MAY 11 1945

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 78th CONGRESS
SECOND SESSION

VOLUME 90—PART 6

AUGUST 25, 1944, TO NOVEMBER 29, 1944
(PAGES 7303 TO 8590)

UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE, WASHINGTON, 1944

Copy 2

AUTHENTICATED
U.S. GOVERNMENT
INFORMATION
GPO

LAW LIBRARY
FEDERAL WORKS AGENCY

United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 78th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

SENATE

FRIDAY, AUGUST 25, 1944

(Legislative day of Tuesday, August 15, 1944)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

Rev. Samuel W. Irwin, D. D., formerly superintendent of Methodist work in Yugoslavia, offered the following prayer:

Eternal Father, we stand in this august place to take upon our lips Thy name. Beyond all human stature and wisdom and power art Thou whose duration is eternity. Yet Thou art gracious in heart and dost draw near to any devout and listening soul, and in confidence we come.

Grant to each one the strength and privacy of prayer; grant us the frankness of a transparent life; give us an abounding courage to do the right; and may we hold a vision of an unshakable realm of brotherhood and find wisdom to defeat every thrust against it of the scheming and the selfish who would permit again the slaughter of our priceless sons.

The needs of the day are so full of portent we must hold conference with Thee. Thou art all-wise and all-compassionate, and Thy servants would be inspired by Thy wisdom and be touched with Thy compassion. The eyes of the whole earth are looking this way—a very troubled earth and eyes expectant and wistful—eyes washed by tears of hallowed sacrifice, yearning with unutterable need, lighted with undismayable hope, and they are looking this way. To Thine own honor and glory and to the unsullied name of our integrity may we prepare a highway in the earth for the feet of the Eternal Justice. Let the crooked be made straight and the rough places plain for the humblest traveler of the race, and may God's Kingdom find an avenue through us to an aspiring but now bewildered humankind.

In the Name that is above every name. Amen.

DESIGNATION OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The Secretary, Edwin A. Halsey, read the following letter:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, D. C., August 25, 1944.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate, I appoint Hon. JOHN H. OVERTON, a Senator from the State of Louisiana, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

CARTER GLASS,
President pro tempore.

Mr. OVERTON thereupon took the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. HILL, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Thursday, August 24, 1944, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. HILL. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Ferguson	Moore
Andrews	George	O'Mahoney
Austin	Guffey	Overton
Bankhead	Gurney	Pepper
Buck	Hawkes	Revercomb
Burton	Hayden	Reynolds
Byrd	Hill	Shipstead
Capper	Johnson, Calif.	Stewart
Caraway	Johnson, Colo.	Taft
Chandler	La Follette	Thomas, Okla.
Connally	Langer	Vandenberg
Cordon	McClellan	Wagner
Danaher	McFarland	Walsh, N. J.
Davis	McKellar	Weeks
Downey	Maloney	Wherry
Eastland	Mead	White
Ellender	Millikin	Wiley

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. BILBO], the Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE], and the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] are absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] is absent because of illness in his family.

The Senators from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY and Mr. REYNOLDS], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CLARK], the Senators from Missouri [Mr. CLARK and Mr. TRUMAN], the Senators from Rhode Island [Mr. GERRY and Mr. GREEN], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. SCRUGHAM], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH], and the Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER] are necessarily absent.

The Senators from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ and Mr. HATCH], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JACKSON], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], the Senator from Utah [Mr. MURDOCK], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senators from Maryland [Mr. RADCLIFFE and Mr. TYDINGS], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. TUNNELL], the Senator from Washington [Mr. WALLGREN], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] are detained on public business.

The Senator from Texas [Mr. O'DANIEL] and the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] are detained in Government departments on matters pertaining to their respective States.

Mr. WHERRY. The following Senators are necessarily absent:

The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL], the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. HOLMAN], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. NYE], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ROBERTSON], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. THOMAS], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. WILLIS], and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. WILSON].

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Fifty-one Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

BILL INTRODUCED

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma, by unanimous consent, introduced a bill (S. 2107) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to partition certain lands in Cleveland County, Okla., which was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

HOURLY MINIMUM WAGE STANDARDS

Mr. PEPPER, by unanimous consent, submitted the following concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 48), which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor:

Whereas pursuant to the act of October 2, 1942, which was designed to aid in stabilizing the cost of living, the President in Executive Orders, Nos. 9250 and 9328, conferred authority upon the National War Labor Board to correct substandards of living; and

Whereas substandard wages not only undermine the health and strength of the Nation, but curtail production; and

Whereas Congress deems it desirable to determine a rate below which wage rates shall be considered substandard: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That it is the sense of the Congress that a straight time hourly rate of 65 cents per hour is the minimum below which the National War Labor Board shall consider any wage rate substandard.

PETROLEUM AGREEMENT WITH GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND—BAN OF SECRECY REMOVED

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, as in executive session, I ask unanimous consent that the ban of secrecy be removed

from Executive F (Seventy-eighth Congress, second session), an agreement on petroleum between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, signed in Washington August 8, 1944.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, and, as in executive session, it is so ordered.

The agreement above referred to was made public, as follows:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
August 24, 1944.

To the Senate of the United States:

To the end that the Senate may give its advice and consent to ratification, if it approve thereof, I transmit herewith an agreement on petroleum between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, signed in Washington August 8, 1944.

With the agreement I transmit for the information of the Senate the report made to me by the Secretary of State relating thereto.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

[Enclosures: (1) Report of the Secretary of State; (2) agreement on petroleum between the United States and the United Kingdom, signed August 8, 1944.]

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, August 24, 1944.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House:

The undersigned, the Secretary of State, has the honor to lay before the President, with a view to its transmission to the Senate to receive the advice and consent of that body to ratification, if his judgment approve thereof, an agreement on petroleum between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, signed in Washington August 8, 1944.

The agreement expresses the mutual understanding of the two Governments with respect to certain principles governing international trade in petroleum. These priciples have relation to (1) the making available of adequate petroleum supplies to the nationals of all peaceable countries at fair prices and on a nondiscriminatory basis, subject to such collective security arrangements as may be established; (2) the development of petroleum resources with a view to encouraging the sound economic advancement of producing countries; (3) equal opportunity in the acquisition of exploration and development rights in areas not now under concession; (4) respect for valid concession contracts and lawfully acquired rights; and (5) safeguarding the production and distribution of petroleum from restrictions inconsistent with the principles and purposes of the agreement.

The agreement is of an interim character, intended to be preliminary to the negotiation of an international agreement to which the goverments of all producing and consuming countries interested in the international petroleum trade would become parties and which would establish a permanent International Petroleum Council. The agreement provides that the two Governments will formulate plans for an international conference to consider the negotiation of a multilateral petroleum agreement and that they will consult with other interested governments with a view to taking any necessary action to prepare for the proposed conference.

Meanwhile, for the discussing and resolving, on a cooperative interim basis, of certain problems of joint immediate interest to the two Governments, the agreement provides for the establishment of an International Petroleum Commission to be composed of eight members, four to be appointed by each Government. The commission is charged with the responsibility of considering problems of mutual interest to the two Governments and their respective nationals. With a view to the equitable disposition of such problems the commission is charged with (1) preparing long-term estimates of world demand for petroleum and suggesting the manner in which this estimated demand may best be satisfied by production equitably distributed among the various producing countries in accordance with the general principles of the agreement; (2) recommending broad policies for adoption by operating companies; (3) analyzing short-term problems of joint interest, wherever the nationals of either country have a significant interest, in connection with production, processing, transportation, and distribution of petroleum on a world-wide basis; and (4) making appropriate reports and recommendations to the two Governments.

It is provided in the agreement that the two Governments will seek the collaboration of the governments of other producing and consuming countries in the implementation of the principles underlying the agreement and will consult, as appropriate, with such governments in connection with activities undertaken on the basis of recommendations of the Commission established by the agreement.

The agreement consists of an introductory article and six numbered articles. Article VI provides that the agreement shall enter into force upon a date to be agreed upon after each Government shall have notified the other of its readiness to bring the agreement into force and that the agreement shall continue in force until 3 months after notice of termination has been given by either Government or until it is superseded by a multilateral petroleum agreement of the character mentioned hereinbefore.

Respectfully submitted.

CORDELL HULL.

[Enclosures: Agreement on petroleum between the United States and the United Kingdom, signed August 8, 1944.]

AGREEMENT ON PETROLEUM BETWEEN THE GOVERNMENT OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA AND THE GOVERNMENT OF THE UNITED KINGDOM OF GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND

INTRODUCTORY ARTICLE

The Government of the United States of America and the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, whose nationals hold, to a substantial extent jointly, rights to explore and develop petroleum resources in other countries, recognize:

1. That ample supplies of petroleum, available in international trade to meet increasing market demands, are essential for both the security and economic well-being of nations;

2. That for the foreseeable future the petroleum resources of the world are adequate to assure the availability of such supplies;

3. That such supplies should be derived from the various producing areas of the world with due consideration of such factors as available reserves, sound engineering practices, relevant economic factors, and the interests of producing and consuming countries, and with a view to the full satisfaction of expanding demand;

4. That such supplies should be available in accordance with the principles of the Atlantic Charter and in order to serve the needs of collective security;

5. That the general adoption of these principles can best be promoted by international agreement among all countries interested in the petroleum trade whether as producers or consumers.

ARTICLE I

The two Governments agree that the development of petroleum resources for international trade should be expanded in an orderly manner on a world-wide basis with due consideration of the factors set forth in paragraph 3 of the Introductory Article and within the framework of applicable laws or concession contracts. To this end, and as a preliminary measure to the calling of the international conference referred to in Article II below, the two Governments will so direct their efforts, with respect to petroleum resources in which rights are held or may be acquired by the nationals of either country:

1. That, subject always to considerations of military security and to the provisions of such arrangements for the preservation of peace and prevention of aggression as may be in force, adequate supplies of petroleum shall be available in international trade to the nationals of all peaceable countries at fair prices and on a nondiscriminatory basis;

2. That the development of petroleum resources and the benefits received therefrom by the producing countries shall be such as to encourage the sound economic advancement of those countries;

3. That the development of these resources shall be conducted with a view to the availability of adequate supplies of petroleum to both countries as well as to all other peaceable countries, subject to the provisions of such collective security arrangements as may be established;

4. That, with respect to the acquisition of exploration and development rights in areas not now under concession, the principle of equal opportunity shall be respected by both Governments;

5. That the Government of each country and the nationals thereof shall respect all valid concession contracts and lawfully acquired rights, and shall make no effort unilaterally to interfere directly or indirectly with such contracts or rights;

6. That, subject always to the considerations mentioned in paragraph 1 of this Article, the exploration for and development of petroleum resources, the construction and operation of refineries and other facilities, and the distribution of petroleum shall not be hampered by restrictions imposed by either Government or its nationals, inconsistent with the purposes of this Agreement.

ARTICLE II

The two Governments recognize that the principles declared in Article I hereof are of general applicability and merit adherence on the part of all countries interested in the international petroleum trade of the world.

Therefore, with a view to the wider adoption and effectuation of the principles embodied in this Agreement they agree that as soon as practicable they will propose to the governments of other interested producing and consuming countries an International Petroleum Agreement which, inter alia, would establish a permanent International Petroleum Council composed of representatives of all signatory countries.

To this end the two Governments hereby pledge themselves to formulate plans for an international conference to consider the negotiation of such a multilateral Petroleum Agreement. They also pledge themselves to consult with other interested governments with a view to taking whatever action is necessary to prepare for the proposed conference.

ARTICLE III

There are, however, numerous problems of joint immediate interest to the two Governments, with respect to petroleum resources in which rights are held or may be acquired

by their nationals, which must be discussed and resolved on a cooperative interim basis if the general petroleum supply situation is not to deteriorate.

With this end in view the two Governments hereby agree to establish an International Petroleum Commission to be composed of eight members, four members to be appointed immediately by each Government. This Commission, in furtherance of and in accordance with the principles stated in Article I hereof, shall consider problems of mutual interest to both Governments and their nationals, and, with a view to the equitable disposition of such problems, shall be charged with the following duties and responsibilities:

1. To prepare long-term estimates of world demand for petroleum, having due regard for the interests of consuming countries and expanding consumption requirements;

2. To suggest the manner in which, over the long term, this estimated demand may best be satisfied by production equitably distributed among the various producing countries in accordance with the criteria enumerated in paragraph 3 of the Introductory Article;

3. To recommend to both Governments broad policies for adoption by operating companies with a view to effectuating programs suggested under the provisions of paragraph 2 of this Article;

4. To analyze such short-term problems of joint interest as may arise in connection with production, processing, transportation and distribution of petroleum on a world-wide basis, wherever the nationals of either country have a significant interest, and to recommend to both Governments such action as may appear appropriate;

5. To make regular reports to the two Governments concerning its activities;

6. To make, from time to time, such additional reports and recommendations to the two Governments as may be appropriate to carry out the purposes of this Agreement.

The Commission shall establish such organization as is necessary to carry out its functions under this Agreement. The expenses of the Commission shall be shared equally by the two Governments.

ARTICLE IV

To effectuate this Agreement the two Governments hereby grant reciprocal assurances:

1. That they will adhere to the principles set forth in Article I, paragraphs 1 to 6 inclusive;

2. That they will endeavor to obtain the collaboration of the governments of other producing and consuming countries in the implementation of the principles set forth in Article I, and will consult, as appropriate, with such governments in connection with activities undertaken under Article III;

3. That upon approval of the recommendations of the Commission they will endeavor, in accordance with their respective constitutional procedures, to give effect to such approved recommendations;

4. That each Government will undertake to keep itself adequately informed of the current and prospective activities of its nationals with respect to the development, processing, transportation and distribution of petroleum;

5. That each Government will make available to the Commission such information regarding the activities of its nationals as is necessary to the realization of the purposes of this Agreement.

ARTICLE V

The two Governments agree that in this Agreement:

1. The words "country" or "territories"

(a) in relation to the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, include, in addition to the United Kingdom, all British colonies, overseas territories, protectorates, protected States and all mandated territories administered by that Government; and

(b) in relation to the Government of the United States of America, include, in addition to the United States, all territory under the jurisdiction of the United States;

2. The word "nationals" means

(a) in relation to the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, all British subjects and British protected persons belonging to the territories referred to in 1 (a) above and all companies incorporated under the laws of any of the above-mentioned territories, and also companies incorporated elsewhere in which the controlling interest is held by any of such nationals;

(b) in relation to the Government of the United States of America, all nationals of the United States including companies incorporated under the laws of the territories referred to in 1 (b) above, and also companies incorporated elsewhere in which the controlling interest is held by any of such nationals;

3. The word "petroleum" means crude petroleum and its derivatives.

ARTICLE VI

This Agreement shall enter into force upon a date to be agreed upon after each Government shall have notified the other of its readiness to bring the Agreement into force and shall continue in force until three months after notice of termination has been given by either Government or until it is superseded by the International Petroleum Agreement contemplated in Article II.

In witness whereof the undersigned, duly authorized thereto, have signed this Agreement.

Done in Washington, in duplicate, this eighth day of August, one thousand nine hundred and forty-four.

For the Government of the United States of America:

E. R. STETTINIUS, Jr.,
Acting Secretary of State of the United States of America.

For the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland:

BEAVERBROOK
Lord Privy Seal

VOTING BY SERVICEMEN FROM NEW YORK STATE—EDITORIAL FROM PHILADELPHIA RECORD

[Mr. GUFFEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Dewey's Costly Victory—Over New York's Soldiers," published in the Philadelphia Record of August 25, 1944, which appears in the Appendix.]

VISIT TO THE SENATE BY HIS EXCELLENCY SVEINN BJORNSSON, PRESIDENT OF ICELAND

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, the President of Iceland is now in one of the anterooms of the Senate Chamber. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand in recess subject to the call of the Chair in order that the President of Iceland may come onto the floor of the Senate. Under the rules that is not possible while the Senate is in session.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senate will stand in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

The Senate being in recess, at 12 o'clock and 20 minutes p. m.,

His Excellency Sveinn Bjornsson, President of Iceland, escorted by Senator CONNALLY, and accompanied by Mr. Bjarm Gudmundsson, Chief of Press Section, Foreign Ministry, Mr. Peter Eggerz, secretary to President Bjornsson, Brig. Gen. F. von H. Kimble, United States Army, and Capt. Harry W. Baltazzi, United States Naval Reserve, entered the Chamber.

President Bjornsson was escorted to a position on the floor of the Senate in front of the Vice President's desk and was there greeted by Members of the Senate, who were introduced to him by Mr. CONNALLY.

Following the informal reception, President Bjornsson and the distinguished visitors accompanying him were escorted from the Chamber.

At 12 o'clock and 24 minutes p. m., the Senate reassembled; when it was called to order by the Acting President pro tempore.

DISPOSAL OF SURPLUS GOVERNMENT PROPERTY

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2065) to establish a Surplus War Property Administration, to provide for the proper disposal of surplus war property, and for other purposes.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, when the Senate took a recess yesterday, the amendment offered by the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCFARLAND], and myself was allowed to go over until today in view of the possibility of agreeing upon an amendment which the Senate generally could support.

The question was submitted to the two members of the staff of legislative counsel who are aiding the Senator from Colorado and other Senators in connection with the bill. Inasmuch as the principal objection raised to the amendment was to the words in the fourth, fifth, sixth, and seventh lines on page 2 of the amendment, those gentlemen suggested that the words "requiring the execution by all subsequent transferors of such property of instruments containing such reservations in connection with all future transfers of such property except transfers to consumers" be stricken out, and that in lieu thereof the following language be inserted on page 2, line 3, after "(B)":

> The inclusion in all subsequent transfers of such property, made prior to the expiration of 5 years after disposition of such property under the provisions of this act, of conditions containing such reservations, except transfers to consumers or, in the case of transfers of real property, to persons who in good faith propose to use or occupy such real property.

Mr. President, in view of the fact that the principal objection raised to the amendment was directed at the language to which I have referred, the authors of the amendment have instructed me to modify the amendment as I have indicated. I ask unanimous consent to modify the amendment.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Tennessee has a right to modify his amendment, without unanimous consent.

Mr. McKELLAR. I ask that that be done, and that the amendment be considered as modified.

Mr. President, that should satisfy all Senators. The principal objection urged against the amendment was to the language to which I have referred. I believe the Senator from Vermont [Mr.

AUSTIN] was opposed to the entire amendment.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair suggests to the Senator from Tennessee that the amendment, as modified, be stated.

Mr. McKELLAR. It should be stated.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment, as modified, will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 74, line 16, in the committee amendment, it is proposed to strike out "A" and insert "(a) Except as provided in subsection '(b)' of this section, a."

On page 74, between lines 24 and 25, it is proposed to insert a new subsection, as follows:

(b) (1) All deeds, bills of sale, leases, or other instruments purporting to transfer title or any other interest in surplus property under this act shall contain provisions (A) reserving to the board the right to examine further transfers of the property covered thereby for the purpose of determining whether excessive profits have been realized by the transferee or any subsequent transferee, and (B) the inclusion in all subsequent transfers of such property, made prior to the expiration of 5 years after disposition of such property under the provisions of this act, of conditions containing such reservations, except transfers to consumers or, in the case of transfers of real property, to persons who in good faith propose to use or occupy such real property.

(2) As used in this subsection the term "excessive profits" means the portion of the profits derived from purchase and sale of any item or group of items of surplus property by any person to whom such property is disposed of under this act, or by any subsequent transferee of such property, which the Board determines in accordance with this subsection to be excessive. In determining whether excessive profits have been realized there shall be taken into consideration the following factors:

(A) reasonableness of profits in the light of normal pre-war profits, and profits realized in the usual course of business on similar items which have not been disposed of under this act;

(B) amount of capital employed and risk assumed;

(C) character of business and rate of turnover;

(D) such other factors the consideration of which the public interest and fair and equitable dealing may require, which factors shall be published in the regulations of the Board from time to time as adopted.

(3) In any case in which, in the opinion of the Board, excessive profits have been realized it shall forthwith give notice by registered mail to the person or persons to whom it believes such profits have accrued together with a statement of the facts used as a basis for such opinion. After reasonable opportunity for hearing, the Board shall enter an order determining the amount, if any, of such excessive profits. The Board shall take such action as may be necessary to recover such excessive profits either by settlement or suit in any court of competent jurisdiction. In any such suit the court may, in addition, impose a penalty in an amount not exceeding twice the amount adjudged to be excessive profits. All money recovered by reason of any such settlement or suit or as a penalty shall be covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the modified amendment offered by the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR] on behalf of himself, the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], and the Senator from Arizona [Mr. McFARLAND] to the committee amendment.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, this amendment is offered in the best of faith for the purpose of protecting the Government. As an illustration of the value of such an amendment, I was told at the breakfast table this morning about a man who had bought a jeep from the Army for $100 and had resold it to a farmer for $1,000. I was also told by the same gentleman that he knew of organizations which were being formed for the purpose of buying property from the Government and reselling it at a profit.

There is $103,000,000,000 at stake. The bill provides that the proceeds from sales are to go back into the Treasury. I am not sure but that we ought to have a provision—and I may offer such an amendment later—that the proceeds from these sales shall be used to retire Government bonds which have been issued. I think it is time to consider, discuss, and take action upon the question of how we are going to pay the enormous debt which will be piled upon the Nation as a result of this war. The general estimate of what we shall owe is $300,000,000,000. That is an enormous sum. I am not sure but that proceeds from the sale of surplus property ought to be earmarked and used for the purpose of reducing the immense amount of bonded debt.

As I have previously stated, Mr. President, the Senator from Mississippi, the Senator from Arizona, and I have offered this amendment solely for the purpose of trying to help protect the Government in the sale of surplus property. We have no other desire. We wish to make it perfectly fair. We do not wish to work hardship on anyone. We have no possible reason for offering the amendment except to protect the Government of the United States in the sale of its surplus property. We know that the principle will work, because it has already been tried under the present renegotiation law. We know that that law has worked, and we believe that the amendment would work equally well.

Mr. President, I have nothing further to say about this matter. I believe that the amendment would save the Government billions of dollars, and I hope the Senate will agree to it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, before the vote is taken on the McKellar amendment, I wish to read into the RECORD a letter received just now from James G. Patton. I am, of course, in hearty accord with Mr. Patton's statement. I cannot speak for the Senate Military Affairs Committee, but as an individual Senator I hope the McKellar amendment will be agreed to. Here is the Patton telegram:

AUGUST 25, 1944.

Senator EDWARD JOHNSON,
Senate Chamber of the Capitol,
Washington, D. C.:

The National Farmers Union strongly favors the Stewart-Murray-Johnson-Taft bill governing disposal of surplus property as the bill was reported to the Senate. We favor also the principle embodied in the amendment proposed by Senators McKELLAR, EASTLAND, and McFARLAND and supported by Senator AIKEN and others for the limitation of profits on surplus resales to a reasonable figure. In particular, we should like to express our desire that section 12 be retained in the bill as it now stands. We believe that the ownership by the Government of huge stocks of educational, medical, and other materials and goods suitable for public use presents the Nation with an unparalleled opportunity for raising the standards of living of all the people. It is an opportunity that should not be allowed to slip away. Rural sections are those most in need of improved facilities and services, and section 12 is supported by every farmer in the country who has had a chance to learn about its provisions.

We also wholeheartedly support the farmland, cooperative, and small-business provisions of the bill, and trust that it will be adopted and adhered to in any subsequent conference with the House, which has adopted the worse-than-useless Colmer bill.

JAMES G. PATTON,
President, National Farmers Union.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the modified amendment offered by the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR], on behalf of himself, the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], and the Senator from Arizona [Mr. McFARLAND], to the committee amendment.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, I rise only to ask for the yeas and nays. There are not many Senators present.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I join in the request for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HAYDEN (when his name was called). I have a pair with the senior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. NYE]. Not knowing how he would vote, I withhold my vote.

Mr. WAGNER. I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED]. I transfer that pair to the junior Senator from Maryland [Mr. RADCLIFFE], and will vote. I vote "nay."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. BILBO], the Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE], and the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] are absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] is absent because of illness in his family.

The Senators from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY and Mr. REYNOLDS], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CLARK], the Senators from Missouri [Mr. CLARK and Mr. TRUMAN], the Senators from Rhode Island [Mr. GERRY and Mr. GREEN], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. SCRUGHAM], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH], and the Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER] are necessarily absent.

The Senators from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ and Mr. HATCH], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JACKSON], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN], the Senator from Utah [Mr.

MURDOCK], the Senator from Montana Mr. MURRAY], the Senators from Marylands [Mr. RADCLIFFE and Mr. TYDINGS], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. TUNNELL], the Senator from Washington [Mr. WALLGREN], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] are detained on public business.

The Senator from Texas [Mr. O'DANIEL] and the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] are detained in Government departments on matters pertaining to their respective States.

The Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] has a general pair with the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES].

Mr. WHERRY. The following Senators are necessarily absent:

The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL], the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. HOLMAN], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. NYE], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ROBERTSON], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. THOMAS], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. WILLIS], and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. WILSON].

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], who is unavoidably absent, has a general pair with the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS].

The result was announced—yeas 18, nays 31, as follows:

YEAS—18

Aiken	Hill	McKellar
Andrews	Johnson, Colo.	Overton
Bankhead	La Follette	Pepper
Caraway	Langer	Shipstead
Connally	McClellan	Stewart
Eastland	McFarland	Thomas, Okla.

NAYS—31

Austin	Ferguson	Revercomb
Buck	George	Taft
Burton	Guffey	Vandenberg
Byrd	Gurney	Wagner
Capper	Hawkes	Walsh, N. J.
Chandler	Johnson, Calif.	Weeks
Cordon	Maloney	Wherry
Danaher	Mead	White
Davis	Millikin	Wiley
Downey	Moore	
Ellender	O'Mahoney	

NOT VOTING—47

Bailey	Green	Robertson
Ball	Hatch	Russell
Barkley	Hayden	Scrugham
Bilbo	Holman	Smith
Bone	Jackson	Thomas, Idaho
Brewster	Kilgore	Thomas, Utah
Bridges	Lucas	Tobey
Brooks	McCarran	Truman
Bushfield	Maybank	Tunnell
Butler	Murdock	Tydings
Chavez	Murray	Wallgren
Clark, Idaho	Nye	Walsh, Mass.
Clark, Mo.	O'Daniel	Wheeler
Gerry	Radcliffe	Willis
Gillette	Reed	Wilson
Glass	Reynolds	

So the modified amendment proposed by Mr. McKELLAR (for himself, Mr. EASTLAND, and Mr. MCFARLAND) to the committee amendment was rejected.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, yesterday I proposed an amendment which would give the States and their political subdivisions the preferential right to purchase surplus military cantonments and fields. In the discussion which followed, several Senators made certain suggestions regarding the amendment of my proposal.

I have now sent to the desk additional language to be inserted at the end of the proposed amendment as it was submitted yesterday. I should like to have that language read. Then, with that addition, I should like to have the Senate pass upon the amendment.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The modification will be read, for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. At the end of the amendment it is proposed to add the following:

If such real property is not purchased or leased by such State or any of its political subdivisions prior to the adjournment of the legislature or general assembly in session at the time such property becomes available for disposition, or if such legislature or general assembly is not then in session, prior to the adjournment of the next session thereafter, such real property may be disposed of in accordance with the provisions of section 22 of this act. Any property purchased by a State or political subdivision thereof under this subsection shall be subject to the provisions of subsection (d) of section 12.

So as to make the amendment read:

(c) Before any real property which was acquired for use as a military camp or cantonment is disposed of under the provisions of section 22 of this act, an opportunity shall first be afforded to the State in which such property is located and to its political subdivisions, including municipalities, to purchase or lease such real property for public uses at discounts not to exceed 50 percent of the sale or lease market value thereof, as the case may be, or 50 percent of the highest price offered by any private purchaser or lessee, whichever is lower. If such real property is not purchased or leased by such State or any of its political subdivisions prior to the adjournment of the legislature or general assembly in session at the time such property becomes available for disposition, or if such legislature or general assembly is not then in session, prior to the adjournment of the next session thereafter, such real property may be disposed of in accordance with the provisions of section 22 of this act. Any property purchased by a State or political subdivision thereof under this subsection shall be subject to the provisions of subsection (d) of section 12.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, as I have already stated, the amendment in this form is acceptable to the Senator from Colorado and other members of the Committee on Military Affairs. I move the adoption of amendment as modified.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. DOWNEY. I yield.

Mr. DANAHER. Inasmuch as the word "legislature" is generic in and of itself, and applies to the State's governing body, I would respectfully suggest to the Senator from California that it be retained in the modified amendment, but that in lieu of the words "general assembly" the Senator insert the words "authorized governing body," for the reason that the Senator has made his amendment applicable to the political subdivisions of a State, and it might be that the council of aldermen or other appropriate group or body might make such a decision.

Mr. DOWNEY. I am very happy to have that modification made.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be so modified.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. DOWNEY. I yield.

Mr. BURTON. As I understand the effect of the amendment, if the legislature of a given State is not in session, and there is property of this kind to be disposed of within the State, the title will not be cleared until the legislature has been called into session and has adjourned.

Mr. DOWNEY. I would not express it in quite that way. As I understand the effect of the amendment, the State would not lose its full opportunity to purchase the property until after the legislature was in session and had adjourned.

Mr. BURTON. That would mean that a private purchaser could not afford to buy the property until after the period to which the Senator has referred had expired, and that might take 2 years.

Mr. DOWNEY. That is correct. I believe that this provision of the amendment was suggested by the Senator from Connecticut and other Senators, as well, and I thought it would be a proper provision.

Mr. BURTON. Does the Senator from California feel that a delay of 2 years might be serious in the disposal of property?

Mr. DOWNEY. No; I do not believe so. I think that such a delay would be the maximum delay, and, generally speaking, there would not be even as much delay as that.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the modified amendment of the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] to the committee amendment.

The modified amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, yesterday afternoon shortly before the adjournment of the Senate, certain amendments were acted upon. I refer particularly to one which was proposed by the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WEEKS]. It appears to have been agreed to unanimously. The amendment is set forth on page 7290 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of yesterday, August 24. It would appear on page 50 of the bill, after line 19, and read as follows: *"Provided, however,* That no extension of credit shall be for a longer period than 5 years."

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate reconsider the vote by which the amendment was agreed to.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request of the Senator from Tennessee? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered. The amendment is again before the Senate.

Mr. STEWART. I shall discuss the amendment later, Mr. President.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Massachusetts to the committee amendment.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, may we have the amendment stated?

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, I asked to be allowed to discuss the amendment later. I should like to talk about it before it is voted upon. I did not understand that it would be called up for immediate consideration.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. STEWART. Am I to understand that the Chair submitted my unanimous-consent request for reconsideration of the vote by which the amendment was passed?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The unanimous-consent request was granted, and then the question arose on agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. STEWART. I should like to discuss the amendment before a vote is taken.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Tennessee may proceed.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, the amendment to which I refer appears on page 50 of the bill at the end of line 19. It comes under section 14 entitled "Small Business." The proposed amendment would entirely hamstring small business concerns of the country in their effort to enter into competitive bidding for surplus war property. The provision with respect to small business does not place any time limitation whatever upon the guaranty of a loan in behalf of small business.

As I have already said, the amendment was added at the end of subparagraph (3) of section 14, which reads as follows:

(3) In appropriate cases in the discretion of the agency or the board, arrange for sales on credit or time bases, or such other terms or conditions as will preserve the competitive position of small business enterprises in the purchase or acquisition of surplus property and accord them a fair opportunity for the acquisition thereof.

The amendment immediately followed that language and read as follows: "*Provided, however,* That no extension of credit shall be for a longer period than 5 years."

If the loan were to be limited to a period of 5 years it would not accomplish the purpose of the subparagraph which I have read. It would not preserve the competitive position of small business enterprises in the purchase or acquisition of surplus war property, or accord to them a fair opportunity for the acquisition of such property. There conceivably might be many instances of small business concerns being anxious to purchase Government plants, the price of which might be within their reach, and not be able to repay the loan within the period which would no doubt be set forth in the application, or at least not within 5 years. There might be cases in which the purchasers would not be able to pay such loans even within 10 years.

The matter as it now stands is in the discretion of the Smaller War Plants Corporation, which has authority to guarantee loans made by lending agencies, private or otherwise. It could certainly be said that not to place a limitation of time in the bill would not be sound business, because in some cases the Smaller War Plants Corporation might aid in the negotiation of the sale of a small war plant to a small business concern in the manner provided for by the act. I have reference now to undertaking to guarantee the payment, for example, to a private banking concern. Sound and good business methods should enter into such a situation, because private business concerns would not be desirous of making loans of this character unless they had at least the aspect of soundness.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STEWART. I will yield in a moment.

If an arbitrary limitation of 5 years should be provided by the statute, it is conceivable that a private banking institution might foresee the impossibility of a small concern paying for the property within a short length of time and thus the opportunities afforded under the proposed act would be destroyed.

Mr. WEEKS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. STEWART. I yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. WEEKS. I do not believe the distinguished Senator from Tennessee and I are as far apart as we might think we are with respect to the amendment agreed to yesterday. The amendment would limit credit to 5 years when it was arranged in accordance with the purchase or acquisition of surplus war property.

Mr. President, as I see it, in paragraph (f) on page 51 of the bill surplus war property, plants, and facilities are set apart and distinguished. In paragraph (f) there is specific provision for loans for acquisition and conversion of plants and facilities. Later in the same paragraph there is reference to credit in connection with sales of surplus property.

I believe that in subparagraph (3) on page 50 of the bill the limitation on the duration of credit, which I think to be proper, applies not to plants and facilities, but to other surplus property in the hands of the owning agencies concerned. I do not believe that the distinguished Senator from Tennessee would object to having some limitation placed upon the duration of credit for the purpose of purchasing surplus war property, plants, and equipment which would go with the plants. That is the definition which I should like to make.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, I invite attention of the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts to the definition of surplus property appearing on page 76 of the bill, reading as follows:

(e) The term "surplus property" means any property which has been determined to be surplus to the needs and responsibilities of the owning agency in accordance with section 9 of this act.

That is in conflict with the section the Senator has just read. I think under this proposed act anything, even land, might be declared to be surplus property; a plant itself might be surplus property, and I think definitely it would be under the provisions of the Senator's amendment.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado and Mr. ELLENDER addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McKELLAR in the chair). Does the Senator yield, and, if so, to whom?

Mr. STEWART. I yield first to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I want to find out first how the proposal applies. It seems to me now that it applies only to small business. If there should be a limitation on credit, the limitation should be to every kind of business and to all parts of the bill pertaining to credit. It does not seem to me that we should single out small business and put a 5-year limitation on the surplus property which small business buys and leave credit wide open in the remainder of the bill.

Mr. STEWART. This bill does not undertake, as I understand, to lend money to any concern except a small business concern.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. It gives the Board the right to sell for cash or for credit.

Mr. STEWART. But it does not permit the Smaller War Plants Corporation to lend money except to small business concerns. It is limited strictly to small business concerns.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. This particular section, section 14 (a), and subdivisions 1, 2, and 3, do not have anything to do with the Smaller War Plants Corporation. They pertain to the Board. On line 21, page 49, it says, "It shall be the duty of the Board, and it is hereby authorized and directed" to do certain things.

Mr. STEWART. Under the general wording of the act, in the case of small business, arrangements would be made through the Smaller War Plants Corporation, would they not?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. That may be, but the loans provided for are loans that are authorized by the Board.

Mr. STEWART. Yes; by the Board, which will administer this proposed act.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. What bothers me in respect to the amendment is, Does it apply only to credit that is given small business or does it apply to other credits that may be arranged?

Mr. STEWART. I think it does, because we should read the entire section 14; it has to be construed as an entirety. Section 14 begins:

SEC. 14. (a) It shall be the duty of the board, and it is hereby authorized and directed to devise ways and means and prescribe appropriate regulations and directives, to prevent any discrimination against small business in the disposal and distribution and use of any Government property covered by this act. To that end the board shall cause the disposal agencies to adopt and pursue the following measures.

Then it proceeds to specify them. It refers to small business and nothing else. That is all that is brought under that section. But paragraph (3) of section

14 specifically refers again to small business, and states, as I read a moment ago:

In appropriate cases in the discretion of the agency or the board, arrange for sales on credit or time bases—

To whom? To small business. Why? Because it says:

or such other terms or conditions as will preserve the competitive position of small business enterprises.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. But the Senator misses the point I am trying to make, which is that it is a specific limitation to small business and does not apply to any other disposal.

Mr. STEWART. It does not apply to any other disposal, but what would be most seriously affected would be small business, because in most instances certainly it is conceivable, I think, that small business would be the one to need loans and assistance and help.

Mr. ELLENDER and Mr. HILL addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Tennessee yield; and, if so, to whom?

Mr. STEWART. I yield first to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. ELLENDER. I gather from the statement just made by the Senator from Massachusetts that it was his idea to limit credit insofar as movable property was concerned, and it was not to apply to plants or real estate.

Mr. STEWART. I do not believe it can be divided in that way in view of the definition of surplus property contained in the bill.

Mr. ELLENDER. It may be possible to do it by amendment. I am going to ask the Senator whether or not he does not think it would be fair to place on credit insofar as the sale of movable property is concerned a limitation of 5 years and in the case of real estate or the sale of plants let the question of credit be left to the discretion of the board.

Mr. STEWART. I do not quite understand the Senator; I fail to follow him.

Mr. ELLENDER. In the list of surplus property there will be quite a lot of movable property, as well, of course, as real-estate, plants, and so forth. So far as the sale of plants is concerned, or real estate, it strikes me that it might be a good idea to leave the question of credit, that is, the length of time in which the purchase price may be repaid, to the board; but, insofar as the sale on credit of movables is concerned, it strikes me that we should write into the bill a limitation on credit. I believe that a limitation of 5 years on credit, insofar as movable property is concerned, might be advisable.

Mr. WEEKS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Tennessee yield to the Senator from Massachusetts?

Mr. STEWART. I yield.

Mr. WEEKS. Does not the Senator from Tennessee consider that in paragraph (f) on pages 51 and 52 there is a distinction, because it refers to loans for the acquisition of plants and facilities, while later in the same paragraph, in effect, other types of surplus property are separated.

Mr. STEWART. Paragraph (f) refers to the Smaller War Plants Corporation, in cases where they step in and undertake to aid small business. If the Senator's amendment is adopted as it reads, placing a limitation on the extension of credit to 5 years in all cases where the board undertakes to arrange for a sale, would that not be an interference with the operations of the Smaller War Plants Corporation?

Mr. WEEKS. In making loans on plants or to help acquire plants?

Mr. STEWART. Yes; or in any instance.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STEWART. I should like to finish this colloquy, because I want to understand what is in the mind of the Senator from Massachusetts, and I want to make plain, if I can, what is in my mind.

Mr. WEEKS. There are two types of surplus property—plants and facilities. I am willing to concede there may be reason in the case of some classes of property to require a more extended credit than there would be in the case of raw materials such as wool or an article that is immediately consumable. Therefore, if on surplus property other than plants and heavy equipment we can put a limit on the extension of credit, I think that what is in my mind would be satisfied.

Mr. STEWART. Let me read section (f); it is short:

(f) The Smaller War Plants Corporation—

It is dealing with the Smaller War Plants Corporation, and not the Board—

is hereby authorized, for the purpose of carrying out the objectives of this section—

We are still dealing with section 14—

to make or guarantee loans to small business enterprises in connection with the acquisition, conversion, and operation of plants and facilities, and, in cooperation with the disposal agencies, to arrange for sales of surplus property to small business concerns on credit or time bases.

That refers not only to plants and facilities but to all surplus property and surplus property might be anything. Under this act as I read it, it might be a plant; it might be real estate; it might be movable goods; it might be cotton; it might be wool, or it might be any kind of property that is declared surplus by the agency or the Board.

Mr. WEEKS. Would the Senator agree to an amendment to the amendment so as to provide an additional qualification, namely, "surplus property other than plants and equipment?"

Mr. STEWART. Let me ask the Senator a question. Would the Senator consider that his amendment, which would appear in section 14, after paragraph (3), to be a limitation upon the provisions of section (f) which I have just read and which is in the same section 14?

Mr. WEEKS. Personally I would not, because I would interpret the words "surplus property" in paragraph (3) on page 50 to have the same connotation they have in paragraph (f) on page 52. But I am quite content to qualify the term "surplus property" by excluding plants and heavy equipment or plants and equipment.

Mr. STEWART. The purpose of the Senator's amendment then is to apply only to movable property; not to apply to plants or to real estate.

Mr. WEEKS. To consumable property, so to speak.

Mr. STEWART. The Senator wants it to apply only to consumable property.

Mr. WEEKS. Consumable property other than plant or land or the heavy equipment which may be purchased in order to get it out of production.

Mr. ELLENDER. Which would also include many tools with which to make consumer goods?

Mr. WEEKS. Smaller tools are generally considered consumable property.

Mr. STEWART. The Senator from Massachusetts is a businessman and I am not. I have always understood that the tools of larger nature and machinery are often sold on an amortization basis of perhaps 10 years.

Mr. WEEKS. Equipment of a permanent or semipermanent nature is generally considered to be heavy equipment, and is depreciated on the fixed basis determined by the Bureau of Internal Revenue. Small tools in any business statement are generally handled more or less as consumable property.

Mr. STEWART. Consumable in its use, like money.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STEWART. I yield to the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. HILL. The Senator had in mind excluding land from this provision, because whereas this section appears under the heading "Small business," the section might perhaps well be construed to apply not only to small business but to landowners and everybody else.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STEWART. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. I wish to ask the Senator from Alabama a question. In the case of lands which have been taken over by the Government for camps or plants or anything of that kind, is there any provision made in the bill that in the disposition of such lands preference shall be given to the original owners?

Mr. STEWART. Oh, yes.

Mr. CONNALLY. Frequently farmers who had their homes on their land willingly let the Government have them, but now when the question of resale arises the former owners should have preference. The land ought not to be turned over to land speculators who would hold it up and profiteer in selling to the former owners. That matter must be handled very carefully.

Mr. STEWART. The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER] wishes to comment on the Senator's question.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, I am as deeply concerned as any other Senator respecting that matter. There is a section in the bill which requires that

the original owner shall be given first opportunity to repurchase the land, and then his lineal heirs, and then tenants, and then veterans. As the Senator from Texas well knows, in his section of the country, as well as in Kentucky, existing Army camps were greatly expanded to accommodate the armored divisions, and in many cases actually good farm land was taken out of production, people who had lived in those communities all their lives were uprooted and moved away, and of course they would like to come back to the places of their birth, and get back their own property, which is good agricultural land and capable of producing good crops. They would like to come back to the places where they have their churches and schools and where their children were born. Under the provision they will have the highest priority to purchase the land, the highest right to purchase it. I think the position taken by the Senator from Texas is sound, and I will say that the bill provides adequate safeguards.

Mr. HILL. The bill not only gives the original owners the high priority, but it even provides in subparagraph (5) on page 62 with respect to purchase price, so as to safeguard the original owner from having to pay a high speculative price.

Mr. CONNALLY. I was coming to that.

Mr. HILL. We endeavor to make sure that not only shall the former owner have the prior right to purchase, but that he shall also have the right to purchase at a fair and reasonable price, and not at a high, speculative price.

Mr. CONNALLY. I was going to suggest, Mr. President, that the bill, in addition to a blanket priority, ought to provide for terms and conditions which the ordinary man can meet. I have already received many letters from people who are interested in repurchase by the original owners of these lands. In my State, as I am sure is true in the Senator's State of Alabama, great areas have been taken over for temporary military establishments. When they are abandoned or released, the former owners should not only be given priority, but the terms should be such as to make possible the repurchase. The Senator is correct in the view that speculation should be excluded. Land operators should be more or less excluded.

Mr. HILL. I may say to the Senator from Texas that the Committee on Military Affairs shared his view about the matter of the disposition of lands, and endeavored to write its views in the bill, giving prior right to the original owner, providing for the payment of a fair price for the property, and then providing that if the owner is dead, his heirs shall have the right to exercise the priority, and then the committee even went a step further and provided that if the owner did not want the land, or if he was dead and his heirs did not want the land, tenants who had been on the land should have a prior right to purchase it.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. CHANDLER. Yesterday, the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] offered an amendment which would have limited the priority to owners and their lineal heirs, and to tenants. I inquire if that amendment has been passed upon. The amendment offered by the Senator from California is as follows:

(c) Before any real property which was acquired for use as a military camp or cantonment is disposed of under the provisions of section 22 of this act, an opportunity shall first be afforded to the State in which such property is located and to its political subdivisions, including municipalities, to purchase or lease such real property for public uses at discounts not to exceed 50 percent of the sale or lease market value thereof, as the case may be, or 50 percent of the highest price offered by any private purchaser or lessee, whichever is lower.

Has that amendment been agreed to by the Senate?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That amendment was considered earlier today, modified, and, as modified, agreed to.

Mr. STEWART. May we have the amendment, as modified, stated? It will answer the question asked by the Senator from Texas.

Mr. CHANDLER. Yes; let the amendment be stated. I am anxious to know what the scope of the amendment is, as it was modified.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 56, after line 7, the following new subsection was inserted:

(c) Before any real property which was acquired for use as a military camp or cantonment is disposed of under the provisions of section 22 of this act, an opportunity shall first be afforded to the State in which such property is located and to its political subdivisions, including municipalities, to purchase or lease such real property for public uses at discounts not to exceed 50 percent of the sale or lease market value thereof, as the case may be, or 50 percent of the highest price offered by any private purchaser or lessee, whichever is lower.

Mr. CHANDLER. Because of the adoption of that amendment I will have to revise the statement I made a while ago in answer to the question of the Senator from Texas, and say that municipalities and local governments have the first opportunity, and that their priority is even higher than that of the original owner.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr CHANDLER. I yield.

Mr. HILL. I think it ought to be brought out in connection with the adoption of the amendment that although the State and political subdivisions thereof would have a higher priority to buy a military camp or cantonment, they would have to buy it for public use. In other words, they could not buy it to sell to someone else. They would have to buy it for public use. Furthermore, the amendment follows a policy which the Congress established some years ago. There were a number of old and obsolete forts and military reservations, as I am sure the Senator from Texas will recall, for which the Federal Government had no further use. Congress provided for the sale of those old forts and military reservations, and in making provision for their sale the States and the political subdivisions of the States were given the prior right to purchase, provided, of course, the land was purchased by the State or a political subdivision thereof to be used for a public purpose, to be used for all the people, so to speak.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, I wish to make a statement with respect to the amendment of the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WEEKS] in connection with which I made a motion to reconsider. We are undertaking to work out a modification of that amendment which we hope will be satisfactory, and I now ask that the pending amendment be passed over for the present. We shall call it up for consideration within an hour or so.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the pending amendment will be temporarily laid aside.

The Chair wishes to say that he is informed by the Chief Clerk that he did not read the modification of the Downey amendment.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, the discussion had drifted rather far afield. That has no connection with the motion to reconsider. Consent has been granted that the amendment offered by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WEEKS] be passed over for an hour or so, when it may be called up again.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, I ask that the clerk read the modification of the Downey amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

If such real property is not purchased or leased by such State or any of its political subdivisions prior to the adjournment of the legislature or general assembly in session at the time such property becomes available for disposition, or if such legislature or general assembly is not then in session, prior to the adjournment of the next session thereafter, such real property may be disposed of in accordance with the provisions of section 22 of this act. Any property purchased by a State or political subdivision thereof under this subsection shall be subject to the provisions of subsection (d) of section 12.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, that would mean that if the property were declared surplus, and were susceptible of disposition, the State legislatures in the several States would have to take appropriate action to acquire the property for the State, or assist in acquiring it for State or municipal purposes. Then the original owners would have to wait until that priority had been exercised. If the legislature had adjourned and no arrangement had been made to acquire the property for State or municipal purposes, the original sections of the bill would become effective, and original owners, their lineal heirs, tenants, and veterans, in that order, would have preference. In some cases they would be the same persons. But they would have priority in the purchase of the land. We were anxious to have such preferences established for the reasons which I indicated a few moments ago. I do not feel like object-

ing to having use made of the land for the public welfare.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I offer an amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McFARLAND in the chair). The amendment offered by the Senator from Vermont will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 48, after paragraph (d) of section 12, in the committee amendment, it is proposed to insert a new paragraph (e) reading as follows:

(e) Whenever any State or subdivision thereof, or any State or Government agency certifies to the Board that any power transmission lines determined to be surplus property under the provisions of this act is needful for or adaptable to the requirements of any Federal, State, municipal, or cooperative power project, such line and the right-of-way acquired for its construction shall not be sold, leased for more than 1 year, or otherwise disposed of, except as provided in sections 11 and 12, unless specifically authorized by act of Congress.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I believe that the purpose of the amendment is undoubtedly clear. It is to restrict the sale of presently publicly owned power lines to private utilities without first giving the States and municipalities an opportunity to purchase them. At first glance one might think that such lines are already fully protected, but it so happens that during the past few years the Defense Plant Corporation has built some very valuable high-tension lines, some of them costing millions of dollars. I understand that they are now held in the name of the Defense Plant Corporation, and are subject to being sold as surplus property unless protected. It seems to me that the States in which such lines are located, and the municipalities in such State should have the first opportunity to purchase them.

As an example of one such line, I submit the following:

During the spring and summer of 1941 the Power Authority of the State of New York, foreseeing a shortage of power for aluminum production in the St. Lawrence River Valley, cooperated with the Corps of Engineers, United States Army, and other Federal agencies in plans for construction of a power transmission line to carry steam-generated power from New York City to the shortage area.

It was an integral part of this plan that any line erected with the use of public funds should be so designed that it would serve, after the defense emergency, for peacetime distribution of St. Lawrence power upon the completion of the St. Lawrence seaway and power project. It was also a basic condition of this plan that the line, when built with the use of public funds, should remain under public ownership, operation, and control and should not be permitted to pass into the hands of any private utility or power corporation.

The first section of this line was built in 1942, and in June of 1942 went into operation supplying power from Taylorville, N. Y., to Massena, N. Y., at which latter point the Government had built an aluminum reduction plant with a capacity of 96,000,000 pounds a year.

The Taylorville-Massena transmission line was built by the Corps of Engineers, United States Army, in record time to serve the aluminum plant during the emergency. The line is 77 miles long. It is a double-circuit, 230,000-volt line, and during 1942 and 1943 carried 100,000 kilowatts from the Taylorville switching station to the Government's aluminum plant at Massena. The cost of the line was about $3,000,000, provided out of public funds supplied by the Defense Plant Corporation.

The Defense Plant Corporation in 1942 allocated $11,500,000 of additional funds to design extensions of this line and to acquire rights-of-way from Taylorville to New York City.

On the express condition that the transmission line should be retained under public ownership and should be available for the distribution of St. Lawrence power, when the St. Lawrence development was completed, the project for construction of the line was recommended by the following public agencies and Federal and State officers:

Power Authority of the State of New York, September 20, 1941.

Governor of New York, Hon. Herbert H. Lehman, September 3, 1941, and December 2, 1941.

Lieutenant Governor of New York, Hon. Charles Poletti, December 4, 1941.

United States Senator ROBERT F. WAGNER, of New York, December 2, 1941.

President Franklin D. Roosevelt, letter to Senator WAGNER and the Office of Production Management, November 21, 1941.

Report of the Federal Power Commission, November 19, 1941.

Lt. Gen. William S. Knudsen, the Director General of the Office of Production Management, December 6, 1941.

Under Secretary of War Robert P. Patterson, December 16, 1941.

The transfer of the St. Lawrence power transmission line to a private utility or power corporation would dissipate some of the principal public benefits of the St. Lawrence development in advance of its construction.

It would turn over for private exploitation and profit a new and useful facility constructed wholly on public initiative with the use of public funds.

It would take advantage of the patriotic and public-spirited generosity of thousands of farmers and property owners in northern New York, who immediately after Pearl Harbor permitted the use by the Army engineers of farm lands and other property for right-of-way for this line at nominal compensation.

The disposal of this line to private interests would also violate a statute enacted by the Legislature of the State of New York, before the line was built, to facilitate its construction. This act permitted the Corps of Engineers to extend the right of way across reforestation lands of the State which had always theretofore been protected against use for the construction of the lines of private power corporations.

This act provided that the conservation commissioner of the State of New York "when so requested by an agency of the United States Government in the interest of national defense" might "permit the construction, maintenance, and operation by any duly constituted agency of government, of roads, highways, power transmission lines, and airway beacons, under, upon, over and across" reforestation lands of the State.

It is not the purpose of this amendment to restrict in any way the sale of transmission lines which are immediately adjacent to plants which might be sold, or upon the property of plants which might be sold, but simply to cover situations such as the one which exists in New York, and I understand also in some other States of the Union. When such lines which have been built by public initiative and with public funds are sold the State should be given the first opportunity to purchase them.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. HILL. The amendment would merely give to the States the prior right to purchase, would it not?

Mr. AIKEN. That is all that is intended.

Mr. HILL. I hope the Senator's amendment will be agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I offer an amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Nebraska will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 72, line 15, in the committee amendment, it is proposed to strike out the words "as miscellaneous receipts" and insert in lieu thereof "to the credit of a special fund which shall be used exclusively for the reduction of the public debt."

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, the recommendation in the Baruch report has this to say with reference to where these funds shall go and what shall be done with them:

All of the war surpluses will have been paid for by the American public either through war taxes or the increase in the national debt. Therefore, the proceeds of all sales should go to reduce that debt, lowering the post-war carrying charges which will have to be met through taxation. Certainly no agency should be permitted to sell surpluses and use the proceeds for other purposes.

The fact that surplus sales will lower the debt dramatizes an important point which some business groups are inclined to forget. The net result of an effective disposal program will aid all business, which is an important consideration to be balanced against the possible short-term effects of individual sales.

Mr. President, I feel that this is not a restriction, but a proper safeguard, and that the money should be used for the purpose of retiring the public debt. I ask that the amendment be adopted.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I have no objection to paying off the national debt, or to anything which would assist along that line. I am very much in favor of it. However, as I understand the amendment offered by the Senator from Nebraska, it seeks to place a limitation on Congress. Congress is the only body upon which any limitation is sought to be placed. Of course, a future Congress could change that provision very easily. It is a limitation on Congress rather than a limitation on any other agency, as I interpret it.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the distinguished Senator for his remarks. However, I disagree with him. I do not believe that the amendment would be a limitation on Congress. The amendment directs that the funds shall go toward payment of the national debt. If a future Congress should wish to make some other provision, of course, that would be within its province; but I feel that the proceeds from the sale of surplus property should be used for no other purpose than to reduce the public debt.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. That is a fine purpose, with which I wholeheartedly agree; but the bill as now written provides that the money shall go into the general revenue fund. Only Congress has the power to divert that money from the Treasury. Therefore I believe that the amendment would be a limitation upon Congress.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. AUSTIN. There are provisions for the management of the disposal of surplus property which involve the use of money. They are to be found on pages 72, 73, and 74 of the bill, There are foreseeable and necessary uses of money. For example, subsection (c) provides:

> To the extent authorized by the board, any Government agency disposing of property under this act (1) may deposit, in a special account with the Treasurer of the United States—

That is to say, not with the general fund—

> such amount of the proceeds of such dispositions as it deems necessary to permit appropriate refunds to purchasers when any disposition is rescinded or does not become final, or payments for breach of any warranty, and (2) may withdraw therefrom amounts so to be refunded or paid, without regard to the origin of the funds withdrawn.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for a moment?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. I had the same concern. But upon examining the amendment, I found that it would change only the words "miscellaneous receipts," in line 15, and would leave untouched the words "except as provided in subsections (b), (c), and (d) of this section." Those words would not be modified in any way, as I understand the matter.

Mr. WHERRY. That is correct.

Mr. AUSTIN. That meets my question.

Mr. President, now let me ask the Senator what the amendment would do.

Mr. WHERRY. The amendment would simply strike out the words "miscellaneous receipts" in line 15 on page 72, and in lieu thereof the following words would be inserted: "to the credit of a special fund which shall be used exclusively for the reduction of the public debt."

Then the language would continue as it is now—"except as provided in subsections (b), (c), and (d) of this section." The amendment would not disturb those.

Mr. President, I ask for the adoption of the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Nebraska, to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated, for the information of the Senate.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Before the amendment is stated, I should like to explain it, because a reading of the amendment would scarcely disclose clearly the purpose, inasmuch as the amendment is largely technical.

Mr. President, in the process of reconversion the primary action necessary in order to speed the process is the clearance of plants after the termination of contracts. In anticipating the clearance of plants, the procurement agencies are now starting to attempt to earmark various properties—machinery, commodities, and so forth—which will fall into the various categories which will be involved in the subsequent negotiations. It will tremendously facilitate contract termination and the disposition of termination inventories if, so far as possible, these identifications may be made in advance, and as rapidly as possible. There is no disagreement on this subject between industry and the termination agencies. Industry, through its representatives, has discussed this process with representatives of the Senate Committee on Military Affairs, and I am advised that a substantial meeting of minds occurred. I regret the absence today of the junior Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], who, I am advised, is in substantial agreement with what I am saying.

Therefore, I am offering an amendment which does nothing more than put the encouragement of law behind the process which has now been started, and which directs the termination agencies to the greatest extent practicable—that is the sole authority involved—to determine in advance of the termination of any contract, and to advise the war contractor, respecting the various standard categories into which the termination property is calculated to fall.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I have no objection to the amendment. In fact, I have great sympathy with its purposes. However, yesterday during the debate over contractor inventories, I agreed to an amendment on page 75, line 9, adding the words "the Contract Settlement Act of 1944," so as to provide that it would be one of the laws which would not be interfered with by this act.

As I understand the Senator's amendment, in reality it would amend the Contract Settlement Act of 1944. So, if his amendment is to be adopted, I had better not agree to have inserted on page 75 the words "the Contract Settlement Act of 1944," which I agreed to do yesterday.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I would not wish to have the Senator alter the agreement he made yesterday. But I think that, upon reflection, he will find there is no relation between that agreement and the amendment we are proposing, because we are not amending the Contract Termination Act in any way, so far as I know, but are merely adding the provision that the process of making termination inventories shall be speeded up by advance identifications.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Then I have no objection to having the amendment adopted.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the amendment printed in the RECORD without reading, since it is merely technical in its language.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment to the committee amendment will be printed in the RECORD, without reading.

The amendment proposed by Mr. VANDENBERG to the committee amendment is as follows:

TERMINATION INVENTORIES

(A) The Congress recognizes that upon termination of war contracts, the plants of war contractors will be filled with vast termination inventories which until removed or disposed of will prevent or interfere with the resumption of civilian production and reemployment, and that, so far as possible, decisions should be made in advance of termination for the disposition and removal of the same without delay when termination occurs. While measures should be taken to realize the greatest possible value of termination inventories, nevertheless a large part of these inventories, notwithstanding the cost of production, are or will be of no further military use and cannot be used economically in civilian production.

The contracting agencies are therefore directed to the greatest extent practicable to determine in advance of the termination of any war contract and advise the war contractor:

(1) To what extent termination inventories are or will be needed for military purposes.

(2) What part of the termination inventory, not needed for military purposes, has any other clearly foreseeable use.

(3) What part of the termination inventory, not needed for military purposes, and having no other clearly foreseeable use (either because of the peculiar qualities or characteristics of the items involved or because the quantities available of such items are in excess of amounts for which such clearly foreseeable further use exists) shall be classified as scrap.

(4) The methods of handling, storing, and disposing of the different classifications of the termination inventory. To the extent

that it shall be impracticable to make the foregoing determinations and to advise the war contractor in advance of termination, the contracting agencies shall be prepared to make such determinations and give such advice at the earliest practicable moment after termination of the war contract.

(B) The Board and Director of Contract Settlement are hereby directed to collaborate for the purpose of achieving the objectives set forth in section (A) above and of section 11 (A) (3) of the Contract Settlement Act of 1944.

(C) The terms "contracting agency" and "termination inventories" shall have the meaning assigned to such terms under section 3 of the Contract Settlement Act of 1944.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, in this connection I suggest that there be printed in the RECORD subsections (b) and (e) of section 12 of Public Law 395, Seventy-eighth Congress, being an act entitled "An act to provide for the settlement of claims arising from terminated war contracts, and for other purposes." The subsections to which I refer appear on pages 11, 12, and 13 of the act, as printed. If such permission is granted, I shall not take the time of the Senate to read the subsections. They show that the pending amendment supplements the existing law.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I shall be very glad to have that done.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the matter referred to was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMOVAL AND STORAGE OF MATERIALS

SEC. 12. * * *

(b) Any war contractor may submit to the contracting agency concerned or to any other Government agency designated by the Director, one or more statements showing the materials which such war contractor claims to be termination inventory under one or more war contracts and desires to have removed by the Government. Such statements shall be prepared in such form and detail, shall be submitted in such manner, through the prime contractor or otherwise, and shall be supported by such certificates or other data, as may be prescribed under this act.

* * * * *

(e) Notwithstanding any other provisions of law, but subject to subsection (h) of this section, the contracting agency concerned or the Director, or any Government agency designated by him, on behalf of the United States, may, by the exercise of any contract rights or otherwise, acquire and take possession of any termination inventory of any war contractor, and any materials removed by the Government or stored for its account under subsections (c) and (d) of this section, whether or not such materials are finally determined not to constitute termination inventory. With respect to any such materials, the Government shall be liable to any war contractor concerned only for their return to such war contractor or for their disposal value at the time of their removal or for the proceeds realized by the Government from their disposal, at the election of the Government agency concerned, unless the Government agency and the war contractor agree or have agreed on a different basis. Any amount so paid or payable to a war contractor for materials allocable to a terminated war contract shall be credited against the termination claim under such contract but shall not otherwise affect the amount due on the claim, unless the Government agency concerned and the war contractor agree or have agreed otherwise. Any materials to which the Director takes title under this section shall be delivered for disposal to any appropriate Government agency authorized to make such disposal.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Michigan know at what place in the bill his amendment should be inserted?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I suggest that it be inserted at the proper place. I am not ready to identify the proper place at the moment.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, the bill contains a basket of miscellaneous provisions into which it might well go.

O. P. A. ORDERS ON OATS AND BARLEY

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, on July 27, just about the time when the farmers of my State were commencing to thresh barley and oats, the Office of Price Administration lowered the price of oats 5 cents a bushel, reducing it from 66 to 61 cents, at Fargo, N. Dak. This arbitrary reduction without hearing on the part of the producers of oats, took away about 8 percent of what the farmer anticipated he would get in order to pay for raising this crop. I might add that the cost of labor was not decreased 8 percent, nor was the cost of gasoline decreased 8 percent, the cost of farm machinery was not decreased 8 percent, the cost of all the other things for which the farmer must pay was not decreased 8 percent. But without any notice to the farmer, 5 cents a bushel was just arbitrarily taken off the price he was to get for his oats. At the same time, under lend-lease, food, grain, and farm machinery were continued to be sent free to foreign countries at the expense of the farmer-taxpayers of the country.

However, this was not the only ruling made. On about the same day the Office of Price Administration at just the moment when the farmer was going to thresh his barley, issued a ruling—Document No. 35120—that barley containing in excess of 20 percent Trebi should not come under the definition of "malting barley," which means the barley the buyer intends to use for manufacturing into barley malt or to resell for use for that purpose.

Immediately, I commenced to receive telegrams from elevator men all over the State of North Dakota, who advised me that they were anxious to get their farmer customers the top price for barley, but that by virtue of this order the farmer was being robbed of 15 or 20 cents a bushel on his barley. I promptly took up this matter with the War Food Administration. I am happy to state that after a week of dickering I was advised this morning by Mr. Gus Geissler, of the A. A. A., Agriculture Department, that the War Food Administration had recommended to the Office of Price Administration that this ruling be changed, and that the Office of Price Administration over the telephone has agreed to withdraw this definition. If it will do this, it will mean hundreds of thousands of dollars for the farmers, to which the farmers are justly entitled.

What particularly impressed me, Mr. President, was that this morning I received from the Equity Cooperative Exchange, of Hettinger, N. Dak., a letter to them from one of the leading commission firms of Minneapolis. The letter advised that a carload of barley had arrived in Minneapolis, the barley being grade 1, but carrying the notation "excess 20 percent Trebi," and that the Federal inspectors saw fit to sustain this notation. For that reason the barley had to be sold for feed only. This grain firm said "calling this kind of barley Trebi is a rank injustice, but our hands are tied."

Mr. President, this morning I telegraphed this company at Minneapolis asking whether I might use its name. If I am given such permission, I shall make a further talk upon this subject upon the Senate floor, with the suggestion that the grain commission firm in Minneapolis which has had the courage to fight in order that the farmer may obtain the price to which he is entitled for his barley should receive a letter of commendation from the Secretary of Agriculture or, better still, a medal, because it is certainly entitled to one. There is evidence of a determination on the part of at least one commission firm to see to it that when a producer has been mulcted he will have a friend in the form of a commission merchant holding membership on the grain exchange in Minneapolis.

DISPOSAL OF SURPLUS GOVERNMENT PROPERTY

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2065) to establish a Surplus War Property Administration, to provide for the proper disposal of surplus war property, and for other purposes.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I offer the amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. AUSTIN in the chair). The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 48, after line 11, it is proposed to insert the following new paragraph:

(e) In disposing of any surplus lands or other real property on or across which highways or streets had been established and constructed and were being maintained by the States or their political subdivisions at the time such lands or other real property was acquired by the Government, and where such highways or streets were vacated, destroyed, or shut off from general public use in order to meet the requirements and serve the purposes of the Government, the States or their political subdivisions first shall be given a reasonable time, to be fixed by the board, in which to repurchase the original rights-of-way on which such highways or streets were established and in which to purchase such new or additional rights-of-way as may be required for reestablishing, in whole or in part, such highways or streets of greater width or on new and more adequate locations, at a price not exceeding that paid therefor by the Government.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, by way of explanation I may say that it has been represented to me by various State

officials, and confirmed by the Bureau of Public Roads, that in a number of instances where tracts of lands had been acquired by the Army, existing roads had been closed. If the tract as a whole had been closed and the road were to be reopened the land would have to be acquired under condemnation proceedings or through negotiations with the future owner. Where the Government now owns such property the purpose of the amendment is merely to bring about a restoration of the conditions existing before the land was taken, with perhaps the addition of certain improvements in the way of realining the highways.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I have no real objection to the amendment because I think it looks in the right direction; but I think that one problem in connection with it should have careful consideration of the conferees if the amendment goes to conference. I do not know what the law is in the Senator's State, but in many States of the Union highways, or land to be used for highways, are taken only for the purpose of temporary use, and the title to the land remains in the abutting owners. What troubles me is whether the amendment is so drafted that in the event of the disuse of the land for highway purposes, either by the Government or by the original municipality, there would be any way by which to restore the land to the possession of the original owners.

Mr. HAYDEN. At the present time the original owners have completely parted with title.

Mr. WHITE. Have they parted with any more than the use of the land for highway purposes? In many instances do they not still have the right of reversion if the land is abandoned for highway purposes? That is the only question to which I wish to call the attention of the Senator, and I hope that it will be considered if the amendment finally goes to conference.

Mr. HAYDEN. It is a matter which could well be considered in conference. What I have in mind is a case in which an entire tract of land was acquired by the Government on both sides of the road, and then, for the convenience of the Government, the road was abandoned. If the land had been in the possession of private owners, the State or county which had a road located on the land ought to have an opportunity to acquire title to the land before it is placed in private hands.

I hope, Mr. President, that the amendment will go to conference.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I have no objection to the amendment going to conference. I think the amendment is of such importance to States, municipalities, and other subdivisions of the States, that it should be taken to conference and perhaps agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I offer two amendments, which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 47, line 11, after "institutions", it is proposed to insert "peoples utility districts and cooperative, nonprofit, or limited dividend associations, the projects of which comply with the requirements of the Rural Electrification Act of 1936."

On page 47, line 23, after "institutions", it is proposed to insert a comma and the following: "peoples utility districts and cooperative, nonprofit, or limited dividend associations, the projects of which comply with the requirements of the Rural Electrification Act of 1936."

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, there are really two amendments, but since they cover the same subject I ask unanimous consent that they may be considered together.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, all the amendments seek to do is to place rural electrification projects on the same footing with municipalities or State governments in the acquisition of any surplus war property which may be available for disposal, so that they may be utilized in the development and extension of the rural electrification program.

It has seemed to me from the beginning that the opportunities which the farmers may have in securing benefits from surplus war property disposal are of necessity, and because of the situation of the farmers, bound to be very limited in character. I find myself in wholehearted agreement with the proposal recommended by the committee to treat States, political subdivisions, municipalities, tax-supported institutions, and nonprofit medical and educational institutions, in a generous manner when disposing of surplus property. But it seems to me that we should be equally generous with the rural-electrification program which has meant so much to the farmers.

I have no doubt, Mr. President, that if the amendments which I have offered are adopted and remain in the bill there will be a surplus of generators and other articles and property which could be utilized in the generation and distribution of electric power. I am sure that all Senators from States in which the rural-electrification program has been carried on will agree with me that in all probability we could not have attained the present goals of agricultural production had it not been for the development of the rural-electrification program. As a matter of fact, bringing electricity to a farm is tantamount to furnishing it with at least the product and benefit of one man's labor in addition to the comfort and convenience which electricity provides for the family. If we are to be generous with other public or quasi-public institutions, and I am in favor of it, it seems to me that we should be equally generous with the rural-electrification program.

Mr. President, I have consulted with the distinguished Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON], who is handling the bill on the floor, and he has advised me that he favors the amendments.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. Does the Senator intend to include copper wire, which is so difficult to obtain at the present time?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. The amendments are intended to include any surplus property which may be made available for disposition under the pending bill. I am not in a position to say exactly what commodities, articles, or types of materials will be made available. The Senator is aware, of course, that there is a stock-pile provision in the measure which covers many of the strategic and other types of mineral and metal products. But it would simply place the rural-electrification cooperatives on the same basis with municipalities, States, charitable and educational institutions of a nonprofit character. The amendment has been carefully drawn in order to provide that it shall apply only to those cooperatives which qualify under the Rural Electrification Act.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendments to the committee amendment, offered by the Senator from Wisconsin, which will be considered jointly.

The amendments to the amendment were agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is before the Senate and open to further amendment.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I offer a clarifying amendment on page 56 of the bill, section 20. It deals with limitations on the disposal of airports and harbor facilities.

At the top of page 56 the right to purchase technical equipment is accorded merely to governmental units, when, as a matter of fact, the intention is to make it possible for States and political subdivisions thereof, including municipalities and other governmental units, to have that right. I have taken the matter up with the Senator from Colorado who is in charge of the bill, and, in order to clarify the provision, I suggest that in line 1, page 56, after the word "interested", there be inserted the words "States and political subdivisions thereof, including municipalities and other"; on the same page, line 1, after the word "the" at the end of the line, to insert the word "use", and in line 2, after the word "operation", to insert a comma and the words "or acquisition."

If the amendment were adopted the particular provision would read as follows:

> And no technical equipment of any airport left in a stand-by condition shall be removed, except for use at some other place, until reasonable opportunity is afforded to interested States and political subdivisions thereof, including municipalities and other governmental units, to enter into arrangements for the use, operation, or acquisition of such airport.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Louisiana to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I wish to say that I am very glad that the committee saw fit to incorporate in the bill section 20. It was my privilege on February 7 to introduce Senate bill 1723, which had the same objective as section 20. I wish to place in the RECORD as a part of my remarks a letter addressed to Mr. Brainard Cheney, staff director, Subcommittee on Surplus War Property of the Senate Small Business Committee, by Mr. William A. M. Burden, Assistant Secretary of Commerce.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE SECRETARY OF COMMERCE,
Washington.

MY DEAR MR. CHENEY: In response to your telephonic request of this date with reference to S. 2065, we are pleased to furnish you with the views of the Department of Commerce respecting the disposition of federally owned airports and related facilities, which are or may be surplus in nature.

Under Public Law 812, Seventy-seventh Congress, and subsequent acts, the Congress has appropriated funds to the Civil Aeronautics Administration for the construction, improvement, and repair of public airports necessary for national defense as determined by a board composed of the Secretaries of War, Navy, and Commerce. Since 1940 the Congress has appropriated approximately $400,000,000 for this program and thus far development work has been approved at approximately 550 public airports in the United States, its Territories, and possessions.

Under this program a local unit of government is required to act as sponsor for the project, acquiring without cost to the Federal Government unencumbered title to all the lands to be improved and entering into an agreement to maintain and operate the completed facilities as a public airport. The Civil Aeronautics Administration does the grading, drainage, paving, and lighting incident to the development of the landing area proper.

The Army and the Navy have occupied many of these airports under agreements with the local units of government which give them the exclusive control of the landing areas of such airports for the duration of the war. In many cases, however, the Army and the Navy have also acquired, under deed or long-term lease, parcels of land adjacent to the airport or on it, particularly those areas upon which they have constructed buildings. In a great majority of these cases the areas thus acquired by the Government comprise the choice building areas of the airport and the buildings constructed are hangars, operations buildings, and other structures which would be useful in connection with aircraft operations at the airport.

Upon the termination of the war it is anticipated that a great many of these airport properties, including the buildings constructed thereon, will become surplus to the needs of the Army and Navy. In the absence of legislation to the contrary, all such property would have to be disposed of as surplus property under whatever general laws on this subject were then in effect, which might mean that many airport lands and buildings would find their way into the hands of private individuals and corporations, rather than of the public agency or other governmental body owning the landing area of the airport. Such dispositions would not insure the availability of the property for public use on reasonable terms and might well make it difficult if not impossible for the public owner of the airport to operate and maintain it in accordance with its agreement with the United States.

In addition to these properties at public airports constructed or improved under the Civil Aeronautics Administration program, there are many other airport lands, runway extensions, airport buildings, air navigation facilities, and other types of airport improvements now owned or controlled by the United States, acting by and through its various instrumentalities of the Government, which will become surplus to the needs of the Government after the war. It is evident that civil aviation would be greatly benefited if these lands and facilities were made available for aeronautical use under public control.

The Army and Navy have indicated interest in continued aeronautical use of aeronautical property which may become surplus to their needs upon conclusion of hostilities. This interest is evidenced by the following communications:

"In addition to the Civil Aeronautics Administration fields currently in use by the Army Air Forces, there is a vast number of airports which have been developed by the Army Air Forces as essential to the prosecution of the war but which cannot conceivably be operated and maintained by the Army during time of peace. In most instances, these fields will be available to civil agencies, possibly through the Civil Aeronautics Administration, and will accommodate the operation of any probable commercial aircraft for many years to come. Almost without exception, these airports are so situated as to be of considerable commercial value."

Letters of the Secretary of War to the Assistant Director of the Bureau of the Budget and the Comptroller General dated December 21, 1942, and February 15, 1943, respectively.

"The Navy Department expresses its willingness to permit as far as legally possible the disposition by the Civil Aeronautics Administration of all Government-owned land and buildings, aprons, and other improvements purchased or constructed with Navy funds which may be situated at such airports developed by the Civil Aeronautics Administration at the request of the Navy whenever such lands, buildings, and improvements are no longer needed for military use in the opinion of the Navy Department. The latter, however, reserves the right at all times to remove and dispose of all such buildings and improvements if the Navy Department believes that they will serve a military purpose elsewhere, in which case the Navy Department is willing to have the land upon which the buildings and other improvements were built be disposed of by the Civil Aeronautics Administration at such times as the Navy Department decides that such land is no longer needed for military use. It is believed that the disposition of Navy-owned properties as outlined above will best promote the development of civil aeronautics and will serve the best interests of the national defense and the United States as a whole."

Letter of the Secretary of the Navy to the Secretary of Commerce dated May 14, 1943.

In order that surplus aeronautical property may be utilized for the development of civil aeronautics and air commerce, it is suggested that the following provision be inserted in S. 2065:

"All surplus lands, buildings, and facilities located within the boundaries of, or adjacent to, airports (except such airports as continue to be operated as such by the armed forces of the United States), the use of which is determined by the Administrator of Civil Aeronautics necessary or desirable to encourage and foster the development of civil aeronautics and air commerce, shall be disposed of by sale, lease, donation, or otherwise in such manner as may be determined after consultation with the Administrator of Civil Aeronautics."

Due to the lack of time, the foregoing has not been submitted to the Director of the Bureau of the Budget. Hence, it is not known whether the same is in accord with the views of the President.

Sincerely yours,
WILLIAM A. M. BURDEN,
Assistant Secretary of Commerce.

MR. BRAINARD CHENEY,
Staff Director, Subcommittee on Surplus War Property of the Senate Small Business Committee, Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I have an amendment making a typographical correction, which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment proposed by the Senator from Colorado to the committee amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. In the committee amendment, on page 47, line 2, after the word "subdivisions," it is proposed to insert "including municipalities."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment offered by the Senator from Colorado to the committee amendment is agreed to.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I have another amendment that is not merely to correct a typographical error, but one which was discussed yesterday. On page 75, line 9, after the word "of", where it first appears, I move to insert the words "the Contract Settlement Act of 1934." The purpose of the amendment is to make certain that this bill will not be interpreted to amend the Contract Termination Act of 1944, which Congress recently passed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. In the committee amendment on page 75, line 9, after the word "of", where it first appears, it is proposed to insert "the Contract Settlement Act of 1944."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment proposed by the Senator from Colorado to the committee amendment is agreed to.

Mr. TAFT. I offer an amendment which I ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 56, lines 17 and 18, it is proposed to strike out the words "and they shall thereafter be put", and insert "but the owning agency or the disposal agency is authorized either before or after such legal transfer to cause such minerals or metals to be put."

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, this amendment has been printed and is on the desk. The present stock-piling provision contains these words:

> The minerals and metals may be transferred in any form in which they are held, and they shall thereafter be put into forms best suited for storage and use for the common defense.

It has been represented to me that, particularly in the case of copper, the process of preparing the metal is often quite a long one, especially in the case of

electrolytic copper. If the contracts are terminated while this process is in course, this section of the bill apparently provides that they must be transferred first and then "they shall thereafter be put into forms best suited for storage and use for the common defense."

The amendment I propose will cause it to read in this way:

The minerals and metals may be transferred in any form in which they are held, but the owning agency or the disposal agency is authorized either before or after such legal transfer to cause such minerals or metals to be put into forms suited for storage and use for the common defense.

In other words, if copper is in the midst of the process of being smelted or prepared for a permanent form, the owning agency may cause it to be finished to a condition in which it may properly be stored or they may make legal transfer to the Treasury Procurement Division or some other agency—it would be the Treasury Procurement Division in the case of stock piling—and they may pay for the additional processing.

I think this is highly desirable to prevent an actual stoppage in the middle of the manufacturing process.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, will the Senator read the amendment again, please?

Mr. TAFT. I will read the provision as it would appear if the amendment were agreed to:

The minerals and metals may be transferred in any form in which they are held, but the owning agency or the disposal agency is authorized either before or after such legal transfer to cause such minerals or metals to be put into forms suited for storage and use for the common defense.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Am I to understand the amendment simply pertains to the authority to place in forms? The Senator's amendment would not give the owning agency, after the metals had been transferred to a stock pile, authority to take the metals out, would it?

Mr. TAFT. No. I think probably the Senator's objection would be met if instead of "disposal agency," the amendment should use the words "Treasury Procurement Division," which is really not a disposing agency, but a storing agency.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. That would make the amendment much clearer.

Mr. TAFT. I ask to modify the amendment by striking out the words "disposal agency" and inserting the words "Treasury Procurement Division."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be so modified. The question is on agreeing to the modified amendment proposed by the Senator from Ohio to the committee amendment.

The modified amendment to the committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I offer another amendment. I may say before the amendment is read that it relates to a fundamental difference.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. We should have a quorum to consider this amendment, it seems to me. Would the Senator object to my asking for a quorum?

Mr. TAFT. I should not object at all if the Senator thinks there is a quorum available.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. If there is not I should like to find it out for certain. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	George	O'Mahoney
Andrews	Guffey	Overton
Austin	Gurney	Pepper
Bankhead	Hawkes	Revercomb
Buck	Hayden	Reynolds
Burton	Hill	Shipstead
Byrd	Johnson, Calif.	Stewart
Capper	Johnson, Colo.	Taft
Caraway	Kilgore	Thomas, Okla.
Chandler	La Follette	Thomas, Utah
Connally	Langer	Vandenberg
Cordon	McClellan	Wagner
Danaher	McFarland	Walsh, N. J.
Davis	McKellar	Weeks
Downey	Maloney	Wherry
Eastland	Mead	White
Ellender	Millikin	Wiley
Ferguson	Moore	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Fifty-three Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I ask that the amendments I have offered may be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendments will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 32, in lines 11 and 12, it is proposed to strike out the words "The Board shall elect one of its members as chairman" and insert "The President shall appoint one of the members to act as chairman."

On page 33, it is proposed to strike out subparagraph (c) and insert "(c) The chairman of the Board shall be the administrative director thereof. Within the limit of funds which may be available, he shall employ and fix the compensation of such deputy administrative directors and other officers and employees, and may make such expenditures for supplies, facilities, and services as may be necessary to carry out the functions of the Board and of the administrative director. All such deputy administrative directors and other officers and employees shall be appointed in accordance with the civil-service laws, and their compensation fixed in accordance with the Classification Act of 1923, as amended. The administrative director shall, where practicable, perform the duties imposed upon him through the personnel and facilities of other Government agencies."

On page 38, it is proposed to strike out "Sec. 5 (a)" and insert "Sec. 5 (a). The Board shall delegate all administrative authority conferred upon it by this act to the administrative director, who may delegate such authority to any deputy director, or to the head of any Government agency to the extent necessary to the handling and solution of problems peculiar to that agency: *Provided, however,* That nothing herein shall authorize the Board to delegate to the administrative director the formulation of policy or the issue of regulations or directives, and the director shall carry out policies, regulations, and directives approved by the Board."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator from Ohio permit an inquiry by the Chair?

Mr. TAFT. Surely.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Ohio propose——

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the three amendments may be considered together since they present a single plan.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. TAFT. Was that the inquiry the Chair was about to make?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I offer the amendment on behalf of the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. STEWART] and myself. The original bill provided for a surplus property administrator, who was to have a board that was purely advisory. The House bill contains the same provision, for a director and an advisory board. The amendment which I now present is a compromise between the two ideas. I have always felt very strongly that when we delegate legislative authority, when we give someone else the determination of policy, that is a proper matter for a board, for the diversification of knowledge and interest, and for the consultation which a board affords. But when we delegate an administrative, an executive job, then I think it ought to go to a single administrator. In the case of the Price Control Administration, the Senate may remember that I advocated a board, because I felt that the fixing of a price was a semilegislative and judicial function, which a board ought to perform, but I provided that the actual administration of the price-control law should be 100 percent in an administrator.

In this instance I am suggesting the same thing. The present provision is for a board of eight, who elect their own chairman, then choose a director and appoint all the employees. My experience in the Government up to date is that, under that kind of organization, every member of the board has someone he wants the administrative director to appoint. He is simply besieged by the different members of the board. They become involved in the question of patronage, and build up antipathies and factions within the board on questions that should have nothing to do with policy. So I have provided that the President shall appoint the chairman, and he shall be the administrative director, and he shall appoint the personnel under the civil-service regulations.

The latter part of the amendment provides that the board shall delegate all administrative authority conferred upon it to the administrative director, instead of saying that it may do so, as the bill provides. The provision in the bill would mean that if the board should not choose to delegate administrative authority to the administrative director, he would not be able to move in connec-

tion with any question, administrative or otherwise. He could not make an agreement with a department of the Government without a resolution of the board passed at a meeting called for that purpose. The amendment provides that the board shall delegate to the administrative director administrative power conferred under the terms of the bill—

Provided, however, That nothing herein shall authorize the board to delegate to the Administrative Director the formulation of policy or the issue of regulations or directives, and the Director shall carry out the policies, regulations, and directives approved by the board.

One of the arguments for the board was that the National Association of Manufacturers was in favor of a board. However, Mr. Bauer, who appeared before the committee in behalf of the National Association of Manufacturers, testified as follows:

The N. A. M. committee proposes that the commission function as a policy-making body, leaving to its own appointed administrator the responsibility of executing policy and carrying out procedures which had been decided upon by the commission. Executive responsibility would therefore be centered in the agent of the commission who would carry out its realistic policies.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Is not that precisely what the bill provides? The board would select an administrator, and the administrator would carry out the policies of the board.

Mr. TAFT. The board would select an administrator; but under the terms of the bill the board itself would be the administrator. Every power is given to it. It may delegate any administrative powers it wishes to delegate to the administrator; but boards do not usually delegate powers unless they are compelled to do so. Under the terms of the bill we should find the same situation that exists in connection with a number of other boards. We should find that every act of the administrator would have to be approved by resolution of the board.

The same problem arose in the case of the Smaller War Plants Corporation, where serious difficulty was encountered. Further examples are the Federal Trade Commission and the Interstate Commerce Commission. So far as passing on policy is concerned, they are excellent; but as an administrative body neither is a success. I feel very strongly that we should attempt to divide this problem, so as to have an administrator to carry out the executive functions. The board would be confined to the adoption of resolutions and the issuing of regulations. The bill is full of powers to issue regulations. That authority should be retained in the board. It should have power to issue regulations as to the method of disposal of airplanes, or any other article; and the administrator should carry out the regulations. However, it seems to me that the administrator ought to be independent. He ought not to have to run to every one of eight members of a board to find out whom he can appoint to office, and what he must do each day to carry out the purposes of the act.

Mr. President, I very much hope that this compromise amendment may be adopted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DANAHER in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the several amendments offered by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] to the committee amendment, which several amendments are being considered together.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I most earnestly hope that the Senate will not agree to the amendment offered by the Senator from Ohio. It seems to me that in going both ways at once, riding the horse in two different directions, he gets all the bad effects of both plans. We ought to go in one direction or the other. If we are to have a board, we should have a board; and if we are to have an administrator, we should have an administrator. It seems to me that a compromise amendment on this question is not at all feasible. It is one of those things which cannot be compromised.

Try as the Congress may, it cannot write all the formulas, rules, and regulations into a law of this kind. We must leave much to discretion. We must leave much to the board itself. Mr. Clayton acknowledges that, because in his testimony before the Committee on Military Affairs he pictured his own office as a very small office. He called it a skeleton office. He stated that his chief function would be to determine policy, and that after he had determined the policy, the disposal agencies would administer the act. If Mr. Clayton visualizes the office as a policy-making office, then it seems to me that the Congress should take notice of that fact, and should establish a board to make policies.

A great many witnesses appeared before the subcommittee on this question. The National Farmers Union advocated a board such as is provided for in the bill. This morning I received a telegram from the president of the National Farmers Union again stating that he likes the way in which we propose to establish the organization. The C. I. O., through its representatives, stated that it desired a policy-making board. The witness who testified on behalf of the American Federation of Labor strongly advocated a board such as is provided for in the bill. The National Association of Manufacturers wants a board, and the United States Chamber of Commerce wants a board. I do not know of anyone who appeared before the committee who did not believe that the policy should be determined by the board.

I most earnestly hope that the amendment offered by the Senator from Ohio will be defeated. It clearly upsets the whole plan and policy of the bill. We have had to delegate a great deal of power and authority on matters of policy. We were compelled to do so. There is no way by which to write into a law all the details of policy. When we delegate such authority, we should have a board which is representative of the various sections of our great country. We must remember that this bill is widespread in its effect. It is not a simple matter. It is not a matter affecting a portion of our people, a portion of our economic system, or a portion of our social organization. It affects every one. It affects industry, labor, agriculture, and consumers. It affects small business and large business. It affects matters entirely outside our own country. It is so far-reaching in its effect that I do not see how the Congress could possibly set up the authority in an administrator.

According to the so-called compromise amendment which the Senator from Ohio has offered, the executive authority would be delegated to an administrator. He says that the policy-making powers would not be delegated to the administrator; and yet the office of administrator would be set up without regard to the board, and the administrator might disregard the board. If the compromise admendment were adopted, there would be constant conflict between the board and the administrator. There would be no way to avoid such conflict. There would be many hairline cases which could be decided one way or the other, and every one of such cases would become a controversial case, causing all sorts of trouble, and poor administration of the act.

This is the way in which the bill would operate: A board would be named by the President, with the advice and consent of the Senate. The nominations of members of the board would have to be confirmed by the Senate. The board would select its own administrator, to carry out the directions of the board. That would be his job. In case of a tie vote of the board, the Director of War Mobilization and Post-War Adjustment, under whose office this function is placed, would step in and break the tie. So under the provisions of the bill there would be harmony all the way. The board would appoint the administrator, and the administrator would have to carry out the policies of the board. That would be the only function of the administrator.

It must be clear to the Senate, to the country, and to those who are studying this question and are interested in it, that neither the administrator nor the board would actually sell anything. They would not sell a penny's worth of anything. The actual selling would be done by the disposal agencies, and the disposal agencies would be the active administrators of the act. The board would sit above the disposal agencies and determine the rules, regulations, formulas, and policies which are not laid down in the bill itself.

One further feature with respect to the board proposed in the bill is that the board would be appointed to represent all geographical areas of the United States. It would represent labor, agriculture, industry, and the consumer. So far as possible, it would be representative of all elements and sections of our great country.

I most earnestly hope that the amendment offered by the Senator from Ohio

will be rejected. I ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, I wish to associate myself with the Senator from Colorado in objecting to the pending amendment. Let me briefly state the reasons.

This amendment brings the issue sharply to the attention of the Senate. The question which should be decided by us is whether we wish to have one man perform this function, or whether we wish to have a board do so. If we wish to have one man perform it, we should vote to have one man, appointed by the President with the advice and consent of the Senate, and let him handle the whole job. But if we agree with the position taken by the committee, we should vote against the pending amendment. The position of the committee is that all sections of the country should be represented by a board appointed by the President. It is much too large a job to place in the hands of one man.

If the pending amendment should be adopted, the agency to be created would be neither fish nor fowl. The board would not be necessary in administering the act, because the board would elect a director, who would have authority to appoint deputy administrators; so there would be no use in having a board.

I do not quarrel with any Senator who wishes to have one man handle this job. One witness who appeared before the committee stated that his idea was that we ought to distribute the property promptly, get the money, and put it back in the Treasury. I do not believe that any greater mistake could be made in the administration of such a law than to attempt prompt sale of more than $103,000,000,000 worth of surplus war property owned by the Government at this time. If that is done, all this property will be sold as speedily as possible, and it is absolutely certain that it will not be distributed to the Government agencies and will not be distributed to the average citizens of the United States to whom most of us are anxious to provide an opportunity to share the property and to obtain some of it for useful purposes.

However, I am glad the amendment has been offered, because it gives us an opportunity to face the issue squarely. If we want one man to do it, we should vote for that. If we want a board to do it, we should vote for a board, and, of course, the board would make rules and regulations and would have some responsibility.

The board would be established in the Office of War Mobilization or in the successor to that Office, whoever that may be. Each of the members of the board would be appointed by the President, with the advice and consent of the Senate, and the President would be asked to give consideration to the geographic and economic interests of the Nation in the selection of the members of the board, and the board would be representative of all the people of the country.

I say the amendment squarely presents the issue to the Senate. The members of the committee were unanimous, as I recall, in the preference for a board, rather than for one man, to be in charge. That is the reason why a board is provided for in the bill which has been reported to the Senate by the committee.

Mr. President, I hope the amendment will be rejected.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, I desire to associate myself with the sentiments expressed by my distinguished colleagues the senior Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON] and the junior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER]. I suggest that the administration of this enormous business is inseparably tied up with the policies involved, and that even though the best policies were established, if they did not reflect through into an efficient administration, we might just as well not have the best policies.

It seems to me we must have both. We can find analogies in our private business organizations. We are about to set up what will probably be the largest merchandising business in the world. In private corporate business the board of directors is the head of the company. It is unthinkable that the one charged with administration of the policies of a company, its president, would not be accountable to the board of directors. To me it is unthinkable that the director of the organization which would be set up under the bill should not be responsible in administrative matters to the board.

So, Mr. President, I hope the amendment will be rejected.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, the idea that it is necessary to have either a board or an administrator seems to me to be contradicted by the terms of the bill. Under the bill there is to be an administrator. The point I should like to make is that under the bill's provisions there will have to be delegated more power than I should like to delegate; but I recognize the fact that probably thousands of different kinds of properties will be disposed of, and every one of them will involve problems of its own. We must delegate to someone the power to make the policies. When we delegate such power, it is proper to delegate it to a board. In other words, a board of eight men is an administrative monstrosity; no board of that kind could ever make a successful administrator. It can determine policies. But it seems to me we must have someone who will head the agency and will provide the spark plug. We must have one man to whom such power will be delegated. If such a person were a mere clerk of the board—and that is all he would be, under the bill—he would not even have the power to designate his subordinates. As I have said, every member of the board would have someone he desires to have appointed; and he would interfere with the work of the clerk, which is all the administrator would be under the provisions of the bill.

It seems to me that if we wish to have successful administration and wish to have the surplus property sold—and that is something which requires push, push, push, all the time—we must have someone with independent power to do the pushing. I think it is perfectly proper to set up a board, and to give it sufficient power, and to have it make whatever regulations it wishes to make with respect to programs and with respect to the other disposal agencies, as it is authorized to do, and to have it make regulations which, so far as the administrator will be concerned, will have the effect of law. It may be said that he may disregard them. Of course, he may disregard the law, too. But so far as we are concerned, the board would determine the policies dealing with the matter of the disposal of the property.

It seems to me that if we wish to have the job done, the administration of the policies we determine and the carrying out of the policies the board determines should be handled by a man who has the power and the prestige which can only be conferred upon him if he is chairman of the board and is appointed by the President for that particular job.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, yesterday I stated on the floor of the Senate that I favored the appointment of an individual administrator, rather than a board. That is why I joined with the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] in submitting the pending amendment which, as I view it, is an effort to work out the problem which is presented to our minds by the amendment of the Committee on Military Affairs which would set up a board of eight men. I commented on the fact that the impression had been left by the testimony of the present Surplus Property Administrator before the Committee on Military Affairs that if the authority were placed in his hands he would immediately dump on the market all the commercial goods as soon as they became surplus, and thus would create a condition which would seriously affect the economic welfare of the country.

I think that impression was one of the reasons which caused the Committee on Military Affairs to conclude that a board of eight men would be better than one man.

While a board comprised of a number of men might have its advantages in some respects, it would have its very distinct disadvantages. I believe I mentioned the other day the fact that in the months gone by we have had experience in dealing with the directors of the Smaller War Plants Corporation during the organization and the early days of the life of that agency. I believe that board consists of five members. For a while, possibly due to lack of direct policy, we were constantly confronted with difficulty in accomplishing anything. The duties which were imposed upon that board, regardless of whether they were of an administrative nature or of a policy-making nature, nevertheless were causing constant delays during the early days of the life of the Smaller War Plants Corporation. That thought is constantly in my mind as an example of the absolute inefficiency which can be caused by the operation of a governmental agency by a number of men.

I think the ideal way to operate under the pending bill would be by means of one administrator, with such safeguards as would be established by the provisions already incorporated in the bill, as well as by the provisions in the amendment the Senator from Ohio presented

a few moments ago on behalf of himself and myself.

I should like to see this matter worked out in that way; namely, to have one administrator chosen, instead of a group of administrators composed of eight men, rather than one man, who would be at the head of this organization.

I am sure that time will not possibly be of the essence, so to speak, with respect to the operations under the bill. Nevertheless, problems will present themselves each day. If each and every problem will have to be passed upon and decided by eight men, each of them possibly having a separate and distinct mind of his own, that will only add to the difficulties which will be encountered.

I definitely think that the establishment of one man as the head of this organization, with power to make decisions in an administrative way, would be highly preferable to the appointment of a number of men, whether two, three, or eight.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I feel that the recommendation of the committee is so vastly superior to the suggestion made in the amendment now pending, that there should be no question at all about the decision of the Senate. Under the amendment which has been proposed and is pending, the board would become a practical nonentity, and the complete power of defining and administering the policies would naturally gravitate into the hands of the administrator who, under the amendment, would have to be appointed.

The committee very carefully considered this proposal. The bill which came to the Senate, well thought out as it was by its distinguished sponsors, embodied the theory of concentrating in one man power to make policy decisions as well as to administer. We felt that that would be particularly unwise at a time when the whole purpose of the proposed act should be to build up the economy of the entire country, and to provide for the distribution of surplus property in a way which would be beneficial to all areas.

So the committee very carefully provided that the President, in making his selection of the members of the board, should take into consideration the geographical areas of the country, and should also take into consideration all economic interests which might be involved. No matter what we do in passing this bill, Congress must delegate tremendous powers which belong to the legislative branch of the Government. It seems to me that there should be no hesitation in the minds of Members of the Senate at a time when it is important that the legislative power be reasserted. In time of war, of course, we must emphasize Executive power, and we grant great delegations of legislative authority in order to enable the Executive to act. But in time of peace it is not necessary to do that. It would be unwise to do so. It would be unwise to clothe a single administrator with the vast powers which would be conveyed to him by this amendment, because it would tend to carry over into the reconversion period and into the period of peace the concentration of authority in the Executive, which in turn would tend to subordinate to it the legislative power.

Mr. President, I hope that the amendment will be rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendments offered by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] to the committee amendment which, without objection, will be considered en bloc.

The amendments to the amendment were rejected.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I should like to have the attention of one of the sponsors of the bill. I ask for the attention of the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON].

Does the bill provide for cataloging surplus materials to be disposed of so that the catalogs may be made available to the people and afford them an opportunity of being informed as to what articles or commodities are to be sold, as well as descriptions and relative prices?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. If the Senator will turn to page 44 of the bill, section 10, he will find a provision which probably covers the question which he has in mind. The provision reads as follows:

SEC. 10. Every disposal agency shall maintain in each of its disposal offices full records of the inventories of surplus property of such office and of each of the disposal transactions negotiated by such office and shall make the information in such records available for inspection by the public.

Mr. PEPPER. Would the provision which the Senator has just read contemplate the printing of catalogs so that they could be distributed to the public in somewhat the same way that catalogs of mail-order houses are distributed upon request?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. No; I do not believe there is any provision in the bill which provides for a procedure so broad as that.

Mr. PEPPER. Last night I asked Mr. Donald Nelson how much mail-order house catalogs cost, and it is my recollection that he said that when a few million copies were to be printed, the cost would be about 90 cents a copy. We shall be disposing of billions of dollars' worth of public property. Obviously the ordinary member of the public will not have an opportunity to investigate inventories and make an examination of the listings. After all, it is the people's property with which we are dealing, and if we can discover the most reasonable and convenient way of making known to them what is to be sold, it seems to me that a provision in the bill covering the situation would be proper.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. On page 35 of the bill, paragraph (d) of section 3, under "Board's duties and authority", reads as follows:

(d) To prescribe regulations and issue directives necessary to provide, so far as practicable, for uniform and wide public notice concerning surplus property available for sale, and for uniform and adequate time intervals between notice and sale so that all interested purchasers shall have a fair opportunity to buy.

Mr. PEPPER. Obviously, the provision to which the Senator has adverted does not authorize or contemplate that the board shall list in a newspaper, which would cost a great deal more than 90 cents, what is to be sold. A certain number of items might be listed. But I do not believe the provision which the Senator has read is adequate to authorize the board, if it should see fit to do so, to prepare a catalog of what is to be sold and furnish copies of it to interested persons upon request.

I move an amendment to the section from which the Senator has read, to provide that so far as may be practical catalogs shall be printed setting forth the goods which may be for sale, giving a description thereof, and, as nearly as can be given, the approximate prices of the various articles.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. If it is desirable to broaden the direction to the board as set forth in paragraph (d) on page 35 of the bill, I believe that the committee would be glad to take the amendment to conference and see if we can arrive at some satisfactory provision.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair asks the Senator from Florida to reduce his amendment to writing.

Mr. PEPPER. Very well.

The amendment as reduced to writing is as follows: On page 30, line 23, after the word "countries" insert a semicolon and the following: "to have printed and distributed if the board deems it practicable a catalog of the property to be disposed of and a brief description of the same and if practicable the price at which the article is to be sold."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, I offer an amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 74, line 16, after the numerals "30", it is proposed to strike out "A" and insert "(a) Except as provided in subsection '(d)' of this section," and on page 74, between lines 24 and 25, it is proposed to insert a new subsection as follows:

(b) (1) No transferee of personal property under the terms of this act or subsequent transferee of such property shall, within 5 years of the date of the enactment of this act, dispose of said property so as to realize therefrom any excessive profit.

(2) As used in this subsection the term "excessive profits" means the portion of the profits derived from purchase and sale of any item or group of items of surplus property by any person to whom such property is disposed of under this act, or by any subsequent transferee of such property, which the board determines in accordance with this subsection to be excessive. In determining whether excessive profits have been realized there shall be taken into consideration the following factors:

(A) reasonableness of profits in the light of normal pre-war profits, and profits realized in the usual course of business on similar items which have not been disposed of under this act;

(B) amount of capital employed and risk assumed;

(C) character of business and rate of turnover;

(D) such other factors the consideration of which the public interest and fair and equitable dealing may require, which factors shall be published in the regulations of the board from time to time as adopted.

(3) In any case in which, in the opinion of the board, excessive profits have been realized it shall forthwith give notice by registered mail to the person or persons to whom it believes such profits have accrued, together with a statement of the facts used as a basis for such opinion. After reasonable opportunity for hearing, the board shall enter an order determining the amount, if any, of such excessive profits. The board shall take such action as may be necessary to recover such excessive profits either by settlement or suit in any court of competent jurisdiction. In any such suit the court may, in addition, impose a penalty in an amount not exceeding twice the amount adjudged to be excessive profits. All money recovered by reason of any such settlement or suit or as a penalty shall be covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, the purpose of the amendment is exactly the same as the purpose of the amendment which was offered by the senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR] and his colleagues from Arizona and Mississippi. That amendment was debated at length yesterday and today. As I followed the debate, it seemed to me that it was the consensus of this body that the purpose sought to be achieved in the first amendment was altogether proper and laudable. The objection which was raised went to the provisions of the first amendment which sought to place a burden upon the title to property and, particularly, real property, first for all time, and later, by suggested amendment, for 5 years.

In presenting my amendment I have followed the usual legislative practice of inserting a provision against the act of securing excessive profits by transfer. The definition of excessive profits as used is exactly that which was used in the amendment heretofore considered by this body, with reference to which I heard no objection. The procedure for determining excessive profits and for collection by the Government of such profits, or a penalty therefor, is exactly the same.

As I view it by the adoption of this amendment absolute protection can be thrown around all personal property which is to be disposed of as surplus by the Government. I submit the amendment on that basis.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Oregon to the committee amendment. [Putting the question.] The Chair is in doubt.

Mr. AIKEN. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. In the opinion of the Chair, the "noes" seem to have it.

Mr. AIKEN. I asked for the yeas and nays before the Chair announced his decision.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The yeas and nays have been requested. Is the demand sufficiently seconded?

Mr. AIKEN. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The absence of a quorum being suggested, the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	George	Overton
Andrews	Guffey	Pepper
Austin	Gurney	Revercomb
Buck	Hawkes	Reynolds
Burton	Hayden	Shipstead
Byrd	Hill	Stewart
Capper	Johnson, Colo.	Taft
Caraway	La Follette	Thomas, Utah
Chandler	Langer	Vandenberg
Connally	McClellan	Wagner
Cordon	McFarland	Walsh, N. J.
Danaher	McKellar	Weeks
Davis	Maloney	Wherry
Downey	Mead	White
Eastland	Millikin	Wiley
Ellender	Moore	
Ferguson	O'Mahoney	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Forty-nine Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present. The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON] to the amendment reported by the committee.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I wish to withdraw my demand for the yeas and nays, but I do request a rising vote on the amendment of the Senator from Oregon. I inquire if debate is closed on the amendment at this time?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment is still open to debate.

Mr. AIKEN. Then, Mr. President, I should like to say that I do not believe the Senate ought to recess for the week end and go home without having made every possible effort to control profiteering and speculation in Government surplus property. For myself, I was satisfied with the amendment proposed by the senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR]. I think that amendment covered the situation. But I realize and recognize the apprehension which the majority of the Senate has that the amendment of the Senator from Tennessee might be misinterpreted and misapplied. I do not know how we can keep any bills we pass from being misinterpreted and misapplied. If we permit such a consideration to be our guide we ought not to undertake to legislate at all. But inasmuch as the amendment of the Senator from Tennessee did not prevail, I think the amendment of the Senator from Oregon, which is aimed at controlling speculation and profiteering in Government surplus property, covers the situation as well as we can hope to cover it, and I trust the amendment will be adopted by the Senate body.

I ask for a rising vote, Mr. President, on the amendment.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, I wish to state that an amendment has now been agreed upon, at least by most of us who have been working on it. As the Chair knows, I asked unanimous consent earlier today to reconsider the vote by which an amendment was agreed to yesterday afternoon. The vote was reconsidered by unanimous consent. An amendment to take the place of the previous amendment has been worked out, which is agreeable, and so far as I am concerned at least is acceptable. The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WEEKS] has that amendment, and I should like to ask that he present it now. Consideration of it will take but a moment, I think.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair wishes to call attention to the fact that the amendment offered by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON] is pending. The question is on agreeing to that amendment. A division has been called for.

On a division the amendment to the amendment was rejected.

Mr. WEEKS. Mr. President, yesterday an amendment was offered by me to paragraph (3) of section 14, which was adopted. Earlier today, as the Senator from Tennessee has recalled to us, a motion to reconsider was agreed to. I now ask that that amendment be withdrawn, and I offer two amendments which I ask unanimous consent to have considered jointly. One concerns the subject matter we have been discussing, and the other provides a definition under the section containing definitions. I ask that the amendments be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment previously offered by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WEEKS] will be withdrawn.

The Senator from Massachusetts asks unanimous consent that two amendments which he has sent to the desk be considered together. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The amendments will be stated.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, did I correctly understand the Senator from Massachusetts to say that one amendment provides a definition?

Mr. WEEKS. The second amendment covers the definition which we discussed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendments will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 38, line 2, after the word "proper", it is proposed to insert the following: *"Provided, however,* That in the case of raw materials, consumer goods, and common supplies, no extension of credit under this act shall be for a longer period than 3 years."

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I did not hear at what point the amendment is proposed to be inserted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On page 38, line 2, after the word "proper."

The clerk will state the second amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 77, after line 2, it is proposed to insert the following:

(g) The term "common supplies" means small tools and hardware and nonassembled articles which may be used in the manufacture of more than one type of product.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I should like to have some explanation offered as to the effect of these proposed amendments.

Mr. WEEKS. Mr. President, the Senator from Wisconsin has asked for an explanation of the amendments. When I offered the amendment yesterday I sought to limit the duration of the credit which might be extended in connection with the purchase of surplus goods. Earlier today, during the discussion which took place, it appeared that Senators on both sides of the argument were in agreement that there should be some distinction made between plant and fixed equipment and land, and so-called con-

sumable and expendable materials, and also it was apparent to all who discussed the matter that this amendment, if it were to be adopted, should be applied to the general provisions which appear in section 3 under the heading "Board's duties and authority." So under paragraph (b) of section 4, where it provides that the board may dispose of property for cash or credit, we limit the extension of credit by saying:

Provided, however, That in the case of raw materials, consumer goods, and common supplies, no extension of credit under this act shall be for a longer period than 3 years.

That, Mr. President, is the substance of what the amendment seeks to accomplish.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I thank the Senator from Massachusetts for his explanation; and, as I understand, it does not apply to machine tools or to plants.

Mr. WEEKS. Mr. President, it does not apply to plants. It does not apply to tools which are normally depreciated over a period of years under Treasury regulations, but it does apply to jigs and other tools, so-called expendable tools, which are normally carried in any business and considered as expendable and consumable.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendments offered by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WEEKS].

The amendments to the amendment were agreed to.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MCKELLAR in the chair). The amendment offered by the Senator from Wisconsin will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 48, between lines 2 and 3, in the committee amendment, it is proposed to insert a new subsection, as follows:

(d) The board may provide, by regulation for reserving for sale or lease to States, political subdivisions thereof, including municipalities, and to tax-supported institutions, such amounts of surplus property as the War Production Board finds necessary to meet their essential needs.

On page 48, line 3, it is proposed to strike out "(d)" and insert "(e)."

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, it will be observed that the proposed new subsection is not mandatory upon the board, but is simply permissive. The amendment is offered because it has been represented to me that some of the States and municipalities are apprehensive that, because of their budgetary requirements and situations, they may not be in an equally advantageous position with corporations or individuals who might desire to purchase surplus property. As every Senator knows, municipalities, States, and other tax-supported institutions have been required by the necessities of the war and their inability to obtain priorities, to forego the purchase of many types of equipment and other materials which might readily be made available to them under the Government program for surplus-property disposal.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I am delighted to yield.

Mr. AUSTIN. There probably was a reason why the Senator omitted nonprofit charitable, medical, and educational institutions which have been held exempt from taxation under section 101 (6) of the Internal Revenue Code. If so, I should like to know what the reason was.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. It was my information that such institutions, if they were in a position to buy at all, would be able to buy at the time the goods were made available, whereas a State or municipality, because of its budgetary situation, meeting of the legislature, or something of that kind, might not be in a position to do so. I should have no objection to including them, if the Senator thinks it would be desirable.

Mr. AUSTIN. I do not. The explanation just made clears my mind of any doubt on the subject.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I feel certain that if it is found, after the bill goes to conference, that it is desirable to include them, they could be included in this provision; but so far as my present information goes, no such representations were made to me on behalf of institutions such as the Senator mentions. I am just as much interested in them as I am in the ones provided for in this section. I hope the conferees will consider that question, because the situation was brought to my attention only so far as States, municipalities, and political subdivisions are concerned. They desire the opportunity to present to the board the desirability of issuing a regulation which would give them equal opportunity with other buyers in the purchase of surplus materials which might be useful to them.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, I hope the amendment offered by the Senator from Wisconsin will be agreed to. I believe that the committee, perhaps through some oversight, did not take care of the situation which he has explained.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, I should like to have the attention of my distinguished colleague the senior Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON]. I invite the Senator's attention to page 47, subparagraph (c) of section 12. I should like to ask the Senator whether in his opinion conservation districts would come under that language?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, conservation districts come under the language with respect to transfer to agencies of the Federal Government. Does the Senator refer to State conservation districts? If he refers to State conservation districts, the answer is "Yes." Federal conservation districts would come under the Federal agency. In either case such districts would be included.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I thank the Senator for his answer.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MCFARLAND. Mr. President, I should like to invite the attention of the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON] to page 66. The other day I made the statement on the floor of the Senate that under section 22 no provision was made for notice prior to negotiation of a sale. The Senator from Colorado stated that the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] had drafted that section. I have called the attention of the Senator from Wyoming to this question, and he has agreed that the bill should be amended on page 66, line 2, after the word "public", by inserting the words "or negotiated." I offer that amendment at this time.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I have no objection to the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Arizona will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 66, line 2, after the word "public", it is proposed to insert "or negotiated."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Arizona to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I should like to have the attention of the Senator from Colorado in respect to the section dealing with stock-piling. I notice, on page 57, that strategic minerals shall include "ores, concentrates, alloys, scrap, and partially and completely fabricated articles of which the principal components by value consist of such minerals and metals."

Suppose a ship were partially completed, and it were decided, for some reason or other, not to complete it. What disposition could be made of it under the provision I have just read? As I understand, the material would have to be stored. It could not be sold as scrap.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, this section does not refer to steel, iron, or such materials. Of course, if the ship contained strategic and critical metals, and if the parts had no further use and were surplus, the metals would go into the scrap pile.

Mr. ELLENDER. What is the meaning of "scrap" as used in this section? It appears at the top of page 57, in line 1. What is the Senator's understanding of the word as used there? It will be noted from line 4 that if a fabricated article is completed, and the Army or Navy has no use for it, it may be sold as scrap, but if it is only partially completed, it may not be sold.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Of course, it is not intended by this section to scrap iron or steel. Only the critical and strategic metals are to be stock piled.

Mr. ELLENDER. What would become of the strategic material if it were part of a ship, tank, or something else that could be scrapped?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Does the Senator mean articles containing copper, zinc, and such metals?

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes; any of the strategic minerals or metals, as defined in the bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Such metals and minerals would be stock piled.

Mr. ELLENDER. Would it be necessary for the Government to take them out of a Government ship, and put them in a stock pile? It seems to me that that language ought to be clarified.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. It is clarified on page 57.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. AUSTIN. Let me offer the suggestion that the word "such", in line 3, on page 57, refers to strategic minerals and metals, which are the subject of this section. Heretofore the word "strategic" has been applied to the words "minerals and metals." I think that is what it means here. If that is its meaning, then any strategic minerals or metals in a ship which was partially constructed and then abandoned would fall under the power expressed here, to stock pile; but they would also fall under the clause which provides that if the cost of recapturing the material is greater than its commercial value, there is no mandate to recapture it by dismantling a ship or doing anything else to obtain it.

Please notice lines 3 to 8, on page 57:

> But shall not include such fabricated articles as the Army and Navy determine are not suitable for their use in the form in which fabricated and which may be disposed of commercially at value substantially in excess of the metal market price of the component minerals and metals of such fabricated articles.

Elsewhere there is a provision which exempts from recapture articles which cannot be recaptured because of their cost.

Mr. ELLENDER. But does not the language to which the Senator has referred apply to fabricated articles and such articles as the Army and the Navy may have no use for?

Mr. AUSTIN. Yes; it does.

Mr. ELLENDER. That would not cover the situation I have tried to describe.

Mr. AUSTIN. No; but it is elsewhere covered, so as to avoid the necessity of wrecking the property.

Mr. ELLENDER. I inquire where is that language?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. It is on page 57, in line 2. It reads as follows:

> Fabricated articles of which the principal components by value—

In other words, the principal components. That would take care of the question the Senator asked in regard to a ship which was being dismantled.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, is the Senator looking for that language?

Mr. AUSTIN. Yes.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, I should like to ask what is the opinion of the Senator from Colorado regarding the language on page 66, beginning with the sentence in line 4, which reads as follows:

> He—

Meaning the Secretary of the Interior—

> shall sell the property upon such terms as he deems most in the public interest to any person whose bid equals or exceeds the appraised value of the property and to whom a sale would be in accordance with the objectives of this act.

I ask whether that does not give to the selling agency the right to a personal choice of a purchaser, so long as the purchaser's bid equals or exceeds the appraised value, and so long as the purchaser otherwise comes within the objectives of the act.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, if the Senator from Oregon would care to offer an amendment which would make that provision apply to the highest bidder, I think there would be no objection to it

Mr. CORDON. That was my thought.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. CORDON. I yield.

Mr. HILL. Let me ask the Senator what is the provision to which he has called attention?

Mr. CORDON. It is on page 66, in the sentence beginning in line 4.

My thought was that in the sale of real property the property should go to the highest bidder whose bid equaled or exceeded the appraised value, and who was otherwise qualified, rather than to any person whose bid equaled or exceeded the appraised value.

I would suggest that in line 5 the words "any person" be stricken out and that the words "the highest bidder" be inserted in lieu thereof. That would accomplish the desired end.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. We shall be glad to accept the Senator's amendment.

Mr. CORDON. I submit that amendment, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment to the committee amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 66, in line 5, it is proposed to strike out the words "any person" and insert "the highest bidder", so as to read:

> He shall sell the property upon such terms as he deems most in the public interest to the highest bidder whose bid equals or exceeds the appraised value of the property and to whom a sale would be in accordance with the objectives of this act.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Oregon to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, to the committee amendment I offer the amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment to the committee amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 46, in line 25, after the word "equipment", it is proposed to insert "and property suitable for use in the protection of public health, including research."

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, under the language of the bill as now written, surplus medical supplies and equipment may be transferred to the Federal Security Administration for donation to the States and their political subdivisions, for their tax-supported health institutions.

The Surgeon General of the Public Health Service, Dr. Parran, has called my attention to the fact that such equipment may be of great value, so far as public health is concerned. As we know, drainage is an important function in that connection, and a bulldozer or other similar equipment might be very valuable for such purposes.

The amendment would permit the property to be transferred to the Federal Security Administrator to be used for the public health if that were thought desirable.

Of course, Senators realize that every year we appropriate millions of dollars to promote the public health. It would seem wiser and better to use the property we have, rather than to buy new property. That is the purpose of the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Alabama to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The attention of the Chair has been called by the Parliamentarian to the fact that in connection with the amendment just agreed to, in line 25 the word "and", before the word "equipment", should be stricken out, and a comma should be substituted for it.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that on page 46, in line 25, the word "and" which appears before the word "equipment" be stricken out, and that in lieu of it a comma be inserted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, to the committee amendment I offer the amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment to the committee amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. In the committee amendment, on page 37, after line 16, it is proposed to insert a new subsection, as follows:

> (i) The board shall designate the committees of the Agricultural Adjustment Agency in each State as the disposal agencies for all farm-size trucks and jeeps, declared to be surplus under this act, and shall distribute them to the States and to the Agricultural Adjustment Agency of each State in accordance with a formula consisting of one-third for area, one-third for population, and one-third for mileage of highways. The board shall fix the prices and prescribe the terms of sale and the people desiring to purchase any of said vehicles may buy them directly under said terms of sale prescribed by the board.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amend-

ment of the Senator from North Dakota to the committee amendment.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, inasmuch as the distinguished senior Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON], the chairman of the subcommittee of the Committee on Military Affairs, has no objection to the amendment, I ask unanimous consent that it be agreed to, and be allowed to go to conference.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I do not think there would be any objection to taking the amendment to conference; but it should be changed, it seems to me, so as to make the organization to which the amendment refers the disposal agency in those cases.

I presume it is not the intention of the Senator that trucks and jeeps be given away. I assume he desires to have them sold, rather than to have them given away. In that event the amendment should be changed so as to make the organization the Senator has in mind the disposal agency. If the Senator will perfect his amendment to that extent, we shall be glad to take it to conference.

Mr. LANGER. I shall do so.

The amendment, as modified, to the committee amendment is as follows:

On page 37, after line 16, insert a new subsection, as follows:

"(i) The board shall designate the committees of the Agricultural Adjustment Agency in each State as the disposal agencies for all farm-size trucks and jeeps, declared to be surplus under this act, and shall apportion such trucks and jeeps for disposal in the several States in accordance with a formula consisting of one-third for area; one-third for population; and one-third for mileage of Federal highways. The board shall fix the prices and prescribe the terms of sale and the people desiring to purchase any of said vehicles may buy them directly under said terms of sale prescribed by the board."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment, as modified, submitted by the Senator from North Dakota to the committee amendment.

The modified amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. WEEKS. Mr. President, yesterday evening just prior to the recess, I submitted an amendment to section 14 (f) on page 52, striking out, in line 2, the words "and operation." I desire to ask unanimous consent to withdraw that amendment, and to substitute the amendment I now offer, which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment to the committee amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. In the committee amendment on page 52, in line 4, after the word "bases", it is proposed to insert *"Provided,* That any loans to be made or guaranteed in connection with the operation of plants and facilities as provided herein shall not be made or guaranteed later than 6 months after such plants and facilities have been acquired and converted, nor shall such loans be extended for a longer period than 3 years, nor shall such loans be made to any small business enterprise which does not have an equity in the business at least equivalent to the amount of such operational loans."

Mr. WEEKS. Mr. President, yesterday evening, just before the recess, I submitted an amendment which called for the elimination of the words "and operation." The amendment was objected to by the distinguished junior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER] and the distinguished senior Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON]. In the pending amendment, I have modified the suggestion I made in the amendment I offered yesterday.

I desire to invite the attention of the Senate, Mr. President, to the fact that the pending bill purports to be one for the disposal of surplus property, including plants, equipment, and consumable or expendable supplies; in other words, everything which is determined to be surplus. In this particular section there appears, for the first and, I think, the only time in the bill, a provision which is entirely foreign, as I see it, to the real purpose of the bill itself. The purpose of the bill is to get rid of surplus property, but this particular section provides that the board may extend credit to assist the prospective purchasers to acquire such property. Here for the first time, and the only time in the bill, is a provision under which the board and its agent, the Smaller War Plants Corporation, may not only extend credit and help to acquire or convert, but also to operate a business. I submit that the purpose of extending credit to help in the operation of the business is foreign to the basic purpose of the legislation itself. I have recognized the wisdom of the suggestion made by the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER] and the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON] that in acquiring property a small enterprise may need and legitimately require some assistance at the beginning of the operation of the enterprise. But I think that to retain the provision, as it is now in the bill, with no restriction as to the amount and duration of the credit, would leave the door wide open for the Smaller War Plants Corporation to go into the business of loaning money without any restriction whatever for the operation of smaller enterprises.

In the amendment I have provided that if an enterprise seeks to acquire a plant, it may be loaned money for the acquisition of the plant and its equipment, or even to acquire some surplus property, such as raw materials, and so forth. If the prospective owner of the plant needs assistance to operate the business I provide in the amendment, Mr. President, that he may have such assistance. If he says that within 6 months of the time he acquires and converts the plant to operation he can make his requirement coincidental with the inauguration of the enterprise, let him have the assistance. But the request must be made within 6 months of the time the plant is ready to operate. If it is made thereafter, the credit may not be extended for more than 3 years.

I have further specified in the amendment that if the individual is to secure a loan for the purpose of operating the enterprise, he should have an equity in the business at least equal to the amount of the operational loan. In other words, in order to establish a business he may borrow from the Government $150,000 for the plant, $50,000 for the equipment, and $50,000 for raw material. He may then need a $50,000 loan to operate the business. I say that he must have at least an equity of $50,000 in the business before he may obtain an operational loan.

Mr. President, I submit the amendment and urge its adoption.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, yesterday the Senator from Massachusetts offered an amendment on page 52, at the beginning of line 2, to strike out "and operation."

The reason for undertaking to help small business is first, that the country is interested in two things, namely, having the plants which are declared surplus property operated so that there may be production and employment. I assume that we are interested in not allowing the plants to be gobbled up by monopolies so that the big fellows will own them all and the little fellows will have no opportunity to acquire any. So we put the following subparagraph into the bill:

(f) The Smaller War Plants Corporation is hereby authorized, for the purpose of carrying out the objectives of this section, to make or guarantee loans to small business enterprises—

And so forth. Those loans are to be guaranteed within the authority of the Smaller Business Corporation Act. Of course, loans may be guaranteed for small business. We put the provision in the bill for several reasons. We wanted small business to be enabled to acquire, convert, and operate plants, and we wished to provide money for that purpose. There is also a provision in the bill that if the owners of the plants do not operate them, for any reason except an act of God or a public enemy, or because of circumstances beyond their control, the Government may repossess the plants and pay a fair value for them. Unless the Smaller War Plants Corporation allows small plants to operate their properties, they cannot operate them, and consequently the plants will not be acquired or reconverted.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHANDLER. I will yield in a moment. If the Senate wishes to allow groups of small businessmen to operate plants, I fear that unless the procedure now outlined in the bill is followed they will be entirely eliminated.

I now yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. TAFT. I really do not think that the restrictions contained in the amendment are any more severe than those which the Smaller War Plants Corporation might reasonably impose. I do not believe that a small businessman should be allowed to operate a business on a shoestring.

Mr. CHANDLER. I do not assume that under the regulations of the board such a thing would be permitted.

Mr. TAFT. The proposed restrictions are very reasonable.

Mr. CHANDLER. I had not reached the proposal which has been made. I was confining myself to the proposal which was made yesterday, and which

has now been abandoned. I wished to place the history of it before Members of the Senate who were not present yesterday when the matter was being considered. The subparagraph to which I have referred, being subparagraph (f), would authorize the Smaller War Plants Corporation—

To make or guarantee loans to small business enterprises in connection with the acquisition and conversion of plants and facilities, and, in cooperation with the disposal agencies, to arrange for sales of surplus property to small business concerns on credit or time bases.

After the word "bases" the Senator from Massachusetts proposes to add:

Provided, That any loans to be made or guaranteed in connection with the operation of plants and facilities as provided herein shall not be made or guaranteed later than 6 months after such plants and facilities have been acquired and converted—

The bill provides that the operator of the plant may operate it for 2 years, and that at the end of that time if he has not operated it properly the Government may repossess the property and take it away from him.

The Senator from West Virginia will recall the discussion which was had in the committee on this point. Now there is to be provided a period of 3 years beyond which loans shall not be extended. I have no objection to limiting the authority of the Smaller War Plants Corporation, or any other agency in loaning money.

The language of the amendment continues:

nor shall such loans be extended for a longer period than 3 years, nor shall such loans be made to any small business enterprise which does not have an operational equity in the business at least equivalent to the amount of such operational loan.

I do not believe that would be any encouragement to a small businessman, although I assume that no small businessman will be able to buy into a plant unless he has some equity. Unless he had some aid and encouragement from the Smaller War Plants Corporation he could not operate the plant, reconvert, or employ other persons. I assume that the purpose of the proposal is to facilitate the operation of small business. To what extent it would limit the operator in meeting a good banker's qualification for a loan I cannot state. The Government should do a little more for small business than the bankers do. It may be a sound banking proposal, but if the small businessmen are required to go to a banker and ask him for a loan, the banker would probably look at him coldly across the table and ask him for his collateral, and he might be unable to furnish it.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHANDLER. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. I do not believe the Government or a bank should loan a man money in excess of the amount of capital he himself is willing to put into the enterprise. It seems to me that such a limit would be a proper one to be placed upon loans to be made to big business, little business, or any other kind of business. If we go beyond that point we encourage persons to go into business on a shoestring, when they are almost certain to fail. I think it is a very reasonable requirement that if we lend money to be used in operating any business the borrowers of the money should be able to put in at least an equal amount. The last provision of the amendment seems to me to be a reasonable limitation, and it would not interfere with any small businessman who wished in good faith to go into business.

Mr. CHANDLER. Suppose a man goes into a business and operates it for 6 months, does not have the necessary operating capital, and after 6 months he is through. Under the amendment who would operate the business?

Mr. TAFT. I suggest to the Senator we might lengthen the time from 6 months to 2 years.

Mr. CHANDLER. That would be within the meaning of the bill and that would give him a chance within a period during which the Government could, if circumstances arose, repossess the plant if the purchaser did not operate it. What we want is operation and employment and production by these plants. If we are going to convert the country to a peacetime operation we have got to give the little fellows a chance. If we make him dependent on a banker's condition we have not given him much chance.

Mr. TAFT. I suggested to the Senator that it might be changed from 6 months to 2 years.

Mr. CHANDLER. I do not object to a 3-year limitation; I want the time to be reasonable.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President——

Mr. CHANDLER. I yield to the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. HILL. I wish to call the attention of the Senate to the fact that, according to the evidence before the Small Business Committee through September 1941, more than 75 percent of all civil contracts went to 56 large corporations and the remaining 25 percent were held by 6,000 out of the Nation's 174,000 manufacturers. I am sure there were many other manufacturers who did not fall within the classification of the 174,000 who were left out. Thousands of small manufacturers of this country could not get a contract with 75 percent of the contracts going to 56 large corporations.

In distributing and disposing of surplus property and in considering the economy of our country, the private enterprise system about which we talk so much and which we cherish so dearly demands that we make provision so that the smaller manufacturers may get some of the surplus property and some of the loans. The Smaller War Plants Corporation cannot loan one single dollar except the dollars which the Congress appropriates for the use of the Corporation. They are operating as our agents; they are operating with money which we give them, and we keep a constant check on them. If we want small business, small manufacturers to have a chance to get some of the surplus property and operate some of the plants and carry on business, we ought to leave the language of this bill as it is and place the authority in the Smaller War Plants Corporation subject to the rules and regulations of the board. To tie it, to hamstring it as is suggested by the amendment before the Senate might prove most harmful not only to smaller manufacturers but to the Nation's economy as well.

Mr. CHANDLER. If Senators will look into the restrictions imposed upon the R. F. C. as to the loans to big business, they will not find any such restriction as is here proposed. If the Senate wants to put itself on record as favoring restrictions on little fellows and no restrictions on the big fellows, it can adopt the amendment.

As I understand, the Senator from Massachusetts has no objection to making the period 2 years. I would not object to that, although I do not approve of it. I do not want to put myself in the position of approving an attempt to limit this help to small business. But with the 2-year and the 3-year provision, it is less objectionable than it was originally. Six months is entirely objectionable, and ought not to be adopted. The latter part of the amendment ought not to be adopted, because it imposes restrictions on small business that we have not imposed on large business or so-called big business.

Mr. STEWART and Mr. TAFT addressed the Chair.

Mr. CHANDLER. I yield first to the Senator from Tennessee. I promised to yield to him. Then I shall yield to other Senators in order.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, I should like to call the attention of the Senator to the following paragraph of section 1 which is under the head of objectives of this act.

Mr. CHANDLER. From what page is the Senator reading?

Mr. STEWART. Page 31. Among other things it is stated:

The Congress hereby declares that the objectives of this act are to facilitate and regulate the orderly disposal of surplus property—

* * * * *

(c) In the disposition of plant, equipment, and materials for use in further production—

* * * * *

(3) To foster the development of new independent enterprise.

Mr. President, here is the picture which is before the Senate: The time is not far distant, we hope, when about 12,000,000 men and women who are now in the armed forces of this country will be returning to their homes. We will be confronted by the problem of aiding those men and women in reestablishing themselves in the business world. Most of them have been drafted into the Army for the purpose of going to the battle fronts all over the globe and fighting a war for the defense of the United States of America. We have taken them away from their businesses, perhaps a filling station on the corner, perhaps a small machine shop, but, whatever it might have been, we have taken them away from their businesses and required them to give service in the Army of their

country. Those men and women are entitled to receive at the hands of the Congress of the United States of America such aid and assistance as is necessary to enable them to reestablish themselves in business. It was with that in mind that there were written into the bill as one of its objectives the words "to foster the development of new independent enterprise."

Mr. CHANDLER. Does the Senator from Tennessee feel that the amendment would be helpful to that end?

Mr. STEWART. No, sir. Those who will come back from the war and be discharged from the Army probably will not have any money at all. Someone said they might want to try to operate on a shoestring. There have been plenty of businesses started in America by adventurous, enterprising industrialists whose shoestring operations have grown to large proportions and whose names have been written high among those who have achieved success. The fact that a man starts operations on a shoestring is no reason why we should be critical of him. I think we owe responsibility particularly to those in the armed services, as well as to those who, whether they are in the armed services or not, have seen their businesses disrupted and destroyed, to do what we can to help them become reestablished, even though their operations might be classified as of the shoestring variety. I think the amendment should be rejected.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President——

Mr. CHANDLER. I yield to the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I feel that most of us are in accord with the views expressed by the able Senators who have spoken upon the subject with respect to the fostering and protection of the small businessman. Certainly I subscribe to that idea. I think, however, that there is much soundness in the pending amendment, and I hope its soundness addresses itself to the Members of the Senate. I am particularly impressed with the feature of the offered amendment which provides that the Smaller War Plants Corporation, which means the Government, shall not loan more money to the borrower than he owns in the property on which he borrows the money. Of course, we are going to do all we can for the returning servicemen. We have made provision for them in the G. I. bill of rights, and I agree heartily with the able Senator from Tennessee [Mr. STEWART], who has just spoken, that the ex-serviceman should be helped; but I may say, Mr. President, that whether a business be large or small, it is very unsound practice for the Government to loan money beyond the value of the business. What will happen if that is done? Will it help small business? On the contrary, may I point out that it may become very hazardous to small business.

Very properly one of the objectives of this bill is to foster new enterprise. Have Senators thought that, in line with that objective, some fly-by-night operator may organize without investment of his own money and borrow beyond the value of the interest he has in the business?

As a member of the committee which reported the bill, I feel that the bill as written is good, but I think the pending amendment would be a helpful addition to it. If a man may borrow beyond the value of the property he has—and under the bill as it is written there is no limitation upon the amount that may be loaned—the consequence is that that business will soon be owned by the Government, and we will be back to the idea of Government operation, which is something we should avoid.

Mr. President, in my opinion, the amendment is a very sound one. I believe further that we owe it to the people of this country, whose money we are lending, not to lend beyond the value of the thing upon which we lend it. For that reason, as it is a sound proposition, I hope the amendment will be adopted.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I hope the amendment will not be agreed to. The competitive segment of our economy, the so-called small business segment, took a licking when this country converted from peace to wartime production. Despite all the efforts which were made by Congress by the creation of the Smaller War Plants Corporation, despite the activities of the so-called Truman committee, despite the activities of the Small Business Committee striving to assist small business and the competitive segment of our economy during the critical period of conversion from peace to wartime production, despite all those efforts, the facts show that the war had the effect of concentrating industry, of strengthening the monopoly segment of our economy, and of enhancing the power of the great corporations of the Nation. The excuse which was given was that because of the speed which was essential in the development and equipment of our armed forces and our Navy, procurement officers were forced by the necessity of circumstances and the critical situation which confronted the Nation to turn to large business and to monopoly in order to obtain the supplies and the equipment and the ships which were necessary for our national defense and participation in the war.

I have never believed, Mr. President, that small business and the competitive segment of our economy was given sufficient protection in the conversion from peacetime to wartime production. But certainly in the disposal of surplus property, and in the disposal of the $15,000,000,000 worth of Government-owned plants, there is no such national crisis, there is no necessity for the speed which was given as the excuse for pulverizing small business during the conversion from peace to wartime production. I believe that the conscious policy of Congress, as enunciated in the objectives of this bill, to stimulate small business, to give small business every possible legitimate opportunity, should be carried out in the terms of the measure. To impose the restrictions which are sought to be placed upon the loans which may be extended, as is contemplated by the pending amendment, would, in my judgment, go far toward defeating the announced objectives of this proposed legislation.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. STEWART in the chair). Does the Senator from Wisconsin yield to the Senator from West Virginia?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Will the Senator please advise me—and I ask the question in all earnestness—wherein small business would be injured if the loans were restricted to the amount of the interest owned by the borrower? Certainly I take it the able Senator from Wisconsin would not have the funds of this country loaned to someone who had no interest in the business for which he borrows the money. If that should be done, then fly-by-night organizations and enterprises would rise over night and compete with established small business.

My point is that the restriction that the loan must be limited to the amount of the equity in the property of the borrower, is a sound provision, because to do otherwise would place one who is not earnestly in business in competition with the small businessman who already has his property.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I do not share the fears which the Senator from West Virginia has expressed. I feel certain that under the terms of the bill, as reported by the committee, loans will be extended only insofar as necessary in order to give small business enterprises which seek to obtain some Government-owned plants sufficient working capital in order to enable them to purchase the plants and successfully to establish their business enterprise. The moment we begin to place restrictions on the extension of loans to small business, we move in the direction of making more difficult a problem which is already very difficult so far as such business is concerned. We must lodge discretion somewhere if we are going to move at all in the direction of repairing the damage which has already been done as a result of the concentration of war contracts and war business in the hands of big business.

I say in all sincerity, Mr. President, that in my opinion, the ultimate survival of democracy in America depends upon our strengthening, revitalizing and rebuilding the competitive segment of our economy. Each and every war in which this country has participated has resulted in a further concentration of industry, in a further strengthening of the monopoly segment of our economy, and every time we move in that direction the effect of our action is to deny the equality of economic opportunity which is essential to the survival of political democracy.

Perhaps some loans will be made, Mr. President, which upon strict business considerations might seem to be unwise, but realizing, as I think I do, that the great bulk of employment prior to this war was on the part of the so-called small business segment of our economy, realizing, as I think I do, the terrific problems which are going to confront this Nation once we begin to reconvert to peacetime production, I prefer to err on the side of a liberal and a generous and a direct effort to repair the damage

which has been done to small business and to the competitive segment of our economy as the result of this war, rather than to be concerned lest perhaps a few injudicious loans may be made.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McKELLAR in the chair). Does the Senator from Wisconsin yield to the Senator from Wyoming?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I interrupt the Senator merely to point out that I have not heard of any great effort to place any restrictions upon the loans which are made to what the Senator so properly called the monopoly segment of our industry. Big business has had no trouble in securing Government funds without restriction for the purposes contemplated, and I see no reason why we should here undertake to impose a restriction upon the judgment of the board. I believe its judgment will be discreetly used to build up our independent competitive economy.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, let me add, in commenting upon what the able Senator from Wyoming has said, that even if we move with every facility at our command during the period of reconversion, toward the objective of revitalizing and strengthening the competitive segment of our economy, we shall find it most difficult indeed to repair even the damage which has been done in the period of war so far as that segment is concerned.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I thank the Senator from Wisconsin for yielding to me again. In view of the statement which he has so ably made, I wish to say that I am in hearty accord with the objective expressed by him, namely, that of protecting the small businessman. I am quite sure that everything I have done and said on the floor of the Senate or in committee has been toward that end. The Military Affairs Committee certainly worked toward that end, as the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER] well knows. We are all in accord upon the objective. The only question is as to the means of attaining the end.

The Senator from Wyoming stated that there was no restriction upon loans to big business. I think there is. Certainly there should be a restriction upon loans to any business, big or little. If the person who borrows money for a business has no interest in the business, and comes to the Government for the people's money, to use it for that business, he should not receive the money to set up such an enterprise in competition with genuine small business. That is my point.

Mr. WEEKS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield.

Mr. WEEKS. Some comment has been made by the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin on the distinction which he believes is drawn between big and little business. First, let me say that I am in favor of some limitation on the lending of Government funds, regardless of who the borrower may be and regardless of the size of the business. But let us understand what we are talking about in connection with this amendment. An article written by Hon. Maury Maverick defines a small business as follows:

> The Smaller War Plants Corporation defines it as a business with fewer than 500 employees.

Let me turn to a publication of the Department of Commerce, which sets forth that there are 1,809,000 industrial establishments in the country, and that approximately 99½ percent of them employ fewer than 500 employees. We are discussing a loaning power which is to be given to the Smaller War Plants Corporation under the proposal in the bill, without my amendment. We are talking about a loaning power to make loans to approximately 99½ percent of the industrial organizations of the whole country.

I have only this to add, Mr. President: I do not think it is good business for the United States Government to lend money without obligating the individual or enterprise borrowing the money to have some stake in the business. If we do not do so, under the terms of the bill as written, an individual or small enterprise may borrow money for plant, equipment, and raw materials with which to start operations, and then obtain a loan for working capital, obtaining all such loans without putting up a single dollar of his or its money. The bill as it is now written so provides. I do not believe that is good business.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I know that the Senator does not think it is good business. Yesterday afternoon the Senator from Massachusetts did not think it was good business to permit the Smaller War Plants Corporation to lend a nickel for the purpose of giving small concerns operating funds. I cannot square the Senator's protestations about his interest in helping the competitive segment of our economy with the direction in which he is constantly moving, namely, to make it more difficult, if not impossible, under an admittedly difficult situation to begin with, for small business and small enterprise to have any part in connection with the disposal of $15,000,000,000 worth of brand new plants which have been built in the United States with the taxpayers' money.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I ask the Senator from Wisconsin, who has made a very thorough study of this question, if it is not true that while 99½ percent of the businesses of the country may be classed as small businesses, during the war period the other one-half of 1 percent has received, not all the war contracts, amounting to billions of dollars, but a very large percentage of them. As I recall, 80 or 90 percent of the contracts have gone to that one-half of 1 percent.

Furthermore, our Government has spent billions of dollars in expanding the plants of the one-half of 1 percent, and has placed contracts with them at figures which would enable them to pay back those investments in 5 years. If that is the case, as I understand it to be, I should say that certainly there has been no discrimination against big business. There has been no discrimination in favor of small business. Small business has been at a disadvantage. If there is any way by which small business can be put back upon an equality with big business, it is not only our opportunity, but our duty to do so.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, let us not forget that what we are talking about is the disposal of $15,000,000,000 worth of Government-owned plants which have been built during the war. If we do not give small business and the competitive segment of our economy substantial and liberal assistance in its endeavor to have some opportunity to utilize a portion of these Government-owned plants, we all know that inevitably they will fall into the hands of the large concerns.

I have no antipathy to business concerns merely because of their size; but I am convinced that in this period of reconversion to peace we have a responsibility to do all in our power to strengthen the independent and small business competitive segment of our economy. As I previously stated, Mr. President, it is inevitably involved in the problem of the survival of democracy itself.

All we have to do is to study what has happened in those nations whose economy has become concentrated in the hands of a relatively few giant trusts. It makes no difference whether that occurs in an economy dominated by a philosophy of the extreme left or a philosophy of the extreme right. The fact remains that political democracy and human liberty have disappeared in the nations in which that economic consequence has taken place. If we wish to preserve democracy and the right of individual liberty in America, we must do all within our legitimate power to strengthen, buttress, and revitalize the independent and competitive segment of our economy so that we may maintain the irreducible minimum, at least, of equality of economic opportunity which is essential to the survival of political democracy.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, in the reconversion period a large number of smaller plants will require modern equipment for reconversion to peacetime production. The larger institutions have protected themselves, and enjoy a distinct advantage because of options obtained in connection with war contracts, which gives them a preference over all other purchasers, both as to Government plants and modern, up-to-date Government equipment. They do not have to purchase through dealers or speculators, or pay any intermediate profit, and they can buy in large quantities.

I am glad that this amendment has been presented, because it will give the Senate an opportunity to pass on this issue. Are we to permit large businessmen, who have money, who have made large sums of money during the war, and who have options in their contracts to

buy plants and equipment, to have this further advantage with respect to property declared surplus by the Government, and paid for by all the people of the country? Are we to permit that advantage to be continued, even after the war is over and the emergency is past? Are we to say to the little fellow, "You are under a handicap. We have kept you down during these years. We have not been able to give you any new machinery or equipment. You struggled and operated despite the handicaps of insufficient equipment and lack of material, and yet you have survived." I submit that no enterprise which has not survived in this emergency is going to buy plants, machinery, or equipment. It must have survived. The man at the head of it must have had courage, and he must have gotten through these awful years. He has not had any help at all except what we have provided under the Smaller War Plants Corporation.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for a question?

Mr. CHANDLER. I shall yield in a moment.

Mr. President, small business can acquire only such machinery as is not already preempted by options. The small businessman will be able to get what is left; what is declared surplus; what has not already been taken by the fellows who were wise enough to say in advance, "We want this and this and this, and when the war is over we will have the first chance to buy it."

The small businessman can buy in only limited quantities, sometimes requiring only one or a few units, such as lathes, and so forth. With the tremendous surpluses available, it should be one of our prime objectives to facilitate the acquisition by smaller plants of the most modern machinery. In this regard several things can be done by the Smaller War Plants Corporation to offset the disadvantages under which the small concerns are laboring, as compared with the circumstances in which the larger plants find themselves, and to equalize the status, if they are granted the power to purchase surplus goods, as now provided in the Senate bill.

If we say to the small businessman, "Notwithstanding the fact that you have gone through this period and have suffered, and that your plant has worn out, you cannot get any of this new equipment and new machinery, even though it is available; and"—as was suggested yesterday—"even if you get it you cannot operate it, because we will not provide you with any assistance at all," what help will we be giving to small business? The big fellow does not need help. The little fellow must have it or else he will not be able to survive.

I want to have the widest opportunity afforded every small business in the country. There is nothing in the bill to indicate that the board or the Administrator will not utilize the normal channels of trade or will be guilty of bad business practices or will be guilty of loaning money to people who have no opportunity to succeed in the operation of their business, so that the Government will have to repossess. However, the bill contains clauses relating to repossession, if for any reason such persons cannot operate their plants successfully within 2 years.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. CHANDLER. I yield.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I am quite sure that the Senator and I are in accord on the very basic idea of assisting and strengthening small business in this country. During the debate there has been argument on many points which I think are not germane to the issue presented by the amendment.

I ask the Senator this question: I know we have been in agreement about assisting small business; but does the Senator believe that the Congress of the United States should authorize the loaning of money out of the Treasury to a person, beyond the value of the property on which it is loaned and beyond the capacity of the person to pay it back?

Mr. CHANDLER. I do not advocate such a thing, and there is nothing in the bill which authorizes such a thing. If I thought that any person who would take office under this bill would deliberately make foolish loans to persons on properties which could not be operated or could not succeed, and as to which the operators were unable to show there was a sound basis for making the loans, I would vote against conferring any authority upon the administrators. However, nothing like that is provided for in the bill.

I desire to find out, and I think it will be demonstrated, whether Senators are for little business in the reconversion period, whether they want little business to have an opportunity to obtain new machinery and new business, or whether they want the big fellows to gobble up the little fellows.

If Senators wish to give the little fellows all aid short of help, that is the way to do it—to vote to render assistance to them, so far as mere words are concerned, but actually to give them no help. That will do what some may intend. But the little businessman will not be fooled.

I myself am a small businessman. I have a newspaper, with a press and a couple of linotype machines. We have not been able to obtain any parts for them. My friend the Senator from West Virginia is also a small businessman, although he operates on a larger scale than I do. His newspaper is managed and edited better than mine is, and the opinions in his newspaper are better than those in my small newspaper. But he knows that we have not been able to obtain any equipment at all during the war period; and all of us know that situated all over the country are other small plants which have gone through the emergency without being able to obtain any assistance. They have not asked for anything, and they have not expected anything, but they have survived.

Now, if Senators wish to say to those small plants, "We have protected the big fellows and have permitted them to have options on everything they want; but to you, all we can say is that we wish you well, and some day we shall get together and help you further," how much encouragement will that be to them?

I wish to have a vote taken on the question whether we wish to have property sold by the board set up under the bill to such little fellows, under proper rules and regulations, or whether such small businessmen can receive no help from us, and will have to depend on bankers' loans.

Mr. President, small businessmen do not need our help in order to get bankers' loans. They could have put mortgages on their property and could have paid 6 percent or more on the loans.

The Government not only has the obligation to keep 4 or 5, or 400 or 500 persons employed in these plants, but it has the obligation to help these people in the post-war period, on a sound basis, not on the basis of helping them to get bankers' loans.

I have no objection to bankers, but they are tough. It is necessary to put up as collateral an arm, or a leg, or something else that is vital, when it is desired to obtain assistance from them. But action on the part of the Government directed toward enabling small businessmen to obtain bankers' loans is not the help such businessmen need, and they understand that it is not.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHANDLER. In a moment.

Mr. President, I make the plea that we help the little fellows, for they need help, and have not asked for anything thus far, and do not ask for anything now except the right to live and to make a living in their small communities. If we do not give them that opportunity, we shall not be helping them at all.

Now I yield to the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, I disagree with the Senator when he says the issue is between big business and little business. I desire to have the Senate vote to take from the Treasury such funds as are needed to render the necessary assistance to small businessmen.

Mr. CHANDLER. Oh, Mr. President, that would not help, because the Treasury is bare now. We owe $300,000,000,000.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, if I had my way in the matter, I would put the same restriction on both big business and little business, namely, that they cannot be loaned money if they cannot pay it back. The Senator says he would not permit that to be done.

Mr. CHANDLER. No; I have not said that. I do not yield for the purpose of having anyone quote me incorrectly. I am not in favor of making unsound loans to anyone, and no provision for such loans is made by the bill. But the Senator, in making loans to small business, would impose restrictions which the Reconstruction Finance Corporation would not impose in making loans to big business. If there is any little business that has any options or rights to buy surplus property after the war, I should like to have it pointed out. The only right little businesses have is the right to die, and everyone has that right.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, I agree with the Senator when he states that money should not be taken from the Treasury to make bad loans, and the Senator has said he has faith that bad loans will not be made.

I say that we should place restrictions which would apply to all, big and little, so that the money of the people of the United States will not be used to make loans in an amount exceeding the value of the property.

Mr. CHANDLER. I understand that. But the amendment has been directed toward imposing restrictions on only the small businessmen.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHANDLER. I yield.

Mr. STEWART. I ask the Senator if it is not true that when we were converting from peacetime to wartime, when we were preparing for this war, the Government not only made enormous loans to those who were manufacturing war materials, but oftentimes built factories and gave them to such manufacturers or gave them options to purchase them?

Mr. CHANDLER. Certainly, Mr. President. We did all that during wartime. But when we come to reconverting to peacetime, we propose to say to the people whom we had to run over in the interest of national defense, "Now that we have time, we are going to give you a chance to rehabilitate and to come back."

Mr. STEWART. Is it not just as important to rehabilitate the small businessmen who, because of the war, have had their small businesses completely taken away from them, and who probably do not have any capital at all with which to make a come-back—is it not just as important to help that group of men as it was to help those who were actually manufacturing war materials for us?

Mr. CHANDLER. It certainly is. That is what we seek to do by the bill.

Mr. President, in order that the assistance will not be rendered to the big businessmen only, the amendment should be rejected, and I sincerely hope the amendment will be rejected by the Senate.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHANDLER. I am about ready to yield the floor, but I will yield to the Senator if he wishes that I do so.

Mr. FERGUSON. I should like to say a few words on the amendment. I take it that we are attempting to pass a bill which will aid recovery, in case we have a slump or a large number of unemployed persons after the war. I am merely fearful that the amendment will not accomplish the good which its authors believe it will.

As I understand the amendment, the difficulty with it is that as a rule the small businessman does not have a large amount of working capital. His pay roll is his biggest item.

The amendment provides:

Provided, That any loans to be made or guaranteed—

In other words, if the small businessman went to a bank and tried to get sufficient money to take care of his pay roll for, let us say, a period of 6 months, he would have to obtain a loan of a certain size. If he did not have that much money in the business, he could not get a loan which would be sufficient, even if he did not use all of it at one time; he would not be able to obtain a loan by means of which he could see his way clear to run the plant for 6 months or for whatever period he needed the funds.

I think the amendment should be rejected. I think we should leave a certain amount of discretion in the hands of those who will perform the functions provided for in the bill, and we should hold them strictly accountable for proper operation. I believe that if we adopt this amendment, and thereby compel small businessmen to have a sufficient investment in their businesses so as to cover or be equal to the amount of money they would be loaned, we will have great difficulty in stimulating small business.

Mr. President, I hope the amendment will be rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Massachusetts.

The amendment to the committee amendment to the amendment was rejected.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, a short time ago, in speaking to my colleague about inventories, I gave him assurance that the bill completely took care of soil-conservancy districts. I am afraid I gave him too strong assurance. I desire to withdraw the assurance I gave him with respect to soil-conservancy districts.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, in order to meet the situation, I offer the amendment to the committee amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment to the committee amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 47, at the end of line 10, it is proposed to insert "and conservancy districts"; and on the same page, at the end of line 21, it is proposed to insert "and conservancy districts."

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, the word used is "conservancy." I now address myself to my distinguished colleague the senior Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON]. I understand that the correct word should be "conservation."

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. The name may differ in different States.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, the Soil Conservation Act is known as the Soil Conservation Act. I am quite sure the word which should be used is "conservation." I hope the Senator from Colorado will modify his amendment by substituting the word "conservation."

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. We are talking about a State agency. States may have different names for the same kind of an agency, but I believe that the word "conservation" would be a better one.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, some States use the word "conservancy." May I suggest that a better choice would be "or conservation"?

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, I modify my amendment by using the words "and conservation districts."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the modified amendment of the Senator from Colorado to the committee amendment.

The modified amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, I ask the senior Senator from Colorado if action was finally taken on the suggested insertion of the words "the Contract Settlement Act of 1944" to be inserted after the word "of", in line 9, on page 75?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Yes; action was finally taken.

Mr. DANAHER. I know that the Senator assured us that such was his intention. I wondered if action had been finally taken.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. DANAHER. I thank the Senator.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I offer an amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 48 in line 20, after the word "policies", it is proposed to insert the following:

The board may empower any owning agency subject to the regulations of the board, to authorize any contractor with such agency or subcontractor thereunder to retain or dispose of any contractor inventories for any other purpose not contrary to the objectives of this act. Where any owning agency takes possession of any contractor inventory from any contractor with the agency or subcontractor thereunder, such property shall be disposed of only in accordance with the provisions of this act.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, the proposed amendment grew out of colloquy which took place yesterday between the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] and the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN] on the question of disposition by owning agencies. The amendment was worked out with the representative of the Under Secretary of War, and with the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], and with the legal staff. Its purpose, as I understand it, is to give to the owning agency, to a certain extent, the status of a disposal agency.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Colorado to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I offer another amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 76, it is proposed to strike out lines 24 and 25; and on page 77, it is proposed to strike out lines 1 and 2 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

(f) The term "contractor inventory" means (1) any property related to a terminated contract of any type with a Government agency or to a subcontract thereunder; and (2) any property acquired under a cost-plus-a-fixed-fee contract and in excess of the amounts needed to complete performance thereunder;

and (3) any property which the Government is obligated to take over under any type of contract as a result of any change in the specifications of plans thereunder; except, in each case, any Government-owned machinery or equipment subject to a separate contract or contract article specifically governing its use or disposition.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, the amendment which has just been read broadens the definition of "contractor inventory" in the bill, and plus the amendment which has already been agreed to, it is my judgment that it will remove the difficulties which were discussed on the floor yesterday.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Colorado to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, on page 38, at the end of line 20, after the word "shall", I move to amend by inserting the words "subject to the approval of the board."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 38, at the end of line 20, after the word "shall", it is proposed to insert the words "subject to the approval of the board."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Connecticut to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, on pages 66 and 67 of the bill there are provisions subjecting real property sold under contract to taxation by local government. On page 67, in line 1, appear the words "upon the purchaser's taking possession thereof." In other words, the language provides that the land shall become subject to taxation, not upon its sale under contract, but upon the physical act of taking possession. I move that the words "upon the purchaser's taking possession thereof" appearing in line 1, on page 67, be stricken.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I hope the amendment will be agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Oregon to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, further calling attention to the same section on page 67, I move that in line 4, after the word "property", the word "and" be stricken out and the word "but" be inserted in lieu thereof, and that in line 7, after the word "shall", the word "not" be inserted, and in the same line, after the word "extinguished", the following be inserted, "but may be foreclosed to the same extent and in the same manner as is provided in the cases of privately owned real property."

The purpose of the amendment is to subject to local taxation property sold under contract and to give local authorities the right to realize their taxes from the property.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 67, line 4, after the word "property" it is proposed to strike out the word "and" and insert in lieu thereof the word "but"; in line 7, after the word "shall" it is proposed to insert "not", and after the word "extinguished" it is proposed to add "but may be foreclosed to the same extent and in the same manner as is provided in the cases of privately owned real property."

Mr. CORDON. The purpose of the amendment is as I have already stated, Mr. President.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Is it the purpose of the amendment to foreclose property which belongs to the United States? Is that the effect of the amendment?

Mr. CORDON. The effect of the amendment, Mr. President, is to make the property subject to such taxes as may have been levied against it while it was held under contract, and in case the Government takes back the title, to make the property subject to foreclosure for the taxes which were levied while it was held under the contract unless the Government desires to pay the taxes. The Government would have its option either to pay the taxes levied under those circumstances, or allow the property to go. When the property is sold under contract and goes to private ownership to the extent, at least, of an equity, and is being operated as privately owned property, it takes its place in the financial arrangements of all local governments as a part of the tax-paying base. The local government has a right to have its equity in the property realized upon, either by the property being made subject to the tax, or by the Government paying the tax.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. It seems unusual to subject property of the United States to foreclosure. That is what the amendment would do.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I discussed the proposal with the Senator from Oregon earlier in the day. The section to which the amendment has been offered was adopted by the committee for the purpose of protecting the right of the States and local subdivisions to obtain tax revenue. The amendment which the Senator originally proposed to me was that the lien should not be extinguished. To that, I have no objection. I think it would be quite proper, and it would not involve, as the amendment which the Senator now offers, a foreclosure suit against the United States. If the Senator were content merely to provide that the lien should not be extinguished, then it would become an obligation to be paid by the next purchaser, and the State and the local subdivision would not be involved, it seems to me, in any foreclosure proceeding. I think what the Senator has in mind would be amply safeguarded by dropping out the latter portion of his amendment.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, as I view the suggestion of the Senator from Wyoming, if the provision simply meant that a lien should be on the property for taxes, but that the lien could not be realized upon, the lien might just as well not be there. The Senator suggests that if it remain, then at some other time the property may be sold and the new purchaser taking it will take it subject to the lien. In that case the United States would be in the position of reducing its price to the second purchaser to such an extent that the total purchase price would not be greater on account of the tax. In other words, the Government would be in exactly the same position, of ultimately paying the taxes. The main effect would be that there would be a dislocation to that extent in the orderly processes of local government, which when it placed the tax upon the particular lands, had raised or thought it had raised money for its ordinary operations, and then would find that that tax was not collectible, and to that extent that amount of money would have to be made up from other sources.

I suggest that the amendment as offered is a reasonable and logical protection to local government in the orderly development of its fiscal policies, and certainly is without any danger to the United States.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, my thought was merely that there are certain legal and constitutional difficulties about filing a suit against the United States, foreclosure suit or otherwise, and I think the Senator will gain his objective more effectively by accepting the suggestion which I make, that he drop that portion referring to foreclosures. The matter will go to conference.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, I think I shall adopt the suggestion of the Senator from Wyoming and modify the amendment to the extent of striking from the amendment the words "but may be foreclosed to the same extent and in the same manner as is provided in the cases of privately owned real property."

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. As modified, Mr. President, there is no objection to the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is upon agreeing to the modified amendment offered by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON] to the committee amendment.

The modified amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now recurs on agreeing to the committee amendment as amended.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I now move that the Senate proceed to consider House bill 5125, to provide for the disposal of surplus Government property and plants, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be reported by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (H. R. 5125) to provide for the disposal of surplus Government property and plants, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Colorado.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider House bill 5125.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I move to strike out all after the enacting clause, and to insert in lieu

thereof the text of Senate bill 2065, as amended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Colorado to strike out all after the enacting clause of the House bill, and to substitute therefor the text of the Senate bill, as amended.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question recurs on the engrossment of the amendment and the third reading of the bill.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Shall the bill pass?

The bill (H. R. 5125) was passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to aid the reconversion from a war to a peace economy through the distribution of Government surplus property and to establish a surplus property board to effectuate the same, and for other purposes."

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendment, request a conference with the House thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. THOMAS of Utah, Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado, Mr. HILL, Mr. CHANDLER, Mr. AUSTIN, Mr. GURNEY, and Mr. REVERCOMB conferees on the part of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, Senate bill 2065 will be indefinitely postponed.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I move that House bill 5125 be printed, showing the Senate amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I desire to enter into the RECORD at this point a letter which I have received from Assistant Attorney General Wendell Berge with respect to certain monopoly features of the bill which has just been passed.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE,
Washington, August 24, 1944.

Hon. JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR O'MAHONEY: You have indicated interest in my views concerning the effect upon the operation of the antitrust laws of the War Mobilization and Reconversion Act of 1944, passed by the Senate on August 11, and the Stewart-Taft-Murray bill, S. 2065.

The War Mobilization and Reconversion Act of 1944 provides, in section 204, that the Attorney General shall make surveys for the purpose of determining any factors which may tend to eliminate competition, create or strengthen monopolies, injure small business, or otherwise promote undue concentration of economic power in the course of war mobilization and during the period of transition from war to peace and thereafter. The Stewart-Taft-Murray bill provides, as I understand it, in section 14, that the Administrator shall ask for the advice of the Attorney General before disposing of surplus property valued at a million dollars or more. The Attorney General is then required to advise the Administrator as to whether the proposed disposition would violate the antitrust laws and would encourage monopoly or undue concentration of industry or commerce, or restrain competition substantially.

It seems to me that these two provisions, section 204 of S. 2051, the War Mobilization and Reconversion Act of 1944, and section 14 of S. 2065, will be of importance in helping to preserve a free enterprise competitive system in this country.

Section 8 of S. 2065 provides that each Government agency charged with responsibility for disposal of surplus war property shall organize advisory committees with which it shall consult regarding policies and procedures to govern disposal of the various classes of surplus property. It provides that such committees shall be fairly representative of larger business units of the interested trade or industry, the smaller business units, labor groups, and interested farm, consumer, and other groups, if any. This section was undoubtedly drafted in order to make sure that the Government agencies had the advice and counsel of persons who might be affected by their decisions. Many of the war agencies, as you know, have had industry advisory committees, and the war agencies and the Department of Justice have, I believe, worked out principles and requirements for these committees which protect the public interest. It is, I believe, extremely important that committees of private persons chosen to represent private interests, even though well chosen and fully representative, should be subject to certain definite limitations and requirements. Thus their function should be only advisory and consultative. If their activities go beyond advisory functions, these committees, composed as they are of persons representing private interests, will represent the handing of governmental power to private groups. It is extremely important in any free enterprise competitive system that the individual citizen be not put into a position where his competitor, as a member of an advisory committee, can determine his business future; such a situation would not be fair to either party.

The danger is real, however, that such may be the case unless certain safeguards are provided in the acts dealing with advisory committees. The path to a re-created N. R. A. can be a very simple path, indeed, if advisory committees are set up under legislative authority and without the safeguards which would prevent these committees from engaging in private activities to allocate or restrict production, fix prices, or to discriminate against competitors. I do not mean to imply that industry committees have engaged in these activities in the past, or will necessarily, or even probably, do so in the future, but legislative enactment of industry advisory committees without safeguards is definitely on the road away from the free-enterprise competitive system.

I understand that in order to safeguard the activities of these committees and in order to permit them to carry on their proper functions, S. 2065 now specifically provides that such committees shall perform only advisory and consultative functions and shall not be authorized to promulgate or administer policies and procedure which shall be the responsibility of the respective Government agencies, and further provides that "full information on all such committees shall be submitted to the Attorney General and no such committee shall continue any operations or activities which the Attorney General finds and certifies to the appropriate Government agency tend to promote the restraint of trade or the extension of monopoly." With these safeguards, I believe that this section is entirely appropriate and useful.

The Colmer bill, H. R. 5125, has in it a provision dealing with advisory committees, which appears as section 4 (b) of the bill. This section, however, has no safeguards and, as I have indicated above, with the best intentions in the world, this kind of a provision, without safeguards, can result in another N. R. A. I believe that safeguards similar to those included in S. 2065 ought to be incorporated in the Colmer bill. I know you agree that during the crucial days which lie ahead it is particularly important that we attempt to protect our competitive system.

Sincerely yours,

WENDELL BERGE,
Assistant Attorney General.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, now that the bill has been passed by the Senate, I should say that I feel there is no further need to consider Senate bill 1913. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a statement which I have prepared concerning that bill.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. President, on May 12 the junior Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], as chairman of the Special Committee to Study the Problems of American Small Business Enterprise, introduced a bill, S. 1913, for himself and included my name as cointroducer.

There are provisions incorporated within the committee print of Senate bill 1913 that had not come to my attention and with which I was unfamiliar, but inasmuch as the committee print was to be offered for the special committee, I reluctantly permitted my name to remain on the bill although I am in complete disagreement with some of its provisions.

Now that the Senate has passed reconversion legislation, many of the provisions in which I was especially interested in Senate bill 1913 have been taken care of, and I wish to make it perfectly clear that from this date, I ask that my name be disassociated from Senate bill 1913 and that should more copies of the committee print be issued, I respectfully ask that my name be deleted as cointroducer of the bill.

INVESTIGATION OF CONDITIONS AFFECTING THE CATTLE INDUSTRY

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, from time to time during the past week or 10 days I have attempted to have reported from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, Senate Resolution 309, signed by 24 Senators, asking for an immediate investigation into the cattle industry, from the producers of feeders to the processors and through to the consumers. That resolution is still in committee. I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the body of the RECORD as a part of my remarks a statement which I have prepared on the subject.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. President, calling the attention of the Senate again to Senate Resolution 309 which is now in the hands of the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, I am again advocating that this resolution be reported out immediately by this committee, as it is imperative that the investigation, particularly of the cattle in-

dustry, from the producer to the consumer, be made at once.

There is much history that I could give you regarding past actions of the Office of Price Administration, but this is well known to everyone. Practically every step that the Price Administrator has taken since the passage of the Price Stabilization Act and the setting up of the Office of Price Administration has tended to discourage the production of an adequate beef supply.

Other Government agencies have added to the disruption of this essential industry.

During the year 1944, the corn freeze order restricting the moving of corn in 125 counties in 4 Midwestern States that represent the largest production of fed beef of any other counties in the United States, resulted in the premature marketing of thousands of cattle that normally would have been kept in the feed lot for a period from 60 to 90 days longer. This would have meant an increase in the weight of each animal of from 150 to 250 pounds.

The corn freeze order not only discouraged farmers from keeping cattle in the feed lot for the normal feeding period, but discouraged their purchase of cattle for the feed lot during the last 3 months. The Department of Agriculture just announced a 41 percent decrease in the number of cattle on feed in the 11 principal feeding States on August 1 as compared with a year ago.

In the last few days, the War Food Administration has increased the set-aside order of beef grading from "good" to "choice" for the armed forces to 50 percent.

O. P. A. regulations and the administration of, or lack of administration of those regulations have resulted in a tremendous movement of beef through black-market channels. Better grades of beef move through such channels. Of the good and choice beef left that should move through civilian channels, not over 15 percent of that will be available, because of the movement of the beef into black markets. This all means that civilians are not going to have, for the next 90 days at least, even a reasonable amount of good and choice beef for consumption; and unless something is done immediately to encourage Corn Belt feeders to purchase the cattle now moving from the western range and take them into their feed lots for finishing, we will not have edible beef during 1945.

This is the time of year that cattle move from the western grasslands to the markets. Of this movement 25 to 30 percent should go for slaughter and a large percentage of it would be utility-grade beef. The balance should move into the Corn Belt for feeding and the feeding of these animals would raise the grade of this beef from utility to good to choice.

Because of the large amount of utility beef that is available to packers for slaughter, these cattle are selling far below the minimum prices set out in the Vinson directive. He still qualifies for subsidies on these cattle because he figures his entire drove to determine whether or not he is complying. At the present time he is buying few of the better-grade cattle because there are only a few available above the maximum prices.

The question is, Are we going to keep faith with these people who are now marketing cattle, and see to it that they receive the minimum prices as set out in the Vinson directive? And are we going to keep faith with the civilian population and see that they have available an adequate supply of edible beef?

The normal consumption of corn by beef cattle is 300,000,000 bushels. According to the Department of Agriculture's last figures on the corn crop this year, there will be approximately 3,000,000,000 bushels of corn raised. With reduced production of hogs in 1944, there is available 600,000,000 bushels of corn for beef cattle, which still leaves sufficient corn for all other uses.

This is the season that the grass cattle are moving and immediate steps must be taken to correct this situation and encourage the movement of these cattle into the feed lots of the Corn Belt. Unless this is done, we are going to see congestion in the market centers because of the lack of slaughtering facilities to slaughter the large number of these grass cattle that are being made available to the packer for slaughter because the Corn Belt farmers are not taking them into their feed lots.

A field investigation as asked for in Senate Resolution 309 will provide a solution, or at least the basis for a solution, of this problem and that investigation must necessarily consider the failure of the Government to pay support prices to producers who produce cattle out in the Plains States of this country.

We could adduce evidence from the cattle feeders who feed our corn to the cattle and we could thus find out why it is there is a shrinkage of 41 percent in feeder cattle in the feed lots of this country.

We should also take evidence from the processor, the distributor, the consumer, and we thus could develop unbiased and unprejudiced testimony on the subsidy program as it operates and affects the prices of different classes and grades of cattle.

We then would be in a much better position to offer constructive legislation to correct a program which now admittedly is very much disorganized, disordered, disrupted, and injurious to the cattle producer.

We must have constructive legislation which will permit an orderly production and marketing of stocker cattle; which will provide a satisfactory margin in feeding cattle. This will enable us to have a surplus of fat cattle for the meat shops of this country, because in the final analysis, a surplus of fat cattle beef is the one effective way to control prices and avoid inflation.

POST-WAR CONSTRUCTION OF HIGHWAYS AND BRIDGES

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I ask Senators to examine Calendar No. 1072, Senate bill 2105, to provide for post-war Federal-aid highway legislation. This is most important legislation, worthy of consideration by Senators, and I expect at some convenient time to bring the subject to the attention of the Senate. I hope Senators will take occasion to examine the bill and the report, which summarizes the purpose to be accomplished, so that if the bill is called before the Senate they will be familiar with its terms.

AUTHORIZATION TO SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE THE NATIONAL-DEFENSE PROGRAM TO FILE REPORT DURING RECESS OF THE SENATE

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Special Committee to Investigate the National Defense Program be given permission to file with the clerk of the Senate during the recess of the Senate for the remainder of the session, reports on matters now under investigation.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, is the Senator asking authority to file reports during the period of time when the Congress is in recess, or during the remainder of the session of this Congress?

Mr. MEAD. During recesses which may be taken during the remainder of the present session of Congress, it is my intention only to file reports on investigations now in progress, and I assume that at least from now until election we will be away much of the time. We only want to file reports with the Secretary of the Senate.

Mr. WHITE. The present session of Congress is not going to end until probably well into December. It seems rather extraordinary to request such extended leave to file reports. Cannot the Senator narrow the time? Why does not the Senator limit his request to the next recess of the Senate?

Mr. MEAD. The Senate may take a recess from tonight until Monday.

Mr. WHITE. Why would it not be appropriate to ask leave to file reports during the recess between now and Monday; and then, depending upon conditions, submit another request? It seems to me rather extraordinary to ask permission to file reports during recesses of the Senate for the remainder of this Congress. I do not wish to consent to such a request.

Mr. MEAD. It would be necessary for the committee to submit similar requests every few days. I wonder if we could not agree to a unanimous-consent request covering the next 30 days?

Mr. WHITE. That would be agreeable to me.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator so modify his request?

Mr. MEAD. I so modify the request, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from New York?

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, it seems to me an extraordinary procedure, and I am hopeful that the minority leader will not too readily yield to the generous suggestion of the able Senator from New York. I do not see anything wrong about it in this instance, but we may establish a precedent which will rise to plague us later. I think it would be proper to make such a request immediately before any recess of the Senate.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the committee be permitted to file its reports with the Secretary of the Senate during the forthcoming recess of the Senate. A little later, when we can perhaps agree to take a recess for a period of 30 days, I shall renew my request for the period of the recess.

Mr. MALONEY. The request as it is now put is entirely satisfactory.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD] as modified? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, can the Senator from Alabama make any statement regarding the probable work of the Senate next week?

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, let me say to the distinguished Senator from Michigan that I know of no important business to come before the Senate until the conference reports on the George bill and on the property disposal bill, which

the Senate has just passed, are brought back to the Senate.

Mr. VANDENBERG. When does the Senator contemplate that those reports will be brought to the Senate?

Mr. HILL. I believe the Senator's opinion on that question is perhaps as good as mine. Of course, it is impossible to say how long a time will be required for the conference on the property disposal bill, which the Senate has just passed. I assume that several days will be required.

As I understand, the George bill has not yet passed the House, but is scheduled for early consideration. That bill will have to go to conference.

Mr. VANDENBERG. When is it scheduled for consideration in the House?

Mr. HILL. I am advised that the House will take up the George bill on Tuesday.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. Is the distinguished acting majority leader in a position to express any opinion as to what is to follow disposition of the two conference reports?

Mr. HILL. I will say to the distinguished minority leader that at this time I am not in a position to state what may follow the disposition of those two conference reports.

Mr. WHITE. I thank the Senator.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. HILL. I move that the Senate proceed to consider executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. HILL (for Mr. TUNNELL), from the Committee on Interstate Commerce, reported favorably the nomination of Leland Olds, of New York, to be a member of the Federal Power Commission for the term expiring June 22, 1949. (Reappointment.)

THE PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MCKELLAR in the chair). If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

POSTMASTERS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations of postmasters are confirmed en bloc.

Mr. HILL. I ask that the President be immediately notified.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be immediately notified.

That completes the calendar.

RECESS TO MONDAY

Mr. HILL. As in legislative session, I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon on Monday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 15 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until Monday, August 28, 1944, at 12 o'clock meridian.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate August 25 (legislative day of August 15), 1944:

POSTMASTERS

ILLINOIS

James W. Arnold, Jr., Alto Pass.
Isaac E. Hortenstine, Gays.
Frank C. Stolfa, Riverside.

LOUISIANA

Agnes B. Subra, Convent.

MASSACHUSETTS

Chester W. Robinson, Accord.
Kendall E. Andrews, Berlin.
Kate S. Taylor, Boylston Center.
Joseph A. Cantin, Clifford.
Ruth B. King, Colrain.
Linda F. Howard, Eastondale.
Nellie T. Huskin, Kenberma.
George H. LaCroix, Leeds.
George E. Plante, Manchaug.
Estelle E. Dionne, Ocean Grove.
Ruth P. Rossier, Paxton.
Evelyn I. Staples, Segreganset.
John C. Jackson, Sherborn.
David S. Caldwell, South Byfield.
Harold L. Laplante, South Vernon.
John H. O'Toole, Sterling Junction.
Anna J. Rusek, Three Rivers.
Rita G. Anderson, West Chelmsford.

WISCONSIN

Abraham A. Siegel, Hawthorne.
Gregor John Bock, Highland.
Henry Magnuson, Irma.

SENATE

MONDAY, AUGUST 28, 1944

(Legislative day of Tuesday, August 15, 1944)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

Rev. Gaston Foote, Th. D., minister, First Methodist Church, Montgomery, Ala., offered the following prayer:

Almighty and everliving God, Thou who didst fling from Thy creative palm the stars and planets, which even now are sustained by Thy law, we beseech Thee to dwell in our hearts this day.

Because the greatness of our human needs transcends the power of our human minds to comprehend, we pray for the guidance of Thy holy spirit. We cannot believe that man alone is sufficient in such an hour as this. The glory of our Nation is measured by the depth of the consecration of her people about Thy altar. Teach us, O God, to seek Thy guidance.

We pray for Thy sons and daughters everywhere. Thou who hast made of one blood all the nations of the earth, teach us to be willing to pay the price of peace as we now pay for the tragic toll of war. Break Thou the barriers of prejudice and hate, override the boundaries of narrow nationalism, heal by Thy love the open wounds of the world, and lead us into an enduring peace, as we follow Him who is the Prince of Peace.

May the ideals for which our sons and daughters this day give their lives be incarnate in our own hearts. May our creeds be expressed not only by our lips but by our lives. May the clouds of fear and despair vanish before the rising winds of faith, hope, and love, and may the kingdoms of this world become, in truth, the kingdoms of our God. Through Jesus Christ, our Lord. Amen.

DESIGNATION OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The Secretary, Edwin A. Halsey, read the following letter:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, D. C., August 28, 1944.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate, I appoint Hon. ELBERT D. THOMAS, a Senator from the State of Utah, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

CARTER GLASS,
President pro tempore.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah thereupon took the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. HILL, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Friday, August 25, 1944, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

PETITIONS

Mr. VANDENBERG presented the following petitions, etc., which were referred as indicated:

A resolution of the Northwest Mining Association, Spokane, Wash., favoring the adoption of Senate Resolution 316, to investigate the activities of the Securities and Exchange Commission and laws administered by it; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Resolutions by the Council of the Village of Saugatuck and the manufacturers' committee of the Traverse City Chamber of Commerce, both in the State of Michigan, favoring the enactment of the so-called Aiken bill, relating to the St. Lawrence seaway and power project; to the Committee on Commerce.

Petitions of sundry citizens of the State of Michigan, praying for the enactment of the bill (S. 65) to provide for the payment of annuities to blind persons, the bill (S. 910) to amend the Social Security Act, and for other purposes, or similar legislation making a reasonable blanket grant to all blind persons with an income of less than $100 per month; to the Committee on Finance.

Petitions of sundry citizens of the States of Michigan and Virginia, praying for enforcement of the Bill of Rights by the enactment of legislation which will prevent interference with the broadcasting of noncommercial programs presented by recognized educational institutions; to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. MCKELLAR:

S. 2108. A bill to reduce the rate of interest on loans secured by United States Gov-

ernment life insurance to 3 percent per annum; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. THOMAS of Utah:

S. 2109. A bill to provide for the education and training of members of the merchant marine and certain members of the Women's Army Auxiliary Corps, after their discharge or conclusion of service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. CAPPER:

S. 2110. A bill for the relief of E. E. Armstrong; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. O'MAHONEY:

S. 2111. A bill to provide for the extension of certain oil and gas leases; to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

By Mr. BALL:

S. 2112. A bill authorizing the Department of Highways of the State of Minnesota to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Pigeon River; to the Committee on Commerce.

RIVER AND HARBOR FLOOD-CONTROL WORKS—AMENDMENT

Mr. MEAD submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 4485) authorizing the construction of certain public works on rivers and harbors for flood control, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

THE AIR ATTACK ON CHERBOURG—LETTER FROM SENATOR McKELLAR'S NEPHEW

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I am about to do a very unusual thing. During my entire service in the Senate I do not believe I have ever asked to put in the RECORD anything about my family. I am very loath to do it now, but I have a copy of a letter written by a young nephew of mine who is named for me, but whom we call Douglas. He is a major in the Air Corps, stationed in England, and for quite a long time has been making periodical trips over Germany and other European countries in a big bomber.

This young nephew is 27 years of age. He is a graduate of Yale and is married. After D-day he wrote his wife, Jessie McKellar, a letter descriptive of the opening attack on Cherbourg. It is a most interesting description of that event. It was so interesting to me that I believe it will be interesting to Senators and Members of Congress generally and to others who may read it. Therefore, I am asking unanimous consent to publish a copy of the letter at this point in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the letter will be printed in the RECORD.

The letter is as follows:

The initial strain and excitement is over, and the event we have all been impatiently waiting for has come to pass at last. I went in with the first wave and wouldn't have missed it for the world. It was a show that I won't forget for years to come, and I earnestly hope its purpose will prove to be worth all the effort exerted.

Just after I wrote you the evening of the 5th I went down to the Three Hundred and Eighty-seventh to fly with them. Only a small portion of our headquarters was in the know up to the last minute, but I'm sure my leaving that evening with full flying equipment was a tip-off to some. Down at the group only the key personnel knew that the next mission was it, and they were ready for it. The crews, however, weren't far off the track, because they had been confined to the post for the last 2 days and overnight all the ships had been painted like black-and-white striped zebras. Tension was high and very few slept at all that night. I wanted to get a few hours' sleep because I knew how early we would have to get up. Walking into the hut where I was to sleep, I overheard one of the old pilots telling a new one whose first mission was to be this one that there would be so many men jumping out of the boats into the water that you could hear the water sloshing up where we were and that the flak smoke would be so heavy that he probably wouldn't see any of the invasion. That sort of chatter is continual between the old and the new. I never like it and promptly squelched it in short order, assuring this young kid that a mission was always easier than what he had heard. Sleeping was practically impossible with all the noise issuing from every hut.

I think I did manage about an hour before I was awakened at quarter of 1 to get something to eat before briefing (preflight instructions as to plans and objectives). D-day had already been postponed a day because of bad weather. The prediction for today was clear and unlimited, and as I walked out of the hut it didn't look too bad. There was a shallow overcast at about 4,000 feet with several breaks visible through which the full moon shone. There was a constant drone of planes overhead, which was probably the R. A. F. at their usual task, only more so. After pancakes and coffee, we proceeded to the briefing room. By far the most nervous man there was the group commander. The announcement of D-day didn't surprise many by this time, and the group commander continued by reading messages of encouragement from General Ike, Mallory, and our own General Anderson. This was to be the predawn assembly, and rendezvous for which I had personally pushed training, and you can bet I wanted everything to run smoothly. A groan of sympathy went up when it was announced that the paratroopers had already landed. Everybody always feels sorry for the other guy, no matter where he is. Spirits were unusually high among these bomb-weary crews of 50 and 60 missions now that there was a real visible incentive. We filed out of the briefing room crammed with all the dope, but a last-minute phone call from command detained the flight leaders—weather was getting bad; we would assemble as planned, but bomb from under the clouds wherever they were, unless told otherwise by command en route. This news was no aspirin.

The weather outside was worse. The overcast was solid and getting blacker. It looked as though we were going to have another enemy to fight. The full moon above it all made objects discernible on the ground. The din of airplane engines above was heavier than ever. Others were already on the way, in that stuff or over it.

Time had gone fast and with the last-minute instructions we were now forced to rush. At 4 o'clock we started engines. I was flying with Captain Schober, my former wing man and hut mate. We were to lead the low flight of the first box. We were in Rich's old ship, *Heavenly Body*, with the large pin-up girl painted on the nose. This plane was a veteran of 85 missions and still going strong. Before we reached the take-off runway it was pouring down rain. I now had my misgivings about the whole thing and I'm sure I wasn't alone. One of our fluorescent lights was out and I was cupping a flashlight so that Schober could see the instruments. Taking off at night in the blinding rain in a B-26 is just a sure way not to reach a ripe old age, but it's surprising what you can do when you have to. We collected a few wing men but I never knew how many, before we got on course and started our climb. At 2,000 feet we entered the cloud and everything blotted out. Up and up on instruments we went. Schober was doing a good steady job, but I watched the instruments like a hawk. One by one the lights of our wing ships disappeared and I never saw them again.

We were to assemble our 54 ships over a point on the south coast at 7,000 feet. That point on the ground would be determined by a radio beam. By the time we reached 7,000 feet neither I nor the radio operator could contact that beam, either because of enemy interference or bad weather. We therefore had no way to locate that point. We were still in heavy rough cloud and ice was beginning to form. Our time on course was up, but to have started circling then would have been suicide with 54 other ships there too and none able to see each other. I had the feeling that God must be against us. The weather had thwarted our effort and those poor guys in the boats would have to scale those beaches without any help from us. We flew straight on and up figuring that was about the safest action. At 9,000 feet we were afraid of more ice and Schober wanted to turn back. I agreed, and in the turn we saw the moon shine through the cloud. What a welcome sight as we broke out above the clouds at 9,200 feet. Between the dawn and the full moon it was quite light up there, but there wasn't a soul in sight. We circled back toward England and I picked up another beam which gave us a general vicinity. By this time other odd Marauders were in sight and flares were being shot here and there. We were encouraged no end now and figured we still had a chance to make good. Before long we spotted the color flare that would be used by our leader and we gave chase. We caught him at 13,000 feet and he was our man. We were in now and the leader had additional instruments whereby he could pin point himself on the ground so our location was correct. We had 7 ships when we left this point on schedule but there were still distant strays to be seen in the sky. On the way to our next point I heard millions of box leaders calling command for instructions. We were all hoping we wouldn't have to bomb from low altitude beneath the clouds. The answer was always the same, "Bomb from under the clouds." Oh, unhappy day!

From a westerly course we now turned south over the channel and started down again. Formations of Liberators were now crossing us from the north and they started down, too. We found holes this time through layers of clouds and were able to keep formation. Down, down we went still unable to see the water and the thousands of boats we knew were under there. The Libs were flying parallel to us now on our left. We sneaked through the last hole and got under the clouds at 6,000, but it was now raining and we could just make out landfall ahead on the Cherbourg Peninsula. We were the second group of Marauders to go in.

The first group was just now forming ahead of us, parts of it coming from all directions out of the clouds. I don't know how they made it at this late instant. Hundreds of Liberators were just on our left. I sure felt sorry for those lumbering crates down at this altitude. In our box we now had 12 out of 18. Our wing men didn't belong to us but they were Marauders, so what the hell. I don't know where the other 6 were, probably behind us in the mob somewhere. We were on time, I was in my correct position and I was full of confidence

and excited. Schober took over again and I now could watch the show.

From this point I have traced our route on the enclosed picture. As we crossed the coast the rain stopped, the weather cleared beneath us and for the first time I caught a glimpse of the surface operations. From this time on it was like trying to watch all 10 rings of a circus at once. It was 6:10. No troops had landed yet and it was quite light now. The front row of ships standing offshore were warships pouring shells into the shore, one a huge battleship. Gun flashes from ship and shore were colossal. The little landing craft lay behind the warships waiting to go in. I could only see the beginning of the masses of landing craft because weather beyond obscured more from view. The available air space was literally packed with airplanes of every description.

As for bombers, there were formations, flights, threes, twos, and even singles who probably couldn't find their formations and went anyway by themselves. There were fighters (ours) by the hundreds from the ground up strafing, dive bombing, patrolling, and escorting. The Jerry pilot who came up in that stuff was either crazy or had a gun in his back. I never saw one. I saw a destroyer hit and after the stern was under water the forward turrets were still firing. The Libs had the south beaches in the Arromanches area. Four-hundred-odd of us Marauders had the west beaches along the course I have drawn.

Our only worry now was flak. At 6,000 feet murderous light flak is deadly. It soon began to come up in showers with red, green, and yellow tracers, pretty to some people, maybe. I shrunk up in my suit of armor like a turtle. A Lib went down on our left, a Marauder went down just in front, then the shower shifted, thank God. There were so many of us they didn't know who to shoot at next. Bombs away, and we dumped our load on gun positions where I marked X. Just before we turned right I looked back and saw two planes laying a smoke screen just over the water in front of the warships through which the landing craft would come. Our last plane dropped at 6:22 and at 6:25 our troops were on the beaches. The explosions of our own bombs rocked us so, both Schober and I thought we were hit. We had never felt them before.

On the way out to Granville we could see gliders and parachutes on the ground, red, green, and white ones that looked like poppies growing in a garden from our height. I wondered where those guys were and how they were doing. The panorama ended when we ran into heavy rain again, sleet, and cloud that herded us together like sheep for safety. We had to go down where we could see, and not stumble over the flak infested Jersey and Guernsey Islands. Dodging them we went back low over the water forced down by the clouds passing over every type of vessel by the hundreds on their way to the beachhead. As one gunner said, "It was the longest queue he had seen in the E. T. O." Back at base the crews prepared to go again and that's the way it's been ever since.

It was some spectacle, Jess, and let's hope this is the beginning of the end we have been waiting for. We feel it was miraculous that as many Marauders as did got to the target and hit it, and we are glad we were able to make it easier for the boys on the ground. That was the worst weather in which I have ever flown a mission but it was worth it and more. We are happy that the initial stages of the invasion went well and we are confident that it will continue that way. We could double our part now if the weather were better and hope for a clear stretch soon, but the morale is high and that will make a big difference.

I'm sure you're better informed about the progress than we are which may surprise you. Radio coverage here is nil. We have to see it to really know it's in progress.

ADDRESS BY SENATOR WAGNER BEFORE NEW YORK STATE FEDERATION OF LABOR CONVENTION

[Mr. WAGNER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by him before the New York State Federation of Labor convention at Syracuse, N. Y., on August 22, 1944, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY SENATOR GUFFEY BEFORE UNITED AUTOMOBILE WORKERS' UNION, BRISTOL, PA.

[Mr. GUFFEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by him before Local Union No. 130, United Automobile Workers, at Bristol, Pa., on August 27, 1944, which appears in the Appendix.]

FOURTH OF JULY ADDRESS BY SENATOR MALONEY AT FANEUIL HALL, BOSTON

[Mr. MALONEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by him at Faneuil Hall, Boston, Mass., on July 4, 1944, which appears in the Appendix.]

RESCUE AND RECOGNITION OF HEBREW PEOPLE—ADDRESS BY SENATOR THOMAS OF UTAH

[Mr. WAGNER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio address delivered by Senator THOMAS of Utah to the second emergency conference to save the Jewish people of Europe, held at the Commodore Hotel, New York, on August 8, 1944, which appears in the Appendix.]

REHABILITATION OF SERVICE MEN AND WOMEN—ARTICLE BY SENATOR THOMAS OF UTAH

[Mr. MURDOCK asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Rehabilitating Our Service Men and Women," written by Senator THOMAS of Utah, and published in the American Journal of Nursing for August 1944, which appears in the Appendix.]

CORRESPONDENCE IN CONNECTION WITH TESTIMONIAL DINNER TO SENATOR DANAHER

[Mr. WHITE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD correspondence in connection with the testimonial dinner tendered to Senator DANAHER at Meriden, Conn., on July 31, 1944, which appears in the Appendix.]

INVESTIGATION OF RECORD OF SENATOR TRUMAN—LETTER FROM MAURICE M. MILLIGAN

[Mr. HATCH asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter to him dated August 23, 1944, from Maurice M. Milligan, United States attorney in Missouri, concerning an investigation of the record of Senator TRUMAN, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE POLITICAL ACTION COMMITTEE—SIDNEY HILLMAN AND THE NEW REPUBLIC

[Mr. BRIDGES asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "The Truth About the P. A. C.," written by Sidney Hillman and published in the New Republic of August 21; correspondence between Senator BUTLER and Mr. Bruce Bliven, editor of the New Republic, relative to the Hillman article; a statement by Senator BUTLER analyzing the Hillman article; and an article from the Reader's Digest entitled "I Object to My Union in Politics," written by William E. Mullins, which appears in the Appendix.]

AN INDEPENDENT R. E. A.—ADDRESS BY HARRY SLATTERY AND EDITORIAL FROM ST. LOUIS STAR-TIMES

[Mr. SHIPSTEAD asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "For an Independent R. E. A.," delivered at Springfield, Ill., on August 17, 1944, by Harry Slattery, at the third annual convention of the Association of Illinois Electric Cooperatives, and an editorial entitled "For an Independent R. E. A.," published in the St. Louis Star-Times of August 21, 1944, which appear in the Appendix.]

LETTER FROM LT. GEN. MARK W. CLARK CONCERNING CHAPLAIN'S PRAYER ON JUNE 6

[Mr. WILEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter addressed by Gen. Mark W. Clark, commanding the Fifth Army in Italy, to Dr. Harris, Chaplain of the Senate, expressing gratitude for the prayer delivered at the opening of the Senate on June 6, which appears in the Appendix.]

SUFFRAGE FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA—EDITORIAL FROM WASHINGTON STAR

[Mr. CAPPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Letter From a Soldier," published in the Washington Evening Star of August 10, 1944, on the subject of suffrage in the District of Columbia, which appears in the Appendix.]

PLANS FOR POST-WAR PEACE—THE DUMBARTON OAKS CONFERENCE

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I do not want at this time to enter into a discussion of the plans for a post-war organization which are now being put together at Dumbarton Oaks, but I do want to sound a note of warning to those who are doing this job. We are told that the American Government has proposed a plan under which there will be an assembly and a council. All member nations will have representatives in the assembly, but the so-called Big Four—the United States, Great Britain, Russia, and China—will have permanent members on the council while all the other nations between them will have only seven, and the Big Four will have a veto on anything proposed and will have in its possession whatever force may be authorized to enforce the decrees of the league. The assembly will be a debating society with no power save to discuss and advise. All power will be in the council, which will be in the hands of the Big Four.

When President Roosevelt spoke to the delegates attending the Dumbarton Oaks conference, he said that "The four of us have to be friends conferring all the time." The President's statement confirms the suspicions of our own citizens and the citizens of other nations that the Big Four intend to dominate and that they will decide the peace provisions and policies of the world. That is not my idea of a sound basis for a permanent peace. In my opinion, that is the basis for big-power politics, with the less powerful nations on the outside looking in.

But it is even worse than that. Mr. Roosevelt uses the personal pronoun "us." That is interesting. If that is an indication of what is on the way, then we are due to have not only big-power politics, but big-ruler politics, not the United States, Great Britain, Russia, and China—but rather, the heads of those

nations—Roosevelt, Churchill, Stalin, and Chiang Kai-shek.

It may be that that is the only way the world can be run and peace secured, though I do not believe it. I do not wish, however, to discuss that question now. What I am objecting to is that Mr. Hull, who, after the proposal of a plan such as that, tells us that this Government has no intention to set up an organization in which the four big powers will run the world. If this plan is necessary, let us understand it and debate it for whatever it is, but it is an insult to our intelligence to tell us that it is not a plan under which we and our three great allies will dominate the world.

If, in the United States, all the 48 States were represented in an assembly with merely the power to discuss and advise, while all the power to decide, together with all instruments of force and authority to make war, were lodged in a small council dominated by New York, California, Pennsylvania, and Illinois, what, Mr. President, do you think the other States would say? Do you think they would believe it if they were told that they were not being dominated by this council of four big States? They would laugh at one who made such a statement.

Mr. President, I should like to have order in the Senate. Apparently some Senators do not care to listen to plain talk about the Dumbarton Oaks Conference, but it will do their souls and their consciences good if they listen, because they are going to hear about what is done at this conference in the months to come and the years to come. I want attention. I want order. I will wait until I obtain it, too.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore rapped with his gavel.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I repeat, if all the 48 States of the Union were represented in an assembly with merely the power to discuss and advise, while all the power to decide, together with all instruments of force and authority to make war, were lodged in a small council dominated by four large States, New York, California, Pennsylvania, and Illinois, what do you think the other 44 States of the Union would say if any one had "brass" enough to tell them they were not being dominated by this council of the four big States? They would laugh at anyone who made such a statement.

Mr. President, I want to warn the members of this conference that our people and the Congress are not going to stand for double talk on this issue. They are not going to be fooled by words. There is altogether too much double talk by the Government.

For instance, we are informed that the council will have the right to make war on any aggressor, but we are told that it will not declare war but will actually declare peace, because the job is to stop the other fellow from making war. That is double talk. That is a queer way to start off on an enduring peace program. I am sure all of us want a permanent and enduring peace. Above all, we do not want to be "kidded," we do not want to be fooled. We are determined to call a spade a spade, and I want to enter this warning at the outset that, whatever plan is evolved, let us have the facts about it in good, plain, understandable English. The American people and the American Congress are entitled to know what is going on, and there is no need for the profound secrecy that has surrounded this and past international conferences. We want the facts. We are entitled to know the facts. We want a permanent peace built, and we want to know that it is built on a sound foundation. The proposal of a plan, as reported from day to day in the meager bits of information we get from the public press and by rumor is not being laid on a sound foundation.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, the Senator from New Hampshire is, of course, well within his rights in issuing any warning that he may see fit to issue in making any suggestion that may occur to him, or any statement of his views as to what should be done so far as the Dumbarton Oaks Conference is concerned. What is very evident from what he said is that he is disturbed by rumors. As we know, Washington is always filled with rumors. I have often thought that in the city of Washington one could hear any kind of a rumor one wanted to hear.

The Senator from New Hampshire must reserve his criticism of the Dumbarton Oaks Conference until he knows what that conference has done. Then, of course, after he knows what the conference has done, if he does not agree with what it has done, he will be well within his rights in criticizing any action taken by the conference. But he cannot know today what the conference has done; he cannot know until the conference acts. For the Senator from New Hampshire to rise on the floor today and issue warnings based on rumors, and indulge in innuendoes, as though something were going on at the Dumbarton Oaks Conference which should not happen, or that some wrong were about to be perpetrated is comparable to the position in which he would place himself if he were to rise on the Senate floor when a committee of the Senate was considering proposed legislation, and indulge in the same sort of tactics, and throw out similar innuendoes concerning the action of a committee of the Senate. Not until the committee had arrived at its conclusions and had acted could the Senator from New Hampshire or any other Senator know what the committee had done.

We confront a similar situation here today. The Dumbarton Oaks Conference is sitting and trying to work out the problem of security and of peace, and of some form of organization for the peace-loving nations, and until the conference has acted, not even the Senator from New Hampshire, with all his wisdom, can know what course the conference has pursued, any more than the Senator can know what the Senate Military Affairs Committee, of which he and I happen to be members, will do when it is in session in yonder committee room, until it has acted and submitted its final report.

Mr. President, what I protest against is that the Senator should at this time rise on the floor of the Senate and make a speech conveying the impression to the people of the country that a grievous mistake is about to be made or that a great wrong is about to be committed.

I am sure the Senator from New Hampshire is interested in the right kind of an organization for peace and security, and let me say to him that if he will simply be a little patient, as he is with the committees of the Senate, and not be swept off his feet by rumors and counter-rumors, if he will wait a little while until he has heard from the Dumbarton Oaks Conference, I have faith to believe that he will find much in the work and the action of the conference of which he will approve.

Mr. BRIDGES. Does the Senator believe in all the secrecy surrounding the conference? Does he not believe it would be rather healthy for the American people and the American Congress to know what is going on?

Mr. HILL. I believe, Mr. President, in making known to the American people and to the world everything that is being done by the conference, but I know of no way to make known the actions of the conference until the conference has acted, any more than I know of any way to make known the actions of a committee of the Senate until the committee has acted. As we know, in committees it often requires considerable time to iron out the different plans which are presented, reconcile divergent views, reach an accord, and consider and prepare a report. Sometimes it is necessary for the committee to recess for a while in order to obtain further information.

In an international conference such as is now taking place it is often necessary for the representatives of the different countries to take time to consult with their governments at home, thousands of miles away from Washington, before any agreement can be reached.

I believe the Senator from New Hampshire is just as honestly and sincerely interested in the establishment of the right kind of an organization for the peace and the security of this world as I am, or as is any other Senator; the Senator from New Hampshire collaborated with us in the so-called B.H. resolution, and collaborated in rather an effective manner; but I protest now against his rising on this floor to cast doubt upon and to throw shadows of suspicion over the work of the conference, before the conference has had time to perform the task assigned to it and prepare a report for the consideration of the American people and all the world.

Mr. BRIDGES. The Senator from Alabama, in other words, to sum up what he said, believes in secret diplomacy?

Mr. HILL. No, Mr. President; the Senator from New Hampshire cannot put those words in my mouth. I do not believe in secret diplomacy, but I do know that no one can state what action has been taken until the action has actually been taken. I say further to the Senator that it is faith that moves mountains and subdues kingdoms, and I am asking him to have just a little faith and at least to give the conference a chance. I ask the Senator not to rise on this floor and cast doubts and suspicions, and in a way condemn the conference before it has even had a chance to do its work.

Mr. BRIDGES. The Senator recognizes, however, that in a secret conference such as this if the American people and the world do not know the results attained until after it is all over and the decisions are made, it will then be too late to protest.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, the American people will know the results of the conference just as soon as there are any results. The Senator can be assured of that. The minute there are any results from the conference the Senator from New Hampshire and the American people will know them. Knowing the Senator to be a friend of peace, as a former collaborationist in endeavoring to have the Senate take the splendid action which it took a year ago when it adopted the Connally resolution, I ask him now not to cast suspicion upon and throw shadows of all kinds over the Dumbarton Oaks Conference until the conference has had a fair chance to do its work. Do not condemn the conference any more than the Senator would condemn a committee of the Senate until it had acted. Mr. President, the Senate of the United States on Friday last passed the bill providing for disposal of surplus Government property. Conferees were appointed on the part of the Senate. The conferees on the part of the Senate will meet with the conferees on the part of the House. It may take a week or it may take 10 days or it may even take longer for the conferees to iron out the differences between the two Houses and come to an agreement and submit their report. I am sure the Senator from New Hampshire is not going to rise on the Senate floor and cast doubt or suspicions of any kind upon the good work of the conferees on that bill. The Senator is going to wait until the conferees submit their report. If the report is not what the Senator thinks it ought to be, he will exercise his right in this body to express his views.

Mr. President, I ask the Senator from New Hampshire, I ask all Members of the Senate, I ask all the American people to give the Dumbarton Oaks Conference a fair chance. I have faith to believe that if they will do that, the work of the conference will be more than gratifying.

RECALL OF SPECIAL AMBASSADOR WILLIAM PHILLIPS

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, a most incredible situation has come to my attention, a situation which I believe merits the attention of Members of the Senate. I have been informed that our great British allies, who have contributed so much to the common good of the United Nations in recent months, have now taken an incredibly harmful step, a step which can only injure friendly relations between ourselves and our heroic British allies.

Mr. President, I have heard with dismay and deep shock that the British Foreign Office has declared President Roosevelt's personal special ambassador, Mr. William Phillips, persona non grata. They have made this declaration because this emissary of our Commander in Chief has made a report on conditions in India which the British do not like. I ask Senators, and my fellow citizens, Mr. President, is the Government of the United States of America so weak, are our people so incompetent, has our sovereignty become so impaired, that even the President of the United States is no longer permitted to know the truth about conditions in friendly countries with which we have diplomatic relations?

For the benefit of my colleagues who are not fully aware of the circumstances surrounding Mr. Phillips' recall, let me give this background: A little more than a year ago Mr. Phillips returned from India. He made numerous oral reports to our President with respect to the conditions in India. He spoke of the mercenary character of the Indian Army. He told of the things which were seriously interfering with the Allied effort in the Far East.

All of us have friends or relatives in the far eastern theater of war. It is our sacred duty to see that those boys are not forgotten. It is our sacred duty to see that everything is done to protect them and to insure their speedy homecoming after a successful military operation against Japan. But what do we find the situation to be in that far-off and remote corner of the globe? We find that the Commander in Chief's personal representative in India points out the miserable condition of the Indian people. The representatives of the Senate who were privileged to go to India will bear out the condition of the people in India, the Indian army, and all the impediments to our entire operation against Japan which exist in that country today. We find that Great Britain, which has not borne, and apparently will not bear, the brunt of the struggle against Japan, by its mismanagement of the Indian situation has made for great discouragement and irritation to General Stilwell and to the heroic Americans fighting in that sector of the world.

India may well become a country dogged by civil war—civil war which may even be a stab in the back for our brave young men in the China-India-Burma theater of operations.

Early in the war I stood on this floor and asked for greater activity on the part of the British and American Governments in the India-China-Burma theater of operations. At that time I expressed the hope that such action would be forthcoming, that it would not be too long delayed, and I stated that failure to realize the seriousness of the situation there might result in China being starved, exhausted, and driven out of the war, might greatly prolong the war, and consequently mean a much greater loss of American lives, equipment, and opportunity.

These are real problems, Mr. President, problems about which our country must know, but apparently our British allies do not think that we ought to know about them. What is more, Mr. President, they think that our President should not know about them.

The statement which is now being made by high officials in the British Government, namely, that what happened in India is none of our business, I repudiate. As soon as they found out what Ambassador Phillips had told his commanding officer, the President of the United States, they put obstacles in the way of his work as a liaison officer on General Eisenhower's staff in England, with the result that he has now "resigned" and is coming home "for family reasons."

Mr. President, I do not know what action our State Department will take in this matter. I do know that the British officials have seen fit to make strong representations to American publishers against the publication of Mr. Phillips' views and I do know that Mr. Phillips has been declared persona non grata both in India and in London.

Mr. President, if our magnificent united war effort is to succeed, we must have friendship and understanding among our allies; but I repeat that we must have it on a realistic basis. Such incidents as this do not encourage or aid the friendship of nations. They make for suspicion; they make for fear; they make for mistrust.

So Mr. President, I respectfully call upon the President of the United States to make a full report to the Senate of the United States on the conditions in India and on any foreign interference with American diplomacy, so that we may safeguard the well-being of our sons, our sons-in-law, our brothers, and our other kinsmen who are heroically fighting the hated Japanese enemy in the Far East.

I repeat, Mr. President, that we owe this to them and that we owe this to the American people, and that only by knowing the true conditions in other countries, not as we wish them to be but as they exist, can the American people in the future organize and promote a policy of friendship with other nations that will ultimately lead to that for which we all pray and so earnestly seek, a generous and everlasting peace among the nations of the earth.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. HILL. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. GEORGE, from the Committee on Finance:

Several officers for promotion in the Regular Corps of the United States Public Health Service.

By Mr. McKELLAR, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads:

Sundry postmasters.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. If there be no further reports of

committees, the clerk will state the nomination on the calendar.

FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION—NOMINATION PASSED OVER

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Leland Olds, of New York, to be a member of the Federal Power Commission for the term expiring June 22, 1949.

Mr. WHITE. I ask that the nomination be temporarily passed over.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

RECESS TO THURSDAY

Mr. HILL. As in legislative session, I move that the Senate take a recess until Thursday next at 12 o'clock noon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 12 o'clock and 38 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until Thursday, August 31, 1944, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate August 28 (legislative day of August 15), 1944:

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

A. Dana Hodgdon, of Maryland, now a Foreign Service officer of class 3 and a secretary in the Diplomatic Service, to be also a consul general of the United States of America.

APPOINTMENTS, BY TRANSFER, IN THE REGULAR ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

TO FINANCE DEPARTMENT

First Lt. Robert John Trout, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from June 12, 1939.

TO ORDNANCE DEPARTMENT

Maj. Irving Arthur Duffy, Judge Advocate General's Department (temporary colonel), with rank from June 12, 1943.

Capt. Almon White Manlove, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from June 12, 1944.

Capt. Walter Marquis Tisdale, Field Artillery (temporary colonel), with rank from June 10, 1942.

TO AIR CORPS

Second Lt. Allen Everett Frawley, Infantry (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from May 29, 1942.

Second Lt. Norman Jay Keefer, Jr., Coast Artillery Corps (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from June 1, 1943.

POSTMASTERS

The following-named persons to be postmasters:

ALABAMA

James W. Sargent, Bangor, Ala. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

William R. Buster, Berlin, Ala. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Genie H. Lister, Chavies, Ala. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Alva Dauphin, Coffee Springs, Ala. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Bertha Morgan, Eva, Ala. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Ila B. Burkhalter, Flat Rock, Ala. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Vollie E. Kirkland, Grant, Ala. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Ruth H. Hill, Hazel Green, Ala. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

James Leon Gamble, Headland, Ala., in place of E. E. Haynes, resigned.

Veda B. Harris, Hollywood, Ala. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Amos R. Morgan, Honoraville, Ala. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Fannie V. Mason, Hope Hull, Ala. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Oliver G. Stone, Long Island, Ala. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Arthur G. Rushton, Rutledge, Ala. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Alexander G. Taylor, Silas, Ala. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Albert M. Philips, Silverhill, Ala. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Pearl D. Stanton, Stockton, Ala. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Nellie C. Davidson, Toxey, Ala. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

ARIZONA

Clark H. Lewis, Tiger, Ariz., in place of S. O. Delgado, resigned.

CALIFORNIA

Muriel J. Broman, Alpaugh, Calif. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Pearl W. McKamey, Biola, Calif. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Floyd C. Palmer, Campo, Calif., in place of W. D. Cannon, resigned.

John A. Bryson, Downey, Calif., in place of Bernard Fallon. Incumbent's commission expired February 6, 1941.

Beatrice E. Bonsack, Empire, Calif., in place of C. R. Sensenbaugh, deceased.

Frederick H. Robshaw, Encanto, Calif., in place of L. B. Morgan, resigned.

Laura K. Murray, Esparto, Calif., in place of V. F. Vieira, appointee declined.

Harry H. Dietrich, Pleasanton, Calif., in place of E. S. Pelle, removed.

CONNECTICUT

Lucille S. McLeod, Brookfield Center, Conn. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Olin A. Gerich, Buckland, Conn. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Gaetano Simoncelli, Talcottville, Conn. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

FLORIDA

Rex O. Simmons, Bascom, Fla. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Jesse C. Womble, Highland City, Fla., in place of W. A. Womble, retired.

Frances Graham, Naranja, Fla. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

GEORGIA

Emma Gene B. Easterlin, Andersonville, Ga., in place of Maxie Rooks, retired.

Charlie R. Hatcher, Attapulgus, Ga. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Robert E. Branch, Jr., Bishop, Ga. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

William B. King, Bluffton, Ga. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Martin A. Byrne, Blythe, Ga. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Denmark K. Talbert, Brinson, Ga. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Wade H. Goode, Bronwood, Ga. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Daniel B. Phillips, Chauncey, Ga. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Alonzo E. Whiddon, Chula, Ga. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Mattie B. Laughridge, Clarkdale, Ga. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Erma R. Culpepper, Clarkston, Ga. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Beatrice McDonald, Cohutta, Ga. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Gertrude H. Harper, Coleman, Ga. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Rachel B. Parks, Dawsonville, Ga., in place of Grady Shoemaker, resigned.

Agnes S. McGehee, Dearing, Ga. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

George B. Wood, Devereux, Ga. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Llewellyn G. Brown, Dewyrose, Ga. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

George P. Copeland, Diffee, Ga. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Claude E. Dillard, Dillard, Ga. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Emily C. Jones, Dixie, Ga. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

James A. Clark, Ellenwood, Ga. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Charlie P. Smith, Enigma, Ga. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Colie E. McKown, Forest Park, Ga. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

John G. Jackson, Harrison, Ga. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Arley D. Finley, Hazlehurst, Ga., in place of A. D. Finley. Incumbent's commission expired March 30, 1942.

Banner Thomas, Hoboken, Ga. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Guy A. Patten, Hull, Ga. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Taylor A. Drake, Iron City, Ga. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

DeWitt T. Wilcox, Jacksonville, Ga. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Nancy Kemp Ellis, Kennesaw, Ga. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Emma P. Hall, Kensington, Ga. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Louie B. Way, Keysville, Ga. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

James T. Jordan, Lilburn, Ga. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Sarah M. Driggers, Stilson, Ga. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Gertrude Blair, Tiger, Ga. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

HAWAII

Gilbert M. Nakatani, Captain Cook, Hawaii. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Anna Dubenick, Mountainview, Hawaii. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Manuel Silva Ramos, Jr., Paauilo, Hawaii. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Eva Lyman, Pahoa, Hawaii. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Manuel Braga Fernandes, Jr., Puhi, Hawaii. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Ernest Joseph Freitas, Spreckelsville, Hawaii. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Lary Masato Kamada, Waianae, Hawaii. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

ILLINOIS

William Harley King, Ewing, Ill. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Elizabeth M. Stone, Junction, Ill. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Homer W. Cleland, Murphysboro, Ill., in place of George Huthmacher. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

INDIANA

Mildred C. McNutt Sander, Economy, Ind. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

John Odell Best, Floyds Knobs, Ind. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Willow B. Pelkey, Grovertown, Ind. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Edward L. Sacksteder, Leavenworth, Ind. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Raymond C. Bray, Monrovia, Ind. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Essie A. Hackleman, New Ross, Ind. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Dale E. Ulmer, Poneto, Ind. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Mark D. Kaufman, Ray, Ind. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Joseph Almonrode, Saratoga, Ind. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Golden High, Spencerville, Ind. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Rebecca C. Maegerlein, Williams, Ind. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

IOWA

Charles D. Burns, Marion, Iowa, in place of M. M. Hollingsworth, deceased.

Warren W. Fulton, Selma, Iowa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

KANSAS

Burt W. Gilchrist, Bentley, Kans. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Bertram W. Wernette, Dresden, Kans. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Lester A. White, Edwardsville, Kans. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Ivah A. Wiles, Muncie, Kans. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Francis R. Kaiser, Park, Kans. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Blanche Gardner, Plevna, Kans. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Anne C. Jordan, Savonburg, Kans. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Walter Leroy Kent, Stafford, Kans., in place of H. E. Blevins, transferred.

Emma M. Drake, Sunflower, Kans. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Nellie M. Spohn, Windom, Kans. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

A. Frank Goebel, Winona, Kans., in place of M. A. Neff, resigned.

Marguerite G. Ryan, Xavier, Kans. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

KENTUCKY

Ruth M. McPherson, Beech Creek, Ky. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Gertrude Stuteville, Bonnieville, Ky. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Romie E. Weisbrodt, Bradford, Ky. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Estill Hurt, Bulan, Ky. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Raymond C. Morgan, Closplint, Ky. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Raymond L. Renfrow, Horse Branch, Ky. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Frances J. Salt, Magnolia, Ky., in place of D. M. Miller, resigned.

Minnie B. Tiller, Rush, Ky. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Ruth M. Keck, Sandy Hook, Ky., in place of M. H. Greene, resigned.

Roy Dye, Scottsville, Ky., in place of R. S. Welch, removed.

Emma L. Hudson, Wheatcroft, Ky. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

LOUISIANA

Emile Aubert, Abita Springs, La. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Ferdinand Nunez, Bell City, La. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Robert E. Guilbeau, Branch, La. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Emma C. Nunez, Grand Chenier, La. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Mathidle D. Gautreaux, Mathews, La. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Louise F. Crawford, Morrow, La. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

MAINE

Mae L. Jack, Denmark, Maine. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

Harland G. Hoffses, Jefferson, Maine. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Irma P. Heal, La Grange, Maine. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Lilia B. Poland, North Jay, Maine. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Mary E. Donnelly, North Vassalboro, Maine, in place of M. E. Donnelly. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Robert E. Johnson, Perry, Maine. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Violet L. Ballard, West Enfield, Maine. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

MARYLAND

Daniel M. Miller, Knoxville, Md. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Howard J. Pardoe, Lusby, Md. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Lester Shipley, Savage, Md. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

B. Adele Palmer, Sharpsburg, Md. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

George R. Bromley, Stockton, Md. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

MASSACHUSETTS

Charles A. Cronin, Lawrence, Mass., in place of C. A. Cronin. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

MICHIGAN

George A. Wright, Jr., Big Rapids, Mich., in place of R. S. Fish, resigned.

Lola C. Clark, Burlington, Mich. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Gertrude Hansen, Coral, Mich. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Bennett Taylor, Dansville, Mich. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Charles N. Stone, Dorr, Mich., in place of Fred Weaver, removed.

Olaf Albin Olson, Gaastra, Mich. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

MINNESOTA

Lyman O. Shattuck, Altura, Minn. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Theresia S. Barton, Bowlus, Minn. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Leonard E. O'Leary, Campbell, Minn., in place of A. D. Hall, resigned.

Bess N. Stone, Cooley, Minn. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Ivan Jacobson, Cushing, Minn. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Ellsworth L. Brown, Dakota, Minn. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Ida V. Lund, Farwell, Minn. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Mattie M. Strauch, Hillman, Minn. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Albert E. Child, Laporte, Minn., in place of William Pennar, retired.

Lorna A. Stender, New Germany, Minn. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Henry M. Syverson, Odin, Minn. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Edward Oja, Pengilly, Minn. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Lester E. Hewson, Stacy, Minn. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Roy E. Granstrand, Shafer, Minn. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Mildred B. Johnson, Welch, Minn. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

MISSISSIPPI

Jesse H. Seale, Big Creek, Miss. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Albert P. Henry, Darling, Miss. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Eva D. Hill, Elliott, Miss. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Sarah F. Myers, Handsboro, Miss. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Honor A. Patterson, Hub, Miss. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Earl J. Lake, Maud, Miss. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Stella M. Lewis, McLain, Miss. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Carrie B. Carter, McLaurin, Miss. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Taylor D. Buntin, Nesbitt, Miss. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Mattie B. Bounds, Ovett, Miss. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Benjamin C. Feigler, Philipp, Miss. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Edna E. Forbes, Sandy Hook, Miss. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Vanie S. Cox, Sarah, Miss. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

William George Knight, Sr., Taylor, Miss. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

James J. Craig, Tillatoba, Miss. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Hilda P. Toombs, Walls, Miss. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

MISSOURI

Aloysius J. Samson, Bonnots Mill, Mo. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Marjorie L. Lennert, Miller, Mo., in place of F. R. Webb, resigned.

Flossie M. Haynes, Walker, Mo. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Ira T. Gray, Zalma, Mo. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

NEBRASKA

Echo M. Ball, Bartlett, Nebr. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

August E. Elam, Falls City, Nebr., in place of J. H. Hutchings, deceased.

Elsie Kelly, Greenwood, Nebr. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Emmet M. Luby, Henry, Nebr. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Herman T. Fast, Jansen, Nebr. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Paulus W. Barker, Rising City, Nebr., in place of P. W. Barker. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

James Jesse Steele, Wayne, Nebr., in place of J. M. Strahan. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

NEW JERSEY

Edward J. Shelton, Great Notch, N. J. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Raphael C. Devlin, Matawan, N. J., in place of R. C. Devlin. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

NEVADA

Edward D. Gladding, Virginia City, Nev., in place of E. D. Gladding. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

NEW YORK

Eunice A. De Lisle, Berne, N. Y. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Peter Lebeis, Duanesburg, N. Y. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Lucy B Pulver, East Nassau, N. Y. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

William Diefendorf, Melrose, N. Y. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Clarence A. Stedman, Middle Grove, N. Y. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

George A. Lortscher, Pittsford, N. Y., in place of J. H. Hutchinson, deceased.

Ralph A. Varney, Schuylerville, N. Y., in place of D. J. Falvey, deceased.

W. Kenneth Atkins, Westerlo, N. Y. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

NORTH CAROLINA

Hattie W. Smith, Atkinson, N. C. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

OHIO

Carl F. Schwartz, Bellbrook, Ohio. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Catherine B. Henning, Blaine, Ohio. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Charles W. Hanna, Burbank, Ohio. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Daniel T. Johnson, Dundee, Ohio. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Marie Thompson, East Fultonham, Ohio. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Charles V. Stayton, Eldorado, Ohio. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Rilla E. Nelson, Enon, Ohio. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Carroll H. Buroker, Fletcher, Ohio. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Norma L. B. Tyler, Galloway, Ohio. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Hattie Reed Willson, Geauga Lake, Ohio. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Annabelle Mechling, Glenford, Ohio. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

George W. Garman, Greensburg, Ohio. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Vennie B. Klingenberg, Guysville, Ohio. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Helen P. Pearce, Harbor View, Ohio. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Rhea E. Genson, Haskins, Ohio. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

George A. Irelan, Hollansburg, Ohio. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Harvey R. Cutter, Holmesville, Ohio. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Ruth C. Walborn, Homeworth, Ohio. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

George A. Kiger, Hoytville, Ohio. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Harvey R. Sprunger, Kidron, Ohio. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Pearl Calovini, Lafferty, Ohio. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Mary E. Hudson, Lakeville, Ohio. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Herman L. Halladay, Litchfield, Ohio. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Olive M. Force, Magnetic Springs, Ohio. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Irma M. Hepp, Maple Grove, Ohio. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Charles F. Beckett, Miamitown, Ohio. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

David F. Dinger, Midvale, Ohio. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Claire F. Metzger, Monclova, Ohio. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

William A. Brailer, Nashport, Ohio. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Smith Dunn, New Milford, Ohio. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Mary A. Cremean, New Plymouth, Ohio. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Cecil O. Bell, New Weston, Ohio. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Elsie Bennett, Okeana, Ohio. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Harold L. Batdorf, Osborn, Ohio, in place of Emmett Lewis, deceased.

Elizabeth J. Calfee, Piedmont, Ohio. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Agnes E. Bingham, Portage, Ohio. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Edith L. Roliff, Randolph, Ohio. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Mary E. Schlechty, Rossburg, Ohio. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Alice Johnson, Sharon Center, Ohio. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Lucile G. Justus, Stoutsville, Ohio. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Charles H. Weary, Suffield, Ohio. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

OKLAHOMA

Mary C. Nixon, Agra, Okla. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Harvey L. Sanderson, Burbank, Okla. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Elmer E. Hill, Cameron, Okla. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Orra E. Cockrell, Colcord, Okla. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Flossie Melton, Colony, Okla. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Helen Krause, Corn, Okla. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

John M. Banks, Crowder, Okla. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Clefford F. Vickrey, Frederick, Okla., in place of G. H. Hope, resigned.

Myrtle Whiteaker, Panama, Okla., in place of Ed Whiteaker, appointee declined.

James F. Pate, Ravia, Okla. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

OREGON

Mary R. Smith, Jacksonville, Oreg., in place of R. E. Hoffman, resigned.

Marie Bevins, Park Place, Oreg. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Modine Skinner, Phoenix, Oreg. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Wayne E. Elliott, Veneta, Oreg. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Charles A. Ridder, Willamette, Oreg. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

PENNSYLVANIA

John M. Jones, Allenport, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Elmer L. Russell, Cokeburg, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

Mary C. Shaefer, East Freedom, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Estelle M. Lazzari, East Monongahela, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Walter W. Raub, Edinburg, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Lawrence E. Barry, Elwyn, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Ethel M. Krug, Emeigh, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Samuel H. Brinton, Etters, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Charlotte S. Clemens, Fallsington, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Jennie T. Rauch, Geneva, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Lula Withrow, Glenwillard, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Earl M. Rynier, Gordonville, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

George C. Shick, Hawthorn, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Engelbert J. Dittmer, Herman, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Anne S. Kornides, Hostetter, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Rachel M. Thurston, Iselin, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Hiram Greenland, Karthaus, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Frank C. Gutekunst, Kintnersville, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Carroll G. Reynolds, Lakewood, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Lillian L. Landis, Lincoln Park, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

LeRoy M. Kutz, Lyon Station, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

William D. Kelvington, Meadow Lands, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Rebecca Campbell, Midway, Pa., in place of Rebecca Campbell. Incumbent's commission expired April 29, 1942.

Pearl M. Severns, Neshaminy, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Mabel Helen Craig, Noblestown, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Nellie R. McNamee, Pomeroy, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Alice D. Traub, Richboro, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

William F. Shuman, Rixford, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Harry Y. Adams, Rothsville, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Anna E. Astle, Stockdale, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Leo J. Kennedy, Vandling, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

George Acker, Venango, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Ruth E. Funk, Washington, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

J. George Keeler, Wyalusing, Pa., in place of F. G. Ackley, retired.

PUERTO RICO

Luis Lugo, Cidra, P. R. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Gloria P. de Leon, Comerio, P. R. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Ana Maria Bou, Corozal, P. R. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Carmen Julia Quinones, Guanica, P. R. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Gustavo Quinones Rieder, Gurabo, P. R. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Rosario Santiago, Maunabo, P. R. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Gonzalo Colon Campos, Morovis, P. R. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Modesta de Vega, Naranjito, P. R. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Josefina E. Avila, Patillas, P. R. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Providencia R. de Rexach, Rio Grande, P. R. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Hortensia Pagan de Berrios, Santa Isabel, P. R. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Josefa Alvarez, Vega Alta, P. R. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

SOUTH CAROLINA

Jesse T. Ross, Blaney, S. C. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Joseph D. Ayers, Blenheim, S. C. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Conway Dial, Cross Hill, S. C. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Laura B. Anderson, Dunbarton, S. C. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Thomas J. Kittles, Garnett, S. C. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

James M. McGill, Hickory Grove, S. C. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Sara C. DePass, Hodges, S. C. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Lucile L. Coleman, Hyman, S. C. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Gilbert B. Heath, Lando, S. C. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Anna E. Boland, Little Mountain, S. C. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Sallie T. Ward, Lugoff, S. C. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Minor P. Gale, Mount Croghan, S. C. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Marvin A. Peebles, Newry, S. C. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Luther L. DuBose, New Zion, S. C. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Thomas R. Ridlehoover, Plum Branch, S. C. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Thelma G. Reeves, Ravenels, S. C. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Maynette Streater, Ruby, S. C. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

James C. Nicholson, Salem, S. C. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Mildred H. Bowie, Starr, S. C. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Dicey M. Gibbons, Turbeville, S. C., in place of W. L. Coker, resigned.

John W. Geraty, Yonges Island, S. C. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

SOUTH DAKOTA

Eva L. De Neui, Chancellor, S. Dak. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Wanda M. Oberle, Mellette, S. Dak., in place of E. M. Ottum, resigned.

Flora T. Benshoof, Revillo, S. Dak., in place of H. J. Seim, resigned.

Ross Bennett, Spencer, S. Dak., in place of L. F. Lemert, retired.

Caroline D. King, Tabor, S. Dak., in place of J. S. Petrik, transferred.

TENNESSEE

Fannie C. Taylor, Antioch, Tenn. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Lutie Davis, Briceville, Tenn. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Mary S. Wilson, College Grove, Tenn. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Nannie F. Jones, Del Rio, Tenn. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Annie Bacon, Fall Branch, Tenn. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Helen McDaniel, Finley, Tenn. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

John F. Anderson, Flag Pond, Tenn. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Mozella J. Cox, Gadsden, Tenn. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Joe C. Hunt, Gibson, Tenn. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Perry Jennings, Heiskell, Tenn. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

James R. Carmack, Hilham, Tenn. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Nora L. Bates, Lobelville, Tenn. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Mary I. Lindsey, Lutts, Tenn. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Celia G. McCauley, Mercer, Tenn. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Anne H. Snapp, Midway, Tenn. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Ida F. Seaton, Morris Chapel, Tenn. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Troy W. Tomlin, Oakland, Tenn. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Lerline Hearn, Pinson, Tenn. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Wade Russell, Rockford, Tenn. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

W. Ernest Moore, Rock Island, Tenn. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

William J. Frazier, Rossville, Tenn. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Lecy D. Mullins, Santa Fe, Tenn. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Chrystel P. Doty, Springville, Tenn. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Blanche T. Bearden, Talbott, Tenn. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Marion R. Kelley, Toone, Tenn. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

TEXAS

Maude Cavender, Encinal, Tex. Office became Presidential July, 1, 1944.

Felix B. Secrest, Georgetown, Tex., in place of J. M. Sharpe, resigned.

Joe A. Nesbitt, Harrold, Tex. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Mildred R. Koontz, Inez, Tex. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

William B. Galloway, Leggett, Tex. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Charlie N. Hooser, Maypearl, Tex. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Claudie A. Oliver, Moore, Tex. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Alice M. Shone, North Pleasanton, Tex. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Harry J. Kuhn, Paige, Tex. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Andrew J. Sitton, Jr., Pyote, Tex. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Barbara L. Gathings, Quemado, Tex. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Edgar L. Fricke, Round Top, Tex. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

R. Dewitt Lancaster, Sonora, Tex., in place of T. C. Murray, resigned.

Georgia Daniel, Toyah, Tex. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

UTAH

Lyle M. McDonald, Orem, Utah. Office became Presidential April 1, 1944.

VIRGINIA

Agnes P. Deans, Churchland, Va. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

Nathaniel H. Keezell, Harrisonburg, Va., in place of G. F. Switzer, resigned.

Thomas G. Fenwick, Howardsville, Va. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

William E. Hankins, Toano, Va., in place of W. W. Ware, Jr., resigned.

WASHINGTON

Walter H. Gihring, Rockford, Wash., in place of W. H. Gihring. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

WEST VIRGINIA

Allen E. Dowdy, Capels, W. Va. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Maggie Ann Brown, Comfort, W. Va. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Mary L. Michael, Fairview, W. Va., in place of F. A. Carpenter, removed.

Pearl C. Harper, Harper, W. Va. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Sam Stinson, Ona, W. Va. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

James A. Haught, Reader, W. Va. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Wesley T. Bitzer, Reed, W. Va. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Williams P. Lyons, Sharon, W. Va. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Homer B. Stover, Wyoming, W. Va. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

WISCONSIN

Ray L. Truskowski, Sobieski, Wis. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Magdalene Grimsrud, Stoddard, Wis. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, AUGUST 28, 1944

The House met at 12 o'clock noon, and was called to order by the Speaker.

The Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., pastor of the Gunton Temple Memorial Presbyterian Church, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, our light in darkness, our strength in weakness, our help in ages past, and our hope for years to come, we humbly and penitently pray that our minds and hearts may be Thy dwelling place.

Grant that all who are charged with the responsibilities of making and administering the laws of our land may have the interpreting and guiding light of the Holy Spirit.

We pray that the victory we are now struggling for may be a victory for Thee and the fullfillment of that glorious day of prophecy when justice shall flow down as waters and righteousness as a mighty stream.

May Thy special blessings be given unto the representatives of the nations planning for a lasting peace. May we strive to make peace more heroic than war and offer ourselves to its accomplishment with a courageous and sacrificial spirit. Make us eager to enlist in a warfare, not waged with carnal weapons but with the insight and understanding of minds and souls that are seeking to witness to the glory of Thy righteousness and the wonder of Thy goodness.

Hear us in the name of the Christ who is our hope and our peace. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, August 24, 1944, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 5125. An act to provide for the disposal of surplus Government property and plants, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the foregoing bill, requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. THOMAS of Utah, Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado, Mr. HILL, Mr. CHANDLER, Mr. AUSTIN, Mr. GURNEY, and Mr. REVERCOMB to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Acting President pro tempore has appointed Mr. BARKLEY and Mr. BREWSTER members of the joint select committee on the part of the Senate, as provided for in the act of August 5, 1939, entitled "An act to provide for the disposition of certain records of the United States Government," for the disposition of executive papers in the following departments and agencies:

1. Department of Agriculture.
2. Department of the Navy.
3. Department of the Treasury.
4. Post Office Department.
5. National Housing Agency.
6. United States Employees' Compensation Commission.

DISPOSAL OF SURPLUS GOVERNMENT PROPERTY

Mr. MANASCO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 5125) to provide for the disposal of surplus Government property and plants, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments and agree to the conference requested by the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. MANASCO]?

There was no objection, and the Speaker appointed the following conferees on the part of the House: Messrs. MANASCO, COCHRAN, WHITTINGTON, GIFFORD, and HOFFMAN.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

(Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.)

SEGREGATION OF THE RACES AT SOUTHERN ARMY POSTS, CAMPS, AND STATIONS

Mr. NEWSOME. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House and to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include two telegrams, one from the Governor of Alabama and one from the commissioner of public safety at Birmingham, Ala.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. NEWSOME]?

There was no objection.

Mr. NEWSOME. Mr. Speaker, whether in Allied, neutral, or enemy country, it has been the policy of our armed services to train our men to respect and to comply with the local laws, traditions, and customs of the people in the area in which they are located.

This policy is both intelligent and humane and has paid great dividends in the avoidance of conflict between soldiers and civilians.

But now, in our Southern States, whose sons are courageously fighting and dying all over the world, the War Department establishes a new policy which violates State laws and the traditional customs and racial relationships as they have existed for generations.

This new War Department order, issued in a letter dated July 8, 1944, written by The Adjutant General of the Army by the direction of the Secretary of War, terminates the segregation of the races in all southern Army posts, camps, and stations.

This policy treats our people of the South with less respect and regard than we show for the people of foreign countries.

The inference is clear that the issuance of this order at this time is political in its intent and purpose.

The order breaks down an essential principle of the South and will most grievously handicap those who are trying to bring about a constantly improving relationship between the races.

With a deep sense of apprehension and depression for the welfare of the

people of the South, both white and colored, I protest this order and ask that it be revoked.

The enforcement of this order can mean nothing but trouble and strife between our people at a time when it is so vital that we be united.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I insert in the RECORD telegrams on this subject received from Chauncey Sparks, Governor of Alabama, and Eugene Bull Connor, commissioner of public safety of Birmingham, Ala.:

MONTGOMERY, ALA., *August 24, 1944.*
Hon. JOHN P. NEWSOME,
Washington, D. C.:

I have sent the following telegram to the President of the United States:

"Local newspapers carry notice today of the War Department's order terminating segregation of races at the Maxwell Field Post Exchange here. As Governor of the State of Alabama, I protest such an order, which violates a State-wide practice and belief and aggravates rather than helps. It breaks down an essential principle of race relationship in the South and greviously handicaps those of us in leadership positions who are trying to bring about a better relationship between the two races and an improvement of both on an equal basis. May I respectfully ask that you give this matter your personal attention and, before the order is made effective, that you give consideration to the opinions of those of us who are trying to be helpful, those of us whose efforts will be neutralized by such orders."

CHAUNCEY SPARKS,
Governor of Alabama.

BIRMINGHAM, ALA., *August 25, 1944.*
Hon. JOHN NEWSOME,
United States Congressman,
Washington, D. C.:

As a citizen of Alabama, I want to call your attention to the fact that with a flying field for colored personnel at Tuskegee, the papers say the Government has ordered the removal of segregation regulations at Maxwell Field in Montgomery. I understand this has also occurred at Camp Sibert in Gadsden. It is not even claimed that this will aid the war effort and on the contrary everyone knows it will retard it. It is an effort to take advantage of the war before it ends to work a change in one of our State's fundamental institutions—segregation. We must be allowed to maintain the doctrine of segregation of the races here, where nearly half of our population is colored, or we will have terror, bloodshed, and calamity for both races. Please make this clear to the President before it happens.

EUGENE BULL CONNOR,
Commissioner of Public Safety.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ENGLE of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD in two instances, in one to include an editorial from the Sacramento Bee and in the other to include some remarks in reference to Judge Carr, California civic and political leader.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California [Mr. ENGLE]?

There was no objection.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

SOLDIER-VOTING SYSTEM ADOPTED BY THE STATE OF NEW YORK

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, Governor Dewey of my State and the Presidential nominee on the Republican ticket, stated over the week end that the State soldier-voting system adopted by the State of New York is working very well.

Let us examine the statement for accuracy. We find, for example, that 23,240 merchant seamen from my State are barred from voting in November; 18,760 U. S. O., Red Cross, O. W. I. workers, and civilian Army and Navy personnel of New York State serving abroad cannot vote in the Presidential election; 365,000 servicemen from New York have failed to file an application for State ballots because of the cumbersome system inspired by Governor Dewey, which system was adopted by the New York State Legislature.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, I had an idea that this sniping on the ballot question was about over, but evidently the gentleman from New York has not awakened to the fact that what the President was trying to put over was a short ballot that would have been confined to the President, whereas Congress gave the soldier the same kind of ballot that his father and his brothers back home have. He is going to have the privilege not only of voting for the President and for Governor, Members of Congress, and Senators but also for sheriff and for all the local officers of his community.

We voted to give the soldiers a square deal when it comes to voting, and I am surprised that the gentleman from New York would get up and condone and applaud the sort of fraud that the administration tried to put over on the boys.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

MISSOURI SERVICEMEN CAN CAST THEIR BALLOTS NOW

Mr. COLE of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, service men and women from Missouri can cast their ballots now for the coming election if they expect to be absent from the State or from their county on election day. To qualify one must be a citizen of the United States; at least 21 years of age on or before November 7, 1944; a resident of Missouri for at least 1 year; and a resident of the county or city in which one votes for at least 60 days before election. While in service a voter is a legal resident of the State, county, or city in which he or she was a legal resident at the time of enlistment or induction. Therefore one who established a residence in Missouri just prior to entering the service and has been in service 1 year on or before November 7, 1944, is qualified to vote. No registration is required.

APPLY FOR BALLOTS NOW

Application for a ballot can be made as follows:

First. The father, mother, husband, wife, or next of kin of any voter in our armed services may cause a ballot to be mailed to such voter by applying to the county clerk of the county where the service man or woman maintains legal residence. This application can be made now or at any time between now and election day.

Second. The service man or woman may use the Government post card furnished by his or her voting officer to apply for a ballot or can make application by any written request, letter, telegram, cablegram, or radiogram which states his or her name, voting address, and the address to which the ballot is to be sent. Application may be sent to the county clerk of the county where the voter resides or to the secretary of state, Jefferson City, Mo.

The ballot that each will receive is the same as the ballot that will be used at the polls on election day in the county where the service man or woman resides. These ballots are ready for delivery now and can be voted now or at anytime until and including election day if returned to the proper election officials by 6 o'clock p. m. the day following the day of election.

Further information can be had by writing your Congressman, WILLIAM C. COLE, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

Mr. Speaker, this morning I received in the mail from a soldier serving with our armed forces in India a mimeographed copy of what purports to be a news digest, apparently issued to our fighting men in that theater, and probably others, by our Department of State. I assume that this is an official release of our State Department, since it carries an official radio bulletin number and date line of the State Department.

Let me describe this so-called digest. Right under the date line, and continuing thereafter for more than 6 full pages of single-spaced typewritten legal-size sheets, is the full text of the speech given by Mr. Roosevelt at Puget Sound Navy Yard, Bremerton, Wash. Following all

of this text there appears on the tail end of page 7 of this legal-size report 4 lines giving the standings of the major leagues on that date; 22 lines under the heading "Miscellaneous press," stating it as Admiral Nimitz's opinion that the occupation of Japan is vital to peace; and 12 lines about Russo-American exploratory talks in June and July about post-war civil aviation. Total, 7 pages, more than six-sevenths devoted to a candidate's speech. That is what is described as a news digest. More than 6 pages of a speech by a President who is a political candidate; one-half page of material which by the most generous definition can be called "Miscellaneous press."

This obviously is an official release of our own Department of State. This obviously cleared through the official channels of communications of that Department, as the date lines indicate. I do not know who took over the mimeographing and distribution of this so-called digest after it cleared through official channels, but due to the speed with which it cleared, I assume that the War Department or the Office of War Information must have served as the breathless messenger which carried this news to our troops.

With this soldier out there on the other side of the globe I wonder, to use his exact language, "If Dewey can get this type of advertising, plus a $20,000,000 boat ride, free?"

I shall look forward with intense interest to see if the State, War, and Navy Departments or the O. W. I. will publicize the speeches of Mr. Dewey and place them in the hands of our fighting men in the same way.

Certainly our men abroad who must depend upon the same sources which inspired this news digest for whatever detailed official news they receive are entitled in all fairness and justice to full coverage of both sides of every question. If this one example is typical, I honestly wonder what chance the average American fighting man has today to reach an unbiased conclusion about his vote in November.

SOCIAL SECURITY ACT

Mr. COX, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 627), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered printed:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (S. 2051) to amend the Social Security Act, as amended, to provide a national program for war mobilization and reconversion, and for other purposes, and all points of order against said bill are hereby waived. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 2 days to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider without the intervention of any point of order the substitute amendment recommended by the Committee on Ways and Means now in the bill, and such substitute for the purpose of amendment shall be considered under the 5-minute rule as an original bill. At the conclusion of such consideration, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any of the amendments adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or committee substitute. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a radio address recently made.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an address delivered by Dr. H. G. Bennett.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. THOMAS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. MORRISON] be permitted to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. GOSSETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the Washington Post on the subject of treaty ratification.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the Washington Post.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a letter which I received from Dr. McCracken, a very distinguished educator from Ohio, who deals with the history of Federal aid to education.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD in two instances; in one, to include a letter written to Chester Bowles, and in the other an editorial from the Omaha World Herald.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD in three instances and include summaries relative to veterans' legislation.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a straw ballot taken by the Des Moines Register, Des Moines, Iowa.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper clipping.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

(Mr. BUFFETT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.)

Mr. WOLVERTON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a summary of the Dingell bill (H. R. 5227) to provide a national program for war mobilization, and reconversion, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that today, at the conclusion of the legislative program and following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

WAR MOBILIZATION AND RECONVERSION

Mr. WOLVERTON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOLVERTON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this time to call attention to the fact that under unanimous consent just granted I have received permission to include in the RECORD a summary of the so-called Dingell bill (H. R. 5227), to provide a national program for war mobilization, and reconversion, and for other purposes. I consider this bill of sufficient importance to request the Members of the House to give it their very careful consideration. This bill was drawn by some Members

of the House after consultation with representatives of the American Federation of Labor, the C. I. O., and the railroad brotherhoods. I am informed, and I believe my information to be correct, that it has the support of the different organizations to which I have just referred. It differs from the Senate bill, known as the George bill, the substitute for the latter as reported by the Ways and means Committee, and the other bills that have been formerly introduced. It is a compromise measure. It has been carefully drawn. It is entitled to the favorable consideration of the membership of the House.

CARE OF VETERANS

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, last week I suggested to General Hines and to the House that there should be appointed an Assistant Administrator of the Veterans' Administration in charge of the disabled. My fear is that General Hines is so busy that he cannot properly take care of the urgent needs of the disabled. Everyone wants to see General Hines but he is occupied with many problems for all veterans. I also brought to the attention of the House the fact that all of the activities for the veterans should be brought under one head and one building, not only at Washington but all over the United States.

It is a hardship for the disabled veterans to be compelled to go to different offices, often far removed from one another, in order to process their claims, to receive examinations, medical treatment, hospitalization, vocational training, loans, and other benefits to which they are entitled. The Veterans' Administration offices at Boston are in different buildings in different parts of the city. The same separation of Veterans' Administration offices undoubtedly exists in other cities throughout the United States. It is working a tremendous hardship on the disabled veterans. It is very difficult for many of them to stand. Many of them cannot stand, and they should not be sent or shoved around from one building to another.

Many of our veterans are cruelly maimed. Many suffer from TB, and many suffer from strange fevers acquired in the Tropics.

Here in Washington one building should be provided, even if some of the old-line agencies have to move out into temporary buildings in order to house the veterans' activities under one roof. One of the purposes of the G. I. bill enacted by Congress was to have all veterans' activities in one central location. Today that is not being done. We must see that the provisions of the original G. I. bill does not become a mere scrap of paper.

Prompt payment by the Veterans' Administration of death claims of the veterans' national service life insurance is most important. Delay in the payment of these claims is inexcusable. While part of the Insurance Section of the Veterans' Administration has been moved to New York as a step toward expediting action on these claims, further decentralization should be considered immediately in order to take care of the claims pending and to keep current in the future in the payment of insurance death claims.

FAIR EMPLOYMENT PRACTICE COMMISSION

Mr. LAFOLLETTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. LAFOLLETTE. Mr. Speaker, last Thursday, August 24, the House Labor Committee decided to postpone until after election the completion of hearings on my bill to establish a permanent Fair Employment Practice Commission, a bill which has been before the committee since January.

I am sorry to have to say that it looks as though this bill is being bottled up in committee during the election campaign only because the Democratic Party platform evaded the issue of discrimination in employment.

I hope I am wrong, because discrimination in employment is an issue which should transcend party lines. It is an issue on which all of us who are up for reelection must stand squarely and be counted.

I introduced H. R. 4005 on January 17. Two of my Democratic colleagues introduced identical bills about the same time. Yet, despite the apparent need to give stability and statutory authority for the post-war period to one of the most important war agencies created by Executive order, the committee failed to act. The need for post-war planning to prevent discrimination in employment against Negroes and other minorities from becoming, as it did after the last war, an issue which provoked race riots throughout the country is so clear that I think the failure of the committee to continue hearings or report a bill before the fall recess is a grave mistake.

Shall we say after this international war, in the name of freedom, to the Negro, the Jew, the Mexican, and others whose full participation in war production we made possible, "Now that it's over, go back to your pre-war status of limited citizenship"?

Shall we say to the Negro, the Jew, the Mexican, who survives and returns from what we are pleased today to call the battlefields of freedom, "Freedom from discrimination was not among the freedoms you fought for?"

Shall we say to the fathers and mothers, the wives and children of those who will never come back, "They really didn't die to make a better world for you?"

The House Labor Committee suspended hearings for the convention recess, but not before enough evidence had been presented to demonstrate the need for immediate action, and to demonstrate that our major religious, civic, and labor groups were solidly behind the bill.

Then what happened?

The Republican Party held its convention and put into its platform a forthright plank declaring, "We pledge the establishment by Federal legislation of a permanent fair employment practice commission." Other planks called for a constitutional amendment to abolish the poll tax, an antilynching law, and legislation to correct "mistreatment, segregation, and discrimination against Negroes who are in our armed forces."

How did the Democratic Party meet this challenge in its convention a few weeks later? By a short, evasive statement which Walter White aptly termed "a splinter" rather than a plank.

We believe—

The statement reads—

that racial and religious minorities have the right to live, develope, and vote equally with all citizens and share the rights that are guaranteed by our Constitution. Congress should exert its full constitutional powers to protect these rights.

And that is all. The right to work equally with all citizens, as you may have noticed, is conspicuous by its absence.

Discrimination in employment is an issue which should transcend party lines. I hope the committee will reconsider its decision and report out a bill before the election recess.

It is a matter of common knowledge that for years this Democratic administration has boasted to labor and liberal groups that no legislation came out of the House Labor Committee except that which the administration approved. Having worn that shoe for 12 years it cannot take it off if it pinches now. I call upon the Democratic Party and its candidate for President to explain to the Jews, Negroes, Mexicans, and other minorities who need the protection of a permanent F. E. P. C., why it has permitted or ordered its Labor Committee chairman to hold up on this legislation until after the coming election.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WILLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Delaware?

There was no objection.

DISPOSAL OF GOVERNMENT SURPLUS PROPERTY

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, the House a short time ago passed a surplus-property bill, which I tried to amend in a number of respects, as other Members did. One or two of our amendments were adopted. Most of them were defeated, however. The Senate passed a very different sort of bill, a bill which includes many of the provisions that some of us tried to get

in on the floor of the House. I merely want to say that in my judgment that Senate bill is considerably better than the one we passed, a tighter bill, more truly a piece of real, thoughtful legislation—less of a blanket grant of sweeping powers to one man. I hope that most of the provisions of that Senate bill will be accepted by the House, for I think we will have better legislation if that is done. Certainly we will have legislation which will more adequately protect small business and the general interest of the people.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. GRANT of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the Montgomery Advertiser.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, on last Thursday I asked unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD a statement on the servicemen's rights and benefits. I have a statement from the Government Printing Office saying that it will cost $195. They might as well have said $195,000. Of course, it will not cost anything of the kind, because all it will cost will be the extra paper and the ink that goes to print it. However, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD notwithstanding that fact.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

LET US NOT INJECT THE BLOOD OF OTHER RACES INTO THE VEINS OF OUR WOUNDED FIGHTING MEN

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include a circular that is being distributed to Government workers here on the question of the blood bank.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. LAFOLLETTE] keeps clamoring for this Fair Employment Practice Committee—F. E. P. C.—and says we ought to all stand up and be counted. If the white people of his district ever find out what that iniquitous proposition is, they are going to count him without his standing up, and I think they will count him out; and they will more than likely count out every other white man who sponsors any such crazy legislation.

This F. E. P. C. would force every enterprise to employ Negroes, Japs, or members of any other race, whether they were wanted or not, and promote them over white people, regardless of the trouble such an arrangement produced. That might suit the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. LAFOLLETTE], but I do not believe it would suit the rest of the white people of Indiana.

Right in line with that communistic program is this circular that is being circulated here to outlaw the separation of the blood that is being banked to be injected into the veins of our disabled servicemen. I wonder if the gentleman from Indiana wants to have that done. I wonder if he wants to have the blood of other races injected into the disabled servicemen of the State of Indiana.

Here is a circular these Communists are circulating among the Government employees here in Washington. It reads as follows:

ON LABOR DAY GIVE BLOOD AND PROTEST PLASMA SEGREGATION

Why?

Fighting men, black and white, are dying each day for democracy. You can save a life and advance democracy at home. All human blood plasma is the same and plasma saves lives. Segregation of plasma is not only senseless but is symbolic of a way of life to which we do not want our heroes to return.

GIVE BLOOD WITH A PROTEST

How?

On Labor Day give blood for our invasion forces, accompanied by an individual printed protest against blood segregation to be signed by you. This card will be handed to you as you enter to give your blood.

To secure an appointment Labor Day, write the Blood Donor Committee, 1212 Eighteenth Street NW., or call EX. 2995, EX. 0340, EX. 0657.

GIVE BLOOD WITH A PROTEST

When?

Labor Day, Monday, September 4, 1944, Preferably 11 a. m. to 1 p. m. and 4 to 5:30 p. m.

Attend mass meeting, 12 noon, Labor Day, on the steps of Acacia Building, Blood Donor Center.

Where?

Red Cross Blood Donor Center, Acacia Building, 51 Louisiana Avenue NW.

Sponsored by: District Council, United Federal Workers of America, C. I. O.; Washington Industrial Union Council; National Negro Congress; N. A. A. C. P., Washington Chapter; Laborers District Council, A. F. of L.

Give blood with a protest.

No one can tell what effect injecting the blood of another race into his body would have on a young white man, or his children.

These Communists that are led now by Sidney Hillman and his gang are offering here the greatest insult that has ever been hurled at those brave men from Indiana, from Mississippi, and from every other State in this Union, who are carrying our flag to victory.

While they are fighting our battles abroad, for God's sake let us not insult them here at home by forcing this damnable F. E. P. C. upon them, or their families, or by wiping out our segregation laws or preparing to inject the blood of other races into their veins.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

ESTATE OF THOMAS SHEA, DECEASED

Mr. McGEHEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 3695) for the relief of the estate of Thomas Shea, deceased, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "$7,171.53" and insert "$5,471.53."

Page 2, line 9, after "death", insert ": *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

Mr. MICHENER. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, this is simply a reduction in the amount in a bill which has heretofore been considered by the House and passed unanimously?

Mr. McGEHEE. That is true.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

(Mr. VURSELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.)

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] is recognized for 10 minutes.

DUMBARTON AND THE PACIFIC

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Speaker, while the Battle of Europe is raging the representatives of Russia, Great Britain, and the United States are meeting at Dumbarton Oaks to discuss the foundations for a secure and lasting peace. When this particular Big Three is finished with its work, the Russian delegate, Andrei A. Gromyko, will step out and be replaced by Dr. V. K. Wellington Koo, representing China.

The Dumbarton Conference is undertaking a difficult but highly necessary task. It is to be sincerely hoped by all of us that petty differences and trivial disputes will not mar the grave and serious proceedings of those who represent the great powers because the hopes of this country—and of mankind—lie in the creation of machinery to establish a just and permanent peace.

This meeting must plan for peace on a world-wide scale and it must give equal consideration to Asia as well as to Europe. It will, I hope, lay the foundations for eventual peace in the Pacific now by coming to an agreement with Russia for the use of its far eastern bases by the United States at the earliest appropriate oppor-

tunity. I realize, Mr. Speaker, that the moment for such bases may not have yet arrived, but I am hopeful the European war will end soon thus freeing Russia from Hitler's armies and allowing her to assist us in our war against Japan.

As a matter of fact, Russia need not, at present, go so far as to declare war against Japan, but she could, as she is now doing in Europe, make shuttle bombing bases available in Siberia for our planes.

This possibility is becoming more feasible because of the fact that Japan has withdrawn large elements of the Kwantung for service in south and central China, thus weakening her forces in Manchukuo and along the Siberian frontier generally. Furthermore, the creation of shuttle-bombing bases would be of inestimable benefit to our hard-pressed allies, the Chinese, who have put up such a magnificent fight for the past 7 years.

There is a question mark in the minds of many Americans as to whether or not we will have to carry on the war in the Pacific alone. If such proves to be the case, the feeling of the American people may become so resentful that the cause of international cooperation will be harmed irreparably.

This is one subject well worth discussion at Dumbarton because it is tied up to the winning of the war in the shortest possible time and, by the same token, necessary to bring about international cooperation and thus insure a lasting peace.

Another matter of grave import is the future of the Japanese mandated islands. In January of this year Admiral Nimitz established a military government in the Marshalls and since that time other mandated islands in the Marianas and Carolines have come under our control. One of the paragraphs of Nimitz's proclamation states:

> Exercise of the powers of the Emperor of Japan shall be suspended during the period of military occupation.

Mr. Speaker, I do not feel that the proclamation goes far enough. The suspension of the Japanese Emperor's powers should not be limited only to the period of military occupation but forever. There must be no repetition of the action by the Allied and associated powers after the last war in giving Japan this mandate nor must there be any secret agreements as was the case in March 1917—before our entrance into the First World War—whereby Britain, France, and Russia, agreed to support Japan's claims to Micronesia—the later Japanese mandated area. These islands, while economically unimportant, are strategically necessary to us for our security and the sooner we make our aims in this respect plainly known the better it will be for us in the future. Our young men are today purchasing those islands with their lives. This time we must make sure there will not be another war and one of the ways of seeing to that in the Pacific is to make these islands American possessions and thus prevent any future possibility of another Pearl Harbor disaster.

Collectively the Japanese mandated islands cover only 840 square miles and have a population of 150,000 people. Their economic possibilities are limited primarily to the growing of sugar and the extraction of phosphate. Under the mandate, Japan was denied the right to fortify the islands or to build bases there. We have good reason to know now that Japan did fortify some of this area and we remember also that it was almost impossible to visit any islands since Japan acquired control of them.

In 1929 the United States requested that American destroyers be allowed to visit Kwajalein, Wotje, and four other ports, but the Japanese denied this request on the ground that there were no pilots and that the harbors were dangerous. In 1936 the United States again asked the Japanese Government to permit one of its destroyers to visit the mandated islands and at the same time we reminded Japan that her ships had been permitted to call at Alaskan ports. No reply was received to this request, but this war has given us the answer to our suspicions concerning the fortification of the mandates and the reason for the visits of Japanese ships—of all types—to Alaskan waters. It must also by now have convinced us of the weakness and needlessness of our appeasement policy toward our enemy.

After 1937 no foreign ships visited Micronesia and after 1939 no natives were permitted to leave the islands. In 1940–41 Japan appropriated $1,417,000 for harbor works, air routes, and aircraft facilities. This, of course, needs to be added on to the appropriations made since 1919, and this, coupled with the secrecy attached to the government of the mandates, is real evidence that bases had been set up in the islands.

Japan's claim to the mandates should be completely nullified. She has never owned them, but held them in trust only on the authority of the allied and associated powers and as a result of a secret agreement in 1917. The 100,000 Japanese, out of a total population of 150,000, must be sent back to Japan after the war and the economy of the islands placed in the hands of the native Kanakas and Chamorros. These islands are or will be ours by right of conquest as partial reparation for our losses, and most important of all, because they are absolutely necessary for our peace and security.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. RICHARDS (at the request of Mr. COLMER), for 3 weeks, on account of official business.

To Mr. DILWEG (at the request of Mr. GIBSON) for 3 days, on account of business.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 32 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, August 29, 1944, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1779. A letter from the Director, Selective Service System, transmitting a report of the registrants deferred as of June 15, 1944, because of their employment in or under the Federal Government; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

1780. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting a report on records proposed for disposal by various Government agencies; to the Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers.

1781. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a list of all contracts in excess of $150,000 undertaken during the fiscal year 1944; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. DOUGHTON: Committee on Ways and Means. S. 2051. A bill to amend the Social Security Act, as amended, to provide a national program for war mobilization and reconversion, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 1798). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. CROSSER: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 5196. A bill to amend section 22 of the Interstate Commerce Act by authorizing common carriers to grant reduced fares to personnel of armed services; with amendment (Rept. No. 1799). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. COX: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 627. Resolution for the consideration of S. 2051, an act to amend the Social Security Act, as amended, to provide a national program for war mobilization and reconversion, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1800). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. DIMOND:

H. R. 5246. A bill to provide for filling a vacancy in the office of Delegate in Congress from Alaska; to the Committee on the Territories.

By Mr. HINSHAW:

H. R. 5247. A bill to authorize the continuance of the liquidation of property formerly used by the Civilian Conservation Corps; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. MANASCO:

H. R. 5248. A bill to amend an act entitled "An act to extend the time for examination of monthly accounts covering expenditures by disbursing officers of the United States Marine Corps," approved December 26, 1941, so as to extend the time for examination of monthly accounts of disbursing officers and special disbursing agents of the Navy and Coast Guard; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. RANKIN:

H. R. 5249. A bill to amend Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a), with respect to payments to educational or training institutions; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. PRIEST:

H. J. Res. 305. Joint resolution to enable the Surgeon General of the United States Public Health Service to dispose of certain reserves of liquid, frozen, or dry blood plasma or serum albumin; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Missouri River States Committee, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to promote legislation toward procuring a single coordinated Missouri River development plan; to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CHURCH:

H. R. 5250. A bill for the relief of Marion S. Buckley; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. COLE of Missouri:

H. R. 5251. A bill granting an increase of pension to Sarah E. Dyer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HENDRICKS:

H. R. 5252. A bill for the relief of Marion Contracting Co., Ocala, Fla.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. McGEHEE:

H. R. 5253. A bill for the relief of Sam Wadford; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. O'TOOLE:

H. R. 5254. A bill for the relief of Martin V. Fay; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

6031. By Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON: Memorial of E. R. Vaughan, of Hearne, Tex., favoring House bill 4846; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

6032. By Mr. LUDLOW: Petition of citizens of Indianapolis, Ind., expressing interest in the enactment of House bill 4284 and House Resolution 3670 for promotion of American prisoners of war; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

6033. By Mr. ROLPH: Resolution No. 1 of the California Cattlemen's Association, opposing further acquisition of lands by the Federal Government and urging that all public lands be restored to the tax rolls as promptly as possible; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

6034. Also, Resolution 2 of the California Cattlemen's Association, endorsing Senate bill 1794 and House bill 4457, both favoring the principle of giving former owners a preference in the sale of Government property acquired for war purposes; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

6035. Also, Resolution No. 3 of the California Cattlemen's Association, setting forth its position in connection with rail carriers extending operations to other fields of transportation; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

6036. Also, Resolution No. 4 of the California Cattlemen's Association, urging return to standard time; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

6037. Also, Resolution No. 5 of the California Cattlemen's Association, opposing any acreage restriction in sale of water from the Central Valley project; to the Committee on Appropriations.

6038. Also, resolution of Pacific Coast Association of Port Authorities, memorializing Congress to enact legislation for return to the ports of the Nation all properties not needed for post-war protection; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

6039. By the SPEAKER: Petition of William W. Anderson, San Diego, Calif., petitioning consideration of his resolution with reference to revising post-war immigration laws to prevent infiltration of Nazi and Fascist elements; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

6040. Also, petition of the Lions Club of San Juan, P. R., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to expediting committee consideration of the project containing amendments to the present Organic Act of Puerto Rico; to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

6041. Also, petition of Arden B. Kitchenmeister, Joseph O. Osgood, and others, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to an investigation of the Federal courts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, AUGUST 29, 1944

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., pastor of the Gunton Temple Memorial Presbyterian Church, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

Eternal God our Father, who alone art worthy of all adoration, may we now render unto Thee our heartfelt praise, for daily Thou art blessing us beyond our deserts and our desires.

We pray that our lives may become increasingly sensitive to Thy will and the needs of humanity. May our thoughts and labors be inspired with a passionate longing to bring in the kingdom of blessedness when nations shall live together in peace and in plenty.

We beseech Thee that a new spirit and a new vision may come into the minds of men everywhere. May we see that Thou art calling us to understand one another, forgive one another, and cooperate with one another. May we not merely be content to live and let live, but may we help one another to live and to keep in love with life and find its joy.

May all our leaders in the affairs of government, whom we honor and revere as our first men, also be our very best men, full of faith and the Holy Spirit. May they be men of courage and integrity, walking in the fear of the Lord, which is the beginning of wisdom, and sincerely striving to stir anew the high idealism of our beloved country.

To Thy name we shall ascribe all the glory. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

COMMITTEE ON THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 628), which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That HOWARD W. SMITH, of the State of Virginia, be, and he is hereby, elected a member of the standing committee of the House of Representatives on the District of Columbia.

The resolution was agreed to.

DEATH PENSIONS OR COMPENSATION OF PERSONS MISSING IN ACTION

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 1508) to provide effective date of awards of death pension or compensation in cases of persons missing or missing in action to authorize payment of such benefits from the date of death of such person as reported or found by the Secretary of War or the Secretary of the Navy, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MAY]?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman from Kentucky explain just what this bill provides?

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, this bill relates to the character of cases where a man is reported missing in action or killed in action and where the Army in one instance, or the Navy in another instance, reports him as dead. The Veterans' Administration starts to pay as of the day following the actual death. The purpose of the bill is to allow the War Department or the Navy Department to determine the day of death from which they start to pay that adjustment.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Is it agreeable to the gentleman's committee?

Mr. MAY. Yes; it was agreed to by the committee. There is a unanimous report from the committee.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAY. I yield.

Mr. FISH. In view of the type of bill which the gentleman has presented to the House, I wonder if he could give us the facts in ascertaining the death of a boy missing in action, because I am sure the gentleman is in a position to do so. I have in mind this type of case, and I speak, of course, in this matter somewhat personally. I have a nephew who has been reported missing in action over Hungary in an airplane over a month ago. Up to this time we have found it impossible to get any information as to whether the boy is alive or not. Does the gentleman know how they get this information and how I could get the information?

Mr. MAY. There was no evidence before our committee on the subject of how this information is gathered, but I happen to know by conference with numerous Army officers that when they send up a plane they always have a record at the field of the personnel in the plane, and they have a report when it returns, or does not return, of the facts as to that. If it is lost in action and there is no recovery of the personnel, some of them may have been killed; others may have been wounded; some of them may have parachuted out and been captured as prisoners by the enemy. Sometimes some of them will land in a neutral country. By means of these records that are kept of the planes that go up and the

personnel in them, they are able to trace where they are and ultimately find out their destination.

Mr. FISH. The gentleman did not understand what I was inquiring about. I want to know how do we contact the enemy countries. I know this plane fell in action in an attack on Hungary. I think the plane fell in Czechoslovakia. But how do we contact the enemy countries to know whether any of those boys parachuted and landed safely in one of the occupied countries?

Mr. MAY. As to that, I do not know just how it is done except through the Army communications.

Mr. FISH. What I am getting at is, Is it handled through the Army and the Navy or through the Red Cross?

Mr. MAY. The Red Cross makes the original report on it, and then they check up on it.

Mr. STEFAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAY. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. STEFAN. Do we not get considerable information from representatives in neutral countries who represent us like the Swiss and Portuguese, and then it comes to the International Red Cross?

Mr. MAY. Well it is given to the neutral country first and then they give it to the International Red Cross. Then as I understand it, the Red Cross makes a report to the military authorities of the country to which the man belongs.

Mr. FISH. What I am anxious to find out is this: Does the gentleman know how long it takes? Does it take a month or 2 months or 3 months to get this information? Suppose the boy is living? After all, his parents are here and they do not know. How long does it take to get that information? Is there any given period?

Mr. MAY. Of course, the gentleman from New York knows, no doubt, that varies in many instances. It depends on the circumstances. A man may be lost and turn up somewhere in some other camp. They have no way of saying how long it will take.

Mr. FISH. I mean if they land in enemy country, does it take 30 days, or 90 days? Does the gentleman know which it takes?

Mr. MAY. I do not know as a matter of fact.

Mr. FISH. That is something I wish to find out.

Mr. ROWE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield.

Mr. ROWE. As the chairman stated, the individual case entirely determines the length of time. For instance, there are boys who come down and keep away from the enemy, they are not captured and the enemy has no information about them.

Mr. FISH. Let us assume the enemy captures them; how long does it take the enemy to notify us?

Mr. ROWE. It depends entirely upon the individual circumstances and how severely the enemy is pressed at the time.

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield.

Mr. BREHM. According to the casualty branch of the War Department it takes approximately 90 days before a man is reported back from enemy country.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That effective December 7, 1941, where in the case of a person in the active land or naval service a report of death or a finding of death has been made by the Secretary of War or the Secretary of the Navy, the effective date of an award of death pension or compensation payable under Public Law No. 2, Seventy-third Congress, as amended, shall be the day following the date fixed by the Secretary as the date of death in such report or finding: *Provided*, That claim be filed prior to 1 year after report or finding of death is made: *And provided further*, That death pension or compensation under the laws administered by the Veterans' Administration shall not be payable to any dependent for any period for which such dependent has received, or is entitled to receive, an allowance, allotment, or service pay of the deceased.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDMENT OF THE PAY ADJUSTMENT ACT

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 1506) to further amend the Pay Adjustment Act of 1942, with Senate amendments and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill and the Senate amendments, as follows:

H. R. 1506, an act to further amend the Pay Adjustment Act of 1942.

Senate amendments:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert: "That the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942 is hereby amended by amending section 3A thereof, as added by section 3 of the act of December 2, 1942 (Public Law 785, 77th Cong.), to read as follows:

"'SEC. 3A. In computing the service for all pay purposes of persons paid under the provisions of section 1, 3, 8, or 9 of this act, such persons, in addition to the time required to be credited by the section under which they are paid, shall be credited with full time for all periods during which they were enlisted or held commissions as officers or held appointments as cadets, as midshipmen, as aviation cadets, or as warrant officers or Army field clerks or as commissioned warrant officers in any of the services mentioned in the title of this act, or in the Regular Army Reserve, or in the Medical Reserve Corps of the Navy, the Dental Reserve Corps of the Navy, or in the Organized Militia prior to July 1, 1916, or in the National Guard, or in the National Guard Reserve, or in the National Guard of the United States, or in the Enlisted Reserve Corps, or in the Naval Militia, or in the National Naval Volunteers, or in the Naval Reserve Force, Naval Reserve, Marine Corps Reserve Force, Marine Corps Reserve, Coast Guard Reserve, and the Reserve Corps of the Public Health Service, or in the Philippine Scouts, or in the Philippine Constabulary, or in the Coast and Geodetic Survey as authorized by section 2 (b) of the act of January 19, 1942 (56 Stat. 6). The provisions of this section shall not be construed to permit any person to receive pay and allowances in excess of the maximum limitations imposed upon the total pay and allowances of his rank, grade, or rating by any of the provisions of this act, nor to modify the character of service required for advancement of commissioned warrant officers to a higher pay period.'

"SEC. 2. (a) The third and fourth paragraphs of section 8 of such act are each hereby amended by inserting after the word 'masters' the words 'and chief engineers.'

"(b) The sixth paragraph of section 8 of such act is hereby amended to read as follows:

"'Every person paid under the provisions of this section shall receive an increase of 5 percent of the base pay of his period for each 3 years of service, not exceeding 30 years. Such service shall be active Federal service in any of the services mentioned in the title of this act or reserve components thereof; service in the active National Guard of the several States, Territories, and the District of Columbia; and service in the Enlisted Reserve Corps of the Army, the Officers' Reserve Corps of the Army, the Naval Reserve, the Marine Corps Reserve, and the Coast Guard Reserve.'

"SEC. 3. The third paragraph of section 9 of such act is hereby amended to read as follows:

"'Every enlisted man paid under the provisions of this section shall receive an increase of 5 percent of the base pay of his grade for each 3 years of service up to 30 years. Such service shall be active Federal service in any of the services mentioned in the title of this act or reserve components thereof; service in the active National Guard of the several States, Territories, and the District of Columbia; and service in the Enlisted Reserve Corps of the Army, the Officers' Reserve Corps of the Army, the Naval Reserve, the Marine Corps Reserve, and the Coast Guard Reserve.'

"SEC. 4. The eleventh paragraph of section 1 and the first paragraph of section 3 of such act, as amended by the act of December 2, 1942, are each hereby further amended by inserting after the words 'Officers' Reserve Corps,' where such words appear in each of those paragraphs, a comma and the following: 'or in the Medical Reserve Corps.'

"SEC. 5. The second paragraph of section 18 of such act is hereby amended by striking out the words 'who is assigned or attached as a member of a parachute unit, including parachute-jumping schools, and'.

"SEC. 6. Section 4 of such act is hereby amended by adding the following paragraph at the end thereof:

"'Notwithstanding any other provision of law, any female member of any of the services mentioned in the title of this act, or the reserve components thereof, shall be entitled to all allowances and benefits authorized in this act on account of dependents but only in the case of a husband, a child or children, or a parent or parents in fact dependent upon her for their chief support.'

"SEC. 7. The last paragraph of section 3 of such act is hereby amended to read as follows:

"'When members of the reserve forces of any of the services mentioned in the title of this act are authorized by law to receive federal pay, payments may include the entire amount lawfully accruing to such persons as pay, allowances, and mileage, and pay, allowances, and mileage for their return home may be paid to them prior to their departure from their last duty station incident to release from active duty: *Provided*, That any such mileage payable shall be computed from the place of release to the place from which ordered to active duty without regard to actual performance of travel.'

"SEC. 8. The fourth paragraph of section 10 of such act is hereby amended by changing the period at the end thereof to a colon and adding the following: '*Provided further*, That an enlistment in a branch of the regular service within three months from the date of discharge from any component of such branch, other than its Regular Establishment, after not less than one year's continuous active service in such component or components immediately preceding the date of discharge therefrom, shall be considered a reenlistment for the purpose of payment of the enlistment allowance provided by this section; and the enlistment allowance shall be computed on the basis of the number of full years' continuous active service immediately preceding the discharge from such component.'

"SEC. 9. The first paragraph of section 12 of such act is hereby amended to read as follows:

" 'Officers of any of the services mentioned in the title of this act, including active and retired personnel of the Regular Establishments and members of the Reserve components thereof and the National Guard, while on active duty in the Federal service, when traveling under competent orders without troops, including travel from home to first station in connection with their appointment or call to active duty and from last station to home in connection with relief from active duty or discharge not the result of their own misconduct, shall receive a mileage allowance at the rate of 8 cents per mile, distance to be computed by the shortest usually traveled route and existing laws providing for the issue of transportation requests to officers of the Army traveling under competent orders, and for deduction to be made from mileage accounts when transportation is furnished by the United States, are hereby made applicable to all the services mentioned in the title of this act, but in cases when orders are given for travel to be performed repeatedly between two or more places in the same vicinity, as determined by the head of the executive department concerned, he may, in his discretion, direct that actual and necessary expenses only be allowed. Actual expenses only shall be paid for travel under orders in Alaska and outside the limits of the United States in North America.'

"SEC. 10. All payments heretofore made of a character authorized by section 9 of this act are hereby validated.

"SEC. 11. Sections 1 to 5, inclusive, of this act shall become effective as of June 1, 1942, section 9 shall become effective as of December 22, 1942, and the other sections hereof shall become effective on the first day of the first calendar month occurring after enactment of this act. No back pay or allowances under any section of this act for any period prior to the effective date of such section shall accrue by reason of the enactment of this act, and no back pay or allowances shall accrue to any person who is not entitled to receive active or retired pay on the date of the enactment of this act."

Amend the title so as to read: "An act to amend further the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942."

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, this is a highly technical amendment. Will the gentleman from Kentucky kindly explain what the Senate amendment does?

Mr. MAY. The only question at issue in the bill as reported from the Senate that conflicts with the House provision, as I understand it, is a provision relating to cadets in the Naval Academy, the Military Academy, and the Marine Corps. We provided that the time taken by the men while they were in those schools shall not be counted on the question of retired pay.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. That was in the House bill and the Senate bill?

Mr. MAY. The Senate bill conforms to the House provisions with that exception.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. The bill as it now stands would not count the period a man was in the academy?

Mr. MAY. That is right; that is what the House agreed to.

Mr. STEFAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAY. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. STEFAN. Our cadets now attend Annapolis for 3 years, but that will not count on the retired pay?

Mr. MAY. That is right.

Mr. STEFAN. That is what the bill provides?

Mr. MAY. Yes.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. That is the present rule anyway.

Mr. MAY. That is right.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAY. I yield to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Is that because the cadet was given a certain sum of money when he graduated from Annapolis or West Point?

Mr. MAY. My committee thought, at least I thought, that his education having been paid for during a 4-year term, a 3-year term now, was a rather handsome gift and should not be counted on retired pay as against a man who came up through the ranks.

Mr. STEFAN. I understand now that they only receive a 3 years' schooling compared with 4 years previously and that the expense of the 3 years amounts to approximately $27,000, is that correct?

Mr. MAY. I do not know just what it amounts to, but I do know that we changed the legislation recently. Instead of requiring 4 years' attendance at the academy we require an attendance of 3 years for the duration of the war.

Mr. STEFAN. And I understand that is worth approximately $27,000.

Mr. MAY. Yes; something like that.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. That is the only change in this Senate amendment?

Mr. MAY. That is the only one I know of.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, this applies largely to retirement pay?

Mr. MAY. That is right.

Mr. RANKIN. For officers?

Mr. MAY. Yes.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I am going to explain why I wanted this measure read. In my opinion, we are increasing very rapidly the spread between the pensions or retirement pay of officers and enlisted men. This applies, of course, to emergency officers.

Mr. MAY. We have taken care of enlisted men in other legislation.

Mr. RANKIN. No, not as compared with emergency officers. We are going to find, probably too late, that we have vastly increased the already wide difference that exists today in the Emergency Retirement Act of 1928, I believe it was, as between the retired officer and enlisted man. I am afraid that what we are doing here is to further extend that spread and further intensify the discrimination against the enlisted man which will probably result in a row over this proposition when the war is over, if not before. I am in favor of taking care of the officers in this war. I want that understood. But I am not in favor of taking two men, brothers we will say, one of whom enlists and goes through all the hell and fire of this war and comes out wounded and receives disability of $30 a month, while his brother, an officer, will get for the same disability, many times that amount. I am not going to object, but I want to say to the Chairman of the Military Affairs Committee that I am not criticizing him. He is doing a splendid job. But I am afraid we are increasing that discrimination against the men in the rank and file of our armed forces.

Mr. MAY. I do not think so, and I can assure the gentleman from Mississippi that the committee is alert in the interest of the enlisted man and always careful to safeguard his interest.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MAY]?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROCLAIMING OCTOBER 11, 1944, AS A DAY FOR THE OBSERVANCE OF THE DEATH OF BRIG. GEN. CASIMIR PULASKI

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I offer a House joint resolution, I ask that it be read, and I ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the House joint resolution (H. J. Res. 306), as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the President of the United States of America is authorized to issue a proclamation calling upon officials of the Government to display the flag of the United States on all governmental buildings on October 11, 1944, and inviting the people of the United States to observe the day in schools and churches, or other suitable places, with appropriate ceremonies in commemoration of the death of Gen. Casimir Pulaski.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, may I say that while under the rules of the House an individual Member only can offer a resolution or a bill or a joint resolution such as this, this joint resolution is to be considered as being offered by myself and the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN], and, if unanimous consent is granted, represents the unanimous wish and desire of this body. If there is no objection, I desire to have the RECORD show that while I have offered the resolution that in fact it shall be considered and treated as if every Member of the House, without regard to party, had offered the same resolution.

Mr. RANKIN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I shall not object, but I want to make a little statement. When I was driving to Washington I saw a monument at Camden, S. C.,

and I noticed it was a monument to General de Kalb, who was killed in the Battle of Camden in the Revolutionary War. In that war we had a great many other generals killed who had come to our shores from various and sundry countries. I am wondering if this is going to be a precedent that will be followed whenever the anniversary of the death of one of these other generals comes around.

Mr. McCORMACK. The answer to that is that this resolution has been adopted from year to year and is not permanent legislation. The reason for the resolution and the proclamation that follows is to honor the brave people of Poland. While Pulaski is recognized directly for his contribution in the Revolutionary War, the proclamation transcends that in paying tribute to Poland, the first country actually invaded by the Nazis, so far as actual warfare was concerned. We all realize the terrible conditions the people of that country have gone through. Only yesterday a statement was made by the Ambassador of the Polish Government in exile in reference to "the wholesale slaughter camp in the suburbs of Pruszkow" and how "the people have been starved, tortured, and deprived of food and water and placed in a situation of inevitable death." As he said, "There have been other instances of untold horror with only the immediate intervention of the Vatican, the Allied Nations, and the International Red Cross, supported by the weight of indignation of every free people on the earth, which we hope may stop the Germans from carrying out their heinous design to slaughter defenseless citizens." It seems to me this is an appropriate time for such a resolution and proclamation.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I shall not object to this resolution, but I want to say to the gentleman from Massachusetts that my hero from Poland, my Polish hero, was Kosciusko. I agree with Thomas Campbell, who said that—

> Hope, for a season, bade the world farewell,
> And freedom shriek'd as Kosciusko fell.

So, if we are going to begin to pay these tributes of respect to the memory of other great Revolutionary heroes, we should not overlook Kosciusko and De Kalb.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and, of course, I shall not object, may I say to the gentleman from Massachusetts, my very good friend, the majority leader, that in my judgment he speaks for the entire membership of the House. This is an unusual parliamentary procedure, but it merely emphasizes our feelings in regard to Poland.

THE SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK]?

There was no objection.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ABANDONMENT OF PROJECT FOR A SEAPLANE CHANNEL AND BASIN IN BOSTON HARBOR, MASS.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (S. 1934), to provide for abandonment of the project authorized in the act of October 17, 1940, for a seaplane channel and basin in Boston Harbor, Mass., and its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I understand that this is an unusual situation, in that it involves a State passing back money to the Federal Government.

Mr. McCORMACK. That is correct, and so that the RECORD will have the complete story, may I say that the bill authorizing the project for the construction of a seaplane channel and basin in Boston Harbor, Mass., was passed by the Congress in 1940 at a time when it was thought that was the proper course to pursue. Since that time, I am informed, the seaplane is no longer an important factor in transoceanic transportation, but extended runways have become increasingly important. As a result the State of Massachusetts has appropriated over $4,000,000 to build the airport out into Boston Harbor so that the runways could be extended. Unfortunately the work of this extension cannot be begun until the seaway authorized in 1940 has been officially abandoned. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HERTER] has been very cooperative with me; in fact he has been in to see me a dozen times in connection with this matter. The reason is that the location of the seaway would cut across the protective extension of the runway.

I wired the chairman of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors a few days ago and despite the fact that he was actively engaged in a vigorous campaign, he replied as follows:

> I consider it important and urgent that the bill (S. 1934) to abandon the project authorized in 1940 for seaplane channel and basin in Boston Harbor be enacted without delay.

I have also conferred with other Democratic members of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HERTER] has conferred with Republican members. This is the abandonment of a project that is absolutely necessary in order that the Commonwealth of Massachusetts may make contracts for work in excess of $1,000,000.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I may say to the gentleman from Massachusetts that I am a member of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and that I have no objection, and I do not think any other member has.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK]?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

> *Be it enacted, etc.*, That the project for construction of a seaplane channel and basin in Boston Harbor, Mass., authorized in the act of October 17, 1940, is hereby abandoned, such abandonment having been recommended by the Chief of Engineers in a report contained in House Document No. 472, Seventy-eighth Congress.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a statement made by the Food Administrator, Mr. Marvin Jones.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona?

There was no objection.

Mr. GRANT of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a poem entitled "Wings."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. NEWSOME. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a telegram from the Governor of the State of Alabama.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the Dothan Eagle.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an article entitled "Libertys Played Big Invasion Role."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an item appearing in the Philadelphia Bulletin, August 22, 1944.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD in two instances: in one, to include an article entitled "Heroic Poland," which appeared in the Boston Daily Record of today, and in the other, an address delivered by the Honorable Joseph P. Kennedy, former Ambassador to Great Britain. I am informed by the Public Printer that the cost will exceed the limit but, notwithstanding, I ask that it be printed in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein excerpts of a letter from a soldier.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an article from Newsweek magazine.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD in three instances: in one to include a short article by the United Press; in the second, a short article by David Lawrence; and in the third, a short article by Frank C. Waldrop.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record and include an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANDIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include four brief quotations.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. WILLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include some material appearing in the Washington Post of August 28, 1944.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Delaware?

There was no objection.

Mr. TALBOT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. COMPTON] be permitted to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an international peace plan. Mr. COMPTON received an estimate from the Public Printer that the cost of printing will be $138. Notwithstanding that fact, I ask that he be permitted to include this article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] be permitted to extend his remarks in the RECORD and to include an editorial from the August issue of the official publication of the Railroad Yardmasters of North America, Inc. I also ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. RIZLEY] be permitted to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include two editorials.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD in two instances, and to include a short article in each case.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an address which I recently delivered in Philadelphia.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

(Mr. CELLER and Mr. BENNETT of Michigan asked and were given permission to extent their remarks in the RECORD.)

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. GIBSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that today, at the conclusion of the legislative program and following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that today, at the conclusion of the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 35 minutes on the subject of Guam.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

WAR MOBILIZATION AND RECONVERSION BILL OF 1944

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 627 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill S. 2051, an act to amend the Social Security Act, as amended, to provide a national program for war mobilization and reconversion, and for other purposes, and all points of order against said bill are hereby waived. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 2 days to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider without the intervention of any point of order the substitute amendment recommended by the Committee on Ways and Means now in the bill, and such substitute for the purpose of amendment shall be considered under the 5-minute rule as an original bill. At the conclusion of such consideration, the committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any of the amendments adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or committee substitute. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the Resident Commissioner of the Philippines.

Mr. ROMULO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 10 minutes out of order.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the Resident Commissioner of the Philippines?

There was no objection.

THE JONES ACT—FOUNDATION STONE OF BATAAN

Mr. ROMULO. Mr. Speaker, 28 years ago today, upon this floor, America gave its first pledge of freedom to the people of the Philippines.

On that day the Congress of the United States approved the Jones Act, promising independence to the subject Philippines in a covenant that is without parallel in the world's history.

It is not my purpose to review the Filipinos' fight against America during the early days of American occupation, nor stress the fact that it took the United States 3½ years of actual fighting to subdue the Philippines. We were not conquered, in the final analysis, by guns, but by the practical demonstration in the Philippines of America's concept of democracy. American teachers brought us new methods of education. Public health, road building, government training—such things were given us. Gradually our feeling toward America changed from resentment and suspicion to confidence and loyalty.

That loyalty was sealed by the passage of the Jones Act.

The long struggle for Philippine independence that was to culminate in the passage of the Jones Act was waged upon this floor. It was a strange struggle, carried on in amity and understanding, for only Americans could comprehend the democratic dreams of our Filipino leaders. There were two of these fiery young nationalists who began the fight for independence. Manuel Luis Quezon, as Resident Commissioner, on this floor set here the demands for the outposts of democracy in the Philippines, laid here the foundation of Bataan. But it was in the Philippines where the strategy of the whole fight was planned under Sergio Osmeña, Speaker of the Philippine Assembly, who, as the then leader of the Filipino people, gave purpose and direction to the peaceful campaign for freedom.

The First Philippine Assembly that convened on October 16, 1907, was the supreme test of our ability to govern ourselves. If it succeeded, more self-governing powers would be awarded the Filipinos. If it failed, it would mean a set-back in our slow march to independence. Those who made the Philippine Assembly a success were men of cour-

age and vision, and our Philippine democracy became the monument to their struggle and their sacrifice. I would like to call their roll today; yet however long and glorious the list, we must come to one name at last, that of the new President of the Commonwealth of the Philippines, Sergio Osmeña. As speaker of that historic assembly, he united its various elements and steered its course, establishing for the first time the policy of Filipino collaboration with America. He led us then through a crucial period in our history, to emerge triumphant in the test that resulted in the recognition, through the Jones Act, of our capacity for self-government and freedom. He is leading us today, as President in exile, through darker days of travail, and the crowning service of this patient and self-effacing statesman will be to establish, after victory has been achieved, the Philippine Republic.

The Jones Act, approved on August 29, 1916, placed the legislative power in Filipino hands. It provided for the creation of the Philippine Senate, to be elected by the people and to be composed entirely of Filipinos. It gave the first glimpse of democracy to the benighted Far East at our back, to millions of enslaved Asiatics. The American name of Jones carried to the Far East America's words that had hammered the year 1776 into history—independence and equality. It was a vested interest in the future that must assure economic and spiritual decency for all men.

I would like to call attention to the fact that on exactly that same date 6 years before, on August 29, 1910, Japan, against the will of the Koreans, formally annexed the ancient Kingdom of Korea and ended its independent existence of 4,200 years.

What curious coincidence could better show the contrast in ideology between the United States and Japan. These two historical incidents reveal why Japan and America are now at war. With the annexation of Korea, Japan started on its bloodstained march of conquest that was to culminate in the sneak attack on Pearl Harbor, while America, with the Jones Act, set a course of freedom and democracy for all peoples.

The Jones Act was our victory. You let us win it upon this floor. It was a pledge made, and America has kept that pledge. In 1934 the Tydings-McDuffie Act set the independence date—for July 4, 1946. Recently, Congress passed Senate Joint Resolution 93, advancing the date of independence as soon as the Japanese invader is driven from Philippine soil and constitutional processes are restored in the Philippines.

We Filipinos, too, kept the pledge. You gave us the Jones Act. We gave you Bataan. For Bataan and Corregidor were dividends paid back out of our loyalty and our faith in America. On this day, 28 years ago, we of the Philippines were promised a place beside our fellow Americans as men equal and free. We earned that position in 1941, when we offered our lives beside Americans, in the blackest hour America has known.

Bataan, where Filipinos fought under the American flag to preserve democracy, was the ultimate outpost of freedom in the Far East.

Half the world lies between the foxholes of Bataan and the floor of Congress, and yet I cannot feel myself a stranger among the representatives of a people for whose flag and ideals my countrymen did not hesitate to fight and die. I speak for them, a nation of prisoners, their tongues stopped with fear or with death, because they cast their lot with Americans, against their "fellow Orientals" the Japanese.

I speak for them proudly, 17,000,000 of them, with new hope, for at last we see the way clear back to the Philippines, and we dare speak of victory.

We know now there will be victory, and palms such as are laid on the graves of Arlington will be placed on the nameless dust of Bataan. On that bloodstained Philippine peninsula Americans and Filipinos must meet over a common grave where lie the bodies of their sons. We will remember then, after victory, how we valued them, those American and Filipino boys who died together for democracy. In our eyes they were beautiful, they were the hope of our lives, and our hearts will break again over their shared dust.

We will meet, my fellow Americans, over that common grave.

Out of that grave, a dream.

Others have died for that dream of world recognition of the ordinary civilities and the divine rights of man.

A Jew named Jesus carried that dream, via Golgotha, to a hill that is known as Calvary.

An American, Abraham Lincoln, carried that dream from a log cabin to the White House. He was assassinated, here in Washington.

The Filipino Manuel L. Quezon died for that dream, after taking his last stand for democracy in the tunnel on Corregidor.

And a boy named José, from Manila, and another boy named Joe, from Missouri, died for the same dream on Bataan, and their commingled dust is holy earth.

How can we sift that dust by race for separate honor! Both were young. Both loved life. But they hated autocracy more than they loved living, and they share one grave on Bataan.

Out of that grave, a dream. As Edgar Lee Masters said: "Bloom forever, O Republic, from the dust of thy bosom."

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, the pending resolution makes in order the consideration of the bill, S. 2051, commonly known as the George bill, amending the Social Security Act. It is an open rule. It is the kind of rule which the Committee on Ways and Means wanted. They wanted it in order to make possible the consideration of all amendments germane to the bill. Mr. Speaker a review of the effort to obtain legislation on this subject must impress one with the thought that when the Committee on Ways and Means wrote this bill they did so with their eyes on the flag. It reveals a realistic understanding of the problems that confront the country. Mr. Speaker, the disposition of members seems to be to hurry on to the consideration of the bill. It is thought that we might close general debate during the day. I know of no opposition to the rule and see no reason why the full time on the rule should be consumed. However, the gentleman from New York will use his time as he sees fit.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I desire to take this opportunity to commend the Commissioner from the Philippines, Colonel ROMULO, for his highly patriotic and interesting address before the House. It came directly from his heart and from information which he had first hand, and which was not available to anyone else in the country. I hope he will speak often before this House and furnish us with first-hand information about the conditions in the Philippines. Mr. Speaker, this is the last phase of the major post-war policy-planning measures. Some 6 months ago the House determined to appoint a Post-war Economic Policy and Planning Committee to deal with these tremendously vital and all-important problems that will confront this country after the war is ended, to try to keep our people employed at a high standard of wages and living; the most far reaching and the most important economic and industrial issue that has possibly ever confronted our country.

What we say here is of little significance. What we do here is vital to the destiny of the greatest Nation in the history of the world. We are still a young country and our destiny lies before us. We know we are on the march to victory, that there is nothing that can stop us from all-out victory in Europe and in Asia. We are in the process now of winning that war. We have made the contributions and the effort, and our soldiers on the battlefields and our pilots in the air and our ships upon the seas are now winning the war. Every day we become stronger and stronger as our enemies get weaker and weaker. I do not know whether we will have an all-out and final victory within 30 days in Europe or 90 days or possibly even 6 months, but I think we are all agreed, Republicans and Democrats, that we will win the war in Europe in the very near future and win it in the far Pacific in another year. So that part of our great war effort in which we are all united is to that extent settled as we march on to victory.

The second great problem which confronts America is the winning of the peace. That is far more difficult, and until we know the peace aims and the war aims of Soviet Russia and the British Empire we are in no position to make any commitments for the United States of America. We are united in favor of a just and lasting and enduring peace, a peace that will not only last for 20 or 25 years, but a peace that will last for generations, and, let us hope, even for 100 years. But to be a lasting peace, it must be a just peace. That also, I hope, is in the process of being solved.

We now come to possibly the most difficult of all the problems confronting America. The Congress has done its duty

and done it well, regardless of partisanship. We have passed and enacted into law the first phase—that providing for the termination of contracts. That is the law of the land at the present time. We have passed in both Houses a bill to dispose of surplus war property and plants, and that bill is now in conference between both Houses. This is the final major phase, and the third part of our greatest and most difficult problem.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MURDOCK. I want to confirm what the gentleman has said about the splendid work which the Congress has done. I feel that the Committee on Post-war Economic Policy and Planning, of which the gentleman is a member, has been instrumental in that work. I understood the gentleman to say earlier in his remarks that this was the final phase of these great problems.

Mr. FISH. That is, for this session of Congress.

Mr. MURDOCK. That is, for this session of Congress. I am glad to get that modification of the gentleman's statement.

Mr. FISH. I am glad that the gentleman corrected me. We have many subcommittees still working on post-war problems. There are subcommittees on public works and agriculture and mining and so forth of the Special House Committee on Post-war Economic Policy and Planning. But for this session of Congress we are now in the final stages on the pending bill, which I will not discuss because that is the prerogative of the Committee on Ways and Means. But I do want to discuss the general proposition of what we are trying to do and impress upon both sides the importance of this legislation as it affects the destiny of America, the richest and freest Nation in the world and the country that has the highest standard of living of any nation in 5,000 years of civilization.

I take this occasion to commend Mr. Bernard M. Baruch and Mr. John Hancock, the originators of much of this legislation, for their admirable and constructive report to the Congress. Naturally I am proud of being the ranking minority member of the Post-war Economic Policy and Planning Committee so ably headed by the gentleman from Mississippi, Representative WILLIAM M. COLMER, which has formulated and recommended most of the post-war legislation. Mr. Marion B. Folsom, the director of the staff and treasurer of the Eastman Kodak Co., deserves a great deal of the credit for his untiring, unselfish, and able contribution in the shaping of the legislation and in writing the reports.

Mr. Speaker, it is of great importance what we do here, that we use our best efforts to preserve our American institutions and free American enterprise, expanding it so as to take care of some 20,000,000 wage earners, 11,000,000 who will come back from our armed forces and another 11,000,000 who will be demobilized from the war factories. We are attempting here by legislation to establish the ground work and set the foundation to expand free American enterprise so that it will take care of 20,000,000 people in time of peace, who are now being employed in our war effort. If we fail, if the Congress fails, if free enterprise fails, then we are apt to have chaotic conditions in this country. We may even lose our American institutions. We are apt to have free enterprise undermined and destroyed, and it might mean the advent of some form of totalitarianism or communism in America. That is why it is so important in legislating here today that we legislate wisely and constructively and make it possible for us to preserve free American enterprise.

Mr. Speaker, I am naturally an optimist. I do not know how to sell America short. I believe we can solve this tremendous, this gigantic problem and provide employment for American citizens; but to do so I think we ought to face the facts; and not live in a fool's paradise by holding out promises that the Congress can assure employment by itself. Therefore, I am going to talk generally and not specifically on the pending bill and present a few figures. I do so in the spirit of one who believes these problems can be solved and will be solved, and that our free institutions will and must be preserved.

For instance, our national income today is $157,000,000,000 per annum. There are those in this House who believe, and I hope they have some foundation for that belief, that after this war our income will continue to be around $130,000,000,000. If that is so, if we in Congress and with the help of business and the administration, can assure that, our post-war problems are solved. But I know of no assurance that our national income will be $130,000,000,000 after this war is over. We never reached that amount in the history of America. Back in 1929, in the boom days, our national income reached a maximum of $90,000,000,000.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 additional minutes.

In 1938 and 1939, just before World War No. 2, our national income was only $67,000,000,000. Now people speak glibly and almost with assurance, that we are about to guarantee a national income of $130,000,000,000 or twice the pre-war figure. There are some facts that I want to present to the Congress, because I do not want the Post-war Economic Policy and Planning Committee, which has given 6 months of its time trying to solve these vital post-war problems and to at least write out a program that will encourage free American enterprise to provide large-scale employment, to be blamed in the future. I do not want to go on record and have anybody think that our committee is guaranteeing an income of $130,000,000,000 a year after this war.

According to testimony presented before the Post-war Economic Policy and Planning Committee, we have the equivalent of 5,800,000 people receiving overtime wages. You take away those overtime wages in war industry, and you lose the equivalent of 5,800,000 individuals employed.

We have 5,200,000 old men, youngsters, and extra women who are not employed normally, who are today working in war industries and receiving big pay. Those people will probably all lose their jobs. In addition to that you have 11,000,000 returning soldiers—a huge and gigantic problem of demobilization to be solved; and converting from war to peace time production. Therefore, the facts must be presented to the American people. The American people are entitled to know the facts, and so is Congress before we finish with the major post-war legislation.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield for a question.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I think it would be well for the gentleman to put into these figures right here our total working force of 51,000,000 people, made up of 34,000,000 males and 17,000,000 females.

Mr. FISH. The figures that have been given to us, as to the number of wage earners at the present date, is 64,000,000. That includes 11,000,000 in our armed forces. Sixty-four million people. The most we ever employed before the war was 48,000,000.

It is difficult for me to see how we can jump right ahead after this gigantic war, with its huge expenditures and enormous national debt, up above the maximum peacetime peak of 48,000,000. We now have 64,000,000 employed in the midst of the war. I do not want to hold out any false promises to the American people or have the Congress hold out any false promises that we can do certain things overnight, and put 64,000,000 people to work and keep them at work, or establish a national annual income of $130,000,000,000. If we do that and we fail, then we will be blamed and the Congress will be blamed for making promises it could not fulfill.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield.

Mr. SHORT. Does not the gentleman think it is wise to remind the American people that they themselves are the government, and that the government can never give the people anything that it does not take away from them?

Mr. FISH. Yes; the gentleman is quite correct. You might as well remind the people in advance, who are receiving these enormous war wages and overtime, that after the war is over that will all disappear and we go back to normal American standards of wages and living, which are the highest of any country in the history of the world. That we hope to continue.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York has again expired.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 2 minutes out of order.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I feel I have been somewhat slighted by the Political Action Committee of the C. I. O. I read in the newspapers that my opponent, a certain Mr. Bennett, now candidate for Congress on the Democratic ticket where

he was unopposed, who was also my opponent in the recent Republican primary, was only given $2,000 by the Political Action Committee, whereas the opponent of my distinguished friend from Georgia [Mr. Cox] received $4,500. I feel somewhat slighted. The gentleman from New York, Mr. Clayton Powell, seeking the nomination for Congress from the Harlem district, received $5,000 from the Political Action Committee. I think I have a right to feel somewhat slighted in that my opponent only received $2,000. But I want to serve notice upon all these people from the outside who desire to contribute to my opponent, or who are opposed to me and want to send money into my district, that it is very acceptable.

We do not object if the P. A. C. wants to send instead of $2,000, $200,000 into my district; we will welcome it. My people can take care of it very well. I consider myself a benefactor to the district. Two years ago they spent $250,000 in my district in an attempt to defeat me. They can spend more as far as I am concerned this year and I will win anyhow. By attracting these slush funds into the district I become a benefactor to the newspapers, the radio, the printers, the addressers, the post office, and the people generally in my district.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 more minute.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield.

Mr. SHORT. If you have any of that lettuce left over send it down to the Ozarks.

Mr. FISH. No; you will have to attract your own lettuce. In my district our people are quite accustomed to these radical and communistic slush funds and I am getting the credit for being a big benefactor by attracting these campaign funds into the district.

But I want to say to the P. A. C., to the Communists, to the American Labor Party, or to any other group outside of my district that the people in my district, Republicans and Democrats, are not for sale. The real issue of my district is communism versus Americanism.

The national weekly newspaper Labor stated a few weeks ago:

> The Reds made their most spectacular drive against FISH. He has a good labor record and was subjected to vicious smearing attacks. The Communist element which dominates the C. I. O. political activities led the drive against FISH.

This is the statement of one of the largest and most important labor papers.

I believe it is true that I am loved for the enemies I have made—the Communists, the pinks, the P. A. C., the left-wingers, crackpot radicals, the Daily Worker, PM, both the New York Post and Washington Post, Drew Pearson and Walter Winchell. I have always stood for a square deal for labor and for social and industrial justice within the confines of the Constitution. I expect a big vote from wage earners, including the American Federation of Labor, the railroad brotherhoods, and the rank and file of the C. I. O.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York has again expired.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER].

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate the members of the Rules Committee for bringing in a liberal rule which will permit all amendments of a liberal character. I heard with interest what my dear friend, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Cox], said about the members of the Ways and Means Committee keeping their eye on the flag. I wish to add when they took the George bill and watered it almost to the vanishing point as far as real relief was concerned, they may have kept their eye on the flag. They may have kept their eye on the flag, I am quite sure they did that, but they also kept their eye on property rights, and I say with all humility that they should have focused some attention upon human rights.

We Members of Congress have a great responsibility to work out a meaningful reconversion. To give any approval to the George bill watered as it came out of the Ways and Means Committee, I say humbly, would be to abdicate our responsibility to the American people. We ask for wool and we get shoddy from the Ways and Means Committee; we ask for a realistic approach to reconversion and all the Ways and Means Committee does is to lead us and the American people up a blind alley. We ask for something genuine and we get ersatz.

An opportunity will be presented I hope to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL] to offer as a substitute to the Ways and Means Committee version of the George bill, H. R. 5227, which indeed highlights the rights of the toiling millions in this country. That substitute bill, incidentally, has the undivided support of the American Federation of Labor, the C. I. O., and the railroad brotherhoods, and I urgently ask the Members of this House to pay strict attention to the substitute and to be advised that what few crumbs of comfort were left in the George bill were swept aside unfortunately by the Ways and Means Committee. This Dingell substitute is a temporary measure, it is not permanent legislation. It seeks to emphasize and highlight the need for the creation of jobs, the creation of at least 10 to 11 million more jobs for the returning veterans as well as additional jobs for those suffering cut-backs and contract termination. Its object is to keep up purchasing power.

Yesterday, the Republicans caucused in support of the Ways and Means Committee's version of the George reconversion bill. Under the false banner of States' rights, Congress is asked to accept a gold brick.

The blame for this less than half-hearted attempt to create jobs for returning veterans and civilians suffering cut-back and war contract terminations, this less than half-hearted approach to continuing the purchasing power of the Nation by giving compensation allowances in the case of unemployment must be laid at the door of the Republican Party and the Democratic bourbons of the House.

Liberals in and out of the House must be aroused to the end that appropriate amendments can successfully be made to this bill so as to make the George bill, as diluted by the Ways and Means Committee, a constructive measure of real relief.

The Ways and Means Committee even went so far as to strike from the George bill the very objectives of the act which were to "facilitate maximum war production during the war and to expedite the transition from war to peace, to achieve full employment, rising standards of living, and effective utilization of the Nation's resources during the period of transition from war to peace and thereafter to provide for the development of unified plans and projects and adequate machinery to achieve the foregoing objectives."

By striking out this language it is clearly shown that the Ways and Means Committee version of the bill is a negation of these objectives.

DIRECTOR OF MOBILIZATION AND RECONVERSION

The Director of War Mobilization and Reconversion is presented in this new version of the bill as a mere figment of the imagination. He has no power of any consequence. There is no unification, so that all the war agencies will be sprawling all over the lot in all directions. The War Manpower Commission, the Social Security group, the Smaller War Plants Corporation, the War Production Board, the Office of Price Administration, the Foreign Economic Administration, the Defense Plant Corporation, and all the other war agencies are permitted to issue their directives independent of the Office of War Mobilization and Reconversion. There is no centralization of authority. There is no opportunity granted to the Director to remove bottlenecks. If he acts at all, it will be only to contribute to the confusion.

It is essential to get an amendment giving strongest powers to this Director with the right to cancel out directives issued by any of the war agencies that impede the carrying out of the objectives aforesaid and which objectives were stricken out by the Ways and Means Committee. It avails us naught to put in as Director a man with guts and courage when we give him a paper sword. All he can do is to tilt at windmills.

UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION FOR FEDERAL EMPLOYEES

The bill presented by the Ways and Means Committee leaves untouched compensation benefits to the vast army of Federal employees. You have the very anomalous situation where a group of men working at the same Federal desk receiving the same Federal salary will be accorded, after dismissal, compensation in accordance with 48 different laws of 48 different States.

Senator GEORGE, of Georgia, stated in the Senate that 40 percent of Federal employees will be unemployed following the termination of hostilities. These

LAW LIBRARY FEDERAL WORKS AGENCY

will include carpenters, riveters, welders, toolmakers, and so forth, presently at work in our navy yards, arsenals, armories, and in other federally owned plants. There are about 3,500,000 Federal employees. Forty percent of same means over 1,400,000 will with war's cessation lose jobs.

UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION FOR MERCHANT SEAMEN

Merchant seamen who have had their ships torpedoed from under them many times will not be given a vestige of relief as far as compensation allowance is concerned by the new bill.

TRANSPORTATION FOR MIGRATORY WORKERS

The George bill contained a provision granting $200 to migratory workers for transportation costs for their families and themselves from the place of employment to home. This is out the window.

NATIONAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

The new version of the bill cancels out the setting up of an advisory committee consisting of representatives of labor, industry, agriculture, and the public. Why the Ways and Means Committee is afraid of good, sound advice from representative national groups is quite beyond comprehension.

DURATION OF THE ACT

The Ways and Means Committee version provides for benefits that can be placed in a tiny capsule, and to rub more salt into the wounds, the duration of payments is to be for 1 year. The George bill provides for a 2-year duration for benefit payments. It took us more than 2 years for mobilization. It should take 2 years for demobilization. The job will be more difficult. Remember, we must create 10,000,000 more jobs for veterans. That task is herculean, but the Ways and Means Committee would give us a Lilliputian to do a man-sized job.

UNITED STATES UNEMPLOYMENT SERVICE

Over and beyond the George bill, it is quite discernible for him who wishes to see that the United States Employment Service must be continued as a national operating system of public employment offices for a period of 2 years after the termination of hostilities. The George bill and the Ways and Means Committee bill provide for 48 separate State employment systems and additional separate employment systems for the Territories—52 in all.

UNEMPLOYMENT BENEFITS

Both the George bill and the Ways and Means Committee version maintain the status quo, leaving the benefit rates to the various States. This, of course, is under the worn-out shibboleth of "States' rights."

The advocates of States' rights profane those rights as often as not. They are the enemies, not the friends of States' rights. They mean to uphold the strong as against the weak and to maintain the status quo as against progress.

There should be a uniform system of compensation benefits. The national maximum of unemployment benefits would be $25 a week for civilians with three dependents and $8 a week minimum. Alabama at present provides a minimum of $2 a week and several of the other States $3 a week. The present maximum range is from $15 a week to $22 a week—Connecticut. Under the present conditions which will be frozen by the bill as presented to the House, liberal States will be penalized. Migratory workers will refuse to go back to the States of their origin or residence if the State in which they are employed presently offers more liberal benefits. Why should a man go back to Alabama, Mississippi, or Louisiana, or any other State where compensation benefits are lower than in the State in which he is temporarily employed?

VETERANS' BENEFITS

Veterans are entitled to greater benefits than are civilian war workers. They have gone through the harrowing experience of battle. They have been separated from home and deprived of opportunity for economic advancement. The G. I. bill of rights must be amended to increase veterans' benefits from the $20 a week to a maximum of $35 a week for a veteran with three dependents. The bill as presented does not offer such additional compensation to veterans.

DURATION OF BENEFITS

There should be a duration of benefits for 52 weeks within a period of 2 years. Under the present scheme the duration of benefit payments is left entirely to the various State laws. Twenty-eight States limit the duration of benefits to 16 weeks or less.

THE COST

We hear much loose talk about the cost of a reconversion bill of the type which I advocate. We hear much loose talk about the present debt of $210,000,000,000, but the Republicans of the House and ultraconservatives fail to indicate that that is the gross debt. There must be subtracted the following:

First. Twenty billion dollars of cash on hand which is deposited in banks and which is owned by the Treasury.

Second. Seventy-five billion dollars' worth of war plants, equipment, and supplies.

Third. Thirty billion dollars in assets owned by Government corporations and credit Government agencies. These are no mere intra-agency bookkeeping entries. They are real assets.

This leaves a temporary national debt of $85,000,000,000.

In addition, there must be considered the reserves which the Government has for claims of corporations for return of excess-profits tax in the sum of $28,000,000,000. In all likelihood only one-half of this reserve will be drawn upon, leaving a possible ten to fourteen billion dollars more to subtract from the gross debt. There are, in addition, some $5,000,000,000 of surplus in the social-security fund for unemployment-compensation purposes. By the end of the war the surplus will be $7,000,000,000. This does not belong to the Government. This, in part, belongs to the workers and those who have contributed to unemployment compensation.

The cost of the scheme I have outlined cannot be adequately envisaged. Nobody knows the number of unemployed we will have. In the Senate debate, Senators forecast a cost that ran from five to ten billions, but it must be remembered that we are not going to fall into the doldrums immediately after the war. The demand for civilian goods here and abroad will be tremendous. I cannot conceive of the cost of unemployed reaching the proportions of ten billions. That is ridiculous.

Be it remembered if we do not pay unemployment benefits, the States will have to give relief allotments. The taxpayer will pay the cost in the end. Furthermore, this period of relief is only temporary. It is for the duration of only 2 years.

But over and beyond all this, we must prepare for a minimum of unemployment. New jobs cannot be created unless we have purchasing power. Unemployment-compensation benefits, in a measure, upholds that purchasing power. Our purchasing power and industries mean about a present national income of $150,000,000,000, with 11,000,000 of our best men in the armed forces. A higher figure than $150,000,000,000 of purchasing power and production must be developed.

Throughout the Ways and Means Committee version of the George bill we find high-lighted property rights. Human rights are blacked out. The rights of working men and women were least considered.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL].

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, supplementing what my colleague the gentleman from New York said with regard to offering a substitute for the so-called George bill, I wish to say for the benefit of the membership that other desirable amendments will be offered on the floor with regard to unemployment compensation and various other important matters in which the membership of the House on both sides is interested. I merely offer that suggestion so that Members may know what to anticipate.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WOLVERTON], a very able member of the Committee on Post-war Economic Policy and Planning.

Mr. WOLVERTON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, in the first place I want to express appreciation to the Rules Committee on behalf of those who are opposed to the bill as reported by the Ways and Means Committee in that the Rules Committee has granted an open rule that makes it possible for those who are not in accord with the Ways and Means Committee bill to bring before this House a bill which they think will more readily and effectively solve the problems with which we are faced.

Mr. Speaker, there are two major tasks which face us on the home front at the present time. One is the need for providing more tanks, trucks, guns, tires, and ships to enable our armed forces to deal the final, crushing blow in the great war of liberation now proceeding so well in Europe and the Pacific. The other task

is one for which we must prepare with all the wisdom and ingenuity at our command so that we may not have to suffer the scourge of unemployment which ravaged our Nation in the decade prior to the war. I speak of the task of the reconversion of our great industrial establishments from the production of war materials to the production of civilian goods.

Mr. Speaker, this war has proven that American skill and ingenuity can bring about full production and full utilization of our natural resources so that every person who wishes to work can find employment. Our great national patriotic effort has lifted the income level to the highest point in our history as a nation. Unemployment for those able and willing to work is practically nonexistent. Our present labor forces, according to the figures furnished by the Post-war Economic and Policy Planning Committee, on which I have the honor to serve, amount to 63,000,000 persons. In 1940 the total labor force was 54,000,000, of whom 46,000,000 were employed and 8,000,000 unemployed.

Although most of the temporary workers will return to their homes, retire, or those of school age will go back to school after the war, we will need to provide from 8,000,000 to 10,000,000 more jobs than the peacetime year of 1940, or an increase of 20 percent. As we said in our report submitted to your honorable body on August 14, "The failure to develop and apply an effective program would mean large-scale unemployment."

The paramount duty before the Congress at this time is to enact legislation which will enable all of us, industry, labor, agriculture, and Government to plan together in such a way as to guarantee full production and employment for many years to come. The American people know that we have been able to achieve full employment in order to prepare for war. They have every right to expect that we can be equally successful in achieving full production and employment in peace time.

The needs of the American people are tremendous—housing, electrical appliances, furniture, shoes, clothing, new roads, bridges, and other things too numerous to mention must be made available. I know that if we plan intelligently there need be only the barest minimum unemployment during the transition from wartime production to peacetime production.

We must, however, make realistic provision for those workers who will necessarily be idle while their plants are being converted from production of war materials to the production of civilian goods. Purchasing power is the key to full production and employment and a high level of national income. Without adequate interim unemployment benefits the workers' purchasing power declines and those industries producing for their needs must therefore decline also. Only a uniform, Federal standard of interim unemployment benefits can guarantee the maintenance of consumer purchasing power sufficient to keep the wheels of industry turning. This great national necessity—the maintenance of purchasing power in the reconversion period—can only be met by action on a national scale.

I must emphatically disagree with the Ways and Means Committee in their evident contention that we can leave the tremendous problem of war mobilization and reconversion to chance and that we must not do everything within our power to prevent a major depression.

I join in the opinion of the dissenting members of the Ways and Means Committee in their statement that—

> The modest objectives of the bill as presented by the Senate have been so further curtailed, reduced, and emasculated that section 101 of the bill, stating the objectives of the Congress, is eliminated by the committee. In other words, the bill has no objectives that are even worth mentioning.

Let me cite here the objectives of the bill in the form in which it passed the Senate:

> (a) To facilitate maximum war production during the war and to expedite the transition from war to peace;
>
> (b) To achieve full employment, rising standards of living, and effective utilization of the Nation's resources during the period of transition from war to peace, and thereafter; and
>
> (c) To provide for the development of unified plans and projects and adequate machinery to achieve the foregoing objectives.

The failure to even mention these objectives in the bill as reported by the Ways and Means Committee indicates that the majority of the committee does not have any faith in America's ability to accomplish these ends. Furthermore, the amendments which strip the Office of War Mobilization of its essential authority to plan and coordinate the work of existing Federal agencies make the Office of War Mobilization nothing but a hollow shell. There is no purpose in setting up such an Office unless it is given full and complete authority to coordinate effectively the activities of the agencies of government handling the problems arising out of the transition from war to peace.

Mr. Speaker, I urge that the bill as reported by the majority of the Ways and Means Committee be amended so that the objectives of the act are once again set forth and the Congress thereby let the American people know that it is not afraid to plan for jobs and full production.

I further urge that the other provisions contained in the so-called Dingell bill—H. R. 5227—which will be offered as a substitute, be adopted. The Dingell bill takes into consideration the human element as well as the economic. Without adequate interim compensation to the unemployed in the transition period we will have distress and our economic structure will be imperiled. We must not let such a condition overtake us. The Dingell bill has been carefully drawn. It has the support of the A. F. of L., C. I. O., and all the railroad brotherhoods.

It deserves the support of the membership of this House.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. BLOOM].

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include two separate statements, one from Mr. Stettinius and the other from the State Department.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of the time on this side to the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. KNUTSON], the next chairman of the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, may I say to my distinguished colleague that the future is in the lap of the gods and much depends upon the intelligence of the American people.

Mr. Speaker, I just do not like the assaults that have been made by the two preceding speakers upon the Ways and Means Committee. Of course, I can appreciate that both of the speakers come from districts that are overwhelmingly labor, but that does not justify their making unfair attacks upon our committee.

Mr. Speaker, your committee has given this subject careful study. Much has been said of the measure that came over here from the Senate which was a compromise with a measure that had been prepared by a man named Schimmel, a C. I. O. representative. A compromise is rarely good or satisfactory, so the Committee on Ways and Means proceeded to further perfect the legislation and, in my opinion, we have succeeded in doing so.

I do not see how anyone can oppose this measure if he votes according to his judgment and the dictates of his conscience.

Mr. Speaker, the time has come to cure those who are afflicted with that very serious malady known as the gimmies. That this bill proposes to do. There is not a State in the Union but that is better fixed financially than is the Federal Government, which is hovering on the verge of bankruptcy; yet, regardless of the grave condition of the Federal Treasury, there are those on the floor of this House who would pile even greater burdens, I may say crushing burdens, upon our taxpayers. I cannot understand that unless it is inspired by political expediency. Political expediency—how many crimes are committed in thy name?

This bill is not perfect but it is a good measure. We propose in this bill to not duplicate existing law. There is not a State in the Union but that has machinery for rehabilitating and retraining those now engaged in war work. The time has come to cut out duplication instead of adding to it. I hope there will not be a single vote on the floor of this House against the pending rule.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (S. 2051) to amend the

Social Security Act, as amended, to provide a national program for war mobilization and reconversion, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill S. 2051, with Mr. LANHAM in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 15 minutes and ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Chairman, if the Members will permit, I prefer to complete my main statement without interruption. However, I will not decline to yield if some Member desires to ask a question.

The Committee on Ways and Means spent the past 2 weeks in intensive study of reconversion legislation. I take this opportunity of expressing my appreciation and thanks to both the majority and minority members of that committee for the splendid cooperation the chairman has had in the preparation of this bill. There has not been the slightest evidence of politics in the preparation of this legislation. I trust that the Members have read the committee report, as it is rather elaborate and explains fully the provisions of the bill. If you have done so, I believe that you will feel that the committee has at least made an honest, earnest, and diligent effort to prepare the best legislation possible at this time, under existing circumstances, for the consideration of the House.

I shall not engage in, and neither shall I reply to the biting criticism that has been made in some of the statements indulged in today with respect to the work of the membership of our committee. You would think, from some of the statements that have been made, that those who made the statements enjoy or possess a monopoly on wisdom, knowledge, and understanding.

Mr. KNUTSON. And friendship for labor.

Mr. DOUGHTON. n a good cause it is never necessary to indulge in severe criticism of those who take an opposite view of the matter that is to be considered and determined. We spent 2 weeks in intensive study of this subject and in the preparation of this bill. The subject is one that is not easy of solution. Naturally there have been differences of opinion. So far as I know, there is no minority report, but there are some dissenting views which I will perhaps briefly refer to later. But the bill reported by the majority of the committee represents the best efforts of the membership of that committee, especially in view of the limitation under which we were working. In other words, this bill now represents what the committee itself felt could properly, wisely, and safely be done at this time. I see no need of rushed, hasty, and ill-considered legislation. In my judgment, to proceed on that basis, might cause more trouble than we would cure. So I see no cause for the criticism that has been made. In the dissenting views complaint is made that hearings were not granted. I received no requests for public hearings from any member of the committee. Certainly no motion was made for public hearings.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOUGHTON. I yield.

Mr. EBERHARTER. The gentleman will remember that in executive session held by the committee a motion was made to call a witness and the motion was voted down.

Mr. DOUGHTON. I asked the clerk if any such motion was made. The minutes do not disclose a motion to have public hearings, and I personally have no recollection of such a motion.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOUGHTON. I yield.

Mr. COOPER. I think what the gentleman from Pennsylvania refers to is the fact that a motion was made to call one man before the committee in executive session, but I think the chairman is correct that there was no motion made for public hearings.

Mr. REED of New York. That is my understanding of it, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. DOUGHTON. I think the RECORD should show that, and I think my distinguished friend from Pennsylvania is in error. The fact is, no member of the committee ever requested it, so far as I know. Does the gentleman state that a motion was made to conduct public hearings and that it was voted down?

Mr. EBERHARTER. The motion was not put in exactly that form, I will say to the gentleman.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Did the gentleman from Pennsylvania make a motion to conduct public hearings?

Mr. EBERHARTER. I have already said, Mr. Chairman, that a motion was made to call a witness. Of course, no motion was made to hold extensive hearings; I agree with the gentleman.

Mr. DOUGHTON. No motion was made for public hearings.

Mr. EBERHARTER. The point I wish to make is this: If a motion to call a particularly important witness could not even prevail, what chance would there be for a motion for extensive public hearings? That is my point.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOUGHTON. I yield.

Mr. KNUTSON. I was not present when the committee began consideration of the bill, but I was given a full report of what had transpired prior to my arrival. The fact of the matter is that the gentleman moved to hear Mr. Byrnes, and Mr. Byrnes was heard. He also moved to hear Director Hines, but Director Hines could not come and wrote a letter in place of a personal appearance.

Mr. DOUGHTON. The gentleman from Pennsylvania well knows that there was no disposition on the part of the committee to prevent public hearings if the majority of the committee thought it was necessary. I repeat, so far as I know, no motion was made to that effect.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Will the gentleman yield further in order that I may make a correction insofar as the statement of the gentleman from Minnesota is concerned?

Mr. DOUGHTON. I yield.

Mr. EBERHARTER. In answer to the gentleman from Minnesota I will say that I did not make any motion with respect to calling either Justice Byrnes or General Hines. I want the RECORD corrected in that respect.

Mr. KNUTSON. I have since learned that that is true, but the motion was made by one of the gentleman's group.

Mr. EBERHARTER. I do not think that is correct, if the gentleman will permit me, because there was no formal motion made to that effect, and I think the chairman of the committee will bear me out in that respect.

Mr. KNUTSON. Then the gentleman has no leg to stand on if no motion was made to that effect.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Chairman, this bill represents what the committee felt could properly, wisely, and safely be done at this time. It should not be considered that this action of the committee closes the door for possible future consideration in the light of later information, events, and conditions.

In that connection I will say that it was the opinion of the committee that public hearings were not feasible, in view of the desire of the House to bring this bill to the floor after the passage of the surplus property bill.

What opportunity did the committee have to get information? What information did it have in the preparation of this bill? The opponents of the bill would make you believe that we proceeded blindly, without any basis for our considerations or the conclusions we reached. You will recall also that both the House and Senate Post-war Planning Committees held extensive hearings covering the general subject, and copies of the hearings were available for consultation. In addition, the committee carefully considered the report of the House Post-war Planning Committee on the Office of War Mobilization and Reconversion, as well as the reports of the Senate Finance Committee and the Senate Post-war Planning Committee on Changes in the Unemployment Compensation System. The committee also conferred with Justice Byrnes, the Director of the Office of War Mobilization, and had the benefit of discussing with him his experience thus far and receiving such recommendations as he cared to make.

The need for coordination of governmental activities in the field of reconversion is emphasized by the rapid progress of the war in Europe and the problems that have already arisen in the recent cut-backs in war production. I am sure that the Members are fully aware of the situation, and I will not now take the time of the Committee to go into details which are fully covered in

the splendid report of the House Post-war Planning Committee. We had access to and studied that report as a basis for our action.

The bill as reported by the Committee on Ways and Means contains five titles. Titles I and II follow rather closely recommendations of the House Post-war Planning Committee.

Title I establishes the Office of War Mobilization and Reconversion, which will supersede the Office of War Mobilization created by Executive order in 1943. In other words, it provides by statute that the things which have been done by the Director of War Mobilization under Executive order can now be done by law. The Office of Contract Settlement and the Surplus Property Administration are placed within the Office of War Mobilization and Reconversion.

It is provided that the Director of the Office of War Mobilization and Reconversion shall be charged with formulation of over-all policies necessary to bring about the transition from war to peace, but not with the actual operations of the agencies. The bill also provides that the Director shall—

First. Coordinate activities of other executive agencies relating to problems of the transition period.

Second. Recommend legislation to Congress to carry out plans.

Third. Promote and assist the development of reconversion plans by other executive agencies; keep agencies informed of plans of other agencies and settle controversies that may arise between agencies.

Fourth. Cause studies to be made for him to determine the need for consolidation or elimination of emergency war agencies, and the relaxation of wartime controls and restrictions.

Fifth. Institute a specific study of agencies in the manpower field and develop plans for reorganizing and consolidating such agencies.

Sixth. Consult and cooperate with State and local governments, industry, labor, and agriculture.

Seventh. Submit quarterly progress reports to the President and Congress.

The Director is authorized to employ such personnel as may be necessary in accordance with the civil-service laws. However, the Director is expected to make use of the personnel of other executive agencies to the fullest extent, and to avoid the creation of another bureau with hundreds, if not thousands, of employees. We are trying to avoid the creation of additional bureaus that would employ hundreds and thousands of needless employees.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 additional minutes.

The present office, I am glad to say, under Director Byrnes, has only 4 employees, while at the outset it had 10.

Title II of the bill relates to general policies of industrial demobilization and reconversion.

This title provides that the contracting agencies shall terminate prime contracts for war production when no longer needed for the prosecution of the war. Contracts are not to be continued merely to provide employment, or for any other purpose, except that of prosecution of the war.

It is also provided that the curtailment and cancelation of war production shall be integrated with the expansion and resumption of production for civilian purposes. In order to achieve this integration and coordination, the contracting agencies are to make continuous surveys, and report to the Director changes and anticipated changes in war production. Executive departments responsible for manpower, production, and materials are directed to permit the resumption of civilian production whenever such production does not require labor or materials needed for the war effort. The resumption of civilian production is to be permitted regardless of whether one or more competitors in the same field are still engaged on war contracts.

The Director is required to establish policies as to selection of contracts to be curtailed or terminated, as well as policies for full and prompt consultation between executive agencies, war contractors, and representatives of labor and war contractors to bring about the most effective use of production facilities and labor released through the curtailment of war production.

The committee felt that great care should be exercised to protect the interests of smaller plants whenever civilian production is permitted on a restricted basis. Therefore, provision is made for the allocation of a fair and reasonable percentage of scarce materials to small plants.

Title III of the committee bill relates to unemployment compensation and follows closely the provisions of the Senate bill with the exception that unemployment benefits for Federal employees is omitted. It provides for loans, without interest, to State unemployment accounts in the event such accounts become seriously impaired as a result of heavy withdrawals for an extended time.

At present there are approximately five and a half billion dollars in the State unemployment funds and those funds are increasing at the rate of $1,000,000,000 per year. There is little doubt as to the adequacy of these unemployment-compensation funds, but because of dislocations caused by the war, this means was taken to guarantee the stability and security of these funds.

Title IV of the committee amendment relates to public works. This provision also follows closely the provision of the Senate bill, with the exception that loans or advances made to public agencies for plan preparation are to bear interest and are to be repaid within a period of 5 years. The Senate provided for loans, but made no provision as to the payment of interest on such loans.

Title V of the committee amendment contains miscellaneous provisions. I think it is proper to call the attention of the Committee to the termination date. The amendment provides that this act shall terminate one year after the cessation of hostilities as proclaimed by the President or, at an earlier time if both House and Senate pass resolutions declaring that the emergency no longer exists.

Now I will refer briefly to the provisions of the Senate bill which are not included in the Committee amendments.

The Senate bill provides for the establishment of a Retraining and Reemployment Administration. I call your attention to the statement in the committee report on the omission of this provision, which is full and complete. It is not my purpose to discuss this matter in detail, because other members of the Committee on Ways and Means will undoubtedly speak on this subject. However, I will say that if, through the passage of events, it should prove desirable and proper to reconsider and reappraise such a program, careful consideration should be given to the probable costs.

Now notice what I say. If events show it is necessary to reconsider this later, proper attention and consideration should be given to the probable costs and to the ways and means of raising the revenue to meet such costs. When members of our committee asked about the costs of the proposal in the Senate bill, no one was able to give an estimate. In other words, there are some who are willing to authorize the expenditure of millions, and hundreds of millions of dollars, without any estimate of how much such a program would cost or any consideration as to where the money would come from. Sometimes I think we need our former colleague the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Mr. Rich, back here. He often cried out, "Where are you going to get the money?" The Committee on Ways and Means, which has the responsibility for raising the funds to carry out the authorizations and appropriations passed by this Congress cannot, in my judgment, authorize appropriations on which estimates of costs cannot be secured.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOUGHTON. I yield to my distinguished friend, the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Did not the language of the Senate bill with reference to the transportation item, provide that if the unemployed worker decided he did not want to go home but wanted to go somewhere where he thought he could get a job, he could still draw the money?

Mr. DOUGHTON. Why, of course.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Did it not say that the money went to anyone whose services had been essential to the war effort? Did it not say that the travel allowance could be claimed by anyone who could say his services had been essential to the war effort?

Mr. DOUGHTON. Why, undoubtedly.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Could farm workers be excluded then?

Mr. DOUGHTON. No.

Mr. Chairman, it behooves Congress to exercise diligent care in the launching of new and expensive programs without at the same time making provision for the raising of revenue for that particular

purpose. With the public debt approaching $300,000,000,000, even a nation as wealthy as ours cannot continue a policy of deficit financing after the war.

The Committee on Post-war Planning did not cover the subject of training and reemployment in its recent report. It is my opinion that further consideration of this subject may very properly be deferred until that committee submits a report containing detailed recommendations.

The other major change from the Senate bill is the omission of unemployment benefits for Federal employees. The committee spent more time on this one provision than any other provision of the bill. However, because the subject has so many ramifications, the committee decided to omit this subject entirely from the bill. It appears to me that no reasonable justification for these benefits to Federal employees has been brought forward that would not have been just as forceful and applicable in 1939, when the last revision of the Social Security Act was under consideration.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 additional minutes.

It should be remembered that Federal employees generally are contributing 5 percent to the civil-service retirement fund. If they have not contributed for a period of 5 years, they may withdraw such contributions. In all likelihood they would probably receive as much from this withdrawal as they would from unemployment compensation benefits. Now I would like to ask this question: If Federal employees should be placed under the Social Security Act or be given unemployment compensation, why were they not placed there in the original Social Security Act? Why were they not included in the amendment of that act in 1939? If they belong there and should be given unemployment compensation benefits why should it be limited to one year? Why not make it a permanent law? Everyone knows that before that could be done extended hearings should be had and both sides of the question heard and the matter given careful consideration. Under the original law it was not considered practicable to include Government employees.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOUGHTON. I yield to my good friend.

Mr. WRIGHT. Does not the gentleman think that because of the fact there have been so many people placed on the Federal pay roll in connection with the war effort, who, we hope, are in the nature of temporary employees, who will lose their jobs as we get out of the war, that there is a special situation created which makes it necessary to include them now where they were not included in the law before?

Mr. DOUGHTON. Not if they can get other jobs, as I have no doubt they will be able to do.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. DOUGHTON. Yes; I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. WRIGHT. What we are considering here is a temporary measure to take care of the men who have lost their employment by reason of the curtailment of the war program.

Mr. DOUGHTON. No; not who have lost their employment, but those whom you fear may lose their employment.

Mr. WRIGHT. I accept the gentleman's correction. Due to the very great number of Federal employees that have been taken on the pay roll by reason of the prosecution of the war, I do not see that they are in any different position than employees in private industry. I feel their exclusion is discrimination, if the gentleman will excuse the criticism.

Mr. DOUGHTON. If we were to do that, does the gentleman not think we first should have an estimate of the cost and then give some consideration as to how we will raise the money?

Mr. WRIGHT. Of course, I do not happen to be a member of the committee which is so ably headed by the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Does the gentleman think we should just proceed blindly?

Mr. WRIGHT. I do not think so.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Does the gentleman think we should proceed blindly to authorize expenditures of hundreds of millions of dollars?

Mr. WRIGHT. I do not think so.

Mr. DOUGHTON. The taxpayers of this country will have to provide funds by paying additional taxes unless we further increase the public debt.

Mr. WRIGHT. If the gentleman will yield while I attempt to amplify my position, without any personal criticism.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Chairman, I do not yield for a speech, but the gentleman can say "Yes" or "No." Does the gentleman believe we should proceed that way?

Mr. WRIGHT. I believe it should have been considered by the committee before the bill was reported out.

Mr. DOUGHTON. I agree with the gentleman, and I am ready to do that at any time, but no request was made for that. When we would ask those who opposed our bill what was the estimated cost, they would shake their heads and say, "We have no idea." I think the cost, as well as means of raising the money, should be taken into consideration.

Mr. WRIGHT. I feel it should be taken into consideration.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOUGHTON. I yield.

Mr. KNUTSON. Of course, the cost is a very, very minor detail.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Chairman, I think there is a great deal of unnecessary excitement about the unemployment problem. I do not think it is as serious as many of us think.

I will read from the United States News:

> You will not be jolted by great changes at home when war ends in Europe, as it will at sometime in the weeks ahead. After that time—
>
> War with Japan will gain momentum, will take up the shock of German war end.
>
> Workers in war industry will lose jobs gradually, won't be fired en masse. There'll be an end to much overtime. Worker incomes will fall. Raises will be even harder to get. But: Unemployment will be modest until Japanese war end.
>
> The shortage in housemaids is not suddenly to disappear.
>
> Men in service will come home very gradually. Demobilization at the rate of 250,000 a month will be about like the mobilization at that rate. Draft will go on taking 17-year-olds becoming 18 but almost nobody else.

We all know that there is a crying need for additional help in almost every line of industry. The railroads are behind in their work. They need thousands of employees. Old farmers, who are taking the place of the young people who left the farms to go to war plants and into the service of their country, will need somebody to come back and take their places. There are millions of homes to be built. The people have the money and they are simply waiting because they cannot get material and labor to build their homes. Almost every home in the land needs painting. There is work to do all over the land. In my judgment, we are unduly excited about the unemployment situation at this time. I think you will all agree that it is much better to give people work, if we have unemployment, than to give them a dole. However, I hope it will not be necessary to give them work at public expense.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOUGHTON. I yield.

Mr. KNUTSON. The gentleman from North Carolina, chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, who is now addressing the House, will recall that in the spring of 1942, there was a proposal before our committee to create a fund of $300,000,000 to be used in the converting from peace to war insofar as labor was concerned. We were told what terrible, dire things would happen if we did not give them that money. We did not do it. We converted without any effort. Some of the men who signed the minority report on this measure were among the most ardent advocates of creating that $300,000,000 fund, if the chairman will recall.

Mr. DOUGHTON. We were told in most lurid terms of the consequences that would ensue if we did not do it. After we failed to pass the legislation we heard nothing more about it.

Mr. KNUTSON. Of course. It just petered out.

Mr. DINGELL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOUGHTON. I yield.

Mr. KNUTSON. If the gentleman will yield further, I think Mr. Hillman was one of the chief proponents of that plan.

Mr. DOUGHTON. The gentleman will agree that the serious results and consequences we were told would ensue apparently did not occur, inasmuch as we heard nothing further of the proposal.

Mr. DINGELL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOUGHTON. I do not think the gentleman will challenge that statement.

I know the gentlemen who took that stand were honest. But they were mistaken. We may be mistaken now.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DOUGHTON] has again expired.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED].

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, I want to compliment the distinguished chairman of the Ways and Means Committee [Mr. DOUGHTON] for the very splendid presentation of the legislative situation as it exists today.

This is a little different role, as far as post-war activities are concerned, from that with which I am familiar, speaking for our side of the House. I remember when the First World War ended. We came into power, and I came to the House at that time. I was elected in November 1918. Now, a heritage was passed on to us from that war in the form of a debt of some $26,000,000,000, which, of course, was a debt in those days, and looked upon as a debt, and as one that would have to be paid.

I also remember very vividly there were 7,000,000 men walking the streets, and there was not a large city in which a series of soup houses had not been set up to feed the hungry. That was when we came into power. The railroads were hardly able to operate. They were practically in bankruptcy. Their cars and engines were worn out. The farmers of the country were in a deplorable state. Great stock piles that had been built up in the warehouses of Europe, Australia, New Zealand, Argentina, and various other countries were poured in here just as soon as the ships were available to land the merchandise in our open ports. There was not a stream of smoke coming from any industry in this country. The supplies which should have been produced here were coming from abroad. The unemployment system at that time would not have been very beneficial, because the spirit of the people was entirely different in those days.

I remember one large automobile city in those days where its citizens believed ardently in home rule. They decided they would take care of the transition from war to peace in their own way—in the American way. What did they do? The heads of the large plants, all the merchants, all the contractors in that city, all those engaged in business enterprises, even down to professional men, got together and they said, "We will take care of this situation. We will pay the boys, even though they are not employed, to the extent of some 3,000, their wages for 90 days." The merchants and professional men and contractors said: "We will supply the people of this city with goods at cost for 90 days." Then the transition took place and a wonderful spirit of home rule resulted. That was in the days before they felt they had to run to the Federal Government for everything. Now when we came into power what did we do? Did we begin to holler about unemployment systems? We did not. We put constructive legislation on the books that gave men jobs in private enterprise, and in less than 1 year after we came into power 7,000,000 men were employed and employed at good wages. The private enterprise was permitted to function. Then we proceeded to look at that public debt of $26,000,000,000. We paid $1,000,000,000 a year each year for 10 years on that debt. Did we jump taxes? No; we reduced taxes five times in a period of 5 years until less than 2 percent of the people paid any taxes at all. For 10 years this country enjoyed the greatest prosperity this Nation has ever seen. Then we had to face a tidal wave swept in from abroad from countries that thought they could work the printing presses, that they could operate on deficit financing, the very same system that radical and racketeering elements are now proposing to meet this situation. We have got to come to the fundamental principles of thrift, production, and common sense.

Mr. Chairman, there was referred to the Ways and Means Committee the bill (S. 2051) to amend the Social Security Act, as amended, to provide a national program for war mobilization and reconversion, and for other purposes. The report of the majority and the views of the minority of the Ways and Means Committee carry a very complete statement in support of the committee action.

The Congress has realized for months the necessity of passing legislation governing the termination of war contracts and the disposal of billions of dollars' worth of war goods. To support this assertion I need only refer to the omnibus bill covering the termination of war contracts and the disposal of surplus materials, which was introduced in another body as early as February of 1944.

It has also been sought through propaganda to create the impression that there does not now exist and never has existed a sound unemployment-compensation system, State controlled. The fact is that such a system does exist and is functioning admirably and will continue to function in the post-war era unless destroyed by the proposals of a radical element which sees in this proposed legislation an opportunity to put the system under Federal control and to use it for political purposes.

There seems to be much concern on the part of the critics of the State unemployment system because of the wide discrepancy between the various States in the weekly unemployment compensation paid and the duration of such payments. The State authorities are better able to pass on this question than the Federal Government. There is a vast difference in the cost of living due to many factors which vary from State to State. Food, fuel, clothes, and housing requirements in the several States, due to different climatic conditions, cannot be ignored when fixing a just standard of unemployment compensation. That the States themselves have been liberalizing the unemployment-compensation benefits without coercion from the Federal Government indicates that the State authorities are fully aware of the increase in cost of living and are providing for it under the American system of home rule.

The proposal of those who wish to play politics with the unemployment system under a rule-and-ruin policy do not hesitate to hold out the political bait of $35 a week to those on the home front, when they know that the G. I. bill only provides for a completely unemployed soldier the sum of $20 a week. There are various gradations of pay for the unemployed soldiers, but $20 is the maximum per week for him. To establish any such discrimination as between the fighting soldier and the home-front worker ought to put to shame the authors of any such proposal.

I wish to say that those who are in earnest about preserving the State unemployment compensation system should keep in mind that disaster can be brought to the whole system by yielding to the demands of the radical element to increase the amount of the benefits and to extend them over a longer period of time than the States find it expedient and wise to do in view of their own economic conditions. There is no group that should be more cautious in this regard than the employees themselves because the experience of other countries, such as England, Germany, and Italy, has shown that there is a limit beyond which it is not wise to go.

It is of the utmost importance in considering this or any other legislation that we bear in mind that we face a national debt of $200,000,000,000, which may easily run up to $300,000,000,000 before the war is over.

It is the duty of Congress to resist any pressure group or groups, no matter how plausible their arguments for high benefits, if such action will tend to weaken or possibly destroy the present State system of unemployment compensation.

It is a system that can be put on a basis of a choice between a vacation with part pay and a job with full pay.

Germany adopted an unemployment compensation system in 1926 with benefits so high as to put a premium on idleness. It created a situation where hordes of people chose to take 10 or 12 marks a week in benefits and spend their time in idleness rather than work for 20 or 25 marks a week. It was this weakness in the German system rather than actual lack of jobs that accounted for the tremendous and disastrous rise in the cost of unemployment compensation. The cost rose from 525,000,000 marks in 1928 to over 1,000,000,000 marks in 1931. Now here is what happened to the system in Germany, according to C. A. Kulp, an authority on social insurance: The federal treasury was obliged to begin payment of special subsidies to local governments for support of the unemployed. In 1930 it gave 3,700,000 reichsmarks; in 1931, 233,800,000 reichsmarks; in 1932, the high mark of Germany's post-war financial crisis, the sum of 652,000,000 reichsmarks. Even with this aid from the federal treasury the load on the local governments was unsupportable, was a direct cause of their nearly universal bankruptcy. Hitler used his dictatorial powers to stop the drain on the treasury by the conscription of labor. Hitler later

attained full employment by means of building a war machine which our boys are now fighting. Great Britain sought to stem the drain on the unemployment compensation fund by reducing benefits, raising contributions, and applying the needs test, a course of action which ought not to be forced upon our unemployment compensation system by the unwise expansion of benefits.

We hear much about the trust funds of the States accumulating to over $5,000,000,000. Well, just remember that every dollar of this vast sum has been spent and in its place are Government bonds. It is important, too, not to forget that the national debt is now $200,000,000,000 and rapidly on the increase. This debt, whether $300,000,000,000 or $500,000,000,000, must be paid in the sweat of the man who labors, or by the dishonest method of repudiation. Why invite disaster by yielding to unwise demands for ever-increasing benefits?

The Ways and Means Committee sought to take such action as would preserve the State unemployment system. The committee fully realized that some States, because of their many war industries and vast number of employees, might exhaust their unemployment funds during a protracted period of unemployment. To meet such an exigency, it has provided under title III advances to State unemployment funds. Section 301 establishes in the unemployment trust fund a separate account to be known as the Federal unemployment account. There is authorized to be appropriated to this account—

First. A sum equal to the excess of taxes collected prior to July 1, 1943, through the Federal unemployment tax over the total unemployment administrative expenditures made prior to July 1, 1943;

Second. For the fiscal year of 1945, and for each fiscal year thereafter, a sum equal to the excess of the taxes collected under the Federal Unemployment Tax Act in the preceding fiscal year, over the unemployment administrative expenditures made in such year; and

Third. For the fiscal year 1945, and thereafter, such further sums, if any, as may be necessary to make advances to the State accounts, as provided in section 302 of the committee amendment.

Propaganda that has been dinned into the ears of the public relating to the so-called demobilization and reconversion features of this bill until many persons believe that these features must of necessity be the very heart of a post-war program. I do not need to remind the Members that the House has disposed of two things that are necessary to facilitate the demobilization and reconversion of the country's production facilities. I refer to the Office of Contract Settlements, created by the Contract Settlement Act of 1944, and the Surplus Property Administration, created by the Surplus Act of 1944.

I realize, as does every member in this House, that prior to the war and all during the war, measures have been passed to meet emergencies. These innumerable legislative acts, all of them, restricted in greater degree the freedom of the citizen. These measures, passed by Congress in the name of emergencies, have augmented the number, the power and the influence of the bureaucrats charged with their application. These entrenched functionaries have become the veritable masters of the American people. It is the hope of those who make up this administrative caste to perpetuate themselves in office and in power under post-war emergencies. They may believe that the citizens of this country, because they have endured the restrictive legislation during wartime, are now ready to accept abject servitude during peacetimes. Such is not my opinion of the American public. What the citizens of this country desire most of all is to win this war. They want their boys to come home to a country free from bureaucratic control. Neither do they want, under the plea of a post-war emergency, to have the war powers of the President continued in him or to be exercised by any functionary appointed by him.

It was with this thought in mind that I examined title III of Senate bill 2051, which was eliminated by action of our committee. Under title III of Senate bill 2051 it provided for "Retraining and Reemployment" and payment of transportation. On the face of it, the title appears to be essential and innocent in all implications of the words "Retraining and Reemployment" but let us see what this would lead to when these words are interpreted in the light of the new philosophy of statutory construction applied by the New Deal bureaucrats, which is: "Legislation by negative action of Congress, wherein the bureaucrat assumes powers not affirmatively denied by Congress on the ground that such powers must be considered as having been tacitly approved by Congress."

That is what we are doing now. Let us see just how far these two innocent words go in title III.

Under such a rule of statutory construction the program of retraining and reemployment could be expanded as follows:

INVENTORY OF PROBLEMS IN RETRAINING AND REEMPLOYMENT—FACT FINDING AND INFORMATION

First. Information on manpower needs and available labor supply—present and projected inventories.

Second. Occupational outlook information; probable war-to-peace shifts in the labor force; amount of increase and decrease in labor demand for each industry and occupation within the industry, by States and regions.

Third. Occupational analyses with emphasis upon common factors in related occupations for purpose of transfer of workers from wartime to peacetime jobs and from military to civilian pursuits.

Fourth. Physical demands studies; job studies from the point of view of the requirements of the work for the selective placement of the handicapped.

Fifth. Information for industries on how to use the handicapped in work they can do, maximizing their abilities and making minimal demands on their disabilities.

Sixth. Handbook giving all the information on his rights and privileges a war worker needs to know.

Seventh. Information centers for servicemen and war workers giving, in large cities, full information through specialized and training interviews, and in small places standardized information and handbook with referral to agency concerned which can give full advice and service.

Eighth. Pooled information for guidance of production program for various industries.

Ninth. Information on demobilization ratios in different geographical areas.

Tenth. Economic and job information for soldiers, veterans, and war workers to guide them in their plans for retraining and employment now.

Eleventh. Report system for a quarterly survey and assembly of all information necessary for the reemployment program.

DEMOBILIZATION, RECONVERSION, AND REEMPLOYMENT

Twelfth. Questions of scheduling of reconversion of plants while the war is going on and afterward.

Thirteenth. Problem of rate of demobilization in relation to ability of industry to absorb workers.

Fourteenth. Cut-backs on contracts in areas of labor shortage first and in areas of labor surplus last.

Fifteenth. Demobilization of war workers in industries and areas with due regard to the effect of such demobilization on the workers, the returning servicemen, and on industry.

Sixteenth. Aid to industries in the development of manning tables and job and labor inventories in projecting peacetime plans.

Seventeenth. Balancing labor supply and demand by redistributing production where necessary.

Eighteenth. Redistribution of labor from region to region to take care of the displacement occasioned by the war and to improve its utilization.

Nineteenth. Continual reappraisal of the national production requirements in relation to consumer demand and manpower resources.

Twentieth. Provision for maintenance, reeducation, and utilization of men and women in factories where retooling is going on.

Twenty-first. Limits of demobilization of Army and Navy in the light of national defense needs.

Twenty-second. Estimated demobilization schedule after one enemy is defeated; when both are defeated; during period of military government, and after.

Twenty-third. Demobilization priorities: Those who have jobs waiting, first; oldest, or married first; longest in service first? Which policy will serve reemployment and stabilization best?

Twenty-fourth. Demobilization of wives and husbands.

RETRAINING

Twenty-fifth. Adequate provision for vocational training through utilization of agencies concerned and established institutions to enable soldiers and war workers to enter new employment.

Twenty-sixth. Conversion of war training institutions and programs, civilian and military, to peacetime training; utilization of suitable plants and facilities.

Twenty-seventh. Institution of new facilities and courses if necessary.

Twenty-eighth. Course construction, based on job analysis; streamlining and acceleration.

Twenty-ninth. Preemployment or vestibule courses for men and women, war workers and veterans in industries.

Thirtieth. Continuous training in industry after employment.

Thirty-first. Liberalization of apprentice training for war veterans providing suitable credit for training and experience along the lines of the trade, and acceleration according to capabilities.

Thirty-second. Experimental determination of minimum and maximum time required to learn a trade or other occupation.

Thirty-third. Establishment of apprenticeship ratios by the labor unions and local apprenticeship committees for veterans.

Thirty-fourth. Vocational and educational guidance, including testing for all applicants for retraining.

Thirty-fifth. Determination of standard cost ranges for instruction, tools, and materials for training.

Thirty-sixth. Securing of lists of accredited schools and training facilities.

Thirty-seventh. Encouragement of the establishment of training departments in industry.

Thirty-eighth. Encouragement of modern methods of instruction; visual aids, job sheets, laboratories, et cetera.

Thirty-ninth. Encouragement of vocational education on adult level; subengineering technical training for foremen.

Fortieth. Continuation of job instructor training, job relations training, in industry and in Government.

Forty-first. Prediction of retraining needs so that educational institutions may prepare their educational services.

REEMPLOYMENT

Forty-second. United States Employment Service program—setting up of experimental stations in which best methods for veterans and war workers are worked out: Training for counselors, et cetera.

Forty-third. Definition of programs of public and private associations for employment of veterans.

Forty-fourth. Definition of work of Selective Service System veterans' representatives.

Forty-fifth. Occupational analyses from the point of view of showing common or transferrable job elements and skills, and coding of occupations and workers on this basis to facilitate placement.

Forty-sixth. Preparation of charts on occupational trends.

Forty-seventh. Preferential employment for veterans in Government and industry; employment ratios for veterans.

Forty-eighth. Training on the job for disabled veterans in Government work with pay while training.

Forty-ninth. Occupational guidance.

Fiftieth. Controlled referrals based on occupational information in hands of United States Employment Service.

Fifty-first. Provision for securing the veteran his old job.

Fifty-second. Estimated need and plans for public works and national service to take up slack in employment in interim period and afterward.

Fifty-third. National service up to 1 year, or other length of time to be determined, for all youth, men and women, including outdoor work, living, and training.

REHABILITATION

Fifty-fourth. Physical and mental rehabilitation of veterans while in the Army and Navy hospitals, or afterward with the Veterans' Administration, with full utilization of physical and occupational therapy.

Fifty-fifth. Vocational rehabilitation, including advisement and training under the Vocational Rehabilitation Service of the Veterans' Administration, with placement and follow-up.

Fifty-sixth. Coordination of all rehabilitation programs, so that continuous service is rendered the individual under military and civilian jurisdiction in guidance and training; transferable guidance schedules and records.

Fifty-seventh. Rehabilitation of disabled war workers through the Rehabilitation Service of the Federal Security Agency.

Fifty-eighth. Occupational analysis to determine physical requirements of jobs in preparation for selective placement of handicapped.

Fifty-ninth. Establishment of employment ratios for the handicapped in industry, that is, in the same proportion in industry as they are in the population or by some other measure.

Sixtieth. Coding system for the purpose of relating certain patterns of disabilities to occupational demands; comparison of systems used in England and other countries.

Sixty-first. Domiciliary care in veterans' hospitals for seriously disabled veterans.

Sixty-second. Adjustment of workmen's compensation laws in the various States so that they do not work a hardship on those they aim to protect; Federal funds for extra compensation for second injuries, et cetera.

Sixty-third. Securing of favorable attitudes of employers and workers toward the handicapped to aid in their employment.

Sixty-fourth. Provisions for extra amount of permanency in jobs for the handicapped in view of the fact that the handicapped have difficulty in securing new jobs while as a matter of fact they hold their jobs very well.

Sixty-fifth. Social rehabilitation of handicapped, especially in blind, since the reconstruction of their social and personal habits is basic to vocational rehabilitation.

RESUMPTION OF EDUCATION INTERRUPTED BY THE WAR

Sixty-sixth. Provision for continuation of educational plans of veterans and young war workers.

Sixty-seventh. Determination of conditions under which education will be furnished, including a length of time in relation to the length of service and proved educational achievement of the applicant.

Sixty-eighth. Prediction of the amount of higher education needed and in what fields so that the institutions may prepare faculties and materials; poll of Army and Navy to secure intentions in regard to amount of education and subject matter desired, under various conditions; Government paying a certain amount; without Government subsidy, etc.

Sixty-ninth. Determination of rates to be paid by the Government for tuition.

Seventieth. Determination of Government aid for subsistence while receiving education.

Seventy-first. Revamping of college courses and methods to make them suitable for older and more experienced students; increase of technical education, and education in economic and political problems capitalizing the new knowledge of the world.

Seventy-second. Advanced standing or credit on length of college courses for war experience, training, and travel.

Seventy-third. Provision whereby those who can make the best use of education will get the most of it; emphasis upon special consideration for the bright as well as the backward.

Seventy-fourth. Information bulletin revised annually listing all the courses of all the higher institutions indexed by course, occupation, and locality.

Seventy-fifth. Information bulletin on all vocational education indexed by occupational objective and locality, including all private as well as public institutions.

Seventy-sixth. Listing of schools on the recommendation of Governors of States or regional educational agencies as accredited for the education of veterans.

PROVISION FOR SPECIAL GROUPS

Seventy-seventh. Retraining and reemployment for women.

Seventy-eighth. Retraining and reemployment plans for professional workers, technical workers, youth, aged, and the disabled.

Seventy-ninth. Securing the cooperation of special groups, organizations, manufacturers' associations, trade unions, and so forth, in educational plans.

UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION AND ASSISTANCE

Eightieth. Establishment of a temporary plan for unemployment compensation to carry over the adjustment period between dismissal or discharge and work for veterans, war workers, and others not presently covered by unemployment insurance—this plan to run so long as the Congress deems advisable. This plan would involve the Federal supplementing of existing State unemployment systems to the extent necessary.

Eighty-first. Exploration of the advantages and disadvantages of dismissal pay. The practicability of this is open to serious question.

Eighty-second. Old-age retirement system can be invoked in case of the superannuated.

Eighty-third. Cooperation of business organizations, chambers of commerce, and so forth. Stimulation of production for jobs.

Eighty-fourth. Government aid in industrial and business expansion.

Eighty-fifth. Cooperation of business organizations, chambers of commerce, and so forth, in making jobs for demobilized soldiers and war workers.

Eighty-sixth. Gearing American production to any plans which may be developed for reconstruction in devastated areas of Europe and Asia.

This program, so we are informed, "is not exhaustive but is indicative of the type of problems which will have to be solved if the major task is to be accomplished."

Now the facts are, as will be found on page 10 of the Ways and Means Committee report, that there are now in the Federal Government two agencies dealing with vocational education and training. One of these is in the Federal Security Agency, which administers the grants-in-aid to the several States for vocational training by State agencies, and the other in the Veterans' Administration, which provides vocational training and rehabilitation for veterans. Why are additional Government agencies necessary to supervise the retraining of civilians released from war work?

I have taken up each of these propositions, which would create a beautiful bureau in practically every community of any size in the United States of America. There are just 86 of these different subjects that are going to be taken up by these bureaucrats, a whole new army of bureaucrats opposed to our elimination of their wild and reckless dreams. No one under the sun, as the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means has pointed out, has ever given the slightest information of what the cost of the program would be, to say nothing of its utter futility.

If any such program were taken up, it would require a study over many months by our committee, or any other committee, to see whether or not it was practicable and whether it should be done and whether it could possibly come within the budgetary possibilities of this Government with its huge national debt.

So far as the removal of certain sections are concerned that we have heard so much about, may I say that I have studied very carefully the hearings before the Colmer committee. Our distinguished friend the gentleman from Tennessee, Representative COOPER, headed a subcommittee which gave study to titles I, II, and III. That is the reason the George bill, titles I, II, and VI, were stricken from the bill and in their place was put the proposed legislation of this special committee headed by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. COOPER]. Those titles I, II, and III of the Cooper proposal underwent some changes, but as modified and adopted they were sound. The provisions had long, diligent study by as able a group of men, both on the majority and minority side of that committee, as can be found in this body, and from every angle these substitutions greatly improved the Senate bill. There is no reason why we should not support S. 2051, and I feel satisfied that it will receive the overwhelming support of this great group of splendid Representatives who already know the dangers that confront this Nation so far as its debt is concerned. In this year of national elections we cannot accept a political bill that holds out so-called benefits way beyond all reason, so much so that they are bound to ruin the very system of benefits now paid under the State compensation systems. Nor must we discriminate against the soldiers who have been going through bloody battles abroad while the men at home have received larger wages than have ever been paid before in any country at any time in the history of the world. We cannot afford to be misled by the threats of political reprisal. We owe something to the rank and file of the sound citizenry of this country, that branch of the citizenry that wants to preserve our wonderful heritage of liberty under the Federal Constitution. We want to get back to constitutional government. Our people want jobs in private industry. They want Congress to put emphasis on future prosperity, not to a great period of unemployment. Let us point the way to a period of unexcelled prosperity under the banner of republicanism.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. COOPER].

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, when our great defense program began it was necessary for us to get into war production in a terrible hurry to save this country. When victory comes it is going to be necessary for us to get out of war production in a terrible hurry if we are to save the economy of the country. This makes imperative a proper demobilization and reconversion program for the transition from war to peace. The pending bill, S. 2051, is a very important part of that program. The Baruch-Hancock report recommended a series of legislative steps that should be taken. The Contract Settlement Act is now on the statute books. The surplus property bill has passed the House and the Senate, and is now in conference. The pending bill is the next step in that important program.

It will be my purpose, as I usually try to do, to briefly discuss the provisions of the committee bill as reported and then briefly to discuss the provisions of the Senate bill which were stricken out by the Committee on Ways and Means and the committee bill substituted in place of it.

The committee bill contains five titles—title I, which establishes an office of war mobilization and reconversion; title II, which relates to industrial demobilization and reconversion and the problems connected with it.

Title III relates to advances to States, to protect their unemployment compensation funds during the transition period. Title IV relates to planning for public works. Title V contains miscellaneous provisions, such as definitions, and so forth.

The bill as passed by the Senate contains six titles. Titles I and II of the Senate bill are very similar to titles I and II of the committee bill. Title III of the Senate bill provided for retraining and reemployment. The Committee on Ways and Means eliminated that title entirely from the bill. Title IV of the Senate bill contains provisions for unemployment insurance, and was divided into two parts. Part 1 of that title provides for advances to the States when the State unemployment funds became impaired. The second part of title IV of the Senate bill provides for unemployment compensation for Federal employees. The first part of title IV of the Senate bill is substantially the same as title III of the pending committee bill. The second half of title IV of the Senate bill, providing for coverage of Federal employees under unemployment insurance, has been eliminated from the bill. Title V of the Senate bill provides for loans to the States and political subdivisions for plans for public works. That is substantially the same as title IV of the pending committee bill, with this one change made by the committee. A provision has been included providing for interest at 2½ percent per annum on the loans that are made to the States and political subdivisions for planning, and the further provision that the loans must be repaid within 5 years or sooner, if the project is started. Title VI of the Senate bill contains the general provisions, such as definitions, and so forth, and they are substantially the same as contained in title V of the committee bill.

I believe that brief explanation will serve to call attention to the major differences between the two bills now under consideration, the Senate bill as passed by the Senate and the bill as reported or recommended by the Committee on Ways and Means as an amendment to the Senate bill.

It will be remembered that the Office of War Mobilization is now in existence under an Executive order of the President. The Office is headed by Justice Byrnes. The provision of title I of this bill provides for the Office of War Mobilization to continue as it exists and is now functioning. Additional duties are assigned for reconversion, so that it becomes an office of war mobilization and reconversion. The provisions of the bill, of course, will become effective upon the passage by Congress and the approval of the President. Of course, the war is still in progress. It is necessary for the Office of War Mobilization to continue for the remainder of the war period as it is functioning now.

In addition to those important duties, the Office of War Mobilization and Reconversion, as provided in this bill, is assigned very important duties insofar as making plans for the transition from war to peace. It also provides for certain studies and reports to be made to

the Congress, recommending any legislation that may be deemed necessary and advisable.

The Committee on Post-war Economic Policy and Planning, of which I have the honor to be a member, gave very careful consideration to the matters covered in titles I and II of the Senate bill and the committee bill, realizing the importance of providing the machinery that is necessary for the over-all coordination and supervision during this important transition from war to peace. The committee bill very closely follows the recommendations of the Committee on Post-war Economic Policy and Planning as contained in the report presented by that committee to the House.

Title III of the committee bill provides for advances to State unemployment compensation funds when they become impaired. It will be remembered that the Social Security Act provides over-all standards under title III for unemployment compensation or insurance. The various States of the Union have enacted social-security acts providing for unemployment-insurance benefits for the workers in those States. The program provided in title III of the committee bill continues the present State programs just as they exist today, just as they have functioned in the past, and simply provides that if the unemployment fund of any State becomes impaired, that an advance will be made by the Federal Government to replenish that fund. It is advanced without interest and for the purpose of keeping the unemployment-insurance funds of the various States of the Union in a sound condition at all times. There are now something like $6,000,000,000 in the unemployment insurance fund of the various States. It is estimated that this will be adequate and sufficient to take care of any needs that may now be expected, unless a situation should develop in some State where there is widespread unemployment to the extent that the fund of that particular State might be depleted to the point that an advance by the Federal Government would become necessary to restore that fund to a sound condition.

The second half of title IV to the Senate bill relating to unemployment insurance for Federal employees, as I said a moment ago, has been eliminated from the bill reported by the Committee on Ways and Means. Of course, there is a difference of opinion as to the wisdom of including Federal employees. We realize, of course, that there are some difficult problems presented by reason of the fact that some of the war plants of the country are operated by the Federal Government; therefore the employees in those plants would not be included in unemployment insurance because they have not been in what is known as covered employment, because they have been working for the Federal Government, and the Federal Government does not pay the unemployment-insurance tax to provide the funds to pay unemployment benefits. It was thought by some that an effort should be made to include Federal employees engaged in industrial plants of different kinds, yet it was recognized that the people working for the Federal Government in these shipyards, arsenals, and plants of that type, were receiving the highest percentage of pay of any employees of the Federal Government during that time.

To include them and not include other employees of the Federal Government might be regarded as unfair. Many of these employees have been working for modest salaries. Various clerks here in the departments of the Government who receive perhaps $1,440 salary per annum, and who are barely able to make both ends meet, would not be included. From the standpoint of fairness and equity, some members doubted whether those Federal employees engaged in industrial work alone should be singled out.

It was further borne in mind by the committee that it is almost impossible to draw a line of distinction between those Federal employees engaged in an industrial type of work and those engaged in nonindustrial types of work. The worker in the war plants, working for the Federal Government, driving rivets, or doing some other type of work of that kind, would certainly be considered an industrial employee, but how about the clerks and the bookkeepers and the people in the office of that same plant who would be doing a very vital and essential part of the work necessary for carrying on the operations of that plant? Therefore, the committee felt that a problem of this kind should receive extensive and very careful and thorough consideration, and that it was the part of wisdom not to try to include it as a part of this bill.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOPER. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WRIGHT. Does the gentleman see any reason why both classes of Federal employees should not be included, that is, those who are engaged in industrial establishments and that portion of the Federal pay roll, the clerks, who represent an unusual amount of employment because of the war? I do not see any reason why there should be a discrimination.

As to the gentleman's other point, that no study has been made of it, I realize of course how hard the gentleman's committee has been working and I have the greatest admiration for the work the members of that committee have done, but I submit that it was our duty to compile those figures and to include this class of employees, for the reason that there is no essential difference between men who work for the Government and men who work for private industry in an emergency such as this.

Mr. COOPER. I readily concede that there is much merit in the contention that they should be included, yet it should be borne in mind that they all accepted positions knowing that they were not covered under Social Security. They have never been covered under it. They knew that when they accepted their positions.

In the next place, it is estimated that there will be 3,500,000 of them, and we had no estimate whatever as to the probable cost of including all of them under the benefits of unemployment insurance. I am sure the gentleman will bear in mind that the Committee on Ways and Means, after all, is the one that has to raise the revenue to pay for all of these expenses. When we were unable to secure any kind of an estimate as to the probable cost of such a program as that, the committee decided it was best, probably, not to include them at this time.

Mr. DISNEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOPER. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. DISNEY. Since the Social Security program was started it never has been the policy of Congress to include Federal or State employees in that program, for good reasons that developed at the original hearings.

Mr. COOPER. Of course, the gentleman is correct.

Bear this in mind: Under Social Security, somebody is taxed for benefits that are provided with respect to title II as well as title III benefits. The major provisions of the Social Security Act are these. Title I relates to old-age assistance, commonly referred to as old-age pensions. Title II relates to old-age and survivors insurance benefits, commonly referred to as old-age annuities, where the employer pays 1 percent and the employee pays 1 percent, and thereby provide the funds to pay the benefits. These funds are paid in during the working period of a man's life, so that he becomes entitled to benefits as a matter of law when he reaches the age of retirement.

Title III of the Social Security Act relates to unemployment compensation. There is a tax of 3 percent on the pay roll of industry to provide the funds to pay the benefits for unemployment compensation. It will be remembered that a tax has not been imposed so far as Federal employees are concerned and a tax has not been imposed so far as State, county, and municipal employees are concerned, because the Federal Government has never reached the point of trying to tax States, counties, and municipalities.

Various other groups are not included, and some reason along a similar line might be advanced as to them. The employees of religious, charitable, and eleemosynary institutions are not covered. Those institutions as employers are not taxed under the Social Security program. Therefore, you do have a clear line of distinction between people employed by institutions or employers who pay a tax, and upon whom a tax can be levied, and employees of institutions or employers upon whom no tax is levied.

Mr. WRIGHT. I realize full well the problems of which the gentleman speaks, and I know there is no person in the House who gives more patient consideration to them than he, but it strikes me that this is a cost of the war. The employees were brought to Washington and brought to the shipyards at the request of the Federal Government. They were brought here to win the war. We are not going to win this war fully until we have both our soldiers and our civilian employees back into normal channels of

industry. We are spending $200,000,000,000 to win the war, and we must consider spending something to adjust ourselves to a peacetime economy. We have not completed our task until we do that.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee has expired.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 additional minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. COOPER. There is much to be said along the lines the gentleman has indicated. I have tried to point out some of the reasons the committee entertained for the action taken. I am not undertaking to say that all of the reasons advanced by the committee are necessarily my individual reasons, but I am trying to explain as best I can the reasons advanced by the committee for the action taken.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOPER. I yield to my colleague from Tennessee.

Mr. PRIEST. Under the civil service regulations the regular employees of the Federal Government contribute a percentage of their salary each month to the civil service retirment fund.

Mr. COOPER. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. PRIEST. I believe that when they are separated from their positions they are entitled to withdraw the amount they have contributed?

Mr. COOPER. That is my understanding.

Mr. PRIEST. I wonder if the Federal employees engaged in an industrial capacity make such a contribution. Are they under that regulation with reference to the civil service retirement fund? I am not sure whether the workers in a shipyard, for instance, are or are not under that regulation.

Mr. COOPER. It is my understanding that all civil-service employees make the contribution to the retirement fund and, when they become separated from the service, are entitled to draw out the amount they paid in. As to whether all workers of the Federal Government are covered under civil service I am not prepared to state at the moment.

But my understanding is, certainly since the passage of the so-called Ramspeck Act, the purpose is to try to cover all of them under it.

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOPER. I yield to my colleague, a member of the committee.

Mr. GEARHART. In view of the fact that this bill originated in the Senate, the only way we could have included these excluded groups would have been by Federal grant?

Mr. COOPER. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. GEARHART. And if we had included them by Federal grant, that would have been a manifest and distinct discrimination against the presently included groups, all of whom have, in part at least, purchased their protection through the payment of taxes which have been treated in the nature of premiums upon the policy which gives to them this unemployment benefit.

Mr. COOPER. The gentleman has made a very pertinent observation. It should be borne in mind this bill having originated in the Senate, is a Senate bill and it cannot be amended so as to levy a tax, because under the Constitution revenue measures must originate in the House. The parliamentary situation is such that we cannot amend this bill and include a tax or extend coverage which requires the levying of a tax for that reason. As the gentleman from California pointed out, working as we now are, under that limitation, the only thing you can do when it comes to taking care of additional employees is to provide the money out of the Treasury of the United States by an authorization for an appropriation.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOPER. I yield.

Mr. STEFAN. I am very much interested in title III. As I understand it, it really covers only those who are covered by social security. Am I correct in that assumption?

Mr. COOPER. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. STEFAN. The gentleman stated that the way you are going to work this under title III is that should some State's social-security funds become depleted they can come to the Federal Government and secure funds without the payment of interest in order to continue the payment of these social security unemployment compensations.

Mr. COOPER. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. STEFAN. As a member of the Committee on Appropriations, I am interested as to just what fund that is. It is not the three-tenths of 1 percent fund that they are going to ask for, is it? Or is it a fund that has accumulated as a result of moneys which have accumulated for administrative purposes; and would that have to be reappropriated? Would the gentleman explain that?

Mr. COOPER. It is not the fund that has been accumulated for administrative purposes.

Mr. STEFAN. I am referring to the three-tenths of 1 percent fund.

Mr. COOPER. The gentleman will kindly turn to page 18 of the committee report. He will see that the committee, in complying with the so-called Ramseyer rule, has there included changes in existing law. The Social Security Act, as amended, section 904 (a), that is the present social-security law, is shown there, and the changes provided in the present bill are indicated.

Mr. STEFAN. Yes; but just as an illustration, if my State of Nebraska would have its funds depleted, the money that they collect there for social security is sent here to Washington and placed to the credit of my State; is that not true?

Mr. COOPER. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. STEFAN. Now if that fund becomes depleted, from what fund would they ask to get money?

Mr. COOPER. From the Treasury of the United States.

Mr. STEFAN. Then we would have to reappropriate that money, would we not?

Mr. COOPER. The necessary funds would have to be appropriated for this trust fund now held in the Treasury of the United States.

Mr. STEFAN. The trust fund, as I understand it, has now reached approximately $6,000,000,000. Would it be that fund from which they would secure this money if the funds of my State would be depleted?

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOPER. I yield.

Mr. REED of New York. I think the gentleman might explain the three-tenths of 1 percent which goes into the Federal Treasury has built up a fund, and I checked up on it this morning, up to July 31, of $915,000,000, which is not earmarked.

Mr. STEFAN. That is the fund I am referring to, may I say to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. COOPER]. Is that the fund?

Mr. REED of New York. If I may just clear this up, out of that there is spent for administration of the Social Security Board about $403,000,000, leaving a difference of about $500,000,000 in that fund.

Mr. STEFAN. Is that the trust fund the gentleman refers to?

Mr. REED of New York. So that I just want to point out the Federal Government would not really be disturbed. This is not earmarked and the Federal Government would not really be disturbed to any great extent, because they have received that amount of money which is in that fund.

Mr. STEFAN. Is that the trust fund?

Mr. COOPER. The gentleman will kindly turn to page 36 of the pending bill and he will find there paragraph (h) containing the following language, "there is hereby established in the unemployment trust fund a Federal unemployment account." This authorizes the appropriation necessary to carry out the provisions of this act.

Mr. STEFAN. But it is not the trust fund to which the gentleman from New York refers? That is the fund the gentleman is referring to and which the bill refers to?

Mr. COOPER. It will be remembered under the Social Security Act the 3 percent tax on the pay roll of industry is levied. Provision is made for a credit to the State of 2.7 percent of the amount paid into the State fund. A credit is given for that. The other three-tenths percent is held for administrative purposes. Now, as I understood the gentleman from New York, he is referring to the amount that has been accumulated from this three-tenths of 1 percent.

Mr. STEFAN. Which is for administrative purposes, and they had an overage of that and it went into the Treasury and is not earmarked for anything, as I understand it.

Mr. COOPER. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. STEFAN. Then they are setting up a surplus fund enough to pay to States whose funds have been depleted?

Mr. COOPER. That is correct.

Mr. STEFAN. In other words, they will have to come in here for an appropriation?

Mr. COOPER. Whatever appropriation will be necessary to keep that fund sound.

Mr. STEFAN. Would that penalize any other States? For instance, some States might remain sound and liquid all the way through. Would we be drawing from some State that has funds to the credit of some States that do not have funds?

Mr. COOPER. No; each State's separate account will be maintained, as I understand it.

Mr. HERTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOPER. I yield.

Mr. HERTER. In this debate today no reference has been made whatever to a very large class of Federal employees, the merchant seamen, 90 percent of whom are on the Federal pay roll and 10 percent on the pay roll of private charterers. Do I understand, striking out this title means the Committee on Ways and Means is planning to give further consideration and further study to the whole problem of the transition of the plan of the merchant marine and that by striking this out their case is not necessarily prejudiced?

Mr. COOPER. The gentleman is correct in saying that their case is not necessarily prejudiced, because it will be remembered that the reason seamen were not included in the original Social Security Act was because we were told at that time that the same thing obtained as to them as obtains with certain other workers.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 additional minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. COOPER. We were told the same thing obtains as to seamen as obtains with reference to some other workers of the country and that it was almost impossible of administration. We were told at that time that men were hired and fired and came aboard and left the ships at ports all over the world. A man might join a ship in China somewhere, or he might quit the ship at some port on the other side of the world. We were told at that time it was almost impossible to administer that. I understand that since then the Social Security Board has been working on it, and the point has been reached where they think it can be administered. Of course, one reason farm labor was left out of the original Social Security Act was because of the great difficulties of administration. Maybe a man worked for half a day helping his neighbors save a hay crop or something like that. There were tremendous difficulties involved. The same thing is true to some extent with respect to domestic servants and casual employees. If these groups to which the gentleman refers and has cited one group as an illustration are to be covered under social security, it will have to be done by a separate bill in order that a tax may be levied to provide the funds to pay their benefits because all that could be done here would be to provide for benefits for them which must be paid out of the Treasury of the United States, and no special tax has been levied to provide those funds.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from New York, a member of the committee.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BLAND], for the reason I think he has a contribution to make with reference to the merchant seamen.

Mr. COOPER. I will be glad to yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. BLAND. At the time the Committee on Ways and Means abandoned the subject there was undertaken in the Ways and Means Committee legislation in the way of a bill, which was referred to the Committee on Merchant Marine. It was considered. Hearings were held and then finally, as the gentleman said, the subject was fraught with so much difficulty that it was referred to a special committee of which the gentleman from Washington [Mr. JACKSON] was chairman. Finally, he worked out a bill and came back in a session of Congress when a bill had not been introduced and was prepared to introduce a bill, and we were told by the Speaker and the Parliamentarian that it would have to go to the Committee on Ways and Means. Though we had had it for about 3 or 4 years and had been working on it trying to find a solution, we found that the Speaker and the Parliamentarian insisted still that it should go to the Ways and Means Committee. Today the Ways and Means Committee has it in its lap.

Mr. COOPER. I believe the gentleman will agree that it will be necessary to handle that by a separate bill, and not include it in this bill.

Mr. BLAND. I would hope it should be included in some way in this bill, but, if not, I trust the Ways and Means Committee will give consideration to the report which has been prepared by the gentleman from Washington [Mr. JACKSON] and filed with our committee, and to the bill which is today introduced, because those men have valiantly carried on, and some consideration of that character should be given them.

Mr. COOPER. I would just like to point out, as I said a moment ago, the reason these additional groups cannot be included in this bill is because we cannot extend coverage that would require the levying of a tax in this bill, because this bill originated in the Senate. It will have to be taken care of in a separate bill.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOPER. I yield.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. I have two questions to ask the gentleman. With reference to section 201, on page 31, of the committee bill, I see the purpose of the section, but I wonder if a strict interpretation of that language would prevent the completion of the manufacture of large items that are under way when the war comes to an end. For instance, it provides that any contractual agency shall terminate contracts, and so forth, and then at the very end, it forbids the continuing of the work for anything other than the prosecution of the war. I see the purpose of it, but if they said you could not finish a vessel or a large plane like the *Mars*, it would work a great hardship.

Mr. COOPER. I will be frank and say that that gave the committee considerable concern. There is some different language in the Senate bill. It was brought to our attention if this did not provide definitely and certainly for the termination of these contracts, there would be constant pressure exerted to just continue a particular project a while longer, just to provide work and just to help sustain a community. As was pointed out, great pressure would be exerted for carrying on the projects after the requirements for war purposes had ceased, unless it was very definitely fixed that they were to be terminated.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. It is certainly not the intention of the committee to prevent the completion of the manufacture of a large item, such as a ship or a large plane like the *Mars*.

Mr. COOPER. I think it would have to be interpreted with reason, of course.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee has again expired.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 5 additional minutes.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. On page 36, where the language is used several times in the bill, "There is hereby authorized to be appropriated to such Federal unemployment account a sum equal to the excessive taxes." I wondered why that was used rather than simply saying, "There is hereby authorized the appropriation of all taxes collected prior to July 31." Why use the language "a sum equal to" instead of "all taxes"?

Mr. COOPER. That is simply the authorization of an appropriation to carry out the provisions of this act.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. I just wondered if the language "a sum equal to" was any different than to say "authorize an appropriation of all taxes collected."

Mr. COOPER. No; the purpose is to authorize the appropriation necessary to carry out the provisions of this act, and makes proper reference to existing titles of the Social Security Act.

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOPER. I yield.

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. If I may return to the subject of unemployment compensation of Federal employees, under normal conditions there is no need for unemployment compensation for Federal employees, because, under civil service, they have a certain tenure which assures them of continuous employment. However, because we are in an emergency, so to speak, we have hired a number of people for the duration plus 6 months.

If those three or three and a half million people are thrown out of employment at the conclusion of the war, their position will be quite different from that

of a man employed in private industry. A man may be thrown out of work for a period of time but he has a chance of returning to his former employment when his employer has converted from wartime to peacetime production. So the situation is quite different. On the other hand, the man who has worked for the Federal Government in an arsenal or in some other Government plant has to compete with the returning veterans for whatever jobs may be available. Under those conditions, since the Federal Government has imposed a tax on employers, and the Government has been the employer in this case, does not the gentleman think it would be reasonable to expect that those men would be allowed at least some unemployment compensation until they can find employment? Unless that is done we are going to be faced with a movement to place unemployment compensation on all Federal employees, and, what many of us are opposed to, we may have federalization of our entire unemployment system.

Mr. COOPER. Of course, there is much merit in the suggestion offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin. As I said in the beginning, this is a rather difficult problem. There is no doubt about it.

Mr. DIMOND. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOPER. I yield.

Mr. DIMOND. I should like to ask the gentleman two questions. First, about title 3, and the amendment therein embraced, to the social security law. The gentleman will observe that reference is made, in title 3, only to States and not to the Territories, either by class or individually. Am I correct in believing that the Territories are nevertheless included in title 3, because of the definition in other parts of the Social Security Act, which includes Territories with the States?

Mr. COOPER. The gentleman is correct. Territories are included in the definition in the Social Security Act, which is not changed at all in the pending bill.

Mr. DIMOND. I should like to ask one further question. In title 4, with relation to public works, provision is made for loans or advances to the States and their agencies and political subdivisions. No mention is made of the Territories. But in subsection (e) of the same section I find the following: "As used in this section the term 'State' shall include the District of Columbia." Can the gentleman tell me any reason why the Territories were not embraced within the section and within the definition therein given?

Mr. COOPER. No; I am not prepared to give the gentleman any reason why they should not be. It would look to me like it might be well to give consideration to an amendment taking proper care of the Territories, as well as the States, as far as the plans are concerned. That is all this relates to—plans for public works.

Mr. MICHENER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOPER. I yield.

Mr. MICHENER. Do the unemployment-insurance benefits provided in this bill inure to the benefit of any person other than those for whom an employer's tax is now paid under the social-security law?

Mr. COOPER. No. It will be remembered that that is all provided under the Social Security Act. There is no change in that respect provided in this pending bill.

Mr. MICHENER. It does not affect the professional man; it does not affect those where the employment is less than eight persons; it does not affect the domestic in the home; it does not affect the farm hand or the casual employee?

Mr. COOPER. It does not affect any of those because in order to include all of those groups that are not now included in covered employment would require one of two things: Either the levying of a tax to provide the funds to pay the benefits which we cannot do under a Senate bill, as the gentleman well knows; or, on the other hand, provides an authorization for a direct appropriation out of the Federal Treasury to pay the benefits with no tax having been collected to contribute to the fund.

Mr. MICHENER. Yes; in other words, this bill inures to the benefit only, generally speaking, of those people engaged in war industry who have received the highest wage during the war ever paid in human history.

Mr. COOPER. No; this committee bill provides simply, as does the Senate bill in that respect, for the present State systems to continue just as they are now, and in case the State fund becomes impaired advances money to replenish that fund.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee has expired.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JENKINS].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio is recognized for such time as he may use, subject to the rules of the House.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Chairman, the bill before the House for consideration today has a very colorful history and has traveled a devious and tortuous course in its progress thus far. It is what is left of the Murray-Kilgore bill after a severe legislative mauling given to it in the Senate, and after the Senate had rejected practically all of it and had substituted in its place what has since become known quite generally all over the country as the George bill, and after the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives has dissected from the George bill most of its unwise and unnecessary provisions. The bill before us for consideration is not perfect by any means, but it deals with the most essential provisions of the George bill.

When this legislation was first initiated there were many among the House Members, including myself, who felt that no provision of the original bill was imminently essential at this time. The provisions of this bill, which set up an Office of War Mobilization and Reconversion, are the most imminently necessary provisions. Since the Senate had elected to take action and since the American people have been stimulated by newspaper and other public discussion, it appears to me that it would be wise for Congress to dispose of these features of the bill now. The House has already given extensive and exhaustive consideration to the matter of the disposition of surplus goods and property of all kinds. It would therefore appear that it would be logical for the Congress to take action to provide for the war demobilization of industry and the reconversion of industry. Legislation with reference to the disposition of surplus property is more urgent than legislation for the demobilization and reconversion of business. I say this because there are great quantities of surplus material which are recognized as being unnecessary for further war efforts and are ready for sale and distribution. But the demobilization and reconversion of business and production plants is a matter that must be done more gradually, and for that reason that program might be more appropriately deferred for a few weeks at least. But since the Senate has acted on the matter it would appear therefore that it should be the duty of the House to proceed to do the same thing.

The Kilgore bill and the George bill carried provisions with reference to demobilization and reconversion of industry and the bill before the House today carries provisions of the same import but the House provisions are a modification of the provisions of the other bills.

The House bill, without a lot of high sounding recitals of promises and purposes as appears in the first 10 or 15 lines of the George bill, proceeds to provide for the establishment of the Office of War Mobilization and Reconversion which is to be headed by a Director of War Mobilization and Reconversion, who is to be paid a salary of $15,000 per year and who is to serve for only 2 years. It is the intention of those who sponsor this bill from the Ways and Means Committee that the President shall appoint to this office a thoroughly competent man who has had wide experience in business and who is not only capable and wise but one who is honest and will render honest service free from political domination. If the President appoints such a man that step will augur well for the success of the program. If he appoints a flaccid individual without any experience or character then the undertaking will inevitably be disappointing to the American people.

Within the purview of the activities of this Director will be the task of selling and disposing of the surplus war products for which purpose the House a few days ago passed a very satisfactory piece of legislation and in addition he will have the responsibility of demobilizing wartime industry and of the reconversion of the same. To demobilize wartime industry means not only to have charge of the demobilization of many hundreds of large war plants in the country and thousands of smaller plants but to also have some responsibility to see to it that the men and women employed in such plants are given every reasonable opportunity to seek and find reemployment. It also provides that when many of the large plants now engaged in war work,

which were formerly engaged in producing peacetime commodities, are compelled to give up the manufacture of wartime commodities and to return to the manufacture of peacetime commodities that they should be assisted in every reasonable way to accomplish this transformation with the least possible financial stress to themselves and with the least strain on the economy of the Nation and on the welfare of their employees. The task of this man is one that will be worthy of the efforts of the most capable executive in the Nation.

None but a vigorous, capable, honest man should be assigned to this tremendous task and he should draw to his assistance as deputy directors the most capable and efficient men that can be found. Those as manufacturers and those as employees who were responsible for the most colossal era of production that the world has ever seen were not moved to perform this great task so acceptably by any political motives and those who shall carry on the demobilization and reconversion of these many gigantic enterprises as well as these numerous small business concerns should not be moved by any but the most patriotic motives. Those who carried on to produce war materials were patriotic and diligent and those who dispose of these wartime facilities should likewise be patriotic and diligent.

There were some who argued that the Ways and Means Committee should not have had jurisdiction over legislation such as is set forth in the two sections to which I have just referred. They would be absolutely right in their contention if the legislation contained no other provisions than the provisions to which I have just referred. The parliamentary situation which took this bill to the consideration of the Ways and Means Committee was brought about by the fact that the George bill contained sections which related to the social-security bill. All social-security legislation originated with the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives, and it was the proper parliamentary procedure to refer this bill to the Ways and Means Committee.

As I have already stated, the country expected the Congress to set up legislation that would provide for the disposition of surplus property and likewise it expects Congress to set up legislation that will provide for the demobilization and reconversion of wartime industries. While the last-named type of legislation might have waited a little while it may yet prove that the Congress was wise in taking it up at this time.

It has been the purpose of the Ways and Means Committee to grant to this Director sufficient power to do the task well. Let us hope that none but an efficient director be appointed.

It was the purpose of the committee to provide such legislation as would encourage production of commodities, for the best antidote for idleness is a demand for jobs and the best antidote for inflation is abundant production. This has always been Republican doctrine. All through the Murray-Kilgore bill and even in the George bill there is a very noticeable inclination to express the opinion that great unemployment is sure to come. The New Deal administration has had no experience with any peacetime prosperity. All of its life it has spent in passing legislation providing funds to take care of unemployment. It has never had a vision of increasing confidence in the country and thereby increasing production and thereby increasing employment by natural methods which not only make a happy people but would make a solvent Treasury and a prosperous country. Wealth comes only from the products of the soil plus the result of human industry and human ingenuity through what we call agriculture, labor, management, and so forth.

PAYMENT OF UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION TO FEDERAL WORKERS

Ever since the passage in 1935 of the Social Security Act there has been a group in the United States who have been determined to federalize this great program. The States have stubbornly resisted all these attempts to invade the State systems. Never in my experience have I seen such unanimity on the part of the States of the Nation as is manifested on every occasion when their rights in this field are being invaded. They appeared as a solid phalanx in the Senate in opposition to the federalization of this program. The Senate reacted very commendably to this decisive support of the sovereign States of the Nation and it refused to pass the Murray-Kilgore bill which would have invaded the rights of the States, but in place of that bill they came forward with what is known as the George bill.

The Ways and Means Committee, after exhaustive discussion and consideration, decided to remove from the George bill that section which sought to set up a plan whereby Federal employees would be paid unemployment compensation. The George bill had provided language which when perused gave one the impression of plausibility. But when the Ways and Means Committee sought to apply this language to the problem and the task before it, it found that the plan expressed in this plausible language was practically impossible of administration. Persons well versed in the set-up of government were forced to the conclusion that it was impossible for them to set up any plan that could be carried out except a plan whereby all Federal employees of every kind and description would be included. I think that it never was the intention that any Federal employee should be included except those who would be considered as workers in temporary munitions plants. It surely was not intended that regular employees who were heretofore employed in defense plants should be included and more surely yet it never was intended that men and women working in offices in Washington who have been employed in Washington for many years and who have had, and do now have, the protection of civil service and who have built up healthy retirement funds for themselves under Government protection, should be included. It surely was not intended that men and women working in the regular establishments of the Government such as the Post Office Department and in the State Department and in the Consular Service in foreign countries, should have been included. But to draw the line as to who should have been included and who should not have been included was an impossible task. In this connection, I might say that under State laws which provide unemployment compensation to workers in the various States, no provision is made for compensation for State employees.

There is a very basic difference between Federal employees and employees of private industry in the various States. This difference can be best seen in a brief consideration of the philosophy underlying the establishment of the social security bill, of which unemployment compensation is a part. The basis of unemployment compensation is the congressional action taken in 1935 in the Social Security Act when it was provided that all employers of 8 or more persons anywhere in the United States should be compelled to pay a tax of 3 percent of the pay rolls of that company. Upon salaries or wages of persons earning over $3,000, the amount above $3,000 was not subject to this tax. This 3 percent tax on all the pay rolls of the Nation represents a tremendous amount of money collected each year. The Federal law provided that of this 3 percent, 90 percent was to be credited to the States out of which the States could pay unemployment compensation to the employees of the employers covered thereunder and 10 percent of the 3 percent should go to the Federal Government to bear the expense of administration. Therefore it can be seen that the basis of the unemployment compensation system is a tax on pay rolls. An employee had a right to feel that when he accepted employment from an employer who had paid this tax that he would have the protection of unemployment compensation. Whereas a person who accepted employment from an employer who did not protect his employees by the payment of this tax knew, or should have known, that he would not be protected by unemployment insurance. In other words, the unemployment compensation as carried on in the various States is a very worthy economic program.

Public employees are not included under its protection. If public employees of the State are not included, why then should Federal employees be included and paid out of State funds when the Federal Government was not paying the 3 percent which private employers were compelled to pay? This might be answered with the statement that under the George bill the Federal Government would reimburse the States. That kind of a program once launched would spell the ruination of State control systems. The Federal Government would stand in the same relative position as a man who holds a mortgage on another person's home. The Federal Government could not tax itself to make these 3 percent payments. The Federal Government does not tax itself for anything. The Federal Government is a creature of the

States and it has been given certain powers under the Constitution and the power to tax itself is not one of those powers granted to it.

There is no question but that any system or any plan provided under the George bill would surely be an invasion of the right of the States to control unemployment compensation which right they have so zealously guarded up to this time. As I have already stated, it was the sentiment of the committee that some Federal employees, such as those who earn small salaries and who are not under Civil Service and who have accepted temporary jobs under the Government and who may find themselves out of employment might with propriety be taken care of. The best method under the Constitution by which these persons could be helped is to raise their salaries. And again, no doubt, there will be some Federal employees who are employed in Government munitions plants who may find themselves out of employment. But it is a well recognized fact that practically all these employees have because of the war been paid much higher wages than they could expect in peace times and no doubt have accumulated something which will tide them over until they can again become located. To the everlasting credit of many of these employees, it may be said that they have most patriotically subscribed for bonds and have permitted bond payments to be taken from their wages and salaries. These bonds will no doubt fortify them against the shock incident to immediate shut-down due to the termination of the war.

ADVANCES TO STATE UNEMPLOYMENT FUNDS

The Ways and Means Committee although striking from the George bill the provisions providing for unemployment compensation for Federal employees does recommend the passage of that section of the George bill which provides for advance to the State unemployment funds. This provision provides that in case any State shall by reason of unusual demands on its funds for the payment of unemployment compensation exhaust its funds and thereby be threatened with failure to meet the legal demands thereon, then the Federal Government will advance to that State sufficient funds to enable it to meet its current demands. The money advanced by the Federal Government will come from that fund which the Government has established by reason of the payment to the Federal Government of a portion of the taxes which I have heretofore referred to. Although the amount payable to the Federal Government out of that tax is only 10 cents on each dollar collected, it has come in in such a great volume that there is in that fund many millions of dollars. It is from that fund that these advances will come and any State receiving such advances is charged with the same and must repay the same.

It may be argued that this is a case where the Federal Government will inject itself into the unemployment compensation set-up as now administered by the States. It is true that this might be thus considered but when it is further considered that the legislation provided in this bill shall all terminate in 1 year after the cessation of hostilities, or when the Congress shall so decide, it is not a very dangerous threat. At least it is not an imminent threat. Should it develop into a serious situation future Congresses can easily cope with it.

No one knows whether there will be any serious unemployment after the war; on the other hand, the country might be confronted with the serious problems that arise when many millions are unemployed. This provision to which I am now referring is intended to guarantee the States that they may be able to carry their burdens. Some States may have additional burdens as the result of a great influx of persons from other States. However that may be, the committee felt that while Congress is giving consideration to this matter that it is wise to provide against every reasonable contingency.

RETAINING AND REEMPLOYMENT

The Murray-Kilgore bill contained a provision for retraining and reemployment. The George bill also contained a similar provision. This was a section that would also have provided for the payment by the Government of the transportation expenses of workers from place to place and back to their homes. This section invoked much controversy in the Senate and much comment all over the Nation. This would have been a great step in the direction of national socialism. The standards for choice of employment, and so forth, set up under the Murray-Kilgore bill made it practically impossible of administration. These standards were modified somewhat in the George bill. But the question for decision is whether we, the United States, are ready to embark on a program where the Government will practically control the movements and the lives of practically all the workers of the Nation. Congress has already set up a retraining program for the World War veterans. Many of these veterans will come home wounded and impaired in health. Most of the World War veterans are young men, a large percentage of whom were taken from the schools and colleges and from the training courses. There is every reason for offering these training facilities to veterans. But the Government does not use any force or coercion with the training of veterans. It is all voluntary and optional. While it might be argued that the Government's program of training employees would not be compulsory or coercive, there is an entirely different psychology among workers than there would be among disabled veterans. The program to train workers would tend to bind them together and eventually put them into ruts out of which it would be difficult for them to extricate themselves, while the training of veterans would be, as I have already said, entirely voluntary and would have a tendency to demobilize them rather than to regiment them.

But the greatest practical objection to this section of the George bill, in addition to the fact that it would infringe upon the training program layed out for veterans, is that it is not necessary because already practically every State in the Union has an extensive training and rehabilitation program which programs are carried on extensively and successfully. And again practically all the large industries and manufacturing concerns of the country have training schools in which are enrolled many thousands of persons, which training courses have been very successful. And again there has been set up in the public schools of the Nation very extensive training courses. Practically every high school in the land has been equipped for the carrying on of Smith-Hughes programs in agricultural sections and other manual training courses for boys and girls in practically every city and town of the Nation.

There is no question that there is a tremendous sentiment in the Nation which is opposed to the Federal Government's entry into the public schools and into the colleges and universities of the land. Financial aid from the Government is an entirely different proposition than management and control by the Goverment. The training courses provided in the George bill and the Murray-Kilgore bill would have injected the Federal Government into the home life and activities of many of our people. When this is once done, it would readily extend to the school and college activities also.

The bill for consideration before the House today and which has been recommended by the Ways and Mean Committee of the House of Representatives contains no provisions with reference to retraining and reemployment.

PUBLIC WORKS

The bill before us for consideration contains another provision, the title of which is "Public Works." The purpose of this provision is to encourage and stimulate demands for the construction of essential and worth-while public works. The idea is to obviate the necessity of a program such as has been employed by the Roosevelt administration since its inception and to which we usually refer as the W. P. A. There is no question but that millions of dollars were wasted on foolish and inconsequential W. P. A. projects.

If this public-works program were carried out honestly and sincerely, there is no doubt that much benefit could be secured therefrom. I shall support the bill with the public-works program included in it, but I must admit that there can be many plausible and convincing arguments made against the inclusion of the public-works program in this bill.

I have alluded casually to some of the benefits, and I shall now stress some of them. One is that it would advise the Federal Government of what programs the various States and municipalities have in mind and might be anxious to project. Another benefit would be that a program of public works could be ready and could be advanced quickly in case great unemployment should develop in the country.

The objections that might be advanced to this title would be that the States and municipalities already have a rather complete and in many instances very worthwhile projects program for which they have already made plans and which they could advance on very short notice. Another objection that might be advanced to this title is that it tends to establish another National Resources Committee. The following language in the bill would indicate as much:

> No loans or advances shall be made with respect to any individual project unless it conforms to an all-over local or regional plan approved by competent local or regional authority.

It is claimed by those who are the principal advocates of this title that the language as recommended by the Ways and Means Committee as is incorporated in this title has rendered the intended program practically unattainable. They seem to object strenuously to the failure of this title to carry any provision for grants by the Federal Government. The fact that this title does not contain provision for grants and on the other hand requires that any money advanced by the Federal Government should bear interest will guarantee that no National Resources Committee program will be advanced.

I agree most heartily with the action of the committee in guarding against any wild and reckless grants of money by the Federal Government and also against the organization of any National Resources Committee program that would inject the Federal Government into the activities of the municipalities and States and local subdivisions of the Nation.

Summing up, therefore, let me say that this bill does the task for which it was principally planned. Congress has been confronted with two tasks that have come to it by reason of war activities and the imminent approach of cessation of hostilities. One of these is the disposition of surplus property. Congress has already acted on that subject. The other is the demobilization and reconversion of wartime industry. That is what Congress seeks to do in this bill. I believe that the first two titles of this bill will accomplish that purpose if the President will cooperate by the appointment of able and efficient men and will permit them to operate without official executive domination. Congress cannot do this work itself. It is the duty of the Congress to provide by legislation the manner and method by which it should be done and it is the duty of the Executive to have the work done according to the legislation passed by the Congress. Congress has with due deliberation disposed of the surplus property question and it will no doubt after due deliberation dispose of the matters intended to be covered by the legislation which now is being given consideration by the Congress.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENKINS. I am glad to yield to the distinguished and learned lady from Illinois.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Along the line of the question just discussed, under this bill and under the Senate bill as soon as the funds of a State are exhausted the State is encouraged in effect to come in and ask the Federal Government for money. As I understand it there is nothing to prevent a State's raising its unemployment payments. Why would it not be the part of wisdom to leave out that paragraph rather than furnish that encouragement inasmuch as the States, it is said, have healthy unemployment funds to the amount of $5,000,000,000?

Mr. JENKINS. I hope that I can answer the gentlewoman; at least I can give her my own reasons for my position favoring that provision. I was one of those who felt, and still feel, that it is almost impossible to adopt a system whereby unemployment compensation can be paid to Federal employees unless we paid it to all Federal employees. I was one of those who at first felt that probably we had better strike out this provision to which the lady directs her question, but here are several reasons why we should keep this provision in the bill: We hope there will not be nearly as much unemployment as many people believe there might be. Personally I think there will not be, because all the States and manufacturers are making plans to cope with it. The big industries of the country are laying their plans. In other words, I think we are running out to meet trouble, running out to meet something that may not happen to us. But suppose it does happen. Suppose there may develop great and unanticipated unemployment in a particular State thereby threatening the solvency of that State's fund without any fault of that State. Let us cite California, for instance. I do not mean to say California will be carried down but I daresay there are more transient people now in California than in any other State. They moved into California because of the fine climate and for various other reasons—I want to square myself with California now in that respect—but suppose California finds her funds depleted through no fault of her own, then we would be criticized if we failed to take appropriate action to care for this great population that might be thrown out of employment. The Social Security Administration has, as you know, about $500,000,000, in a fund which came to it as its part of the 3-percent tax levied on the pay rolls of the country. Why not use that fund if an emergency develops?

Personally I hope no emergency will develop, but I should feel remiss and should feel subject to criticism if I had gone away from this session of Congress and some State should become overwhelmed by the unemployment claims of people—some from my State, some from your State—and was unable to carry its load and we had failed to pass this provision of this bill to get aid from the Federal Government. By doing this we also answer the ungrounded claim that we had done nothing to strengthen unemployment compensation.

You might go further in your opposition to this provision and say that this is a dangerous precedent, and that it is an invasion of the right of the States to provide unemployment compensation. The States are now doing it voluntarily. This fund is in a sense a State fund. The money came from a tax paid to the State. The Federal Government, as has been stated here this afternoon and stated many times, the Federal Government in a sense ordered the States to build up an unemployment compensation fund. Congress passed a law levying a tax of 3 percent on practically all wages and salaries earned in all the States. Farm labor and domestics and some other classes were omitted. It is a State operation, it is a great operation; and it involves the collection of millions upon millions of dollars. Every employee in practically every State has learned to depend upon it. An employee picks his employer with a good deal of care. You can hardly get a man to take employment in a concern that is not protected with unemployment compensation. The employers pay for it and it is a compulsory tax.

It is said that this plan to guarantee the solvency of these State funds is an innovation, and that it will be abused; that some States, as the gentlewoman from Illinois suggested, might build up greater benefit payments and exhaust their surpluses immediately and then depend upon the Federal Government. This may be true, but I hardly think it will, but, if so, there will be another Congress.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. You are going to invite the rest of the States to compete with them.

Mr. JENKINS. If that develops it will be unfortunate, but I do not believe that will develop.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Are not these loans by the Federal Government, not gifts?

Mr. JENKINS. They are not grants, they are loans; they must be paid back. True, they do not carry any interest charge, but the money must be paid back, every dollar of it.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENKINS. I yield to my distinguished friend from Connecticut.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. There are some who feel that the States should not be required to exhaust their funds because the burdens created in certain States, California and other industrial States—Connecticut happens to be one of them—are burdens created by the war effort. Perhaps 60,000 additional workers came into my district to work in the war effort. The benefit goes to the Federal Government, to the country as a whole. Why should not the Federal Government protect the State against depleting its funds for these workers in the common interest? There are those who feel that the fund should come out of the Federal Treasury, that the States should not have to shoulder the burden completely.

Mr. JENKINS. Of course, if these are Federal employees the burden will not be on the State, for the States are not required to pay to Federal employees. I believe the committee, if it could have

done so, would have devised a definite system by which these employees could be classified, but they could not do it. Let us take for example Federal employees who work in these arsenals. I can state to the gentleman that we canvassed the situation and the civil-service experts and everybody else from whom we could get information said it could not be done. Let me give an illustration. Here is a man working in an arsenal in your district and has been working there steadily for 20 years. Here is a new war employee who came from Mississippi working in the same arsenal alongside the veteran employee and getting the same wage. Can we in justice pay the new war employee unemployment benefits without paying the other fellow who is an old employee? Or, across the street from the arsenal is a factory in which the employer's earnings are taxed 3 percent. The employer has paid his tax and his employees want to work for him because they know they are going to get the benefit of unemployment insurance. Here comes along a man from Florida who goes to work in the arsenal where he knows he will have an easier job and probably get more money. Would it be fair to give the man employed in the arsenal the same benefits as received by the man upon whose wages taxes were paid to create a State fund, out of which the man could be paid unemployment compensation?

If you retained the provisions of the George bill and pay unemployment compensation to Federal employees you are going to pay them out of State funds. It is impossible to do it otherwise. There is only one way to pay these Federal employees and that is for the Federal Government to say: "We will set up an unemployment fund ourselves and provide for Federal employees." Very well, where would that stop? When you do that it is impracticable. Do you want to pay the mail carrier who delivers the mail in your city? There is no more popular Federal employee. Do you want to pay the man who is working down here in one of these departments and who has been there for 20 years and who makes seven or eight thousand dollars a year? He has a big retirement built up. You are getting away from this girl or farmer who moved into the city to take employment in one of these war plants.

Who wants the Federal Government to set up this kind of an agency? Not many of us want that because then the Government will work in direct competition with the States again. What is the use of getting all heated up about this whole thing? There would not be this heat but for the fact we passed the G. I. bill. We did pass a G. I. bill which sought to look after our veterans, but there is a difference between a G. I. boy and an employee who works in an arsenal. The man who works in an arsenal did not lie in the foxholes in various foreign lands and face death in many forms. It is not necessary for me to continue along that line. There is a difference and a very vital difference. What we did for the G. I. boys we did in line with what we have done following every war. We are giving him consideration, but you cannot place the G. I. man in the same category as these other men.

If anybody had come forward with a formula that would have taken care of these people that we describe as unemployed war plant workers, the man and girl who has come from far away places and taken a job in a munitions factory and then finds himself or herself out of a job and away from home, and presented that formula to the Ways and Means Committee we would have considered it carefully, because it appeals to every fair-minded person. But no such formula was presented and none can be presented so far as we have been able to ascertain. What is the use of committing ourselves to an expensive program to meet that exigency which we hope will never develop? If it did develop, would you pay the civil service girls down here who are getting $120 a month, who cannot get a place to live in this city? What are you going to do about them? There you are opening the door and you solve nothing, you get nowhere. You must pay all Federal employees in all parts of the world or pay none because it is impossible to classify them.

Mr. NORRELL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENKINS. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. NORRELL. As I understand it, if it becomes necessary for any loans to be advanced to the States, the loans will come out of this unemployment reserve fund. With reference to the question propounded by the gentlewoman from Illinois, let us assume that it becomes necessary to make these loans and this $500,000,000 should be exhausted. Then what would the situation be?

Mr. JENKINS. We would be required either to discontinue the practice or appropriate money from the Treasury of the United States. You would have to meet that emergency when you came to it.

Mr. NORRELL. It would come out of the general revenue fund of the Federal Government unless in the meantime a tax should be passed?

Mr. JENKINS. Yes; it would have to come that way.

Mr. WRIGHT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENKINS. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WRIGHT. The gentleman spoke about the folly of going to a lot of expense for a contingency that may not arise. There would not be any expense unless the contingency did arise. But suppose we are overwhelmed by a flood of unemployment and we do not take any precautionary measures, the gentleman can realize the disastrous effect that would have.

Mr. JENKINS. You can put the Federal Government in the unemployment-compensation business and thereby invade the systems of the States. After you exhaust the $500,000,000, I do not know where else you will go, but we will have a Congress as long as we have a government, and Congress has never yet failed its people. Why should we assume that the next Congress will be impotent and be unpatriotic? We will meet that emergency when it comes. We have put up about $500,000,000 in anticipation of that situation, and that is the best we can do.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENKINS. I yield to the gentlewoman from Illinois.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Does not the gentleman think it would be a good idea to postpone consideration of this legislation until the Commander in Chief and his aides make up their minds whether we are going to have a depression or inflation? This bill assumes we are going to have unemployment. Before we left we had a price-control stabilization bill, assuming wages were going to be higher, and we had to have ceilings on wages and prices. Does not the gentleman think, before we pass this bill, we ought to make up our minds what it is to be?

Mr. JENKINS. There are some people who will agree with the gentlewoman, but we are in the midst of this matter now. The Senate has passed a bill and the public expects us to take some action. We have an obligation to the people and we must discharge that obligation now.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. We are shooting both ways at once.

Mr. JENKINS. Well, I hope nobody gets shot.

Mr. KNUTSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENKINS. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. KNUTSON. If we were to follow the suggestion of the gentlewoman from Illinois, and defer consideration of this legislation until the administration and the Commander in Chief made up their minds, that would be tantamount to postponing consideration indefinitely?

Mr. JENKINS. Yes. I thank the gentleman for his observation.

Mr. STEFAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENKINS. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. STEFAN. As I understand it, title III of this bill merely covers those who are now covered by social security unemployment insurance?

Mr. JENKINS. That is right.

Mr. STEFAN. Is it intended in this bill to increase that?

Mr. JENKINS. No; not any.

Mr. STEFAN. Then why are you changing the Social Security Act in title III?

Mr. JENKINS. We are not making any change in the law controlling the States in their handling of unemployment compensation.

Mr. STEFAN. There is no intent to increase the amount they are to receive?

Mr. JENKINS. That is fixed by State law. The State fixes that itself.

Mr. STEFAN. Why do we write title III into the bill then?

Mr. JENKINS. We take out of the bill that section of the George bill that provides for the payment of compensation to Federal employees and leave the other section which does the things we are talking about; that is, which guarantees the solvency of State funds.

Mr. STEFAN. You leave the social-security unemployment compensation as it is now, to be administered by the States?

Mr. JENKINS. We leave that alone. We do not invade the rights of the States.

Mr. STEFAN. Then why the reference to the $500,000,000?

Mr. JENKINS. Because some State fund might become depleted. If it does, then the Federal Government would be authorized to advance to that State's account out of this $500,000,000 fund whatever amount the Board should decide it would require and then charge the State with that amount and compel its repayment later.

Mr. STEFAN. Why are you going to deplete the fund that we have now of approximately $6,000,000,000 in the social-security fund?

Mr. JENKINS. Nobody is going to willfully deplete that fund. The reason the States have this $6,000,000,000 surplus is because in these wartimes there has not been very much demand on the fund. Employees have not been coming in to get the unemployment insurance because they were not unemployed. In other words, they have not been idle. They do not get unemployment insurance until they lose their jobs. We are anticipating that after the war there may be much unemployment and a consequent tremendous demand for collection of unemployment insurance.

Mr. STEFAN. We are anticipating that by title III?

Mr. JENKINS. Yes.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Will the gentleman yield again?

Mr. JENKINS. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. The gentleman spoke of unemployment after the war. He might be interested to know that in the city of Hartford, Conn., designated as a critical area, last week 1,304 people applied for unemployment compensation, and this, as I stated, in a critical labor scarcity area.

Mr. JENKINS. They had better revise their appraisal of critical labor scarcity areas.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Yes; I should think so.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Chairman, let me proceed again with a discussion of one feature of this bill which I have already discussed but which bears repetition. It has been said on this floor today that the pending bill does not do anything. The attack on this bill is going to spring from that sort of philosophy. I think that amendments to be offered to the bill are going to be based on the assumption that the bill does not do anything.

Let us see if it does or not. What does it do? I stated awhile ago that the people of the country have been very much agitated about this bill. Why? Because the bill has had a very tortuous course. It has been before the public a long time. It originated in the Senate as what was known as the Murray-Kilgore bill. What happened to the bill? We have a right now to stop and consider this for a minute. Another body of this Congress debated that proposition for days and days. What did that body do? That body by its vote overwhelmingly defeated that bill.

There will be an effort made here in the next few days to put back into this bill some of the provisions of the Murray-Kilgore bill that were rejected in the Senate overwhelmingly.

Mr. Chairman, the war is going to leave us two great problems absolutely due to the war. One of them is the question of disposal of surplus property. This House has decided that issue. It took us a long time to do it, but this House did take it up in a statesmanlike manner, gave it thorough consideration, debated the bill thoroughly and passed the bill methodically.

In due time that bill will reach the Senate, and then it will reach the conferees and it will be disposed of.

It was brought out before the Ways and Means Committee that almost the only personal assets this Government owns today, outside of its gold down in Kentucky, are these supplies the Government has on hand. That is the principal asset of the Government by way of personal property. There is fifty to seventy-five billion dollars worth of it. And maybe more. We are going to sell it. What else can we do?. Therein lies a great task.

We have before us another great war problem. I refer to the problem that comes from the necessity to demobilize and reconvert many large industries that have been built up to produce war material of all kinds. There are plants that the Government has spent billions of dollars to construct. There are thousands of men and women who have been trained to do many kinds of war work. Those men are going to be dislocated in their employment and those plants are going to be transformed. Who is going to do this tremendous task? While it is the obligation of Congress to do it yet Congress cannot in fact do it. It is a job for the executive branch of the Government but it is the duty of Congress to provide the plans by which it is to be done. And that is exactly what Congress is trying to do by this legislation. We talk so much about unemployment compensation and retraining and those other things. As I said before, we would not have had the training program if it had not been for the G. I. bill. A great number of people in this country believe that this unemployment compensation should be federalized. They have always felt that way, and this movement is spearheaded by that same sentiment to federalize unemployment compensation.

These things are all collateral to the real issue before us. The real issue is what is this Congress going to do to demobilize these industries and reconvert them? I say that is our responsibility. We built them up. We furnished the money. What are we going to do about it? Just lie idly by and let them demobilize themselves and reconvert themselves? No. We are going to provide in this bill that a man be appointed to direct the affairs. Who is he going to be? I do not know. Who is going to appoint him. The Chief Executive will appoint him; the President of the United States, who should appoint him, and who should see to it that the right man is appointed. We are going to pay him a big, fine salary of $15,000. And we are going to provide what he shall do. We lay down a chart in this bill describing what his duties shall be. He shall proceed with an abundance of power and authority and with the dignity and with the honor of the Government behind him and with the right arm of the President supporting him. He is going to proceed to reconvert these industries. In this bill we provide some specifications. How near do they approach those in the George bill? Why, they are practically the same, but there is some difference. There is just the difference that 15 Democrats and 10 Republicans, as members of the Ways and Means Committee, working together for 2 weeks, thought it would be necessary to make the bill more workable and more acceptable to Congress and the country.

This legislation provides that the Director of Mobilization and Reconversion shall operate under the directives of the President as far as Presidential directives apply, and also in part under the provisions of this law. The Presidential directives will of course apply while the war is on, but not longer, and we may want to be permitted to operate without Presidential directives, but so long as Congress authorizes the President to issue these directives in wartime, we canno complain now. Let us hope that the President will appoint a capable man and this man will do a good job without Presidential dictation. Let us not have another exhibition such as that given us recently by the quarrels of Donald Nelson and Charley Wilson.

You might say in connection with this legislation that this might be done and that might be done, but when you point to unemployment compensation and when you point to retraining you point to two propositions that are absolutely extraneous to the real purposes of this legislation. In this bill the Congress has an opportunity to discharge its duty and responsibility to two very important and far-reaching problems. I am sure we will not fail.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON] such time as he may desire.

Mr. CARLSON of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, everyone must realize that our Nation faces a most difficult problem in the transition from a production for war to a production for peace.

The productive capacity of our Nation has been expanded to a degree that seemed almost unbelievable a few years ago. This great expansion of production by private industry has demonstrated to the world the ability of a democracy to organize for war production. As a free people we have far surpassed those nations ruled by dictators. Is it not possible to believe that we as a nation can produce the same volume of goods and distribute them for the betterment of humanity? Surely we can reverse our national operations and produce for constructive purposes instead of destruction.

In my opinion there is too much of a defeatist attitude regarding unemployment at the conclusion of the war. I do not minimize the problem. However, I do sincerely believe that industry, which was so successful in reorganizing for war can also organize successfully for peace, if given an opportunity.

The Government can play an important part in this transition but it must not write legislation or enact laws that will impede or strangle the efforts of industry. We must keep in mind that social security is not a substitute for employment at useful work. There is only one answer for production and distribution of goods and that is jobs—full employment in private industry operating at a profit. It seems to me the issue facing Congress in the enactment of the proposed legislation is far deeper than the expansion of the social-security program. The decision we make on this important legislation will determine whether our Nation is to get back to the basic principle of prosperity through production rather than a false prosperity through the distribution of Federal funds. The issue is drawn in the basic differences between the George bill and the Murray-Kilgore-Truman bill. There is one thing about the future of America on which all parties are in agreement. That is—we must have a higher volume of production, more widely distributed, and a higher national income than we had before the war if we are to maintain our social system. This seems to be agreed upon by economists, bankers, the C. I. O., and every other group. We cannot face the inevitable burden of debt and the inevitable maladjustments that will follow the war unless our national income greatly exceeds the pre-war period.

To attain a sound national income of sufficient proportions to carry this burden of debt and Federal expenditures we must produce in a greater volume and more efficiently than we have ever done before. There is another way of getting a high national income in dollars. That is to draw from the Federal Treasury expendable currency and charge it to the future by increasing the debt.

It is my contention that this bill clearly brings before the American people the choice between these two philosophies. I am casting my lot with the first philosophy—quantity production, wide distribution, and high income. This is no doubt the most difficult way, and calls for character, hard work, and intelligence. It also will require the tightening of the belt. The second way is the most attractive. The road down is the easiest to take. It postpones the troubles of today for the future. It may be easy, especially in a campaign year, to urge more and greater benefit payments from the Federal Treasury. It may be that the latter method means votes in the ballot box. Yet, I cannot believe so. Our Nation from its beginning has developed because of the character, integrity, and sturdiness of its people. If we are to continue to grow and expand we must again get back to the fundamental principles of sound government. Continuous deficit financing should end with the war. As I stated previously, the issue before the House today is greater than one of weekly payments and the number of weeks to be paid in unemployment compensation. The fundamental difference is the difference between the philosophies of the two bills. While the George bill may cost the Nation a few billion dollars, the Murray-Kilgore-Truman bill is estimated to cost twenty to thirty billion dollars, and is but the beginning of a great program of Federal spending of borrowed money in order to maintain national income.

The next logical step is the W. P. A., with all its attendant evils. This solves no problem permanently.

Regardless of the temptation to be big-hearted and liberal during an election year, I sincerely hope this House will seriously consider the effect of adopting the program of increasing national income by distribution of funds from the Federal Treasury.

Let us, instead, follow the first course and build a production program the like of which has never been dreamed. To do this we must give every encouragement to industry.

First. Wartime restrictions on priorities for materials must be eased as rapidly as possible.

Second. Taxes must be reduced and rationalized so that little business may become big business.

Third. Federal regulations and restrictions which have forced thousands of small concerns to close their doors must be removed. The George bill, as amended, is the realistic approach to the problem. The Murray-Kilgore-Truman bill represents the type of political philosophy that perpetuates the unsound theory of prosperity through Federal spending of borrowed money.

I want it definitely understood that I am not satisfied with the present social-security program.

The present program of unemployment compensation and old-age survivors insurance is so unfair to millions of our people that it should be restudied immediately. If we are to have a national social-security program let us make it truly national.

Under the present law millions of our citizens are contributing directly and indirectly to a national social-security program, under which they can receive no benefits. These same individuals are taxed both directly and indirectly for the cost of the program. Contributions for unemployment compensation are paid by the employer by a 3-percent tax on pay roll. No one is so naive as to believe that the employer pays the tax. He is merely the collector. If he produces goods for the Government the Government pays the tax. If he produces goods for peacetime consumption the consumer pays the tax. In any event the citizen is taxed directly or indirectly for the entire cost. Old-age and survivors insurance are paid for by contributions of 1 percent each by employer and employee. Certainly no one would argue that the Government or citizens generally do not pay for a large portion of the cost of this program.

It was because of this unfairness that I have introduced in Congress during the past several sessions a resolution providing for a joint study by the House and Senate of the entire social-security program. We have now had about 10 years' experience with the operation of the present act and I contend it is time we review its effect on our national economy and our citizens generally. We should give serious consideration to the operation of the program at present as well as its effect on our citizens in the Nation generally.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CARLSON of Kansas. I yield.

Mr. KNUTSON. If we were to adopt and follow the system outlined by the gentleman, depending upon continual Federal aid, it would inevitably lead to a situation where we would have to make our living by taking in each other's washing.

Mr. CARLSON of Kansas. I am in accord with the sentiment expressed by the gentleman. After all, we just cannot continue the program that we have been following for years of deficit financing for increasing national incomes.

Mr. DISNEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CARLSON of Kansas. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. DISNEY. Who is really going to bell the cat?

Mr. CARLSON of Kansas. I presume the American Congress is going to have to think this thing through and think seriously as to how to work it out. We must also have the support of the people.

Mr. DISNEY. I agree, but generally speaking I cannot see any results along that line. I do not deprecate the efforts of any individual in either party, but it seems to me that unless there is a limit put on us, the Congress of the United States, as there is on every other money-spending body in the United States, it will continue as it is now.

Mr. CARLSON of Kansas. I have every reason to believe that we are going to start thinking sanely and constructively. The one answer is production and distribution of goods rather than the spending of borrowed Federal funds. We must have a higher volume of production—more widely distributed and higher national income.

Mr. ROWE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CARLSON of Kansas. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. ROWE. It is hardly fair for us who are charged with the responsibilities of this day to expect the coming generation to pay not only their own debts but ours as well.

Mr. CARLSON. That is very true. I am in accord with the gentleman.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may care to consume to the distinguished gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL].

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, I ask your indulgence for the brief period which I may find necessary to encompass my thoughts with regard to the measure pending before the committee at this time.

Of course, everybody is familiar with the provisions of the far-fetched Mur-

ray-Kilgore bill. I am sure the Members of this House are equally informed with regard to the conservative bill which was produced as a result of the labors of the Senate and which bears the title of the George bill.

No one has ever charged Senator GEORGE with any extremist views or any radicalism, and I am quite certain that I can say with good grace that I am in good company when I willingly and anxiously support most of the provisions of the George bill. Frankly, I say to you that I was not in agreement with the bill as presented to us and I certainly am not in agreement with the bill which is brought here by the Committee on Ways and Means, because I consider the bill to have been emasculated, eviscerated, and bruised to the point where you cannot recognize the original.

With all due deference, I say that if it were not for the fact that we aim to provide loans to States to guarantee solvency where the unemployment compensation fund of a State has been or might be impaired, the bill, frankly, would not have been presented here because we of the Committee on Ways and Means would have lost jurisdiction. I am certain there is no other excuse for this bill's being presented by the Committee on Ways and Means except that it has in it a vague, remote possibility covering unemployment compensation. In order to bolster that, because of jurisdictional claim and of an extreme and feigned apprehension of possible impairment of these State funds, we provide loans by the Federal Government without interest.

I do not think a scintilla of evidence has been presented here to indicate that these funds will ever be impaired. I do not see how they can be. They are substantial in themselves and I hope will meet just about all the requirements and strain on the present scale of benefits. There would be some sense in providing loans to States if the level of benefits were provided was raised as I sought to do through an amendment which I offered to the bill in committee and which was defeated. I hope to present the same amendment to you, and I hope it will be acted upon favorably tomorrow or the day after.

Mr. Chairman, the bill presented to us indicates clearly by comparison that, among other things, the Committee on Ways and Means struck out even the reference to the objectives; in other words, we did not want the world to know what the objective of the bill was, and you could not leave the objectives in the bill after you started kicking the stuffings out of it. So the objectives declaration had to be stricken out because you took out all of the entrails and the backbone, and it could not stand up.

We struck out provisions for Federal employees. It is a complex question, I grant you, but it was not a problem which was insurmountable. We could have made provision to cover the problem. My good friend the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON], who is not a radical either, was very anxious to work out something to take care of hundreds of thousands of employees in shipyards and those generally employed in industry by the Federal Government itself. But they are not in the bill, they were stricken out with a vengeance.

The question of retraining came up and that too was kicked into a cocked hat. The bill provided also for a travel allowance. While I was one who did not subscribe to any wild-eyed provision in a bill which would permit workers to joy ride or to travel all over the country and finally get home via Chicago, Milwaukee, St. Paul, Seattle, Dallas, and St. Louis, and then get back in a roundabout way to the Corn and Cotton Belts. I was in favor of allowing an employee who came to Detroit from Tennessee, Kentucky, or Alabama after he finished his patriotic service to his country, by helping us produce buckshot and bombs and other things needed to give the Hun hell, which he deserves, I was willing when the time came to send him back home that we should allow him a reasonable amount in rail fare. Because, we do not want him in Detroit. He will be a problem there to us and to himself and he will be drawing unemployment compensation. I thought it would have been the better part of wisdom and I thought it would be economically wise to send him back to the Corn or Cotton Belt where he will be needed and where he created a problem by his absence. So I wanted to send him back there. What was wrong with that? Well, the committee was just determined that they would not permit it and struck out the entire provision having to do with travel.

Mr. DEWEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DINGELL. Not at this point. I would rather finish my statement. So that was wiped out of the bill. The question of retraining came up. I was not one of those who believed that we ought to retrain every Tom, Dick, and Harry. As a matter of fact I think it is silly to try and retrain a fellow who was put on at the Ford motor works turning nut No. 411 by hand or retraining a man who used a power wrench, or someone who applied a certain amount of leverage with one jerk of a large hand wrench. I do not think it is necessary to retrain him. It was not necessary to train him in the first place. So I could not go for that. Nor did I think, for example, that it was proper to go in for retraining some of the women in my friend's State of California who have learned how to use a blowtorch and how to do riveting on airplanes, because those women went in for patriotic reasons, to aid their Government, to stand by husband, to stand by son, or sweetheart who was in the service. What she or they earned was a windfall. I think I was reflecting the sentiment of the craftsmen and trade-unionists of this country, who know that they do not want to extend a lot of retraining because I know they are already restricting their own apprentice and training programs. They do not want to create competition with well-trained journeymen. But there was a need for coordinating the training provisions for which so many governmental agencies today have authority. I thought it would have been wise and that it would have been economical to make some such provision. There is too much duplication and overlapping which needs coordination to reduce it. But again the great majority of the committee decided that there shall be no mention of it, and kicked that into a cocked hat. Therefore, that is out. Now my contention is solely and only, and my opposition is predicated upon the fact, tha' we have gone too far in our purging of this "radical" George bill. Then we provided for a reduction of the life of the bill from 2 years to 1 year. Well, that may be all right, but it may work out entirely to the detriment of our people. I believe the bill provides 2-year tenure for the Administrator. Certainly it constricts farsighted planning. The advisory committee was stricken out. I would not quibble about that. I would not particularly want a committee of 12 or 15 which might be prompted by political considerations to sit on the neck of the Director and to force strained decisions. So I was willing that that should be stricken out. With great gusto the committee kicked that into a cocked hat.

Now as to the question of public works: That subject is going to be covered by my good friend the gentleman from New York [Mr. LYNCH], who knows a great deal about it, having made a very special and a very thorough study of it. We took the provision out of the George bill which allowed a grant of 2 percent to cover building plans; yes, not to exceed 2 percent, and we specifically provided more forceful language to cover the plan. When the committee acted on that they favored it. Lo and behold, the next day, I do not know whether it was prompted or whether it was just spontaneous, the committee just blew the lid off of that and struck out the 2 percent for this purpose and put in a senseless provision for a loan to the States and municipalities and other governmental subdivisions for a period of 5 years at the rate of 2½ percent. It seems to me as devoid of any vision, that we should quibble over a small amount.

An expert appearing before our committee, one of the two privileged individuals who was permitted to come and give us any advice, although we disregarded it in the final analysis, said this 2 percent outright grant which he recommended he was convinced would probably have produced a great deal in public works, and he said there was no substitute for it and that it was the cheapest way he knew to stimulate building projects which might be necessary. He thought it might provide work for at least 1,000,000 persons after the war. We paid no attention to that and went counter to his expert advice, which we sought and thought sound in the first place. He did not volunteer it. We called him and then we disregarded the sound advice which he gave us. Mark my words, if there is any depressed condition in the building trade after this war we probably are going to be called upon to allow anywhere from 50 percent

to 70 percent in Government loans or grants for the purpose. And the bad part of it will be that we are going to wait a year or two because there will be no plans on the shelf of our local governments, our State governments. I think we made a mistake. It might have been a proper thing to have left a mere pittance of 2 percent to be granted to municipalities and States for this very important purpose. Then, of course, there was a provision in the bill which was to authorize the Secretary of Labor to report to the Congress and to the President within 6 months after making a study and investigation of the problem of the specific feasibility of annual wage systems for the good of labor, industry, and of the Nation as a whole. But that was stricken from the bill. In other words, we do not want to make any plans whatever with regard to the needs of labor. Everybody said that in the instance of labor it was a desirable thing to provide a system or formula under which there would be uniform regular employment.

Some States under our compensation laws even grant certain concessions to employers who have worked out a plan under which they work their employees throughout the year. One farsighted packer up in Minnesota, I think it is Hormel, worked out an annual wage plan that is successful. A large boot and shoe manufacturer gained distinction and fame throughout the Nation by working out a similar plan. Seemingly, we do not want to know anything about that. The Secretary of Labor must not make any investigation; must not make any report to us, because we do not want to do anything for labor. That may not be the real attitude, but that is the result.

Mr. Chairman, what I want to leave with the committee is that the bill in itself as a whole is deficient. It ought to be strengthened. We will have an opportunity to attach certain amendments tomorrow or the next day. The bill provides, perhaps insufficiently, but nevertheless quite generously, for industry. That is proper. We all want industry to be prosperous, because that will help labor. But let us not go on the theory of permitting things to trickle down from the top. Let us provide as well at the bottom. I would rather see a yawning cavernous idle plant than to see a starving, hungry kid, any day. If we are to provide for industry let us provide for the workers as well. If you disregard the buying element, the workers, you will fail in both instances. The working man, as I view it, should be treated at least on a par with industry. The problem is one and inseparable.

We have made many provisions for industry. I hope we will do something for labor, and thus we will strengthen both.

As I said, there will be some amendments offered. One that I am particularly interested in I want you to think over. It will square with the recommendations of Mr. Justice Byrnes, who appeared as special adviser to the committee with regard to this question. It will provide unemployment compensation up to $20 per week, for a period of 26 weeks. The method or basis of calculation is to raise it from 40 or 50 percent to 75 percent; so that if a person has earned $8 a week and becomes unemployed, and under certain State laws now only receives 50 percent, or $4.00, under the terms of my amendment he would get 75 percent or $6.00. That is nothing to brag about, but $2 is 50 percent more than he has been accustomed to. It is not going to bankrupt anybody. It is not going to do any real injury to any State compensation fund. I think it is a desirable objective, and the raising of such allowance will be in agreement with the Federal Government and the difference paid by the Federal Treasury. And it will be for how long? For the life of the bill—1 year.

Of course, some people fear this will be an invasion of States' rights. I think some States ought to have their rights invaded, where they have gone as far as permitting a minimum of 50 cents per week unemployment compensation, and in some other instances $2. That is not a joke. That is an insult. That does not belong in our scheme of things and ought to be corrected. If the States cannot correct it, the Federal Government ought to step in and do something about it, because it is unpatriotic, it is un-American, and it ought not be permitted to continue.

Mr. DEWEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DINGELL. I yield.

Mr. DEWEY. I always listen with deepest interest to my colleague on the committee; but when he begins to talk at this time of wages of $8 a week, I just wondered where he gets the example. We want to get the facts on these situations, but, after all, I do not know of any pay rolls of $8 a week.

Mr. DINGELL. I will grant you this will not apply to Chicago, but there are thousands of localities in this country where $8 a week is a lot of money.

Mr. DEWEY. Does the gentleman think that today anywhere in the United States there are pay rolls of $8 a week?

Mr. DINGELL. Yes; I not only think so but I know so. I think the burden of disproving that statement rests upon the gentleman's shoulders.

Mr. DEWEY. I would certainly like to have proof on that. I would like to know the State in this Union that pays $8 a week.

Mr. DINGELL. Now I am not going to go into the question of submission of any proof of that.

Mr. DEWEY. The gentleman has put into the RECORD that statement, and that puts me, as a member who has voted against this in the committee, in a very small light. That would be niggardly.

Mr. DINGELL. I grant you that you are in the grease, but I am not going to fish you out. You disprove the statement and do not put me to the task of proving it.

Mr. DEWEY. The gentleman need not worry about me.

Mr. DINGELL. I refuse to yield any further, Mr. Chairman. I have made my position clear.

Mr. DEWEY. No. You have made the statement that you can prove there are $8-a-week pay rolls.

Mr. DINGELL. I made no such statement as to proving it. I made the statement that where anyone was receiving $8 a week compensation, under existing law he shall receive $4; under my amendment it would amount to $6.

Mr. DEWEY. But you said there were plenty of them.

Mr. DINGELL. I say to you there are localities where there are plenty of them. If you want to disprove that, you may try to disprove it.

Mr. LYNCH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DINGELL. I yield.

Mr. LYNCH. It is a fact that at least one State pays 50 cents a week unemployment insurance, and others go as low as $4 a week?

Mr. DINGELL. Oh, yes. It is $2 a week.

Mr. LYNCH. That is the minimum rate, but it is based on a percent of the salary or the wages of the people who get it?

Mr. DINGELL. That is right. Therefore, if compensation is based on a percentage of the amount of pay received, it must be obvious that in the schedules studied in committee showing $4 benefits at 50 percent must have been predicated upon an $8 basic wage. That is obvious.

Mr. DISNEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DINGELL. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. DISNEY. I wonder how far the gentleman would go on the training program. The committee struck it out, and the gentleman has expressed great concern. I wondered how far the gentleman wanted to go.

Mr. DINGELL. I will be glad to answer that. I made my position clear in committee. I think it would be economic and wise to provide for the power of coordination, so that there would be no overlapping. I do not want to grant any authority for any additional retraining. I do not want to provide the Director with any vast funds. I sought to bring about the elimination of overlapping. I learned later on that my premise was sound and correct, because there were many agencies scattered throughout the Government that had training programs of their own. I thought it was wise to coordinate those efforts so that there would be no costly, useless overlapping.

Mr. DISNEY. In striking out the retraining program, the committee rather accords with your views, if it had gone further and had provided for coordination?

Mr. DINGELL. That is all I said with regard to overlapping, because there is the possibility of increased duplication and overlapping with no controls. I think it will continue to exist under Executive order.

Mr. DISNEY. Now, recurring to the matter of $8 a week, I do not think the gentleman implied or meant to imply that there were any Government officials paying $8 a week.

Mr. DINGELL. I did not mean that nor did I say it. I now yield to my friend from Pennsylvania [Mr. WRIGHT].

Mr. WRIGHT. As regards with philosophy of States' rights with reference to this unemployment compensation, is

it not conceivable and is it not reasonable that while in normal times unemployment compensation may be a State matter yet here in a demobilization period following a war when the Federal Government has brought workers to California, brought workers to Detroit, brought workers to shipyards all over the country, it becomes our obligation as a Federal Government and not of the 48 States to get these people back into post-war peacetime employment?

Mr. DINGELL. That is right; I agree with the gentleman. Here is some proof we might cite as a basis, table 17 from Post-war Economic Policy and Planning Committee hearings showing the State coverage provisions, wage record of the system, and benefit formulas. The State of Mississippi pays $3 on the basis of its own percentage calculation; Louisiana pays $3; Arkansas pays $3. The State of Alabama pays a minimum of $2; and the State of Missouri pays 50 cents.

Mr. CARLSON of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. DINGELL. Yes; I shall be pleased to yield to my friend from Kansas.

Mr. CARLSON of Kansas. I am in accord with the gentleman. He is reading from a table we discussed in the committee; and we did find Missouri paying a minimum of 50 cents. It is not up to me to rise to the defense of Missouri, for I do not represent that State; but this matter will be referred to many times and I do not think it is quite right to refer to it as a minimum payment of 50 cents. As a matter of fact the State of Missouri does not pay for less than 6 weeks in any case; so their minimum payment in reality is $3. We might as well start with the facts on the record.

Mr. DINGELL. But that is the amount for 6 weeks.

Mr. CARLSON of Kansas. They never pay less than $3 in any one payment. If the man is entitled to 50 cents he gets $3.

Mr. DINGELL. Yes; and it is conceivable that he has to starve for 5 weeks on $2.50.

Mr. CARLSON of Kansas. No unemployed person in Missouri gets less than $3. We are going to have a lot of discussion about these minimum payments; but to say that the minimum received by an unemployed person in Missouri is 50 cents is not fair.

Mr. DINGELL. I understand the gentleman's point of view. I deplore the fact we should have any misunderstanding on that point because I think we all want to raise these minimum provisions. I mean they are inexcusable. Even before the gentleman from Illinois was on the committee I stood opposed to the bureaucratic grab for power and we tried to center all of the provisions with regard to unemployment compensation and with regard to old-age pensions in the States where it properly belongs; but we do expect, we have a right to expect, we in Congress who have yielded them that power and that responsibility have a right to expect, that now they shall discharge their duties properly and honorably and pay the working man what he should properly have. I now yield to my friend from Michigan.

Mr. SADOWSKI. I understand the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL] has introduced a bill, the Dingell bill. I have had the privilege of reading it. I thing it is a very constructive measure. I think it goes a long way to correct the weaknesses in the committee bill. I am just wondering whether we are going to have an opportunity to vote on the Dingell bill and when we may have that opportunity.

Mr. DINGELL. I may say to my colleague from Michigan that I intend to raise a parliamentary question as to the proper time and then to present it as a substitute for the pending bill and I think that if the substitute passes it should be made the basis in conference for the rewriting of the bill together with the George bill so we can bring out something real and substantial that we can all get behind 100 percent.

I now yield again to my friend from Kansas.

Mr. CARLSON of Kansas. While we are discussing these low payments in certain States, in fact, low minimum payments in all States, we should bear in mind that when this law was originally enacted the States made it permanently low in order that they could make a greater coverage. It was not the thought that they wanted to pay these people just that very minimum, but it gave them an opportunity with very limited funds to spread it to more people. I think when we reach a consideration of the bill under the 5-minute rule we shall have an amplification of that.

Mr. DINGELL. I hope we shall correct many things that were allowable in the first instance but which today are no longer justified. The funds are liquid, they are sufficient to meet a reasonable increase and the inclusion of certain classes that are not touched by it. I think that is what we all had in mind when the bill was before the Committee on Ways and Means back in 1935; but still many of those States have remained static and have to date made no liberalizing provisions. I believe if we do nothing more here and now than to focus public attention upon these insufficiencies it will perhaps bring about a liberalization of the niggardly provisions in some cases.

Mr. CARLSON of Kansas. The gentleman is so generous with his time that I hesitate to trespass further upon it, but I ask him if it is not a fact that the average weekly payments in every State in the Union has gone up greatly during the last few years? The lowest average as I get it from the table in the hearing is $11 per week. So while we may talk about $2.50 and $3 there must be very few of those payments when the lowest weekly average in the Nation is $11.

Mr. DINGELL. There has been marked improvement in some States, but it does not reflect itself throughout.

Mr. PACE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DINGELL. I yield.

Mr. PACE. If the gentleman will permit, I should like to ask a question regarding another section of the bill, section 41, relating to loans to States, counties, and municipalities for the drafting of plans and surveys for post-war projects. Did the committee go into the question of how effective that would be in those States with a constitutional limitation upon the amount of funds the State or any municipal subdivision thereof could borrow?

Mr. DINGELL. I am sorry; I am not competent to shed very much light on that, as I cannot recall the matter being probed.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. DINGELL. I shall be very happy to yield to my friend from Tennessee.

Mr. COOPER. I am sure the distinguished gentleman from Michigan will recall that that question was raised by Mr. Folsom while he was appearing before us in executive session. He said that some of the planning of the States and political subdivisions had run into the difficulty that there were certain constitutional limitations in the States. He was hoping they might be able to work out some kind of arrangement to overcome that, but it was pointed out to us that there are some difficulties along that line.

Mr. DINGELL. I do recall that now.

Mr. COOPER. Obviously, in the Ways and Means Committee or here in the House we cannot amend the constitutions of the various States, so we are just doing the very best we can for the situation as it exists. He did, however, express the hope that something might be accomplished along the line of working out an arrangement to take care of that situation.

Mr. DINGELL. I thank the gentleman. I now yield to my friend from New York.

Mr. CELLER. We hear a lot stated about the cost of this program that might be involved in the gentleman's bill. In that connection there is a lot of loose talk about our debt. When people speak of our public debt, it is always a gross debt, it is not a net debt. For example, today our debt is about $210,000,000,000, but there must be subtracted from that $40,000,000,000 of borrowing, upward of seventy-five billions in surplus disposable material which will be sold. The Treasury has some $20,000,000,000 in cash on hand deposited in banks that must be deducted. In addition, Government corporate and credit agencies have assets, real assets which may be realized upon, not merely interagency bookkeeping entries, amounting to $30,000,000,000. In addition thereto, there is on deposit in the security fund about $5,000,000,000 due for unemployment insurance benefits, it may run to $7,000,000,000 before the war is over. In addition thereto, the Government has in the form of a trust fund about $28,000,000,000 that may or may not be due to corporations with reference to their excess-profits taxes. It is estimated that only half of that will be used.

Mr. McCORMACK. How about the gold at Fort Knox?

Mr. CELLER. I did not even speak of the gold on deposit at Fort Knox. There is silver in great quantity, too.

But in any event, on those figures alone our net debt will be less than $100,000,000,000.

Mr. DINGELL. I thank the gentleman for that observation. I wish to yield the floor at the earliest possible moment, and I am going to ask, after I yield to my friend from Arkansas, that I be permitted to yield the floor.

Mr. NORRELL. I merely wanted the RECORD to show that since the question of minimum payments by some States, including Arkansas, has been brought out, that the maximum possible weekly payments in all the States range from $15 to $20 per week.

Arkansas has a maximum payment of $15 per week; I believe Michigan has a maximum possible payment of $20 a week; and Massachusetts $18 per week. I would like to say, while I am on my feet, that I know of no industrial worker in Arkansas who is not getting over $3 a week.

Mr. DINGELL. I am glad to hear that.

[From the Washington Post of August 29, 1944]

HUMAN SIDE

We hope that before taking action today the House will have read the minority report protesting against the committee version of the George reconversion and civilian demobilization bill. It was written by four Democrats from districts which have bitter knowledge of the horrors of mass unemployment. Thus the writers have good cause to dread widespread cancelation of war orders. They know that the end of the war will impose a severe strain upon the unemployment insurance funds of industrialized States, such as Michigan and Pennsylvania, with their expanded war industries—that it will leave thousands of stranded workers needing assistance to get back to their former homes or to other parts of the country where jobs may await them. Let the House equally ponder these dangers.

As passed by the Senate, the George bill took cognizance of these dangers. It filled some of the gaps in the existing State unemployment insurance systems by bringing into the State systems, at Federal expense, about three and a half million workers employed by the Federal Government. It also provided vocational training for war workers and travel allowances. The modified bill reported out of the Ways and Means Committee has, however, been stripped of all these provisions. It merely retains a section providing for Federal loans without interest to State unemployment insurance funds, in case of need. As the four protesting Democrats on the Ways and Means Committee state, it is impossible to justify a policy that requires private employers to provide unemployment compensation, while permitting the Federal Government to ignore the claims to like protection of thousands of workers in its own arsenals, navy yards, shipyards, and ammunition plants. The manifest unfairness of such discriminatory action was bad enough. But it was not as disturbing as the apparent lack of understanding of the gravity of the unemployment problem that lies ahead of us.

The fact is that the Ways and Means Committee was thinking less about unemployment than about States' rights. Republican members of the Ways and Means Committee who joined the Democratic majority in pruning the George bill kept harping on the necessity of guarding against federalization of State unemployment insurance systems. Now federalization is, in our opinion, essential to put unemployment insurance on a satisfactory basis for workers in all parts of the country. However, the George bill as approved by the Senate took every precaution against overturning the State-administered systems of unemployment insurance—at the expense of a really sound measure. Further weakening of this originally inadequate measure certainly cannot be defended on the ground that pruning was required to protect the State insurance systems against Federal encroachment. In any case the States cannot be asked to pay out unemployment benefits to workers dropped from Federal pay rolls. That is an obligation that the Government itself must assume, if any protection at all is to be afforded to this group.

So the Ways and Means Committee passed up an opportunity to improve the George bill with a well-rounded, moderate system of unemployment benefits that would tide the country over a difficult period without putting a premium on idleness. By whittling down that bill until it has become a skeletonized version of the original measure, it has, moreover, increased the pressure for action exerted by disappointed advocates of ultraliberal Federal benefits.

An adequate system of idle allowances, payable during the immediate post-war period, would not retard industrial reconversion, as some Congressmen apparently fear. On the contrary, it would hasten reconversion by providing buying support for industry. Workers without jobs, eating up their wartime savings or subsisting precariously on such hand-outs as they can pick up, are not going to provide an active demand for the output of post-war industry. And industrialists will assuredly hesitate to spend large sums to reconvert their plants to meet peacetime needs, if consumer demands fail to materialize. So even if Congress feels no special responsibility to assist war workers left stranded by cancellation of Government contracts, it should remember that a do-nothing policy may slow down reconversion and aggravate the unavoidable economic disorders of the post-war transition period.

Mr. CARLSON of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS].

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, the wartime controls over the American people and over our economy should end with the ending of the war. We should not, in the legislation now before us, or in any other legislation, lay the basis for a continuation of wartime regulations, restrictions, allocations, or rationing. We should not, by what we do today, give any excuse whatever for the continuation of boards, bureaus, and agencies set up to do a wartime job. The millions and millions of people now employed by the Government must be taken off the backs of the taxpayers at the earliest possible time. It is my firm opinion that unless this Congress shows its clear intention to stop regimenting the American people just as soon as the war is over, another Congress will be elected that will restore to the American people their liberty.

It is necessary that we keep in mind the reason for wartime controls. The restrictions on the use of steel, copper, aluminum, rubber, sugar, meat, and other items were not for the purpose of policing business. These restrictions were not for the purpose of breaking up monopolies or bringing about social reform. The Congress authorized the President to do this regulating for the purpose of speeding up and making possible the production of guns, planes, tanks, ammunition, ambulances, and all the other things needed to win the war. When the war is won, the wartime controls will have served their purpose. To vote to continue them is to take a position in favor of the policing of business, the continued regimentation of the American people, and the use of the wartime powers of the Federal Government to bring about social reform in peacetime. I subscribe to no such doctrine.

There is an additional and very important reason why these controls should be thrown off, and I mean thrown off, not slackened. Unless these controls are ended, there can be no reconversion to private enterprise. There can be no resumption of full employment in private business unless the controls are taken off. There is no chance for the small manufacturer to forge ahead, or for the potential manufacturer who possesses only an idea and ambition to get started, if he must get on his knees before any Government agency and beg for a small amount of steel or copper or cotton, or any other raw material.

The New Deal party has no faith in America. They think in terms of unemployment and not employment. They do not dare to trust the American capitalistic system and give it a chance for jobs for all who want to work. They are defeatists; they think America is through.

This Congress today, instead of flirting with peacetime controls should be here enacting a post-war tax bill that would bring about new ventures in the business world. By the encouragement of risk, capital jobs are provided and a market is created for the things the farmers produce.

Let us consider for a moment the control, restricting, or allocating of raw materials when the war is over. The vast majority of manufacturers will be anxious to resume their peacetime production, whether it be the making of washing machines, bicycles, electric fans, cooling systems, automobiles, furniture, utensils, hardware items, or what not. This manufacturer will face many unknowns. He will not know just what his labor costs will be, nor his taxes. If the Government requires him to waste precious months in filling out forms, questionnaires, and applications for priorities for raw materials, you have tied his hands before he ever gets started to reconvert to peacetime production.

You have then retarded, discouraged, and destroyed post-war jobs. The only thing that I can think of that would be more discouraging to such a manufacturer would be the threat of a continued price ceiling on his peacetime products. That, too, would completely stop him from taking a risk and forging ahead.

Small businessmen have been the recipients of a great deal of oratory in the past few years. I challenge anyone who contends that raw materials should be controlled and allocated after the war to visit all the small manufacturers in his district and get their honest opinion on it. The businessmen of America have faith in our economic system, even if the city of Washington does not have. They would much rather rely upon their own ingenuity, the natural competitive processes and the fairness of their estab-

lished suppliers of material, than to be at the mercy of a bureaucrat in Washington. We should keep in mind that most of the great army of top-notch businessmen who have given their services to the war agencies of the Government will leave the Government when the war is over. Are we going to place the future of our economic system in the hands of the professional, theoretical Government official who sometimes is a "do gooder" or a "pink" or a "punk"?

Mr. Chairman, we must continue the drive for winning the war. A total and complete victory over the Axis is America's first job, but when that is done the American people should be unharnessed. Regimentation should go out the window, and liberty and opportunity should be restored in this the land of the free.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. GORE, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (S. 2051) to amend the Social Security Act, as amended, to provide a national program for war mobilization and reconversion, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

HOUR OF MEETING TOMORROW

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock tomorrow.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD in two instances, and in one to include an article from the Washington Post.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. PLUMLEY] be permitted to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I be permitted, in connection with the remarks I made today on the George bill, to insert an editorial appearing in the Washington Post this morning captioned "The human side."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD in two instances.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include two editorials from the Philadelphia Inquirer under dates of August 28 and August 29.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

FAIR EMPLOYMENT PRACTICE COMMITTEE

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 2 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I note in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of August 28 an attack on the Labor Committee of the House by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. LAFOLLETTE]. As chairman of that committee and in all fairness to me and to the committee, I believe it is important for the House to know the facts.

I called the committee to meet on Thursday, August 24, to decide whether or not to continue hearings on F. E. P. C. bills. There were Republicans and Democrats present at the meeting. A motion was made and carried to postpone further hearings until after election. There was not a protest from any member of the committee. The reason this action was taken was because it was realized that it would be physically impossible to hear the listed number of proponents and opponents and report a bill before election. It was not and is not the intention of the committee to shelve its responsibility. A practical situation confronted us. Members are busy on many problems concerned with their districts and, realizing that a bill could not be passed before election, it was decided to postpone consideration until after election. This takes the issue out of politics at this time. I am in entire agreement with Mr. LAFOLLETTE that the issue should transcend politics. The position of the Democratic Party is clear on this subject. It translated its attitude toward minorities through the President's Executive order creating the Fair Employment Practice Committee, and, if further evidence of its position is necessary, I would suggest that the action taken by the Philadelphia Transit Co. and the Los Angeles Railway Co. in the hiring and up-grading of Negroes is sufficient answer as to the sincerity of the Democratic administration. Actions speak much louder than words.

The Democratic Party is responsible for every advance gained by the Negro people over a generation. Under the humanitarian administration, sponsored by President Roosevelt, Negroes have been given equal opportunities in government. They will continue to receive such recognition and, if the Republicans will join the Democrats when the F. E. P. C. hearings are resumed, following the election I can promise that F. E. P. C. will be enacted into law before the close of the Seventy-eighth Congress.

J. A. KRUG AND THE W. P. B.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 4 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, today we have a new man in charge of W. P. B. His name is Krug.

Who is this man Krug? This is a question of vital importance to every one of our fighting men all over the world, and all of our citizens everywhere, because this is the man who has been entrusted not only with the tremendous job of supplying all of the munitions requirements of our armed forces, but has been put in charge of reconversion which will determine whether millions of workers will have jobs or be back on the Roosevelt New Deal dole.

We all know who William S. Knudsen is. He is one of the greatest masters of mass production the world has ever known. Is it possible that the New Dealers now think a Knudsen is not big enough to be entrusted with the authority now granted Mr. Krug? Are they back to the point where they were when Knudsen could only be a codirector of our war-production program with equal power granted to Sidney Hillman, a Communist bedfellow?

We all know who Donald Nelson is. Public sentiment forced authority into his hands only after the stern reality of Pearl Harbor taught our slumbering Chief Executive that we would have to get down to business. Under Nelson's direction our enemies have been made to feel the tremendous power of our great American system of production.

Only a week ago the President was protesting that he was not kicking Donald Nelson in the teeth. And within 3 days it developed that the President was not kicking him in the teeth—he was just kicking him 10,000 miles across the Pacific. And it seemed to be Charles E. Wilson who was being kicked in the teeth.

We know something about Charles E. Wilson, too. He is the man whom Roosevelt himself credits with having brought the airplane and shipbuilding programs out of chaos.

Now we have Mr. Krug. His chief qualification up to now seems to be that

he is the choice of the New Deal backstairs cabal who have succeeded in getting rid of so many efficient men.

Does Mr. Krug know the difference between a lathe and a screw machine? Has he ever had actual charge of producing anything? His position in Government employment during practically all of the time since his graduation from college in 1929 certainly does not qualify him as a production expert.

A few days ago we heard a voice pleading from a west coast naval base for just 4 more years. It asked the American people whether they are willing to trust "this big 1944 job to inexperienced hands."

Candidate Roosevelt has given us his own answer. At a moment when the Army is pleading for cannon and an Army representative is testifying that the program is only 53 percent fulfilled; at a time when the Navy is pleading for ships of all kinds, and a Navy representative is testifying that the war in the Pacific is being delayed, out go two of the most efficient men who have ever had a part in our production program, and there is substituted a production unknown, with "inexperienced hands."

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. I yield.

Mr. EBERHARTER. I take it that the gentleman from Indiana gives the present administration a great deal of credit for selecting, in the first place, men of the caliber and qualifications of Donald Nelson and Mr. Wilson; is that correct?

Mr. HALLECK. If the gentleman had listened to me, he would understand that I said public sentiment had forced the yielding and granting of the authority to men of the character and capacity of Donald Nelson and Charles E. Wilson. Under their leadership the people knew how to produce. The enemies of this country have felt the sting of this great system of ours, and they now know that they are looking utter defeat right straight in the face.

Mr. EBERHARTER. I wonder what the gentleman means by public sentiment.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired.

CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order on tomorrow, Calendar Wednesday, be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

RESIGNATION OF A CONFEREE

The SPEAKER. The Chair has received a telegram from the Honorable CLARE HOFFMAN in which he submits his resignation as a conferee.

Without objection, the resignation is accepted.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Chair appoints the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BENDER] in place of the gentleman from Michigan.

The Clerk will notify the Senate accordingly.

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. GIBSON] is recognized for 30 minutes.

THE SOUTH ATTACKED

Mr. GIBSON. Mr. Speaker, in the so-called Washington Afro-American, a colored slander sheet here in Washington, in its July 29, 1944, issue, was carried an article that I cannot permit to pass without challenge.

It is the most damnable stench that I have ever seen in print, to say nothing about coming out in big headlines on the front page, during the progress of a desperate war with foreign enemies, of a newspaper which is sent through the United States mails.

I quote this filthy compilation of rank and vicious lies, as follows:

"—— —— THOSE WHITE SOUTHERNERS"

YADDO, SARATOGA SPRINGS, N. Y., *January 27.*

DEAR JEAN ——: I have your letter with the enclosure from Mrs. —— of ——.

Mrs. —— speaks of the high-school library only. However, Mrs. —— and her friends are trying to start a general library for colored people. She wrote me this week that they are now trying to find a room that can be used for the library.

I suppose I ought to have counted the books in the high-school library, for they may have more than 100. I was so bitter from all my experiences in the South that everything seemed dark, indeed.

I went to speak in the high school and found that the principal's "office" was on the assembly platform and that the assembly, so-called was a large room which had been partitioned off by bookshelves into classrooms. When there were meetings—as when I went there—the bookshelves had to be shoved here and there out of the way and chairs brought in by the children.

Then the faculty of the high school did not dare ask me to stay for luncheon, for a white person cannot sit down with a colored person and eat like human beings.

Nor can colored people go to white homes and mingle as equals.

Nor could Mrs. —— (you must be careful not to use her name) go to that school too often or show too much interest in it, lest it get about and she becomes known as a "nigger lover."

Nor could she invite any of the colored faculty to her home to meet Margaret Webster, who was to be in the town the following week. Even as it is, I fear that I may cause trouble for the colored faculty there merely by suggesting to the whites of Louisiana that everything is not all sweetness and light.

TAKE SCHOOL MONEY

Again you cannot mention it, but Mrs. —— has just sent me a booklet on educational funds in the South. From it I do not see, as you say, that Louisiana is generous in its educational and library funds. I'd send you this booklet but I sent it off yesterday to a newspaperwoman I know. There are educational funds apportioned for both white and colored schools in the South, indeed, but the white county and parish officials take the money and use most of it for the white children only.

A group of white professors in —— University in —— told me of a region not far from house to house to get food and shelter. from the city where colored school teachers get just $3 a month salary and have to live

They said that schools might have 200 children in them, but the children had to walk for 5 to 6 miles a day to reach it; it was so exhausting that about 100 attended school; the children went every other day. These professors tried to arrange for me to return to —— from Texas, and intended to take me out to see such things for myself. My schedule prevented me from returning to ——.

THE BUS DRIVER

Not only this, but when you say that colored people—students, workers, and others—can order books by mail and pay postage, you are taking many things for granted. I doubt if more than a handful of colored workers can read and write more than their name; nor do they know about the library service. Postage? Nor do they know what books to order.

I heard a bus driver talk to a colored worker as if he were a dog because the worker did not have 25 cents to pay for his extra fare.

I saw colored people standing in the aisles in buses when half the white sections were empty and I heard colored people called niggers as a curse word. I saw a northern white soldier ask a colored soldier to sit down by him and the latter did so; then the bus driver stopped the bus and said: "Stand up, nigger."

The colored soldier stood up. The white soldier said, "Aw hell," and stood up also. But had that white soldier not been in uniform, I don't know what would have happened to him. As I went into —— our bus stopped to take on a group of five or six colored men and two white women. The women were simply and tastefully dressed and their faces were intelligent and sensitive. The bus driver threw open the door and said:

"You niggers stand back and let the whites on first."

The colored men stood back and the two women got on. Then by some means, the driver saw they had colored blood. He slapped his thigh and roared with laughter and turned to us white passengers and said:

"Ain't that a —— —— good joke on me? I thought they were white, but they're niggers."

LIKE A TRAITOR

Now, when I heard this I should have stood up and killed the driver.

But I sat there, petrified, sat there like a traitor to the human race.

I kept thinking what Jesus would have done, and knew that He would perhaps have allowed Himself to be killed. I didn't.

I didn't do a thing for many reasons: because I was warned a dozen times by white people that if I did anything it would be the colored people who would suffer for it. I would be thrown out of the bus and left by the roadside, but in the scuffle, it might be the colored who would be killed.

In this state of mind I went into —— to lecture to a white institution, and I heard more and more intimate things about the colored problem. I stayed over a day to lecture to the colored high school and I went to it with shame in my heart, and everything seemed dark and bitter. I passed through the South like a traitor.

You are right in saying that the southern whites have a tendency to become beggars on the North, to let the northerners do things for the colored people. From what I saw, if we wait for the South to shoulder responsibility, little or nothing will be done. The whites have everything, the colored come out at the small end of everything.

THE SOUTH'S LIBERALS?

Regarding education: I enclose a clipping which will interest you. The South gets around everything. While I was in Georgia the press reported that a colored man had been sentenced to 10 years hard labor for stealing half a chicken and three sandwiches, and a colored woman had been sentenced to 3 years for stealing a pair of shoes.

From what I saw I really wonder if white people would use the same books used by

colored people. I spent an evening with white liberals in ———. They had heard me speak at a white school. I had said, among other things, that China questions both American democracy and American Christianity because of our racial and color prejudices. A rustle started and spread through the entire audience. I didn't stop until it finished, but went right on. People told me afterward that I could not go further than that and get away with it.

HATCHET CLUB

I'm writing Mrs. ——— about the high school in ———. I'm going to tell her that the colored faculty there made no complaint to me about books or anything else. It was I myself who took up the matter. If I don't do this, the faculty there will suffer. You may not know it, but in that very region there used to be a Hatchet Club of secretly organized white men who made a habit of killing whole colored families that were suspected of "not keeping their places." The southern whites hate northern white people who say a word about the color situation. So I must try to protect those colored people in ———.

G—— d—— those white southerners! I've never seen such savagery in my life as in the South.

One bus driver who saw me constantly watching the colored passengers and his treatment of them came right up to me at a station where we stopped, hoisted his blamed pants and laughed brutally in my face, then walked away, saying not a word.

I returned here with the belief that a day of reckoning is coming, and I told my friends that I was willing to have another civil war and to break the bones of the South, bone for bone.

Whatever we do in the North must be done with consideration for the colored people. They are the ones who suffer from the whites there when we do one d—— thing. The whites take vengeance.

As soon as the newspaperwoman friend of mine returns the booklet on educational and library and other facilities, for colored people in the South, I will send it to you.

COLORED RESENTMENT RISING

If Mrs. ——— and her friends continue to work for the library for colored people, we must send what books we can. I am sorry, but I just don't believe that the South will make more than token offers. The rising intelligence and spirit of resentment of the colored people in the South is causing tension of a sinister kind in the South. A white professor in ———, La., complained to me because the C. I. O. is organizing colored workers in production plants and demanding decent wages for them. "These fellows come in here and make trouble," the professor said.

I agree with you that the ——— people can and should use a small room. They plan to do this. I have already written Mrs. ——— that the Rosenwald Fund could help with her plan.

THE SOUTH'S ALARM SYSTEM

——— intended to invite me back next year for another lecture. But I am certain now that I will not dare go—I would be driven out of town for raising the colored issue. I'm certain there is whispering in town, going from house to house.

The whole South whispers and the least thing breaks out.

In one town in Georgia a fight started in the colored section of the town. So great is the tension that the minute it started the railway engine on the trains began to toot, the air raid sirens went off as if there were an air raid, police cars and motorcycles roared through the street and I heard firing of guns for 15 minutes. A street fight starts such a night alarm.

I spoke at a colored college in that town, and a white woman put me up. She watched me always with trepidation, though I said not a word to her. Of the college she said, "They are nice Negroes—make no trouble at all; well-behaved." The assumption being that Negroes generally "make trouble" and are not "well-behaved."

I'm sorry to be lecturing you, for God knows you do not need it.

You can use any of this letter you wish, but leave out the name of Mrs. ——— or the ——— high school; and the location of any place must not be mentioned. I suppose you've been in the South and need not be told of the tension that exists there.

I saw colored people cower—this is not imagination—and sit on the edges of their seats in busses. In some places they are simply pulverized.

The bus drivers in the South seem to be gangsters.

In Texas I read a report of a colored soldier who was sentenced to 10 years' hard labor by a court martial; he had killed a white bus driver. If he had not been a soldier he would have been hanged. I could understand his killing the man. In his own defense he said that the bus driver kicked him over an argument about his bus fare. This soldier replied to the kicking—and I understood well, for I felt like killing more than one bus driver.

AGNES SMEDLEY.

I desire to make some comments on this filthy, bitter slander which is directed at the entire South. I am not in position to identify the author of this article, but what I say is directed at the person responsible for the words used in this filthy discourse. I regret to have to stain the pages of the official RECORD of this body with the language of this moral leper, but if the United States will permit such to be carried through the mails and distributed to the people of this great commonwealth, then I expect to expose its filth to the decent law abiding citizens who would not stoop to subscribing to this slander sheet and who would have no opportunity to see it and become fully informed of the works of those who would destroy the democracy that shields them.

Every statement of alleged fact contained therein is a malicious and premeditated lie, made with a vicious and un-American purpose. The one responsible for the utterances made in such article is a human vulture unworthy of the respect of the lowliest Negro on the globe. The truth is not in her or him, whoever it may be. Again I say she claims to be a white woman. Her skin may be white, but no one with a white heart would utter the nefarious lies contained therein. She claims to be a lady. The language used refutes this assumption. Think of her caption: "G—— —— those white southerners." She calls on the Divinity, on God the Giver of all that is good to damn the babes in mothers' arms, because they were born in the South. Yet, she condemns prejudice, and presents herself as the great champion of the rights of the oppressed. She would have God to damn a babe because she, while sitting in judgment, has condemned an imaginary act of its parents. Yet she holds herself out as a crusader for human justice. The only true words she spoke in the whole article were these words, and I quote:

I passed through the South like a traitor.

Surely those are true words, she is a traitor. A traitor to every true American, a traitor to all the blood that has ever been spilled to save our flag, a traitor to every boy, white and black, who fights in blood, smoke, and mud on the many battle fronts of the world today, that such a human carcass as she may enjoy the liberties and blessings of a free land to which she is not worthy. She did not only travel through the South as a traitor, but where she travels or where she dwells she does it as a traitor because a traitor she is.

I was born and reared in the deep South, in Georgia, the Empire State of the South, where a noble people have built and developed a great State, where white and black have lived together in peace and understanding. Our Negroes are better people than the author of this article and would condemn the falsehoods contained therein with resentment and bitterness. It is a black sin and a great injustice that any person would go to such extremes in a time of peril in our national life to excite prejudice and hatred against a minority race who are not responsible for her nasty acts. Her motive is clearly selfish. She was motivated by one of two dastardly selfish purposes. She either got quite a sum of money for compiling these lies under the pretense of the shadow of a white skin, and I say "shadow" because the inside would be bound to reflect; or, she constitutes a portion and arm of Sidney Hillman's communistic gang, and this is a part of their pattern and plan of dividing our people to where they can install their system of slavery for both whites and blacks in lieu of our democracy.

That gang uses nothing but lies, for truth will not sustain their purposes and cannot emanate from their warped hearts. They are working double time while every heartstring, every emotion, every muscle, and every resource of decent Americans who love their country are engaged in an effort to win this horrible war. They have no thought or care for your boy who lies dead or bleeding on the battlefield tonight, or who is fighting desperately on the land, on the sea, or in the air against a desperate enemy, but only to destroy before he can return what he has died for or is fighting to preserve.

It is significant that at every instance where the name of a person, university, or city would enable you to check up and prove her words to be lies from a poison pen and heart of hatred, she blanks the space. Truth needs no shelter, nor does it have to be concealed or protected.

I am brought to wonder to whom she refers when she says, I quote:

Nor could Mrs. ——— (you must be careful not to use her name lest it get about and she become known as a nigger lover).

Who is the Mrs. ———, I wonder?

Another thing of significance, I quote:

Then the faculty of the high school did not dare to ask me to stay for luncheon, for a white person cannot sit down with a colored person and eat like human beings. Nor can colored people go to white homes and mingle as equals.

I fear she is flattering herself. My opinion is the Negroes have more respect

for themselves than to want to associate with her. They had to know that her only purpose was to destroy them and to try to bring them into hatred.

I notice in another place that she says that colored school teachers in some place in Louisiana, which she dared not name, were getting $3 per month salary to teach school. She knew that was a lie when she quoted it, and its only purpose could be to try to cause excitement, disunity, turmoil, and hatred among people during a desperate war when unity is most needed.

I notice in another place that she complains that there is resentment in some unnamed place in Louisiana because the C. I. O. is organizing colored workers. She very nearly came out of her trance of slander and lies and spoke in her own language. Her sentiments are so close to the C. I. O. and her thoughts so welded to the subject that her heart, or the organ in her body functioning as one, spoke ahead of her wilted, polluted, and warped inference of brains.

The most vicious thing she did throughout the article was to use the name of Jesus Christ, the Saviour of mankind. She refers to Jesus and thereby would possibly prefer to indicate that she loves His teachings, and then in the next breath uses these words, I quote:

> I told my friends that I was willing to have another civil war and to break the bones of the South, bone for bone.

She says that in a time of bloodshed and sorrow she is willing to start a civil war, that is a war among our own people, and thereby give to the enemy your blood and my blood is fighting to conquer the greatest aid possible. She says she is willing to break the bones of the South, bone for bone; that is the bones of my babies and yours; newborn babes who have never had an evil thought, but yet she dares to use the name of Jesus Christ. Woe unto ye scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites.

From her own words she would break the bones of the southern heroes who are fighting for her today on foreign battlefields; yes, who lie in unmarked graves, who forfeited their young lives that she, the treacherous creature she is, might live in a land of liberty and freedom. From her own words I would presume she would walk as a skeleton with outstretched, poisoned fingers, that she would crawl as a serpent into the fox holes and crush their bones because they were born in the South. Yes, as the slimiest serpent of the waters, crawl into the watery grave of Colin Kelly and crush his bones while his spirit rests with the God who gave him life.

When you consider her words, quote: "I told my friends that I was willing to have another civil war and to break the bones of the South, bone for bone," coupled with the many falsehoods charged to a great section of the Union and a great body of citizens of this Republic, calculated to array class against class and section against section, at a time we are desperately fighting a foreign foe, engaged in a world war, it seems to me that her acts at least border on treason and sedition.

I think that she and her activities should be investigated by the Federal Bureau of Investigation with the assistance and cooperation of the Dies committee.

To her, or the author, whomever he may be, I return your challenge without the use of the sacred name of the Supreme Being and say, damn you and your dastardly existence in this land of liberty and glory.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GORE). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE] is recognized for 35 minutes.

FORTIFICATION OF GUAM

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, the Hillman-Browder-New Deal "smear bund" continue to feed the American people plain, unadulterated falsehoods about Guam. In their frenzied efforts to achieve a fourth term, they seek to cover up and conceal the real facts as to the responsibility for the Pearl Harbor disaster by talking about Guam. They proceed upon the theory that if a lie is repeated often enough some people will finally accept it as truth. They are trying hard to squelch the constantly growing demand for the facts with reference to Pearl Harbor. They have with typical cunning tried to lead the American people to believe that the tragedy of Pearl Harbor resulted because of the failure of Congress to permit the fortification of the island of Guam. They seek to give the impression that the President was balked by the Congress in his efforts to build our Pacific defenses, and that as a result the responsibility for our greatest military and naval disaster can be charged to the Congress. By clever distortions of truth, and by plain nasty falsehoods, they try to create the impression that the New Deal clamored for the fortification of the island of Guam—that Congress refused to permit it to be fortified—that as a result our Pacific Navy was smashed and thousands of men lost their precious lives. It might be expected that men of small and petty vision, seeking partisan political advantage, might resort to such reprehensible tactics. However, when men of high position with congressional and executive responsibility reiterate such falsehoods, it is time to lay the cards on the table face up and give the American people the naked truth.

The President in his recent travel chat told the American people, "We were not permitted to fortify the island of Guam." He did not amplify that statement. The inference was clear, however, that Congress must have withheld permission, because only Congress had the authority to grant it. Here again with subtle New Deal cunning, the American people were misled as to the true facts.

On March 30, 1944, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, Hon. SAM RAYBURN, of Texas, delivered a political speech at San Francisco. It appears in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of Friday, April 14, 1944. The gentleman from Texas made no reference to Pearl Harbor. He did, however, speak about Guam. I quote:

> The men in Congress refused to fortify the island of Guam. Where is Guam today? For what it was worth these men had the satisfaction of overruling the aims and purposes of the administration.

This statement embraces the whole New Deal argument about Guam. Coming from the Speaker of the House of Representatives, it demands a complete answer. This statement clearly tells the American people that the aims and purposes of the administration were to "fortify the island of Guam." It further says:

> The men in Congress refused to fortify the island of Guam.

The question, "Where is Guam today?" conveys the clear impression that the loss of this island to the Japs resulted solely from this act on the part of the Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I believe it is now time to give to the American people the naked truth about Guam. I propose to do so this afternoon. I challenge any person in or out of this Chamber to dispute the facts I shall now present.

The island of Guam was acquired by the United States from Spain following the Spanish-American War. It has been administered by the Navy Department ever since. In 1919 the Joint Army and Navy Board recommended that Guam be developed as an advance naval base. No such proposal, however, was submitted to the Congress at that time. In 1922, pursuant to an almost universal demand, the United States, Great Britain, and Japan entered into the Washington Naval Armament Limitation Treaty. So long as this treaty remained in force, the United States could not develop Guam as a fortified naval base without violation of article 19 of that treaty. We maintained our treaty obligations. Japan terminated the treaty in 1936.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. KEEFE. I will yield later on but I do not care to yield at this time.

As a result of this action on the part of Japan, the treaty restrictions against the fortification of Guam were removed on December 31, 1936.

Thereafter the Navy began to make plans for the improvement of the facilities at Guam and other islands. Later, under the provisions of the Naval Expansion Act of May 17, 1938, a board was appointed to investigate and report upon the need for additional naval bases, installations and facilities on the coast of the United States, its Territories and possessions. This board, headed by Admiral Hepburn and frequently referred to as the Hepburn board, reported to the Secretary of the Navy on December 1, 1938, 3 years and 6 days before Pearl Harbor was attacked. Thus the President had the recommendations of this board before him on December 1, 1939. The recommendations as to Guam were clear cut: "Adequate air and submarine protection securely based on Guam" were recommended by the board as necessary to make "the island secure against anything short of a major effort on the part of any probable enemy."

It must be remembered that the Hepburn board proposed a program of great magnitude involving as to Guam the ultimate expenditure of some $200,000,000.

No proposal to carry out these recommendations of the Hepburn board were ever submitted to the Congress of the United States by the President or by the Navy Department.

What was the exact proposal submitted to the Congress that has been the basis for all this argument about "failure of the Congress to fortify Guam"?

In January 1939 a bill was reported to the House, generally referred to as the Vinson bill. This bill was considered by the House on February 22 and 23, 1939. It was a general naval authorization bill and contained a multitude of items. The RECORD discloses that the Clerk had concluded the reading of a paragraph of the bill which authorized the Secretary of the Navy "to establish, develop, or increase naval aviation facilities at certain shore stations," including $5,000,000 for the island of Guam. The CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 22, 1939, page 1779, discloses that the gentleman from New Jersey, Mr. Sutphin, a Democrat and a Member of the House Naval Affairs Committee, offered the following amendment:

Amendment offered by Mr. Sutphin: On page 2, line 5, after "$2,800,000", strike out "and Guam, $5,000,000."

Thereafter by agreement, debate on this amendment was limited to 30 minutes, and the debate was put over until the following day, February 23. The debate begins on page 1832, and concludes on page 1842 of volume 84, part 2, Seventy-sixth Congress, first session.

Many Members of the House spoke on this amendment. The House of Representatives also had before it the hearings containing the testimony of naval officials with reference to this item of the bill. The Naval Affairs Committee also filed a comprehensive report. In the hearings on the bill, naval officials were direct and positive in asserting that its provisions with respect to Guam were not those recommended by the Hepburn board, and that the proposal in the pending bill involved no fortifications. The funds requested were to be expended in improving the harbor and nothing more. The Navy Department did not recommend the fortification of Guam. There was no request from the President to fortify Guam.

The chairman of the Naval Affairs Committee of the House, Hon. CARL VINSON, did not recommend the fortification of Guam. In the course of the debate, he said:

Opposition to this item has been based on the assumption that Guam is to be fortified and made into a strongly defended naval base for airplanes and submarines. In view of this opposition the committee has gone into this matter at great length, and I can assure you that there is no intention on the part of the Navy Department to fortify Guam, or do anything further than what is included in this bill.

Admiral Hepburn himself appeared before the House Naval Affairs Committee in 1939 and in part testified as follows:

Mr. MAAS. Would you recommend putting operating units in Guam without giving them adequate defense?

Admiral HEPBURN. No.

Mr. MAAS. It would be suicide?

Admiral HEPBURN. If you are going to hold it, hold it strongly.

Mr. MAAS. Do it right, or not at all.

Admiral HEPBURN. Absolutely.

Mr. MAAS. This bill does not propose what your Board recommended?

Admiral HEPBURN. No.

Admiral Leahy, who was then the Chief of Naval Operations, the highest post in the Navy, testified before the House Naval Affairs Committee in 1939. I quote:

Admiral LEAHY. This bill does not propose the development of an airplane and seaplane base in Guam—there was at one time a plan to fortify the Island of Guam and make it a strong defense base.

Mr. MAAS. The Navy has nothing to do with the fact that it could not be carried out. That was national policy as a result of the 1922 Arms Limitation Conference.

Admiral LEAHY. The failure to carry out this plan to fortify Guam resulted from an agreement of the United States not to fortify islands in the Pacific.

On the basis of this testimony alone it should appear clear that there never was a proposal before the Congress to fortify the Island of Guam. If further proof were needed it might be found in the record of the debates on this bill. The gentleman from Florida [Mr. HENDRICKS] as disclosed on page 1839 of the RECORD asked this question:

I understand that Admiral Hepburn has said it would take $150,000,000 to fortify Guam. It is my thought that we gave the Philippines its independence because we realized it was indefensible. Now if that was true, why would we go over among 1,400 Japanese-mandated islands and set up fortifications on Guam? I would like to ask that question, Mr. Chairman, simply to provoke thought.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. The bill in the first place does not call for any fortification whatsoever.

If further proof were needed I would turn to the argument made by the then majority leader the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN] found on page 1841 of the RECORD, where he is quoted as saying:

Mr. Chairman, I quite agree with the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MAAS] that there is no reason whatsoever for unseeming excitement for such an item in this bill. If I wanted to justify this statement I would merely read the minority report. Every argument I would have to meet for this bill is met by the language of the minority report. The minority report states: "We recognize the right of the United States to establish military facilities in Guam." We are attempting, and the committee is attempting no such thing as that in this bill.

From these simple facts, taken from the official record, is it not clear that there was never any proposal before the House of Representatives to fortify the Island of Guam?

Despite the statement in his San Francisco speech, the Speaker himself assured the Congress when the bill was under consideration that the Congress was not attempting to establish military facilities or fortifications on the Island of Guam. The chairman of the House Naval Affairs Committee gave positive assurance of such fact. Admiral Hepburn and Admiral Leahy without qualification stated that the proposal for an appropriation of $5,000,000 to improve the harbor at Guam in no sense involved the recommendations of the Hepburn committee.

A separate roll-call vote was ordered on the Sutphin amendment. The amendment carried by a vote of 205 to 168. One hundred and thirty-three Republicans and 72 Democrats voted for the amendment. Twenty-six Republicans and 142 Democrats voted against it. It is interesting to note that at this time the administration had an overwhelming majority in the House of Representatives. If the administration wanted this item passed, I am certain that it could have been accomplished without difficulty. It is now contended that the President wanted this item passed. Congressman RICHARDS, Democrat of South Carolina, answered this contention on February 23, 1939, page 1836, volume 84, first session, Seventy-sixth Congress, when he said:

It has been implied by some that possibly President Roosevelt, the great leader of the Democratic Party, is in favor of this provision. If so, we have no word to that effect. You will remember that on March 2, 1934, the President in delivering the only message he has sent to Congress on the subject of fortification in the Far East stated: "That it is our aim and purpose to withdraw from any fortifications, and not propose any new fortifications in the Philippine Islands."

It must be clear, therefore, that there was never any proposal either from the Navy Department or the President involving the fortification of the island of Guam. This, perhaps, accounts for the fact that so many leading Democrats in the House voted for the Sutfin amendment. This list is an impressive one and includes many of the outstanding administration supporters in the House. It is inconceivable that these stanch followers of the President would in such large numbers have turned against him if in truth and fact the administration wanted to fortify Guam.

In view of this plain record, is it not clear that party policy was not involved in this vote? How, then, can it be said today that "the men in Congress refused to fortify the island of Guam"?

Mr. Speaker, when did the men in Congress refuse to fortify the island of Guam? When did the Navy ever request Congress for authority and funds to fortify the island of Guam? When did the administration or the Commander in Chief ever ask Congress for authority and funds to fortify the island of Guam? The record is barren of any such facts.

If further proof were needed, we might turn to the proceedings of the Senate and there read a statement of Senator WALSH of Massachusetts, the Democratic chairman of the Naval Affairs Committee of the Senate, who on February 13, 1942, said:

No direct request for fortification of Guam was ever put before the committee of the Senate or the House.

Mr. Speaker, in all fairness to the American people, is it not about time that the administration leadership gave the American people the truth about

Guam? Is not it about time that the American people were given the truth about Pearl Harbor? Is not it about time that we cease making untrue statements about Members of the Congress relative to their vote on the Guam issue and give the people the truth?

Let us hope that the Commander in Chief and his administration will see fit to give the American people the truth about Pearl Harbor.

Mr. DREWRY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 2 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection?

Mr. DREWRY. Mr. Speaker, I happen to be a member of the Committee on Naval Affairs of the House. I am speaking from recollection. I have no record before me, but it seems to me that the gentleman who just preceded me was putting up a man of straw just to knock him down. I understood him to say that the Members of the Congress did not permit the President to fortify Guam. Was that the gentleman's statement?

Mr. KEEFE. I did not say any such thing.

Mr. DREWRY. What was the gentleman's statement?

Mr. KEEFE. I said that the President stated that we were not permitted to fortify Guam, and I further stated that he did not amplify it. If the gentleman had listened, I stated that I concluded he could not have meant anybody else but the Congress, because the Congress was the only body that could have given him permission.

Mr. DREWRY. Of course, I have nothing to do with the interpretation that my friend, the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin, makes of those words, but I do not make the same interpretation.

Mr. KEEFE. May I say to the gentleman that whatever I said is in writing. I was not talking at random and talking from recollection. I was speaking from the official record.

Mr. DREWRY. I am speaking from recollection, as I stated a little while ago. I am still speaking from recollection, because I did not expect to have this question arise. In using the words that the President said "we were not permitted to fortify Guam," it seems to me that anybody reading the statement would construe that to mean not that the Congress prevented the President from fortifying Guam or recommending it, but that he and the country were not permitted to fortify Guam because of the 1922 treaty, which prohibited fortification in the Pacific; that was the reason.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DREWRY. I yield.

Mr. KEEFE. Is the gentleman the chairman of the Democratic National Campaign Committee?

Mr. DREWRY. Yes; I am.

Mr. KEEFE. As the chairman of the Democratic National Campaign Committee, is the gentleman prepared to rest his case upon the statement that he just made, namely, that the President was not attempting to say that the Congress had refused to permit him to fortify Guam, but that they were unable to fortify it because of the provisions of the 1922 Navy Limitation Treaty?

Mr. DREWRY. Up to 1936, yes; I mean to say just that.

Mr. KEEFE. Does the gentleman contend that the President has been balked at any time by the Congress since 1936? Has he ever made any request of Congress to fortify Guam?

Mr. DREWRY. I do not think the matter ever came up. I think the whole question is one that is tweedledee and tweedledum. It is not a question of fortifying Guam. The matter before the House was not a question of fortifying Guam. The record very plainly states it was not a matter of fortifying Guam.

Mr. KEEFE. I am glad to hear the gentleman make that statement, and agree fully with what I stated in my speech.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Virginia has expired.

Mr. ROWE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman be given 5 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. DREWRY. I think this is a good time to clear this matter up, and it might as well be cleared up. Nobody has ever heard me say that I thought the appropriation carried in that bill was for fortifying Guam. I made a speech on the subject, and the gentleman might have quoted me and said that I said it was not for the purpose of fortifying Guam. I say it now. It was not a matter of fortifying Guam. It was an appropriation of $5,000,000 to clean up the harbor in order that the coral rocks which were below the surface and were a menace to the submarines and airplanes that might land on that water, be dredged out. The $5,000,000 was asked for in order to do that dredging and it was not asked for fortification purposes. There was no fortification in that appropriation. But, of course, it was intended that this harbor should be so prepared as to make a good submarine base if the time ever arose when this country would need it, and that was the point that was involved in the whole discussion.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. DREWRY. I yield.

Mr. KEEFE. Was there ever any proposal before the gentleman's committee or reported to the Congress or any request for an appropriation to convert this into a submarine base prior to this time?

Mr. DREWRY. Nothing except the Hepburn report.

Mr. KEEFE. The President has never requested the Congress to provide funds to carry out the provisions of the Hepburn report; has he?

Mr. DREWRY. I do not know whether he has. I could not tell the gentleman whether he has or not.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DREWRY. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. As I remember it, there were three votes on this question: One at that time, and I think there was one on the rivers and harbors bill, and there was one on an appropriation bill. There were at least three roll calls. The third time it passed. That was when everybody knew the danger that confronted us. My recollection is that there was considerable argument at that time against this particular authorization, and the argument was made that it might offend the Japs. My recollection of the argument is that it was based on the fear of offending the Japanese Government. I know that I voted to keep it in, and I know when I voted I had no misunderstanding as to my state of mind. I was for the $5,000,000, with the expectation that more would follow to put that harbor in condition so that in case of attack our forces there might hold back the Japanese Navy for 24 or 48 hours, and that period of time might have been of inestimable value to our country.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DREWRY. I yield.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. May I say that if the gentleman from Massachusetts possessed that information, it was not passed on to the rest of the Members of the House.

Mr. McCORMACK. I am expressing my state of mind.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Of course, we can only vote on what is presented to the House, and that information was not given to the rest of the Members of the House.

Mr. McCORMACK. I do not agree with the gentleman.

Mr. DREWRY. What information does the gentleman refer to?

Mr. McCORMACK. The question is: What was the substance of the debate before us? Everybody in the House knows what the underlying substance was.

Mr. DREWRY. The substance was to dredge the harbor of Guam in order to get rid of the coral rocks which were a great menace to navigation.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. And that is all that any Member of the House knew was before us at that time?

Mr. DREWRY. Absolutely, so far as I know.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. No one heard anything about a submarine base at that time.

Mr. DREWRY. I do not think it was talked about.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Not a bit.

Mr. DREWRY. It was a question of whether we should appropriate $5,000,000 for the purpose of dredging the harbor, and the sentiment of the House was that $5,000,000 could be put somewhere else to better advantage, and therefore they did not vote for the $5,000,000 appropriation to do this dredging. Of course, I do not suppose there was anybody who did not think that eventually, if it was neces-

sary, they would have this place made into a base.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper article.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Thursday next, at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day and following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

INFORMATION ABOUT THE CONDUCT OF FOREIGN AFFAIRS

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 2 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, we have just been discussing Guam, and there were various honest differences of opinion, as the vote showed, regarding the authorization for the dredging of the harbor of Guam. I voted for it. I was not afraid of offending Japan. I realized what Japan planned to do to us, and realized it over a long period of years. I realized that Japan understood only the strong arm, that Japan was playing with us and was against us always. The so-called neutrality legislation enacted by Congress a few years ago that I voted against in the Committee on Foreign Affairs and on the floor of the House and that was sponsored by the administration lulled the country to sleep and into a feeling of false security. This legislation, in my opinion, cost the country much in materials and men.

I wish there had been more candid statements from the Department regarding Japan and her possible intentions, just as I wish today that the conferences at Dumbarton Oaks might be given to us, not in detail, for I realize that in matters of this kind we cannot have all the details, but at least we should have the general pattern or the structure or the foundation which may be being laid today for the future security of this country. I feel very strongly about this matter, and I regret very much that the Committee on Foreign Affairs as a committee has not taken action and has not asked that we be given information or allowed to hear the delegates at least in some of the meetings, as we were at Atlantic City during the meetings on United Nations Relief.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentlewoman be permitted to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I fear that foundation for peace security will be dug so deeply and so strongly that it will be very difficult for the Senate, without giving great offense to foreign nations, to refuse to ratify any treaty which may result therefrom. We must think of the smaller nations, we must think of the security of our own Nation. We must be sure that those delegates from our own country do not promise too much, that they do not make promises that will commit the Nation too deeply and unwisely into the future. If we were given some information it would be extremely helpful. I can get a certain amount of information and other Members probably can, but certainly all members of the committee that primarily have to do with foreign affairs should be given information. All of them ought to have the advantage of it. England's system of reports to the Parliament is much better, to my mind, than ours. The Secretary of State, the Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Navy, and the other Cabinet members should come to the Congress to report on the progress of the war. The Cabinet heads ought to give an accounting of their stewardship to the Congress.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. A member of the British Cabinet occupies a different position than does a member of the Cabinet here, in that he is a member of the House of Commons and when he goes into the House of Commons does so as a member, with all the rights of a member. Of course, the gentlewoman understands that.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I think that system would be better for us. The members of the Cabinet have to render an accounting to the Parliament. It is a very useful and beneficial procedure.

Mr. McCORMACK. I sort of like to go along with the system we have. However, I did not mean to go into that subject, anyway.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I am very glad to discuss it.

Mr. McCORMACK. What I meant to do was call this to the attention of the gentlewoman. I appreciate her state of mind. I think we all do. On the other hand, we must appreciate the practical situation that confronts a conference of this kind. The delegates are representatives of three nations. They are doing a lot of exploring. At the right time, I have no doubt, and I have no hesitancy in saying this, the Congress of the United States and the American people will be advised. However, just as we have executive sessions of committees, this is in a sense, I should assume, an executive session where they are exploring many questions. While we would all like to get all the information we can, there is always a time and a place for it. I express with confidence the statement that at the right time the results of the conference will be disclosed, and there will be nothing that will constitute a surprise. Certainly, on treaties the United States Senate has never been surprised. John Hay said in substance some years ago, as I recall, that a treaty never comes out of the Senate the way it goes up there.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Yes, but I think it would be very helpful if indications as to the trends, as to the bricks and stones that are being laid in the security structure, could be given us in order that we could prepare for them. I warned the House constantly against Japanese encroachment, Japanese competition, and Japanese unfair trading methods. I warned repeatedly that we should not be sending scrap iron and other commodities of war to Japan. First, that material was used against China, our friend, and then used against the United States.

Today I heard a very alarming story, and I trust it is not true in any way, that rubber is reaching Japan through one of our allies. I am trying to run down the source of that information.

I do wish that the administration or the State Department would be more frank regarding the Japanese, and regarding many things. I speak of Japan especially because the danger was constantly in my mind from the very beginning of and during the time when I first came to Congress. I had exhibitions of the Japanese goods that were made in competition with our own. I showed up also the very objectionable trade methods that Germany was using at that time, the way they were using their blocked marks in trade to the detriment of our own trade, and doing it in a dishonest way. I was the first person on the floor of Congress to protest against persecution of the minorities by Hitler. I thoroughly agree that some plan for cooperation of the Allied Nations, if we are to have a real and durable peace, must be agreed to. However, that plan must be worked out in justice and fairness to all if that peace is to last. Without information, no group can act intelligently.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Speaker, I call the attention of the House to a rather shocking situation which was revealed in the press yesterday, at a time when American boys are fighting and dying in the swampy jungles of Burma and India, and American boys 12,000 miles from home, surrounded by the menace of malaria and the dreaded Japanese foe, are giving their lifeblood for the "four freedoms."

Mr. Speaker, I learned yesterday from the press through Drew Pearson's column and from a statement made by Senator CHANDLER in the Senate that behind the backs of these boys, our ally, the British Government, has made what apparently amounts to a colossal blunder. The British Government has declared President Roosevelt's personal ambassador to India persona non grata simply because he reported to the President the true nature of conditions in India.

I think this is something that requires an explanation, at least from the State Department. It is difficult for the people here at home and difficult for the men who are fighting abroad, particularly in that theater, to understand why such a condition should be allowed to exist. I believe that an explanation should be made by the State Department and by the British Government in this instance.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. MUNDT (at the request of Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts), for an indefinite period, on account of official business.

To Mr. CANFIELD (at the request of Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts), for an indefinite period, on account of death in the family.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Mr. KLEIN, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 3695. An act for the relief of the estate of Thomas Shea, deceased.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 51 minutes p. m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, August 30, 1944, at 11 o'clock a. m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1782. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting the seventh report of the Attorney General covering the period from May 7, 1944, through August 25, 1944; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1783. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting a report on records proposed for disposal by various Government agencies; to the Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. BURCH of Virginia: Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads. H. R. 5154. A bill relating to dual employment in the Postal Service, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 1824). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. JENNINGS: Committee on Claims. S. 1101. An act to provide for the payment of the claim of John C. Shaw, administrator de bonis non of the estate of Sydney C. McLouth, deceased, arising out of a contract between said deceased and the United States Shipping Board Emergency Fleet Corporation, for the construction of seagoing tugs; without amendment (Rept. No. 1801). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CARSON of Ohio: Committee on Claims. S. 1278. An act for the relief of Yellow Cab Transit Co.; with amendment (Rept. No. 1802). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. ABERNETHY: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1772. A bill for the relief of Henry Stovall; without amendment (Rept. No. 1803). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. SCRIVNER: Committee on Claims. H. R. 3279. A bill for the relief of Clarence G. Doelling and Doris J. (McNeil) Doelling; without amendment (Rept. No. 1804). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. ABERNETHY: Committee on Claims. H. R. 3323. A bill for the relief of Mrs. William M. Watson; with amendment (Rept. No. 1805). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. JENNINGS: Committee on Claims. H. R. 3400. A bill for the relief of LaVerne Whipple; with amendment (Rept. No. 1806). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. McGEHEE: Committee on Claims. H. R. 3678. A bill for the relief of Floyd E. and Lena Mae Drummond; with amendment (Rept. No. 1807). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GREEN: Committee on Claims. H. R. 4105. A bill for the relief of Ira Cannon; with amendment (Rept. No. 1808). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. ABERNETHY: Committee on Claims. H. R. 4125. A bill for the relief of Kelly Hobbs; with amendment (Rept. No. 1809). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. JENNINGS: Committee on Claims. H. R. 4248. A bill for the relief of the legal guardian of Louis Ciniglio; without amendment (Rept. No. 1810). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GREEN: Committee on Claims. H. R. 4322. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Floyd M. Adair, Evelyn Louise Adair, Cora Ann Adair, Betty Floyd Adair, and Ernest Dean Adair; with amendment (Rept. No. 1811). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. McGEHEE: Committee on Claims. H. R. 4363. A bill for the relief of Ollie Brashear Hearldson; with amendment (Rept. No. 1812). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CARSON of Ohio: Committee on Claims. H. R. 4451. A bill for the relief of John McLaughlin, Sr., and John McLaughlin, Jr.; with amendment (Rept. No. 1813). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GREEN: Committee on Claims. H. R. 4549. A bill for the relief of Sandy C. Brown; with amendment (Rept. No. 1814). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. ABERNETHY: Committee on Claims. H. R. 4588. A bill for the relief of Robert L. Whiddon; with amendment (Rept. No. 1815). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GREEN: Committee on Claims. H. R. 4703. A bill for the relief of the estate of Annie Brown; with amendment (Rept. No. 1816). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. SCRIVNER: Committee on Claims. H. R. 4736. A bill for the relief of Dr. H. L. Klotz; with amendment (Rept. No. 1817). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. ABERNETHY: Committee on Claims. H. R. 4815. A bill for the relief of the Board of County Commissioners of Volusia County, Fla.; without amendment (Rept. No. 1818). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CARSON of Ohio: Committee on Claims. H. R. 4817. A bill for the relief of Wilfred T. Plant, Sr.; with amendment (Rept. No. 1819). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CARSON of Ohio: Committee on Claims. H. R. 4878. A bill for the relief of the estate of Emma B. Fleet, deceased; with amendment (Rept. No. 1820). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. ABERNETHY: Committee on Claims. H. R. 4927. A bill for the relief of Francis D. Stovall, Jr.; with amendment (Rept. No. 1821). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CARSON of Ohio: Committee on Claims. H. R. 5034. A bill for the relief of the estate of Francis A. Collins; with amendment (Rept. No. 1822). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. McGEHEE: Committee on Claims. H. R. 5212. A bill for the relief of E. E. Armstrong; without amendment (Rept. No. 1823). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BLAND:

H. R. 5255. A bill to amend the Coast Guard Auxiliary and Reserve Act of 1941, as amended; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. JACKSON:

H. R. 5256. A bill to establish a system of unemployment insurance in the maritime industry, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RANDOLPH:

H. R. 5257. A bill to provide for health programs for Government employees; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

By Mr. HAYS:

H. R. 5258. A bill to amend section 5155 of the Revised Statutes, with respect to the establishment of branches by national banking associations; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ALLEN of Illinois:

H. R. 5259. A bill for the relief of Miss Rosella M. Kostenbader; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. NEWSOME:

H. R. 5260. A bill for the relief of Alice Walker; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. OUTLAND:

H. R. 5261. A bill for the relief of William Schoeb; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. REECE of Tennessee:

H. R. 5262. A bill for the relief of Joseph M. Boyd, Sr.; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

6042. By Mr. CARTER: Resolution of the American Association of Airport Executives urging the United States Government to institute the establishment of a pool for surplus airport maintenance and operation equipment under the authority of the Civil Aeronautics Administration; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

6043. By Mr. GWYNNE: Petition of Mrs. F. S. Wheeler and other residents of Marshall County, Iowa, urging passage of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

6044. By Mr. HEIDINGER: Resolution of Local Union No. 170 of the Progressive Mine Workers of America, of Harrisburg, Ill., signed by L. C. Cavender, president, and James E. Veatch, recording secretary, requesting that certain amendments be made to the Social Security Act to the end that any person working in a covered industry, who becomes completely disabled, shall upon proper proof of such disability, receive the same benefits for the remainder of life as if such person had reached the age required for retirement; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

6045. Also, resolution of Local Union No. 115, Progressive Mine Workers of America, Harrisburg, Ill., signed by Clarence Vaughn, president, and Wilmer L. Watson, recording secretary, requesting that certain amendments be made to the Social Security Act to the end that any person working in a covered industry, who becomes completely disabled, shall upon proper proof of such disability, receive the same benefits for the remainder of life as if such person had reached the age required for retirement; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

6046. By Mr. ROLPH: Resolution 4155, series of 1939, Board of Supervisors City and County of San Francisco, regarding acute hotel situation in San Francisco; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, AUGUST 30, 1944

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m.

Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., pastor of the Gunton Temple Memorial Presbyterian Church, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

Most merciful and gracious God, whose blessings cannot be numbered and whose treasury of goodness is infinite, grant that we may manifest our gratitude in a life of devotion and a sincere desire to do Thy will.

We pray that our many blessings may become gifts and contributions in our hands with which we shall minister to the needs of others. Transform our strength into service and our knowledge into guidance. Make us more sensitive and responsive to the appeals of needy humanity.

May Thy spirit descend upon mankind, leading it out of misunderstandings and clashing interests into the ways of concord and amity. May we all be more like the Master in attitudes and aspirations, in ideals and principles, in sympathy and service.

Bless our President, our Speaker, and the Members of this Congress, upon whom rests the responsibility of leadership. Give them wisdom to devise ways and means for the building of a social order in which there shall be peace, not war; where there shall be abundance for all and poverty and want for none; where there shall be love and friendship instead of fear and hatred, tolerance and good will instead of prejudice and bigotry, joy and gladness instead of tears and misery.

Hear us for the sake of our Saviour. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

AMERICAN INTERPARLIAMENTARY CONGRESS

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication, which was read and referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs:

JUNE 12, 1944.

SPEAKER OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C.:

I have the high honor of informing you of the resolutions adopted at the session of April 15 last by the committee of the House of Deputies of Chile and the American parliamentary delegations which attended the celebration of the Day of the Americas in this capital, with the purpose of asking you, if you see fit, to submit them to the consideration of the legislative body over which you preside, for its ratification.

The text of these resolutions is as follows:

"1. The parliamentary delegations of Peru, Uruguay, Colombia, United States, Mexico, Costa Rica, El Salvador, Nicaragua, Panama, and Chile agree to promote through their respective Parliaments a movement of continental unity;

"2. To accomplish such project, they propose the establishment of an American interparliamentary congress for which the delegates will solicit the approval of their respective Parliaments;

"3. To set up a permanent committee composed of the chairmen of the attending delegations, presided over by Don Pedro Castelblanco, President of the Chamber of Deputies of Chile, for the purpose of organizing and fixing the time, place, and subject matter of the interparliamentary congress of America;

"4. To communicate those resolutions to all the countries on the American Continent and invite the countries whose parliaments were not represented to adhere to these resolutions.

"Therefor the Permanent Committee to Promote American Unity Through the Parliaments, and in compliance with the third resolution, is constituted as follows: President, Pedro Castelblanco, of Chile; and members, Messrs. Luis Carlos Mese, of Colombia; Jose Albertassi Munoz, of Costa Rica; Jose Erasmo Pacheco, of El Salvador; Pete Jarman, of the United States; Carlos F. Madrazo, of Mexico; Carlos Morales, of Nicaragua; Roberto Jimenez, of Panama; Carlos Sayan Alverez, of Peru; and Luis Batlle Berres, of Uruguay."

Permit me to tell Your Excellency that the Chamber of Deputies of Chile in its session held on the 6th of this month ratified unanimously the above-mentioned resolutions.

God keep Your Excellency.

PEDRO CASTELBLANCO A.

INTERSTATE COMMERCE ACT

Mr. CROSSER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 5196) to amend section 22 of the Interstate Commerce Act by authorizing common carriers to grant reduced fares to personnel of armed services.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and, of course, I am not going to object, because I happen to know what the legislation is and I am heartily in favor of it; however, I think that the gentleman from Ohio should explain to the House just what the legislation is.

Mr. CROSSER. Mr. Speaker, the bill is not an intricate one at all. It is contended by some members of the Interstate Commerce Commission that they do not have the authority to permit the enlisted men, the soldiers and sailors, who may be on leave or on furlough, or going home after being discharged, to have a lower rate of fare under the present law than that which applies to ordinary civilians. A great many people think there is authority now in the law, but in order to make it perfectly clear, this legislation was reported favorably and unanimously by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce of the House, authorizing without any question the Interstate Commerce Commission to permit the soldiers and sailors when they are going home and being discharged or on leave or on furlough to have a lower rate.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. This is simply validating that which we already do?

Mr. CROSSER. Yes; we are doing it now.

Mr. LEA. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. LEA. It applies to the rail, highway, and water carriers. It simply is permissive and authorizes them to grant these rates to these three carriers. As the gentleman from Ohio has stated, it is in accordance with existing practice.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, this applies only to members of the armed forces?

Mr. CROSSER. Yes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 22 of the Interstate Commerce Act is hereby amended by inserting at the end of the second clause thereof, following "homes;" the following clause: "nothing in this part shall be construed to prohibit any common carrier from publishing and filing, in such form and manner and subject to such conditions as may be authorized by special permission of the Commission, reduced fares for application to the transportation of (a) personnel of United States armed services or of foreign armed services, when such persons are traveling at their own expense, in uniform, and while on official leave, furlough, or pass, or (b) persons discharged from United States armed services not more than 30 days prior to the commencement of such transportation and traveling at their own expense to their homes or other prospective place of abode;".

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert "That section 22 of the Interstate Commerce Act is hereby amended by inserting after 'homes;' at the end of the second

clause thereof the following clause: 'nothing in this part shall be construed to prohibit any common carrier from establishing by publication and filing in the manner prescribed in section 6 reduced fares for application to the transportation of (a) personnel of United States armed services or of foreign armed services, when such persons are traveling at their own expense, in uniform of those services, and while on official leave, furlough, or pass; or (b) persons discharged, retired, or released from United States armed services within 30 days prior to the commencement of such transportation and traveling at their own expense to their homes or other prospective places of abode;'."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by inserting a poem by a soldier on the other side, a young constituent of mine, who is now fighting somewhere in New Guinea.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

THE PATRIOTISM OF ITALIAN-AMERICANS

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

[Mr. DICKSTEIN addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

PORT CHICAGO, CALIF., EXPLOSION

Mr. McGEHEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 5181) to provide for compensating certain individuals for damages sustained as the result of the explosions at Port Chicago, Calif.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I understand this is legislation that our colleague the gentleman from California [Mr. CARTER] has been pressing for some time?

Mr. McGEHEE. It is.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Will the gentleman now explain what the bill is?

Mr. McGEHEE. Mr. Speaker, the bill (H. R. 5181) is a bill to increase the authority of the Navy Department to settle claims on account of the accident which happened at Port Chicago, Calif., on July 17, 1944, wherein a couple of ships exploded and damaged a great deal of Government property and practically every home and place of business in this town, killed several hundred people, and injured many.

Today the Navy has authority under an act passed by the Congress several months ago to settle claims during the war period—and the Army has this authority, also—up to $1,000. They are asking for authority to settle claims up to $5,000 in this one particular instance.

As I understand from an investigation made by the Navy there are something over 300 claims. In the event we do not give them authority to settle these claims while their investigators are there on the ground we shall have some 300 private bills coming before the committee that the Congress will be asked to pass on.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. The liability of the Government has been fully established?

Mr. McGEHEE. Yes; and the Navy under the terms of the bill must make a report to the Congress of the claims they settle. If any claims are for more than $5,000 they are to be submitted to Congress and are not to be settled by the Navy.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. Would it not be better for those claims to be submitted to the Committee on Claims and if the Committee on Claims find the individual claims are justified that they be submitted to Congress in an omnibus bill than to set a precedent here that might rise up to smite us in the future? We are going very far when we give carte blanche authority to any department to settle damage claims up to $5,000, claims that have never been adjudicated by any court and claims that no committee of Congress has investigated. It seems to me it would be better and sounder practice to have those claims follow the same procedure similar claims have followed in the past, be presented individually to the Committee on Claims of the House. I think we should go very slowly in delegating congressional authority.

Mr. McGEHEE. I answer the gentleman from Mississippi by saying that personally as chairman of the Claims Committee I feel just as does the gentleman from Mississippi—under ordinary circumstances; but this is extraordinary. As I understand it a majority of these people whose homes have been damaged are poor people. The rainy season is about to set in. They do not have money to go ahead and repair their homes. Under these circumstances I am willing to delegate this authority to the Navy Department in settling them. My experience in the past has been that the Navy and the Army are pretty tight in settling claims. If the gentleman has introduced any private claims bills involving the Army or the Navy in the last few years I am sure he has found that in 90 percent of the cases these departments report on them unfavorably.

Mr. RANKIN. The gentleman says this is an extraordinary situation. All such situations, of course, are extraordinary. The gentleman mentioned the fact that the rainy season was about to set in in California. That would be an extraordinary situation.

Whenever cases such as these come up they are going to have extraordinary angles.

This matter is of such stupendous importance and probably will set a precedent that will cause so much confusion that I believe the bill ought to be brought in under a rule, taken up under the regular rules of the House, and not passed by unanimous consent I certainly should like to investigate this further before going on record as giving carte blanche authority to any department of the Government to settle damage claims up to $5,000.

I hope the gentleman will withdraw his bill and let it come up under the regular rules of the House.

Mr. McGEHEE. Let me say to the gentleman that the Committee on Claims in a meeting last Wednesday considered this bill with more than a quorum present. The bill was reported favorably unanimously by the committee membership. I may further say to the gentleman that in my opinion and knowing the feeling of the membership of the committee as I do about delegating authority to governmental agencies to settle claims that we are trying to safeguard the Congress in every respect. We felt under the circumstances, however, that we would save the taxpayers of this country quite a little money by passing this bill and letting the Navy settle these claims instead of having some three or four hundred individual bills come to the committee and the House.

Mr. RANKIN. This bill is simply delegating authority that ought not to be taken out of the hands of Congress or out of the hands of the Court of Claims. We are in a war. These incidents are likely to occur all over the world. There is no telling how many of these claims will arise, and this legislation will be used as a precedent in an effort to drive Congress into further delegation of its legislative authority.

I am going to ask the gentleman from Mississippi to withdraw his request for the time being.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I yield.

Mr. CARTER. I should like to say to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] that as has been stated by the chairman of the Committee on Claims, there are a number of small claims involving the repair of a number of houses in this small city that was near the scene of the explosion. The information I have from out there which was obtained through the Navy Department and through the chairman of the disaster committee who was a resident of the community is to the effect that it is the roofs of the houses largely that are damaged.

The gentleman makes a very sensible, sane, and under ordinary circumstances logical, suggestion as to the handling of these claims. I am sure, however, that when the gentleman considers that several hundred people were killed there, that the property of these citizens located in the immediate vicinity of the naval station was damaged, that the rainy season in California is approaching, that if these houses are not repaired at once a great deal of additional damage will be caused. I am sure he will

consent to giving the Navy Department in this particular case the authority requested.

This is the only tragedy of this consequence, I am thankful to say, that we have had in this country in connection with our war activities; and I hope it is the last, and I am sure the gentleman does too.

I am speaking for those small home owners who have not a roof over their heads at the present time and I am asking this House to permit this bill to go through granting the Navy the authority in connection with this disaster alone. As the chairman of the Committee on Claims has stated, the Navy Department now has such authority up to $1,000. This bill would grant them a leeway of an additional $4,000 in the settlement of these claims. I may say to the gentleman from Mississippi that they are settling these small claims in that area now because of the urgent need and necessities of the people.

Mr. RANKIN. Let me say in reply to the gentleman from California that if any of those people have not a roof over their heads, I can put a roof on practically any house in California for less than $1,000. If those people were injured to the extent he indicates it would probably take a judicial decision to determine to what extent they were injured.

I am not in favor of delegating this power to the Navy Department or to any other department of the Government at this time. If these homes have been slightly injured, or the small homes he speaks of seriously damaged, they can be repaired for a thousand dollars or less. I submit that the Navy Department should make its recommendation to the Congress and the Claims Committee should take those claims up and pass on them and then let the Congress pass on the measure itself. I am not in favor of delegating power of this kind under these circumstances because I realize it will merely be getting the camel's nose under the tent for an unlimited barrage you might say, of claims of this kind growing out of this war.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I yield.

Mr. DONDERO. Was any investigation made as to whether or not the property of these claimants was covered by insurance against accidents of this kind?

Mr. McGEHEE. In the event they are covered by insurance, I answer the gentleman from Michigan by saying that the insurance companies have clauses in their policies whereby they are subrogated to any rights the claimants may have; so the insurance companies would collect from whatever amounts were allowed those people to the extent they insured for.

Mr. DONDERO. Would the insurance companies go ahead and repair these buildings if they are subrogated to the rights of the claimants?

Mr. McGEHEE. They would where they insured them but in the event of recovery from the Government by the claimant the insurance companies would be subrogated to the amount insured and they would be reimbursed from amounts paid a claimant; in fact, the Government would protect the insurance company's claim.

I may say to the gentleman from Mississippi further that it is practically a rule of the House, and is a custom of the Committee on Claims that $5,000 is the maximum allowable in the case of death. So if the Navy Department settles death claims in the sum of $5,000 they will have done only that which the Congress itself does.

I may say further that in the case of claims arising on account of the death of a person caused by this accident the chances are 100 percent that the Congress would allow them, so the Navy would be doing only that which the Congress itself would do in the settlement of these death claims, and I daresay there might be instances where the Congress would allow to individuals probably more than $5,000 on account of injury.

Any claim exceeding $5,000 would have to be referred to Congress under the provisions of this bill, as I stated to the gentleman.

The Navy Department is very much interested in the passing of this legislation authorizing it to make these settlements and adjustments while their representatives are on the ground. In my opinion it would be wise to let them do so, for as stated it would save the Congress the trouble and expense involved of going through three or four hundred individual claims, and duplicating the investigations already being made by the Navy.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. The Navy already has the right to settle claims up to $1,000.

Mr. McGEHEE. Yes; during the period of the war.

Mr. RANKIN. If any person feels aggrieved he has the right to file an additional claim before the Claims Committee and have it adjudicated in the proper way.

Nobody is going to suffer as the result of holding this legislation up or letting it come before the House for amendment and for general discussion under the rules of the House. I am not willing to give my consent to the passage of a bill of this kind that will delegate such broad powers to the Navy Department or to any other department at this time. We have delegated too much authority already. So I am going to object to the present consideration of the bill.

THE LATE JOHN MARSHALL WOLVERTON

Mr. ROHRBOUGH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROHRBOUGH. Mr. Speaker, it is with a feeling of deep sorrow that I rise to announce the death of a former Member of this body, the Honorable John Marshall Wolverton. He was born at Big Bend, Calhoun County, W. Va., in 1872, and grew up in that rural community.

He was educated in the country schools, at Glenville and Fairmont State Colleges, and at West Virginia University. From the university he received his law degree in 1901 and continued in the practice of law during the remainder of his life.

He served a term as mayor of the city of Richwood and two 4-year terms as prosecuting attorney of Nicholas County. In 1924 he was elected to the Sixty-ninth Congress, succeeding the Honorable Stuart F. Reed, who was not a candidate for reelection. He failed for reelection to the Seventieth Congress, being defeated by the Honorable William S. O'Brien, whom he in turn defeated for the Seventy-first Congress.

In 1907 he married Laura D. Herold, who survives him. To this union three children were born—Lt. James H. Wolverton, assistant trial judge advocate in the United States Army Air Corps at Morrison Field, West Palm Beach, Fla.; a daughter, Helen, wife of Lt. Nathan Callaghan, a Navy dentist at Jacksonville, Fla.; and a second daughter, Barbara, wife of Capt. Thomas Saunders, an Army dentist at Roanoke, Va.

Within the past 2 years I called on him occasionally, and found him, in spite of failing health, still much interested in national and international affairs. His observations were timely and pertinent. Three weeks before his death I visited him at his home in Richwood. At that time it was evident that he could live but a short time, and I am sure he was fully aware of that fact. However, he was in full possession of all his mental faculties and discussed with keen insight and clarity the problems facing the country, particularly the great national debt and the dangers of financial disaster that threaten. Throughout my visit he bore himself with supreme courage and complete composure, as though the transition immediately facing him had no terrors whatever for him, and as though it were but a customary experience.

SIDNEY HILLMAN

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, certain Members sought to hurt Sidney Hillman by some questions before the House Campaign Expenditures Committee, but Hillman was more than a match for them. A few more such experiences and those who come to scoff will remain to praise.

One sought to deprecate him because of his birth in Lithuania. Yesterday we honored Pulaski, who came from Poland. In Pulaski's day Lithuania was a part of Poland. The great hero Kosciusko whom we have often honored, was born in Lithuania.

Hillman's detractors call him Communist. He is president of a large bank, the Amalgamated Bank of New York, and

a director of a Chicago trust company. It is hardly likely that a Communist would be permitted to remain as a high officer of any bank.

Dewey addressed a C. I. O. convention, and in 1937 accepted through his campaign manager a contribution of $5,000 to his campaign fund from Mr. Hillman's union. His managers even asked for more. It is altogether different when one is on the receiving end.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an editorial published in the Washington Daily News.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include an excerpt sent to me by Mr. S. K. Smith, of Flovilla, Ga., same being a poem published in the Atlanta Journal by Harry Stillwell Edwards, the title of which is "Coming Down My Creek."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include an article appearing in the Washington Evening Star.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

SIDNEY HILLMAN

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, I do not think that the gentleman from New York should make such extravagant and unfounded statements as saying that Mr. Dewey accepted $5,000 from the C. I. O. for his campaign in 1938. I deny it. His campaign committee may have received $5,000, but there is a difference, and beside, C. I. O. had not blossomed forth in its true colors at that time.

However, I do want to thank the gentleman from New York for coming to the defense of Sidney Hillman who is the greatest single asset that the Republican Party has in this campaign.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, as long as the Republican Party relies in its campaign on an attempt to defame Mr. Hillman, so long shall the Republican Party be doomed to defeat. If the Republican Party wages a constructive campaign, as the Democratic Party is doing, relying on their achievements, then there may be some hope for the once great Republican Party; but if they descend to personalities and an attempt to incite the people of America to prejudice because of Mr. Hillman's foreign birth or because of his affiliation with the Jewish religion, I feel certain that the American people, who love and defend liberty, both religious and otherwise, will rise in their wrath and condemn that party to defeat.

REPUDIATE SIDNEY HILLMAN AND HIS GANG

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I arise to try to make peace. We Democrats have used Wendell Willkie as our secret weapon to beat the Republicans' ears down with for the last 4 years. Now, we find they are using Sidney Hillman as their secret weapon to beat ours down.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WRIGHT] states that the Republicans should not attack the Democratic Party because of Sidney Hillman's being an alien, or foreign-born, or because he is a Jew, or because they do not like him for any other reason.

I will tell you how to solve this problem in a way that ought to make everybody feel decent. That is for everybody in public life to repudiate Sidney Hillman and his gang and do it now.

Both candidates for President should repudiate the communistic, fascistic machine that Sidney Hillman and his gang are trying to build up in this country, financed with blood money wrung from the helpless workers of the Nation. That would give both parties an air of respectability.

Then we could carry on an American campaign in the American way; which we cannot do with Sidney Hillman and his gang financing either ticket.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

WAR MOBILIZATION AND RECONVERSION BILL OF 1944

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (S. 2051), to amend the Social Security Act, as amended, to provide a national program for war mobilization and reconversion, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, S. 2051, with Mr. LANHAM in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SIMPSON].

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I would like to address myself and direct your attention for a moment to a part of title I of Senate 2051, and likewise to the committee amendment thereto. It contains a departure from the usual practice of New Deal administration which may be worthy of consideration. I would like to inquire as to the original creation of the Office of War Mobilization and the reason specific congressional action is now sought to establish that office as we hopefully approach the end of the war. There have been thousands of Executive decrees ranging from the most trivial, to the creation of an office second in importance only to the Presidency itself. Some have clearly been within the intended powers delegated by the Congress—others, as this creation, have had to depend on undefined and indeterminate authority termed "constitutional war powers of the President."

We have had the Office of War Mobilization since 1943. It was created by the President under authority of his constitutional wartime powers, and general grants of power made by Congress.

Personally I am willing to accept his conclusions in these respects for the present, though in my opinion another method for the creation of an Assistant President should have been used. Generally the direct and not the indirect method is best understood and is more conducive to good government. The people of our country cannot be blamed for criticizing a President who having questionable authority by decree creates an office with literally powers of life and death over every and any American business and worker. How much better it would be had the President come to Congress for specific legislation establishing the Office of War Mobilization, just as is done in this bill, at this late date.

Does he now question, or do his leaders in Congress now question his authority? Is it now the purpose to avoid the charges that he exceeded his authority by his decree establishing that Office? Is it now realized that the vast powers the Director exercises over the American businessman and worker, should have been secured from their representatives by specific legislation? Does he now realize that in these days when representative government along with dictatorships is on trial—our form of government would be strengthened, if instead of Executive decrees, in vital matters, he went to the people's representatives for specific authority?

So far as I know no one has in the courts seriously contested this exercise of power by the President. Perhaps he actually did have the power; perhaps he did not have it. Most likely those who in peacetime would have contested the matter, decided that with our Nation in a life-and-death struggle, the President should be given the benefit of a doubt and his decree go unchallenged.

Certain it is that the naming of Justice Byrnes, who was called from the Supreme Court, as Director pleased the

public and removed temporarily, at least, their fear lest they find a Henry Wallace, a Harry Hopkins, or a Sidney Hillman as dictator of American business. In Justice Byrnes, a real American, one recognizes a man of great ability, of long and distinguished legislative experience; a man worthy of donning the robe of Assistant President after surrendering the judicial robe. Truly, the authority of Justice Byrnes is great; he is the Assistant President, second in power only to the President himself. And so the American people, with every confidence in Justice Byrnes, accepted and submitted to his authority.

These same people, pleased by Justice Byrnes' appointment to this vital position, were shocked this summer when, at the Democratic National Convention in Chicago, this distinguished American and Democrat, this former United States Senator and Justice of the United States Supreme Court, this Assistant President, was denied nomination for Vice President by his party, because, and only because, Sidney Hillman, seeking control of the Democratic Party, his party's real leader, so ordered. What Sidney Hillman did in Chicago he can do in Washington, so perhaps Justice Byrnes' present position is not permanent; perhaps he will be fired when this bill becomes law.

Indeed, on the very best of authority, it is noted that Justice Byrnes will not serve as Director of War Mobilization and Reconversion in the post-war period. I assume he will desire to continue his present position for the remainder of the war. But should the same Sidney Hillman who denied him the Vice Presidential nomination so order Justice Byrnes, he would undoubtedly follow HENRY WALLACE and Donald Nelson on a one-way journey to China.

I note, too, that HENRY WALLACE has been instructed by his good friend not to remove himself from Washington. He is to remain "on tap" for whatever use can be made of him at that time. In the meantime he will, of course, with the certainty of a post-war job plug all the harder for a fourth term. Conceivably this job as Director of War Mobilization and Reconversion will be vacated by request and given to either Sidney or Henry. Either would welcome the chance of exercising New Deal authority over business. Then we would see a real cracking down. Then a depression would be a certainty, then the re-creation of the W. P. A. would certainly follow with its political hammer over the head of free men—demanding their votes in exchange for makeshift jobs.

We see through this request at this late date for congressional establishment of the Office of War Mobilization and Reconversion. There is a campaign just around the corner. The President is being rightfully accused of seeking to rule his people by decrees, and not by laws made by the peoples' representatives. He seeks now to cover up and have it appear that Congress in this act fully approves his questionable exercise of authority and perhaps he sought to extend into peacetimes the duties of the War Mobilizer in this manner. It is true also that Justice Byrnes' office is being used as a bait—the idea being that Congress would certainly approve the continuance of the wartime duties of the War Mobilizer, and so many unreasoned, unworkable, wasteful, inequitable, and unwise foolish proposals were attached.

If some such purpose was intended, the action of the Ways and Means Committee, guided by our very distinguished chairman, and the action I anticipate this committee will take has defeated that purpose. In the first place, the committee clearly defines the powers the reconversion director shall have. It makes him the agent of Congress. In the second place, it struck from the bill those wasteful and extravagant proposals.

The committee recognizes our country's financial picture; it knows our obligations now and in the post-war period far exceed our probable tax receipts; it knows the fallacies and dangers of continued deficit financing; it knows sales resistance to the purchase of Government bonds will increase when victory is ours.

It knows American citizens will want good American dollars for their War bonds in post-war years.

It knows, above all, that the only money to meet our obligations to pay these bonds can come from taxes or new bond sales, unless printing-press money is used.

The committee knows Social Security tax collections have all been spent and that future Social Security payments can only be made out of new tax collections from the workers themselves.

The committee knows the returning soldier or sailor will unload his knapsack and duffle bag and substitute for the implements of war a tax load of at least $1,700.

So the committee, seeing its duty to the American people, has not failed them. It has carefully defined the post-war powers of the Office of War Mobilization and Reconversion and it has deleted from S. 2051 those authorizations for unestimated expenditures which would certainly exceed $10,000,000,000 we do not have.

I hope the committee amendment is agreed to.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. I yield.

Mr. KNUTSON. I think it only fair that the RECORD should show at this point that the Democratic National Convention at Chicago was dominated by big city bosses, such as Kelly, Hague, Pendergast, and the Tammany machine. They got together and decided to nominate for Vice President one of their own number, a man who had been a faithful follower of the Pendergast machine in Missouri for many years.

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. LYNCH].

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Chairman, it is to be regretted that a bill of the importance of the present one is being made a political football, judging from the remarks of the preceding speaker.

I am one of the four men on the Ways and Means Committee who filed views dissenting from the report of a majority of the committee favorably reporting out S. 2051, as amended. I do not consider this bill as reported by our committee a piece of real constructive legislation. It simply provides by statute for the Office of War Mobilization already created by Executive order and provides further for industrial reconversion. It contains no provision for the benefit of the American worker. Insofar as the individual worker is concerned, this bill is a false alarm. It is inadequate and innocuous. The ultraconservatism of the original George bill, referred to our committee, has been further reduced to the do-nothingness of the bill now before us. The Congress has rightfully and properly passed legislation giving aid and benefit to our returning veterans. We have likewise passed legislation for the benefit of industry as indicated by the War Contract Termination Act, the surplus property bill, and the reconversion provisions of the present bill, but we have failed to make any provision to protect the worker on the home front from the economic shock that will be produced by mass unemployment during the transition period from war to peace.

Yesterday several of those who spoke in favor of this bill expressed the hope that there will be no mass unemployment. There is an old adage, "Live in hope and die in despair." I, too, hope that there will be no mass unemployment, but looking at the stark realities I am thoroughly convinced that unless we take a courageous attitude, looking the facts squarely in the face, we will be wholly unprepared for the unemployment which will follow when our war industries shut down. I do not subscribe to the opinion that we should wait until mass unemployment is upon us before we prepare for it. I hold that we should plan now for the future.

I cannot, in the time allotted me, set forth my complete objections to this bill. I will, therefore, confine myself to that part of the bill which has to do with public works and if time permits will take up some other features.

Mr. Chairman, I feel that we cannot go forward with our eyes closed to the fact that when the war is over there will be millions of people now engaged in war industry who will then become unemployed. Today we have in the labor force of the country somewhere between 55,000,000 and 60,000,000 people. When this war is over some 18,000,000 people alone who are now engaged in war industries will have lost their jobs. Many never again will go back to employment, some will go back to their housewife duties, others because of age will not be again employed, and many more are school children who will not return to employment for several years to come; but the fact remains that there will still be between 10,000,000 and 15,000,000 people who will have been thrown out of employment when the war ends who will be

seeking jobs in civilian industry. In addition, there are 11,000,000 of our men and women in the service of our country. They will be demobilized, at what rate we know not, but we can safely say that at least 5,000,000 or 6,000,000 will be demobilized within the first year and probably 10,000,000 within the second year. Those veterans likewise will have to be taken care of by some means. We must find employment for them somewhere, and the only thing we can do is to encourage employment throughout the entire country, not only in private industry but also by the construction of public works.

I am afraid that if we do not plan for the future we will be faced once again with the W. P. A., and I venture to say there is not one Member of the House who is present here today who is in favor of the return of the W. P. A. The American people do not want it. It was forced upon us because of the exigencies of the times. Although it did a wonderful work, although it supplied employment for the breadwinners of the families of the unemployed, yet the fact remains that a great part of the work of the W. P. A. was not planned until it was almost too late. You will recall the days of leaf raking and boondoggling. They were caused by the fact that we had no plans, they were caused by the fact that we had not looked ahead to the days of unemployment. Now, when those days of unemployment are once again facing the American people, I say we must look ahead and plan to reduce unemployment to the minimum. One of the ways we can do that is by a program of public works.

In the George bill as presented here, S. 2051, there is provision for loans to the various States and municipalities for the preparation of plans for public works, repayable out of the first moneys authorized for construction.

I was one of the first to introduce in this House a bill on public works. At one time I felt that loans might be the effective way to encourage and stimulate the construction of public works, but now, when the day of peace is almost in sight, when we are confronted with the fact that according to the records some $3,600,000,000 of public works are in contemplation and only 5 percent of those public works have plans that are completed so that they can go to work within 60 days, I say we are in a dangerous situation, and mere loans to the States and communities will never in the world spur them on to the required activity.

There is only one way we can get the States and the municipalities to go into a program of public works, and that is by giving grants-in-aid. That plan has worked out insofar as road development is concerned and will work out now if we have the courage and the foresight to tell the people of the States and of the cities that if they are going to handle the problem of unemployment they must have some system of public works and they must plan now.

I do not say that public works in themselves are a cure-all for the unemployment that will come, but with $3,600,000,000, or with $5,000,000,000 of public works, it is estimated that between 1,000,000 and 2,000,000 will receive employment after the war is over. Can we in the face of the great number of unemployed that we know we will be confronted with, turn our backs on a plan that definitely will give employment to some 1,000,000 or 2,000,000 of our people? It seems to me that if we do not give grants-in-aid in this bill we will be passing a bill that, insofar as public works are concerned, means absolutely nothing.

I was talking yesterday to one of our colleagues from Georgia. He told me that in Georgia the bill as it stands means nothing to them, because by constitutional limitation they cannot borrow any moneys whatsoever until they have some kind of a vote or referendum. That is not the only State in that position. There are other States that are similarly situated; other States and municipalities that will not be able to undertake any great system of public works until the full authorization for the entire construction of the job has been given to them by the people under the constitutions or the laws of their States or municipalities.

Under these circumstances, it is my intention to offer an amendment tomorrow which will provide that, instead of this system of loans or advances provided for in the George bill, and also in the committee bill which we have before us, we shall provide for grants-in-aid so that we may get this program of public works under way.

What we need today is a stimulus. There is no stimulus in the bill we have before us today when the States and municipalities have to pay back within 5 years, with interest at the rate of 2½ percent, the moneys they borrow in connection with the preparation of plans. That is putting the Federal Government right squarely into the banking business. What State or what municipality is going to borrow money from the Federal Government under this bill, when the loan is repayable within 5 years and interest is charged at the rate of 2½ percent, when they can go to any bank in their State, or any bank in their community, and get the loan from that bank at a lower rate of interest. I cannot vision any State, county, or municipality borrowing from the Federal Government at 2½ percent, when every local bank would be only too glad to make the loan, and at a lower rate of interest.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman, my good friend, for whom I have affection and high regard, yield to me?

Mr. LYNCH. I yield, Mr. Chairman. May I say to the gentleman I certainly reciprocate his kind feelings.

Mr. KNUTSON. I thank the gentleman. But is it not true that the several States are now in much better financial condition than the Federal Government at the present time?

Mr. LYNCH. In answer to the gentleman's question I shall say there is no doubt that the States and the municipalities are better off financially than the Federal Government at the present time. But again the gentleman fails to recognize the important point, that this is not simply a question of loaning money for the sake of the project itself. The purpose of the grant-in-aid which will be contained in the amendment, is that it will act as a stimulus for these States that have not yet undertaken any plan or procedure for the construction of public works. Let me illustrate by reading in part a report that has been compiled at the request of the Chairman of the Special Committee on Post-war Economic Policy and Planning, a report that has been prepared by the Federal Works Agency in collaboration with the Census Bureau.

Every State was contacted to make inquiry as to what projects it had under contemplation or what projects it had plans for. Of the 48 States contacted, 37 responded. One State reported that no plans were in process whatsoever. Thirty-six of the forty-eight States reported that they had plans. Of the 36 States that reported they had plans for projects, only 22 States reported that they had any fully completed plans. Twenty-three States reported they had plans for projects in the design stage. Twenty-five reported they had plans for projects in the preliminary stage, and thirty-five reported that they had plans for projects in the idea stage.

By project plans in the completed stage I mean where there are final plans and specifications, necessary land, or rights of way secured, and financial arrangements made to the point where bids could be advertised and contracts awarded within 60 days.

By projects in design stage of plan preparation I mean those for which complete surveys, borings, soundings, and so forth, are being made; land acquisition maps being prepared; final plans, specifications, and contract documents completed or in process of preparation; and all necessary steps could be taken to place the projects in the completed stage of plan preparation within 6 months.

By projects in preliminary stage of plan preparation I mean those which have been carried to a point where an engineering report is being or has been prepared covering the scope of and need for the project, and where general layouts, preliminary land-acquisition studies, preliminary estimates of cost, preliminary plans, and similar data, are now available.

By projects in idea stage of plan preparation, I mean those projects the need of which is known and the construction of which is contemplated within the next 6 years, but upon which no basic engineering studies have been made except very preliminary sketches and estimates of cost.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself a half minute.

The very able address just made by the distinguished gentleman from New York, sounded to me like a prospectus for a proposed ride that the spenders would give Uncle Sam down printing-press alley.

Mr. Chairman, I now yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DEWEY] such time as he requires.

Mr. DEWEY. Mr. Chairman, I contemplate attacking this subject from a little different angle than some of the members who have made the able speeches and discussions that you have heard on the bill now before us.

I am not only going to talk to you, my colleagues, but I would like to talk further afield, to the mothers and to the wives of servicemen, and to the young people of this country. What we are doing here, the provisions contained in this bill and the things proposed to be placed in the bill, have a great bearing on the future life, happiness, welfare, and opportunity for success of the young people of this country and for generations to come.

MOTHERS AND WIVES, THIS IS YOUR PROBLEM

Mr. Chairman, with the passage of this bill now under consideration, the Congress will have taken the preliminary steps necessary for the care of our returning soldiers—the termination of war contracts, the disposition of surplus war property and the coordination of the administration of the reconversion under a single director.

For the soldiers—may a kind providence guard and protect them—we provided a mustering-out pay as far back as February of this year, and in June the soldiers' G. I. bill became law. This latter legislation provides for hospitalization, education, loans for purchasing and construction of homes, farms, and business property, and for retraining and unemployment allowances.

For these men of ours who have served and sacrificed for their country, I wish that some magic way could be found by which the cost of these benefits they will receive will not ultimately fall back on their own shoulders in the form of taxes, or increase of the public debt, which they themselves will have to pay.

So many of us, when we recommend that the Government provide the money for a public benefit even as worthy as the G. I. bill, forget that the Government has no money of its own. It obtains all all of its funds from one of two sources, either by taxing the people or by selling the people Government securities which the people themselves will have to pay off with interest by additional taxation on themselves. We must always bear in mind that when we make a commitment for the future we are placing a mortgage on the younger people of the country, who in this case are the very soldiers and sailors who have already done so much for the protection of our United States.

When this bill that is now before us was in the Senate and when in committee here in the House, efforts were made to extend the unemployment benefits to all civil servants of the Federal Government and to increase the unemployment benefits as now paid by the different States to a maximum of $20 per week for 26 weeks a year, all of this additional cost, amounting to many hundreds of millions of dollars, to be paid out of the Federal Treasury. It is my belief that the people of this country, the mothers and wives of soldiers, and the soldiers themselves, should be informed of what the present financial situation of this country is and what such additional expenditures of Federal money may mean to them.

I am going to place here in the RECORD a few figures to show how this mortgage on our children has grown. These figures in themselves will prove why every mother and wife of a soldier should demand of any person or group proposing the expenditure of the people's money, that they show proof wherein an increase of our national debt or taxes can be justified.

That you may have a basis for comparison, I take you back to the year 1917 when the United States entered the First World War. In 1917, this country had 104,000,000 population and an insignificant public debt of only $2,975,000,000 or but $28.57 for each citizen.

In 1919, the year after the war, the population was 106,000,000 but the public debt, due to the cost of the war, had risen to what we then thought to be the fantastic figure of $25,500,000,000 or $240 per citizen.

By 1930, the population had increased to 121,000,000 but the public debt, owing to the wise financial planning of the Coolidge administration, had been reduced from $25,000,000,000 to $16,185,000,000, or only $131 per citizen.

During the following 11 years, that is to say, by 1941, the outbreak of the present war, the population had increased to 133,000,000 and the public debt had risen by about $33,000,000,000 to $49,000,000,000, or $367 per citizen.

But what has occurred in the last 3 years? As of today, with a population estimated at 138,000,000 of people, the public debt of the United States is $203,000,000,000, or $1,468 for each citizen, and at the present rate of expenditure it is estimated that by June 30 next, it will have risen to $1,823 for every man, woman, and child, including our soldiers.

That, my colleagues, means that when our boys come home they will start their new lives with a mortgage to pay off of almost $1,900 per soldier. Should a soldier have a family consisting of a wife and two children, that family starts life anew encumbered by a mortgage of almost $8,000.

We at home have passed through a period of full employment and high wages with the result that State reserves for unemployment benefits are adequate. We know that, due to full employment, State reserves for unemployment insurance benefits under the Social Security Act will have reached about $6,000,000,000.

During our hearings on the subject we were informed by the various State administrators of unemployment insurance that these reserves would probably be more than sufficient to pay any forseeable unemployment benefits, under the schedules existing throughout the different States of the Union.

In my own State of Illinois, over 2,185,000 workers are covered by unemployment insurance providing benefits of $20 per week for 20 weeks for which, as of July 31, 1944, a reserve fund of $422,188,259 had been accumulated.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. DEWEY. Certainly.

Mr. KNUTSON. At this point of the gentleman's address I think the RECORD should show that every State in the Union and the Territories have unemployment insurance.

Mr. DEWEY. The gentleman is entirely correct.

Mr. KNUTSON. Already have, I mean.

Mr. DEWEY. The 48 States and 2 Territories have accumulated, as I have already stated, reserves of about $6,000,000,000 for this purpose with which they contemplate under their own State laws taking care of their own unemployed people.

Mr. KNUTSON. And $6,000,000,000 before the advent of more abundant life was some sum.

Mr. DEWEY. These State unemployment reserves, as you know, were built up by a 3-percent tax on the pay rolls of employers and hence were not a burden on the general public nor on the workingmen themselves, but any increase of these benefits, as now proposed and for which no reserves have been set up, will be an additional charge against the soldiers and the young people of this country.

In the consideration of this bill and all other legislation having to do with the reconversion from a war- to peacetime economy, we should interest ourselves almost exclusively in those items that will make jobs available to the men of our armed service and, as far as possible, keep our productive efforts on such a basis that employment may be provided for the large percentage of those who had entered our war industries. On the other hand, I shall look with suspicion and, in fact, be opposed to Federal expenditure which will increase the mortgage on our people above the figure of $1,823.54, which it is estimated it will be on June 30, 1945, or the figure of $1,468.29, which it actually is today.

Mr. Chairman, in the consideration of this bill and some of the arguments that were made yesterday favoring increase of benefits throughout the States at public expense, I think it would probably be well to see what is the financial condition of the American people today.

Not many months ago when we were considering the 1943 tax bill and the renegotiation-of-contracts law we heard as witnesses important members of the administration, those who were occupied with the maintenance of prices at the present level and preventing an inflationary spiral. In fact, these officials came to the Ways and Means Committee urging an increase of the tax on the people by $10,000,000,000. They claimed that the people due to the full employment and high wages had great sums of unexpended purchasing power in their hands which might go into the market and cause a rise in prices. I thought it might be interesting to make a more recent investigation of what these sums amounted to today or as recently as I could obtain figures. The figures I am about to give are as of July 1 last.

From these figures which came from the Treasury Department and the Federal Reserve Board it is interesting to note that the so-called savings bonds in the hands of the people, the A, B, C, D,

E, F, and G bonds at their current redemption value as of July 31, 1944, amounted to $36,538,000,000.

The currency in circulation outside of banks, in the pockets and in the hands of the people amounted, as of June 30, to $22,504,000,000.

Individual demand deposits in banks, not business deposits, but those deposits belonging to individuals, withdrawable on demand, amounted to $18,000,000,000.

Individual time deposits, that is postal savings and deposits in savings banks amounted to $34,000,000,000. Adding all these figures gives you the astounding total of $111,000,000,000 in the hands of the American people today, expendable at the American people's will.

What does $111,000,000,000 mean in comparison to what these same people had during peacetime prior to the war? The total national income of the United States, the average for the years 1938 and 1939, the last 2 pre-war years, was only $67,000,000,000. That was the total national income. Today, due to high employment and high wages, the American people have more than one and one-half times the total national pre-war income at their immediate disposal. Hence when I consider taking out of the Treasury Department funds for some of the purposes proposed by some of the opponents of the committee bill, I can consider their projects as purely raids on the Treasury at a time when the American people have in their possession $111,000,000,000 or one and one-half times the total national pre-war income.

I think of the future, I think of the taxes that must be placed on the soldiers, on the younger generation. At my age it makes no difference, I will get along, but it is the coming generation that is going to pay off these sums. They will pay the taxes, they will retire the public debt. I cannot approve any such expenditures unless they are going to create jobs and provide the ability to work in order that the on-coming generations may live the kind of life I had the joy of living in our great country prior to this war.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEWEY. I yield.

Mr. KNUTSON. It is an indisputable fact that the boys who are fighting this war will have to pay for it after they get back.

Mr. DEWEY. Not only an indisputable fact but it is regretful that even the benefits they receive under the G. I. bill they themselves will have to pay for.

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEWEY. I yield.

Mr. GIFFORD. The gentleman recited so splendidly the amount of money the States have built up for unemployment payments. Did the gentleman recognize and mention the large amount the municipalities all over the Nation have set aside for this sort of relief in order that they may have some public improvements and the men may have jobs?

The municipalities themselves have set aside large sums for practically the same purpose.

Mr. DEWEY. That is expected. Most cities are proud of their own ability to look after their own and I think the people, giving serious thought to what the other system will bring with it, will go back to the old system of self dependence.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. MALONEY].

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. Chairman, the war news has been most encouraging, and, as shadows forecast coming events, it is not unreasonable to expect a victorious ending of this unholy war in the near future. Therefore, it is right and proper that we prepare for our peacetime program that will maintain a stable economy.

In making provisions for the conversion to a healthy domestic business, including the welfare of our temporary unemployed, the orderly demobilization of our armed forces, and its personnel reestablished in business, professional, and educational pursuits, we should include and give thought to a program of development of foreign trade. In this last I wish to call attention to the trade that can come from the Middle and South American countries in exchange for our trade, which would be mutually beneficial. By balancing this exchange of commerce, we could develop a very substantial and valuable business.

The people of the South, particularly of the Mississippi Valley, are aware of the possibilities of such an arrangement.

My home, the great city of New Orleans, the metropolis of the South, and the gateway to the Middle and South American countries being close to the Gulf of Mexico, should be the hub on which the wheel of commerce can turn on and through. In our city, we have every facility to carry forward and meet the requirements for a smooth exchange of commerce between this country and our Latin American neighbors. So that you may have a better understanding in regard to our facilities, I shall quote from a statement made by one of our most prominent citizens, one whose life work has been well identified with the upbuilding of the trade in the Mississippi Valley, and one who is prominent in banking, commerce, and shipping. The gentleman to whom I refer is Mr. Rudolph Hecht. His statement was made at the Chicago World Trade conference, on February 14, 1944, in Chicago. Quote:

We in New Orleans view foreign commerce as a very important segment of our business life and we are deeply interested in seeing a greater development of the export and import business between the Central West and the rest of the world. We believe that notwithstanding the competition of eastern ports New Orleans will be the port of exit and entry for most of the products involved in such trade, and we propose to leave no stone unturned to make it advantageous to your manufacturers to route their shipments that way.

First of all, we are fortunate enough to have excellent railroad service rendered by eight different railroad systems entering our port and the present freight-rate structure is such as to make it cheaper from most valley points to ship through the port of New Orleans than it is through Atlantic ports.

Second. We have in New Orleans unexcelled port facilities and have every reason to believe that in the post-war era our steamship sailings to all parts of the world will be equal in speed and regularity of service to those of any other American port. Furthermore, New Orleans is at the heart of a great system of inland waterways which affords the most economical transportation, thus supplementing in a constructive manner the port's other shipping facilities. The proposed Alexander seaway from New Orleans to the Gulf will provide a shorter and more economical deep tidewater channel to the sea, and thus facilitate the flow of the vastly augmented trade with Latin America and the other countries of the world.

Third. The banking facilities in New Orleans have developed greatly, and although a large part of the credits opened in this country by foreign banks still come through New York institutions, such credits can now in many cases be arranged through midwestern or southern banks if the seller insists on this being done. In any event there is no difficulty in negotiating, and if desired, discounting foreign drafts through New Orleans or other Mississippi Valley banks.

Fourth. New Orleans, which has always been one of the country's great seaports, has now become a great skyport as well, with several new airfields and new air lines, thus making it one of the important international air and surface transport gateways to all points of the Western Hemisphere and affording fast communication for buyers and sellers to get together.

Fifth. There are in New Orleans a number of important export and import houses and responsible forwarding agents to handle the intricate details of the export and import business for those manufacturers who are not versed in such transactions.

Sixth. We have recently established in New Orleans what we believe to be a very worth-while organization for stimulating international trade, known as International House.

A group of businessmen of our city have gotten together with the determined purpose of bringing to the attention of the Latin-American businessmen the many advantages that can be had by the development of commerce between these countries and the United States. They have gratuitously contributed several hundred thousand dollars for the purpose of acquiring and equipping a building that will be known as a center for exchange of culture and trade. This building is being furnished with every necessary equipment and personnel so that all visitors from the Latin-American countries interested in promoting the trade between the United States and their countries will have every convenience at their disposal while in New Orleans.

The gentlemen who have undertaken this program are to be commended for their public spirit and good citizenship as the arrangement they have provided will be most neighborly and of extreme advantage in developing the commerce between the United States and those countries; and in addition to increasing the trade, many opportunities will be opened up for employment.

Not only is New Orleans the real gateway to the Middle and South American countries because of its natural advantages, but it is a city which has a distinct and unique background with its French and Spanish culture and education that

should be most attractive to every Latin-American citizen.

Mr. Chairman, while we are doing our best to place our Nation's economic system on four wheels, we must not overlook this—the possibilities of the expansion of the trade I referred to.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LANHAM].

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Chairman, we are told in Holy Writ that in a time of want Elijah betook himself to the brook called Cherith. There he was fed daily by the ravens and he drank of the brook. The Scriptures then go on to say that "it came to pass after a while that the brook dried up."

In recent years, and even in times of plenty, we have seen the cities and the States form the habit of taking copious financial drafts from the brook of the Federal Treasury. I wonder if that brook is drying up? Certainly it is getting very low and is being but little replenished. I wonder if it is still safely potable. I wonder if we might not develop from it a case of poisoning of the body politic. What effect will these drafts have upon our organic system, the system that came to us from our fathers? Will they destroy that system? With the little stream of Cherith "it came to pass after a while that the brook dried up."

Mr. Chairman, I want to talk for a few moments about our national debt. It is not a pleasant subject. We sometimes hear it referred to as the debt of the Federal Government. Technically that is true, but it is really the debt of the American people, and the American people will have to pay it.

We realize that the war has greatly increased that debt. We realize, also, that substantial sums have gone to foreign governments under the lend-lease provisions, and it is quite conjectural how much will be repaid. With reference to the remainder of our debt, we have been told that we owe it to ourselves, but let no citizen delude himself into believing that he is going to pay his part of it to himself.

The size of the national debt is staggering. It is difficult to get an accurate conception of it. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DEWEY], who has just preceded me, indicated the amount that it represents in the way of the indebtedness of every man, woman, and child in the United States. Let me bring it also to your attention that it represents more than $200 for each minute which has elapsed since the birth of Christ. Still the cities and the States keep coming for these Federal grants. It is time for us to awaken to a realization of the fact that there is no such thing as a Federal grant aside from the constitutional provisions with reference to expenditures by the Federal Government. The Federal Government has nothing to give to the people except what it takes from the people. There was only one period in our history when a Federal grant was possible, and that was when our Federal expenditures were less than $1,000,000,000 a year. We then could get this amount of money from customs and miscellaneous receipts, and what we did not expend for Federal purposes we could grant to the States. But the people now must furnish all the money for each and every one of these grants and then have part of it taken from them in order that the Federal Government may establish its agencies and bureaus and place restrictions upon the expenditure of the fractional part that is given back to the States.

Mr. Chairman, it is a well-known fact that the cities and the States are in much better financial condition today than the Federal Government. We must realize that the Federal Government is broke and that there is no financial plum tree or grab bag from which we can extract large sums of money and make of Uncle Sam a bountiful monetary godfather for all the people of this country.

I would like also to bring it to the attention of the Congress and to the attention of the American people that these Federal grants have contributed in great measure to the creation of many Federal bureaus against which the people are complaining. When these grants are made and parts of the contribution of the States are retained to carry on administrative agencies, naturally bureaus exist. It does not require very many bureaus to carry on the normal functions of the Federal Government. Many have been created for these abnormal functions. If we can awaken to a realization of the fact that the people are paying all this money and will have to settle this debt, we shall go far toward elimination of these unnecessary Federal bureaus.

I think often in these days of the pioneers and of the hardships they endured. They gave us our governmental system. They believed in the dual system of government that the fathers established. The thought never entered their minds, despite their trials and tribulations and hardships, of coming to the Federal Government for bounty. They were independent, they were courageous, they were thrifty, they were self-reliant; and it behooves us today to set an example worthy of those pioneers, that we may be not merely their passive admirers but their worthy successors in carrying on this Government according to the spirit and purpose for which it was established.

Let us beware, Mr. Chairman, and let the cities and the States and the American people beware; the brook of the Federal Treasury is drying up.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from California [Mr. GEARHART].

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Chairman, if anyone is looking for perfection in the bill that we have now under consideration, he will not find it there; neither will he find perfection if he looks through the numerous pages of our statute books, for in none of our efforts of the yesteryears have we been able to achieve it. We have come closer in dealing with other subjects for the reason we were dealing with facts which in those instances were not in controversy. But we have less perfection in this bill than that which is usually achieved legislatively for the reason we are at this moment looking into an uncertain future; trying to deal with problems which have not yet formulated themselves, problems which are easy to define in generalities but which are very complicated and very mystifying when we try to break them down into their several parts.

What will be that which the future is to unfold? There is not one among us who would stand up and say: "I know what the future will be." So we cannot today legislate definitely, but we can lay the foundation for detailed legislation to be enacted at a time yet undetermined. And that is all this bill does—lays the foundation for the acquisition of the information we must have; suggest a formula for dealing with that information when it becomes available, and promises the formulation of legislation in the days to come when the problem has been clearly revealed and the necessity of legislation is apparent.

In this bill we take an agency of Government which was created by Executive order, an agency which has been efficient in the main, an agency which has done a good job, and we translate that agency from one based upon Executive order into an agency based upon statutory authority and expand it into an investigatory agency which shall devote its organization to ascertain and reveal the facts which we must face and deal with on the morrow. After reenacting all the powers of the Office of War Mobilization so that it can continue to carry on its war work, we change its name so that it shall hereafter be known as the Office of War Mobilization and Reconversion, thereby adding to the Director's responsibilities the problems that will arise during the transition from war to peace.

With respect to reconversion, and dealing with the future, this bill says that the Director shall formulate, and have formulated, plans to meet the problems of the transition; that he shall coordinate the activities of the various Executive agencies now in existence; that he shall recommend to the Congress appropriate legislation; that he shall cause studies and reports to be made, and that he shall institute specific studies for the benefit of the President, the Senate and the House of Representatives in dealing with specific problems; that he shall coordinate the activities of State and local governments, industry, labor, agriculture, and other groups; that he shall submit reports to the President and the Senate and the House of Representatives, and that he shall also recommend to the Congress at the proper time appropriate legislation to carry out any plans that may be developed under the authority of the bill not already authorized under existing law.

The one I last mentioned is the great justifying feature of this legislation. It is legislation which resolutely faces the uncertain future in the effort to find a way to solve its problems, obligates itself to recommend further legislation when the necessities of the future have been fully revealed, when we know what we are doing. No; this is not legislation that you need apologize for. It is legislation which you can wholeheartedly

support. It is legislation that does not contemplate nor admit the certainty of widespread unemployment. It is legislation that looks forward to the time when we, knowing the problem, can find a way to prevent unemployment by providing employment for those who need it; legislation under which a way will be found to keep the people at work. It is legislation that turns its back on the theory of continued poverty. It is legislation that faces the future with optimism, a future which shall involve the intent and purpose to maintain the high level of prosperity which we are now enjoying.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GEARHART. I yield.

Mr. KNUTSON. The Congress is continually spurred on to consider freak legislation. If it is not inflation, it is something in the offing; it is unemployment. The gentleman will recall a few years ago the medley of dangers that lay ahead of us, but they did not point out to us the one big danger that they were carefully nurturing, and which finally burst upon us with all the fury of a Texas cyclone—war.

Mr. GEARHART. The gentleman's contribution is most timely. We must not forget that the theories which are advocated by those who would reject this bill and substitute the terms and conditions of another are theories that are inspired by despair, defeatism. As the gentleman from Minnesota very aptly brought out, they are already willing to surrender to that which has naught to offer but the misery of widespread unemployment, with doles, gifts, grants, and a further augmentation of the national debt as the only remedy. I know that we cannot unscramble this war effort of ours in a fraction of a second. We cannot stop rationing the instant the last shot is fired. For a long time, longer than any of us are willing to admit at this moment, we will have to continue under a system of restraints, permits, priorities, and rationing—until a measure of normalcy has returned.

After the war is over and the conditions of peace again prevail, we are going to see set up in the United States many an industry which today is inactive or operating only in a feeble way. Little business as well as big business in this country is going to struggle to get into the competition under the most favorable conditions. More than one feature of this bill deals with this competition upon the threshold of which we now stand. The competition between small business and large business for the necessary materials with which to return to peacetime production will be very keen. Each will endeavor to get into the field under the most advantageous conditions when this post-war competition begins.

There is one thing in this bill that I like, and that is the protection which it will afford to small business in the United States, the competition which small business will have to carry on with big business during the early days of the reconversion. This bill time and time again, in line after line, throws the protection of Government about small business in its unequal contest with the larger and better financed and more powerful big business enterprises of our country. It assures the little fellow an opportunity to get his fair share of the materials he needs under formulas which are just to each. It offers to the American, humble though he may be, courage to face the bitter competition of peacetime with hopefulness, for he will know that he is not going to be overwhelmed by competition that is not fair. Millions upon millions of American people are worrying about that very selfsame thing. Those millions upon millions of little folks are going to be reassured by the writing of this legislation on the statute books. It means that the American system of free enterprise, from the smallest operation to the largest, is going to have the fair and equal protection of the laws.

I am not one who is at all enthusiastic about this provision which provides for the making of plans by local agencies, but I consented to its inclusion in the bill because I thought it would stimulate an interest in local development. It is going to start people thinking about plans for the future. When they have to make a decision between asking for a loan from the Federal Government or doing it at local expense, I am sure they are going to decide to do it without Federal aid, first, because the local agencies are in better condition financially than is the Federal Government to which they would otherwise apply; secondly, because they do not want to involve themselves with a debt when they have idle cash which they might spend for the purpose. Since the interest rate of 2½ percent is a little above that at which local governments can borrow, resort will eventually be made to the local banking institution rather than to the Treasury of the United States. This section of the bill will inspire local interest and local planning will, in the end, work out to the improvement of every community, provide the essential employment opportunity to the unemployed, and, at the same time, render unnecessary an increase in the national debt.

There is so much that is covered by this bill that one might discuss to the advantage of the measure but to do so would be to usurp time which justly belongs to his colleagues. Let it suffice for me to say in a rather abrupt conclusion that this is good legislation, legislation which will work to the advantage and welfare of our country, and at the same time protect us and the country we love from an inordinate increase in the national debt, an objective which must be constantly striven for if the Nation is to survive the shock of this war.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FORAND].

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Chairman, I regret very much that I have to take a position in opposition to our great Committee on Ways and Means. I assure the membership of that committee that when I do that, I hold no animosity toward any of the members, and particularly against the chairman, because I recognize that he and every member has a right to his own opinion, just as I have a right to mine. Our views may differ, but I believe there is sincerety behind the views of every man, and for that reason I respect the views of my colleagues and I ask that I be extended the same type of respect.

Mr. Chairman, I realize also that there are a great many members who would like to speak on this subject during general debate. For that reason I shall try to be brief. However, I do want to touch on the bill itself because I am one of those who voiced criticism of it on the ground that the bill as amended does not do what it was intended to do. In fact, we considered that when the bill, S. 2051, came to us from the Senate it was an ultraconservative bill. As reported by our committee it is ultra, ultra, ultraconservative.

In these critical days it is regrettable, indeed, that we cannot be in agreement on such an important subject as the one before us. We realize that orderly demobilization and reconversion are the keys to our future economy. It is a most important matter, and I am not a bit surprised that we cannot all be in agreement as to how the job should be done.

Our first objective, naturally, is to win the war, and we must not lose sight of that fact. The war is not yet won, and no one can exactly predict when the end will come. Therefore, our war effort must not slacken.

On the other hand, because the war is going so well in our favor, we are justified in looking forward to the post-war period, particularly to the period of transition from war to peace, and to make plans for the returning members of our armed forces and for the orderly demobilization and reconversion of industry so that there may be no mass unemployment but jobs for all who want to work.

We have already made provision in the G. I. bill for the returning service men and women. We have provided for business and industry in the Contract Settlement Act and in the surplus-property bill, as well as in the bill before us, as was so well pointed out a few moments ago by the gentleman from California [Mr. GEARHART].

We have heard a great deal about free enterprise. If by that term is meant operation of business and industry on a fair, competitive basis, I am for it 100 percent, but if, on the other hand, by free enterprise is meant monopoly, cutthroat competition, or big profits for the employers and starvation for the employees, then I am against it 100 percent.

It is argued that our national income must be maintained around $130,000,000,000 in order that reasonably full employment may be provided. Unemployment means less purchasing power and less purchasing power means less national income, and out of that circle there is bound to come an increase of unemployment.

We are hopeful that reconversion will be rapid so that unemployment will be reduced to a minimum. That is only a hope, and we must prepare against the possibility that our hope is not realized. It is imperative, therefore, that in mak-

ing plans for the transition period all parts of our economy be included, and so far the only category that has been left out of our plans is the worker.

Extension of coverage to 26 weeks with a maximum of $20 per week would, I believe, cushion the shock of reconversion and maintain the purchasing power of the Nation.

We must not lose sight of the fact that unemployment insurance payments are not made indiscriminately. To be eligible for unemployment insurance payments, a worker must be registered with the United States Employment Service; he must not refuse employment for which he is qualified; and he must have good reasons for having left his previous employment. With these safeguards, unemployment insurance payments are made only to workers who are out of work because they cannot find a job.

It is reasonable to believe, therefore, that while no one can estimate exactly the cost of the program, if our program of reconversion is successful and jobs are provided as we hope they will be, the cost of unemployment insurance will not be great.

Various experts, such as the Brookings Institution, the United States Bureau of Labor Statistics, and others have estimated that under the most favorable conditions new jobs must be created in excess of those existing in 1940 for approximately 15,000,000 workers.

With these facts before us, is it any wonder that war workers, especially those not covered by the Unemployment Compensation Act, are seeking to leave war industry and get into nonwar industry in the hope that at the end of the war they will be in a position where they will feel that they have permanent employment?

I want business to prosper, but I also want to be sure that we do not forget the human element in this entire proposition. I realize that business has a big job, that business and industry are eager to do the right thing. I am conscious of the fact that we have passed considerable legislation here to that end. I am also conscious of the fact that business and industry have made enormous profits out of this war and that, in addition to their war profits, they stand to secure a refund from the Federal Government after the war is over that will run anywhere from $15,000,000,000 to $30,000,000,000. That is possible under existing tax law, in the relief provisions of section 722 of the Internal Revenue Code, the post-war refund provisions and excess-profits credit carry-back provisions of section 710 of the code, and the net operating cost carry-back provisions of section 122, as well as a possible readjustment of amortization benefits under section 124.

I base that statement on the following letter written to Secretary of the Treasury Henry Morgenthau, Jr., by Guy T. Helvering a few days before he left the office of Commissioner of Internal Revenue. The letter follows:

OCTOBER 6, 1943.

MR. SECRETARY: The committee which I appointed some months ago to recommend bureau organization and procedure for administering the relief provisions of the excess-profits-tax law (section 722 of the code) has submitted the following memorandum relating to the number and amount of relief claims, and to the possible effects on post-war revenues of the various provisions of the code authorizing refunds of corporation taxes collected in wartime:

"In our report of August 3, 1943, we submitted an estimate of the extent to which the relief provisions embodied in section 722 of the Internal Revenue Code would be availed of by taxpayers. We stated that, on the basis of the information then available, as many as 20,000 claims would probably be filed for the taxable years 1940, 1941, and 1942. We estimated that a net revenue reduction of well over $1,000,000,000 would be sought in such claims. This meant that more than $2,000,000,000 of excess-profits tax would be claimed as overpaid, and that if the taxpayers' claims were allowed in full the net reduction in their tax liability, after deducting the offsetting additions to normal tax and surtax, would exceed $1,000,000,000. Except as taxpayers have already reduced their tax payments by reason of their relief claims (see sec. 710 (a) (5)), the net amount of relief allowed will be refundable.

"Through September 20, 1943, 24,834 claims for the recovery of $2,190,443,311 in excess-profits tax have been filed.

"Approximately 5,000 corporations secured extensions of time to file their returns for 1942. Such extensions were for periods up to 6 months. In these cases, September 15, 1943, was not the last date upon which claims could be filed. As a rule, the corporations securing extensions of time to file were the larger corporations. A majority of them will doubtless file relief claims under section 722.

"Other corporate taxpayers have had faith in the statement contained in the press release issued upon the joint authority of the Secretary of the Treasury, the chairman of the Finance Committee of the Senate, and the chairman of the House Ways and Means Committee to the effect that an extension of time to file would be granted by Congress immediately upon its reconvening.

"In view of these facts, it now seems likely that more than 30,000 claims, asking for a reduction of more than $3,000,000,000 in excess-profits tax, will be filed with respect to the taxable years 1940, 1941, and 1942. The maximum amount of refunds, if such claims were allowed in full, would exceed $1,500,000,000.

"Determinations of constructive base period net income under section 722 will ordinarily establish bases for all subsequent years during which the excess-profits tax remains in force. Until such determinations are made, overcollections will commonly continue from year to year. In consequence, the total amount to be refunded will increase with each year's filing.

"The large volume of potential refunds under section 722, in conjunction with potential refunds under other provisions of the code, threatens to reverse the net effect on the results of the audit of income-tax returns. During the fiscal year 1943 such audit resulted in the assessment of $321,973,101 of additional taxes. Additional assessments are continuing at an even higher rate during the months of the present fiscal year for which we have data. However, as soon as claims under section 722 are acted on in large numbers, it seems likely that the resulting refunds will more than offset all additional assessments. Moreover, there are a number of other provisions of the Internal Revenue Code that promise refunds of even larger amounts.

"While this threatened change has no direct bearing on the administration of section 722, we feel justified in bringing it to your attention because of the fact that section 722 will play so large a part in bringing it about.

"Sound administrative considerations appear to demand an over-all study of the probable effect upon tax revenues for future years of the relief provisions (section 722, I. R. C.), the post-war refund provisions (section 780, I. R. C.), the excess profits credit carry-back provisions (section 710 (c) (3), (A), I. R. C.), the net operating loss carry-back provisions (section 122 (b) (1), I. R. C.), and the possible readjustment of amortization benefits (section 124 (d) (3) I. R. C.). It may not be unreasonable to think that refund of previously collected taxes under these statutory provisions will present a grave problem of national financing.

"We feel safe in advising you that unless the public mind is thoroughly prepared for the amounts of corporate refunds that will have to be made, the payment of such refunds may develop a critical press and provide opportunities for political discussion of tax administration that will dwarf even the experience that followed the adjustment of the tax accounts of corporations after the last war."

I agree with the committee's views as to the seriousness of the refund problem and as to the wisdom of undertaking an early appraisal of the over-all effects of the refund provisions on post-war financing. Press reports have indicated that Under Secretary Patterson, of the Department of War, in testifying before the Ways and Means Committee, suggested that possibly $15,000,000,000 might have to be refunded. A news item indicates that estimates have been stated from other quarters of a total possible refund cost of nearly double that amount.

Before leaving the Bureau to assume my new duties, I feel it my duty to bring the matter to your attention, and to suggest that it may be of such importance as to warrant calling it to the attention of the President.

GUY T. HELVERING,
Commissioner.

Mr. Chairman, as I said at the outset, I have much that I should like to say on the bill before us, but I want to give my colleagues an opportunity to get the floor. I am not going to monopolize it any longer than is necessary. I do want to refer, however, to two items in particular.

One item is that we are supposed to provide in the bill before us for the Director of Mobilization or the Director of Demobilization, whatever he will be called, to have the same powers that he has under the Executive order. However, I invite the attention of the Members to part of the language which has been stricken out of the old section 101 of the George bill, where we strip the Director of the power to issue directives to executive agencies. We strike from the bill that clause which reads:

Each executive agency shall carry out the directives of the Director—

Naturally, they will not carry out any directives if he cannot issue them. But in subsection 4 of section 102 of the George bill there appears this language, which the Director is supposed to carry out—

promote and assist in the development of demobilization and reconversion plans by other executive agencies; develop procedures whereby each executive agency is kept informed of proposed demobilization and reconversion plans and proposals which relate to its work and which are being developed or carried out by other executive agencies;

and settle controversies between such executive agencies in the development and administration of such plans.

I ask you, how can he settle controversies if he cannot even issue a directive?

I am not going to say any more on that point. I am just going to make one more point very, very briefly. On tomorrow or the next day when, in the reading of this bill, we reach that portion where it will be appropriate, I intend to offer as an amendment the reinstatement in the bill of section 403 of the George bill so as to provide for the coverage of Federal employees under the benefits of unemployment compensation. I feel that Federal employees are just as much entitled to compensation when they are out of employment as the individuals working for private concerns. It has been illustrated in this way by some of my colleagues.

There are two plants, one on each side of a street, one operated by the Federal Government and the other operated by a private contractor, both doing the identical type of work, war work. The man in private employment receives a higher rate of pay than the man in Government employment, whether it be a shipyard, torpedo station, arsenal, or powder plant. However, when the work stops and both men are thrown out of employment, the man who works for the private individual is entitled to unemployment compensation, whereas the man who works for the Government is not entitled to any compensation whatsoever.

The effect of my amendment will not be to make this a permanent proposition but only to carry it over during the reconversion period, simply during the life of the bill we are now considering.

We know that cut-backs and cancelation of contracts will mean that overnight thousands and thousands of people will be thrown out of employment.

We also know that after reconversion many plants which now are working on war production will not employ as many people when they go into consumer goods production. Under those circumstances you will have to find jobs, and as I said before, it may amount to perhaps 15,000,000 in excess of the number of jobs we had available during the 1939–40 period.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, I now yield 10 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GIFFORD].

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I feel like complimenting the acting chairman on the splendid speech he made a few moments ago when he declared that all the people will have to pay the national debt. I have been made to realize that fact. But I am seemingly supposed to be one of those who should vote for measures to take away from certain classes of people and give to those people who are now led to expect to pay a full share of the national debt. How are we going to counteract that theory? They have been made to believe that only the wealthy will pay the taxes and that the poor will receive benefits by using me and you to constantly take away from one class of people to pay largesses to another class. But that was a splendid speech made by the gentleman from Texas. I think it will be quoted very generally. He said that very few bureaus ought to be needed to run this Government. Is it possible that every law we now pass makes it necessary for us to set up a bureau to carry it out and to have an army of snoopers to seek out violators? Formerly we waited for an aggrieved party to complain and go to court. The law was specific. Now we have a drive here, apparently, that we should pay much larger unemployment compensation. I approve of a reasonable amount, and I always have, in the case of accidents and other unfortunate conditions, but only during the length of the period of necessity.

You and I have made inquiries, probably, of unemployment agencies and asked them, "Are you paying out money that should not be paid?" I interviewed one, and they told me, "Yes, but we can get no attention paid when we report the cases." Did you read the article where 100 employees in one large establishment were drawing unemployment compensation, although they were still working? It seemed they managed to hide away from the inspector, and alternated on night work. Why should that magazine print such a thing if it was not true? How careful we must be about this matter. When we get it in the minds of the people that they can draw unemployment compensation for a certain number of weeks and can then return to work for a week, in collusion with the employer, and still go on and draw another 16 or 20 weeks of compensation, it is not good for the morale of our people. Is it possible, after many of the States like my own State, have made ample provision for unemployment compensation, that there are certain States which are not forehanded and want to place the burden on the Federal Treasury? Is it their voice that is forcing us to further burden the Federal Government and Federalize employment agencies? Keep the Federal Government out of this unemployment agency, formerly a State function. Our States are more competent to judge these payments than the Federal Government here in Washington. When we offer too great an inducement, what happens? The great majority of our people are honest and hard-working people; but there are some lazy, unprincipled people, are there not? There are people who would not try very hard to get a job if they could get $35 a week. Have I used this illustration before? If not, will you see the force of it? The little daughter of a workingman was met by the foreman who asked the child whose father was injured on the job. "When will your father come back to work?" She replied, "I do not think for a long time. Compensation has set in." I think that illustration is a good one. Human nature is what it is. How many people would hurry to get a job if they could receive $35 a week for a long period?

It is contrary, as one of the previous speakers has said, to what our fathers taught us; not to encourage laziness, not to encourage avoidance of work by bleeding the Federal Treasury and thinking they will take it away from somebody else and that they do not contribute. We have been taken a very long way along this road lately. There is now $111,000,000,000 "spendable" according to the gentleman from Illinois. Thirty-six billion dollars in War bonds, cashable, "spendable," he said. Thirty-six billion dollars, Mr. Chairman, that can now be demanded of the Federal Government. Oh, you younger Members do not recall, but I have made many a plea here and worried myself a good deal about a debt of $40,000,000,000. I did not dream I would ever have the courage, or you either, to tax the people as you are taxing them today, to the extent of forty-odd billion dollars. I have often said that the public debt could be met only by willingness of Congress itself to tax the people to pay it. We have shown great courage. I want to say to the gentleman from Illinois that he made a splendid speech today and it will be very helpful. I want to ask him if he does not realize fully that while the people do pay these taxes, many are made to believe that somebody else pays them and that they receive the benefits. They do not realize that they really do pay a large portion. How can we teach them? It seems difficult to arouse them. As to these unemployment problems, my State and municipalities have raised large sums, usually invested in United States bonds that are cashable so as to provide employment when the war is over, by making public improvements in those municipalities and for assistance in other directions. The smaller communities in my section are looking well after the future at the present time, and there should be employment and benefits for those out of present jobs. That is the ordinary municipalities.

In the large centers, where great numbers of workers have secured jobs in war plants, will they still want to stay there? Must we transport many of them at the expense of $200? Must we pay them unemployment compensation rather than induce them to return to their old jobs? Many competitive situations will arise. My New England is greatly worried, as only 3 percent of the Nation's money has been spent there for plants and new business, and that sort of thing, while they are supposed to furnish 9 percent of the production. These new plants built in other places, in far away places, where workers have been transported at great expense, will they not be competitors of that New England section? I am expected to protect the established business of New England.

The pendulum of relief agencies has been swinging too far. This administration in the last 10 years has indoctrinated our people with these ideas. What of the national debt? The national debt does not seem to worry those in high places. As one speaker once said here, "What of posterity? What have they done for us?" The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DEWEY] mentioned our duty to posterity. What have they done for us? Is that the viewpoint of some people? It does seem

so. The gentleman said, "I am getting older. I can get along." I think I might apply that to myself; but I do worry a great deal about posterity. I have those whom I dearly love and wonder what their future may be. The only comfort maybe is that they say they will live under the same kind of government as other young people and, therefore, they might not be unhappy. If all people live under the same conditions, then one does not feel so unhappy, it is said.

I feel very strongly about his unemployment insurance. I was in the Massachusetts State Senate when the matter was proposed and enacted there. I have watched it. Lately here has not been enough of real supervision and it is thought unwarranted payments have been often made.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. KNUTSON. I will yield the gentleman 2 additional minutes.

Mr. GIFFORD. I was about to mention New York and Philadelphia. The Saturday Evening Post and other magazines have portrayed this situation badly. Did you not recall the story where the young lady wanted to get married and so she went on a wedding trip and drew unemployment insurance while she was gone? What wonderful uses they have made of it. The conscience of many of the people has been weakened. There are rules and regulations by the thousands now promulgated by the agencies of government and avoidance of them is altogether too universal, because not approved by the people. They obey if they have to. How the businessman struggles to fill out the voluminous reports required. He is very much opposed to further exactions.

As I have said once before, and I shall say it again, what I dread mostly today is this alien-led, alien-made-up conglomeration of radicals obtaining further influence and control. Is not labor itself forging its own chains of slavery? What pawns labor would be under such a leadership as that. A laboring man would have a job only if they would let him work; he would have to take the price of his labor as they would dictate. What can we do to make labor wake up and rid themselves of such leadership? Has that word "reasonable" entirely disappeared from the Constitution and laws of the United States?

In closing I repeat, must we be simply tools to be used by certain classes of people to take away from the successful, the thrifty, the honest class who are willing to work, and give to those of the opposite viewpoint?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has again expired.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. CAMP].

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Chairman, as our mighty armed forces advance steadily across Europe toward the German border, sweeping across lines and fortifications thought by the enemy to be impregnable, victory not only is assured to us, but it is imminent, and the careful and thoughtful consideration by Congress of demobilization and reconversion plans, and legislation to marshal all our strength for a change or transition from production of instruments and munitions of destruction or war to the production of the goods and implements needed by our citizens in the civilian pursuits of peace, is not only timely but necessary now lest we lose precious time. As I see it, the oft-referred-to post-war era is not far distant.

As I view the situation, there should be no great fear or dread of any dire hardship to be experienced by our people in making this change if well-laid plans are adopted and we proceed with thought and care to the job that faces us.

A nation that has produced military leaders with the ability to plan the strategy of north Africa, Sicily, Italy, and France; the solution of the submarine menace; and the supply lines established around the world, will certainly produce the leaders to effect this transition. A free nation whose magnificent leaders of industry and labor changed so quickly from the manufacture of goods for peaceful civilian uses to the engines and munitions of war, and in such a manner as to startle the whole world, can certainly make this reconversion.

I do not intend to speak lightly of the problem before us, but I for one, have the deepest and fullest confidence in the ability of our people, if unhampered by too much regimentation and governmental restriction, to again startle the world in their change of front from war to peace, by the swift "beating of swords into plowshares and spears into pruning hooks."

Now I shall not go into this bill in great detail, for those who have spoken before me have covered the subject well. I do want to say that the Committee on Ways and Means has spent nearly 3 weeks of hard work on the subject, and that our deliberations were not marred by partisanship, and the bill we have represents the careful opinion of the great majority of the committee.

I like the statement made yesterday by the gentleman from Kansas, and I believe the majority of our committee believe that the Government must play an important part in the transition period, but that we must not enact a law that will impede or strangle the efforts of American industry.

Something has been said about not having hearings. We have had before us the very full and complete work of the two committees, the War Planning Committee of the House and the committee of the Senate. We have had the Senate hearings before us. We have had Mr. Justice Byrnes before us. We have had the full report from General Hines. There has been no lack of information before this committee.

The full employment of our workers in private industry is our goal, and to have a great production and fair distribution of these goods labor must be employed at useful work, and industry must have a fair profit.

This Nation, in winning this struggle, has amassed a large national debt. We must stop deficit spending at the earliest moment and begin whittling down that debt.

The object of this legislation is not to pay pensions to everybody who works in this country. The object of this legislation is to coordinate all our forces, all our efforts toward this great change, this about-face, this return of American industry to the American way of producing goods, in order that we may have full employment for all of our people and in order that we may get about the job of producing civilian necessities, not only for our people at home but for the markets abroad.

What has this bill done? It establishes a great office here. I call it great, because I think it will be the most important one we will have in the immediate era after the war.

This bill establishes the Office of War Mobilization and Reconversion, with a Director and Deputy Directors to have general supervision over and to coordinate the work of the Office of Contract Settlement, the Surplus Property Administration, and, in addition to any powers which the President is authorized to and does delegate to the Director for the purpose of more effectively coordinating the mobilization of the Nation for war, the Director shall, subject to the direction of the President:

First. Formulate or have formulated such plans as are necessary to meet the problems arising out of the transition from war to peace;

Second. Coordinate the activities of other executive agencies with respect to the problems arising out of the transition from war to peace;

Third. Recommend to the Congress appropriate legislation providing authority to carry out plans developed under this section but not authorized under existing law;

Fourth. Promote and assist in the development of demobilization and reconversion plans by other executive agencies, develop procedures whereby each executive agency is kept informed of proposed demobilization and reconversion plans and proposals which relate to its work and which are being developed or carried out by other executive agencies, and settle controversies between such executive agencies in the development and administration of such plans;

Fifth. Cause studies and reports to be made for him by the various executive agencies which will enable him to determine the need for the simplification, consolidation, or elimination of such executive agencies as have been established for the purposes of the war emergency, for the termination, or establishment by statute, of executive agencies which exist under Executive order only, and for the relaxation or removal of emergency war controls;

Sixth. Institute a specific study, for submission to the President and the Congress, of the present functions of the various Executive agencies in the field of manpower, and develop a program for reorganizing and consolidating such agencies to the fullest extent practicable;

Seventh. Consult and cooperate with State and local governments, industry, labor, agriculture, and other groups, both national and local, concerning the problems arising out of the transition from war to peace; and

Eighth. Submit reports to the President, the Senate, and the House of Representatives on the 1st days of January, April, July, and October on the activities undertaken or contemplated by him under this act. Such reports shall summarize and appraise the activities of the various executive agencies in the field of demobilization and post-war adjustment, and may include such legislative proposals as he may deem necessary or desirable.

When this bill was drawn it contained section 3 which provided for a coordinator for retraining and reemployment.

Mr. Chairman, we have already established by an act of the Congress what is popularly known as the G. I. bill for full training for the returning soldier and we have settled as a policy of the Congress and the Government, and it is the desire of the Nation, that the soldier be given every opportunity to return to peaceful pursuits. We have established training for the soldier and we have made it possible for them to resume any college training he may have done prior to the time he entered the war. All of that training by the act is placed under the Veterans' Administration now headed by General Hines. General Hines has had under his direction the retraining and rehabilitation of the soldiers from World War No. 1. He has experience in that line. On the other hand we have set up in this country vocational training and guidance which is under the Social Security Administration at this time. Under that great program as set up in every State in the Union training is available for any citizen regardless of his age and regardless of where he has worked. That retraining program might be called a vocational training program for any occupation. It is now established and has directors in each State, and even though we desired to do so, there is no need to set up another retraining or training supervisory course or organization for workers in industry.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for an observation?

Mr. CAMP. I yield.

Mr. KNUTSON. The gentleman has failed to mention the work being done under the Smith-Hughes Act, which is very extensive.

Mr. CAMP. I group them all under the term "vocational training and vocational guidance."

Mr. KNUTSON. But if they were separated we would find there were 4, 5, or 6 activities carrying on that work. If we were to add to that it would merely cause confusion and duplication.

Mr. CAMP. It would bring about confusion.

Mr. KNUTSON. It would bring about greater confusion.

Mr. CAMP. There is no question about that. We have the great opportunity schools established all over this country for young people who are at work and want to better themselves and take training in some other vocation. We have the night schools in all the engineering colleges. I know well the one in my own State of Georgia, the Georgia School of Technology night school, is giving engineering training to boys who work in the daytime but who go there to study in the afternoon or at night. There is vocational training and guidance and there is no necessity of setting up here or authorizing under this bill any further retraining.

As I have said before, the bill in its general terms gives this director the right to coordinate any work that needs coordination between the training of veterans under Veterans' Administration and the National Vocational Training organization.

I wish to refer to another feature of title III of the George Act, which was stricken from this bill, a section which provided free transportation for workers, their families and their household goods up to the amount of $200 from the place they worked back to the place whence they came. The Ways and Means Committee of this House is the fiscal committee or the business committee of this House, and to authorize this expenditure of what perhaps may run into billions of dollars could not be done. There was no way we could find out how much would be involved in paying those transportation charges. We have not deemed it necessary to do it. It was only after much thought and consideration however that the title was stricken.

Mr. Chairman, in bringing this legislation to the membership for their consideration I feel sure the members of the committee who voted to report this bill out in its present form agree that our main object is to turn the wheels of American industry into the production of peacetime needs and goods thereby giving employment to all these people who have been at work in essential war industries. It is our belief that American industry which has made a great chapter in American history in this war by its production of war goods in such quantity and without interruption, a feat that has earned for them the admiration of the whole world, that same industry can if given the opportunity and unhampered by Government restrictions produce jobs for the workers of this country.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CAMP. I yield.

Mr. DOUGHTON. In the judgment of the gentleman, has there ever been a time in the history of this country when the needs for peacetime production were as great as they are now and when the people were as able to make those goods as they are now?

Mr. CAMP. I am so glad the gentleman suggested that. The whole plan from the beginning of this war—and this plan has been shared by business and by labor and has been nonpartisan—has been to get back into civilian production with as little delay as possible when the war needs had been filled. The fact that we stopped the production of civilian goods entirely and turned all our energies to the manufacture of war goods makes the needs for civilian goods all the greater, in fact greater than has ever been known in this country. Not only does the need exist, but by holding down prices and encouraging savings the American people have the greatest buying power they ever possessed. I see nothing to keep down employment in this transition. The only necessary thing I see is to hasten the day and give them all the encouragement and help possible.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WRIGHT].

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, I wish to preface my remarks by saying that I have a profound and sincere admiration for the personnel of the great Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives, and I have also some understanding of the problems with which they are confronted; but neither my admiration for their ability and sincerity nor my understanding of their problems should prevent me from saying that in the bill reported out for our consideration they have failed in a very signal respect to meet some of the great problems which are going to confront us. I have some idea why that failure took place. It was probably through a sincere desire for economy, an anxiety as to the size of our mounting national debt, a wish not to burden the taxpayers of this country unnecessarily. I respect the motives, but I maintain that in so doing they have been cautious where they should have been bold, and their caution has blinded them to the great problem which will face American industry when we have a cut-back and a shut-down in production in some of our war plants.

I read an item in the paper the other day to the effect that it is expected that 300,000 workers will lose their jobs as soon as the aviation program comes to a close. I understand a great many of those workers are located in the State of California, which has grown to be the great center of the aircraft industry in this country. I also understand that California has a progressive and liberal unemployment-compensation law. What is going to happen to those workers who are left in California? Is it expected that they shall drain the unemployment fund of the State of California, when the necessity for their presence there was not caused by the peril of California alone but rather by the peril of the 48 States, the peril of the country as a whole?

The committee in the pending bill has deleted a provision that the return of these workers to their homes shall be aided by the payment of traveling expenses. Even were this payment retained, there are many of them who will not return to their former homes but will become domiciled in California. They will take advantage of the more liberal unemployment compensation allowances in that State. I do not know that there is very much we can do about entirely curing this situation. But I

think we can do more than we are doing in this bill.

In the first place, I do not see any reason why the return of these workers should not be encouraged and facilitated to the place of their origin or, possibly, better still, to some other locality where gainful employment can be found. Considering the national scope of this problem, that the eventual reemployment of the workers now employed in California may occur in States such as New York, Pennsylvania, New Jersey, or Michigan, I am brought inevitably to the conclusion that this is a national and not a local problem and that any cry or plea of States' rights fails to meet the practical realities of the situation.

I have no desire to unnecessarily concentrate in Washington the functions of government which should belong to local governmental units, but also I am not blind to the fact that due to the centralization and the national character of industry today, with huge corporations having holdings in very many States and due to the war emergency, which has uprooted people from their homes and has compelled them at the insistence of the Government to settle in congested war areas, this is not a State problem; this is a problem national in scope which requires national administration.

Mr. ROWE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WRIGHT. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. ROWE. Does the gentleman's statement apply only to the transportation feature?

Mr. WRIGHT. No; and I thank the gentleman for his question because it leads me to another point which I was going to develop. This national treatment applies not only to transportation but also to the unemployment compensation features of the bill.

I can see how unemployment compensation should be left, and justly so, in the hands of the States in normal times. Every State adjusts its unemployment compensation to its own economic needs and to its own revenues. Some of the unemployment compensation payments I consider rather low, but perhaps I should not speak with too much certainty upon that point since I am not acquainted with conditions which may have prompted the size of those payments or entered into the determination of the size of the payments. But that is the normal peacetime picture.

We are in a state of emergency. This war will not be over so far as settling back to peacetime conditions when the last gun is fired. We have an obligation to our country and to our people to see to it that everything possible is done, not only to stimulate industry to a great peacetime production but also to prevent large-scale unemployment during the period of reconversion to peacetime life.

Here is another factor which I do not believe very many Members have taken into consideration. We have heard many statements on the floor in the past when debating the O. P. A. bill and other bills about the spiral of inflation. That is a mounting spiral caused by an acceleration of prices which if it is not stopped in time will become so rapid as to be irresistible. But there is also the possibility of a descending spiral in unemployment. If we have a great portion of our population stagnated in some of the large industrial centers where there has been a shut-down in war industry, if we do nothing about it, we immediately lower to a very appreciable extent the purchasing power of the American people. If we lower the purchasing power of the American people we discourage the industries which depend upon these very same people for their markets to purchase their goods. We thereby, consequently, create more unemployment.

Even to the extent of burdening the already overburdened taxpayers, we must make certain that the American people are going to be gainfully employed, above all. In the meantime, during the transition period when they are out of work and when our Government and industry are trying to place them somewhere else where they can be gainfully employed, they should not be allowed to remain out of work and they should not be allowed to become destitute. I recall very vividly the condition which existed in 1930 and 1931 when the American people probably reached, particularly in industrial centers, the lowest and saddest state of destitution and poverty in our history. Coming from a community such as Pittsburgh I do not believe I will ever forget it. It was the philosophy of the administration at that time, which I deprecated and which the American people deprecated, as they later showed, that the welfare of the American people, their opportunity to eat and have some place to live, was no concern of the Federal Government, that it was a State matter with which the Federal Government had no right to interfere. It is not my purpose to stand before the House today and conjure up a vision of the repetition of that unfortunate period, but I think it entirely possible that during the period of transition we are going to have much misfortune and much hardship.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. KNUTSON. I wish the gentleman would correct me if I am wrong, but is it not a fact that up to the time of Pearl Harbor we had spent $18,000,000,000 for relief and still had ten and one-half million unemployed.

Mr. WRIGHT. I do not have the figures. I know there was some unemployment at the time.

Mr. KNUTSON. Some. I will say there was some.

Mr. WRIGHT. I did not wish to go into the matter, but since the gentleman propounded the question I will say that prior to 1932 the American Nation was in a condition bordering upon revolution because the people were walking the streets of America and they did not have anything to eat and they were desperate. I do not propose, if I can raise my voice, to see such a condition return.

Mr. KNUTSON. If such a situation existed at that time, it was because the Democrats in the House refused to cooperate with the Republicans.

Mr. WRIGHT. The American people did not blame it on the Democrats, as the election at that time showed.

Mr. KNUTSON. The gentleman knows the American people are gullible.

Mr. WRIGHT. I refuse to yield further.

They are gullible, but they are not so gullible as to accept the explanation which the gentleman is trying to make.

Mr. ROWE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. ROWE. I would like a little further amplification in connection with this compensation matter. The statement was made that it was a national responsibility. I would like to have the gentleman's views on that.

Mr. WRIGHT. I believe the administration of unemployment compensation should remain in the States even during this period of emergency. I believe that after the period of the emergency is over, and when we return to what we hope are normal conditions, that all Federal aid, such as was contemplated in the Kilgore bill—although I do not agree entirely with it either—should cease, but I believe that during the period of the emergency the administration of unemployment compensation should remain in the States, but that the Federal Government, as a wartime obligation, should supplement that amount so that we would have practical certainty that we are not going to have hordes of unemployed. Various amounts have been suggested. The gentleman from Michigan suggested 26 weeks, with a maximum payment of $20. Other amounts suggested are considerably higher. I do not know exactly what the proper amount should be, but I feel, with all the sincerity I can muster, that the bill that has been reported out by this committee is inadequate and neglects entirely the problem of our postwar unemployed.

Mr. ROWE. Is it the gentleman's conclusion that if we have the right to extend Federal aid to some State in order that it may raise its compensation, that we likewise have the same right to extend help to another State to bring theirs down?

Mr. WRIGHT. Of course, I think there are some safeguards in the Unemployment Compensation Act which would prevent the States from lowering their payments. After all, I do not think any of our States are going to be so unstatesmanlike and so parsimonious with their own people that they are going to reduce their payments merely because the Federal Government chooses to help them.

Mr. ROWE. Some States were mentioned here yesterday, Missouri being one, paying 50 cents. If the Government said to the State of Missouri, "We will give you aid if you will raise it to $15 a week," can the Government by that same gesture of authority say to the State of Connecticut, "We will give you aid if you lower yours to $15 a week."

Mr. WRIGHT. The gentleman is entering into a mathematical computation that I have not even considered, may I say to the gentleman. My sole thesis is this: I think unemployment compensation should be left in the hands of the States in normal times, and although the management of unemployment compensation should be left in the hands of

the States at the present time, in this period of emergency, where people are far away from their homes and crowded and congested into certain war centers, it becomes the Government's obligation to aid the States insofar as unemployment compensation is concerned until those people are rehabilitated into normal civilian life.

A bill has been introduced by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL]. I understand that it represents the sentiments of the combined labor organizations, the American Federation of Labor, the C. I. O., and the brotherhoods. I think that it has very many good features and in a choice between the two bills I would support it. I do think, however, if we had more time to work out a bill we might be able to harmonize some of the differences between the bills; in other words, I do not think that either group has achieved or arrived at a perfect bill yet. I say that with full knowledge of the gravity of the situation and of the difficulty with which we have been faced.

Mr. DEWEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. DEWEY. I think we all have the same feeling regarding unemployment as does the gentleman.

Mr. WRIGHT. I am quite sure the gentleman has. We have different ideas as to how to alleviate it.

Mr. DEWEY. Probably differences of ideas. But when one glances over the benefits that are now being offered by the different States, they are rather adequate, to a certain extent, in consideration of the very full-time employment that has been going on during the past year.

Take in my own State of Illinois, they take the highest quarter of the year preceding the period of unemployment, and take 5 percent of those wages, with a minimum of $7 and a maximum of $20. With such high employment you are going to find very few minima. It will be pressing mostly toward the maximum. We have had word from all of the State administrators that the six billions of funds is adequate to take care of those unemployed payments under the State benefit plan. This bill provides that we make advances to the State, should those funds prove insufficient. I think the query is: Can this country carry on a benefit Nation-wide at $20 for 26 weeks?

One must admit that living costs in the South and in certain sections of the country are less, because they do not have fuel expenses, for instance, and it is generally admitted, I think, that living costs in the smaller cities in the rural areas, are less than they are in New York City or Chicago. I think if you make a flat payment it is too much, and I think these States have probably worked out what their workmen would require.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. DEWEY. I thank the gentleman for letting me consume his time. I hope the distinguished Chairman will grant him additional time.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. WRIGHT. I thank the gentleman. The gentleman will realize that when I began my address to the House, I commended the sincerity of the committee in attempting to work out what they considered a good solution. But I will tell the gentleman frankly what I am afraid of. I think, as I said before, that probably the States are the best judges of what their own unemployment compensation should be in normal times. But I am afraid of a great mass of workers being congested in such an area as the West coast—as Detroit, and as some of our eastern shipyards. I do not think we are going to have a very great problem in Pittsburgh, because I think our reconversion problems are going to be simple compared with some of the other sections. If these unemployed workers are congested in these centers, and if we do not provide for such an emergency we will accelerate, or we will promote a depression instead of an inflationary period, and we will make it impossible for us to ever retire our national debt or to maintain a high scale of production and a high scale of national income. That is my fear. I want the gentleman to remember that if there is no unemployment, we do not pay anything. We are not spending anything unless the worst comes to pass.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 additional minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania, so that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DEWEY] may ask him a question.

Mr. DEWEY. The gentleman mentioned the State of Michigan, which has a maximum payment of $20 for 20 weeks. Under this bill should the reserve fund in the State of Michigan prove inadequate to take care of all those war workers who have come to the State of Michigan and who will get their benefits——

Mr. WRIGHT. And who might not go home. Some of them are registered there.

Mr. DEWEY. Yes; but should they go home they still would get their benefits from the place they worked. This bill provides additional funds to augment and supplement the reserve fund of the State of Michigan should it prove inadequate.

Mr. WRIGHT. It does not give them, even in Michigan, that additional 6 weeks, though.

Mr. DEWEY. That, of course, is a matter of argument between ourselves, but they do get $20 for 20 weeks.

Mr. WRIGHT. That is a fairly liberal provision as the various unemployment-compensation bills go, but it is not uniform throughout the country.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has again expired.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, one would almost think that this was a gathering of the Congress of Industrial Organizations. I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO] to utterly refute the arguments advanced by the preceding speaker.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I had not intended to speak on this bill. It must be obvious, however, to the country, and I think it is apparent to the Congress of the United States, that in the preparation of this bill the Committee on Ways and Means was conscious of the fact that there is a limit to the credit of the United States, and that one of the things that must be done if this Nation is to remain solvent is to preserve in this country a sound economic system. If that is lost, all that we seek to accomplish by this bill will be lost with it. In my opinion, the Committee on Ways and Means of the House is to be commended for bringing in a bill which, while it may not be liberal enough to please everybody, is sound, workable, and reasonable. I shall support the committee bill.

In answer to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WRIGHT] who just preceded me, it is illuminating to observe the amount of money the Keystone State has in its unemployment-compensation fund. I find that in Pennsylvania as of May 25 of this year 2,625,000 people were employed with an unemployment-compensation fund on hand of $517,000,000, or enough money to take care of those covered by unemployment insurance to the extent of 77 percent. Certainly if the war should end, it seems highly improbable that more than 77 percent of those who are employed in that State would be unemployed then, to exhaust this fund.

I have just wired my State capital to find out what that fund is in my own State of Michigan, to which reference has been made. I find that as of May 25 of this year in my State there were 1,571,000 workers covered by the unemployment insurance fund, and the fund amounted to $233,000,000, from which those covered by the insurance might receive $20 a week for a maximum of 20 weeks, or 39 percent of all of the workers of that State covered by this fund. Michigan State Treasurer has replied to my telegram that the unemployment insurance fund is now $246,000,000—an increase of thirteen million in 3 months. Certainly it seems to me that the bill makes ample provision for unemployment and loans to the States in case their fund should be exhausted. The programs of the States are not disturbed. State control of unemployment and State funds to meet the problem remains with the States, and will be administered by the States. No good reason has been advanced for changing the status quo.

There is not a State in the United States whose financial condition at the present time is not better than the Federal Government. The national debt today is approximately $210,000,000,000. The total debt of the 48 States, deducting sinking fund requirements and surpluses, is approximately $2,000,000,000. The Federal Government has no money that it does not first take away from the people in the States. The people must again assume local responsibility and obligations and cease looking to the Fed-

eral Government to meet all demands. A trend has grown up in this land to look to Washington for everything. All moneys received by the Federal Government are taken out of the pockets of the people first. Some people seem to believe that through some magic process or sleight of hand performance money can be taken from the people of the States, brought to Washington, administration expenses deducted and then sent back to the States with increased benefits. This is a delusion and a philosophy that can only lead to financial ruin. This has been the method used to build up Federal bureaucracy.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. EBERHARTER].

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Chairman, the bill before us as reported out by the Committee on Ways and Means is entitled and will be entitled "The War Mobilization and Reconversion Act of 1944." I think it is generally admitted throughout the country and in the Halls of Congress, and even throughout the world, that insofar as war mobilization is concerned this country is already well mobilized. It is about as well mobilized as it is possible to get it and yet keep some semblance of our peacetime economy and some order to our wartime economy. So that then we get down to the proposition that the main reason for the passage of a measure at this time is to take care of the post-war period, that is, the reconversion period, the period of post-war readjustment to normal activities in the business world and in the working world.

I do not believe there is anybody in this country who will deny that that will indeed be a very difficult period. It will be a period of strenuous readjustment, not only for business and finance but for the workingmen and for the housewives, and for every activity that we have been carrying on, since we were attacked at Pearl Harbor, at least.

No businessman or no workingman, no rich man or no poor man, no man whether he be learned or unlearned, or whether he be high or low will deny that we will face a critical period the minute hostilities cease. If anybody will deny that, I should like to know on what basis he will say that we can transfer from the period of war mobilization in which we now are to a period of normal activity without great strain on our economic life and without a tremendous effort at readjustment.

So, Mr. Chairman, that makes me believe that there is upon the Congress a duty to do whatever it possibly can to tide us over that period of readjustment. We are faced with a real problem. Is this Congress going to face that problem? Is it going to meet that challenge? Nobody will deny, as I said before, that something must be done. Is it the part of statesmanship, I ask you, to close our eyes to what we are going to face? Is it up to us to say, "When that period comes we will try to make some plans immediately and we will try to take care of the situation no matter how serious it is?" In other words, should we as the Congress of the United States sit here and do nothing—practically nothing—or should we wait until the catastrophe is upon us?

We are charged with the responsibility here of tackling this problem. We should tackle it with some courage and with a little bit of vision, and with an eye to trying to find a practical and a workable solution.

I do not believe anybody will deny that when the shooting stops there will be a great deal of unemployment. In any large industrial city in this country or in any small town, or even out on the prairies where the munitions factories have been erected, immediately when the shooting stops there will be thousands upon thousands to whom it will be said, "You need not report to work tomorrow." What does that mean? It means that immediately the purchasing power of the great mass of the American people is cut off. They receive no more wages. What does that in turn mean? It means in turn that the businessman will have no person to whom to sell his goods, because the workingman will have no money. It will hurt business, it will bring a loss of confidence to all the business of the country, whether it be big business or small business, whether it be the corner groceryman or the United States Steel Corporation. The financial structure of this country will be strained to its utmost in order that we do not have economic collapse. It is something to which we must look forward. What incentive will business have when it finds that all of the workingmen, who supply the very lifeblood of American industry, have no more income? What incentive will private enterprise have and what incentive will any person have who has some funds laid by for investment to take a chance and invest in some business when he knows there will be mass unemployment?

If we fail now, Mr. Chairman, I want you to think of the cycle that will be commenced immediately at the cessation of hostilities. We can look for something much, much worse than what would face us if we pass a really constructive act today or before the shooting stops. We all know that local communities who were not equal to the occasion when the depression came several years ago were helpless; they had no funds. They may have a little bit of funds now, but when this national emergency arises, the funds that they have certainly will not take care of the unemployment for any length of time by public works or anything else. I imagine it is going to be a great surprise to many of the municipalities and the States to know that this Congress will not even go along with the proposition of putting up 2 percent—2 percent, mind you—of the construction costs for public works. Will we refuse to do that? Mr. Chairman, if we refuse right now to grant 2 percent to help prepare plans, many of these municipalities will be shocked. Shall we take such a parsimonious attitude? Many of them have been looking forward to coming down here to the Federal Government to help them out in this post-war period. I say if we do not do something now and help them to make some plans so they can spend what little money they have, we will be faced with something much, much greater. This Capitol will be flooded by calls from many, many communities and many, many groups, beseeching us for all kinds of funds, so that we are going to be faced with something that will be appalling in the way of requests. Find a way to avoid those demands, demands which, I submit, will be so necessary and so compelling in their arguments that we will be unable to resist them. It may well become an avalanche that will engulf us and threaten the stability of our financial system. Pass legislation now and avoid such a prospect. Mr. Chairman, we will look back at the period when we were discussing this bill and talking about the public debt; I say the public debt will rise many, many more millions of dollars if we have another depression. The way we are going at this bill, parsimoniously—"How much are we going to spend?" and all that, is going to react against us later on. Mr. Chairman, other Members have spoken on the floor of this House and detailed the many different ways in which the very life of this very conservative bill which came to us was crushed out by amendments. They have told you of the relatively unimportant results that this reported bill would bring. I do not want to go into details so far as all of those things are concerned, but I think this is a period when we should exercise a little bit of judgment, when we should tackle the subject boldly so that we will not face something many, many times more serious in the near future. Mr. Chairman, this is an important measure. It should be an important measure.

It is important enough, I think, that we should have the advice of the best brains of the country. We should have had the advice of business. We should have had the advice of finance. We should have had the advice of the workingmen, and we should have had the advice of those who have made a study of economic conditions. But what do we have? We have the benefit of very, very little, Mr. Chairman, I submit. We have had the benefit of some suggestions of that great man, former Supreme Court Justice Byrnes, who has been the Economic Coordinator for some time and who has made a study of what is going to face us later on. The recommendations of this very estimable statesman were rejected almost in their entirety. Then we had a recommendation or two from General Hines, Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, which came to us in the form of a letter, and his recommendations were rejected, Mr. Chairman. Then we had some recommendations from Mr. Folsom, the director, the director, if you please, of the Special Committee on Economic Policy and Planning of the House, who has been recognized as one of the foremost and most brilliant and soundest men in the country, a vice chairman of the board of directors of Eastman Kodak Co., a man who everybody admits is sound. His recommendations to the committee were rejected. Then it is said that this committee has

brought out a wonderful bill. Other letters came to the committee, and they were given scarcely any consideration. Mr. Chairman, we are falling down. This is nothing but a failure. I saw in the news dispatches yesterday that Chester Bowles recommends as one point of an 11-point plan that we should liberalize unemployment payments; that we should broaden the coverage. Is Mr. Bowles a high professor or some starry-eyed idealist? The committee rejects that idea. A distinguished Member of the other body yesterday in a statement, and I cannot mention his name, said that Federal employees are entitled to compensation just as much as private employees. I submit to you that nobody can successfully contradict that statement. Mr. Chairman, if we do not meet this issue, we can be considered as failures. Mr. Chairman, I hope the Members will read this committee report. I sincerely hope they read it. The report of the majority is a most unusual one.

Mr. Chairman, if you start reading on page 10 of the report, the previous pages being taken up largely with a reprint of the bill, there you will find the headings "Senate provisions omitted." "Omissions of provisions relating to retraining and reemployment," "Omission of provisions for unemployment compensation to Federal employees," "Omission of provisions relating to the advisory board." "Omission of provisions relating to an appeal board." Mr. Chairman, I have never in my experience in this House seen a report that was mainly dedicated, to my way of thinking, to an apology of why things were not done. The entire report seems to me to take a defensive attitude. The bill as reported will not meet the situation. Mr. Chairman, we still have an opportunity. Amendments will be offered. We still have an opportunity to save something from the wreckage. If we do not adopt some constructive amendments the Congress will be charged with a failure to meet its responsibilities, and failure to do its task. They say, "Oh, the Federal Government cannot afford it." If we cannot afford a little bit now, if we cannot make some wise, liberal provisions to sort of help along, just help along the States and the political subdivisions and municipalities, then I say we are throwing our hands up and opening ourselves up to something much, much worse. The few affirmative provisions in this bill were weakened so that they are nothing but milk and water now. Even the authority of the Coordinator or the Director to issue directives was taken out of the bill. Imagine that. The Director has no authority under the bill to issue directives. They also struck from the bill the provision which would require the agencies which he is supposed to coordinate to follow whatever instructions he gives. Oh, yes, they were very, very careful to strike out all the authority of this supposed-to-be Coordinator. Mr. Chairman, I hope that the committee and the House will really give some serious consideration to amendments that will be offered tomorrow; amendments with respect to the amount of unemployment compensation, amendments with respect to the travel pay, amendments with respect to length of time that unemployment compensation should be paid, amendments with respect to the public-works program, and several other amendments which will really make the bill something that we need not be ashamed of. I hope that when the time comes tomorrow and the next day that a sufficient number of Members will give support to what we believe to be very, very mild amendments, so that something may be accomplished.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EBERHARTER. I yield gladly to my colleague from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WRIGHT. When the gentleman was cataloging the nature of the various amendments that are going to be offered, I feel certain it was only through oversight he did not mention amendments as to unemployment compensation for Federal employees and as to maritime workers.

Mr. EBERHARTER. I did not attempt to cover every amendment that will be offered, but I will say that the amendment which will be offered covering Federal employees is one that I do not think the House in justice and in its wisdom could, by any manner of thinking, reject.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself one-half minute.

If the gentlemen who are showing so much concern over the passage of legislation pertaining to unemployment, would give as much thought to employment, there will not be any necessity for unemployment legislation.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH].

Mr. FISH. Mr. Chairman, I thought this might be a good time to discuss an amendment which I will propose if there is any chance of it being in order or being germane to the bill.

The bill that we are discussing has to do with demobilization of our resources, of our plants, and of our manpower after the war has been won. I was wondering whether we could carry it so far as to cover demobilization of certain servicemen who are now in our armed forces. I would like to offer this amendment to the bill, if it is germane, which would provide for the demobilization of servicemen who are married, and who are 35 years of age and over; that they be demobilized from our armed forces on the termination of war with Germany. Those married men, 35 years and over, are the forgotten men in this war. Many of them volunteered. Others, of course, were drafted. Married men with families, men in business of their own, many of whom have been financially ruined. Many of those men were making upward of three, four, and five thousand dollars a year, and had been working in their trades and business for 5, 10 or 15 years. All of a sudden the war comes and the Government reaches out its long arm and takes them away from their families, their children, and their livelihood. The business that they had built up over these long years was virtually wrecked and ruined. It seems to me we ought to give them some kind of priority, some kind of preference in being released or demobilized from the armed forces.

From the beginning I have fought, as a former serviceman, the taking of these older men into our armed forces. General Marshall has repeatedly said that the hospitals are filled with men 35 to 45 years of age, who cannot keep up with the pace and exactions of war; who cannot march 20 miles a day with a pack. Broken down, they have gone into the hospitals and filled the hospitals to overflowing.

So it seems to me a matter of common sense, of fairness, and of military advantage for the Congress to pass legislation to give preference to demobilizing married men 35 years of age and upward. That is the proposal I want to make to Congress, to take care of these forgotten men. They are forgotten. Many of them have been in the armed forces for 2 or 3 years, and once in the service they become forgotten men. They cannot do anything themselves to get out of the Army, Navy, or Marine Corps. They cannot do anything, even though they are not rendering any essential service in the Army or Navy to get back to their families and provide for their families. I am speaking as a matter of simple justice.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Kentucky, the chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. MAY. Does the gentleman propose in his suggestion, that this demobilization begin now, or does he propose to leave it to the judgment of the military commanders as to when they can let the men go, or is it the plan to let it be done after the war is over?

Mr. FISH. My amendment, of course, is subject to change. I will be very glad to discuss the matter with the chairman of the Military Affairs Committee later on. The amendment reads this way:

Providing, That servicemen, 35 years of age or over who are married, shall be immediately demobilized from our armed forces, provided they voluntarily submit an application for release to their commanding officer within 30 days of the termination of the war with Germany.

If that is not satisfactory to the chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs, or those who have expert knowledge on matters of this kind, of course, I would be glad to amend it.

Mr. MAY. Would not the gentleman save the question if we provided that the commanding general should approve the discharge?

Mr. FISH. I will be very glad to consider that as an amendment, because all I am interested in doing is to get action and to help these older men get released from active service who I think are the forgotten men, and whose families have gone through tragic times and suffered many privations and hardships. They should be given the earliest possible opportunity to save their jobs and preserve their own business.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE].

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, if there is any activity of government more than any other to which I have tried to devote myself since I have been a Member of Congress it is the subject of unemployment compensation. I want to address myself to that subject a little bit this afternoon because I think it is quite evident there is a great deal of misconception in the minds of many Members of Congress as to this subject.

The United States Government is the greatest employer in the land. It tried to set an example to private employers in the States when, by the passage of the Social Security Act, it forced the employers of eight or more persons into an unemployment-compensation system by imposing an excise tax of 3 percent on their pay rolls. By the passage of that Social Security Act the United States Government, the greatest employer of them all, compelled employers in your State and in mine to set up, through their State legislatures, systems of unemployment compensation and compelled them to pay a tax of 3 percent on their pay roll. I am happy to say that the State of Wisconsin had the vision of unemployment compensation long before the United States Government caught that vision. Yet this greatest of all employers has made no provision whatsoever to provide unemployment compensation for its own employees.

To my mind that is indeed a paradoxical situation. There is not a State in the Union that is permitted to pay Federal employees unemployment compensation. Up to date the Congress has not seen fit legislatively to include Federal employees within any program of unemployment compensation.

Mr. Chairman, I have tried to give some thoughtful consideration to this bill and to this problem. Just one of two things is going to happen when this war is over: Either we are going to have unemployment from one end of this country to the other as predicted by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. EBERHARTER], or we are going to adjust our economy in this country so as to cushion the shock of reconversion and make unemployment as negligible as possible. Both political parties and the leadership of both political parties are telling the people of America and the soldiers overseas that we are going to provide them with jobs when this war is over. If we do provide them with jobs then the problem of unemployment compensation will not assume major importance. If we do not provide jobs, then certainly there will be unemployment, and we should prepare for it in a sensible way now. According to the chairman of the Civil Service Committee, who predicted an exodus of 2,000,000 employees from the civil-service rolls of this Nation, the greatest unemployment will be found among employees of Uncle Sam who have no possibility of reconverting. Just bear that in mind. I want to call your attention to the fact that in the political convention lately held in the city of Chicago, the party of which I am a member in one of the fundamental planks in its platform said to the American people: "We pledge our support of the following: First. Extension of the existing old-age insurance and unemployment-insurance systems to all employees not already covered." I agree with that plank in the platform. I agree with that promise in that platform. As far as I am concerned, I intend to see that it is carried out at the first available opportunity. Your present existing social-security law, the Federal law, applies only to employers of eight or more. Think of the tragedy in the post-war period of thousands of employees—hundreds of thousands, if you please—working for small employers throughout the country who are not now covered by unemployment compensation. They will not be touched by this bill in any event; but here is this great mass of Government employees all over the country, a couple of million of them, going to lose their jobs and no provision is made for them. I think the plank in our platform and the promises of the New Deal Party contemplate that this great mass of employees shall be given the benefit of the provisions of the social-security law, and I can conceive of no reason under the sun why they are not given that benefit when this law is written.

Every Member of this House knows that ever since I have been a Member of this body I have been a protagonist for the State systems of unemployment compensation. I have never missed an opportunity to see to it that the States' right to manage unemployment compensation in the matter of benefits, in the matter of duration of benefits, in the matter of disability, and everything else, was preserved as a function of the State. In the amendment which I shall offer which embodies almost exactly, with two or three exceptions, the language contained in the George bill, we propose to bring within this law Government employees who constitute the biggest single noncovered group in this entire country.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield.

Mr. KNUTSON. Has the gentleman given any consideration to the difficulties that will be encountered administratively? Federal employees are scattered all over the world, some are employed on a per diem basis, others on some other basis; some are entitled to retirement pay and some are not.

Mr. KEEFE. Yes; we have given consideration to that and gone into it at great length, I may say to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. KNUTSON. What conclusion did the gentleman reach?

Mr. KEEFE. The gentleman reached the conclusion that there were no administrative difficulties whatsoever under the proposal as the amendment will read and as I shall explain it if time is available when the amendment is submitted. The amendment provides simply that as far as Federal employees are concerned—it makes little difference whether they are on a per diem basis, on a monthly basis, on an hourly basis, or any other basis—the amount of compensation the Federal employee receives can be ascertained and determined, and his unemployment compensation will be paid upon application by him to the unemployment compensation organization in the State or Territory where he renders service. The amount of the payments and the duration of payments will be determined by the law of the State where he performed his service. For example, a person from my State goes to work in a Federal shipyard in Alabama. Had he remained on his job at Allis-Chalmers in Milwaukee and he was cut back and put out of employment, he would have been entitled to unemployment compensation in accordance with the law of Wisconsin, which is a maximum of $20 a week, with a maximum payment of 20 weeks. Now then, working in this shipyard in Alabama, working in a Government plant, when he is out of a job he gets no unemployment compensation whatsoever. Under the amendment as contained in the language of the George bill, and the language of the amendment I shall offer, his claim for compensation will be against the State of Alabama, in which his service was rendered. He will be paid by Alabama authorities in accordance with the provisions of Alabama law, and the Federal Government will reimburse Alabama for the amount so paid.

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. May I have some more time? I should like to explore this very important question.

Mr. KNUTSON. We can well afford to give the gentleman all the time he needs.

Mr. KEEFE. I thank the gentleman from Minnesota. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. GEARHART. Let us consider one of the largest groups, the seamen in the employment of the merchant marine. They are sent off on a trip and when they get back they receive a certificate of discharge. Then they remain off the pay roll until they sign for another trip. When they get back they take another certificate of discharge. Are we going to pay unemployment insurance at the end of every trip for 26 weeks?

Mr. KEEFE. They are working for private employers or the Government?

Mr. GEARHART. They are working for the merchant marine. Ninety percent of all the seamen are working for the Government.

Mr. KEEFE. In answer to the gentleman from California, may I say that the amount and duration of compensation would be figured on the basis of the State law of the State from which he shipped. Take California as an example. The maximum amount he could receive in any 1 year would be $20 for 24 weeks. The law of California would provide the formula for each seaman based there. I may say, however, that if the men in the merchant marine are working in the Government service, in my humble judgment, they should receive the same treatment that any other employee receives

under similar circumstances. If by virtue of the nature of his employment he is compelled to be out of employment for periods of time which are due to no fault of his and for which he is not compensated, I believe such men should be given the benefit of unemployment compensation pursuant to the provisions of the law of the State where he is employed.

Mr. GEARHART. I am in complete sympathy with the objective the gentleman is seeking to obtain, but I want to point out, as in the case of seamen that number hundreds of thousands, each and every individual classification has got to be carefully studied and it cannot be done in the few weeks we had to devote to the preparation of this bill.

Mr. KEEFE. You are going to have a conference, are you not?

Mr. GEARHART. Yes.

Mr. KEEFE. It is expected there will be a conference between the House and Senate on this proposition.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 5 additional minutes.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, it may well be that there will be a few things that it may be necessary to give consideration to in this conference. I want to say now that as to the great mass of employees throughout the country who are in the Federal service, I cannot see one sound reason or argument why they should not be paid unemployment compensation in accordance with the laws of the State in which their service is rendered. I can see no sound argument why the Federal Government should not assume the responsibility for reimbursing the State that is compelled to pay that unemployment compensation, thus protecting the trust funds that have been created as a result of the imposition of the 3-percent excise tax.

Mr. KNUTSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. KNUTSON. Would the gentleman inform the Committee as to the probable cost of the operation of his amendment?

Mr. KEEFE. I cannot inform the gentleman as to the probable cost of this amendment, nor can anyone else. The cost of this amendment will depend upon the extent to which unemployment grips this country and the number of Federal employees that are released. They have lived through one period of gross unemployment in this country and have recorded what the Government did to relieve it. Here is an opportunity to lay the groundwork of precaution and set up means for taking care of it now so that we will not be bothered in the future with the hit-or-miss programs of W. P. A., and so forth, that may come up. Who can tell how much unemployment there is going to be?

Mr. KNUTSON. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. KEEFE. Does the gentleman know how much unemployment there is going to be?

Mr. KNUTSON. That is the trouble. The best estimate we can get is $100,000,000 a week.

Mr. KEEFE. You have that estimate, no doubt, from figuring the maximum unemployment, considering everybody is going to be unemployed. If everybody is going to be unemployed, God help America. And what are you going to do about it? What program are you going to adopt? What are you going to do to take care of them if that situation prevails?

Mr. KNUTSON. I did not get those figures in a seance composed of long-haired economists whose sole aim in life is to bankrupt this Government and bring on communism.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I do not know what the innuendoes are as contained in the last statement of the gentleman, but so far as my personal record in this Congress is concerned, I do not believe that I have the reputation of being a long-haired, visionary crackpot. I am inclined to believe, however, that the person who furnished my friend with the figures as to cost just quoted, must have been not only crackpot but visionary and unreliable as well. One does not have to be an economist to reach that conclusion. Assume there are 3,000,000 Federal employees. Assume they all lost their jobs and all drew unemployment. Let us see what the cost would be. Under existing State laws the average maximum compensation is less than $20 per week. The average duration of payment in any one year is less than 20 weeks. Take $20 weekly compensation for 3,000,000 Federal workers and it would only amount to $60,000,000 per week. For 20 weeks in any one year it would be $1,200,000,000, a far cry from the figures quoted by my friend from Minnesota. Let us be practical. Does anyone believe that more than 2,000,000 workers will lose their jobs. If this occurs and none of them can find employment the cost could not exceed $40,000,000 a week for 20 weeks. If unemployment ever reaches such tragic proportions, God help America. Regardless of the accusations that may be said on one side or the other, I want my personal position to be clear. I intend to carry out at the first opportunity possible the pledge that was made by my party when it wrote its platform at Chicago. I intend so far as I can possibly influence a single Member in this House, to see to it that here and now we lay the foundation as well as we may to take care of a problem which may occur and which may not occur. If we do not have unemployment, then all this talk means nothing; if we do have unemployment, then I want to be prepared to take care of it.

Mr. DEWEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. DEWEY. We all know the gentleman's reputation. He is on one of the great committees which appropriates the funds with which all these things are done. We know of his conscientious work on that committee; therefore when I offer any criticism I do so only in a thoughtful way and in order to try to stimulate a little over-all thinking on this subject.

Mr. KEEFE. The gentleman intends to cushion his criticism with a little adulation to start with?

Mr. DEWEY. No.

Mr. KEEFE. I am ready to accept it.

Mr. DEWEY. The gentleman himself drew attention to his own standing and position in the House and I applaud that position.

Mr. KNUTSON. Which is very good, or has been up to now.

Mr. DEWEY. Without taking up any more time with regard to that matter and to speak of unemployment, which we are all against and for which a $6,000,000,000 fund has been set up by the States, taken by a tax on the creation of wealth.

Mr. KEEFE. Does the gentleman want to ask a question?

Mr. DEWEY. I do. I am going to ask a question.

Mr. KEEFE. Will the gentleman give me more time?

Mr. KNUTSON. Certainly. The gentleman from Illinois has to lay a foundation for his question.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 10 additional minutes.

Mr. DEWEY. We have a reserve of $6,000,000,000 taken by a tax out of the creation of wealth and not out of the workingman or out of the Federal Treasury.

Mr. KEEFE. May I answer the gentleman right on that question.

Mr. DEWEY. Please, let me finish.

Mr. KEEFE. The gentleman may take all the time he wants.

Mr. DEWEY. I am not going to make a speech. I am trying to ask further about unemployment. All the State directors of unemployment believe that is adequate, including war workers under the same rules that the gentleman applies in his amendment—namely, the State rules. Now, we come to other classifications, including that of seamen and civilian seamen, who as I understand it, are not covered, and we come to the civil servants of the Government.

Mr. KEEFE. What is the gentleman's question?

Mr. DEWEY. Does the gentleman not think it would be advisable to take sufficient time on this subject and not, as was the case in committee, write a fuzzy law about these civil servants, but really take time and write a law covering them in? I would be glad to take part in such effort.

Mr. KEEFE. I assume the gentleman would like to see them included?

Mr. DEWEY. I would be glad to see the workers in war plants included.

Mr. KEEFE. All right. Insofar as I am personally concerned, may I say to the gentleman that we have gone into that question very carefully and I do not think there is any fuzziness to the thinking. There are people who have devoted years and years of study to this problem and, personally, I have had the benefit of their suggestions and advice. I have consulted with the Interstate Conference of Unemployment Compensation Directors of this Nation and I know what their attitude is. I know

they believe we will be making a mistake if we do not adopt the amendment I am going to propose, and a lot of you Members will hear from them in respect to this situation tomorrow because they have been in conference for a very considerable period of time going over all of the questions the gentleman raises.

Mr. DEWEY. One more question, if the gentleman will yield. Could the gentleman get the approval of the directors of civil service to cover his amendment?

Mr. KEEFE. I have not tried to get the approval of the directors of civil service; no.

Mr. DEWEY. I misused the word.

Mr. KEEFE. I do not have to ask their approval or disapproval.

Mr. DEWEY. I know, but as to the administration possibilities of it.

Mr. KEEFE. There will be little difficulty with the administrative possibilities if you include all Government employees. That is what this amendment proposes to do. The gentleman looks at me with disgust and discouragement when I make that statement. May I ask the gentleman this question? Down here in the Navy Department there is a little girl that came from a small town in my district who is working as a stenographer. She came here in response to the demands of her Government to fulfill a patriotic duty. But she is earning barely enough upon which to exist and pay her train fare back home. Some have to get help from home to maintain themselves here in the city of Washington today. Right next to her is a group of WAVES, working in exactly the same capacity. When this cut-back comes and the WAVES are let out and my little girl is let out, the WAVES will have the benefit of unemployment compensation under the G. I. bill, and the girl from my district will have nothing. Does the gentleman approve of that? Does the gentleman believe that is fair? Can he see any justice in that situation?

Down in Rock Island, Ill., a matter I happen to know something about, there are a great many employees working in the arsenal. They left plants in my own city in response to the request of the Government for urgent help and went down there to work during the war for Uncle Sam. Right across the street, or nearly so, is the great John Deere plant, a private industry. The rates of pay in the two are substantially the same. The worker who went from my home town to work in the arsenal, who left a position where he was in covered employment, patriotically, to help Uncle Sam, is out of a job at the arsenal. He does not have unemployment compensation. But the worker over in the John Deere plant, a plant making substantially the same things, 100 percent war work, is receiving unemployment compensation. If you can see any justification in that, I would like to have it explained. I cannot believe that it is fair or just to have a situation of that character prevail in our post-war economy.

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield.

Mr. GEARHART. The person who was working in private industry was submitting himself to a pay-roll deduction in the nature of a tax which, when collected by the Government, became of the nature of a premium on this policy of protection.

Mr. KEEFE. The gentleman is absolutely wrong there, because the person who was working in private industry has no pay-roll deduction whatsoever to pay unemployment compensation. That tax is paid by the employer. It is an excise tax levied against the employer, and the employer charges it up to his cost of doing business.

Mr. GEARHART. That is exactly the point I am making.

Mr. KEEFE. The consumer pays that, if anybody does.

Mr. GEARHART. The tax is on the pay roll of the person.

Mr. KEEFE. But the employee does not have anything to do with that.

Mr. GEARHART. It directly affects the salary or wages that the person gets. That person has made a sacrifice for his protection. As to the other person that the gentleman brings in now, nothing has been set aside; no pay-roll deduction has been made and no tax has been levied. Are you going to give it to him as a grant? Is there not a distinction there?

Mr. KEEFE. Let us explore that proposition a little more fully. Suppose Federal employees had been included in the original social-security law. Who would have paid the tax upon the pay roll of such employees? The answer is clear: It would have been paid by the employer—the Federal Government. Where would the Government have raised the money? Again the answer is clear: Out of the Federal Treasury. If Federal employees are included in this program now, the cost will be perhaps less to the Treasury than it would have been had the Federal Government been paying a 3-percent excise tax on pay rolls during the time the law has been in force.

As I understand, the gentleman contends that because the Federal law imposes an excise tax of 3 percent upon the employer, based upon the amount of his pay roll——

Mr. GEARHART. Two and seven-tenths.

Mr. KEEFE. It is a maximum of 3 percent. The State law may offset it 2.7 or 90 percent of the tax. But in any event, so far as the Federal law is concerned, it is a flat 3 percent subject to such offsets as provided for under State law.

I understand the gentleman's statement to mean that because there has been paid by the employer into an unemployment-compensation trust fund 3 percent of the gross pay roll of those employees subject to the tax, that that makes a differentiation as between the employee in the private plant and the employee in the Government plant whose employer has made no contribution to the trust fund, or any trust fund. I will say to the gentleman that I want to be perfectly fair about it. There is that difference just as has been stated, but I cannot feel the force of the gentleman's argument. It is clear in any event that the money that would be used to pay the unemployment compensation for Federal employees would have to be raised by taxes upon all the people.

Mr. GEARHART. All the people?

Mr. KEEFE. All the people. Likewise, the amount of the 3 percent deduction or contribution made by the employer in the form of an excise tax upon him is paid by all the people who purchase the consumer goods and the services of his company. To me there is very little distinction between the two. I expect to go into this matter in some detail when the amendment is offered, and I am simply trying to give notice of the position which will be assumed at that time. In conclusion may I call attention to the fact that the proposed amendment is limited in operation to 2 years. It is purely emergency planning to take care of a situation that may or may not arise. The amendment is as follows:

Amendment to S. 2051 (Rept. No. 1798):

Page 37, line 3, after "XII", insert "and XIII."

Bottom page 39 (or top of 40). Insert new section 303, reading as follows:

"UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION FOR FEDERAL EMPLOYEES

"SEC. 303 (a). The Social Security Act, as amended, is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following new title:

"'TITLE XIII. UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION FOR FEDERAL EMPLOYEES

"'SEC. 1301. (a) Any person who shall have rendered service as a civilian in the employ of the United States Government, after September 16, 1940, shall be entitled, in accordance with the applicable provisions of the unemployment compensation law of the State against which claim for compensation is filed, to receive compensation for each week of unemployment commencing after September 30, 1944, in the same amounts, on the same terms, and subject to the same conditions, as though the unemployment compensation laws of the several States did not exclude services performed in the employ of the United States Government. Any claim for compensation under this section shall be filed against a State in which a part of the service in the employ of the United States Government was performed. As used in this section, the term "United States Government" includes any wholly owned instrumentality of the United States.

"'(b) The Social Security Board is authorized on behalf of the United States to enter into an agreement with any State or with the unemployment compensation agency of such State, under which such State agency will make, as the agent of the United States, payments of unemployment compensation to individuals with respect to services performed by them as civilians in the employ of the United States Government, on the basis provided in subsection (a).

"'(c) Each State shall be entitled to receive from the Federal unemployment account for each quarter, beginning with the first quarter commencing after enactment of this act, an amount equal to the total of all payments of unemployment compensation made by such State during such quarter, pursuant to an agreement under this section.

"'(d) In the event that any State does not agree to make such payments to such persons, the Civil Service Commission is hereby authorized and directed to make such payments.

"'(e) All departments, agencies, and instrumentalities of the United States are directed to make available and furnish to the appropriate State agency such information with reference to compensation of persons in the employ of the United States Government as may be necessary to determine the benefits payable under this title.

"'(f) In case of an agreement under this section that a State agency will make payments as agent of the United States, there shall be paid in advance to the State such sum as the Board estimates the State will be entitled to receive for each quarter under such section; reduced or increased, as the case may be, by any sum by which it finds that its estimate for any prior quarter was greater or less than the amount which should have been paid to the State. All money paid to a State under this subsection shall be used solely for the payment of unemployment compensation. Any money so paid to a State which is not used for the purpose for which it was paid shall, upon termination of the agreement, be returned to the Treasury.

"'(g) Determinations of entitlement to unemployment compensation made by a State agency under an agreement that such agency will act as agent of the United States under this section shall be subject to review in the same manner and to the same extent as determinations under the State unemployment compensation law, and only in such manner and to such extent. Such an agreement may require any officer or employee of the State disbursing funds pursuant to the agreement or otherwise participating in its performance to give a surety bond to the United States in such amount as the Board may deem necessary and may provide for payment of the cost of such bond from appropriations for carrying out the purpose of this act.

"'(h) The Board shall from time to time certify to the Secretary of the Treasury for payment to each State the sums payable to it under this section. The Secretary of the Treasury, through the fiscal service of the Treasury Department, and prior to audit or settlement by the General Accounting Office, shall make payment in accordance with such certification.

"'SEC. 305. The grants made by the Social Security Board under title III of the Social Security Act to each State agency entering into an agreement under this title shall be sufficient to cover the amounts necessary for the State agency's proper and efficient administration of such agreement under this title, and no segregation of such grants or expenditures shall be required.'"

(NOTE.—The foregoing section 303 is intended to be identical with section 403 of S. 2051 as passed by the Senate, with the exception of the underlined language. Section 305 is new.)

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I do not feel that the remarks made by the gentleman from Wisconsin should go unanswered. The gentleman's amendment would add $5,000,000,000 to the operating expenses of the Government in the next fiscal year. That money would have to be raised by direct and increased taxation. How are we going to reestablish normalcy in this country? By restoring confidence and full employment. We cannot restore confidence while the Congress is literally shoveling money out with scoops. Reckless spending will prevent expansion, creating new outlets for labor and in other ways hamstring and discourage expansion. Of course, from a purely sentimental standpoint my heart goes out to the proposition that the gentleman from Wisconsin is interested in, and my heart bleeds for the little war worker that he mentioned. I cannot believe that this House will on tomorrow give serious consideration to a question with which the Committee on Ways and Means wrestled for hours, a question to which we found so many angles and ramifications that we determined to lay it aside and make it a subject for special study at a later time, when there will be more time available to the committee. May I ask the gentleman from Tennessee if that is not correct?

Mr. COOPER. I think the gentleman states the situation in that respect correctly. I am rather reluctant to take any part in this very friendly controversy between gentlemen on that side of the aisle. The distinguished gentleman from Minnesota is a member of the same great party to which the gentleman from Wisconsin belongs. I am wondering if the gentleman from Minnesota agrees with the interpretation of his party platform as given by the gentleman from Wisconsin. I am wondering whether or not the gentleman from Wisconsin correctly interprets that statement in his party platform, or whether or not that refers to an extension of coverage under Social Security to groups not now covered. Is not that the gentleman's idea about that part of the platform?

Mr. KNUTSON. The gentleman from Wisconsin being a lawyer can read any interpretation into the Republican Platform that he wishes to. I, being a mere newspaperman, must take it literally. I do not have enough imagination developed by legal study to read other meanings into it.

Mr. COOPER. Certainly the gentleman's amendment as he has suggested it here is not to accomplish that purpose, because that would mean the extension of coverage under Social Security to all the groups not now covered. It would not mean singling out one group for whom no tax has been paid and providing benefits for them out of the Federal Treasury.

Mr. KNUTSON. If we would follow the argument of the gentleman from Wisconsin, we would turn the social-security system into an economic Mother Hubbard that would cover everything but give protection to nothing.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KNUTSON. I yield.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. If you include people who have not paid their premiums on their unemployment compensation insurance, that is in effect a gratuity or a dole from the Treasury, is it not?

Mr. KNUTSON. Not being a lawyer, I do not feel qualified to answer that question.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. I am quite sure that it is. Further, as between a dole and W. P. A., where men work for what they get, is not W. P. A. preferable?

Mr. KNUTSON. It is the lesser of two evils.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER].

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I am very grateful for that illuminating speech made by the gentleman from Wisconsin. He will have considerable support on our side of the aisle if he offers any amendment aiding Federal employees.

There has been considerable improvident talk and conversation about the national debt, the amount of that debt, our ability to pay it. The amount of our national assets have an appreciable bearing upon the import of the bill that we pass and assuredly must be considered concommitantly with the amount of our national debt. Our gross national debt today is $210,000,000,000. I repeat, that is the gross debt. It does not take into consideration the various assets the Government now possesses.

If you go into a bank and want to borrow some money you have to give a financial statement. On one side you present your liabilities and on the other side you present your assets, with a breakdown of your assets as between fixed assets and liquid assets. Let us have a financial statement as far as the Government is concerned. I get my figures in part from the daily statement of the United States Treasury as of August 26, 1944, and each Member of Congress gets such a statement daily.

What are the assets the Government owns today? In the first place, there is a working balance comprised of cash in banks of $17,600,000,000. Secondly, the Government possesses a great deal of gold and silver. We have a gross value of gold—at cost—stored at Fort Knox of twenty-billion-odd dollars. Outstanding against that gold are various gold certificates, Federal Reserve notes. We have a gross value of silver—at cost—of $1,906,000,000, against which are outstanding silver certificates. By the calculations appearing in this daily statement of the United States Treasury, we have a net value of gold and silver of $729,651,000. That is a most valuable offsetting asset.

Thirdly, the assets of Government corporations and credit agencies which can be realized upon—and they are not merely interagency bookkeeping entries—are $30,000,000,000.

Fourthly, the Office of War Information states that we have surplus plants and surplus property conservatively valued at $75,000,000,000.

What is the sum total of those four categories of assets? They run up to $123,329,651,000. Subtract those assets from the gross debt as of the present date and you have a net debt of $96,670,349,000.

So I brand as rather loose talk all these observations that our debt is $300,000,000,000, $250,000,000,000, or $200,000,000,000. We have a net debt as of today of less than $100,000,000,000.

Over and beyond that there are many, many other assets belonging to the Government. I cannot calculate them. Let me give you a few. There are Government lands, Government buildings, huge forest reserves, minerals belonging to the Government, and the petroleum reserves. I said I do not know what the value of them is. If I were possessed of them I would go to the bank and the bank would put a value on them. I do not know what the value is. They are of untold value. They may not be disregarded in figuring our net national debt.

Over and beyond that, under the internal revenue laws there is a reservoir of $28,000,000,000 that may or may not be due to corporations, depending upon their excess-profit taxes. They have a right to draw down from that reservoir

certain amounts depending upon a comparison of their excess-profits taxes for the current year with the base period. It is estimated that not even half of that will be drawn upon, leaving probably $14,000,000,000 more in the Treasury. Let us say it is only $10,000,000,000 more in the Treasury. You see how we cut down that gross indebtedness that we hear so much exaggeration about?

Over and beyond that still, in the Social Security Board there is over $5,000,000,000 of surplus in the unemployment compensation fund. I am told that at present rates it will go up to $7,000,000,000 before the war is over.

I do not state all this to encourage what the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. KNUTSON] says is the "gimme's" or to encourage improvident spending or the setting up of new W. P. A.'s or any new boondoggling.

I feel we are financially strong enough to meet a decent unemployment-compensation program as embodied in the Dingell bill. What would the cost thereof be? I do not know, nobody knows what the cost will be. Nobody can now estimate the possible amount of unemployment. Some estimate that the cost will be, under the Dingell provisions and rates, $10,000,000,000. I doubt that. Examine the reports of the Brookings Institution and you will find that directly after every war there is a great lush period of prosperity. The demand for civilian goods after every war is terrific. This tremendous demand for civilian goods after the war will give us real prosperity, possibly for 2 years. There may be little unemployment. I doubt, therefore, that there will be any such cost for the unemployment compensation as $10,000,000,000. But we have the cushion there already—to wit, the five billion already noted as unemployment compensation surplus. It may run up to $7,000,000,000. At the present moment it is over $5,000,000,000, that is, the moneys now actually in the unemployment compensation fund, or supposedly in that fund. In any event that money is due the workers.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. I yield.

Mr. KNUTSON. I notice on yesterday the gentleman listed in his remarks, which appear on page 7375 of the RECORD for August 29, several large funds that are earmarked for a specific purpose as assets to offset the national debt. Of course, it is very encouraging. If we apply that in private life we can take money which we have set aside to pay for our insurance, and we could use it to buy a new suit of clothes without in any way upsetting the budget. It is an interesting and a new phase. The gentleman spoke only for a short time, but in that short time he very materially reduced the national debt. It was with deep regret to me that the gentleman did not continue for another 5 minutes so that he could have wiped the thing out completely.

Mr. CELLER. I would have been happy to do so if I could. I am giving facts, irrefutable facts. They may not suit the gentleman. That is just too bad.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. I yield.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. As I understood the gentleman, he subtracted the gold value from the national debt and used it in payment, and then dissipated it. I think the gentleman ought to explain to the people, in that case your money would not be worth anything and you would be in a worse shape than if you had a $500,000,000,000 debt.

Mr. CELLER. Unfortunately, I do not follow the gentle lady. I was very careful to set aside a gross value of gold against which there are outstanding gold certificates. The same with silver. The net of gold and silver is $729,000,000, despite the fact that we have a gross value of gold far in excess of $20,000,000,000. I was very careful to state that.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 additional minutes to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. CARLSON of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. I yield.

Mr. CARLSON of Kansas. I am very happy the gentleman brings this up. I notice in his remarks of yesterday, and he made the same remark today, that we have $5,000,000,000 in the old-age unemployment compensation fund and it will probably be $7,000,000,000 at the end of the year.

Mr. CELLER. That is, if the war is over.

Mr. CARLSON of Kansas. As a matter of fact, if he will look it up, he will find we have about $13,000,000 in the Treasury. The rest of it is in bonds. So when the States start paying unemployment compensation and asking for reimbursement, we have to go out and sell $5,000,000,000 worth of bonds to give it out to the States.

Mr. CELLER. I think the Treasury must be criticized for its action for putting the dipper in the well and using that money for general purposes. It had no right to do that. It was not our intention that the Treasury should do that. Those compensation and social-security funds should have been used to reduce our indebtedness—to pay off preexisting bonds. But the Treasury used the money and issued new bonds. But I did not subtract those funds from the gross national indebtedness. I said the money is supposed to be there and should be used for unemployment compensation purposes. It belongs to the workers as insurance against unemployment. I have nothing but condign criticism for the Treasury in using these unemployment compensation funds for the general expenses of government without appropriate segregation. They are only a trustee of those funds. They have the stewardship of those funds and the Treasury has failed in its trust in that regard.

Mr. CARLSON of Kansas. If the gentleman's statement were taken literally the States would assume money is lying here in Washington, when, as a matter of fact, there is no money practically in this fund.

Mr. CELLER. I did not say that. I did not subtract that from the national gross debt.

Mr. CARLSON of Kansas. I think that statement should be corrected.

Mr. CELLER. I did not subtract that from the national gross debt. The gentleman's observations are correct, otherwise——

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me for a question?

Mr. CELLER. I have not even finished my statement. I have only a few minutes remaining, but I will yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I am very anxious to know what the $28,000,000,000 State trust fund is and where that is reflected in any Government figure.

Mr. CELLER. The gentleman will find, if he will consult with the Treasury, that there is a fund of about $28,000,000,000 upon which the corporations may draw in the event their excess profits for a certain base period is less than 8 percent.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Now, the point I wish to make with reference to this, and I think it is a fair question, is as follows——

Mr. CELLER. May I first state to the gentleman that I said the corporations would not draw down that whole amount, because the Treasury Department is very, very careful and very cautious and very guarded. Getting money back from the Treasury is like pulling teeth.

Mr. CRAWFORD. But can the gentleman cite any record on earth where the Treasury has set up any special fund or reserve of $28,000,000,000 with which to facilitate losses that may be incurred by corporations, thereby digging into the $28,000,000,000 referred to?

Mr. CELLER. The money is supposed to be in the form of a trust fund set aside. If the Treasury has not set it aside, they are again derelict, but as far as I know they have set it aside.

Mr. DEWEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. I yield.

Mr. DEWEY. I have in my hand a statement of the President of the United States as of August 1, 1944, a review of the 1945 Budget. I am only going to put in two figures here. "The total war program: Obligations for the fiscal year 1941 to 1944, $294,000,000,000." Those are obligations. Those are not authorizations, but obligations which the Government has made to various companies.

Mr. CELLER. Does the gentleman doubt that the present national debt is $210,000,000,000? I do not know what the gentleman is reading from, but I will be glad to examine it later.

Mr. DEWEY. If the gentleman will listen to my question, I have to at least give him a figure. The obligations are $294,000,000,000. The expenditures are $199,000,000,000, making a total of $95,000,000,000 which we have to find to take care of the war obligations during this fiscal year. If the gentleman does not think that is going to increase the public

debt, he can go to the Treasury and find out they are making plans for the Sixth War Loan drive now.

Mr. CELLER. I do not get the import of the gentleman's remarks. The public debt is limited by statute. I say we are running a deficit of about $4,000,000,000 each month and our taxes are only $45,000,000,000 a year. Our deficit will be at least $48,000,000,000 a year, therefore.

We cannot adequately appraise the initiative, energy, and inventive and administrative genius of 135,000,000 people, but I say it is sufficient to support a Dingell bill proposal. That is my answer to the "poor mouths" and the crabbers who moan and bewail what they call our staggering, astronomical debt, which, they say, will deprive our children's children of their heritage.

The ability to pay our national debt depends upon what the United States is worth. What is the United States worth? Of course, the amount is incalculable.

Harold L. Ickes in the American magazine of August 1943 in answer to What Is America Worth? states:

> Roughly, about $12,000,000,000,000 in physical assets, with a little odd change amounting to $23,000,000,000 left over for tips and other miscellaneous items of expense.
>
> This would be the size of our national bank roll if we could bring all of our coal, mineral, and oil reserves to the earth's surface and sell them before they had been processed or refined, and if we had a buyer also for our farms, forests, fisheries, industries, etc. In other words, $12,023,000,000,000 is what we ought to get for our country, raw, at a forced sale.

He goes on to state:

> While riding out to my farm one evening after work I amused myself by figuring it out that $12,023,000,000,000 in $1 bills would make a chain of 1,140,000,000 miles long that could wrap itself around the earth's middle more than 45,000 times. Divided equally among 135,000,000 of us it would give every man, woman, and child in America the tidy sum of $89,000.

Remember, the ability to clear the national debt also depends upon the size of the national income and the size of the national income depends upon production and demand for goods and that, in turn, depends upon purchasing power. One of the purposes of unemployment compensation is to provide a bolstering up of purchasing power. As people lose jobs, purchasing power diminishes. To the extent of that decrease unemployment compensation must step in.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SUMNERS].

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, this has been a very interesting and a very high-type discussion. It pays compliment to the men and women assembled here today to deal with this very, very important matter.

As I view our situation and the question now pending and what will really be determined by the direction in which we move in this matter it seems to me that today and tomorrow may be evaluated by the historians of the future as 2 of the most important days in the governmental history of this country. We are at the point now where we are deciding in which direction we are going to try to go. We have been building up a psychology in this country for a long, long time that when any private person, any State or community gets into trouble, when an individual faces a situation that challenges him to use his initiative and all of his resources, and gain capacity by its use, when a small community faces a situation where it has a local problem to deal with and it requires some ingenuity, something that will develop its local citizenship, and fit them for the responsibilities of a democratic government, they come to Washington to get some money. They decline the challenge, they lose their opportunity to increase their fitness to govern.

No people can long maintain a democracy who pursue that policy. A democracy is a group of private people engaging in the common enterprise of governing themselves. They constitute the democracy. It is an interesting fact that when they initiate that democracy, then nature begins to operate on that thing. It ought to be evident, it seems to me it is evident to those of us who face the determination whether we are going to have a democracy in this country or a bureaucracy or centralized government, that a democracy is that sort of government designed by God Almighty for human beings. It is not a self-perpetuating foolproof thing, however. Only God can make a tree, but man can kill it.

This thing we are dealing with today reaches mighty deep. You cannot do a thing, the natural consequences of which will destroy the capacity of the people to govern and maintain a democratic government. They are subject to the laws of cause and effect. If we built up a citizenship in America, where men who do not have a job today can come to the Federal Government and receive as a gift as high as $35 per week as provided for in one of the Senate bills, or a lesser amount, that is not developing the self-reliance and self-respect, the general ability, and pride of independence which are the indispensable assets of democratic citizenship. My distinguished friend, who has just spoken, points out the fact that the next 2 years may be lush years insofar as work is concerned. But instead of us throwing ourselves upon our own responsibility and resources as long as possible and if absolutely necessary at the last minute have the Federal Government come in and do something about it, it is proposed we engineer and encourage millions of people now, before there is any developed necessity, to come up here and get some money out of the Federal Government. Now, you think of that. We know that the Federal Government has not got any money. Now, we are sensible people, dealing with a practical proposition. We are all in the same boat in this matter. We know that we confront two or three definite dangers. We know that we are not too far from the printing press for money. We know that when this war is over it is not going to be easy to sell bonds. We know there is a limit beyond which money cannot be gotten by taxation. We know that whenever the tax burden upon privately owned property is greater than its receipts, private ownership will not be attractive. We know that there can be but two sorts of ownership, private ownership and public ownership. Public ownership means communism. We are dealing with practical propositions.

Whenever we create a situation where nobody wants to own and nobody wants to work and manage, then there can be no owner except the Government and no liberty among its people. There can be no democracy, no popular government, where ownership and control is vested in the governmental organizations. We are not dealing with theories. We are dealing with practical situations.

It is admitted in the debate on the floor of this House that the financial situation of the Federal Government is worse than that of the local communities and States. Yet, in face of that situation, we are advocating an advertisement to everybody that, when this thing is over with, you do not have to rustle much. Spend all the money you can make in your job now, and when you get through if you really do not want to stay where you are, just send down here and Uncle Sam will send you a ticket. Just draw on us. We have got plenty of money up here. You do not have to rustle. And you States come up here and borrow money from Uncle Sam. We have been childish and foolish long enough. We set a precedent today and tomorrow. We are not just passing a bill. We are going somewhere.

It is utterly impossible to maintain a democratic system of government where the Federal organizations control the purse strings of the private person, the municipalities, and the States. That is common sense. What is the use talking about decentralizing governmental power when we put control of the purse strings up here in Federal organizations? That is not progress; that is reactionary. That is turning back on the road of democratic progress. We are trustees of the greatest democracy that has been evolved through the processing of the ages. We know it is going to be the most difficult sort of thing to preserve it. It is worth the effort. It is going to challenge the genius of a great people, the statesmanship of a great people to preserve it. We are a great people. We will be a greater people when we shall have met this challenge. It is not going to be easy to pay for these bonds in money of comparable value to the buying power of money now. Every increase of the national debt will add to that difficulty. What will happen to insurance policies, to the people who own these bonds, some of them the men who have been fighting the battles of the world, if the accumulated debts of the country become greater than the capacity to pay? What will become of the value of social-security fund obligations payable to widows and orphans and old people, the purchasing power of civil employees, and other salaried people? Men giving their lives on the battlefields of the world to preserve democracy and we holding out in advance of demonstrated necessity this lure, this opportunity, this invitation to

millions of people to receive gifts from the Federal Treasury and have the amount charged to the generation to which our fighting men belong, and calling ourselves statesmen. A condition might develop under which the Federal Government would have to do something about it. But the very idea now, in advance of a demonstrated necessity to have introduced and seriously consider a bill that would give access to millions of people to the Federal Treasury—not loans, gifts. Why are they entitled to come to the Federal Government for this money? The Federal Government has not got any money. Those of our generation are not going to pay it. We have spent billions of dollars more than we are going to pay. I am not talking about some theory. I know what it is for people to have to do a little rustling themselves. When I was a boy my father went broke and did a perfect job. The first house we lived in after that we paid $600 for it, but we paid for it. I worked for $25 a month. I slept in a lawyer's office, while I read law, but I earned that money myself and I did not lose anything by the effort and by the struggle to get it either. How can you expect people to retain strength in their muscles unless they use them?

How can you expect these millions of people in the United States who must be the citizens of tomorrow and the citizens of today—how can you expect them to be able to guide the destiny of a great republic bottle-fed and rocked to sleep in the arms of a Federal bureaucracy?

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, would not a program of this kind apparently discriminate against the man who works the hardest for the smallest pay of any laborer in America today, the American farmer? He is not covered by this bill at all, is he, by this entire program?

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Maybe so, but the point I am trying to make here is that we are discriminating basically against the private individual when we deprive him of the necessity to use his own ingenuity. That is what I am trying to say. I am saying we are discriminating against and destroying the people upon whom we have got to depend to guide the destiny of this great Republic.

We cannot deal with this question as Democrats or Republicans; we are deciding today and tomorrow in which direction we move, and upon that decision, in my humble judgment, depends the fate of this democracy. Public opinion is the supreme law of the land, but the voice of this Congress rings throughout the land and helps to develop public opinion. It is a great thing to see men and women forget party alignment in an hour of their Nation's peril. I do not want to be critical of those who hold different opinions from that which I have expressed. This is the soul of the Nation, there must be liberty of speech. I do not question their motives, but I question the soundness of the conclusions of any man or woman in an hour like this when the Nation stands at the forks of the road where it must choose, where it must move toward independent individual responsibility, community responsibility, responsibility of the States to govern in matters within their governmental capacity. One road leads in that direction and the other road leads toward the Federal Government. And the signboards—do not forget that we are putting up the signboards; let no one make any mistake about that—we are putting up the signboards by this legislation. One leads back to the individual, back to the local community, back to the State, back to the struggle, back to the ability to gain strength and courage and determination; and the other leads to the Federal Government, the Federal Treasury, to Uncle Sam, to dependence, to individual defeatism, to us loss of those strong qualities, characteristic of our people, characteristics which we are destroying, characteristics which are indispensable in a democracy. The people of this country want to preserve this democracy. They are willing to pay the price. One leads toward national bankruptcy, one leads to the depreciation of the dollar, one leads toward the inability of the Federal Government to pay its obligations in money of purchasing power comparable to the present value; the other leads toward strength, toward solvency, toward the hope of the ages; because, as America goes, so goes the world. In our hands we hold the hope of the ages for men and women who aspire to be free—free—I mean free individuals.

We cannot be free if we lose the capacity to govern; we cannot be free if the control of liberty and ability and opportunity to do as we will is lost; we cannot be free if we are dependent upon a great Federal bureaucracy to take care of us; that is all there is to it. Then we become but tools in the hands of men who aspire to be great, great governors of people instead of useful servants of a great free people, the only aspiration the public official, or any one else, has any right to have in a democracy. If that time comes when the Federal Government must do something about it, that would be different. But now, at this deciding time, now we stand at the forks of the road, as I see it, it would be a tragic thing to move toward the Federal Treasury, to lure millions of people toward the Federal Treasury to receive gifts—no; not gifts; the money will be charged to them and to our fighting men. We vote that debt on them while they are gone. What can be the wisdom, what can be the soundness and statesmanship for us—the people still pay some attention to what we say—for us to point the whole Nation toward the Federal Treasury in a bill like this in an hour like this? That is what our responsibility is. We are not going to do it. We are all in the same boat. This is our Treasury; we must preserve its solvency. This is our Government; we must preserve it as a democracy. This is our responsibility in this time of decision. Our decision in which direction we move now, by this bill, if I read the signs of the times aright, will be one of the most important in the history of our Government.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Cox].

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Texas has just given expression to a very profound statement, something that is worthy to be engraved upon the threshold of every home in the Nation, in my judgment a complete complement to the measure proposed by the Ways and Means Committee of the House.

This is not the first time the peoples of the world have lived under a so-called new deal, but in no instance where unchecked have they failed to produce complete wrack and ruin. The proposal brought here by the Ways and Means Committee is a check upon the impulse to go all the way in that direction. Let me give you an example:

Diocletian became Emperor of Rome in A. D. 284. In an unprecedented depression and a great emergency, he sprang a new deal on the Empire in 301. Under him the Roman Senate became politically impotent and the last vestiges of republican institutions disappeared. Diocletian was of opinion that social security could be permanently established and the economy of the Empire forever stabilized by the creation of bureaus and commissions. The genius of the Roman was administrative. Diocletian was vested with absolute authority and he fixed by decree, he thought for all time, in supposedly fair relationship, the intricate processes of society.

The prices of all commodities, wages and other activities of the people were under complete control of the state. Price ceilings were engraved on tablets of stone and set up in the market places. Even to this day fragments of this edict are being unearthed in remote places once embraced in the Roman Empire. In all more than 800 articles were included in the edict: Cereals, wine, oil, meats, vegetables, skins, leather, furs, shoes, timber, clothing, poppy seeds, snails, goat's flesh, underwear, and mantles were given a fixed selling price.

Wages for services rendered from common laborer to dancing teacher and lawyer were determined by directive and a bureaucracy regimented everything from the number of acres a farmer could plant to the maximum hours labor could be employed.

There was rationing, rent controls, and a kind of interstate commerce commission covered transportation down to the "rent for a laden ass, per mile." Unless the transportation of that day carried more than two persons per ass, there was no chance of showing a profit. And the asses that they employed then could not carry more than two passengers.

Rome flourished, its population increased, with the multiplicity of bureaus and commissions and coordinators. There were as many stonecutters in Rome as there are stenographers in Washington. The law of supply and demand was repealed and the economic and social life of the people was so completely regulated that a perfect society flourished. A kind of Plato's New Republic or More's Utopia or our own New Deal was organized in the Eternal City.

What happened to this "noble experiment," this effort to socialize and regiment an empire? History records the

answer—Diocletian and his new deal failed to reckon with the significant fact, that neither he nor all his legions could control human nature. Despite the fact that Diocletian punished by death or deportation all violations of his price-fixing agency, the scheme collapsed. Black markets flourished to traffic in meat. Overcharges made by merchants and the money changers who exacted usury were checked, but production also stopped. Absenteeism became common with labor. Merchants closed their marts and went on vacation. Competition disappeared and men neglected to manufacture or to buy and sell or to exchange commodities for services. Farmers ceased to till their land, moved to cities, and society generally became decadent.

Individual freedom was destroyed. The essential fires of enthusiasm were extinguished, and individual and collective initiative perished. Diocletian took the fun out of work. Legislation and regimentation crushed ambition. However good might have been the Emperor's intentions, his attempt to regulate everything that could be controlled to meet a great emergency was disastrous, and ultimately fatal.

Diocletian stated, in part, in the introduction to his edict:

> Inasmuch as there is only seen a mad desire, without control, to pay no heed to the needs of the many * * * it seems good to us, as we look into the future, to us who are the fathers of the people, that justice intervene to settle matters impartially, in order that that which, long hoped for, humanity itself could not bring about may be secured for the common government of all the remedies which our care affords.

Writing of Diocletian's new deal more than 1,600 years ago, Lactantius wrote:

> He tried to fix by law the price of articles offered for sale. Thereupon for the veriest trifles much blood was shed, and out of fear nothing was offered for sale, and the scarcity grew much worse, until, after the death of many persons, the law was repealed from mere necessity.

The passing of Diocletian marked the decline of local self-government and the growth of a centralized system. Probably no other Roman emperor proposed so many sweeping reforms. He completely reorganized the government, set up new systems of coinage and taxation, and redivided the provinces. He ruled for 20 years.

The collapse of Diocletian's edict also marks an important turning point in history, for there followed in the wake of his experiments a thousand years of night. From 300 A. D. to almost 1300 A. D. is known in history as the Dark Ages. During that long night, what was once the Roman Empire produced not a single poet, historian, orator, painter, sculptor, architect, or builder. The practical effect of the decree was to stop the flow of goods and suspend the activities of the Empire. There were no banks, no insurance companies, no transportation companies, no mail service, and no newspapers during this long night, society slipped into slavery, men became base and dishonest. The world was dominated by the police power. They took charge of the taxing power and production. Famines were frequent and the status of the human race, in its fight for food, was little better than that of the beasts of the jungle.

The Roman Empire was built before the coming of the Caesars. For 750 years the Roman citizen had enjoyed more freedom than man had ever before experienced. Under the planned economies of the Caesars it took 150 years to accomplish the complete disintegration of the Empire's commerce and expose it as easy prey to the barbarian.

Mr. Chairman, continuing in the direction that we are going, How long will it be before we destroy by regulation, by regimentation, and by edict this Nation of ours?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. MORRISON].

Mr. MORRISON of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, if we wish to ever have prosperity and independence among the people of our country, we must cease to appropriate money to be derived from taxation, even for many things we would like to see done, because—great and rich and productive as we are—there is a limit to taxation which we can stand without destroying values, producing commercial and economical demoralization and wretchedness in our country.

I have no criticism whatever to offer of the necessary expenditures we have had to make in the last decade, or such a matter, because I believed then that artificial stimulation of business, with employment to follow, was better than the dole that wrecked nearly every country in Europe.

I have approved every expenditure that was made to carry this war to a triumph and success. What the people are looking forward to when this war is over is a cessation of burdens and, as hurriedly as possible, a reduction in taxation. We may theorize and say, "So and so would be a good thing," but we have reached the point where taxation must stop and must be reduced. Let us think a little bit about taxation. Take the case of corporations, their tax is 40 percent on profits besides an excess-profits tax. When the stockholder gets a part of the profits that are left which are distributed to him immediately the high schedule of our revenue bill applies to his individual and personal income, and it goes up and up until very quickly there is very little left. How is it left? The creator of wealth, small or great in this country, is allowed to keep the part left to him as a mere trustee for life. It is not his. He is told to be very careful what he does with it. He cannot deduct it for this, that or the other. If he spends it in a prescribed channel for himself, all right, but the Government says, "You keep it; you are a mere trustee of it; when you die we are going to take more of it, in most cases, than we allow you to give your beloved ones or to give to great religious or patriotic organizations in which you may be interested." It is not worthwhile to waste time and go back and say, "That is anybody's wastefulness. That is anybody's tyranny."

It has all been made necessary to save this great Republic and make it ready for the great war, and then to carry us through. What do you propose to do? You propose to make billions of dollars of expenditures available to the people engaged in war work in a way you would not have done before the war ensued. When you had social security before the country, was there any serious effort made to include Government employees? I do not remember that there was. Now, with these burdens bearing heavier and heavier upon us, and when those who are creating the wealth look forward to a little relief, you propose to adopt social security retroactively, to wit, let the Government pay while the employees make no contributions whatsoever. That is a very flimsy disguise for simply going into the Treasury and giving those who have worked for the Government during these trying times at splendid wages—and I am glad they had good wages—the amount of money involved. You give it to them. You are not contributing it to a social security fund where it is fixed beforehand, and the employer contributes so much and the employee so much. No. It is going back during a period that the employee contributed nothing and giving him an amount variously estimated at $5,000,000,000. God knows how much they will get, too, when we say to all of the people of the United States, "Well, if you cannot find anything to do, we will pay you millions in better wages than you ever had in your life anyway." The past is secure, and I think the future historian of my country will commend it all. But now, with all the property of this country practically confiscated, you talk about taxation. I do not criticize it. We had to do it, and I have supported it step by step.

You are now taking more of the citizen's property in most cases, as well as income, than he may enjoy himself, and then you enjoin him to be careful how he spends it, for when he dies the Government will take most of what little they allow him to retain as his part. Yet the gentlemen seem to think if they can draw a picture of an expenditure being a noble and good thing, it is all right to go ahead and make it. If you make it, you must pay it in funds derived from taxing the people. May I say to you, as one who has grown old, as young as I look, that the best thing you can do to give us post-war prosperity is not to adopt any of your programs, except for the soldiers. Many of them will have to be adopted, but none of them will compare good to the country to reducing taxation in the United States and allowing the men and women to whom the incomes belong to keep some of it to make expansions in their business, to give to the church, or to make other contributions for noble and fine things. Property is practically all destroyed. Sometimes I think my friend Huey Long was a mere piker compared to where we are about to go. Huey wanted to divide it all up and leave everybody $5,000 and start all

over again, I believe. But we do not leave anybody anything. We really take most of it and then tell him, "Now, Mr. Trustee, watch your step. If you do not watch out what you do with your money, you will get in jail or pay a gift tax on it, and when you die we will take it." My God, it is a terrible time for old people. It is one of the worst times to die in the history of the world. A man cannot hope to leave his family much, if anything; it does not make any difference what he has, because the Government is going to take what they leave you as trustee, as I have tried to hammer home. There is not much to leave.

In England, Parliament levies the tax. We have taxing bodies in this country so thick you can hardly count them. The State levies heavy taxes, income, privilege, and what not. The county levies taxes. School districts levy taxes. Towns and cities levy taxes. What little will you have left? With what little they leave, my dear old friend, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DOUGHTON], and his committee, and the corresponding committees of the Senate, will wade into, of necessity, confiscating property to bear the burdens already put upon the people.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 2 additional minutes.

Mr. MORRISON of North Carolina. We propose to make appropriations to do something that, if it should have been done at all, should have been done when we passed the social-security bill. My distinguished colleague from Wisconsin a while ago looked over toward me and said something about the C. I. O. and "their friend Governor Morrison," inferring that I was a member of the C. I. O. I know a great many noble and patriotic people who do belong to the C. I. O., but I do not belong to anything but the Democratic Party and the Presbyterian Church. There is not a group in my State, in my old age, Mr. Chairman, that will not trust me.

They say, "He is with the farmers sometimes but he is a hard-headed old Scotchman and he is as apt to disagree with us as not, and we had better not trust him." The businessmen say, "It is strange, but by George, he is with the labor people now and then." Then the labor people say, "My golly, it won't do to trust that fellow. When he was Governor he was against us two or three times down there, and he is just as apt to be again."

I know no group or class division except the one that the great northern President, Mr. Lincoln, recognized, the group who are right and the group who are wrong.

I care not what their avocations may be or from what section or party they hail, I tell you that this grand Committee on Ways and Means and this other committee of the gentleman from Alabama, Judge MANASCO, have brought two great bills before this body, representing the people of the United States. I pray to God that a great majority of this House may rally behind both of them and follow the mountaineer statesman, the gentleman from North Carolina, ROBERT L. DOUGHTON, to victory in this matter.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. WASIELEWSKI].

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr. Chairman, S. 2051 as brought to the House floor by your Committee on Ways and Means is not a perfect measure, but it is a good bill; however, it does not go far enough to meet the problem before us. The speakers before me have explained the details of the bill, so I shall not dwell on that subject since our time is limited.

I hope that before S. 2051 leaves the House two very important sections, which I will discuss in detail, may be adopted. One of these provisions was recommended to the committee by the Colmer committee and the other was contained in the original version of the bill before us when it came to your Committee on Ways and Means.

The gigantic task presented in this legislation is very broad and far reaching. The technical detail, the vastness and complexity of the problems that face the Director require that he obtain the thoughts, assistance, and advice of the best qualified men in the land.

The suggestion made by the Colmer committee with reference to the make-up of an advisory committee appeals to me. It is suggested that the advisory board consist of 12 members, all of whom shall represent the general public and the public interest, but in order that the board may have the benefit of the experience in the matters with which it will deal under this act, three members of the board shall have had experience in business management, three members shall have had experience in matters relating to labor, and three members shall have had experience in agriculture. The President shall designate one of the remaining three members as chairman of the board.

In the various boards made up of representatives of the three or four principal recognized groups, it appears that invariably the representatives of the individual segments act as one. Oftentimes they appear to take the position that they must stand by their particular group whether it be right or wrong. As a result, we get decisions 3 to 6 or 6 to 3 from boards like the War Labor Board and others. By having all the board members represent the general public and the public interest, this unfortunate cleavage may be avoided and should make for more meritorious action.

When we get to the reading of the bill I hope that the suggestion of the Colmer committee with reference to the creation of an advisory board may be incorporated into S. 2051.

The section of the bill before us that I believe should be restored is the one dealing with unemployment compensation for Federal employees as found on page 20 beginning with line 7 and continuing through pages 21, 22, and 23 to line 15, inclusive.

In normal times Federal employees whether employed in Government agencies, shipyards, or arsenals have civil-service tenure which reasonably assures them of continuous employment. However, even before Pearl Harbor, all new Federal employees have been hired on a temporary basis—for the duration plus 6 months. A Federal employee once he is released at the conclusion of hostilities cannot hope to be reemployed by the Government since the Government will have no need for his services. There is no conversion or reconversion problem but one of going out and finding a new job. To find this new job the Federal employee will have to compete in the labor market with the returning servicemen. His position will be quite different from the average industrial worker who can look forward to a peacetime job as soon as his employer is able to convert to peacetime production. Thus we are faced with the problem of meeting an emergency. We should face it squarely. Unless we make some provision for the Federal employees we should not be surprised if many of them forsake the Government agencies to go into private industry. This definitely would be unfortunate for our war production effort, particularly now that we wish to sprint, since victory is definitely in sight. In peacetime there is no need for unemployment compensation for Federal employees. However, unless we meet the present emergency we may be faced not only with an effort to place them under the Unemployment Compensation Act but with the ultimate federalization of our entire unemployment compensation system.

It appears to me that some people are inclined to take a defeatist attitude with reference to the reconversion period. They seem to lack confidence in our ability to return to peacetime production nearly as rapidly as we converted from peacetime production to war production.

I have every confidence in the ability of our labor and industry to meet the problem with the cooperation of the Government. This cooperation, however, need not take the form of a dole or subsidy. It means the gradual lifting of the wartime restrictions as quickly as will serve the best interest of our people and our economy and make such changes in our tax laws as will encourage persons to become employers of labor and will bring risk capital out of the safety-deposit boxes and other hiding places.

When Pearl Harbor came many of our principal industries were still engaged in peacetime production. Some of them were reluctant about converting to war production for they did not appreciate the seriousness of our predicament and were afraid some competitor might get ahead of them. I do not condone the behavior of these few selfish firms. By and large, industry cooperated wholeheartedly and it was found that our State unemployment-compensation systems more than adequately met the unemployment that arose in the interim. In the conversion back to peacetime production undoubtedly unemployment will be somewhat heavier since we will have the returning service men and women as well as the temporary Federal employees who must be provided work.

We must face the problem realistically. Many thousands, maybe even more than a million persons not normally gainfully employed or in retirement have entered our offices and shops, purely out of patriotic motive in order to relieve the manpower shortage. These persons should be encouraged to return to their former status. This should tend to at least slightly reduce the unemployed labor inventory during the conversion period.

The purpose of the reconversion program is to make peacetime jobs available as quickly as possible. With the broad fields open as a result of our suspension of the manufacture of our ordinary peacetime goods and the inventions and developments that have been made in the course of the war there will be a mad scramble by industry to enjoy every possible advantage of having its product in the market first. With the public savings aside from War bond investments approaching $140,000,000,000, the businessman knows that the purchasing power is present, that all he needs to do is to produce the goods.

As a result of our training program in connection with war production we have more persons skilled in the operation of industrial equipment than ever in our history. All we need is the jobs, and I am confident that they will be forthcoming faster than some of us expect. The paying out of huge sums out of the Federal Treasury to subsidize larger and longer unemployment benefits under State laws, as proposed by the distinguished gentleman from Michigan, will not contribute anything materially to the reconversion program.

If the two amendments suggested by me dealing with the advisory board and the unemployment compensation for Federal employees are accepted, it is my opinion that it will definitely humanize this legislation and aid greatly in having it fulfill the job we intend it should.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

TITLE I—OFFICE OF WAR MOBILIZATION AND RECONVERSION

SECTION 101. (a) There is hereby established the Office of War Mobilization and Reconversion, which shall be headed by the Director of War Mobilization and Reconversion (hereinafter called the "Director"). The Director shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, shall receive compensation at the rate of $15,000 per year, and shall serve for a term of 2 years.

(b) The following agencies shall be placed within the Office of War Mobilization and Reconversion and shall exercise their functions subject to the general supervision of the Director:

(1) Office of Contract Settlement, created by the Contract Settlement Act of 1944.

(2) Surplus Property Administration, created by the Surplus Property Act of 1944.

Nothing in this subsection shall imply any derogation of the powers of the Director under subsection (c) with respect to other agencies not specifically placed within his office.

(c) In addition to any powers which the President is authorized to and does delegate to the Director for the purpose of more effectively coordinating the mobilization of the Nation for war, the Director shall, subject to the direction of the President—

(1) formulate or have formulated such plans as are necessary to meet the problems arising out of the transition from war to peace;

(2) coordinate the activities of other executive agencies with respect to the problems arising out of the transition from war to peace. Nothing contained in this section shall be construed as authorizing any activities to carry out any plans formulated under this section which are not within the scope of the powers possessed by the President or the executive agencies under provisions of law other than this section;

(3) recommend to the Congress appropriate legislation providing authority to carry out plans developed under this section but not authorized under existing law;

(4) promote and assist in the development of demobilization and reconversion plans by other executive agencies; develop procedures whereby each executive agency is kept informed of proposed demobilization and reconversion plans and proposals which relate to its work and which are being developed or carried out by other executive agencies; and settle controversies between such executive agencies in the development and administration of such plans;

(5) cause studies and reports to be made for him by the various executive agencies which will enable him to determine the need for the simplification, consolidation, or elimination of such executive agencies as have been established for the purposes of the war emergency, for the termination, or establishment by statute, of executive agencies which exist under Executive order only, and for the relaxation or removal of emergency war controls;

(6) institute a specific study, for submission to the President and the Congress, of the present functions of the various executive agencies in the field of manpower, and develop a program for reorganizing and consolidating such agencies to the fullest extent practicable;

(7) consult and cooperate with State and local governments, industry, labor, agriculture, and other groups, both national and local, concerning the problems arising out of the transition from war to peace; and

(8) submit reports to the President, the Senate, and the House of Representatives on the 1st days of January, April, July, and October, on the activities undertaken or contemplated by him under this act. Such reports shall summarize and appraise the activities of the various executive agencies in the field of demobilization and post-war adjustment, and may include such legislative proposals as he may deem necessary or desirable.

(d) The Director shall, within the limits of funds which may be made available for this purpose by Congress, employ and fix the compensation of such Deputy Directors and other officers and employees, and may make such expenditures for supplies, facilities, and services as may be necessary to carry out his functions. All such officers and employees shall be appointed in accordance with the civil-service laws and their compensation fixed in accordance with the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, except that Deputy Directors may be employed and their compensation fixed without regard to such laws. To the fullest extent practicable, the Director shall perform the duties imposed upon him through the facilities and personnel of other executive agencies; and for that purpose he is authorized to delegate and provide for the redelegation of the powers and duties vested in him. The Director may require such reports and information from other executive agencies as he deems necessary to enable him to carry out his functions under this act, and each executive agency shall furnish any information and reports so required.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. LANHAM, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration the bill S. 2051, had come to no resolution thereon.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an article from the Iowa Legionnaire.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

(Mr. MCCOWEN asked and received permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.)

Mr. ROLPH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include an article about the American merchant navy.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. PLUMLEY] may extend his own remarks in the RECORD and include an address made today before the State Republican convention; and also that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOODRUFF] may extend his own remarks in three instances.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks on two different subjects and include therein a newspaper article and some other articles.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

HOUR OF MEETING TOMORROW

Mr. MCCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourns to meet tomorrow at 11 o'clock.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MCCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN] have permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include therein an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include as part of my remarks made today a letter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Rhode Island?

There was no objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. CHIPERFIELD, in-

definitely, on account of illness in his family.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 6 minutes p. m.) under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, August 31, 1944, at 11 o'clock a. m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1784. A letter from the Acting Administrator, Federal Security Agency, transmitting a report by the Superintendent of St. Elizabeths Hospital on the receipts and expenditures of that institution for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

1785. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting one certified copy each of various ordinances enacted by the Public Service Commission of Puerto Rico, granting to the various sugar companies and mills listed, the right to engage in the manufacture and processing of raw sugar; to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. McGEHEE: Committee on Claims. S. 1665. An act to relieve certain employees of the Veterans' Administration from financial liability for certain overpayments and allow such credit therefor as is necessary in the accounts of Guy F. Allen, chief disbursing officer; without amendment (Rept. No. 1825). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. McGEHEE: Committee on Claims. S. 1827. An act for the relief of Oliver N. Knight; with amendment (Rept. No. 1826). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. MURPHY: Committee on Claims. H. R. 3645. A bill for the relief of Mary Agnes Lichtefeld Droppelman; with amendment (Rept. No. 1827). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GOODWIN: Committee on Claims. H. R. 4542. A bill for the relief of Harold Miller; without amendment (Rept. No. 1828). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. MURPHY: Committee on Claims. H. R. 4593. A bill for the relief of Thomas R. Clark; with amendment (Rept. No. 1829). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. JENNINGS: Committee on Claims. H. R. 4674. A bill for the relief of the estate of Everette Maxwell, the estate of Redman P. Maddux, Elmer Massa, and Estel Massa; with amendment (Rept. No. 1830). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. SCRIVNER: Committee on Claims. H. R. 4737. A bill for the relief of W. A. Smoot, Inc.; with amendment (Rept. No. 1831). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. JENNINGS: Committee on Claims. H. R. 4921. A bill for the relief of Dr. J. Sims Norman; without amendment (Rept. No. 1832). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GOODWIN: Committee on Claims. H. R. 5048. A bill for the relief of the estate of Cecile H. Burgett, deceased; with amendment (Rept. No. 1833). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. HÉBERT:

H. R. 5263. A bill to secure prompt payment and adjustment of just claims for loss of or damage to property received by laundries and dry-cleaning and dyeing establishments in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. COLE of Missouri:

H. R. 5264. A bill to broaden the coverage of title IV of the Social Security Act to provide for State aid to all needy orphans and other needy children; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PACE:

H. R. 5265 (by request). A bill to provide for the development of better diets and an improved nutritional status for the people of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. WEISS:

H. R. 5266. A bill to amend the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act with regard to taxation of real property; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. CURTIS:

H. R. 5267. A bill to permit the assignment to banks, as security for loans, of life-insurance policies issued by the United States; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. LEA:

H. R. 5268. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act authorizing the attorney general of the State of California to bring suit in the Court of Claims on behalf of the Indians of California," approved May 18, 1928; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. CALVIN D. JOHNSON:

H. Res. 629. Resolution protesting the condemnation by the British of Ambassador Phillips; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Chamber of Deputies of Chile, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to ratify various resolutions adopted at the session of April 15 last by the committees of the House of Deputies of Chile and the American parliamentary delegations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CURTIS:

H. R. 5269. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Helen Garwood; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. LANDIS:

H. R. 5270. A bill for the relief of John Hames; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. LANE:

H. R. 5271. A bill for the relief of John Seferian and Laura Seferian; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. McGEHEE:

H. R. 5272. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Ellen C. Burnett; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. McLEAN:

H. R. 5273. A bill for the relief of Betty Ellen Edwards; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SOMERS of New York:

H. R. 5274. A bill for the relief of Therese R. Cohen; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WHITE:

H. R. 5275. A bill granting a pension to Marion M. Luther; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

6047. By Mr. DICKSTEIN: Petition of William R. Cleary, commander, Disabled American Veterans of the World War; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

6048. By Mr. HEIDINGER: Petition submitted by Jesse H. Schoemann and signed by 28 music students of Carmi, Ill., asking that Congress enact legislation that will prevent interference with the broadcasting of noncommercial programs when presented by academically accredited, tax-exempt, educational institutions not in competition with professional talent; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

6049. Also, petition signed by Jesse H. Schoemann and 23 other representative citizens of Carmi, Ill., and surrounding community, requesting Congress to enact legislation that will prevent interference with the broadcasting of noncommercial programs presented by recognized educational institutions in accordance with certain proposals; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

6050. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the four political parties of Puerto Rico, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to legislation granting a greater degree of self-government to Puerto Rico; to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

6051. Also, petition of Mary Strachan, Brooklyn, N. Y., and others, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to Federal unemployment insurance for merchant seamen; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

6052. Also, petition of Ross C. Patton, Philadelphia, Pa., petitioning consideration of his resolution with reference to his application for patent on a fire-fighting apparatus to combat air raids; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE

THURSDAY, AUGUST 31, 1944

(Legislative day of Tuesday, August 15, 1944)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Eternal Spirit, in whom alone is the strength of our hearts and the hope of our world, we come in our noontide fellowship of prayer not so much to seek Thee as to open our faltering lives in penitence and need to Thy waiting strength. In a world of illusions, as we turn to the noisy hours of the driven day, unfold to us the vision of the utterly real, which is Thyself, never betraying, never forgetting, a bulwark never shaken, a peace like a river, a presence like summer roses pouring their fragrance through a garden, and underneath a support like everlasting arms.

In the midst of events so colossal that as individuals on the confused world

stage we seem puny and inadequate, O God, who sittest above the flood of man's insanity, lift us into the only greatness we will ever know by using us as the channels of Thy purpose and intent. Give us sagacity, strength, and spaciousness of mind and a transparent purity of heart, that in a world stricken with hatred and pride and greed we may see God and the Godlike as we walk humbly the ascending path of a faith that has a better air to breathe than cynicism and denial. In these days of great peril, critical decision, and measureless opportunity, as against the powers of darkness Thou art unloosing the fateful lightning of Thy terrible swift sword, save us from all policies whose reaping will be another harvest of horror for our children's children. Give us now to know clearly and to follow faithfully the things that belong to our peace and to the peace of the whole world.

We ask it in the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Monday, August 28, 1944, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. McLeod, one of its clerks, announced that the House had passed without amendment the following bills of the Senate:

S. 1508. An act to provide effective date of awards of death pension or compensation in cases of persons missing or missing in action to authorize payment of such benefits from the date of death of such person as reported or found by the Secretary of War or the Secretary of the Navy, and for other purposes; and

S. 1934. An act to provide for abandonment of the project authorized in the act of October 17, 1940, for a seaplane channel and basin in Boston Harbor, Mass.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to each of the following bills of the House:

H. R. 1506. An act to further amend the Pay Adjustment Act of 1942; and

H. R. 3695. An act for the relief of the estate of Thomas Shea, deceased.

The message further announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5125) to provide for the disposal of surplus Government property and plants, and for other purposes; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. MANASCO, Mr. COCHRAN, Mr. WHITTINGTON, Mr. GIFFORD, and Mr. HOFFMAN were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message informed the Senate that Mr. BENDER had been appointed a manager on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5125) to provide for the disposal of surplus Government property and plants, and for other purposes, vice Mr. HOFFMAN, resigned.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bill and joint resolution, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 5196. An act to amend section 22 of the Interstate Commerce Act by authorizing common carriers to grant reduced fares to personnel of armed services; and

H. J. Res. 306. Joint resolution authorizing the President of the United States of America to proclaim October 11, 1944, General Pulaski's Memorial Day for the observance and commemoration of the death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (H. R. 3695) for the relief of the estate of Thomas Shea, deceased, and it was signed by the Vice President.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

WAIVER OF PROCEEDINGS UNDER ANTITRUST LAWS, ETC.

A letter from the Attorney General, submitting, pursuant to section 12 of Public Law 603, Seventy-seventh Congress, his seventh report covering the period from May 7, 1944, through August 25, 1944, relating to the waiver of prosecution or proceedings under the antitrust laws or the Federal Trade Commission Act (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

PUERTO RICAN COMPANIES AND MILLS ENGAGED IN RAW SUGAR MANUFACTURE AND PROCESSING

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a certified copy each of various ordinances enacted by the Public Service Commission of Puerto Rico, granting to certain sugar companies and mills the right to engage in the manufacture and processing of raw sugar (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs.

RECEIPTS AND EXPENDITURES, ST. ELIZABETHS HOSPITAL

A letter from the Acting Administrator of the Federal Security Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the receipts and expenditures of St. Elizabeths Hospital for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1944 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a list of papers and documents on the files of the Department of the Navy which are not needed in the conduct of business and have no permanent value or historical interest, and requesting action looking to their disposition (with accompanying papers); to a Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Papers in the Executive Departments.

The VICE PRESIDENT appointed Mr. BARKLEY and Mr. BREWSTER members of the committee on the part of the Senate.

PETITION

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a petition of sundry citizens of New York City and vicinity, praying for the enactment of pending legislation to increase the pay of letter carriers, which was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

PHILADELPHIA WAGE TAX—MEMORIAL

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I have received at my office a communication from employees of the Philadelphia Quartermaster Depot addressed to the distinguished majority leader [Mr. BARKLEY] and to me. It is in the form of a letter, but I think in this instance it is really a memorial remonstrating against adoption of the so-called Philadephia wage tax and relating to House bill 3592. I ask consent to present it and request its appropriate reference. I do this with the concurrence of the Senator from Kentucky.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the memorial will be received and lie on the table.

DELAYS OF RATIONING BOARDS AND SHORTAGE OF FARM MACHINERY— MEMORIAL

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask consent to present to the Senate a memorial signed by a great many farmers from North Dakota on the subject of the delays of rationing boards and the shortage of farm machinery. I ask that the memorial, including the signatures, be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the memorial was received, referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency and ordered to be printed in the RECORD with the signatures attached, as follows:

AUGUST 14, 1944.

Hon. WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

We, the undersigned, residents of this community, desire to register a protest against the delaying actions of rationing boards with respect to tires and gasoline. Farmers in midst of harvesting crops are forced to wait for necessary items until meeting of rationing boards, whether case be emergency or not. Boards and employees so independent in their action it is impossible to talk sense to them. Further protest shortage of farm machinery, repair parts, and such items as welding gas. New machinery not available. Farmers forced to repair and use old machines. Old machines break down and parts are not available to repair. Can't get old parts welded because blacksmith cannot get sufficient quantities of welding gas. How is the American farmer to harvest his crop and feed the world?

L. M. Streibel, Fessenden, N. Dak; Edmund Hartl, New Rockford; Ernest W. Lies, New Rockford; L. T. Sylling, Sheyenne; Grant Bjertness, Sheyenne; William W. Zander, Cathay; Even Hanson, Sheyenne; Peter Sleck, Sheyenne; John Hitz, Bremen; August Larson, Bremen; Chas. W. Johnson, Sheyenne; H. A. Johnson, Sheyenne; Lynn Jorde, Sheyenne; W. H. Seidel, Cathay; John Alfstad, Sheyenne; H. T. Larson, Bremen; E. J. Lange, Bremen; Wm. J. Seiler, New Rockford; Eugene Irmen, New Rockford; Emil J. S. Martin, Cathay; W. A. All-

maras, New Rockford; Joe Allmaras, New Rockford; Geo. R. Allmaras, New Rockford; Alvin Sylling, Sheyenne; John Bergmark, Bremen; Lawrence Sylling, Sheyenne; Henry A. Allmaras; Henry Rosendahl, Sheyenne; Thomas Sylling, Sheyenne; Barbara Ackermann; Olof Larson, Bremen; John Schuster, Bremen; Leo Lange, Bremen; Wilma Rosendahl, Bremen; John Billiomire, Bremen; Joseph Lill, Cathay; Verner Erickson, Sheyenne; Henry Bjertness, Sheyenne, John Schafter, Bremen; Leo Seiler, New Rockford; Mrs. Clemence R. Lies, Cathay; Tony Lill, Cathay; Wilfred Shamos, Fessenden; Herman Allmaras, New Rockford; Christ. Christianson, Sheyenne; Walter Irmen, Cathay; Vernon Salmonson, New Rockford; Alfons Allmaras, New Rockford; Jerome Allmaras, New Rockford; Chas. Riggle, Sheyenne.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. BARKLEY (for Mr. LUCAS):

S. 2113. A bill for the relief of Mary G. Marggraf; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CAPPER:

S. 2114. A bill to provide for the payment to certain Government employees for accumulated or accrued annual leave due upon their separation from Government service; to the Committee on Civil Service.

By Mr. WHEELER:

S. 2115. A bill authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to LeRoy Milliken; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma:

S. 2116. A bill authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to Maurice M. Bedoka; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts:

S. 2117. A bill to amend the Coast Guard Auxiliary and Reserve Act of 1941, as amended; to the Committee on Commerce.

S. 2118. A bill to amend the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942, as amended; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CORDON:

S. 2119. A bill granting a pension to Frank P. Tebbetts; to the Committee on Finance.

(Mr. BALL introduced Senate bill 2120, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and apepars under a separate heading.)

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado:

S. 2121. A bill to permit any person entitled to retired pay from the United States for disability incurred in line of duty while serving as a commissioned officer in any of the services mentioned in the Pay Readjustment Act of 1922 (U. S. C., title 37), and who holds a civilian office or position, appointive or elective, under the United States Government, to draw the full retired pay provided for such disability, in addition to the compensation provided for the civilian office or position; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. REYNOLDS:

S. 2122. A bill to recall certain National Guard officers to active duty; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HAYDEN:

S. 2123. A bill for the relief of Antonio Ruiz; and

S. 2124. A bill for the relief of the estate of Walney A. Colvin, deceased; to the Committee on Claims.

(Mr. LANGER introduced Senate Joint Resolution 147, which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor and appears under a separate heading.)

NATIONAL SAFETY COUNCIL—CONGRESSIONAL CHARTER

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, I request unanimous consent to introduce a bill to incorporate the National Safety Council and ask that it be appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 2120) to incorporate the National Safety Council, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, this is a bill to grant a congressional charter to the National Safety Council. A similar bill is being introduced in the House today by Representative CLIFFORD DAVIS of Tennessee. I think most Senators are familiar with the work of the council, which was organized in 1913 in Chicago, and has operated in most of the States since then. It is one of the most unselfish and efficient organizations that I know of and is engaged in reducing accidents of all kinds in factories, on the highways, and in the home. It is significant, I believe, that every year since 1913, when it was organized, the national accident rate has decreased, with the exception of 1913 and 1936. During the war the council has, at the request of the President, cooperated with the Department of Labor and W. P. B. in an aggressive campaign, which has been very successful, to cut down the accident rate in industry.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a statement outlining the purposes and the record of the National Safety Council be incorporated in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The National Safety Council is an independent, noncommercial, nonprofit, nonpolitical, educational organization founded in 1913 in Chicago, Ill., to reduce the number and severity of all kinds of accidents. The accidental death rate, except in the years 1917 and 1936, has been lower every year since 1913 than it was that year. These reductions represent a saving of 300,000 lives. Frequency and severity of accidents have been reduced throughout the country by the use of materials, advice, and services of the council.

The effectiveness of the program of the National Safety Council was recognized officially when it was requested by President Roosevelt, at the beginning of the war, to lead a Nation-wide drive against accidents that were delaying victory by destroying irreplaceable men and material. In response to this assignment, the council strongly organized the first accident prevention effort ever developed on a scale commensurate with the size of the national accident problem. This was the first safety movement of national proportions supported and conducted wholly in the public interest and designed to reach all elements of the national population in all walks of life. Recent statistics on the accident experience of 1943 show that, after 16 months of operation of this program, the situation as compared with that of 2 years before was:

1. The all-accident death toll down 7 percent.

2. The rising trend of accident fatalities among workers on the job completely halted, despite an increase of 9 percent in man-hours worked.

3. Traffic deaths down 42 percent, due mainly to wartime restrictions, but due also to public cooperation.

4. Public deaths of civilians, other than traffic, held constant.

A program geared to such results has as its pattern the utilization of every established channel of influence and every possible source of voluntary cooperation. This has involved a policy of working with and through all responsible organizations and agencies in a position to assist the movement in any phase of activity anywhere in the country; of cooperating with State and community safety councils in expanding their programs and unifying their efforts with the national effort; of stimulating the interest and encouraging the participation of individuals of key influence throughout the country in the safety movement; and of enlisting the cooperation of the press, the magazines, the radio, and all other available media in reaching and influencing public opinion on an unprecedented scale. Since effective State and community programs are essential to assure a progressive safety program for the nation, the strengthening of existing State and community safety councils and the development of new ones have been primary objectives of the National Safety Council. New community safety councils and State organizations have been developed as chapters of the National Safety Council.

To accomplish this national program, the National Safety Council has doubled its personnel and its budget since 1942. It has established regional offices in Chicago, Atlanta, New York, San Francisco, and Washington, D. C., to give aid and assistance to all public and private agencies active in safety endeavor. At its headquarters office in Chicago, it has gathered the largest safety library in the world for the reference use of all who may need its materials. Thus the council is meeting the impetus of its patriotic duty, and pledges itself to mobilize and energize the ever-growing forces of safety, and to give them national support and leadership.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H. R. 5196) to amend section 22 of the Interstate Comerce Act by authorizing common carriers to grant reduced fares to personnel of armed services, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

FEDERAL CORRUPT PRACTICES ACTS AND POLITICAL ACTIVITIES (S. DOC. NO. 232)

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have Senate Document No. 222 reprinted. This is a document which contains the Federal Corrupt Practices Acts and political-activities provisions of the law. The reason I ask for reprinting is that when we passed a measure last week we made certain changes in the so-called Taft amendment which was adopted to the Soldiers' Vote Act. It is desired to have those changes incorporated in the Senate document.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the matter referred to by the Senator from Alabama will be printed as a Senate document.

GENERAL PULASKI'S MEMORIAL DAY

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, the House of Representatives has passed House Joint Resolution 306 authorizing the President to proclaim October 11 as General Pulaski's Memorial Day. The joint resolution would ordinarily go to the Committee on the Judiciary. I ask unanimous consent that it may be now

taken up for consideration without reference to the committee.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the resolution (H. J. Res. 306) authorizing the President of the United States of America to proclaim October 11, 1944, General Pulaski's Memorial Day for the observance and commemoration of the death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski, was read twice by its title, considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ROTATION OF DUTY OF ENLISTED PERSONNEL IN THE NAVY

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the body of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a letter recently received from Rear Admiral L. E. Denfeld, Assistant Chief of Naval Personnel, concerning the discharge and rotation of duty of certain enlisted personnel of the naval service. Many members of the Senate have received letters requesting information on this subject, and this letter is in reply to one sent by me as chairman of the Naval Affairs Committee, asking for information on this subject and an outline of the present policy of the Navy.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NAVY DEPARTMENT,
BUREAU OF NAVAL PERSONNEL,
Washington, D. C., August 28, 1944.

Hon. DAVID I. WALSH,
Chairman, Naval Affairs Committee,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: This is in reply to your recent letter pertaining to the policy of the Navy Department concerning the discharge and rotation of duty of certain enlisted personnel of the naval service.

To date the Navy Department has issued no instructions to the effect that men over 35 or 38 years of age are to be discharged or released from the naval service. As you know, the proper prosecution of the war effort demands that adequate personnel be available at all times. Consequently, this Department has refrained from issuing any instructions directing the discharge or release of trained and experienced personnel within a certain age bracket until such time as the future manpower needs of the Navy can be thoroughly estimated. I assure you, however, that when and if conditions permit a gradual demobilization program will be inaugurated affecting men within certain age brackets. You will be notified promptly of any such policy that is adopted.

With reference to your inquiry concerning the Navy Department's rotation policy, you are advised that a rotation-of-duty program was announced more than a year ago whereby men who have been performing hazardous duty aboard ship and at outlying stations are considered available to return to the United States for rehabilitation leave and reassignment to duty after a minimum of 18 months in such duty. A standard leave policy was established in August 1943, prescribing rehabilitation leave up to 30 days for personnel who have served continuously outside the continental limits of the United States for a period of 1 year or more. In cases where service outside the continental limits has been less than 1 year leave is granted at the rate of 2½ days for each month of such service or major fraction thereof. Survivors are granted 30 days' leave upon returning to the United States. Up to 60 days' convalescence leave is granted patients who no longer require hospitalization, but who are in need of a period of convalescence at home, upon expiration of which they report to the naval hospital nearest to their homes for disposition.

The rotation-of-duty program is implemented by quotas assigned the respective fleets for new construction and service-school instruction. More recently interchanges of personnel between the fleets and shore establishment have been authorized, and men in considerable numbers who have returned from combat areas and advanced bases are now being assigned to shore duty as reliefs for others who have served a normal tour of shore duty in the United States. However, the extent to which actual rotation of personnel can be effected is dependent upon several controlling factors, such as availability of personnel, availability of transportation, and the immediate needs of our forces in the forward areas. While our goal is to afford rotation and rehabilitation leave every 18 months, it must be realized that the foregoing factors often prevent its accomplishment in full.

I trust that the foregoing statements will clarify the misunderstanding you mentioned in your letter and will satisfactorily indicate the policy pertaining to the matters in question.

Sincerely yours,

L. E. DENFELD,
Rear Admiral,
Assistant Chief of Naval Personnel.

ADDRESS BY SENATOR REVERCOMB BEFORE CONVENTION OF VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS

[Mr. REVERCOMB asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by him before the convention of the Veterans of Foreign Wars at Chicago, on August 23, 1944, which appears in the Appendix.]

EXCERPTS FROM SPEECHES BY SENATOR WILEY ON FOREIGN POLICY

[Mr. WILEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD excerpts from speeches made by him from 1939 to 1944, inclusive, on the subject of foreign policy, which appear in the Appendix.]

EXCERPTS FROM SPEECHES BY SENATOR WILEY ON PREPAREDNESS

[Mr. WILEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD excerpts from speeches delivered by him from 1939 to 1944, inclusive, on the subject of preparedness, together with editorial comment thereon, which appear in the Appendix.]

LATIN-AMERICAN UNREST—ARTICLE BY WILLIAM PHILIP SIMMS

[Mr. REYNOLDS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Latin-American Unrest," written by William Philip Simms, which appears in the Appendix.]

WAR REFUGEES AS IMMIGRANTS—EDITORIAL FROM COLORADO SPRINGS GAZETTE

[Mr. REYNOLDS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "War Refugees as Immigrants," published in the Colorado Springs Gazette of August 19, 1944, which appears in the Appendix.]

C. I. O. UNIONS AND COMMUNIST FRONTS—ARTICLE BY WESTBROOK PEGLER

[Mr. REYNOLDS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article by Westbrook Pegler on C. I. O. unions and Communist fronts, which appears in the Appendix.]

MANAGEMENT OF MONEY—ARTICLE BY L. L. CORYELL, SR.

[Mr. BRIDGES (for Mr. WHERRY) asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Management of Money," by L. L. Coryell, Sr., which appears in the Appendix.]

FREEDOM OF SPEECH, THE PRESS, AND THE RADIO

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, a foreign minister of Germany, Kiderlin Waechter, once said:

> A press campaign of 4 months will convince the German people of the rightness of any idiocy you like to suggest.

We have seen the deadly effect of propaganda at work in Germany. That became effective because freedom of the press went out the window.

Very shortly after Hitler came into power—it will be recalled that he seized power in February 1933—German newspapers and German broadcasting stations published only the news, foreign and domestic, which the Nazi leaders siphoned into those channels.

We have seen in the last 2 years one of the American republics, Argentina, bow before dictator tactics. It was the Argentine Congress which was abolished, and the rights of public assembly and speech were done away with, and two of the greatest newspapers in the Americas were throttled—La Prensa and La Nazion.

Mr. President, good and true men in all times have known the value of free speech and a free press. Free discussion, oral or written, uncovers error and shows it for what it is. Truth can stand upon its own feet and face fearlessly misrepresentation, prejudice, bigotry, and hate.

Paraphrasing Jefferson, I believe "that reason and free inquiry," spiritual intuition, and men who handle freedom of speech and a free press as a trust job "are the only effectual agents against these errors."

Freedom of the press does not give a right to twist, destroy, malign, slander, abuse, or villify. Such action is not freedom. It is not using it justly or guarding it well. Rather, such action shows that the individual is enmeshed in the dictator concepts of our time, such as coercion, suppression, false propaganda, failure to respect others' rights, and lack of appreciation of being a trustee for a free press.

Mr. President, on December 7, 1941, after Pearl Harbor, there was no further issue left to divide us. I stated then that Pearl Harbor did not decide the issue as to who was right, the interventionists or the noninterventionists, and that I hoped we could postpone that discussion until after the war was won and we had solved our peacetime problems.

To me, there is just one issue in this campaign. It is this: Which party and nominees can best serve the interest of the Nation in handling the war and the post-war problems, economic, social, national, and international? This issue may be subdivided as follows:

First. Which party can the better get our home economy into action so as to

bring about the maximum of employment?

Second. Which party can the better look after our international problems—protect America, see that she is not "sold down the river," and at the same time adequately look after our international responsibility?

Third. Which party can the better reorganize the machinery of the Federal Government with its overburdened bureaucracy, its waste, inefficiency, and inordinate centralization?

Fourth. Which party can the better handle the problems of the old folks, the farmers, labor, the veterans, small businessmen, and white-collar workers?

Fifth. Which party can the better look after tax reforms, grafters, and racketeers, reconversion, and surplus property, and plan and rebuild the physical and spiritual structure of America?

Mr. President, a free and untrammeled press and radio are going to have much to do with making known the facts and the truth relating to these issues.

I do not think that there will be any danger in America of the Congress being abolished or freedom of speech, freedom of the press, and freedom of the radio done away with as they were in Germany and in Argentina. But, Mr. President, no thinking person can be oblivious to the situation which now obtains in this country. No one can listen to the radio or read the reports of certain columnists without sensing that the news and the facts are colored, partially stated, and that biased and prejudiced reports are given forth.

I recall what was told me 2 weeks ago on the train. It illustrates the danger of which I am thinking. I was speaking with a citizen from another State than mine, and he told me that a prominent citizen of his State had said that "within 6 years we can elect any man we want for Governor. We are going to get control of the radio stations. We are working on that now." Then this citizen told me of another way the news is colored. He said that he hired a certain individual to get the news which went over a chain of radio stations four or five times a day. The individual got his news items from A P., U. P., and I. N. S., over the news ticker, but as he was of a certain political persuasion the news he picked out—and of course it becomes necessary to discriminate with respect to news casts because there is so much news—related simply to his "side of the fence." In other words, the whole chain of radio stations four or five times a day receives the news that this man simply picks out from the mass of news, and which reflects his political ideas.

Mr. President, I give these facts because when the people are alert no Pearl Harbors can happen. The saying oftimes heard that "eternal vigilance is the price of liberty" has special application in the campaign ahead. While we do not have any "kept" press, we do have bias and prejudice, and we do have some newspapermen and radio commentators who are paid to represent certain lines of thinking, and many such persons become mired in the pursuit of accomplishing the result and forget their responsibility to the public welfare.

Mr. President, each nation is weaving a tapestry of its own. Hitler made puppet thinkers of his own people, regimenting their thinking en masse. The tapestry woven by that people resulted in a pattern that was red and discolored, and showed the world torn into shreds. We want none such here. We know that if in this country mass thinking could easily be directed by those who pull the strings through the press and the radio, our system of checks and balances in government would disappear.

The glory of America has been and is her free press and free radio, and her clear thinkers, who are men and women of vision. Those who operate the press and the radio are indeed trustees of great value. We must see to it that this idea of trust relationship does not "slip its mooring."

GASOLINE AND THE MEAT SUPPLY SITUATION

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I call the attention of the Senate to two problems which immediately affect the production of beef and breadstuffs. At a press conference recently held Gov. Andrew Schoeppel, of Kansas, stated that a threatened shortage of gasoline in the western half of Kansas will have serious results unless averted. Fortunately, farmers on the whole had enough gasoline in storage and immediately available to take care of the wheat harvest and summer fallowing needs.

I immediately wrote to Mr. J. C. Mohler, secretary of the Kansas State Board of Agriculture, asking if he had any further information. I also asked Mr. Mohler for any suggestions he had to make in regard to feeding cattle for Prime beef production. He confirmed Governor Schoeppel's statement as to decreasing supplies of gasoline available for farming operations, and also the correctness of the very complete statement on the cattle feeding situation which was presented to the Senate a few days ago by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY].

The reports made by the Senator from Nebraska and by Mr. Mohler on cattle in feed lots are confirmed by the Department of Agriculture report of August 14. These reports show that the number of cattle in feed lots in Kansas on August 1 this year was only 57 percent of the number on the corresponding date a year ago; for the 11 Corn Belt States the reports show 41 percent fewer cattle on feed.

The Department also reports that the cattle population not on feed is about the same as the previous year. There is a shortage of corn for feeding purposes, but not proportionately as great as the decrease in cattle on feed. Marketing cattle off grass, instead of from feed lots, means less beef and poorer quality beef.

Before the Senate adjourned for the summer, the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] on behalf of himself and a score of other Senators from farm States, submitted a resolution calling for a Senate investigation into the meat supply situation. I think it highly important that some action be taken in this matter, particularly in view of the apparent approach of cessation of hostilities in Europe. Some of us remember, and the memory is a most unpleasant one, what happened to the cattle industry after World War No. 1—and if that can be prevented this time, it certainly should be.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, as part of my remarks, a newspaper clipping from the Topeka Daily Capital, my letter to Secretary Mohler, and his reply.

There being no objection, the article and letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GASOLINE TANKS RUNNING LOW IN WESTERN KANSAS—DEALERS AND FARMERS HIT BY SHORTAGE AS TRANSPORTATION LAGS

Grave gasoline shortage problems are confronting a number of towns and communities in the western half of the State, Governor Schoeppel told a Monday press conference following a week-end conference with prominent oil men in Wichita.

Transportation difficulties contribute the greatest source of trouble for dealers in many towns and cities, as well as in the rural areas where farmers are finding their storage tanks running dangerously low.

Most of the farmers had filled their farm storage tanks before the wheat harvest and summer fallowing periods. But the difficulty in getting gasoline to a number of affected areas is becoming increasingly great, the Governor said.

"One very serious trouble is the matter of tires for oil transports," the Governor said. "I was informed in Wichita that between 30 and 40 large transports, which had been in constant service, are now tied up because operators cannot secure tires. The tank-car shortage on the rail lines also is serious, since many cars have been diverted to eastern and northwestern services."

The Governor said he would keep in intimate touch with the situation in Kansas and would be provided with daily reports concerning the movement of gasoline to affected communities.

AUGUST 19, 1944.

Hon. J. C. MOHLER,
Department of Agriculture,
State House, Topeka, Kans.

DEAR JAKE: I enclose you a clipping from the Topeka Capital, which tells what troubles our farmers are having as a result of gasoline shortage. It will be very helpful to me if you will give me any information you possibly can on this subject. I will bring it to the attention of the Federal officials who are in position to do something.

I also enclose you a statement made on Friday by Senator WHERRY, of Nebraska, with respect to the trouble of the cattle feeders in our part of the country, including Nebraska, Kansas, and North Dakota. I would greatly appreciate it if you would write me at once a statement covering this subject. Let me know what the difficulties are, and also be kind enough to offer me any suggestions that might occur to you. I am cooperating with Senator WHERRY on this matter, and will bring it to the attention of the proper officials at once.

I might add that we Republican Senators from the Farm Belt are doing our best to see that the farm interests of the Middle West get the very best consideration, notwithstanding the fact that we have a New Deal administration in control of affairs at Washington.

Kindly return the enclosed.

Cordially yours,

ARTHUR CAPPER.

KANSAS STATE BOARD OF AGRICULTURE,
State House, Topeka, August 23, 1944.

Hon. ARTHUR CAPPER,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR CAPPER: Replying to your letter of August 19, there seems to be no doubt about gas getting scarce out this way; even locally a pinch in supply is noticeable. First, it was ethyl, restricted to 50 percent of last year's sales to stations; and more recently a scarcity of regular gas is evident. A local station, handling Vickers gasoline, for 2 days in succession within the past week had to hang out the "Out of gas" sign. This station is supplied by tank truck which comes from Lawrence, I believe. Big truck tires are a national headache and will, by their absence, affect deliveries of all commodities. We have received several complaints from localities supplied by tank trucks, as inadequate gas was available for fall plowing.

With respect to your inquiry about the cattle situation, I would say that our August 1 report shows Kansas as having 57 percent of the number of cattle in feed lots this year as compared to the number on feed in 1943. The number of cattle being marketed, however, is nearly the same as was shipped in 1943. Senator WHERRY made a good statement on cattle on feed in the Corn Belt States, and I believe we have no additional information just at this time that would throw any further light on the subject.

The enclosures with your letter are returned herewith, as requested.

With kindest regards.

Sincerely yours,

J. C. MOHLER,
Secretary.

PREPARATIONS FOR PEACE

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Mr. President, I do not want to be an alarmist, but I cannot escape a feeling of profound concern about our preparations now for the peace that may come any time, any week, in Europe. The more I hear and see what is going on here in Washington the more I am convinced that the Government has literally no plans for the country in the event of a German surrender. It is becoming clearer every day that if peace came tomorrow, it would find us as unprepared as we were for war when the Japanese hit us at Pearl Harbor. We began this war with a military disaster at Pearl Harbor. If we do not spur the administration to action we will begin the peace with an economic Pearl Harbor in America.

The problems of returning this vast country to the activities of peace are tremendous. They involve not merely reconversion of war plants, but the resumption of innumerable industries which have been suspended, the return of millions of fighters to civilian life and the transfer of millions of workers to new jobs, the adjustment of our staggering financial policies, our tax and price policies, the management not merely of war surpluses but of suddenly created surpluses of all sorts, and a hundred other features of our social and economic life which must be geared to new conditions.

Here and there a few bureaucrats sit behind closed doors, cooking up in secrecy fantastic plans of the Harry Hopkins-Henry Wallace-Sidney Hillman-Earl Browder model which will dissolve the moment they are exposed to the air. What has been suddenly brought to light in the W. P. B. is only one sample. Here is an agency, second only to the armed forces in importance, which, when finally operated by businessmen, did a magnificent job of putting into motion the great production machinery whose performance has astonished the world. Yet for months the W. P. B. has been torn by dissensions. The explanation, I believe, is not far to seek. The President has been away traveling or resting or playing politics.

Whenever and wherever an able business executive or an independent leader of any sort has appeared on the Federal bureaucratic scene, the New Deal wrecking crew has gone to work on him. The war in Europe is now nearly won, and the men in the administration who are following the subterranean leadership of Sidney Hillman want to get control of the vitally important War Production Board. These men with communistic tendencies want to bend this great production agency to their own weird purposes to fit it into their plans for America on the National Socialist model.

New dealers have been busy in the W. P. B., sowing the seeds of dissension and discord, engendering hatreds, smearing and sniping to drive out every businessman or labor leader who is not sympathetic to the New Deal. This is what has happened in the W. P. B. The new dealers, by chasing that able Administrator, Donald Nelson, off to China and making conditions on W. P. B. impossible for Charles Wilson, have crippled the production machinery of the war, now that we are well on the road toward the end of hostilities in Europe. Now that the fire seems to be under control, the new dealers, by their own subtle methods, have placed one of their own little youthful career bureaucrats as head of this immense and complicated W. P. B.

While dissension was developing in the W. P. B., the President, posing as Commander in Chief, was traveling across the country to the Pacific coast; he was traveling far out into the Pacific aboard a warship; he was in Hawaii watching soldiers parade past his jeep.

The situation which is sc apparent on the home front is serious. It is a crisis, and the consequences are so grave that every thinking American should give sober and realistic thought to what is happening here in our country.

These thoughtful Americans and our true Democratic friends in Congress should join with us Republicans to put an end to the weaknesses and the bungling on the home front. We should all combine to force the man in the White House to get down to business and unite the energies and intelligence of this Nation, to prepare for the great problems of peace which lay ahead of us.

JAMES A. FARLEY

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks two editorials, one entitled "Keeps His Self-Respect," from the Greensboro (N. C.) News of June 14, 1944, and the other, entitled "Jim Farley," from the High Point (N. C.) Enterprise of June 9, 1944.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Greensboro (N. C.) News of June 14, 1944]

KEEPS HIS SELF-RESPECT

Whatever may be behind the resignation of James A. Farley from the chairmanship of the New York State Democratic committee, this latest and final severance of official party ties must emphasize the political unhappiness of the man who used to be known as "Genial Jim" and who steered Franklin D. Roosevelt into the political arena and twice into the Presidency of the United States.

Although plenty of criticism has been and will be directed toward Mr. Farley, he cannot be charged with intellectual dishonesty or hypocrisy. "Genial Jim" always got credit for being an honest politician; dirt and skulduggery have never been part of his stock in trade. He has continued to have his own views and responsibilities, his own civil inclinations and conscience; and in marked contrast to Charlie Michelson, whose revelations in his recent book speak for themselves, never gave way to cynicism, insincerity, or duplicity.

When Mr. Farley did not like the way things were going in the Democratic Party, he said so. He exercised his right and prerogative to disagree on the third term and in that exercise gave up the hetmanship of the party and let up in his national efforts. It is but logical to assume that if he did not like a third term, he likes a fourth even less. Under such a situation he could not honestly, sincerely, and conscientiously head up fourth-term efforts in the Empire State. Consequently in his same strength of views and of character, he stepped down. There is every reason to believe, too, that Mr. Farley did not relish the way things are shaping up in New York Democracy where the disbanded Communists and the American Labor Party are more and more wagging the dog. There was little point, self-respect, effectiveness, or peace for Mr. Farley to remain chairman in a key State where his views and his advice counted for so little in the council chambers of his party.

The Daily News has ofttimes hopped on Mr. Farley with both feet; but it has always recognized and admired the character of the man, and that recognition and admiration are not lessened by his paramountcy of principles, whatever one may think of them, as he sees them, and the spotlighting of a highly placed politico who veers away from the doctrine that the end always justifies the means.

[From the High Point (N. C.) Enterprise of June 9, 1944]

JIM FARLEY

A man who deserves to be held in high esteem of his country, as well as his political party, is Jim Farley.

He not only is able and affable, he also is a man of principle and one of the most admirable men in politics.

Whether or not you agree with him, you must admit that Farley had the courage of his conviction that no man should serve more than two terms as President of the United States—a conviction which was held by George Washington, Thomas Jefferson, and most every other statesman until the recent trend toward paternalistic and totalitarian government swept the country.

Jim Farley's loyalty toward Franklin Roosevelt was great. But his loyalty to principle was greater—a fact for which some men in and around the White House have never forgiven him.

So Farley stepped down out of the national political picture—a far bigger man

than were those who were throwing brickbats at him.

Yesterday he also resigned as New York State Democratic chairman. We think we know why. Some of the New Deal crowd had things arranged to beat him, but then, at the last minute, Chairman Hannegan swung administration support to Farley and he was reelected. But shortly thereafter he resigned. He did it, we believe, because it was suggested that in return for his reelection he should back the fourth term, go against his principles. But once again he was a bigger man than his detractors. He didn't want the chairmanship under those conditions. So he resigned.

What this country needs is more Jim Farleys, and fewer men inpublic life who will compromise with their consciences.

UNIVERSAL MILITARY TRAINING

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, considerable has been published in the newspapers of recent date in reference to military training, some form of which I naturally favor. I have not as yet decided what kind of military training or what degree of military training would be best in this country. I believe that America as a whole is largely agreed on the fact that after the war we should inaugurate some sort of program of military training. In that connection a couple of editorials have been published, one in the Washington Times-Herald and the other in the Washington Daily News, relative to universal military training. I ask unanimous consent that they be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks, immediately following Senate bill 1182, which I introduced on February 2, 1939.

There being no objection, the bill and editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 1182

A bill to provide for military instruction and training for members of the Civilian Conservation Corps

Be it enacted, etc., That the first section of the act entitled "An act to establish a Civilian Conservation Corps, and for other purposes," approved June 28, 1937, as amended, is amended by inserting before the colon, at the end of the first proviso thereof, a comma and the following: "and not less than 2 or more than 5 hours each week may be devoted to military instruction and training."

SEC. 2. The Secretary of War is authorized to furnish to the Civilian Conservation Corps any military equipment or supplies or other facilities which may be useful or necessary for the military instruction and training provided for by this act.

[From the Washington Times-Herald]

MADAM PRESIDENT

The American Legion has come out for a system of universal compulsory military training after this war, as an insurance policy against our being caught by some future Pearl Harbor without adequate trained reserves.

Mrs. Franklin D. Roosevelt has come out against such a system. Her first move has been a series of articles in her syndicated newspaper column, in which she undertakes to sabotage the Legion position.

Mrs. Roosevelt is too clever a politician to say frankly that she is against universal military training. She nibbles away at it by rolling out a lot of vague talk about how such training might be nice, but. As she sees it, the boys ought to get what she calls basic training (setting-up exercises, we presume) for 2 or 3 months, then have 9 or 10 months' "education in democratic citizenship," whatever that may mean.

The President apparently goes along with his wife on this plan to defeat any real universal military training system after the war. He remarked the other day that yes, he favored military and civilian training of some sort after the war.

Mrs. Roosevelt was in considerable part responsible for our sad lack of preparedness at Pearl Harbor time. The Civilian Conservation Corps (C. C. C.) was established in 1933 to give young depression victims work of some sort. From the outset, Mrs. Roosevelt opposed all suggestions that the C. C. C. boys be trained in the fundamentals of modern warfare. The plea was that this would be to prepare them as cannon fodder, because they were poor boys, while the rich ones would escape. So we got into this most desperate of wars without the large reserve of partially trained men which the C. C. C. could have yielded 1933–41.

If the Roosevelts favored universal military training after this war, it would be an acknowledgment that they expected future wars, and that would be an admission that this war had been fought largely in vain.

As a wife and mother and First Lady of the land, Mrs. Roosevelt rates respect. We can see no argument on that point, have always accorded that measure of respect to Mrs. Roosevelt in this space, and intend to go on doing so.

But Mrs. Roosevelt considers herself more than a wife and mother and mistress of the White House. She has never been elected to any public office, but she acts as if she had been elected Madam President by the people, a sort of queen consort.

MRS. ROOSEVELT AS POLITICIAN

The lady interferes in assorted Government departments and bureaus. She makes political speeches. She runs a widely syndicated newspaper column which frequently carries political propaganda. She talks over the radio on this and that. Altogether, Mrs. Roosevelt exercises a great deal of power in our national life—and is now heavily engaged in the drive to get her husband elected to a fourth term so that she can hold onto and enlarge that power.

We consider Mrs. Roosevelt in this respect the most dangerous woman in the United States today. She is dangerous because she lends her prestige to Communists and their fellow travelers—enemies of the Republic who have only patched up a truce with our Government and our institutions until Russia shall have been saved from Germany.

What we shall need after this war is a real system of universal training, applicable to every able-bodied American male between about 17 and 21. Each man should have a solid year's training in how to fight with real weapons in modern wars. His hitch over, his uniform and equipment should be ticketed and stored away for him, and he should become a reserve soldier subject to immediate call for a given number of years. This is nothing more than national insurance.

It may insure us against another war, though the history of mankind throws doubt on that. But if and when war does come, it will assure us a better chance of victory. In any event, it will pay for itself by teaching young Americans personal hygiene, venereal precautions, the value of exercise, etc., and by taking up considerable unemployment slack.

No substitute offered by the Roosevelts or anybody else will yield such results as these.

[From the Washington Daily News of August 21, 1944]

UNIVERSAL MILITARY TRAINING

After this war we shall need a strong skeleton army of highly trained career officers and noncoms, plus an ever-young reserve of trained men to build that army up to war strength on short notice.

The way to provide for that is to get a universal training law on the books now, while we are at war and can see the need of it, and start the system operating right after the war.

Age limits should be so that training can be given between high school and college or after college. But it ought to be 12 consecutive months' military training. Each able-bodied male American should devote one of those years to learning how to be a fighting man.

BENEFITS OF WAR TRAINING

Such a system would be good for the country, obviously; but it would also be good for the boys themselves. They would learn a great deal about taking care of their teeth, eyes, ears, etc.; about prevention and cure of venereal disease; about personal hygiene, and keeping the shoulders back and the gut sucked in; about taking care of personal property, and respecting public property.

Too, there is almost certain to be a slackoff in employment after the war, and a system of universal training would help fill that gap.

President Roosevelt has now announced himself in favor of a year's military "and civilian" training after this war. We presume the "and civilian" part was put in to please Mrs. Roosevelt. Military training as above outlined includes most important civilian training. We assume Mr. Dewey will be for the same principle. That would be good because it would make it more likely to come about.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, the bill introduced by me on February 2, 1939, would have provided military instruction and training for members of the Civilian Conservation Corps. That was a couple of years or more before we became engaged in this war. Naturally I contend that if my bill, providing the opportunity for the boys in the C. C. C. camps to have received military training, had been passed then, we would have been much better prepared for this war than we were, when it suddenly came upon us.

Those who opposed the bill at that time stated very frankly that in their opinion it would interfere with civil liberties. Others stated that to enforce military instruction upon the poorer or more unfortunate boys in our C. C. C. camps would have been to impose something on them that was not being imposed on the richer or more financially fortunate boys. However, I contend that it would have been the finest thing that could possibly have happened, because the poor boys would have had the advantage of basic military training which would not have been given those who were not in the C. C. C. camps. As a result, those who were in the C. C. C. camps would have had an advantage over the boys who were not in those camps.

LEND-LEASE DEBTS

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I rise to call the attention of the Senate to the fact that the people of this country are fast awakening to the fact that the administration, to which was turned over billions of dollars for lend-lease, has not protected the interests of the country.

At the very time when I voted against lend-lease, and later its extension, I stated that in my opinion it would never

be repaid. Not only is it not going to be repaid, but the men whom this country depended upon to use business methods in handling these billions of dollars made no provisions for acquiring ownership of the air bases developed in foreign countries. Relying upon the patriotism of our citizens, money has been squandered and money and property given away in spite of all warnings, through actions which are indefensible.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks an editorial entitled "Lend-Lease Debts," published in the Washington Evening Star of August 26, 1944.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. AIKEN in the chair). Is there objection to the request of the Senator from North Dakota?

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LEASE-LEND DEBTS

Leo T. Crowley, foreign economic administrator, has taken what looks like the first step in an effort to "unsell" the people of this country on the belief that the foreign recipients of lease-lend aid are going to repay us in any conventional sense of that term.

Addressing the Advertising Club of Washington, Mr. Crowley said that "since lease-lend material is being used against our mutual enemy it is questionable whether our allies should be required to repay us." Now that statement, or rather its implication that we should not seek repayment, may be sound enough. But the unfortunate part is that this is not what the people of this country were led to expect when lease-lend was first proposed.

At that time the impression was created that we would be repaid for the assistance to be extended, in kind if not in dollars. Perhaps that was helpful in "selling" lease-lend to the country in the first instance, but if it develops in the future that we are not going to be repaid, then the early job of salesmanship is apt to pay dividends in the form of resentment and bad feeling toward our present allies.

We have had unhappy experiences of this sort in the past and, aside from the lease-lend matter, there is serious danger that we will have more in the future. First impressions "take" well on the American people. They are easily oversold. But it behooves the salesmen to remember that there comes an inevitable day of reckoning; a day when the congenial atmosphere that can be established on the basis of false impressions gives way to cynicism and disillusionment.

INVESTIGATION OF CAUSES OF INFANTILE PARALYSIS AND ENCEPHALITIS AND THEIR CURE

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, Rita Fitzpatrick, of the Times-Herald, has written several splendid articles dealing with infantile paralysis and the way it has been treated at the Kenny Institute in Minneapolis.

As a former head of the Board of Health in the State of North Dakota where we have had infantile paralysis epidemics occurring in cycles, I am very familiar with the splendid work done by Sister Kenny, of the Kenny Clinic, at Minneapolis.

As Rita Fitzpatrick states:

The Kenny Clinic began, as do many worthy institutions, in a small way, in the wards of the Minneapolis General Hospital in 1940.

After 2 years of observation of Sister Kenny's work by leading orthopedic surgeons, the city of Minneapolis glimpsed the tremendous value of her discovery and voted to establish an institute with funds and facilities made available by the board of public welfare.

A 2-story gray brick building, which once housed a tuberculosis clinic, was turned over to Sister Kenny in December 1942, and was dedicated as the Kenny Institute. Today this building, still owned by the city of Minneapolis although the institute is a private nonprofit corporation, is the "alma mater" for the dissemination of knowledge of infantile paralysis. It serves to hospitalize and treat patients from all parts of the globe and is a teaching center for serious-eyed students from the 48 States, the District of Columbia, 6 Provinces of Canada, Mexico, Cuba, Argentina, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, and New Zealand.

But no one building can accommodate such a vast purpose. Today, it is bursting at its seams and it has been forced to convert classrooms and corridors into wards.

With present facilities the institute can readily accommodate only 57 patients, but as of this date—

The article was written yesterday—

78 youngsters and adults are being cared for, with 12 more cases to be entered this week. The patients come from all parts of the Western Hemisphere, hobbling or in the arms of their parents. Eighty-eight percent of them walk out erectly and firmly unaided by material human support.

The recoveries seem miraculous. One boy from Owatonna, Minn., was given up to die by his physicians. Sister Kenny took him in the institute. Somewhere now, a year later, he is in the Navy. Another, a young Coast Guardsman, was turned over to the institute by the Navy when it appeared that all medical aid was of no avail. The sailor has returned to duty. Similar case histories are numerous.

Mr. President, speaking as one who has lived in the very heart of an infantile paralysis epidemic, I resolved when I came to the Senate to do everything possible to assist in conquering this dread disease, and therefore, on the 21st day of August 1941, upon the Senate floor, I moved an appropriation of $3,000,000 to be spent in the fight against infantile paralysis.

That appropriation was provided by the Senate, but it never passed the House. The result is that today, in the throes of this terrible epidemic in the East, and with the end not yet in sight, a year and a half late we find a conclave of leading physicians called in Washington today when it should have been called long, long ago.

So, Mr. President, in order to win this fight, I ask unanimous consent to introduce a joint resolution to provide for the general welfare by investigations into the causes and cures of infantile paralysis and encephalitis. The joint resolution is so important that I shall read it in full. It reads as follows:

Resolved, etc., That (a) there is hereby created and established an Infantile Paralysis Control Board (hereinafter referred to as the "Board") to be composed of the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service, who shall be its Chairman, and one outstanding member of the medical profession in each of the States and the District of Columbia, to be appointed by the Surgeon General. The Surgeon General is also authorized to appoint Sister Kenny, the famed Australian nurse, as a member of the Board. Members of the Board shall be reimbursed for necessary travel expenses and shall be compensated at the rate of $15 per diem while engaged in the business of the Board.

(b) The Board is authorized, without regard to the provisions of any laws applicable to the employment or compensation of officers or employees of the United States, to appoint and fix the compensation of such officers and employees as the Board deems necessary to perform its functions under this joint resolution. The Board is authorized to accept and utilize voluntary and uncompensated services of any person or, with the consent of any State, of any officer or employee of such State or any political subdivision thereof, and may utilize, without additional compensation, the services of such persons as may, at the request of the Chairman of the Board, be assigned for that purpose by the head of any department, establishment, or other agency of the United States.

SEC. 2. (a) In cooperation with the United States Public Health Service and the health authorities of the States, the Board is authorized to investigate and study the origin, causes, and means of control of infantile paralysis.

(b) The Board is authorized to prescribe, amend, and rescind such regulations as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this joint resolution.

SEC. 3. The Board shall submit to the Congress in January of each year an annual report covering its activities during the preceding calendar year and including such information, data, and recommendations for further legislation for the purpose of controlling infantile paralysis as it may find advisable.

SEC. 4. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of $10,000,000 which shall remain available until expended for carrying out the purposes of this joint resolution.

Mr. President, at the next session of the Senate I shall do as I did in 1941 when the leaders of both the majority and minority parties of the Senate joined in obtaining prompt action upon the joint resolution which I then introduced. I believe that if the House had passed the joint resolution which was passed by the Senate in 1941 the board to deal with infantile paralysis and encephalitis would now be functioning, and that instead of a conclave of doctors being called in Washington today it would have been called 3 years ago. I need only call the attention of the Senate to the fact that if such a board had been functioning at that time, and if doctors and physicians had been called from all over the country, as was contemplated by the joint resolution, and as is contemplated by the joint resolution which I am now introducing, it is possible that some doctor or physician whose name today may be unknown would be just as well known as is Dr. Banting, the doctor who discovered not a cure but a help for the relief of sufferers from diabetes. This young doctor came from a small town, and at a time when diabetes was just as deadly as is cancer today, engaged at McGill University, Montreal, Canada, in the studies and experiments which led to the discovery of insulin. Every physician and a great many laymen are familiar with the fact that Dr. Banting's work resulted in great relief to sufferers from diabetes and made him world-famous.

I believe that under this resolution, if it is adopted, Mr. President, with the proposed board calling before it from all over the United States doctors who have made a study of infantile paralysis and encephalitis, not only will much be done to wipe out the current epidemic but there may be discovered the cause of infantile paralysis and encephalitis, and perhaps a cure may be found and steps taken to prevent the recurrence of these epidemics which seem to come in cycles.

I send the resolution to the desk and ask that it be appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 147) to provide for the general welfare by investigations into the causes and cures of infantile paralysis and encephalitis introduced by Mr. LANGER, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

WARTIME PRICE AND PROFIT CONTROLS IN RECONVERSION PERIOD

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, since the Senate Military Affairs Committee began to delve into the problems of industry reconversion, it has become increasingly evident that wartime price and profit controls have an important bearing on all that is done. We are now considering means of protecting those who may become unemployed during the transition from war- to peace-time production.

At this point I wish to digress to express the hope that the reconversion program will go forward as rapidly as possible, because no one can tell when our difficulties in Europe will be ended, and, that being so, we will find ourselves confronted with the necessity of providing employment for several million men and women who have worn the uniform and several million patriotic men and women who have been producing war goods for the use of our armed forces on all the battle fronts of the world. I am highly in hope, as every other Member of the Congress must be, that we may be able to devise the machinery by which this influx of unemployed persons may be taken care of immediately after the war is over, that is, during the transition period.

However, I feel that not enough is being done to clarify the extent to which wartime controls will be relaxed to encourage the largest possible consumer production as soon as the military situation permits. I embodied my own views on the subject in a statement issued to the press. Simultaneously, I find an item in the New York Times dealing with an announcement from the Office of Price Administration, in connection with the stove industry, in which it is proposed to further tighten wartime price controls. This order proposes to place the burden of proof on the manufacturer to show that if his production is lost, consumers will ultimately have to pay higher prices for comparable stoves. All this comes at a time when we are trying to stimulate means of providing employment. It looks to me as if our wartime price and profit controls will prove to be a drag on our whole economic system unless the War Production Board and the Office of Price Administration do some realistic thinking on the proper ways to stimulate production as it can be permitted now and when the war ends.

At this point I ask unanimous consent to have published in the body of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the statement which I released to the press and to which I referred a moment ago.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Senator ROBERT R. REYNOLDS (Democrat, of North Carolina), chairman of the Senate Military Affairs Committee, today declared that a sound reconversion program, with minimum unemployment, and the least economic impact, calls for the widest possible expansion of consumer production as soon as the military situation permits, and must be predicated on reasonable pricing policies.

Pointing out that piecemeal legislation dealing with jobless pay, surpluses, and a variety of other things, but without a basis that will bring maximum production in the quickest possible time, will serve to hasten rather than avoid a post-war depression, Senator REYNOLDS issued the following statement:

"The problem of drafting a workable pattern for reconversion has come quicker than many military and civil leaders expected. This is due to our military strength and military gains on the fighting fronts. It is evidence that our foundation for victory has been built well.

"The readjustments necessary in anticipation of peace should be tackled with the same speed that we prepared for war. While waiting for jobs and long-denied consumer goods, people generally will be impatient with legislative and executive snarls in planning and bringing about the reconversion of industry. The experience of wartime should be injected into a working program that can be translated into action as soon as our enemies are defeated.

"Armies are not expected to win battles without anticipating the conditions under which they will operate. Likewise, private industry cannot shift from war- to peace-time production and provide employment unless it has some assurances of the conditions to be met. For example, manufacturers of automobiles, household goods, stoves, farm machinery, clothing, and foods cannot plan for the future unless they have some index to the prices they can charge consumers. All studies of the reconversion problem convince me that there is too much of a tendency to give lip service to increased production, and at the same time actually retard it by tight profit and price controls.

"Inquiries reaching me since the Senate Military Affairs Committee has considered reconversion are along the following lines: Are allowances to be made for heavy increases in labor and material costs since products were last manufactured? Will steps be taken to relate low volume and higher costs when production is first getting under way? What steps are being taken by Federal agencies to assure profit margins sufficient to attract private capital and stimulate production? Are such controls as the 2-percent limit before taxes in the Vinson directive to be continued? Will there be a distinction in the reconversion processes as between necessities and luxuries?

"Answers to these questions should be quickly provided by the War Production Board and the Office of Price Administration to give private industry the assurance that the Government intends to stimulate production as soon as war trends will permit. The alternative, from the standpoint of unemployment and economic recession is too serious to contemplate. Along with the G. I. bill of rights we should have a bill of rights for private industry. Each is needed to safeguard the other.

"Unless the appropriate Federal agencies—now pressing Congress for action on reconversion—begin to clarify their own planning and give the assurances needed by business and industry, it will undoubtedly be necessary for Congress to quickly amend price-control legislation. This is particularly important from the standpoint of the heavy consumer goods industries.

"One appropriate amendment would be to provide that when industries or plants largely or wholly engaged in war work are ready to esume manufacture of civilian goods, or those in consumer production find that costs have increased far beyond those in effect at the time price ceilings were established, they should have the right to demand immediate price-ceiling adjustments. This sort of assurance would stimulate private industry far beyond any other conversion formula.

"Obviously, with the higher wage levels and increases in material costs, manufacturers cannot produce and sell at prices prevailing on October 1, 1941. In other words, peacetime price ceilings in every line of products should be readjusted to take into account higher costs if we are to expect the volume of civilian production necessary when the war ends.

"Certainly it is not reasonable to expect that price levels imposed in a scarcity market to avoid inflation and black markets should be continued at a time when volume production is needed. Volume production is the secret of economic progress. It will do more than anything else to curb inflation and prevent some of the evils we have faced in wartimes. I strongly oppose putting consumer production ahead of military needs at this crucial stage of the war, and I am just as strongly opposed to putting wartime experiments and controls ahead of normal resumption of business and industrial life when peace comes."

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. BARKLEY. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. AIKEN in the chair) laid before the Senate executive messages from the President of the United States, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. CHANDLER, from the Committee on Military Affairs:

Milton E. Ballangee for appointment as director of Selective Service for the Territory of Hawaii, under the provisions of law.

By Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts, from the Committee on Naval Affairs:

Capt. Gail Morgan, United States Navy, to be a commodore in the Navy, for temporary service, to continue while serving as commander, naval operating base, Midway;

Sundry officers for appointment and/or promotion in the Navy; and

Sundry naval aviators of the Marine Corps Reserve to be second lieutenants in the Marine Corps, under the provisions of law.

By Mr. McKELLAR, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads:
Sundry postmasters.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further reports of committees, the nominations on the calendar will be stated.

FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION—LELAND OLDS

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Leland Olds, of New York, to be a member of the Federal Power Commission for the term expiring June 22, 1949, which had previously been passed over.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I understood the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MOORE] desired to discuss this nomination. If he does not want to do so at this time I shall ask that the nomination go over again.

Mr. MOORE. I want to have a quorum present when action is taken on the nomination.

Mr. BARKLEY. In view of that situation, this nomination will have to go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The nomination will be passed over.

THE PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

The legislative clerk proceeded to read two nominations in the United States Public Health Service.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask that the nominations be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations are confirmed en bloc.

POSTMASTERS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read the nominations of sundry postmasters.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask unanimous consent that the postmaster nominations be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the postmaster nominations are confirmed en bloc.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of all nominations confirmed today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BARKLEY. As in legislative session, I move that the Senate adjourn, which means that it will meet again tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 12 o'clock and 45 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, September 1, 1944, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate August 31 (legislative day of August 15, 1944):

UNITED STATES MARSHAL

Benjamin J. McKinney, of Arizona, to be United States marshal for the district of Arizona. (Mr. McKinney is now serving in this office under an appointment which expired July 19, 1943.)

TEMPORARY APPOINTMENT IN THE ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

TO BE MAJOR GENERAL

Brig. Gen. Raymond Stallings McLain, National Guard of the United States.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate August 31 (legislative day of August 15), 1944:

UNITED STATES PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

PROMOTIONS IN THE REGULAR CORPS

To be dental surgeons

Joseph J. Dunlay
Walter J. Pelton

POSTMASTERS

ARIZONA

Armon D. Cheatham, Laveen.
Bessie L. Savage, Sells.

ARKANSAS

Kathleen B. Farris, Biscoe.
Robert W. Tuck, Redfield.

LOUISIANA

Carmen Colomb, Chalmette.
Libbie T. Tubre, St. Landry.
Nita Rouillier, Union.

TENNESSEE

John M. Pearcy, Lascassas.
James C. Davis, Luttrell.
Hattie B. Riddick, Maury City.
Eddith Scott Dawson, Parrottsville.
G. Ivan Malone, Piney Flats.
Carrie E. Monday, Speedwell.
Lillie M. Reel, Watauga.

VERMONT

Leo B. Dunn, Brandon.
Alice G. Dudley, Shoreham.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, AUGUST 31, 1944

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou who dwellest in the heavens, unto Thee do we lift up our eyes. In this place of sacred memories and noble friendships be not only with us here where it is easy to worship, but with those who wait in wonderment and in fear lest Thou not hear them. Do Thou strengthen us with the unclouded sky of faith, and may there issue from our lives a song of praise as sweet as a vesper chime.

In these distracting times, as we make difficult decisions, be Thou with us and guide us, for what we do here is of incalculable influence upon all our people. In great issues of right and wrong as we stand together, may we face the same direction, defending the helpless and the oppressed, holding before us the vision of a free life in a peaceful world. Always and ever grant that we may offer at the altar of our Republic the sacrament of allegiance and obedience to the divine will. We praise Thee; so long Thy power hath blessed us, sure it still will lead us on till the night is gone. O give unto our President, our Speaker, and all Members the spirit of understanding and rest from all mental strife. Through Jesus Christ, our Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a letter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Rhode Island?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. NORMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLER of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include therein a certain digest of an article concerning the G. I. bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. HEIDINGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an article written by Carl H. Jordan to the editor of the March of Progress.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection?

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend the remarks I expect to make in the Committee of the Whole this afternoon and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Tuesday next, after the regular order of business, I may address the House for 30 minutes on the subject A Post-war Tax Program.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

THE SOLDIER VOTE

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, during the debate in Congress on the Soldier Vote Act, the leaders of the Republican Party boasted time and again of their solicitude for the service men and women and of their great desire to see that they had every opportunity to vote.

We have just had in Ohio an example of the kind of solicitude the Republicans have for G. I. Joe and G. I. Jim. I desire to call this to the attention of Congress and to the people of the Nation because of the importance of this

issue, and because of the prominence in the controversy in my State of a particular man, namely, the Vice-Presidential nominee of the Republican Party. The Republicans of Ohio, with Gov. John W. Bricker leading them, endeavored to disfranchise thousands of soldier voters by holding that only those ballots marked with black lead pencil would be valid. Governor Bricker, for a week, steadfastly refused all pleas that he alter this stand and ask the Legislature to clarify the Soldier Vote Act so that every ballot, whether it was marked with pencil, pen, crayon, or even blood should be counted so long as the intent of the voter was apparent.

I would like to point out that the legislature was due to meet at the call of Governor Bricker within a few days to act on other matters, but under Ohio law, could not remedy the defects in the Soldier Vote Act, without a directive from the Governor.

Permit me to recall that this is the same John Bricker who in 1940, when he realized that President Roosevelt would carry Ohio, did not hesitate to spend thousands of dollars of the taxpayers money to call the legislature into special session to separate the State ballot from the National ballot in order to save his own political hide.

The Democratic Party in Ohio, civic organizations, veterans organizations, newspapers and fair-minded Republicans, including my colleague from Ohio, the Republican Congressman at Large, GEORGE BENDER, publicly called upon the Governor to change his position and pleaded that servicemen should not be denied their franchise because of legal technicalities.

It was only this tremendous pressure of public opinion that forced the Governor finally to retreat and to agree to ask the legislature to waive technicalities in the markings of G. I. ballots.

But the Governor's about face does not alter the situation so far as he is concerned. His first decision was the true reflection of his attitude toward the soldier vote. John W. Bricker, the running mate of the Republican nominee for President, doesn't want the soldiers to vote because he knows the great majority will not vote for him and the Republican nominee for President.

POLITICAL PROPAGANDA

Mr. OUTLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. OUTLAND. Mr. Speaker, an Associated Press dispatch from Montpelier, Vt., under date line of August 30, reads as follows:

KELLAND CALLS ATTACK ON PEARL HARBOR FAULT OF ADMINISTRATION

MONTPELIER, VT., August 30.—Clarence Budington Kelland, author and Republican national committeeman from Arizona, declared today that President Roosevelt "cannot avoid responsibility" for the Pearl Harbor naval disaster, which he said "lengthened the duration of the Japanese war, possibly by years."

In a speech before the Vermont State Republican convention, Mr. Kelland charged administration neglect of "elementary precautions" had subjected "America to the disgrace of the most tragic naval disaster in our history."

"Instead of having no effect upon the course of the Pacific war, Pearl Harbor lengthened it by months, perhaps by years, and the odium must attach to the highest authority which permitted the condition to exist," he added.

This, I think, is striking a new low in political propaganda, and is most certain to be resented by the American people. If it represents a typical example of the kind of attack that will be made against President Roosevelt, I am afraid we face one of the lowest kinds of campaigns. Such a statement as that of Mr. Kelland is not only unwarranted; it is cheap and cowardly and rotten. It reminds me of the statement of a famous Englishman, "If you believe what you are saying you are a fool; if you don't, you are a liar."

JOHN W. BRICKER

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JENKINS]?

There was no objection.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, I take the floor at this time to reply to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FEIGHAN] in his tirade against Gov. John W. Bricker. I want the world to know that Ohio has a model soldiers' voting law. In Ohio the legislature, called into special session by Governor Bricker, dedicated itself to do one thing, and that was to give every soldier everywhere in the world a chance to vote. That legislation brought forth a law that provided to every soldier everywhere the same kind of a ballot as his father and mother would vote. Our law in Ohio also gives that father and mother the right to make application to the election officers for a ballot and thereby initiate proceedings that will take to every soldier speedily a complete ballot which he can vote in privacy and return to the election officials without let or hindrance from any officer or any person.

Originally it was provided in the Ohio law that the ballot must be marked by a black lead pencil. The purpose was to make it uniform. Now, then, the legislature will meet shortly by special call of the Governor and will amend the law to permit soldiers to mark their ballots by pen and ink or by pencil. I resent the accusation that the Governor is guilty of any misconduct of any kind or description, because that is absolutely a misstatement of fact. The soldiers from Ohio are abundantly satisfied with what the Governor and the legislature have done to secure for them the right to vote a complete ballot and not a bobtail ballot such as the New Deal tried to foist on the soldiers.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

JOHN W. BRICKER

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my own remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. McGREGOR]?

There was no objection.

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, it is indeed regrettable that my distinguished friend from Cleveland [Mr. FEIGHAN] took the floor a few minutes ago in an attempt to smear and cast unfair reflections upon the Governor of his own State—Gov. John W. Bricker—who has been chosen three consecutive times, by increasing majorities, by the people of the great State of Ohio.

In reply to the accusation of my friend, I say to him, that we Republicans of Congress and Governor Bricker, of Ohio, and the Ohio Legislature have a right to be proud of our endeavors in order that the soldier could vote. What has the New Deal done to help the soldier vote? They, with the help of my distinguished friend from Cleveland, endeavored to force the soldier to vote a Federal bobtail ballot, a ballot which would have denied those wearing the American military uniforms the right to vote for their State and local officials.

I believe the record will show my friend the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FEIGHAN], voted for this discrepancy. Now, he wants to blame the Governor of Ohio for a law that has been on our statute books for years. A law demanding that black pencils be used in marking the ballots. A law that was on the statute books when my colleague was a leader in the Ohio Legislature. A law that was on our statute books during World War No. 1.

My colleague the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FEIGHAN] tries to leave the impression that the Governor is calling this special session only after great pressure, and he names the Democratic Party as one who put the pressure on. Did the distinguished gentleman from Cleveland make a suggestion to the Governor to call a special session—a letter, a telegram, or a telephone call? I do not know, but I venture to say he did not.

The Governor has called a special session of our State legislature to pass such laws as may be necessary so that those in military uniforms can mark their ballots with any kind of a pencil or pen or marking instrument. May I add a direct statement made by Governor Bricker prior to his nomination as candidate for Vice President on the Republican ticket?

I want the soldiers from my State to have an opportunity to vote for their State and local officers.

He further stated he planned to call a special session of the legislature to enact any further laws that may be necessary to comply with the statute Congress was in the process of enacting.

The Governor after careful consideration has called the special session, and I sincerely hope that the laws passed will meet with the approval of those individuals who are stooping to a low degree of politics and are endeavoring to smear a really and truly great Governor and public servant.

POLITICAL PROPAGANDA

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, certainly the gentleman from Massachusetts, the distinguished majority leader, does not think that this House is so gullible as to believe that the President's recent trip to Hawaii was nonpolitical. It is significant that en route West he stopped off at the Chicago Democratic Convention to confer with Mr. Hannegan. Pray, what has Mr. Hannegan to do with the conduct of the war? It is also significant that after visiting a shipyard in California the President as Commander in Chief wrote a very fine letter to the manager of that shipyard, and 50,000 copies of the letter were later printed and distributed to the workers, notwithstanding that there is a tremendous shortage of paper. Talk about it not being politics; it was not anything but politics. Had it not been, he would have taken Chiefs of Staff Marshall and King with him, for they are our military leaders who pass on all phases of strategy. Certainly the subordinates cannot plan a military campaign. The letter already alluded to follows:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, August 17, 1944.

Mr. CLAY P. BEDFORD,
General Manager,
Permanente Metals Corporation,
Richmond, Calif.

DEAR MR. BEDFORD: As you know, I have just returned to Washington from a conference with Pacific war leaders, Admiral Chester Nimitz, commander in chief of the Pacific Fleet, and Gen. Douglas MacArthur, commander in chief of the Southwest Pacific forces. Naturally, I cannot divulge any detailed plans discussed relating to the all-out drive against the Japanese. I can say to you, with all sincerity, that the combat loaded transports now being constructed at your Richmond shipyard will play a highly important part in the amphibious campaign of the Pacific.

As Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy, may I personally urge that every man and woman engaged in the construction of these special-type vessels at your shipyard be informed of the importance of delivering them at the earliest possible moment.

The past performance of shipbuilders on the west coast makes me feel confident that every possible effort will be made to meet, if not surpass, the schedules set for you.

Very sincerely yours,
FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. RODGERS of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include tables and figures supplied by the Committee on Appropriations.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an address that I delivered before the Rivers and Harbors Congress at New Orleans recently.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask that on tomorrow, at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day and following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

POLITICAL PROPAGANDA

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call attention to the fact that there are other great statesmen in the world today, notably the Prime Minister of England, Mr. Churchill, who make very frequent trips for consultation with the heads of the various governments.

Mr. Churchill has been spending considerable time lately in Italy and other sections of the world. Everybody will admit that those conferences are of great import to the war effort. If it is necessary for the Prime Minister of England to make those extended trips for conferences, I do not see why we in this country should say it is absolutely wrong for the President of the United States to travel and have important conferences with respect to the conduct of the war. I think the American people will come to the conclusion that it is for the benefit of the war effort that these conferences and these trips were made by the President of the United States.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

[Mr. LEWIS addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

WAR MOBILIZATION AND RECONVERSION BILL OF 1944

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (S. 2051), to amend the Social Security Act, as amended, to provide a national program for war mobilization and reconversion, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, S. 2051, with Mr. LANHAM in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee rose on yesterday, the first section of the bill had been read. Are there amendments to be offered?

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to substitute the bill H. R. 5227 for the pending bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DINGELL: Strike out all of the committee substitute and insert the following:

"TITLE I—GENERAL PROVISIONS

"SEC. 101. The Congress hereby declares that the objectives of this act are—

"(a) to facilitate maximum war production during the war and to expedite the transition from war to peace;

"(b) to achieve full employment, rising standards of living, and effective utilization of the Nation's resources during the period of transition from war to peace, and thereafter; and

"(c) to provide for the development of unified plans and projects and adequate machinery to achieve the foregoing objectives.

"SEC. 102. (a) There is hereby established the Office of War Mobilization and Reconversion, which shall be headed by the Director of War Mobilization and Reconversion (hereinafter called the 'Director'). The Director shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, shall receive compensation at the rate of $15,000 per year, and shall serve for a term of 2 years.

"(b) The following agencies shall be placed within the Office of War Mobilization and Reconversion:

"(1) Office of Contract Settlement, created by the Contract Settlement Act of 1944.

"(2) Surplus War Property Administration, created by Executive Order No. 9425, and any surplus war property administration hereafter created by statute.

"(3) Retraining and Reemployment Administration, created by Executive Order No. 9427, and any similar office or administration created in this or any other act.

"Nothing in this subsection shall imply any derogation of the powers of the Director under subsection (c) with respect to other agencies not specifically placed within his office.

"(c) In addition to any powers which the President may delegate to him for the purpose of more effectively coordinating the mobilization of the Nation for war, and for the purpose of more effectively attaining the objectives of this act, the Director shall, subject to the direction of the President—

"(1) formulate or have formulated such plans as are necessary to meet the problems arising out of the transition from war to peace in such a manner as to achieve the objectives of this act;

"(2) issue such directives on plan, policies, and procedures to other executive agencies as may be necessary to carry out their powers in a manner consistent with the plans formulated under this section and to coordinate the activities of other executive agencies with respect to the problems arising out of the transition from war to peace. Each executive agency shall carry out the directives of the Director expeditiously and, to the extent necessary to carry out such directives, shall modify its operations and procedures and issue regulations with respect thereto. Nothing contained in this section shall be construed as authorizing any activities which are not within the scope of the powers possessed by the President or the executive agencies under existing law or future acts of the Congress;

"(3) recommend to the Congress appropriate legislation providing authority to carry out plans developed under this section but not authorized under existing law;

"(4) promote and assist in the development of demobilization and reconversion plans by other executive agencies; develop procedures whereby each executive agency is kept informed of proposed demobilization and reconversion plans and proposals which relate to its work and which are being developed or carried out by other executive agencies; and settle controversies between such executive agencies in the development and administration of such plans; evaluate and report on current and projected public and private activities affecting war mobilization and peacetime full production and employment; survey continuously the necessity

for additional programs of legislation as will achieve the objectives of this act; promote and assist in the development of war mobilization and post-war adjustment plans and surveys by other Government agencies;

"(5) cause studies and reports to be made for him by the various executive agencies which will enable him to determine the need for the simplification, consolidation, or elimination of such executive agencies as have been established for the purposes of the war emergency, for the termination, or establishment by statute, of such agencies as now exist under Executive order only, and for the relaxation or removal of emergency war controls;

"(6) institute a specific study, for submission to the President and the Congress, of the present functions of the various executive agencies in the field of manpower, and develop a program for reorganizing and consolidating such agencies to the fullest extent practicable;

"(7) consult and cooperate with State and local governments, industry, labor, agriculture, and other groups, both national and local, concerning methods of achieving the objectives of this act; survey continuously all rules, regulations, and orders issued by any Federal Government agency exercising control over manpower, production, or materials, for the purpose of determining whether any such rules, regulations, or orders prevent or hinder the full employment. Whenever the Director determines that any such rule, regulation, or order so prevents or hinders full employment and is not required for the purpose of insuring production for war purposes, he shall direct such Government agency to rescind, modify, or amend such rule, regulation, or order; and

"(8) submit reports to the President, the Senate, and the House of Representatives on the 1st days of January, April, July, and October, on the activities undertaken or contemplated by him under this act. Such reports shall summarize and appraise the activities of the various executive agencies in the field of demobilization and post-war adjustment, and may include such legislative proposals as he may deem necessary or desirable.

"(d) The Director shall, within the limits of funds which may be made available, employ and fix the compensation of such deputy directors and other officers and employees, and may make such expenditures for supplies, facilities, and services as may be necessary to carry out his functions and the functions of the Office. All such officers and employees shall be appointed in accordance with the civil-service laws and their compensation fixed in accordance with the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, except that Deputy Directors and expert administrative, technical, and professional personnel may be employed and their compensation fixed without regard to such laws. To the fullest extent practicable, the Director shall perform the duties imposed upon him through the facilities and personnel of other Government agencies. The Director may require such reports and information from other Government agencies as he deems necessary to enable him to carry out his functions under this act, and each Government agency shall furnish any information and reports so required.

"SEC. 103. There is hereby created an advisory board, the members of which shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, and which shall include three representatives of industry, three representatives of labor, three representatives of agriculture, and one public representative, who shall be chairman. The representatives of industry, labor, and agriculture shall be selected from panels submitted by the appropriate national organizations.

"It shall be the general function of the board to advise with the Director with respect to war mobilization and reconversion, and make to him such recommendations relating to legislation, policies, and procedures as it may deem necessary to achieve the objectives of this act.

"Members of the board shall receive a per diem allowance of $25 for each day spent in the actual performance of duty, plus necessary traveling and other expenses incurred while so engaged.

"SEC. 104. (a) There is hereby established a Special Joint Committee on Post-war Adjustment—hereinafter referred to as the 'committee'—to be composed of four Members of the Senate—not more than two of whom shall be members of the majority party—to be appointed by the President of the Senate, and four Members of the House of Representatives—not more than two of whom shall be members of the majority party—to be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives. Vacancies in the membership of the committee shall not affect the power of the remaining members to execute the functions of the committee, and shall be filled in the same manner as in the case of the original selection. The committee shall select a chairman and a vice chairman from among its members. The committee is empowered to appoint and fix the compensation of such experts, consultants, technicians, and clerical and stenographic assistants as it deems necessary and advisable. The committee may utilize such voluntary and uncompensated services as it deems necessary, and is authorized to utilize the services, information, facilities, and personnel of the departments and agencies of the Government. The expenses of the committee shall be paid one-half from the contingent fund of the Senate and one-half from the contingent fund of the House of Representatives upon vouchers signed by the chairman.

"(b) It shall be the function of the committee—

"(1) to make a full and complete study and investigation with regard to legislation on demobilization and post-war adjustment in cooperation with such public and private agencies and such persons as it might see fit to consult;

"(2) to consult with the President and the Director on the need for legislation on demobilization and post-war adjustment;

"(3) to consult with the appropriate standing committees in the Senate and in the House of Representatives on the preparation of demobilization and post-war adjustment legislation, and on methods of obtaining expeditious action on demobilization and post-war adjustment legislation by achieving coordination among, and avoiding duplication of effort between, such committees; and

"(4) to study and review each report submitted to the Congress by the Director, and otherwise maintain continuous surveillance of the operations of the Director and other executive agencies under this act.

"TITLE II—INDUSTRIAL DEMOBILIZATION AND RECONVERSION

"SEC. 201. Any contracting agency shall terminate prime contracts for war production whenever in the opinion of the agency the performance under such contracts will not be needed for the prosecution of the war, and shall not continue performance under such contracts merely for the purpose of providing business and employment, or for any purposes other than the prosecution of the war, unless the continuation of some or all of the work under any such contract will benefit the Government or is necessary to avoid substantial injury to a plant or property.

"SEC. 202. Curtailments of war production or terminations of war contracts shall be integrated and synchronized with the expansion, resumption, or initiation of production for other war purposes, and, to the greatest extent compatible with the effective prosecution of the war, of production for nonwar use. To effectuate this policy—

"(a) the contracting agencies shall continuously survey their product and material requirements and report to the Chairman of the War Production Board, in such form and detail as he may determine, on current and anticipated changes in requirements and on all anticipated curtailments of war production or terminations of war contracts;

"(b) the Government agencies exercising control over manpower, production, or materials shall permit the expansion, resumption, or initiation of production for nonwar use whenever such production does not require materials, components, facilities, or labor needed for war purposes, or will not otherwise adversely affect or interfere with the production for war purposes. Such production for nonwar use shall be permitted regardless of whether one or more competitors normally engaged in the same type of production are still engaged in the performance under any contract which is needed for the prosecution of the war, and shall not be made dependent upon the existence of a concern or the functioning of a concern in a given field of activity at a given time;

"(c) the Chairman of the War Production Board shall—

"(1) establish policies to be followed by the contracting agencies in selecting individual contracts or classes of contracts for curtailment, nonrenewal, or termination;

"(2) establish policies providing for full consultation between the Government agencies, war contractors, and the representatives of the employees of war contractors with regard to obtaining the most effective use in other war production or in production for nonwar use of facilities and manpower to be released through anticipated curtailments in war production or terminations of war contracts.

"SEC. 203. (a) Whenever the expansion, resumption, or initiation of production for nonwar use is authorized by any Government agency having control over production, or materials, on a restricted basis, the restrictions imposed shall not be such as to prevent any small plant capable and desirous of participating in such expansion, resumption, or initiation of production for nonwar use from so participating in such production.

"(b) There is hereby created in the Office of War Mobilization and Reconversion a Board of Appeals to consist of three members appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, each of whom shall receive compensation at the rate of $8,000 per year, and shall serve for a term of 2 years. When any person is aggrieved by the action of any Government agency having control over production or materials, on a restricted basis, in allocating available materials for the production of any item or group of items for nonwar use, such person shall, upon application therefor under such regulations as the Director may prescribe, be afforded an opportunity forthwith to present his views thereon at a hearing before the Board of Appeals. If, at such hearing, such person establishes to the satisfaction of the Board of Appeals that as a result of such action his business operations will be seriously interfered with or substantially curtailed because of a shortage of any material necessary to such operations, that his inability to continue business operations will result in a serious unemployment problem for his employees, or that the interests of the consumers of the articles produced or manufactured by such person will be substantially impaired, the Board of Appeals shall make an immediate report thereon to the Director. Thereupon the Director shall allocate to such person such amounts of the material with respect to which the shortage exists as in his judgment will be

necessary to prevent substantial hardship to such person, his employees, or consumers.

"SEC. 204. The Attorney General is directed to make surveys for the purpose of determining any factors which may tend to eliminate competition, create or strengthen monopolies, injure small business, or otherwise promote undue concentration of economic power in the course of war mobilization and during the period of transition from war to peace and thereafter. The Attorney General shall submit to the Congress within 90 days after the approval of this act, and at such times thereafter as he deems desirable, reports setting forth the results of such surveys and including recommendations for such legislation as he may deem necessary or desirable.

"'TITLE III—RETRAINING AND REEMPLOYMENT

"'SEC. 301. The Congress hereby declares that the objectives of this title are—

"'(a) To facilitate the most effective mobilization and maximum utilization of the Nation's manpower in the prosecution of the war;

"'(b) To maintain maximum employment in the transition from war- to peace-time production;

"'(c) To provide for the coordination of the demobilization of servicemen with employment opportunities under a policy of demobilizing servicemen as rapidly as the military situation permits;

"'(d) To provide necessary training of ex-servicemen and war workers; and

"'(e) To provide the necessary economic assistance to returning ex-servicemen and war workers in connection with transfer, training, and reemployment.

"'SEC. 302. There is hereby created a Retraining and Reemployment Administration to be headed by an Administrator who shall be appointed for a term of 2 years by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, and who shall receive a compensation of $12,000 per annum. It shall be the function of the Administrator of the Retraining and Reemployment Administration (hereinafter referred to as the Administrator), subject to the discretion and control of the Director, to establish a unified reemployment program covering recruitment, training, transfer, and placement of returning servicemen and workers in war and civilian production. The reemployment program shall include provision for compiling full detail on declining and increasing employment opportunities (by industrial segments, geographic areas, and plants) resulting from curtailment in war production and resumption of civilian production; for placement of workers in appropriate employment; and for interim financing of workers, including returning servicemen, pending placement in accordance with the authority of this title. The Administrator shall prescribe regulations and issue directives to Government agencies necessary to effectuate the objectives of this title and all such Government agencies shall be governed by these.

"'SEC. 303. The Administrator shall consult and advise with a Committee on Retraining and Reemployment, consisting of one representative from each of the following: Department of Labor, Veterans' Administration, War Manpower Commission, Federal Security Agency, War Production Board, Selective Service System, Civil Service Commission, War Department, Navy Department, President's Committee on Fair Employment Practice, and such other Government agencies as the Administrator may designate.

"'SEC. 304. (a) The War Production Board and other agencies having data on production changes and employment opportunities shall furnish the Administrator full information on current and projected schedules of military and civilian production in such detail as the Administrator shall deem necessary.

"'(b) The War and Navy Departments shall furnish data on current and projected rates of discharge of servicemen providing such details concerning the servicemen as the Administrator may deem necessary and is practicable for the War and Navy Departments to furnish. It shall be the duty of the War and Navy Departments to anticipate so far as practicable, the forward programs of demobilization of servicemen, and to cooperate with the Administrator in furnishing such data on such demobilization as military security permits.

"'(c) The War and Navy Departments shall discharge from the armed forces of the United States the men and women serving therein during the present war as rapidly as the appropriate department determines that the services of such persons are no longer needed for the prosecution of the war or for the national defense, and shall not retain such persons in the armed forces merely for the purpose of preventing unemployment or awaiting opportunities for employment.

"'SEC. 305. To the fullest extent practicable the Administrator shall perform the duties imposed upon him through the facilities and personnel of other Government agencies and through appropriate State agencies. The Administrator may require such reports and information from other Government agencies as he deems necessary to enable him to carry out his functions under this title, and each Government agency shall furnish any information and reports so required.

"'SEC. 306. (a) In order to facilitate the recruitment, training, transfer, and placement of workers and ex-servicemen, the United States Employment Service and such other Government agencies as may be designated by the Administrator are hereby authorized, upon application therefor, to pay the cost of transportation of workers and ex-servicemen, including transportation of dependents and household effects, from their last previous residence to new jobs, or to the location of their bona fide residence within the continental United States prior to their migration to war jobs, or to both, in accordance with such regulations as may be prescribed by the Administrator: *Provided*, That such allowances shall not exceed the allowances provided for Government employees, except that the fare of dependents may be paid.

"'(b) The United States Employment Service shall be continued as a nationally operated system of public employment offices for a period of 2 years after the termination of hostilities.

"'SEC. 307. (a) The Administrator shall have general supervision and direction of the activities of all Government agencies relating to the training and retraining of persons released from war work, including all work directly affected by the cessation of hostilities or the reduction of the war program and to issue necessary regulations in connection therewith.

"'(b) In consultation with the Government agencies concerned, the Administrator shall develop plans and programs relating to such training and retraining.

"'SEC. 308. Nothing in this title shall be deemed in any extent to affect, amend, or modify the powers now vested in the Veterans' Administration or the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs.

"'TITLE IV—INTERIM PLACEMENT BENEFITS

"'SEC. 401. (a) Every unemployed qualified employee (as defined in sec. 402) shall be entitled, upon registration in accordance with regulations to be prescribed by the Administrator, at a public employment office, to assistance in securing suitable employment.

"'(b) "Interim placement benefits" shall be paid to any qualified employee (as defined in sec. 402) with respect to each week of unemployment or part week of unemployment which begins (1) after the first Sunday of the fourth calendar month which begins after the date of enactment of this act and (2) before the last day of the twenty-fourth calendar month which begins after the termination of hostilities. For a qualified employee the "interim placement benefit" payable for a week of unemployment in any benefit year shall be 75 percent of "weekly wages": *Provided, however*, That these amounts shall be rounded upward to the nearest dollar, but shall not in any event be less than $8 nor exceed $20 for an individual who has no dependents, or $25 who has one or more dependents: *Provided further*, That in any 2 consecutive benefit years, benefits to any qualified employee shall not exceed 52 times the last weekly amount of interim placement benefit of such employee in such 2 years.

"'(c) There shall not be considered as a day of unemployment, with respect to any employee—

"'(i) any day on which he fails to maintain, in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Administrator, a registration at a public employment office;

"'(ii) any Sunday unless (A) it is the last day of a week or part week of unemployment and is preceded by a day of unemployment or (B) it is preceded and followed by a day of unemployment; or

"'(iii) any day in any period with respect to which he is receiving or has received (A) an annuity or pension under the Railroad Retirement Act of 1935 or the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937; (B) insurance benefits under title II of the Social Security Act; (C) retirement or disability annuity, compensation, or allowances under any system maintained by the Federal or a State or local government or by any wholly owned instrumentality of such a government (except pensions, compensation, or retired pay paid by the Veterans' Administration and benefits under any Federal or State workmen's compensation law); (D) a vocational education or training allowance under the law of any State or the United States; or (E) unemployment benefits under an unemployment compensation law of any State or the United States, except an "interim placement benefit" payable under this act: *Provided*, That if any such payment is less in amount than the "interim placement benefits" under this act which, but for this paragraph, would be payable with respect to such period, the preceding provisions of this paragraph shall not apply but such "interim placement benefits" shall be diminished in the amount of such other payments.

"'(d) There shall not be considered as a day of unemployment, with respect to any employee, any day in a period of not more than 5 weeks, beginning with a day with respect to which the agency administering benefits finds that—

"'(i) he failed, without good cause, to accept suitable work available on such day and offered to him, or to comply with instructions from a public employment office to apply for such work or to report, in person, or by mail as directed, to such office;

"'(ii) he was properly discharged or suspended for misconduct related to his employment;

"'(iii) he left work voluntarily, without good cause;

"'(iv) subject to the provisions of subsection (e) of this section, his unemployment was due to a stoppage of work because of a labor dispute, other than a lock-out, in the establishment, premises, or enterprise at which he was last employed;

"'(v) he knowingly made, or aided in making, or caused to be made any false or fraudulent statement or claim for the purpose of causing benefits to be paid.

The length of the periods of disqualification, within the limit of 5 weeks specified above, with respect to the findings herein set

forth shall be fixed by regulations prescribed by the Administrator.

"'(e) The disqualification provided in section 401 (d) (iv) of this act shall not apply if the agency administering benefits finds that—

"'(i) the employee is not directly interested in the labor dispute which causes the stoppage of work; and

"'(ii) he does not belong to a grade or class of workers of which, immediately before the commencement of the stoppage, there were members employed in the establishment, premises, or enterprise at which the stoppage occurs, any of whom are directly interested in the labor dispute: *Provided*, That if separate types of work are commonly conducted in separate departments of a single enterprise, each such department shall, for the purposes of this subsection, be deemed to be a separate establishment, enterprise, or other premises.

"'(f) No work shall be deemed suitable for the purposes of this section, and benefits shall not be denied under this act to any otherwise qualified employee for leaving work voluntarily or for refusing to accept work if—

"'(1) the position offered is vacant due directly to a strike, lock-out, or other labor dispute;

"'(2) the remuneration, hours, or other conditions of work offered are substantially less favorable than those prevailing for similar work in the locality, or the rate of remuneration is less than the union wage rate, if any, for similar work in the locality;

"'(3) as a condition of being employed he would be required to join a company union or to resign from or refrain from joining any bona fide labor organization;

"'(4) acceptance of the work would require him to engage in activities in violation of law or which, by reason of their being in violation of reasonable requirements of the constitution, bylaws, or similar regulations of a bona fide labor organization of which he is a member, would subject him to expulsion from such labor organization; or

"'(5) acceptance of the work would subject him to loss of substantial seniority rights under any collective-bargaining agreement between a bona fide labor organization and any other employer.

"'(g) In determining whether work is suitable or whether an employee has good cause for a voluntary separation from work or a failure to apply for or accept an offer of work, the agency administering benefits shall consider, in addition to such other factors as it deems relevant, (1) the current practice, recognized by management and labor with respect to such work; (2) the degree of risk involved to such employee's health, safety, and morals; (3) his physical fitness and prior training; (4) his experience and prior earnings; (5) his length of unemployment and prospects for securing work in his customary occupation; and (6) the distance of the available work from his residence and from his most recent work.

"'(h) No otherwise qualified employee shall be denied interim placement benefits because of a refusal to make application for or accept transportation authorized by section 306 of this act.

"'(i) Any person who shall knowingly make or aid in making or cause to be made any false or fraudulent statement or claim for the purpose of causing benefits or other payment to be made or not to be made under this title, shall be punished by a fine of not more than $10,000 or by imprisonment not exceeding 1 year, or both.

"'SEC. 402. (a) A person shall be a "qualified employee" if the agency administering benefits finds that with respect to the calendar year next preceding the beginning of the benefit year there was payable to him wages of not less than $150.

"'(b) Within 10 days after the appointment of an Administrator pursuant to this act, such Administrator shall afford to each State an opportunity to participate in the administration of the "interim placement benefits" provided by this title. Any State agency shall be permitted by the Administrator to participate in the administration of interim placement benefits upon agreement by it to do so in accordance with the provisions of this section. Such participation shall be terminated by the Administrator (subject to the provisions of subsection (h) of this section) only if the Social Security Board finds, after a request for an investigation by the Administrator and after reasonable notice and opportunity for hearing to the State agency, that there is a failure to comply substantially with the terms of such agreement. Such finding shall be communicated to the State agency at the same time the Administrator is notified.

"'Such participation shall include, pursuant to agreement with the Administrator, (A) receiving claims for interim placement benefits; (B) adjudicating such claims, or forwarding such claims to another State or Government agency, as may be appropriate; (C) paying, or certifying to the Secretary of the Treasury for payment, claims for interim placement benefits found payable in accordance with regulations of the Administrator; and (D) providing that the funds in the State's account in the Unemployment Trust Fund shall be used for the payment of such benefits or for the reimbursement of the United States, to the extent (hereafter referred to as the "State contribution") that interim placement benefits paid during any period are not in excess of the compensation (determined as if this act had not been enacted) which would have been payable during such period under the unemployment compensation law of the State (as it existed on July 1, 1944). The agreement may provide for payment of interim placement benefits, either through a Government agency or through the State, from funds appropriated pursuant to section 602, and for reimbursement of such appropriation, to the extent of the State contribution, by the State; or may provide for payment of such benefits by the State from a special account established by the State, into which the State agrees to pay the State contribution and the Administrator agrees to pay, from funds appropriated pursuant to section 602, such further sums as may be needed; or may provide for payment of such benefits by the State from its account in the Unemployment Trust Fund and for reimbursement of such account by the Administrator, from funds appropriated pursuant to section 602, to the extent that the total benefits so paid exceed the State contribution. The agreement may provide for determination of the State contribution for any period by such statistical, sampling, or other method as may be agreed upon by the State and the Administrator; and shall provide that the filing, receipt, adjudication, forwarding payment, and certification of claims shall be in accordance with such regulations as the Administrator may prescribe.

"'(c) (1) The Railroad Retirement Board and the Unemployment Compensation Board of the District of Columbia shall participate in the administration of "interim placement benefits." Such Boards, in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Administrator, shall receive applications for "interim placement benefits," shall adjudicate such applications or forward such applications to a State or Territorial unemployment compensation agency or to a Government agency, as may be appropriate, and shall certify to the Secretary of the Treasury for payment, from the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Account or the District of Columbia Account, as the case may be, in the Unemployment Trust Fund, any claim or part thereof found payable in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Administrator.

"'(2) The Railroad Retirement Board and the Unemployment Compensation Board of the District of Columbia shall determine, in consultation with the Administrator, what amounts would have been payable under the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act and the District of Columbia Unemployment Compensation Act, as the case may be, if claims for "interim placement benefits" had been claims for benefits under such acts and had this act not been enacted. In either case, such amounts may be determined by such statistical, sampling or other method as may be jointly agreed upon by the Administrator and such Board. The Administrator shall from time to time certify to the Secretary of the Treasury, for payment into the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Account, or the Account of the District of Columbia, as the case may be, in the Unemployment Trust Fund the amounts by which the payments of "interim placement benefits" made on certifications of the Railroad Retirement Board or of the Unemployment Compensation Board of the District of Columbia, in the preceding calendar quarter exceeded the payments which would have been made from the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Account or the Account of the District of Columbia, as the case may be, in the Unemployment Trust Fund had claims for "interim placement benefits" been claims for benefits under the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act or the District of Columbia Unemployment Compensation Act, as the case may be, and had this act not been enacted.

"'(d) The Administrator may arrange for the administration, by any Government agency, of "interim placement benefits," to whatever extent he deems necessary, after utilizing the services of State agencies and the Railroad Retirement Board to the maximum practicable extent, to insure to every "qualified employee" adequate opportunity to claim and receive such benefits. The administration of such benefits by such Government agencies shall be in accordance with such regulations as the Administrator may prescribe.

"'(e) Any claimant whose claim for benefits has been denied, in whole or in part, upon an initial determination by the agency administering benefits under this title, shall be entitled to a fair hearing before an impartial tribunal. In the case of a State agency such tribunal shall be that provided under the law of such State for the hearing of appeals from initial determinations by the State agency under the unemployment compensation law of such State. If the Administrator finds that a Government agency administering benefits under this title has no appropriate tribunal for such purpose, he shall establish one.

"'(f) The decision of the agency administering benefits, and of any tribunal reviewing the decision of such agency, shall be communicated to the claimant and to other interested parties within 5 days after it is made. Any claimant and any labor organization, of which such claimant is a member, duly authorized to represent employees in accordance with the National Labor Relations Act or the Railway Labor Act may, after all administrative remedies have been availed of and exhausted, obtain a review of any final decision of such agency or tribunal by filing a petition for review within 90 days after the mailing of notice of such decision to the claimant, or within such further time as the agency may allow, in the United States district court for the judicial district in which the claimant resides or in the United States District Court for the District of Columbia. A copy of such petition, together with the initial process, shall forthwith be served upon the agency or any officer designated by it for such purpose. Service may be made upon the agency by registered mail, addressed to it. Within 15 days after receipt

of service or within such additional time as the court may allow, the agency shall certify and file with the court in which such petition has been filed, a transcript of the record upon which the findings and decision complained of are based. Upon such filing the court shall have exclusive jurisdiction of the proceeding and of the question determined therein. It shall have power to enter upon the pleadings and transcript of the record a decree affirming, modifying, or reversing the decision of the agency with or without remanding the case for rehearing. The findings of the agency as to the facts, if supported by evidence and in the absence of fraud, shall be conclusive. No additional evidence shall be received by the court, but the court may order additional evidence to be taken before the agency, and the agency may, after hearing such additional evidence, modify its findings of fact and conclusions and file such additional or modified findings and conclusions with the court, and the agency shall file with the court a transcript of the additional record. The judgment and decree of the court shall be final, subject to review as in equity cases.

"'An applicant for review in a district court of the United States under this section shall not be liable for costs, including costs of service, or costs of printing records, except that costs may be assessed by the court against such applicant if the court determines that the proceedings for such review have been instituted or continued without reasonable ground.

"'(g) No decision or finding of an agency administering benefits under this title shall be subject to review by any Federal court or any Government agency, except as provided in this title.

"'(h) Any State agency found by the Social Security Board to have failed to comply substantially with the terms of an agreement entered into pursuant to subsection (b) of this section may obtain a review of such finding by filing a petition for review within 90 days after the communication of the finding to such State agency in a United States district court for any judicial district in the State or in the United States District Court for the District of Columbia. A copy of such petition, together with the initial process, shall forthwith be served upon the Social Security Board or any officer designated by it for such purpose. Service may be made upon the agency by registered mail addressed to the Chairman. Within 15 days after receipt of service or within such additional time as the court may allow, the Social Security Board shall certify and file with the court in which such petition has been filed, a transcript of the record upon which the finding was based. Upon such filing the court shall have exclusive jurisdiction of the proceeding and of the question determined therein. It shall have power to enter upon the pleadings and transcript of the record a decree affirming, modifying, or reversing the finding of the Social Security Board, with or without remanding the case for rehearing. The finding of the Social Security Board as to the facts, if supported by evidence and in the absence of fraud, shall be conclusive. No additional evidence shall be received by the court, but the court may order additional evidence to be taken before the Social Security Board and such Board may, after hearing such additional evidence, modify its finding and file such additional or modified finding with the court, and the Social Security Board shall file with the court a transcript of the additional record. The judgment and decree of the court shall be final, subject to review as in equity cases.

"'(i) From time to time, after consultation with each State and Government agency other than the Railroad Retirement Board and the Unemployment Compensation Board of the District of Columbia, the Administrator shall estimate the amounts of contribution or reimbursement to be due each such agency pursuant to the provisions of subsection (b) during an ensuing period of not more than 3 months, and shall certify such amount to the Secretary of the Treasury for payment; reduced or increased, as the case may be, by any sum by which he finds that payments for any prior period were greater or less than the amount which should have been paid under such subsection.

"'(j) Upon receipt of a certification, by the Administrator, by the Railroad Retirement Board, by the Unemployment Compensation Board of the District of Columbia, or, to the extent permitted by the regulations of the Administrator, by a Government agency or a State agency, for payments pursuant to this section, the Secretary of the Treasury through the Fiscal Service of the Treasury Department, and prior to audit and settlement by the General Accounting Office, shall make payment in accordance with such certification.

"'(k) The Administrator shall, from time to time, certify to the Secretary of the Treasury, for payment to the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Administration fund, such amounts as he determines to be equal to the administrative expenses incurred by the Railroad Retirement Board by reason of this act.

"'SEC. 403. The Administrator is authorized to delegate (i) to any officer or employee of the Retraining and Reemployment Administration, (ii) to any State unemployment compensation agency, (iii) to the Railroad Retirement Board, or (iv) to any member or officer of any such agency or such Board any of the powers and duties herein described, excluding only the power to prescribe regulations. Such delegation may be revoked or modified whenever the Administrator deems it advisable: *Provided, however,* That a delegation to a State unemployment compensation agency shall not be revoked or modified while an agreement between such agency and the Administrator, pursuant to subsection (b) of section 402 is in effect.

"'SEC. 404. (a) The Administrator shall have and shall exercise all the powers necessary for the effective administration of this title. He may employ such persons and provide for their remuneration and expenses as may be necessary for the proper administration of this title. Such persons shall be employed and their remuneration prescribed according to the civil-service laws and the Classification Act of 1923, as amended. Notwithstanding any other provision of law or regulation, the Social Security Board and the Railroad Retirement Board may disclose their records of compensation to any agency or person authorized by the Administrator to adjudicate claims for interim placement benefits. The Administrator shall have power to require an employer to report the amount of any wage or any other information needed to adjudicate a claim for interim placement benefits.

"'(b) (1) The Administrator is authorized to make such studies and investigations, to hold such hearings, and to obtain such information as he deems necessary or proper in order to aid in carrying out the provisions of this title. The Administrator is further authorized by regulation or order to require any person to furnish any such information under oath or affirmation or otherwise, and to make reports, and he may require any person to permit the inspection and copying of records.

"'(2) For the purpose of obtaining any information under this subsection, the Administrator or any State or Government agency, or member, officer, or employee thereof, to whom the Administrator has delegated such authority, may administer oaths and affirmations and may by subpena require any person to appear and testify or to appear and produce documents, or both, at any designated place.

"'(3) The production of a person's documents at any place other than his place of business shall not be required under this section in any case in which, prior to the return date specified in the subpena issued with respect thereto, such person either has furnished the person or agency issuing such subpena with a copy of such documents (certified under oath to be a true and correct copy), or has entered into a stipulation with such person or agency as to the information contained in such documents.

"'(4) In case of contumacy by, or refusal to obey a subpena served upon, any person under this section, the district court of the United States for any district in which such person is found or resides or transacts business, upon application by the person or agency issuing such subpena, shall have jurisdiction to issue an order requiring such person to appear and give testimony or to appear and produce documents, or both; and any failure to obey such order of the court may be punished by such court as a contempt thereof.

"'(5) Witnesses subpenaed under this subsection shall be paid the same fees and mileage as are paid witnesses in the district courts of the United States.

"'(6) No person shall be excused from complying with any requirements under this subsection because of his privilege against self-incrimination, but the immunity provisions of the Compulsory Testimony Act of February 11, 1893 (U. S. C., 1940 ed., title 49, sec. 46), shall apply with respect to any individual who specifically claims such privilege.

"'(7) Any person who willfully fails to comply with any requirement made under this subsection, or who makes any statement or entry false in any material respect in any document or report required to be filed under this subsection, shall, upon conviction thereof, be subject to a fine of not more than $10,000, or to imprisonment for not more than 1 year, or both.

"'SEC. 405. (a) Subsection (a) of section 700 of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 (Public Law 346, 78th Cong.) is hereby amended to read as follows:

"'"Any person who shall have served in the active military or naval service of the United States at any time after September 16, 1940, and prior to the termination of the present war, and who shall have been discharged or released from active service under conditions other than dishonorable, after active service of 90 days or more, or by reason of an injury or disability incurred in service in line of duty, shall be entitled, in accordance with the provisions of this title and regulations issued by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs pursuant thereto, to receive a readjustment allowance as provided herein for each week of unemployment or of partial unemployment which (1) begins after the first Sunday of the third calendar month after the date of enactment hereof, and (2) occurs not later than 2 years after discharge or release or the termination of the war, whichever is the later date: *Provided,* That no such allowance shall be paid for any period for which he receives increased pension under part VII of Veterans Regulation 1 (a) or a subsistence allowance under part VIII of such regulation: *Provided further,* That no readjustment allowance shall be payable for any week commencing more than 5 years after the termination of hostilities in the present war."

"'(b) Subsection (a) of section 900 of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944

(Public Law 346, 78th Cong.) is hereby amended to read as follows:

"'"The allowance for a week shall be—

"'"(1) $20, plus

"'"(2) (A) $5 if he has one dependent, or

"'"(B) $10 if he has two dependents, or

"'"(C) $15 if he has three or more dependents, less that part of the wages payable to him for such week as is in excess of $3: *Provided*, That where the allowance is not a multiple of $1, it shall be computed to the next highest multiple of $1."

"'(c) Subsection (b) of section 900 of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 (Public Law 346, 78th Cong.) is hereby amended to read as follows:

"'"In any 2 consecutive calendar years, an eligible veteran shall not be entitled to receive allowances in excess of 52 times the allowance at the last rate established for him in such 2 years."

"'(d) New subsections (c), (d), (e), and (f) are hereby added to section 900 of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 (Public Law 346, 78th Cong.), such subsections to read as follows:

"'"(c) (1) As used in this section the term 'dependent' includes only—

"'"(A) the lawful wife of a claimant living with him or receiving regular support from him, or the lawful husband or a claimant if dependent upon his wife for support, who, in the week for which an allowance is claimed, has not received $5 or more either as wages, as an allowance under this title, or under any Federal or State unemployment or disability compensation law; or

"'"(B) an unmarried child either (1) under 18 years of age, or (2) of any age, if incapable of self-support by reason of mental or physical defect;

"'"(C) a parent of an unmarried individual if such parent is incapable of self-support and either is living in the same household with such individual or is dependent upon such individual for more than half his support.

"'"(2) As used in this section the term 'child' shall include only—

"'"(A) a legitimate child;

"'"(B) a child legally adopted;

"'"(C) a stepchild, if a member of the claimant's household; or

"'"(D) a child to whom the claimant stands in loco parentis and has so stood for not less than 12 months prior to the date of this claim on behalf of such child.

"'"(d) The Administrator may find an individual to be a dependent of the claimant if the claimant has certified the facts required by the provisions of this subsection.

"'"(e) Where a child is a dependent of more than one claimant, allowance for the child shall be made only on behalf of one claimant, as determined by the Administrator.

"'"(f) Where a claimant seeks an allowance for a dependent who is separated from him under court order or written agreement, the allowance for the dependent shall not exceed the amount fixed in the court order or in the written agreement. If such amount is not fixed at a weekly rate, the portion payable for each week shall be determined in accordance with regulations of the Administrator."

"'TITLE V—PUBLIC WORKS

"'SEC. 501. (a) In order to encourage States and other non-Federal public agencies to make advance provision for the construction of public works (not including housing), the Federal Works Administrator is hereby authorized to make, from funds appropriated for that purpose, loans or advances to the States and their agencies and political subdivisions (hereinafter referred to as "public agencies") to aid in financing the cost of architectural, engineering, and economic investigations and studies, surveys, designs, plans, working drawings, specifications, procedures, and other action preliminary to the construction of such public works: *Provided*, That the making of loans or advances hereunder shall not in any way commit the Congress to appropriate funds to undertake any projects so planned.

"'(b) Funds appropriated for the making of loans or advances hereunder shall be allotted by the Federal Works Administrator among the several States in the following proportion: 90 percent in the proportion which the population of each State bears to the total population of all the States, as shown by the latest available Federal census, and 10 percent according to his discretion: *Provided*, That the allotments to any State shall aggregate not less than one-half of 1 percent of the total funds available for allotment hereunder: *Provided further*, That no loans or advances shall be made with respect to any individual project unless it conforms to an over-all local or regional plan approved by competent local or regional authority.

"'(c) Advances under this section to any public agency shall be repaid by such agency if and when the construction of the public works so planned is undertaken. Any sums so repaid shall be covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

"'(d) The Federal Works Administrator is authorized to prescribe rules and regulations to carry out the purposes of this section.

"'(e) As used in this section, the term "State" shall include the District of Columbia.

"'TITLE VI—MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

"'SEC. 601. When used in this act—

"'(a) The term "Government agency" means any department, independent establishment, or agency in the executive branch of the Government, including any corporation wholly owned by the United States.

"'(b) The term "contracting agency" means any Government agency which has been or hereafter may be authorized to make contracts pursuant to section 201 of the First War Powers Act, 1941, and includes the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and any corporation organized pursuant to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act (47 Stat. 5), as amended, and the Smaller War Plants Corporation.

"'(c) The term "State" (except when used in title V) shall include the several States, the District of Columbia (except when used in section 402), Hawaii, and Alaska.

"'(d) Subject to the provisions of section 401 (c) and section 401 (d) a "day of unemployment" with respect to an employee means a calendar day (which is not a day of full-time work for remuneration) on which he is able to work and is available for work and with respect to which (i) no remuneration in excess of 75 cents is payable or accrues to him and (ii) he has, in accordance with such regulations as the Administrator may prescribe, registered at a public employment office: *Provided*, That remuneration for a working day which includes two consecutive calendar days shall be deemed to have been earned on the second of such days: *And provided further*, That an employee shall not be deemed unable to or unavailable for work in any period of continuous unemployment by reason of illness or disability which occurs after the commencement of such period.

"'(e) A "week of unemployment" with respect to an employee shall mean any period of 7 consecutive calendar days, each of which was a day of unemployment: *Provided*, That any 7 consecutive calendar days which but for the amount of remuneration which accrues or is payable to him would be a "week of unemployment" shall be a week of unemployment if the amount of such remuneration does not exceed $3.

"'(f) A "part week of unemployment" is any period of 7 consecutive calendar days in which there are 3 or more days of unemployment.

"'(g) The term "benefit year" means the 12-month period beginning on July 1 of any year and ending on June 30 of the next year, except that a week of unemployment or a part week of unemployment beginning in June and ending in July shall be deemed to be in the benefit year ending in such month of June.

"'(h) The term "dependent" means—

"'(A) an unmarried child (including a stepchild or adopted child), of an individual, who has not attained his eighteenth birthday and who either is living in the same household with the individual or is dependent upon such individual for more than half his support;

"'(B) the wife of an individual if such wife either is living in the same household with such individual or regularly receives support from him, other than a wife who is regularly engaged in rendering services for remuneration or in any occupation for profit if the remuneration for such services or from such occupation is substantial;

"'(C) a parent of an unmarried individual if such parent is incapable of self-support and either is living in the same household with such individual or is dependent upon such individual for more than half his support.

"'In determining whether an individual has dependents, and in determining the number of such dependents, the agency administering benefits or maintenance, allowances may accept certification by the alleged dependent or, if the alleged dependent is a child, by the claimant, as to the facts necessary for such determination.

"'(i) The term "wages" means (i) compensation as defined in section 1 (i) of the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act and (ii) all remuneration for employment including the cash value of all remuneration paid in any medium other than cash; except that such term shall not include—

"'(1) that part of the remuneration which after remuneration equal to $3,000 has been paid to an individual with respect to employment during any calendar year, is paid to such individual with respect to employment during such calendar year;

"'(2) the amount of any payment made to, or on behalf of, an employee under a plan or system established by an employer which makes provision for his employees generally or for a class or classes of his employees (including any amount paid by an employer for insurance or annuities, or into a fund, to provide for any such payment), on account of (A) retirement, or (B) sickness or accident disability, or (C) medical and hospitalization expenses in connection with sickness or accident disability, or (d) death, provided the employee (i) has not the option to receive, instead of provision for such death benefit, any part of such payment or, if such death benefit is insured, any part of the premiums (or contributions to premiums) paid by his employer, and (ii) has not the right, under the provisions of the plan or system or policy of insurance providing for such death benefit, to assign such benefit, or to receive a cash consideration in lieu of such benefit either upon his withdrawal from the plan or system providing for such benefit or upon termination of such plan or system or policy of insurance or of his employment with such employer;

"'(3) the payment by an employer (without deduction from the remuneration of the employee) (A) of the tax imposed upon an employee under section 1400 of the Internal Revenue Code or (B) of any payment required from an employee under a State unemployment compensation law;

"'(4) dismissal payments which the employer is not legally required to make.

"'(j) The term "employment" means any service performed as a civilian after December 31, 1940, (1) by an employee for his employer, irrespective of the citizenship or residence of either, (A) within the United States, or (B) on or in connection with an American vessel under a contract of service which is entered into within the United States or during the performance of which the vessel touches at a port in the United States, if the employee is employed on and in connection with such vessel when outside the United States, or (2) outside the United States, as a civilian employee of the United States or as an employee of a contractor (including a subcontractor or subordinate subcontractor with respect to the contract of such contractor) while in the performance of a contract with the United States, if such employee was a citizen of or resident in the United States on September 16, 1940, except—

"'(1) service performed in the employ of a foreign government (including service as a consular or other officer or employee or a nondiplomatic representative);

"'(2) service performed in the employ of an instrumentality wholly owned by a foreign government—

"'(A) if the service is of a character similar to that performed in foreign countries by employees of the United States Government or of an instrumentality thereof; and

"'(B) if the Secretary of State shall certify to the Secretary of the Treasury that the foreign government, with respect to whose instrumentality and employees thereof exemption is claimed grants an equivalent exemption with respect to similar service performed in the foreign country by employees of the United States Government and of instrumentalities thereof.

"'(3) domestic service in a private home, local college club, or local chapter of a college fraternity or sorority;

"'(4) service performed by an individual in the employ of his son, daughter, or spouse, or service performed by a child under the age of twenty-one in the employ of his father or mother.

"'(k) The term "American vessel" means any vessel documented or numbered under the laws of the United States; and includes any vessel which is neither documented nor numbered under the laws of the United States nor documented under the laws of any foreign country, if its crew is employed solely by one or more citizens or residents of the United States or corporations organized under the laws of the United States or of any State.

"'(l) "Public employment office" shall include an office of the United States Employment Service, an office of the Civil Service Commission so designated by the Commission a free employment office maintained and operated by the Railroad Retirement Board, and a facility maintained by an employer under the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act designated as a free employment office by the Railroad Retirement Board, and any employment facility maintained by a State, by a labor organization or by an employer and engaged in placing workers which is designated as a "public employment office" by the Administrator.

"'(m) "Weekly wages" for the purposes of any benefit year means the amount determined by dividing by 13 the wages in that calendar quarter of the calendar year preceding the beginning of such benefit year in which such wages were highest: *Provided, however,* That in the case of any individual whose exact wages for the applicable period are not available or the record of whose wages was not maintained by quarters, the weekly wages shall be determined on a basis deemed by the Administrator to be fair and equitable.

"'(n) The term "termination of hostilities" means termination of hostilities in the wars in which the United States is now engaged as declared by Presidential proclamation or concurrent resolution of the Congress.

"'(o) The term "person" means an individual, a trust or estate, or a corporation.

"'(p) The term "United States," when used in a geographical sense, means the several States, the District of Columbia, Hawaii, and Alaska. When used with reference to the United States Government, it includes Government agencies.

"'SEC. 602. There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary or appropriate to carry out the purposes and provisions of this Act, including such amounts for additional grants under title III of the Social Security Act, as amended, as may be necessary by reason of this act.

"'SEC. 603. The provisions of this act shall become effective immediately, unless otherwise provided in the act, and unless otherwise provided shall be terminated at the end of 24 months after the termination of hostilities.

"'SEC. 604. If any provision of this act, or the application of such provision to any person or circumstance, is held invalid, the remainder of this act or the application of such provision to persons or circumstances, other than those as to which it is held invalid, shall not be affected thereby.

"'SEC. 605. When the Director first appointed under section 102 has taken office, the Office of War Mobilization established by Executive Order No. 9347, dated May 27, 1943, shall cease to exist; and such records and property of the Office of War Mobilization, and such unexpended balances of appropriations or other funds available for its use, as the President shall determine shall be transferred to the Office of Mobilization and Reconversion.

"'SEC. 606. All orders, policies, procedures, or directives prescribed by the Director of War Mobilization, in effect upon the effective date of this act, and not inconsistent with this act, shall remain in full force and effect unless and until superseded by the Director in accordance with this act, or by operation of law.

"'SEC. 607. No alien shall be employed in any capacity in the administration of this act unless he has served honorably in the armed forces of the United States.

"'SEC. 608. This act may be cited as the "War Mobilization and Reconversion Act of 1944".'"

Mr. DINGELL (interrupting the reading of the amendment). Mr. Chairman, in order that we may save time, I should like to have an understanding with the Chairman and the Members of the House on both sides that in lieu of reading the amendment we have an agreement that a reasonable amount of time be allowed for an explanation of what is contained in it. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the further reading of the bill.

Mr. COOPER. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Chairman, simply for information, I am sure the gentleman will agree that from time to time changes have been made in the draft he is offering as a substitute. Is not that correct?

Mr. DINGELL. No; I do not think so. This bill, H. R. 5227, comes to the House in the exact form in which it was originally presented. There were no changes in it whatsoever.

Mr. COOPER. Then, to be definite and certain about it, as I understand, this substitute seeks to extend coverage for a large maximum of unemployment insurance benefits and a greater length of time, but seeks to do so by authorizing appropriations for that purpose.

Mr. DINGELL. That is correct.

Mr. COOPER. It does not in any way seek to extend coverage by the imposition of a tax of any nature.

Mr. DINGELL. That is correct, but may I say that my only motive at this time in seeking to dispense with the reading of the amendment is that each section may be explained by Members who are interested on both sides of the aisle. If the Committee desires that the amendment be read, that is all right with me, but in the interest of fairness I suggest that we likewise have an agreement that a reasonable length of time be used in explaining the various sections.

Mr. RANKIN. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Chairman, I think the bill ought to be read. This is a very important piece of legislation and a violent departure from the established policies of this Government. The gentleman will have an opportunity to offer his amendment to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert at the proper time, but I do not think we ought to dispense with the reading of the bill. Therefore, I am going to object to the request.

Mr. DINGELL. Will the gentleman withhold his objection for a moment?

Mr. RANKIN. Yes.

Mr. DOUGHTON. May I ask my distinguished colleague, a member of the committee, if there is anything new in his substitute, anything that was not fully considered and discussed in the committee?

Mr. DINGELL. I should say there are additional points in the bill that were proposed and not discussed in the committee. All I would want to say at this time is that my bill is far broader than the amended George bill which was presented to the House by the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. DOUGHTON. What I want to know from my friend is whether or not the substance of the substitute was not fully discussed and voted down in the committee.

Mr. DINGELL. I cannot say that all of the features contained in this bill have been discussed in the committee.

Mr. CELLER. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Chairman, it is interesting to note that this so-called Dingell substitute has the undivided and enthusiastic support of the American Federation of Labor, the C. I. O., and the railroad brotherhoods. There are many features of it, I may say to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, which have not been explained to the Members of the House. In the interest of fair play, it may be advisable to have certain of the Members explain portions of this amendment. I wonder if an agreement cannot be reached whereby, say, an hour's time

may be devoted to an explanation of the bill.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. COOPER. The question now before the Committee is the unanimous-consent request to dispense with the further reading of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. COOPER. We are losing time now. If that request is to be objected to, the objection had better be made so we can proceed.

Mr. RANKIN. I am going to object to dispensing with the reading of the bill, I will tell you that.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is heard. The Clerk will read.

Mr. COOPER (interrupting the reading of the amendment). Mr. Chairman, in the interest of saving time and after conference with the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi, I renew my unanimous-consent request that the further reading of the amendment offered as a substitute be dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object——

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I have no objection to dispensing with the reading of this amendment.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, that is what I asked for.

Mr. RANKIN. But when it comes to the reading of the bill, I want the bill read under the 5-minute rule, if this amendment is voted down.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the right to object.

The CHAIRMAN. If the committee substitute is adopted, it would be read under the 5-minute rule of the House, of course.

Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I think this would be a good time, in order to save time in the long run, to make some agreement as to how long this particular amendment will be debated.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, that is not in order, to make any such agreement now. We have to have some debate on the amendment before such an agreement can be made.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman that further reading of the amendment offered as a substitute be dispensed with?

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I object.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is heard. The Clerk will read.

Mr. KNUTSON (interrupting the reading of the amendment). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the further reading of the bill be dispensed with at this time, and if the gentleman wishes to make his objection later on it will be perfectly all right.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman means the further reading of the amendment?

Mr. KNUTSON. I mean the further reading of the amendment; yes.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I understand that the chairman of the committee and those handling the bill have stated they will give a reasonable time on the bill.

Mr. KNUTSON. Oh, certainly.

The CHAIRMAN. May the Chair state that the question of time would not be entered into until after there has been 5 minutes of debate on the substitute amendment.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my objection with the understanding the bill is open to amendment later on.

Mr. KNUTSON. Certainly, certainly.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, of course I realize that the membership of the committee is very anxious to dispose of the question before it at the earliest possible moment. I am not going to go into any detailed explanation, because other speakers who will follow will each, in their turn, shed light on what the substitute bill contains. I do want to say this, however, to those who are opposed to the bill which I present here: It was born as a result of the fact that the Committee on Ways and Means had too far constricted the provisions of the George bill, otherwise this bill would not have been presented here. Now the intention is to present the liberalized version of what is needed for post-war reconversion in order that we might in conference have an opportunity to liberalize the provisions of the George bill, which has been reduced in substance and in future effect upon what is deemed to be a pressing and important problem of post-war planning. So, Mr. Chairman, under those circumstances I feel constrained to present the amendment and to urge my colleagues here in the House to act favorably upon the substitute. It will afford to the conferees the opportunity of liberalizing several of the provisions.

It is not my intention as sponsor to bring anything in from the conference committee that the House could not support. I do want to say for the benefit of the membership that the substitute has the united support of the A. F. of L., the C. I. O., and the railway brotherhoods, and enjoys the support of many of the most influential and respected Members of the House on both sides of the aisle. The membership of the committee will be privileged to hear their expressions and explanations with regard to what is contained in the bill.

In connection with my remarks, Mr. Chairman, I should like to have the opportunity to insert in the RECORD several communications I received which I deem important and having a direct bearing upon the subject matter before the House.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state to the gentleman from Michigan that it will be necessary to get consent for that purpose in the House rather than in the Committee of the Whole.

Mr. DINGELL. I stand corrected, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, many provisions in this substitute will be thoroughly explained by subsequent speakers. My friend the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER], who has taken an active part in the preparation of this bill, will be prepared to elucidate and answer any questions.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. DINGELL. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. KNUTSON. Wherein does the gentleman's substitute differ from the original C. I. O. bill as drafted by Mr. Schimmel?

Mr. DINGELL. I do not think there is any connection with Mr. Schimmel. I do not know the gentleman.

Mr. KNUTSON. I did not assume the gentleman did.

Mr. DINGELL. I am positive Mr. Schimmel has no connection with this bill.

Mr. KNUTSON. I assume the gentleman did not know him, because the gentleman usually keeps very good company.

Mr. DINGELL. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. KNUTSON. There is a connection, is there not? And I should like to know just wherein they differ.

Mr. DINGELL. No; no.

Mr. KNUTSON. I am seeking information.

Mr. DINGELL. I understand. I am confident the gentleman is sincere in the question he asks, but there is no connection between this bill and the so-called Murray-Kilgore bill, although several of the provisions are parallel, such as the appeals board and the question of an advisory commission. Those matters are in the substitute which I present now.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DINGELL. Yes; I yield to my friend from Tennessee.

Mr. COOPER. For information permit me to ask the distinguished gentleman from Michigan whether his pending substitute contains title I substantially the same as the so-called George bill passed by the Senate with respect to the Office of War Mobilization? Is that substantially correct?

Mr. DINGELL. I should say so; yes.

Mr. COOPER. Then, with respect to title II, does the gentleman's substitute substantially follow the so-called George bill passed by the Senate with respect to industrial mobilization and reconversion?

Mr. DINGELL. I should rather have my friend, the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER], go into the detailed explanation, paragraph by paragraph, pointing out the difference between the two bills.

Mr. COOPER. I am merely asking if it does not substantially follow.

Mr. DINGELL. I should say so regarding the first two sections.

Mr. COOPER. The first two titles are substantially the same.

Mr. DINGELL. That is right.

Mr. CELLER. Not exactly.

Mr COOPER. I did not say "exactly"; I said "substantially."

The gentleman's substitute includes title III of the so-called George bill which was eliminated by the Ways and Means Committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. COOPER. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Chairman, that the gentleman may be allowed to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. DINGELL. Two additional minutes will be sufficient because I would rather have the gentleman from New York go into a detailed explanation of the various sections.

Mr. COOPER. Title III has to do with retraining and reemployment.

Mr. DINGELL. It is my understanding that retraining is virtually out of the substitute—that is as compared with the original bill.

Mr. COOPER. On page 13, line 20 of the gentleman's substitute bill appears title III: "Retraining and reemployment," and extends from page 18. It covers approximately six pages.

Mr. DINGELL. The bill provides for a retraining administration, as it is in the George bill.

Mr. COOPER. In the gentleman's draft, however, the $200 limitation for transportation of workers to new jobs or to their former bona fide residence is eliminated, is it not?

Mr. DINGELL. That is right.

Mr. COOPER. No limitation even to the $200 is provided in the gentleman's substitute?

Mr. DINGELL. That is right, but I explained to the gentleman that the purpose of this bill is to get in somewhere between what the original George bill provided and what the committee presented here.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DINGELL. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. DOUGHTON. How many pages are contained in the gentleman's substitute?

Mr. DINGELL. Fifty pages.

Mr. DOUGHTON. How many in the bill reported by the Committee on Ways and Means? Only 15 pages?

Mr. DINGELL. Yes; I believe so. The George bill which came to us was somewhere near the same as mine.

Mr. DOUGHTON. The gentleman asks the committee to substitute a bill of 50 pages for one reported by the committee of 15 pages. Has the gentleman read his substitute?

Mr. DINGELL. Yes; I have.

Mr. DOUGHTON. I infer from the difficulty the gentleman had in answering questions that he never read it.

Mr. DINGELL. I have not had the time to give it the study that it deserves, and I made that clear to those who requested me to introduce the bill.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Let me ask the gentleman this further question: In the dissenting views that the gentleman signed, complaint is made that hearings were not had on the bill that the committee reported. The gentleman admitted a while ago there was matter in this substitute that had never been considered by the committee. Does the gentleman expect the committee to intelligently and fairly pass upon a substitute of 50 pages brought in here that were never considered by the committee when the gentleman says himself he does not understand it, and he calls on somebody else to explain it?

Mr. DINGELL. I hope we will not go into a lot of hair splitting.

Mr. DOUGHTON. There is no hair-splitting about it.

Mr. DINGELL. Let me answer the question.

Mr. DOUGHTON. It is a fair question.

Mr. DINGELL. It is fair according to the gentleman's view, but I may say to the gentleman, when this goes before the conferees we can bring out a bill that will restore the provision for the Federal employees; we can bring in certain other things that have deliberately been left out of the original George bill. That is the purpose of submitting the substitute at this time.

Mr. DOUGHTON. How are we going to know what is in the 50 pages of the gentleman's substitute?

Mr. DINGELL. We will know as the explanations go on following me. If the gentleman wants to learn what is in the bill, there will be a thoroughgoing explanation given of every paragraph within the bill.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Let me ask another question. If the gentleman is sincere about this, and I know he is.

Mr. DINGELL. I hope the gentleman will not question my sincerity.

Mr. DOUGHTON. I give the gentleman credit for all sincerity. Why were not the things in this bill, that he says were not brought to the attention of the committee, not brought to the attention of the committee, so that it could be given full consideration by the committee?

Mr. DINGELL. Simply because we had no hearings. No one had any opportunity to bring anything before the committee, and the chairman of the committee knows that.

Mr. DOUGHTON. The gentleman had every opportunity.

Mr. DINGELL. When we tried to bring Mr. Altmeyer before the committee, the committee voted it down.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may have 5 additional minutes.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, I decline any further time. I said at the outset that if the gentleman from Minnesota is anxious to proceed with consideration of the substitute other Members who are desirous of making explanations, and I refer to Members on both sides, will go into detail and give a complete explanation as to each paragraph.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the request.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that further debate on the substitute and all amendments thereto be limited to not to exceed 1 hour.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. COOPER].

Mr. FISH. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, does that include the whole section?

Mr. COOPER. It includes this substitute bill that has been offered by the gentleman from Michigan.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I shall try in 5 minutes to explain the differences between the committee version of the George bill and the so-called Dingell substitute. There are roughly a dozen or so differences.

First. The Committee on Ways and Means bill strikes out of the George bill the objectives of the act. Those objectives are included in the Dingell bill. Direct expression of a bill's purposes and objectives aids in the act's interpretation in case of disputes and difficulties arising out of administration thereof.

Second. The Committee on Ways and Means version of the George bill draws all the teeth as to powers from the Director. The Dingell bill restores those teeth and gives the Director full powers to cancel out, if necessary, conflicting directives of other war agencies.

Third. In the George bill there is provision made for unemployment compensation insurance for Federal employees. In the Committee on Ways and Means version that is stricken out. That provision is reinstated in the Dingell substitute. Why should molders, carpenters, riveters, electricians working in camps, arsenals, and navy yards and on Federal pay roll be denied, for example, unemployment compensation which is granted those same workers employed in private shipyards, and shops and plants?

Fourth. Retraining of civilian employees is not included in the Committee on Ways and Means version of the George bill. That retraining program is included in the Dingell substitute.

Fifth. The Dingell substitute makes provision for unemployment compensation for merchant seamen on ships owned by private owners. The Committee on Ways and Means version does not take that relief into consideration. In the George bill only seamen on Federal ships and on Federal pay roll are considered.

Sixth. The duration of the benefits under the George bill is for 2 years. The Committee on Ways and Means struck that down to 1 year. The Dingell substitute reasserts the 2-year provision.

Seventh. The George bill provides for $200 transportation for migratory war workers to their homes. The Committee on Ways and Means version struck that provision out. The Dingell substitute reinstates that provision, with one additional provision that the $200 can be used to go home, or the $200 can be used to go to another war job.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. I yield.

Mr. COOPER. Will the gentleman kindly point out where the $200 limitation appears in the substitute? This subject matter as discussed is found on page 17, but I fail to find any $200 limitation at all.

Mr. CELLER. I will come to that in a moment. Let me finish these other differences first. I am quite sure it is in there. There is, however, in the Dingell substitute no limitation on the amount that may accorded the discharged civilian worker.

Mr. COOPER. There is no $200 limitation in the subsitute.

Mr. CELLER. That is correct. Please let me finish these general differentiations between the measures. I am disinclined to yield any further. Eighth. In the Committee on Ways and Means' version of the George bill there is no provision for the setting up of an advisory board to aid or implement the work of the Director; the advisory board to consist of representatives of labor, industry, agriculture, and the public. The Dingell substitute reinstates that provision, which may be found in the George bill. Ninth. The Committee on Ways and Means' version of the George bill strikes out from the George bill what is known as the appeals board where one aggrieved by the action of the War Production Board, for example, with reference to the disposition of war materials, would have the right to appeal to an appeals board. That provision is not in the Committee on Ways and Means' version, but is in the Dingell substitute. Tenth. Surveys of employees are out of the Committee on Ways and Means' version. They are in the Dingell substitute. Eleventh. There are certain minor changes with reference to loans to States for public works. The Dingell substitute remedies that situation. Twelfth. Neither the Committee on Ways and Means' version nor the George bill provides for the retention of the United States Unemployment Service. The Dingell substitute provides for the retention of the United States Unemployment Service for a period of 2 years. It is absurd to have such a service for mobilization and not for demobilization. There will be greater need, since 11,000,000 more jobs for returning veterans must be found. With no such agency we will have after the war 48 different job agencies for 48 separate States.

Those, in general, are the distinguishing features between the Dingell substitute and the Committee on Ways and Means' version of the George bill. I cannot in 5 minutes explain in detail all these differences. I am going to confine myself to one, namely, that difference concerning the powers of the Director as they are asserted in the different bills. In the Dingell substitute, in title I, we have significant language as to powers of the Director which was originally in the George bill, and was deleted from the Ways and Means version of the George bill. On page 3 of the George bill you find this language, and it is very important. The language begins on line 12:

> The Director shall have the power to—
>
> Issue such directives to other executive agencies as may be necessary to carry out their powers in a manner consistent with the plans formulated under this section or to coordinate the activities of other executive agencies with respect to the problems arising out of the transition from war to peace. Each executive agency shall carry out the directives of the Director expeditiously and, to the extent necessary to carry out such directive, shall modify its operations and procedures and issue regulations with respect thereto. Nothing contained in this section shall be construed as authorizing any activities which are now within the scope of the powers possessed by the President or the executive agencies under existing law or future acts of the Congress.

Mr. DOUGHTON. In reality, is this the Dingell substitute or is it the Celler substitute?

Mr. CELLER. This is in general the Dingell substitute, not the Celler substitute. The Dingell substitute is the bill that was prepared by a committee composed of representatives of the American Federation of Labor and certain Members of Congress. It is primarily an A. F. of L. bill, and the C. I. O. and the railroad brotherhoods join in supporting it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman be permitted to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

Mr. CARLSON of Kansas. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Chairman, and I am not going to object, I sincerely hope the gentleman will discuss the benefits. I trust someone will bring that up before the gentleman takes his seat.

Mr. CELLER. That is reserved for another Member to discuss.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. CELLER. Continuing, I wish to state something with reference to the genesis and the history of this bill. It is primarily a bill prepared by the representatives of the American Federation of Labor. It is not the Kilgore bill, it is not the Murray bill, it is not the Celler bill. It is, however, a realistic approach to reconversion. Both the C. I. O. and the railroad brotherhoods have joined with the A. F. of L. in support of this bill. This bill has the unified and enthusiastic support of all the national labor organizations.

It is unfair to say that anyone by the name of Schimmel or anyone by the name of Kilgore or Murray wrote this bill. Those names are borne, however, by most honorable and distinguished gentlemen. The representatives of labor met on numerous times in my office and finally in the office of the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FORAND], and we fashioned this bill after many days of toil. Numerous liberal-minded Members of this body met with us. Much of the Kilgore bill is not included in the so-called Dingell substitute.

It has been agreed that those who will offer separate amendments in event the Dingell substitute fails will explain the various provisions of the Dingell substitute. It is within my province and I have been delegated to explain the differences with reference to the powers of the Director.

We cannot have any decent and logical kind of reconversion unless somebody has power. If we give the Director powers with one hand and withdraw those powers with the other hand, all he can do is tilt at windmills. We give the Director in the pending bill only a paper sword. Under the version of the Committee on Ways and Means, the Director of War Demobilization has most of his power shorn from him. Great powers are given to the President, but that will not answer. If a dispute arises between the War Manpower Commission and the Director of War Demobilization, or between the Director of War Demobilization and the selective-service group, they cannot be rushing to the President. He is a man enmeshed in multifarious duties. He should not be burdened with the settling of the disputes every day between this war agency and that war agency, between a Mr. Wilson and a Mr. Nelson, between a Vice President and a Mr. Jesse Jones. With the version of the Committee on Ways and Means, you are going to have confusion worse confounded. The War Manpower Commission or the Smaller War Plants Corporation or the Army or Treasury Procurement will issue a directive, and the Director of War Demobilization under the Ways and Means Committee version may not want it because it unduly interferes with his work. Under the Dingell substitute he would have the power to cancel out the action of the war agency that interferes with the work he is trying to do in carrying out the purposes of the act, which is to bring about a proper and an appropriate reconversion with a minimum of unemployment and by creating as many new jobs as possible.

Mr. ROLPH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. ROLPH. Will the gentleman explain how the public-works section of this bill compares with the public-works section of the George bill?

Mr. CELLER. The gentleman from New York [Mr. LYNCH] is going to cover the subject of public works and loans, and I ask the gentleman to be patient and wait to hear him.

In the report issued by the Committee on Ways and Means, its members cite favorably certain observations of the House Committee on Post-war Economic Policy and Planning, as to concentration of power in the War Mobilization Director, but in drafting the bill they fail to follow these observations.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has again expired.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Chairman, my remarks will be directed at what I think is the fundamental question the House is going to have to decide. There are things in the Dingell substitute which I think could be improved, things, which I think would have to be worked out. I believe that could

be done without difficulty in conference. But what I am thinking of is the situation that the United States confronts at this hour. I do not believe that situation can be met by passing a bill in a frame of mind which would be appropriate only to our undertaking a task of amending peacetime unemployment compensation laws in this country in, let us say, the year 1925. I do not believe the bill as reported to the House is in line with the tremendous scope of the problems we face. I hope the House will realize that the greatest war in history is, we fervently hope and pray, going to be won in the course of the next year or so. But when that war is finally won we shall confront the greatest problem of economic readjustment in all the history of the world, a problem that cannot possibly be met by quarrelling over the amount of unemployment-compensation benefit that is paid in certain States, the question of States' rights, or similar matters. The question is simply this: Whether the United States will provide for meeting that reconversion period on a broad plane of statesmanship and imagination and with a will to see to it that America has full production and full employment of our people; or whether we will fail to see it in that light. Members have taken the floor of the House and spoken of the national debt and expenditures involved and they have accused those who have advocated Federal standards during this interim period for unemployment compensation as being pessimists and prophets of doom. I ask, Mr. Chairman, who are the prophets of doom? Are they those people who say that, if we provide for an orderly system of preventing the buying power of our country from collapsing during this period, we will be forced to spend untold billions of dollars because forsooth they must believe widespread unemployment is coming, or those of us who say we believe it is possible if we provide for an orderly and effective method of reconversion to prevent unemployment and depression and thus avoid any large expenditure? Mr. Chairman, I believe the first group are the prophets of doom. We who advocate forthright dealing with reconversion problems have sincere faith that we can prevent a deflation and depression if we will. The problem of the national debt depends directly upon whether we maintain an economy of full production and high national income in the period after this war. Every student of the subject tells us and knows that in connection with reconversion there will be a period of adjustment and some unemployment will result. My own State, my own county, has hundreds of thousands of people employed in aircraft plants. We know those people cannot continue to be employed in the aircraft plants. We want a really effective job done of helping those people to get to work in other places. We want the job done so that the over-all buying power of America will afford a sufficient sustained market so that other industries can spring up and so that new businesses can start and so that there will be some place to sell the goods which these people are going to have to produce if they are to be employed at all.

Mr. Chairman, this problem is not one, in my judgment, that can be considered from a small point of view. It is only one that can be considered from this standpoint: We know there will be some unemployment. Estimates are that it will reach 5,000,000, no matter how fast reconversion takes place. The whole question is whether after it reaches 5,000,000, we will have a continuing downward spiral because we permit a decline in effective demand to take place, or whether we will provide well enough for that transition period so that although unemployment may rise to an unavoidable 5,000,000 there will not be a reduction in the over-all market for goods because we here provide against it and we can then see employment start upward again and can enter into a period of real, full national production so that we can pay off this national debt. But if the buying power of those who are unemployed is allowed to go down to a very low level then that vicious downward spiral of less buying power, less production, less and less employment, and lower and lower prices will become inevitable. At the present rate of production, Mr. Chairman, it will be altogether possible, if we kept taxes where they are now—which, of course, we will probably not do—but assuming we did keep taxes where they are now, and assuming we were to maintain production where it is now, we could pay the whole national debt in less than 20 years. The whole question of paying that debt and carrying it depends upon whether we sustain full production or not. And to a great extent Congress is going to decide that question by its action in providing or failing to provide an effective bridge for all our people, businessmen, workers, everyone, from war to peace. And that does depend in turn very largely upon whether or not really effective unemployment compensation payments, effective programs for the shifting of workers from war to peace jobs, effective planning of essential public works, and all the rest are done before, not after, it is too late. The time for such action is now.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 4 additional minutes.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, this debate is limited to 1 hour. There are numerous Members who want to speak on the amendment and from now on I propose to object to all requests for additional time.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I am sorry to have to ask for additional time.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, I very much dislike to object but we are all responsible for our districts. We want a voice on this matter.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent then to proceed for 1 additional minute.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, I dislike to, but I am going to object. I object.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is heard.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. DISNEY] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DISNEY. Mr. Chairman, I have no slight idea that this Committee is going to adopt this substitute, for I am minded that Members here want to think things out and understand them. This substitute, consisting of 50 pages and covering the general subject, was substantially only yesterday called to the attention of members of the committee. Personally I did not have a chance to get hold of it until we adjourned yesterday, because we were constantly at work on the bill reported by the committee; and to read it, digest it, and understand it in that short period of time would be next to impossible. I doubt seriously if I understand the individual gentlemen in this House that they are going to vote for a substitute they have never seen, have not heard read, which the Ways and Means Committee has not seen and has not had the opportunity to study and digest. It would seem inconceivable that they would.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DISNEY. I have only 5 minutes.

Mr. CELLER. I just want to state that the bill was offered on the 22d of August.

Mr. MAY. Tell us about the additional cost of this.

Mr. DISNEY. I do not know what it would cost; I do not know; but I do know that we are collecting now about $45,000,000,000 in Federal taxes from the people of the Nation and about $11,000,000,000 in State and local taxes. If we are going to add unnecessarily to that stupendous tax bill I think we are reaching a difficult problem.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for just a brief question?

Mr. DISNEY. If I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky I shall have to yield to others and it would be unfair to me because I have only 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, this is a most far-reaching bill. Regardless of who drew it, it is most fearfully and wonderfully made. I cannot conceive of your understanding it, and I have too much confidence in your judgment for you to vote for it without understanding it more than you could from the explanation that the gentlemen, who will come to you as partisan authors of the bill, or provisions in the bill, can give you in the short period of time that will be allowed to them. An hour now to consider a 50-page amendment that the Ways and Means Committee never had a chance to

study! It is full of committees. On page 7 is one committee; on page 15, another; on page 12 is a board of appeals. You will want to think that out and know about these committees that are going to have charge of your public business; you want to know about that.

The whole retraining program, more than the original, appears in this bill if I understand it. I have had a chance to read it only cursorily, but there is not a word of limitation in this bill except the judgment of the Director; no limitation on the amount of money that would be spent in sending people to jobs or back home from jobs. Even the $200 limit is omitted. On page 17 you find that the retraining Administrator has substantially the right to prepare what is called a unified reemployment program covering recruitment, training, transfer, and placement of the workingmen of this country. I have not had a chance to see whether or not that section provides for enforcement of the plan, but obviously it is in contemplation that it be enforced; that is to say, the placement and the recruitment of workers in this country. Have we come to that? Are we contemplating going to that, legislatively speaking? To the regimentation of all our citizens who labor? I can only touch on a few features here in 5 minutes. If you have copies of the bill—let me read you this because you have not the bill. Now, this is the generalization for your State and your district or State having a responsibility as well as a right.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma has expired.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Oklahoma may proceed for 5 additional minutes.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last three words.

Mr. Chairman, I should like to have the attention of the House, because the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER] has laid down the gage of battle, if there is any real battle in this substitute amendment that is before us. In other words, he has pointed out to you honestly and fairly that his bill, which I presume is the Dingell bill, has 12 major differences as contrasted with the legislation that we are now considering.

I want to say that each and every one of those 12 objections were considered exhaustively and extensively by the Ways and Means Committee. Practically all of these are matters that were originally contained in the old Murray-Kilgore bill. I will not occupy the time of the House to review again in detail how this legislation we are now considering, the bill brought in by the Committee on Ways and Means, comes to the House, but you will remember in the Senate the Murray-Kilgore bill was considered at great length. It was amended very materially, and the bill that passed the Senate was henceforth designated as the George bill. The whole philosophy of the Murray-Kilgore bill was changed in the bill reported as the George bill.

The George bill came to the Ways and Means Committee. We took it up and considered it thoroughly. We took into consideration all of these items that the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER] has so honestly and fairly presented to us. I cannot blame him for his position. He is taking an honest position, but he is just wrong. Let us take his position and consider what it would cost. It would cost billions and billions of dollars. Nobody has cared to risk his reputation as a financier or as a prophet by offering a guess.

At this time, Mr. Chairman, when we are confronted with such a tremendous national debt and such terrific current expenditures, how in the name of common sense can we dare consider embarking upon a program or programs that will cost billions and billions of additional dollars? The gentleman from New York said he rose to prove that the pending bill did not give to the Administrator sufficient power. May I say in all candor and in all honesty that there was no disposition in the Ways and Means Committee, politically or in any other way, to set up any kind of an organization except an efficient one. We started out on that premise. We provided for the appointment of a Director of Demobilization and Reconversion and that the President should make that appointment. We gave this Director the right to select as many assistants as he might need and to select them outside of civil service. In other words, we started him out without any hamstringing of any kind. We put him on his feet and started him on a program to do a big job in a big way.

There is absolutely no use giving consideration to all these objections that my distinguished friend makes, because they have been through the mill of controversy in the other body and have gone through the mill of controversy here. The Celler-Dingell bill, as I said before, is largely a rehash. As a matter of fact, it is not as consistent as the original Murray-Kilgore bill. It is a makeshift proposition. They have tried to take certain portions of the Kilgore bill and the George bill and put them together, with the result they do not jibe. There is only one respect in which they are consistent, and that is in their tremendous and colossal expense.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED].

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, one of the details in the Dingell bill, of course, that makes a great appeal from a reading of it is the matter of the retraining of these war workers for new jobs. When I took the floor here the other day I pointed out just where that would lead us. Nobody could estimate the cost of putting these 86 different activities under various bureaus in this country.

In my remarks on this bill on Tuesday, I called attention to the need for adequate provision for vocational training through utilization of agencies concerned and established institutions to enable soldiers and war workers to enter on new employment. I am now calling your attention to some of the facilities which have been developed under the vocational education acts during the past 27 years which may be utilized for retraining purposes. An inventory of this program discloses the following accomplishments and resources:

First. A State director and supervisory staff in all the States, including the Territories of Hawaii and Puerto Rico and the District of Columbia, amounting to approximately 1,000 persons who have been professionally trained and experienced in the organization and supervision of vocational school programs.

Second. A corps of local directors, supervisors, and teachers amounting to approximately 60,000 having occupational experience and professional training in the administration of vocational schools in agriculture, trades and industries, home economics, distributive education, and occupational information and guidance. The annual enrollment in these vocational schools approximates 2,500,000. Of this enrollment, slightly more than 50 percent are adults who go back to school for further training to up-grade them in their vocation.

Third. The vocational training for defense workers program, now known as the vocational training for war production workers program, was inaugurated by the passage of Public, No. 668, Seventy-sixth Congress, third session, approved June 27, 1940, which provided an initial appropriation of $15,000,000. The Congress has appropriated funds for the conduct of this program each succeeding year. The total amount so appropriated for the cost of courses, including the appropriations for the present fiscal year, is $318,340,000. During the same period an additional amount of $43,000,000 has been appropriated for equipment.

The development of vocational education as a cooperative activity between the States and the Federal Government was initiated by the enactment of the Smith-Hughes Act, Public, No. 347, Sixty-fourth Congress, approved February 23, 1917, and subsequently augmented by the George-Deen Act, Public, No. 673, Seventy-fourth Congress, approved June 8, 1936. During the course of the years following the enactment of this legislation the public schools throughout the Nation, in cooperation with the United States Office of Education, have progressively developed trade and industrial education. In 1940, at the inception of the defense training program, it was recognized that the public schools of the Nation were in a strategic position to undertake the expanded training program necessitated by the war emergency and that they would be an important factor in supplying the manpower needs of war industries.

A survey of the training facilities of the public schools throughout the Nation, made by officials of the United States Office of Education and representatives of the Army and Navy, disclosed that in May 1940 there were between 25,000 and 35,000 skilled teachers and supervisors, between 50,000 and 75,000 training stations in public vocational schools, and approximately a billion dollar plant ready and available for an emergency program to supply workers for war industries. At the present moment there is enough

equipment available, due to subsequent purchases made possible by Federal funds, to provide in excess of 150,000 training stations.

During the past 4 years many of the training stations have been used on a two- or three-shift basis. Many have operated the full 24 hours "around the clock." If the demands for retraining by returning veterans and war production workers warrants, there is no reason why many of these facilities cannot again be operated on a more than one-shift basis.

During the same period, through the facilities made available in the public schools, a total of 6,562,411 persons were trained for entrance into employment in war production industries or received additional training.

Fourth. In addition to the training opportunities for employment in trade and industrial occupations, the vocational program offers part-time and evening instruction in the distributive occupations, in which more than 300,000 men and women were enrolled in 1943.

Fifth. The United States Government has a large investment in the vocational schools of the Nation. During the past 27 years, Congress has appropriated, under the Smith-Hughes and acts supplementary thereto, $281,000,000 for allotment to the States on a matching basis for the promotion of vocational education. This large investment in the training of personnel to serve as directors, supervisors, teacher-trainers, and for the salaries of teachers, together with a large investment for the cost of courses and equipment in the war training program operating by public vocational schools should now be utilized to enable soldiers and war workers to enter new employment.

Sixth. As the war production training program diminishes and finally terminates with the end of hostilities, the demand for vocational training to enable returning soldiers and war workers to enter new employment will increase. The facilities in personnel and equipment available in the public schools of the Nation should be utilized to the fullest extent for this retraining program.

Seventh. The regular program of vocational education is carried on as a cooperative enterprise between the States and the Federal Government. States and local communities have from the beginning contributed approximately two dollars for every dollar of Federal money received. In 1940, under the exigencies of war, the Federal Government assumed the entire cost of courses and supplied considerable additional equipment. With the ending of this emergency, we should return to the peacetime cooperative program in which the Federal Government cooperates with the States and local communities in the support of vocational education. It is important that we return to this principle to preserve education as a State and local function free from the domination of the Federal Government.

Eighth. If additional funds over those regularly appropriated for vocational education are needed to assist the States and local communities in making adequate provision for vocational training for soldiers and war production workers to enter new employment, then those responsible for the administration of these programs should present their needs to Congress and additional funds should be appropriated on a matching basis in sufficient amounts to meet the need.

SOURCE MATERIALS

Data for the statistical figures contained in the attached memorandum may be secured from the following documents:

First. Digest of Annual Reports of State Boards for Vocational Education to the United States Office of Education for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1943.

Second. Hearings before the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations, House of Representatives, Seventy-eighth Congress, second session, on the Department of Labor-Federal Security Agency appropriation bill for 1945; part II, pages 192 to 198, inclusive. Review of Activities of the Vocational Training for War Production Workers Program from July 1940 to June 30, 1943, as revised for the fiscal year 1944.

Third. Vocational Training Problems When the War Ends, published as Vocational Division leaflet No. 12, Federal Security Agency, United States Office of Education.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD at this point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Rhode Island?

There was no objection.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I had not intended speaking on this legislation at all. I have very definite opinions respecting this bill, H. R. 5227, and I have examined it very carefully. I could not imagine there would be such violent opposition to the bill since it appeared to me to embody no more than the bare essentials of American justice and fair play.

I have sat here growing "madder" by the minute as I listened to great blasts of oratory—all apparently more concerned with the defeat of Roosevelt than with the prevention of another depression.

It is quite thrilling no doubt, to listen to the stimulating cry, "The public purse has been protected." It is inspiring to listen to the great declamations about States' rights and their sacred character.

But what of the citizen himself—does he rate no protection? Does he have no rights that are sacred?

An American citizen is not a chattel. His toil is not an article of commerce. You cannot play fast and loose with his life and with his home—and tell him to starve while you stand here preaching about the public purse and States' rights.

Turn your back on him again—let him flounder once more in the sea of despondency as he did in the roaring twenties—and though you stuff that public purse with all the greenbacks from hell to hackney—it will not be worth as much as a wagonload of second-hand ashes. You can buttress yourselves with States' rights until your Commonwealth hides behind impregnable walls of complete isolation—but if you refuse to heed the cry of American families they will tear down your walls and they will destroy forever your dream of smug complacency.

I may be all wrong. I admit I get a bit confused sometimes when I listen to all these windy expositions of intricate economics from those who refuse to do business with common sense. I am just one of the ordinary run-of-the-mill Americans, and I do not understand too well all the complicated arguments about economic cycles; but to my way of thinking the most important single thing this country has, ever had, or ever will have, is a happy and prosperous citizen. If he is not worth consideration and protection, then all the acres of print about free enterprise and economic cycles are not worth the paper they are written on.

Up where I come from, in Rhode Island, we have a newspaper which is violently opposed to such legislation as the one under consideration. While this subject was being debated in the United States Senate, the Providence Journal kept up a running attack upon it. Daily editorials kept up a steady fire; and when the George bill was enacted, the Journal chortled with glee; and even though Rhode Island was at the peak of a terrific heat wave—the trap was being closed on the Nazis in Normandy and General Eisenhower was promising a great victory—the Providence Journal gave front editorial space to its cheers for the victory of the George bill.

This daily periodical prefaces its condemnations of social legislation with the statement that it is interested only in the working men and women of Rhode Island. Among Rhode Islanders that statement is as sour as the Journal's masthead declaration that it is an independent newspaper.

This paper proclaimed in violent language that stark tragedy would follow in the wake of the passage of such a bill. We had the old Hoover cry again—grass will grow in the streets; business will stop doing business; we will all starve if you get any money while you are out of work. The Journal condemned as betrayers of the working men and women, of business, big and little, and of the Nation itself, any legislator who would dare cast a vote in favor of such legislation.

The Journal claimed it argued as it did, only because of its great love of the working men and women of Rhode Island, when the real fact of the matter is the Journal is not interested in States' rights, or the public purse, or anything else any more than are the Hottentots of Asia. The Journal's one all-consuming interest in Rhode Island is a cheap labor market—just what it has always wanted and what it has always fought for.

In its every utterance on this legislation the Providence Journal demonstrated that its real opposition was caused by its complete lack of faith—by its complete disgust with the working men and women of Rhode Island. Never once did it argue unemployment benefits such as here provided would be unnecessary because we would have no unemployment. No; on the contrary, it argued that unemployment benefits should not be liberal because men would prefer to loaf. The Providence Journal argued

that the workingmen of Rhode Island—the sons and grandsons of the immigrants our built our State, our cities, our mills and factories—yes, and the fabulous fortunes that were the fruit of their toil—that these men are bums and would not work if they could get $30 a week.

Do not pass this legislation, this Journal said, because the workingman is lazy. The home he is struggling to pay for should be taken from him. The education he is trying to give his children should be denied him. The food on his table, the clothes on his kids' back, all he has he does not care for—he would rather see it go, while he wallows around in his hovel and shuns work. He should be made to work 60 hours for $9 a week, and the Federal Government must not dare presume to interfere with our plans for him.

According to the Providence Journal—and in its Sunday, August 13, editorial it positively proclaimed the real danger in this type of legislation was what I have just set forth—no working man or woman in my State has ambition enough to want to rise out of the rut of abject poverty.

No mention does the Journal make about the plight of the father of a large family struggling to own a home of his own, to pay for a car, to pay for the washing machine in the cellar, and to send a couple of his boys through medical school or college. Not one jot or tittle does the Journal care whether that man has peace of mind in his struggles; not a wisp of a hope does it hold out for him. He is a bum and a sloven.

All the Journal is interested in is a guaranty that he can be forced to accept $9 a week or starve.

This paper dragged up as a smoke screen for its real purpose the old argument about States' rights. It forbade the enactment of this legislation because the pillars of our Republic would come crashing down round our ears if the sacred doctrine of States' rights were not heeded and this bill thrown out the window.

I cannot help recalling the last time the Journal's crowd of "let-the-State-do-it-fellows" were at the helm of our National Government. I cannot help asking how strong then were the pillars of our Republic, how much longer would they have stood on their foundations had we not reconciled doctrine to facts and applied the remedies which were urgently needed. It seems to me I recall one great champion of States' rights put to the torch the hovels that housed servicemen who came to their Nation's Capital to appeal for a loaf of bread. It seems to me the doctrine of States' rights required they be thrown out of their Nation's Capital and the great engineer turned the guns and the gas on them and their blood flowed on Pennsylvania Avenue.

This great doctrine of States rights flourished in the closing hours of the roaring twenties. States were left to their own devices. States rights were all hallowed. There was no encroachment by the National Government on the provinces of the several States. Yes—and banks closed—savings of many a lifetime were swept away. Families starved—suicides became the order of the day. Business disappeared, both big and little. Farmers were dispossessed and home owners were driven into the street. Yes, and veterans—for whom this very same journal professes such great concern—stood to their knees in slush and snow, humble and meek before the great god of States rights, and polished apples praying someone who came from any State or any country would offer up a nickel as a sacrifice on the altar of private enterprise. All this went on while prosperity sulked around that famous corner which States rights blocked from view.

Yes; we had States' rights while the farmers and home owners were being evicted and States were struggling and going broke trying to pay a pauper's pittance to unemployed and hungry men for whom our great National Government was supposed to exist.

There is no man alive who has more affection for his homeland than have I for the hills and fields and shores of Little Rhody. I love, with an intense affection, every stone wall that winds over the hills. I love every tree, every blade of grass, every wave that rushes from the sea to kiss her fair shores.

I believe there is no place in all the world that compares with Little Rhody, nor is there a people in all this land who surpass Rhode Islanders in charity, in decency, in honor, in brotherly love. Nor is there anywhere a prouder history of complete and violent independence—political and otherwise. The people of Rhode Island are proud they are Americans, and they believe in cooperation. They are proud of all other Americans and they believe all Americans believe in cooperation.

We are all in this war together. We are all determined we shall cooperate with the peoples of the world to prevent the recurrence of such holocausts. We are also determined that we will not stand around preaching international cooperation—and at the same time preach isolationism at home.

We will not listen to manifestations of interest in the welfare of peoples of other lands from those who boastfully maintain their complete disregard for our fellow Americans. Our responsibility is here. It is under our noses and we do not have to go running thousands of miles to find a chance to be on the level.

Let us forget politics in this thing. Let us not be afraid to admit we are Americans—all of us—and if we determine to make America a little better place to live in the world perforce will be a better place for everyone.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WOLVERTON].

Mr. WOLVERTON of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, it has been my privilege to serve on the special committee of the House on post-war planning. As a result of that service my interest in the subject of post-war unemployment problems has been greatly increased. The information that I have been able to obtain as a member of that committee has been very helpful in understanding the several elements that enter into the problem and the means that must be taken to guard against as well as provide a remedy for such unemployment in the event that it comes upon us. I have studied the subject as thoroughly as any subject that I have ever studied since I became a Member of this House.

I am convinced that the most serious problem this Nation faces as it goes into the post-war period is that with respect to maintaining a national income that will permit purchasing power to keep our peacetime industries going. I am aware of the debt that hangs over this Nation. I am just as solicitous that no unnecessary expenses be added as any Member of this House, but I am equally certain that unless we take the measures that will enable us in the days that are ahead to keep up the purchasing power which produces national income, which carries the burden of the Government, that we will face direful days. It is unpleasant to think what the condition would be if we do not have a sufficient national income to sustain our National Budget.

I have considered it a privilege to serve with the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER] and others in drawing the Dingell bill, H. R. 5227, now before the House as a substitute for the skeleton bill offered by the Ways and Means Committee. The Dingell bill is sound. It recognizes the human element that should enter into legislation of this character. It represents the careful and studied judgment of Members of this House who are interested in seeing that the welfare of those who labor is not bypassed or overlooked. It is realistic and sound in its provisions. If a time of unemployment comes upon us, then it will be necessary to have provisions such as are in this bill. All that this bill does is to set up safeguards and standards to meet such an emergency, if and when it occurs. I have given of the best thought and judgment of which I am possessed in the drawing of the bill. So has every other member of that unofficial committee who assisted in the drawing of the bill. This includes representatives from the A. F. of L., C. I. O., railroad brotherhoods, and officials of our Government who by years of experience know the problems with which we are faced and the remedy that should be applied.

Every member of that unofficial committee of House Members was convinced of the importance of the subject and sought to do something that was worth while. I am proud of the bill that is the result of our combined labor.

It is regrettable that those who favor a bill of the importance of the measure we now have before this House do not get the opportunity they should have to inform the Members of the House as to what it contains. The desire for speed in disposing of the matter cannot be justified. I am certain, judging by some of the statements that have been made by some of the Members who are opposed to the Dingell substitute bill that they have never read it. I was astounded to hear the gentleman from Oklahoma, a member of the Ways and Means Committee, state that he did not know anything about the Dingell bill. That it had never come to his attention, nor

had it been considered by the Ways and Means Committee of which he is a member. Why did he not know about it? Where has he been? The bill was introduced and has been a part of the official files of this House since August 22. During the time that has intervened the committee of which he is a member has been holding its meetings discussing this subject. If he has been as interested in providing a worth-while bill on this subject, as he indicates, it seems to me he would have brought to the attention of the committee this important measure, H. R. 5223, which bears the name of a distinguished colleague who is also a member of the committee. A bill that has the support and approval of the A. F. of L., C. I. O., and the railroad brotherhoods. It may be too much to expect that the committee would agree with the bill in its every particular, but when I see a great committee of this House, for the members of whom we have great respect, bringing before this House a bill of the character that has been brought before it, without having any hearings, I do not wonder that the people of the Nation begin to lose respect for legislative processes.

The legislation before the House today affects the welfare of millions of our people. It has a direct and important bearing upon the future economy of this Nation. Notwithstanding the importance of the subject, no hearings were held by the Ways and Means Committee before it submitted its bill to the House. No one who had any interest in the subject or had any knowledge as a result of study or contact with the problem was given an opportunity to testify before the committee in open hearings. This is such a disregard of the rights of our citizens that in my judgment it is subject to condemnation and is inexcusable. The Dingell bill is entitled to, and should have the support of the membership of this House.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. LAFOLLETTE].

The Chair may state that recognition is being given to those Members who rose and asked for recognition under the limitation of time.

Mr. ROLPH. A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. ROLPH. I know there is a limitation of time, but I did not know that Members who sought recognition were requested to rise. Is there any time left?

The CHAIRMAN. If there is time left, of course recognition can be given, priority being necessarily given to members of the committee.

Mr. DEWEY. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. DEWEY. How much time is left?

The CHAIRMAN. There will be 20 minutes remaining after the gentleman from Indiana has spoken.

Mr. CARLSON of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. CARLSON of Kansas. Will members of the committee be given consideration in the allocation of the remainder of the time?

The CHAIRMAN. Always, if they rise seeking recognition.

Mr. CARLSON of Kansas. Then I ask for recognition later, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Indiana is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. LAFOLLETTE. Mr. Chairman, I fully realize that there are two different points of view involved in these different bills. I do not believe I am a Keynesite. I do not believe wealth is the circulating medium. I think wealth is the material wealth which is produced from all materials processed and distributed among the people. However, I do feel and I think I do know that this is an emergency situation. We have produced for war. As we think of it, it has been an inflationary process despite everything we have done, because the things you produce for war are wasted, they do not become a part of your civilian economy, they do not become a part of anything which could be consumed by the ordinary processes.

When we end that, it is said, "Oh, but the people who will be out of work will have or should have a great deal of money." I do not propose to debate that, because there are disputed figures on that and they are being presented before the War Labor Board, for instance, all the time. But I do know this. Remembering my own experience in the last depression, I was a fortunate person. I had a little means. I could live on it. But the income from the practice of law, in my office at least, went down about 60 percent. It curtailed extremely my expenditures for things I would want to consume—clothes, food, shoes. Of course, we did not buy automobiles then, at least those of us who were brought up as I was, with the idea that you could not have butter and jam on the same piece of bread until you had saved enough to own at least two "rent houses," as we described rental properties in my country when I was a boy.

But that curtailment, which I experienced, is going to be experienced by these people. Suppose a man has an amount of $300 or $400 which is saved up. We stop producing for war. There is going to be a period of at least 6 months or a year before you get people back at work, producing consumer goods. There will be the products of the farm; there will be the consumer goods that are available now. They will not be consumed, so that people can go on, unless you give these people reasonable assurance that they can spend with some feeling that they are going to have a regular income.

There is going to be a need for a great post-war building program after this war is over. We all know that. Would it not be much better if we produce a uniform maintenance stand-by pay for the people who work, so that if they have savings they may be used as a down payment on the building of homes rather than to start the financing of homes, as you will do otherwise, on a Government proposition, where you go from 90 percent to 95 percent or for all the financing?

This thing, fundamentally, is not the nationalization of the social-security system, because there is no tax levied. That question is one which might and will be, undoubtedly, debated after this is over. No one, at least of those who propose this legislation, even contends that that is true, but if the product and the wealth of invested capital come from sales which transcend State lines, and the greatest thing that has contributed to the development of America, in my opinion, is the commerce clause of the Constitution of the United States, then if you have levied a 3-percent excise tax upon the employers and the manufacturers, that is passed on to the consumers and those consumers are all over the United States.

Then if capital received accretions from sales all over the Nation and to the Nation at war, why deny equally national treatment of unemployment benefits to the worker in industry. Industry consists of capital and labor; both should be treated similarly by this body.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON] is recognized.

Mr. CARLSON of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I regret very much that the debate is so limited that this amendment cannot be thoroughly analyzed by the Committee. We have analyzed it in committee and I am somewhat familiar with it. Before the House votes on this particular amendment as a substitute for the George bill, I think every Member should be apprised of the fact that its approval would bring about a change in what has been our national policy from the beginning of our Nation for the treatment of our war veterans. We have always accorded those boys who fought our battles a preferential treatment over those who remained at home and took their place on the farms and in the factories.

Mr. LAFOLLETTE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CARLSON of Kansas. Not at the present time.

Mr. LAFOLLETTE. The gentleman's statement is not correct.

Mr. CARLSON of Kansas. I have read this bill and if I understand the English language it provides on page 19 that a war worker who is an individual and has no dependents will receive $20 a week for a period of 52 weeks, and an individual who has one dependent will receive $25. In another section of the bill I notice that a veteran who has no dependents is to receive $20. If he has one dependent he receives $5 additional, or $25. Congress passed the G. I. bill, which provides a weekly compensation of $20 a week for a period of 52 weeks for our veterans. This bill makes the same payments for our war workers who have been receiving high wages, time and a half and double time. It may be that some individuals take the view that we should pay the same benefits to those who have remained at home as those boys who are fighting our battles in Italy, Normandy, and the Pacific. I want it definitely understood that is not my view. I will not support

legislation that will place the veterans of this Nation on the same basis as the folks who have stayed at home and drawn higher wages than they ever made before. This amendment would provide the same benefits for placement and unemployment compensation. The C. I. O. has definitely taken the position that war workers are entitled to the same consideration as our boys who have gone through torture and faced death.

I want to quote from the hearings a statement which will be found in the hearings before a subcommittee of the Military Affairs Committee of the United States Senate on May 30, 1944. The committee held hearings on S. 1730 and S. 1823 on mobilization and demobilization problems. I am going to read it to you now. This is not my statement, but it is the statement of Richard T. Frankensteen, vice president and director of the Aircraft and United Automobile Workers, Congress of Industrial Organizations. Listen to this. This is his statement on page 220, in case you want to look it up:

War workers and war veterans should be treated alike so far as job placements and unemployment compensation are concerned.

On page 221, further quoting Mr. Frankensteen:

No legislation will be satisfactory to our organization—

Meaning the C. I. O. Listen to that—

to our organization which provides separate treatment with respect to jobs for returning servicemen and for war workers.

Those are his words; they are not mine. I leave it to this House if we today are going to vote for legislation which will change a policy that this Nation has always had, the policy of preferential treatment for those who have faced death on the battlefield.

Mr. ROLPH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I ask for this time in order to read two telegrams received this morning from San Francisco.

When the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER] was on the floor I asked him to explain any difference between the public-works section in Senate 2051 and the Dingell substitute to the House committee bill. The gentleman from New York, Congressman CELLER, states that the gentleman from New York [Mr. LYNCH] will explain the public-works provisions in the two bills. Before the gentleman from New York, Representative LYNCH, speaks, I wish to submit these telegrams; the first comes from Builders of the West, and reads:

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF., *August 30, 1944.*
Representative THOMAS ROLPH,
Washington, D. C.:

The cities, counties, and other political subdivisions in the 11 Western States are desperately in need of assistance for preparation of plans and blueprints for post-war public work. The provisions of title 5 of Senate 2051 are very workable if passed in its present form. Modifications of title 5 of Senate 2051 as recommended in report of Ways and Means Committee of House of Representatives are entirely unworkable. We have checked with many political subdivisions and all have same reaction. Requirements for repayment of loans are far too rigid. This plus inclusion of interest will prohibit acceptance of loans by political subdivisions until referendum vote has been taken. We urge you to do everything in your power to obtain passage of Senate 2051 retaining title 5 thereof as it was passed originally by the Senate. This will do more to speed up preparation of plans for public work than anything else that can be done at present time. Without it we are doomed to another W. P. A. Similar wire being sent to each Congressman from 11 Western States.

REX L. NICHOLSON,
Managing Director,
Builders of the West, Inc.

I now read the other wire coming from the California State Federation of Labor:

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF., *August 30, 1944.*
Hon. THOMAS ROLPH,
Washington, D. C.:

Urge your support of Senate bill 2051 without amendments recommended by House Ways and Means Committee.

C. J. HAGGERTY,
Secretary, California State
Federation of Labor.

Mr. SADOWSKI rose.

The CHAIRMAN. For what purpose does the gentleman from Michigan rise?

Mr. SADOWSKI. In support of the Dingell substitute.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Dingell substitute. I am disappointed to find that the Ways and Means Committee approached this problem of reconversion and neglected entirely the subject matter of reemployment. It seems to me that reemployment and reconversion are tied in together. The whole subject matter of reconversion is based on the proposition of reemployment, of putting our people back to work. Perhaps down there in Minnesota where our great sage, and colleague [Mr. KNUTSON] comes from, he may not have the problems we have in Michigan; perhaps he will not be hit as hard, but in our State it is not only the C. I. O., the A. F. of L., and the railway brotherhoods and all organized labor that are alarmed about the reemployment situation, but our Detroit Chamber of Commerce, our Michigan Manufacturers' Association all have pointed out repeatedly through their publications this terrific problem we are going to be faced with.

I should like to be optimistic and join with the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, with the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. KNUTSON] and others and say: "Oh, well, there is going to be plenty of work; everybody is going to find employment; everybody is going to be taken care of," but my business people in the city of Detroit, the manufacturers in the city of Detroit do not believe it can be settled so easily. We have a problem here to face and they have asked help in this respect. We are not giving them any help at all, we are simply saying: "You go ahead and find your own way out."

I am mindful of the situation in the district of my distinguished colleague the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT], which adjoins mine. In the last couple of years he has had a hundred thousand new people move into his district. I am mindful of the district of my distinguished colleague the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO]. I know that he has had at least 100,000 new people move into his district. These people have come from every part of the country, Tennessee, Alabama, Mississippi, Georgia, and some have come from the upper part of Michigan; but they are there only temporarily; they have come in there for these war jobs. Now they have got to go back; we have to make terrific readjustments.

We must feel that we have a responsibility toward that phase of human readjustment. Certainly this Congress is neglecting one of its most important duties. One of the most important things we have to do today is to find employment and see that these people are readjusted into new jobs, into their old jobs, you may say, with the least bit of shock to the economic system.

I think the Dingell substitute is worthy of your support for it has been gone into so carefully by the Celler committee, and they have given it real careful study, they have tried to take care of about 10 of the important points that were eliminated in the House committee bill. Those points are all important, and they are incorporated in the Dingell substitute. I am going to vote for that bill.

I do not think the cost is going to be too great. Maybe it will be tremendous, as some of the folks say it will be. I do not know, nobody knows, what the cost will be, but we cannot take a chance on it. We cannot just simply say, "Oh, well, we will see after the thing hits us." After the flood is on and the misery and suffering is on and the economic condition has been jarred to such an extent that everybody will suffer, farm prices and everything else, then it is too late to come down here and take care of this situation. We will probably be in recess. This is something we should do now. If the situation does not turn out to be as bad as some of us fear it may be, so much the better, it may not cost us anything or very little; but if it is bad, if the situation is bad, at least we will have something here to stop a condition which would be demoralizing to the Nation.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. TOLAN].

Mr. TOLAN. Mr. Chairman, today I voted for the Dingell substitute to House Ways and Means conversion and demobilization bill. I deem it a far superior piece of legislation than the Ways and Means Committee bill.

I firmly believe that the present bill should contain a provision for a representative advisory board, consisting of labor, industry, agriculture, and the public, concerning which the Ways and Means Committee is silent. The Dingell bill has just such a provision.

I also believe that all Federal workers should be included, many of whom are now employed in Government-owned plants. This provision is not in the House Ways and Means Committee bill, and the Dingell bill does include these workers.

It seems to me also that the committee bill is woefully lacking in not providing for a reasonable Federal compensation employment insurance. Justice

Byrnes, presently head of the War Stabilization Board, strongly recommended before the Ways and Means Committee of the House that a uniform Federal standard of unemployment insurance of $20 a week for a period of 26 weeks should be allowed. His advice was not followed, and the committee has made no provision whatever for any uniform Federal unemployment insurance. The Dingell bill contains such a provision.

I am not impressed with the arguments made on the floor that there will be no unemployment after the war. What a miracle this would be.

It must be remembered that at least 30,000,000 people will shift jobs in the reconversion period. This Nation cannot stand half of them or even a quarter of them unemployed. The only way to reduce our huge national debt is full production and full employment.

Under the Dingell bill safeguards are provided. A worker must be registered with Federal employment agencies and are not eligible for Federal unemployment insurance if they refuse to accept jobs.

It does not seem logical to me to have 48 States, Hawaii, Alaska, and Puerto Rico administering 51 unemployment-insurance laws, each providing for different amounts. This is what the committee bill provides for, and the Dingell bill is just the opposite.

This is not the way we sent our boys to war and our workers to our defense plants. Every post-war problem is a national problem. Unemployment insurance should be uniform, otherwise you will have thousands and thousands of workers shifting around to the States paying the higher unemployment insurance.

We were all in the war; we must all be in on the peace or our national economy may be shattered to its very foundation. This Nation will never decay as long as industry and agriculture are prosperous and our people are employed and their children fed.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DEWEY].

Mr. DEWEY. Mr. Chairman, I listened with interest to what the distinguished gentleman from Michigan has just said, but I cannot let go unchallenged the statement that the Ways and Means Committee in its study of the rehabilitation and reconversion period has not taken into consideration the matter of unemployment.

The gentleman has referred to conditions in his own great State of Michigan, which has undoubtedly produced as much if not more war materials than any other State in the Union, even including the State of California and the State of Illinois. From what the gentleman stated, you would think that when the termination of contracts comes it will be a matter of indifference to the House and the provisions contained in the present bill reported by the Ways and Means Committee, what will become of workmen when they lose their jobs.

The gentleman must know well—it has been stated a number of times during the debate—that there are $6,000,000,000 amassed in the different States to take care of unemployment.

In the gentleman's own State of Michigan under the State law that State is prepared to pay $20 a week for 20 weeks in any year. The Dingell bill only asks for 26 weeks, and that puts the war worker on the same basis as the G. I. Joe's. I could not stand for that. Twenty dollars a week for 20 weeks is sufficient. The bill under consideration also provides that if the funds in the State of Michigan are not sufficient, then the Federal Treasury can step in and supplement them by advances and bring them up to the point where unemployment benefits can be fully paid.

In the State of California, another great war-production State, the weekly benefit is $20 for 24 weeks in every year, only 2 weeks less than that asked in the Dingell bill. No, Mr. Chairman. The unemployment situation has been well considered in the bill reported by the Ways and Means Committee, the funds are adequate, and if not adequate under the reserves now built up the Federal Treasury can supplement them, so that unemployment will be taken care of as provided by each State.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEWEY. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. MAGNUSON. My State is one of those States, but in order to be eligible for unemployment insurance in the State of Washington you must be a citizen of that State. Many of these war workers do not wish to relinquish their citizenship. They may have come from the gentleman's State.

Mr. DEWEY. It is my understanding that wherever a man works the unemployment insurance will apply. If he is a citizen of the State of Arkansas and is working in the State of Michigan he will get the benefits of the State of Michigan. There is an arrangement between the States so that no matter whether he goes back to Arkansas or not he will get the benefits of the State of Michigan.

Mr. MAGNUSON. We would have to change the State law in Washington to do that.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN].

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD at this point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Chairman, it is my purpose to support the substitute offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL]. I feel that if we will pass liberal legislation to provide for a real program for war mobilization and reconversion we are in effect preventing another depression. If my thought is correct and we can prevent another depression then certainly there will be great savings to the Treasury of the United States in the end. I do not think that the bill reported by the committee is sufficient to meet the unemployment situation that will develop during the reconversion period. I do not know of a more important problem that will be confronting us in the future. I might also say that I see no reason why those in the Federal Government should not be covered under the provisions of this bill. I sincerely hope that the Dingell amendment will apply.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DOUGHTON].

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Chairman, the Committee is confronted at this time with a rather strange and unusual situation. We have now been presented with a substitute for a bill reported by a large majority of the Committee on Ways and Means after careful and thorough consideration. The committee bill contains about 15 pages. We are now asked to adopt a substitute bill containing 50 pages, on which there is no report. There is a full report on the committee bill. We are asked to set aside a bill reported by a large majority of the Committee on Ways and Means, which has been fully explained in the committee report. Every Member has had an opportunity to understand and know just what is in the committee bill. We are asked to substitute therefor a bill which has been called the Dingell bill, but what, in reality, from what has occurred here today, I am constrained to believe is the Celler substitute rather than the Dingell substitute.

The author of the substitute confessed that he knew little about it. He also confessed to me this morning that there was some substantive matter in his substitute bill that was never presented or brought to the attention of the Committee on Ways and Means. What do you think about adopting a substitute of 50 pages which has never been considered by any committee? Complaint is made that the Committee on Ways and Means failed to conduct hearings. The author of this substitute never asked the Committee on Ways and Means to consider the substitute. I do not want to use the word "effrontery," but that is what it amounts to, or the next thing to it, to ask this House to adopt a substitute of 50 pages, much of it new matter, that has never been considered by any committee. There are not a dozen Members in this House who have ever read what is in the substitute. The author of the substitute himself confessed he did not know what was in it, and called on someone else to explain it. That is the most outstanding and unusual admission that I have ever heard of in my thirty-odd years of service in this House.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOUGHTON. I yield.

Mr. KNUTSON. Would it not be highly dangerous for this Committee to adopt the Dingell amendment? No one knows what is in the measure; not even the author.

Mr. DOUGHTON. They cannot know it. As chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means I do not know what is in it. I have not had an opportunity to find out what is in it. The author of it would not explain or attempt to explain it.

Mr. KNUTSON. The gentleman will admit that it is too big a dose to take on faith at one time.

Mr. DOUGHTON. I yield to no one in my sincere desire and anxiety to do everything that is reasonably possible to take care of the unemployment situation, but in my judgment, the proper way to take care of the matter is not at this time to dip into the Treasury, but to give incentive to industry to go ahead and employ the unemployed. We would prevent unemployment by giving incentive to industry rather than dipping into the Treasury for doles and creating idleness. That is what this substitute means.

The bill, as reported by the Ways and Means Committee, is as far as the Congress can wisely, properly, and safely go with the information at hand. Certainly, there will be an opportunity to plan wisely a public-works program, if needed, to meet an extended period of unemployment. The unemployment compensation system was not created for the purposes set out in the Dingell bill.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired.

The question is on the substitute amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL].

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MICHENER. Do I understand that if the amendment of the gentleman of Michigan [Mr. DINGELL] carries, we are practically through; that if this motion carries the House has adopted the Dingell substitute as the bill, and there will be no further discussion of the Dingell substitute, and no further explanation of its various complicated provisions; is that correct?

The CHAIRMAN. The statement of the gentleman from Michigan is correct.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the substitute amendment.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. EBERHARTER) there were—ayes 43, noes 138.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. EBERHARTER and Mr. DOUGHTON.

The Committee again divided and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 54, noes 188.

So the substitute amendment was rejected.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which is at the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the bottom of page 28, insert a new subsection to be known as 1 (a), to read as follows:

"Issue such directives to other executive agencies as may be necessary to carry out their powers in a manner consistent with the plans formulated under this section or to coordinate the activities of other executive agencies with respect to the problems arising out of the transition from war to peace. Each executive agency shall carry out the directives of the Director expeditiously and, to the extent necessary to carry out such directives, shall modify its operations and procedures and issue regulations with respect thereto. Nothing contained in this section shall be construed as authorizing any activities which are not within the scope of the powers possessed by the President or the executive agencies under existing law or future acts of the Congress."

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I am not the author of this amendment. Senator GEORGE, of Georgia, is the author of this amendment. It appears on the bill before you at page 3, lines 12 to 24, and on page 4, lines 1 and 2. The language was stricken out by the Committee on Ways and Means. Why they did so is beyond my comprehension. The Director of War Mobilization and Reconversion under the language of the Ways and Means Committee version, is a mere figment of the imagination. He has no power of any consequence. There is no unification so that all the war agencies will be sprawling all over, issuing directives in all directions. The War Manpower Commission, the Social Security Board, the War Production Board, the Smaller War Plants Corporation, the Office of Price Administration, the Foreign Economic Administration, the Defense Plant Corporation and all the other war agencies are permitted, without let or hindrance, to issue their directives, independent of the office that we set up here under this bill. There is no centralization of authority. There is no opportunity granted to the Director to remove bottlenecks. He cannot cancel out any directives of other war agencies that unduly interfere with his work. If he acts at all it will only be to create more confusion. Now it is essential to get an amendment of the type of this George amendment giving the strongest power to this Director to wipe out and cancel out any orders issued by any of the war agencies that impede the carrying out of the objectives of the act. It avails us naught to put in as a director a man with courage, a man with guts, if we only give him a paper sword. That is what we do without my amendment.

All you give him by the Ways and Means Committee version is words. It is like the story of Sancho Panza in Don Quixote. There was placed before him wines, fruit, and other viands, and when he started to partake thereof it was taken away from him. All you give this director is words and not substance. When he tries to avail himself of any substance it is taken away from him.

It is very strange that the Ways and Means Committee report quoted favorably the recommendations of the House Committee on Post-war Economic Policy and Planning. That committee said that there should be one centralized authority, the director of war mobilization. There must be one authority. I will read from the report of the House Committee on Post-war Economic Policy and Planning:

There must be one authority which can coordinate the work of the agencies engaged in these problems of reconversion—settlement of contracts, disposal of surplus property, policies relating to curtailment of war production and resumption of civilian production, facilitating reemployment, continuation or relaxation of wartime controls and many other problems. This was one of the principal recommendations of the Baruch-Hancock report.

The Director would be charged with the formulation of over-all policies necessary to bring about the transition from war to peace and with the responsibility of seeing that these policies are carried out by the agencies.

The Director shall formulate plans necessary to meet the problems arising out of the transition from war to peace; issue directives to executive agencies to carry out their powers in a manner consistent with these plans and coordinate the activities of the agencies. He would recommend to Congress legislation needed to provide authority to carry out the plans. The Director would promote and assist in development of demobilization and reconversion plans for the agencies, keep the various agencies informed of the plans of other agencies, and settle any controversies which might develop between them in the development or administration of plans.

In carrying out his functions, it is recommended that he consult and cooperate with the State and local governments, industry, labor, and agriculture.

The Director would establish policies to be followed by the agencies in selecting the contracts for curtailment or termination. He would establish policies providing for full and prompt consultation between agencies and the war contractors and representatives of the employees of war contractors to obtain the most effective use of nonwar production factilities and manpower released through the curtailments of war production.

How can he coordinate? How in thunder can he settle controversies of that character unless you give him power? The Ways and Means Committee version, for reasons beyond my comprehension, does not give him that ample power. The George amendment—my amendment—gives that power. We should reinstate those powers.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and amendments thereto close in 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. DISNEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, this is settled completely in the bill before us. If you will turn to page 28 you will find the following language:

In addition to powers which the President is authorized to and does delegate to the Director for the purpose of more effectively coordinating the mobilization of the Nation for war, the Director shall, subject to the direction of the President—

And then on page 29 you will find this:

(4) Promote and assist in the development of demobilization and reconversion plans by other executive agencies; develop procedures whereby each executive agency is kept informed of proposed demobilization and reconversion plans and proposals which relate to its work and which are being developed or carried out by other executive agencies; and settle controversies between such executive agencies in the development and administration of such plans;

The language is plain. Now, do we need more than one man in an executive department issuing directives? The President is the proper authority to do that, in my humble judgment, and when

we start giving authority to administrators and other directors to issue directives to other parts of an executive department, I think we get into an unusual type of performance.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DISNEY. I yield.

Mr. CELLER. Does the gentleman think it is fair to put these additional burdens on the President?

Mr. DISNEY. We put them on the Director. We tell him to settle controversies between other agencies.

Mr. CELLER. He cannot change the directors of other agencies.

Mr. DISNEY. What plainer language can we use than we did use, namely, to say: "You settle this controversy between DOUGHTON and KNUTSON; go settle it." What greater authority could we give a person than that? What greater grant of jurisdiction could a court be given than that?

Mr. CELLER. The mere fact that you struck out the George provision is an indication that you do not want him to have that power.

Mr. DISNEY. This is not the only George provision that we struck out. There were remnants of the Kilgore bill all through it, as it came to the committee, which we struck out.

Mr. CELLER. But how can he exercise that power over these other agencies?

Mr. DISNEY. How can we state it more specifically than to say he is to settle all the controversies between the other agencies? I submit that under any construction of the English language that is what it does mean.

Mr. CELLER. You say; "the President shall have the power to do it"; you do not say the Director; it is up to the President to direct the Director.

Mr. DISNEY. Oh, no; he is given this authority under the fourth subsection, subsection (c). He is specifically given the authority first to promote the plans and second to settle differences between them. This proposed amendment is mere verbiage.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DISNEY. I yield.

Mr. EBERHARTER. It is the gentleman's contention that the word "settle" gives to this Director the authority to make these different agencies comply with whatever he decides shall be done; is that correct?

Mr. DISNEY. I do not know any other construction that can be placed on it. If a controversy over a plan arises between different agencies of the Government he has the right to settle it. Is not that the kind of jurisdiction that is given a court?

Mr. EBERHARTER. Any person who has jurisdiction also has the power to enforce his judgment and the decision that is made; but my contention is that this does not give the power to enforce the decision which he might make in arriving at what is a proper settlement.

Mr. DISNEY. I think we just disagree on the meaning of the English language.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DISNEY. I yield.

Mr. JENKINS. Is it not true that in the committee every effort was made to aid the Administrator by giving him smooth, full, complete authority?

Mr. DISNEY. It was attempted to give him liberal authority.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DISNEY. I yield.

Mr. REED of New York. Just one word of warning. That with this power they might be able to issue directives against the public.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I should like to call the attention of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DOUGHTON] to a certain feature of the bill. I notice under the provisions of the bill the committee is anticipating the passage of the Surplus Property Act of 1944. Am I correct in my understanding of the provisions of paragraph 2 on page 29 that if the Surplus Property Act does become effective in 1944 that nothing in this bill will set aside the objectives that might be named in the Surplus Property Act?

Mr. DOUGHTON. I may say to my distinguished friend that there is nothing in it that conflicts; there is not a thing that would disturb that bill in the least.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WASIELEWSKI: Page 31, after line 16, insert a new section as follows:

"SEC. 102. (a) There is hereby created an advisory board, which shall consist of 12 members who shall be appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. All of the members of the Board, shall represent the general public and the public interest, but in order that the Board may have the benefit of experience in the matters with which it will deal under this act, three members of the Board shall have had experience in business management, three members shall have had experience in matters relating to labor, and three members shall have had experience in agriculture. The President shall designate one of the remaining three members as chairman of the Board.

"(b) It shall be the general function of the Board to advise with the Director with respect to war mobilization and reconversion and make to him such recommendations relating to legislation, policies, and procedures as it may deem necessary.

"(c) Members of the Board shall receive a per diem allowance of $25 for each day spent in actual meetings of the Board or at conferences held upon the call of the Director, plus necessary traveling and other expenses incurred while so engaged."

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr. Chairman, this section was recommended by the Colmer committee and was quite fully discussed by me yesterday in the course of my remarks. The advisory committee as set forth in the amendment has a number of virtues which will be quite helpful to the fulfillment of the purposes of this act.

Mr. COOPER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. COOPER. May I say to the gentleman that this was presented by the Committee on Post-war Economic Policy and Planning and, as I have the honor of being a member of that committee, it is, in my opinion, in the interest of business in this country to have an advisory committee to assist and counsel the Director in carrying out these very important duties that are imposed upon him.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I agree heartily with what the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. COOPER] has said, and may I ask the gentleman whether it is not true this amendment will primarily seek to get this job just a little bit closer to the American people and whether or not such an advisory committee would not itself be able to bring to the Director the opinions and feelings of people throughout the country in order that his work might reflect better the desires of the people as a whole.

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. I am in wholehearted agreement with the statement of the gentleman from California.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. WASIELEWSKI].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. COOPER) there were—ayes 72, noes 26.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of August 29, page 7354, there is a statement by the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER] which should not go unnoticed or unchallenged. He made the statement that after computing certain assets which he claims we have, it leaves a temporary national debt of only $85,000,000,000.

The Treasury statement as of today shows the gross debt to be $211,098,944,067.83.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER] is apparently confused as to the nature of the public debt and the relationship it bears to our public assets. These assets in large measure are not available to repay the indebtedness represented by the figure of $210,000,000,000, as he says, or $211,000,000,000 as shown by the Treasury statement. At best they are only part of the security, if we can call it that, behind the obligations of the Government. The credit of the entire country, of every firm and individual, along with certain tangible Government assets is also a part of the security behind the Government's obligations. The ability of the American people to work, manufacture, construct,

and produce is also an asset which, of course, according to Mr. CELLER's theory, should be used to offset the national debt. But these things are not tangible. They do not constitute available assets.

We cannot say that all of these assets, so-called, therefore, when totaled up, exceed the amount of our interest-bearing debt, and we therefore have no such debt. By placing a mortgage of $1,000 on my home which is valued at perhaps $5,000, can it be argued that I have no net debt on my home? It seems to me rather absurd to indicate that we do not owe this debt, and that we do not have to pay it because of these intangible offsetting assets. Mere ability to pay a debt certainly does not discharge the obligation and for that reason cannot be set up as an offset against indebtedness. The offsetting assets which he claims we have and which reduce the debt from two hundred and eleven billion dollars to eighty-five billion dollars among others are $20,000,000,000 of cash on hand, which is deposited with banks and owned by the Treasury. Of course, this money is not available. This money is in the bond accounts of the banks. It represents receipts from the sale of Government bonds and is held by the banks for the account of the Government. If we could imagine the liquidation of the Federal Government as of today, that it was not going to cost us anything tomorrow or next week or next year or maybe 20 years from now to run the Federal establishment, then we could correctly use that money as an offsetting asset. However, we are not going to close up business in this country today or tomorrow or next day or next year; so those assets are not available as a credit against the national debt.

This money will be withdrawn from the banks by the Government to meet obligations which have already been committed and which are maturing from day to day.

He also says there are $75,000,000,000 worth of war plants' equipment and supplies. Most of these war plants have been purchased or constructed by the Defense Plant Corporation and have been paid for out of moneys raised by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation through the sale of its bonds and debentures. If the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER] is going to use those factories and plants as assets chargeable against the gross national debt, then, of course, he must take into consideration in computing the gross national debt the contingent liability of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and all of the other corporations, which probably might total fifty to seventy-five billion dollars. So, if he computes those as assets, of course he must accept the liabilities which made those assets possible, which are the bonds, debentures, and notes which have been issued by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and all of the subsidiary corporations. He does not do that, and so, of course, these plants are not assets to be credited against the gross national debt.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Chairman, I move o strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, if I may have the attention of the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, I would like to ask for a statement on the thought of the committee with respect to subparagraph 6 appearing on page 30 which reads:

> Institute a specific study, for submission to the President and the Congress, of the present functions of the various executive agencies in the field of manpower, and develop a program for reorganizing and consolidating such agencies to the fullest extent practicable.

I have been hopeful that at the earliest date possible the agencies that deal with manpower would be restricted from prescribing for any individual the employer for whom he should work, and would leave that individual free to work for whomever he pleased if the employer wanted to employ him.

May I ask the chairman or the members of the committee what their intent is by instituting this study, whether they expect to perpetuate the present manpower agencies with their directives to employers and to potential employees as to where and for whom they shall work. The other day the American Legion in the State of Nebraska, at Omaha, adopted a resolution memorializing Congress to make it possible for any honorably discharged veteran to go to work for whomever he wants to work if that employer wants him to work for him. Today, under the regulations put forward by the War Manpower Commission, there are restrictions on an employer's employing individuals, whether veterans or otherwise, and there are also restrictions on the individual as to where he can work and for whom he may work.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASE. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. COOPER. This provision was given very careful consideration by the Committee on Post-war Economic Policy and Planning and by a subcommittee of that committee, of which I had the honor to be chairman. It was also given careful consideration by the Committee on Ways and Means. It would be difficult for us to see how it could be made much plainer than the language as carried in the bill.

That statement might be supplemented by saying to the gentleman that the only purpose of this provision is to coordinate the activities of the different agencies having to do with these subject matters. It is not intended that any additional authority or any additional power will be conferred by this provision, except for the purpose of consolidating these agencies and coordinating their activities. The agencies involved would include, for instance, the National War Labor Board, the War Manpower Commission, the National Labor Relations Board, and the Labor Department. In other words, this Director is here charged with the responsibility of working out plans to be submitted to the President and to the Congress for the coordination of the activities of these different agencies.

Mr. CASE. The gentleman speaks of consolidation of agencies and coordination of activities. In many cases I trust that will mean termination for both. Speaking for myself, I hope that, in addition to bringing together and coordinating manpower agency activities, the program recommended will make it possible for an individual in this country to work for any employer he wants to work for if that employer wants to employ him.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on title I and all amendments thereto close in not to exceed 15 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. MORRISON].

Mr. MORRISON of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, it is, of course, important that we consider the indebtedness of this country in our action upon all bills carrying appropriations.

I hope the gentleman from New York is right in the comforting words he gave us about a way that the debt will and should be reduced. However that may be, there is another phase of this question that we should consider in all of these appropriations, to wit, taxation. Yesterday I made a slight reference to it in my limited remarks, but I want you to think a minute. The States levy taxes in this country, the counties levy taxes, the towns and cities levy taxes, and much of the property in this country is taxed for local purposes more than it yields to the owner. In a great many instances stocks and bonds, real estate, and various properties that are not liberal rent or profit bearers, pay huge, local taxes. Then when we get to the national revenue law, whatever is left, as I told you yesterday, is necessarily taxed very heavily to meet our past responsibilities and difficulties.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORRISON of North Carolina. I yield.

Mr. MAY. I would like to suggest to the gentleman that in the enumeration of the things which are taxed and the number of authorities which tax them, in addition to what the gentleman called attention to, all franchises and all public service corporations pay a State tax.

Mr. MORRISON of North Carolina. Absolutely, every manner of tax is imposed. The tax writers and authorities of all our great universities have been studying and every way to get money out of the people has been adopted in either the States or localities or by the Federal Government. Why, there is no other way. And who pays this tax? A great many people who have not benefited one bit in the world by the war, people of fixed income, people who are engaged in avocations that the war has not helped one bit in their salaries are taxed and the boys who answered the drum taps and march under the flag, who are keeping the flag of liberty in the skies, are also taxed. We called on them to answer the call of the flag and sent

them away to die for our country and when they do die we practically confiscate their estate, and that is done by the country for which they have died. Why? It has been necessary to do it. I am ready to meet in debate on the stump anywhere, any assailant of the justice and necessity of this great, expensive, program. But I hope day is breaking for the taxpayers of this country. We not only ought to so legislate as to avoid increasing taxation, Mr. Chairman, but we ought, if possible, to legislate so it can be reduced and rapidly reduced. Oh, yes, we talk about the boys in the Army, as if they did not pay taxes. Every well-to-do young man in this country is under the flag. Every heir to all the property in this country, of male persuasion, and many of the daughters, are under the flag. The tax bears on everybody, everywhere, and we hear no thought and no particular expression of desire to reduce it. We seem to assume, if we can prevent raising it we are doing well. You can do nothing for the prosperity of the people of this country, nothing, that will equal a reduction of the taxation which is breaking the back of the people of this country. I tell you that we are not far from the line where values will commence to topple and perish, because this Government has taxed the owner of property, the earner of the salaries, and incomes, so much that the property from which it comes has ceased to be valuable. They are trying to give away great properties all over the country because such properties will not yield the tax imposed on it.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CLASON] is recognized.

Mr. CLASON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

At this point in the bill which has been under discussion I wish to call attention to the fact that the Director is not ordered or directed to report shortly on the need for unemployment compensation for Federal employees. This bill makes no due provision, in my opinion, for the proper protection of Federal employees. I feel that if this bill is to be passed without any reference whatsoever to Federal employees, someone should offer an amendment at some point which will protect those employees, even to the extent of returning to section 403 of the Senate bill.

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CLASON. I yield.

Mr. FORAND. When we reach that point I have an amendment that will reinstate section 403 of the George bill.

Mr. CLASON. If the gentleman, a member of the Ways and Means Committee, had not decided to offer the amendment I would state that I would do so. I am very glad to assure the gentleman I will support his amendment when it is offered.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CLASON. I yield.

Mr. KEEFE. May I say I discussed that matter quite thoroughly yesterday and I also have an amendment at the Clerk's desk which goes a slight bit further than the amendment proposed by the gentleman from Rhode Island.

Mr. CLASON. I heard the very able speech of the gentleman from Wisconsin, yesterday. I understood it went further than the Senate amendment. I certainly hope that some amendment in one form or another will be adopted. I think all Federal employees should be given proper consideration in this legislation.

I think there is a great deal of misunderstanding about the pay which has been received by Federal employees, particularly those in arsenals. Those employees have not received the same amount in wages as employees in similar industries in the same area during the present war. When the President put into effect his order which froze wages it caught the employees in the Federal arsenals. In other words, they depend for the amount of their wages upon wage surveys which are provided under the Federal method of determining wages for such employees.

It so happens that in Springfield, wage surveys were conducted. They showed that certain employees, many hundreds of them, in the Springfield Armory, were entitled to increases in wages to bring them up to the average—not to the highest, but to the average wage of persons engaged in similar lines of work in our area, which includes Hartford, Conn., and on up into Vermont.

When it came time to put into effect the wage survey schedules the War Department was advised that it could not be done; that because of the freeze order of the Executive, the employees at the armory could not expect any higher wages after that order went into effect. Therefore, they have been working at lower than the average wage received by persons in private industry. Undoubtedly that is true throughout the United States.

In addition to that, what do these people get when they leave the armory? We hope, and they hope, that the war will be over soon. Thousands of them will leave before they have been in the civil service for 5 years. As a result, they are not expecting to receive retirement pay when they have finished. In other words, the War Department will tell them they can have back the amount that has been deducted from their wages for that purpose. The time when they are going to need that money is when they are out of employment. But do they get it at once? Of course they do not, because the Federal Government, through its red tape and through the number of agencies involved, never gets around to giving them back their retirement pay. Some of them wait 6 months, some of them 8 months, some of them a year, some of them a year and half before they get back their retirement pay. If unemployment compensation is going to mean anything to employees in private industry, the same or similar advantages should be granted to Federal employees who have given equally fine service during this terrible war.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, I ask for recognition.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee is recognized.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of the time and ask that the Clerk read.

The Clerk read as follows:

TITLE II—INDUSTRIAL DEMOBILIZATION AND RECONVERSION

SEC. 201. Any contracting agency shall terminate prime contracts for war production whenever in the opinion of the agency the performance under such contracts will not be needed for the prosecution of the war, and shall not continue performance under such contracts merely for the purpose of providing business and employment, or for any purposes other than the prosecution of the war.

SEC. 202. Curtailments of war production or terminations of war contracts shall be integrated and synchronized with the expansion, resumption, or initiation of production for other war purposes, and, to the greatest extent compatible with the effective prosecution of the war, of production for nonwar use. To effectuate this policy—

(a) the contracting agencies shall continuously survey their product and material requirements and report to the Director, in such form and detail as he may determine, on current and anticipated changes in requirements and on all anticipated curtailments of war production or terminations of war contracts;

(b) the executive agencies exercising control over manpower, production, or materials shall permit the expansion, resumption, or initiation of production for nonwar use whenever such production does not require materials, components, facilities, or labor needed for war purposes, or will not otherwise adversely affect or interfere with the production for war purposes. Such production for nonwar use shall be permitted regardless of whether one or more competitors normally engaged in the same type of production are still engaged in the performance under any contract which is needed for the prosecution of the war, and shall not be made dependent upon the existence of a concern or the functioning of a concern in a given field of activity at a given time:

(c) the Director shall—

(1) establish policies to be followed by the contracting agencies in selecting individual contracts or classes of contracts for curtailment, nonrenewal, or termination;

(2) establish policies providing for full and prompt consultation between the executive agencies, war contractors, and the representatives of the employees of war contractors with regard to obtaining the most effective use in other war production or in production for nonwar use of facilities and manpower to be released through anticipated curtailments in war production or termination of war contracts.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. VOORHIS of California: Page 33, line 15, add the following:

"3. Establish policies which will take in account particular present and future problems of specific areas and geographic regions of the country."

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Chairman, in offering this amendment let me say it is my very sincere belief that the committee reporting the bill intended that the very thing be done which my amendment specifically directs the Director to do. I wish the membership of the House, however, would place

themselves in the position for five short moments of a person from the Pacific coast.

Everyone anticipates that the war against Germany will be concluded before the war against Japan. In that interim period we on the Pacific coast will obviously be called upon to be not only the area through which practically all of the war supplies for continuing war will flow but also the area above all where the heaviest strain upon war production will be placed. We therefore are confronted with the very real danger that a considerable portion of the balance of the country will have an opportunity for reconversion before our industries. The west coast is more heavily weighted with war production than any other portion of this Nation. We have a higher percentage of people in aircraft, shipbuilding, and other types of industry which everybody knows are not going to be able to continue on anything like their present scale after the war is over. At the same time certain policies pursued by some of the governmental agencies work very much to our disadvantage. Some of us believe that our small manufacturers are being denied the opportunity to reengage in civilian production, even to produce those civilian goods which would be consumed right on the Pacific coast to a great extent. We believe we ought to be able to produce the civilian goods that we need right there instead of shipping them in from some other part of the country.

We also conceive that unless wise policies are pursued from an area standpoint our future may be very seriously affected. All my amendment asks is that the Director shall be called upon in establishing his policy to take into account the particular problems of specific areas and geographical regions in the country. It is not limited to my region. It affects all regions. We only ask in determining these reconversion policies that regional problems shall be considered.

Mr. Chairman, the regional problem on the Pacific coast is a very, very important one.

Mr. COOPER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. COOPER. I am trying to understand the purpose to be accomplished by the gentleman's amendment. In the formulation of policies by the Director the gentleman, as I understand it, wants him to take into consideration the problems affecting certain regions and localities throughout the country?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. That is correct; to take into account the future problems of a given region if a determination is to be made in regard to resumption of civilian production or a cut-back or something of that kind, to try to view the matter not only from a national standpoint but in determining the policies with regard to this thing to determine them with regard to how they are going to affect a given region as well as the Nation as a whole. As I said in the beginning, it is my belief the committee intended that to be done. All I want to do is to make it absolutely certain.

Mr. COOPER. Does not the gentleman think in the discharge of the duties we impose upon the Director, he would naturally consider all sections and parts of the country?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I think so, but I would like to be doubly certain on that and I would like to have us do something in the bill that we can point to in that regard.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. SHEPPARD. In response to the interrogation of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. COOPER], our past experiences have not been indicative of that interest.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. In many instances I regret to say that is true.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Under the broad powers of the bill the gentleman is referring to, if the Director did not take into consideration any such situation why he would not be qualified to be a Director. It would be a reflection on him. We give him all the broad powers that are necessary. Now, when you talk about localizing every local problem that might come along, if we localize the Pacific coast we have to localize the Atlantic coast, the Mississippi Valley, and everywhere else.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. No. My amendment is not limited to the Pacific coast at all.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Are there not broad powers in the bill?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS].

Mr. Chairman, there is nothing basically wrong with the amendment offered by the gentleman from California but it is superfluous. I call his attention to subsection 7 on page 30, which reads as follows:

> Consult and cooperate with State and local governments, industry, labor, agriculture, and other groups both national and local, concerning the problems arising out of the transition from war to peace.

Consult on what? On local problems. You can read in between the lines "in that particular area" because it directly and specifically charges the men who are to do this work with cooperating, and, of course, that means to consult with and to consider local interests and problems.

I do not see any objection to the gentleman's amendment, but, really, in view of subsection 7 which completely covers what the gentleman seeks to accomplish, I do not see the necessity for his amendment.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KNUTSON. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Would the gentleman be willing to state that he believes it to be the intention of the committee that the thing I am seeking to accomplish by the amendment is supposed to be done by the Director?

Mr. KNUTSON. I will so state without equivocation or reservation.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Does the chairman of the committee agree that that is the committee's intention, and also the intention of the House, if the bill is passed in its present form, for the Director to take into account the problems that I spoke of?

Mr. DOUGHTON. I do not think there is any question about it.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Under those circumstances, Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Amendment offered by Mr. MILLER of Connecticut: Page 31, line 24, after the comma, strike out the balance of the line and line 25.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is very simple. I can conceive of situations where it would create a hardship, to put it mildly, if all of these contracts, particularly for large items, such as a ship or a huge aircraft like the *Mars* was ordered to be discontinued immediately following the cessation of hostilities. It seems to me if we say in this bill that we are not going to keep war industries going "merely for the purpose of providing business and employment" that we have said all that we should say. The added language "for any purposes other than the prosecution of the war" might interfere with the orderly termination of a contract for something the completion of which would be of value to the Army or Navy even after the war.

It might be that if the contract was not completed that the material used would be wasted and certain articles would not be worth anything except scrap if they were not completed. I cannot think of any sound reason for the language "or for any purposes other than the prosecution of the war." I can, however, see danger in it, and unless the committee has some purpose that I do not comprehend, I believe those words should be stricken from the bill.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. I yield.

Mr. COOPER. With all deference to the gentleman from Connecticut, can he suggest any reason in the world for war production except for war purposes?

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Yes; certainly.

Mr. COOPER. For something besides war?

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Absolutely; for the peacetime establishment of our military forces it might be much more economical to finish the contract

and turn it over to the Army or the Navy for peacetime utilization. We are going to have an Army and a Navy after the war ends, and that material will not be used for war purposes, the completion of an experimental plane for example.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. I yield.

Mr. KNUTSON. Can the gentleman name any article of war of which there will not be a tremendous surplus when hostilities cease?

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Of course there will be surpluses of war material.

Mr. KNUTSON. Why make more?

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Are you just going to waste everything that is partly built. You should have an orderly termination of these contracts.

Mr. KNUTSON. The gentleman certainly would not advocate that we throw the taxpayers' money away in the production of something we are not going to need.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. The gentleman is asking me a foolish question. What is the committee's meaning of that language, "or for any purposes other than the prosecution of the war"?

Mr. KNUTSON. I presume the purpose of that language is to provide that we shall not engage in it.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. To that extent I agree. I do not want those contracts continued solely for the purpose of providing business and employment.

Mr. KNUTSON. The section reads, "shall not continue performance under such contracts merely for the purpose of providing business and employment."

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Is the gentleman going to leave a vessel in a shipyard 80 percent finished?

Mr. KNUTSON. I would rather lose 80 percent than 100 percent.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. You are not going to lose 100 percent. If you finish it, it has some real value.

Mr. KNUTSON. If you are completing it, you are putting 20 percent onto something that you have no further use for.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. I can conceive of a vessel 80 percent completed valued only as junk, but if you put 20 percent more into it, it can be sold.

Mr. KNUTSON. To whom?

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. To other nations; to private companies.

Mr. KNUTSON. To Germany or Japan?

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. The gentleman knows I am not proposing selling vessels to Germany or Japan.

Mr. KNUTSON. I am asking for information.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Any other United Nation may want to buy it.

Mr. KNUTSON. And the national debt which you would have——

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. I refuse to yield further.

Mr. BLAND. The idea is to finish the vessels, as we did in 1918 and 1919, rather than to scrap them.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. That is the very thing I am thinking of. In 1919 unfinished vessels rusted out in shipyards all over the Atlantic coast. A comparatively small sum of money would have given them a real value. Instead of that, they laid on the ways and rusted out, and finally were sold as junk or sunk.

I do not want to go on making war material just to furnish business and employment, and I agree with the committee, but I think the language I would strike out might well interfere with the orderly winding up of these contracts, because somebody will come along and say that factory A or shipyard B is simply trying to make business and employment. You do not give the Director any leeway in an orderly conclusion of contracts.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE. It strikes me that if anything is to be done to this language it should be to restore a portion of that which was stricken from the Senate provision, and instead of striking out what the gentleman proproses to strike out, add the words:

Unless the continuation of some or all of the work under any such contract will benefit the Government.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. That would accomplish my purpose. It seemed to me the simplest way, would be to say that war material shall not be manufactured simply to make work, but if there is some other good reason for completing a contract it should be completed. Increased salvage value might be a good reason.

Mr. CASE. I fear that the gentleman's amendment does not entirely cure the matter. It would leave the words in the first part of section 201 that—

Any contracting agency shall terminate prime contracts for war production whenever in the opinion of the agency the performance under such contracts will not be needed for the prosecution of the war.

The situation is not met by simply striking out what the gentleman proposes to strike out. I agree with him that there may be instances where a completed article may have more salvage value than the material scrapped in partial completion. It may be to the interest of the Government to complete some items that are more than half finished. Such a situation can be provided for if the conferees keep in the first part of the language that follows this section in the Senate bill. That would add:

Unless the continuation of some or all of the work under any such contract will benefit the Government.

And would continue to omit the following words:

or is necessary to avoid substantial injury to a plant or property.

That language is not necessary since allowance for such injury can be made in the settlement for contract termination.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Connecticut.

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 203. (a) Whenever the expansion, resumption, or initiation of production for nonwar use is authorized, on a restricted basis, by any executive agency having control over manpower, production, or materials, the restrictions imposed shall not be such as to prevent any small plant capable and desirous of participating in such expansion, resumption, or initiation of production for nonwar use from so participating in such production.

(b) Whenever such executive agency allocates available materials for the production of any item or group of items for nonwar use, it shall make available a percentage of such materials for the exclusive use by small plants for the production of such item or group of items. Such percentage shall be determined by the head of such agency after giving full consideration to the claims presented by the chairman of the board of directors of the Smaller War Plants Corporation and shall be fair and equitable.

(c) In allocating the materials thus set aside among such small plants, such executive agency shall establish criteria, standards, quotas, schedules, or other conditioning factors after consultation with the chairman of the board of directors of the Smaller War Plants Corporation. Such executive agency shall allocate such materials directly to such small plants and shall, to the fullest extent practicable, provide for making such allocations through local offices easily accessible to such small plants. For the purposes of this title, a small plant means any small business concern engaged primarily in production or manufacturing either employing 250 wage earners or less, or coming within such other categories as may be established by the head of such executive agency in consultation with the chairman of the board of directors of the Smaller War Plants Corporation. Such other categories shall be defined by taking into consideration the comparative sizes of establishments in a particular industry as reflected by sales volumes, quantities of materials consumed, capital investments, or by other criteria which are reasonably attributable to small plants rather than medium or large-size plants.

Mr. LAFOLLETTE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. LAFOLLETTE: Strike out all of section 203 following the word "production" on page 33, line 23, down to and including the word "plants" on page 35, line 4, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"(b) There is hereby created in the Office of War Mobilization and Reconversion a Board of Appeals to consist of three members, only two members of which shall be of the same political party, appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, each of whom shall receive compensation at the rate of $8,000 per year, and shall serve for a term of 2 years. When any person is aggrieved by the action of any such Government agency referred to in subsection (a) in allocating available materials for the production of any item or group of items for nonwar use, such person shall, upon application therefor under such regulations as the Director may prescribe, be afforded an opportunity forthwith to present his views thereon at a hearing before the

Board of Appeals. If, at such hearing, such person establishes to the satisfaction of the Board of Appeals that as a result of such action his business operations will be seriously interfered with or substantially curtailed because of a shortage of any material necessary to such operations, that his inability to continue business operations will result in a serious unemployment problem for his employees, or that the interests of the consumers of the articles produced or manufactured by such person will be substantially impaired, the Board of Appeals shall make an immediate report thereon to the Director. Thereupon the Director shall allocate to such person such amounts of the material with respect to which the shortage exists as in his judgment will be necessary to prevent substantial hardship to such person, his employees, or consumers."

Mr. LAFOLLETTE. Mr. Chairman, this amendment seeks to substitute for the language on pages 33 to 35 of the bill the language found on page 11 of the Senate bill, which was stricken out, beginning at line 12. The only change is that I provide a board of three members, of which not more than two shall be members of the same political party. Historically this was what was known as the O'Mahoney amendment. In the other body it was accepted by both extreme groups as a proper amendment. The purpose, of course, is to protect primarily small war plants in the allotment of critical materials in this reconversion program. I am aware of the fact, and it has been pointed out to me by members of the committee, that the committee, on pages 33 and 34, attempted to use language which was quite broad, to see that this was fairly done. But there is in my mind a very solid and firm theory and principle of government involved here, which I think we should uphold, and that is that no person should be entitled to review his own acts.

It is true they say there is a board in the W. P. B. to allot material. I know, and I can give the Members of this House some very extreme examples, where small business people in my community have asked for critical material in order to compete with a branch of a monopolistic outfit making the same material and the curtailment was so drastic against that small individual firm or business, that it would make your eyes pop out. That is what I am afraid will happen during reconversion if you continue to let the same people review the allotments of materials who make such allotments. Why should we not have a separate board to which the small businessman or large businessman, can go whose competitor happens to be sitting in on the W. P. B., so that the man not represented on the board can get an impartial body to hear his complaint, that there has been an unfair or unjust allotment of critical material?

In very great deference to the committee, I point out there was no opposition to this amendment in the other body and if anyone here is interested in small business, if anyone here is interested in seeing that an equitable allotment is made, with a right to appeal to an independent board against inequitable allotments, I feel sure that they will find it not only possible, but urgent to support this amendment.

I wish to include as part of my remarks the following letter from Mr. Maury Maverick, Chairman and General Manager, Smaller War Plants Corporation:

AUGUST 30, 1944.

The Honorable CHARLES M. LAFOLLETTE,
House of Representatives.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: Concerning your discussion with me about my having expressed opposition to the O'Mahoney amendment which provides a board of appeals. I had not, as a matter of fact, expressed my opinion in connection with this, but I have no reason to be opposed to it.

The Congress of the United States, in my opinion—and this is a nonpartisan opinion based on legislative experience—should, as a matter of fact, set down policies in some detail. When such policies provide for appeals procedures for citizens or give them more opportunities to get hearings, it would seem to be advisable to set it up.

Sincerely yours,

MAURY MAVERICK,
Chairman and General Manager.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment, but only to detain the Committee long enough to state that the Committee on Post-war Economic Policy and Planning reached the very definite conclusion that this amendment was certainly not desirable. The Committee on Ways and Means reached the conclusion that such an amendment would do more harm than good. Ample protection is provided here for the small plants throughout the country. If there is any one thing that the Committee on Post-war Economic Policy and Planning as well as the Committee on Ways and Means, has exerted every effort possible to safeguard and protect, it is the interest and welfare of the small plants throughout the country. Justice Byrnes appeared before us and advised very strongly against any such provision as this. The general counsel of the War Production Board advised very strongly against the inclusion of any such provision as this. This amendment was put in on the floor of the Senate without the consideration of the committee and came into the bill as a floor amendment in the Senate. Certainly there is no reason for providing three jobs at $8,000 each to do something that is already being done and being done perhaps in a more efficient and more satisfactory way than it would be done under this proposal. So I ask that the amendment be voted down.

Mr. LAFOLLETTE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOPER. I yield.

Mr. LAFOLLETTE. There is no court appeal provided under this act or any other reconversion act, is there? There is no appeal to any court?

Mr. COOPER. There is an appeal board now existing in the War Production Board, that is functioning for the very purpose that is pointed out by the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. LAFOLLETTE. Pardon me, but I do not believe the gentleman has answered categorically. There is no appeal to any court.

Mr. COOPER. And the gentleman's amendment could only result in confusion and delegation of authority to another agency that has already been performed by an existing agency.

Mr. LAFOLLETTE. There is no appeal to any court under any of these provisions? No court appeal?

Mr. COOPER. Neither does the gentleman's amendment provide for an appeal to a court.

Mr. LAFOLLETTE. Exactly. That is why I think the gentleman's amendment is necessary.

Mr. COOPER. The gentleman's amendment is not necessary. There is an appeal board functioning now, that takes care of all of these questions. It is doing it in an efficient, satisfactory manner, and there is no occasion for setting up another board of three men at $8,000 a year each, to do something that is already being done.

Mr. KNUTSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOPER. I yield.

Mr. KNUTSON. When we had this matter before the committee we said we would discuss it further in conference, did we not?

Mr. COOPER. The gentleman is correct. It is already in the Senate bill.

Mr. KNUTSON. And it has not been disposed of finally, at all.

Mr. COOPER. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. CASE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOPER. I yield.

Mr. CASE. This section defines small business as being those which employ 250 or less. Would a firm which has customarily been employing from 300 to 500 be entitled to the benefits guaranteed to a plant employing less than 250, if it wanted to operate on that curtailed basis?

Mr. COOPER. I hope the distinguished gentleman will not stop reading at that point. Will he go on and read the balance of it? If you can think of anything else that could possibly be included to take care of small business, you will be doing better than your Post-war Planning Committee could do, or the Committee on Ways and Means. We covered it all.

Mr. CASE. I want to take care of two businesses that I have in mind that have been employing about 300 people. Could they restrict themselves to the employment of 250 people and be entitled to the benefits that you guarantee the employer of 250 or less?

Mr. COOPER. They would not have to restrict themselves. They might well come under other provisions. For the purpose of this title, a small plant means any small business concern engaged primarily in production or manufacturing, employing 250 wage earners or less, or coming within such other categories as may be established by the head of such executive agency in consultation with the chairman of the board of directors of the Smaller War Plants Corporation.

Mr. CASE. Is it the gentleman's opinion that the word "production" includes mining?

Mr. COOPER. I would certainly think so; yes.

Mr. CASE. I thank the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. LAFOLLETTE].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. LAFOLLETTE) there were—ayes 20, noes 58.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. EBERHARTER: Page 35, after line 4, insert the following new section:

"SEC. 305. The Administrator upon application may provide transportation, including transportation of dependents and household effects for civilian workers who have been employed in activities essential to the war effort, from the place of such employment to the location of their bona fide residence within the continental United States prior to their migration to war employment, or, at the election of such worker, to any other location of available employment arranged by the worker: *Provided,* That the cost of such transportation shall not exceed $200 for any one worker, his dependents, and household effects, and shall not exceed the amount allowable for civilian employees of the several departments and independent establishments of the Federal Government by law and in the standard Government travel regulations, except that within the limitations of this section the fare of dependents may be paid: *Provided further,* That under this section no civilian worker shall be furnished travel allowance more than once."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Chairman, I may say at the beginning—

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for information?

Mr. EBERHARTER. I shall be pleased to yield.

Mr. COOPER. The gentleman's amendment seeks to restore the provisions of title III of the Senate bill with respect to travel pay for workers, except the $200 limitation contained in the Senate provision is not included in the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. EBERHARTER. The $200 limitation is included in my amendment.

Mr. COOPER. I am sorry; I did not understand so from the reading.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Yes; it is included. I read:

Provided, That the cost of such transportation shall not exceed $200 for any one worker, his dependents and household effects.

It also contains the following limitation:

It shall not exceed the amount allowable to civilian employees of the several departments and independent establishments of the Federal Government by law and in the standard Government travel regulations.

That is in the amendment. For the information of the Committee I may say that I have also included a further proviso that under this section no civilian war worker shall be furnished travel allowance more than once.

So that is a further limitation.

As was mentioned by the gentleman from Tennessee this provision was in the so-called George bill when it came to the House and was before our Committee on Ways and Means. I have however, changed the language to conform to language suggested by General Hines, Administrator of Veterans' Affairs. General Hines made one or two changes in the actual language which really have no effect so far as I can see, on the intent of the provision as it passed the Senate.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EBERHARTER. Gladly.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. The question I want to ask has to do with making this reconversion job an effective one. Let us assume that I am a man who has been working in a war job and that the gentleman from Pennsylvania is the head of a United States Employment Service office. I come in and say: "I am unemployed and am about to apply for unemployment compensation." The gentleman tells me: "There is a job over here at such and such a place." I say: "But I have no funds to get there."

If the gentleman's amendment be adopted he can then turn to me and say: "Oh, yes you have, and you cannot get unemployment compensation because there is a job for you elsewhere and our task is to get you there. You can have that job."

If the gentleman's amendment be not adopted what happens at that point?

Mr. EBERHARTER. Then at that point the unemployed war worker would stay on the unemployment compensation rolls and would increase the cost of unemployment compensation the States will be forced to pay. I may say for the benefit of the committee that this proviso has the unqualified approval of Justice Byrnes, it has the approval of General Hines, and I believe it is a very worthwhile proviso.

What is going to happen, Mr. Chairman, when the shut-down comes in these various war centers, these centers of munitions production, these centers of steel production and in all of these centers where there will be an overconcentration of employees? The result will be that the former employees in war work will go on the compensation rolls. They will not go back to their homes unless they have some incentive to do so. This will create quite a social problem in these war centers which are overcrowded now. These war workers will have no means of getting home, and, as stated by the gentleman from California, they will sit by and stay on the unemployment compensation rolls. This will contribute, in my opinion, to a housing problem, it will contribute to slum conditions, if these former well-paid war workers are not furnished some incentive to go back to the home from which they came prior to their migration. It is going to be said, Mr. Chairman, that we do not know how much this will cost.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Chairman, aside from the problem which will occur in the war centers, there are many sections of the country where these people migrated from, that will really need them back, the farm sections, the Corn Belt and the Cotton Belt. These employees will never get work except perhaps work on a farm or work in some of the small towns. They are not going back to the farm unless they have some incentive to do so. Anything done to get them back to their homes or on another job will contribute greatly to the stabilization that is so necessary in the reconversion period.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EBERHARTER. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. STEFAN. How did the gentleman arrive at the maximum of $200?

Mr. EBERHARTER. It was felt that $200 would pay the cost, if a person had to travel with his family quite a distance across the country and also transport his household effects.

Mr. STEFAN. Of course, we now furnish transportation for household goods to families in the Foreign Service and some of our other agencies in the Government. They would not be covered by this. Their experience is that $200 is too low.

Mr. EBERHARTER. The gentleman says the experience is that this is a pretty low amount? It is a very low amount. When the Government has an employee and shifts him from one city to another city, under the Federal law now the Government stands that expense. So this would not be creating something new; $200 is the limit. I would not want the members of this Committee to get the impression that it would cost $200 in each case. Under the regulations which will be promulgated by the Director, he will furnish a railroad ticket so that the Government will not be paying money that is not actually required for this necessary help in relocating workers who have been dislocated because of wartime conditions.

Mr. STEFAN. Does the amendment call for transportation of the worker, his family, and household goods?

Mr. EBERHARTER. It provides for the cost of transportation of the war worker, his dependents, and household effects, but in no instance to exceed $200, and not to be more than one such travel allowance.

Mr. STEFAN. In my opinion, I do not believe it could become effective because in many cases that $200 would not cover the expense. The gentleman referred to the approximate cost of this. Where is the money going to come from to pay this expense? From what fund or out of what fund would this money come?

Mr. EBERHARTER. This measure authorizes appropriations to cover whatever costs are absolutely necessary in order to carry out the purposes of the bill.

Mr. STEFAN. By direct appropriation out of the Treasury.

Mr. EBERHARTER. By direct appropriation which the Committee on Appropriations necessarily would have to pass upon and for which justification would have to be made by the Director of Reconversion and Mobilization.

Mr. STEFAN. During the hearings was there any estimate made of the approximate cost of this undertaking?

Mr. EBERHARTER. No; I may say in answer to the gentleman that there was no public hearings in the first instance on this bill.

Mr. STEFAN. On this amendment, I mean, because it was included in the Senate bill.

Mr. EBERHARTER. It was in the Senate bill; yes. I may say in further answer to the gentleman from Nebraska that it was said that there are many instances, even at the present time, where men who are laid off now are not able to travel to a different city in order to secure employment. If you could just give them some little incentive in the way of a payment or help toward paying transportation costs they would go to that new city and take up employment. That is one of the things that this proviso seeks to accomplish.

Mr. STEFAN. This creates an authorization for an appropriation for that purpose, but the gentleman has no estimate as to the possible amount involved, has he?

Mr. EBERHARTER. We do not have any estimate, because that would be pretty hard to make. Any estimate that you make now would be largely in the nature of a guess, I suggest to the gentleman. Some people have claimed that there will be no unemployment after the shooting stops, and others claim there will be great mass unemployment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes, because several gentlemen have asked me to yield.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. CARLSON of Kansas. I wonder if the gentleman has given consideration to this fact, if his amendment were approved: That we would be paying up to $200 for the transportation of war workers and their families from places of employment to their homes or other employment? But take a man in the service in one section of the country who had moved his family there, we pay his transportation home but not his family's or dependents'. I think that ought to be given consideration.

Mr. EBERHARTER. I may say, as far as that is concerned, a serviceman does not have his family with him when he is in the service in 99 cases out of 100, so there is no necessity for paying the transportation charges of his family. The first thing the soldier wants to do is to go back home to his family, and therefore the law provides that the cost of his transportation shall be borne by the Government to his home.

Mr. CARLSON of Kansas. I think the gentleman will find that thousands of our boys have moved their families to the places where they have been stationed in the service for a long period of time, and they will be faced with the necessity of paying their own transportation, excepting an individual who is in the service.

Mr. EBERHARTER. I think the percentage of those in the service who have moved their families to the place where they are stationed now is very negligible.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EBERHARTER. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE. The gentleman's amendment carries this language: "who have been employed in activities essential to the war effort." Does the gentleman have any basis for defining what activities are essential to the war effort, and has he any estimate of the number of people engaged in activities essential to the war effort?

Mr. EBERHARTER. In answer to the gentleman's question, I can only refer to the fact that the War Manpower Commission at the present time has several categories which they have determined to be essential to the war effort. The experience of the draft boards can be taken into account. I am certain if any director is clothed with the authority provided for in this proposed amendment that he would be very careful not to waste public funds.

Mr. CASE. By reference to the War Manpower Commission the gentleman brings attention to the fact that practically every worker today is supposed to be engaged in an activity essential to the war effort. What this proposal would mean would be that all of us would contribute to paying the transportation of all of us to somewhere else. Unless there is some limitation, nobody can estimate what the cost of this would be.

Mr. EBERHARTER. I submit that under the amendment, under the language as drawn and the debate here, it would clearly be the intention that these tickets would be furnished only in order to help toward the reconversion and post-war readjustment. I may say that in the other body this proviso received overwhelming approval. It has the approval of the only persons who appeared before the committee. They felt it was a very wise proviso. I hope the Committee will see it as I do and cast a favorable vote on the amendment.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Would the gentleman from Pennsylvania accept an amendment to his amendment making ineligible for such benefits anyone who has gone on strike while engaged in war work?

Mr. EBERHARTER. That is a question I think I should give a little consideration to, in the first place. Some of the strikes are not altogether the fault or even remotely the fault of the workingmen. We have an instance where the employer refused absolutely to follow the orders of the War Labor Board. If those workingmen went out on strike, I do not think they should be ineligible for these benefits. By making such a suggestion the gentleman is bringing up the whole question of who is responsible for all of these strikes. I do not hold to the opinion that the workingman is alone and solely responsible. I hold to the opinion that in many instances the business concern which refuses to follow the directives of the War Labor Board is responsible for the strikes.

Mr. KNUTSON. Does the gentleman think we could work out an amendment to his amendment that would be workable?

Mr. EBERHARTER. If the gentleman wants to offer an amendment to my amendment and will then support my amendment and ask the Members of the House to go along with it, I shall be delighted to accept the amendment.

Mr. KNUTSON. I could not conscientiously do that.

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I think this amendment is one of the most dangerous amendments that has been offered to this bill. The gentleman speaks of our not having information on the subject of how many workers would be involved in this transportation item. None of the people who appeared before our committee could give us even a guess.

This amendment does not apply solely to the transfer of workers from one job to another. This is a broad amendment that gives transportation home to every worker who has worked in any work that has been called essential to the war effort. Under a broad interpretation of that term, all of our work has been essential to the war effort.

The cost of this transportation item alone would run into millions and millions of dollars. Two hundred dollars a person is as much as the average amount that was asked for in the First World War bonus bill. When the World War No. 1 bonus bill was brought up here, it asked for only a dollar a day for each day the soldier was in service in this country and $1.25 for each day the soldier served abroad.

The total amount of base credit for a soldier was not $200. This amendment, in my humble opinion, will entail the expenditure of a huge sum, far more than the cost of the retraining or any other item in this bill. It would mean an invitation to every worker in the United States today: "Go ahead and spend what you are making; when you are through with your job, we will take care of sending you home." I ask your thoughtful consideration before you vote for this amendment.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in not to exceed 10 minutes.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I know a gentleman who expects to offer an amendment to the amendment which I

have offered and he is preparing it now. Therefore, I would ask for a little more than the 10 minutes.

Mr. COOPER. The gentleman has had 15 minutes. We cannot hold up the proceedings waiting for some Member to prepare an amendment. The amendment to the amendment would have to be offered before a vote was taken anyhow.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Would not the gentleman be willing to ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and amendments thereto close in 15 minutes?

Mr. COOPER. My request is that it close in 10 minutes because I see only one Member on the floor asking for time.

Mr. EBERHARTER. I am only asking for 5 minutes more.

Mr. COOPER. The gentleman has had 15 minutes already. I think, in all fairness, he has been liberally treated.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Then, Mr. Chairman, I will have to object and let it go to a vote.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in not to exceed 10 minutes.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, after hostilities there will have to be a great trek of war workers to civilian plants. It would be utterly impossible to get most of these migratory war workers out of the industrial war areas unless you adopt this amendment.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. CELLER. I yield.

Mr. TABER. I wonder if the gentleman would think that this would require the payment of traveling expenses of a labor organizer from one end of the country to another?

Mr. CELLER. It would not. And I say beyond peradventure of doubt, that is utterly out of the question. Unless you pass this amendment, you are going to have these huge bottlenecks of labor and you are not going to have the proper kind of transfer or recruitment and placement of war workers in civilian industries. It does not mean every worker is going to get $200. That is the maximum amount. Now you can quibble and say that the worker has the savings and that he can pay for his transportation.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I refuse to yield. Permit me to reply to that statement often heard concerning savings. The O. P. A. studies of consumer incomes and savings during 1942, show that half the families and single consumers studied had income of less than $2,000 a year and that the average savings in this group of about 23,000,000 families and single consumers, was only $57. I would like to be somewhat impertinent and ask you gentlemen how much you have of savings from your $10,000 a year? You have mighty little. I have little left, if anything at all. Now, if you have not got very much of savings left with your $10,000 a year, these war workers who had an average of only $36.41 a week, cannot have very much left. I am reading from The National Week, the David Lawrence weekly, as to the average real weekly wages of workers in the war industries. In August 1939, it was $23.77. The average in June 1944, contrary to the ideas that most of you gentlemen have, was only $36.41. What savings will be left out of a weekly wage, with a higher cost of living, out of $36.41? The average savings being but $57, there will be little incentive to travel to a new job or home. Surely there will be little need in the mind of the worker to hasten home and get back to the normal.

We had a very anomalous situation in New York. The Brewster plant was compelled to close as a result of cutbacks, and very glibly some people said to these workers, "You can get a job down in New Orleans at the Higgins Shipyard; you can get a job at San Diego, Calif., in the Kaiser Shipyard." It is very nice to say that, but where were these Brewster workers to get the wherewithal to transfer themselves, their families and their household goods from Brooklyn to San Diego, or from New York to New Orleans? They did not have the wherewithal and they could not get it. That situation will be multiplied a hundredfold after the war. For example, under this bill you are going to do away with the United States Employment Service. You are taking away all guideposts, taking away all sign posts to the workers suffering cut-backs or contract terminations. They do not know where to go. You are going to say by this bill, "Instead of one centralized Government agency, there shall be 52 separate employment agencies." There will be 48 separate agencies in the 48 States and the balance in the Territories. Fifty-two separate employment agencies instead of one agency as at present. And still you do not want to give this maximum of $200 for transportation to take the worker into civilian production. I think it is a crying shame if we do not grant it. You take away all means of informing the worker as to where and how to go back home. You take away the moneys he should have to effectuate his transfer back home to a new job.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER] has expired.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I ask for recognition to offer an amendment to the Eberharter amendment unless the committee desires the time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from California.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. VOORHIS of California to the amendment offered by Mr. EBERHARTER: In the first line after the word "may", insert the following: "Upon approval by the United States Employment Service."

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this amendment is simply this, to say that assistance in travel from the place where there are not jobs to a place where there are jobs shall be granted in cases where the Employment Service approves. The Employment Service will know that in the interest of the orderly reconversion program for the Nation as a whole, even without regard to any individual problem, it is to the interest of the reconversion program for a certain worker to be shifted from an overcrowded area to one where there is a job he can do. It seems to me it is an important measure to be used in the reconversion program, to have something of this kind available.

My amendment is for the purpose of making it clear that this is to be done in cases where the Employment Service certifies that the move of the worker is in the interest of the reconversion program as a whole. If we are to do this job successfully a good many such moves will be necessary. Is it not of great importance that orderly provision be made so that here again unemployment can be kept at a minimum?

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California, to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. VOORHIS of California) there were ayes 47 and noes 80.

So the amendment to the amendment was rejected.

The question recurs on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. EBERHARTER) there were—ayes 41, noes 89.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 35, line 5:

"SEC. 204. The Attorney General is directed to make surveys for the purpose of determining any factors which may tend to eliminate competition, create or strengthen monopolies, injure small business, or otherwise promote undue concentration of economic power in the course of war mobilization and during the period of transition from war to peace. The Attorney General shall submit to the Congress within 90 days after the approval of this act, and at such times thereafter as he deems desirable, reports setting forth the results of such surveys and including recommendations for such legislation as he may deem necessary or desirable."

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I want to take this occasion to say that I am in full sympathy with what you are trying to do in this transition period, but in my judgment there is a very likely possibility that it will not work at all. Remember that of all these people working in plants, about 10,000,000 came from the farming sections of the country than which there is no better place for labor to find employment in America today. There is not a farm in the United States but what can use from one to two men right now. The farming is being done by women, children, and old men who should not be working at all. The question is: Are they going back to the farm? They have been in the habit of getting around $83 a week. Just show me any place in America where a farm can compete with that kind of wages. It seems to me that at the end of 6 months we are going to be just about

as bad off as we were at the beginning. Those men who have been entirely engaged in labor and in labor organizations, in the manufacture of materials are in a different classification altogether, but it is going to take some time before these 10,000,000 people will want to go back to the farm. If they do not go back to the farms, they will swell the ranks of labor elsewhere.

What I see wrong about this bill is that it is not long range enough in its scope. You are dealing with a long-term matter in a temporary way. It depends upon whether private business can reemploy all these millions, and I hope it can, but you know as well as I that it could not do so before. This Government ought to have a wide-range plan so that wherever industry fails then the Government can step in. In this bill you have made no arrangements to pay the kind of people who of all need assistance most.

You have made no arrangement to give aid to the aged, to the crippled, or to the mothers of the country, and that should be in the same bill. While I am going to vote for this bill because you think it is going to help temporarily, I take this occasion to point out that you are only doing a temporary piece of business and, in my judgment, at the end of 6 months you will have to do it all over again.

Mr. WHITE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURDICK. I yield to the gentleman from Idaho.

Mr. WHITE. Is there not a strong possibility that if this reconversion problem is not handled properly, the people out of work will commence cashing in their Government bonds and the Treasury will have to issue a tremendous amount of new currency, which will cause inflation because the people are out of work and cannot live without cashing in the bonds, and those bonds will have to be taken in?

Mr. BURDICK. My answer is if we do not have national planning to take up this slack of the unemployed, we will have the same proposition over again that we had before.

Mr. WHITE. This reconversion matter hinges on inflation. If we do not have proper reconversion, we will have inflation.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURDICK. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Of course, the gentleman from Idaho should know that the Treasury is this week completing arrangements whereby the 13,000 or more banks of the United States can proceed to cash these bonds as fast as the people bring them in. That is being publicized. The arrangements have already been made. I am now talking about certain savings bonds. That is public information.

Mr. WHITE. In response to the statement of the gentleman from Michigan, may I ask, what is it the banks are going to cash the bonds with and where are they going to get the money if they do not print more money?

Mr. CRAWFORD. This is public information. It is not the banks of the country that are doing this; it is the policy of the Treasury of the United States to keep faith with the people because they told the people they could cash these bonds any time within 60 days after becoming owners of the bonds.

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Chairman, may I conclude by saying that I do not think this Congress has before it right now any definite plan to take care of the unemployed in case private business cannot do it. We had a planning board, but I notice the House voted down an appropriation for it; therefore, we have absolutely no plan today to take up this slack. The only plan we have put forward is this plan—a plan to keep up payments for 6 months after employment ceases, and after that, what? Jobs are what the workers want, not merely pay for a few months and then no jobs. Private business cannot absorb the unemployed now any better than it did from 1932 to 1936. We should be ready now with a Government plan of employment, in case private industry cannot do the job.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. THOMASON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I rise at this time to make a brief observation and to pay what I consider a deserved tribute at this point in the RECORD.

On pages 10 and 11 of the report on the pending bill is an explanation of why certain retraining and reemployment provisions of the Senate bill were omitted from the bill as reported by the House committee. In the course of such explanation there is the following statement:

> With respect to reemployment, there are also at least two agencies of the Government which provide employment services; one, the United States Employment Service, which maintains offices throughout the United States and works in close cooperation with the State employment offices; and the other, in the Veterans' Administration, which provides placement services for veterans. The committee was not convinced of the necessity of maintaining an additional Federal agency to deal with reemployment.

The report fails to mention the reemployment functions and services which are being performed by the selective-service local boards and reemployment committeemen under the supervision of the Director of Selective Service by authority of section 8 (g) of the Selective Service Act.

I am sure that failure to mention these selective-service functions was an oversight on the part of the committee, and, consequently, I am calling attention to those functions so that we will be sure to give credit where credit is due. These 73,000 reemployment committeemen, plus the many thousand local board members, receive no Federal pay but are already and will continue to be of great assistance to the returning veterans in helping them get jobs. We desire them to continue to lend their full support toward that end so that the responsibilities placed by Congress upon the Director of Selective Service will be properly carried out. At the present time these responsibilities are being carried out by the Selective Service System at only a nominal cost to the Government because of the patriotic services contributed without cost by the local board members and reemployment committeemen in 6,500 different localities all over this Nation. These patriotic citizens have a real interest in the men they selected for induction and can be of great assistance in seeing to it that former employers or new employers give employment to veterans.

And so we should pay appropriate tribute to these patriotic citizens and give them every encouragement to carry on their important assignments with the knowledge that we are well aware and most appreciative of their efforts and contributions.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMASON. I yield.

Mr. REED of New York. This morning I discussed the facilities we have for vocational education, and I think the gentleman has made a great contribution to show that the Committee was right in eliminating this.

Mr. THOMASON. I thank the gentleman. I just wanted to make sure that those patriotic citizens who are rendering such effective service without pay are given some recognition in this program.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, as we approach this problem of reconversion, we must have in mind that if reconversion is to be successful it must come not as the result of crackpot planning boards that produce nothing except plans laid out on a defeatist philosophy. If reconversion is successful, it will be as a result of the effort of the manufacturing plants and the business institutions throughout the country who have prepared for this situation that is coming. Thousands and thousands of them are now prepared with new things that they can produce, things that they used to produce and will produce on a better basis, so that we may raise the standard of living. When the war is over the demands of peace for automobiles, washing machines, refrigerators, and all the new devices which forward-looking manufacturers are preparing to put on the market as soon as they get a chance, and the rehabilitation of our highway system, our city pavements, our public conveniences, and the rehabilitation of our railroads are going to keep millions and millions of our people employed in the days following the peace.

The problem is not going to be to find a job so much as it is to find the workers, and we must not, in any bill that we pass here, attempt to interfere with the processes that really will put people to work by fancy notions and doles and that sort of thing designed to keep people out of work and prevent reconversion. If this is going to be a reconversion bill, let it be a reconversion bill. When the peace comes, the thing that

will do most toward supporting employment in the days that follow will be some kind of a quick revision of our tax system which will cut out the excess profits and those things that go with war activities. We in Congress have to be alert to take advantage of that situation and to meet our responsibilities if reconversion is going to be a success.

I hope that the Congress will face this problem squarely and honestly and will not rely upon fancy notions and fake planners and that sort of thing to prevent honest, legitimate reconversion.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of the bill is to provide a national program for war mobilization and reconversion. It is the last in a series of four bills, to which I referred in debate on the war surplus-property bill on August 16.

In the Senate there was a contest between the Murray-Kilgore bill, allowing a maximum of $35 per week unemployment insurance, and the George bill, allowing a maximum of $20. After prolonged consideration and debate, the Senate voted 49 for the George bill and 25 for the Murray-Kilgore bill. Then on final passage the vote was 55 in favor of the George bill and 19 against it; that is, the Murray-Kilgore bill was definitely killed in the Senate and has no possibility of becoming a law at this time even though the House should adopt it as an amendment to this bill.

The Committee on Ways and Means has made certain amendments to the Senate bill. These differences have been minutely described by members of the committee. The real points of controversy, however, are: (a) The Senate bill includes Federal employees in the unemployment benefits provided. (b) The Senate bill allows up to $200 travel pay to unemployed war workers. The House bill eliminates these two provisions entirely.

It must be remembered that this bill is an amendment to the Social Security Act and covers only those groups covered by that law. I call the attention of the House to page 7366 of the RECORD, where I made inquiry of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. COOPER], who was explaining the bill in behalf of the Ways and Means Committee. I read from the RECORD:

> Mr. MICHENER. Do the unemployment-insurance benefits provided in this bill inure to the benefit of any person other than those for whom an employer's tax is now paid under the social-security law?
>
> Mr. COOPER. No. It will be remembered that that is all provided under the Social Security Act. There is no change in that respect provided in this pending bill.
>
> Mr. MICHENER. This amendment does not affect the professional man; it does not affect those where the employment is less than eight persons; it does not affect the domestic in the home; it does not affect the farm hand or the casual employee?
>
> Mr. COOPER. It does not affect any of those because in order to include all of those groups that are not now included in covered employment would require one of two things: Either the levying of a tax to provide the funds to pay the benefits which we cannot do under a Senate bill, as the gentleman well knows; or, on the other hand, provides an authorization for a direct appropriation out of the Federal Treasury to pay the benefits with no tax having been collected to contribute to the fund.
>
> Mr. MICHENER. Yes; in other words, this bill inures to the benefit only, generally speaking, of those people engaged in war industry who have received the highest wage during the war ever paid in human history.

Mr. Chairman, I voted for the Social Security Act even though its coverage was not complete. They all understood the difficulties of administration. It is clear now that if that law is to adequately serve the purpose for which it was enacted, there must be greater coverage. In this connection it is well to recall that under social security somebody is taxed for benefits that are provided with respect to title II as well as title III. Title I relates to old-age assistance, commonly referred to as old-age pension. Title II relates to old-age and survivors' insurance benefits, commonly referred to as old-age annuities, where the employer pays 1 percent and the employee pays 1 percent, and thereby provide the fund to pay the benefits. These funds are paid in, during the working period of the person's life, so that he becomes entitled to benefits as a matter of law when he reaches the age of retirement. Title III of the Social Security Act relates to unemployment compensation. There is a tax of 3 percent of the pay roll of industry to provide the funds to pay the benefits for unemployment compensation.

Now, none of these social-security taxes are paid by Federal employees. This group has a special retirement law of its own, financed by a different tax on the beneficiaries.

I also call attention to the fact that employees of religious, charitable, and eleemosynary institutions are not covered, because they are not taxed under the social-security program.

In short, unemployment compensation is provided in the House bill for only those who are contributing a tax under the Social Security Act.

It has been made clear by the committee that early consideration is to be given to legislation extending the social-security law, but such amendments are not germane to this bill.

During the last few days the proponents of the Senate bill have been asked repeatedly what the cost of the bill would be. No one has been able even to guess an estimate. Is it in the interest of our country to hastily pass legislation at this critical time when no one has any conception as to its effect on the taxpayer? Surely not. Further study by the Ways and Means Committee, plus public hearings, will furnish this information. Nothing can be lost by passing this House bill, and later ascertaining the facts before venturing into the broader field. There is much argument in favor of including Federal employees in this bill. Specific cases where injustice is done by not including them have been cited. At the same time, compelling reasons have been suggested why they should not be included without more study.

The payment of travel pay up to $200 to each war worker, most of whom are receiving the highest wages in history, seems to me not only inadvisable but really inexcusable. Maybe it will become necessary for the Federal Government to indulge in such a charitable luxury before we get through, but certainly we should not pass a law in advance, notifying all war workers that they will receive a gift or a bonus of this type, if and when they want to change locations after the war.

The philosophy of the Murray-Kilgore bill is that another Federal agency be set up in Washington to administer a Federal unemployment insurance law providing uniform unemployment insurance throughout the Nation. Local responsibility and administration would be abandoned. An all-wise Washington group would make the rules and regulations, and the money would come out of the Federal Treasury. Conditions of employment, living costs, and wages differ in various parts of the country. If this is true, then why should Federal taxpayers be called upon to pay unemployment insurance which does not furnish equal benefits to all of the recipients?

Both the Senate bill and the House bill recognize the right and the duty of the States to control unemployment insurance in their respective jurisdictions. These bills underwrite the unemployment insurance funds in the several States. There is now approximately $6,000,000 in the fund contributed by the employers in the several States, and it is the considered judgment of the committee that this amount will be adequate to finance the unemployment insurance paid under this bill. However, if more money is required, the Federal Government is directed to furnish the money to the States without interest. Of course, if there is to be a long period of unemployment after the war, then this money will not be sufficient. If this and other legislation enacted by the Congress is effectively administered, the $6,000,000 will do the job. Personally, I believe it will.

Mr. Chairman, we all know that when the President signs this bill the Congress contemplates recessing until after election. This is as it should be. Essential legislation, dealing with the war and the imminent collapse of Germany, has been provided. However, the terms of the recess will be such that the Congress may be reconvened on 3-day notice any time during the recess period; that is, the Congress may be called into action either by the majority or the minority leaders. The political parties and the country are thereby assured of a Congress in session in case this should become desirable. On November 15 we will return here with the elections behind us and prepared for the real job that is ahead.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this section and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. LEMKE].

Mr. LEMKE. Mr. Chairman, he who thinks that our future is secure is indeed

an optimist. Out of the insanity of this global war, there will come a new civilization. Let us hope that it will not be an "old deal"—a deal representing the Dark Ages. Nor yet a New Deal with bureaucratic stacked cards, loaded dice, and points—a deal saturated with arrogant bureaucratic ignorance, blunders and stupidity. Let us hope, in spite of doubts and fears, that it will be a better civilization. But, remember that whether it will be better or worse depends upon the intelligence, the ingenuity, and the honesty of purpose with which we approach post-war problems.

We hear a lot about economic planning—we planned it so. Economic planning is all right if based upon intelligent experience. It is all wrong if based upon the thinking of pygmies—of inmates of an asylum. The destruction of millions of cattle—the destruction of 6,000,000 little pigs, and burying them in a cemetery in Chicago so that the poor might have some meat to eat—was the planning of madmen. The curtailment and destruction of agricultural wealth, "the abundant life by scarcity," was the planning of bureaucratic ignorance. That kind of planning Congress must stop.

Penalizing the farmer 49 cents a bushel for raising wheat; urging him to increase his hog production and then refusing to permit him to sell them; the putting of a ceiling of 63 cents a dozen on eggs in Washington when the producer received 14 cents in Ohio; the Government buying $550,000 worth of eggs and selling them for $2,800; the loss to the taxpayers of $100,000,000 on this egg venture and the all but destruction of the wool and livestock industry are the results of regimentation—government by a book-educated, ignorant bureaucracy.

I, too, wish to thank the Committee on Ways and Means for attempting to bring about legislation to meet the crisis that we all know is coming. When 15,000,000 civilians are released from war work, and 12,000,000 veterans come home, then, there will be danger ahead. However, I cannot congratulate the committee on the results of its labor. I cannot agree with its reasoning or its conclusions. I feel that the whole approach to this situation is wrong.

The idea of handing out sandwiches and paying able-bodied men and women for being idle, is the planning of bureaucratic imbeciles. I feel that in place of unemployment insurance—unemployment encouragement—we should have employment assurance. There is plenty of work to be done in this Nation. There always will be. It is Congress' responsibility to see that it is done. It is our responsibility to assure employment rather than insure unemployment.

It is our duty to see that the new wealth created each year is more equally and justly distributed among its creators—the laborer, the farmer, and the small business and professional man. These all need protection from monopoly and international cartels. The internationalists, who would sell the veteran, the farmer, the laborer, and the small businessman in foreign market places, had better take to the cyclone cellar. America will never substitute a mongrel flag for the Stars and Stripes.

I would sooner make a loan of $5,000, without interest and payable at convenience, to a person for productive purposes, than to give him a single sandwich for nothing. In the one case, I build up morale and self-respect. In the other, I destroy it. We need a higher standard of public morale together with a higher standard of public morals and intellectual honesty. I am not interested in the drones that do not work—that consume the wealth that the toiling millions create.

In the pending legislation, I have no choice. The committee failed to bring out an employment assurance bill, and until that is done, we will have to have unemployment insurance. Let me warn you that the great mass of toilers will never again submit to the condition that was forced upon them after the last war.

The farmers of the Nation will never again submit to the loss of their homes by wholesale mortgage foreclosures. The returning veterans from victorious foreign battlefields will never again submit to an economy bill, the vetoes, and the abuse that was heaped upon them by their Uncle Sam after World War No. 1. They will not again sell apples for a subsistence. Their Uncle Sam who inducted them into the armed forces will be compelled to put them in the same condition that they would have been in if they had not been inducted. He will have to give them an opportunity for a new start in life.

If the committee had given one-half of the time that it gave to unemployment insurance to employment assurance, then, I am sure they would have served a better purpose. Then, they would, at least, have convinced the Nation that there is a situation ahead that must be met by intelligent and experienced planning. This committee has before it plenty of bills that it could consider, and should consider, in place of trying to patch up the defective Senate bill.

It had before it H. R. 4088, a bill providing for the rehabilitation of able-bodied veterans. A bill that would put the returning veterans into the same position they would have been in if their Uncle Sam had not inducted them into the armed forces. A bill that would prevent unemployment, chaos, and confusion at the end of the war, by promoting individual, productive enterprise, and by enabling the returning veterans to engage in such enterprise and employ themselves in place of asking for jobs that do not exist.

This bill would take care of the 12,000,000 veterans. It would give to every veteran a paid-up life insurance policy at the rate of $100 a month from October 16, 1940—when the draft went into effect—to the assault on Pearl Harbor, December 7, 1941. After that the amount of the insurance would be increased at the rate of $150 a month for home, and $300 a month for overseas service.

The bill provides that the veteran may borrow up to 85 percent of the face value of the policy in order to engage in a productive enterprise. The veteran need not pay interest on this loan for 2 years. This in order to give the enterprise an opportunity to become productive. After that the loan is to be repaid in 20 equal payments with interest at 1½ percent. Under this bill, any number of veterans can associate themselves and form a partnership or corporation, the proceeds of all such enterprises to be exempt from all State and Federal income tax for 5 years.

No honest man can object to the amount of this paid-up insurance. It is conservative. It is no more than the veteran could have earned if he had not been inducted into the armed forces. It is far less than many of those who stayed at home earned. Will we deny to the defenders of this Nation equal financial treatment, for work that was far more dangerous and far more exacting than that performed by those who stayed at home? There is no 40-hour week in the Army or Navy. There is no 40-hour week on foreign battlefields—on many occasions it is a 24-hour day, and your life and your limbs are at stake.

This legislation is fair. It is honorable. It is the least that we can do for our soldiers. We trusted them to protect our honor and defend our Nation on foreign battlefields. But I am asked, "Do you think that patriotism is for sale?" No; it is not for sale, but it can, at least, be appreciated by those of us who stayed at home—by those of us who were too old, or for other reasons unable, to serve in the armed forces when the Nation called.

It is claimed that in order to pay our Federal debt, estimated at some $356,000,000,000 at the end of the war, we must keep our factories going full blast after, the same as during, the war. In other words, that we must keep on going deeper into the red in order to pay our debt. That is wishful and fallacious thinking. The indebtedness would increase faster than the national income. The laborer would gain nothing by such an attempt because for every dollar of indebtedness there is a coupon clipper as well as a producer. The clipper clips the interest, the producer produces it.

We are living in a fool's paradise. Every day I am asked "Why is it that we can have prosperity in wartime, but, not in peacetime?" The truth is that you are not having prosperity in war. You are simply squandering the substance and the wealth you have accumulated in the past and that you will accumlate in the future. In this war, you have not only put a mortgage on your own wealth, but, on the wealth that you and unborn millions will have to create in the years yet to come.

You have just gone on a spree. Your headache will follow when pay day comes. You are having the same kind of false prosperity that you would have if you mortgaged your home equal in amount to $5,000 for each member of your family. Then, you could go on a splurge and continue until the proceeds were gone. In spending the proceeds, you only consumed the wealth you had accumulated.

Then, while you were having a good time spending the proceeds, you could ask with equal force "Why is it that the only time we have prosperity is when we put a mortgage on our farm and home? Why cannot we have the same prosperity without the mortgage?" The truth is that the apparent prosperity that you have been having is at the expense of your home—your accumulated savings.

Here is the similarity. In war a blanket mortgage is put on your home and on each member of your family. In this war, the blanket mortgage is a $356,000,000,000 Federal debt. It will be collected from you and future generations by the tax collector. Not only through Federal and State taxes on your income and on your home, but, in hidden taxes on everything that you wear, drink, eat or use. There are now, and there will be, more than 73 hidden taxes on a hot-dog sandwich. You do not see these taxes, but, you eat them just the same and you pay them.

In the price that you pay for that sandwich there are included not only the price you pay for the material and the labor put into the meat and the bun, but the taxes that the proprietor pays when he buys his clothes as well as the taxes he pays on the place where he does business. In it are included his State and Federal income taxes. All these must come out of the hot dog or else he could not continue in business.

When this war ends, there will be a Federal debt of some $356,000,000,000. This is the amount that will have to be paid out of new wealth created. That is the wealth that this Nation has been squandering by placing a mortgage on the future. That is the fool's paradise—the so-called prosperity that some think we have. It will have to be paid for by you and your family and the unborn millions.

That is the price we pay for the prosperity that you ask me about when you say "Why can we not have the same kind of prosperity in peacetime as in wartime"? That is the kind of prosperity I hope God will never again permit to be fastened on an intelligent world. A world that is supposed to be civilized, but a world that kills and destroys and then pays for it through the sweat and tears of future generations.

When this devastating war is over, it will be our duty to help rebuild the ravaged nations. We must provide food for the hungry. We must provide material to rebuild productive enterprises. This from out of our surpluses—not out of our own necessities.

Let us clear away the wreckage and help to build the world anew, but, all the time let us keep in mind that "charity begins at home." America will not sell its domestic markets in order to bribe good neighbors. Neigbors you have to bribe are not neighbors, but, enemies. We have gone far enough with that ignorance. We will not mingle our standard of living with the poverty of other nations, but, we will assist them in bringing their standard up to ours.

Now, let us consider America's problems on the home front. All of us, except a few hyphenated hybrids, are primarily concerned with the welfare of our own Nation. Yes; we are Americans first, last, and all the time. Let that soak deep into your conscience. Anyway, what is wrong with being an American first? Churchill is an Englishman first. Stalin is a Russian first. Chiang Kai-shek is a Chinese first. Our armed forces are giving their lives for America. Then, why should not we all be Americans first? Can anyone but a disloyal person object?

When the war drums cease to beat there will be plenty to do without fooling around with one-world lunacy. Caesar, Alexander, Charlemagne, and Napoleon all died of that disease and it is about to finish Hitler.

When that time comes we will owe $356,000,000,000 Federal debts. We—135,000,000 possessing less than 10 percent of the world's resources—will owe more than all the other nations together—more than the over 2,000,000,000 that possess 90 percent of the world's resources.

There will again be deflation; there will again be unemployment; there will again be overproduction, or, rather underconsumption; there will again be an agricultural problem, a home owner's problem, this unless we meet these issues intelligently. There will again be unpaid taxes and debts by the billions. There will be a financial collapse unless we adopt an American program.

The time to face these issues is now. The time to discuss them is now. The time to pass legislation to meet the situation is now. America must have a domestic program as well as a foreign policy.

First among these safety valves is cost of production for the farmer on 43 principal agricultural products—not 75 percent parity on only 5. The ignorant regime of the "abundant life by scarcity" is past. Restricting production, wantonly killing livestock, regimenting and penalizing the farmer, now belong to the Dark Ages. Never again will the farmer submit to having 265,000 bellwethers placed on his back to tell him what he may produce and what he may not produce, what he may eat and what he may not eat.

Next, Congress must provide a living annual wage for common labor. We do not mean merely a subsistence wage, but a wage sufficient so that the workers can educate their children the same as the rest of us. The hostility toward organized labor by the paid propaganda over the radio and the metropolitan press and theaters must stop. Organized labor consists of 48 percent of our population. They have 48 percent say about the Government under which we live. American labor has done a marvelous job during this war. They, too, are getting tired of being regimented—of government by bureaucracy.

Again, there must be an intelligent old-age compensation—security from want. Any person who has worked from the age of 20 to 60 has produced enough wealth to last for life. If such a person finds himself in financial distress, and without means of a comfortable livelihood, then it is because society appropriated the wealth he created. Therefore, it is society's duty to protect such a person from want.

Congress must also resurrect, protect, and promote individual enterprise. It must give to small business a square deal, not a new deal with points, stacked cards, and loaded dice. It must protect it from the nuisance of the O. P. A. and all the rest of the alphabetical set-ups. Congress must also protect small business from monopolies built up during this war. Look behind the scenes and you will find multimillionaires—economic royalists—in all key positions. The Stettiniuses, the Rockefellers, the Harrimans, the du Ponts, and even the Tommy Lamonts are in the saddle.

If the American way of life is to continue, we must have more democracy—not less. All executive sessions and secret diplomacy must cease. What our officials know, we, their masters, are entitled to know. There must be no more one-man made laws. The courts must again learn to respect the Constitution.

If we are to continue as a republic we must provide for the nomination and election of the President and the Vice President by popular vote in a primary and general election. The term of office should be limited to 7 years, with no successive reelection. The President and the Vice President should not be elected at the same time that Congress is elected. This will prevent political manipulation. It will prevent self-perpetuation in office. It will make the unwarranted assumption of legislative and judicial power by the Executive impossible.

Finally, Government by bureaucracy must be abolished. There has been too much concentration of power in Washington. The bureaucrats not only wish to control the Nation's industrial activities, but insist upon doing the thinking for all of us. Many of these are incompetent to do their own thinking, let alone the Nation's. Congress must stop this nonsense—if representative government is to survive—the people must abolish bureaucracy on November 7.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WOLVERTON].

Mr. WOLVERTON of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, at times during this debate expression has been given to language, which, it seems to me, is unjustified. In the effort to defeat the proposal that has been made by the offering of the Dingell bill, the interest of some has led them to give expression to thoughts that are not justified from the standpoint of the bill or from the standpoint of the purpose of those who have been interested in offering it. Frequently reference has been made that it is the result of deliberation of long-haired boys and their theories, or it is the work of crackpots. I want to say to you that the Members of this House who joined together in an effort to produce a worth-while piece of legislation upon this important subject are not to be described in that manner. Those who joined with them were representatives of the American Federation

of Labor, the C. I. O., the railroad brotherhoods, and representatives from different departments of our Government who have had intimate contact with this problem over a period of years, and whose judgment has been accepted in this House on more than one occasion. None of these are of the long-hair or crackpot type. We sought to produce a bill that would be entitled to receive the support of this House. We believe the Dingell substitute bill to be sound, logical, and worth while.

Now, on the larger question, namely, the matter of sufficiency of benefits, let me bring to your attention the fact that the necessity of increased unemployment benefits has had the support and approval of leading men of business, agriculture, and labor. In a joint statement on social security, issued by the National Planning Association and signed by representatives of agriculture, business, and labor, 17 representatives of business joined in a statement which included the following criticism of the existing State laws:

The unemployment insurance system should also be amended so as to raise the level of benefits and to provide benefits for dependents and to protect workers who worked in more than one State during their eligibility period from impairment of benefit rights. Unemployment insurance is capable of making a major contribution to the stability of the economy—

And get these further words—

during the inevitable displacements that will accompany the conversion of industry to peace. But to do this certain amendments are necessary.

Among the businessmen who signed the above statement were men representing the General Electric Co., the Johns-Manville Co., the Bankers Trust Co. of New York, Swift & Co., and the Aluminum Co. of America.

The men representing those companies are not radicals. They are not what you call crackpots. They are not what you call long-haired boys. They know that adequate liberal employment insurance benefits are necessary to assure business a good market. They boldly state that the level of benefits is inadequate, both in amount and duration, and that it is necessary to make some special provision to supplement, at Federal expense, the existing system of unemployment insurance during the process of reconversion.

Another one who has made a statement that has a direct and important bearing on this subject was former Supreme Court Justice James F. Byrnes. No one would say that he was a crackpot. No one looks upon him as a long-haired boy or a radical. What did he say?—

Existing State employment insurance laws were framed to meet local conditions of temporary unemployment, and are not adequate to deal with the Nation-wide problem of reemployment. Demobilization must be regarded as a national problem and its cost as a part of the cost of the war. State unemployment insurance plans should be supplemented by Federal support to the extent necessary to give practically all workers during the transition from war to peace suitable unemployment benefits.

Similar opinions have been expressed by Mr. Altmeyer, Chairman of the Social Security Board, and Mr. Latimer, Chairman of the Railroad Retirement Board. They have made similar statements as to the inadequacy of the State unemployment-compensation laws. This Congress has placed itself on record in the G. I. bill by supplementing State employment compensation by a federalized system providing larger amounts than would otherwise have been received. National Commander Atherton, testifying on the subject, stated that this Congress was right in making such a provision. It illustrates that Congress recognizes the insufficiency as to amount and time of duration of State unemployment-compensation benefits.

The unemployment problem can be of tremendous importance during the reconversion period. We must be prepared to deal with it in a realistic way if it should occur. Only in this way can we prevent fear arising in the hearts of our workers as to their future security. We will need confidence to a high degree in the uncertain period that lies ahead.

In conclusion I want to bring to your attention a quotation from a report made by the New York Joint Legislative Committee on Industrial and Labor Conditions. This report was made in 1943. The report in its conclusion said:

The benefit provisions of the State laws cannot be said to be adequate to meet fully the needs that will arise if unemployment succeeds the cessation of hostilities * * *. It does not seem possible that in the remaining time (before the war ends), most State unemployment compensation laws will be sufficiently extended and improved to intensify sufficiently the degree of protection against widespread unemployment. The search for a solution to the problem must therefore proceed in other directions.

The above reference to "other directions" must mean Federal legislation. There is no other place to go. The Dingell bill seeks to provide a solution in the manner the above-mentioned report indicated, namely, by Federal legislation.

Today this House faces a great responsibility—the passage of the Ways and Means Committee bill will prove "too little and too late" in meeting the situation in the event we are faced with a great unemployment problem due to the transition from war production to peacetime production.

The Dingell bill provides a solution that will give heart, courage, and a feeling of security to every worker. I appeal to the membership of the House to give approval to it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

All time has expired.

The Clerk read as follows:

TITLE III—ADVANCES TO STATE UNEMPLOYMENT FUNDS

SEC. 301. (a) Section 904 (a) of the Social Security Act, as amended, is further amended by inserting, immediately before the period at the end of the second sentence of the subsection, a comma and the following: "or deposited pursuant to appropriations to the Federal unemployment account."

(b) Section 904 (e) of the Social Security Act, as amended, is further amended by inserting, after the words "a separate book account for each State agency" a comma and the following: "the Federal unemployment account."

(c) Section 904 of the Social Security Act, as amended, is further amended by adding, at the end of the section, the following new subsections:

"(g) The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed, prior to audit or settlement by the General Accounting Office, to make transfers from the Federal unemployment account to the account of any State in the Unemployment Trust Fund in accordance with certification made by the Board pursuant to section 1201, not exceeding the amount on deposit in the Federal unemployment account at the time of such transfer.

"(h) There is hereby established in the Unemployment Trust Fund a Federal unemployment account. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated to such Federal unemployment account a sum equal to the excess of taxes collected prior to July 1, 1943, under title IX of this act and under the Federal Unemployment Tax Act, over the total unemployment administrative expenditures made prior to July 1, 1943; and there is hereby authorized to be appropriated to such account for the fiscal year 1945 and for each fiscal year thereafter (1) a sum equal to any excess of taxes collected in the preceding fiscal year under the Federal Unemployment Tax Act over the unemployment administrative expenditures made in such year, and (2) such further sums, if any, as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of title XII. Any amounts in the Federal unemployment account on the termination date prescribed in section 503 of the War Mobilization and Reconversion Act, and any amounts repaid to such account after such date, shall be covered into the general fund of the Treasury. As used in this subsection, the term 'unemployment administrative expenditures' means expenditures for grants under title III of this act, for the administration of that title by the Board, and for the administration of title IX of this act and of the Federal Unemployment Tax Act by the Department of the Treasury and the Board. For the purposes of this subsection there shall be deducted from the total amount of taxes collected prior to July 1, 1943, under title IX of this act, the sum of $40,561,886.43 which was authorized to be appropriated by the act of August 24, 1937 (50 Stat. 754)."

Mr. CARLSON of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD. I have prepared an analysis of payments by States and some discussion of the present unemployment compensation section of our security laws. I should like to insert it in the RECORD at this point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. CARLSON of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, there are several factors in each of the State laws which determine the amount of benefits paid to any unemployed individual. The most important of these are:

First. Eligibility—the right to receive any benefits at all.

Second. The benefit formula—relationship of benefits to prior wages.

Third. The minimum benefit amount.

Fourth. The maximum benefit amount.

These factors are closely related and a change in one of them may affect the others.

For example, proponents of a Federal system scoff at the low minimum benefit amounts provided in some of the State laws.

Let us see what happens in some of the States fixing low minimum amounts.

Alabama is the lowest, with a minimum of $2. But here an individual can receive this benefit even if he earned as little as $39.01 in the calendar quarter in which he has received the highest wages in his base year. This means that in one 3-month period he earned less than $40—or as little as $3 a week. It is hardly conceivable that such an individual has been supporting himself or has suffered any great wage loss by being out of work.

In Arkansas the minimum is $3, and to get that the applicant must have earned as much as $66 in a base year.

In Louisiana the minimum is $3, and an individual who has earned only $90 in a year can receive this.

In Mississippi the minimum is $3, and the wage requirement is $90 in a year.

In Missouri the minimum is $3 a week, and the individual must have earned $120 in a year.

Surely, our friends who prefer a Federal system would not propose to pay unemployment benefits based upon wages in minimum amounts such as are paid in some of the larger industrial States and pay such benefits to individuals who have only earned in the neighborhood of a hundred dollars a year.

To pay a benefit of $10 a week to an individual who has averaged only $2 a week in wages over a year would not be unemployment compensation. This would be relief, and if necessary should be done under a relief system.

Actually, where higher minimum amounts are paid, the wage qualification is considerably higher. In the States paying a higher minimum, what actually happens is that people with very low earnings do not get any benefits under this system at all.

Unemployment insurance was not designed for people who have not actually been supporting themselves on their wages.

But the low minimum does not mean that the State is stingy. It means, that the State is paying benefits to many people who receive very low incomes.

Now let us turn to the matter of benefit formulas—the provisions of the laws that fix the benefit amounts.

Under unemployment compensation, in this country, benefits are always related to past wages earned in a covered occupation.

In this system we do not consider need—we do not consider the number of dependents or whether the family has enough to eat, or anything except the prior wages. This is not a relief system. In a relief system we consider every aspect of individual and family need.

But this is a semi-insurance system and the benefits paid out depend on the taxes paid in by the employer. Both are based on wages and the aim of the States has been to find a formula that is reasonable and that pays a benefit roughly in proportion to what the individual has been used to earning when employed.

The most simple way to do this would be to pay in benefits a specified percentage of the average weekly wage. This was done in the early laws.

But it was soon found that benefits under this plan were not high enough. When these laws were passed there was a good deal of partial unemployment. Working hours were reduced and many people were laid off part of the time. So the States adopted the plan of trying to relate benefits to full-time wages.

Nobody could develop a satisfactory way to define what an individual's full-time wage might be, so the Social Security Board recommended, about January 1939, that benefits be related to the wages earned in a 3-months' period. The Board suggested as a starting point, the wages earned in the highest paid calendar quarter of a base year.

This meant that in the case of seasonal employments, benefits would be based, not on the average wage, but on the peak wages.

This formula goes beyond the concept of full-time wages—it includes all the overtime and bonuses and everything that the individual earns in his best calendar quarter.

About the same time there appeared a tendency to increase the ratio between benefits and wages.

At first most of the States were agreed that the correct benefit was half the regular wage.

But this was not enough, so the States began increasing the percentage. The method of doing this was suggested by the Social Security Board in recommended amendments for State laws, which the Board distributed to all States in 1939.

Assuming full employment in a calendar quarter of 13 weeks, the weekly wage would be one-thirteenth of the quarterly wages and half of the weekly wage would be one-twenty-sixth of the quarterly wage. This figure appeared in many State laws in 1939.

But many of the States began about that time using larger fractions. They adopted figures of one-twentieth or 5 percent and higher, so that the result was that an individual who had ordinary full-time employment in his highest paid quarter received as a benefit more than half his average wage for that quarter and individuals who received overtime compensation received much more than half their full-time wages.

There has been a lot of discussion of the average benefits paid by the States.

Before the Senate post-war committee—hearings, page 754—Dr. Eigge, of the Social Security Board said that the average benefit paid by all States in 1943 was $13.84 a week, for total unemployment.

He also said that—

> It should be remembered that while we speak of benefits as being roughly equal to 50 percent of wages, the average benefit of $13.84 for 1943 is only about one third of the average weekly wage.

Now, gentlemen, this is a very misleading statement. If we had a formula that paid each recipient exactly half the average weekly wage, the total benefits paid would always be less than half the wage as long as any maximum figure is set.

The answer is that unemployment compensation is not intended to make up the wage loss of highly paid people.

Under a system like this we have to put a ceiling somewhere. I do not profess to know exactly where that ceiling should be in every community in the United States, and I do not believe any Member of this body does know where it should be. I think the figure must vary and that the State legislatures who can make careful studies of this problem under the circumstances prevailing in the States are in a much better position to determine these things than we are sitting here in Washington.

But to go back to Mr. Bigge's figures, as a matter of fact, the figures he gave to the Senate committee are out of date.

The Bureau of Unemployment Security has published average benefit amounts for 1944. Their review of Employment Security Activities for June 1944 states:

> The average weekly benefit payment for total unemployment was $15.87 during the second quarter of 1944, as compared with $15.43 for the first quarter of the year and $13.84 for the year 1943.

So, as might have been expected with rising wages, the average is climbing rapidly.

But actually these averages mean very little. There are available from the Social Security Board summaries showing the maximum benefit provisions of all State laws. Turn to these summaries, gentlemen, and you will find the figures that are important today.

Why are we debating this bill at this time?

Every Member of this House knows that this bill has been brought before us as a part of a reconversion program.

Federalization of unemployment compensation has been proposed at this time, as this bill is proposed at this time, to help solve the problem of those who will lose their jobs in war plants.

Now we all know the wages that are being paid today in our war plants. Are these plants paying wages from $10 to $20 a week? Certainly not.

Under a law that pays the unemployed individual half his prior wage, practically every man or woman who has been employed in a war industry for any length of time will receive the maximum benefit provided for in his State law.

He is not interested in what the average payment was in 1943, when there wasn't any appreciable unemployment, or in 1938, when wages were so much lower than they are today.

That individual is interested in only one provision of his State's weekly benefit formula. That provision is the maximum benefit.

Of course, he is also interested in how long he can get that benefit. Well, that will depend partly on how long his unemployment may last. But again, the State legislatures know as well as we do what their problems are and I fancy somewhat better.

The great majority of State legislatures will be in regular session in 1945 and several of the other will presumably meet in special session. They will have an opportunity at that time to reexamine these laws and I for one have no lack of confidence in their ability to make wise decisions in this field.

But to return to the matter of weekly benefit amounts. The facts are:

First. That workers in war plants today are earning enough wages to qualify them for the highest benefits paid under their State laws, even where the benefit paid is only half the weekly wages earned.

Second. Actually, the formulas pay more than half. It would take a Philadelphia lawyer with special mathematical training to understand the formulas in some of these laws. They are full of complications. But all of these complications represent different ways of increasing benefits above half the wages earned.

The oldest unemployment compensation director in the business today—oldest in point of service—is Paul Raushenbush, of Wisconsin, who was administering an unemployment compensation law when no other State had one. Mr. Raushenbush told the Senate Post-war Committee at its hearings that through weighted tables and other devices the States are actually paying benefits as much as 60 percent in many cases and sometimes two-thirds of the wages earned.

Of course, this is not true in the higher wage brackets, but unemployment-compensation laws, I venture, never would have been passed for the benefit of those receiving high wages. And unless all maximums are removed, those receiving the highest wages will never get as high a proportion of their wages in benefits as will those who are lower paid.

Third. The limit on benefit payments is not the amount of money available to the States. The States today are in a much better financial position than the Federal Government.

The limiting factor in benefits is the knowledge of the legislatures as to what is best for their States. They know their conditions. They know best how far they should go in paying benefits. In the past there has been a steady trend in the States toward higher benefits. Though this trend has been interrupted during the war when there has been so little legitimate unemployment now, with higher living costs, I have no doubt that this trend will be resumed in 1945.

Fourth. The Social Security Board has repeatedly called attention to some very low benefit payments, such as the low minimum amounts I referred to before.

Practically all the States weight their formulas so that the lowest-paid worker gets the highest percentage of his wages when benefits are paid.

So, actually these low benefits reflect, not stingy legislation but a low-wage level.

We must recognize that there is nothing in unemployment compensation that can raise the wage scales in any section of this country. We could, of course, pay unemployment benefits so high that nobody would accept a job at low wages. But this is not the purpose of unemployment insurance.

The only effect of unemployment insurance upon employment is to burden it. Now the only thing we can accomplish by increasing the cost of this system as far as employment is concerned is to make employment more difficult—to reduce employment or to reduce wages.

There are some sections of this country—and some occupations everywhere—where wages are low, and we all deplore this.

If wages in these places and these occupations can be increased, then the increases will be reflected in the size of unemployment benefit payments. We can no more raise wage levels by increasing the maximum unemployment benefit than we can change the weather by adjusting our thermometer.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks further at this point in the RECORD, and when we get back in the House I shall ask permission to include therein a paper by Stanley Rector, chief counsel of the unemployment compensation department of the Wisconsin Industrial Commission, on interstate benefit payment procedure in unemployment compensation.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. CARLSON of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, there has been considerable discussion during the debate as to what happens to the unemployment compensation of a worker who moves from one State to another. For a few minutes I want to discuss that problem.

What happens when an individual moves from the State in which he has been working and becomes unemployed in another State?

On the floor of the Senate it was stated that the individual would have to draw his benefits against the fund of the State in which he might be located, and it was implied that that State could not collect from the State that had collected the tax on his employment.

This is, of course, not correct.

Every State in the Union has entered a reciprocal agreement under which individuals may move from State to State and may continue to receive their benefits, if unemployed. These benefits are all chargeable against the State where the individual was previously employed.

In other words, if a Kansas resident has gone to Michigan to work in a war plant, and if he returns to Kansas, when unemployed at the end of the war, all he has to do is to go and register at a Kansas employment office. His benefits will be computed at the rate of Michigan, where his wages were earned. The benefits will be paid to him by his local Kansas office, but the cost will be borne by Michigan, where the tax was collected.

This system has been in effect universally for years, and I cannot understand why some interests in this field continue to claim that federalization is the only method that will solve the problem of interstate benefit payments.

Stanley Rector, chief counsel, unemployment compensation department, Wisconsin Industrial Commission, recently wrote an article entitled "Interstate Benefit Payment Procedure in Unemployment Compensation." I have secured permission from the House to insert that article at this point.

INTERSTATE BENEFIT PAYMENT PROCEDURES IN UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION

(By Stanley Rector, chief counsel, unemployment compensation department, Wisconsin industrial commission)

A primary reason urged for the necessity of substituting a completely national unemployment compensation program for the present State system is that a uniform overall national system is necessary to assure that an employee's benefit rights, wherever they may have been earned, will be forthcoming to him, wherever he may be.

It is a favorite device, on the part of the advocates of the national system, to picture our present one as being comprised of 51 tightly compartmented jurisdictions characterized by distracting differences between them that particularly affect the benefit rights of migrating workers.

It is, of course, a favorite strategem of advocates of centralization in any field—education, law enforcement, marriage and divorce, regulation of corporations, etc.—to picture the notorious inequities that accrue by reason of the attempt of the people to govern themselves through State and local governments. These alleged inequities would allegedly magically disappear under national surveillance.

In keeping with this general approach of the advocates of federalization, those of their number interested in the field of unemployment compensation picture State lines in particularly sinister coloring. The State lines are made to appear as high wire entanglements with glistening barbs, on which migrating workers leave the tattered and torn remnants of their benefit rights as they travel through them from one State to another.

The present system of State laws does not affect the benefit rights of employees, and those who charge that it does are either ignorant as to the facts or guilty of willfully misrepresenting them.

This is an attempt to develop, in a rather summary fashion, the administrative procedures through which the States have achieved a rather full and complete protection of the unemployment compensation rights of workers who may travel from State to State. It is not designed with the idea of converting acknowledged opponents of the present State system, but rather with the intention of dissipating, if possible, the misinformation for which they have been responsible.

The machinery for attacking the problem of giving adequate protection on a national basis to the benefit rights of workers under a system of State laws is provided by a national association of unemployment compensation agencies, known as the Interstate Conference of Employment Security Agencies. This association of administrators, which was organized in 1936 to enable its members to discuss, study, and recommend action on issues of mutual concern, from the first addressed itself to the problem of protecting the benefit rights of workers who traveled from place to place.

One of the first special committees appointed by the conference to consider the problem of the migrating worker evolved a uniform definition of employment, and the adoption of this uniform definition by 49 of the present 51 jurisdictions having unemployment-compensation laws has done much to allow a worker's benefit status to be determined at one particular place—wherever he

may be or however widely he may have traveled. This preliminary action on the part of the State agencies has been followed by others, with the result that there are now 4 devices which have been worked out to assure protection to migrating workers:

1. A uniform definition of employment.
2. Interstate benefit-payment plan.
3. Plan for combining wage credits.
4. Interstate reciprocal coverage arrangement.

UNIFORM DEFINITION OF EMPLOYMENT

The language of the uniform definition of employment now in the laws of 49 jurisdictions is designed to enable a single State to cover all the employment of a worker employed in several States, provided that such work was performed for a single employer. In essence, the definition provides a series of tests or standards which are designed to operate so that a maximum opportunity is given to locate a worker in a single State for the purposes of unemployment compensation. This, of course, accrues also to the advantage of the employer in the preparation of his payroll reports. The definition has particular application in the case of traveling salesmen, traveling construction crews, and persons traveling out of the State of their primary business location as an incident to their business.

INTERSTATE BENEFIT PAYMENT PLAN

The writer was chairman of the next special committee assigned by the Conference of State Agencies to further deal with the problem. The plan proposed by the committee was adopted by the conference, and by June 1938, which was prior to the time that the great majority of the States had begun to pay benefits, the present interstate benefit payment plan was in operation. This plan is now smoothly functioning, and all States and Territories are now participating in its administration.

The purpose of the plan is to protect the benefit rights of a worker who, unemployed in one State, moves to another State in search of work. In such cases the employment in the new State is, of course, customarily with a new employer. When he becomes unemployed in the second State, or perhaps the third or fourth State, he will have had wages from several employers and benefit rights in several States. The procedures established under the plan permit the worker to realize on his accrued benefit rights in the several States in which he may have had employment.

Through the plan a worker can file a claim for benefits at any local employment office in the United States. The claim is then forwarded to the central office of the State of States in which the employee earned his benefit rights, and, regardless of the State where the local office taking the claim is located, the employee receives his benefit check by mail, just as he would have had he remained in a single State. The worker's rights—that is, eligibility, qualifications, etc.—are determined by the provisions of the law of the State or States paying the benefits.

The plan in its operations may be compared to the procedures in a bank clearinghouse system. An individual who has a bank credit in his home town can, on proper identification, cash a check at almost any bank in the country. In effect, that is what happens under the interstate benefit payment plan. The unemployed worker who has benefit rights established in his home town can, upon proper identification, draw on those rights through any local employment office in the United States.

Under the plan multi-State workers are given as nearly as possible the equivalent treatment afforded intra-State workers. If the employer seeks to deny the payment of benefits, the State taking the claim (agent State) makes an investigation of the employee's side of the case and forwards the necessary depositions, etc. to the State on which the claim is made (liable State). If the liable State has made a determination of the contested matter which is not satisfactory to one of the parties, the dissatisfied party may ask for a formal hearing. The agent State then, through its appellate division, holds a hearing to obtain the employee's testimony, while the liable State does the same for the employer. Transcripts of the hearings are prepared by the liable State and a decision is issued on the basis of the evidence contained in the transcripts. It is submitted that the advocates of a Federal system could think of no better procedure for handling contested matters than the ones that the States have adopted, unless, perchance, they considered bringing employers and employees across the country to confront each other at the same hearing involving a relatively few dollars in benefits. The item of expense being of little or no concern to Federal bureaus, perhaps this might be done.

COMBINING WAGE CREDITS

The uniform definition of employment and the interstate benefit payment plan, operating together, afforded a nearly complete solution to the problem of protecting the benefit rights of migrating workers. However, there was one small element of the working population covered under State laws to whom protection was not given. To be able to claim under the interstate benefit payment plan, it was necessary that a worker have benefit rights in one or more States. The work of some employees was of such a nature and their stay in any particular State was as a consequence of such short duration as not to permit them to qualify for benefits under the laws of the States to which their work took them. Generally speaking, migratory work of this nature is mainly to be found in the field of agricultural labor, which field of employment is excluded from coverage under the Federal Unemployment Tax Act and most State unemployment compensation acts. However, the existence of a few unprotected migratory workers that were covered under State laws gave opportunities for attacks on the State system, which opportunities were fully and completely realized by advocates of federalization.

In the fall of 1943, the conference of State agencies adopted an interstate plan for combining wage credits, whereby the States could, by subscribing to the plan, mutually arrange for the combining of wage credits.

The plan works like this: Worker A is employed on separate construction jobs, by separate employers, in Iowa, Wisconsin, North Dakota, and Idaho. He does not earn sufficient wages or work long enough to qualify under any of the unemployment compensation laws of the enumerated States. After his last job he returns to his home in Iowa where he files a claim for unemployment compensation benefits. The Iowa unemployment compensation agency obtain's A's wage credits from the other States and finds that his total earnings on all jobs are sufficient to qualify him under the Iowa law. In accordance with the interstate plan for combining wage credits, Iowa pays unemployment benefits to A. Once each 3 months Iowa bills the States of Wisconsin, North Dakota, and Idaho for their proportionate share of the cost of A's benefits.

At the present time 16 States—Colorado, Connecticut, Delaware, Idaho, Iowa, Louisiana, Missouri, New Mexico, New York, North Carolina, North Dakota, South Dakota, Vermont, West Virginia, Wisconsin, and Wyoming—have subscribed to the wage credits combining plan. Additional States are expected to subscribe shortly.

Employers desiring the continuance of the present State program, as against a centralized national plan, could perform a friendly act by advocating that their State agency subscribe to this new device.

RECIPROCAL COVERAGE

The reciprocal coverage arrangement, though relatively unimportant in contrast with the three preceding procedures, is the last step that has been taken by the conference of State agencies in the interest of workers traveling from State to State and of their employers. In December 1943, as the result of a few years of experience with the uniform definition of employment, the conference recommended the arrangement for adoption by the State unemployment compensation agencies. Experience had demonstrated that, while the uniform definition of employment had, by and large, served to satisfactorily locate traveling employees at a particular situs for the purposes of unemployment compensation, yet there were some situations in which it did not accrue to the advantage of the employees or the employer. The reciprocal coverage arrangement, in brief, permits an employer's employees who may be under the laws of several States to be brought together and considered to be under the law of a single State for the purposes of unemployment compensation. This has obvious advantages to the employer in the preparation of pay-roll records and also has advantages to the employees arising out of increased convenience, and, generally speaking, increased benefit coverage.

The following example illustrates the purpose and operation of the arrangement: Company A is a chain-store corporation with stores in Maryland, Illinois, North Dakota, and Washington. Certain of A's employees are periodically moved from store to store. Company A is subject to the separate laws of each State in which it operates. The interstate reciprocal coverage arrangement will allow company A to elect to cover all of its interstate workers in one of these States. Now assume A elects to cover them in Illinois. Illinois, upon receipt of the employer's election, clears with the States of North Dakota, Maryland, and Washington. If those States have no objection, company A's election goes into effect. The result is reduced reporting and simplified accounting for company A and increased benefit coverage for the workers.

A final observation seems in point. Advocates of a national unemployment compensation act seem to overlook the fact that, under their proposed system, the problem of "keeping up" with workers who change from place to place would have essentially the same character and dimensions. Certainly the unemployment-compensation checks for the whole country could not be written in Baltimore on the basis of the old-age and survivors insurance records assembled there. The necessity of making benefit payments promptly would require a decentralization of the mechanism for making payments. This would mean a regionalization of the country, with paying stations in each region. Presumably, copies of the employees' records assembled at Baltimore would be transmitted back to the appropriate paying station, for the purpose of paying the benefits when claimed. However, it can reasonably be assumed that workers would still continue to travel across the regional lines established by the Federal bureau, and this would require the setting up of something closely relating to the interstate benefit payment plan and the combining of wage credits plan, which have been worked out by the States. Unfortunately, federalization will not remove all of the complexities of the present program. Indeed it may, if experience is a teacher, serve to introduce further complications.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 302. The Social Security Act, as amended, is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following new title:

"TITLE XII—ADVANCES TO STATE UNEMPLOYMENT FUNDS

"SEC. 1201. (a) In the event that the balance in a State's account in the Unemployment Trust Fund on June 30, 1945, or on the last day in any ensuing calendar quarter which ends prior to the termination date prescribed in section 503 of the War Mobilization and Reconversion Act, does not exceed a sum equal to the total contributions deposited in the Unemployment Trust Fund under the unemployment-compensation law of the State during that one of the two calendar years next preceding such day in which such deposits were higher, the State shall be entitled, subject to the provisions of subsections (b) and (c) hereof, to have transferred from the Federal unemployment account to its account in the Unemployment Trust Fund an amount equal to the unemployment compensation paid out by it in the calendar quarter ending on such day, which is in excess of 2.7 percent of the total remuneration, paid during such quarter, subject to the State unemployment-compensation law.

"(b) The Social Security Board is authorized and directed, on application of a State unemployment-compensation agency, to make findings as to whether the conditions for the transfer of moneys provided for in subsection (a) hereof have been met; and if such conditions exist, the Board is directed to certify, to the Secretary of the Treasury, from time to time, the amounts for transfer in order to carry out the purposes of this title, reduced or increased, as the case may be, by any sum by which the Board finds that the amounts transferred for any prior quarter were greater or less than the amounts to which the State was entitled for such quarter. The application of a State agency shall be made on such forms, and contain such information and data, fiscal and otherwise, concerning the operation and administration of the State law, as the Board deems necessary or relevant to the performance of its duties hereunder.

"(c) Any amount transferred to the account of any State under this section shall be treated as an advance, without interest, to the unemployment fund of such State and shall be repaid to the Federal unemployment account from the unemployment fund of that State to the extent that the balance in the State's account in the Unemployment Trust Fund, at the end of any calendar quarter, exceeds a sum equal to the total contributions deposited in the Unemployment Trust Fund under the unemployment-compensation law of the State during that one of the two preceding calendar years preceding such day in which such deposits were higher. The Secretary of the Treasury shall, after the end of each calendar quarter, transfer from the unemployment account of each State in the Unemployment Trust Fund to the Federal unemployment account the amount required to be repaid from the unemployment fund of such State at the end of such quarter under this subsection."

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DINGELL: Page 39, after line 24, insert the following:

"SEC. 1202. (a) The Board is authorized on behalf of the United States to enter into agreements with any State or with the unemployment compensation agency of such State under which such State agency will make payments supplementary to those under its unemployment compensation law in accordance with the provisions of this section. Such agreements shall provide for supplementing the unemployment compensation payable under the unemployment compensation law of such State by such amount as the State may elect, not in excess of the amount found by the Board to be sufficient to provide, until the termination date prescribed by section 503 of the War Mobilization and Reconversion Act of 1944, (1) for paying, to individuals entitled to unemployment compensation under the law of such State, compensation at rates which (including the amounts of unemployment compensation otherwise payable under such State law) are calculated to equal, for a total week of unemployment, (A) 75 percent of the weekly wages of such individuals or (B) $20, whichever is lesser, and (2) for paying to individuals entitled within a benefit year to unemployment compensation under the law of such State, an amount of unemployment compensation in such benefit year equal to compensation (at the rates specified in clause (1) of this subsection) for 26 weeks of total unemployment, before denying them unemployment compensation by reason of the exhaustion of their benefit rights. For the purposes of this subsection, the weekly wages of an individual shall be deemed to be the amount of remuneration, subject to the State law, paid him during the period used for determining his rate of compensation (A) divided by the number of weeks in such period if such period is the calendar quarter, within a period (specified in the State law) of at least three calendar quarters, in which his remuneration, subject to such law, was greatest, or (B) in case any other period is used, divided by the number of weeks other than weeks of total unemployment, in such period. No agreement under this section shall be valid if compensation to any individual under the State unemployment compensation law will be denied or reduced by reason of any payment made pursuant to such agreement or if the compensation payable to any individual under such State law is less than it would have been under the law of such State as it existed on July 1, 1944.

"(b) Each State shall be entitled to receive from the Federal unemployment account for each quarter, beginning with the first quarter commencing after enactment of this act, an amount equal to the total of all supplemental payments of unemployment compensation made by such State during such quarter, pursuant to an agreement under this section.

"(c) In case of an agreement under this section that a State agency will make supplemental payments, there shall be paid in advance to the State such sum as the Board estimates the State will be entitled to receive for each quarter under this section; reduced or increased, as the case may be, by any sum by which it finds that its estimate for any prior quarter was greater or less than the amount which should have been paid to the State. All money paid to a State under this subsection shall be used solely for the payment of such supplemental payments. Any money so paid to a State which is not used for the purpose for which it was paid shall, upon termination of the agreement, be returned to the Treasury.

"(d) Determinations of entitlement to such supplemental payments made by a State agency under an agreement that such agency will act as agent of the United States under this section shall be subject to review in the same manner and to the same extent as determinations under the State unemployment compensation law, and only in such manner and to such extent. Such an agreement may require any officer or employee of the State disbursing funds pursuant to the agreement or otherwise participating in its performance to give a surety bond to the United States in such amount as the Board may deem necessary, and may provide for payment of the cost of such bond from appropriations for carrying out the purpose of this act.

"(e) The Board shall from time to time certify to the Secretary of the Treasury for payment to each State the sums payable to it under this section. The Secretary of the Treasury, through the fiscal service of the Treasury Department, and prior to audit or settlement by the General Accounting Office, shall make payment in accordance with such certification."

Mr. COOPER (interrupting the reading of the amendment). Mr. Chairman, permit me to ask the gentleman from Michigan: This amendment proposes to provide for the payment of not to exceed $20 a week for 26 weeks and up to 75 percent for the base pay?

Mr. DINGELL. That is right.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the further reading of the amendment be dispensed with for the reason the balance of it is only technical language.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. COOPER]?

There was no objection.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, the amendment which I propose here is in accordance with the recommendations which were made before the committee by the distinguished Mr. Justice Byrnes, who pointed out the inadequacy of the compensation provisions as they are generally applied. He recommended that the committee take some favorable action with regard to raising the amounts of unemployment compensation. He pointed out that unless this is done some other method or means would have to be found which, perhaps, would be more desirable even than the possible interference with so-called States rights.

Many of the States already pay $20 per week or more. Many States provide benefits for a reasonably long period of unemployment. On the other hand, certain States are sadly deficient. They have failed to keep in step with the times and to provide for the needs of their unemployed. For these reasons, it becomes necessary, Mr. Chairman, to present an amendment of this nature at the present time.

As pointed out by the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WOLVERTON] in reference to the post-war unemployment situation and pointing to the effect that neglect of the problem may have on the period immediately following, it must be conceded that the States which have failed to bring up their unemployment compensation payments to meet reasonable needs are lacking in vision and they are not going to contribute anything toward the maintenance of post-war prosperity. The amendment, I may say for the benefit of the Members, provides that the Federal Government, through the Social Security Board, shall enter into agreements with the various States and when an agreement has been reached the Federal Government will then pay the difference between what the State has been paying and what the amendment provides. I want you to know definitely it is a matter affecting the Federal Treasury, though I deem it absolutely essential

in instances such as I pointed out yesterday where the minimum pay is $2, $3, and in some instances the provision amounts to only 50 cents for unemployment compensation, that something must be done. Something ought to be done now to elevate the standard.

The principal part of the amendment, as I see it now, is that part which provides for raising the basis of calculation from 40 or 50 percent, or whatever it happens to be in a given State, up to 75 percent, because we are particularly concerned about raising the compensation of those workers in the lower brackets.

This amendment will distinguish the Members here as to whether they are really interested in labor's welfare or not, and I say that with all due deference to those with whom I may honestly differ. This is the real test. States whose compensation have been so deficient, which have remained static, have no claim whatever now because we in the Federal Government have given them the right to use their discretion and to use their States' rights, but they have failed the worker in this critical moment.

I fail to see how any Member of this House can vote against it. I am particularly anxious about my numerous friends on the left who are here in force to aid me in bringing about this amendment at this particular time. May I say further, that if the States are willing to come up by themselves there can be no interference by this amendment, and the State funds are sufficient in most instances so that they can raise their own compensation.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DINGELL. I yield.

Mr. KNUTSON. Without divulging anything that happened in executive session at the last meeting of the committee, it is my recollection that the gentleman offered this amendment in the committee on the last day.

Mr. DINGELL. I do not remember what day it was, but I did offer it in committee.

Mr. EBERHARTER. It was reoffered in committee.

Mr. DINGELL. That is right; it was reoffered in committee on the last day. I do not want to divulge what happened in committee, because I may be divulging something that would not be exactly pleasant, but I will state that it was reoffered on the last day. It was originally offered early in the deliberations of the committee.

Mr. KNUTSON. And overwhelmingly defeated.

Mr. DINGELL. Yes; it was overwhelmingly defeated.

Mr. PACE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DINGELL. I yield.

Mr. PACE. Are the supplemental funds supplied by the Treasury in the nature of grants or loans to the States, under the gentleman's amendment?

Mr. DINGELL. They would be outright payments from the Federal Government; the difference between what the State paid and what the amendment provides for.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, I am wondering if we can reach an agreement as to time on this amendment. I think most of what was said on the Dingell substitute applies to a considerable extent to this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in not to exceed 20 minutes.

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I would like to ask the gentleman this question: This does not apply to the title as a whole, but simply to this section?

Mr. COOPER. I stated as emphatically as I could: To this amendment and all amendments thereto.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD at this point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona?

There was no objection.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, it is exceedingly difficult to plan our timing for conditions immediately after the close of the war. We must not slow down or quit producing too soon. Of course, we would like to minimize the cost of the war by changing from war production as soon as we may safely do so. Of course, being unable to predict the time of the cessation of hostilities accurately, we do not think of planning for the last bullet to shoot the last enemy, nor with anything like such accuracy. We know that we shall produce more than we shall need.

Now, in regard to production we have been quite generous in protecting the propertied interests of the corporations producing our weapons and munitions of war. We have desired to safeguard them and they have seen to it that we have done so. How thoughtful have we been for the workers? What is the least that we should do for war workers?

We read some time ago that our great shipbuilder on the west coast gathered workers from as far away as New York City. Presumably he paid their expenses to the west coast and charged it up to Uncle Sam. Has he made any arrangement about shipping those people back to their homes in other States when they are no longer needed in producing war orders? I imagine not. I think we should have made some arrangement in regard to it in the termination of contracts so as to hold the contractor responsible for the return of those workers who have been gathered from a distance. It was not written into the law, but it ought to be provided for, either in some law or by administration.

There are those who say the workers have received the highest wages in history and that they should have saved something for that very contingency at the end of the war. Perhaps so, but I doubt whether many of them have done it. The cost of living for these war workers has been high in war-boom communities and their real wage was much less than the pay envelope indicated. Of course, if we had provided for workers' return in the termination of contracts, I have not the least doubt but that Uncle Sam would have footed the bill anyway, merely paying it through the contractors.

There are many communities throughout the country where war work has been carried on intensively to which war workers have been attracted from great distances. Some of these communities may, but others probably will not, have peacetime industry which after an interval will pick up the employment of those dismissed from war work. What is the responsibility of the Government for such communities which will have a heavy strain thus thrown upon their local resources? I am not advocating that we give war workers joy rides and tourist excursions across the country, but I do feel that some feasible and sane provision ought to be worked out whereby dismissed war workers who must return to their former homes because they cannot get further employment in the communities where they have been in war work, may be returned and that the Federal Government should do this job.

In fairness to soldiers and for the good of our economy, I am one who thought that we ought to have had more liberal provisions even than our mustering-out pay for the members of the armed forces. I am one of several Members who proposed that the soldier's regular pay be continued for several months after the close of the war and their discharge from the service. Certainly it is wise to provide for the production of weapons and ammunition enough for several months longer than the war will actually continue, because we cannot know when it will certainly stop. We do not take chances with a military foe.

Now, it seems to me that it would also be wise to regard as a part of the necessary war expenditures adequate financial provision for ex-service members and war workers so that they will not be cut off financially the very hour of the armistice. Not riotous living conditions but safety for all against an economic foe. This question has an economic aspect as well as an individual aspect which deserves to be recognized in this legislation.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS].

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I will try to pick up the speech that I started earlier this afternoon but which I was unable to finish.

Mr. Chairman, when the contract termination bill was under consideration by the House and by the committee, we were advised by witness after witness that, although billions of dollars of contracts were involved, and although the speedy termination of those contracts might cause some billions of dollars to be lost by the Government, nonetheless speedy termination was worth so much from the standpoint of effective reconversion of our economy that we ought not to be penny-wise and pound-foolish.

Members of the House repeatedly said the same thing.

Today, however, when the consideration is the basic buying power of the masses of people of this Nation, the market for the goods of that very industry—the people of our country—we are urged to take an entirely different point of view, one which in my judgment has so far largely shut out the big consideration that should motivate our action and has focused upon meticulous detail of one kind or another and small considerations.

I want to try to give the House a few broad facts in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan. That amendment will not upset a single State unemployment-compensation system. All it will do will be to superimpose on top thereof for the period of reconversion—and if anything ever was a national problem, that period of reconversion is—a scheme of Federal contributions to State payments so as to bring them up to 75 percent of basic wages, not to exceed $20 per week in any case, and to make the extension of time 26 weeks.

Mr. Chairman, we are at the present time producing about $180,000,000,000 or more of national wealth. Our paid-out national income is about $157,000,000,000 per year. Our people are almost all employed. The reason we are doing that is that the Government is buying $90,000,000,000 of that production for the war. The problem with which we are confronted today is, What is going to happen when that $90,000,000,000 of Government orders is withdrawn? We are confronted with the problem of how we are going to see to it that when that happens we shall continue to have full production and full employment of our people, a market for the goods of full production, a market for the production of our agriculture, and a chance to keep tax revenues sufficient to meet the problem of national debt. The only way we can possibly do that is to expand, not contract, the market here at home among our own people.

I do not believe we can do that job by simply relying upon the State unemployment compensation systems during that reconversion period. I believe we must supplement those systems to a degree at least sufficient that we get this result. In the families of America, there must, if reconversion is to be successful, be a reasonable assurance in the homes of America that their chance to live is not going to go down to such a point that they have to squeeze onto every dollar of savings they have, because every calculation for the future of orderly and speedy reconversion is based upon the volume of savings that exist today. But those savings, Mr. Chairman, will not be spent unless there is a reasonable assurance in the minds of the people that there is not going to be a long period of unemployment and distress and poverty in this country.

There does not have to be any such period. There is no sense in there being such a period. If there is such a period, there is going to be a most serious problem, and that problem will be faced by this Congress after it is too late, no matter what party is in power, by a huge appropriation for some emergency measure. I should like to see us face it now, provide for sustaining our home buying power and prevent the necessity of such action.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD].

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I consider that this amendment, as presented by the gentleman from Michigan, is one that, if passed by this House, would go a great way toward the expenses of reconversion and the elimination of poverty and suffering of the millions of war workers in this Nation who have given their all in the production field during this war. A few months ago this Congress passed the Ruml plan. When we passed that plan we returned approximately $8,000,000 in tax obligations. We canceled them and returned them to those most able to pay their taxes during this wartime period; a period of the highest earning year in our history up to that time. We have in the defense plant expansion loan, set up a 20-percent amortization clause to pay for those plants which these plans have built.

In many instances, if those plants do not make a dime of profit, it will equal $20,000,000 or $30,000,000 or $50,000,000 in plant equipment, which will be useful in the post-war period, or a great deal of it at least. We have earmarked $28,000,000 in excess taxes which can be returned under certain provisions to the corporations in the years immediately following X-day so that they can keep their earnings up to a certain percentage of their base period earnings. In our G. I. bill we have made provision for men in the armed forces to solve the terrible problem of rehabilitation and reconversion to civilian life of the members of our armed forces. What have we done for the workers? What have we done for the workers who made possible the guns, tanks, ships, and planes with which the men of our armed forces are now winning the war? To me, this is a question of whether you want to carry this reconversion through to a greater number of people—and I am speaking in terms of numbers now—to a greater number of people, to workers and their families, to give them a chance, also, to rehabilitate themselves in the post-war period.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me for just a moment?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I yield.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Is it not true, that the only thing that can compensate in market demand for the Government's $90,000,000,000 of war orders, is going to be an increase in the consumer demand for goods in the American market?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Of course, the gentleman is perfectly right. Unless the workers of America have money to buy the goods which we are capable of producing, we will have another depression, which will make the last one look like a picnic.

Mr. Chairman, I ask for the adoption of the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. LYNCH].

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Chairman, I have previously said that this bill means nothing to the American worker. There is no single provision in the bill which in anywise helps him. Here we have gone forward on the reconversion of industry. Now, when it comes to the point of doing something for the worker, I fear that this House is going to take the position that the worker is to be forgotten. I am in favor of this amendment because I feel that in this period of transition the Congress should do something for those who help win the war on the home front. At the present time, in the various State funds there are some $6,000,000,000 in unemployment funds. That is more money than the States ever had in those funds. It has been caused by the fact that there has been greater employment during the past few years and because of the fact that the drain on such funds by reason of unemployment is practically negligible. Now, what we feel should be done with respect to these war workers is this: That if the Federal Government guarantee, as you intend it to guarantee, these funds, then the States ought to do something for that guaranty. I understand they could pay every claim which would be made upon them for the next year under the present provisions of law relative to the various State funds. In return for that guaranty let the State extend the benefits in larger sums than they are doing today. What does 50 cents a week unemployment compensation mean to a man who loses his job and has to keep his family going? Yet in one State the minimum payment is 50 cents a week and no payment is made until after 6 weeks. What does $3 or $4 a week mean insofar as unemployment benefits are concerned, as some States provide?

The only sensible thing for us to do, if we are going to do anything for the American worker who will be out of employment when the war is over, is to enlarge the money benefits of the unemployment compensation and to extend the period of payments to every 6 weeks. If we do not enlarge the payments and extend the time, we are going to be put back in the same position as the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS] stated, that sooner or later we will be confronted with relief rolls. That is something I think none of us wants to see happen again in this country. On the other hand, if during the period of transition, unemployment benefits are increased from their present amounts and from their present duration to a term of 26 weeks and in the amounts as set forth in the amendment, it seems to me we will be able to carry the unemployed over a considerable distance. Therefore, I earnestly urge that in coming to your final determination on this amendment, you consider the fact that the present rates are wholly inadequate; that with

the unemployment that will come, if the income of the country decreases to less than $120,000,000,000, we will have a catastrophe in the country somewhat similar to the one we had in the late twenties and the early thirties.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York [Mr. LYNCH] has expired.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. I shall only ask the indulgence of the Committee briefly to point out that as was indicated a few moments ago, this amendment was offered in committee and was overwhelmingly defeated.

It will be remembered that this bill provides for the present State unemployment systems to continue. As has been pointed out before, there is something like $6,000,000,000 now in the State Unemployment Compensation funds. Those funds are growing at the rate of about a billion dollars a year. If the war should continue until 1945, there would be about $7,000,000,000 in the State funds. I can see no reason why we should now say there should be additional money paid out of the Treasury of the United States to pay unemployment compensation benefits.

We have State systems enacted by the legislatures of the various States of the Union. We must assume that they know the conditions in their States. They have fixed the amounts of unemployment insurance benefits. They have fixed the time of duration for the payment of those benefits. There is no reason why the Congress should now say that the legislatures of all of the States were mistaken in the action which they took, and that we must now provide additional funds out of the Treasury of the United States to supplement the amounts that the various States of the Union have provided for the payment of unemployment compensation.

This amendment should not be adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. DINGELL) there were—ayes 41, noes 113.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer some comment on an article by the distinguished gentlewoman from Connecticut [Mrs. LUCE] which probably appears in many newspapers throughout the country, but it was published yesterday in the Philadelphia Inquirer, a paper of my home city.

I wish the gentlewoman were here; notwithstanding the fact that this is a most important piece of legislation she is not present. I called her office on the telephone to make sure she would be on the floor when I spoke, but was informed she was not in the city of Washington. I think I have the same chivalry as every Member of this House, and I deplore the necessity of entering into a controversy with one of the gentler sex, but when a Member of this House assumes the role of a news reporter and breaks into public print with statements that are irresponsible and unreliable I believe that he or she assumes responsibility for such statements; and I may say before I come to what I desire to comment upon that in the same column today the gentlewoman has this to say with respect to every Member of this House. She says:

> Last week during the debate on the surplus property bill if the Members who dozed on the floor could be placed end to end they would be more comfortable.

With that I am not concerned, but the gentlewoman through innuendo and insinuation creates disunity in the United States; she attempts to convince the American people that the President of the United States is callous with regard to the welfare of the men who are fighting in the Pacific, and she quotes, or at least she says, that a high officer of the Naval Establishment urged the President not to make that trip; and I am quoting from her column. She says:

> Admiral Nimitz urged the President not to go to Hawaii on the grounds that it would place a needless strain on the Air Force and naval personnel responsible for the President's safety and would accomplish nothing militarily.

Mr. Chairman, I can tell you on high naval authority that that statement is absolutely and unequivocally untrue. I should like the country to realize what the Members of this House think of the lady's judgment and what they think of her qualifications as an expert and I am going to go back into some of the history of this House. I hope the newspapers carry it.

You remember when we had the tax bill. The gentlewoman had only been a Member of this House several months.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I raise the point of order that the gentleman from Pennsylvania has no right to talk about a Member of the House in that way.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I think the gentleman is out of order in raising the point of order.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I do not want to demand that the gentleman's words be taken down, but I think he ought to confine himself to the parliamentary situation. We were good enough to give him an opportunity to speak out of order.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I hope this is not taken out of my time.

Mr. Chairman, I wish the gentlewoman were here because I dislike to talk when she is not, but here is a statement made by her in the press yesterday and today which requires immediate rebuttal. I cannot stop because the gentlewoman is not here.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I do not think the gentleman confined himself to what was in the paper.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I cannot yield to the minority leader, much as I would like to, and I hope this is not taken out of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will proceed.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, when we had the tax bill under consideration, a bill that was labored upon by the Ways and Means Committee of this House, by men whose experience is second to none of any group of men in the United States, men who had spent hours in hard work, who had the advantage of expert testimony from the Treasury Department and from businessmen during hearings held daily for months, but the gentlewoman from Connecticut brought in her own bill. Not only is she an expert about military and naval operations and foreign affairs but she also professes to be an expert on taxation. She brought in her bill and this is what happened. She has the unique distinction of being the only Member of Congress in the history of the country who ever offered a bill that was defeated unanimously. We have thousands of measures which have passed unanimously in this House, but none defeated unanimously.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. I am sorry. If the gentleman will request that I get 5 additional minutes I will be glad to yield.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I will not make any such request.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. Then I cannot yield.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. The gentleman cannot prove that statement that it was defeated by an unanimous vote.

The regular order was demanded.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will proceed.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, the circumstances were that the gentleman from California [Mr. GEARHART] offered that amendment in her behalf and he did it at the same time he said he was sorry he could not vote for it. The gentlewoman was not here, and no other Member voted for it, so she has the unique distinction of being the only Member of Congress who ever offered a bill that never got a single vote when it was on the floor.

Mr. GEARHART. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. I cannot yield.

Mr. GEARHART. I want to say to the gentleman the RECORD will not disclose that. I did vote for that amendment.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. The gentleman stated on the floor of the House in his remarks that he was not going to vote for it and the RECORD will show that statement unless the gentleman struck it from his remarks after he made it.

Mr. GEARHART. The RECORD will not show that at all.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I am not going to say that the gentlewoman deliberately published an untrue statement, but I will say that she received information from sources that perhaps had a malicious intent in giving her inaccurate information, and she has a duty when she assumes the mantle of a newspaper columnist to guard against the presentation of unverified rumors to the American people.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I ask that the gentleman's words be taken down.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, I think we are giving this too much attention.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, it is time this is ended.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I hope the gentlewoman in her future utterances will confine herself to facts.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment, and I ask unanimous consent to proceed out of order for 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, it is unfortunate that this episode should have occurred, and I want to apologize to the galleries. It is most unusual to attack a colleague when absent from a session.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

Mr. KNUTSON. I have read the two articles written by the gentlewoman.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that it is not proper within the rules of the House for a Member standing on the floor to address any remarks to the galleries.

Mr. KNUTSON. I did not address my remarks to the gallery.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota did not address his remarks to the gallery.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Chairman, I would like to have a ruling on the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair overrules the point of order. The gentleman from Minnesota is recognized.

Mr. KNUTSON. I read the two articles written by the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Mrs. LUCE]. I thought they were very temperate. There were some things she might have said in connection with the President's recent trip—or should I say jaunt—to the Pacific that she refrained from telling. She did not inform the country that the President was accompanied by a flotilla of battleships, cruisers, and destroyers that should have been out in the far Pacific fighting the Japs. Neither did she comment upon the rumor that Falla, that little Scotty dog, had been inadvertently left behind at the Aleutians on the return trip, and that they did not discover the absence of the little doggie until the party reached Seattle, and that it is rumored a destroyer was sent a thousand miles to fetch him.

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FORAND: Page 39, after the period in line 24, add a new section as follows:

"UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION FOR FEDERAL EMPLOYEES

"SEC. 403. (a) The Social Security Act, as amended, is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following new title:

" 'TITLE XIII. UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION FOR FEDERAL EMPLOYEES

" 'SEC. 1301. (a) Any person who shall have rendered service as a civilian in the employ of the United States Government, after September 16, 1940, shall be entitled, in accordance with the applicable provisions of the unemployment compensation law of the State in which claim for compensation is filed, to receive compensation for each week of unemployment commencing after September 30, 1944, in the same amounts, on the same terms, and subject to the same conditions, as though the unemployment compensation laws of the several States did not exclude services performed in the employ of the United States Government. Any claim for compensation under this section shall be filed in a State in which a part of the service in the employ of the United States Government was performed. As used in this section, the term "United States Government" includes any wholly owned instrumentality of the United States.

" '(b) The Social Security Board is authorized on behalf of the United States to enter into an agreement with any State or with the unemployment compensation agency of such State, under which such State agency will make, as the agent of the United States, payments of unemployment compensation to individuals with respect to services performed by them as civilians in the employ of the United States Government, on the basis provided in subsection (a).

" '(c) Each State shall be entitled to receive from the Federal unemployment account for each quarter, beginning with the first quarter commencing after enactment of this act, an amount equal to the total of all payments of unemployment compensation made by such State during such quarter, pursuant to an agreement under this section.

" '(d) In the event that any State does not agree to make such payments to such persons, the Civil Service Commission is hereby authorized and directed to make such payments.

" '(e) All departments, agencies, and instrumentalities of the United States are directed to make available to the appropriate State agency such information with reference to compensation of persons in the employ of the United States Government as may be necessary to determine the benefits payable under this title.

" '(f) In case of an agreement under this section that a State agency will make payments as agent of the United States, there shall be paid in advance to the State such sum as the Board estimates the State will be entitled to receive for each quarter under such section; reduced or increased, as the case may be, by any sum by which it finds that its estimate for any prior quarter was greater or less than the amount which should have been paid to the State. All money paid to a State under this subsection shall be used solely for the payment of unemployment compensation. Any money so paid to a State which is not used for the purpose for which it was paid shall, upon termination of the agreement, be returned to the Treasury.

" '(g) Determination of entitlement to unemployment compensation made by a State agency under an agreement that such agency will act as agent of the United States under this section shall be subject to review in the same manner and to the same extent as determinations under the State unemployment compensation law, and only in such manner and to such extent. Such an agreement may require any officer or employee of the State disbursing funds pursuant to the agreement or otherwise participating in its performance to give a surety bond to the United States in such amount as the Board may deem necessary, and may provide for payment of the cost of such bond from appropriations for carrying out the purpose of this act.

" '(h) The Board shall from time to time certify to the Secretary of the Treasury for payment to each State the sums payable to it under this section. The Secretary of the Treasury, through the Fiscal Service of the Treasury Department, and prior to audit or settlement by the General Accounting Office, shall make payment in accordance with such certification.'

"SEC. 404. This act, and the amendments to the Social Security Act made thereby, shall cease to be effective at the end of the second full calendar year after the termination of hostilities in the present war as declared by Presidential proclamation or concurrent resolution of the Congress, except that the obligation of the State agencies to repay advances made from the Federal unemployment accounts shall remain effective until such advances are repaid. Any amounts so repaid after the end of such year, and any amounts in the Federal unemployment account at the end of such year, shall be covered into the general fund of the Treasury."

Mr. FORAND (interrupting the reading of the amendment). Mr. Chairman, I think I can save the time of the Committee and try to make up for this little humorous sketch, or whatever it was we had here a few minutes ago. I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with. If the Members will refer to the copy of the bill they have, beginning on page 20, entitled "Unemployment Compensation for Federal Employees," which is a section of the George bill, they will have the amendment that is now pending before the House.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Rhode Island?

There was no objection.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order against the amendment.

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Chairman, the intent of my amendment is to restore to the bill as brought to the floor by the committee section 403 of the George bill providing for unemployment compensation for Federal employees. I need not go into the details of this amendment, because I am sure you are all familiar with it. I do, however, want to call attention to the fact that when this war ends, there will be some 2,000,000 Federal employees thrown out of work. Those employees, in many instances, could be receiving higher wages and better earnings if they were in private employment doing similar work. People doing similar work in private industry are eligible for unemployment compensation when the war ends, but those employed by the Federal Government, unless we do something about it, are left out in the cold.

The Federal Government through legislation passed by the Congress has provided that private employers shall make

a contribution of 3 percent—some have called it an excise tax on their pay roll—toward the unemployment compensation fund. We compel private employers to do that for the benefit of their employees, but the largest employer in the country, the United States, has failed to do the same thing for its employees. Because of that fact, I think it is only fair that we should have legislation covering in for the life of this act those employees of the Federal Government who will be thrown out of employment. We are hopeful that business will be able to create jobs; that everybody will be employed, but we know that the Federal Government will not reconvert; it will not reemploy those same people that it is throwing out at the end of the war. Because of that fact, provision must be made for them.

Someone has said, "How much is that going to cost, and who has the figures?" I cannot give you the figures. Nobody can give you the figures relative to the cost of unemployment for those Federal employees who will be thrown out of employment, any more than you can tell me exactly how much this war is going to cost. But I can tell you that the cost of unemployment for these Federal employees will be governed by the success of our hope and our plans for reemployment of people after the war. I trust that you are going to give this amendment serious consideration.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORAND. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. RAMSPECK. As I understand the gentleman's amendment, it proposes to do the same thing for the Federal employees that the George bill does for private employees.

Mr. FORAND. That is absolutely correct. The amount paid and the handling of the cases will be governed strictly by State law.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Then I think it is a fair proposition and ought to be adopted.

Mr. FORAND. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. IZAC. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORAND. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. IZAC. Perhaps the lack of manpower in the naval establishments on the west coast and in our arsenals throughout the country is due to the fact that those men are now going into private industry where they will be protected when the cut-back comes, whereas they will not be protected, unless the gentleman's amendment is accepted, as long as they remain in Federal establishments.

Mr. FORAND. The gentleman is absolutely correct. I pointed that out in my remarks yesterday.

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORAND. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. BLAND. Will that include the seamen who are working on ships that are run by the War Shipping Administration?

Mr. FORAND. There are certain seamen who are receiving their money now from the Federal Government, but I am told an amendment will be offered to cover all of them.

Mr. Chairman, I think the issue is clear. I ask every Member of the House to give serious consideration to this matter and to support the amendment.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against the amendment that it is an appropriation of funds in violation of clause 4 of rule XXI of the House. I call the attention of the Chair particularly to this language. I refer to the page and line of the Senate bill rather than the amendment, because I have that in front of me and I assume the Chair can refer to it readily. It begins on page 21, line 6:

(c) Each State shall be entitled to receive from the Federal unemployment account for each quarter, beginning with the first quarter commencing after enactment of this act, an amount equal to the total of all payments of unemployment compensation made by such State during such quarter, pursuant to an agreement under this section.

(d) In the event that any State does not agree to make such payments to such persons, the Civil Service Commission is hereby authorized and directed to make such payments.

(e) All departments, agencies, and instrumentalities of the United States are directed to make available to the appropriate State agency such information with reference to compensation of persons in the employ of the United States Government as may be necessary to determine the benefits payable under this title.

(f) In case of an agreement under this section that a State agency will make payments as agent of the United States, there shall be paid in advance to the State such sum as the Board estimates the State will be entitled to receive for each quarter under such section. All money paid to a State under this subsection shall be used solely for the payment of unemployment compensation. Any money so paid to a State which is not used for the purpose for which it was paid shall, upon termination of the agreement, be returned to the Treasury.

I make the additional point of order, Mr. Chairman, that the amendment is not germane to the bill or any part of it, and I call attention to the provision on page 21, line 12:

In the event that any State does not agree to make such payments to such persons, the Civil Service Commission is hereby authorized and directed to make such payments.

It is not only perfectly clear that the whole amendment is a violation of clause 4 of rule XXI and is an appropriation direct but it is also clear that there is no reference anywhere else in the bill to the Civil Service Commission and no other function is required of the Civil Service Commission, so the amendment is not germane to the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would like to make an inquiry of the gentleman from Rhode Island who offered the amendment, as to whether the provisions of the amendment as offered by him would authorize the taking of money from the Treasury without a direct appropriation?

Mr. FORAND. No; it does not, not any more than section 301, of title III, does.

The CHAIRMAN. If the gentleman will look at page 22, of the bill, subsection (h) which is similar to the language in his amendment, he will find the following language:

The Board shall, from time to time, certify to the Secretary of the Treasury for payment to each State, the sums payable to it under this section. The Secretary of the Treasury, through the fiscal service of the Treasury Department, and prior to audit or settlement by the General Accounting Office, shall make payment in accordance with such certification.

Can the gentleman from Rhode Island show how that is not included in the prohibition in the rule cited by the gentleman from New York?

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Chairman, I have not studied that point. I did not expect it was going to be raised. It has been carried in the Senate bill all the way through without a question, and I contend that title 301 (a), under title III, is in the same category. No point of order has been raised against that. So if one is subject to a point of order, I imagine both would be.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state to the gentleman from Rhode Island that the rule under which we are considering this measure, waives points of order against the committee substitute, but not against the amendments which would be offered to that substitute. The rule cited by the gentleman from New York is very clear and specific:

No bill or joint resolution carrying appropriations shall be reported by any committee not having jurisdiction to report appropriations, nor shall an amendment proposing an appropriation be in order during the consideration of a bill or joint resolution reported by a committee not having that jurisdiction. A question of order on an appropriation in any such bill, joint resolution, or amendment thereto may be raised at any time.

In the opinion of the Chair, the language cited by the Chair and other language cited by the gentleman from New York, clearly provides for an appropriation.

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Chairman, if the committee amendment, which is an entire new bill, had not been brought to the floor of the House as it is now, we would be considering the George bill, and that would be in the George bill. Would not the rule given to us by the Committee on Rules clear that? We understood this was a broad rule.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. LANHAM). Yes; the rule would clear the Senate bill, but we are not considering the Senate bill; we are considering the committee substitute amendment to the Senate bill. This is offered as an amendment to the committee amendment. In the opinion of the Chair the point of order is well taken.

The Chair sustains the point of order on the authorities cited.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I was about to offer an amendment to the amendment proposed by the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FORAND] so as to afford to our merchant seamen unemployment protection. I was prevented from so doing, however, when the point

of order raised with regard to the Forand amendment to provide unemployment compensation for Federal employees was sustained by the Chair.

The question of unemployment protection for merchant seamen is, to say the least, most confusing. In 1935 upon enactment of the Social Security Act these seamen were omitted from its provisions for the sake of expediency. It was claimed at that time that the difficulties of administration would be insurmountable.

On Tuesday we were informed by report of the Ways and Means Committee that unemployment insurance for merchant seamen involves new taxation. If this be the case, the reconversion bill, now under discussion, having originated in the Senate, cannot be amended to provide a system covering seamen.

The distinguished gentleman from Virginia, chairman of the House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee, on the day before yesterday stated that after 3 or 4 years of consideration, his committee is close to a solution, but that the Speaker and the parliamentarian have insisted that the measure go to the Ways and Means Committee.

On the other hand, the so-called George bill, as passed by the Senate, covers 90 percent of our merchant seamen manning Government-owned and chartered vessels according to the War Shipping Administration.

Are we not confusing two different problems? One is the need of a permanent unemployment compensation system for maritime workers. Such a system has been advocated by the Social Security Board, by the President of these United States, and on the floor of this House on innumerable occasions. This system requires the taxation of private employers and must necessarily be founded in legislation originating in the House of Representatives. It has been studied and restudied. It is long past due and yet today passage does not seem near.

Problem No. 1 is to afford unemployment insurance to seamen working for private peacetime shipping. However, today we have no private shipping. Nine out of every ten seamen are working directly for the Federal Government on vessels owned by or chartered to the War Shipping Administration. For the duration these men are working for the United States Government in a status which borders on the military.

The second problem is whether these seamen are entitled to certain of the readjustment provisions afforded members of the armed services. Certainly this Government owes them a guaranty of unemployment benefits for the transitional post-war years. We must assure unemployment benefits to our seamen for at least 2 years after the war as guaranteed in the Senate bill. At the same time Congress must go ahead immediately with the task of enacting a taxation measure for our peacetime merchant marine so that a large solvent fund will be available after the transitional years.

I am advised that Admiral Land, the War Shipping Administrator, in a communication to the chairman of the House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee dated August 23, has urged the granting of readjustment benefits to our seamen for the years immediately following the war upon the basis of the task merchant seamen have performed in the war, and in terms of the inadequacy of their existing rights, and those of their dependents, to meet the misfortunes of war.

Our merchant seamen are civilian volunteers who fight side by side with our servicemen. They are part of the great army in the Services of Supply. They are shipmates with Navy gun crews and with Army troops. When attack comes they frequently load and man the guns beside our fighting Navy men. For the men in the engine room attack means keeping on the job and waiting for the tin fish to hit or miss.

Why are these men out there volunteering?

It is not the fear of being drafted. Thousands of our seamen are over draft age, and thousands are boys of 16 and 17 years. They could be at home safe with their families. For the others who are of draft age I can say this: You do not get a job sitting on a load of high explosives knowing that more of your buddies have been killed proportionately than in any branch of the armed services if you are afraid to fight.

It is not the money. The annual "take home," including wages, overtime, and bonuses of our seamen ranges between $1,600 and $2,400 a year. They are skilled men who could be earning more in war jobs back home. Even in comparison with the men of the Navy gun crews, when one takes into account the various allotments and benefits that these Navy men receive, a seaman does not come off much better financially. The gun crews know it, too, and our Navy men and merchant seamen work like a well-trained team.

It is not the glory, either. No one is pinning medals on our merchant seamen. Few cities are opening their doors to them and inviting them to enjoy their hospitality.

Why, then, are they out there? Let a seaman answer. He writes:

> Every day spent at sea either by the Navy or the merchant marine, days which could be spent with your wife or loved ones doing the things you would like to do, are days torn from your life. These are days that are marked down, and on your return—if you make it—you count them, saying, 'My God, could it be that long?'
>
> At last leave, maybe 1 week, 2 weeks—who knows. Then one day someone asks for you, but you cannot be found. But I know where you are. You are out there where all hell is loose * * * above, below, and around you * * * but do you care? No. You have but one thought in mind. This, our America, is worth fighting for altogether.

Here is the answer. It is "Our America is worth fighting for."

Mr. Chairman, we owe these men some consideration for their war service. The War Shipping Administration has recommended provision for adequate hospitalization and medical care, allowances for the dependents of seamen who have given their lives in this war, education rights, retraining and rehabilitation and disability payments, in addition to readjustment allowances. There will be need for further legislation to pay these men the debt we owe them.

Today we are underwriting unemployment benefits for our war workers in the transition period. We have already been drawing legislation which gives some measure of protection to our returning veterans. We are told that our seamen come under neither of these categories. We are told they must be dealt with separately. Are they neither fish nor fowl? We must not exclude these men from the benefits of the reconversion legislation we draft today. We must grant them unemployment protection for the immediate post-war years.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment which is at the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Amendment offered by Mr. VOORHIS of California: On page 39, line 24, add the following new title, Title 4, section 401:
>
> "Title II of the Social Security Act, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:
>
> "'MILITARY SERVICE BENEFITS
>
> "'SEC. 210. (a) For the purposes of this title, an individual who is engaged in military service within the period beginning with October 1, 1940, and ending 1 year after the termination of the emergency declared by the President on May 27, 1941, shall be deemed to have been paid for each month in which he performs any military service within such period wages equal to the greater of the following: (1) $100, or (2) the monthly average (not counting any part of such monthly average which exceeds $250) of the wages received by him during the four calendar quarters immediately preceding the calendar quarter in which he began a period of military service which commenced after September 9, 1939.
>
> "'(b) The term "military service" as used in this section means active service in the land or naval forces (including the Coast Guard) of the United States.
>
> "'(c) The Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Navy, and the Secretary of the Treasury shall, at the request of the Social Security Board, furnish to the Board such information with respect to individuals who render military service under their respective jurisdictions as may be necessary for the purposes of this title.
>
> "'(d) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated from time to time to the trust fund, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such amounts as may be necessary to meet additional costs of payments under this title, and of administration, arising by reason of the provisions of this section.'"

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS] that it is not germane to this bill or any part of it. It relates to military pay and allowances, which is certainly not within the scope of anything in this bill.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Chairman, may I be heard on the point of order?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will be glad to heard the gentleman from California on the point of order.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Chairman, my amendment seeks to amend the Social Security Act. The title of the bill reads "To amend the

Social Security Act, as amended, to provide a national program for war mobilization and reconversion, and for other purposes." All in the world my amendment does is to give credit, under title II of the Social Security Act, toward old-age annuity benefits to any man serving in the armed forces for the period of time that he serves therein. It seems to me that an amendment to amend the Social Security Act ought to be germane to this bill. That is what I seek to do.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, I submit further that the gentleman's amendment is to title II of the Social Security Act, which is not in any sense dealt with in the pending bill at all. The only amendment to the Social Security Act in this bill relates to title III.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. LANHAM). For the reasons cited by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. COOPER], which are controlling in the opinion of the Chair, the Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. OUTLAND. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. OUTLAND: At the bottom of page 39, after line 24, add a new section, as follows:

"UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION FOR PACKING-SHED WORKERS

"SEC. 403. The Social Security Act, as amended, is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following new title:

"'TITLE XIII—UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION FOR PACKING-SHED WORKERS

"'SEC. 1301 (a). Every unemployed qualified employee as defined in section 1301 (g) shall be entitled to interim placement benefits with respect to each week of unemployment or part week of unemployment. For a qualified employee the interim placement benefits payable for a week of unemployment in any benefit year shall be 75 percent of weekly wages, but shall not exceed $20: *Provided*, That in any one year the benefits to any qualified employee shall not exceed 26 times the last weekly amount of interim placement benefits in any year.

"'SEC. 1301 (b). The Social Security Board is authorized on behalf of the United States to enter into an agreement with any State or with the unemployment compensation agency of such State, under which such State agency will make, as the agent of the United States, payments of unemployment compensation to individuals with respect to services performed by them as packing-shed workers, on the basis provided in subsection (a).

"'SEC. 1301 (c). Each State shall be entitled to receive from the Federal unemployment account for each quarter, beginning with the first quarter commencing after enactment of this act, an amount equal to the total of all payments of unemployment compensation made by such State during such quarter, pursuant to an agreement under this section.

"'SEC. 1301 (d). In case of an agreement under this section that a State agency will make payments as agent of the United States, there shall be paid in advance to the State such sum as the Board estimates the State will be entitled to receive for each quarter under such section; reduced or increased, as the case may be, by any sum by which it finds that its estimate for any prior quarter was greater or less than the amount which should have been paid to the State. All money paid to a State under this subsection shall be used solely for the payment of unemployment compensation. Any money so paid to a State which is not used for the purpose for which it was paid shall, upon termination of the agreement, be returned to the Treasury.

"'SEC. 1301 (e). Determinations of entitlement to unemployment compensation made by a State agency under an agreement that such agency will act as agent of the United States under this section shall be subject to review in the same manner and to the same extent as determinations under the State unemployment compensation law, and only in such manner and to such extent. Such an agreement may require any officer or employee of the State disbursing funds pursuant to the agreement or otherwise participating in its performance to give a surety bond to the United States in such amount as the Board may deem necessary, and may provide for payment of the cost of such bond from appropriations for carrying out the purpose of this act.

"'SEC. 1301 (f). The Board shall from time to time certify to the Secretary of the Treasury for payment to each State the sums payable to it under this section. The Secretary of the Treasury, through the Fiscal Service of the Treasury Department, and prior to audit or settlement by the General Accounting Office, shall make payment in accordance with such certification.

"'SEC. 1301 (g). Any unemployed person engaged in handling, planting, drying, packing, packaging, processing, freezing, grading, storing, or delivering to storage or to market or to a carrier for transportation to market any agricultural or horticultural commodity shall be deemed to be a qualified employee; but only if such service is performed as an incident to ordinary farming operations or, in the case of fruits and vegetables, as an incident to the preparation of such fruits or vegetables for market. The provisions of this paragraph shall not be deemed to be applicable with respect to service performed in connection with commercial canning or commercial freezing or in connection with any agricultural or horticultural commodity after its delivery to a terminal market for distribution for consumption.

"'SEC. 1301 (h). The same terms and conditions shall apply as though the unemployment compensation laws of the several States did not exclude the services performed by any qualified employee as defined in section 1301 (g).'

"SEC. 404. This act, and the amendments to the Social Security Act made thereby, shall cease to be effective at the end of the second full calendar year after the termination of hostilities in the present war as declared by Presidential proclamation or concurrent resolution of the Congress, except that the obligation of the State agencies to repay advances made from the Federal unemployment account shall remain effective until such advances are repaid. Any amounts in the Federal unemployment account at the end of such year, shall be covered into the general fund of the Treasury."

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment on the ground that it is not germane to this bill, that there is nothing in the bill at all relating to packing-shed workers, and there is nothing to which this amendment to the Social Security Act could be germane. I make the further point of order that the amendment provides for an appropriation of funds out of the Federal Treasury in violation of clause 4 of rule 21.

Mr. OUTLAND. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman withhold his point of order?

Mr. TABER. I rather think we should dispose of it one way or the other at this time. It uses largely the same language as the previous amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. In the opinion of the Chair, a perusal of the amendment does make it clear that it makes an appropriation. For that reason and the reason cited to the previous amendment the Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. OUTLAND. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. OUTLAND. Mr. Chairman, I have introduced this amendment hoping that by its adoption we may bring under the Social Security Act another segment of the working people of this country. I realize that this amendment is limited in scope, and that many other groups of American workers should likewise be covered. Personally, I hope for the day when we shall see all Americans covered during periods of unemployment, and with adequate insurance for their old age; that day is certainly coming, no matter how many temporary setbacks we have at the present time. However, I have limited this amendment to one particular group, the packing-shed workers, because it seems to me that of all the groups not now covered, this one is the most logical to be next included. Let us go back for a few minutes, and review the history of this situation.

Packing-shed workers were excluded from the Social Security Act by special act of Congress in 1939—Public Law No. 379, Seventy-sixth Congress, first session, chapter 666, section 209.1.4—under amendments added to the Social Security Act at that time. Previously agricultural labor had been defined by the Bureau of Internal Revenue as follows:

The term "agricultural labor" includes all services performed—

(a) By an employee, on a farm, in connection with the cultivation of the soil, the harvesting of crops, or the raising, feeding, or management of livestock, bees, and poultry; or

(b) By an employee in connection with the processing of articles from materials which were produced on a farm; also the packing, packaging, transportation, or marketing of those materials or articles. Such services do not constitute "agricultural labor," however, unless they are performed by an employee of the owner or tenant of the farm on which the materials in their raw or natural state were produced, and unless such processing, packing, packaging, transportation, or marketing is carried on as an incident to ordinary farming operations as distinguished from manufacturing or commercial operations.

As used herein the term "farm" embraces the farm in the ordinarily accepted sense, and includes stock, dairy, poultry, fruit, and truck farms, plantations, ranches, ranges, and orchards.

The amendment of 1939 changed this definition to the following:

The term "agricultural labor" includes all services performed—

(1) On a farm, in the employ of any person, in connection with cultivating the soil, or in connection with raising or harvesting any agricultural or horticultural commodity, including the raising, shearing, feeding, caring for, training, and management of livestock, bees, poultry, and fur-bearing animals and wildlife.

(2) In the employ of the owner or tenant or other operator of a farm, in connection with the operation, management, conservation, improvement, or maintenance of such farm and its tools and equipment, or in salvaging timber or clearing land of brush and other debris left by a hurricane, if the major part of such service is performed on a farm.

(3) In connection with the production or harvesting of maple sirup or maple sugar or any commodity defined as an agricultural commodity in section 15 (g) of the Agricultural Marketing Act, as amended, or in connection with the raising or harvesting of mushrooms, or in connection with the hatching of poultry, or in connection with the ginning of cotton, or in connection with the operation or maintenance of ditches, canals, reservoirs, or waterways used exclusively for supplying and storing water for farm purposes.

(4) In handling, planting, drying, packing, packaging, processing, freezing, grading, storing, or delivering to storage or to market or to a carrier for transportation to market, any agricultural or horticultural commodity; but only if such service is performed as an incident to ordinary farming operations or, in the case of fruits and vegetables, as an incident to the preparation of such fruits or vegetables for market. The provisions of this paragraph shall not be deemed to be applicable with respect to service performed in connection with commercial canning or commercial freezing or in connection with any agricultural or horticultural commodity after its delivery to a terminal market for distribution for consumption.

As used in this subsection, the term "farm" includes stock, dairy, poultry, fruit, fur-bearing animal, and truck farms, plantations, ranches, nurseries, ranges, greenhouses, or other similar structures used primarily for the raising of agricultural or horticultural commodities, and orchards.

We all know that agricultural workers have always been excluded from the provisions of the Social Security Act, just as they have been excluded from the Fair Labor Standards Act and the National Labor Relations Act. However, the original injustice worked in this act was carried much further when the definition of agricultural labor was extended in 1939 to cover workers who are employed in operations which can hardly be distinguished from those of other industries. This move was the one successful achievement in a general campaign carried on over a period of years to deprive a large segment of workers from the protective legislation of the past decade. Attempts to extend the definition of agricultural labor have been used as a device to achieve this end. Proposed amendments to the Fair Labor Standards Act in 1938 would have excluded some 3,000,000 industrial workers, including packing-shed, cannery, and warehouse workers. These amendments failed. However, the extension of the definition in the Social Security Act succeeded in removing one of these industrial groups, the packing-shed workers, from coverage under that act. It is to remedy this unjust situation that I offer this amendment to the pending bill, and I hope that the Members of this House will give most serious consideration to it.

What are the facts regarding the numbers of workers that would be covered by this proposed amendment? It is difficult to arrive at an accurate national employment figure for these workers, since there is no break-down either in the agricultural census or in any other census material specifically covering this group.

A rough estimate would put the national figure at around 200,000 jobs. Since a considerable portion of these workers migrate, hitting different jobs at peak seasons, this does not mean that there are 200,000 workers employed.

While there is considerable variation in the degree of mechanization in packing sheds, both according to crop and area, the typical packing shed in large specialty crop areas such as California, Arizona, Florida, Texas, and Washington, is an industrial plant comparable to a cannery or any other food-processing plant.

The conveyor-belt system used in the lettuce and citrus industries in California is characteristic of the modern mechanized packing shed. There is a high degree of specialization in different jobs, with the actual packing job the most highly skilled. Wrap-packing of fruits, including tomatoes, and packing of lettuce and melons are among the most highly skilled jobs. The work in a packing shed is generally performed by two types of workers—the itinerant "fruit tramp," who is a highly skilled and experienced worker and travels from job to job, and the "home guard," workers who live in the area and work during the seasonal peak in the packing shed and in other local industries during the off seasons where work is available.

The "tramp"—and this is a term of pride, not of opprobrium to the workers involved—has been the backbone of the industry and has filled the key jobs year after year. In California and Arizona a large proportion of the migrants are from Oklahoma, Arkansas, and other States, who went west and who by their initiative developed higher skills than those involved in agricultural field labor.

The migrants travel at their own expense and usually in family groups. In the lettuce industry, for example, the man will be employed as a packer and his wife as a trimmer. Frequently they have had difficulty in obtaining proper educational facilities for their children and in securing adequate medical and other community services. One of the main problems is housing.

Because allocation of manpower in these industries has been highly chaotic, the individual worker in most cases must make his own schedule and arrange for the dovetailing of one job with another. When there are crop failures, overlapping of seasons due to irregularities in harvesting periods, and so forth, he may find that he is unemployed through no fault of his own. While the casual nature of employment in the industry could be corrected to some extent by a more rational manpower program, the industry will always retain a considerable degree of hazard from the standpoint of providing full and continuous employment. This has proved to be true even during the war period when there has been a scarcity of labor, and it will certainly be true during a period of reconversion.

This industry has been largely concentrated in particular States. In California and Arizona the fresh fruit and vegetable packing industry employs a peak number of 47,600 jobs. Some of the major crops, together with annual production and value, are listed below:

Crop	Annual production	Value
Lettuce.....crates..	20, 201, 000	$70, 541, 000
Melons.....do....	7, 488, 000	29, 145, 000
Carrots.....bushels..	14, 464, 000	22, 385, 000
Tomatoes.....do....	4, 897, 000	18, 373, 000
Oranges and grapefruit..boxes..	60, 697, 000	135, 162, 200

The Salinas-Watsonville area is the largest single lettuce-producing area in the country. In 1943 it accounted for 53.3 percent of all carload shipments of lettuce in the United States.

In Florida some 25,000 workers are employed in the citrus and vegetable packing sheds. In Texas, primarily in the Rio Grande Valley, there is a concentration of grapefruit and vegetable production which employs approximately 15,000 workers. A somewhat smaller number than that cited for Florida is employed in Washington and Oregon. In addition there are major packing-shed operations in Idaho, potatoes and peas; Virginia, apples; Mississippi, vegetables; and a number of other States, including New York and Pennsylvania.

Many of the most highly skilled workers in the industry annually make the trek from California through Texas to Florida and back again. Others work on a circuit between California and the Pacific Northwest. Still others work up from Florida through Mississippi, Virginia, New York, and other Northeastern States. Within the California-Arizona area about half of the migrants follow the cycle from Salinas to Phoenix to Yuma and the Imperial Valley and back to Salinas. Others work the long season in Salinas and spend most of the rest of the year in the small fruit and melon "deals."

During the war period there has been considerable intensification of production in tomatoes, citrus fruits, and other specialty crops of high nutritive value. There has been some conversion of lettuce operations to more essential vegetables such as carrots and broccoli. A post-war program for continued expansion of food production will require at least as many workers. However, two factors demonstrate the possibilities of a reconversion period of unemployment and the necessity for provision for these workers of emergency unemployment compensation during such a period.

First. Expanded food production for 1945 has not yet been definitely decided upon, since full employment in the agricultural and food-processing industries, in the last analysis, is dependent on full production and employment in basic industries generally. There is bound to be a period ahead with uncertain prospects. Particularly in the highly specialized crop industries of California the possibility that there may not be an adequate market can serve to create uncertainty

in production. Furthermore, immediate foreign relief and rehabilitation food needs will not draw upon the fresh fruit and packing industries and this will accentuate the possibility of curtailing production.

Second. Even when the uncertainty of the immediate post-war period has been overcome, and assuming that the perspective will be one of full production and employment in both industry and agriculture, there may well be shifts in crops. The necessity for such shifts may come from changes in foreign needs, as well as changes in domestic consumption. Dislocation in employment may be expected when such shifts necessitate changes in packing-shed operations or in growing seasons.

Aside from the justice of the requests of workers in this industry that they be covered in any permanent social-security program, their contribution to the war effort through the production of vitally needed food products certainly entitles them to coverage under any emergency unemployment-compensation benefits.

Particularly in the States which are primarily agricultural, where great numbers of the packing-shed workers and agricultural workers are employed, their exclusion from unemployment compensation which is available to other workers will merely throw the burden to the State relief apparatus, and through reduction in the purchasing power of a major section of the population in these States special problems will be created affecting not only these workers themselves but the communities in which they live, the small businessmen whose customers they are, and the general level of prosperity in the States where they are employed.

In 1942–43 it was estimated that the average annual earnings of workers in the California-Arizona packing-shed industry did not exceed $1,500 a year. Annual earnings remain at this low figure in spite of an average hourly rate of about 85 cents and in spite of increased production on a piece-work basis which has taken place during the war period. The chief cause is the casual nature of the employment and lapses between jobs, due both to improper allocation of manpower and causes beyond the control of the industry and the workers.

It is obvious that such annual earnings, which compare unfavorably with the estimated annual earnings of $1,758 for California workers in nondurable goods industries in 1942, allow no margins for savings, and this group of workers can make no provisions for security in their later years through savings, insurance, and so forth.

How much more must we pay in the way of relief, how much more must we see endured in human suffering before the realization dawns that unemployment compensation is not charity and is not a dole—it is a measure not only to prevent human misery, but to sustain purchasing power. Unless the purchasing power of America is sustained on a level much higher than that maintained during the years immediately preceding the war, we shall see a serious depression descend upon our Nation. The inclusion in the Social Security Act of new segments of our working people, of which the packing-shed workers are among the most deserving, will help to prevent such a catastrophe. It is not only right and just; it is also plain common sense.

I am realistic enough to understand that the chance of extending the provisions of the Social Security Act in this bill to any new groups is extremely small. I say frankly, however, that if this amendment is not adopted I shall introduce a new bill into this House aimed at achieving the same end. Regardless of technical arguments which may be raised here, it is my firm conviction that we in Congress have a solemn obligation to the American people, an obligation to do everything in our power to prevent catastrophic depression and to insure as many of our people as is humanly possible against the ravages of unemployment and the misery of an insecure old age. We have spent hundreds of billions of dollars, and rightly so, in prosecuting the war against fascism; certainly we can afford to spend a very small fraction of that amount in order to help our people protect themselves during periods when they cannot find work no matter how hard they try and during their declining years. I, for one, fail to see why a man or a woman who is working in one particular field of American life should be excluded from the security which is extended to workers in other areas. Hunger is no respecter of technicalities. It will be a time for rejoicing when this Congress takes the steps necessary to place not only the packing-shed workers, but also those in other fields of industry not yet covered, under the provisions of the Social Security Act. May that time come soon.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JACKSON: Page 39, after line 24, insert the following:

"SEC. 303. The Social Security Act, as amended, is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following new title:

"'TITLE XIII. UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION FOR CIVILIANS ON WAR SHIPPING ADMINISTRATION VESSELS

"'SEC. 1301. (a) Any person who shall have performed service as a civilian on vessels owned by or bareboat chartered to the War Shipping Administration after September 16, 1940, shall be entitled, in accordance with provisions of the unemployment compensation law of the State with which claim for compensation is properly filed, to receive compensation for each week of unemployment commencing after September 30, 1944 and before the termination date prescribed in section 503 of the War Mobilization and Reconversion Act of 1944, in the same amounts, on the same terms, and subject to the same conditions as though such law had been applicable to all such services wherever performed. Any claim for compensation under this section shall be filed with the State in which a part of the service on vessels owned by or bareboat chartered to War Shipping Administration was performed except that if no part of the service was performed in any State, a claim may be filed with the District of Columbia. Any claim filed with a State under this section may be filed through the unemployment compensation agency of such State or the unemployment compensation agency of any other State.

"'(b) The Social Security Board is authorized on behalf of the United States to enter into an agreement with any State or with the unemployment compensation agency of such State, under which such State agency will make, as the agent of the United States, payments of unemployment compensation to individuals with respect to services performed by them as civilians on vessels owned by or bareboat chartered to the War Shipping Administration, on the basis provided in subsection (a).

"'(c) Each State shall be entitled to receive from the Federal unemployment account for each quarter, beginning with the first quarter commencing after enactment of this act, an amount equal to the total of all payments of unemployment compensation made by such State during such quarter, pursuant to an agreement under this section.

"'(d) In the event that any State does not agree to make such payments to such persons, the United States Maritime Commission is hereby authorized and directed to make such payments.

"'(e) All departments, agencies, and instrumentalities of the United States are directed to make available and furnish to the appropriate State agency such information with reference to compensation of persons on vessels owned by or bareboat chartered to the War Shipping Administration and such other facts as may be necessary to determine the benefits payable under this title.

"'(f) In case of an agreement under this section that a State agency will make payments as agent of the United States, there shall be paid in advance to the State, from such sums as may be hereafter appropriated by the Congress for such purpose, such sum as the Board estimates the State will be entitled to receive for each quarter under such section; reduced or increased, as the case may be, by any sum by which it finds that its estimate for any prior quarter was greater or less than the amount which should have been paid to the State. All money paid to a State under this subsection shall be used solely for the payment of unemployment compensation. Any money so paid to a State which is not used for the purpose for which it was paid shall, upon termination of the agreement, be returned to the Treasury.

"'(g) Determinations of entitlement to unemployment compensation made by a State agency under an agreement that such agency will act as agent of the United States under this section shall be subject to review in the same manner and to the same extent as determinations under the State unemployment compensation law, and only in such manner and to such extent. Such an agreement may require any officer or employee of the State disbursing funds pursuant to the agreement or otherwise participating in its performance to give a surety bond to the United States in such amount as the Board may deem necessary, and may provide for payment of the cost of such bond from appropriations for carrying out the purpose of this act.

"'(h) The Board shall from time to time certify to the Secretary of the Treasury for payment to each State the sums payable to it under this section. The Secretary of the Treasury, through the Fiscal Service of the Treasury Department, and prior to audit or settlement by the General Accounting Office, shall make payment in accordance with such certification.'"

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, I regret very much to have to make a point of order against the amendment on the ground it is not germane and on the further ground it makes an appropriation, the same reasons heretofore advanced.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Washington desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Chairman, I might state there is a provision in this amendment, section (f), which reads as follows:

In case of an agreement under this section that a State agency will make payments as agent of the United States, there shall be paid in advance to the State such sums as may be hereafter appropriated by the Congress for such purpose.

This is not a direct appropriation but an authorization.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair calls the gentleman's attention to subsection (h) of his amendment:

The Board shall from time to time certify to the Secretary of the Treasury for payment to each State the sums payable to it under this section. The Secretary of the Treasury, through the Fiscal Service of the Treasury Department, and prior to audit for settlement by the General Accounting Office, shall make payment in accordance with such certification.

It is the opinion of the Chair that that is clearly in violation of the rule formerly stated, and the Chair on that ground sustains the point of order.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Chairman, I offer the same amendment with section (h) deleted.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JACKSON: On page 39, after line 24, insert the following:

"SEC. 303. The Social Security Act, as amended, is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following new title:

"'TITLE XIII. UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION FOR CIVILIANS ON WAR SHIPPING ADMINISTRATION VESSELS

"'SEC. 1301. (a) Any person who shall have performed service as a civilian on vessels owned by or bareboat chartered to the War Shipping Administration after September 16, 1940, shall be entitled, in accordance with provisions of the unemployment compensation law of the State with which claims for compensation is properly filed, to receive compensation for each week of unemployment commencing after September 30, 1944, and before the termination date prescribed in section 503 of the War Mobilization and Reconversion Act of 1944, in the same amounts, on the same terms, and subject to the same conditions as though such la· had been applicable to all such services wherever performed. Any claim for compensation under this section shall be filed with the State in which a part of the service on vessels owned by or bareboat chartered to War Shipping Administration was performed except that if no part of the service was performed in any State, a claim may be filed with the District of Columbia. Any claim filed with a State under this section may be filed through the unemployment compensation agency of such State or the unemployment compensation agency of any other State.

"'(b) The Social Security Board is authorized on behalf of the United States to enter into an agreement with any State or with the unemployment compensation agency of such State, under which such State agency will make, as the agent of the United States, payments of unemployment compensation to individuals with respect to services performed by them as civilians on vessels owned by or bareboat chartered to the War Shipping Administration, on the basis provided in subsection (a).

"'(c) Each State shall be entitled to receive from the Federal unemployment account for each quarter, beginning with the first quarter commencing after enactment of this act, an amount equal to the total of all payments of unemployment compensation made by such State during such quarter, pursuant to an agreement under this section.

"'(d) In the event that any State does not agree to make such payments to such persons, the United States Maritime Commission is hereby authorized and directed to make such payments.

"'(e) All departments, agencies, and instrumentalities of the United States are directed to make available and furnish to the appropriate State agency such information with reference to compensation of persons on vessels owned by or bareboat chartered to the War Shipping Administration and such other facts as may be necessary to determine the benefits payable under this title.

"'(f) In case of an agreement under this section that a State agency will make payments as agent of the United States, there shall be paid in advance to the State from such sums as may be hereafter appropriated by the Congress for such purpose such sum as the Board estimates the State will be entitled to receive for each quarter under such section reduced or increased, as the case may be, by any sum by which it finds that its estimate for any prior quarter was greater or less than the amount which should have been paid to the State. All money paid to a State under this subsection shall be used solely for the payment of unemployment compensation. Any money so paid to a State which is not used for the purpose for which it was paid shall, upon termination of the agreement, be returned to the Treasury.

"'(g) Determinations of entitlement to unemployment compensation made by a State agency under an agreement that such agency will act as agent of the United States under this section shall be subject to review in the same manner and to the same extent as determinations under the State unemployment compensation law, and only in such manner and to such extent. Such an agreement may require any officer or employee of the State disbursing funds pursuant to the agreement or otherwise participating in its performance to give a surety bond to the United States in such amount as the Board may deem necessary, and may provide for payment of the cost of such bond from appropriations for carrying out the purpose of this act.'"

Mr. JACKSON (interrupting the reading of the amendment). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the further reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against the amendment on the same grounds that have heretofore been stated: First, that it is not germane; there is nothing in this bill relating to unemployment compensation to marine workers, and there is nothing that relates to unemployment compensation for any group who are not already covered. This is enlarging the scope, and therefore it is not germane.

I make the further point of order that the amendment is still an appropriation in violation of clause 4. I call particular attention to paragraph (d). The only paragraph that contains a provision for an appropriation is paragraph (f). Paragraph (e) is subject to the same objection. There is no change which brings it within the rule, and I therefore make the same point of order that has been made heretofore.

The CHAIRMAN. In the opinion of the Chair each point of order stated by the gentleman from New York is well taken, that the amendment is not germane to the committee amendment under consideration and the section as cited for making appropriation. The Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. KEEFE: Page 39, after the period in line 24, insert new sections 303 and 304, as follows:

"UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION FOR FEDERAL EMPLOYEES

"SEC. 303. (a) The Social Security Act, as amended, is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following new title:

"'TITLE XIII. UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION FOR FEDERAL EMPLOYEES

"'SEC. 1301. (a) Any person who shall have rendered service as a civilian in the employ of the United States Government, after September 16, 1940, shall be entitled, in accordance with the applicable provisions of the unemployment compensation law of the State against which claim for compensation is filed, to receive compensation for each week of unemployment commencing after September 30, 1944, in the same amounts, on the same terms, and subject to the same conditions, as though the unemployment compensation laws of the several States did not exclude services performed in the employ of the United States Government. Any claim for compensation under this section shall be filed against a State in which a part of the service in the employ of the United States Government was performed. As used in this section, the term "United States Government" includes any wholly owned instrumentality of the United States.

"'(b) The Social Security Board is authorized on behalf of the United States to enter into an agreement with any State or with the unemployment compensation agency of such State, under which such State agency will make, as the agent of the United States, payments of unemployment compensation to individuals with respect to services performed by them as civilians in the employ of the United States Government, on the basis provided in subsection (a).

"'(c) Each State shall be entitled to receive from the Federal unemployment account for each quarter, beginning with the first quarter commencing after enactment of this act, an amount equal to the total of all payments of unemployment compensation made by such State during such quarter, pursuant to an agreement under this section.

"'(e) All departments, agencies, and instrumentalities of the United States are directed to make available and furnish to the appropriate State agency such information with reference to compensation of persons in the employ of the United States Government as may be necessary to determine the benefits under this title.

"'(g) Determinations of entitlement to unemployment compensation made by a State agency under an agreement that such agency will act as agent of the United States under this section shall be subject to review in the same manner and to the same extent as determinations under the State unemployment-compensation law, and only in such manner and to such extent. Such an agreement may require any officer or employee of the State disbursing funds pursuant to the agreement or otherwise participating in its performance to give a surety bond to the United States in such amount as the Board

may deem necessary, and may provide for payment of the cost of such bond from appropriations for carrying out the purpose of this act.

"'SEC. 304. The grants made by the Social Security Board under title III of the Social Security Act to each State agency entering into an agreement under the title shall be sufficient to cover the amounts necessary for the State agency's proper and efficient administration of such agreement under this title, and no segregation of such grants or expenditures shall be required.'"

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against the amendment that it is an appropriation on a bill coming from a committee other than the Committee on Appropriations, in violation or clause 4 of rule XXI.

The CHAIRMAN. Will the gentleman from New York cite the part of the amendment to which he directs his point of order?

Mr. TABER. It is this part:

Each State shall be entitled to receive from the Federal unemployment account for each quarter, beginning with the first quarter commencing after enactment of this act, an amount equal to the total of all payments of unemployment compensation made by such State during such quarter, pursuant to an agreement under this section.

If there were nothing else in it that would be enough.

On top of that, it is not germane to this part of the bill or to the bill we are now considering. There is nothing whatever in the bill we are considering. or in this part of the bill that relates to unemployment insurance for Federal employees. That is an entirely new subject that is not germane to this particular part of the bill, and therefore is out of order at this point.

The CHAIRMAN. Would the gentleman from Wisconsin like to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I would like to be heard on the point of order. Referring to the bill as reported by the committee, there is established, pursuant to the terms of the bill, an unemployment trust fund, "a Federal unemployment account." I am reading from it:

There is hereby authorized to be appropriated to such Federal unemployment account—

And so on. The bill as reported by the committee itself makes authorization for an appropriation to a Federal unemployment account. The entire provisions of title III and title XII of this bill relate to the entire subject of unemployment-compensation payments. The amendment which I have offered in no sense provides for any appropriation, because it is provided, in the amendment as offered, that any payments that are to be made pursuant to the amendment shall be paid from the unemployment trust fund or Federal unemployment account, for which an appropriation is authorized under the terms of this bill.

On the subject of germaneness, if this particular subject matter which proposes an amendment to the provisions providing for unemployment compensation by amendment is not germane to the bill, two titles of which are devoted exclusively to the subject of payment of unemployment compensation, then it seems to me that the rule and the interpretation of the rule, as suggested by the gentleman from New York, is indeed a very restricted one.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, I submit for the consideration of the Chair a further point than that asserted by the gentleman from New York. The gentleman from Wisconsin speaks of the pending bill authorizing an appropriation. Of course, that is not the language to which the point of order is made. The point of order is made because the gentleman's amendment seeks to appropriate money.

Mr. KEEFE. Will the gentleman point out where my amendment seeks to appropriate money?

Mr. COOPER. The committee having charge of the bill under consideration does not have authority to report appropriation bills. I submit to the Chair that the language cited by the gentleman from New York, "each State shall be entitled to receive from the Federal unemployment account for each quarter," means an appropriation. How can the State receive money without the money being paid to it? That means, of course, an appropriation, which would not be in order under this bill.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, may I be heard further? May I direct the attention of the Chair and of the gentleman from Tennessee to the fact that the very language in the amendment which the gentleman from Wisconsin has proposed, provides that the State shall be entitled to receive, not "from the Federal Treasury," but from the "Federal unemployment account," which is provided for in the language of the bill reported by this committee. There is no appropriation from the Treasury of the United States and there can be no payment from this account until the account is set up under the language of the bill through the appropriation which is provided for in this bill.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, if I may be indulged one moment further. The fact is that Federal employees are not now covered under social security. There can be no dispute about that. The gentleman is seeking by his amendment to bring them under social security and to pay the money out of the Treasury of the United States to pay those benefits. Of course, that could not be done without an appropriation. That is what the amendment seeks to do, not to authorize an appropriation, but to pay the money out of the Federal Treasury to Federal employees.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Chairman, if I might I would like to submit an observation for the consideration of the Chair.

The rule providing for the consideration of this bill provided that the committee amendment should be considered as an original bill. The committee amendment, so far as I have been able to discover, in no place seeks to broaden the base of the Social Security Act. I have been unable to find any provision in the committee amendment which brings under the Social Security Act any new class of new employees. The amendment proposed by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE] clearly seeks to broaden the base of the Social Security Act by making a new class of employees eligible to its benefits. Therefore, it broadens the scope of the act and broadens the scope of the committee amendment; and consequently is not germane.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. LANHAM). The Chair is ready to rule.

It is hardly necessary for the Chair to rule upon the question of whether or not subsection (c) of the proposed amendment comes within the rule forbidding appropriations under measures of this character, by reason of the fact that in the opinion of the Chair, in view of the fact that the committee substitute amendment under consideration deals in no way with unemployment compensation for Federal employees, the amendment which has been offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin is not germane to the pending amendment. On that ground the Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FORAND] and the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE], I may be allowed to place my remarks in the RECORD at this point.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, this amendment by my colleague, the gentleman from Wisconsin [FRANK B. KEEFE] is not only offered by a Member with a background of familiarity with all the social legislation of Wisconsin, but also that enacted by the Congress. To me, this amendment is the Wisconsin idea and should become law.

When home a few weeks ago I read a press dispatch which quoted the Honorable ROBERT RAMSPECK, majority whip of his party and assistant chairman of the speakers' bureau of his party, as saying that after the war 2,000,000 of the 2,900,000 Federal employees were going to be removed from the Government pay roll. I did not know whether this was a pre-election promise or was an end devoutly to be wished.

The article by the Honorable ROBERT RAMSPECK caused me to reflect as to just what effect this mass removal of people from war to civilian life would have on the well-being of the individuals and on the economic life of this Nation.

First, I thought of the legislation that had been considered in the name of business. This was the renegotiation bill which has already been enacted in the law. There most assuredly is a human element in this renegotiation legislation as great harm could be caused the employees of both large and small business if it is not handled in a satisfactory manner. I also thought of the harm that could come to business, both large and small, and the effect it would have upon employees of these businesses if the surplus war materials were not disposed of

in a sensible manner during wartime and during the post-war period.

Second, I thought of the effects of reconversion on the farm people of our nation. Many of them had increased their indebtedness in order to increase production although they did not come under the renegotiation procedure. If they had individual farm contracts no doubt they would have had this privilege. Then I thought of the protective legislation that the Congress had set up under the leadership of our late and highly respected colleague, the Honorable HENRY B. STEAGALL of Alabama. This provided for 90 percent of parity guaranty to farmers during the war and for 2 years after the war.

Third. I thought of the legislation still to be enacted and the effect that this reconversion would have not only on the 2,000,000 Federal employees that the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. RAMSPECK] said were surplus employees in peacetime, but the reconversion of the whole group of millions of wartime employees when and if it became necessary for them to again secure civilian employment.

Naturally, the human element becomes more apparent and more direct than in the legislation that has already been adopted. The great bulk of these Federal employees are in the lower income brackets. It is not their fault that too many are found in too many places. It is not their fault that an overtime cost-of-living bonus was provided Federal employees wherein the Federal employees receiving from $10,000 up to $15,000 a year get $628.32, and the employees in the lower income brackets get half as much for meeting the same increased cost of living and putting in the same number of hours of overtime. It is not the fault of the great number of Federal employees in the lower income brackets that they have not had the protection of fair legislation any more than it is the fault of the farmer that the Agriculture Department has not lived up to the letter or the spirit of the law which is supposed to guarantee him the 90 percent of parity during the war and 2 years thereafter. These Federal employees should not be held responsible for the maladministration of the present administration.

The great weakness of the whole New Deal approach to legislation is that it is for the few at the expense of the many, whereas progressive legislation has always been for the greatest good for the greatest number. We have tried to put it into operation in Wisconsin social legislation that is of the greatest benefit to the greatest number. If any group is to receive unemployment insurance, no logical reason can be presented why the people working for the Government, especially those receiving salaries that put them in the lower income brackets should not be provided the same protective legislation afforded other groups. The Federal employees in these lower income brackets are surely entitled to be included in the present bill.

Who can say that one of the young ladies from your district who answered the call of her Government and accepted a $1,440 or $1,620 job and came to Washington is not just as entitled to the protection of unemployment insurance as she would be provided if she went to work in the office of some war plant. The unemployment-insurance base should be broadened just the same as the social-security base should be broadened.

Upon inquiry you will find in Wisconsin labor, industry, and agriculture keenly recognize the dependence of one on the other. Wisconsin farmers know that labor is not going to buy their products unless it is employed at a fair wage. Labor and agriculture in Wisconsin look upon business as a friend and recognize that business is making a contribution as necessary as their own contribution to the economic welfare of their State and country.

If this post-war world of full employment is to be as extensive as it is so gloriously pictured there would be little need for funds for this unemployment insurance. If somewhere near full employment does not take place a rejuvenated W. P. A. with all of its ills can be expected.

Let us do our part to see that the machinery is set up to do the greatest good for the greatest number which is after all the American way of life.

The State system of unemployment insurance will be maintained.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

TITLE IV—PUBLIC WORKS

SEC. 401. (a) In order to encourage States and other non-Federal public agencies to make advance provision for the construction of public works (not including housing), the Federal Works Administrator is hereby authorized to make, from funds appropriated for that purpose, loans or advances to the States and their agencies and political subdivisions (hereinafter referred to as "public agencies") to aid in financing the cost of architectural, engineering, and economic investigations and studies, surveys, designs, plans, working drawings, specifications, procedures, and other action preliminary to the construction of such public works: *Provided*, That the making of loans or advances hereunder shall not in any way commit the Congress to appropriate funds to undertake any projects so planned.

(b) Funds appropriated for the making of loans or advances hereunder shall be allotted by the Federal Works Administrator among the several States in the following proportion: 90 percent in the proportion which the population of each State bears to the total population of all the States, as shown by the latest available Federal census, and 10 percent according to his discretion: *Provided*, That the allotments to any State shall aggregate not less than one-half of 1 percent of the total funds available for allotment hereunder: *Provided further*, That no loans or advances shall be made with respect to any individual project unless it conforms to an over-all local or regional plan approved by competent local or regional authority.

(c) Loans or advances under this section to any public agency shall bear interest at the rate of 2½ percent per annum and shall be repaid by such agency within 5 years from the making of the loan or advance or, if the construction of the public works so planned is undertaken prior to the end of such 5 years, shall be repaid when such construction is undertaken. Any sums so repaid shall be covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

(d) The Federal Works Administrator is authorized to prescribe rules and regulations to carry out the purposes of this section.

(e) As used in this section, the term "State" shall include the District of Columbia.

Mr. DIMOND. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which is at the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DIMOND: On page 41, line 16, after the word "Columbia", insert a comma and the following: "Alaska, Hawaii, and Puerto Rico."

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, I feel sure there will be no objection to that amendment.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, as far as I am concerned, if it is agreeable to my colleagues on the committee, we will accept the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the Delegate from Alaska.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. DIMOND. Mr. Chairman, title IV of the bill reported by the Committee, which has thus been amended, provides for Federal loans and advances to the States and their agencies and political subdivisions for the purpose of making appropriate, detailed plans for post-war public works. Subsection (e), which is amended, provided that the term "States" shall include the District of Columbia. As now amended, the term "State" shall include not only the District of Columbia, but also Alaska, Hawaii, and Puerto Rico.

The bill as reported by the committee in this respect is identical with the language of the corresponding provision of the Senate bill. A history of the Senate bill shows that as originally introduced the bill included Alaska, Hawaii, and Puerto Rico as well as the District of Columbia in the public works title, but that Alaska, Hawaii, and Puerto Rico were stricken from the subsection when the bill was in course of passage in the Senate, as indicated by the following quoted from the RECORD of August 11, 1944, page 6904:

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I may say that the words "Alaska, Hawaii, Puerto Rico" are to be stricken out for the reason that those insular possessions are under the jurisdiction of the Interior Department. It has seemed unwise to bring them into a general planning program inasmuch as the Cabinet member at the head of the Interior Department is already in the field with full authority to act in the premises.

While the Secretary of the Interior has large authority, and I suppose he may make plans with respect to the Territories and Puerto Rico if Congress appropriates money for that purpose—though I know of no such appropriation so far as Alaska, Hawaii, or Puerto Rico are concerned—he has neither the duty nor the right to make public-works plans for the governments of those Territories or for the cities therein situated. The governments of Alaska, Hawaii, and Puerto Rico are at least quasi-independent governmental agencies, created by acts of Congress, each enjoying considerable governmental authority, with large powers as respects taxation, and

the cities possess virtually all of the authority of government exercised by the cities of the States. It is true that Congress may annul any act or any Territorial legislature, but so far as I recall, that power has never yet been put into operation.

Speaking of Alaska only, the impact of the war has affected its economy even more than it has affected the economy of some of the States. War work has brought thousands of people to the Territory. Gold mining has been almost entirely suspended. Transportation and travel have been restricted. Even our mail is still subject to censorship though there is not the slightest occasion for it. When the war is ended, adjustment to civilian economy will be difficult, and it is of the highest importance that ample plans for such adjustment be made promptly, not only by those Federal agencies like the Department of the Interior which have jurisdiction in Alaska but by the people of Alaska themselves, acting through their Territorial government and the governments of their several cities. The largest measure of home rule is just as valuable and just as much prized in Alaska as it is elsewhere. The citizens of the Territories, who are citizens of the United States, should be just as amply encouraged to plan for their own welfare as the citizens of the several States. Every reason that can be adduced in support of this title in its reference to the States and the District of Columbia has even added force for application to Alaska, Hawaii, and Puerto Rico.

Moreover, Alaska and Hawaii at least are embraced within all of the provisions of the income tax and other internal-revenue laws of the United States. All come fully within the scope of the Selective Service Act. The soldiers from the Territories are fighting on all of the battle fronts of the world with other American citizens. On all counts, we are entitled to treatment on parity with the States.

Mr. Chairman, we of these regions of the Nation not yet admitted to statehood—and Alaska and Hawaii are now earnest applicants for that high status—are deeply sensible of the gracious action of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. COOPER] and the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. KNUTSON] in recommending the amendment, and the House in accepting it without objection or debate, or even explanation. With such a spirit manifested, I feel confident that the amendment will be in the measure when it is finally passed and approved.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, I offer a clarifying committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment offered by Mr. COOPER: On page 41, line 2, after the word "over-all", insert the word "State"; and after the word "competent", insert the word "State."

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, this is only a clarifying amendment that was agreed to in the committee at a meeting of the committee this morning.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Chairman, I believe everybody concedes that a program of public works will be necessary when this war is over. Both the other House and our own Ways and Means Committee conceded that to be necessary because they provided in title IV that loans shall be made to the States and to the municipalities for the purpose of drawing plans for public works.

The amendment I offer is to strike out the words "loans and advances" and insert in lieu thereof the word "grants." I also provide that no grant shall be in excess of 50 percent of the estimated planning cost for any individual project.

The reason for the grant rather than the loan or advance is that as I stated yesterday only 5 percent of all the public works that are contemplated are now in the blueprint stage where bids could be let within 60 days and work started. It seems to me most important that some stimulus should be given to the municipalities and States. They have the money to do planning to a certain extent, of course; nevertheless, we are faced with a situation that whether or not they do have the money they are not planning as they should plan in anticipation of the days of unemployment. None of us here wants a return to W. P. A.; we do not want any more leaf raking, any more boondoggling; we want public works that are well planned, are necessary, and that will be permanent. I believe that if we give grants instead of loans and advances to the States and municipalities that we shall furnish the stimulus that is so greatly desired.

Mr. DISNEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. LYNCH. I yield for a question.

Mr. DISNEY. Is not this like the bankrupt paying the claim?

Mr. LYNCH. I would not say it was the bankrupt paying the claim by any manner of means.

Mr. DISNEY. Another question: Are not all of these States practically out of debt? Can they not prepare these plans?

Mr. LYNCH. I would not say that all the States were out of debt, but I certainly would say that the States have some money with which to do this planning. The fact remains however that only 22 States have any completed plans. One State has no completed plans for public works; at least it so reported; and I presume the other 11 who have not reported to the Federal Works Agency or the Census Bureau likewise have no plans. I believe it is for the best interests of all that we get our local communities started on this system of planning for public works not with the idea of making a loan repayable in 5 years at an interest rate of 2½ percent but by a grant of 50 percent of the loan, but by an outright grant so there will be a stimulus to plan now for this necessary construction work.

Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. LYNCH: On page 40, line 15, change the period to a colon and add the following: *"Provided further,* That no grant shall be in excess of 50 percentum of the estimated planning cost for any individual project"; and, on the same page strike out the words "loan or advances" appearing in lines 6, 7, 13, 16, and 25, and insert the word "grants" in lieu thereof.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order against the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] reserves a point of order against the amendment. The gentleman from New York [Mr. LYNCH] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Chairman, what does this present bill do? It puts the Federal Government squarely in the banking business. What municipality is going to go to the Federal Government to borrow for the purpose of making plans when they have to pay back within 5 years at 2½ percent? They can go into their local community and borrow for less. The fact they are not borrowing today is, to my way of thinking, an evidence they have no plans in contemplation for public works. If we do not have plans in readiness when the war ends, we are going to go back to those days of the W. P. A. Therefore, in view of all the testimony that has been given before the Subcommittee on Public Works of the Special Committee on Postwar and Economic Policy and Planning, unanimously favoring grants in order to get these public works started, I earnestly urge for the sake of your various communities that you adopt the amendment I have proposed.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment on the ground it is not germane. An amendment adding the word "grants" to a provision providing for loans is clearly different and is not germane to the provisions of the bill, especially to the provisions of section 401. It is absolutely incongruous and I therefore insist on the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from New York desire to be heard?

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Chairman, the title of this section is "Public Works," and it is stated: "In order to encourage States and other non-Federal public agencies to make advance provision for the construction of public works" in which case certain loans or advances might be given.

It seems to me it is thoroughly germane to encourage the States and other non-Federal agencies public in nature and that grants be given in aid of these public works.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I might call attention to page 41, paragraph (c) wherein every one of the loans and advances are required to be repaid, which clearly implies that no grants are intended. Grants are entirely incongruous and contradictory.

Mr. LYNCH. Grants are not contradictory because it might even read: "Grants, loans or advances;" so they would not be contradictory in any sense.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is ready to rule.

In the opinion of the Chair there is a very great difference between loans and advances and grants. The pending committee amendment refers only to loans and advances. In the opinion of the Chair, the provision for grants would not be germane to the committee amend-

ment, and for that reason the Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. DIMOND. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at the point immediately following the adoption of the amendment on page 41, line 16.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alaska?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

TITLE V—MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

SEC. 501. When used in this act—

(a) The term "executive agency" means any department, independent establishment, or agency in the executive branch of the Government, including any corporation wholly owned by the United States.

(b) The term "contracting agency" means any Government agency which has been or hereafter may be authorized to make contracts pursuant to section 201 of the First War Powers Act, 1941, and includes the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and any corporation organized pursuant to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act (47 Stat. 5), as amended, and the Smaller War Plants Corporation.

SEC. 502. There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary or appropriate to carry out the purposes and provisions of this act.

SEC. 503. The provisions of this act shall terminate at the end of 1 year after the termination of hostilities in the present war, as proclaimed by the President, or at such earlier time as the Senate shall have passed a Senate resolution, and the House of Representatives shall have passed a House resolution, declaring that no emergency exists which requires the further continuance of the provisions of this act; and the date on which the provisions of this act terminate shall also be the termination date for the purposes of sections 904 (h) and 1201 (a) of the Social Security Act, as amended.

SEC. 504. If any provision of this act, or the application of such provision to any person or circumstance, is held invalid, the remainder of this act or the application of such provision to persons or circumstances, other than those as to which it is held invalid, shall not be affected thereby.

SEC. 505. When the Director first appointed under section 101 has taken office, the Office of War Mobilization established by Executive Order No. 9347, dated May 27, 1943, and the agencies within such Office created by subsequent Executive orders, shall cease to exist; and such records and property of the Office of War Mobilization, and such unexpended balances of appropriations or other funds available for its use, as the President shall determine, shall be transferred to the Office of War Mobilization and Reconversion.

SEC. 506. All orders, policies, procedures, or directives prescribed by the Director of War Mobilization, in effect upon the effective date of this act, and not inconsistent with this act, shall remain in full force and effect unless and until superseded by the Director in accordance with this act, or by operation of law.

SEC. 507. This act may be cited as the "War Mobilization and Reconversion Act of 1944."

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Chairman, this legislation known as War Mobilization and Reconversion Act of 1944, which we are now considering, will without a doubt have a great influence upon the economy of this country immediately following this war. Therefore, it is most important that we proceed with caution in passing S. 2051 as amended by the Ways and Means Committee.

I hold the greatest respect for the members of this committee and know they likewise consider this an important bill; however, I am afraid that they have been entirely too conservative in their amendments. The bill as reported to the committee was in itself a strong departure from what could be called a liberal bill.

This bill has been debated at length, but it is quite evident here that it is futile to attempt to amend any bill reported by this powerful Ways and Means Committee. I think this bill should have further consideration by the committee.

I think the bill is not equitable in discriminating against those Government employees working in the war effort, who are not covered by unemployment insurance.

I think more constructive steps should have been taken to raise the amounts allowed as unemployment insurance. We know that some States have exceedingly low benefit payments.

My colleague the gentleman from California [Mr. ROLPH] called your attention to the unworkable provisions for public works.

The gigantic task undertaken by this agency certainly calls for the advice and counsel of an advisory committee, which has been stricken out of the bill before us.

I voted for the Dingell amendment as I considered it a fair compromise between the two extreme versions originally discussed in both Houses.

We in California realize we will have many social problems unless provisions are made for the returning of war workers to their homes.

The post-war problems will not become acute until after we have whipped the Japs, therefore, I think the Ways and Means Committee should give this legislation further consideration, and I hope the bill is recommitted to the committee for further study.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee substitute, as amended, for the Senate bill.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. EBERHARTER) there were—ayes 162, nays 39.

So the committee substitute as amended was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. LANHAM, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration the bill (S. 2051) to amend the Social Security Act, as amended, to provide a national program for war mobilization and reconversion, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 627, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the amendment.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were refused

So the amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time and was read the third time.

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. POULSON. I am, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. POULSON moves to recommit the bill S. 2051 to the Committee on Ways and Means for further study.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion to recommit.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The motion to recommit was rejected.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were refused.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMITTEE ON ACCOUNTS

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Accounts be permitted to meet tomorrow afternoon.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

WAR MOBILIZATION AND RECONVERSION ACT OF 1944

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House insist on its amendment to the bill S. 2051 and ask for a conference with the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the motion of the gentleman from North Carolina is agreed to.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Chair appoints the following conferees: Mr. DOUGHTON, Mr. COOPER, Mr. DISNEY, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. KNUTSON, Mr. REED of New York, and Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan.

ADJOURNMENT OVER

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns tomorrow it adjourn to meet on Tuesday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and to include therein a letter to me from Secretary Hull.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein three short editorials.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include therein a statement made by the commissioner of reclamation at Phoenix, Ariz.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona?

There was no objection.

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks and to include therein an excerpt from the Detroit Free Press.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include certain communications.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Idaho?

There was no objection.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on two different subjects and to include an excerpt in each case.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. POWERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. AUCHINCLOSS] be granted a 5-day leave of absence, due to illness.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

(Mr. POWERS asked and received permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.)

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and that they be placed in the RECORD immediately following the conclusion of the reading of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and to include therein a letter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. CARLSON of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend the remarks I made in the Committee of the Whole by including an article by Stanley Rector, Chief Counsel, Unemployment Compensation Department, Wisconsin Industrial Commission.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. KUNKEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by including a revised summary of the G. I. bill of rights.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

(Mr. FORAND asked and received permission to revise and extend his own remarks in the RECORD.)

Mr. GAMBLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD in two instances, and to include some editorials.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. RAMEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on next Tuesday, after completion of other business, I may address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in two instances and to include certain excerpts and quotations.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. LAFOLLETTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may include in the remarks I made today upon my amendment to section 203 (a) a letter from Maury Maverick.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. GRANT of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. MERRITT] may extend his remarks and include an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS] is recognized for 35 minutes.

COMMUNIST CONTROL OF THE DEMOCRATIC PARTY

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I am about to make a shocking statement, but it is a true one. The Communists have taken over a great portion of the party machinery of the Democratic Party. It has always been known that Communists and near-Communists held high positions in and formulated important policies of the New Deal administration, but until recently they had left the interparty control of the New Deal party to the regular politicians of that political persuasion. I expect to prove that that is no longer the case.

It should be borne in mind that the Communist Party was the first political party in the United States to select Candidate Franklin D. Roosevelt for a fourth term. On February 4, 1944, I placed in the Appendix of the RECORD, on page A586, a news account of a meeting of the Communist Party for Maryland and the District of Columbia, wherein the Communists officially went on record for the fourth term for Roosevelt. That news account quoted Mr. Al Lannon, executive of the party, as saying that fulfillment of the aims of the Teheran Conference, which he described as the "greatest turning point in world history," necessitated national unity behind the President. A little later in my remarks I will have something more to say about the Teheran Conference.

I have before me a photostatic copy of the Daily Worker for Saturday, August 12, 1944. In it there is an article by Eugene Dennis, vice president of the Communist Political Association, and an associate editor of the Daily Worker. The article is entitled "The Decisive 3 Months" and it is described in the heading as follows: "An Abridged Text of a Report Delivered on July 27 in Chicago to a Midwest Conference of Leaders of the Communist Political Association." The quotations that I will hereafter make are all taken from this article by Mr. Dennis. The Communist endorsement of Candidate Roosevelt is in no uncertain terms. Here is what they say:

> Therefore, among other things, it is necessary as never before to make clear that Roosevelt must be supported, not because he is a Democrat and the candidate of the Democratic Party, but because he is a great patriot and the foremost leader of the national interest and of the national coalition dedicated to victory. Roosevelt must be reelected to insure the continuation of his leadership as the vital and successful head of our Nation's military effort, and as one of the greatest architects of the American-Soviet-British alliance, of the Moscow, Cairo, and Teheran Conferences, which guarantee the way toward victory, a durable peace, and post-war security.

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS. I will be glad to yield when I have finished my statement.

Mr. SADOWSKI. Does the gentleman disagree with that statement?

Mr. CURTIS. I will yield when I have finished my statement.

Who makes this statement, the New Deal National Chairman? Oh, no. Let me read a little further from this article:

We Communists who are working in the main stream of national unity, influencing and helping shape the course of events—we must now work more effectively, even though more modestly and tactfully, than ever before. In developing the most active support to and cooperation with the broad national unity movement, supporting the President and other win-the-war candidates, we Communists should set an example of a real nonpartisan approach and campaign.

In this article we find this challenging paragraph:

It is clear that our Communist political association enters the final stage of the elections confronted with heavy responsibilities. Whether it be in the sphere of helping forge and mold labor and national unity, whether it is in the field of helping organize the camp of victory, or whether it is in the clarification of issues—we Communists have a paramount obligation and we are equipped to help deliver the goods.

If the Communists are equipped to deliver the goods, it means that they are the dominant force in the New Deal party. It should challenge the patriotism of the Jeffersonian Democrats who still follow the New Deal. Here is another paragraph that ought to cause Jeffersonians to stop and think. It is one of the reasons why millions of Jeffersonian Democrats are going to vote for Dewey and Bricker in order to restore their own Democratic Party. Listen to this:

The Democratic ticket headed by Roosevelt and Truman continues the national leadership dedicated to speedily winning the war and forging a just peace. It is a ticket representative not only of the Democratic Party but of important and wider sections of the camp of national unity.

So the Roosevelt-Truman ticket is representative of important and wider sections of the camp of national unity in addition to the Democratic Party. This means that the Democrats have queer bedfellows in the management of their party. Whom do you suppose the Communists consider "the important sections of the camp of national unity"?

I know what many are apt to say. They are apt to say that Mr. Roosevelt is not responsible for every radical group that endorses him. Generally speaking, that is true in the political world. Oftentimes a candidate will be endorsed by groups which he does not endorse. It is not so with the Communists. The Communists know what they are doing. They are noted for their planning and scheming and their designing to take full control of our Government. They do not endorse anyone, unless they have an understanding. I will prove this by their own words. Again quoting from this same article, we find this most significant statement:

We Communists must refrain from taking such unilateral actions as that of endorsing candidates, unless this is done in full agreement with the given candidate and with our collaborators.

The Communists have unqualifiedly selected and endorsed Candidate Roosevelt for the fourth term. They openly boast that they make no endorsement of candidates, unless it is done in full agreement with the candidates, and with their collaborators. What kind of an agreement do they have with the fourth-term candidate? Do their "collaborators" that they speak of live in America, or on foreign shores? Can the real Democrats in America go along on such a proposition?

Now, there are those who insist that Candidate Roosevelt would not make an agreement with the Communists. Did it ever occur to you what a humiliation would come to the fourth-term candidate if he should be defeated? The humiliation at home is a small part of it. This fourth-term candidate who relishes a world position would hate to have Russia, England, France, Italy, China, and the rest of the nations of the world view him as a defeated man. Is there anyone who doubts that in order to save himself from defeat, this candidate would make whatever promise or agreement was expedient? Do you think there will be any known tricks in the bag that will go unused to put over the fourth term?

It might be argued that there are only a few Communists in the United States, and that they could not do all the things that they say they are going to do. Let me quote a few more paragraphs from this article which show their technique:

Now, more than ever before, as Earl Browder has stressed, it is necessary to steer a resolute course of nonpartisanship in the elections, to work to unite patriots of all classes and party affiliations for the reelection of Roosevelt and the election of a Victory Congress. For only in this way can victory be assured in November for the coalition supporting the Commander in Chief and the Government's war and post-war policies.

Here is something else they expect to do, and, again, I quote:

Among other things, it is necessary to encourage and help form women's committees of trade-unionists, of independent voters, and of soldiers' wives and mothers. It is necessary to involve the churches.

Think of it, my fellow Americans. The Communists boldly and brazenly assert that to put over the fourth term for Candidate Roosevelt and the program of communism they are going to involve the churches. Communism and Christianity are incompatible, yet they would involve the most sacred of all institutions.

The church is the only institution that can heal our war-torn and sad world. It is the only organization that holds the hope of immortality to those who have lost a loved one in this war.

Every churchman, every layman, and every church leader in America should use up and put his full strength in the fight to defeat atheistic communism.

The Communists also plan to work through women's clubs and college organizations. But let me go ahead with the quotation of this Communist official.

Through these committees, the trade unions, and other organizations, there should be developed special and systematic activity among the women in their organizations and in the neighborhoods, in behalf of the soldiers' vote and soldiers' welfare, in support of job and social security for women war workers, as well as to rally the women in support of Tehran, including support for an international peace organization based upon the alliance of the anti-Hitlerite coalition.

The Communists even describe some of the organizations created to help them put over the fourth term. This article by Mr. Dennis contains this statement:

The formation of the broad and influential National Citizens' Committee for Political Action will accelerate this process and strengthen labor's political role and cooperative ties with other patriotic forces.

The Communists assert that the action by America's labor unions needs to be revamped by them. They have a program for that. They say:

Labor's role in the elections is still limited, primarily to actions of the top, to the positions and work of the officers and executive boards and political-action committees of the internationals, of the State and city councils and bodies, and of the locals. Far too little attention is being given to reaching, educating, and mobilizing the bulk of the trade-union membership, not to speak of their families and friends, and to organizing joint and parallel action of the A. F. of L., C. I. O., and brotherhoods on a plant, ward, and city basis.

It is a well-known fact that the vast majority of the rank and file of organized labor are outstanding, honest, upright, patriotic Americans. Countless entire unions have a splendid record. Many labor leaders are of the highest type. Like all other groups made up of human beings, unwise and self-seeking leaders sometimes get out of line. We should not forget that these racketeers are in the minority. It is heartening to see national leaders and great sections of the American Federation of Labor, many independent unions, and some C. I. O. unions repudiate the C. I. O.'s Political Action Committee. Let us note what the Communists have to say about the C. I. O. and the New Deal National Convention. I quote them, as follows:

Labor, especially the C. I. O., played a key role in helping determine the national ticket. By its preconvention activities it helped guarantee that Roosevelt would be the Democratic standard bearer. By its last-minute activities it helped elevate WALLACE into a position of national stature and political prestige and prevented the nomination of a Byrnes or a Rayburn as Vice President.

How do you boys from Dixie like that? Are the friends of Justice Byrnes and of our beloved Speaker, Mr. RAYBURN, going to go along and support a national ticket that is not controlled by the real Democrats? Many followers of Thomas Jefferson have stated that the way to save the Democratic Party is to defeat the New Deal. They are right.

Most people understand why the Communists prefer a Vice Presidential candidate from the Pendergast camp than one from Dixie.

I am not here to suggest that Communist principles will be discussed in the campaign. The Communists are too sly for that. Here is what they say about the issues.

Now, as in the past, it must be made clear that communism is not and cannot be made an issue in these elections. The single and decisive election issue is that of destroying

fascism, of achieving victory, peace, and security, within the framework of existing social conditions.

Similarly, it must be proved again and again that those who are indulging in red-baiting, in stirring up anti-Communist prejudices and divisions today, are playing Hitler's and Goebbels' game, are weakening and undermining the unity of our Nation and that of the United Nations.

That particular quotation will bear reading again, and then thought through. In the light of that quotation, I ask the question: Why is Mr. Roosevelt such a satisfactory candidate for the Communists? This article goes on to say:

Just as the struggle to develop and apply the policy of national unity and to organize the election campaign will be influenced greatly by the understanding and mass work of our association, so too, the clarification of the central election issues and problems is dependent to no small extent upon our Marxist knowledge and political activity. It will be influenced considerably by the use we make of our press and publications, especially of Browder's book, Teheran: Our Path In War and Peace, and upon the political role and educational activity of our members and clubs.

The Communists also say:

In the very forefront, as the heart of all issues, everything must be done to really clarify the meaning of Tehran and to muster active support for all those agreements and measures which will accelerate its realization.

This is most urgent, because only a fraction of the American people has grasped the significance of Tehran.

Mr. Speaker, why all this talk by the Communists about the Teheran Conference? When they opened the drive for Candidate Roosevelt last February, they said that it was the greatest turning point in world history. In these quotations from this abridged text of the Chicago conference of the Communist Political Association they have repeatedly stressed the Teheran Conference, and they boldly assert, "Only a fraction of the American people grasp the significance of Teheran." What happened at Teheran? Why are the Communists so interested in the Teheran agreement? Candidate Roosevelt has never told the American people what happened at Teheran. Secretary Hull has never told the American people what was contained in the agreements entered into at Teheran.

There is an old saying that the truth will out. The truth has leaked out in reference to Teheran. History will show that the Atlantic Charter was thrown in the discard at Teheran. History will show that the small freedom-loving nations of eastern Europe were sold down the river at Teheran. History will show that Candidate Roosevelt let the Communists have their way with reference to Yugoslavia, Poland, Finland, the Baltic States, and the other nations that have been victims of aggression. Candidate Roosevelt abandoned, at Teheran, the high and noble things for which the American people were fighting.

You might ask: How do we know this about Teheran? A gain, I say, the truth will out. When the truth is known about the Teheran Conference it will cause millions of freedom-loving persons in America whose sympathies were with the Poles, the Czechs, the Finns, the Yugoslavs, and other downtrodden people to turn against Candidate Roosevelt and the New Deal.

You do not need to take anyone's word for this. The Communists themselves boast about it. Listen to this sentence from Mr. Dennis' article:

We must remember that what is clear for us and for our collaborators, may not be, and usually is not, clear for others.

The Communists also say in this same article:

Moreover, we can and must explain that Teheran is beginning to operate on the political and economic fronts, as is witnessed by the cessation of American diplomatic relations with Finland, by the improvement of American-Free French relations, by the steps to organize a new anti-Fascist Yugoslavian Government representative of all national liberation forces.

The Communists have made inroads and infiltrations into our armed forces. Many well-known Communists have received commissions that look a little suspicious.

Mr. Speaker, what has happened to American ideals? Are we going to spend our blood and our substance to enforce an unjust peace? Is there something to it that freemen are capable of self-government? Can the people be trusted with the facts? Why is it that Candidate Roosevelt continues to make hidden, secret agreements, and refuses to make those agreements public?

Of course, the Communists do not speak for all members of the New Deal Party, but let us consider what the Communists themselves have to say on that very point. Again I quote from this same article:

In approaching this question, it is necessary to remember, first of all, that influential and powerful monopoly and financial interests, such as are represented by Stettinius, Taylor and Baruch, Lehman, and Nathan Strauss, not only support the Government's Victory program, but are part of the Roosevelt administration. This is a fact. And existing collaboration with these sections of big business in support of the Government's Victory policies can and must be continued.

Secondly, it should be borne in mind that the Democratic Party, which rests upon and is influenced by labor's support and growing influence within the administration and within the Democratic Party itself, is composed of a coalition which embraces powerful financial, industrial, and sectional group interests, as well as a series of local and State machines having vested financial and partisan interests. The Democratic Party as a whole is not yet a people's party.

Democrats should take notice that if present trends continue, they are in for a remaking. Old line Democrats are no longer the bosses of the New Deal Party. A high ranking new dealer was so brazen as to state, before the national convention, that WALLACE would be thrown overboard and TRUMAN selected as their Vice Presidential candidate in order to make the South think that they had won a victory. Speaking of the influence of the South in the present New Deal Party, let us quote one more paragraph from Mr. Dennis' article:

On the basis of the ambiguous wording of the inadequate plank dealing with the rights of minority groups, it might appear that the Democratic convention yielded ground to the poll-taxers, to the Southern Bourbons on the question of the Negro people, and therefore, on the issue of all democratic liberties. But actually such an estimate does not correspond to the real state of affairs.

I would like to ask the Democrats from the Southland: "What is the real state of affairs, and how do you like it?"

Mr. Speaker, the answer to this challenge of the Communists is the election of Thomas E. Dewey and John Bricker. They are two outstanding Americans. They have made a success in their own fields. A vote for Dewey and Bricker is a vote for a speedy and victorious ending of the war, to the end that our boys may be brought home again. It is a vote for sincere and honest cooperation among nations for a lasting peace. Moreover, it is a vote for the preservation of our liberties at home.

All are agreed that the election in 1944 is a most important one. We are faced with a choice of philosophies. We should meet this as Americans, and not as partisans. Every American should work unceasingly for the election of Dewey and Bricker. Their election would be the best thing for America. Their election would be the best thing for both major political parties, the Republicans and Democrats.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS. I yield.

Mr. BUSBEY. The gentleman made a statement in the course of his remarks to the effect that commissions have been given to Communists in the armed forces. Can the gentleman name specific cases where such commissions have been given to Communists in the armed forces of the United States?

Mr. CURTIS. There have been many cases. It is in violation of law, but it has been done. Here is a copy of the Washington Daily News for May 18, 1944. The headlines say:

Navy eases up on commies, but refuses to comment. The Navy Department, which in the past has pursued a vigorous policy of barring Communists from its rolls was reported reliably today to be scrapping its Communist investigating division and shipping specialists in this field of counter intelligence to other duties.

Now the gentleman wants some specific cases. Here is a clipping from the New York World Telegram of August 28, 1944:

ARMY AND NAVY OKAY RED FOR WAR JOB

Both the Army and Navy intelligence bureaus have cleared for a most important and secret type of work a well-known Communist who was dropped by the Office of Strategic Services after an investigation by the F. B. I. and who is currently barred from all Federal employment by the United States Civil Service Commission, a check disclosed by the World Telegram today. As a result of this, Leonard E. Mins is now working on a Government war contract for the firm of Walter Dorwin Teague, 444 Madison Avenue, which is in charge of compiling a basic Navy instruction manual on the most closely guarded methods of firing and control of antiaircraft and other artillery.

It is a long article and I will not read it, but it ends up by saying that Mr.

Mins was not only restored to the Army, but given his back pay. I would like to further answer the gentleman's question by inserting a list of Communists who have been commissioned or promoted in the Army with a synopsis of their Communist activities. One of them, Milton Wolff, now with Stilwell in China, appeared before the Dies committee on April 11, 1940. He says:

I knew the Government of the Soviet Union, as far as I knew, was elected by the people. I was not aware of the existence of any dictatorship in the Soviet Union.

The gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS] asked him this question, "What do you think of support of Germany by Russia?"

Mr. WOLFF. I would like to know what my opinion of Soviet support of Germany, of alleged support of Germany, has to do with the subpena that was served on me.

Mr. MATTHEWS. In the event of war between the United States and the Soviet Union, which side would you support?

Mr. WOLFF. If war should break out between the United States and the Soviet Government I would be glad to give my answer.

That is on pages 7787 and 7788. That man is in the United States Army.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. NORRELL). The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may proceed for 2 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend in the RECORD a list of Communists to whom I referred in my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

The list refered to follows:

KNOWN COMMUNISTS RECEIVE UNITED STATES ARMY COMMISSIONS AND PROMOTIONS

Lt. Richard L. Criley, at present in Sicily for the Army forces in charge of labor matters, mentioned in Army Hour program, May 21, 1944. Member of presiding committee of the Ninth Convention of the Young Communist League held in New York City, May 11–15, 1939. Also a member of the Resolution Committee and the National Council of the Young Communist League. (Hearings, vol. 1, p. 590; vol. 3, pp. 1979, 1981.)

George Watt, 488 Bombardment Group, McDill Field, awarded Oak Leaf Cluster and Air Medal. (Daily Worker, May 29, 1944, p. 9.) This is in line with the Communist policy of winning confidence and standing for future exploitation. Education secretary, New York State Young Communist League. (Daily Worker, March 2, 1942, p. 1, 4.) Political commissar, Washington-Lincoln Battalion in Spain. (Daily Worker, April 30, 1938, p. 6.)

Irving Goff, first lieutenant, United States Army (Daily Worker, May 29, 1944, p. 0.) Contributor of two articles in Soviet Russia. Today, September and October 1941, in which he described how the Abraham Lincoln Brigade members were trained in guerrilla warfare by Russian Army officers in Spain. Goff was a lieutenant in the Abraham Lincoln Brigade. (Daily Worker, February 11, 1939, p. 8.) He lectured at the (Communist) New York Workers School. (Daily Worker, January 6, 1941, p. 3.) He was national secretary of the Veterans of the Abraham Lincoln Brigade, which supported the line of the Communist Party before, during, and after the Stalin-Hitler Pact. (Daily Worker, October 11, 1940, p. 2.) It is characterized as a Communist front by the Dies Committee in its report of March 29, 1944.

Milton Wolff, sergeant, joining General Stillwell's forces in China. (Daily Worker, May 29, 1944, p. 9.) Speaker. New York State Young Communist League. (Daily Worker, February 10, 1939, p. 5 and (Young Communist League) Review June 24, 1940, p. 4.) Delegate to the Emergency Peace Mobilization which later picketed the White House. (Daily Worker, September 3, 1940, p. 4.) National commander, Veterans of the Abraham Lincoln Brigade, see above for characterization. (Volunteers for Liberty, March 1941, p. 1.) First commander of the Lincoln Battalion in Spain. (Daily Worker, September 30, 1939, p. 5, second section.) Speaker at (Communist) New York Workers School. (Daily Worker, January 6, 1941, p. 3.) Given 15-day jail sentence for demonstrating before the French Consulate in New York while France was at war with Hitler. (Daily Worker, April 27, 1940, p. 2.)

Morris Brien, Irving Fajans, a man named Cook and another named Crumpley, known Communist agitators, were commissioned in the Army after G2, the Craig board, a special board appointed by General McNarney and Assistant Secretary of War McCloy, all recommended against their appointment.

There are thousands of Communist agitators on record in the F. B. I. who could be rounded up within 24 hours and jailed for subversive activities if they were not under the protection of Attorney General Biddle and the United States Government.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS. I yield.

Mr. BUSBEY. I would like to express my opinion that if the Military Affairs Committee and the Naval Affairs Committee of the House of Representatives made a thorough investigation of the Intelligence Department of the Navy and the Army they would find that this communistic influence has infiltrated into these departments to such an extent that they are positively and absolutely wrecked from their original intention today.

Mr. CURTIS. Will the gentleman agree that there are high-ranking officers in the service who, if they were permitted to talk, would tell a most shocking story about some of the orders that have come down from apparently nowhere?

Mr. BUSBEY. I will not only agree to that, but I would say that the truth, if they would be able to speak it, would rock this country from coast to coast.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Nebraska has again expired.

SMEAR BUNDS

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. MURPHY. For some months on the floor of this House I have been listening to talks day in and day out by gentleman on the left about the so-called smear bunds in America, and asking that there be an investigation of the smear bunds. I came into the Chamber this afternoon and I think the investigation might begin right here at home. Not only is there an attempt to appeal to prejudice and bias, but there is a deliberate attempt, apparently on the floor of this House, to weaken the confidence of the soldier boys in the gallery and the boys in the armed services throughout the United States, and the American people in our armed forces.

There is a political campaign on, but the American people are not going to be fooled by such attempts to appeal to prejudice and bias. Let us conduct the campaign on a high plane. What about winning the war? What about post-war plans? What about conversion? What about what we are going to do after the war?

In conclusion, the other afternoon I noticed three distinguished statesmen of America used the time of practically all stations on the National Broadcasting Co., or at least some of them, to indulge in a similar smear campaign.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may have 2 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. MURPHY. One of those gentlemen, the Governor of California, Governor Warren, is free to admit that his speech was forwarded to him from New York and it was of such a nature that he refused to use the text and had to change it himself before delivering it.

Mr. McCORMACK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURPHY. I will be glad to yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. Does the gentleman think there is any foundation to the story that a speech was released 18 hours before to the press and then recalled in view of the fact that the testimony before the Campaign Expenditures Investigating Committee showed that Mr. Dewey received a contribution from Mr. Hillman and his union some years ago?

Mr. MURPHY. I do not know what prompted a change in the speech, but I will say that the New York Times, that always reliable paper, stated today that Governor Warren said he had to change his speech. I now say that Governor Green of Illinois and Governor Baldwin, should speak up and say who wrote their speeches.

Mr. McCORMACK. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. MURPHY. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. Reference has been made to commissions in the Army. Every member of this House knows that that is an Army and Navy matter. Everyone knows the care that is undertaken. If there are any actual commissions in the Army, then it is a result of investigations and actions of those who pass upon commissions in the War and Navy Departments.

Admiral Jacobs is the head of the Bureau of Naval Personnel. In the Army

there are several procurement officers who pass upon those matters. I can assure the gentleman from Nebraska, however, that as far as the White House is concerned, the White House has never injected itself in any way in connection with any application made by any person for a commission or in the granting of any commission. I cannot challenge the gentleman's statement about Communists being commissioned; I do not know. If they have been commissioned it is as a result of action of those in the War Department and the Navy Department.

Mr. CURTIS. May I ask, Who is the Commander in Chief of the Army and the Navy?

Mr. McCORMACK. Oh, that is a weak observation. The gentleman knows; he knows.

Mr. CURTIS. We all agree that he is weak.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania be given 2 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman knows that there are civilian activities and there are war activities. The gentleman knows the same thing applies in the Navy Department; the gentleman knows that as well as anybody else.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, I demand the regular order.

Mr. McCORMACK. Under a special order there is no regular order.

The gentleman knows these Communists were commissioned over the objection of the regular orders of the Army and the Navy.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Pennsylvania yield?

Mr. MURPHY. I do not yield. I wish to answer the question as to who is Commander in Chief, and I may say to the distinguished gentleman from Nebraska that I will quote from a speech of the distinguished Governor of the State of New York his reference to the title of Commander in Chief; and I will quote what every schoolboy in America knows about who is Commander in Chief in discussing the great difficulties Abraham Lincoln had as Commander in Chief; and I would also refer the gentleman from Nebraska to a very excellent article in this month's American Mercury discussing the duties of the Commander in Chief and the problems which our Presidents have had down through the years as Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy. The Constitution says it is Franklin D. Roosevelt.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has again expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, in view of some of the statements that have been made here by the gentleman from Pennsylvania I venture to suggest that perhaps we might be enlightened as to whether or not we are to have a repetition of the smear campaign that was in vogue in the fall of 1942 when Democratic candidates throughout New York State, day after day on the same day, delivered the same speech in each district, and the basis of those speeches were false statements gotten out and published early in the spring of 1942 under the signature of Tom Amlie, the notorious Communist from Wisconsin, and Frank Kingdon from New York? I venture to inquire whether or not that same practice is to be followed this fall and that same kind of smear campaign based entirely upon false testimony is going to occur?

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. MURPHY. I may say to the gentleman from New York that in this campaign I hope we shall not get into the bypath the gentleman has been pursuing for the last minute or two. Franklin D. Roosevelt will discuss the issues as they confront the people of America and those issues only.

Mr. TABER. We will hope so; and we hope the campaign will be confined to the truth. You can be sure it will be as far as this side of the aisle is concerned.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. Bearing on that question, Governor Dewey made reference in Pittsburgh to the Roosevelt depression from 1933 to 1940. Does the gentleman from New York remember that we had a Hoover depression and that Roosevelt inherited it?

Mr. TABER. But it did not get to a head until Franklin D. Roosevelt was elected, and then the fear of the inauguration of Franklin D. Roosevelt brought it to a head——

Mr. McCORMACK. What an excuse!

Mr. TABER. And we had an emergency administration from then right straight to now; and just as long as Roosevelt stays in the White House we shall have nothing but a state of emergency in this country. He will find some way to keep the country in a continuous state of emergency.

Mr. McCORMACK. My dear friend, whom I like and whose fervor we all enjoy, still has not answered the question: Was there a Hoover depression?

Mr. TABER. Moderate as compared with the Roosevelt emergency.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Dewey does not even remember that.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may proceed for 1 additional minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MURPHY]?

There was no objection.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MURPHY. The gentleman said that the Hoover depression was more moderate than the Roosevelt depression. The gentleman as the ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations must know that in 1932 the corporations had a four billion deficit while under Roosevelt last year they had an $8,000,000,000 surplus.

Mr. TABER. All coming out of $300,000,000,000 borrowed money.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include two editorials, and I also ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in two other instances in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

SHALL WE PERMIT THE GERMANS TO ESCAPE THEIR JUST PUNISHMENT?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. DICKSTEIN]?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, the nearer the victorious Allied troops will get to Germany's borders the louder we may expect to hear the pleading voices from within and without Germany asking for mercy on the poor, innocent German people. The old, reliable fairy tales will be brought out again about the kind, "gemütlich" German citizenry who, desiring nothing more eagerly than to be at peace with the rest of the world, was forced into a brutal war against its wishes; these generous people who are now just as eager to stop this terrible war if they, the poor, misunderstood German people, will be treated with the respect and consideration due them.

In anticipation of the type of psychological warfare used so successfully by the Germans on previous occasions, I would like to suggest that all of us read the official documents released by our gallant allies, the various governments in exile, and by our own State Department as to the inhuman, barbarian treatment these peace-loving German people meted out to the people who had the misfortune to come under their domination. These documents, containing accounts of the murder and destruction wrought by the Germans in enslaved Europe should once and for all destroy the myth of a cultured and civilized German people. Only fiends and barbarians could have possibly carried on such a systematic and cruel program of annihilation.

One of the American reporters wired back a story after he and 30 other foreign correspondents inspected the former German concentration camp at Majdanek, where approximately 1,500,000 persons from nearly every country in Europe were killed during the last 3 years. After inspecting the gas chambers in which the Germans asphyxiated their

victims and the furnaces in which their victims' bodies were cremated; after listening to the stories of some of the survivors, some of them former German officers in charge of the program of destruction, even a hard-boiled war correspondent who has seen plenty of death and destruction in the last few years, had to exclaim that after facing the proof of German barbarism at Majdanek he was prepared to believe any story of German atrocities, no matter how savage, cruel, and depraved.

I am inserting Mr. Lawrence's story on Camp Majdanek in the hope that people who missed it in the New York Times will get a chance to read it so that all of us will remember it when the cries for mercy for the poor, innocent German people will try to sway our sympathy so as to save the Germans from the just retributions their inhuman actions call for:

[From the New York Times of August 30, 1944]

NAZI MASS KILLING LAID BARE IN CAMP—VICTIMS PUT AT 1,500,000 IN HUGE DEATH FACTORY OF GAS CHAMBERS AND CREMATORIES

(By W. H. Lawrence)

LUBLIN, POLAND., August 27.—I have just seen the most terrible place on the face of the earth—the German concentration camp at Maidanek, which was a veritable River Rouge for the production of death, in which it is estimated by Soviet and Polish authorities that as many as 1,500,000 persons from nearly every country in Europe were killed in the last 3 years.

I have been all through the camp, inspecting its hermetically sealed gas chambers, in which the victims were asphyxiated, and five furnaces, in which the bodies were cremated, and I have talked with German officers attached to the camp, who admitted quite frankly that it was a highly systemized place for annihilation, although they, of course, denied any personal participation in the murders.

I have seen the skeletons of bodies the Germans did not have time to burn before the Red Army swept into Lublin on July 23, and I have seen such evidence as bone ash still in the furnaces and piled up beside them ready to be taken to nearby fields on which it was scattered as fertilizer for cabbages.

TEN MASS GRAVES OPENED

I have been to Krempitski, 10 miles to the east, where I saw 3 of 10 opened mass graves and looked upon 368 partly decomposed bodies of men, women, and children who had been executed individually in a variety of cruel and horrible means. In this forest alone, the authorities estimate, there are more than 300,000 bodies.

It is impossible for this correspondent to state with any certainty how many persons the Germans killed here. Many bodies unquestionably were burned and not nearly all the graves in this vicinity had been opened by the time I visited the scene.

But I have been in a wooden warehouse at the camp, approximately 150 feet long, in which I walked across literally tens of thousands of shoes spread across the floor like grain in a half-filled elevator. There I saw shoes of children as young as 1 year old. There were shoes of young and old, men and women. Those I saw were all in bad shape—since the Germans used this camp not only to exterminate their victims, but also as a means of obtaining clothing for the German people—but some obviously had been quite expensive. At least one pair had come from America, for it bore a stamp "Goodyear welt."

I have been through a warehouse in downtown Lublin in which I saw hundreds of suitcases and literally tens of thousands of pieces of clothing and personal effects of people who died here, and I have had the opportunity of questioning a German officer, Herman Vogel, 42, of Millheim, who admitted that as head of the clothing barracks he had supervised the shipment of 18 freight carloads of clothing to Germany during a 2-month period and that he knew it came from the bodies of persons who had been killed at Maidanek.

EVIDENCE FOUND CONVINCING

This is a place that must be seen to be believed. I have been present at numerous atrocity investigations in the Soviet Union, but never have I been confronted with such complete evidence, clearly establishing every allegation made by those investigating German crimes. At Kiev's lonely Babiyar last November, for example, I heard the story of how the Germans had killed 80,000 Jews and later disinterred their bodies for cremation on a huge, multi-layered pyre, over which gasoline had been poured to increase the speed with which they burned.

At Kiev there was little evidence remaining to substantiate the story we had been told, except a few bone fragments. But at Maidanek I looked inside the furnaces and handled a huge steel stretcher on which bodies were loaded into the stove, five in each furnace—not unlike the huge instrument with which bakers remove bread pans from the oven after baking.

After inspection of Maidanek, I am now prepared to believe any story of German atrocities, no matter how savage, cruel, and depraved.

As one of a group of nearly thirty foreign correspondents brought to Poland on the invitation of the Polish Committee of National Liberation, I also had an opportunity to sit with the special mixed Soviet-Polish Atrocities Investigation Commission, headed by Vice Chairman Andrey Witos of the Polish Committee, and to question 6 witnesses, including 3 German officers—Vogel, Theodore Shoelen, and Tanton Earness—who will probably face trial for their part in the administration of the death camp.

RESPONSIBLE GERMANS LISTED

For the correspondents, the commission's prosecutor, a Pole, summed up the evidence taken. He said it had been decided that these Germans bore the main responsibility for the crimes committed at Maidanek and in the Krempitski Forest:

General Globcnik, Gestapo, and S. S. Chief of the Lubin district.

Governor Wendler of the Lublin district, described as a distant relative of Heinrich Himmler.

Former Governor Zoerner of the Lublin district.

Lisske, who had charge of all the concentration camps in the Lublin district.

General Weiss, who was in charge of the Maidanek camp.

Company Commander Anton Tumann, who at one time had charge of Maidanek.

Mussfeld, who was in charge of the crematorium.

Klopmann, who was chief of the German political department in the Lublin district.

It is impossible in the space here available to relate details of all the evidence of crimes we saw and heard, but for the benefit of those who have not had the opportunity to see with their own eyes, here is the story as it came from the lips of a German who had been a prisoner in Maidanek and was left behind by the retreating Germans. He is Hans Staub, a 31-year-old, tall, husky man with close-cropped hair, who had been imprisoned for engaging in black market meat operations in Germany.

Despite German orders that prisoners were to keep out of the crematorium area, he managed to slip inside the brick fence one day and secrete himself about the time a truck loaded with about a dozen persons drove up. Among them was a Polish woman he estimated to have been 28 or 29 years old. The prisoners were guarded by tommy-gunners, who ordered them to alight from the truck and undress. The woman refused and this enraged Mussfeld, who beat her. She screamed and Mussfeld lost his temper, shouting, "I'll burn you alive."

According to Staub, Mussfeld then directed two attendants to grab the woman and bind her arms and legs. They then threw her on an iron stretcher, still clothed, and pushed her body into the oven.

"I heard one loud scream, saw her hair flame and then she disappeared into the furnace," Staub said.

According to several witnesses, the peak death production day for Maidanek was November 3, 1943, when for some reason not made clear the Germans executed a total of 18,000 to 20,000 prisoners by a variety of means, including shooting, hanging, and gassing.

CAMP COVERS 670 ACRES

This is Maidanek as I saw it. It is situated about a mile and a half from the middle of Lublin on the highroad between Chelm and Cracow. As one approaches he gets a view of the concentration camp almost identical with those pictured in American motion pictures. The first sight is a 12-foot-high double barbed-wire fence, which was charged with electricity.

Inside you see group after group of trim-green buildings, not unlike the barracks in an Army camp in the United States. There were more than 200 such buildings. Outside the fence there were 14 high machine-gun turrets and at one edge were kennels for more than 200 especially trained, savage man-tracking dogs used to pursue escaped prisoners. The whole camp covered an area of 670 acres.

As we entered the camp the first place at which we stopped obviously was the reception center and it was near here that one entered the bathhouse. Here Jews, Poles, Russians, and in fact representatives of a total of 22 nationalities entered and removed their clothing, after which they bathed at 72 showers and disinfectants were applied.

Sometimes they went directly into the next room, which was hermetically sealed with apertures in the roof, down which the Germans threw opened cans of Zyklon B, a poison gas consisting of prussic acid crystals, which were a light blue chalky substance. This produced death quickly. Other prisoners were kept for long periods; the average, we were told, was about 6 weeks.

Near the shower house were two other death chambers fitted for either Zyklon gas or carbon monoxide. One of them was 17 meters square and there, we were told, the Germans executed 100 to 110 persons at once. Around the floor of the room ran a steel pipe with an opening for carbon monoxide to escape at every 25 centimeters.

VICTIMS' DEATH WATCHED

We were told the victims always received a bath in advance of execution, because the hot water opened the pores and generally improved the speed with which the poison gas took effect. There were glass-covered openings in these death chambers so the Germans could watch the effect on their victims and determine when the time had come to remove their bodies. We saw opened and unopened cans of Zyklon gas that bore German labels.

About a mile from the gas chambers was the huge crematorium. Built of brick, it looked and was operated not unlike a small

blast furnace for a steel mill, operating with coal as fuel, fanned by an electrically operated blower. There were five openings on each side—on one side the bodies were loaded in, and on the other ashes were removed and the fire built up. Each furnace held five bodies at a time.

We were told it took 15 minutes to fill each furnace and about 10 to 12 minutes for the bodies to burn. It was estimated that the battery of furnaces had a capacity of 1,900 bodies a day.

Near the furnaces we saw a large number of partial and complete skeletons. Behind a brick enclosure nearby were more than a score of bodies of persons who, we were told, had been killed by the Germans on the day the Red Army captured Lublin, which they did not have time to burn before fleeing.

Beyond the furnace area were a number of opened mass graves, which included bodies of persons who had been buried recently, as well as of persons who had been dead for a long time. At one place I counted more than 30 skulls, many of which had bullet holes in them. We were told these had been Red Army prisoners of war whom the Germans executed in 1941 or 1942.

Not far from the furnaces were a large number of earthenware urns, which investigating authorities said witnesses told them were used by the Germans for ashes of some of their victims, which they sold to families for prices ranging up to 2,500 marks.

Mr. Speaker, judging by the stories appearing in the press of the last few days, the tale of death and destruction for which the Germans are responsible is too enormous and too gruesome to be fully conceived. Some time in the future, after a thorough and painstaking inquiry, the full scope of this crime committed by the Germans against humanity will come to light. We shall then be able to discover how many people perished in slavery, doing forced labor for the superrace, in addition to the great number that was annihilated in formal concentration camps. Some day the whole immensity of the crime will be brought to light and we who have survived this blood bath of our century owe a solemn duty to the martyrs who perished to punish their murderers so as to set an example to others of their ilk who might fall prey to illusions of grandeur and decide to go on another rampage to enslave the world.

Mr. FISH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. FISH. I believe there should be a little further discussion of what the gentleman has stated. This is a ghastly, tragic affair. Has the gentleman any suggestion as to what should be done to prevent further murdering and butchering of defenseless women and children in central Europe?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I have made a suggestion several times on the floor of the House to the effect that we should open up some free ports to allow people to go to who can escape killing by the Axis. They should be permitted to temporarily stay here and in other parts of the world. This camp that we opened up recently has taken care of approximately a thousand people who are very grateful for being allowed to stay here. We could have larger camps and we could save the lives of hundreds of thousands of people if we paid a little more attention to this matter. The other Allied Nations of the world should do likewise.

Mr. FISH. May I ask the gentleman if we could not use our influence in this country, Congress and the Government, to persuade the British Empire to open up Palestine to immigration?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I am grateful to the gentleman for his contribution. I think he is right 100 percent in that suggestion.

Mr. FISH. I want to do something concrete to help these people find a place in which to live. Can we not through our influence urge the British Empire to open up the doors of Palestine for say a half million of these people?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. That would be the logical thing to do. Palestine can absorb more than a half million. It is the duty of the Allied Nations to open their doors, including the United States, to these people of all races who are about to be annihilated. It has been shown definitely by the press that over one and a half million were annihilated in gas chambers in Poland without regard to race or creed. They were just annihilated.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a statement appearing in the New York Times on August 30, 1944.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

PROGRAM FOR NEXT WEEK

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. TABER. May I ask the majority leader if he can tell us anything about the program for the balance of this week and next week, if possible.

Mr. McCORMACK. I will be very glad to. There will be no business tomorrow, of course. The House will meet, but will adjourn over until Tuesday. Two bills will be in conference. If either one of those conference reports are agreed upon and either one of them should be brought up in the House next week, they will not be acted upon before next Thursday. There is no other business. In the event either one of the conference reports are ready Tuesday or Wednesday, they will not be acted upon until Thursday, and I have my doubts as to then, but I cannot make any statements to the House beyond that time.

Mr. TABER. Of course, if either of those reports are controversial, one objection would prevent their being considered on the date that they were reported.

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes; but of course, the leadership would see that that situation would not arise. But I am making the definite statement that as far as next week is concerned there will be no business to require the presence of Members here until Thursday, and if no conference report is ready Thursday, there will be no business then.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. FISH. May I ask the majority leader if he has any intention of calling up any rule?

Mr. McCORMACK. No.

Mr. FISH. The second question I have in mind is this: May I ask the distinguished majority leader if he would not use his good judgment and his influence, if possible, to see to it that if both reports happen to be available at the same time, that they be brought up either on the same day or succeeding days, in order that the Members who may have an opportunity to go home will not be brought back for separate reports?

Mr. McCORMACK. I think that is a very fair observation to make, and I can assure the gentleman from New York that it appeals to me. I know it would appeal to the leadership on both sides.

Mr. FISH. That would give the Members at least 48 hours' notice.

Mr. McCORMACK. I know what is in the gentleman's mind, and I fully agree with him.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Do I understand that we do not have to come back here until about Wednesday?

Mr. McCORMACK. There will be no business in the House until Thursday of next week, and then only on Thursday if the conference reports are ready to be brought up under the rules of the House.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I thank the gentleman.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a very splendid article written by Willard L. Thorpe appearing in the August issue of Dun's Review.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. KLEIN, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 1506. An act to amend further the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942.

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 1508. An act to provide effective date of awards of death pension or compensation in cases of persons missing or missing in action to authorize payment of such benefits from the date of death of such person as reported or found by the Secretary of War or the Secretary of the Navy, and for other purposes; and

S. 1934. An act to provide for abandonment of the project authorized in the act of October 17, 1940, for a seaplane channel and basin in Boston Harbor, Mass.

BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. KLEIN, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee did on this day present to the

President, for his approval, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 3695. An act for the relief of the estate of Thomas Shea, deceased.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 50 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, September 1, 1944, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

1786. Under clause 2 of rule XXIV a letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a report for the fiscal year 1944, in compliance with Public Law No. 779, Seventy-seventh Congress, was taken from the Speaker's table and referred to the Committe on Military Affairs.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ENGLE of California:

H. R. 5276. A bill to provide for the deportation after the war of Japanese aliens residing in the United States and citizens of Japanese descent who have declared their disloyalty to the United States or have requested repatriation; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. CAPOZZOLI:

H. R. 5277. A bill to amend the Judicial Code with respect to the admission of attorneys at law to practice before the departments and offices of the Government exercising judicial or quasi-judicial functions; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DAVIS:

H. R. 5278. A bill to incorporate the National Safety Council; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FULMER:

H. R. 5279. A bill to provide for the establishment and operation of forest products pilot plants, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. NORRELL:

H. R. 5280. A bill to terminate the use tax on motor vehicles and boats; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CANNON of Florida:

H. R. 5281. A bill to extend the benefits of title II of the Social Security Act to certain employees performing service outside the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CASE:

H. R. 5282. A bill for post-war construction, improvement, and maintenance of Indian reservation roads; to the Committee on Roads.

By Mr. BARRETT:

H. R. 5283. A bill to provide for the extension of certain oil and gas leases; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. PETERSON of Florida:

H. R. 5289. A bill to provide for the acceptance and protection by the United States of property within the authorized boundaries of the Everglades National Park project, Florida, pending the establishment of the park, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. DICKSTEIN:

H. Res. 630. Resolution requesting information from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation regarding distribution of surplus materials and other matters; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. Res. 631. Resolution requesting information from the Alien Property Custodian as to ownership and control of J. M. Lehmann Co., Inc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. MARCANTONIO:

H. R. 5284. A bill for the relief of Rosalia Cataudella Di Rosa and son, Georgio Di Rosa; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. O'NEAL:

H. R. 5285. A bill for the relief of William M. Silk and Henrietta Silk; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. RANDOLPH:

H. R. 5286. A bill for the relief of Monongalia, County, W. Va.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. TOLAN:

H. R. 5287. A bill for the relief of Elmer C. Hadden; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 5288. A bill for the relief of Henry R. Butler; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

6053. By the SPEAKER: Petition of employees of General Electric Co., Fort Wayne, Ind., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to promotion of American prisoners of war; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

6054. Also, petition of Eunice V. Taylor, Syracuse, N. Y., petitioning consideration of her resolution with reference to her complaints on three judges; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE

FRIDAY, SEPTEMBER 1, 1944

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father God, to Thy chastening presence we would lift our sin-stained lives at the morning call of prayer. Yet we shrink from Thy scrutiny knowing that outer dissemblings, duplicities, and sophistries which may mask us from our fellows hide us not from Thee from whom no secrets are hid. As we see the shame and smirch of our sinful selves against the white splendor of Thy holiness, may we grow penitent, hating the evil impediments that our self-deception build up against Thy coming to us and through us.

Not only for our separate lives do we pray but for the common global interests that bind us all together. For our Nation and its leaders and the whole body of our citizens in this fiery ordeal of testing and sacrifice guide us, O Thou great Jehovah, be Thou still our strength and shield. Give us gallant courage to endure to the victorious end and the wisdom from above so to mold and fashion the victory bought with so great a price that we may not miss the way again to just and enduring peace. We ask it in the name that is above every name. Amen.

DESIGNATION OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The Secretary, Edwin A. Halsey, read the following letter:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, D. C., September 1, 1944.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate, I appoint Hon. KENNETH MCKELLAR, a Senator from the State of Tennessee, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

CARTER GLASS,
President pro tempore.

Thereupon Mr. McKELLAR took the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Thursday, August 31, 1944, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. McLeod, one of its clerks, announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 2051) to amend the Social Security Act, as amended, to provide a national program for war mobilization and reconversion, and for other purposes; that the House insisted upon its amendment to the bill, asked a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. DOUGHTON, Mr. COOPER, Mr. DISNEY, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. KNUTSON, Mr. REED of New York, and Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

ENROLLED BILLS AND A JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills and a joint resolution, and they were signed by the Acting President pro tempore:

S. 1508. An act to provide effective date of awards of death pension or compensation in cases of persons missing or missing in action, to authorize payment of such benefits from the date of death of such person as reported or found by the Secretary of War or the Secretary of the Navy, and for other purposes;

S. 1934. An act to provide for abandonment of the project authorized in the act of October 17, 1940, for a seaplane channel and basin in Boston Harbor, Mass.;

H. R. 1506. An act to amend further the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942; and

H. J. Res. 306. Joint resolution authorizing the President of the United States to proclaim October 11, 1944, General Pulaski's Memorial Day for the observance and commemoration of the death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski.

ADDRESS BY SENATOR BARKLEY NOMINATING PRESIDENT ROOSEVELT AT DEMOCRATIC NATIONAL CONVENTION

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. In his capacity as a Senator from Tennessee, the Chair asks unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD

the address delivered by the distinguished Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] at the recent Democratic National Convention placing in nomination President Roosevelt. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the address will be printed in the RECORD.

The address is as follows:

Mr. Chairman, members and guests of the convention, it has been my privilege to serve you in responsible capacities in three preceding national conventions.

To none of these did I bring a deeper sense of personal pleasure or public duty than that which actuates me on this occasion.

I come to the fulfillment of this assignment, not simply as a Democrat but as an American, seeking to promote the welfare of my country and the enduring happiness of her people.

As we assemble here, evil forces stalk across the stage of human affairs whose power must be annihilated lest the whole course of civilization be reversed and mankind be reconsigned to the miseries of total slavery.

In such a posture, we must rise above the level of the petty and the inconsequential.

We must look beyond the horizon of temporary expedients and contemplate the larger opportunity and the larger challenge.

A RENDEZVOUS WITH DESTINY

Eleven years ago, standing before an eager and distraught multitude, a new President of this Republic was heard to say, "This generation of Americans has a rendezvous with destiny."

Some of those who listened looked upon it as a handsome figure of speech uttered in the course of an inaugural address.

The speaker perhaps was thinking of our domestic problems chiefly, then in utter chaos and disorder; thinking of the 16,000,000 whose feet were treading upon the unresponsive pavements in town and city seeking work; thinking of the anxious eyes and hungry mouths of women and children; thinking of the toilers in the fields who dare to cope with Nature and her seasons to feed and clothe the world; thinking of the incomparably low prices marking the reward of the Nation's farmers; of burned crops and mounting debts and unpaid mortgages, and dried-up credit and broken promises quadrennially made by those who had the power but not the will to keep them.

Perhaps he thought of the smokeless smokestacks and the silent wheels of industry; or our lost trade with the nations of the world; of the motionless turbines of our merchant marine, tied up in harbors for lack of cargoes; of the billions lost by innocent investors in the speculative orgy fostered and inspired from the portals of the Treasury by "the greatest Secretary since Alexander Hamilton"; of the collapse of our financial institutions, the loss of other billions of the people's deposits and the loss of their faith and confidence in these institutions.

In all likelihood he saw the insecurity of old age, the hazards of sickness and unemployment; the sordid record of financial exploitation among our neighbors in the western world under the alliterative aegis of dollar diplomacy, and the fear and suspicion and hatred that policy had inspired.

He saw the wasting soil reserves washing to the sea, the idle natural resources of the Nation unharnessed for the use of man, the devastating floods destroying life and property and uprooting the happiness of whole communities and valleys.

Looking across two oceans, proclaimed by some as the unassailable fortresses of our protection and security, he beheld the beginnings of Japanese aggression in Asia and the rise to power of Adolf Hitler in Europe.

Surveying these national and world perplexities, is it strange that this dauntless man uttered the prophetic sentence, "This generation of Americans has a rendezvous with destiny"?

What a destiny. What a rendezvous.

Centering his searching mind and great abilities upon our own domestic problems, he restored our financial institutions—strengthened them beyond any previous stability—and rekindled the people's confidence in them to the end that today they hold larger deposits of their funds than at any other time in their history.

He built anew the basis of agricultural prosperity, restored the farmer's credit, lowered his interest rates, electrified his homes, lifted a portion of the drudgery from the backs of housewives, organized a program of soil conservation, expanded the field for the use of agricultural products, increased the annual income of farmers by more than 300 percent, and contributed more to the stability of farm life in America than was ever before accomplished in three times the length of time, if ever at all.

FOUNDATIONS FOR VICTORY

While the war has brought hardships to farm life, these strides made by agriculture under the guidance of this man of whom I speak, laid the foundation for the magnificent contributions being made by the farmers and their families to the victory we shall ere long achieve against our enemies and the enemies of all freedom.

In his address from this platform 3 weeks ago the Governor of California asserted that under this administration the farmer works all day and keeps books all night.

He paid to this administration an unintentional compliment. For under the administration of its predecessor the farmer worked all day and worked all night and had no books to keep, or if he kept any at all he made his entries in the crimson liquid of bankruptcy and despair.

Truly enough he keeps books now, and he makes his entries in the jet-black liquid of canceled mortgages and savings deposits and improved farms and War bonds.

The man of whom I speak set in motion the machinery for the employment of the idle. In 4 years he reduced unemployment from 16,000,000 to less than ten, and in 4 more years to less than 6,000,000.

Three weeks ago, from this platform, the nominee of the Republican Convention complained with glee that this administration had not solved completely the unemployment problem.

He should have said with greater frankness that this administration did not create but inherited that problem from the administration of his own political mentor, guide, and counselor; and that neither that administration nor any of its apologists then or since have ever offered a sane or understandable remedy for the chronic malady which they bequeathed to the American economic system.

In addition to the reduction of unemployment, this Democratic administration gave to labor the boon of collective bargaining, the reassuring balance wheel of minimum wages and maximum hours, the stimulating guaranty of unemployment insurance and compensation, the tardy inauguration of old-age subsistence, and abolition of child labor.

Under the driving power of the head of this administration, the market for securities was made a safe and honest place for the transaction of business, and the small home owner was saved from eviction and enabled to preserve the traditions of his vine and fig tree.

For the sordid emblem of the dollar on the escutcheon of our diplomatic relations he substituted the symbol of the good neighbor.

For the logrolling, corrupt methods of tariff legislation he substituted mutual trade agreements, restoring to a material extent the natural flow of commerce with other nations.

By these and other great measures of similar importance to the American people, the American economic system and the American conception and way of life were fortified for the impact of war and the defense of our land.

THEY HAVE NOT SAID

What will our opponents do with this modern vehicle we have created? They have not said. Having neither the foresight nor the creative genius to conceive or construct it, they now admit the virtue of most of it, but say they could have done it better if they had thought of it and knew how.

Their platform looks in all directions and sees nothing. It is like the exhortation of the devout minister who concluded as follows a sermon on sin:

"I say unto you, brethren, repent of your sins, more or less; ask forgiveness, in a measure; or you will be damned, to some extent."

Before this gloomy prospect the baffled intellect must pause and kneel for guidance and direction.

To one intelligent observer it is "The pattern for chaos." To another it is "The tired old platform." To nobody is it either the "Substance of things hoped for, or the evidence of things unseen."

ACCOMPLISHMENT UNIQUE IN HISTORY

Against this nebulous milky way we shall present a record of constructive accomplishment unique in American history.

We shall present a candidate who inspired and guided and drove that record to certain consummation.

We shall present a candidate who not only traveled but constructed the highway which leads to a fuller and happier life.

When the new foundations for this sounder American economy were advancing toward completion, disorder was on its way in other parts of the world. Fear began to grip the hearts of millions who remembered or learned the tragic horrors of the last world conflict.

The cloud which at first seemed but a fleck upon the rim of heaven grew until it covered the earth with its forebodings and obscured the sun of man's hopes for peace and life.

The past rose before us like a nightmare. We heard the sound of preparation and the noise of boisterous drums. We saw hundreds of assemblages and heard the raucous voice of the diabolical agitator across the sea.

In all of this, though the domestic task was yet unfinished, the President of the United States saw the import of the gathering storm and sought to avert it.

Through every channel of diplomacy, every weapon of official and personal persuasion, every resort to logic and reason, he appealed to egocentric and distorted minds to forego the butchery of another world war, another selfish and ambitious design upon the peace of nations, another reversion to the barbarism of the Dark Ages, multiplied a thousand times.

And he appealed to his own country not to dwell too long in a fool's paradise; not to indulge the fancy that we could be safe from the fires that might consume other peoples.

For this foresight and forthrightness he was denounced as a war monger, and assailed as the friend of the war profiteer; and he became the object of partisan and personal vilification like unto that from which Washington suffered and which Lincoln endured.

Whose was the voice then that cried from the wilderness? Who became the major prophet—the man who saw and warned the people against approaching danger, or those who fulminated their jeremiads against him because he had the clarity of vision to see and the courage to proclaim our profound interest in the world's developments?

When the treachery of Pearl Harbor came we were not ready. The shock of it blasted us from our complacency, as the previous shock of Hitler's attack on Europe blasted his neighbors out of theirs.

No democracy is ever ready for war at the drop of a hat. That is true of Europe and Asia no less than of America. And because the people themselves who live in those democracies have not wanted war, because they believed in the good faith of treaties made to prevent war, they were unwilling to believe that war would come or to be ready for it.

Thus happened the world's narrow escape from complete and bitter subjugation.

But war came nevertheless to Asia, to Europe, and to America. And though unready for it when it came, we have gone farther and faster, and with more profound temporary readjustments in our lives than was ever true of any other nation in the whole history of nations.

DEFEAT FOR THE WAR LORDS

Our industry, our labor, our agriculture, our finance, our manpower, our homes, yea, the moral and spiritual fiber of a mighty people have all been fused into an irresistible stream whose momentum will drive the war lords of the Nazi and Nipponese back into the war hatchery from which they were spewed to become the world's supreme scourge.

We have raised and trained, and through these agencies have equipped, the ablest fighting force that ever flew the sky, sailed the sea, or marched beneath a banner.

In order to pay in part for this titanic effort the American people are paying in taxes into the Treasury of the United States annually $6,000,000,000 more than their total income from all sources in 1932, and have left in their pockets more than a hundred billion dollars with which to buy the bonds of their Government and meet the other obligations of a nation and a people.

On all the battle fronts these efforts, these gifts of blood and treasure are being justified and sanctified by the incomparable bravery which brings glory everywhere and victory ever nearer to our cause.

But we are told by the nominee of our opponents that those in charge of our Government have grown old and tired in office and that they are young and fresh.

Life is not measured by figures on a dial.

This administration and the Democratic Party have done more for the youth of America than was ever done before by any combination of administrations or political parties.

In this struggle to emancipate humanity, men and women of all ages, political beliefs, religions, races, colors, and conditions have the power and the obligation to serve and they are serving in every imaginable capacity.

None of those who are in charge of the Government of the United States are as old as the old guard which dominated the convention which met in this place 3 weeks ago.

The President of the United States has not been the head of this Government as long as the Generalissimo has been the head of the Chinese Government, or as long as Josef Stalin has been head of the Russian Government, or as long as Winston Churchill has held high office in the British Government.

Yet with what dismay and consternation would the people of America receive news that any or all of these had been banished from office by the people of their respective countries.

In this hour of tragedy, when the lives of innocent men, women, and children all over the world hang in the balance; when blood and treasure beyond calculation are being poured out to save civilization; when hearts and minds and tongues that think and feel and speak in every language cry out for peace and deliverance and the leadership of experience in war and its aftermath, no birth certificate, whether inscribed on the crisp new page of the latest volume of vital statistics, or whether it is slightly faded from longer use and service, can or will constitute the prime qualification for the Presidency of these United States.

Shakespeare must have had our opponents in mind when he said, "Heat not a furnace for your foe so hot that it do singe thyself."

THEY NEITHER FLY NOR LIGHT

In their platform, and thus far in their public statements, they have attempted to compromise the convictions of Willkie with the underground of isolationism. They neither take the ground nor abandon it. They neither fly nor light. They hover.

The Democratic Party goes before the American people on its record, and it will not become a fugitive from the truth.

It has pushed outward the frontiers of enterprise, enlarged the boundaries of human endeavor, quickened the spirit of the man who earns his bread in the sweat of his face, and opened new routes to the hopes of mankind.

Democracy knows that in a free land there are some things never to be tolerated, and one of them is intolerance.

Democracy must make mistakes. Ours has been no exception to this rule, and we freely admit that we have made them.

But all progress among men is the residuum of a multitude of mistakes. Only through error does man or nation come to know the truth. And how often have we come to realize in this administration that questions once objects of great debate and controversy are now accepted as indisputable fact. We must preserve the continuity of democracy by bringing together the experiences of yesterday, the tasks of today, and the aspirations of tomorrow.

We know that in our struggle as a people through the years we have kept this ideal before us, and it is our beacon light today.

Though we do not know the day or the hour when it will come, we know that the sum total of all our past and present devotions will bring success to the cause of justice in the war, and peace and healing to the souls of men when it is over.

Already we are preparing for the return of our national economy to the practices and conditions of peace.

Already we are laying the solid ground work for the demobilization of men and materials and plants, and for their gainful employment in private enterprise.

Already we have provided for the just and helpful transition of men and women in the service; for the education, rehabilitation, and compensation of those who bear the heat of battle and for their dependents; for the reintegration of men and women and industrial and agricultural enterprises into the jobs and activities of post-war readjustments.

We propose to create no economic stalemate which will make it necessary for men and women in the service to march on Washington to petition the Government under the Constitution, only to be driven out with the very instruments with which they have saved the Nation.

Already the foundations for victory; for a just, honorable, and durable peace; and for the organization of the world for peace when its organization for war is no longer needed, have been set deep in the soil of the United Nations.

Already the American people have made up their minds that this Nation, under God, shall have a new birth of freedom; that it will not seek to avoid its solemn responsibilities in the family of nations; and that it shall pledge its experience, influence, and cooperation to the end that no other generation shall be driven through the slaughterhouse through which this one is passing in order that human liberty may be preserved.

UNDER WHOSE LEADERSHIP?

Under whose leadership have these things moved forward to accomplishment?

Under whose leadership have we as a Nation marched from the valley of depression to the peak of national well-being?

Under whose guiding hand have we made the long journey from military impotence to war power unrivaled in human history?

Whose hand has moved the throttle of our productive engine?

Whose touch at the pilot's wheel has steered our stately ship through the treacherous waters of international controversy and intrigue, and brings us now within sight of the harbor and its impregnable shores?

Whose name among all the millions of dejected and disheartened men and women stands today as the symbol of freedom and deliverance?

I have not always agreed with this man who has been honored beyond his fellows. Though recognizing his more intimate knowledge and greater responsibility, I have on occasion found myself in disagreement with him over the substance or the method of some course of action in which we were concerned. Under similar conditions again I would not feel at liberty to pursue a different course.

But, it is one thing to differ from a friend, though he be the President, on some course of action that seems fundamental.

It is quite another thing to discard, or seem to discard, a leadership unsurpassed if ever equalled in the annals of American history; or to repudiate a record of achievement in national and international affairs so amazing and successful that his friends proclaim it, and his enemies dare not threaten it with destruction.

Like all true believers in liberty the President fights and has always fought, not doggedly for opinions but for the right to entertain and express them.

From time to time my views may change. In the light of broader knowledge or modified conditions, my opinions may be altered. So may his. We both fight now and have all our lives fought for the right to harbor our opinions, to express and defend them, and to change them when convinced of error.

This is the essence of democracy. It was this conception of democracy which made Jefferson the premier among the defenders of freedom of thought, of the press, of education, of speech, and of religion.

It is this atmosphere of freedom that gives validity to the immortal words of Voltaire to Helvetius:

"I wholly disapprove of what you say, but will defend to the death your right to say it."

Because I believe in these eternal truths, and because they have been the sheet-anchor of his faith and the guideposts of his conduct in public and in private station, I present to this assembly for the office of President of these United States the name of one who is endowed with the intellectual boldness of Thomas Jefferson, the indomitable courage of Andrew Jackson, the faith and patience of Abraham Lincoln, the rugged integrity of Grover Cleveland, and the scholarly vision of Woodrow Wilson—Franklin Delano Roosevelt.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

TRANSPORTATION FURNISHED BY NAVY DEPARTMENT FOR GOVERNMENT AND OTHER PERSONNEL

A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relating to the furnishing of transportation for certain Government and other personnel necessary for the effective prosecution of the war (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

LEGISLATION BY MUNICIPAL COUNCIL OF ST. THOMAS AND ST. JOHN, V. I.

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of legislation enacted by the Municipal Council of St. Thomas and St. John, V. I.

(with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs.

EDUCATION AND TRAINING OF DEFENSE WORKERS

A letter from the Acting Administrator of the Federal Security Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the fourth quarterly report of the United States Commissioner of Education on the education and training of defense workers, covering the period from April 1, 1944, through June 30, 1944 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Education and Labor.

REVISED EDITION OF SENATE RULES AND MANUAL

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, from the Committee on Printing, I report favorably Senate Resolution 323, and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. I take it this is the usual form of resolution?

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes; it is the customary resolution.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 323) submitted by Mr. BYRD on August 23, 1944, was considered and agreed to as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Rules be, and it is hereby, directed to prepare a revised edition of the Senate Rules and Manual for the use of the Seventy-ninth Congress, and that 1,500 additional copies shall be printed and bound, of which 1,000 copies shall be for the Senate, 200 copies for the use of the Committee on Rules, and the remaining 300 copies shall be bound in full morocco and tagged as to contents and delivered as may be directed by the committee.

BILLS AND A JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. HAYDEN (for Mr. SCRUGHAM):

S. 2125. A bill to permit the sale in foreign markets of newly mined gold or silver produced within the United States, its territories and possessions, including Alaska, and which may be surplus to the war effort; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. BURTON:

S. 2126. A bill to authorize the Secretary of State to continue to completion the collecting, editing, and publishing of official papers of the Territories of the United States; to the Committee on Printing.

By Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts:

S. 2127. A bill to further amend the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HILL:

S. J. Res. 148. Joint resolution authorizing the disposal of certain blood plasma reserves; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

CITIZENSHIP REQUIREMENT FOR CERTAIN GOVERNMENT POSITIONS—CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, several months ago the senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR] introduced Senate bill 521 requiring that persons holding certain positions under the United States be citizens of the United States. That bill was referred to the Civil Service Committee. I now ask unanimous consent that that committee be discharged from further consideration of the bill, and that it be referred to the Committee on Immigration.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Tennessee? The Chair hears none, and the change of reference will be made.

REDUCTION OF JUVENILE DELINQUENCY—AMENDMENT

Mr. ANDREWS submitted an amendment in the nature of a substitute intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 1578) to reduce juvenile delinquency by providing for the care and prompt return home of runaway, transient, or vagrant children of juvenile age, going from one State to another without proper legal consent, through the use of funds appropriated under the provisions of the Social Security Act for aid to dependent children, under certain conditions, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary and ordered to be printed.

UNIFORM UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION—STATEMENT BY SENATOR BURTON

[Mr. BURTON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement on the negative side of the question, "Should the Federal Government provide unemployment compensation above State standards during the reconversion period?" made by him on America's Town Meeting of the Air August 31, 1944, which appears in the Appendix.]

A CHALLENGE TO THE AMERICAN PEOPLE — ARTICLE BY ARCHIBALD MACLEISH

[Mr. HILL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "A Challenge to the American People," written by Archibald MacLeish, Librarian of Congress, and printed in the New York Times Magazine of August 13, 1944, which appears in the Appendix.]

PRODUCTION AND THE ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF AMERICAN LABOR

[Mr. THOMAS of Utah asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a table showing production and the work performed by American labor during the war, which appears in the Appendix.]

DEWEY AS A FARMER—EDITORIAL FROM WICHITA EAGLE

[Mr. CAPPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Dewey as a Farmer," published recently in the Wichita (Kans.) Eagle, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY—EDITORIAL FROM CHICAGO DAILY NEWS

[Mr. AIKEN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Peace Job No. 1," dealing with the St. Lawrence seaway, published in the Chicago Daily News of August 25, 1944, which appears in the Appendix.]

ACTION OF O. P. A. ON TREBI BARLEY

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, in connection with the various statements I have made upon the Senate floor concerning the action of the Office of Price Administration in arbitrarily defining Trebi barley which resulted in a penalty of 15 cents a bushel to the farmers all over the Northwest, I have a letter from the Killdeer Grain Co., of Killdeer, N. Dak. I particularly wish to call the attention of Senators to the letter, because it shows how absolutely arbitrary and foolish the ruling of the Office of Price Administration is with reference to this barley. The letter, which was written on August 24, reads as follows:

KILLDEER GRAIN CO.,
Killdeer, N. Dak., August 24, 1944.

Senator WILLIAM LANGER.

DEAR SENATOR: I have your letter of August 21 regarding your efforts with O. P. A. on Trebi barley notations in excess of 20 percent. This action is ridiculous. If the buyers wanted this barley before the Government action why in the world isn't it worth as much today as it was then.

Why should a farmer be penalized just because he raises Trebi barley instead of some other type, any more than one farmer be penalized for raising black hogs instead of white hogs; as long as the buyer is willing to pay the price up to the ceiling.

Any results you can get will be appreciated.

Yours truly,

E. L. MARSH.

I may add, Mr. President, that the War Production Board and the Agricultural Department both have asked the Office of Price Administration to change that ruling. They have done so day after day for a week, but to the present time the Office of Price Administration has not seen fit to revoke its ruling, and it is causing every farmer in the Northwest who is raising barley and who has 20 percent Trebi in it a loss of 15 cents a bushel.

EXTENSION OF UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 2051) to amend the Social Security Act, as amended, to provide a national program for war mobilization and reconversion, and for other purposes.

Mr. GEORGE. I move that the Senate disagree to the amendment of the House, agree to the request of the House for a conference thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Acting President pro tempore appointed Mr. GEORGE, Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts, Mr. BARKLEY, Mr. VANDENBERG, and Mr. TAFT conferees on the part of the Senate.

Mr. GEORGE. I now ask that Senate bill 2051, which is the bill just sent to conference, be printed showing the House amendment.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

DISPOSAL OF SURPLUS GOVERNMENT PROPERTY

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, a few days ago, while the bill providing for the disposal of surplus Government property was under consideration and was being debated, I made a statement on the floor of the Senate that I had been advised by members of the Military Affairs Committee that testimony before the committee by the present Administrator of Surplus War Property gave rise to the belief that he, as Administrator, would indiscriminately dump such prop-

erty on the market immediately after it was declared to be surplus by the proper authorities. That statement was made by me at the time, and I so stated upon information received from members of the Military Affairs Committee.

I received a letter from the Administrator of Surplus War Property a day or two ago asking me to correct that statement on the basis that such an inference should not have been drawn from his testimony before the Military Affairs Committee. He enclosed an excerpt from his testimony which tended to show that he possibly had the contrary view, but I did not hear his testimony before the Military Affairs Committee. I made the statement, as I said, at the time upon information I had received and therefore I am not in a position to make a correction of the statement as to the position of the Administrator of War Surplus Property.

I will state, however, that in the letter he wrote to me he said, in substance, that his position was misconstrued by the Military Affairs Committee. That is as far as I can go in making any explanatory statement.

AMERICAN LABOR AND THE WAR EFFORT

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, the contributions of labor to the progress of the American war effort should not go unnoticed on this eve of another Labor Day. It was but 3 short years ago that this Nation found itself in the vortex of a titanic struggle, and we discovered, to official and public dismay, that we were inadequately conditioned, both in trained military personnel and in the instruments of war, to undertake such action as would carry our men at arms to a not too distant goal of victory. Mr. President and fellow Senators, we need not strain our powers of memory to recall vividly the stresses and strains, and even anxiety, of those unpleasant days of unpreparedness. We remember the hustle and bustle incident to the conversion of American industry to the Gargantuan task of producing implements of war in amounts calculated to reach astronomical proportions, and to the molding of the best physical segment of our civilian population into efficient fighting units.

The present blessings of military success are manifest evidence of the capable work performed by our Army and Navy authorities in this latter work. But it is most appropriate to center very special attention upon the miracles performed by our industrial establishments in the organization of their plants for the production of those weapons without which the most competent soldier, sailor, or marine would be little short of useless. Again, industrial plants, with their confusing array of scientific machinery, do not operate of and by themselves; they are the development of the human mind, and it is the human element in the form of labor which is ultimately responsible for the fluent and effective operation of the motors of industry.

Human nature being what we all recognize it to be, the problems issuing from continuous operation of the industrial machine at top speed developed frictions which here and there were the causes of annoyance. These frictions, in the form of strikes—which strikes, in my opinion, were not justified in wartimes—have been emphasized far beyond their actual effects. American industry, during this war, has suffered some strikes, but American industry has also enjoyed to a far greater degree the continued, efficient, and patriotic services of American labor to which every American is indebted. So great, so outstanding, so tremendous have been the production goals attained by American labor that they are today a source of wonder and astonishment, not only to our enemies, but also to our allies and to ourselves.

These circumstances prompt me to rise today for the purpose of giving expression to my own sentiments in this matter, with the conviction that my colleagues in the Senate entertain similar thoughts of appreciation for the grand performance of American labor during the present emergency.

WHERE ARE WE GOING?

Mr. MOORE. Mr. President, under date of August 30, I wrote the Attorney General of the United States a letter, upon which I desire to comment. The communication is as follows:

Hon. FRANCIS BIDDLE,
Attorney General of the United States,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. ATTORNEY GENERAL: On June 6 last, I addressed a communication to you pointing out the political activities of the Congress of Industrial Organizations, a labor organization, through and by its Political Action Committee, which had come to my attention. On June 9, you replied that the Criminal Division of your Office had for some time been investigating these activities and some of the matters referred to in my letter had already been under examination. Since that date I have not been informed of your conclusions.

According to the press, you have stated that the use now of funds by the C. I. O. Political Action Committee for political purposes will constitute a violation of the Federal laws. I am, therefore, assuming that it is your opinion that contributions received and money spent by the C. I. O. Political Action Committee prior to the primaries, are within the provisions of the Federal statutes.

In view of the plain language of the Federal laws and the open and admitted political activity of the Congress of Industrial Organizations, a labor organization, there is a feeling in the public political mind that your Office is reluctant to prosecute this group for law violations for the reason that its announced purpose is political activity, and its announced purpose is to reelect President Roosevelt for a fourth term, and that you too are enthusiastically favoring the same objective.

The Hatch Act (title 18, art. 61m (a), U. S. C., 1940 ed.) expressly declares it to be unlawful for any person, including an association, corporation, or other organization, to make a contribution in excess of $5,000 during any calendar year to any committee or other organization engaged in furthering, advancing, or advocating the nomination or election of any candidate for an elective Federal office, including the office of the President of the United States.

Recently, at a hearing before the House Campaign Expenditures Committee, Mr. Sidney Hillman disclosed that the Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America, a labor union, and certainly an organization within the meaning of the Hatch Act, had contributed the sum of $100,000 to the Political Action Committee of the C. I. O. during the present calendar year. The testimony definitely disclosed that the Political Action Committee of the C. I. O. had been and was engaged in political activities. It was shown that it had contributed directly to the campaigns of numerous candidates who were seeking nominations for Federal elective offices. You certainly could not assert that the C. I. O. Political Action Committee has not been engaged in pressure politics and clearly in violation of the spirit and intent of the law.

It was further disclosed that contributions from the Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America and other member unions of the C. I. O. to the C. I. O. Political Action Committee aggregated $806,715 as of August 15.

Under the language of the statute and the admitted activities of the C. I. O. Political Action Committee, there can be no doubt that the member unions of the C. I. O. which contributed funds to the C. I. O. Political Action Committee in excess of $5,000 in any calendar year have violated the terms of the Hatch Act and are subject to prosecution thereunder by your office. If there has been no prosecution initiated, what reason can you assign for your failure to do so?

Another circumstance to which I desire to call your attention is the activities of the so-called National Citizens Political Action Committee, organized by the same personnel as the Political Action Committee of the C. I. O. Its offices and headquarters are located at the same address as the Political Action Committee of the C. I. O. I am advised that its personnel and employees are the same who serve the Political Action Committee of the C. I. O. It seems clear that the organization of the National Citizens Political Action Committee is a mere technical effort expressly designed for the purpose of attempting to evade the provisions of the Federal Corrupt Practices Act, as amended by the Smith-Connally Act.

In the case of the C. I. O. Political Action Committee, the funds were originally paid by individual union members as dues and assessments to their respective union organizations and were passed on directly to the C. I. O. Political Action Committee. In the case of the National Citizens Political Action Committee, the individual members of the C. I. O. union, through special committees of their union organizations, are being solicited individually for voluntary donations which these committees of the union organization, in turn, are passing on to the National Citizens Political Action Committee, which organization is admittedly engaged in furthering and supporting the election of Presidential and Vice Presidential electors and certain candidates for election to the Senate and House of Representatives at the general elections in November.

The Federal Corrupt Practices Act prohibits any labor organization from making contributions in connection with any election at which Presidential and Vice Presidential electors, or Members of the Senate or House of Representatives, are to be voted for. The act likewise prohibits any political committee from receiving any such contributions. Special union committees engaged in the solicitation of funds from individual union members are as much a labor organization as the union organization itself. The National Citizens Political Action Committee is an integral part of the C. I. O. labor organization. Its acts are in truth and in fact the acts of the C. I. O., either in the solicitation of funds or in the receipt of funds. Its actions cannot be dissociated from the C. I. O. by mere words or by fictitious distinctions. If this were not so, then why is it that these individual union members do not make their contributions directly to bona fide, recognized political parties as permitted by law? The answer, of course, is plain. Such contributions might not be used for the express benefit and at the direction of the C. I. O.

The Federal Corrupt Practices Act was passed by the Congress to protect the people against the political activities of private pressure groups for private advantage.

It is difficult for the public to believe that if the policies adopted by the C. I. O. were adopted by persons or corporations to evade other Federal laws, such as the Sherman antitrust law, the Clayton Act, or the Elkins Act, your office would hesitate to look through such evasion. I am familiar with one case in which your office has prosecuted and is continuing the prosecution of a group of oil and gasoline pipe-line companies under the Elkins Act, on the theory that dividends paid by these companies to their stockholders, who are also shippers, constitute a rebate prohibited by the statute.

There can be no doubt in the minds of informed people that the Federal laws are being violated through the medium of the various political committees of the C. I. O. No other conclusion, therefore, could be reached except that you are not prosecuting because of the political implications involved.

Yours very truly,

E. H. MOORE.

Mr. President, it has become apparent that Mr. Biddle has not performed his duty as a public officer, and that he does not expect to perform his duty in relation to the political activities of the labor organizations to which I have referred.

It is also apparent that the administration, from the top down, is encouraging this open and well-known violation of the law. The charge has been made time and again that the present administration has little or no respect for constitutional government. It now becomes apparent that it has little respect for the laws of Congress when and if they interfere with the self-perpetuation of its tenure of power.

The contribution of money for political purposes and for direct campaign expenditures by the C. I. O. and other political activities of this organization, by whatever alphabetical combination they may be denominated, is a menace to our American way of life and a threat to the preservation and integrity of our biparty system. The maintenance of the identity and virility of political parties as such in America is necessary to our representative form of government. It is only through free and uncontrolled political parties that the American voter may have the freedom of expressing his political opinions. As suggested by the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MALONEY] in a speech at New Haven, Conn., on February 22, of this year:

The political party is an essential institution of American freedom. It gives direction and effectiveness to the franchise of free citizens. It permits the development of ideas of government upon the basis of consistent principles, and, above all, it lessens the dangers that can arise from aggressive personal leadership.

Continuing, the Senator from Connecticut said:

Too frequently campaigns are being waged on the personalities of the candidates alone, while the candidates themselves demonstrate little fidelity to the platforms upon which they are supposed to stand. The time is coming, in my opinion, when the Democratic Party, great and strong as it is, will collapse from dry-rot unless we do more than we are now doing to insist that those who accept the support of the party respect the principles for which it stands.

The record of Mr. Sidney Hillman, who heads the political activities of the C. I. O., has been one of lifelong association and collaboration with Communists and the Communist Party. I am well aware of the fact that Mr. Hillman disavows these connections, but his record speaks for itself. His political beliefs have been assailed by his closest associates in the American Labor Party.

The members of the Democratic Party of Jefferson and Jackson are embarrassed and chagrined by the dominance of his influence at the recent Chicago convention. Thousands of Americans, who believe in constitutional government and believe in the Democratic Party as an instrumentality through which it may be preserved, were appalled and shocked at the one-man domination of the 1940 Democratic convention, but today they are stunned into silence by the spectacle of a leadership that has arisen from outside the party to control its thought and action as completely and as effectively as ever the machines of the Pendergasts, the Kellys, the Crumps, or the Flynns controlled their local political jurisdictions.

I pause to inquire of the members of the Democratic Party what they can hope for or expect of the future by delivering control of their party into the hands of men who hold to the ideologies represented by Mr. Hillman, Harry Bridges, Joseph Curran, Ben Gold, Donald Henderson, Lee Pressman, Julius Emspak, Abram Flayer, Ferdinand C. Smith, Joseph P. Selly, Reid Robinson, Michael J. Quill, Frederick N. Myers, Wyndham Mortimer, Saul Mills, Lew H. Michener, John T. Bernard, Louis Cohen, and other members of the C. I. O. Political Action Committee, all of whom the Dies committee has, after extensive investigations, found to be members of or affiliated with the Communist Party?

In an article published by the Saturday Evening Post in its issue of October 19, 1940, it was said of Hillman:

Hillman is the only really outstanding labor leader who never was a worker. He is not a worker either in background or in experience, and to this day he is rather in the labor movement than of it.

The Dies committee report of March 29, 1944, says:

There have been times when Hillman clearly deemed it expedient to collaborate with Communists for the attaining of his own political objectives. His present collaboration with Communists in the C. I. O. Political Action Committee is not by any means the first time in his labor career that Hillman has seen fit to work closely with Communists. In the early days of the Russian Bolshevik revolution, members of the Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America were deeply stirred by the events which were transpiring under Lenin's leadership. Many of them, like their leader Hillman, had been born in Russia. In 1922 Hillman himself wrote a favorable book on the revolution, entitled "Reconstruction of Russia and the Task of Labor."

The Dies committee report further says:

It was during this period of collaboration between Hillman and the Communists (both in the United States and in Russia), that Hillman donated the sum of $3,000 to the Jewish Communist newspaper Freiheit in the name of Bessie Abramowitz, his wife. The Freiheit has been one of the rankest organs of Communist propaganda in this country for almost a quarter of a century.

According to the Dies committee report, it was also during this period of the early days of Russian bolshevism that Mr. Hillman became a member of the board of directors of the famous Garland Fund, "a circumstance which indicates that Hillman was involved not only in schemes to finance Communist industry in Russia, but also in a large project to finance Communist subversive activities in the United States." Associated with Hillman as directors were Roger N. Baldwin, William Z. Foster, Robert Morss Lovett, and other well-known Communists. Among the beneficiaries of the Garland Fund were the Daily Worker, the official Communist organ; the New Masses, a Communist publication; the Vanguard Press; the Federated Press, which listed Mr. Earl Browder as a member of its executive board; the Russian Reconstruction Farms, under the direction of Harold Ware, son of Ella Reeve Bloor; Commonwealth College; Young Workers League, later known as the Young Communist League, and still later as American Youth for Democracy; and many others which have been exposed by the Dies committee as Communist front organizations.

Communism is wholly incompatible with our republican form of government. The assumption of political leadership by men who represent influences not in harmony with Americanism through the use of huge slush funds and the threat of wielding the power of mass votes at this critical time, when Americans are dying on the battle fronts around the world for the preservation of our republican form of government, is a tragedy undeserved by our soldiers. It is a tragedy which could not be possible except for the collaboration and encouragement of those who hold high positions in the present administration. It is nothing short of fraud for public officials to pledge themselves to preserve and defend the Constitution of the United States, and at the same time fail to repudiate the support of those who profess to believe in a communistic destruction and overthrow of that Constitution.

Coming events that now cast their shadow upon the future of America spring from the close association and collaboration of those entrusted with official leadership and those who do not believe in the American system and American traditions. It is well known that many key postions in our Government are filled by men and women who despise private enterprise and all that it implies, men and women whose fidelity to and zeal for constitutional government are doubtful, who believe in centralized and bureaucratic government, and who hold a contempt for legislative and judicial processes.

A remark of the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON] is pertinent. In a radio speech delivered on February 21 of this year he said:

As I see it, the New Deal has been the worst fraud ever perpetrated on the American peo-

ple. It has bankrupted the Federal Treasury and it has tried, with considerable success, to destroy the free-enterprise system.

It would be an almost endless task to recount the many individuals who fill responsible positions in our Government whose statements, actions, and affiliations have identified them as being out of tune with our representative form of constitutional government. Inch by inch the influences represented by those individuals have crept into our Government. The danger of such influences has been recognized by Members of Congress from both of our dominant political parties. Although we may differ in political beliefs, there must not be a division upon the question of Americanism. Our Government and our American institutions must be kept in the hands of men who reflect the same fidelity and zeal for constitutional government that was exemplified by the framers of the Constitution.

A great deal of public condemnation has been directed at the Congress in recent years for its failure to maintain its constitutional rights as a coordinate branch of the Government. That condemnation has come from inside the Congress, as well as from outside. Those who are aligned with the majority party have been as loud and severe in their criticisms as have those of the opposition party' Only recently on the floor of this Chamber the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] urged us to pass forthwith a resolution advising the Executive of our intention and determination to assert our rights in the forthcoming peace negotiations to remedy a dangerous situation in our national life. The Senator said:

> The time is ripe for the rectification of our course. Let us take the right course, a course from which we have certainly deviated. Let us no longer allow the Executive to infringe upon our constitutional mandate and assume our constitutional obligations in the most chaotic moments of a world crisis.

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY], in discussing the influences which surround the present administration, has said:

> We are face to face with an organized, well-financed, ably led movement by the leftist-wing members of the American Labor Party to capture the Democratic Party by infiltration. They propose to defeat any Senator, any Member of the House, or any other candidate for public office who does not bow down to their policy of coercing the workingmen of America, their policy of saying, "If you do not pay, you shall not work." They are saying to Senators that if they do not vote for all manner of extravagant and subversive demands, "We will organize in your State and send you out in the wilderness to starve with the worker who fails to respond to our demands for a $25 initiation fee and a dollar a month dues."
>
> I call that coercion, and I am ashamed of the fact that my Government is a party to it. I will never apologize for it. I will never defend it. I will always oppose it. Such a policy may be written into every political platform, but I will not run for office on any such platform. It is coercion in a free country.

Hon. LOUIS LUDLOW, a Democratic Representative from the State of Indiana, has said:

> The overshadowing menace to the Constitution today is the bureaucracy that has flowered and bloomed in modern times, especially under the impetus of war conditions.

On another occasion Representative LUDLOW told the House:

> My plea is that in this time of our country's extremity we shall cast all partisanship aside; that as Americans and not as partisans we shall take note of malevolent and harmful trends of government and try to correct them before it is too late. I speak not as a Democrat but as one who believes that patriotism is universal and transcends all narrow partisan confines. I speak as an American to Americans. I will be happy if my feeble efforts to point out danger signals and remedial measures will have some constructive value. * * *
>
> We are afflicted with the very kind of domineering bureaucracy that Jefferson repeatedly warned posterity to avoid as a blighting curse which, if it once became thoroughly entrenched, would smother individual liberty and stifle free enterprise. * * * Professors who are loaned temporarily to the Government and beardless boys with academic degrees, including a considerable sprinkling with communistic tendencies, who never were inside a factory or on a farm, are telling our hard-headed, experienced businessmen what to do and how to do it, and are regimenting the poor farmers of America until they do not know whether they are farmers or guinea pigs. One of these bureaucrats said recently to the spokesman of a large and important Indianapolis company who had gone to the bureaucrat seeking relief:
>
> "You represent a rich company, but it will not be so rich after a while. Capitalism in this country is doomed."

Speaking of Rexford G. Tugwell, now Governor of Puerto Rico, who is one of the leaders of the Communist influence that dominates the present administration, the Resident Commissioner from Puerto Rico recently advised the House of Representatives:

> Governor Tugwell has squandered more than two hundred and fifty millions of public funds during his tenure of office in Puerto Rico. He has toyed with pet experiments and crackpot dreams. He has overburdened the insular government pay roll with 20,000 bureaucrats in useless new bureaus, boards, commissions, and authorities created by him. * * * Free enterprise is a devil to Tugwell and his government accomplices. The island is going on the rocks, and hunger and misery prevail now in Puerto Rico more than ever before.

In condemnation of the sinister influences that permeate this administration, the Honorable E. E. Cox, a Democratic Representative from the Democratic State of Georgia, on March 20, 1944, told the House that—

> While our sons face the tyranny of despotism and the oppression of conquest abroad, here at home we are confronted with the tyranny of dictatorship and the oppression of bureaucracy. The New World planners have come a long way during recent years. They have acquired constantly increasing authority over the affairs of our people and our private industry. Congressional grants of power have been enlarged by administrative interpretation and used to bring the people under a government of men rather than a government of law.
>
> The great economic principles underlying our success as a people and a Nation have been freedom of enterprise and individual initiative. These principles made us ingenious and inventive at home and invincible abroad. We were unassailable so long as we held steadfast to them.

Commenting upon the agitation for communistic social reforms, Congressman LARCADE, a Democratic Representative from Louisiana, recently said:

> We have witnessed this agitation springing from many connected with this administration, and further by and through many governmental agencies who are trying to force an issue at the least propitious time in the annals of the history of our country.

In a recent speech to the California Legislature, the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN] told that body:

> The trend to centralization, economic and industrial as well as political, constitutes today the greatest menace to democracy.

In warning of the dangers of the trend of government espoused by those who have seized control of this Administration with respect to the destruction of the States and States' rights, Hon. HATTON W. SUMNERS, of Texas, on the floor of the House recently said:

> Even our States have not entirely escaped the blight of our growing dependence upon the Federal Government as a superguardian and provider, as we have moved away from the democratic philosophy of Jefferson, and the plan of nature for the development of human fitness, into the destructive bureaucratic philosophy of the Frenchman. * * *
>
> As we examine the present and look into the future, it is evident that the States must equip themselves to move quickly and efficiently in the resumption of the responsibilities of general democratic government. There is no chance for an efficient Federal Government, functioning as the agency of our democracy through its normal constitutional machinery, until it shall have been relieved of its governmental overload of non-Federal duties. On the other hand, there is no chance of the States preserving their vigor and governmental efficiency except by the resumption and exercise of their normal reserve powers and duties of general government.

The distinguished Democratic Representative from Texas further said:

> I have discovered nothing more destructive of that which a people must preserve in order to maintain free government, than the notion that everything must be provided for them by the Government.

Mr. President, under the influences that control the present administration, from the personnel of the palace guard down to the youngest and newest bureaucrat, there has been inaugurated a government of men, instead of laws, imbued with the idea that the Constitution is outmoded, that capitalism and private enterprise are instrumentalities of evil. With the aid and encouragement of the administration itself they have inaugurated and fostered a centralized government that has usurped the constitutional powers and prerogatives of the States, whence the Federal Government derived its origin.

In keeping with their theories of communism, the executive branch has in effect, through its dictatorial policy of Executive decrees, usurped the powers of the legislative and judicial branches.

Under the influences of these alien ideologies, there has been created a government of bureaus and bureaucrats who make the law, enforce the law, and interpret the law. With the twin objectives of bribing the American voters and buying elections, and destroying private enterprise and redistributing the wealth of our country, these controlling influences in the present administration, even before the war, had rolled up a national debt equal to nearly 50 percent of all the money that had been spent by all the previous administrations. It is estimated that by the close of the war, the national debt will be in excess of three times the total expenditure for all governmental purposes from the founding of the Government to the inauguration of Mr. Roosevelt. This administration must stand guilty of laying an unprecedented burden of debt on the people.

It is these dominating influences in this administration that have inaugurated a policy of economic scarcity and enforced the policy of plowing under our crops, destroying our pigs, and punishing the individual who dared to plant acreage in excess of the quota allowed by the dictatorial rules of the bureaucrats.

Under these influences, this administration has, for political reasons, punished capital and free enterprise by a continued and systematic persecution, in hand-picked and sympathetic courts, under the guise of antitrust prosecutions and by useless and unnecessary regulations, while for the same reasons it has coddled and encouraged the Communist influences operating under the guise of labor organization.

Under these influences, the present administration has put Government into practically every phase of business enterprise through Government corporations in competition with the private enterprise of our people, with the use of money taken from the same people with whom they compete.

Under these influences, this administration has encouraged and permitted strikes, sit-downs, and stoppage of war work, while the blood of American manhood is actually being spilled in the defense of the strikers.

In closing, I should like to paraphrase the recent admonition of the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] to this body in connection with the President's veto of the tax bill, by saying that if patriotic Americans have any self-respect yet left, they will, regardless of party affiliation, at the first opportunity exercise their rights to drive these influences from public office and replace bureaucracy with constitutional government, the Communists' and Communist Party's objections to the contrary notwithstanding.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Mr. President, I wish to add my word of complete approval and agreement with the very excellent remarks just completed by the Senator from Oklahoma. Supplementing what the Senator has said, I hold in my hand a print from the Times-Herald of Washington under date of July 16, 1944, which gives a complete compilation of Federal expenditures under all administrations from the beginning of the Government down to the present time. I offer that as a part of my remarks and ask that it be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the compilation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE BIGGEST SPENDER OF ALL TIME

We are indebted to the New York Sun for the table, reproduced below, showing the complete financial record of every President of the United States from George Washington's first term through Franklin D. Roosevelt's third. The table has appeared in the Times-Herald of July 8, but we felt that a reprint in more readable type was needed.

These figures establish Mr. Roosevelt as the biggest spender in the history of the world to date.

President	Number of fiscal years served	Receipts	Expenditures	Surplus (+) or deficit (−)	Cumulative public debt at end of administration
George Washington	8	$32,665,765	$34,088,506	−$1,442,741	$83,762,172
John Adams	4	34,984,839	34,262,668	+722,171	82,976,294
Thomas Jefferson	8	113,400,835	72,424,289	+40,976,546	65,196,318
James Madison (War of 1812)	8	130,311,080	176,473,974	−46,162,894	127,334,934
James Monroe	8	171,895,253	147,237,899	+24,658,054	90,875,877
John Quincy Adams	4	94,831,286	65,427,037	+29,404,249	67,475,044
Andrew Jackson	8	252,061,371	152,969,098	+99,092,273	336,953
Martin Van Buren	4	102,219,579	122,325,262	−20,105,683	5,250,876
Harrison and Tyler [1]	4½	104,430,540	108,904,688	−4,474,148	15,925,303
James K. Polk (Mexican War)	4	123,139,658	175,477,220	−52,337,562	63,061,859
Zachary Taylor	1	43,603,439	39,543,492	+4,059,947	63,452,774
Millard Fillmore	3	163,993,174	140,088,047	+23,905,127	59,804,661
Franklin Pierce	4	282,172,928	225,154,264	+27,018,664	28,701,375
James Buchanan	4	197,716,370	272,933,490	−75,217,120	90,582,417
Abraham Lincoln (Civil War)	4	763,026,123	3,352,380,410	−2,589,354,287	2,677,929,012
Andrew Johnson	4	1,825,248,460	1,578,557,655	+246,690,805	2,545,110,590
Ulysses S. Grant	8	2,670,905,586	2,253,386,783	+417,518,803	2,107,759,903
Rutherford B. Hayes	4	1,225,899,968	1,032,268,057	+193,631,911	2,019,285,728
Garfield and Arthur	4	1,474,023,408	1,027,742,757	+446,280,651	1,578,551,169
Grover Cleveland (first administration)	4	1,474,159,137	1,077,629,099	+396,530,038	1,249,470,511
Benjamin Harrison	4	1,536,450,844	1,412,315,899	+124,134,945	961,431,766
Grover Cleveland (second administration)	4	1,316,948,887	1,441,674,184	−124,725,297	1,226,793,713
William McKinley (Spanish-American War)	4	2,076,208,146	2,093,918,534	−17,710,388	1,221,572,245
Theodore Roosevelt	8	4,676,747,962	4,655,450,515	+21,297,447	1,148,315,372
William Howard Taft	4	2,794,065,060	2,799,211,874	−5,146,814	1,193,047,745
Woodrow Wilson (World War No. 1)	8	24,375,781,688	46,938,260,143	−22,562,478,455	23,976,250,680
Warren G. Harding	2	8,116,239,632	6,667,235,429	+1,449,004,203	22,349,687,758
Calvin Coolidge	6	23,959,941,899	18,585,549,136	+5,374,392,763	16,931,197,748
Herbert Hoover	4	11,453,002,513	15,490,476,656	−4,037,474,143	22,538,672,164
Total, Presidents before F. D. Roosevelt	144½	91,586,076,130	112,203,367,065	−20,617,290,935	22,538,672,164
Franklin D. Roosevelt	12	160,073,270,777	369,791,966,466	−209,718,695,689	258,000,000,000
Grand total, all Presidents	156½	251,659,346,907	481,995,333,531	−203,335,986,624	258,000,000,000

[1] Until 1843 the fiscal year coincided with the calendar year. In the administration of President Tyler, however, it was changed to run from July 1 to the following June 30, thus making President Tyler accountable for 4½ fiscal years instead of 4.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT FISCAL RECORD

Fiscal year	Receipts	Expenditures	Deficit	Public debt
1934	$3,115,554,050	$6,011,083,254	$2,895,529,204	$27,053,141,414
1935	3,800,467,220	7,009,875,312	3,209,408,110	28,700,892,625
1936	4,115,956,615	8,665,645,422	4,549,688,807	33,778,543,494
1937	5,028,840,237	8,177,408,756	3,148,568,519	36,424,613,732
1938	5,854,661,227	7,238,822,158	1,384,160,931	37,164,740,315
1939	5,164,823,626	8,707,091,581	3,542,267,955	40,439,532,411
1940	5,387,124,670	8,998,189,706	3,611,065,036	42,967,531,038
1941	7,607,211,852	12,710,629,824	5,103,417,972	48,961,443,536
Total peace	40,674,639,479	67,518,746,013	27,444,106,534	48,961,443,536
1942	12,799,061,621	32,396,585,098	19,597,523,477	72,422,445,116
1943	22,281,642,709	78,178,885,241	55,987,242,532	136,696,090,330
1944	44,148,926,968	93,743,513,214	49,594,586,246	201,003,387,221
1945 [1]	40,769,000,000	97,954,236,900	57,185,236,900	258,000,000,000
Total war	119,998,631,298	302,273,220,453	182,274,589,155	258,000,000,000
Grand total, Franklin D. Roosevelt	160,073,270,777	369,791,966,466	209,718,695,689	258,000,000,000

[1] Official Budget estimate. All other figures in this table are actual.

These figures show, also, that Mr. Roosevelt by the end of his third term next January 20 will have spent in excess of $250,000,000,000 more than was spent by President Woodrow Wilson, the biggest spender in our history prior to Mr. Roosevelt.

Twelve years of President Roosevelt will have cost us more than one-third of one trillion dollars.

The prevailing economic theory for centuries—and one that always seemed to prove true—has been that a person gets rich or well-to-do by working at something productive and saving a part of the money he earns. Also that a nation becomes prosperous and stays that way by pursuing a similar policy.

Another economic theory has got into circulation of late years, however—the theory that the more a nation spends on nonproductive activities, and the bigger the deficits it rolls up from year to year, the more prosperous it will become.

Preaching from this theory, some economists are assuring us that after we have shot away perhaps three hundred billion in this war we shall glide happily and smoothly into an era of the most abounding prosperity this Nation ever enjoyed.

It is a glamorous prospect. Let us all hope it comes to pass. But we must say that that wasn't what we were brought up to believe about the way for a nation or a person to become well-off.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. BARKLEY. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations (and withdrawing a nomination), which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received and nomination withdrawn, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

ASSAYER IN THE SAN FRANCISCO MINT

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, from the Committee on Finance, I report favorably the nomination of Donald J. Dwyer, of San Francisco, Calif., to be assayer in the mint of the United States at San Francisco, Calif., to fill an existing vacancy.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The report will be received and filed.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I now ask unanimous consent for immediate consideration of the nomination.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The nomination will be stated.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Donald J. Dwyer, of San Francisco, Calif., to be assayer in the mint of the United States at San Francisco, Calif., to fill an existing vacancy.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the nomination? The Chair hears none, and without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the calendar.

FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION—LELAND OLDS

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Leland Olds, of New York, to be member, Federal Power Commission, for the term expiring June 22, 1949.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I ask the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MOORE] if he wishes to discuss this nomination?

Mr. MOORE. Yes; I do.

Mr. WHITE. At this time?

Mr. MOORE. No.

Mr. BARKLEY. Does the Senator wish to discuss the nomination now?

Mr. WHITE. I understood the Senator from Oklahoma to say that he did not care to discuss it at this time.

Mr. BARKLEY. I wish the Senator would speak louder so we can all hear.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. President, I am ready to discuss the nomination at any time when there is a quorum present so that a yea-and-nay vote may be had.

Mr. BARKLEY. There is no quorum present, so we cannot take it up now. The nomination will have to go over.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination will be passed over.

The clerk will state the other nominations on the calendar.

SELECTIVE SERVICE

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Milton E. Ballangee to be Director of Selective Service for the Territory of Hawaii, under the provisions of section 10 (a) (3) of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

POSTMASTERS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask that the nominations of postmasters be confirmed en bloc.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nominations are confirmed en bloc.

THE NAVY

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Navy.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. I ask that the nominations in the Navy be confirmed en bloc.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nominations are confirmed en bloc.

THE MARINE CORPS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Marine Corps.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. I ask that the nominations in the Marine Corps be confirmed en bloc.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nominations are confirmed en bloc.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask that the President be immediately notified of all nominations this day confirmed.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the President will be so notified.

RECESS TO TUESDAY

Mr. BARKLEY. As in legislative session, I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon on Tuesday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 12 o'clock and 53 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until Tuesday, September 5, 1944, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate September 1, 1944:

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

Harry C. Hawkins, of Virginia, to be a Foreign Service officer of class 2, a secretary in the Diplomatic Service, and a consul general of the United States of America.

THE JUDICIARY

Harold Maurice Kennedy, of New York, to be United States district judge for the eastern district of New York, vice Hon. Marcus B. Campbell, deceased.

IN THE NAVY

Capt. Paul Hendren, United States Navy, to be a rear admiral in the Navy, for temporary service, to rank from the 11th day of January 1943.

Capt. Dixwell Ketcham, United States Navy, to be a commodore in the Navy, for temporary service, to continue while serving as commander, Fleet Air Wing 1.

Capt. Julius F. Hellweg, United States Navy, retired, to be a commodore in the Navy on the retired list, for temporary service, to continue while serving as Superintendent, United States Naval Observatory.

Capt. Milton S. Davis, United States Navy, retired, to be a commodore in the Navy on the retired list, for temporary service, to continue while serving as port director, Naval Transportation Service, San Francisco, Calif.

Capt. Charles F. Russell, United States Navy, retired, to be a commodore in the Navy on the retired list, for temporary service, to continue while serving as commander, United States Naval Training Center, Bainbridge, Md.

Capt. Harry A. McClure, United States Navy, to be a commodore in the Navy, for temporary service, to continue while serving as commander, Naval Training Center, Norfolk, Va.

Capt. Schuyler F. Heim, United States Navy, to be a commodore in the Navy, for temporary service, to continue while serving as commander, Naval Operating Base, Terminal Island (San Pedro), Calif.

Capt. Harry A. Badt, United States Navy, to be a commodore in the Navy, for temporary service, to continue while serving as commander, Naval Training Center, Sampson, N. Y.

Capt. Cary W. Magruder, United States Navy, to be a commodore in the Navy, for temporary service, to continue while serving as commander, Naval Training Center, Newport, R. I.

Capt. Robert R. M. Emmet, United States Navy, to be a commodore in the Navy, for temporary service, to continue while serving as commander, Naval Training Center, Great Lakes, Ill.

Capt. Vance D. Chapline, United States Navy, to be a commodore in the Navy, for temporary service, to continue while serving as director, Fleet Maintenance Division, Office of Chief of Naval Operations.

Capt. Frank H. Kelley, United States Navy, to be a commodore in the Navy, for temporary service, to continue while serving as commander, Naval Training Center, Farragut, Idaho.

Capt. Robert S. Haggart, United States Navy, to be a commodore in the Navy, for temporary service, to continue while serving as commander, Naval Training Center, San Diego, Calif.

Capt. Edmund W. Burrough, United States Navy, to be a commodore in the Navy, for temporary service, to continue while serving on the staff of the Commander in Chief, United States Fleet.

Capt. Robert W. Cary, United States Navy, to be a commodore in the Navy, for temporary service, to continue while serving as commander, Naval Training and Distribution Center, San Francisco, Calif.

Capt. John K. Richards, Jr., United States Navy, retired, to be a commodore in the Navy on the retired list, for temporary service, to continue while serving as commander, Officer Training Center, New York.

Capt. Richard A. Warner, United States Navy (MC), retired, to be a medical director with the rank of commodore in the Navy on the retired list, for temporary service, to continue while serving as medical officer in command, Naval Dispensaries, Navy Department, Washington, D. C.

IN THE MARINE CORPS

Brig. Gen. Lemuel C. Shepherd, Jr., to be a major general in the Marine Corps, for temporary service, from the 1st day of February 1944.

Brig. Gen. Graves B. Erskine to be a major general in the Marine Corps, for temporary service, from the 3d day of February 1944.

Col. Robert Blake to be a brigadier general in the Marine Corps, for temporary service, from the 2d day of October 1942.

Col. William A. Worton to be a brigadier general in the Marine Corps, for temporary service, from the 2d day of October 1942.

POSTMASTERS

The following-named persons to be postmasters:

ALABAMA

Lena W. Glover, Margaret, Ala. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

ALASKA

Marie F. Harwood, Platinum, Alaska. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

ARKANSAS

Madia B. Adams, Austin, Ark. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

John H. Long, Donaldson, Ark. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Bertha Clinton Cragar, Grannis, Ark. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Charles E. Watson, Greenway, Ark. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Monroe K. Churchill, Hector, Ark. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Clarence U. Price, London, Ark. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Samuel E. Adkisson, Mount Vernon, Ark. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Bland F. Bryant, Success, Ark. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Charles A. Affholter, Vandervoort, Ark. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

CALIFORNIA

George H. Crooks, Ahwahnee, Calif. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Maud F. Olsen, Yorba Linda, Calif., in place of Ollye Beard, transferred.

CONNECTICUT

Mary B. Hartley, Enfield, Conn. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Henry H. Canfield, North Woodbury, Conn. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

DELAWARE

John B. Derrickson, Ellendale, Del. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Grace E. Bright, St. Georges, Del. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Alma E. Boulden, Stanton, Del. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

HAWAII

Minoru Tanaka, Hana, T. H., in place of Minoru Tanaka. Incumbent's commission expired March 28, 1942.

IDAHO

Harold S. Bailey, Grand View, Idaho. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Clara Hand, Roberts, Idaho. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Alvin L. Ralphs, Rockland, Idaho. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

ILLINOIS

Ivory Bunch, McClure, Ill. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

INDIANA

Marie W. Jarrett, Williamsburg, Ind. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

IOWA

Ruby C. Loes, Alburnett, Iowa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

George Lieb, Atkins, Iowa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Thomas V. Darby, Cresco, Iowa, in place of D. D. Mead, removed.

Katherine A. Clarahan, Harper, Iowa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Agnes M. Workman, Henderson, Iowa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Albert Johnson, Huxley, Iowa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Henry Frost, Laurel, Iowa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Harley J. Greenwalt, Mount Auburn, Iowa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Gayle Snedecor, Rhodes, Iowa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Bessie Mae Rice, Urbana, Iowa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

KENTUCKY

Hollis M. Smith, Fonthill, Ky. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Mossie L. Winters, Twila, Ky. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

LOUISIANA

John A. Ludwig, Grand Isle, La. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

MASSACHUSETTS

Wayne A. Smith, Griswoldville, Mass. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

MICHIGAN

Esther I. Geroux, Bergland, Mich. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

MINNESOTA

Lawrence J. Voight, Clara City, Minn., in place of J. M. Gunter, transferred.

Olive M. Stromgren, Constance, Minn. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Norman C. Worden, Erhard, Minn. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Heziakah H. Wood, Freeborn, Minn. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Edward J. Garrity, McGrath, Minn. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

MISSISSIPPI

Edith M. Hattox, Ecru, Miss. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Willie G. Rogers, Plantersville, Miss. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Lee R. Adams, Sweatman, Miss. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Oleane Wright, Tremont, Miss. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

MISSOURI

Grace L. Smiser, Amsterdam, Mo. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Charles P. Tompkins, Barnett, Mo. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

James D. Kochel, Canalou, Mo. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Margaret Stephens, Clarksburg, Mo. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Arthur M. Hoy, Esther, Mo. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

William O. Morris, Eugene, Mo. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Arvell E. Hightower, Grovespring, Mo. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Irene B. O'Briant, Livonia, Mo. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Mara T. Keevil, Syracuse, Mo. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

John S. Smith, Williamstown, Mo. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

MONTANA

Lawrence E. Osness, Huntley, Mont. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

May M. Beckman, Lame Deer, Mont. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Keith Hane, Power, Mont. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

NEW MEXICO

Herman E. Kelt, Carrizozo, N. Mex. in place of H. E. Kelt, resigned.

Daniel M. Chavez, El Rito, N. Mex. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Floyd L. Cole, Hope, N. Mex. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Lue E. Miles, Vanadium, N. Mex. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Kate M. Wallace, Zuni, N. Mex. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

NEW YORK

Vivian E. Shaw, Chafee, N. Y. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Nellie S. Andrews, Conklin, N. Y. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Anna H. Callahan, Constable, N. Y. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Arthur D. Toomey, Fredonia, N. Y., in place of H. B. Hickey, retired.

Charles Riccardi, Glasco, N. Y. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Helen Wheatley, Greenfield Center, N. Y. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Mortimer E. Clement, Honeoye, N. Y. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

William Light, Morrisonville, N. Y. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

NORTH CAROLINA

Henry A. Sims, Waxhaw, N. C., in place of J. A. Davis, transferred.

OHIO

Inez S. Winget, Edison, Ohio. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

OKLAHOMA

Basil E. McClendon, Bixby, Okla., in place of B. M. Crosby, transferred.

Weldon N. Wadley, Tyrone, Okla. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

OREGON

Roscoe M. Lackey, Fort Stevens, Oreg., in place of C. L. Haines, resigned.

PENNSYLVANIA

Kathryne L. Kline, Adamsburg, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Joseph M. Gallagher, Audenried, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Elva G. Reed, Barto, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Harold Doering, Bethayres, Pa. in place of Harold Doering. Incumbent's commission expired May 6, 1942.

H. Vincent Miller, Bird in Hand, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

John B. Faust, Blandon, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Margaret Darras, Bulger, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Nora Schuch, Cogan Station, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Loren R. Judson, Columbia Cross Roads, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Kathryn McCann, Crabtree, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Pauline M. Barry, Custer City, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Edith May Reph, Danielsville, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Anna M. Warner, Derrick City, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Hope B. Sterner, Dewart, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

William T. Smith, Harrison City, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Helen F. Sheehan, Landenburg, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

George S. Matyas, Jr., Tresckow, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Ruth E. Funk, Washington Boro, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Edward S. Bookheimer, West Point, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Gertrude A. Burns, Winfield, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Jules V. Vanderscott, Wyano, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

SOUTH DAKOTA

Brendan A. Keane, Stephan, S. Dak., in place of J. J. Snyder, resigned.

Agnes C. Maroney, Winfred, S. Dak., in place of H. W. Landwehr, retired.

TENNESSEE

Evie Brasier, Castalian Springs, Tenn. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Hersey B. McKinney, Cedar Grove, Tenn. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Gladys S. Cunningham, Cottontown, Tenn. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Ruby Mathis, Deer Lodge, Tenn. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Lenora E. Parker, Enville, Tenn. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

TEXAS

Ben F. Brooks, Bagwell, Tex. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Gaynell Bond, Donie, Tex. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Luther M. Dye, Graford, Tex., in place of J. P. Luce, transferred.

Charles Smart, Lone Oak, Tex., in place of P. G. Stevens, transferred.

Charles M. Bollinger, Powderly, Tex. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Charles E. Turner, Smithfield, Tex. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

UTAH

Harold D. Roberts, Centerville, Utah, in place of M. S. Porter, resigned.

Margaret C. Hatch, Corinne, Utah. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Florence M. Manning, Hooper, Utah. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

VIRGINIA

Pattie B. Chappell, Carson, Va. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Frank H. Jones, Green Bay, Va. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Matilda W. Campbell, Greenville, Va. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

WASHINGTON

Tollie M. Livingston, Bridgeport, Wash. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Herbert B. Dye, Leavenworth, Wash., in place of G. A Hauber, removed.

Forde Phelps, Mineral, Wash. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Mary C. Nelson, Olalla, Wash. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Walter Jones, Pinehurst, Wash. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Roy H. Hughes, Satsop, Wash. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Ernest E. Riddell, Tracyton, Wash. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Helen M. Walkup, Tukwila, Wash. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

WEST VIRGINIA

Herbert Adkins, Harts, W. Va. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Bessie S. Fisher, Sissonville, W. Va. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

WYOMING

Eva I. Fleenor, Fort Laramie, Wyo. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate September 1, 1944:

ASSAYER IN THE MINT

Donald J. Dwyer to be assayer in the mint of the United States at San Francisco, Calif.

SELECTIVE SERVICE

Milton E. Ballangee to be director of Selective Service for the Territory of Hawaii.

IN THE NAVY

APPOINTMENT FOR TEMPORARY SERVICE

Gail Morgan to be commodore in the Navy for temporary service to continue while serving as commander, Naval Operating Base, Midway.

APPOINTMENTS IN THE NAVY

To be ensign, to rank from January 6, 1941

Clarence F. Avery

To be assistant surgeons with the rank of lieutenant (junior grade), to rank from the date stated opposite their names

Joseph O. M. Thatcher, October 7, 1941.
Edmond P. Larkin, November 22, 1941.
Bothwell Graham 3d, May 26, 1942.
Francis E. Martin, July 6, 1942.
Rider R. Lewis, July 14, 1942.
Byron D. Casteel, July 15, 1942.
Charles B. Tolle, July 1, 1943.
Richard B. Leander, July 8, 1943.
Mark F. Todd, July 10, 1943.
Robert P. Lyons, July 10, 1943.
John F. Kincaid, Jr., July 10, 1943.
Charles W. Harding, July 10, 1943.
John A. Pease, July 10, 1943.
Robert T. Maurer, July 11, 1943.
Edward J. Hagan, July 12, 1943.
Donald B. Freshwater, July 24, 1943.
John R. Cole, January 9, 1944.
V. Dale Alquist, January 13, 1944.
Arthur B. Watts, January 10, 1944.
Joseph F. Rorke, January 20, 1944.
Jackson H. Stuckey, March 6, 1944.
Kenneth G. Jones, April 4, 1944.
Claude E. Arnett, Jr., May 3, 1944.
William B. Ford, May 30, 1944.
William A. Cantrell, June 1, 1944.
James A. Stewart, June 1, 1944.
Frederick G. Dorsey, June 1, 1944.
Dorliska W. Brown, Jr., June 5, 1944.
Charles C. Sprague, June 6, 1944.
Joe B. Stephens, June 6, 1944.
Marvin F. Sherrill, June 7, 1944.
Walter D. Roberts, June 7, 1944.
Malcolm Y. Colby, Jr., June 7, 1944.
Henry G. Gardiner, Jr., June 7, 1944.
Jackson W. Modisett, June 7, 1944.
John R. Weber, June 7, 1944.
Arvin T. Henderson, June 7, 1944.
Jack J. Hatfield, June 7, 1944.
Victor V. Davie, June 7, 1944.
Rolla D. Burghard, June 8, 1944.
Richard L. Mason, June 8, 1944.
William C. Mills, Jr., June 8, 1944.
Walter P. Anthony, Jr., June 8, 1944.
William R. Thornton, June 9, 1944.
James Y. Bradfield, June 10, 1944.
Andrew J. Causey, June 10, 1944.
William H. Thompson, June 27, 1944.
Donald E. Stephens, June 27, 1944.
Irving L. White, June 27, 1944.
Robert H. Mitchell, June 28, 1944.
Marshall M. Searcy, June 30, 1944.
Hugh H. Hanson, July 8, 1944.
Charles F. Climie, Jr., July 26, 1944.
John T. Manning, July 26, 1944.
John D. Conway, July 28, 1944.
John W. Markson, July 28, 1944.
George H. Lawrence, July 28, 1944.
Eugene W. Rumsey, August 5, 1944.
Amos B. Root, Jr., August 5, 1944.
Frank R. Morrow, August 5, 1944.
Donald B. Hull, August 5, 1944.
Adrian B. Goodman, August 5, 1944.
Walter R. Ogden, August 5, 1944.
Franklin J. Grabill, August 9, 1944.

To be assistant paymaster with the rank of ensign, to rank from February 13, 1943

William K. Woodard

To be assistant paymaster with the rank of ensign, to rank from June 9, 1941

James J. Lynch

To be lieutenant (junior grade), to rank from June 1, 1942

Rex W. Warner

To be assistant paymaster with the rank of ensign, to rank from June 19, 1942

William T. Peach 3d

IN THE MARINE CORPS

To be second lieutenants, from date placed opposite each name

Donald G. H. Jaeckels, March 16, 1941.
Kenneth R. Chamberlain, July 16, 1941.
Robert J. Bear, August 4, 1941.
Robert F. Stout, August 4, 1941.
Robert W. Vaupell, August 18, 1941.
Harold G. Schlendering, August 30, 1941.
James B. Maguire, Jr., October 8, 1941.
Clair "C" Chamberlain, October 10, 1941.
John P. Sigman, October 14, 1941.
George F. Bastian, October 16, 1941.
Israel E. Boniske, October 16, 1941.
Brenton G. Myking, October 16, 1941.
Robert O. White, October 16, 1941.
Jack E. Conger, December 16, 1941.
James A. Gilchrist, December 16, 1941.
Oliver T. Koch, December 16, 1941.
Elton Mueller, December 16, 1941.
Lynn H. Stewart, December 16, 1941.
John "E" Hughes, January 9, 1942.
Arnold A. Lund, January 9, 1942.
John B. Maas, Jr., January 9, 1942.
Henry S. Sabatier, January 9, 1942.
Louis R. Smunk, January 9, 1942.
John R. Stack, January 9, 1942.
Robert W. Teller, January 9, 1942.
Joe L. Warren, January 9, 1942.
Joseph W. White, Jr., January 9, 1942.
Eugene A. Trowbridge, February 7, 1942.
Jack L. Brushert, February 9, 1942.
William E. Crowe, February 9, 1942.
Samuel B. Folsom, Jr., February 9, 1942.
Thomas W. Furlow, February 9, 1942.
George L. Hollowell, February 9, 1942.
Samuel Richards, Jr., February 9, 1942.
Leo F. Tatro, Jr., February 9, 1942.
Howard L. Walter, February 9, 1942.
George D. Wolverton, February 9, 1942.
William "B" Freeman, March 12, 1942.
Raymond A. Rogers, Jr., March 12, 1942.
Wallace G. Wethe, March 12, 1942.
Frank P. Barker, Jr., March 14, 1942.
Willard C. Lemke, March 14, 1942.
Carroll E. McCullah, March 14, 1942.
Edward J. Montagne, March 14, 1942.
Clarence H. Moore, March 14, 1942.
Arthur N. Nehf, Jr., March 14, 1942.
Martin B. Roush, March 14, 1942.
Carol D. Dalton, March 17, 1942.
James E. Grubbs, March 17, 1942.
Henry W. Horst, March 17, 1942.
Robert W. Johannesen, March 17, 1942.
William G. Johnson, March 17, 1942.
Francis X. Witt, Jr., March 17, 1942.
William P. Dukes, March 25, 1942.
Jay E. McDonald, March 25, 1942.
John D. Noble, March 25, 1942.
Billie K. Shaw, March 25, 1942.
Joseph F. Wagner, Jr., March 25, 1942.
George B. Herlihy, April 3, 1942.
Dale M. Leslie, April 3, 1942.
William P. Mitchell, April 3, 1942.
James L. Secrest, April 3, 1942.
Gordon L. Alleh, April 23, 1942.
Richard L. Braun, April 23, 1942.
Werlin U. Gray, April 23, 1942.
Clinton C. Basinger, May 1, 1942.
Edmund W. Berry, May 1, 1942.
Howard W. Bollmann, May 1, 1942.
Dan H. Johnson, May 1, 1942.
Billy C. Marks, May 15, 1942.
Frank B. Baldwin, May 22, 1942.
Charles H. Woodley, May 22, 1942.
Robert H. Brumley, June 8, 1942.
Dennis P. Casey, June 8, 1942.
William L. Gunness, June 8, 1942.
Samuel "C" Roach, Jr., June 8, 1942.
John Skinner, Jr., June 8, 1942.
Fred J. Gilhuly, June 18, 1942.
John E. Worlund, June 18, 1942.
Robert E. Kelly, June 19, 1942.
Harold L. Spears, June 19, 1942.
Augustus L. Arndt, June 25, 1942.
Percy F. Avant, Jr., June 25, 1942.
William N. Case, June 25, 1942.
John E. Hays, June 25, 1942.
Archie D. Simpson, June 25, 1942.
Clyde H. Davis, Jr., July 13, 1942.
Richard E. French, July 13, 1942.
Lynn "N" Kelso, July 13, 1942.
Henry M. Turner, July 13, 1942.
Ray K. Wolff, July 13, 1942.
John F. Bolt, Jr., July 18, 1942.
Elmer F. Brooks, Jr., July 18, 1942.
John G. Charbeneau, July 18, 1942.
Reinhardt Leu, July 18, 1942.
Jack M. Wells, July 18, 1942.
John L. Morgan, Jr., July 23, 1942.
Wilbur J. Thomas, July 23, 1942.
Floyd C. Haxton, August 5, 1942.
George Major, August 5, 1942.
Thomas L. Wyatt, August 5, 1942.
Warner O. Chapman, August 11, 1942.

Thomas R. Merritt, August 11, 1942.
Robert Dailey, Jr., September 16, 1942.
Homer L. Daniel, October 16, 1942.
"H" Leverett Jacobi, October 16, 1942.
Richard K. Todd, October 10, 1942.
John D. Curd, November 1, 1942.
Julius F. Koetsch, November 1, 1942.
Robert D. Morris, November 1, 1942.
Paul A. Mullen, November 1, 1942.
Wiley A. Green, November 16, 1942.
Charles "E" Cornwell, December 1, 1942.
Arthur P. Duttenhofer, Jr., December 1, 1942.
Walter A. Petersen, December 1, 1942.
William W. Blakely, August 7, 1943.
Richard R. Breen, from February 4, 1944.
Fred F. Harbin, from May 2, 1944.
Michael D. Benda, from May 2, 1944.
William A. Wilson, from May 2, 1944.
Edwin L. Hickman, Jr., from May 2, 1944.
Howard K. Alberts, from May 2, 1944.
John B. Sullivan, from May 2, 1944.
Robert E. Wagoner, from May 2, 1944.

POSTMASTERS

ALABAMA

Bernice P. Jones, Adger.
Joe Slatesky, Jr., Brookside.
Phoebe E. Johnson, Coatopa.
Herman Poe, Corona.
Joseph A. Russell, Dawson.
Gladys Reaves, Dolomite.
Rosa L. Cothran, Dutton.
Austin M. Causey, Fivepoints.
Thomas D. Noles, Graham.
Joseph W. Smith, Mount Hope.
Bertha O. Burt, Pittsview.
Tinnie Mae McGinty, River View.
Onita E. Wood, Round Mountain.
Mary W. McLain, Salem.
Jessie E. West, Sayreton.
Leona M. Bird, Shelby.
Sarah B. Baker, Shorter.
Ada G. Taylor, Tanner.
Jesse G. Reynolds, Toney.
Francis Dawson Lile, Trinity.
Augustus S. McDermott, Union Grove.

CALIFORNIA

Muriel J. Broman, Alpaugh.
Pearl W. McKamey, Biola.
Homer Clark, Blue Lake.
William M. Wright, Bostonia.
Margaret E. Tann, Brisbane.
Floyd C. Palmer, Campo.
Louise J. Riley, Cardiff-by-the-Sea.
Anna Olds Brown, Chualar.
Edith B. Clark, Clearlake Oaks.
Mildred I. Roberts, Coleville.
Mabel Draper, Columbia.
Dorothy M. Krollpfeiffer, Del Monte.
Emma B. Near, Descanso.
John A. Bryson, Downey.
Christine Haines, Earp.
Beatrice E. Bonsack, Empire.
Frederick H. Robshaw, Encanto.
Laura K. Murray, Esparto.
Eunice C. Dick, Essex.
Rose Stringham, Fenner.
Gladys Head, Garden Grove.
Alta E. Collins, Harbor City.
Juanita M. Casey, Kelso.
Guy E. Thrailkill, Leucadia.
Henry R. Gewe, Los Alamos.
Ramona P. Lansing, Los Olivos.
Archie L. Shelp, Marina.
Phoebe Vickroy, Montgomery Creek.
Harry H. Dietrich, Pleasanton.
Geneva Christofferson, Potter Valley.
Mary E. Shear, Princeton.
Louis R. Riave, Santa Susana.
Selene M. Fair, Santa Ynez.
Amos R. Knupp, Scotia.
LaZella N. Liddell, Sequoia National Park.
Alice DeC. Algar, Stinson Beach.
Harry A. Eckert, Westpoint.
George E. Richardson, Wrightwood.

COLORADO

Anna Christensen, Agate.
Harry E. Cotter, Crowley.
Derrett C. Smith, Kim.
Magdalene Skees, Loretto.
Eileen E. Palmateer, Milliken.
Elmer F. Huitt, Pierce.
Martin F. Mendine, Valdez.
Jessie M. Hanks, Westminster.

CONNECTICUT

Richard Arthur Greiser, Easton.
Edward F. Charter, Ellington.
Lillian M. Maxcy, Mansfield Center.

GEORGIA

Elizabeth M. Carlton, Bolton.
Ralston H. Kinsey, Mayfield.
Willie E. Fulcher, McBean.
M. Wallace Forrester, Mount Airy.
James E. Chambless, Rentz.
Wiley T. Young, Riverdale.
John H. Wood, Rocky Face.
William A. Garrett, Roopville.
Ethline F. Kendrick, Sharon.
Eva L. Ellis, Sumner.
Jewell Morrison, Talking Rock.
Mell S. Rhodes, Taylorsville.
William C. Lively, Waco.
Vera H. Cummings, Warthen.
George L. Sinclair, Waverly Hall.
Julia J. Scott, Williamson.
Nas Paulk, Wray.

HAWAII

Gilbert M. Nakatani, Captain Cook.
James Costa Amarino, Holualoa.
Anna Dubenick, Mountainview.
Manual Silva Ramos, Jr., Paauilo.
Eva Lyman, Pahoa.
Manuel Braga Fernandes, Jr., Puhi.
Ernest Joseph Freitas, Spreckelsville.
Lary Masato Kamada, Waianae.

INDIANA

Cora J. Quinn, Bringhurst.
Nina M. Stokesberry, Camby.
Florence L. Heifner, Charlottesville.
William F. Hilkene, Cumberland.
Raymond M. Cornett, Decker.
Hueston H. Harris, Denver.
Vallie F. Webster, Forest.
Inez Murnan, Fountaintown.
Carrie Kay, Fredericksburg.
William E. James, Harlan.
Beryl Birdwell, Heltonville.
Dayton L. Barkley, Hoagland.
Wilma B. Foster, Kimmell.
Grace Pittman, Laconia.
Enos H. Young, Laotto.
Phyllis G. Plummer, Larwill.
Brian W. Smith, Lebanon.
Elfia E. Leach, Lizton.

IOWA

Georga L. Muenchow, Arcadia.
Peter S. Juhl, Crystal Lake.
George H. Miller, Libertyville.
Magdalene M. Klosterman, New Vienna.
Paul E. Heckathorn, Van Wert.
Charles G. Marquis, Woodburn.

KANSAS

Dora M. Phillips, Belpre.
Burt W. Gilchrist, Bentley.
Merton P. Hill, Benton.
Bertram W. Wernette, Dresden.
Lester A. White, Edwardsville.
John O. Alman, Fontana.
Selma R. Cochran, Ford.
Warren P. Armstrong, Hepler.
George E. Noble, Madison.
Ivah A. Wiles, Muncie.
Francis R. Kaiser, Park.
Blanche Gardner, Plevna.
Anne C. Jordan, Savonburg.
Walter Leroy Kent, Stafford.
Clarence M. Chaney, Stark.
Emma M. Drake, Sunflower.
Eula Dorrell, Treece.
Roy T. Henderson, Winfield.
Nellie M. Spohn, Windom.
A. Frank Goebel, Winona.
Marguerite G. Ryan, Xavier.

KENTUCKY

Lillian F. Burke, Allen.
Darwin C. Wells, Auxier.
Clayton Samples, Bagdad.
Maywood Whitaker, Blackey.
Leonard H. Banks, Burdine.
Coy Oscar Glass, Dunham.
Owen L. Ellis, Dunnville.
Nellie Antis, Fullerton.
Mary B. Garvey, Glencoe.
Nelly B. Jones, Grand Rivers.
Edgar K. Sturgill, Harold.
Alvin Francisco, Hellier.
Frank May, Langley.
Dora E. Pike, Livingston.
Lawrence E. Ratliff, Lookout.
Bailey Kendrick, McAndrews.
Jimmie Lee Oldham, Okolona.
Ethel G. Abbott, Silver Grove.
Alice O. Cannon, Turners Station.
Louise R. McCormack, Waddy.
Irene T. Nickell, Webbville.
Fannie Runnels, West Prestonsburg.
Nellie Stafford, Wurtland.

LOUISIANA

Maud M. Mayes, Ansley.
Thelma M. Humble, Calhoun.
Jeanne H. Crouchet, Carencro.
Jennie O. Parker, Crowville.
Joseph Fenelon Landry, Delcambre.
Vera M. Canady, Eros.
Ruth M. Fairleigh, Holly Ridge.
James A. Duke, Kelly.
Milly G. McCullough, Livingston.
Lena Evasovich, Triumph.

MAINE

Ermine B. Davis, Burnham.
Mae L. Jack, Denmark.
Harland G. Hoffses, Jefferson.
Irma P. Heal, La Grange.
Lilia B. Poland, North Jay.
Mary E. Donnelly, North Vassalboro.
Robert E. Johnson, Perry.
Vera G. Brown, New Sharon.
Phoebe Stevens, Portage.
Violet L. Ballard, West Enfield.

MINNESOTA

Leonard W. Lamppa, Embarrass.

MISSISSIPPI

Sarah B. Hudson, Carpenter.
Nannie R. Strickland, Eden.
Louisa J. Megehee, Escatawpa.
Jerome C. Washington, Pheba.
Frank H. King, Pocahontas.
Douglas R. Butler, Smithdale.
William N. Mangum, Star.

MISSOURI

Anna Lee Byers, Agency.
Martha T. Russell, Bertrand.
Roy D. Holland, Butler.
Clifton C. Thompson, Cainsville.
Frances Ann Brown, Deering.
Genevieve Frakes, De Kalb.
Goldie M. Edmundson, Dudley.
Cornelia Hart, Granby.
Nathaniel Nunnery, Holland.
Hallie M. Swain, Koshkonong.
Mildred K. Bedell, Sumner.

NEBRASKA

Echo M. Ball, Bartlett.
August E. Elam, Falls City.
Elsie Kelly, Greenwood.
Emmet M. Luby, Henry.
Herman T. Fast, Jansen.
Paulus W. Barker, Rising City.
James Jesse Steele, Wayne.

NEW HAMPSHIRE

Clarence A. Morse, Brookline.
Harry H. Atwood, Pelham.
Marion B. Lyman, Silver Lake.

NEW JERSEY

John R. Powell, Alloway.
Margaret G. Walter, Cedar Knolls.
Gertrude Hynes, Colonia.
Joseph R. L. Jackson, Hazlet.
Bessie W. Blutstein, Jersey Homesteads.

James D. Treible, Lafayette.
Helen Moore, Lawnside.
Edward T. Sherwood, Rosemont.
Margaret Butterfield, West Milford.

NORTH CAROLINA

Hattie W. Smith, Atkinson.
Bertha James, Chinquapin.
Ella E. Meshaw, Council.

OHIO

Frank A. Driscoll, Bedford.
Earl N. Tarrier, Bidwell.
Lud E. Treece, Continental.
Charles H. Barth, Fresno.
Roma V. Condrey, Germantown.
Arthur Fisher, Hiram.
John R. Gallagher, Ludlow Falls.
Ruth L. Bergamyer, Somerville.

PUERTO RICO

Luis Lugo, Cidra.
Gloria P. de Leon, Comerio.
Ana Maria Bou, Corozal.
Carmen Julia Quinones, Guanica.
Gustavo Quinones Rieder, Gurabo.
Rosario Santiago, Maunabo.
Gonzalo Colon Campos, Morovis.
Modesta de Vega, Naranjito.
Josefina E. Avila, Patillas.
Providencia R. de Rexach, Rio Grande.
Hortensia Pagan de Berrios, Santa Isabel.
Josefa Alvarez, Vega Alta.

TEXAS

Lois B. Deaver, Bluff Dale.
Emma Johnson, Brookeland.
Ina McCall, Burke.
Hugo Suhr, Cat Spring.
Graves Burke, Cherokee.
Ernst H. A. Schlather, Cibolo.
Henry E. Philippus, Cost.
Winnie G. Tanner, Flomot.
Winola C. Lee, Fritch.
Nora C. McNally, Godley.
Lucile H. Pape, Gregory.
Oscar H. Brent, Hamshire.
Irma Jane Farek, Hockley.
Ouita Schaeffer, Honey Island.
John Marvin Murray, Lyons.
Lottie H. Rector, McCaulley.
Paul D. Davis, Nevada.
Clark C. Coppedge, Ore City.
Edward D. Farmer, Pierce.
Sadie R. Smajstra, Placedo Junction.
Veda G. Evans, Red Oak.
Mattie Cowden, Sandia.

VIRGINIA

Vira B. West, Bandy.
Julia A Powers, Bon Air.
Agnes P. Deans, Churchland.
John S. Allen, Doswell.
Adline Quesenberry, Dugspur.
Nathaniel H. Keezell, Harrisonburg.
Thomas G. Fenwick, Howardsville.
Milton J. Turner, Huddleston.
Lottie M. Gertzen, Iron Gate.
William Burton Adams, Java.
Grover G. Watkins, Lottsburg.
Grace F. Boley, Lynch Station.
Hubert S. Cline, Mount Sidney.
Edgar L. Paisley, Mouth of Wilson.
Mary F. Burks, Natural Bridge Station.
Lulu B. Woodyard, Occoquan.
A. Hyslop LeCato, Painter.
Ruby P. Perdue, Penhook.
Mary E. Holmes, Plasterco.
Julia W. McCann, Roxbury.
William L. Johnston, Somerset.
William E. Hankins, Toano.
Goldie P. Pasley, Trout Dale.
Nancy G. Dunn, Vernon Hill.

WITHDRAWAL

Executive nomination withdrawn from the Senate September 1, 1944:

POSTMASTER

PENNSYLVANIA

Ruth E. Funk to be postmaster at Washington, Pa.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

FRIDAY, SEPTEMBER 1, 1944

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou whose wondrous name is love and mercy, we pray Thee to make Thy sanctuary in the hearts of men; enable them to behold the undying truth in Thy law. In the ebbing tides of this week, fill the recesses of our souls with deep spiritual power which provides strength and courage to keep us undaunted and true in our mission. More and more may we learn to walk undismayed in temptation and adversity, inspired by the might of moral manhood and womanhood. O lift us into that full life in which there is no pettiness or ignoble ambition as revealed in the earthly life of our Lord.

Make our country Emanuel's land, where there shall be no strife and in which a man is justified by the measure of his sacrifice, interpreting his surplus as another's need. Lest America go the way of forgotten nations, cleanse Thou the arteries of our national life and redeem our populous centers from the foulness of poverty, sin, and shame. We bless Thee for all the channels of high privilege with which our land is so richly endowed; O let their ministries of unselfishness reach all classes, reclaiming the ups and downs of human experience. Anoint all citizens with the spirit of obedience and true fellowship whose consummation is freedom from hatred, want, and fear. In the name of Him who said to all men: "Our Father." Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Gatling, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a joint resolution of the House of the following title:

H. J. Res. 306. Joint resolution authorizing the President of the United States of America to proclaim October 11, 1944, General Pulaski's Memorial Day for the observance and commemoration of the death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski.

The message also announced that the Vice President has appointed Mr. BARKLEY and Mr. BREWSTER members of the joint select committee on the part of the Senate, as provided for in the act of August 5, 1939, entitled "An act to provide for the disposition of certain records of the United States Government," for the disposition of executive papers in the following Department:

Department of the Navy.

CITY OF KETCHIKAN, ALASKA

Mr. DIMOND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (H. R. 5144) to authorize the city of Ketchikan, Alaska, to issue bonds in a sum not to exceed $150,000 for the purpose of constructing and acquiring additions and betterments to and extensions of the electric light and power system of said city, and to provide for the payment thereof, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the Delegate from Alaska?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, this is a request of the city itself?

Mr. DIMOND. Yes; it is the request of the city presented through the common council of the city, which is unanimous on the subject. If the bill passes, before the bonds are issued it will be necessary to hold a special election, and the issue must be approved by 51 percent of the registered taxpayers of the city.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. There is nothing in the bill applicable to anything other than that particular city?

Mr. DIMOND. That is quite right.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. The gentleman's committee is unanimous?

Mr. DIMOND. The committee is unanimous, and the report was made by the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ANGELL].

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the Delegate from Alaska?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the city of Ketchikan, Alaska, is hereby authorized to issue and sell its bonds in an amount not to exceed $150,000, for the purpose of constructing and acquiring additions and betterments to and extensions of the electric light and power system of said city.

SEC. 2. Before said bonds shall be issued, a special election shall be ordered by the common council of the said city of Ketchican, Alaska, at which election the question of whether such bonds shall be issued, in an amount not exceeding the amount above specified and for the purposes hereinbefore set forth, shall be submitted to the qualified electors of said city of Ketchikan, Alaska, whose names appear on the last assessment roll of said city for purposes of municipal taxation. The form of the ballot shall be such that the electors may vote for or against the issuance of bonds for the purposes herein specified up to the amount herein authorized. Not less than 20 days' notice of such election shall be given to the public by posting notices of same in three conspicuous places within the corporate limits of the city of Ketchikan, Alaska, one of which shall be on a bulletin board in the public lobby of the United States post office at Ketchikan, Alaska. The election notice shall specifically state the amount of bonds proposed to be issued and the purposes for which said bonds are to be issued. The registration for such election, the manner of conducting the same, and the canvass of the returns of such election shall be, as nearly as practicable, in accordance with the requirements of law for general and special elections in said municipality; and such bonds shall be issued for the purposes herein authorized only upon the condition that not less than 51 percent of the votes cast at such election shall be in favor of the issuance of said bonds for such purposes.

SEC. 3. Said bonds shall be authorized by resolution or ordinance of the common council, and may be issued in coupon form, and may be made registerable as to principal alone or as to both principal and interest under such terms and conditions as the common council shall provide. Said bonds shall be dated and shall be in such denomination or denominations, and may mature in such

amounts and at such time or times not exceeding 20 years from the date thereof, and may be payable at such place or places as the common council shall determine. The said bonds may be made redeemable either with or without premium, in the discretion of the common council, and may be sold at public or private sale. Said bonds shall be signed by the mayor and clerk of the city of Ketchikan, Alaska, and shall have impressed thereon the official seal of said municipality, and the coupons annexed to said bonds representing interest to be payable thereon shall be signed with the facsimile signatures of said mayor and clerk. Said bonds shall bear such rate or rates of interest as the common council shall determine. In the event any of the officers whose signatures or countersignatures appear on said bonds or coupons shall cease to be such officers before delivery of such bonds, said signatures or countersignatures, whether manual or facsimile, shall nevertheless be valid and sufficient for all purposes the same as if said officers had remained in office until such delivery.

SEC. 4. The bonds herein authorized shall be general obligations of the city of Ketchikan, Alaska, and the mayor and Common Council of the City of Ketchikan are hereby authorized and directed, in the resolution or ordinance authorizing the issuance of said bonds, to pledge to the payment of the principal and interest thereof the full faith and credit of the city of Ketchikan and to obligate the city, if necessary, to levy taxes upon all the taxable property within said city for the payment of the principal and interest of said bonds as and when the same become due and payable, without limitations as to rate or amount.

SEC. 5. In addition to the pledge of the taxing power contained in section 4 hereof, the mayor and common council are hereby authorized and directed, in the resolution or ordinance authorizing said bonds, to pledge to the payment of said bonds and the interest thereon the revenues, income, receipts, and profits derived by the city of Ketchikan from the ownership, management, and operation by said city of the electric light, power, water, and telephone properties and all additions and betterments to and extensions thereof remaining after the payment of the expenses of operation and maintenance of said properties and reserve for depreciation and prior pledges of such revenues. In the resolution or ordinance authorizing the issuance of said bonds of the Common Council of the City of Ketchikan is authorized to covenant with the holders from time to time of the bonds issued hereunder as follows:

(a) That the city will maintain and operate the public utility properties of the city hereinbefore mentioned in an efficient and economical manner;

(b) That the city will fix, establish, and collect rates, tolls, rents, and other charges for all commodities, services, or facilities sold, furnished, or supplied by the city through said public utility properties adequate to provide revenues, income, receipts, and profits sufficient to pay the expenses of operation and maintenance of said properties and to provide reasonable reserves for depreciation, and for the payment of the principal of and interest on all bonds payable from such revenues and all other charges and expenses whatsoever which may be or become a charge on such revenues;

(c) That the city will keep all the revenues, income, receipts, and profits arising from the ownership, management and operation of the public utility properties by the city in a fund separate and apart from all other funds of the city to be collected, held, and disbursed in such manner as the city may provide in the resolution or ordinance authorizing the issuance of bonds hereunder;

(d) That the city will not thereafter issue any bonds, notes, or other evidences of indebtedness payable from such revenues, except within such limitations as may be prescribed in such resolution or ordinance;

(e) That the city will not thereafter issue any bonds, notes, or other evidences of indebtedness payable from such revenues which would be a prior lien or charge upon said revenues over the bonds issued pursuant to such resolution or ordinance;

(f) That the city will provide a special fund for renewals and replacements to the public utility properties into which fund the city shall pay sums from the revenues of said properties in such amounts as may be specified in said resolution or ordinance;

(g) That the city will not sell, lease, or otherwise dispose of any or all of said public utility properties without then or theretofore making provision for the payment of the bonds authorized by this act;

(h) That the city will keep books and accounts with respect to the operation of said public utility properties in such manner as prescribed by the Federal Power Commission governing municipal licenses and provide for the periodic audit of such books by certified public accountants who shall report on such operations;

(i) That the city will provide for periodic examinations of the public utility properties of the city by an engineer or firm of engineers who shall report thereon at such times as shall be prescribed in said resolution or ordinance; and

(j) That the city will do and perform such other acts and take such other proceedings as may be necessary to more fully secure the payment of the bonds authorized by said resolution or ordinance as shall be deemed advisable by the common council.

SEC. 6. Upon the sale of any bonds authorized by this act, the city of Ketchikan shall provide for the payment of the proceeds thereof into a special fund which shall be used for no other purpose except as specified in this act, and said bonds may be sold all at once or from time to time as the Common Council of the City of Ketchikan shall direct.

SEC. 7. The city of Ketchikan is hereby authorized to enter into contracts with the United States of America or any agency or instrumentality thereof to obtain a grant or loan of money funds to aid in the construction of the additions and betterments to and extensions of the public utility properties of the city authorized by this act, and is further authorized to expend surplus moneys in the treasury of the city from the revenues of said public utility properties for such purpose.

SEC. 8. The provisions of this act and of any resolution or ordinance authorizing the issuance of bonds hereunder shall constitute a contract with the holders of such bonds from time to time, and the provisions thereof and hereof shall be enforceable by any owner or holder of said bonds by mandamus or by any other appropriate suit, action or proceeding at law or in equity in any court of competent jurisdiction.

SEC. 9. This act shall be complete authority for the issuance of the bonds herein authorized, and shall be liberally construed to accomplish its purposes. Any restrictions, limitations, or regulations relative to the issuance of bonds by the city of Ketchikan, Alaska, contained in any other act shall not apply to bonds issued under this act, and any act inconsistent herewith shall be deemed modified to conform with the provisions of this act for the purposes of this act only.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXPLOSIONS AT PORT CHICAGO, CALIF.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 5181) to provide a method for compensating certain individuals for damages sustained as the result of the explosions at Port Chicago, Calif.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, it is understood that the gentleman has a couple of amendments there.

Mr. CARTER. Yes; in fact, I have three amendments which I am going to offer.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Navy is authorized and directed to make a thorough investigation of the merits of those claims against the United States for compensation for property damage, death, or personal injuries alleged to have been caused by the explosions which occurred at the naval magazine at Port Chicago, Calif., on July 17, 1944, which shall have been submitted to the Navy Department in writing within 6 months after the date of enactment of this act.

SEC. 2. The appropriations for the Naval Establishment for the fiscal year 1945 shall be available for payment, and payment is hereby authorized, upon approval of the Secretary of the Navy or his designate, of claims referred to in section 1 hereof (a) for disability or death resulting from personal injury sustained by persons not then members of the armed forces or civilian employees of the United States: *Provided*, That settlements shall not aggregate in excess of $5,000 with respect to the disability or death of any one person nor shall any such settlement be made in amounts which would not be allowable, or for beneficiaries who would not be eligible, under the United States Employees' Compensation Act, as amended, if the disabled or deceased person were an employee of the United States; or (b) for property loss or damage: *Provided*, That settlements shall not aggregate in excess of $5,000 for any one claimant.

SEC. 3. Any settlement made under the provisions of section 2 hereof shall be in full settlement of all such claims against the Government of the United States.

SEC. 4. In connection with any settlement authorized by section 2 hereof, the Secretary may require assignment to the United States of any right of action against third parties arising from the death, injury, or property damage with respect to which such settlement is made.

SEC. 5. The Secretary of the Navy shall transmit to the Congress each claim submitted the Navy Department in accordance with section 1 hereof not settled by him, with supporting papers and a report of his finding of facts and recommendations thereon and also a report of each claim settled and paid by him pursuant to section 2 hereof. Such reports shall contain a brief statement of the character and justice of each claim so transmitted or settled, the amount claimed, and the amount found due.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CARTER: On page 2, line 11, strike out "$5,000" and insert "$3,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, I offer another amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CARTER: On page 2, line 17, after the word *"Provided"*, strike out the remainder of line 17 and all of line 18 and insert "That settlement shall not be made in excess of $3,000 for injury to any one building or structure."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. ROLPH. Mr. Speaker, I wish to take this opportunity to congratulate my colleague the gentleman from California [Mr. CARTER] for the bill he has just introduced, and I want to thank the Members of the House for passing it unanimously. This legislation will bring much relief to the people in an area surrounding Port Chicago, Calif., who suffered through the blast that happened there a few weeks ago. The gentleman's district adjoins mine. Everyone in San Francisco is deeply distressed over the suffering that has been caused. Many of my constituents had friends and relatives in the area. I feel that every person in California will be grateful indeed to the gentleman from California [Mr. CARTER] for this legislation, and which the House has just adopted.

POSTAL SERVICE

Mr. BURCH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (H. R. 5154) relating to dual employment in the Postal Service, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman explain what the bill accomplishes?

Mr. BURCH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, this is a bill which comes in with the unanimous approval and recommendation of the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads. It simply provides that the Post Office Department may use laborers or mail handlers as substitute mail carriers in the railway service when it is needed.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. It is necessary because of the shortage of labor?

Mr. BURCH of Virginia. Yes.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 1 of the act of March 1, 1929, entitled "An act for the relief of present and former postmasters and acting postmasters, and for other purposes" (45 Stat. 1441), as amended (39 U. S. C., 1940 ed., Supp. III, 136), is amended to read as follows:

"When in the judgment of the Postmaster General the needs and interests of the Postal Service so require he may employ mail messengers and postal employees in a dual capacity, or assign extra duties to such mail messengers and postal employees; and, notwithstanding the provisions of sections 1763, 1764, and 1765 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (U. S. C., title 39, secs. 58, 69, and 70), compensation shall be paid to such mail messengers and postal employees for such services at the rate provided by law for such services."

With the following committee amendment:

On page 2, line 4, strike out "39" and insert "5."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

POLAND

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, on this, the fifth anniversary of Poland's entry into this tragic war, it must be a source of great satisfaction not only to the people of Poland but to Polish people everywhere throughout the world to realize that their day of deliverance is near. The courage and fortitude shown by the Polish people has been and will continue to be an inspiration to all freedom-loving people everywhere. God grant that the awful suffering heroically endured during the past 5 years may soon be forgotten in the dawn of a happier day. We join with you today in sympathy and affection, praying that God may heal your wounds and when the war ends give you strength and courage to join the other freedom-loving nations of the world in establishing a just, honorable, and lasting peace.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HART. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a Synagogue of Rome broadcast.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. HART. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the gentleman from New York [Mr. MERRITT] I ask unanimous consent that he be permitted to extend his remarks in the RECORD and to include a short newspaper article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include Westbrook Pegler's column of Wednesday, August 30, 1944, carrying the caption "French Reds assume role of liberators."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

REDS FAIL WARSAW PATRIOTS

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and extend and revise my own remarks in the RECORD at this point.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the "black day" in the history of modern Poland is September 1, 1939. Today, September 1, 1944, we enter into the sixth year of this global war. It was September 1 of 1939 that Hitler selected to invade the peaceful nation of Poland and unleashed his fiendish and barbarous hordes upon the fertile plains of the land of my forefathers. Though a small nation and outnumbered by greatly superior forces, the people of Poland rose in rightful indignation and resisted the greatest war machine ever assembled in the history of the world up to that time. The Polish Government had rejected Hitler's proposal for a joint attack on Russia and, because of that refusal, Hitler unleashed his hordes on Poland.

The defense of Poland's capital, Warsaw, by Mayor Stefan Starzynski is a debt that can never be repaid by the United Nations because the precious time Starzynski and his heroic defenders purchased with their lives gave the United Nations the opportunity to marshal their forces. For the past 5 years Polish patriots have never ceased to fight the hated Nazis. That fight is going on today right in the city of Warsaw. In fact it was on August 1 of this year that the Warsaw units of the Polish Home Army attacked the German garrison of Warsaw, seized strategical key points of the city, and since that time have been fighting an unequal struggle with the German occupants. Armed with rifles, hand grenades, and machine guns they face an enemy equipped with all means of modern warfare, artillery of all calibers, mortars, flame throwers, tanks, and numerous planes.

In doing so they were prompted by the swift approach of the Soviet troops, which at the time had opened the siege of Warsaw, shelling its eastern suburbs, and by the necessity of saving the city from deliberate destruction by the retreating German armies. Numerous previous appeals to the Polish people, broadcast by the Soviet radio, to rise in arms and to liberate the city of Warsaw from the German yoke were also an important factor which precipitated the uprising.

The hopes of the Warsaw people, that the Germans would be forced to abandon their city as a result of joint Polish-Soviet military operations, have not been fulfilled up to the present.

The Russians not only failed to advance on the Polish capital, but to the greatest surprise of the fighting Warsaw soldiers and of the Poles everywhere, have not given to the struggling patriots any help whatsoever. The Red air force neither bombed German artillery positions, dropped badly needed supplies, nor gave to the Poles any fighter protection against constant aerial bombardment by the Luftwaffe.

The Allied air forces consisting of British, American, as well as Polish planes, which dropped to the besieged Polish forces in Warsaw munitions, armaments, and supplies were forced to make flights from distant bases at a

heavy cost in human lives and planes. These supplies thus delivered covered but an insignificant part of the needs of the Polish troops fighting in Warsaw.

Had the airfields in the part of Poland already occupied by the Red Army been used for this purpose, some of them at a distance of only 20 minutes' flight from the Polish capital, the plight of the besieged Poles could have been greatly alleviated and casualties among Allied airmen considerably reduced.

Unable to break the spirit of the Warsaw fighters, the German fury turned against the helpless civilian population. At least 150,000 of them have been driven out from residential sections, chased to the open-air camp at Pruszkow—10 miles west of Warsaw where they are held for weeks without food, water, or shelter. Thousands of them are perishing daily from untold sufferings, thousands more are being murdered and their homes burned.

On the occasion of the 3d of May of this year—the Polish Constitution Day—183 Members of the Senate and House of the Congress of the United States paid tribute to the Polish people and to their great ancestors, who 153 years ago tried to forge a better future for the Polish Nation.

Today the same nation is again fighting for its freedom and for the survival of civilization and democracy. It is the duty of every free man in the world to raise his voice in defense of the fighting and dying people of Warsaw. Help for them is the more urgent as the life and the whole future of hundreds of thousands of people, best in their nation, is at stake.

In this gravest hour of Poland's history the whole influence and moral prestige of the Senate and House of the Congress of our great American Nation should be used in order to bring about by all possible means immediate and efficient aid and assistance to the fighting soldiers of Warsaw and to its civilian population which faces complete annihilation.

On the fifth anniversary of the German attack on Poland, the Polish capital cannot be left unaided as it was in 1939. Aid should be given to Warsaw if the ideals for which this war is being waged, are to be preserved, if the most primitive principles of human justice and decency are to survive, and if staggering losses in lives are not to be suffered in vain.

On the eve of the victory of the United Nations over barbarous Germany, the people of Warsaw must at any cost be saved from annihilation for otherwise grave political consequences would overshadow the fruits of victory.

It has been estimated that approximately 5,700,000 liberty-loving Poles have been exterminated, of which 2,500,000 are of Jewish faith. The sacrifices and the sufferings of the Polish people for the past 5 years should be remembered on this, the anniversary of the "black day" of the history of modern Poland, and the combined voices of the people of America and the other United Nations should be raised in one huge cry of demand upon the Reds that they do not continue to fail the gallant patriots of Warsaw in their struggle for liberation.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

(Mr. O'NEAL asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FURLONG. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial appearing in yesterday's Evening Star.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD on the subject of Guam and include therein extracts from testimony given.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Tuesday next, after the disposition of business on the Speaker's desk and other special orders, I may address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROLPH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that today, after the disposition of the other special orders, I may address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks on this day, September 1, the fifth anniversary of the war against Poland.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

SEPTEMBER 1, 1939, AND SEPTEMBER 1, 1944, TWO MEMORIAL DATES IN THE HISTORY OF POLAND

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, as was stated by the gentlewoman from New Jersey [Mrs. NORTON] and the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. LESINSKI], 5 years ago the world was astonished by the broadcast of alarming news—the Nazi attack on Poland. For the first time since Hitler assumed dictatorial power over Nazi Germany, with the conspirative determination to dominate the world, he was met with the first armed resistance. For 35 days the whole civilized world followed the unequal struggle of the heroic Polish Army and the gallant nation with the despotic Prussian colossus, and the heroic defense of Kutno, Lwow, Modlin, and Warsaw will remain in history as an example of unparalleled heroism.

After 5 years of continuous struggle and sacrifices of more than 6,000,000 of human lives, Warsaw of today is fighting the uneven battle with the German might. Five years ago Warsaw Poles answered the call to arms of their patriotic mayor and defender of Warsaw, Stefan Starzinski; likewise today at the command of General Bor they have taken up arms in open uprising to break the chains of their German tyrannical bondage.

I am sure that there is no one who regrets more than I that Poland and other small nations of Europe were so ruthlessly despoiled of their liberty, and deplore that these freedom-loving nations became victims of the Hitler-Nazi barbarism, because, as some of you who are still here may remember, it was my good fortune and honor to aid in the liberation of Poland and other suppressed European nations from the brutal Prussian, Austrian, and Russian despotism during the First World War and helped them to attain the freedom for which they have struggled for centuries.

Today, commemorating the fifth anniversary of Poland's struggle for liberation and self-determination, I am confident that in the short period of a few weeks, yes, I hope in a few days, Warsaw and Poland again will be set free and her sacrifices will not have been made in vain and that she again will assume her place of honor among the civilized nations of the world.

Just a few days ago, since the advance of the Allied victorious armies nearing the German borders, almost unbelievable reports are coming to us describing the tragic deaths of millions of Polish and other peoples who were the victims of the Hitler-Nazi murderers. The concentration camp at Maidanek became a cemetery of more than 1,500,000 persons from nearly every country of Europe who were killed and tortured by the Germans during the last 3 years of occupation. When the Russian Army came into Lublin, skeletons of thousands of persons were discovered which the Germans did not have time to burn. Judging by the reports appearing in the daily press of the last few days, the tale of destruction and death constitute crimes for which the Germans must be held responsible. They have been the most heinous, atrocious, and gruesome ever perpetrated in the history of mankind. The immensity of all these German crimes and annihilations will be brought to light and the deserved punishment of the murderers will be had.

But notwithstanding the fact of all these sacrifices, today, as we did 5 years ago, we hear how the heroic Polish Army,

Navy, and Air Force is demonstrating to the whole world its determination to carry the struggle for freedom and liberty not only for the salvation of their native country—Poland—but for all other brutally suppressed and enslaved nations of the world.

I am hopeful, yes I feel that Poland will again be restored to its pre-war historical rights and greatness, and I as one in my humble position will oppose and resent any unfair or unjust action that may delay the early restoration of Poland.

Mr. Speaker, I have the utmost confidence and assurance that our great President, Franklin D. Roosevelt, who proclaimed that the Atlantic Charter will light the way toward a just and lasting peace settlement, will show and prove beyond doubt, when the last Nazi is driven from Polish soil, his interest, friendship, and influence in behalf of Poland. The United States and the nations of the world recognize the support given by the armed forces of Poland to the United Nations armies and navies.

Today the guerrilla units in Poland organized from its soldiers and civilians are waging valiant and effective opposition to Nazi hordes; another unit composed largely of Polish regulars is concentrated in Great Britain and most of them now are fighting shoulder to shoulder with the Americans, British, and French in France, and still other large numbers of Polish soldiers have taken their stand with the Americans and the British on the Italian front, serving as a distinct Polish unit and driving the Nazi from that country.

Mr. Speaker, I deem it proper to give Poland's contribution toward the cause of the United Nations constituting as she does one of its allies. Since the beginning of the war Poland's losses on the battlefields have numbered 900,000 soldiers, in occupied Poland the losses including civilians and military have approximated 5,700,000, making a total of 6,600,000 casualties which amounts to nearly 20 percent of the total pre-war population of the country.

Poland has suffered greatly and has done her share in the United Nations' struggle to maintain democracy and freedom. Her liberty and freedom was obtained with the lifeblood of her citizenry, and I have the utmost confidence that President Roosevelt, who has always demonstrated his friendship for the Polish people and who knows of their aspirations for freedom and independence will, when the time comes, champion the recognition of the rights of Poland and its restoration to the place of honor among the nations of the world so that the sacrifice of the millions of lives to the cause of humanity, democracy, and freedom will not have been made in vain.

EFFECT OF PEACE ON FARMERS' MARKETS AND PRICES

Mr. DILWEG. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. DILWEG. Mr. Speaker, the possibility of an early defeat of the Axis Powers in Europe threatens to change the position of the farmer who has had very little difficulty in disposing of his produce. Farmers, generally, are beginning to worry about the possible effect of peace on their prices and markets.

Since the peak need for production is passing, one of our biggest domestic problems will be the burden of supporting prices for the farmers. In the future, supplies may exceed demands in the case of many commodities for which price support must be given. In order to sustain market prices and support levels under such conditions, greatly increased price-support activity will undoubtedly be required. Techniques will have to be developed for supporting the prices of commodities, such as, chickens, turkeys, milk, and butterfat, for which very little price-support activity has heretofore been necessary. The accompanying problem of handling, storing, and disposing of the large stocks of commodities that will undoubtedly be acquired will have to be solved.

All this indicates, I think, that the task of supporting farm prices under such circumstances will be a much more difficult and challenging task than it has thus far been, and is today. Congress and the administration must anticipate the needs of the farmer with the same foresight and action now aimed at the needs of industry and labor.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include in my extension of remarks a timely editorial which appeared recently in the Milwaukee Journal:

TOO MUCH FOOD

American agriculture, like industry, has shown that it can produce whatever this country needs in peace and war. Our agriculture can do it, even with the handicap of manpower and farm-machinery shortages.

The major food problem facing the Government today is surpluses—vast stores that apparently will not be needed, unless they find outlets through the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration. This seems to be true for about everything except butter.

There are several reasons for the surpluses. The first is that in war you have to plan to produce too much of everything. You don't know what your losses will be. You plan for the worst.

Only losers can come out even or be short. Victors must always approach the end of a war or reach it with surpluses. They will have food uneaten, guns unfired, planes unflown, ships unfinished and unused. War is waste, and it may mean more waste for the victor than for the beaten aggressor. Of course, there were mistakes—in small-arms planning, in tank and plane production, in parts of the food program—but the over-all results were, and are, successful.

Another factor in food surpluses is this, as the War Food Administrator says: "You can't turn off agriculture like you can a switch in a munitions plant. You can't turn off a cow or a growing crop."

Our biggest domestic problem, of course, will be the burden of supporting prices for the farmers, now that the peak need for production is passing. That is bound to be a growing headache, but the country will, in some way, meet it fairly.

Where are those faint-hearted or hysterical prophets of doom, like Louis Bromfield, who told the Nation not many months ago that it would soon face starvation? Where are the others, cattlemen and some few in the food industry, who—either for political purposes or because they sought greater subsidies for themselves—painted lurid tales of bread lines and empty American tables?

We are on the road to victory, and we have—as we must and should have—too much food. That's the way to win a war.

The side that has no extra ammunition and no surplus of food is the side that will accept unconditional surrender.

We set these obvious conclusions down merely in the hope of contributing something toward keeping the record straight. Somebody, some of these days, is going to try to make a lot of political capital out of food surpluses.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

MR. WILLIAM PHILLIPS

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

Mr. Speaker, there is no connection whatever between Mr. William Phillips' resignation from General Eisenhower's staff and the unauthorized publication of views he had communicated to the President concerning India. When Mr. Phillips was first assigned to London, the Secretary of State advised the press on September 8, 1943, that his assignment was for a temporary period. The British Government was at that time confidentially advised that Mr. Phillips would be doing special work in connection with the planning of the invasion of the Continent and that it was contemplated that he would remain in London only during the planning period.

In April 1944, Mr. Phillips indicated that his work was approaching completion and that before long he would wish to resign for personal reasons and return to the United States. On July 10, 1944, Mr. Phillips wrote specifically that he wished to return in September 1944. The Secretary of State reluctantly agreed to his request.

It was only on July 25, 1944, that the unauthorized publication of certain of his views on India occurred.

Neither the British Government nor the Indian Government has ever requested or even suggested Mr. Phillips' recall, either here or in London.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. MAAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Tuesday next after disposition of business on the Speaker's table and at the conclusion of any special orders heretofore entered I may be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. NORMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include an editorial from the Mount Vernon (Ohio) News.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. CASE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Thursday next after disposition of business on the Speaker's table and at the conclusion of any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

There was no objection.

POLAND

Mr. GRANT of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. GRANT of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, 5 years ago today Hitler attacked valiant Poland and World War No. 2 began. We enter this sixth year of the war with every hope that it will be the last.

Millions upon millions of Americans in uniform have carried the battle to every quarter of the globe. They, together with our allies, today pursue the enemy on every front.

Next Monday is Labor Day. I want to take this opportunity to salute the workers in American industry, on our farms, in our offices, and on our transportation systems—all who have contributed to that never-ending stream of planes and tanks and guns and ships that have made our victories possible.

With but scattered exceptions the workers in American industry have stayed on the job and with a quiet determination have made possible the miracle of American production that has astounded the world. That is especially true in the district which I have the honor to represent.

Labor Day 1944 would see more unity among organized labor and among the American people if Sidney Hillman and his little carbon copies had not been dragging their feet. That the American workers have done so much in the face of such handicaps as have come from this sprinkling of noisy, irresponsible leadership is an additional tribute to them.

We salute them on this Labor Day.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on the subject of the anniversary of the attack on Poland.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that today following any special orders heretofore entered I may be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

THE WAR DEPARTMENT ORDER OF NONSEGREGATION

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I have always tried to cooperate with the War Department and it is a matter of keen regret that southern Members of Congress and the southern white people have had to protest against a certain action recently taken by that Department.

The distinguished gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] placed in the RECORD a few days ago a recent order of the War Department regarding segregation of races. This order opens up all the exchanges, all the transportation facilities owned or operated by the Government or governmental agencies, and all motion-picture theaters in all Army installations to the indiscriminate use of Negroes and whites. This order was issued, notwithstanding the fact that in all Army camps and posts, as I understand, there are separate accommodations already installed at great expense for each race. There was no necessity whatever for this order.

Mr. Speaker, this is a slap at the South. Everybody knows that. This is a slap at every southern white man wearing the uniform of the armed forces of the United States throughout the world. This is an effort to break down the traditions, laws, and customs of the Southern States. In my opinion it will do more harm and will stir up the race question more than anything else that has been done. This comes at a time when southern white men by the thousands are dying for this country. When we need all the harmony we can get, this order comes, which can have no other effect than to create discord, distrust, and confusion, and is bound to be hurtful to both races. The order is aimed at the South and southern white people. We do not like it. I have sent a formal protest to the President, the Secretary of War, and also to the Adjutant General. I have requested that the order be rescinded. I have always entertained a high regard for the War Department, and I regret exceedingly that it has lent itself to this unholy effort to break down the spirit of the Southland. Certain groups and individuals have repeatedly been striking at the South in this race question, and it is a matter of deep regret to us that the War Department seems to have given impetus to this attack in this order it has issued.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include an editorial by Senator J. C. Nance.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include an article on Poland and 5 years of war.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in two instances in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

(Mr. WASIELEWSKI, Mr. HORAN, and Mr. BLACKNEY asked and were given permission to extend their remarks in the RECORD.)

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial by Mr. Lud Roe, editor and publisher of the Montevideo (Minn.) News, in reply to Mr. Sidney Hillman.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

THE C. I. O. AND THE MIDDLE WEST

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota.

There was no objection.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Lud Roe, editor and publisher of the Montevideo News, so well expresses the reaction of the majority of the people in the Midwest against the appeal by the C. I. O. Political Action Committee to elect President Roosevelt for a fourth term that I feel Mr. Roe's editorial is worthy of being read by every Member of the House of Representatives.

Known as one of the best editorial writers in Minnesota, Mr. Roe so clearly

sees through the flimsy structure of the demagogic appeal by Sidney Hillman and his kind and just as clearly presents in this editorial the reasons why the people of the great Midwest farming areas of this Nation, quoting from Mr. Roe, "Will have no truck with the C. I. O. committee this fall."

IN REPLY TO SIDNEY'S LETTER

The editor of this newspaper got a letter last week from Sidney Hillman, of New York City, who appears to be more active than Chairman Hannegan in the Democratic national campaign. It is flattering to hear from so prominent and potent a person. To make it all the nicer he starts the letter with "My Dear Friend."

Admittedly there is the disturbing thought he might not be interested in us at all if this wasn't election year. He never wrote before. And we have to face the prospect that he may not write in 1945. But why think of such things. Instead, live in the present when "big shots" write letters and call us "dear friend."

An answer is called for. Here it is:

DEAR SID: You ask me to help the National Citizens Political Action Committee which this fall will continue the campaign "already begun by the C. I. O. Political Action Committee" to elect President Roosevelt for a fourth term.

Count us out. I don't believe that your C. I. O. committee holds the key "to assure that hard-won social gains at home and the bloody victories abroad shall not be lost on November 7." This country moves ahead. Its forward progress is not tied to any one political machine; and certainly not yours. If Dewey and Bricker are elected on November 7, and I hope they will be, the United States will continue on its productive way—with the improvements that new blood can bring.

You ask for "suggestions as to how we can make political action a democratic reality across the Nation." One way, Sid, will be to allow citizens free action in their thinking, talking, and voting. It will be done by discouraging class distinction and class distrust. Your C. I. O. committee has seemed to use undue pressure to encourage a hostile feeling; we don't want internal wars after global fighting ends.

Across the country there are men and women of all shapes and sizes who are for Roosevelt, and they are entitled to their beliefs. There are men and women, of many different walks of life, who are for Dewey. Let both function as citizens freely, without being subjected to pressure groups. I have talked with farmers, organized workers, unorganized workers, old folks, white-collar people, housewives, and small business operators who are sincerely convinced it will be a good thing for our country to have a change in national administration.

They are just as interested in keeping social gains at home and not losing the benefits of bloody victories abroad as you are.

From literature sent out by your committee I gather that you believe, or profess to believe, that black days of reaction will set in if your side loses on November 7. This just isn't so. There are a lot of people in this country—more than you think—who are kindly, constructive, open-minded, patriotic; and who are on the other side of the political fence from you.

May I say, Sid, that I don't take stock in the effort to smear you because you are "alien-born." Here in our community are many foreign-born citizens who also take keen interest in politics. They aren't as powerful as you, although their votes will count as big as yours. It is a good thing for the country that they and you take this interest even though foreign-born.

It might surprise you to find out how many of these good people—common, ordinary, the undecorated foot soldiers of peacetime—will have no truck with your C. I. O. committee this fall.

When their views prevail in the National Government, labor and management and capital and the common man will move right ahead. They are convinced, many of them, that their country will move ahead more securely, more soundly, more safely, if your committee loses in this election. I feel that way, too, so I decline your invitation.

But keep on sending your literature; it makes interesting reading, and we can all learn by reading the other fellow's arguments.

Yours sincerely for a better-than-ever America under new leadership.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS] be permitted to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on the matter of oleo versus butter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. CARLSON of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include copies of correspondence with the Department of Agriculture.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

G. I. BILL

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and to include a section of the G. I. bill, and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call again the attention of the Members of the House to the provision in the G. I. bill enacted on June 22, 1944, which provides for the establishment by the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy boards of review whose duties shall be to review the type and nature of discharge or dismissal of men and women from the armed forces. I have already received from former members of the armed forces requests for review under this section. These men were not satisfied with the kind of discharges given them on leaving the service. The War and Navy Departments advise me that boards of review have already been established under this section 301 of the G. I. bill and they will commence to function immediately. Col. George W. Price is president of the War Department Board. Capt. A. B. Anderson is president of the Navy, Marine, and Coast Guard Boards. This is a very important section of the G. I. bill. I have worked to secure the prompt establishment of these Boards. The bill reads as follows:

SEC. 301. The Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy, after conference with the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, are authorized and directed to establish in the War and Navy Departments, respectively, boards of review composed of five members each, whose duties shall be to review, on their own motion or upon the request of a former officer or enlisted man or woman or, if deceased, by the surviving spouse, next of kin, or legal representative, the type and nature of his discharge or dismissal, except a discharge or dismissal by reason of the sentence of a general court martial. Such review shall be based upon all available records of the service department relating to the person requesting such review, and such other evidence as may be presented by such person. Witnesses shall be permitted to present testimony either in person or by affidavit and the person requesting review shall be allowed to appear before such board in person or by counsel: *Provided*, That the term "counsel" as used in this section shall be construed to include, among others, accredited representatives of veterans' organizations recognized by the Veterans' Administration under section 200 of the act of June 29, 1936 (Public Law No. 844, 74th Cong.). Such board shall have authority, except in the case of a discharge or dismissal by reason of the sentence of a general court martial, to change, correct, or modify any discharge or dismissal, and to issue a new discharge in accord with the facts presented to the board. The Articles of War and the Articles for the Government of the Navy are hereby amended to authorize the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy to establish such boards of review, the findings thereof to be final subject only to review by the Secretary of War or the Secretary of the Navy, respectively: *Provided*, That no request for review by such board of a discharge or dismissal under the provisions of this section shall be valid unless filed within 15 years after such discharge or dismissal or within 15 years after the effective date of this act whichever be the later.

The World War Veterans' Committee felt this provision of the G. I. bill would make them very careful in regard to the type of discharge given to the service men and women of our armed services. Only today I am investigating 10 discharge cases.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of the legislative program of today, and following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that today, at the conclusion of the special order requested by

my colleague the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HAYS], I may be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that today, at the conclusion of the special order requested by my colleague the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD], I may be permitted to address the House for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MONKIEWICZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a statement issued by the Polish-American Congress and a letter written to the editor of the New York Times.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the Fort Wayne News Sentinel.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. GORSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on the subject of the fifth anniversary of the invasion of Poland.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate, by Mr. Gatling, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate disagrees to the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 2051) entitled "An act to amend the Social Security Act, as amended, to provide a national program for war mobilization and reconversion, and for other purposes," agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. GEORGE, Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts, Mr. BARKLEY, Mr. VANDENBERG, and Mr. TAFT to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

PRESIDENT'S TRIP TO THE PACIFIC

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, recently I enjoyed the pleasant fellowship of the citizenry of Maine, and in the course of some very humble remarks which I trust are a contribution to enlightenment in this year of decision, I was on a national hook-up. I learned subsequently by telephone from the Associated Press editor at Boston that some observations had been made on the floor in which it was alleged that I used the term that the President was campaigning under false pretenses.

I only want the record to show that the statement which was actually made was that—

> No man should seek the Presidency under a pretense.

I then submitted the record of the Commander in Chief's trip to the Pacific and back as to whether it was within the framework of that observation.

It was correctly carried in the Maine papers. It was correctly carried in the Boston papers. I can readily understand how this mistake could occur, and I must say that our good friend, the majority leader, was not at fault in using the observation that did appear in the Washington paper, but it came about through the release of an incorrect copy of that speech. I do believe, however, that the permanent RECORD ought to show the remarks that were made. I like to be circumspect in my language, and I like to be accurate in my data.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday during debate our friend the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. KNUTSON], in referring to an article the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BRADLEY] said had been written by the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Mrs. LUCE] and which had appeared in a Philadelphia paper, said:

> She did not inform the country that the President was accompanied by a flotilla of battleships, cruisers, and destroyers that should have been out in the far Pacific fighting the Japs.

I talked with Admiral Leahy this morning—and I think all the American people will accept Admiral Leahy's word—and he said, and I quote him, that such a rumor about battleships and cruisers is not correct. As we all know, the President was on a cruiser, but as far as any rumors about any other battleships or cruisers accompanying him on the trip are concerned, that is not correct.

It is best to catch a rumor or a false impression or a falsehood as soon as possible. It is always best to investigate rumors before remarks are made on the floor of the House. I feel that the House is the place to clinch that incorrect rumor and that falsehood. The remarks having been uttered on the floor and my friend having acted upon the rumor, I know in good faith, I am not charging my friend with a falsehood, but the rumor would be a falsehood.

My friend also said:

> Neither did she comment upon the rumor that Fala—

We know that Fala is the President's dog. A lot of people in this country have dogs that they love, and a lot of people admire the President for his affection for his dog.

I repeat:

> Neither did she comment upon the rumor that Fala, that little Scotty dog, had been inadvertently left behind at the Aleutians on the return trip, and that they did not discover the absence of the little doggie until the party reached Seattle, and that it is rumored a destroyer was sent a thousand miles to fetch him.

I am rather sorry that a rumor should be dignified on the floor of the House. However, those remarks were made, so I asked Admiral Leahy again for the purpose of clinching a rumor that is false, because many people might believe it, as many people want to believe things on both sides when a political campaign is on. Admiral Leahy said—and I can quote him:

> The story about the dog is made out of whole cloth. The dog was never lost. The dog was never sent for.

I make this observation just for the RECORD so that the truth will appear and so that the people of the country will know the truth. I am sure that during the course of the campaign when reckless charges are made by anyone, without regard to party, the people will do their own thinking and investigate before they believe.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, knowing the President's affinity for dogs, it was only natural that I should believe that there was some foundation to the story that Fala had been left behind in the Aleutians and a destroyer sent back a distance of a thousand miles to fetch him. Of course, I accept Admiral Leahy's story that no battleships or cruisers accompanied the President as an escort on his trip to Hawaii, but I notice that the Admiral very carefully refrained from mentioning destroyers and aircraft carriers. What about that phase of it? I suggest Admiral Leahy write a letter to the House giving actual facts.

You know, it is not so very long ago that a certain very high-placed American woman made a trip to Australia in a bomber that it is reported had been remodeled so as to permit of the installation of a shower bath. In checking up I found that 43,000 gallons of gasoline had been consumed on the trip by that one plane, assuming that there were no escort planes, and, mind you, that was at a time when the American people were being severely rationed on gas, and farmers could not get gasoline for their tractors nor to take their products to market, and all the time our people were held down to 2 gallons a week. It just did not set good with the man on the street.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KNUTSON. Yes; I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. Why does not my good friend be big enough—I have served

with him for 10 years on a committee, and I know he has great mental capacity when he wants to exercise it affirmatively—and say that he was wrong in believing the rumors and accept Admiral Leahy's word? Why try to get out of this position by trying to create another rumor?

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will wait a moment, I have not completed my remarks. The gentleman from Massachusetts is anticipating, and that is something he rarely does.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for another minute.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Minnesota has already proceeded for 2 minutes. There are others of his colleagues who have special orders and if they have no objection the gentleman may proceed for another minute.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for another minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, if there is no foundation to the doggie story, of course I am happy. The fact nevertheless remains that in a statement made by Drew Pearson in his radio broadcast a week ago, when he said that the President's trip cost the American taxpayers $20,000,000, has not been challenged or denied.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks on three different subjects and to include therein two newspaper articles and one editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. BRYSON] is recognized for 10 minutes.

GOD'S HAND IN VICTORIES

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, the several communities in my district are organizing and otherwise making preparation for the proper celebration of V-Day.

Also, it is very gratifying to note that the Washington Post has been thoughtful enough to encourage through its columns, editorially and otherwise, a religious observance of our anticipated victory. The attitude taken by this great metropolitan newspaper should be followed by the press generally throughout the country.

In the glorious victories of the Allied forces in all of the theaters of war there is cause for great rejoicing, and it is obvious that the Germans and the Japanese will soon be forced to our terms of unconditional surrender; and when that time comes let us be prepared for it, better prepared than we were for the struggle which began when the Japanese hurled their bombs of death at Pearl Harbor.

And when I say prepared, I mean that we should be prepared to give thanks to God, to lift up our hands worshipfully, rather than to engage in any orgy of recklessness, tape and paper throwing, with all of the elements of a Mardi Gras, consumption of champagne, liquor, and other stimulants.

The 300,000 who are casualties in this terrible conflagration, if they could express themselves, might well frown on such demonstrations as are being planned in some communities when the day comes that peace is declared and the awful slaughter of men ceases.

Word comes back from the fighting fronts that there are no unbelievers in the foxholes; there are no atheists. War's awful carnage with its devastating toll of lives has driven away doubts and has caused the G. I. Joes to reach the conclusion that God is in Heaven and that He is watching over them. In that there is a lesson for those who are on the home fronts.

Naturally the victories of our armed forces have brought great joy to our civilians, and possibly their first thought is on a celebration such as we have never had before in our country. Victories have brought to us joy and optimism and assurance that right reigns in the end.

But let us stop, look, and listen. What would our boys want, both those who have made the supreme sacrifice and those who will come back sometime to join again the loved ones they have been separated from so long?

They have seen the stark tragedy of war. They have seen their comrades blown to bits; they have seen the suffering and the blood and grime of war. And they have lifted up their hands in prayers of thankfulness as victories have come. They have thanked God for the guidance, for instilling them with courage to meet the awful tests of hardship and battle.

After peace came in World War No. 1, in most of our cities there were wild, howling crowds bent on celebrating, drunkenness, license, fires, parades, and all that goes with such disorderly demonstrations.

If God's guidance has brought success to the Allied Armies, as it surely has, there should be solemn thanksgiving instead of a wild orgy. I am informed that plans are already being made for celebrations; that committees are being named to arrange programs; that some officials have issued proclamations providing for the closing of liquor stores V-Day and for the placing of property where it will be out of reach of mobs. Proprietors of stores and owners of property have been advised to protect plate and other glass which might be the targets of mobs in such a celebration.

This provision for the protection of property is a judicious one, without doubt, but it does not presage a solemn and prayerful attitude. It means that crowds are expected to surge through the streets and highways with little regard for property.

I doubt very much that the brave men who have given their lives and who have passed on to their reward would approve of any such program of destruction; they saw too much of destruction, of carnage and slaughter when they held the gage of battle. And the living have seen too much of it, and they have well realized that God's watchfulness has been with them, and they feel that there should be ceremonies in which God would be thanked for the blessings bestowed.

The hand of God has been so clear in the battles. The facetious remark credited to Napoleon that the Lord is on the side of the heaviest artillery has little standing when this has been shown in so many battles, in so many instances. It is the more surprising that some have failed to recognize this. Our men in the armed forces know it; they have felt it in their throbbing heads as they struggled forward against a hail of machine-gun bullets. The men in the ranks, the officers, the chaplains—oh yes, they know.

Peace will mean great new problems which will have to be faced. No war has ever thrown industry and life itself so far out of gear as World War No. 2. The tremendous questions which will have to be determined when hostilities cease will require the very highest statesmanship the country has ever known. Wisdom of a high order will be a necessity.

And so as we give up prayers of thanks to God for the blessings of His guidance in the war, and for the splendid victories attained, it is plain that we should offer up prayers for a wise solution of these problems and for wise action on the part of those to whom this great task is entrusted.

As such problems stand before us, we should not engage in a wild celebration such as seems to be planned in some of our communities, but in a dignified and solemn ceremony with an expression of thanks to God for victory and peace.

I think when we consider this question soberly, we all will realize that gatherings in our churches, in our temples of worship, in synagogues and even in the open spaces in which we may raise our voices in prayerful thankfulness for God's watchfulness and care, for the great victories which have come to us in this war, will be far more fitting and suitable than a parade, destruction of property, and a wild orgy of paper and confetti throwing not unlike a carnival.

So, therefore, I feel that the President of the United States should lead us in prayer and thanksgiving. I believe that the President should issue a proclamation at the proper time and fix the time of prayer so that with his leadership we may turn our eyes to Heaven and give thanks to Almighty God for deliverance from our enemies and from the fate their victory would spell.

In joy at victory, many are likely to give little thought to the Lord at such a time. His guidance, it must be remembered, will be just as essential in the carrying out of the peace plans as it was in the triumphant march of our forces to magnificent victory.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. ROLPH] is recognized for 10 minutes.

THE MATSON CO. IS AIR-MINDED

Mr. ROLPH. Mr. Speaker, the Matson Navigation Co., of San Francisco, has developed transportation between Pacific coast ports and Hawaii to the point where it is the equal of ocean travel anywhere in the world. Matson progressed from sail to steam, from tiny brigantines to mighty palatial liners. Matson was ready to serve the Nation when the blow struck at Pearl Harbor. Matson is doing yeoman service in carrying freight tc the South Pacific.

Matson, ever ready to meet changing conditions, ever forward looking, seeks an air franchise to supplement its steamship line to Hawaii. The Civil Aeronautics Board interprets existing law as precluding steamship lines from operating air transport. Congress should act to correct every misunderstanding.

The Pacific American Steamship Association, of San Francisco, writes under date of August 30, 1944:

There is called to your attention the attached clipping from the San Francisco Call-Bulletin of August 29, 1944, concerning post-war air-line services and is in accord with the views of the members of this association.

The article is headed "For air-line service" and reads as follows:

FOR AIR-LINE SERVICE

The Civil Aeronautics Board has interpreted existing law as prohibiting steamship companies from engaging in air transport service. However, the Board will hold a hearing in Washington next week on the application of the Matson Navigation Co. for permission to operate air-line post-war passenger and freight service between San Francisco and Hawaii.

The fact that the hearing is to be held makes it appear the Government is uncertain of the stand it has taken and that it may, after presentation of arguments, reverse its present position.

If the law is that ambiguous there can, of course, be no assurance as to how it may be interpreted by succeeding boards. A steamship company licensed by one board could, after investing large amounts of capital in equipment and facilities, conceivably be held by a later board to be operating in violation of law.

The Congress should take early action to clarify this situation, and the Civil Aeronautics Board should be among the first to request such action. The Board should do this to assure stability and permanence to its own decisions, as well as to remove the element of uncertainty from prospective business operations.

The Congress should remove all doubt by amending the law to make it state specifically that steamship companies are authorized to engage in air service.

This Nation must have a strong peacetime merchant marine, both for purposes of national defense and to carry our commerce to world ports. The surface ships must be augmented by airplanes to permit of competition with the foreign companies that will provide such added service.

If our steamship companies are restricted to operation of surface craft, then they must enter upon post-war operations with two strikes against them.

If this Nation's merchant marine is prohibited from engaging in air transport service, then we will have a merchant marine that is inadequate for our national defense. We will also be insufficiently equipped to carry our merchandise to world markets.

That would necessitate curtailing the amount of our manufactured and grown products, which in turn would be reflected in increased unemployment. The Congress, certainly, is not going to permit of any such foolhardy policy—a policy that would cause strangulation of our national economy.

Mr. Speaker, I sincerely hope that my colleagues in the House of Representatives will give profound thought to this subject which means so much to the future commerce of our Republic.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order, the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES] is recognized for 15 minutes.

LEGISLATION TO ESTABLISH OFFICE OF PRINTING CONTROL

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, a few months ago there appeared in one of our local papers a statement made by the Public Printer, the man who is in charge of our Public Printing Office. Among other things, he said:

We handle all the printing, you know, for all branches of the Government, some $79,000,000 worth, although we farm out about half of it to private printing companies.

It would be interesting to have the following information from the Public Printer. Does the figure include:

First. The printing of bonds, stamps, and all kinds of securities printed at the Bureau of Engraving and Printing, United States Treasury Department.

Second. Work procured direct by departments and agencies of the Government through waivers from the Government Printing Office.

Third. Printing done in agency-owned equipment in Washington and in the field.

Fourth. Contract field printing procured from commercial printers.

Fifth. Work produced in authorized field printing plants owned by the Government.

In a document report made at the request of one of our executive agencies, entitled "Report on the Reproduction and Distribution of Printed Matter for Executive Agencies in the Washington Metropolitan Area," I find this statement:

However, it must be said once again that the basic difficulty is political rather than a straight administrative problem, even though the Government printing bill has risen from approximately $10,000,000 in 1933 to an estimated $300,000,000 for 1943.

There have been many other estimates made as to the total annual expenditures for Government printing that range all the way from $300,000,000 to $1,000,000,000 when all incidental costs are considered. I am informed the total appropriation for printing and binding in the executive departments of the Government for the fiscal year 1945 is approximately $50,000,000. Contrary to the opinion of most people only a small part of the printing done for our Government agencies is done by the Government printing plant. It would interest you to know that about 90 percent of all of our printing is done outside of the Government printing plant.

A number of attempts, at Government expense, have been made to secure figures on the total expenditures of printing and duplicating, but they appear to be unsuccessful. Obviously, no such figures are available. During the past several years a number of studies, and surveys, and investigations have been made at a cost of hundreds of thousands of dollars with a view of solving the confused and complicated Federal printing and duplicating situation. They have included the First Report of the Interdepartmental Committee on Printing and Processing in October 1938. We have a document entitled the "Report on the Reproduction and Distribution of Printed Matter for Executive Agencies in the Washington Metropolitan Area." This document is dated February 1944, and it appears to be the result of a survey made at the request of the Bureau of the Budget. Then there is the report made by the Brookings Institution that appears in Senate Report No. 1275, Seventy-fifth Congress, first session. The document is entitled "Investigation of Executive Agencies of the Government." I do not intend to discuss at length these numerous reports. They all point to the same conclusion. There is no existing centralized agency in the Government with adequate authority for the over-all control of Federal printing in the executive departments or centralized control in each department. The condition is contrary to the intent of Congress as expressed in the public printing law.

The amount of printing and binding expenditure controlled by the direct appropriations made by Congress is only a fraction of the total cost when the cost of material produced on agency-owned equipment and other expenses incidental to printing and duplicating are taken into consideration.

I am reliably informed that one department has a duplicating and printing unit employing 1,000 employees. This same department has a field unit where there are in the neighborhood of 600 duplicating machines. I am also reliably informed that there are innumerable duplicating and printing establishments throughout the Government, both in Washington and the field.

My attention has been called to the number of agencies that publish their own manuals on forms, standardization, and publications. It is difficult for me to understand why such a thing is necessary when the printing and forms problem is basically the same in all agencies. One manual prepared by a central agency should be adequate for the use of all of them.

While the departmental printing situation in Washington represents a tremendous amount of waste, extravagance and duplication from information I have been able to secure, the situation in the field is even more serious. An investigation made in a city of a half million population discloses there are 92 different Federal offices, each producing and procuring printing material. Such lack

of centralization is inconsistent and extravagant and results in unnecessary expenditures.

The appalling number of forms used to serve the same purposes in the hundreds of agencies creates a situation that demands a Government-wide standardization and simplification program. Two of our major departments estimate they have a combined total of 400,000 different forms.

We understand, of course, that many different kinds of forms must be used for various purposes, but there is no sense in having hundreds of forms that are used for the same purpose whether in one department or all departments of Government. For example, forms for retirement, classification, promotion, time and leave ought to be practically the same throughout Government, and yet I am advised retirement is the only form that has really been standardized thus far.

Every agency in the Government has a different leave slip and a different type of leave record, and yet all you need to know is when the employee's leave begins and ends, and the type of leave together with the signature of the official in charge.

In one department alone there are 300 different travel forms of various sizes, color, and description. Every agency has developed a different kind of travel request. They are different sizes, different qualities of paper, and different forms, but they have the same basic information—itinerary, purpose, and period of absence. These are only a few examples. There are plenty more of them.

It seems strange that every agency and each department have different kinds of requests for medical examination of employees when all in the world you want is a medical examination, and yet there are hundreds of different kinds of forms on that subject.

Requests made with the Civil Service Commission for new employees are different and distinct in all agencies. I want to emphasize again that these various papers differ in size and form so that you have just as many different kinds of cabinets in which to file them.

I find in one old-line agency 50 different types of attendance slips. There are about 400 or 500 different types of attendance records in one of our departments. There ought to be one kind for all agencies.

When information is requested with respect to a certain department from the division chief, a report is made from each unit on a unit form. It is transferred to a sectional report and from there to a branch report, then the bureau, then the division. Why in the world could not the units make their reports direct to the division chief?

Some agencies go to the extreme on carbon copies. I am informed that in one department 17 copies of a particular order were made when only three were necessary.

When it comes to ordering amounts of material, some agencies go the limit. All departments of Government, and in many cases hundreds of agencies in each department, have various expedite tags of all description. For example, one small division made up its own expedite tags of rush, urgent, expedite, please expedite, priority, and frantic. There is no reason at all why these tags should not be designed and distributed from a central authority.

I quote from the Report on the Reproduction and Distribution of Printed Matter for Executive Agencies in the Washington Metropolitan Area:

> Few functions of the Government are the subject of such a multitude of laws, rules, or regulations from such a variety of sources as are printing, binding, and processing. * * * It seems hardly possible that a relatively simple problem should have become so complex.

Forms, stationery, sheets, and administrative material consume the bulk of paper used by the Government. Paper is one of the most universally useful and necessary commodities. It is becoming scarcer every day. The report to which I have just referred says:

> That if proper savings were made for the entire Federal Government, there could be a saving of more than $100,000,000 and a saving in white paper in the tremendous amount of 250,000 tons.

Also, according to this report, we have about $50,000,000 invested in printing and duplicating equipment outside of the Government Printing Office.

The waste and extravagance in the oversupply of printing is tremendous. In order to be sure that an agency has a supply of certain forms extra amounts are printed and afterwards go to waste because the particular forms cannot, of course, be used in other departments or even in the agencies of the same departments.

Mr. Speaker, the situation with respect to printing in our Government demands immediate attention of this Congress. It has got to a place where it is clogging and slowing down the business of the Government and prevents its activities from functioning as they should. I have today introduced a bill that in my judgment, if passed by this Congress, will go a long ways in solving the problem.

The bill I have submitted establishes an Office of Printing Control in the Department of the Treasury. It provides for the appointment of a Director with three Assistant Directors, each Director at the head of a separate branch, being departmental printing branch, field printing branch, and forms and publication standardization branch. Functions of the office shall be exercised under the direction of the Director. The Director is authorized to establish such regional offices as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of the act. It shall be the duty of the office to establish standards and policies for the adoption of the executive agencies and exercise supervision and direction of printing and duplicating activities of executive agencies. The office shall make studies and investigations as are required to carry out the purposes of the act.

Under this bill all executive agencies are directed to eliminate nonessential printing and duplicating and to maintain accurate records of printing and duplicating expenditures. Executive agencies are required to submit estimates for printing and binding and submit statements as to the number of types of printing and duplicating equipment in use.

This measure provides for an advisory committee consisting of one member appointed by the Bureau of the Budget, the Public Printer, the Comptroller General, the Bureau of Standards, and Civil Service Commission. They shall serve without additional compensation and act in an advisory capacity. The Office is limited to not more than a total of 100 employees. The Office of Printing Control does not contemplate a raft of new jobs. The control will be effected through utilization of existing employees in the agencies.

Mr. Speaker, I have gone into this matter very carefully and given it a considerable amount of study. I trust this measure may have the very careful consideration of the Members of the House, and I trust that on final consideration it will have your approval. It will save the people of this country a tremendous amount of material that is now being wasted. It will save millions of dollars as well as a lot of unnecessary manpower.

It is my opinion the enactment of this bill into law would save more than $100,000,000 in a year for the taxpayers of this country. Not only that, but we could save the employment of thousands of unnecessary employees as well as the use of tremendous amount of expensive equipment. The Government has asked the publishers to reduce the use of paper. The Government is sponsoring waste paper drives throughout the country and calls attention to the critical necessity of saving paper, but it certainly has established no executive control over the use of paper itself.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. CALVIN D. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that today, following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a radio address by the national employment officer of the Disabled American Veterans.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY] be permitted to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address delivered by the Honorable Josephus Daniels before the graduating class of the University of North Carolina on August 30, 1944.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS] be permitted to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HAYS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

JOINT RESPONSIBILITY FOR THE PEACE

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I rise for the purpose of calling the attention of the Members to two identical resolutions being introduced today by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD] and myself. Under the rules of the House the resolutions must be presented separately, of course, but they are identical in text, and I trust will be studied carefully by the Members.

Let me read the resolution, which is very brief:

> Whereas it is the sense of the Congress that measures involved in the establishment of a peace to follow the present hostilities should be considered without reference to partisanship: Therefore be it
>
> *Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring)*, That all legislation pertaining to the participation of the United States in international agreements and machinery to establish and to maintain peace shall be the joint responsibility of the majority and minority parties.

The purpose of the resolution is very clear. It is to pave the way for a peace policy which will represent not the ideas of one political party, but of both great parties of the country, or all of the parties, so far as that is concerned. What we are trying to get at, of course, is the establishment of a peace policy which will represent all of the people. The resolution is not offered in disparagement of our political system or the arrangement by which the House recognizes the majority and the minority. But in the peace that is to be formulated and the constructive criticism that is to be offered, there should be a joint responsibility and it is the conviction of the authors that all of our resources are to be required if we are to have a lasting peace. We should waive whatever advantage we might have as a majority party and that means whichever of us should be the majority in the next Congress, or since we are so nearly equally divided as to numbers in this Congress, it seems to me there should be a recognition of the fact and that we should draw upon the resources which we have as Americans rather than as party members. This is an hour for unity and we ought to be demonstrating to the world that our people are united.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYS. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I desire to commend the distinguished gentleman from Arkansas for presenting this resolution and for presenting the idea to the Congress and to the country. I am sure the gentleman agrees with me that next to the winning of the war our people are interested in winning a lasting peace.

If this resolution and suggestion will create a better spirit of unity and more responsibility on the part of all of us irrespective of our party affiliations, then I say that is a great step in the direction of the peace of the world. May I add, further, many of us remember that after World War No. 1 partisan politics did get mixed up in the peace that was to follow and there are some of us, at least, who felt that except for that we might have had a functioning League of Nations and we might have prevented this terrible catastrophe in which the world is now engaged.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYS. I yield.

Mr. MICHENER. I concur, of course, in the objective of this resolution. I hope that in case it is considered and passed, it will not express merely a pious hope. Of course, a resolution of that type has no vitality. It can only express a hope. If there is to be no partisanship in the making of the peace that is to come, if it is not to be a Democratic peace or a Republican peace, but a peace of all the people where the parties are and should be united, does not the gentleman think it would be at least advisable to permit the minority party to sit in conferences such as at Dumbarton Oaks where the very thing which the gentleman is talking of is being discussed and decided upon? In other words, does not the gentleman think that this unity and this harmony can be more easily accomplished if all the parties interested are permitted to participate in the arrangement that is to be made, rather than to be advised by the majority party at a later date, that a certain policy had been determined upon and that to oppose that policy would be showing partisanship?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, would it be in order for the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD] to yield to me 1 minute of his time?

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman be permitted to proceed for an additional 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. HAYS. I thank the gentleman very much. Obviously, it is the purpose of this resolution to provide for the utmost participation by the minority in all of the deliberations that lead to the peace and in the deliberations that are designed to make it secure and maintain it in the future.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYS. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I do not know that I understand the reference of the gentleman from Michigan to the Dumbarton Oaks Conference, about which there has been considerable controversy and criticism because it has not been in the open and because there has not been a daily report upon what they are trying to do. Of course, the gentleman understands this is a preliminary conference. They cannot reach any final agreement. They can only meet and make recommendations, and there will be many other conferences. The day that any agreement is arrived at, the welkin will ring at both ends of the Capitol about every sentence and every paragraph in any kind of document that might finally be agreed upon.

Mr. HAYS. I thank the gentleman. Will it not be agreed that the very references that have been made on the floor to these discussions prove the point that I made that we need as majority Members to renounce any advantage we may have by reason of being the majority and invite the minority to participate not as a minority but as equals with joint and equal responsibility for the peace, that no party, whichever one of us it should be, should go before the Nation and claim any advantage by reason of having been the majority in this crucial period?

Mr. HARRIS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYS. I yield.

Mr. HARRIS of Arkansas. I appreciate the fine objectives of my colleague from Arkansas as included in the resolution, and we do, of course, join him and the people throughout the Nation in expressing the hope that a joint responsibility may be established at the termination of the war. Following the present discussion, it is a fact that only recently our great Secretary of State, Mr. Hull, has called before him for a discussion of this very problem members of the minority and the majority parties on several occasions.

Mr. HAYS. I thank the gentleman for his contribution. That, of course, touches executive responsibility. What we are directing attention to here is legislative responsibility. I should like to say in answer to the comment of my friend from Michigan that there is far more than a pious hope back of the resolution. It must be implemented by additional resolutions. It must provide for a change in the mechanics of the House so that measures touching the peace shall be considered by committees set up in a manner consistent with this resolution. This is but the first step to be taken. We are prepared to say in answer to what I believe is the feeling of the people of this country that we are acting together without partisanship, without any feeling whatever of political advantage; but the country is seeking common ground for united action, not for political advantage, and expects us as its representatives to seek agreement. We, who are sponsoring this resolution, would regret to see it adopted by a mere majority of the House; it must be adopted by an overwhelming majority and must represent substantial unanimity if it is to be effective. That is what the country wants when the peace is found and when it is made secure.

This does not represent snap judgment on our part. There have been many conversations and conferences preceding it. It grows out of a deep conviction on our part that the answer is in this sort of declaration and in the steps that are to follow, that we will join as Republicans and Democrats in saying to the country that we are not acting with political advantages in mind, but to serve the country and the world in a crisis.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD] is recognized for 5 minutes.

JOINT RESPONSIBILITY FOR THE PEACE

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, Pearl Harbor made clear to all Americans of whatever party or opinion that there is no possibility of our ever again having a decent, orderly, peaceful world with security for our own country unless there is an overwhelming victory over Hitlerism and Japanese militarism.

But it is also clear we can get that victory, as we did once before, and still not get the decent world.

We early learned that we could not win the war unless the nations achieved a considerable degree of unity in planning and working and fighting together.

We knew that we in America could not be sure of victory unless all parties and groups here learned to plan and work together. Pearl Harbor produced that unity for the war effort. Can we hope to get the maximum benefit from victory unless we somehow achieve a similar miracle of unity for the peace effort?

How can we continue for preventing wars the same sort of cooperation we have worked out for winning this war?

It was never a Democratic or a Republican war effort. It was an American war effort. Unless we want to lose this war after winning it, I am convinced we must somehow work, without partisanship, for a national foreign policy that will be stable, continuing, predictable. That means it must be neither Republican nor Democratic, but American.

Under the present actualities of our two-party political system, any international agreement which the party in power works out alone with other nations is almost certain to be rejected by the minority party and by the people, even though the settlement be as sound as the Ten Commandments. That is true no matter which party may be in power. We cannot get a truly national and stable foreign policy unless both parties have worked it out jointly and have equal responsibility for it.

A year ago this House by an overwhelming majority passed the Fulbright resolution expressing itself as favoring "the creation of appropriate international machinery with power adequate to establish and to maintain a just and lasting peace, among the nations of the world, and as favoring participation by the United States therein."

How can the United States have most influence in helping create such appropriate international machinery? Under what conditions are we to participate therein in order to be most effective in assuring its successful operation and thereby increasing our own national security? Surely, only if the majority and minority parties in Congress are jointly responsible for the formulation and the passage of all legislation dealing with our part in helping establish and maintain a just and lasting peace.

Therefore my Democratic friend and colleague the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HAYS] and I are today introducing identical concurrent resolutions, as follows:

Resolved, Whereas it is the sense of the Congress that measures involved in the establishment of a peace to follow the present hostilities should be considered without reference to partisanship: Therefore be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That all legislation pertaining to participation by the United States in international agreements and machinery to establish and to maintain peace shall be the joint responsibility of the majority and minority parties.

There are various ways by which this end can be attained which I shall not attempt to discuss here and now. It will of course require changes of some of the established procedures in both Houses of Congress. But the obstacles are not insuperable. New conditions of warfare required that our military leaders make bold and drastic changes in their traditional methods and tactics, if they wanted to win. Can we in Congress be less bold if we want to win our part of the task, less willing to make whatever adjustments are necessary to insure that this time our heroic men and women shall not have died in vain?

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of other special orders today I may be permitted to address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SNYDER] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include a bill that I have just introduced.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

CREATION OF OFFICE OF MILITARY RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT IN THE WAR DEPARTMENT

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, my long connection with military appropriation measures has convinced me that military research should head up in a legally constituted authority, who would be responsible to the Congress for a vigorous, comprehensive procedure. Too much division of authority and effort exists, and, if the head of a particular agency is not a researcher, or keenly interested in the subject, research suffers and the whole service suffers.

During the war there has been available under civilian direction the best scientific talent in the country. Vast amounts have been made available for such method of procedure, independently of the large appropriations that have been made available to the Army and Navy. That talent will cease to be available upon the conclusion of peace. Worth-while projects, presently under study, should not be permitted to terminate. The Army and Navy should pick them up and carry them forward. Responsibility for so doing should lodge in a single official, clothed with proper authority.

My bill contemplates the use of civilian agencies and facilities, when advisable or desirable and collaboration with such agencies; also, coordination of Army and Navy research. Its effectiveness would be strengthened by permanence of the joint chiefs of staff.

My bill (H. R. 5182) creating an office of Military Research and Development in the War Department is as follows:

H. R. 5182

A bill creating an office of Military Research and Development in the War Department

Be it enacted, etc., That the President of the United States be, and he is hereby, authorized to appoint, for a term of not exceeding 4 years, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, from the officers of the Army, a Director of Military Research and Development, with the rank, pay, and allowances equal to the maximum rank, pay, and allowances now or hereafter authorized by or in pursuance of law for the Director of Naval Research and Development in the Navy Department. The officer so appointed shall be experienced in the administration of research and development and have a wide engineering background.

SEC. 2. There may be detailed as assistant to the Director of Military Research and Development an officer of the Army, who shall have the rank, pay, and allowances of a brigadier general, and such assistant, in case of death, resignation, absence, or sickness of the Director of Military Research and Development, shall, unless otherwise directed by the President, as provided by section 179 of the revised statutes, perform the duties of such Director until his successor is appointed or such absence or sickness shall cease.

SEC. 3. Among other officers of the Army detailed to the office of the Director of Military Research and Development, there shall be at least one officer of the Medical Department of the Army, one officer of the Quartermaster Corps of the Army, and one officer of the Army Air Corps.

SEC. 4. The office of the Director of Military Research and Development shall be in the War Department, where such Director shall, under the direction of the Secretary of War, have general supervision of all research and development in which the Army may engage. He shall be required to (a) coordinate all military research and development activities; (b) approve all research and development projects in advance of their being undertaken; (c) approve of the place or places where such research or development shall be undertaken, governmental or otherwise, including educational institutions; (d) either himself or by deputy represent the War Department at the meetings, councils, or deliberations of any agency, governmental or otherwise, engaged in research matters where representation of the War Department

may be requested, desirable, or required by or in pursuance of law; (e) advise the Secretary of War upon the provision of additional research establishments or facilities; (f) recommend to the Secretary of War the abolition of any existing facilities or establishments under War Department jurisdiction which may be a duplication of facilities or establishments, governmental or otherwise, and available or better equipped for particular lines of research; and (g) he may, with the approval of the Secretary of War, require the initiation of fundamental research, subject to the availability of appropriations.

SEC. 5. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated such amounts as may be necessary for the administrative expenses of the Office of Director of Military Research and Development. The appropriations of the several branches and offices for research and development shall be under the jurisdiction of such branches and offices except as herein provided, but the estimates of appropriations of such branches and offices for research and development shall be processed through the Director of Military Research and Development to the Secretary of War and by such Director justified to the Congress.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CALVIN D. JOHNSON] is recognized for 5 minutes.

UNITED NATIONS RELIEF AND REHABILITATION ADMINISTRATION

Mr. CALVIN D. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, U. N. R. R. A. is again on the march. This group of crystal gazers, whose heads are in the clouds and whose hands are in our pockets, are again attempting to dip into American farm machinery production and grab a large portion for distribution throughout Europe. They are demanding that 5,500 tractors be taken from the fourth quarter farm machinery production and turned over to Europe.

In addition they are requesting 4,675 grain drills, 1,500 of which are 14-run and under, and 3,175, 14-run and over; 15,000 steel-bottom walking plows; 1,950 two-bottom tractor plows; 100 one-way plows; 23,000 knapsack sprayers; 3,500 ground-drive mowers; 3,550 tractor trailers; 3,100 three-bottom tractor-drawn plows; 900 four-bottom plows; 9,348 spring-tooth harrow sections; and 86 tandem disc harrows.

This equipment, in addition to the 5,500 tractors is to be taken from this country's farm machinery production during the last quarter of 1944 and the first quarter of 1945. It is to be taken in spite of the fact that farm machinery production is behind schedule and dealers throughout the country have been notified that their allotments of certain types of equipment have been cut as much as 60 percent. This machinery has been demanded and the War Food Administration has been directed to make it available.

Unless drastic steps are taken to stop this allocation, it will be lost forever to the American farmers who have been called upon, not only to feed the people of our country but the armies of the allied world.

I request that an immediate investigation be made by the House Agriculture Committee, that this entire U. N. R. R. A. program may be brought to light, that the American public may be informed of the true character of this organization before the star-gazers who direct its operations have us not only bankrupt but committed to a W. P. A. program that encompasses the entire world.

Mr. Speaker, I join with millions of Americans in voicing my disapproval of the recent order that sent Donald Nelson to the Orient on what I consider to be a wild-goose chase. It is stated that his mission is to determine the needs of China. I contend that if there is a second lieutenant in either the American or Chinese armies stationed in that country who does not already know those needs he should be dismissed for the good of the service.

I consider Donald Nelson to be one of the greatest industrial organizers this Nation has ever produced, and when the history of this war is written his name should be at the top. He is the man who has gathered the materials and coordinated the energies of this Nation and combined the two into a war effort that has performed miracles in mass production. While he directed and produced, others made press releases, and now his reward for the most magnificent job of industrial organization in world history is that he is cast into the limbo that contains every other man whom this administration has feared because of their rising popularity with the public.

Nelson, an industrialist, is sent to an agricultural country. He is to view a nation destitute from a war that we have paid little attention to for 3 years. His mission cannot bear fruit for China does not want lip service. She has had too much of that. Seven bitter years have taught her that wars cannot be fought on promises nor won with platitudes. China's need is for war materials, food, drugs, and other supplies for her people. It is high time that we delivered them, for until now practically the only materials China has received from this country are bombs and shells that were manufactured from steel purchased from America and dropped by the Japanese. The materials China needs must be delivered, and the job of delivering them is one for General MacArthur and Admiral Nimitz. These two able leaders explained their contemplated method of procedure to the President when he visited them during his recent vacation in the Hawaiian Islands. In his visit there is renewed hope for China. The war in the Pacific has been rediscovered. It is the same war, however, that General MacArthur has been fighting for 3 years without adequate men, materials, or encouragement.

If I am overly suspicious at the recent order sending Donald Nelson to China, my fears will be dispelled if he returns to this country within a reasonable length of time and again assumes his duties as Chairman of W. P. B. If he does not I, as well as millions of other Americans, will consider it proof that his head has been added to others that litter the path of this administration—heads of men whose only fault was that their personal popularity, plus outstanding ability, had made them idols of the American people.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CALVIN D. JOHNSON. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Does the gentleman recall the date of passage of the appropriation for U. N. R. R. A.?

Mr. CALVIN D. JOHNSON. I recall the incident but I do not recall the date.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Can the gentleman tell us whether or not that organization has started operations? Has it actually delivered any relief to the poor and starving of the war stricken countries?

Mr. CALVIN D. JOHNSON. As to that I could not say. I do know, however, that under Decision No. 8, amendments 1 and 2, this machinery has been requested from the War Food Administration to be delivered from the fourth quarter of this year and the first quarter of next year to be distributed throughout Europe. As to its actual operations in those theaters, I cannot say.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. The Director General makes the following statement in his report of July 31, 1944:

> The Administration has not as yet been called into relief or rehabilitation operations.

Mr. CALVIN D. JOHNSON. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CALVIN D. JOHNSON. I yield.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, I feel that the gentleman from Illinois is to be commended upon his continued fight against the exportation of farm machinery from this Nation when our own farmers need it as badly as they do. The gentleman will probably recall the fight he and I made on this floor, along with others, toward getting W. P. B. to be more generous in their allocation of steel and farm machinery. It seems to me that we were given to understand, more or less, when the basic act for U. N. R. R. A. was before the House, that these people had no intention of shipping a great quantity of farm machinery abroad. Was there not some such understanding?

Mr. CALVIN D. JOHNSON. That impression was left with the Members of the Congress, including myself. The original U. N. R. R. A. program called for 180,000 tons of carbon steel. It also called for 13,000 tons of repair parts, or approximately one-half million pieces of machinery that were to be exported. I made an exposé of their intentions on the 22d of March 1944. Following that I was informed that the program was abandoned and that the Army would take over, and that the program had been cut from 180,000 tons to 20,000 tons. This has nothing to do with the Army,

because I have contacted them, and I have been informed that they have no part in this.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. RAMEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that today, following the special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under previous special order of the House, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PRIEST] is recognized for 10 minutes.

SMEAR TACTICS

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, in the past we have heard a great deal in this Chamber and elsewhere about smear campaigns. I want to go on record as saying that I deplore such tactics, regardless of what party, what group, or what individual may indulge in them. I believe, Mr. Speaker, that perhaps Governor Warren, of California, has unintentionally exposed such tactics as may now be engaged in by the Republican National Committee. Governor Warren and other Republican Governors were widely advertised a few days ago for political speeches over a national hook-up. The office of Governor is a very honorable and a dignified one. The American people assume that a Governor of a great State is capable of preparing his own speeches, or at least that he is capable of preparing speeches in close cooperation and collaboration with others who may be close to him in his official life. What do we find as the result of events that have been disclosed during the past few days? We find that changes in some speeches were made, and that it became rather embarrassing for three of these Governors. We find that the speech, for instance, of Governor Warren, was prepared for him by those ghost writers of the Republican National Committee. This exposure, I believe, must be rather humiliating to Governor Warren, and to the other Republican Governors who might be involved.

Governor Warren exposes to the people of the country the kind of a campaign that is being waged by the Republican National Committee. In the future, when other Republican Governors are advertised to make radio speeches, the American people certainly will know at that time that these Governors are nothing more nor less than the Charlie McCarthys of the Republican National Committee. They will know as soon as they may be advertised, or, at least, they will believe, that a prepared speech will be sent out from those pen pushers, those ghost writers of the committee in New York.

The Associated Press is a reliable news agency. On August 31—and I have a copy of it here—out of Los Angeles came the Associated Press story in which Governor Warren admits that the New York headquarters of the campaign to smear President Roosevelt sent him the speech that he was to make. He tried to work himself out of his embarrassing position by saying:

> The New York headquarters sent a draft of a suggested speech to me and it arrived the day before at the capitol in Sacramento. I worked it over and made such changes as to me seemed desirable. Then it was given to the newspapers.

What an admission. Booked as he was to make a major speech in this campaign, he never prepared it or undertook to prepare it and received it the day before he was to deliver this thundering attack on President Roosevelt.

Does Governor Warren, or does anyone else, think the American people are so gullible or so lacking in common judgment as to swallow this story about knowing nothing about these poison-pen writers in New York preparing this speech for him?

But let us look a little further. Governor Warren is reported as saying—and I quote again:

> He was unaware why the original speech was released to the press Monday by the Republican National Committee without his approval.

He also said:

> This speech was killed Tuesday night by the Republican National Committee headquarters before publication.

Does Governor Warren believe that the American people will believe that he knew nothing about the prepared speech being released before he had received it?

Would a Governor permit himself to be treated that way unless he knew that the speech he was to deliver was to be prepared for him, released to the press without his knowledge? Unless something happened requiring a decided change in that speech, the American people would never have known that the speech delivered by Governor Warren was the speech of other persons, the behind-the-scene ghost writers, and that Governor Warren was nothing but a front for these minds, for their views, and for their phraseology.

This situation I know is embarrassing to all Republicans. It was so embarrassing that Herbert Brownell, Jr., chairman of the Republican National Committee, who never misses an opportunity, of course, to get into the press, would not make any comment.

Even the embarrassed Republican Governors Green and Baldwin, who also made radio speeches, could not at once be reached for comment. And then, when exposure of this type of campaign was fully and completely made, the Associated Press story said, and I quote:

> Efforts in New York to compare the text of the proposed speech with the one Governor Warren delivered were met by the statement from the Republican National Committee, "The Republican National Committee made its request to kill the advance copy of the Governor's speech before broadcast time. It therefore cannot now grant permission for publication of any parts of the killed copy."

The Republican National Committee prepared the speech Governor Warren was booked to deliver. The Republican National Committee released it to the press before Governor Warren received or read the speech. The Republican National Committee admits it killed the advance copy before broadcast time.

It was done without even consulting Governor Warren. The Republican National Committee refuses to make public the original speech. What happened is important to the American people, because it shows the type of campaign that is being conducted by the Republican National Committee. While this exposure will negative speeches of Republican governors in the future during the campaign, as the people will know that the speeches are prepared for them, nevertheless it shows the American people how far those who hate President Roosevelt will go in their effort to deceive the voters and to destroy the President.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRIEST. I will be glad to yield to the distinguished gentleman.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Does the gentleman wish to infer, I did not hear quite all he said, but does the gentleman wish to infer that Governor Bricker, for example, is having ghost writers prepare his speeches for him and that if the incident he is discussing did eventuate and that what Governor Warren did was wrong, and I am not admitting either, that the American people are to infer from this alleged episode that all of the Republican campaign will be of the same order?

Mr. PRIEST. May I say to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio, I think the American people will draw their own inferences from what has happened in this particular case, and of course I make no charge whatsoever that Governor Bricker, who is a Vice Presidential nominee, is having his speeches prepared for him. He is a Governor of a State, but in a somewhat different category since he is the Vice Presidential nominee. I make no charge. I simply quote from what the Associated Press, a very reliable news agency, has given us, and I think the American people will draw their own inference when other Governors are advertised for Nation-wide hook-up addresses in this campaign.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Tennessee be allowed an additional minute to answer a question.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Does the gentleman wish to give the impression to the

country that the New Deal is wholly devoid of all ghost writers?

Mr. PRIEST. May I answer the gentleman again by saying I am not attempting to give to the people of the country any impression other than to put into the RECORD what has been recorded as being the facts in the case. The people can form their own judgment in this case, or on President Roosevelt or the New Deal or anything else. Give them the facts and they will form their own impressions and draw their own inferences and reach their own conclusions.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRIEST. I yield to the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. McCORMACK. The fact remains, as stated by the gentleman from Tennessee, that the speech was prepared. The speech was released even before the Governor received it, according to the Associated Press, which the gentleman has stated.

Mr. PRIEST. That is true.

Mr. McCORMACK. Now, that is an amazing situation. I am sure the gentleman from Ohio himself would not stand for it. I have too much respect for his opinion of himself and respect for him to think he would do that. Certainly we all know that suggestions are made, but we all make our own speeches in the final analysis—that is, those of us who do make our own speeches. Certainly no one is making any release for me without my knowing what the release is when the release purports to represent my own personal views.

The significant thing is that the speech was prepared and the Governor did not undertake to prepare his own speech. If you were going to make a speech you would undertake to prepare your own speech, and so would I. It was received the day before at Sacramento. It was released by the Republican National Committee before it was sent to the Governor or before the Governor saw it and read it. Then the Republican National Committee killed it, for certain reasons that we all know, because certain testimony had appeared before a committee which would have made the Governor ridiculous and the Republican National Committee ridiculous in the eyes of the people of the country.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FULBRIGHT). The time of the gentleman from Tennessee has expired.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, it is interesting to know that the very telling speech made by the Governor of California has gotten under the hide of the Democratic National Committee, as well as the majority leader. If this were not the case, a prepared speech embodying much research would not have been brought to the floor of the House this morning and delivered by my very good friend, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PRIEST]. The gentleman from Tennessee is one of the leaders of his party and is very familiar with the technique of the preparation of campaign speeches by the Democratic National Committee. He must not, however, assume that similar technique is followed by the Republican Committee.

I join with my colleague in protesting against ghost-writer speeches. He has attempted to prove that Governor Warren wrote his own speech. No one doubts that. Warren is just like the other Republican Governors. He does his own thinking. It is impossible by subtle words and innuendo to detract from the speech which the Governor made. I can assure the gentleman from Tennessee that the domain of political smearing has been preempted by some of the New Deal writers and orators, and the Republicans will not enter into any competition along that line.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. RAMEY] is recognized for 4 minutes.

ONE HUNDRED AND THIRTY-FIRST ANNIVERSARY OF THE BATTLE OF LAKE ERIE

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may have 2 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. RAMEY. I yield.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I wonder if the gentleman noted in the press the other day something to the effect that Judge Rosenman, who has been more or less credited with being ghost writer for the President, was with him on his late tour of the Pacific.

Mr. RAMEY. Is the gentleman asking me?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I am asking the gentleman if he noted that in the press.

Mr. RAMEY. This is my first term. I have never seen a ghost writer. I do not know what he is. I have never seen a smear bunder. I would like to look upon an exhibit like that sometime, because they are all talking about them, and all I know about them is what I have heard about them through the exhibits. If somebody is telling the truth about us it ought to be told, and if somebody is lying about us it will not hurt us but it will only hurt the person who lies.

I am not going to use any manuscript so that you will not feel I have one of these—what do you call them—ghostmen? I would like to see one of them. I would like to see a picture of one, at least. I thought that every man elected to the Presidency or to the Congress of the United States could make his own speech.

Mr. GEARHART. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAMEY. I yield.

Mr. GEARHART. If the gentleman really wants to meet a ghost writer he might speak to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK], and he will probably introduce the gentleman to Charlie Michelson.

Mr. RAMEY. I do not know what they are. I do not know what they look like. I want to talk in what time I have left, about a man who must not have had any ghost-writers or never heard of a smear-bunder, because they did not have them in that locality, and they do not have them there now. On the 10th of this month is the one hundred and thirty-first anniversary of the Battle of Lake Erie. You will see the painting at the foot of the Senate stairs of the Battle of Lake Erie and Commodore Oliver H. Perry. He had the distinction—but I want to speak about the little island folk in the island of Lake Erie, who participated in that battle, and about their plight today. Since September 10, 1913, there has been a yearly celebration of that victory on South Bass Island.

The little village of Put In Bay was built there because Commodore Perry and his heroic sailors put in that bay. On that island there will be no celebration this year. One was arranged for and the senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] was to deliver the address, but it has been canceled, due to the fact that all the lads on the islands—Middle Bass Island, South Bass Island, North Bass Island—are in the armed service and in view of the further fact that those islanders cannot get help and have no boats except one—the *Mystic Isle*, run by Mr. Lanz—there is a plane that carries the mail operated by Mr. Herschberger, but there is no help on the islands because all the sons are in the service. Those men are giving their all. Mr. Schnoor of Put In Bay has told me that they cannot have a celebration, that their celebration is going to consist of the realization that every boy on the islands is in the service, that no help can be secured in these islands, that they are unable to get priorities for radio service for the safety of their planes, that they cannot get help to fix telephone cables when they go out. The celebration of these islands this year will be the celebration of total patriotism in action.

The island folk are grateful to Senator TAFT and hope to have him there when their hero boys return.

Help has been promised to radioing the safety in their air service.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include therein an editorial recently appearing in the Boston Globe entitled "Progress and a Suggestion."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. COSTELLO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein a brief editorial.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

Mr. KLEIN, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a joint resolution of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. J. Res. 306. Joint resolution authorizing the President of the United States to proclaim October 11, 1944, General Pulaski's Memorial Day for the observance and commemoration of the death of Brigadier General Pulaski.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. KLEIN, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his aproval, a bill and joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 1506. An act to amend further the Pay Adjustment Act of 1942; and

H. J. Res. 306. Joint resolution authorizing the President of the United States to proclaim October 11, 1944, General Pulaski's Memorial Day for the observance and commemoration of the death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 49 minutes p. m.) the House, pursuant to its previous order, adjourned until Tuesday, September 5, 1944, at 12 o'clock noon.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. ANGELL: Committee on the Territories. H. R. 5144. A bill to authorize the city of Ketchican, Alaska, to issue bonds in a sum not to exceed $150,000 for the purpose of constructing and acquiring additions and betterments to and extensions of the electric light and power system of said city, and to provide for the payment thereof, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1834). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. RAMSPECK: Committee on the Civil Service. H. R. 4114. A bill to amend section 8 (b) of Public, 49, Seventy-eighth Congress, first session (War Overtime Pay Act of 1943); without amendment (Rept. No. 1835). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. RAMSPECK: Committee on the Civil Service. H. R. 4918. A bill to provide for the payment to certain Government employees for accumulated or accrued annual leave due upon their separation from Government service; with amendment (Rept. No. 1836). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. RAMSPECK: Committee on the Civil Service. H. R. 5257. A bill to provide for health programs for Government employees; with amendment (Rept. No. 1837). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ENGLE of California:

H. R. 5290. A bill to permit the sale in foreign markets of newly mined gold or silver produced within the United States, its Territories and possessions, including Alaska, and which may be surplus to the war effort; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LECOMPTE:

H. R. 5291. A bill to amend sections 1400 and 1410 of the Federal Insurance Contributions Act, as amended, so as to continue, during the calendar year 1945, the present rate of tax on employees and employers; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. REES of Kansas:

H. R. 5292. A bill to establish, in the executive branch of the Government, an office of Printing Control; to the Committee on Printing.

By Mr. BRUMBAUGH:

H. R. 5293. A bill creating a Veterans' Industrial Reinsurance Corporation to issue industrial policies covering employees who are disabled veterans; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. BENNETT of Missouri:

H. R. 5294. A bill to change the name of Nichols Avenue in the District of Columbia to Missouri Avenue; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. DILWEG:

H. R. 5295. A bill relating to the domestic raising of fur-bearing animals; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. FERNANDEZ:

H. R. 5296. A bill to amend section 2 (a) of the act of Congress, entitled "An act to promote the mining of coal, phosphate, oil, oil shale, gas, and sodium on the public domain," approved February 25, 1920, as amended (49 Stat. 679; U. S. C. title 30, sec. 223a); to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. HAYS:

H. Con. Res. 95. Concurrent resolution establishing the joint responsibility for the peace; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. JUDD:

H. Con. Res. 96. Concurrent resolution establishing the joint responsibility for the peace; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin:

H. Res. 632. Resolution to authorize a full and complete investigation of the rotation-of-furloughs plan, as established by the War Department; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolution were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. REES of Kansas:

H. R. 5297. A bill for the relief of Col. J. M. McHugh; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. TARVER:

H. R. 5298. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Ruby H. Hunsucker; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. TIBBOTT:

H. R. 5299. A bill granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth E. Andrews; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. VURSELL:

H. R. 5300. A bill for the relief of Harry McWilliams; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

6055. By Mr. BRYSON: Petition of G. R. Brummett and 51 other citizens of Shattuck, Okla., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

6056. Also, petition of Carrie Reinheimer and 150 other citizens of Ellwood City, Pa., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

6057. Also, petition of Mrs. T. W. Pollister and 60 other citizens of Peoria, Ill., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

6058. Also, petition of A. M. Garner and 45 other citizens of Edcouch, Tex., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

6059. Also, petition of Rev. Charles De W. Brower and 34 other citizens of Interlachen, Fla., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

6060. Also, petition of Mrs. Ralph Zork and 56 other citizens of St. Louis, Mo., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

6061. Also, petition of Mrs. Leigha S. Miller and 103 other citizens of Philadelphia, Pa., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

6062. Also, petition of A. J. James and 47 other citizens of Fayetteville, N. C., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to

reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

6063. Also, petition of Edna I. Hunt and 35 other citizens of Hermon, N. Y., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

6064. Also, petition of Anna Fleming and 49 other citizens of Gouverneur, N. Y., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

6065. Also, petition of Mrs. R. F. Walker and 37 other citizens of Rome, N. Y., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

6066. Also, petition of Mrs. Henry Ryder and 99 other citizens of Mineola, N. Y., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

6067. By Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON: Petition of Mr. and Mrs. L. N. Free, Route No. 2, Teague, Tex., favoring House bill 4846; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

6068. By Mr. REES of Kansas: Petition of Mrs. Hester Sautter and a number of other prominent citizens of Geary County, Kans., in support of legislation for refunding wheat penalty payments and opposing subsidies on farm commodities and demanding a fair marketing price for everybody; to the Committee on Agriculture.

6069. Also, petition signed by Mrs. Freida York and a number of other farmers of Geary County, Kans., urging refunds on penalty collected unfairly by the United States Government from farmers who raised more wheat than was allocated by the Government program; to the Committee on Agriculture.

SENATE

TUESDAY, SEPTEMBER 5, 1944

(Legislative day of Friday, November 1, 1944)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father God, in times of cruel violence and dense darkness in every generation Thy word of truth and freedom has been made flesh and dwelt among men. In the living present Thou dost speak through the lives and lips of those whose hearts are moved with compassion at the want and woe of their fellows. Once more our Nation mourns the loss of a servant of Thine and of the commonweal who for twoscore years in this temple of democracy was a pillar of the people's hope. We thank Thee that by faith he removed mountains, harnessed rivers, exalted valleys, and wrought reforms by the strategy of wise statesmanship, venturing valiantly on the expanding frontiers of social welfare, scorning the consistency that is forever tied to the stake of a dead past.

Teach us anew that these prophets of the rights of man are as unpredictable as the light which shone when Hope was born above an eastern inn where there was no room for the heavenly guest. We never know where to look for them till they come. Nevertheless, in Thy good grace they come, with their frank and refreshing candor, out of the deep springs of our common humanity, sun-crowned, living above the crowd in private living and public thinking. Such men as they serve their day and generation, and, honored, falling on sleep, speak to us in their life and in their death, reminding us still that honesty and goodness and kindness and labor are our common birthright. May these starry ideals lend their sure and high distinction to our little day and tie our small endeavors to the mighty majesties of time and eternity. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. HILL, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Friday, September 1, 1944, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF HAROLD MAURICE KENNEDY TO BE DISTRICT JUDGE, EASTERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, and in accordance with the rules of the committee, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Wednesday, September 13, 1944, at 10:30 a. m., in the Senate Judiciary Committee room, upon the nomination of Harold Maurice Kennedy, of New York, to be United States district judge for the eastern district of New York, vice Marcus B. Campbell, deceased. At the indicated time and place all persons interested in the nomination may make such representations as may be pertinent. The subcommittee consists of myself, chairman, the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER].

TRIBUTE TO THE LATE GEORGE W. NORRIS, FORMER SENATOR FROM NEBRASKA

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, on last Saturday evening we heard over the radio the sad announcement of the death of former Senator George W. Norris. It seems only a few brief weeks since Senator Norris was here in the Senate, taking part in the debates and actively and vigorously participating in the work of this body.

For 10 years he served in the House of Representatives and for 30 years he labored in the Senate. I shall not at this time attempt to review his monumental work or to tell what his life meant to America and to the world, but I shall reserve this privilege for a later and more propitious occasion.

I do wish to bespeak the deep sense of personal loss that I feel in Senator Norris' death. He meant much to me as he did to countless thousands throughout our country. I believe that I voice the sentiments of every Member of the Senate with whom he served when I express profound sorrow over his passing.

He set an example of integrity, of courage, of devotion, and of magnificent service for all of us. He stood in his strength like Gibraltar, with each receding wave leaving him steadfast and immovable in the power and majesty of his statesmanship. He will stand through the years as one of the great men in our history.

George W. Norris was ever the friend of the poor and the distressed, ever the warrior fighting for the underprivileged and the oppressed. He carried high the torch of Jefferson and Lincoln, lighting the way that men might know the truth and that they might be free.

Today in the Tennessee Valley we see unfolded in brighter outline, in more golden color, the fundamental justice and the wonderful possibilities of the dream of George W. Norris. So long as the waters of the Tennessee River roll to the sea, they will chant his requiem and proclaim the glory of his struggles, that common men might enter into their inheritance.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. President, I listened with deep attention and emotion to the words which were uttered this morning by the acting Democratic leader [Mr. HILL] paying tribute to the late George W. Norris, former Senator from Nebraska. I recall him in days far gone. Not many of my colleagues who are here now were here then. I wish to recall some words I uttered on December 19, 1924, when he was taunted by the then Democratic leader because of what he termed "the dream of Senator Norris," his dream of the Tennessee Valley Authority. After the taunt had been given and the jibe proceeded, I said a few words in relation to Senator Norris. I shall read them now because I saw him then as I always like to see him and as I have always thought of him. It was, as I have said, on December 19, 1924, 20 years ago, when I spoke these words in his behalf:

Mr. President, to one who holds the views that I hold—the views of a lifetime that have been confirmed with the passing of the years—the discussion that has been indulged here has been singularly interesting and illuminating.

The very distinguished Senator from Alabama, Mr. Underwood, with his usual clarity and with great emphasis, has presented one side. The earnest Senator from Nebraska, Mr. Norris, with all of his enthusiasm, has presented another. I think fundamentally, Mr. President, this is a question of two warring philosophies of government, not wholly so, perhaps, but as the Senator from Alabama said the other day, two conflicting ideas of what might be done under circumstances such as are presented by the Muscle Shoals proposition; and it is on the fundamental idea thus presented that I reach the conclusion that I have reached in this matter.

It seems to me, sir, without discussing in detail what may be sought in the one case or the other, this is plainly a proposition of whether of not, when the United States Government has expended $150,000,000 in a project it shall continue with that project for the benefit of the people of the United States.

I do not quarrel with the view that is presented by the Senator from Alabama or the view that is presented by those who advocate his course. I recognize that they are just as earnest and just as honest in the view they present for the turning over of this particular project in the manner that they suggest as we who believe that when the Government itself has expended the people's money it should have been expended for all the people, and that the Government should carry on the enterprise whenever necessary for the benefit of all the people.

I heard the Senator from Alabama say the other day that the Senator from Nebraska was dreaming dreams. Maybe he is right. Perhaps the Senator from Nebraska, in what he asks, is dreaming dreams; but since man emancipated himself, Mr. President, men have been dreaming dreams for man and mankind, and it is the dreaming of these dreams that has marked the mile posts in human progress during all the centuries past.

I can recall historically that Galileo dreamed dreams. He dreamed his dreams, and, though compelled to recant under the threat of torture, his frightened lips yet told the immutable and the unchangeable truth.

Newton dreamed a dream as he lay upon the ground and saw an apple fall. He dreamed a dream that now we all understand.

Columbus dreamed a dream of another world far beyond the oceans that then were known—a dream at which every court scoffed and every courtier laughed. We are here today because Columbus dreamed that dream.

The men who landed at Plymouth Rock and those who came to Jamestown dreamed a dream of a new empire and a great, new nation. That dream we of this generation realize in part.

Garrison and Wendell Phillips dreamed a dream—a dream that resulted in one of them being mobbed in New York and another chased by a populace in Boston. Just think of it. But Lincoln brought the realization of that dream. Roosevelt dreamed a dream of the Panama Canal. Today it is the greatest engineering feat in all the world.

The Senator from Michigan [Mr. Couzens] dreamed a dream in the city of Detroit—of Detroit public ownership there. Today that public ownership exists profitably for the city of Detroit.

Down in the city of Los Angeles a self-educated engineer named Mulholland dreamed a dream that water might be brought for domestic purposes 250 miles, over gorges and canyons and impassable mountains. First he was laughed at. That dream today is a realization, and Los Angeles draws its great water supply from the Owens Valley, 250 miles distant.

Some men in the city of San Francisco years ago dreamed a dream when the city was in the grip of a street railroad that wrought its own will as it pleased. They dreamed a dream that San Francisco might operate a municipal road. Today San Francisco operates that road, operates it on a 5-cent fare, and the municipal road there, in opposition to that privately owned, is operated successfully, prosperously, advantageously.

So it has been, Mr. President, with dreams of real men during all the years. Dream on, you Senator from Nebraska, for your dreams mean but one thing. Your dreams, sir, mean that humanity may benefit, people may prosper, and human beings may be a bit happier.

So the dream of the Senator from Nebraska I can appreciate. I trust he will continue iterating and reiterating. I regret the note of discouragement that I observed the other day in his remarks. Oh, be not discouraged, sir. Never mind the temporary defeat or the temporary disaster. Never mind what ephemeral catastrophe there may seem to be, for dreams such as are yours ultimately will prevail, for the truth prevails. Sometimes it is as dangerous to preach the truth as to enter a powder magazine with a lighted torch, but, nevertheless, truth yet exists; and all history has taught us, all people's governments have taught us, that whatever may be the check, whatever may be the defeat, whatever the haltings, the heartburnings, and the disappointments, they are but ephemeral, and ultimately, finally, the truth will prevail.

Mr. President, on December 19, 1924, I addressed those words to George Norris. I believed what I said. Such as they are, and ill-spoken as they may have been, I leave them as my tribute to his character.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Megill, one of its clerks, announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 5144. An act to authorize the city of Ketchikan, Alaska, to issue bonds in a sum not to exceed $150,000 for the purpose of constructing and acquiring additions and betterments to and extensions of the electric light and power system of said city, and to provide for the payment thereof, and for other purposes;

H. R. 5154. An act relating to dual employment in the Postal Service, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 5181. An act to provide a method for compensating certain individuals for damages sustained as the result of the explosions at Port Chicago, Calif.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore (Mr. McKELLAR) laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

TRANSPORTATION FURNISHED BY WAR DEPARTMENT FOR GOVERNMENT AND OTHER PERSONNEL

A letter from the Acting Secretary of War, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relating to the furnishing of transportation for certain Government and other personnel necessary for the effective prosecution of the war (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF CERTAIN ALIENS

A letter from the Attorney General, submitting, pursuant to law, a report stating all of the facts and pertinent provisions of law in the cases of 238 individuals whose deportation has been suspended for more than 6 months under authority vested in the Attorney General, together with a statement of the reason for such suspension (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Immigration.

LEGISLATION BY MUNICIPAL COUNCIL OF ST. CROIX, V. I.

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of legislation enacted by the Municipal Council of St. Croix, V. I. (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs.

PERSONNEL REQUIREMENTS, THE NATIONAL ARCHIVES

A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, an estimate of personnel requirements for The National Archives for the quarter ending December 31, 1944 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Civil Service.

DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a list of papers and documents on the files of the Departments of Post Office, Navy (8), Commerce, and Agriculture (2); The National Archives, and the Federal Works Agency which are not needed in the conduct of business and have no permanent value or historical interest, and requesting action looking to their disposition (with accompanying papers); to a Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Papers in the Executive Departments.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore appointed Mr. BARKLEY and Mr. BREWSTER members of the committee on the part of the Senate.

PERSONS EMPLOYED BY COMMITTEES WHO ARE NOT FULL-TIME SENATE OR COMMITTEE EMPLOYEES

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate reports from the chairmen of certain Senate committees, made in response to Senate Resolution 319 (agreed to August 23, 1944), relative to persons employed who are not full-time employees of the Senate or any committee thereof, which were referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. FERGUSON subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the reports laid down earlier today by the Acting President pro tempore which were referred to the Committee on Appropriations. The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] is not now on the floor of the Senate. I know that if present he would desire and ask to have them printed in the RECORD. I therefore make the request.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The reports requested to be printed are as follows:

COMMITTEE ON MILITARY AFFAIRS

SEPTEMBER 1, 1944.

To the Senate:

The above-mentioned committee hereby submits the following report showing the names of persons employed by the committee who are not full-time employees of the Senate or of the committee for the month of August 1944, in compliance with the terms of Senate Resolution 319, agreed to August 23, 1944:

Name of individual	Address	Name and address of department or organization by whom paid	Annual rate of compensation
Helen A. Rice	1324 Monroe St. NW. (Apartment 44), Washington, D. C.	War Department, Legislative and Liaison Division, Office of Chief of Staff	$2,000
Theodore B. Stothart	3801 4th St. SE (Apartment 3), Washington 20, D. C.	War Department, Adjutant General's Office, Civilian Personnel Division, Branch 3.	1,800
Col. David A. Watt	Clinton, Md	War Department, General Staff	6,000
Col. Lewis Sanders	1911 R St. NW	War Department	6,000

ROBERT R. REYNOLDS, *Chairman.*

WAR CONTRACTS SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE SENATE MILITARY AFFAIRS COMMITTEE

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON MILITARY AFFAIRS,
September 1, 1944.

The VICE PRESIDENT,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. VICE PRESIDENT: Pursuant to Senate Resolution 319 I am transmitting herewith a list of employees of the War Contracts Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Military Affairs who are not full-time employees of the Senate. Included with this list is the name and address of each such employee, the name and address of the Department paying the salary of such employee and the annual rate of compensation for each such employee.

Respectfully yours,

JAMES E. MURRAY,
Chairman, War Contracts Subcommittee.
By CHARLES A. MURRAY,
Executive Secretary.

SEPTEMBER 1, 1944.

To the Senate:

The above-mentioned committee hereby submits the following report showing the names of persons employed by the committee who are not full-time employees of the Senate or of the committee for the month of August 1944, in compliance with the terms of Senate Resolution No. 319, agreed to August 23, 1944:

Name of individual	Address	Name and address of department or organization by whom paid	Annual rate of compensation
Marian Banner	1302 Gallatin St. NW., Washington, D. C.	Reconstruction Finance Corporation, Washington, D. C.	$2,300
Kurt Borchardt	1385 Nicholson St. NW., Washington, D. C.	Smaller War Plants Corporation, Washington, D. C.	5,600
Marion Fostner	60 Elm Ave., Takoma Park, Md.	Navy Department, Washington, D. C.	2,600
Grace Mayer	3610 Minnesota Ave. SE., Washington, D. C.	Smaller War Plants Corporation, Washington, D. C.	2,000
Maj. Wm. E. Nefflen	Army-Navy Club, Washington, D. C.	War Department, Washington, D. C.	3,000
Vernice O'Mullane	Alcott Hall, West Potomac Park, Washington, D. C.	War Production Board, Washington, D. C.	1,620
Doris Phippen	Frankfort Hall, 40 Plattsburg Court NW., Washington, D. C.	Navy Department, Washington, D. C.	2,040
Omer J. Regnier	209 Franklin Ave., Silver Spring, Md.	Farm Security Administration, Washington, D. C.	3,800
Sigmund Timberg	2215 42d St. NW., Washington, D. C.	Foreign Economic Administration, Washington, D. C.	6,500

JAMES E. MURRAY, *Chairman.*

SENATE MILITARY AFFAIRS COMMITTEE, SPECIAL SUBCOMMITTEE ON WAR MOBILIZATION

SEPTEMBER 1, 1944.

To the Senate:

The above-mentioned committee hereby submits the following report showing the names of persons employed by the committee who are not full-time employees of the Senate or of the committee for the month of August 1944, in compliance with the terms of Senate Resolution No. 319, agreed to August 23, 1944:

Name of individual	Address	Name and address of department or organization by whom paid	Annual rate of compensation
Boyce, Virginia W	2030 Fort Davis St., Washington, D. C.	Department of the Interior, Washington, D. C.	1,800
Gertler, Ann S	3721 39th St. NW., Washington, D. C.	do	2,000
Heslep, Hope C	2 East Maple St., Alexandria, Va.	War Manpower Commission, Washington, D. C.	2,000
Larson, C. Theodore	3917 North 5th St., Arlington, Va.	National Housing Agency, Washington, D. C.	5,600
Manuel, Fritzie P	1621 T St. NW., Washington, D. C.	War Manpower Commission, Washington, D. C.	3,800
McConkey, Darel	Rural free delivery, Box 153, Alexandria, Va.	War Production Board, Washington, D. C.	4,600
Moen, Cora L	5327 16th St. NW., Washington, D. C.	Office of Price Administration, Washington, D. C.	2,000
Moore, Walter Louis	2220 Perry St. NE., Washington, D. C.	National Housing Agency, Washington, D. C.	1,440
Oleksy, Elizabeth H	1620 Fuller St. NW., Washington, D. C.	War Production Board, Washington, D. C.	2,600
Rosenberger, Francis C.	5814 64th Ave., East Riverdale, Md.	Office of Price Administration, Washington, D. C.	4,600
Schimmel, Herbert	3604 Minnesota Ave. SE., Washington, D. C.	War Production Board, Washington, D. C.	8,000

H. M. KILGORE, *Chairman.*

COMMITTEE ON NAVAL AFFAIRS

SEPTEMBER 1, 1944.

To the Senate:

The above-mentioned committee hereby submits the following report showing the names of persons employed by the committee who are not full-time employees of the Senate or of the committee for the month of August 1944, in compliance with the terms of Senate Resolution 319, agreed to August 23, 1944:

Name of individual	Address	Name and address of department or organization by whom paid	Annual rate of compensation
Capt. James A. Saunders, U. S. Navy (retired).	4105 Oliver St., Chevy Chase, Md.	Office of the Chief of Naval Operations, Navy Department, Washington, D. C.	$6,000 per year plus $162 per month subsistence and rental allowance.
Chief Yeoman Herbert S. Atkinson, (AA) U. S. Naval Reserve.	2405 Pennington Rd., Trenton, N. J.	Potomac River Naval Command, Navy Department, Washington, D. C.	$1,512 per year plus $91.50 per month subsistence and rental allowance.

DAVID I. WALSH, *Chairman.*

SENATE NAVY LIAISON OFFICE, ROOM 461, SENATE OFFICE BUILDING

SEPTEMBER 1, 1944.

To the Senate:

The above-mentioned committee hereby submits the following report showing the names of persons employed by the committee who are not full-time employees of the Senate or of the committee for the month of August 1944, in compliance with the terms of Senate Resolution No. 319, agreed to August 23, 1944:

Name of individual	Address	Name and address of department or organization by whom paid	Annual rate of compensation
Lt. Frederick A. McLaughlin, U. S. Naval Reserve.	5305 41st St. NW, Washington, DC	Bureau of Naval Personnel, Navy Department, Washington, D. C.	$2,400 per year plus $132 per month subsistence and rental allowance.
Lt. Joseph G. Feeney, U. S. Naval Reserve.	2745 29th St. NW, Washington, D. C.	do	Do.
Yeoman (2d cl.) Eleanor W. St. Clair, U. S. Naval Reserve.	2134 R St. NW, Washington, D. C.	do	$1,152 per year plus $91.50 per month subsistence and rental allowance.
Yeoman (2d cl.) Loretta F. Jochman, U. S. Naval Reserve.	do	do	Do.

These employees are representatives of the Naval Bureau of Personnel to assist the Senators on naval personnel matters.

DAVID I. WALSH, *Chairman.*

COMMITTEE ON PENSIONS

SEPTEMBER 1, 1944.

To the Senate:

The above-mentioned committee hereby submits the following report showing the names of persons employed by the committee who are not full-time employees of the Senate or of the committee for the month of August 1944, in compliance with the terms of Senate Resolution 319, agreed to August 23, 1944:

Name of individual	Address	Name and address of department or organization by whom paid	Annual rate of compensation
Louis J. Meyerle	612 Bennington Dr., Silver Spring, Md	Veterans' Administration	$5,000

JAMES M. TUNNELL, *Chairman.*

SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON POST-WAR ECONOMIC POLICY AND PLANNING

AUGUST 31, 1944.

To the Senate:

The above-mentioned committee hereby submits the following report showing the names of persons employed by the committee who are not full-time employees of the Senate or of the committee for the month of August 1944, in compliance with the terms of Senate Resolution No. 319, agreed to August 23, 1944:

Name of individual	Address	Name and address of department or organization by whom paid	Annual rate of compensation
Claire Cahill[1]	Washington, D. C.	Bureau of Census	$3,700
Miles L. Colean[2]	do	Starrett Bros. & Eken, Washington, D. C.	(3)

[1] Miss Cahill performed approximately 4 days of statistical work in connection with a study of post-war housing and was not compensated from committee funds.

[2] Mr. Colean is compensated from committee funds at the rate of $25 a day for work performed as an adviser to a subcommittee of this Committee on Housing and Redevelopment, of which Senator TAFT is chairman. He performed approximately 4 days' work during the month of August.

[3] Unknown.

WALTER F. GEORGE, *Chairman.*

SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO STUDY AND SURVEY PROBLEMS OF SMALL BUSINESS ENTERPRISE

UNITED STATES SENATE,
SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO
STUDY PROBLEMS OF
AMERICAN SMALL BUSINESS,
September 1, 1944.

The VICE PRESIDENT,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. VICE PRESIDENT: Pursuant to Senate Resolution 319 I am transmitting herewith a list of employees of the Special Committee To Study Problems of American Small Business who are not full-time employees of the Senate. Included with this list is the name and address of each such employee, the name and address of the department paying the salary of such employee, and the annual rate of compensation for each such employee.

Respectfully yours,

JAMES E. MURRAY,
Chairman.
By CHARLES A. MURRAY,
Executive Secretary.

SEPTEMBER 1, 1944.

To the Senate:

The above-mentioned committee hereby submits the following report showing the names of persons employed by the committee who are not full-time employees of the Senate or of the committee for the month of August 1944, in compliance with the terms of Senate Resolution No. 319, agreed to August 23, 1944:

Name of individual	Address	Name and address of department or organization by whom paid	Annual rate of compensation
Ruth B. Abrams	2515 K St. NW., Washington, D. C.	Foreign Economic Administration, Washington, D. C.	$3,200
J. Russell Boner	4207 Russell Ave., Mount Rainier, Md.	Smaller War Plants Corporation, Washington, D. C.	4,600
Agnes E. Crivella	1408 Buchanan St. NW., Washington, DC	War Production Board, Washington, D. C.	2,700
Emerald G. Devitt	2425 27th St. South, Arlington, Va	do	2,000
Elsie A. Digges	120 C St. NE., Washington, D. C.	do	1,800
F. Preston Forbes	510 Four Mile Rd., Alexandria, Va.	Department of Commerce, Washington, D. C.	4,600
Carol M. Fuller	2101 S St. NW., Washington, D. C.	Office of Price Administration, Washington, D. C.	2,100
Scott K. Gray, Jr.	119 Joliet St. SW., Washington, D. C.	Reconstruction Finance Corporation, Washington, D. C.	4,600
Stella J. Groeper	1127 Branch Ave. SE., Washington, D. C.	War Production Board, Washington, D. C.	2,600
Dorothy M. Heckard	2828 Buena Vista Terrace SE., Washington, D. C.	do	2,000
Kathleen Kimball	1701 Park Rd. NW., Washington, D. C.	do	1,800
Elizabeth P. Lucas	1730 Quincy St. North, Arlington, Va.	do	1,800
Lois M. Miller	3120 Massachusetts Ave. SE., Washington, D. C.	do	2,600

SENATE SMALL BUSINESS COMMITTEE

SEPTEMBER 1, 1944.

To the Senate:

The above-mentioned committee hereby submits the following report showing the names of persons employed by the committee who are not full-time employees of the Senate or of the committee for the month of August 1944, in compliance with the terms of Senate Resolution No. 319, agreed to August 23, 1944:

Name of individual	Address	Name and address of department or organization by whom paid	Annual rate of compensation
John W. Nelson	1445 Ogden St. NW, Washington, D. C.	War Production Board, Washington, D. C.	$5,600
Jessma Oslin	2205 S St. SE, Washington, D. C.	do	1,800
Grace F. Purdy	230 Rhode Island Ave. NE, Washington, D. C.	Office of Price Administration, Washington, D. C.	3,200
Arthur G. Silverman	719 D St. NE, Washington, D. C.	do	5,600
Lt. (Jr. Gr.) George H. Soule.	4020 Beecher St. NW, Washington, DC.	Navy Department, Washington, D. C.	2,000
Lillian Evelyn Spicer	1433 Decatur St. NW, Washington, D. C.	do	2,600
Frederick W. Steckman.	4000 Cathedral Ave., Washington, D. C.	Maritime Commission, Washington, D. C.	4,600
Allen G. Thurman	201 East Shepherd St., Chevy Chase, Md.	do	6,500
Alfred J. Van Tassel	1622 Mount Eagle Place, Alexandria, Va.	War Production Board, Washington, D. C.	6,500
Olga Yelenesics	2400 13th St. NW. Washington, D. C.	do	2,000

JAMES E. MURRAY, *Chairman.*

COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

SEPTEMBER 1, 1944.

To the Senate:

The above-mentioned committee hereby submits the following report showing the names of persons employed by the committee who are not full-time employees of the Senate or of the committee for the month of August 1944, in compliance with the terms of Senate Resolution 318, agreed to August 23, 1944:

Name of individual	Address	Name and address of department or organization by whom paid	Annual rate of compensation
John F. Feeney	1425 Rhode Island Ave. NW.	General Accounting Office, Washington, D. C.	$6,400
Harold E. Merrick	906 Aspen St. NW.	do	4,800
Thomas J. Scott	3500 14th St. NW.	Federal Bureau of Investigation, Department of Justice, Washington, D. C.	4,800

KENNETH MCKELLAR, *Acting Chairman.*

PETITION

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a resolution adopted by the Civic Reform League of Puerto Rico, favoring the prompt enactment of certain proposed amendments to the Organic Act of Puerto Rico, which was referred to the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs.

ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY AND POWER PROJECT—RESOLUTIONS BY VERMONT AND NEW YORK FEDERATIONS OF LABOR

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, American labor is keenly alert to the need of preparing a program to take up the unemployment slack after the war. This concern is reflected in the resolutions adopted by the various State labor conventions. It is plain that the desire of labor is not alone for a program to provide jobs to ease unemployment during the reconversion period but also for a program that will add materially to the wealth of the Nation and make possible a great expansion of private industry and trade and bring about permanent employment.

During recent years many State organizations have endorsed the St. Lawrence seaway and power-development project. This year other States have joined their ranks. I ask consent to present to the Senate a resolution adopted by the Vermont State Federation of Labor at its forty-first annual convention held at Burlington, Vt., on August 12, 1944, and also a resolution adopted by the New York State Federation of Labor at its annual convention held at Syracuse, N. Y., last month, the exact date not being indicated on the resolution. I ask that the resolutions be printed in the RECORD and referred to the proper committee.

There being no objection, the resolutions were received, referred to the Committee on Commerce, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION ENDORSING S. 1385 ADOPTED BY THE VERMONT FEDERATION OF LABOR AT THEIR FORTY-FIRST ANNUAL CONVENTION, HELD AT THE CITY OF BURLINGTON, VT., ON AUGUST 12, 1944

Whereas there is pending before the Congress a bill sponsored by Senator GEORGE D. AIKEN, of Vermont, which bill embodies a project known as the St. Lawrence seaway and power project;

Whereas the construction of this project would bring about greatly reduced transportation costs in shipping from the Great Lakes area and that territory adjacent to and bordering on the St. Lawrence basin;

Whereas the economic production of power that would be generated and distributed through the surrounding area and Vermont would contribute directly to the economic well-being and improvement of farmers and small industry in Vermont and this would be reflected in the general welfare of labor;

Whereas the construction of this project would furnish employment to a large number of people, both veterans and workers in the post-war period and thereby materially contribute to the relief of unemployment during that time; and

Whereas the benefits resulting from this project would favorably affect the national economy so profoundly, and thus permeate and raise up the economic well-being of agriculture, industry, and labor: We therefore

Resolve, That the Vermont Federation of Labor endorse this legislation and urge the construction of the St. Lawrence seaway and power project as soon as possible.

That a copy of this resolution be sent to the Honorable Franklin D. Roosevelt, President of the United States of America;

That a copy be sent to Senator GEORGE D. AIKEN, of Vermont;

And further copies be sent to Senators WARREN R. AUSTIN and JOHN H. OVERTON; Congressmen CHARLES PLUMLEY and WILLIAM A. PITTENGER.

ANDREW MITCHELL,
President.
ROBERT SINCLAIR,
Secretary.

RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY NEW YORK FEDERATION OF LABOR, AT ITS ANNUAL CONVENTION HELD AT SYRACUSE IN AUGUST 1944

Whereas a bill is now pending in Congress, Senate bill 1385, authorizing the St. Lawrence seaway and power projects; and

Whereas S. 1385 is designed to:

1. Develop more than 2,000,000 horsepower of electricity by creating a power plant in the International Rapids section of the St. Lawrence, on the boundary of the State of New York;

2. Open the Great Lakes for ocean navigation by deepening the St. Lawrence River and connecting channels of the Great Lakes; and

Whereas the completion of this development, already largely improved, has been strongly recommended by every President since World War No. 1 because of its benefit to the entire country and its value as a permanent asset to our national defense; and

Whereas the construction of the works needed to complete the project will create tens of thousands of jobs at the site in New York and throughout the country during the critical post-war period; and

Whereas on completion, the project will provide cheap and ready power for millions of consumers, as well as a great new artery of commerce connecting our midwestern area with the sea: Be it therefore

Resolved, That this organization go on record in full support of S. 1385; and be it further

Resolved, That we urge the Congress to approve S. 1385 without further delay; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the President, to the Governor, and to our Senators and Representatives in Congress.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. BUSHFIELD, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

S. 1688. A bill to authorize the Governor of the Farm Credit Administration and the Secretary of Agriculture to compromise, adjust, or cancel certain indebtedness, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 1071).

By Mr. BALL, from the Committee on Immigration:

H. R. 2707. A bill for the relief of Henry White; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1072).

By Mr. RUSSELL, from the Committee on Immigration:

H. R. 1680. A bill to amend the Nationality Act of 1940 to permit the Commissioner to furnish copies of any part of the records or information therefrom to agencies or officials of a State without charge; without amendment (Rept. No. 1073);

H. R. 3722. A bill to amend section 342 of the Nationality Act of 1940 in respect to fees for the issuance of certificates of arrival; without amendment (Rept. No. 1074); and

H. R. 4257. A bill to expatriate or exclude certain persons for evading military and naval service; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1075).

By Mr. RUSSELL (for Mr. MALONEY), from the Committee on Immigration:

H. R. 2509. A bill for the relief of Marie Engert; without amendment (Rept. No. 1076); and

H. R. 4271. A bill to amend the Nationality Act of 1940 to preserve the nationality of citizens residing abroad; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1077).

By Mr. RUSSELL (for Mr. HOLMAN), from the Committee on Immigration:

H. R. 312. A bill for the relief of Freda Utley; without amendment (Rept. No. 1078).

By Mr. FERGUSON, from the Committee on Immigration:

H. R. 2134. A bill for the relief of Paul Szeliga; without amendment (Rept. No. 1079).

By Mr. BURTON, from the Committee on Immigration:

H. R. 1434. A bill for the relief of Anna M. Kohler; without amendment (Rept. No. 1080).

SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE PRESIDENTIAL, VICE PRESIDENTIAL, AND SENATORIAL CAMPAIGN EXPENDITURES—LIMIT OF EXPENDITURES

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, I report favorably Senate Resolution 322, and ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be read.

The resolution (S. Res. 322) submitted by Mr. GREEN on August 22, 1944, was read as follows:

Resolved, That the special committee authorized by Senate Resolution 263, Seventy-eighth Congress, to investigate the campaign expenditures of the various Presidential candidates, Vice Presidential candidates, and candidates for the United States Senate, and facts relating thereto, is authorized to expend from the contingent fund of the Senate $40,000 in addition to the amounts heretofore authorized for the same purpose.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, is the Senator from Arizona asking for immediate consideration of the resolution?

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes. The committee is out of funds.

Mr. WHITE. That is perhaps a common affliction.

Mr. HAYDEN. The committee has work to do, and it cannot function without funds. If granted, the amount proposed would allow the committee a sum of money equal to that which was allowed 4 years ago.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, the Senate authorized the appointment of the committee. The committee has been functioning, and I suppose it has spent substantial sums of money. I believe that we must provide for whatever funds the committee may need. Of course, the proposal places an individual Senator in a somewhat embarrassing position because he knows nothing about the circumstances justifying the request. But I think that we must assume that the committee is either right or wrong, and that it is carrying on its duties. I do not object to the resolution.

There being no objection, the resolution was considered and agreed to.

INVESTIGATION OF HYDROELECTRIC POWER DEVELOPMENT AND IRRIGATION PROJECTS—LIMIT OF EXPENDITURES

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, I report favorably, with an amendment, Senate Resolution 313, and ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

Mr. HAYDEN. The resolution has been amended so as to reduce the amount of money originally requested.

Mr. WHITE. How much of an appropriation does the resolution propose?

Mr. HAYDEN. The resolution originally provided for an appropriation of $10,000 and the committee reduced the amount to $5,000.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution (S. Res. 313) submitted by Mr. MCFARLAND (for himself and Mr. HATCH) on June 19, 1944.

The amendment of the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate was, on page 1, line 8, after the word "by", to strike out "$10,000" and insert "$5,000", so as to make the resolution read:

Resolved, That the limit of expenditures of the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation under Senate Resolution 155, Seventy-eighth Congress, agreed to June 26, 1943, as amended by Senate Resolution 304, Seventy-eighth Congress, agreed to June 5, 1944 (relating to an investigation with respect to the need for development of irrigation projects and with respect to the supply and distribution of hydroelectric power), is hereby increased by $5,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

REPORTS ON DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

Mr. BARKLEY, from the Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers, to which were referred, for examination and recommendation, three lists of records transmitted to the Senate by the Archivist of the United States that appeared to have no permanent value or historical interest, submitted reports thereon pursuant to law.

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED

Mrs. CARAWAY, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that on September 1, 1944, that committee presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills:

S. 1508. An act to provide effective date of awards of death pension or compensation in cases of persons missing or missing in action, to authorize payment of such benefits from the date of death of such person as reported or found by the Secretary of War or the Secretary of the Navy, and for other purposes; and

S. 1934. An act to provide for abandonment of the project authorized in the act of October 17, 1940, for a seaplane channel and basin in Boston Harbor, Mass.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. THOMAS of Utah, from the Committee on Military Affairs:

Brig. Gen. Raymond Stallings McLain, National Guard of the United States, for temporary appointment as major general in the Army of the United States, under the provisions of law; and

Sundry officers for appointment, by transfer, in the Regular Army.

By Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts, from the Committee on Naval Affairs:

Sundry officers for temporary appointment and/or promotion in the Navy; and

Several officers for temporary appointment and/or promotion in the Marine Corps.

By Mr. MCKELLAR, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads:

Sundry postmasters.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. RUSSELL:

S. 2128. A bill for the relief of Gussie B. Bacon;

S. 2129. A bill for the relief of Florence Jackson;

S. 2130. A bill for the relief of the legal guardian of Jettie Smith, a minor; and

S. 2131. A bill for the relief of Oscar Spencer; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts:

S. 2132. A bill for the relief of Ensign Frederick Matthews McCord, United States Naval Reserve; and

S. 2133. A bill to authorize the transfer of certain lands within the Colonial National Historical Park, Yorktown, Va., to the Secretary of the Navy; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. GUFFEY (for himself and Mr. TRUMAN):

S. J. Res. 149. Joint resolution requesting the President to proclaim February 1 as National Freedom Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were each read twice by their titles and referred as indicated:

H. R. 5144. An act to authorize the city of Ketchikan, Alaska, to issue bonds in a sum not to exceed $150,000 for the purpose of constructing and acquiring additions and betterments to and extensions of the electric light and power system of said city, and to provide for the payment thereof, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 5154. An act relating to dual employment in the Postal Service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

RECOGNITION OF WORK OF DRAFT BOARDS

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. President, the selection of men to serve in the armed forces of this Nation is at once a vital and a difficult task. That that task has been well performed is attested by the magnificent Army and Navy which have been built up in this Nation in the comparatively short period of 4 years.

The men and women who serve on the local draft boards throughout the Nation have done a commendable job, and their distinct contribution to the war effort should be recognized and commended by the Government which they serve.

In the State of Pennsylvania the local draft board of my own district, which comprises the borough of Carrick and other surrounding boroughs in the Pittsburgh area, has performed its job effectively and well; so well, in fact, that the members of that board—board No. 29—have been cited by both State and Federal authorities for the high standards of efficiency and fairness which have attended their efforts thus far. This board, like the vast majority of other boards throughout the country, has studied well the problems of its registrants and has done its utmost to reach fair, impartial, and reasonable decisions.

It is my belief, Mr. President, that the Government of the United States should approve some type of certificate or emblem to be presented to the members of the local boards, in order to signify that the Government and its people appreciate the contribution which the members of these boards have made to the winning of the war.

As an indication that the value of the service of the members of these local draft boards is being recognized, I ask unanimous consent to include in the RECORD as a part of my remarks an editorial which appeared in the Pittsburgh Press on Sunday, September 3, entitled "They Have Done a Good Job."

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THEY HAVE DONE A GOOD JOB

They didn't get any compensation for it. In fact, the job cost most of them money out of their own pocket.

They did get a great deal of criticism, most of it unwarranted.

And they were plagued to death with red tape, conflicting directives, and the plethoric pronouncements of Maj. Gen. Lewis B. Hershey.

They were the members of the country's draft boards.

They have been on the job since October 1940. Nearly 4 years of tedious, painstaking work, often full of heartaches, generally full of headaches, and many times, no doubt, desperately discouraging.

Some made mistakes. Some few—very few—did not bring to the task the high order of intelligence, fairness, and diligence which was the general average.

But the system worked amazingly well and in genuine democratic fashion.

Now that draft quotas have been materially reduced, it is proposed to consolidate draft offices. The purpose is to curtail paid personnel and save rental costs. These are legitimate reasons for the action contemplated by the State selective service headquarters.

The boards, however, will stay on the job, each functioning as a separate unit although their burdens now have been greatly lightened.

Between now and the actual end of the war these boards will get what might be termed a relative respite. They have earned it. They will need a rest for the even bigger job which faces them after victory.

For the Selective Service System and the local boards are charged with the responsibility of helping returned servicemen restore themselves to civilian life.

We have built up a powerful Army and Navy in a short time. In this the draft boards played an important part. We face an even greater test in demobilizing that Army and Navy to peacetime pursuits. Here, too, the draft boards will play an important part.

The best that we can hope is that they do as good a job on the second half of their assignment as they have done on the first.

DEFINITION OF THE NEW DEAL

Mr. GUFFEY. Mr. President, I should like to read into the RECORD a definition from the New Merriam Webster's International Dictionary which I read last night for the first time. The definition is as follows:

New Deal: A number of measures of President F. D. Roosevelt, designed to promote economic recovery and social security. Some of the most important of these measures are the National Industrial Recovery Act, farm relief, public works, control of public-utility holding companies, old-age pensions, and unemployment insurance.

PROPOSED EQUAL-RIGHTS AMENDMENT—NOTICE

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, while I have not conferred with the distinguished majority or minority leaders, I wish to announce at this time that it is the intention of the sponsors of the so-called equal-rights amendment which is Calendar No. 272, Senate Joint Resolution 25, to call it up for consideration by the Senate sometime during the coming week.

PRODUCTION AND THE ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF AMERICAN LABOR

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, on Friday last I asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a table showing the production and the work performed by American labor during the war. Inadvertently there were omitted from the table I placed in the RECORD at that time certain other facts and figures which I ask to have printed in the RECORD of today at this point, and then for the permanent RECORD that they be added to the table presented by me on Friday last.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The matter referred to is as follows:

In spite of the absence of 8,400,000 men, the pick of the Nation's manpower, to the armed forces since the attack upon Pearl Harbor labor has made up this loss and added 5,700,000 workers; 3,000,000 workers of this number are women who have left their homes to help produce the weapons and equipment with which we are winning the war:

Military forces:	
December 1941	2,100,000
January 1944	10,500,000
Men withdrawn from Nation's manpower	8,400,000
Labor forces:	
January 1942	56,300,000
January 1944	62,000,000
Labor forces gained	5,700,000

Additional figures on production clearly demonstrate the success of the determined effort American labor has made and is making to win the essential battle of production:

1. Over-all production

Total production war and nonwar:	
1941	$93,900,000,000
1943	146,900,000,000
Total production war goods:	
1941	1,400,000,000
1943	67,000,000,000

2. Naval vessels

Naval vessels owned:	
December 1941	2,500
January 1944	23,700

3. Airplanes

	Weight of airframes, pounds
Military airplane production:	
1941	83,500,000
1943	667,000,000

4. Gasoline

	Barrels per day
High octane gasoline:	
1941	40,000
1944	400,000

SPEECH OF ACCEPTANCE BY SENATOR TRUMAN AT LAMAR, MO.

[Mr. HATCH asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the speech delivered by Senator TRUMAN at Lamar, Mo., August 31, 1944, accepting the nomination for Vice President of the United States, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY SENATOR O'MAHONEY BEFORE INDIANA BAR ASSOCIATION

[Mr. O'MAHONEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the address delivered by him before the Indiana Bar Association at Indianapolis, Ind., on September 1, 1944, which appears in the Appendix.]

ISSUES IN THE NOVEMBER ELECTION—ADDRESS BY GOVERNOR SCHOEPPEL, OF KANSAS

[Mr. CAPPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio address on the subject of the issues in the November election, delivered by Gov. Andrew Schoeppel, of Kansas, on September 1, 1944, which appears in the Appendix.]

GOVERNOR DEWEY AND FOREIGN POLICY

[Mr. GUFFEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD two editorials from the Lincoln (Nebr.) Star, one from the issue of August 19, 1944, entitled "'Old Man' Hull in Shirt Sleeves," and the second entitled "Governor Dewey's Reverberating 'No'," which appear in the Appendix.]

SANCTUARY FOR JEWS

[Mr. DAVIS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "We Must Give Jews Sanctuary," writ-

ten by Harry H. Schlacht and published in the Pittsburgh Sun-Telegraph of September 3, 1944, which appears in the Appendix.]

TRIBUTES TO HON. JAMES A. FARLEY

[Mr. GILLETTE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial from the Hawkeye-Gazette, of Burlington, Iowa, of June 13, 1944, entitled "Still a Strong Man," and an editorial from the Pawtucket, (R. I.) Times, of June 12, 1944, entitled "Mr. Farley Steps Down," which appear in the Appendix.]

CIVILIAN PUBLIC SERVICE CAMPS—LETTER FROM RUTH SUCKOW

[Mr. GILLETTE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter addressed to him by Miss Ruth Suckow, of Cedar Falls, Iowa, relative to civilian public-service camps, which appears in the Appendix.]

FOUNDRIES—THE BOTTLENECK IN MANUFACTURE OF FARM MACHINERY

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, the real bottleneck in the manufacture of farm machinery, over and above the historical quota basis of production, is the shortage in the manufacture of castings and foundry supplies for such machinery. This has been brought about solely because of the shortage of manpower in such foundries due to the insufficient wages paid the foundry workers. This has seriously interfered with the production of the farmer. These supplies have been badly needed in order to offset the loss of manpower to the armed forces and to the munitions manufacturers. The same shortage has also greatly interfered with the manufacture of repair parts for farm machinery.

In recent weeks we have seen press releases by General Somervell, General Clay, and the Office of War Information with reference to the shortage of heavy trucks, bulldozers, tractors, and heavy munitions. An examination of the facts brings me to the conclusion that the real shortage of such war material comes from our inability to produce in our foundries of America. This bottleneck in the foundries is nothing new; it has existed for months. It appears that the various agencies recognize the real cause, which is the shortage of labor in the foundries due to the low wages paid the workers; but nothing has been done to remedy this condition.

As part of my remarks I wish to have placed in the body of the RECORD some factual data which are contained in a letter I wrote on August 31, 1944, to Hon. James F. Byrnes, Director of the Office of War Mobilization, in order that Members of the Senate may be familiar with these facts.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AUGUST 31, 1944.

Hon. JAMES F. BYRNES,
Director, Office of War Mobilization,
The White House, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR JUSTICE: There is one thing that has been troubling me greatly for the past month in connection with our war effort and that is the problem of the bottleneck in foundries. In almost all of the hearings held by our committee in connection with the investigation of shortages we run into this question.

I am setting down here a few of my thoughts and am wondering whether the problem cannot be solved, for it seems so important to me and so easy of solution if we will recognize the real trouble.

Why are men in our foundries paid an average of 87 cents per hour when men in similar work in war plants get $1.15 per hour, and for many months we are told that lack of manpower makes the foundry the bottleneck in our war productions?

I have just received a letter from the War Manpower Commission, Detroit office, with these quoted paragraphs:

"Labor shortages have affected most seriously the output of such vital war industries as foundries, forge shops, nonferrous metal plants, heavy ordnance, trucks and truck tires, and steel mills; industries characterized as hot, dirty, low-paid work which the average worker is understandably reluctant to enter. Most of these facilities are seriously behind schedule, some as much as 2 or 3 months.

"Employment in foundries and forge shops has continued downward despite the apparent halting of the over-all drop in employment. The decline in employment in these plants was over 600 from July 1 to August 1 and over 5,000 between December 1943 and August 1944.

"Foundry and forge shop employment continues to decline, however, and this situation may not improve materially so long as wage rates in these industries continue relatively low."

Heavy duty military trucks have been lagging for 8 months. Industry experts attribute the lag to the shortage of labor in key foundries. Yet we find that over one-half of all foundries have increased their capacity from 25 percent to 50 percent. Much of this expansion took place without regard to the fact that production could have been increased if labor had been made available to the existing foundries by offering higher wages. It can be definitely proved that foundry facilities have been expanding in many cases, while the production has been falling off steadily because of the shortage of manpower.

The shortage in farm machinery is caused by the same shortage of labor in foundries. Common labor in foundries was frozen under sweeper's wages in some war plants; wages of 87 cents in foundries, $1.15 for similar work in war plants. The wage scale for foundry workers has been below that for plant sweepers and janitors due to the wage ceilings in foundries, which are from 20 cents to 40 cents lower than an intelligent laborer can obtain in nearby plants for much more pleasant and healthful work.

In most cases the ceiling prices on purchased castings for established manufacturers of these products is low compared to the ceiling prices of castings used directly for the Army and Navy so that pressure must be put on the foundries to have them produce the lower ceiling-priced casting.

The increase in plant facilities alone will not do it. The Defense Plant Corporation has approved for expenditure for land, buildings, and machinery for iron castings the sum of $16,237,767.88.

One plant with maximum capacity of 800 tons of castings in November 1942, after building and equipping additional facilities designed to produce 2,500 tons in May 1943, produced only 700 tons because of the shortage of labor.

In some cases where new foundries with the latest and most modern equipment have been added, the new alone is producing, the old foundry is wasted. It has cost the Government the additional investment and all the additional manpower for the construction.

Ceiling prices fixed by O. P. A. have not helped the situation. Here is what O. P. A. did. It placed ceilings on prices paid by regular foundry customers but not on prices to be paid by new customers or by Government agencies. As a result, foundries have refused old customers work to take on new work at higher prices, an increase as much as 150 percent. As the foundrymen had to learn the new jobs, their output decreased, the percentage of rejections increased—in some cases from 5 percent to 35 percent of total. You have less output per man and consequently a need for more men plus the fact that work has to be done in distant cities with its cost of transportation.

The Government tried to meet the situation by building more plants and new machinery, taking more manpower for this, only to be faced with still lower production as more men leave the foundries for better paid war jobs.

The War Manpower Commission finally admitted its labor shortage of 20,000 men in foundries. It stated that the wages were low and working conditions dusty. Wages were not increased as an industry as they were in shipyards. So foundries did not get men and even lost men.

Here are the United States Department of Labor manpower figures:

	June 1944	May 1944	April 1944	June 1943
Gray-iron and semi-steel castings	73,100	73,400	74,600	81,900
Malleable-iron castings	24,600	24,600	25,000	26,800
Steel castings	74,500	75,600	76,900	83,900

These figures indicate what has happened in manpower in foundries.

These situations have been called to the attention of the W. P. B. and Government agencies, but there is no real improvement in the situation simply because the fundamental difficulty of low wages has been ignored. The agencies will try anything, except the one thing to solve the difficulty. All agree the foundry is the bottleneck in many of our present critical war materials.

Why is this low wage ignored as the cause? Labor itself recognizes it, for the Labor Section of the W. P. B. asked labor union representatives to come to Washington to see if they would permit the importation of Mexicans for foundry work, and labor said, "That is not what we need—we want more money paid in the foundries."

They wasted 3 days here. They finally agreed to permit Mexicans to come in with the vague understanding that wages and hours in the foundries would be investigated.

The State Department didn't permit the Mexicans to come in for foundry work, 80,000 having come in for farm work and 40,000 for railroad work.

Now some relief is being received from labor from the West Indies.

There are some cases to increase wages in foundries pending before the W. L. B. They are individual cases, some sponsored by both labor and management, some disputed.

The War Labor Board says nothing will be done in the industry as a whole, but each individual case will be handled separately. Judge Vinson says 45 cents may be paid in the South and $1 in Detroit.

Why these low wages? Is it really the War Labor Board or Judge Vinson? Or is it that some of the industries do not want to increase the wages, thinking of the future when they will not have war orders? In the meantime the war effort suffers. General Somervell tells of the shortages—August 1, 1944, release. General Clay followed with a release—August 28, 1944, O. W. I.—repeating the story of our shortages. All agree the bottleneck is the foundry. The foundry needs up to 12,000 men.

With best personal regards, I am,

Sincerely,

HOMER FERGUSON.

AIR BASES FOR POST-WAR AVIATION

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. President, America has had a most tragic lesson in the potentiality of aviation. We were blasted into this World War by the lack of intelligent leadership and understanding of the power of destruction from the air. As a result, our fleet and air power in the Pacific were sunk and destroyed at Pearl Harbor. A part of the terrible result was the unbelievable suffering, starvation, and final surrender of an American Army in the Philippines. The blame for this failure still hangs heavily on those responsible not only for the plight of the troops stranded and deserted in the Philippines at that time, but for the deaths reported daily of our gallant men in the Pacific who must now pay with their lives for this tragic mistake.

The Japanese also made a mistake when they underestimated the potential ability of the United States to awaken to the importance of air power. The gigantic strides being made daily in the Pacific and in the amazing blitz the Allies are making against the German armies are made possible by our supremacy in the air.

Facing complete disaster, the American people turned to the production of air power. The best brains in the country began to design and build airplanes; great assembly lines were set up; hundreds of thousands of men and women by day and night trained and turned their inventive genius to the building of ships for the sky. In August of this year more than 7,700 airplanes were produced in America alone. Almost 100,000 planes in 1 year was the answer of free America to the challenge of the despotic dictators of the earth.

The youth of America responded to the call for pilots, navigators, gunners, radar and radio operators to man these new ships. So many of them responded and qualified that today both the Army and Navy have had to curtail their pilot training. Thousands of young men are bitterly disappointed as they are transferred out of or denied admission to pilot training courses in our armed forces.

These American planes and pilots have played a magnificent part in the liberation thus far of the world. They are not only the eyes of the Allied armies, but they are flying cannon protecting and paving the way for our gallant forces to advance on land and sea.

When we read and rejoice over the news of the advances of the Russian armies, it is well to recall that they are racing to victory by the aid of American equipment. More than 300,000 American trucks and other military motor vehicles, and in excess of 11,000 American planes have been sent to Russia to aid in her brilliant achievement.

More than 10,000 airplanes from America have been flown to the United Kingdom by United States Army Air Transport flyers in the last year. These great planes and pilots from America have not only helped save Great Britain, but are helping lead the way for their troops on the European Continent.

Australia was saved and the enemy driven back by the brilliant air force under General MacArthur's direction.

The only supplies to reach China for months have been flown in by American airmen in American planes over the world's most dangerous air route. Flying over the "hump" of the Himalaya Mountains, sometimes 22,000 feet in the sky, these American planes, piloted by American airmen, are carrying into China daily a considerably greater tonnage than was ever carried over the Burma Road.

To make this magnificent contribution to the winning of the present wars of the world, great changes and advances have been made in both airplanes and air routes. Hundreds of millions of American dollars have been expended in the development of airports and bases. In addition, great radio communication facilities have been constructed by American brains, blood, and finances. These lessons of desperate necessity have been severe and costly in war, but they can pave the way for tomorrow's progress. These lessons and achievements have changed our thinking and will develop our future habits of transportation in commerce as well as future pleasure and national defense.

A straight line is the shortest distance between two points—provided the two points are on a flat surface. But the shortest distance between two distant points on the surface of this planet, which is curved and global, is a great circle flight. This will necessitate a change not only in our thinking, but our future maps. Just as speed pays great dividends in the saving of human life in war, it will pay great dividends in maintaining peace and peacetime commerce. The world always has and always will pay high premiums for faster, more efficient ways of doing its daily business.

When this war is over we will face the problems of peace as well as prosperity in the light of these lessons learned in war. Taking the city of Chicago, Ill., as a hub, the shortest route to London, Paris, Berlin, Moscow, or Tokyo will be directly over Canada, where great airports have been built by the forces and finances of the United States. Yet the War Department has already disposed of all of them by sale without first having our country enter into a treaty which will establish our right to future use of these strategic air bases.

Nine of these bases were constructed by the United States along the northwest staging route at a cost of more than $37,000,000. Five of these bases were constructed along the northeast ferry route at a cost in excess of $34,000,000. Flight strips were constructed throughout Canada at a cost considerably more than $4,000,000.

Already, before the war has been won, our War Department has sold all of these bases and flight strips at a price of almost $14,000,000 less than the cost to us.

In the light of the unprecedented experience and advances made in air power during this war, it is doubtful if there is a single area or country on earth where future air rights will be as necessary and beneficial to the defense of the United States as those in Canada. We have several treaties, long leases, and agreements with Canada pertaining to water, railroad, and limited air rights, but having spent almost $90,000,000 to build these strategic air bases and facilities in Canada, creating the latest air routes to the principal areas of the world to save humanity, it would only be good common sense to demand future rights in them to protect ourselves in the future.

The potential possibility of air power in the future of mankind is self-evident, and yet it is in its infancy. America has contributed more to modern aviation in material, men, money, and scientific skill than any other country and will have developed approximately one-third of the air power of the entire world by the end of the present wars. This was our contribution to save liberty-loving peoples everywhere. Surely we are entitled to and should have the right to use these air bases and air power developments as we prepare to perform our full part in developing the future peace and prosperity of the world.

The Congress has given complete cooperation and unquestioned appropriations to the War and Navy Departments to build whatever facilities were necessary for the prosecution of the war. But the Congress cannot shirk its full responsibility to safeguard the future rights and protection of the American people after the war.

One of the most remarkable and enlightening trips among the many taken by millions of Americans during this entire war was taken by five distinguished Members of the United States Senate—the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], the Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD], the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER], and former Senator Lodge, of Massachusetts. This trip was taken around the world in 9 days' flying time. Without exception, they expressed their concern about our future rights in and access to these strategically located air bases in the world.

I quote from their report.

The Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] stated:

> All of us are concerned about American rights in air bases and air facilities which have been constructed at our expense all over the world. There should be no delay in having some definite understanding and agreement as to the post-war rights of commercial aviation. Certainly we occupy a better position to negotiate such understandings now than we will have after the war is over. We cannot expect to have sovereignty over all bases that we have constructed for military purposes, but we should assure to American enterprise an equal chance with others in these bases we have paid for, and the right to operate in all parts of the world.

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER] reported a year ago:

> We had already spent more than $500,000,000 on airfields and equipment all over the world. In most places we have no right except to get out when the war is over. We have constructed these fields and placed these installations on the land belonging to other countries.
>
> It is obvious that this situation must be remedied, as practically all of our bases outside of continental United States are on this basis. We must hold bases in the islands of

the ocean which, in possession of hostile nations, would constitute a threat and a menace to the people of the United States. Many of these bases have been won by the blood of American soldiers. We gave up our right to these bases after World War No. 1 and came home. This time we must keep them. The men who are making the sacrifice want it that way.

Former Senator Lodge, in speaking of his trip, stated:

Perhaps one of the most striking physical phenomena to a modern world traveler are the huge airfields which have been constructed with American money and American labor, at the farthest corners of the earth. Most of these have not been constructed in territory belonging to the United States, and military secrecy forbids my stating just where they are. Estimates of the amounts expended on these airfields run as high as $500,000,000. So far as I could learn, we have no post-war rights of access to any of them. We do not seek dominance; we abhor imperialistic domination over native people; all we want is an even break.

The Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD], in speaking about these air bases, stated:

That leaves the matter of the air bases that have been constructed for military purposes by the Army and Navy in foreign countries since our entry into the war open for negotiation so far as their post-war use is concerned.

Here, again, I am of the opinion that the members of the United Nations who have been working harmoniously on the same team in a military sense will be able to reach agreements for the use of these fields which will prove satisfactory to all parties at interest.

Here is an instance in which it will be necessary for the Congress to determine a policy with reference to post-war aviation which will serve as a guide for those in the executive branch of the Government whose responsibility this problem becomes.

The Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] stated:

Considerable consternation has been expressed at the strong and unanimous report of the five members of our senatorial committee concerning the future of America in the air. The language of our unanimous report to the Senate and the country upon this point is as follows:

"The United States has constructed huge airfields all over the world at tremendous cost to our people. The use of some of these fields in the future may be just as essential to our security as battleships or divisions. We have no post-war rights of access to these fields outside the Western Hemisphere at the present time. These rights of access are also indispensable to the vitally important growth of commercial aviation."

The Senator from Maine further stated:

The surprise which has been expressed on both sides of the Atlantic at our conclusions on this score are extremely revealing as to the lack of realization in the United States as to what is here involved.

This situation was first brought to my attention in December 1942, as a result of heated debates upon the subject in the British Parliament.

In these discussions very great concern was expressed as to the position of America and as to the necessity of Britain taking action to insure her position in commercial aeronautics in the post-war world. Assurance was given that the matter was being carefully considered and explored and accumulating evidence is at hand as to the customary thoroughness with which the British have approached this global problem.

Their consideration culminated in the holding of an Empire conference this past month in London, at which their program for meeting this situation was carefully considered, and the announcements at the conclusion indicated that agreement had been reached regarding the part which all parts of the British Empire would play in developing post-war commercial aviation.

Certainly it is proper that America should similarly give attention to the determination of its policy in order that our people may be fully informed and that Congress, in collaboration with the Administration, may determine the form of our policy in this highly important field.

Certainly the Congress and the people of this country were very well informed by these five distinguished Senators as to the specific problem of our future air rights. This report and warning was made almost 1 year ago, on October 7, 1943. Since that date millions of men and women and billions of dollars of supplies under lend-lease have gone to our allies all over the world. We have built additional air bases and have flown thousands upon thousands of additional planes to aid our allies over the area visited by the Senators on their trip; and yet no provisions have been made to guarantee to the people of the United States the use of these bases and facilities longer than 6 months after the war. No provision was made for the right of Americans to use these American-built bases for commercial purposes even during the war. No provision has been made for the use of these air bases by the United States for any purpose beyond 6 months after the close of the war.

This is another flagrant example of giving away the substance and rights of the American people, while millions of American sons and daughters are fighting, suffering, and dying all over the world to defend and preserve their beloved country.

I realize full well that whenever one speaks of protecting and demanding rights for America there are some who always shout that to do so would disrupt the war effort or help our enemies This I deny.

We all remember how Mussolini bombed poor little Ethiopia into submission; but as soon as the Ethiopians were liberated with the aid of American funds and equipment, the British quickly negotiated a treaty with Haile Selassie, Emperor of Ethiopia, which provided in part:

His Majesty the Emperor will not permit foreign aircraft other than British to fly to, in, or over Ethiopia without the concurrence of the Government of the United Kingdom.

It was not too early for Great Britain to secure all future air rights over liberated Ethiopia, and it did not hinder the war effort.

After we have sent millions of men and spent more than $12,000,000,000 of America's money to provide munitions, materials, medicines, and food to save beleaguered England, Lord Beaverbrook assured the House of Lords as late as May of this year that we acquired no commercial rights in the bases we received in return for desperately needed destroyers when England was in her darkest hour of this war. He stated:

These bases are leased only for military purposes. They cannot be used for civil aviation except with our consent. They do not pass under the general conception of bases for civil aviation. What may be the intention of the government in the future remains to be seen, but at present the question of civil aviation in connection with these bases never has arisen so far as I know. They are good people to deal with—the Americans.

Again, on August 26, 1944, Prime Minister Churchill reassured a member of Parliament that there is not the slightest "question of any cession of British territories" in the leasing of bases to the United States.

Mr. President, after we guaranteed with our troops and material that no possible invasion of Iceland could take place by the barbarous Naji in their westward march, Iceland's Foreign Minister, Vilhjalmur Thor, is reported to have stated recently that Iceland is going to grant no military bases after the war "by lease or outright ownership."

After we purchased the output of Canada's factories with American money to help save her economy and sent many of these same products to the British Empire under lend-lease, Canada bought with this same money these air bases which we built with no definite provision being made for our future right to use them after the Empire is no longer in danger.

All of this is eloquent proof that the British Empire is moving with greater speed than we are in this all-important question.

The sale of these all-important air bases in Canada brings forceful evidence of what will probably happen throughout the world, and soon, unless the Congress acts with dispatch to prohibit the further sale of any American-built base anywhere until the Senate has had a chance to pass upon any treaty with any foreign country in which our future rights are protected and guaranteed. It is the duty of Congress to stop immediately the further disposition or sale of these valuable and vitally important air bases built by Americans throughout the world, and it is the duty of the administration to immediately negotiate treaties with each country wherein these bases are located, which will permit America to use and maintain these airports after the war.

Just as air power today has been a key to victory, air power tomorrow will be a key to peace. It is incredible that we should have built such strategically important air bases throughout the world and incurred this tremendous debt that will be carried by our troops when they return from war, along with the rest of the American people, without securing future rights to use these bases. The future lives, happiness, and prosperity of generations to come will depend upon our ability to turn these sacrifices for and strides in aviation to the benefit of future America.

This subject should be of prime importance to the representatives of the United States who are now participating

in the all too secret Dumbarton Oaks Conference. Certainly there is nothing more important to be considered, and America truly needs a spokesman today who will fight for American rights as forcefully as the leaders of our allied countries protect the rights of their people.

The American people are a peaceful people. They want peace and they want to insure it.

No nation in all recorded time has ever contributed so much or gone so far to defend others and themselves. We were able to make this unprecedented sacrifice and contribution in war because we were a strong, free, and independent Nation. It is our solemn and sacred duty to demand and secure our just rights to guarantee our future freedom and independence and thus insure our strength in a war-torn world.

INVITATION TO STATE DEPARTMENT TO DISCUSS INTERNATIONAL PROBLEMS BEFORE THE SENATE

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I wish to compliment the distinguished junior Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS], who has spoken today on a subject which has given me concern for a number of years. I have repeatedly made radio addresses over national hook-ups on the question of making America safe in the future by seeing to it that the island bases of the world are kept in our possession, or at least that we have partial control of them. I have made reference to the bases in the Far East, the islands which Wilson literally surrendered to the Japanese, and which we have spent thousands of lives and millions of dollars to recapture. Those bases are on the air lanes of the world, and those islands are the outposts and the outer ramparts of our defense. I refer to the islands in the Pacific. Mr. President, I did not rise to speak on that subject, but because the subject is somewhat akin to that which has been discussed by the distinguished junior Senator from Illinois, I wish to inquire just where our country finds itself at this time in relation to its dealings with its allies and in relation to the problems which will be thrown in our laps in the next few weeks.

Mr. President, the past week has been the greatest week for the Allies since the war began. Bradley, Montgomery, Patton, Eisenhower, and millions of our fighting sons are demonstrating the superiority of American manhood and American weapons. These sons of ours are fighting their way through towns in Belgium, France, and Germany, where their fathers fought 26 years ago.

Finland is dropping out of the war. Rumania becomes one of the Allies. Bulgaria is wobbling. Hitler is retreating from the Peloponnesians. The Russians are on their way to Berlin, and we, too, are on our way there. It is a race to see who will get there first. The Philippines invasion is only a few days or few weeks ahead, and in Germany and the lands still occupied by Hitler his slave army is arising. In France only mopping-up operations remain to be carried on by our forces.

All of this means that before we know it Germany will be suing for peace. Where does that place us? Where are we at? We were told that the conference at Dumbarton Oaks was to consider the machinery only, and we were told something about a council and a general assembly and a court.

But, Mr. President, when our war job is finished, when our enemy has quit, then the real job begins in Europe. I should like to know what machinery is available to handle the tremendous number of post-war problems in Europe. What are our commitments in relation to the rehabilitation of our Allies? By rehabilitation I mean helping France, Poland, Belgium, Holland, Norway, so they may become competent to help themselves.

We learned the lesson of too little and too late in war, although now apparently we are getting plenty of what it takes into the battle against Germany. But, Mr. President, there is another war. There is the war of diplomacy. As has just been suggested by the distinguished junior Senator from Illinois, there is the war of control of the air bases of the world. There is the conflict in international affairs. Above all, I, as a Senator, wish to know what we have been doing since Pearl Harbor in relation to the world picture, and what plans, what understandings, and what mechanics exist.

On February 14, 1941, which was a long time ago, I submitted a resolution, and I am going to offer another one today, calling upon the Senate to proceed with closed doors, in executive session, and asking that the Secretary of State and his Under Secretaries be requested to attend, to discuss the eastern situation and other related matters. No attention was paid to my first resolution. I wanted to find out the condition of our fleet and especially of the coordinating air arm in the Far East. I said so on the floor of the Senate. I wanted to know if it was like the Russian Fleet was in the Japanese War. Later, when Pearl Harbor came, we found that it was. I wanted to know whether our fleet had a coordinating air arm such as the war had recently demonstrated every fleet should have. I wanted to know our military position and our condition in the Philippines, and whether we had sufficient airplanes, and whether we were ready for any eventuality. All that is to be found in volume 87, part II of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, at page 1714.

Mr. President, in July 1943, after war came upon us like a thief in the night, the Washington Post, in commenting upon my resolution, made the following editorial statement:

> Ten months before Pearl Harbor, Senator WILEY introduced another resolution asking the Secretary of State to report in executive session to the Senate on the threat of war in the Far East and our preparations to meet it. At that time the State Department knew that war in the Pacific was rapidly approaching.

Let me say parenthetically that when the white paper was issued in 1942, it showed that in January 1941, Ambassador Grew had informed the President and the Secretary of State that the Japs were ready to attack at any time.

Mr. President, was my resolution simply a shot in the dark, so far as I was concerned? No. For the first time, I shall relate why my resolution was offered. I happened to have friends in New York who told me—and the Secretary of State knew this—that in January and February the Japanese government and Japanese businessmen, instead of depositing credits in the New York banks to meet their obligations there, were withdrawing money. To my mind that indicated quite clearly that there was a "nigger in the woodpile" somewhere. I wanted to find out.

I read further from the editorial:

> But the resolution was pigeonholed. The Senate did not get the information sought. No adequate preparations to meet an attack were made. The United States was humiliated at Pearl Harbor, and a great sacrifice of human life will be necessary to regain what we have lost in the Far East. No one can say with assurance how the situation would have been changed if the information in the hands of the State Department had been conveyed to key Members of Congress. This much however, is certain—

I wish to have the Senate bear this point in mind, because it is directly in line with the remarks made today by the distinguished junior Senator from Illinois—

> the withholding of such information makes it impossible for the representatives of the people to act intelligently in the face of a global crisis.

Mr. President, I have just read an editorial printed in the Washington Post on July 19, 1943. I repeat its closing words:

> The withholding of such information makes it impossible for the representatives of the people to act intelligently in the face of a global crisis.

Again, Mr. President—this time on September 7, 1942—I offered a resolution which is to be found in volume 88, part VI, page 7164 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, as follows:

> *Resolved*, That the Chief Executive be invited to join with the Senate in the creation of a Foreign Relations Advisory Council to be constituted of the following: The Secretary of State, the Under Secretary of State, other technicians whom the Secretary of State might designate, the chairman and the ranking minority member of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, and the chairman and the ranking minority member of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, and such other Senators as the President might from time to time designate.

In the resolution I was seeking the creation of machinery for collaboration between the State Department and the Congress. Secretary Hull dismissed the suggestion, and in reply I said:

> It was elementary that the grave deficiency of machinery for collaboration between the State Department and Congress in the inception steps of the treaty cannot be casually dismissed by a faith in the efficacy of the congressional friendships of the Secretary of State. Such friendships are not an adequate substitute for a carefully planned machinery for collaboration between the executive branch and the Congress.

My statement was prompted by the fact that Secretary Hull had said in his

letter to me, "I have friends in the Senate with whom I can talk." My suggestion was brushed aside and we carried on in the same old way for more than a year and a half. Then Secretary Hull set up what some called a liaison committee, like the one I had suggested.

Mr. President, in speaking on behalf of my resolution on November 25, 1942, I said:

> New occasions in the lives of individuals as well as in the lives of nations create new responsibilities, and new duties, and when such new responsibilities and duties arise we should have adequate governmental machinery so that we can properly function. America has a tremendous job ahead of her. She must be equal to the task. She must become equipped to do the job.

On numerous occasions I stated on the floor of the Senate that the suggested Foreign Relations Advisory Council would provide a clearinghouse for ideas, not merely the ideas of the Secretary of State, but of the best thinkers in America and the rest of the world—ideas relating to the very things which are now upon us. In some quarters no attention was paid to my suggestion, but magazines and newspapers saw the validity of it.

On September 24, 1942, the Christian Science Monitor stated that the resolution was "the most important, constructive, and forward-looking suggestion in behalf of the future peace which has come from Congress since the United States formally entered the war."

The representatives whom the Secretary of State has chosen from the Foreign Relations Committee sit and listen to what he thinks the idea should be. That is not what I had in mind. I had in mind that we have been facing the situation which has been referred to by the distinguished Senator from Illinois. We are facing a thousand problems. Certainly Members of the Senate should not be disregarded. The mere fact they have been called in to have a little tea is not the important thing to consider. The best brains of America have been thinking about this matter for months and years. The best brains of the world have been thinking about it. I stated that the committee could well be a clearinghouse to which the ambassadors of other countries could come and confer. Out of such conferences we might be able to find the best way to handle the multitude of problems which are now coming upon us.

The informal gatherings during the past 6 months of the Secretary of State and a few chosen buddies does not come within a thousand miles of the suggestion I had in mind, and now we have Dumbarton Oaks and Europe ready to be thrown in our laps.

Mr. President, there was a time when people everywhere looked to us as the hope of the world. That was when I submitted my resolution. Then was the hour to start planning. Then was the hour when we could have put America's ideas into the mechanism for peace. Then was the time to have obtained agreements ceding to America the outer ramparts.

I repeat, if Germany cracks up, what machinery will be available? Are we again too late with too little? We were told that the Dumbarton Oaks conference was only a preliminary meeting and that afterward the "Big Three" would meet. In the meanwhile, Mr. President, Europe may be in our laps. Without question Russia is now assuming the position in the European picture which France assumed after the last World War.

Following the last war we wanted nothing but to live in peace with the rest of the world. Since then the world has been contracted and made smaller. The islands surrounding our continent are our outer bulwarks. The time to strike has passed. In the First World War we loaned billions of dollars which have not been repaid to us. We are now merely one of the victors. We can sit around and talk. But whose job was it? Who was acting for the American people? Who was supposed to design and execute plans as a trustee in behalf of our Government? I repeat, Whose job was it? As suggested by the editorial in the Washington Post, there was no collaboration with this body, which is the constitutional body representing the Government with which a treaty must be made.

I again ask, If Germany cracks up, what machinery will be available? Are we again too late with too little? We have been told that the Dumbarton Oaks Conference is merely a preliminary meeting, and that afterward the Big Three will meet. It is a preliminary meeting now, Mr. President, when Europe's house is being thrown into our lap. Europe will be in our lap, and in the meantime those of us who know our history know that Russia is now in the same position that France occupied following the First World War. We also know that France and England had considerable discussion through the years as to who should dominate Europe. We are facing realistic problems, and we should realistically approach them. What plans do we have? What are the mechanics? What are the understandings? Are there to be any treaties?

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to submit a resolution and ask that it be appropriately referred. It reads as follows:

> *Resolved*, That the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business with closed doors and the Secretary of State and his Under Secretaries be requested to attend to discuss with the Senate the European situation and other related matters.

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 326), submitted by Mr. WILEY, was received and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. WILEY. The other related matters may involve the question of air bases as well as other questions. Mr. President, the Senate of the United States is still a branch of the Government of the United States, but the Senate is still being disregarded. A few Senators have met. What plans, what pledges, what commitments, what understandings, and what mechanics exist?

Mr. President, it appears that no machinery has been set up. We can expect that, when Germany cracks up, there will be revolutions and counterrevolutions in a number of the Balkan states. I suggest that at Geneva there is still available considerable of the wreckage of the League of Nations which might be utilized as a stopgap until our Government and the other governments finally have the vision to establish the necessary machinery.

RELIEF OF SUFFERERS FROM PORT CHICAGO EXPLOSION

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. President, a bill has just been sent over from the other House, where it was passed unanimously. It relates to an accident which occurred very recently in Port Chicago, in the State of California. It was one of the worst accidents which has ever plagued us. It not only caused great loss of property but blew human beings apart so that their remains could not be identified. I shall not try to picture that accident because words would fail me entirely if I attempted to do so. But the bill which was passed unanimously by the House of Representatives to provide relief for individuals who sustained damages as a result of the explosion at Port Chicago, Calif., has been sent to the Senate. It is an emergency measure; if we do not act upon it today, we probably will have no opportunity to act before January next. So, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill may be laid before the Senate and considered at this time.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from California yield to the Senator from Alabama?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I yield.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I think the facts and circumstances surrounding this proposed legislation constitute such a real emergency that speedy action is to be greatly desired.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. It is, indeed.

Mr. HILL. I hope the Senator's request will be granted and that the bill will be passed.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the Chair lays before the Senate a bill coming over from the House of Representatives.

The bill (H. R. 5181) to provide a method for compensating certain individuals for damages sustained as the result of the explosions at Port Chicago, Calif., was read the first time by its title and the second time at length as follows:

> *Be it enacted, etc.*, That the Secretary of the Navy is authorized and directed to make a thorough investigation of the merits of those claims against the United States for compensation for property damage, death, or personal injuries alleged to have been caused by the explosions which occurred at the naval magazine at Port Chicago, Calif., on July 17, 1944, which shall have been submitted to the Navy Department in writing within 6 months after the date of enactment of this act.
>
> SEC. 2. The appropriations for the Naval Establishment for the fiscal year 1945 shall be available for payment, and payment is hereby authorized, upon approval of the Secretary of the Navy or his designate, of claims referred to in section 1 hereof (a) for disability or death resulting from personal

injury sustained by persons not then members of the armed forces or civilian employees of the United States: *Provided*, That settlements shall not aggregate in excess of $3,000 with respect to the disability or death of any one person nor shall any such settlement be made in amounts which would not be allowable, or for beneficiaries who would not be eligible, under the United States Employees' Compensation Act, as amended, if the disabled or deceased person were an employee of the United States; or (b) for property loss or damage: *Provided*, That settlement shall not be made in excess of $3,000 for injury to any one building or structure.

SEC. 3. Any settlement made under the provisions of section 2 hereof shall be in full settlement of all such claims against the Government of the United States.

SEC. 4. In connection with any settlement authorized by section 2 hereof, the Secretary may require assignment to the United States of any right of action against third parties arising from the death, injury, or property damage with respect to which such settlement is made.

SEC. 5. The Secretary of the Navy shall transmit to the Congress each claim submitted the Navy Department in accordance with section 1 hereof not settled by him, with supporting papers and a report of his finding of facts and recommendations thereon and also a report of each claim settled and paid by him pursuant to section 2 hereof. Such reports shall contain a brief statement of the character and justice of each claim so transmitted or settled, the amount claimed, and the amount found due.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

THE DUMBARTON OAKS CONFERENCE

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Mr. President, almost a year ago, in an article published in the Chicago Sunday Tribune, I proposed an association of nations patterned upon the Pan American Union for the purpose of dealing with post-war peace administration. Today the President has a plan of his own—a plan so shrouded in secrecy that there is no official report on its vast ramifications; its far-reaching potentialities. But there are leaks which show that we Americans are to be called upon to surrender our sovereignty and our liberty to the caprice of one man. I do not believe Americans will approve such a proposal.

The Conference at Dumbarton Oaks to form a new league of nations, now meeting in the city of Washington upon the call of the President of the United States, and consisting of representatives of Great Britain, Russia, and the United States, with China hiding behind the curtains in order not to offend the aesthetic sense of sensitive Japan, has been in session many days. Despite the fact that the newspapers have repeatedly and urgently requested permission to attend the Conference, or receive some information about its activities and proposals, the only recognition of that request was an invitation the other day to attend a press conference which, as described by one of the representatives of the press, was "a run-around," and "we were told nothing."

Now, however, we have been furnished some enlightenment upon the work of the Conference. On August 22 the New York Times published the following statement:

WASHINGTON, August 22.—The United States, Great Britain, and Soviet Russia outlined today to the delegates at the Washington Conversations on International Organization their broad proposals for the creation of an international league to prevent and repel aggression.

In two executive sessions in the rennaissance music room at the Dumbarton Oaks mansion, which was surrounded by military police and barred to reporters, Edward R. Stettinius, Jr., Under Secretary of State, and Sir Alexander Cadogan and Ambassador Andrei A. Gromyko, chairmen of the British and Russian delegations, proceeded from general statements on the problem of securing the peace to the much more difficult task of defining how it was to be done.

An official communiqué disclosed that the three plans had been discussed and that Mr. Stettinius had been selected as permanent chairman of the conversations, but it did not say anything about the proposals or about the questions asked after the reading of each plan.

The New York Times, however, has obtained from an unimpeachable source the following digest of the three plans, which were drafted by the governments recently and exchanged for study and comment.

As is well known, all three powers propose the creation of an international security organization having an assembly of all the powers; a council, controlled by the United States, Britain, Soviet Russia, and China, who have primary authority and responsibility for preventing and repelling aggression; an international court of justice and a general secretariat.

The American plan is careful to emphasize that the United States has no intention of proposing a four-power dictatorship on the rest of the world, but it makes quite clear that the authority of the assembly of all the powers shall be limited.

The purpose of the assembly, the American plan is understood to state, is to assist the executive council, upon request, in enlisting all states toward giving effect to the actions of the council." Each of the United Nations would be represented on the council by six members, each nation would have one vote, and the assembly would meet once a year, probably in a different capital each year.

The "executive council" (which the American plan calls it) would have four permanent members—the United States, Britain, Soviet Russia, and China. Provision is also made for several additional members. This council, the American plan states, would be primarily responsible for the peaceful settlement of international disputes and for the security of the nations.

Moreover, it makes clear, the four permanent members would have authority in the council in proportion to their obligation to provide most of the money, men, and force to repel any aggression which might occur. Consequently, the American plan stipulates that in order to use force to prevent aggression, the court permanent members must vote for it unanimously and in addition to this, that there must be a majority vote of the entire council before military sanctions can be applied.

Thus, if there were eleven members of the council not only the four permanent members of the council would have to apply force against an aggressor, but two other powers would also have to favor it. This latter stipulation is designed to quell the fears of the other powers that they would not have a voice in the major decisions of the proposed league.

The most important part of the American plan is contained in the proposal that the powers should enter into a general agreement on the number and type of forces they are obligated to put at the disposal of the executive council. This agreement would evidently limit the number of forces and facilities which each member nation was obligated to provide for the use of the council, but the Senate of the United States—

I call particular attention to that sentence—

but if the Senate of the United States approved the treaty in which this agreement was contained, these forces would, under the American plan as it now stands, be available for the use of the security league without the necessity of returning to Congress for approval every time the American delegate and a majority of the council voted to apply force to prevent aggression.

Mr. President, I realize that this is not an official report, but more than a week has elapsed since its publication and no denial has been made. Certain Members of Congress have seen the American plan therein described and they agree that the report of the New York Times is substantially correct. Under that plan, the President will have the power to declare war without the consent, the knowledge, or the approval of Congress. I should like to know, Mr. Roosevelt, whether that is your demand. I should like to know whether that is the platform upon which you are running for the fourth term as President of the United States. It must be because the so-called American plan was prepared either in your office or that of the Secretary of State with your approval and submitted to the Dumbarton conference as the proposal of the American Government.

You did not always believe in such entanglements as you now propose, Mr. Roosevelt. Reading back through your public statements, we find these words spoken on December 28, 1933:

The definite policy of the United States from now on is one opposed to armed intervention. We are not members of the League of Nations and we do not contemplate membership.

On January 3, 1934, you said:

I have made it clear that the United States cannot take part in political arrangements in Europe.

On August 14, 1936, you said:

We shun political commitments which might entangle us in foreign war; we avoid connection with the political activities of the League of Nations.

And yet, Mr. Roosevelt, you have prepared and presented to representatives of the Allied Nations a proposal for a new League of Nations far more comprehensive than the League of Nations which you heretofore have condemned.

Let me call your attention to article 10 of the Covenant of the old League of Nations, which said:

The members of the League undertake to respect and preserve as against external aggression the territorial integrity and existing political independence of all members of the League. In case of any such aggression or in case of any threat or danger of such aggression, the Council shall advise upon the means by which this obligation shall be fulfilled.

Article 10 of the old League of Nations was debated for months and was defeated. Subsequently, in the next Presidential election the American people ap-

proved that defeat by an an overwhelming vote.

Now you propose that Congress turn over to you, one individual, the full and complete power as a member of this new League of Nations to take this Nation into war in any part of the world and send our sons tc enforce your orders.

Do you, Mr. Roosevelt, base your campaign for a fourth term upon the despotic and extraordinary power outlined in this so-called American plan?

The practical administration of such a proposal to declare war carries with it the right to spend money; to supply and provide for the military and naval operation.

Likewise, the implication of this proposal is that this Congress undertakes to bind the hands of every future Congress. This right of every Congress to determine its own policy is one of the fundamentals of democracy.

If the New York Times article really be the language of the so-called American plan proposed by the President, it can mean only one thing. It means that if he can secure the approval of the Senate to this plan, then thereafter whenever the League Council decides the use of force against any nation shall be undertaken, the President has the power, without going back to Congress, to send troops and ships and planes to invade or attack any nation; and that means war by Presidential order.

Mr. Roosevelt, you have said much in recent months about the "peace-loving nations." All the Allied Nations are presumably peace-loving nations. The American people are peace-loving people; but when you propose a new League of Nations that gives to you, or to the President of the United States, whoever he may be, power to declare war and send our soldiers anywhere in the world, I ask in all sincerity, is that your campaign issue?

Every war in history has been started by some king or ruler who had the power to do the thing you now propose. War is never started by the people. If this power is granted to you, we will have taken the last and final step of laying the foundation for the next war.

Under this plan proposed by you, who is going to decide what aggression is? Who is going to decide when it is necessary to send troops into some distant part of the world? You, Mr. Roosevelt. And suppose that you issue an order sending an army against Canada, or Mexico, or Brazil, on the statement by you that aggression is contemplated or has taken place, who can deny your assertion? What power can override your order? Under the provisions of your proposal, you become the absolute despot of the American people; a true dictator in all sense of the word.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I have listened with a great deal of interest to the remarks of the able Senator from South Dakota with respect to the Dumbarton Oaks Conference. I shall not undertake to make any detailed reply to his remarks, since they seem to be very largely of a political nature. Several times he referred to the candidacy of the President and the election in November. My efforts have been in the direction of trying to keep the issue of foreign relations out of politics, so I shall not fall into the trap so skillfully set by the Senator from South Dakota and discuss this question from a partisan standpoint.

Mr. President, no international conference ever adopts proposals unanimously. With rare exceptions, the Senate never adopts any proposal unanimously. There is always some particular feature about any bill or policy which does not suit us in its details; but in the final analysis we regard the measure as an entity, as a whole, and sometimes waive our objections.

We can make no intelligent discussion of the work of the Dumbarton Oaks Conference at this time, or even when it adjourns, in my view, because it is merely a technical conference. The main conference will be held at a later time, on what is called a higher level, with the foreign ministers of the governments concerned, and with representatives of all the United Nations that desire to participate. That will be the meeting which will really determine the shape, structure, and form of whatever international machinery may be established. So I shall withhold any discussion of the matter at the present time, because no one knows exactly what the final instrument will contain.

I remind the Senator from South Dakota and other Senators that whatever may be adopted must come back to the Senate, the forum selected by the framers of the Constitution. It must come back to the Senate and run the gauntlet of the most searching scrutiny and the most careful and meticulous examination, not only in the Committee on Foreign Relations, but on the floor of the Senate itself. I remind the distinguished Senator from South Dakota that the minority is represented on the Foreign Relations Committee by an unusually able group of very distinguished Senators. They have the faculty of inquisition developed to a very high degree, and he need not fear that anything will get through the Foreign Relations Committee until the distinguished Senators, both of the majority and of the minority, examine the instrument, take it apart, analyze it, take out all the wheels, and unwind the spring. He need not fear that anything will be put over on the Senate without its knowledge or consent. I hope the Senator from South Dakota will bear his excitement in patience. The "higher level" will probably not promulgate the instrument until after the November election. In fact, it is an international conference, and is supposed to be indifferent to local elections in the various countries; and I assume it is.

I remind the Senator from South Dakota that this is a matter which ought to be above partisan politics. In the field of foreign affairs there is a rather trite saying that "politics ends at the seashore." Mr. President, we hope that this war, which has grieved us and robbed our land of some of its finest and richest blood, and which has required the pouring out in unstinted measure of our treasure, is about to come to an end, at least so far as one aspect of it is concerned, by the triumph of American arms.

What would it profit me as a Democrat, or what would it profit the distinguished Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] or the disinguished Senator from Maine [Mr. WHITE] as Republicans to aid in the construction of an international tribunal to preserve the peace of the world and to prevent another war? What political advantage would it be to us? It would interest us only as Americans, hopeful of keeping our country out of another war. I am not speaking of other countries. I am not speaking of Russia, Great Britain, or China, although I entertain for them all a very high regard and admiration. I am speaking of America itself. We are not engaged in a Sir Galahad mission in this respect. We are acting in the interests of America itself. It is the red blood of our sons that we do not want spilled again. It is the treasure of our people here at home that we do not want to be wasted again. We are in this fight to create an international tribunal to preserve the peace of the world because that means our peace, our security, and our safety. I hope no Senator will approach this problem bearing the emblem of his party. It is not a political question. It is not a domestic question. It is a question of the highest national importance.

When the casualty lists come from the Office of the Chief of Staff, they contain names such as Sgt. James Smith, of Tennessee, or Corp. Henry Johnson, of South Dakota. They contain the serial number, the names of the parents or survivors, the name of the particular organization, and the branch of the service, such as Infantry, or paratroops. But the list does not contain any information as to whether or not the man was a Democrat or a Republican. It is of no significance to the Nation whether he was a Democrat or a Republican. He goes out on the battlefield, sheds his blood, or gives his life for his country, without regard to whether he is a Democrat or a Republican.

So, Mr. President, I refuse to discuss this question at this time from a partisan angle. I wish to say to the Senator from South Dakota that when the work of the conferences shall have been concluded, I shall discuss these matters. I shall not run away from them, and I am sure other Senators will not run away from them. When the treaty comes before the Senate all of us are Senators and all of us are able to stand upon our own feet. All of us are representatives of great commonwealths. If a Senator does not approve of the treaty, it will be his duty to vote against it, and I shall not impugn the motives or the patriotism of any Senator who does so. I wish to associate with men who have minds and convictions of their own. I do not expect every one to agree with me, because anyone who did so would be wrong a part of the time, no doubt.

So, Mr. President, there is no occasion for excitement now. The Dumbarton Oaks Conference has not concluded its work. It has been well advertised that

the Conference is merely a meeting of the technicians to more or less put into proper form the plans, under a general outline, that are to be agreed upon. But they have no force, they have no prestige, they have no compulsion, until the main conference shall have convened, after the Dumbarton Oaks Conference shall have adjourned.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Does the Senator care to answer the question whether he has seen the plan which is called the American plan?

Mr. CONNALLY. I do not mind saying that I have and that the Senator from Maine [Mr. WHITE], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG], and the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN] have seen it.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. I should like to ask a further question, if the Senator will yield to me again.

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Does that plan contain the statement, as alleged in the New York Times, that after the Senate has approved the general agreement or treaty, the President or the executive member for this country will have the power to designate the area in which the forces maintained by the council will be used?

Mr. CONNALLY. It does not make provision in that form, I may say to the Senator. I do not wish to dodge the question. Some months ago the President made a statement outlining the general characteristics of the so-called league. Here is what it provides: It provides for a council. It provides that the four major nations shall be permanent members of the council. Does the Senator object to that?

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Not at all. But does the Senator approve of the statement which has been made by the——

Mr. CONNALLY. Just a moment, Mr. President; I wish to obtain a little information from the Senator, so that I can answer his question. Does the Senator object to having the four great nations be permanent members of the council?

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Not at all. But I wish to see the plan, and the American people wish to see the plan, before it is agreed to and decided upon.

Mr CONNALLY. Exactly; and I will get to it. Of course, the only way to meet the Senator's wishes would be to have him sit in the conference. None of the rest of us are sitting in it. I do not see why the Senator from South Dakota should claim the right to something which all the rest of us are denied.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Why should any of us be denied that?

Mr. CONNALLY. For the simple reason that the Senate can never negotiate the treaty. Why, Mr. President, we cannot successfully negotiate a bill for the disposal of surplus property after the war; we cannot successfully negotiate a post-war unemployment measure. However, I do not wish to get into frivolous discussion.

Let me answer the Senator's question. The Senator has said that he thinks the four great nations should have places on the council. Why? Because the four great nations are the ones which have fought this war. It is their blood which has been spilled, it is their treasure which has been wasted, on the fields of battle. God knows, if there is another war, the armies and navies of the great nations will either have to fight it or stop it, one or the other.

I will say to the Senator that the plan provides that on the council there shall be four permanent members. It then provides—I am not certain; I do not think there has been any final agreement on this point—that there shall be other members of the council who shall be elected by the general members of the assembly. That means all the countries, both small and large, in addition to those four.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Does the Senator call France a small country?

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I will say that France has played the part of a small country in this war. I have always admired France. When I was a schoolboy I sympathized with her in her Hundred Years' War with Great Britain. I have always sympathized with France. But France has played a very sorry spectacle in this war, and the Senator knows it. She had an army of 5,000,000 men, armed and supposedly trained and equipped. But they collapsed like a house of cards before the marching armies of Germany.

What has France done since then? I think France should prove her ability to sit on the council. She may be elected by the other nations. I understand that a great many of the nations that are concerned in this matter wish to put her on the council at once. But I would say let her serve an apprenticeship for a while.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator another question.

Mr. CONNALLY. I will yield, but I have not yet answered the Senator's first question. However, I shall be glad to take on another one; I shall make up an agenda of the Senator's questions.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. In the article which appeared in the New York Times——

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I thought the Senator's newspaper was the Chicago Tribune. I did not know he had gone over to the New York Times. He quoted the Chicago Tribune at first.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. I appreciate the humor of the Senator's remark; but if he will answer——

Mr. CONNALLY. I will answer if I can. But when the Senator asks first one question and then another, the point he has in mind is difficult for me to grasp.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. I should like to refer to the article which appeared in the New York Times.

Mr. CONNALLY. Very well; I am glad to have the Senator proceed.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. The article says that—

> The most important part of the American plan is contained in the proposal that the powers should enter into a general agreement on the number and type of forces they are obligated to put at the disposal of the executive council. This agreement would evidently limit the number of forces and facilities which each member nation was obligated to provide for the use of the council, but if the Senate of the United States approved the treaty in which this agreement was contained, these forces would, under the American plan as it now stands, be available for the use of the security league without the necessity of returning to Congress for approval every time the American delegate and the majority of the council voted to apply force to prevent aggression.

Does the Senator approve of that?

Mr. CONNALLY. I will answer the Senator's question. In the first place, the tentative agreement provides that in no case can armed forces be employed without the unanimous vote of the four major members of the council and, I understand, probably in addition without the approval of a majority of the council. What would that do? It would give the United States a veto power on the use of armed forces in any dispute or quarrel. That meets the argument that was successfully made on the floor of the Senate against the League of Nations and article X of the covenant. The great argument then was, "Oh, we shall never join one of these organizations that can order our boys to foreign fields without the consent of the United States." So we provide that they cannot do that if the representative of the United States vetoes it.

That is all there is to it. The assumption is made by the Senator from South Dakota and, I assume, by other Senators, that without saying anything more, the plan means that the international organization would have the power to call on the various governments to send troops and to intervene. But if the Senator will read the agreement he will find that one of its provisions is that the governments which are supposed to furnish troops must, under the agreement, make another agreement among themselves as to the number and kinds of troops which each country shall supply and as to the terms and conditions upon which they shall be supplied. That agreement has not been worked out. I do not know what it will contain. But there is a requirement that that agreement must be negotiated and must be made a pact between the nations that are members of the council. If I am not correct in that statement, I shall be glad to be corrected by any Senator who is familiar with the matter.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Much as I have enjoyed the richness and the eloquence of the distinguished Senator's remarks, I must point out that he still has not answered the question I asked.

Mr. CONNALLY. I have undertaken to do so.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. My question was this: After the agreement or treaty, or whatever it may be called, has been finally adopted by the United States Senate, will the President or his representative on the council be able to order our troops here and there over the world without any action by the Senate?

Mr. CONNALLY. I will say to the Senator that I tried to answer a minute ago by saying that the agreement requires the formulation of another agreement covering that point. I do not know what will be in that agreement; and, without knowing what will be in it, I cannot answer that question specifically. But I will say to the Senator that he puts his question in the most extreme fashion. I do not know whether the President will be our representative in this League; but he would not have authority to order our troops anywhere, even under the restricted construction which the Senator has used, unless all four of the other powers joined in the action and unless a majority of all the nations composing the council were to do so. I do not agree, however, that that necessarily follows at all, because, as I have said, one of the conditions of the whole plan is that the nations which will be called upon to furnish troops must make among themselves another agreement with regard to the kinds and numbers of troops and the conditions under which they will be employed. That agreement has not as yet been made.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for a question?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Who will make the agreement about which the Senator has just been talking?

Mr. CONNALLY. That agreement is supposed to be, as I understand—I do not have the draft before me; it is in my office—among at least the four great nations, the members of the council.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Would it be made by our representatives in the Assembly or the council, or would it come back to the Congress in any form?

Mr. CONNALLY. I am sure it would come back before the Senate. It would be a treaty, and I am sure it would be submitted to the Senate.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Under the structure of the plan developed so far, and so far as the Senator knows about it, if the council decided that we should engage upon a military venture could the matter develop in such a way that the United States Congress would be put into the position of running out on the representative of the United States if it did not acquiesce in the views of the representative in regard to the matter?

Mr. CONNALLY. The Senator has propounded what sounds like a $64 question. What would constitute running out would depend upon the language of the treaty, and upon how far our obligations extended. The whole thing depends upon the discretion of the council. It is not an absolute grant.

Does the Senator from Maine desire me to yield to him?

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, I was about to suggest that, as I understand the situation, an obligation will be placed upon the council to negotiate the agreement under which armed assistance might be called forth, and the agreement specifying the terms, conditions, and the extent to which we might be called upon to contribute force would have to come back to the Senate for approval in a constitutional manner.

Mr. CONNALLY. That is my understanding of the matter.

Mr. MILLIKIN. To the Senate, may I ask, or to the whole Congress?

Mr. CONNALLY. I would say the Senate.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I do not quite understand the theory by which it would come back exclusively to the Senate.

Mr. CONNALLY. It would be in the nature of a treaty, would it not?

Mr. MILLIKIN. A declaration of war——

Mr. CONNALLY. Oh, it would not be a declaration of war. It would not be a declaration of war. It would be a declaration of peace. Senators become excited about armed forces. Where have armed forces been sent by Presidents of the United States heretofore without any action having been taken by Congress? In the Boxer Rebellion in China——

Mr. BUSHFIELD. How about Iceland?

Mr. CONNALLY. How about Iceland? It is very cold there.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. The question may seem to be a very amusing one, but American troops were sent to Iceland before war had been declared by the Congress.

Mr. CONNALLY. The President is the Commander in Chief of the armed forces.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. The Senator asked where troops had ever been sent without a declaration of war having been made. I merely wished to remind him.

Mr. CONNALLY. What the Senator has said is another instance which proves what I am saying. When the Boxer Rebellion took place in China who was President of the United States then? William McKinley, was he not? Mr. McKinley was a great man. I admired him. America sent an army to China in cooperation with armies of other nations such as Germany, Great Britain, and France. The American Army performed its functions and protected American representatives, and then withdrew. No one objected. No declaration of war was made in that instance. The United States did not declare war on China. Our troops were sent to China because it was felt by the representatives of our Government that the interests of Americans required the presence in China of our armed forces.

What about troops in South and Central America? What about the marines? I cannot recite all the instances which I have in mind. There were occurrences involving Santo Domingo, under Republican Presidents and Democratic Presidents as well. There was the instance of Nicaragua under Republican and Democratic Presidents. There were countless instances of our Army and Navy being sent into foreign lands.

I do not wish to weary the Senate, but there seems to be an inquisitive spirit here. I wish to give Senators all the information which I can give them.

In 1817 freebooters took possession of Amelia Island in the name of the Governments of Buenos Aires and Venezuela, proclaimed the independence of East Florida against Spain, and so forth. By direction of President Monroe the uprising was suppressed by military forces of the United States. The action was not taken in concert with the Spanish Government or the local authorities in Florida.

Was there a declaration of war on the Barbary Coast pirates?

Mr. HILL. No.

Mr. CONNALLY. I do not wish to venture. In the case of the Barbary Coast pirates I am not clear as to whether there was a declaration of war against the Bey of Algiers.

Mr. HILL. It was the Bey of Tunis.

Mr. CONNALLY. I refer to the Bey of Tunis. However, we sent our fleet abroad and we suppressed the uprising.

I shall not name the various places in detail which I have in mind.

During the War of 1812 British forces occupied Pensacola, and the Spanish Government either could not or would not prevent them from doing so. Early in November 1814 General Jackson marched to Pensacola and took possession. Do we want to repudiate old Andrew Jackson at this late hour? [Laughter.] I do not think so.

In December 1817 the President assigned General Jackson to command the troops acting against the Indians in Florida. Jackson found that the Spanish officials were in collusion with the Indians. He seized St. Marks and Pensacola and by the end of May 1818, Florida was in the military possession of the United States. Jackson could not wait until the President had called into session a recalcitrant Congress, the Members of which were running for reelection, and spending time in order to obtain votes. He had to act. Under the direction of the President, he acted.

In July 1823, men from two United States barges landed on the coast of Cuba in pursuit of pirates who were seeking to escape from their vessel, which had been attacked by the two barges. Men from the barges and local authorities killed, wounded, or took prisoners all who reached the shore. That was almost war if it was not war. It involved killing almost everyone in sight.

There was also an incident in Puerto Rico. Because of an insult to Lieutenant Platt of the United States Navy, Commodore Porter landed 200 men at Foxardo, P. R., in 1824.

In 1831 three American schooners were seized and their crews imprisoned, while taking seals on the Falkland Islands.

I shall not mention all of the various places where our armed forces have visited.

In 1831, while the American vessel *Friendship* was engaged in taking on cargo at the island of Sumatra, natives succeeded in taking possession of the vessel. We attacked them and stormed the town and fort located there. A considerable portion of the town was burned.

There were incidents in the Fiji Islands in 1840, in Samoa in 1840, and in Japan from 1853 to 1854. What did Admiral Perry do to Japan? He steamed there and sent diplomatic word to the authorities that he wanted to enter, and the Japanese said they did not want him to enter. He told them that if they did

not open up the gates he would open them up with cannon. They opened them up. There was no declaration of war in connection with what took place then. Our State Department representatives wanted a commercial treaty with Japan. They obtained one. That was in 1853 and 1854.

In April 1854, there were collisions between Chinese Imperial and revolutionary forces. Forces were landed from British and American ships and 150 British and 90 Americans participated in an engagement with the Imperialists.

There were also incidents in Greytown, Nicaragua, in 1854, in Uruguay in 1855, in China in 1856, in Uruguay in 1858, in the Fiji Islands in 1858, in Shanghai in 1859, in Africa in 1860, in Panama in 1860, in Japan in 1863 and in 1864, in Formosa in 1867, in Japan again in 1868, in Uruguay in 1868, in Korea in 1871, in Mexico in 1876, in Egypt in 1882, in Korea again in 1888, in Samoa in 1888, in Haiti in 1888, on Navassa Island in 1891, at Valparaiso, Chile, in 1891, at Honolulu in 1893, at Rio de Janeiro in 1893, at Seoul, Korea, in 1894, in Samoa in 1899, at Bluefields, Nicaragua, in 1899, and the Boxer uprising in 1900. I have already adverted to the Boxer uprising.

In 1900 the so-called Boxer uprising in China created a demand for United States troops and marines to protect the lives and property of American citizens at various points in China. Two detachments of marines were sent to China early in 1900 for the purpose of serving as a guard to the American legation. They remained there from the time of their arrival to the capture of the city by the Allied forces. Later, American troops, under the command of Gen. Adna R. Chaffee, and American marines participated in the operations against Tientsin and Peking. That was in 1903. At that time Theodore Roosevelt was President of the United States. I do not doubt that the Senator from South Dakota was one of his enthusiastic supporters in 1903. He probably quit him in 1912, but in 1903 I believe he was one of the closest supporters of Theodore Roosevelt, who was a great American.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. Yes; I yield.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. I am greatly obliged to the distinguished Senator for placing himself in the position in which he has placed himself in the last few minutes. He is now defending the action of the Executive in starting wars without any action of the Senate or the Congress. So I am obliged to the Senator for placing himself in that position and on record.

Mr. CONNALLY. That is not a question. I understood the Senator to state that he wanted to ask me a question.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Very well; I shall ask the Senator a question now.

Mr. CONNALLY. That was not a question; it was an accusation.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. The Senator stated he had in his possession a copy of the so-called American plan proposed by the President or the State Department which would deny some of the statements I have made. Why did not the Senator offer that for the RECORD so that we could see what it says?

Mr. CONNALLY. All the Senator need do is to consult the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] and others. The President made a speech on the subject.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. The Senator declines to offer it for the RECORD.

Mr. CONNALLY. I do because it was given to me in confidence. Does not the Senator recognize the obligation of confidence?

Mr. BUSHFIELD. I do not know how it was given to the Senator, but he has not given it to us.

Mr. CONNALLY. I am telling the Senator how it was given to me. I am answering the Senator's question.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. The Senator has not answered the question yet.

Mr. CONNALLY. I may not answer it to the satisfaction of the Senator from South Dakota; I can only answer it within my own poor capacity and in accordance with the facts. I cannot make facts. Every time the Senator asks a question I cannot make a new fact and shoot it at him and then make up another fact and put that to him. I can only discuss matters within known facts and known information.

Puerto Plata, Dominican Republic, 1904.

President Roosevelt, Teddy Roosevelt, was then President of the United States. I do not think that President Theodore Roosevelt sent the marines to Santo Domingo for any improper purpose. I think he sent them there because he believed that it was in the interest of peace to send them there, to compose order, and enforce respect for property and respect for American lives. I do not believe that Theodore Roosevelt had any improper motives.

Habana 1906, * * * American vessels had been sent to Cuba by order of President Roosevelt—

Theodore Roosevelt. I do not think that he acted improperly then.

Cuba again in 1906.
Trujillo, Honduras, 1907.
Honduras, 1910–11.
Bluefields, Nicaragua, 1910.
Nicaragua in 1912.
Cuba, 1912.
Vera Cruz, 1914.
Haiti, 1915.
Dominican Republic, 1916.
Cuba, 1917—

And so on and so on—

Punitive expedition, Mexico, 1916.

We did not make any declaration of war against Mexico when General Pershing marched his expedition into Mexico in an effort to capture Villa, who had made an attack on Columbus, N. Mex. The Senate knows the story.

Mexico, Ciudad Juarez, 1919.

We did not declare war. They were shooting across the border and our troops returned the fire, I suppose. According to the Senator, they ought to have waited; Congress should have been called into session; but in the meantime they would all have been dead.

Mexico, 1919.
Panama, 1918, 1919, 1925.
Honduras, 1919, 1924.
Guatemala, 1920.
Smyrna, 1922—

Smyrna, away over yonder in the eastern Mediterranean—

China, 1901–27.

And so on, and so on. I shall not weary the Senate by further recitation of the incidents.

Mr. President, why can we not approach this matter in an orderly way? As has been so well pointed out by the Senator from Maine [Mr. WHITE], the use of troops is going to be governed by the agreement which the council shall have negotiated among the members of the council who are expected to furnish armed troops or armed ships, and it will delineate the quotas of troops, how they will be employed, and when and where.

If the Senator from South Dakota is so excited about this matter, let me say that any treaty which may be framed will come to the Senate, and if he should want to put a reservation on it he would have the right to offer one, and the Senate would have a right to adopt it if it saw fit to do so. Let me suggest, however, Mr. President, that there will never be constructed any instrument of international peace or international anything else which in every detail will please every man or every Senator.

I have a watch here which is supposed to be a very fine one. I did not buy it; it was given me by a member of my family. It is a Swiss watch, made by one of the most famous makers of Switzerland, fabricated with great care after years of experience, yet it does not please every watchmaker in Switzerland. A factory across the street is making a different kind of watch; some little gadget in my watch does not suit that factory; some little springs are not adjusted as the springs in the watches of the other factory are adjusted. Across the street is another watch plant which is just as famous and which produces watches which have just as fine a reputation as my watch. Going on down the street, every three or four doors there is another kind of watch made, a different brand of watch, and each maker claims that he produces the best watch in the world.

So, Senators, we are not going to be able to construct any kind of an international instrument which in every detail, in every sentence, in every phrase, in every paragraph, is going to meet the approbation of every Senator.

Now, let us, for the sake of the argument only, assume the Senator's position. If when Hitler hurled his armies into the Rhineland—and that was the beginning of the devilment—England and France and the other peaceful nations had had the authority and the will immediately to throw their armed forces into the Rhineland, and had done so, Hitler would not have taken possession of the Rhineland, and it is within the possibility that this war might not have occurred. Let us assume that when Hitler drove into Poland a similar situation was presented. If the Senator's theory is correct we could not have participated. It would have been said, "Wait a minute; we have got to call Congress into session." Well, the Congress is busy with a campaign; it is impossible to get a

quorum in the Congress, and then when a quorum is obtained someone speaks for 2 weeks discussing the matter. In the meantime Mr. Hitler has gobbled up Poland just as he did gobble it up.

I admit that this is a very difficult and very intricate matter. So far as I am concerned, I am going to approach it, I hope, in a spirit of nonpartisanship, in a spirit of trying to serve my country and trying to serve my country first. I have, of course, an interest in other countries, I have an interest in the great nations and in the small nations; I want to see the people of the world, whether they are white or black or yellow or red, comfortable; I want to see them have an economic life; I want to see them enjoy the blessings, insofar as they are capable of enjoying them, of free government and free institutions. But, Mr. President, my first affection is for my own country. This is the land that gave me birth. My ancestors have lived in America since 1748, and in every war in which my country has been engaged some member of my family has worn its uniform. I want it to be the place that shall cover my ashes when I am gone; I want it to be the place where my son will carve out for himself a career and a reputation of his own. These old United States of America are my first love, above all other nations of the earth. What I may do with respect to this treaty and what I may undertake to do here in the Senate, I pray God, may always be prompted and guided by my affection and my love for my great country, the United States of America.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I would not have participated in this debate today but for the fact that the Senator from Texas has twice identified me as being familiar with the text of the American plan. Because of the injunctions of secrecy which necessarily were placed upon the members of the Foreign Relations Committee with respect to it, I do not feel free now to discuss any phase of the matter which is dependent upon the information given me in confidence. But in the course of this debate today at least a few hypotheses have been publicized, and I want to comment very briefly only upon those hypotheses, because I think the able Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD] is entitled to a square answer to his question.

Mr. President, I suggest to the able Senator that the question which he raises is not one which involves the work of the conference at Dumbarton Oaks at all, except as the conferees at Dumbarton Oaks might proceed under a misapprehension as to what our own ultimate American policy will be as respects the authority to be exercised by our American delegate on the council of the new international security organization. So far as the Dumbarton Oaks Conference is concerned, it can only set down the rules under which all delegates to the council of the new organization from all countries shall operate and vote. It has no jurisdiction over instructions that any individual country shall give to its own delegate in respect to whether or not he shall be a free agent in voting. In other words, the question raised by the Senator from South Dakota will be fairly raised when the Senate is asked to ratify this document, because it is at that moment that we must either define the rules under which our delegate shall operate in connection with this international organization or in good conscience forever after hold our peace.

Now, the question raised by the Senator is: What shall we say in respect to the rules which we shall lay down to govern our own American delegate when he is called upon finally to vote in respect to the use of force under the new international organization? The Senator correctly says that if he is a free agent to vote as he pleases or as the President directs in respect to ordering the use of force, he has committed us to follow through with that use of force, and if it results in war, his act has been equivalent to a declaration of war, in my judgment, without the constitutional concurrence of Congress.

Mr. President, that will raise a very interesting question which will have to be settled by us. It cannot be settled at Dumbarton Oaks. It cannot be settled at any international conference. It is nobody's business but ours as to how we shall order our voice to be registered in the international organization when this grave question of the use of force arises.

The document itself will undoubtedly require that this authority shall be voiced through the regular constitutional procedure of any given country, but that is not enough, because, so far as we are concerned, that still leaves the question wide open, for, under the constitutional procedure of the United States, as the able Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] has just indicated, there is a distinction between the rights of the Chief Executive as Commander in Chief to use the armed forces for the emergent defense of the country and the right to declare war, which is an exclusive congressional function. I do not know whether it is possible to draw a line between those two things by textual definition.

In contemplating the subsequent use of this authority, so far as I am concerned I am perfectly willing to let the President of the United States, whoever he may be, use, on his own primary authority, the preliminary armed forces of this country in whatever emergencies are of a nature such as we have always heretofore permitted him to use these forces and which have always been considered constitutional. I think the only rule that I, for myself, can establish, which would make it clear, is to put this preliminary use of force upon a regional basis, and to say that he can exercise that power in North and South America, in pan-American partnership, which is simply a reiteration of the jurisdiction of the Monroe Doctrine, so far as we are concerned. It seems obvious to me that there may be many minor regional disturbances in the future as in the past, which should be promptly handled on a regional basis and which do not mount to the dignity of a declaration of war and which, as a matter of fact, have never been heretofore considered by us as mounting to the necessity for a declaration of war. Such a conception, of course, would envision similar primary, regional responsibilities for other powers elsewhere.

But, Mr. President, I want to make it very clear to the Senator from South Dakota that, so far as I am concerned, when this delegate, sitting in this international organization, and speaking for us, is proposing the use of force outside of our normal zone at a level which is tantamount to a declaration of war, I cannot agree that this be done, and I do not believe the American people will agree that this be done, without the joint action of Congress, as required by the Constitution of the United States. That is my answer to the Senator's question.

But I do not want to leave it there, because it seems to me that the great error which is being made today in the discussion of this entire world security program is the error of putting all the emphasis upon the question of the use of force, though the final use of force must always be in sight.

Mr. President, if there is nothing more effective than the use of force developed through this new great adventure, developed as an instrumentality to keep the peace of the world, the thing will be a miserable failure. Peace finally is a state of mind. Peace is a moral and spiritual conviction. Peace is a matter of world-wide education. Peace is a matter of developing international law, mediums of investigation and arbitration, rules of reason and every possible instrumentality for the substitution of justice for force. Force may finally be unavoidable. If it is, it must be used. Plans can constantly be made for its use. It can always be ready. In my view—perhaps I should say in my expectation and hope—the exhaustion of these rules of reason will make any future aggressor so clearly criminal and so clearly outlawed that there will be no hesitation on any nation's part, our own included, to join voluntarily in military suppression. But I do not believe that we can put peace in an automatic steel strait jacket. If we go to war 25 years from today as the result of the declaration of a new international organization, it will not be primarily because of any agreement we entered into in 1944, but it will be because the occasion then arising justifies it, in the conscience of our countrymen.

The thing I want to say with respect to this great undertaking upon which we are embarking is that the greatest emphasis should be placed on the instrumentalities which are in process of creation for the purpose of exhausting the rule of reason before there is any necessity for resort to the rule of force at all. In the present state of mind of the civilized world, and in the presence of the physical fact that the weapons of mass murder will scientifically improve at such a rate in the next 20 years that another World War will represent the decimation of civilization, I am convinced that the world is ready to undertake to exhaust rules of reason before there is another resort to force.

So, Mr. President, I wish the emphasis in this thing we are trying to do might

be put upon the creation of these instrumentalities to exhaust the rules of reason, rather than to put all the emphasis, as is too often done, exclusively upon the exercise of force. I agree that force has always got to be finally available in some form. I agree that we must never be out of touch or out of sight of force. But in the prospectus which I can see the possibility of developing, Mr. President, in respect to organizing the security of the earth, I believe that in the presence of the awful catastrophe the world has just suffered these rules of reason will go infinitely far toward reducing the ultimate necessity for the use of force to an utter minimum, particularly if we have sense enough in the interim to make absolutely sure once and for all and forever that the Axis aggressors never again can reaccumulate the physical means of becoming aggressors.

If we eliminate them, then where are the aggressors of tomorrow? They must be among the Allies of today. I decline to indict the Allies of today as being unwilling to live under rules of reason, and that is why I insist again and again and again that the hope of this great international organization, to which we look forward, is not in the ultimate final reliance upon force; the hope is upon its creation of instrumentalities which will make the rules of reason omnipotent upon this earth rather than the rules of force. But when we finally get to the use of force, except as that rule is regionally applied under the historic constitutional precedents of this country, so far as I am concerned, no President, no delegate speaking for any President, can vote this country into war without the joint approval of both Houses of Congress. I know of no other attitude which can be faithful to the Constitution of the United States. But, despite this final limitation, I believe America can go forward in wholehearted cooperation in the creation of an international organization which will be a blessed benediction upon international security in a free world of freemen—particularly if we base the whole adventure upon the indispensable foundations of a just peace. Under such circumstances no Congress, in the final analysis, will ever fail to do its voluntary duty.

There may be some better rule than the regional rule for the initial use of force. I throw that out merely as a suggestion—merely to illustrate my point. But above all I want to see this tremendous peace enterprise launched upon a basis which has the wholehearted support of our people so that it may have a maximum chance to serve the security and welfare of humankind, ourselves included.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I join in the remarks of the Senator from Michigan, and I want to say that the Senator from Michigan has been of very great service in the Committee on Foreign Relations, and in the conferences we have been having from time to time with the Secretary of State, with respect to this whole plan. I have very great respect for his ability and appreciate his deep interest in the subject.

Let me say to the Senator, however, that while I share with him his hope that peaceful measures may render it unnecessary to use force, and while I admire the optimism with which he believes that reason and logic will insure peace, and that peace is a state of mind, I think we must go further. Of course, peace is a state of mind, and if we could persuade everyone to be of that state of mind we should have peace. The trouble is that the state of mind is in the wrong people. How much good does anyone think it would have done to address beautiful homilies to Mr. Hitler? Would it have been sufficient to have said, "Adolf, be a good fellow, do not jump on the Poles. Do not go into the Rhineland. Do not take Austria. Do not bother Czechoslovakia." How long would the rules of reason and persuasion have influenced Mr. Hitler? How long would Hirohito have entertained similar persuasions in his course?

Mr. President, I point out that this plan does the very thing which the Senator from Michigan says he wishes to see done. We read in the newspapers this morning about plans for a world court, to be more comprehensive, and to have a wider jurisdiction than any other such court which has gone before, in an effort to settle controversies without war, by means of equity, law, and logic. The function of the council is to undertake to settle international disputes without the operation of force, through conciliation, diplomatic measures, and arbitration. All those things are embraced within the conception of this international instrumentality. We have no right to overaccentuate force. Force is only the last resort. Force is to be used against a nation which cannot be reached by peaceful measures. It is to be employed against the nation to which reason does not appeal.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Texas yield to the Senator from Michigan?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I agree completely with the Senator's analysis. However, let me add that it seems to me under this new conception, if all the intervening instrumentalities for the rule of reason are exhausted, the next aggressor will be so obviously a criminal because of this intervening process that there will be no doubt about the necessity of crushing him by force, or about the attitude of the American Congress in respect to participation.

Mr. CONNALLY. I thank the Senator. I am glad he holds such views.

Force is to be employed only as a last resort; when reason fails, when persuasion fails, when humanitarian considerations fail, when all the noble conceptions and precepts of law and logic fail, and we have before us the bloody-handed criminal bent upon the conquest of peaceful nations, force, at the point of a bayonet, is the only rule which will master such mad ambitions.

I agree with the Senator when he says that the nations which have brought on this war must be permanently disarmed. But we cannot disarm them with persuasion; we cannot disarm them with logic; we cannot disarm them by sending them Sunday-school tracts; we cannot disarm them by reading to them the Ten Commandments and the Lord's Prayer. We must disarm them at the point of the bayonet in their vitals, or by bombs from aircraft, or by cannon which hurl metal from their throats into the ranks of those who oppose these principles.

After all, we must have force as a last resort, just as the policeman on the beat must have force as a last resort. Two women can quarrel over the back fence about chickens getting over the fence, children throwing stones across the fence, or about pouring dishwater over the fence; but, after all, when they cannot settle their dispute by peaceful means, the policeman on the beat must be appealed to. When he arrives, he must bring his stick with him, not necessarily to use it, but to have it available, so that it can be seen.

So it is with this international instrumentality. It must ultimately have force behind it, as a last resort, so that we can say to those who rely upon force, those who swear by the sword, those who worship armies and navies, not for self-defense, but for the accomplishment of their ambitions, the satisfaction of their greed for more territory, and their hunger for more subjects, "You misplaced your worship; you have bowed down to force; but there is a mightier force than yours, and that is the combined force of the nations which propose to preserve peace and to overwhelm you in your mad ambitions and bloody dreams of power and conquest."

THE DISTRICT'S NONSUFFRAGE STATUS—DENIAL OF VOTE TO DISTRICT SERVICEMEN

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I have in my hand a post card which calls attention to one of the most inequitable situations on the home front. I doubt that many Senators have seen these post cards with the two red bands across the face. The Army has had 3,500,000 of them printed, and they are being handed to each of our soldiers overseas. They are applications for ballots under the soldier voting law with which the Senate struggled this spring.

This is the application of Col. E. C. Morse, commander of the Fortieth Station Hospital, now in Corsica after functioning throughout the north African campaign. Before Pearl Harbor Colonel Morse was Dr. Morse, an orthopedic surgeon operating at the Emergency Hospital in Washington. He was born in Washington and has had his home here for 54 years.

Colonel Morse was probably in something of a quandary when handed this card. Instructions for filling out the cards are shown to the soldiers in big charts posted at every overseas headquarters. Opposite the name of the District of Columbia the charts say: "No provision for absentee ballots for citizens of the District."

These cards are addressed to the secretary of state of blank, blank, blank. Desirous of voting, Colonel Morse wrote in the blanks "District of Columbia, care of the Evening Star, Washington, D. C.," and mailed the card.

A lifelong resident of Washington, Colonel Morse knew that the Evening Star has constantly supported the fight waged by generations of civic-minded Washingtonians who wanted the right to vote for President and Representatives in Congress for themselves and their fellow citizens.

This card was brought to me by George Kennedy, a reporter for the Washington Star, to see what could be done about getting a ballot for Colonel Morse and some 75,000 other Washington, D. C., men in uniform. The reporter asked about the Sumners-Capper resolution empowering Congress to grant national representation for the District of Columbia, which was referred to the Judiciary Committee at the opening of this Congress. This is a joint resolution authorizing an amendment to the Constitution empowering Congress to allow the citizens of the District to vote for President, Vice President, and as many Members of Congress as the Congress shall by legislation allow them. As it is an amendment to the Constitution, and an amendment is necessary to allow citizens of the District to participate in our national elections, I am afraid that with the greatest good will on our part we would be unable to get a ballot to Colonel Morse for the coming election.

But we could give the vote, the highest privilege of citizenship, after their return, to Colonel Morse and the 75,000 young men who have gone from Washington into the Army, the Navy, the Marine Corps, and the merchant marine, in recognition of what these neighbors of ours in this big city have contributed to victory.

Mr. President, Washington's contribution has not been small. As in the last war, the number of soldiers who have gone from Washington homes exceeds that of several of the States.

There was a militia type of military organization here called the Fifth Marines, a reserve group. They used to drill on Tuesday nights in an abandoned church a few blocks northwest of Capitol Hill, near the new Municipal Building. They were Washington lawyers, policemen, clerks, printers, and others. There were more than 200 of these Washington men from the Fifth Marines in the first landings on Guadalcanal. They were a sizable portion of the dogged detail of leathernecks who held on there when our Navy could not get in and the Jap Fleet tried to blast them off the island.

As the history of our Pacific war is released we will come to realize what we owe to those men of Guadalcanal who carried out our first offensive against the enemy and did not fail. I think the Congress owes it to these Washington boys to put them on a par with others in the service by making them full-fledged citizens.

All except the very newest Members of the Senate will remember the old National Hotel building, that crumbling relic of the fabulous fifties which stood on the Avenue at Sixth Street. The National Guard of the District used to drill there, also on Tuesday nights. The integration of the National Guard placed the District units in the Twenty-ninth Division. We remember reading about the Twenty-ninth Division on D-day. It was one of those divisions in the initial landings. Washington boys, combat engineers, were in the very first wave ashore, where they busied themselves removing German obstacles and mines, ignoring the deadly German artillery fire which kept shrapnel bursting about the beach.

Paris is liberated today, and Allied exterminators are ridding the valleys of the Seine and the Somme of the verminous swarms that ruined every countryside they descended on. Mr. President, Europe as well as America owes something to those Washington boys of the Twenty-ninth who helped breach Hitler's wall. I am sure that Europeans who will visit here in the days of peace to come will find it very hard to understand that the frontline veterans from Washington are not full citizens.

What about the parents who brought them up to be such good soldiers? We all know some of them. Would it be amiss to include them in the roll of some 130,000,000 Americans with the full privilege of citizenship?

Mr. President, I have always said that apathy was the principal reason that the people of Washington do not have the full privilege of citizenship. But during this war there has been a new awakening of the meaning of being an American. That apathy is disappearing. When those boys come home, the boys who were given one of these red-barred post cards and did not have anything to do with it because they were citizens of the District of Columbia, apathy will have changed to demand. It is not right, Mr. President, to have a population of nearly 1,000,000 Americans denied participation in the democratic process, denied the right to vote.

Mr. President, many Senators probably saw in Sunday's Star the statement that the reporter who called on me with this card polled the Judiciary Committee. He found little opposition to the proposal to let our fellow citizens in the District of Columbia vote in national elections. Two members of the committee said they were against it. One opposed it because of Negro suffrage. The other who said he was against it confined himself to constitutional grounds.

I shall pass over the first ground. There are larger groups of Negroes voting in New York, Philadelphia, and Chicago without dire consequences.

As for the constitutional grounds, we have all observed the difficulties of the courts in determining the intent of Congress as to the application of legislation passed a year or two ago. That should give us pause in attempting to divine the intent of the founding fathers. It is very hard to determine what their thought was about each section and clause. We know one thing they never thought: That in setting aside 10 square miles as the seat of government they were denying suffrage at some future date to a million people.

Seven members of the Committee on the Judiciary said they would vote to report the joint resolution or one similar to it to the floor if it ever was brought up in committee for consideration. The senior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH], who is acting chairman of the Judiciary Committee, expressed his readiness to submit the question of District of Columbia voting in national elections to this body and to the States.

Four members of the committee refused to commit themselves. Five were out of the city.

It appears that this joint resolution would be reported by the committee if given consideration. In time of war I believe we all feel stronger about the right of citizens to vote.

Mr. President, there is no pressure behind the joint resolution, as we have come to know the term. No Member of the Senate will have his tenure of a seat in this Chamber strengthened or weakened by his vote on this measure. It is a matter of simple right, of pure justice, of the American way.

For these reasons, Mr. President, at this time I respectfully request that the Judiciary Committee favorably report Senate Joint Resolution 33, proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States empowering Congress to grant representation in the Congress and among the electors of President and Vice President to the people of the District of Columbia.

CONTROL AND ERADICATION OF CERTAIN ANIMAL AND PLANT PESTS AND DISEASES

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, several months ago the Senate considered and passed House bill 4278, authorizing by statute a number of expenditures for which appropriations have been made by the Congress for the Department of Agriculture for several years past. Three Senate amendments were attached to that measure. One of them provided for the extension of the Farm Security Administration for a period of 2 years. Another provided for the extension of the so-called school-lunch program for a period of 2 years. Another, the third, allowed a tolerance of one-fifth of an acre in the tobacco acreage for this year's crop.

The House of Representatives rejected the tobacco amendment and reduced to 1 year the time limit of the Farm Security Administration extension and the school-lunch program extension.

A number of conferences have been held between the two Houses on these three items, which have been in disagreement. I am convinced that the House will not accept any extension beyond 1 year of the important Farm Security program and the school-lunch program.

However, there are in the bill a number of items which should be enacted into law at the earliest possible date. It is

important to have the law enacted because it will have a great deal to do with the formation of the budget for the coming year for a number of agricultural activities such as the program relating to the control of Bang's disease and a number of other programs which are embraced within the bill and have been approved by both Houses.

The most important item in the entire bill, and the one which makes it most necessary that it be enacted into law at the earliest possible date, is that which relates to the rural electrification program which extends the time of the amortization of Federal loans for rural electrification and which reduces the interest rate on the loans which are made by the Rural Electrification Administration to the local cooperatives.

Mr. President, I am, of course, as all Members of the Senate know, greatly interested in the Farm Security Administration and in the school-lunch program. But I do not think it is fair to the other activities of the Department of Agriculture to hold up this measure any longer. I do not think there is the slightest possibility of having the House of Representatives to agree to the Senate amendment extending these activities for 2 years.

In the 1945 appropriation bill, provision has been made for both of them for 1 year. The Farm Security Administration is now in operation under this provision in the agricultural appropriation bill, and the school-lunch program will be carried on during the fiscal year 1945, just as it has been in the past, by virtue of an authorization in the appropriation bill. I do not see that it would serve any useful purpose to longer insist on the Senate's position on these amendments.

The papers are on the clerk's desk and I should like to call up the measure, if it is agreeable to do so, in order to have the Senate recede from these amendments, so that the bill may be enacted into law.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its action on certain amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4278) to provide for the control and eradication of certain animal and plant pests and diseases, to facilitate cooperation with the States in fire control, to provide for the more efficient protection and management of the national forests, to facilitate the carrying out of agricultural conservation and related agricultural programs, to facilitate the operation of the Farm Credit Administration and the Rural Electrification Administration, to aid in the orderly marketing of agricultural commodities, and for other purposes, which was read, as follows:

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, U. S.
June 3, 1944.

Resolved, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 1 to the bill (H. R. 4278) to provide for the control and eradication of certain animal and plant pests and diseases, to facilitate cooperation with the States in fire control, to provide for the more efficient protection and management of the national forests, to facilitate the carrying out of agricultural conservation and related agricultural programs, to facilitate the operation of the Farm Credit Administration and the Rural Electrification Administration, to aid in the orderly marketing of agricultural commodities, and for other purposes, and concur therein with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert:

SEC. 303. That all purposes and objects of expenditure which are provided for under the item "Loans, grants, and rural rehabilitation," in the Department of Agriculture Appropriation Act, 1944, are hereby authorized for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1945, in the manner, in the detail, and under the conditions, authorities, restrictions, and limitations as are contained in the item referred to, and there are hereby authorized to be appropriated and to be otherwise made available such sums as Congress may deem necessary for the purposes of this section: *Provided,* That no part of such sums be available for the promotion or aid of any program of medical care which prevents the patient from having the services of any practitioner of his own choice so long as State laws are complied with, except that this provision shall not be applicable to the promotion or aid of a program of medical care where a majority of the participants within the program group elect to confine their choice of practitioners to a list of available licensed practitioners selected by them.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 3, to said bill, and concur therein with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert:

SEC. 403. Section 32 of the act entitled "An act to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act, and for other purposes," approved August 24, 1935 (49 Stat. 774), as amended, is hereby further amended by the addition of the following language:

"Not exceeding $50,000,000 of the funds appropriated by and pursuant to this section may also be used during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1945, to provide food for consumption by children in nonprofit schools of high-school grade or under and for child-care centers through (a) the purchase, processing, and exchange, and the distribution of agricultural commodities and products thereof; or (b) the making of payments to such schools and centers or agencies having control thereof in connection with the purchase and distribution of agricultural commodities in fresh or processed form and, when desirable, for the processing and exchange of such commodities and their products; or (c) by such other means as the Secretary may determine: *Provided,* That funds appropriated for the purposes of this program shall be apportioned for expenditure in the States, Territories, possessions, and the District of Columbia in accordance with school enrollment and need, as determined by the Secretary, except that if program participation in any State does not require all funds so apportioned, the Secretary may reapportion such excess funds to such other States in consideration of need, as he may determine: *Provided further,* That benefits under this section to schools or child-care centers shall in no case exceed the cost of the agricultural commodities or products thereof delivered to the school or child-care center as established by certificates executed by the authorized representative of the sponsoring agency: *Provided further,* That such sponsoring agency shall maintain accounts and records clearly establishing costs of agricultural commodities or products furnished in the program and that such accounts and records shall be available for audit by representatives of the Department of Agriculture: *Provided further,* That these funds may be used for, or to make payments in connection with, the purchase of such agricultural commodities and for exchanging, distributing, disposing, transporting, storing, processing, inspection, commission, and other incidental costs and expenses without regard to the provisions of section 3709 of the Revised Statutes and without regard to the 25 percent limitation contained in this section: *Provided further,* That not more than 2 percent of the funds made available under this amendment shall be used to provide food for children in child-care centers. The amount of funds used in any State during any fiscal year under this paragraph shall not exceed the total amount otherwise furnished for the same purpose by or on behalf of the State and local school authorities and other sponsoring agencies in such State including the value of donated services and supplies, as certified by the respective schools, care centers or agencies having control thereof.

"There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such additional amounts for the purposes of this amendment as the Congress may deem necessary."

That the House insist upon its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 2 to said bill.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, let me say that I am not as familiar with this legislation as perhaps I should be. But it is my understanding—if I am wrong, I wish the Senator would correct me—that this legislation has been pending in the House, in the Senate, and in conference since early in the year.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator is correct in that understanding. I will ask the Chair to state just when the bill passed the Senate. It has been several months since it was passed. The bill has been pending in the two bodies for more than a year.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill was passed by the Senate on May 2, 1944.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I further understand that the primary purpose of the bill is to write into permanent law certain authorities which the Department of Agriculture has asserted from time to time in the past.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Department of Agriculture has done so by virtue of authority contained in appropriation bills approved by the Congress.

Mr. WHITE. And the Appropriations Committee has met the problem and the doubt by acting.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Appropriations Committee has approved the bill. I may say to the Senator that I do not recall that there was any objection whatever to the portion of the bill which is not affected by the motion which I shall make, that the Senate recede from its position on these amendments. It was generally agreed by all Members of the Senate, as well as by the other body, that these matters should be clarified by statute and that standards should be fixed and restrictions imposed by statute. That has been done in the bill.

Mr. WHITE. The effect of what the Senator proposes is to have the Senate recede from its position on certain amendments which it heretofore has adopted; is that correct?

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator is correct.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Mr. President, I should like to inquire whether I am to understand that unanimous consent is

required at this time in order to take up the message.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator is not correct. The message has been laid before the Senate. Only a majority vote is now required.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Am I to understand that the Senator from Georgia has proposed that the Senate recede from its position on the amendments?

Mr. RUSSELL. I was proposing to make such a motion as soon as I could get the floor, Mr. President. I had stated that it was my purpose to move that the Senate recede from its position in agreeing to the amendments.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I had understood that the message had been read for the information of the Senate, and I assumed that the Senator from Georgia was going to request unanimous consent for present consideration of the amendments.

Mr. RUSSELL. It is not my purpose to call the matter up if there is any objection to its consideration. Of course, I know that any Member present may suggest the absence of a quorum, and that in that event the Senate would be compelled to recess until a later date.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, so far as I am concerned I have no objection to the consideration of the matter at this time; but the Senator from South Dakota may have a different idea about it, and I do not want his rights to be foreclosed by anything which I may have said.

Mr. RUSSELL. I have discussed the matter informally with the Senator from South Dakota and I do not understand that he has any objection to the consideration of the matter.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Mr. President, I have no intention to ask for a quorum call. I realize the situation now confronting the Senate. However, I had understood that in order to bring the bill before the Senate unanimous consent would have to be obtained.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair will state the rule of the Senate on the subject. It is upon such rule that the Chair acts.

Paragraph 7 of rule VII reads as follows:

> The Presiding Officer may at any time lay, and it shall be in order at any time for a Senator to move to lay, before the Senate, any bill or other matter sent to the Senate by the President or the House of Representatives, and any question pending at that time shall be suspended for this purpose. Any motion so made shall be determined without debate.

In view of such rule, the Chair laid the message before the Senate. Unanimous consent was not required.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I move that the Senate recede from its amendment numbered 1.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Mr. President, in order to present my point of order, it is necessary that I comment very briefly upon what has happened in connection with the bill.

The bill was passed by the House. It came to the Senate and, as I recall, three amendments were offered. One of the amendments was one in which I was interested. It was an amendment to section 303. During the discussion on the floor of the Senate I offered an amendment at the end of section 303. The amendment was as follows:

> *Provided*, That no part of such sums be available for the promotion or aid of any program of medical care which prevents the patient from having the services of any practitioner of his own choice so long as the State laws are complied with.

That amendment was adopted unanimously by the Senate without objection. The bill was sent to conference. Conferees were appointed. When the bill finally got back to the House from the conference, Representative TABER said:

> Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order against the conference report on the ground that it is beyond the range of the conference.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. BUSHFIELD. I yield for a question.

Mr. AIKEN. I ask the Senator from South Dakota whether the amendment which he proposed was an amendment to an amendment which was subsequently adopted by the Senate, or was it an amendment to the bill itself?

Mr. BUSHFIELD. An amendment to section 303 of the bill was proposed on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. AIKEN. The Senator's amendment was an amendment to an amendment.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Yes.

Mr. AIKEN. So if the Senate should recede from the amendment as adopted by the Senate, the amendment of the Senator from South Dakota would be unnecessary.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. It would be eliminated, as I understand.

When the conference report came before the other House, Representative TABER raised a point of order. He was sustained by the Speaker, and under the rules of the House the conference report was rejected. It was the duty of the conferees—I am sure I am right about this—so to report the matter to the Senate. As I recall, that was done on May 6; and on May 18 the House got the bill back into its own hands and added an amendment at the end of my amendment completely emasculating the amendment which the Senate had previously adopted. As I have already said, my amendment was as follows:

> *Provided*, That no part of such sums be available for the promotion or aid of any program of medical care which prevents the patient from having the services of any practitioner of his own choice so long as State laws are complied with.

The House then added the following language:

> Except that this provision shall not be applicable to the promotion or aid of a program of medical care where a majority of the participants within the program group elect to confine their choice of practitioners to a list of available licensed practitioners selected by them.

Such language would mean that the individual borrower of the Farm Security Administration would not have anything to say about his choice of physicians. He would come under the complete control of the majority of the group of borrowers and, if they saw fit, they could limit the person's choice to one or more physicians.

Remember that the Senate passed section 303 of the bill with the amendment to it which I had proposed. The bill went to conference. It finally got back to the House and the House amended it, adding the language which I have just read, namely, the amendment of Representative FLANNAGAN.

The point I desire to make is this. Have we any jurisdiction to recede from the position taken by eliminating section 303 with my amendment? The House has already adopted the provision. It is a part of the bill which has come to us.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senate has not acted upon the amendment. A motion to recede from the Senate amendment, if carried, would eliminate the language.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. How can we recede and destroy something which the House has already acted upon? That is the point in which I am interested.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senate can do as it pleases. On a vote it can either recede or sustain.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Can it do so after the House has adopted the language as a part of the bill?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Yes; even after the House has adopted the language as a part of the bill.

The question is on the motion of the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] to recede from certain amendments.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Mr. President, is the motion debatable?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. It is.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BUSHFIELD. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. Is the Senator about to proceed with a somewhat lengthy discussion in opposition to the motion?

Mr. BUSHFIELD. No.

Mr. HATCH. If there is to be extended opposition, perhaps we should wait until we have a larger attendance of Senators.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. I have no objection to waiting. I should like to have a larger attendance of Members of the Senate.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I have no objection to considering the matter now, or letting it go over to any date that is agreeable. I am here as amicus curiae, attempting to complete action on the bill. I do not think there is any question involved which should provoke extended discussion.

This is the whole situation: There was an amendment to extend the Farm Security Administration for the fiscal year 1945. Three months of that year have now practically passed. What possible purpose could be served, when the appropriation bill already contains such a provision, by fighting over a dead horse, namely, an amendment which relates to

some subject matter which would have little effect on the statute, and would merely clutter up the statutes with an authorization which is already in the appropriation bill? An amendment was offered by the Senator from South Dakota. It was adopted by the Senate. It related to a very small phase of the so-called medical program of the Farm Security Administration.

I am perfectly willing that the matter go over, but I do not see how any useful purpose could be served by discussing the amendment at any length. The fiscal year is already under way. It would be most unusual if we were to attempt to go back retroactively to the first of the present fiscal year and impose other rules and regulations, and a new system of administration of Farm Security Administration legislation. I have no quarrel with the purpose of the Senator from South Dakota. I believe that his amendment perhaps created a situation which even he himself did not anticipate. So far as his purpose is concerned, I am in accord with it. But contracts have already been entered into, and the proposed legislation cannot affect the situation at all. We can debate it, but it is a wholly moot question. If there is a desire on the part of any Senator to postpone consideration of the matter until Friday or any other date, it is perfectly agreeable to me. I was merely interested in straightening out the matter of a low-interest rate for the rural electrification program, because the proposed legislation would tremendously benefit that program. I do not think the program is one concerning which we have any argument. There certainly has been no fight made against it. When the bill was pending the matter was explained and the bill was passed without any objection being made to it. So far as I am concerned, I am perfectly willing to have the matter go over if there is any disposition on the part of any Senator to object.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President——

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from South Dakota yield to the Senator from Maine?

Mr. BUSHFIELD. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, the matter is now before the Senate. I take it, if we recess until Thursday or Friday or some other day this week, it will be immediately in order before the Senate when it reconvenes. In the circumstances, and especially in view of the fact that there are relatively few Senators present at the moment, I suggest to the distinguished Senator from Georgia that he let the matter go over and take it up afresh when the Senate reconvenes.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I am always glad to accede to any request made by the distinguished minority leader, and I am perfectly willing to have the matter go over.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. I understand that the matter goes over until the next meeting of the Senate?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Yes; until next Friday.

REGULATION OF PRODUCTION AND DISTRIBUTION OF OLEOMARGARINE

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the college of agriculture of the University of Wisconsin has made some outstanding contributions to science and to the welfare of mankind. Many of these have been in the dairy world. They include the work of Dr. Babcock, inventor of the Babcock butter test, as well as that of his coworkers, such as Prof. E. H. Farrington and the present-day professors. Among these is the outstanding record of Dr. Hugo H. Sommer.

Mr. President, there is pending before a Senate committee a bill which would remove the tax on oleomargarine, enable that product to be colored and sold as a substitute for butter, and thus make it possible to perpetrate a fraud upon the American consumer. Dr. Sommer appeared before the committee of the Senate and his exposition of the subject is so excellent that I am about to ask that what he said be printed in the RECORD following my remarks. Dr. Sommer called attention to the fact that, because of the advance in science, fatty foods might now be made even from coal. However, he gave ample evidence as to why the lawmakers of the country should guard their footsteps and not foster legislation which would ruin the dairy industry of the Nation. As everyone knows, the dairy industry of this country, from the standpoint of money return—money invested, that is, farms and equipment—is the largest segment of farm life in our country. I now ask that the testimony of Dr. Sommer be printed in the RECORD at this point.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The testimony is as follows:

STATEMENT OF DR. HUGO H. SOMMER, PROFESSOR OF DAIRY INDUSTRY, UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN

Dr. SOMMER. My name is Hugo H. Sommer. I am a member of the faculty of the college of agriculture, University of Wisconsin, with the rank of professor of dairy industry. My duties are teaching and research in this field. I was trained in the science of agriculture, and in my graduate study specialized in biochemistry and bacteriology.

Senator ELLENDER, Senator GILLETTE and Senator WILLIS, I neglected to state to you that if you desire to ask any questions of the witnesses, we will be glad to have you do so.

Senator GILLETTE. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Senator WILLIS. Thank you, Senator.

Senator ELLENDER. Proceed, Dr. Sommer.

Dr. SOMMER. The doctor of philosophy degree was conferred upon me in this field in 1922. I am the author or coauthor of a number of scientific papers on subjects relating to dairy products. I am the author of two books on dairy subjects, and these books are used as texts in all of the leading dairy schools in this country. One of them has been translated into Russian.

I am appearing in opposition to S. 1744 with the specific authorization of our administrative officers, and I am here at their direction. At the outset I want to make it clear that our opposition is not based on the question of nutritive equivalency between fortified oleomargarine and butter. I want to make it equally clear, just to keep the record straight, that we do not concede any such equivalency. The final chapter on nutrition has not been written and there are still unanswered questions in this field. The conclusions which have been introduced in support of this bill must be regarded as provisional, and it is more nearly correct to speak of approximate nutritive equivalency.

Our opposition to S. 1744 is based upon the firm conviction that repeal of the tax on yellow oleomargarine would have the following consequences:

1. Extensive fraudulent sale of colored oleomargarine as butter would result.

2. The price of butter and of all dairy products would be depressed with resulting decrease in milk production.

Senator ELLENDER. Dr. Sommer, on what basis do you argue that the elimination of the tax will eliminate fraud?

Dr. SOMMER. It is just the opposite. The elimination of the tax will encourage fraud.

Senator ELLENDER. I am sorry. What is your reasoning for that statement?

Dr. SOMMER. The profit motive in such case would be much greater.

Senator ELLENDER. As I understand, the price of oleomargarine, say in Vermont, as Mr. Brigham testified, is 25 cents per pound.

Senator AIKEN. I think he said about 25—25 to 29.

Senator ELLENDER. Yes; and 52 cents, as I recall it, for butter, or a difference of 27 cents. If you put the tax on, it would make the oleomargarine sell for 35 cents as against 52 cents for butter. Do you think that the 10-cent difference would cause fraud not to be practiced to the same extent since the difference in the price of butter and margarine is still very substantial with the tax?

Dr. SOMMER. It would certainly tend to be a limiting factor, and I think past performance would bear me out in saying that it has been a fairly effective deterrent to fraud. And if it should develop that a higher tax is necessary to deter fraud, I would be in favor of the higher tax.

Senator ELLENDER. As a matter of fact, you would be in favor of a tax to eliminate oleomargarine altogether; would you not?

Dr. SOMMER. I would not say to eliminate oleomargarine altogether. That is one or my reasons for wanting to tax colored margarine, and I am very frank in stating it.

Senator ELLENDER. I understand. I am not trying to find fault with your view. What the committee is trying to do is to get both sides of the picture and find the fundamental reasons for the difficulties that are brought to our attention by the different witnesses. And as I have expressed on two or three occasions, I cannot for the life of me see how the elimination of the tax would be more conducive to fraud. I would rather have you base your argument on commercial reasons, which are to me really the real reasons. And if you are not in agreement with that—— .

Dr. SOMMER. Well, pardon me, the elimination of the tax would make it more conducive to fraud.

Senator ELLENDER. That is what I stated.

Dr. SOMMER. Because the profit motive would be definitely greater, to the extent of the 10 cents per pound.

Senator ELLENDER. The difference between the price of oleomargarine in Vermont and butter is still about 17 cents?

Dr. SOMMER. That might be under certain conditions, and it might encourage fraud as experience would develop because it has been true in the past experience. I would be definitely in favor of increasing the tax, in the interest of defeating fraud.

Senator ELLENDER. I do not know. I do not question your motives, but I am of the impression that many would like to increase the tax not so much to eliminate fraud as it would be to eliminate the production of oleomargarine.

Dr. SOMMER. That is why I said and why I frankly state that eliminating the fraud is only one reason for the position we assume.

Senator ELLENDER. Dr. Sommer, do you or do you not believe it will be possible for the Congress to enact some legislation which would eliminate, as far as possible, as has been done in respect to the manufacture of other products, fraud?

This has been done with respect to liquor and to any number of products which are manufactured.

Dr. SOMMER. Well, I do not know.

Senator ELLENDER. In other words, could we not attain that goal to a better extent by passing laws sending a man to the penitentiary if he should sell oleomargarine for butter? Would that not be more conducive to having the article sold as margarine than this little tax that you speak of?

Dr. SOMMER. It is conceivable.

Senator ELLENDER. Yes.

Dr. SOMMER. And for the other reasons as I will develop, we will still be opposed to the eliminating of the tax.

Senator WILSON. Mr. Chairman, going back to the price in Vermont, as I understand it, it is 25 cents now, uncolored?

Senator AIKEN. Compared with 51 cents for butter.

Senator WILSON. So, if you take off the present restriction of 10 cents per pound, they could continue to sell their oleomargarine colored for 25 cents and they would have a difference of 27 cents, instead of 17 cents?

Senator AIKEN. That is right. If you take it off. But what we have in mind, Senator, is to that which is now sold the difference under the law is 17 cents.

Senator WILSON. Yes, sir.

You would have the margarine colored to look like butter, and according to his testimony in the manufacture it would not increase the cost of margarine in any respect by leaving the color in, so you would have colored margarine at 25 cents as against your butter that was around 52 cents, and the margarine would not be more than 27 cents.

From a competitive standpoint the competition would be greater; you would, therefore, have a differential of 27 cents instead of 17 cents, margarine being 25 cents and butter being 52 cents?

Senator ELLENDER. I grant that. But I am saying this: The omission of the tax is no deterrent, just as the imposition of the tax is no deterrent to fraud, as has been said by many witnesses here.

Senator AIKEN. Mr. Chairman, inasmuch as Vermont has been brought into this a great deal from both sides, I should like to say that Vermont adopts a very tolerant attitude toward oleomargarine. Vermont sells a great deal of fluid milk, and when the price of fluid milk is high a great deal of oleomargarine is consumed in the State by the farmers of the State as well as others.

At almost every session of the legislature some enthusiastic individual introduces a bill to curb the sale of oleomargarine, and the Vermont Legislature, comprised for the most part of dairy farmers, every time votes it down. Six hundred and twenty-five licenses for dealers have been issued and, I think, have been on the books a long, long time. As far as I know, it has been a very long time since these people have been selling oleomargarine, and as far as I know, they have not asked that it be rescinded; possibly they have, but that is not a deterrent, as far as I know.

Dr. SOMMER. I was enumerating the basis for our opposition to the bill, S. 1744. The third point is a shift in our agriculture in the direction of less livestock and more field crops would take place, with accompanying losses in soil fertility by soil mining and erosion.

Senator WILSON. What was the second point?

Dr. SOMMER. The price of butter and of all dairy products would be depressed with resulting decrease in milk production.

The first point was extensive fraudulent sale of colored oleomargarine as butter would result.

Fourth. There would be a loss in terms of human health because the effect of a decrease in milk solids production would outrank any possible benefit that is visualized in support of the bill.

Fifth. A dangerous precedent would be set in the field of imitation food products.

Sixth. The greatest common good would be adversely affected when all consequences are taken into consideration, including the effects on the consumer, the dairy farmer, and the producer of oil crops.

I shall not dwell on all of these points in detail. The extreme likelihood of fraudulent sales has already been covered. Certainly the incentive for fraud is obvious when we consider that the ingredient fats in oleomargarine normally cost only one-fifth to one-fourth as much as the milk fat in butter.

The potential profit in imitating the higher-priced butter is so great that it stimulates considerable ingenuity. It is difficult to draft legislative control measures that foresee all possible evasions. For example, several years ago a product appeared on our markets in Wisconsin in two packages—one contained the fat and the other contained the other ingredients in water, so planned that by blending the two together in the home a typical oleomargarine resulted. It was necessary to amend our State law to bring this product clearly under its jurisdiction.

I understand that the economic phases of the subject will be presented in detail by others. In studies of economic control measures applied to fats and oils in European countries, the conclusion is outstanding that there is a close relationship between fats and dairy products. It is inescapable that expanded use of vegetable oils will depress the price of dairy products.

A great deal could be said about the place of livestock in a well-balanced permanent agriculture. It is axiomatic in the science of agriculture that livestock is essential to maintaining soil fertility and is the most economical means for rebuilding depleted soil. Even the advocates of oleomargarine recognize this fact. For example, Whitehead, in a publication from the University of Georgia, entitled "Margarine and Georgia," says:

"It is only too clear that Georgia needs a livestock industry, and needs it badly."

We need only look at the declining cotton yields per acre to appreciate what Whitehead is talking about. Obviously, we cannot shift our dietary more and more to field crops without decreasing livestock products. Such a shift in the type of agriculture will increase soil mining and erosion. Crops such as soybeans are especially bad offenders as far as erosion is concerned. Their root system is such that the soil is loosened, and it washes away very easily. Unless the fields are very flat and level this causes very serious erosion.

A sound national policy with respect to agriculture requires that the proper balance between field crops and livestock be established in deficient areas and thereby a permanent agriculture be created and maintained, rather than to encourage practices which deplete and erode the soil and then spasmodically and uneconomically spend public funds to repair the damages. Actually this is the significance of Whitehead's plea when he said, "Georgia needs a livestock industry, and needs it badly."

This policy of maintaining a proper balance between livestock and field crops is not only important to a sound, permanent agriculture but is also directly important to human health. From the reports of the United Nations Conference on Food and Agriculture, held at Hot Springs, Va., May 18 to June 3, 1943, it is evident that malnutrition is widely prevalent throughout the world and especially in sections where such products as milk, meats, and eggs do not constitute an adequate part of the dietary. The outstanding deficiencies, aside from actual undernourishment or starvation, are in the proper quality of proteins and in minerals and vitamins. Vitamin A, with which we are concerned here in fortified oleomargarine, is only one of the important vitamins involved in this picture.

I have listened with interest to the testimony offered in support of S. 1744. The conclusions on the nutritive value of fortified oleomargarine are based on reports from the New York Academy of Medicine, the American Medical Association, and the food and nutrition board of the National Research Council. It is claimed that fortified oleomargarine is the nutritive equivalent of butter and that repeal of the 10-cent tax on yellow oleomargarine is in the interest of adequate nutrition of low-income families.

The most direct answer is that the yellow color contributes nothing to the food value of the product. Furthermore, there is no assurance that the yellow oleomargarine would be fortified with vitamins. Mere repeal of the tax would not make it compulsory to add the necessary vitamin A dosage assumed in these reports. Under the standard of identity promulgated under the Food, Drug, and Cosmetics Act, the addition of vitamin A is purely optional. Even if we assume that the oleomargarine industry as now constituted has every intention of fortifying adequately, there is still no assurance that newcomers, who are sure to enter the field if the Federal tax is repealed, will abide by such a policy. If the 10-cent tax were repealed, consumers might then be fooled into believing they are eating butter, and would be doubly injured by the unjustified price they are paying, and by failing to get the vitamin A content they have been led to expect.

No matter how you approach this problem, the only sound solution and adequate control is found in sharply discouraging the ultimate step in the imitation, by keeping the present tax on yellow oleomargarine in force. Further, the fact that the favorable conclusions by the three named scientific organizations is based on fortification makes the present tax on both uncolored and yellow oleomargarine all the more justified. The fortification, which is done at significant cost, should actually be there, otherwise we are doing low-income families real harm when we encourage them to use the product.

Senator ELLENDER. At that point let me ask you this: Why is it that you add color to butter? You do not have to do it, yet you do.

Dr. SOMMER. That practice developed many, many years ago, long before there was even a suspicion that the yellow color had any nutritional significance, so the practice definitely had for its only purpose equalization of the seasonal variation in color.

Senator ELLENDER. It does not make it more palatable.

Dr. SOMMER. It makes it more acceptable. Uniformity is necessary for the successful marketing of any product.

Senator ELLENDER. I presume that that is one of the reasons why the oleomargarine people would like to have the same privilege, in fact, the very same privilege, Mr. Sommer, as is accorded butter.

Dr. SOMMER. There is no question about it. It would add to the appeal of their product.

It would seem just to tax the imitation product so as to bear the cost of the special supervision that is required to assure compliance with the approximate nutritive equivalency claims. I should add before leaving the three scientific reports on fortified oleomargarine that they are qualified in several important respects. The report by the American Medical Association closes with these words:

"Since the nutritional factors have not all been identified, and since butter contains numerous additional fatty acids of unknown nutritional significance, the consuming public has a right to demand that the practice

of identifying oleomargarine and butter so that anyone can differentiate between them should be continued."

Senator ELLENDER. In that respect, Dr. Sommer, I think that the members of the committee are in full accord with that.

I am wondering if you would feel more kindly to the bill if it should be provided that nothing but a specific kind of oil could be used, and that such oil must be produced within the confines of continental United States?

Dr. SOMMER. For the moment, I was speaking from the development of the consumer's interest in this problem. I think as I discuss this matter the other points will make that rather clear.

Senator ELLENDER. I did not say you would not be against it, but I was wondering whether or not you would not feel more kindly toward the bill by the utilization of home-grown products?

In other words, to develop home industries, as it were, and let the tax remain on margarine made from foreign oils that are used in its manufacture.

Dr. SOMMER. Such measures undoubtedly would enlist more sympathy.

Senator ELLENDER. Yes, I think so.

Dr. SOMMER. The New York Academy of Medicine report states:

"The committee has looked into the matter solely from a nutritional and social viewpoint, without regard to the economic aspects of the situation."

Its first recommendation is that the fortification of oleomargarine be made mandatory, and its other recommendations are apparently predicated upon that requirement. It should be added that their recommendations were also limited to the duration of the war.

The food and nutrition board report closes with the clause in conclusion dealing with taxes "but the implications of these taxes are so extensive and complex that no recommendation with respect to them can be made in this report."

The implications which might have been mentioned are concerned with fraud prevention, adequate enforcement, sound national agricultural policy, and also nutritional problems aside from fats and vitamin A.

It is probably true that many nutritionists, physicians, and home economists are favorably inclined to the idea of removing all taxes on oleomargarine. Likewise, many housewives and consumer organizations are in favor of such a policy, especially under rationing conditions. Their sincerity cannot be questioned, but neither can 't be questioned that their outlook on the problem is narrowed down to a single thought. Either consciously or subconsciously they assume that we can alter just this one factor and leave everything else fixed and undisturbed.

These groups see in the repeal of taxes on oleomargarine a means of improving the nutrition of low-income families. Even if we make the most favorable assumption, namely, that most of the oleomargarine will continue to be fortified, which is not assured, we have another nutritional consequence which apparently does not occur to them.

Extensive sale of oleomargarine will inevitably depress the price and the production of butter and of all dairy products. That means that there will be less milk solids as a byproduct of the butter industry and by virtue of discouraged dairying generally. Milk solids are considered so essential that their compulsory inclusion in bread is demanded. This bread program is also conceived in the interest of low-income families and their adequate nutrition. Low-income families subsist on bread and cereal products to a great degree, and it is held, rightly so, that milk solids should be included in the bread to supplement the deficient cereal proteins and to provide essential minerals and vitamins. The present price structure in the dairy industry is supporting this bread program by providing relatively cheap milk solids not fat. Even if the price structure could be changed to one with less of the value on the fat and more on the solids not fat and thereby maintain milk production, it is highly questionable whether the bread program could be advanced under such price conditions. We cannot consistently have a greatly expanded use of oleomargarine and a greatly expanded use of milk solids to enrich bread. Of the two, the latter is recognized as nutritionally more important and significant.

There is no gain if in attacking one nutritional deficiency problem we intensify another problem of equal or greater importance. The fact remains, as most nutritionists agree, that the improvement in nutritional status must come chiefly through education aimed at dietary habits, and through improvement in economic status. There is no assurance that those who most need improved dietaries will be reached by either the fortified oleomargarine program or the fortified bread program.

Under a moderate tax on uncolored oleomargarine and a discouraging tax on yellow oleomargarine, both programs can go forward in a balanced manner and to the best advantage of human health, insofar as it may be possible to improve the general dietary status through programs rather than education.

Dr. Carlson testified that he would propose nothing that would decrease the amount of milk available to our consumers, and admitted that more, rather than less, milk solids should be used. His entire position in the matter under consideration here is therefore predicated on the false assumption that repeal of the 10-cent tax would not decrease the production of milk solids, and on his opinion that no such decrease would result.

In my contact and discussions with pure nutritionists, and such contact has been quite extensive, I find that they are inclined to oversimplify commercial interrelations. For example, in a sizable committee meeting with nutritionists where this general subject was under discussion, the view was quite freely expressed that a decrease in the market value of milk fat need not cause a decrease in milk prices and milk production. They pointed out that all that would be necessary would be to attach more of the value to the skim milk, going on to say that nutritionally the skim milk is worth much more than its present prices. All very true, but the only catch is that commercially the skim milk is worth only as much as you can get for it.

It has also been implied that the dairy industry has not used proper ingenuity and diligence in seeking to promote the sale of butter and of skim milk. On the contrary, educational leaders in the dairy industry have stressed the food value of the skim-milk portion of milk for years, and have kept themselves informed on nutritional developments to this end. However, just as Dr. Carlson said, you cannot change ingrained notions overnight with respect to the value of skim milk. The dairy industry has found that you cannot change this ingrained notion over a considerable period of years. Some progress has undoubtedly been made, but that is already reflected in present price structures, and any compulsion now to attach more of the value of milk to the skim milk just wouldn't find the consumer acceptance there to support it.

Much of the sentiment among consumers in favor of repealing Federal taxes on oleomargarine is engendered by the State taxes. The fact that many States have tax laws on oleomargarine has been used to engender this feeling when, as a matter of fact, all but seven States exempt the product on some basis or other. With normal distribution of population these seven States affect only 7.5 percent of our Nation's population. It is the Federal tax that is important in controlling the product; the State taxes, however, reflect the sentiment of individual States. Some consumers have expressed the belief that repeal of the Federal tax would set the pattern, and repeal of State taxes would follow. It is our considered opinion that the reverse would be true, and more stringent State laws would undoubtedly follow in a number of cases.

There are those who are skeptical about these consequences of repealing the tax on yellow oleomargarine. In this respect, as well as other respects, the timing of these repeal efforts is opportunely chosen. Our production and flow of goods is temporarily not under the normal effect of economic laws but is directed by price controls, set-aside orders, and quotas.

It is largely due to the resulting conditions that much of the consumer pressure for repeal originates. The butter industry has literally gone to war. It served as a reserve milk supply which has been extensively diverted to other products. A large part of the nonfat dry-milk solids, a byproduct of the butter industry, is being used by the armed forces and for lend-lease shipments, and our chief customer in normal times, the baking industry, cannot be adequately supplied. It is true that some of the consequences here pointed out will not occur under the war conditions, but repeal is not limited to the duration. It is also true that repeal of taxes would not add 1 pound of fat to our total national supply. Further, it is also true that it would be a shameful act to undermine the butter industry while it has been diverted to war, analogous to taking away a soldier's permanent job and violating his home.

But there is another respect in which repeal efforts may be opportune. Developments in the chemistry of fats foreshadow striking improvements in oleomargarine with respect to body and texture, as well as flavor, through still more exact duplication of butter. After this has been achieved, the potential effects on the dairy industry would be so obvious that repeal of taxes would be difficult.

To be more specific: One of the problems in the manufacture of oleomargarine is to duplicate the body and texture; in short, the spreading quality of butter. It so happens that butterfat contains fatty acids of different molecular weights ranging all the way from 4 carbon to 24 carbon fatty acids. This gives butter the property of undergoing a very gradual change in firmness over quite a wide temperature range. It has no definite melting point, and it is only by arbitrarily choosing the test conditions that we can assign a melting point to it. The fats from which oleomargarine is made do not contain the lower molecular weight, fatty acids. While it is possible to adjust their melting point by mixing, blending, and hydrogenation, it has not been possible to duplicate the gradation in firmness over an appreciable temperature range. This can unquestionably be obtained by adding fats of low molecular weight fatty acids, but no such fats are naturally available except in butter Coconut oil is a step in that direction but still falls considerably short. The low molecular weight fats can eventually be made by synthesis. In this connection, let me point out that according to an article by A. Imahusen, published in Kolloid Zeitschrift, volume 103, No. 2, page 105, May 1943, a method has been developed for the manufacture of fatty acids, soaps, and finally edible fats from petroleum paraffin and from a byproduct of their synthetic-gasoline plants. In this method they have control of the length of the carbon chain in the fatty acid molecule. He reports a plant in operation producing synthetic edible fats as early as 1937 and also mentions the active production of "synthetic butter." He also

mentions affiliation of these activities with I. G. Farben-Industrie. This is partly confirmed in a report from the International Institute of Agriculture issued from Rome in 1939 in Studies of Principal Agricultural Products on the World Market, No. 5, Oils and Fats: Production and International Trade; part II, page 342, where it says:

"Finally, very recently, there have been experiments in the production of synthetic fats. Of these, experiments in the production of synthetic fatty acids from coal led to practical results. Already in Germany in 1937 the first factory for the manufacture of artificial fatty acids was established with a production capacity of 20,000 metric tons, and preparations were in progress for the erection of a further two factories with similar capacity."

If we adopt nutritive equivalency as our basis of policy, developments such as these may prove embarrassing. Imhausen says of these synthetic fats as follows—this is a translation:

"The Public Health Bureau of the Reich has by thousands of experiments under the leadership of Professor Flossner demonstrated the high value of the synthetic edible fats, and has released it as the first synthetic food material of the world for human nourishment."

In connection with the synthesis of fatty acids and its significance in assuring the German fat supply, Professor Imhausen in May of 1943 presented a rather full statement.

That has a very definite bearing upon the problem that we are discussing here, Senator, and about which you have inquired. Perhaps a little fuller reference to it at this time would serve to bring out more definitely my point.

The questions you have just asked me, I think, are in large measure answered by this.

For instance, Professor Imhausen says:

"It is difficult to present the magnitude of fat utilization, production, and imports correctly and accurately in a few words. It is necessary to differentiate between food fats, technical fats, and such fats which serve both purposes. It is necessary to consider the pure-fat content of the individual fats. It is necessary to take into consideration which part of the domestic production has its origin in imported feeds. And it is necessary to consider whether and to what degree the fat of whole milk as beverage milk contributes to nourishment besides the spreading and cooking fats. If one views all that, then it develops that before the war the truly domestic production, that is, the production based on our own feed basis, supplies about 50 percent of the requirements. This holds for Germany as well as for Europe to about the same degree.

"The other half of the requirements before the war, aside from the feeds for cattle and hogs, was furnished by the tropical and Antarctic regions, which supplied the whale oil, and the former the oils and fats of oil-bearing plants. To this there must be added east Asia, as supplying soybeans, and South America, as supplying linseed.

"The National Socialistic Economic Management recognized in its full scope the dangers that arose out of this dependence on foreign sources for the German fat supply. It introduced a planned supply economy and carried through workable saving measures. It soon became apparent that these measures alone did not suffice to assure the fat supply against the possibility that Germany might be isolated from foreign sources of raw material. One required, therefore, especially the development of new kinds of raw material on a German raw-material basis.

"The procedure which has been worked out by me for the preparation of synthetic fatty acids, therefore, enjoyed from the start the energetic encouragement of related Government offices. Their help later contributed materially to the fact that in an astonishingly short time the laboratory experiments could find them practical in a technical large-scale installation.

"At the start of the war we, therefore, had at our command a fat factory which already had been in operation for several years, and which had operated practically without any 'children's diseases.' For the technical fats and the washing materials field, a suitable raw material basis had thereby been provided. At the same time this materially improved the edible fat field, since large quantities of natural fats, which formerly were required for technical uses, were now released for food.

"Also the processing of technical fatty acids had already been tried in peacetime on a large technical scale, so that based on these experiences the measures required by the war could be met without risk.

"The idea of preparing fatty acids from hydrocarbons is not new. The first works in this field were carried out nearly 100 years ago. A large number of investigators up to the present time have busied themselves with this problem, and in these efforts the most varied hydrocarbons and the most diverse types of oxidation media have found utilization. Hofstadter must be credited with being the first one to point out that the 'limit hydrocarbons,' Grenzkohlenwasserstoffe, the paraffins, are not so chemically inert as their name indicates.

"On treatment of paraffin by fuming nitric acid he was able to prove lower fatty acids in the reaction products. In the time that followed many chemists have busied themselves with the problem of oxidizing paraffin, and in this the names that deserve special mention are Gill and Mensel who used chromic acid as the oxidation medium; Willigk, who worked with a mixture of nitric acid and sulfuric acid, as also Champion and Bellet. A significant step forward was attained by Bolley and Tuchachmidt, who carried out experiments to convert paraffin to fatty acids by atmospheric oxygen. In 1885 E. Schaal announced his basic patent 'Procedure for the oxidation of petroleum and similar hydrocarbons to acids and for the preparation of soaps and esters of these acids.' During the World War the need for the synthetic preparation of fatty acids became especially acute, but even Schaal himself had to admit before the end of the war that his work was not ripe for technical application.

"The World War gave the investigation in the field of fatty acids a new impulse. At that time, for example, the firm Fantho & Co. in Pardubitz erected a small technical installation, in which they oxidized some quantities of paraffin, but this installation was soon shut down since both the quality and also the yield of the prepared products were poor. Also Harries, Kotzschau & Fonobert toward the close of the war applied their works to the oxidation of lignite coal tar oil. The trials had to be discontinued as wholly unsuited to economical operation. Later, Ubbelohde, Kelber, Franz, Fischer, Gun, Loffl, Franck, and many others published their works in this field. Now also begins the large series of patents by I. G. Farben-Industrie, which had taken up the investigation in the field of fatty acids on a large scale. Also the works of Zerner, Pflugh, and Avenarius must be considered. There would be dozens of names to be mentioned if credit were to be given to everyone who worked in this field not without result. A large number of patents have been announced however without attaining large scale technical evaluation of these works.

"All these experiments were carried through with natural raw materials. I also used, for my early experiments, lignite paraffin, petroleum paraffin, and various other hydrocarbons.

"It was a fortunate circumstance that at this time the economic director of the Fuhrer, Secretary Kepplar, placed a new product at the disposal of professional people. To close the gap in the field of motor fuels, Secretary Kepplar, in addition to the erection of gasoline plants according to I. G. Farben processes, had started carbon monoxide hydrogenation plants according to the Fischer-Tropsch process.

"In these plants, in addition to motor gas, gasoline, Diesel oil, and high-molecular paraffins, also a fraction was obtained which was designated as 'Gatsch.' This Gatsch at that time represented a troublesome byproduct for which no use had been found. I soon found that in this Gatsch, fractionated suitably, I had the most suitable starting material for the fatty acid oxidation. Secretary Kepplar at once saw the large significance of this discovery. He directed Prof. Wo. Ostwald to investigate the new procedure exhaustively. By means of a clear and simple method Prof. Wo. Ostwald was able to prove the value and advantages of the new procedure convincingly. By the opinion of Prof. Wo. Ostwald the views of Secretary Kepplar were verified on all points, so that the building of a production plant proceeded with all vigor.

"It developed that the length of the carbon chain in the raw material is of decided significance. The oxidation does not take the course, as it might on first glance appear to, when the structural formula of a hydrocarbon and a fatty acid are compared. It can now be stated definitely that the oxidation does not, or to an insignificant extent, occur at the methyl group at the terminal carbon of the hydrocarbon. Even if the oxidation processes in the production of synthetic fatty acids from hydrocarbons are too complicated to permit a conclusive opinion as to the course of the oxidation it is definite that the oxidation proceeds through the peroxides. The presence of peroxides in the reaction products as well as the composition of the reaction products make this theory very plausible.

"According to this view a molecule of oxygen joins at a C–C bond with the formation of a dialkyl peroxide, whereby the molecule is ruptured. Besides the possibility that the oxygen will not rupture the molecule as a primary action, but instead forms a labile addition product on the paraffin molecule in the form of an alkyl hydro peroxide, one can also defend the view that, with the aid of the conception of active reaction centers, the first phase of the oxidation is a dehydrogenation with the formation of olefines, on which the oxidation medium then acts further in the well-known manner. That means, however, that in the oxidation there is a decrease in the length of the carbon chain. According to the length of the chain, one arrives at fatty acids with short carbon chains. Since technically, the fatty acids with C_1O to C_2O are the most interesting and valuable, and the aim of the paraffin oxidation must be to obtain the largest yield of these fatty acids, it is necessary to start with a material of such C chain length that the fatty acids mentioned will result as oxidation products.

"This fundamental fact makes it necessary from the start to fix the carbon chain length of the source material by a suitable fractionation.

"Neither the naturally occurring hydrocarbons nor the products of carbon monoxide hydrogenation meet this requirement. For this reason extensive fractionation of the source material was undertaken in order to determine the optimum boiling limits of the source material. Also in the technical, large scale plant we now start with a carbon monoxide hydrogenation product that distills within an accurately fixed temperature range. Besides the fatty acids a large number of other oxidation products are obtained such as dicarboxylic acids, oxy acids, alcohols, ketones, aldehydes, lactones as also reaction products formed by the interaction of the individual reaction products.

"In the oxidation experiments it soon had to be determined that it would hardly be

possible in one oxidation procedure to oxidize all of the Gatsch, even though this thought was persistent; the atmospheric oxygen during the reaction attacks not only the hydrocarbons started with but also the formed fatty acids; yes, these even to a higher degree, since they are more susceptible to oxidation than the hydrocarbons themselves. In order to limit the production of undesired oxyacids, the reaction must after a time be discontinued.

"The choice of the catalyst was also significant in this connection. A catalyst was found which not only favored the reaction but also directed it; i. e., in our case, hindered the formation of oxyacids unfavorable to fatty acids, to the greatest possible extent. Thus we succeeded in oxidizing the source material about one-third, without forming oxyacids in noticeable amounts.

"The dispersion of the air plays a further significant role in the oxidation. The laboratory experiments which showed that both the utilization of the air and the reaction time develop most favorably when the air is applied in a finely divided condition, were also later fully verified in the large-scale technical process.

"The synthetic fatty acids are manufactured in Witten in the plants of Deutsche Fettsaure Werke, G. M. B. H.

"This corporation was formed in the year 1936 jointly by the firms, Henkel & Cie., Dusseldorf, and Markische Seifen-Industrie, Witten. First, a small model factory was built in a building of the Markische Seifen Industrie, and then soon thereafter the erection of a large-scale plant was started, which after an extraordinarily short building time was able to assume production as early as the spring of 1937 and since then increase from year to year. Later the Deutsche Fettsaure Werke joined the I. G. Farben Industrie, which had produced pioneer work in the field of synthetic fatty acids to form a working association (Arbeitsgemeinschaft). After the start of the war, I. G. Farben also erected large-scale plants for the production of synthetic fatty acids. The plants operate according to the following procedure:

"The 'Gatsch' with the definite boiling range is collected from the several carbon monoxide hydrogenation plants in kettle wagons or tank autos and mixed in a tank. It is then freed from small impurities by centrifuging, since these can affect the oxidation procedure unfavorably. The 'Gatsch' is then pumped to the oxidation units in which, after the addition of the catalyst, the actual oxidation proceeds through the introduction of compressed air at temperatures above the boiling point of water. Since the reaction is exothermic, the oxidation units are equipped with cooling coils as well as the heating coils which are to start the reaction. By means of the cooling coils an accurate control of temperature is provided during the reaction.

"With the air that escapes lower molecular weight oxidation products are carried off, which even today constitute a valuable raw material for the most varied purposes. They are condensed by special coolers and consist in part of lower molecular weight fatty acids, and the other part out of alcohols, aldehydes, ketones, and low molecular weight hydrocarbons. The main product in the oxidation unit, the oxidation. This method has a further fundamental advantage:

"As already stated, the oxidation products contain not only fatty acids, but also, e. g., esters, lacetones, 'estolide,' and so on. The fatty acids which are obtained by the extraction procedure still show a relatively high ester number, a constant which indicates the presence of esters. This ester number cannot be eliminated by means of a normal saponification. Only by the treatment of the saponification products at higher temperatures as it is applied in the distillation procedure does one arrive at a fatty acid which is most completely free from an ester number. The soap which comes out of the vaporizing chamber and contains only small parts of unsaponifiable matter is decomposed with acid. One obtains a raw fatty acid which is light brown and it represents a mixture of fatty acids of various chain lengths.

"Even though at the start it was stated that through suitable prefractionating of the raw material the chain length can be extensively influenced, it is not to be avoided that a certain percentage of lower and higher acids result. This is apparent from the reaction mechanism.

"For the further technical utilization of the raw fatty acids they are subjected to steam-vacuum distillation which makes it possible to separate them into different fractions practically without any cracking. The main part of the distillate consists of fatty acids with a carbon number of C_D to C_{20}. Thus they represent the fatty acids which are obtained in the saponification of natural fats. However, they differentiate themselves fundamentally in that they also contain the fatty acids of uneven numbers of C atoms. These synthetic fatty acids can by treatment with alkali be converted to soaps of desirable cleansing power. Naturally the synthetic fatty acids can also be reduced to the corresponding fatty alcohols.

"But not only for technical purposes are the synthetic fatty acids the suitable raw material. It has developed that by esterification of definite fractions with glycerin an unusually valuable edible fat can be prepared.

"The Public Health Bureau of the Reich has, by thousands of experiments under the leadership of Professor Flossner, demonstrated the high value of the synthetic edible fat and has released it as the first synthetic food material of the world for human nourishment. Under the instigation of Secretary Keppler the first large-scale plant for the manufacture of edible fat after my procedure was erected. This has been in operation for years—'Diese ist seit Jahren in Betreib.'

"For some time the edible fat has also been prepared in emulsified form as 'synthetic butter.' It has developed that the synthetic edible fat, because of its keeping quality, is superior to the natural fats. Also for therapeutic purposes it is even today of specially large significance.

"Besides this main fraction with carbon chains of C_D to C_{20}, there are also acids with shorter and others with longer carbon chains. Both types are equally interesting and can be introduced for the most varied purposes. The lower fatty acids have not been available to the chemical industry in practically utilizable quantities. Only the fatty acid synthesis gives us these interesting fatty acids which are winning increasing significance in ample amounts. The situation is similar for the residue, the so-called high molecular fatty acids.

"I believe without exaggeration I can say that the synthesis of fatty acids has not only fulfilled our expectations, but has far exceeded them. Through it there has come first an abundance of interesting raw materials which still await their absolute disclosure. The synthesis of fatty acids has opened the door to a new field in chemistry into which till now only a small step has been taken. Just as in its time coal tar gave an unexpected upswing to the chemistry of cyclic compounds, the carbon oxide hydrogenation in conjunction with the fatty acid synthesis has given the development of aliphatic chemistry the determining jolt that in its full significance cannot yet be judged."

This question of nutritive equivalency contains other troublesome angles. If by our present action we apparently establish the principle that approximate nutritive equivalency of an imitation food product is the criterion of legal legitimacy, then we are opening up numerous possibilities. In the dairy field, filled milk, filled cheese, and filled ice cream then become definite possibilities by similar reasoning and similar standards of approximate equivalency. But it has been argued that oleomargarine is not an imitation product. Yet the fact remains it was conceived in France as an imitation product and Napoleon's prize was awarded on the basis of the manner in which it succeeded in duplicating butter. In fact, because of the duplication and the obvious possibility of fraud, the committee recommended that oleomargarine be not colored, a policy which has been followed consistently in France.

Practice in this country and the standards adopted by the Food and Drug Administration involve imitation, detail for detail. The legal minimum fat content is the same for both butter and oleomargarine—80 percent. The water and salt content are the same. Milk or skim milk are used in oleomargarine to imitate the curd content of about the same—about 1 percent in butter and to imitate its flavor. Lecithin normally present in butter may be added up to 0.5 percent in order to imitate the quiet foaming type of frying as with butter. The flavor ingredients typical of butter starters may be added. When oleomargarine is fortified, it must contain 9,000 U. S. P. units of vitamin A per pound, a value arrived at on the basis of testimony that purported to show that this is the approximate average content of butter. The final step in the imitation is color. A noteworthy deviation in this imitation is that the use of a preservative is permitted in oleomargarine, but not in butter.

We may have a court opinion that oleomargarine has an identity of its own, but this does not alter the actual facts. Nor is this our answer to the possibilities of filled milk, filled cheese, and filled ice cream. By similar reasoning that flies in the face of facts, it could also be held that such products have an identity of their own. They have all been made at one time or another, and if mere existence means having an exclusive identity, then no inconsistency would be involved.

But it is argued that oleomargarine is to be released from tax in the interest of adequate nutrition of low-income families. Exactly the same argument can be made for the other imitation products I have mentioned. Some interesting variants can even be introduced in the arguments.

For example, in the case of filled ice cream, the argument might be as follows:

A low-fat product containing 2.5 to 4 percent fat is made in semblance of ice cream in some States and is sold as "ice milk" or "milk ice." The plea is that low-income consumers can thereby buy an inexpensive frozen dessert. However, let us continue: In a frozen dessert a substantial part of the cost is in processing and selling in the frozen condition. This cost would be no greater if the product contained more fat—a cheap fat, so that it could still sell at a low price. There you have all of the elements as in imitation butter.

Again, we might apply the same reasoning to cheese. Here we might start with the observation that a certain amount of skim milk is used for animal feed. It is too valuable a human food to be so wasted, so let us make it into cheese. But in cheeses such as Cheddar cheese the product would be tough and unpalatable, so in the interest of keeping it cheap for low-income families, let us add a cheap fat to the milk and then make cheese. It can be done. It has in time past been done in this country, but was made illegal. Under the policy of approximate nutritive equivalency, it might well be revived.

Filled milk is with us even now, despite the Filled Milk Act of March 4, 1923. We have it in the intrastate commerce of at least one State, and it remains to be seen whether the law will be sustained, even as to interstate

shipment. Filled ice cream has not become an extensive problem, but there have been violations of existing laws. Filled cheese was at one time widely prevalent, but was brought under effective control by the Filled Cheese Act of June 6, 1896.

Now, obviously, I am not arguing in favor of such imitation products. I am merely pointing out that the principle is the same in all of them. With respect to filled cheese, filled milk, and filled ice cream, the attempt to legislate them out of existence has been more or less successful. Oleomargarine arrived on the scene earlier, in about 1874 in this country, and at that time Congress elected to control it through taxation. Had it arrived later when the consciousness of authorities was developing as to the need for control of adulteration, the fate of oleomargarine might well have been the same as filled milk, filled cheese, and the other products. The act of 1886 was later construed by courts to mean that oleomargarine had been recognized as a legitimate article of commerce.

So now we have taxation of oleomargarine established as the means of controlling this product. Yet, it can be made to sound abhorrent—to tax a wholesome food. Actually, even if the consumption of an individual consumer were 20 pounds per annum, the tax on uncolored oleomargarine amounts to only a nickel a year. It is our contention that it must be done to keep this dangerous trend under control, otherwise, once the policy has been established, it will have far-reaching consequences. If imitation were allowed to go unchecked, the dairy industry, as we know it today, would cease to exist. In forming our policy, our outlook must obviously be larger than mere nutritive equivalency coupled with pleas in behalf of the low-income groups.

Imitation in the field of foods must be regarded apart from imitation in any other field. Imitation in foods is invariably practiced to cheapen the product. Imitation in other lines in many cases has resulted in products that are growing superior and sell at a higher price. Imitation in foods cannot be easily detected by the consumer. In many cases it requires laboratory tests to prove it, and in any case the evidence is gone when the food has been consumed. The consumer cannot judge the results of use in the case of foods; continued use and time are required for any effects to become evident and then usually only to the trained diagnostician or nutritionist with physiological training. As against this, imitation in other lines can be checked by results and the article is still there as proof if wear or other results are not in keeping with the price exacted.

We believe that in controversial matters a sound and well-established legislative principle is that the greatest common good shall prevail; it is our contention that the present taxes on oleomargarine are in the interest of the greatest common good. Certainly the one-quarter cent per pound tax on uncolored oleomargarine is not burdensome but it assures a type of enforcement that cannot be attained in any other way. It is true that the 10-cent tax on yellow margarine may eliminate the eye appeal of butter yellow, but certainly the consumer gets almost complete protection against fraud in return. It is also highly likely that the restriction on yellow color means lower prices to the consumer. Certainly, if the yellow color is so important to eye appeal it will become a definite price factor and the price of yellow oleomargarine can then easily advance since uncolored oleomargarine will disappear in all but a few States. It is definitely in the interest of consumers to maintain the present taxes.

As between the dairy industry and oil crop producers, the greatest common good definitely lies with the maintenance of the existing Federal taxes. Even if oleomargarine were to take over the greater part of the butter market, the gain in market value to the oils could not possibly approach, even to a fractional degree, the loss to the dairy industry This must inevitably be true because the entire huge pool of fats and oils would have to be lifted in price. Resisting this effect would be the shifts in uses—shifts of fats from technical uses to edible uses, shifts from soaps to sulfonated hydrocarbons in the cleansing field, and possibly also the actual synthesis of fats from petroleum byproducts. It is also likely that whatever benefits would accrue would not be reflected back to the ultimate producer as directly and completely as in the case of dairy products.

As against this, the loss of a substantial part of the butter market would cause decided losses to all dairy products since the entire price structure is based on the butter market. This loss would go directly to the dairy farmers. There are some 3,000,000 such farmers, and the industry concerned represents about one-sixth of our national agricultural income in normal times.

It is our well-considered judgment that sound national policy and the greatest common good require that the present Federal taxes on oleomargarine be maintained.

That is all I have to present, unless you have some questions.

Senator AIKEN. Senator WILSON, do you have any questions?

Senator WILSON. No.

Senator AIKEN. I do not have any. Do you desire to enter anything further, Dr. Sommer?

Dr. SOMMER. There was one point I might clear up.

As the record stands now, there was testimony introduced which would have us believe that in comparing adjoining States, one in which the State has no restrictions on oleomargarine and a neighboring State which has restrictions on oleomargarine, that such restrictive taxes have had the effect of causing a lower return for milk in the State concerned.

Those figures introduced—and they were based on combined sales of butter, cream, and milk in the State, and compared New York and Vermont. It was thus shown that the return in terms of price per pound of butterfat was considerably higher in New York than in Vermont. The difference was 9 cents per pound in favor of New York.

A more fair comparison would have been to compare the returns for cream sold to plants, dealers, and so forth, which would then exclude the high-class, high-priced milk that goes to the city market.

When that comparison is made it shows just the reverse in all but one of those five pairs of States, where the difference was only 1 cent.

Instead of placing a construction on the figures, the figures that have been introduced earlier, and the figures to which I now refer—instead of placing the construction on them that was done, obviously, the correct construction is that in each case the State that had restricted taxes on oleomargarine had those taxes because in their State a large portion of the milk sales had to go to manufactured dairy products which are obviously most directly affected by competition from oleomargarine. And the existence of a tax reflects that condition rather than proves anything else.

Senator AIKEN. Thank you.

Mr. WILEY. At the same meeting there was testimony from Dr. E. B. Hart, of the University of Wisconsin, in whose laboratories far-reaching and important experiments have been conducted during the past 38 years. These experiments include some of the first experiments in vitamins, substances which intrigue so many of us, and cause us to spend much money, and about which we hear so much over the radio, large sums being paid to commentators to put on fine programs advertising them. The distinguished Dr. E. B. Hart, of the University of Wisconsin, was among those who led the way in the field of vitamins. He appeared at this meeting and gave his testimony. It reads like a fairy book, and, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that his testimony follow my remarks and be printed at this point in the RECORD.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The testimony is as follows:

STATEMENT OF DR. E. B. HART, PROFESSOR OF BIOCHEMISTRY, UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN

Dr. HART. My name is E. B. Hart. I am professor of biochemistry at the University of Wisconsin. I am here authorized by the dean of the college of agriculture. I am sure you do not care for me to go into details of my qualifications, except to say that I have been at the university for 38 years, and my principal work has been in biochemistry and in nutrition.

Senator ELLENDER. As a teacher?

Dr. HART. As a teacher and in research, so that the problems that are here before us have been under investigation at that institution for some time.

Senator ELLENDER. Doctor, before you proceed, I wish to state that Senator AIKEN made a request yesterday that we put before you certain samples of oleo butter and butter made from soybeans, and so forth, so that you could look at them and discuss them if you desire to, or you may even go so far, if you desire, as to ask questions of Mr. Hopkins, who presented them here. That is a little unusual, but as I have stated to many of those in attendance at these hearings, what we want here are the facts, and if we do not follow the strict rules and regulations of the committee, that is our business. Mr. Hopkins is very anxious to go to New York, he would like to get away before 12 o'clock. We stopped him yesterday from going, and he is very anxious to leave, so, if it will not interfere with your present program, I would appreciate it if you would be kind enough to go into that matter at present, so that we can give him a leave of absence.

Dr. HART. Well, Senator, may I present what I have to say first?

Senator ELLENDER. That is perfectly all right, if you insist.

Dr. HART. And then come to this.

Senator ELLENDER. That is agreeable.

Dr. HART. I will not be very long. It has been stated here by certain witnesses that the nutritive value of good margarine is identical with good butter, except for flavor. That particular point I want to discuss somewhat, especially in reference to the vegetable oils.

The history of research in reference to the nutritive value of vegetable oils goes back a good many years, and goes back to our own laboratory, when it was first shown that the vegetable oils contain very little vitamin A. That was done in my own laboratory by Dr. McCollum. About 25 years ago an attempt was made to put upon the market a product known as Hebe, a filled milk which was made by taking the fat out of milk and then homogenizing it in a vegetable oil.

At that time, in Wisconsin, we opposed by legislation the manufacture of that product, on the basis of the vegetable oils not containing vitamin A. Statutes in reference to filled milk have been extended to other States. The objection 25 years ago was that the nutritive value of Hebe was not equivalent to that of a whole evaporated milk.

As time went on and research accumulated, it became possible for men to find vitamin A and put it in vegetable oils. The Caroline Co., of Fitchfield, Ill., a few years ago began

the manufacture of a filled milk in which they put vitamin A in the vegetable oil.

Senator ELLENDER. What kind of milk was that?

Dr. HART. Filled milk.

Senator ELLENDER. What is that?

Dr. HART. That is milk from which you have taken the butterfat and in which you have substituted——

Senator ELLENDER. You would not call that skim milk?

Dr. HART. Not skim milk, but it is substituted in vegetable oil, and then they put the vitamin A in vegetable oil and claimed the product as equivalent to evaporated milk. In the meantime they would get out an injunction against the enforcement of the filled milk law in the various States and put this material on the market. So there has been legislation pending concerning the legality of such procedure.

I have been a teacher of biochemistry for a great many years. I have always been interested in milk and its constitution, and I have always suspected that the mammary gland made something very special when it constituted milk. You have in milk a special sugar known as lactose; you have special fine products. As the studies have gone on it has been determined that practically all the nutrients that are necessary for continued life and reproduction by a laboratory animal are contained in milk. All you have to do to make milk a complete food is to add iron, copper, and manganese, and vitamin D for the child, and you have a complete food. It carries them through one cycle after the other, these laboratory animals. And as a matter of fact, boys in our short course oftentimes in the winter have been sustained on this milk for months, reinforced in this way.

Well, the point I wanted to make is this: That I suspected that there was something more in butterfat than mere calories, as compared, for instance, with coconut oil or soybean oil, and so on, and so we began a series of experiments to determine whether, after we had reinforced a skim milk from which the fat had been taken out reinforced with vitamin A or vitamin D, as to whether that milk so reinforced was equivalent in nutritive value to butterfat or a butterfat milk. Those results were rather interesting, and demonstrated to us that there was some growth-promoting influence superior in butterfat to the vegetable oils when we used a skim-milk diet.

Senator ELLENDER. What do you use for a subject in your experiments?

Dr. HART. This is the rat.

Senator ELLENDER. Somebody objected to the use of the rat yesterday as a subject to experiment with. So in your process you are using the rat?

Dr. HART. We use the rat in our experimental work entirely, as the laboratory animal, because, after all, as I want to point out, it is impossible to have experiments with humans.

Senator ELLENDER. I understand that, Doctor.

Dr. HART. No one has done that yet. No one has taken a thousand children and subjected them to the influences of these particular kinds of things.

Senator ELLENDER. You are of the opinion that the use of the rat as a subject to demonstrate the qualities of foods is reliable?

Dr. HART. Very useful, but not necessarily translatable to the human. Let me give you an illustration. These laboratories have been using rats as an experimental animal for a great many years. You have in the South the disease called pellagra, dermatitis of the skin, insanity following, and so on.

Had the rat been used to experiment with to disclose whether that was a nutritional disease or not, they would have completely failed, and not until the dog was used that is sensitive to this particular disease, was there a possibility of putting the cause of pellagra upon a nutritional basis.

Senator ELLENDER. Suppose it be a rat, a dog, a coon, or a mink, is it possible to find out the effect of certain drugs or foods that may be transmittable to the human? The reason I am asking you is because it was questioned in the testimony by some witness—I do not recall who it was now—but since you have opened the subject, I should like to have in the record your views on that, and I presume that you will tell us about the experiments you carried on with the rats, and how that was translatable to the human.

Dr. HART. Well, Senator, they have not been translated, because they have not been tried with the human. And, as I say, one cannot absolutely conclude. There are a good many phases of nutrition that appear in the rat, like rickets—we can produce rickets in the rat, and we know we can produce rickets in the human, and we know the same thing that takes care of one will take care of the other. But, as I mentioned, in the case of pellagra, you cannot produce pellagra in the rat. Why?

Senator ELLENDER. I understand.

Dr. HART. Because he makes the substance himself.

Senator ELLENDER. Well, you know Dr. Carlson, I am sure, from the University of Chicago?

Dr. HART. Yes.

Senator ELLENDER. And I think he made the statement here that from a nutritional standpoint there is absolutely no difference between butter and oleomargarine, if you add vitamin A to it which can now be done. The subject that he used in order to determine that was the rat. Later, some witness questioned that method. Since the question has been raised, I would like to get your views, if you do not mind, in the record for our information.

Dr. HART. I will come to that, because that is important, as to how far you can translate from one to the other. Now, as we went along in these experiments on the vegetable oils versus butterfat and milk, using skim milk as the base of the diet, we moved over to powdered milk, that is, skim-milk powders. There again we found these same differences in the growth-promoting properties of butterfat as compared with the vegetable oils. These skim-milk powders as they are manufactured always contain some butterfat. It is never completely taken from it. And so at times in these experiments with the skim-milk powders, the differences were not great.

Then we moved to a strictly synthetic diet. By that I mean, instead of using all fat material, like skim-milk powder, we made the ration of sugar of milk, lactose, casein of milk, then we put in salts and an arrangement of vitamins that are necessary. With lactose as the main sugar in the diet, these differences again between butterfat and the vegetable oils became very, very definite.

Well, it then occurred to us that possibly this sugar of milk fits best with butterfat and that that combination which nature has provided in milk makes for a superior food. Then we moved over to the next step, and that was to take the lactose out of these synthetic diets and put in the ordinary carbohydrates, like starches and like dextromaltose, and so forth. It was very interesting then to see that the gap in the difference between the lactose diet and the mixed carbohydrate diet in respect to these vegetable oils and butterfat was somewhat closed; in other words, when you had a diet with starch or dextromaltose in it, and the lactose was in a very small amount, then these vegetable oils appeared to do with the rat, in the time of the experiment a very good job, that is, they did the job quite as good as with the butterfat.

So that the point that I bring out is that with the kind of ration that you use, the kind of ration that you construct where lactose is predominant, as it is in milk, and as it comes for the child, as contrasted with the diet of the adult where the starches, and so on, prevail, that we cannot demonstrate any distinct difference in the time we exposed these animals, we cannot demonstrate any distinct difference between the vegetable oils and the butterfat in their nutritive value so far as the rat was concerned.

Now, just this point: We have moved on to some further experiments where with these carbohydrates other than lactose we have exposed our animals to low water-soluble vitamin intake. In the other experiments we had a high water-soluble vitamin intake. And it appears now that even with the starches and the carbohydrates other than lactose, and where the water-soluble vitamin intake is low, then these differences or this gap appears again, not so great, but it appears again, between the influence of butterfat and the vegetable oils.

In other words, the whole matter, this nutritive comparison, seems to rest upon the influences of these various nutrients upon the flora that grow in the intestinal tract. That is a new field in nutrition that has not been developed, but it is one that is going to become of very great importance, because apparently these various nutrients have an influence upon the character of the flora of the tract, and that flora of the tract makes certain things that are necessary for the animal.

For example, I can construct a ration of synthetic products that is wholly satisfactory for the rat. I take that same ration and give it to the little chick at 1 day of age, and he fails completely. And now go to a natural substance like liver, and add that to that chick ration, then he comes along fine, but those things that are in the liver could be made by this animal, but they could not be made by the chick.

Now, suppose I take this successful ration with the chick that contains liver and carry that over to the guinea pig. It fails again. He needs more things than the chick did, that we do not know about.

What I am trying to say here is the state of knowledge of nutrition in reference to all of these things is so incomplete that one questions very much the scientific value of a statement that the nutritive value of one thing is equal to the other.

Senator ELLENDER. Doctor, there is one question I would like to ask you. Your testimony is technical, and I follow you fairly well. You have been talking, as I understand, of a kind of liquid diet, in which you put this lactose and take it out. You use this liquid for feeding, as I would judge, as milk with and without lactose and you have described the effects on rats with and without lactose. Now, I was under the impression that butter was made out of the fat itself, the butterfat out of the milk; is that true?

Dr. HART. Yes.

Senator ELLENDER. Now, how much of this lactose is in butterfat?

Dr. HART. There is none in butterfat.

Senator ELLENDER. That being true, why should there be any difference in the utilization of the butterfat from cow's milk, in contrast to soybean fat, or cottonseed fat, or the fats from any other oil if in the manufacture of butter this precious lactose that you have been describing to us is absent in the butterfat from cow's milk?

Dr. HART. I would like to have the answer to your question myself. I do not know.

Senator ELLENDER. Well, that is why I referred to the testimony we have had so far from Dr. Carlson. Of course, he did not raise any question about this lactose, but he said that experimenting with rats—and I do not know, maybe some other animals—he demonstrated that, nutritionally speaking, there was as much nutritive value in oleomargarine as there is in butter.

Just one moment. Mr. Reporter, let the record show that Senator GILLETTE, from

Iowa, and Senator WILLIS, of Indiana, are present at this hearing, although not on the committee.

Dr. HART. Please let me refer now to the experiments that Dr. Carlson quoted from. He quoted from Duell's experiments at the University of Southern California. He did not quote from our experiments. I am acquainted with the publications of Dr. Duell, and his conclusions. He worked, as we did, with a skim-milk powder unextracted with a solvent, which should remove, had he used it, the residual butterfat that was in the skim-milk powder. The skim-milk powder that he used, from his own testimony, contained 1 ½ percent of lipoids, of which butterfat was the main constituent. In consequence of that, Duell's experiments, in my judgment, in which he found little or no difference between these vegetable oils and butterfat are entirely clouded by the presence of a certain residual butterfat in his experimental diet.

Now, let me add one other thing, and I am proceeding now with my statement:

These studies are summarized in the Journal of Nutrition for December 1943:

1. With lactose as the sole carbohydrate in the diet, rats showed superior growth when fed butterfat or lard as compared with corn oil, coconut oil, cottonseed oil, soybean oil, peanut oil, olive oil, and hydrogenated cottonseed oil.

2. With a mixture of carbohydrates composed of sucrose, starch, dextrose, dextrin, and lactose in the diet, the average growth response of the animals fed vegetable oils was equal to that of animals fed butterfat and lard. The growth rate on this ration was more rapid than when the only carbohydrate present was lactose.

3. Properly fortified oleomargarine fats gave growth equal to butterfat over a period of 6 weeks when the above mixture of carbohydrates was incorporated in the rations.

4. Properly fortified oleomargarine fats did not give growth equal to butterfat when lactose was the sole carbohydrate in the diet. On such a regime rats fed butterfat grew slightly better than rats fed oleomargarines of animal origin, but decidedly better than rats fed oleomargarines of vegetable origin.

It should be noted—and I am referring now to our own experiments—that these are experiments with rats and only over a 6-week period and do not involve reproduction or lactation. If 6 weeks of growth of the rat at a rapid stage of its development can be used as the criterion of adequate nutrition, then certainly these oleomargarines compare favorably with butterfat. Whether this deduction is entirely sound can be answered only when growth to maturity and reproduction are studied experimentally. It should be recorded that there are no published controlled experiments with infants, children, or mature men on the comparative nutritive value of vegetable oils, butterfats, and oleomargarine.

More recent experiments, unpublished, indicate that only when the water-soluble vitamins are abundantly supplied in the ration will the character of the carbohydrate fed close the gap in the differences between butterfat and the vegetable oils as influenced by the carbohydrates.

Senator AIKEN. May I interrupt? If I remember Mr. Hopkins' testimony correctly, he made some reference to the range of the vitamin A content of butter as being from five to twenty thousand units.

Dr. HART. I am covering that.

Senator AIKEN. All right.

Dr. HART. We have results that show that on low intake of water-soluble vitamins a mixture of carbohydrates such as starch, dextrose, and dextrin did not give as good results with the vegetable oils as did the butterfat.

In other words, this matter of comparative nutritive value is a complex one and will be influenced by the kind of carbohydrates, the kind of fat, and the level of soluble vitamins in the diet. This means that all of these nutrients have a profound influence upon the kind of flora inhabiting the intestinal tract, which in turn can or cannot make an abundance of certain unknown nutrients needed by the rat.

In none of our experiments have we ever found butterfat inferior to any of the animal fats or vegetable oils experimented with. In the present state of our knowledge it is preposterous—let me repeat that—in the present state of our knowledge it is preposterous for any scientist to make the blank statement that it is proven that oleomargarine or vegetable oils have an equivalence to butterfat in nutrition.

I might add something which is not contained in this printed matter, as to the experiments of Mr. Gullickson at the University of Minnesota with calves. He fed calves skim milk with butterfat in some cases, and with the vegetable oils in other cases, and he published the records in the Journal of Dairy Science in 1942, and the records show that those animals receiving the vegetable oils grew poorly, in fact, he snatched them from the grave by merely substituting, as they got down, certain animal fats, butterfat, or even lard, and he even used tallow, and it successfully brought those calves away from death. He has not pursued the subject further. And you might ask me why, or how this works, and I would simply have to tell you that I do not know in the present state of our knowledge of nutrition.

Senator ELLENDER. Well, Doctor, assuming what you have stated, that the value of oleomargarine has not been found to be equal to that of butter, and it may be, as you have indicated, that you will never be able to determine it, Have you ever made any experiments, or heard of any, where oleomargarine is harmful to the human being, and that it does not promote growth?

Dr. HART. None at all. I have never heard of that sort of thing.

Senator ELLENDER. I suppose you have given thought to this idea that most of this butterfat you talk about is made from vegetation. They use cottonseed meal for feed, and they also use various other ingredients of the same kind that are used to make oleomargarine. As a matter of fact, do you not get the same product in some way through the cow?

Dr. HART. That is where this wonderful synthetic mechanism of the mammary gland comes in, to make things over, to reconstruct.

Senator ELLENDER. In other words, the cow is used as the machine to make the butterfat from this vegetation or vegetable oils in a different form than the factory uses them to make margarine?

Dr. HART. There is no fat that has been studied that is more complex in composition, and from year to year new unsaturated acids found, as in butterfat.

Senator ELLENDER. But, as I said, with all of the experiments you have found that the utilization of margarine is conducive to growth?

Dr. HART. It certainly is.

Senator ELLENDER. With human beings?

Dr. HART. Well, I do not know. There is no experimental evidence; but it is with rats, certainly.

Senator ELLENDER. Have you any knowledge of any experiments that have ever been carried out with human beings, using butter as a diet and using oleomargarine?

Dr. HART. No; I have not.

Senator ELLENDER. It is a pity some of that has not been done.

Dr. HART. It has been urged, but has not been done.

Senator ELLENDER. Do you know of any reason why it has not been done?

Dr. HART. No; I do not know of any reason why it has not been done. Of course, the supposition has been that there was no difference in the vegetable oils and the butterfat.

Senator ELLENDER. That is what I have concluded.

Dr. HART. Among pediatricians. They have not wanted to subject the infant to that exposure.

Senator ELLENDER. It could have been carried out with grown human beings. Infants do not eat butter.

Dr. HART. They have the fat.

Senator ELLENDER. But they get it from the mother's breast.

Dr. HART. Yes.

Senator ELLENDER. It could have easily been carried on with children from 5 to 10 years of age. Dr. Carlson stated that from all of his experiments, all of his observations, that nutritionally speaking there was absolutely no difference between butter and oleomargarine as now being made and fortified by the vitamin A content.

Dr. HART. The only answer I have to that is that I would like the evidence.

Senator ELLENDER. Well, the way to do it, I guess, is for us to get a few thousand dollars together, and use humans as guinea pigs.

Senator AIKEN. Human guinea pigs.

Dr. HART. If you do that, then, of course, you are hamstrung by the question of translation to the human.

Senator AIKEN. I said human guinea pigs.

Senator ELLENDER. I am sorry, Senator AIKEN, I interrupted you.

Senator AIKEN. It was suggested by another witness that the bleaching required in the process of the manufacture of oleomargarine might remove some nutritional value from the product. Do you know anything about that? Do you agree with that?

Dr. HART. No; I do not know. I do not know anything about it. Testimony has been introduced to the effect that the vitamin A content of butter may be as low as 500 I. U. per pound. The conclusion has been drawn that fortified oleomargarine is therefore a more dependable source of vitamin A than is the case with butter. The facts are that analysis of some 200 samples of commercial Wisconsin butter showed a vitamin A content of 10,000 units per pound of winter butter and 18,000 units in summer butter. These facts are presented for the purpose of keeping the records accurate.

Senator ELLENDER. Well, is that amount of vitamins more prevalent in a Wisconsin cow than it is in a Missouri cow, or let us say a Louisiana cow, or an Iowa cow?

Dr. HART. Of course, the amount depends upon how they are fed, and I have not the records available of the butters of the United States.

Senator ELLENDER. Well, Wisconsin has the reputation, I believe, of being the leading dairy State in the Union. I presume you folks pay strict attention to the diet of the cow, and it ought to be done in many other places. I am in agreement with all of that. But do you have any knowledge as to what the vitamin content of the milk of the average cow is, just like we have, say, in other States where they are not as careful of the cow's diet as is the case in Wisconsin?

Dr. HART. Well, Senator, as to those records, there has been in the Food Board of the National Research Council a national survey of the vitamin A content of butters, and those analyses—they are not available to me—but so far as I know I think they are available, and perhaps someone here knows more about it than I and can give you a summary.

Senator ELLENDER. Well, maybe Mr. Holman can. He is the head of it. I am going to ask him, if he is present, to get that information since the question has been raised.

Dr. HART. I say that these facts are presented for the purpose of keeping the records accurate. My opposition to the bill is based on the statement that follows, and while we do not concede that there is established evidence of the equivalence in nutritive value

of oleomargarine and butterfat, yet our opposition to the bill is not based upon that evidence.

It becomes axiomatic, it seems to me, that if the tax is taken off of yellow oleomargarine and its price to the consumer is reduced, it will become distinctly competitive with butterfat. It is known that butterfat prices largely control the price of dairy products. Should the price of butterfat fall to certain low levels, the production of milk would be curtailed, and, if this occurs, then the very direction in which improvement in nutrition should go would be defeated. We want more milk, and not less.

Recently a draft memorandum of the United Nations' program has been prepared, and prepared by a group of economists and medical scientists. In this memorandum they classify the status of nutrition of different countries into seven groups. The first group includes New Zealand, Denmark, and the Northern States of the United States of America. The seventh group includes China and India. Everyone knows that dairying and the production of milk is the feature industry of New Zealand and Denmark, and also everyone knows that the cereal grains are the predominating constituents in the nutrition of the people of China and India.

Senator ELLENDER. At that point, Doctor, will you permit an observation? As I recall, we had testimony here yesterday or the day before that more oleomargarine was used in Denmark than butter. That is my recollection.

Dr. HART. More oleomargarine?

Senator ELLENDER. Yes, sir; more oleomargarine used in Denmark than butter. I mean among the inhabitants. Now, Doctor, you made a very significant point a while ago there, and I am inclined to agree with you somewhat, and that is that if oleomargarine is permitted to compete with butter, and the people of our Nation can be made to see that the nutritional value of oleomargarine is as good as butter, that it might put the butter manufacturer "on ice," as it were. I can see that, but on the other hand, there was some evidence produced here that the milk producers could find new outlets for milk, that is, the milk itself, so that the people can get more of this lactose that you say is so necessary for the flora of the intestines and that is conducive to growth. Now, do you not think it is possible that some way can be devised whereby more and more milk in the raw state can be sold and used, and more can be used in powdered form and other forms, and thereby let a product like oleomargarine have a better play?

Dr. HART. That is a fine program, and I agree with your program, and my successors here will discuss that, what has been tried, and how much failure there has been to do the very thing that you suggest.

Senator ELLENDER. Well, I thought maybe you might have some intelligent and practical views on the subject. That suggestion has been made here by two or three witnesses, and of course the committee will be glad to receive as much evidence along that line as possible, because I can well see that the butter market can be destroyed if we can educate the people to believe that oleomargarine is as nutritive and as palatable as butter, and 50 percent cheaper.

Dr. HART. If you let oleomargarine come in——

Senator ELLENDER. I concede it.

Dr. HART. What I fear is the reduction in milk production and things other than butter that are so important in the nutrition of the Nation.

Senator ELLENDER. I am glad you say that witnesses will be produced to discuss that, because that is very important.

Senator AIKEN. Doctor, I think Dr. Carlson called attention to the fact that the stature of the Sioux and the Crow Indians indicates that the human being does not require milk at all to attain the proper physique and strength. What have you to say as to that?

Dr. HART. They were meat eaters. I do not know anything about their stature. But let me point out one thing. India is a good illustration of three states of nutrition. In the northwestern corner of India you have wheat-growing and dairying and some rice. On the other side, you have fish and some wheat and rice, little dairying. In the southern part you have mostly rice, and the poorest state of nutrition. The people in the northwestern part are in the best state of nutrition.

Going on as to the draft memorandum of the United Nations' program, this memorandum points out that the length of life is about 67 years in New Zealand, Denmark, and the northern United States, and only about 36 years in China and India. The memorandum promulgates this idea—to improve the nutrition and general health of countries that fall below the first group must involve the provision of protective foods, of which milk is one of the most important.

If the removal of the tax on yellow oleomargarine is going to curtail the production of milk in this country, then certainly the improvement in nutrition will be curtailed and the plea for better health will have a distinct obstacle put in its path.

It is a notorious fact that low income, low living standards, poor health, and short span of life are found where the average diet is high in cereals and potatoes. Let me quote:

"Korea is typical of the countries with monotonous and deficient diets. More than one-half of the Korean's daily food is rice. The remainder is a combination of millet, soybeans, sorghum, buckwheat, sweetpotatoes, and corn. The other foods necessary for a balanced diet—vegetables, fruit, milk, and dairy products—are not even listed in Korea's consumption tables."

This memorandum from which I quote generally and consistently recommends milk and dairy products as the means of improving the nutritional status of peoples whose nutrition today is recognized as inadequate.

Senator ELLENDER. Have you anything further, Doctor?

Dr. HART. No.

Senator ELLENDER. Any questions?

Senator AIKEN. It occurs to me, I think, in Mr. Hopkins' testimony that he called attention to the fact that States that had taxes against oleomargarine paid to milk producers a lower price than adjoining States that had no tax against oleomargarine, and I believe he used Wisconsin and Illinois as examples. Is it true that the milk producers of Wisconsin get less money than the milk producers of Illinois for their product?

Dr. HART. I cannot answer that question.

Senator ELLENDER. Senator AIKEN, at your request I suggested to Mr. Hopkins that he bring back his samples. They are here. Do you want to question him in the presence of Dr. Hart?

Senator AIKEN. I would like to have Dr. Hart see the samples.

Senator ELLENDER. Mr. Hopkins, will you kindly step forward, please? You have already been identified for the record.

Senator AIKEN. I am not questioning the samples myself, Mr. Chairman, but the suggestion was made here yesterday that these samples might be here for the occasion.

Senator ELLENDER. Let the record show that in response to a request by Senator AIKEN, the samples were this day produced.

Mr. A. G. HOPKINS (representing National Association of Margarine Manufacturers). Mr. Chairman, would you care for me to go through these samples?

Senator ELLENDER. What you might do is this, present these various samples and state what they are, and if Dr. Hart or anybody present desires to ask any questions, I know you will be glad to try to answer them.

Mr. HOPKINS. Gentlemen, this is sample No. 1 of crude soybean oil, a vegetable oil. You can see the sample is not particularly clear, because the gums and residual matter have not been removed.

This is sample No. 2 of refined soybean oil, and since the record will not show without some further description, I would like to point out that this has a distinct brownish yellow color.

This is the same sample, sample No. 3, as No. 2, except that it has been bleached—the oil has been bleached by the conventional bleaching process—and you will observe by comparing the two that practically all of the color has been removed from the refined oil.

Senator AIKEN. Is that bleaching required by law?

Mr. HOPKINS. You have to bleach this oil down to this color in order to get the color within the restrictions demanded by the Internal Revenue Department. Now, when we continue with the process of manufacturing in making margarine we hydrogenate, and this is a sample of this oil that has been hydrogenated, and you will observe it is practically white, because it has been hydrogenated.

This is a sample of the same oil manufactured into margarine. This, of course, is sample No. 6—the first one I referred to. Here the hydrogenated oil is pure fat. This is margarine bleached artificially white, and I would like to emphasize that it is bleached to be an artificial white, not a natural white. This is margarine that has 80 percent fat.

Now, let us go back to sample No. 2. This is refined oil. Suppose we did not go through this operation here, suppose we did not bleach this oil. We come to an unbleached partially hydrogenated oil here, and we get a very distinct yellow sample. I want to emphasize that for the record ,that this is a pronounced yellow color, and if there be any disagreement about the color, I would like to have that stated for the record.

Senator ELLENDER. What kind of oil was used in order to make this yellow?

Mr. HOPKINS. All of these samples I am showing are soybean oil.

Senator AIKEN. And you state there is nothing but soybean oil in that?

Mr. HOPKINS. No. I might emphasize this, that it is not artificially colored, no chemicals have been used to give an artificial color, nothing else has been used in this sample.

Senator AIKEN. That is as I understood you.

Mr. HOPKINS. Now this yellow sample of partially hydrogenated soybean oil unbleached for manufacture of margarine would produce a margarine with a very distinct yellow color, as is shown in sample 5. I believe there was some question you wanted to ask about the possibility of carrying through some color in the finished product. This is 80 percent fat, and is margarine made out of oil that has not been bleached.

Dr. HART. May I ask a question?

Senator ELLENDER. Yes; surely.

Dr. HART. Is this an acceptable edible product?

Mr. HOPKINS. It would be accepted.

Dr. HART. Have you records to show that it is?

Mr. HOPKINS. Please bear in mind, Doctor, that this work was done entirely for demonstration here. The law does not permit us to manufacture colored margarine, and we have not done it on the commercial scale, so far as manufacture in the plant is concerned. But anything we can do in our laboratory we can do in our plant on a commercial basis.

Dr. HART. Can you make an acceptable edible product?

Mr. HOPKINS. Yes, sir. It would be an acceptable product; yes, indeed.

Senator ELLENDER. Well, how would that product differ from the margarine that is now sold?

Mr. HOPKINS. This is sample No. 7, and sample No. 7, as you will recall, is the artificially bleached margarine, the product that was bleached to make it white. This is a sample made from the natural colored oil, without the addition of artificial coloring, without the addition of any chemicals.

Senator ELLENDER. Would you say that there would be the same nutritive value in the bleached margarine as there would be in the one in which the color is not removed?

Mr. HOPKINS. I think Dr. Hart would probably be better able to advise you on that, because I am not an authority on nutrition, but it is my understanding—I believe I got that information for the record—that in the vegetable oil you take out carotene and certain other things that are helpful, that have a food value and that go out with the fuller's earth in the bleaching operation.

Senator ELLENDER. Well, Dr. Hart, would you be able to describe the color of this margarine that was made with the unbleached oil, in contrast, say to butter color? What is the difference in the color, for the record?

Dr. HART. I think it looks more like butter.

Senator AIKEN. Has anyone here a sample of soya butter? I was wondering how that would compare with it.

Mr. HOPKINS. I know nothing about soya butter.

Senator AIKEN. You heard the testimony yesterday afternoon?

Mr. HOPKINS. No, I was not here. I would like to enlarge a little more on that one point. Yesterday there was some discussion, and I bring this out because there seemed to have been some indication that certain things could not be done. This, gentlemen, is a sample of pure butterfat, sample No. 8, and it is butterfat that was made in the spring of the year. It has a rich golden color. This is not butter—it is butterfat that has been extracted. And I want to point out that in my testimony I did not say you could make white butter, except that by bleaching butterfat in the same way that you bleach vegetable oils, you would produce a white butterfat, and this is butterfat that has been bleached in the same conventional way that we bleach vegetable oils, and you can see very distinctly it has practically no color—it is practically a perfect white.

Senator ELLENDER. Well, will you present a sample of that bleached butterfat, and also a sample of bleached margarine, to Dr. Hart, and ask him if there is any distinction or difference between the two in color, just for the record?

Dr. HART. Well, nothing significant, I should say.

Senator ELLENDER. They are about the same color?

Dr. HART. It would seem so to me.

Senator ELLENDER. Senator AIKEN, is there anything else you want to bring out?

Senator AIKEN. No. All I wanted was to have Dr. Hart see the samples and see if he had any comments to make.

Senator ELLENDER. I want to be sure that we have produced what you wanted. Do you want the samples for any other purpose?

Senator AIKEN. Not that I know of.

Mr. HOPKINS. I will be glad to leave the samples for the hearings at Washington.

Senator ELLENDER. Suppose you leave them in the possession of Mr. Donoho.

Mr. HOPKINS. They will have to be kept under refrigeration.

Senator AIKEN. This is simply to cover the testimony given yesterday.

Senator ELLENDER. So that if somebody asks for them, we will have them available. Thank you, Mr. Hopkins. Now you are discharged and I desire to again thank you for your indulgence.

Dr. Hart, I was given to understand that there was an experiment, I think carried on in some foreign country—it may have been Great Britain—where they tried in an orphanage the use of margarine and butter for a certain period. Are you familiar with the experiment, sir?

Dr. HART. No, I am not.

Senator ELLENDER. Thank you, Doctor. I thought maybe you were. If there are no questions, you may be excused, Dr. Hart, and thank you very much.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I am sure that everyone is interested in the factual presentation of the question of oleo or butter, and of vegetable oils and animal fats. The dairy industry of the country, and I am sure, everyone who will read these remarks will be interested in reading a very short statement by Mr. Walter E. Camp. He is a partner in Vita Health Foods Co., of the city of Washington, and I am sure the people reading his testimony will be much intrigued therewith. So I ask that it be printed in the RECORD following my remarks.

There being no objection, the testimony was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF WALTER E. CAMP, VITA HEALTH FOODS, WASHINGTON, D. C.

Mr. CAMP. My name is Walter E. Camp, and I am a partner in the Vita Health Food Co. here in the city, selling various vegetable foods.

Senator ELLENDER. Some witness testified here last week that some soybean butter manufactured by Butler Food Products in Cedar Lake, Mich., was handled by your store.

Mr. CAMP. We sold it until recently; yes, sir.

Senator ELLENDER. Why don't you sell it now?

Mr. CAMP. It gets moldy in hot weather, so we discontinued it during the summer.

Senator ELLENDER. In what size container is this soya butter sold?

Mr. CAMP. That is the only size I know of [indicating] and this morning I got a new size, but this new size we have never handled yet.

I think it is quoted at about 79 cents.

Senator ELLENDER. I notice the contents is one pint, or 13½ ounces, net weight.

Mr. CAMP. Yes, sir.

Senator ELLENDER. Is that new size the same weight as the other?

Mr. CAMP. It says on there, I believe, 13½ ounces.

Senator ELLENDER. What do you retail that for, what price?

Mr. CAMP. Fifty-five cents.

Senator ELLENDER. How much do you pay for it?

Mr. CAMP. Thirty-eight and one-half cents.

Senator ELLENDER. Is that a normal profit?

Mr. CAMP. It is a little less than our profit that we have to have, but we believe that with common food products we can make a little less. We usually make more on this. If you want an explanation of our profit, I will be glad to give it to you.

Senator ELLENDER. No; I don't care to go into your business. I want to be fair with you.

Do you know that this same product is being sold in Cedar Lake, Mich., and other parts of Michigan and Wisconsin for 36 cents a pint?

Mr. CAMP. That is the wholesale price in that section, I understand. I don't believe it is the retail price, although I am not informed as to what they sell it for. We pay 38½ for it.

Senator AIKEN. My recollection is that one witness said it was selling at the stores for 36 cents in Michigan and 59 cents in Washington.

Senator ELLENDER. That was the testimony here.

Mr. CAMP. I thought it was 55 cents. I am not quite sure about that.

Senator ELLENDER. And you say it cost you 38 cents delivered in Washington?

Mr. CAMP. Thirty-eight and one-half cents delivered here.

Senator AIKEN. One of the witnesses testified that he went into your store to buy some of this and was asked for six ration points, but another one that went in and made a purchase was asked for no ration points at all. Why was one asked to give up ration points and others were not?

Mr. CAMP. Well, all meats went out without ration points very recently, so the one that made the first inquiry, was apparently while it was still on rationing, and when the actual purchase was made, the O. P. A. had taken the points off of soybean oil and meat products, so that when the purchase was made, there were no points on it any more.

Senator AIKEN. Perhaps Mr. Camp can tell us, if soybean oil is being generally substituted in restaurants for other products, both oleomargarine and butter?

I asked the distributor that question this morning, or last night, rather, and he told me he sells it in 30-pound containers to the Statler Hotel, and he sells it to the People's Drug Stores, and he probably has other patrons. At one time very recently there was absolutely no butter available, and the restaurants and hotels substituted anything they could get. For instance, in the seafood restaurants they apparently substitute soy oil for butter when they serve lobster.

Mr. CAMP. We have a restaurant and we use soy oil a great deal.

Senator ELLENDER. I was out to dinner the other night, and I do not like lobster very well, but I had to have lobster, and apparently it was soy oil that was served with the lobster. It had no resemblance, so far as I could see, to butter and not much to oleo.

Senator AIKEN. How about the taste?

Senator ELLENDER. It tasted like soy oil. I suppose the restaurant uses it because of their inability to get butter.

Mr. Camp, do you handle oleomargarine?

Mr. CAMP. No; we do not.

Senator ELLENDER. Then you say the reason you are not handling this product any longer is because it mildews in the summer?

Mr. CAMP. It does. I understand there is no benzoate of soda in it. We do not handle products that have benzoate of soda or anything of that sort in them, so we just have to discontinue the product in the summer.

Senator ELLENDER. I believe that is all, Mr. Camp. Thank you very much.

Mr. CAMP. I have some literature here in case you should be interested in it.

Senator AIKEN. When did you discontinue the sale of this product, Mr. Camp?

Mr. CAMP. It was as soon as the weather got hot, 2 or 3 weeks ago. It may be that one of the downtown stores still have a pound on hand. I don't know how recently you bought it, but it might have been bought just after that. But all of the rest of it was moldy and I just sent it back.

Senator AIKEN. Could that be renovated and sold again?

Mr. CAMP. I don't know about that.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations (and withdrawing a nomination), which were referred to the appropriate committee.

(For nominations this day received and nomination withdrawn, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

RECESS TO FRIDAY

Mr. HATCH. I move that the Senate stand in recess until Friday next at 12 o'clock noon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 3 o'clock and 10 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until Friday, September 8, 1944, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate September 5 (legislative day of September 1), 1944.

UNITED STATES PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

The following-named officers for promotion in the Regular Corps of the United States Public Health Service:

ASSISTANT SURGEON TO BE TEMPORARY PASSED ASSISTANT SURGEON EFFECTIVE JULY 1, 1944

Willys M. Monroe

PASSED ASSISTANT SURGEONS TO BE TEMPORARY SURGEONS EFFECTIVE SEPTEMBER 1, 1944

James A. Finger
Milton W. Gwinner
George F. Ellinger
Luther L. Terry
Albert L. Chapman

SURGEONS TO BE TEMPORARY SENIOR SURGEONS EFFECTIVE SEPTEMBER 1, 1944

Cassius J. Van Slyke
David C. Elliott
Roy E. Butler

SENIOR SURGEON TO BE TEMPORARY MEDICAL DIRECTOR EFFECTIVE SEPTEMBER 1, 1944

Michael J. Pescor

PASSED ASSISTANT DENTAL SURGEON TO BE TEMPORARY DENTAL SURGEON EFFECTIVE AUGUST 1, 1944

Francis J. Walters

ASSISTANT SANITARY ENGINEER TO BE TEMPORARY PASSED ASSISTANT SANITARY ENGINEER EFFECTIVE SEPTEMBER 1, 1944

Harvey F. Ludwig

SANITARY ENGINEER TO BE TEMPORARY SENIOR SANITARY ENGINEER EFFECTIVE AUGUST 1, 1944

Ellis S. Tisdale

TO BE PASSED ASSISTANT SANITARY ENGINEER EFFECTIVE DATE OF OATH

Malcolm C. Hope

PASSED ASSISTANT SURGEONS TO BE TEMPORARY SURGEONS EFFECTIVE AUGUST 1, 1944

John G. Crawford
Vernon W. Foster
Ray H. Vanderhook
William G. Budington
Jesse D. Harris

SURGEON TO BE TEMPORARY SENIOR SURGEON EFFECTIVE MAY 1, 1944

Leland J. Hanchett

SENIOR SURGEONS TO BE TEMPORARY MEDICAL DIRECTORS EFFECTIVE AUGUST 15, 1944

Otis L. Anderson
Edwin H. Carnes

ASSISTANT SURGEONS TO BE PASSED ASSISTANT SURGEONS, EFFECTIVE DATES INDICATED

Alfred L. Holloman, July 1, 1943.
John G. Crawford, October 16, 1943.
John C. Grier, July 1, 1944.
Buell S. Bindschedler, September 19, 1944.

PASSED ASSISTANT SURGEONS TO BE SURGEONS, EFFECTIVE DATES INDICATED

Victor H. Haas, September 1, 1944.
Clifton K. Himmelsbach, September 1, 1944.
Kenneth E. Gamm, September 1, 1944.
John W. Oliphant, September 1, 1944.
Seymour D. Vestermark, September 1, 1944.
Hollis U. Maness, September 1, 1944.
Leroy E. Burney, September 12, 1944.
Charles R. Mallary, October 1, 1944.

SURGEONS TO BE SENIOR SURGEONS, EFFECTIVE DATES INDICATED

Adolph S. Rumreich, September 2, 1944.
Ernest E. Huber, September 2, 1944.
Alfred J. Aselmeyer, November 29, 1944.

WITHDRAWAL

Executive nomination withdrawn from the Senate September 5 (legislative day of September 1), 1944:

POSTMASTER

MICHIGAN

John J. Hauserman to be postmaster at Negaunee, Mich.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, SEPTEMBER 5, 1944

The House met at 12 o'clock noon, and was called to order by the Speaker.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

We praise Thee, O Christ, that with Thee trifles are revelations and that Thou dost tarry before the commonplace and abide in the presence of every passing hour. With Thee every countryside may become a Bethlehem, every feast a Bethany, and every shore line a Bethesda. Let us hail this day, with its conditions and circumstances, as the call of the Lord and accept our labors as Thy errands. Thou who fillest eternity with Thy glory, find Thy spirit in our praise, see Thy will in our motives, and Thy life in our love.

When Thou didst weep over Jerusalem, Thou didst grieve over the failure of a national center. O God, unite our country and take it unto Thyself, directing it in brotherly ways that we may move on to a great and wonderful future. Mold our citizens into the sons of the morning, beholding the light as Thou art in the light, making them a torch of spiritual knowledge that shall banish ignorance and divisive influences and enkindle the spirit of the divine presence in the breast of our whole land. O hasten the hour when the guns shall be put in the racks and our boys come home, and peace shall fill the earth as the waters cover the sea. In the name of Him who is the hope of the world. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Friday, September 1, 1944, was read and approved.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include excerpts from the Senate hearing before the Committee on Agriculture, and also to extend my remarks and include a letter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to extend and revise my own remarks in the RECORD at this point.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

THE RED MENACE THREATENS THE PEACE OF THE WORLD

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the conference at Dumbarton Oaks of the three powers, United States, Great Britain, and Soviet Russia, which has for its purpose the creation of an international security league, furnishes another example of how far the United States and Great Britain are going in bending over backward to meet the wishes of Russia. The Government of China is not included in this conference at the present time at the request of Russia because, as she puts it, Russia is not at war with Japan. That, however, is not the real reason, as Russia does not wish to have China represented at the conference because Russia has been doing everything possible to communize China. In fact, there is a communistic army in northern China which is controlled by Russia and takes its orders from Stalin, and does not take orders from the great Chinese leader, Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek.

The Chinese were the first to feel the might of the imperialistic Japanese war lords, and all freedom-loving nations owe China a great debt for the valiant and gallant fight that she has been making against the Japanese for these many years—in fact, the Sino-Japanese war has been going on 7 years, 8 weeks, and 3 days. I can see no reason why China, a great nation of peace-loving people, should not have delegates at Dumbarton Oaks. Certainly she should not be denied representation there on the flimsy basis that Russia is not at war with Japan. If that were the real basis, then neither the United States nor Great Britain could have delegates there, because both the United States and Great Britain are certainly at war with Japan. We hear now that at the second session at Dumbarton Oaks the Chinese and French will be represented and that the Reds will withdraw but will be kept fully advised as to the subject matters of the conferences. I sincerely trust, however, that something constructive will come out from the conference at Dumbarton Oaks, and I also express the hope that the Congress and the people of the United States be fully advised as to the discussions at Dumbarton Oaks. It certainly is not sufficient to give to the public only the statements on the opening day of the representatives of the three great powers, followed by occasional press releases.

The statement of Andrei A. Gromyko, the Russian Ambassador, is indeed very pertinent as to the attitude of his Government and is as follows:

The present meeting is the first meeting of exploratory discussions between representatives of the United States, Great Britain, and the Soviet Union on the establishment of an international security organization. I fully share the thoughts expressed by Secretary

Hull in regard to the importance of the present discussions.

The people of our countries are waging a life and death struggle against the worst enemy of humanity—Hitlerite Germany. This struggle has already cost our countries, as well as many other freedom-loving countries of the world, heavy human and material sacrifices. Waging a struggle for their freedom and independence, the peoples of our three great nations are also saving the freedom and independence of other freedom-loving peoples of the world.

As a result of the combined efforts of the Allies, our common foe—Nazi Germany—is nearing its inevitable catastrophe. Our brave warriors are squeezing the enemy from the east, west, and south. As a result of the latest offensive of the Red Army, military operations are already being carried to enemy soil. The time is not far off when the combined efforts of the freedom-loving countries of the world, and, first of all, the efforts of our nations, will bring a complete and decisive victory and will force Nazi Germany to her knees.

In view of the heavy destruction and countless sacrifices which the present war has brought to humanity, the freedom-loving peoples of the world are naturally looking for means to prevent repetition of a similar tragedy in the future. They have shed too much blood and made too many sacrifices to be indifferent to their future. That is why they are striving to establish an international organization which would be capable of preventing a repetition of a similar tragedy, and of guaranteeing for the peoples peace, security, and prosperity in the future.

Members of such an organization can be, as it is said in the four nations' declaration signed at the Moscow Conference on October 3, 1943, all big and small freedom-loving countries of the world. All of us are glad that one of the distinguished participants of the Moscow Conference, Secretary Hull, is among us at the present meeting.

It goes without saying that in order to maintain peace and security it is not enough to have the mere desire to harness the aggressor and the desire to apply force against him if it should be demanded by circumstances. In order to guarantee peace and security it is absolutely necessary to have resources with the aid of which aggression could be prevented or suppressed and international order maintained.

In the light of the above, it becomes clear what responsibility falls to the nations, members of the future security organization, and especially to the nations which bear the main brunt of the present war, and which possess the necessary resources and power to maintain peace and security.

That is why all those to whom freedom and independence are dear cannot but draw the conclusion that this freedom and independence can be preserved only if the future international security organization will in the interests of the freedom-loving peoples of the world use effectively all resources in possession of members of the organization and, first of all, the resources of such great nations as the Soviet Union, and United States and Great Britain.

The unity displayed by these countries in the present struggle against Hitlerite Germany and its vassals gives ground for certainty that after final victory is achieved these nations will cooperate in maintaining peace and security in the future as they are cooperating at the present time in saving humanity from enslavement by the Fascist barbarians.

In this noble striving our countries naturally cannot but find support on the part of the other United Nations, big and small, which will be participants of the international security organization, which will be based on the principle of the sovereign equality of all freedom-loving countries and which will bear joint responsibility for the maintenance of peace.

The unity of the Allies displayed in the struggle against the common foe and their striving to maintain peace in the future is a guaranty that the present exploratory discussions will bring positive results. They are the first step leading to the erection of a building in the foundation of which all freedom-loving peoples of the world are interested—for an effective international organization and maintenance of peace and security.

In closing, I consider it necessary to note the initiative taken by the Government of the United States in calling the present conference. The Soviet delegation is glad to begin discussions with the American delegation, headed by Edward R. Stettinius, with whom I have had the pleasure since 1941 of meeting and discussing at different times various matters of mutual interest, and also with the British delegation headed by Sir Alexander Cadogan.

I have no doubt that in the course of the present discussions the representatives of the three nations will conduct their work in a spirit of mutual understanding and in a friendly atmosphere which cannot but add to the successful outcome of the discussions.

This is, indeed, a statement of high-sounding phrases, and if it could be accepted at its face value thinking people around the world would rejoice because it would result in the dawn of a new day that surely would engulf the world in the bright light of perpetual peace. However, the nations of the world, both large and small, who have had dealings with the present communistic regime at Moscow have learned to their sorrow that any statement, any treaty, or any agreement with Stalin cannot be relied upon for its face value.

William C. Bullitt, former United States Ambassador to France and Russia, in a brilliant article in the current issue of Life magazine of September 4, 1944, entitled "The World From Rome," sets forth that—

The Eternal City fears a struggle between Christianity and communism and that the Italians fear that the present war will result in the subjugation of Europe by Moscow instead of Berlin, and also said that the Italians believe the failure of the United States and Great Britain to stand strongly for independence for all the states of Europe has made certain a new world war.

Mr. Bullitt further stated:

The Romans expect the Soviet Union to dominate Finland, Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Rumania, Bulgaria, Hungary, and Czechoslovakia, as well as eastern Germany.

The article further states that the Italians are terrified in their fear that the neighboring nations of Austria and Yugoslavia will be dominated and be brought under the influence of Russia. It is brought out that the Italians are surprisingly well informed about events in all of Europe and that they hope, but are not convinced, that the United States and Great Britain can hold off the "hordes of invaders from the east." It appears that the Italians are of the opinion that Great Britain will emerge from this war a tired victor and they feel that Great Britain will be unable to stop the threat from the east alone, and are by no means sure of what the United States might do.

Mr. Bullitt's article is unusually well written and in a very informative manner which to the most casual reader discloses that the author is not only unusually well informed but also a master of the subject matter of the article.

The political aims of Stalin and Soviet Russia are further set forth in an article by Samuel Crowther, written in July, entitled, "What Happened at Bretton Woods," and published by the National Economic Council, Inc., 350 Fifth Avenue, New York City.

Mr. Crowther sets forth in his article in regard to the United Nations Monetary and Financial Conference held at Bretton Woods, N. H., from July 1 to 22 that—

Considered for itself, and also as a dress rehearsal of international conferences to come, holds a lesson and a warning for every American. The large Russian delegation was mostly made up of men who spoke only Russian and who did no mixing around with the other delegates. They were very intent and interested only in having a large quota in both the stabilization fund and the bank, in order that they might have a large voting power and a large borrowing power. They were all set to make a raid and get what they wanted. They also insisted that they put up a minimum amount of gold and a maximum amount of promises. They refused to disclose any facts on their gold or other holdings. They made their demands as of right, practically as orders from Stalin to the conference. They answered no questions and made no decisions except on their cabled instructions. They did not bother with argument or logic.

It is brought out by Mr. Crowther in his article that—

The delegates did not reach an agreement. They merely signed a paper which looked like an agreement. But on the minutes they entered reservations that destroyed the agreement. The final statement by Secretary Morgenthau was utterly disingenuous. All this had a considerable effect on the delegates from some of the smaller nations who had been taught to believe that the American Government was always frank with its own people.

In regard to the attitude of the Russian delegates Mr. Crowther had this to say:

The dominance of the Russians disillusioned and discouraged Poland, Czechoslovakia, Yugoslavia and Greece. Their territories are now occupied by the Germans. They have all been living on promises from Washington and now they find Russia predominant. Every shift upward in the Russian quota was accompanied by a shift downward in their quotas. They see nothing ahead for them and they feel they have been abandoned.

Take Poland. The Poles had worked out a careful reconstruction program based on half-official assurances from Washington. If they should get their freedom and their territory, the funds now available to them under the plans would not be sufficient for reconstruction. But they plainly see, from what has gone on here, that the territory they get and the freedom they get will be at the will of Russia and, instead of an independent government, they will get a Quisling government which will join the Soviet Union. They do not expect to be collectivized, but they know that the Soviet is planning for buffer states in Europe and that it intends to keep those states for a defense in depth against invading armies while it moves its industries far into the interior. They see a Poland of the future that will only be good ground for armies to fight over.

The same prospect holds out for Yugoslavia, Czechoslovakia, and Greece. They

have to conceal their feelings, but they are very bitter. They had all relied on direct aid from America.

Mr. Crowther sums up the conference in the last paragraph of his article, which is as follows:

In a word, the conference showed that "one world" to date means "one sucker"—the United States. That is our diplomatic progress to date reduced to crude language.

The warning given by Mr. Crowther in his article on the Bretton Woods Conference was "a dress rehearsal of international conferences to come" certainly has borne fruit as the Dumbarton Oaks Conference discloses by the attitude of the "Reds" to dominate everything, and their refusal to permit the Chinese to participate with them in the Dumbarton Oaks Conference, although they were a signatory to the Four Nations' Declaration of Moscow.

It would be well for the United States and Great Britain to take cognizance of the statement of former Ambassador Bullitt in his very able article in Life magazine:

Will the result of this war be the subjugation of Europe by Moscow instead of by Berlin?

If the Allied policies are to be based on the naive and childish faith in the Soviet assurances and promises, it will surely lead the world into a still greater catastrophe than was caused by the faith in the past guaranties of Adolf Hitler made just a little over 5 years ago. The whole world knows these guaranties and promises were never kept and resulted in the outbreak of this present European war by the invasion of the German hordes into Poland on September 1, 1939.

The liberty-loving Poles, fighting with their backs to the wall, received the mortal blow when they were invaded from the rear and stabbed in the back by Russia on September 17, 1939—that was the death blow. Even though mortally wounded, Polish patriots continued to fight until death. The heroic defense of Warsaw by Mayor Stefan Starzynski was viewed with admiration by the entire civilized world. The Poles in 1939 at Warsaw were left to fight it out by themselves. It is sad but true—history has again repeated itself. The Polish patriots of Warsaw were called upon to rise and evict the Nazis from the capital of the Republic of Poland. The underground of Poland has never ceased to fight since the fall of Poland, and the remarkable advances of the Red Army westward which has been acclaimed by all the world could never have been accomplished had it not been for the heroic work of the Polish underground, who paved the way for Stalin's army to the gates of Warsaw.

The Reds of Moscow realized that within the city of Warsaw was the flower of the Polish underground. Even though they had called upon the Polish underground for assistance, which was so willingly given to the Reds, in order that the hated Nazis could be driven from Poland, the Reds let the Polish patriots down by halting at the gates of Warsaw. For 34 days the Polish underground fought valiantly and took over large portions of the city of Warsaw, expecting every hour of every day that the Reds would push on into the city. When all hope of assistance from the Reds was a foregone conclusion, the women of Warsaw addressed a pathetic appeal to His Holiness, the Pope at Rome. However, all appeals were in vain. The Polish patriots were without food, water, medicine, ammunition, and other supplies—exhausted, they were compelled to retreat. When the women made this appeal to Pope Pius XII the Russian Army had been standing at the gates of Warsaw more than 3 weeks and had not moved one step forward. Thus, again, the Republic of Poland—the first to resist the Nazi hordes—had twice within 5 short years been denied the assistance which she could rightfully expect from her allies.

Oh, it is true that Poland did receive some assistance, but since April of this year the Polish underground has received no appreciable assistance, and during this last seize of Warsaw the only assistance General Bor did receive was the supplies that the British, American, and Polish flyers dropped from the skies. In fact, the Russians refused to permit the American, British, and Polish flyers to make shuttle flights—that is, leave their home bases and land on Russian airfields. If such shuttle flights had been permitted by the Russians, these flyers could have carried much heavier loads of supplies; but, be that as it may, the irony of it rests in the fact that there were Russian airfields within 20 minutes' flight distance from Warsaw, and the Reds absolutely refused, and did not even attempt to fly supplies to the valiant pariots of Warsaw. I need not tell the Members of this House that the majority of the Russian supplies and equipment came from the United States—you only have to read the lend-lease reports and draw your own conclusions.

Despite the remarkable advances of the American, British, and Canadian Armies on the western front, particularly the Army under the leadership of General Patton, the war against the barbaric Nazis is not yet over. It is now certain, however, that victory will be on the side of the Allies. It therefore follows that it is superfluous to talk about Nazi danger to the world. Instead, it becomes necessary to analyze carefully and cautiously the Soviet policy and its administration relative to the organization of Central Europe and China as vassal states.

Soviet Russia has already annexed three free Baltic countries, Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia, and has incorporated them into her territory as Soviet republics. Thus the Soviet Government endeavors to establish in Europe a bloc of states friendly disposed toward Russia. Such states would at first even enjoy a so-called independence, but would later fall under Russian influence and an absolute Soviet leadership through the action of communistic agents. For instance, the seizure of Poland by a formation of a treacherous new government is not a novelty of Russian tactics. As we all know, Stalin made a pact in 1940 with the legal Lithuanian Government and as a token of friendship offered Wilno, having no right whatsoever to do so, for it was not Russian property. A few months later, after having prepared the ground for such an act through Soviet propaganda, the Russian Government issued orders to arrest and deport the members of the Lithuanian Cabinet, accusing them of being involved in the killing of two Red Army soldiers. A new government, nominated by Stalin himself, under the leadership of a Lithuanian Communist, Paleckis, started to function in Wilno. That is a classic example of Stalin's strategy, and hundreds of such moves could be possible if Russia establishes a sphere of influence in Central Europe and Germany.

In brief, if Soviet Russia accomplishes their plan there will be in Central Europe and Germany a huge bloc of states composed of one hundred and twenty to two hundred million people supervised and controlled by Moscow. If that Red menace comes into being it will be the greatest menace of all time, and will be particularly directed at Great Britain and the United States. The security of both the United States and Great Britain rests on individual, independent states in Europe or a federation of such states which, as free and independent states, will be the bulwark that will separate the plans of Russia's westward movement for world domination, and will act as a buffer for the security of Great Britain and the nations of the Western Hemisphere.

If Soviet Russia is permitted to create such a bloc without a word of protest from the Allies—in fact as it now appears often with their actual consent and help—a powerful bloc of nations will have been brought under the influence of Moscow. For instance, if Soviet Russia dismembers Poland against the agreement already made with her, she will be throwing the whole Polish Nation at the mercy of a government formed in Moscow and composed of communistic traitors and criminals. By that act the liquidation of the legal Polish government-in-exile in London and the abolition of the independence of Poland will have been brought about—which is in accordance with present policy and procedure—without protest by either Great Britain or the United States. Certainly such is not the policies as enumerated by the Atlantic Charter. For instance, if Russia succeeds in her plan in China, there too, they would have at their disposal an enormous reserve of people of more than two hundred million, together with great and unestimated natural resources.

The Union of Soviet Socialist Republics is, therefore, creating--without a word of protest from the Allies, and often with their actual consent and help—a powerful bloc of nations which would be under her influence and absolute domination. It is, therefore, possible to determine the extent of such a bloc and to visualize its size and influence, which are enormous. It would comprise approximately one-half billion people when you include the population of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics before this present war.

When one gives serious thought and considers the manner in which the Soviet Government is mobilizing the civilian populations in the countries which apparently have been liberated with the help of their own Quislings and Red agents, we then have a clear picture of Communistic Russia's real intentions—notwithstanding promises, pledges, treaties, and agreements made with the members of the United Nations, including the principles of the Atlantic Charter, of which Soviet Russia was a signatory.

The appalling fact that stares us in the face is that with a bloc of nations mobilized or as a potential threat for mobilization, what awaits the world, there is one answer—a perpetual Red menace. If the plans of Moscow are brought into being it is practically impossible to anticipate the next move of Stalin and his communistic government. Will Stalin and his government postpone their intentions of communizing the world until after the reconstruction of his country? Will he or his government, still under the camouflage of friendship for Great Britain and the United States, take advantage of the post-war chaotic conditions? Will Stalin and his government, as many think, take advantage of the post-war period and provoke a world-wide revolution in all European and Asiatic countries, starting with China and India? It has often been said that it is not given to man to foretell the future, but the mothers and fathers of today whose sons and daughters are in the armed forces view with apprehension the world of tomorrow.

Take, for instance, Yugoslavia. Soviet Russia has destroyed the unity of that country through the action of her agent Tito and has incited a civil war in Yugoslavia. Yet it is one of the Allies. It has been proven by subsequent events that the arrangement by which General Mihailovich was supplanted by Tito as military leader in Yugoslavia, and Purich was supplanted by Subasich as Prime Minister, had the blessing of Great Britain's Prime Minister, Mr. Churchill. This switch of leaders in Yugoslavia, of course, was instigated by Soviet Russia and is another classic example of Great Britain bending over backward to meet the wishes of Stalin.

It is indeed interesting to note how the government of Subasich was brought about. On May 18, 1944, Mr. Churchill, in a speech regarding Yugoslavia, stated:

> That he had received a message from King Peter that he had accepted the resignation of Prime Minister Purich and his Cabinet.

However, Prime Minister Purich had not resigned. In fact, he wired the Yugoslav Ambassador in Washington, Dr. Fotitch, that he was still functioning as Prime Minister and that the rumors were without any foundation whatsoever so far as he had knowledge.

The resignation, or rather dismissal, of the Purich Cabinet took place on June 2, 1944, almost 2 weeks after Mr. Churchill had stated in the House of Commons that he had resigned. This proved beyond any doubt that the British Government was exerting the utmost pressure upon the poor young King of Yugoslavia to dismiss not only his Prime Minister Purich but also General Mihailovich, the War Minister of Yugoslavia, who was and still is leading the major forces of Yugoslav resistance, even as Tito parades about in Italy and has his photograph taken in company with Mr. Churchill.

In Mr. Churchill's speech before the House of Commons in regard to the Yugoslav situation he stated:

> This involves the severance from the Royal Yugoslav Government of General Mihailovich in his capacity of Minister of War.

And he continued by saying:

> We do not know what will happen in the Serbian part of Yugoslavia. Mihailovich certainly holds a powerful position locally as commander in chief and it does not mean that his ceasing to be Minister of War will rob him of his local influence. There are perhaps 200,000 Serbian peasant proprietors who are anti-German but strongly pro-Serb, less enthusiastic in regard to communism than some of those in Croatia and Slovenia.

Mr. Churchill thus assumes the role of an arbitrator who has already made up his mind. While telling the world that Mihailovich has the support of the Serbs, and admitting the Chetnik leader's influence over the largest part of Yugoslavia, he takes the view of a militant minority that has support in Slovenia and Croatia, although even in these parts of Yugoslavia, Tito has a very limited following. This seems to be a very poor excuse for stoppage of support to General Mihailovich and for arming a well-organized minority which, prior to Russia's entry into the war, was defeatist.

This prearranged plan was put into operation soon after formation of the new Yugoslav Government under Subasich. In July, Stoyan Pribichevich, a known Tito sympathizer, reported that—

> The two members who had entered the Subasich Cabinet as Tito representatives are not the members of his organization and while Tito has nothing personally against them, it should be understood that they do not represent his anti-Fascist Council which is that supreme governing body of Yugoslavia.

A few days later the world was told that Tito had gone into Yugoslavia to lead the fight against the occupators. The fact is, however, that since Tito had fled Yugoslavia, he had never set foot anywhere in the proper mainland of that country. He was installed on the small island of Vis, an island in the Adriatic held by the British, where Tito himself lives in a cave. The British officers on the same island live in houses but ever since the fatal parachute attack by the Germans on his former headquarters in Yugoslavia Tito prefers to live in a cave against further German attack.

The tragic part of this whole affair is that the British, especially Mr. Churchill, had continued to support and also has been successful in having our Government support the Tito movement instead of realizing the error, we continue supplying and arming this small resolute and united minority. General Mihailovich has reported that the Partisans, armed by the Allies, attacked his forces while he was organizing his units for the coming Allied invasion through the Balkans. Tito's headquarters also reported the attacks, mind you, not against the Germans but against the Serbs as if the Serbs were our enemies and not the most loyal of allies of this and the last World War. The Partisan report was made on August 13, via Associated Press from London:

> In another battle with General Mihailovich's Chetniks, 522 Serbs were killed, 500 wounded, and 637 captured.

It will be remembered that it was the Serbs who led Yugoslavia over to the side of the Allies by the coup d'état on the 27th of March 1941, and not Tito and his Communists. And it was the Serbs who lost more than 1,000,000 dead, or approximately one-eighth of their population in their fight against the Germans. There are more than 140,000 Serbs prisoners of war in Germany. These prisoners of war have steadily refused offers by the Germans to return them home if they will promise not to continue the fight against the Germans. It is regretted that such attacks against the loyal Serbs by the Communist Partisans are made possible only by the arms and supplies sent to Tito by the Allies, many of which instruments of war are made right here in America for use supposedly against the Germans and the Japs.

It has been recently learned by reliable sources that the War Department rejected a demand by Tito that the British and Americans guarantee him military support in a military campaign against General Mihailovich. Tito's demand was supported by the British, but the War Department of the United States took the position that its original agreement to give arms to Tito was on the basis that America was willing to help anyone who wished to fight the Germans, and the agreement was not for the purpose of supplying ordnance to assist Tito in his efforts to seize control of Yugoslavia.

Tito's demand was a supplement to the agreement between him and Ivan Subasich, new pro-Communist Croat Premier whom Churchill forced on the Yugoslavs. The Tito-Subasich agreement was signed on June 16 at Bari, Italy, where Tito had arrived after fleeing from Yugoslavia. It contained the following provisions:

First. The Subasich government in exile recognizes the legality of the Communist administration and institutions created by Tito.

Second. The Subasich government recognizes and legalizes post facto all actions taken by Tito.

Third. The Subasich government agrees that King Peter will not be permitted to return to Yugoslavia until after a plebiscite.

Fourth. The Allies will support only Tito and not Mihailovich.

Fifth. The Subasich government will comprise two Serbs, two Croats, two Slovenes, and two representatives of Tito.

Sixth. All diplomatic and military personnel who have opposed Tito and the Communists are to be eliminated from the government and army.

Seventh. Tito is recognized as commander in chief of all Yugoslav combatants.

The men who now comprise the Tito-Subasich government include one man who personally signed the pre-war pact with Germany and three Communists. The signer of the pact that turned Yugoslavia over to Hitler is Dr. Juraj Sutej, who is now Subasich's minister of finance and commerce. Sutej and Subasich represent Croatia, which under Nazi nudging, declared war on the United States and which still remains at war with this country. Sutej, as minister of war in Prince Paul's cabinet, not only signed the pact with Hitler, but to avoid freezing of Yugoslav funds in America ordered approximately $10,000,000 transferred from American banks to Brazil.

The new premier himself, Dr. Ivan Subasich, also supported the Yuoslav pact with Hitler. Last March his name appeared as honorary member of the pro-Tito Communist propaganda committee in this country headed by Louis Adamic. The Communists in the government include two representatives of Tito and Dr. Sava Kosanovich, who worked here in America for 3 years with Adamic on the propaganda promotion of Tito.

The pay-off of this creation of Churchiavellian power politics is that the new Yugoslav Government does not include a single representative of the intrepid patriots who rebelled against Regent Prince Paul's pact with Hitler and whose courageous coup d'état overthrew Prince Paul and replaced him with the youthful King Peter and under the military leadership of General Mihailovich rallied the Yugoslav people to continue the war against the Nazis.

On August 16 the Polish underground informed the Polish Government in London that the wife of General Mihailovich had died in a Nazi concentration camp at Oswiecim, Poland. Will the Communists find in this tragic news further proof that General Mihailovich is collaborating with the Germans?

Soviet Russia has not only taken steps to destroy the national unity of Yugoslavia, but she also has interfered with the domestic affairs of Greece, and attempts now to draw Bulgaria into the sphere of her strong influence. Russia is preparing the occupation of the territories in Germany not only assigned her by the Allies, but also of the remaining part of the country, through a skillfully prepared revolution with the help of the Moscow-born Committee for Liberation of Germany and through the close collaboration of this state after its annexation. Russia has encouraged the increase of the Communist movement in France and Italy and has acquired almost one-fourth of China and has created there a communistic army.

All these facts point to evidence that a clandestine pact made by Russia with Japan arrived at the division of China into two spheres of influence—Japanese and Russian. Soviet Russia is inciting pro-Soviet movements in Iran and India. It is clearly Russia's plan to set up a world-wide Soviet regime. Both Lenin and Stalin, together with other Soviet masters, have frequently said that the Soviet regime is in constant danger as long as it exists only in Russia. Russia should not be an isolated island on the sea of capitalistic states, but should—still being a citadel of socialism—inoculate Soviet ideas in other populous communities, especially in Germany, China, and India. Despite all maneuvers and Stalin's statements, together with his camouflaged actions, a careful analysis of the present Soviet tactics shows that Stalin, lulling the opinions of western states, prepares to realize the above plan.

If, step by step, he attains his aim without opposition and with the help of the western states, the pattern of the future is clear. After the creation of such a bloc of states, the Soviets will next attempt to abolish democracy and Christian civilization in America and England, for these are enemies No. 1 of the country of the proletariat, as Stalin and Lenin often stated.

In this manner, the "great mission" which Stalin undertook with fanaticism and with political ingenuity will finally be achieved. As he put it:

> The rotten world of capitalism and religious superstitions will cease to exist. A wonderful era of flourishing proletarian culture will follow, based on modern science and proletarian idealism.

May I, in the conclusion of my exposé remind you of the results of this so-called idealism? I want to emphasize that the following facts are not taken from Polish, but from exclusively Russian, Ukrainian, and partly Lithuanian sources.

During 20 years of Soviet regime in Russia, there were shot or perished from exhaustion in forced labor and concentration camps the following number of Soviet and non-Soviet citizens:

1. The number of the liquidated Soviet opposition, Socialists, social-revolutionists, democrats	3,000,000
2. The number of members of clergy and persons affiliated with the church	1,000,000
3. The number of members of the liquidated peasant opposition (Kulaki)	8,000,000
4. The number of members of the national Ukrainian opposition	10,000,000

Moreover, during this war, not including the murders committed on people like Alter and Erlich, who followed Marshal Tuchachewski, Radek, and Bucharin, millions of Polish citizens deported to Russia were killed in a cruel manner, together with many thousands of priests, leaders of intellectual and religious life of Polish as well as Latvian, Lithuanian, Estonian, Ukrainian, and Jewish societies.

An investigation is not necessary to find who committed the Katyn crime. "A state without justice is only a band of outlaws and gangsters," said St. Augustine in the seventh century. Crime does not recognize pacts or keep promises. A criminal respects only strength. In my opinion the hopes for the success at Dumbarton Oaks are at least 15 centuries too late.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that today, at the conclusion of the legislative program and following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that today, after the special order granted to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. MURRAY] I may be permitted to address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

SOME FACTS ABOUT OLEO

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, on page 7 of a publication called Legislation Which Renders It More Difficult to Secure Adequate Nutrition, by Dr. A. J. Carlson, star witness of the Oleo Institute and darling of the oleo promoters, is found the following statement:

> The United States census of manufactures of 1939 reports a considerable decline in the output of margarine. This decline applied to all types of margarine whether made solely of vegetable oils or of mixtures of animal and vegetable oils and fats.

This shows that the people did not care for much oleo even at that time. Here is another statement:

> As of January 1, 1943, however, by order of the War Production Board, margarine manufacturers where previously allowed to use only 110 percent of their average consumption of fats and oils in 1940 and 1941 were permitted to raise that figure to 180 percent.

This should clear up the question as to whether or not the unspeakable dairy lobby was holding down the production of oleo. Many loud-mouthed and loose-thinking oleo promoters were making that statement. The production and sale of oleo was being controlled by the amount of oil allocated by the W. P. B. and the amount of oleo the people wanted to buy.

There is another interesting paragraph on page 11:

> Milk provides us with many different food items. In terms of food value fluid milk ranks highest and butter lowest as we shall show. * * * Butter has a very close nutritional substitute that can be produced at considerably less cost.

Is it not a great statement to be made? Many scientists have shown that butterfat is a fat without a peer. However, what are these men going to do if they want to make use of only the skim milk? Would they in their attempt to promote oleo pour the cream down the sewer? Surely powdered skim has 35 percent of a splendid animal protein, but everyone knows except some blinded New Dealer who has instructions to follow the line, that skim milk has to be supplemented by other feeds in order to get the proper health and growth. One cannot follow that line of reasoning until someone develops a cow that gives only skim milk. How are you going to get the skim

milk? What are you going to do with the fat?

There is another statement on this same page:

The importance of milk depends upon the use to which it is put. Milk going into butter when the skim milk is not utilized for human consumption, is far less important in the human diet than is whole milk or milk products using all the milk solids.

An analysis of this statement is appropriate. First, that much butterfat is produced in the United States on farms remote from market, and where the whole milk could not be marketed. In many sections the road would not be passable for daily deliveries of milk; and in many sections there is not enough dairying being done to provide a local market for milk, while the cream can be shipped to market. If Dr. Carlson had ever raised any farm animals, pigs, calves, or chickens he would know that this skim milk is not wasted when it is fed to growing animals. If Dr. Carlson lived in some parts of northern Wisconsin he might find it rather difficult to deliver his whole milk each day, although he might be able to get his cream out to the road a couple of times a week in the middle of winter.

Here is another angle. When the whole milk is delivered to the factory, butter is manufactured from the butterfat. In the up-to-date plants the skim milk is made into powder. Where does this skim-milk powder go? Part of it for human consumption, and part of it goes into feed for livestock, such as dog feed, calf feed, chicken feed, and so on. If whole milk is delivered to a factory, the butterfat made into butter, and the skim milk is made into skim-milk powder as animal food for someone's animals to consume, why is this powdered skim milk thus made any more contribution to feeding the world than would the natural skim milk contribute to feeding the world if it was kept and fed on the farm where produced in the first place?

The total production of animal skim-milk powder in the United States is of large volume. The O. P. A. and W. F. A. combination has had rationing on the products such as cottage cheese made from skim milk, although at the same time the man with the price could buy all the cream he desired. Figure that one out if you can. The average New Dealer thinks that no one ever valued the skim milk as a food until they came into power, though this skim milk has been made into cottage cheese and other soft cheeses for centuries.

Dr. Carlson spent several minutes of his time before our Agriculture Committee with a long dissertation on his greatness. He testified he was being paid by the Oleo Institute for his testimony.

If the Oleo Institute is going to rest its case on Dr. Carlson's testimony, it appears they have lost their cause, first because he makes statements as facts that neither he nor anyone else knows to be facts; and second he makes statements that show that he has not much practical experience in dairying or in the problems involved in milk production.

The testimony given before the Senate Agriculture Committee in June 1944 by Dr. E. B. Hart, the leading nutritionist in the world today, should be conclusive evidence that no one wants to be misled by any hired mouthpiece of the Oleo Institute. It is on page 169 in the hearings and is as follows:

In the present state of our knowledge it is preposterous—let me repeat that—in the present state of our knowledge it is preposterous for any scientist to make the blank statement that it is proven that oleomargarine or vegetable oils have an equivalence to butterfat in nutrition.

According to my standard dictionary, preposterous means "contrary to nature, reason, or common sense, strikingly or utterly absurd, foolish and ridiculous."

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, and include certain extracts from the inaugural address of President William Henry Harrison, delivered March 4, 1841.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD in two instances; in one to include an editorial, and in the other a statement by John D. Jones, Jr., representing Hoard's Dairyman.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, and include an article setting forth the benefits available to discharged veterans of World War No. 2.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, and include two extracts from hearings before a committee in the other body relative to the shortcomings of oleo.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

EUROPEAN BATTLEGROUNDS

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Speaker, nearly 200 Members of this body served during World War No. 1, and each and every one of us is thrilled as we read the rapidly changing headlines, in which we see such familiar names as Soissons, Chateau-Thierry, Belleau Wood, St. Mihiel, Verdun, the Meuse, and the Argonne—names which come back to us over a quarter of a century, recalling more youthful and active days.

These youngsters of ours are performing exploits which not only equal but surpass the feats of World War No. 1. Many of these men are sons of members of the A. E. F., and they are now taking and passing through towns of which many years ago they heard their fathers tell. In an hour these young Americans, in their trucks and tanks, travel distances which took their fathers days and weeks to go on foot and with horse-drawn artillery.

Mr. Speaker, the victory which these young Americans are bringing us is the result not only of American production but especially of American brawn, brains, and bravery. This time the peace must not be soft and too sentimentally idealistic. We must have a realistic peace under which the Huns, led by another Hitler, cannot again try to bring upon the world the tragedy of world conquest.

Mr. Speaker, the veterans of the A. E. F. vintage of 1917–18 take off their hats to the hard-hitting youngsters of the new A. E. F.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a resolution adopted by the American Legion, Department of Michigan.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. COLE of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that today, following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

PROPOSAL TO ERECT A PERMANENT PEACE PALACE AT BELLE ISLE

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, I ask has been called the hub of the arsenal of democracy. Mr. J. Lee Barrett, executive vice president of the Detroit Convention and Tourist Bureau, has sent to the common council and the Honorable Edward J. Jeffries, Jr., mayor of the city of Detroit, a proposal to erect on Belle Isle a $1,000,000 shrine for a peace palace established as permanent headquarters for a new international league. Belle Isle is located in the Detroit River at the international boundary. It is fitting that the peace shrine should be established there where there is a record of 132 years of uninterrupted peace along 2,500 miles of the unfortified United States-Canadian boundary, setting an example to the world that peace can exist between adjacent nations.

Detroit offers an ideal location for peace headquarters because of its cosmopolitan citizenry and its position at the crossroads of the new hemispherical world created by the airplane.

The industrial genius of that city and the State of Michigan has been proclaimed to the world in the war effort. No finer tribute could be paid to Michigan, which ranks first in its contribution of industrial production to the war effort. The Allied armies are riding to victory in vehicles many parts of which came from Michigan. May the machinery for peace be produced here, too.

It is only proper that the invitation to the Allied Powers to recognize Detroit as a fitting place for the peace palace should receive the utmost favorable consideration.

BITUMINOUS COAL ACT

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I do not think the Congress should adjourn before taking action to reenact the bituminous coal legislation. We have been giving a great deal of thought and attention to legislation preparing the way for conversion of industry from wartime production to peacetime production, but none of this legislation will, in any way, bring relief to the coal industry. Why, I ask, should the coal industry be left out of the reconversion picture? All familiar with the coal industry know exactly what will happen if the war ends without the renewal of the coal legislation. The industry will be thrown into a chaotic condition, the operators will suffer irreparable loss, and misery and distress visited upon hundreds of thousands of honest, hard-working miners and their families. We cannot afford to let this happen.

A Democratic House cannot offer one single excuse as to why this legislation which, as you know, we wrongfully let expire, should not be reenacted. The legislation is the child of this administration as it was initiated by this administration in cooperation with the miners and a great majority of the operators. And in spite of the dire prophecies made at the time of its enactment, in spite of an adverse Supreme Court decision which caused the legislation to be redrafted and reenacted, it worked, and brought order and stability to the industry, untold benefits and blessing to the miners, and a dependable supply of coal to the public at fair and reasonable prices. It is, if we mean what we say, still the child of this administration. We again placed the stamp of approval upon the legislation in our 1944 platform. Since the adoption of the 1944 platform the President has again written a strong letter not only approving the legislation but urging its reenactment. Surely the leadership of the House will follow the Democratic platform and the President's recommendation made in keeping therewith.

Now just a word as to the legislation that has been introduced: The bill I introduced (and similar bills were introduced by other Members) was agreed upon by the miners and a great majority of the operators, and follows closely the old act. Only two objections, so far as I know, have been advanced against present action. Instead of using the word objections I should say excuses, because that is exactly what they are, and they are being advanced for the purpose, I am afraid, of delaying and defeating the legislation. Let me take up these excuses:

First, we are told that long and lengthy hearings will have to be held. Now the fact is we have held, on more than one occasion, long and lengthy hearings, and the membership of the Ways and Means Committee, as well as the membership of the House, is perfectly familiar with the pros and cons of the legislation. If we held hearings from now until doomsday nothing new would be developed. All hearings have been printed, and if any Member desires to refresh his memory all he will have to do is to review the printed hearings.

In the second place, the excuse is made that there is a controversy as to whether the legislation should be administered by an administrator or by a commission. The bill I introduced which, as I have stated, has been agreed upon by the miners and a great majority of the operators, provides that the administration of the act shall be in the hands of a commission of five, one representative of the industry, one representative of the miners, and three representatives of the public. Surely this is just and fair. Surely the wishes of the industry and the miners, those who will be so vitally affected by the legislation, should in this respect be respected, especially when the public representatives will constitute the majority of the Commission. The miners and industry, more than any other groups, are vitally interested in seeing the act work, in seeing that the act is administered in the right way, and they should be represented in the administrative set-up. Until the old act was by Executive order transferred to the Interior Department and placed under an administrator, it was administered by a Commission, and be it said to the credit of the Commission, in spite of all the criticism, that it did a splendid job. At the time of the transfer the Commission had done all the spade work which required months and months of tedious, painstaking, and exacting work, and all the administrator had to do was to put into effect the labors of the Commission.

If we save the miners and the industry the time to act is now. Delay, I am afraid, will be fatal.

MEXICO

Mr. OUTLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. OUTLAND. Mr. Speaker, one of the most concrete examples of the working of the good-neighbor policy between the United States and the Latin-American nations to the south is the way in which our neighbor, Mexico, has been helping us to meet the acute manpower shortage among our agricultural workers. When the necessity arose for expanding our Army and Navy to hitherto unheard-of numbers, our farms and ranches, especially in the West, were extremely hard hit. Crops were in imminent danger of spoiling because there was no one to harvest them.

Into this situation stepped the Farm Security Administration, and worked out a program with the Mexican Government by which many thousands of Mexican nationals could be temporarily imported into this country to work in the fruit and vegetable crops. The Department of Agriculture today has informed me that as of August 16 there were more than 65,000 such Mexican nationals working in the United States. In my own State of California alone, 30,537 laborers were recruited this year. Even more are needed, and the Department hopes to obtain a minimum of 8,500 more workers this month.

When one considers the mutual suspicion that frequently has existed between the two countries, we must all admit that this has been not only a remarkable achievement, one that has contributed materially to the war effort, but also a most clearcut demonstration of friendly cooperation on the part of our nearest southern neighbor. I pay tribute today, not only to the Mexican nationals who have helped us so much here on the home front, but to the Mexican Government itself for its help, its friendship, and its unselfishness in this matter. I feel certain that it is only one of many indications of increasing cooperation between our two countries.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ENGLE of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD in two separate instances, in one to include a telegram in regard to the operation of the W. P. B. order on the lumber industry, the other extension being in regard to the Table Mountain Dam in California.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

EXPORT-IMPORT BANK

Mr. DEWEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. DEWEY. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing today an amendment to the law which set up the so-called Export-Import Bank of Washington. I think it is thoroughly agreed by all economists and all thoughtful people in the House and throughout the country that in order to give full employment we must have our industry and our agriculture producing at high levels. This will naturally develop surpluses. We have at the present time no national financial machinery by which those surpluses may be financed outside of the territorial United States.

This amendment increases the powers of the Export-Import Bank so that it

may aid in the disposal of surpluses, to the end that they may not hang over our domestic market and thereby eliminate jobs and decrease employment.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD on the subject of benefits to service men and women, veterans, and their dependents.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include a statement made before a committee in the other body by Fred Brenkman of the National Grange.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANTON J. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, I have two unanimous consent requests, one to extend my own remarks and to include therein an editorial, and the other to extend my own remarks and to include therein a statement given by Dr. Harrison A. Ruehe before a committee in the other body.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

WAR MOBILIZATION AND RECONVERSION ACT

Mr. CARRIER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. CARRIER. Mr. Speaker, this House has considered at some length and has passed legislation known as the War Mobilization and Reconversion Act of 1944. The Senate has passed the so-called George bill carrying somewhat different provisions. The two bills are now in conference, and the final legislation will probably be something in the nature of a compromise.

There has been much criticism by various groups because of the conservativeness of the unemployment compensation benefits provided in this legislation. Personally, while I am in favor of legislation to tide the workingman over the transition period, I do not believe unemployment-compensation benefits should be made so attractive as to put a premium on idleness, or as would cause workers to abandon all thrift.

The purpose of reconversion legislation is to enable this country to transfer from a war economy to a peace economy with the least possible shock and hardship to our business and individual life.

Now that we have provided for reasonable unemployment-compensation benefits, I believe this Congress should immediately pass legislation which will shorten that transition period from war to peacetime economy by creating constructive employment which will give due return to the debt-ridden taxpayers of America.

I am in favor of immediate passage of H. R. 4915, the Post-War Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1944, in order that construction may get under way at the earliest possible date. This bill recently reported by the House Committee on Roads authorizes an appropriation of $1,500,000,000, to become available at the rate of $500,000,000 a year for 3 successive postwar fiscal years. The respective State highway departments must be advised of the funds to be made available and other details before they can proceed with preliminary plans. There is no time to lose in passing this legislation.

In my State of Kentucky the legislature has inaugurated a plan for the construction of five new tuberculosis hospitals in the State. Public Law 410 of this Congress provides authorization for appropriations up to $10,000,000 annually, beginning July 1, 1945, for aid to the States for the control of tuberculosis. Much time will be lost, many lives will be snuffed out by this dreaded disease which might be saved, and many man-hours of employment will be lost between now and July 1, 1945. This money should be made available at the earliest possible date.

Another piece of legislation, H. R. 2849, known as the Educational Finance Act of 1943, would assist not only during the reconversion period but benefit the future America. This bill authorizes an appropriation of funds to assist the States and Territories in more adequately financing their systems of public education during emergency and in reducing the inequalities of educational opportunities through public elementary and secondary schools. This bill has been peacefully resting in the House Committee on Education since June 2, 1943, with no action taken on it. Discharge petition No. 12 is now on the Speaker's desk to bring it before the House. It is my contention this legislation, if enacted, would give added employment to many teachers who are now engaged in war production. It is also my contention that no child should be penalized or denied elementary or secondary school advantages because of the locality in which he is born. Under the present system, there is no equality in the educational advantages available to children. This should not be permitted in a country boasting of equal privileges for all.

Statistics recently published indicate that attendance in American high schools dropped 1,000,000 during the last 3 years. This is accounted for by an increase of approximately the same number of boys and girls of 14 to 17 who are employed in industry either full or part time. I maintain better schools, including vocational training, which Federal aid would make possible, would encourage these youngsters to go back to school and thus indirectly aid employment.

The educational provisions in the G. I. bill of rights is a step in this direction and will aid the employment situation.

Another means of unemployment relief, much more constructive, to my mind, than paying large sums to young people to remain in idleness, is to make possible more adequate annuities for the aged.

I am also in favor of expansion of rural electrification. Such a program has great possibilities as a creator of employment.

Summing up the problem of reconversion, the surrender of Germany will not put an end to all war production; neither will it mean immediate demobilization of all the armed forces. The whole country has been forced, and has graciously conceded, to get along without many of the conveniences to which it has been accustomed. Farmers have had to get along without proper machinery and equipment, peacetime industry is anxious to expand, and there is scarcely a home in America that is not waiting for repairs, furniture, and so forth, which only labor can supply.

The people have been urged to buy bonds, and have bought bonds, which will afford them a source of ready money to be converted into durable civilian goods the moment materials and labor can be released and goods manufactured. Many people are now working for patriotic reasons and will retire upon cessation of hostilities. Many wives and mothers are looking forward to the day when the call of their homes may be heeded, rather than the call of their country to work in war plants.

In my opinion, good Americans who believe the people should support the Government, rather than the Government support the people, will favor a program of reconversion such as here outlined. They believe the taxpayers' money should be spent for constructive enterprises, such as better roads, better schools, better health, better homes, and for better care of the aged, thereby making a better America.

Mr. Speaker, I hope this Congress will take immediate steps to enact such legislation without delay.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an article from the West Side Messenger of Indianapolis.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include a number of editorials from Tennessee papers, lamenting the passing of former Senator George W. Norris.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

THE LATE SENATOR GEORGE W. NORRIS

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, the Nation laments the passing of former Senator George W. Norris. The people of the Tennessee Valley, for whom he did so much, are especially grieved. Senator Norris will be remembered as one of the great men of the United States Congress. He will always be remembered by the people of the Tennessee Valley for the contribution he made to our welfare and for his unselfish friendship. His long and untiring fight for the success of T. V. A. stands out as an example of his national vision and of his stature as a truly great statesman. It is appropriate that the great Norris Dam and the city of Norris should serve to keep alive for future generations the name of the man who was so largely instrumental in setting up this project which is one of the Nation's great assets.

Last January, after Senator Norris' retirement from the Senate, a scroll expressing the appreciation of the people of the Tennessee Valley was presented to him. The scroll was signed by the officers of every municipal power board, electric cooperative, and R. E. A. group in the valley. On his passing the sentiment contained in this scroll is reexpressed in perpetuity.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

ARMY-NAVY GAME

Mr. WEISS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

[Mr. WEISS addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in two instances, and in one to include a communication from a serviceman and in the other a part of a column by Bill Cunningham, of Boston.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein an article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. RAMEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, and I also ask unanimous consent to place in the Appendix of the RECORD an address made by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ROWE] on September 3 at Akron, Ohio.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. RIZLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Thursday next, after the legislative business of the day and any other special orders, I may have permission to address the House for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. DAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may address the House today for 15 minutes after the conclusion of the regular business of the day and any other special orders previously made.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, and include an article on millionaire radicals.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, and include a letter from Mr. W. Seger, of Indianapolis, and I also ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHAFER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD in two instances, and in one to include an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

SURVEY OF CONGRESSIONAL LEGISLATIVE PROCEDURE

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include therewith an editorial from the South Bend Tribune.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Speaker, the Senate recently passed a resolution of far greater importance than the attention given it would indicate. It provides for a joint Senate-House survey of congressional legislative procedures and could result in vast savings to the taxpayers.

It is impossible for the Members of Congress themselves to go into each department and section of each bureau to determine for themselves the exact needs of that particular agency, and it is obvious that ambitious bureaucrats are not going to advise congressional committees to lop large sums off their department's budgets. Department heads testify at committee hearings as to their money needs, the President has his Budget Bureau to pass on requests for funds, so why should not Congress have its experts to do the necessary investigation of departments' needs? Such committee experts, responsible only to Congress, could save the taxpayers many, many times the amount of their salaries.

The editorial is as follows:

[From the South Bend Tribune of September 1, 1944]

FOR MODERNIZATION

Without pleasing the radicals who advocate changes that would impair the constitutional checks-and-balances system Congress can consider modernization of its organization and procedures with greater efficiency as the goal. A certain amount of modernization could disarm the radicals. Some phases of the internal organization of Congress and some of its procedures are tending to justify much of the criticism of that legislative body.

Senate approval, therefore, of a resolution proposing establishment of an inter-House committee of 12 to make "a complete study of the organization and operation of the Congress of the United States" obviously is a step in the right direction. Such a study should be conducted by representatives of both Houses. Whether or not a joint committee is necessary at the outset is an authentic question but not necessarily a vital one. If the House of Representatives should consider independent preliminary action to that end an insuperable obstacle apparently would not be raised.

Although the need of some modernization is reasonably plain, hasty action should not and probably will not be demanded by the public. Whatever is done eventually should reflect the best judgment not only of Members of both Houses of Congress but of private authorities on legislative procedure who are sensitive to the vital importance of the legislative branch and respectful of the Constitution and the checks-and-balances system in general. Steady, orderly progress toward modernization would be vastly preferable to fast action that might lead to development of legislative conditions worse, at least from the public-welfare viewpoint, than those abated or eliminated.

As one House passes the resolution for an official study and it goes to the other House the indicated trend does not appear dangerous. One of the most discussed modernization projects is consolidation of some congressional committees. Much duplication serving no constructive purpose is involved in the present method of each House having its own committees to prepare bills for presentation to the full Houses. Loss of time, increased expense to the taxpayers and sometimes confusion are products of this system.

Feeling is also spreading that staffs of experts be formally created for the purpose of helping congressional committees and perhaps even individual Members of the two Houses. Too often it seems that all committee members are not thoroughly familiar with legislative projects they help submit to the full Houses. Too often also some Senators and Representatives lack complete understanding of bills for which they vote in the final tests in the Houses. As matters stand, experts must be "borrowed" from bureaucratic agencies in Washington. A permanent staff of experts mandated to do nothing but help the Members of Congress to shape and to understand legislation might be beneficial not only to the legislators but to the Nation.

SHUT-IN'S DAY

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, we who are privileged to pursue our daily tasks in the hustle and bustle of this great country are not always conscious of our greatest blessing, that of good health. And yet there is scarcely one among us who does not know some person who is spending his life in some hospital or who may be confined to his home for an indeterminable period. Those of us who have sought out these people have found them invariably cheerful and courageous to a degree beyond our own understanding. Many of them are fighting battles of their own which try men's souls and there is reason to believe that this number will be increased daily as the result of the present struggle in which America is engaged.

From time to time, there have been proclamations by various States in the Union to set aside a given day for special attention to these shut-ins. It would seem to me altogether fitting to make this a day of national observance—designating the first Sunday of June of each year for the purpose of encouraging the public to remember those sick and disabled persons, war veterans and civilians alike, who are confined to their homes, in hospitals, sanatoria, or other institutions. I am introducing a resolution to that end.

As an outstanding example of what these shut-ins are doing, I would like to mention Mr. Charles Reid-Burke, an arthritic patient in one of our Washington hospitals. Although completely paralyzed this man conducts a mail-order business from his hospital bed as a means of rehabilitating himself. His spirit remains undaunted; his faith is an inspiration to many who call upon him. These shut-ins, and the term implies those who have been that way since birth as well as others who have had illnesses that have laid them low, need to know that they are remembered and that their lives are dear to us all.

The United States of America Chapter of the Shut-In's Day Association "International," an organization composed of shut-ins throughout the country, is sponsoring the designation of the first Sunday of June as Shut-In's Day. Mr. Burke is the District of Columbia representative.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial paying tribute to Senator Norris.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

SENATOR GEORGE W. NORRIS

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, it was with profound sadness that I learned of the passing of my distinguished friend and co-worker in the cause of public power, former Senator George W. Norris of Nebraska.

As you all know, I was the coauthor with him of the bill that finally became a law creating the Tennessee Valley Authority, which has wrought the greatest development of its kind the world has ever known. It has set an example for the entire Nation to follow, if our people are to enjoy the full benefits of this electric age.

He was a leader in the fight for rural electrification which has done so much for the farmers of the Nation. He regarded the power business as a public business, and electricity as the lifeblood of our advancing civilization. He felt that it was a necessity of our modern life which must be handled by a monopoly, since it would be too expensive for several different concerns to furnish electricity to one community. Besides he pointed out that water power of the Nation already belongs to the Federal Government, which gives it an additional public interest.

Today the American people are enjoying the benefits of the struggle which Senator Norris led, for reduced light and power rates, while millions of farmers throughout the Nation have their homes lighted as a result of those efforts.

Then, too, the T. V. A. and other public power projects are producing the war materials that are bringing us victory in this titanic struggle.

This year the people of this country will use more than 200,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours of electricity. In 1921 they used only 40,000,000,000, or about one-fifth of the amount they are using today.

There are 230,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours of electric energy going to waste every year in our navigable streams and their tributaries which should be developed, and must be developed, for the use of the people as a whole.

Just think what that would mean to our children, the future inhabitants of an electrified America.

We have learned recently that more than 10 percent of the earth's crust is aluminum, and we are going to use this power to develop it.

We are told that there is enough aluminum within 10 feet of the earth's surface to cover the ground a foot deep, or more in volume than all the iron, all the copper, and all the wood in the world. With the aid of electric power, we are bringing in the aluminum age. In the years to come you will see furniture, automobile bodies, streetcars, railroad cars, boats, barges, and building materials made of aluminum.

These are some of the things that are coming to pass in the new age that lies before us, largely as a result of our public power program, which was led by that great humanitarian, Senator George W. Norris, of Nebraska.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a news item from this morning's New York Times with reference to the economic situation in Italy.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include therein an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Thursday next after the disposition of the business on the Speaker's table and other special orders the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BATES] may address the House for 45 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MASON] is recognized for 30 minutes.

A POST-WAR TAX PROGRAM

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, I wish to predicate what I have to say upon the challenging statement, "Our future economic, social, and political life will be determined quite largely by the tax policies and program we adopt for the post-war era." Conceding the truth of this statement then the following facts and opinions should be of interest to the Members of Congress and to the country as a whole. I offer them for the careful consideration of my colleagues, in the hope that they may shed some light upon a most difficult problem that Congress must face and solve. Upon the proper solution of the problem of post-war taxes rests the future of this Nation.

THE PRESENT TAX SITUATION

Mr. Speaker, during the current fiscal year ending June 30, 1945, Uncle Sam will spend $105,000,000,000 and receive in taxes $45,000,000,000, going $60,000,000,000 deeper in debt. This means that at the end of this fiscal year we will owe $250,000,000,000, and if the war lasts until June 30, 1946—and everything seems to point that way—we will have a national debt of $300,000,000,000, twice as much as even the most optimistic economist 3 years ago—yes, even Roosevelt himself—thought we could ever safely

assume. That means we will face a serious financial condition, not a theory, and something must be done about it.

Studying the Treasury Reports issued following the last war by two great men, CARTER GLASS and Andrew Mellon, we learn that they cut the Nation's wartime tax load in half within a short period after the close of that war, and at the same time they reduced the Nation's war debt at the rate of $1,000,000,000 per year, a remarkable achievement, really a financial miracle.

THEN AND NOW

Our total war debt then was $26,000,000,000. Our total war debt this time will be anywhere from two hundred and sixty to three hundred billion dollars. Our peak war tax load then was five and one-half billion dollars. Our peak war tax load this year will be $45,000,000,000. But while the figures are much higher today than they were then, the problem is much the same, and it can be solved in much the same way.

Mr. Speaker, many economists claim that when taxes total 25 percent of the national income they have reached the point of diminishing returns. Today we are taking $45,000,000,000 in Federal taxes out of a national income estimated at $150,000,000,000. This means our Federal taxes alone amount to 30 percent of our national income. When added to State and local taxes, the total tax burden amounts to nearly 40 percent of the national income. Perhaps this tax load is a wartime necessity, but it certainly is not a peacetime possibility. Figuring on a national income of $130,000,000,000 in the post-war period—and that is an optimistic figure—Federal taxes cannot and should not exceed $24,000,000,000—a little more than one-sixth of the national income. That is a safe estimate of what the maximum Federal tax load should be. It allows a margin for State and local taxes during the post-war era before the total tax load will exceed 25 percent of the national income. Now the question arises, Can the Federal Government get along on $24,000,000,000 a year in the post-war period? Budgeting a $24,000,000,000 income for Uncle Sam will mean, roughly:

(a) A $6,000,000,000 yearly service charge on the public debt—three hundred billion at 2 percent.

(b) Six billion dollars applied yearly on the national debt, which means a 50-year period for liquidation.

(c) Twelve billion dollars for the total operating expenditures of the Government, and that must include a greatly expanded Army and Navy upkeep.

Briefly, that is the picture of the post-war tax situation, and a conservative national budget to fit into that picture.

THE NEW DEAL THEORY AND PRACTICE OF TAXATION

Mr. Speaker, Bernard Baruch, in his report on war and post-war adjustment policies, brings a strong indictment against the New Deal tax policies of the past decade. Analyzed and summarized the Baruch reports says in substance:

First. The New Deal tax policies are designed to prevent business concerns from growing and expanding, and new businesses from being created.

Second. Taxes have been levied for three distinct purposes:

(a) To collect necessary revenue for the Government.

(b) To redistribute wealth—a socialistic program.

(c) To penalize success—another socialistic idea, the slow-down principle applied to management.

Third. Baruch also says that at current tax rates neither individuals nor corporations can hope to start new enterprises, because they cannot repay borrowings out of earnings after taxes have been deducted. He says if we want to preserve private enterprise we must make it possible for a man to repay what he borrows within a reasonable time.

Mr. Speaker, the Baruch report is both refreshing and encouraging to one who has had to listen to Morgenthau, Secretary of the Treasury; to Randolph Paul, General Counsel for the Treasury Department; and to Marriner Eccles, Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board—all three of whom have been clamoring for higher, higher, and ever higher Federal taxes on business, and also business earnings when paid to stockholders in the shape of dividends. The New Deal tax policies initiated by these three men have dried up the sources of risk capital and prevented industrial expansion. Their tax policy has been part and parcel of the scarcity program that has been the basis of the New Deal economy. In contrast Baruch claims:

> Lower tax rates, which stimulate a high volume of business and a high national income, will yield greater total tax receipts and more jobs than will high rates, which depress business volume, employment, and income.

Eric Johnston, president of the United States Chamber of Commerce, says:

> Present taxes are too high for American enterprise to function. We won't have to vote socialism; we will get it by default if the Government becomes the only source of new capital for business.

The same thought was expressed many years ago when Chief Justice John Marshall said:

> The power to tax is the power to destroy.

The effect of the New Deal tax program has been to destroy private enterprise by taxation. The Baruch report certifies to this fact. Now, what should our post-war tax program be?

GENERAL SUGGESTIONS

First. Cut the tax burden in half.

Second. Adopt a national economy budget.

Third. See that the tax burden is spread equitably and in such a way that it will stimulate business expansion and thereby create jobs.

SPECIFIC RECOMMENDATIONS

First. Repeal the excess-profits tax.

Second. Revise both corporate and individual tax rates downward, and eliminate all surtaxes.

Third. Levy a single transfer tax to cover both estate and gift taxes, at reasonable rates.

Fourth. Keep excise taxes on luxuries, such as tobacco and liquor, high; and adopt a moderate Federal sales tax.

That is the post-war tax picture as I see it. It should be drafted into the form of a tax bill and be dropped into the legislative hopper the first day of the next session of Congress.

A CEILING UPON FEDERAL TAXATION

Mr. Speaker, in connection with the subject of a post-war tax program we should give some thought to placing a ceiling upon Federal taxation. A resolution calling for a constitutional amendment to place a limit of 25 percent upon Federal taxes has been before the Congress for 5 years, but no action has been taken upon it. Today, 17 States—Wyoming, Rhode Island, Mississippi, Iowa, Maine, Massachusetts, Michigan, Indiana, Arkansas, Delaware, Pennsylvania, Texas, Illinois, Wisconsin, Alabama, Kentucky, New Jersey—are proceeding to force action by petitioning Congress through their legislatures, as provided in the Constitution itself. The amendment proposed would repeal the present sixteenth amendment—income tax—and substitute for it an amendment containing the 25 percent limitation. At present the sky is the limit on rates the Federal Government may levy, and the sky in Federal taxation has about been reached.

The first Federal income tax—1913—had rates that ran from 1 to 6 percent; today the rates run from 19 to 95 percent. Taxpayers this year in the highest brackets actually are required to pay more than 100 percent of their incomes. A limitation upon the power of the Federal Government to tax during peacetime should be adopted, and a 25-percent ceiling is high enough.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MASON. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman mentioned a moderate sales tax as a part of a post-war tax program. What does the gentleman mean by "a moderate sales tax"?

Mr. MASON. I would say a 5-percent general sales tax collected at the source. Call it a manufacturer's tax, if you want to. But that would be what I would term not only a moderate sales tax but also a practical and feasible one.

Mr. McCORMACK. I am glad the gentleman stated "collected at the source," because 15 years ago I agitated the same thing, what is known as a general manufacturer's excise tax, collected at the source, rather than when the buyer goes into the retail store, with all the annoyance that is connected with such a tax.

Mr. MASON. The difficulty of going into a store and collecting a retail tax is that about 27 of our States have State retail taxes, and it would be on top of that. If this tax were collected at the source, it would be much more effectively and much more cheaply handled, and it could be better administered.

Mr. McCORMACK. The individual State would have difficulty in collecting a State tax at the source where the Federal Government would not, because a State collecting the tax at the source would penalize its own industry more in connection with adjoining States and competition, whereas when the Federal Government applies the tax at the source

it applies to all manufacturers throughout the country. As the gentleman knows, my inquiry is most friendly, and is for the purpose of trying to have the record show more pointedly just what the gentleman meant by a moderate sales tax. There are two types of taxes of this character—one collected at the source, commonly and properly referred to as a general manufacturer's excise tax, and then there is the sales tax on the consumer. I thoroughly agree with the gentleman as to the advisability of a manufacturer's excise tax. I advocated it years ago; in fact, we got such a tax placed in one tax bill, but on the floor of the House it was stricken out. I agree that the tax should be imposed at the source rather than on the consumer's end, and I think 5 percent would bring in a very substantial amount. Would the gentleman consider any exemptions to such a tax?

Mr. MASON. I would not.

Mr. McCORMACK. I think that is meeting the question directly and squarely, and I agree with the gentleman.

Mr. MASON. As a student of taxation, may I say that the Federal taxing powers have overlapped and duplicated some of the State taxing powers. There are certain taxes that are much better collected by the Federal Government and others which the State government should preempt.

Mr. McCORMACK. I notice the gentleman referred to a redistribution of wealth. Not for the purpose of controversy, may I say that I am sure the gentleman's charge of socialism in that connection would not apply to a redistribution of income.

Mr. MASON. It would not.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MASON. Yes.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I was very much interested in the gentleman's statement, and I want to thank him for it. I would like to know just what the gentleman would include in the words "general sales tax," and whether or not he would include, in addition to manufacturers, the jobber and wholesaler and everyone above the retailer?

Mr. MASON. If a general sales tax or a manufacturers' tax were collected at the source where the article is produced that would be the end of it.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. It would be then a manufacturers' tax?

Mr. MASON. It would be then a part of the cost of production.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. It would not include a tax on any other business, as in the financial fields?

Mr. MASON. It would not.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. And would not include a tax on any other business, as in the financial fields, on stocks and bonds, or anything?

Mr. MASON. It would not.

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MASON. I yield.

Mr. GIFFORD. The gentleman will recall James M. Beck, who was a great student of government. I want to record him here today. He used to offer many splendid speeches here on various amendments to the Constitution of the United States. I asked him one day if he would not agree with me that the sixteenth amendment had caused more bedevilment to our country and to our Government than any other amendment. He said he would think it over. He came to me a few days afterward and said, "I fully agree with you, the sixteenth amendment to the Constitution is an amendment wherein a few States support the Government. They have learned how to make those few States support the Government."

Mr. MASON. I agree with the gentleman. That is the reason that I advocate changing the sixteenth amendment to place a limit upon the power given in that amendment.

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I want that grand old man, whom I quoted, to go on record; he would vote with the gentleman to repeal this sixteenth amendment.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. RAMEY] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. RAMEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield back my time.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. RAMEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Thursday, after other special orders heretofore entered, I may have permission to address the House for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SMITH] is recognized for 15 minutes.

NEGLECTED MEN IN SOUTHWEST PACIFIC—WAR DEPARTMENT FAILS TO KEEP PROMISE—NO FURLOUGHS AFTER 2 YEARS OF SERVICE

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, it is my duty again to address this House on the subject of furloughs for the men who have been in the southwest Pacific theater of operations for more than 2 years. Last October the War Department announced that a method of giving furloughs to these men had been established. This was great news for the people at home, but still greater news for those boys over there who have been living, fighting, yea, dying, in a "green hell." Almost 1 year later, Mr. Speaker, it is also my duty to report that the War Department has failed to keep its promise to these men, many of whom have served more than 2 years. After all these months but very, very few of them have been furloughed, and I am advised by men and officers over there that unless the program is accelerated considerably a great majority will not get home until after the war, no matter how long it may take. Mr. Speaker, there is a limit to physical endurance. These men expect and demand that Congress by law fix and establish a policy of furlough rotation for troops which serve in areas far from home and in jungle country. The War Department has failed them; they cannot speak for themselves; we are their spokesmen.

Mr. Speaker, on last Friday I introduced House Resolution 632, which makes a request for a full and complete investigation into this matter. This is a vital subject and goes to the very heart of a highly important intangible we call morale.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I yield.

Mr. HINSHAW. As a member on the Subcommittee on Civil Aviation of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, my committee and I have just returned from Alaska. While we were in Alaska we had occasion, of course, to talk with troops in various parts of that great Territory and to ask them what they thought about the troop rotation plan versus the furlough idea. Almost every one of them said that the troop rotation plan was not working out at all, because, if they put in for rotation, it might be 2 or 3 years before their number would come up, and consequently they were forced to choose the furlough, which meant returning to the United States and then back to Alaska. Many of those men in Alaska have been there more than 30 months, away from their homes and families. Some of them have been there since before we were actually attacked at Pearl Harbor. There are units of certain National Guard organizations that were there at that time. I desire to compliment the gentleman upon introducing his resolution, although it seems to me the War Department could take care of this by a sound rotation plan by units and not by individuals. I hope that attention is paid to the gentleman's resolution.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. MURDOCK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I yield.

Mr. MURDOCK. I did not hear the gentleman's resolution, but I heard the remarks just made by the gentleman from California. I think his suggestion of a rotation by units is a good one and hope it may be used. I want to say that I have had numerous letters from Arizona concerning men in the South Pacific who have been there more than 30 months. They complain that the rotation system by individuals now in use is too slow to get them back within the United States in the next several years at the rate it is being applied. They also point out that a stay of 3 weeks or 21 days in the States for those on furlough is inadequate. I think the gentleman is doing well to call attention to this deplorable situation in that area because certainly there is a limit to human endurance. Let us urge a better plan if we can possibly give them relief. I have taken this matter up with Judge Patterson.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I thank the gentleman. I believe with the gentleman from California [Mr. HINSHAW] that this is a matter that could be handled by the War and Navy Departments.

Mr. HINSHAW. Does the gentleman care to yield further?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I yield.

Mr. HINSHAW. At one point we found a military outpost in which there are 19 human beings living within a radius of 100 miles of that spot. Some of those boys have been there for a great many months longer than they should have been. About that time we find that the number of knotholes on the side of a wall becomes a very important question, and one over which personal animosities can arise concerning the count. That sort of thing persists in these isolated outposts. It seems to me that attention should be paid to those conditions here, otherwise we are going to have a lot of psycho cases that we need not have.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. As a matter of fact, those psycho cases are already coming back in great numbers, I understand.

Mr. HINSHAW. They are coming from the Aleutians, from the interior of Alaska, and also from the Yukon territory.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. The War Department says that we have no ships and no replacements which are necessary before those men can be relieved. This, I doubt, but if this resolution is adopted we can get the whole story. I am told that 75 percent of our ships return empty, and there always seems to be ample space for thousands of returning war brides.

Our men out on the fighting fronts and their families find it difficult to reconcile these facts and they now demand action. A soldier out there wrote me recently: "You can bet that we shall have long memories, and when we return we intend to have these injustices righted. We will not forget." There is bitterness, disappointment, and disillusionment in that young man's heart. Yes, Mr. Speaker, we will have to answer the wrath of those serving out there unless we ascertain all of the facts in this situation. I urge that the Military Affairs Committee will give House Resolution 632 immediate consideration and I shall appreciate the support of other Members in this request. These men are entitled to fair treatment.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may insert at this point in the RECORD, and as part of my remarks a series of letters from the Honorable Henry L. Stimson, Secretary of War; Gen. Douglas MacArthur; and letters from soldiers and constituents all of which relate to this furlough matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PRIEST). Without objection, the letters will be included.

There was no objection.

The letters referred to are as follows:

GENERAL HEADQUARTERS
SOUTHWEST PACIFIC AREA,
OFFICE OF THE COMMANDER IN CHIEF,
May 23, 1944.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN SMITH: Your letter of May 13, 1944, has been received. I am as solicitous as possible of the welfare of the officers and enlisted men in this command and have done everything in my power to effect a reasonable rotation to the United States and to give recuperational leave, but I am limited by War Department policies which are dictated by the lack of shipping in the Pacific Ocean. The selection of individuals to be relieved from the theater or to be granted leave, within the limitation of available facilities, is in the hands of local commanding officers who have an intimate knowledge of the merits of individual cases. I shall continue to do everything possible but because of the shortage of shipping in the Pacific there is no adequate solution to the problem. The return to the United States without replacement of all men who have served a specified length of time would, of course, halt our offensive against Japan and might indefinitely prolong the war.

I have sent a copy of your letter and of my reply to the Commanding Officer of the One Hundred and Thirty-fifth Medical Regiment for his consideration. Our reports indicate that the general service of this unit has been excellent and that its morale and spirits are high.

Very truly yours,

DOUGLAS MACARTHUR.

WAR DEPARTMENT,
Washington, D. C., May 27, 1944.

DEAR MR. SMITH: I have your letter of May 23 and enclosure in further regard to the rotation of troops from the South and Southwest Pacific areas.

Permit me to reinvite your attention to the following statement in my letter of November 2 to you: * * * "you have my firm assurance that the War Department will do everything physically and militarily practicable to alleviate the rigorousness of our soldiers' service overseas." I made this statement in all sincerity and assure you that the War Department will return as many of these men as possible under the circumstances.

In this connection I was pleased to note the observation in your speech of May 17 that, "We are all cognizant of the difficulties involved in this situation; no one has a desire to interfere with those charged with the responsibility for a successful prosecution of this war. If the retention of men in that area is the difference between success or failure of that campaign, then by all means the men must be retained there." This statement is the crux of the matter. Military limitations alone, not our disinterest, have prevented a more liberalized rotation policy.

We are keeping in intimate touch with the morale of the men in the Southwest Pacific areas. Of course, you realize that General MacArthur also is most vitally concerned. This is one of the most important aspects of his command responsibility. Neither he nor the War Department will permit the morale of the troops in this area to deteriorate to such an extent that either the war's prosecution or the ultimate welfare of the men themselves will be adversely affected.

Sincerly yours,

HENRY L. STIMSON.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Now, Mr. Speaker, in support of the statements I have made, I wish to submit excerpts of letters that I have received from men in the Southwest Pacific:

NEW GUINEA, *April 30, 1944.*

DEAR MR. SMITH: To you, the following topic may be of little interest, although I hope not, for to us it is of vital importance. I look to you as an unknown friend who might be of some aid in getting us a little consideration on this "getting home" subject.

As you know our outfit is going into its twenty-seventh month overseas. Not a man as yet has left. For the months of June, July, and August our company has been allotted two places as its quota to go home. At this rate, for example, I who am on the last list to go, stand a good chance of spending another 2 years here. Here may I add that along with 50 others I was sent overseas with this regiment after only 5 weeks of training in the States, so that practically all of my time in the service has been overseas.

Now it seems that if the American boy does his duty as he is called upon to do it, the least the Government should also do, is its duty to that one; in regard to sending him home after his allotted time determined by the "rotation policy." It appears that they are holding to this policy legally by a mere shred.

The touring Senators and newsmen will give ample evidence that the most important question on the men's minds was, "When are we getting home?" And, how jubilant they were when promised a trip home after a specified time—in this area that time being 2 years, compared with 18 months in all other areas. Yet the world-wide fighting Aussie will tell you that this climate, terrain, and living conditions are the hardest a soldier will endure anywhere. Who arrived at this decision (2 years time) certainly used unexplained logic.

Is it being unpatriotic to expect to get home (only for a short period) after years (as promised) or 2½ years in this tropical climate? Most certainly, entertainers, movie stars, and recreational activities will not supplant the yearning for home and loved ones.

Also, one must take into consideration that this area is like none other; in that we might be termed virtually isolated, since there are no towns or cities of any kind about, no diversion, not even a civilian or life as we know it back in the States anywhere—so that the utter monotony is a hardship, too.

It is not to be supposed that the soldier, upon returning home, expects to then remain there for the duration. At any time after his short leave is up, the soldier is subject to go wherever they may deem it necessary to send him. Who can say that he wouldn't? Can one be called unpatriotic considering the foregoing?

Recently, upon touring one of the camps here, an inspector general, upon being questioned about leaves home, by some of our men, replied that: "The rotation policy did not guarantee all of us getting home—even for a leave—that some of us would remain for the duration." Is this what was intended to be believed by the parents and loved ones, and soldiers when the news was released concerning this rotation policy? Certainly not. Who can be responsible for such an interpretation? We, who have been living in a world of hope since that policy was announced, find that little faith can be put in the Government's word.

About a year ago a notice from General MacArthur's headquarters stated that upon the relief of the then shortage of shipping, we would be gradually relieved. Now that the Mediterranean Sea is ours, Kaiser continues to break ship-building records, and the combined fleets of the Allies is admittedly all out of proportion to their enemies—plus issued statements of our surplus of shipping, it would seem that his (General MacArthur's) point has been cleared up.

Another reason why we aren't being relieved, we are told, is because the replacements are not as yet qualified to substitute for us. An obvious contradiction of fact—for in my own case if after 5 weeks of Army training, over 2 years ago, I was considered overseas material, certainly these men who have been in the Army a year and more, are more fit than I was at that time.

I only hope and pray that some definite policy will be adopted, whereby we may have some hope of getting home soon—if only for a short time.

Many thanks to you, Representative SMITH, for giving ear to a downhearted and homesick soldier.

May God bless you and yours, I remain,

Sincerely,

NEW GUINEA, *May 6, 1944.*

HI FOLKS: Things over here are in the same sad plight that they have been. It makes me sick to think about it so will just drop the subject. One of these days I will blow off again and reexplain the whole situation to you. I hate to get into these moods though, because I can feel the effects of them for 2 days later. I suppose my letters for the past few weeks have been disheartening but there is no use trying to hide the truth as we shall never get anything done that way. Even the Aussies know this place is no good for any man for when their men have been here for 15 months they are required to send them back for a 6-month break.

Mr. Speaker, more soldier letters could b produced but the letters above are sufficient evidence of the state of mind that these men are in. And this attitude is reflected on the home front, too, and I submit herewith a few letters from the folks back home.

CLEVELAND, OHIO, *May 24, 1944.*

DEAR SIR: Permit me to extend my heartfelt appreciation of the remarks which you made in Congress and which appear in the RECORD of May 17, 1944, with reference to the conditions which exist in the Southwest Pacific area.

Within the past few days the death of my son in New Guinea has been reported to me by the War Department. While details are lacking, I am satisfied that his death was directly due to the diet or lack of diet, the climate, and the failure of our Government to permit the rotation of troops in this area after service of not less than 12 months.

It is bad enough to have to lose men in battle. That is unavoidable in time of war. But to permit the loss of lives, health, and sanity to thousands of our young men because of inefficiency, bungling, and neglect in the administration of our armed forces is inexcusable and deserving of the most severe condemnation. So long as the War Department has shown its utter inability to cope with this situation, it certainly is incumbent upon Congress to exert its power to remedy the situation forthwith so that other boys might not suffer the same fate that my son did.

Very truly yours,

———.

EUCLID, OHIO, *May 25, 1944.*

DEAR SIR: The enclosed letter (to President Roosevelt) explains itself. You may use it in any shape, manner, or form if it will help my dear son's beloved remaining buddies of the Thirty-second Division, mostly from the State of Wisconsin.

I am sending it to you as a salute and tribute for the many times you have carried the torch for the lads trapped like rats in the Southwest Pacific. As a daily reader of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD I well know what you tried to do and what others failed to do.

I did the same thing in a humbler capacity, but it fell on deaf ears, as people are living on the let-George-do-it theory for years now, so why bother. God bless you.

Sincerely,

———.

MILWAUKEE, WIS., *May 25, 1944.*

Hon. Representative SMITH:

In respect to your plan of obtaining furloughs for servicemen, I hereby present a case as follows:

My son-in-law has been in service 3 years up to May 30, 1944. Over 2 years in foreign service and never had a furlough. He is a married man and his wife was operated on about a month ago and his mother died a week ago. The American Red Cross tried to get a furlough, but no success. I think I am justified in writing you as a man who served overseas over 2 years as this boy has done certainly is entitled to a furlough for the good of the service he has rendered. I am writing you for my daughter. This boy being my son-in-law, I know you can take his case up at Washington, D. C., as a servant of our community and country. Everything you do in this case will be wholeheartedly appreciated with thanks.

Respectfully,

———.

EDGERTON, WIS., *May 26, 1944.*

DEAR SIR: From all reports, our boys of the Thirty-second must be given a furlough now.

My son has been in service over 3 years, more than 2 years overseas, and in that time he has had one furlough home. Certainly it is not the shipping problem as we seem to have plenty of transportation facilities available to bring the girls from Australia and New Zealand across. Why couldn't our boys be given that space?

Are our own people, and especially those poor boys who have lived and existed any old way not to be considered? If not, I can't see what my three sons and one son-in-law are fighting for. Mr. SMITH, please give this your immediate attention and earn the gratitude of both boys and mothers.

Sincerely,

———.

Mr. DILWEG. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I yield.

Mr. DILWEG. Would the gentleman be so kind as to insert in the RECORD a letter that I have received on the same subject from Adjutant General Ulio?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I will be glad to.

Mr. DILWEG. I think it would assist in our general effort to get some respite for these boys who are in the South Pacific and many other parts of the world.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I thank the gentleman.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the additional letter may be included.

There was no objection.

(The letter referred to follows:)

AUGUST 5, 1944.

Hon. LA VERN R. DILWEG,
Representative in Congress,
Green Bay, Wis.

DEAR MR. DILWEG: I have your letter of August 1, 1944, enclosing a newspaper clipping, and making further reference to the return of military personnel from overseas. You also make reference to a previous letter dated July 31, 1944, on this same subject. I addressed a letter to you on August 4 in reply thereto which you have, no doubt, received.

The return of soldiers from foreign theaters for any purpose has been delegated entirely to the discretion of the commanding general of the theater involved, with the result that the determination whether an individual may be spared from his assignment is the responsibility of his theater commander and will not be initiated in the War Department. I might observe, however, that there is no set period of duty on foreign service before a soldier may be returned to the United States, the governing criterion being military requirements, the nature of the soldier's duty, and similar factors which are entirely local in character.

It may be helpful to explain the procedures involved in the return of soldiers from overseas. As you know, the War Department has never questioned the desirability of returning men to the United States who have served overseas for long periods. The fact is, the matter has been under constant study since the war began. Until recently, however, the lack of shipping space has been an insurmountable obstacle, but the shortage is now partially remedied and has permitted some liberalization of our rotation policies.

Units and individuals within each oversea theater are constantly rotated from combat duty to rest areas, and, subject to shipping limitations, theater commanders have authority to select individuals in their commands for return to the United States. Among the soldiers now being returned are battle-trained officers and enlisted men to act as instructors and aid in the formulation of new training doctrines and techniques; those who require medical attention unavailable overseas, or whose physical condition warrant their return; and those returned for emergency reasons. We also are implementing personnel rotation policies for most overseas areas and plan to extend and increase these rotations as rapidly as circumstances permit. However, it is impracticable, as well as incongruous from the military standpoint, to remove entire units from an active theater of war.

As the situation now stands, soldiers in Alaska and the Caribbean Defense Command with more than 2 years' service in those areas and certain numbers of those with over 18 months' service in the north African theater may normally be returned to the United States. A procedure has only recently been placed in operation which will effect the return of some of the soldiers on a rotational basis who have been in the South Pacific and Southwest Pacific theaters for 2 years or longer.

Unfortunately so many factors must be considered in connection with returning able-bodied personnel from overseas and, at the same time, providing suitable replacements to continue the prosecution of the war, that it is virtually impossible to prescribe any fixed procedure applicable to all areas under all conditions. However, we are attempting to effect as complete an exchange of personnel as possible within various military limitations unavoidably imposed upon us. You will appreciate that the continuation and/or liberalization of the present policy will depend upon the course of the war, the availability of shipping facilities and replacements, the local situation in each theater, and similar military considerations.

Our primary mission must continue to be the successful conclusion of the war as promptly as possible, with the least expenditure of life and property. Any fixed requirement which would effect the return of individuals or organizations to the United States after certain specified periods of service overseas would result only in the absorption of our facilities and manpower in the movement of large numbers of troops without compensating increases in effective strength throughout the various theaters; moreover, the adverse effect of such a policy upon military strategy and projected tactical operations would result in an inexcusable and expensive delay in the date of final victory.

I appreciate and share the feeling that these men should be returned as soon as possible to the United States. This will be done, but our plans must remain subject to our military needs.

With kindest regards,

Sincerely yours,

J. A. ULIO,
Major General,
The Adjutant General.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I call attention to the report of 5 United States Senators whose observations on a 45,000-mile trip to the war areas were reported to the Congress in the form of 10 conclusions. One of these conclusions, dealing with the subject under consideration, was as follows:

8. A policy of relieving men overseas after they have served a certain length of time would be in the interest of efficiency as well

as conducive to physical and mental welfare. The committee is aware of the shipping problems which have created this situation. It believes that the shipping situation is now improving. A definite promise to a man that after a certain length of time he will be replaced, is a big morale factor.

Here we have the studied conclusion of men who realize the importance of a definite and unequivocal policy of rotation of those men who are today serving in the southwest Pacific. As I have previously pointed out, the need for immediate action is imperative. It should not be delayed any longer. Thousands of these men who ask for just a brief respite from jungle warfare have been in uniform for almost 4 years. They are the National Guard units of that famous Thirty-second Division from Michigan and Wisconsin; they are the citizen-soldiers who were ready to defend their country before Pearl Harbor. We owe them consideration and fair treatment now. The purpose of my resolution is to get at the facts, let us find out if there is actually a shortage of ships and replacements at this time. The responsibility is now upon the proper House committee.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I yield.

Mr. HINSHAW. I understand the Inspector General, or a representative of his office, made a tour of Alaska and its posts, and that his report was terse and to the point. It was to the effect that there is nothing wrong with the morale of our troops in Alaska that a sound troop-rotation plan would not cure.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I thank the gentleman from California.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MAAS] is recognized for 15 minutes.

AMERICA'S FUTURE IS IN THE AIR

Mr. MAAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include therein certain excerpts from letters and reports.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. MAAS. Mr. Speaker, for some time I have had a growing concern which I am certain is also being felt by every other Member of Congress, as well as by the American people at large, about what we may expect, and should plan for, in the aftermath of the present war.

All Americans now believe in the certainty of a relatively early United Nations military victory, this belief being based largely on reports and public statements of heads of Government agencies and assurances we have received from our military leaders. It seems to be a fact, however, that as our conviction grows that we shall win an early military victory, our doubts or fears increase as to how the United States of America may fare in the peace terms and in the economic war that will certainly follow the military conflict. In this respect, it has been pointed out that it is only natural to assume that some of our present Allies will be competitors in the forthcoming economic battle.

There is a growing belief throughout our land that there has never been a time in the history of our great country when real patriotic effort and statesmanship was more sorely required than will be needed during the ensuing months, in order that our people may be fairly and adequately safeguarded during the years following World War No. 2.

During the period between World War No. 1 and World War No. 2, foreign powers have been actively engaged in planting, in this country, many foreign-born ideas and "isms", for the purpose of influencing and shaping public opinion in America along lines that would be of material benefit to such foreign countries, and harmful to us; ideas that would enable other sections of the world to take away from our country the leadership we now have in things and activities that mean so much to the prosperity, progress, and happiness of the American people.

There is a growing alarm among my constituents, and yours, that the dissemination of these various foreign "isms" in this country are now increasing to such an extent that unless our leaders and moulders of public opinion exercise the greatest energy, intelligence, and patriotic effort, we may find after the war is ended that we have lost the peace, and at least acquiesced in American standards of living, freedom of thought, action, opportunity, and general welfare being endangered or actually taken away.

National policies relating to both domestic and international activities and rights of Americans are of growing importance, and every good American has the right and the duty to express his or her thoughts about such things, to their executive officials and to their Congress.

I am convinced that there has never been a time when Congress had a more serious or demanding obligation to its country, its future prosperity and safety, than it has on its shoulders today in matters relating to the war's aftermath.

The American people are becoming more and more seriously concerned about secret agreements reportedly being entered into during this period between major and minor officials of our country and officials of the Allied Nations. Our people recognize the propriety and necessity of certain types of secret understandings between certain officials of our Government and those of Allied Nations on matters of a military nature. It is recognized that divulging our military plans in detail might endanger the war effort, but we feel equally certain that agreements as to post-war policies, not connected with the war effort, are dangerous to the future welfare of our people and even to our future friendly relationships with foreign powers, unless such agreements have been given advance study by Congress, and even until the American public has had an opportunity to analyze them with reference to possible results and their effects on future generations. The only justification for secrecy is to protect military secrets. The American people are entitled to full information on all else, and especially on commitments made in their name.

Disturbing rumors are rife throughout the land and, particularly in Washington, as to secret agreements on post-war matters being discussed or made, without the benefit of congressional deliberations. Perhaps the majority, and I hope all, of these disturbing stories are rumors, without the foundation of fact, but I believe that Congress has the responsibility to our people, to make certain in every possible manner that no unnecessary trading away of rights of future generations of Americans shall be accomplished by any agency or representative of our Government, no matter how sincere and honest, though misguided, their efforts may be.

On matters of such extreme importance affecting national policy, particularly with reference to international activities, we must all, at least temporarily, disregard partisan politics, and work together as a well-organized, cooperative, and patriotic team, putting up a solid front for the rest of the world.

It is divulging no military secret when we admit the fact that there are many differences of opinion between leaders of the Allied Nations as to post-war policies, spheres of influence, and so forth. I am certain that there is no one in our Government who knows, and can express with absolute assurance, what the attitude on post-war policies will be of Chiang Kai-shek, Stalin, or Churchill, much less the attitude of our military enemies. The ability and statesmanship of our leaders is challenged by this situation, and we shall certainly be faced with new problems in the peace era which we have not yet had the opportunity to study, and which are so entirely new and complicated and far-reaching that they are potentially as dangerous to our country as a 6-ton blockbuster would be dropped upon an unprotected auditorium packed with helpless humanity.

Theories and idealistic suggestions are interesting as subjects of study or entertainment, but we cannot afford to be other than most realistic, intelligent and patriotic in dealing with the new post-war problems with which we are faced as a result of the present most brutal and merciless conflict in the history of human beings.

A case in point, and one which is of such vital importance to the country's welfare that it deserves the most careful study and thoughtful consideration that can be given it by every Member of this House, is national policy for world-wide air transporation after the war is over.

There has been considerable discussion of the subject, and that in itself, is good. We have to have full and free discussion to bring out the facts upon which to make decisions. Unfortunately, however, the loudest and most persistent talking has been singularly unrealistic, and worse than that, it has ignored the fundamental consideration, which is the position of the United States in the international air transport picture.

I refer specifically to arguments advanced and eloquently advocated for free and open competition among American companies operating in the international air transport field.

To cry out for freedom of competition is to voice a popular theme. But in this particular case it is a tragically unrealistic approach to the problem. Within the borders of our own country we can profit by competition between our able American companies, but in the foreign field, unbridled competition among ourselves is not necessary, and more than that, it would be a definite hazard to our national economy. You ask why? Competition among ourselves is unnecessary because there is already enough competition in the field—more than enough—to spur our own people on to higher and broader achievement. All the major foreign powers have their own highly developed international air transport systems. We have to meet that foreign competition and do better than our rivals if we want to lead the way in global air transportation after the war, as we did prior to Pearl Harbor. That is why unlimited competition would be a hazard to our own economy.

We are not going to get anywhere by scattering our national effort into as many different operating companies as may have the desire to fly the oceans. We have to unify our effort, combining and coordinating our resources in such a way as to make the strongest possible showing in comparison with our foreign rivals.

We simply cannot afford to dissipate our energies in fighting among ourselves for foreign markets and foreign trade routes in the air. If we do, our competitors among the other nations, with their heavily government subsidized and controlled overseas air lines will play one American air line against another to the disaster of our whole American effort in world air commerce. This coming trade war in the air will be ruthless. Expect no international concessions to us as an expression of appreciation by other nations for our aid to them in this war. It will be every nation for itself. Therefore, the United States must be as well organized and united in its effort for the battles of peace as for the battles of war. Our overseas air routes should be operated by one American company, preferably owned cooperatively by all domestic air lines, at least in the first few years. Our competition will be with government owned, controlled, or financed foreign air-line monopolies. We had better not divide our energies and our strength in this field, competing among ourselves, but rather unite all of our resources and energies into a national effort for our proper place in world air commerce. The leading position that we now hold in the world can be lost overnight when this war is over, if we fumble the ball in this matter.

Policy for international air transport is a complete subject, and I will not pretend that I can give you the right answers to all the questions today. But I do ask that you keep an open mind and not permit yourselves to be swayed by the persuasiveness of those who want to get in on the ground floor of a good thing to serve their own interests in their own way. Apply the test of the national interest.

How can we operate international air transport so as to maintain the leading position of our country on the international air lanes—the position won prior to the war by this country's international operation?

In the foreign field we cannot afford to serve the interests of any one individual or any one company. We must serve the interests of 130,000,000 Americans.

In due course, Members of this House will be called upon to cast their votes for or against certain proposals, and I want to call your attention to a very thorough and statesmanlike job of fact finding that already has been accomplished by a Senate subcommittee, and which will be of assistance to Members in reaching decisions.

The very competent Senate Commerce Committee, under the chairmanship of Senator JOSIAH BAILEY, through a subcommittee under the leadership of Senator BENNETT CLARK, have conducted executive hearings for some months in an endeavor to separate the wheat from the chaff on the important subject of international air transportation and have made a report by letter to the President very recently.

This subcommittee has devoted a great deal of time and study to the subject. I am informed it has had many competent and well-informed witnesses, including executives of all American air lines concerned.

Many controversial issues are involved, which has been at least partially responsible for conducting the hearings in executive sessions; it being important that all witnesses be able to speak freely and frankly and not be compelled to run the risk of public misinterpretation of ideas during an intermediate period of presentation. The subject is that complex. I know their task is a heavy one and of such importance that no single detail should be dealt with in haste.

In view of the fact that we will now have the benefit of the studies of the above committee, it appears to me that none should be influenced at this time by the self-serving statements or propaganda that are being put out by any prejudiced person or groups, political and industrial.

Permit me to quote from the letter of the Senate Commerce subcommittee to the President of the United States, dated August 19, 1944. I am quoting random paragraphs from this letter:

> The committee is deeply impressed with the importance of the decisions which must now be reached; whether there should be any change in United States policy in the matter of regulating international air transport with foreign countries and whether the United States should have a number of American flag air lines operating abroad or concentrate American operations under a single system in which all transportation interests able to contribute would be permitted to participate. In these decisions, the advantage of any one air line or group of air lines must be subordinated to the paramount national interest. Policies which will best assure the United States retaining the position of leadership in international air transport, to which its resources and geographical situation entitle it, should be adopted. * * *
>
> The question of whether or not the United States should now modify its historic position as to sovereignty of the air above its borders and to what extent the United States may wisely go in subscribing to the various doctrines being proposed that contemplate general agreements with another nation or group of nations concerning freedom of the air or freedom of innocent transit seem to the committee to invite the most careful consideration by both the executive and legislative branches of the Government and particularly of those concerned with the determination of policy. * * *
>
> All the evidence before the committee has indicated that approximately 75 percent of international air travel may be expected to be of United States origin. Under these circumstances, the United States would seem to be entitled to expect a position of preeminence in international air operation.
>
> In the special report of the Civil Aeronautics Board on International Air Transport Policy under date of April 12, 1944, it is recommended that the Governmental agreements suggested "should place no limitation on the total volume of operation on particular routes agreed upon." The consequences of such a policy, if adopted, seem to the committee to offer great dangers to the development of United States international air transport. Under such a policy under the lower operating costs of foreign carriers with lower wage levels traffic of United States origin might well come to be monopolized by foreign flag lines to the very great prejudice of the national interests of the United States. * * *
>
> Whether or not American international air transport should follow the pattern that has been adopted by all principal foreign trading nations, or should develop several independent systems, each to serve a separate trade area abroad, presents a question of policy for legislative as well as executive consideration.
>
> A number of important American companies concerned with air as well as surface transportation have presented the advantages of creating a community company to represent the United States effort abroad in which all transportation interests able to contribute by air, sea, and land may pool their resources and facilities to present a united and coordinated air transport system to meet the undoubted severe competition of other nations that the United States must face in the post-war period and American labor organizations have shown great interest in the advantages of such a plan.

Foreign commerce, in all of its phases, has, during the past 50 years, become of utmost importance to our country, therefore, every American activity even remotely affecting our future foreign commerce should be dealt with in the soundest possible manner. In this connection it appears to me that we should make sound plans that would result in at least 50 percent of our future foreign commerce being carried on American bottoms. I understand that as late as 1939, in spite of the millions our Government has appropriated as subsidies to our shipping companies, less than 25 percent of American commerce was carried on American bottoms.

To avoid a growing army of unemployed, a lowering of wage schedules and standards of living, in the war's aftermath we must prepare now to secure for our people a fair share of the expected increase in foreign commerce. We must

make it possible for a substantial number of American families to gain their livelihood from such activities, we must train a fair percentage of our youth to engage in this field.

When individuals or groups approach the subject dispassionately and seek to get at the fundamentals, the results in many cases are much happier. Among such are the conclusions reached by the great railroad labor organizations of our country with reference to national aviation policy. Quite naturally, railroad labor executives have looked for the implications of the situation which involved wage levels and standards of living. It was certainly both sensible and patriotic for labor to give thoughts to these phases, since post-war standards of living are of paramount importance to all of us. The labor organizations apparently looked far beyond their own immediate interests and thought in terms of the welfare of the Nation as a whole—that being their own ultimate interest as well. For example, Alvanley Johnson, grand chief engineer of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, and A. F. Whitney, president of the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, in a joint statement regarding national policy on aviation, used these words, and I quote only a small portion of their statement:

That post-war development of international air commerce will have a far-reaching effect upon our world society and the future of America is regarded as a major post-war certainty by nearly everyone. We believe that the time has come when our Government should assume a leading part in the shaping of America's future international and domestic air-transport policy. We believe that there should be a thorough public discussion of this important problem, and that its solution should not be left entirely to diplomatic negotiations. The people of the United States should move now to formulate and establish a comprehensive policy. * * *

The present war has seen the development of air power as a third major branch of the military. Nations heretofore have competed principally in the building up of armies and navies. We have now three dimensional warfare. If the United Nations fail to establish the machinery to a secure world peace, then a key issue in the preparation for the inevitable World War No. 3 will be that of air policy. Therefore, considerations of international air policy are not alone simple considerations of labor policy as such and of maximum service at minimum cost. International (and also domestic) air transport policy is inextricably enmeshed with the issue of national safety and of war and peace.

Sovereignty of the skies describes the system under which all international air transport has been developed. It established that each nation shall have full authority or sovereignty over the air space above its own territorial domain. Under this system air lines carrying the American flag are now leading in the field of international air commerce. This principle means that foreign air lines cannot land, refuel, and do business in this country or fly their planes over it except as authorized in a specific franchise.

The term "freedom of the air" would seem to imply the right of the international air carriers of all nations to fly anywhere and land anywhere and do business anywhere on the face of the earth without restriction of national boundaries. The British interests, who are now the leading exponents of the principle, have broken down the definition into three parts: First, the freedom of peaceful transit over all territories for the aircraft of all nations; secondly, the free access to airports and other air facilities; thirdly, the freedom to transport international traffic, including goods and passengers, under any flag from any point of origin to any destination.

In general we believe that the unsettled international situation and the unpredictable ultimate results of post-war peace plans call for a continued maintenance, in fact a freezing, of our policy. We are therefore opposed to any relaxation of our present control of our air space. For the present we must consider complete sovereignty of the air as a necessary principle of national safety. Until the machinery of post-war peace has been designed and made operative it would be unrealistic, in fact national folly, to barter away any military and commercial protection or advantage which sovereignty now gives the United States.

High wage standards are essential in a highly skilled industry like air transportation. Government policy should be devoted to the support of such standards and the protection of the American carrier, maintaining them against cheap labor of foreign powers. Such a policy will react to maintain wage standards in all other forms of transportation and the American standard of living. We have, therefore, suggested in point 1 above that the Congress study this problem.

It is by no means certain that the United Nations will be able to agree on a decent and durable peace after the Axis Powers are defeated. In any event, until such a peace is assured the American people should not sink their Navy; junk, abandon, or sell their merchant marine; barter away our large reserves of aircraft; or in any way relinquish their present advantages in commercial aeronautics and military air power.

Our No. 1 post-war objective is a just and stable peace. The above-outlined policies should be subordinate to this grand objective. Any projected plans for a secure peace will involve the knotty question of national sovereignty. Let's see the blueprints of the peace before we throw away any of the valuable tools which we can use to build it or any of the useful weapons which we must defensively keep if we cannot attain it.

I would also like to call your attention to a recently published statement by George Meany, secretary-treasurer of the American Federation of Labor, writing in the American Federationist, in which he has gone thoroughly into the implications of international air transportation to the future of our country and in which final paragraphs he concludes as follows:

In the final analysis, let us remember that the whole problem of civilian air transport in the future is inevitably tied to our future as a nation. Who flies airplanes over our country is our business. Who makes the airplanes that fly over our country and at what wages these planes are made is also our business. Let us in this case decide coolly and calmly for ourselves what we should do in the air-transport field of the future to protect ourselves. Let us not make such decision on an emotional basis superinduced by a slogan that sounds good to us.

Let those who are interested in avoiding unnecessary unemployment among American workers and in protecting American wage standards from the unfair competition of low-wage countries operating through government-subsidized monopolies, avoid being carried away by "freedom of the air."

Let us keep in mind the thought that, before buying an article so attractively painted and so urgently offered, it is well to remember a much older and better pedigreed slogan: Caveat emptor—let the buyer beware.

Another interesting report on this same subject is contained in the December issue of International Conciliation gotten out by the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, in which Dr. Arthur E. Trexler analyzes the various theories and recommendations advanced by certain groups and then summarizes the situation in part as follows:

Commercial air power, whether we like it or not, is going to be a spearhead instrument of national policy so long as any vestige of nationalism remains in the world political structure. To ignore this fact would be dangerous, and to neglect it would be suicidal. The policy of the United States on international air transport should be one of enlightened self-interest for the immediate future, coupled with a dynamic long-term policy of international cooperation and good neighborliness.

The idea of freedom of the air is admirable as a long-term goal, but it is utterly impractical under present conditions. Without an international civil aeronautics administration, which would necessarily work in cooperation with other international bodies, the ideology of freedom of the air is simply a cloak for anarchy in international air transportation. Neither the idealists nor the air-line leaders who take a realistic point of view should stand in the way of an undertaking to secure regulation of world air traffic. The fact that the voices which have been raised in favor of this so-called freedom are articulate and strong will not count in the balance when the problem is really faced and all the facts are represented in international negotiations.

The present practice of the major powers with respect to the securing of operating rights in other countries should be continued. This practice consists of the conclusion of liberal reciprocal agreements between the leading nations and the obtaining of unilateral franchises covering rights to operate air lines in other countries. A general policy of reciprocal agreements would lead to dilution of the American position on the trade routes of the world, particularly in areas where our air lines would cross a large number of small countries.

Both the labor and the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace publications and the Meany article on the important subject of national aviation policy should be studied by all concerned.

Thousands of American men and women are dying on foreign fields in an endeavor to protect the country and the homes of their descendants against the efforts of any other nation or nations to take away or endanger the rights and opportunities of Americans. Make no mistake about it, our fighting men on the war fronts of the world are fighting and dying primarily for the purpose of protecting America and Americans. Self-preservation is and always will be the first law of nature. If while American soldiers are protecting the future of their own country and own people our Government incidentally finds it possible to succor peoples of other countries, our fighting men will not object, provided that in doing so our Government has not given away rights, material things, and opportunities of American citizens of this and following generations.

We all know that our country has no desire to seize territory or rights from any nation as a result of this war. We

do not want to take anything away from any other nation, victor or vanquished, that is rightfully theirs, but neither do we want to find ourselves in the position when the smoke of battle is cleared away, of having acquiesced, much less of having mistakenly arranged, to give away to other nations anything that rightfully belongs to American posterity.

In this connection our attention is called to a public statement of some months ago credited to that great leader of the British Empire, Prime Minister Churchill, to the effect that he did not become Prime Minister of England to liquidate the British Empire. We may be equally certain that Stalin is as patriotic and nationalistic with reference to his own country and does not propose to give away to us or to any other nation anything he may want for Russia. These two able leaders are indeed great and patriotic in the interests of their countries, and in no uncertain terms indicate to the rest of the world that they consider the interests of their respective countries first. The leaders and citizens of all other nations are becoming more and more nationalistic in their ideas and efforts, and we certainly cannot afford to be less so.

This does not in any way imply any unwillingness to join other nations in cooperative efforts to maintain the world peace. We cannot contribute effectively to such cooperative efforts, however, unless we are ourselves strong at home. A weakened United States will not be much help to strengthen the world.

It is perhaps unfortunate for us that we are about to be faced with a heated partisan political fight during the most critical period of our existence, but we must, regardless of political faith, indulge in partisan politics, only to the extent that such activities do not jeopardize the future of our people.

It is not my intention nor desire to criticize the sincerity of purpose nor to impugn the motives of any of the officials or representatives of our Government who may or may not be carrying on secret negotiations relating to post-war policy. However, it is not only the right but the duty of all good Americans to question the judgment of any official of our country when we honestly feel that the judgment is subject to question or that the actions of such official may conceivably result in needlessly giving away American rights or sovereignty of any kind.

Our great and generous people are taking care of, on our own shores, literally thousands of refugees from war-stricken foreign lands. In addition, we are feeding, clothing, and financing millions of war-ravaged people in their own countries. We are, through lend-lease and other methods furnishing the sinews of war, in large quantities, to all of our allies. We are doing our full share, and more, to finance the war and to aid the people of the rest of the world, to an extent never before done by any country.

Many of the war-ravaged and destitute foreigners for whom our people are making great sacrifices will certainly not appreciate and will forget the generosity of Uncle Sam after this war is over and the economic battle of the future begins. We are doing more to help in every manner possible the rest of the world than any people had any right to expect, and we are doing it at the expense of my children and yours. These things I do not criticize, but I point them out merely to illustrate that while we have been and are being so generous to others we must at the same time try to be fair to our own people and protect their interests in every fair and practical manner.

It has been my privilege to talk in confidence with many of our military men who have served at home and abroad about the subject matters of my talk today, and my remarks have been based on what I have heard from them and on my own observations in Washington. It is with deep regret that conditions have made it impossible for me to stay in uniform with other Americans in the front ranks, but since circumstances have forced me to return to Congress, away from the carnage of battle, I am most anxious to do my full share at home and to join with all good Americans and my friends in Congress, regardless of their political faith, in combatting inside our country and in the Halls of Congress insidious influences wherever they may crop up and whose effects might result in making the forthcoming victory a hollow and worthless one, and in making a mockery of deaths of our fighting men, valueless because we at home may not have fought our part of the battle as unselfishly and valiantly as our soldiers are fighting wherever they meet the enemy.

The question is: How well prepared are we with plans for the period following our military victory? I am addressing myself particularly again to the question of our future in the air. We are coming into an air age and I firmly believe that America's future is in the air. Today we dominate the air in every phase, commercially, militarily, design, construction, and production capacity. In the post-war period 80 percent of the air traffic will originate in the United States. How well prepared we are to meet that will determine to a large extent whether we retain our leadership which we have now won or whether we lose it. We have that leadership today—remember, it can be lost. We have built up the greatest system of air bases. One of the main questions that arises is as to the disposition of these bases. Specifically in the Pacific area there are many bases that we took with the blood and lives of Americans, and at great cost in our resources, islands that were mandated to other countries by the League of Nations. Those islands were either surrendered without fighting or were conquered by the Japs.

I can see no other position than when such mandated territories were surrendered the mandate ceased to exist, and that when we occupied those islands by virtue of having driven the Japs out the ultimate disposition of those islands is our responsibility, and no nation has any rightful claim to them and no American official has any right to make any agreement disposing of those vital military bases, which also will have great commercial importance, without the full knowledge and approval of the American people. I do not think any executives have the right to hand around territory.

The island bases I am talking about were not the sovereign territory of any nation since the last war. They were generally German islands that had been mandated by the League of Nations to Japan, Australia, New Zealand, and England. They are not parts of the sovereign territory of those nations. I know that our naval and air needs will require a comprehensive system of air bases in the Pacific. The question as to innocent passage or freedom of the air sounds very attractive, but to a large extent that is a way to divide with other nations the advantages which we already have—advantages that were built up legitimately and honestly by American initiative and toil.

There has been some sort of an agreement that we would limit our trips in competitive areas to those of other nations. Many times the capacity of another nation will be so limited that they might be able to make but 2 trans-Atlantic trips a day, whereas our capacity, our production of airplanes, our reserve of pilots, and our know-how might make it possible to run 10 trips a day. However, we are apparently agreeing to limit ours to the minimum of any other nation with whom we are competing.

Mr. HINSHAW. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAAS. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HINSHAW. Before the gentleman launches into that subject, I would like to advert to his statement concerning the islands of the Pacific which our troops and Navy have taken and will take in the future. I have not looked up the international law on the subject, but I would assume that possession is nine points of that law and particularly in the present case where possession was taken by force and occupation is in force. It would seem to me that under those circumstances that they can be considered the property of the United States and would come under article IV, section 3, paragraph 2, of the Constitution, which provides that no property of the United States can be disposed of without act of Congress.

Mr. MAAS. I feel the same way the gentleman does on that subject, but we have those in the executive department who do not seem to agree with us merely because no act of Congress was passed in the acquisition of such bases. I do not think that position is well founded. We have obtained a great deal of territory without specific acts of Congress every time they became a part of our sovereign territory. I do not contend that these islands are necessarily a part of our sovereign territory, but I do contend that their ultimate disposition is the responsibility and solely the responsibility of the United States.

Mr. HINSHAW. Certain members of the Marine Corps not in high official position have told me about the access of our troops to these islands and the reconquering of those islands from the

Japanese, islands that had belonged to another Allied Power. Upon the conquering of these islands by the American troops the flag of this other country was raised upon the island without ado by a consular representative of that nation.

Mr. MAAS. Yes. For instance, at Tarawa both the American and British flags were raised side by side, although there was not a representative of the British Empire even present.

The British started operating the mineral deposits on Tarawa Island before the fighting was over. Certainly no base that we now occupy should be disposed of until our military people have made a complete and comprehensive post-war survey and have reported to us the need for a complete system of bases to defend this country. Certainly, I think that would be the attitude of the American public if they understood the full problem.

May I briefly go into this question of the competition in the air that is coming when the war is over? It will be an air age, both as to commercial traffic and passenger traffic, and therefore the defense of the Nation will be in the air. Whether this Nation can ever pay off the ghastly debt that it has had to assume by reason of this war depends upon whether we can take our proper place in world trade. Since that trade will be largely in the air, at least spearheaded in the air, what we do in the air will be of vital importance.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAAS. I yield.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I am glad the gentleman made the remarks that he has in regard to world trade. May I ask the gentleman this question: He is a Navy man, I believe?

Mr. MAAS. Marine; pardon me.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I stand corrected. We will have approximately 20,000,000 tons of cargo shipping available after this war is over, and possibly more. Our country was driven from the high seas in the hauling of world products and world trade because of the differential in the cost of operations.

I assume that will take place again, because most other countries which have cargo ships to haul world products pay their men less than we do, and there are even government subsidies for the operation of those ships. I assume the gentleman, as I do, wants to have a big world trade, but does not the gentleman feel that we must have some means of providing adequate subsidies so we can keep our ships on the seas and also keep our fleet of airplanes in the air?

Mr. MAAS. I am not sure that is necessary. If American ingenuity and initiative and energy are permitted free play, I would rather take the results of the American way of doing things than I would the subsidized way of our competition. But if American industry and our commerce in the air are to be strangled and put at a disadvantage by unfavorable agreements with other nations, and then we are forced to have destructive competition among ourselves for our overseas traffic, then even a subsidy would not meet the problem.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Assuming that of this 20,000,000 tons of cargo shipping we have, half is given away to the other countries so that they can go into competition, and that the wages they pay are 70 percent below the wages that under existing law are paid to our sailors, what will we be up against then?

Mr. MAAS. I recognize the problem and I hope we are not going to give away our merchant fleet or any substantial part of it. There is no reason to. We are all in favor of helping our allies to the last drop to win this war, but that does not impose any responsibility or obligation or confer the right upon us to assist them during the war to prepare them to compete with us when the war is over, at our expense.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a news item from the Washington Post under date of September 2, appearing on page 1, entitled "Pope Pius XII Urges Enforced World Peace."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. MURRAY] is recognized for 20 minutes.

THERE SHOULD BE BUTTER TO SPREAD ON YOUR BREAD, REGARDLESS OF THE READER'S DIGEST ARTICLE

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, butter could be plentiful today if the War Food Administration was operated on the basis of producing more food. The principal reason that the people do not have butter to spread on their bread is because the New Deal political agriculturists have not carried on a real food-production program. In the December issue of the Reader's Digest I read an article entitled, "Here's Why There Is Nothing to Spread on Your Bread," by Harland Manchester.

My first thought when I read the article was the question as to whether or not a magazine would really pay money for such an article. My second thought was if the Reader's Digest would actually pay money for this kind of article. I wondered what they would pay for an article based on facts and one that would give the factual bread spread picture.

In reply to my letter of inquiry to the Reader's Digest I received the following communication:

THE READER'S DIGEST,
Pleasantville, N. Y., December 16, 1943.

Mr. REID F. MURRAY,
Member of Congress,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. MURRAY: We've referred your query about Harland Manchester's sources of information for the oleomargarine article to Mr. Manchester himself. You will doubtless hear from him in the near future.

Sincerely,

THE EDITORS.

I then received the following letter from Mr. Manchester:

THE READER'S DIGEST,
Pleasantville, N. Y., December 18, 1943.

The Honorable REID F. MURRAY,
Congress of the United States,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. MURRAY: Your letter to the Reader's Digest, asking for information about my professional background, has been forwarded to me, and I am glad to supply you with whatever facts may be of interest.

My experience as a newspaperman and magazine writer has covered more than 20 years, and in recent years I have specialized in technical and scientific subjects which require extensive research, both in technical literature and in the field. My articles have appeared in such publications as the Reader's Digest, the Atlantic Monthly, Harper's Magazine, the American Mercury, Scientific American, Science News Letter and the Technology Review. If you wish to take the trouble, you can find much of my work listed in Reader's Guide to Periodical Literature for the last 5 years or so, and a number of my articles have been reprinted in scientific anthologies.

I have always been interested in problems of agriculture, both economic and technical, and have discussed many of these problems with farmers and agricultural scientists, as well as studying much of the literature of the field. My interest is partly due to the fact that I spent my youth on a dairy farm, and also because of an appreciation of the vast importance in our national economy of the production and distribution of foods and the development of new foods which will help raise the national standard of nutrition.

I first became interested in the suppression of margarine several years ago while making a study of interstate tariff barriers, a system which I consider destructive to national prosperity and a de facto violation of article I, section X, subsection 2 of the Constitution of the United States. You are doubtless aware of the part antimargarine legislation plays in this network of tariff barriers. As you know, there is a vast literature on margarine legislation from 1886 to date, and numerous recent analyses of the content and nutritive value of margarine by distinterested medical and scientific bodies. Because of the limitation of space, I was forced to omit much of this interesting material from my recent article.

In recent months, as you know, butter has been virtually unobtainable at many times by millions of families, my own included. This raises a particular problem in making meals appetizing to young children. The importation of low-grade Argentine butter, which has been widely publicized, is only a temporary stopgap and a none too reassuring one.

If this deprivation were necessary in the conduct of the war, I would not complain and I do not know anyone who would. But everyone knows now that there is a satisfactory substitute which is cheaper and uses fewer man-hours in the national production effort. They know it is being barred from their tables and they know why. My family and many of my friends have been able to obtain margarine by seeking out shops which carry it and coloring it in the kitchen. But all this is time consuming, and these discriminatory difficulties placed in the way of buying a cheap and satisfactory food have caused mounting irritation among a great number of people with whom I have come in contact.

This situation was the immediate background of my decision to write the article of which you speak. So far as I can discover, the same feeling prevails throughout the country. People want something to

spread on their bread, and they don't care whether it comes from a Wisconsin soybean or a Wisconsin cow.

I hope I have given you the information you sought.

Sincerely yours,

HARLAND MANCHESTER.

There is nothing personal about this situation, as I never heard of Mr. Manchester before. I would not bother to even take this time today, if it were not for the fact that I have been reliably informed that Fortune Magazine is coming out with an oleo article in November 1944.

ANALYZING THE ARTICLE

First there is this statement in the Reader's Digest article:

Here are the facts: Margarine, made by churning a pure vegetable oil—usually cottonseed or soybean—with skimmed milk, salt, and other minor ingredients, has been approved unanimously by recognized health authorities as the nutritive equal of butter. It is now fortified with vitamin A to bring it up to butter standard in that respect. It is flavored to taste so like butter that it is not always possible to tell the difference. Its content is regulated by law, and its manufacture and sale supervised by the Pure Food and Drug Administration.

You will note that Mr. Manchester makes no mention of the fact that the oleo manufacturers used 215,000 pounds of benzoate of soda as a preservative in 1942 according to their own reports. In fact oleo has nearly everything in it but the kitchen sink. Rape oil, linseed oil, cottonseed oil, peanut oil, and many other ingredients too numerous to mention.

I now quote Dr. E. B. Hart, of the University of Wisconsin, in whose laboratory at Madison, Wis., Dr. McCollum, of Johns Hopkins University, first discovered vitamin A, and in whose laboratory Dr. McCollum first showed that vegetable oils contain very little vitamin A:

In the present state of our knowledge it is preposterous—let me repeat that—in the present state of our knowledge it is preposterous for any scientist to make the blank statement that it is proven that oleomargarine or vegetable oils have an equivalence to butterfat in nutrition.

Dr. Hart has been at the University of Wisconsin for 38 years and is recognized as the greatest biochemist and nutritionist in the world today.

With the background and experience of these two men to be considered which one do you wish to call your leader?

The following is another quote from his article in the Reader's Digest:

Iowa State College has been publishing a series of pamphlets about wartime food production. Oswald H. Brownlee, of the faculty, wrote one of them. In simple, businesslike fashion Mr. Brownlee stated that there is a serious butter shortage, that feed and farm labor are so scarce there is little chance of overcoming it, and that margarine is just as nutritive and palatable and much cheaper to produce. He concluded that, if housewives can't get butter, they ought to have more margarine.

There are several answers to this statement. The first is that oleo is not as nutritive and palatable, and all oleo is not fortified, either. Second, all the oleo is being made for which the War Production Board has allocated oil to the oleo industry to make. The third answer could easily be that the War Food Administration has not provided for a maximum milk-production program. They have not even lived up to their commitments to producers in obtaining the milk that has been produced, either.

In January 1942, W. F. A. agents told Wisconsin dairymen they would receive $2.10 per hundredweight for their milk, and in 90 days they received as low as $1.65 per hundredweight. In other areas they promised $2.35 per hundredweight, and in 90 days the farmers were receiving $1.85. The War Food Administration, by controlling the cheese market by their purchases, took 3 cents per pound off the price of cheese in 1942, after their agents had pleaded for increased dairy production. The Plymouth-plus gives Wisconsin farmers as much as 2 cents per pound less for Wisconsin cheese than some other States received. The milk-subsidy program gives Wisconsin farmers 30 cents per hundredweight less subsidy than that given many other States. The Plymouth-plus showed a 20-cents-per-hundredweight differential. Such manipulations have not nor will not obtain maximum national milk production. This provides Wisconsin with 50 cents per hundredweight below the price in some other areas.

Then here is another excerpt from the article:

Wisconsin leads the shameful parade, but it would take a volume to list the measures by which 45 other States prevent people from buying a cheap food that is good for them.

The answer is that no one is trying to prevent the manufacture of oleo. All that is hoped for is that oleo will not be sold as butter. There is nothing stopping anyone from buying and eating oleo. An effort is being made to keep oleo from being sold as butter.

There are Federal laws against interstate traffic in filled milk; there are Federal statutes governing and defining cheese and filled cheese.

If Mr. Manchester, or the gentleman, whoever he is, that is preparing his article for Fortune magazine, believes that a fortified vegetable oil such as cottonseed oil, rape oil, mustard oil, used in oleo, is equal to butterfat in butter, then they must come out frankly and advocate filled milk and filled cheese. The principle is exactly the same. No oleo and vegetable oil promoters are bold enough to suggest this yet. If the oleo promoters were really as interested in the low-income groups as they profess, and if they knew much about dairy products, they would know that powdered whole milk could be used and reconstituted and provide a saving of three times as much on the milk bill as oleo would save on the butter bill.

This article by Mr. Manchester should give the dairy farmers of America an idea of the vicious propaganda that is being spread by the oleo interests. After getting legislation passed so that vegetable oils can be sold for animal fats, the next step, no doubt, will be to fortify vegetable proteins and claim they are equal to the animal proteins of meat.

The present New Deal administration may give them a hand. At least at this time when eggs—one of the very best animal proteins—are being converted into pig feed and bringing 5 cents per case, the present War Food Administration is spending $14,000,000 this very year as a subsidy to get people to eat a vegetable protein in the form of peanut butter.

No one wants to try to stand in the way of science. Maybe Mr. Manchester is right when he says in his article that—

There are many evidences that taxpayers, even in the great dairy States, are becoming scornful of the petty parochialism of their lawmakers.

There happens to be 1 percent of the dairy cows of the United States in the Seventh Wisconsin District, which I have the honor to represent. I have studied under Dr. E. B. Hart, one of the greatest teachers as well as scientists of the day. I do not intend to let any name calling whether called provincialism or parochialism keep me from giving the people of my district the facts. I am not going to be misled by the rantings of any bogey scientists that the Oleo Institute hires to give testimony. I am not here as a Member of Congress to sit idly by and see the dairy industry of our Nation ruined by any individuals that get paid for writing articles or be misled by the babblings of any high-sounding Oleo Institute. When and if ever the scientific facts prove that vegetable oils are equal to animal fats, the dairy industry should recognize it and govern itself accordingly.

If the New Deal political agriculturalists follow an agricultural program that raises millions of acres of cotton each year they do not know what to do with after it is grown, if the New Deal political agriculturists raise the tobacco acreage 16 percent and then give away 25 percent of the crop, if they provide fertilizer for nonfood crops, if they pay a subsidy to export cow feed as they have, at the same time they paid an import subsidy and if they do not have a constructive dairy program that includes feed production, there is no one to blame but themselves if they do not provide butter for the spread for bread. Since cream for the man with price has been obtainable without even being rationed, and has been provided, an adequate spread for bread, butter, could be provided for the average family if and when we have an agricultural department that wants and wishes to work toward that end.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I yield.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Some of those oils, I understand, are not digestible.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. RAMEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I gladly yield to the gentleman.

Mr. RAMEY. In the introductory part of the gentleman's address he spoke of

"political agriculturalists." Then he referred to a gentleman who evidently received money from writing on agriculture. Now, by "political agriculturists," I believe the gentleman was referring—we hear the word "refer" in Washington about 100 times a day, so I use the word "refer"—the gentleman was referring to the man who had never done real, dirt farming or hard work, to a man who has never worked but has been able to get money by what is called "research"; or an "inspector", as we have found here in Washington, where most of the people who are getting money from agriculture are folks "referring" to inspectors who refer you to rereferrers, and so forth, but who have never done constructive work.

Now, had this researcher or referrer who is writing and telling other folks what to do, gone to the great farms of our country, you would have had no trouble about producing substitutes, would you?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I would say that we do not have a man in a real key position in the present New Deal administration that has any knowledge of the dairy industry; or one who has had any agricultural training. It may not be exactly appropriate to say it, but I have not seen any farmers appointed on the Supreme Court bench. It seems to me that after Congress has appropriated the money as it has for 50 years to these experiment stations and agricultural colleges, the farmers at least should be sufficiently recognized so that at least one of tnem might secure a key position. It should not be necessary to have an Assistant Secretary and an Under Secretary and the man in charge—all people without any agricultural training whatsoever. Especially is this disturbing when the one agriculturally trained man is rather put in cold storage evidently for the duration or until after election anyway.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I yield.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. The gentleman is overlooking that great statesman Paul McNutt, who took natural oleomargarine in raw state and ordered the injection of 9,000 units of vitamin A, so that it would have what he called the same nutritive value as butter. He, apparently, is tied in with the same group who are out to jeopardize the interests of the dairy farmers of this country. The gentleman would not belittle Oleo McNutt at all in the effort he is making to help the dairy farmer?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I would answer the gentleman by saying that I firmly believe, without any political implications connected with it at the present time, that the dairy industry of this country is in the most hazardous condition it has ever been.

Mr. SPRINGER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I yield.

Mr. SPRINGER. Supplementing what the gentleman has just stated regarding Hon. Paul McNutt and his apparent affinity for oleomargarine, I might state to the gentleman that when he was Governor of the State of Indiana, he purchased oleomargarine for use in all of the institutions in the State of Indiana, against which the people protested vigorously.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I yield.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I am glad to get that information about our friend McNutt.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I thought the gentleman would be.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. We happen to come from a dairy section. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. MURRAY] has done a magnificent job in finding out facts and figures and giving the details in order to protect the dairy industry of the country and protect the consumers from deception. However, I want to say that we from the dairy sections do not have any objection to people eating as much oleomargarine as they want to, but what we object to is the deception that takes place where some of these people want to color it and prepare it to have it appear and taste like butter, and thereby deceive the consumers of the country. Is that not correct?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Yes. In the particular district that I represent we do not happen to be one of the large butter-producing districts. But anyone who has ever taken the time to follow this controversy through knows that this oleomargarine controversy is just the camel getting its head under the tent, because nutritively the principle is absolutely the same in all cases. If vegetable oil is equal to the animal fat in butter, then the vegetable oil is equal to the animal fat in filled milk—and equal to the butterfat in cheese. In other words, it is not only the butter industry but it is the whole dairy industry that is being threatened. This combination of interests that willingly or unwillingly are threatening the dairy industry must not be allowed a free hand in putting their plans into operation. Post-war agriculture in Wisconsin, Minnesota, Iowa, and many other States must be approached on the basis of how much progress the vegetable oil interests make at the expense of the animal fats of the country.

I certainly would not stand up here, nor would I want anybody else to stand up here, and oppose science any time science will prove a fact. I do not care to be misled by any bogey scientist coming down here at the bid of the oleo institute and talking half an hour about how much he knows, and let him do the leading as far as the legislative action of this Congress is concerned. I represent a dairy district, and regardless of any criticism of being called provincial I surely am not going to stand idly by and see the greatest industry of our State completely wrecked by these people that are doing it intentionally or unintentionally at the present time.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I yield.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Furthermore, the gentleman does not want to be a party to any proposition which proposes to turn over a synthetic product to people where the question of health is concerned.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. That is right; it should not be allowed.

Mr. CLEVENGER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I yield.

Mr. CLEVENGER. At about what date did they begin stepping up and fortifying oleomargarine?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. The oleo people have always forced their product on to the American people through deceit and deception. They tried to deceive them into believing it was just as good as butter before they even fortified it. I believe they first began fortifying oleomargarine in 1937 and expanded the injections of vitamin A in 1938. The oleo interests said oleo was equal to butter before they ever fortified it. They do not inject vitamin A into 100 percent of it even at the present time.

Mr. CLEVENGER. I believe Mr. McNutt was Governor of Indiana from 1934 to 1937. At the time he was forcing this thing on the State institutions of Indiana it had none of the fortification they claim for it now.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. No; that is right. It was brought out very clearly in the hearings. The tables submitted by the Oleo Institute show that they began the fortification in 1937, and expanded it from 1938 to the present time, as I said before. I also said before, it is not 100 percent fortified even now. By fortification I mean, it does not all contain 9,000 international units of vitamin A. The reports of the United States Department of Agriculture show that the average winter butter contains 11,000 international units of vitamin A per pound; that summer butter averages over 20,000, and much butter goes to 27,000. To prove that the oleo boys do not tell the facts just exactly as they are, there is evidence that lots of butter contains three times as much vitamin A, to say nothing of other qualities, as there is in oleo that has 9,000 international units of vitamin A injected into it. Butter has 50 to 500 international units of vitamin D and oleo has none.

Mr. CLEVENGER. Will the gentleman tell the House something about the nutritional value of a pound of lard compared with some of these substitutes?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. As far as calories are concerned, a pound of lard has more calories than either a pound of butter or a pound of oleo. Lard has around 4,000 calories; oleo and butter have 3,600 due to moisture held in the butter, and the moisture put in the oleo. The pure fats should have no moisture. Oleo has 17 percent of skim milk put into it to make it smell like butter. In the manufacture of butter they cannot get out all the moisture if they so desired. If a pound of lard was fortified with an equal number of international units of vitamin A as a pound of oleo was, lard would have more food value. It might not be as palatable as the oleo

would, since the oleo has been perfumed up in a manner to make it taste and smell like butter.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

(Mr. PLOESER and Mr. VURSELL asked and were given permission to revise and extend their remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.)

Mr. WILLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein a short resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Delaware?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under the previous order of the House the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. SPRINGER] is recognized for 10 minutes.

THE FACTS ABOUT GUAM

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, much confusion has been created about the island of Guam, and that confusion has been augmented to such an extent that it is now time that the American people know the facts about that small island and the legislation that was presented to Congress respecting the same. Quite recently it was discovered in many congressional districts that some of the people were greatly confused respecting the facts concerning Guam, and without ascertaining the facts on that subject made statements to the effect that Members of Congress should be defeated in the coming election because they have voted against fortifying Guam. It is lamentable, indeed, that any person would deliberately make any such statement without knowing the facts on that subject.

Mr. Speaker, the truth is there was never any bill presented to Congress, either in the Seventy-sixth, Seventy-seventh, or seventy-eighth sessions thereof, and that covers the entire period of time that I have been a Member of the Congress, to fortify Guam. The question of fortifying Guam was never presented, during that period, and no Member of Congress had any opportunity to vote upon that question. There was never any bill reported out of any committee, during that period of time, by which it was sought to fortify the island of Guam. Therefore the many statements made, by those without knowledge upon the subject, by which the inference is left with the people that there was some measure presented for the fortification of Guam, is without any foundation whatsoever.

It has been a great surprise to me to find that many of those representing the New Deal have been, and they are now, trying to confuse the American people upon that subject and are making an effort to create the impression that Members of Congress, and especially the Republican Members of that great lawmaking body, voted against the fortification of Guam. Of course, both Democrats and Republicans—and I speak of all of them—did not vote on the subject of fortifying Guam, because there was never any bill presented to the Congress on that subject, and the opportunity to vote upon that subject was never presented. The President, who is the Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy, never sent any message nor did he make any request for an appropriation for the purpose of fortifying Guam, and the majority in Congress, which has been under the full control of the President since he took office, did not at any time suggest or present any bill or measure for the fortification of Guam. Therefore, all of the adroit statements made and the misleading assertions uttered which tend to leave the inference that Congress, or any Member thereof, declined to vote for the fortification of Guam, is confusing, entirely misleading, and purely disgusting. If the President wanted to fortify Guam, or if he gave that matter any consideration, why did not he ask for it? During the pre-war period he had a great majority in the House of Representatives and he could have obtained an appropriation for that purpose, without doubt, if he had requested it. But the fact remains, and the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD so discloses, that there never was any request made for an appropriation for the fortification of Guam.

Mr. Speaker, quite recently the President, while on one of his many trips, told the American people:

> We were not permitted to fortify the island of Guam.

He did not in any way amplify that statement. He did not tell them that he had failed to ask for any appropriation for the fortification of Guam, and he did not tell the American people that there had never been any suggestion or request made to Congress that Guam be fortified, but he was content to try to leave the inference that Congress had failed to do that which was necessary relative to the fortification of Guam. That was merely a cunning method of attempting to play politics with the American people, and such a method places a new and a low level in politics during this, our greatest war, to which the American people will take exception. Regardless of the cunning statement made by the President, in his effort to mislead the people, I state, again, there was never any bill presented to the House of Representatives to fortify Guam. The Members of the lower House of Congress never had any opportunity, therefore, to vote upon that question and any statement to the contrary is entirely misleading.

Mr. Speaker, what was the proposal that came before the House of Representatives respecting the island of Guam? And what was the item submitted to the Members of the House of Representatives for debate, consideration and vote? The sole question was presented by an item in the pending measure for an appropriation for $5,000,000 for cleaning out and dredging the harbor at the Island of Guam. There was no request to fortify that island. In the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of date February 22 and 23, 1939, the entire debate and action on that appropriation of $5,000,000 for the cleaning and dredging of the harbor at Guam is set forth. Democrats and Republicans alike voted against that useless expenditure of $5,000,000 for the cleaning and dredging of the Guam harbor, because it would only serve to irritate Japan, which then occupied many of the mandated islands in that immediate vicinity. Admiral Hepburn, who testified on this subject, openly stated to the Naval Affairs Committee, that the dredging and cleaning of the harbor, and improving the harbor facilities, at Guam, did not follow the recommendations made by the Hepburn Board. That statement comes from high authority. Again we have some very high authority on the subject of the matter presented to Congress, and upon which the confusion to which I have referred has resulted, because Hon. CARL VINSON, chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs in the House, made the following statement:

> Opposition to this item has been based on the assumption that Guam is to be fortified and made into a strongly defended naval base for airplanes and submarines. In view of this opposition the committee has gone into this matter at great length, and I can assure you that there is no intention on the part of the Navy Department to fortify Guam, or to do anything further than what is included in this bill.

As hereinbefore stated, the pending measure provided, only, for the cleaning and dredging the harbor, and improving the harbor facilities, at Guam.

Admiral Leahy was interrogated on the question of fortifying Guam before the Naval Affairs Committee, and he testified, in 1939, as follows:

> Admiral LEAHY. The failure to carry out this plan to fortify Guam resulted from an agreement of the United States not to fortify the islands in the Pacific.

During the debate on this question, the then majority leader in the House, now the Speaker of the House of Representatives, Hon. SAM RAYBURN, of Texas, took a part in the debate on this very question, and he made the following illuminating statement:

> Mr. Chairman, I quite agree with the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MAAS] that there is no reason whatsoever for unseeming excitement for such an item in this bill. If I wanted to justify this statement I would merely read the minority report. Every argument I would have to meet for this bill is met by the language in the minority report. The minority report states: "We recognize the right of the United States to establish military facilities in Guam." We are attempting, and the committee is attempting, no such thing as that in this bill.

The gentleman from Georgia, Hon. CARL VINSON, chairman of the Naval Affairs Committee, who had charge of the bill on the floor of the House, made the following statement during the debate on the measure:

> Mr. VINSON of Georgia. The bill, in the first place, does not call for any fortification whatsoever.

More recently, Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Virginia, Hon. PATRICK H. DREWRY, a member of the Naval Affairs Committee, and on the 29th day of August 1944, had this to say upon this subject, and I refer to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of August 29, 1944, page 7382:

> Mr. DREWRY. I think this is a good time to clear this matter up, and it might as well be

cleared up. Nobody has ever heard me say that I thought the appropriation carried in that bill was for fortifying Guam. I made a speech on the subject, and the gentleman might have quoted me and said that I said it was not for the purpose of fortifying Guam. I say it now. It was not a matter of fortifying Guam. It was an appropriation of $5,000,000 to clean up the harbor in order that the coral rocks which were below the surface and were a menace to the submarines and airplanes that might land on the water be dredged out. The $5,000,000 was asked for in order to do that dredging and it was not asked for for fortification purposes. There was no fortification in that appropriation.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, it is a great surprise to me to learn that there are some people in our country who, for political purposes, or for want of knowledge and understanding on the subject, continue to try to leave the impression that Members of Congress voted against fortifying Guam. Such was not the case. There was no measure presented for the fortification of Guam, and the Congress has never had the opportunity to vote upon that question. The Navy never requested any measure for the fortification of Guam, the President never made any such request, and the majority in the House, under the complete domination of the President, has never suggested nor requested any appropriation for the fortification of Guam. Therefore, if any mistake was made in failing to ask for the fortification of Guam, the President made that mistake because he failed to ask for the appropriation for the fortification of Guam. The fault does not lie in the lap of Congress because this is the legislative body. The fault lies with the Commander in Chief, and he should assume his full responsibility in this and in all matters; he should not, by cunning phrases and subterfuge, attempt to place the blame elsewhere.

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COLE] is recognized for 15 minutes.

CHRISTMAS MAIL FOR OUR ARMED FORCES OVERSEAS SHOULD BE MAILED NOW

Mr. COLE of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, in order that Christmas parcels may reach the addresses on time and in good condition, arrangements have been made by the Post Office Department in cooperation with the War and Navy Departments—the latter including the Marines and Coast Guard—for the acceptance of such parcels for members of our armed forces serving outside the continental United States.

The term armed forces overseas includes the personnel of our armed forces who receive their mail through an A. P. O. or fleet post office in care of the postmaster at New York, N. Y., San Francisco, Calif., New Orleans, La., or Seattle, Wash., or an A. P. O. in care of the postmaster at Miami, Fla., Presque Isle, Maine, or Minneapolis, Minn., or through a naval installation or station in care of the postmaster at Seattle.

TIME OF MAILING

Christmas cards and Christmas parcels for personnel of the armed forces overseas must be mailed during the period beginning September 15, 1944, and ending October 15, 1944, the earlier the better. The War Department advises that Christmas greeting cards for soldiers overseas must be sent in sealed envelopes and prepaid at the first-class rate.

NO REQUEST REQUIRED

No requests from the addressees are required in connection with Christmas parcels mailed to Army personnel during this period only. Patrons should endorse each gift parcel "Christmas Parcel." Special effort will be made to effect delivery of all Christmas parcels mailed during that period in time for Christmas.

SIZE AND WEIGHT

In view of the urgent need for shipping space to transport materials directly essential to the war effort, Christmas parcels shall not exceed the present limits of 5 pounds in weight or 15 inches in length or 36 inches in length and girth combined. These Departments have pointed out also that members of the armed forces are amply provided with food and clothing and the public is urged not to include such matter in gift parcels. Not more than one Christmas parcel or package shall be accepted for mailing in any one week when sent by or on behalf of the same person or concern to or for the same addressee.

Christmas parcels for members of the Army personnel leaving home stations en route overseas shortly before or subsequent to October 16, 1944, will be accepted after October 15, up to and including December 10, 1944, upon presentation by the sender of a change of address notification—W. D. A. G. O. Form 204 or equivalent notice—from the addressee received subsequent to September 30, 1944, provided the parcels come within the prescribed limits of weight and size and are endorsed "Christmas Parcel." Only one such parcel will be accepted from any one person to any one individual having an overseas A P. O. address.

PREPARATION OF PACKAGES

Owing to the great distance this mail must be transported and the handling and any storage it must undergo, it is absolutely necessary that all articles be packed in boxes of metal, wood, solid fiberboard, or strong double-faced corrugated fiberboard reinforced with strong gummed-paper tape or tied with strong twine, or both. It is highly desirable that all fiberboard boxes be securely wrapped in heavy paper, if available, as experience has shown that boxes without an outer wrapper often become crushed or split, thus allowing the contents to escape. Furthermore, as each parcel is subject to censorship, delay in handling may be minimized by securing the covering of the parcel so as to permit ready inspection of the contents.

When combination packages are made up, including miscellaneous toilet articles, hard candies, soaps, and so forth, the contents should be tightly packed, in order that the several articles may not be loosened in transit, damaging the contents or the covering of the parcels. Christmas boxes should be enclosed in substantial containers. Hard candies, nuts, caramels—including those covered with chocolate—cookies, fruit cake, and chocolate bars individually wrapped in waxed paper should be enclosed in inner boxes of wood, metal, or cardboard. Soft candies, whether home-made or commercial, do not carry well. Sealed packages of candy, cigars, tobacco, and toilet articles in simplest mercantile form may be placed in parcels without affecting the parcel-post classification of such packages. Sharp-pointed or sharp-edged instruments, such as razors, knives, and so forth, must have their points or edges protected so they cannot cut through their coverings and damage other mail or injure postal employees.

PERISHABLE MATTER NOT ACCEPTABLE

Perishable matter will not be accepted, and the sending of fragile articles should be discouraged.

PROHIBITED ARTICLES

Intoxicants, inflammable materials—including matches of all kinds and lighter fluids—and poisons, or compositions which may kill or injure another or damage the mails, are unmailable.

HOW TO ADDRESS PARCELS

Addresses must be legible, in typewriting or ink. Copies of sales slips of retail stores should not be used as address labels. The complete address should also be shown on a sheet of paper inside the parcel in order to permit identification of the addressee in the event the outer wrapper becomes torn, mutilated, or destroyed in transit. Parcels addressed to overseas Army personnel should show, in addition to the name and address of the sender, the name, rank, Army serial number, branch of service, organization, A. P. O. number of the addressee, and the post office through which the parcels are to be routed.

Parcels for naval personnel, including the Marine Corps and Coast Guard should show, in addition to the name and address of the sender, the name, rank, or rating of the addressee and the naval unit to which he is assigned with the Navy number assigned thereto, or name of the ship and fleet post office through which the parcels are to be routed.

Mail for Coast Guard personnel is addressed the same as for naval personnel except that the words "U. S. Coast Guard" shall be used in place of "U. S. Navy" after the man's name.

POSTAGE

Postage must be fully prepaid, the rate on parcels of fourth-class matter—that is, parcels exceeding 8 ounces—being the zone rate applicable from the post office where mailed to the post office in care of which the parcels are addressed. The third-class rate of 1½ cents for each 2 ounces applies to packages not exceeding 8 ounces, except in the case of books, on which the rate is 1 cent for each 2 ounces. The third-class rate of 1½ cents for each 2 ounces or fraction thereof is also applicable to unsealed greeting cards, addressed to other than Army personnel provided they bear no unpermissible written additions. It is suggested, how-

ever, that they be mailed as first-class matter since in that event they will be returned, if undeliverable, provided they bear a return card. Parcels containing only books conforming to the requirements prescribed therefor are acceptable at the special rate of 3 cents a pound, plus 1 cent on each parcel, the limit of weight being 5 pounds.

PERMISSIBLE ADDITIONS

In addition to the name and address of the sender, which is required, inscriptions such as "Merry Christmas," "Please do not open until Christmas," "Happy New Year," "With best wishes," and the like, may be placed on the covering of the parcel in such manner as not to interfere with the address, or on a card enclosed therewith. Books may bear simple dedicatory inscriptions not of a nature of personal correspondence. Stickers or labels resembling postage stamps are not permissible on the outside of parcels.

INSURANCE, REGISTRY, AND C. O. D. SERVICES

No matter addressed to members of the Army or other persons receiving mail through A. P. O.'s overseas shall be accepted as insured or C. O. D. mail. Letters or packages containing money or other articles of value shall be refused registration, but letters containing valuable or important papers may be registered.

Mail for personnel of the Navy, Marine Corps, or Coast Guard may be accepted for registration or insurance if it conforms to existing requirements as to weight, size, and other prescribed conditions, and mailers should be advised to register or insure Christmas gifts of more than ordinary value addressed to personnel of the Navy, Marine Corps, or Coast Guard.

DO NOT SEND CASH—USE MONEY ORDERS

Postal money orders should be used to transmit gifts of money to members of the armed forces outside the continental United States. Do not send cash because at many places where such forces are stationed there is a local prohibition against the importation of United States money, and it could not be used if received. However, domestic postal money orders can be cashed at A. P. O.'s wherever they are located, and they are paid in local foreign currency at the rate of exchange in effect on the date the orders are presented.

CHRISTMAS MAIL FOR MEMBERS OF THE UNITED STATES MERCHANT MARINE

Christmas mail for members of the merchant marine should also be mailed between September 15, 1944, and October 15, 1944, if delivery by December 25, 1944, is desired. Parcels for such persons cannot be registered or insured, and there is no money-order service available to this branch of the service.

Further information can be had by writing your Congressman, WILLIAM C. COLE, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DAY] is recognized for 15 minutes.

THE WAR WILL NOT END IF WE HAVE A FOURTH TERM

Mr. DAY. Mr. Speaker, now that we are approaching the end of the war with Germany, all over the land anxious and devoted mothers and fathers are asking, When will our boys come home? The answer to this question depends upon who is elected President of the United States on November 7.

We are all busy discussing the post-war era with the bright expectation that soon there will be a return to the days of peace and nonmilitary activities. We all know that with the tremendous fighting forces which are in action the fall of Japan will follow comparatively soon after the fall of Germany. Will these welcome events usher in the post-war era?

Because I am convinced of certain things, I am going to speak very plainly and give the American people my conclusion. The war will not end under President Roosevelt. There will be no post-war under Roosevelt. It will be perpetual war. President Wilson said that we fought World War No. 1 to end war. President Roosevelt favors the fighting of this war to perpetuate war and it is no secret here in Washington that he intends to make war in alliance with two great world powers on his own initiative and without coming to the Congress for a declaration of war. And this is in total defiance of section VIII of article I of the Constitution of the United States vesting in the Congress the sole power to declare war. This is why the conference at Dumbarton Oaks is secret.

Let us visualize the future with President Roosevelt exercising these vast and perpetual war powers. By agreement with the British Empire and the Soviet Union, our armed vessels would continually patrol the seven seas and if any small craft came out of a harbor anywhere in the world without previous permission, duly certified and in possession of the master of the craft, a shot could be fired across her bows to make her heave to for inspection by Uncle Sam, the world policeman. A plane could not take to the air without interruption of its course by an air squadron constantly patrolling its beat. There would no longer be any peaceful borders between nations. And the crying outrage of all of this would be visited upon the American people when the world commander in chief called forth our American boys to go forth to battle. The Congress of the United States is expected to sit supinely by while this is taking place and to forget their oaths to support the Constitution of the United States. This majestic dream of too much power would not only involve us in perpetual war but would utterly destroy the spirit of the American people and render us a nation in trembling fear of the next morning's headlines or a coming flash over the radio. We are a great nation because we have lived with honest devotion to the checks and balances of the Constitution of the United States with powers divided between the executive, legislative, and judicial departments of government, well defined and well understood and sanctioned by over 150 years of steady growth and development. Power begets power and the path of history is strewn with the wrecks of governments where too much power reposed in one man. We fought this war to end dictatorships and we must see it through to the triumph of liberty regulated by law under a leader faithful to the obligations of the Constitution of the United States.

Many good Americans feel more or less secure because they expect that the whole matter will be determined by a treaty approved by a two-thirds vote of the United States Senate. A reservation to this effect was placed in the Connally resolution upon the insistence of Senator WILLIS, of Indiana. It will be a shock to these well-intentioned people to learn that the Roosevelt plan is to handle the entire matter as a continuation of the war powers which he now holds and which in my opinion he never intends to return to the American people and their Congress.

Is this a violent conclusion? Let us see. President Roosevelt construed his election by a majority of the American voters in 1932 as a mandate. The result was N. R. A., utterly unconstitutional and so held by unanimous opinion of the then existing United States Supreme Court. President Roosevelt in 1936 construed his second election by a majority of the American voters as another mandate. The result was the Court-packing scheme to completely destroy the independence and integrity of the Supreme Court of the United States, a scheme which the Senate Judiciary Committee thus characterized:

> It stands now before the country, acknowledged by its proponents as a plan to force judicial interpretation of the Constitution—a proposal that violates every sacred tradition of American democracy.

President Roosevelt construed his election by a majority of American voters in 1940 as a mandate to edge us into the present world war by steps characterized as short of war, but which must inevitably involve us in the war. Can anyone doubt that a fourth election in 1944 by a majority of the American voters will be construed by him as a mandate to keep us in perpetual war? Can anyone honestly argue that an organized continuing militarism is peace?

I have been asked many times whether the vast powers which were granted to President Roosevelt to carry on the war will ever be returned to the American people and their Congress. These vast powers, almost unlimited, are known as the war powers. My answer to this question is in the affirmative if Governor Dewey and the Republican Party are chosen to govern this Nation on November 7, 1944. If President Roosevelt and the New Deal Party is continued in power, my answer is in the negative. Is this a violent conclusion? Let us see.

Bearing in mind that we will be in a close military alliance with two other great powers and that the President will make war at the behest of either one or both of these great powers without coming to the Congress for a declaration of war—a step which he characterizes as

not sufficiently speedy—why would he return these war powers to the American people or to their Congress when he could readily make use of them at any time without a moment's notice?

I participated in the historical debates which preceded our entrance into the war which came after the dastardly Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor, and I recall what was said by the proponents of the New Deal about an undeclared war. There was evidenced a feeling of dissatisfaction that the President could not make war upon his own initiative but must wait for the slower processes of a declaration of war by the Congress. From all indications which are steadily gaining in strength and taking definite form, the President and the New Deal Party now intend to bypass the Congress entirely and make war at the sole discretion and whim of the President. Can it be possible that a majority of the American voters, with their eyes open, will reelect President Roosevelt for a fourth term when he has declared his intentions?

I have long been a student of the Constitution of the United States and like to approach great issues from that angle. If President Roosevelt, elected for another 4 years, refuses to return these vast war powers the only remedy would be impeachment. The Constitution provides that when a President is impeached he shall be tried by the Senate, the Chief Justice of the United States presiding. It is a well-established fact that in such a trial the Chief Justice passes upon the rules of evidence since the Constitution is silent upon that point. It thus becomes of great importance to ascertain who will be the Chief Justice of the United States to succeed Chief Justice Stone, who is generally expected to resign.

Under our constitutional system, the Chief Justice of the United States occupies a position second only to the President. The American people proudly recall the noble services of Chief Justice Charles Evans Hughes during the terrible days of the "Court packing" controversy and how he stood out as a great pillar of constitutional freedom, thwarting the efforts of the New Dealers to weaken and destroy the confidence of the people in our highest tribunal. I question whether the Supreme Court could survive as the apex of one of three great coordinate branches of the Government—the judiciary—if we had a New Deal Chief Justice in addition to the overwhelming number of New Dealers already appointed by President Roosevelt to that Court. It is commonly rumored in Washington that Samuel Rosenman will be the next Chief Justice, if President Roosevelt is reelected.

The American people have a right to feel justly proud of the stand which the Members of the Seventy-eighth Congress have taken in support of the Constitution of the United States. A majority of this Congress have been steady and firm in their opposition to New Deal encroachments. Vicious and underhanded attacks are being made by subversive influences against those who have had the courage to protect and defend our great charter of freedom. We are Americans and share with the immortal Daniel Webster his great devotion to our beloved country which he proclaimed in these words that can never die:

I shall know but one country. The ends I aim at shall be my country's, my God's, and truth's. I was born an American; I live an American; I shall die an American; and I intend to perform the duties incumbent upon me in that character to the end of my career. What is the individual man, with all the good or evil that may betide him, in comparison with the good or evil which may befall a great country, and in the midst of great transactions which concern that country's fate?

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 53 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, September 6, 1944, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARING

The Subcommittee on Merchant Marine in Overseas Aviation, of the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries will hold a public hearing Monday, September 11, 1944, at 10:30 o'clock a. m.

At that time the subcommittee will consider the right of the merchant marine to engage in overseas aviation to protect their passenger services over trade routes pioneered and developed by them.

Persons desiring copies of the printed hearings when available will please notify the Clerk by letter.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1787. A letter from the Acting Secretary of War, transmitting a report covering the period from July 1, 1943, to June 30, 1944; under the provisions of section 2 of Public Law 779, Seventy-seventh Congress; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

1788. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting pursuant to section 16 of the Organic Act of the Virgin Islands of the United States, approved June 22, 1936, one copy each of various legislation passed by the Municipal Council of St. Croix; to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

1789. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill for the relief of Ensign Frederick Matthews McCord, United States Naval Reserve; to the Committee on Claims.

1790. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to authorize the transfer of certain lands within the Colonial National Historical Park, Yorktown, Va., to the Secretary of the Navy; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

1791. A letter from the Acting Administrator, Federal Security Agency, transmitting the fourth quarterly report of the United States Commissioner of Education on the education and training of defense workers, covering the period beginning April 1, 1944, and ending June 30, 1944; to the Committee on Appropriations.

1792. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting pursuant to section 16 of the Organic Act of the Virgin Islands of the United States, approved June 22, 1936, one copy each of various legislation passed by the Municipal Council of St. Thomas and St. John; to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

1793. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a report stating all of the facts and pertinent provisions of law in the cases of 238 individuals whose deportation has been suspended for more than 6 months under authority vested in him, together with a statement of the reason for such suspension; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

1794. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting a copy of the quarterly estimate of personnel requirements for The National Archives for the quarter ending December 31, 1944; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

1795. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting a report of the Archivist of the United States on records proposed for disposal by the Government agencies indicated; to the Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. BARRETT: Committee on the Public Lands. H. R. 5283. A bill to provide for the extension of certain oil and gas leases; without amendment (Rept. No. 1841). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. PETERSON of Florida: Committee on the Public Lands. H. R. 5289. A bill to provide for the acceptance and protection by the United States of property within the authorized boundaries of the Everglades National Park project, Florida, pending the establishment of the park, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1842). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BULWINKLE:

H. R. 5301. A bill to provide safety in aviation and to direct an investigation of the causes and characteristics of thunderstorms; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CARTER:

H. R. 5302. A bill to provide for the construction of a Federal building in Oakland, Calif.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. DEWEY:

H. R. 5303. A bill to extend the functions of the Export-Import Bank of Washington, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. HINSHAW:

H. R. 5304. A bill to amend the first section of the act of July 29, 1942 (56 Stat. 726); to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. JENKINS:

H. R. 5305. A bill to change the name of Bladensburg Road in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. WILLEY:

H. R. 5306. A bill to authorize the issuance of United States Government life-insurance policies to replace such policies which have been surrendered for cash; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. HINSHAW:

H. J. Res. 307. Joint resolution designating the first Sunday in June of each year as

Shut-In's Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMITH of Virginia:

H. Res. 633. Resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of the fifth intermediate report (H. Rept. No. 1366) of the House Select Committee to Investigate Executive Agencies, submitting an analysis of a bill to amend the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942; to the Committee on Printing.

H. Res. 634. Resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of the sixth intermediate report (H. Rept. No. 1797) of the House Select Committee to Investigate Executive Agencies, submitting an analysis of a bill to improve the administration of justice by prescribing fair administrative procedure; to the Committee on Printing.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CHENOWETH:

H. R. 5307. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Bessie I. Clay; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HINSHAW:

H. R. 5308. A bill for the relief of Virginia Packard; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HOBBS:

H. R. 5309. A bill for the relief of the county of Talladega, Ala.; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 5310. A bill for the relief of R. Heine; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 5311. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Ada H. Keith et al.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. JEFFREY:

H. R. 5312. A bill for the relief of Joe B. Crawford; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

6070. By Mr. GWYNNE: Petition of Florence Leibundguth and sundry other residents of Black Hawk County, Iowa, in favor of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

6071. By Mr. LUDLOW: Petition of Indianapolis Junior Chamber of Commerce and Wayne Township War Mothers Clubs 1 and 2 urging enactment of House bills 3670 and 4284 relating to promotion of American prisoners of war; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

6072. By Mr. ROLPH: Resolution of County Supervisors Association of California in the matter of encouraging Japanese to return to their native land and amending the laws relating to the operation or ownership of property by persons ineligible to citizenship; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

6073. Also, resolution of County Supervisors Association of California in the matter of memorializing Congress to take steps to insure the extension of international air commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

6074. Also, resolution of County Supervisors Association of California in the matter of making available equipment, material, and supplies produced for United States of America to counties when not needed for war work; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

6075. Also, resolution of County Supervisors Association of California in the matter of increased welfare load urging the establishment of fourth category and requesting that the Federal Government participate financially in the program; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

6076. By the SPEAKER: Petition of F. W. O'Neil, president of the Mining and Metallurgical Society of America, petitioning consideration of its resolution with reference to making minerals and metals available for purchase by all nations without discrimination or restrictions, as they have been in the past; that the governments maintain adequate information at all times concerning metals and minerals production, stocks, and consumption in all countries; and that wartime metal and mineral controls should in the post-war period be relaxed and discontinued as promptly as may safely be done; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, SEPTEMBER 6, 1944

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Thou who art Lord of all the earth, we beseech Thee to speak to us out of the depths of Thy holy nature; and like the exile far from home, may we heed Thy welcome voice. In the name of Him who achieved great miracles when the waters were bitter and the cup was full, we ask Thy blessing of comfort upon the world's stricken multitudes, that in the darkness of their tragic suffering they may feel the breath and hear the approach of Thy coming. O hear our prayers for them and grant that they may rise as holy incense from the altar of the soul of America.

We pray for our Nation and for all who are in authority that they may be united with Thee and guided through these critical and perilous times. Grant that the dawn may speedily come to all nations, that the welfare of one may be the welfare of all. O may intelligence and virtue prevail in our own land and be reflected to those nations which are in the region of darkness and death. O be their savior; preserve them and keep them alive, that they may be blessed on earth. Clothe us all with those high and noble elements which sustain our national life, and Thine shall be the praise and glory, O Master, world without end. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 5181. An act to provide a method for compensating certain individuals for damages sustained as the result of the explosions at Port Chicago, Calif.

The message also announced that the Acting President pro tempore has appointed Mr. BARKLEY and Mr. BREWSTER members of the joint select committee on the part of the Senate, as provided for in the act of August 5, 1939, entitled "An act to provide for the disposition of certain records of the United States Government," for the disposition of executive papers in the following departments and agencies:

1. Department of Agriculture.
2. Department of Commerce.
3. Department of the Navy.
4. Post Office Department.
5. Federal Works Agency.
6. National Archives.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein certain newspaper articles.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. DIMOND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix in two particulars, to include in one an editorial from the New York Times and in the other an article written by Capt. Richard L. Neuberger.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the Delegate from Alaska?

There was no objection.

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM], I ask unanimous consent that he be permitted to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances, to include an address before the Rotary and Kiwanis Clubs of Richmond, Va., and one before the Kiwanis Clubs of Roanoke, Va. It is estimated by the Government Printing Office that the latter address can be printed at a cost of $121.40.

The SPEAKER. Notwithstanding, without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial from the Memphis Commercial Appeal.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. WEISS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial from a local newspaper.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

(Mr. GIBSON asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.)

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that today, at the conclusion of business on the Speaker's table and other special orders, I may address the House for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

LEADERSHIP NEEDED IN THE PRESIDENCY

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, in the Presidency of the United States we need a man of experience.

We need a man who, in a world in turmoil, would find some use for 10,000,000 unemployed beyond leaf-raking or unproductive public works.

We need a man whose experience would warn him not to indulge in the folly of making warlike noises without prudent preparation for war.

We need the kind of alert supervision of Cabinet and department heads which one who is himself a trained and careful administrator can supply.

We need the kind of experience which would foreclose even the possibility, through negligence or willfulness, of leaving the Nation's Fleet at the mercy of a treacherous enemy, after due warning of that enemy's intentions.

We need the kind of experience which would lead a cautious executive not to squander a nation's assets in overseas donations without receiving in return, and in advance, commitments in aid of our national security and welfare sufficiently definite to warrant the action taken.

We need the homely sort of experience which holds that a nation should not put all its eggs in one basket—or in three. The French, the Dutch, the Chinese, the smaller nations, have baskets too, and we may end up without eggs—or with an omelet.

Yes; we need a man of experience for the Presidency of the United States: A man whose experience tells him that this Nation is greater than any man; a man humble enough to believe that the distinguishing mark of a true republic is that it can produce many men fit to preside over its destinies for a time, but that it cannot submit to a permanent ruler without losing its character as a republic.

Now, after 12 years, it has never been more truly said, for the salvation of the Republic we need a man of experience in the Presidency of the United States. That, to secure such experience, we shall have to change Chief Executives by the decision of the people in November is no new thing in the history of a country where progress through change was for so long the order of the day.

WHY DESTROY THE DOMESTIC SUGAR INDUSTRY?

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, on page 11 of today's New York Times there appears a photograph of Mr. LaGuardia, the "Little Flower," shaking hands with Dr. Ramond Grau San Martin, President of Cuba.

It will be interesting to Hawaiians, Puerto Ricans, and some 38 Members of the other body, to the Representatives of 19 States in this body, and millions of Americans to know that the mayor of New York City proposes again that the beet-sugar industry of the United States be destroyed. He points out that there are no quotas in a good-neighbor policy.

I wonder if Mr. LaGuardia feels that quotas should be continued in peacetime on the production of sugar in the 18 or 19 States on the continent and with Cuba and other foreign countries permitted to produce on an unlimited scale and ship into the markets of the United States, thereby affecting the markets and our own people.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

PAYMENT TO CERTAIN GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES FOR ACCUMULATED OR ACCRUED ANNUAL LEAVE

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (H. R. 4918) to provide for the payment to certain Government employees for accumulated or accrued annual leave due upon their separation from Government service.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I shall not object, will the gentleman explain this bill?

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, this bill has been unanimously reported by the Committee on the Civil Service and it provides for the payment of accrued accumulated leave in a lump sum. Under the present procedure if an employee is separated from the service and has 30 days' leave coming to him, he must be retained on the pay roll until the 30 days expires.

This will simplify the procedure and will eliminate certain clerical work. It does have an effect on men going into the service who need this money promptly.

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, does the gentleman know how many employees this will cover? How many cases similar to the one he is referring to does this affect?

Mr. RAMSPECK. It covers a great many people because the turn-over in the Government service is rather large at this time. Many of them are going into private employment, and many of them are going into the armed services. I have no estimate as to the number. It will not cost any more money to make payment in a lump sum.

Mr. McGREGOR. If the gentleman will yield further, we had a private claim some weeks ago which was objected to on the floor of the House involving a man employed by the O. P. A. Under the law that we passed during this session he was relieved from that duty because he was not experienced. He had 30 days' time coming to him. This bill would cover that man and would give him the right to receive his money, make it legal for the department to pay him after he is off the pay roll?

Mr. RAMSPECK. It would not cover a case of that sort retroactively; no. It only covers future cases.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, this is one of two bills the gentleman spoke to myself and the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER], the acting minority leader, about?

Mr. RAMSPECK. That is correct.

Mr. McCORMACK. This is for the purpose of authorizing the payment of time the employees have earned on separation from the service?

Mr. RAMSPECK. That is right, time that they have not taken in many cases due to the war effort. They have not taken their leave and have foregone their vacations in some instances.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, as I understand it, this is a unanimous report of the committee?

Mr. RAMSPECK. That is correct.

Mr. MICHENER. And the gentleman from Kansas who has addressed the House with reference to this bill speaks for the minority.

Mr. RAMSPECK. That is correct. I consulted the gentleman from Kansas before asking the Speaker to permit me to bring it up.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, as I understand it from the Civil Service Commission, you can only accumulate 90 days leave?

Mr. RAMSPECK. That is a law made by the Congress.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. The Civil Service Commisison tells me that you can accumulate a leave based on the 90 days as well. That has been so up to this time.

Mr. RAMSPECK. There is some question, since they have kept the employee on the pay roll until his leave expires as to whether or not he accumulated additional leave during this period of 30, 60, or 90 days.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. This bill would rectify that so there will not be any question as to how many days leave he might have.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Yes.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I thank the gentleman.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That whenever any civilian officer or employee of the Federal Government or the government of the District of Columbia is separated from the service or elects to be paid compensation for leave in accordance with the act of August 1, 1941, as amended by the act of April 7, 1942, or section 4 of the act of June 23, 1943, he shall be paid compensation in a lump sum for all accumulated and current accrued annual or vacation leave to which he is entitled under existing law. Such lump-sum payment shall equal the compensation that such employee would have received had he remained in the service until the expiration of the period of such annual or vacation leave: *Provided*, That if

such employee is reemployed in the Federal service under the same leave system prior to the expiration of the period covered by such leave payment, he shall refund to the employing agency an amount equal to the compensation covering the period between the date of reemployment and the expiration of such leave period, and the amount of leave represented by such refund shall be credited to him in the employing agency. The sum so refunded shall be covered into the Treasury as "Miscellaneous receipts": *Provided further*, That the lump-sum payment herein authorized shall not be regarded as salary or compensation and shall not be subject to retirement deductions.

SEC. 2 Upon the death of any civilian officer or employee of the Federal Government, or the government of the District of Columbia, compensation for all of his accumulated and current accrued annual or vacation leave in a lump sum equal to the compensation that such employee would have received had he remained in the service until the expiration of the period of such annual or vacation leave shall be paid to the estate of such deceased employee.

SEC. 3. That all accumulated and current accrued leave be liquidated by a lump-sum payment to any employee of the Federal Government or the government of the District of Columbia in cases involving transfer to agencies under different leave systems. Such lump-sum payment shall equal the compensation that such employee would have received had he not been transferred until the expiration of the period of such leave: *Provided*, That the lump-sum payment herein authorized shall not be regarded as salary or compensation and shall not be subject to retirement deductions.

SEC. 4. The provisions of sections 1 and 2 of this act shall not apply to officers and employees of the Panama Canal and Panama Railroad on the Isthmus of Panama.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 3, line 3, after the word "any", insert "civilian officer or."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on table.

AMENDMENT OF WAR OVERTIME PAY ACT OF 1943

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 4114) to amend section 3 (b) of Public, No. 49, Seventy-eighth Congress, first session—War Overtime Pay Act of 1943.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I shall not object. Will the gentleman explain the bill?

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, this is another bill that was unanimously reported by the committee. It amends the pay legislation last passed by this Congress to rectify a situation which we did not foresee, and which involves about 800 employees in the Customs Service.

In the pay bill we provided that those employees who could not work longer hours, or who had irregular hours, should receive a 15-percent increase in pay for the duration, or until June 30, 1945. These particular employees work in connection with private business, inspecting imports and collecting duties. They can work only when the private concerns work. In some of our larger cities these concerns do not work on Saturdays, and therefore it has been impossible to put these particular employees on a 48-hour week regularly. Some of them work one Saturday and some another so that they average about 44 hours a week. Actually they are getting less than 15-percent increase on account of that fact, and this will give them the equivalent of 15 percent, which means an actual increase to them of about 3 percent. It puts them on a parity with other employees who work less than 48 hours a week.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. This particular group received, according to the report, an increase of 10.8 percent.

Mr. RAMSPECK. That is right.

Mr. McCORMACK. And this bill seeks to correct an unintentional inequality?

Mr. RAMSPECK. That is correct.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I yield.

Mr. SPARKMAN. There are two additional groups that I should like to ask the gentleman about. One of the groups does not come under the jurisdiction of the gentleman's committee, but he just mentioned that the purpose of this legislation is to put this particular group on a parity with the others. I have reference to the post-office employees. I do not believe they come under the gentleman's committee.

Mr. RAMSPECK. They do not. They come under the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I wonder if the gentleman's attention has been called to the fact that a great many of our postal employees are not getting the benefit of the additional pay that we voted to them for pretty much the same reason that the gentleman has given in explaining how these people were left out.

Mr. RAMSPECK. The postal employees had two pieces of legislation passed for them by this Congress. One was a flat $300 a year temporary increase. The other was a provision similar to the bill we are now amending, which gave them pay for additional hours worked. Of course, when they do not work those additional hours, they do not get any additional pay under that particular act. They do, however, get $300 a year.

Mr. SPARKMAN. They get the flat bonus.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Yes.

Mr. SPARKMAN. The other group that I desire to ask the gentleman about—and I am asking merely for information, for I am sure the gentleman's committee has given some thought to it—is the employees of the War Department who, I understand, have just recently been put on a 9-hour daily basis, or 54 hours a week. By virtue of lengthening their hours to 9 hours a day, they are going to get increased pay at the overtime rate; is that not true?

Mr. RAMSPECK. That is correct.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I wonder if the gentleman's committee has explored the situation to determine the necessity of a blanket application to all of the War Department employees of those lengthened hours?

Mr. RAMSPECK. I am glad the gentleman brought that up. When that order first came out, I called the personnel director of the Army Service Forces. Incidentally, it only applies in the Army Service Forces. He came to my office and we talked about it. He said the reason for the order was that they had a backlog of work that had accumulated in some of the branches of the Army Service Forces. General Somervell thought the best way to meet it was to extend the hours. He made it optional in what they call the field offices, that is, the offices outside of Washington. Only on yesterday afternoon I had about an hour's conference with this same personnel director, and they are making a study now to determine whether or not the 54-hour week should be continued or whether the backlog has been caught up. I think unquestionably that order was issued without a sufficient study being made in some cases. I think it has resulted in people not having enough work to do. Unquestionably in other places there was need for additional services, and perhaps this was the best way to meet it. That is particularly true in the casualty branch, where they were behind. We are all sorry that it was necessary that they be behind, but that is the truth. I think that within the next month the probabilities are that they will catch up with this backlog and be able to eliminate those extra hours.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I yield to the gentleman from Idaho.

Mr. DWORSHAK. The committee of the gentleman from Georgia several weeks ago held extensive hearings to determine the need for reducing the number of personnel on the civilian pay roll. Was any conclusion reached by the gentleman's committee indicating the need for curtailment of the Federal pay roll?

Mr. RAMSPECK. Yes. We got a net reduction of about 200,000.

Mr. DWORSHAK. A reduction over what period?

Mr. RAMSPECK. Over the period of time when we were holding those hearings; in other words, in the 3 months following July 1 of last year there was a net reduction of approximately 200,000 in civilian employment, 135,000 of which came in the Army Service Forces. I think General Somervell is entitled to credit for having made that reduction.

Mr. DWORSHAK. The gentleman is also aware, however, that during the first 6 months of the current calendar year there was a net increase of about 90,000 in the civilian pay roll?

Mr. RAMSPECK. There has been a net increase of approximately that amount.

Mr. DWORSHAK. How is that accounted for?

Mr. RAMSPECK. It is largely in the Army and Navy. The Army accounts for it by the expanded operations incident to the invasion of France and to the expanded needs in the casualty branch and in other branches of the Army, and the same reasons apply in the Navy.

Mr. DWORSHAK. The June report of the United States Civil Service Commission indicated there was a total on June 30 of about 3,300,000 civilian employees, both inside the country and in the Canal Zone and in Alaska. Does that figure reflect any curtailment?

Mr. RAMSPECK. I think the gentleman's figures are a little high.

Mr. DWORSHAK. That is the report of the Civil Service Commission as of June 30.

Mr. RAMSPECK. That is not my recollection of it. I think the paid employees numbered about 2,850,000.

Mr. DWORSHAK. That is in this country, but when you add those in the Canal Zone and Alaska the total figure is 3,300,000. That is the report of the United States Civil Service Commission.

Mr. RAMSPECK. The fact remains that the Committee on the Civil Service checked the increase which was going on at the rate of 100,000 per month. We got a net reduction of 200,000, and we are continuing in every way we can to try to hold down the number of employees and to secure further reductions.

Mr. DWORSHAK. However, there has been a subsequent increase of 90,000 which probably has been limited only by the inability of recruitment to fill the requirements of the various agencies.

Mr. RAMSPECK. I do not agree with the gentleman's conclusions. I am not going to put myself in the position of saying to the Army and the Navy, "My judgment is superior to yours as to what you need to carry on this war." We are checking them wherever we can.

Mr. DWORSHAK. All these increases were not confined to the Army and Navy Departments, according to this report.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Most of them were.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Not a majority of them.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 3 (b) of the War Overtime Pay Act of 1943 (Public, 49, 78th Cong.) is hereby amended to read as follows:

"Any officer or employee to whom this act applies and who is entitled to no additional compensation under subsection (a) or subsection (c) for a pay period shall be paid for such pay period, in lieu of overtime compensation under section 2, additional compensation at the rate of (1) $300 per annum if his earned basic compensation is less than $2,000 per annum, or (2) 15 percent of so much of his earned basic compensation as is not in excess of $2,900 per annum if his earned basic compenstation is at the rate of $2,000 per annum or more, unless his overtime compensation under section 2 for such pay period is at least equal to such additional compensation."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Speaker, apropos of what my friend the gentleman from Pennsylvania said just now, I call the attention of the Members to the fact that last night the majority leader on the Forum of the Air made this statement, taking it from the Federalist, and quoting Mr. Alexander Hamilton:

Without supposing the personal essentiality of the man, it is evident that a change of the Chief Magistrate, at the breaking out of a war, or at any similar crisis, for another, even of equal merit, would at all times be detrimental to the community, inasmuch as it would substitute inexperience to experience, and would tend to unhinge and set afloat the already settled train of the administration.

THE LATE DR. J. RION McKISSICK

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, in the passing of Dr. J. Rion McKissick, president of the University of South Carolina, not only our State, but the entire Nation has lost an outstanding citizen. Dr. McKissick was a native of my district, having been born in Union County, the son of Isaac Going McKissick and Sara Foster McKissick.

With the exception of such time as was spent in furthering his formal education, President McKissick gave his entire life to the service of his native State. For years the press felt the good influence of the scholarly work contributed to it through Mr. Kissick as a reporter, editor, and publisher of my home-town newspapers. As great as was the influence in the field of journalism of this accomplished gentleman, even greater was his service to public education. The University of South Carolina has for approximately a century and a half stood high among the great educational institutions of our country. Steady hands have steered our alma mater through the turbulent past. Among the leaders presiding over this historic institution, none were greater than Dr. McKissick. His scholarly attainments placed him at the forefront of our educational leaders while his friendly manners, sympathetic desires, and pleasing personality were always an inspiration to young men and women coming under his helpful influence.

The teachers of the country, as custodians of the moral and intellectual lives of our children, occupy extremely important positions.

The successful completion of Dr. McKissick's work affords an opportunity to acknowledge our indebtedness to him and his fellow teachers of America, who have so unselfishly devoted their lives to the task of striking the shackles of ignorance that hinder the progress of our people.

Having had the privilege of knowing Dr. McKissick personally and to have profited by his fine example, I take this opportunity to say this humble word of tribute. Following are appropriate editorials and news items:

[From the Spartanburg Herald]

RION McKISSICK

People of Spartanburg and the Piedmont section will especially regret the passing of the president of the University of South Carolina, Rion McKissick, for he was in many ways a product of this section. He was well known here, being a kinsman of Dr. Webb Thompson and Mr. H. B. Carlisle of this city.

He was born in Union County, served for a while as a reporter of Union newspapers, was editor of the Greenville News, and was later editor of the Greenville Piedmont, of which he was majority stockholder. It was while he was editor of this last-named newspaper that he accepted the position as dean of the school of journalism at his alma mater, the University of South Carolina.

William Arthur Sheppard, author of Red Shirts Remembered, and an acquaintance of many years, says this of him:

"Intimate friends of Rion McKissick were aware of his profound love for South Carolina. Thirty years ago he encouraged men and women of the State to collect historical minutiae as hobbies, and these collections have grown into valuable deposits that have shaped the works of historians in many parts of the world. He did this work quietly, as he was almost wholly devoid of showmanship, but his contribution to the written record of the State cannot be estimated. I have no doubt that the library of South Caroliniana on the campus of the University of South Carolina was one result of his efforts to preserve historical material about South Carolina, and I say this without any desire to detract from the efforts of the late Yates Snowden and Dr. Robert L. Meriwether."

Dr. McKissick's death is particularly untimely in these days when it is so difficult to get able executives to head important educational institutions.

[From the Greenville News]

McKISSICK RITES TO BE AT 6 P. M.—PRESIDENT OF UNIVERSITY TO BE BURIED ON CAMPUS IN FRONT OF LIBRARY

COLUMBIA, September 4.—Dr. J. Rion McKissick, 59, who died unexpectedly Sunday night of a heart ailment, will be buried tomorrow on the campus of the University of South Carolina which he served as president since 1936, longer than any other head of the institution in 110 years.

Brief rites will be conducted at 6 p. m. in the university chapel. Public services and interment will follow in front of the South Carolina Library.

WAS NINETEENTH PRESIDENT

McKissick, nineteenth president of the 143-year-old, State-supported college, was the first accorded honor of burial on the campus. The board of trustees voted permission on recommendation of the faculty. A petition signed by nearly every member of the student body also asked that the president's body be interred on university grounds.

The body will lie in state from noon tomorrow until 4:15 p. m. in the library

and from 4:15 until 6 p. m. in the university chapel, attended by a Navy guard of honor. After the chapel rites, services at the grave will begin at 6:15 p. m.

His death brought messages of condolence and tribute from educators throughout the State.

Gov. Olin D. Johnston, president of the university's board of trustees, said Dr. McKissick had "rendered invaluable service to the building of a greater university, and his influence will long be felt in the accomplishments of those young men and young women who received their university training under his guidance and leadership."

OTHERS DEPLORE PASSING

Among other educators who sent messages mourning the loss of a "progressive and distinguished leader" were Dr. James H. Hope, State superintendent of education; Dr. Patterson Wardlaw, dean emeritus of the University of South Carolina; Dr. R. F. Poole, president of Clemson College; Gen. C. P. Summerall, president of The Citadel, Charleston; Henry Sims, president of Winthrop College, Rock Hill.

Also Dr. J. Caldwell Guilds, president of Columbia College; Dr. Robert C. McQuilkin, president of Columbia Bible College; Dr. William P. Jacobs, president of Presbyterian College, Clinton; Dr. E. M. Gwathmey, president of Converse College, Spartanburg; Dr. R. C. Grier, president of Erskine College, Due West, and Dr. W. K. Greene, president of Wofford College, Spartanburg.

REGRETS FROM PRESS

CLINTON, September 4.—President W. W. Harris, of the South Carolina Press Association, said today that in the death of Dr. J. Rion McKissick, University of South Carolina president, the press association "has lost one of its most faithful, beloved, and useful members."

Dr. McKissick, who died at Columbia Sunday night, was a past president and a member of the present executive board of the press association.

Harris issued this statement:

"The State is called upon to give up one of its outstanding educators and citizens.

"Dr. McKissick's services to South Carolina, which he dearly loved, were of incalculable value. All who knew him loved and trusted him. We are grieved that he has gone. We shall ever keep green in our hearts the memory of this friend and coworker and what his life has meant to us. Our association bows in grief over his passing."

Harris named the following committee to serve with him in representing the press association at the funeral tomorrow: Judson Chapman, of the Greenville Piedmont; B. J. King, of the Aiken Review; A. L. M. Wiggins, of the Hartsville Messenger; Harold C. Booker, of the Lancaster News; Ed H. DeCamp, of Grit and Steel, Caffney; H. G. Osteen, of the Sumter Daily Item, and S. L. Latimer, Jr., of the State, Columbia.

[From the Greenville Piedmont]

DR. MCKISSICK

A useful South Carolinian who contributed much to the best interests of his State was lost to us in the passing last night of Dr. J. Rion McKissick, president of the University of South Carolina—a useful citizen and leader, and a man beloved.

Dr. McKissick had given distinguished service in both journalism and education. He had served as editor of the Greenville News from 1916 to 1919 and of the Greenville Piedmont from 1919 to 1926, when he became dean of State university's school of journalism. He was elevated to the presidency in 1936.

Dr. McKissick—he was always "Colonel" to his newspaper associates—served the people well through the press, and in his latter years, with characteristic thoroughness in a field that always had been close to his heart, he served them in the same faithful and competent manner through the field of education.

South Carolinians in general sorrow in his death, and to many of us it brings a deep sense of personal loss because Rion McKissick to us was a cherished friend.

[From the Union Daily Times]

J. RION MCKISSICK, PRESIDENT OF SOUTH CAROLINA UNIVERSITY, DIES

COLUMBIA, September 3.—Dr. James Rion McKissick, 59, president of the University of South Carolina since 1936 and former newspaper writer, editor, and lawyer, died at Columbia Hospital tonight at 7:10 p. m. He had been ill several days.

A native of Union County, McKissick was a graduate of the University of South Carolina, the Harvard University School of Law, and held a master's degree in journalism from the University of Wisconsin. He came to the university in 1926 as dean of the school of journalism.

He began his newspaper career as a reporter with Union papers and was chief editorial writer for the Richmond (Va.) Times-Dispatch from 1911 to 1914. He then moved to Greenville, where he practiced law and was editor of the News, morning paper, from 1916 to 1919. He was editor and majority stockholder of the Piedmont, Greenville afternoon newspaper, from 1919 to 1926, when he sold his interest to join the university staff.

Born October 13, 1884, he was the son of the late Isaac Going McKissick and the late Mrs. Sara Foster McKissick. His father, who had been a lieutenant colonel in the Confederate Army, served several terms as a member of the State house of representatives; was elected to Congress in 1872, although a Republican majority refused him a seat on the ground that at this time South Carolina had not been properly reconstructed.

McKissick attended Union elementary schools, Auburn, Ala.; schools at Asheville, N. C.; and the College of Charleston, in addition to the university here; the University of Wisconsin; and the Harvard Law School. He was admitted to the South Carolina bar in 1914.

He married Caroline Virginia Dick, May 18, 1927, who survives.

Funeral arrangements were incomplete.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

(Mr. THOMAS of Texas asked and received permission to revise and extend his remarks in the RECORD.)

COMMITTEE ON POST-WAR ECONOMIC POLICY AND PLANNING

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLMER], chairman of the Committee on Post-War Economic Policy and Planning, be permitted to file a report from that committee on economic problems of the reconstruction period by midnight tomorrow.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

ALEXANDER HAMILTON AND THE NEW DEAL

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, it seems a little strange that the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BULWINKLE] would stand before this House and quote Alexander Hamilton in connection with the tenure of office of the Chief Magistrate. He represents the party which has condemned the philosophy of Alexander Hamilton for a century and a half and has followed the advice, at least up until the Roosevelt administration, of Thomas Jefferson, Andrew Jackson, Grover Cleveland, Woodrow Wilson, and others who condemned and warned us against more than two terms for the President. I can hardly understand the reasoning unless this is just pure, plain, ordinary politics, in a desperate effort to justify a position now taken by the New Deal administration for life tenure. Alexander Hamilton was for a monarchy. He wanted life tenure for the Presidency, and it was only after many days of heated debate in the Constitutional Convention that a compromise was reached for the term of 4 years. It was men like Jefferson who urged a single term of 7 years for the President, and every Chief Magistrate from George Washington down through 144 years to Mr. Roosevelt followed the precedent of two terms. I want to warn the gentleman from North Carolina that the breaking of the two-term precedent is a threat to constitutional government and American freedom. Let me say with all possible emphasis that there are principles involved in this question which far transcend partisan interests. These principles are far more important than the ambitions of any single individual, the interests of any political party, or the immediate issues of any single campaign.

O. P. A. AT BENTON HARBOR, MICH.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from North Carolina, in quoting Alexander Hamilton, forgot that Alexander Hamilton is dead; that even Hamilton, with all of his vision and wisdom, could not have anticipated as destructive and restrictive an administration as that under which our people are now trying to carry on, and that neither Alexander Hamilton nor anyone who lived in his time ever saw anything like the New Deal; that, could Hamilton and his contemporaries have envisioned the multiplicity of confusing, business-destroying orders and directives which the New Deal is now issuing and attempting to enforce, he and they might have advocated a change in administration without waiting 4 years for a Presidential election. They might have insisted upon something like the British plan, where, when the people have, as they have here, lost confidence in an administration, they can force an immediate election.

Now let me give you just one concrete illustration of what the New Deal O. P. A. has done and has failed to do.

On August 8, I wrote the O. P. A. here in Washington, advising that representatives of the farmers and the packing houses were apprehensive that a large portion of the maturing fruit crop might be lost because, among other things, there was a shortage of truck tires upon which the movement of thousands of bushels of fruit and vegetables depended. I advised them that last year the value of the produce going over the Benton Harbor market was over $8,000,000, and further wrote that, while we realized that there was a shortage of truck tires, the crop could not be moved unless tires were released.

This morning, within the hour, I had a phone call from the manager of the Benton Harbor fruit market, telling me there were yesterday 75,000 to 100,000 bushels of peaches on that market and that the truck tires were gone, but that in the stores at Benton Harbor and St. Joseph there were tires that could be supplied to those trucks. But Mr. Richards, of the O. P. A., at Grand Rapids, refuses to let the market authorities or truckers have them.

Now, for the next week, every day, there will be approximately 100,000 bushels of peaches on that market. The truckers cannot handle them because the O. P. A. refuses to release the truck tires which are in the stores at Benton Harbor and St. Joseph, and which no one else needs.

If Alexander Hamilton and the framers of the Constitution ever anticipated anything like this New Deal, he and they would have limited the Presidential term to 1 year and would have made provision for a recall election.

The following is a copy of the telegram confirming a part of the phone conversation:

Confirming phone, Elberta peaches being harvested this area 100,000 bushels daily. Largely dependent truck transportation. Office of Price Administration, Grand Rapids, truck tire panel, refuses authorize delivery new tires to truck operators for movement this highly perishable fruit in spite of fact that new tires are available in tire dealers' hands this section resulting loss waste of crop unless new tires can be released immediately for crop movement. Fruit industry here proposes file claims suits for damage O. P. A. covering losses sustained with ample evidence in hand. Trucks from southern areas, Texas, Louisiana, able secure new tires their ration boards. Why discrimination here?

PRODUCERS SERVICE CORPORATION.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ROLPH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include a newspaper article about Poland.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

ANNISTON, ALA., ORDNANCE DEPOT

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, it gives me pleasure to make another observation with regard to that which is so dear to all our hearts—our districts. As we are filled with joy when our children are praised, so are we when our districts are complimented.

Maj. Gen. L. H. Campbell, Jr., Chief of Ordnance, United States Army, and Mr. K. T. Keller, president of the Chrysler Corporation, accompanied by a delegation of ordnance officers—namely, Brig. Gen. W. P. Boatwright, Brig. Gen. E. L. Ford, Lt. Col. B. Ourisman, and Maj. T. Moore—have just made an inspection tour of the Anniston Ordnance Depot located, ideally, in the Fourth Congressional District of Alabama.

The visiting delegation paid high tribute to the officers and employees of the depot, praising the efficiency of the organization, the decreasing rate of absenteeism among employees, and the general cooperative attitude throughout the establishment.

General Campbell is quoted as saying:

We consider this depot the finest one we have. We have one of the best ordnance officers here, Major Ogden, and the Chrysler Corporation, under the management of E. C. Rowe, is working with their regular Detroit methods to bring about efficiency. We are especially pleased with the way in which the civilian employees have taken over and are going forward. This depot is geographically well located, it has fine buildings, and the people in this area are cooperative.

Mr. Keller stated that the Chrysler Corporation has found the quality of work at the Anniston Depot very excellent. He commented especially on the cleanliness of the establishment indicating a high spirit of interest among all employees. "We have found excellent cooperation from everybody in and around Anniston."

Those of us who have the honor and pleasure of living in the Fourth Congressional District of Alabama, generally known as God's country, so frequently hear such praise of various and sundry outstanding features of our district that ordinarily such statements are not a cause for comment. But when the source of such compliments is as preeminent in the leadership of our Nation as is here the case, we are unusually delighted and grateful.

General Campbell and Mr. Keller are outstanding leaders in their respective fields not only in this country but in the world. They are men whose experience and talents cause them to know whereof they speak and they are of those who measure their words.

Not only, however, should Alabamans be justly proud of these remarks, but every one of us who loves America will rejoice in hearing of this outstanding example of the efficiency with which our war effort is being conducted.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. MERRITT] may extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

PROGRAM FOR THE WEEK

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I do this in order to ask the distinguished majority leader as to the program for the rest of the week.

Mr. McCORMACK. I am very glad the question has been asked.

As a result of information I have received in connection with the two bills now in conference, I am prepared to state to the House that the conference reports will not come up this week.

There will be no further legislative business this week except those matters which can be disposed of by unanimous consent.

I am making this announcement to the Members so they may govern themselves accordingly for the remainder of the week.

Whether or not a conference report will be filed in time to be taken up Monday, I am unable to state.

The conference report on the George bill would have to be acted upon in the Senate first. It is my recollection that the conference report on the surplus-property bill according to my recollection would have to be acted upon in the House first. Whether or not they will be filed so they can be called up Monday, I am unable to state at this time, but neither will come up this week.

Mr. MICHENER. Is it the gentleman's intention to adjourn over from tomorrow?

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes; immediately after our colloquy is concluded, I intend to submit a unanimous-consent request to that effect.

Mr. MICHENER. I yield for that purpose; Mr. Speaker, I yield the floor.

ADJOURNMENT OVER

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns tomorrow it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO FILE CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the conferees on the part of the House on the bill (S. 2051) to amend the Social Security Act, as amended, to provide a national program for war mobilization and reconversion, and for other purposes, known as the George bill, may have until midnight Saturday to file a report if an agreement is reached on or before that time.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I shall not, I was interested in the gentleman's statement that there would be no conference reports called up this week. Can the gentleman give the Members any idea when those conference reports will come in?

What I am driving at is this: There are some of us who would like to go to the American Legion convention in Chicago on the 18th, and we should like to know, if the gentleman can give us any idea, whether these conference reports will be out of the way by that time so that after the Legion convention we can go home.

Mr. McCORMACK. I wish I could answer the gentleman's question, but in all fairness I am unable to. It is my hope that both conference reports will be out of the way by the 18th. I am dependent upon information from the chairman of the House conferees and other members of the conference committees on the part of the House. When I make a statement that nothing will come up, it means that nothing will come up. Beyond next Monday I am unable to state what the situation may be. I should rather imagine that the conference report on the George bill would probably be agreed upon between now and Saturday and be brought in the early part of next week. I am very hopeful that the conferees on the surplus property bill will agree so that it can be disposed of next week. But to give the gentleman any kind of definite answer to his proper inquiry at this time I am unable.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I thank the gentleman.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] asks unanimous consent that the conferees on the bill, S. 2051, may have until midnight Saturday to file a report. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

MAJ. GEN. GEORGE S. PATTON

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, looking across the aisle I see a Member with a newspaper containing a headline to the effect that General Patton and his intrepid army have now reached German soil.

It is fortunate for us and our allies that the smear bund failed in its attempts to destroy General Patton a few months ago.

If I remember correctly, I was the only man on the floor of either House who rose to defend General Patton when Walter Winchell, Drew Pearson, and that gang were carrying on their smear drive against him.

General Patton has done one of the greatest jobs of any general in this war. He has performed one of the greatest tasks with the smallest sacrifice of human life. We are proud of him. He is one of the outstanding soldiers of modern times.

We are fortunate that those members of the smear bund were not able to destroy him, as they tried to do, and as they tried to destroy the Supreme Court of the United States a few years ago with that loathsome book called the Nine Old Men.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, the remarks made by the gentleman from Mississippi refresh my memory on an impression that was in my mind when General Patton was undergoing the embarrassment he suffered. I feel that this is an appropriate time, following the proper remarks of the gentleman from Mississippi, to express the personal view I entertained at that time. We all remember the incident, the publicity, and the embarrassment that must have been suffered by General Patton.

During that time there was one person, in my opinion, who did more to help General Patton than anyone else. That was the girl who has taken the journey of life with him, his wife. As we look back we all remember the very fine statements she made, nothing apologetic, not trying to minimize, but the very nice way in which she handled the situation. She was the best asset that General Patton had in his predicament. When that hero comes back he can thank that girl of his, his wife.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CASE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include a poem by the poet laureate of South Dakota entitled "Acceptance."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT] is recognized for 30 minutes.

RESPONSIBILITY FOR THE PEARL HARBOR TRAGEDY

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to include certain articles by David Lawrence and certain official documents.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker—

Question. What is the duty of the Commander in Chief?

Answer. To protect the security of the Nation and of its armed forces and to repel aggression or attack.

The President stated recently in a letter to Robert Hannegan that he had been Commander in Chief of the Nation for more than 11 years.

The President has thus asked the Nation to pass judgment on the issue of his stewardship of the office which he designates as Commander in Chief of the Nation.

In so doing, the public has been made the jury but has not been given the evidence on which to render its decision.

Questions are being asked and are not being answered. But they must be answered if the public is to have the facts on which to pass its judgment of the manner in which the Commander in Chief has discharged his duties.

His candidate for Vice President—or Assistant Commander in Chief—has opened up the entire question of the Pearl Harbor disaster and has prejudged it, in allocating blame, before all the facts have been made known.

Much of what I have to say is based upon official documents. Where it is not, I have set forth some of the questions now being freely discussed in Washington and elsewhere.

There may be a good and sufficient answer to all of them. If there is, why should there not be a full disclosure before asking the public to accept without question the implication that the administration is blameless?

I know full well that in raising these questions I am inviting clamor and accusation by those who wish the full story concealed. I would not raise them at all if I thought the disclosures could possibly be of any aid or comfort to the enemy.

After all, what could have been of greater aid or comfort to the enemy than the destruction of our Pacific Fleet? What could be of greater aid or comfort to the American people than to know that our Government is strong enough and candid enough to tell our people the full truth, now that 3 years have past?

Truth will serve the cause of patriotism. Continued concealment for partisan advantage will not.

REPORT THAT JAPAN MIGHT ATTACK PEARL HARBOR

Ambassador Grew reported to the Department of State on January 27, 1941, that one of his diplomatic colleagues had told a member of the Embassy staff that there were reports from many sources, including a Japanese source, that Japanese military forces planned a surprise attack at Pearl Harbor in case of trouble with the United States. (Peace and War, Department of State, p. 113, Doc. 196.)

Congressional circles are asking whether precisely the same information—the Japanese plan to attack Pearl Harbor by surprise—was not furnished to the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy about January 24, 1941—3 days earlier—by sources within the Army and Navy? If so, was the President informed? In any event, was he informed by the Secretary of State of Ambassador Grew's warning of January 27?

About the beginning of 1941, numerous complaints were forwarded to high administration sources by merchants, business interests, and others in the Hawaiian Islands that the fleet was being kept out of Pearl Harbor and at sea too much. Did not the President send for Admiral James O. Richardson, then Commander in Chief of the Pacific Fleet, who had then served but 1 year of his normal 2-year tour of duty at this time? Did the President advise Admiral Richardson that the fleet should be kept in Pearl Harbor more often and particularly on week ends, as there had been complaints from Hawaii that the absence of the fleet was bad for business, or words to that effect? Did not Admiral Richardson, who had flown to Washington from Hawaii, demur to the suggestion and return to the Pacific? These questions are being asked among Members of Congress and in the press. If they are not true, why not have an investigation or court martial promptly and make all the facts known—after nearly 3 years—to the American public?

Subsequently, was not Admiral Richardson again summoned from Hawaii to the White House and was he not told in more peremptory fashion that the fleet must be kept in Pearl Harbor more frequently? At this point did not Admiral Richardson state, in effect, that as long as he was commander of the Pacific Fleet he would be compelled to use his own judgment and would do what was best for the security of the fleet, adding that, of course, the President had the power to remove him? After this inconclusive conference, did not Admiral Richardson fly back to Hawaii and was he not then or shortly thereafter relieved of his command by Admiral Kimmel, who had been jumped about 50 numbers—over other admirals—and given the assignment? Did not Admiral Kimmel then comply with administration orders and keep the fleet in Pearl Harbor much more frequently than before? In fact, after the negotiations began with the Japanese special envoy, Kurusu, was not the fleet definitely kept in Pearl Harbor during these negotiations? Naval officers present at the time have informed me that the concentration in Pearl Harbor during the time shortly before the disaster was greater than any concentration they had ever known. Is Representative MAGNUSON'S charge that the fleet was kept in Pearl Harbor at the insistence of the Japanese Government correct?

Is it not a fact that in the summer of 1941, when the fleet was split in two and part of it was sent to the Atlantic by the order of the Commander in Chief, against the best judgment of many naval authorities, as soon as the last aircraft carrier passed through the canal, the Japanese Government proceeded with the occupation of French Indochina? Was not this because our fleet was no longer a balanced fleet and the Pacific Fleet no longer existed in strength sufficient to assure our security in those waters?

Did not Admiral Kimmel continually protest the stripping of the Pacific Fleet and particularly point out the danger inherent in the transfer of destroyers to the Atlantic, which in Kimmel's opinion were essential to the Pacific Fleet setup?

Now, let us look at the record:

While this was going on, the Secretary of State on June 21, 1941, handed the Japanese Ambassador a document containing a comprehensive statement of the attitude of the United States. The fourth point in that document reads:

> 4. Mutual assurances by the United States and Japan that each would supply the other with such commodities as were required and were available and that steps would be taken to resume normal trade relations between the two countries. (Peace and War, p. 117.)

Since Japan at that time required aviation gas and scrap iron, this is a peculiar proposal to come from our Government.

In mid-June of 1941, it was common talk in the War and Navy Departments in Washington that Japan planned to attack our Pacific bases by surprise and that an agreement existed between Japan and Germany that Germany would declare war on us within 1 week after the Japanese attack on our Pacific bases.

On July 24, 1941, the Commander in Chief suggested to the Japanese Ambassador that the Japanese Government did not understand Hitler as clearly as we did and added that—

> It was entirely possible that after some years the navies of Japan and the United States would be cooperating against Hitler as a common enemy.

The President went on to point out to the Japanese Ambassador that we had been very generous in supplying Japan with oil, stating:

> Our citizens were unable to understand why, at a time when they were asked to curtail their use of gasoline, the United States should be permitting oil supplies to go to Japan when Japan had given every indication of pursuing a policy of force and conquest in conjunction with the policy of world conquest and domination being carried on by Hitler. (Peace and War, pp. 120, 121.)

The President further pointed out to the Japanese Ambassador that Japan had virtually completed the encirclement of the Philippine Islands and placed its armed forces within striking distance of vital trade routes. This, of course, was made possible by use of the oil supplied by us.

On July 24, 1941, the Commander in Chief froze Japanese assets in the United States. On July 30, 1941, by message from the Secretary of the Navy to all naval establishments, did not the Commander in Chief direct all naval vessels to go into full wartime preparation at once and to prepare "to take offensive action against Axis surface craft"? Were not these the shooting orders which the Commander in Chief did not reveal to the American public until a radio address on September 11, 1941? This address is reported on page 109 of Peace and War, but the Commander in Chief's phrase, "I have given shooting orders," is left out of this summary of his speech. The charge of the gentleman from Michigan, Representative BRADLEY, on the floor of the House that these shooting orders were actually given late in July has never been denied.

On October 17, 1941, the Commander in Chief "emphasized that the orders to the United States Navy 'to shoot on sight' were still in effect"—Peace and War, page 112.

See also pages 128 and 130 of Peace and War in reference to the Japanese proposal to bring about a meeting between Prince Konoye and the President; the President failed to agree to such a meeting, the Secretary of State pointing out that "there should be a meeting of minds on the essential points before the meeting between the President and the Prime Minister was held."

Reverting to September 1941, there were 50 Consolidated Navy PBY's—seaplanes—available for the protection of Pearl Harbor. Had not Admiral Kimmel as commander in chief, Pacific Fleet, been promised 300 PBY's in all? Upon the completion of the additional 250 PBY's by Consolidated, the arrangement to send them to Pearl Harbor was canceled and all 250 were sent by Harry Hopkins, of the Munitions Assignment Board, to Great Britain. In the absence of these planes, the Navy was unable to conduct, for the protection of the fleet, an adequate 360° reconnaissance of the area around the Hawaiian Islands. We were, therefore, left with a number of blind spots in this essential survey. The Commander in Chief vested the power to make this decision in Harry Hopkins, who had had no naval or military experience, and in the Munitions Assignment Board. Mr. Hopkins is not subject to court martial.

Between September and November 1941, the Pearl Harbor situation was the subject of frequent discussion by high-ranking naval officers; did not a high-ranking naval officer call on the Commander in Chief and ask permission to get the fleet out of Pearl Harbor, pointing out the dangerous analogy to the situation in the Russo-Japanese War when the Japanese attacked a Russian naval base by surprise without a prior declaration of war? Did not the fleet remain at Pearl Harbor in spite of warnings of the Japanese plan to attack it there?

On November 3, 1941, Ambassador Grew warned the State Department "of the possibility of Japan's adopting measures with dramatic and dangerous suddenness which might make inevitable a war with the United States."

Four days later, on November 7, Secretary Hull stated at a Cabinet meeting that relations between Japan and the United States were extremely critical and that there was "imminent possibility"

that Japan might at any time start a new military movement of conquest by force—Peace and War, page 130.

The Secretary of the Navy on November 11, in a public address pointed out that the Pacific no less than the Atlantic called for instant readiness for defense. Nevertheless, is it not correct that no orders were given to put the Army and Navy on the No. 1 alert in the Pacific at this time and the fleet remained at Pearl Harbor?

On the same day Under Secretary of State Welles, acting at the suggestion of the entire Cabinet, warned publicly that "at any moment war may be forced upon us"—Peace and War, pages 130, 131.

On November 17, Ambassador Grew cabled from Tokyo, again warning that the Japanese might attack us by surprise—Peace and War, page 131. Is it not a fact that the fleet still remained at Pearl Harbor and no change in the alert orders was given by the Commander in Chief or his Cabinet officers?

On November 17 the President stated to the Japanese Ambassador that "from the long-range point of view, there was no occasion for serious differences between the United States and Japan"—Peace and War, page 132.

On November 25 and 28, 1941, at meetings of "high officials"—to whom does this refer?—of this Government, Secretary Hull stated that "any plans for our military defense should include an assumption that the Japanese might make the element of surprise a central point in their strategy and also might attack at various points simultaneously with a view to demoralizing efforts of defense and of coordination for purposes thereof"—Peace and War, page 138. To whom would Secretary Hull be likely to give this vitally important warning?

On November 26, 1941, the Secretary of State handed the Japanese Ambassador and Mr. Kurusu an ultimatum including the suggestion that Japan would "withdraw all military, naval, air, and police forces from China and from Indochina." The Japanese representatives informed the State Department that "this response to the Japanese proposal could be interpreted as tantamount to the end of the negotiations"—Peace and War, page 137.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCOTT. I yield.

Mr. CASE. The gentleman's thesis is rather interesting to me because I have been doing some research along that line with a view to making some remarks for which I have a special order tomorrow. In view of the treatment the gentleman has given the subject, I may decide that my order is unnecessary, and decline the time. However, in connection with his reference to Admiral Richardson I would like to ask the gentleman if he has noted in Clark Lee's book the reference to the fact that he was in Honolulu about a year prior to Pearl Harbor and found that Admiral Richardson was keeping the fleet scattered, permitting not more than two or three major ships to be in the harbor at any one time, and keeping the patrols out. He then made the statement that he was confident that the Japanese would never catch us at Pearl Harbor as they caught the Russians at Port Arthur in 1904 because he had seen the policy that Admiral Richardson was following in Hawaii.

Mr. SCOTT. I thank the gentleman for his contribution. I have some familiarity with the source from which he quotes, and if the gentleman has additional information, I would suggest to him that I am sure the public has waited a long time for it and would be very glad to have it.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCOTT. I yield.

Mr. CASE. I would point out that the references which the gentleman makes to statements by Ambassador Grew are set forth in documentary fashion in Grew's own diary recently published. I wonder if the gentleman investigated a report in October that the Korean people who were Korean patriots, placed before the State Department complete plans of the Japanese for the attack on Pearl Harbor, having obtained the same, according to the report, from the underground free Korea movement within the Japanese Navy?

Mr. SCOTT. I may say to the gentleman that it has been frequently reported here in Washington and in the public press, that the Korean independence group, not only in October but on frequent other occasions, fruitlessly sought to call the attention of somebody in the American Government to the fact that the Korean underground had complete plans of the Japanese intended attack upon us.

On November 29, 1941, Secretary Hull conferred with the British Ambassador. The Secretary said that "the diplomatic part of our relations with Japan was virtually over and that the matter will now go to the officials of the Army and Navy," adding that "Japan may move suddenly and with every possible element of surprise and spread out over considerable areas and capture certain positions and posts before the peaceful countries interested in the Pacific would have time to confer and formulate plans to meet these new conditions"—Peace and War, page 138. Did the fleet remain in Pearl Harbor and was any change in the alert ordered by the Commander in Chief?

On December 6, 1941, the President went over the heads of the Japanese Government and telegraphed a personal message to the Emperor of Japan. This message appears to have been sent without any notice to the Emperor's representatives here or to the Emperor's Government. On the same date as the President's message to the Emperor, did not the Australian Government learn that a Japanese fleet was steaming toward Pearl Harbor and did it not on the night of December 6–7 inform our Government at Washington? Did not our Government transmit the information to naval and military authorities at Pearl Harbor at or about 6:30 a. m., on December 7—Hawaiian time—by commercial cable and was not the message received 7 hours after the attack?

Would not Admiral Kimmel testify that he had no knowledge whatever of the nature of the ultimatum to Japan of November 26? Was this ultimatum a 10-day ultimatum and did it expire at midnight of December 6, 1941, or was it limited as to time at all? What did the Commander in Chief do to prepare our armed forces at Pearl Harbor for the ending of diplomatic negotiations and the initiation of hostilities by the treacherous Japanese?

Why were the acts of commission and omission at Washington so carefully excluded from the scope of the Roberts inquiry?

And I may add that I am including certain quotations from statements made by David Lawrence and from the United States News which I think may be of interest to you.

(The matter referred to follows:)

TRUMAN GIVES DEWEY CLUE IN PEARL HARBOR PROBE

(By David Lawrence)

WASHINGTON, August 24, 1944.—Maybe Senator HARRY TRUMAN, Democratic Vice Presidential nominee, has unwittingly done the Nation a service by bringing on at this time a discussion of the true responsibility for the tragedy of Pearl Harbor—something that has been concealed from the public now for more than 2½ years.

When Senator TRUMAN wrote his article for Collier's magazine and made certain charges against Admiral Kimmel and General Short, he was obviously speaking with a background of confidential information obtained in his position as a member of the Senate committee investigating the war effort. Admiral Kimmel has indignantly denied the charges and innuendoes in a public letter but the Missouri Senator insists that when the court-martial proceedings are held his charges in the article will be correct.

This raises at once the question of why the court martial has been delayed and what reason Senator TRUMAN had for taking the initiative in airing in a magazine article something that the Roosevelt administration has thus far so effectively kept from the public by postponing the court-martial proceedings again and again.

The official reason given for the delay is that it would be prejudicial to the war effort to try the case now. But the Republicans in the Senate also have been in possession of certain information about it and succeeded recently in forcing an Army-Navy board to begin an inquiry on what happened at Pearl Harbor. These proceedings, however, are secret and conclusions reached will not be available till after the Presidential campaign.

Meanwhile, Governor Thomas E. Dewey, Republican Presidential nominee, who has a bit of experience in prosecutions, might decide to try the case in public. Certainly Senator TRUMAN has given him the cue.

For a long time Army and Navy officers, retired and otherwise, have been gossiping about the Pearl Harbor tragedy and have been asking many questions, as for instance:

1. Why were all our battleships in harbor in Hawaii on December 7, 1941, instead of out at sea, and who in Washington gave the orders to keep them there, especially at a time of tension in the relations between Japan and the United States?

2. What admiral recommended that the ships be sent from Hawaii and what happened to the admiral who made such a recommendation, and was he relieved of his command at his own request or through the initiative of someone higher up?

3. Why, in view of the tense relations between Japan and the United States after the November 26 note was sent to Japan

by the State Department and prior to December 7, were no mobilization orders sent to the fleet by Admiral Stark, then Chief of Naval Operations, thus putting the fleet on a war basis?

4. Why was the report of Justice Roberts confined wholly and specifically to circumstances and events happening in Hawaii, and why were the official acts of commission or omission at Washington in the War and Navy Departments excluded from the scope of the Roberts inquiry, so that the public got only part of the story?

There are many other collateral questions which a congressional inquiry rather than a court martial could get at.

Inasmuch as President Roosevelt is running for reelection on the argument that he has been Commander in Chief of the armed services "for more than 11 years," as he expressed it in his letter to Chairman Hannegan, of the Democratic National Committee, the Republicans feel they have a right to pin the responsibility for Pearl Harbor on the Commander in Chief who knew all the facts about our relations with Japan and was in a position to order the mobilization of the fleet or else to send it away from Pearl Harbor. The American people, including the mothers and fathers of the more than 3,000 boys who were killed at Pearl Harbor, are entitled now to all the facts that Senator TRUMAN had when he wrote his magazine article and to all other facts that bear on the tragedy.

One point congressional investigators of Pearl Harbor want cleared up is why President Roosevelt, as Commander in Chief, relieved Admiral James O. Richardson as Chief of Naval Operations, after 1 year instead of the normal 2 years of service, following Admiral Richardson's protest against concentration of the United States Fleet in Pearl Harbor on the ground that this concentration was dangerous and offered the Japanese an opportunity to destroy much of the Navy at a single blow.

Let the people know. Who was to blame for Pearl Harbor? No good can come from further concealment of the facts.

The duty of the Commander in Chief is to protect the security of the armed forces of the Nation and to repel aggression or attack.

If I have said here anything which I should not have said, I hope it will be called to my attention on the floor of the House, rather than in the form of unwarranted attack or invidious comment in the public press, on the part of any who here and now have the privilege of the floor.

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCOTT. I yield.

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. The gentleman has made a most illuminating statement. I assume he realizes that in this listing he has cited the experience upon which we are asked to reelect the present Democratic nominee for the Presidency. Certainly if this experience record is substantially true that man should not continue in that office.

Mr. SCOTT. I agree entirely with everything the gentleman has said. The issue of the capacity of the Commander in Chief, of his experience, of his judgment, should be before the American people. Many lie dead at Pearl Harbor. The blame has never been fixed. Nearly 3 years have passed. Someone is to blame for that. Why are not the American people informed? Is it a sufficient answer to say that a court martial has been deferred, investigations have been postponed, boards of inquiry have made no public report? Official silence has descended over the negligent and the alert alike, while the careers of two of our former leaders, Admiral Kimmel and General Short, remain under a cloud, and they are unable to state their side of the story.

Let us have the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth. Only thus can the innocent be absolved, the guilty judged, the dead ultimately vindicated, and the public interest served.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania ha expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include therein an editorial on the late Senator George W. Norris.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein two newspaper articles and two editorials.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

(Mr. O'KONSKI and Mr. HOFFMAN asked and were given permission to extend their remarks in the RECORD.)

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Leave of absence was granted to Mr. JUDD, for 3 weeks, on account of trip to England.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 7 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, September 7, 1944, at 12 o'clock noon.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar as follows:

Mr. COLMER: Special Committee on Post-War Planning. Interim report pursuant to House Resolution 408. Resolution creating a Special Committee on Post-War Economic Policy and Planning (Rept. No. 1855). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar as follows:

Mr. KEOGH: Committee on Claims. H. R. 299. A bill for the relief of Hyman L. Schiffer; without amendment (Rept. No. 1843). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. SCRIVNER: Committee on Claims. H. R. 3369. A bill for the relief of Harry V. Hearn; with amendment (Rept. No. 1844). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GOODWIN: Committee on Claims. H. R. 3995. A bill for the relief of Walter Lundmark; with amendment (Rept. No. 1845). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. KEOGH: Committee on Claims. H. R. 4200. A bill for the relief of William Weber; with amendment (Rept. No. 1846). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. McGEHEE: Committee on Claims. H. R. 4333. A bill for the relief of Bertha LeFrancq; with amendment (Rept. No. 1847). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. McGEHEE: Committee on Claims. H. R. 4442. A bill for the relief of Albert B. Weaver; with amendment (Rept. No. 1848). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House

Mr. GREEN: Committee on Claims. H. R. 4481. A bill for the relief of William H. Crompton; with amendment (Rept. No. 1849). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. JENNINGS: Committee on Claims. H. R. 4629. A bill for the relief of Ludwig Wolf; without amendment (Rept. No. 1850). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GREEN: Committee on Claims. H. R. 4929. A bill for the relief of Lt. James H. Clark and Eleanor Clark; with amendment (Rept. No. 1851). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. McGEHEE: Committee on Claims. H. R. 4962. A bill for the relief of Jessie Springsteen and John Springsteen; with amendment (Rept. No. 1852). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. SCRIVNER: Committee on Claims. H. R. 4931. A bill for the relief of the city of Beardstown, Ill.; with amendment (Rept. No. 1854). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. DIMOND:

H. R. 5313. A bill to amend section 2 of the act approved June 20, 1936, entitled "An act to extend the benefits of the Adams Act, the Purnell Act, and the Capper-Ketcham Act to the Territory of Alaska, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. FULMER:

H. R. 5314. A bill providing for the transfer of surplus war materials, equipment, and supplies to schools, junior colleges, colleges, and universities supported in whole or in part by public funds; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. STEWART:

H. R 5315. A bill to validate State court judgments in Oklahoma and judgments of the United States district courts of the State of Oklahoma and conveyances in the State of Oklahoma where Indian lands of the Five Civilized Tribes of Indians are involved; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. JENKINS:

H. J. Res. 308. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the terms of office of the President; to the Committee on Election of President, Vice President, and Representatives in Congress.

By Mr. KNUTSON:

H. Res. 635. Resolution providing additional compensation for clerk for minority members of Committee on Ways and Means; to the Committee on Accounts.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr KUNKEL:

H. R. 5316. A bill for the relief of Ruth Burkholder Cable; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. OUTLAND:

H. R. 5317. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Mae E. Sutton; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SIKES:

H. R. 5318. A bill for the relief of Ira Henderson; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 5319. A bill for the relief of Warn Wright; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R 5320. A bill for the relief of George Wright; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R 5321. A bill for the relief of W. E. Howell; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 5322. A bill for the relief of Willis Hobbs; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 5323. A bill for the relief of M. E. Gainey; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 5324. A bill for the relief of G. W. Gainey; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 5325. A bill for the relief of J. E. Carroll; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 5326. A bill for the relief of Hughie Brown; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

6077. By Mr. ARNOLD: Petition of sundry music students of Kirksville, Mo., High School urging enforcement of the Bill of Rights by enacting legislation that will prevent interference with the broadcasting of noncommercial programs when presented by academically accredited, tax-exempt, educational institutions not in competition with professional talent; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

6078. By Mr. BRYSON: Petition of M. Evelyn Killen and 45 other citizens of Harbeson, Del., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

6079. Also, petition of Eva Harju and 57 other citizens of Wakefield, Mich., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

6080. Also, petition of Minnie Hendrixson and 38 other citizens of Amelia, Ohio, urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

6081. Also, petition of Hazel Davis and 31 other citizens of New Castle, Ind., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

6082. Also, petition of H. L. Clark and 63 other citizens of Townville, Pa., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

6083. Also, petition of Lilias Monahan and 38 other citizens of Huntington, Long Island, urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

6084. Also, petition of Mary D. DuBois and 457 other citizens of Salem, N. J., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

6085. Also, petition of Mary N. Harris and 20 other citizens of Clarksville, N. Y., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

6086. Also, petition of Matilda Galey and 46 other citizens of Dallas, Tex., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

6087. Also, petition of Edna May Souers and 80 other citizens of New Philadelphia, Ohio, urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

6088. Also, petition of Mrs. Schuyler Pearse and 22 other citizens of Watervliet, N. Y., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

6089. Also, petition of Freda S. Smith and 58 other citizens of Belle Vernon, Pa., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

6090. Also, petition of Myrtle M. Withiam and 67 other citizens of Anoka, Minn., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 7, 1944

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, our Heavenly Father upon earth, do Thou be pleased to consider and hear our morning prayer. Bless every one of us today with the mercy of a grateful heart. May we ever be thankful for those great and abiding realities upon which our democracy must ever abide for its glory and for its perpetuity, namely, the Christian home, the open Bible, the school, and the library. Hear us, O Heavenly Father, and grant that we may ever be true to these wonderful and historic traditions which have made our Republic great. We ask Thy gracious blessings upon the homes of this land whose firesides have been darkened by the absence of some boy. God bless them as the loved ones sit in the shadows, waiting, praying for those who perhaps will never return.

We thank Thee for the words of our Lord and Master, for the way He has taught the world to go, and hear us as we pray the prayer that fell from His immortal lips.

Our Father, who art in heaven, hallowed be Thy name. Thy kingdom come. Thy will be done, on earth as it is in heaven. Give us this day our daily bread. And forgive us our trespasses, as we forgive those who trespass against us. And lead us not into temptation, but deliver us from evil. For Thine is the kingdom, and the power, and the glory, for ever and ever.

Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday I received unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD an article by Dr. Nicholas Murray Butler. I am informed by the Public Printer that this article runs over one-third of a page, and will cost $121. Notwithstanding, I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

DUMBARTON OAKS CONFERENCE

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask that there be printed in the RECORD at this point the texts of two letters recently exchanged between Gov. Thomas E. Dewey and Secretary of State Cordell Hull and released yesterday by the Department of State.

These letters constitute a heartening manifestation of national unity on the problem of the establishment of an international peace and security organization. They should bring gratification to the people of the country and to the House of Representatives, where we have approached this tremendous problem in a nonpartisan spirit.

The following letters have been exchanged between Governor Dewey and Secretary Hull:

AUGUST 25, 1944.

Hon. CORDELL HULL,
Secretary of State,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I am deeply gratified at the result of the discussions you have had with Mr. Dulles, my representative. They constitute a new attitude toward the problem of peace.

Heretofore war has been the only matter which has been lifted above partisanship during a Presidential campaign. I recently said that if we are to have lasting peace we must wage peace as we wage war.

I feel that we are now making a beginning toward doing that, and it is my hope that we shall have great success to that end.

With assurances of my high esteem, I am,

Sincerely yours,

THOMAS E. DEWEY.

SEPTEMBER 4, 1944.

The Honorable THOMAS E. DEWEY,
Governor of New York,
New York.

MY DEAR GOVERNOR DEWEY: You may be sure that I appreciate your letter of August 25 expressing gratification at the result of the conversations recently concluded here with Mr. Dulles.

These conversations and your letter constitute a heartening manifestation of national unity on the problem of the establishment of an international peace and security organization. I am convinced that with unity, and only with unity, we can successfully carry forward this project which means so much to the people of this generation and to the people of generations to come.

Sincerely yours,

CORDELL HULL.

HOUSE SELECT COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE EXECUTIVE AGENCIES

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Speaker, from the Committee on Printing I report back favorably without amendment (Rept. No. 1856) a privileged resolution (H. Res. 633) authorizing the printing of additional copies of the fifth intermediate report (H. Rept. No. 1366) of the House Select Committee to Investigate Executive Agencies, submitting an analysis of a bill to amend the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That 15,000 additional copies of the fifth intermediate report (H. Rept. No. 1366) of the House Select Committee to Investigate Executive Agencies, submitting an analysis of a bill to amend the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, transmitted pursuant to the resolution (H. Res. 102) establishing a select committee to investigate acts of executive agencies beyond the scope of their authority, be printed for the use of said committee.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Speaker, from the Committee on Printing I report back favorably without amendment (Rept. No. 1857) a privileged resolution (H. Res. 634) authorizing the printing of additional copies of the sixth intermediate report (H. Rept. No. 1797) of the House Select Committee to Investigate Executive Agencies, submitting an analysis of a bill to improve the administration of justice by prescribing fair administrative procedure, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That 31,000 additional copies of the sixth intermediate report (H. Rept. No. 1797) of the House Select Committee to Investigate Executive Agencies, submitting an analysis of a bill to improve the administration of justice by prescribing fair administrative procedure, transmitted pursuant to the resolution (H. Res. 102) establishing a select committee to investigate acts of executive agencies beyond the scope of their authority, be printed for the use of said committee.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMITTEE ON MILITARY AFFAIRS

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Accounts, I present a privileged resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution (H. Res. 636), as follows:

Resolved, That the further expenses of conducting the investigation authorized by House Resolution 30 of the present Congress, incurred by the Committee on Military Affairs, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, not to exceed $15,000 in addition to sums heretofore made available, including expenditures for the employment of experts, and clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by such committee, signed by the chairman thereof, and approved by the Committee on Accounts.

SEC. 2. The official stenographers to committees may be used at all hearings held in the District of Columbia, unless otherwise officially engaged.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COCHRAN. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. How much money has this committee already had?

Mr. COCHRAN. This committee has had $155,000.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. This year?

Mr. COCHRAN. No; since it was authorized about 2 years. It has now a balance of approximately $3,500. On the basis of the amount of money it is now spending monthly, this $15,000, together with the unexpended balance, is more than sufficient to carry the committee under its present activities up to the end of the Congress, when the committee dies unless it is extended by the next Congress.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. What is the committee doing at the present time?

Mr. COCHRAN. The committee is making investigations of various kinds under the resolution the House adopted, granting special jurisdiction. It is supposed to be investigating expenditures of the War Department.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Did I correctly hear the gentleman say "supposed"?

Mr. COCHRAN. That is what it is supposed to do under the resolution.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COCHRAN. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. MAY. May I say to the gentleman from Missouri and the gentleman from Massachusetts and to the House that the House Committee on Military Affairs is continuing the same kind of investigations it has made in the past. We have expended in the entire two and a half years we have been working here the sum that has been appropriated in total less this $3,500. We have saved for the Government more than $1,000,000 for every $1,000 we have spent.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. What are you doing now?

Mr. MAY. At the present time we are looking into the situation of wounded veterans in the hospitals of this country. Something has been said in the press about it, but we have full, detailed information on many of them.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. What is the matter with the wounded veterans in the hospitals? What is happening to them?

Mr. MAY. In some places they have inadequate facilities. In other places they were not getting the kind of treatment we thought they ought to have.

As a result of that we found several cases where the War Department agreed with us that the situation was not exactly what it ought to be and remedied it. I will say this, that the War Department, when we do call their attention to these things, is ready and anxious to cooperate with us.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Do hospitals not come under the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation?

Mr. MAY. They are still in the Army until they are discharged.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Oh, they are not veterans, then?

Mr. MAY. No. We deal with Army hospitals only.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I will say that when we asked the question before the Committee on Accounts as to what activities they were engaged in, the chief investigator stated they were looking into some of the conditions that existed in the hospitals for sick soldiers. The gentleman mentioned veterans. The committee took the position that their jurisdiction does not extend to such investigations as veterans' hospitals. Of course, we just took that position, and we told the chief investigator that. The Committee on Accounts cannot control the investigations or what special committees are doing.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. But the gentleman gave them the money.

Mr. COCHRAN. We gave them $15,000 because the House made it mandatory when it created this committee and extended its life to the end of this Congress to provide funds to carry out the purposes of the resolution and we made

it plain we did not want them to go beyond their jurisdiction. Other committees of the House handle matters affecting veterans although we are all interested in the veterans' welfare.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COCHRAN. I yield.

Mr. MAY. The question of investigating the hospitals and the wounded veterans who are being returned, I maintain is entirely within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Military Affairs under this resolution, so long as they remain as wounded soldiers in Army hospitals. We do not investigate veterans' hospitals. But that is not all we are engaged in.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I want to make clear my position. What I am trying to do is to find out what the committee is doing so as to justify the expenditure of this money. I do not think the gentleman from Kentucky should feel that my inquiry is antagonistic.

Mr. MAY. Certainly not. I do not mean to imply in the slightest that the gentleman from Massachusetts objected to this House knowing and to the country knowing that we are trying to take care of these wounded veterans.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I think you should.

Mr. MAY. If I may be permitted to just make a little further statement. That is not all we are investigating. We are investigating the same character of things that we have been investigating in connection with the prosecution of the war and the promotion of the war effort.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COCHRAN. I yield.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. By "veteran" the gentleman from Kentucky does not mean veterans who come under the Veterans' Administration? He means men who are still in the Army?

Mr. MAY. Certainly; they are still in the Army until they are discharged from Army hospitals.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COCHRAN. I yield to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I hope very much, from now on, all the hospitals built for the Army for our soldiers, and the naval hospitals, will all be of fireproof construction. It is very unfortunate that a good many buildings went up which are, in reality, fire traps. I am very sure the committee is taking that up. I am very much distressed that we have not enough hospitals for the soldiers when they become veterans. That is not your problem; that is our problem.

Mr. MAY. There is a clear line of demarcation between who is a veteran out of the Army and who is a soldier in the Army. We do not go beyond the line. We are simply looking after those who are in Army hospitals. We never even touch the veterans' hospitals and do not intend to. Of course, if we found something very wrong in a veterans' facility we would call that to the attention of Mr. RANKIN's committee and I am sure he will take care of it.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. You know, under the law, those hospitals must be of concrete construction and fireproof construction. We hope the Army will put them in there.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Missouri yield for a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. COCHRAN. I yield for a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, when a Member has the floor and other Members desire recognition, should those desiring recognition address the Speaker or direct their inquiry as to whether the gentleman will yield to the gentleman who has the floor?

The SPEAKER. If we carried on in a parliamentary fashion the Member who desires to interrogate the Member who has the floor should address the Speaker. It is not done so very often in this House any more.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COCHRAN. I will yield just as soon as I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COCHRAN. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation, I have no objection whatever to this resolution. We have made it a rule to ask Members of Congress when they go home or go into a community where there is a veterans' hospital and especially the members of the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation, to go to that hospital and go through it from top to bottom. We have no objection to any committee of Congress or any Member of Congress investigating these hospitals. If there is anything wrong in any of them we want to find it out. If there is any suggestion for an improvement, we should like to have it.

So, as chairman of the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation, I say we have no objection to this resolution.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] for an observation.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I only wanted to ask the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MAY] whether or not he has had many complaints from Members and also from constituents and people in the country generally about excessive charges being made by some companies in the production of goods, and whether or not his committee has not investigated those charges and expects to continue to do so.

Mr. MAY. Is that question propounded to me?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Yes.

Mr. MAY. Will the gentleman yield for a moment?

Mr. COCHRAN. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. MAY. I would like to answer the question just propounded by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] by saying that we receive complaints from numerous Members of this House from time to time about various and sundry things connected with the Army. We immediately take it up and consider every one of them, and if it is found there is sufficient evidence to justify an investigator being put on it, we do it as soon as we can. We have been limited somewhat in our staff because we did not have the funds to expend, and we will still be limited until the 1st of January. As a matter of fact the investigation has been very much reduced for want of funds. I would like to make this further observation that in connection with the investigation of one hospital—I will not name it at present—we found that they were without refrigeration; that they had no electric fans; that they were overcrowded; and in fact that there was an adequate hospital within about 30 miles of this particular hospital not fully occupied. We immediately complained to the War Department that we had found these conditions which involved the location of fresh meat out in the open, with flies on it, there being even no screens. They immediately made available $80,000 for improvements and sent refrigeration and other facilities to it. Similar conditions have existed in two or three different instances.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COCHRAN. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. Was that an Army hospital?

Mr. MAY. Yes. We do not investigate those.

Mr. RANKIN. Let me emphasize the fact, and I hope every Member present will remember this, that nearly all of you have veterans' hospitals either in or near your district. When you go home or go to any community where one of these hospitals is located I hope you will take it on yourself to go and investigate it from top to bottom and come back and be prepared to report to Congress the conditions you find. I am sure you will find no such condition, in my opinion, in any of the veterans' hospitals, as that described by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MAY]. He was referring to Army hospitals.

Mr. MICHENER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COCHRAN. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. MICHENER. This discussion has made it clear that there should be further work along the line provided for by this resolution. I am sure all the people in the country want to do the right thing all the time by our veterans and especially those needing hospitalization. It seems to me discussions of this kind pointing out these deficiencies where they do exist in reference to the hospital facilities, are at least helpful.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Missouri yield?

Mr. COCHRAN. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. I call attention again to the fact that the conditions described by the Chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MAY], were found in Army hospitals, not in veterans' hospitals.

Mr. MICHENER. It does not make any difference to the country whether

they are veterans' hospitals or Army hospitals; the fact is there are ex-servicemen who need medical attention. There should be no dispute as to whether they receive it in Army, Navy, or veterans' hospitals; the objective is the thing that matters. These service people must have the best care made available, and the country will be satisfied with nothing less.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield again?

Mr. COCHRAN. I yield.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I have been bringing to the attention of the House steadily the thought that there will be a great shortage of beds in the Veterans' Administration hospitals. They are very slow in going ahead with their construction. I understand they could not get engineers. Anyway they have been extremely slow in starting their program. I think they could have borrowed Army engineers. The facilities of the Army hospitals will be needed more than ever to care for the growing load of casualties as a result of the speed with which we are going forward on the western front.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. COCHRAN. I yield once more.

Mr. RANKIN. I want to call attention to a fact the gentlewoman from Massachusetts well knows, that we provided $500,000,000 for veterans' hospitals in the so-called G. I. bill recently passed by Congress and approved by the President. I understand that this proposition of funds for the construction of necessary hospitals is now pending before the Bureau of the Budget. As soon as it is approved, they will go forward with this program of hospital construction so that in the future we may be able to take care of all our disabled veterans.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

THE LUTHERAN CHURCH OF THE REFORMATION

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, in a few weeks, perhaps while Congress is not in session, the Lutheran Church of the Reformation, located here on Capitol Hill, across East Capitol Street from the Congressional Library, will celebrate its seventy-fifth anniversary.

A large number of us who are Members of the Congress worship in that church. Many of us, including Speaker RAYBURN, have addressed meetings of that congregation. On behalf of these Members of Congress, I take this opportunity to express to the Church of the Reformation our congratulations upon this happy anniversary of splendid Christian service to God and country for three-quarters of a century.

This church has spent its entire life on Capitol Hill, under the shadow of the Capitol dome. It was organized in 1869 on First Street SE., very close to where the present Old House Office Building stands. When it was organized, the only public building on the Hill was the Capitol itself. The two wings of the Capitol were just completed and the wooden dome had been replaced by the present iron one only a few years before.

This church has given about 230 of its young men and women to the present armed forces of the Nation. Four of its young men have entered the Christian ministry during the past 10 years, 2 of them now serving as chaplains in the Army and Navy. This church symbolizes the contribution of the churches of America to the moral and spiritual strength of our Nation.

I am proud to say that the present pastor of this great church, Dr. Oscar F. Blackwelder, was reared in Concord, N. C., which is in the district I have the honor to represent. A great preacher and a great church are doing a great work for the spiritual, moral, and social uplift of the city of Washington.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on the subject of German atrocities against minority groups.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

DEMOBILIZATION OF THE ARMY

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, for the information of the House I wish to announce that during the present week the Military Affairs Committee of the House has conducted an executive conference with the appropriate high-ranking officers of the United States Army, the Selective Service Bureau, and naval officers on the question of demobilization of the Army and the future operation and needs of the selective-service system.

These conferences have disclosed that the Army is doing what I think and what I believe my committee thinks is a very fine job. First of all, they took a poll among the troops in continental United States, in the European theater of war, and in the southwest Pacific theater of war to determine the wishes of the men themselves. Based upon that poll, which was rather decisive, a system has been formulated and a release has been issued, which I am sure you have received by this time.

May I say that it seems a very satisfactory manner of demobilization.

In connection with the question of the selective-service law, as you know, the power to induct and to increase the armed forces through induction will expire next May. The selective-service officials have informed the committee that they will cooperate in every possible way toward keeping us posted as to their needs between now and that time, so that we can then determine whether or not there will be need for further extension.

SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON POST-WAR ECONOMIC POLICY AND PLANNING

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Post-war Economic Policy and Planning may have until midnight tomorrow night to file an interim report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include therein a letter written by Carl R. Pepper, Jr., of Bristol, Va.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

(Mr. MYERS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks in the RECORD.)

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include an article by William Mather Lewis, president, Lafayette College, Easton, Pa.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a speech that I made before the Polish-American Society; also to extend my remarks and to include an article appearing in the New York Times of September 4, 1944, entitled "The Cry of the Tortured Action"; and also to extend my remarks and to include an article from the New York Times of September 4, 1944, entitled "Young Pole's Tale Bares Death Camp."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House today for 15 minutes at the conclusion of any special orders heretofore entered.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ROMULO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include an address of President Sergio Osmeña to his cabinet.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the Resident Commissioner from the Philippines?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an article from a magazine.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein Veterans' Administration Instruction No. 1, title V, Public No. 346, Seventy-eighth Congress, Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in two instances in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include therein editorials.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

(Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.)

THE PEARL HARBOR CATASTROPHE

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, it has been 2 years and 9 months since the catastrophe at Pearl Harbor; still no charges have been filed against anyone, and the blame for that catastrophe has not been determined.

The American people want to know, and they are entitled to know, who was to blame. Some think Admiral Kimmel and General Short were to blame, while many others think the blame lies much higher.

Why keep the facts from the American people any longer? Military and naval discipline prevent Kimmel and Short from telling the facts except at a court-martial trial, if and when one is had. Admiral Kimmel says that "when the entire story is given to the American people, they will be amazed at the truth." In fairness to the American people, to the Army and Navy, and to Admiral Kimmel and General Short, a public hearing should be had at once.

In my opinion, there will be no action taken unless it is forced. I, therefore, urge citizens throughout the Nation to circulate petitions in their communities immediately, and send them to the President, demanding that the truth be no longer suppressed, and that a full, open, public hearing be had before November 7, so that the people can definitely know who was to blame.

I would suggest that the following form of petition be used:

To the PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES:

We, the undersigned, loyal American citizens, hereby demand that a free, open, and full public hearing be had and completed before November 7, so as to definitely determine who was to blame for the catastrophe at Pearl Harbor on December 7, 1941.

Name _____
Street _____
City _____

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial from the Mt. Vernon (Ohio) News entitled "Experience."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a resolution passed by the Vincent B. Costello Post, No. 15, of the American Legion, District of Columbia, on the subject of hospitalization of veterans.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that today, at the conclusion of the legislative program and following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker I ask unanimous consent that today, following the special order granted to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. MURRAY] I may be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

NEW ROOSEVELT EMERGENCY IS BEING CREATED TO FURTHER FOURTH-TERM CAMPAIGN

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, another Roosevelt emergency is in the making. Another New Deal crisis is aborning. The purpose, of course, is to keep us in the middle of the stream that we never seem to get across.

Steps to create this new emergency have been taken by the New Deal spokesmen in recent utterances, at their national convention, on the floors of Congress, and in the Vice Presidential nominee's opening campaign speeches in Detroit.

There is no doubt about it. The New Dealers, experienced hands in creating emergencies, are plunging us into just one more emergency which, in fact, need not exist unless it is deliberately created by an administration that is bent on regulating the lives of every one of us, whether we need it or not.

It is the same old story that has been repeated so many times in the past 12 years. During all of that time we have been kept in a constant state of getting out of one emergency only to be told that another is in the offing.

Today, Mr. Speaker, the hue and cry from the master minds of the New Deal inner sanctum is that a horrible specter of unemployment faces us in the post-war period.

These master minds would have us believe that the New Deal, and only the New Deal, is capable of driving away that specter. In every utterance that has been made by a New Deal spokesman since the opening of their national convention in Chicago, is the statement or prediction of the frightening state of affairs that will prevail when it comes time for America to lay down the sword for the plowshare. The din and the roar surrounds us everywhere. All in a frantic effort to convince the American people of something which just common ordinary judgment says does not make sense.

Any employer of labor will tell you, Mr. Speaker, that such a post-war unemployment crisis as the New Dealers are picturing can develop only if hopeless fumbling in Washington creates it. If the manufacturer and the businessman and the farmer are forced to follow the dictates of those in Washington who would rather have what they call a controlled economy than prosperity, then it is conceivable that we might blunder into serious unemployment problems.

Certainly, nothing that has been done by the New Deal up to now would indicate otherwise. But if the problems of reconverting to peacetime production are handled by practical men of real experience, and not by dreamy-eyed planners of the New Deal, there is nothing to fear.

A sensible approach to the problem can be made by employers themselves if they are allowed to do so. Is there any real reason why they should not be given some freedom to work out their own individual problems of reconversion, or must we deliver all of industry and all of labor into the hands of the bureaucrats who can then make or break any one or all of us?

Indeed, if the problem of reconversion is as gigantic and is as fraught with danger as the New Deal would have us believe, then there is all the more reason why it should not be entrusted to any one man or small group of men. We must not be forced to stand or fall according to the ability or lack thereof possessed by the planners.

Given an even chance by labor leaders and Government, business and industry in America can take care of their own problems of reconversion, and the unemployment problem, that the New Dealers

profess to fear so mightily, will be automatically avoided. Many an employer or industrialist has told Congress of plans for rapid expansion and production when peace comes. Many of them have given figures showing just how many thousands they can employ, but the New Deal has been too busy planning our economy to listen to men who have the hard, cold facts.

As a matter of fact, there are many industries that will not have to pass through a retooling or reconversion period before going into full peacetime production. One example to substantiate this statement is seen in my own congressional district. There the paper industry in the city of Kalamazoo alone can add hundreds of workers for peacetime production, even on the present time schedules. If the time schedules are returned to what they were before the war, double the number of men can be added to the pay rolls.

There are hundreds of such industries where production has either fallen off since the war due to the scarcity of raw material or where the production has gone almost entirely into war work. With the coming of peace production will be expended to take care of the tremendous backlog of orders from civilian sources.

One manufacturer from Coldwater, Mich., in my congressional district, who is in Washington this week, advised me that his company, which manufactures plumbing supplies, is 2½ years behind orders.

Then there is the farm-labor situation about which so much has been said during the past few months. Anywhere from one to three million men will be needed to work the farms of the Nation which have been so shorthanded during the war. The forestry and timber and fishing industries, too, are badly depleted in manpower. They need no period of reconversion. They need not even await a supply of raw material. They only need men to work.

And, again, there are new industries that have started, or have come into their own, during the war. The entire field of plastics, where the possibilities for new products are unlimited, is ready and anxious to apply its new-found secrets on the production of civilian goods. Those plants are built now. They are ready to produce. Only the wartime restrictions in the supply of raw material, and the necessity to produce only for military needs, is holding back the plastic manufacturers from developing one of the world's greatest industries. And they will need men by the thousands to do it.

The fabulous science of electronics is another industry that will absorb thousands of workers after the war. Television and the million marvels it will bring is ready to go. The plans are laid. The experimenting has been done to a large extent in the development of war equipment. As soon as the all-clear signal is given the electronics industry will be ready to start heavy production schedules on television that will bring the events of the world to the living room of every home, not only in sound but in sight, by the flick of a switch or a button.

Mr. Benjamin Abrams, president of the Emerson Radio & Phonograph Co., predicted not long ago that the electronics industry would advance from an annual dollar volume of $350,000,000 before the war to a $3,000,000,000 volume after the war. And there will, of course, be a corresponding increase in the number of workers employed in that already large industry.

One can name dozens of such industries and occupations which are ready to absorb workers as soon as the wartime strait jacket is removed by the Government.

Our public works have been neglected during the war. There has been almost no new construction of roads, bridges, and public buildings except where directly needed in the war effort. Most of our public highways are badly in need of repair. The road crews have gone to war but their jobs will be there when they return.

The same is true in our transport industries where needed work has not been done or where men have been replaced by women, most of whom have no desire to continue at the unfeminine tasks of driving busses and streetcars when the men come back. Railroad roadbeds and equipment are in notoriously bad condition, as everyone knows who has ridden on a train in recent months. This all means work. Work for returning servicemen and all others who want to work.

Let us not forget, too, the fact that industry now is operating on a basis of long shifts designed to compensate for the lack of manpower. If all plants were to go back to a 44- or 40-hour workweek immediately after the war, there would be need for thousands upon thousands of workers. The immediate effect of cut-backs in war contracts can be largely cushioned by the return to a shorter workweek. And it would be a boon to all of us when that happens. Under the strain of long hours at the shop and in the offices nerves have been worn and tempers have become short. Minor grievances among workers have been built up to a degree out of all proportion to their real importance. Both sides in these squabbles have been guilty of exaggerating the issues. We have all been driving ourselves to work and produce under conditions that we would not tolerate in peacetime. The headaches of management and labor have reached migraine proportions, and yet we have had to keep going. In peacetime we can change all of that, if labor leaders and the Government will permit.

Recently at the Willow Run airplane plant of the Ford Motor Co. there was a 30-percent slice in the Government's orders for planes. Yet not one single man was laid off. The cut was made in the hours of work and I am told that it was to the satisfaction of all concerned.

No, Mr. Speaker, the New Deal's specter of impending unemployment will not bear the light of analysis. It is scare psychology, designed to create panic-thinking, and to prepare the minds of the people of America for more of the same old New Deal. As I said in the beginning, it is another artificial emergency to keep us in the middle of the stream that we never seem to get across. In fact, we will never get across that stream while the New Deal remains in power.

There is no greater campaign strategy in the world than creating fear in the minds of the people and then trying to create in their minds the thought that only one person can protect them.

CONGRESS HAS DONE ITS PART—FOOD PRODUCTION HANDICAPS AND FLUCTUATING PRICES KEPT IN STATE OF CONFUSION BY NEW DEAL POLITICIANS

Mr. LANDIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend my remarks, and to include three brief amendments.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANDIS. Mr. Speaker, there have been many statements made about the 90-percent parity guaranteed the food producers for the duration of the war and 2 years thereafter. We should face the situation squarely, so that no farmer or businessman is led to believe things that are not facts. This may be as important to feed dealers, potato buyers, handlers of dairy products, butchers, and packers as it is to the farmer.

In order to properly approach this problem, I will quote the following legislation in connection therewith:

[Public Law 147, 77th Cong., ch. 270, 1st sess.]

H. R. 4972

An act to extend the life and increase the credit resources of the C. C. C., and for other purposes

SEC. 4. (a) Whenever during the existing emergency the Secretary of Agriculture finds it necessary to encourage the expansion of production of any nonbasic agricultural commodity, he shall make public announcement thereof and he shall so use the funds made available under section 3 of this act or otherwise made available to him for the disposal of agricultural commodities, through a commodity loan, purchase, or other operation, taking into account the total funds available for such purpose for all commodities, so as to support a price for the producers of any such commodity with respect to which such announcement was made of not less than 85 percent of the parity or comparable price therefor.

This 85 percent guaranty was changed to 90 percent as shown by:

[Public Law 729, 77th Cong., ch. 578, 2d sess.]

H. R. 7565

An act to amend the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, to aid in preventing inflation, and for other purposes

SEC. 9. (a) Section 4 (a) of the act entitled "An act to extend the life and increase the credit resources of the Commodity Credit Corporation, and for other purposes", approved July 1, 1941 (U. S. C., 1940 ed., Supp. I, title 15, sec. 713a-8), is amended— .

(1) By inserting after the words "so as to support" a comma and the following: "during the continuance of the present war and until the expiration of the two-year period beginning with the 1st day of January immedi-

ately following the date upon which the President by proclamation or the Congress by concurrent resolution declares that hostilities in the present war have terminated,".

(2) By striking out "85 per centum" and inserting in lieu thereof "90 per centum".

(3) By inserting after the word "tobacco" a comma and the word "peanuts".

(b) The amendments made by this section shall, irrespective of whether or not there is any further public announcement under such section 4 (a), be applicable with respect to any commodity with respect to which a public announcement has heretofore been made under such section 4 (a).

When the life of the C. C. C. Act was extended in February 1944, the La Follette-Taft amendment was adopted. This is as follows:

In cases where producers have expanded or hereafter expand production of nonbasic agricultural commodities pursuant to any public announcement made under section 4 (a) of the act entitled "An Act to extend the life and increase the credit resources of the Commodity Credit Corporation, and for other purposes," approved July 1, 1941, as amended, it shall be the duty of the Secretary of Agriculture or the War Food Administrator through loans, purchases, and other operations under such section 4 (a), to completely fulfill all commitments made to such producers. In order to carry out the purposes of this section, the Secretary of Agriculture or the War Food Administrator shall use such of the funds available for carrying out the provisions of such section 4 (a) as may be necessary, and such funds as hereby made available for such purpose.

You will note that the Congress not only passed the basic law guaranteeing 90-percent parity floor, but, since it was not followed, Congress again showed its position by passing the LaFollette-Taft amendment. This was a case of passing a law and then compelled to pass another law to make the bureaucrats carry out the provisions of the law.

Since the Department of Agriculture urged the farmers to produce more poultry, eggs, pork, and milk, it was their duty to keep faith with the American farmers and follow the law which provided a 90-percent parity floor.

In extending the life of the Commodity Credit Corporation Act, Public Law No. 147, Seventy-seventh Congress, H. R. 4972, provides:

Any such commodity loan, purchase, or other operation which is undertaken shall be continued until the Secretary has given sufficient public announcement to permit the producers of such commodity to make readjustment in the production of the commodity.

This so-called 90-percent guaranty then applies only to nonbasic commodities for which the United States Department of Agriculture has publicly announced a request for increased production. This would include poultry, eggs, milk, and pork. The so-called basic commodities—corn, cotton, wheat, rice, tobacco, and the lowly peanut—have the protection of the loan program under the basic A. A. A. law.

EGGS

Now let us take eggs for an example. Ever since last December it was evident that a surplus of eggs could be expected. There were many factors that contributed to this surplus. What happened? Eggs sold for 25 cents per dozen when the 90-percent parity was 39 cents per dozen, and day after day, week after week the egg producers received less than the legal guaranteed price. This situation has been somewhat remedied for the time being. Many people believe that the election is having considerable influence in getting the bureaus to show more interest in the 90-percent guaranty in the law and in following it. However, the sad part of it is the W. F. A. does not know how to dispose of surplus food products.

During this surplus egg period we have seen these eggs sold for making tankage at 5 cents per case. Eggs are one of the best sources of animal protein. We note the political agriculturists diverted $14,000,000 of our grandchildren's earnings into subsidy to a vegetable protein in the form of peanut butter as just one more example of favoring the South.

Here, then, is the question—when these egg surpluses did become embarrassing why in the name of common sense did not the War Food Administration exercise the provision of the law as quoted above that says:

Any such commodity loan, purchase, or other operation which is undertaken shall be continued until the Secretary has given sufficient public announcement to permit the producers of such commodity to make a readjustment.

If this part of the law were followed the egg producer could put his house in order and could produce accordingly.

PORK SITUATION

Now let us consider the Price Control Act as provided in Public Law 421, Seventy-seventh Congress, chapter 26, second session, H. R. 5990, section 2, paragraph h, the following:

The powers granted in this section shall not be used or made to operate to compel changes in the business practices, cost practices, or methods or aids to distribution, established in any industry, except to circumvention or evasion of any regulation, order, price schedule, or requirement under this act.

We also find in Public Law 729, chapter 578, as an amendment to the Price Control Act, section 3, subsection 2, the following:

Provided further, That in the fixing of maximum prices on products resulting from the processing of agricultural commodities, including livestock, a generally fair and equitable margin shall be allowed for such processing: *Provided further*, That in fixing price maximums for agricultural commodities and for commodities processed or manufactured in whole or substantial part from any agricultural commodity, as provided for by this act, adequate weighting shall be given to farm labor.

This then is the basic law although many interpretations, directives, and Executive orders have also been issued. One thing is certain, this part of the law has not had much consideration. It is doubtful if it has even been read by some of the people charged with the responsibility of administering the act. If it had been read, one of the purely political appointees of the War Food Administration would not have been sending out letters to the country butchers telling them to get new slaughter houses in 10 days or he would take away their permit to butcher. Nor would the small packers have been put out of business as ruthlessly as they were.

The law provided for a 90-percent parity guaranty, and remember, friends, parity means the price on the farm. What happened? One would not believe that this was a part of the law of the land, as little attention as it has received. This legal guaranty of 90-percent parity price must not be confused with the support prices which have been manipulated in such a manner as to cheat the hog producer out of untold millions of dollars.

Light-weight hogs have sold as low as 30 percent of parity in the face of this 90 percent of parity legal price, supposedly guaranteed by law, as shown by the official sales receipt inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of June 23, 1944, which reads as follows:

NOVEMBER 23, 1944.

Martin Rice, Plain:

Hogs	3
Weight	250
Price per hundred pounds	$3.00
Amount	$7.50
Deductions: Yard charges	.90
Net	6.60

A parity price means hogs of all weights.

THE DAIRY BUSINESS

The W. F. A. and the O. P. A. have never made much of an attempt to even follow the spirit of the law so far as some of the dairy products are concerned. The act provides in section 5 that the Administrator is authorized to confer with the producers and processors but the cheese price was fixed without consulting the producers nor even the large dairy associations in the country:

[Public Law 421, 77th Cong., ch. 26, 2d sess.]

H. R. 5990

An act to further the national defense and security by checking speculative and excessive price rises, price dislocations, and inflationary tendencies, and for other purposes

Be it enacted, etc.—

VOLUNTARY AGREEMENTS

SEC. 5. In carrying out the provisions of this act, the Administrator is authorized to confer with producers, processors, manufacturers, retailers, wholesalers, and other groups having to do with commodities, and with representatives and associations thereof, to cooperate with any agency or person, and to enter into voluntary arrangements or agreements with any such persons, groups, or associations relating to the fixing of maximum prices, the issuance of other regulations or orders, or the other purposes of this act, but no such arrangement or agreement shall modify any regulation, order, or price schedule previously issued which is effective in accordance with the provisions of section 2 or section 206. The Attorney General shall be promptly furnished with a copy of each such arrangement or agreement.

This is the provision of the law which Congress expected the O. P. A. Administrator to carry out. I realize it says "is authorized to confer" but Congress expected the spirit of the law would necessitate the conferring.

In 1942 the Department of Agriculture agents promised $2.10 per hundredweight for milk in one section and 100 days later milk was selling for $1.65 per

hundredweight. In 1942 they promised $2.35 per hundredweight for milk and 90 days after the farmers were receiving $1.85 per hundredweight. Why were these commitments not fulfilled? What has all this confusion led to? First we find feed subsidies in Southern States 80 percent greater than in Indiana and the other leading dairy States of the Midwest. Second, take a State like Minnesota or Wisconsin which the O. P. A. has just fined the dairy cooperatives $3,000,000 for selling their powdered skim milk above the O. P. A. ceiling price. The managers of these cooperatives did not know and could not find out what the O. P. A. ceiling price really was. The money was disbursed to the farmer members and now the O. P. A. comes along with a fine three times greater than the overcharge. However, I do not believe they will try to collect the $3,000,000 before the election.

This is a peculiar situation. These Midwest dairymen had a fixed price based on the butter and powdered skim milk that would yield them $2.63 per hundredweight for their milk.

It happens that the milk price in States like North and South Carolina, Georgia, and Florida is $3.75 to $4.60 per hundredweight. What appears confusing to the dairy people of the Midwest as well as to others with a sense of justice, is this: If these midwestern farmers receiving $2.63 per hundredweight fixed price, should accidentally obtain 20 cents per hundredweight more for their milk, why should it be so illegal for these farmers to obtain $2.83 per hundredweight for their milk when the dairymen in these other sections were provided a price that was $1.77 per hundredweight more or $4.60 per hundredweight?

Another fact that makes this appear ridiculous is that the protein feeds were as much as $10 per ton less in these Southern States than in Indiana and the Midwest. The South also received the lion's share of the protein feed last year. Is it any wonder that it is confusing to try to follow the rulings, orders, and directives of these bureaucrats?

There are fundamental issues involved in this situation. The first is that the producers and the people have lost confidence in Washington. The second is that there is no use talking about a 90-percent floor for farmers for 2 years after the war, if the same people—political agriculturists—are to administer it. This is especially true when they will not maintain the 90-percent parity price during the war when the demand for farm products are at its greatest peak. It is rather irritating to see the would-be New Deal agriculturists telling about the billion dollars that is being given away before the 1944 election. The New Deal found it worked when they distributed mattresses and hams in 1936 and 1940 elections, so they apparently think the farmers might fall for it too. They take the role of Santa Claus, at the very time that the Department of Agriculture is not even fulfilling the legal commitments it has made to the food producers of America. They had better be using these millions they announce they are going to give away to pay the producers who have not been paid the legal price for their eggs, pork, and other products during the past year.

Congress has done its part in passing the necessary legislation to increase food production and to protect the farmer. If these laws have not been carried out or are not being carried out in conformity to the letter and spirit of the law, it is the responsibility of the political agriculturists who are more interested in the vote crop of 1944 than they are in the food crop of 1944.

One fact is certainly more apparent each day and that is that the farmers of this country cannot expect much security from this 90-percent parity floor in the post-war agricultural world, if the present outfit remains in power.

JEEPS

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, judging from the mail I received in the past 10 days, the men in active service are much interested in the opportunity of purchasing surplus war material. I received a V-mail letter in yesterday's mail that I thought might interest the House. This is from a boy serving in Italy:

> Begging your pardon in advance, for the trouble I cause, I would like a litle information. I'm in love with a jeep and trailer. I sigh every time one passes me, kicking up a cloud of dust. My heart is set on having one. I'm glad to read that the G. I. will have a chance to own one without some dealer robbing him. It makes me very happy, and would buy one today if it's possible. My weary feet are tired from chasing Jerries so if and when I get home, my wife and I would take our bumps on a jeep. All information, including price, how, when, and where, and how soon I can get one, would more than make me happy.

REEMPLOYMENT OF VETERANS

Mr. STEWART. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. Speaker, I call the attention of the Congress to the contemplated method of reemployment of our soldiers who are being mustered out of service. The present scheme and the most discussed plan by those in authority is to send them to the U. S. E. S., the left arm of the C. I. O. and Sidney Hillman. That does not meet with the approval of the people in the State of Oklahoma one iota. The G. I. bill has made adequate preparation for the reemployment of the soldiers. I am told that the reconversion bill is setting up an additional board, which will conflict with the G. I. board. But above all, and in the name of high heaven, let us not have this C. I. O. Political Action Committee making our soldiers pay union dues, fees, tribute when they return from service.

Our service forces are not going to forget such demands and those responsible will be brought to an accounting in due time.

Whom of you favor the paying of tribute by our armed forces to a group of foreign-born self-appointed labor leaders?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

(Mr. BENNETT of Michigan asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.)

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an order of the O. P. A.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD in two instances, in one to include some remarks of mine printed in the Jewish Forum and in the other to include the platform of the Affiliated Young Democrats, Inc., of New York State. I have been advised that the latter document exceeds the limit as to the amount of space extraneous matter may occupy in the RECORD, and will cost $104, but I ask that it be printed despite that fact.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York

There was no objection.

Mr. IZAC. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, and include an article from the Washington Star.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a very short newspaper article on the subject of the recovery of the city of Paris.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

REMOVAL OF WILLIAM PHILLIPS FROM STAFF OF GENERAL EISENHOWER

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include an editorial from the Pittsburgh Press and an article from the Pittsburgh Sun-Telegraph.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, certainly I do not wish to appear critical of the British Empire and its people. They are our gallant ally, fighting by our side, turning in magnificent victories, victories which will lead the world out of the cataclysm of war in which it is now engulfed, and victories which will stamp out forever the ruthlessness of the aggressive powers. However, I do feel that the arrogance of British statesmanship has reached a new high when they asked for and evidently, I under-

stand, have secured the removal of William Phillips, former Under Secretary of State and special ambassador to India, from the staff of General Eisenhower in London. This is an action that should give every Member of Congress grave concern. I cannot recall that the British Government disavowed the responsibility for the public statement made in June of this year by British Minister of Production Lyttelton that "Japan was forced into attacking the Americans at Pearl Harbor." This statement aroused the ire of our State Department and Secretary Hull stated, according to the Pittsburgh Press of June 22. I quote:

Unfortunately, the statement of the British Minister of Production is entirely in error as to the facts and failed to state the true attitude of the United States both during the earlier stages of military preparations for world conquest by Germany and Japan, and during the latter aggressions of those countries.

The editorial goes on to state, and I quote:

We should not blame the British, not even when they let slip as Mr. Churchill did last year, the plan to demobilize much of their army as soon as Germany is defeated. If we were in their position maybe we, too, would consider Jap aggression must less important than German. Anyway, justly or unjustly, there still is fear in this country of Britain's attitude toward the Pacific war. Unless the Prime Minister disavows the Lyttelton libel of the United States, this fear will fester and grow. That would not help Anglo-American understanding—the chief hope of winning the war and the peace.

Now it appears that it is all right for British executives to potshot at Uncle Sam and get away with it--but when William Phillips, our military adviser, courageously presents his views, he finds himself on the way out. Evidently there are a great many in the British Empire who fail to recognize the fact, and it is properly recorded in a document known as the Declaration of Independence—that we declared our independence on July 4, 1776, and certainly we cannot but sympathize with India who, like ourselves, seeks its independence. It appears from our appeasing methods with the British that the Union Now about which we have heard so much is seemingly a reality and the membership of the House has not been apprised of this information.

A well-known columnist stated in a news story in the Pittsburgh Sun-Telegraph Friday, September 1—and I quote:

He also stated that the British consuls throughout the United States had been instructed to ask local newspapers to counteract the Phillips letter to the President.

And evidently they were at work, because the Phillips story did not break in some of our metropolitan dailies until several days later.

I wonder what would happen to our representatives in the British Empire if we attempted any suppression of news of a similar nature. They would be booted out just as William Phillips was booted out.

Now I want to take this opportunity to pay tribute to this great American, William Phillips, for his courage to inform the people of this Nation as to what is happening in the world on matters affecting the United States and our fighting men in this theater of war. If the William Phillips policy is pursued and the American people are properly informed as to what is happening in the world, I feel quite certain we will never again have a repetition of Pearl Harbor. If we had more men in the State Department of the Phillips type representing Uncle Sam, rather than a lot of social-minded nobility-loving aristocrats, this Nation would be far better off.

The very able British statesmen—and they are men of ability—seemingly are able to "take over" our statesmen like Joe Stalin took over the Ukraine. Many of our supposedly able diplomats think more of an invitation to the British Embassy to tea or to be entertained by British nobility than looking after Uncle Sam's interests. So when a fellow like William Phillips appears on the horizon and publicly informs the American people that what we need is a "diplomatic policy with a backbone to it," certainly I feel that he deserves our thanks and recognition.

Now that the war with Germany is nearly over, our full resources will be turned upon the Japanese Empire. To effect the complete defeat of our eastern enemy we must remain united with all the peoples of the world who seek to live under the much-publicized "four freedoms." India, one of the main arteries of the fighting front, is far from being in accord with us. They are apathetic and indifferent, and a hostile India at the backs of our fighting men is equally as dangerous as the enemy they face. Through India must be sent much of the food, ammunition, and the mechanical equipment to sustain these men. Without these supplies, the present campaign in Burma would become another Bataan. By refusing to permit the Indian people to enjoy the liberties of the freedoms the Allies are rapidly arousing this mistrust and losing the confidence and cooperation of millions of people who represent the small nations. Without their confidence and cooperation, a lasting peace is impossible.

We have heard much about the Atlantic Charter and the freedoms, and up jumps an American, William Phillips, who actually believes in the freedoms, so he opens up with freedom of speech to find himself shellacked all over the lot and told to pack up his bag and get out. The four freedoms is a great instrumentality for the nations of the world when it does not affect the British Empire—but when it comes to India for the Indians, Ireland for the Irish, Hong Kong for the Chinese, and Palestine for the Jews—well, that is just another story.

A few months back, when the world was in turmoil and the backs of British were up against the wall, the British appealed to this Nation for help, and we responded gladly with everything that we had available at the time, and American business and labor took off their coats and turned out the planes, the tanks, the jeeps, the guns, and the foodstuffs in a frenzy of productivity that reinspired the world. The youth of our Nation with courage and determination in their hearts, flung themselves into the far-flung battle lines of the world and in the air and on the sea and under the sea, they turned what looked like hopeless defeat and despair into glorious victory—with one objective, and that is, for the peace and freedom of the people of the world.

So, now what happens? When one of our diplomats has the courage to express his opinion on the critical Indian situation, which he does in an honest and truthful manner, the British statesmen take offense and he is ordered out.

No doubt the State Department will hush up the incident for fear of offending the British. However, in conclusion, I sincerely hope that we can enlist the services of more men of the William Phillips type and character to represent us in our dealings throughout the world. I understand from a press release he is to leave the State Department. This indeed is to be regretted.

For the benefit of those who did not read the story, I will insert the news story in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as it appeared in the Sun-Telegraph, Pittsburgh, Pa., September 1, also the editorial from the Pittsburgh Press, of Pittsburgh, of June 22, entitled the "Lyttelton Libel," which should prove interesting reading:

[From the Pittsburgh Press of June 24, 1944]

THE LYTTELTON LIBEL

The British Government should disavow responsibility for the statement of Production Minister Lyttelton that "Japan was forced into attacking the Americans at Pearl Harbor." That is what Tojo and Hitler say. If true, the American people were hoaxed into war. It is a lie.

Apparently the British cabinet officer meant it as praise. But, even after his statement had provoked congressional protests, his excuse was so lame and his apology so left-handed that Secretary of State Hull had to brand it officially.

If this were an isolated case, Secretary Hull would not be so angry. But the American Government and people have reason to be particularly sensitive regarding British attitudes toward Japan and the Pacific war. Americans cannot forget that Britain's refusal to stand by the United States in support of treaties when Japan invaded Manchuria in 1931 encouraged Japan's decade of aggressions up to Pearl Harbor—and the aggressions of Italy and Germany as well. As Secretary Hull puts it:

"Unfortunately the statement of the British Minister of Production is entirely in error as to the facts, and failed to state the true attitude of the United States both during the earlier stages of military preparations for world conquest by Germany and Japan and during the later aggressions of those countries."

It is true that we were a standing challenge to Jap aggression. And it probably is true that we could have saved ourselves—for awhile—by selling out China to Japan as Britain did, not only in Manchuria and Tientsin but also in closing the Burma Road. But, having seen Britain's tragic failure to stop Axis aggression by making deals, we refused to make a Munich with the Japs. Our policy was only partly due to our regard for China and our duty to the Philippines. Chiefly, as Secretary Hull says, it was "a policy of self-defense."

Had we been as logical as the thrice-burned British—who belatedly attacked Hitler when

he hit Poland—we would have struck Japan before she had a chance to attack us. But we didn't.

We didn't even prepare adequately against a Jap blow at us. Why? Because London persuaded Washington that the attack on us would come from Germany instead of Japan. That is the irony of the Lyttelton canard.

We should not blame the British—not even when they let slip, as Mr. Churchill did last year, the plan to demobilize much of their Army as soon as Germany is defeated. If we were in their position, maybe we too would consider Jap aggression much less important than German.

Anyway, justly or unjustly, there still is fear in this country of Britain's attitude toward the Pacific war. Unless the Prime Minister disavows the Lyttelton libel of the United States, this fear will fester and grow. That would not help Anglo-American understanding, the chief hope of winning the war and the peace.

[From the Pittsburgh Sun-Telegraph of September 1, 1944]

ROOSEVELT PROBE DEMANDED IN PHILLIPS' OUSTER

WASHINGTON, September 1.—Removal of William Phillips, former Under Secretary of State and special Ambassador to India, from the staff of General Eisenhower in London, at the insistence of the British Government, today threatened to bring an investigation of British interference in American internal affairs.

Senator A. B. CHANDLER, Democrat, of Kentucky, has called on President Roosevelt to "make a full report to the Senate on conditions in India, and on any foreign interference in America diplomacy," as a result of the ousting of Phillips.

And in the House, Representative CALVIN D. JOHNSON, Republican, of Illinois, has asked that the British Minister to Washington and the British Minister for India in Washington be declared persona non grata, "should they continue their efforts to mold public opinion" concerning Phillips' reports on India.

REPORT REVEALED

Drew Pearson, Washington Merry-go-Round author, recently revealed that Phillips was declared persona non grata in London because of a report he made to President Roosevelt highly critical of British policy in India. In his report Phillips declared that it was "time for the British to act."

Pearson declared the British had brought all sorts of pressure on the State Department to have it make a statement claiming that Phillips' views on India did not represent those of the United States Government.

He also said the British consuls throughout the United States had been instructed to ask local newspapers to counteract the Phillips letter to the President.

Pearson charged that both Prime Minister Churchill and Foreign Minister Eden had "made things uncomfortable" for Phillips, demanding all sorts of explanations from the United States Government, and finally had informed the State Department that Phillips was persona non grata, and must leave London.

PHILLIPS' LETTER

The full text of Phillips' letter to the President, made public for the first time, follows:

"May I add a few words to what I said to you on Tuesday afternoon when I had the pleasure of giving you an oral report on my impressions of the Indian situation.

"Assuming that India is known to be an important base for our future operations against Burma and Japan, it would seem to be of highest importance that we should have around us a sympathetic India rather than an indifferent and possibly a hostile India.

"It would appear that we will have the prime responsibility in the conduct of the war against Japan. There is no evidence that the British intend to do more than give token assistance.

"If that is so, then the conditions surrounding our base in India become of vital importance."

MERE LEGAL SENSE

"At present, the Indian people are at war only in a legal sense, as, for various reasons, the British Government declared India in the conflict without the formality of consulting Indian leaders or even the Indian Legislature.

"Indians feel they have no voice in the government and therefore no responsibility in the conduct of the war.

"They feel that they have nothing to fight for, as they are convinced that the professed war aims of the United Nations do not apply to them. The British Prime Minister, in fact, has stated that the provisions of the Atlantic Charter are not applicable to India, and it is not unnatural, therefore, that Indian leaders are beginning to wonder whether the charter is only for the benefit of white races.

"The present Indian Army is purely mercenary and only that part of it which is drawn from the martial races has been tried in actual warfare, and these martial soldiers represent only 33 percent of the army."

STILWELL CONCERNED

"General Stilwell has expressed his concern over the situation and in particular in regard to the poor morale of the Indian officers.

"The attitude of the general public toward the war is even worse. Lassitude and indifference and bitterness have increased as a result of the famine conditions, the growing high cost of living, and continued political deadlock.

"While India is broken politically into various parties and groups, all have one object in common—eventual freedom and independence from British domination."

ONLY ONE REMEDY

"There would seem to be only one remedy to this highly unsatisfactory situation in which we are unfortunately but nevertheless seriously involved, and that is to change the attitude of the people of India toward the war, make them feel that we want them to assume responsibilities to the United Nations and are prepared to give them facilities for doing so and that the voice of India will play an important part in the reconstruction of the world.

"The present political conditions do not permit of any improvement in this respect. Even though the British should fail again, it is high time that they should make an effort to improve conditions and reestablish confidence among the Indian people that their future independence is to be granted.

"Words are of no avail. They only aggravate the present situation.

"It is time for the British to act. This they can do by a solemn declaration from the King Emperor that India will achieve her independence at a specific date after the war and as a guaranty of good faith in this respect a provisional representative coalition government will be reestablished at the center and limited powers transferred to it."

URGES UNITED STATES VOICE

"I feel strongly, Mr. President, that in view of our military position in India, we should have a voice in these matters.

"It is not right for the British to say this is none of your business when we alone presumably will have the major part to play in the struggle with Japan.

"If we do nothing and merely accept the British point of view that conditions in India are none of our business then we must be prepared for various serious consequences in the internal situation in India which may develop as a result of the despair and misery and antiwhite sentiments of hundreds of millions of subject people.

"The peoples of Asia—and I am supported in the opinion by other diplomatic and military observers—cynically regard this war as one between Fascist and imperialist powers."

GESTURE NEEDED

"A generous British gesture to India would change this undesirable political atmosphere. India itself might then be expected more positively to support our war effort against Japan.

"China, which regards the Anglo-American bloc with misgivings and mistrust, might then be assured that we are in truth fighting for a better world.

"And the colonial people conquered by the Japanese might hopefully feel that they have something better to look forward to than simply a return to their old masters.

"Such a gesture, Mr. President, will produce not only a tremendous psychological stimulus to flagging morale through Asia and facilitate our military operations in that theater, but it will also be proof positive to all peoples—our own and the British included—that this is not a war of politics, but a war for all we say it is."

MURPHY'S NEW POST

Meanwhile, the controversy over Phillips' recall was heightened by announcement of the appointment of Robert Murphy to London as political adviser, with the personal rank of ambassador, on matters concerned with the administration of Germany.

State Department officials, who announced Murphy's assignment insisted that he was not being sent to replace Phillips.

Murphy has been political adviser to the commander in chief of the Mediterranean area, and has been a controversial figure in our relations with France.

The State Department, in announcing Murphy's new assignment, said merely that he was going to London, but there was little doubt that he would be attached to General Eisenhower's headquarters.

ATTACKED BY CHANDLER

Senator CHANDLER, in his exposé of the Phillips case, charged flatly that he was ousted because of the British objections to his forthright report.

CHANDLER declared:

"The statement is being made in some British quarters that what happens in India is none of our business, but I repudiate that statement."

He added that conditions in India have a bearing on the war with Japan.

CHANDLER accused the British of mismanagement in India, and said the situation had "made for great discouragement and irritation to General Stilwell."

DENIED BY HALIFAX

Lord Halifax, British Ambassador, last night curtly denied Senator CHANDLER'S charge that the British Government had requested Ambassador Phillips' recall.

Representative JOHNSON, in asking the House to declare the two British Ministers persona non grata, declared that the Indian Army and people would not participate with any force in the war until they had received a definite promise of independence.

He declared that Ambassador Phillips had "pointed to the inertia of the Indian Army and the criticism of it given by General Stilwell, which unquestionably contributes to our delays in that theater of war."

WANT LEAK PROBED

When Pearson published a résumé of Phillips' letter to the President, the British Embassy got in touch with London immediately, and Foreign Secretary Eden ordered Sir Ronald Campbell, British Chargé d'Affaires, to approach the State Department and

demand a formal investigation of how it leaked out.

Meanwhile, the State Department admitted that the British Government had formally protested publication of the letter, but Department officials denied that Phillips had been declared persona non grata. The British Embassy also denied that Phillips had been asked to leave Britain.

The State Department, however, reiterated its earlier announcement that Phillips would return to the United States in order to rejoin his family, from whom he had been separated for some time.

NO RETRACTION

Eden then ordered Sir Ronald to approach the State Department again; asked that it issue a statement disassociating itself from the views expressed by Phillips. Sir Ronald saw both Under Secretary Stettinius and Assistant Secretary Berle, but failed to get the retraction.

Churchill and Eden, it was reported, then put pressure on Phillips to change his views, but he replied that he was more convinced than ever that he was right.

Eden finally declared Phillips persona non grata and said that "India is more important than a thousand Phillips."

REEMPLOYMENT OF VETERANS

Mr. ELSTON of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. ELSTON of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, this morning there was brought to the attention of the Military Affairs Committee a situation which I believe will be as shocking to the other Members of the House as it was to our committee. When Congress passed the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, usually referred to as the G. I. bill, we very definitely indicated that it was the intent and purpose of Congress that returning veterans should be provided with the maximum of job opportunity in the field of gainful employment. In that act we specifically provided for a Veterans' Placement Service Board, consisting of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs as chairman, the Director of the Selective Service System, and the Administrator of the Federal Security Agency, to see to it that the intentions of Congress were carried into effect.

Notwithstanding the provisions of this bill, we are advised that returning service men and women are required to submit themselves to the United States Employment Service for assignment to such positions as that agency may designate. This would occur in the event the veteran does not himself obtain a job within 60 days.

This situation exists not because of any order of the Veterans' Placement Service Board created by Congress but solely by virtue of an edict of the War Manpower Commission.

Under the Selective Training and Service Act a veteran is entitled to the position he held when he went into the service if he applies within 40 days after his discharge. With that provision we have no complaint, but many veterans had no employment when they went into the service. Veterans within that group, according to the regulations of the United States Employment Service, have 60 days from the date of their discharge from the service to obtain a job wherever they may find one. If a place it not obtained within that time, the veteran may no longer seek employment wherever he wishes but must go wherever that agency may see fit to send him. This is clearly in violation of the law and the will of Congress and a shocking procedure.

In my judgment, and I can assure you every member of our committee who was present at our session this morning agrees with me, no restriction should be placed against a veteran who wants a job. He is entitled to a job of his own choosing and while he should be permitted to avail himself of the facilities of the United States Employment Service, he should not be ordered around by that or any other Government bureau. Our committee is incensed that this procedure is being followed and is demanding that it be terminated forthwith.

RATIONING

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, it has been common gossip all over the country that the New Deal would abandon the rationing of many articles of food and many other widely consumed commodities just before the November election. The press of yesterday and today indicate that the people guessed it right. Just another case of injecting politics into food distribution.

The Republican Congressional Food Study Committee, although favoring the rationing of food when necessary in wartime emergency, prophesied that rationing restrictions would be greatly relaxed before the election. The New Deal philosophy of scarcity is incompatible with rationing. Why hold down production and then proceed to ration? The Republican policy has been to encourage production and thereby remove the necessity of rationing.

The terrible burdens that the New Deal has placed on the distributor and consumer of food through needless regulations has been little short of shameful. Most of these regulations should have been removed months ago.

Heretofore, the Food Administrator and the Price Administrator had the responsibility of rationing and price control of foods, but for some unknown reason it is Justice Byrnes, the Director of War Mobilization, who yesterday issued the order that the lid should be lifted from 17 different food items. The fact that Justice Byrnes is closer to the White House is probably the reason for this shift in authority.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, and to include therein some newspaper comments on the late Senator Norris.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

INTERNATIONAL DISSEMINATION OF NEWS

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, it is a basic tenet of our political philosophy that the truth will prevail if the people are correctly informed. I believe that we should pledge ourselves anew to the preservation of the basis principles of free speech and a free press, as guaranteed by the Constitution and without which our form of government and way of life cannot long endure.

Fundamental to our conception of a decent world is the belief that all peoples must be free to select their own form of government and it is self-evident that this cannot be done effectively in an atmosphere of restricted or distorted news and information. Hitler and Goebbels have proved to us that the most powerful tool of dictators in driving their peoples to violence and war has been the control of the channels of information. Normal men become killers only under the influence of mass emotion, and the usual method by which unscrupulous rulers drive their peoples to war, is by the skillful sowing of the seeds of national prejudices, and then cultivating such prejudices into mass hatreds. If truthful news is neither suppressed at the source, nor shut off nor distorted in transmission, truth will eventually stifle the evils of prejudice.

Most of us recognize the necessity for appropriate international machinery with power adequate to maintain peace. Likewise I think it is equally evident that a better understanding of one another must be brought about among the nations of the world if peace is to endure. Education within our own borders can do much to promote this understanding, but of equal importance is the unhampered flow of truthful news throughout the world.

The Democratic and Republican Parties have stated their beliefs positively in recognition of this principle.

The Republican statement reads as follows:

> In times like these when whole peoples have found themselves shakled by governments which denied the truth or, worse, dealt in half-truths or withheld the facts from the public, it is imperative to the maintenance of a free America that the press and radio be free and that full and complete information be available to Americans. There must be no censorship except to the extent required by war necessity. * * * All channels of news must be kept open with equality of access to information at the source. If agreement can be achieved with foreign nations to establish the same principles, it will be a valuable contribution to future peace.

The Democrats used this language:

> We believe in the world right of all men to write, send, and publish news at uniform communication rates and without interference by governmental or private monopoly and that right should be protected by treaty.

In view of these statements it seems to me appropriate that this Congress

should at this time also express in no uncertain terms, its devotion to and belief in the principle of freedom of speech and of the press.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an address by Norman M. Little, assistant United States attorney.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROWAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an article from the Chicago Sun.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include therein a release issued by the War Department on yesterday, entitled "War Department's Demobilization Plan After Defeat of Germany."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

VETERANS UNDER SOCIAL SECURITY

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, in reply to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ELSTON] I desire to say that the very condition the gentleman pointed out is something that the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation was trying to avoid. You have heard a great deal of fanfare of a dramatic ride of a Member of Congress from Georgia here to break the deadlock in the conference. That conference was trying to prevent subordinating the rights of the servicemen to the C. I. O., or others who had never fought or worn the uniform in this war.

When agreement was finally reached, before the gentleman from Georgia arrived, the Senate conferees agreed that General Hines was to be chairman of this board and was to appoint the executive secretary. It was our understanding then that he would not put veterans under the War Manpower Commission, but that they would be treated separately, in carrying out the provisions of this law. That is what we intended, and if the Members of the House had had their way it would have been definitely written into the law today.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on the privilege of voting November 7.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday upon the conclusion of any legislative business and any special orders I may be permitted to speak for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

TRUCK TIRES

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I, too, am deeply interested in this post-war planning for the people across the sea, but I am also interested in some of the questions that have been raised by our folks at home. Yesterday I was telling you about the 75,000 bushels of peaches which each day will come on the market at Benton Harbor, Mich., some of which cannot be moved because of lack of truck tires, which are in the stores in those States.

I took it up with the O. P. A. and Mr. Brown told me he would consult Cleveland and they would call Grand Rapids, which has the final say, and which turned down the request. I called him again today and he said it was following the regular course, that they had the same problem in California; that in about a week they would be able to tell us whether we would be able to get the truck tires. Then I asked him what we would do with these 75,000 bushels of peaches each day and he said that was our problem.

What I want now from some of you Members who have peach growers in your districts is to tell me what we will do with those peaches while we wait for a week on the O. P. A. to give us tires to move them.

It might be well if those who administer the rules and regulations of the O. P. A. would read the story in the current number of the American magazine, where Scattergood Baines finally induced a member of a draft board to mix a little common sense with the letter of the law.

I can understand why, if tires were not available, we could not get them. But when they are to be had right in the same place where they are needed and no one else seems to need them, I just cannot understand a policy which would keep trucks idle.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] has expired.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] is recognized for 20 minutes.

THE INDISPENSABLE MAN AND PEARL HARBOR

Mr. CASE. Mr. Speaker, this is a year of decision for the United States. It is the year of a general election in which the people will deliver a verdict on the world's No. 1 job—the Presidency of the United States.

Opening the case for the election of Franklin D. Roosevelt for a fourth consecutive term, the New Deal candidate for the Vice Presidency, Senator TRUMAN, advanced the issue upon which, it seems to me, the election will turn one way or the other. Recognizing that the war in Europe, at least, might be nearing an end, he asked for the reelection of the President not merely as the Commander in Chief but as the one person, the superman, who alone could make the peace. He spoke of the end of the war as "the completion of one turn in a long road" and said that peace is "a continuing process, already years under way, still years in prospect." In other words, a continuing emergency requiring the continued ministrations of the one indispensable superman, the President-Commander in Chief.

Curiously enough, Mr. Speaker, within the same week, there appeared in Collier's Weekly, a national magazine, an article by the same Vice Presidential candidate which pointed to a devastating answer to his own argument. In that article Senator TRUMAN laid the blame for the tragedy of Pearl Harbor upon a divided command.

That struck me as peculiar, because 2 years ago, when I put in a bill to unify the armed forces of the United States, an administration spokesman took pains to tell me that we had a unified command under the President as Commander in Chief.

The whole incident, Mr. Speaker, throws the question of responsibility for Pearl Harbor squarely into the issues of the Presidential election. For, as the respected Army and Navy Journal, in demanding an immediate hearing for Admiral Kimmel and General Short, promptly said:

> Unfortunately Pearl Harbor has become an issue in the Presidential campaign; the more so because Mr. Roosevelt is running for reelection as Commander in Chief as well as President. Because of the persistent postponement of the courts martial, belief has grown that Washington was negligent and that the commanders were scapegoats for higher authority.

This issue is inescapable in the election, Mr. Speaker, for if the fourth term proposal succeeds, it will be due to a feeling that the President, and he alone, can run the war and make the peace, that he is indeed a superman, the one indispensable man, whose talents will be lost to the country if he is not reelected. On that basis, it becomes in order to measure the success of the President-Commander in Chief in the one supreme test of his peace-making ability, his attempt to avoid war, and particularly his efforts to prevent war in the Pacific that culminated in the disgrace of Pearl Harbor.

Two questions become pertinent at this point:

First. What was the President's policy with regard to the Pacific and the Orient?

Second. What advance information, if any, did the President have with regard to the intentions and plans of the Japanese prior to Pearl Harbor, December 7, 1941?

Information on these two questions divides naturally into two fields. They are: First, that which the American people and the Congress knew; and second, that which only the President as his own prime minister, director of foreign policy and Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy knew.

Let us examine the record on those points. In the limited time before me, I shall not attempt to cover every detail but shall take up only major, outstanding items in policy and information now of record.

First, then, what did the American people and the Congress know and what could they see and what had they a right to count upon as the settled, professed and proclaimed policy of the President in foreign affairs generally and in the Pacific, in particular?

There are two great indisputable acts of record that the American people and the Congress knew and on which they were entitled to proceed as that policy. They were: the passage of the Philippine Independence Act and the passage of the Neutrality Act.

Both of these acts were requested by, approved by, and proclaimed by the President as achievements of his administration. They were cited by him and by administration spokesmen, again and again and again as evidence of his efforts and ability not only to keep America out of war but to keep war away from the United States, yes, even away from Pearl Harbor.

The act to grant independence to the Philippines was asked for by President Roosevelt after a similar act had been vetoed by President Hoover. It was asked for in the Democratic platform of 1932, the platform that Mr. Roosevelt accepted 100 percent, a platform, incidentally that asked a survey of existing military and naval establishments with a view to relieving the people of a burden of expenditure fast approaching a billion dollars annually and that specifically asked for further reduction of armaments.

That same year, 1932, the Republican platform said that the Army had reached the irreducible minimum and called attention to the disturbed conditions in the Far East. The Republican platform said that President Hoover and the Secretary of State had maintained a just balance in the controversy between China and Japan, always "taking a firm position to avoid entanglement but consistently upholding the established treaty rights and never condoning developments that endangered the obligation of treaties or the peace of the world."

Yet, Mr. Roosevelt, as President, requested and the overwhelmingly New Deal Congress of 1934 passed the act in the face of a warning on the floor of this House by a Member from California, Mr. Colden, who cried:

> Before we haul down the American flag and set a helpless people adrift in the face of a neighboring empire that is rampant with imperialism and militarism, we should pause and reflect. A nation that is today maintaining a mandate over the islands of the Pacific and flaunting the League of Nations, a nation that has invaded the territory of a peaceful neighbor and is taking advantage of China's chaotic domestic afflictions should not be given a license to override the will of the Filipinos. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, March 19, 1934.)

And a Member from New York, the distinguished Robert Bacon, said:

> We are scuttling our entire position in the Far East because of local selfish interests. * * * Momentous questions are involved, and yet we are passing this bill with but 40 minutes debate.

In the face of such warnings, however, under the indispensable leadership of the man in the White House, the bill was passed and became law.

Three years later, the Roosevelt administration led the nation and the Congress into the adoption of a Neutrality Act. A temporary act had been passed in 1935. In 1937, administration spokesmen came before the House and said, in just about so many words "The President has a mandate from the people. As part of his program, he wants the temporary neutrality law made permanent."

And a distinguished Member of this House, a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee, assured the Congress and the country that even if other countries should become wayward and go down the road to war, the United States would pursue the even tenor of its ways unaffected because of the protective guidance of the Neutrality Act inspired by the great leader in the White House.

He had heard Mr. Roosevelt ridicule the nations that were lured by the fool's gold of war profits. He had heard the indispensable man say that war could be avoided if those in charge of foreign affairs were careful in their day-to-day decisions, implying of course, that the present administration knew how to be wise and careful and was.

I know what was said about the Neutrality Act when it was made permanent law because that was done in my first term here, and first impressions were vividly made. I had some questions about the matter, then, and voiced them in a discussion with a Member from Mississippi, a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee. I questioned the rigidity of it, the inflexibility if we had an aggressor nation to deal with, but, I regret to say, I finally yielded to the persuasiveness of the leaders and voted for the bill. Once passed, I took, and the American people took, the act at face value. Unfortunately so did Japan and so did Hitler.

In the fall of 1937, after Japan had again invaded China and seized her lands by force of arms, when the President took no action to embargo munitions as required by the act, I introduced a resolution of inquiry on the subject.

The resolution asked certain A, B, C questions, as to whether or not, in fact, Japan had invaded Chinese soil, had seized property, had attacked Chinese people and killed them, and finally, whether, or not, in fact a state of war existed. A reply came from the State Department and was placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. You can find it—eight pages of it, speeches and documents. The nub of it was summed up in the statement that "The President had not found a state of war to exist; Japan had not declared war."

Mr. Speaker, back in 1931, our Minister to China, Mr. Johnson, reported to Secretary of State Stimson that the invasion of Manchuria was "an aggressive act by Japan" and that the military operation "must fall within any definition of war." That incident is cited in the official white paper of the Department of State, recently published under the title Peace and War and is found at page 4. Yet in 1937, faced by an even more brazen and less defensible attack upon China, the President whose leadership in peace and war is said to be indispensable could not find a state of war to exist, and refused to invoke the embargoes prescribed by the Neutrality Act which we had been assured would keep us out of war.

Well anyway, Mr. Speaker, those were the great outstanding definitions of the President's foreign policy in the Pacific in the fateful years—the passage of the act to turn the Filipinos loose with the implication that we were pulling out of the Orient, and the passage of the Neutrality Act which said we would stay out of all foreign wars; stay out, that we would not ship or permit to be shipped, munitions and instruments or aids of war. Those were the things the country knew, they were the things the Congress knew.

Now we come to what the President knew, the President who has been his own Prime Minister, the President who is the Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy.

What did he know, through the special sources of information open to him?

What did he learn from the agents of the United States stationed around the world?

What did he learn from his advisers in the State Department and in the Army and Navy?

Of course, I do not know and no one knows all that he knew or was told nor what any man would learn if placed in the same position. Again, I will only highlight a few of the things we now know that he knew in the fateful years.

In his remarkable speech yesterday, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT], suggested what the Commander in Chief was told by Admiral Richardson who was stationed in Hawaii, in the critical period before the Commander in Chief replaced him with Admiral Kimmel. He knew that Richardson believed the Pacific Fleet should always be on the alert, that it should never permit itself to be bottled in a single harbor where the Japanese could strike without warning.

Clark Lee, ace reporter of the Associated Press, in the Far East in his recent book, They Call It Pacific, tells of being in Manila in the early days of December 1941, when he scoffed at the fears of an Argentinian and said:

> "They won't catch us napping as they did the Russian Fleet at Port Arthur back in 1904," I told Roberto. Even a year ago last spring, when I visited Honolulu, Admiral Richardson was so concerned over the possibility of a Japanese attack that he wouldn't allow more than two or three of our capital ships in Pearl Harbor at one time. The Navy was maintaining aerial patrols far out

to sea. The Japs will be the ones to be surprised this time.

How it happened we do not yet know. The country only knows that the indispensable director of foreign policy and Commander in Chief of the Navy removed Admiral Richardson before his tour of duty expired and placed Admiral Kimmel there and that thereafter more ships were kept in Pearl Harbor, and particularly on the morning of December 7, 1941.

Back in November 1940 Joseph Alsop and Robert Kintner, columnists who were supposed to have a special standing at the White House and in the State Department, in their column of November 11, 1940, said:

Perhaps the most concise statement of American far eastern policy as it is now developing was given by the President a few days ago to his congressional leaders. His meeting with them had more than a touch of drama, for it took place just after publication of the interview in which Japanese Foreign Minister Matsuoka was quoted as declaring the United States would have to fight to maintain the status quo in the Pacific. Rather naturally the leaders wished to know the President's mind.

As authoritatively summarized, the President's statement to the congressional leaders was as follows: We are not going to fight Japan, but we are not going to back down in the Far East either. Possibly Japan will choose to attack us because we have refused to back down. Then our course will be clear, but the possibility that Japan will so choose seems to be extremely remote.

That was all the American people were told at that time, except further comment to the effect that official opinion held that "the United States ought to be able to break Japan's naval power very rapidly and very easily."

So that was what the people knew and what the Congress knew. What else did the President know?

Again we only know a fraction of what he knew. But here are some authentic evidences of what he knew or at least was told. I shall confine myself at this point entirely to information given him by Ambassador Grew, the man who was in Berlin 10 years prior to World War No. 1, and who also was in Tokyo for 10 years before Pearl Harbor. I quote first from his recently published Diary.

On September 12, 1940, Grew wrote in his Diary:

I have expressed the opinion that the American-Japanese relations would be set on a downward course if sanctions were applied by the United States. It may be that retaliation would take the form of countermeasures by the Government, but more likely that it would be a sudden stroke on the part of the Army or Navy without prior knowledge or authorization of the Government. These dangers constitute an imponderable element. However, it would be short-sighted to deny their existence or formulate a policy and adopt measures without fully considering these potential risks.

That is, Grew thought Japan would not hesitate to strike and so told the President. The President told the country he did not think Japan would.

Four months later, on January 7, 1941, Grew wrote in his Diary:

Ko Kumin warns the Japanese people that war between Japan and the United States will be necessary because of the collapse of Great Britain. * * * The Axis Powers have ample provocation to declare war against the United States.

Twenty days later, on January 27, 1941, the State Department in its white paper, Peace and War, recently released, tells us:

Ambassador Grew reported to the Department of State on January 27, 1941, that one of his diplomatic colleagues had told a member of the Embassy staff that there were reports from many sources, including a Japanese source, that Japanese military forces planned a surprise mass attack at Pearl Harbor in case of trouble with the United States.

There is not time to review here all the succeeding warnings that came throughout the summer and fall of 1941—warnings to the President-Commander in Chief, carefully and perhaps properly not given general publicity at the time.

On the 4th of November 1941, Grew's Diary tells us that he sent the following telegram to his superiors in Washington:

Japan may resort with dangerous and dramatic suddenness to measures which might make inevitable war with the United States.

Such a warning, of course, it would be presumed would be considered in relation to all his warnings running back over a period of 10 years, and particularly in relation to his warning of January 27 that in case of war, Japan had plans for a surprise attack upon Pearl Harbor.

That the Army and Navy, at least, recognized the delicate nature of the situation is known by some Members of Congress who were repeatedly cautioned in hearings during the summer and fall of 1941 to avoid saying anything whatsoever about the deployment of our forces in the Pacific lest it cause Japan to attack. I remember one such caution given a committee of which I am a member, at the time the two Japanese emissaries, Kurusu and Nomura, were on their way to the United States.

We can think of nothing—

The caution ran—

which would be worse right now than to have Japan open up on us. We can think of nothing that Hitler would want more than to have us get in a war that would interrupt the flow of supplies we are sending England.

Of course the Commander in Chief knew those fears. But he had superior knowledge, presumably, that led him to send a personal message to the Japanese Emperor on the 26th of November 1941, a message which many competent observers have said was tantamount to an ultimatum.

In any event, in about the time that it would take a force to move to Honolulu, the Japanese struck at Pearl Harbor on the morning of December 7, 1941, just as Grew had warned they might, just as the Korean patriots are reported to have warned, and the peace policy of the superman in the Pacific blew up with a bang. We were in the war—all the way in—and will be there until complete victory is won.

Time has not permitted me to touch upon the policy whereby we put the squeeze on Japan in her trade with South American countries while we shipped her war goods from the United States with a lavish hand—scrap iron, machine tools, airplane parts, aviation gasoline. Time does not permit reviewing the evidence now coming to light that planes and ships were sent out of Honolulu in late November with sealed orders to fight, to shoot hostile craft. And I am not condemning such incidents in the game of international poker in which the President found himself engaged.

I am not even saying but that the President did what any other normal man would have done. Another President, another Commander in Chief, might also have sought to baby Japan along. But if he had, I today would not be urging him as a superman, as an indispensable man.

Whatever the American people thought, whatever the Congress did was thought or done against the background of the limited knowledge they had of the intentions of Japan.

Whatever they thought or did was in light of Mr. Roosevelt's proclaimed policies confirmed in the acts of Philippine Independence and General Neutrality. But what the President-Commander in Chief did was done with the best inside knowledge of Army and Navy and international politics that could be had.

If, with that special knowledge, the President's policy in the Pacific failed not only to keep us out of war but brought the war to the United States in a crushing surprise attack that limited and crippled us for a year and a half afterward, how can any man claim some other man might not have done as well, indeed might not do better in completing the war and making the peace?

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that today, following any special orders heretofore entered, I be permitted to address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BONNER). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. COSTELLO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that today, following any special orders heretofore entered, I be permitted to address the House for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. RIZLEY] is recognized for 20 minutes.

THE REAL ISSUE ON THE DOMESTIC FRONT: SHALL NATIONAL SOCIALISM SUPPLANT AMERICAN DEMOCRACY?

Mr. RIZLEY. Mr. Speaker, for 12 years, come next March 1, the present New Deal Party will have been in complete control of the Government of the United States. They have had the Chief Executive and both Houses of the Congress. All but two of the present membership of the United States Supreme Court have been appointed by the pres-

ent Chief Executive. If mistakes have been made either in the foreign or the domestic affairs of the country during that period of time, they must assume the responsibility.

If the failure to fortify Guam resulted in Pearl Harbor—which, of course, is not true, because there was never any legislation calling for the fortification of Guam—but if, as some of the spokesmen and smear artists would now try to make the American people believe, the failure to fortify Guam caused the disaster at Pearl Harbor, then this administration must assume full responsibility, because they had overwhelming majorities in both the House and the Senate prior to Pearl Harbor, and could have fortified Guam or any other island in the Pacific or elsewhere, had they so desired.

If the policy of appeasing Japan by permitting millions of tons of scrap iron and other war materials to be shipped there, including oil, assisted Japan in its preparation in building up its war machine, and use of the materials shipped to it under the appeasement policy to subsequently kill and wound thousands of American boys, in the light of future events was a bad policy—they must assume responsibility, because they were in power and made the policy.

If reckless spending of public funds and waste and extravagance was responsible for the country's reaching an all-time high in our national debt long before we were in the war, the responsibility was theirs, because they were in complete control of the fiscal policies of this country for 10 long years before the war.

If the farmers, businessmen, laborers, and industrialists believe that regimentation, economic planning from Washington, usurpation of State and local self-government, bureaucratic domination, law by Executive decree rather than by the people's Congress, and all of the hundreds of alphabetical agencies with their power to cause and direct a host of Government agents to swarm down upon your farms and places of business, and keep you constantly filling out forms, applications, and subjecting yourself to the whims of some bureaucrat or Government pay-roll patriot in order to farm, work, or engage in business is a good thing for you and the country, then you should vote to keep the New Dealers in power; because they gave you all of this and are calling upon you now to return them to power with a subservient Congress that will do their bidding.

I have said on numerous occasions, both in and out of Congress, that if the present trends continue in this country, there can be but one result, some sort of national socialism. You may call it what you will.

Our system of representative democracy cannot survive under the policies that the spokesmen for the New Deal advocate and have made effective. If a majority of the people want to abandon the traditional American system and supplant it with this new system, that is, of course, their privilege. They should, however, know what they are doing; and I feel certain if they realize what is being done to them, that the vast majority of the people in this country will rise up and rebel. If they want to continue a republican form of government such as we have had under both of the old political parties and the sort of government which made this the greatest Nation on the globe, they must defeat the New Deal party.

That is why many of us have said repeatedly that the election this year far transcends partisan party politics. Democrats who believe in the philosophy of Jefferson and of Jackson cannot in good faith longer support their party leadership masquerading under the Democratic label but being directed from New York by Sidney Hillman and his C. I. O.-P. A. C., who have supplanted the philosophy of Jefferson and Jackson with the philosophy of Hillman, Hopkins, Hannegan, and Hague.

Prof. Malcolm McDermott, a professor of law at Duke University, a graduate of Princeton and of Harvard law schools, who for many years was a practicing attorney, and before going to Duke was dean of the Tennessee University Law School, and a Democratic Presidential elector in 1928, in an address before the North Carolina Bar Association recently, gave what I believe to be some of the most thought-provoking statements and made what I believe to be one of the finest contributions to what is happening to us under the new idealism that has been made by anyone. Among other things, he says, and I quote:

> Our danger is that amid the preoccupation of world problems, with our eyes focused on the international scene, we are going to overlook what is being done to our own country on the inside.
>
> Step by step, the plan is being put into effect. The post-war period will merely bring the finishing touches. The regimentation under wartime emergency will, according to these planners, make the post-war achievement of their plan an easy one.
>
> I propose—

Says he—

> to speak with utter frankness and with no apologies. When gentlemen in Washington make no bones of setting about to plan our lives for us, then the right to speak out belongs to the "plannee" quite as much as to the planner.

Continuing, this distinguished jurist says:

> What we are here to consider transcends party politics. If what I have to say sounds like an attack upon the present administration, let me remind you that men in the high councils of the party now in power are speaking out openly of the same perils.
>
> Senator O'MAHONEY, of Wyoming and Congressman SUMNERS of Texas, both outstanding Democrats, as patriotic public servants have laid before American citizens unvarnished facts showing that, quite apart from war measures, constitutional democratic government in this country is fast vanishing.
>
> What kind of government is being substituted? We are having foisted upon us national socialism, that is, none other than the German system of government.
>
> If the majority of the American people want that system, they are going to have it. What I object to is having the system put over under the guise of liberalism and democracy, and without an understanding on the part of the citizens of just what is involved.
>
> I have talked with some of the inner circle in Washington. In answer to my remonstrances one of them said in substance: "Elections are held and we get a majority of the votes. What else is a democracy? We hold a mandate from the people."
>
> If a majority vote means democracy, then Germany and Italy (before her fall) were two of the most perfect democracies among the nations.
>
> We are quite mistaken if we imagine that Hitler rose to power and kept that power by openly tyrannizing his people. On the contrary, he came as a savior of the people, as the friend of the poor man, and as the opponent of the vested interests. The same is substantially true of Mussolini.
>
> The mere fact that a majority of the people is corralled behind a party or its leader does not make of that government a democracy. We must look deeper and find out how that government deals with its people, and especially with unorganized minorities therein.
>
> In the years 1936 and 1937 I spent considerable time in Germany. My chief purpose was to find out, if possible, just what national socialism really means. I came to the conclusion that national socialism, stripped of all fanfare, simply means a system of government that readily enables those who gain control to exploit the entire Nation for their particular purposes. The people need not, and generally do not, know what those purposes ultimately are, but they are handled in such fashion that they willingly lend themselves to these ends. In Germany that purpose was to build a titanic war machine and launch it upon a course of world conquest. That is quite clear now, but it was not at all clear, even to the great mass of German people, as late as 1936.
>
> The objective of the leader or group that gains control under a national socialistic regime may vary according to circumstances. It may be a purpose to take from those who have worked and saved, and give to those who have not, or to exalt a particular person or class, or to build a political machine, or a combination of any of these.
>
> I wondered how an intelligent people, such as the Germans surely are or were, would let themselves be thus duped. This led to a study of the various steps by which national socialism had fixed its hold upon that nation. I wanted to find out what made national socialism work. I give you the results of that first-hand study.
>
> In order for national socialism to work, certain definite steps must be taken, and they are the same for fascism; they differ in name only.
>
> They are as follows:
>
> 1. The people must be made to feel their utter helplessness and their inability to solve their own problems. While in this state of mind there is held up before them a benign and all-wise leader to whom they must look for the cure of all their ills. This state of mind is most readily developed in a time of economic stress or national disaster.
>
> 2. The principle of local self-government must be wiped out, so that this leader or group in control can have all political power readily at hand.
>
> 3. The centralized government while appearing in form to represent the people must dutifully register the will of the leader or group in control.
>
> 4. Constitutional guarantees must be swept aside. This is accomplished in part by ridiculing them as outmoded and as obstructions to progress.
>
> 5. Public faith in the legal profession and respect for the courts must be undermined. Let me pause to say that these various steps as thus enumerated are not necessarily undertaken in the order in which they are here listed. In fact, the subordination of the lawyers and of the courts is likely to be one of the early steps taken by those interested in setting up a national socialistic regime.
>
> 6. The law-making body must be intimidated and from time to time rebuked, so as

to prevent the development of public confidence therein.

7. Economically, the people must be kept ground down by high taxes which under one pretext or another they are called upon to pay. Thus they are brought to a common level, and all income above a meager living is taken from them. In this manner economic independence is kept to a minimum, and the citizen is forced to rely more and more upon the government that controls him. Capital and credit are thus completely within the control of government.

8. A great public debt must be built up so that citizens can never escape its burdens. This makes government the virtual receiver for the entire Nation.

9. A general distrust of private business and industry must be kept alive so that the public may not begin to rely upon its own resources.

10. Governmental bureaus are set up to control practically every phase of the citizen's life. These bureaus issue directives without number, but all under authority of the leader to whom they are immediately responsible. It is a government of men and not of laws.

11. The education of the youth of the Nation is taken under control, to the end that all may at an early age be inoculated with a spirit of submission to the system and of reverence for the benevolent leader.

12. To supplement and fortify all of the foregoing there is kept flowing a steady stream of governmental propaganda designed to extol all that bow the knee, and to vilify those who dare raise a voice of dissent.

Continuing, Mr. McDermott further says:

You will recall that at the outset of this decade our country was experiencing an economic depression. It was by no means the first, nor yet by comparison the worst. Heretofore, the country shouldered its burdens and its losses, and pulled through. This time it was asserted that the people were unable to handle their own problems and hence all must look to Washington for the answers. That was to be the source of all recovery, handed down from above. This idea was so drilled into the minds of the people that it is now responsible, says Congressman SUMNERS, for the enormous bureaucracy that exists. That is why he entitled his article as he did, "Don't Blame the Bureaucrats." (Reader's Digest, September 1943.) His view is that under this kind of governmental nursing, the people have grown more and more helpless and have formed the habit of turning over all their local problems for solution at the national capital. Certainly, no effort has ever been made to discourage the habit. On the contrary, Washington bureaucracy has been more than ready to reach out and down into the everyday lives of the people, and in many cases to insist upon doing for them what they should do for themselves.

The right of local self-government, a cardinal principle of American democracy, is being steadily destroyed. This has been accomplished in part by spurious interpretation of the constitutional provision giving Congress the power to regulate interstate commerce. Thus it has come to pass that the central government has assumed power, for example, to regulate the amount of wheat a farmer may grow, even though it is fed to his own chickens and never touches interstate commerce.

This power has been upheld by the reconstituted Supreme Court upon the ground that if the farmer did not raise wheat he might buy wheat in interstate commerce and thus interstate commerce might be benefited, while if he did grow wheat he might not buy wheat in interstate commerce and thus interstate commerce might be depressed. Therefore, this is said to be a regulation of interstate commerce. Such is the astounding holding in the Wickard case—*Wickard* v. *Filburn* (317 U. S. 111; 1942). By its reasoning practically every activity of human life can now be regulated in Washington.

Again, we have seen not only the judiciary but also the legislative branch of the National Government fall into line under the Executive. For years legislation was drafted for Congress under Executive direction and marked "must." Blanket appropriations were made in huge sums, the spending of which was left to Executive discretion. Broad powers were granted to the President on the basis of an existing emergency, but somehow the emergency never ceased, and the powers continued. It was not until the election of 1942 that Congress began to reassert in some measure its true constitutional functions as the real law-making body. How long it can hold out under the enormous pressure of the Executive will depend, no doubt, on what reaction comes from an awakened public.

Now, let us look for a moment at some of the things being planned for us in the post-war period. The pattern still rings true.

In the early days of the Seventy-eighth Congress, the President in a message to the Congress submitted the recommendations of his National Planning and Resources Board for the post-war period with, and I quote from his message, "my earnest hope for its full consideration."

Head of that Board was Mr. Frederic A. Delano, uncle of the President.

After an examination of that lengthy document, I made the following statement:

The President's message to the Congress yesterday, submitting the recommendations of the National Planning and Resources Board of a so-called guaranty of full economic security from the cradle to the grave for every individual as the post-war new order for America, is in my humble judgment a full, complete, and outright program of national socialism of which the main objectives of the New Deal thus far have been a forerunner. It entirely supplants the incentive, motive, and free enterprise system, and contemplates a planned and controlled economy based upon restriction, direction, management, and complete supervision of all business, industry, agriculture and labor by the Government.

Past and current history fully prove that such a system can only operate by and through some form of a dictatorship. This proposal, however, clearly and concisely, in my humble judgment, defines the issue and lays down the challenge, and it is now squarely up to us who oppose this system to accept the challenge or unconditionally surrender. As for me and my household, I propose to fight and not surrender.

A further extended examination of the proposed program discloses that it calls for:

First. Government management of large segments of private enterprise; far-reaching control of consumer demand, supply, labor, prices, wages.

Second. The Government—politicians in office—will assume responsibility for investing the people's surplus savings and directing their flow into the industries selected for survival. On the other hand, the business not favored will be permitted to die. They propose to do this by taxing the people's savings out of their pockets and reinvesting them.

Third. Commodity rationing would continue a long time, perhaps indefinitely. Raw materials would be rationed to producers as now, and many consumable goods to retail buyers as now.

Fourth. Price controls would probably continue, also the control of rents.

Fifth. The supply and allocation of labor—human beings—would remain under Government controls.

Sixth. Industries based on scarce raw materials and diminishing natural resources such as petroleum, copper, timber, and so forth, would be nationalized in every sense, except that lip service would continue to be paid to private ownership.

Seventh. Government employment agencies would dominate the hiring of labor.

Eighth. Industries now tooled for war, such as aluminum, magnesium, shipbuilding, automotive, and aircraft factories largely financed by the Government, with mixed boards of directors, both Government officials and stockholder representatives.

Ninth. The Government would acquire the Nation's railroads, rehabilitate them as a part of the huge post-war W. P. A. program. The roads would then be rented back to the railroad companies as operating agents for the public. It is reasonable to assume that having taken over the railroads, that truck and bus companies would be next in line, as it seems quite unlikely that the Government would permit any real competition by rival transportation agencies. I think it is also reasonable to assume that it would also apply to aviation, highway, and pipe lines; and, mind you, all of this assistance from the Government must come from taxes assessed against such business enterprises as might remain in private ownership, the farms and the personal property of private citizens.

Tenth. The fiscal plans of Federal, State, and local governments are, according to the recommendations, to be firmly associated. Some of the more outspoken economic planners for the future, suggest that the Federal Government collect all taxes and then allocate them back to the States and other political subdivisions. This, of course, would completely destroy the political and economic independence of the States, counties, cities, and towns.

You say to me, "Why this could not happen." Well, it is true that fortunately the Congress, in a brave hour, refused to continue the appropriations for the National Planning Board who made these fantastic recommendations, and it became officially dead. However, its personnel and ideas have infiltrated into other policymaking agencies of the Government, and it should further be remembered that a majority of the Congress who had the courage to stop this socialistic scheme in its tracks, is now on the purge list; and a $5,000,000 campaign fund is being exacted by the C. I. O. Political Action Committee spokesmen for the New Deal, to be used in defeating the Members of Congress who dare oppose them.

In order that there may be no misunderstanding of what the purposes of

this purge committee are, I quote from a statement which was issued by Mr. Sidney Hillman on January 1, 1944:

Sidney Hillman, chairman of the C. I. O. Political Action Committee, said he would make public tomorrow at the conclusion of a 2-day meeting of 12 of the 14 regional directors, a list of Senators and Representatives to be purged by the committee in the 1944 elections. The committee meeting, Hillman said, is to effect a political machine, working through both major parties, that will go into every ward and precinct of the country to register at least 14,000,000 voters for this year's election. Hillman pointed to the 28,000,000 who voted in 1942, compared with 50,000,000 in 1940, and said it would be the first purpose of the Political Action Committee to overcome this apathy and register as many men and women as possible.

The committee is aiming at a goal of at least $5,000,000, with which to carry out its political program.

Again you ask, Could this really happen in America? and appropriately you ask why men born and raised under the influence of American traditions would desire to foist such calamity upon their own country? The answer to these questions is found in the history of certain periods of the world dominated by men of inordinate personal ambition. Genghis Khan, the Chinese warrior, overran Asia to satisfy his ambition to rule the known world. Alexander the Great, moved by personal ambition, conquered the world and wept because there were no more worlds to conquer. Napoleon wrought wreck and ruin upon Europe to satisfy his appetite for unlimited power. Hitler and Mussolini are modern examples of men who were consumed by their personal ambitions. And, now we, the American people, stand at the threshold of a new world under the leadership of a man who has attained and maintained his position by the exercise and use of the same methods that have led to dictatorship and ruin for many other peoples of the earth. The ambition to trample underfoot a third-term precedent is convincing evidence of the ambition that surges up within this man. The ambition for a fourth term is confirmation of that ambition. The signposts all point in the same direction. Every American, regardless of party, should stop, look, and listen before it is too late.

The conclusion is inescapable. The real issue on the domestic front is whether national socialism shall supplant American democracy.

Our forefathers were all too familiar with the dangers inherent in governmental power. That is why, after setting up the machinery of government, they immediately attached numerous brakes thereto, to prevent it from running away with itself; and that is why they carefully distributed the limited powers of the Central Government among the several branches, reserving all others to the States and to the people. Under that kind of government America grew, waxed strong, and weathered every storm.

Will we abandon it now and turn to one that has brought unhappiness and disaster to every people who have tried it?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a statement by Mayor John B. Gage, of Kansas City, Mo.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BATES] is recognized for 40 minutes.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. In the waning days of this war Congress, I take the floor to present a review of the activities of one of the world's greatest fighting organizations—the United States Navy. The development of the Army has already been ably discussed on this floor by members of the Committee on Military Affairs. As a member of the Committee on Naval Affairs I would like to discuss the Navy and some of its difficulties in the recent past and some of the truly staggering accomplishments that may be expected by the end of this year.

The story goes back nearly 7 years to January 31, 1938, when Admiral William D. Leahy, then Chief of Naval Operations, made his first appearance before the House Naval Affairs Committee to testify in behalf of a 20-percent expansion program for the fleet. He made one of the most prophetic statements that I have had the privilege of hearing during my service on the Naval Affairs Committee.

His specific request was prefaced by a masterly analysis of world conditions, which he accurately termed "far more threatening than at any time since 1918." He referred to the war in China as "a major conflict," which endangers our own sovereign rights and interests. The civil war in Spain, he said, presented the "threat of a general European war." He hinted at possible trouble in Latin America, and, in a masterpiece of understatement, reminded us that the then recently concluded Italo-German-Japanese anti-Communist protocol "must be taken into consideration by America's sea defense."

Turning to the naval situation, he bluntly stated that the principle of limitation of naval armament by agreement, as initiated by the United States and established under the Treaty of Washington of 1922 had failed. The 6 years from 1930 to 1936 witnessed the violation of treaties and the invasion of weak nations by those with aggressive policies, the admiral said. When her demands for parity were rejected, Japan withdrew from the London Naval Conference in 1935, joining Germany and Italy in what was described as an extravagant naval building program. Consequently, Great Britain and France gave notice that they would refuse to be bound by any quantitative limitation of naval armaments. Italy and Japan were both withholding information about their naval construction programs.

Admiral Leahy summed up his analysis with this statement:

The complete break-down of international agreement as to the limitation of armament, and the initiation of at least one powerful armament bloc of three nations cannot be questioned.

His words were questioned however—questioned again and again—questioned and challenged and contradicted and condemned. At that time, you will recall, amateur strategists were in their heyday, and they filled the transcript of those hearings with nearly 1,000 pages of gold-brick reasons why the Navy should not be expanded and why all was right with the world.

What amazes me as I reminisce on the subject is that the word of the amateur gained such wide currency among the American people. Their word was specious coin, as events have abundantly proved, yet it was accepted as the coin of the realm in preference to the word of professionals who should have known and, of course, did know what they were talking about. But this phenomenon was just one of the signs of the times.

Those were wondrous days, and all the more wondrous when one considers that another war was just around the corner. The public was still apathetic about matters of national defense. There was a prevalent feeling that the will for peace was, in itself, sufficient to guarantee the continuance of peace. Because we wished that we would never get into another war, many apparently believed that wishing would make it so. We had a sallow disconcern for the momentous events that were setting the rest of the world afire. We still believed that disarmament would bring about peace, never thinking that, instead, it might constitute an invitation to attack. And so we gazed placidly out over the Atlantic and Pacific, with an air of naive detachment. We thought of those oceans as great barriers of defense, but it never seemed to occur to many of our citizens that they were two-way streets that could just as readily be turned into broad avenues of attack by enemy powers.

The national will was enervated by this sort of thinking, but in spite of it the 20-percent expansion was finally written into law on May 17, 1938, after strenuous debate. It called for 46 combatant ships totaling 295,412 tons and 26 auxiliary ships, totaling 133,560 tons, or a total of 428,972 tons.

Opponents of the expansion dubbed it "monstrous" and "indefensible," and tagged it a "super-Navy bill." But we who supported it contended that it was only a moderate naval expansion.

Of course, it was moderate compared with subsequent expansions, but the tonnage involved fails to reflect the true significance of this program. The 20-percent expansion program was the cornerstone of our present fleet—a fleet that is now larger than the combined fleets of all the rest of the nations of the world, friend and enemy alike. It gave our Navy designers the opportunity to develop plans for the most modern ships. It made possible the development of standard designs and techniques, and the building up of an experienced

nucleus of shipbuilding companies and shipyard workers, without which the subsequent expansion programs would have been impossible. But most important of all, the program supplied the ships that stood us in good stead in the early days of the war when we had all too little of everything that floats and flies. In fact, it can be said without exaggeration that our fleet might well have been swept from the seas in those crucial days of 1941–42 had it not been for the vessels that were leaving the ways at that time under the 193[illegible] naval expansion program.

The 428,972 tons of ships authorized in this program failed to compensate for the loss of tonnage our Navy sustained as a result of the Washington conference. All in all, the United States scrapped 30 battleships, either completed or under construction, for a total of 755,380 tons. This represented a cost of $279,256,616, which had to be written off the books as a bad investment in a scheme to prevent war through disarmament.

After that bitter fight over the 20-percent expansion in the spring of 1938 the shadows of war lengthened and in September 1939 engulfed the continent of Europe. But the outbreak of hostilities in Poland still failed to convince many Americans that we had anything at stake in the struggle. While the belligerents were marshalling their forces, we dubbed it a phony war and sought the comfortable refuge of neutrality. We still placed our trust in the Atlantic and Pacific, and hoped that the conflagration would not leap across these waters. Our military production was pitifully inadequate for fighting a war that a growing number of us feared lay ahead in the not-too-distant future. For example, I personally visited the west-coast plant of Consolidated Aircraft in the summer of 1939 and was dismayed to find that the total monthly output of this large plant was just two military planes. For many precious months, the crisis abroad served to do little more than stimulate the discussion and dissension among Americans on the all-important question of our stake in the world conflict.

Newspapers were still writing editorials about such pointless subjects as do we have to fight Japan? I might say, parenthetically, that the Japanese answered the question for us. Furthermore various groups of our citizens were flooding Congress with vehement petitions demanding that America stay out of war—as if the decision were ours alone to make. And Congress was deluged by resolutions condemning our "threatening belligerency." I suggest, again parenthetically, that these petitions and resolutions were misdirected—they should have been sent to our present enemies. Despite all this, the evidence piled up that we would eventually be drawn into the conflict, and the situation was blamed on warmongering in general instead of the warmongering Germans and Japs in particular. The controversy intensified until at times I had the feeling that some of our citizens would rather lose a war than lose an argument.

I might pause here to pay tribute to my colleagues on the Naval Affairs Committee, and particularly its chairman. Throughout this period when schisms racked the land, I can testify that I never heard the question of politics arise in discussions relating to the needs of the Navy. The committee's concern for the mounting needs of the fleet was never debased, to my knowledge, by personal political ambitions or motives. The defense of the Nation was our primary consideration.

It was not until the Germans had overrun Poland in a lightning offense; had taken the Low Countries, cracked the Maginot line, and were racing toward the channel ports that America awoke from its lethargy. In quick succession two more naval-expansion bills were rushed through Congress and signed by the President. The ink on the 11-percent-expansion bill of June 14, 1940, providing for 167,000 tons of combat and 75,000 tons of auxiliary ships was hardly dry before the 70-percent-expansion bill of July 19, 1940, providing further for 1,325,000 tons of combat and 100,000 tons of auxiliary ships was placed before the President for his signature.

I shall come in a moment to the remarkable construction record of the Navy in completing vessels under these and other expansion acts. But one of the contributing causes was the extraordinary speed with which contracts were placed as soon as Congress made available appropriations to carry out the authorized construction. The regular annual appropriation for the fiscal year 1941 was enacted on June 11, 1940, with funds for construction of 19 combatant vessels and five auxiliaries, and the next day contracts for all 19 combatant vessels and all but one of the auxiliaries had been let.

Similarly, within a week following June 26, 1940, the date of the signing of the First Supplemental National Defense Appropriation Act, 1941, which carried funds for combatant tonnage authorized under the 11 percent and earlier acts, contracts had been placed for the construction of 68 vessels. So also with the vessels authorized by the 70-percent act, contracts were let for the construction of no less than 199 combatant ships on the very same day the money became available by act of Congress on September 9, 1940.

Thus, in a period of less than 3 months after the enactment of the 11-percent act on June 14, 1940, marking the commencement of the emergency shipbuilding program, the Bureau of Ships placed more than $4,000,000,000 worth of contracts for the construction of naval vessels. Only those conversant with the tremendous amount of preliminary work involved in the letting of contracts can appreciate the magnitude of this accomplishment. The Navy literally did the impossible—or at least a job that had been previously considered impossible.

Despite our belated efforts to construct a fleet capable of fighting a modern war, Pearl Harbor caught us meagerly prepared. Ships on the ways at Boston, Philadelphia, New York, Norfolk, Puget Sound, Mare Island, and other navy yards could not stem the tide of Japanese aggression as their forces swept down through the Philippines, Netherlands East Indies, New Guinea, and finally to the Solomons on the very threshold of Australia itself. You know this saga of sad events. The mightiest industrial Nation in the whole world was reduced to the necessity of fighting a rear-guard action against a second or third rate nation that had nonetheless marshaled its meager resources during the previous decade to construct a fleet that was, for the moment, superior to ours.

The remnants of our battered fleet finally managed to stem the tide at the Battle of the Coral Sea in May 1942. And then came our first offensive efforts when the marines moved into Guadalcanal in August of that year. Of all the battles we have fought since and all we shall fight in the days ahead, the Solomons campaign deserves a special niche in our glorious military history. In that bloody jungle were the heroic marines, who subsisted on rice for days on end and endured hardships that can never be fully described in word or picture. And in the surrounding seas, there was our embattled fleet, slugging it out with superior forces in a vicious war of attrition. For months on end our Solomons offensive hung by a slender thread—a thread so slender that, had our enemies but known it, our gallant forces could have been overwhelmed. Those were the lean days. PT boats were thrown into the breach to do the work of destroyers. There were times when our task forces ventured into enemy waters without a covering air umbrella, and only the superiority of our fire power saved our ships from the fate of the *Repulse* and *Prince of Wales* 2 years before. We were finally reduced to one aircraft carrier—the doughty *Enterprise*. But our depleted naval forces were magnificently commanded. What we lacked in ships we made up for in daring and aggressiveness. On one occasion, a single United States task force engaged in two bombardments, one screening operation, one air battle and a surface engagement in an intensely active period of 72 hours. This task force appeared in so many widely separated engagements that the Japs thought there were three American task forces at sea instead of one. We took care to preserve the enemy's illusions, and by the time they discovered the real truth, it was too late for them to do anything about it.

Since Coral Sea, Guadalcanal, and Midway we have enjoyed a rich diet of naval victories. We have the men and the material and the determination to sweep our enemies from the seas, but in the flush of our coming triumph, I hope we do not forget those lean days when victories were strictly rationed and defeats and retreats constituted our principal bill of fare.

I trust we will not forget the 76,850 Americans in the Army and Navy, Marine Corps and Coast Guard, who have already given their lives; the 164,162 who have been wounded and some of whom will never regain their health; the 54,299 who are missing, many of whom may never return, and the 48,874 who have

suffered privations and even tortures as prisoners of war. The 344,185 brave men in these various categories have borne the brunt of war in its most fiendish modern fashion. The rest of us 130,000,000 Americans owe them a debt that can never be measured in words or money; the debt we owe must remain forever unpaid despite our best efforts to extend to them some token of our appreciation.

Those of us who are veterans of that first big expansion fight in 1938 can contemplate the growth of the fleet with more than ordinary interest. Between July 1, 1940, when the wartime expansion of the Navy began in earnest, and July 1, 1944, the Navy increased the number of combatant ships on hand by nearly 300 percent, and the number of supporting vessels and landing craft by 6,500 percent. In that period, the Navy's effective air striking arm multiplied 20 times, and the fire power of the fleet was more than trebled. On the question of fire power, you can get some idea of the increase when I tell you that the fire power of the close-in antiaircraft battery of the majority of our battleships in service in 1940 has been stepped up more than 1,000 percent.

For obvious security reasons I cannot give you at this time a complete breakdown on the size of the fleet by classes of ships. Suffice it to say that the 15 battleships on hand on July 1, 1940, have now grown to 23, and the six large aircraft carriers then in the fleet have now become 13. In every other combatant category, with one exception, the increase in numbers of ships ranges from 60 percent up.

During 1943, we more than doubled the number of combatant ships in the fleet. In that single year, the Navy completed 2 45,000-ton battleships, 6 aircraft carriers of the 27,000-ton class; 9 aircraft carriers of the somewhat lighter cruiser type, 50 escort carriers, 11 cruisers, 128 destroyers, 306 destroyer escorts and 56 submarines, a total of 568 combatant ships with a total displacement of 1,359,318 tons—which was more than the combined tonnage of the United States Fleet in 1938 when the 20 percent expansion program was proposed.

The 1944 schedule calls for completion of 581 combatant ships, representing a total of 1,483,195 tons—an increase of 125,000 tons over last year

Taking this year and last, we can summarize by saying that each of these years we constructed fleets larger than the whole United States Fleet back in 1938 when all we had afloat was 1,256,000 tons.

The emphasis in 1944 will be placed on landing craft and naval aircraft. As one high naval officer said recently: "1944 will be landing and aircraft year." Let us look at some of the overall figures in these fields.

The year 1943 witnessed a tremendous output of landing craft as that program swung into high gear. A total of 21,525 landing craft representing a total of 793,531 tons were launched. As successful as was the 1943 program, however, the 1944 program will easily outdistance it. During the first half of 1944, the tonnage of landing craft completed was 728,418 tons, or nearly as much as was completed during the whole year preceding. Before the end of the year, completions are expected to total more than a million and a half tons.

The building of aircraft carriers and the planes to be operated from them represents another very encouraging picture. During 1943 and 1944, the Navy will have completed in the neighborhood of 120 aircraft carriers of all types—and six score carriers can make up a lot of hard-hitting task forces for use against the enemy. A goodly percentage of these carriers are fleet types, capable of a speed equal to battleships and cruisers, and with a range that extends over thousands of miles. The converted carriers and escort carriers, of course, are slower and smaller, but they have already been put to excellent use in the second line of our striking forces afloat. In addition, these carriers can be credited with playing a very large part in the battle against the Nazi U-boats in the Atlantic, which took a tremendous toll of our merchant ships and men in the early days of the war.

But 1944 will perhaps be even more outstanding as the year in which the naval service makes its greatest stride in the addition of hard-slugging aircraft to the fighting fleets. During 1944, the Navy will more than double the number of combatant aircraft it received during the previous year. The figures are 13,524 combatant planes accepted in 1943, as against more than 28,000 first line fighting and bombing planes projected for acceptance in 1944. These numbers, gentlemen, do not include trainer planes or other noncombatant types of aircraft. Production in 1944, I might add, will vastly increase a naval air force which is already by far the biggest in all the world. These planes are being, and will be flown by a force of 47,276 Navy and marine pilots whose rigorous training has brought them to a high state of perfection.

I offer at this point a table showing naval expenditures each year beginning in January 1938 and continuing to June 29, 1944. These figures, supplied to me by the Navy Department, show that a total of $19,634,059,924 has been expended on ship construction over those 6 years, and an additional $5,229,416,977 has been spent on public works. The table follows:

Naval expenditures

	Ship construction [1]				Public works
	Construction and machinery	Armor, armament, and ammunition	Emergency construction	Total ship construction	
Fiscal year—					
1938 (January to June)	$73, 679, 745	$21, 840, 854	----------	$95, 520, 599	$3, 764, 632
1939	167, 572, 064	59, 137, 242	----------	226, 709, 306	34, 383, 582
1940	254, 317, 221	74, 502, 172	----------	328, 819, 393	72, 503, 150
1941	747, 363, 067	210, 144, 284	----------	957, 508, 251	361, 654, 523
1942	2, 412, 225, 951	732, 929, 523	$69, 553, 569	3, 214, 709, 043	975, 758, 503
1943	4, 665, 521, 198	996, 051, 470	845, 708, 929	6, 507, 281, 597	2, 337, 665, 461
1944 (to June 29, 1944)	5, 835, 549, 930	1, 142, 525, 765	1, 325, 436, 050	8, 303, 511, 745	1, 443, 687, 126
Total	14, 156, 230, 066	3, 237, 131, 310	2, 240, 698, 548	19, 634, 059, 924	5, 229, 416, 977

[1] Includes "Major alterations to naval vessels."

I will not detain you with further statistics. In general, it can be said that the United States Navy is the greatest fleet ever launched by man—the greatest in quantity, in quality, and in performance. It has a mobility that has never before been attained. Through the use of a sizable train of supply vessels, individual task forces can operate virtually on a nonstop basis for weeks and months at a time without returning to base. Your fleet has a fire power that has successfully defied shore-based batteries and overwhelmed them in bombardment duels. Its ships of the sea and its ships of the air are manned by a Navy of 3,717,000 men, who are more highly trained in the art of sea-air warfare than any other group of fighting men in the world. This number includes Coast Guard and marines.

In describing the achievements of the naval service, we are at the same time focussing the clear light of fact on the vision and handiwork of this House and the Congress of the United States. In this connection, let me quote the words of Rear Admiral E. L. Cochrane, Chief of the Navy's Bureau of Ships, as incorporated in a public statement made earlier this year in Boston.

Since the authorization of the two-ocean Navy—

Said Admiral Cochrane—

one expansion has followed on the heels of another, until today we are speaking of the Navy's many fleets which, when completed, will be strong enough to cover the five oceans and the seven seas.

For years Congress has met every request of the Navy for additional authorizations and funds to meet the emergency Navy shipbuilding program.

I am still quoting Admiral Cochrane. He continues:

This cooperation by Congress, which made possible in 1943 alone the delivery to the fleet of nearly one and one-half million tons of fighting ships, and 2,000,000 tons of auxiliary vessels and other supporting craft, is the answer to those who comforted themselves with the conviction that a democracy could not function effectively in time of war.

Those are warming words, gentlemen. I dare say there is none here who has the technical education, the background, or the experience to assume the command of a mighty battle fleet. Our abilities lie within another field. Ours is the high privilege and responsibility of providing, in the name of all the people, the ships and guns and planes and supplies which bring a mighty battle fleet

into being. Ours is the honor and the sacred duty of seeing to it that our fighting men are given an abundance of the tools which they will need in building the structure of a decisive victory and a lasting peace.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from New York, a member of the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Mr. COLE of New York. The gentleman is making and has made a very fine and informative statement. I am sure the public would be interested in knowing that he has been a member of the committee of the Congress which has in part made this program possible. In connection with the extent of the expansion of our fleet, I would suggest to the gentleman that at present the tonnage of our landing craft of all types, which have been characterized as the secret weapon of America in this war, is equal to if not greater than the entire combatant tonnage, battleships, cruisers, destroyers, and submarines, which this country had 6 years ago.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. The gentleman is correct. This year we are building, in landing craft alone, a tonnage that exceeds the total tonnage of the combat fleet in 1938, when Admiral Leahy first appeared before our committee.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. I yield.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I would like to ask the distinguished member of the Committee on Naval Affairs whether, during all this time, during his close connection with the work of the committee, and this expansion, there has ever been any request, except in people's minds, for an appropriation to fortify Guam?

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. That matter has been discussed on the floor of the House, all over the country, and in the newspapers over a period of the last 3 or 4 years. I want to say, and I have some knowledge of the facts, and the record will bear me out, at no time did the Navy Department recommend to the Congress or to the Committee on Naval Affairs, an appropriation, or ask for an authorization, for the fortification of Guam.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. The only thing that we ever had before the committee was the bill calling for the dredging of the harbor and the striking off of the coral reefs, the building of a breakwater, and improving the seaplane take-off area so that the commercial planes and perhaps some Navy planes on their way to the Philippines could find safe refuge in the harbor of Guam. But at no time, and it surprises me to hear those in high authority often say, that the fortification of Guam was recommended by the Navy Department to the Congress. The record will clearly show that no recommendation was ever made to the Committee on Naval Affairs or of the Congress of the United States, and all of the members of the committee who served with me in those early days would bear witness to the fact also that at no time was any recommendation ever made for the fortification of Guam.

Mr. MOTT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from Oregon, a member of the committee, who also served on that committee in 1938.

Mr. MOTT. It is a fact, however, is it not, that the Hepburn Board, which was authorized by our committee, did include in its recommendations, an item for the fortification of Guam, and they declined to present it to the committee or insist upon it, because the administration was opposed to it and they could not get consent either of the general board or of the Navy.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. May I also say at this point that the Hepburn Board was created as a result of a resolution emanating from the Committee on Naval Affairs. The Hepburn Board was appointed by the Secretary of the Navy. It made its report to the Navy and then to Congress, but when the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. MOTT] asked Admiral Leahy himself what did he have to say about the fortification of Guam as recommended by the Hepburn Board, Admiral Leahy said, quote:

> I can tell you definitely that at the present time there is no proposition by the Navy Department to provide a naval base at Guam. It is entirely possible that in the future this Government may consider it necessary as a defensive measure to provide defensive facilities for the island of Guam. The matter has not been given serious study at the present time and there is no proposal now to do it.

Mr. MOTT. That is very informative. I am glad to have it in the RECORD.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from Washington, a member of the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Of course, it ought to be brought out here, I think the gentleman will agree with me, and I ask him if he does not agree, despite the fact that no one, as such, officially, as I recall it, asked our committee to go ahead with the complete fortification of Guam, the Hepburn Board recommended it. That report was given wide circulation and as I recall it, some of the members of the committee, possibly the gentleman from Massachusetts himself, and I know I did, and I think perhaps the gentlemen from New York and Oregon did, but many of us at the time thought we should introduce a separate bill to go further than the so-called dredging of the harbor irrespective of the Navy Department not officially asking us to do so.

I personally introduced a bill for further fortification of Guam. The word "fortification" is a loose term; but, to do more for Guam. I want to say to the gentleman while he is here making this excellent address, I will be leaving the House in a few days, and there is one fine thing about my service here, and that is being a member of the gentleman's committee. We have tried to be nonpartisan about the thing about which the gentleman is speaking. I doubt if there is any committee in Congress that has passed out more bills with the unanimous report of the committee than the Committee on Naval Affairs. Ever since I have been a member of that committee, we have tried to build this Navy. It has not been a partisan effort. Sometimes we succeeded and sometimes we did not, but we struggled along, finally helping the Navy Department to do so. Guam was a little incident thereto. I would be derelict in my duty to my friend from Massachusetts [Mr. BATES] if I did not insert in the RECORD at this place the fact that no one has been more zealous in aiding the Democrats on that committee than the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BATES].

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. I thank the gentleman. I wish to say that before his entrance into the Chamber I made this statement:

> I might pause here to pay tribute to my colleagues on the Naval Affairs Committee, and particularly its chairman. Throughout this period when schisms racked the land, I can testify that I never heard the question of politics arise in discussions relating to the needs of the Navy. The committee's concern for the mounting needs of the fleet was never debased, to my knowledge, by personal political ambitions or motives. The defense of the Nation was our primary consideration.

I am glad to hear the gentleman from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], a member of the committee on the Democratic side, testify as to the approach that the Republican members of the committee made to the determination of all the problems that came before us.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. I yield.

Mr. COLE of New York. On this question of fortification of Guam, as the gentleman from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] has indicated, it comes down to a definition of the word "fortification." What is meant by "fortification"? If by the use of that term to mean the dredging of the harbor, then the Congress failed to fortify Guam.

So that the record may be straight, my recollection is that the recommendation of the Hepburn Board, a creation of the Congress, was that a submarine and air patrol base be established at Guam. If you call that "fortification," then even the Navy failed to recommend to Congress the recommendation of the Hepburn Board, to my mind that is not fortification. There never has been a recommendation by the Navy Department, by the Hepburn Board, by the President, or anybody along the line for the complete, impregnable fortification of Guam.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. This is the first time the members of the Naval Affairs Committee have taken part in the discussion on the floor of the House, since all of these statements were uttered in the press and over the radio about the supposed recommendations for the fortification of Guam. I am glad to see the members on the floor today reiterating what has been reiterated many times here and elsewhere, in refutation of those

who mention the fact that the fortification of Guam was recommended. As members of the committee who participated in the debate and the discussions and in the examination of Admiral Leahy, we can testify that no fortification was ever recommended. Furthermore, the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. MOTT] interrogated Admiral Leahy and asked if this was the beginning of the fortification of Guam. Admiral Leahy said, "Absolutely no; there is no intention on the part of the Navy to fortify Guam or to recommend it. That matter is still before the General Board for further consideration and no determination has been made by them up to this time."

Mr. MOTT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. I yield.

Mr. MOTT. The gentleman will recall also that in the debate in the shore expansion bill it was reiterated repeatedly by members of the committee in the discussion on the floor that the item of $5,000,000 was not for the fortification of Guam; that it was a harbor development; and in reply to that statement it was pointed out by other members that if that were the case, then that proposal should come out of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and not out of the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BREHM. Is it not also true that the hearings revealed that if you did agree to this $5,000,000 for the dredging of the harbor we would not be able to hold Guam against the encroachment of a foreign power and that they would reap the benefits of that dredged harbor if that money were spent in the beginning?

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. In regard to that I want again to recall to the mind of the Committee on Naval Affairs what also was said at the hearings, that if we completely fortified Guam at an estimated cost of nearly $200,000,000, the best that we might be able to defend it would be 3 or 4 weeks. Furthermore, if you will recall in that bill the recommendations of the Hepburn Board relative to Guam were not carried out insofar as the amount which was asked for was concerned. The same applies also to Midway, Wake, Johnston, and Palmyra, all of which estimates were included in the first Hepburn report but were substantially reduced when the Navy Department recommended the improvement of the facilities at these various outlying islands. It is a part of the record that the recommendations for those islands were not fully followed along the lines of the Hepburn Board recommendations.

Mr. BREHM. And had that been done it would have aided and helped the enemy that much more.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. If we had developed the islands of Wake, Midway, Johnston, and Palmyra, then on the day of December 7 had our scouting planes been operating in the air a thousand miles away from Pearl Harbor observing the enemy coming along they never would have struck Pearl Harbor because their planes never could have flown that far. It seems quite obvious that the scouting planes were not operating from these islands with the result that the Japs came through.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. I yield once more to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. COLE of New York. That is another of those rather insignificant items on Guam that appeared at that time. Is it not correct that the opposition to that item which developed on the floor of this Chamber came from both sides, from the Democratic as well as the Republican Party?

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. That is right.

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. I yield.

Mr. BLAND. Was there a constitutional or treaty provision against the fortification of Guam? It seems to me I have seen that somewhere. I am not asking for political reasons, but am seeking information.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. When the islands were turned over to Japan there was an understanding that she was not to fortify any of the mandated islands. It was also part of the treaty of 1922, the Washington Disarmament Treaty, that we would not fortify Guam, but the singular part of it was that while we did not do anything with Midway, Wake, Johnston, Palmyra, or even Guam, we could not get any information as to what the Japs were doing in the mandated islands because they would not permit us to go anywhere near them.

Mr. BLAND. So the $5,000,000, or any other like sum, would not have done us any good.

Mr. COLE of New York. In order that the record may be complete, the treaty limitation which prevented us from fortifying Guam expired in 1936.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. That is right.

Mr. COLE of New York. So at the time this question came up, we were free to fortify it if we decided it was necessary.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. I wish to complete this statement.

The progress of this war thus far, I submit, is clear evidence that we have exercised our abilities and have discharged our responsibilities in a manner which is a ringing justification of the democracy under which we live. Except for the work of the Congress of the United States, there could have been no invasion of Africa or the Solomons, there could have been no smashing and successful onslaught in the Central Pacific, there could have been no savage attack on the enemy behind their bastions at Tarawa, Eniwetok, Kwajalein, Saipan, Tinian, Guam, Hollandia, Normandy and southern France.

Quite often our work here is dull and unexciting. Sometimes it is sheer drudgery. On many occasions it is necessary to burn the midnight oil in long hours of concentrated and thankless effort. Nevertheless, our work here has its thrills and its rewards. For example, some of the ships which we have authorized at this session of Congress, some day will flaunt the Stars and Stripes over the waters of Tokyo Bay. The war with Germany may soon be over, but a long, hard fight still remains before us in the Pacific. It must be kept in mind that we are still 1,400 miles away from the mainland of Asia and the homeland of Japan. With the tremendous fleet now at hand and in the making, manned by stalwart men who have already proved their worth in battle, we can confidently look forward to the day when victory will be ours over the forces that have brought great misery and suffering to the people of the world. Every one of us will be proud when we learn that—due in part to our work—Coast Guard transports are unloading Army troops on Corregidor, that the Navy is pursuing a shattered Japanese fleet, and that the marines have established beachheads on the home islands of Japan itself.

Remembering vividly as I do our pre-war difficulties in building up the fleet, I must confess that I have grave misgivings when I contemplate the post-war future of our Navy. Few will quibble now when it is proposed tha we retain a strong navy. But I suspect that the fear of defeat has merely drowned out many of the voices of negation that plagued us before the war. These voices may be heard again in rising volume as the quiet of peace returns to the world.

Of course, the term "strong navy" is a relative term. The size of the fleet we retain must be determined in accordance with the world situation in the years following the cessation of hostilities. The Navy has outlined three broad plans to fit different hypothetical situations. The first, as outlined not long ago by Vice Admiral Horne, Vice Chief of Naval Operations, is based on the hypothesis that the world situation in post-war will be one in which there is no agreement whatever among the Allied Nations to cooperate in maintaining world peace. The second plan is based upon the assumption that the United States will take responsibility for maintaining peace in the Pacific and western Atlantic. The third is designed to cover the situation if the United Nations set up a workable system of collective security.

Whatever the situation at hand, let us be doubly certain that our Navy is strong enough to handle the job. The size of the fleet should be tailored to fit our national obligations. But let us never again skimp on the cloth, for that is one sure way to weaken the whole fabric of the peace.

In his appearance before the Naval Affairs Committee in 1938, Admiral Leahy defined the purpose of the Navy as aptly as I have ever heard it put before.

The Navy—

He said—

insures our national integrity, supports our national policies, guards the continental United States and our overseas possessions, and gives protection to our citizens abroad. The Navy can do this effectively only if it is maintained at a strength which will prevent

a serious challenge by any nation or nations to any of America's vital national policies, which will insure respect by foreign states and their people for our citizens abroad, and which will make an attack on any part of our territory too costly and too hazardous for any foreign nation or nations to attempt.

Those words were uttered 6 years and 76,850 lives ago. I say "76,850 lives ago" because, you will recall, that is the total number of Americans in unif rm who have been killed to date since December 7, 1941.

That is an awful toll to be taken for unpreparedness. That is a fearful price to pay for our dawdling policy of "too little and too late." And, let me remind you: We have not yet done with paying.

We must not glibly quote the total number of dead as if it were nothing more than a mere statistical fact. Each digit that goes to make up this total represents a human life—some son, some husband, some father, some relative whose hopes and desires and ambitions will never be realized; whose smile and laugh and love will be grievously missed; whose absence will constitute a limitless void in the life of some American family.

Surely there is something to be learned from all this human loss and sacrifice and grief. Surely America has learned by now the folly of unpreparedness.

Let me repeat again in closing that, in a world such as ours, disarmament is not the way to permanent peace. It is a snare and a delusion to trap the naive and unsuspecting, and I fervently hope that America will not again resort to it as a cure-all for war. America is strong and virile, and a policy of vacillation and weakness is out of national character. Furthermore, America has grown too powerful to resort again to a policy of being innocuous, in the hope that the rest of the world will leave us alone in our little ivory tower.

America will be guided by the paths of peace if it has, first energetic statesmanship; secondly, a strong Navy, and thirdly a body of enlightened public opinion to sustain both our statesmanship and our Navy.

Your Navy is the first line of defense in time of peace; and the first line of offense in time of war. It should be maintained in continuous strength, in war and peace alike, and in strength sufficient to fulfill its gloried mission.

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. I yield.

Mr. BLAND. That would also include a strong merchant marine.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. I thoroughly agree with the gentleman. We must have the supporting facilities for the combat fleet.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. McMURRAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an address which I delivered last year in New York City on the subject of political reconstruction of the world.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Tuesday next, at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day and following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous special order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. RAMEY] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. RAMEY. Mr. Speaker, I think it is time that we in the Congress set an example for the press and the radio by redefining the word "labor" as it has been used of late. We have fallen into the habit of referring to labor as though labor were a group of men somehow set apart from the rest of us. Extreme conservatives, I regret to state, are openly critical and suspicious of a term they call labor. Some people speak of labor as though it were a name to cover a group with whose members they are wholly unfamiliar and who are unknown to them. Perhaps they speak more truthfully than they know. At any rate, they use labor as a term in the same way that they use the name of a remote group of nationals or a racial group they little understand and seldom see. They speak of labor as they speak of the Basques, or the Ecuadoreans, or the Levantines.

In the Ninth Ohio District, we have more than 100,000 men and women working in the war plants. We have thousands of farm workers. We have thousands of white-collar workers. Their sons and their daughters are in the armed forces. Their homes are next door to yours and mine. Their individual problems are identical, if you please, with the problem of the editor, or the Congressman or the columnist. I am, of course, limiting that comment to the individual problem of one citizen as against that of another.

The problem of the worker, of course, is not identical with that of the employer, since one is on the pay roll and the other at the pay-roll window. One seeks to simplify matters, larger wage checks and better working conditions, and if he gets it he gets it at the immediate expense of the employer. So, we cannot say as some extreme conservatives of bygone years once said that the employer's problem and the workers' problem is one problem.

We can say, however, that while conflict is inherent in this situation as between employer and employee and while it is not accurate to say that their problems are identical it is accurate to say that their problems are almost identical, and are increasingly leveled toward a common objective.

The plain truth is that the employer and the employee, in the months immediately ahead, must work together, or we shall face chaos, detrimental to both, perhaps tragic, and then indeed their problem will be identical, for it will be the problem of saving law and order and justice from confusion.

We need to credit the men and women who are in the unions with the common sense necessary to recognize this situation. They do. We need to accord them a status as individuals tremendously concerned with a vital problem, not a bloc insisting on its own point of view. There used to be a saying that there are three sides to every labor dispute—the employers' side, the workers' side, and the truth.

In these crowded days we want to see that both disputants line with the truth. Proceeding from that point we should be able to accomplish worth-while ends.

At the present time there are two much-discussed measures in the public mind. One of them has to do with reconversion and the reimbursement of industry on the basis of taxes. The other provides for the payment to war workers who have been in a labor pool and in many cases have been shunted from city to city and State to State. On each there has been more light than heat.

Time and again we will be confronted in this Congress with legislation calculated to achieve an immediate remedy for some real or fancied wrong. Time and again we will be confronted with measures which are conceived in a spirit of revenge and designed to punish.

It is my intention to approach the matters affecting employer and employee as they develop judicially and practically. We are engaged in a gigantic plan of straightening out an unbelievable economic tangle. Let us start with the notion that industry is honest, that labor, meaning our fellow citizens who are workers, is honest, and that each is trying to avert catastrophe.

Labor's right to organize and bargain collectively must be protected. Our social gains, of primary importance to the workers, must be preserved and they can at the same time be streamlined and rid of bureaucratic red tape and confusing administration. They can be simplified. Private enterprise must be unfettered as nearly as we can do it, so that we can go forward to an era in which jobs and pay envelopes will be worth while, and the right motives maintained as a keystone to our system and an incentive to greater effort and greater reward—even to the humblest of us.

As a Labor Day message in this year of great upheaval, I feel that it is fitting to comment that we in the United States are dedicated to the preservation of our own way of life and to the expanding growth that should be ours. We are dedicated to progress and improvement and the realization of those ambitions which the future generation holds. We are confronted with many problems, not the least of them being that of employer and employee, but the nation which today is gaining victory through cooperation and ingenuity and daring cannot despair in the face of effecting reconciliations which should not be difficult to men of good will.

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAMEY. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BREHM. First, I want to congratulate the gentleman upon his very intelligent and judicial approach to this problem. Second, I wonder if the gentleman does not agree with me in feeling that the primary objective of the average working man is to improve and expand our present economic system, under which labor may receive increased benefits, rather than to destroy the present system and replace it with some system which is foreign to our American way of life, or to attempt to tie his union to the tail of any political party. Does not the gentleman feel that the average workingman in the ranks has in mind improving the present economic system rather than destroying it?

Mr. RAMEY. I thank the gentleman for his contribution, and in answer would say that I believe all men would agree with the gentleman in toto—I know the workers agree, and I know that the men who are organized into unions and who have sons in the armed forces, they who have been the main force, we might say, in producing everything that is needed, our railroad men especially—that this is not a problem of any political party. The true union man and the true worker would no more support a man because he belonged to some party than because he might belong to some church.

He is not interested in whether a man is a Republican or a Democrat. He is dedicating his all to the cause for which every man here is dedicating his all. He is sincere. I have been grateful for the record of the gentleman from Ohio, Dr. BREHM, and wish there were more like the gentleman. Your view is appreciated by all the workers who are deeply in earnest and are not going to be exploited by anyone who pretends to be their friend and at the same time has deceived them.

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. RAMEY. I will be happy to yield.

Mr. BREHM. My chief concern is that some radical, self-seeking, power-hungry individual is attempting to use my loyal, patrotic workers, of whom I have thousands in my district, as a stepping stone for his own personal gain. I, for one, feel that the average individual, the average workingman in my district, will not be deceived by that type of thing and that they can see through it and they will not be misled and taken down a dark alley, which is not for their good, but which is for the good of some one individual. I am sure that the boys who have been raised with and who have worked with you and me are too intelligent to be misled into that blind alley.

Mr. RAMEY. I want to thank the gentleman from Ohio further. The workingman who is giving so much is not going to be deceived. He is not going to be led down a blind alley. He is listening to the call of God and country, and in the words of Henry Van Dyke, "The worker today is thinking without confusion, clearly." He is not fooled by mountebanks.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAMEY. I will be happy to yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. MURRAY].

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Many things that happen here in Congress have been confusing to me in connection with this labor situation. In one breath I hear people say their hearts are bleeding for the laboring man and they want to save him 2 or 3 cents a day on his grocery bill. Then afterward, which happened right here in June 1944, when we had the Price Control Act up for consideration, we had something happen which I have not been able to figure out. How in the name of common sense could administration spokesmen get up here on the floor and oppose the Andresen amendment that would have provided that any white-collar workers, or anyone else, could get up to $37.50 a week without having to take it up with somebody in Washington? In other words, if the employer and the employee were willing to agree on a salary up to $37.50 a week, they would have been able to do so without taking it up in Washington. How could administration spokesmen stand here on this floor and say that that was going to cause inflation?

Mr. RAMEY. I agree with the gentleman. People should have the fruit of their toil without interference or bungling from Washington. The workingmen deserve to be respected, not inspected.

Idle mischief makers are bad enough, but when we must endure them on a pay roll, then in the words of the great statesman, "I shudder for my country when I know that God is just."

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. The point I made in connection with the rollback grocery bill of 3 cents a day was to show how ridiculous that is in comparison with the attitude that they did not want the white-collar worker and those in the lower income groups to get $37.50 a week, as if $37.50 a week per family would cause inflation. I just cannot follow that through. That is the reason I mentioned the 2 or 3 cents on the grocery bill, as if that were going to be a great saving to them, when, as a matter of fact, no one can say that the lower income groups during all this time received salaries that would have any effect on inflation. It is hypocrisy in the *n*th degree, in my opinion.

Mr. RAMEY. In the *n*th degree; and do not forget the workingmen can detect hypocrisy. Men who work hard think, and think clear. Perhaps the workingman has been more talked about and more untruths have been said about him than any other man. It is not because of his actions. It has been because occasionally someone who cares not for this country or the world, someone who would stab your boy or my boy in the back, by stealth, by cunning, might get into some union for sometime and endeavor to exploit or deceive them. But 999 out of every 1,000 of the men in our unions are patriotic and are not going to be fooled.

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAMEY. I yield.

Mr. BREHM. Returning to the question asked by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. MURRAY], the gentleman from the Ninth District of Ohio, as well as myself, as shown by the RECORD, voted for the Andresen amendment. In other words, if an employer and an employee got together and agreed on a price that was satisfactory to both, then I agree with the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. MURRAY], why should any bureaucrat in Washington step in and arbitrarily say, "You cannot pay it"? I know this has happened and is happening now. They are only permitted to pay a certain wage per week. The men will not stay on the job at that price. So, when Saturday night comes around, they give them a present which amounts to $37.50. In other words, making crooks out of the American people. I maintain that that agreement should be between management and labor. If a man is worth his hire and the employer is willing to pay that for the service rendered, I feel it is the concern of no one but those two people involved, and no bureaucratic agency in Washington or elsewhere should step in and dictate the terms under which those two should make this agreement.

Then, as the gentleman further said, to give them a 2- or 3-cent subsidy on the pretext of helping and then deny them an increase which was agreed to by the parties concerned is not even common sense.

Mr. RAMEY. And sometimes it is done in the name of patriotism. What was it that Dr. Samuel Johnson said? "Oftentimes patriotism is the refuge of a scoundrel." Sometimes those who exploit the workingmen use patriotic phrases and slogans. Do not forget, both the workingmen who produce and those in the armed forces of this country are not being deceived.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. RAMEY. I yield.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. As a good example of what we have been talking about is the attitude that was taken toward the railroad men of this country when the finger of suspicion was pointed toward them as if they were unpatriotic because they asked for 8 cents an hour increase in salary at a time when one-third of them were getting 57 cents an hour or less and they were turned down. Mr. Fred Vinson at the very time had an increase of $2,500 in salary for himself, yet no one heard about the effect on inflation. However, if these railroad men were to get 8 cents an hour, that great bogy of inflation was just around the corner and was going to jump on somebody's back. This approach to the wages for the lower-income groups never made sense to me. To me it is one more example of hypocrisy in the *n*th degree.

Mr. RAMEY. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. DICKSTEIN] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to discuss what I believe is a most vital problem for the American people to face but one to which we paid little

attention when we considered ceilings on rents. We managed to get some control over rising rents in residential housing, but we failed to protect the little businessman who today is suffering as a result of having a lot of greedy landlords increase their rentals on commercial property to the point where it is driving the little fellow out of business. This applies not only to my own city and State, but I can point out instances in different sections of the country, covering almost 30 States, where similar conditions prevail. We talk about the little fellow, the little businessman in particular, being the backbone of the country, but at the same time we do little to protect him from shylocks, rent-raisers, and conspirators who buy up a lot of property in desirable sections of a city and jack the rent up 40, 50, 60, 70, or even 80 percent. It is driving the little fellow out of business.

I have introduced a bill, H. R. 5184, which went before the Committee on Banking and Currency. Under that bill I sought to fix ceiling prices during this emergency, limiting raises on business property to a maximum increase of 25 percent in such cases where the evidence and facts justified the increase, the proof to be presented to the Office of the Price Administrator. I have communicated with our worthy colleague, the chairman of that committee, and have received a communication in which he stated that during the hearings on the continuation of the Emergency Price Control and Stabilization Act of 1942 the question of giving the Administrator the power to control rents of commercial properties was discussed. Notwithstanding the fact that the Administrator of Economic Stabilization requested the power be given to the Price Administrator, the committee failed to do so. The chairman further advised me that he would discuss the matter further with his committee and unless the committee had changed its views it will be useless to hold hearings on my bill. In my opinion, the committee made a mistake not to grant such power of control over rents of commercial buildings, and I hope the committee has changed its view since. The little businessman has to comply with the ceilings put on his products by the O. P. A. If he violates that ceiling not only is he fined but he may be sent to jail. He is not allowed to go beyond the price ceiling fixed by O. P. A. in the sale of any of his commodities, yet the landlord comes along and says: "Now, here, Mr. Jones, your rent has been $500 a month; we are going to increase it to $800." In certain instances they have more than doubled the rent.

As Members of Congress what have we done to protect the little businessmen from these gougers who are trying to make up their losses of the last 20 years on some of the real estate they have by taking advantage of a wartime shortage of available space?

Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that the Committee on Banking and Currency should have given the matter more careful study for the sole purpose of trying to do something to protect the honest businessmen who are forced to pay enormous rent increases. This is driving people out of business and we are going to lose greatly in the strength of our country.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Will the gentleman be specific and tell us what the O. P. A. is allowing to happen that is not according to the law so that the membership will have an idea exactly what the gentleman's complaint is? What is the situation? What is the O. P. A. doing that it should not do, or what is it not doing that it should do?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. The O. P. A. is powerless to do anything. To illustrate my point, may I say that I have received a great number of letters from all sections of the country after I introduced my bill to fix a rent ceiling on commercial property. There is no question but what some property owners are entitled to an increase within reason, based on the return upon their investment, but the increases demanded by these so-called landlords are tremendous. Some of them do not live in your city, but they buy improved property in your city and jack up the rent two or three times. That little storekeeper in your city or my city, when he sells his merchandise that was referred to a little while ago, groceries or whatever it may be, is obliged to adhere to a ceiling price. He can only charge so much. On the other hand, the Congress has not given the O. P. A. power to control the rents which their landlords may charge them. Therefore these little fellows are driven out of business because they cannot raise the prices of their products while at the same time their expenses increase immensely because of the outrageous increases forced upon them by the owners of their business property.

I want to give a few illustrations as I ran through my mail. A small concern in the city of New York has this to say:

> My rent was $2,600. They are now asking me $4,500 a year. For me to pay this increase will mean closing my business and discharging 33 employees as I cannot stay in business with an increase of that kind; yet I have no other place to go.

A man in Salt Lake City complains:

> I started out to pay a hundred dollars per month. Now the landlord wants $175 and practically wants me to do all the repairs.

Here is another case:

> The rental increase is outrageous. We ourselves are called upon to pay a 40-percent increase over the 1942 lease. We have no alternative but we must pay it because it is demanded and we have no other place to go.

Here is another illustration:

> We expected and paid an increase in rent for 1944 of $6,000 which was tremendously exhorbitant, 33⅓ percent. We have been notified by the representatives of our new landlord that if we wish to remain in our present location, which has been our established headquarters for over 8 years, we must pay an additional $20,000, or an increase of 83⅓ percent.

All the complaints I have received from all parts of the country seem to be along the same lines. Judging from these communications it seems that the increases demanded run to 40, 50, 60, 80, and even 90 percent. It is absolutely unconscionable and unreasonable not to have any control over certain manipulators in many of the big cities of this country who are trying to destroy the little fellow by jacking up rents to a point which means complete ruination for him. Yet, the O. P. A. has no power of regulation.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. The gentleman's party was in power when the Price Control Act was passed. I am in entire sympathy with what the gentleman has stated. May I call the gentleman's attention to the fact that this O. P. A. outfit seems to have power, and what power they do not have they seem to take, to go out in Wisconsin and go to a little country creamery that is making butter and skimmed milk and because they charge a cent a pound too much for the powdered skimmed milk, they are assessed a fine of $3,000,000. It is a little embarrassing to them, because it is getting along toward election time and there are fifteen or twenty thousand farmers involved.

It seems peculiar to me to have my good friend from New York, a member of the Democratic Party, come in here today and complain when his own party put the thing in operation and let these people in New York City, who have gouged these people, out from under the provisions of the O. P. A. in the first place. The O. P. A. bill, I might say to my colleague, had a whole lot of New York City influence behind it when it was put through the House in the first place.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I do not quite agree with the gentleman's views, although I will let him speak his piece.

In the first place, I am in sympathy with the very thing the gentleman mentioned. The Congress has fixed a ceiling price and enacted a law that authorized someone in authority to keep the prices down to protect the American people from overpaying. Nevertheless, we have not given the same authority to the O. P. A. to stop a landlord from unjustifiable, uncalled for increases on commercial property.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Why have they not? That is what I want to know.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. That is what I am asking, too. I am not a member of the committee that handled this legislation. Do not let us make it a partisan question, a political football. We are all working together in trying to protect the American people against the hazards of a war economy. We all try to do a job in the interest of our country and our boys over there. It is not a political question, in my judgment. Members on both sides of the aisle voted both ways, and more power to them. It was done in accordance with what we believed was the right thing to do. But we have not gone far enough. I know of a certain group from Chicago that came into Jersey City and New York City and with a lot of money bought up considerable property that had been held in estates for years without

raising the rents at all. They jacked up the rents, running into millions and millions of dollars, which drove the people out of business. May I say to the gentleman that you should not try to blame either party? Every man in this Congress has been trying to do a good job. In this case we just made a mistake—shall we say of judgment—which should be rectified at the earliest possible moment.

I might agree with the gentleman that the O. P. A. perhaps has not done a perfect job all the time. They might have done a better job in some instances, but no administration and no organization with any sort of power can be perfect, because there will always be some people who can find something to kick about. The point I am trying to bring home is that during this crucial period we must protect the people of this country, we must stop this gouging by a lot of unscrupulous landlords who are coming in and jacking up rents and driving the small business concerns out of business just because they have an insatiable greed for profits. The responsibility lies with the Congress to authorize and empower the O. P. A. to fix rentals on business property, or otherwise there will be chaos in this country.

I wish I could insert into this RECORD all of the inquiries and all of the complaints I have received from all sections of the country on this subject matter. Yes; a man should get a return on his investment. Let him get not only a return, but let him make a profit of 10 percent. Surely he should not be permitted, just because there is a war on and there is no housing and no stores or no lofts available, to jack the rents up to a point where it is almost humanly impossible for his tenants to comply with the laws governing their business and pay the high rents forced upon them.

In view of that situation, and in view of the fact that the chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency wrote me that there might not be any hearing on my bill, I am introducing today House Resolution 637 for the purpose of giving the Congress the right to make a study of this question and bring in a report forthwith.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD in two instances, and, further, to revise and extend the remarks I made this afternoon during the address of our distinguished colleague the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. RAMEY].

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PRIEST). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. MURRAY] is recognized for 30 minutes.

DAIRYING—LEGISLATION AND THE NEW DEAL ADMINISTRATION

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include a newspaper article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the Oleo Institute and the cottonseed oil combine have promoted and urged oleo legislation especially in the present session of Congress. Oleo legislation has been before the Agricultural Committees of both the House and the Senate. In the House Committee on Agriculture it came within two votes of carrying.

It was promoted by the oleo interests on the basis of war needs, although it was shown that all the oleo was being manufactured that the War Production Board had allocated oil to make. If any person has not had all the oleo he wanted, needed, or could assimilate, it is because the W. P. B. did not see fit to allocate more oils to the industry. The dairy industry could and should not be held responsible.

The cotton plant has had dozens of legislative devices to subsidize its production. Among these are, first, subsidy for growing or not growing it; second, subsidy because it did not bring enough in the market place; third, subsidy for exports where it was sold for some $40,000,000 less in 1 year than the Government had in it; fourth cotton use subsidy whereby in 1944 cotton is sold to manufacturers of insulating material for $6,000,000 less than it is worth on the cotton market; fifth, subsidy on cotton seed oil; and sixth, subsidy for mattresses are a few of them.

If the New Deal passed 38 agricultural bills the past 12 years as they claim, 30 of them must have been for cotton or its products.

These interests have now joined hands with other oil producers in an effort to remove the Federal tax on oleo. The Federal oleo taxes bring in around $2,000,000 a year although the subsidy on the oil alone is twice as much.

THE PRESENT ADMINISTRATION

The present New Deal administration has given comfort to the enemies of the dairy cow. The dairy cow is the most efficient farm animal known. She converts the grasses of millions of acres of untillable land, into one of the most excellent foods known to man.

THE BROADCAST

On July 5, 1940 the United States Department of Agriculture put on a Nationwide broadcast. The wonders of oleo were extolled. This broadcast was made on your time and at your expense. This one food product was selected and promoted. This caused unlimited criticism. For a while everything was quiet on the oleo front. Then the war came along and this was going to be the time to promote the consumption of oleo.

BUTTER 16 POINTS, OLEO 2 POINTS

Then rationing came along and we saw the points needed for a pound of butter gradually rise and the points needed to secure oleo gradually lowered. Whether this was a deliberate attempt on the part of the administration to force a large oleo consumption or not I shall not say but we do know it aided greatly in accomplishing this purpose. If the New Deal thinks oleo is as good as butter why do they put on eight times as many points on butter? There has been an attempt to raise the ration points on butter to 20 points for September but this proposal seems to have died.

THE PROTEIN FEEDS

The protein feeds were not diverted in keeping with a sound food program. North Carolina had more protein feed in March 1944 than Wisconsin although North Carolina produced only $70,000,000 worth of livestock and livestock products in 1943 and Wisconsin produced over $500,000,000 worth during the same year.

THE OLEO COMMITTEE HEARINGS

The oleo bill was introduced into Congress by my good friend the chairman of the Agricultural Committee. He is from South Carolina where in August 1944 the farmers received $4.10 per hundredweight for their milk and a 65 cents per hundredweight subsidy in comparison to Wisconsin's $2.65 per hundredweight for milk and 35 cents per hundredweight subsidy.

When the hearings on the oleo bill started before the House Agriculture Committee, our distinguished speaker the Honorable SAM RAYBURN made the following statement as found on page 3 of the Tuesday, October 26, 1943, hearings:

STATEMENT OF HON. SAM RAYBURN, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF TEXAS AND SPEAKER OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

The SPEAKER. Mr. Chairman, I am not here to testify, because I am not supposed to have any position on legislation. However, I did come over this morning with Mr. Arthur Hopkins, of Sherman, Texas. He happens to be in the district that I represent. He is head of the Meadolake Foods. They produce milk. They buy milk. They produce margarine. He is a man of long and wide experience, and any statement that he makes for the record is a true statement as far as he, himself, knows.

He comes here representing the margarine industry, who think that they should still be treated as a food product and should not be penalized, simply because they might come into competition with someone else, and I simply wanted the committee to know that I know Mr. Hopkins, I know his capabilities, I know his splendid work both in milk production and in the production of cottonseed products, and when he comes before you, you will have a man before you who has been designated by this great industry to represent it here and one who knows something about it.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. We will be glad to hear the gentleman later on.

I sat in committee and listened to this statement. It occurred to me that there was an indication of sympathy to the position taken by Mr. Hopkins, of Texas, who is president of the Oleo Institute.

THE WAR FOOD ADMINISTRATION

The War Food Administration and the Department of Agriculture, which are pretty well jumbled in their operations by Executive orders, directives, and laws, really have not any men in key positions

who have ever had any training or experience in dairying. They have been operating pretty much as political agriculturists, since Secretary Wickard, who fathered a food-production program, has been put out of circulation. Sometimes it appears as if the O. P. A. was going to take everything over and run things as they wish.

LESS BUTTER

What do we see? A constant reduction in butter production and total milk too for that matter. We see millions of acres of cotton raised that are not needed for the market. We see tobacco acreage increased 16 percent and funds provided to give away 25 percent of the crop. We see wheat acreage increased 20 percent, with a billion-bushel crop, because wheat has a loan program not applicable to the other grain crops. We see fertilizer allocated to nonfood crops that should go to food crops. We see subsidies paid as an export bonus in order to export a crop at a time we also pay a subsidy on importing the same crop.

During all this time they tell the American consumer to eat less butter and put plans into operation so the people have had to do that. Butter is not a luxury. If one eats butter and cottage cheese he will find he has about all the nourishment that he would obtain if he drank a corresponding amount of milk.

THE FINE FOR BUTTER MAKERS

After all these performances the O. P. A. says the Wisconsin butter producers, largely the co-ops, are to be fined some $3,000,000 for selling powdered skim milk over what the O. P. A. ceiling was supposed to be. Yet, ladies and gentlemen, the net returns to these Wisconsin farmers producing butter and powdered skim was as much as $1.50 to $2.15 per hundredweight less than the milk price in many other States. And in addition, these other southern States received a subsidy of from 50 to 80 percent more per hundredweight than that received by the Wisconsin farmers. If these oleo promoters believe in their wares why do they insist on having a subsidy 50 to 80 percent more for their milk than Wisconsin receives?

Will the O. P. A. make a very serious attempt to collect this $3,000,000 fine from the Wisconsin dairy plants—largely cooperatives? The politicos are pretty embarrassed right now. If they collect it, which they should not do, they will be doing something very unfair to 15,000 to 20,000 farmers. If they do not collect it, there will be conclusive evidence that the O. P. A. has been overreaching and doing something they did not have any business or authority to do in the first place.

Now, if the New Deal is not trying to wreck the dairy industry of Wisconsin, would someone sometimes tell me exactly what they are up to?

In short, then, here is the situation:

First. Wisconsin farmers were promised one price for milk in 1942 and received a lower one within 90 days after the promise was made.

Second. The Plymouth-plus price was put on cheese, which yielded the Wisconsin farmer 20 cents less per hundredweight for his milk than the price provided in other States. Wisconsin, which makes 50 percent, and probably more than 50 percent, of the Nation's high-quality cheese, is compelled to take less for its cheese than any other State in the Union.

Third. The Wisconsin farmer was given a smaller feed subsidy. In fact, several other States were provided feed subsidies 80 percent greater than Wisconsin feed subsidies. The Wisconsin farmer was compelled to pay $10 more for protein feed than farmers of many other States. This alone made another 30 cents less per hundredweight return to Wisconsin farmers.

Fourth. Wisconsin butter producers were fined $3,000,000, with their cases pending, for selling their powdered skim higher than the O. P. A. said they should. This overcharge was estimated at some 15 to 25 cents per hundredweight on the milk basis.

Fifth. These Wisconsin farmers were sued for this $3,000,000 for realizing $2.65 per hundredweight for their milk at the very time that the price in other States ran from $3.75 to $4.80 per hundredweight. These prices are controlled by the same O. P. A. and W. F. A. In other words, Wisconsin farmers are threatened and sued even after they have produced and sold their milk, including the so-called overcharge, for $2.85 per hundredweight, when dairymen in the more politically favored sections are receiving as much as $1.50 to $2 more per hundredweight.

Sixth. Can one blame these Wisconsin milk producers for feeling they are being discriminated against?

If the butter business is ruined by oleo, filled milk and filled cheese are not far behind. The New Deal administration has never given the dairy industry a fair deal since its very inception, and it appears that the best solution is to get rid of the New Deal on November 7.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CHURCH] is recognized for 15 minutes.

INVESTIGATION OF PEARL HARBOR DISASTER

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, last night's newspapers announced the death of Lt. Comdr. Manning M. Kimmel in the service of his country as the commander of the submarine *Robalo*, which failed to return from patrol duty. He is the son of Rear Admiral Husband E. Kimmel, the suspended naval commander at Pearl Harbor at the time of the Japanese attack.

The loss of one's son brings sorrow to the parents no words can express. As deep and grave as that sorrow is, I cannot help but feel that the sorrow of Admiral Kimmel is deeper and graver still. His gallant son died without ever having the knowledge that his father was even so much as given the opportunity to clear his name of the stigma of responsibility for the Pearl Harbor catastrophe.

The boy gave his life for the things we hold sacred—for freedom, for justice, for equality before the law, for the right of all men to their name and honor. Yet, Mr. Speaker, the very things for which the young man made the supreme sacrifice have been denied his father.

Admiral Kimmel has two other sons in the naval service. I am sure they will serve with the same gallantry and distinction as their brother. But are they, too, to risk their lives for principles of justice and fairness discarded in the case of their father? For 2½ years Admiral Kimmel has sought the opportunity to clear his name. All that he asks is that he be given the opportunity to defend himself, to be able to submit his case to the bar of public opinion, a fair and impartial trial, and he will accept the verdict. But that has been and continues to be denied him.

Why? The answer is obvious. It is because those at the head of our Government place political expediency before justice and fairness. There can be no other reason. As I stated on this floor on June 5, 2½ years have elapsed since Pearl Harbor and the damage done there has long since been repaired. What possibly could now be revealed publicly with respect to an event 2½ years ago that would aid the enemy?

Mr. Speaker, this is a democracy. This is a free country. We are the people's custodians of individual rights. It is my conviction that we should not permit those rights to be denied any man. I urge that this House authorize a committee for the investigation of the Pearl Harbor question. The Army and Navy investigations that are now in process are not public and, moreover, they are limited to the military and naval aspects of the disaster. Responsibility for Pearl Harbor goes beyond the role of the Army and Navy. The people should know the truth and the whole truth.

On previous occasions I have pointed out some of the rather mysterious developments in connection with the Pearl Harbor disaster. Some of you may recall that when I discussed this subject on June 5, I called attention to the fact that a private, George E. Elliott, Jr., of Chicago, who was operating a detector unit at the time the Japanese planes approached and who insisted that the information be sent to headquarters, was not given proper recognition by the Army; but, on the other hand, a private, Joseph L. Lockhard, of Pennsylvania, who was with him at the time and who was reluctant to send the information to headquarters, was subsequently made a lieutenant. You will also recall that when I discussed this subject on August 21 I called attention to the fact that the lieutenant at headquarters, Kermit A. Tyler, who received the information from the privates of the approach of planes and told them to forget it, was subsequently elevated to the rank of lieutenant colonel. It also seems to me a bit strange that in 1941 Joseph T. McNarney, who served on the Roberts commission, held the temporary rank of brigadier general.

In 1942 he was made a lieutenant general, two ranks higher. Perhaps it is not strange if it is borne in mind that the Roberts report is nothing more or less than a political document, designed to alleviate the public pressure at the time for information concerning Pearl Harbor. Admiral Kimmel publicly said that "the Roberts report does not contain the basic truths of the Pearl Harbor catastrophe."

Mr. Speaker, the real story about Pearl Harbor has never been publicly told. It should be told. The people have a right to know and the men accused of being responsible for the failure of our forces to be on the alert should be given the opportunity to defend themselves.

I should like to know, Mr. Speaker, whether or not it is true that on the Thursday morning before the Sunday morning of the historic December 7 the President of the United States was notified that the Japanese would soon attack. I should also like to know whether or not it is true that not later than the Saturday evening before Pearl Harbor another message was delivered to the President of the United States advising him that the Japanese planned to strike at 1 p. m. the following Sunday or 8 a. m. Pearl Harbor time. If that is true, Mr. Speaker, that two such messages were delivered to the White House, why wasn't this information promptly telephoned or radioed to our commanders in the Pacific?

It is my information that there were only 54 planes at Pearl Harbor but a single patrol of the area required 84 planes. While it was impossible, because of the inadequacy in the number of planes, to maintain a complete patrol, if the commanders had been advised of the contents of the messages delivered to the White House, it would have been possible for a patrol to cover from 300 to 700 miles on a single mission of determining the location of the Japanese carriers. In other words, the primary responsibility for the Pearl Harbor catastrophe was in Washington and not in the Pacific. Certainly this is true if we were taken by surprise simply because Washington failed to give the commanders in the Pacific the specific information received at the White House with respect to the plans of the Japanese.

I should also like to know, Mr. Speaker, whether or not the person who delivered the two above-mentioned messages to the President has been permitted to testify before the Roberts commission or before the two boards that have been investigating the Pearl Harbor episode. If not, why not? I should like to know whether or not the delivery of the last-mentioned message was delayed at the White House before it was delivered to the Secretary of the Navy, the Secretary of War, and to General Marshall.

Mr. Speaker, Admiral Kimmel and General Short stand accused of negligence or failure to discharge properly their duties. They are forced to remain silent. They are not permitted to answer their accusers with the facts within their knowledge. We owe it to them, Mr. Speaker; we owe it to ourselves; we owe it to the people we represent; we owe it to the principles of free government for which our boys are giving their lives—that they be given an opportunity to be heard without further delay. We would be rendering a great service if this House would promptly act and itself make an immediate public investigation. By so doing we would demonstrate to such boys as Lieutenant Commander Kimmel that the principles of fairness and justice for which they make the supreme sacrifice truly live in this land of the free.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House on Monday next for 20 minutes at the close of other business.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include two bulletins from the National Council of Farm Cooperatives.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PRIEST). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS] is recognized for 10 minutes.

THE HOPE OF PEACE

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, the conference at Dumbarton Oaks can be the first step toward a peaceful world. It is to be taken for granted that the first step in the building of a firm peace as well as in the formation of a world organization will have to be an agreement between the United States, Great Britain, Russia, and China. It is they who by the expenditure of their blood and treasure, will, God willing, win the war. It is they who will have to be the guarantors of peace and order in the immediate post-war period. Upon the manner in which they discharge this responsibility will depend in large measure the hope of building on a world-wide basis a sound structure of international relationships.

A truly peaceful world cannot be built in a day, nor can it be guaranteed by one conference or many conferences, by a single treaty or even a whole host of treaties. It can, in the last analysis, only be built stone upon stone by the earnest and devoted efforts of the peoples of the world. Its building will depend in large part on the quality and character of the thinking of each American citizen.

One reason the defeat of Japan and Germany is so important is because the governments now dominating those nations cannot by their very nature seek peace. They are essentially war-making machines. Only governments truly devoted to the general welfare of their people can build for peace—only those that are democratic governments in the best and fullest sense of that word. We cannot determine the form of government other nations are to have but our Government can make it very clear that it can never have the same cordial and cooperative relationship with other types of government as with those which accord their people freedom and strive earnestly to serve their welfare.

In my opinion in connection with each liberated nation, as that nation is liberated there should be genuine and effective aid and encouragement from America to those forces of true democracy—as opposed to dictatorship of any sort—in those countries to the extent that it is possible for us to do it. For I believe that upon such aid and encouragement might well depend the future of democratic government in considerable areas of Europe, not to say other parts of the world. I believe that to the extent that Americans, experienced in the operation of democracy, can give such aid and encouragement to groups in those countries, to a free labor movement, to cooperative organizations of farmers and consumers, to democratic political forces, that we will be insuring the peace of the world in one way which will be perhaps more important than any other.

Criticism of the conference at Dumbarton Oaks on the ground that it consists only of representatives of the United States, Britain, and Russia is wrong, provided it is understood, as I believe it is by those delegates and by their governments and by the peoples of those three nations that this conference is only a first step. Were it to fail of its major purposes, as we have sound reason to believe it will not, the best hopes of the peoples of the world for peace would be ended here and now. If on the other hand it succeeds, then the major portion of the work of building the peace still lies ahead.

For while the four major nations must stand together on a basis of reasonable agreement, if they attempt to take to themselves exclusive power to guide the destinies of mankind, the result will not be peace over the long run. The Chinese have seen this very clearly all along. The thing we hope for is that Dumbarton Oaks and the conferences to follow between representatives of the major nations, including China, will lay the groundwork for an organization in which all the nations of the world will be joined together in a universal organization for the maintenance of peace.

Nor must the keeping of peace rest upon the military power of a grand alliance.

There are four foundation stones upon which that peace must be built. If one of them is lacking the structure cannot stand.

The first of these is universal access to the truth for all the peoples of the world, the breaking down of barriers everywhere and by whomever erected which prevent the peoples of the one nation from knowing the truth about the peoples and governments of other parts of the world.

The second foundation stone is justice—economic, political, and social—not merely for some of the nations but for all the peoples of the earth. This ideal cannot perhaps be reached in any short period of time. But it must be the foundation stone of peace and upon its progressive realization the hope of real peace will always depend.

The third foundation stone is the world organization itself. I shall not try to describe in detail what I hope it will be like except to say I am convinced it must by definition be universal including all nations, and affording substantial equality to small and large nations alike. As many constructive tasks as possible must be undertaken by this organization—tasks similar to that performed by the International Labor Office. Commissions of this world organization must be set to work in the fields of health, education, improved trade relations and a dozen other fields where constructive cooperative effort can be made to benefit all nations. Painstaking, laborious, and earnest work carried on in these and other fields can bring the nations closer together in understanding. Again, work must be carried on for the gradual building of a code of international justice to which the nations can be brought to accord. And finally the international organization must possess, I believe in its own right, the means of taking immediate action to prevent the destruction of the peace of the world by an aggressor nation. This requires that it must be possessed of a nuclear international military power, a force which need not be large enough to threaten to dominate any nation, but sufficient to take the first and necessary immediate steps to prevent peace being destroyed.

The fourth foundation stone of peace must be an agreement among the nations, especially militarily powerful nations, whereby each will pledge itself that under agreed upon circumstances and in an agreed upon manner it will make its proper contribution toward military forces capable under all circumstances of preventing aggression and maintaining a peaceful world.

In laying these four foundation stones, the task of America is crucial. There are things which America can do which no other nation is in a position to accomplish. May we play that role well in all the steps which must be painfully and carefully and earnestly taken before the real objectives of the sacrifice of this war can be realized.

America has always been—may she always be—the rallying point of the hopes of common folk around the world for freedom and justice and peace.

This is not an ideal world, but in accordance with expressions by leaders of both political parties let us never lay down America's effort to make it a far better one than it is today.

We ourselves have set a pattern for treatment of people in so-called colonial areas. We set that pattern in the Philippines as the inspiring speech of the Delegate of the Filipino people to this House so eloquently testified. Let America stand resolutely for similar treatment for every such people in the world.

In Asia let us stand for an independent Korea, for restitution to China of every foot of Chinese soil and every right to rule as a sovereign power on every foot of that soil without foreign interference. And let us stand for application in other parts of Asia of the right of peoples to growth and freedom and hope such as I believe we have given the people of the Philippines. Americans are not fighting simply to restore the status quo of 1939 or 1941 but for a new day for the millions of the world.

The smaller nations of Europe have looked to America for a clear-cut declaration that they shall have opportunity to form a free cooperative federation for the solution of economic and political problems among themselves, for the reduction of the past importance of national boundaries, and for the keeping of the peace. Only if some such federation is created can the danger of balance of power be overcome. Only within the framework of such a federation would the breaking up of Germany into small states make any real sense. May we not disappoint these millions of peoples who look to America for this leadership—good people with Amgot to help reconstruction on a democratic basis.

As to the enemy nations, there must be destruction of their military power and they must be required insofar as humanly possible to make restitution of what they have destroyed in so many other people's lands. But aside from resolute enforcement of disarmament of these enemy nations there should not be an attempt to impose economic destitution upon the common people thereof. In any case that cannot be done without severe harm to other nations. And if and when over a period of time it has been demonstrated that decent free government prevails in those nations they should be able to hope for a place along with others in a world society of nations.

And as to that world society of nations, let us remember the mistakes and blunders of the past. Neither balances of power nor military alliances have ever kept the peace for long, nor did isolationism keep the peace for America.

This is America's second chance. Another chance to build peace may not come. If we for one moment intend to keep faith with the men who today are dying in their country's cause we must provide a far, far better machinery for keeping peace than has been had heretofore in all history. That machinery must, if it is to succeed, place all nations on the same basis of substantial equality as has prevailed in the Western Hemisphere Pan American Union and in the relationship of Western Hemisphere nations in recent years.

Peace can be built only upon a foundation of justice for all peoples in the world and the basic function of any international organization must be the task of constant consideration of international problems and constant effort to bring about better and better adjustment of the relationships existing between the nations. Attempts merely to preserve a status quo without regard for the dynamic character of human society would be doomed to failure. In my judgment it was such an attempt more than anything else that robbed the League of Nations of success.

And peace will be kept not merely by wishing for it, but by the same methods that keep it in our communities at home. Those methods will in all human probability require at times the use of force. That fact must be faced now.

Only the United States has the tradition, only the United States has the fortunate geographical location, only the United States has the power to take effective leadership for a peaceful world. We cannot before God fail to take this, our second chance, to save a war-sick, war-torn, war-terrorized world from further conflict and destruction.

It is well for us to recall the language of the Fulbright resolution passed by the House of Representatives on September 21, 1943:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the Congress hereby expresses itself as favoring the creation of appropriate international machinery with power adequate to establish and to maintain a just and lasting peace, among the nations of the world, and as favoring participation by the United States therein.

Opportunity to take leadership for world peace knocked once upon our door at the close of the First World War. The knock was in vain. America's door stayed closed.

Contrary to the proverb, that same opportunity is knocking again at our Nation's door. May we not pass by on the other side again.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PRIEST). Under previous special order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. COSTELLO] is recognized for 20 minutes.

CIVIL AERONAUTICS AUTHORITY'S WAR TRAINING SERVICE

Mr. COSTELLO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to include a War Department release.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. COSTELLO. Mr. Speaker, because of the great interest evidenced by so Many Members of the House in the future utilization of the many civilian instructors employed in the Civil Aeronautics Authority's War Training Service, I have requested and obtained from the Army Air Forces information regarding the disposition of these men. Each member of this House is naturally interested in the welfare of these civilian instructors who had teamed up with our military leaders to assist in building for the Nation the biggest and finest air force in all the world in the shortest possible time. Likewise each Member has been interested in the military disposition of the 4,687 young men who were in training last January under these civilian instructors.

During the first days of the war the nation had to have thousands of fliers to

man the thousands of aircraft as this Nation's first line of defense and offense. It had to have the finest type of young men from 18 to 27 to endure the rigors of aerial combat. The limited number of trained pilots available to our Air Forces had to be divided between the Pacific, Africa, and England, as well as used in the final stages of aerial training. In conducting the training of young men in the pre-flight, primary, and basic phases, the Air Forces, needing assistance, turned to every available civilian source. Civilian flying schools were placed under contract, colleges and universities were enrolled, and the cooperation of the C. A. A. was secured.

The Nation had a big pool of men with long years and many hours of experience in flying the lighter type of aircraft and some 10,000 of these men became civilian instructors in the C. A. A. War Training Service and instructor trainee programs and in the A. A. F. college indoctrination program and in the A. A. F. civilian contract schools. Facing the uncertainties of war, the A'r Forces also had to plan to keep on expanding its training program. Those plans called for additional civilian instructors as well as additional schools, and, upon the suggestion of the C. A. A., the Air Forces agreed to a program for training those young men who, having failed to qualify for combat training, might yet become civilian instructors.

Late in 1943 the Air Forces found that it had almost completed the stupendous job of building strength sufficient for global warfare, and found that fortunately the rate of combat casualties was much lower than it had had to plan for.

Hence, the Air Forces thereupon reassessed its entire program and immediately adjusted its training requirements to meet its needs as demonstrated in actual warfare. It must be remembered that it requires 18 months to train a combat pilot, and so the Air Forces training program must anticipate combat requirements by at least a year and a half. Upon this new determination of the requirements, the Air Forces promptly announced the cancelation of the program for training additional civilian instructors, since it was evident that there would be no military need for additional civilian training schools as originally contemplated. Eight hundred and ninety-nine civilian flight instructors in the C. A. A. War Training Service instructor program thus became excess on January 15, 1944, when this program was ordered terminated.

The Air Forces announced it would call those instructors who were Air Corps Reservists into service; that those who met its age, physical, and mental requirements would be given every opportunity to win commissioned status as flying officers; that the others would be utilized as specialists in an enlisted status.

Also at the time of the discontinuance of the C. C. A. W. T. S. instructor program on January 15, 1944, there were 4,687 undergraduate students, then in training to become instructors. There being no military need for any more civilian instructors, it would have been utterly useless to continue training these students. The situation of these trainees, being the first to arise, occasioned the major part of the discussion which took place in the House just prior to the summer recess. Yet the trainee problem was comparatively easy to solve, and has been solved as indicated in the announcement made by General Arnold to the press on August 5. This announcement, released through the War Department Press Branch, I am including in its entirety so that a complete understanding of this matter may be had at this time. The announcement reads as follows:

WAR DEPARTMENT,
BUREAU OF PUBLIC RELATIONS,
August 5, 1944.

MAJORITY OF 4,687 C. A. A.-W. T. S. TRAINEES TO BE DISCHARGED AT THEIR OWN REQUEST

A majority of the 4,687 enlisted men who were trainees in the Army's civilian pilot instructor program, which was canceled because it was no longer needed, will be discharged and returned to civilian life at their own request rather than remain as enlisted technicians in the Army Air Forces, the War Department announced today. Many of the men are in the higher draft age brackets, but all who are discharged will immediately be subject to selective service.

The option of discharge was offered to this group because the men had volunteered for specific, professional training and, when the program was found to have no further military necessity, it was felt that those volunteers who so desired should be returned to their former civilian status and be subject to normal induction processes.

The A. A. F. had made no promises, real or implied, of commissioned status, as these men were being trained solely for civilian activity. They were part of the Civilian Aeronautics Authority War Training Service pilot instructor program and were called to duty in the summer and fall of 1943. The program was terminated January 15, 1944, when a surplus of instructors had developed.

The option of remaining in the A. A. F. as enlisted specialists and technicians or of returning to civilian life, applies to 3,122 of the 4,687 former trainees. Of the remainder, 1,529 have applied and been found qualified for aviation cadet or glider pilot training, one was transferred to the Air Transport Command for service-pilot training, and 35 have been discharged, have died, or are hospitalized.

The 1,530 trainees who qualified for aviation cadet, glider pilot, or service pilot training have thus been given an opportunity to win their wings as commissioned flyers and will not be given the option of discharge. Those who are eliminated from such training will be reassigned within the A. A. F. as enlisted men.

The 3,122 enlisted men eligible for discharge are now in A. A. F. technical training or in specialist assignments. Some are overseas. They have all been notified that they will be discharged on request and have been advised that upon return to civilian life they will be subject to selective-service regulations.

The A. A. F. Training Command, Fort Worth, Tex., advised the A. A. F. yesterday that replies received from a majority indicate that approximately 90 percent of the 3,122 will ask to be discharged.

Statistics on the entire group of former trainees show many in the higher age brackets: 30.8 percent were less than 27 years of age; 36.5 percent were 27 to 31; 30.6 percent were 31 to 37; and 2.1 percent were over 37 years.

Requirements for joining the program were not as severe as for combat or service pilot training, as it was not planned nor expected that these men would possess the qualities requisite for combat or transport pilot training. Those in the combat age group of 18 to 27 years had to furnish proof that they had failed the aviation-cadet examination, including a class I physical. However, 1,529 of the former trainees subsequently succeeded in passing this examination and qualifying for cadet or glider-pilot training.

Those of more than 27 years had to pass a class II physical. They became members of the Air Corps Enlisted Reserve and were told that if they were eliminated they would be assigned to technical training as enlisted men. However, they were also told that if they completed the training they would be put on inactive status as civilians and be employed in civilian contract schools or in connection with the C. A. A.-W. T. S. program. Termination of the program canceled the opportunity for these volunteers to enter into the civilian training program and resulted in their assignment to enlisted jobs, just the same as if they had been eliminated from the program.

Mr. Speaker, the very equitable disposition of these trainees indicates that the alarm on the part of Members of the House and the unwarranted criticism directed at General Arnold wer entirely unjustified. Only a complete misunderstanding of the issues involved and a lack of knowledge of the problem confronting the Air Forces could excuse the accusations which were made. My absolute faith in General Arnold and in his promise that the Army Air Forces would do everything possible to prevent any injustices or inequities to arise in the disposition of these men, made me confident that an adequate and liberal solution would be evolved.

Mr. ROLPH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COSTELLO. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. ROLPH. I want to compliment the gentleman from California for his very interesting and very informative discussion about the civil aeronautics program. I am particularly interested in his reference to General Arnold and would like to say that the achievements of General Arnold in this war have been simply amazing. The American people owe him a debt of gratitude that they will never be able to pay. General Arnold's record has been outstanding, and, as I stated before, the gentleman from California [Mr. COSTELLO] is doing a very fine thing for the country by bringing this before the Nation at the present time, and I compliment him.

Mr. COSTELLO. I appreciate the gentleman's remarks because, frankly, I have a very high regard for General Arnold, and I believe he has done the country a great service in bringing the Air Force command to its present high position all over the world.

Mr. ROLPH. If the gentleman will think back to our Air Force at the time the war broke out and then think of our Air Force at the present time, it is almost fantastic. It has been largely due to General Arnold's effort that we have the large Air Force we do have at the present time.

Mr. COSTELLO. I appreciate the gentleman's remarks.

While few Members of the House were aware of the fact that even greater numbers of civilian pilot instructors than trainees were soon to become excess to our war effort, nevertheless, I was sure that the Air Forces would make provision for all of these men. This it has done of its own volition and in keeping with General Arnold's pledge, and the solution of this trying problem should prove satisfactory to everyone.

Equitable disposition of all civilian instructors—fair to them and in keeping with the Nation's war requirements—was no simple proposition. The problem was to be aggravated as more and more instructors were released from their employment. As I mentioned, 899 civilian instructors were released when the C. A. A. W. T. S. civilian instructor trainee program was cancelled on January 15, 1944. Between March 15 and August 4 the progressive termination of A. A. F. civilian contract schools left 2,960 instructors unemployed. On June 30 the arduous task became more difficult when termination of the C. A. A. W. T. S. college indoctrination program released 3,046 instructors. In all, the A. A. F. had as of August 4 the problem of disposing of 6,895 former civilian instructors. As of September 2, this figure had risen to 7,450 unemployed instructors, and by the end of October an additional 1,400 will be left jobless. These instructors are all men varying widely in flying ability and experience, in age, and in military flying qualifications. They were scattered throughout the country. Only a portion, usually those of lower age, were reservists.

Beginning July 1, the Air Forces Training Command conducted a Nation-wide man hunt of surprising proportions in order to try to solve this problem. It has sought out former instructors now in every line of business and in the armed services here and overseas. It has had 100 officers out on this job. Each man contacted was given his choice: to remain a civilian and contribute in that capacity to the war effort, or to serve with the Air Forces. If he chose to serve, every opportunity was offered for him to win his A. A. F. wings.

I had hoped to be able to report to you today that the job of interviewing all of these 7,450 former instructors had been completed, but finding the last 1,000 or so instructors is becoming a lengthy job for the A. A. F.'s man hunters. Most of the job had been completed by August 12 when General Arnold announced results to the press. But the job has been pushed since and sizable changes have been made in the totals. I am privileged to be able to summarize these results for the House today.

Through personal interviews, the wishes and qualifications of a majority of the 7,450 civilian instructors have been determined. Determination of their wishes was the first step, followed by determination of their qualifications for flying officer training. This involved a personal interview with each man and a flight check for each found otherwise qualified.

The September 2 disposition records showed:

Two thousand five hundred and fifty-six nonmembers of the Air Corps Enlisted Reserves had elected not to serve but to remain civilians subject to selective service.

One thousand two hundred reservists had elected discharge and will remain civilians subject to selective service.

One hundred and eighty-two of those interviewed had not yet voiced their decision as to discharge or service in the A. A. F.

One hundred and sixty-one had been reported to The Adjutant General for call to active duty or for option of discharge because they had refused to express a preference for any type of training.

Nine hundred and six were service-pilot officers with the Air Transport Command, in training to become flight officers, or waiting entry into such training.

Seven hundred and six were in aviation cadet-pilot training, to become commissioned pilots, or waiting entry into such training. If a man elects to serve, is physically qualified, and 18 to 26 years of age, inclusive, he is required to take this training. However, in the case of the instructors, the usual aviation cadet qualifying examination and psychological aptitude scores are being waived.

Sixty-six were training to become flight officers with glider-pilot ratings, or were awaiting entry into such training.

One hundred and five were in combat-crew training, to become gunners, or were waiting for such training.

One hundred and six had elected to be called to active duty for normal active enlisted classification.

Two hundred and thirty have been transferred from the Aviation Cadet Enlisted Reserve's responsibility to various other agencies or essential industrial war activities.

In all, 6,218 former instructors have so far been interviewed, leaving only 1,232 remaining to be contacted. Practically all of the 1,400 instructors yet to be released from employment between now and the end of October have been interviewed in advance in order to determine their personal wishes as to their future utilization.

In addition, 2,139 other former instructors have been graduated as service pilots and have been assigned to the Air Transport Command. They had entered upon such training before the general cut-back was started on January 15, 1944, and their total is not included in the disposition record.

There also is an undetermined but small number of former instructors now serving in the A. A. F. as enlisted men. Any of these who can qualify are being offered the same opportunities for training, including courses leading to officer pilot ratings.

While the A. A. F. naturally could not reduce its minimum requirements for pilot officers, it has done everything it could to qualify these men. Early in this program it was found that although almost all of the former instructors had a minimum of 1,000 flying hours required to enter Air-Transport (service pilot) training, many were unable to pass a flight test and others did not have the minimum of 200 hours in an A. A. F. primary type aircraft or its equivalent (aircraft of approximately 200 horsepower). In an effort to assist these men who desired Air-Transport training and were not qualified for aviation-cadet training, the A. A. F. has initiated a new training course, termed "pre-air transport." New and absolutely minimum requirements have been set. Those who elect the course and are found qualified are given the usual 35 days of basic training, then given sufficient flight training to enable them to enter air-transport training, from which they can graduate as flight officers with service-pilot ratings. This additional training increases greatly the percentage of those who can eventually qualify for duty as service pilots.

As General Arnold announced on August 12:

> The A. A. F. recognized that the unemployed civilian instructors had played a vital role in helping to build the Army Air Forces and directed that every effort be made to utilize the skills of those instructors who wished to serve in the A. A. F.

I am completely satisfied with the record of General Arnold's action and believe that the House can rest assured that the interests of these men have been fully met.

Once more the absolute fairness, honesty, and integrity of the chief of the Air Forces has been demonstrated and we, as a Nation, can consider ourselves fortunate indeed that during this great war our Army Air Forces has been led by a man of the unquestioned ability of General Arnold.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. HALLECK (at the request of Mr. ARENDS), indefinitely, on account of death in his family.

To Mr. JACKSON (at the request of Mr. MAGNUSON), for an indefinite period, to attend hearings on the west coast of the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. KLEIN, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

> H. R. 5181. An act to provide a method for compensating certain individuals for damages sustained as the result of the explosions at Port Chicago, Calif.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 8 minutes p. m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, September 11, 1944, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARING

The Subcommittee on Merchant Marine in Overseas Aviation, of the Com-

mittee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries will hold a public hearing Monday, September 11, 1944, at 10:30 o'clock a. m.

At that time the subcommittee will consider the right of the merchant marine to engage in overseas aviation to protect their passenger services over trade routes pioneered and developed by them.

Persons desiring copies of the printed hearings when available will please notify the clerk by letter.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1796. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to section 16 of the Organic Act of the Virgin Islands of the United States, approved June 22, 1936, one copy of legislation passed by the Legislative Assembly of the Virgin Islands; to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

1797. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to section 16 of the Organic Act of the Virgin Islands of the United States, approved June 22, 1936, one copy each of various legislation passed by the Municipal Council of St. Thomas and St. John; to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

1798. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to amend the Mustering-Out Payment Act of 1944, to provide a method for accomplishing certain mustering-out payments on behalf of mentally disabled veterans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. JARMAN: Committee on Printing. House Resolution 633. Resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of the fifth intermediate report (H. Rept. No. 1366) of the House Select Committee to Investigate Executive Agencies, submitting an analysis of a bill to amend the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942; without amendment (Rept. No. 1856). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. JARMAN: Committee on Printing. House Resolution 634. Resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of the sixth intermediate report (H. Rept. No. 1797) of the House Select Committee to Investigate Executive Agencies, submitting an analysis of a bill to improve the administration of justice by prescribing fair administrative procedure; without amendment (Rept. No. 1857). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. COCHRAN: Committee on Accounts. House Resolution 636. Resolution providing additional funds for expenses of conducting studies and investigations authorized by House Resolution 30; without amendment (Rept. No. 1858). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah: Committee on the Territories. H. R. 5246. A bill to provide for filling a vacancy in the office of Delegate in Congress from Alaska; without amendment (Rept. No. 1859). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma:

H. R. 5327. A bill to provide for the making of loans to veterans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. ELLSWORTH:

H. R. 5328. A bill to provide for the transfer by the Secretary of War of the Roseburg Rifle Range, Douglas County, Oreg., to the Defense Plant Corporation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. KEFAUVER:

H. R. 5329. A bill to amend the Judicial Code; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

H. R. 5330. A bill relating to the retirement of certain officers of the Navy; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. PETERSON of Florida:

H. R. 5331. A bill to authorize the transfer of certain lands within the Colonial National Historical Park, Yorktown, Va., to the Secretary of the Navy; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. FULBRIGHT:

H. Con. Res. 97. Concurrent resolution favoring world freedom of information and of communications; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. RANKIN:

H. Con. Res. 98. Concurrent resolution authorizing that the pamphlet containing information as to the rights and benefits that are available to veterans of the armed forces and their dependents be published as a document and providing for the printing of additional copies thereof; to the Committee on Printing.

By Mr. DICKSTEIN:

H. Res. 637. Resolution creating a select committee of the House of Representatives to study the question of the feasibility of conferring upon the Price Administrator the power to fix rentals for the occupancy of business premises in defense rental areas; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. COSTELLO:

H. R. 5332. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Florence Mersman; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 5333. A bill for the relief of Susan S. Wiseman; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

6091. By Mr. COCHRAN: Petition signed by Henry Levison and 120 others of the National Defense Commission, American Legion, Department of Missouri, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

6092. Also, petition of M. C. Steffen and 30 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

6093. Also, petition of the Barry Wehmiller Machinery Co. signed by 30 St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

6094. Also, petition of the American Legion, Post 299, signed by 30 St. Louis citizens protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

6095. Also, petition of Herman E. Herberer and 30 other St. Louis citizens protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

6096. Also, petition of Josephine McMahon and 30 other St. Louis citizens protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

6097. Also, petition of LeRoy Shipley and 30 other St. Louis citizens protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

6098. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the president, Civic Reform League of Puerto Rico, petitioning consideration of its resolution with reference to legislation providing for amendments to the Organic Act of Puerto Rico; to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

SENATE

FRIDAY, SEPTEMBER 8, 1944

(Legislative day of Friday, September 1, 1944)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O God, whose spirit searcheth all things and whose love seekest us even through pain and loss, incline our hearts to draw near to Thee in sincerity and truth. We do not ask that Thou shouldst give heed to the poverty and pettiness of petitions that may spring out of the perversions of our warped desires. But we beseech Thee to hear and answer the deep cry of our inner need. The contradictions of our strange natures and the perplexities of these dark times drive us to Thee; for our very prayers are fashioned in the agony of times that try our faith, our patience, and our very souls. Give us to see that the one shining thing we can offer to a warring world is just a soul sensitive to goodness and beauty, rich in expanding human relationships; holding sacred the sacrament of friendship; capable of devotions, of quiet heroisms and in high hours of flaming sacrifices: a self at any cost to be kept true to sacred birthrights, to be perfected through suffering and disciplined in the ripening experiences of life. So may our illumined powers yield their devotion to Thy kingdom and Thy light be shed through us upon the dark places of the earth, that the habitations of violence may be destroyed and that to human misery and wrong there may come oil of joy for sadness and beauty for ashes.

We ask it in the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Tuesday, September 5, 1944, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Perry, one of its clerks, announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 4114. An act to amend section 3 (b) of Public, 49, Seventy-eighth Congress, first session (War Overtime Pay Act of 1943); and

H. R. 4918. An act to provide for the payment to certain Government employees for accumulated or accrued annual leave due upon their separation from Government service.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (H. R. 5181) to provide a method for compensating certain individuals for damages sustained as the result of the explosions at Port Chicago, Calif., and it was signed by the Acting President pro tempore.

ERNIE PYLE

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, a man small in stature, frail in physical strength, but strong in will went forth to the battle fronts of World War No. 2. Not in the uniform of a soldier—he was too old far that—but armed with his typewriter he braved the dangers of battle—a real fighting man. Those dangers he faced that he might give us through the daily press a true picture of warfare as he saw and experienced it. His was no casual inspection trip. He actually lived with our fighting men. On their transports, in their camps, at their mess, and sharing their dangers, he became the friend and companion of privates and generals upon equal terms with all.

It is no wonder the name of Ernie Pyle is spoken with genuine affection by our men everywhere. It is unnecessary to refer to the great stories he daily cabled the Scripps-Howard papers for which he writes. America has already evidenced her choice of him as her favorite war correspondent, even as the men overseas acclaim him friend.

Today, Ernie is tired. In a few poignant paragraphs he writes:

This is the last of these columns from Europe. By the time you read this the old man will be on his way back to America. After that will come a long, long rest. And after the rest—well, you never can tell.

Undoubtedly this seems to you to be a funny time for a fellow to be quitting the war. It is a funny time. But I'm not leaving because of a whim, or even especially because I'm homesick. I'm leaving for one reason only—because I have just got to stop. "I've had it," as they say in the Army. I have had all I can take for a while.

I've been 29 months overseas since this war started; have written around 700,000 words about it; have totaled nearly a year in the front lines.

I do hate terribly to leave right now, but I have given out. I've been immersed in it too long. My spirit is wobbly and my mind is confused. The hurt has finally become too great.

All of a sudden it seemed to me that if I heard one more shot or saw one more dead man I would go off my nut. And if I had to write one more column I'd collapse. So I'm on my way.

It may be that a few months of peace will restore some vim to my spirit, and I can go war horsing off to the Pacific. We'll see what a little New Mexico sunshine does along that line.

So Ernie is coming home to rest in the sunshine and health-giving atmosphere of New Mexico. It is well that he has so decided. The months spent on the firing line require the change he now contemplates. Personally I regret his leaving the war just on the eve of victory, that victory which he has truly helped to win. But as one of his admirers and as a New Mexican, I am glad he is returning to our State where the sunshine and wonderful climate will fully heal war's cruel hurt.

In the city of Albuquerque, in the shadows of the Sandias, Ernie Pyle will find rest and ease far from the horrors of war. But if I know him, the placid calm and peaceful atmosphere will not be long for him.

When the Battle of Europe is over and the Pacific war increases in might and fury, I predict "the old man" will again grab his faithful typewriter, and, with scent of battle in his nostrils, will go "war horsing" to some far distant island to write again and give us those vivid daily paragraphs which describe as only he can describe the conditions under which our sons fight and die, that the sons of all men may be free.

Without regard to what the future may hold, I take this opportunity to express my own appreciation of his truly great work, a task which he has performed bravely and magnificently. New Mexico will be glad to welcome Ernie Pyle home again.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. ELLENDER, from the Committee on Claims:

S. 1853. A bill for the relief of Dr. Frank K. Boland, Sr.; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1081).

By Mr. HATCH, from the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys:

S. 1062. A bill to authorize certain employees of the General Land Office to administer or take oaths, affirmations, affidavits, or depositions in the performance of their official duties; without amendment (Rept. No. 1082);

H. R. 3384. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to accept property for the Moores Creek National Military Park, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1083); and

H. R. 5025. A bill to allow credit in connection with certain homestead entries for military or naval service rendered during World War No. 2; without amendment (Rept. No. 1084).

By Mr. HATCH (for Mr. O'MAHONEY), from the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys:

S. 2111. A bill to provide for the extension of certain oil and gas leases; without amendment (Rept. No. 1085).

By Mr. HATCH (for Mr. WILLIS), from the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys:

S. 1807. A bill authorizing and directing the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain land to the city of Duluth, Minn.; with amendments (Rept. No. 1086).

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

Bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. THOMAS of Utah:

S. 2134. A bill to amend the Mustering-Out Payment Act of 1944, to provide a method for accomplishing certain mustering-out payments on behalf of mentally disabled veterans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SHIPSTEAD:

S. 2135. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Susanna Gimm; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BROOKS:

S. 2136. A bill for the relief of the city of Beardstown, Ill.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma:

S. 2137. A bill to provide for naming the lake formed by waters of the Red River impounded by Denison Dam; to the Committee on the Library.

S. 2138. A bill to make retroactive as of June 1942 the increase in the purchase prices paid by the Procurement Division of the Treasury Department on and after January 14, 1943, for class A used nonportable typewriters to be used by the armed forces, and to provide for payment of such increase in prices to all persons, firms, and corporations who sold such typewriters to the Procurement Division of the Treasury Department prior to January 14, 1943; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. MOORE:

S. 2139. A bill to repeal the act of June 26, 1936 (49 Stat. L. 1967); to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

(Mr. LANGER introduced Senate bill 2140, which was referred to the Committee on Commerce, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. ANDREWS:

S. 2141. A bill to provide for the acceptance and protection by the United States of property within the authorized boundaries of the Everglades National Park project, Florida, pending the establishment of the park, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

By Mr. BYRD:

S. J. Res. 150. Joint resolution making an appropriation to pay the necessary expenses of the inaugural ceremonies of the President of the United States, January 20, 1945; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. HAYDEN:

S. J. Res. 151. Joint resolution authorizing the erection on public grounds in Springerville, Ariz., of a memorial to Gustav Becker; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

ELECTRIC POWER GENERATED AT FORT PECK DAM, MONT.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, various bills are pending for the distribution of the water in the Missouri River Basin. Personally, I like the Murray M. V. A. bill the best of those that are pending. However, it may be years before that project involving hundreds of millions of dollars is completed.

It is my belief that the farmers in North Dakota, Montana, South Dakota, and other Missouri River Basin States, should not be deprived of the enormous amount of electrical power that is now going to waste at Fort Peck. Only seven farmers out of every hundred in North Dakota have rural electrification. Contrast that to Japan, often described as a barbaric country, where 95 farmers out of every hundred have rural electrification.

I believe that every farmer who wants cheap electricity and power for his farm should get it at cost, and I hope to see the day soon when every farmer in North Dakota and Montana and South Dakota and other Missouri River Basin States will have that electricity and power from

Fort Peck. The dam is built; the power is there; the farmers and their wives should long, long ago have had electricity and power made available to them under the provisions of such a bill as that proposing to create the Missouri Valley Power Administration.

Every farmer will have electricity and power made available to him shortly after the war is over, and the materials needed for the building of transmission lines are available.

That, Mr. President, is what is provided for in the bill I am about to introduce. I urge that the bill be referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and I request that the chairman appoint a subcommittee promptly so that if this war should end within the next 4 or 5 weeks, as we all fervently hope and pray it may, the manpower coming back may be immediately used in the building of these lines.

Certainly all of us who have seen the hard, slaving drudgery of farm life, especially as it affects the women folk, know what a welcome boon it will be to the women and how much, too, it will mean to everyone living on these farms.

I hope that the Administrator will see to it that power and light are supplied as soon as possible to every farmer in North Dakota, South Dakota, Montana, and neighboring States in the Missouri Valley Basin.

Mr. President, I ask consent to introduce with request that it be referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, the bill which I have mentioned during the course of my remarks.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore (Mr. McKELLAR). Without objection, the bill introduced by the Senator from North Dakota will be received; the Chair thinks a more appropriate reference would be to the Committee on Commerce, and the bill will be so referred.

The bill (S. 2140) to provide for disposition of electric power generated at Fort Peck Dam, Mont., was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were each read twice by their titles and referred to the Committee on Civil Service:

H. R. 4114. An Act to amend section 3 (b) of Public, 49, Seventy-eighth Congress, first session (War Overtime Pay Act of 1943); and

H. R. 4918. An Act to provide for the payment to certain Government employees for accumulated or accrued annual leave due upon their separation from Government service.

FEDERAL-AID FOR POST-WAR HIGHWAY CONSTRUCTION—AMENDMENTS

Mr. TYDINGS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 2105) to amend and supplement the Federal-Aid Road Act, approved July 11, 1916, as amended and supplemented, to authorize appropriations for the post-war construction of highways and bridges, to eliminate hazards at railroad-grade crossings, to provide for the immediate preparation of plans and acquisition of rights-of-way, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. TYDINGS also (by request) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to Senate bill 2105, supra, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

RIVER AND HARBOR FLOOD-CONTROL WORKS—AMENDMENT

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I ask consent to submit an amendment which I intend to propose to House bill 4485 authorizing the construction of certain public works on rivers and harbors for flood control, and for other purposes, and ask to have it printed.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the amendment will be received, lie on the table, and be printed.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, the amendment would eliminate from the bill authorization for the construction of a dam near the mouth of the West River in Vermont. I wish it to be understood that in submitting the amendment I am not expressing opposition to the flood-control bill as a whole or to the general program of flood control. In the case of the dam proposed for the West River, however, in my opinion the amount of benefit derived would be far exceeded by the damage caused by the destruction of one of New England's finest and potentially richest valleys. It is most unfortunate that there is insistence upon this particular dam when by constructing three or four smaller dams the same amount of protection could be afforded the people living in the Connecticut Valley, and also protection for the people living in the West River Valley itself.

I wish to say further that when the flood-control bill is taken up for action I shall oppose the committee amendment on page 10, which reads as follows:

> Provided, further, That none of the dams herein authorized for the Connecticut River Basin shall be utilized for the generation of hydroelectric power.

Undoubtedly there may be constructed some dams from which the development of electric power will not be warranted, but at other dams power may be developed for the benefit of the communities where they are located. I feel that we should not include in any flood-control program a rigid restriction against the development of power.

INFANTILE PARALYSIS AND ENCEPHALITIS—AMENDMENT

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask consent to submit an amendment in the nature of a substitute, which I intend to propose to Senate Joint Resolution 147, which I introduced last week, to provide for the general welfare by investigations into the causes and cures of infantile paralysis and encephalitis.

I may state briefly that of the $10,000,000 proposed to be appropriated by the joint resolution the amendment would provide that $1,000,000 shall be used for the establishment in the District of Columbia of an infantile paralysis clinic to be operated by Sister Elizabeth Kenny under the supervision of the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service.

My whole idea is, Mr. President, that all the forces that are now combating infantile paralysis shall be united in one strong unified fight against infantile paralysis and encephalitis.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the amendment submitted by the Senator from North Dakota will be received, referred to the Committee on Education and Labor, and printed.

TWENTY-THIRD ANNUAL REPORT OF BOARD OF ACTUARIES OF THE CIVIL SERVICE RETIREMENT AND DISABILITY FUND (S. DOC. NO. 233)

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. In his capacity as a Senator, the present occupant of the chair, on behalf of the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY], asks unanimous consent that the report of the Board of Actuaries of the Civil Service Commission transmitted to the Senate on August 15, 1944, be printed as a Senate document. The Chair understands it has been the custom to print such reports when received. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed as a Senate document.

REMOVAL OF BAN OF SECRECY FROM DOUBLE TAXATION CONVENTION WITH CANADA

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent, as in executive session, that the ban of secrecy be removed from Executive G, Seventy-eighth Congress, second session, a convention between the United States of America and Canada for the avoidance of double taxation and the prevention of fiscal evasion in the case of estate taxes and succession duties, signed in Ottawa on June 8, 1944.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, and, as in executive session, it is so ordered.

The convention was made public, as follows:

> The Government of the United States of America and the Government of Canada, being desirous of avoiding double taxation and of preventing fiscal evasion in the case of estate taxes and succession duties, have decided to conclude a Convention and for that purpose have appointed as their Plenipotentiaries:
>
> Ray Atherton, Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America at Ottawa, for the United States of America; and
>
> W. L. Mackenzie King, Secretary of State for External Affairs, and Colin W. G. Gibson, Minister of National Revenue, for Canada.
>
> Who, having communicated to one another their full powers found in good and due form, have agreed upon the following Articles:
>
> ARTICLE I
>
> 1. The taxes referred to in this Convention are:
>
> (a) for the United States of America; the Federal estate taxes;
>
> (b) for Canada; the taxes imposed under the Dominion Succession Duty Act.
>
> 2. In the event of appreciable changes in the fiscal laws of either contracting State, the competent authorities of the contracting States will consult together.
>
> ARTICLE II
>
> 1. Real property situated in Canada shall be exempt from the application of the taxes imposed by the United States of America.
>
> 2. Real property situated in the United States of America shall be exempt from the application of the taxes imposed by Canada.

3. The question whether rights relating to or secured by real property are to be considered as real property for the purposes of this Convention shall be determined in accordance with the laws of the contracting State imposing the tax.

ARTICLE III

1. Shares in a corporation organized in or under the laws of the United States of America, of any of the states or territories of the United States of America, or of the District of Columbia, shall be deemed to be property situated within the United States of America.

2. Shares in a corporation organized in or under the laws of Canada, or of any of the provinces or territories of Canada, shall be deemed to be property situated within Canada.

3. This Article shall not be construed as limiting the liability of the estate of any person not domiciled in Canada or of any citizen of the United States of America, under the estate tax laws of the United States of America.

ARTICLE IV

1. The situs of property shall be determined in accordance with the laws of the contracting State imposing the tax, except as otherwise provided in this Convention.

2. Allowance for debts shall be determined in accordance with the laws of the contracting State imposing the tax.

3. Domicile shall be determined in accordance with the laws of the contracting State imposing the tax.

ARTICLE V

1. In the case of a decedent who at the time of his death was a citizen of, or domiciled in, the United States of America, the United States of America may include in the gross estate any property (other than real property) situated in Canada as though this Convention had not come into effect.

2. In the case of a decedent (other than a citizen of the United States of America) who at the time of his death was domiciled in Canada, the United States of America shall, in imposing the taxes to which this Convention relates:

(a) take into account only property situated in the United States of America; and

(b) allow as an exemption an amount which bears the same ratio to the personal exemption allowed in the case of a decedent who was at the time of his death a citizen of, or domiciled in, the United States of America as the value of the property of such decedent situated in the United States of America bears to the value of the property included in the entire gross estate of the decedent.

3. In the case of a decedent who at the time of his death was domiciled in Canada, Canada may include in the gross estate any property (other than real property) situated in the United States of America as though this Convention had not come into effect.

4. In the case of a decedent who at the time of his death was domiciled in the United States of America, Canada shall, in imposing the taxes to which this Convention relates:

(a) take into account only property situated in Canada; and

(b) allow as an exemption an amount which bears the same ratio to the personal exemption allowed in the case of a decedent who was at the time of his death domiciled in Canada as the value of the property of such decedent situated in Canada bears to the entire value of the property, wherever situated.

ARTICLE VI

1. In the case of a decedent who at the time of his death was a citizen of or domiciled in the United States of America, the United States of America shall impose the estate taxes to which this Convention relates upon the following conditions:

(a) In respect of property situated in Canada which, for the purpose of estate taxes, is included in the gross estate, less such property as is specifically deducted therefrom (either because of transfer for public, charitable, educational, religious or similar uses or because the property has been previously taxed under provisions of law relating to property previously taxed), there shall be allowed against the estate taxes a credit for Canadian succession taxes in respect of the property situated in Canada, the situs of such property being determined in accordance with the laws of Canada, subject to the provisions of this Convention.

(b) The portion of the Canadian succession taxes to be allowed as a credit against United States estate taxes shall be an amount which bears the same ratio to the total Canadian succession taxes as the value of the property situated in Canada and with respect to which estate taxes are imposed by the United States of America bears to the total value of the property with respect to which succession taxes are imposed by Canada.

(c) The credit in any such case shall not exceed an amount which bears the same ratio to such estate taxes, computed without the credit provided for herein, as the value of the property situated in Canada and not excluded or deducted from the gross estate as provided in (a) bears to the value of the entire gross estate.

(d) The values referred to in (c) are the values determined by the United States of America for the purpose of estate taxes.

(e) The credit provided for herein shall apply after the application of section 813 (b) of the Internal Revenue Code, as amended by the Revenue Act of 1942.

2. In the case of a decedent who at the time of his death was domiciled in Canada, Canada shall impose the succession taxes to which this Convention relates upon the following conditions:

(a) In respect of property situated in the United States of America which, for the purpose of succession taxes, is included in the gross estate, less such property as is specifically deducted therefrom (because of transfer for charitable, educational, religious or similar uses), there shall be allowed against the succession taxes a credit for United States estate taxes in respect of the property situated in the United States of America, the situs of such property being determined in accordance with the laws of the United States of America, subject to the provisions of this Convention.

(b) The portion of the United States estate taxes to be allowed as a credit against Canadian succession taxes shall be an amount which bears the same ratio to the total United States estate taxes as the value of the property situated in the United States of America and with respect to which succession taxes are imposed by Canada bears to the total value of the property with respect to which estate taxes are imposed by the United States of America.

(c) The credit in any such case shall not exceed an amount which bears the same ratio to such succession taxes, computed without the credit provided for herein, as the value of the property situated in the United States of America and not excluded or deducted from the gross estate as provided in (a) bears to the entire value of the property, wherever situated.

(d) The values referred to in (c) are the values determined by Canada for the purpose of succession taxes.

3. (a) The credit referred to in this Article may be allowed by the United States of America if claim therefor is filed within the periods provided in section 813 (b) of the Internal Revenue Code, as amended.

(b) The credit referred to in this Article may be allowed by Canada if claim therefor is filed within the period provided by subsection 4 of section 35 of the Dominion Succession Duty Act relating to refund of overpayment.

(c) A refund based on the credit may be made if a claim therefor is filed within the respective periods above provided.

(d) Any refund based on the provisions of this Article or any other provisions of this Convention shall be made without interest.

ARTICLE VII

1. With a view to the prevention of fiscal evasion each of the contracting States undertakes to furnish to the other contracting State as provided in the succeeding Articles of this Convention, the information which its competent authorities have at their disposal or are in a position to obtain under its revenue laws in so far as such information may be of use to the authorities of the other contracting State in the assessment of the taxes to which this Convention relates.

2. The information to be furnished under this Article, whether in the ordinary course or on request, may be exchanged directly between the competent authorities of the two contracting States.

ARTICLE VIII

1. The Commissioner shall notfy the Minister as soon as practicable when the Commissioner ascertains that in the case of:

(a) a decedent, any part of whose estate is subject to the Federal estate tax laws, there is property of such decedent situated in Canada;

(b) a decedent domiciled in Canada, any part of whose estate is subject to the Dominion Succession Duty Act, there is property of such decedent situated in the United States of America.

2. The Minister shall notify the Commissioner as soon as practicable when the Minister ascertains that in the case of:

(a) a decedent, any part of whose estate is subject to the Dominion Succession Duty Act, there is property of such decedent situated in the United States of America;

(b) a decedent domiciled in the United States of America, any part of whose estate is subjected to the Federal estate tax laws, there is property of such decedent situated in Canada.

ARTICLE IX

1. If the Minister deems it necessary to obtain the cooperation of the Commissioner in determination of the succession tax liability of any person, the Commissioner may, upon request, furnish the Minister such information bearing upon the matter as the Commissioner is entitled to obtain under the revenue laws of the United States of America.

2. If the Commissioner deems it necessary to obtain the cooperation of the Minister in the determination of the estate tax liability of any person, the Minister may, upon request, furnish the Commissioner such information bearing upon the matter as the Minister is entitled to obtain under the revenue laws of Canada.

ARTICLE X

The competent authorities of the contracting States may:

(a) prescribe regulations to carry into effect this Convention within the respective States and rules with respect to the exchange of information;

(b) if doubt arises, settle questions of interpretation or application of this Convention by mutual agreement;

(c) communicate with each other directly for the purpose of giving effect to the provisions of this Convention.

ARTICLE XI

If any fiduciary or beneficiary can show that double taxation has resulted or may result in respect of the taxes to which this Convention relates, such fiduciary or beneficiary shall be entitled to lodge a claim or protest with the State of citizenship or domicile of such fiduciary or beneficiary, or, if a corporation or other entity, with the State in which created or organized. If the claim or

protest should be deemed worthy of consideration, the competent authority of such State may consult with the competent authority of the other State to determine whether the alleged double taxation exists or may occur and if so whether it may be avoided in accordance with the terms of this Convention.

ARTICLE XII

The provisions of this Convention shall not be construed to restrict in any manner any exemption, deduction, credit or other allowance accorded by the laws of one of the contracting States in the determination of the tax imposed by such State.

ARTICLE XIII

1. As used in this Convention:

(a) The term "Minister" means the Minister of National Revenue of Canada or his duly authorized representative.

(b) The term "Commissioner" means the Commissioner of Internal Revenue of the United States of America, or his duly authorized representative.

(c) The term "competent authority" or "competent authorities" means the Commissioner and the Minister and their duly authorized representatives.

2. When used in a geographical sense:

(a) The term "United States of America" includes only the states, the Territory of Alaska, the Territory of Hawaii, and the District of Columbia.

(b The term "Canada" means the provinces, the territories and Sable Island.

ARTICLE XIV

1. This Convention shall be ratified and the instruments of ratification shall be exchanged at Washington as soon as possible.

2. This Convention shall be deemed to have come into effect on the fourteenth day of June, 1941. It shall continue in effect for a period of five years from that date and indefinitely after that period, but may be terminated by either of the contracting States at the end of the five year period or at any time thereafter provided that at least six months prior notice of termination has been given.

Done in duplicate, at Ottawa, this eighth day of June, 1944.

RAY ATHERTON.
W. L. MACKENZIE KING.
COLIN GIBSON.

OVERSEAS INTER-AMERICAN HIGHWAY FROM KEY WEST, FLA.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. President, ceremonies were held recently at Key West celebrating the completion of the overseas highway from the mainland of Florida to the island of Key West. A large part of the causeway portion of the Florida East Coast Railway extending to Key West was destroyed or so badly damaged as a railway by the big hurricane of 1935, that permission was granted to abandon it. Soon thereafter, there was established under Florida statutes, the overseas highway district, which issued bonds with which, together with aid provided from the State of Florida and the Federal Government, it purchased, for less than $1,000,000 that portion of the Florida East Coast Railroad extending from the mainland to Key West. The original construction had cost over $60,000,000. Some of the finest engineering was required to construct this overseas highway on top of steel bridges and reinforced concrete piers. This highway, although not completed until this year, aided greatly in our war effort during the submarine menace, which hovered around the Florida Peninsula during the first 2 years of the present war.

For some time a plan has been underway to utilize this overseas highway to connect up with the national highways of Cuba; thence, by ferries, east to Haiti and the Dominican Republic and Puerto Rico; also to the west from Habana to the western end of Cuba; thence across the Yucatan channel to Mexico to connect with the Pan-American Highway being completed from Laredo on the Rio Grande through Mexico and the Central American republics to Panama. Most of this highway will soon be completed.

Naturally the people of the United States are very much interested in having a more economical and convenient connection with our pan-American neighbors. It has been my privilege to talk with some of the officials of the countries through which this proposed highway would pass and their enthusiastic cooperation can, I am sure, be depended upon.

Some have thought it advisable that Congress should appoint a special joint committee of the Senate and House to make investigations as to the cost, practicability, and feasibility of such overseas highway, and I am submitting a concurrent resolution to that effect, which I ask to be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered; and the concurrent resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

(The concurrent resolution appears at the conclusion of Mr. ANDREWS' remarks.)

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. President, one of the most encouraging features now is that apparently it will not be a very expensive project for the United States and the countries to be traversed by this highway, in that much of it has already been constructed or is now under construction. Perhaps the most feasible and the most encouraging phase of this highway system will be the safe, efficient, and economic way by which connection can be established from Miami, Key West, and other embarkation points to Cuba; thence to Haiti and from Haiti and the Dominican Republic to Puerto Rico; also west from Cuba to Yucatan and Mexico where it would connect with the great Pan-American Highway, which during the recent submarine menace was spoken of as the American Burma Road.

It should be very practical as a postwar project, as there will be a great surplus of large craft convertible for ferry boats and ample labor practically to assure the completion and operation of the whole system within a relatively short period of time. The Public Roads Administration has looked into this route in recent years, and kindly furnished a sketch of the proposed route which I have for inspection.

Mr. President, I submit for the examination of Members of the Senate a map prepared by the National Geographic Society on which is traced the proposed route. It shows how the highway would connect up at various points.

The land-water automobile traffic could be routed also over trunk highways of the southeast and the trunkline highways of Florida, converging at embarkation ports for Habana to connect with the highway-sea route to Yucatan and the Pan-American Highway, to return, if desired, by the city of Mexico and save over 1,500 miles on a trip from the east to the city of Mexico, thus completing the Gulf Sunshine Circle in much shorter time and less expense for automobile tourist travel.

A very timely and able article by Miss Virginia Pruitt appeared in the Washington Post recently, pointing out the history and efforts for a more practical and economic communication between the American republics, and calling for attention to the fact that a line of communication connecting the New World republics by land is one of the oldest pan-American ideas, and that it was suggested at the first Pan-American Conference in 1889 that a connecting system of railways should be built to stimulate trade and friendship in the hemisphere; also that the fifth conference at Santiago de Chile in 1923 proposed cooperative action on a pan-American highway, and that early in 1930 work on several sections got under way, and by 1936 the 760-mile stretch between Laredo, Tex., and Mexico City was completed.

The importance of land communications among the American republics has in fact been stressed at every conference since 1923. In the middle 1930's the United States began to lend the Central American countries modest sums to help along with the work. In late 1941, when the terrible submarine menace made a land connection vital, the Congress appropriated $20,000,000 to rush the Mexico-Central America link with the Panama Canal Zone. Central American countries, in addition to their own funds, borrowed $10,000,000 to aid in the work. There are about 300 miles of highway to be constructed between Panama and the nearest completed highway in Colombia where motorists can travel to nearly all the South American republics over highways at least one-half of which could be traveled in all kinds of weather. Eighty percent had dry-weather surfaces and that work was slowly going forward on one of the two gaps in the route in southern Ecuador.

Southward from Mexico to the Panama Canal it is said that about three-fifths of the highway is ready for all-weather use. There are unfinished stretches in Mexico, Costa Rica, Nicaragua, Honduras, and Panama.

As a defense measure, the United States, after Pearl Harbor made arrangements for our Army to build a pioneer road along the route of the highway to span gaps in Central America. It was at first intended to complete it this year, but overseas offensives have slowed down shipment of road machinery and at present the pan-American "Burma Road" is apparently scheduled to be finished in 1944.

It is said that the building of the 300-mile link between the Panama Canal and the South American highway has been postponed until after the war. It may cost much money and time, but the belief is that its ultimate realization will advance the mutual trade and friendly relations between our American Republics far beyond that which can now be visualized. When this great continental system is completed, it will give the New World, first of all, a line of land com-

munication in case we are caught short again by a war. Its completion will permit a tourist and commercial exchange that will tie all the countries closer together as nothing else will or can. It will help these countries hold among themselves the new trade that the present war has started. In addition, it will start internal development in the heretofore untouched natural resources of each country.

This great inter-American development will effectively increase economic activity within countries where the highway runs and likewise increase commercial interchange among neighbors. Nothing could be more desirable for the prosperity and strength of the Western Hemisphere.

It is our hope that the joint committee of Congress will be created and that their report will justify our hope and predictions of great benefit to each republic traversed and to the whole of the Western Hemisphere.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 49) submitted by Mr. ANDREWS was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, as follows:

Whereas there has recently been completed from the mainland of Florida to the island of Key West, what is known as the Overseas Highway; and

Whereas it is the sense of the Congress that we can greatly strengthen cordial relations with our neighbor republics by fostering the early extension of the Overseas Highway, recently completed to Key West, to connect by ocean ferries at Habana with the East-West Cuban Highway; thence east to connect with Haiti, Dominican Republic, and Puerto Rico; also west from Habana to the most westerly point of the island of Cuba; thence by ferry to Yucatan Peninsula in Mexico; thence to connect with the Pan-American Highway now being completed from Laredo on the Rio Grande through Mexico and the Central-American countries to Panama; and

Whereas it is contemplated that there will be a surplus of ocean craft suitable for conversion to ferryboats, also ample labor and construction machinery, after the close of the war, which otherwise may for some time have to remain idle; and

Whereas the construction and operation of such an inter-American highway would materially aid in solving the contemplated post-war labor situation and also would assist in bringing continental United States in closer touch with the many essential raw materials in Central and South America which may be had in exchange for manufactured articles for use in essential industries and agriculture: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there is hereby established a Joint Overseas Inter-American Highway Committee of Congress (hereinafter referred to as the "joint committee") to be composed of three Members of the Senate, to be appointed by the President of the Senate, and five Members of the House of Representatives, to be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives. Vacancies in the membership of the joint committee shall not affect the power of the remaining members to execute the functions of the joint committee, and shall be filled in the same manner as in the case of the original selection. The joint committee shall select a chairman from among its members.

SEC. 2. It shall be the duty of the joint committee to investigate, hold hearings where necessary in collaboration with proper officials of other American countries traversed by said highway, and report to Congress their recommendations as to the most practical route, its feasibility, and approximate costs to each nation traversed for any additional construction and costs of operation of said highway; that such investigations shall include an overseas ferry from Key West to Habana, Cuba, to (a) connect with the East-West Cuban Highway to the most westerly point of the island of Cuba, thence by overseas ferries to Yucatan, Mexico, to connect with the Pan-American Highway now being completed through Mexico and Central America by way of Panama into South America; (b) connect with and include the Cuban National Highway from Habana, Cuba, to connect by ferry and highways with Haiti, Dominican Republic, and Puerto Rico.

SEC. 3. The joint committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof is authorized to sit and act at such places and times during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Seventy-eighth Congress, to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, to procure such printing and binding, and to make such expenditures as it deems advisable. The cost of stenographic services to report such hearings shall not be in excess of 25 cents per hundred words.

SEC. 4. (a) The joint committee shall have power to employ and fix the compensation of such officers, experts, and employees as it deems necessary in the performance of its duties, but the compensation so fixed shall not exceed the compensation prescribed under the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, for comparable duties. The joint committee is authorized to request the use of the services, information, facilities, and personnel of the departments and agencies in the executive branch of the Government.

(b) The expenses of the joint committee, which shall not exceed $, shall be paid out of the contingent funds of the Senate and House of Representatives, one-half to be disbursed by the Secretary of the Senate and one-half to be disbursed by the Clerk of the House of Representatives.

WAR DEPARTMENT DEMOBILIZATION PLAN

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, the War Department has issued a statement on its interim demobilization plan covering the period between the defeat of Germany and the defeat of Japan. Because of the intense interest that the more than 10,000,000 families of our men and girls in the armed services have in the plan, I ask that the statement of the department be included in the RECORD. The Committee on Military Affairs has been in contact with the War Department during the development of the plan; and I wish particularly to commend the cooperative spirit of the Secretary of War and of the General Staff in basing the plan, so far as military necessity permits, on the sentiment of both the Congress and the public for as rapid a demobilization of our men and girls as circumstances may permit.

This is a very human plan and the basis of determining eligibility for discharge was determined through a poll of the men themselves to ascertain what they thought was just. Selection for discharge is on an individual basis which gives a just opportunity to the man in the Pacific theater of operations even though his unit is continuing in the fight.

Particularly noteworthy are the provisions for informing all the men of the principles and provisions of the plan for discharge, so that each man may understand why he is or is not eligible for discharge, and so that he may be able to determine his own eligibility through the impartial application of the principles of the plan; included is a provision for counselors for the men to help them in reorienting themselves for their return to civil life.

I regret to see by the morning press that an attempt is being made to create a political issue of what is strictly a military matter intimately connected with the conduct of the war, although we were assured that the war was to be kept out of the political campaign. I can assure the Senate, as of my own knowledge, that the announced plan of demobilization is one based solely on the best judgment of the special board set up over a year ago in the General Staff to study this subject and having as its objective the demobilization of the largest number of men permitted by the military situation. It was at the request of the War Department that a section was included in the Senate version of the reconversion bill providing that the War and Navy Departments should not be required to retain in service any men for other than military reasons.

There being no objection, the statement issued by the War Department was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WAR DEPARTMENT DEMOBILIZATION PLAN AFTER DEFEAT OF GERMANY

The Army has adopted a plan for the readjustment of military personnel after the defeat of Germany and prior to the defeat of Japan calling for a partial and orderly demobilization from its present peak strength.

When the war against Germany has ended, the military might of the United States will be shifted from the European area to the Pacific area. Military requirements in the European and American areas will be drastically curtailed, while tremendous increases will be essential in the Pacific.

To defeat Japan as quickly as possible, and permanently, the United States will have to assemble, readjust, and streamline its military forces in order to apply the maximum power. Our military requirements to achieve this end, involving men, weapons, equipment, and shipping, have been set forth by the Combined Chiefs of Staff. These requirements are the determining factors of the readjustment and demobilization plan adopted by the War Department.

Military necessity decrees that sufficient men suited to the type of warfare being waged in the Pacific must remain in service as long as they are essential. Certain units of the Army also, of necessity, will have to be retained in the various theaters where action has ceased in order to fulfill such occupation duties as are necessary. Other elements, no longer needed in the theater in which they are assigned, will be transferred to other areas, reorganized and redesignated to meet current military requirements in the theater, or they will be inactivated.

Within each element of the Army thousands of individuals may become surplus to the needs of the theater or major command in which they are serving. But more thousands will be required for further military service.

First priority in this readjustment program will be the transfer of elements from theaters no longer active to the Pacific war zone, or from the United States to the Pacific war zone. All available transportation will be utilized for this tremendous undertaking.

The readjustment and demobilization plan developed by the War Department after months of study takes into account all of these variable factors. Briefly, the plan for the return of nonessential soldiers to civilian life will start with the assembly in the United States of men declared surplus to the needs of each overseas theater and to the major commands in the United States. From among these men some will be designated essential, and a substantial number will be designated as nonessential to the new military needs of the Army and will be returned to civilian life according to certain priorities.

As an example, the commanding general of the European theater of operations will be informed by the War Department of the types and numbers of his units which will be needed in the Pacific, and the types and numbers of his units which will remain as occupation troops, and the types and numbers of his units which are surplus.

The simplest plan of demobilization would have been to return these surplus units to this country and discharge their personnel intact.

Such a method, however, would operate with great unfairness to many individuals who have had long and arduous service but are not assigned to one of the units declared surplus. If only units in Europe were considered, this basis of expediency would work unfairly to units long in the Pacific or at outpost bases in the American theater. It would operate unfairly to men who have seen extended combat service both in Europe and the Pacific and have been returned to this country for reassignment. It would release men only recently assigned as replacements to units long in combat and would discriminate against veterans of many campaigns and units not selected for return.

Consequently, it was determined that the fairest method to effect partial demobilization would be through the selection of men as individuals, rather than by units, with the selection governed by thoroughly impartial standards.

For the standards, the War Department went to the soldiers themselves. Experts were sent into the field to obtain a cross-section of the sentiments of enlisted men. Thousands of soldiers, both in this country and overseas, were interviewed to learn their views on the kind of selective process they believed should determine the men to be returned first to civilian life. Opinions expressed by the soldiers themselves became the accepted principles of the plan.

As finally worked out, the plan accepted by the War Department as best meeting the tests of justice and impartiality will allow men who have been overseas and men with dependent children to have priority of separation. Ninety percent of the soldiers interviewed said that that is the way it should be.

As part of the plan adopted, an adjusted-service rating card will be issued to all enlisted personnel after the defeat of Germany. On this card will be scored the following four factors that will determine priority of separation:

1. Service credit, based upon the total number of months of Army services since September 16, 1940.

2. Overseas credit, based upon the number of months served overseas.

3. Combat credit, based upon the first and each additional award to the individual of the Medal of Honor, Distinguished Service Cross, Legion of Merit, Silver Star, Distinguished Flying Cross, Soldier's Medal, Bronze Star Medal, Air Medal, Purple Heart, and bronze service stars (battle participation stars).

4. Parenthood credit, which gives credit for each dependent child under 18 years up to a limit of three children.

The value of the point credits will be announced after the cessation of hostilities in Europe. In the meantime, the point values will be kept under continuous study. The total score will be used to select surplus men from the theaters overseas and in the United States. The score also will be used when a certain portion of all these surplus men will be declared nonessential and returned to civilian life.

In all cases, however, the demands of military necessity and the needs of the war against Japan must first be met. Regardless of a man's priority standing, certain types of personnel can never become surplus as long as the war against Japan continues.

As an example of how the plan will work, assume that there are four infantry divisions in the European theater. One is declared surplus. Men in all four divisions are rated according to the priority credit scores. The top fourth is selected and those not essential for retention in service by reason of military necessity are designated as surplus. Men in the surplus division who are marked for retention by reason of military necessity are then shifted into the active divisions. All of the men designated as surplus are shifted into the surplus divisions, which now will serve as a vehicle for eventually returning them to the United States.

No man in a unit that remains in service can become surplus until a qualified replacement is available. If military necessity should entail the immediate transfer of a unit to the Pacific, there may conceivably be no time to apply the plan to men of that unit before the emergency transfer is made. Consideration will be given these men when they arrive in the new theater.

The active units needed against Japan will be shipped to the Pacific. Those units required for occupation duty in Europe will be sent to their stations, and surplus units will be returned to the United States as quickly as possible.

In the United States, the men of these surplus units will revert to a surplus pool in the Army Ground Forces, Army Service Forces, and Army Air Forces. These surplus pools will include surplus men from all overseas theaters and surplus men from the continental United States.

From these surplus pools the reduction of various types of Army personnel will be made. The number to be returned to civilian life as no longer essential to over-all Army needs will be chosen from among those with the highest priority credit scores.

It is emphasized that the rate of return of surplus men from overseas will depend upon the number of ships available. Thousands of ships will be required to supply the Pacific theater. The Pacific theater will have No. 1 priority. All else must wait. To it will be transported millions of fighting men, millions of tons of landing barges, tanks, planes, guns, ammunition, and food, over longer supply lines than those to Europe.

This means that most of the ships and planes that were used to supply the European theater will be needed to supply the Pacific theater. The majority of ships proceeding to Europe will continue on to the Pacific laden with troops and supplies for that distant campaign. Very few will turn around and come back to the United States. The Army, therefore, will not be able to return all surplus men to the United States immediately. It may take many months.

While the process of selecting and returning men from the European theater is taking place, the plan for readjustment and partial demobilization also will be applied in active theaters, like the southwest Pacific. Individuals in those theaters will be declared surplus to the extent that replacements can be provided. Naturally, since the Pacific will be the only active theater, there will be no surplus units of any type. Military requirements there will demand an increase rather than a decrease in fighting units. Nevertheless, troops in the Pacific area will benefit by the reduction of the Army, not as units, but as individuals.

Commanders in the Pacific area will be told the number and types of men who can be replaced. They then will select these men, using the same standards as apply in inactive theaters and in the United States. These men then will be returned to the United States as rapidly as replacements of the same type become available and as the military situation permits.

As an example: Normally there will be a great flow of men needed to build up and maintain an offensive against Japan, but say that several thousand men over and above the required number can be shipped to the Pacific each month. Then a corresponding number of men in the Pacific with the highest priority credit scores can be declared surplus and returned to the United States, where their scores and military necessity will determine whether they are among the personnel no longer essential to the Army.

Simultaneously with the selection and return of men in the overseas theaters, the same selective formula will be applied among troops stationed in the continental United States. Troops in the United States, however, will serve as the main reservoir of replacements for the overseas theaters, for, in general, their priority scores will be lower than the scores of men who have served overseas and have seen combat duty.

Any man who may have been declared nonessential under this plan who wishes to remain in the Army, provided he has a satisfactory record, will not be forced out of the Army if he can be usefully employed.

In the case of officers, military necessity will determine which ones are nonessential. These will be released as they can be spared.

Priority of release for members of the Women's Army Corps will be determined in the same way as for the rest of the Army, but treating the Corps as a separate group. However, in the case of all female personnel of the Army, those whose husbands have already been released will be discharged upon application.

The plan as now adopted will provide some reduction in the Army Ground Forces and initially considerably less in the Service Forces and in the Air Forces.

Following Germany's defeat, the Air Forces will have to move combat groups and supporting ground units from all over the world to the Pacific areas. The nature of the Pacific area dictates that Service Forces personnel will be needed in great numbers to carry the war to Japan. Long supply lines, scattered bases, jungles, primitive country, all contribute to the importance and necessity for Service Forces personnel. Therefore, the reduction in its strength will be slow at first.

As replacements become available from the Ground Forces and from new inductees, the Air Forces and the Service Forces will discharge a fair share of men proportionate with the Ground Forces.

Surplus individuals declared nonessential to the needs of the Army will be discharged from the service through separation centers. Five Army separation centers are already in operation, and additional ones will be set up when the need develops. A total of 18 in all parts of the country are contemplated. Their wide distribution will enable us to discharge soldiers close to their homes.

The readjustment and demobilization plan applies only to readjustment and demobilization in the period between the defeat of Germany and prior to the defeat of Japan. It sets forth the principles and responsibilities involved during that period. Theater commanders and commanders of all other major commands of the Army will put the plan into operation in as simple a manner as possible, based on these principles and responsibilities.

The War Department has determined that the successful operation of the plan requires that the troops themselves, as well as the public, be kept fully informed.

The size of the Military Establishment that will be needed after the defeat of Germany has been calculated with the same exactness as the size of the Army needed up to now. No soldier will be kept in the military service who is not needed to fulfill these requirements. No soldier will be released who is needed.

It must be borne in mind always that the war will not be won, nor the peace enjoyed, until Japan has been completely crushed.

UNDESIRABLE WAR MEMORIALS—LETTER FROM NATIONAL COUNCIL OF AMERICAN WAR DADS

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter I received from Remmie L. Arnold, national president of the American War Dads, a patriotic organization with headquarters at Kansas City, Mo., warning the public against the types of war memorials which cannot be utilized for community purposes.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NATIONAL COUNCIL, AMERICAN WAR DADS,
Kansas City, Mo., August 31, 1944.

MR. ARTHUR CAPPER,
Publisher, the Topeka Capital,
Topeka, Kans.

DEAR MR. CAPPER: This organization believes it is very essential to forewarn the public against the types of war memorials which cannot be utilized for community purposes.

Not only do we have word of such proposed projects from many communities in this country but we know that the opinions of World War No. 2 veterans themselves are decidedly in favor of memorials which will serve the public in a practical way.

An Illinois editor, commenting on this American War Dad movement, said recently in his editorial columns:

"We feel that the group in our city which is behind the plan to erect a seven-lobed billboard to contain the names of all who have had any service to play in this war means honestly to do right by our boys. Their hearts are true, but they are victims of a mania for erecting huge lists of names, sold to them by a high-pressure hireling of a firm obviously determined to capitalize on the sentiment of the hour. Many smaller cities are breaking out with the 'board rash.' The Post is adding its weight to a countermovement here which hopes to save our city and public square from catching the thing."

We are persuaded that if a community or its citizens plan to spend public money on a memorial, it should be something useful, such as public swimming pools, stadiums, day nurseries, public meeting places—anything that would benefit and improve the community and be an expression of democracy at work.

If you agree, we hope you will find occasion to give voice to a movement which we War Dads feel should have public consideration even at this early date.

Sincerely,

REMMIE L. ARNOLD,
National President.

OBJECTIONS OF FARM ORGANIZATIONS TO PENDING HIGHWAY LEGISLATION

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, in connection with highway legislation which I understand it has been planned to take up in the Senate in the near future, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter from Edward A. O'Neal, president of the American Farm Bureau Federation, pointing out several objections to Senate bill 2105 in its present form.

I also ask unanimous consent to have printed a letter from Albert S. Goss, master of the National Grange, setting forth even stronger objections to the road bill, House bill 4915.

I invite special attention to the objection of the Farm Bureau to the allocation of $200,000,000 for urban highways, while appropriation of $250,000,000 is made for projects on the Federal highway system, which the Bureau says also would include urban highway construction.

I believe that Congress should study the matter very carefully before changing the formula for apportionment of Federal highway aid to the States, as proposed in House bill 4915. It seems to me that both these measures contemplate the granting of a disproportionate share of Federal funds to the more densely populated areas.

I ask unanimous consent that both letters be printed at this point in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AMERICAN FARM BUREAU FEDERATION,
Washington, D. C., September 2, 1944.

To All Members of the Senate.

We are strongly opposed to the enactment of S. 2105 unless it is amended to correct several serious weaknesses and particularly to remove its discrimination against rural areas.

We are strongly opposed to abandonment of the historic 50–50 basis for matching of Federal and State funds for highway construction, which has been in effect for a quarter of a century. This bill proposes a new matching requirement under which the States would be required to contribute only 40 percent and the Federal Government 60 percent of the cost of any project. Such a change is more inappropriate now than at any previous time, because of the unprecedented, colossal increase in the Federal public debt, which now exceeds $200,000,000,000 and is still soaring rapidly, while State and local governments are in better financial condition than for many years. Furthermore, to abandon the equal sharing of expense between the Federal Government and the States and place a heavier share on the Federal Government would tend to invite increased Federal control over our highways.

The bill provides a special fund of $200,000,000 for projects on highways in urban areas to be apportioned to the States on the basis of the total population in cities of 5,000 or more. Another fund of $250,000,000 is provided for projects on the Federal highway system. Presumably, urban areas would also obtain money for highway construction out of this fund for the Federal-aid highways running through cities. The urban areas in the States with large cities would receive a large share of these funds, totaling $450,000,000.

We are strongly opposed to this arrangement, which gives a disproportionate share of funds to heavy populated areas. If a special fund of $200,000,000 is to be provided solely for Federal-aid highways through cities, then, in fairness, the $250,000,000 for projects on the Federal-aid highway system should be limited to Federal-aid projects outside of urban areas. Otherwise, urban areas would be obtaining funds from both sources.

However, we believe it is unwise to provide a special fund solely for Federal-aid highways through urban areas, as this prevents the States from exercising their own judgment in apportioning these Federal-aid funds within their States to urban and rural areas. Since these apportionments to the States must be matched by the States out of State funds and since all of these funds are to be expended on Federal-aid projects, we recommend that the $200,000,000 for urban areas be eliminated and such additional funds as may be necessary be added to the two hundred and fifty million for Federal-aid projects and that these funds be made available for expenditure on Federal-aid highways through urban areas as well as outside urban areas, as provided by existing law. All these funds should be apportioned to the States on the basis of the regular Federal-aid formula—one-third on the basis of total population, one-third on the basis of area, and one-third on the basis of rural post-road mileage.

We strongly favor the allocation of $200,000,000 for projects on the principal secondary and feeder roads, including farm-to-market roads, rural free delivery mail and public school bus roads, but we recommend these funds be apportioned to the States on the basis of the following formula: One-third on the basis of rural population; one-third on the basis of total area; and one-third on the basis of total mileage of the principal secondary and feeder roads, including farm-to-market roads, rural free delivery mail and public school bus roads. We believe that this formula is a more equitable and realistic formula for the apportionment of these funds for this type of roads than the formula proposed in this bill. We further urge the insertion of an amendment providing that specifications for the construction of secondary and feeder roads shall be determined solely by the respective States.

The foregoing recommendations were approved by the board of directors of the American Farm Bureau Federation at its meeting in Chicago, on August 31, 1944. I hope these recommendations will receive your earnest consideration and that they will meet with your approval.

Sincerely yours,

EDW. A. O'NEAL,
President.

THE NATIONAL GRANGE,
Washington, D. C., August 17, 1944.

Hon. J. W. ROBINSON,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN ROBINSON: We are quite concerned over the situation in connection with the pending road bill, H. R. 4915. We are in thorough accord with the purpose of having plans and finances ready to meet any possible emergency arising from the transition from a wartime to a peacetime economy. If this is to be done, it will be necessary to have any program which may be passed by the Congress approved by the various State legislatures. Forty-five of these legislatures meet next January, and many of them will not meet in regular session for another 2 years. It seems most urgent that any legislation the Congress enacts should be passed quickly to avoid the danger of holding up plans which should be gotten under way.

However, we are also concerned about some of the provisions of the bill as reported out by your committee. We fear some of the provisions indicate a tendency to make the bill an unemployment-relief bill rather than a highway bill; that some of the formulae for allocation of funds will not meet the needs either for employment or building a highway system as equitably as we would like, and that some emergency needs may have led to an expedient course which will serve as a handicap in developing a well-balanced highway system in the future. We, therefore, want to urge the approval of some committee amendments which are designed to meet this situation, provide a more equitable allocation of funds, and protect the prime purpose of building a Federal highway system.

For many years the formula of apportioning road funds on the basis of one-third area, one-third population, and one-third post-road mileage has worked out most satisfactorily in rural areas, and we feel it should not be discarded unless it can be improved. We realize the justice in providing funds for carrying this system through cities or even skirting the city itself, and favor authorization of funds for this purpose. However, when we applied the allocation formula in the bill to the field, we found some indefensible results. Some States with large urban population and small areas would receive less than seemed equitable, while in sparsely settled States, more funds for development in urban areas would be received than they could possibly use economically. We worked on a wide variety of factors in an effort to find some combination which would do reasonable equity to the rural and urban sections alike, but were finally forced to the conclusion that there were certain economic factors which were common to practically all rural sections, and certain other factors which were common to practically all urban centers, but there was not much in common between these two groups. We concluded that the only way to approach equity was to determine the amount of money to be spent on rural highways and the amount to be spent on highway development in the urban areas, then provide for an equitable allocation of each of these sums according to the factors which would give the most equitable practical results in each case.

We propose that the funds authorized for the Federal-aid highway system in rural areas and for the feeder roads be apportioned to the States as provided in section 21 of the Federal Highway Act (one-third area, one-third population, and one-third post-road mileage).

We propose that the funds authorized for Federal-aid highway projects in urban areas be apportioned among the states in the ratio which the population in municipalities of 10,000 population or more in each State bears to the national total population in municipalities for 10,000 or more.

We believe the purpose of the bill to construct a Federal highway system should be preserved. If later money is needed for relief, let it be appropriated as such, and let it be allocated according to the need. We fear the wording of the bill may not be quite clear and may give rise to misunderstanding, and be considered as authorizing the expenditure of funds on city streets quite apart from the highway system. We believe this is not the intent, but misunderstanding could be avoided if the authorization for urban expenditures were clearly defined as "on Federal-aid highway projects in urban areas."

The highway system which has served us so successfully these many years permits a portion of the general Federal-aid highway funds to be used in urban areas. The pending bill would provide additional funds which could not be used except in urban areas, but does not prevent using a portion of the general Federal-aid highway funds being used there also, just as is now the case. This is probably as it should be, but the wording which specifically provides for the use of these funds "either inside or outside of urban areas" without any limitations would seem to invite needless rivalries and political pulling and hauling between cities and country areas. We believe the provisions of the present law are ample in this respect, and believe the inclusion of these additional words will merely lead to confusion.

We feel that the bill can be greatly improved by making the changes we suggest, and urge that it either be recalled for further consideration, or that committee amendments be prepared designed to correct the conditions to which we have invited your attention.

Sincerely yours,

A. S. Goss,
Master, The National Grange.

KIWANIS CLUB CITATION TO SENATOR HAWKES

[Mr. REVERCOMB asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the 1943 citation of the Kiwanis Club of New York, citizenship committee, to Senator HAWKES, the presentation of the citation by Hon. James W. Gerard, the address on the occasion by Senator HAWKES, and remarks by Senator REVERCOMB, which appear in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY POSTMASTER GENERAL WALKER BEFORE SAN FRANCISCO JUNIOR CHAMBER OF COMMERCE

[Mr. McKELLAR asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio address by Hon. Frank C. Walker, Postmaster General of the United States, delivered on September 8, 1944, before the Junior Chamber of Commerce at San Francisco, Calif., which appears in the Appendix.]

EXPENDITURES AND RECEIPTS OF DOMESTIC AND FOREIGN AIR MAIL SERVICE—REPORTS OF POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

[Mr. McKELLAR asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD two reports addressed to him as chairman of the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads by the Post Office Department, one on expenditures and receipts of the Domestic Air Mail Service, and the other on expenditures and receipts of the Foreign Air Mail Service, which appear in the Appendix.]

FEDERAL ASSISTANCE TO STATES FOR PUBLIC EDUCATION—ADDRESS BY DR. HOWARD A. DAWSON

[Mr. HILL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "Federal Assistance to the States for Public Education," delivered by Dr. Howard A. Dawson before the Representative Assembly of the National Education Association at Pittsburgh, Pa., on July 6, 1944, which appears in the Appendix.]

EDUCATION FOR WORLD AFFAIRS—ADDRESS BY WILLIAM M. HEPBURN

[Mr. HILL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "Education for World Affairs—The Basis for an Understanding Peace," delivered by Dr. William M. Hepburn, dean of the law school of the University of Alabama, at the summer school graduation on August 25, 1944, which appears in the Appendix.]

STATES' RIGHTS—ARTICLE BY LOWELL MELLETT

[Mr. HILL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "States' Rights Makes Good Talk, But Doesn't Create Any Jobs, Says Writer," written by Lowell Mellett and published in the Washington Star of September 7, 1944, which appears in the Appendix.]

FARM PROGRAM—LETTER FROM G. C. OLIVER

[Mr. BARKLEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter pertaining to the farm program addressed to him by G. C. Oliver, chairman of the Cumberland County, Ky., A. A. A. board, which appears in the Appendix.]

FEDERAL ROAD PROGRAM—EDITORIAL FROM ST. LOUIS GLOBE-DEMOCRAT

[Mr. BARKLEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Federal Road Program" published in the St. Louis Globe-Democrat of September 5, 1944, which appears in the Appendix.]

TRIBUTE TO GEORGE W. NORRIS

[Mr. HILL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a number of editorials and newspaper articles, and a statement by Sidney Hillman, paying tribute to the memory of former Senator Norris of Nebraska, which appear in the Appendix.]

THE GOVERNMENT'S SUIT AGAINST THE RAILROADS

[Mr. SHIPSTEAD asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter written by Wendell Berge, Assistant Attorney General, under date of August 25, 1944, to the editor of the New York Times, relating to the Government's suit against the railroads, and an editorial entitled "Look Homeward, Mr. W!", published in the Minneapolis Morning Tribune of October 22, 1943, which appear in the Appendix.]

THE GOVERNMENT'S SUIT AGAINST THE RAILROADS

[Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD two editorials from the New York Times, one of August 25, 1944, and the other of August 30, 1944, and an article from the Wyoming State Tribune of August 29, 1944, relating to the Government's suit against the railroads, which appear in the Appendix.]

BASES FOR PEACE—ARTICLE FROM COSMOPOLITAN MAGAZINE

[Mr. BROOKS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Bases for Peace" published in the September 1944 issue of Cosmopolitan magazine, which appears in the Appendix.]

EXPANSION OF SERVICE INDUSTRIES—ARTICLE BY C. HARTLEY GRATTAN

[Mr. WALSH of New Jersey asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Factories Can't Employ Everybody—Why the Service Industries Must Expand," written by C. Hartley Grattan, and published in Harper's magazine of September 1944, which appears in the Appendix.]

THOUGHTS ON V-DAY—EDITORIAL FROM NEWARK EVENING NEWS

[Mr. WALSH of New Jersey asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Thoughts on V-day," published in the Newark (N. J.) Evening News of September 5, 1944, which appears in the Appendix.]

SANCTUARY FOR THE JEWS IN PALESTINE

[Mr. LANGER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial from the Boston Evening Globe of August 10, 1944, entitled "They Suffered Most"; an editorial from the New York Daily Mirror of August 1, 1944, entitled "Well Mr. Churchill"; an editorial from the Courier News of Plainfield, N. J., of August 1, 1944, entitled "Palestine as A Refugee"; an editorial from the New York Post of August 24, 1944, entitled "Men of Faith"; an editorial from the New York Post of August 15, 1944, entitled "Share the Job"; and an editorial from the New York Post of August 10, 1944, entitled "Twenty-four Days Have Passed"; all relating to providing sanctuary for the Jews, which appear in the Appendix.]

CONTROL AND ERADICATION OF CERTAIN ANIMAL AND PLANT PESTS AND DISEASES

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] that the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 1, 2, and 3 to the bill (H. R. 4278), the title of which will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (H. R. 4278) to provide for the control and eradication of certain animal and plant pests and diseases, to facilitate cooperation with the States in fire control, to provide for the more efficient protection and

management of the national forests, to facilitate the carrying out of agricultural conservation and related agricultural programs, to facilitate the operation of the Farm Credit Administration and the Rural Electrification Administration, to aid in the orderly marketing of agricultural commodities, and for other purposes.

PROMOTION OF CERTAIN AMERICAN PRISONERS OF WAR

Mr. BROOKS obtained the floor.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, is it the desire of the Senator from Illinois to address the Senate at this time?

Mr. BROOKS. I expect to speak for a few minutes.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Will the Senator be kind enough to yield to me for a moment?

Mr. BROOKS. I am delighted.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, before proceeding to ask unanimous consent for the consideration of a bill on the calendar, I wish to compliment the Senator from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS] on the statement which he made to the Senate a few moments ago. I am personally acquainted with the matters of which he speaks. In my opinion no more important program could be carried out in the post-war period than the project he has discussed.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of Senate bill 1374, Calendar 1057, which is a bill unanimously reported by the Committee on Military Affairs.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 1374) to provide for promotion of certain American prisoners of war.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, will the Senator from New Mexico give us some intimation of what the bill involves?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I shall be glad to do so. This bill originated as a result of the plight of American prisoners of war in the Philippine Islands, in Wake, and in Guam. As the Senate knows, practically every State in the Union had prisoners of war in the Philippine Islands after the fall of Bataan and Corregidor. The bill was introduced about 10 months ago. Only recently the Senate Committee on Military Affairs unanimously reported the bill. The Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS], who has been kind enough to yield to me, has constituents from Maywood, Peoria, and elsewhere, who are prisoners of war. Practically every State in the Union is interested.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, in view of the explanation made, and in view of what I understand to be the attitude of the minority members of the committee, I have no objection.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, as I understand, the bill applies only to officers and enlisted men who were imprisoned by the Japanese.

Mr. CHAVEZ. That is correct.

Mr. CONNALLY. Why should it not apply to those imprisoned by the Germans? They are in just as bad a situation.

Mr. CHAVEZ. The reason is that at the time the bill was introduced, the only prisoners involved were those who were taken at Guam, at Wake, and in the Philippine Islands. It is the thought of the sponsors of the bill that inasmuch as those particular prisoners were taken under circumstances which are not applicable to prisoners taken elsewhere, they should be taken care of. Personally I have no objection to taking care of prisoners who were taken elsewhere; but I believe it would be well to take care of these particular prisoners at this time. I have no objection to taking care of the prisoners to whom the Senator refers.

Mr. CONNALLY. Would the Senator object to my offering an amendment to that effect?

Mr. CHAVEZ. The only thing I have in mind in that respect is——

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. Let me say to the Senator from Texas that I quite appreciate the suggestion which he has made. It should be said that there is no intention to discriminate against prisoners anywhere. However, as my colleague has explained, this bill was introduced at a time when it seemed peculiarly fitting with respect to prisoners in the Philippines, who went through that tragic experience called the march of death, and who have been held for a long time as prisoners of war under most terrible conditions. My colleague introduced the bill as a mark of our country's appreciation of what those men suffered under those circumstances. I hope the amendment will not be pressed at this particular time, because I am quite sure it would complicate the passage of the bill. I believe that the bill should be passed as it was originally introduced.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. As the Senator and his colleague have said, at the time the bill was introduced a certain situation existed. However, we are asked to pass the bill now, under present conditions. We cannot pass it nunc pro tunc, under conditions which heretofore existed. If we are to promote a prisoner in the Philippines—and I am not opposed to it—I cannot see why an officer who was captured in north Africa and imprisoned by the Germans, and who is still imprisoned, should be denied promotion. I understand that the War Department has a regulation which provides that no officer who is imprisoned anywhere shall be promoted. Most of the former associates and colleagues of such officers, who have been in active service, have been promoted two or three grades, while their companions in rank are still in the German prison camps and cannot be promoted. What reason is there for promoting prisoners in the custody of the Japanese and not those in German custody?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I cannot see any reason, except that, so far as the prisoners of the Japanese are concerned, they had to fight under the most trying circumstances, without supplies, without food, and without adequate arms and ammunition. Their situation is somewhat different from that of prisoners who were taken in isolated cases in the campaign in Africa. I assure the Senator that I am acting in the best of faith in this instance. I do not object to taking care of the class of prisoners which the Senator from Texas has in mind.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I notice, from the letter from the Navy Department, which is a part of the committee report, that there is a suggestion of further discrimination. I invite the attention of the Senator from Texas to the language at the bottom of page 3 of the report. The Navy Department objects because the bill "is limited to those who were serving in only three locations—the Philippine Islands, Guam, and Wake—and only to those who were serving in those locations on one specific date, December 8, 1941." In other words, apparently it does not include even all those who should be eligible in the particular theater to which the Senator from New Mexico refers.

Mr. CHAVEZ. That is correct. The report speaks for itself. There is no question that both the War Department and the Navy Department made adverse reports on the bill. However, I believe that the significant part of the report of the War Department, which convinced the Committee on Military Affairs, is contained in the letter from the Secretary of War, which is found on page 2 of the report. In explaining the objections of the War Department to the bill the Secretary of War said:

> In the case of captured personnel—

He is speaking of all the personnel captured in the Philippine Islands—

> there is no way to distinguish between those men who, by virtue of having fought to the last, might be deserving of a reward in the form of promotion and those who surrendered in circumstances under which they might reasonably have been expected to continue to resist.

In my opinion that was the compelling point which prevailed upon the Committee on Military Affairs to report the bill. Even before the bill was reported by the committee, the War Department recommended the promotion of General Wainwright. I am sure it was deserved. This body acted upon it and approved it.

The surrender came after the commander of the troops saw that there was nothing else to do. The American prisoners taken in the Philippine Islands were captured under entirely different circumstances from those obtaining with respect to prisoners captured in other theaters. I am not opposed to the promotion of prisoners captured in other fields of battle; but I ask Senators to consider what the boys in the Philippines, Guam, and Wake went through, and the defense which they made.

Guam, which has only recently been retaken by American forces, was defended by 300 marines. Were they not fighting under different circumstances from those surrounding men who became lost from their divisions in Tunisia, Africa, Italy, and France, and who surrendered because they were surrounded by a platoon of German soldiers? What about the boys at Guam and Wake? They had no supplies. They were doing their duty under most trying circumstances. So I feel that their case is a little different.

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield.

Mr. GILLETTE. Reserving the right to object, I should like to ask the Senator a question. I am disturbed at the possible interpretation of the provision of the bill which calls for similar promotions each year thereafter, without any limitation. Is it the intention that these men are to be promoted every year from now on?

Mr. CHAVEZ. So long as they are prisoners of war.

Mr. GILLETTE. But there is no such limitation in the language of the bill. The bill simply provides that—

Similar promotions shall be made December 8, 1943, and December 8 in each year thereafter in the case of each person below the grades above specified on such dates, respectively.

There is no limitation providing that they must continue to be prisoners of war if the promotions are to be continued. The bill merely provides for similar promotions each year.

Mr. CHAVEZ. The intention of the framers of the bill—and I am sure the bill will be so interpreted, especially in view of the reports from the War Department and the Navy Department—is that such promotions shall continue only so long as the men are prisoners of war.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. The prisoners in the Philippines were taken under the most terrifying circumstances which have confronted any soldier in this war. They have been held prisoners of war under different circumstances than those which obtain with respect to prisoners of war in other theaters and areas. The men who were taken in the Philippines were not even permitted to receive medical supplies. They have not been permitted to receive Red Cross help. No food has been permitted to go to those men in the prison camps. That is not the fault of our Government. That is the way the enemy has treated the men who were taken in the first stages of this war. Senators all know something of what that treatment has been.

This measure, which my colleague has introduced, is the only expression this Government can make for the prisoners in question have been bound and tied in every other way—to these men in the Philippines and to their fathers and mothers, who are meeting here in Washington this very day, that their Government does recognize the services, the trials, the dangers, the hardships, and the terrors through which they have gone.

It is a small matter, to my mind, to give these men a slight promotion. I know of nothing else that we can do for them. It is merely in recognition of our appreciation of their sacrifices and of the gallant, brave stand they made on Bataan.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. CHAVEZ. Certainly; I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I agree with everything both Senators have said regarding the eligibility of these particular servicemen for particular and special consideration. The point I was raising related solely to the fact that the Navy Department says in its report that we are discriminating as between the very men to whom both Senators from New Mexico have referred. The bill does not include those who were taken prisoner in the Philippine Islands and whose service may have commenced after December 8, 1941. It includes only those known to be prisoners of war and excludes those who may be listed as missing but who actually are prisoners.

My inquiry goes simply to the point whether the able Senator has reached the objective he seeks to reach.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I am and have been so much interested from a moral, a governmental, and a human standpoint that I have considered the bill carefully, as I did at the time when it was drawn. I am satisfied that anyone within the scope of the bill, who was there at that particular time, will be taken care of. Of course, we cannot tell what interpretations may be made by various departments.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I did not hear the Senator's answer to the point raised by the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE]. Surely it is not intended that this annual promotion shall proceed without end, regardless of whether promotions are received by the other men in the service.

Mr. CHAVEZ. No; it was not my intention to have the bill drawn in such a way that they would continue to receive promotions every year, regardless of whether they are prisoners.

Mr. GILLETTE and Mr. HATCH addressed the Chair.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator yield, and if so, to whom?

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me? If he does, I will defer to the Senator from Iowa, because he is ready to make that point clear, I am sure.

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, I shall object to further consideration of the bill unless the Senator will agree to clarify that language.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I will gladly agree, because that is the intention.

Mr. GILLETTE. I understand that there is before the Senator certain language which, if adopted, will clarify the situation.

Mr. CHAVEZ. The suggested amendment of the Senator from Iowa is on page 2.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Before the consideration of amendments, the question is on present consideration of the bill. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1374) to provide for promotion of certain American prisoners of war.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I offer the following amendment: On page 2, in line 3, after the word "respectively", insert a comma and the words "as long as such imprisonment continues."

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from New Mexico.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I desire to say that I favor the measure, but I think some provision should be made for officers who are in German prison camps. While I shall not embarrass the Senator by undertaking to draw such an amendment so hurriedly at this time, I should like to offer a similar measure later on, to cover officers and men who are incarcerated in German prisons. In most cases those men have undergone actual combat. Many of them have been wounded. Many of them flew over Germany in very hazardous adventures, and had to make forced landings, and were captured. So if any are to be covered, I think all officers and men who received similar treatment and are in a similar situation should be covered.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Texas offer an amendment?

Mr. CONNALLY. I do not, because I have not had time to prepare one properly at this moment.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I assure the Senator that I agree with everything he has said; and I, for one, will go along with him.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. I merely wish to commend the Senator from New Mexico, because a large number of R. O. T. C. officers and other reserve officers, as well as many others from my State, are in the category of which the Senator has spoken. I certainly hope the bill will pass.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill, S. 1374, was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That effective December 8, 1942, each officer of the Army, Navy (including the Coast Guard), or Marine Corps below the grade of colonel or corresponding grade in the other services, and each warrant officer and enlisted man below the grade of master sergeant or corresponding grade in the other services, who was serving in the Philippine Islands or on Wake or Guam on December 8, 1941, and who is now a prisoner of war, shall be advanced one grade from the grade he held on that date; and similar promotions shall be made December 8, 1943, and December 8 in each year thereafter in the case of each person below the grades above specified on such dates, respectively, as long as such imprisonment continues: *Provided*, That nothing in this act shall be construed to reduce the grade or pay of any person promoted between December 8, 1941, and the date of his capture.

SEC. 2. Each of the persons specified in section 1 who, by reason of the character of his service, such as aviation personnel, persons serving on submarine duty, and the like, received special pay, shall continue to receive such pay during the time he is a prisoner of war notwithstanding the fact that by reason of his status he is unable to engage in the service qualifying him for such additional pay.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Illinois for his patience.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield to me for a moment?

Mr. BROOKS. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. I wish to make a brief statement for the information of Senators with regard to the legislative situation, so that they may govern themselves accordingly.

Two important measures are now in conference. On both of them progress is being made, but it is not likely that they will be ready for action on the part of the Senate before Tuesday or perhaps Wednesday of next week, depending on the further progress made in conference.

In the meantime, there are measures on the calendar which various Members desire to have considered, and during the consideration of which it will be necessary not only to have a quorum of the Senate present, but, in my judgment, to have as full an attendance as possible. Therefore, I hope that all Senators who are here will remain here. We have taken steps to recall other Senators who are necessarily, unavoidably away, so that during next week we may have, not simply a bare quorum, but as full an attendance as possible, so that we may dispose of the business which will be brought forward as expeditiously as possible.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator from Illinois has the floor, but I am sure he will yield.

Mr. BROOKS. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. Will the Senator from Kentucky indicate to us what are the particular pieces of legislation to which he has referred?

Mr. BARKLEY. At the moment I am not able to do so. I contemplate that a recess will be taken until Tuesday. In the meantime, conferences will be in progress with Members interested in the measures and with the Senator from Maine, so that we may be able to have some definite information on Tuesday.

Mr. REED and Mr. VANDENBERG addressed the Chair.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. BROOKS. I yield first to the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. REED. I may say to the Senator from Maine that, as one of those who are taking an active part in connection with highway legislation, for the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, the committee has reported a highway bill which is now on the calendar. I hope that bill will be taken up.

Mr. BARKLEY. I may say that it is contemplated that action will be undertaken to be had on it at a very early date.

Mr. REED. I merely made that statement for the information of the Senator from Maine.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield to me?

Mr. BROOKS. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. It occurs to me that it is hardly fair to ask Senators to return, to act on legislation which will require House action in order to complete it, because all the information which comes to me very definitely indicates that there will very probably not be a House quorum present for some time.

Mr. BARKLEY. Of course, Mr. President, the Senate has to be responsible for its own actions; and even legislation which cannot pass the House immediately will be at least half way over the hurdle if it gets through the Senate.

At any rate, it is necessary that we have as large an attendance as possible during next week, because of matters which are pending and which will be brought up regardless of what the House may do. It may be that some of the bills are House bills. If some of them are not House bills, and if we are ready to consider them, they should be considered before we make our exodus, if one we are to make, between now and the great event to which we all look forward.

AMERICAN POST-WAR RUBBER PRODUCTION

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. President, the lessons of war are many times tragic and always costly. No one ever realizes this as much as the men who face the cruel test of combat, and pay with their flesh, their blood, and some with their lives.

Our casualty list is already more than 300,000, and no one can predict how many more of the flower of American youth will be offered upon the altar of war before the despicable despots of the world are finally subdued.

Several days ago I spoke of the tragic lesson of the potential possibilities of air power—how our leadership had failed to realize its terror, and how now, with the combined brain and brawn of a free nation, we have developed one-third of the air power of the entire world but have thus far failed to protect our future rights in air bases throughout the world.

Today I wish to speak of another all-important lesson that was brought so forcibly to our attention—a lesson which could and would have been fatal except for American ingenuity, inventive genius, and productive capacity of our free people.

When we were so suddenly blasted and blown into this war by the sinking and destruction of our Pacific Fleet and air power at Pearl Harbor, we were not only cut off from our gallant Army in the Philippines, but we were cut off from the vitally important raw rubber supply with the subsequent fall of British and Dutch possessions in the distant Pacific.

Although the problem of substitute rubber was absolute and apparent, its solution was bungled and delayed for months. In fact, it was not until the Senate took action that it was given the attention that it deserved in our tragic situation.

On July 22, 1942, the Senate, taking the situation in hand, passed a bill to create a new agency to produce synthetic rubber from grain alcohol, leaving the War Production Board to continue to wrestle with the conflicting views of diverse interests which had various plans to make synthetic rubber from petroleum.

The bill was passed over the protests of administration leaders, but it brought action. On August 6, 1942, the President appointed a Special Inquiry Committee, headed by Mr. B. M. Baruch, to make a survey and report its findings. The danger was so real that in 4 days the report was finished and sent to Congress containing the following language:

> We find the existing situation to be so dangerous that unless corrective measures are taken immediately this country will face both a military and civilian collapse.

Finally a program was instituted for making synthetic rubber which has helped save humanity in war, and if we are wise, it will make us safe and self-sufficient in regard to our rubber requirements for all time to come.

The Nation, as well as all of our allies in this war, owes a debt of gratitude to both William M. Jeffers and his successor, Col. Bradley Dewey, for their great contribution while directing our national effort in producing synthetic rubber. Their work is done. The agency is to be dissolved and its future direction turned back to the War Production Board under its New Deal post-war planner, Mr. J. A. Krug.

Just as the development of this gigantic life-saving rubber program was of vital importance to every man, woman, and child in America, its future is equally important to all of us.

In the first place, 95 percent of all the synthetic rubber plants in this country were built with public funds amounting to more than $700,000,000. This will be a part of our $300,000,000,000 debt, a part of which will hang heavily upon the shoulders of every living American during his entire lifetime. The plants are public property, and they should be preserved and improved for the permanent benefit of the American people.

The final report of Director Bradley Dewey, a distinguished colonel in the Chemical Warfare Service in World War No. 1, is a remarkable document. It comes from a man rich in experience and activity in defending his country through two wars. In speaking of the future of these plants he stated:

> It is hoped that enough will be operated so as to protect this Nation against the danger of ever again being cut off from supplies of rubber. The economy of this country is geared to rubber—civilian transportation rolls on rubber, armies smash to victory on rubber, airplanes must have it, and surprisingly, ships and Navy equipment consume a large tonnage. Without the synthetic rubber now being produced in adequate supply the war effort and victory would not be possible.

I wish particularly to emphasize the following statement made by Col. Bradley Dewey:

I believe the post-war world demand will be so large that there will be need for all the crude rubber present plantations can turn out and also the production of the low-cost producers of the synthetic-rubber program—from 400,000 to 600,000 tons. There should be no duties or subsidies or international agreements. This country is today independent for its supplies of rubber of other nations, of the effect of wars between other nations, or the destruction of plantations by plant blights. It must so remain.

Mr. President, those are the words of a genuine American. I regret that the future destiny of this gigantic rubber program cannot be left in such competent and understanding hands.

It was my pleasure to vote in the Senate in 1942, for the bill which resulted in the appointment of the Baruch committee. It has been my honor to serve on the Senate Committee on Appropriations during the time vast public sums were appropriated for the all-important rubber program. I speak today to reinforce the parting words of Colonel Dewey in his timely and patriotic admonition that this Nation is now and should be forever independent in its vital supply of rubber.

In two wars we have had unfortunate experiences concerning rubber as well as being forced to pay unreasonbly high prices for rubber in peacetime because we were always at the mercy of foreign rubber control.

During the last war, although we were allies in arms, our people not only paid high prices for Dutch and British rubber but we were put to considerable inconvenience because of the complete control by Great Britain of the principal world source of rubber. After the First World War we in America consumed 75 percent of all the rubber produced in the world. When raw rubber prices declined in 1920, under the brilliant leadership of their then colonial secretary, Hon. Winston Churchill, the British rubber growers sought to have effected a restriction act to curtail and control the production of rubber and thus increase the cost to us. An act known as the Stevenson Restriction Act was approved November 1, 1922. The price of rubber went up, and it is estimated by competent authorities that the people of the United States paid approximately $1,250,000,000 more for their rubber in the 6 years which followed because of this restriction act which formally ended on November 1, 1928.

Mr. President, I do not mention this remarkable bit of interesting history to speak disparagingly of Winston Churchill. I admire him greatly. I only want someone to represent and defend the interests of our people as ably as he has always represented and defended the interests of his people.

Every man, woman, and child in America has a vivid memory of the danger that confronted us in this war because of our continued reliance upon a distant foreign supply of rubber. Their present daily inconveniences are constant reminders of this folly.

Today we no longer need to rely upon any foreign supply of this important product that means so much in our individual and national daily life. If we have any regard or respect for the sacrifices of our gallant sons and daughters who have fought, bled, and died for our security and our strength, we will never again lose this independence.

This new American industry born out of the tragedies of war has already cost the American people three-fourths of a billion dollars. It will accomplish its wartime purpose. It has saved America and her allies from a rubber starvation which was threatened by the Japanese capture of plantations which produced 90 percent of the world's prewar supply.

We are approaching the end of the war, and a few have questioned the peacetime future of this new industry. There is much talk about future peace being controlled by cartels, trade agreements, international regulation of production and consumption. Agreements have already been signed by the United States for the control of wheat, coffee, and oil, and there are suggestions that it should be extended to other commodities and manufactured goods including rubber. Suggestions have been made that we scrap our synthetic rubber plants and return the rubber commerce to its pre-war status. This pressure must be resisted.

There are among us global do-gooders who would surrender America's synthetic rubber industry. They are the advocates of an international W. P. A. to be financed by Uncle Sam. Their theory was epitomized by Vice President HENRY WALLACE, a recent White House guest, when he advocated a quart of milk a day for all the underprivileged races in the world.

The crackpot theory is that America should wreck its synthetic rubber industry for the benefit of European empires whose plantations in the Southwest Pacific are being cleared of Japanese at the dreadful cost of American lives today. They argue that America must return to the importation of rubber so that the South Pacific native jungle workers can get American dollars to buy American exports.

This is a false argument. The jungle rubber workers never prospered. Many of these plantations were developed and worked with indentured labor imported from India and China and paid as little as 14 cents a day.

These international manipulators would destroy America's newest home industry to revive the pre-war British-Dutch cartel which controlled rubber prices for years with the connivance of the Empire governments. This connivance reached its height, and America was the main victim of these artificial prices when we consumed 75 percent of the world's output of raw rubber.

This new synthetic rubber industry can be one of the most important post-war business in this country. We have the unquestioned authoritative opinion of Col. Bradley Dewey that the synthetic product can compete in price and quality with the natural product in the future.

An even larger contribution to America's post-war economy will develop indirectly from this new industry. With domestic prices stabilized and protected from foreign manipulation, there will be an expansion in the manufacture of rubber goods. The value of these goods in pre-war years approximated a billion dollars a year. Estimates of the reasonably anticipated expansion range from 50 to 100 percent over the pre-war level.

With this new synthetic industry in operation, the American people will enjoy new, cheaper, and even better rubber goods. This applies to tires, upholstering, flooring, tableware, shoe soles, insulation, and a myriad of familiar articles. Some of these articles are made of rubber now, and some will be made of rubber for the first time because the manufacturer will be assured of a stable cost for his raw material and because the raw material, synthetic, will be better than natural rubber for many uses.

These advantages, so dearly paid for, must never be surrendered or sacrificed at the importunity of alien interests. From a military standpoint alone, they must be preserved, for America must never again base her defense upon rubber plantations 8,000 miles overseas.

There have been suggestions that we should halt or curtail production of synthetic rubber after the war but keep the plants in stand-by condition as part of our Military Establishment for emergency wartime operations. We have the testimony of Col. Bradley Dewey that deterioration in idleness would be excessive. The public's ownership of $700,000,000 worth of idle manufacturing facilities would be a further drain upon a staggering Public Treasury, whereas in operation they would constitute a benefit to our entire American economy.

In idleness, these costly plants would not protect the American public from prices formerly fixed abroad for our rubber imports. The production of rubber goods could not be expected to expand, and the supplies of raw material for synthetic rubber would lose this essential market.

The principal raw materials for synthetic rubber are petroleum, natural gas, and alcohol. Alcohol, now being consumed for synthetic rubber at a rate of a million gallons a day, is a farm product. American farmers have performed heroic service to their country in this global war, and any new use for farm products to protect them against their post-war problems should be guarded jealously by all Americans. The synthetic manufacture of rubber from petroleum and natural gas is a part of a new diversified chemical industry based upon these American raw materials.

For the future military and economic strength of America; to protect the $700,000,000 investment of American taxpayers; to give American consumers cheaper and better rubber goods; to promote jobs in America for Americans, let us for once stand on our rights and tell the world

that we are going to continue to make our own rubber.

Mr. President, American sons and daughters are serving, suffering, sacrificing, and dying farther from home than any other people in the world. They are willing to die, if necessary, to keep America secure and strong; but they look to us, their Representatives in Congress, to preserve their security and strength at home. They will not fail us and, Mr. President, we must not fail them.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, in connection with the address made by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS] regarding the synthetic rubber situation, I wish to say simply that I, myself, do not know of any responsible officer of the United States who favors the scrapping of the synthetic rubber industry. There may be such a person, but I do not know who he is, and I have seen no statement from any responsible officers of the United States indicating such a position.

Furthermore, I think it ought to be stated that the mere fact that Vice President WALLACE on one occasion in a speech expressed the hope that some time the world economic situation might be so developed as to guarantee to every child in the world a bottle of milk a day, would have nothing to do with the synthetic rubber situation unless it might have some vague connection with rubber nipples put on the bottles so that the children might consume the milk which he hopes they may all have.

Furthermore, I think the Senator from Illinois ought to recall, as we all do, that in both bills now pending in Congress dealing with the disposal of surplus Government property there is a provision that the synthetic rubber plants shall not be disposed of except after a declaration of policy on the part of the Congress. So we have it in our control to determine what shall be done with the synthetic rubber industry which we have built up during the course of the war.

I certainly do not favor by any stretch of the imagination scrapping the synthetic rubber industry, and I repeat that I do not know of any responsible agency or person within the Government of the United States who does believe in such a plan.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I wish to say that the provisions contained in the bills dealing with the disposal of surplus Government property—to wit, that the synthetic rubber plants shall not be disposed of and shall not be scrapped in any way—are entirely in line with and in conformity with the recommendation of Mr. Bernard Baruch, who, as will be recalled, made the study for the administration and submitted the report concerning the disposition of surplus property and reconversion.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. President, I am very happy to have this authoritative assurance that that is going to be our continued attitude. The difficulty, as I have found it, has been that many things are done and agreements are signed before we know about them, and I wanted to enter my protest against such a procedure. From the remarks of the distinguished majority leader I am sure that we will have his wholehearted support, so far as he is concerned, in assuring the country that these plants will not be scrapped and that so far as the rubber industry is concerned we will be secure and independent.

THE WASHINGTON, D. C., SEDITION TRIAL

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I rise to discuss the so-called sedition trial which is now taking place here in the city of Washington.

In time of war every precaution should be taken to protect the armed forces, their dependents, the citizens of the United States, and the country itself, and I applaud the efforts of officials when they do this, but also in time of war extraordinary precautions should be taken that innocent people should not be deprived of their constitutional rights.

Certainly, in this war the Attorney General, Mr. Biddle, has not gone witch hunting, and just as certainly his record, when compared to that of A. Mitchell Palmer, the Attorney General in World War No. 1, is most commendable. It is that very fact, Mr. President, which makes the action of the Attorney General in the so-called sedition cases all the more inexplicable. I realize that a Senator who takes up the cudgels in behalf of these people on trial is instantly met with the report of the subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary, that the courts are handling this matter and that the legislative branch of the Government should not interfere with the judicial branch.

Indeed the report of the subcommittee states nothing should be done until after the courts are through with this matter, but, Mr. President, with that conclusion I disagree. Certainly, it would be the duty of the Congress, as the legislative branch representing the people, to protest if the President, as the Executive head, was infringing upon the rights of the people—in fact, Congress has often done so; and likewise I believe it is the duty of the Congress, as the representative of the people, to bring to the attention of the country any flagrant cases in which the rights of the people in the courts are jeopardized.

So, Mr. President, whether I am right or whether I am wrong, as long as I believe I am right I shall never shirk what I conceive to be my duty in fighting to preserve the rights of any man or woman, regardless of race, color, or creed, whether rich or poor.

Mr. President, I have always been one of those in public life who believe that the rank and file of the people can be trusted. I do not believe in secrecy and star-chamber proceedings on the part of those elected to serve the people of this country. I do not believe, for example, that the O. P. A. should have the right to sue a farmer or an implement dealer and have the Office of Price Administration as the prosecutor, the judge, and the jury. I believe, on the contrary, that every man should have his day in court, and have it openly, and honestly; and if the defendant is without means, the court should give him proper paid representation. Mr. President, the people of my State believe that. They abhor railroading anyone to the penitentiary. They abhor even the appearance of it.

They want the rights of the defendant as well protected as the rights of the State which is prosecuting him. I say this from my experience as county attorney and one who for two terms held the office of attorney general. I say it as one who has been in court frequently, not only as an attorney, but as a litigant and as a defendant in civil and criminal cases.

The prosecution in its opening statement in the present trial claimed that these defendants were part of a world-wide conspiracy, that their intent was to overthrow democracy throughout the world, and that they had underground armies. We were given to understand, with much fanfare, including press, screen, and radio publicity, that civilization was hanging by a hair until these defendants were brought from the four corners of the Nation and put on trial here in Washington.

Who are these 30 allegedly world-shaking defendants, most of whom have been indicted 3 times—1942, 1943, and 1944—on similar conspiracy charges and brought to trial only April 17 of this year? The public has been led to believe that they are powerful, and that some of them are very wealthy. What is the truth, the cold, stark naked truth, as to who these 30 defendants are?

One of them is Elmer J. Garner, a little old gentleman of 83, almost stone deaf, with 3 great grandchildren. After he lost the mailing permit for his little weekly paper, he lived with his aged wife through small donations, keeping a goat and a few chickens and raising vegetables on his small home plot. Held in the District jail for several weeks for lack of bond fees, and finally impoverished by 3 indictments and forced trips and stays in Washington, he died alone in a Washington rooming house early in this trial with 40 cents in his pocket. His body was shipped naked in a wooden box to his ailing, impoverished widow, his 2 suits and typewriter being held, so that clothing had to be purchased for his funeral. That is one of the dangerous men about whom we have been hearing so much.

Another frail, aged defendant, James True, who has been too ill since 1940 to write or work at anything, was severed from the trial when he became too ill to get to court.

Another defendant, David Baxter, a sign painter who wrote a little, was indicted at least twice with most of the other defendants and was kept in the District jail for lack of funds. After many weeks of the present trial, his case was severed because he was unable to hear anything that went on at the trial, since he was 80-percent deaf. Small contributions eked out by unpaid court-appointed attorneys and other defendants barely kept him and his wife and their two small children alive in a Washington slum until he could get back to his little California sign-painting shop.

Another defendant, Prescott Freese Dennett, had served his country honorably and is still a private in the United

States Army. He has not been disciplined nor discharged by the Army, but was taken from the Walter Reed Hospital, where he was undergoing treatment, when the trial started, and was deprived of Army support and forbidden to wear his Army uniform to court.

Another, Ernest F. Elmhurst, had been a waiter in New York hotels and wrote a book. He has been working nights in Washington hotels while on trial, and has been followed up and caused to lose these jobs because of being a defendant.

Another, Garland L. Alderman, a young man whose wife and child are being supported by relatives, was chairman of a Michigan America First Committee chapter. He has been working nights here while on trial, since April 17.

Another, William Robert Lyman, Jr., has a brother in service who was recently cited for bravery. He has worked at one odd job or another and peddled literature. He was working as a seaman in the United States merchant marine, transporting supplies to England in 1942. While in England he read about his first indictment and immediately returned to America and went to the Department of Justice and gave himself up. He was kept in the District jail for 5 weeks for lack of bond money. He now ekes out a bare living while on trial here.

Another, E. J. Parker Sage, has been a Detroit factory worker. He lost his night job in Washington when it became known that he was a defendant in this trial.

Another, Charles B. Hudson, formerly issued a small home-mimeographed bulletin. His wife kept roomers, and for several years he was unable to get his teeth fixed because of lack of money. One of the defendants who has been dragged here, one of those who, it is said, are so powerful that they are going to overthrow democracy in this country, one of those who have underground armies in the United States, for several years was unable to have his teeth fixed because he did not have money enough to pay the dentist. His wife kept roomers. He lost his old car, and when this trial started, they had to break up their home and put their furniture in storage. They live in one room here in a rooming house, sleeping on one three-quarter size bed.

One frail, aged defendant, Robert E. Edmondson, has been unable to work at anything since 1940. His money is gone. He and his wife depend upon small donations. Mr. President, they depend upon charity.

Another, Peter Stahrenberg, formerly a small printer, shares a cheap room here with another defendant and works nights at odd jobs for a living.

Another, Lawrence Dennis, is a man of moderate means and a former member of the United States Consular Service. He is defending himself as his own attorney and rooms here with his wife and two small daughters.

Another, George Deatherage, is an industrial efficiency engineer with a son fighting in the service.

Another defendant, Howard V. Broenstrupp, whose specialty is eccentric occultism, has been under treatment at a veterans' hospital for undernourishment.

One woman defendant, Lois de Lafayette Washburn, was working at housework when indicted and arrested. Two or three of the defendants had large imaginations and little paper organizations composed of themselves and very few, if any, others. Several of the defendants have sons in active service.

Another defendant, Col. Eugene Nelson Sanctuary, is an aged gentleman who served in World War No. 1, and received high military praise. He has written many hymns and has conducted Bible classes. As a result of the three indictments and the shock of his being kidnapped during his wife's absence from their apartment, and held in jail for weeks until he could make bond, his wife has had two strokes, and they are impoverished, spending their last few dollars saved for their old age.

One of the defendants, Robert Noble, recently severed from the trial—although he was convicted in California and is now serving time—so if he committed any crime, he is now being punished, has a son in active service in the Navy of this country.

Eight of the defendants are in custody as political prisoners or, as some claim, at least, for being German born. One of them in March of this year lost a son fighting under the American flag in Italy, and has another son now serving in north Africa.

Another defendant is a Christian minister, Mr. Gerald B. Winrod, and he also has a son in the armed services.

The son of the other woman defendant, Mr. President, who is Mrs. Elizabeth Dilling, graduated on March 4 from officer candidate school, but a few hours before graduation his commission was withheld, allegedly, although I do not state it as a fact, because his mother is a defendant in this trial. Her writings have been recommended by the Army and Navy Register, the American Legion's National Americanization Commission, the National Sojourners, and other similar organizations.

One defendant has made 11 trips from Chicago to Washington in connection with arraignments, hearings, and trial on these indictments.

Mr. President, out of all 29 of the defendants, only two have paid attorneys. Two of the defendants managed to raise bare living expenses for their attorneys, aided by contributions. Two defendants are acting as their own lawyers. The other defendants being paupers are represented by unpaid, court-appointed lawyers.

Would it not seem that these unpaid, court-appointed attorneys have sacrificed enough through loss of practice and income in the interest of justice, by having already served for 5 months for nothing in these trials? Is it not also time to let the defendants go back to their homes and work, after being held under indictment for over 2 years, undergoing the constant hardship of raising bond, fees, and expenses to go to and stay in Washington?

How many underground armies, fleets, or battleships, Mr. President, do you or does any other fair-minded American citizen think these defendants are capable of maintaining? Take for example the old gentleman who died, partially from starvation, with 40 cents in his pockets.

Therefore, Mr. President, when I have received from North Dakota letters relative to the sedition cases which are now pending in Washington, I have been impressed by the fact that the people of my State and, I believe, of the entire country do not believe that the defendants in the sedition cases are receiving a square deal.

I wish to read a typical letter which I received from Mrs. H. L. Shelley, of Watford City, N. Dak. She is a fine, splendid, patriotic lady, one whose life has been without blemish, a lady of splendid character, a lady of outstanding reputation, an honest, God-fearing advocate of what she believes to be right. She sent me the following typical letter:

WATFORD CITY, N. DAK., *July 27, 1944.*

DEAR MR. LANGER: Am enclosing a letter which is self-explanatory. I do not need to tell you of the ruthless persecution of innocent subjects which is going on in Washington. Please read the enclosed letter carefully. It may throw a new light on the situation.

Knowing how you yourself have suffered from similar persecutions and believing you still have your old fighting spirit left, I am appealing to you to do all that you can to stop these unjust suits. We are coming in on both ends of the expense (though that is the minor part—against seeing the innocent used so unjustly). We pay our taxes to help prosecute them, and donate money to the helpless ones who are unable to finance their own defense, which runs into big money when they are dragged up time after time. Personally I'm getting tired of it and I think it is high time there was a lasting muzzle put on some of these birds.

When you were in trouble we did all we could to help you, and only a few months ago one of our leading commentators "took your name in vain." You may be sure he got told off—and on a post card, too, so all could see you still had one friend. Now I'm depending on you to help these unfortunates.

Yours for a better America,

MRS. H. L. SHELLEY.

In connection with that letter, in which Mrs. Shelley mentioned the expense, I need only call to the attention of the Members of this body the fact that various newspapers have said that the cost to our taxpayers of prosecuting those defendants, whose condition I have described, will be between one-half a million dollars and three-quarters of a million dollars.

Mr. President, until a few days ago I did not know any of these defendants. Then I chanced to meet some of them who came to see me in my office. One of them, a Mr. Noble, wrote me from prison, and I helped secure a lawyer for him, and the lawyer succeeded in having his case dismissed.

Until day before yesterday I had never met Mr. Viereck or Mr. Jones or Mrs. Dilling or any of the other defendants whose names we see in the newspapers so much. Incidentally, let me say that Mr. Jones, who is from California, is now

an old man, but for 10 years was editor of Life magazine.

As I just said, I had not seen any of the other defendants, except for the three or four I have mentioned. But as a member of the Committee on the Judiciary, day before yesterday I conceived it to be my duty actually to attend a session of the court where these men and women are being tried.

Mr. President, I frankly confess that I went into that courtroom prejudiced in favor of the defendants. I was prejudiced by reason of an editorial which appeared in the Washington Post. Mr. Eugene Meyer, the editor and publisher of the Washington Post, is a very prominent citizen of Washington. His wife, Mrs. Agnes Meyer, is one of the outstanding women of America, and in many instances she has rendered splendid service to the people of this country. As I have said, I was prejudiced by reason of the fact that the Washington Post, which Mr. Meyer owns, and which assisted in originating the so-called sedition cases, on July 16, published an editorial which reads as follows:

MASS TRIAL

The severance of 3 cases from Washington's mass sedition trial is the best news that has come out of this dreary affair in Judge Eicher's court. It clearly suggests belated recognition of the mistake that was made in bringing 30 individuals of widely varying temperaments and backgrounds to trial at the same time and place for a series of alleged offenses classified as sedition.

One defendant recently died. Another is too ill to attend court sessions regularly. A third found it difficult to follow the proceedings because of limited hearing. A fourth proved to be so obstreperous as seriously to interfere with the progress of the trial. In other words, the exigencies of human life are such as to defeat most any attempt to dispose of complicated criminal charges en masse with both fairness and dispatch. It is a pity that the Department of Justice did not foresee this objection to mass trials before embarking on such an adventure.

The fact that 4 cases have been eliminated from the trial is overshadowed, therefore, by the larger fact that 26 cases remain before the court. We hope that better progress can now be made, but no end of even the presentation of evidence by the prosecution is in sight after 13 weeks. How can the jurymen be expected to remember testimony given many weeks before their verdict will be rendered? How can they, in these circumstances, distinguish the varying degrees of guilt, if any, among the 26 remaining defendants? We fear that whatever may be the outcome of this trial it will stand as a black mark against American justice for many years to come.

On July 28, 1944, the Washington Post carried another editorial on the same subject. I again invite attention of the Senate to the fact that the Washington Post helped gather the evidence which is being used at the trial. The Washington Post helped originate the sedition cases. I now read what it said in an editorial on July 28, 1944, entitled "Courtroom Farce":

For weeks Washington has been aware of the farcical nature of the sedition trial that is droning on from one weary session to another in Justice Eicher's court. Everyone who reads the newspapers knows that the trial has been characterized by obstruction, unruly conduct on the part of some of the defendants, unreasonable delays, prolongation of the testimony and cross-examination, and laxity of control or direction. If there were any lingering doubts as to the farcical nature of the trial, they must have been removed by James E. Chinn's factual account of the proceedings on the "third day of the fifteenth week" in the Post yesterday.

Justice Eicher has undoubtedly tried to make the best of a bad situation. He has attempted to prevent the trial from being turned into a comedy of errors; he has tried to keep it moving toward a conclusion. But the very nature of the case has thwarted his efforts. Mass trials may possibly be successful where the issues are simple and the testimony is brief—or where the Russian technique of condemning the defendants first and putting on a trial for show is used. But where the issues are complicated and defendants who have not been browbeaten stand on their democratic rights, a trial involving more than two dozen individuals is almost certain to be a fizzle.

We think the time has come to recognize the unlikelihood of securing any fair approximation to justice from this unhappy experiment. The end of the Government's testimony is nowhere in sight. Prosecutors have 4,000 exhibits to offer in evidence and only about one-eighth of them are in the record at present.

I digress for a moment in order to say that Mr. Meyer has far, far understated the number of exhibits, because when I was in the courtroom day before yesterday the prosecutor offered Government's exhibit 4,121, and I understand the trial yet has many weeks to go.

I continue reading the editorial:

Prosecutors have 4,000 exhibits to offer in evidence and only about one-eighth of them are in the record at present. That will make 3,200 altogether. Then each of the 26 defendants will have to present his case. At its present rate of progress, therefore, the trial may run on for several years after the war is over.

Mr. President, I do not say that. That is said in the editorial of the Washington Post, the newspaper which sent Mr. Stokes, one of its employees, to dig up the evidence; the newspaper which helped originate the trial.

The editorial continues:

Meanwhile it is gravely undermining confidence in American justice.

Apparently it would be impossible now to end this sorry spectacle and try the individual defendants separately. But the court could probably sever additional cases and insist that the testimony be stripped down to essentials. After all, this is a trial of men and women accused of sedition, not a contest in befuddlement. In our opinion the trial can continue its present course only at the cost of serious impairment of our judicial system and the reputations of those responsible for this travesty.

Here we see America at its best. We see Eugene Meyer, editor and publisher of the Washington Post, after he has decided that the defendants whom he himself helped to have arrested are not getting a square deal, frankly saying so in his newspaper.

Mr. President, I invite the attention of the Senate to an article in America's oldest weekly publication, the Pathfinder. The article is an indication of what the American people think of the pending sedition trial. I understand that the Pathfinder has a circulation of nearly a million. The article to which I refer appeared in the issue of July 24, 1944. I wonder, Mr. President, what the nearly a million persons who are subscribers to the Pathfinder thought when they read the editorial entitled "Three Months in a Brawlroom," which, as I have said, was published in the Pathfinder of July 24, 1944. The article is as follows:

Last week, while Washington's million war workers panted through the third week of a heat wave, three other people were legally kicked out of an air-conditioned court chamber to sweat with them. Their discharge, for trial at some unnamed date in the future, lowered to 26 the motley company of German aliens, professional rabblerousers, and weirdly prejudiced citizens who have argued and jeered through 14 weeks in the cool, green chamber of Criminal Division No. 1 in the United States District Court Building.

They have been in the same room since April 17 and, from all indications, will still be there at snowfly. One of the original company of 30 is, gratefully, dead. The others, strange cats in the garret of United States jurisprudence, continue to cuss the court, the Federal authorities, one another, and, occasionally, themselves.

This is the unhappy spectacle of the so-called sedition trial, the largest trial for a crime of this nature in American history. Most of the 29 defendants, grouped together in a large enclosure at the center of the courtroom, object strenuously to being tried with their codefendants. The crime charged against them is conspiracy to cause insubordination in the armed forces, largely by printed material. They did not all join in one publication. They did not separately do identical or even similar acts. Several of them have carried on campaigns of anti-Semitism for the past 10 or 12 years. Others are ex-leaders of the bund and similar tub-thumping, pro-Nazi organizations of the 1930's.

Ten of the original 30 are in jail already for seditious offenses. Some are infamous, some have no past criminal record; some are mentally unbalanced.

I ask any Senator upon this floor how he would like to have his brother or his sister or his son or daughter tried with 28 other defendants, some of them mentally unbalanced.

Several defendants have voted for separate trials on the ground that a chosen few of their codefendants are insane. One defendant failed to appear when the trial was set, and explained it by charging that the New Deal interfered with his mail notice of the date.

About half of the defendants are represented by attorneys appointed by the court, who receive no compensation. More than 3,000 pages of record had been amassed by court reports before any evidence was offered in the trial.

I wish to repeat that statement. This is what the Pathfinder says:

More than 3,000 pages of record had been amassed by court reports before any evidence was offered in the trial. For a defendant to obtain a copy of this record would cost $1,200.

So, Mr. President, I may digress for a moment to say, we find that honest men and women, some of them with sons fighting for this Government, are brought into court and before one word of testimony is offered, if they want to get a copy of what has transpired up to that time, they must pay $1,200. I ask you, Mr. President, if that be justice, if it is in accordance with the rights guaranteed to the defendants by the Constitution of the United States.

The article in this usually reliable weekly newspaper, the oldest weekly in America, the Pathfinder, goes on to say:

Such a copy of the record is a substantial aid to the defense. The prosecuting attorney has a copy.

In other words, Mr. President, to digress once more, the taxpayers pay $1,200 to give the prosecution a copy, but if one of the defendants wants a copy of what has transpired he must pay $1,200.

The court ruled it had no power to supply defendants with free copies of the record.

The courtroom atmosphere, from the beginning, has been pandemonium. Rulings of the court have been met with cries of "unreasonable" and "unjust." In open court there has been booing, cheering, loud laughter, moans, and catcalls. To be heard, attorneys must shout. At times the voices of court and attorneys have been drowned in the uproar. The judge has been attacked as too biased to preside.

Four defense attorneys have been fined for contempt of court and other actions.

That is the picture. It offends good taste. It is a questionable experiment in United States trial procedure. For an opinion on the questions of jurisprudence and common rights involved in the trial, Pathfinder went to the famed legal authority Arthur Garfield Hays, director of the American Civil Liberties Union and erstwhile champion of the defendants in the Scopes, Sacco-Vanzetti, and Reichstag "fire" trials. Mr. Hays' statement, prepared exclusively for Pathfinder, follows in full.

Here it is:

In connection with the sedition conspiracy cases in Washington, the position of the American Civil Liberties Union, of which I am general counsel, has been set forth in a statement heretofore sent you.

In substance, that position is that the union reserves participation in the case until the issues are clear, which would come about in the event of conviction and appeal, this chiefly because it is understood that the Government claims that it has evidence involving the receipt by some of the defendants (prior to the entry of this country into the war) of funds from the German Government.

The union is interested in the case because it involves questions of free speech. We hope that the Government will be held to the test of the "clear and present danger" rule as laid down by Mr. Justice Holmes in the last war and in this, we refer to "clear and present danger" at the time of the acts or words of which complaint is made. The union regrets the Government's resort to the 1940 peacetime Sedition Act. It is our view that there should be no such law applicable in time of peace. Also, we object to trials of a number of people on conspiracy charges; we recognize that such methods savor of tyranny and are of great danger to defendants who may be innocent.

Mr. President, to digress from the article, I wish to quote no less an authority than William Howard Taft, former President of the United States and later Chief Justice. I have in my hand the recommendation made by the Chief Justice and the conference of senior circuit judges of the United States, which was adopted on June 9, 1925. Chief Justice Taft transmitted to the circuit judges and the district judges of the United States certain resolutions adopted by the conference for their guidance.

Among other things, here is what was said by the Chief Justice, a man who had been President of this country, a man who never, so far as I know, has been accused of being a radical or being disloyal to this great America of ours, and his statement was sent to every law-enforcement officer in the Department of Justice and to the Attorney General himself. The Chief Justice said:

Further, the rules of evidence in conspiracy cases make them most difficult to try without prejudice to an innocent defendant.

Mr. President, at the same time the Attorney General of this country under Calvin Coolidge was John Sargent, and in the reports of the Attorney General on pages 5 to 8 we find him referring to conspiracies, and he quotes Chief Justice Taft:

Further, the rules of evidence in conspiracy cases make them most difficult to try without prejudice to an innocent defendant.

Mr. President, the words of the former President and late Chief Justice of the United States should serve as a beacon light. The idea of bringing together for one trial in Washington 30 people who never saw each other, who never wrote to each other, some of whom did not know that the others existed, with some of them allegedly insane, and the majority of them unable to hire a lawyer. And remember, they were brought to Washington from California and Chicago and other States a long way from Washington, placed in one room and all tried at the same time, with the 29 sitting idly by while the testimony against one of them may go on for weeks and weeks and weeks, the testimony of a man or woman other defendants never saw before in their lives. That is what is taking place in Washington today. The article in the Pathfinder, the oldest weekly in America, continues:

While the above expresses the point of view of the A. C. L. U., I personally am unreservedly opposed to this prosecution in Washington. In the first place, and as of course, I object to the Smith Act which makes so-called seditious utterances a crime even in time of peace. No one can tell until the happening of subsequent events whether what he is saying will turn out to be seditious or not. It is clear to me that if we had not gone to war with Germany and Japan, these people would never have been prosecuted.

Secondly, I abhor the thought of people, most of them poor, being dragged from various parts of the country to face a serious trial far from home, on a charge of conspiracy to commit a crime with others, most of them complete strangers. In that trial they will be faced with responsibility not only for what they have done or said, but for what the others have done or said—of which they may have no knowledge. For that is what happens in conspiracy trials. Very often this is the very purpose of bringing this sort of an indictment.

I shall repeat that language, Mr. President, because of its tremendous importance:

In that trial they will be faced with responsibility not only for what they have done or said, but for what the others may have done or said—of which they may have no knowledge. For that is what happens in conspiracy trials.

Is that not what Chief Justice Taft said?

Very often this is the very purpose of bringing this sort of an indictment. If any of these people have violated the law, they should be charged with the substantive crime at the place where it was committed.

I am sure that the great jurist, Chief Justice Taft, had that in mind when he said what I have just quoted, at the time he called in the judges from all the circuits.

Mr. President, if a man robs a bank he is tried at the place where the robbery occurred, or at least in the State. If a man commits a murder in the State of Tennessee, he is tried in your State of Tennessee, Mr. President. He is tried before a jury of his peers. He is tried before a jury that knows the conditions existing in the State of Tennessee. But here, Mr. President, we find men and women brought 3,000 miles, some of them, to the city of Washington, where some of them have never been before in all their lives, brought here to the city of Washington where there is a large jury panel made up in many cases of men and women a majority of whom or relatives of whom are in the pay of the United States Government. Such individuals are placed upon a jury. I do not know whether any such are on the present jury or not, but, Mr. President, I condemn the system which permits fine, loyal Americans to be brought from California or Tennessee or North Dakota or any other State to be tried in the city of Washington, hundreds, if not thousands, of miles away from their homes.

The article in the Pathfinder continues:

Thirdly, the evidence will revolve largely about what these various people said during the period from the passage of the Smith Act until December 7, 1941. It is alleged in the indictment that as part of the conspiracy, various of the defendants said certain things; thus each defendant from the point of view of the jury will be connected not only with what he said, but, likewise, with what 29 other people said, * * * a sort of prosecution for speech once removed, or for someone else's speech, and this in spite of the first amendment that Congress shall pass no law abridging the freedom of speech.

Fourthly, I am particularly opposed to a situation where in time of war men are tried because of statements in time of peace. Those utterances may have meant quite different things in the setting of peacetime. Whatever may be the court's charge, it is impossible for any jury at the present time to fit these words into the background in which they were said.

Fifthly, the proceedings on the trial emphasize how difficult, if not impossible, it is to hold a fair trial in wartime in such a case.

I may digress once more, Mr. President, to say that of all the cities of the United States, none has a more dangerous wartime atmosphere for these defendants than the city of Washington, which is the wartime Capital, not only of this country but of the entire world.

The article in the Pathfinder continues:

If, as is claimed, some of the defendants are unsound mentally, their antics may well prejudice the jury against the others. Boos and catcalls during the opening statement of the prosecution, the giving of the Nazi salute by one of the defendants, the unseemly behavior of the lawyers for some of the defendants—all these things are prejudicial to

all of the defendants. It is all very well for a judge to charge a jury that no defendant is responsible for what another has done except in the course of the conspiracy, but everyone knows that when a thought once gets into the mind of a human being—even when he is, or particularly when he is on a jury—nothing on earth can get it out again. And it must be remembered that the views of all these people are properly distasteful to any American jury at the present time. Clarence Darrow used to say that a jury is apt to convict if it does not like the defendant.

From the viewpoint of public policy, it seems to me that no good purpose is served by a trial of this kind. The charge is that the acts of the defendants (chiefly words of the defendants) were likely to and were intended to incite disaffection in the armed forces. If we were actually afraid of those words spoken or written in 1941, we would hardly provide a public forum which would result in those words being read by millions of people. I am convinced that we are not much afraid of the effect of what the defendants said. We are moved by a desire to "get" people we don't like.

Finally, one cannot doubt that prosecutions of this kind have an unfavorable effect upon the free expression of opinion and upon untrammeled debate. The prosecution of a few people is comparatively unimportant. But the result is that thousands, perhaps millions of people, fear to express any critical point of view because of the intimidating effects of prosecutions of this kind.

The Government is 100 percent for the war, so are our educational institutions, and with few exceptions, so are the radio, the pulpit, and the newspapers. The Government should have sufficient confidence in the loyalty of our people not to fear dissent from the fractional proportion of crackpots who may at one time have had or even today may have, obnoxious views. The war itself "shut up" most of them, until the Government through this prosecution again opened their mouths.

After having said the above, I wish to express my appreciation of the commendable restraint shown by the Government in having brought so few cases seriously challenging freedom of speech, or of the press. This is particularly emphasized by comparison with the last war. In addition, I would like to add that the one thing that gives me faith that the Government has some substantial evidence against the defendants, or at least against some of them, is the fact that the prosecuting attorney is John Rogge. Yet, as I have stated, even if the Government has evidence along the lines suggested, a prosecution for seditious conspiracy, in my opinion, should never have been brought. If any of these men were paid by the German Government and failed to register, they should have been prosecuted for that crime. If any have incited to riot or to violence, or to a breach of the peace, or to any other violation of law, they should have been prosecuted for that crime. The answer might be that that wouldn't have made a "state" trial nor provided so good a show. The public always has an appetite for a Roman circus.

Yours truly,

ARTHUR GARFIELD HAYS.

Mr. President, the Washington Post, and the Pathfinder, have described this situation. The people of America can trust both of these newspapers because they are both located in Washington and are intimately acquainted with the facts and are strong enough and unafraid enough to tell the truth about these trials regardless of contemptible slurs, or disgusting sneers, or challenges against their patriotic integrity.

The attitude of these newspapers, and the letters which I have received from North Dakota and other places, including the letter which I received from Mrs. Shelley, are an inspiration.

Last week the distinguished senior Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON] when he eulogized the late Senator George Norris, stated that he had "dreamed a dream" which eventually became a realization with the actual building of the T. V. A. I am one of those who have always "dreamed a dream" that America should have the best judicial system of any country in this world, a judicial system under which any defendant, no matter how rich or how poor, no matter what his color, creed, or religion, whether in wartime, or peacetime, should be given a fair trial.

Mr. President, I agree with Eugene Meyer. I agree with the article in Pathfinder, that these defendants are not getting a fair trial. If any Senator thinks that any one of these defendants is getting a fair trial, I suggest that if his brother, sister, father, or mother were on trial under similar circumstances, he would be loud in his protest.

It is right to say that a person who has done wrong should be prosecuted, and it may be said that some of these defendants may have made ill-advised statements or writings of opinion; but I respectfully submit that if these were of a serious enough nature there is a proper way to try these men and women, and that is the good old-fashioned American way of bringing the person or persons to trial on the particular facts in his or her case and letting the jury pass upon those facts without being befuddled with the facts in 29 other cases tried at the same time.

I have been impressed with the fact that some of the outstanding lawyers in Washington are almost unanimous in their opinion of what they term a legal farce, or a perversion of justice. I believe, Mr. President, that the Attorney General of this country should dismiss these cases promptly. I believe he should personally walk into the court room and say to the Court:

Your Honor, originally complaint was made of the violation of the Federal Statutes of these defendants in a matter that concerned the safety of this republic. The evidence assembled in support of these complaints was presented to the Grand Jury, which returned indictments. Further developments have demonstrated that some of these defendants, if guilty of reprehensible conduct toward their country, are either actually demented or approximately insane—at least to the point of belonging distinctly to the lunatic fringe. Unfortunately such eccentric groups are formed in every government including those governments that have the democratic principles as their basis. For such reasons, in my opinion, their actions do not arise to the importance justifying continuance of prosecution.

Democratic institutions have as their very foundation certain fundamental rights accorded to a free people. Among the most fundamental of these rights is that of open and free discussion. It is very difficult to draw any line of limitation to the exercise of this right. Of course there will be abuses of those who lack any fair appreciation of the value of the privileges of a free democracy and will for purposes of gain of any type including cheap publicity, abuse these rights regardless of the harm they do to their neighbors. This is one of the penalties we pay for the exercise of free speech on the part of all.

Some of this group, within the lunatic fringe, may well consider themselves to be martyrs even when they are performing acts which in and of themselves would strike at the very heart of democracy itself. But even when this Nation is at war, these fundamental rights must be maintained; like Caesar's wife they must be above suspicion. It probably is more important to maintain these basic rights, however, abused, than to give those who do abuse the rights their just deserts and in a manner impair the privileges so generously provided and intended to be exercised in a temperate and normal manner.

While there is some credible evidence of the fact that some of these defendants at least did much more than express their opinions and evade the issues, they did it is alleged in truth and fact carry on in a manner to give aid and comfort to the avowed enemies of democracies and the way of life in our country which we all cherish. The evidence shows, however, that these efforts were impotent and characteristic of a general conduct of these defendants, relatively ineffective.

Mr. President, I believe that in the interest of good government, in the interest of seeing that the right kind of attitude is maintained by the American people toward the courts, the Attorney General should do as I have suggested, and I hope he will.

In conclusion, let me say that perhaps the most striking of all the defendants is the lady from Chicago about whom we have read so much. I had never met her until day before yesterday. After I met Mrs. Dilling in the courtroom I inquired from some in whose judgment I have confidence, whether or not she was a dangerous character, as had been contended by some of the newspapers of the country. I was amazed—nay, Mr. President, I was more than amazed—when I discovered the background of this lady. While I was in the courtroom I secured a copy of the opening speech to the jury in behalf of Elizabeth Dilling, as delivered by her attorney, her husband, Albert W. Dilling, on the 22d day of last May. It interested and fascinated me to such an extent that I wish to read a portion of it to the distinguished Members of this body. This is what the lawyer for this lady stated in his opening address to the jury:

May it please the court, and ladies and gentlemen of the jury—

There are two ladies on the jury—

the evidence introduced in this cause on behalf of Defendant Elizabeth Dilling will prove conclusively, not only that she has never written nor uttered a single word, nor ever performed a single act or had a single motive, charged by the prosecution in the indictment herein, but that, on the contrary, her every thought, word, and deed since she first commenced to take an active interest in public affairs, on our return from Russia in the fall of 1931, has been in support and defense of our present form of government, the American Constitution, and the American flag, in support of strong national defense, and against all enemies of these, including communism and all other "isms" except Americanism; that her lone crusade has laid

particular stress upon communism because of what she saw in Russia of its atheistic tyranny and because of the great strides its ideology and followers have made in this country in churches, educational institutions, unions, and political life and power, particularly during the present administration. Its actual menace to our Christian institutions and to Christianity as a whole, which is Mrs. Dilling's main concern, will be shown with factual detail.

As "intention" is the essence of the falsely alleged crime charged against Mrs. Dilling, I would like to relate something of her background in order that you ladies and gentlemen may better understand the intentions and motives impelling Mrs. Dilling to engage in this lone crusade for almost 13 years, to the exclusion of everything else except her home responsibilities, expending her time, energy, peace of mind, and funds, and being subjected to a continual barrage of vilification and abuse, including criminal libel, as will be developed by testimony during this trial.

HER BACKGROUND

Mrs. Dilling was born in Chicago, Ill. Her mother's maiden name was Elizabeth Harding. She was born in Cleveland, Ohio, and her mother and father were Cleveland pioneers who had traveled from Philadelphia by ox team over log corduroy roads in a trek consuming 8 months. Mrs. Dilling's maternal grandmother was English-born Jane Musquet, whose mother was English and whose father was French, her uncle having been a Catholic priest in Paris. She came to the United States with her parents at the age of 9; they were shipwrecked off the American coast and her father died from exposure. Jane Musquet married Thomas Harding, also English-born, who came from a family in which there was a long line of Church of England bishops.

Mrs. Dilling's father, a celebrated physician and surgeon, was Dr. Lafayette Kirkpatrick. The name Lafayette was given him because one of his maternal ancestors had met and admired General Lafayette at the time of the American War for Independence. His great-grandfather was born in Virginia. Before that the Kirkpatricks had come from the north of Ireland, where they had fled from Scotland to escape political persecution. The Kirkpatrick estate still exists at Rathfreeland, County Down, Ireland.

After Dr. Kirkpatrick's death, when Mrs. Dilling was 6 weeks old, and her brother, Lafayette Harding Kirkpatrick, 7 years old, Mrs. Dilling's mother brought them up alone. Mrs. Dilling has often told audiences about her mother, with her sister and English-born mother, making an 8 months' tour of Europe at the time Mrs. Dilling's mother was about 20 years old and about all of them having cried with joy when they caught sight of the Statue of Liberty on their return; how the arrogant attitude of the British toward even English-born American citizens had nettled them and made them realize that their allegiance to America, like that of George Washington, also of English ancestry, was 100 percent, without hyphenation. Mrs. Dilling has often told how in childhood, she used to think that it was silly of her mother to cry about getting home; that if she ever got to travel abroad she would only cry because the trip was over, but this was before she actually did travel all over the world and in so doing learn why and how dearly she loved this country. Each trip has made her the more grateful for having been born an American and made her understand why people all over the world want to come here to live.

EDUCATION

Mrs. Dilling was educated at the Chicago Normal School, attended the Academy of Our Lady in Chicago, where she took up the study of the harp, graduated from the Starrett School for Girls and took special courses at the University of Chicago during 4 years, studied with Walfried Singer, Chicago Symphony Orchestra harpist, and with the world's greatest harpist, Alberto Salvi, who prepared her to play concertos for symphony orchestra; she also had special French study from childhood.

TRAVELED WIDELY HERE AND ABROAD

From her mother she inherited the desire to see the world and before we were married (May 8, 1918) she had traveled with her mother and brother all over the United States and into Canada and Mexico and had literally "seen America first."

We shall show how Mrs. Dilling's opposition before Pearl Harbor to United States involvement in World War No. 2 started in 1923, many years prior to the rise of Hitler. During World War No. 1 she knitted scarves for soldiers to "help make the world safe for democracy." In 1923, I had occasion to go to London and took Mrs. Dilling and our son, Kirkpatrick, then 3 years old, along. On that trip, Mrs. Dilling was amazed to find not one person in England and France to whom she talked (and Mrs. Dilling speaks, reads and writes French fluently) who would admit that the United States deserved any credit for or had anything to do with winning World War No. 1. They merely berated us for not coming in sooner. They called the United States "Uncle Shylock" for making any mention of war or post-war debts. In a huge panorama in Paris, depicting the nations that had participated in the World War on the allied side, Mrs. Dilling was perturbed to note that the American flag and any United States representation were conspicuous by their absence. She questioned the guide but he could make no explanation as to why they were absent.

UPHOLDS UNITED STATES OF AMERICA AND UNITED STATES NAVY

Our little boy wore a cap with the words "U. S. Navy" on the ribbon and this elicited more than one insult from perfect strangers, British travelers we encountered. When for the second time the remark was made, "That is quite a joke, that Navy of yours, isn't it?", Mrs. Dilling finally replied in exasperation, "I don't know that it is such a joke. It has been able to lick Great Britain twice and I think it could do it again!" The same attitude was evident in 1928 when we were touring north Africa. For instance at Biskra at the edge of the Sahara desert, in a long conversation Mrs. Dilling had with a well-informed British woman who also maintained that the Americans had done nothing in the World War, were crude, were Shylocks, mongrels, etc., when Mrs. Dilling spoke of the high prices and difficulty in securing help during the war, this woman characteristically replied, "I can't see what possible difference the war could have made to you Americans!" British newspapers continuously up to and including the summer of 1939 when our entire family toured England and other countries, reflected the same critical anti-American attitudes.

We shall show that all of such first-hand experience on many family trips abroad engendered in Mrs. Dilling a conviction that our participation and sacrifices in World War No. 1 were not only unappreciated but had bred positive jealousy, envy, and enmity toward us on the part of those Allies whom we had aided. Repeatedly she declared that we would be suckers to ever again become embroiled in the quarrels and wars of Europe, and that George Washington's advice to avoid entangling foreign alliances had been right in that respect as in others.

MORE FAMILY BACKGROUND

The evidence will show that Mrs. Dilling and I met in the summer of 1917 and were married on May 8, 1918, at La Porte, Ind., in a civil ceremony, which was followed on August 12, 1918, by an Episcopal service at the Episcopal Cathedral in Chicago; that we started from scratch, I having had nothing to offer but a good education, bright prospects, good health, and some sizable debts; that we borrowed money and bought a home in Wilmette, Ill., on time, and that Mrs. Dilling remodeled it and kept roomers to help pay for it; she played the harp at church services and I sang as bass soloist; that I soon secured a much better position and we started to prosper; that a little later Mrs. Dilling received substantial legacies from the estates of her mother and a couple of aunts of means, and we were then able to indulge in our flair for travel, as has already been discussed. The evidence will also show that I was born in Salt Lake City, Utah, and that I was raised as a Lutheran. My parents were both born in Norway and so were their ancestors, as far back as I have been able to ascertain. That I was confirmed in Norwegian in a Lutheran church, and that, after our marriage, I joined the Episcopal church, of which Mrs. Dilling was a communicant, and was subsequently confirmed again in that church. That we have two children—Kirkpatrick, his mother's maiden name, now 24 years old, and Elizabeth Jane, now 18 years old. That both children attended kindergarten and grammar school in Kenilworth, Ill. (a suburb of Chicago), where we lived. That our son attended New Trier High School in Winnetka, Ill., near our home, and later attended Cornell University for 1 year and Northwestern University for 3 years, where he received a degree of bachelor of science in law. Elizabeth Jane attended a private high school for girls, Roycemore, in Evanston, Ill., and until this trial started spent the current school year at Northwestern University, Evanston. Both children have been confirmed in the Episcopal church.

SON VOLUNTEERED

That Kirkpatrick was a member of the R. O. T. C. at Cornell University and is imbued with the same love of country that has all along inspired his mother. That he volunteered in September 1941 at his local draft board for induction and was given a IV-F rejection because of bad eyesight. That thereafter, from the time of Pearl Harbor until November 1942, he stormed every Army and Navy office in Chicago in unsuccessful attempts to enlist. That in January 1942 though he was then employed in a defense plant in an important capacity, he, nevertheless, turned down industrial deferment, in writing, to be inducted into the Army on January 10, 1943. He was passed as officer material by two officer candidate school boards (Hammer Field, Calif., and Hamilton Field, Calif.). That he entered the Army Air Forces Officer Candidate School at Miami Beach, Fla., on November 15, 1943, and successfully completed a 4-month course. That he was to have graduated and been commissioned on March 4, 1944, but that 18 hours before graduation his commission was held up on orders from Washington and he was graduated without commission.

The evidence will show that Mrs. Dilling has always been in favor of a strong national defense; that she encouraged her son to enter the R. O. T. C. and while he was attending New Trier High School she fought unsuccessfully to have an R. O. T. C. unit installed there so that her son might join it; that she opposed Communist attempts to prevent extension of the R. O. T. C. to additional Chicago high schools and remove it from those in which it was already established, appearing with documents supporting her position at the special hearing to consider the matter called by the Chicago Board of Education; that she aided in the defeat of that strong, organized Communist effort to sabotage the R. O. T. C.

WORLD TRAVEL

Prosecutor Rogge referred to Mrs. Dilling traveling in Germany as though this were a crime. The evidence will show that Mrs.

Dilling is known as a world traveler and that a very small part of her travels have been in Germany. On our 1923 trip abroad we traveled extensively in France, Italy, Genoa, Naples, Florence, Italian Lake District, and Rome, and while in Rome had an audience with the Pope; in Switzerland, Holland, Belgium, and England, having crossed on the English ship, the *Berengaria*, and returning on the British ship *Regina* via the Thousand Islands, Montreal, Quebec, and so forth.

Our daughter, Elizabeth Jane, having been born in the interim, on our next European trip in 1923 she, being then 3 years old, also went along. We crossed to England on the British White Star liner, the *Olympic*, spent some time sightseeing around London, traveled down through France and into Italy where we embarked from Naples for Algiers in north Africa. We spent 10 days traveling across Algiers and Tunisia by private auto provided by the Transatlantique or French Line Co. which also owned the French hotels at which we stopped. We sailed from Tunis for Naples on a small French ship and embarked at Naples for Palestine on the British liner *Samaria*, stopping en route at Athens, Greece. Landing at Haifa we proceeded to Jerusalem where we spent about a week sightseeing and attended the Christmas midnight service at the Church of the Nativity at Bethlehem, staying at a monastery with other pilgrims. On Christmas Day the four of us rode around the walls of old Jerusalem on donkeys. We then went to Egypt visiting Cairo, the pyramids, Luxor on the Nile where King Tut's and other tombs were visited. We embarked from Alexandria for Sicily, traveling up through Italy and France and spending considerable time in Paris before returning to the United States on the French liner *Ile de France*. Numerous trips to Cuba, Florida, and so forth, were made by the family.

In 1931, all four of us took a West Indies cruise on the Holland America liner *Volendam*, visiting Cuba and various cities on it, Martinique, Puerto Rico, Virgin Islands, Dutch Curacao, British Bermuda, Barbadoes, Trinidad, Panama, Caracas, Venzuela, etc. The following summer, 1931, all four of us took a North Cape cruise on the German Hamburg Amerika liner *Reliance* which included Iceland, Spitzbergen, the North Cape, and tours into the fjords of Norway all the way down its coast. We visited Leningrad and Moscow, Russia, Helsingfors, Finland, Stockholm, Sweden, Hamburg and Berlin, Germany, at which time there was street fighting going on in Berlin between Nazis and Communists. We then spent considerable time in Paris before sailing for home.

In 1932 all four of us sailed from San Francisco on the American Dollar Line ship *Hoover*, visiting Hawaii, Japan, Hong Kong, and Shanghai, China, the Philippines, Celebes, Bali, Java, Singapore, and back to the United States again via three Dutch liners, a Japanese and an American ship, visiting China and Japan again en route to British Columbia and the United States.

In February 1934, while Mrs. Dilling's "Red Network" was on the press, she and I sailed from New Orleans on a United Fruit line boat for Vera Cruz, Mexico, and spent a week or more sightseeing around Mexico City.

The summer of 1934, with the objective of seeing the world famous Passion Play on the life of Christ, at Oberammergau, which was having a special presentation, we sailed, all four of us, on the German liner *Bremen*, landing in England. We left there later to spend considerable time in Paris then through Italy into Germany where we excursioned down the Rhine, saw the Passion Play, then visited Austria, Holland, Switzerland, returned to France and sailed for home on the German ship *Europa*.

In 1937, when I could not leave because of urgent business, Mrs. Dilling took the two children on a West Indies, north Africa, Mediterranean cruise on the French ship *Champlain*, stopping at some of the Balearic and Canary islands, Algiers, Dakar, Casablanca, Morroco, in north Africa; they traveled up through France from Marseilles to Lourdes, and Carcassone, to Paris where Mrs. Dilling sent our son home to get back to school, while she and our daughter spent some time visiting in England and went over to Germany from there and back on a hurried trip, spending 2 days in Germany out of curiosity to find out whether or not they were starving as the press was then reporting, before sailing for home on the French liner *Normandie*, from England.

In the summer of 1938, when the Civil War was raging in Spain and Communist batallions were being sent from the United States and other countries to aid the Red coalition of Communists, Socialists, and Anarchists which formed the backbone of the Loyalist regime, Mrs. Dilling went alone to see first-hand what was happening there. She sailed on an Italian liner for Lisbon, Portugal, carrying press credentials.

Mr. President, I shall not continue further reading from the opening address of Mrs. Dillings' attorney. If anyone is interested, he can secure a copy of it for himself. The opening address does show, however, that the lady in question has traveled far more widely than has the average man or woman in the United States; it shows that she has a background which she has used in giving her talks; and, certainly, if she has done anything that is criminal, as 1 of the 29 defendants, certainly I believe she ought to be tried in her own State of Illinois by a jury of her peers.

Yet when she was arrested, when she fought extradition, when her attorney in Chicago, Mr. Stewart, made a plea to have her retained in Chicago so that she could be tried by the United States Government there, she was ordered by the court to be tried in the city of Washington. I submit that her case is typical of the cases of the other 29 defendants. In view of what has been said in the Pathfinder and of what has been said by Eugene Meyer in the Washington Post in 2 editorials upon two different occasions, I submit the Attorney General would be doing a service to his country in the administration of square justice by going into the courtroom and asking the court to dismiss these sedition cases. I pray that he may do so soon.

EMPLOYMENT IN THE POST-WAR ERA

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, a great leader spoke yesterday, the leader of a great party, whose voice was heard throughout the Nation. I desire to voice my complete delight at the courage of Governor Dewey, who was not afraid to tell the American people that the place for our boys when this war is won and over is home. I subscribe to Governor Dewey's proposal that there shall be retained in Europe whatever soldiers may be needed for the job of keeping the peace there. I subscribe to the general thesis, to which the leaders of both parties apparently agree, that every effort of which man is capable must be put forth in order to create the machinery necessary to keep the world safe from another holocaust. But we know, Mr. President, that only a fraction of our vast armies will be required to remain in Europe. We are in favor of providing our share of the armed forces that may be needed, but we are against keeping them there any longer than is necessary. We protest strenuously against using the post-war situation in Europe as an excuse for making jobs—very poor jobs at that—in the Army all over Europe for the men who have won this war. To do that would be a crime against our boys. They have been taken from their homes, their jobs, their careers to do the fighting and the dying, and they have won the victory. At home those who have remained behind have enjoyed peace and plenty, high wages for war work. As soon as the war ends peacetime jobs will begin to reappear, and, as I stated on the floor of the Senate some time ago when we were discussing the George reconversion bill, the function of America is to create work, to provide jobs, and that will be done unless the bureaucrats, those in power, gum up the works. That will be the time when employees in peacetime industries will have jobs to offer if we have the vision and the courage to go forward in peace as we have in war, labor, and management, farmer and city folk united as one team, carrying the ball as a team and not as individuals.

Let our soldiers come home and get a crack at those jobs. Let them come back with their world vision. They, too, have traveled; they, too, have experienced a life of suffering and many of them will have died. Those who shall return will come back not as defeatists but as conquerors; they will come back with the ideals and aspirations which have made America great. We do not want any gigantic W. P. A. when the men come back. We do not want it dressed up in soldiers' uniforms but still a W. P. A., because that is the cheapest kind of a W. P. A. No; we do not want the soldiers to remain in a uniformed W. P. A. Why should they not have their chance to have good, lasting jobs, indeed to their own jobs in many cases, the jobs they had to abandon to go to war?

I cannot believe that the present administration is planning to march the country back to W. P. A.; and yet there are things that would seem so to indicate. The Administration proposes to leave many of them in Europe, far from their homes, far from their opportunities, far from their families, for, as General Hershey says, that is the cheapest kind of a W. P. A.

Mr. President, at every meeting we hear the song, God Bless America, and we join in it. God will only bless America through the channel of men and as men organize their efforts. We will have great hidden resources, the great industrial mechanism we have created, the tremendous resources of wealth, the hidden reserve in every man's pocket, the hidden demand from the North, the South, the East, and the West, the hidden demand from every class, to start the wheels of industry going and create an economic condition which will make absolutely unnecessary any kind of W. P. A., in uniform or out of it.

CONTROL AND ERADICATION OF CERTAIN ANIMAL AND PLANT PESTS AND DISEASES

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I hope the Senate may now dispose of the pending business.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] that the Senate recede from certain amendments to the bill (H. R. 4278).

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Mr. President, I have a few remarks to make on the motion of the Senator from Georgia.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The motion is debatable.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Mr. President, House bill 4278 came to the Senate last spring. The Senate added an amendment known as section 303, authorizing, for the first time as I understand, the Farm Security Administration to make loans to Farm Security clients for medical purposes. I am not at all pleased, and I have not been for a long time, with the Farm Security policy of handling that type of loans; in fact, it became so rank in my State of South Dakota that while I was Governor I secured the passage of a law making it a criminal offense for the medical set-ups under the Farm Security to operate in the State.

I realize that this is a very important bill. It has been pending for a number of months and those interested in the major features of it are extremely anxious that it be disposed of. On the floor of the Senate last spring I offered an amendment prohibiting the Farm Security Administration from interfering with the choice by the borrowers of the kind of doctor or individual they wanted to treat them and their families. The amendment was adopted unanimously by the Senate. I think it was a just, equitable, and proper amendment, and should prevail. Unfortunately, the Farm Security Administration has not seen fit, in the face of that pending legislation, to pay any attention to the merits of what I proposed and what the Senate adopted, but has gone right ahead with its medical dictation to clients so that in many cases, in fact in most cases, there is no freedom of choice on the part of the borrowers. But, as I have said, I do not wish to hold up the pending legislation. I am hopeful that the junior Senator from Georgia and I and other Senators who are interested in the subject can have action taken on the matter at a later time.

I wish to pay very high tribute to the junior Senator from Georgia, because I have enjoyed working with him. He is extremely able in his handling of legislation before the Senate. I hope that before the next agricultural appropriation bill comes before us we can persuade the Farm Security Administration to adopt the type of policy for which I am contending. The Senator from Georgia assures me that he is in favor of the idea contained in my amendment. So, Mr. President, I shall not continue my objection to the motion now, but will agree to its adoption.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] that the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 1, 2, and 3 to House bill 4278.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I wish to express my appreciation to the distinguished Senator from South Dakota for his kindly reference to me. I appreciate the depth of his feeling about this matter, and therefore I am all the more grateful to him for not endangering this tremendously important bill by insisting on continuing his attitude of opposition. I certainly would be the last one to wish to see any borrower from the Farm Security Administration coerced or intimidated or even channelized in the selection of his doctor in connection with any loans which may be made to medical cooperatives. This provision will, of course, not affect the present year's operation, but I shall hope to be able to cooperate with the Senator and with the officials of the Farm Security Administration and all others interested to see that there is no coercion or intimidation of the borrowers, and that they shall have freedom of choice to select the doctor they wish to serve them.

I thank the Senator from South Dakota for his statement and his attitude.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, as a member of the conference committee which considered this bill, I wish to say that I was in full sympathy with the objectives of the Senator from South Dakota. Our trouble seemed to lie in commanding proper wording to use so that we could do justice to all parties without doing any serious harm. We were not able to find wording which would accomplish that result. But I wish to say, as the Senator from South Dakota has said, that I hope before any more important legislation affecting the Farm Security Administration is passed, that when the next agricultural appropriation bill comes before the Senate we will be able to work out the proper wording so that the objective which he seeks may be attained.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] that the Senate recede from its amendments Nos. 1, 2, and 3 to House bill 4278.

The motion was agreed to.

C. I. O. POLITICAL ACTION COMMITTEE—LETTER FROM SENATOR MOORE TO ATTORNEY GENERAL BIDDLE

Mr. MOORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a copy of a letter dated September 5, 1944, which I addressed to Attorney General Biddle, concerning a booklet issued by the Political Action Committee of the C. I. O. entitled "Jobs for All After the War."

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SEPTEMBER 5, 1944.

Hon. FRANCIS BIDDLE,
Attorney General of the United States,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. ATTORNEY GENERAL: On September 1, 1944, there came to my desk a booklet, Jobs For All After the War, published and paid for by the Political Action Committee of the C. I. O. The booklet is frankly a campaign document supporting the reelection of Mr. Roosevelt for a fourth term as President of the United States.

On page 3, a war worker is quoted as saying: "When the war is over I may be out of a job, just as I was a dozen years ago, in the days of the great engineer." The political implications of this statement are too clear to be mistaken.

On page 4 of the booklet, the following quotation appears: "President Roosevelt has said freedom from want is eternally linked with freedom from fear." On page 8 of the booklet, it is stated: "If we once start sinking we will sink still further to the conditions of 1933. And then even lower."

On page 17, there appears the following statement: "What we must not lack is a plan to keep our industries going full blast, and a President and a Congress who will assume the responsibility for all the people's needs."

An excerpt from page 18: "Some big businessmen alreadys have a plan. Theirs is a plan to return to normalcy." It will be noted in the book that this word "normalcy" is quoted and, of course, has specific reference to a campaign slogan attributed to the Republican Party during the administration of Mr. Harding.

On page 19, the Congress is advised that it should: "Adopt the new Bill of Rights as our national objective." On page 20, it is explained: "President Roosevelt, in his message to Congress in January 1944, blazed a trail to freedom and security in America after the war, by enumerating eight rights, which have since become known as The New Bill of Rights." There follow the eight points enumerated by Mr. Roosevelt.

On page 21, it is declared—

"If we, the people, dedicate ourselves to the new Bill of Rights, and if we dedicate ourselves to the task of translating those ideal rights into accomplished facts, we shall have full employment after the war and, what is more, we shall have the sound promise of a lasting and glorious peace." * * *

"If we have the right kind of President and the right kind of Congress—as well as the right kind of State governments—we can attain our objectives."

Commencing at the bottom of page 21 and continuing on page 22, we find this final plea in behalf of Mr. Roosevelt as a candidate for President:

"We shall attain our objectives, if the people understand the issues clearly, realize the gains made in the last 12 years under the leadership of Franklin Delano Roosevelt and vote him into office, and if we support the President with a Congress which will work not against the President but with him—for the good of all the people."

The Federal Corrupt Practices Act, as amended by the Smith-Connally law, makes it unlawful for any labor organization to make a contribution in connection with any election at which Presidential and Vice Presidential electors, or a Senator or Representative are to be voted for; or for any candidate, political committee, or other person to accept or receive any such contribution.

The question, therefore, presented is whether contributions made by member unions of the C. I. O. to the Political Action Committee and used to publish and distribute the booklet, from which the above quotations are taken, have been made and received in connection with an election, at which Presidential and Vice Presidential electors and Members of Congress will be voted for.

To my mind the question must be answered in the affirmative, and I would be pleased to know what your position is with respect to the matter.

Yours very truly,

E. H. MOORE.

THE GOVERNMENT'S SUIT AGAINST THE RAILROADS

Mr. MOORE. Mr. President, the antitrust suit, recently commenced by Attorney General Biddle against the railroads, is a fraud on its face. It charges the railroads with conspiracy to fix and maintain unreasonable and discriminatory rates. The public should understand that power to regulate rates with

respect to railroads is by law vested in the Interstate Commerce Commission. The Interstate Commerce Commisison has had jurisdiction of this important function for more than 50 years. The rates which have been fixed are as a matter of law the legal rates, and it would be a violation of the law for any carrier to fail to comply. If the rates are improper and discriminatory, existing laws afford an adequate, and the exclusive, remedy before the Interstate Commerce Commission. The suit is a plain attempt of the Attorney General to invade the administrative functions delegated to the Commission by Congress.

Mr. Biddle did not, however, choose to respect these provisions of the law; instead, he chose to bring a political lawsuit in the hope of creating hate and prejudice against private enterprise in an effort to corral votes for a continuation of the New Deal. Last month, Mr. Bidle made a campaign tour of the west coast, seeking support for this latest onslaught on private business. I note that in a speech before the Bar Association at Spokane, on August 9, he told the people of that section that they were hampered by discriminatory freight rates and charged that the railroads were under the domination of a czar who told them what they may or may not do.

In view of the commencement of this suit by Mr. Biddle's office, it was highly prejudicial and improper for him to make a public speech of this character. The explanation is, of course, that it was a bid for New Deal votes. It is obvious that a year or more will intervene before a suit can be tried, and the defendants will have no opportunity to refute the charges until after the election.

The Assistant Attorney General in charge of this suit says that it in no way involves joint through rates. This, of course, implies that it involves only local rates covering short hauls. And, even if the Northwest were suffering under discriminatory sectional rates, the suit is not directed at relieving that situation. The Supreme Court has held that shippers may not sue for damages under the antitrust laws in instances where the Interstate Commerce Commission has held the rates or practices complained of to be lawful. Under what authority then may the Attorney General question their lawfulness?

The campaign of preparing the public for the suit against the railroads seems to have been well organized. At about the same time Mr. Biddle was lambasting the railroads on the west coast, Assistant Attorney General Berge was delivering a similar speech at Kansas City. Mr. Berge argues that freight rates in general are unfair, and that the railroads have delayed the introduction of new equipment and retarded the development of other carriers. As a matter of fact, the Nation is indebted for the outstanding services rendered by the railroads during the recent war years. No industry has done a more magnificent job under more crushing handicaps than the railroads. They have depleted their equipment almost to the exhaustion point, while at the same time paying a rate of tax that does not permit the accumulation of a surplus to replace their worn-out equipment.

The charges against the railroads, right or wrong, are a matter for the Interstate Commerce Commission and not for the Attorney General's office.

The transportation arteries of the country are the sinews that bind our economy into a coordinated activity. The New Deal economists recognize this important fact, and the attack on this important segment of our industry at the very first whisper of victory presages what is in store for all private enterprise.

It is my opinion that this is the first step of the New Deal to consummate public ownership of the railroads. Ocean transportation has already been reduced in practical effect to Government ownership. Aviation, inland waterways, and motor carriers are on the list. Already the oil and gasoline pipe lines of the country are being operated under the dictatorship of the Attorney General, by the terms of a so-called permanent consent decree.

The files of the Attorney General's office are filled with consent decrees in connection with practically every industry in the country, under which the Attorney General is in effect an economic czar.

The suit against the railroads brings the New Deal's number of antitrust suits now pending in the Department of Justice to 114, and indicates that the New Deal is moving into the final stages of its program of national socialism.

EXCLUSION FROM THE UNITED STATES OF EVADERS OF MILITARY SERVICE

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, there are on the calendar two House bills, H. R. 4257, Calendar No. 1089, and H. R. 4271, Calendar No. 1090, which were recently unanimously favorably reported by the Senate Committee on Immigration. For certain reasons it is important that these bills be enacted into law at the earliest possible date. Both bills were passed by the House unanimously. They were approved by the Senate Committee on Immigration unanimously, with generous representation on the part of both the majority and the minority. I have discussed the bills with the able majority leader, and our able and distinguished minority leader, and I hope that they may be taken up and disposed of at this time. The Department of Justice is exceedingly anxious that these bills be enacted into law. While both bills are not of very general application, they are of tremendous importance to certain classes of our citizens.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bills?

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I will say that the Senator from Georgia was good enough to speak to me about two bills on the calendar in which he was interested, but probably, through my own confusion, I entirely misunderstood what the bills were. I thought they were calendar Nos. 1094 and 1095. I have taken occasion to look hurriedly at the reports on those two bills, and I have talked with such of the minority members of the Committee on Immigration as I could get in touch with on the floor during the day.

I have not spoken to any member of the committee about the two bills to which the Senator now refers, and I have had no opportunity to look at the reports on them. If the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BURTON], who is a member of the minority representation on the committee, is familiar with the bills and signifies his approval of them, I certainly shall not object; but unless some member of the minority representation on the committee is familiar with the bills, I should not want them to pass. I am sorry for my error.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, it is the error of the Senator from Maine. I did not give him the numbers, but I undertook to point out on the calendar the two bills to which I made reference. Perhaps I should have left with the Senator from Maine a copy of the calendar.

Mr. WHITE. I marked the two which I thought were involved; namely, Calendar Nos. 1094 and 1095.

Mr. RUSSELL. There is nothing pressing about those two bills.

Mr. WHITE. The Senator from Ohio is familiar with the two bills to which the Senator from Georgia refers; and if it is agreeable to him, I shall not object.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. BURTON. I was present at the meeting of the Committee on Immigration when all four of these bills were recently considered. I am familiar with the two bills to which the Senator from Georgia refers, and I am prepared to recommend them, as it was the unanimous view of our committee that they should be passed. I am sure that if the Senator from Georgia will make a brief statement in connection with each of the bills, there will be no objection to their passage at this time.

Mr. RUSSELL. I thank the Senator. I may state further that according to my recollection the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], and the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL] were also present at the committee meeting. Perhaps some other members of the minority whom I do not now recall were present.

The first bill, House bill 4257, Calendar 1089, relates to the class of persons, whether citizens of the United States or aliens, who departed from the United States in order to avoid service in the armed forces of the United States under the Selective Service Act. Information before the committee indicated that on one day several hundred persons departed from the United States through the city of El Paso, Tex., alone, in order to avoid service in either the Army or the Navy of the United States, and to avoid selection under the selective-service law. This bill provides that any person who is a national of the United States, or an American citizen, and who in time of national stress departed from the United States to another country to avoid serving his country, shall be deprived of his nationality.

It further provides that any alien who is subject to military service under the terms of the Selective Service Act, and

who left this country to avoid military service, shall thereafter be forever barred from admission to the United States.

Mr. President, I do not see how anyone could object to such a bill. An alien who remains in the country and refuses to serve in the armed forces in time of war is prosecuted under our laws, and if found guilty he is compelled to serve a term in the penitentiary. Under the terms of the Selective Service Act an American citizen who refuses to serve when he is called upon to do so is likewise subject to a prison term. Certainly those who, having enjoyed the advantages of living in the United States, were unwilling to serve their country or subject themselves to the Selective Service Act, should be penalized in some measure. This bill would deprive such persons as are citizens of the United States of their citizenship, and, in the case of aliens, would forever bar them from admission into the United States. Any American citizen who is convicted of violating the Selective Service Act loses his citizenship. This bill would merely impose a similar penalty on those who are not subject to the jurisdiction of our courts, the penalty being the same as would result in the case of those who are subject to the jurisdiction of our courts.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will state the first bill by title, for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H. R. 4257) to expatriate or exclude certain persons for evading military and naval service.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Immigration with an amendment in section 1, on page 1, at the beginning of line 9, to strike out "(i)" and insert "(j)."

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

PRESERVATION OF NATIONALITY OF CITIZENS RESIDING ABROAD

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will state the second bill by title, for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H. R. 4271) to amend the Nationality Act of 1940 to preserve the nationality of citizens residing abroad.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Immigration with an amendment on page 1, line 7, after the words "expiration of", to strike out "six" and insert "five."

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, let me make a brief explanation of this bill. The bill relates to naturalized American citizens who were residing abroad at the time of the outbreak of the war, and who have been unable to return to the United States, thereby endangering their nationality. Under the provisions of our nationality laws, any person who is a naturalized citizen, and who returns to the land of his origin and remains there for as long as three years, thereby loses his citizenship.

There are a great many American citizens who, by virtue of conditions created by the war, have been unable to return to the United States. If those citizens do not return by a certain date in October—I do not recall the exact date, but I believe it is the 6th of October—they will lose their American citizenship through no fault of their own. The bill would merely extend to October, 1945, the time within which certain naturalized citizens who have been denied the privilege of returning to the United States may have the opportunity to return and save their Americar citizenship, and would prevent them from being divested of their citizenship.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. BURTON. I think the date to which the Senator has reference is October 14. As the bill passed the House, I believe there was an extension of 2 years, and our committee has recommended that there be an extension of only 1 year.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator is correct. The House extended the time for 2 years, but the Senate committee felt that if it were extended for 1 year, at the end of that time we could determine what the conditions were, and if necessary we could extend the time for another year. I thank the Senator from Ohio for calling that fact to my attention.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment reported by the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

FEES FOR DOMESTIC INSURED AND COLLECT-ON-DELIVERY MAIL, AND SPECIAL-DELIVERY SERVICE

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of House bill 4780. The bill was reported from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads by the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR]. It relates to the fixing of fees for domestic insured and collect-on-delivery mail, and special-delivery service.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H. R. 4780) to fix the fees for domestic insured and collect-on-delivery mail, special-delivery service, and for other purposes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I understand that the bill relates only to the matter of fees to be collected, and is not general legislation in other respects.

Mr. CONNALLY. That is my understanding.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. RUSSELL. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations (and withdrawing two postmaster nominations), which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received and nominations withdrawn, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. HATCH, from the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys:

Mrs. Belle D. Byrne, of North Dakota, to be register of the land office at Bismarck, N. Dak. (reappointment); and

Mrs. Jessie C. Weeks, of Wyoming, to be register of the land office at Buffalo, Wyo., vice Theodore A. Wanerus.

By Mr. GEORGE, from the Committee on Finance:

Sundry officers for promotion in the regular Corps of the United States Public Health Service.

By Mr. CONNALLY, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

A. Dana Hodgdon, of Maryland, now a Foreign Service officer of class 3 and a secretary in the Diplomatic Service, to be also a consul general; and

Harry C. Hawkins, of Virginia, to be a Foreign Service officer of class 2, a secretary in the Diplomatic Service, and a consul general.

By Mr. MCKELLAR, from the Committee on Post Offices and and Post Roads:

Sundry postmasters.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the calendar.

FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION—NOMINATION PASSED OVER

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Leland Olds, of New York, to be a member of the Federal Power Commission, which nomination had been previously passed over.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I understand that there is an agreement that this nomination shall not be considered until next week. I therefore ask that it be passed over.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination will be passed over.

POSTMASTERS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

Mr. RUSSELL. I ask unanimous consent that the nominations of postmasters be confirmed en bloc.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nominations of postmasters are confirmed en bloc; and, without objection, the President will be immediately notified.

THE ARMY

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Army.

Mr. RUSSELL. I ask unanimous consent that the Army nominations be confirmed en bloc.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the Army nominations are confirmed en bloc; and, without objection, the President will be immediately notified.

THE NAVY

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Navy.

Mr. RUSSELL. I ask unanimous consent that the Navy nominations be confirmed en bloc.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the Navy nominations are confirmed en bloc; and, without objection, the President will be immediately notified.

THE MARINE CORPS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Marine Corps.

Mr. RUSSELL. I ask unanimous consent that the nominations in the Marine Corps be confirmed en bloc.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nominations in the Marine Corps are confirmed en bloc; and, without objection, the President will be immediately notified.

That completes the calendar.

THE DIPLOMATIC SERVICE

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, earlier in the day there were reported from the Committee on Foreign Relations two nominations in the Diplomatic Service. In one of the cases especially it is very urgent that early confirmation take place, because the appointee must proceed at once to a foreign post. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the nominations.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The nominations will be stated.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of A. Dana Hodgdon, of Maryland, now a Foreign Service officer of class 3 and a secretary in the Diplomatic Service, to be also a consul general of the United States of America.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the nomination? The Chair hears none. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed; and, without objection, the President will be immediately notified.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Harry C. Hawkins, of Virginia, to be a Foreign Service officer of class 2, a secretary in the Diplomatic Service, and a consul general of the United States of America.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the nomination? The Chair hears none. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed; and, without objection, the President will be immediately notified.

RECESS TO TUESDAY

Mr. RUSSELL. As in legislative session, I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon on Tuesday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 3 o'clock and 35 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until Tuesday, September 12, 1944, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate September 8 (legislative day of September 1), 1944:

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

H. Coit MacLean, of Virginia, now a Foreign Service officer of class 2 and a secretary in the Diplomatic Service, to be also a consul general of the United States of America.

Edward P. Lawton, of Georgia, now a Foreign Service officer of class 4 and a secretary in the Diplomatic Service, to be also a consul general of the United States of America.

THE JUDICIARY

UNITED STATES ATTORNEY

Howard F. Houk, of New Mexico, to be United States attorney for the district of New Mexico, vice Everett M. Grantham, resigned.

ASSAYER OF THE MINT

Paul S. Nice, of Denver, Colo., to be assayer in the mint of the United States at Denver, Colo., to fill an existing vacancy.

UNITED STATES MARITIME COMMISSION

Edward Macauley, of California, to be a member of the United States Maritime Commission for the term of 6 years from September 26, 1944. (Reappointment.)

UNITED STATES PATENT OFFICE

Mark Taylor, of Virginia, to be Examiner-in-Chief, Board of Appeals, United States Patent Office.

UNITED STATES PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

The following-named officers for promotion in the Regular Corps of the United States Public Health Service:

Passed Assistant Dental Surgeon Fred D. Lewis, Jr., to be temporary dental surgeon effective September 1, 1944.

Assistant Surgeon Leon A. Heppel to be temporary passed assistant surgeon effective August 1, 1944.

Assistant Surgeon Robert J. Huebner to be temporary passed assistant surgeon effective August 1, 1944.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate September 8 (legislative day of September 1), 1944:

FOREIGN SERVICE

A. Dana Hodgdon to be a consul general of the United States of America.

Harry C. Hawkins to be a Foreign Service officer of class 2, a secretary in the Diplomatic Service, and a consul general of the United States of America.

TEMPORARY APPOINTMENT IN THE ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

To be major general

Raymond Stallings McLain

APPOINTMENTS, BY TRANSFER, IN THE REGULAR ARMY

To Finance Department

First Lt. Robert John Trout

To Ordnance Department

Maj. Irving Arthur Duffy
Capt. Almon White Manlove
Capt. Walter Marquis Tisdale

To Air Corps

Second Lt. Allen Everett Frawley
Second Lt. Norman Jay Keefer, Jr.

IN THE NAVY

FOR TEMPORARY SERVICE

Paul Hendren to be rear admiral, to rank from January 11, 1943.

Dixwell Ketcham to be commodore, to continue while serving as commander, Fleet Air Wing 1.

Julius F. Hellweg to be commodore on the retired list, to continue while serving as Superintendent, United States Naval Observatory.

Milton S. Davis to be commodore on the retired list, to continue while serving as port director, Naval Transportation Service, San Francisco, Calif.

Charles F. Russell to be commodore on the retired list, to continue while serving as commander, United States Naval Training Center, Bainbridge, Md.

Harry A. McClure to be commodore, to continue while serving as commander, naval training center, Norfolk, Va.

Schuyler F. Heim to be commodore, to continue while serving as commander, naval operating base, Terminal Island (San Pedro), Calif.

Harry A. Badt to be commodore, to continue while serving as commander, naval training center, Sampson, N. Y.

Cary W. Magruder to be commodore, to continue while serving as commander, naval training center, Newport, R. I.

Robert R. M. Emmet to be commodore, to continue while serving as commander, naval training center, Great Lakes, Ill.

Vance D. Chapline to be commodore, to continue while serving as Director, Fleet Maintenance Division, Office of Chief of Naval Operations.

Frank H. Kelley to be commodore, to continue while serving as commander, naval training center, Farragut, Idaho.

Robert S. Haggart to be commodore, to continue while serving as commander, naval training center, San Diego, Calif.

Edmund W. Burrough to be commodore, to continue while serving on the staff of the commander in chief, United States Fleet.

Robert W. Cary to be commodore, to continue while serving as commander, naval training and distribution center, Sar Francisco, Calif.

John K. Richards, Jr., to be commodore, for temporary service, to continue while serving as commander, officer training center, New York.

Richard A. Warner to be medical director with the rank of commodore, to continue while serving as medical officer in command, naval dispensaries, Navy Department, Washington, D. C.

APPOINTMENTS FOR TEMPORARY SERVICE IN THE MARINE CORPS

Lemuel C. Shepherd, Jr., to be major general from February 1, 1944.

Graves B. Erskine to be major general from February 3, 1944.

Robert Blake to be brigadier general from October 2, 1942.

William A. Worton to be brigadier general from October 2, 1942.

POSTMASTERS

ALABAMA

James W. Sargent, Bangor.
William R. Buster, Berlin.
Genie H. Lister, Chavies.
Alva Dauphin, Coffee Springs.
Bertha Morgan, Eva.
Ila B. Burkhalter, Flat Rock.
Vollie E. Kirkland, Grant.
Ruth H. Hill, Hazel Green.
James Leon Gamble, Headland.
Veda B. Harris, Hollywood.
Amos R. Morgan, Honoraville.
Fannie V. Mason, Hope Hull.
Oliver G. Stone, Long Island.

Arthur G. Rushton, Rutledge.
Alexander G. Taylor, Silas.
Albert M. Philips, Silverhill.
Pearl D. Stanton, Stockton.
Nellie C. Davidson, Toxey.

CONNECTICUT

Lucille S. McLeod, Brookfield Center.
Olin A. Gerich, Buckland.
Gaetano Simoncelli, Talcottville.

GEORGIA

Emma Gene B. Easterlin, Andersonville.
Charlie R. Hatcher, Attapulgus.
Robert E. Branch, Jr., Bishop.
William B. King, Bluffton.
Martin A. Byrne, Blythe.
Denmark K. Talbert, Brinson.
Wade H. Goode, Bronwood.
Daniel B. Phillips, Chauncey.
Alonzo E. Whiddon, Chula.
Mattie B. Laughridge, Clarkdale.
Erma R. Culpepper, Clarkston.
Beatrice McDonald, Cohutta.
Gertrude H. Harper, Coleman.
Rachel B. Parks, Dawsonville.
Agnes S. McGehee, Dearing.
George B. Wood, Devereux.
Llewellyn G. Brown, Dewyrose.
George P. Copeland, Diffee.
Claude E. Dillard, Dillard.
Emily C. Jones, Dixie.
James A. Clark, Ellenwood.
Charlie P. Smith, Enigma.
Colie E. McKown, Forest Park.
John G. Jackson, Harrison.
Arley D. Finley, Hazlehurst.
Banner Thomas, Hoboken.
Guy A. Patten, Hull.
Taylor A. Drake, Iron City.
DeWitt T. Wilcox, Jacksonville.
Nancy Kemp Ellis, Kennesaw.
Emma P. Hall, Kensington.
Louie B. Way, Keysville.
James T. Jordan, Lilburn.
Sarah M. Driggers, Stilson.
Gertrude Blair, Tiger.

HAWAII

Minoru Tanaka, Hana.

IDAHO

Zella G. Steele, Bancroft.

ILLINOIS

William Harley King, Ewing.
Elizabeth M. Stone, Junction.
Homer W. Cleland, Murphysboro.

INDIANA

Mildred C. McNutt Sander, Economy.
John Odell Best, Floyds Knobs.
Willow B. Pelkey, Grovertown.
Edward L. Sacksteder, Leavenworth.
Raymond C. Bray, Monrovia.
Essie A. Hackleman, New Ross.
Dale E Ulmer, Poneto.
Mark D. Kaufman, Ray.
Joseph Almonrode, Saratoga.
Golden High, Spencerville.
Rebecca C. Maegerlein, Williams.

MARYLAND

Nan R. Eaton, Flint Stone.
Daniel M. Miller, Knoxville.
Howard J. Pardoe, Lusby.
Harold Slingluff, Mitchellville.
Lester Shipley, Savage.
B. Adele Palmer, Sharpsburg.
George R. Bromley, Stockton.

MASSACHUSETTS

Charles A. Cronin, Lawrence.

MISSOURI

Aloysius J. Samson, Bonnots Mill.
Naomi M. Snodderley, Elmo.
Marjorie L. Lennert, Miller.
Flossie M. Haynes, Walker.
Ira T. Gray, Zalma.

NEW JERSEY

Edward J. Shelton, Great Notch.
Raphael C. Devlin, Matawan.

OHIO

William L. Roush, Aberdeen.
Ada M. Waggal, Amelia.
Carl F. Schwartz, Bellbrook.
Catherine B. Henning, Blaine.
George W. Miranda, Blue Creek.
Charles W. Hanna, Burbank.
Francis A. Taylor, Chippewa Lake.
Gail Miller, Christiansburg.
Jerome H. Langhals, Cloverdale.
Merle A. Rowe, Coalton.
Mary Tigar, Cozaddale.
Julia Garlic, Crown City.
Clara Korta, Custar.
Daniel T. Johnson, Dundee.
Marie Thompson, East Fultonham.
Charles V. Stayton, Eldorado.
Rilla E. Nelson, Enon.
Carroll H. Buroker, Fletcher.
Norma L. B. Tyler, Galloway.
Hattie Reed Willson, Geauga Lake.
Annabelle Mechling, Glenford.
George W. Garman, Greensburg.
Vennie B. Klingenberg, Guysville.
Helen P. Pearce, Harbor View.
Rhea E. Genson, Haskin.
George A. Irelan, Hollansburg.
Harvey R. Cutter, Holmesville.
Ruth C. Walborn, Homeworth.
George A Kiger, Hoytville.
Harvey R. Sprunger, Kidron.
Pearl Calovini, Lafferty
Mary E. Hudson, Lakeville.
Herman L. Halladay, Litchfield.
Olive M. Force, Magnetic Springs.
Irma M. Hepp, Maple Grove.
Charles F. Beckett, Miamitown.
David F. Dinger, Midvale.
James P Lavey, Milan.
Claire F. Metzger, Monclova.
William A. Brailer, Nashport.
Smith Dunn, New Milford.
Mary A. Cremean, New Plymouth.
Cecil O. Bell, New Weston.
Elsie Bennett, Okeana.
Harold L. Batdorf, Osborn.
Elizabeth J. Calfee, Piedmont.
Agnes E. Bingham, Portage.
Edith L. Roliff, Randolph.
Mary E. Schlechty, Rossburg.
Anna L. Milhoan, Sawyerwood.
Alice Johnson, Sharon Center.
Lucile G. Justus, Stoutsville.
Charles H. Weary, Suffield.
Robert S. McConnell, Tippecanoe.
Etta G Duffield, Vanburen.
Mary A. Cramer, West Chester.
Gurney H. Lowe, Williston.
Pearl B. Hildreth, Woodstock.
James R. O'Leary, Zaleski.
Frank V. Miller, Zanesfield.

PENNSYLVANIA

William D. Anderson, Linden.
Franc G. Neuland, Lucinda.
Lawrence L. Hackman, Oberlin.
Daisy O. Deardorff, Orrtanna.
Ethel T. Croft, Osceola.
Mary L Kovalchick, Sagamore.

SOUTH CAROLINA

Jesse T. Ross, Blaney.
Joseph D. Ayers, Blenheim.
Hudnalle B. McLean, Blythewood.
Mattie O. Bruce, Chapin.
Bessie F. Cannon, Clifton.
Eva S. Drake, Converse.
Conway Dial, Cross Hill.
Philip P. Gaillard, Dalzell.
Laura B. Anderson, Dunbarton.
William S. Hills, Edisto Island.
Thomas J. Kittles, Garnett.
Milas Y. Sease, Gilbert.
Myrtle R. Sams, Glendale.
Vivian W. Edwards, Gresham.
James M. McGill, Hickory Grove.
Sara C. DePass, Hodges.
Lucile L. Coleman, Hyman.
Raymond S. Younginer, Irmo.
Gilbert B. Heath, Lando.
Anna E. Boland, Little Mountain.
Sallie T. Ward, Lugoff.
Minor P. Gale, Mount Croghan.
Marvin A. Peebles, Newry.
Luther L. DuBose, New Zion.
Beulah E. Bryson, Owings.
Mary C. Morrow, Pauline.
William F. Lachicotte, Pawleys Island.
Thomas R. Ridlehoover, Plum Branch.
Thelma G. Reeves, Ravenels.
Ethel M. Rogers, Roebuck.
Maynette Streater, Ruby.
James C. Nicholson, Salem.
Mildred H. Bowie, Starr.
Beatrice M. Whitfield, Townville.
Dicey M. Gibbons, Turbeville.
William Y. McNeill, Waterloo.
John W. Geraty, Yonges Island.

SOUTH DAKOTA

Esther Opsahl, Carpenter.
Eva L. De Neui, Chancellor.
Marjorie F. Sougstad, Fulton.
Wanda M. Oberle, Mellette.
Agnes O. Sundheim, Peever.
Flora T. Benshoof, Revillo.
William O. Brennan, Sherman.
Ilah L. Scriver, South Shore.
Ross Bennett, Spencer.
Caroline D. King, Tabor.
Eloise Holdren, Vale.
Jesse V. Heath, Vivian.
Anna F. Dillon, Whitewood.

TENNESSEE

Fannie C. Taylor, Antioch.
Lutie Davis, Briceville.
Evie Brasier, Castalian Springs.
Hersey B. McKinney, Cedar Grove.
Mary S. Wilson, College Grove.
Gladys S. Cunningham, Cottontown.
Ruby Mathis, Deer Lodge.
Nannie F. Jones, Del Rio.
Lenora E. Parker, Enville.
Annie Bacon, Fall Branch.
Helen McDaniel, Finley.
John F. Anderson, Flag Pond.
Mozella J. Cox, Gadsden.
Joe C. Hunt, Gibson.
Perry Jennings, Heiskell.
James R. Carmack, Hilham.
Nora L. Bates, Lobelville.
Mary I. Lindsey, Lutts.
Celia G. McCauley, Mercer.
Anne H. Snapp, Midway.
Ida F. Seaton, Morris Chapel.
Troy W. Tomlin, Oakland.
Lerline Hearn, Pinson.
Wade Russell, Rockford.
W. Ernest Moore, Rock Island.
William J. Frazier, Rossville.
Lecy D. Mullins, Santa Fe.
Chrystel P. Doty, Springville.
Blanche T. Bearden, Talbott.
Marion R. Kelley, Toone.

WASHINGTON

Walter H. Gihring, Rockford.

WEST VIRGINIA

Nellie M. Hilton, Bellepoint.
Lenna S. Jones, Bristol.
Dorena Annese, Brownton.
Louie E. Bumphrey, Burlington.
Roy Palmer, Cannelton.
Allen E. Dowdy, Capels.
Samuel L. Carter, Colliers.
Maggie Ann Brown, Comfort.
Kathleen E. Gilreath, Eleanor.
Mary L. Michael, Fairview.
Louise W. Boyd, Glenalum.
Clyde Y. Harman, Harman.
Pearl C. Harper, Harper.
Flossie Shuman, Hastings.
Earl C. Shroades, Inwood.
J. Bruce Brookover, Jacksonburg.
Golden F. Row, Junior.
Dennis H. Beverage, Layland.
Harry C. Skaggs, Long Branch.
Jessie D. Hoffmaster, Millville.
Ward Schoonover, Montrose.
Willie J. Thompson, Nolan.
Socia Anna Winter, Norton.
Sam Stinson, Ona.

James A. Haught, Reader.
Wesley T. Bitzer, Reed.
Mary A. Conrad, Roanoke.
Hallie M. Young, Rock.
Hiram A. Hetherington, Roderfield.
Williams P. Lyons, Sharon.
Lossie R. Lemons, Sinks Grove.
John E. Crickmer, Squire.
Paul E. Love, Verdunville.
Evelyn M. Griffith, Windsor Heights.
Homer B. Stover, Wyoming.

WITHDRAWALS

Executive nominations withdrawn from the Senate September 8 (legislative day of September 1), 1944:

POSTMASTERS

CALIFORNIA

James A. Adrian, Jr., to be postmaster at Banning, Calif.

WASHINGTON

Forde Phelps to be postmaster at Mineral, Wash.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, SEPTEMBER 11, 1944

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. C. E. Hawthorne, D. D., pastor of the Wallace Memorial United Presbyterian Church, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, God of our Nation and our God, we bow humbly before Thee to worship. We come with thanksgiving and praise, for Thou has blessed us through the years as a nation, guiding, strengthening, keeping, sustaining. Always Thou hast dealt with us in grace and mercy. Today we would thank Thee especially for the progress of the war and the encouragement that comes to us at this hour. We recognize Thy hand and power in it all, and in simple childlike faith we render the thanks and praise of our hearts. We now pray for Thy continued blessing upon our armed forces. May Thy protecting hand shelter and keep them this day, and may the victory soon come, and in a way and in a time that will glorify Thee. Forgive our sins as a nation. Take away pride and self-trust and selfishness, and give us a desire to seek Thee and to obey Thee. And now at the opening of this day's deliberation, guide those in authority in this Nation—the President of the United States, the Houses of Congress, and all others. Keep Thy hand upon us and direct in every plan and in every decision made in this House. Bless personally the individual Members of this body and the people whom they represent. In these difficult days we would turn our hearts to Thee, believing that Thou art "able to do exceeding abundantly above all that we ask or think." And we offer our prayer in the name and in the merit of our Lord and Saviour, Jesus Christ. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, September 7, 1944, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 4780. An act to fix the fees for domestic insured and collect-on-delivery mail, special-delivery service, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 1374. An act to provide for promotion of certain American prisoners of war.

The message also announced that the Senate recedes from its amendments Nos. 1, 2, and 3 to the bill (H. R. 4278) entitled "An act to provide for the control and eradication of certain animal and plant pests and diseases, to facilitate cooperation with the States in fire control, to provide for the more efficient protection and management of the national forests, to facilitate the carrying out of agricultural conservation and related agricultural programs, to facilitate the operation of the Farm Credit Administration and the Rural Electrification Administration, to aid in the orderly marketing of agricultural commodities, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 4257. An act to expatriate or exclude certain persons for evading military and naval service; and

H. R. 4271. An act to amend the Nationality Act of 1940 to preserve the nationality of citizens residing abroad.

PVT. (1ST CL.) LEO J. "POP" POWERS

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to include with my remarks various articles from the Montana Standard and the Daily Missoulian, of Missoula, Mont.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Speaker, the people of Montana are tremendously proud of the fact that Pvt. (1st cl.) Leo J. "Pop" Powers, of Alder, Mont., has been awarded the Congressional Medal of Honor and has thus become Montana's top-ranking hero of World War No. 2.

As the Representative of the First Congressional District of Montana, in which "Pop" Powers and his family reside, I am happy to call to the attention of the Congress the outstanding abilities portrayed by this 36-year-old Montanan who was originally rated in the limited-service classification. Because of his extraordinary activities on the field of battle, he became known as the "one-man army" during the historic Fifth Army battle for Cassino. He will be the fifty-fourth holder of the Congressional Medal of Honor produced by this war and he is the first Montanan to earn that badge of valor.

Montana, which has been in the forefront of every drive connected with the prosecution of the war and has furnished more of its men on a per capita basis than any other State in the Union in this as well as in the last World War, is especially proud of this sheep rancher from Alder because he typifies the spirit of the rest of his comrades from our State.

This limited-service Montanan won the Medal of Honor for an exploit before Cassino that would have been good going for a battalion of Rangers. It is too bad that "Pop" was not able-bodied, as he would doubtless have ended the war right there.

To him the Congress is glad to extend its felicitations, and to his family back home in Montana I want to say in behalf of not only the people of Madison County but in behalf of the people of all Montana as well that we are proud of "Pop" Powers and that we hope the day will not be too far distant when he will be back with us once again.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent granted to me, I am including articles from the Montana Standard, of Butte, dated September 5 and 7, 1944, and the Daily Missoulian, of Missoula, dated September 4, 1944, concerning the exploits of this outstanding Montanan in the battle of Cassino:

[From the Daily Missoulian, Missoula, Mont., of September 4, 1944]

LIMITED SERVICE FOR MONTANAN WINS TOP HONOR

WITH THE FIFTH ARMY IN ITALY, September 3.—For the single-handed conquest of a hill in the battle for Cassino, Pvt. (1st. cl.) Leo J. "Pop" Powers, 35-year-old limited-service soldier from Alder, Mont., has been awarded the Nation's highest military decoration, the Congressional Medal of Honor.

With only 4 hand grenades, the Thirty-fourth "Red Bull" Infantry Division private knocked out 3 enemy machine guns entrenched in pillboxes, killed 5 Germans, and probably wounded 12 others, took 4 prisoners, and led to the capture of 13 others.

Powers later said he was motivated by the sight of inexperienced replacements being cut down by heavy machine gun and mortar fire. He tossed the grenades underhanded into openings of two pillboxes. It was brought out later he had never been able to throw a grenade well in the accepted overhand manner.

Powers was a sheep rancher before entering the Army. His wife, Mrs. Jane Powers, lives in Anselmo, Nebr., and a sister, Blanche, resides in Alder.

[From the Montana Standard, Butte, Mont., of September 7, 1944]

MONTANA'S LEADING HERO OF WORLD WAR NO. 2

Dubbed "The one-man Army" for his single-handed conquest of a strategic hill in the battle for Cassino, Pvt. (1st. cl.) Leo J. "Pop" Powers, 36-year-old Alder sheep rancher, is the first Montanan to get the Nation's highest military decoration, the Congressional Medal of Honor. "He just stood up and tossed grenades in underhanded. He couldn't hit a barn door overhanded. I expected him to be killed any minute." In these words, one of "Pop" Powers' buddies described the action. Originally rated a limited-service classification because of sore feet and a back ailment, Private (1st cl.) Powers saw green replacements being mowed down by German machine gun and mortar fire. He took only 4 hand grenades, knocked out 3 enemy machine guns entrenched in pillboxes, killed 5 Germans, and probably wounded 12 others, took 4 prisoners and led to the capture of 13 more. Private (1st cl.) Powers entered the armed forces at Butte, September 17, 1942. He has been wounded twice.

[From the Montana Standard, Butte, Mont., of September 5, 1944]

ALDER SOLDIER IS FIRST MONTANA MAN TO WIN HIGHEST AWARD

Pvt. (1st cl.) Leo J. "Pop" Powers, Alder sheep rancher, became Montana's top-ranking hero of World War No. 2 this week with the announcement by the War Department Monday that he has been awarded the Nation's highest military decoration, the Congressional Medal of Honor. The 36-year-old Montanan, who originally rated a limited service classification because of sore feet and a chronic back ailment, was dubbed "The one-man Army" during the historic Fifth Army battle for Cassino for his single-handed conquest of a strategic hill.

He is the first Montana soldier to win the Congressional Medal of Honor, the Nation's highest military decoration, in the Army.

With only 4 hand grenades, the Thirty-fourth "Red Bull" Infantry Division private knocked out 3 enemy machine guns entrenched in pillboxes, killed 5 Germans and probably wounded 12 others, took 4 prisoners, and led to the capture of 13 others.

Powers' company, reduced to 17 men, advanced up the hill, captured an additional 13 Germans, drove away the 20 defenders who had survived, and captured the hill.

HERO WOUNDED

Powers was wounded less than 2 weeks later when a German shell hit a house.

Technical Sgt. Gerald V. Montgomery, of Fayetteville, W. Va., who fought at Powers' side before Cassino, offered to tell how the Alder infantryman was motivated when he attacked the pillboxes.

"Pop and I used to talk things over, like at night when we were alone in a dugout waiting for something to happen," Montgomery said. "After that Cassino deal we were sitting around one night, and I asked Pop what got into him on Hill 175.

"You see, he was a pretty quiet guy and cautious. He always dug a foxhole first thing and never picked up souvenirs on the battlefield for fear of booby traps. He didn't go in for hero stuff. This is how Pop answered me, or the gist of it anyway:

" 'I don't like to talk about it much, Mont,' he said, 'but something did get into us. I watched those young fellows charging up the hill with us—we'd got some replacements a few days before, you know—and I saw some of them get hit. Then we were all pinned down by that machine-gun and mortar concentration.' "

SO YOUTH COULD LIVE

" 'There I was, a pretty old man compared to those youngsters. They ought to do a lot more living yet. Suddenly I felt that maybe I could do something to let them live. So I got up and did it. You understand, don't you, Mont? I'd hate for you to think I put on an act.'

"That was quite a stretch of talking for Pop. But he didn't have to tell me that he hadn't put on an act. He had trouble with his feet. On marches he could never take advantage of a rest period, because he was always trying to catch up with the rest of us. A guy like that doesn't go in for heroism. He goes in for what he thinks he has to. But imagine a guy taking a hill practically by himself because he felt he was too old!"

A SWELL GUY

"Pop was a swell guy," said Pvt. (1st cl.) Lloyd Eaton, speaking of Powers, who was his tentmate during the early phase of the Italian campaign. "We got along swell. He was always cheerful and was a good friend of everybody. He didn't talk much, but when a recruit wanted information he usually went to Pop for it."

The tentmates were known to their comrades as "Pop" Powers and "Mother" Eaton. Eaton, 33, a rifleman, lived in Corbin, Ky., before the war.

Powers has since been reclassified and relieved of combat duty, going into an ordnance unit.

"He had sore feet and couldn't keep up on hikes," Eaton said of Powers. "He was always the last one and could never take a break with the rest of the guys. He hated those hikes and forced marches.

"Pop was a replacement when he joined us in Africa, and when we got into combat in Italy he remembered everything he'd learned in training. He was always the first to dig a fox hole. He never picked up battlefield souvenirs, and he always kept his rifle in perfect condition."

"He's short," put in Pvt. (1st cl.) George Raschbaum, of Brooklyn, N. Y., who fought in the hill battle with Powers, "about 5 feet 4 inches I would say. Kind of stocky, not very though. He's got coal black hair, usually needs a shave. He had an easy way of talking and was sociable but didn't shoot off his mouth. He didn't complain much either except about long hikes. His feet gave him trouble."

NOT RECKLESS

"You'd think that a guy who stuck out his neck like 'Pop' did at Cassino was a reckless type all the time. But 'Pop' wasn't. He was always pretty careful. We used to kid him because he'd be the first to dig a fox hole. And he was forever cleaning his rifle."

" 'Pop' always gave new fellows in the company this advice," added Pvt. (1st cl.) Hubert G. Miller, of Vienna, W. Va. " 'First learn to hug the ground. The rest will come.' 'Pop' was battlewise, not one of these smart alecs."

Miller also is a veteran of the Cassino siege.

"He wasn't excited when he knocked out those pillboxes," Miller resumed. "He just stood up and tossed grenades in underhanded. He couldn't hit a barn door overhanded. I expected him to be killed any minute."

" 'Pop' smoked a lot," attested Corp. Leon F. Farr, of Columbiana, Ala., "and was a great coffee drinker, like most G. I.'s. But he wasn't nervous, and I never saw him excited."

READY TO HELP

Sgt. Edward G. Ness, of Sioux City, Iowa, mess sergeant in Powers' outfit, recalled that Powers had a healthy appetite and usually came back for seconds.

"What I noticed about Pop was that he was always ready to help a guy in any way," said Sgt. Burnell J. McNaughton, also of Sioux City. "He never complained when details had to be given in a rest area, like digging sump holes or putting up a tent."

Pvt. (1st cl.) Dino A. DeAngelis, of Southbridge, Mass., recalled that Powers, who got lots of mail packages, didn't eat much candy himself, and whenever he got any he passed it round. He could never say 'No' to the Italian kids who beg for 'caramelli.' "

"Pop liked vino," Staff Sgt. Bert L. Guizette, of Waukee, Iowa, remembered, "but he never let it get the best of him. Careful as he was in everything else, he'd never play for more than a buck a throw in a crap game. In one game I remember he passed 15 times but still wouldn't bet more than a dollar."

Entering the Army at Butte, Mont., Sept. 17, 1942, Private Powers was originally given a limited service status because of sore feet and a chronic back ailment, which was the cause of his recent transfer to duty out of combat.

He joined the Thirty-fourth Division in May 1943 in north Africa, where he trained for 4 months prior to making the invasion in Italy last September. He was wounded twice during the campaign, participating in the fight for Mount Pantano, three operations to establish bridgeheads across the Volturno River and the offensive that pushed over the Gustav line. He fought as a rifleman.

UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION FOR FEDERAL EMPLOYEES

Mr. OUTLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. OUTLAND. Mr. Speaker, last Friday I received from Gov. Earl Warren, of California, a letter urging me to support unemployment compensation for Federal employees. I am in complete accord with Governor Warren's position in this matter; as a matter of fact, I would extend the benefits of unemployment compensation to other additional groups in our population, including seamen, packing-shed workers, and others. I am pleased to note that the Governor of California has come out for this provision in the George bill which was so unceremoniously removed here in the House.

I have only one suggestion to make to Governor Warren. It will be noted that every minority member of the House Ways and Means Committee opposed the retention in the bill of the provision including Federal workers. Governor Warren is recognized as a leading member of the Republican Party, even though he won his election for governor by campaigning as a nonpartisan. I would suggest to him that he write similar letters to all Republican members of the Ways and Means Committee, requesting them to reverse their stand and to work for the extension of the Social Security Act to cover Federal workers. Surely his position on this important matter would receive the utmost consideration by the leaders within his own party.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Wednesday, after the completion of the business of the day, I may address the House for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

(Mr. LANDIS asked and was granted permission to extend his own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.)

BATTLE OF INFLATION

Mr. LANDIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

[Mr. LANDIS addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include an editorial from the Christian Science Monitor.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Vermont?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that after other special orders today I may be permitted to address the House for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

INEXPERIENCED AND UNTRAINED MEN IN THE ARMED FORCES

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to extend my remarks and include therein a letter I have received.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I accuse the present administration of sending new men, inadequately trained to fight, against veteran troops on various battlefields. I am quoting here from an article appearing in an Illinois paper, which reads:

Word was received Thursday afternoon by Mrs. Rena Lutyens, Rock Falls, from her son, Seaman Edward C. Lutyens, that he has arrived overseas, somewhere in the South Pacific. He has been in the Navy for approximately 3 months. He stated in his letter that he enjoyed the trip and was feeling fine. He is married and has two children.

I also received a letter from a father which reads as follows:

AMBOY, ILL., *September 8, 1944.*

Hon. LEO ALLEN,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. ALLEN: This just happens to be from a very indignant father over what I claim to be pretty rotten in treatment of 17-year-old boys going into the Navy.

All last winter the radio told the boys what swell chances they had by enlisting in the Navy schooling and so forth, so with this in my mind I signed off for my son who won't be 18 until next month. Here is what he got: 7 weeks at Great Lakes, 9 days at home, 1 day back at Great Lakes, 3 days in Long Island, and then an address in care of Fleet Post Office, San Francisco, Calif. All the schooling he received was how to become a first-class porter.

I know war is war; my dues have been paid for years in the American Legion and the 40 and 8, but we ridiculed Hitler for using 16- and 17-year-olds and what are we doing? My son has yet to complain, but I think it time for parents of 17 years to do so, especially when they ship these kids out of this country with no training. If my memory is correct, no 17- or 18-year-old boys were to be sent out of this country without a year's training. Great Lakes still has plenty of ball players who have been there quite a while; the same goes for other training stations and camps. It is not what you know but who you know. If I were a "bookie," my son would still be at Great Lakes.

If I had known what I know now, my son would still be working here in a drug store. I had hopes of his getting into something which he could be useful at now and in years to come, with the pharmacy experience he has had. My feelings are mutual with another parent whose son, 17 years old, was with my son until they left New York.

Two and one-half months after graduation from high school, boys are on their way to foreign shores.

I would appreciate a reply.

Yours very truly,

A. D. NEIS.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. EATON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include therein an address which I delivered on July 6 in my home district on the subject of post-war problems.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on two subjects, to include in one a brief on the ceiling for Federal taxes, and in the other on the subject, Mr. Dewey, an Apostle of Hope, to include a short editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

POST-WAR UNEMPLOYMENT POLICY

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, this is the first time since I have been a Member of this House that I have entered into any discussion that might be termed "political." I wish only to say to our good colleague the gentleman from California [Mr. OUTLAND], who seems so worried about what Governor Warren of California had to say about paying unemployment insurance to Federal workers that I hope when Governor Warren writes that letter to the Republican members of the Ways and Means Committee it might be a good thing for him also to write to the Democratic members of the Ways and Means Committee, who have a majority, and to the administration which controls this House. Why try to pass your shortcomings to the minority?

Personally I am getting tired of hearing Members rise in this Chamber and criticize Republicans for being reactionaries and Tories and wanting the Members to vote for $35 a week for somebody's not working for 2 years when they would not even let the white collar workers get $37.50 a week when they were willing to work.

My colleague the gentleman from Wisconsin, the Honorable FRANK B. KEEFE, introduced an amendment to extend the unemployment insurance to Federal workers. This was objected to on a point of order. Many Members of the House, both Republican and Democratic, would have supported the terms of this Keefe amendment if the Democrat-controlled Ways and Means Committee had not brought out the bill they did.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

ERADICATION OF INSECT PESTS

Mr. PACE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 4278) to provide for the control and eradication of certain animal and plant pests and diseases, to facilitate cooperation with the States in fire control, to provide for the more efficient protection and management of the national forests, to facilitate the carrying out of agricultural conservation and related agricultural programs, to facilitate the operation of the Farm Credit Administration and the Rural Electrification Administration, to aid in the orderly marketing of agricultural commodities, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments; that the House recede from its amendments to Senate amendments Nos. 1 and 3 and agree to the action of the Senate in receding from their amendments Nos. 1 and 3.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman explain in very clear language the necessity for this?

Mr. PACE. The bill H. R. 4278 was an authorization bill which passed the House last May authorizing certain appropriations that Congress has made for a number of years but which had never been authorized by law. After being amended I believe the bill passed the House practically unanimously.

The Senate Committee on Agriculture reported the bill line for line as it was passed by the House; but they did add three amendments, one having to do with the school-lunch program, a second having to do with the Farm Security Administration, and a third having to do with the tobacco-acreage allotments.

The House never agreed to the amendment relating to tobacco allotments but did agree with an amendment to the school-lunch and Farm Security provisions. On account of the fact that these two provisions subsequently were written into the agricultural appropriation bill and enacted into law the Senate has agreed to recede from all three amendments. Inasmuch as the other two provisions are now in the agricultural appropriation bill they have receded from the tobacco amendment.

I am advised by the Parliamentarian, however, that inasmuch as we concurred in two of the amendments with amendments it is now necessary that the House concur in the action of the Senate in receding from their original amendments.

Mr. MICHENER. Yes; I understand that. The language of the request is unusual from a parliamentary standpoint; it is very difficult to understand. It expresses what ought to be done, but in a very unusual way. I do not wish to apologize for the Parliamentarian in drafting the language of the request, for I think it is the only possible approach he could make to a situation so unusual.

Mr. PACE. I am advised it is under these circumstances.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may I ask the gentleman if it is not a fact that this year we have a 16-percent increase in tobacco, and we have had to give 25 percent of the crop away? As one individual, Mr. Speaker, I am going to make the point of order a quorum is not present. I am tired of seeing these measures for corn, cotton, and wheat brought up. I have seen 30 bills for cotton in the last 10 years brought up, and I think it is time to call a halt.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman object to the unanimous-consent request?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER. Objection is heard.

Mr. PACE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PACE]?

There was no objection.

Mr. PACE. Mr. Speaker, the Senate amendment related to a tolerance of one-fifth of an acre on tobacco in the measurement of it, but that amendment is knocked out; consequently there is nothing in the bill that has to do with tobacco. The consent we are asking expressly eliminates from the bill all reference to tobacco. In view of the gentleman's interest in rural electrification which is carried in this bill and which is now held up, I hope the gentleman will not object and hold up action on the bill as it contains nothing relating to cotton, corn, tobacco, or to any other subject of that kind.

Mr. JENKINS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PACE. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. JENKINS. I understand if we should adopt the gentleman's suggestion the tobacco allowance will be eliminated?

Mr. PACE. Yes. The Senator from South Carolina offered an amendment providing when a man's tobacco acreage is measured, if it comes within one-fifth of an acre of his allotment he would not be held to be a noncooperator. The Senate felt that tolerance should be permitted, but the Members of the House were not willing to agree to that tolerance; consequently the House never concurred in the tobacco amendment. The Senate has now receded from the tobacco amendment and therefore it is out of the bill. The importance of the bill at this moment is that it authorizes many appropriations that are very necessary and provides for the expansion of rural electrification. This bill should get to the White House at the earliest possible moment.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman renew his request?

Mr. PACE. Mr. Speaker, I renew my request.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I am going to make a point of no quorum. This is one of the most important measures so far as the farmers are concerned that has ever passed Congress. It contains three provisions that I have been urging for years. It reduces the interest rate to the R. E. A. co-ops to 2 percent, extends the amortization period to 35 years, and removes the limit that can be provided for rural electrification each year. It will enable us to electrify every farm home in America, just as soon as materials are made available.

I certainly want to commend the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PACE] for his diligent and persistent efforts to get this measure through. He is one of the best friends rural electrification has in this House and he has rendered the farmers a great service in securing the passage of this bill.

Mr. McCORMACK. If there is any way to help the gentleman, we will do so. The leadership on both sides will be glad to assist the gentleman, but I call the gentleman's attention to the fact that his making the point of order will not meet the situation because this has to be done by unanimous consent just the same.

Mr. RANKIN. It will develop a quorum and serve notice on other Members to be here, because if the gentleman from Wisconsin persists in his objections, we are going to have to put this measure through by a vote of the House. I want this measure with these rural electrification provisions in it to become the law now, so that the R. E. A. cooperatives can begin to make surveys of their needs.

Mr. McCORMACK. I am in complete agreement with the position taken by the gentleman from Mississippi and the gentleman from Georgia. I am in thorough agreement with their objectives and desires, but I call attention to the fact that the making of a point of order and the development of a quorum will not meet the situation and enable it to be considered because it has to go through by unanimous consent.

Mr. RANKIN. In that connection let me say to the gentleman from Massachusetts, the majority leader, that it does not have to go through by unanimous consent. There are two ways in which it can be brought to the floor of the House, one under suspension of the rules, and another under a rule. In either case the chances are there will be a roll call and we should like to know if there is a quorum in Washington before we come to that point.

As I said, we must get this measure through as early as possible, so that work may begin on these R. E. A. lines just as soon as we can get materials.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman from Mississippi, of course, gives the gentleman from Massachusetts credit for knowing that it can be brought up under those two processes. The call of the Consent Calendar will not take place until a week from Monday, as I understand it. It is only then that a motion to suspend the rules will be in order, if the Speaker would recognize a Member for that purpose. Also the probabilities of a rule coming out at this time, as the gentleman from Mississippi knows, is very, very remote.

I hope that the gentleman from Wisconsin will withdraw his objection.

Mr. RANKIN. A member of the Rules Committee sitting here by me assures me that we can get a rule.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I have no reason today more than any other day to be disagreeable, but I do not like to be put behind the eight ball all the time. I always like to know what is going on. I figure a lot of things are happening that I do not know anything about.

Mr. RANKIN. I hope the gentleman from Wisconsin will withdraw his objections. I am sure he would like to see us electrify every farm home in America. Rural electrification is the greatest thing that has ever been done for the farmers of this country, so let us reach them all with it.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. May I say to the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi that my colleague the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PACE] has explained to me now that there is nothing in this legislation that has not already had the approval of the House and also the Agricultural Committee of the House, so I withdraw my objection, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. RANKIN. I thank the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my point of order.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

THE LATE JAMES A. REED

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for an announcement.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I regret to announce the death of a man who, through 18 years of distinguished service as a Senator from Missouri, played a large and determining part in the history of the Nation and the world. Former Senator James A. Reed, of Missouri, at the age of 82, died at his summer home near Fairview, Mich., Friday, September 8. By nature he was an irreconcilable. Through his long and notable career as a legislator and a jurist he remained consistently a nonconformist rather than a collaborator, a belligerent rather than a pacificator, a prosecutor rather than a defender, an iconoclast rather than a builder. Although an adherent of the Democratic Party he was out of sympathy with every Democratic administration in power during his service in the Congress and opposed vigorously and indefatigably the major administrative measures of his party throughout his legislative career.

Championing the cause of labor in his first campaign, he became the implacable foe of organized labor in his later years. Opposed to woman suffrage until its enactment, he asked for the support of the women of Missouri from every platform in the State in his 1922 campaign. At all times an aggressive opponent of national prohibition he appealed for the

support of the dry sentiment of the Nation in his campaign for the Presidency at the Houston Convention in 1928. Commending in his earlier speeches international collaboration for universal peace, he was the first to attack and was probably more than any other one man instrumental in preventing the ratification by the United States of the Covenant of the League of Nations. One of the prominent farm leaders of his time who had heard his apostrophe to agriculture at the Kansas State Fair and his vitriolic denunciation of the farm support of McNary-Haugen bill on the floor of the Senate said, "The Great Master of the Universe Himself never knows What Jim Reed is going to do or say."

Often an Ishmaelite, "with every man's hand against him," he was eminently capable of taking care of himself. Branded by party leaders as a renegade, listed by President Wilson as one of the famous "little group of willful men" in the Senate battle for ratification of the Versailles Treaty, denied—on the official report of the Committee on Credentials—a seat as delegate at the San Francisco Convention in 1920, he fought his way back to the Senate in the 1922 election and established himself more firmly than ever as an outstanding figure in American politics.

Then at the height of his powers and prestige, he voluntarily retired from the Senate and from public life and resumed the practice of law.

He was one of the most eloquent men in the long list of congressional orators. He was a word painter, a phrase maker, a coiner of epigrams, a master of satire and sarcasm, of invective and caustic objurgation, and his speeches were not only models of judicial logic but contributions to American literature of the highest order. His tribute to Speaker Clark, delivered almost extemporaneously in this Chamber is the most beautiful eulogy in the English language. Speaking at the funeral services of the great Speaker on March 5, 1921, he said:

A wonderful stream is the river of life. A slender thread emerging from the mysterious realm of birth, it laughs and dances through the wonder world of childhood. Its broadening currents sweep the plains of youth between the flower-decked banks of romance and of hope. A mighty torrent, it rushes over the rapids of manhood and breaks in foam upon the rocks of opposition and defeat, then glides away across the barren, sterile fields of age until it is engulfed and lost within the waters of the eternal sea.

The robes of royalty, the beggar's rags, the rich man's golden hoard, the pauper's copper pence, the jeweled diadems of princes, and the thorny crowns of martyrs alike are swept by the same ceaseless tides.

The miracle of birth, the mystery of death remain the unsolved problems of all time. The shepherd philosopher who, 3,000 years ago upon the Syrian plains, observed the procession of the planets and contemplated the decrees of fate was as wise perhaps as is the wisest of today. He only knew that standing here upon this bank of time his straining eyes could not glimpse even the shadowy outline of the farther shore. He could only behold the white sails of receding fleets; ships that sail out, but never come again. He only knew that at the grave's dread mouth all men must cast aside the burden of their honors and their griefs; that man takes with him only that which he has freely given away; but that even death may not despoil him of the riches of service and self-sacrifice.

Measured by that standard, he who sleeps today bears with him to the tomb a legacy so rare that even envy is compelled to pay the tribute of admiration.

CITY OF BEARDSTOWN, ILL.

Mr. PATTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 4931) for the relief of the city of Beardstown, Ill.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. MICHENER. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I see the gentleman who represents the Beardstown district is present. Will one of the gentlemen explain the bill?

Mr. PATTON. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SIMPSON] to explain the bill.

Mr. SIMPSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, the city of Beardstown has owned and operated a municipal bridge for the past 50 years. The tolls on this bridge represent about 90 percent of that city's revenue. The purpose of the proposed legislation is to appropriate the sum of $75,000 to the city of Beardstown, Ill., in full settlement of all claims against the United States for damages and cost of replacement of the municipally owned bridge across the Illinois River as the result of being struck by United States Navy vessel *LST 610* on April 30, 1944.

Mr. WHITE. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, the gentleman says the bridge has been in operation for the last 50 years. Have not the revenues paid for its construction yet? Is it the settled policy on the part of that city to derive its revenue from the payment of tolls by people passing across the country?

Mr. SIMPSON of Illinois. The draw span of the bridge was completely damaged by the Navy vessel's striking it, putting the bridge entirely out of commission.

Mr. WHITE. That does not answer my question. I want to know if it is the settled policy of that community to charge tolls for the use of a bridge as a means of raising their city revenue, or are the tolls eventually going to be taken off and the bridge made a free bridge?

Mr. SIMPSON of Illinois. It is to raise revenue.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. The Navy recommended this and so did the Director of the Budget.

Mr. McCORMACK. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, this is the bill the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN] spoke to me about. This has the unanimous report of the committee. The gentleman from Illinois upon my suggestion also contacted one of the members of the objectors committee on the Democratic side. That is correct, is it not?

Mr. SIMPSON of Illinois. That is right.

Mr. McGREGOR. As a member of the objectors committee on the Republican side, may I say that we were contacted and we have no objection to it.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the city of Beardstown, Ill., the sum of $100,000. Such sum represents the actual cost to the city of Beardstown of repairing the municipally owned bridge across the Illinois River. Such bridge was partially destroyed on April 30, 1944, when it was struck by United States Navy vessel *LST 610*.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, strike out lines 6, 7, 8, 9, and 10 and insert the following: "$75,000 in full settlement of all claims against the United States for damages and cost of replacement of the municipally owned bridge across the Illinois River as a result of being struck by United States Navy vessel *LST 610* on April 30, 1944: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that tomorrow, at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day and following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that tomorrow, following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

UNEMPLOYMENT IN RECONVERSION

Mr. ROLPH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include a letter from Gov. Earl Warren, of California, in connection with the unemployment provision in the reconversion bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROLPH. Mr. Speaker, Gov. Earl Warren, of California, urges some form of unemployment compensation for Fed-

eral employees. Copy of the Governor's letter, dated Sacramento, Calif., September 6, 1944, has been filed with House and Senate conferees now considering S. 2051.

So all Members of Congress may be familiar with the views of California's chief executive, I quote the communication in full:

STATE OF CALIFORNIA,
GOVERNOR'S OFFICE,
Sacramento, September 6, 1944.

Hon. THOMAS ROLPH,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: The provision of some form of unemployment compensation for Federal employees is a matter of unusual interest to the State of California. Federal employment on war activities in this State has represented almost 10 percent of our total employment at times during the war years.

We must anticipate the eventual possibility of large-scale unemployment of such workers. While they will not constitute a liability on our State unemployment compensation fund, their unemployment without compensation will create a serious problem. Its magnitude will be sufficient to affect seriously the economic situation in the State.

While many of these Federal employees have accumulated deferred annual leave, and some of them will be entitled to refunds of their contributions to the retirement fund, such benefits do not serve the same purpose as unemployment compensation.

Your consideration is respectfully invited to the importance of the final retention in Senate bill No. 2051 of some form of equitable provision for unemployment compensation for Federal employees.

Sincerely,

EARL S. WARREN, *Governor.*

NIKOLAI KRISTIAN STORKERSEN, CHIEF OFFICER, PRESENTED MERCHANT MARINE DISTINGUISHED SERVICE MEDAL FOR HEROISM UNDER ENEMY ACTION

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include two letters.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to call to your attention and to the attention of the Members of the House, the fact that the President presented the Merchant Marine Distinguished Service Medal to Capt. Nikolai Kristian Storkersen who is a resident of my congressional district, for heroism under enemy action in the face of almost certain death. The citation recites that this act of heroism was in keeping with the fine traditions of the United States Merchant Marine. The award was made to Captain Storkerson on September 8, 1944, in the office of the War Shipping Administration in New York City.

Captain Storkersen's ship, the steamship *Samuel Parker,* was engaged in making a landing on the Sicily beachhead and was unloading high explosives and aviation gasoline when it was strafed by incendiary and explosive bullets, by the enemy. Through the open hatches the cargo was set on fire and an explosion was imminent, when Captain Storkersen, without hesitation descended into a hold with fire hose and extinguished the fires in the ammunition; and stopping only long enough to strap on foamite shoulder tanks, descended into another hold to stop gasoline fires. I know the people of my district, as well as every American citizen, is proud of the heroic action of Captain Storkersen and many thousands of other fighting Americans in our armed forces who are facing danger and death in line of duty, to bring success to our arms.

Mr. Speaker, as a part of my remarks, I include the citation making the award to Captain Storkersen and the letter of transmittal to me from Mr. E. S. Land, Chairman of the United States Maritime Commission.

UNITED STATES MARITIME COMMISSION,
Washington, September 7, 1944.

The Honorable HOMER D. ANGELL,
House of Representatives

DEAR CONGRESSMAN ANGELL: It is my pleasure to send you a copy of the citation accompanying the award of the Merchant Marine Distinguished Service Medal to Capt. Nikolai Kristian Storkersen for heroism under enemy action while serving as chief mate in the steamship *Samuel Parker.*

The medal will be presented to Captain Storkersen by Capt. Edward Macauley, United States Navy, retired, member of the Maritime Commission, in the office of the War Shipping Administration in New York City on Friday, September 8, 1944.

Captain Storkersen's home address is 1916 SE. Fifty-sixth Avenue, Portland, Oreg.

This award is made by authority of Public Law 524.

Sincerely yours,

E. S. LAND, *Chairman.*

[Enclosure.]

UNITED STATES MARITIME COMMISSION,
Washington, September 4, 1944.

The President of the United States takes pleasure in presenting the Merchant Marine Distinguished Service Medal to Nikolai Kristian Storkersen, chief officer.

Citation: For heroism under enemy action.

His ship, steamship *Samuel Parker,* supporting our landing on the Sicily beachhead, was unloading high explosives and aviation gasoline when a wave of enemy planes strafed the ship with incendiary and explosive bullets. Several of these hit into open hatches setting fire to the cargo. Though an explosion which might completely demolish the ship was imminent, Chief Officer Storkersen and an able seaman unhesitatingly descended into one hold with fire hose and extinguished the fires in the ammunition, and then, stopping only long enough to strap on foamite shoulder tanks, descended into the other hold and extinguished the gasoline fires.

His heroism in the face of almost certain death was in keeping with the finest traditions of the United States Merchant Marine.

For the President:

EMORY SCOTT LAND, *Chairman.*

A BILL TO EXTEND TIME FOR VETERANS TO PAY INCOME TAXES

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, under the provisions of section 513, Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act of 1942, as amended, men and women serving in the armed forces may suspend payments of income taxes during their period of service and for 6 months thereafter.

There are thousands of members of our armed forces who have found it necessary to take advantage of this provision. In the meantime families of many of these people have used their surplus funds for living expenses. As these men and women are separated from service they are bound to go through a period of financial rehabilitation. It will be impossible in thousands of cases for them to meet the obligations of paying their back income taxes within 6 months after leaving the service.

I believe it is in the national interest, as well as fair and equitable, that the present law be amended to provide that when men and women are discharged from the armed forces they be granted an extension of 5 years after the 6 months' period during which to pay these taxes with a further provision they be paid in quarterly installments. This amendment will save a lot of embarrassment on the part of service men and women as well as their families and give them a reasonable chance to take care of their obligations. The fact of the matter is, there are a great many men and women who will not be able to comply with the present law. We may as well recognize that fact right now. The Government will lose no revenue, and many service men and women will be relieved of a lot of inconvenience and embarrassment.

I am today introducing a bill carrying the provisions of the statement I have just made. I trust the committee to which it is referred as well as the House will see that this important measure is given prompt and favorable consideration.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the the RECORD and to include a speech made by Governor Bricker a short time ago.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio.

There was no objection.

WAR PRODUCTION BOARD

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, not many days ago, Director Byrnes appeared before the Ways and Means Committee and advocated the George bill with its provisions for unemployment compensation for about three and a half million Federal employees and with its provision for the payment of $300 travel pay to unemployed claiming that there would be many who would need such assistance.

In yesterday's paper, however, he is quoted as saying that "the fear of great unemployment after the defeat of Germany has been exaggerated."

Likewise just a few days ago the War Production Board had a big explosion which blew Donald Nelson to China and Charlie Wilson back to Pittsburgh. The War Production Board has

had under its control more business than any other agency in the history of the world. All at once young Julius Krug is put at the head of this great Government activity although he has had no business experience whatever. His principal qualifications are that he has been a New Dealer who takes orders from Frankfurter, Hopkins, and Lilienthal. He now gives the impression that the administration of the War Production Board is an easy matter indicating that Congress need not worry further about the disposition of this hundred billion dollars of business and property controlled by the Government for it will be disposed of in the typical New Deal manner. In other words, we are justified in believing that it will be wasted and scattered.

Why these great changes in viewpoint in face of the fact that the Congress is acting on these important problems? They are afraid of the action of Congress and are afraid that this is the last chance for them before a change of administration on the 20th of January 1945.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that after the completion of other special orders today, I be permitted to address the House for 25 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks briefly at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I believe this is the first time that I have taken the time of the House to mention a purely partisan matter. However, I cannot refrain from making the observation that the opening speech in this 1944 campaign made by Mr. Dewey in Philadelphia has brought about more action from the New Deal administration than dozens of speeches along the same line have produced during the past year. In the few days that have elapsed since Mr. Dewey's Philadelphia speech, just about every one of the war agencies have rushed into print with assurances that they are about to release the restrictions they have imposed on our constituents for the past 3 years.

Only 2½ weeks ago, Mr. Chester Bowles assured the country that rationing would be continued for at least 2 years after the war but immediately following Mr. Dewey's speech, War Mobilizer Byrnes released a statement from the White House that does away with rationing on about seventeen different items. War Production Board followed with an announcement that its restrictions would be lifted immediately after the collapse of Hitler. War Production Board's announcement was immediately followed by a release from the War Department which would lead one to believe that the speedy demobilization of the Army was uppermost in the minds of our General Staff. I fully expect that it is only a matter of hours until Secretary Morgenthau announces that there will be no more Federal taxes after Hitler collapses.

I am reminded of the career of the Honorable Ben Butler, of Massachusetts, who used to say that he could make more accusations and charges against his political foe, in an opening campaign speech, than could be answered before election. I am frankly fearful that some of the New Deal spokesmen have, in the past week, made more promises than they can fulfill during the balance of their political lives which should expire on January 20 next.

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein two editorials, one entitled "Dewey's Foreign Policy," and the second entitled "No Mourners."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD in one instance, and in the second instance to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota.

There was no objection.

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include therein a special report of the National Association of Insurance Commissioners.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Mexico?

There was no objection.

LET US DISPOSE OF OUR SURPLUS PROPERTY IN A WAY THAT WILL BENEFIT THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

Mr. IZAC. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. IZAC. Mr. Speaker, the disposal of surplus Government property, of which it is expected we will have $100,000,000,000 worth, should be of vital concern to our constituents and to the taxpayers generally. For this property which already accumulates and which consists of all kinds and types imaginable, was paid for by the people of this country. As their Representatives, it seems to me it is incumbent on us to see that a procedure is established whereby we realize the greatest return possible to the Federal Treasury on all sales of this property, and at the same time prevent the gouging of the public by those who obtain these goods for resale to our people.

The amendment which I stated to the House on August 15 that I would offer when the bill now in conference was before us, was known as the mark-up limitation amendment, and my colleague the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS] and I collaborated to present it to the House. Our purpose, of course, was to prevent the acquiring by some fly-by-night outfit of large quantities of surplus property at a low price and then disposing of it to the American people at a high figure. This amendment, if adopted, taken together with my colleague's other amendment, requiring the disposal of materials in the smallest practicable lots, would, we hoped, make it possible for our constituents to acquire some things they had already paid for through taxes, and at a price which would be the normal commercial mark-up permitting the middleman—if there were one—to have a fair profit but denying excessive profits to anyone.

I am sure our people want no more of those scandals such as from time to time have rocked the country; where, for instance, a lot of goods is sold by a Government agency for a song and then resold by the lucky or crooked individual or group to their fellow citizens at a profit of hundreds and even thousands percent. If I correctly interpret the wishes of my constituents, I will say we should make it possible for all our people to share in the proceeds of this vast disposal program: First, by covering into the Treasury of the United States as much money as can possibly be obtained from the sale of this property, thus to that extent reducing the national debt; and, second, by permitting the individual to obtain at a fair price what he needs of this surplus property without paying a tribute in the form of excessive profits to a middleman.

Mr. Speaker, it is a matter of keen regret to me that our amendment failed. The Committee on Naval Affairs in its hearings covering a period of many weeks recognized the desirability of such a mark-up limitation even though we could find no proper formula therefor. This House should insist on finding a way to gain our objective if they are not satisfied with my amendment. Right now the conferees on the part of the House and the Senate are endeavoring to write a bill we can all support. No bill which permits exorbitant mark-ups of surplus Government supplies will be acceptable to me or to my constituents. If such a bill is finally agreed upon and we experience again the nauseating scandals of the post-war period of World War No. 1, I want to be on record as having voiced this warning.

It is not too late to close the doors against these dangers. Let the conferees protect us against future condemnation. I offer them again the same amendment which, although strongly supported throughout this body, was rejected when we were in Committee of the Whole. Herewith amendment to H. R. 5125. Insert the following new section:

In order to prevent speculative and excessive profits being realized by anyone the Administrator shall prescribe fair margins of mark-up on any item disposed of by any Government agency for resale by the purchaser. These margins shall be in accordance with usual trade practices and it shall be unlawful to resell surplus property for a

price in excess of these margins so prescribed.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, I have two unanimous-consent requests. In both cases I desire to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include certain communications and excerpts.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Idaho?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow, at the close of other special orders, I may address the House for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

WAR PRODUCTION BOARD

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, in answer to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JENKINS], I would like to make two points. In the first place, it is altogether consistent to be confident that there will not be a period of serious unemployment in this country and also at the same time to make the kind of provision against it which will assure us that it will not happen. In the second place, I took this floor and expressed my profound regret over any move to remove Donald Nelson from the War Production Board. I still feel the same way. I hope Mr. Nelson will come back to his old position. But in all fairness, it seems to me it should be pointed out that Mr. Krug apparently has gotten a very good, constructive start on his job. I also want to say that the great majority of the governing personnel on the War Production Board has from the beginning and is today men of Republican background and present Republican Party affiliation. We have got to continue to carry this job through. I think Mr. Krug has made a good beginning and I do not think his work ought to be obstructed before he fairly gets started. He has a very big and most difficult job under all the circumstances.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks that I made in response to the remarks of the gentleman from Massachusetts a few moments ago.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN]?

There was no objection.

THE LATE SENATOR JAMES A. REED, OF MISSOURI

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to extend those remarks and include therein an address delivered on this floor by the late Senator James A. Reed, on the occasion of the death of former Speaker Champ Clark.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I for one join the distinguished gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] in what he had to say about former Senator James A. Reed.

I knew Senator Reed well. While we did not always agree, I was glad to call him my friend.

When I came to Congress, there were giants in the United States Senate. Among them was Oscar Underwood, of Alabama, one of the greatest parliamentary leaders of all time; John Sharpe Williams, of my own State, one of the best informed men who ever occupied a seat in either House; Robert M. LaFollette, of Wisconsin, one of the most thorough men on details and statistics I have ever known. There was William E. Borah, of Idaho, a great debater, and a great political philosopher as well; and James A. Reed, of Missouri, who could hurl jovian bolts of oratory with an irresistible force that has not been equaled since the days of Clay, Calhoun, and Webster.

The address that Senator Reed delivered on this floor on the occasion of the death of former Speaker Champ Clark was one of the most beautiful expressions I ever heard. It was not an oratorical effort, but it went deep into the tender realm of human sentiment and marked him as one of the most eloquent men of his generation.

When he finished, the man sitting next to me asked what I thought of it. I said that it was the only address of its kind I had ever heard that, in my opinion, measured up to, if it did not surpass, Col. Robert G. Ingersoll's address at his brother's grave.

His remarks on the life of Champ Clark might well be applied to Senator Reed himself.

They were as follows:

Senator REED. A wonderful stream in the river of life. A slender thread emerging from the mysterious realm of birth, it laughs and dances through the wonder world of childhood. Its broadening currents sweep the plains of youth between the flower-decked banks of romance and of hope. A mighty torrent, it rushes over the rapids of manhood and breaks in foam upon the rocks of opposition and defeat, then glides away across the barren, sterile fields of age until it is engulfed and lost within the waters of the eternal sea.

The robes of royalty, the beggar's rags, the rich man's golden hoard, the pauper's copper pence, the jeweled diadems of princes, and the thorny crowns of martyrs alike are swept by the same ceaseless tides.

The miracle of birth, the mystery of death remain the unsolved problems of all time. The shepherd philosopher who 3,000 years ago upon the Syrian plains observed the procession of the planets and contemplated the decrees of fate was as wise perhaps as is the wisest of today. He only knew that standing here upon this bank of time his straining eyes could not glimpse even the shadowy outline of the farther shore. He could only behold the white sails of receding fleets; ships that sail out, but never come again. He only knew that at the grave's dread mouth all men must cast aside the burden of their honors and their griefs; that man takes with him only that which he has freely given away; but that even death may not despoil him of the riches of service and self-sacrifice.

Measured by that standard, he who sleeps today bears with him to the tomb a legacy so rare that even envy is compelled to pay the tribute of admiration.

His long life was devoted to the public weal. Upon his country's altar he placed his wonderful natural talent, the zeal of his youth, the energy of middle life, the wisdom of old age.

With tireless brain he wrought to promote the general good, with sympathetic spirit he labored to lift the burdens of sorrow from the shoulders of the oppressed. His heart cried out for all who trod adversity's harsh road. He explored every avenue of learning and burned his candle late into the night that he might gather for them the lore of other countries and of other times.

The fires of patriotic love for home and country consumed his very soul. He faced each task with the heroic courage of those who do not count the cost. His character rested upon a foundation laid deep in human love.

Champ Clark lives because his works live. He lives because he helped to defend and keep secure the Constitution that preserves our rights. He lives in the Declaration of Independence, whose principles he nurtured with a tender and fearless affection. He lives because he helped liberty to live. Men who have so achieved never die. In ever-widening circles the influences of Champ Clark will be felt, and deeper and yet deeper the tender love the people of his State have borne for him will sink into their hearts.

As time runs on and the historian surveys the picture of these troubled days there will arise in it no figure more heroic than the rugged form that lies so still today.

He was the best beloved of Americans.

How cold are words. Let me speak of the man as my friend. For 30 years I have known him intimately. I watched his course through all the storms of life. How big and brave and rugged was this man. He met each danger like a brave soldier. He never flinched from any task. He stood square-fronted to the world.

They say that he is dead, but we who gaze upon his marble brow must realize the man we knew does not lie here today. The soul that made him what he was cannot have been destroyed.

To his family I cannot speak; but of them let me say in all the world I never knew so much of filial affection, or wifely tenderness, of fatherly love as was manifested in his home. They must find consolation in the memory of this glorious man.

Soon he will sleep in the soil of his beloved State. As it enfolds him, the very clods that touch his coffined clay will be blessed with the love he bore for the old Commonwealth of Missouri.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks on two different subjects.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix and include a newspaper article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may extend my remarks and include newspaper articles on three different subjects in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

THE O. P. A.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend those remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I have asked permission to address the House because I again need the help of the Members as to congressional duty. One of the editors in my district wrote in his paper yesterday "HOFFMAN is a hard-working, sincere Congressman who says what he believes; HOFFMAN is diligent in solving personal problems of his constituents." But then he wrote: "While admiring him for these qualities we are convinced that he would be more effective as a Congressman spending his energy full time on major problems, thereby eliminating many of the minor problems of his constituents at their source."

That was all right. I thought it over and figured I might try that for a time. Then this morning here comes an 11-page single-spaced typewritten complaint from a co-op representing 1,200 farmers, saying that the O. P. A. has fined them $29,000 and has brought suit for $110,000 in the Federal District Court of Grand Rapids, because it charged more than the ceiling price for grapes, and even though it was selling for less than some of its competitors. What would you do as a Congressman? I am asking for your advice? Would you present that complaint to the O. P. A., or would you try to convince Congress that it ought to amend the law governing the O. P. A.? Do you see where I am? I have tried to do both—I guess I will look after the folks in my district first.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a newspaper article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. SASSCER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein a letter from the Chamber of Commerce of Prince Georges County.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include therein a news item.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. MURRAY] may extend his own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

PROGRAM FOR THE WEEK

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, can the majority leader advise us whether there has been any development to indicate when either of the outstanding conference reports will be before the House?

Mr. McCORMACK. I am sorry, but at the present time I am unable to give any answer to the inquiry in which I myself would have confidence.

Surplus property bill: The best information I have at this time on the bill relating to the disposition of surplus property and the status of its progress in conference is that the latter part of the week would be the earliest that I could indicate—I do not even want to predict—indicate that it might come up.

Demobilization and reconversion: As far as the other bill is concerned I made inquiries this morning and could get no information on which I could even attempt to express an indication. I expect to have more information this afternoon, but it is quite probable that whatever action is taken on that bill, whether it be in the nature of the conferees' asking a separate vote on instructions, or otherwise, it probably would not be before the latter part of the week.

I look for nothing on either bill until the latter part of the week at the earliest, and that is more or less speculation on my part.

Mr. MICHENER. In other words, it all adds up to this: The latter part of the week begins on Thursday; there would be nothing before Thursday; and the probability, and the possibility, is that we shall have nothing before Friday.

Mr. McCORMACK. I see one of the points raised in the gentleman's inquiry. I cannot see anything before Thursday. I make the statement now that neither conference report will be called up before Thursday even though they can be brought up. I say this in all confidence that they will not be ready by that time anyway.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MICHENER. I yield.

Mr. JENKINS. I should like to ask the distinguished majority leader whether the conferees on the surplus property bill have agreed and that all that remains to be done is the matter of drafting the report, as we have heard?

Mr. McCORMACK. That is not my understanding based on a talk I had with one of the conferees on the floor just a little while ago. They have made good progress. I believe there is one matter still under discussion that requires a lot of consideration. I believe that outside of that, what the gentleman has said covers the situation, that they are pretty nearly agreed except on one important matter. Even if they did agree on that today it would take some little time to have the bill and conference report prepared.

Mr. JENKINS. It would require considerable time, of course, to put the amendments in the bill if they were many, insert them in the bill in their relative positions.

Mr. McCORMACK. Exactly; and I believe the conferees even after agreement would probably want to go over their work again to be sure that the report represented the complete views of the conferees.

REPEAL OF SECTION 2 OF ACT APPROVED MAY 17, 1926

Mr. THOMASON. Mr. Speaker, at the request of the chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs, who is unavoidably absent, and with the acquiescence of both the majority leader and the minority leader, likewise a minority member of the Committee on Military Affairs, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HARNESS], I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 1250) to repeal section 2 of the act approved May 17, 1926, which provides for the forfeiture of pay of persons in the military and naval service of the United States who are absent from duty on account of the direct effects of venereal disease due to misconduct.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks he can say this to his beloved colleague from Texas better than he could say it to anybody else. The Chair made a statement a while ago that, after consulting certain people and before a unanimous-consent request to call up legislation is presented, the Member should confer with the Speaker. The Chair is going to recognize the gentleman, but he hopes other Members will remember that in the future.

Mr. THOMASON. The Speaker is exactly right. I understood the Speaker had given his consent. I am not familiar with the details of the bill, and as ranking member of the committee, called it up at the request of the chairman.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, this bill, as I recall it, was unanimously reported by the Committee on Military Affairs, but the gentleman from Texas should explain it.

Mr. THOMASON. I should like to have the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] do that. He is familiar with the bill and can speak for the chairman and so far as I know every member of the committee. The bill has passed the Senate unanimously, it has the unanimous support of the House Committee on Military Affairs and likewise has been

amended to conform with certain suggestions of the Veterans' Administration.

Mr. MICHENER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. MICHENER. Is this the bill that the chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs referred to on the floor the other day?

Mr. THOMASON. I am not sure, but I do not think so. The gentleman from Alabama is in charge of the bill and it is at his instance that I called it up today.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. I think the gentleman from Alabama should explain it.

Mr. McCORMACK. The inquiry of the gentleman from Indiana is a very good one so that the RECORD may show just what the bill undertakes to do and will accomplish.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Speaker, the bill does two things. In the first place it repeals section 2 of an act which was approved on May 17, 1926. That act provided for forfeiture of pay of persons in the active military and naval services who are absent from duty on account of the direct effect of venereal disease due to misconduct. The suggested repeal of that provision was sent up by the War Department.

It is particularly important that it be repealed in order to prevent a habit that has grown up which is proving quite dangerous, particularly so in our flying forces; that is, to have concealment and the habit also of secret treatment. This habit of secret treatment has become dangerous especially with the use of the sulfa drugs. It is at the request of the armed services themselves that this be repealed.

The Senate committee added section 2 which provided that no person after separation from the service should be denied any of the benefits or privileges by reason of venereal disease contracted while in the active service. The Veterans' Administration objected to that provision in the form in which it was sent in. Our committee struck out section 2 and rewrote the provision which, as I understand it, conforms to the wishes of the Veterans' Administration. It lends protection to these persons after they are separated from the service.

Mr. MICHENER. In other words, does the amendment provide that if a man in the service, because of his own misconduct, contracts one of these venereal diseases and then becomes physically disabled permanently because of that conduct and that action, he shall receive the same consideration so far as veterans' benefits are concerned as the soldier who conducts himself properly while in the service?

Mr. SPARKMAN. It amends the regulations affecting such cases. Of course, that is a rather broad question to ask. If he became disabled, will he be taken care of, because the causative factor always enters into the case. What section 2 of our amendment does is to project the protection that section 1 gives to the man in the service to that same case after he gets out of the service. It has for its objective the same thing that section 1 has; that is, to prevent concealment of this condition of venereal activity while he is in the service, and it also seeks to prevent the man from indulging in self-treatment while concealing it from the medical officers and from his commanding officer.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I do not like to object, but this is one of those matters that has been before the Congress since the World War. The position of the Veterans' Administration, as I recall, up to now, has been that those incurring disability because of that type of conduct in the service, should not receive the same Government compensation benefits throughout the rest of their lives, as the men who conducted themselves properly while in the service. Immoral conduct should not be encouraged but punished.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I believe a careful reading of our amendment as reported by the reading clerk and of the letter sent to Speaker RAYBURN on October 5, 1943, by Brig. Gen. Frank T. Hines, Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, will satisfactorily answer the gentleman's questions and allay his fears.

The letter from General Hines is as follows:

OCTOBER 5, 1943.

Hon. SAM RAYBURN,
The Speaker's Rooms,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SPEAKER: There is transmitted herewith a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to amend Veterans Regulation No. 10, as amended, to define line of duty and misconduct for pension and compensation purposes," with the request that the same be introduced and referred to the appropriate committee for consideration.

Reference is made to the enclosed copy of the memorandum of disapproval of the President, July 13, 1943, to the Congress on H. R. 986, Seventy-eighth Congress, "An act to define misconduct, for compensation and pension purposes, as limited to felonious misconduct." The last paragraph of the memorandum is quoted for convenience:

"I am advised by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs that as a result of studies made pursuant to understanding with certain committees of the Congress suggestions as to possible amendatory legislation to remove recognized defects will be submitted for consideration of the Congress at an early date."

The enclosed draft incorporates the proposed legislation resulting from the studies made by the Veterans' Administration pursuant to understanding with certain committees of the Congress, referred to by the President in the last paragraph of his said memorandum. There is also enclosed a draft to show changes in existing law which would result from enactment of the enclosed proposal.

The Bureau of the Budget has advised that there would be no objection to the submission of this proposed legislation to the Congress for consideration.

Identical letter sent to the President of the Senate.

The purpose of this proposed legislation is to liberalize the misconduct bar now provided by existing law. The subject has been under study by the Veterans' Administration for a considerable length of time, taking into consideration the legislative history of the provisions of the World War Veterans' Act, 1924, as amended, repealed by Public, No. 2, Seventy-third Congress, March 20, 1933, and restored with limitations and modifications by subsequent legislation as well as the provisions of paragraphs VIII and IX of Veterans Regulation No. 10, as amended, which define "line of duty" and "misconduct." With particular reference to service-connected disabilities, any material liberalization of the definition of "misconduct" as contained in paragraph IX of Veterans Regulation No. 10, as amended, would require changes in the definition of "line of duty" as contained in paragraph VIII of the same regulation, as amended. For that reason, as to service-connected cases under parts I and II of Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a), as amended, it is the opinion of the Veterans' Administration that both "line of duty" and "misconduct" as used in parts I and II of Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a), as amended, may be defined more adequately by incorporating both definitions in the same paragraph, i. e., paragraph VIII of Veterans Regulation No. 10, as amended. The proposed amendment to paragraph VIII would provide that any injury or disease incurred during military or naval service will be deemed to have been incurred in line of duty and not the result of the veteran's own misconduct when the person on whose account benefits are claimed was, at the time injury was suffered or disease contracted, in active service in the military or naval forces, whether on active duty or authorized leave, unless such injury or disease was the result of his own willful misconduct.

The first proviso of section 1 of the bill would remove the presumption of willful misconduct heretofore applied in cases of venereal diseases under precedent decisions of the Comptroller General under the World War Veterans' Act, 1924, as amended. As to such diseases, however, the other requirements specified in the proposed amendment of paragraph VIII would have to be met before service connection could be established.

It is not believed that venereal disease should be presumed to be due to misconduct if the person in service complies with the Army or Navy regulations requiring him to report and receive treatment for such disease. This would be consistent with the recommendations of the War and Navy Departments regarding removal of forfeiture of pay in order to insure necessary and effective medical treatment and cure. It would remove the presumption as to such cases. Further, it is not believed that monetary benefits should be paid where it appears that at the time the injury was suffered or disease contracted the person on whose account benefits are claimed (1) was avoiding duty by deserting the service, or by absenting himself without leave materially interfering with the performance of military duties, or (2) was confined under sentence of court martial or civil court.

The effect of the proposed paragraph would be to establish a bar more comparable to that incorporated in the World War Veterans' Act, 1924, as amended, as restored with limitations and modifications by Public, No. 141, Seventy-third Congress, March 28, 1934; Public, No. 196, Seventy-sixth Congress, July 19, 1939; and sections 7 and 8 of Public, No. 866, Seventy-sixth Congress, October 17, 1940. As to World War No. 1 cases under the World War Veterans' Act, 1924, as amended, and as restored with limitations and modifications, compensation cannot be paid if the injury, disease, aggravation, or recurrence was caused, by the veteran's own willful misconduct. However, the World War Veterans' Act provided that no person suffering from paralysis, paresis, or blindness shall be denied compensation by reason of willful misconduct, nor shall any person who is helpless or bedridden as a result of any disability be denied compensation by reason of

willful misconduct. In restoring these provisions of the World War Veterans' Act, 1924, as amended, Public, No. 196, Seventy-sixth Congress, provided that except as to section 26 of Public, No. 141, the limitations, except as to misconduct or willful misconduct contained in sections 27 and 28 of Public, No. 141, as amended by section 5 of Public, No. 304, Seventy-fifth Congress, would be for application. Public, No. 196, limited the restoration to those on the rolls March 19, 1933. Section 7 of Public, No. 866, however, removed the requirement that the veteran must have been on the rolls March 19, 1933, and also provided for death compensation benefits under Public, No. 484, as amended, for the additional groups included within that section, Public, No. 484, death benefits having been previously provided for the group included under Public, No. 196, supra.

The original War Risk Insurance Act, as amended, included a line-of-duty requirement which was removed in the enactment of the World War Veterans' Act of June 7, 1924, and the willful-misconduct bar was incorporated in section 200 of that act. Based upon experience in the Veterans' Administration with the provisions of paragraphs VIII and IX, Veterans Regulation No. 10, as amended, and willful misconduct limitations, with exceptions, pertaining to World War No. 1 cases heretofore explained it is believed that the proposed paragraph VIII will simplify administration and will permit payment of monetary benefits in a number of cases where it is believed injustices result from the denial thereof. Particularly, it is believed that the proposed paragraph will generally meet the desires and purposes of the committees of Congress which have had this limitation under consideration on repeated occasions, and more particularly during the present Congress.

While the death benefits in World War No. 1 misconduct cases are those provided under Public, No. 484, Seventy-third Congress, as amended, as to those cases which can meet the requirements of the proposed paragraph VIII, the death compensation or pension rates provided under parts I or II of Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a), as amended, would be for application where the death is due to service-connected disability.

The foregoing comment with reference to paragraph VIII pertains to the service-connected cases. The proposed paragraph VIII pertains to service-connected cases both as to the line of duty and misconduct limitations and adequately sets forth the definitions of these terms for such cases.

The second section of the bill would amend paragraph IX of Veterans' Regulation No. 10, as amended, to prohibit payment of pension under part III of Veterans' Regulation No. 1 (a), as amended, for any disability due to the claimant's own willful misconduct or vicious habits. This would have the effect of providing a limitation in service-pension cases similar to that which obtained under the service-pension acts pertaining to the Civil War and the Spanish-American War, including the Boxer Rebellion and Philippine Insurrection, before such limitations were removed from their laws, and would furnish a more satisfactory provision than that now provided under paragraph IX so as to permit the payment of service pension in certain meritorious cases, particularly in the light of the amendment to paragraph VIII for service-connected cases, where such action cannot be taken under the existing definition.

Section 3 of the bill provides that the act shall be effective from the date of its approval and applicable to claims filed or adjudicated thereafter. The beginning dates of awards would be as provided in the applicable statute or regulations. It is further provided that no claim heretofore disallowed by reason of misconduct or line-of-duty requirement shall be revived, but benefits may be payable on the basis of a new claim filed after the date of enactment of the act in such form as may be prescribed by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs.

For the foregoing reasons, it is the recommendation of the Veterans' Administration that the proposed legislation receive early and favorable consideration by the Congress.

Very truly yours,

FRANK T. HINES,
Administrator.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 2 of the act approved May 17, 1926 (44 Stat. 557; 10 U. S. C. 847b; 45 U. S. C. 882b), is hereby repealed.

SEC. 2. No person shall be denied, after separation from the service, any right, benefit, or privilege granted by law, solely by reason of a venereal disease contracted by him either before or during service in the armed forces; and no record thereof made by the War or Navy Department shall be revealed to any person not in that department or to any other governmental department, bureau, or agency, except with the consent of such person.

With the following committee amendment:

On page 1, strike out lines 6 and 7, and on page 2 strike out lines 1 to 6, inclusive, and insert the following:

"SEC. 2. That paragraph VIII of Executive Order Numbered 6098, dated March 31, 1933 (Veterans Regulation Numbered 10, as amended; 38 U. S. C., ch. 12) be amended to read as follows:

"'PAR. VIII. An injury or disease incurred during military or naval service will be deemed to have been incurred in line of duty and not the result of the veteran's own misconduct when the person on whose account benefits are claimed was, at the time the injury was suffered or disease contracted, in active service in the military or naval forces, whether on active duty or on authorized leave, unless such injury or disease was the result of his own willful misconduct: *Provided*, That venereal disease shall not be presumed to be due to willful misconduct if the person in service complies with the Army or Navy regulations requiring him to report and receive treatment for such disease: *Provided further*, That the requirement for line of duty will not be met if it appears that at the time the injury was suffered or disease contracted the person on whose account benefits are claimed (1) was avoiding duty by deserting the service, or by absenting himself without leave materially interfering with the performance of military duties; (2) was confined under sentence of court martial or civil court.'

"SEC. 3. That paragraph IX of Veterans Regulation Numbered 10, as amended, be and is hereby amended to read:

"'PAR. IX. Pension shall not be payable under part III, Veterans Regulation Numbered 1 (a), as amended, for any disability due to the claimant's own willful misconduct or vicious habits.'

"SEC. 4. This act shall be effective from the date of its approval. Sections 2 and 3, inclusive, shall be applicable to claims filed or adjudicated thereafter and the beginning date of awards shall be as provided in applicable statute or regulations: *Provided*, That no claim heretofore disallowed by reason of misconduct or line of duty requirement shall be revived but benefits may be payable on the basis of a new claim filed hereafter in such form as may be prescribed by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "An act to repeal section 2 of the act approved May 17, 1926, which provides for the forfeiture of pay of persons in the military and naval service of the United States who are absent from duty on account of the direct effects of venereal disease due to misconduct, and to amend Veterans Regulation No. 10, as amended, to define line of duty and misconduct for pension and compensation purposes."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] is recognized for 10 minutes.

WANTED—A PURCHASABLE, DOCILE, OBEDIENT CONGRESS

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, the C. I. O.'s Political Action Committee, renamed the National Citizens' Political Action Committee, backed by the war chest of the C. I. O.; the Communist Party, renamed the Communist Political Association, with its former Presidential candidate, Earl Browder, recently released from prison by President Roosevelt, and the New Dealers not only demand the reelection to a fourth term of Franklin D. Roosevelt but they are in the market for a Conress which will follow orders.

They make no secret of their intention to, either by persuasion or by purchase, elect a Congress which will do their bidding. This does not mean that all the candidates supported by these organizations would answer their specifications. Some of those so supported beyond question are sincere, patriotic Americans; but by and large what the individuals and organizations herein named want is a Congress which will submit to dictation from the C. I. O., and that without question as to the ultimate purpose to be accomplished.

One of the organizations which is collecting funds for the purchase of a Congress recently expressed its opinion of Congress. In a demand for funds in the Fleetwing Airplane Factory, at Bristol, Pa., the union posted this bulletin:

> Acting under instructions from the international union, I have been ordered to collect the sum of $1, an assessment which has been levied on every member of our local union. This must be paid by July 10, 1944. Your steward will collect the money and give you a receipt for same.

That notice, signed by the treasurer of the local, was supplemented by a letter from the local president, which told the membership:

> Sad as it may seem, in this great democracy of ours, Congressmen must be greased, that is wined, dined, and bribed for their votes, and they can be very effectively. This greasing process costs a tidy sum with every session of Congress. This is what your dollar goes for.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Just for a question.

Mr. RABAUT. The gentleman has been here for 10 years. Does he believe that is true?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Of course, that is a silly, absurd, slanderous statement. This insulting statement that Congressmen can be bought for a sandwich and a bottle of wine is the rankest sort of nonsense. But that the C. I. O. money was intended for political corruption through the Political Action Committee, or otherwise, is obvious. Does the gentleman want to know why I repeat it? I will tell him. I repeat it because I think it is time for this House to call in these creators and disseminators of falsehood and force them to admit that their statements are without foundation.

Another C. I. O. official, Max Perlow, secretary-treasurer of the United Furniture Workers-C. I. O., explains the need for money and the union leaders tell one of the purposes for which it is to be used:

Political action is the need of the hour. * * * But we must remember that political action and finances go hand in hand. The C. I. O. is told: "You can't use any moneys in the election campaign except direct contributions from individuals." But, we know better than that.

Members and leaders of the United Furniture Workers, wherever you are, act immediately on the program in support of the N. C.-P. A. C. One dollar per C. I. O. member; 50 cents for the local activity and 50 cents to the N. C.-P. A. C. Let's count noses—$1 can be a real contribution to the cause of humanity.

The professed belief of the C. I. O.—and they know better—that Congressmen are corrupt is nothing new, as pointed out by me on the floor of the House on June 11 of last year. As stated by me then—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, page 5738:

In No. 3, volume 1, the June 1943 issue of Ammunition, the official publication, International Education Department, U. A. W., C. I. O., published by International Union, United Automobile, Aircraft, and Agricultural Implement Workers of America, on page 25 appears an article entitled "Made in Washington."

It is not signed, and the author is not disclosed. It is a vicious attempt to discredit Congress. Among other statements are the following:

"The United Automobile Workers, Congress of Industrial Organizations, rank and file made itself heard here last month. Delegates from eight Midwestern States came to tell Congress how the people back home felt about the shenanigans going on in Congress at a time when the people of the country are making every sacrifice in order to win the war. They also called on the various Government offices and told them the facts of life.

* * * * *

"Groups of Congressmen and Senators met collectively and individually with delegates from their States. The pressure on Congress was climaxed by a banquet at which 13 Congressmen from 5 States were guests of all the delegates. President R. J. Thomas and Secretary-Treasurer George F. Addes spoke. Vice President Richard T. Frankensteen acted as master of ceremonies."

Then, under the heading "Congressmen impressed" is the following:

"There is no doubt that the Congressmen were impressed. Technical assistance and information provided to the delegates by the Washington office, plus the first-hand information on prices and wages and manpower which the delegates brought with them, made it plain to the Congressmen that unions were a force to be reckoned with. The delegates were impressed with the need to counter reactionary pressure being put on Congress."

Then, in black-face type, was this statement:

"One Congressman, for example, told us off the record at the banquet that all Republican Congressmen had been promised $5,000 as a contribution to their next campaign if they voted for the Ruml plan."

That statement is a direct charge that a majority of the Republicans in Congress had been offered a bribe in return for a vote for the Ruml plan.

It is all very well to talk hush-hush, but when an organization like the C. I. O., with millions of dollars at its command, which has threatened to purge Congress, makes a statement which we know is false it is time that the Members of the House call that organization to an account.

To me, by one of those present, has been given the names of 11 Congressmen who were present.

My suggestion is that the Speaker of this House appoint a special committee, consisting of three members; that that committee be given power to subpena witnesses; that it meet during the coming week, call before it each of the Congressmen who was present and learn what, if anything, was said at that banquet by anyone which would serve as a justification for the paragraph in Ammunition which has just been quoted.

In addition to the Congressmen, the writer of the paragraph should be called and, under oath, be required to tell what justification he has for so outrageous, so false, a charge.

All that such an investigation would cost would be the stenographer's fees and the witness fees of the C. I. O. writer. Less than $200 would do it.

Congress has been pushed around. It has been vilified. It has been slandered and libeled, and whatever may be our shortcomings, there is no excuse for a charge like the one made. Our duty to our constituents, our own self-respect, should move us to action without any delay.

At that time I also introduced a resolution proposing the appointment of an investigation committee.

No action was taken by the House to meet that false, vicious charge, presumably on the theory that it was so ridiculous that no one with common sense would believe it. But false charges, no matter how absurd, repeated often enough, finally gather weight.

In my judgment, those who publicly state that Congressmen have been bribed, that Congressmen are saboteurs, that they are aiding the enemy—as has frequently been stated by a certain radio commentator—should be called before a House committee, made either to prove their charges—and if there is proof, the offending Member should be expelled without delay—or the originator or circulator of such false charges should be made publicly to admit his falsehood.

There is no question but that the C. I. O. is compelling some of its members, in order to hold their jobs, to contribute a dollar each to its political slush fund.

Members have been expelled from the other body because of the use of excessively large sums of money for campaign purposes, even though much of the money was spent in an educational way.

Here for the first time in our history is an open solicitation and collection of millions of dollars which it is publicly stated are to be used to elect a Congress which will do the will of the Political Action Committee, headed by and acting under the direction of Sidney Hillman, who, having imposed his will upon thousands of workers in New York, now seeks to become the boss of all Americans by assuming to dictate whom they shall elect to the Seventy-ninth Congress.

Never was there a more open, brazen effort to purchase an election, buy a Congress. This organization has decreed that more than two-thirds of the Members of the present Congress shall not be reelected, that they shall be defeated.

The move is now so out in the open, its purpose so dangerous, that some A. F. of L. unions, as well as some C. I. O. locals, now see so clearly the destructive results which will follow the complete loss of their freedom as union men that they are protesting.

From the September 9, 1944, issue of the Washington Times-Herald comes the following account of a protest by an A. F. of L. union at Dayton, Ohio:

A. F. OF L. CHIEF HITS P. A. C. BETRAYAL OF UNIONISM—HILLMAN BRANDED LABOR DISRUPTIONIST

DAYTON, OHIO, September 8.—A bitter attack against Sidney Hillman, chairman of the C. I. O. Political Action Committee, and against P. A. C. itself is contained in an editorial published today in the Labor Union, official organ of the Dayton Central Labor Council.

The editorial is presented as the first of a series of eight summarizing the findings of the newspaper based on a broad survey made of P. A. C. activities and leadership.

HILLMAN CALLED DISRUPTIONIST

John E. Breidenbach, business manager of the council, vice president of the Ohio State Federation of Labor and president of the Ohio Building and Construction Trades Council, is the author of the exposé.

He asserted there is a growing conviction of many outstanding trade unionists that the activities now being promoted by Hillman in the name of the C. I. O. are fouling the nest of all American organized labor.

Today's first article is entitled "Sidney Hillman—America's No. 1 Disruptionist."

"The story of the C. I. O.'s P. A. C. is the story of Sidney Hillman," writes Breidenbach. "From inception, the P. A. C. has been his brain child. The far-flung wires which connect the P. A. C. with C. I. O. labor and its Communist allies in every part of the United States are all in his hands.

"UNSAVORY REPUTATION

"Should the P. A. C. be successful this November in reelecting Roosevelt for a fourth term, there can be no question that Hillman would become the most powerful trade union leader in Washington during the next 4 years. For this reason, it is imperative that we set our sights upon this yearner for power who has loomed up so suddenly as the new man behind the throne in the Democratic Party.

"Who is Hillman? American organized labor knows him well—and unpleasantly. Hillman enjoys the unsavory reputation of being the greatest disruptionist in the American trade union movement. He is known as

the man who, for 30 years, has waged an unceasing and unscrupulous campaign of dual unionism against the American Federation of Labor.

"He has an unbroken record as an irresponsible wrecker of every major trade union movement with which he has been identified.

"A Roosevelt victory this November would definitely put Hillman in the position to launch the most audacious disruptive job of his career—the splintering of the whole American population into warring and embittered social groups.

"If this seems fantastic consider the record of this man who has now become President Roosevelt's No. 1 lieutenant."

Breidenbach reviews Hillman's birth in Lithuania, then a part of Russia, and of Hillman's 20 years as a youthful participant in the Russian revolutionary movement which became the Communist Party.

He tells of his arrival in America in 1907 and of his joining the A. F. of L. United Garment Workers Union.

In 1914 Hillman participated in his first "disruption," Breidenbach says. Failing in an attempt to gain control of the U. G. W. convention, the editorial asserted, he led his followers out of the A. F. of L. and formed the Amalgamated Clothing Workers' Union, which he still heads.

In 1919, with a staff of Socialists and Communists, he precipitated a number of strikes in the textile industry to form a rival to the A. F. of L. Textile Workers' Union, but the effort collapsed.

"Disruption No. 3," states the editorial, "which never got beyond the talking stage, was planned while Hillman was in Moscow in 1921. By a strange coincidence, William Z. Foster and Earl Browder (Communist Party leaders) were there at the same time.

"At Lenin's suggestion, the three dreamers of power conferred on plans for uniting forces to capture the A. F. of L. for communism. Apparently Hillman agreed to the plan, but after his return he became embroiled in a series of quarrels with the Communist leaders, and the project came to naught."

Another act of disruption listed was Hillman's formation of the C. I. O. in 1935 and his break away from the A. F. of L., which had admitted his union to membership in 1934. Then came his ouster from the post of Codirector of the Office of Production Management in January 1942, because, Breidenbach says, he had "created so much animosity among labor leaders that it became obvious that his continued presence was a distinct menace to the war program." The last "disruption" was his seizure of control of the American Labor Party in New York with Communist help, causing the anti-Communists to form the Liberal Party.

Let no one mistake the purpose of either Browder, Sidney Hillman, the Political Action Committee, or the Communist Political Association.

At a convention of the Amalgamated Clothing Workers Sidney Hillman introduced Robert Minor as a speaker, and Minor then proceeded as follows:

We want the labor movement to obtain physical control and ideological domination of this country. By physical control we mean the governing power—the power to make decisions and enforce them—the power to direct an army and a navy—the power to control industry—the power to say who shall be in jail and who shall be out—in other words, political power. And there is no political power except complete political power.

But what of our principles? What of the form of rule, what of the Soviet system of dictatorship of the working class? Never mind—we have not deserted any of our principles nor of any of our organizational forms.

Earl Browder; the Communist Political Association; Sidney Hillman, head of the National Citizens Political Action Committee, in reality the C. I. O. Political Action Committee, and all of their crew apparently want not only to name for the voters of America this coming November the President and the Members of Congress, but they want the power to say "Who"—and this may include you—"shall be in jail and who shall be out."

Two years ago the New Dealers and the Reds sought to accomplish their purpose of electing a subservient Congress by charging many of the Members of Congress with disloyalty and lack of patriotism. They failed because the people knew their representatives.

Now, by appealing to class prejudice; by seeking the favor of minority groups; by the use of money and false propaganda, they are again on the warpath against every candidate for Congress whom they believe they cannot control.

It is time for the people to select their own representatives without dictation from anyone.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS] is recognized for 20 minutes.

DISPOSAL OF SURPLUS LAND

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, in the first place, I would like to assure the gentleman from Michigan that no special group, including the Political Action Committee or the National Association of Manufacturers, or any other special group, is going to dominate America or any political party in America. Things are just not run that way in the United States. Mr. Speaker, I might say also in that same connection I do not believe, in the long run, any group on the other side of the fence is going to dominate the political organizations or the Government of the United States—and there are other groups which have tried.

Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this time to speak about the disposal of surplus lands.

Mr. Speaker, I am already on record very definitely, indeed, against the action of the Administrator of Surplus Property Disposal in turning over to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation the entire job of disposing of all types of Government land. I testified before the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments in opposition to this action by Mr. Clayton, and I spoke against it on the floor. In addition, I offered an amendment to the bill, which read as follows:

(g) In order to promote the orderly disposal of real property, a board of classification and assignment is hereby created, consisting of one representative of the Department of Agriculture, to be appointed by the Secretary of Agriculture; one representative of the Department of the Interior, to be appointed by the Secretary of the Interior; and one representative of the Public Buildings Administration, to be appointed by the Administrator of the Federal Works Agency. The Administrator shall refer all real property declared as surplus to this board, and such board shall assign such property for disposition to that Government agency which, in his opinion, is best equipped for the essential disposition of the property in the public interest: *Provided, however,* That land suitable for agriculture or forest development shall be assigned to the Department of Agriculture and lands suitable for grazing or the development of minerals shall be assigned to the Department of the Interior.

This amendment, I am sorry to say, was not adopted because a point of order was made against it.

The House will recall that although a few amendments were adopted to the bill it was passed in substantially its original form, which means that we passed it in the form in which it was prepared by Mr. Clayton and a committee of his own appointment working under his direction.

The Senate, on the other hand, passed a very different sort of bill and included within that bill specific provisions regarding the disposal of surplus Government lands which require, logically enough, that this disposal be put basically into the hands of the General Land Office of the Department of the Interior, the agency that has since time immemorial carried on the work of Government land disposition, and that as to agricultural lands disposition shall be through the Agriculture Department.

I am making this speech today in justification of the position which I have taken from the beginning in this matter and in the earnest hope that the facts which I shall submit together with other considerations will have influence upon the action of the House in connection with the conference report on this bill. My speech is based upon public documents and public records and not merely upon my own opinions in these matters.

I have read with care the hearings of the Senate Committee to Investigate the National Defense Program, formerly known as the Truman committee, and now operating under the chairmanship of Senator MEAD, of New York. On August 17 Assistant Attorney General Norman M. Littell, head of the Lands Division of the Department of Justice, who was called before the Truman-Mead committee, testified on the question of surplus lands disposal. Let me say at the outset that this testimony was absolutely objective. The Lands Division of the Department of Justice is neither an acquiring nor disposing agency. It is a neutral arm of the Government which renders legal service to all of the agencies of government when they take title to real property in the name of the United States. In his testimony Mr. Littell sharply criticized action taken by Mr. Clayton with regard to the disposal of lands and gave his reasons. Subsequently the committee called before it Col. John J. O'Brien, head of the Army real estate section, and Mr. Clayton himself. At the outset let me say that the main thing I am interested in in this whole matter is seeing to it that land suitable for farming should be sold first to those who formerly owned it, if they want to repurchase, and if not, then direct to farm families, preferably veterans, in family-size tracts for the purpose of being used for a farm homestead. I do not want any intermediaries in these transactions. I do not think there is any reason why there should have to

be injected a middleman commission between the Government agency selling the land and the farmer purchaser. This has never been the practice of either the Agriculture or the Interior Department. This is the primary reason why I want the Department of Agriculture to handle the disposal of agricultural lands. It is the primary reason why I do not want the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to handle it. In the first place, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation is, by all its experience, geared to contact banks, large financial and industrial institutions. It has never had any contact whatsoever with working farmers, but always with those who at best would be absentee owners of farm land, a condition we certainly do not want to encourage.

In testifying before the Senate committee, Mr. Clayton was asked by the Senate committee whether it was customary for farm land to be sold through real-estate brokers. His answer was that he did not know. I submit that Members of the House hope very earnestly that surplus lands suitable for agriculture can be sold directly without middlemen's profits to those who will actually make of them farm homes. Furthermore, Mr. Clayton was asked by Senator FERGUSON this question: "Prior to this time has the R. F. C. sold any land?" To which Mr. Clayton replied, "I don't know whether they have actually sold any land or not." The fact of the matter is, from what I am able to discover from an examination of this record, that what has actually been done is not to turn the disposition of land over to the R. F. C. so much as to turn it over to one man who never has been in the R. F. C. before but who was hand-picked, out of the Real Estate Division of the War Department, by Mr. Clayton and Col. John J. O'Brien, head of that Real Estate Division, and placed bodily over in the R. F. C. in his colonel's uniform, there to be put into complete charge of the disposal of all the 6,000,000 acres of agricultural and grazing lands, which is now in the hands of the Government, as well as other lands. This man's name is Col. M. J. O'Byrne.

Colonel O'Byrne's whole background and experience has been in the real-estate business in Ohio. He was recommended by two members of the National Association of Real Estate Boards, Mr. Walter Schmidt, of Cincinnati; and Mr. E. L. Ostendorf, of the firm of Ostendorf & Morris, of Cleveland, Ohio. Colonel O'Byrne was commissioned in the Army in 1942 directly from civilian life and was placed in charge of one of the regional offices under the War Department Real Estate Division.

Now, may I say Mr. Speaker, some of the best and finest friends I have in the world are engaged in the real-estate business, and furthermore, that I certainly think that it is altogether proper for reputable men engaged in the real-estate business to be consulted about the problem which we confront with regard to the disposal of certain types of land now held by the Government. On the other hand, I am bitterly opposed to seeing the disposal of agricultural lands, grazing and mineral lands particularly, dominated by a handful of men with no governmental responsibilities whatsoever, and who cannot, in the nature of the case, fail to have a direct personal interest in the policy to be pursued by the Government in regard to this land disposal.

The reason I express this concern is because I find that very early in the game Colonel O'Brien, in consultation with some of the largest real-estate operators in the country, all of them members of the National Association of Real Estate Boards, had developed a program for the disposal of Government lands which apparently met with the full approval of Mr. Clayton and which is still the program that is proposed to follow in the disposal of these lands. Indeed, on April 17, Mr. Clayton offered to Colonel O'Brien the position of Director of Real Estate Disposal in the Surplus Property Administration. Colonel O'Brien, quite properly, of course, stated he could not accept this position unless released by the Army, which the Army would not do. The Army, however, did release Colonel O'Byrne, the next man to Colonel O'Brien in the Real Estate Division of the War Department, who, I have stated, has been transferred to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to take charge of surplus-land disposal. Some of the features of the plan for land disposal developed by Colonel O'Brien's committee I will come to later on in this speech. Suffice it to say at this point that it appears from the evidence that the reason for Mr. Clayton's insistence upon putting land disposal in the hands of the R. F. C. and for choosing the man who was to be specially appointed to the R. F. C. to take charge of this land disposal was in order to carry out the plan submitted by Colonel O'Brien and his committee, composed largely, if not wholly, of members of the National Association of Real Estate Boards. Now, there are a number of agencies in the Government—the General Land Office of the Department of the Interior and the Lands Division of the Department of Justice, whose entire work throughout all the years has had to do with land acquisition and disposal. These agencies were not consulted to any real degree whatsoever, and certainly to the extent they might have been consulted; their advice was completely disregarded. The program was all set to go and it met, so far, I am sorry to say, with the stamp of approval of this House. For Mr. Clayton certainly is a successful businessman, to state the matter in the most conservative terms. And he, therefore, must have known what he wanted to accomplish when he pursued the course he did in working exclusively with the Real Estate Division of the War Department on this matter of surplus land disposal. Not only has Colonel O'Byrne been put in complete charge of the land disposal in the R. F. C., but Colonel O'Brien has been made chairman of the advisory committee to Mr. Clayton on the disposal of lands. This committee was composed of representatives from various departments of government familiar with land problems. The Lands Division of the Department of Justice, which serves all of the land-acquiring agencies of government and which has been especially commended by the Truman committee report of March 4, 1944, for its outstanding services, was conspicuous by its absence.

Why did neither Clayton nor Colonel O'Brien ask that a representative of the Lands Division, Department of Justice, serve on the Advisory Committee? Mr. Clayton stated that he did not ask the Justice Department to send a representative because he did not even know that they had a Lands Division over there. This seems to me rather an amazing admission on the part of an Administrator charged with the disposal of surplus realty, who would necessarily have to know all about the Government's vast business in lands. The most cursory inquiry on his part would have revealed to him the very important fact that some of the realty he was then planning to dispose of was at that very moment in process of acquisition by condemnation in the very department of which he professed to know nothing—and the very title to some of those lands would have to be acquired by that division before Mr. Clayton could dispose of them.

As to Colonel O'Brien, he knew the Lands Division well—and he knew, too, what was more important, that the Lands Division was not for the proposed program. He definitely did not want the Lands Division of the Department of Justice opposing that program. Here is a portion of the testimony:

Mr. HALLEY. Do you now have any opinion on whether or not the Lands Division of the Department of Justice should be included on that committee?

Colonel O'BRIEN. Based on Mr. Littell's testimony before this committee, I see no reason why they should be on the committee.

Senator FERGUSON. You mean it wouldn't have been in line with what the committee wanted to do?

Colonel O'BRIEN. That is right.

But Assistant Attorney General Littell had heard, apparently by accident, of Mr. Clayton's Advisory Committee on Surplus Realty, and promptly called Mr. Clayton on the telephone to offer the experience and background of the Lands Division to Mr. Clayton for whatever assistance they might be to him.

Mr. Clayton admitted he did not know there was a Lands Division and stated that he would "take it up with Colonel O'Brien."

Mr. Clayton then wrote that "it was agreeable to Colonel O'Brien to have you name a representative from the Department of Justice" to "make recommendations of policy and procedure."

Meantime, the Assistant Attorney General found that the basic decision had already been made; the agricultural lands, together with mineral, forest, and grazing lands, had been assigned to R. F. C. for disposal.

On July 6, Mr. Littell wrote to Mr. Clayton:

When I telephoned to you I did not know that Colonel O'Brien was chairman of your committee. I can well understand Colonel O'Brien's reluctance to have the head of the Lands Division sit on the advisory committee, particularly in view of the comments of the Truman Committee Report of March 4, 1944. I am aware that he has the full support of the National Association of Real Estate Boards and related associations, with

whose plans, respecting the disposal of real estate, I am in strong disagreement.

I have long been of the opinion that policies in the disposal of surplus real estate could have a most damaging effect upon the economic life of the country, but it now seems clear that basic policies have already been determined under the chairmanship of Colonel O'Brien, the latest one being the reference of agricultural lands to R. F. C. for disposal.

With all due respect to the able staff of R. F. C. and the new personnel which would have to be employed, it is patently impossible for them to acquire the "know how" of handling agricultural lands and grazing lands. Intimate knowledge of the land problems of the country is required. There are existing staffs of men with expert knowledge and years of experience in dealing with the multiple phases of these problems in the Department of Agriculture and Department of the Interior. While I know Colonel O'Brien's contrary views and therefore his recommendation to you, I submit that the failure to assign agricultural lands and forest lands to the Department of Agriculture, and grazing lands to the Department of the Interior violates basic principles and established practices of good government and, for that matter, of good management in any business.

There has been and is now only one objective in the Lands Division of the Department of Justice and that is to serve the public welfare, but in the foregoing circumstances I doubt whether any service could be rendered by this belated representation on your committee. While an invitation is not directed to me, it is quite clear that any representative of the Lands Division would share my doubts.

This matter has for many months been of grave concern to me. As you may or may not know, I wrote a memorandum for Mr. Bernard Baruch before his report of February 1944 was made public, and my testimony before the Manasco committee is now a matter of public record. I have had a study made of the existing law and have kept a current analysis of all pending bills. From this study and experience in the acquisition of all these lands, I realize the enormous complexity of the problem which confronts you and will be happy to render any service that I possibly can at any time. Indeed this is my purpose in writing to you.

On July 8, Mr. Clayton replied:

Your letter of the 6th has my careful attention

For your information, I enclose a copy of the report of Colonel O'Brien's committee, and call your attention particularly to the recommendation of this committee that the disposal agency for surplus real estate, as distinguished from industrial property, should be either the Reconstruction Finance Corporation or the Public Buildings Administration. The committee was about equally divided between these two agencies and left the decision to me.

I turned the report over to Col. M. J. O'Byrne, who at that time was acting as Director of the Real Estate Division of the Surplus War Property Administration, asking that he make a very careful study of the report and give me his recommendation. I now enclose a copy of Colonel O'Byrne's recommendation.

In my opinion, the R. F. C. is the agency of Government best equipped to dispose of surplus lands, many of which are a part of the industrial properties of which they are the disposal agency named in Executive Order 9425.

I appreciate your offer to be of service in connection with the disposal of this surplus real estate and, no doubt, we will have occasion to call on you from time to time.

But in the meantime, Mr. Littell ascertained that the committee had really recommended that agricultural and forest lands be assigned to the Department of Agriculture and mineral and grazing lands to the Department of the Interior. Littell replied as follows on July 17:

Upon receipt of your letter I inquired somewhat further into the meetings of Colonel O'Brien's committee. The minutes of the meeting of June 5 expressed the true opinion of the committee and these were not included in your letter. In a special report adopted at that meeting for submission to you it was said:

"It was the sense of the committee that, generally speaking, agricultural and forest land should be disposed of by the Department of Agriculture; grazing, mineral, and related lands by the Department of the Interior; and miscellaneous properties by the Public Buildings Administration."

A board of classification and assignment was recommended and the report recites that "this recommendation was adopted by the committee by majority voice vote," with the representatives of the National Housing Agency and the War Department dissenting.

With the two exceptions noted, the recommendation was the unanimous opinion of competent men widely experienced in the transaction of Government business in lands.

Without going into detail, at the meeting of June 12 your disapproval of the above recommendation was expressed to the committee. A "division of opinion" was thereafter reported to you, without, however, taking a vote on the matter. For these reasons I do not think you can predicate your decision to assign the properties to R. F. C. upon the recommendations of the committee.

The only two votes in favor of giving agricultural lands to the R. F. C. for disposal were those of the representatives of the War Department and the National Housing Agency.

As to the War Department representative, he naturally shared Mr. Clayton's views in the matter; the N. H. A. representative, Mr. Robert Hayes, was to become general counsel for the new agency to be set up at R. F. C.—if R. F. C. received the lands for disposal. Naturally, he voted for R. F. C. He is now in fact general counsel for Colonel O'Byrne at R. F. C.—Truman committee, Wednesday, August 23, 1944, T. 1974.

On July 19, Mr. Clayton wrote Mr. Littell, stating that "the only official communication which I have had from the committee is the committee's final report of June 12."

Mr. Littell then wrote that inasmuch as Mr. Clayton had not been fully informed, and inasmuch as his order assigning lands to R. F. C. had been based on a misunderstanding of what the true views of the committee were, Mr. Clayton should now correct the mistake, and reassign the lands. Mr. Clayton, whose position was now thoroughly clear, replied rather sharply on July 26:

As a lawyer, I think you will agree that an official report to me signed by Colonel O'Brien as chairman of his committee, stating the conclusions of the committee's deliberations in its meeting of June 12 should prevail over statements made by a nonmember of the committee of actions purported to have been taken by the committee in its meeting of June 5.

Under the circumstances, I see no occasion to alter the decision already made to appoint the R. F. C. as the disposal agency for surplus real estate, other than that assigned in our regulation No. 1. I enclose two releases recently made on the disposal of surplus real estate other than industrial property.

As you doubtless know, the R. F. C. has already written to the Department of Agriculture, and to the Department of Justice, and other interested agencies, inviting each of them to name a representative to serve on a committee to advise and assist the R. F. C. in the disposal of these lands.

The Truman committee let the cat out of the bag and exposed this correspondence to the light of day. First, Mr. Clayton said he did not know about his committee's recommendation on June 5, but when confronted with it, he did not care, and told Littell in effect to mind his own business.

Mr. Clayton stated in his testimony before the Truman committee that his mind had been made up before his advisory committee had voted, and it obviously made little difference to Mr. Clayton what they advised. The lands were going to be assigned to R. F. C. In Mr. Clayton's own statement to the Truman committee he says:

On being verbally informed of the action of the committee, I sent word to the acting chairman that the committee's recommendation was not acceptable to me and asked that another meeting be held when the chairman could be present and that the committee recommended to me a single agency of Government to handle this surplus real property. (Statement of W. L. Clayton before Mead committee, August 23, 1944, p. 4; also Truman committee, 45 WO.)

There was a division of opinion at this meeting and no vote was taken—yet Mr. Clayton relies on this committee's findings in his letter to Mr. Littell as "the recommendation of this committee that the disposal agency for surplus real estate should be either R. F. C. or the P. B. A."

It is to be remembered that the R. F. C., unlike other land-acquiring agencies of the Government, does not have to clear its titles through the Department of Justice. It is an independent corporation and since its creation, in both acquisition and disposal, it has been a law unto itself.

I shall not attempt to detail all the things brought out at the hearings before the Truman-Mead committee except to say that I earnestly wish that every Member of the House could read that testimony as I have done. There is, for example, the instance where the War Department paid approximately twice as much as did the Navy for similar lands on the New Jersey waterfront. In this instance the land purchased by the War Department was appraised by a real estate man by the name of Mr. Harry Taylor, member of a firm which had previously recommended the appointment of the division real estate officer of the North Atlantic Division for the War Department. It was this division real estate officer, a Mr. J. A. Lockwood, who in turn appointed Mr. Taylor to do the appraising of the property purchased by the War Department. Whatever the reasons might be, it is unquestionably true that this small group of very powerful real estate men, who apparently

pretty much dominate the National Association of Real Estate Boards, have been very well satisfied with the work of Colonel O'Brien in the War Department.

The whole question of the Florida hotels is to be remembered here also, which has been made a matter of record by the Truman committee and earned for that committee a good many bitter attacks by the National Association of Real Estate Boards.

The thing that worries me, Mr. Speaker, is the very great likelihood that we are getting into a situation here unless the House sharply reverses its position in this matter, where the program of Government land disposition, including the land that ought to be made available for farm homes to returning veterans and others, will be dominated by the most powerful private parties at interest in the whole Nation.

I wish to emphasize again that generally speaking there is no finer group of American citizens in this country than men engaged in the real estate business. Indeed it is they themselves who have protested against the high-pressure efforts of a handful of the most powerful people in their line of business to attempt to dominate Government policy.

I now come to the regulation No. 2 issued by Mr. Clayton's office to govern the disposal of Government lands. In this regulation is included a provision which opens the door wide for the disposal of all this Government land through the middleman acting between the Government and the purchaser of the land. It is quite understandable why the real estate men should want it this way and no doubt there will be certain types of land where it will be best handled in this fashion, but the provision which I am about to read to the House covering the use of brokers reenforces tremendously, in my judgment, the case for having a board of classification and allocation such as my amendment offered in the House would have provided for. With such a board in existence it could be determined what land should be handled on a basis of direct sale through the General Land Office, the Department of Agriculture, or the Public Buildings Administration, and which land it might be wisest to dispose of through licensed real estate brokers. Here is a portion of regulation No. 2 by Mr. Clayton's office:

(3) Brokers: Where, in its judgment, disposals will thereby be made to the better advantage of the Government, Reconstruction Finance Corporation is authorized to utilize the services of approved and established real estate brokers. No exclusive listings of real estate shall, however, be made with brokers. Brokers shall not be paid a commission for leasing or selling real estate to another Government agency or to an individual, firm, or corporation sponsored by another Government agency. Commissions not to exceed established conventional rates, ordinarily paid in a particular community, may be paid to brokers who perform the service of producing buyers and negotiating sales to them. Such commissions shall be paid only after sales transactions have been consummated and a further requirement shall be that the buyers will execute an affidavit to the effect that the broker to whom the commission is to be paid is the only broker whom he recognizes or had any dealings with in connection with the sale and that the broker did perform such services as are ordinarily performed by a broker in bringing buyer and seller together.

Now I am not opposed to brokers—no reasonable person denies their usefulness. But this provision does not apply to all brokers; it applies only to approved and established brokers who are to get commissions at established conventional rates. Furthermore, as Assistant Attorney General Littell testified, brokers must naturally be interested primarily in earning profitable commissions, rather than the basic Government policy of resettling farmers, tenants, and veterans on the land. The broker is naturally interested in buyers having money with which to buy rather than in the veteran or the small farm family needing very long-term loans to get them established on the land. It will be noted furthermore that regulation No. 2 does not provide that any licensed real-estate broker may participate in this business, but only those who are to be approved by those in charge of the Government disposal program. The question is just which real-estate brokers will get this business and which will be left out in the cold. Senator FERGUSON very definitely pointed this out in cross-examination with Mr. Clayton. Mr. Clayton admitted—Truman committee, in previous testimony it was pointed out that even in the sale of surplus Army trucks, a farmer could not come in and buy; he had first to get a dealer to go with him and pay him a 17½-percent commission—in his testimony that the wording made the choice discretionary with R. F. C., and Senator FERGUSON promptly pointed out, "Then you are going to put in the hands of the R. F. C. the right to place this business—this brokerage business—in one or a few firms"—Truman committee, page 54, W. O.

As to the author of this regulation on brokerage, no one wants to claim it.

Mr. Clayton testified that he thought "most of this regulation is taken from the recommendation of Colonel O'Brien's committee—practically all of it"—Truman committee.

But Colonel O'Brien said he did not put it in; he seemed anxious to disclaim it, he thinks Colonel O'Byrne did it. No one wishes to claim the orphan child. I have previously mentioned the Cleveland firm of Morris & Ostendorf. Both Mr. Morris and Mr. Ostendorf are past presidents of the National Association of Real Estate Boards, and Mr. Ostendorf had been a principal spokesman in Washington. He had been selected to speak for the National Association of Real Estate Boards before the Committee on Expenditures of the House, advocating brokerage as a means of disposal. He stated:

I think private industry has used that method for a great many years. I think it has been successful. I think those men who have given their lives to the development of this business, to research and study of the real-estate business, are best qualified to solve real-estate problems, just the same as lawyers are qualified for law and doctors for medicine. I think not to make use of this qualified personnel is poor business for government.

There will, of course, be instances in the disposal of surplus lands where Mr. Ostendorf is right. But I am deeply disturbed by one concrete example that Mr. Littell gave to the Senate committee. In his testimony he made these charges:

According to Mr. Littell, John W. Galbraith, president of the National Association of Real Estate Boards, purchased a property in Joliet, Ill., in April 1943, from the American Steel & Wire Co.—an old, dilapidated, run-down, and abandoned plant—for about $53,000. He mortgaged the place immediately, so that he only had about $10,000 or $12,000 of his own cash in the investment. In July 1943 he leased the property to the Hawaiian & Pacific Contractors Co., a contractor constructing a parts depot for the Navy Department. The lease was for $70,000 a year. Already Galbraith had made a neat profit on his moderate investment, but that is not all. The Navy spent $1,250,000 in improving the property, and now faces an expansion program of about $800,000 more. It is necessary to buy the property outright, but, of course, Galbraith, through his brokers, Morris Ostendorf, claims he improved the value of the property—improvements which the Navy had made.

As Mr. Littell testified, these brokers, who are apparently accustomed to doing things in a very large way, asked $1 a square foot, or $450,000 for this plant in its reconditioned status. One of them testified their willingness to at least begin conversations at $250,000. Even since this matter has been made public, there has been no concession, no offer of plain fair dealing, on the part of Galbraith, the president of the National Association of Real Estate Boards, or his two brokers, both past presidents of the National Association of Real Estate Boards, Mr. Morris and Mr. Ostendorf. The property has now been condemned and the case will have to go to trial to determine what is fair value for the Government to pay under these extraordinary circumstances—Littell testimony, page 33, A. A.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to reiterate what I said in the beginning, namely, that the major interest which I have in this matter is to see that the American people as a whole derive the greatest possible benefits in the disposal of these Government lands. I believe much more strongly than I did at first that the only right way for this to be done is to set up a board of classification and allocation to determine what agency will dispose of lands declared to be surplus. Some of them no doubt should go through the R. F. C., some might be handled well through licensed real estate brokers on some basis whereby all of them would have a fair and equal opportunity. But certain it is that there are other lands, notably farm lands, which ought to be sold directly to veterans and other prospective farm owner operators, and certain it is also that the one most logical agency of all to have general oversight of this land disposal is the General Land Office of the Department of the Interior.

Nor do I believe that there is any set-up where the disposal of these lands can be safely approved by the Congress unless the Lands Division of the Department of Justice has a real voice in the determination of policies that will be fair and just for all concerned.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I yield.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Knowing the deep interest that my colleague from California has, as a member of my committee, I would like to ask his opinion as to one situation. As I understand the G. I. bill, the veteran is set up for a 20-year loan at 4 percent, on his farm.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Yes; except that the interest for the first year is paid by the Government.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. The G. I. bill makes provision that he can come under the Bankhead-Jones Act. If he comes under the Bankhead-Jones Act he would get a 3 percent loan for 40 years.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. That is right.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I have been wondering if we are just going to have a confused situation. I am in agreement with the gentleman that this land should go first to the owners, and then next to the veterans, but, are we not going to get ourselves in a position of seeing one group of veterans get their money for 3 percent for 40 years, and another group pay 4 percent for a 20-year loan. In other words, one group of veterans will pay one-third more interest than another group, and then we will have the nonveterans in the same position, of having the advantage over the veterans as far as the loan is concerned.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Under the Farm Tenant Purchase Act, as the gentleman well knows, the loans are as he states. Any veteran who can qualify under the Bankhead-Jones Act—and the G. I. bill did broaden the qualifications of the veterans under the Bankhead-Jones Act to a considerable extent—could get his entire loan under the terms of the Bankhead-Jones Act.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Only a limited number I might say.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. That is right, because of the fact that Congress does not provide for a broad enough program under the Bankhead-Jones Act. My main answer to the gentleman is this, that I was one Member of the House who fought hard when the G. I. bill was before us to try to iron out that problem, and to see if we could not coordinate that whole program so that it would not lead to some of the difficulties which the gentleman envisages.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I know that my colleague from California supported the amendment that was offered at the time the G. I. bill was under discussion that provided that the veteran would not have to pay any more interest than anyone else, to the Government for any farm loan.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. That is right. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I take this opportunity to say that I knew at that time that he was cognizant of the dangers we were going to run into.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. That is right, and precisely what should have been done at that time and what ought to be done now, in my opinion, I may say to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Yes.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include the section of Regulation No. 2 of Surplus Land Disposition, to which I made reference; to include certain excerpts from the testimony before the Truman-Mead Committee, and certain letters passing between Assistant Attorney General Norman Littell and Mr. Clayton, the Surplus Property Administrator.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. OUTLAND). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend the remarks I made today on the bill S. 1250 and include a letter from General Hines to Speaker RAYBURN.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that today, following the special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HARNESS] is recognized for 30 minutes.

GENERAL SHORT AND THE TRUTH ABOUT PEARL HARBOR

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, on the morning of December 7, 1941, the lives of more than 3,000 American boys were snuffed out, and military and naval matériel, reckoned at millions of dollars, was destroyed by the Japanese sneak attack. These American boys, relying upon their Government in Washington to warn them, were oblivious to the danger, and planes and ships were concentrated on the fields and in the harbor in such a manner that mass destruction was a simple matter for the Japs. This tragedy is the result of the culpability and the criminal negligence of someone with whom we had entrusted the safety of our country. Who is the guilty person or persons? The American people have been asking that question now for nearly 3 years without a satisfactory answer. The Commander in Chief of the armed forces has concealed the truth of this great disaster by denying a hearing to General Short and Admiral Kimmel, where the true facts could be made public.

Of course, we cannot restore the lives of the thousands of boys needlessly sacrificed at Pearl Harbor by making public the true facts, but we can at least learn who is responsible and assess the blame where it rightly and justly belongs.

General Short and Admiral Kimmel have been charged, accused, and blamed for this catastrophe, but during all this time they have been denied a hearing in their own defense. They have been living under a cloud these many months. In the light of facts which have come to public attention since this incident, however, many of us are wondering if the real offenders are not hiding under the secrecy of the blanket thrown over this whole incident by the administration.

Only recently Admiral Kimmel indignantly denied charges and innuendoes made in a magazine article by the New Deal candidate for Vice President and Assistant Commander in Chief. The admiral let it be known that he was eager and anxious for a public hearing and announced that when the truth was known it would shock the Nation. And now, Mr. Speaker, I am informed by sources that I believe to be thoroughly reliable that General Short stands willing to appear before Congress or any other official tribunal and present documentary proof clearing him of responsibility for the greatest disaster this Nation has ever suffered. While I do not speak for General Short, information in my hands indicates that the General, upon learning that the Roberts committee was coming to make an investigation, gathered all the information in his office and in his files that would show who was responsible for the Pearl Harbor debacle and presented this information to the Roberts commission; that this documentary file consists of more than 250 pages, the originals of which are still in the possession of General Short. This documentary proof, copies of which no doubt are in the files of the War Department, General Short believes will completely vindicate him of unfounded charges and prove that he used all reasonable care and precaution, and had, in fact, acted completely justifiably in view of the information that had been furnished him by Washington.

This evidence, I am informed, will show that General Short was in charge of the Pearl Harbor defenses from February of 1941 until he was relieved of that post about December 20, 1941, a few days after the Pearl Harbor attack; that on numerous occasions General Short asked the War Department for additional men and equipment, and for priorities and critical supplies, in view of the imminence of danger, in his opinion. These requests were denied and no satisfaction was given to his pleas. For example, on June 10, 1941, he sent a wire to the War Department with reference to the aircraft warning system in Honolulu.

In the wire, Short stated that this project of building such systems was, in his opinion, the most important single project in the islands. He asked for immediate priority in order that the work could be started on this and completed at the earliest possible moment. The response that he received from the War Department, and subsequent correspond-

ence shows that up to the time of the attack the project had not been completed. This evidence will further show that on November 27, 1941, as a result of communications passing between General Short and Washington, Short put into effect in the Hawaiian Islands one of three very extensively planned alerts. This was alert No. 1, and was called principally for general vigilance against sabotage. Simultaneously with putting this into effect, he informed the Chief of Staff in Washington that he had done so. The Chief of Staff, by return wire, confirmed the propriety of this alert and by very clear intimation in this confirmation indicated that it was the proper one of the three alerts, and that the other two were properly held in abeyance for the moment. The other two were more drastic, the third one being the alert that was to announce preparation for an immediate attack. Short had no information on which to judge that the No. 3 alert was the proper one. This evidence will further show that General Short received a wire from the Chief of Staff in Washington, about 8 hours after the Japanese attack, saying that the Government in Washington expected a Japanese ultimatum at 1:30 p. m., December 7, and the Government had learned very confidentially that instructions were sent out from the Japanese Government to all Japanese emissaries in this hemisphere to destroy the code. This wire was sent at 1:30 a. m., December 7, from Washington, which was about 6 hours before the attack, but was not delivered to General Short until 2:30 p. m., December 7, approximately 7 hours after the attack occurred. It did not arrive in Honolulu until about 11:30 a. m., 4 hours after the attack occurred, and it took a couple of hours to decode it after that. The wire was sent by commercial radio instead of the usual more rapid direct military means. General Short will contend that this information was extremely significant because of the instructions to destroy the code which is only a last resort. General Short believes that if this message had been telephoned him at 1:30 a. m., he would have been sufficiently alerted by that information and would have been much better prepared when the attack occurred. This evidence will further show that at 9 p. m., December 6, 1941, the night before the attack, the Army dispatched 12 B-24 bombers from San Francisco to Honolulu for use in the general defense of the islands. These bombers were sent with their defense equipment completely inoperative, and arrived that way in Honolulu. All of the machine guns and small cannon were in their original wrappings and cosmoline, were not sighted in, and none of the ammunition was in position to be used. These planes arrived about half an hour after the attack started, and in the midst of it several of them were shot down and the crews killed. Fortunately the planes carried only skeleton crews. It is shown that the Army had been flying bombers from San Francisco to Honolulu in this same manner prior to this date, and General Short had vigorously protested against the flights being made without proper defense mechanism, but his protests were unheeded.

There appears to be an abundance of evidence to show that 72 hours before the attack on Pearl Harbor, the Australian Government advised the American Government in Washington that an aircraft carrier task force of the Japanese Navy had been sighted by Australian reconnaissance headed toward Pearl Harbor; that our Government was again notified 48 hours before the attack that this Japanese task force was still in progress toward Hawaii, and the same notification was sent 24 hours before Pearl Harbor. None of this information was, I am informed, given to General Short.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. I yield to my friend the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. JENKINS. I think the gentleman deserves a lot of credit for having gone into this matter extensively. I am frank to say I do not assume to know very much about it except what I read in the papers. If what the gentleman has stated just now is true with reference to this notification from Australia, then somebody in Washington must be very, very culpable because if Australian forces had seen that the Japanese were on their way and had notified anybody in power and in authority in Washington, it would seem to me this investigation ought to start from that point.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. I would like to say to the gentleman from Ohio, that before I get through reciting this evidence which can be shown by documentary proof, any person is naive who will not be convinced that the authorities here in Washington had all the facts and knew this, and did not communicate those facts to their commanders on the island at Pearl Harbor.

This evidence will further disclose that under the limits of jurisdiction of the Army and Navy in Hawaii at the time of Pearl Harbor all long-range reconnaissances which would be the type that would spot Japanese ships or aircraft were directly the responsibility of the Navy, but that the Navy for some reason made no such reconnaissances and no requests for assistance from the Army in such reconnaissance flights, which might have spotted the Japs coming in. It is recorded that General Short and Admiral Kimmel conferred regularly; and in a conversation which took place in Admiral Kimmel's office on November 27, 1941, in which conversation Kimmel's war-plans officer, in response to a direct question in the presence of both Short and Kimmel, made a very positive statement that there was absolutely no chance of a Japanese raid on Oahu. General Short, I am advised, would further show that at 7:15 a. m. on the morning of the attack, which was about 40 minutes prior to the main attack, a small Japanese submarine was sunk inside of Pearl Harbor and that he was never notified of this until after the attack was completely over. He claims that although time would have been very limited in which to do anything, he could have almost completely alerted his forces had the Navy notified him promptly of the sinking. General Short contends that aside from the above-mentioned instance, insofar as he knows, there was pretty complete liaison between Kimmel and himself; that is, the Army and the Navy.

There is grave doubt that General Short and Admiral Kimmel can now be brought to trial before a court martial because of the lapse of the statute of limitations and that resolutions of Congress extending the period of the statute of limitations are of doubtful constitutionality. However, I am informed that General Short is eager and anxious to be tried and is willing to waive the statute and submit to trial. General Short has no desire to embarrass Mr. Roosevelt in his campaign for reelection, nor does he want politics to enter into this case. He insists, however, that simple justice entitles him to a judicial or congressional hearing and that the true facts that would be presented would completely vindicate him.

Let me repeat that I have no personal knowledge of the facts related here, but they come to me from a source that I believe to be thoroughly reliable and trustworthy, and they are of such grave moment to the people of America that I present them to the House for such action as they merit. And, might I add, if these facts, considered with others that have been given us, are true, the responsibility for the Pearl Harbor disaster rests on others in high position in our Government than General Short and Admiral Kimmel. Did the President, who designates himself the "Commander in Chief of the Nation," know of the warning of the Australian Government of the Japanese task force proceeding toward Pearl Harbor? Did he know of the imminence of attack when he sent the Emperor of Japan a message a few hours before the assault? If so, why did he not warn General Short and Admiral Kimmel? Did the President of the United States know of the repeated warnings of Ambassador Joseph Grew, one of the best-informed men on Japan in this country? Why did the Commander in Chief remove Admiral Richardson from duty at Pearl Harbor 1 full year before his tour of duty was up? The mothers and fathers of the 3,000 men who died, but whose lives might have been saved through the exercise of the proper vigilance and precaution, want these questions answered. The people of America want them answered in the interest, safety, and security of the country.

If he was in possession of the information warning us of the Japanese plan to attack Pearl Harbor, why did he not command, why did he not instruct the men in charge of the military and naval forces in Hawaii?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. I yield.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I am sure every true American is grateful to the able gentleman from Indiana for his interest

in behalf of the two men in our armed services who probably have been given the most severe penalty—by that I mean not given the right to appear to prove their innocence—in the history of our Nation. I feel that not even Benedict Arnold in the Revolutionary War would have had to wait 3 years to be found guilty or innocent. I repeat that I believe the gentleman is doing a great service to the country for using every honest effort in order that these men after 3 long years will have the opportunity of having their day in court.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Here are two high-ranking officers, one of the Army and one of the Navy, men who were held in the highest esteem until this incident at Pearl Harbor, publicly charged—but not officially indicted—with near treason. This cloud has hung over their heads for almost 3 years, and the President, the Commander in Chief, has thus far denied them a chance to clear their names of this infamous accusation. Simple justice, the very thing we are fighting for in this war, demands that they be at least given a chance to defend themselves.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Is it not reasonable to suppose that if the Commander in Chief believed that General Short and Admiral Kimmel were guilty of the negligence that resulted in the Pearl Harbor disaster he would have demanded long ago that these two high-ranking officers be court-martialed?

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Of course; we know that the President of the United States, who calls himself the Commander in Chief of the Nation, does not want them court-martialed. I believe, and I think General Short believes, that the War Department under the direction of the President and the Commander in Chief has denied him trial thus far.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. I yield.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I believe the gentleman mentioned that 3,000 lives were lost at Pearl Harbor, many battleships, much equipment, airplanes, and so forth. I ask the gentleman if it is not true that indirectly it probably caused much greater loss of life by reason of the fact we did not have those battleships and planes to use in the Philippines? It would amount to many more than the 3,000 the gentleman mentioned.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Why, of course. We are told that the loss of lives at Pearl Harbor was about 3,800. Our entire Pacific Fleet was destroyed at Pearl Harbor. No one can estimate how many lives might have been saved in the Philippines, at Wake, Midway, and Guam if this disaster at Pearl Harbor had been averted. Imagine for a minute what hundreds of airplanes, the battleships, cruisers, destroyers, and other naval craft destroyed would have meant to General MacArthur in the defense of Bataan. Yes; the tragedy of Pearl Harbor has undoubtedly cost the Nation thousands of lives and prolonged the war against Japan many months and perhaps years.

It is therefore perfectly obvious to any thinking person that thousands of lives needlessly sacrificed is due to the criminal negligence of someone in this Government who was charged with the safety and the security of our Nation, but who blundered at Pearl Harbor.

Mr. KNUTSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. KNUTSON. If the Commander in Chief demands credit for the victories, he certainly should shoulder responsibility for defeats.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. On whom rests the responsibility for Pearl Harbor if it is not the Commander in Chief? Can the President as Commander in Chief claim credit for all victories and escape responsibility for our defeats? It is clear that the President would like the country to hold General Short and Admiral Kimmel responsible, and thereby escape criticism himself. His refusal to bring them to trial is proof of that. You know, of course, that Mr. Roosevelt placed both these officers in command at Pearl Harbor and they were under command of the President. Who had the inside information if it was not the State Department, the White House, the Secretary of War, and the Secretary of the Navy?

Mr. CHURCH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. CHURCH. The gentleman is a member of the Committee on Military Affairs of the House. I am wondering if the gentleman does not realize that if Admiral Kimmel is brought before one of the committees, the Naval Affairs Committee, or if General Short is brought before the gentleman's committee, both of them might be held for court martial for offering to explain anything in opposition to the contentions of the administration?

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. No; I do not think either one of them would be liable for court martial for appearing before an official committee of this House. Of course, the administration does not want the truth of Pearl Harbor to become known, and therefore would not dare bring court-martial proceedings. Admiral Kimmel and General Short would welcome the opportunity to appear before a congressional committee investigating this matter.

Mr. MICHENER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. MICHENER. Out of what might possibly be termed an abundance of caution, and giving the administration the benefit of every doubt, I have not up until this time indulged in any criticism or discussion of this court-martial controversy; however, we know that the Roberts committee made a report. We have been advised that the complete report made by the Roberts committee has never been given to the public, that that report was censored by the O. W. I. and only such information as the O. W. I. thought should be given to the American people at the time—taking into consideration military necessities—was given to the American people. If that be true why should there be further delay when the country knows that there is a report which is under lock and key, a report that has never been published which contains all the facts?

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Of course, the gentleman is an astute lawyer and he is one of the very able Members of the House. The gentleman knows, and millions of other people in this country know, that the Roberts report that was given to the public does not give all the truth at Pearl Harbor, only that part which the administration wanted the people to have.

Mr. MICHENER. That is what I said.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Of course, that is what the gentleman said and I want to confirm what he said.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. I have in my hand copy of an article which appeared in the Saturday Evening Post of October 10, 1942, written by Lt. Clarence E. Dickinson, United States Navy. This article has never been denied. With the gentleman's permission I would like to read the first two paragraphs of the article in the record at this point.

Lieutenant Dickinson, incidentally, was a pilot on one of the carriers that left Pearl Harbor on November 28:

> You would damn well remember Pearl Harbor if you had seen the great naval base ablaze as we of Scouting Squadron 6 saw it from the air, skimming in ahead of our homeward-bound carrier. The shock was especially heavy for us because this was our first knowledge that the Japs had attacked on that morning of December 7. We came upon it stone cold, each of us looking forward to a long leave that was due him.
>
> It wasn't that the pilots didn't sense the tension that gripped the Pacific. You could feel it everywhere, all the time. Certainly the mission from which we were returning had the flavor of impending action. We had been delivering a batch of 12 Grumman Wildcats of Marine Fighting Squadron 211 to Wake Island, where they were badly needed. On this cruise we had sailed from Pearl Harbor on November 28 under absolute war orders. Vice Admiral William F. Halsey, Jr., the commander of the Aircraft Battle Force, had given instructions that the secrecy of our mission was to be protected at all costs. We were to shoot down anything we saw in the sky and bomb anything we saw on the sea. In that way, there could be no leak to the Japs.

There is only one man in the United States who would dare in peacetimes give that type of order to shoot down anybody they saw in the air and bomb anybody they saw in the sea, and that is the Commander in Chief of the United States Army.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. I am very glad the gentleman put those two paragraphs in the RECORD. I had in mind, when I referred to other facts that had become public knowledge since Pearl Harbor, the very thing the gentleman mentions.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. I yield.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Discussing the very question the gentleman from Michigan raised about the delivery of the 12 planes to Wake Island, it was while that carrier force was on the way back to Pearl Harbor that the attack took place. But the significant part of the whole discussion seems to me depends in a large degree as to what was being done at Wake Island, Midway Island, Johnston Island, and Palmyra Islands that the Committee on Naval Affairs 3 years before had authorized considerable money for the dredging of the harbors, building a breakwater, the take-off areas, and seaplane ramps. It is the understanding of those of us on the Committee on Naval Affairs that the real reason for the attack on Pearl Harbor that morning, other than not being on the alert, was because we did not have the scouting planes in that perimeter formed by these islands which are 600 to 1,500 miles away from Pearl Harbor where the planes should have been in the air, if we had the planes there. But we did not have the planes there. I am reliably informed that Admiral Kimmel over a long period of time pleaded for more planes so that the Navy could cover with its scouting planes the entire area covered by these islands. The planes were not there and the Japs broke through. We had the planes but they were diverted to other uses, particularly lend-lease.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Of course not, because we had nearly all of our planes and our Pacific Fleet assembled on the island at Pearl Harbor which naturally made perfect targets for the Japs.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. I yield.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Certain radio commentators have stated that the reason these men are not brought to trial is due to the fact that the President stated it would take several men away from their lines of duty. We know that only about a week or two ago the President took a political junket over into the Pacific at a cost, so it has been reported, of $20,000,000, taking with him cruisers, battleships, seaplanes, and men.

He brought General MacArthur and his people away from the south, as well as Admiral Halsey. How can you reconcile the fact that the President on one hand says he cannot spare these men away from line of duty, witnesses and others, and then on the other hand he will spend $20,000,000 on a political junket and take General MacArthur and other able men away from the front for political reasons?

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Your question answers itself. I think that excuse for not bringing these men to trial is simply ridiculous and outrageous in the light of the facts you relate. I suppose to Mr. Roosevelt it is perfectly all right for him to call these officers and men away from their duties and commands to meet him at Pearl Harbor to afford publicity for his candidacy for reelection.

Mr. CALVIN D. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. I yield.

Mr. CALVIN D. JOHNSON. I think the most outstanding statement that I have heard during the argument presented by the gentleman—and I want to be sure that I understand him correctly—is that the Australian Government notified Washington 72 hours prior to the attack; that there was a second call 48 hours, and a third call 24 hours prior to the attack that a Jap carrier force was on its way to Pearl Harbor.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. That is right.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a letter from the Director of Mobilization, Mr. Justice Byrnes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SMITH] is recognized for 25 minutes.

U. N. R. R. A. FOR THE RELIEF OF THE STARVING?

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, when the bill for the establishment of United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration was up for passage last January, it was evident that Representatives in Congress were unanimous in the desire that our country should render all possible relief aid to the people who are likely to suffer from the need of the essential necessaries of life in the aftermath of the war in Europe and elsewhere. There was no division on that point.

However, there was some question among some of the Members as to the kind of program that should be set up. They believed that we should follow the experience our country had in providing relief aid to the peoples of Europe during and immediately following the other World War. That program was eminently successful. I share the belief with many that it was one of the noblest deeds ever performed by the hand and mind of man. It was efficient and economical to a degree and administered in the spirit of true charity, as the money cost for administering it shows.

But the Administration wanted a different kind of relief set-up. It wholly disregarded the rich experience we had in providing relief during the other war. It pressed for an international organization made up of nearly all the nations of the world where all would join together in some new kind of cooperative endeavor to succor the war-stricken needy. This, we were told, would provide a more efficient and economical distribution of relief supplies. Above all, it would spread throughout the world the spirit of charity and good will among all mankind such as has never been witnessed before. Emphasis seems to have been placed on quantity rather than quality charity.

However, some in Congress were skeptical. They had seen so many political agencies created where the promises of good to flow from them bulged large but out of which came little else but additions to the bureaucracy.

The Administration plan prevailed, and U. N. R. R. A. was created last January. On June 30, 1944, it was given an appropriation of funds amounting to $450,000,000. In addition, it received authorization, subject to certain conditions, to receive goods valued at $350,000,000 from lend-lease. Since then, U. N. R. R. A. has been busily engaged in organizing its administrative staff, getting ready to start operations.

Now we are for the first time permitted to see something of what this international agency to feed the starving really looks like. Below are presented some data showing the number of persons employed and some of the others to be employed by it, their salary rates, and other miscellaneous items.

I could not have obtained the data here presented directly from U. N. R. R. A. headquarters. From reliable sources I learned that U. N. R. R. A. refuses to give out certain information that is customarily available to Congress and the public from Government sources, on the ground that it is not a Federal Government agency but an international body. Further, that it could not do so because there has been no agreement among the nations involved to make this matter public. It is my understanding the Director General of U. N. R. R. A. expects to make a report of its activities and its operations September 15, and I have been informed by competent sources that no more than a small part, if any, of the material I am herewith presenting will be published in that report. In discussing this point with persons in authority to speak, I have come to the conclusion that U. N. R. R. A. takes the position that since it is an international body and not a Federal Government agency, what it does is not necessarily the concern of the American public.

If this be true, then our public may find itself in a bad way. It may not be permitted to know just what is being done with the money it furnishes to this agency, or about other operations which are of vital concern to it. It is the duty of Government officials to make available to the public full and complete information respecting any and all operations that involve the expenditure of taxpayers' money and that affect in any manner the well-being of the community. Failure or refusal to do so is a violation of the very first principle of the Constitution, namely, representative government. If this international agency has the power to withhold from the people of the United States any information relating to its activities which are paid for with our taxpayers' money, then it was created in violation of the Constitution and ought forthwith to be abolished.

It might well be asked whether U. N. R. R. A. is to be the pattern of the numerous other international organizations that appear to be in the making. This agency is supposed to be a wholly altruistic instrumentality for distributing charity to the hungry and naked. When we consider the demeanor which is manifested in its secretive operations as well as the form taken by it, as shown by the data below, what should we expect from such international political bodies as the proposed International Monetary Fund and Bank, should this become a reality? The promoters of this international monetary and financial scheme emphasize that it is not to concern itself with disinterested benevolence but only with hard-fisted financial bargaining.

Following the data relating to U. N. R. R. A. will be found some facts pertaining to administrative costs of the United States Food Administration program during the other war. Compare these costs with those of U. N. R. R. A.

U. N. R. R. A. ADMINISTRATIVE SET-UP SHOWING BASE RATES OF PAY OF OFFICIALS AND EMPLOYEES, PERSONNEL, ETC.—EMPLOYEES ASSIGNED ABROAD RECEIVE CERTAIN ADDITIONAL ALLOWANCES—THE DATA ARE SUBSTANTIALLY ACCURATE, SUFFICIENTLY SO, AT LEAST, FOR THE PURPOSE OF ILLUSTRATION

BUDGET FOR U. N. R. R. A. HEADQUARTERS OFFICE

One at $15,000 per annum.
One of $14,000 per annum.
Five at $12,000 per annum.
One at $11,500 per annum.
Seven at $10,000 per annum.
Five at $9,000 per annum.
Twenty-eight at $8,000 per annum.
Fifty-two at $7,000 per annum.
Sixty-nine at $6,000 per annum.
Forty-five at $5,000 per annum.
Twenty-three at $4,500 per annum.
Sixteen at $4,000 per annum.
Thirty-five at $3,600 per annum.
Forty-eight at $3,200 per annum.
Forty-one at $2,800 per annum.
Forty at $2,000 per annum.
One hundred and nine at $2,400 per annum.
One hundred and nine at $2,000 per annum.
Twenty at $1,800 per annum.
Fifteen at $1,620 per annum.
Total, $2,624,000.

BUDGET FOR BALKAN MISSIONS

One at $9,500 per annum.
Three at $9,000 per annum.
Thirteen at $8,000 per annum.
Fifteen at $7,000 per annum.
Fifty-eight at $6,000 per annum.
One hundred and thirty-five at $5,000 per annum.
Fifty-five at $4,500 per annum.
One hundred and eighteen at $4,000 per annum.
Ten at $3,600 per annum.
Nineteen at $3,200 per annum.
Fourteen at $2,800 per annum.
Forty-two at $2,400 per annum.
Total, $2,226,800.

BUDGET PERSONNEL SERVICES, BUREAU OF AREAS

One at $12,000 per annum.
Four at $8,000 per annum.
Thirteen at $7,000 per annum.
Twelve at $6,000 per annum.
Nine at $5,000 per annum.
One at $4,500 per annum.
One at $6,745 per annum.
Two at $5,662 per annum.
Four at $4,795 per annum.
One at $4,470 per annum.
One at $4,146 per annum.
Six at $3,600 per annum.
Nine at $3,200 per annum.
Eight at $2,800 per annum.
Fourteen at $2,400 per annum.
Eleven at $2,200 per annum.
Two at $2,000 per annum.
Total, $436,965.

BUDGET PERSONNEL SERVICES, BUREAU OF SUPPLY

One at $12,000 per annum.
One at $11,500 per annum.
One at $9,000 per annum.
Thirteen at $8,000 per annum.
Twenty-seven at $7,000 per annum.
Thirty-two at $6,000 per annum.
Twenty at $5,000 per annum.
Eight at $4,500 per annum.
Four at $4,000 per annum.
Six at $3,600 per annum.
Eleven at $3,200 per annum.
Fifteen at $2,800 per annum.
Forty-three at $2,400 per annum.
Twenty-seven at $2,200 per annum.
Three at $2,000 per annum.
One at $1,620 per annum.
Total, $938,520.

Notable in this budget are the numerous small offices, or subdivisions, consisting of from 3 to 10 persons, usually 1 at eight or seven thousand, 1 at six or five thousand with a secretary; also high salaries paid to analysts for analysis of seeds, for analysis of poultry, for analysis of containers. Salaries of five, six, and seven thousands.

ITALIAN MISSION OBSERVERS

Four at $7,000 per annum.
Seven at $6,000 per annum.
Three at $5,000 per annum.
One at $2,800 per annum.
One at $2,400 per annum.
Total, $90,200.

Part of the D. G.'s staff consists of an office of public information staffed by:

One at $10,000 per annum.
One at $7,200 per annum.
Three at $7,000 per annum.
Two at $6,300 per annum.
One at $6,000 per annum.
One at $5,300 per annum.
One at $3,900 per annum.
One at $3,600 per annum.
One at $2,500 per annum.
Four at $2,400 per annum.
Two at $2,260 per annum.

Including Chief of Visual Media at $7,000; Chief of Radio, $7,000; Chief of Organized Groups, $7,000.
Total, $86,220.

TYPICAL SALARIES PAID BY THE U. N. R. R. A. TO ITS OFFICIALS AND EMPLOYEES

Public information officer, $10,000.
Assistant, $9,000.
Assistant, $8,000.
Financial adviser, $10,000.
Two assistants, $6,000.
General counsel, $10,000.
Assistant, $8,000.
Assistant, $7,000.
Library and reports chief, $7,000.
Historian, $5,000.
Welfare division director, $10,000.
Deputy, $8,000.
Chief of studies, $7,000.
Two special assistants, $7,000.
One associate, $6,000.
Treasurer, $10,000.
Assistant, $8,000.
Bureau of Finance—Disbursing officer, $8,000.
Budget officer, $8,000.
Budget analyst, $6,000.
Chief accountant, $8,000.
Auditor, $8,000.
Auditor examiners, $5,000.
Chief administrative analyst, $8,000.
Senor administrative analyst, $5,000.
Personnel division director, $9,000.
Assistant director, $8,000.
Deputy director, $7,000.
Placement and personnel officers, $7,000, $6,000, and $5,000 each.
Administrative service director, $8,000.
Food Division chief, $8,000.
Chiefs of four subdivisions, $7,000 each
Clothing Division chief, $8,000.
Two chiefs of subsections, $7,000 each.
Four subsection chiefs, clothing division, $6,000 each.
Industrial equipment chief, $8,000.
Assistant, $7,000.
Three assistants, $6,000 each.
Bureau of Areas, chief, $12,000.
Assistant, $9,000.
Three subsection chiefs, $7,000 each.
One subsection chief $6,000.
One subsection chief, $5,000.
Recruiting representatives (6 or 7 of them) salaries range from $6,745 to $5,662 to $4,795 each.

In D. C. Training Center at University of Maryland, classes are held in languages, regional orientation, history, and background of international aid; programs are also being inaugurated at London and Cairo.

We understand the administration has not as yet been called into relief or rehabilitation operations, as of July 31, 1944.

ADMINISTRATION COST OF RELIEF DURING THE OTHER WAR UNDER THE UNITED STATES FOOD ADMINISTRATION

The data relating to the United States Food Administration were taken from Surface, American Food in the World War and Reconstruction, and Mellendore, History of the United States Food Administration.

It is my understanding that the United States Food Administrator served during the other war and armistice period without pay, except $1 per year.

As head of the Commission for Relief in Belgium, the United States Food Administrator and Director General for Relief from 1914 to 1919 directed the shipment and distribution of more than 30,000,000 metric tons of grain, flour, sugar, forage, pork, milk, clothing, medical supplies, and other related items to our allies and the hungry and needy of the war-stricken countries of Europe. The total was valued at more than $4,000,000,000.

On December 1, 1918, the total number of paid employees in the Washington office was 1,338, with a total annual salary rate of $1,705,722 or an average annual salary of $1,274.83.

The number of employees in the States eventually reached a total of about 9,000. The number of volunteers in the States reported about December 1, 1918, was 7,984. On this date there were in the States only 1,583 paid employees.

The total expenditures for food administration were $7,862,669 over the 2-year period from August 1917 to July 1919. This included the cost of temporary buildings—still in use by the Government—and $1,236,377 for printing and binding.

The amount paid for services of permanent and temporary employees in the Relief Administration from August 1917 to July 1919 was $3,793,000.

It is seen from the above totals of salaries that the annual budget for administration of U. N. R. R. A. and before this agency has actually started opera-

tions, is more than three times greater than the annual amount paid for salaries in connection with the United States Food Administration.

Further, the average annual salary rate for U. N. R. R. A. employees at Washington headquarters, on the basis of the data shown above, is three times greater than was that of the United States Food Administration employees.

It should also be borne in mind that the value of supplies handled by the United States Food Administration was greatly in excess of $4,000,000,000, while the total sum that is to be made available to U. N. R. R. A. is only about $2,200,000,000.

With one hand he put a penny in the urn of poverty, and with the other took a shilling out.

Mr. RAMEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. I yield.

Mr. RAMEY. The gentleman speaks about its secret manipulations. U. N. R. R. A. was passed by this body. The appropriations for it were made by this body. This body passed it in good faith. I was one who voted for it, thinking it was to feed the hungry and to clothe the naked. But according to the gentleman's statement, and most statements now, it is being eaten up with salaries, and so forth. But the gentleman speaks of secret manipulations. How can any department operate with any secrecy when it is created by the Congress of the United States of America? How can any appointed group keep any secret from the body which created it?

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I think the question, of course, answers itself.

Mr. RAMEY. How? Just a short time ago another speaker spoke about a department, referring to the Roberts report, saying that it was not giving all the facts. Can any department in Washington of appointed men keep from the elected representatives of the people any secret? Has that been done? Can it be done, and how?

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. The powers that be are doing it.

Mr. RAMEY. The powers are created by this Congress. I want information. How can that be done?

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. I do not believe it can be done, as I have already indicated, constitutionally. It can only be done by violating the Constitution.

The SPEAKER. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN] is recognized for 8 minutes.

NATIONAL LEADERSHIP

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 3 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, American history is repeating itself. Again, with a great, a desperately important job ahead of us, America has produced a man who is a match for that job. Again it has been proved that, with all our ability and genius to produce material things, our greatest ability and genius are in the great men we produce—the men of vigor and vision and integrity. Governor Dewey is demonstrating that the line of American greatness has not run out. He is proving that, for the new tasks that face us, we can have—we will have—new, unwearied, forthright leadership. He is proving that our destiny does not hang by the frail thread of one man's life. And we are reassured by that proof. We know now that indispensability is a myth—an un-American myth.

When he spoke in Louisville on last Friday night, Governor Dewey helped to destroy several other myths. They badly needed destroying. The New Dealers have been telling us that, of course, Mr. Roosevelt really wants to retire to his Hyde Park estate. Mr. Roosevelt also said that in his acceptance speech—from the west-coast naval base. He indicated that he was tired and weary after so many years in office. He wanted peace and quiet once more in which to recuperate. He said the same thing to his press conference only last Friday.

I think that all Americans sympathize with his feelings. The Presidency is a wearying, an eroding burden to bear. We can only guess the terrible toll which 12 years of bearing it must have exacted from Mr. Roosevelt. We understand why, now, he wishes that he could lay that burden down.

Why, then, does not he? The New Dealers, the bosses, the Hillman-Browder Communist axis—all those whose power and whose hope of greater power derive from Mr. Roosevelt—have an answer. They tell you—and, despite his weariness, Mr. Roosevelt also tells you—that the future depends upon him. They say—and Mr. Roosevelt endorses their saying—that now that we are winning the war, he must stay where he is—worn out though he is—because without him we cannot possibly win the peace.

That, of course, was never true. That is a smoke screen—a myth—behind which a dangerous conglomeration of evil political forces aim to get the Government of the United States even more firmly in their grasp.

That is one of the myths which Governor Dewey blasted in Louisville. He made it clear that peace does not depend on 6 months or a year or 4 more years of Roosevelt. Governor Dewey made it clear that peace is not something that can be insured merely by making it possible for Mr. Roosevelt to have two or three more conferences at Teheran or Quebec or Honolulu. Governor Dewey showed us that peace is something that will require the best efforts of all of us for next year, for 5 years, for 10—even for 50 years. In short, Governor Dewey was advocating peace by statesmanship.

The New Dealers are advocating peace by personality—peace by the indispensable personality. There is hope for us—there is hope for peace in the Dewey way. There is no hope for us—and no hope for peace in the other. That way leads not to peace but to war.

I am grateful—all Americans are grateful that Governor Dewey shattered that myth. In regard to this great problem of stopping the next war before it starts we now, for the first time, begin to feel solid ground under our feet. We can thank Governor Dewey for that.

And let me tell you one other myth that Governor Dewey shattered. He shattered the New Deal myth that what we do to help the world has no relationship to our own ability to help ourselves. Governor Dewey made it clear that our very ability to help the world depends, and must continue to depend, upon our own strength, our own unity, our own prosperity and progress here at home. It is good to get that ground under our feet also. For the New Deal—having written a record of 8 long years of failure on the home front—now aims to dazzle us by what it proposes to do on the world front. We know, Governor Dewey knows, that failure at home sooner or later means failure abroad. Our job of helping mankind, our responsibility to help mankind, begins with ourselves.

It is not to be wondered at that—from coast to coast—the American people are starting this week feeling better about themselves and about America. We are feeling that way—all of us—because, at long last, we have found a man who believes that way. America has been waiting for such a man. When the American people, on next November 7, elect Governor Dewey they will be electing more than the Republican candidate. They will be electing statesmanship, the kind of statesmanship by which peace can be achieved, in our dealings with the world.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 3 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I regret very much the gentleman from Illinois was not willing to yield to me. I would like to point out to the House that only this afternoon I did yield to him, and I do not understand why he would not yield to me.

What I wanted to say was this: I do not think Governor Dewey has found out anything unusual. Of course, the establishment of lasting peace is going to take time. Of course, it will require the hard, earnest labor of many people in all the nations of the world. But everyone knows that. I only need point out that only a few days ago I made a speech in the House, the whole purport of which was that very thing. I wrote a book, Beyond Victory, on that very same theme. I do not know of anybody in the Democratic Party or any other party that thinks peace can be established on the basis of a few conferences or by the work of a few people, however powerful they may be. Governor Dewey says nothing new when he says that only out of the hearts of this Nation and other nations can peace truly be built. I only

hope that in the days that lie ahead of us; in the months and years that lie ahead of us; the people of America are not once more going to be deceived how that peace can be gained, and will learn from the experiences that followed the First World War that we have to do a lot better job than we did then if we hope to keep faith with the men fighting and dying in this war.

UNITED NATIONS RELIEF AND REHABILITATION

Mr. RAMEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 2 minutes and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. RAMEY. Mr. Speaker, I would not use this time if I had not listened to the address of the gentleman from Ohio, Dr. FREDERICK C. SMITH, a few minutes ago. I voted for United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation, and am proud of it. It was represented to us in such a manner that in reality it seemed to me Christianity in action; that it was the thing to do. I thought of David Livingston as I voted for that bill and thought that the Congress of the United States was doing officially what he endeavored to do. We are givers here and we voted to give to feed the hungry in the world and to clothe the naked. May I beseech those interested and especially beseech those in U. N. R. R. A. in God's name to read that address of Dr. SMITH, and be alert that this sacred cause is not being just a matter of jobs and secrecy. Think of the starving and naked children, and this country giving its all just to help. This matter is too sacred to bypass Congress. May I beseech that department to act in good faith as we in this body in good faith acted when we voted for that measure.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 1374. An act to provide for promotion of certain American prisoners of war; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

S. 1464. An act for the relief of the estate of Charles Noah Shipp, deceased; to the Committee on Claims.

BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. KLEIN, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee did on September 8, 1944, present to the President, for his approval, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 5181. An act to provide a method for compensating certain individuals for damages sustained as the result of the explosions at Port Chicago, Calif.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ROWAN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 24 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, September 12, 1944, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1799. A letter from the Secretary, United States Employees' Compensation Commission, transmitting a copy of the quarterly estimate of personnel requirements for the quarter ending December 31, 1944; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

1800. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to authorize the course of instruction at the United States Military Academy to be given to not exceeding 20 persons at a time from the American republics other than the United States; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

1801. A letter from the Acting Postmaster General, transmitting the estimates of personnel requirements for the Post Office Department, for the quarter ending December 31, 1944; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

1802. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a copy of communication from this Department to the Director of the Bureau of the Budget relating to revision of current personnel ceiling of the Procurement Division; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

1803. A letter from the Associate Director, United States Department of the Interior, National Park Service, transmitting a copy of quarterly estimate of personnel requirements for the quarter ending December 31, 1944, covering the appropriation "Maintenance, Executive Mansion and Grounds, 1945"; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

1804. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting a report on records proposed for disposal by various Government agencies; to the Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers.

1805. A letter from the Administrator, National Gallery of Art, Smithsonian Institution, transmitting a copy of the report on its quarterly estimate of personnel requirements; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

1806. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to amend the act entitled "An act for the award of the Air Mail Flyer's Medal of Honor," approved January 14, 1931; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

1807. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Department of Agriculture, transmitting reports of negative preliminary examinations made by this Department pursuant to the flood-control acts for the watersheds of various rivers; to the Committee on Flood Control.

1808. A letter from the Director, Selective Service System, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to amend the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, to extend the time within which application may be made for reemployment, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. GREEN: Committee on Claims. H. R. 449. A bill for the relief of the Puget Sound Bridge & Dredging Co.; with amendment (Rept. No. 1861). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FERNANDEZ: Committee on Claims. H. R. 545. A bill for the relief of G. F. Odom; with amendment (Rept. No. 1862). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. McGEHEE: Committee on Claims. H. R. 763. A bill for the relief of Lindsey Harcrow; with amendment (Rept. No. 1863). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GOODWIN: Committee on Claims. H. R. 2213. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Agnes Wolters; without amendment (Rept. No. 1864). Referred to the Committee on the Whole House.

Mr. MURPHY: Committee on Claims. H. R. 2300 A bill for the relief of Rose B. Luzar; with amendment (Rept. No. 1865). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CARSON of Ohio: Committee on Claims H. R. 2543. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Nelle Jones; with amendment (Rept. No. 1866). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GOODWIN: Committee on claims. H. R. 3017. A bill for the relief of Hubert McMahon and Barbara McMahon, a minor; with amendment (Rept. No. 1867). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. SCRIVNER: Committee on claims. H. R. 3373. A bill for the relief of Dewey H. Davis; with amendment (Rept. No. 1868). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. PATTON: Committee on Claims. H. R. 3414. A bill for the relief of Edward C. Robbins; with amendment (Rept. No. 1869). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. MURPHY: Committee on Claims. H. R. 3881. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Anna Chandler; with amendment (Rept. No. 1870). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GREEN: Committee on Claims. H. R. 3928. A bill for the relief of James LeRoy Eden; without amendment (Rept. No. 1871). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. JENNINGS: Committee on Claims. H. R. 4016. A bill for the relief of John Casey and Marie Casey; with amendment (Rept. No. 1872). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. SCRIVNER: Committee on Claims. H. R. 4212. A bill for the relief of Robert Rowe and Mary Rowe; with amendment (Rept. No. 1873). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. PATTON: Committee on Claims. H. R. 4213. A bill for the relief of Karl Lungstras; with amendment (Rept. No. 1874). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. MURPHY: Committee on Claims. H. R. 4309. A bill for the relief of Rosa Lee Foreman; with amendment (Rept. No. 1875). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. JENNINGS: Committee on Claims. H. R. 4367. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Julia Toler; with amendment (Rept. No. 1876). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. McGEHEE: Committee on Claims. H. R. 4652. A bill for the relief of Frank Lore; with amendment (Rept. No. 1877). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. McGEHEE: Committee on Claims. H. R. 4855. A bill for the relief of Captolia Colvin; with amendment (Rept. No. 1878). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. SCRIVNER: Committee on Claims. H. R. 5060. A bill for the relief of Clyde H. Palmer; with amendment (Rept. No. 1879). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BLAND:

H. R. 5334. A bill to provide for the admission on motion of certain merchant seamen to practice law in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. CANNON of Florida:

H. R. 5335. A bill to extend the benefits of title 11 of the Social Security Act to certain employees performing service outside the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FERNANDEZ:

H. R. 5336. A bill to authorize the War Food Administrator or the Secretary of Agriculture to adjust boundary disputes by settling claims to certain so-called Sebastian Martin land grants, in the State of New Mexico; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. REES of Kansas:

H. R. 5337. A bill to amend the Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act of 1940 so as to extend the time within which members of the armed forces may pay income taxes falling due prior to or during the period of military service; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr STEWART:

H. R. 5338. A bill to provide for naming the lake formed by waters of the Red River impounded by Denison Dam; to the Committee on Flood Control.

By Mr. VOORHIS of California:

H. R. 5339 A bill to authorize the coinage of 50-cent pieces in commemoration of the memory of Will Rogers; to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

By Mr. BOREN:

H. R. 5340. A bill to amend section 17 of the act of January 12, 1895 (title 44, sec. 31, U. S. Code), section 18 of the act of January 12, 1895 (title 44, sec. 33, U. S. Code), and the act of May 29, 1928 (title 44, sec. 39a, U. S. Code); to the Committee on Printing.

By Mr. WHITE:

H. R. 5341 A bill to provide for the erection of a memorial to Brig. Gen. William L. Mitchell; to the Committee on the Library.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolution were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr OUTLAND:

H. R. 5342. A bill to confer jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the Southern District of California to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claims of Eugene Allen and Mrs. Gail Allen; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SASSCER:

H. R. 5343. A bill for the relief of William W. Willett, Jr.; to the Committee on Claims.

SENATE

TUESDAY, SEPTEMBER 12, 1944

(Legislative day of Friday, November 1, 1944)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess..

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, we bow in Thy presence, solemnly conscious of impending events shaping the future and fixing the destiny of unnumbered hosts whose anguished longings are like the sound of many waters. As we think of our Nation conceived in liberty and dedicated to the common rights of man, may we fear nothing but to fail humanity and Thee.

To the councils of our leaders, fraught with such awesome responsibility, give wisdom. In victory grant us the humility born of a vivid sense of our own failings. Upon our embattled sons with liberating sword unsheathed, storming this day the very gates of the foe, may there rest the grace of courage and of strength to strike a blow for a free world. In an hour which calls for greatness may our public service be a sacrament, our politics purged of corroding littleness. Climbing to high places of discernment, may our eyes search the horizon and see the stars of universal brotherhood shining steadfastly above the mists of selfish strife. So may our personal devotion become a part of the highway down which the hopes and dreams of those who have seen the city of God across the hills of time go on in triumph, from victory to victory. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Friday, September 8, 1944, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILLS

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, who also announced that on September 7, 1944, the President had approved and signed the following acts:

S. 1508. An act to provide effective date of awards of death pension or compensation in cases of persons missing or missing in action to authorize payment of such benefits from the date of death of such person as reported or found by the Secretary of War or the Secretary of the Navy, and for other purposes; and

S. 1934. An act to provide for abandonment of the project authorized in the act of October 17, 1940, for a seaplane channel and basin in Boston Harbor, Mass.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. McLeod, one of its clerks, announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 1250) to repeal section 2 of the act approved May 17, 1926, which provides for the forfeiture of pay of persons in the military and naval service of the United States who are absent from duty on account of the direct effects of venereal disease due to misconduct, with amendments in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had receded from its amendments to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1 and 3 to the bill (H. R. 4278) to provide for the control and eradication of certain animal and plant pests and diseases, to facilitate cooperation with the States in fire control, to provide for the more efficient protection and management of the national forests, to facilitate the carrying out of agricultural conservation and related agricultural programs, to facilitate the operation of the Farm Credit Administration and the Rural Electrification Administration, to aid in the orderly marketing of agricultural commodities, and for other purposes, and that the House had agreed to the action of the Senate in receding from the amendments of the Senate Nos. 1 and 3 to the bill.

The message further announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 4931) for the relief of the city of Beardstown, Ill., in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

LEGISLATION BY LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY AND MUNICIPAL COUNCIL OF ST. THOMAS AND ST. JOHN, V. I.

Letters from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of legislation passed by the Legislative Assembly and the Municipal Council of St. Thomas and St. John, V. I. (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs.

AIR MAIL FLYER'S MEDAL OF HONOR

A letter from the Acting Secretary of Commerce, submitting, in accordance with the provisions of Reorganization Plan No IV, a draft of proposed legislation to amend the act entitled "An act for the award of the Air Mail Flyer's Medal of Honor," approved January 14, 1931 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

FEDERAL AID FOR POST-WAR HIGHWAY CONSTRUCTION—FLIGHT STRIPS AND AVIATION

A letter from the Acting Secretary of Commerce, relating to certain provisions of the bill (S. 2105) to amend and supplement the Federal Aid Road Act, approved July 11, 1916, as amended and supplemented, to authorize appropriations for the post-war construction of highways and bridges, to eliminate hazards at railroad-grade crossings, to provide for the immediate preparation of plans and acquisition of rights-of-way, and for other purposes, pertaining to the maintenance of flight strips adjacent to public highways, etc.; ordered to lie on the table.

AMENDMENT OF SELECTIVE TRAINING AND SERVICE ACT—EXTENSION OF TIME TO FILE APPLICATION FOR REAPPOINTMENT

A letter from the Director of the Selective Service System, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, to extend the time within which application may be made for reemployment, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Military Affairs.

THIRTEENTH BIMONTHLY REPORT OF SMALLER WAR PLANTS CORPORATION (S. DOC. NO. 234)

A letter from the Acting Chairman of the War Production Board, transmitting, pursuant to law, the thirteenth bimonthly report of the Smaller War Plants Corporation for the period June 1, 1944, through July 31, 1944 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and ordered to be printed, with illustrations.

PERSONNEL REQUIREMENTS

Letters from the Acting Postmaster General, Associate Director of the National Park Service ("Maintenance, Executive Mansion and Grounds, 1945") Alien Property Custodian, Director, Office of Defense Transportation, Director of Civilian Defense, Secretary, United States Employees' Compensation Commission, Acting Secretary of the Smithsonian

Institution, Administrator of the National Gallery of Art, and third vice president of the Panama Railroad Company transmitting, pursuant to law, estimates of personnel requirements for their respective offices for the quarter ending December 31, 1944, and also a letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a revision of personnel requirements of the Procurement Division for the quarter ending September 30, 1944 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Civil Service.

DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a list of papers and documents on the files of the Departments of the Treasury, Post Office (3), Navy, and Labor; the National Archives, Railroad Retirement Board, Interstate Commerce Commission, Federal Security Agency, War Food Administration, and Office of Price Administration which are not needed in the conduct of business and have no permanent value or historical interest, and requesting action looking to their disposition (with accompanying papers); to a Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Papers in the Executive Departments.

The VICE PRESIDENT appointed Mr. BARKLEY and Mr. BREWSTER members of the Committee on the part of the Senate.

PETITION

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a letter in the nature of a petition from the Yugoslav-American Central Council, of San Pedro, Calif., praying that Mr. Konstantin Fotitch, former Ambassador for Yugoslavia, be deported from the United States, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

FEDERAL AID FOR POST-WAR HIGHWAY CONSTRUCTION—VIEWS OF NATIONAL FARMERS UNION

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I have received from Russell Smith, legislative secretary of the National Farmers Union, a telegram setting forth the views of that organization with regard to Senate bill 2105, the so-called Federal aid for post-war highway construction bill, and ask that it be appropriately referred and printed in the RECORD in accordance with his request.

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *September 12, 1944.*

Senator ARTHUR CAPPER,
Senate Office Building:

We have sent the following telegram to Representative ROBINSON and Senator REED, and would appreciate it very much if you would offer it for insertion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

"The National Farmers Union's position as regards S. 2105 and H. R. 4915, authorizing post-war highway construction, is as follows:

"1. We endorse the view of Representative MOTT in his minority report on H. R. 4915, as follows: 'Practically without exception, the witnesses appearing before the committee emphasized the absolute need of at least $1,000,000,000 annually in Federal aid to support the post-war highway program. Witness after witness admonished the committee that unless a Federal-aid program of such proportions is established we will not be able to even approach post-war highway requirements and face a break-down of the transportation system.'

"2. We believe the 60–40 Federal-State apportionment of cost is thoroughly justified in view of the interstate nature of the Federal system, and of the long-time financial strength of the Federal as opposed to the State governments. We cite again Mr. MOTT's minority report indicating the self-liquidating nature of highway expenditures: 'A Federal-aid authorization of a billion dollars a year for each of the 3 post-war years would have very little, if any, effect on the size of the national debt. Highway projects may be truly classed as self-liquidating projects, and according to competent authorities receipts from Federal excise taxes during the post-war period will be sufficient to meet the expenses of a program twice the size of the one contemplated under H. R. 4915.'

"3. In particular, the amount provided under either the Senate or the House bill for farm-to-market roads is utterly inadequate under any apportionment formula. We believe that the Nation should plan to expend at least $350,000,000 annually on such roads. Secondary and feeder roads have suffered perhaps more than any part of the road system during the war, and drastic action without regard to present population figures is needed."

RUSSELL SMITH,
Legislative Secretary,
National Farmers Union.

REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

The following reports of a committee were submitted:

By Mr. HATCH, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

H. R. 1569. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to amend the act creating the circuit court of appeals in regard to fees and costs, and for other purposes," approved February 19, 1897 (29 Stat. 536; 28 U. S. C. 543); with an amendment (Rept. No. 1087); and

H. R. 1623. A bill to amend an act entitled "An act to provide fees to be charged by clerks of the district courts of the United States," approved February 11, 1925 (43 Stat. 857), as amended (28 U. S. C., secs. 548–555); without amendment (Rept. No. 1088).

PERSONS EMPLOYED BY A COMMITTEE WHO ARE NOT FULL-TIME SENATE OR COMMITTEE EMPLOYEES

Mr. GILLETTE (for Mr. SMITH), from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, submitted a report, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations, as follows:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY,
September 9, 1944.

To the Senate of the United States:

Pursuant to the provisions of Senate Resolution 319 agreed to August 23, 1944, the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry reports the following list of persons employed by the subcommittee charged with the duty of investigating the broadened utilization of farm crops, and coming within the purview of said resolution:

Name of individual: Paul E. Hadlick.

Address: National Press Building, Washington, D. C.

Name and address of department or organization by whom paid: Engaged in private legal practice.

Annual rate of compensation: $3,600.

E. D. SMITH, *Chairman.*
By G. M. GILLETTE.

REPORT ON DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

Mr. BARKLEY, from the Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers, to which were referred for examination and recommendation a list of records transmitted to the Senate by the Archivist of the United States that appeared to have no permanent value or historical interest, submitted a report thereon pursuant to law.

JOINT COMMITTEE TO ARRANGE FOR THE INAUGURATION OF THE PRESIDENT-ELECT—NEWS RELEASE

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there may be printed in the RECORD a news release issued by the Joint Committee to Arrange for the Inauguration of the President-Elect, and also a statement issued in connection therewith.

There being no objection, the news release and statement were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SEPTEMBER 8, 1944.

At a meeting held today in the Speaker's rooms, Senator HARRY F. BYRD, of Virginia, was named chairman of the Joint Committee for the Inauguration of a President on January 20, 1945. Col. Edwin A. Halsey, Secretary of the Senate, was named secretary of the joint committee.

A motion was made, and agreed to, that the candidates for the Presidency be consulted as to their wishes for an inaugural ceremony.

The committee was authorized to ask for an appropriation for $25,000, under a joint resolution, to be made immediately available for the preliminary expenditures.

All members of the joint committee, Senators BYRD, MCKELLAR, and VANDENBERG on the part of the Senate, and Speaker RAYBURN, Representatives DOUGHTON and MARTIN on the part of the House, were present and concurred unanimously in the suggestions.

PRESIDENTIAL INAUGURATIONS

Washington, 1789; gallery of Senate Chamber, New York.

Washington, 1793; Senate Chamber, Philadelphia.

Adams, 1797; House Chamber, Philadelphia.

Jefferson, 1801; Senate Chamber, Washington.

Jefferson, 1805; Senate Chamber, Washington.

Madison, 1809; House Chamber, Washington.

Madison, 1813; House Chamber, Washington.

Monroe, 1817; Portico, United States Capitol Building, Washington.

Monroe, 1821; House Chamber, Washington.

J. Q. Adams, 1825; House Chamber, Washington.

Jackson, 1829; Portico, United States Capitol Building, Washington.

Thenceforth inaugurations were held on the Capitol Portico except in the following cases:

President Fillmore took the oath of office in the House Chamber.

President Hayes took the oath of office privately.

President Taft took the oath of office in the Senate Chamber—an outdoor ceremony being impossible on account of a blizzard.

President Coolidge took the oath of office August 3, 1923, at Plymouth, Vt.

APPROPRIATION FOR EXPENSES OF THE INAUGURAL CEREMONIES

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, from the Committee on Appropriations I report back without amendment Senate Joint Resolution 150, making an appropriation of $25,000 for the payment of the necessary expenses of the inauguration of the President-elect, and I re-

quest unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the resolution (S. J. Res. 150) making an appropriation to pay the necessary expenses of the inaugural ceremonies of the President of the United States, January 20, 1945, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That there is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $25,000, to enable the Secretary of the Senate and the Clerk of the House of Representatives to pay the necessary expenses of the inaugural ceremonies of the President of the United States, January 20, 1945, in accordance with such program as may be adopted by the joint committee of the Senate and House of Representatives, appointed under the concurrent resolution of the two Houses agreed to June 23, 1944, including the pay for extra police, fiscal year 1945.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. HILL:

S. 2142. A bill for the relief of Lindon A. Long; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. THOMAS of Utah:

S. 2143. A bill to authorize the course of instruction at the United States Military Academy to be given to not exceeding 20 persons at a time from the American Republics, other than the United States; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. ANDREWS:

S. 2144. A bill to provide more efficient dental care for the personnel of the United States Navy; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. BARKLEY (for Mr. LUCAS):

S. J. Res. 152. Joint resolution establishing a commission to select a site and design for a memorial to the contributions of members of all religious faiths to American military and naval history; to the Committee on the Library.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H. R. 4931) for the relief of the city of Beardstown, Ill., was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Claims.

FEDERAL AID FOR POST-WAR HIGHWAY CONSTRUCTION—AMENDMENTS

Mr. BYRD, Mr. DAVIS, and Mr. MCCLELLAN each submitted an amendment, Mr. RUSSELL submitted two amendments, and Mr. MALONEY and Mr. STEWART each submitted several amendments, intended to be proposed by them, respectively, to the bill (S. 2105) to amend and supplement the Federal Aid Road Act, approved July 11, 1916, as amended and supplemented, to authorize appropriations for the post-war construction of highways and bridges, to eliminate hazards at railroad-grade crossings, to provide for the immediate preparation of plans and acquisition of rights-of-way, and for other purposes, which were severally ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. HILL (for Mr. LUCAS) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by Mr. LUCAS to Senate bill 2105, supra, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

FREEDOM FOR TRANSMISSION BY PRESS AND RADIO OF NEWS FROM NATIONS SIGNATORY TO PEACE TREATIES

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, in the Republican Party platform recently adopted at Chicago, there is contained a statement with regard to the desirability of obtaining by international agreement complete freedom of the press and radio throughout the world. The statement reads as follows:

All channels of news must be kept open with equality of access to information at the source. If agreement can be achieved with foreign nations to establish the same principles, it will be a valuable contribution to future peace.

Vital facts must not be withheld.

We want no more Pearl Harbor reports.

A similar declaration, omitting reference to Pearl Harbor, is contained in the Democratic platform.

A resolution upon the subject was submitted in the House of Representatives last week by Representative FULBRIGHT, and I ask consent to submit a similar resolution in the Senate. It is short, and I wish to read it. It reads as follows:

Whereas the opening of all channels of news throughout the world, the complete absence of censorship and the removal of discrimination in the use of facilities of communication will contribute to the knowledge of all peoples, nullify the effect of false propaganda, and remove causes of misunderstanding among nations, thereby contributing to the prevention of war in the future: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the President of the United States be requested to propose to all other nations that there be included in the treaties of peace, or in the treaty providing for an international organization of sovereign nations as proposed in the Connally resolution adopted by the Senate of the United States on November 5, 1943, or in separate treaties, specific covenants between the United States and all nations willing to agree thereto providing that each nation shall give to all responsible press and radio representatives of the other nation the same access to information at the source, the same right to transmit without censorship such news out of the country for publication, the same access to all facilities for communication, and the same rates of charge for communication over national and international facilities as is given to any press or radio representative of the nation making the agreement or of any other nation.

Mr. President, I send the resolution to the desk and ask that it be appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 50), submitted by Mr. TAFT, was received and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

VIRGINIA VETERANS' ASSISTANCE AND POST-WAR EMPLOYMENT PROGRAM (S. DOC. NO. 235)

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed as a Senate document the Virginia veterans' assistance and post-war employment program, which is of considerable interest through the country. I also ask that the survey accompanying that program, made by the Lynchburg (Va.) Chamber of Commerce, illustrating the assistance such a survey will render in the post-war employment program of the community be included in the Senate document.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PROBLEMS OF RECONVERSION—REPORT TO THE PRESIDENT BY WAR MOBILIZATION DIRECTOR

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the report of the Director of War Mobilization, the Honorable James F. Byrnes. It is addressed to the President, was released under date of September 9, 1944, and relates to the problems of reconversion.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MCKELLAR. Mr. President, the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] has obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the plan of former Senator Byrnes of South Carolina. On last Sunday the Washington Post printed on its first page a summary entitled "High Lights of Byrnes' Plan for Plant Demobilization." It is very succinct, and I think it should appear in the RECORD at the head of the article which the Senator from Georgia asked to have printed in the RECORD. I ask unanimous consent, and I hope the Senator from Georgia will give it, to have the article, the headline of which I just read, printed in the RECORD immediately preceding the report which was requested to be printed by the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. GEORGE. I have no objection.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The summary and report are as follows:

[From the Washington Post of September 10, 1944]

CLEARING THE DECKS—HIGH LIGHTS OF BYRNES PLAN FOR PLANT DEMOBILIZATION

High lights of War Mobilization Director James F. Byrnes' industrial demobilization program to strip away all possible Government controls after Germany falls to clear the way for civilian production:

A prompt return to a 40-hour workweek, except in critical war production and a handful of labor shortage areas will be ordered.

Government personnel will be reduced in proportion as controls are stripped away.

As far as possible, competitive units in the same industry will be released simultaneously from war production.

States were asked to liberalize unemployment compensation benefits now, and Byrnes expressed the hope that Congress will act to provide a maximum of $20 a week for 26 weeks after the presidential election.

O. P. A. is preparing to adjust prices of goods coming back into the market to take care of increased costs.

Industry should be told that the excess profits tax will be removed after the war, and manufacturers should be allowed to depreciate new machinery for tax purposes by substantial amounts when they purchase them.

Congress was asked to appropriate up to $2,000,000,000 in 1945 to carry out its commitment to support farm prices in view of looming food surpluses.

The Army Service Forces was directed to begin trimming its strategic reserve of supplies for a million men by 50 percent, and to reduce supply depot stocks.

REPORT OF WAR MOBILIZATION DIRECTOR

SEPTEMBER 7, 1944.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: For many months Government agencies have been making plans for a return to civilian production when Germany surrenders. Recently we have held conferences, as a result of which the representatives of the departments directly concerned with reconversion problems are closely cooperating and synchronizing their programs.

This is a report upon the status of some of these programs and some recommendations as to future action.

CUT-BACKS

More than a year ago, at the request of the Office of War Mobilization, the Army, Navy, Maritime Commission, and Foreign Economic Administration appointed committees to review their procurement programs to determine whether or not there could, at this time, be some modification either of the rates of production or of the total objective for the major items of procurement. Subsequently, at my request, the Joint Chiefs of Staff appointed a committee of four officers of high rank, two from the Army and two from the Navy, to review constantly the action of the several procurement agencies in the curtailment of procurement programs. They have been in daily touch with the procurement officials, who since that time have canceled more than $18,000,000,000 of authorized expenditures.

Of course, while these curtailments and cancelations have been taking place, necessity has arisen for the expenditure of many other millions for certain additional munitions and supplies resulting from the change from a defensive to an offensive warfare. But the figures show that the procurement agencies themselves have tried to prevent the accumulation of unnecessary supplies while at the same time furnishing the weapons and supplies that have made possible the victories of our armed forces.

General Somervell, commander of the Army Service Forces, with the approval of the Chief of Staff, General Marshall, has directed:

(a) That the strategic reserve be immediately studied in the light of current production and strategic situation without delay.

(b) That authority be given him to immediately suspend procurement on not to exceed 50 percent of the matériel provided in the current strategic reserve.

This strategic reserve embraces supplies of initial equipment for an additional million men. The decision of General Somervell will not result in cut-backs of existing orders but it will result in reducing by 50 percent orders placed after this date for supplies for these strategic reserves.

At the supply depots stocks heretofore have been authorized at 90 days of anticipated issue. In the light of current procurement and strategic conditions, General Somervell has ordered that the depot stocks be reduced to 60 days of expected issue for items vital to combat and 45 days for expected issue of other items. This will also reduce future procurement orders.

The ample supply of some munitions and some supplies will not, however, lessen the emphasis all Government agencies have been placing upon the necessity for overcoming the shortages in certain other critical supplies. They continue short. Reports continue of the short supply of certain artillery ammunition requiring our officers to restrict the number of rounds fired per day. For the last week the conduct of the war, fortunately, has lessened the demand upon the supply of heavy artillery ammunition. But no one can tell when demands will again increase. The Army cannot gamble as to the day of surrender.

AGENCY COOPERATION IN CUT-BACKS

Recognizing the need for an orderly shifting of facilities to meet changing requirements during the period of maximum war production, I directed the War Production Board on June 5, 1944, to establish an appropriate division with representatives from the procurement services and the War Manpower Commission to develop cut-back procedures, having in view that these cut-back procedures will be available to facilitate reconversion upon the defeat of Germany.

The current procedures for the administration of cut-backs are designed to provide for interim revisions in war requirements. Under these procedures, the procurement agencies determine the allocation of cut-backs among contractors under broad policies developed by the War Production Board to secure maximum production. The procurement agencies furnish the War Production Board with advance notice of any cut-back for an item or related group of items in which the value of the cut-back equals or exceeds $1,000,000 in the current month or any of the next succeeding months.

As detailed plans are developed, these plans are also reported to the War Production Board. They include information with respect to the facilities involved, the labor employed, the labor area in which the work is located, costs, past production, future requirements, plant capacities, and the selection of facilities for retention and release.

The staff of the War Production Board assigned to the study of cut-backs reviews the detailed proposal and gives clearance or recommends changes which appear desirable. This staff is composed of representatives of the war procurement agencies, the War Manpower Commission, the Smaller War Plants Corporation, and various divisions of the War Production Board.

For cut-backs of over $200,000 but less than $1,000,000 in the current month or any one of the succeeding 3 months, modified information is made available to the War Production Board prior to final determination of the facilities to be cut back.

As a result of these procedures, the War Production Board, the War Manpower Commission, and the Smaller War Plants Corporation are advised before final notification is given to the contractor so that appropriate arrangements may be made for the use of the facilities for other war purposes or for essential civilian production. This also permits the development of a program for the utilization of the manpower made available by the cut-back.

V-E-DAY

With the defeat of Germany, the requirements of the procurement agencies for matériel and supplies will be reduced by approximately 40 percent. The primary objectives in the cut-back procedure will differ somewhat from those now in effect. The need will still remain to give full protection to the necessary war programs for the conduct of the war against Japan, but in so doing, every opportunity will be provided to permit the resumption of maximum civilian production without delay, thus preventing extended unemployment.

The procurement agencies confronted with major readjustments following the defeat of Germany have prepared special procurement programs for the continuing war with Japan which are ready for implementation immediately upon the defeat of Germany.

These agencies are now engaged in notifying prime contractors of their tentative plans under policies prescribed by the War Production Board. Moreover, the proposed contractual changes in major items have been or are in process of being submitted to the War Production Board for review and for the consideration of such changes as may appear desirable in the interests of the national economy.

The staff which has obtained experience in analyzing current cut-backs is being utilized to examine the tentative cut-backs which will result with the defeat of Germany. The factors for the selection of facilities to be released at this time will differ, obviously, from those used with respect to current production, as speed in reconversion to desirable civilian production now becomes a major factor.

CRITERIA FOR SELECTION OF CUT-BACKS AFTER V-E-DAY

The factors being evaluated in the selection of facilities for the second phase of the war follow:

(a) The procuring agency will retain until final victory those contractors which it has found from experience to be capable of producing required items of desirable quality at the desired scheduled rates. The contractors retained in war production until the end of the war must be the best qualified, and all other rules of selection are applicable only among those so qualified. No contractor, however, will be disqualified simply because he is a small contractor.

(b) As between qualified contractors, the following factors will be considered in selecting facilities to accomplish the necessary readjustment and curtailment of production:

1. Privately owned plants, not normally engaged in production of a military character, will be given first priority of release from war production in order to facilitate their reconversion to civilian production, due consideration being given to the wishes of the contractors.

2. Government-owned plants will be kept in operation or reserve until their production is clearly no longer required for military needs. This is subject to modification in the case of a plant located in an isolated section with no opportunity for displaced workers where the exercise of wise administrative discretion may prompt other action.

3. Insofar as practicable, the release to civilian production of competing units of the same industry should be simultaneous.

4. In scheduling the release of plants and industries, due consideration is to be given to cushioning the shock of unemployment.

5. In scheduling the release of plants or industries, due consideration is to be given to:

(a) Security considerations;

(b) Considerations affecting public transportation, such as accessibility to the sources of labor, raw materials, components, depots or storage facilities, and ultimate destination;

(c) The relative unit cost to the Government;

(d) The welfare of smaller business.

6. Where practical considerations make it possible, companies responsible for the development and engineering of specialized products will be retained in their manufacture in preference to those companies which are merely licensed for their manufacture.

As a result of advanced planning, representatives of the procurement agencies are today conferring with contractors, agreeing in advance of termination as to methods of accounting, and settling such questions as the allotment of overhead expenses as between war production and civilian production.

The agencies will also notify their contractors by telegram when the defeat of Germany is announced of the curtailment of war production in the contractor's plant so that the contractor may start immediately with converting to normal civilian production that portion of his plant no longer required for war production.

The War Department personnel engaged in contract-termination work now exceeds 6,500. Plans developed for the speedy termination of the contracts will require more

than 25,000 persons. Additional personnel for this work is being trained in special schools and training courses are being provided for procurement officers and for employees of contractors.

NAVY CUT-BACKS

The plans of the Navy Department are necessarily different from those of the War Department. The Navy has a smaller number of contracts. The task of the Navy following the surrender of Germany will be just as great as before the surrender. A review of Navy plans indicates the same thoroughness as is evidenced by Army to do all possible to lessen the impact upon the civilian economy resulting from the curtailment or cancelation of contracts.

MARITIME CUT-BACKS

The Maritime Commission, like the Navy, has a tremendous task to perform in the war of the Pacific. The surrender of Germany will not lessen the necessity for the construction of certain types of ships, but it will make possible the cancelation of some ships. Plans have already been prepared to become effective upon the cessation of hostilities in Europe, listing the contracts to be canceled or curtailed.

WAR CONTROLS TO BE MODIFIED TO STIMULATE CIVILIAN PRODUCTION

There will be some time lag between the curtailment and cancelation of war contracts and the resumption of large civilian production. The length of that period may be lessened by the promptness with which wartime restraints are removed.

To insure the utmost speed in reconversion and to permit the prompt resumption of civilian production at least equal to the civilian production of the United States in 1939, controls now in existence will be released or modified to the fullest extent possible to permit manufacturers a freedom in planning for the resumption of civilian production and in ordering materials and components which will assure maximum speed.

The military needs for the war against Japan must be assured. Unquestionably there will remain areas of tight supply which will necessitate war production receiving a preferential position. However, the controlled materials plan, with its necessary but cumbersome paper work, will no longer be required, provided industry as a whole continues to recognize the importance of war and essential civilian production and the necessity for the protection of small business.

As the Acting Chairman of the War Production Board has announced, existing controls will be relaxed immediately after the defeat of Germany and the following controls substituted:

(a) The establishment of a new military preference rating to be assigned to the war procurement programs of the War Department, Navy Department, Maritime Commission, War Shipping Administration, and military lend-lease. Contractors will be required to accept orders in this rating band and to fill these orders in preference to any other orders.

(b) The establishment of a new civilian production preference rating band subordinate to the military rating, but superior to all other ratings to be used only if necessary to protect the more essential civilian programs. It is not anticipated that this rating band will be necessary and it will be used only in the event programs in this category fail to meet schedules.

(c) The new rating structure will be placed in effect immediately following the defeat of Germany It will automatically assign the new ratings to the prime contractors of the designated programs and these prime contractors will be directed to extend the ratings to their suppliers. After an appropriate period has elapsed to permit a rerating and rescheduling of orders, all other outstanding preference ratings will become void.

(d) The priority regulations now in effect will be amended to conform to these changes.

(e) The controlled-materials plan will be revoked immediately after the defeat of Germany, except that it will remain in effect for steel and copper during the remainder of the quarter in which the revocation is issued. In effect, orders under the controlled-materials plan become priority orders; however, suppliers will be permitted to receive and fill all orders placed after the defeat of Germany to the extent made possible by the cancelation of orders which they then hold under the controlled-materials plan.

(f) L and M orders will be revoked, except for a few selected orders which must be retained as a mechanism for programing items which will continue in short supply, such as tires, batteries, motors, lumber, and some textiles and chemicals.

(g) The War Production Board will retain the authority which it now has to continue or to institute controlled mechanisms to cope with individual production and procurement problems, to include the authority to issue individual directives to manufacturers or suppliers to produce or deliver a product or products to a designated purpose. This will permit the War Production Board to take appropriate action to prevent or to correct hardship cases.

ADMINISTRATIVE MACHINERY FOR SECURING THE PROMPT CLEARING OF CONTRACTORS' PLANTS

An essential step to the prompt reconversion of a war facility to civilian production is the removal of war materials and equipment from the plant. This clearance is a part of the contract-termination procedure which has been planned in detail by all of the procurement agencies in close cooperation with the Director of Contract Settlements and with the Surplus War Property Administrator.

Arrangements for prompt advance payments and for loans assure the war contractor of quick financing. There remains the inventory and disposal of plant equipment and materials pertaining to the war contract which must be removed to prevent interference with reconversion.

To expedite prompt clearance, the following procedures have been developed:

(a) Whenever a war contractor is of the opinion that he no longer requires for the performance of any war contract Government-owned facilities covered by purchase or lease option, he will promptly notify the owning procurement agency of his desire to exercise or waive the option. If he desires to exercise the option, the facilities will be disposed of accordingly. The procurement agencies are prepared to waive or release, under terms and conditions deemed appropriate, any existing obligations of war contractors under facilities contracts.

(b) The war contractor will submit an inventory list of items which become excess with the curtailment of his contract and which are not under option classified for retention or for removal. He will indicate the space which he has available for storage under appropriate rental. Unsatisfactory inventory lists will be returned by the procurement agencies within 10 days. Within 20 days, the procurement agencies will notify the war contractor of those items in his inventory which are—

1. Necessary for war production;
2. May be retained by the contractor;
3. May be stored by the contractor; and
4. Should be prepared for shipment to a designated place.

Within 60 days after receipt of a satisfactory inventory list, the procurement agencies—

1. Must dispose of any or all of the facilities to the war contractor which the Government is willing to release;
2. Complete arrangements with the war contractor for the storage of those inventory items which he is prepared to store; and
3. Remove the balance.

At any time in this period the war contractor may remove and store at his own expense and risk any materials or equipment no longer required for war production. After the elapse of 60 days from date of receipt of inventory, the contractor may remove and store such materials at the risk and expense of the Government.

In order to facilitate the removal of equipment and material, the procurement agencies are developing storage space requirements and reporting these requirements to the space control committee of the Surplus War Property Administration.

This space control committee has regional subcommittees located throughout the United States which maintain listings of all suitable storage space and allocate space to the procurement agencies to meet their requirements.

In addition large centrally located storage centers are being developed where prefabricated temporary storage shelters can be erected quickly to protect stored equipment. These storage areas will be located in industrial centers and will be operated under Government contracts by commercial warehousemen.

All procurement agencies will be required to establish a reporting procedure which will show the progress being made in clearing plants.

To further facilitate reconversion the Surplus War Property Administrator has approved the immediate sale of machine tools and industrial equipment being used by manufacturers for war work to these manufacturers on a depreciation formula believed fair to both industry and to the Government.

Machine tools not desired by the manufacturer are reported as surplus and become available for sale to other contractors desiring the tools for the resumption of civilian production, under the same general depreciation formula, but with a somewhat more favorable price differential, in view of the additional costs of installing such machinery as compared with machinery sold in place.

STEPS TO AID EMPLOYMENT DURING RECONVERSION

The effectiveness of any plans for the transition from war production to peace production will depend upon our ability to provide jobs for the workers who will be displaced by the reduction in war production.

The fear of prolonged unemployment following V-E-day has been exaggerated. The prosecution of the war against Japan will demand the continued production of great quantities of war materials. Basic industries such as steel and textiles will not be affected. We will speedily return to civilian production. The pent-up demand for goods will come from a people who have the money with which to buy them.

But it is inevitable that in some particular industries and in some communities there should temporarily be reduced employment. This is more likely to occur where the curtailment is in Government-owned plants engaged entirely in war production and having no plans for civilian production.

In order to meet this situation I have appointed a committee consisting of representatives of the War Production Board, the War Manpower Commission, the Defense Plant Corporation, and the Surplus War Property

Administration. They are at work interviewing the contractors. Their objective is to ascertain whether or not the contractor will exercise his option to buy or lease the plants. If he is not interested, then the committee, having determined to what uses the plant can be put, will inquire whether local capital or some corporation or individual can be interested in purchasing or leasing the plant—of course, subject to the policies prescribed by law.

The primary purpose is to help the manpower situation. The presence of a representative of Manpower Commission on this committee will enable that agency to know what progress is being made in arranging for the operation of these plants. If such operation does not seem probable, Manpower Commission, in advance, can make plans to secure jobs for the workers when their employment is terminated.

It is obvious that any restrictions upon the sale or leasing of these plants that will delay their conversion to civilian production will cause unemployment. In the Government-owned plants there are several million war workers. If they are not employed until other plants can be built or other machinery installed, they will be out of work for a long period. The plant equipment of these Government-owned plants must be put to work promptly if jobs are to be provided.

WARTIME MANPOWER CONTROLS TO BE LIFTED

It is apparent that with the defeat of Germany the necessity for existing manpower controls will largely cease. Hence, these controls will be abandoned to facilitate the transfer of manpower from the curtailed war programs to civilian production. The services available through the War Manpower Commission and the United States Employment Service will continue. The Production Urgency and Manpower Priorities Committees will also continue to function as at present although their functions will become advisory.

However, a loss of manpower in war production below the needs to meet the schedules established for the war against Japan would necessitate a prompt restoration of controls. It is anticipated that the voluntary establishment of ceilings will correct such conditions locally if the need arises.

FIRST LINE OF DEFENSE AGAINST UNEMPLOYMENT

Unemployment compensation is our first line of defense against unemployment. In view of the failure of the Congress to provide for more liberal benefit payments by the unemployment compensation systems of the States through supplemental appropriations by the Federal Government, there will be some States in which the payments will be very inadequate, particularly in view of the increase in the cost of living since such payments were established by those States.

The weekly benefits were established several years prior to the war. If they were adequate then, they are inadequate now. The State systems have, during the war, as a result of increased contributions and reduced expenditures, accumulated reserves of $5,500,000. That is fortunate. But the objective of the system is to provide a defense against unemployment, and not merely to accumulate money. The States should act now to liberalize the benefits and make the State systems serve their true purpose.

I still hope the Congress will reconsider its action in rejecting the plan suggested by me that the maximum weekly benefit should not be less than a stated percentage of the workers' previous wages or $20, whichever is the lower; should be paid for as long as 26 weeks and the coverage be extended to include workers where the number of employees is less than eight. Several influential members expressed to me the view that they did not want to consider at this time a bill liberalizing the benefits because they feared if such a bill was considered at this time just prior to a Presidential election, there would be bidding for votes and the proposal would not be considered upon its merits. They thought that after the election legislation providing reasonable liberalization could be enacted. I earnestly hope this will be done.

RETURN TO 40-HOUR WEEK

It is evident to me that if on V-E-day we are to reduce war production 40 percent, it is necessary that the Government plan now to spread the work.

Only the necessities of war production and the shortage of workers caused the Government to increase the workweek to 48 hours. When V-E-day comes we should return to the 40-hour week. This will give jobs to those who are left without employment. The workers want jobs and not unemployment compensation.

On February 9, 1943, I recommended that the President issue an order authorizing the increased employment to 48 hours. As the reason for the order will not exist after V-E-day, I hope an order will be issued returning to the 40-hour week provided by law, except to take care of production necessary to the war effort and some specially tight labor areas.

This will help solve a problem which is already giving concern. Many employees have been leaving plants engaged in war production to seek employment where they believe civilian production will be quickly resumed. If a worker remains in war production, and is allowed to work 48 hours with time and a half for the extra 8 hours, his weekly takehome will be larger than the weekly takehome of the worker engaged in civilian production and working only 40 hours. The financial incentive thus provided may induce workers to remain in war production.

RETRAINING AND REEMPLOYMENT ADMINISTRATION

The Retraining and Reemployment Administration has been at work for months upon the problems of employment and training. Central offices have been established in all important cities where there are concentrated the representatives of various agencies concerned with employment, vocational training, and other activities of Government agencies so that the unemployed may, in one place, secure information as to the assistance they can secure from the Government. The plans worked out by this agency will be of assistance to the unemployed veterans and war workers.

PUBLIC WORKS

The Federal Works Agency has obtained from States, counties, and cities much information as to work projects planned by such governments. The demand for construction projects exists. As a rule those governments have the funds for the projects. In communities where there is no unemployment following V-E-day it would be unfortunate if large public works were undertaken. It would be more unfortunate if they were not undertaken in communities where there is unemployment.

It is not possible to exercise direct control over the time when expenditures will be made by local governments. But the Federal Government can time its expenditures of Federal funds for road construction and work projects to relieve unemployment.

PRICES FOR RECONVERSION

When a manufacturer has been advised of the curtailment of a war contract and that he can resume civilian production, he probably will not move until he ascertains what ceiling price will be placed upon his goods. The price of civilian goods which have been produced throughout the war has been fixed by O. P. A. and takes into account increased production costs. But articles not now produced, such as automobiles, radios, refrigerators, may have to be priced somewhat above the prices prevailing in 1941 when civilian production of these articles was stopped.

It is entirely possible that on V-E-day, as a result of the curtailment of contracts, several hundred producers would at the same time ask O. P. A. for a decision as to a ceiling price. Obviously, if a decision is delayed until investigation can be made of production costs of all such articles at that time, it would increase the ranks of the jobless.

One practical way would be to authorize a percentage increase over earlier prices for articles which have been out of production for some time, with the right and duty devolving upon O. P. A. to adjust such prices upward or downward in the light of experience. Since January 1, 1941, when the production of civilian durable goods was drastically curtailed, industrial wholesale prices have increased. Often it is difficult to ascertain quickly the amount of such increase because the increase has not been uniform for all commodities. Some commodities have risen substantially while others have declined or not risen at all. For example, iron and steel prices have not risen and the price of aluminum actually has declined. There has been very considerable technological progress during the war, which should serve in some cases to offset increase in labor and material costs.

However, it should be feasible for O. P. A. to establish a general ceiling for articles out of civilian production for some time at a fixed percentage above the prices charged for such articles before civilian production ceased. This percentage can be quickly computed on the basis of increased material, labor, and other costs. Provision can be made to take care of hardship cases on appeal. As manufacturers return to production competition should cause some prices to drop quickly and substantially below the fixed ceilings.

The Stabilization Director and the Price Administrator are engaged in determining the formula to be applied in arriving at the percentage increase to be allowed. The formula cannot now be announced. No hard and fast rule can be applied to all industries but a price program is being worked out that will make certain that the reconversion to civilian production in any industry will not be delayed by lack of information as to prices.

TAXES

Before the manufacturer returns to production he will want to know something more than the ceiling price. He will want some idea about taxes in order to determine whether there will be a profit in his business. Everybody cannot be an employee. There must be an employer if people are going to get jobs. Before a man puts his own money and asks his friends to put money in a business he wants to know that there is some prospect of his making a profit.

The excess-profit tax is a war tax. With the ending of the war there should be an end to excess-profit taxes. It cannot be done upon V-E-day because we will still have war production and war profits, but the administration and the leaders of the congressional committees might well announce an intention to urge the elimination of the excess-profit taxes when the war with Japan is at an end.

We should consider, also, the advisability of allowing manufacturers to depreciate new machinery substantially in the years in which such machinery is purchased. Great Britain has incorporated such a plan in its current budget. This action would induce many companies to hazard new ventures, thereby increasing employment. It would give a real incentive to companies to keep our industry ahead of the rest of the world technologically. It would provide a steady domestic market of substantial proportion for capital goods and would go far to pro-

vide a stable basis for employment in that field in the post-war readjustment.

CONTROLS

I have requested a survey to be made to determine what war controls can be modified after V-E-day. To enforce controls requires personnel. When the controls are released Government employees should be released. The scheduled reduction of procurement in the War Department, the removal of controls by the War Production Board, and other agencies, should make it possible for many Government workers to return to their homes when Germany surrenders.

The justification for rationing is the short supply of a commodity. When the supply is sufficient for normal demands rationing should cease. Many foods have already been removed from the ration list. Others will be removed as soon as supplies justify removal.

V-E-day will result in increasing the supply of gasoline available for the civilian population. It is impossible now to make a definite statement. My opinion is the increase will not permit the discontinuance of rationing but the allowances can be increased in certain areas.

There are many commodities, however, that are still in short supply and must continue to be rationed.

FOOD PROGRAM

V-E-day requires a review of our plans for production on farms as well as in factories. In the near future War Food Administrator Jones must announce the goals for farm production in 1945. So far as food supplies are concerned here is the problem:

Food production in the areas under Allied control with the exception of Russia is approximately one-third above normal production. War reserves have been established. When peace comes the reserves in the military theaters will become surplus.

Because of the submarine activity, blitz bombing, and the irregularity of shipping, reserve stocks for the civilian population of the United Kingdom were increased from a normal of approximately 1,500,000 tons to 5,500,000 tons. These stocks were made up of supplies domestically produced, purchased in the market, lend-lease, and other sources. If after V-E-day this stock should be fixed at 3,500,000 tons, it will leave 2,000,000 tons available for relief. This will, of course, affect only the size of the reserve stocks and not the food available for current consumption in Britain.

It is estimated that in the year following V-E-day our military food procurement will decline about 50 percent or approximately 4,000,000 tons. In addition we know that the Army has accumulated considerable stocks of combat rations in the European theater which will be available for civilian use.

In order to meet lend-lease shipping schedules the War Food Administration has had to accumulate a stock of food commodities.

Thus approximately 8,000,000 tons of food can be released from the wartime pipe line or reserve for other uses. This will include 6,000,000 tons of food other than wheat.

Excluding wheat, the estimated requirements of the armed forces for food during the first 6 months of reoccupation are 1,200,000 tons. U. N. R. R. A. estimates its requirements for the same period at approximately 2,700,000 tons.

This would make approximately 6,000,000 tons of food available against requirements of 3,900,000 tons for the first 6 months of 1945. It seems, therefore, that European requirements will be met without very large drafts on the United States production in 1945.

That means that we must decide what we will do about the commitment of the United States Government to support farm prices contained in what is known as the Steagall amendment. If, as a result of reduced demand, the market price drops below the support price, Government must buy the surplus if it is going to support prices.

Domestic consumption will increase with the removal of all ration controls. Prior to the war we disposed of surplus foods through the school-lunch program, the stamp program, and direct-relief program. These programs, however, cannot absorb enough to maintain prices in the domestic market.

We must increase our exports, but we must realize there are difficulties. Our price level is higher than for similar commodities in other producing areas. The United Kingdom will be asked to make contracts for food in Canada, Australia, New Zealand, and South America. Russia has indicated a desire for machinery and machine tools, but for few consumer goods.

We know that the civilian population of other nations have not consumed anything like the consumption of our people. As other nations return to full production and full employment, there will be increased demand for food abroad as well as at home. I have abiding confidence that ways will be found to make certain that we do not return to a policy of scarcity.

But here is the immediate and concrete problem. Congress has committed the Government to support prices but has not appropriated funds to carry out the commitment. In the light of the situation above described it is estimated that compliance with this commitment may require an appropriation of as much as $2,000,000,000 in 1945.

I therefore suggest that the Congress be asked to prescribe methods by which the support price commitment shall be carried out and appropriate adequate funds for the purpose. Action is necessary at this time in order that the Food Administrator can establish quotas for the various crops and fix the support prices.

COMMENDS BARUCH-HANCOCK REPORT

Last November I requested Mr. B. M. Baruch and Mr. John Hancock to investigate and report upon the problem of reconversion. In March of this year they filed a report which was submitted by me to the various Government agencies to establish a pattern for action by them on the suggestions therein discussed. The report has been of inestimable value and should continue to be the guide for reconversion policies.

PRESENT INCOME AND EMPLOYMENT LEVELS SHOULD BE MAINTAINED

The fear of timid people may temporarily retard our return to full production and full employment. But it will be only for a short time.

Today America is stronger than ever before. We should make the maintenance of the present national income and high level of employment our goal, and achieve that goal.

I realize that in reporting at length upon plans for returning to civilian production there is danger of diverting the attention of the people from the tremendous tasks to which we must devote all of our efforts if we are going to contribute our part to the victory. But I have confidence in the common sense and sound judgment of the people and believe the knowledge that their Government has been preparing plans for peace will cause them to increase their efforts to bring about that peace.

Sincerely yours,

JAMES F. BYRNES.

Mr. MAYBANK subsequently said: Mr. President, earlier in the day the Byrnes report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD. I ask unanimous consent to have printed, following the report, an editorial which appeared in the Washington Post on Monday last. I desire to read merely the last two lines of the editorial:

It will stand as a mark of the conscientious service he has rendered to the Government in wartime.

Speaking for the people of South Carolina, as their junior Senator, let me say that we have always appreciated the ability and integrity of my distinguished predecessor, in the conscientious service he rendered to the United States and to our people, in this body and in the House of Representatives.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MR. BYRNES' REPORT

There is ample evidence in O. W. M. Director Byrnes' report to the President that extensive planning for the resumption of civilian production after the defeat of Germany has been done. Mr. Byrnes' lengthy report covers nearly every aspect of the problem of shifting from a wartime economy to a state of partial demobilization on the home front. For the most part the plans announced appear to be fair to both war contractors and war workers, to protect the public interest and to give promise of prompt conversion after V-E-day so far as that can be accomplished without interfering with the production of war supplies for the final defeat of Japan.

Contractors to be kept on the job of producing weapons, Mr. Byrnes says, will be those best qualified for this work, whether large or small producers. As between qualified war contractors, the chance of reconverting for production of civilian goods will be given first to privately owned plants. Specially built war plants will be kept in operation or in reserve when that is necessary. Competing units of the same industry will be released from war production simultaneously when practicable. Other factors to be considered are the cushioning of unemployment, and proximity of an industry to the point from which supplies must be shipped, unit costs, and the welfare of small business. It is clear enough that no precise formula can be worked out to fit all cases. But the laying down of these general guidelines should be a great advantage when the time for large-scale reconversion comes.

The plan outlined by Mr. Byrnes also contemplates prompt removal of war materials and equipment from plants that are to be reconverted, prompt contract settlements and loans to facilitate the financing of civilian production. Machine tools and industrial equipment will be sold to manufacturers in place, if wanted, with an allowance for depreciation. To avoid long delays in deciding the future status of plants built by the Government, Mr. Byrnes has appointed a committee to find out whether contractors wish to exercise their options to buy such plants. If not, the committee will attempt to interest local capital or some corporate enterprise in taking over each plant to avoid prolonged unemployment.

Manpower controls will be relaxed after V-E-day, except where they may be locally necessary to insure full production of ships and weapons needed for the war in the Pacific. The 40-hour week will be restored in civilian industry, although the 48-hour week will be retained in war industry with the expectation that the larger take-home pay thus provided will help to keep war workers in their jobs.

Apparently there is to be no control over civilian production after V-E-day, unless that should prove necessary to protect the continued military program and provide an ample supply of civilian goods. If materials

should be foolishly diverted from essential civilian use to the detriment of the public, the W. P. B. plans to put into effect a civilian production preference rating system. Price adjustments will have to be made for many commodities that have not been produced during the war years because of higher production costs. Obviously manufacturers must know something about the prices they will be permitted to charge before they can go ahead with reconversion plans. So the O. P. A. is attempting to establish general ceilings at a fixed percentage higher than the old prices, with arrangements for adjustment on the basis of experience.

In the legislative field, Mr. Byrnes urges once more an adequate unemployment compensation bill, repeal of the excess-profits taxes when the war is finally won, prompt trimming of Government pay rolls as fast as regulatory functions are suspended and some means of coping with the potential agricultural surplus now being encouraged by exorbitant support prices. If this report is to be the last major accomplishment of Mr. Byrnes before he retires from office, it will stand as a mark of the conscientious service he has rendered to the Government in wartime.

SENATOR TRUMAN'S CAMPAIGN ADDRESSES—ARTICLE FROM PHILADELPHIA BULLETIN

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, our distinguished colleague the junior Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN], as we all know, has been nominated by the Democratic Party as candidate for the Vice Presidency. I am glad to see by the press and hear by the radio that the Senator's three speeches since his nomination have been cordially received. I was particularly pleased in reading an article I found in the Philadelphia Evening Bulletin of September 8, which said that our Vice Presidential candidate will profit by his outlined program, and has achieved a new high in American politics. This is indeed gratifying.

With the country at war, we have many serious problems, and it will be heartening to us all if our Presidential campaign is kept on a high plane. It is my earnest hope that the issues of the campaign will be discussed without recrimination or resort to calumny or abuse

I congratulate our candidate on his achievement so far, and I wish him every success for the reception of his speeches in the future.

The writer of the article has made an excellent summary of the situation, but I do not agree with his statement that Americans care little who is Vice President. We have a very admirable one now, and I am sure the Senator from Missouri will bring further distinction to the office.

I ask that the article be incorporated in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TRUMAN'S SPEECHES SET A GOOD CAMPAIGN EXAMPLE

(By Ralph W. Page)

WASHINGTON, September 8.—The character and convictions of HARRY S. TRUMAN are going to have a major influence upon the outcome of the election in November. This is not because he is a candidate for the Vice Presidency. The folks care little who is Vice President, or what he thinks.

It is because in these particular circumstances he will have to take the lead and conduct the campaign for the Democratic Party. The President cannot. Even the most bitter partisan will concede that collaboration with the nations of the world in pressing home joint victories on innumerable fronts and maintaining a unity of purpose for organizing the peace will tax his utmost strength and occupy all his mind and time.

To date the Senator has made three public appearances. These provide a preview of the tone and plane of the debate he proposes to conduct—and the substance of his arguments.

The first was a speech in the Senate when he resigned as chairman of the committee that bears his name. The only reference he made to his opponents was this: "I have repeatedly emphasized the tremendous help and assistance which has been given the committee by its four Republican members. * * * They have always been a tower of strength, and I want again publicly to acknowledge this and personally thank them from the floor of the Senate."

The second was the opening of the political debate at his home town. It was devoted exclusively to presenting the qualifications of Roosevelt for conducting the business that confronts the country. He urged that the President had unique knowledge of the situation and greater experience than any other man. And that was all. He belittled nobody, and questioned no one's motives, record or ability.

The third was an appeal to labor. The passage, remarkable in campaign tactics, was this:

"Now a word of warning from a friend. Labor has duties as well as rights. * * * Just as bankers have their embezzlers, and lawyers their shysters, labor has among it those who are unwilling to pull their own weight.

"Like Caesar's wife, labor must be beyond suspicion. You must elect and follow wise leaders of proved integrity. Your contracts must be sacred.

"Above all else you must turn in an honest day's work every day you are on the job."

People have been anticipating this fall with dread. For Presidential elections have become an orgy of recriminations, grotesque exaggerations, palpable contortions of facts an intentions, shrieking emphasis on trivialities, exhibitions of rancor and temper, and veritable mires of calumny and abuse.

If TRUMAN maintains his affirmative and constructive attitude and refrains from reflecting upon the motives and personalities of his rivals, he will have achieved a new high record in American politics. And incidentally he will reveal himself to be a humble, tolerant, and kindly man seeking the friendship of all citizens and the hostility of none—and more concerned to influence his own partisans to act with wisdom and integrity than to slander his opponents.

GOVERNOR DEWEY'S OPENING CAMPAIGN ADDRESS AT PHILADELPHIA

[Mr. TAFT asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the address delivered by Governor Dewey at Philadelphia, Pa., September 7, 1944, opening his campaign for the Presidency, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY HAROLD D. WILSON BEFORE UNION MEETING OF CHURCHES AT FREMONT, NEBR.

[Mr. CAPPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by Harold D. Wilson, State executive director of Allied Dry Forces of Nebraska, at a union meeting of Fremont churches in the Baptist Church at Fremont, Nebr., which appears in the Appendix.]

TO A GOLD-STAR MOTHER—POEM BY CHAPLAIN FRANK J. PIPPIN

[Mr. CAPPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a poem entitled "To a Gold-Star Mother," written by Chaplain Frank J. Pippin, and published in the Christian Evangelist of August 9, 1944, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE CARTEL SYSTEM IN RELATION TO NATIONAL DEFENSE

[Mr. KILGORE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter from the President of the United States to the Secretary of State and excerpts from committee hearings, bearing on the subject of the cartel system in relation to the national defense, which appear in the Appendix.]

MEET MR. DULLES—EDITORIAL FROM LA FOLLETTE PROGRESSIVE WEEKLY

[Mr. GUFFEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Meet Mr. Dulles," published in the La Follette Progressive Weekly of September 4, 1944, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE DEMOCRATIC PLATFORM — EDITORIAL FROM RALEIGH (N. C.) NEWS AND OBSERVER

[Mr. GUFFEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "A Binding Contract," published in the Raleigh (N. C.) News and Observer of August 30, 1944, which appears in the Appendix.]

WHERE IS LIFE MAGAZINE GOING?—ARTICLE FROM PM

[Mr. GUFFEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Where Is Life Magazine Going?" published in PM for September 11, 1944, which appears in the Appendix.]

FOR PRESIDENT, THOMAS E. DEWEY—EDITORIAL FROM CLEVELAND PLAIN DEALER

[Mr. TAFT asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Appendix an editorial entitled "For President, Thomas E. Dewey," published in the Cleveland Plain Dealer of September 7, 1944, which appears in the Appendix.]

SIDNEY, THE KING MAKER—ARTICLE BY FRANK C. WALDROP

[Mr. NYE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Sidney, the King Maker," by Frank C. Waldrop, published in the Washington Times-Herald of July 21, 1944, which appears in the Appendix.]

GUAM—ARTICLES BY FRANK C. WALDROP

[Mr. NYE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD two articles on the subject of Guam, one entitled "Strange Change," published in the Washington Times-Herald of August 14, 1944, and the other entitled "Guam Again," published in the Washington Times-Herald of August 22, 1944, which appear in the Appendix.]

EDITORIAL COMMENT ON ADDRESS BY SENATOR BANKHEAD BEFORE BIRMINGHAM KIWANIS CLUB

[Mr. HILL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Looking Forward," published in the Birmingham (Ala.) News of August 31, 1944, on the subject of an address delivered by Senator BANKHEAD before the Birmingham Kiwanis Club, which appears in the Appendix.]

DISPOSAL OF SURPLUS GOVERNMENT PROPERTY—LETTER FROM SURPLUS WAR PROPERTY ADMINISTRATOR TO SENATOR CHANDLER

[Mr. CONNALLY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter from W. L. Clayton, Surplus War Property Administrator, to Senator CHANDLER, together with appendixes thereto, which appear in the Appendix.]

TREATMENT OF FARMERS IN THE MARKETING OF HOGS

[Mr. LANGER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement on the subject of the treatment of farmers in the marketing of hogs published by Bryson Bros., which appears in the Appendix.]

REMEDIAL LEGISLATION FOR LETTER CARRIERS — ADDRESS BY EMANUEL KUSHELEWITZ

[Mr. MEAD asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio address on the subject of remedial legislation for letter carriers delivered by Emanuel Kushelewitz before Empire Branch 36, National Association of Letter Carriers, New York City, N. Y., on Tuesday, August 29, 1944, which appears in the Appendix.]

CALL OF THE ROLL

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senate met today following a recess, and there is no pending business.

Mr. BARKLEY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Gillette	O'Mahoney
Andrews	Guffey	Reed
Ball	Gurney	Reynolds
Bankhead	Hatch	Robertson
Barkley	Hayden	Russell
Bridges	Hill	Scrugham
Burton	Johnson, Calif.	Shipstead
Bushfield	Johnson, Colo.	Stewart
Byrd	Kilgore	Taft
Capper	Langer	Thomas, Okla.
Caraway	McClellan	Thomas, Utah
Chavez	McKellar	Tunnell
Clark, Idaho	Maloney	Tydings
Connally	Maybank	Vandenberg
Cordon	Mead	Walsh, Mass.
Danaher	Millikin	Walsh, N. J.
Davis	Moore	Weeks
Ferguson	Nye	White
George	O'Daniel	Wiley

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. BILBO], the Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE], and the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] are absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JACKSON], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCFARLAND], the Senator from Utah [Mr. MURDOCK], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON], the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN], the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER], and the Senator from Washington [Mr. WALLGREN] are detained on public business.

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. RADCLIFFE], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH], and the Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER] are necessarily absent.

Mr. WHITE. The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN], the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BUCK], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HAWKES], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. HOLMAN], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. THOMAS], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. WILLIS], and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. WILSON] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is absent on official business.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Fifty-seven Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

PUBLIC STATEMENTS BY GOV. THOMAS E. DEWEY

Mr. GUFFEY. Mr. President, I should like to read for the information of the Senate an editorial entitled "Truth Speaks Louder Than Governor Dewey," from one of the great metropolitan dailies of this country, the Philadelphia Record, of this morning:

TRUTH SPEAKS LOUDER THAN GOVERNOR DEWEY

The Record is not going to charge Gov. Thomas E. Dewey with deliberate falsehood in the public statement he made in Des Moines, Iowa, yesterday.

What we are going to do is print what Mr. Dewey said, and then print with it the truth, the facts, and the figures, and let our readers draw their own conclusions.

Here's what Dewey said:

"At the end of 8 years in office, the administration had a limping unproductive economy with 10,000,000 unemployed, and absolutely no military preparation for the events the present administration now claims it foresaw. As a matter of fact we had an Army of only 75,000."

Take the last statement first, "we had an Army of only 75,000." Here are the official figures on the size of the Army, taken from the World Almanac, which Mr. Dewey could have consulted had he chosen to do so:

June 30—	Total	Regular Army	National Guard	Reserve
1937	484,620	178,101	192,161	114,358
1940	625,516	264,035	241,612	119,869
1941	1,522,926	506,815	285,027	731,084

Even if Mr. Dewey had referred only to the Regular Army, without the total available trained forces in National Guard and Reserve, he was little more than 25 percent right as to 1940.

These are facts, Mr. Dewey.

Did the President "make absolutely no military preparations" for the war?

In the winter of 1938–39, long before war had broken out in Europe, President Roosevelt called on Congress for the National Defense Act which provided $48,800,000 for defense. Included in the act was establishment of 10 new Atlantic and Pacific air bases.

In June 1940, the President gambled his political future by calling upon Congress to pass the Selective Service Act.

In August 1941, the President asked that the term of selectees be extended beyond 1 year, owing to the war emergency. The House passed the extension bill by one vote.

Of the Republicans in the House, only 21 voted to keep the Army intact, and 133 Republicans voted to release those men already trained. Most of these 133 Republicans are running with Dewey in 1944.

In October 1941, the President called for a program to produce 50,000 planes a year. Mr. Dewey sneered at that program; said in a speech in Dallas: "What is the good of talking about 50,000 planes unless we know what we are talking about? Experts estimate it would take 4 years to accomplish this."

But in less than 3 years we were producing 100,000 planes a year.

These are facts, Mr. Dewey.

The President also "prepared" by asking for the Lend-Lease Act, to help Britain and Russia hold back the Nazi tide, before we were attacked.

Dewey opposed the Lend-Lease Act, called it "a grave blow * * * to freedom everywhere."

In May 1940, while France was collapsing, Dewey still was preaching isolation, urging that we reject "every entanglement in the affairs of Europe."

We know Lend-Lease saved Britain, helped turn the tide in Russia.

These are facts, Mr. Dewey.

The reader can compare these facts with Dewey's statements.

The conclusion will be obvious.

Why the Governor has become so reckless in his speeches and interviews we do not know. Perhaps his advisers have told him his speeches are not going over, so instead he now goes overboard.

The Republican Presidential nominee has a right, even a duty, to oppose the Roosevelt administration's policies and methods. The public has a right to expect him to respect the truth in doing so.

PROPOSED EQUAL RIGHTS AMENDMENT—NOTICE

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, on September 5, I gave notice to the Senate generally, including the leadership of the majority and minority sides, that it was my purpose to call up for Senate action at the earliest opportunity the so-called equal rights amendment to the Constitution. Since that time I have conferred with the leaders. I have also conferred with the leaders on the House side. I have received numerous telephone calls and telegrams from Senators who, for reasons which seemed to them of utmost importance, are absent from the city.

I do not share the agitation of some who have expressed themselves to me as believing that this proposal is sort of a legislative booby trap which is set for unaware Senators, to take advantage of them. Neither do I share the worry of those who feel that for this measure, as a proposed amendment to the Constitution, as large a Senate membership as possible should be present when it is considered. While I agree that that is desirable, the fact should be borne in mind, Mr. President, that this is simply the initial action to be taken by this body on the proposal for an amendment to the Constitution, to be followed by action by the other body, as everyone knows, and then to be sent to the States for their action. Thereafter, if it receives the ratification of three-fourths of the States, 5 years subsequently it will become a part of the Constitution. So

there is no cause for worry that any advantage is to be taken of the membership.

Nevertheless, Mr. President, I am indeed reluctant to take advantage of the fact that some Senators are absent because they have made commitments to deliver speeches or have other obligations which prevent their attendance at this time. Consequently, I do not expect to call up the measure at this particular time.

I hope that it can be called up at an early date, when there is an attendance in the Senate which in the opinion of everyone will justify such action.

I merely wish to say before I take my seat, Mr. President, that the fact that the announcement was made has brought, of course, as in the case of all important legislation, a volume of protest and a volume of support. Personally, I am ready to submit to the people of the United States any proposal which has substantial support, regardless of whether I personally approve of it. I do not have such confidence in the infallibility of my own judgment on matters of this kind that I should hesitate to present it to the people.

This particular proposed constitutional amendment has the endorsement of both major parties in their platforms. It was introduced in the Senate with the cosponsorship of 24 Members of this body. With that volume of support, it is a matter on which the people should pass, regardless of one's own views. I should be willing to submit to the people a proposal which had such support, even a proposal to eliminate me from public life. Of course, I would oppose such a proposal when it was presented in my own State, but I would be willing to submit such a matter to the people.

Let me say in closing that the pending proposed constitutional amendment which was reported by the Committee on the Judiciary was the result of the labors of a subcommittee headed by the distinguished senior Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN] and is not the measure which was originally introduced. Many of those who have protested are not at all conversant with the proposal now before the Senate, and some who have cited the legal opinions of eminent lawyers of the past cannot cite a legal opinion which goes to the pending measure.

The proposed amendment provides that equality of rights under the law shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of sex. I do not pretend to be a constitutional lawyer, and I do not wish to anticipate the debate, but I do not believe there is a lawyer anywhere in the United States who would construe that language, if it should become a part of the Constitution, as taking away, excepting in unusual instances, the protective legislative acts which have been placed on the statute books of most of our States for children, for women, and for industrial working conditions, based on the type of work and service and not on sex alone. For instance, in my own State there is a provision requiring the building and making available of a reformatory for the incarceration of women for infraction of a penal statute. Does anyone claim that the proposed amendment would give women the right to insist upon being incarcerated in a penitentiary for men?

In my own State there are 101 protective legislative proposals which in my humble opinion would not be affected. The amendment would simply require that equality of rights under the law shall not be denied or abridged, not that all securities shall be abolished.

That, Mr. President, is all I wish to say at this time. Again I say that it is my hope and my purpose at the earliest time when there is a representative attendance in the Senate to move to take up this proposed legislation.

FEDERAL AID FOR POST-WAR HIGHWAY CONSTRUCTION—AMENDMENTS

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, I have been advised that the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] expects to call up today Senate bill 2105, the so-called road bill. Let me inquire of him whether my understanding is correct.

Mr. HAYDEN. I am on my feet ready to move that the Senate proceed to its consideration.

Mr. STEWART. Then, Mr. President, with that information in mind, I send to the desk amendments to that bill, which I ask to have printed and lie on the table.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendments will be received, printed, and lie on the table.

EFFECT OF NOVEMBER ELECTION ON RUSSIAN PARTICIPATION IN WAR AGAINST JAPAN—STATEMENT BY SENATOR PEPPER

Mr. HAYDEN obtained the floor.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, in the Middletown (Conn.) Press for September 7, 1944, there appeared an article which, it seems to me, should be called to the attention of the Senate. It strikes a new low in political utterance. It is entitled "Pepper Says Red Aid Depends on Election—Sees Soviets Entering Pacific War if Roosevelt Wins Again." I read from the article:

SEATTLE, September 7.—Russian participation in the war against Japan depends on the outcome of the November election, Senator CLAUDE PEPPER (Democrat, Florida) said here last night on his arrival by plane from California.

"Under President Roosevelt, many factors promise Russian participation in the war against Japan, with the resultant saving of tens of thousands of American lives, billions of dollars, and much time," PEPPER said.

"Mr. Roosevelt," PEPPER said, "can get Russia on our side in the war against the Japanese as soon as Germany is whipped. We could pour troops into Siberia through Alaska fast enough to guarantee Stalin against initial reverses during any time lapses between closure of the main Russian offensive and transport of veteran troops to Siberia from the eastern front.

"Stalin is a realist," PEPPER added. "If Roosevelt is defeated, he will reason that there is not much use trying to deal with reactionaries."

PEPPER said he believed that if Gov. Thomas E. Dewey, the Republican nominee, won the November election, Stalin would delay open participation in the Pacific war and the granting of Siberian bases to American forces "until the cycle revolved again and an American Government he could trust was put back in power."

Senator HIRAM JOHNSON (Republican, California), an opponent of lend-lease to Russia prior to American entry into the war, "would be the Republican Secretary of State," according to PEPPER.

[Laughter.]

Mr. President, at a time when we are approaching at Dumbarton Oaks the resolution by the three great powers of whatever difficulties there may lie in the way of peace, it is most disheartening to find one of our colleagues trafficking for the franchise of the American people through utterances of the kind which I have read. Such talk deserves denunciation by our colleagues here in the United States Senate. I offered this particular exhibit with that thought in mind.

Mr. JOHNSON of California and Mr. McKELLAR addressed the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Arizona yield, and if so to whom?

Mr. DANAHER. I request, Mr. President, that the Senator from Arizona first yield to the Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON].

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Whom was the Senator from Connecticut quoting?

Mr. DANAHER. I was quoting from a newspaper article.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I do not care about the newspaper article.

Mr. DANAHER. The newspaper quotations are attributed directly to "Senator CLAUDE PEPPER, Democrat, of Florida."

Mr. JOHNSON of California. The Senator from Florida?

Mr. DANAHER. Yes.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Oh! Oh! Oh! [Laughter.]

PROPOSED CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT LIMITING TAXING POWER OF CONGRESS IN PEACETIME—STATEMENT BY ROBERT B. DRESSER

Mr. MOORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. President, there has been proposed a twenty-second amendment to the Constitution which would fix a limitation on the power of Congress in peacetime to impose taxes on incomes, inheritances, and gifts to a maximum rate of 25 percent. The Division of Tax Research of the United States Treasury Department has filed objections to the proposed amendment. Robert B. Dresser, an able lawyer of Providence, R. I., has made what I think is a very revealing reply to the objections mentioned, and I ask unanimous consent to have the reply of Mr. Dresser printed in the body of the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks. I think, Mr. President, that the reply is of such vast importance to the people of this country that it is entitled to have the distribution which the RECORD may afford.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IN RE PROPOSED TWENTY-SECOND AMENDMENT

(Reply of Robert B. Dresser to U. S. Treasury Department's adverse report of May 31, 1944)

In a statement dated May 31, 1944, the Division of Tax Research of the United States Treasury Department expresses its opposition to the so-called twenty-second amendment to the Federal Constitution and states at some length its reasons for so doing. The proposed amendment, which has been endorsed by the legislatures of 16 States, provides that the power of Congress in peacetime to impose taxes on incomes, inheritances, and gifts shall be limited to a maximum rate of 25 percent.

TREASURY'S OBJECTIONS

The Treasury's objections to the amendment may be summarized as follows:

1. The amendment "would eliminate the prospect of a budget surplus and make a deficit probable even in a prosperous year."

2. "Progression in income-tax rates would be almost entirely obliterated," and it would be necessary to try to increase the revenue by various tax adjustments, including among others the abandonment of "the especially favorable treatment of capital gains," and a possible resort to sales taxes and excises, with the prospect, however, that in spite of all efforts "a chronic deficit" would remain.

3. The net effect of the changes resulting from the amendment would be a deterrent rather than an incentive to business.

4. The effect upon the State and local governments would be harmful.

5. Federal credit, as well as State and local credit, would be impaired.

6. The amendment constitutes in effect "writing tax legislation into the Constitution" and would "dangerously reduce the adaptability of the Federal Government to changing circumstances and emergencies."

Let us consider these objections in their order.

1. First objection: The amendment "would eliminate the prospect of a Budget surplus and make a deficit probable even in a prosperous year."

The Treasury introduces its argument on this point with the statement that, "There is probably not much room for downward revision of Federal taxes after the war unless revenues are to be permanently less than expenditures—that is, unless a policy of deficit financing is to be adopted."

In this statement lies the basic difference between the Treasury and the proponents of the amendment, which involves in the final analysis a difference as to the philosophy of government—national socialism as opposed to a representative form of government based on free enterprise.

The Treasury proposes, therefore, that there shall be little or no reduction of Federal tax rates after the war—with the exception, apparently, of the excess-profits tax and the automatic post-war excise-tax-rate reductions—on the ground that such a reduction would prevent the balancing of the Budget and lead to disastrous economic results.

Under the present law the personal income-tax rates start at 23 percent on the lowest taxable incomes, those of $2,000 and under, and run to 94 percent on those over $200,000; the corporation income-tax rate—except on small incomes—is 40 percent, the estate-tax rates run to a high of 77 percent and the gift-tax rates to 57¾ percent.

The proponents of the twenty-second amendment propose that none of these rates shall exceed 25 percent. They maintain that such a limitation will not prevent the balancing of the Budget. On the contrary they assert that it is only through a drastic reduction in tax rates and the elimination of waste and extravagance that we can hope to maintain a balanced Budget after the war, pay the Federal debt, maintain a high level of employment at satisfactory wages, and provide an adequate market for the products of the farm and the factory.

This is the issue.

In its discussion, the Treasury assumes a certain level of national income in the post-war period, which it states to be $125,000,000,000, and apparently ignores the possibility that this level might, if proper conditions were provided, rise much higher.

CASE FOR THE AMENDMENT

The case for the amendment can, I think, be stated about as follows:

No tax policy can succeed which ignores the fact that the all-important thing is to increase the national income and at the same time expand the country's total wealth and productive capacity. This can be accomplished only through providing the necessary incentive for people to labor and to invest in productive enterprise. This incentive is furnished by the reward of profits measured by the labor and risk involved and the right to transmit one's property to others, either during life or on death. Excessive taxation takes away this reward, thereby either retarding or stopping the growth of the national income or actually decreasing it, with a corresponding effect upon the tax revenue.

In this connection a comparison of the 7 years, 1926–32, inclusive, with the 7 years 1933–39, inclusive, is most instructive. In the later period, with a substantial increase in population and much higher tax rates, the average annual national income was 13 percent less, the cost of the Federal Government was 92 percent greater, the number of unemployed workers was 120 percent greater, wages and salaries were 20 percent less, farm income was 15 percent less, new capital issues were 82 percent less, and private construction was 64 percent less.

Between March 1933 and January 1941, a time when the country was at peace, the Federal debt was more than doubled, over $60,000,000,000 was spent by the Federal Government, in no year was the Federal Budget balanced in spite of the very high tax rates, and when the defense program was started in the spring of 1940 we still had 10,000,000 unemployed.

During this period the functions and power of the Federal Government steadily increased at the expense of the States, and bureau after bureau was established in Washington with a huge increase in the number of persons on the Federal pay roll.

A depression which started in 1929 and should, according to all normal experience, have ended within 2 or 3 years, was stretched to a full 11 years, and it took a war boom to end it. According to Dr. Carl Snyder, author of Capitalism the Creator, and for many years statistician of the Federal Reserve Bank of New York, the cost of this depression to the people of the United States was $150,000,000,000—an amount equal to the total investment in American industry at the end of 1940.

During this unfortunate period, in an attempt to balance the Budget, the Federal Government drastically increased its tax rates on incomes, estates, and gifts in 1932 and succeeding years—for example, increasing the maximum rate on individual incomes from 25 to 63 percent in 1932 and to 79 percent in 1936, and raising the maximum estate-tax rate by degrees to a height of 70 percent in 1936 and to 77 percent in 1940—a course which was directly opposed to the objective sought to be accomplished.

Both reason and experience demonstrate that in peacetime a moderate tax rate will produce more revenue and will increase the national wealth and well-being of the people. Take, for example, the case of the income tax, which produces most of the Federal revenue. There can be no doubt that within reasonable limits the lower rate will, over a period of time, produce the greater revenue.

The explanation of this seeming paradox is (1) that the lower rate leaves more income in the hands of the taxpayers which, when invested and put to work, produces more wealth; and (2) that the lower rate encourages investment and the production of wealth. This increase in wealth, when invested, produces additional income, which in turn, when invested, produces still more income, and so on ad infinitum. By thus increasing the national income, which is the base on which the tax is levied, more revenue is obtained and at the same time the wealth of the Nation is increased to the benefit of the people as a whole.

To illustrate the effect of the first of the above two factors, namely, that the lower rate leaves more revenue in the hands of the taxpayers, which, when invested and put to work, produces more wealth, let us take the case supposed by Dr. Irving Fisher and Mr. Herbert W. Fisher in chapter 9 of their book, Constructive Income Taxation.

It is said that in a period of 40 years the fortune of Henry Ford increased from $1,000 to a billion dollars, which is at the average annual rate of 41.42 percent compounded. For simplicity, the Messrs. Fisher use round figures in their example. They suppose an automobile business in which the owner had invested $1,000 in 1900. They further suppose that there was no income tax and that the net worth of the business increased at the compound rate of 40 percent a year, which would give it a value at the end of 40 years of $700,500,000.

They then suppose that instead of no income tax there was a 100-percent tax and that despite this the business continued to produce income before taxes of 40 percent a year, or $400. This is admitted to be an impossible case, since no one would be willing to operate a business with no chance of profit. It is chosen merely for simplicity of exposition. At the end of the 40 years instead of having a net worth of $700,500,000, the business would have its original net worth of $1,000, and during this period, the Government would have collected in taxes $16,000, which is at the rate of $400 per year. Had the Government not collected the $400 a year in taxes, it would have had to obtain the money elsewhere. Assuming that it borrowed it and paid as high a rate of interest as 5 percent, the $16,000 with compound interest at this rate would have amounted to but $48,320 at the end of 40 years. Compare this with the revenue which might have been obtained from an estate or inheritance tax of say 25 percent on $700,500,000, the net worth of the business at the end of 40 years with no income tax.

In this same chapter the Messrs. Fisher show the effect not merely of a 100-percent tax, but also of an 80-percent tax, a 50-percent tax and a 20-percent tax in the case supposed. With an 80-percent income tax the net worth of the business at the end of 40 years would have been $21,700 and the Government would have collected $82,600 in taxes. With a 50-percent tax the net worth at the end of 40 years would have been $1,470,000, and the taxes collected $1,470,000. With a 20-percent tax the net worth at the end of 40 years would have been $66,500,000 and the taxes collected $16,600,000.

In other words, as the tax rate decreases, both the revenue and the net worth of the business increase.

The results at lower rates of growth than 40 percent are shown in a table annexed hereto, marked "A," which is taken from the Messrs. Fishers' book, Constructive Income Taxation, at page 74.

In all of these cases, in addition to the revenue from the income tax, there would, of course, be the revenue from the estate or inheritance tax upon the death of the owner.

The above figures illustrate the effect of but one of the two factors involved and

take no account of the other factor—namely, the encouragement given by the lower rate to the production of wealth, which is probably the more important of the two.

It should be noted that by increasing the national income the Federal Government, the States, the municipalities, and the taxpayers all benefit. For example, a Federal tax of 50 percent on an income base of $50,000,000,000 would produce $25,000,000,000, leaving $25,000,000,000 for division among all of the other parties in interest. A Federal tax of 25 percent on an income base of $100,000,000,000 would produce exactly the same amount of revenue and would leave $75,000,000,000 for division among the others.

Economists and many leaders of both of the major political parties have long recognized the principle that in peacetime a moderate tax on income will produce more revenue than a higher tax. In 1924 President Coolidge expressed the view that the point of diminishing returns is reached at 25 percent, if not sooner. This conclusion, he said, was based upon "the experience of the Treasury and the opinion of the best experts." That the 25 percent rate would produce more revenue than the higher rate was demonstrated by the experience under the tax act passed by Congress 2 years later in 1926 reducing the maximum individual income tax rate from 46 percent to 25 percent.

The principle here involved is the same as that governing the operation of a successful business—namely, that within certain limits the greatest profits come from charging a low rather than a high price for goods sold. The Ford Motor Co. is an outstanding example. Had Henry Ford charged $2,500 instead of less than $1,000 for each Ford car, he would have sold a much smaller number of cars and have made far less money for his company. By keeping the price low he increased the volume of sales, and with a smaller profit per car he made a much larger aggregate profit.

In other words, the high price lessens the ability and incentive to buy. The high tax rate lessens the ability and incentive to produce.

It is important in this connection to understand the part that capital plays. For a nation to be prosperous there must be an ever-increasing supply of new capital for investment in productive enterprise. For example, in normal times it requires on an average about $7,000 of capital for industry to provide a job for one person—capital needed to build and equip the plant and supply the working capital. With an average annual addition to our labor force of about 600,000 in normal times, this means that over $4,000,000,000 of new capital is needed each year merely to give jobs to the new applicants. Besides this, there is, of course, a large amount needed to maintain and improve the existing plant and equipment.

With this capital the American workman has been provided with improved machinery and equipment that have made it possible for him to produce an ever-increasing amount of wealth. This improved machinery and equipment has enabled him to earn $1 per hour in recent years instead of the $1 per day of two generations ago. This has made it possible for the American railroad worker, for example, whose industry has an average capital investment of $25,000 per employee, to move so much more freight in a given time that he can be paid wages from 50 to 100 times those paid to the Chinese coolie transport worker who performs his service without the aid of machinery or equipment.

It is these high wages that provide a market for the farmer's products at good prices. Likewise, it is the good prices received by the farmer that make possible an adequate market for the products of the factory. All groups are benefited.

The capital needed for these purposes can come only from the savings of corporations and individuals. Studies by Dr. Carl Snyder indicate that the great bulk of the capital supplied by individuals comes from those having the larger incomes. Excessive taxation not only discourages the investment of capital in industry, but it reduces these savings which constitute the source of supply. It is the so-called venture or risk capital that is most important, capital required by new and hazardous enterprises, such as the railroads, the automobile industry, the aircraft industry and many others which have provided jobs and good wages for millions of workers. The starting and development of such industries mean more jobs and higher wages. It is the only way of improving the workers' lot.

But such enterprises are risky. Many of them fail and the investor loses his investment. If high taxes take the great bulk of the profits where the enterprise is successful, all incentive to invest is destroyed.

Where the needed capital is not forthcoming, business stagnation and large-scale unemployment result, with a consequent lowering of the national income and a reduction in the revenue for taxation.

It has been fully demonstrated by our own experience that, in the absence of excessive taxation and undue governmental interference with business, the national income will increase steadily over the years. From a study[1] by Dr. Carl Snyder it appears that every 10 years from 1790 to 1930 the national income showed an average rate of growth not differing greatly from one decade to the next. This rate of growth was about 4 percent per annum compounded. In other words, during this period of 140 years the national income doubled approximately every 18 years.

During the 11 years from 1930 to 1940 this astonishing growth was arrested for the first time in the Nation's history and in no year during that period did the national income reach even the level of the last half of the preceding decade. The principal cause of this was undoubtedly the great increase in tax rates.

As Dr. Snyder has pointed out, our national income in 1940 should have been between $120,000,000,000 and $130,000,000,000, instead of $77,000,000,000, increasing to nearly $200,000,000,000 by 1950. These would be the amounts if the annual rate of growth of 4 percent a year compounded, which had prevailed from the founding of the Republic to 1930, had continued.

What the national income will be immediately following the war, when the war's stimulating effect upon business is removed, nobody can foretell. That, at least in the first several years the income will be substantially reduced would seem inevitable. The degree of such reduction will undoubtedly depend in large measure on the extent to which tax rates are decreased. The higher the rates, the less funds there will be for investment, the less incentive there will be to invest and produce and the smaller will be the national income.

If we are to solve our financial problems in the post-war period and avert national disaster we must restore the progressive increase in capital investment and national income that prevailed during the 140 years prior to 1930, a doubling every 18 years. Think what this would mean. A national income of $125,000,000,000 in an early post-war year, for example, would become $250,000,000,000 in 18 years, and $500,000,000,000 in 36 years, as compared with an estimated wartime national income for the current year of $153,000,000,000. This increase in national income would make possible a decrease from time to time in the tax rates.

The importance of this cannot be too strongly emphasized. It outweighs every other consideration. Upon it depends the preservation of our economic and governmental systems.

By all odds the most important factor involved in accomplishing this objective is that of taxation. Tax rates must be kept within reasonable bounds, and the people must be assured that this will be done. Otherwise, the needed venture capital will not be forthcoming. There must be no return to the conditions prevailing in the decade immediately preceding our entry into the present war. Only by an amendment to the Constitution limiting the taxing power of Congress can the needed assurance be given.

I do not believe that the Budget will be balanced during the first several years following the war. But this gives me no concern, provided a sound tax policy is adopted, expenditures are kept within reasonable bounds, and business is not subjected to undue interference and control. The expansion of the national income which would follow would unquestionably provide the means of balancing the Budget within a reasonable period, and would at the same time continue the improvement in the general standard of living that has taken place throughout the history of the Republic. The deficits in the first several years may be regarded as a part of the cost of the war.

In a study completed in 1939 and published as Pamphlet No. 21 under the title "Taxation and Capital Investment" the Brookings Institution makes the following pertinent statements.

In recommending that the surtax rates in the upper brackets be substantially reduced the study states:

"We have made no attempt to estimate the extent to which the various recommendations which have been made would reduce current taxation receipts, or to suggest other taxes which would presumably make good the deficiency. It is our view that even if there should be, immediately speaking, a considerable net reduction in tax revenues, the gains resulting from the stimulus to the expansion of private enterprise would, in the near future, much more than offset any probable revenue losses. As has been pointed out earlier in this analysis, the means of securing fiscal stability is to be found in the expansion of total national production. Taxation revenues will pretty much take care of themselves if we can achieve full economic recovery. * * *

"The primary need at this time—outweighing every other consideration—is the stimulation of capital expansion."

2. Second objection: Progression in income-tax rates would be almost entirely obliterated, and it would be necessary to try to increase the revenue by various tax adjustments, including among others the abandonment of the especially favorable treatment of capital gains, and a possible resort to sales taxes and excises, with the prospect, however, that in spite of all efforts a chronic deficit would remain.

In order that we may have some concrete figures before us for discussion, I present below a budget for a post-war year following several years during which the conversion from war to peace takes place and the economy gets well started on its upward course. The revenue shown is based upon the assumption that the proposed 25-percent limitation is applied to income, estate, and gift taxes, and that the national income is $140,-

[1] The results of Dr. Snyder's study, to which I refer, are shown in a chart annexed hereto marked "B," which appears in his book Capitalism, the Creator, at p. 89.

000,000,000, which is $13,000,000,000 less than the estimated national income for 1944:

Suggested post-war Federal Budget

EXPENDITURES

	Billions of dollars
1. Interest on post-war debt of $250,000,000,000, at 2 percent	5 5
2. Expenditures for armed forces	5 to 6
3. All other expenditures	3 to 5
	13 to 16
4. Debt retirement	1 1
Total	14 to 17

Revenue

[Comparison with 1944 and 1943 shown as to items listed]

	Fiscal years ending June 30		
	Estimate		Actual, 1943 [2]
	Early post-war year [1]	1944 [2]	
1. Individual income taxes	*Millions* $9,000	*Millions* $18,917	*Millions* [3] $6,630
2. Estate and gift taxes	200	506	448
3. Corporate income taxes	[4] 5,000	5,445	[5] 4,521
4. Excise taxes on liquor and tobacco	2,500	2,497	2,338
5. Customs	400	420	324
Total	17,100	27,785	14,261
Assumed national income in early post-war year	[6] 140,000		

[1] 25 percent limitation assumed to be in effect in early post-war year.

[2] Taken from the Conference Board's Economic Record for Mar. 31, 1944, p. 6. Source: Bureau of the Budget.

[3] Individual income-tax rates involved in the fiscal year 1943 for all brackets (both above and below 25 percent) were substantially lower than those for the fiscal year 1944.

[4] $5,000,000,000 estimated for corporate income taxes for the post-war year is somewhat less than 25 percent of the corporate profits of $22,800,000,000 for the calendar year 1943, when the national income was $142,000,000,000 (U. S. Department of Commerce, Survey of Current Business, January 1944, p. 17).

[5] The corporate income-tax rate involved in the fiscal year 1943 was 31 percent for the first 2 payments, and 40 percent for the last 2, as compared with 40 percent for all payments in 1944.

[6] The national income for the calendar year 1942 was $119,800,000,000, for 1943 $142,300,000,000, and for 1944 $153,000,000,000 (estimated).

NOTE.—Social security transactions are not included in the above budget. As the system now operates large revenues are produced in excess of benefit payments. This excess should not be used for current purposes.

NOTE.—It should be observed that the gasoline tax and all other excise taxes, except those on liquor and tobacco, are eliminated in the above post-war year estimate. I am not recommending this, but am merely seeking to demonstrate that it can readily be done. If desired, a general retail sales tax or other special excise taxes could be added to the above taxes or substituted for part of the revenue to be raised from any of the sources above specified.

It is, of course, not necessary to start paying off the debt in the first post-war year or for that matter during the first several years. It should be observed, also, that considerable latitude in the matter of expenditures, other than interest on the post-war debt, is allowed. There can be no doubt that the total expenditures could be kept substantially below even the lower figure without impairing any of the essential services, if there were a will to do so.

A few comparisons with the expenditures for earlier years will be helpful. For this purpose the Federal expenditures for the fiscal years 1914 to 1944, both inclusive, are set forth in a table attached hereto marked "C." It will be observed from this table that in the fiscal year ending June 30, 1916, the year before we entered the First World War, the total expenditures of the Federal Government for all purposes were $697,000,000. The highest expenditures during this period prior to 1942 were $18,459,000,000, and occurred in the fiscal year 1919. They consisted principally of the costs of the First World War. During each of the 6 years from 1924 to 1929, inclusive, the total expenditures were less than $3,000,000,000.

The suggested revenue of $9,000,000,000 from individual income taxes contemplates a maximum rate of 25 percent and much lower rates on the smaller incomes.

In a table prepared by the Division of Research and Statistics of the Treasury Department under date of May 6, 1944, and submitted to the Senate Finance Committee on May 9, 1944, in connection with its consideration of the individual income tax bill of 1944, it appears that at the levels of income estimated for the calendar year 1944 the normal tax net income for all individual taxpayers is estimated at $108,733,656,000. In a note to this table "normal tax net income" is defined as "net income minus partially tax-exempt interest and long-term capital gains subject to the alternative tax rate of 50 percent." The number of taxable income recipients is estimated to be 51,166,630.

It is estimated that the national income for the year 1944 will amount to about $153,000,000,000. The budget which I have suggested is based upon a national income of $140,000,000,000, an amount which, I understand, is being used by the Committee for Economic Development in its study of post-war Federal taxes. A reduction of the national income from $153,000,000,000 to $140,000,000,000 would on a proportionate basis reduce the normal tax net income from $108,733,000,000 to $100,000,000,000.

It is obvious that with normal tax net income of $100,000,000,000, $9,000,000,000 of revenue could readily be obtained from individual income taxes with a maximum rate of 25 percent and with substantial downward graduations for the lower incomes. Moreover, as the national income increases the rates could be progressively lowered, and at the same time increasingly larger amounts could be paid each year on the Federal debt.

I, therefore, take issue with the Treasury's statement on page 3 of its report that "if no part of taxable income for any taxpayer were subject to a rate exceeding 25 percent, progression in income tax rates would be almost entirely obliterated."

If the views which I have expressed are sound, it becomes unnecessary to consider in detail the various objections and comments made by the Treasury; such, for example, as the necessity of abandoning a number of desirable features present in the existing tax laws. The enumeration of these favorable features, which the Treasury says might have to be abandoned, is evidently designed to arouse the fears of taxpayers as to the effect of the proposed amendment. Among other things, the Treasury suggests that "part of the revenue loss from rate reductions brought about by the limitation could conceivably be made up by measures designed to increase the tax base," * * * as for example by abandoning "the especially favorable treatment of capital gains." This statement is rather surprising in view of the fact that the more favorable treatment accorded to capital gains by the Revenue Act of 1942 and succeeding acts has, according to reports, resulted in a very large increase in revenue from that source. As a matter of fact, prior to the enactment of the 1942 act, revenue from the capital-gains tax on individuals and fiduciaries had about reached the vanishing point, amounting to but $12,868,000 in the calendar year 1940 [2] and declining, I am informed, to $2,000,000 in 1941. It is reported that the yield for 1942 was $70,000,000 and for 1943, $165,000,000.

3. Third objection: The net effect of the changes resulting from the amendment would be a deterrent rather than an incentive to business.

The Treasury devotes a considerable part of its report to the question of whether the net effect of the proposed limitation, after the adjustments which it asserts would be necessary, would be an incentive to business, and reaches a negative conclusion. The greater part of its discussion on this point is devoted to the question of the desirability of the proposed limitation from the incentive standpoint when applied to estate and gift taxes, and tables are presented to show how many generations it would take to reduce an estate of $5,000,000 to $100,000 or less on the basis of various assumptions.

That incentive would be seriously impaired by the existing rates, which run to a height of 77 percent in the case of the estate tax and 57¾ percent in the case of the gift tax, would seem to require no argument. Furthermore high estate or death taxes and excessive gift taxes are extremely destructive of capital and will in the long run destroy the accumulations of capital that are so necessary for industrial activity and expansion and for the full employment of labor.

Moreover, the heavy taxation of large estates compels the rich to seek comparatively safe, liquid investments in order to provide for the heavy taxes that will be imposed upon their estates at death, thus further reducing the capital available for hazardous business ventures which have done so much to improve the lot of the American people.

It should be realized that rich men, like Henry Ford, play a very important part in our economy. They and their families can personally consume and enjoy but a trivial part of their wealth. The balance is in effect held by them as trustees for the public. It is this wealth that provides much of the venture capital to which I have referred. Since many of the ventures fail, the investor must have funds that he can afford to risk. Most people do not have such funds, and banks, insurance companies, and trust estates are not permitted to take such risks.

Does anyone doubt that the wealth of Henry Ford, for example, has been of far greater benefit to the people of this country in his hands than it would have been in the hands of the Federal Government? He has used it to develop a great industry which has given employment at high wages, directly and indirectly, to many people.

Based upon 1939 reports, which are the most recent available, the number of jobs created directly and indirectly by the automobile industry is 6,105,000,[3] which is 10 percent of the total number of persons now employed in all classes of employment, including over 10,000,000 in the armed forces.[4]

In the hands of the Federal Government the money would soon have been dissipated in the construction of nonproductive post offices and other Government buildings and in paying the costs of an overexpanded bureaucracy.

There should be no fear that the absence of a heavy Federal estate tax would lead to an undue concentration of wealth in the hands of a few persons. The rule against perpetuities, inherited by us from the common law of England, forbids tying up the ownership of property for a longer period than a life or lives in being and 21 years. In other words, an estate must be divided among the heirs or beneficiaries in the second succeeding generation. From that time on

[2] Table introduced by Mr. Randolph E. Paul, tax adviser to the Secretary of the Treasury, at hearing before Ways and Means Committee, March 30, 1942.

[3] Automobile Facts and Figures, twenty-third edition, 1941, p. 76.

[4] National Industrial Conference Board's Management Record for July 1944, p. 196.

the estate will be subject to a further subdivision with each generation if it should happen that there is any of it left to be divided. The proverb of "from shirt sleeves to shirt sleeves in three generations" is not without foundation.

And finally, the amount of the revenue from the estate and gift taxes is but a trivial part of the total Budget. Even with the present high rates, the revenue from these two sources amounted to but $448,000,000 in 1943 and $506,000,000 (estimated) in 1944, a substantial part of which, of course, would still be obtained if the top rate were fixed at 25 percent.

Assuredly, the harm done to the economy by the present high rates is out of all proportion to the revenue produced and cannot be justified by any argument based on fiscal needs.

4. Fourth objection: The effect upon the State and local governments would be harmful.

I cannot agree with the Treasury's contention that the effect of the amendment upon State and local governments would be harmful. As already pointed out, there can be no doubt that the lower tax rates required by the amendment would, after a reasonable period of time, produce more revenue for the Federal Government than higher rates, and at the same time leave more income and wealth in the hands of the taxpayers on which State and local taxes could be levied.

The practice of the Federal Government through high taxes of draining the wealth of the people of the States into Washington and then doling part of it back to the States on conditions has the effect of making the States dependent upon the Federal Government. It should be remembered that every source of tax revenue, aside from customs, resides within the States themselves.

The proposed amendment would serve the double purpose of limiting the power of the Federal Government and at the same time restoring to the States the power to be financially independent and to free themselves from Federal domination.

5. Fifth objection: Federal credit, as well as State and local credit, would be impaired.

The Treasury's objection that Federal credit, as well as State and local credit, would be impaired by the amendment has been answered by what has already been said. An expanding economy with ever-increasing national income and wealth is the best guaranty of national solvency.

In this connection, it should be observed again that the budget which I have proposed makes no provision for sales or excise taxes, except those on liquor and tobacco. Herein lies a potential source of revenue of substantial size, should it at any time be deemed advisable to resort to it.

6. Sixth objection: The amendment constitutes in effect "writing tax legislation into the Constitution" and would "dangerously reduce the adaptability of the Federal Government to changing circumstances and emergencies."

My answer to this is that to secure and maintain the reduction in rates essential to the solution of our fiscal and economic problems a constitutional amendment is necessary. It is needed for the simple reason that in the past Congress has often disregarded the fundamental principles of sound taxation and there can be no assurance that it will refrain from doing so in the future, unless it is restrained by the Constitution. This is the only effective way to safeguard the Nation against the destructive effects of excessive taxation. The amendment would have the invaluable effect of attracting venture capital into new and hazardous enterprises to an extent possible of achievement in no other way.

The Constitution is filled with curbs on the power of Congress, which were placed there to protect the people's rights, such, for example, as freedom of religion, freedom of speech, freedom from unreasonable searches and seizures, and freedom from being deprived of life, liberty, or property without due process of law. Excessive taxation would ultimately render many of these rights of little value. For example, what benefit would the citizen derive from the constitutional guaranty that he shall not be deprived of his property without due process of law, if his property is taken from him by excessive taxation? The freedom of the individual, which is the highest prize of all, is not safe without a curb on the taxing power. Congress should no more have unlimited power over one's property than over his person; for, in the language of Chief Justice Marshall, "The power to tax involves the power to destroy."

If it is important to the future well-being of the people that a constitutional limitation be placed on the taxing power of Congress, I can see no sound reason for objecting to such a limitation being expressed in terms of a percentage of the object to be taxed, as is done in the proposed amendment. There would seem to be no other effective way of accomplishing the desired objective.

It is worthy of note that the constitutions of 19 States contain curbs on the taxing power of their legislatures, and that in 4 of these States—Florida, Louisiana, North Carolina, and Utah—the curb relates to taxes on income.

The Treasury ends its own summary of its report with the following paragraph:

"The 'power to destroy' of which advocates of the proposed limitation complain cannot well be separated from effective government. A government whose powers were so limited that their misuse could do no damage would be a government so weak as to be useless—which is a worse danger. Moreover, the democratic processes of government give the best assurance that governmental power will not be used against the public interest."

This would constitute a good argument for the abolition of the Bill of Rights, the purpose of which was to protect the individual in the exercise of certain fundamental rights. Those who drafted and secured the adoption of the Bill of Rights did not assume that governmental power would not be abused. Experience and a knowledge of history had taught them the contrary.

For the reasons already stated, I am not impressed by the argument that a limitation upon the taxing power of the sort imposed by the twenty-second amendment would weaken or impair the effectiveness of our Government. On the contrary, I believe that it would greatly strengthen the Government's position and effectively aid in averting national financial disaster.

CONCLUSION

In conclusion let me repeat that the difference between the Treasury and the proponents of the twenty-second amendment lies primarily in the fact that the former would continue the policy of high tax rates, the ultimate result of which would be to prevent an increase in national income, produce business stagnation and national financial disaster, and lead eventually to national socialism against which this war is being fought.

The proponents of the twenty-second amendment propose by a drastic reduction in tax rates to promote a steady increase in national income which over the years would not only provide greater revenue for the Federal Government and for the State and municipalities, but would at the same time greatly increase the wealth of the people. As a result, our representative form of government would be preserved, free enterprise would be saved, and the States would be freed from Federal domination.

It is the case of a static economy as opposed to a dynamic expanding economy, the case of a Government-controlled economy as opposed to an economy of free enterprise.

In an article by John Rustgard, the author of the Problem of Poverty, published in 1943 under the title "Taxation and the National Debt," the author says (pp. 29-30):

"In the Problem of Poverty there is a chapter on taxation wherein I take the position that the prosperity of the country is always in proportion to its growth in wealth, and that to further this growth so as to increase prosperity the wealth must be nourished and protected even against the tax collector. That was written in 1933. It was unheeded, but I see no reason for changing my mind on the subject. What has taken place in this country since that year has clearly demonstrated the correctness of my views. Nor was the law as thus announced any new discovery. Adam Smith puts the same doctrine in the following language:

" 'It is not the actual greatness of national wealth but its continued increase which occasions the rise in the wages of labor. It is not, accordingly, in the richest countries, but in the most thriving, or in those which are growing rich fastest, that the wages of labor are highest.' "

Respectfully submitted.

ROBERT B. DRESSER.

PROVIDENCE, R. I., *July 31, 1944.*

APPENDIX A.—TABLE APPEARING ON PAGE 74 OF CONSTRUCTIVE INCOME TAXATION, BY IRVING FISHER AND HERBERT W. FISHER

TABLE I.—*$1,000 fortune after 40 years (for specified rates of growth and taxation)*

Potential rate of growth of fortune	Tax rate				
	100 percent	80 percent	50 percent	20 percent	No tax
40 percent	$1,000	$21,700	$1,470,000	$66,500,000	$700,500,000
20 percent	1,000	4,800	45,300	379,000	1,480,000
10 percent	1,000	2,210	7,040	21,700	45,300
5 percent	1,000	1,490	2,685	4,801	7,040

TABLE II.—*Tax collection through 40 years (for specified rates of growth and taxation)*

Potential rate of growth of fortune	100 percent	Tax rate		
		80 percent	50 percent	20 percent
40 percent	$16,000	$82,600	$1,470,000	$16,600,000
20 percent	8,000	15,000	44,200	94,400
10 percent	4,000	4,750	5,990	5,160
5 percent	2,000	1,916	1,660	940

TABLE III.—*Government's debt accumulated in 40 years (including 5 percent compound interest, from borrowing instead of collecting as per the preceding table)*

Potential rate of growth of fortune	Tax rate			
	100 percent	80 percent	50 percent	20 percent
40 percent	48,320	$164,500	$2,050,000	$20,700,000
20 percent	24,160	37,600	80,300	142,000
10 percent	12,080	13,500	14,080	10,300
5 percent	6,040	5,590	4,355	2,220

APPENDIX B

IX. NATIONAL WEALTH AND INCOME OF THE UNITED STATES

We have official estimates of the increase of national wealth—that is, taxable wealth—from 1850, and back of that some careful estimates by the English statistician Mulhall. Prof. W. I. King has made similar estimates of national income from 1850; these have been here carried back to 1790 by comparisons with the increase of production and trade. With these are shown capital invested in manufacturing, and total deposits in banks, revealing how closely all of these factors are associated. It is precisely this increase in available capital and in bank deposits which has made possible the extraordinary growth of our national income and well-being. And when this capital supply is cut off, we have just such stagnation and social depression as in the 10 years from 1930—leading to every conceivable economic vagary, and to a colossal loss in wealth, employment, and income. If we could but learn that here, at least, money (i. e., capital) makes the mare go.

APPENDIX C—TABLE APPEARING ON PAGE 394 OF THE NATIONAL INDUSTRIAL CONFERENCE BOARD'S ECONOMIC ALMANAC FOR 1943-44

FEDERAL EXPENDITURES

The conference board's series on Federal expenditures has been revised to include the net activities of lending corporations and agencies, as well as expenditures from which no repayment is expected. The series designated as "Costs of Government," excludes disbursements in the form of loans for which repayment is expected. Loans include net advances to Government corporations through the sale of guaranteed obligations and through direct advances from the Treasury.

Functional distribution of Federal expenditures

[Millions of dollars; H=high; L=low]

Year	National defense	Interest on the Federal debt	General government	Cost of government	Loans	Total
1914	L 253	L 23	157	709		709
1915	258	L 23	167	727		727
1916	274	L 23	L 151	L 697		L 697
1917	1,456	25	183	1,917	9	1,925
1918	11,771	190	221	12,538	110	12,648
1919	16,795	619	235	18,070	389	18,459
1920	4,613	1,020	422	6,507	[1] 199	6,308
1921	2,691	999	493	4,994	[1] 5	4,989
1922	844	991	396	3,118	94	3,213
1923	829	1,056	330	3,151	[1] 97	3,054
1924	711	941	313	2,851	[1] 41	2,810
1925	649	882	341	2,843	[1] 41	2,801
1926	611	832	371	2,799	[1] 20	2,779
1927	612	787	363	2,761	[1] 24	2,738
1928	662	732	385	2,802	[1] 3	2,799
1929	694	678	490	2,945	12	2,958
1930	730	659	463	2,996	156	3,152
1931	734	612	533	3,324	236	3,560
1932	752	599	680	3,611	1,029	4,640
1933	679	689	516	3,342	1,269	4,611
1934	531	757	550	5,179	2,183	7,362
1935	689	821	463	6,444	H 3,294	9,738
1936	900	749	572	8,403	695	9,098
1937	929	866	630	7,816	[1] 62	7,754
1938	1,029	926	632	6,764	212	6,977
1939	1,206	941	656	8,316	45	8,361
1940	1,657	1,041	718	8,621	203	8,824
1941	6,301	1,111	[2] 683	12,719	1,143	13,862
1942	[2] 26,011	1,260	[2] 727	32,045	1,935	33,980
1943	72,109	1,808	769	77,731	1,873	79,604
1944	H 97,000	H 2,700	H 916	H 103,373	1,862	H 105,235

[1] Excess of credits, deduct.
[2] Revised.

Source: Treasury Department; Bureau of the Budget.

CATTLE ON FEED AUGUST 1, 1944—REPORT OF UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, once more I invite the attention of the Senate to the number of cattle which are on feed. I have before me a report of the United States Department of Agriculture prepared by the Agricultural Statistician at Columbia, Mo. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks the report to which I have referred showing the number of cattle on feed as of August 1, 1944, in Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, Michigan, Wisconsin, Minnesota, Iowa, Missouri, South Dakota, Nebraska, Kansas, and the entire Corn Belt.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Cattle on feed Aug. 1, 1944, as a percentage of Aug. 1, 1943

Ohio	37
Indiana	55
Illinois	66
Michigan	35
Wisconsin	80
Minnesota	40
Iowa	65
Missouri	55
South Dakota	50
Nebraska	54
Kansas	57
Corn Belt	58.9

NORTH DAKOTA SENATORIAL PRIMARY

Mr. NYE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield to me?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. NYE. I do not desire to mislead the Senator. If he does yield to me I should like the floor for 8 or 10 minutes. I would appreciate it if the Senator would do so under the circumstances.

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. NYE. I thank the Senator.

Mr. President, I choose to burden the Senate with a brief accounting of a story, authenticated, having to do with an offer of money to a veteran of the last war in return for his becoming a candidate for the Senate against me in a three-way primary election. The offer was made by one very close to the White House. The price offered was $110,000.

While I am flattered to know that there could or would be such a price on my political head, I tell the story to the Senate for quite another reason.

The Senate would have no interest in practices resorted to in the election of its membership so long as those practices were lawful. Without now arguing the lawfulness of certain practices involved in this particular story, I do believe the Senate will find interest in the story I undertake here to tell, the story of resistance afforded against high rewards offered to a group of six North Dakota veterans of the last war.

The story of resistance by these veterans wins my great admiration. I am sure it will equally invite the admiration of my colleagues and others who may become conversant with the facts, for the story is one of personal denial of "easy money" by poor men and a story of jealous guarding of the good name of the service organization of which these six veteran constituents were members, the Disabled American Veterans.

One year ago these six disabled veterans left North Dakota, all delegates to the national convention of the Disabled American Veterans being held then in New York. All of them bore splendid reputations, as citizens, and they were respected by all who knew them. Too, each bore the marks of the hell of war. Each had served or then was serving as an officer of his organization, each was proud of what he and his organization had done to serve and ease the way of others who had suffered as a consequence of the courageous service they had rendered their country 25 years ago. These men should be here named and identified. They were:

Neal E. Williams, at present a special assistant attorney general, serving under Mr. Alvin Strutz, attorney general of North Dakota; also traffic commissioner for the Fargo Chamber of Commerce. Mr. Williams has pleaded many cases before the Interstate Commerce Commission here in Washington and likewise has made many appearances before committees of Congress and is known to a number of members of the Senate. He is the

tenth district national executive committeeman and national deputy chief of staff of the Disabled American Veterans. Last year he was North Dakota State department commander of the same service organization.

Andy Nomland, Grand Forks, N. Dak., national service officer and adjutant of the Disabled American Veterans;

Oscar Winters, commander of the Grand Forks chapter of the D. A. V.;

Charles Gray, adjutant of the Bismarck chapter of the D. A. V.;

Howard Shirey, adjutant of the Grand Forks chapter of the D. A. V.; and

Fay DeWitt, of Minot, senior vice commander of the State D. A. V.

Just 1 year ago this week—on September 14, 1943, to be exact—these six men stopped in Washington on their way to New York, registering at the Hamilton Hotel, and spent their day calling upon their Members of Congress and others. They spent an hour that day in the gallery of the Senate Chamber. In a following hour, Mr. DeWitt and Mr. Gray visited with one of their Senators at his office. During the course of their conversation, it was revealed that DeWitt was affiliated with the Masonic Order, the Order of Elks, the American Legion, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, and the Disabled American Veterans.

Also, DeWitt, who had served with great gallantry under fire in France, was the possessor of membership in the Military Order of the Purple Heart. His Senator allegedly requested that he be permitted to hold for a few hours the pocket cards showing DeWitt's affiliations, promising to return them to Mr. DeWitt that evening.

That evening, the Senator, by appointment, came to the Hamilton Hotel to visit the North Dakota men, bringing with him one whom the men remember being introduced as a "Mr. McSheehan" or a "Mr. Keenan." There ensued during the evening a conversation that dazed the veterans.

Mr. DeWitt was held to be wonderfully available as a candidate against NYE for election to the Senate from North Dakota. It was contended that Mr. DeWitt possessed those qualifications that would strongly appeal to the fathers and mothers of sons in the service, just the sort of appeal essential to success in these times.

When it was suggested that Mr. DeWitt would be a third candidate in the Republican primary election and therefore would enjoy a reduced chance to win, DeWitt was assured that if he lost in such a three-way fight, he would be taken care of, appointed United States marshal, for instance.

The uninvited guest, Mr. McSheehan or Mr. Keenan, was presented to the North Dakota veterans as a former Assistant Attorney General, a prominent Democrat, now engaged as Washington representative of a large brewing industry. When the stranger was asked what could be his interest as a prominent Democrat in a Republican senatorial fight in North Dakota, he, according to Andy Nomland, responded that he was interested in defeating Senator NYE, stating "We got to get him out of the Senate." Oscar Winters alleges that Keenan said he was "a Democrat with White House connections, interested in seeing Senator NYE's defeat."

During the course of the evening of urging DeWitt to become a candidate for the Senate, Mr. McSheehan or Mr. Keenan, offered to finance the DeWitt campaign to the extent of $110,000, $10,000 to be paid on the spot.

The North Dakota veterans, led by Mr. Williams, administered a verbal lashing in response to the proposition to buy a candidate for the Senate. After 3 hours of this conversation, the party broke up, but not before the former Assistant Attorney General had told the North Dakota men they were making a mistake in not accepting the proposition, that there could be a guaranty that some serviceman would be in the race for the United States Senate.

The following night in the lobby of the New Yorker Hotel in New York, Mr. DeWitt was approached on the subject again, this time by complete strangers, from whom DeWitt walked away.

I wish here to pay my compliments to these constituents, these distinguished veterans, who demonstrated both courage and strong character. And I wish here to say that there is no longer any mystery as to the identity of the former Assistant United States Attorney General involved in the story. The North Dakota men have identified the party from photographs as being Joseph B. Keenan, native of Pawtucket, R. I., resident of Cleveland, Ohio, who in 1933 became associated with the Department of Justice, prosecuting kidnaping cases. He became head of the criminal division of the Department and under Attorney General Cummings became First Assistant Attorney General. Mr. Keenan has been recognized in congressional circles as an administration contact man on Capitol Hill. At one time it was speculated that Mr. Keenan would become a secretary to President Roosevelt. He resigned from the Justice Department in 1939, at which time newspaper accounts credited him with saying that though he was retiring to private life, he hoped to remain useful to the Roosevelt administration.

This entire story to which I have briefly addressed myself, is told in sworn testimony by Neal Williams before the Senate committee investigating senatorial campaigns, and in affidavits by the five other veterans, which have been filed with the committee at the committee's request. I ask unanimous consent that the testimony and affidavits may be printed in the RECORD following my remarks.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator from North Dakota yield?

Mr. NYE. I should like first to have action on the request I have made.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. O'MAHONEY in the chair). Does the junior Senator from North Dakota address the Chair to object to the request?

Mr. LANGER. I have no objection to the request of the senior Senator from North Dakota.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the request of the senior Senator from North Dakota is granted.

The testimony and affidavits are as follows:

STATE OF NORTH DAKOTA,
County of Ward, ss:

Fay C. DeWitt, being first duly sworn, on his oath deposes and says: That I am the senior vice commander of the Disabled American Veterans of North Dakota; I am also the alternate tenth district national executive committeeman for the Disabled American Veterans.

That on September 14, 1943, I arrived at Washington, D. C., together with Mr. Neil E. Williams, department commander of the Disabled American Veterans, and Andy Nomland, of Grand Forks, N. Dak., the department adjutant of the organization and national service officer of the Disabled American Veterans, Oscar Winters, who was then commander of the Grand Forks chapter of the Disabled American Veterans; and Charley Gray, of Bismarck, N. Dak., a member of the organization; C. T. Hoverson, manager of the veterans' hospital at Fargo, N. Dak., and past department commander of the Disabled American Veterans.

That the group also included Howard Shirey, who was then the adjutant of the Grand Forks chapter of the Disabled American Veterans.

Upon our arrival in Washington, D. C., we checked in at the Hamilton Hotel, where we had previously arranged for accommodations; we then went in a body to the Senate Office Building with the intention of paying courtesy calls to the delegation representing the State of North Dakota in the Congress at Washington.

Upon our arrival at the Senate Office Building, the only one available was Senator WILLIAM LANGER, who at the moment was attending a session of the United States Senate; his secretary advised to wait a moment while he contacted him by telephone; he invited us to proceed to the Senate Building and, upon our arrival, to notify the page boy of our presence, which we did, and were greeted by Senator LANGER, who then arranged for seats in the Senate gallery, from which point we could observe the Senate in action.

We stayed there perhaps 1 hour, after which we proceeded to the Senator's office again, and during our second visit the other members of our party, with the exception of Charley Gray and myself, left for the hotel; Mr. Gray and myself talked to Senator LANGER for a short while, and he suggested he would like to buy dinner for the entire delegation; we informed him that without doubt the rest of the boys would be glad of an opportunity to have dinner with him, and we left him with that arrangement—that he was going to call at our hotel about 6 or 6:30 o'clock, and we would all go out to dinner

Before leaving Senator LANGER'S office he inquired of me as to my affiliations with various organizations in North Dakota and asked to see my membership cards; then he suggested that he would like to keep the cards until he joined us at dinner; I could see no good reason for not permitting him to do that, so I left the cards with him; to enumerate the organizations with which I am affiliated and the membership cards which I left with the Senator, they are, as follows: Membership card in the Benevolent and Protective Order of Elks; membership card in the Masonic Order; membership card in the American Legion; membership card in the Veterans of Foreign Wars; membership card in the Disabled American Veterans; and membership card in the Military Order of the Purple Heart.

Mr. Gray and I then joined our delegation at the Hamilton Hotel and informed our comrades of the Senator's offer to take us out

to dinner; shortly after our arrival at the hotel, the Senator called our State commander, Mr. Neil Williams, by telephone and explained that some unforeseen thing had prevented him from keeping the dinner engagement and asked to be excused, but indicated that he would like very much to meet the boys along about 8:30 or 9 o'clock at the hotel; this was readily agreed to and after we had our dinner, we retired to our respective rooms and finally Mr. Winters, Mr. Nomland, Mr. Shirey, Mr. Gray, and myself were assembled in Mr. Williams' room.

At about 9 o'clock, Senator LANGER put in his appearance together with an individual who he introduced to all those assembled, as Mr. Tom Keenan, or a name somewhat similar, whom he explained was a friend of his who lived in Washington.

We sat around the room talking of current events, the trend of the war, conditions in North Dakota, and just a general conversation; finally Senator LANGER asked: "What do you boys intend to do about Senator NYE's reelection?" None of us made any reply inasmuch as our State commander was present. The general feeling was that any statements that would be made should rightly come from him. After a short interval, Commander Williams replied: "What do you mean—'What are we going to do about Senator NYE's reelection?' You know, BILL, that our organization never has and is not now concerned with partisan politics or never intends to take part in the candidacy of anyone."

To that Senator LANGER replied that it was his opinion that a veteran who had a wide acquaintance in the State would make a good run if he announced himself as a candidate for the United States Senate. Mr. Williams replied to him—as I remember the conversation: "You know, BILL, that you control the political pasture in North Dakota as far as the Nonpartisan League is concerned and anyone seeking to be elected in North Dakota ought to have the endorsement of the Nonpartisan League, and furthermore, BILL, you could take that telephone there, and call North Dakota, and name whoever you wanted to"—to which Senator LANGER replied, "That is all taken care of by the county committees and State organizations and anyway, Mr. Oscar Erickson or Mr. Beede will be named by the Nonpartisan League." Mr. Williams then replied: "Why that is a fantastic idea of yours, BILL, to try and get some veteran to run—you know from past experience, campaigns cost a lot of money and furthermore all of the choice radio time has been purchased by you and your organizations many months ago, so what chance would a new man in the field have without radio time or money?"

With the mention of money, the friend whom Mr. LANGER had with him got into the conversation and he indicated that money would be forthcoming in sufficient amounts to meet the situation. "As a matter of fact," he says, "we are prepared to start the thing off with $10,000 cash right now—to be followed by an additional sum of $50,000, and, if necessary, an additional $50,000 would be made available."

While the conversation then concerned the manner in which the veteran could properly present himself to the people, and with that Senator LANGER said: "You have a man right with you that can be the next Senator from North Dakota." We looked at each other more or less dumfounded, not realizing that any one of our group could wear the Senator's shoes, or had any inclination to do so. Some one of the group then asked the Senator who he had in mind. With that he said: "This man, DeWitt, from Minot, can be the next United States Senator, and if he isn't elected by any chance, he can be made the next United States marshal—at least we will take care of him."

Naturally, I was more dumbfounded than the rest—not ever having given any such proposition a thought, and the rest of my comrades seemed to be as dumbfounded as I was. Then LANGER'S friend entered into the conversation, explaining that most people had at least one near and dear relative in the armed forces and would be receptive to the suggestion that a candidate for the United States Senate would make certain that upon the return of the men from the armed services they would be well taken care of and provided for very substantially.

Mr. Williams then cut into the conversation and proceeded to give the two gentlemen—that is, Senator LANGER and his friend, Tom Keenan, a verbal lashing, informing them again, in no uncertain words, that our organization was not concerned with politics and that we had no intention of taking part in any political activity, and furthermore that this attempt was very evidently an idea of LANGER'S to get into the race a third candidate who would undoubtedly split the vote in such a manner as to assure the election to the Nonpartisan candidate.

He further informed him that this organization could not be bought, or an individual thereof, for any sum of money to be used as a pawn in a political campaign.

At this moment Mr. C. T. Hoverson put in his appearance in the room, and the conversation was immediately swung to other subjects by the Senator who suggested that we discuss some pending veteran legislation, and that perhaps it would be better if we retired to another room in order that Mr. Hoverson, who is an officer of the Veterans' Administration, would not be present.

We then went down to my room, that is, Mr. Williams, Mr. Winters, Mr. Nomland, Senator Langer and his friend, Tom Keenan, and Charley Gray; upon arriving at my room Tom Keenan again opened the subject of a candidate for the United States Senate and again offered to produce the initial $10,000 payment and indicated that arrangements would be made for the additional sums as indicated before. He was informed again, in no uncertain terms, that the Disabled American Veterans, as an organization, were not interested and that we, as individuals, were not interested and would have no part in the plan at all.

Mr. Keenan remained until nearly midnight trying to press his point that some action should be taken then and there, but finally concluded that it was impossible and left; about 15 minutes or so later Senator LANGER left for the evening, but before leaving said that he would like to join us at breakfast the following morning, which he did, and at that time returned to me the membership cards which I had previously left with him. At the breakfast the following were present: Andy Nomland, of Grand Forks; Charley Gray, Bismarck; Mr. Shirey, of Grand Forks; and myself.

We left Washington in the afternoon on September 15 and proceeded to New York City, where we had previously arranged for reservation at the Hotel New Yorker. While in my room at Hotel New Yorker on September 17, shortly after lunch hour, I answered the telephone, and was informed by a voice, after having ascertained my identity, that a group of friends of mine were assembled at the Waldorf Hotel and would like to have me come over there. I inquired as to whom they might be, not having any acquaintances in New York City, I would prefer to know whom I was to meet before I accepted the invitation. They told me that was immaterial and that they wanted to discuss with me a proposition, and I inquired as to what proposition they had in mind, and they referred to the meeting that we had had at the Hamilton Hotel in Washington. I told them that I was in my room at the New Yorker, and that I would be very happy to have them come over and discuss with me and my comrades anything they might have in mind, but that I was not in the habit of accepting invitations from strangers. With that he hung up the telephone.

Shortly following the telephone conversation I was sitting in the lobby of the Hotel New Yorker watching the crowds, and a well-dressed gentleman slid in alongside of me on the settee and made some remarks about the convention that was being held in the city, and finally he asked me if I had made any decisions on the proposition that had been made in Washington. I then inquired as to who he was, and he said, "That is immaterial. I was just wondering whether or not you had given the matter any further thought."

I said, "I do not know what you are talking about. I do not recall of having any proposition made to me anywhere," and that if he wanted to know anything about any proposition that might have been made, perhaps he had better go over and call on our State commander, who was our mouthpiece for our delegation from North Dakota.

He promptly got up and left the hotel lobby, and I have never seen him before or since.

FAY C. DEWITT.

Subscribed and sworn to before me this 9th day of August 1944.

[SEAL] ELSIE N. BLISS,
Notary Public, Ward County, N. Dak.
My commission expires November 29, 1949.

THE GRAY AFFIDAVIT

STATE OF NORTH DAKOTA,
County of Burleigh, ss:

Charles Gray, of Bismarck, N. Dak., being first duly sworn, deposes and says: That he is the person referred to in the attached affidavit of Fay C. DeWitt, of Minot, N. Dak., being submitted to the United States Senate Special Committee Investigating Campaign Expenditures of 1944;

That he has read the said affidavit and knows the contents thereof, and that the same are true and correct to the best knowledge, information, and recollection of this affiant.

CHARLES GRAY.

Subscribed and sworn to before me this 9th day of August 1944.

[SEAL] HARRY ROSENTHAL,
Notary Public, Burleigh County, N. Dak.
My commission expires June 10, 1948.

WINTERS' AFFIDAVIT TELLS OF PROMISE TO HAVE SERVICEMAN CANDIDATE

STATE OF NORTH DAKOTA,
County of Grand Forks, ss:

Oscar W. Winters, of Grand Forks, N. Dak., being first duly sworn, deposes and says: That he is the person referred to in the attached affidavit of Fay C. DeWitt, of Minot, N. Dak., being submitted to the United States Senate Special Committee Investigating Campaign Expenditures of 1944:

That he has read the said affidavit and knows the contents thereof, and that the same are true and correct to the best knowledge, information, and recollection of this affiant.

That he, Oscar W. Winters, understood the name of Senator LANGER'S friend to be Joe Keenan, instead of Tom Keenan as testified to by F. C. DeWitt;

That he, Oscar W. Winters, understood said Joe Keenan to have stated, which statement was confirmed by Senator LANGER, "that he, Joe Keenan, was the Washington representative of Anheuser Busch Co., of St. Louis, Mo., and further that he was a Democrat with White House connections, interested in seeing Senator NYE's defeat."

That he, Oscar W. Winters, further testified that he heard Senator LANGER say upon leaving DeWitt's room that "he (Senator

LANGER) was sorry Fay DeWitt would not accept his proposition, that he would not run, that this organization would not sanction the deal, but he would guarantee a serviceman would be in the race for the United States Senate.

OSCAR W. WINTERS.

Subscribed and sworn to before me this 15th day of August 1944.

[SEAL] ARTHUR W. STOKES,
Notary Public,
Grand Forks County, N. Dak.

My commission expires August 13, 1949.

THE SHIREY AFFIDAVIT

STATE OF NORTH DAKOTA,
County of Grand Forks, ss:

Howard Shirey, of Grand Forks, N. Dak., being first duly sworn, deposes and says: That he is the person referred to in the attached affidavit of Fay C. DeWitt, of Minot, N. Dak., being submitted to the United States Senate Special Committee Investigating Campaign Expenditures of 1944:

That he has read the said affidavit and knows the contents thereof and that the same are true and correct to the best knowledge, information, and recollection of this affiant;

That he, Howard Shirey, cannot testify as to what took place in Mr. DeWitt's room where adjournment was taken after the appearance of Mr. C. T. Hoverson, but that he, Howard Shirey, did have breakfast, the following morning with Senator LANGER and the delegates mentioned in Mr. DeWitt's affidavit, copy of which is next attached. Howard Shirey sayeth further that he understood the name of Senator LANGER's friend as Joe Keenan, a representative of Anheuser Busch Co. Further than that herein subscribed to, affiant sayeth not.

HOWARD A. SHIREY.

Subscribed and sworn to before me this 10th day of August 1944.

[SEAL] ARTHUR W. STOKES,
Notary Public,
Grand Forks County, N. Dak.

My commission expires August 13, 1944.

NOMLAND AFFIDAVIT TELLS OF PROMISE TO GET A SERVICEMAN CANDIDATE

STATE OF NORTH DAKOTA,
County of Grand Forks, ss.:

Andy Nomland, being first duly sworn, on his oath deposes and says, that I am national service officer and North Dakota State adjutant of the Disabled American Veterans; also national deputy chief of staff of the Disabled American Veterans, and I reside at Grand Forks, N. Dak., with office headquarters in the United States Veterans' Administration Building at Fargo, N. Dak.

I have been the recognized national service officer of the Disabled American Veterans, State of North Dakota, for the past 7 years and full-time national service officer since August 5, 1943. I have held the job as North Dakota State department adjutant continuously since May 1941, serving the same organization as their department commander the year 1927. I have held all the offices in the Grand Forks Chapter No. 2, Disabled American Veterans, at various times since the Disabled American Veterans were first organized.

I was a duly elected North Dakota State department delegate to the New York City National Disabled American Veterans convention September 16 to 20, 1943. While en route to the New York convention, arriving in Washington, D. C., on September 14, 1943, together with the rest of the North Dakota delegates, we registered at the Hamilton Hotel.

Some time during the afternoon of September 14, 1943, I was advised that United States Senator WILLIAM LANGER had offered to take the North Dakota delegation out for dinner that evening, and later on, about 6 p. m., the telephone rang in our room, which was answered by Commander Neal E. Williams, and after telephone conversation Senator LANGER informed Commander Williams that the dinner engagement would have to be canceled on account of Senator LANGER claiming to have some other appointment, but that he would like to see the North Dakota delegation later on during the evening in our room.

About 9 p. m. of the same day, Senator LANGER, together with a gentleman whom he introduced to us as Mr. Tom Keenan, entered our room. The following individuals, D. A. V. delegates, were present in the room at that time:

Mr. F. C. DeWitt, department senior vice commander; Mr. Neal E. Williams, department commander; Mr. Oscar W. Winters, commander Grand Forks Chapter No. 2; Mr. Charles A. Gray, adjutant Bismarck Chapter No. 3; and Mr. Howard A. Shirey, adjutant Grand Forks Chapter No. 2, Disabled American Veterans.

After the two gentlemen's arrival, shaking hands, and introducing Mr. Keenan, Mr. Neal E. Williams attacked Senator LANGER regarding our D. A. V. resolutions passed at the previous convention, telling Mr. LANGER that he certainly got our machinery screwed up by introducing our bills in the manner he handled same.

Senator LANGER discussed other matters concerning North Dakota, and finally Mr. LANGER put a question something like this before the group: What is North Dakota going to do about the senatorial campaign or election coming up next year? After all, we will have to get Senator NYE out of Washington. And the way to do that, Mr. LANGER said, would be to promote some influential war veterans to enter the race. The following discussions for a few minutes entered into by different individuals, I do not recall, someone finally asked Senator LANGER if he had anyone in particular in mind, and Mr. LANGER said, "Sure, our best candidate is right here, Mr. DeWitt, from Minot." He could make a good race. He was not only a veteran but a disabled veteran, has a Purple Heart Medal, Silver Star, and a past department commander of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of North Dakota, besides an influential citizen of Minot and the State of North Dakota. Similar things were said, I know Mr. Williams then stated, "That, after all, Senator the D. A. V. organization has never entered into politics and never intends to. Besides I don't think that there is anyone in this gang that would have money enough to enter such a campaign even though they were interested." About that time Mr. Keenan entered the conversation, saying that, "Money is no object; we'll take care of that part of it, if Mr. DeWitt is interested; we will start him out with, oh, say, $10,000 cash immediately, with an additional $50,000 as the campaign progresses and any additional amounts necessary. Of course, that depends upon the kind of a showing he makes." About that time Mr. Fay Dewitt informed the gentleman that he was not interested in going into any campaign, that he had a job with the Northern States Power Co. at Minot, N. Dak., and wasn't interested in politics. Then Senator LANGER said, "We will take care of you, Fay, if you fail of election; we will make you the next United States marshal or give you some other job; we always take care of our friends." Commander Williams then made inquiry as to why Mr. Keenan was interested in someone other than a Democrat because he had announced himself as being a Democrat. Tom Keenan then replied that he was interested in defeating Senator NYE, stating, "We got to get him out of the Senate." About that time Mr. C. T. Hoverson, manager, United States Veterans' Administration, Fargo, N. Dak., entered the room. Senator LANGER shook hands with him and introduced Mr. Keenan to him and a short conversation took place between Mr. Hoverson and Senator LANGER. Then Senator LANGER, on account of discussing veterans' legislation, so he said, to Mr. Hoverson, he did not think that Mr. Hoverson would be interested in discussing same with us, and suggested that we go to some other room. Mr. DeWitt then informed Senator LANGER and Mr. Keenan that they could go down to his room. Thereupon Commander Williams, Mr. DeWitt, Mr. Winters, Mr. Gray, myself, Mr. Keenan, and Senator Langer went to Mr. DeWitt's room, leaving Mr. Hoverson and Mr. Shirey in Commander Williams' room.

After arriving in Mr. DeWitt's room, Senator LANGER continued with political discussions trying to persuade Mr. DeWitt to accept the proposition. And Mr. Keenan done his part in selling us on the idea stating, "You boys had better take this $10,000 and get started with the campaign because we got to get a candidate in the field and if you don't accept it, we will have to get some other veteran to enter the race."

Thereupon Mr. DeWitt again told them that he was not interested and Mr. Williams again advised them that the Disabled American Veterans couldn't be bought for any sum of money and that there wasn't any use to further discuss this matter. At which time Mr. Keenan left the room. This was about midnight. Senator LANGER still stayed on for about 15 or 20 minutes, requesting us to think this over and finally left the room in tears.

I realize that this statement is made under oath, that my memory isn't clear as to all the details of all the conversations, but that the statements herein made are true and correct, and furthermore that these statements are not made on account of prejudice against any individual or individuals but for the sole purpose of giving the facts to the Senate Elections Committee and saving me a trip to Washington, D. C., if at all possible.

ANDY NOMLAND.

Subscribed and sworn to before me this 10th day of August 1944.

[SEAL] ARTHUR W. STOKES,
Notary Public, Grand Forks County,
Grand Forks, N. Dak.

My commission expires August 13, 1949.

STATEMENT OF NEAL E. WILLIAMS, COMMITTEEMAN, NATIONAL EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE, TENTH DISTRICT, DISABLED AMERICAN VETERANS, SPECIAL ASSISTANT ATTORNEY GENERAL OF THE STATE OF NORTH DAKOTA, COMMERCE COUNSEL FOR THE CHAMBER OF COMMERCE OF FARGO, N. DAK.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Senator, I am from Fargo, N. Dak., and I am special assistant attorney general for the State of North Dakota.

I am here in Washington at this time, as you know, to argue this Southern Governor's case before the Interstate Commerce Commission.

And I am also the tenth district national executive committeeman for the Disabled American Veterans. That is four States—Minnesota, North and South Dakota, and Montana.

And in addition to that, I am a national deputy chief of staff of the Disabled American Veterans.

During our convention—our convention was held in New York City last September, beginning September 16 through to the 20th—and being at that time the North Dakota State department commander for the Disabled Veterans for the State of North Dakota, I brought to Washington here the entire delegation, all of our department officers.

I had with me our national service officer, Mr. Andy Nomland from Grand Forks, who, in addition to being the national service officer, is also adjutant.

I also had with me Mr. Oscar Winters, the commander of Grand Forks Chapter No. 2, and Howard Shirey from Grand Forks, who is

adjutant for the Grand Forks Chapter No. 2; and Mr. Fay C. DeWitt, senior vice commander for the state department, Minot; and likewise Mr. Charles Gray, adjutant from the Bismarck chapter.

Now, these members of our organization were traveling to the New York convention via Washington.

We came through Washington, I think, primarily to see Senator LANGER about certain bills that he had introduced into the Senate for the Disabled American Veterans.

Now, at our meeting in Grand Forks, at our Department Convention in Grand Forks, in May 1943, we adopted the national organization's resolutions, and they were in turn adopted by the American Legion and the Veterans of Foreign Wars, and I mailed these resolutions to our two Senators, Senator NYE and Senator LANGER, and to Congressman LEMKE and Congressman BURDICK, as I was instructed by the national headquarters.

Senator LANGER undertook on his own volition to introduce some 37 bills in the United States Senate for the benefit of the American disabled veterans, and we came through Washington to get a report on those bills to take up to national headquarters, because I understood all of the missions had been filled here, and instead of Senator LANGER taking up with our department headquarters here and our national officials, he undertook to introduce bills in the Senate, we stopped by to take up reports to go back to the convention.

During the course of the function Senator LANGER made dinner appointments with two of our members and said he would be down to the hotel that evening, which was September 14, 1943; and when I came into the hotel about 6:30, Senator LANGER called and said he would not be able to go to dinner with us.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. Did you omit the names intentionally?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Sir?

The CHAIRMAN. Did you omit their names intentionally?

Mr. WILLIAMS. No, I just mentioned that he had made this dinner appointment with two of our members.

The CHAIRMAN. But you didn't say who they were.

Mr. WILLIAMS. No. I was going to tell you who they were as I proceeded.

They were Mr. DeWitt of Minot and Charles Gray of Bismarck who were the two comrades we delegated to Senator LANGER and with whom he made an engagement to take all of us to dinner that evening.

Senator BALL. I see. He just talked to those two?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Yes.

So the dinner did not materialize.

He called at 6:30 and said he would not be able to go out to dinner with us but asked us if we would meet with him in the hotel at 9:00 o'clock that evening.

The CHAIRMAN. What hotel?

Mr. WILLIAMS. The Hamilton. Our rooms were in that hotel.

So I said to the Senator, "I will be glad to ask the group to remain here at the hotel until 9 o'clock to meet you."

Well, to my surprise, Senator LANGER came up to my room at the hotel where all of our comrades were gathered to meet him, and he had with him a gentleman by the name of Tom McSheehan, so he was introduced to us.

The CHAIRMAN. How do you spell it?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I would spell it M-c-S-h-e-e-h-a-n or M-c-S-h-e-a-h-a-n. He introduced him as Tom McSheehan.

The CHAIRMAN. Did you know him?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Never met him before in my life.

And he came into my room at the hotel and said, "Well, boys, I am going to make the next Senator from North Dakota out of some one of you." I said, "Which one are you going to make Senator?"

The CHAIRMAN. Who said this, McSheehan?

Mr. WILLIAMS. He introduces us first to Tom McSheehan.

Senator TUNNELL. But who said he was going to make a Senator?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Senator LANGER said that.

And I said, "Congratulations, Bill. Now we know who is going to get the League endorsement in North Dakota."

He said, "No, no; I cannot give him the League indorsement." He said, "That has got to go to Oscar Ericson."

I said, "Well, I am sorry then, I don't know how you intend to elect any one of these comrades here then, Senator."

Tom McSheehan spoke up and said, "Yes, we are going to make Mr. DeWitt the next Senator." He said, "He has got the Silver Star and the Purple Heart and has seen a lot of service, he is a past department commander of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, and is the logical man to run as a serviceman candidate from North Dakota." I said, "You will have to have something more than that, Bill, before you can be elected to the United States Senate from North Dakota." I said, "You mean you are going to run him in place of your League candidate?" He said, "Well, you know, I cannot give him the League indorsement——"

The CHAIRMAN. McSheehan said that?

Mr. WILLIAMS. No; Senator LANGER said that.

I said, "How do you expect to elect him to the Senate?" He said, "Tom McSheehan here is a Democrat and he is interested in electing a Democrat to the Senate." I said, "You have lots of Democrats in North Dakota besides Comrade DeWitt here."

Tom McSheehan said, "I tell you boys I can back your candidate here with $10,000 immediately and if he makes any kind of showing we can put up at least $50,000 more."

And I said, "You expect to elect a Senator in North Dakota with $50,000." I said, "Run him against Senator LANGER's candidate here for the league?"

Well, Senator LANGER says, "If he doesn't make it we are going to take care of him."

I said, "Well, he is the personnel officer out there for the power company in Minot and if he gets into any such controversy here," I said, "McSheehan here is only interested in electing a Democrat and you are only interested in electing a leaguer and if you put him out in the field and back him with $10,000 and then $50,000 more if he makes good," I said, "You are just throwing him to the wolves."

Well, Senator LANGER said, "We will take care of him. We always have. We will make him United States marshal if he fails." He says, "We always take care of our league friends." I said, "Well, you didn't say you were going to give him the league endorsement, Senator, and" I said, "Further than that, don't get me wrong, you say you always take care of your man, where is Oscar Hagan?" I said, "You ran him for Governor last year and now he is out at Williston on a farm." I said, "The league didn't take very good care of him."

And at that time into the room came Ted Overson, manager of the Veterans' Bureau at Fargo, and Ted was a delegate for the Fargo Chapter No. 1 and a member of the Veterans' Administration at Fargo, and, of course, Mr. McSheehan was for leaving right away. Senator LANGER told Ted Overson, he said, "This is one of my former assistant attorney generals." And I said, "Well, we are talking about matters here that perhaps don't concern you as manager of the Veterans' Administration," and so Senator LANGER asked to go down to Mr. DeWitt's room, so we left Mr. Overson talking with Howard Shirey from Grand Forks and the rest of us retired to DeWitt's room down the corridor in the Hamilton Hotel.

The CHAIRMAN. That is LANGER——

Mr. WILLIAMS. And this Tom McSheehan.

The CHAIRMAN. Did he say he was from North Dakota?

Mr. WILLIAMS. McSheehan?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes.

Mr. WILLIAMS. No. Senator LANGER introduced him as general counsel for the Anheuser Busch Brewing Co., Washington counsel, he said, and he told us that he had been a former Assistant Attorney General in the Wilson administration.

The CHAIRMAN. He said this before him?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Yes. Before all of us.

And we went down to Mr. DeWitt's room and the conversation continued and I said, "Well, now, I told you gentlemen there is no use you trying to come up here and induce one of our comrades and a member of the Disabled American Veterans to become a candidate for any political office." I said, "Our national organization is chartered by Congress, it is purely nonpolitical, and," I said, "there is no use to come down here and attempt by any means to get any of our comrades to run for the United States Senate or any other office." I said, "I am sorry, Senator, that you would come up here and approach us." I said, "It is a sad state of affairs, because both of you gentlemen have admitted you are not interested in electing this man as candidate for the Senate, you are simply interested in getting the candidate for the Senate to support your interests in your respective concerns, namely, to elect your own Democratic candidate or your own Republican candidate."

And this conversation continued down there in the room until 12:20 that night.

The CHAIRMAN. Was anything said about Senator NYE?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Yes; Senator LANGER said he had to beat Senator NYE because NYE is particularly obnoxious to him down here in Washington; he said, "He votes just the opposite to what I vote. I cannot get any place." This conversation continued until 12:20 in the morning, and I told Senator LANGER, I said, "This is a tragic thing for you to do, come down here and try to induce our disabled comrades to come down here and be a football for you." And Senator LANGER left the room with tears in his eyes about 12:20, and McSheehan got out a little ahead of him, but McSheehan is the man who had the money to back the campaign.

They figured we had five chapters in North Dakota, that we had $2,000 a chapter to open our campaign with and that we were assured of $50,000 additional to carry on with, depending upon the showing made.

Well, I told the Senator that $10,000 was not a great deal of money for me but I said "It looks probably pretty big here to these other disabled comrades of mine and I want the boys to know what the ulterior motive is behind it." I said "I want them to know that neither of you gentlemen are interested in electing Comrade DeWitt to the Senate, you are just interested in using him and," I said, "I don't want any more of it at all. I am sorry you even came up here tonight, Senator, it places me in a tragic position; I am special assistant attorney general for the State of North Dakota and I prosecute cases against the railroads and I cannot afford to be put in this light." I said "Anyone of these comrades may go back to North Dakota and start talking and it will look to the public as if I am just in the picture for Senator LANGER and you know that is not the truth."

The CHAIRMAN. What did he say to that?

Mr. WILLIAMS. That is when he began to cry. I think he saw his mistake.

And I came back to North Dakota and told the attorney general, Mr. Strutz, and I told him in the presence of one of our comrades in the Bismarck Chapter; I told Mr.

Strutz what had taken place, and I said "Undoubtedly these men will get some serviceman in North Dakota and," I said, "I want you, Alvin Strutz, to know all the facts here."

I told the same thing to Commissioner Ben Larkin of the public service commission.

I represent the commission in railroad cases before the Interstate Commerce Commission. I told him. And I told him in the presence of Commissioner Dohl, commissioner of agriculture and labor in North Dakota, told them what had taken place in the Hamilton Hotel.

That was last September when I came back and told Mr. Strutz about it. I said "My purpose in telling you about it is for my own protection." I said, "If something blossoms up here in North Dakota I don't want to be tagged with it; if some serviceman candidate comes into the field with some of this money behind it"——

The CHAIRMAN (interposing). Did you tell Senator NYE about it?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Yes; I told Senator NYE. That was after I told the attorney general and my immediate superiors with the railroad commission and with the chamber of commerce in Fargo.

The CHAIRMAN. Did these other men talk about it when they got home?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Senator, I can develop that; they went back and did just that, went to their respective communities like Minot and started talking, just as I anticipated would happen, and the smear campaign was on against me.

Then when the Republicans had their convention in Bismarck they invited me up to their room at the hotel——

The CHAIRMAN (interposing). When was that?

Mr. WILLIAMS. That was on March 16, I believe.

The CHAIRMAN. Last March 16.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Yes. And I was put on roundly and soundly by the businessmen of Fargo who were interested in the particular service from the candidate that was running, and they said "Why didn't you tell us about it?" I said, "I have made my report to the attorney general, I have made my report to the commissioner of agriculture and labor and the railroad commission, and my immediate superior of the chamber of commerce in Fargo, and I am not concerned for any man in politics, it is not my business to be in politics, and you gentlemen have known about this before you got in the field."

The CHAIRMAN. Have you heard anything from Mr. McSheehan?

Mr. WILLIAMS. No. I think I have handled him so that he won't even want to look for me.

The CHAIRMAN. Have you heard anything about him since?

Mr. WILLIAMS. No. I wasn't even interested in him.

The CHAIRMAN. Was he the man described by Senator LANGER? Did he hold those positions?

Mr. WILLIAMS. How do I know?

The CHAIRMAN. I didn't know but what you looked him up.

Mr. WILLIAMS. No; I wasn't interested in him. I wouldn't be very markedly concerned in any such citizen of our country.

And I told him plenty, gentlemen, behind closed doors up in the room that night.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, what was supposed to be his interest in the matter?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Well, he wanted to get a candidate to split the vote in the primary.

The CHAIRMAN. Did he say so?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Oh, yes. Oh, yes. When I got through putting the rod on him he wasn't really interested in Mr. DeWitt, he was only interested in getting a candidate.

And I suppose he thought that all he needed was some money.

The CHAIRMAN. What was his connection with Senator LANGER politically?

Mr. WILLIAMS. That is the first time I ever saw him in my life.

The CHAIRMAN. I know, but I thought maybe he said that too.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Who?

The CHAIRMAN. McSheehan.

Mr. WILLIAMS. McSheehan said all that I said to you.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, did he give any intimation as what common interest he had with Senator LANGER?

Mr. WILLIAMS. No. I presume both of them had had dinner together that night.

Senator BALL. Did you or DeWitt ask LANGER where this $10,000 was to come from?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Oh, yes. DeWitt asked him.

Senator BALL. What did he say?

Mr. WILLIAMS. He said he had the $10,000 with him.

Senator BALL. Did you see it?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I didn't see it.

After I got through with him he wasn't interested in discussing $10,000 with anybody, he was just interested in getting out as gracefully as he could.

Senator BALL. Did he say where the money came from?

Mr. WILLIAMS. He said he represented the Democrats. He said he was former Assistant United States Attorney General and he was general counsel, Washington general counsel, for the Anheuser Busch Brewing Co.

The CHAIRMAN. I thought you said Senator LANGER said that about him.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Well, he did, but Mr. McSheehan verified that.

You want to remember now, this conversation runs from 15 minutes to 9 to 12:20.

Senator BALL. Did he imply this fund was raised by the Democrats, this $10,000?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Yes; he said that was Democrat money.

Senator BALL. Democrat money.

Mr. WILLIAMS. That is why I thought it was such strange procedure for him to be up there with Senator LANGER trying to make a book with us. My God, we weren't interested in politics.

The CHAIRMAN. Did he say where the $50,000 was coming from?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Oh, yes, he said they would back him with another $50,000, depending on the showing he made.

And that looked like big money to these comrades who might only draw in the neighborhood of $200 a month.

And, frankly, I believe, had I not been there, that the deal would have been made. But I pushed them so to have them both admit that neither one of them was interested in electing the man DeWitt——

Senator BALL. In other words, McSheehan admitted that what he wanted to do was to win in the final for the Democrats?

Mr. WILLIAMS. That's right.

Senator BALL. And LANGER was for the Non-Partisan League?

Mr. WILLIAMS. LANGER said he would have to support the league candidate.

And I promptly told Mr. DeWitt he would be alone with his initial $10,000 and the promise of $50,000 to come, and I said "What kind of campaign can you put up with any such support?"

He wouldn't, of course, admit it that he didn't want any part of it and couldn't understand why they had selected him.

Senator BALL. Did LANGER personally urge DeWitt to take this proposition?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Oh, yes.

Senator BALL. He did?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Yes. And he told him if he couldn't make it and if he should not be elected he would give him an appointment as United States marshal.

Senator BALL. LANGER said that?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Yes.

Senator BALL. In your presence?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Yes.

Senator BALL. And who else?

Mr. WILLIAMS. All the rest of them I have named, the comrades.

Senator BALL. The whole six of them?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Have you talked it over with these others? Would they tell the same story now, or would their recollection not be so vivid?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Well, I don't think with the impressive meeting that we had that night that any one of them would testify any different than I have just testified.

Senator TUNNELL. What did you mean, Mr. Williams, by saying they started in to smear you?

Mr. WILLIAMS. In North Dakota?

Senator TUNNELL. Yes.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Well, understand, this fellow goes back to Minot and starts talking and the other fellow goes to Grand Forks.

Senator TUNNELL. Saying what?

The CHAIRMAN. What could they say about it that would smear you?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Well, they couldn't say anything about me that would smear me.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, that would tend to smear you?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Well, the impression was undoubtedly being left that Williams was sort of a fixer.

Understand, these comrades of mine don't know me like the men who know me as a practitioner before the Interstate Commerce Commission through hundreds of rate cases together. These fellows only know me through their casual acquaintance with me as the North Dakota State commander of the Disabled American Veterans.

Why, this was comedy all the way up to New York; the boys would say, "Well, if DeWitt don't make it for the Senate, why, they will make him United States marshal."

It may have been comedy to them but it was close to tragedy for me.

The CHAIRMAN. Did they get someone later to take DeWitt's place?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I don't know. I can't say.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, you know who are candidates?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Yes; I know who are candidates. Sure. A national commander of the American Legion is a candidate. But I am not going to say anything against him—

The CHAIRMAN (interposing). You mean Democratic candidate?

Mr. WILLIAMS No; he is Republican candidate—independent.

But I am not going to say that Lynn Stambaugh has any connection with this deal.

Senator BALL. Stambaugh stands pretty well.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Oh, yes. I have been a member of the American Legion for 25 consecutive years out there and I always supported Stambaugh in all of his activities in the American Legion work.

The CHAIRMAN. How many candidates are there now?

Mr. WILLIAMS. For the Senate?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Well, there is Senator NYE for reelection and there is Congressman BURDICK—Congressman BURDICK is backed by the league, Nonpartisan League.

And there is Lynn U. Stambaugh.

The CHAIRMAN. He is the——

Mr. WILLIAMS. He is the independent Republican candidate for the Senate.

The CHAIRMAN. And that is what they wanted DeWitt to be?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Well, yes. But I am not saying that Lynn Stambaugh has any part of this type.

The CHAIRMAN. No. But Stambaugh finally took the position which DeWitt declined taking. Is that right?

Mr. WILLIAMS. That is what I would assume.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, he did, as a matter of fact. It isn't a question of opinion. It is a fact, isn't it?

Mr. WILLIAMS. It is a fact, but Mr. Stambaugh may be in there unconsciously.

The CHAIRMAN. Certainly. I am not questioning motives. I am just getting the facts, that is all.

Senator TUNNELL. But these fellows haven't been nominated?

Mr. WILLIAMS. The primary is on June 27.

Senator TUNNELL. They are candidates at the Republican primary?

Mr. WILLIAMS. That's right.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, then, he got what he wanted, a veteran?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Yes; he got a veteran.

The CHAIRMAN. For a third party.

Mr. WILLIAMS. If you wanted to speak plainly and tie Stambaugh up to Senator LANGER, which I wouldn't do, personally.

The CHAIRMAN. No.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Or say that Stambaugh had any part of any arrangement which was offered us.

But it leaves a strong inference, and that leads up to the smear against Williams, doesn't it?

And the only defense I offer is that the national organization of Disabled American Veterans hasn't any candidate in the field.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there three principal parties in North Dakota?

Mr. WILLIAMS. No; there is what we primarily call the Nonpartisan League, and then there is the Independent Voters Association, the independent Republican organization; and then there are the Democrats.

The CHAIRMAN. Three?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Yes. But the Democrats don't——

Senator BALL (interposing). The league operates within the Republican Party, doesn't it?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Yes.

The Democrats don't have to participate in the primary because they select their own man. Their candidates have already been selected.

Our present Governor Moses will be the Democratic candidate in the fall for the Senate.

The CHAIRMAN. The other three elements in the Republican Party are the three you mentioned?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Yes.

Under our system of balloting Democrats can cast their votes for Republican candidates in the Republican primaries, then vote the Democratic ticket in the fall.

Do you see the program behind this election?

The CHAIRMAN. I should think everyone at that meeting here in Washington would have been very much surprised at a Democrat coming in to select the candidate for Republican primaries.

Mr. WILLIAMS. It is understood that in the primary on June 27 a Democrat can cast a ballot in the Republican primary and in the fall he can vote Democratic.

Now, that might seem strange procedure but nevertheless that is the truth.

The CHAIRMAN. It would be interesting to know what became of that $10,000, wouldn't it?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Well, that kind of money I am not concerned with. I do know—feel in my own heart—that had I not been there and put the pressure on those boys, some one would have fallen for this money.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, have you anything else to tell us that would throw light on the coming primary?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Well, I haven't anything further than this. Everybody practically of any prominence knows about this situation in North Dakota. It would be my suggestion that you call in before your committee these other officers of our organization for their testimony.

The CHAIRMAN. They are all out in North Dakota now?

Mr. WILLIAMS. They are all in North Dakota; yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, it would be only fair to ask Senator LANGER about it too, wouldn't it?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Well, I was hoping that he would be here this afternoon.

The CHAIRMAN. I believe he has gone home.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I didn't know that.

The CHAIRMAN. Somebody told me that. I don't know whether it is true.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Perhaps Senator LANGER can identify this McSheehan for you and produce him.

The CHAIRMAN. Where was his home? Did he mention?

Mr. WILLIAMS. McSheehan?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Right here in Washington.

The CHAIRMAN. Oh, this is his home?

Mr. WILLIAMS. He said he was the Washington general counsel for the Anheuser Busch Brewing Co.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there any reason why that company should take an interest in North Dakota politics?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Not that I know of. I wouldn't know any reason for McSheehan to be up there unless he had an ulterior motive

They kept talking about him as Tom, Tom. Well, you can imagine——

The CHAIRMAN (interposing). You never looked him up in the Washington directory or the telephone directory?

Mr. WILLIAMS. No I never had any further use for him after the first 15 minutes of conversation.

Understand, I had a difficult situation to bear to convince these other fellows, members of our organization, that we should not be tangled up in a deal like this. And they didn't——

The CHAIRMAN (interposing). I only meant that perhaps your natural curiosity might lead you to find out who this fellow was and what his interest was.

Senator BALL. Off the record.

(Discussion was had outside the record.)

The CHAIRMAN. Have you any questions to ask, Senator TUNNELL?

Senator TUNNELL. No.

The CHAIRMAN. Have you any questions, Senator BALL?

Senator BALL. No.

(At this point the witness took oath, administered by the chairman, as to the truth and veracity of his testimony heretofore given.)

The CHAIRMAN. Well, thank you very much, Mr. Williams.

FEDERAL AID FOR POST-WAR HIGHWAY CONSTRUCTION

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. NYE. I yield the floor.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Arizona yield to the Senator from North Dakota?

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I desire to make a motion, and then I will yield. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 2105, to amend and supplement the Federal Aid Road Act, and so forth.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for a question?

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes.

Mr. WHITE. The bill has been reported from the committee, and it is now the Senator's purpose to make the bill the unfinished business, to permit discussion of it, and the offering of amendments to it, but it is not the Senator's purpose to press for a vote today? Is that correct?

Mr. HAYDEN. That is correct. There are a number of Senators who have proposed amendments to the bill. I have conferred with the chairman of the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR], and we have concluded that the better course to follow is to allow the amendments to be printed and have a meeting of the committee tomorrow morning to consider the amendments, so that if any of them are to be recommended they may be recommended as committee amendments, and then it is hoped to dispose of the bill tomorrow.

Mr. WHITE. I asked the question simply so that Members of the Senate might be advised what the purpose was.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I desire to be heard on the motion to take up the measure. I do not want to interrupt the Senator from North Dakota, and after he shall have concluded I hope to be heard on the motion of the Senator from Arizona.

Mr. HAYDEN. I now yield to the Senator from North Dakota.

NORTH DAKOTA SENATORIAL PRIMARY

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I am not going to take up a great deal of time on what has been said by my colleague from North Dakota [Mr. NYE], but I do not want to let pass this particular opportunity to denounce as entirely false the statement that Mr. Joseph B. Keenan ever offered anybody a single dollar to be a candidate against the senior Senator from North Dakota in the coming election.

May I now, first of all, Mr. President, bring to your attention that, according to my colleague's own statement, this conversation took place on the 14th day of September 1943, nearly 10 months before the primary election in North Dakota, and before the senior Senator had announced his candidacy, before there was any other candidate running for the office of United States Senator in North Dakota? So how, I ask, could there be a three-way fight when there was no candidate at that time, and the distinguished Senator himself had not announced his candidacy, at a time a year and 3 months before the general election to be held this fall?

Mr. President, fortunately it happened that I was present at that entire conversation, and I state again upon my honor as a gentleman, upon my honor as a United States Senator, upon my honor as a citizen of the State of North Dakota in which I was born, that Mr. Keenan never offered anybody one single penny.

Mr. President, there are some in the State of North Dakota who were at that time, and who are now for reasons they think are entirely sufficient, opposed to the reelection of my colleague from the State of North Dakota, but I want to take this opportunity now to say that I resent the implication that is cast here upon the candidacy of Lynn Stambaugh, who is a candidate at the present time for the office of United States Senator on

the Independent ticket. May I say, Mr. President, that I did not support Mr. Stambaugh in the primary. I supported USHER L. BURDICK, one of the two Representatives in Congress from our State. In view of the fact that my colleague from North Dakota has chosen to take this matter up on the Senate floor, so that the press would print it and he could frank the speech and send it to every voter in North Dakota, rather than having it taken up in its proper place, which is the Committee on Privileges and Elections, where witnesses could be called and cross-examined and not simply affidavits and statements filed. Since, instead of bringing it up in the proper place, my colleague chose to bring it up upon the Senate floor, I shall stand in this same forum and reply item by item, paragraph by paragraph, to the statement the Senator has made, and I shall do so at the proper time. I could not at this time, however, Mr. President, permit to go unanswered the statement challenging the fine character of Joseph B. Keenan, because no one knows better than my colleague from the State of North Dakota that it was because of the hard, efficient work of Mr. Joseph B. Keenan, who as a lawyer, prepared the minority report at the time that my seat was challenged in this body, that the acts of Mr. Keenan have been challenged from that time on. So I say that in good time, and it will be soon, so that I can also frank my speech, I shall make a reply to my colleague. I shall reply in detail and give the reason for the opposition upon the part of various citizens of the State to my colleague having a seat in the Senate.

FEDERAL AID FOR POST-WAR HIGHWAY CONSTRUCTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] that the Senate proceed to the consideration of a bill, which will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (S. 2105) to amend and supplement the Federal-Aid Road Act, approved July 11, 1916, as amended and supplemented, to authorize appropriations for the post-war construction of highways and bridges, to eliminate hazards at railroad-grade crossings, to provide for the immediate preparation of plans and acquisition of rights-of-way, and for other purposes.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, this bill represents the considered opinion of the Senate Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads. The bill was reported to the Senate by me. However, it is not my particular bill, but is a committee bill carrying out the committee's views.

As I said a few moments ago, a number of Senators not members of the committee have proposed amendments to the bill. I suggest that they submit their amendments today, and have them printed, so that when the committee meets tomorrow morning it can give consideration to all the suggestions which may be made. I think such a course will expedite the consideration of the bill.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. RUSSELL. When does the Senator propose to press for final action on the bill?

Mr. HAYDEN. Tomorrow.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. Am I to understand that after the amendments are submitted, the Senator from Arizona proposes to refer the bill and all the proposed amendments to the committee for consideration?

Mr. HAYDEN. No. But it very frequently happens that after a bill has been reported——

Mr. TAFT. I simply wanted to understand what the Senator's plan was. The Senator simply says that he will not press for a vote on the bill today, but that he will ask the committee, which no longer has the bill under its charge, to consider the amendments tomorrow morning for some possible effect on the vote tomorrow on the amendments? Is that correct?

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, it very frequently happens that after a bill has been reported, the committee which reported the bill considers amendments to the bill, informally perhaps, and that may be the situation in this case. I would rather have the judgment of the committee as to whether amendments should be accepted than to accept them myself upon the floor, inasmuch as the bill is not my particular pet measure, but represents the judgment of the committee.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. BRIDGES. Why is not the proper thing for the Senator to do, to ask to have the bill recommitted to the committee? Why try to rush action on the bill now, to make it a special order?

Mr. HAYDEN. If the procedure suggested by the Senator from New Hampshire were followed the bill would go back to the committee, it would not be on the calendar, and the work would have to be done all over again. I was merely trying to obtain the advice of the committee. I wish to have the bill and the amendments sent to the committee, and have the committee's judgment on whether its members will accept the amendments rather than for me to accept them on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. BRIDGES. Why does not the Senator take action in the usual manner?

Mr. HAYDEN. I am taking action exactly in the usual manner. It is a procedure which has been followed time and again.

Mr. BRIDGES. It is an incorrect manner of handling the bill to undertake to make the bill the unfinished business, and then refer it back to the committee for consideration behind closed doors, and in an informal way amend it.

Mr. HAYDEN. I am sorry that the Senator cannot see my point. I am merely seeking advice.

Mr. BRIDGES. I see the Senator's point in trying to rush the bill ahead, but I cannot see why the Senator does not do it in the correct parliamentary manner.

Mr. HAYDEN. If I were to ask to have the bill recommitted to the committee that would result in a loss of time.

Mr. BRIDGES. Certainly. Why the rush?

Mr. HAYDEN. The rush, I will explain to the Senate, if I may be permitted to do so, is that this is a bill which must be enacted promptly, because 45 State legislatures will meet next year, and this is the only kind of Federal aid whereby the States match the Federal money. The bill is based upon the assumption that the American people cannot enjoy prosperity without an adequate highway-transportation system. The question naturally arises as to what it will cost to have an adequate system of that kind. About a year and a half ago—and this is proof that the bill is not a measure simply pulled out of the clear sky—at a meeting of the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, where representatives of the State highway departments, the Association of State Highway Officials, appeared, suggestion was made that a proposal be worked out as to what we should do after the war in order to have an adequate highway system. At the committee's suggestion, the Association of State Highway Officials, about 2 months thereafter, submitted the draft of a bill. Their report was to the effect, that in order really to have the kind of transportation system the American people need and should have, about $12,000,000,000 would be required to do a thorough and complete job. Their recommendation, however, was that $1,000,000,000 be appropriated each year after the war for 3 years, or a total of $3,000,000,000. In other words, it is proposed to do in a 3-year period approximately one-fourth of the total job which needs to be done in the United States.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. BRIDGES. Does not the Senator know that many States are unable to meet the matching requirements, and that the proposed expenditures would be a great deal more than the States could equitably meet?

Mr. HAYDEN. That was one reason why I was about to say that the House of Representatives, in considering the bill, decided that $1,000,000,000 a year of Federal aid was more money than the States could match. Therefore the amount was reduced to $500,000,000 a year. The committee reported the bill to the House in that form after very extensive hearings. I think the hearings in the House lasted 2 or 3 months. Everyone was given an opportunity to be heard. I believe that that judgment was sound. I believe that an expenditure of $1,000,000,000 a year for Federal aid would be more than the States could match.

To get to the problem itself, $12,000,000,000 sounds like a great deal of money to improve a Federal highway system. Even $3,000,000,000 sounds like a great deal of money; but we have actually invested in our highway system at this

time $42,000,000,000. That is the investment which the American people have made in their roads and highways as they stand today. Operating on those highways, when the war began, there were 34,400,000 motor vehicles, more than twice as many as all the other nations of the world combined had. The system represented an investment of $50,000,000,000. Those are astronomical figures, but figures of that kind are required to illustrate how great and how important is the transportation problem in the United States.

Mr. WEEKS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. WEEKS. Does the Senator have figures at hand to show the largest amount of money which the States have ever put up to match the Federal allotment in any one year?

Mr. HAYDEN. I know that it is not as large as the amount in this bill, because Congress has never appropriated such a large sum.

Mr. WEEKS. Does the Senator know what the actual figure is, representing the greatest amount of money which has ever been matched by the States as a whole?

Mr. HAYDEN. That information is readily obtainable, but I do not happen to have it with me.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. Certainly.

Mr. BRIDGES. In his general discussion the Senator has been speaking of the importance of the transportation system and the importance of good roads, to which we all agree. However, I for one wish to see this program proceed on a reasonable and sane basis. The Federal Government is now deeper in debt than it has been at any time in the history of our Nation; and yet it is proposed to change the basis of the allotment to the States from the old 50-50 basis to the basis of a 60-percent contribution by the Federal Government and a 40-percent contribution by the States. It is proposed to appropriate for Federal roads more money than was ever before appropriated in the history of our country. I should like to see the program placed on a reasonable and sane basis.

Mr. HAYDEN. What would the Senator consider a reasonable and sane basis? Can the Senator give exact figures?

Mr. BRIDGES. I shall do so in due course.

Mr. HAYDEN. I am interested to know the Senator's views.

Mr. BRIDGES. The basis I have in mind is substantially below the figures in the Senator's bill.

Mr. HAYDEN. There will be an opportunity for the Senator to offer amendments reducing the amount to be appropriated, or changing the ratio of apportionment. The committee makes this recommendation, and I am ready to defend the recommendation of the committee.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. REED. I interrupt the Senator only to obviate any atmosphere of suspicion in connection with the subject. There is no occasion for alarm on the part of any Senator. There is some question as to whether the States can match the full amount of $650,000,000 carried in the bill for 3 years. There is no question about their being able to match the Federal appropriations the first year, in the case of virtually every State. The reason for haste—I do not like that term—the reason for prompt action is that we should go on record, after a year and a half of the fullest consideration, with the aid of the State highway officials, and should act promptly in order that the States may know what they will have to meet when the legislatures convene next year.

There is every reason in the world why this bill should be given consideration and promptly passed. I agree with the Senator from Arizona. Some important amendments have been submitted. We have had a hasty discussion, and conferences have been held on the floor of the Senate. So far as I am concerned, I should like to have the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads meet tomorrow morning and consider the amendments, so that we may examine them as individual members of the committee, and in order that the committee may, if it wishes to do so, express an opinion as a committee, or individually. I believe that such procedure would be much better than to try to resolve important questions on the floor of the Senate. I assure my colleagues that there is no occasion for undue concern.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. BRIDGES. Is the Senator from Kansas in favor of recommitting the bill to the committee of which he is a member?

Mr. REED. No; I do not believe that that is necessary. If the motion of the Senator from Arizona should prevail—and I hope it will—and the bill should be made the unfinished business of the Senate, then by agreement it could go over until tomorrow. Tomorrow morning the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads could meet and consider the amendments in committee. Then tomorrow there would be full opportunity for discussion and debate.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. There is nothing unusual about a committee considering amendments to a bill while the bill is pending before the Senate. Frequently committee amendments are offered after a bill has been reported to the Senate and before it has been disposed of. If the amendments have the sanction of the committee, they are presumed to carry more weight. So it is unnecessary to recommit the bill to the committee in order to have the committee suggest amendments, or express its opinion with regard to amendments which are submitted.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. BRIDGES. Does the Senator from Kentucky like to legislate in that manner? Does he call that good legislative procedure?

Mr. BARKLEY. I do, if the committee considers the question properly.

Mr. BRIDGES. I wish to remember that, because I know of other instances in which the Senator has not held the same view.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator may try to lead me into a trap; but I see the trap into which he is leading me before he gets to it. I say that when a committee has reported a measure, and during the pendency of the measure before the Senate, it frequently happens that the committee desires to offer amendments, which are known as committee amendments. Frequently when an amendment is offered on the floor of the Senate a Senator will ask, "Has the amendment had the consideration of the committee?" If it has not, and he is opposed to it, he uses that fact to oppose the amendment. If the amendment has been endorsed by the committee, Senators who favor the amendment use that fact in favor of the amendment. So there is nothing unusual or vicious about a committee considering amendments which are submitted after a bill has been reported to the Senate. It seems to me to be much wiser for the committee, in deliberation, to consider amendments and make some suggestion or report on them than for us to try to pass upon them on the floor of the Senate without permitting the committee an opportunity to consider them.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. To substantiate what the distinguished majority leader has said, I may add that I am a member of the committee. We have held only two or three meetings, and they have been brief. Since the bill has been printed and mailed to my constituents in North Dakota, I have received a great many suggestions in connection with the bill, and I should like to have an opportunity to submit them to the committee as a whole before we proceed with the consideration of the bill.

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. MALONEY. I should like to refer briefly to the observation of the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY]. The procedure suggested is at least mildly unusual, because no hearings were held on this particular bill. I am not offering any criticism of the chairman of the committee, or of the committee itself. I think it is a little unfortunate, however, that we were not afforded the opportunity to appear at hearings on the bill, in order that our views might be presented before the bill was reported to the Senate. I am not greatly dissatisfied, up to this time, because I have prepared several amendments of my own, one of which would reverse the ratio of contributions and provide for a 60-percent contribution on the part of the States and a 40-percent contribution on the part of the Federal Government.

At a time when the Federal Treasury is empty, and a majority of the States are exceedingly well-off financially, I cannot see wisdom in such procedure as has been suggested. Quite apart from that, I am fearful that if we take such a step as is proposed, we may later abandon the age-old practice of States and State highway commissions directing highway affairs within the States. If we were to take such a step as is proposed, I fear that ultimately the road program of the country would be entirely centralized in Washington. I believe that that would be unfortunate.

I thank the distinguished Senator from Arizona.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. RUSSELL. It always pains me to differ with my good friend from Arizona. However, I believe that this bill is out of balance, and proposes to appropriate entirely too much money. I do not believe that we could possibly justify borrowing almost $2,200,000,000 for the purposes of this bill, to pyramid on top of the present public debt, unless the program were in some way related to the relief of unemployment. If it were proposed to spend the money in a period of unemployment, this tremendous program could be justified. However, it is distinctly another thing to authorize such large expenditures at a time when the rate of employment is high and everyone who wants to work can find a job.

I rose to ask my friend whether or not the bill would change the system which we have had heretofore, with respect to railroads contributing to the elimination of grade crossings. I have read the bill hurriedly, but so far as I can see, the cost of eliminating grade crossings is proposed to be saddled entirely upon Federal or State taxpayers, and the railroads would not contribute anything to the cost of eliminating grade crossings. Heretofore they have been required by law to contribute.

Mr. HAYDEN. The Senator is mistaken in that respect. In connection with the elimination of railroad grade crossings, no change from the existing law is proposed in the bill.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. REED. I should like to make an observation for the benefit of the Senator from Georgia.

The Federal Government would not have to borrow any money to carry out the provisions of the bill. In my State, and in other States, there is a constitutional prohibition against using money collected by taxing highway users for any other purpose than that of highway improvement. The Federal Government has been collecting from highway users at the rate of approximately $640,000,000 a year. Information as to such collections can be placed in the RECORD in detail. I make that assertion today to clear the atmosphere. Highway users would pay to the Federal Government, in taxation, all the money required by the bill over the 3-year period during which the Federal Government would contribute 60 percent and the States 40 percent.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. REED. In just a moment.

Mr. President, I agree that 50–50 is the old, historic basis, and should be continued. But temporarily we need a little different treatment of highways. We have not done anything on them for 3 years. We have not constructed any new ones. We have not even maintained the ones we have. The great cities have complained about the inadequate maintenance of highways to the centers of population. In the bill we have made provision for highways serving the densely populated sections.

I am sure the Senator from Georgia was not cognizant of what I have said——

Mr. RUSSELL. Oh, yes, Mr. President; I was cognizant of the argument the Senator is making. I have heard it often before. It is the most specious argument I have ever heard advanced by intelligent men. The Federal Treasury is now bare. We are confronted with a national indebtedness which will reach the staggering sum of $300,000,000,000. The carrying charge of that indebtedness will exceed $6,000,000,000 every year, which is more than the entire National Budget in ordinary times. With this condition staring us in the face, we are solemnly told that we should allocate such sums of money as are paid in taxes by a certain class of citizens for a specific purpose without regard to liquidating the indebtedness, paying the interest, or considering the other essential expenses of the Government. Some of these taxes are what are commonly called war taxes, and yet we are told that all of them, at a time when the national debt and carrying charge is such a stupendous amount, should be spent for the specific purpose of building highways because the taxes are paid by those who own automobiles. It would be just as reasonable to say that no sum should be applied to the payment of the public debt unless it were paid in taxation by those who hold Government securities. Such a proposal might have validity if it were not for our national obligations, but it just does not make sense to me when we are emerging from a great war and are so heavily burdened with debt.

Suppose an individual who owed a great deal of money and had some race horses were to budget his funds so as to expend all of his winnings by his horses in playing the races but continued to increase his borrowings to cover his losses. It would not be long until he would be in the bankruptcy courts. This argument in support of the present proposal may be attractive to some, but it does not appeal to me when I consider our national obligations.

In the first place, this bill proposes Federal expenditures amounting to about $700,000,000 annually, which is in excess of the amount derived from automobile owners at the present time. By allocating these large sums for this purpose we are sure to increase the national indebtedness any way you figure it. I am not willing to agree that we should spend tax money for the benefit of a certain class of taxpayers any more than we could properly allocate the taxes derived from cigarettes solely for purposes beneficial only to cigarette smokers.

The people of the country and the Members of the Congress have become so accustomed to these large appropriations that I fear we are becoming callous to the responsibility of the Treasury to the holders of Government obligations.

Mr. President, the time will come when we will be forced to consider the magnitude of the public debt. I believe it is here now. I have always advocated expenditures for public-works projects at times when any considerable number of the people of the United States were unable to find work. I have advocated large appropriations on this floor for the benefit of classes of our citizens who were suffering on account of some economic dislocation. I have even been called a radical on account of my views on public spending. However, I do not think that such large expenditures can be justified unless they are made in a period of great unemployment. With conditions such as they are, we should be careful about obligating the Federal Government to the expenditure of nearly $2,200,000,000 for the purposes set forth in this bill. There will be a time when a public-works program will be necessary, and if we are to proceed with such vast expenditures when they are not needed to give employment we will find ourselves in a time of need unable to finance such a program.

There is a great deal of advocacy today of costly public-works programs such as are contemplated by this bill. Many others are clamoring for an immediate reduction in all taxes upon the cessation of hostilities. So far I have failed to see any program or indeed any general demand for the reduction of the public debt. Several plans have been advanced for both taxes and expenditures in the post-war years. I have seen none for the reduction or retirement of the public debt. Recently I saw an article in the United States News, an able and conservative newspaper, proposing various post-war budgets. One was based on a probable income of $80,000,000,000; another on a probable annual income of $100,000,000,000, and still another which envisioned an annual income of $120,000,000,000 by our people. In not one of these budgets, including the highest, was 1 dime set up for the retirement of any part of the public debt. All of the proposed budgets contained an item of $6,000,000,000 for the payment of the interest on the debt, but none of them set forth a specific fund for the purpose of retiring any part of it.

Mr. President, it is disturbing to me to see practically all of our people who are thinking in terms of the post-war budget show no interest in reducing the public debt. When are we to pay for this war? Has everyone in this country subscribed to the philosophy of those who contend that it is a good thing for this country and our people to carry on deficit financing indefinitely at a time when the public indebtedness will probably reach $300,000,000,000? For my part I do not sub-

scribe to that theory. With the exception of those who have gone into the armed forces, there has been practically no sacrifice on the part of our people in this war. But pay day will come sooner or later, and we will have to pay for it in one way or another. It will not be openly repudiated. It can only be paid by high taxes and prudent spending, or it will be paid through inflation and reducing the value of the dollar. This of course would be a method of repudiation, to which we should not resort. We should pay as much as possible of the public debt while times are good, income is high, and money is abundant. The locked-up buying power of the American people will carry us for some years, but sooner or later we are sure to run into fiscal difficulties in this country. The extent of our troubles will be largely determined by the amount of the public indebtedness. When the depression does come, how will we be able to finance a huge public-works program with such a debt? How would we finance another war in case we should be again attacked, which God forbid, if we start into hostilities with an indebtedness of $300,000,000,000? We must not close our eyes to the difficulties which may require large expenditures in the future. I propose to be very careful about helping commit ourselves to large expenditures or to drastic reduction of taxes in this period of prosperity until there has been some provision for an orderly retirement of a substantial portion of our public debt. We will certainly never get around to retiring any of it if we accept the theory that the money paid as taxes by special groups of citizens into the common Treasury should be allocated and appropriated for the benefit of the class of taxpayers who paid the money.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. HAYDEN. I should like to ask the Senator from Georgia a question, because I am interested in his philosophy.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, will the Senator permit me to make an observation?

Mr. HAYDEN. I should like to ask the Senator from Georgia a question before I yield, because I am interested in his philosophy.

I am sure the Senator will concede it to be true that if there is substantial unemployment in the United States—unemployment of, let us say, 3,000,000, 4,000,000, or 5,000,000 persons—there certainly must be some sort of public-works program.

Mr. RUSSELL. I would certainly support it in that event. But I would not want to meet that condition and find that we have a still larger public debt to carry and be unable to afford relief to our people on account of our failure to exercise good judgment in times of prosperity.

Mr. HAYDEN. Let me ask the Senator another question. Is it better to plan ahead and to have a program of sound projects ready, so that if there is unemployment—and it is to be assumed that there will be some, at least—the money will be expended in a proper way, or shall we wait until the unemployment is actually with us, and then improvise projects, as we did under the W. P. A.?

Mr. RUSSELL. If the Senator will adopt in his bill the philosophy he has just expressed, I shall be happy to support it. If he will insert in the bill a provision that the program will not take effect until we have any reasonable number of unemployed in this country, I shall withdraw any objection.

But the bill as presented has absolutely no relation to a depression, to unemployment, or to hard times or to the cost of materials or to the cost of labor. It is a flat three year proposition, providing for the expenditure of approximately $2,200,000,000 from the Federal Treasury, although actually we would have to borrow that money at a time when we should be enjoying relative prosperity and reducing the debt. There is a huge spending power in this country which will carry us over the first year or two after the war has ended; I think most of us agree that that is the case. Without regard to conditions in the country, under the terms of this bill there will be expended in the first year it is in effect, including the funds contributed by the States, around $1,500,000,000.

If the Senator will amend his bill with a provision that it shall not take effect until there are a certain number of people unemployed in the country—any reasonable number of unemployed who are unable to find work elsewhere—I shall be happy to support the bill. The construction of public roads is one of the most important and useful features of any necessary public works program that the Congress could possibly adopt. I have always fought for priority for public roads in all of our programs of public works. But any such pretentious program as is envisioned in this bill should have some connection with or relation to the need for the prevention of unemployment. As the bill stands now, this is not the case.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, if the Senator will pardon me, let me say that I have proceeded on an entirely different assumption. I have assumed that we cannot have prosperity in the United States without having an adequate transportation system. It is conceded that we do not have such a system now. It is just as essential as any other element to our prosperity. It is just as much a cost to the consumer, whether it is paid for in the cost of transportation or in the cost of materials or in the cost of labor. We pay for these roads, regardless of whether we have them.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for an observation?

Mr. HAYDEN. I was about to yield to the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Georgia whether he would suspend indefinitely a road construction program because of the fact that the Government is in debt.

Mr. RUSSELL. No; that is not my position, and I did not make such a statement. I am willing to support a reasonable measure for road construction and improvement to commence immediately upon the end of the war and the availability of materials. My objection is to the magnitude of this proposal. I am perfectly willing to go along with a reasonable proposition. I think I am correct in the statement—and the Senator from Arizona can correct me if I am in error, for he has been the author of most of our highway legislation—that $135,000,000 is as much as we have ever authorized in any 1 year heretofore from Federal funds to assist the States in highway construction. This does not include, of course, the unusual public works grants incorporated in public works programs to combat unemployment. As compared with this sum, the pending bill proposes to spend nearly $2,200,000,000 over a 3-year period. It proposes to spend $650,000,000 a year for the construction of roads in and between towns and cities, in rural areas, and for the elimination of grade crossings. It proposes to increase the appropriations for forest highways to $25,000,000 a year for 3 years, with the additional sum of $12,500,000 for forest development, roads, and trails. It appropriates $12,750,000 a year for roads and trails in national parks, with the additional sum of $5,000,000 a year for access roads to national parks and national monuments.

This will take approximately $700,000,000 a year from a National Treasury which will lack $300,000,000,000 of having any money in it. Instead of so much talk about reducing taxes and appropriating money to be spent after the war, we should tackle this gigantic public debt. How are we going to pay it? It will not be paid by reducing taxes and increasing expenditures on such vast public works programs.

The Senator has said that the roads are wearing out. I concede that many of them are in bad shape and in need of repair. However, we must bear in mind that there is nearly $150,000,000 of money heretofore appropriated for public roads which the States can match for expenditures immediately after the war, or on essential projects at the present time. I should like to point out, also, that it is proposed to put this program into effect at a time when there will probably be fewer automobiles on the highways than we have seen for several years. No new automobiles have been produced for some time, and I recently heard that the average age of those in use at the present is 7 years. I also recently read a statement that around one and a half million automobiles are wearing out and going off of the roads every year. By the time that automobiles are back in production and the average person is able to buy them, we may have reached the need for a public-works program, and we can then build the roads.

There are other things in the bill which are innovations. One of them is a provision to permit the use of Federal funds, as I now understand, to buy rights-of-way. That has been done in special public-works bills in the past, but I think I am correct in saying—and I have tried to keep up with this legislation in the past—that this is the first time in a Federal-State aid roads project that we have authorized the Federal Government

to buy rights-of-way. I do not think such a departure is a wise one. The States and counties can buy the rights-of-way for much less than the Federal Government can buy them.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, the Senator is entirely mistaken in that respect. We aid the States in acquiring rights-of-way, but there is no Federal condemnation.

Mr. RUSSELL. I know that there is no Federal condemnation of lands for highways. However, it will be impossible to keep the jurors who pass on condemnation cases from knowing that the Federal Government is contributing funds to pay for the lands condemned. They will either read it in accounts of this legislation or the defense attorney will get word to them. It is perfectly natural for jurors to award larger verdicts when the Federal Government is footing the bill. If the juror is a taxpayer in his county and if he realizes that the funds to pay for the lands condemned will come from the county treasury, he will make a much more modest verdict than if the funds are provided by the Federal Government. He will come much nearer to arriving at the true value of the lands. I think that this departure from the present system is very dangerous. It will cost more money, and will give the Federal Government more authority over the States in the matter of highway construction.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I assume that the Senator is not opposed to Federal highway legislation along such normal lines as we pursued in the past.

Mr. RUSSELL. I have just offered an amendment which would strike out from the bill the sum of $1,950,000,000, reduce it to $600,000,000, and make the expenditures $200,000,000 a year instead of $650,000,000. This sum will be about $65,000,000 more than we have ever spent for such purposes in any previous year. I hope that the Members of the Senate will consider the amendment when it is reached.

Mr. McCLELLAN. The amount which the Senator has indicated would be for all purposes?

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I agree with the Senator in what he has said about the national debt. It becomes the duty of Congress as well as of all responsible Government officials, to take the matter into account. Only a few days ago there was before us for consideration—and is now in conference—a proposal to appropriate many billions of dollars for unemployment compensation. I say to the Senator from Georgia that I think that such a program is too ambitious, but certainly legislation of this character is needed.

Mr. RUSSELL. I grant that some legislation should be enacted to provide for the normal Federal aid road program.

Mr. McCLELLAN. It is far sounder to have ready projects which will furnish employment on a safe basis than to propose measures which are almost unlimited, or ultra ambitious in providing for unemployment compensation. Legislation establishing projects by which both State and Federal funds would be used would provide employment on projects that would add to the capital wealth of the Nation. That would be a much sounder policy or philosophy than to undertake to appropriate huge sums of money and provide machinery for the payment of unemployment compensation. I do not say that I favor the bill in its entirety, but I favor the program of post-war highway construction.

Mr. RUSSELL. I subscribe to the statement of my friend, the Senator from Arkansas, and if he will relate this bill to unemployment and a public works program to relieve distress and give work to those who need it I shall support it. This is not an ordinary Federal aid to highways measure.

In its present form it is proposed to put into process the expenditure of almost $1,500,000,000 for the first year in carrying out a road program at a time when we would have less unemployment in this country than we have ever had before.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. As I understand, the bill would not only authorize the expenditure of vast sums of money, but would have an absolute bearing on contracts by the Federal Government for the expenditure of $650,000,000 the first year. So we are asked to determine now a part of the post-war budget.

Mr. HAYDEN. There is no question about that. Legislation cannot be enacted and obtain cooperation of the States unless they have a firm understanding that if they bear their share of the financial burden, the Federal Government will perform its share of the work.

Mr. TAFT. It has been suggested that the highway users will be paying the money. As a matter of fact, a 1-cent gasoline tax produces about $200,000,000 a year. A tax of one-half a cent, which was added before the war and which should be taken off, will return another $100,000,000 of the $650,000,000. All the excise taxes have been levied for war purposes, not for road purposes. The present tax should be reduced, so that during the 3-year period of spending $650,000,000 a year we will not raise from the automobile users anything like $350,000,000, or anything like the sum raised before the war started, which, as I understand, was approximately $300,000,000.

Mr. HAYDEN. As I understand, the Senator from Ohio does not object to a gasoline tax, and a tax on automobile parts if he knows the money will be used in the construction and reconstruction of roads. Of course, if the money collected is to be diverted and used for other governmental purposes the tax should not be collected.

Mr. TAFT. Is it not true that in many States money is being raised by a tax imposed on the purchase of gasoline and used for other purposes? We are being asked to help States take money away from the highway users and divert it to other purposes. Under the bill the States would come to the Federal Government and ask for 60 percent of the money to be used.

Mr. HAYDEN. I think the bill would do more to prevent diversion of funds by State legislatures than anything else that we could do. During the depression, when very little highway work was being done, State legislatures diverted funds collected through gasoline taxes because they were hard up. The States are now in excellent financial condition, and the time to bring an end to the diversion of gasoline-tax funds by the States is now.

Mr. TAFT. The bill does not state that it will stop diversion on the part of the States.

Mr. HAYDEN. The existing law provides that if there is any further diversion of funds after the enactment of the law, the States will not receive any further aid. Some States will cease diversion if substantial sums from the Federal Government are made available to them.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield to me?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. I wish to make a suggestion to the Senator. It seems to me that this matter is of such tremendous importance, involving as it does a new policy and affecting one of the most important post-war problems, that consideration of it should be postponed until after election. Fifty-six Senators are present today. That is more than a quorum. But so far as I am concerned I cannot be present tomorrow. Frankly, we have an Ohio State Republican convention in session tomorrow, and I plan to be present. Other Senators who are absent are presumably away because of similar obligations. This is the first time we have been asked to consider a post-war budget. For the first time we are proposing to fix an expenditure of the Federal Government for the post-war normal budget. For the first 3 years after the war it is proposed that the Federal Government commit itself to a $650,000,000 program for roads. I think that amount is large. I have not gone over the budget. No one has yet attempted to say what the budget will amount to. If we have any prosperity at all, how much money will we raise after taxes are reduced? I do not know. If we can raise $17,000,000,000 I think we will do very well. Our budget will call for approximately that sum of money.

Of course, money for public roads and public works should be provided in the budget, but how much? I cannot personally judge. I think the Federal Government should put into its budget provision for whatever public works are worth while, whether they be rivers, harbors, roads, or anything of that nature, on the basis of whether the work is worth performing. I admit that the roads are probably the most justified form of public works. How fast we can rebuild our highway system, or repair losses, I do not know. I do not see how the determination of whether it will take 3 years or 10 years can be made until we know what the post-war budget will look like.

I appeal to the Senator to defer consideration of this bill until after the November election. We can take it up then. A great deal of work is being done on both post-war expenditures and post-war taxes. I think we can get a fairly reasonable picture of what the post-war program will be. After the war there will be many tag ends. The Army will be somewhat reduced. However, we should raise enough money to pay the normal expenditures which will be involved in the post-war program.

I disagree with the theory that unemployment can be cured by a public-works program. I do not think that a billion dollars spent on public roads would give employment to more than 500,000 men.

Mr. HAYDEN. I think the Senator is correct in that regard.

Mr. TAFT. I believe that approximately $2,000 on work of this character will be required in order to provide one job, taking into account all the facts of the program. After the war we will have to employ approximately 55,000,000 persons. Not 500,000, but 55,000,000. My only hope of employing persons in the post-war period is to have sound business and a sound financial structure. We must establish a tax system which will encourage persons to go into business and provide jobs. A public-works program will help unemployment to some extent, but I have not seen any public-works program yet that will help very much. A $5,000,000,000 program will not provide employment for more than two and a half million men out of a total of 55,000,000 who will need employment. Our whole attention should be centered on stimulating private enterprise, and public-works programs are not justified as a means of curing unemployment, certainly not in the initial period.

Public works ought to be supported on the basis of their essential soundness. I am willing to go along with that, and pay just as much for public works as I think we can afford out of the entire budget. I do not know how much that may be. It may be a billion dollars, and if a billion dollars is provided for public works it may be that $650,000,000 is the right amount for roads. I do not know. However, particularly since the Senator admits there are many things that ought to be considered, and since the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] says there were only two or three meetings of the committee and this has to do with a fundamental question of Federal policy in the post-war period, I think the bill ought to go back to the committee and the committee ought to give consideration to the fundamental questions I am stating, and try to relate the bill to the post-war budget. I know the George committee is doing the same thing with the general subjects of a post-war budget and post-war taxes. I really appeal to the Senator to take this bill back to the committee, study it thoroughly, and I shall cooperate certainly a hundred percent after the election in trying to work out this problem and to get this thing done by the time the legislatures meet in January.

Mr. HAYDEN. The difficulty about that is that after the election is over maybe the bill will come back and maybe it will not. We cannot tell what the political effect is going to be. I do know that this is a matter which must be passed upon by the State legislatures.

The Senator from Ohio should make the distinction that this is the only type of public works as to which the States are compelled to contribute in order that the work may be done. If we are going to go into other types of public works all at Federal expense, I would say "Yes, it would be well to include them all and see what the total would be, but highway work can be differentiated from every other kind of public works because of State cooperation." In order to obtain State cooperation it is necessary to give the States advance notice. There is one fact that no one can dispute, namely, that it usually takes on a highway job of any consequence as long to plan it as it does to build it. It is necessary to look a long time ahead and long notice must be given the States in order that the job may be done.

I remember very well when we provided the first appropriation for works for unemployment in 1933. We appropriated $3,300,000,000. Nobody in either branch of Congress would ask that that money be spent upon substantial public works that would add to the wealth of the Nation. What happened? We appropriated money but there were no plans. The money was allocated where there was supposed to be some planning, but it could not be spent, and in the meantime, off in one corner, Mr. Harry Hopkins began with the W. P. A. He had a very small appropriation, and soon exhausted his funds. Then any money allocated, after larger public works extending beyond a year, was turned over to Mr. Hopkins, and so, in the course of time we spent more money in the depression era through the W. P. A. than we spent upon standard public works. That is the fear I now have, that we will waste the public funds because of lack of planning. We cannot do the planning. If the States are to do the work they must do the planning, and must have advance notice.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. Is it not true that the States are now planning? I know our highway department already has adequate plans for roads which are to be built. I have no objection to appropriating money to help them go ahead with plans. There is such a provision in the George bill which we are now considering in conference. If the only question is to help the States in their planning, that is a very simple thing, and we would not have to appropriate $650,000,000 immediately for their planning.

Mr. HAYDEN. There could be planning in a vague and general way, but if there is something specific there could be a real job of planning.

Now, I desire to discuss the question about the size of the bill which has been criticized on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. The Senator spoke about the necessity of time for planning. Is it not a fact that every State highway commission in the country has a whole group of projects which have already been planned and approved by the Bureau?

Mr. HAYDEN. Those are comparatively small projects. They are of no great consequence.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Oh, no; there are great arterial highways running through our States, hundreds of miles of highways, planned for years, and ready to go ahead.

Mr. HAYDEN. We heard that same story before, but when the time came the projects did not materialize.

Now, Mr. President, I wish to discuss the size of the bill, because it has been criticized generally. The Association of State Highway Officials said that in order to do an efficient job, in order to have an adequate system to take care of traffic which was then on the highways and which it is expected will be on the highways after the war, there ought to be merely, as a cold-blooded business proposition, a billion dollars a year spent each year after the war. That is what it will cost. The argument was made that there were States that could not match so large a sum of money. So it was proposed to reduce the amount. We arrived at this point based upon the amount of money collected by the Federal Government from the road users.

We have very good authority for adopting that provision. Senators will remember that Republican Governors met with Mr. Dewey in St. Louis——

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. HAYDEN. I should like to read what the governors said.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. I should like to understand in my mind what the Senator has said.

Mr. HAYDEN. I said we recommended $650,000,000 a year because $650,000,000 is the closest approximation of what we believe the Federal Government will collect during the period from the users of highways under the present Federal taxation schedule on gasoline, oil, tires, tubes, and automobiles.

When the Republican Governors met in St. Louis this was the declaration they made with respect to highways. I read it in full:

> Federal aid in building and maintaining highways, as carried out under Republican administrations and since continued, is a sound and comparatively harmonious program.
>
> In principle, taxes collected by the Federal Government from gasoline and from motor vehicles should be wholly devoted to highway purposes and distributed equitably among the States.
>
> Actual construction by the State governments has demonstrated how eminently successful such cooperative enterprises can be when State responsibility is recognized by the Federal Government and accepted by the States. This practice should be continued.

The Governors of the States knew about their highway departments. I have no doubt that if an equal number of Democratic Governors were assembled they would make the same kind of a declaration.

I can see no reason for delaying consideration of this bill beyond the time the Senate may make up its mind. We are wholly familiar with the principle of Federal aid. We adopted it in 1916. Now we come to a time when we realize that our highway system is not adequate to meet the needs of the country. It was not adequate at the time we went into the war, and everybody knew it. We have the terrific problem of bottlenecks, getting in and out of cities, traffic jams. The greatest problem of millions of Americans today is how they are to go from where they live to their jobs and back without getting tied up in traffic. That is the city problem. The country problem is when the farmers are growing greater crops than ever how can they get their products from the farm to the market without getting stuck in the mud.

There are two great highway problems. So far as the main trunk-line highways are concerned, the problem is fairly well solved, and people can travel over the country. There are about 225,000 miles of that kind of highways. But a survey of the strategic network of highways in the United States disclosed that there are 150,000 miles of such highways that ought to be improved. They have too many curves, they have a type of bridges that will not carry the strain and stress. So we have not a perfect system of highways; and if we are going to try to run the country in 1946, 1947, and 1948 on 1930 roads we cannot have prosperity

Mr. REED. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. REED. I wish to thank the Senator from Arizona for yielding so generously, and to explain that when the Senator from Georgia took us both off our feet, without any regard for the rules of the Senate, I was going to conclude with this statement:

The urgency of this case comes from the State highway commissions and the State highway officials. I sat in conference in the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads with these officials a year and a half ago when they laid down the broad principles of a program for a billion dollars a year on a 75–25 basis, if you please.

There will be ample opportunity for discussion of this matter tomorrow. I hope the motion of the Senator from Arizona will prevail, and then that the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads will consider the amendments, express their judgment if they desire, and tomorrow we may proceed with the general discussion of the merits or lack of merits of this case.

I want to make only one more statement, Mr. President, and that is that without exception all highway departments in this country employed by the States and representing the States want us to say what we are going to do and what is going to be available for them to work with next year, because they must obtain authority from their legislatures before they can do anything beyond routine work.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. KILGORE. I wish to say one other thing, that due to the shortage of transportation—and I happened to notice it all over the United States, and particularly in my State—trucks have been greatly overloaded and have been driven over highways which the States have not had the materials to maintain and keep in proper repair. I know of nine counties in my State in which the road system has almost ceased to exist due to war needs and the fact that we were putting 10-ton loads on 2½-ton chassis in order to get material to places where needed.

I think the time has come when we should give the State road commissions a chance to make their plans, and give them some help if we expect the road program to proceed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado in the chair). Does the Senator from Arizona yield to the Senator from South Dakota?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. A thought occurs to me in connection with the proposal of the Senator from Arizona. He stated that the road program was based approximately upon the amount of money the Federal Government collected by way of Federal gas and oil taxes. There is a general feeling throughout the country, and especially back in the States, and I know, on the part of Members of Congress, that the tax in question was an emergency tax placed upon gas and oil at a time when the money was needed for the emergency, and that the tax should be repealed as soon as the war is over. We may repeal that tax as soon as the war is over, and the Senator now is proposing to expend a couple of billion dollars based on something which may not be in existence when the time comes to make the appropriations.

Mr. HAYDEN. I am assuming that if Congress passes the proposed legislation we will retain the gasoline tax; that if Congress does not pass the proposed legislation, the gasoline tax will be repealed. The two things go together, according to the declaration I have read.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. STEWART. The Senator made a motion, as I understand, to recommit the bill to the committee?

Mr. HAYDEN. No; the pending motion is to proceed to consideration of the bill.

Mr. STEWART. Then it is not planned to recommit the bill to the committee?

Mr. HAYDEN. Oh, no; not at all.

Mr. STEWART. I was out of the Chamber when the Senator made some statement along that line.

Mr. HAYDEN. I made the statement that I thought it would be advantageous to the Senate if members of the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, who are familiar with the subject, could be given an opportunity to look over the proposed amendments which Senators may offer, so that if acceptable to the members of the committee, they could recommend acceptance, rather than that I should do so on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. STEWART. Then the motion is to proceed to consideration of the bill now, and the Senator from Arizona proposes to press the motion at this time?

Mr. HAYDEN. The pending motion is that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the bill.

Mr. STEWART. I will say to the Senator that I have amendments which I shall offer.

I listened to the very able statement made by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], who, by the way, I did not understand to take either the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] or the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED] off their feet. I thought he abided by the rules of the Senate. However, his statements were very persuasive and full of good sense and good judgment. Of course, the time will come—the time, as a matter of fact, is always here in one degree or another—when we must give consideration to the amount of the public debt and the ability of the country to repay it, but I look upon this road bill, I will say to the Senator from Arizona, in a somewhat different light. I think there is a definite need for rebuilding many roads in this country. For the past few years, not only since the United States has actually been engaged in the war, since December 7, 1941, but in the preceding period, to which we refer as the time when we were preparing for our national defense, road-building material was not available, and most States were not only unable to build new roads but were unable to repair old roads, to keep the roads which were already in existence in a fair and reasonable state of repair. In the past 4 or 5 years, which is about the period of time my observation has covered, most of us have traveled about in various sections of the country and have seen the condition into which the highways and the roads have been allowed to fall by reason not only of inability of the States and the counties to procure the necessary materials for road construction but also by reason of the serious manpower problem, when our whole country has had its shoulder to the wheel in an effort to keep our fighting men on the various fronts of the earth equipped with the necessary sinews of war. So, for that reason, it is necessary that pretty soon some attention be given to the road situation.

The Army itself has carried on training and other operations throughout practically all the 48 States of the Union, and I know that particularly in the middle section of my State of Tennessee, where maneuvers were held for a solid year, almost every road is actually obliterated. My colleague will bear me out in that statement. Some bridges have been condemned as the result of the extremely heavy traffic they have been required to bear on account of the movement of troops and war materials and war essentials. Bridges which were limited to a certain number of tons have been strained even beyond their capacity. Highways which were built for peacetime use have had to carry vehicles of war, and have had to carry trucks loaded with war materials which weighed many tons more than the roads were built to bear.

So the roads have been seriously damaged. I am sure the entire road system of the country has been hurt. Many of the cities, anxious to rebuild streets which are in a bad state of repair, have been unable to do so for the reasons I have already mentioned with respect to country roads and highways. Therefore I think that some measure must be considered by this body at a reasonably early date at least to give relief to a situation which now exists, with which we are now confronted, and which we must remedy.

Mr. President, I am especially interested in the rural-road construction, the so-called farm-to-market roads. About 10 months ago I introduced a bill which was designed to build an all-weather type of farm-to-market roads throughout the entire Nation in the post-war period. The bill was not only introduced for the purpose of aiding unemployment, if there should be unemployment, which there probably will be at some period or another after the war, but it was designed to meet a need, designed to place the farmers of the Nation upon all-weather roads, so that they might transport their produce to market. A farmer is just as close to town as the condition of the highway or the road on which he lives will permit.

I am interested, therefore, in that feature of the bill reported by the Senator from Arizona which provides for the expenditure, as I recall, of about $200,000,000 annually for a period of 3 years on farm-to-market roads. The only thing I regret about the proposal is that the amount, in my opinion, will not be ample. I think the country has been derelict in its duty to the farmers in that respect. We have spent probably extravagant sums on great highways, but we have neglected the men who are in a large measure the backbone of the Nation. I am particularly interested in that feature of the bill reported by the Senator from Arizona, to which I submitted an amendment today, which I hope the Senator will seriously consider, which would set up in the P. R. A. a separate division known as the Rural Roads Division, to be presided over by an administrator or commissioner or director, or whatever title it is preferred to give him, who would be appointed by Mr. MacDonald, the present Commissioner of Public Roads. I have submitted that amendment for the purpose of emphasizing the need for attention to the so-called farm-to-market roads on the part of the Congress of the United States; not simply construction of such roads as were constructed in the W. P. A. days, and were abandoned, but in the construction of roads of as permanent a nature as cheap farm-to-market roads can be built, the specifications and so forth to be determined by those in the particular communities which the roads will serve, or by the officials in the county or in the particular political subdivision which will be served. I believe that such a Rural Roads Division is necessary. I believe it is highly important because there is need for extending our great national highway system. Repair of the existing roads, which compose a part of the system about which I have been speaking, requires the specific attention of expert engineers and road builders who have in mind the building of roads which can carry heavy loads, and roads on which vehicles can operate at a high rate of speed. That is a different type of road from the kind of road which my amendment contemplates. I believe that this place should be filled by a man who has the vision which the farmers desire him to have—the kind of man about whom county highway authorities, county judges, and county road supervisors throughout the Nation have been talking for the past 10 or 15 years.

I believe that there is special need for attention to rural roads. I do not believe that a man with a superhighway in mind is the man to give attention to the building of such roads. I have been told by men from many States in the Union who are interested in the building of farm-to-market roads that they have been unable to obtain cooperation from the Public Roads Administration because of the fact that the requirements and specifications for such roads have been made entirely too high. As I see it, that is a perfectly natural consequence. A man who has in mind building superhighways simply cannot bring himself down to the ground to consider the building of farm-to-market roads costing $2,000, $3,000, or $4,000 a mile.

One of the finest things done by the W. P. A., in the days when it was necessary and was in operation, was the building of so-called farm-to-market roads. Some of the counties in the various States have maintained such roads. They have placed oiled surfaces on them to prevent them from washing away, and today those roads are serving a good purpose. Of course, many of them have been allowed to wash away and are of no further benefit.

I am speaking of the cheaper type of road, the farm-to-market road. That type of road is not required to bear heavy traffic. It is not required to be constructed so that rapidly moving vehicles can travel over it. The type of road which I have in mind is an all-weather farm-to-market road, built as cheaply as it can be built, in the various counties which it serves. The counties should be the judges. Such roads enable the farmers of the Nation to bring their produce to market. That is a definite responsibility of Congress. It is a problem to which we should give attention. That is the problem which I wish to emphasize by my amendment, and I hope I have done so.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I wish to express the hope that the motion of the Senator from Arizona will prevail. I do not know whether the amounts named in the bill are the amounts which should be named, and I do not know whether all the provisions of the bill are what they should be. It seems to me that we should authorize the appropriation of a considerable amount of money—perhaps as much as is provided for in the bill—and that it should be properly related to the question of unemployment so that it may be made available when needed.

We all know that the war will end some day. We do not know what day it will end; but we feel that in Europe, at least, it will end very soon. On all sides we hear expressions of fear as to what will happen when the war ends. We ought to rejoice that we are near the end of the war. We ought not to fear it, but we ought to be ready for it.

The effects of unemployment are cumulative. If we once let unemployment get away from us, it will go like a snowball rolling down hill. If by having ready at the end of the war a program of public works which will provide employment for 1,000,000 men we can prevent the unemployment of 10,000,000 men a year or two later, that is exactly what we should do at this time.

We have been back here since about the 1st of August and I cannot think of one constructive piece of work that the Congress has completed up to this time. If we do not do any more than we have done thus far, we shall justify what the critics are saying and have said about the Congress. We have not yet enacted one single piece of constructive legislation to get ready for the end of the war. The executive department has established some machinery to prepare for the end of the war. We criticize the executive department for taking things into its own hands; and yet if the war should end tomorrow it seems to me that the only thing that would save the country from economic chaos would be another series of Executive orders and executive agencies of various kinds.

We do not wish to see such a situation arise. I hope that we will get ready for the end of the war. It seems to me that the first thing we should do is to proceed to consider the bill which is the subject of the motion of the Senator from Arizona.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I believe the Senator from Vermont will agree with me that there is absolute necessity for an improvement in the Federal highway system throughout the Nation, and that the roads which bring products from the farms to the markets require immediate attention because of the pounding which our highway system has received, and the congestion of traffic in the cities. The only disagreement there could be would be as to the degree to which we should try to meet the situation. My judgment is that the amount of money provided by the bill would not be sufficient to do a good job.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I believe that very person in the country knows that it is absolutely necessary to restore the highways at least to the condition in which they were before the war. I also believe that unless we are willing to admit that our economy has reached a static condition, we must have a great elaboration of the highway system which we had before the war. I believe that the very life of our economy depends upon our transportation system. I have no sympathy whatever with the defeatists and the pessimists who talk about returning to pre-war conditions. I believe that we shall require the greatest expansion of all forms of transportation which the country ever knew, including

highways, airways, waterways, and railways. I have noticed that when one form of transportation improves its services, all other forms also gain.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 2105.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I should like to have a vote on my motion.

Mr. WHITE. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Guffey	Reed
Andrews	Gurney	Robertson
Ball	Hatch	Russell
Bankhead	Hayden	Scrugham
Barkley	Hill	Shipstead
Bridges	Johnson, Calif.	Stewart
Burton	Johnson, Colo.	Taft
Bushfield	Kilgore	Thomas, Okla.
Byrd	Langer	Thomas, Utah
Capper	McClellan	Tunnell
Caraway	McKellar	Tydings
Chavez	Maloney	Vandenberg
Connally	Maybank	Walsh, Mass.
Cordon	Mead	Walsh, N. J.
Danaher	Millikin	Weeks
Davis	Moore	White
Ferguson	Nye	Wiley
George	O'Mahoney	

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MCKELLAR in the chair). Fifty-three Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

The question is on the motion of the Senator from Arizona to proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 2105.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, on that motion I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. REED (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER]. I understand that on this question he would vote as I am about to vote, and therefore I am at liberty to vote. I vote "yea."

Mr. STEWART (when his name was called). I have a pair with the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. HOLMAN]. I transfer that pair to the Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN] and will vote. I vote "yea."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. DAVIS. I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER]. I understand that he would vote as I am about to vote. I am, therefore, free to vote, and I vote "yea."

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. BILBO], the Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE], and the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] are absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JACKSON], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCFARLAND], the Senator from Utah [Mr. MURDOCK], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON], the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN], the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER], and the Senator from Washington [Mr. WALLGREN] are detained on public business.

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the Senators from Rhode Island [Mr. GERRY and Mr. GREEN], the Senator from Texas [Mr. O'DANIEL], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. RADCLIFFE], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. REYNOLDS], and the Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] is also necessarily absent.

Mr. WHITE. The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN], the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BUCK], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HAWKES], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. HOLMAN], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. THOMAS], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. WILLIS], and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. WILSON] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. NYE], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY], and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] are absent on official business.

The result was announced—yeas 35, nays 18, as follows:

YEAS—35

Aiken	Gillette	Millikin
Ball	Guffey	O'Mahoney
Bankhead	Hatch	Reed
Barkley	Hayden	Robertson
Capper	Hill	Scrugham
Caraway	Johnson, Calif.	Shipstead
Chavez	Johnson, Colo.	Stewart
Connally	Kilgore	Thomas, Okla.
Cordon	McClellan	Thomas, Utah
Davis	McKellar	Tunnell
Ferguson	Maybank	Walsh, Mass.
George	Mead	

NAYS—18

Andrews	Gurney	Tydings
Bridges	Langer	Vandenberg
Burton	Maloney	Walsh, N. J.
Bushfield	Moore	Weeks
Byrd	Russell	White
Danaher	Taft	Wiley

NOT VOTING—43

Austin	Glass	Radcliffe
Bailey	Green	Revercomb
Bilbo	Hawkes	Reynolds
Bone	Holman	Smith
Brewster	Jackson	Thomas, Idaho
Brooks	La Follette	Tobey
Buck	Lucas	Truman
Butler	McCarran	Wagner
Chandler	McFarland	Wallgren
Clark, Idaho	Murdock	Wheeler
Clark, Mo.	Murray	Wherry
Downey	Nye	Willis
Eastland	O'Daniel	Wilson
Ellender	Overton	
Gerry	Pepper	

So Mr. HAYDEN's motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2105) to amend and supplement the Federal Aid Road Act, approved July 11, 1916, as amended and supplemented; to authorize appropriations for the post-war construction of highways and bridges; to eliminate hazards at railroad-grade crossings; to provide for the immediate preparation of plans and acquisition of rights-of-way; and for other purposes.

Mr. WHERRY subsequently said: Mr. President, I was not in the Chamber this afternoon when the yea-and-nay vote was taken on the motion to proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 2105. I should like to have the RECORD show that if I had been present and privileged to vote, I would have voted against taking up the bill at this time, with the provisions it now contains.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is before the Senate and open to amendment.

Mr. HILL. I offer an amendment, not to be considered at this time but simply in order that it may be printed and be before the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads in the morning, and for consideration by the Senate at a later date.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be received, printed, and lie on the table.

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, I desire to offer an amendment to the pending road bill. On pages 4, line 23, strike out the period after the word "census" and insert a comma and the following language: *"Provided,* That New England towns shall be considered municipalities regardless of their incorporated status."

Mr. President, I also offer the following amendment:

On page 4, line 16, strike out the period after the word "act" and insert a comma and the following language: *"Provided,* That no State shall receive less than an apportionment equal to six-tenths of the percentage of the Federal gasoline tax collected in the State, as measured by the total net amount taxed value in Public Roads Administration Statistical Report G–2 for 1941."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendments will be received, printed, and lie on the table.

Mr. MALONEY. I should like to give notice that I shall tomorrow offer the following amendment:

On page 5, line 14, after the word "exceed", to strike out "60" and insert "40."

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I desire to offer an amendment to the so-called road bill on page 5, line 14, to strike out "60" and insert "50."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator desire to have the amendment considered now?

Mr. BYRD. I ask that it lie on the table and be printed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That order will be made.

NAMING OF LAKE FORMED BY WATERS IMPOUNDED BY DENISON DAM

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I intend momentarily to move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business, it being understood that the road bill will not be proceeded with further this afternoon. Several amendments have been offered, and the committee is going to consider them tomorrow. I should like to have Senators remain in the Chamber because we are going to enter upon the consideration of the Executive Calendar, and the first nomination on the calendar is a subject of controversy, and it will probably be necessary to have a yea-and-nay vote

upon it. I hope therefore that Senators will not leave the chamber.

Before moving an executive session, Mr. President, I was about to say that at the border between Texas and Oklahoma, under an act of Congress providing for the improvement of the Red River and the impounding of its waters, there has been created a reservoir. It was first known as the Denison-Durant Reservoir, and under the act which authorized it, it is now known as the Denison Reservoir. It is the desire on the part of Texas and Oklahoma that the reservoir be given a name which will combine the names of the two States. It is not possible to change the name except by act of Congress, inasmuch as the act under which the reservoir was created names it the Denison Reservoir. The representatives from the two States have agreed on a name for this lake. So, from the Committee on the Library I report favorably, without amendment, Senate bill 2137 which gives the lake the designation of Lake Texoma, which is a combination of Texas and Oklahoma. I ask unanimous consent that the bill be now considered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Kentucky?

There being no objection, the bill (S. 2137) to provide for naming the lake formed by waters of the Red River impounded by Denison Dam, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That from and after the enactment of this act the lake formed by the impounding of waters of the Red River by Denison Dam, the construction of which was authorized by the act of June 28, 1938 (52 Stat. 1215), shall be known and designated on the public records as Lake Texoma.

ANNA M. KOHLER

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of an immigration bill, as to which there is an emergency and as to which there is no contest. It is Calendar No. 1092, House bill 1434, which was passed by the House about a year ago.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H. R. 1434) for the relief of Anna M. Kohler.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, while the bill is reported without amendment, the State Department had recommended a minor amendment. The minor amendment was omitted from the committee report by error, the committee having approved the amendment when it had the bill under consideration. I therefore wish to offer at this time the amendment recommended by the State Department and approved by the committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. Beginning on line 7, after the word "insofar", it is purposed to strike out the words "as the offense which she admitted committing in Canada may be concerned" and insert "as her admission that she had previously sworn falsely in connection with her applications for admission and an extension of stay may be concerned."

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point the letter from the Acting Secretary of State, E. R. Stettinius, Jr., under date of October 29, 1943, setting forth the facts and the reason for the amendment.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, October 29, 1943.

The Honorable RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
United States Senate.

MY DEAR SENATOR RUSSELL: Reference is made to your letter of September 30, 1943, wherein you requested the views of this Department concerning the enactment of H. R. 1434, a bill for the relief of Anna M. Kohler.

The files of the Department disclose that Mrs. Anna M. Kohler was refused an immigration visa on July 9, 1941, at the American Consulate at St. John, New Brunswick, Canada, on the ground that she was inadmissible into the United States under the provisions of section 3 of the Immigration Act of February 5, 1917, as a person who had admitted the commission of an offense involving moral turpitude, namely, perjury.

The basis for the refusal of the visa was Mrs. Kohler's admission at a hearing conducted by the Immigration and Naturalization Service at Boston, Mass., that in applying for an extension of stay on April 3, 1940, she had sworn that she was not gainfully employed, when in fact she was employed at that time. The alien also admitted that she intended to engage in gainful employment at the time that she entered the United States on a visitor's visa on December 21, 1939, which fact was withheld from the immigration officials, and that she secured a position about a month after her entry.

It was noted that the bill provides that an immigration visa shall not be refused and an exclusion at a port of entry shall not be required under the moral turpitude clause of section 3 of the Immigration Act of February 5, 1917, "insofar as the offense which she admitted committing in Canada may be concerned." As Mrs. Kohler admitted having committed in the United States an offense involving moral turpitude, and as she made this admission at the time of her examination by the Immigration and Naturalization Service at Boston, Mass., it is believed that if it is desired to enact legislation authorizing Mrs. Kohler's admission into the United States, this portion of the bill should be amended to read somewhat as follows: "* * * insofar as her admission that she had previously sworn falsely in connection with her applications for admission and an extension of stay may be concerned."

In the event the bill should be amended along the lines suggested, I should interpose no objection to its enactment.

Sincerely yours,
E. R. STETTINIUS, Jr.,
Acting Secretary.

REDUCTION IN VALUE OF OATS IN NORTH DAKOTA

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I desire to read a telegram which I received today, as follows:

ELLENDALE, N. DAK., *September 11, 1944.*

Hon. WILLIAM LANGER,
Washington, D. C.:

Recent decrease in oat value loss to me $1,000. Many other thousands with neighbors. Please enter vicious protest.

ROY BYERS.

FEDERAL AID FOR POST-WAR HIGHWAY CONSTRUCTION

The Senate resumed consideration of the bill (S. 2105) to amend and supplement the Federal Aid Road Act, approved July 11, 1916, as amended and supplemented, to authorize appropriations for the post-war construction of highways and bridges, to eliminate hazards at railroad-grade crossings, to provide for the immediate preparation of plans and acquisition of rights-of-way, and for other purposes.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I have heretofore sent to the desk and asked to have printed and to lie on the table, an amendment to the pending bill, S. 2105, reducing the amounts which are provided in various allocations.

I wish to have printed and to lie on the table, and considered by the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads which meets tomorrow, an amendment which would strike out, wherever it may appear in the bill, any authority to expend Federal funds for the acquisition of rights-of-way.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment will be printed and lie on the table.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, it is my understanding that a meeting of the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads has been called for tomorrow morning at 10:30, at which time Senate bill 2105 will be considered. I consider the bill to be of tremendous importance. In view of what I believe to be its great importance, I hope that all Senators who have amendments which they intend to propose will submit the amendments now and ask that they be printed, in order that they may be available for consideration of the committee tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair suggests that the clerk of the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads should have made available to him copies of the printed amendments.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that all the amendments which are submitted to Senate bill 2105 may be printed, and that the committee may have copies of the amendments so they may be available for consideration of the committee tomorrow morning.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. BARKLEY. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McKELLAR in the chair) laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. HATCH (for Mr. McFARLAND), from the Committee on the Judiciary:

Benjamin J. McKinney, of Arizona, to be United States marshal for the district of Arizona; and

By Mr. HATCH:

Howard F. Houk, of New Mexico, to be United States attorney for the district of New Mexico, vice Everett M. Grantham, resigned.

By Mr. GEORGE, from the Committee on Finance:

Several officers for promotion in the Regular Corps of the United States Public Health Service.

By Mr. THOMAS of Utah, from the Committee on Military Affairs:

Lt. Gen. Omar Nelson Bradley (brigadier general, U. S. Army), Army of the United States, vice Maj. Gen. Ben Lear, retired, to be major general in the Regular Army with rank from September 8, 1944;

Sundry officers for promotion in the Regular Army; and

Sundry officers for temporary appointment and/or promotion in the Army of the United States, under the provisions of law.

By Mr. McKELLAR, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads;

Sundry postmasters.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the calendar.

FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION—LELAND OLDS

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Leland Olds, of New York, to be member, Federal Power Commission for the term expiring June 22, 1949.

CONFIRMATION OF UNCONTESTED NOMINATIONS

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, in view of the fact that the remainder of the nominations on the Executive Calendar are not of a controversial nature, I ask unanimous consent that all the nominations on the Executive Calendar, except that of Leland Olds, of New York, to be a member of the Federal Power Commission, be considered at this time and confirmed, so that the Senate will have nothing before it except the Olds' nomination.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and, without objection, all nominations on the Executive Calendar, except the nomination of Leland Olds to be a member of the Federal Power Commission, will be confirmed en bloc, and, without objection, the President will be immediately notified.

FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION—LELAND OLDS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The nomination which is in controversy will now be stated.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Leland Olds, of New York, to be member, Federal Power Commission for the term expiring June 22, 1949.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to this nomination?

Mr. MOORE. Mr. President, the matter we now have before us for consideration is the reappointment of Leland Olds as a member of the Federal Power Commission.

The Federal Power Act was passed in 1935 and it repealed partly, and reenacted partly, a law passed in 1920 which was known as the Federal Water Power Act. The act now gives jurisdiction to the Power Commission in the matter of the regulation of water power and resources on navigable streams and the power to regulate electric utility companies engaged in interstate commerce, including the authority to make, fix, and enforce electric utility rates.

In 1938, the Natural Gas Act was passed and under the provisions of this act the transportation of natural gas in interstate commerce, the sale of natural gas in interstate commerce for resale for domestic, commercial, industrial, or any other public consumption, the regulation of natural gas companies engaged in such transportation or sale, excluding the production of natural gas but including the right to regulate all rates and charges made, was committed to the jurisdiction of the Federal Power Commission.

The original Federal Power Commission Act of 1935 was a complete act within itself with respect to the formation of the Commission and its powers and duties to employ personnel, conduct investigations, hearings, and make orders, rules, and regulations.

The procedure with respect to the regulation of water power on navigable streams under the jurisdiction of the Congress provides for a complete procedure and the licensing of rights for the construction of hydroelectric projects on such streams. The act provides that its powers to license the building of power projects shall be subject to the rights of the States for the prior use of water for irrigation purposes.

The section of the Federal Power Act dealing with the regulating of electric utility companies engaged in interstate commerce likewise expressly provides the procedure to be followed by the Commission.

The Federal Power Act provides that the commissioners shall, after the expiration of their initial terms, be appointed, each for a term of 5 years from the date of the expiration of the term for which his predecessor was appointed, except that any person appointed to fill a vacancy shall be appointed only for the unexpired term of his predecessor. Not more than three commissioners shall be appointed from the same political party. The qualifications of the commissioners are stated in a negative manner—that is, no person employed or connected with any licensee, firm, or corporation engaged in the generation, transmission, distribution or sale of power or owning any stocks or bonds thereof, or in any manner interested therein, shall hold the office of commissioner, and the commissioners are prohibited from engaging in any other business or employment. One member of the Commission is designated as chairman by the President. The act fixes the salary of each commissioner.

In 1938 Leland Olds was appointed Chairman of the Federal Power Commission for a term of 5 years and his term of office expired during the present year. He was reappointed in June of this year by the President, as the act provides, which act also provides, like many other acts do, that his appointment shall be confirmed by the Senate. His appointment was referred to the Interstate Commerce Committee. I am a member of that committee. As a member of that committee, I received a great many letters from various State regulatory bodies, some having jurisdiction of the various subject matters within their own States which are dealt with under the act creating the Water Power Act, the Electric Utility Power Act, and the Natural Gas Act.

It was intended by the acts of Congress now being administered by the Federal Power Commission that the jurisdiction of the Federal Power Commission attached only in matters held to be in interstate transactions—that is, under the Water Power Act, navigable streams; under the Electric Utilities Act, rates and transmission in interstate transactions; and, likewise, natural gas under movement and sale in interstate and not in intrastate transactions.

In all of the various complaints that were made by members of the regulatory bodies of the States, and by many members of the industry engaged in the manufacture and sale of electric power, transportation and sale of natural gas, the complaints went to the objection to the reappointment of Leland Olds because he had exceeded the authority intended by the act of Congress and because he invaded the rights and prerogatives of the States in the exercise of their jurisdictions as fixed by the statutes and laws of their own States.

As a member of the Committee on Interstate Commerce, I communicated the fact of these complaints to the Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER], chairman of the Interstate Commerce Committee, who appointed a subcommittee to hear these complaints. The subcommittee was made up of the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. TUNNELL], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HAWKES], and myself. Hearings were had before this subcommittee during the days of July 6, 7, and 8. A record of the hearings was made and a report made to the full Committee on Interstate Commerce. Six members, I believe, of the whole committee met on the 25th day of August and reported this appointment out to the floor for action. The subcommittee voted 3 to 2 for confirmation.

Of course, the record that has been made has not been read, I assume, by many Members of the Senate, or even

of the Committee on Interstate Commerce. The hearings consist of 235 printed pages; and, in addition to the hearings, voluminous exhibits were filed which are part of the files but not a part of the record. Based upon these hearings and this record as a whole, I object to the confirmation of Mr. Olds for reasons which I shall briefly state.

Men representing various regulatory bodies of the States who testified or filed statements in these hearings are Hon. A. B. Hill, commissioner of the Department of Public Utilities of the State of Arkansas; Hon. Walter R. McDonald, chairman of the Georgia Public Service Commission; Hon. H. Lester Hooker, commissioner, State Corporation Commission of Virginia; Hon. Reuben W. Peterson, chairman of the Public Service Commission of Wisconsin; and the Honorable Leonard T. Young, member of the Railroad and Public Service Commission of Montana.

My opposition to the appointment of Mr. Olds is not an attack upon him as an individual. As an individual, under the Constitution he is free to maintain such views and to represent such philosophies of government as he may see fit, but as a public official and as an administrator of the laws of Congress his views, his policies, and his philosophies of government become important factors in the preservation and continuation of constitutional government. It is in this attitude that I desire to discuss the record of Mr. Olds and the influence of his philosophies upon government.

According to the record, Mr. Olds first became active in the public eye about 1924 as coeditor of the Federated Press. Mr. Olds' associate editor in this enterprise was Carl Haessler, one of the outstanding and most notorious members of the Communist Party in America, who had behind him at that time a record of conviction for evasion of the draft laws in World War No. 1, having served a sentence in the Federal penitentiary at Leavenworth, Kans., and later, because of his activities while in prison, he was transferred to the Federal penitentiary on Alcatraz Island. The executive board of the Federated Press at and during the time Mr. Olds was a writer and coeditor of this organization, included such outspoken and active Communists as John W. Edelman, Earl Browder, and William Z. Foster. The Federated Press was represented in Washington by Laurence Todd, who at the same time represented the Tass Agency, the official press organization of the Soviet Union. The statement of ownership, management, and circulation of the Federated Press, as required by the acts of Congress, discloses that it was owned by various groups and organizations which were in the main dominated by Communist members and Communist leadership. It should be remembered that when we refer to Communists and the Communist Party we are talking of men and a party who do not believe in constitutional government as Americans know it and understand it. We should understand that the Communist Party stands for an overthrow of the American form of government, even by force if necessary. We should remember that communism springs from alien minds and espouses alien philosophies of life, liberty, and happiness. The extent to which communism has injected itself into our Government in recent years is so great that many of us have become hardened and calloused to the name "communism" and to communistic references.

It is indeed a failure of patriotic zeal to permit ourselves to become insulated against the danger of these alien ideologies in government. The Federated Press masqueraded as a legitimate organ of labor. Such, however, was clearly a masquerade. In 1924 the American Federation of Labor, after an investigation by a special committee of that organization, condemned it as including "all of the various revolutionary elements, hostile to the American Federation of Labor; hostile to democratic principles in general, and in open warfare to undermine and destroy the American Federation of Labor," and as an organization that "lends itself continuously to the spreading of doctrines subversive of the best interest of the American working people as expressed in the bona fide trade-union movement." This was the organization with which Mr. Olds was associated from 1922 until some time in 1929. During those 7 years, Mr. Olds was active in writing articles for the Federated Press, which was distributed to some seventy-five or eighty papers and magazines of the ownership groups, one of which was the Daily Worker, a well-known, admitted official organ of the Communist Party. The Dies committee characterizes the Daily Worker as a "Communist newspaper which over a period of 20 years has published a larger volume of subversive, seditious, and treasonable utterances than any other publication ever known in this country." An examination of the files of the Daily Worker from 1924 to 1929 discloses an article prepared by Mr. Olds in practically every issue. I call attention to a few of these articles which are representative of the predominant note of all of Mr. Olds' articles and of the studied effort to plant revolutionary thought and to excite revolutionary action.

On February 20, 1924, the Daily Worker carried a story by Mr. Olds, headlined as follows:

Yes, Capitalists Have No Brains.

In this article the president of a large corporation is quoted as saying that the progress of industry has outstripped the progress of technical education and to meet the situation the technical schools must prepare to provide a better all-around training to a greater number of more carefully selected students. Then Mr. Olds said:

Such remarks mean that a revolution is in progress. Ownership will become more and more divorced from any active part of the business of society. The owners will cease to be necessary. They will be nothing but consumers who live in idleness and luxury on the basis of a vested right to the productive work of others. The business of producing and distributing the goods which people require will be carried on by the workers with hand and brain from the unskilled laborer up to the professional director.

On January 12, 1925, Mr. Olds' article was headlined as follows:

Review of Foreign Labor Status Shows Instability of Capitalism the World Over.

On May 18, 1926, Mr. Olds' article was headlined:

Capitalism on Downgrade in British Isles.

On October 29, 1926, Mr. Olds' article was headlined:

Huge Wisconsin Labor Turn-over Shows Bad Conditions and Big Waste in Capitalistic System.

On February 2, 1927, Mr. Olds' article for the Daily Worker castigated the United States Steel Corporation, and among other things stated:

President Coolidge with his share of steel stock is entitled to about $900 out of the 1926 profit. An unskilled worker in the steel mills would have to work more than 2,100 hours to earn as much for his family as Coolidge gets without a stroke of work.

On March 20, 1928, the Daily Worker carried an article by Mr. Olds condemning a public-utility corporation as a scab concern for the use of coal from nonunion mines.

During these years as coeditor of the Federated Press, Mr. Olds was a recipient of gifts and grants of money from the American Fund for Public Service, commonly known and referred to as the Garland Fund. The Garland Fund was set up in 1922 by young Charles Garland, who had inherited a fortune of about $900,000, consisting principally of stock of the First National Bank of New York City. Having been indoctrinated by radicalism while in college, and being of a peculiar and pliable mind, he became the victim of radicalism. As a result, the fund was dedicated to the advancement of communistic front organizations in America. In 1925 Leland Olds received $3,640 as a gift from the Garland Fund. In 1926 he received a gift of $3,600 from the fund.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HATCH in the chair). Does the Senator from Oklahoma yield to the Senator from Vermont?

Mr. MOORE. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I have before me a copy of the hearings. Is all this matter brought out in the hearings where we can find it? Do the hearings contain reference to the $3,600 gift, and so forth?

Mr. MOORE. It may not be in the record. It is in the files, which are a part of the record.

Mr. AIKEN. The reason I ask the question is that I have tried to read the hearings quite thoroughly, and so far the Senator has not told us very much that is incorporated in the hearings.

Mr. MOORE. Everything that I have used, including all the figures and statements which I have used, is in the hearings, or is a part of the files, which are not a part of the record.

Mr. AIKEN. Does that include reference to the payments from the Garland fund, whatever that may be?

Mr. MOORE. Yes.

Mr. AIKEN. What is the Garland fund?

Mr. MOORE. I shall be very glad to tell the Senator what the Garland fund is. I am about to do so now. I have already stated that the Garland fund was established by this young man Garland to set up communistic fronts.

In 1928 the fiscal report of the Garland fund shows that Mr. Olds again received a gift of $3,600. During this time the Federated Press received grants from the Garland fund totaling $76,000. The Daily Worker was also a recipient of advances from the Garland fund. It was with the financial aid of the Garland fund that the official Communist magazine, known as The New Masses, was founded in the United States.

During the early years of Mr. Olds' association with the Federated Press, Mr. Earl Browder was a member of the executive board. He also had a record of conviction as a draft evader in the First World War and for conspiracy to violate the draft law; he was later convicted of violating the immigration laws of this country and sent to the Federal Penitentiary at Atlanta, Ga., where he subsequently was pardoned by Mr. Roosevelt. Mr. Browder was, until the recent dissolution of the Communist Party, its general secretary in the United States. Mrs. Irene Browder, wife of Earl Browder, like her husband, has run afoul of the laws of the United States and is now under an order for deportation to her native Russia. The Dies committee says that she probably arrived in this country sometime in 1933.

Mr. William Z. Foster, a member of the executive board of the Federated Press, when subpœnaed before a congressional committee in 1928, refused to be sworn because he did not believe in a Supreme Being. Mr. Foster was the Communist candidate for President in 1928, and in his acceptance speech stated:

> No Communist * * * could even if he would become President of the present Government. When a Communist heads the Government of the United States, and that day will come just as surely as the sun rises, that government will not be a capitalistic government but a Soviet government, and behind this government will stand a Red army to enforce the dictatorship of the proletariat.

Mr. Foster was one of Mr. Olds' bosses during the many years he served the Federated Press.

From 1931 to 1939, Mr. Olds, under an appointment from the Governor, was active as a member of the New York State Power Authority which, according to Mr. Olds' testimony before the subcommittee, was for the purpose of studying and developing public-owned hydroelectric-power plants on the St. Lawrence River and the distribution of such power to consumers. During this time, however, Mr. Olds was active in a political way. He found time to make a trip through the countries of continental Europe at the request of Mr. Roosevelt, to study and report upon the manner, method, and progress of cooperatives in Europe, with the apparent view to implanting, so far as possible, the European philosophies of government in the United States. Mr. Olds also found time during this period to serve as a member of the National Resources Planning Board, chairman Mr. Frederic A. Delano, and which later was denied existence by the Congress, which refused to appropriate further funds for its use.

In 1939, Mr. Olds came to the Federal Power Commission fresh from the background of long associations with communistic thought and idealism; he came with the zeal and fire of a crusader; he came with that same inspiration and determination that characterizes the zealots of radicalism and which has so permeated the New Deal administration that it has been the subject of condemnation of Members of Congress from both major political parties.

During Mr. Olds' service as a member of the New York State Power Authority, he became active in the American Labor Party, which included in its membership Mr. Sidney Hillman, whom the Dies committee of the House, in its latest report, says is in complete sympathy with and subservient to the views and ambitions of the Communist Party—the same Mr. Hillman who only a few days ago at Chicago ruthlessly and in true Soviet style asserted himself as the most potent force in what was once the great Democratic Party, not even Mr. Roosevelt excepted. This same Mr. Sidney Hillman now flaunts the laws and intent of the Congress with respect to the political activities of labor organizations, and by thin and sleazy technicalities proceeds to do indirectly that which he cannot legally do directly.

The Dies committee, in a report dated March 29, 1944, as the result of an investigation of Mr. Hillman's un-American activities and of his communistic affiliations and sympathies, says:

> His present collaboration with Communists in the C. I. O. Political Action Committee is not by any means the first time in his labor career that Mr. Hillman has seen fit to work closely with Communists.

The committee report also observes:

> Wherever there is a Communist Party front organization, there will usually be found a large number of C. I. O. leaders in closest collaboration with the party. Each of the prominent Communist C. I. O. leaders is so useful to the Communist Party that his name appears not in one but in many of the Communist front organizations.

The report also presents the Communist records of 34 leaders in the work of the C. I. O. Political Action Committee, and says:

> We have gone to some lengths in offering a mass of detailed evidence in order that there may be no doubt in any quarter of the fact that these individuals are properly and fairly labeled "Communist." With a larger staff and with unlimited space in this report we could have given such detailed records on hundreds rather than 34 of the leaders of the C. I. O. Political Action Committee.

In 1938 Mr. Olds was the temporary chairman of the New York State convention of the American Labor Party, and on that occasion was the party's keynote speaker. Among other things, the American Labor Party adopted a platform in which it was held that:

> Public regulation of power facilities has notoriously failed to establish fair rates or to protect the consumer against extortionate charges by private companies. *The alternative is public ownership which alone offers to the public the fair service at fair rates.* As a start in that direction we favor city-owned power plants to be used as a yardstick in determining what constitutes a fair rate.

In Mr. Olds' keynote speech to the American Labor Party convention, on October 3, 1938, he asked the question:

> How can I escape war and find peace?

And concluded with:

> The old parties—that means the Democratic Party as well as the Republican Party—cannot answer this fundamental question of the people because their organizations are still based upon selfishness.

Since the political leadership of this country has not changed since 1938, when Mr. Olds gave public utterance to this belief, it is to be assumed that he still is of the opinion that the present political leadership of this country will be unable to escape war in the future or to achieve a lasting peace.

According to the New York Times of October 4, 1938, Mr. Olds in his keynote speech to the American Labor Party said:

> The Labor Party was born [in 1936] *because* the President could not count upon the machinery *of his own party* to support his efforts.

Mr. Olds added, according to the Times:

> Millions of men and women knew that neither the Republican nor Democratic Parties could be depended upon to enable Franklin Delano Roosevelt to continue to lead the Nation into the promised land of security, equality, love, and peace. The Labor Party is the response to the political awakening that is shaking the foundations of the old political machines which, while giving lip service in their platforms to the needs of the people, were in reality willing tools of the financial power that ruled America and made its democracy a sham.

Does Mr. Olds still believe that American democracy is a sham?

The philosophy represented by Mr. Olds has found shelter in many agencies of government. The recent investigations by the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee of the House in connection with the operations of the Federal Communications Commission are an amazing revelation of how completely the application of such philosophies will destroy constitutional government. Not only have representatives of communistic views and theories crept into our permanent agencies of government, but they have likewise thronged into the places of authority in our war agencies. Surely, we have not forgotten the indignation of the public arising out of the character of the personnel and operations of the Office of Civilian Defense under the direction of the "Little Flower," assisted by aesthetic dancers of both sexes, and, likewise, the

indignation over the Office of Facts and Figures, under the direction of Archibald MacLeish, which later became the O. W. I., and is now the haven for such outstanding left-wingers as Bjorne Braatoy, who was the 1943 president of the League for Industrial Democracy.

Particularly in the early days of the O. P. A., that agency was generously staffed by many members of the League for Industrial Democracy, a well-known and well-recognized Communist-front organization. Mr. H. Stephen Raushenbush, one of the leaders in the League for Industrial Democracy, in his book The Socialism of Our Times, published in 1929, said:

> One good man with his eyes, ears, and wits about him inside the department . . . can do more to perfect the technique of control over industry than 100 men outside.

The same Mr. Raushenbush is now "inside the Government" as an adviser to Secretary Harold Ickes, at a salary of $8,000 a year.

Mr. Robert Morss Lovett was the first president of the League for Industrial Democracy. He held that position for many years until he, too, was rewarded with a position in the Government. He will be remembered as the former secretary to the Virgin Islands.

Mr. Paul Blanshard, for many years a field secretary and organizer for the League for Industrial Democracy, in one of his books said:

> Socialists propose to supplant the competitive planning of capitalism with a highly centralized planned economy. Our aim is frankly international and not narrowly patriotic. * * * If we gained the control of the American Government we would probably begin with a complete revision of the national governmental system. We would do one of two things. We would write an amendment to the Constitution giving the Federal Government the right to regulate all private business and to enter into any business which it deemed proper, or we would abolish the Constitution altogether.

He later told the Academy of Arts and Sciences in Philadelphia, on April 15, 1932:

> Having once captured the Government and shelved the Supreme Court, we socialists would nationalize as many large industries as we could chew. We would do it peacefully, if possible, and we would do it otherwise if necessary.

This same Mr. Paul Blanshard, according to my last information is "inside the Government" as an economic analyst and consultant in the Foreign Service Division of the State Department.

Dr. Adolf A. Berle, now an Assistant Secretary of State, expressed his friendliness to the League for Industrial Democracy, in 1940, by telegraphing the following greetings to the convention of that organization:

> The League for Industrial Democracy has valiantly championed the cause of evolutionary social reform in the United States. Today its opportunities are greater than ever.

These men I have quoted, who have crept into government, are fellow travelers of Mr. Olds.

What has been the record of Mr. Olds as Chairman of the Federal Power Commission?

Hon. Reuben W. Peterson, chairman of the Public Service Commission of Wisconsin, in testifying before the subcommittee stated:

> I have had occasion to discuss Mr. Olds with many commissioners from all over the United States and those conversations have led me to believe that a vast number of men are convinced that Mr. Olds' objective as Chairman of the Federal Power Commission is to have the Commission completely engulf and supersede the present State regulatory bodies. As a matter of fact, I have Mr. Olds' own statement which seems to bear me out in that presumption.
>
> In a book entitled "The Power Industry and the Public Interest," published under the auspices of the Twentieth Century Fund under date of 1944, I find the following on page 17:
>
> "In 1940 the Chairman of the Federal Power Commission stated that the development of Government power policy since 1933 may be traced directly to the failure of State regulation to find any way of establishing and enforcing sound cost and sale standards in the business of supplying the country's power requirements."

Mr. Peterson accused the Commission under the leadership of Mr. Olds of an unwarranted expansion of its jurisdiction over the streams and rivers of the State of Wisconsin, by finding and holding that certain streams and rivers of that State were navigable, although in fact they were not navigable at all. The action of the Commission has been defended on the grounds that it was sustained by the Supreme Court of the United States.

Such, however, does not necessarily prove the soundness of the Commission's action. It is a well known and acceptable principle of law that the courts will not disturb findings of fact of an administrative body if there is any evidence to support the findings, however thin the evidence may be. The court decides the legal issues upon the findings of fact as they come from the administrative body. Although the administrator may have acted arbitrarily or with poor judgment, if the finding is supported by any evidence it will not be disturbed by the courts. It is, therefore, all important that those who hold administrative positions have a high regard for constitutional government, a keen sense of fairness, justice and equity, an abiding faith in the American traditions, and be possessed of sound judgment and adequate powers of reason. It is these qualities which Mr. Peterson of Wisconsin does not believe were exemplified by the Federal Power Commission in its attitude toward the streams of Wisconsin.

Mr. Peterson testified:

> It is my firm belief that the Federal Power Commission under the leadership of Mr. Olds is attempting to get jurisdiction over all the waters of this State, he having in mind that dams are built on these waters and electricity is generated at those dams, and if he has jurisdiction over the electricity that is generated at those dams, it is conceivable that he will attempt to exercise jurisdiction over all of the electric utilities over whose lines any of this particular electricity flows.

Hon. A. B. Hill, former chairman and now Commissioner of the Department of Public Utilities of the State of Arkansas, told the subcommittee that:

> I am convinced * * * that the Honorable Leland Olds is not a proper person to serve on the Federal Power Commission. * * * Whatever he may be personally, I am convinced that his background, training, and environment before going on the Federal Power Commission were such as would disqualify him, or any other person for that matter, as a Commissioner of that great and responsible Federal agency. * * * He is still an outspoken advocate of collectivism.

Mr. Hill condemned the actions of Chairman Olds in coming into the State of Arkansas and appearing before the Department of Utilities of that State and declaring that certain power lines would be built in the State of Arkansas regardless of the findings or desires or actions of the State authorities. Mr. Olds admitted that his appearance and actions before the Arkansas Commission were improper, except that he was carrying out the directions of the President during the war emergency, as an aid to the war effort. The power line that was in controversy between the Arkansas Commission and Mr. Olds, although condemned by representatives of the Army and the Navy, was later constructed at the request of the War Production Board, but according to Mr. Hill has now proved to be a useless and wasteful expenditure of critical materials. Mr. Olds was condemned by this member of the Arkansas Commission for an attempt to extend his jurisdiction over purely intrastate rates in the case of the Arkansas Power & Light Co. The action was eventually dismissed by the Federal Power Commission with a finding that it had no jurisdiction.

Hon. H. Lester Hooker, member of the State Corporation Commission of Virginia, in a statement filed with the subcommittee, said:

> If the future is to be judged by the past, there does not appear to be any doubt that under the administration of Mr. Olds the jurisdiction of the Federal Power Commission will be extended and expanded to the full limit permitted by the Congress and the courts. It is plain that he covets power and delights in the exercise thereof. There is no public need for the encroachment on the rights of the States and in my opinion it is adverse to the best interest of the public.

Hon. Walter R. McDonald, chairman of the Public Service Commission of the State of Georgia, filed a complete and illuminating statement with the subcommittee, in which he stated:

> I wish to take this opportunity to outline some of the facts relating to Mr. Olds' stewardship and his evidenced desire and egotistical ambition to become the utility czar of our country. Our experience during the electric-power shortage in the Southeast during the latter part of 1941 gives evidence to this intention and ambition.

Mr. McDonald further stated:

> Obviously, to take an outspoken position against a regulatory commission or its chief leads to charges and beliefs that the accuser is merely a tool of the public utilities, working for their selfish interest. I am fully aware of the unenviable position, but I do not feel restrained to withhold the truth, even if it means personal sacrifice. I am positive there are many others who would join me but for the implications involved. As an individual and as chairman of the Georgia Public Service Commission, I wish

to go on record as opposing the reappointment of Mr. Leland Olds to the Federal Power Commission.

In a statement filed with the subcommittee by Hon. Leonard C. Young, member of the Railroad and Public Service Commission of Helena, Mont., after a lengthy review of the actions of the Federal Power Commission under Mr. Olds in a case involving one of the principal utilities of the State of Montana, it is stated:

My real purpose in presenting this statement is that I have been shocked at the recent hearings at the practices of the Commission of which Mr. Olds is chairman. I have the impression that the Federal Power Commission's staff presumes that every concern which it investigates has done something wrong; that it completely ignores the presumption of innocence, which I have always considered one of the fundamental and constitutional rights of American citizens; that it reaches its conclusions in disregard of and in spite of the evidence presented; that frequently its conclusions are based on evidence which would not be competent in any court in the country, even though it has before it entirely competent evidence which would require a contrary conclusion.

In a letter to me dated July 1, 1944, Hon. Stanley Windborne, chairman of the North Carolina Utilities Commission, says:

I have no hesitancy in saying that in my opinion Mr. Olds' background completely unfits him for membership on the Federal Power Commission. Furthermore, from the writings and utterances of Mr. Olds, I have reached the conclusion that he is definitely in favor of Government ownership of power companies and that he has used his office to promote dissatisfaction in the public mind with private ownership, and it is, therefore, inconceivable to me that a man who is utterly opposed to private ownership of power companies would be placed on a commission to regulate companies that he does not believe should exist. Also, Mr. Olds' attitude toward State commissions and his desire to arrogate to the Federal Power Commission control and supervision of purely intrastate companies is not conducive to the most effective regulation and has created considerable resentment on the part of various State commissions throughout the Nation.

Hon. Thomas C. Buchanan, member of the Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission, appeared before the subcommittee in support of Mr. Olds' appointment, and filed a statement with that committee in which he said that cooperation between the Pennsylvania commission and the Federal Power Commission had been excellent. However, under questioning, Mr. Buchanan admitted that the other four members of the Public Utility Commission of the State of Pennsylvania held contrary views to his own with respect to Mr. Olds.

The St. Louis Daily Globe-Democrat of January 21, 1943, reporting on an address made by Mr. Olds at the annual meeting of the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association on January 20, 1943, at St. Louis, stated:

Leland Olds, Chairman of the Federal Power Commission, opened the day's official lambasting of public utilities at an afternoon session, in which he said the utilities' "great campaign for private enterprise is a campaign to destroy the very roots of the great unity of purpose which is moving to share the democratic use of the country's resources."

For the most part, the speech made by Mr. Olds on January 20, 1943, at St. Louis, is given over to reviewing and lauding the activities and accomplishments of the cooperatives of European countries which he had studied in 1936 as a member of a group appointed by the President for that purpose.

Probably the most astounding example of the arbitrary action of the Federal Power Commission under Mr. Olds' leadership which was brought to the attention of the subcommittee was the record of the Commission's actions in connection with the application of a company known as the Tennessee Gas & Transmission Co. for a certificate of necessity and convenience to build a natural-gas pipe line from Louisiana into the State of West Virginia, later amended to extend the line into the State of Texas; and the record of the Commission's action in a companion case filed by the Hope Natural Gas Co., in which it also sought a certificate of necessity and convenience for the purpose of constructing a natural-gas pipe line from the State of Kansas into West Virginia.

The Tennessee Co. grew out of an association of individuals in the State of Tennessee which sought to bring an additional supply of gas into that State from Louisiana. Later, in 1940 or 1941, the organization was incorporated with Curtis P. Dall as president of the company. Soon thereafter the application of the Tennessee Co. for a certificate authorizing the construction of a line from Louisiana into West Virginia was filed with the Federal Power Commission. Hearings on the application of the Tennessee Co. over a period of many months disclosed that the company was without financial backing or a supply of gas. I have been furnished with a copy of a letter dated August 9, 1943, from the Director of Natural Gas and Natural Gasoline Division of the Petroleum Administration for War, directed to the Natural Gas Division, Office of War Utilities, in which the proposal of the Tennessee Co. to build the line, for which it was seeking a certificate from the Federal Power Commission, was summarized as follows:

In view of these findings, we can only conclude that while the immediate gas requirements of the Tennessee gas and transmission project might conceivably be met by connecting the majority of both primary and secondary sources and drilling sufficient wells, evidence of successful negotiation for gas from these sources will be necessary before it can be shown that gas will be available to meet initial requirements and beyond the initial phase. It appears that the fields under consideration do not at the present stage of development qualify as competent sources of supply and reserves for a project of the magnitude and character of that proposed.

Such was the status of the company with respect to a supply of gas as determined by the Petroleum Administrator for War on August 9, 1943.

Previously, on June 29, 1943, the Hope Natural Gas Co. had filed an application with the Federal Power Commission, seeking a certificate for the construction of a natural-gas pipe line designed to bring a supply of gas to the identical terminal to which the Tennessee Co. was seeking to supply gas. The application of the Hope company alleged that it had a sufficient and adequate supply of gas and disclosed the location of such gas, and so far as I know, no one then or now has ever questioned the adequacy of the supply of gas at that time available to the Hope Co. As a matter of fact, the record discloses that the Hope Co. had entered into contracts for delivery of 200,000,000 cubic feet of gas per day from the Hugoton Gas Field, in Kansas and Oklahoma, which is probably the greatest reserve of known gas in the United States.

It was further alleged by the Hope Co. that it was able and willing to finance the line with private capital. The application of the Hope Co. was set for hearing before the Commission on August 18, 1943. In the meantime, on July 5, 1943, and while the application of the Hope Co. was pending, the Federal Power Commission issued a most amazing order to the Tennessee Co. in the nature of a conditional certificate of necessity and convenience which would become final if and upon the condition the Tennessee Co. could within 60 days show that it had acquired an adequate supply of gas and had a responsible commitment for financing the construction of the line.

Mr. AIKEN rose.

Mr. MOORE. When I am through I shall be glad to answer the criticism which I know the Senator has in mind with reference to my remarks.

Mr. AIKEN. I do not think the Senator should assume that I will be critical.

Mr. MOORE. The Senator has already challenged my statement with regard to the record.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Oklahoma yield to the Senator from Vermont?

Mr. MOORE. I decline to yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma declines to yield.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. President, on July 13 the Commission, for reasons not disclosed and without notice or knowledge to the Hope Co., postponed further hearings on the Hope application until August 31, 1943. On August 3, 1943, the Commission denied an application for a continuance of the Hope case filed by the National Coal Association, and other interveners. But on August 28, 1943, the National Coal Association and other interveners filed a renewed application for continuance of the Hope case, and upon the same day the Hope Co., without previous notice and without an opportunity to be heard, was notified that hearing on the Hope application had been continued until September 21, 1943. The attorney for the interveners who filed the second application testified before the subcommittee that after his first application for continuance was denied on August 3, 1943, he was called on the telephone by an associate in the case, who advised him that if he would refile his application he knew it would be granted. The

attorney further testified that he was told by this associate that the *information* came from the Federal Power Commission.

In the meantime, and on September 8, 1943, hearings on an amended application of the Tennessee Co. to build a pipe line from south Texas into West Virginia, were again commenced. It then appeared for the first time that the Tennessee Co. had secured an adequate supply of gas. On September 4, 1943, the Office of Petroleum Administration for War, for the first time, recommended that the reserves of gas the Tennessee Co. had contracted for through the Chicago Corporation were adequate to meet the requirements for the pipe line. On August 28, 1943, the War Production Board had informed Mr. Olds, as Chairman of the Federal Power Commission, that either the Tennessee or the Hope project would provide an effective means of safeguarding the gas supply for the Appalachian area, that neither project had a substantial advantage over the other in terms of material, equipment, deliverability, or any other physical factor, and that material would be furnished for whichever of the projects a certificate was granted by the Commission. Hearings on the Tennessee case continued through September 20, 1943, and on that day the testimony shows that 90 percent of the common stock and all of the preferred stock of the Tennessee Co. was sold to the Chicago Corporation, a corporation of Chicago, Ill., for a consideration of approximately $540,000 which repaid the Tennessee group for all their expenses and left them with a 10 percent interest in the project without a single penny of cost. The only asset of the Tennessee Co. on that date was the conditional certificate which had been granted by the Commission on July 5, 1943. The only asset received by the Chicago Corporation in that deal was the conditional certificate.

At 7 o'clock on the evening of September 20, 1943, 1 day before the Hope case was set for hearing, the Commission granted a permanent certificate to the Tennessee Co. after the transfer of stock had been made known to the Commission by the interested parties. The new stockholder, the Chicago Corporation, through its president, Mr. Richard Wagner, testified that the Chicago Corporation was in a postion to finance or cause the line to be financed. On the following day, September 21, 1943, the Hope Co. case was indefinitely continued.

According to a letter from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation dated July 5, 1944, and a part of the record before the subcommittee, the R. F. C. negotiated a loan to the Tennessee Co. on February 12, 1944, in the sum of $44,000,000 for the building of this pipe line.

And thus closes a sordid scene in administrative procedure.

The Hope Co. was never at any time given an opportunity to be heard. The failure of the Commission and the failure of Mr. Olds, as Chairman of that Commission, to see that the Hope Co. was given a fair and impartial hearing, was a rank and inexcusable abuse of administrative discretion.

The only defense offered by Mr. Olds for his action was that the Tennessee Co. had filed its application 18 months prior to the Hope application, and that extensive hearings had already been held on the matter.

It is perfectly apparent that the Power Commission under the chairmanship of Mr. Olds had exercised its discretion to arbitrarily put one group into business while denying another even the right to be heard. A colloquy between the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON] and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. STEWART] appearing on pages 71 and 72 of the printed record will emphasize the point. I quote as follows:

Senator JOHNSON of Colorado. Well, all the hearings had been held, and the hearings disclosed the fact that this [Tennessee] company had neither a supply of gas nor the finances to build a line. That is what the hearings disclosed.

Senator STEWART. No; they disclosed that they were making an effort to acquire these things and probably could. There was no disclosure that they were totally sterile. The hearings disclosed that there might be some question about adequate financing or adequate supply of gas, but that they had contracts. The hearings speak for themselves. I don't recall just how strong they go on that, but they made a pretty strong showing, Senator JOHNSON, both on finance and on——

Senator JOHNSON of Colorado. They made a strong enough showing so that the Commission said, "All right, boys, you can have this permit, provided you get yourselves a supply of gas——"

Senator STEWART. Yes, sir.

Senator JOHNSON of Colorado. "And provided you find some money to finance it." So they did a pretty good job in the hearings of convincing the Commission.

Senator STEWART. Well, what is wrong with that? I just can't quite get your viewpoint.

Senator JOHNSON of Colorado. Well, this is wrong with it: That a person can come in and apply for a certificate, and a certificate is something of value; it is a monopoly; it is something that you can go out in the market place and buy or sell. Where do you get that value? You get it from the Government agency. Now, the Government agency issues a certificate, and these people went out and peddled that certificate, while another applicant at the same time came in with a supply of gas, with the finances to build a line, and was not even given a hearing.

Senator STEWART. In response to that——

Senator JOHNSON of Colorado. If you think that that is right, why you have a different conception of a public commission than I have: A commission that is to protect the public interest.

Mr. President, there is another incident in this long and weird proceeding that stands out like a searchlight on a dark night. Up to July 1, 1942, the Tennessee Co. was managed by Curtis Dall, as its president. On that day he entered the Army Air Forces but continued as the president of the Tennessee Co. He was carried on the pay roll at $100 a month. He continued to hold his position in name although the active management was in the hands of others, and continued to draw this salary up to and including the month of August 1943, the month *following* the granting of the conditional certificate by the Commission to the Tennessee Co. Mr. Dall testified that when he entered the Army he was given a letter by the President of the United States in which the President expressed the hope that Mr. Dall would be given the same "shake" as any other G. I. American. By the terms of the letter, Mr. Dall was authorized to show it to whomever he pleased. This letter was in the possession of Mr. Dall while he was still on the pay roll of the Tennessee Co. as its president, and while the application of the Tennessee Co. was pending before the Commission.

The record in this case is such that it leads inevitably to one of two conclusions. Either the Tennessee Company received the certificate from the Federal Power Commission as the result of personal influence, or, as a desire of those who dominated the Commission to favor publicly financed projects to the exclusion of privately financed enterprises. My personal belief is that there was a feeling in the Federal Power Commission, born of the background and association of Mr. Olds, that the Hope company was a part of a great monopolistic enterprise which should be thwarted at any cost and that it was the better part of sound government, as he saw it and in accordance with his philosophies of government, to grant a cer1 tificate to an organization that would be financed by the people's money—that is, the taxpayers' money.

Constitutional government in America has indeed become the victim of creeping paralysis. The disease has been spread by men who possess the theories and ideologies of Mr. Olds. The influence of these philosophies in government are the same that drove the Senator from Kentucky, the majority leader of this body, to charge the President of the United States with belittling and impugning the integrity of himself and the Members of the Senate, and to admonish the Congress that if it had "any self-respect yet left" it would override the veto of the President and enact the recent tax bill into law, the President's objections to the contrary notwithstanding. It is these influences in government that caused the senior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] in discussing the pernicious efforts to destroy constitutional government, to say in an article appearing in the Reader's Digest of August 1943:

One is led to believe that the current increasing practice of that "pernicious doctrine" is not wholly a result of a determination to win the war. Instead, it appears to reflect the purpose, in some Government quarters, to use the war to make over our Government in the ugly shape of a totalitarianism which Congress and the people—if they were consulted—would emphatically repudiate.

It was this influence in government that caused the senior Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON] in an address on March 21, 1944, at North Park College, Chicago, to declare:

The trend, or more correctly speaking, the stampede toward centralized government in this Nation is a cause for grave concern and genuine alarm. * * * The growth of bureaucratic and concentrated government in

the United States already has marked the decline of liberty. If that decline is to be halted, the people, the Congress, and the States must be aroused from their lethargy and resist as they resisted King George III.

It is the reflection of the influences in government represented by men who think as Mr. Olds does that caused the senior Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] to point out in an address on September 12, 1943, before the graduating class of Georgetown University, that:

Nothing could be more violative of the principle of government by consent of the governed than a system under which laws are made by appointive officials, interpreted by the same or other appointive officials, and administered by the same or still other appointive officials.

It is no fallacy and it is no quibble to say that a large body of our law today is so made, so interpreted, and so administered. Yet, without congressional sanction, and often without color of support from any constitutional source, these rules and regulations have all the force of law; more than that, they are law; and frequently they actually supersede laws passed by the Congress.

Hardly a Member of Congress has not at some time been conscious of the influence of radicalism, communism, and left-wingers of various shades ranging from a soft pink to a deep red. Most of us have expressed our fears and apprehensions.

I should like to close my remarks with respect to Mr. Olds and the philosophy of government that I am convinced he represents, by repeating the admonition of George Washington: "Let no one but Americans be on guard."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to this nomination?

Mr. MOORE. I ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. TUNNELL. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware has addressed the Chair, and is recognized.

Mr. TUNNELL. Mr. President, I am a member of the Interstate Commerce Committee of the Senate, and as such was appointed on the subcommittee to hear the testimony with reference to Mr. Olds.

There were appointed on that subcommittee the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] as chairman, the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. STEWART], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HAWKES], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MOORE], and myself. At the beginning I knew nothing about the case, and listened to the testimony with a great deal of interest. Shortly after the subcommittee was appointed the Senator from Oklahoma stated that he had received a great many complaints and objections to the confirmation of Mr. Olds. I do not know whether any other members of the committee received similar complaints. I do not think I did. However, certain representatives of public utility commissions appeared before the subcommittee.

First, Mr. President, I wish to say that I was very much surprised that practically nothing was developed in the committee hearings against any act or statement by Mr. Olds since he was appointed to the Federal Power Commission.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TUNNELL. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I still would like to receive an answer to a question which I asked, but which has not yet been answered. Was the matter or the charge or the assertion that Mr. Olds was supported by the Garland Fund and maintained by Communist organizations brought out before the committee?

Mr. TUNNELL. There was some hint of communism.

Mr. AIKEN. I have failed to find it in the hearings.

Mr. TUNNELL. There was some hint about communism, and I will read that before I conclude.

Mr. AIKEN. But was the matter of payments by the Garland Fund brought out?

Mr. TUNNELL. No.

Mr. AIKEN. The reason I wanted to know that is that I do not think anyone in America should be accused of being a Communist and of being supported by Communists when he is not able to defend himself or state his side of the situation in any way.

Mr. TUNNELL. The Senator knows that attacks are made in the Senate on individuals which would probably not be made outside the Senate. I do not know whether this is such a case or not.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TUNNELL. I yield.

Mr. MOORE. I can assure the Senator from Delaware that I have made no charge or deduction which is not confirmed by the material which was filed in the record. I am not talking about the record of the hearings. I am talking about a large file of exhibits which was made and left with the committee. The Senator from Delaware will remember that there were a great many documents put into a file. We said they were of such a voluminous character that we would not burden the record of the hearings with them.

Mr. TUNNELL. That is correct.

Mr. MOORE. I have made no statement with reference to the Garland Fund or any other statement which is not backed up by evidence which I consider to be sufficient. That is not in the record of the hearings, however.

Mr. AIKEN. But the copy of the hearings is all we have by which to go and if there were charges made against Mr. Olds as to his Communist affiliations as a boy, if he had any, apparently the committee did not consider them serious enough to put them in the report which was submitted to the Senate.

Mr. TUNNELL. As the Senator from Oklahoma has stated, certain records were produced before the subcommittee which had never been read by the rest of us before that time, nor since, so far as I know.

Mr. AIKEN. But did witnesses appear before the subcommittee and make these charges?

Mr. TUNNELL. No.

Mr. AIKEN. I thought Mr. Peterson and Mr. Hill and others appeared before the subcommittee.

Mr. TUNNELL. I do not think anyone believed that Mr. Olds was a Communist. I do not think the Senator from Oklahoma believes that Mr. Olds is a Communist. I do not think anyone believed that. The matter came up in this way. On page 176 of the hearings Mr. Olds stated:

Of course I was speaking definitely for the American Labor Party—

That was with reference to certain quotations, I believe, from some speeches—

but I think that the working out of these problems we face in this country is a much broader problem than even the political parties can solve. I think it goes very much deeper, and over the period of years I have been trying to see what I could do to find the ways of implementing the trend that I think was the only solution, which is——

Senator STEWART. You believe in communism?

Mr. OLDS. No, sir.

Senator STEWART. When you made that statement that Senator MOORE referred to, that the safety of this country could not be maintained by either the Democratic or the Republican Party, I believe, did you mean that the Communist Party probably could save the country?

Mr. OLDS. No, sir; I did not. As I tried to say a few minutes ago, my whole search—and I have never been a member, or really a member of any party.

Senator STEWART. You were, I thought you said, a member of the American Labor Party.

Mr. OLDS. Yes; I was. What I mean is, I have never been a party man through the whole range of from the left to the right, as it is called.

Senator STEWART. You have never——

Mr. OLDS. The thing I have been most interested in all along is, out of the roots of our American system, out of what is the traditional American system, to see how it can gradually evolve, adapting itself to the new conditions. Now, we talk about the private-enterprise system. We are not talking about anything that is static. Any system that is static is doomed.

Senator MOORE. It sounds like Willkie.

Apparently the Senator objects to a person changing his party. That seemed to be the attitude towards Mr. Olds. Olds admitted that at one time he had belonged, in a way, to the American Labor Party. If he ever did belong to the American Labor Party there was nothing shown that he did, aside from certain statements to which the Senator has taken exception, and that was many years ago. I think one can go to the records of many Senators and find that they have contradicted themselves in a much shorter period.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TUNNELL. I yield.

Mr. HILL. Is it not a fact also that Mr. Olds has served on the Federal Power Commission now for a period of years?

Mr. TUNNELL. For 6 years.

Mr. HILL. He has been on the Commission for 6 years, and is it not true that any statements now attributed to him, as I understood the speech made by the Senator from Oklahoma, were made before he served on the Commission?

Mr. TUNNELL. That is as I understood the record; yes.

Mr. HILL. In other words, he has a record now of 6 years of service, and that record, of course, is available to the Senate of the United States, for Members of the Senate to determine whether they will give their advice and consent that Mr. Olds continue to carry on a service which has already extended over a period of 6 years.

Mr. TUNNELL. That is correct. I thank the Senator.

Mr. HILL. It would seem to me that any statements he had made some years before would be rather immaterial, incompetent, and irrelevant.

Mr. TUNNELL. I had just made the statement a few minutes ago, when a Senator asked me to yield, that so far as I remember there is nothing in the record of any statement or of any act of Mr. Olds during the 6 years he has been a member of the Federal Power Commission to which anyone is taking exception, except a few things which I shall mention, and these particular things are such as are attempted to be hitched back to his record as a member of the American Labor Party. I do not know what the American Labor Party platform is, but at any rate Mr. Olds said that he had been affiliated with it, but that he had never been really a party man, and I think he showed very clearly that he had not been.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TUNNELL. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. Is it not also a fact, in addition to what the distinguished Senator from Alabama has brought out, that Mr. Olds, as Chairman of the Federal Power Commission, had many dealings with various public service commissions in the 48 States and in the Territories?

Mr. TUNNELL. Oh, yes. I shall read some of the statements made by members of State commissions about Mr. Olds.

Mr. MAYBANK. I ask the Senator from Delaware if there ever was an unkind statement made so far as the Chairman's dealings with the various State commissions are concerned?

Mr. TUNNELL. I think not. I think nothing of that sort appeared throughout the hearings. An attempt was made to show that Mr. Olds' ideas were rather Federal than State in their nature.

Mr. MAYBANK. But there was no charge of unfairness made against him?

Mr. TUNNELL. No, I think not. It was shown that of the rulings made by the Commission while Mr. Olds was Chairman none has been reversed by the Federal courts.

Mr. MAYBANK. So far as his ideas with respect to Federal and State powers are concerned, naturally he followed the law and the Constitution.

Mr. TUNNELL. Oh, yes; there can be no doubt about that. The only thing that was said was that in one or two instances the rulings were upheld by a divided court. But the majority of the court held in favor of the decisions of the Federal Power Commission, and that was criticized by one of the witnesses.

Mr. MAYBANK. If the distinguished Senator from Delaware has no objection, I should like to state that in the work which has been done in my State in the development of electricity, particularly of rural electricity, we have always received great help from the distinguished Chairman of the Federal Power Commission.

Mr. TUNNELL. That is correct.

I wish to read, beginning at page 9 of the hearings:

Senator TUNNELL. I would like to ask a question: Your objection to the confirmation of Mr. Olds is based on a difference of opinion between you and him, as you contend, as to the jurisdiction of the Commission; isn't that right?

Mr. PETERSON. Yes; that is correct; the interpretation of the jurisdiction that has been granted to the Commission.

Senator TUNNELL. Yes. Is this a matter that is subject to court determination?

Mr. PETERSON. Yes.

Senator TUNNELL. Has it been determined by the courts?

Mr. PETERSON. It has in the two cases that I referred to, the Jersey case and the Hartford case.

Senator TUNNELL. Are they the only cases that have gone to the courts?

Mr. PETERSON. Well, they are the two cases which we feel, and the officers of our national association apparently feel, were the most important on this question.

Senator TUNNELL. Well, have there been other cases?

Mr. PETERSON. It is probable.

Senator TUNNELL. Determined?

Mr. PETERSON. By the United States Supreme Court or by lower courts?

Senator TUNNELL. Yes. By either.

Mr. PETERSON. Well, I would not want to say that there have not been. No other case comes to my mind on it.

Senator TUNNELL. Yes. Was the ruling of the Commission sustained in the two cases you referred to?

Mr. PETERSON. Yes.

Senator TUNNELL. Is it your theory that the Commission should have decided in a way that the Court could not have sustained them?

Mr. PETERSON. No, no.

Senator TUNNELL. Well, isn't that your argument?

Mr. PETERSON. No. My argument is this: That if the interpretation placed upon the act by the Federal Power Commission——

Senator TUNNELL. And sustained by the——

Mr. PETERSON. And sustained by the Supreme Court——

Senator TUNNELL. Yes.

Mr. PETERSON. Is correct, it is not the law that Congress intended to pass, and it should be redefined so that Congress could make more particular just what power they want to give to the Federal Power Commission.

In other words, the witness says that even though the ruling of the Commission was sustained by the Supreme Court, it still was not what the Congress intended to enact.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. RUSSELL in the chair). Does the Senator from Delaware yield to the Senator from North Dakota?

Mr. TUNNELL. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. Who are Mr. Peterson and Mr. Hill?

Mr. TUNNELL. Mr. Peterson is chairman of the Public Service Commission of the State of Wisconsin.

Mr. LANGER. Is that a private agency or a State agency?

Mr. TUNNELL. My understanding is that it is a State agency. The criticism seemed to be, as I understood, that the rulings of the Federal Power Commission had a tendency to favor the Federal idea of control rather than the State idea, and members of State commissions were taking exception.

I understand that Mr. Hill is a public-utility commissioner from the State of Arkansas.

I continue to read from page 9 of the hearings:

Senator TUNNELL. Well, that is a suggestion to Congress, isn't it?

Mr. PETERSON. That is correct.

Senator TUNNELL. That is not a criticism of Mr. Olds?

Mr. PETERSON. Oh, Mr. Olds is very vehement in his objections to such a suggestion to Congress.

Senator TUNNELL. Well, I know, but that does not prevent Congress from taking such action, does it?

Mr. PETERSON. Well, it is not 100 percent stopped; no. I imagine that it would be an impediment. I recognize that his arguments before committees of Congress would bear considerable weight.

In other words, his objection was that if confirmed as a member of the Federal Power Commission his views would have weight before congressional committees.

Senator TUNNELL. Well, Mr. Peterson, my position is simply this: You said that you are asked to come here for the purpose of meeting an objection or of making an objection or of sustaining an objection, I believe, was the thought. Now, I have never heard of any of these objections before. So that I have listened with a great deal of interest myself. I just never heard of any of the objections against Mr. Olds, and it is a new field so far as I am concerned.

Mr. PETERSON. Yes; of course.

Senator TUNNELL. But what I am getting at is this: It seems to me that your criticism is rather of the law, or the lack of law, than it is of Mr. Olds.

Mr. PETERSON. Well, when a legislative body passes an act, it has in mind the correction of past evils in the law, we will say. "Evils" may not be the word that I should use. I am using it in a charitable sense.

Senator TUNNELL. Yes.

Mr. PETERSON. You are attempting to make a correction of an existing situation; and when you as a Senator vote "yes" or "no" on that bill, you have in mind the correction of that situation. The law is worded so that by a very strained interpretation, and one which did not appear in the minds of the legislative body that enacted the law—by a very strained interpretation some other meaning could be developed from that written word. I believe, from reading the briefs that were presented to the committees at the time of the passage of the 1935 act, that the Congress of the United States did not intend that the Federal Power Commission should exercise the jurisdiction that it is exercising.

Senator TUNNELL. But you say that the courts have sustained their contention that they do have that right?

Mr. PETERSON. The Court, by a divided—very divided Court, which I recognize does not make any difference; it is still the law of the land——

Senator TUNNELL. You do not contend that there is an obligation to take the minority rather than the majority view of the Court?

Mr. PETERSON. No. No; but I still say that if that interpretation is a correct interpretation of the written law, it is not the interpretation of the intent of Congress in writing that law, and we think that Congress should

have an opportunity to rewrite it and erase any doubt as to whether or not the Federal Power Commission should extend its justification.

In other words, he is assuming that the Congress of the United States had some sort of individual mind, and that that mind ran with his, and that it was against the interpretation of the Federal Power Commission, and against the interpretation of the Supreme Court. That was the attitude taken.

We were given to understand that there was general opposition to Mr. Olds by the power commissions of the various States. I understand that there are approximately 40 of them. Mr. Olds himself asked to have introduced in the record certain papers and letters which he had. I now read from the statement of Mr. Olds, on page 208 of the printed hearings:

Mr. OLDS. Senator MOORE had raised this question of our cc peration with the State commissions and I had expressed the fact that I had been a little bit surprised to have that issue being raised this year in view of our experience in working with State commissions. I have here a few documents, letters, et cetera, that indicate very clearly our relations with some of these State commissions, and I am just going to call attention to a few brief quotations from those and then ask that they be made a part of the record.

Donald Hacking, commissioner of the Public Service Commission of Utah in an address before the National Association of Railroad Utilities Commissioners last September, in which the question of our cooperation with the States, or the question of our invasion of States' jurisdiction was very much to the fore, as I think you know, spoke as follows—I do not think the whole speech needs to go in, but if any member wishes a copy of it we would be glad to furnish it.

Senator MOORE. We do not, any of us, want to overburden the printed record. However, I think a copy of that might very well be put in the file so that it would be accessible. What do you think about it, Mr. Chairman?

Senator TUNNELL. I think that is a good idea to put as little of those long documents in the printed record as possible; for two reasons. In the first place, it costs money and in the second place it is very discouraging reading matter.

Mr. OLDS. Mr. Hacking, speaking on the subject Federal Power Commission and State Autonomy said, in part:

"It is unfortunate that I am not a good public speaker because I do think it is rather appropriate that this subject be discussed by a member of the Utah commission because all of our relations with the Federal Power Commission have been harmonious and I think we have been mutually helpful. They have furnished us readily with such information as we have requested in addition to their regular publications, and they have loaned to our Commission expert members of their staff to assist our own staff in working out the problems with which we have been confronted as a State commission. I can understand that this type of assistance may not be greatly needed by large, well-staffed State commissions, but to commissions as Utah's, whose staff is so limited that its members must perform many diversified duties, the availability of Federal experts for a particular purpose is of great benefit. It can mean the difference between just trying to regulate and effective regulation. We have been very active in our sphere of operations and at no time which I can recall has the Federal Power Commission invaded, or attempted to invade, what I consider our rightful State jurisdiction."

That was the position of the Utah commission last September.

Because Arkansas has been somewhat featured in this hearing I would like to read two brief letters from two chairmen of the Department of Public Utilities of the State of Arkansas, one from Mr. Thomas Fitzhugh, under date of October 5, 1940:

Mr. LELAND OLDS,
Chairman, Federal Power Commission, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. OLDS: This acknowledges receipt of the information that you have so kindly furnished us regarding construction costs of natural-gas companies.

We sincerely appreciate the cooperation that the Federal Power Commission has always extended to this department. If we may be of any help to you at any time please call on us.

Cordially yours,
THOMAS FITZHUGH,
Chairman.

Mr. WILEY. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. CARAWAY in the chair). Des the Senator from Delaware yield to the Senator from Wisconsin?

Mr. TUNNELL. I yield.

Mr. WILEY. I have listened with interest to the remarks of the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MOORE], and those of the distinguished Senator from Delaware [Mr. TUNNELL]. I am particularly interested in knowing just what the legal point is in the interpretation of the statute by the Commission. The Senator has told us that the Supreme Court, by a divided Court, affirmed the decision of the Commission. Apparently the question involves the centralization of authority in the Federal Commission. I wonder if the distinguished Senator can tell us what was the legal point involved. I am interested in knowing what it is.

Mr. TUNNELL. We did not attempt to reopen that case.

Mr. WILEY. I realize that.

Mr. TUNNELL. However, there was a suggestion as to one question which was ruled upon. It involved the question as to whether a certain stream—I believe it was in Wisconsin—was a navigable stream. The Federal Court decided with the Federal Power Commission on that question.

Here is another letter. It comes from Mr. A. B. Hill, of the Department of Public Utilities of the State of Arkansas:

Chairman LELAND OLDS,
Federal Power Commission, Washington, D. C.

DEAR CHAIRMAN OLDS: This letter is written for the purpose of expressing to you and your associates, both members of the Commission and members of your staff, the appreciation of the department of public utilities for the many courtesies extended to us while we were in Washington last week.

We thank you very much for the use of your hearing room, and greatly appreciate the fact that Mr. C. W. Smith was made available by your Commission as a witness for the Department of Public Utilities of Arkansas.

When and if any members of your Commission or staff happen to be in Arkansas, we hope that this department will be able in some measure to repay you for your many evidences of good will.

With best wishes and kind personal regards, I am,

Sincerely yours,
A. B. HILL, *Chairman.*

So, Mr. A. B. Hill was very appreciative.

Mr. STEWART. Is that the same Mr. Hill who testified?

Mr. TUNNELL. I think so; that is my recollection.

Madam President, I have before me two letters from the chairman of the Illinois Commerce Commission, which is one of the larger commissions. The first letter reads as follows:

In re Natural Gas Pipe Line Co. of America.

GENTLEMEN: Our staff has reported on its review of the proposed application of the accrued rate reduction to be made by Natural Gas Pipe Line Co. of America. From this information we find that the proposal meets with our conception of the desirable disposition of this accumulated fund.

May we express to you our satisfaction at the harmonious relationship which has existed between our two commissions from the time that we first initiated this matter to its now successful conclusion.

Yours very truly,
ILLINOIS COMMERCE COMMISSION,
JOHN D. BIGGS, *Chairman.*

That letter, as will be noted, is signed by the Illinois Commerce Commission, John D. Biggs, chairman.

The other letter was written a year and a half later. It is dated December 14, 1943, and is signed by John D. Biggs. It reads as follows:

Hon. LELAND OLDS,
Chairman, Federal Power Commission, Washington, D. C.

DEAR CHAIRMAN OLDS: Your letter of December 8, 1943, relative to the disposition of certain accounting adjustments to be made by Mississippi River Power Co. indicates a company proposal that is acceptable to you.

The Illinois Commerce Commission has discussed the proposal as described by you having received as direct advice from the company, and, in the opinion of the commission, the proposal, if made by the company, will be acceptable.

Our chief of accounts and finance reports that he has received a copy of a statement on this subject from Mr. Smith and is prepared to conclude the matter along the lines indicated. Pursuant to your suggestion, therefore, we name Mr. Fred Kleinman, chief of accounts and finance, to confer with your Mr. Smith and representatives of the company for the purpose of working out all of the details so that concurrent and equivalent orders may be entered by your Commission and the Illinois Commerce Commission covering the disposition of this matter.

We hope that the disposition of this matter may set a precedent for future relations between our two commissions whereby matters requiring action on the part of both commissions may be frankly discussed by representative commissioners prior to the formulation of any conclusion by either commission.

Sincerely yours,
JOHN D. BIGGS.

Then we have a letter from the Corporation Commission of Oklahoma, the Senator's home State. It is addressed to the Federal Power Commission. During the hearings the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON] asked, "What is the date?"

Mr. Olds replied, "The date is May 15, 1942."

The letter referred to reads as follows:

FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION,
Wright Building, Washington, D. C.
(Attention John W. Scott, *Commissioner.*)

GENTLEMEN: The Corporation Commission of Oklahoma is very appreciative of the efforts put forth by your Commission in the settlement of the Lone Star Gas Co. case.

The gate rates charged by this company have been a source of much litigation and much embarrassment to this commission for more than 10 years, and, but for the Natural Gas Act and the recent action taken, the matter would still have been in controversy.

Mr. Green and Mr. Reid have reported the courteous treatment accorded them in their recent conference in connection with this case.

We wish to assure you that if this commission can be of any service to you in connection with any matters in which we are interested, we will cooperate to the fullest extent.

Yours very truly.

Next we have a letter which comes from the general counsel of the Oklahoma Corporation Commission, to Commissioner Scott, of the Federal Power Commission. It reads as follows:

OCTOBER 27, 1942.

Hon. JOHN W. SCOTT,
Commissioner,
Federal Power Commission,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SCOTT: I am in receipt of your letter of October 21 enclosing a copy of the opinion in the Panhandle Eastern Pipe Line Co. case, for which I thank you.

The Federal Power Commission has rendered some valuable assistance to the various regulatory commissions in the matter of rate litigation, and an opinion from the Supreme Court in line with the views expressed in this case would be of inestimable value to us in this State.

Again thanking you, I am,
Yours very truly,

FLOYD GREEN,
General Counsel.

I read that letter to show the Senator that all Oklahomans do not agree.

Mr. MOORE Madam President, I suppose the Senator will agree that Oklahoma people usually are polite, and those are merely polite letters.

Mr. TUNNELL. And Oklahomans generally tell the truth, and I believe most of them are truthful.

Here is a personal letter from Mr. Gail S. Carter, chairman of the New Mexico Public Service Commission:

SEPTEMBER 17, 1941.

HON. LELAND OLDS,
Chairman, Federal Power Commission,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. OLDS: Words fail to suffice when I try to say "thank you" for your coming to Santa Fe during our public forum discussion of the New Mexico public-utility law.

You rendered a great service to the New Mexico Public Service Commission and the State of New Mexico. Governor Miles, Commissioner Fernandez, and Commissioner Manson join me in an expression of deep gratitude.

Sincerely yours,

GAIL S. CARTER,
Chairman.

Next we have a letter coming from Minnesota. The Senator from Oklahoma did not get word from all the commissions. I have before me a letter from the Minnesota Railroad and Warehouse Commission. Incidentally, let me say to the Senator from Oklahoma that this letter is quite important in connection with the question of the reclassification of accounts cases. The letter is signed by the statistician of the Minnesota Railroad and Warehouse Commission, and is addressed to Mr. Charles W. Smith, Chief of the Bureau of Accounts, Finance, and Rates, Federal Power Commission, Washington, D. C. It reads as follows:

ST. PAUL, *April 26, 1943.*

Mr CHAS. W. SMITH,
Chief, Bureau of Accounts, Finance, and Rates, Federal Power Commission, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I wish to thank you for a copy of the opinion of the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit in the Northwestern Electric Company case.

It is gratifying to find that most of the opinions issued by the Federal Power Commission are sustained in the courts. Too much credit cannot be given to yourself and the Commission for the progress being made in the matter of public-utility regulation.

Yours truly,

L. R. BITNEY,
Statistician.

Another letter comes from Samuel Graff Miller, senior counsel of the Pennsylvania Utility Commission. His letter is addressed to the counsel of the Federal Power Commission, Mr. Charles V. Shannon. It reads as follows:

HARRISBURG, *January 10, 1943.*

CHARLES V. SHANNON, ESQ.,
Counsel, Federal Power Commission,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CHARLIE: My heartiest congratulations on our famous victory in the above case. It has certainly advanced regulatory law a long distance in the right direction. I am looking forward to an opportunity to celebrate appropriately with you.

With best personal regards, I am,
Sincerely yours,

SAMUEL GRAFF MILLER,
Senior Counsel.

Next I have before me a letter from the Railroad Commission of the State of California, signed by Mr. H. G. Mathewson, Secretary. It reads as follows:

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF.,
December 30, 1942.

FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION,
Regional Office, San Francisco, Calif.
(Attention Mr. J. C. Beebe, regional administrator; R. G. Backett, acting regional administrator.)

GENTLEMEN: This will acknowledge receipt of your supplemental reports addressed to our Mr. Roy A. Wehe, dealing with protection of gas properties and gas supply for the Pacific Gas & Electric Co., Southern California Gas Co., and San Diego Gas & Electric Co. The specific copies referred to are designated by you as copies No. 7 for the first two named utilities and No. 6 for San Diego.

As you state in your letters of transmittal, these reports are in accordance with our previous arrangement whereby this Commission made available somewhat similar reports dealing with the protection of the gas properties named from sabotage, and in addition, they represent a later inspection of the utilities' properties to determine what further protection measures were reasonably necessary under present conditions.

It would appear that your engineers, in the preparation of these supplemental reports, have done a very commendable piece of work, and we are happy that we, as two commissions, could exchange our studies and so be helpful to one another, and by so doing, cut down some of the work both to ourselves and to the utilities.

Very truly yours,

RAILROAD COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA.
By H. G. MATHEWSON, *Secretary.*

I now have before me a statement by Mr. Jerome N. Joffe, special assistant city counselor, Kansas City, Mo. His statement reads in part as follows:

I believe that this institute does owe a great debt of gratitude to the Federal Power Commission. It has been my experience to appear before various regulatory bodies in various public utilities, but I have never witnessed so many cases so well prepared in the interests of the public as the cases presented by the staff of the Federal Power Commission, and they are working for the municipalities and in the interests of the consumers there, and I do believe that we should bear that in mind that this is one Federal agency which is doing a mighty fine job for the municipalities of the United States.

Mr. MEAD. Madam President, will my distinguished colleague yield to me for a moment?

Mr. TUNNELL. I yield.

Mr. MEAD. I do not wish this RECORD to come to a close without stating my approval of the nomination of this resident of my State. I desire to commend the distinguished and able senior Senator from Delaware for the splendid argument he is making in behalf of the nominee. I wish to say that not only has his record been reviewed by the Senate's committee and approved by the two Senators representing his State, but some 6 years ago it was reviewed by a committee similar to the Senator's, and at that time he was recommended by the two Senators who represented his State.

Furthermore, prior thereto his record was reviewed by the Legislature of the State of New York and by the committees to which nominations for the positions which he held in our State had to be referred. Before coming to Washington, Mr. Olds was, as Senators know, a member of the New York State Power Authority. He served under Governor Lehman with the approbation of the present President of the United States. He had been in the limelight of public opinion, and for many years his record had been reviewed by legislative bodies as well as by persons in executive offices. His work has always measured up to a very high standard from the standpoint of efficiency. To my knowledge his integrity has never been challenged, and likewise his patriotism has never been challenged. I am appreciative of the opportunity of saying a few words in behalf of the nominee, and I wish to commend the able Senator from Delaware for the effort he is putting forth in his behalf.

Mr. TUNNELL. I assume that the nomination of Mr. Olds to be a member of the New York body was confirmed by the Senate of the State of New York.

Mr. MEAD. It is my opinion that his confirmation by the Senate of the State of New York, and later by the United States Senate, was never questioned as it has been questioned today.

Mr. MOORE. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TUNNELL. I yield.

Mr. MOORE. I should like to inquire if any hearing was held before the Interstate Commerce Committee in 1938, when he was first appointed to this position.

Mr. TUNNELL. I am satisfied that no objections were raised, or the Senator's correspondents and others who have complained about Mr. Olds would have found them.

Mr. MOORE. I did not mean to say that the record was silent as to whether there had been a hearing. I merely asked if a hearing had been held.

Mr. MEAD. Madam President, if I may interpose, the committees of the Senate were just as diligent in those days as they are today, and there was evidently no reason to hold up approval of the nomination of Mr. Olds.

Mr. TUNNELL. I will go further and say that no reason has been assigned since then. Not a single act of Mr. Olds while connected with the Federal Power Commission has been attacked. The attacks to which reference has been made were against the Federal Power Commission, or against the law under which it was functioning. No one has attacked Mr. Olds. The Senator must go back approximately 20 years in order to find some ground on which to attack Mr. Olds.

Mr. HILL. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TUNNELL. I yield.

Mr. HILL. One reason the Senator from Oklahoma is opposed to Mr. Olds' nomination is that he felt that in one instance, at least, Mr. Olds talked too much like Mr. Wendell Willkie.

Mr. TUNNELL. I believe the Senator from Oklahoma had some objection to Wendell Willkie.

Mr. BARKLEY. Madam President, the Senator from Oklahoma did not have enough objection to Mr. Willkie to keep from voting for him in 1940.

Mr. HILL. In spite of whatever objection the Senator from Oklahoma has had, he made a radio speech in behalf of Mr. Willkie in 1940.

Mr. TUNNELL. He also worked financially for him, which was of considerable importance in Oklahoma.

I have before me a resolution of the Louisiana Public Service Commission in connection with the case of the United States pipe line, information concerning which was put in evidence. It reads, in part, as follows:

> In conference with Chairman Olds, of the Federal Power Commission, in St. Louis, Mo., in 1942, the State commission was assured of full cooperation.

That indicates what the power commissions of the States really think of Mr. Olds. The objection which was raised by one or two persons who came before the subcommittee was not sustained by the members of the committee.

I wish now to refer to the case to which the Senator has called attention. I think if we go into it we will find the real reason for any objection being raised today to the confirmation of this nomination. I shall not use the complete names, but I refer to the Hope Co. and the Tennessee Co. The Hope Co. was a Standard Oil affiliate, and the Tennessee Co. was not. The law permitting the issuance of certificates of necessity and convenience had been enacted, and early in 1942 the Tennessee Co. filed an application. The Hope Co., the Standard Oil affiliate, stood by and never filed its application until after a determination had been made to issue the certificate to the Tennessee Co., but before it was announced. It is strange that the determination to issue the certificate was about the 14th of June 1943, as I recall. On the 29th of June, and before the statement was issued as to what was about to be done, the Hope Co., the Standard Oil affiliate, filed its application. The application by the Tennessee Co. was filed in 1942. There were arguments. Testimony had been taken on the question of whether the Tennessee Co. could perform, or whether it could obtain gas, and whether it had the necessary financial backing. Nothing was said about the affiliate of the Standard Oil Co. having sufficient financial backing, but there was a question raised with reference to the Tennessee Co. The matter was debated at length, and finally, in June 1943, the Commission determined to issue a certificate of convenience and necessity after it had been shown that the Hope Co. had sufficient financial backing. The result was that the Hope Co., on the 29th day of June, after the determination had been made, filed its application and requested continuances. Mr. Dougherty, representing the Hope Co., stated that the company did not know whether the Tennessee Co. would be able to produce the necessary evidence, and that if it was not able to do so it still wanted to hang on to its application, which it had filed after the determination of the case with reference to the other company.

Why did the Standard Oil Co. wait all that time? What was it trying to do? What was its purpose? The Senator has told us about the company wanting more time. What time did it need when it had had all of the previous year, and had read all the arguments and all the evidence which had been presented? The Standard Oil Co. was never before known to be so short of time. The company waited and dilly-dallied. The dates do not bear out statements which have been made that the company needed more time.

There was absolutely no unfairness in the treatment of the Standard Oil affiliate. The company held up the application for some time and filed it by presenting a belated petition. It undoubtedly had in mind preventing the functioning of the Tennessee Co. It did not want the Tennessee Co. to furnish gas in the territory involved. That was all there was to the matter.

Mr. HILL. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TUNNELL. I yield.

Mr. HILL. I believe that the Senator has a copy of a letter which the Acting Chairman of the Federal Power Commission, Mr. Basil Manly, wrote to the senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] in which Acting Chairman Manly set forth all the details of the Tennessee case and its relation to the application of the Hope Co.

I hope the Senator will ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of his remarks the letter from Basil Manly to the Senator from Ohio. The Senator from Delaware has made a very fine presentation and to my mind has conclusively answered the argument made by the Senator from Oklahoma concerning this particular Tennessee pipe-line case. I thought it well to have the letter from Mr. Manly also placed in the RECORD, because it gives all the details.

Mr. TUNNELL. I will say to the Senator from Alabama that I have never read the letter to which he referred.

Mr. HILL. I have read the letter.

Mr. TUNNELL. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that a letter of September 11, 1944, addressed to Hon. ROBERT A. TAFT, United States Senate, Washington, D. C., and signed by Basil Manly, Acting Chairman of the Federal Power Commission, be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(The letter, exhibit A, appears at the conclusion of Mr. TUNNELL's remarks.)

Mr. AIKEN. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TUNNELL. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. Is it not a fact also that objection was raised before the Commission by one or more of the States wherein was located the field from which the Standard Co. intended to obtain the gas to the removal of the gas from that area on the ground that it was needed for industries which already existed in that vicinity?

Mr. TUNNELL. I think the Senator is correct. I have not checked entirely on that situation. I do know, however, there was a great deal of discussion concerning it, and some changes were made in the petition. Amendments were made to the petition on the ground that the company was getting the gas from a section which at first might not have been contemplated, and I know there was opposition all along.

Mr. AIKEN. Is it not also a fact that the petition filed by Standard's subsidiary after the Commission had already determined to grant a certificate to the Tennessee company was taken back and some parts of it rewritten afterward, indicating that it had been written so hurriedly, in order to come in ahead of the issuance of the certificate to the Tennessee company, that it had not been properly drawn?

Mr. TUNNELL. I think the Senator is correct about that. I know that I criticized the attorney for the Hope Co. for the way in which the Hope application had been managed, and it was undoubtedly done for the purpose of preventing any other company from serving that particular territory.

Mr. WILEY. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TUNNELL. I yield.

Mr. WILEY. When the Senator from Oklahoma spoke he brought out two facts

in that connection with respect to which I should like to have a little clarification. I think a fair statement of what he said is that the facts did not, in his opinion, authorize the granting of a conditional permit to the Tennessee company. In other words, the Tennessee company did not have the gas, did not have what was necessary to grant to it, as he thought a conditional permit. That is No. 1. The second proposition is that apparently the Tennessee company received $500,000 for this conditional permit, and who profited? Who were the individuals who profited from that $500,000? And in connection therewith I think the Senator stated that immediately after the conditional permit had been bought by the Hope Co., it was found that the permit, instead of being conditional, was absolute. If I am wrong about that I should like to be corrected.

Mr. STEWART. Madam President, let me correct one statement there. No permit was sold. The Senator is entirely incorrect in his statement about that. Wagner organized in Chicago the company that bought the stock of the Tennessee Gas Co. The permit belonged to the Tennessee Gas Co. The permit was conditioned upon the showing that within 60 days the company would be able to supply an adequate amount of gas from a well known and permanently known field, and that the company would be able to finance the building of the pipe line.

Further, there was absolutely no profit made by anyone. The $500,000, or whatever the amount was—I do not recall—went to reimburse those who had expended money in this enterprise over a period of 2 or 3 years. The record shows that there was first an application filed to build this line to a point as far north as Tennessee. I think that is the reason why it happened to be a Tennessee corporation that made the application. That application did not languish in the Commission. It was on the records of the Commission for a period of a year and a half, during which time extensive hearings were held.

Finally, because of the fact that it was entering into a new field where there was no gas being sold, a construction of the law as it then existed impelled the decision on the part of the Federal Power Commission that it was without jurisdiction. The petition was then dismissed after all this expenditure of money and all this waste of time, if it might be so called.

After the petition was dismissed, Congress, in February 1942, as I recall, amended the law so as to give the Commission jurisdiction in cases of that kind. The Commission had construed the law to mean, as I remember, that it did not have jurisdiction except where companies were entering territory which was already being served; that it had jurisdiction to permit companies which were rendering the service to extend their service, but had no jurisdiction to grant permits, as the Commission construed it—and I am speaking from memory—or issue certificates to concerns which were entering a new or virgin field which was not being served.

So Congress corrected that situation in February 1942, and a few days after it was corrected the Tennessee Gas Co. filed a new petition based upon the new law. After that extensive hearings were again held. It is perfectly understandable how these persons could have spent a tremendous amount of money. No one, as I am advised, and as was developed in the hearings, made any substantial profit, or, indeed, any profit, out of this matter.

Mr. WILEY. Madam President, am I to understand that the Tennessee Co., as it is called, was organized with a capital stock paid in of half a million dollars, that the company spent practically all that money, and that the only asset the company had was the conditional permit, so that when the transfer was made it was the stock which carried the property, and the only property was the conditional permit?

Mr. STEWART. During all that time, let me say to the Senator——

Mr. WILEY. In other words, were there any other assets?

Mr. STEWART. During all that time no one challenged the Tennessee Co.'s right before the Power Commission. The company was the only one that made application. What is wrong with granting a conditional permit if the Commission can be convinced that the applicant has an adequate supply of gas and adequate finances to build a pipe line, which will justify making the permit permanent?

Mr. WILEY. I merely wish to obtain the facts.

Mr. STEWART. I have stated nothing but the facts.

Mr. WILEY. But the Senator has not answered my question.

Mr. TUNNELL. Madam President, let me answer the question. The Senator from Wisconsin is asking about something concerning which probably no one outside the company knows the entire details. The Standard Oil Co. people contended the very thing that the Senator is now suggesting, that there had been a sale of something which had no value except as a certificate. Whether or not that was true, they had done all the preliminary work. They had spent money in attempting to give service to that great territory in western Pennsylvania and eastern Ohio. If the testimony is correct, they did not make any money by the transaction.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I should have made clear in my mind one thing with respect to the Tennessee Co., the Hope Co., and the Chicago Corporation. Was the pipe line built, and who owns it now?

Mr. STEWART. I am advised unofficially that the pipe line will be completed in 2 or 3 weeks.

Mr. AIKEN. Who owns it?

Mr. STEWART. It is owned by the Tennessee Gas & Transmission Co.

Mr. AIKEN. I thought it was sold to the Chicago company.

Mr. STEWART. A group of men in Chicago and elsewhere in the country—possibly some of them in Texas—bought the stock of the Tennessee Gas & Transmission Co. from the stockholders who owned it at the time the original petition was filed.

Mr. AIKEN. Did the committee make any investigation to find out whether, subsequent to the issuance of the certificate, the Hope Co. or any other standard subsidiary, acquired a controlling interest in the stock of the company to which the certificate was issued or sold?

Mr. STEWART. The Hope Co. acquired no stock whatever in the Tennessee Gas & Transmission Co.

Mr. AIKEN. Is the Hope Co. interested in the Chicago company?

Mr. STEWART. No. I understand there is no connection between them. I believe I am correct in that statement.

Mr. TUNNELL. I believe that is correct.

Mr. STEWART. The Hope Co. was a subsidiary of the Standard Oil Co., and was already serving that area, and had been serving it for a great many years. The Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MOORE] is an expert on gas, and can correct me if my statement is not accurate. I believe that the chief source of supply in years gone by, before the Hope Co. came into the picture, was West Virginia and Pennsylvania. Is not that correct?

Mr. MOORE. The Hope Co. was in Texas, Oklahoma, and other parts of the Southwest territory, and in Louisiana as well.

If the Senator will yield now, I should like to ask a question, in order to have the record clear. By the way, the Chicago Corporation bought the stock of the Tennessee Gas & Transmission Co. It paid $540,000 for 90 percent of the stock. Ten percent of the stock remains with the stockholders of the Tennessee Co., whoever they are. I do not know that they have been identified.

Mr. STEWART. I believe that is correct. I had forgotten about the 10 percent feature of it. I, myself, do not know who the stockholders are.

Mr. MOORE. Both the Senator from Tennessee and the Senator from Delaware were present when this testimony was taken.

Mr. TUNNELL. The Senator is correct about that.

Mr. MOORE. Yes. It has been some time since the testimony was taken. I desire to get this matter straight, for the RECORD.

The conditional permit was issued, so far as the record shows, without any knowledge about whether they could comply with two requirements. One was to get the gas; the other was to get the money with which to build the pipe line. The permit was issued within 60 days, or thereabouts, as I recall, according to the record. If I am mistaken about that, I should like to be corrected.

Mr. TUNNELL. They were given 60 days within which to show that they could comply with those conditions.

Mr. MOORE. That is correct. Within the 60 days they came to the Power Commission, and said that Mr. Wagner, of the Chicago Corporation, would finance it or cause it to be financed, and that they had financed the company, or 90 percent of it.

Mr. TUNNELL. I may say to the Senator that Mr. Dougherty, who represented the Hope Co., said that their reason for taking the steps they did take, after they found the certificate was issued, was that they thought perhaps the Tennessee Co. would not be able to comply within the 60 days. There was no contention that it was not legitimate.

Mr. AIKEN. The Commission has no information, then, has it, as to whether the Hope Co. or the Standard Oil Co. actually controls the pipe line, through the stock in either the Chicago Corporation or the Tennessee Co.?

Mr. MOORE. Oh, no. The Hope Co. has no interest in the Chicago Corporation or the Tennessee Co. The corporation borrowed $40,000,000 from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

Mr. TUNNELL. Of course, it would be perfectly legal if it did.

Mr. MOORE. The Hope Co. has no interest in it.

Mr. TUNNELL. I think I can say to the Senator from Vermont that the Standard Oil interests devoted themselves to trying to make some arrangement to supply a portion of that territory. I cannot give the exact details. But it is not the same company.

Mr. MOORE. Madam President, if the Senator will permit me to clarify this matter, let me say that the Hope Co., which is a distributor of gas in the Appalachian area, extended its facilities to the Tennessee Co. or the Chicago Corporation for the distribution of the gas when brought here through the pipe line which is now being built.

Mr. TUNNELL. After it found the permit was granted.

Mr. MOORE. That is correct.

Mr. STEWART. The Hope Co. is now making a contract to buy a part of the gas which will be brought by the pipe line.

Mr. MOORE. The Hope Co. purchases all of it.

Mr. STEWART. I do not think it purchases all of it.

Mr. MOORE. It distributes it in the Appalachian area.

Mr. STEWART. Does not the Senator think that is the better way to handle it, rather than to create a monopoly by giving the entire field to the Hope Co.?

Mr. MOORE. The Senator can draw his own deductions about that. I am talking about administrative procedure.

The Senator from Tennessee will remember that the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON] is the one who commented on the fact that it had nothing to sell to the Chicago Corporation except the permit which was granted to it, and that it peddled it before it was granted.

Mr. STEWART. And it was granted before the Hope Co. knew anything about it. Both of them were dickering with the War Production Board all the time, and were communicating back and forth with one another.

Mr. TUNNELL. Not only did they know it, but the representative of the company testified they knew it and that they were waiting for the Hope Co. to comply within the 60 days.

In conclusion let me say that I never saw an objection to anything or anyone fall so flat as it fell in this case. Absolutely nothing was shown against Mr. Olds in any of his official acts. His record, so far as the record goes, is as clean as it is possible for any human being's record to be.

Not only that, but he has the distinction of having presided over the Commission and having all its decisions which have been tested, supported by the Supreme Court of the United States.

The only persons who seemed to object at all were representatives of the Standard Oil Co., representatives of the power commissions of certain States, and possibly some of the unions who do not want coal displaced by gas.

So Mr. Olds' record is a wonderful one. It would be a reflection on the Senate of the United States to refuse the confirmation of this nomination without any demonstrated reason.

EXHIBIT A

FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION,
Washington, D. C., September 11, 1944.

Hon. ROBERT A. TAFT,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR TAFT: This will acknowledge your letter of September 8 enclosing copies of letters addressed to you and Governor Bricker, of Ohio, by Michael M. Lucak, president of the Cleveland City Council. I am happy to send you my comments on Mr. Lucak's letters.

Mr. Lucak's criticisms are directed against the unanimous action of the Federal Power Commission in granting a certificate of convenience and necessity to the Tennessee Gas & Transmission Co. for construction of a natural-gas pipe line from the Texas fields to relieve the threatened shortage of gas for war industries in the Appalachian area, particularly in Ohio and Pennsylvania. His criticisms run particularly to the Commission's procedure in the case.

The facts may be briefly summarized as follows:

1. Tennessee's original application for a certificate for a line to deliver gas from Louisiana fields to serve new markets in Tennessee and northern Alabama dates back to April 1940. After extensive hearings the Commission, on July 22, 1941, denied the application for want of jurisdiction under the act as then written.

2. As early as January 1941 the Commission's studies indicated a threatened shortage of natural gas for war industries in the Ohio-Pennsylvania area, which could be partially met by certain interconnections between systems, but would ultimately require a major line from one of the southwestern fields if war should require maximum production. The increasing demands were rapidly exhausting local fields.

3. Following amendment to the Natural Gas Act, on February 7, 1942, giving the Commission jurisdiction, the Tennessee Co. on February 10, 1942, filed a new application, and by June of that year had amended its plan to provide for transportation of natural gas from southwestern Louisiana to the Kentucky-Ohio area, "specifically designed to serve most adequately the requirements of the war defense program." The new application to the War Production Board continued, "Natural gas will be transported from areas in southwestern Louisiana and made available to meet the present crisis of a natural-gas shortage in one of the most industrialized areas of the country, the Appalachian area." Tennessee notified the Commission that its application for certificate would be amended accordingly.

4. The Tennessee Co.'s amended application aimed to meet the needs not only of the Pittsburgh-Wheeling area but also of the entire State of Ohio through lines radiating from near Ashland, Ky. This was of particular interest to Ohio cities, including Cincinnati, Hamilton, and Dayton.

5. The Tennessee application also provided for obtaining the gas from the Louisiana portion of the tremendous new Gulf fields extending down into Texas, instead of from the heavily drawn upon and rapidly depleting Monroe field in northern Louisiana. It contemplated further use of gas which would first be processed to extract such essentials as high-octane gasoline.

6. At this time the only alternative proposal was contained in a 1941 application of the Hope Natural Gas Co. to the War Production Board for a line to bring gas to its own lines at Cornwell, W. Va., from the overdrawn Monroe field. When the War Production Board denied this application, along with that of the Tennessee Co. in 1942, no further proposal was made by the Hope Co. until the June 29, 1943, application for a line to the Hugoton field in Oklahoma, Kansas, and northern Texas. At no time while its application was pending before the War Production Board did Hope make any move to apply for a certificate of convenience and necessity, as required by the Natural Gas Act, as amended February 7, 1942.

7. The Commission delayed action on Tennessee's application until the autumn of 1942, awaiting advice from the War Production Board as to whether materials would be made available. But on October 5, 1942, when the situation was growing serious, the Commission wrote the Director of Operations indicating that hearings must be initiated in the near future, and calling attention to a report of Capt. Robert R. Gridley of the Matériel Command, Army Air Forces, which concluded: "1. That there is no satisfactory solution to the imminent shortage of natural gas in the Appalachian area by winter of 1943–44, other than a new major pipe line from a new source of supply. 2. That failure to construct such a line will necessitate curtailment measures causing a reduction in war production and considerable consumer inconvenience."

8. On October 17, 1942, the Commission received a copy of a letter to Chairman Nelson from the chairman of the House Committee on Military Affairs, expressing his great interest in the situation and containing the statement: "It occurs to me that certain persons within the War Production Board, by delaying a decision on the subject, may have in mind a hurry-up call at some future date whereby the Hope Co. (Standard Oil of New Jersey subsidiary) could conceivably be the only company ready to build the line." He continued to urge on the Commission and the War Production Board the importance to the war effort of prompt action on the Tennessee application.

9. On November 4, 1942, the Commission ordered a hearing on the application and subsequently received a copy of a letter addressed to the chairman of the House Committee on Military Affairs by Chairman Nelson, of the War Production Board, in which he said: "As you know, one of the important preliminary conditions is the securing of a certificate of convenience and necessity under the Natural Gas Act. I understand that on November 4, the Federal Power Commission set down for hearing on December 8, the application of Tennessee Gas & Transmission Co. for the required certificate, explaining that this action was being taken in order to facilitate the ultimate construction in the event the War Production Board issued the necessary priorities. There is, of course, no objection on the part of the War Production Board to this method of procedure."

10. In reply to Mr. Nelson, Chairman MAY, of the House Military Affairs Committee, wrote on November 12: "As I understand it,

the Tennessee Gas & Transmission Co. and the Hope Co. are the only companies who have approached the War Production Board at any time indicating they are ready to build a line that would relieve the gas shortage in the Appalachian area. My understanding is that the applications of both companies were turned down in the early summer, and that the Tennessee Gas & Transmission Co. refiled its application, and at the present time it is the only application pending before your Board for building a line to the Appalachian area."

11. Following the setting of the matter for hearing, the cities of Cincinnati and Hamilton, Ohio, expressed interest in the proposed line, with a view especially to augmenting supplies of gas to southwestern Ohio. Cincinnati, as an intervenor, contended that the northern terminus of the line should be there, at the lines of the Cincinnati Gas Transportation Co. (a Columbia subsidiary). The city wished to emphasize the importance of gas deliveries by Columbia to this Ohio area, from Cincinnati, through Hamilton, Middletown, Dayton, Springfield to Columbus, in comparison with its deliveries to the Pennsylvania area.

12. On May 20, 1943, while the hearings were proceeding, Director Krug, of the Office of War Utilities, War Production Board, wrote the chairman of the House Military Affairs Committee an extensive letter on the situation, in which he said: "It is our present view that the War Production Board should approve a transmission project for the Appalachian area sometime this summer so that all arrangements can be made for scheduling the production of pipe and completing the line in time for operation during the 1944–45 season."

13. Mr. Krug continued: "We have pending only one application for priorities although other interests in the Appalachian area have indicated that they propose to file applications. The particular line which will finally be approved by the War Production Board will, of course, be that one which will bring maximum support to the area in the shortest time with minimum use of critical materials. In any case, we propose to bring the matter to a prompt conclusion so that a new line can be brought into service when required, and so that the proceeding before the Federal Power Commission can likewise be completed seasonably."

14. Testimony of both Vice President Beckfjord, of the Columbia Gas & Electric Co., and President Tonkin, of the Hope Natural Gas Co., originally given in the East Ohio Gas Co. case but incorporated in the Tennessee case record, made it clear that both systems would require large additional supplies of gas from outside the area. Mr. Tonkin expressed the view that "somebody is going to have an outside source for this gas supply because, as far as we know, it is not in West Virginia," and Mr. Tonkin also testified that in his opinion industrial customers, many of them vital war industries, would bear the brunt of necessary curtailments. Yet the Hope Co. had made no application for certificate or for intervention in the Tennessee case. In the East Ohio case Mr. Tonkin indicated they had no plans for meeting the shortage.

15. On March 18, 1943, Chairman MAY of the House Military Affairs Committee had transmitted to the Commission a copy of a report of the committee's investigations with respect to the Appalachian area gas supply. In his letter he said: "It is my judgment that unless immediate action is taken by the War Production Board or by the Federal Power Commission, and preferably by both, there will be such a shortage of gas by the end of this year that during the winter 1943–44 we will undoubtedly lose steel production far in excess of the amount of steel which would be required to make available an adequate supply of gas from outside sources. Investigation discloses that there is but a single application pending before your Commission, that of the Tennessee Gas & Transmission Co., which proposes the construction of a line from Louisiana to the Appalachian area where connection can be made with all existing facilities near Ashland, Ky. At the same time it is found by the investigators that there is unquestionably a movement under way by the Standard Oil Co. or some of its subsidiaries, particularly the Hope Engineering Co., to in some way delay the construction of any line by any independent concern so that they may be the only supplier of gas to that region after the war, thereby enjoying a monopolistic position detrimental to the public interest."

16. The report of the committee's investigators pointed out that (a) Hope's original application to the War Production Board, turned down April 16, 1942, proposed to get gas from the Monroe field from which no less than six major natural-gas pipe lines were already taking gas in large and increasing quantities and which "will be largely depleted within a relatively short period, even without the greatly added drain on its dwindling reserves so proposed by the Hope Co."; and (b) "Hope has neither renewed that application nor taken any steps to apply to the Federal Power Commission for the certificate of public convenience and necessity requisite before any such interstate natural-gas pipe line could be constructed under existing statutes, either from Louisiana or from Texas. So far as it can be ascertained, the proposal so made by the Hope Co. for ameliorating the Appalachian gas shortage can, therefore, be considered a closed incident."

17. After noting the refusal of the Hope Co. to cooperate with the Tennessee Co., the report sums up: "It seems desirable to reiterate that the proposal of the Tennessee Gas & Transmission Co., above outlined, is the only proposal now being made to relieve the shortage in question. * * * Unless it be the efforts of the Tennessee Gas & Transmission Co., nothing measuring up in any reasonable way to this need is now being done by anyone or any agency. * * * Viewing the situation over all, it appears that the Tennessee Gas & Transmission Co. project is the only proposal now being made which offers a reasonable hope for the solution of this important problem." The report suggests "that efforts be made to accelerate affirmative action on this project by both the War Production Board and the Federal Power Commission in aid of the war effort, with which it is unquestionably so closely connected."

Under these circumstances the Commission would have been derelict in its duty if it had not prepared to act promptly. There was no question as to the threatened shortage of gas and as to its menace to war production in the Ohio-Pennsylvania area. There was no question as to the need for a large pipe line from the Southwest gas fields to meet the emergency. There was but one proposal for such a line—that of the Tennessee Co. The decision had to be made in time to get the necessary orders into the schedule of pipe and equipment manufacturers. The Commission could not shop around for other proposals.

The Commission, therefore, decided to act on the Tennessee Co. application along the lines previously followed in its 1939 Kansas pipe line decision. In other words, it decided to give the applicant 60 days' time within which to submit at further hearings evidence of commitments for gas supplies, financing and priorities with the assurance that, if the showing on these matters was satisfactory, it intended to authorize the necessary certificate.

The Commission actually reached this decision prior to June 29, 1943, when the Hope Natural Gas Co. filed its application for an alternative line to the Hugoton field. It was only the time required for phrasing and processing the accompanying opinion which gave grounds for the contention that the Commission acted without giving another applicant an opportunity to be heard. Under the circumstances, including the fact that Hope's dilatory application raised important new issues involving interventions from States concerned with safeguarding the Kansas-Oklahoma gas reserves against accelerated depletion, it would have been contrary to the public interest in proper scheduling of war production to have reopened the entire matter. In fact, on August 28, 1943, the Commission received a letter from Director Krug, of the Office of War Utilities, War Production Board, and Program Vice Chairman of the War Production Board, stating in part:

"The Steel Division advises that in order to meet the necessary fabrication schedule to complete the line in time for operation during the winter of 1944–45, firm rated orders for pipe must be placed not later than October 1, 1943. We, therefore, strongly urge that the Federal Power Commission take final action in this matter prior to that date."

The Tennessee project, as finally approved, was satisfactory for the purpose. It provided an independent source of supply for both Columbia and Standard Oil subsidiaries. It met the needs of Ohio as well as Pennsylvania. And, as Mr. Dougherty, counsel for Standard Oil interests, stated in the Senate hearings on the reappointment of Mr. Leland Olds to the Commission: "I don't think they were wrong in granting them a certificate, because as events subsequently transpired they came and showed an adequate supply of gas and showed financial ability to do so, and as soon as that developed our company made a contract with them."

In the face of this record, Mr. Lucak can hardly sustain his contention that the Commission's action was such as to encourage monopoly or to exclude a competitor from a fair hearing. The Standard Oil interests, already entrenched in the area, had every opportunity to come in seasonably and to obtain a full hearing. They chose to pursue dilatory tactics and the effect of the Commission's action was to permit an independent competitor for gas supply to the area to construct the interstate line.

Mr. Lucak's second contention that the Tennessee company was given a 60-day period in which to peddle its monopolistic right to its own financial advantage is similarly unsupported by the facts. The Commission on July 5, 1943, gave the applicant no certificate or other right whatsoever. The arrangement with the Chicago corporation, by which Tennessee obtained the necessary financing and supplies of gas, provided simply for the reimbursement of the original owners for the considerable expenses incurred in the company's development of a project which would serve the public interest and its presentations over a period of years before bodies authorized to pass on such projects. In view of the well-known policy of the Federal Power Commission of basing rates only on legitimate investment in such an enterprise, explicitly stated to the interested parties in the hearings before the full Commission, the charge that the Commission's action will result in undue burdens on Ohio consumers appears erroneous.

Mr. Lucak's third contention, to the effect that the company received a loan from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to the exclusion of private capital obviously has no bearing on the Commission's action in the case. This phase of the matter did not come before the Commission in connection with the granting of the certificate. The Chicago corporation made a firm commitment to provide the necessary financing and showed clearly its ability to make good on that commitment. It is our understanding that the provisions of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation loan, pursuant to congressional

authority, assure the rapid amortization of this public investment by private capital.

Finally, it may be noted that the city of Cleveland intervened in the Tennessee Gas & Transmission case, expressing its interest in the proposed pipe line in terms of the potential availability of southwestern gas for the purpose of meeting the wartime demands of Cleveland consumers.

In closing, I wish to express our appreciation of your affording an opportunity for comment on Mr. Lucak's contentions. The Commission is seeking at all times to act only after according all interested parties, whether States, municipalities, competitors, or industries dependent on competing fuels, every legitimate opportunity to be heard. But it cannot allow abuse of this opportunity to delay decisions which affect the country's war production or the health and comfort of its citizens.

Sincerely yours,

BASIL MANLY,
Acting Chairman.

Mr. HILL. Madam President, I desire to commend the Senator from Delaware [Mr. TUNNELL] for his very able presentation, and I wish to associate myself with him, the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. STEWART], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK], and the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] in their support of the confirmation of the nomination of Mr. Olds.

During the past 6 years when Mr. Olds has been Chairman of the Federal Power Commission, I have had some knowledge of the work of Mr. Olds in that position. He has at all times been able, devoted, diligent, and faithful. I think we are fortunate to have a man of the character, the courage, and the indefatigable devotion of Mr. Olds as Chairman of that Commission, sitting there day after day, and working hour after hour, to protect and safeguard the public interest.

Madam President, there are many reasons why I favor the confirmation of the nomination of Mr. Olds. But one of the strongest reasons is the enemies he has made in his position as Chairman of the Federal Power Commission.

Mr. AIKEN. Madam President, I shall not detain the Senate more than 3 or 4 minutes.

I have known Mr. Leland Olds for a great many years. He was born and raised not far from my home in New England. His father was president of Amherst College for many years. I consider him a very efficient public servant, honest, and not afraid to fight the most powerful of his enemies. He has spoken frequently in Vermont. He is very popular with the State Farm Bureau. He has spoken before the Champlain Valley Council, and he is always welcome to return and speak to us again. He is an earnest supporter of farm cooperatives, believing that a certain percentage of business done cooperatively effectively controls the manner in which the rest of the business is handled.

I believe that the Senate would be committing a very grave injustice if it should refuse to confirm his nomination.

Mr. BARKLEY. Madam President, I understand that there is to be no further discussion of this nomination. I also understand that the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MOORE] intends to ask for a yea-and-nay vote on the confirmation of the nomination. It is obvious that it is too late in the day to obtain a quorum. I therefore ask unanimous consent that upon the reassembling of the Senate tomorrow at 12 o'clock the Senate proceed to vote upon this nomination without further debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Kentucky? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

RECESS

Mr. BARKLEY. I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 24 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Wednesday, September 13, 1944, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate September 12 (legislative day of September 1), 1944:

APPOINTMENT IN THE REGULAR ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

TO BE MAJOR GENERAL WITH RANK FROM SEPTEMBER 8, 1944

Lt. Gen. Omar Nelson Bradley (brigadier general, U. S. Army), Army of the United States, vice Maj. Gen. Ben Lear, retired.

PROMOTIONS IN THE REGULAR ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

TO BE COLONEL WITH RANK FROM AUGUST 16, 1944

Lt. Col. Ralph Gillett Barrows, Corps of Engineers (temporary colonel).

TO BE COLONEL WITH RANK FROM SEPTEMBER 1, 1944

Lt. Col. Holland Luley Robb, Corps of Engineers (temporary colonel).

Lt. Col. Hamilton Ewing Maguire, Field Artillery (temporary colonel).

Lt. Col. William Morris Hoge, Corps of Engineers (temporary brigadier general).

Lt. Col. William Roscoe Woodward, Field Artillery (temporary brigadier general).

TEMPORARY APPOINTMENTS IN THE ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

TO BE LIEUTENANT GENERAL

Maj. Gen. Thomas Troy Handy (brigadier general, U. S. Army), Army of the United States.

Maj. Gen. Lucian King Truscott, Jr. (lieutenant colonel, Cavalry), Army of the United States.

Maj. Gen. Daniel Isom Sultan (brigadier general, U. S. Army), Army of the United States.

TO BE MAJOR GENERAL

Brig. Gen. Edwin Daviess Patrick (lieutenant colonel, Infantry), Army of the United States.

Brig. Gen. Norman Daniel Cota (lieutenant colonel, Infantry), Army of the United States.

Brig. Gen. Frank Dow Merrill (captain, Cavalry), Army of the United States.

Brig. Gen. Eugene Warren Fales (colonel, Infantry), Army of the United States.

Brig. Gen. Robert Wilkins Douglass, Jr. (major, Air Corps; temporary lieutenant colonel, Air Corps; temporary colonel, Army of the United States, Air Corps), Army of the United States.

Brig. Gen. Francis Bernard Mallon (colonel, Infantry), Army of the United States.

Brig. Gen. Gilbert Xavier Cheves (lieutenant colonel, Cavalry), Army of the United States.

Brig. Gen. Maurice Rose (lieutenant colonel, Cavalry), Army of the United States.

TO BE BRIGADIER GENERAL

Col. Henry John Dick Meyer (lieutenant colonel, Field Artillery), Army of the United States.

Col. Truman Everett Boudinot (lieutenant colonel, Cavalry), Army of the United States.

Col. Wayne Cliffton Zimmerman (lieutenant colonel, Infantry), Army of the United States.

Col. Philip Guillou Blackmore, Ordnance Department.

Col. Franklin Babcock, Coast Artillery Corps.

Col. Thomas Wade Herren (lieutenant colonel, Cavalry), Army of the United States.

Col. George Robert Acheson (major, Air Corps; temporary lieutenant colonel, Air Corps; temporary colonel, Army of the United States, Air Corps), Army of the United States.

Col. Cuthbert Powell Stearns, cavalry.

Col. Kenner Fisher Hertford (major, Corps of Engineers), Army of the United States.

Col. William Stevens Lawton (major, Coast Artillery Corps), Army of the United States.

Col. Willard Ames Holbrook, Jr. (lieutenant colonel, Cavalry), Army of the United States.

Col. Charles Bishop Lyman, Infantry.

Col. Hugo Peoples Rush (lieutenant colonel, Air Corps; temporary colonel, Army of the United States, Air Corps), Army of the United States.

Col. Charles Conrad Brown (lieutenant colonel, Field Artillery), Army of the United States.

Col. Harlan Leslie Mumma (lieutenant colonel, Quartermaster Corps), Army of the United States.

Col. Tom Christopher Rives (lieutenant colonel, Signal Corps), Army of the United States.

Col. Don Emerson Carleton (major, Cavalry), Army of the United States.

Col. Joseph Sladen Bradley (lieutenant colonel, Infantry), Army of the United States.

Col. Henry Davis Jay (lieutenant colonel, Field Artillery), Army of the United States.

Col. David Nathaniel Hauseman (lieutenant colonel, Ordnance Department), Army of the United States.

Col. Fay Roscoe Upthegrove (major, Air Corps; temporary lieutenant colonel, Air Corps; temporary colonel, Army of the United States, Air Corps), Army of the United States.

Col. Richard Clark Lindsay (captain, Air Corps; temporary lieutenant colonel, Air Corps; temporary colonel, Army of the United States, Air Corps), Army of the United States.

Col. Elmer Forrest Wallender (lieutenant colonel, Quartermaster Corps), Army of the United States.

Col. John Perry Willey (major, Cavalry), Army of the United States.

Col. Junius Henry Houghton (lieutenant colonel, Air Corps; temporary colonel, Air Corps), Army of the United States.

Col. Joseph Theodore Morris (lieutenant colonel, Air Corps; temporary colonel, Air Corps), Army of the United States.

Col. Hamilton Ewing Maguire (lieutenant colonel, Field Artillery), Army of the United States.

Col. Henry Jeffrey Matchett (lieutenant colonel, Infantry), Army of the United States.

Col. Burton Murdock Hovey, Jr. (major, Air Corps; temporary lieutenant colonel, Air Corps; temporary colonel, Army of the United States, Air Corps), Army of the United States.

TO BE BRIGADIER GENERAL

Col. William Robert Clayton Morrison (major, Judge Advocate General, Reserve), Army of the United States.

Col. Frederick Smith Strong, Jr., Quartermaster, Reserve.

TO BE MAJOR GENERAL

Brig. Gen. Joseph Wilson Byron, Army of the United States.

Brig. Gen. Cyrus Rowlett Smith, Army of the United States.

TO BE BRIGADIER GENERAL

Col. William James Williamson, Army of the United States.

Col. Paul William Johnston, Army of the United States.

Col. Charles Merville Spofford, Army of the United States.

Col. John Stetson Allard (temporary colonel, Army of the United States, Air Corps), Army of the United States.

Col. Wayne Russell Allen, Army of the United States.

IN THE NAVY

Admiral Chester W. Nimitz, United States Navy, to be an admiral in the Navy, for temporary service, to rank from the 31st day of December 1941.

Admiral Royal E. Ingersoll, United States Navy, to be an admiral in the Navy, for temporary service, to rank from the 1st day of July 1942.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate September 12 (legislative day of September 1), 1944:

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

REGISTERS OF LAND OFFICES

Mrs. Belle D. Byrne to be register of the land office at Bismarck, N. Dak.

Mrs. Jessie C. Weeks to be register of the land office at Buffalo, Wyo.

UNITED STATES PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

PROMOTIONS IN THE REGULAR CORPS

Willys M. Monroe to be a temporary passed assistant surgeon, effective July 1, 1944.

To be temporary surgeons, effective September 1, 1944:

James A. Finger — Luther L. Terry
Milton W. Gwinner — Albert L. Chapman.
George F. Ellinger

To be temporary senior surgeons, effective September 1, 1944:

Cassius J. Van Slyke
David C. Elliott
Roy E. Butler

Michael J. Pescor to be a temporary medical director, effective September 1, 1944.

Francis J. Walters to be a temporary dental surgeon, effective August 1, 1944.

Harvey F. Ludwig to be a temporary passed assistant sanitary engineer, effective September 1, 1944.

Ellis S. Tisdale to be a temporary senior sanitary engineer, effective August 1, 1944.

Malcolm C. Hope to be a passed assistant sanitary engineer, effective date of oath.

To be temporary surgeons, effective August 1, 1944:

John G. Crawford — Jesse D. Harris
Vernon W. Foster — Ray H. Vanderhook
William G. Budington

Leland J. Hanchett to be a temporary senior surgeon, effective May 1, 1944.

To be temporary medical directors, effective August 15, 1944:

Otis L. Anderson
Edwin H. Carnes

To be passed assistant surgeons, effective date indicated:

Alfred L. Holloman, July 1, 1943.
John G. Crawford, October 16, 1943.
John C. Grier, July 1, 1944.
Buell S. Bindschedler, September 19, 1944.

To be surgeons, effective date indicated:

Victor H. Haas, September 1, 1944.
Clifton K. Himmelsbach, September 1, 1944.
Kenneth E. Gamm, September 1, 1944.
John W. Oliphant, September 1, 1944.
Seymour D. Vestermark, September 1, 1944.
Hollis U. Maness, September 1, 1944.
Leroy E. Burney, September 12, 1944.
Charles R. Mallary, October 1, 1944.

To be senior surgeons, effective date indicated:

Adolph S. Rumreich, September 2, 1944.
Ernest E. Huber, September 2, 1944.
Alfred J. Aselmeyer, November 29, 1944.

POSTMASTERS

ALABAMA

Lena W. Glover, Margaret.

ALASKA

Marie F. Harwood, Platinum.

CALIFORNIA

George H. Crooks, Ahwahnee.
Maud F. Olsen, Yorba Linda.

CONNECTICUT

Mary B. Hartley, Enfield.
Henry H. Canfield, North Woodbury.

DELAWARE

John B. Derrickson, Ellendale.
Grace E. Bright, St. Georges.
Alma E. Boulden, Stanton.

FLORIDA

Catharine C. Johnson, Arlington.
Margaret M. Scruggs, Aucilla.
Gertrude R. Gauger, Bagdad.
Thad J. Walker, Jr., Baker.
Elma Shuler, Bristol.
Archibald C. Greiner, Dundee.
Abbie A. Casey, Freeport.
Ida B. McMillan, Grand Ridge.
Leah G. Green, Greensboro.
Helen D. Hall, Lake Hamilton.
Alvis W. Reams, Lamont.
Mary E. Walker, Lloyd.
John E. Clonts, Oakland.
Wilbur A. Willis, Oklawaha.
Jane E. Henley, Orlovista.
Alice E. Robison, Wakulla.
Stephen R. Mallory, Wellborn.
Claude E. Crosby, Wesconnett.
Leonard F. Stewart, Jr., Zellwood.

INDIANA

Marie W. Jarrett, Williamsburg.

IOWA

Ruby C. Loes, Alburnett.
George Lieb, Atkins.
Thomas V. Darby, Cresco.
Katherine A. Clarahan, Harper.
Agnes M. Workman, Henderson.
Albert Johnson, Huxley.
Henry Frost, Laurel.
Harley J. Greenwalt, Mount Auburn.
Gayle Snedecor, Rhodes.
Bessie Mae Rice, Urbana.

LOUISIANA

Emile Aubert, Abita Springs.
Ferdinand Nunez, Bell City.
Robert E. Guilbeau, Branch.
Emma C. Nunez, Grand Chenier.
Mathidle D. Gautreaux, Mathews.
Louise F. Crawford, Morrow.

MASSACHUSETTS

Wayne A. Smith, Griswoldville.

MICHIGAN

Lola C. Clark, Burlington.
Gertrude Hansen, Coral.
Lyman E. Fay, Howell.
Crystal Weldon, Mears.
Ruth Hoffman, Palmyra.

MINNESOTA

Lyman O. Shattuck, Altura.
Theresia S. Barton, Bowlus.
Leonard E. O'Leary, Campbell.
Bess N. Stone, Cooley.
Ivan Jacobson, Cushing.
Ellsworth L. Brown, Dakota.
Lloyd F. Jensen, Darwin.
Ida V. Lund, Farwell.
Mattie M. Strauch, Hillman.
Albert E. Child, Laporte.
Lorna A. Stender, New Germany.
Henry M. Syverson, Odin.
Edward Oja, Pengilly.
Lester E. Hewson, Stacy.
Roy E. Grandstrand, Shafer.
Mildred B. Johnson, Welch.

MISSOURI

Grace L. Smiser, Amsterdam.
Charles P. Tompkins, Barnett.
James D. Kochel, Canalou.
Margaret Stephens, Clarksburg.
Arthur M. Hoy, Esther.
William O. Morris, Eugene.
Arvell E. Hightower, Grovespring.
Irene B. O'Briant, Livonia.
Mara T. Keevil, Syracuse.

NEW MEXICO

Herman E. Kelt, Carrizozo.
Daniel M. Chavez, El Rito.
Floyd L. Cole, Hope.
Lue E. Miles, Vanadium.
Kate M. Wallace, Zuni.

NORTH CAROLINA

Henry A. Sims, Waxhaw.

OKLAHOMA

Mary C. Nixon, Agra.
Basil E. McClendon, Bixby.
Elmer E. Hill, Cameron.
Orra E. Cockrell, Colcord.
Flossie Melton, Colony.
Helen Krause, Corn.
John M. Banks, Crowder.
Myrtle Whiteaker, Panama.
James F. Pate, Ravia.
Weldon N. Wadley, Tyrone.

OREGON

Orra B. Cole, Cannon Beach.
Louie E. Briggs, Charleston.
Elsie Langley, Fairview.
Roscoe M. Lackey, Fort Stevens.
Antoinette McKechnie, Gearhart.
Harriet E. Payne, Harbor.
Frank E. Cross, Hebo.
William B. Small, Hood River.
Mary R. Smith, Jacksonville.
Marie Bevins, Park Place.
Modine Skinner, Phoenix.
Wayne E. Elliott, Veneta.
Charles A. Ridder, Willamette.

TEXAS

Maude Cavender, Encinal.
Felix B. Secrest, Georgetown.
Joe A. Nesbitt, Harrold.
Mildred R. Koontz, Inez.
William B. Galloway, Leggett.
Charlie N. Hooser, Maypearl.
Claudie A. Oliver, Moore.
Alice M. Shone, North Pleasanton.
Harry J. Kuhn, Paige.
Andrew J. Sitton, Jr., Pyote.
Barbara L. Gathings, Quemado.
Edgar L. Fricke, Round Top.
R. Dewitt Lancaster, Sonora.
Georgia Daniel, Toyah.

VIRGINIA

Pattie B. Chappell, Carson.
Frank H. Jones, Green Bay.
Matilda W. Campbell, Greenville.

WASHINGTON

Tollie M. Livingston, Bridgeport.
Herbert B. Dye, Leavenworth.
Mary C. Nelson, Olalla.
Walter Jones, Pinehurst.
Roy H. Hughes, Satsop.
Ernest E. Riddell, Tracyton.
Helen M. Walkup, Tukwila.

WEST VIRGINIA

Herbert Adkins, Harts.
Bessie S. Fisher, Sissonville.

WYOMING

Eva I. Fleenor, Fort Laramie.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, SEPTEMBER 12, 1944

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father in heaven, confidently and trustfully we lift up our prayer to Thee for peace and forgiveness; we pray that we may never betray nor forsake Thee. Nothing in all human aspirations is quite so splendid as when our Master inspires a human soul for Himself. We wait for Thy loving kindness, O God; do Thou fill the gaps in our knowledge and understanding that we may be wholly Thine.

Blessed Lord, keep us free from unworthy conceptions; let us grow in heart, in charity, and outlook, making a larger allowance for human infirmities. We pray for more meditation, more pondering, and more of that secret assimilation which takes hold of the eternal grounds of justice and tolerance; this is life divine, based on noble principles and radiant with great hopes. Like the breath of heaven making free course through our whole natures, grant that the joy of the Lord may be our strength, moving in living currents through heart and life. O God, according to Thy name so is Thy praise unto the world's end; Thy right hand is full of righteousness. In the name of our Saviour, the Son of the living God. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, sometime ago I accepted an invitation to address the National Tax Association in St. Louis, Mo., today. However, my official duties prevented my going to St. Louis. I ask unanimous consent to insert the address which I prepared in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. HAGEN] be permitted to extend his remarks in the RECORD on farm subsidies and farm programs.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. CLEVENGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BUSBEY] be permitted to extend his own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. PLUMLEY] may extend his own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include a newspaper article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD on two subjects and to include an editorial of the Miles City Daily Star on the Missouri River Valley matter, and a resolution of the Lion's Club of Casper, Wyo., on the Missouri River.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wyoming?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow, after the other business and any other special orders, I may address the House for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Dakota?

There was no objection.

SUGAR SUPPLY

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, Members of the House are receiving telegrams from wholesale grocers throughout the country wondering why they cannot obtain a sufficient amount of refined sugar to take care of the fruit crop.

We must bear in mind that last year and the year before, due to scarce farm labor, there was a great reduction in the production of beet sugar in the Western States. There is not the usual stocks of sugar in that area to supply the trade. Raw sugar primarily comes from the West Indies at the present time. There is a shortage of ocean-transportation facilities and an unusually large load on seacoast refiners. Inland, there is a shortage of transportation facilities. Therefore, there is a shortage of refined sugar all through the Central States. That shortage will undoubtedly continue for some time and I think will grow worse. I do not know anything we can do about it particularly. The errors have been made. The Government agencies have made improper calculations, and the fruit will be undoubtedly wasted to a very great extent.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Thursday, after the business of the day and any other special orders, I may be permitted to speak for 30 minutes on politics and other matters.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that upon the conclusion of the address by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BULWINKLE], I may be permitted to proceed for 15 minutes upon similar topics.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include as a part of my remarks a radio address made by Mr. Upton Close on foreign affairs.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague from Wisconsin [Mr. STEVENSON] may extend his own remarks in the RECORD and include therein several letters.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein a short article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK] is recognized for 20 minutes.

DEMOBILIZATION

Mr. MCCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, it is a well-known fact that the War Department for over 2 years has given consideration to the question of demobilization in whole or in part when the fortunes of war turned in our favor and permitted men in the Army to be demobilized. It was being considered by the General Staff, and around April of 1943 the Special Planning Division of the War Department Special Staff, which comes under General Marshall, the Chief of Staff, was organized to study and consider that very problem. The head of this Division was Brig. Gen. William F. Tompkins, who is now a major general. This Division was formed to coordinate all considerations given by the War Department prior to that time to the question of demobilization. Its specific duty and task was to devote itself to the study of demobilization and to recommend to the Chief of Staff and to the Secretary of War the War Department's plans for demobilization of the military personnel. As a matter of fact, the organization of this Division could have been ascertained

by any Member of Congress upon inquiry, or could have been ascertained by any Governor, or by any citizen interested enough to find out that the Division was functioning and considering this important question. This applies to Governor Dewey, who has made his ridiculous and untrue charge.

The Division made its recommendations to the Chief of Staff, who in due time approved them and submitted them to the Secretary of War. He in turn approved them and they were announced to the public. The War Department plans on demobilization, which has just as much effect on the officers and men of the Army as any law passed by Congress has on our people, was promulgated and made public on September 6, 1944, the day before Governor Dewey made his first speech in Philadelphia, in which he made a charge about demobilization as far removed from the truth as any charge could be.

Governor Dewey attempted to use a statement made by General Hershey, Director of Selective Service, as the means for supporting his ridiculous charge that it is the administration's policy to use the War Department in its demobilization program in an effort to meet any unemployment situation that might exist immediately after the termination of the war.

In his Philadelphia speech of September 7, 1944, Governor Dewey quoted a statement made by General Hershey, in which General Hershey is reported to have said:

> We can keep people in the Army about as cheaply as we could create an agency for them when they are out.

Governor Dewey said:

> For 6 months we have been hearing statements from the New Deal underlings in Washington that this was the plan.

He further said:

> I do not share that fear. I believe that our members of the armed forces should be transported home and released at the earliest practical moment after victory.

At the time Governor Dewey made that statement he knew—or should have known—that it was not a correct statement; that it conveyed to the American people and the officers and men of the United States Army a completely false impression.

Now, what are the facts? On September 6, 1944, the War Department, in a release which was carried extensively by all the newspapers throughout the country, stated its policy in relation to demobilization. A general order was issued, and a general order of the Army is binding upon all officers and men in the Army. While in operation, it is just as binding as a law passed by Congress is binding upon our people. Every officer and man in the United States Army knows when a general order is issued what their rights are under that order.

In the release made the day before Governor Dewey made his speech in Philadelphia the War Department said:

> The size of the Military Establishment that will be needed after the defeat of Germany has been calculated with the same exactness as the size of the Army needed up to now. No soldier will be kept in the military service who is not needed to fulfill these requirements. No soldier will be released who is needed.

Mr. Speaker, at this point in my remarks, I ask unanimous consent to insert the release of the War Department.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

The matter referred to follows:

WAR DEPARTMENT,
BUREAU OF PUBLIC RELATIONS.

(For release at 12 noon, eastern war time, Wednesday, September 6, 1944)

WAR DEPARTMENT DEMOBILIZATION PLAN AFTER DEFEAT OF GERMANY

The Army has adopted a plan for the readjustment of military personnel after the defeat of Germany and prior to the defeat of Japan calling for a partial and orderly demobilization from its present peak strength.

When the war against Germany has ended, the military might of the United States will be shifted from the European area to the Pacific area. Military requirements in the European and American areas will be drastically curtailed, while tremendous increases will be essential in the Pacific.

To defeat Japan as quickly as possible, and permanently, the United States will have to assemble, readjust, and streamline its military forces in order to apply the maximum power. Our military requirements to achieve this end, involving men, weapons, equipment, and shipping, have been set forth by the Combined Chiefs of Staff. These requirements are the determining factors of the readjustment and demobilization plan adopted by the War Department.

Military necessity decrees that sufficient men suited to the type of warfare being waged in the Pacific must remain in service as long as they are essential. Certain units of the Army also, of necessity, will have to be retained in the various theaters where action has ceased in order to fulfill such occupation duties as are necessary. Other elements, no longer needed in the theater in which they are assigned, will be transferred to other areas, reorganized and redesignated to meet current military requirements in the theater, or they will be inactivated.

Within each element of the Army thousands of individuals may become surplus to the needs of the theater or major command in which they are serving. But more thousands will be required for further military service.

First priority in this readjustment program will be the transfer of elements from theaters no longer active to the Pacific war zone, or from the United States to the Pacific war zone. All available transportation will be utilized for this tremendous undertaking.

The readjustment and demobilization plan developed by the War Department after months of study takes into account all of these variable factors. Briefly, the plan for the return of nonessential soldiers to civilian life will start with the assembly in the United States of men declared surplus to the needs of each overseas theater and to the major commands in the United States. From among these men some will be designated essential, and a substantial number will be designated as nonessential to the new military needs of the Army and will be returned to civilian life according to certain priorities.

As an example, the commanding general of the European Theater of Operations will be informed by the War Department of the types and numbers of his units which will be needed in the Pacific, and the types and numbers of his units which will remain as occupation troops, and the types and numbers of his units which are surplus.

The simplest plan of demobilization would have been to return these surplus units to this country and discharge their personnel intact.

Such a method, however, would operate with great unfairness to many individuals who have had long and arduous service but are not assigned to one of the units declared surplus. If only units in Europe were considered, this basis of expediency would work unfairly to units long in the Pacific or at outpost bases in the American theater. It would operate unfairly to men who have seen extended combat service both in Europe and the Pacific and have been returned to this country for reassignment. It would release men only recently assigned as replacements to units long in combat and would discriminate against veterans of many campaigns in units not selected for return.

Consequently, it was determined that the fairest method to effect partial demobilization would be through the selection of men as individuals, rather than by units, with the selection governed by thoroughly impartial standards.

For the standards, the War Department went to the soldiers themselves. Experts were sent into the field to obtain a cross-section of the sentiments of enlisted men. Thousands of soldiers, both in this country and overseas, were interviewed to learn their views on the kind of selective process they believed should determine the men to be returned first to civilian life. Opinions expressed by the soldiers themselves became the accepted principles of the plan.

As finally worked out, the plan accepted by the War Department as best meeting the tests of justice and impartiality, will allow men who have been overseas and men with dependent children to have priority of separation. Ninety percent of the soldiers interviewed said that that is the way it should be.

As part of the plan adopted, an Adjusted Service Rating Card will be issued to all enlisted personnel after the defeat of Germany. On this card will be scored the following four factors that will determine priority of separation:

1. Service credit—based upon the total number of months of Army service since September 16, 1940.

2. Overseas credit—based upon the number of months served overseas.

3. Combat credit—based upon the first and each additional award to the individual of the Medal of Honor, Distinguished Service Cross, Legion of Merit, Silver Star, Distinguished Flying Cross, Soldier's Medal, Bronze Star Medal, Air Medal, Purple Heart, and Bronze Service Stars (battle participation stars).

4. Parenthood credit—which gives credit for each dependent child under 18 years up to a limit of three children.

The value of the point credits will be announced after the cessation of hostilities in Europe. In the meantime, the point values will be kept under continuous study. The total score will be used to select surplus men from the theaters overseas and in the United States. The score also will be used when a certain portion of all these surplus men will be declared nonessential and returned to civilian life.

In all cases, however, the demands of military necessity and the needs of the war against Japan must first be met. Regardless of a man's priority standing, certain types of personnel can never become surplus as long as the war against Japan continues.

As an example of how the plan will work, assume that there are four infantry divisions in the European theater. One is declared surplus. Men in all four divisions are rated according to the priority credit scores. The

top fourth is selected and those not essential for retention in service by reason of military necessity are designated as surplus. Men in the surplus division who are marked for retention by reason of military necessity are then shifted into the active divisions. All of the men designated as surplus are shifted into the surplus divisions, which now will serve as a vehicle for eventually returning them to the United States.

No man in a unit that remains in service can become surplus until a qualified replacement is available. If military necessity should entail the immediate transfer of a unit to the Pacific, there may conceivably be no time to apply the plan to men of that unit before the emergency transfer is made. Consideration will be given these men when they arrive in the new theater.

The active units needed against Japan will be shipped to the Pacific. Those units required for occupation duty in Europe will be sent to their stations, and surplus units will be returned to the United States as quickly as possible.

In the United States, the men of these surplus units will revert to a surplus pool in the Army Ground Forces, Army Service Forces, and Army Air Forces. These surplus pools will include surplus men from all overseas theaters and surplus men from the continental United States.

From these surplus pools the reduction of various types of Army personnel will be made. The number to be returned to civilian life as no longer essential to over-all Army needs will be chosen from among those with the highest priority credit scores.

It is emphasized that the rate of return of surplus men from overseas will depend upon the number of ships available. Thousands of ships will be required to supply the Pacific theater. The Pacific theater will have No. 1 priority. All else must wait. To it will be transported millions of fighting men, millions of tons of landing barges, tanks, planes, guns, ammunition, and food, over longer supply lines than those to Europe.

This means that most of the ships and planes that were used to supply the European theater will be needed to supply the Pacific theater. The majority of ships proceeding to Europe will continue on to the Pacific laden with troops and supplies for that distant campaign. Very few will turn around and come back to the United States. The Army, therefore, will not be able to return all surplus men to the United States immediately. It may take many months.

While the process of selecting and returning men from the European theater is taking place, the plan for readjustment and partial demobilization also will be applied in active theaters, like the Southwest Pacific. Individuals in those theaters will be declared surplus to the extent that replacements can be provided. Naturally, since the Pacific will be the only active theater, there will be no surplus units of any type. Military requirements there will demand an increase rather than a decrease in fighting units. Nevertheless, troops in the Pacific area will benefit by the reduction of the Army, not as units, but as individuals.

Commanders in the Pacific area will be told the number and types of men who can be replaced. They then will select these men, using the same standards as apply in inactive theaters and in the United States. These men then will be returned to the United States as rapidly as replacements of the same type become available and as the military situation permits.

As an example: Normally there will be a great flow of men needed to build up and maintain an offensive against Japan, but, say that several thousand men over and above the required number can be shipped to the Pacific each month. Then a corresponding number of men in the Pacific with the highest priority credit scores can be declared surplus and returned to the United States, where their scores and military necessity will determine whether they are among the personnel no longer essential to the Army.

Simultaneously with the selection and return of men in the overseas theaters, the same selective formula will be applied among troops stationed in the continental United States. Troops in the United States, however, will serve as the main reservoir of replacements for the overseas theaters. For, in general, their priority scores will be lower than the scores of men who have served overseas and have seen combat duty.

Any man who may have been declared nonessential under this plan who wishes to remain in the Army, provided he has a satisfactory record, will not be forced out of the Army if he can be usefully employed.

In the case of officers, military necessity will determine which ones are nonessential. These will be released as they can be spared.

Priority of release for members of the Women's Army Corps will be determined in the same way as for the rest of the Army, but treating the corps as a separate group. However, in the case of all female personnel of the Army, those whose husbands have already been released will be discharged upon application.

The plan as now adopted will provide some reduction in the Army's Ground Forces and initially considerably less in the Service Forces and in the Air Forces.

Following Germany's defeat, the Air Forces will have to move combat groups and supporting ground units from all over the world to the Pacific areas. The nature of the Pacific area dictates that Service Forces personnel will be needed in great numbers to carry the war to Japan. Long supply lines, scattered bases, jungles, primitive country, all contribute to the importance and necessity for Service Forces personnel. Therefore, the reduction in its strength will be slow at first.

As replacements become available from the Ground Forces and from new inductees, the Air Forces and the Service Forces will discharge a fair share of men proportionate with the Ground Forces.

Surplus individuals declared nonessential to the needs of the Army will be discharged from the service through separation centers. Five Army separation centers are already in operation, and additional ones will be set up when the need develops. A total of 18 in all parts of the country are contemplated. Their wide distribution will enable us to discharge soldiers close to their homes.

The readjustment and demobilization plan applies only to readjustment and demobilization in the period between the defeat of Germany and prior to the defeat of Japan. It sets forth the principles and responsibilities involved during that period. Theater commanders and commanders of all other major commands of the Army will put the plan into operation in as simple a manner as possible, based on these principles and responsibilities.

The War Department has determined that the successful operation of the plan requires that the troops themselves, as well as the public, be kept fully informed.

The size of the Military Establishment that will be needed after the defeat of Germany has been calculated with the same exactness as the size of the Army needed up to now. No soldier will be kept in the military service who is not needed to fulfill these requirements. No soldier will be released who is needed.

It must be borne in mind always that the war will not be won, nor the peace enjoyed, until Japan has been completely crushed.

A half an hour after Governor Dewey finished his speech, and over a national hook-up, Maj. Gen. William F. Tompkins made a radio speech—and it took time to prepare that speech—on the question of demobilization and the Army's plan, in which he said:

Military necessity is the No. 1 consideration in these plans. How many soldiers can be released and how quickly they can be brought home will be controlled by the manpower and transportation requirements of our war against Japan. Thus, although it will be possible to return to civilian life a fairly large number of men, it will be necessary to keep in service many more than can be released.

The reason for this, as stated, is due to "transportation requirements" and the necessity of conducting the war in the Far East against Japan. General Tompkins further said—and this is very significant and important in showing the falsity of Governor Dewey's statement:

On one thing, however, I wish to offer emphatic assurance. We will not keep one man more than is needed to fulfill our military requirements. Neither will we release one man who is needed. The surest way to bring our soldiers home is to throw all our energy into the defeat of Japan.

Mr. Speaker, at this point I ask unanimous consent to include in my remarks a radio speech made by General Tompkins.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

The speech referred to follows:

Question. General Tompkins, would you say that we are fighting two wars—one in Europe and the other in the Pacific?

Answer. We in the War Department have never subscribed to this view. To us, this has always been a global war—an indivisible conflict which cannot end until our enemies on both sides of the world have been utterly defeated.

Our troops in Germany, France, and Italy are closing in for the final battle with Hitler's forces. They are writing a new conclusion to Mein Kampf in letters of blood. When they finish the job it will be our duty to shift our miltary might with all possible speed from Europe to the Far East.

The Combined Chiefs of Staff have given careful attention to the problems involved in readjusting our military forces to achieve this end with certainty and speed. Using the same exact procedures that went into the planning of our invasion of the Continent of Europe, they have calculated the men, weapons, equipment, and shipping that we will need to finish the war after Germany has collapsed.

Military necessity is the No. 1 consideration in these plans. How many soldiers can be released and how quickly they can be brought home will be controlled by the manpower and transportation requirements of our war against Japan. Thus, although it will be possible to return to civilian life a fairly large number of men, it will be necessary to keep in service many more than can be released.

On one thing, however, I wish to offer emphatic assurance. We will not keep one man more than is needed to fulfill our military requirements. Neither will we release one man who is needed. The surest way to bring our soldiers home is to throw all our energy into the defeat of Japan.

Question. General Tompkins, how will the Army decide which men are to be kept and which are to be released after Germany is eliminated from the war?

Answer. We felt that no one was better qualified to give the answer to that question,

Mr. DeBrown, than the soldier himself. So we went to him to find out what standards he believed would best meet the test of justice and impartiality. Thousands of enlisted men in this country and overseas were interviewed, and 90 percent said they felt the fairest and most objective method was to grant priority of release to men who had served overseas and to those who had dependent children. Special stress was put on combat service.

In line with this point of view, an adjusted service rating card will be issued to all enlisted personnel after the defeat of Germany. These cards will contain point ratings on four separate factors that will determine priority of separation from the Army.

These factors will take into account how long the soldier has been in the Army, how long he has served overseas, how many campaigns he has participated in, how many combat decorations he has received, and how many dependent children under 18 years of age he has, up to a maximum of three.

The value of the point credits in each classification will be announced after the cessation of hostilities in Europe. In the meantime, the point values will be kept under continuous study.

The plan to be followed in reassigning and reducing our forces is a product of the joint thinking of the entire War Department. The General Staff, the Army Air Forces, the Army Ground Forces, and the Army Service Forces are all in full accord with the plan.

Question. Will the men to be released be selected exclusively from among those now serving in Europe, General Tompkins?

Answer. Absolutely not. The point system will apply impartially to all enlisted men wherever they may be serving. However, I want to reiterate that the governing consideration in every case will be the demands of military necessity and the needs of the war against Japan.

The rate of return of surplus men from overseas will depend upon the number of ships available. Everything else must take second place to the staggering task of transporting millions of fighting men, tanks, guns, planes, ammunition, food, and clothing to the Pacific over longer supply routes than those to Europe.

Question. General Tompkins, I know our listeners would be interested to learn something of the War Department's views on how big an army we will require after peace is reestablished throughout the world.

Answer. I am sure everyone realizes that all our thinking about the peacetime Army must be tentative and advisory at this time. In the first place, we look to the President and Congress for a definition of basic policy. In the second place, the speed with which we can get down to our bedrock Army will depend on the rate at which the problems left by the present war are settled and the volume of our future international responsibilities and commitments.

However, all our planning has been predicated on the principle that a large professional Army has no place among the institutions of a modern democratic state and that the post-war American Army must consist of a relatively small professional organization, with adequate citizen reserves built up through a system of universal military training.

It should be borne in mind that when we speak of a small standing Army we do not contemplate falling back to the pitifully small Army we had during the period from 1928 through 1935. If you subtracted the garrisons we maintained in the Philippines, Hawaii, and Panama, you could have put that entire Army in the Yankee Stadium and still had some empty seats. We believe that our requirements for national security in the post-war world will necessitate an Army many times that size.

This standing Army would be supplemented by a much larger reserve force of citizen soldiers trained on a systematic and universal basis in peacetime. We feel it is far wiser to establish such a system of military training, planned to benefit our youth from a physical standpoint, than to risk having to spend hundreds of billions of dollars and, worse still, hundreds of thousands of lives in another titanic struggle to maintain the very existence of our Nation.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, yet on the following night in a speech in Louisville, Ky., Governor Dewey repeated the same false charge. In the Philadelphia speech he credited the program of holding men back to General Hershey; in his Louisville speech he credited it to the administration.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include at this point in my remarks a portion of an editorial appearing recently in the Washington Star of September 9, 1944, and also the Washington Post of September 9, 1944, relating to this subject, as well as another editorial appearing in the Washington Post of the same day.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

The matter referred to follows:

[From the Washington Evening Star of September 9, 1944]

At the end of his address he interpolated a few remarks of dubious political character. He said last night, for instance, that the New Deal would be slow to discharge the soldiers when the war ends because they can be kept in the Army about as cheaply as they can be cared for by some agency. He implied that this was evidence of defeatism on the part of the President.

When Governor Dewey first made this point, at Philadelphia, he correctly attributed it to a remark made by General Hershey, the Selective Service Director. Later in the Philadelphia speech it became the policy of "they" and then the policy of the administration. Last night it was the policy of the New Deal. The fact is that General Hershey is a Republican. He is not the New Deal. He is not the administration. He is not even "they." Governor Dewey would be well advised to drop this issue, for it is wholly lacking in substance and sensible people know it.

[From the Washington Post of September 9, 1944]

But the burden of the initial attack on Mr. Roosevelt was far from well advised. He chose to make an issue out of a demobilization plan which, in our opinion, is splendidly conceived in the national as well as the servicemen's welfare. This we say in an adjoining column. Not content with making a wise and bold transition scheme an issue, Governor Dewey proceeded to trace the dirty trail of New Deal politics in it. The charge on its face is unfounded. It is given on the authority of the Director of Selective Service, who has never been renowned for apt phraseology, but who happens to be a Republican. Governor Dewey, doubtless, will change his tack when he reads the demobilization plan and hears from his friends of General Hershey's Republican affiliations. But the change is required not only for reasons of political strategy. This war is not yet over, and it is damaging to the morale of the fighting soldiers to allege that this Government is playing politics with their demobilization. Already the feeling is to be encountered among the troops that demobilization may be politically delayed.

[From the Washington Post of September 9, 1944]

DEMOBILIZATION

The Army's demobilization, like its recruitment, will have to be on a selective basis. Once Germany has been defeated, the military problem will be radically changed. Manpower requirements in the European and American areas will be curtailed, while great increases will be essential in the Pacific. As the War Department puts it, "to defeat Japan as quickly as possible, and permanently, the United States will have to assemble, readjust, and streamline its military forces in order to apply the maximum power. * * * Military necessity decrees that sufficient men suited to the type of warfare being waged in the Pacific must remain in service as long as they are essential." This, of course, is the consideration which must take precedence over all others. It is the incontrovertible reason for the Navy's postponement of any demobilization program and for the Army's decision to move slowly in the discharge of Air Forces personnel.

In the demobilization of surplus troops, it is eminently fair that a priority system be established on an individual rather than upon a unit basis. The War Department is very warmly to be commended for consulting the wishes of the soldiers themselves in the formulation of such a system. It is of the most vital importance to morale that the men in service should feel that discharges among them are apportioned in an altogether reasonable, equitable, and impartial manner. Ninety percent of the soldiers, says the War Department, feel that the factors which ought to govern priorities for a return to civilian life are length of service, overseas duty, combat record, and parenthood. These are the considerations upon which the Army will base its selection. We have little doubt that 90 percent of the civilian public will agree that they are wise and fair.

Lest unfounded hopes be raised among families at home, the War Department warns that "the rate of return of surplus men from overseas will depend upon the number of ships available. And since it is intended to let nothing interfere with unstinted prosecution of the war against Japan, most available shipping is likely to be tied up for some time to come with the transport of men and matériel to the Pacific. As replacements arrive, men in that area will be released on the same basis as men in the European theater." Necessarily the process will be gradual, and perhaps rather slow. The men in uniform and those who so eagerly await them here must still be patient. But it seems to be a thoroughly well-thought-out process, democratic in concept and admirably calculated to speed the day of final victory.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, in his Philadelphia speech he talked about 8 years of defeatism at home; in his Louisville speech he talked about 12 years of defeatism at home. Within 24 hours Governor Dewey jumped 4 years.

Now what is the further evidence that Governor Dewey knew, or ought to have known that the charge made in both Philadelphia and Louisville is not only incorrect but false? It is fair for us to assume that Governor Dewey knew of the action of the War Department. If he did not it would be a strange admission for him, as a Presidential candidate, to make to the American people.

We find that Congress has been considering this question. Governor Dewey's statement is a reflection upon every Member of the Congress of the United States. He takes the statement made by the Director of Selective Service, who

has nothing to do with demobilization, and Governor Dewey then tries to create the impression that that statement constitutes the policy of the War Department, of the administration, and of the Congress of the United States. And in passing may I say that General Hershey has absolutely no connection with the War Department. While he is a major general in the Army his sole responsibility is as Director of the Selective Service System. It is his duty to get men into the Army and the Navy in accordance with the military and naval requirements of the Army and the Navy.

The question of demobilization then rests with the Army and Navy. He has nothing to do with demobilization.

From the angle of Congress there is a history in connection with demobilization showing that Members of Congress and committees in Congress have been giving it consideration. Strong provisions providing for demobilization were contained in Subcommittee Print No. 3, section 301 of S. 1730, dated June 9, 1944, introduced by Senator GEORGE, and I quote:

The War and Navy Departments shall discharge from the armed forces of the United States the men and women serving therein during the present war as rapidly as the appropriate department determines that the services of such persons are no longer needed for the prosecution of the war or for the national defense, and shall not retain such persons in the armed forces merely for the purpose of preventing unemployment or awaiting opportunities for employment.

There is also a provision in Subcommittee Print No. 1 of S. 1893, dated June 9, 1944, introduced by Senator KILGORE.

A report signed by Under Secretary of War Robert P. Patterson, on Subcommittee Print No. 3, section 301 of S. 1730, stated:

The War Department strongly favors the enactment of such section. I hope that it will be reinstated in the bill as finally reported to the Senate.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that at this point I be permitted to include in my remarks two reports of Undersecretary Patterson.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

AUGUST 3, 1944.

Hon. ROBERT R. REYNOLDS,
Chairman, Committee on Military Affairs, United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR REYNOLDS: I respond to your oral request for an immediate expression of my views with respect to Subcommittee Print No. 2, dated August 3, 1944, of a bill "To Provide a National Program for War Mobilization and Post-war Adjustment."

In response to a request from Senator JAMES E. MURRAY, chairman of the War Contracts Subcommittee. I wrote to him on June 14, 1944, with respect to earlier committee prints of S. 1730 and S. 1893 covering some of the same subject matter as the present Subcommittee Print No. 2. As I stated in that letter, the War Department favors adequate provision for unemployment compensation and benefits for servicemen and unemployed war workers. However, as these matters are not within the direct province of the War Department, I shall not comment on the specific provisions with respect thereto contained in title III of the subcommittee print, except as to one section hereinafter mentioned which does directly affect the War Department. For like reason I shall not comment on the provisions as to housing and public works contained in title IV thereof.

I shall, however, comment on titles I and II of the subcommittee print. Some of the principal objections which I expressed in my letter of June 14, 1944, are no longer applicable to the present subcommittee print. Accordingly, with certain amendments hereafter indicated, which we believe to be important, the War Department favors the enactment of these titles in the present form.

1. Section 103 (c), page 7, provides that the Deputy Director shall prepare, upon request of the Board, such reviews of plans, reports and studies, and shall secure for the Board and each individual member thereof, such other information from the Director or any other Government agency, as may be necessary to enable the Board to discharge its functions under this act. The seeking of information as requested by each individual member of the Board would place an undue burden upon the War Department. Furthermore, requests upon the War Department for information from the Deputy Director would duplicate the power of the Director to require reports as contained in the last sentence of section 102 (d), page 6, and would also put an unnecessary burden upon the War Department. It is, therefore, suggested that section 103 (c) be amended by the deletion of the words "and each individual member thereof" in line 17, and and of the words "or any other Government agency" in lines 18 and 19. This will centralize through the Director all requests for information from the departments.

2. Section 103 (d), page 7, of the subcommittee print requires the Director, the Chairman of the War Production Board, and such other Federal officials as shall be designated by the Board, to meet with the Board at least once a month and to consult and advise with it on all basic policies and programs. Here again I believe an undue burden is placed upon officials of the War Department and other departments. The necessity of consulting with the Board on all basic policies and programs might seriously affect the prosecution of the war. It seems to me that the Board would receive sufficient information through consultations and meetings with the Director as contemplated by the provision contained in section 103 (d) of subcommittee print dated June 9, 1944, of S. 1730, and would be able to make its advice more effective in that manner. I therefore suggest that section 103 (d) of the subcommittee print of August 3 be amended to read as follows:

"(d) The Director shall advise and consult with the Board at regular intervals and, at least once each month, shall convene the Board for the purpose of advising and consulting with it with respect to the preparation and the administration of plans and projects under this act."

3. In my letter to Senator MURRAY of June 14, I expressed my objections to what is now set forth in section 103 (e) of the subcommittee print of August 3, page 8. This section would require the procuring agencies to consult with industrial or area councils representing industry, labor, and agriculture with respect to policies, programs, and operations affecting industrial segments or geographical areas. This would seem to require such consultation by the War Department on every award, termination, or modification of any contract and would be wholly impracticable. It seems to us that the area and industrial councils should consult and advise with the Director and the Board to which they are subordinate, rather than directly with the procuring agencies, and that in this way a more unified policy could be obtained.

4. Section 202 (c) (2), page 13, provides that the Chairman of the War Production Board shall establish policies and procedures and, when necessary, detailed programs to be followed by the contracting agencies in selecting individual prime contracts or classes of prime contracts for curtailment, nonrenewal, or termination. It also provides that whenever he deems such action necessary he shall require that the selection of prime contracts or classes of prime contracts for curtailment, nonrenewal, or termination be submitted to him for his approval. In view of the powers and responsibilities vested in the Director by this act, it seems sounder to leave to him the decision whether the selection of individual contracts for curtailment, nonrenewal, or termination should be submitted by the contracting agencies to other agencies for approval. For this reason we suggest that the provision in lines 10 to 14, on page 13, be deleted.

5. Subsection (3), section 202 (c) of the subcommittee print, page 13, authorizes the Chairman of the War Production Board to establish policies and procedures providing for full consultation between the contracting agencies, prime contractors, and subcontractors with respect to the selection of subcontracts for curtailment, nonrenewal, or termination. This seems to imply that the War Department would be required to consult with the prime contractor as to the selection of individual subcontracts to be terminated when a prime contract is terminated. If so, this would be totally impracticable to administer. The number of War Department contracts which will ultimately be terminated will number in the thousands, and the number of subcontracts to be terminated will aggregate hundreds of thousands.

6. Section 202 (c) (4), page 13, authorizes the Chairman of the War Production Board to establish policies and procedures with respect to notice of curtailments and terminations. This provision substantially duplicates section 11 (a) (1) of the Contract Settlement Act of 1944, approved July 1, 1944, except that it transfers the authority from the Director of Contract Settlement to the Chairman of the War Production Board. I see no reason for this change in the act so recently approved by the Congress.

7. Section 304 (b), pages 18–19, of the subcommittee print, requires the War and Navy Departments to anticipate so far as practicable the programs of demobilization of servicemen and to cooperate with the Director of the Selective Service System and the Work Administrator in furnishing full data on such demobilization. The giving of information in this regard might in some cases impair military security. It is therefore suggested that the last phrase in the section (lines 4 and 5, page 19) be changed to read "in furnishing such data on such demobilization as military security permits."

8. The subcommittee print of August 3 does not contain a provision similar to section 301 of S. 1730, subcommittee print of June 9, 1944. I note, however, that in a committee print of August 2, 1944, of an alternative proposal for title III, such section is again set forth as title III, section 301. The War Department strongly favors the enactment of such section. I hope that it will be reinstated in the bill as finally reported to the Senate.

In the time given me I have not been able to comment on certain additional minor changes in the draft which we may desire. We would like the privilege of making such further suggestions when the bill is on the floor of the Senate or in conference.

Since you ask to have our comments immediately, we have not been able to consult the Bureau of the Budget and, accordingly,

the War Department has not been advised by the Bureau of the Budget as to the relation of this proposed legislation, or our comments thereon, to the program of the President.

Yours sincerely,

ROBERT P. PATTERSON,
Under Secretary of War.

Hon. JAMES E. MURRAY,
War Contracts Subcommittee, Committee on Military Affairs of the United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR MURRAY: As requested by your letter of June 9, I am glad to give you our comments on Subcommittee Print No. 3 of S. 1730 dated June 9, 1944, and Subcommittee Print No. 1 of S. 1893 dated June 9, 1944.

The War Department has no objection of substance to the provisions of this revised form of S. 1730. We believe that titles I and II of this draft are workable and generally desirable legislation. As for titles III and IV, the War Department strongly endorses section 301 and favors adequate provision for unemployment compensation and benefits for servicemen and unemployed war workers, but is not prepared to comment on the specific provisions with respect to them.

On the other hand, the War Department has serious objections to many of the principal features of the revised draft of S. 1893, and believes its enactment would be unwise and undesirable. Some of the major provisions to which we object are as follows:

1. Title I of this bill appears to contemplate a complex central agency with extensive functions and operations. Our experience convinces us that an over-all agency must be limited to establishing basic policy and planning, in order to perform its essential functions without becoming an administrative bottleneck. We fully agree with the testimony of Mr. Justice Byrnes before your committee on June 12, that to be effective such an office must be small and compact. In our opinion, the agency created by title I of S. 1893 would inevitably tend to become unduly large and to invade the operating fields of existing agencies and duplicate their operations. We think that this would interfere with efficient administration and would defeat the basic objectives of an over-all agency.

2. Section 105 is considered undesirable for several reasons. First, it seems inappropriate to require the President to appoint the Board from panels submitted by national organizations of industry, labor and agriculture; appointments to an agency of this importance should not be limited in this manner or put under the control of private interests. Secondly, the War Department strenuously objects to the provision that the Board and each member shall have access to all data of the over-all office and of all other Government agencies bearing on war mobilization and post-war adjustment. This would obviously violate necessary military security and interfere with the orderly operation of the Department during the war. Furthermore subsection 105 (e) would require the procuring agencies to consult with industrial or area counsels representing industry, labor, and agriculture with respect to "policies, programs, and operations affecting industrial segments of geographical areas." This would seem to require such consultation by the War Department on every award, termination, or modification of any contract, and would be wholly impracticable.

3. Section 201 would impose on the Chairman of the War Production Board the duty to review military production programs and to establish "policies and programs for the expansion, transfer, and curtailment of military production" covering specific products, firms, industry segments, and geographical areas, and to develop programs for curtailing military production based on assumed military developments. Such duties would directly interfere with the basic responsibility of the armed services for the procurement and production of military supplies and for determining their requirements for various military items.

4. Section 203 would require every procurement agency to report to the War Production Board "every projected change in its procurement program, including the award of new contracts and the modification, transfer, or termination of contracts previously awarded." In view of the thousands of such transactions, this blanket requirement would impose serious administrative burdens without corresponding benefits.

5. Title III deals with the disposition of surplus war property. Many of its provisions follow the bill recommended to your subcommittee by the Surplus Property Administrator and approved by the War Department. But certain of its other provisions, particularly sections 306, 308, and 310, differ from these recommendations. To the extent this bill differs in substance from the draft submitted by the Surplus Property Administrator, the War Department considers its provisions objectionable.

6. Title IV deals primarily with reemployment and unemployment benefits. While the War Department favors adequate provisions for these purposes, it is not prepared to comment on the particular provisions in the proposed draft, since these are not within its field of responsibility. Section 401 (c) dealing with the demobilization of servicemen is ambiguous; and might be interpreted to establish a policy different from that prescribed by section 301 of S. 1730. If that is its purpose, the War Department is strongly opposed to this provision.

In view of these and other objections, the War Department believes that S. 1893, as revised, should not be reported or enacted. We believe that the revised form S. 1730 is basically sound, and in view of the need for prompt action, recommend that S. 1730 be used as the vehicle for this legislation instead of attempting to revise S. 1893 completely to eliminate its many undesirable features.

Since you asked to have our comments immediately, we have limited them to matters of substance without dealing with defects of form or detail in either of the drafts. The Department has not been advised by the Bureau of the Budget as to the relation of this legislation to the program of the President.

Sincerely yours,

———— ————,
Under Secretary of War.

Mr. McCORMACK. The only bill introduced in this session of Congress, which I can find, which has any relationship to withholding the separation of persons from the military or naval service because of any employment conditions which might exist, is S. 672, introduced by Senator DAVIS, of Pennsylvania. As we all know, Senator DAVIS is a Republican Member of the Senate. S. 672 provides:

No such person shall be separated from the active military or naval service without his consent until his local selective service board has notified the head of the branch of the service in which such person served that such employment has been secured for and will be available to such person upon his separation from the service.

It is very significant to note that the only bill introduced along the lines that Governor Dewey attacks was introduced by a Republican Member of the other body. It, therefore, follows that Governor Dewey has better authority for condemning a member of his own party in the making of this charge than he has for attacking the Democratic Party.

I do not criticize Senator DAVIS. He exercised his judgment. Whether or not we agree with his bill is one thing, but I am not going to condemn a man for exercising his honest judgment, although I might disagree with him in the bill he introduced, as I do. There is no doubt but what Senator DAVIS had something in mind that he thought was a reasonably proper and justifiable policy for our Government to follow.

The significant thing about S. 672 is the fact that the War Department in its report on this bill vigorously opposed its enactment and said:

It is believed further that if it should develop when the time for demobilization approaches that existing legislation is inadequate, less drastic solutions may be devised than keeping under arms great numbers of men without military necessity therefor.

In other words, the War Department called for "less drastic solutions" than provided for in S. 672.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that at this point I be permitted to include in my remarks the report of the War Department on S. 672.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Hon. ROBERT R. REYNOLDS,
Chairman, Committee on Military Affairs, United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR REYNOLDS: The War Department is opposed to the enactment of S. 672, Seventy-eighth Congress, a bill "To amend the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended."

This bill is designed to require that no person who entered upon active service in the land or naval forces subsequent to May 1, 1940, and who served satisfactorily therein, shall be separated therefrom without his consent until his local selective-service board, with the assistance of the Personnel Division established in accordance with the provisions of subsection 8 (g) of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, shall have obtained employment for him either by replacement in his former position or by securing a new position.

Section 8, of the above-mentioned act, approved September 16, 1940 (54 Stat. 885, 890; 50 U. S. C., App., 308), preserves the employment rights of persons in the military or naval forces of the United States who occupied permanent positions at the time of their entrance into the service. If such person was in the employ of the United States Government, its Territories or possessions, or of the District of Columbia, or of a private employer, he will be restored to the same position or one of like seniority, status, and pay. If the person was in the employ of any State or political subdivision thereof, it is declared to be the sense of the Congress that such person should be restored to such position or to a position of like seniority, status, and pay. If any private employer fails or refuses to restore the veteran to a former or similar position, the District Court of the United States for the district in which the private employer maintains a place of business shall have power to require such employer to comply with the provisions of the law and to compensate the veteran for loss of wages or benefits suffered by reason of such employer's unlawful action. The court

is required by the act to order a speedy hearing in any such case and advance it on the calendar, and the United States district attorney is directed to appear and act as attorney for the veteran. No fees or court costs shall be taxed against any veteran applying for such relief. The Director of Selective Service is required to establish a personnel division to render aid in the replacement in their former positions of, or in securing positions for, members of the reserve components of the land or naval forces who satisfactorily complete any period of active duty or training and service under the Selective Training and Service Act.

By section 7 of the Service Extension Act of 1941 (act Aug. 18, 1941. 55 Stat. 627; 50 U. S. C., App., 357), the reemployment benefits enumerated above were extended to persons who, subsequent to May 1, 1940, have entered upon active Federal military or naval service, to the same extent as in the case of persons inducted under the Selective Training and Service Act.

It is manifestly impossible to foresee at this time the duration of the war; the length of time (if any) during which our men will have to be kept under arms from military necessity even after active hostilities have ceased, or the numbers of our men who will have to be so retained; the rates, times, and manner of their demobilization; or the economic conditions which will prevail at such time or times. Nobody can say today, with any definiteness or assurance, what the problems will be at that time, or whether the guaranties of reemployment for veterans contained in the above-mentioned provisions of the present law will or will not require extension or enlargement.

The legislation under discussion is therefore deemed premature, both in the sense that the necessity for it has not yet been demonstrated, and in the sense that it attempts to meet a situation the nature of which is not presently determinable. It is believed, further, that if it should develop, when the time for dembbilization approaches, that existing legislation is inadequate, less drastic solutions may be devised than keeping under arms great numbers of men without military necessity therefor.

It is impossible to estimate the cost of this legislation.

The Bureau of the Budget advises that there is no objection to the submission of this report.

Sincerely yours,

_____,
Secretary of War.

Mr. McCORMACK. Another significant thing about S. 672 is that a report was received, dated August 31, 1943, from Maj. Gen. Lewis B. Hershey, in which he said:

With respect to the portion of the proposed bill providing for retention of men in the armed forces until jobs are obtained for them, it is believed that such retention should not be mandatory, but that authority should be granted to retain men in the armed forces for such lengths of time as proper and orderly demobilization and return to civilian endeavors would require from the standpoint of the welfare of the Nation.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include in my remarks at this point the report of General Hershey on S. 672.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

AUGUST 31, 1943.

The Honorable ROBERT R. REYNOLDS,
Chairman, Committee on Military Affairs, United States Senate.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: This will acknowledge receipt of your letter requesting the views of the Selective Service System in connection with S. 672, a bill "To amend the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended."

The proposed bill would amend section 8 of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, by adding thereto a new subsection designated as "(h)," which would place upon the selective service local boards the duty, with the assistance of the Personnel Division established pursuant to subsection (g) of section 8 of such act, to obtain employment for all persons who entered upon active service in the land or naval forces subsequent to May 1, 1940, and who have satisfactorily completed a period of active duty or a period of training and service under the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended. The new subsection would also provide for the retention of persons on active naval or military service until their selective service local boards have notified the heads of the appropriate branches of the services in which such persons serve that employment has been secured for and will be available to such persons upon separation from the service.

Section 8 (g) of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, reads as follows:

"(g) The Director of Selective Service herein provided for shall establish a Personnel Division with adequate facilities to render aid in the replacement in their former positions of, or in securing positions for members of the reserve components of the land and naval forces of the United States who have satisfactorily completed any period of active duty, and persons who have satisfactorily completed any period of their training and service under this act."

Section 7 of Public Law 213, Seventy-seventh Congress, reads as follows:

"SEC. 7. Any person who, subsequent to May 1, 1940, and prior to the termination of the authority conferred by section 2 of this joint resolution, shall have entered upon active military or naval service in the land or naval forces of the United States shall be entitled to all the reemployment benefits of section 8 of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940 to the same extent as in the case of persons inducted under said act: *Provided*, That the provisions of section 8 (b) (A) of said act shall be applicable to any such person without regard to whether the position which he held shall have been covered into the classified civil service during the period of his military or naval service."

The Director of Selective Service in accordance with the duties placed upon him by such provisions of law has necessarily already formulated a plan and created an organization in order to perform his responsibilities. In this connection a Reemployment Division was informally established in October 1940, and formally organized on or about December 1, 1940. Its principal objectives are to insure the return of men to former jobs or to secure new employment for them after they are discharged from the armed forces. In order to carry out these objectives the plan provides for the ascertaining and recording of occupational and educational background and experience of each man in the armed forces, which information is supplemented at the time of discharge by his military record.

In order to carry out these objectives and to efficiently supervise, at the time of demobilization, the return of the physically fit to useful occupations in the civilian life of the Nation and also provide proper care and disposition of the disabled, the Director of Selective Service has, in addition to creating the Reemployment Division in national headquarters, appointed one or more reemployment committeemen for each of the approximately 6,500 local boards. It is contemplated that there will be one reemployment committeeman to look after the interests of each 20 or 30 men in the armed forces. These committeemen are attached to and work in cooperation with the selective service local boards and the various agencies and organizations involved, such as the United States Employment Service, the Vocational Rehabilitation Agency under the Department of Education, the Veterans' Administration, the home services of the American Red Cross, and other agencies and organizations.

In order to assist the Reemployment Division and the reemployment committeemen in carrying out their functions, national, State, and local clearinghouse committees, consisting of representatives of the various civic and private organizations, are being organized. In this way the necessary coordination among and cooperation by all of the appropriate agencies and organizations will be obtained.

The Selective Service Reemployment Organization is functioning now and will continue to function during the war in order to coordinate the placement of men being discharged. The volume of placements is, of course, small in comparison with that which will exist during the period of demobilization.

In view of the foregoing it is my belief that the authority contained in section 8 (g) of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, together with the administrative action that has been taken thereunder obviate the necessity of imposing by legislation additional duties on Selective Service local boards. Under existing law, local boards can be used in connection with reemployment to any extent deemed advisable.

With respect to the portion of the proposed bill providing for retention of men in the armed forces until jobs are obtained for them, it is believed that such retention should not be mandatory, but that authority should be granted to retain men in the armed forces for such lengths of time as proper and orderly demobilization and return to civilian endeavors would require from the standpoint of the welfare of the Nation.

While it is recognized that some additional legislation may be required in order to have a demobilization properly coordinated and interrelated with the absorption of the returning soldiers into the civilian activities and economy which will be undergoing considerable changes in the course of being converted from war-effort activities to civilian activities, it is believed that a comprehensive plan must be first worked out, the necessary details of which should be embodied in any such legislation.

In view of the foregoing, it is my opinion that this entire subject should be given immediate consideration by your committee toward the end that a properly coordinated plan will be formulated at the earliest possible moment and that any legislation required to put such plan into effect will be enacted. Consequently, I recommend that this proposed bill be not favorably considered until your committee has fully considered the subject and modified the bill accordingly.

It is respectfully requested that we be given an opportunity to appear before your committee, in the event your committee decides to give this legislation further consideration, and present our views in detail concerning this very important subject.

The Bureau of the Budget has advised that there is no objection to the submission of this report to your committee.

Sincerely yours,

LEWIS B. HERSHEY,
Director.

Mr. McCORMACK. In other words, on August 31, 1943, in a report to the Senate Committee on Military Affairs, General Hershey makes a statement different from the one Governor Dewey used as the premise for his baseless charge.

Mark you he is a candidate for President, which makes his charge all the more serious. In addition, it has come at a critical stage of the war, when the morale of our fighting men might be affected. The effect of his charge, which is completely inconsistent with the truth, is of such a nature that it might confuse in the minds of the troops an official order of the War Department with a willful political charge, which can only deceive our men of the armed forces and to influence their loved ones at home. His purpose is to get votes.

We must bear in mind that the general order of the Army is the statute of the United States Army on the subject mentioned therein. It states the War Department's policy, to which all officers and men must adhere. This order on demobilization is one that every one of the approximately 8,000,000 officers and men of the Army know will govern their demobilization. When an order is issued it goes from the Adjutant General's Office to every officer and man of the Army, no matter where he is located. It reaches the soldier at the front, and then along comes the false charge made by Governor Dewey, his politically irresponsible charge, his smear, his attempt to confuse the mind of the soldier in the Army, tending to confuse the manner in which his Government will treat him on the question of demobilization.

Governor Dewey knew, or ought to have known—certainly, he now knows—that his charge was not truthful. If he made it without the knowledge of the War Department order, and that is hard to believe, he should do the manly thing and undo whatever harm he has already done. He should publicly admit he grievously erred. But will he? He knows as well as you and I that it is the duty of the Selective Service System to get men into the Army and the Navy. The Army has jurisdiction over a soldier until he is actually demobilized.

Governor Dewey knows; or ought to have known, that General Hershey has nothing whatsoever to do with demobilization and that he has nothing at all to do with the War Department. Once he turns a young man who has been inducted into the service over to the War Department or the Navy Department, he loses all jurisdiction over that man. The question of that man's training, what happens to him afterwards is something that rests with the War Department, and the question of demobilization is one that is exclusively within the jurisdiction of the War Department.

Why did Governor Dewey make this charge? There is only one inference to draw, and that is that he made this charge in an attempt to obtain a political advantage, knowing that the officers of the Army could not answer him. Fortunately for the American people, the record clearly contradicts Governor Dewey and shows the falsity of his charge. When he made that charge, Governor Dewey hit "below the belt," and the ones he tried to hit "below the belt" were the officers and men of the United States Army and their near and dear ones at home.

The fact that this charge is incorrect and false should be disseminated as widely as possible by all newspapers and all commentators.

The very brazenness of his charge, his very disregard for the truth, is clearly evidenced by the fact he made his first charge the day after the War Department made its public release on demobilization to the American people. The very fact he repeated the charge the next night in his Louisville speech emphasizes the brazenness of his charge, the falsity of his charge, and the complete lack of respect he has for the intelligence of the American people.

I might also add that the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] inserted in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, on page A3907, the release made by the War Department on its demobilization plan. It was that evening that Governor Dewey made his first speech in Philadelphia.

Senator THOMAS of Utah also inserted the same release in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of September 8, 1944, on page 7612, the very day that Governor Dewey made the same baseless charge in his Louisville speech.

If Governor Dewey takes the position he did not know of the War Department plan, then he displays great ignorance as to what is going on. Every person who reads the newspapers throughout the United States knew of the plan of the War Department. It is the duty and responsibility of Governor Dewey to make amends. He should repudiate his charge. This incident conveys to the American people the reckless extent to which Governor Dewey will go in his attempt to create a false issue in this campaign, and that he will stop at nothing to try to get votes.

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 3608), relating to certain overtime compensation of the employees of the field service of the Post Office Department.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman tell the House what this bill provides?

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, this bill is from the Committee on Claims and it has the effect of forgiving certain employees of the Post Office Department who worked overtime in the Christmas season of 1942. They were paid for that overtime. At the time much of that work was requested and performed, it was not in contravention of the law. The Comptroller General now forbids the retention of this money by these employees. It involves about $30,000, and applies to postal employees all over the United States. The Post Office Department is very anxious to have the bill enacted as a matter of simple justice to a lot of people who performed extra service in good faith at the request of their superiors.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted etc., That employees or former employees of the field service of the Post Office Department, including special-delivery messengers, (1) are hereby relieved of liability to repay to the United States any amounts received by them for any pay period which were in excess of the maximum compensation to which they were entitled for such period under those provisions of the joint resolution approved December 22, 1942 (Public Law 821, 77th Cong.), which limited the overtime compensation of any employee to an amount which "will not cause his aggregate compensation to exceed a rate of $5,000 per annum", and (2) shall be entitled to refunds of any such amounts that they have repaid to the United States.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert: "That employees or former employees of the United States who were in the purview of Public Law 821, Seventy-seventh Congress, approved December 22, 1942, which law was in effect from December 1, 1942, to April 30, 1943, and which limited the overtime compensation of any employee to an amount which "will not cause his aggregate compensation to exceed a rate of $5,000 per annum", (1) are hereby relieved of liability to repay to the United States any amounts received by them for any pay period which were in excess of the maximum compensation to which they were entitled for such period under the provisions of said Public Law 821 and (2) shall be entitled to refunds of any such amounts that they have repaid to the United States: *Provided*, That in no case shall there be validated aggregate payment to an employee in excess of five-twelfths of $5,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read a third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill relating to certain overtime compensation of civilian employees of the United States."

SIDNEY HILLMAN

Mrs. LUCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 10 seconds.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mrs. LUCE. Mr. Speaker, clear everything with Sidney.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. IZAC. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a dispatch from the battle zone in France.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

(Mr. IZAC asked and received permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.)

Mr. KELLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include therein an address by Mr. Paul A. Strachan, president of the American Federation of the Physically Handicapped, at a recent convention of that organization.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 34 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, September 13, 1944, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON THE PUBLIC LANDS

The Committee on the Public Lands will have a hearing on Wednesday, September 13, 1944, at 10 a. m., in the committee room to consider H. R. 4286, H. R. 4697, H. R. 4555, H. R. 5235, and such other matters as may properly come before the committee.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. LESINSKI: Committee on Invalid Pensions. H. R. 5041. A bill to amend the Veterans' Regulations; without amendment (Rept. No. 1882). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. PATTON: Committee on Claims. H. R. 3639. A bill for the relief of Herman Weinert, Jr., M. D.; with amendment (Rept. No. 1880). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. McGEHEE: Committee on Claims. H. R. 3931. A bill for the relief of A. D. Gibson, M. D.; with amendment (Rept. No. 1881). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. POWERS:

H. R. 5344. A bill to authorize long-distance telephone calls by military personnel at Government expense, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. RANDOLPH:

H. R. 5345. A bill to provide for the reconversion of small industries to civilian production, to expedite the reentry into business of small businessmen whose businesses have been curtailed or closed because of war emergencies, to aid men and women of our armed forces and others who desire to enter into business on their own after the war, and to encourage the free flow of American capital into small- and intermediate-sized enterprises, by the establishment of a permanent Small Business Finance Corporation within the Federal Reserve System to assist financing institutions in making short- and long-term credit available to small- and intermediate-sized enterprises; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. MAAS:

H. Res. 638. A resolution establishing a select committee to be known as the Committee on the Sale and Disposition of Surplus Government-owned Property; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama:

H. R. 5346. A bill for the relief of Lindon A. Long; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. McLEAN:

H. R. 5347. A bill for the relief of Joseph Wyzynski; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. RANDOLPH:

H. R. 5348. A bill for the relief of William D. McCauley; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

6099. By Mr. COCHRAN: Petition submitted by St. Louis Industrial Union Council, of St. Louis, Mo., signed by 1,800 members praying for full employment, full production, and a national income level equal to our wartime national income, holding that they are essentials to a national program of reconversion if our country is to enjoy peace and prosperity in the post-war period and if our soldiers, sailors, and war workers are to have jobs and a decent standard of living. They also advocate the principles contained in the Kilgore bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

6100. By Mr. ROLPH: Resolution of Department Store Employees Union, No. 1100, of San Francisco, covering need for plan to assure full employment in post-war period; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

6101. By the SPEAKER: Petition of J. M. Garcia, Tapachula, Chiapas, Mexico, petitioning consideration of his resolution with reference to the return to Mexico of the territory of El Chamizal; to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, SEPTEMBER 13, 1944

(Legislative day of Friday, September 1, 1944)

The Senate met in executive session at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou God of our salvation: Cause us to know Thy loving kindness in the morning, for in Thee do we trust; cause us to know the way wherein we should walk, for we lift up our souls unto Thee. Touch our tasks this day with some gleam of Thy glory until, blind and willful though we are, we begin living as they should live who have eternity set in their hearts. Lift us more and more into the steadying sense of our kinship with Thee.

In Thy light may we bring to the bar of judgment the hopes which have misled us, the motives which shame us, the methods which have failed us, and the values which have cheated us. Defeat us in all else save the doing of Thy will. Give us a part in making the earth's crooked ways straight, when social and industrial relations will lose their hard antagonisms and become the hallowed cooperation of comrades in human service. Toward this high purpose may we labor while our brief day lasts, in quiet confidence forever sure that Thou wilt guide our steps and keep our feet from falling. We ask it in the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

DESIGNATION OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The Secretary, Edwin A. Halsey, read the following letter:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, D. C., September 13, 1944.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate, I appoint Hon. FRANCIS MALONEY, a Senator from the State of Connecticut, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

CARTER GLASS,
President pro tempore.

Mr. MALONEY thereupon took the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. HILL, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day of Tuesday, September 12, 1944, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. McLeod, one of its clerks, announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 3608) relating to certain overtime compensation of civilian employees of the United States, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION—LELAND OLDS

Mr. HILL. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Cordon	McKellar
Andrews	Danaher	Maloney
Ball	Davis	Maybank
Bankhead	Ferguson	Mead
Barkley	George	Millikin
Bridges	Gillette	Moore
Buck	Gurney	O'Daniel
Burton	Hayden	O'Mahoney
Bushfield	Hill	Reed
Byrd	Johnson, Calif.	Reynolds
Capper	Johnson, Colo.	Robertson
Caraway	Kilgore	Russell
Chavez	Langer	Scrugham
Clark, Idaho	McCarran	Shipstead
Connally	McClellan	Stewart

Thomas, Okla.	Vandenberg	Wherry
Thomas, Utah	Walsh, Mass.	White
Tunnell	Walsh, N. J.	Wiley
Tydings	Weeks	Willis

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. BILBO], the Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE], and the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] are absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JACKSON], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. GUFFEY], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCFARLAND], the Senator from Utah [Mr. MURDOCK], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON], the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN], the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER], and the Senator from Washington [Mr. WALLGREN] are detained on public business.

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH] is absent on official business for the Special Committee to Investigate the National Defense Program.

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. RADCLIFFE], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH], and the Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER] are necessarily absent.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN], the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HAWKES], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. HOLMAN], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. NYE], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. THOMAS], and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. WILSON] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is absent on official business.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Fifty-seven Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

The matter before the Senate is the nomination of Leland Olds, of New York, to be a member of the Federal Power Commission. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to this nomination? Under the order of the Senate of yesterday, no further debate is permissible.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, may I inquire of the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MOORE] whether he desires a yea-and-nay vote?

Mr. MOORE. That is correct; I desire a yea-and-nay vote.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I call for the yeas and nays.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is the demand for the yeas and nays sufficiently seconded?

The yeas and nays were not ordered.

Mr. TUNNELL. Mr. President, may I make a correction in the RECORD?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. No debate is in order at this time.

Mr. TUNNELL. What I propose to do does not constitute debate. I simply wanted to know if I could make a correction in the RECORD.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair is advised that that is in the nature of debate and must go over for the present.

The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to this nomination? [Putting the question.] The "ayes" have it, and the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, I understood the Chair to announce the confirmation of the nomination of Mr. Olds.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Yes; the nomination of Mr. Olds has been confirmed.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, I request that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of the nomination.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the President will be immediately notified.

NOMINATIONS OF ADMIRAL CHESTER W. NIMITZ AND ADMIRAL ROYAL E. INGERSOLL

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Mr. President, from the Committee on Naval Affairs I report favorably the nomination of Admiral Chester W. Nimitz, United States Navy, to be an admiral in the Navy, for temporary service, to rank from the 31st day of December 1941.

I also report from the same committee the nomination of Admiral Royal E. Ingersoll, United States Navy, to be an admiral in the Navy, for temporary service, to rank from the 1st day of July 1942.

In connection with this report, I ask to have inserted in the RECORD a statement prepared by the Naval Affairs Committee giving the reasons for the promotions of Admiral Nimitz and Admiral Ingersoll to the rank of admiral in the Navy.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A law enacted more than 20 years ago authorized the officers who were assigned to duty as commander in chief of the Pacific Fleet and commander in chief of the Atlantic Fleet to assume the rank of admiral while serving in these positions. These officers are not confirmed by the Senate and revert to their permanent status upon being detached from these particular duties. This law has been amended from time to time so that three officers of the Navy who hold important command positions may be designated as admirals without being confirmed by the Senate.

Admirals Nimitz and Ingersoll hold their ranks as admiral by virtue of being assigned to duty, respectively, as commander in chief of the Pacific and Atlantic Fleets. Upon being detached from these specific duties these officers would revert to their permanent rank of rear admiral.

Approximately 3 years ago Congress enacted legislation authorizing officers to be temporarily promoted during the war and for a period of 6 months thereafter. It provided also that officers promoted to the rank of admiral should be confirmed by the Senate.

The nominations pending before the committee of Admirals Nimitz and Ingersoll are nominations under the more recent law, which provides that they shall hold the temporary rank of admiral during the war and for a period of 6 months thereafter, regardless of what duties they may be assigned.

THE EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, while we are engaged in executive business, I think we might as well dispose of the Executive Calendar for today. Therefore I ask that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none. The clerk will proceed to state the nominations on the calendar.

THE JUDICIARY

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Howard F. Houk to be United States attorney for the district of New Mexico.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Benjamin J. McKinney to be United States marshal for the district of Arizona.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the United States Public Health Service.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask that the nominations in the United States Public Health Service be confirmed en bloc.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nominations are confirmed en bloc.

POSTMASTERS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

Mr. BARKLEY. I make the same request with respect to the nominations of postmasters.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nominations of postmasters on the calendar are confirmed en bloc.

THE ARMY

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Army.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I should like to have the consideration of the nominations in the Army go over until Friday.

Mr. BARKLEY. Or until the next session.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Yes.

Mr. BARKLEY. Whether Friday or some other day.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the consideration of the nominations in the Army will go over as requested.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask that the President be immediately notified of all nominations this day confirmed.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the President

will be notified of the confirmation of the nominations.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, all of our proceedings up to the present moment have been in executive session. I therefore move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider legislative business.

PERSONNEL REQUIREMENTS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate letters from the Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs and the executive secretary, Office of Scientific Research and Development, transmitting, pursuant to law, estimates of personnel requirements for their respective offices for the quarter ending December 31, 1944, which, with the accompanying papers, were referred to the Committee on Civil Service.

BILL INTRODUCED

Mr. REYNOLDS, by unanimous consent, introduced a bill (S. 2145) to amend the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, to extend the time within which application may be made for reemployment, and for other purposes, which was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H. R. 3608) relating to certain overtime compensation of civilian employees of the United States, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Claims.

FEDERAL AID FOR POST-WAR HIGHWAY CONSTRUCTION—AMENDMENT

Mr. BUSHFIELD and Mr. RUSSELL each submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by them, respectively, to the bill (S. 2105) to amend and supplement the Federal Aid Road Act, approved July 11, 1916, as amended and supplemented, to authorize appropriations for the post-war construction of highways and bridges, to eliminate hazards at railroad-grade crossings, to provide for the immediate preparation of plans and acquisition of rights-of-way, and for other purposes, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

REDUCTION OF NONESSENTIAL FEDERAL EXPENDITURES — CIVILIAN EMPLOYMENT IN THE EXECUTIVE BRANCH FOR THE PERIOD APRIL 1 THROUGH JULY 31, 1944.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, on behalf of the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures, I desire to present a report on civilian employment in the executive branch of the Government for the period April 1 through July 31, 1944. I ask unanimous consent that a statement explanatory of the report, and the report itself, be printed in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement and report were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT

The total number of paid employees for July 1944 is 3,112,965, excluding 252,978 employees of the War Department outside of continental United States.

The total employment for July 1944, is 17,502 in excess of the employment peak of 3,095,463 reached in the month of June 1943. This figure is exclusive of the employees of the War Department outside the continental United States.

Thirty-seven departments and agencies have increased 101,749 between May 1, 1944, to July 31, 1944, while 26 departments and agencies have eliminated only 5,703 employees, making a net increase of 96,046 for the period. For the first 7 months (January 1 to July 31, 1944) the net increase is 134,736.

Substantial increases were made by the following: War Department, 40,051; Navy Department, 31,030; Post Office Department, 9,001; Interior Department, 3,767; and Veterans' Administration, 2,535.

Greatest reductions were made by the following: Selective Service, 879; National Housing, 766; Tennessee Valley Authority, 657; and Office of Civilian Defense, 538.

The increase in the War Department is in part due to 24,000 force account employees and 9,600 not reported before as coming under the pay rolls of A. S. F. (Army Service Forces) and Army Air Corps. Further information will be furnished by said Department if necessary. The increase in the Post Office Department is due to the temporary substitute employees.

Following the last report to the Senate on the status of Federal civilian employees of the Federal Government presented June 23, 1944, the Civil Service Commission, in a report to the President and a release to the press, indicated that there had been a reduction in the number of civil-service employees and an increase in manpower utilization. Reports received by the committee show quite the contrary. In presenting the last report on personnel in June, the record showed that there had been a steady net increase in the number of Federal civilian employees for the months of January, February, March, and April.

In submitting the present personnel report for the months of May, June and July, the figures received show that the number of Federal civilian employees is still on the increase despite the impression made by the Civil Service Commission's press release that "personnel is being reduced" and "manpower utilization is being outstandingly increased." These increases are shown on the table attached.

On August 25, 1944, I wrote to Harry B. Mitchell, President, United States Civil Service Commission, regarding this report and press release and asked for information showing the reduction in total paid civilian employees within the continental limits of the United States since January 1, 1944. Reply to this letter was received under date of September 1, with a table enclosed showing figures for March 31, 1944, and June 30, 1944. The Commission implies in its letter that a reduction in paid civilian employees has been made, whereas the table enclosed shows an increase in the total paid civilian employees. The Commission states further that actually the personnel of the War Department has increased in recent months but fails to state or admit that the total paid civilian personnel also has increased. When we realize that the ratio of Federal civilian employees to State civilian employees is now about 7 to 1, it is further evident that the Federal Government is considerably overstaffed. About 5 percent of the working population of the United States works for the executive branch of the Federal Government, approximately 3,000,000 people. Approximately 10 percent of these are in the Washington, D. C., area; another 10 percent in the State of New York, and approximately 9 percent in California. The remainder are scattered across the other 46 States. If this army of Federal employees were lined up four abreast in military formation, the line would reach from Washington, D. C., to New York City.

REPORT

Civilian employment of the executive branch of the Federal Government, by departments and agencies, for months of April, May, June, and July 1944, showing increases and decreases in number of paid employees

Department or agency	1944				Increase	Decrease
	April	May	June	July		
Executive Office of the President: Bureau of the Budget	548	552	545	563	15	
Departments:						
Agriculture Department	82,071	80,025	80,925	81,991		80
Commerce Department	29,270	29,733	30,095	29,638	368	
Interior Department [1] [2]	40,762	42,038	43,313	44,529	3,767	
Justice Department	29,201	29,364	29,722	29,943	742	
Labor Department	6,114	6,597	6,825	6,977	863	
Navy Department [1]	736,797	747,055	765,929	767,827	31,030	
Post Office Department	352,476	348,166	352,778	361,477	9,001	
State Department	8,545	8,548	8,859	8,909	364	
Treasury Department	92,093	93,264	94,308	94,019	1,926	
War Department [3]	1,225,590	1,234,919	1,262,913	1,265,641	40,051	
National war agencies:						
Committee on Fair Employment Practice	113	122	123	117	4	
Division of Central Administrative Services	4,044	4,068	3,986	3,814		230
Foreign Economic Administration	5,638	5,629	5,699	5,818	180	
National War Labor Board	3,711	3,977	3,689	4,616	905	
Office of Alien Property Custodian	894	891	890	878		16

[1] Includes 10,324 employees of Navy and 112 of Interior now in the hands of the enemy.
[2] Increase due to seasonal employees.
[3] Does not include employees outside continental United States.

REPORT—Contnued.

Civilian employment of the executive branch of the Federal Government, by departments and agencies, for months of April, May, June, and July 1944, showing increases and decreases in number of paid employees—Con tinued

Department or agency	1944				Increase	Decrease
	April	May	June	July		
National war agencies—Continued.						
Office of Censorship	12,077	11,942	11,871	11,647		430
Office of Civilian Defense	684	452	292	146		538
Office of Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs	1,375	1,366	1,367	1,357		18
Office of Defense Transportation	5,141	5,155	5,138	5,181	40	
Office of Economic Stabilization	11	11	10	10		1
Office of Price Administration	59,015	60,547	60,782	60,799	1,784	
Office of Scientific Research and Development	1,191	1,248	1,293	1,340	149	
Office of Strategic Service	1,857	1,934	1,946	2,061	204	
Office of War Information	7,201	7,959	8,283	8,522	1,321	
Office of War Mobilization	36	49	51	58	22	
Petroleum Administration for War	1,308	1,279	1,277	1,264		44
Selective Service	23,998	23,859	23,589	23,119		879
Smaller War Plants Corporation	1,746	1,740	1,746	1,750	4	
War Manpower Commission	26,075	27,901	27,002	27,338	1,263	
War Production Board	16,993	16,748	16,565	17,268	275	
War Shipping Administration	5,037	4,838	4,694	4,852		185
Independent agencies:						
American Battle Monuments Commission	1	1	1	1		
Board of Investigation and Research—Transportation	51	47	28	22		29
Civil Aeronautics Board	330	336	336	343	13	
Civil Service Commission	7,498	7,736	7,640	7,521	23	
Employees Compensation Commission	513	510	509	523	10	
Export-Import Bank of Washington	60	59	58	59		11
Federal Communications Commission	2,162	2,063	1,871	1,712		450
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation	1,058	1,039	1,017	1,002		56
Federal Power Commission	663	663	668	669	6	
Federal Security Agency	30,978	31,563	31,082	31,338	360	
Federal Trade Commission	454	451	450	451		3
Federal Works Agency	20,593	20,303	20,252	20,226		367
General Accounting Office	11,221	11,444	11,992	12,644	1,423	
Government Printing Office	7,434	7,290	7,283	7,249		185
Interstate Commerce Commission	2,159	2,132	2,135	2,147		12
Maritime Commission	9,970	10,509	10,593	10,781	811	
National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics	5,508	5,753	6,090	6,262	754	
National Archives	357	340	349	366	9	
National Capital Housing Authority	257	258	249	250		7
National Capital Park and Planning	18	19	18	17		1
National Gallery of Art	260	261	262	258		2
National Housing Agency	19,183	18,827	18,900	18,417		766
National Labor Relations Board	679	681	713	718	39	
National Mediation Board	91	83	86	90		1
Panama Canal	29,538	28,717	28,651	30,361	823	
Railroad Retirement Board	1,720	1,745	1,789	1,829	109	
Reconstruction Finance Corporation	7,892	8,221	8,287	8,550	658	
Securities and Exchange Commission	1,209	1,206	1,196	1,192		17
Smithsonian Institution	418	419	430	430	12	
Tariff Commission	306	305	303	301		5
Tax Court of the United States	123	122	124	123		
Tennessee Valley Authority	21,800	21,838	21,025	21,143		657
Veterans' Administration	50,803	51,226	52,069	53,338	2,535	
Total	3,016,919	3,038,143	3,092,961	3,113,802	101,863	4,980
Net increase					96,883	
War Department civilian employees stationed outside of continental United States, as of June 30, 1944 [1] [2]	252,978	252,978	252,978	252,978		
Grand total	3,269,897	3,291,121	3,345,939	3,366,780		

[1] Reported quarterly.

[2] Employees outside continental United States spread over various departments and agencies, totals, May, 11,358; June, 12,506; July, 11,472.

NOTE.—Employment figures now reported to the committee include dollar-per-annum, terminal leave, and without-compensation employees of the consultant-expert type who are authorized to receive per diem in lieu of subsistence.

Totals of Federal civilian employees and net monthly increases

	Monthly totals [1]	*Net increases*
January	2,978,229	-------
February	2,983,466	5,237
March	2,997,452	13,986
April	3,016,897	19,445
May	3,038,143	21,246
June	3,092,961	54,818
July	3,112,965	20,004
		134,736

[1] Exclusive of War Department employees stationed outside of continental United States, 252,978.

VIEWS OF AMERICAN FARM BUREAU FEDERATION ON AGRICULTURAL PROBLEMS—ADDRESS BY EDWARD A. O'NEAL

[Mr. CAPPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by Edward A. O'Neal, president of the American Farm Bureau Federation, at the Northeastern Regional Farm Bureau meeting, New York, N. Y., on August 23, 1944, which appears in the Appendix.]

AMERICAN WAR DADS—STATEMENT BY JOHN M. COLLINS

[Mr. CAPPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement by John M. Collins, chairman of the National Committee on Public Relations of the American War Dads, setting forth the aims and objectives of the American War Dads, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY SECRETARY ICKES BEFORE NINTH CONVENTION OF U. A. W.-C. I. O., AT GRAND RAPIDS, MICH.

[Mr. KILGORE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the address delivered by Hon. Harold L. Ickes, Secretary of the Interior, before the ninth convention of the International Union United Automobile, Aircraft and Agricultural Implement Workers of America, at Grand Rapids, Mich., September 12, 1944, which appears in the Appendix.]

EDITORIAL COMMENTS ON RETIREMENT OF JAMES A. FARLEY

[Mr. WALSH of New Jersey asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Sunny Jim Farley Makes His Exit," published in the Hastings (Nebr.) Daily Tribune of June 9, 1944, and an editorial entitled "Mr. Farley Dismounts," published in the Flint (Mich.) Journal of June 13, 1944, which appear in the Appendix.]

AUTHORIZATION FOR COMMITTEE ON INDIAN AFFAIRS TO FILE REPORTS

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, inasmuch as we shall probably have a call of the calendar some time soon, and because there are a number of bills which are ready to be reported from the Committee on Indian Affairs, but upon which reports have not yet been filed, I ask unanimous consent to have until midnight tonight to file such reports as the committee has ordered.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Subsequently, under authority of the order, supra, the following reports were

submitted today from the Committee on Indian Affairs:

By Mr. BUSHFIELD:

S. 1746. A bill authorizing and directing the Secretary of the Interior to issue to Peter A. Condelario a patent in fee to certain land; without amendment (Rept. No. 1090).

By Mr. CHAVEZ:

S. 1953. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to contract with the Middle Rio Grande Conservancy District of New Mexico for the payment of operation and maintenance charges on certain Pueblo Indian lands; without amendment (Rept. No. 1091).

By Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma:

H. R. 2185. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior, in carrying out the purposes of the act of May 18, 1916 (39 Stat. 137), to purchase logs, lumber, and other forest products; with amendments (Rept. No. 1092).

FORFEITURE OF PAY OF PERSONS IN MILITARY AND NAVAL SERVICE IN CERTAIN CIRCUMSTANCES

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 1250) to repeal section 2 of the act approved May 17, 1926, which provides for the forfeiture of pay of persons in the military and naval service of the United States who are absent from duty on account of the direct effects of venereal disease due to misconduct, which were on page 1, to strike out all after line 5, over to and including line 5 of page 2, and insert:

SEC. 2. That paragraph VIII of Executive Order No. 6098, dated March 31, 1933 (Veterans Regulation No. 10, as amended; 38 U. S. C., ch. 12), be amended to read as follows:

"PAR. VIII. An injury or disease incurred during military or naval service will be deemed to have been incurred in line of duty and not the result of the veteran's own misconduct when the person on whose account benefits are claimed was, at the the injury was suffered or disease contracted, in active service in the military or naval forces, whether on active duty or on authorized leave, unless such injury or disease was the result of his own willful misconduct: *Provided*, That venereal disease shall not be presumed to be due to willful misconduct if the person in service complies with the Army or Navy regulations requiring him to report and receive treatment for such disease: *Provided further*, That the requirement for line of duty will not be met if it appears that at the time the injury was suffered or disease contracted the person on whose account benefits are claimed (1) was avoiding duty by deserting the service, or by absenting himself without leave materially interfering with the performance of military duties; (2) was confined under sentence of court martial or civil court."

SEC. 3. That paragraph IX of Veterans Regulation No. 10, as amended, be and is hereby amended to read:

"PAR. IX. Pension shall not be payable under part III, Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a), as amended, for any disability due to the claimant's own willful misconduct or vicious habits."

SEC. 4. This act shall be effective from the date of its approval. Sections 2 and 3, inclusive, shall be applicable to claims filed or adjudicated thereafter and the beginning date of awards shall be as provided in applicable statute or regulations: *Provided*, That no claim heretofore disallowed by reason of misconduct or line of duty requirement shall be revived but benefits may be payable on the basis of a new claim filed hereafter in such form as may be prescribed by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs.

And to amend the title so as to read: "An act to repeal section 2 of the act approved May 17, 1926, which provides for the forfeiture of pay of persons in the military and naval service of the United States who are absent from duty on account of the direct effects of venereal disease due to misconduct, and to amend Veterans Regulation No. 10, as amended, to define line of duty and misconduct for pension and compensation purposes."

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the amendments of the House.

Mr. WHITE. Will the Senator from Colorado indicate what are the House amendments in which the Senator is proposing that the Senate concur?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Senate bill 1250 is a bill to repeal section 2 of the act approved March 17, 1926, which provides for the forfeiture of pay of persons in the military and naval service of the United States who are absent from duty on account of the direct effects of venereal disease due to misconduct.

This bill passed the Senate, and in the form in which it passed it was objected to by the Veterans' Administration. General Hines made a recommendation to the committee in the House which was considering the Senate bill, and the committee amended it in keeping with the recommendations of General Hines.

General Hines wrote a letter, which may be found in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for September 11, last, on page 7641, in which he states his position, and in which he says that the amendments which he recommends, and which have been adopted by the House, are approved by the Bureau of the Budget.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Colorado.

The motion was agreed to.

TERMINATION CLAUSES IN EMERGENCY LEGISLATION

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Mr. President, all the members of Senate committes have experienced from time to time difficulties in determining what language to use in fixing termination clauses in emergency legislation. Recently I inquired of the Navy Department whether or not it has made a study of and reached any conclusions as to conditions which should exist to render operative the various termination clauses that have been used in emergency legislation affecting the Navy. I inquired if the Attorney General had rendered an opinion on this subject, as other departments of the Government are affected in a similar manner.

The Secretary of the Navy has replied to my letter, informing me that the Attorney General has not rendered any formal opinion on the general subject, but he states that the Department of Justice has compiled a list of statutes with classifications as to termination clauses and that an extensive list of war and emergency statutes has also been compiled by the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress. He enclosed a list of temporary laws relating to the Navy in force on July 31, 1944. The enumeration of the various clauses used in emergency statutes and the observations made in reference to each will be found interesting and useful when Congress considers terminating certain temporary laws.

I ask that the letter and other data be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter and data were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY,
Washington, September 1, 1944.

Hon. DAVID I. WALSH,
Chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs, United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Reference is made to your letter of June 2, 1944, asking whether the Navy Department has made a study of, and reached conclusions, as to conditions which must exist to render operative various termination clauses contained in emergency legislation enacted since December 7, 1941. It was pointed out in your letter that possibly the Attorney General may have rendered an opinion on this subject as many other departments of the Government are affected in a similar manner.

It appears that the Attorney General has not rendered any formal opinion on the general subject. However, a list of statutes with classifications as to termination clauses was compiled by the Department of Justice some several months ago. An extensive list of war and emergency statutes has also been compiled by the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress. This list is contained in Bulletin No. 20 of the Public Affairs bulletins of the Library. Neither list is strictly up to date.

There is enclosed a list of temporary laws relating to the Navy, in force on July 31, 1944, compiled in the Office of the Judge Advocate General of the Navy.

In reviewing the problems raised by war and emergency legislation becoming ineffective on some date connected with the end of the war, it is apparent at the outset that the problem is of necessity much broader than that of legislation enacted after December 7, 1941. As indicated by the enclosure, some important temporary legislation was enacted over a period of several months prior to that date. Further there is a considerable body of permanent legislation effective only in time of war or emergency which will raise the same practical problems at the close of the war or the end of the emergency as are raised by the temporary acts. The Library of Congress bulletin above referred to includes some 260 acts, enacted before December 7, 1941, in this latter class. Some of these acts are of such age as to be included in the Revised Statutes.

The following classification can be made of war or emergency statutes, according to the nature of the contingency upon whose happening they expire:

1. EXPIRING AT THE CONCLUSION OF THE WAR

This would include not only temporary legislation effective "during the present war," "during any war in which the United States is now engaged," "until the termination of the present war with Germany, Italy, and Japan," but also permanent legislation operative "in time of war," "during the existence of war in which the United States is engaged," "whenever a state of war exists." The difficulty lies in the determination of the date on which the war terminates for purposes of determining when the statute ceases to be effective. This difficulty is resolved by provisions in many of the statutes provid-

ing for determination of such date by the President in a proclamation or other method of designation or by the Congress by concurrent or joint resolution. Lacking such guides, it is necessary to refer to the previous court decisions on the same problem following past wars.

The determination of the date of termination of war is for the political branch of the Federal Government, and is usually made by a formal proclamation. It is not a question of fact to be determined by the judiciary. The Court in *Hamilton* v. *McClaughry* (136 Fed. 445 (Apr. 12, 1905)), stated:

"It is the well-settled law that the existence of a condition of war must be determined by the political department of the Government; that the courts take judicial notice of such determination and are bound thereby," and cited in support thereof *U. S.* v. *129 Packages* (Fed. Cas. No. 15, 941); *Sutton* v. *Tiller* (98 Am. Dec. 471).

It is clear that the date of termination of the war is that date established by unequivocal public proclamation by the President or proper legislative action by the Congress. No event precedent to that time is sufficient to predicate a termination of the war in the legal sense.

Thus the Civil War was terminated by President Johnson's proclamation of August 20, 1866 (14 Stat. 817), declaring that the insurrection against the Nation was at an end; and that peace, order, tranquillity, and civil authority existed in and throughout the whole of the United States of America. This date was recognized as the date of the termination of the war by the Congress in section 2 of the act of March 2, 1867 (14 Stat. 422).

The United States Supreme Court approved this date in the case of *McElrath* v. *United States* (102 U. S. 426, 438, October term 1880), holding that the limitation "except in time of peace" on the power of the President to summarily dismiss a military officer, contemplated not a mere cessation of hostilities, but peace in the complete sense, officially proclaimed.

A variety of termination clauses was adopted by Congress for war and emergency legislation adopted during World War No. 1. The provisions of the termination clauses of the more important World War No. 1 emergency acts are given in a note at 251 United States, page 165. "Conclusion of the war" as used by Congress was held in *Hamilton* v. *Kentucky Distilleries Co.* (251 U. S. 146; 40 Sup Ct. 106) not to mean the mere cessation of hostilities. This case involved a prosecution under the Wartime Prohibition Act (40 Stat. 1045, 1046), which was enacted in reliance on war-emergency powers of the Congress and became effective 10 days after the signing of the armistice with Germany (November 11, 1918).

The Court continued "nor may we assume that Congress intended by the phrase to designate the date when the treaty of peace should be signed at Versailles or elsewhere by German and American representatives, since by the Constitution a treaty is only a proposal until approved by the Senate. Furthermore, to construe 'conclusion of war' as meaning the actual termination of war activities would leave wholly uncertain the date the act would cease to be operative; whereas Congress evinced here, as in other war statutes, a clear purpose that the date of expiration should be definitely fixed."

A similar result was reached in *Kahn* v. *Anderson* (255 U. S. 1, 10 (Jan. 31, 1921)) wherein it was held that the ninety-second article of the Articles of War (1916), providing that "no person shall be tried by court-martial for murder or rape committed within the geographical limits of the States of the Union and the District of Columbia in time of peace" contemplates a complete peace, officially proclaimed, and that such a peace was not brought about by the armistice and the cessation of hostilities in the war with Germany and Austria.

Because of the failure of the President and the Senate to agree on a definitive treaty of peace following World War No. 1, considerable delay and confusion resulted in the determination of the date of termination of the war.

President Wilson in his message to Congress of November 11, 1918, transmitting terms of the armistice, stated "the war thus comes to an end, for having accepted these terms of the armistice, it will be impossible for the German command to renew it." Despite a few contrary decisions, such as *United States* v. *Hicks*, 256 Fed. 707 (1919) (which appear to be ill-considered), the President's statement has not been accepted as an official proclamation of the legal end of the war.

On July 14, 1919, a general enemy trade license was issued by the Department of State, authorizing all persons in the United States to trade and communicate with persons residing in Germany. On July 15, 1919, by order of the Postmaster General, the post office facilities were opened to receive mail matter destined for Germany and coming from Germany.

President Wilson was unwilling to take action to officially terminate the war. In answer to a question by Senator Fall, in August 1919, the President replied that in his judgment he did not have the power by proclamation to declare that peace exists, and that in no circumstances could he consent to take such a course prior to the ratification of a final treaty of peace.

In the early months of 1920 the Congress passed a resolution declaring the state of war at an end. This resolution was vetoed by the President on May 27, 1920, and the House of Representatives sustained the veto.

Considerable discussion resulted as to whether Congress or the President could separately terminate the state of war. (As to power of Congress to declare peace, see 18 Michigan Law Review (May 1920) pp. 669–675 wherein Edward S. Corwin argues that Congress has such power simply by virtue of its power to repeal its previous enactments (e. g. the Declaration of War). Also John M. Mathews, The Termination of War (19 Mich. Law Review 819).

So far as war legislation was concerned the question was finally resolved by the joint resolution of March 3, 1921 (Public Res. No. 64, ch. 136, 41 Stat. 1359).

The resolution of March 3, 1921, provided that the effective date of the resolution should be construed and treated as the date of the termination of the war or of the present or existing emergency in the interpretation of any acts of Congress, joint resolutions, or proclamations of President containing provisions contingent upon the duration or the date of the termination of the war or the present or existing emergency. Certain statutes, including the Trading with the Enemy Act of October 6, 1917, were excepted from the operation of the resolution.

2. EXPIRING ON THE CESSATION OF HOSTILITIES

The expressions "cessation of hostilities," "termination of hostilities," present difficulties of interpretation unless accompanied by provision for self-determination, such as determination or proclamation of the President, or resolution by the Congress. The cases previously cited distinguish the "cessation of hostilities" and the "conclusion of the war." (*McElrath* v. *United States*, 102 U. S. 426; *Hamilton* v. *Kentucky Distilleries Co.*, 251 U. S. 146; *Kahn* v. *Anderson*, 256 U. S. 1, 10.)

These cases indicate the "cessation of hostilities" ordinarily would occur prior to the date of the termination of the war. Certainly "cessation of hostilities" would not of itself terminate the state of war. The "cessation of hostilities" might be fixed by an armistice. Thus the armistice between the Allies and the Germans signed on November 11, 1918, provided for a "cessation of hostilities by land and in the air 6 hours after the signing of the armistice" and an "immediate cessation of all hostilities at sea."

However, there is question as to whether an armistice is conclusive evidence of the cessation of hostilities. Judge Learned Hand in *Commercial Cable Co.* v. *Burleson* (255 Fed. 99, 104–107; S. D. N. Y., 1919), stated: "An armistice effects nothing but a suspension of hostilities; a war still continues. * * * Neither had hostilities ceased. * * * There were still military operations, the armistice had not been carried out, and after it was, armed forces of the United States were in occupation of enemy territory."

The situation surrounding an armistice and cessation of hostilities lends itself to uncertainty and difficulty in determining a date for expiration of legislation contingent upon a cessation of hostilities. This would be particularly true where Congress in the subject legislation provides no method for determining or evidencing of such a cessation. Unless Congress would provide for evidencing of a cessation, such as by proclamation of the President or resolution of the Congress, it would appear inevitable that uncertainty and confusion would ensue.

3. EXPIRING ON TERMINATION OF AN EMERGENCY

Another class of statutes are those effective during any period of national emergency, during the national emergency declared by the President on September 8, 1939, or during the national emergency declared by the President on May 27, 1941.

In view of the original declaration by the President, it would be logical to look toward him for a proclamation terminating the various emergencies, and thus terminating or suspending the statutory provisions dependent thereon. While it is reasonable to assume that the termination of the emergency period would be coterminous with the termination of the war, such a conclusion would not inevitably follow. For various reasons, the President might consider it desirable to continue the emergency after the termination of the war.

In view of the failure of ratification of the Versailles Treaty such a situation occurred following World War No. 1. The impasse was solved by the joint resolution of March 3, 1921, fixing March 3, 1921, as the date of the termination of the present or existing emergency in the interpretation of any acts of Congress, joint resolutions, or proclamations of the President containing provisions contingent upon the present or existing emergency.

However, doubt existed as to the status of statutes conditional upon the existence of any emergency or national emergency or upon a time of peace. In response to the Secretary of the Navy's inquiry on such statutes, the Attorney General gave his opinion on April 11, 1921 (32 Op. Atty. Gen. 505). In this opinion, the Attorney General held the joint resolution applied to those statutory provisions which in general terms applied to any emergency or national emergency and included the present or existing emergency without specific reference thereto. Likewise the joint resolution affected those statutes relating to the Navy which relate in terms to time of peace, since time of war and time of peace are mutually exclusive. Congress by the joint resolution meant to declare a condition of peace to exist as to the laws of and governing the United States, and hence all laws and regulations depending for their force upon a state of war or emergency were of no further force.

4. EXPIRING ON A DAY CERTAIN

Because of the uncertainty manifest in the afore-mentioned classes of termination clauses, the Congress has resorted increasingly to provisions extending the legislation

for a fixed period (commonly 2 years, although other periods, such as 1 year have been employed).

No difficulty is presented by such provisions in ascertainment of the expiration of statutes containing such provisions.

5. VARIATION OF THE AFORE-MENTIONED CLAUSES WITH PROVISION FOR TERMINATION SUBSEQUENT TO THE BASIC CONTINGENCY

A large number of the statutes under consideration are effective for a fixed period (commonly 6 months, although other periods ranging from 3 to 18 months are also used) after the happening of a specified event. An example of such a provision is "the authority granted in this act shall remain in force during the continuance of the present war and for 6 months after the termination of the war." Once the basic contingency (i. e., the date of the termination of the war) is determined, the ascertainment of the date of the end of the additional period follows easily by simple calendar computation.

6. PROVISIONS IN THE ALTERNATIVE FOR TERMINATION PRIOR TO THE BASIC CONTINGENCY

Many of the statutes in addition to providing for termination upon the happening of a contingency, also provide for earlier termination as the Congress by concurrent resolution or the President may designate. Obviously, the date of such earlier termination, rests in the exercise of the discretion conferred by the specific statute, whether it be the Congress or the President.

The Judge Advocate General's Office is continuing its study of the problem raised by termination clauses with a view to determining what administrative or legislative action may be required in connection with the termination of the war. It is hoped that the foregoing incomplete discussion may prove of value to the Committee, and that you will feel free to call upon the Department for further development of any aspect of this problem or the preparation of legislation in connection therewith.

Sincerely yours,

FORRESTAL,
Secretary of the Navy.

AUGUST 21, 1944.

TEMPORARY LAWS RELATING TO THE NAVY, IN FORCE ON JULY 31, 1944

The following classes of temporary laws are not included in the attached list:

(a) Laws which authorize the construction, acquisition, or conversion of vessels for the Navy.

(b) Laws which authorize the appropriation of funds for essential equipment and facilities at private or naval establishments for the building and equipping of naval vessels, the alteration and repair of naval vessels, the manufacture of aircraft and aeronautical material, or the production of ordnance and munitions.

(c) Laws which authorize the appropriation of funds for construction of public works.

(d) Miscellaneous provisions contained in acts making appropriations for the Navy Department and the naval service for the fiscal year 1945.

FEDERAL AID FOR POST-WAR HIGHWAY CONSTRUCTION

The Senate resumed consideration of the bill (S. 2105) to amend and supplement the Federal Aid Road Act, approved July 11, 1916, as amended and supplemented, to authorize appropriations for the post-war construction of highways and bridges, to eliminate hazards at railroad grade crossings, to provide for the immediate preparation of plans and acquisition of rights-of-way, and for other purposes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Consideration of amendments to Senate bill 2105 is in order.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads have been giving very careful consideration to the several amendments which were offered to the bill and printed, and have made considerable progress. I was asked by the committee to suggest that if they had a little more time they believe they could bring proposals to the Senate which would be satisfactory to the Senate. I think it would be advisable to allow the committee a little more time, and the Senate, in the meantime, might take up consideration of the calendar or some other business for a while today. Could that be done, I should like to ask the leaders?

Mr. BARKLEY. Of course, it is always in order to call the calendar, but I am wondering whether the members of the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, which is now in session, would be interested in the calendar, so that it would be unfair to them to call it in their absence?

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, my judgment is that the committee will not complete consideration of the amendments today. There is one other suggestion which I should like to make, to see if it meets with approval. The suggestion is that we dispense with consideration of the road bill today and let it go over until tomorrow or until Friday, which will give the committee ample time to work the matter out, and that the Senate then resume consideration of the bill.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President in response to the suggestion of the Senator from Arizona I should say that I believe time would really be saved by giving the committee ample opportunity and time to consider the amendments and to thresh them out. It may be that the committee's report to the Senate would be largely satisfactory to those who have offered the various amendments. We all realize that we have arrived at what may turn out to be the tail end of this session, at least for the present. It is increasingly difficult to keep a quorum in the two Houses of Congress under such conditions. Both sides of the House of Representatives have already entered into an agreement not to transact any other business after the conference reports on the reconversion and surplus property legislation are disposed of. We all know in the Senate how difficult it is to legislate wisely under present conditions.

I am perfectly willing to let the so-called road bill go over until Friday and to have the Senate recess until Friday, but if we can dispose of the calendar today—for many Senators are interested in disposing of the calendar before we shall disperse—I think it ought to be done in the interest of proposed legislation which has been reported to the Senate. I realize, as does the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], the difficulty of legislating at all under present conditions. If we cannot call the calendar today in justice to Senators who are not on the floor, or who are in committee, I feel like stating that we will call it, or attempt to call it, before there is any recess or any adjournment of the Senate.

Mr. HAYDEN. For that matter, we can meet tomorrow for that purpose, or on Friday.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I think in the circumstances, there is much merit in the suggestion that the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, to which yesterday was rather committed the task of considering the various proposed amendments, should have further time for the consideration of and for decision with respect to these many amendments. I think probably that in the long run time will be saved by giving the committee time to complete that task now. I should very much dislike to see the calendar called now, without notice to Members of the Senate who are engaged in committee meetings, or who may be on conference committees, and other Senators who are not now in the Chamber. I agree with the distinguished majority leader that some time this week there ought to be a call of the calendar, and that there should be opportunity for disposition of measures on the calendar. However, I hope the Senator from Kentucky will not urge the consideration of measures on the calendar at this time.

Mr. BARKLEY. I do not intend to do so. I made the suggestion in the hope that we might save some time by calling the calendar now. However, I do not wish to take advantage of any Senator who is absent.

Let me explain also that, as I understand, the conferees on the surplus-property-disposition bill have practically agreed. They will not be able to formulate their agreement into language in time to take the matter up this week in the other body, where it must be considered first. I believe an effort is being made to have the report ready for consideration in the House next Monday.

The conferees on the reconversion and unemployment-compensation bill, known as the George bill, have practically reached an agreement on all but two items, upon which it is impossible for the conferees to agree. The House conferees have decided to take back to the House those two matters for further consideration on the part of the House, to determine whether the House will instruct its conferees either to yield or to adhere to the House amendment to the George bill. That disposition will also be postponed until Monday or Tuesday. The ability of the conferees on that legislation to get together may or may not depend upon the action of the House regarding the House amendments to the George bill. Whatever the action of the House may be, the conferees will meet again to consider the question. At any rate, we cannot hope to have that matter again before the Senate before early next week.

It is important and essential that Senators remain in Washington, because when either of these conference reports comes before the Senate for considera-

tion, any Senator can demand a yea-and-nay vote, or he can demand a quorum. Certainly the Senate is not bereft of a sense of responsibility to a degree which would make it indifferent to the final disposition of this legislation at the earliest possible date. For that reason I am urging, with all the force at my command, that Senators remain in the city, where they will be available, until this legislation is completed. I hope that it will not be necessary to repeat this urging on my part, or on the part of any other Senator, with regard to the importance of this legislation. It would be a serious reflection upon the legislative process if, on measures of this kind, with respect to which all Senators are agreed that it is important to dispose of them as quickly as possible, we should find the Senate not in a position to act.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, because of confusion in the Chamber, I did not hear the statement of the Senator from Kentucky as to the disposition to be accorded Senate bill 2105.

Mr. BARKLEY. The suggestion has been made that the bill go over until Friday.

Mr. RUSSELL. I regret very much that we cannot proceed with the bill today. I cannot be present on Friday.

Mr. BARKLEY. I had hoped that we might dispose of the bill today; but the Senator from Arizona, who is in charge of the bill, requests further time for consideration by the committee of the amendments which have been submitted.

Mr. RUSSELL. I am delighted to know that the committee is going further into the question, which needs closer scrutiny. However, it will be impossible for me to be present on Friday.

Mr. BARKLEY. I regret that the Senator, who is one of the ablest legislators in the Senate, finds himself compelled to be absent on any day, and especially on Friday.

Mr. RUSSELL. I thank the Senator for the compliment he pays me. I wish it were deserved. Perhaps it will be impossible to dispose of the bill on Friday, and it may go over until next week.

Mr. BARKLEY. I do not know about that. If the committee should deal with the amendments in a reasonably satisfactory way, it might be possible to dispose of the bill this week.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, the committee has made considerable progress with respect to the amendments. I am sure that news will be quite pleasing to Senators who have submitted amendments. I believe it will be possible, with the committee giving its attention to the remainder of the amendments, to bring the bill before the Senate and have it considered without substantial opposition.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. RUSSELL. Has the committee considered the advisability of relating a part of the proposed expenditures in some way to the need to afford protection against a condition of unemployment?

Mr. HAYDEN. There was no amendment to that effect pending, and we have not yet reached that question.

The reason why I urged the consideration of the highway bill at this time was that I had been told by Senators interested in the conference reports, which deal with highly controversial matters, as Senators are aware, that it would not be possible to adopt the conference report on either measure—either the George bill relating to reconversion or the surplus-property bill—without having a quorum of the Senate present. That being true, and it being necessary to have a quorum present for those purposes, I thought we might profitably utilize the time in discussion and action upon the highway bill.

The suggestion I should like to make now, and what I should like to have agreed to by unanimous consent, is that if we are to pass the road measure over until Friday, let us have a print of the bill made for the information of the Senate. The print would indicate the changes recommended in the bill by the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I have no disposition to object to the Senator's request. I think it is one which will expedite the proposed legislation. But I should like to inquire whether the Senator thinks the committee is likely to consider any amendment which might in some wise relate some part of this tremendous expenditure to a condition of unemployment in the country. I am now working on an amendment, which I am undertaking to prepare, which would provide for the expenditure of $200,000,000 a year in any event, but would defer any further expenditures, although the projects could be planned and be made ready for action, dependent upon a condition involving unemployment to the extent of 4,000,000 persons. I hope to furnish to the Senator a copy of the amendment. It is a rather difficult one to draw.

Mr. HAYDEN. If the Senator could do so by tonight—it could be printed at any time—I should be very glad indeed to see that it is brought to the attention of the committee. If it were prepared and printed, I think it would be very helpful in the committee's consideration of the bill.

Mr. RUSSELL. I hope to have it ready for the committee in a short time.

Mr. HAYDEN. That will be desirable because the committee is sincerely interested in all phases of the matter. We want to report sound legislation which will meet with the approval of all Members of the Senate. After all, the committee is the servant of the Senate.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair is informed that the Senator from Arizona or his committee can obtain a committee print without any action on the part of the Senate.

Mr. HAYDEN. I merely wished to make sure that, whatever we did, we would not have to go through a great many papers.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I should like to ask the Senator if there are any amendments before the Senator's committee which is considering the pending bill which would restore the old formula, as we have known it for the past year.

Mr. HAYDEN. Oh, yes; there is an amendment which has been offered by the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD].

Mr. WHERRY. Is the Senator and his committee giving that amendment the utmost consideration?

Mr. HAYDEN. It is receiving every consideration.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the Senator.

THE CALENDAR

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to consider House bill 2509, Calendar No. 1096, a bill for the relief of Marie Engert.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be reported by title, for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (H. R. 2509) for the relief of Marie Engert.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. DANAHER. Yes.

Mr. BARKLEY. After further consultation, and at the suggestion of a number of Senators, it seems that we might well proceed now to the call of the calendar. In doing so, we would reach the bill to which the Senator has referred.

Mr. DANAHER. Very well; I withdraw my request.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of bills on the calendar to which there is no objection, beginning at the end of the last call.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? Without objection, the clerk will proceed to state the measures on the calendar, beginning at the end of the last call, which is Calendar No. 1047.

Does the Senator from Connecticut desire recognition?

Mr. DANAHER. No, Mr. President. The Senator from Kentucky cleared up the point to which I wished to refer.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Then the clerk will proceed to state the measures on the calendar, commencing with Calendar No. 1047.

BILLS PASSED OVER

The bill (H. R. 4485) authorizing the construction of certain public works on rivers and harbors for flood control and for other purposes was announced as first in order.

Mr. WHITE. Let the bill go over.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 1218) to repeal the act of June 18, 1934, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. TUNNELL. Let the bill go over.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

EXEMPTION OF NATIONAL WAR LABOR BOARD OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES FROM CERTAIN PROVISIONS OF CRIMINAL CODE

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1780) to exempt certain officers

and employees of the National War Labor Board from certain provisions of the Criminal Code, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with amendments, on page 2, line 11, after the word "Board", to insert "or any of its said agencies"; and in line 12, after the word "Board", to insert "or for 90 days thereafter", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That nothing contained in sections 109 and 113 of the Criminal Code (U. S. C., title 18, secs. 198 and 203) shall be deemed to apply to any person heretofore or hereafter appointed to the National War Labor Board or any of its agencies under the authority of the War Labor Disputes Act, any Executive order or regulation issued under the provisions of the act of October 2, 1942 (56 Stat. 765), or Executive Order Numbered 9017, dated January 12, 1942, as amended from time to time, because of intermittent service as a member of the National War Labor Board or of a regional board, industry, commission, tripartite panel or similar agency of the National War Labor Board, or as a hearing officer or arbitrator of such Board, if such person is serving or has served in such capacity without compensation, or with compensation on a per diem when actually employed basis for not in excess of 90 days a year: *Provided, however*, That the provisions of this act shall not apply to any representation before the National War Labor Board or any of its said agencies while such person is an officer or employee of the National War Labor Board or for 90 days thereafter.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

BILLS PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 2061) to provide a national program for war mobilization and postwar adjustment was announced as next in order.

Mr. WHITE. I ask that the bill go over.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (H. R. 3187) to amend section 5, Public Law 140, Seventy-seventh Congress, was announced as next in order.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of this bill? If not, I ask that it go over.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

PUNISHMENT OF PERSONS CONSPIRING TO VIOLATE COUNTERFEITING AND OTHER LAWS

The bill (S. 725) to provide for the punishment of persons conspiring to violate the laws relating to counterfeiting, and certain other laws, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That chapter 7 of the Criminal Code, as amended (U. S. C., 1940 ed., title 18, ch. 7), is hereby further amended by adding at the end thereof the following section:

"SEC. 178a. If two or more persons conspire to violate any provision of this chapter, or of sections 205, 218, 219, or 220 of chapter 8 of the Criminal Code, as amended (U. S. C., 1940 ed., title 18, ch. 7, and secs. 328, 347, 348, and 349 of ch. 8), or of the act of August 26, 1935 (49 Stat. 866; U. S. C., 1940 ed., title 18, sec. 349a), and one or more of such persons do any act to effect the object of the conspiracy, each of the parties to such conspiracy shall, on conviction thereof, be subject to the same fine or imprisonment, or both, as is applicable in the case of conviction for violating such provision."

BILLS PASSED OVER

The bill (H. R. 3592) to amend the Judicial Code in respect to the original jurisdiction of the district courts of the United States in certain cases and for other purposes was announced as next in order.

Mr. WHITE. Let the bill go over.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (H. R. 3750) to provide for the appointment of an additional circuit judge for the third circuit, and to permit the filling of the first vacancy occurring in the office of district judge for the eastern district of Pennsylvania was announced as next in order.

Mr. DANAHER. Let the bill go over.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

ARVO KARI, LEMPI K. HOLM, AND BURT JOHNSTON

The bill (H. R. 2792) for the relief of Arvo Kari, Lempi K. Holm, and Burt Johnston was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

DR. E. S. AXTELL

The bill (S. 1942) for the relief of Dr. E. S. Axtell was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Dr. E. S. Axtell, of Rantoul, Ill., the sum of $398, in full satisfaction of his claim against the United States for compensation for services rendered the United States Engineer Office, Louisville, Ky., in conducting physical examinations of prospective civilian employees of the United States, such claim having been disallowed by the Comptroller General on the ground that payment for such examinations was not authorized by law: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

DEWEY H. DAVIS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1392) for the relief of Dewey H. Davis, which had been reported from the Committee on Claims, with an amendment, on page 1, line 6, after the words "sum of", to strike out "$10,000", and insert "$5,000", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Dewey H. Davis, of Macon, Ga., the sum of $5,000, in full satisfaction of his claim against the United States for compensation for personal injuries sustained by him as the result of an accident which occurred when the passenger bus in which he was riding was struck by a United States Army truck near Robins Field, Ga., on July 7, 1943: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

GORDON LEWIS COPPAGE

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1987) for the relief of Gordon Lewis Coppage, which had been reported from the Committee on Claims, with amendments, on page 1, line 6, after the words "sum of", to strike out "$4,197 47" and insert "$1,535.07"; and on page 2, line 2, after the word "expenses", to strike out "and other losses", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Gordon Lewis Coppage, of Chicago, Ill., the sum of $1,535.07, in full satisfaction of his claim against the United States for compensation for personal injuries and damage to personal property sustained by him when the truck which he was driving was struck by a Navy ambulance at the intersection of Bryn Mawr and Central Avenues in Chicago, Ill., on December 4, 1943, and for reimbursement of medical and hospital expenses sustained by him as a result of such injuries and damage: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ERNEST A. GROTTKE

The bill (H. R. 3496) for the relief of Ernest A. Grottke was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MARY HERTZ

The bill (H. R. 527) for the relief of Mary Hertz was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

JOHN SALFI

The bill (H. R. 2387) for the relief of John Salfi was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

TRESSIE SPRING AND MRS. HAZEL STUTTE

The bill (H. R. 3033) for the relief of Tressie Spring and Mrs. Hazel Stutte was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MRS. GRACE PAGE

The bill (H. R. 3038) for the relief of Mrs. Grace Page was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

R. GUY DORSEY

The bill (H. R. 3296) for the relief of R. Guy Dorsey was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

RALPH W. COOLEY

The bill (H. R. 3464) for the relief of Ralph W. Cooley was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

PERLEY M. SILVER

The bill (H. R. 1708) for the relief of Perley M. Silver was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

LEOLA EVANS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1784) for the relief of Leola Evans, which had been reported from the Committee on Claims, with an amendment, on page 1, line 6, after the words "sum of", to strike out "$5,000" and insert "$3,000", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Leola Evans, of Columbus, Ga., the sum of $3,000, in full satisfaction of her claim against the United States for compensation for the death of her husband, James Evans, who died as a result of injuries sustained by him when a truck driven by him was struck by a United States Army tank at Fort Benning, Ga., on August 21, 1942: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ALEX WYLIE

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1785) for the relief of Alex Wylie, which had been reported from the Committee on Claims, with an amendment, on page 1, line 6, after the words "sum of", to strike out "$1,500" and insert "$1,000", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Alex Wylie, of Columbus, Ga., the sum of $1,000, in full satisfaction of his claim against the United States for compensation for personal injuries sustained by him when the truck in which he was a passenger was struck by a United States Army tank at Fort Benning, Ga., on August 21, 1942: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ARTHUR M. SELLERS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1732) for the relief of Arthur M. Sellers, which had been reported from the Committee on Claims, with an amendment, on page 1, line 6, after the words "sum of", to strike out "$10,000" and insert "$5,000", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Arthur M. Sellers, of Baxley, Ga., the sum of $5,000, in full satisfaction of his claim against the United States for compensation for the death of his son, Walter R. Sellers, who died as a result of personal injuries sustained by him when the passenger bus in which he was riding collided with a United States Army vehicle near Allenhurst, Ga., on April 24, 1943: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MRS. MAMIE DUTCH VAUGHN

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1869) for the relief of Mrs. Mamie Dutch Vaughn, which had been reported from the Committee on Claims, with an amendment, on page 1, line 6, after the words "sum of", to strike out "$10,000" and insert "$5,000", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Mrs. Mamie Dutch Vaughn, of Tattnall County, Ga., the sum of $5,000, in full satisfaction of her claim against the United States for compensation for the death of her minor daughter, Gladys Vaughn, who was killed on the night of April 23, 1943, in Liberty County, Ga., when the bus on which she was riding was struck by a motor vehicle driven by a soldier in the Army of the United States: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MRS. AMY McKNIGHT

The bill (S. 1959) for the relief of Mrs. Amy McKnight was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That sections 15 to 20, inclusive of the act entitled "An act to provide compensation for employees of the United States suffering injuries while in the performance of their duties, and for other purposes," approved September 7, 1916, as amended, are hereby waived in favor of Mrs. Amy McKnight, widow of George McKnight, a former employee of the War Department at Fort Peck, Mont., whose death on February 20, 1936, is alleged to have resulted from pneumonia contracted while in the performance of duty prior to February 12, 1936, and the United States Employees' Compensation Commission is authorized to receive and consider her claim under the remaining provisions of the said act: *Provided*, That claim hereunder shall be filed within 6 months from the approval of this act: *Provided further*, That no benefits shall accrue prior to the approval of this act.

HERMAN PHILYAW

The Senate proceed to consider the bill (S. 2008) for the relief of Herman Philyaw which had been reported from the Committee on Claims with an amendment, on page 1, line 6, after the words "sum of", to strike out "$1,000" and insert "$650", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Herman Philyaw, of Tate, Ga., the sum of $650, in full satisfaction of his claim against the United States for compensation for personal injuries sustained by him when he was struck by an Army vehicle as a result of an accident which occurred in Tate, Ga., on January 23, 1944: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

C. C. THORNTON

The bill (S. 1766) for the relief of C. C. Thornton was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to C. C. Thornton, of Walnut, Miss., the sum of $2,000, in full satisfaction of his claims against the United States for compensation for personal injuries and property damage sustained by him when the wagon in which he was riding was struck by a Civilian Conservation Corps truck on Sepember 20, 1941, near Walnut, Miss.: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor

and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

LUM JACOBS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2007) for the relief of Lum Jacobs, which had been reported from the Committee on Claims with an amendment, on page 2, line 1, after "October 2", to strike out "1942" and insert "1943", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Lum Jacobs, of Wills Point, Tex., the sum of $1,030, in full satisfaction of his claim against the United States for compensation for personal injuries sustained by him, and for loss of wages because of such injuries, as a result of an accident which occurred when the wagon in which he was riding was struck by an Army vehicle near Wills Point, Tex., on October 2, 1943: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

JOEL A. HART

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1557) for the relief of Joel A. Hart, which had been reported from the Committee on Claims with amendments, on page 1, line 6, after the words "sum of", to strike out "$600" and insert "300"; on line 7, to strike out the word "for" and insert "or"; and on line 8, to strike out "being deprived of" and insert "losing", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Joel A. Hart, of Milton, Fla., the sum of $300, in full satisfaction of his claims against the United States for compensation or damages sustained and expenses incurred by him as a result of his losing the use of his property when he was required to vacate such property pursuant to a notice erroneously served upon him in connection with the condemnation by the United States of certain land in Dixie County, Fla.: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

W. A. SMOOT, INC.

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1922) for the relief of W. A. Smoot, Inc., which had been reported from the Committee on Claims with an amendment, on page 1, line 6, after the words "sum of", to strike out "$2,417.19" and insert "$1,210", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to W. A. Smoot, Inc., Alexandria, Va., the sum of $1,210. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said W. A. Smoot, Inc., against the United States for damages caused to its lumber and millwork plant located at Cameron and Union Streets, Alexandria, Va., as the result of an explosion on March 2, 1944, in a nearby building used and occupied by the Records Division of The Adjutant General's Office of the Department of War.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. BYRD subsequently said: Mr. President, has Order No. 1083, Senate bill 1922, a bill for the relief of W. A. Smoot, Inc., been passed?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill was passed.

Mr. BYRD. I ask unanimous consent that the votes by which the bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed be reconsidered, and that the bill be restored to the calendar. I wish to prepare an amendment, and I should like to have the bill remain on the calendar.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the votes by which the bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed are reconsidered, and the bill will be restored to the calendar.

MRS. SOPHIA TANNENBAUM

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1897) for the relief of Mrs. Sophia Tannenbaum, which had been reported from the Committee on Claims with an amendment, on page 1, line 6, after the words "sum of", to strike out "$10,000" and insert "$5,327.45", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Mrs. Sophia Tannenbaum, of University City, Mo., the sum of $5,327.45, in full satisfaction of all claims against the United States arising out of the death of her husband, Morris Tannenbaum, who died as the result of injuries sustained by him on February 13, 1943, when a United States Army truck struck another vehicle which struck the said Morris Tannenbaum: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

JOSEPH SCARPELLA AND DOROTHY SCARPELLA

The bill (H. R. 2390) for the relief of Joseph Scarpella and Dorothy Scarpella was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

IRMA S. SHERIDAN

The bill (S. 2069) for the relief of Irma S. Sheridan, postmaster at Rockville, Oreg., was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the General Accounting Office is hereby authorized and directed to credit the account of Irma S. Sheridan, postmaster at Rockville, Oreg., in the sum of $150, representing the amount in which the postmaster's account was disallowed because, through a misunderstanding, the postmaster was authorized to employ the assistant postmaster upon a mail-messenger route at the rate of $450 per annum, although the act of June 3, 1924 (43 Stat. 356; 39 U. S. C. 579), limits the compensation which may be paid to postmasters, assistant postmasters, and clerks of post offices of the third and fourth classes to $300 in any 1 year for contract mail-messenger service, it being established that the route is a very difficult one upon which the services of a mail messenger have been exceedingly hard to obtain.

AUTHORITY TO COMPROMISE CERTAIN INDEBTEDNESS

The bill (S. 1688) to authorize the Governor of the Farm Credit Administration and the Secretary of Agriculture to compromise, adjust, or cancel certain indebtedness, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the bill?

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. What is the number of the bill?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. It is Calendar No. 1087, Senate bill 1688.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Mr. President, I was one of the sponsors of the bill. It is a bill to enable compromise settlements to be made on the old seed and feed loans which were made a number of years ago throughout the country. The bill has been submitted to the Department of Agriculture and has the approval of the Department. It comes to the Senate after approval by the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, my request for an explanation was caused by curiosity as to what loans the bill related to, and how far back it would extend. I realize that in connection with some of the old crop seed loans there should be authority to compromise, but I did not desire to have any general power or authority granted to the Farm Credit Administration to compromise obligations. Does the Senator recall the years in which the loans were made?

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Offhand, I am unable to do so.

Mr. RUSSELL. If the Senator will permit the bill to go over temporarily until I can examine the report of the committee, I shall have no objection to it being called up again.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President, this matter came up in the Senate some years ago. I think that if the Senator from Georgia will make an investigation, he will find that the loans were made during the period of drought in 1934 and 1935.

Mr. RUSSELL. If the Senator from Minnesota is sure that the bill relates only to loans made in those years, I shall have no objection.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. I will not say definitely to what it refers, but I presume that the issue is the same as that we had before us some years ago, and the Senate refused to grant authority to compromise or cancel the loans. In my opinion, they should have been canceled a long time ago, because those who suffered in the drought were made destitute, and collectors went into the section of the country where the borrowers lived and grabbed anything they could get. As a matter of fact, there has been a great deal of what amounted almost to persecution in the collection of the old debts. While those affected borrowed money for seed loans, they did not get any crops from the seed. People have written to me that seed loans had accumulated, with interest, amounting to hundreds of dollars, which the Federal Government thought they should pay, while others, who made no loans because they had no farms, were living on relief, and were getting cash to enable them to live, when those who borrowed were trying to raise crops, but could not raise any. I believe that if it is confined to those years, the bill should be passed, but at the moment I cannot say. I have not read the bill for some time.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] has asked that the bill be passed over temporarily. The bill will be temporarily passed over.

Mr. RUSSELL subsequently said: Mr. President, I have hurriedly examined Senate bill 1688, providing for cancelation of certain indebtedness to the Department of Agriculture. I have no objection to legislation which would provide for the adjustment or cancelation of indebtedness heretofore created. My objection was to conferring any power upon the Secretary of Agriculture to cancel, adjust, or compromise any indebtedness which may be entered into in the future. I believe that it would be very unwise for us to extend any such power.

There is only one provision in the bill which could possibly confer such power. I refer, on page 8, line 20, to the words "or hereafter enacted." If those words were stricken from the bill I would have no objection to the bill being passed.

Mr. President, on page 8, line 20, after the word "heretofore", I wish to offer an amendment, to strike out "or hereafter enacted."

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, I have no objection to the amendment, but I wish on my own behalf to offer an amendment to the bill.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, I object to the present consideration of the bill.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection is heard.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, I wish to have the RECORD show that had we considered the bill I would have offered an amendment to insert "A complete report to Congress shall be made at intervals of 6 months of all settlements, cancelations, or adjustments authorized by this act."

HENRY WHITE

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The next bill on the calendar will be stated.

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 2707) for the relief of Henry White, which had been reported from the Committee on Immigration, with an amendment, on page 1, line 8, after the word "States", to insert "Upon the enactment of this act the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the quota for the Chinese of the first year that the said quota is available."

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

PAUL SZELIGA

The bill (H. R. 2134) for the relief of Paul Szeliga was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

FREDA UTLEY

The bill (H. R. 312) for the relief of Freda Utley was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

AMENDMENT OF NATIONALITY ACT OF 1940 IN RESPECT TO CERTAIN NATURALIZATION FEES

The bill (H. R. 3722) to amend section 342 of the Nationality Act of 1940 in respect to fees for the issuance of certificates of arrival, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

AMENDMENT OF NATIONALITY ACT OF 1940 IN RESPECT TO COPIES OF RECORDS

The bill (H. R. 1680) to amend the Nationality Act of 1940 to permit the Commissioner to furnish copies of any part of the records or information therefrom to agencies or officials of a State without charge, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MARIE ENGERT

The bill (H. R. 2509) for the relief of Marie Engert was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

DR. FRANK K. BOLAND, SR.

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1853) for the relief of Dr. Frank K. Boland, Sr., which had been reported from the Committee on Claims, with an amendment on page 1, line 6, after the words "the sum of", to strike out "$3,000" and insert "$2,000", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Dr. Frank K. Boland, Sr., of Atlanta, Ga., the sum of $2,000, in full satisfaction of his claim against the United States for compensation for personal injuries sustained by him as the result of an accident which occurred when the automobile in which he was riding was struck by a United States Army truck near Mabelton, Ga., on February 11, 1943: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

AUTHORIZATION TO CERTAIN EMPLOYEES OF THE GENERAL LAND OFFICE TO ADMINISTER OATHS, ETC.

The bill (S. 1062) to authorize certain employees of the General Land Office to administer or take oaths, affirmations, affidavits, or depositions in the performance of their official duties, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the authority to administer or take oaths, affirmations, affidavits, or depositions, whenever necessary in the performance of their official duties, is hereby granted to field examiners and other employees of the General Land Office designated by the Commissioner of the General Land Office, Department of the Interior, for that purpose.

MOORES CREEK NATIONAL MILITARY PARK

The bill (H. R. 3384) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to accept property for the Moores Creek National Military Park, and for other purposes, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

CREDIT IN CERTAIN HOMESTEAD ENTRIES FOR MILITARY OF NAVAL SERVICE

The bill (H. R. 5025) to allow credit in connection with certain homestead entries for military or naval service rendered during World War No. 2, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

CONVEYANCE OF CERTAIN LAND TO THE CITY OF DULUTH, MINN.

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1807) authorizing and directing the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain land to the city of Duluth, Minn., which had been reported from the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys, with amendments.

The first amendment was, on page 3, line 4, after the word "meridian", to strike out "*Provided*, That the land authorized to be conveyed hereunder shall be used for the construction of and be maintained as a public highway free of any expense to the United States, and all work thereon shall be such as not to interfere with the operations and efficiency of the fisheries station and in a manner satisfactory to the Secretary of the Interior: *Provided further*, That in the event of

the discontinuance by the city of Duluth of the use of the above-described property as a public highway or the failure to maintain same in a manner satisfactory to the Secretary of the Interior, the title of said land shall revert to the United States" and insert "The said conveyance to the city of Duluth shall be made subject to the conditions that the land be used for the construction of and maintenance of a public highway free of any expense to the United States, that the highway be constructed and maintained so as not to interfere with the operations of and access to the fish hatchery station, and that in the event of the discontinuance by the city of Duluth of the use of the above-described property as a public highway, or upon failure to maintain the same in accordance with the conditions of the deed, title to said land shall revert to the United States."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, at the top of page 2, to insert the following new section:

SEC. 2. Nothing herein contained shall affect the applicability of the Federal Highway Act, approved November 9, 1921 (42 Stat. 212), as amended, to the public highway to be constructed on the land authorized to be conveyed hereunder.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to convey to the city of Duluth, Minn., the following-described land, now a part of the fisheries station in said city: Beginning at a point on the east line of Sixtieth Avenue East in the city of Duluth, State of Minnesota, said point lying forty-three and four one-hundredths feet in a northerly direction from a point at the intersection of the center line of London Road, extended with the said east line of Sixtieth Avenue East; thence extending in an easterly direction at an angle of sixty-six degrees and fifteen minutes to the left of said east line of Sixtieth Avenue East a distance of sixty-one and fifty-seven one-hundredths feet to a point of curve; thence continuing on a curve to the left whose radius is one thousand three hundred and forty-five and seven-tenths feet a distance of three hundred and sixty-four and eighteen one-hundredths feet, to the center line of Lester River as now located; thence in a southeasterly direction along the center line of said Lester River a distance of one hundred and thirty-two and thirty-six one-hundredths feet to a point; thence westerly parallel to the curve above described and distant therefrom one hundred and twenty feet, a distance of one hundred and seventy-eight and twenty one-hundredths feet to a point; thence northerly on a radial line a distance of eight and five-tenths feet to a point; thence westerly parallel to the curve first above described and distant therefrom one hundred and eleven and five-tenths feet a distance of two hundred and seventy-eight and ten one-hundredths feet to a point of tangency; thence westerly on a tangent line a distance of twelve and fifty-one one-hundredths feet to a point on the east line of Sixtieth Avenue East; thence northerly on said east line of Sixtieth Avenue East a distance of one hundred and twenty-one and eighty-two one-hundredths feet to a point of beginning and there terminating, containing an area of one and one-hundred-and-seventy-six one-thousandths acres; said land being located in sections 5 and 8, township 50 north, range 13 west, of the fourth principal meridian. The said conveyance to the city of Duluth shall be made subject to the conditions that the land be used for the construction of and maintenance of a public highway free of any expense to the United States, that the highway be constructed and maintained so as not to interfere with the operations of and access to the fish hatchery station, and that in the event of the discontinuance by the city of Duluth of the use of the above-described property as a public highway, or upon failure to maintain the same in accordance with the conditions of the deed, title to said land shall revert to the United States.

SEC. 2. Nothing herein contained shall affect the applicability of the Federal Highway Act, approved November 9, 1921 (42 Stat. 212), as amended, to the publis highway to be constructed on the land authorized to be conveyed hereunder.

EXTENSION OF CERTAIN OIL AND GAS LEASES

The bill (S. 2111) to provide for the extension of certain oil and gas leases, was announced as next in order.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, may I ask if the bill in any way refers to the Elk Hills or Teapot Dome area?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Oh, no. It deals only with 5-year leases. The purpose of the bill is to afford an additional year's time to operators who have complied with the law but have not yet brought in necessary production.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the last sentence in the first section of the act entitled "An act to grant a preference right to certain oil and gas leases," approved July 29, 1942, as amended, is hereby amended to read as follows: "The term of any 5-year lease expiring prior to December 31, 1945, maintained in accordance with the applicable statutory requirements and regulations and for which no preference right to a new lease is granted by this section, is hereby extended to December 31, 1945."

FEES AND COSTS IN CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 1569) to amend the act entitled "An act to amend the act creating the circuit court of appeals in regard to fees and costs, and for other purposes," approved February 19, 1897 (29 Stat. 536; 28 U. S. C. 543), which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment on page 2, line 5, after the word "appeals", to insert "and in the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia."

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

FEES IN DISTRICT COURTS OF THE UNITED STATES

The bill (H. R. 1623) to amend an act entitled "An act to provide fees to be charged by clerks of the district courts of the United States," approved February 11, 1925 (43 Stat. 857), as amended (28 U. S. C., secs. 548–555), was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That completes the calendar.

FOREIGN SERVICE BY MEMBERS OF THE NAVY WOMEN'S RESERVE

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Mr. President, from the Committee on Naval Affairs, I report favorably, with amendments, Senate bill 2028, and I submit a report (No. 1089) thereon. I ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be received, and the bill will be read by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 2028) to amend the Naval Reserve Act of 1938, as amended, so as to permit foreign service of members of the Women's Reserve under certain conditions.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Mr. President, I wish to make a statement with regard to the bill.

The bill relates to foreign service of the WAVES. There has been a great deal of controversy on the subject because of differences between members of the Committee on Naval Affairs of the House of Representatives, and members of the Committee on Naval Affairs of the Senate. The Committee on Naval Affairs of the House of Representatives has recommended granting to the Women's Auxiliary of the Navy—the WAVES—the right of foreign service in the European area. The Committee on Naval Affairs of the Senate has expressed its opposition to granting to the WAVES the right of foreign service in the European area on the ground that there is only one major naval station where the WAVES could be used, and that a great deal of expense would be involved, and considerable trouble would be experienced in providing adequate quarters for the WAVES in London. The Navy is different from the Army in that its activities are at sea, while the activities of the Army are confined to land. The fact that the WAC's have been granted permission to be sent to any part of the world has led to a movement on the part of those interested in the WAVES to be given like permission. As a result of this discussion and controversy, or difference of opinion, a compromise has been reached by the Committee on Naval Affairs of the Senate and the Committee on Naval Affairs of the House, due to a special request made by the Navy Department which I will read with the permission of the Senate.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, would the Senator mind my asking him a question at that point?

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. I am glad to yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts if the service of the WAVES on foreign duty is to be purely voluntary?

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. The bill provides that they may not be sent to Hawaii without their consent.

Mr. MAYBANK. In other words, such service would be purely voluntary.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. That is correct.

Mr. MAYBANK. I thank the Senator.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. The Committee on Naval Affairs were informed that Admiral Nimitz, the commander in chief of the Pacific Fleet and the Pacific Ocean area, stated that 332 male officers and 4,906 male enlisted personnel could be relieved by women in the Hawaiian Islands, and that the male personnel so relieved could be immediately made available for sea duty or for duty on the small islands and atolls in this area. The committee understand that housing and other facilities for the accommodation of the members of the Women's Reserve are available in the Hawaiian area.

Since members of the Women's Reserve were enrolled on the assumption that they would not be assigned to duty beyond the continental limits of the United States, the committee feel that they should not now be so assigned without their consent, and have provided in the bill that they may be assigned to duty at naval stations outside the continental limits of the United States but in the American area, and in the Territories of Hawaii and Alaska, only upon their prior consent.

This bill merely responds to the appeal made to the committee by the Navy Department, and provides that members of the Women's Reserve may, under the direction of the Navy Department, be sent to the Hawaiian area.

I note that the Senator from Iowa has risen and probably desires to ask me a question. If he does I shall be glad to yield to him.

Mr. GILLETTE. I thank the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts. As he knows, there was in the Naval Affairs Committee of the Senate a strong majority opinion in opposition to the proposal to authorize or allow foreign service for members of the Women's Reserve. As the Senator also knows, the Department has from time to time changed its viewpoint as presented to the Naval Affairs Committee. It was not long ago that request was made that we approve legislation to allow sending the WAVES to the European area. Now I understand that Department has taken another position and is willing to have the service limited to the Hawaiian area, and I further understand that the amendment which is to be offered by the chairman of the committee provides that service in Hawaii and in the Western Hemisphere shall be voluntary. The chairman of the committee also is well aware that members of the House committee have taken a different viewpoint, and have insisted that the doors be thrown wide open to foreign service.

I may say, Mr. President, to the distinguished chairman of the committee that I am not disposed to oppose the amendment as presented, if the chairman of the committee, within the limits of course of his position, can give us any assurance that it will not be thrown out in conference committee between the two Houses. If assurance can be given that the amendment will be accepted, I should like to have him give such assurance if he can.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. The distinguished Senator from Iowa has expressed the views on this subject of a large majority of the Committee on Naval Affairs. As he has well stated, there has been a strong feeling in the committee that the WAVES should be confined to service in continental United States, and that a sufficiently strong case was not made for sending them abroad, for the reasons I have given. There has been a good deal of feeling that the WAVES should have the same legislation that the WAC's have, but there has been lack of understanding or failure to appreciate that the naval service is primarily sea service. Except in very rare instances no man can be accepted for service in the Navy who is not able to go to sea, who cannot go to sea, and who is not willing to go to sea. So there is a different situation in the case of the WAVES than that which prevails in the case of the WAC's.

Now let me answer the question. I know the distinguished Senator from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS] feels as the Senator from Iowa and others feel. The final compromise was reached after a meeting between the acting chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs of the House, myself, and the Secretary of the Navy; and it is my understanding that when this bill is passed with the amendment now proposed the Naval Affairs Committee of the House will recommend its adoption without going to conference on the amendment. That would dispose of the objection which the distinguished Senator from Iowa had and which I myself had.

Now why should this bill be passed at the present time? During the past week the Secretary of the Navy has appealed to me at least three times about this bill. The House will meet in all probability only on one day when legislation of this kind may be considered before a recess is taken, and that will be on Monday. That is why it is important to take action now on the bill.

I want to say that I think the members of the Committee on Naval Affairs have been very considerate and have tried to go a long way to meet the wishes of the Navy Department, although there have been very strong feelings in opposition to legislation permitting WAVES to go outside the United States.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. President——

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. ANDREWS. I should like to ask the distinguished chairman of the committee if there is an estimate of the number that would be required?

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Admiral Nimitz states that 332 male officers and 4,906 male enlisted personnel can be relieved by sending members of the Women's Reserve to the Hawaiian Islands, and I assume the same number of members of the Women's Reserve would be sent to take the place of the officers and enlisted personnel who would be assigned to other duty elsewhere. That number, I understand, would be the maximum.

Mr. ANDREWS. There is one question I have raised to which I think no reference has been made. I believe it to be conceded that naval operations in the Atlantic have been carried on to a greater extent than anywhere else in the world. In view of the present situation in Europe, if Germany should be defeated within the next few weeks, the personnel of the Navy in the Atlantic would be in such position that a number of men could be spared, because there would be no more fighting in the Atlantic, and it has occurred to me that they could well be used in the Pacific.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. That has been thought of and considered by the Navy and by the Committees on Naval Affairs. In my opinion, it will be many days before there will be a reduction in the personnel of the Navy, notwithstanding the ending of the war in Europe. The officers and men of the Navy who are now serving in the Atlantic will be immediately transferred to the Pacific. The Navy Department represents to me that notwithstanding the situation suggested by the Senator from Florida, the Women's Reserve are needed in Hawaii. I know the Department appreciates the Senator's views and the views of other members of the committee, and I think they should be commended for making a compromise of their original views in order to comply with the pressing request of the Navy Department.

Mr. President, in connection with my remarks I ask that the report submitted by the committee on the bill be printed in the RECORD.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The report (No. 1089) is as follows:

The Committee on Naval Affairs, to whom was referred the bill (S. 2028) to amend the Naval Reserve Act of 1938, as amended, so as to permit foreign service of members of the Women's Reserve under certain conditions, having considered the same, report favorably thereon with amendments and recommend that the bill as amended do pass.

Members of the Women's Reserve established under the Naval Reserve Act of 1938 and the Women's Reserve established under the Coast Guard Auxiliary and Reserve Act of 1941, are restricted to the performance of duty within the continental limits of the United States. They may not be assigned to duty on board vessels of the Navy or the Coast Guard, or on combat aircraft.

The purpose of the present bill, as amended by the committee, is to modify existing restrictions so as to permit their assignment to duty in the American area and in the Territories of Hawaii and Alaska.

The committee were informed that Admiral Nimitz, commander in chief of the Pacific Fleet and Pacific Ocean area, states that 332 male officers and 4,906 male enlisted personnel can be relieved by women in the Hawaiian Islands, and that the male personnel so relieved could be immediately made available for sea duty, or for duty on the small islands and atolls in this area. The committee understand that housing and other facilities for the accommodation of the members of the Women's Reserve are available in the Hawaiian area.

Since members of the Women's Reserve were enrolled on the assumption that they

would not be assigned to duty beyond the continental limits of the United States, the committee feel that they should not now be so assigned without their consent, and have provided in the present bill that they may be assigned to duty at naval stations outside the continental limits of the United States but in the American area, and in the Territories of Hawaii and Alaska, only upon their prior consent.

Attached hereto, and made a part of this report, is a letter addressed to the chairman of the committee by the Secretary of the Navy, dated September 5, 1944:

THE SECRETARY OF THE NAVY,
Washington, September 5, 1944.

Hon. DAVID I. WALSH,
Chairman, Senate Naval Affairs Committee, United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: In my letter to you dated June 22, 1944, I expressed my interest in the legislation to remove the present provision of law which restricts members of the Women's Reserve to shore duty within the continental limits of the United States.

A recent communication from Admiral Nimitz, commander in chief of the Pacific Fleet and Pacific Ocean areas, discloses that the replacement of 332 male officers and 4,906 male enlisted personnel can be effected in the Hawaiian Islands if this proposal should become a law. The male personnel could immediately be made available for sea duty and for duty on the small islands and atolls.

In the event of enactment of this legislation it is my intention that members of the Women's Reserve not be assigned to duty in Europe. Also, I should like to reiterate my assurance to you that WAVES will not be ordered outside the continental United States until adequate housing facilities are available for them prior to their departure, and that each such assignment will be on a voluntary basis. These assurances are already set forth in the printed hearings.

The Navy Department believes that removal of the aforementioned restriction is essential to the war effort, and in the consideration of S. 2028 by your committee I urgently recommend favorable action thereon in the interest of the entire Naval Establishment.

Sincerely yours,

JAMES FORRESTAL,
Secretary of the Navy.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I am not familiar with the details of this proposed legislation, but I have an understanding that it comes before the Senate in amended form as a result of compromise efforts of the Naval Affairs Committee.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. And in conjunction with the Naval Affairs Committee of the House of Representatives.

Mr. WHITE. It comes before the Senate with the approval of the naval authorities, I take it to be?

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Absolutely; not only with their approval but with their urgent request for action.

Mr. WHITE. I think I am justified in saying that I think it comes here with the approval of some members at least of the Naval Affairs Committee of the House?

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Yes.

Mr. WHITE. We all have to accustom ourselves to the acceptance of compromises in legislative bodies. I would go much further than the proposed legislation goes, but I think it would be a calamity not to accept the compromise in the spirit in which it is offered, and I hope very much that the bill will be passed.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. President, I should like to ask the chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs whether the bill, while it provides that members of the WAVES cannot be sent to Hawaii without their consent, would relate to new enlistees or inductees. Would they be obliged to go?

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. In my judgment, they would be. Those who have enlisted up to this time enlisted with the understanding that their services would be confined to the continent of the United States. From now on they would understand that they might be sent to Hawaii.

Mr. WILLIS. Does the Senator feel this would not have an adverse effect on future enlistments?

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. There is a two-sided judgment on that question. Many think that the fact that we have a statute preventing the sending of WAVES outside the continent has been helpful to enlistments; and, indeed, the enlistment record of the Navy Women's Auxiliary has been much better than that of the Army Auxiliary. Others say that there would have been more enlistments. So it is a disputed question.

Mr. WILLIS. I thank the Senator for his opinion in the matter.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Mr. President, I ask that the bill be considered.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2028) to amend the Naval Reserve Act of 1938, as amended, so as to permit foreign service of members of the Women's Reserve under certain conditions, which had been reported from the Committee on Naval Affairs with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That section 504 of title V—Women's Reserve, of the Naval Reserve Act of 1938, added by the act entitled "An act to expedite the war effort by releasing officers and men for duty at sea and their replacement by women in the Shore Establishment of the Navy, and for other purposes," approved July 30, 1942 (56 Stat. 730; U. S. C., 1940 ed., Supp. III, title 34, sec. 857c), is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 504. Members of the Women's Reserve shall not be assigned to duty on board vessels of the Navy or in aircraft while such aircraft are engaged in combat missions and shall not be assigned to duty outside the American area and the Territories of Hawaii and Alaska, and may be assigned to duty outside the continental United States only upon their prior request."

SEC. 2. Section 404 of title IV—Women's Reserve, of the Coast Guard Auxiliary and Reserve Act of 1941, as added by the act entitled "An act to amend the Coast Guard Auxiliary and Reserve Act of 1941, as amended, so as to expedite the war effort by providing for releasing officers and men for duty at sea, and their replacement by women in the Shore Establishment of the Coast Guard, and for other purposes," approved November 23, 1942 (56 Stat. 1020; U. S. C. 1940 ed., Supp. III, title 14, sec. 384), is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 404. Members of the Women's Reserve shall not be assigned to duty on board vessels of the Navy or Coast Guard or in aircraft while such aircraft are engaged in combat missions and shall not be assigned to duty outside the American area and the Territories of Hawaii and Alaska, and may be assigned to duty outside the continental United States only upon their prior request."

SEC. 3. As used in this act the term "American area" means the area geographically defined as follows:

"East boundary—From the North Pole, south along the seventy-fifth meridian west longitude to the seventy-seventh parallel north latitude, thence southeast through Davis Strait to the intersection of the fortieth parallel north latitude and the thirty-fifth meridian west longitude, thence south along that meridian to the tenth parallel north latitude, thence southeast to the intersection of the equator and the twentieth meridian west longitude, thence along the twentieth meridian west longitude to the South Pole.

"West boundary—From the North Pole, south along the one hundred and forty-first meridian west longitude to the east boundary of Alaska, thence south and southeast along the Alaskan boundary to the Pacific Ocean, thence south along the one hundred and thirtieth meridian to its intersection with the thirtieth parallel north latitude, thence southeast to the intersection of the equator and the one hundredth meridian west longitude, thence south along the one hundredth meridian west longitude to the South Pole."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to amend the Naval Reserve Act of 1938, as amended, and the Coast Guard Auxiliary and Reserve Act of 1941, as amended, so as to permit service of members of the Women's Reserves in the American area, the Territories of Hawaii and Alaska, and for other purposes."

RECESS TO FRIDAY

Mr. BARKLEY. I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon on Friday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 1 o'clock and 15 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until Friday, September 15, 1944, at 12 o'clock meridian.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate September 13 (legislative day of September 1), 1944:

FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION

Leland Olds to be a member, Federal Power Commission, for the term expiring June 22, 1949.

THE JUDICIARY

UNITED STATES ATTORNEY

Howard F. Houk to be United States attorney for the district of New Mexico.

UNITED STATES MARSHAL

Benjamin J. McKinney to be United States marshal for the district of Arizona.

UNITED STATES PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

PROMOTIONS IN THE REGULAR CORPS

Fred D. Lewis, Jr., to be temporary dental surgeon, effective September 1, 1944.

Leon A. Heppel to be temporary passed assistant surgeon, effective August 1, 1944.

Robert J. Huebner to be temporary passed assistant surgeon, effective August 1, 1944.

POSTMASTERS

ARIZONA

Clark H. Lewis, Tiger.

ARKANSAS

Madia B. Adams, Austin.
John H. Long, Donaldson.

Bertha Clinton Cragar, Grannis.
Charles E. Watson, Greenway.
Monroe K. Churchill, Hector.
Clarence U. Price, London.
Samuel E. Adkisson, Mount Vernon.
Bland F. Bryant, Success.
Charles A. Affholter, Vandervoort.

FLORIDA

Rex O. Simmons, Bascom.
Alice W. Martin, Bay Pines.
Percival L. Buzbee, Gibsonton.
Irene E. Culbreth, Jennings.
Janet E. Barr, Limona.
Robert G. Wood, Jr., Lithia.
Varena M. Cox, Montverde.
Frances Graham, Naranja.
Bert Emberton, Port Tampa.
Marvin A. Thomason, Produce.

ILLINOIS

Carter H. Pietsch, Bloomington.
Veneta L. Moss, Dakota.
Harley R. Foster, Deer Creek.
Ivory Bunch, McClure.
Bertha M. Esh, Spring Grove.
Jennie Puma, Thayer.
Thomas J. Gawthorp, West Salem.

IOWA

Charles D. Burns, Marion.
Warren W. Fulton, Selma.

LOUISIANA

John A. Ludwig, Grand Isle.

MINNESOTA

Lawrence J. Voight, Clara City.
Olive M. Stromgren, Constance.
Norman C. Worden, Erhard.
Heziakah H. Wood, Freeborn.
Edward J. Garrity, McGrath.

MISSISSIPPI

Roy E. Hussey, Abbeville.
Lina B. Dietz, Beaumont.
Jesse H. Seale, Big Creek.
Annette Boleware, Carson.
Mary Bloodworth, Cascilla.
Albert P. Henry, Darling.
Edith M. Hattox, Ecru.
Eva D. Hill, Elliott.
Jimmie L. Coffey, Etta.
James E. Rogers, Falkner.
Sarah F. Myers, Handsboro.
Honor A. Patterson, Hub.
Earl J. Lake, Maud.
Stella M. Lewis, McLain.
Carrie B. Carter, McLaurin.
Taylor D. Buntin, Nesbitt.
Mattie B. Bounds, Ovett.
Benjamin C. Feigler, Philipp.
Willie G. Rogers, Plantersville.
Edna E. Forbes, Sandy Hook.
Vanie S. Cox, Sarah.
Lee R. Adams, Sweatman.
William George Knight, Sr., Taylor.
James J. Craig, Tillatoba.
Oleane Wright, Tremont.
Hilda P. Toombs, Walls.

NORTH DAKOTA

Gertrude E. Kraus, Alice.
Edward Jerke, Fredonia.
Esther N. Overn, Kathryn.
Vaughn C. Magnuson, Martin.
Benjamin J. Schnedar, Pisek.

OKLAHOMA

Clefford F. Vickroy, Frederick.

SOUTH DAKOTA

Brendan A. Keane, Stephan.
Agnes C. Maroney, Winfred.

TEXAS

Ben F. Brooks, Bagwell.
Gaynell Bond, Donie.
Luther M. Dye, Graford.
Charles Smart, Lone Oak.
Charles M. Bollinger, Powderly.
Charles E. Turner, Smithfield.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, SEPTEMBER 13, 1944

The House met at 12 o'clock noon, and was called to order by the Speaker.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

We bless Thee, merciful God, for all our days, laden with spiritual benedictions and influences. Let the fretful and questioning heart say with the Psalmist: "Return unto thy rest, O my soul, for the Lord hath dealt bountifully with thee. I will pay my vows unto Him in the presence of all the people and will walk before the Lord in the land of the living." In Thy blessings enable us to profit in knowledge, strength, and courage.

Through self-revelation, Heavenly Father, show us a vision of the new and better life in which shall be arrested the unmastered tendencies of our hearts and unfetter the entanglements of temptation. Forgive the meagerness of our obedience and sacrifice; we plead for more faith, for a more resolute spirit that shall defeat the barriers and besetments to true manhood and womanhood. O deliver us from the enthrallments of the solitary and selfish life which so often teems with delusions and false estimates. We would pray for the wondrous virtue of Thy spirit with directive energy that frames the soul with abounding grace and power. We ask Thee "for a present mind intent on pleasing Thee." Through Jesus Christ, our Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed, with an amendment in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 1434. An act for the relief of Anna M. Kohler.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed a bill and a joint resolution of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 2137. An act to provide for naming the lake formed by waters of the Red River impounded by Denison Dam; and

S. J. Res. 150. Joint resolution making an appropriation to pay the necessary expenses of the inaugural ceremonies of the President of the United States, January 20, 1945.

The message also announced that the Vice President has appointed Mr. BARKLEY and Mr. BREWSTER members of the joint select committee on the part of the Senate, as provided for in the act of August 5, 1939, entitled "An act to provide for the disposition of certain records of the United States Government," for the disposition of executive papers in the following departments and agencies:

1. Department of Labor.
2. Department of the Navy.
3. Department of the Treasury.
4. Post Office Department.
5. Federal Security Agency.
6. Interstate Commerce Commission.
7. National Archives.
8. Office of Price Administration.
9. Railroad Retirement Board.
10. War Food Administration.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may address the House today, after other special orders, for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

TO AMEND THE NATIONALITY ACT OF 1940

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 4271) to amend the Nationality Act of 1940 to preserve the nationality of citizens residing abroad, with a Senate amendment, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 1, line 7, strike out "six" and insert "five."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman explain this amendment?

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MICHENER. I yield.

Mr. MASON. This amendment which the Senate has placed upon this bill simply cuts the 2-year extension which the House provided in the bill to 1 year to maintain their citizenship. That is all it does.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. DICKSTEIN]?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TO EXPATRIATE OR EXCLUDE CERTAIN PERSONS FOR EVADING MILITARY AND NAVAL SERVICE

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 4257) to expatriate or exclude certain persons for evading military and naval service, with a Senate amendment, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 1, line 9, strike out "(i)" and insert "(j)."

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman from New York explain the Senate amendment?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, this bill was passed by the House after it had been unanimously reported by the committee. The purpose of the bill is to

keep out of the country certain people who evaded war service and left this country after Pearl Harbor, especially most of them having left after the declaration by the President and the Congress of a state of war. This bill will keep them out and they will not be given a change to come back. They are of military age.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MICHENER. I yield.

Mr. MASON. I may say that the Senate amendment simply changes the number of the paragraph from "i" to "j."

Mr. DICKSTEIN. That is all.

Mr. MASON. That is all it does.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. That is all; but I thought my colleague wanted to know something about the bill itself.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague the gentleman from New York [Mr. BARRY] may extend his own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a speech made on the 30th day of August last by the gentleman from Montana [Mr. O'CONNOR] before the Rotary Club of White Sulphur Springs, Mont.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include therein a newspaper article from the Knoxville Journal about a marine combat correspondent.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a speech I delivered in Staunton, Va., on yesterday before the service clubs of that city entitled "Some Problems of a Lasting Peace."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD on the bill H. R. 4715 and include therein a letter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include therein a newspaper article by James Morgan that appeared in the Boston Globe.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a resolution just passed by the National Association of County Officials. Coming as it does from local units in the State it must have some interest to the Nation.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Dakota?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 20 minutes today at the conclusion of the other special orders.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow after the disposition of the business on the Speaker's table and other special orders I may address the House for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

THE OLEO TRUST

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, in its vain attempt to promote the concoction known as oleo the Oleo Trust issued a four-page spread, each page 18 inches by 23 inches, which arrived in our offices today. The heading is "Newspapers rally support for margarine bill." There are comments from various newspapers.

However, the Oleo Trust in its attempt to show the newspaper support for oleo made one serious mistake; it included the following editorial from the Shelbyville (Ky.) News of June 22, 1944.

The editorial from the Shelbyville (Ky.) News is as follows:

THE OLEO FIGHT AFFECTS US TOO

The local dairy industry, which represents an important cog in the whole milk production machine, has shown only mild concern over the oleo fight in Congress. The view perhaps has been that it is somebody else's fight and won't directly affect the average producer of milk. Yet the outcome of proposed legislation in the present battle could undermine the whole milk price system.

By forcing the price of butter down, the oleo manufacturers would devalue the basic element of the milk industry—the price of butterfat.

At the Washington hearings on the Smith bill, it has been disclosed that oleo manufacture is in the hands of 18 or 20 companies.

The present proposal would take the Federal 10-cent tax off colored oleo. It would change the name of oleomargarine to margarine and permit manufacture and sale of yellow oleomargarine with the payment of only ¼ cent a pound. The bill is championed by Senator ELLISON D. "COTTON ED" SMITH, with the aid of the southern cottonseed oil interests.

Similar proposals have been defeated many times since the first tax went on oleo in 1886, but each time the battle gets hotter.

Dairying is the most important year around source of income for Shelby County. The fight of the dairy interests in Washington should have at least the undivided moral support of this area.

If this editorial from the Shelbyville (Ky.) News is an example of the "Newspapers rally support for the margarine bill," it is hoped that the Oleo Trust will print and distribute more of this kind.

The Shelbyville (Ky.) News shows a deep understanding of the question involved. This paper realizes and calls attention to the threat to the whole dairy industry. Surely under normal times about 42 pounds out of every 100 pounds of milk produced was made into butter, 5 pounds diverted into ice cream, 5 pounds diverted into cheese, 5 pounds diverted to evaporated milk, 30 pounds sold as fluid milk, and the remainder of the 100 pounds fed to calves and wasted. This editorial realizes that once you allow vegetable oils to replace animal fats in butter by removing the protective Federal legislation the next step is to remove the protective Federal legislation enjoyed by the evaporated and condensed milk industry with filled milk replacing the condensed milk, that the next step is to remove the protective Federal legislation enjoyed by the cheese industry, with the result that filled cheese will replace natural full-cream cheese.

All the oleo is being and has been made that the Oleo Trust could make with the oil allocated to the industry by the War Production Board. No one objects to anyone eating all the oleo wanted, but the dairymen want oleo sold as oleo and for what it is, and not as butter.

Remember the testimony of Dr. E. B. Hart, one of the greatest living scientists, before the Senate Agriculture Committee in June 1944. I quote:

In the present state of our knowledge, it is preposterous—let me repeat that—in the present state of our knowledge it is preposterous for any scientist to make the blank statement that it is proven that oleomargarine or vegetable oils have an equivalence to butterfat in nutrition.

According to the dictionary the definition of the word "preposterous" is as follows:

Contrary to nature, reason, or common sense; strikingly or utterly absurd or impracticable.

The Shelbyville (Ky.) News is to be complimented for its keen insight into the threat to the dairy industry. Why is it oleo has not had a dollars-and-cent ceiling? Why has oleo been selling for 17 to 29 cents per pound? Why has the present administration been able to

fix dollars-and-cents ceilings even on skim-milk products and not on oleo?

DR. JOHN COMPTON BALL

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday, September 7, I brought to the attention of the House briefly the history of the Lutheran Church of the Reformation in Washington and the great work of this church and its pastor, Dr. Blackwelder. Today I am calling your attention to another historic event in the religious life of our Capital City.

Dr. John Compton Ball, pastor of Metropolitan Baptist Church, located at Sixth and A Streets NE., a little more than a stone's throw from the Capitol, is the only living minister who has opened the House with prayer under nine different Speakers, beginning with Speaker "Uncle Joe" Cannon and on down to our present Speaker, Hon. SAM RAYBURN.

On Sunday, September 10, 1944, Dr. Ball preached his farewell sermon, having requested retirement at the end of his forty-first year as pastor at Metropolitan Church, at the age of 81.

On Friday night, September 15, 1944, Dr. Ball's congregation is tendering him a reception. Invitations have gone out to the clergy of Washington as well as many friends and acquaintances of Dr. Ball.

Metropolitan Baptist Church extends to the Members of the Congress an invitation to attend the reception, 8 p. m., Friday, September 15.

Dr. Ball was born in Northamptonshire, England, in 1863, came to America at the age of 7, attended public schools in Philadelphia, was employed by John Wanamaker until entering the ministry, attended Temple College and obtained his doctor of divinity degree from that university, was graduated from Corzier Theological Seminary in 1899. He became pastor of Metropolitan Baptist Church September 1, 1903. His ministry there has been uninterrupted.

This church now has a membership of 3,000. Its growth has been phenomenal, due largely to the faithful work of this devout, outstanding man of God. His life, his ministry, and his leadership have done great things for the spiritual, moral, and civic uplift of Washington, and I am sure we all wish for Dr. Ball in his retirement many years yet of usefulness, health, and happiness.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include therein an editorial from the St. Louis Globe-Democrat of Sunday, September 3, 1944, entitled "M. V. A. Is Not the Answer."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include two articles, which appeared in the Weekly K. A. P. Review, one concerning the Most Reverend Francis J. Spellman, archbishop of New York, who is at present touring the various military posts in Europe as military vicar of the United States armed forces, and the other one concerning the Most Reverend Thomas O'Shea, archbishop of Wellington, and Bishop Herbert Holland of the Church of England.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. DILWEG. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include an article which appeared in the morning Post.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. OUTLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include a statement by Mr. Hannegan, in which he brands a story appearing in the press as untrue.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. O'TOOLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on today at the conclusion of any special orders heretofore entered I may address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

EXPENSES OF THE INAUGURAL CEREMONIES OF THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES ON JANUARY 20, 1945

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table (S. J. Res. 150) making an appropriation to pay the necessary expenses of the inaugural ceremonies of the President of the United States, January 20, 1945, and for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the Senate joint resolution, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That there is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $25,000, to enable the Secretary of the Senate and the Clerk of the House of Representatives to pay the necessary expenses of the inaugural ceremonies of the President of the United States, January 20, 1945, in accordance with such program as may be adopted by the joint committee of the Senate and House of Representatives, appointed under the concurrent resolution of the two Houses agreed to June 23, 1944, including the pay for extra police, fiscal year 1945.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I understand that this resolution is the customary resolution; that it is identical in language with resolutions heretofore adopted with the sole exception that the sum provided instead of being $35,000 as heretofore is reduced to $25,000.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, this is the stereotyped resolution which has always passed in anticipation of the President's inauguration. It is, as the gentleman from Massachusetts has said, identical with the resolution passed 4 years ago, with the exception that instead of appropriating $35,000 as they did then, the appropriation is for $25,000 this year. Of course, as the House understands, this amount is used almost exclusively for the building of stands, and it was anticipated that they could make a saving this year of $10,000, by providing less space on account of travel conditions which are expected to limit the attendance at the inaugural ceremonies.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I yield.

Mr. MICHENER. This amount was determined by the special committee?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Yes. The special committee, which met last Friday, I believe, approved the sum, and also directed the introduction of the resolution. A resolution of this character, of course, originates usually in the House, but, in this instance, the chairman of the Inaugural Committee being a Member of the Senate, it originated in the Senate.

Mr. MICHENER. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN] is a member of that committee?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Yes.

Mr. MICHENER. The gentleman was present at that meeting?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Yes. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN] is a member of the committee, and was present at the time, and approved the resolution authorizing the introduction of this joint resolution passed by the Senate and now on the Speaker's table.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the committee on the reduction of the appropriation. I am sure that Mr. Dewey will not want an ostentatious inauguration. He will want no expense other than that which is actually necessary, and that all appropriations be used for the things for which the country needs money so badly.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Roosevelt has been through the experience before, and in keeping with his usual economical management would, I am certain, favor the reduction in the amount at this time. The general public is never as interested in a repeat performance.

Mr. MICHENER. The gentleman said the President favored the reduction. Has the President been interviewed as to the amount of money that is going

to be appropriated for the inauguration of Mr. Dewey?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. The resolution passed by the committee provided that the two candidates for the Presidency should be consulted.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, in view of what the gentleman said about Mr. Roosevelt having gone through the experience so often, it would seem to me you would not need an appropriation at all, if you expected his inauguration to take place, because you could use one of those old stands used by him; build it of second-hand lumber. But that is not the thing I am worrying about. The thing that worries me is: Are we going to continue to meet here from day to day without a quorum, with just a few present, and deal with legislation? Are you going to keep us here indefinitely while waiting for these conference reports? Some of us have business to attend to at home. This administration has gotten our folks into such a situation that they want to know what we are going to do to relieve them. What I want to know is how long are we going to be kept here dallying along instead of passing important legislation or going home and give attention to that portion of our work.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. There is always a quorum available.

Mr. HOFFMAN. There is always a quorum available?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Yes.

Mr. HOFFMAN. If that is so, I will make the point of order that a quorum is not present to find out if the gentleman is correct. The gentleman knows there is not a quorum in town.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. The gentleman may exercise that constitutional prerogative at any time. There is always a constructive quorum present and there is one here this morning.

Mr. HOFFMAN. We are not doing anything except wasting more time and money.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I know the gentleman would not want to go home and leave important legislation pending.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I still reserve the right to object. Why do we not get about that important business?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. As has been announced by both party whips, I understand that the conference report on the surplus property bill will be before the House on Monday, and the conferees on the George bill will also be before the House Monday or Tuesday. For further information, I refer the gentleman to his own leader, who can give him the information he requires.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Some of us do not have the benefit of that $2,000,000 Sidney Hillman slush fund with which he expects to buy the next Congress. Some of us have to get home and find out what our folks want us to do about that. We do not have anything to do with the spending of that money. He is spending it for the election of a Congress which he can control.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

The joint resolution was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I do this for the purpose of asking the majority leader as to the program for the rest of the week.

Mr. McCORMACK. There will be no legislative program for the remainder of the week.

I am informed that the conferees on the bill relating to the disposition of surplus property have agreed, and it is expected that the conference report on that bill will be brought up Monday.

The conferees on the other bill will come back to the House for instructions on two specific questions: One, whether or not Federal employees shall be included in the bill, and the other on the question of travel allowance.

It is the intention to bring up both of these matters on Monday. It is not the intention to bring up any other legislation thereafter except that which can be disposed of by unanimous consent.

Mr. MICHENER. As far as the bill from the Committee on Ways and Means is concerned, the procedure on Monday then will probably be to have an hour's debate on each of the controversial proposals?

Mr. McCORMACK. It is my understanding that under the rules that would be the limit, unless a longer time for debate is allowed by unanimous consent, and I have no knowledge of any such intention. As to the order in which they will be brought up, I do not know whether the report of the conferees on the George bill will come up before the conference report on the surplus property bill, but they are both scheduled for Monday, and it is the intention of the leadership to bring them up Monday.

Mr. MICHENER. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MICHENER. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. JENKINS. May I ask the majority leader with reference to the road bill. I see that the Senate yesterday decided to take up a road bill. Does not that mean that if the Senate should pass it we will get it?

Mr. McCORMACK. I have no definite knowledge as to what the Senate has decided to do, but what knowledge I have had about it is in substantial agreement with the understanding of the gentleman from Ohio. For the benefit of the Members of the House I may say that assuming the Senate does act favorably upon that bill, it is not the intention to take up the road bill in this body before the election, but it is the intention that the bill shall be taken up after election day and before the termination of this session. The leaders on both sides are in agreement in that respect. I believe my friend from Michigan will agree that after the election we must take up that bill and dispose of it, because the legislatures of the several States meet next year and many of them have a constitutional time limit.

There are certain provisions of the bill which have to be acted upon by the several State legislatures. It is an obligation and a duty and it is only right. So far as I am concerned, I make the statement that the bill will be brought up after election.

Mr. JENKINS. That is the reason I brought it up. Everybody recognizes that it is very important legislation.

Mr. McCORMACK. There is no question about it.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a statement on the Chinese situation.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

BUTTER SHORTAGE

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, the present shortage of butter which threatens to remove this nutritious dairy product from the diet in large consuming areas, is primarily due to the stupidity in O. P. A. policies during the past 3 years.

Greater O. P. A. price ceilings for fluid milk used for manufacturing purposes, outside of butter, has drastically cut cream supplies for butter production. Butter supplies in the coming 6 months will be from 12 percent to 25 percent less than in 1943. Due to increased labor and feed cost, dairy farmers have been forced to divert milk sales from cream for butter into fluid milk for other uses. A farmer can receive at least 50 cents more per hundred pounds for his fluid milk, under present regulations, than if he sold his cream for butter.

The War Food Administration is anxious to get more butter and so are the people. And I want to urge the O. P. A. and the W. F. A. to promptly get together and establish proper compensatory price regulations to increase butter production and also provide an adequate supply of milk for other purposes.

It also appears to me that certain officials and interests might not be adverse to the idea of encouraging the butter shortage in order to increase the use of oleomargarine. Five million dairy farmers are fully conscious of what is being done to them in this respect.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in one instance, and include a newspaper editorial, and in the second instance to extend my own remarks by including a brief address by a former Member of the House.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. HERTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an editorial from the Washington Star.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, I make two unanimous consent requests, one to insert in the RECORD a short poem and the other to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein nine affidavits with reference to election frauds in my district.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

CROP INSURANCE

Mr. PACE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. PACE. Mr. Speaker, the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts, the majority leader [Mr. MCCORMACK], has pointed out that following the general election it is the intention to bring up for consideration the road bill. There is a measure which has been voted out and which has been on the calendar. A rule has been granted on it. It has been endorsed by both of the great political parties. That is a measure concerning crop insurance. I am anxious to learn whether or not it is the intention of the leadership to let the crop-insurance bill come along immediately following the road bill?

Mr. MCCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, in answer to the gentleman's question, and in light of the fact that the rule has been granted on the bill, as I am informed by the gentleman from Georgia, may I say that the bill will come up after election. It is an important bill. I make a definite statement and promise that the bill will come up after election for the consideration of the House.

GEN. GEORGE C. MARSHALL

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include therewith an editorial and a newspaper article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, the global war now raging has produced a number of outstanding military and naval leaders. The United States is playing the decisive role in this struggle by providing the greatest and most powerful Air Force, fighting Navy, and merchant marine in the world. These forces are backed by the largest and most powerful land Army in all our history and unparalleled production of war matériel. In the galaxy of military stars produced by all nations in this conflict, none compare with our own brilliant Chief of Staff, Gen. George C. Marshall. He has shown an unexampled grasp of the problems involved in worldwide strategy. As the leading military representative of the greatest Nation on earth, he has conceived, planned, and molded our military strategy which is proving so highly successful everywhere. His knowledge of our democratic institutions and the psychology of the American people is so thorough and comprehensive, he has been able to obtain the support of public opinion in this country for all phases of the war effort to a degree unexcelled in our history. Modest in demeanor, magnetic in personality, brilliant in the fields of tactics and strategy, consecrated to the cause of freedom and our way of life, the luster of his name and fame will shine through the ages.

[From the Gadsden Times of September 11, 1944]

GEORGE MARSHALL, CHIEF OF STAFF

Eisenhower, Patton, and MacArthur, the field commanders, are getting the attention these days. But George Marshall, who selected these officers to do their jobs and who planned the stategy, sits modestly in Washington seeing that his plans do not go astray.

Ask a schoolboy about Patton, MacArthur, or Eisenhower and he can tell you right off a good bit about them. Ask about General Marshall and he is likely to hesitate. Maybe the name is vaguely familiar. He has seen his picture somewhere. But he doesn't know much about General Marshall, because Marshall's name is not associated with the flow of battle.

Those in Washington who know say that General Marshall is chiefly responsible for our grand strategy. Roosevelt and Churchill discuss grand strategy and have the final say-so. But they listen first to George Marshall. More than any other man he has directed the American war effort on the field of battle.

General Marshall, a graduate of the famous Virginia Military Institute, personally selected Eisenhower, Patton, Bradley, and Clark for their specific jobs. He helped train them. He forgot West Point priorities and the old army seniority game and selected capable men for promotion to the important field commands.

Marshall was quick to see the need for increased air power. He was quick to adopt new battle technique. He has from the first fought the war with all modern devices at his command and not forgetting the wisdom of the military ages.

We should know more about this modest Chief of Staff, for he is worth knowing better and is worthy of much more admiration than the public has heaped upon him.

[From the Washington Post of September 11, 1944]

WASHINGTON CALLING

(By Marquis Childs)

GEN. GEORGE C. MARSHALL

To find in the hour of supreme need that we had a soldier of the greatness of Gen. George Catlett Marshall was a piece of good fortune that America hardly deserved. We have never been a military Nation. In normal times we've regarded our military men with grudging suspicion.

Entering his sixth year as Chief of Staff, Marshall has in 5 short years worked a miracle. Confirmation of his genius in direction and planning is now coming from all over the world. When time has blown away the fog of the present, I believe this man will stand forth as among the greatest of great men.

Four years ago the odds were heavily against him. The Nation was torn by deep inner conflicts. Congress was surly and suspicious. England stood alone, and many Americans would have let her go down. The German plan called for a crossing from Dakar to the bulge of Brazil and then up, with the aid of native Fascists drawn by success, toward the Panama Canal.

That last was no fiction. Four years ago it was a menacing reality, as no one knew better than the Chief of Staff.

What his share has been in the task of pulling the Nation together, it's too early to say. With Congress, it's been of the first importance. By a combination of tact and forthrightness he has won the confidence of men of all parties.

Appearing before congressional committees, he is never spectacular, never loud or demanding. When he speaks, you feel certain beyond any doubt that he speaks out of knowledge and out of deep inner conviction.

He has an extraordinary faculty for saying exactly what he means to say. It may be because his own ego never gets in the way of his true objective. He speaks precisely, crisply, yet without any military rhodomontade. Disciplined always, his deep humanity rarely shows on the surface.

On the score of his contribution to the organization of America's fighting strength, there's no need to wait for history. World War No. 1 proved him a master of logistics, which is the military term for getting the men and the stuff there in the quickest possible time.

As assistant chief of operations to the United States First Army in the fall of 1918, he had a try-out for the job he was to be called on to do 25 years later. His orders then were to transfer 600,000 troops, with all their supplies, from St. Mihiel to the Meuse-Argonne sector entirely by night and in complete secrecy. This meant, among other items, 40,000 tons of ammunition, 34 evacuation hospitals, 3,980 guns.

"It seldom happens in war that plans can be so precisely carried out as was possible in this instance," General Pershing said in his memoirs of the man who for 5 years after the first war served as his aide de camp. "The details of the movements of troops connected with this concentration were worked out under the able direction of Col. George C. Marshall."

What he did then was small in comparison to the job this time. He took an army equipped with stove pipes, built it into a superb striking force, and deployed it around the world.

In the 28 days after D-day, a million men were moved across the Channel. The great majority of them had never been in combat before, and yet thanks to their thorough training and their native stamina, they were able to drive back the wehrmacht in all its pride and glory. Supplying the American Armies as they raced across France is an achievement that will be analyzed in textbooks for many years to come.

And yet, in spite of the concentration on great masses of men and incredible stores of supplies, General Marshall has never lost sight of the individual man. From members of his staff you hear instance after instance of his consideration for the men serving under him. That consideration extends down to the lowliest private. This man at

the head of our Army is a human being as well as a general.

OKLAHOMA HIGHWAY COMMISSIONER

Mr. STEWART. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include an article from the Washington Times-Herald.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday I read in the Washington Times-Herald that the Civil Service Commission asked that a member of the Oklahoma State Highway Commission be fired. This man was appointed by the Governor of our State without regard to the Civil Service Commission. He was our State chairman of the Democratic State Central Committee at the time he was appointed. He held over for a short while, and this fact with his activities in connection with a victory dinner, they say, violates the Hatch Act. It occurs to me with all the legitimate complaints made by Members of Congress against violators of the Hatch Act against persons employed by the Federal Government should be given prior consideration, but not so; apparently they are hunting for big fish.

I have called attention to the fact of numerous primary election violations and I am lucky if I can get one of their investigators to make a verbal report in a year and a half, to say nothing of being able to find any evidence to sustain the complaint. Everyone in the District knows about it but the Civil Service Commission.

The first thing we know they will attempt to stop school boards from taking any part in elections. It occurs to me as one that has made two races for Congress that nothing is ever done when a Federal employee goes out and beats the bushes for their candidate. The next thing we know the Civil Service Commission will ask for a law, that all employees of the various States come under their jurisdiction. It is high time that if the Civil Service Commission can interfere with a State official that we change the laws. If a State desires a Hatch Act let the State pass the law. I have been told by two civil-service investigators that only $50,000 per annum was available to make investigations and that they would do the best they can under the circumstances, but under the circumstances they have done exactly nothing, yet they can make the front page of every daily newspaper in the country of their findings in recommending the firing of a member of the State highway commission of my State.

Hon. France Paris is not entitled to be made the subject of such outbursts as printed on the front page of the Washington Herald. In the first place he did not have to qualify under any civil-service examination to be appointed, his salary is paid by State funds, and on the other hand there are many violators in Oklahoma, yes in Oklahoma if you please, that are under civil service and I know of nothing being done about it other than the excuse that funds are not available to make an investigation.

When any Member of Congress introduces a law without regard to the civil-service laws they will receive a letter asking them to be sure and strike the provision.

The Civil Service Commission on their own motion should reconsider their action with respect to Mr. Paris and reverse their holdings or they should make a sincere effort to see that all violators are brought to justice. I have actually called to the attention of appointing heads the violation of Federal employees and nothing has been done about it, and if that is the way the Civil Service Commission is going to hold they should be told about, not just this time but often. Many of the official heads have the authority to pass upon the justification of applicants and if an applicant for a job does not suit their fancy it has been my experience that they will find a way to scuttle him. In one case 2 years ago a guard at the Red River Dam opened up the headquarters of my opponent and managed his campaign and as soon as the campaign was over he was put back on his job. I wrote the employing head and he said that he had gotten a release from his job and in view of the fact that he was a good guard he reemployed him, and that is not a violation of the Hatch Act. It may be necessary for me to bring to the well of the House all cases in which I am interested, and if such procedure becomes necessary, I assure you, I shall pursue such a course.

The Civil Service Commission should see to it that each State receives its quota of employees with the respect of the population of any State to the population of the whole United States, and I mean in equal rating along with the proper percentage. We have visited many Federal agencies here in the Capital City and in the State of Oklahoma, and if we have our quota I am a bad calculator, for in many if not most cases the Federal employees in Oklahoma are from some of the other States or the District of Columbia.

The article in the Washington Times-Herald is as follows:

CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION ASKS OKLAHOMA HIGHWAY CHIEF BE FIRED

The Civil Service Commission ruled yesterday that France Paris, Oklahoma State highway commissioner, should be removed from office because his service as State Democratic chairman and his activities in connection with a victory dinner to raise campaign funds violated the Hatch Act.

Commissioners Arthur S. Flemming and Lucille F. McMillin voted for Paris' removal following a Commission hearing, with Commission President Harry B. Mitchell dissenting. Mitchell held that, although a violation of the act had been established, it was not of a character to warrant or require removal from office.

"If it were required to show evil intent or premeditated purpose to violate or defy the law (to justify removal from office) we should not find that Mr. Paris' removal was justified," the majority report said.

"The respondent, however patriotic his motives might have been, simply failed to realize that the Hatch Act required him to make a choice between serving the public as a whole in official employment and serving a party in partisan employment.

"It is not for the Commission to say that this particular type of offense is inconsequential. If a person can serve as State chairman (of a political party) with impunity, how could this Commission consistently impose a penalty for service anywhere down the line?"

GIVE THE WEEKLY NEWSPAPERS A BREAK

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing H. R. 5349, a bill to permit weekly newspapers to suspend publication for not more than two issues in any one calendar year without the loss of second-class mail privileges.

The daily newspapers can, in general, afford to give their employees vacations, and they all have managers, as well, who can oversee affairs when the publisher wants time off. The small weeklies—the backbone of the newspaper industry—are usually run by a man or woman who has to be publisher, editor, printer, advertising man, and reporter, all in one. These people, I believe, are entitled to the privilege of a vacation without having to reapply for a second-class reentry which not only takes time but costs $10 as well.

I have been informed that the Montana State Press Association when it met in Missoula on August 19 and 20, 1944, went on record in favor of State legislation which would change the frequency of issues so that newspapers could continue to qualify as mediums for the publication of legal advertising.

The passing of the bill by Congress will, when the States affected change their laws covering legal notices, be of inestimable value to the weekly publishers and give them the chance to take much needed vacations which they are all barred from having now. It will give the little fellows in the newspaper field a break; it will confer no special favor; it will not cost the Government anything; and it will recognize a needed adjustment in a field that needs this assistance and needs it now. I sincerely hope that this measure will receive the enthusiastic support of the entire membership of the House.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. WORLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday next, after the regular order of business and any other special orders, I may address the House for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

HON. ANTHONY J. DIMOND

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON]?

There was no objection.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. Speaker, the district which I represent is connected

up with the economic, cultural, and social life of the great Territory of Alaska. We have many legislative and other problems in common.

Since I have been a Member of this House it has been my great pleasure to work with the man who has represented the great Territory of Alaska. Inasmuch as many of us will be here only a few days longer, and inasmuch as that gentleman is going to grace the bench in his home Territory of Alaska, I would be somewhat derelict in my duty to my own constituency, to my feeling toward him, and to the people of Alaska, if I did not place in the RECORD at this time some semblance of spoken word regarding the fine work he has done in the House during his long service here. I refer to the Delegate of Alaska, Hon. ANTHONY J. DIMOND. I shall tell him as I tell the people of Alaska that his leaving here will not only be our loss but the loss of the inhabitants of that great Territory. We all wish him well.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include an article from a newspaper.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

WAR LEADERSHIP

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, the statement of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. STARNES] is most reassuring to me and I am sure it will be to many of the people of the country in the light of the money that has been spent and the great number of words that have been printed trying to convince the people of the country that all the success of this war was due to the gentleman in the White House.

We now learn that it is General Marshall who has been doing this work. I say I am glad to know that when the President goes out of office, if the war still continues, we shall have a capable and successful leader to direct the war program.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an article by Westbrook Pegler from the Times-Herald of this morning.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Idaho?

There was no objection.

PEARL HARBOR RESPONSIBILITY

Mr. OUTLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. OUTLAND. Mr. Speaker, the charge has been made on the floor of this House and has been widely quoted all over the Nation to the effect that several days before the attack upon Pearl Harbor the Australian Government had warned the United States of such an impending attack; that it had notified Washington that a Japanese task force was preceding eastward toward Hawaii. All over America people are asking whether or not such a statement as this can possibly be true. If it is not true, they will demand that such loose talk be immediately stopped, even if it is made in the Halls of Congress.

An Associated Press dispatch from Australia dated September 12 quotes Prime Minister John Curtin as flatly denying this rumor. I quote from the dispatch:

> This is pure invention. Our cables had no data regarding the Japanese Fleet.

The Prime Minister's statement should end this rumor once and for all; it is evident that it is only one more rather clumsy attempt to play a dangerous brand of partisan politics.

It seems to me the Members of this House should have adequate data before they make statements of this kind which they know will be widely quoted all over America.

If any Member of this House has any proof, I ask him to come forward and give it now; if not, I would respectfully suggest that such un-American types of political campaigning be suspended at least for the duration.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, I am inclined to agree with the gentleman from California. For over a year, yes, for over 2 years, the American people have been demanding all the facts pertaining to Pearl Harbor, but the administration continues to keep the lid on.

Admiral Kimmel and General Short have asked for an opportunity to be heard and to tell the American people the facts. Only a few days ago General Short announced that when the facts are known to the American people the blame for our unpreparedness at Pearl Harbor must be laid elsewhere. Certainly that would not be in Tokyo; but rather, in Washington.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein some excerpts.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

DEMOBILIZATION AND RECONVERSION

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DOUGHTON].

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it may be in order on Monday next for me to make two motions to instruct the managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the bill (S. 2051) entitled "An act to amend the Social Security Act, as amended, to provide a national program for war mobilization and reconversion, and for other purposes."

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object——

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENKINS. I yield.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, we are in full accord on this side with the request of the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, what this request really amounts to is that it shortens the process of accomplishing that which this resolution accomplishes: It gives two motions to recommit and it will give sufficient time to debate the two matters in disagreement. All this does is just shorten the process which will have to be gone through with unless this unanimous-consent request is granted?

Mr. DOUGHTON. That is right.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, I do not understand what the gentleman is trying to do, although I have an idea what he is trying to do. Inasmuch as we are going to adjourn here shortly and will not know what he proposes to do, will he explain it?

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, it is the intention of the gentleman from North Carolina, if this request is granted, to ask unanimous consent to print in the RECORD at this point the two motions he expects to make on Monday.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD at this point the two motions which it is my purpose to offer on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

The motions referred to follow:

Mr. DOUGHTON moves to instruct the managers on the part of the House in the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the bill (S. 2051) entitled "An Act to Amend the Social Security Act, as Amended, to Provide a National Program for War Mobilization and Reconversion, and

for Other Purposes," to insist on their disagreement to section 402 of said Senate bill relating to unemployment compensation for Federal employees.

Mr. DOUGHTON moves to instruct the managers on the part of the House in the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the bill (S. 2051) entitled "An Act to Amend the Social Security Act as Amended, to Provide a National Program for War Mobilization and Reconversion, and for Other Purposes," to insist on their disagreement to section 303 of said Senate bill relating to the transportation of civilian workers.

RUMORS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I have a very strong feeling of personal friendship for my friend the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. KNUTSON]. I do not like to see him continuously making statements that are not consistent with the facts. For example, not so long ago, being bereft of any issue, he created a fight with the President's little dog Fala. This was found to be incorrect. Then he tried to offset that, when the truth was made known, by saying that Drew Pearson had stated it cost $20,000,000 for the President to take his trip and hold conferences in Hawaii. What Pearson said was the Republicans would charge that.

Now he makes the statement about the administration putting "the lid on" and like the other two statements it is entirely without foundation and is made out of whole cloth.

Mr. KNUTSON. Will the gentleman yield inasmuch as he made a statement about me?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. KNUTSON. The gentleman has made a statement here that I feel should be answered. The gentleman has access to information denied the minority.

May I suggest to the distinguished gentleman that he call up the proper official and find out if it is true that instead of a destroyer having been used a plane was used? Will the gentleman also inquire from his friend, Admiral Leahy, if the cruiser that carried the President to Hawaii was not accompanied by a carrier and three destroyers?

Mr. McCORMACK. In response to the gentleman's question, may I say he is guilty of the same offense of rumor mongering. The gentleman is also guilty of befogging the facts.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentlemar has expired.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, it seems to me the most important thing that the gentleman from Minnesota said was that if all the facts were brought out about this matter the blame would rest elsewhere than with the commanders at Hawaii and that in his opinion it would not be on Tokyo but rather upon Washington.

That remark brings up something a great deal deeper than some of these other things that have been talked about. All I want to say is that as far as I am personally concerned, I believe the Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor was the fault of Japan, not the United States; and, furthermore, the only way, if you will read the history of the last few years, that the attack on Pearl Harbor or something altogether like it could have been avoided would have been for the United States to tell the Japanese to go ahead and do just exactly as they pleased in China and all over the Pacific Basin.

ALASKAN WATER POWER—HON. ANTHONY J. DIMOND

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I desire to join the gentleman from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] in paying tribute to our distinguished colleague from Alaska [Mr. DIMOND].

No one regrets seeing him leave this House more than I do, for he has been a faithful and diligent servant of the people of that great Territory.

As a member of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors he went along with me in my efforts to get a survey of the potential water power in Alaska, with a view to its development and distribution; which would be the greatest improvement the Territory has ever known. There is a wealth of undeveloped water power in Alaska, sufficient to make it a rich and a prosperous land.

On several occasions I have addressed this House on water-power developments in Japan and Russia, and also in the European, Asiatic, and African countries as well as South America. In each of these presentations I have stressed the high importance of knowing world trends, modern developments, and progress. With the advance of the present war, and the resulting discussions on peace and post-war monetary arrangements, the trends that I have previously mentioned, are becoming more pronounced.

If we are to hold our own as a nation we must give more attention to our resource balance sheet in the future than we have in the past.

Today I wish to carry these studies further by taking another look at our resource inventory, and to then point out how some of our future national deficiencies can be corrected by giving more attention to the opportunities that are possible in Alaska.

WAR AND RESOURCE DEPLETION

For years it was the popular belief that this country had an unlimited supply of natural resources. Events since Pearl Harbor, and the restrictions under which we have since lived, have exploded that theory. All who have investigated scientifically our resource levels under the demands of this global war, have urged serious consideration of ways and means to protect our future position.

I have on a number of occasions called this matter to the attention of this House. How many Members can answer these questions: How long a period of time will our vital resources sources be kept above the danger point? Have we assurances that the material shortages of the past 2 years are not indications of future permanent shortages? To throw some light on this important subject let us examine the facts on the supply situation of a few most vital materials.

VITAL MATERIALS

Let us first consider our petroleum reserves. Up to a short time ago we were supplying about 60 percent of the Allied oil requirements. A year ago the Secretary of the Interior, when appearing before the Senate Appropriations Committee, stressed the seriousness of the oil situation. It has been clearly established that our oil supply is not inexhaustible. We have actually encountered a reversal in the graph relating new discoveries to consumption demands. Since Pearl Harbor, new developments have seriously lagged behind current requirements, and the extent of our new fields have materially decreased. The best evidence we have today is that 10 to 15 years consumption will definitely see this Nation in the midst of an oil depletion cycle. It is true that new fields are being developed in Mississippi and other areas, but they may not prove sufficient.

Our high-grade iron-ore deposits are rapidly being dug out. The great Mesabi range, which has in years past supplied over 80 percent of our iron requirements will be, from present indications, depleted in 10 or 15 years. Our former numerous copper mines have been exhausted, and all that remains in continental United States are the mines of western Montana and Arizona. The same facts can be shown to apply to other major materials such as lead, zinc, and bauxite.

These materials will have to be replaced to a large extent by aluminum taken from aluminum-bearing clays of which we have an unlimited supply. But it will take large amounts of electricity to process it.

A year ago the Bureau of Mines gave Members of the Senate complete listings on 20 other important metals where this Nation's supply is inadequate to meet its peacetime needs. These 20 different metals are highly essential in the manufacture of high-strength, high-quality alloys, which are needed for modern machines, like automobiles, ships, trucks, tanks, and airplanes. All the metals that I have mentioned are highly important both in peace and in war.

What has happened in Europe since D-day simply confirms a principle that has been established since the beginning of time. This principle is that any nation which loses its resource base becomes a decadent nation, and later the prey of other nations. China is an outstanding example of a solid nation losing its resource base, both agriculturally

from soil erosion, and in minerals through depletion and lack of exploration.

MODERN PROCESSES

Mr. Speaker, we became in the past decade a great Nation by building our industries around what has since been known as conventional processes. However, progress has altered processes. For 40 years the tendency has been to swing away from the older conventional processes where high-strength, high-quality products are needed. Modern machines, like the airship, the naval carrier, the heavy fighting ships, the truck, and the automobile, as well as modern chemicals, are dependent on electric processes to secure the requisite strength and quality demanded by progress.

The material quality now needed must come from the electric cell or the electric furnace. I have stated on several occasions before this House that the automobile industry at Detroit would not have been possible if the electric alloys manufactured at Niagara with low-cost hydro power had not been available. Modern commerce has required, and will in the future require, more and more electric metals. This means a coupling of two resources—namely, water power and metallic ores and agricultural products. Water power is the only resource we have that cannot be depleted. It has well been stated that it is equivalent to a mine that cannot be dug out or an oil well that never runs dry.

Fortunately, for the country, we had developed sizable blocks of low-cost hydro at T. V. A., Boulder Dam, and on the Columbia. I do not know where we would have been in this war without them, as nearly 70 percent of the modern metals going into our air program came from these Federal hydro projects. To clarify our thinking along these lines we should look upon the modern metals as frozen kilowatts and the modern chemicals as liquid or gaseous kilowatts.

Price of any essential product determines its place in industry and commerce. Therefore, the price of power is a large factor in the effective coupling of the resources I have mentioned. Take, for example, the highly essential light metals like aluminum and magnesium. Each difference of a tenth of a cent per kilowatt-hour of power cost changes the pound price of the metal by 1 cent. Therefore, an abundance of cheap electricity is absolutely necessary.

A realization of these control factors by Germany resulted in the seizure of Norway, a country rich in hydro power. I have previously developed for the benefit of my colleagues a picture of the hydro-power resources of Norway. To restate for the purposes of this discussion, I wish to again call attention to the fact that Norway leads all the countries in the world both in developed and potential hydro power per thousand population. Over one-tenth of the national wealth of Norway is represented by hydroelectric installations, and over 75 percent of its people, up until the German occupation, had received all the benefits low-cost electricity could bestow.

A PROTECTED PEACE

By resolution and by action this Nation is committed to a speedy victory and such international cooperation as will preserve peace. The latter is a generalized statement, which lacks practicability unless we consider both from a national and international standpoint the effective equalization of resource bases. Until we do, we will not accomplish our objective of a protected peace. Present discussions seem to have neglected this practical fundamental.

Nationally at this time we must take action only on those essentials which will preserve our resource base. If we do not we will find that with depletion this Nation will encounter a lowering of living standards and a drop in earning power. If we do not protect our resource base we will find that our standards will drop to the level of the countries from which we import to overcome deficiencies. Then will follow an upset in our trade and industrial system and we will reach the point where we cannot hold our world position. What can be done about this long-range gloomy outlook?

We can protect our resource base by a resurvey of all of its elements, and by using the opportunities the Creator has given us. The main purpose of these remarks today is to point out resource opportunities in Alaska.

ALASKA CLIMATE

There has been so much misinformation existing as to the climate of Alaska, that the facts need to be stated in order to correctly appraise the situation under discussion. Because of the eastward course in the Pacific of the Japanese current, the climatic effect is similar to that existing in the States of Washington and Oregon, and in northwestern Europe, resulting from the course of the Gulf Stream. This results in a mild temperature, in the coastal regions, with a mean annual temperature of 55° to 60°. Temperature extremes do exist, however, in the inland plateau areas; for example, the mean temperature range at Fort Yukon, near the boundary between Alaska and Canada is 64° in the summer to minus 31° in the winter.

The rainfall in the coastal regions is heavy and ranges between 80 and 110 inches per mean year which is about the same as exists in the heavy potential hydropower areas of Washington and Oregon, west of the Cascades.

The Alaskan point of highest latitude is Point Barrows on the Arctic Ocean. This is exactly the same latitude as the most northerly point of Norway. The southern extremity of Alaska is about 54 degrees latitude, which is three and a half degrees of latitude, or about 300 statute miles, south of the Norwegian most southerly point.

The Alaskan coast line has topography similar to that of Oregon and Washington, and also the west coast of Norway. The coast-line topography is precipitous and is indented with numerous deep fjords.

From this it can be seen that generally the Alaskan areas west of the extended American Cascade Range, have waterfall and water volumes comparable with the great potential power areas of Norway and the best power sections in this country, namely, Oregon and Washington.

RUSSIAN DEVELOPMENTS

On this floor on June 8, 1943, I traced at length the great Russian resource advances since the first Gelro plan of 1920. What Russia is doing so effectively in the war today is the result of coupling together its mineral and chemical resources with power.

The Russian foresight of the past 25 years in minerals, chemicals, and power has brought that country to a top position amongst nations. Their foresight is progressively continuing, and, as an example of national wisdom, I wish to cite a few facts that have developed since the German invasion of that country, when the large Dnieperstroy and other power plants were destroyed. I cite these facts not in any sense of criticism but to bring out modern trends, and to show the power progress of forward-looking nations.

MINERAL RESOURCES

In 1867 we purchased Alaska with $7,200,000 in gold. Since that date we have taken out of the Territory about 90 times the amount of gold represented by this purchase price.

With so much of the Alaskan area unexplored and not surveyed, it would be wild speculation to attempt to state Alaskan reserve volumes. But certain mineral facts are sufficiently established to clearly indicate possibilities, and with such reservation I wish to point out a few of these possibilities in connection with electric processes.

The remaining placer gold reserves in Alaska are probably equal to what has been taken out since acquisition, and the gold lode reserves may exceed the placer reserves. Placer mining is now conducted in Alaska with large power dredges and 24 large operating organizations.

The strategic minerals like copper, tin, antimony, platinum, chromium, tungsten, and molybdenum have been located in Alaska. These are all processed by modern electric methods. Only tin and antimony have been mined commercially. Copper production in Alaska ceased in 1938 because of the world competitive price situation, but by electric processes copper can still be produced. From the small amount of information available it can be safely stated that possibilities for upbuilding our mineral resource base in Alaska through use of electric processing is very substantial.

POWER RESOURCES

Additional water resource surveys are needed to fully cover Alaskan power possibilities both in the usable streams and in the fjords along the coast. These two classes of hydro power will be discussed separately as they involve different fundamentals.

Water resource investigations in Alaska have been meager. From 1906 to 1921 the United States Geological Survey carried out intermittent investigations until available funds were exhausted. These earlier water resource

surveys resulted from the demands of the mining industry, and were, therefore, scattered. In the national forest area stream measurement programs have been carried on by the Forest Service in cooperation with the Federal Power Commission.

The favorable combination of high rainfall, heavy run-off, natural storage sites, high falls, and the nearness of such sites to navigable water makes the southeastern and the south central portions of Alaska an unusually attractive location for hydro projects. Reconnaissance surveys have been made on power sites with possibilities exceeding 800,000 horsepower which is equal to 3,600,000,000 kilowatt-hours annually. These known sites need to be developed to promote industry to use the mineral, timber, fish, fur, and other resources of Alaska. In the other parts of Alaska no surveys or measurements have been made. Obviously additional field work is necessary.

From the information that is available it can be conservatively stated that the usable Alaskan streams have potential power possibilities of about 1,500,000 horsepower of firm power good for 7,300,000,000 kilowatt-hours annually and 2,500,000 of good quality secondary power or 9,000,000,000 annual kilowatt-hours, capable of being used industrially, or a total of around 4,000,000 horsepower or 16,300,000,000 kilowatt-hours—or about as much as is now used in Pennsylvania. The best potential water-power States in this country are Washington, Oregon, California, New York, and Idaho. The potential stream power in Alaska is nearly equal to that of New York and Idaho on a potential installed basis, and is about two-thirds that of Oregon and one-half of the amount that exists in the State of Washington.

As I have previously pointed out, we will have shipped by next July to Russia power equipment totaling nearly one-half of all stream potential power in Alaska, and with power equipment now under negotiation the Russian total of United States procurement should be nearly double this type of Alaskan possibilities. For comparison, it should be stated that the actual developed hydro-horsepower in Norway is 3,500,000, or 16,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours; in Italy, 6,300,000, or 23,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours; and in Switzerland 3,300,000, or 13,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours. These nations have become great industrially by utilizing water power averaging about equal to the Alaskan potentialities. The very profitable Norwegian hydro installations each range in size from 100,000 to 300,000 horsepower, capable of producing 480,000,000 to 1,500,000,000 kilowatt-hours annually. The Norwegian installations have another marked commercial advantage besides low cost, and that is they are located adjacent to tidewater and low transportation costs. The Alaskan possibilities also have a decided commercial advantage, and Alaskan resources and conditions are similar to those of Norway.

The tidal range along the middle coast of Alaska is about 48 feet. Such outstanding protected fjords like Cooks Inlet and Susitna Lake have large power possibilities. The amount of this capacity cannot be definitely stated until surveys have been made, but conservative estimates lead to the conclusion that the available Alaskan tidal power will equal about one-half of the stream potential power capability I have given, which in kilowatt-hours represents between seven and eight billion kilowatt-hours a year.

There is very little feasible potential power located along the route of the Alaskan Highway from Fort Nelson, British Columbia to Fairbanks, Alaska, or on the inland streams because of ice.

The installed hydro plants in Alaska now only total the small amount of 45,000 horsepower, or about one-fiftieth of what we will have supplied to the Russians by the end of this fiscal year. This represents capability of about 200,000,000 kilowatt-hours per year. What I have given indicates that we are neglecting one very essential part of the foundation of our resource base.

A LAND OF OPPORTUNITIES

The Territory of Alaska is our last frontier. It is one that must not be neglected. We are going to have to maintain air bases in Alaska for all time to come and to correct the deficiencies resulting from years of neglect. We owe this not only to our returning soldiers but to all our people. For our own national protection we need to correct the erosion of our own resource base through feasible Alaskan developments. Our national resource deficiencies will first come in those fields involving different forms of energy. Therefore, we cannot afford to neglect the only nondepleting resource we have, namely, water power. We have helped other nations reestablish their bases and it is well to remember that we should do likewise at home.

In this way we can make a new and a brighter land of Alaska and provide there a permanent home for a growing and a self-sustaining population.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. DISNEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include two editorials.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. COFFEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. COFFEE. Mr. Speaker, I wish to supplement the remarks made by my colleague the gentleman from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] and also the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] in saying a few words panegyrizing the career and activities of the distinguished Delegate from Alaska, the Honorable TONY DIMOND. As one who represents a district in effect almost adjacent to the vast Territory to the northward, I cherish more than a mere friendship for TONY DIMOND. The loss of Congress is a gain of the Judiciary. TONY DIMOND has represented Alaska in a wholly impartial manner. His popularity in the House of Representatives is almost unparalleled. The projects and Federal aid for which he has crusaded in connection with the Territory of Alaska have been supported without regard to party. To a large extent the remarkable contributions he has rendered to the Territory of Alaska are due to the infectious personality and the persuasive logic of the Honorable TONY DIMOND.

May I say in behalf of the House that we will all miss you immeasurably. We know that when you go back there your life will be somewhat easier, insofar as it is removed from the incessant clamors and the nerve strains of the 2-year elections, which are the ineluctable lot of every Member of the House. We know that your judicial career will be outstanding and notable. Our felicitations and our warm sympathy go with you. We wish you happiness, longevity, and prosperity in your new career.

Mr. ROLPH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROLPH. I, too, want to say a word concerning the distinguished Delegate from Alaska, Hon. ANTHONY DIMOND. The relationship between California and Alaska has been most intimate all through the years. As a matter of fact, you will be interested to know that at one time a section of California was Russian territory. Government of Russian interests in California was located at Sitka, Alaska.

Russian River, just north of San Francisco Bay, gets its name from a Russian settlement at its mouth.

In my city scores and scores of ships were outfitted for the Alaska salmon industry. Great salmon-canning companies were started in San Francisco. The same is true of trading companies handling furs and other products.

Many San Franciscans devoted their lives and their fortunes in developing Alaska.

Our association with the Territory has been close indeed. We hope it grows still closer in the years ahead.

Personally I feel a deep sense of loss in realizing that genial TONY DIMOND is leaving the House of Representatives. We all shall miss him. I wish him Godspeed and good luck in his new responsibilities.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I know we all feel the great loss this Congress will sustain by the resignation of our good colleague the Delegate from Alaska [Mr. DIMOND]. It is a privilege and a pleasure

for me to say a few words about this fine, outstanding gentleman. As a member of the Subcommittee on Appropriations for the Department of the Interior I have seen the Delegate from Alaska come before our committee and make requests pertaining to his Territory. These requests have always been fair, and the demands he has made upon the pocketbook of the American people have always been in line with good common sense. For that reason, he generally has gotten what he wanted.

It is a pleasure and a privilege for me to say these few words for our good friend the gentleman from Alaska, TONY DIMOND. We wish him well and Godspeed in the new endeavors he is about to enter.

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, TONY DIMOND has served on my committee as long as he has been here. I do not know of any man who has been more valuable. I might say that he is invaluable. I regret very much to see him go. He knows the fisheries, he knows the merchant marine, he knows all the subjects that come before the committee. It will be very, very hard to find a man to take his place. I shall miss him very much. I shall miss him personally, but, more than that, I shall miss his counsel, his advice, his wisdom, and his experience. The whole committee wishes him Godspeed and regrets exceedingly that he is going to continue no longer with us.

We could depend upon him. Every representation he ever made on any matter presented the truth of the situation, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth. Tony, God bless you wherever you go and may Heaven's richest blessings be yours through the years that are to come, and may they be many.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I certainly would feel derelict in my duty if I did not add a word to what has been said with reference to our good friend, TONY DIMOND, in connection with his leaving this august body. I have had the pleasure of serving with him on the Committee on the Territories for a number of years. There has been no man with whom I have come in contact here in the House for whom I have a higher regard than he. TONY DIMOND has brought to his work a very fine understanding of the problems of his own district. He has been most diligent and effective in his work here in this body. He has been broad-minded in his consideration not only of the problems with which he has had to do personally affecting Alaska but all the problems that have come before us during that time.

Last summer I had the privilege of visiting Alaska and meeting TONY DIMOND while there. He showed me every courtesy.

May I say, with reference to that great Territory, that we have in Alaska a remarkable asset. I feel such many of you do not appreciate the strategic importance of the Territory of Alaska to this great country, particularly in the years that are ahead of us, with the development of the great airway leading from the continental United States to Siberia and Asia over the top of the world through Alaska. The work we have done there in furtherance of the war effort will be one of the outstanding contributions in this great conflict which is now soon, we hope, to be brought to a close. TONY DIMOND has done remarkable and outstanding work in his contribution to that great endeavor. I know he will render the same high service on the Federal bench. I wish him Godspeed.

UNEMPLOYMENT-COMPENSATION BENEFITS FOR FEDERAL EMPLOYEES

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, when the motion of the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means comes before the House on Monday, the House will have an opportunity to vote upon the amendment I tried to present to the House when the bill was under consideration here, to include Federal employees within the scope of unemployment-compensation benefits. At the time the discussion was had upon that subject by the gentleman who is now addressing the House, some very wild and extravagant statements were made as to the possible cost of the inclusion of Federal employees within this program. I did not have an opportunity thereafter to answer those wild and extravagant statements that were made in the RECORD. I shall attempt to briefly do so now.

It must be understood that the proposal to include Federal employees under unemployment compensation does not contemplate the establishment of a Federal system. The amendment which I offered, and which was ruled out on a point of order, simply provides that all Federal employees shall be entitled to receive unemployment compensation in accordance with the laws of the State in which the service was rendered. This means, therefore, that the States, through their unemployment compensation agencies, would retain full authority to administer the law. Payments of unemployment compensation would only be made in accordance with the law of the State in which the Federal employee rendered his service. The States would be merely acting as the agents of the Federal Government in administering the payment of unemployment compensation to Federal employees. Thus, every employee would be equitably and reasonably treated.

A shipyard worker released from employment in Alabama would receive unemployment compensation in accordance with the unemployment compensation laws of the State of Alabama. The rate of payment, the duration of payment, and any disabilities inflicted by Alabama law would control, regardless of the place of residence of the employee.

It must be borne in mind that all unemployment compensation in the States is paid out of funds derived from a tax on pay rolls paid by the employer. I believe only one State provides for any part of the tax to be paid by the employee. Therefore, it must be clear that had Federal employees been included within the program when the law was first enacted the contribution to the trust fund would have been made by the Federal Government the same as private employers.

What we seek to do now is to ask employer Uncle Sam to treat his employees in exactly the same manner as employees of private industry are treated.

It must be borne in mind, also, that all State laws require employees to subject themselves to employment opportunities and to report at stated periods to the U. S. E. S. office. In the event a person receives unemployment compensation and is thereafter exposed to a suitable employment opportunity, unemployment compensation will cease under State laws when the employee refuses to accept such employment.

It must also be borne in mind that the amount of compensation and the duration of payment varies throughout the various States and Territories. The average for the Nation is less than $20 per week for a period of not to exceed 20 weeks in any year. Thus, the maximum amount that could be obtained under the average figures just quoted would be $400 per employee. Assuming that 3,000,000 Federal employees were to all be discharged and the processes of government completely halted, the maximum amount that would be required to pay unemployment compensation under such circumstances could not possibly exceed $1,200,000,000. If any person can conceive of such a monstrous situation developing in our economy, then God help America. No one can prophesy with certainty how many Government employees will be discharged nor what period of time will be necessary to accomplish the reduction in Government personnel. If 1,000,000 were discharged in the next year and all of them were unable to secure employment, the most that the Government would have to pay for its contributions to the States would be $400,000,000. If we are to have a wave of post-war prosperity with full employment, then the inclusion of Federal workers in the program becomes a moot question. If we are to have continuous wholesale unemployment, then we must prepare now to take care of the situation.

The unemployment-compensation program in my judgment offers a much better groundwork of stability and economy than would be found in hurried attempts to provide relief projects under another W. P. A. We must bear in mind that this Government will continue to function at the conclusion of hostilities, and

many of the agencies of the Government that have been set up will continue for a considerable period in our post-war era. The regular establishments of government will continue and the regular civil service employees will remain on the pay roll.

Is it not clear therefore that the bogey thrown into this discussion as to cost is designed merely to frighten and confuse Members of Congress? I fully believe that the United States Government, the greatest employer in the Nation, owes it to the States who have adopted unemployment compensation for private employees and employers, to set an example and to give its employees the benefits which it has bestowed upon the employees of private employers.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, and further to extend my remarks and include a brief article from the American Bar Association Journal.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. MURRAY] may extend his own remarks and include some excerpts.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT OVER

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns tomorrow, it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. JARMAN] is recognized for 20 minutes.

THE NATURAL IRRESPONSIBILITY OF INEXPERIENCED YOUTH VERSUS THE ALLEGED WEARINESS OF TIRED OLD AGE

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Speaker, when the opposition brought forth, early in this campaign, what it apparently regarded then, and I suppose still does, as the paramount issue of the campaign, I did not take it very seriously. I scarcely thought it consequential. But I am delighted to say to my good friends on the other side of the aisle that they have finally and entirely converted me and caused me to thoroughly agree with their position that this really is the prime and paramount issue in this campaign, an issue which deserves the careful consideration of every American voter—hence my discussion of it. I refer, of course, to the issue of the natural irresponsibility of inexperienced youth, versus the alleged weariness of tired old age. Now, as I say, only recent developments have succeeded in converting me to agreement with that position. These developments have, in fact occurred since Governor Dewey commenced his present campaign tour. The emphasis that has been placed on that issue by one party to the campaign, coupled with the remarks of their candidate, has caused me to wonder if it is really a fact that they honestly do intend, in the event of the far-fetched possibility of their success, to propose a constitutional amendment and urge its adoption by the States to stipulate a maximum age of 45 years for President, 40 years for membership in the other body, and 35 years for membership in this body. I can but wonder, too, if it is really a fact that they will pass a law, regulation, or order, causing it to be impossible for the Chief of Staff of our Army and the Commander in Chief of our Navy to be over 45 years old; one preventing a man over 40 years old serving as a major general, one over 35 being a brigadier general, and stipulating that no colonel be more than 30, and no lieutenant colonel or major more than 25.

I wonder, too, if, should they by any chance be successful, they would logically continue this procedure by urging on those Governors of States whose misfortune it may be at the time to belong to the Republican Party, the passage of legislation by the State stipulating a maximum age of 30 years for Governor and 25 years for other State officers.

Thinking along that line caused my mind to revert to an editorial from the Birmingham Age-Herald of about 2 weeks ago, which I read:

REPUBLICAN PROPAGANDA

Insidious Republican propaganda has invaded Democratic homes in Birmingham, and there is great consequent distress in certain of them. Apparently, the Republican campaign management has set about organization of an Infants-for-Dewey League of Alabama. It is a distressing manifestation of the Southern "revolt" of the Democratic Party and stems undoubtedly from the Texas oil millionaires' electoral vote withholding manipulation, contaminated undoubtedly by similar abortive efforts in South Carolina, Mississippi, and Louisiana.

Evidence of plutocratic capital financing this insidious propaganda movement has alarmed the Democratic Party authorities, and a congressional investigation will be requested in the next few days. * * * Whether it is simply an exploitation of the Dewey-Dulles, or Dulles-Dewey campaign for greater authority for small nations in the international security organization is not yet known.

At any rate, here are the facts as developed by the Democratic gestapo agents, alarmed by this totalitarian manifestation of Republican aims:

A few days ago a young father, a Democrat, a Federal office-holder, a bureaucrat, perhaps, reported to Democratic headquarters that his 18-month-old daughter was going about the house, muttering sotto voce, "Dooey, Dooey, Dooey, Dooey." This was bad enough, but worse was yet to come. Not satisfied with having apparently captured the year-and-a-half old sweepstakes, the Dewey-Dulles outfit has gone further, and now an editor, a lifelong Democrat, an ardent Roosevelt supporter, alleges that his 5-month-old grandson, who bears his name, has been heard to offer a modified version of the same mumbling treason, namely, "Dooey, Dooey." So far neither has been heard trafficking with the sacred name of Dulles.

The matter has been laid before the Alabama delegation in the House, as well as before both Senators BANKHEAD and HILL.

Ils ne passeront pas, exclaim these Democratic parents and grandparents, as they expose this nefarious attempt to foist Dulles-Dewey on an unsuspecting Alabama Democratic world. Down with this effort to seduce the infants of Alabama to the Republican billfold!

Ridiculous, do you think? So did I when I first read it. In fact, as I read that editorial to Mrs. Jarman, as we drove from Tuscaloosa to Birmingham, her comment, with which I agreed, was, "That editor had a lot to do to write that." I thought so, but as I read it again on the plane I was impressed that it might not be so farfetched after all and it occurred to me not to throw that paper away, but to clip the editorial and place it in my portfolio where it peacefully slept unthought of again until Governor Dewey commenced this campaign tour. Then it was positively called to my attention and I became convinced that this issue of the natural irresponsibility of inexperienced youth versus the alleged weariness of old age was really the main one in this campaign. Time of course does not permit me to dwell on the numerous remarks of the Governor which so convinced me. I shall explore only one of them.

In New York in his press conference just before the tour commenced, as I recall, he commented on the alleged intention to keep the soldiers in the Army because it was cheaper to do that than to maintain them outside; and as I recall he used the indefinite expression "they say." Proceeding to Philadelphia and using the speech doubtless prepared by his ghost writers—since this reference appeared in its published text—he repeated that charge and said the administration was going to do thus and so. That accusation naturally brought forth loud applause just as any criticism of this administration to that audience would have elicited great applause. Undoubtedly the irresponsibility of his youth caused him to be misled by that applause into believing he had hit the bull's-eye, so down at Louisville the next night in a speech in which the prepared ghost writers' text, as published in the press, contained no reference to this. He bounded forth in the exuberance of his naturally irresponsible youth to greater heights, repeating this charge, and this time accusing the New Deal of the determination to unnecessarily retain soldiers in the Army after the war. Within just a few days prior to that first statement the acting chairman of the Military Affairs Committee of the Senate and the chairman of the Military Affairs Committee of the House had given press interviews in which they referred to the plans for demobilization which they said were proceeding apace, and stated that the War Department would give out details the following day at noon, which occurred. Every other comment on this phase I have read or heard has been favorable. Not only that, but as early as June 12 Justice Byrnes had made this statement:

Our fighting men are entitled to first consideration in any plan of demobilization.

Their orderly release at the earliest possible moment consistent with the effective prosecution of the war—

I repeat—

Their orderly release at the earliest possible moment consistent with the effective prosecution of the war has ever been the primary consideration of both the President and the Joint Chiefs of Staff—

Which, of course, includes General Marshall.

Now, did our distinguished young irresponsible friend base his remark on what those gentlemen said? Every one of them has some responsibility for demobilization directly or indirectly. No. They are all suffering from the weariness of tired old age and consequently, despite their competence to discuss that subject, despite their connection with it, and despite the fact that they are all parts of this administration and Democrats, he waved aside what they said—and I charge him with the responsibility of knowing what they said because even though he may not have time to read the papers he certainly has people around him who are doing so and reporting to him, people like his ghost writers, clipping services, and so forth. He waved aside what those gentlemen said because they were tired old men, I suppose, and he picked up what a junior major general said, who, though not so young as he is, not as old as any of the gentlemen to whom I have refered, and who is, therefore, comparatively another irresponsible youth, General Hershey, whose sole duty is to bring men into the Army and who has no responsibility whatever for demobilizing them. While an Army officer, his organization is not a part of the Army.

Mr. ELSTON of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JARMAN. I shall be pleased to yield to my distinguished friend when I get through. He observes that I am speaking extemporaneously and I have only 20 minutes.

Mr. ELSTON of Ohio. I want to answer right there a point the gentleman is making.

Mr. JARMAN. I beg the gentleman's pardon.

Mr. ELSTON of Ohio. I wish to answer the point the gentleman is making right at the place he is making it.

Mr. JARMAN. I shall be pleased to have the gentleman answer it when I finish. The gentleman knows my fondness for him. He knows I am speaking extemporaneously. I do not, of course, know how much time I will need. I hope the gentleman will answer it when I am through.

Mr. Speaker, here are these tired old men: Senator THOMAS is serving his twelfth year in the other body, the gentleman from Kentucky, Chairman MAY, his fourteenth year here, during about half of which he has served as chairman of the all-important and quite germane Military Affairs Committee. General Marshall, of whom my colleague from Alabama spoke so complimentarily a while ago, with every word of which I thoroughly agree, one of the greatest, if not the greatest, Chiefs of Staff the Army has ever had, a four-star general who has worn that insignia longer than any American, I believe, a man who has created this Army, transported it to foreign soil, has successfully fought it, is successfully fighting it today and will continue to do so until victory crowns our efforts on every battlefield, and our flag waves supreme. He is a tired old man who is several years older than President Roosevelt. Then, there is Justice Byrnes who served 14 years in this body, 10 years in the other, 1 on the Supreme Court, 2 as Stabilization and Mobilization Director, and who is frequently referred to as "assistant" President. Despite his closeness to the President and natural familiarity with what is occurring and the intentions of the administration, he is a tired old man, several years the President's senior. Governor Dewey waved aside what all of these gentlemen, who are so peculiarly competent to discuss the matter, say and charged the administration with this terrible, yes this unconscionable charge when all the facts are considered, because of what General Hershey said.

I did not know until this occurred what General Hershey's politics are, just as I do not know and do not care whether Generals Eisenhower, Bradley, Patton, Hodges, Patch, and Admirals King, Nimitz, and Halsey are Democrats or Republicans, they are all doing magnificent jobs on which I heartily congratulate each of them. I did not know or care because as you are all well aware, this administration has very properly and commendably been determined that the war effort profit by the use of the ablest brains in this country whether Democratic or Republican. This is evidenced by the fact that the War Department has been ably presided over throughout the war by a great former Republican Secretary of State, and it is unfortunate indeed that the world did not take the advice he gave relative to the Japanese situation while serving in that capacity in 1931. By the way, he is another tired old man. Secretary Stimson is with one exception more than 10 years older than any of these weary old men I have mentioned and is still going very strong. Another outstanding illustration until his unfortunate and untimely passing was that able and charming gentleman, Hon. Frank Knox, recently a candidate for the Vice Presidency on the Republican ticket, who presided over the naval affairs of this country and who was older than any of the tired old gentlemen whose appropriate statements Governor Dewey spurned.

So, as I stated, I did not know what General Hershey's politics were, but the papers now tell us that he is a Republican. He is the comparatively irresponsible youth whom Governor Dewey in his natural irresponsibility quotes, deliberately waving aside correct information from competent men who deal with this matter and who are responsible therefor. When he did that, what did he do? He did not help one particle the morale of our troops on the battlefield or elsewhere by telling them they should come home and, "If I am elected President I am going to return you home sooner than this administration will if it is retained in power." No; it is not helpful to morale to attempt to make soldiers believe they are being mistreated by their superiors and any effort to do so while our country is at war, whether responsible or irresponsible, is damnable conduct. In fact, were it responsible it would be treasonable. He certainly did not contribute toward expediting our war with Japan. While he did not say that the troops would be demobilized at the end of the European war but indicated that troops would be retained for the Japanese effort, his reference to voluntary soldiers and the difference in language will most probably cause Japan to misunderstand. Her only hope, just as Hitler's only hope for some time has been, is the ridiculous possibility of continuing this war sufficiently to wear us out and enjoy some kind of negotiated peace. As I say, he did not so state, but I am afraid Japan will construe his remarks to mean that if he is elected President all soldiers who wish to may come home. I say to you that he contributed nothing toward the war effort and certainly saved no American lives by encouraging Japan to carry on.

But worse than either of those, if anything could be worse, was his deliberate effort to mislead the people of America, in view of my charge that he is charged with the responsibility of knowing what those tired old men said, and particularly to play on the heartstrings of the sad and lonely mothers throughout this land, every one of whom naturally is quite anxious for her son to return as soon as possible, consistent with the war effort.

I say to you that in making that statement he was deliberately playing on the heartstrings of every one of those mothers for political purposes, which would have been quite unbecoming of one in his position even had it been true.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JARMAN. I will gladly do so just as soon as I have finished my statement.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I just wonder who was playing on whose heartstrings when he said "I promise again and again and again."

Mr. JARMAN. Since the gentleman inquires about the President's repeated promise not to send our boys to foreign wars, I cannot refrain from calling his attention to the fact that since Pearl Harbor this has not been a foreign war, and from saying to the patriotic citizen I know him to be, that had he made that statement "again and again and again," and had he been President when that dastardly attack occurred at Pearl Harbor, I know that he would have done just exactly what President Roosevelt and this Congress did. In fact, if he was present, as he generally is, he so voted.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, may I answer that?

Mr. JARMAN. I have answered the gentleman's question. I will be glad to yield further after I finish.

I charge that in deliberately waving aside responsible testimony, even though it was from tired old men, and picking up this irresponsible testimony—because it was from a man who has no responsibility in the matter—that one of

three things was true. Governor Dewey was guilty of one of three errors, either of which is unpardonable by a man in his position. He was either criticizing something and promising to remedy that of which he knew absolutely nothing, it resulted from the natural irresponsibility of inexperienced youth which caused him to be unable to evaluate the information, or it was, as I said, this deliberate effort to play on the heartstrings of the mothers of this country.

I am frank to say, despite the fact that Governor Dewey has decreased my regard for him considerably during this tour, I still am unable to, and I will not, believe that a man who has been nominated for the Presidency by one of our great parties would intentionally stoop so low as to play on the heartstrings of the sad and lonely mothers of America in order to gain votes. Consequently, I want to believe, and do believe, that it was one of those first two, either absolute ignorance of a matter with knowledge of which he was charged by reason of his position or the natural irresponsibility of his youth. Let us compare the reactions of tired old age and inexperienced youth. Tired old age, or alleged old age in the person of the President, absolutely annihilated that charge in four words as positively and as effectively as I have ever heard any statement annihilated. When the reporter queried him in reference to what General Hershey said, he simply replied, "Is that his job?"

For further comparison let us observe the reaction of irresponsible youth to that remark. When the reporter asked this irresponsible young candidate what he thought of the President's remark, he said, "I will let you draw your own conclusion as to the inadequacy of the comment." And I am perfectly willing for you, my colleagues, and for the people of America to draw their own conclusions from this one illustration of the irresponsibility of youth, which can and will be multiplied hundreds of times before this campaign concludes.

I am perfectly willing for the world to draw its own conclusions whether the man who indulged in this great error—and that is the most charitable way in which it can be referred to—is competent to serve our Nation as its President and preside over the destinies of 133,000,000 people during the most critical period with which we have ever been confronted; and that will, I fear, be true whether 1 month, 1 year, 2 years, or 5 of the next administration be those of peace or war.

Mr. ELSTON of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JARMAN. I now gladly yield to my good friend the able and distinguished gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. ELSTON of Ohio. The gentleman has spoken on the assumption that General Hershey's only job is to take men into the Army and has nothing to do with demobilization. Is the gentleman not aware of the fact that General Hershey served with the Army and the Navy in the preparation of all plans for partial demobilization, and is in a position to know as well as anybody in the Army or the Navy what those plans are?

Mr. JARMAN. I absolutely disagree with the gentleman that he is in position to know as well as anybody in the Army or the Navy what those plans are.

Mr. ELSTON of Ohio. The testimony before our committee yesterday was that he did serve with the Army and the Navy in the preparation of those plans.

Mr. JARMAN. Does the gentleman mean to express the opinion that General Hershey is more familiar with those plans and more competent on that subject than General Marshall?

Mr. ELSTON of Ohio. General Marshall did not serve on the committee. What I am saying is that General Hershey, having sat with the Army and the Navy officials in the preparation of demobilization plans, was in a position to know what he was talking about when he made that statement. The gentleman is not correct in saying that his only function is to see that men get into the Army and has nothing to do with demobilization.

Mr. JARMAN. Was he serving on that committee in his capacity as Director of Selective Service? And does the Selective Service Director shoulder any responsibility whatever for demobilization?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Alabama has expired. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK] is recognized for 30 minutes.

A REVIEW OF SOME OF OUR NATIONAL ISSUES

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, I desire to present to this House a short review of the developments in our national life which I consider of the highest importance. At the same time I want to point out what this Congress has done and can do to restore normal conditions after two World Wars. It is impossible in the time allotted to me to make this a detailed presentation. I shall only attempt to draw a general outline of the situation from the perspective of my 10 years' service here in the House of Representatives.

A POOR MAN'S CONGRESSMAN

During 6 years of my service here in the House my time was devoted almost exclusively to relief problems in North Dakota and the Nation. I was a poor man's Congressman. The people of North Dakota had to eat, and it was necessary to establish work programs and, in thousands of cases, direct grants. In some of the western counties, as many as 60 percent of the farmers were on some kind of relief. Providing necessary feed and seed was another part of this poor man's program; combating grasshopper infestation was another; the conservation of water was another; the support prices for agriculture was another.

The picture is now somewhat changed. Those people who were once poor are now on their feet. Instead of having a bundle of unpaid notes and tax notices, these same folks have no outstanding notes or delinquent taxes, but instead they have cash in the bank. When a small village like Munich, in Cavalier County, with a population of 200, has bank deposits exceeding $2,000,000, you can readily understand a change has taken place.

In my judgment, the day is not far off when conditions will turn for the worse again. The cycle of good crop years will not always last, and when we emerge from this war and the millions return from the factories and the battlefields, there is grave doubt whether this Nation will have jobs enough to go around. This Congress is planning now to avoid a situation where we shall again have 15,000,000 jobless; private industry is working feverishly to shape itself to handle the problem, but I fear that the Government and private business, working together, cannot accomplish the full job without much hardship and perhaps suffering on the part of the people.

LABOR

Our system of free enterprise presupposes that capital and labor shall be partners in a common effort. When the system works to the advantage of each, phenomenal results are accomplished. When, for any reason, capital refuses to cooperate in this joint enterprise, and the benefits are lopsided and unjustly distributed, leaving labor a scant subsistence, trouble starts. In this war we have had an example of the two forces, labor and capital, working pretty much in harmony. There have been a few strikes, but considering the total man-hours of employment, these cases have been negligible.

Members of organized labor have struggled for half a century to make their calling honorable, to make the wage adequate to provide a decent standard of living for the worker and his family, and more is to be accomplished. When, because of a few strikes during this war, there arose the threat that labor would be stripped of all its hard-won gains, I established my position on two conclusions: First, the strikes developed because the workers could not make their wages cover the increase in the cost of living. Second, there were no disputes that could not be settled in an orderly way.

All of these disputes can be and are being adjusted and settled in an orderly way. The almost unbelievable accomplishments in our war preparation have conclusively demonstrated that our system of free enterprise is inferior to no other system, and that it is possible to maintain a fair and just balance between capital and labor. Obviously this balance cannot be held if organized labor is stripped of all of its gains over the past half century and is compelled to refrain from seeking further reforms.

OLD-AGE SECURITY

No one in Congress, during the past 10 years, has been more interested in bringing about adequate old-age security. I have addressed the House time after time on the subject and have never slacked in my efforts to have enacted an adequate old-age pension system.

The first old-age security measure was passed by Congress because of the pres-

sure brought by the Townsend organizations. While the first act was nothing but an abject dole measure, it was a beginning. The Townsend pressure still continues and will continue until a just and honorable bill is enacted. After this war it will be one of the miracles of the age if we do not go down in another depression, and the enactment of the Townsend bill will do more to avoid this plunge than any bill yet before Congress. I can see some of you smile as I say this, but it is only because you do not understand the bill.

THE FARM PROGRAM

A great many people, including some of my personal friends, were under the impression that I have been a little too willing to support the farm program of the administration. My reasons for so doing are best told by referring to the following tables:

Table I

Price of wheat in 1932, per bushel	$0.36
Price of hogs in 1932, per 100 pounds	2.65
Price of cattle in 1932, per 100 pounds	3.30
Price of corn in 1932, per bushel	.27
Price of barley in 1932, per bushel	.14

Table II

Average price 1935–39:	
Wheat	$0.83
Hogs	7.36
Cattle	5.80
Corn	.57
Barley	.37

Wheat increased 47 cents per bushel.
Hogs increased $4.71 per 100 pounds.
Cattle increased $2.50 per 100 pounds.
Corn increased 30 cents per bushel.
Barley increased 23 cents per bushel.

Table III

The 1943 level of prices:	
Wheat, per bushel	$1.31
Hogs, per 100 pounds	12.90
Cattle, per 100 pounds	10.00
Corn, per bushel	.93
Barley, per bushel	.96

When I came to Congress the situation in respect to farm prices was disastrous. The McNary-Haugen bill had been passed and vetoed twice. Prices had fallen to the confiscatory. See Table I set forth above. Foreclosures and dispossessions were rampant through the whole farm belt.

Under these facts should I have not been willing and ready to try any plan to bring prices up? For supporting this program I have no excuses to offer and would take like action again under like circumstances.

The program resulted in buying power for the farmers 450 percent greater than it was in 1932.

In 1932 farm foreclosures took 63.3 out of every thousand farms; and now the figure stands at a loss of only 8 farms per thousand.

Who wants to return to 32-cent wheat and 14-cent barley? Who wants to return to the days when 63 out of every thousand farms were foreclosed?

During my first 6 years' service in the House, the Congress was confronted with not only taking action to increase farm prices, stop foreclosures, assist farmers to obtain feed and seed and grasshopper poison, but there was a more serious job to undertake.

Thousands of farm families had been put out by foreclosure and had moved to the small towns and cities. They were skilled in farming and nothing else. Many thousands of these families were on relief grants, which cost the Government on the average $750 per family a year. Something had to be done to give them a chance to help themselves.

The Farm Security Administration was set up. A lot of people fought this organization, but in my judgment it offered the only means of putting these families back on their feet. The following figures show how the program worked out in North Dakota:

Loans were made to 39,361 North Dakota farmers who were unable to secure credit elsewhere, and a total of $16,572,149 has been loaned in the State. The farmers were helped to start over again and today they are on their feet. Over 85 percent of the principal of these loans has been paid. In addition to that, 363 farmers purchased land outright, and to date 100 percent of the maturities have been paid.

Moreover, these farmers in the Farm Security Administration program have made an outstanding record in the production of food during this war. The increased production in 1943 over that of 1942 is shown by the following table:

	Percent increase
Production of hogs	89
Production of cattle	71
Production of sheep	106
Production of milk	15
Production of chickens	80
Production of eggs	45

The following table shows that this production was extensive and important:

Sold by F. S. A. clients in 1943:	
Hogs (pounds)	10,888,157
Cattle (pounds)	19,094,236
Sheep (pounds)	2,907,552
Milk (gallons)	17,619,691
Chickens (pounds)	1,227,654
Eggs (dozen)	1,692,665

Does anyone think this Congress was wrong in making it possible for farmers who were down and out to produce not only food for themselves but to supply this country in its hour of need a vast quantity of food products, and in the process to pay off their indebtedness? The CONGRESSIONAL RECORD shows my stand on this matter and I have nothing to excuse or explain. No one, not even the most arrogant reactionary in the whole country will complain against this agency when he knows what has been accomplished.

DEVELOPMENT OF OUR VAST LIGNITE RESOURCES

The lack of strategic war materials has focused the attention of the whole country on the huge lignite coal deposits in North Dakota. That this coal contains limitless quantities of oil, rubber, plastics, and explosives, has definitely been demonstrated by the Bureau of Mines. Fully a year before anyone else presented these possibilities to the Congress, I presented the whole situation in two speeches on the floor of the House. Now practically every candidate in the United States claims the credit for bringing about the development of this vast field of coal. But it will be impossible for those who read the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to find where these same candidates ever said anything about the subject until after others had been working on the matter for a period of over a year.

The first processing plant will start its machinery in operation before there is another election in North Dakota. My record on this whole matter may be found in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD: August 20, 1942; January 12, 1943; April 7, 1943.

INDIAN CLAIMS

That the Indians of the United States have just claims against the Government for millions of dollars, no informed person denies. For 150 years we have made solemn treaties with the Indians, in which the Indians gave up title to their lands on the express promise of payment by the Government. Time has worn away year after year and still the Indians have not been paid. A few examples of this situation can be found in North Dakota.

In 1868 we made a treaty with the Sioux at Fort Rice, in which the Indians gave up title to their lands east of the Missouri River, except actual reservation lands, and in return it was agreed that the Black Hills and all country west of the Missouri River to the Rocky Mountains was to be and remain Indian country where the Indian could live unmolested.

In 1874 General Custer's expedition to the Black Hills established definitely that there was gold in the Black Hills. This information caused a grand stampede to the Black Hills and thousands of prospectors swarmed into the Hills to chase the rainbow of gold. That the country was Sioux country as established in the treaty of 1868 no one denied—not even the Government. The gold was taken and finally the land was taken, in violation of the treaty, and to this day the Sioux have not been paid a dime for their gold or a nickel for their land. The claim is still pending.

The Sioux Sisseton-Wahpeton claim, the Fort Berthold Indian claim, and the Turtle Mountain Band of Chippewas claim, all present the same situation.

Since I have been in Congress, I have given attention to these just claims and have tried to have jurisdictional bills passed to permit these claims to be heard and settled, and each time the Court of Claims has in one way or another avoided a head-on decision in the matter. Four years ago I presented or caused to be presented to the two major parties a plank in respect to settling all Indian claims. The Republicans adopted the plank and the Democrats adopted one that went further than the one I presented. Yet neither party has made any move to redeem these pledges. I took the pledges seriously and introduced a Claims Commission bill which, if adopted would be the means of gathering up all these claims in a period of 5 years and settling them for good on the ground of justice and equity. But the bill will not be passed by this Congress.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURDICK. I yield.

Mr. MURDOCK. I have been a member of the Committee on Indian Affairs since I have been a Member of Congress. The gentleman addressing us has also been a member of this committee. I wish to congratulate the gentleman from North Dakota on his good influence and approve his courageous stand in the deliberations of that committee; and I wish to say to the Nation, and particularly to his constituents, that there has been no more ardent champion of the rights of the aboriginal Americans than the gentleman from North Dakota. I appreciate the fairness and the boldness with which he has championed their cause, based upon an intimate knowledge of their situation.

Mr. BURDICK. Under the circumstances I shall have to thank the gentleman for his contribution. As far as I personally am concerned I introduced a bill in this House to provide for a claims commission to round up all these Indian claims and finally settle them, but there the bill remains.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. BURDICK. I yield to my colleague from New York.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I, too, happen to be a member of the Committee on Indian Affairs and fully agree with what our colleague the gentleman from Arizona has said. Let me ask the gentleman, however, if the investigating committee created by the House was not directed to study this entire question with a view to making some disposition of all these claims and also study the question of allowing the Indians free movement in the country such as other citizens enjoy?

Mr. BURDICK. I think that may have been the primary intent.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. That was my purpose in supporting it.

Mr. BURDICK. We have had these investigating committees operating since 1787 when this Government came into being. I recall one report consisting of 32 volumes of an investigating committee on the question of Indian affairs. The volumes are filed, the Members have access to them, but 12 years have gone by and nothing has been done about that report and, in my judgment, nothing will be done on the present report when it is made.

SURPLUS WAR MATERIAL

When the surplus war property bill came before the House on August 15, 1944, I made an address on the floor discussing this bill—see CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for August 15, 1944. In that speech I pointed out that the Army and the Navy would have for disposal, after peace was established, approximately $6,000,000,000 worth of property, consisting of aluminum, copper, steel, zinc, rope, lumber, wire, nails, tools, trucks, jeeps, other motor vehicles, clothing, shoes, blankets, bedding, kitchen utensils, and so forth.

The bill contained this provision:

> To afford smaller business concerns, farmers, and agricultural enterprises, generally, an opportunity to acquire surplus property on equal terms with large competitors.

This did not satisfy small buyers, because the amounts offered might be more than a small concern or an individual could buy. An amendment was then written into the bill providing that when these goods were offered for sale they should be sold in small units. As the bill was passed by the House, any quantity of goods which the small businessman needs can be purchased at the same price as a large concern taking 100 times as much would have to pay.

This bill is now in conference and the House conferees have insisted that the sale of barbed wire, tools, and all other accessories be sold in small units so that a few large concerns could not buy the whole lot in one bid.

The sale of this material will not greatly interfere with our normal production, as the amount involved covers less than 2 months of actual sales under normal conditions. Probably the most important thing about this bill is that the materials will be available to small business concerns throughout the country, and that the small businessman will also be limited in the price he asks. The result is that when this bill is passed, it will make all of this material available to the farmers and other consumers, in a fair open market, at fair and reasonable retail prices. For further information, see my speech above referred to.

WILL WE INSIST UPON THE RIGHT PRINCIPLES OF PEACE WITH THE GERMAN PEOPLE?

It is of great importance to the world what kind of peace is made with Germany. The idea that Germany as a nation must be crushed is the wrong approach to a lasting peace. That the military aggressors of Germany must be crushed is an entirely different thing. Along with our allies, we may have to do a lot of this crushing, but finally Germany herself will complete the job. The German nation has the right to live and survive and any peace that does not give her this chance will breed another war. The people who make up Germany must be given an opportunity to shape a government of their own and our interest in the matter is to see that such a government confines itself to Germany and does not again become an aggressor. Only when the evidence of aggression becomes apparent are we concerned.

If Germany as a nation is given a chance to become a law-abiding nation among the nations of the world, there is not much doubt but what she will pursue a course of action that will not interfere with her neighbors. This means, of course, that the German people must be given a clear open chance to work out their own internal difficulties, and to trade on equal terms with other nations and have the same opportunity to become a respected nation as we ourselves have. In my judgment, if this is kept in mind at the peace table, we can look forward to peace in Europe as far as Germany is concerned.

The philosophy of crushing Germany as a nation should be abandoned if we are actually looking for a durable peace.

This time we must take just as important a part in the writing of the peace as we did in the actual fighting. Last time we packed up and came home and let others write the peace terms, and they were the forerunner of this war. We should stay on the job with our men and guns until the peace treaty is written and signed.

RECONVERSION FROM WAR PRODUCTION TO PEACETIME PRODUCTION

On this measure which is still in conference and not finally passed, I addressed the House on two occasions—see the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for August 24 and August 31.

This bill falls far short of accomplishing full employment after the war ends. It seeks to provide security for war workers when they lose their jobs by paying them a weekly salary for 6 months after the plant closes. The rate of pay was left to each State.

I do not think this measure creates a single job. It provides pay for no jobs. It provides the worker a period of time in which he may find another job. But the bill does not create jobs; it merely pays those who have no jobs.

I am not an alarmist, or a defeatist, but I cannot quite forget the period following World War No. 1. Millions will be coming back from war plants and the armed services. They will not be looking for pay for doing nothing, but they will be looking for an actual job.

I believe that men in private industry should be given every encouragement to expand their business and take on labor, but at the same time I believe that this Government should have a plan in mind designed to supplement private industry in the huge undertaking of reemploying millions who will be looking for work. Following the first war we had no such plan, but as the jobless reached 10,000,000 and soared up to 15,000,000, we frantically worked to provide jobs overnight. The result was that W. P. A. was set up and the work attempted was in many cases work of no lasting value. Anything had to do when we had no plans. This time we should be ready with a definite works program. Public roads, public buildings, airports, repair of houses, electric lines, dams, irrigation systems, farm labor, educational assistance for those who have missed training because of the war, all present needful labor of a permanent nature.

In addition to that we must be sure that our money circulates and does not become hidden away in vaults, thus stopping development. As I pointed out in my speech of August 24, no better recovery program has been presented before Congress than the Townsend recovery plan. We should be ready with this bill when the war ends, so that we can make it impossible for money to hide itself and withdraw the blood from our financial system. Congress must take the blame if we are forced into another disastrous depression. The record is that Congress turned down an appropriation for national planning and the House refuses to debate the Townsend Act.

Mr. MURDOCK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURDICK. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. MURDOCK. We have been giving our attention to planning, of course, first things first, as we say. We have now enacted a statute in reference to the termination of war contracts. Two other

measures are on the way, now in conference, one to dispose of surplus war property and the other having to do with demobilization. I agree with gentlemen that those things come first.

However, the gentleman has hit squarely upon a very important thing and that is that we have not yet planned as we must, to take care of the ten, twelve, or fifteen million additional workers that we are going to have at the close of hostilities. We must not leave this to chance as was done before. I want private employers to give them an opportunity for employment, but it is the duty of the Government to plan wisely to take up the slack. Encourage industry, yes! Along with that the Government can match our buying power with our marvelous ability to produce by the right kind of legislation.

Mr. BURDICK. The gentleman is precisely right.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURDICK. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I want to thank the gentleman for what he has said and I would like to ask him if he will agree with me about the following remark. I rather think he will. That is, the crux of our problem lies in maintaining in circulation in this country a buying power that is in line with our power to produce; that in order to accomplish this one of the essential things we have got to have is the divorcement of the supply of money from an increase in the public debt in order that we can have Congress exercise its constitutional prerogative in that field.

Mr. BURDICK. I think the gentleman is correct on that. May I say—and you are going to smile when I say it, and so far as I am concerned, you can smile, for I have had that happen before—I think the one outstanding bill which will do more to cause circulation of money among the people of the Nation is the Townsend recovery plan.

When you circulate this money every month down to the grass roots, where the people live, by the time it flows around through the circulation of our national system and finally gets back into the vaults and is shut up and taken out of circulation, an equal amount is turned loose at the grass roots again.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURDICK. I yield.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. May I say that I am not one of those who smile. It seems clear and obvious that with the power to purchase which has been developed in this country during the war, and the fact that we have a full home market for what we can produce, that the necessity of a national old-age pension system should be apparent as the most just, fair, and reasonable way to maintain that circulation of buying power.

Mr. BURDICK. I thank the gentleman. May I say further that this recovery plan is not simply one for the protection of the aged alone, although that would be a very worthy accomplishment of this Congress, but it is a national recovery program that will keep this money circulating. You now object to a tax of 3 percent. Suppose I am a storekeeper. What difference does it make to me when I am doing business if I pay a tax? I cannot pay any tax at all if I cannot sell goods.

Mr. COFFEE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURDICK. I yield.

Mr. COFFEE. May I ask the distinguished gentleman if I am correctly informed that he is not going to be with us for the next 2 years?

Mr. BURDICK. That all depends on what the people decide on election day.

Mr. COFFEE. Is the gentleman still a candidate?

Mr. BURDICK. Like the Missouri River, I am always running.

Mr. COFFEE. That is all I wanted to find out. I am very much gratified to receive that information.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURDICK. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. I just want to say to the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK] that the depression after the last war, and also the depression of 1929, was caused by the Federal Reserve System contracting the currency and retiring the Federal Reserve notes that are, to all intents and purposes, money in this country, being legal tender for all purposes. If the Congress wants to prevent a depression after this war it can do it by passing a law to prevent the retiring of these Federal Reserve notes. In 1920 we had $5,698,000,000 in circulation, or $53.21 per capita, but a short time after the war closed, you will remember, the Governor of the Federal Reserve Board, Mr. W. P. G. Harding, raised the rediscount rate, called the loans, and reduced the per capita circulation below $30. That brought on the panic of 1920.

In 1929 the same crowd of financial highbinders brought about a reduction of the currency by retiring Federal Reserve notes, and again reduced the amount of money in circulation per capita below $30. In 1920 we had $53.21 per capita in circulation. Today we have $164.34 per capita in circulation. At that time we had $5,698,000,000 in circulation. Today we have $22,699,000,000 in circulation. If we permit those same selfish financial interests to retire those Federal Reserve notes—greenbacks, if you please—when this war is over and reduce the circulating medium, we are going to have another depression the like of which probably the Nation never saw. If the Congress of the United States and the administration want to prevent a depression after this war, the way to do it is to freeze the amount of money in circulation the day the war closes and not permit them to retire those notes from circulation. That will hold up prices generally and allow farm prices to balance up to industrial prices. Then we will have prosperity for the next 10 or 20 or probably for the next 50 years.

Mr. BURDICK. I do not agree with the gentleman on everything, but he is as sound as granite on this question.

Mr. RANKIN. The gentleman agrees with me on most things.

Mr. BURDICK. May I say to the gentleman from Mississippi that I was on the farmers' receiving end in that situation. The Federal Reserve Board met here on May 16, 1920, and put this thing into operation. At that time I had a large number of sheep that were worth on the average of $8 per head. The local bank said to me, "You have to pay up." I said, "What for?" "Well, the Federal Reserve bank has demanded a pay-up system. We have to pay up and you have to pay up." I said, "The only way I can pay up is to sell the sheep." They said, "Well, sell them."

So I started to sell, and my neighbor started to sell. Everybody sold. In about 2 weeks, do you know what we were getting for our sheep when everybody had to sell? I was getting 50 cents apiece for them.

There was a story circulated in this Congress and it came right from my country, where one farmer sent down a load of sheep and the price he received did not pay the freight. They sent him back a letter saying he owed $18. He was a good farmer—we are all good farmers, we are real sports—and he said, "I am sorry that you are behind on the proposition. I haven't any money, but I can send you another load of sheep."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from North Dakota has expired.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman be permitted to proceed for 10 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. In that connection, it is well known that prices in a free economy are governed by two things, the volume of the Nation's currency multiplied by the velocity of its circulation. If the Federal Reserve banks, or the Federal Reserve Board, undertake to withdraw these Federal Reserve notes, which are legal tender in this country, if they attempt to withdraw them from circulation, then Congress should take this gold we have buried in the ground in Kentucky and set aside a sufficient amount of it, and issue currency against it, dollar for dollar for every dollar of these Federal Reserve notes that are taken out of circulation. In that way we can prevent another depression such as the gentleman from North Dakota described a little while ago.

I saw Mr. Kincaid, of Nebraska, an old man who had served faithfully here, walking around the House Office Building in 1921. I said, "Judge, what is the matter?" He said, "Corn in Nebraska is down to 17 cents a bushel; it is so cheap that people are burning it in their stoves instead of coal."

It was for no reason on earth except the contraction of the currency by the Federal Reserve System.

I am making this statement now because I expect to press it. If Congress wants to prevent a depression after this war, it can do so. We can have prosperity, as I said, for 20, 50, or 100 years after this war closes if the Congress will do its duty.

Mr. BURDICK. I do not think anyone in this Congress could state the situation any better than the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. I thank the gentleman from North Dakota.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURDICK. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I agree with what the gentleman from Mississippi has said, but I go this one step further. I think we are going to have a fight to prevent deflation after this war. I think there are going to be powerful forces that are going to actually want a deflation. However, it is not going to be enough for us simply to take measures to try to maintain an active circulation of cash money. As the gentleman well knows, we are dependent for the bulk of our circulating medium upon bank credit created by the banks.

Mr. BURDICK. That is right.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. That money can be taken out of circulation and destroyed by the banks simply by their refusal to renew loans or to make loans. At the present time, therefore, for our medium of exchange we are dependent upon the willingness of banks to lend money at interest and the willingness of borrowers to borrow it, which is the reason for my original question when I asked the gentleman whether he did not believe that to a large extent the solution of our problem lay in the divorcement of the supply of money in this country from the volume of our debt.

Mr. BURDICK. In other words, I take the gentleman's statement to mean a large percentage of our business turnover every day is done by check, instead of cash.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. That is right, and a large proportion of what we call money in this country is actually demand deposits, written up on the books of the banks with but 20 percent of cash money reserve behind it.

Mr. BURDICK. That is right.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURDICK. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. Let me say to the gentleman from California that as long as this $23,000,000,000 is in circulation the banks are not going to let it lie idle in their vaults without putting it back in circulation or putting it out where they can get interest on it. If you keep the amount of money which is in circulation and in business today in circulation when the war closes, you will not have any depression in this country. I think we would have a boom of prosperity for years and years to come.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from North Dakota has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include several newspaper articles.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. DICKSTEIN] is recognized for 15 minutes.

THE WAR IS BEING WON BY AMERICANS OF ALL RELIGIONS

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to insert therewith certain excerpts from newspapers and books.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York.

There was no objection.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I am very grateful and I know every Member is, for our great success in the war. We are winning the war on every front. The war is being won by Americans. The boys are not fighting as Catholics or Protestants or Jews. They are fighting as Americans, American soldiers. No religion and no creed can take any particular or special credit while this fight is going on. At the same time while there is complete unity of purpose on the battlefield there does not seem to be as much harmony on the home front. There are still a number of groups who are seeking to divide us and arraign one group against another. They carry on their insidious propaganda by dissemination of Nazi-inspired lies which seek to poison the minds of the American people. I think something ought to be done by this Congress to make sure that when our boys return home they will not have to face the same enemies they had to face on the battlefields. What is the policy of our Government? What are our standards of equality? So far nothing has been expressed by this Congress and nothing has been done officially to assure our people and the world as a whole that we in America do not believe in intolerance, hate, and bigotry. The moment bigotry and intolerance are permitted to spread in our country, we can no longer brag about having a healthy country, and we can no longer be sure of having won the war. We shall then have sacrificed the very principles upon which this Nation was built.

After careful study of this serious problem I introduced in June of this year, House Concurrent Resolution No. 92, which reads as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the Congress hereby express itself that whosoever conducts or participates in anti-Semitism, or other poisonous propaganda, seeking to array class against class, creed against creed, or race against race, is playing Hitler's game, and that there is no place in the lives or thoughts of true Americans for such ideology.

I hope that before this Congress adjourns sine die it will adopt this resolution so that the world may know and our people will understand that we mean to keep our basic beliefs in the basic principles of our forefathers, that all people are entitled to equal treatment, and that we will not permit the rise of Nazi or Fascist ideologies in the United States. By adopting this resolution we can demonstrate to the world that we, the Congress of the United States, representing all the people, have reiterated our faith in the strength of our democratic way of life.

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I yield.

Mr. BURDICK. Was not the substance of your proposed resolution contained in the Declaration of Independence, as written by Mr. Jefferson?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Yes; in other form and language. Yes; it is one of the oldest and most basic tenets of our form of government.

Now, I have no quarrel with any man or any woman or any Member of this House. I feel that every man and woman should have an equal opportunity. When our boys come home, when they take off their uniforms, whether they be Catholics, Protestants, or Jews, I want them to come back to their homes knowing that they are all Americans, with equal rights.

Some years ago I pointed out to this Congress and to the American people that there were 110 or 120 organizations in this country, financed by certain sinister groups, who were spreading all forms of hate, intolerance, and bigotry; who were seeking to array Jew against Catholic or Catholic against Protestant.

These are the people who in my judgment are a menace to any democracy. It seems to me that the job that was supposed to have been done of ferreting out these sinister groups—some of them have been destroyed—should still continue for others are still operating. To illustrate: Our post office is being flooded with so-called second-class matter through which this propaganda of hatred is being spread to a great extent. There is no way to check up. The only way it could be checked it would be to pass House Resolution 49 which I introduced. That would take away from certain organizations who preach intolerance and hatred their second-class mail privilege. It costs the Government $80,000,000 a year—that much of a loss annually—to distribute second-class mail. I did not seek to take the second-class mailing privilege from newspapers, publications, and responsible organizations, but my effort was to deny the second-class mail privilege to certain groups financed by foreign agitators, groups which distribute the hate program through our mails. Just when we think we can locate them they vanish and there is nothing left but a post-office box number. These groups are all irresponsible. As I said, when we think we have them located and are ready to arrest them they go to another one of our great metropolitan cities, rent another post-office box and operate through second-class mail from the new address. Because we love our country and because we want our boys to come back and find a better place in which to live we must do everything in our power to save the home front for them. It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that it is our duty to proclaim freedom for all the people, hatred and prejudice against none. America is going to be the leader in the post-war era and we must live up to the hope and faith put in us.

The men at the peace table, especially the Americans, should make doubly sure that those who were responsible for the

killing and burning of innocent women and children shall pay the extreme penalty for their crime so as to set an example for others of their kind who might have an urge to try their program in the future.

Mr. Speaker, just as a physician himself may succumb to the virus of a contagious disease while saving numbers of unfortunate victims stricken by a raging epidemic, so a nation may be defeated by the infiltration of its enemy's ideologies even though it succeeds in gaining a physical victory on the battlefield. Realizing the danger of infection and contagion, science has gone to work and found ways and means to protect mankind against it. Is not our spiritual health as precious as our physical well-being? Why not extend our precautionary measures to the protection of the spiritual health of our people? Why not heed the symptoms of a cancerous growth which may destroy the very foundations of our accepted way of life? Why not expose the dangers to the people on whom the dastardly enemy is trying to foist itself surreptitiously?

In a recent column, writing under a Newport, R. I., September 7 date line, Cornelius Vanderbilt reported the following in his daily column in the New York Post:

> The Jewish problem is the subject of more chit-chat at exclusive Bailey's Beach, the gold and clambake clubs, the reading room and private parties than anything else save perhaps the date of the end of the European war.
>
> Certain of the wealthier, older coupon-clippers are vitriolic anti-Semites. To hear them talk you would think you were listening to conversations at Berchtesgaden.
>
> I dropped my own bombshell into the midst of one group last night at one of those ultrachic affairs.
>
> I began by reminding them that Prussia seems to be the root of most of the evils which the Germans have brought to the European contingent for more than 100 years. So why not, I suggested, turn all of Prussia into a free port for homeless Jews?
>
> My remark killed the conversation. You could have heard a pin drop. The subject was changed instantly.

In his book, The Curtain Rises, the outstanding foreign correspondent Quentin Reynolds describes his utter amazement and horror at the conditions he found at a summer resort he went to for a short rest after returning from the battlefields of Europe. To quote Mr. Reynolds:

> At the resort a man asked me where I lived. I told him I lived in New York City. "How awful," he said, looking at me sympathetically, "all you see there are Jews." "I'm used to being with Jews," I told him. "Where I've been lately the place is full of them." "Where have you been," he asked. "I have been with the First Division in Sicily," I said. "Full of Jews. It'll please you to know a hell of a lot of them were killed." He looked at me and blinked not understanding and I walked away because I was a little afraid that I might get sick or slug him. This was the America I returned to. Our men abroad deserve something better than a country which is still stupid with reaction and prejudice. There are no Democrats, no Republicans at the front. There are no Protestants, no Catholics, no Jews at the front. There are men in uniform who at the very best are giving up a year or two of their lives to serve a country they believe in.

The above quoted remarks are reports of symptoms of a sneaking, underhanded attack on the health of our Nation. Earnest observers are shocked by the similarity of the pattern of behavior of such people as Gerald K. Smith, Joe McWilliams, and William Dudley Pelley in our country and the people like Goebbels, Himmler, and Streicher in Nazi Germany. Decent people are amazed and angered that the same ideologies that brought Hitler and his gangsters into power and that brought the whole world to the brink of destruction should now be peddled within our own borders. Is it possible that—even while our boys are paying with their lives for the folly of a veak people who swallowed these horrible doctrines of super race and Aryan destiny to conquer and rule the world—the enemy has succeeded in finding a way to attack their country behind their lines? Is it possible that the enemies of civilization and humanity shall be successful in accomplishing within our borders what the courage, self-sacrifice, and gallantry of our soldiers have prevented them from accomplishing on the field of battle? Shall we permit this sneak attack on our country to go unchallenged or shall we expose these groups who seek to undermine the very foundations of our great Nation and to weaken the very structure of it? Shall we permit these termites to gnaw from within, to destroy the unity of our people by inciting the various religious and racial groups against each other?

To answer these questions, let us look at Europe. Let us keep in mind the present picture of Europe, a Europe which was beautiful until the ravaging diseases of intolerance, bigotry, and race discrimination turned it into hell on earth. Let us keep in mind the inevitable results of such spiritual illness, the concentration camps and the gas chambers where culture and the sense of values were destroyed by ignorance and mediocrity, where decency and humanity were sacrificed on the altar of greed.

Maybe, if we present the inevitable results of this dangerous illness threatening our beloved country, we may awaken our people in time to take preventive measures to smash the enemy from within.

The world was shocked by the story of the murder factory maintained by the Germans on the outskirts of the city of Lublin, which was recently liberated, but Lublin was not the only Polish city in which extermination was going on, on a mass-murder basis. In addition to concentration camps, which were established all over Poland, and into which were sent practically all Jews, and a good many non-Jews, in many places so-called labor camps were also set up just to vary the pattern of organized destruction.

These labor camps were originally organized as places where able-bodied men and women could be put to work by their German masters. But the German sadists did not get enough enjoyment out of these labor camps, and pretty soon these camps, too, were turned into gruesome death chambers where their victims were tortured until death came as a relief.

In the city of Lvov, which had a large Jewish population, amounting to about 100,000 or more, of the Jews who were not deported to Germany some 6,000 were murdered outright. The others were scattered throughout Germany and placed in labor camps, with the usual result.

In the city of Vilna, which also had a population of 100,000 Jews, only 170 Jews survived. These survivors were kept alive and forced by methods which, for sheer cruelty, cannot be equaled even by a criminally insane, to use their skills as specialists in various branches of industry for the benefit of their torturers.

In a town of Nowogrodek, out of 6,000 Jews only 200 managed to escape their cruel fate.

The Vilna district had a special furriers' Ghetto which consisted of 500 Jewish specialists and experts. The Germans deported most of its inhabitants to Estonia for forced labor, and from there only a few were able to escape by boat to Sweden.

After hiding 3 months in the cellar ruins of the Warsaw ghetto, after a heroic fight which aroused the admiration of the whole world, 60 of the Jewish fighters escaped through the sewers to carry on the fight against their oppressors.

They were eventually joined by a number of other people from the Polish underground and now constitute a regular fighting unit at present operating in various parts of eastern Poland. They claim to have killed at least 200 Germans.

Reports from Pinsk, eastern Poland, show that almost the entire Jewish community numbering over 40,000 was wiped out by the Germans. Most of them were killed in the autumn of 1941, others during 1942 and 1943. Only a few hundred Jews managed to survive, and these have formed special fighting guerrilla units to avenge the death of their brethren.

According to information of the Overseas News Agency, all the ghettos in Lutsk and in Krzenieniec were liquidated by the Germans, but some French Jews deported from France to Poland escaped, formed a number of partisan units, and are now attacking German transports and trains in the wooded country of central Poland.

A harrowing account of the sufferings of Jews deported from western Europe to Poland has been given by the underground paper of the Belgian Jewish Defense Committee, Le Flambeau. It is based upon information supplied by two Antwerp Jews who fled from Belgium in May 1940, were captured by the Germans in Nice, and deported to a labor camp at Sosnowiec, from where they subsequently escaped. According to their report, Jews on their arrival in the camp were stripped of their possessions as well as their clothing, and were given a few rags called working clothes, which were adorned with four yellow stars—one on the chest, one on the back, and one on each knee. The most brutal beatings were inflicted under the slightest pretext. Men and women worked in separate camps, where they were constantly subjected to inhuman treatment.

Those who were regarded as unfit for work, due to either age or infirmity, were deported to Oswiencim to be liquidated. Countless children, having heard about the horror of Oswiencim, pretended to be over 13 years of age, in order that they might be considered eligible for work. The report related to two incidents, of which the escaped were eyewitnesses. When some trucks arrived at Chraznow to take away the people unable to work, a little girl of 9 or 10, from a crowd of children and old people, ran forward to the German officer in command, fell on her knees, and begged for mercy. She cried that she was able to do the hardest work and did not have to be sent to Oswiencim to die. The officer generously allowed the child to join those who were chosen for hard labor. After several cruel beatings at that camp the child finally met the fate she was trying so desperately to escape. A whole generation of innocent youngsters was thus starved and tortured to death by the Herrenvolk—sacrificed to the evil god of nazi-ism.

The food at the labor camp consisted of two slices of bread and a bowl of warm water a day, and the hours of labor, under the supervision of the SS, men trained in savagery, were unlimited. The rate of mortality was high. The dead were stripped of their clothing and placed in large refuse bins, and when there were sufficient corpses, they were taken by the Nazis to a crematorium. Everything was well organized—the looting as well as the killing.

Near Sosnewiec the 2 eyewitnesses saw 700 girls between the ages of 16 and 20, who had been collected from all parts of Poland, crowded in a large courtyard. These girls were selected from the population for a special fate—to be sent to the front to "entertain" the Nazi warriors.

We have heard and read so much about the gruesome details of well-organized German mass murder that our feelings have been numbed. We have almost become negatively adjusted to the unmentionable sufferings inflicted upon our fellow men, simply as a defense of our own sanity. However, no decent human being can afford this luxury of numbness. No decent human being has a right to protect his own mental and emotional stability by shutting himself off from the inhuman sufferings inflicted upon other innocent decent people. If we want to protect ourselves and our children, if we want to have a decent world to live in, we have to face the brutal forces at work abroad and—what is just as important—we must have the courage to face the apostles of hate and intolerance in our own midst. We cannot afford to lose our priceless heritage of liberty and equality, of the rights guaranteed to us under our Constitution, while we are fighting abroad to help the subjugated people of Europe to regain these rights for their people. We must show the traitors who have come amongst our people to divide us that we as a government, do not condone their activities and that we consider them subversive and contrary to the best interests of our country.

Mr. Speaker, as I said before, I introduced House Concurrent Resolution 92 in order to give Congress a chance to make our stand clear to the whole world.

Let us pass this resolution as a warning to the Gerald K. Smiths the Pelleys, the McWilliams, and others of their ilk. Let us pass the resolution as a declaration of faith to all the decent people of this country and the world. Let us pass this resolution as a promise to all the brave, gallant men and women fighting on the battlefields and behind the barricades of occupied cities and towns. Let us pass this resolution as a solemn pledge that we shall fight the dark forces of evil so that never again will they be able to bring the world to the brink of destruction.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include therein an editorial from the September 9, 1944, issue of the Las Vegas Daily Optic, published at Las Vegas, N. Mex., commenting on S. 1374, authorizing the promotion in rank of the heroes of Bataan, Corregidor, Wake, and Guam, who are now prisoners of the Japanese.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Mexico?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House on tomorrow for 10 minutes at the conclusion of any special orders heretofore entered for that day.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include a quotation from a Selma paper?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS] is recognized for 20 minutes.

BRETTON WOODS CONFERENCE

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, the Bretton Woods, N. H., conference on monetary questions was attended by representatives of all the United Nations. The conference drew up and unanimously signed two proposed agreements to be submitted to the respective governments for ratification.

At the outset it is important to stress the fact that this was a conference of government representatives, not a conference of private bankers, and that all who attended it were acting for their governments and as government officials.

There is at present a woeful lack of understanding of the real significance of the Bretton Woods agreements. Bitter opposition has been voiced against the Bretton Woods recommendations by conservative banking circles and particularly by those groups which can be fairly termed "international bankers." In addition there has been opposition from some earnest people who through the years have been worried about the power of international finance, but who in my judgment have misinterpreted the significance of what Bretton Woods proposes.

It would require a long time to explain or even to fully understand all the ramifications of the two Bretton Woods agreements. Certain outstanding facts regarding them, however, are clear. First and perhaps most important is the fact that neither the agreement for the international monetary fund, nor the agreement for the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development contains provisions which would rob any nation of the freedom to manage its own monetary system as it sees fit. Neither agreement would prevent a nation from expanding its monetary supply in order to combat unemployment and deflation. Neither agreement would prevent contraction to combat inflation. Neither agreement presumes to say what any nation shall use for money. Neither agreement contains any requirement compelling any nation to maintain any particular sort of metal reserves. Indeed, nations can indefinitely participate in both the fund and the bank even if they have no gold reserves at all.

Any nation is privileged to withdraw from either the fund or the bank at any time it sees fit. All it need do is give notice of its desire to withdraw and it immediately ceases to be a participant in either the fund or the bank or both.

The all-important feature of the proposed International Bank for Reconstruction and Development is the fact that if put into successful operation it would go a very long way toward putting an end to the sort of diabolical control which private international financial houses have in the past exerted over sovereign nations. One of the greatest evils of the monetary system which has dominated the world ever since the Middle Ages has been the power which private international bankers have been able to exert over whole nations and their people. The pages of history are replete with cases where nations have been compelled to go to the big bankers of London, Paris, Berlin, Tokyo, or New York and to ask on bended knee for loans to be made to them. Frequently these loans have been made at exhorbitant rates of interest and on conditions which enabled foreign bankers to shape the whole course of nations, cause governments to be established or overthrown, and in all too many instances to bring on suffering, distress, and even war.

The International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, if agreed to by the nations, would be run not by private international banking houses, but by representatives of the governments of the participating nations. Under the terms of the agreement this bank would substitute decent low interest loans made only for the purpose of developing the productive capacity of the

borrowing nations for this old system. These loans could either be made directly by the bank or the bank could guarantee loans made from private sources under conditions and terms approved by the bank. The repayment of such loans would have to be guaranteed by the governments of the borrowing nations and would in turn be guaranteed by the International Bank—thus removing the possibility of the United States going through the same experience as it did after the last world war when most of the loans made by this country were never repaid.

The agreement provides that if money were loaned to some nation, let us say to China, for the construction of a dam, a railroad, or a power system, it would be made available to her only as the actual work for which the loan was made progressed. Thus it would be possible to make certain that the money was actually used for the purpose for which it was supposed to be borrowed.

The importance of the low interest rates provided for is impossible to overemphasize. For this means that the rate of interest on the loan would be low enough so that out of the increased productive capacity and general prosperity of the borrowing nation the loan might be repaid without undue burden and without setting up a vicious spiral necessitating the borrowing of more and more money and the constantly increasing indebtedness of the nation in question.

The kind of loans proposed to be made by this international bank are, I submit, the only sort of loans which could conceivably make possible an improvement in the international economic situation in which our own country finds herself. America desires to have a high level of exports. At the same time we are a creditor Nation and presumably we want our loans to be repaid. We desire also to maintain a merchant marine of considerable magnitude and if we do so it will of course mean that payments formerly made by us to foreign countries for shipping services and thus affording a market for our exportable goods will be no longer made and our export market will, in the absence of counteracting forces, be correspondingly reduced. Only loans which actually increase the productive standards and the living standards of other nations can help us to correct the dilemma in which our foreign trade will otherwise find itself. Again only loans of this character can promote international peace and good will. For since they will be made by an international institution it will be impossible for them to increase the stranglehold of any one wealthy nation over the internal life of a borrower nation.

I want to reemphasize at this point that neither in the case of the international fund nor in the case of the Bank for Reconstruction and Development would any private bank, any private central bank, any private international banking house or institution be able to gain political control over any nation or the relations between nations. In both cases the people and their governments would be in complete control.

It is true most of the loans would probably be made with private money, but the terms, conditions, and the guaranty would be fixed and made by the Bank for Reconstruction and Development.

I now come to a brief discussion of the international monetary fund.

The fund undertakes to make it possible for all nations belonging to it to obtain reasonable amounts of the money of other nations for use in foreign trade on condition that participating nations do not pursue policies which would interfere with the orderly settlement of international balances, nor change the exchange value of their money by more than 10 percent without the consent of the fund unless such action is taken to correct what is called a fundamental disequilibrium, a term which I shall explain more fully in a moment.

No nation having the advantage of the use of the fund could do what Germany did in the years just before the war, namely, trade on the basis of "blocked balances" which would compel another nation selling to it to purchase in all cases an equivalent amount of its goods. Neither could any nation discriminate in the matter of exchange rates by giving one nation a more favorable rate than that given to another nation. We ourselves have had the experience of certain nations giving more favorable exchange rates to Great Britain than were given to ourselves at certain times in the past.

The whole principle of the fund is to assure every nation that if it maintains a stable exchange value for its money and does not try to take unfair advantage of other nations, then it can obtain through the fund reasonable amounts of the money of other nations for the purpose of carrying on its trade. This would assure all nations, great and small, that they need not fear that artificial barriers will be placed against their trade in the future by means of exchange manipulations on the part of private international banking houses or national governments.

Let us suppose, however, that a nation feels it does not want to abide by the comparatively simple rules laid down under the fund agreement and that it takes action contrary to this rule. What then would happen to such a nation? Simply this. It would have no further access to the international monetary fund. It would from that time on have to carry on its foreign trade in the manner that has been done in the past before the fund was in existence, securing foreign exchange as best it could.

It is important to emphasize once again that any nation can withdraw from either the fund or the bank at any moment it desires to do so.

I said a while ago that nations could make changes in the exchange value of their money in order to correct "fundamental disequilibria." This statement requires some explanation. By fundamental disequilibrium, as used by the Bretton Woods agreements, is meant a situation where over a long period of time the exports of a nation substantially exceed its imports or where the imports of a nation substantially exceed its exports. In both cases, of course, payment for services such as interest upon debt, payments for shipping, and similar items, must be taken into account. The fund agreement erects no obstacle; on the contrary, it will work to encourage any nation which is buying more than it can afford to buy in relationship to its exports to use monetary or other means to correct this situation. Likewise, it will encourage a nation whose exports substantially exceed its imports, as is the case with the United States, to take appropriate action to bring about a better balance in its foreign trade.

The one thing which America could do which would be most certain to bring about this result, the very result sought by the international fund agreement, would be for us to resolutely maintain the highest practicable national income, full employment of our people and resources, and a full home market for an amount of goods and services equivalent at least to what we ourselves are able to produce if all our people and resources are reasonably employed. Indeed, none of these plans will be successful unless America does this. For to the extent that we were foolish enough, short-sighted enough—I was about to say cruel enough—to permit a period of depression and unemployment to engulf our Nation—to that same extent our own home market would become inadequate to absorb even our own production. We would begin, as was done by every industrial nation in the war-breeding period before this conflict began, to seek desperately for export markets, to shut out imports, to take measures which would lead to further a flow of gold into this Nation in exchange for exports, and do all the other things which lead ultimately only to economic disaster and, in the present instance, to war itself.

The whole impact of the fund agreement so far as our own country is concerned would be to encourage us to resolutely keep the volume of active purchasing power in our country at a level high enough to provide not only a market for what we can produce but a market for a volume of import goods equivalent to the value of the exports which we, of course, earnestly hope to make.

Under the fund agreement the money of each nation would originally be valued in terms of gold. This, however, so far as I am able to discover in no way implies any requirement that a nation maintain gold reserves or that its money be of any one kind or another. Valuing the currency in terms of gold is only done for the purpose of providing a convenient common denominator so far as I am able to see from my study of the agreement. If I believed for a moment that either of these agreements contained elements which would tend to drive the nations back onto a gold standard I would oppose them with all the vigor at my command. I will go further and say that if anyone can show me how either agreement would lead to this result I will change my position of support of these agreements. But I cannot find that element in either agreement.

Once currencies were valued at what is called a par value in the agreements

nations would still be able to make changes of not more than 10 percent in the exchange value of their money merely by informing the fund that they were doing so, but entirely without the necessity of the fund's agreement. Again every nation would have unlimited leeway to correct a fundamental disequilibrium if such existed. In simple terms what this would mean would be that a country importing beyond its exports and thus running constantly into greater and greater debt would be positively encouraged by the fund to raise the price of gold—thus making its money worth less in terms of gold—thus in turn reducing the buying power of its money abroad, tending to cut down its imports and making its goods cheaper. This it would be hoped would increase its exports, lead to further employment and production, and ultimately correct the so-called disequilibrium. A nation on the other hand faced with a chronic excess of exports could either lower the price of gold in terms of its money to make its money more difficult to get and to make its foreign purchases easier, or it could maintain a higher level of national income at home—thus expanding its home market. Obviously the latter course would be the one for the United States to pursue, especially since the American market is by far the most important single market in the whole world.

In other words, under the terms of this agreement the thing for the United States to do would be to adopt monetary policies which would make certain that our money in circulation would expand as rapidly as our production increased. This, so far as I can determine, would be the one primary duty that America would have under the terms of this agreement. It is obviously a duty which we owe to our own people in any case.

Thus the operation of the fund would encourage each nation to pursue the kind of monetary policy which would lead to the best results, not only for its foreign trade but for its own internal economy as well.

And, finally, if this international fund is successful, it might well mark by far the longest step that has ever been taken in the history of the world toward putting international trade on a truly orderly and mutually advantageous basis. And it would prevent private international bankers from manipulating the exchange value of the currency of different countries for their own private gain and to the destruction of the prosperity of the peoples within those nations.

It is important to emphasize, however, that under the fund agreement, the fund has no power to compel any nation to change the par value of its currency without the consent of that nation itself. This is crucial, I believe, for I think to have attempted to set up any international monetary body which would have been given power to dictate policy to the nations of the world would have been more likely to lead to conflict than to peace. This agreement, however, does not do so. It offers certain very real advantages to all nations which play the game according to the rules. Nations not choosing to do that are not penalized or punished. They simply cease to have the advantages which the fund offers.

The stabilization fund will amount to $8,800,000,000, the nations subscribing quotas to the fund in proportion to their financial resources and having a voting power corresponding to their quota contributions. The United States would subscribe a quota of $2,750,000,000 and would have approximately 28 percent of the voting power in the fund. The United States, Great Britain, self-governing British dominions, and almost any other one country of reasonable size, such as France or China, or one of the larger Latin American countries, would command an actual majority of the voting power in the fund.

As to the bank the proposed share capital to be subscribed by the national governments would be $9,100,000,000, of which the United States would subscribe $3,175,000,000. In this case the United States would enjoy a voting power of 31.37 percent and together with Britain, Canada, Australia, and New Zealand would command an absolute majority of the voting power.

Both the fund and the bank are to be managed by a board of governors consisting of 1 representative from each nation and delegating to the executive directors most of the actual functions of management and decision. In each case there would be 12 executive directors chosen as follows: The United States, Britain, Russia, China, and France will have 1 director each and the remaining 7 will be elected by the other members under a system of proportional representation except that as to the fund, 2 of these additional 7 directors are specifically reserved for Latin America. It will be clear, however, that the actual control rests with the voting power of the different members and the votes of the directors will be weighed accordingly.

Anyone would be foolish to contend that even should both of these agreements be adopted by the nations and put into full effect it would offer any cure-all for the economic problems of the world. Indeed, as I have already pointed out, unless full employment and a high level of national income is maintained in the United States there is little hope that either the peace or the jobs and opportunity which have been promised to returning fighting men by ourselves and representatives in every nation, can be achieved. Nonetheless, as instruments tending to help bring about that result and similar results in other nations insofar as an international monetary program can do so, these two proposed Bretton Woods agreements recommend themselves as most important forward steps. The only single thing in the monetary field which is more important than the ironing out of international monetary problems is the establishing of a scientific monetary system within the borders of the nations themselves.

I have had much to say on this subject since I have been a Member of Congress. Indeed I have even written a book on the subject. The key to the establishment of a monetary system which would be in accord with modern economic conditions is a comparatively simple one. It consists of having the Nation take unto itself the function of the creation of the medium of exchange and exercise that function in such fashion as to maintain a constant balance between production of real wealth on the one hand and the supply of active buying power on the other. This must be done without further increasing the national debt or adding to the interest burden of the people. That it can be done that way no one will seriously question. That it must be done that way is to me evident from the single fact that the one basic economic cause of the world dislocations which paved the way for the present war was the failure of every important industrial nation in the world to maintain the buying power of its own people at a level sufficient to provide a home market for a volume of goods and services equivalent to its home production. Unless we correct this maladjustment we may do all other things, but we will still fail future generations in this most critical hour of the world's history.

Peace must be built after this war has finally been won. For the next war of which some talk so glibly will see robot bombs falling not just in England but all over the world and B-29's not in our hands alone but in the hands of all belligerents as well. Even as the present war so far as destruction of the life and wealth of the world is concerned has been manifold worse than was World War No. 1, so World War No. 3 would be in geometric proportion yet more terrible—especially for the women and children of all the cities of the world, the wives and children of the very soldiers who at this moment are winning this conflict.

If this fund and this Reconstruction Bank—if this unanimous agreement of all the United Nations were to contribute in any substantial degree at all to that peace which mankind must build—then it is worth many times the $6,000,000,000 which our country would subscribe. Indeed that sum is less by $1,000,000,000 than the cost of this war for one month to the U. S. A. And, be it added, even if in a sincere attempt to advance the peace of the world we had to in some degree risk the $6,000,000,000, that would certainly be far, far better than to risk loss of the far more precious lives of another generation of America's young men.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. O'TOOLE] is recognized for 10 minutes.

KIMMEL AND SHORT

Mr. O'TOOLE. Mr. Speaker, I am addressing myself at this particular time to the Society of Pseudo Bleeding Hearts for Kimmel and Short. I have sat in this body for the past 8 years and during that time I have come to have a high regard for the Members of this House, both personally, and as to their motives and their patriotism. But, for the past few days I have wondered just what it is that is causing some of the Members on the other side of the aisle to be carried

away on flights of fancy with a complete disregard for the record. This would be amusing, were it not for the fact that the gravity of the accusations is likely to influence the views of many of the people of this country.

Admiral Kimmel and General Short were not mere fighters. They were officers of the highest rank; men who had been entrusted with a great responsibility. They were possessed of knowledge relative to the national danger and national defense that was not known to even Members of Congress. They were men who had been selected with care because it was felt that they were men of common sense and sound judgment. It was felt by those in charge that these men had a grave sense of responsibility and that they were conscious of the fact that they were in command of those forces that we had looked upon as our first line of defense against a potential enemy for many years.

In the days before Pearl Harbor, we were engaged in a conference with the Japanese representatives that had been called at the request of the Japanese Emperor. While we were a peaceful, civilized Nation accustomed to dealing with people whose traditions were the same as our own, we nevertheless knew that Japanese and American relations were skating on very thin ice. There was talk in this House, in the press, on the air, of the danger that confronted our country. Months before the women folks had been ordered out of our Pacific island possessions. The children on the streets knew and sensed that there was some grave danger hovering over the land. But, above all, the two gentlemen who stood on the front line, Admiral Kimmel and Lieutenant General Short, knew better than others how fraught the situation was with danger. They admitted their consciousness when they admitted that they had almost daily conferences about the situation. They had requested additional support in the way of men, supplies, and equipment. They knew, as did every citizen in the country, that the negotiations between the two powers seemed doomed to failure. What did they do? Did they take the precautions that normal men would have taken under the circumstances? No. Admiral Kimmel brought into Pearl Harbor the greatest vessels of our fleet and tied together three battleships deck to deck so that men could walk from one ship to another despite the fact that he knew of the imminent threat. It was not that this represented an investment of one hundred and fifty million dollars, it was that these ships were the first line of defense between our country and the Japanese. Surely the Commander in Chief could not be held responsible for the berthing of the fleet in the harbor. Surely, the Commander in Chief did not allow shore leave for the major portion of the men.

Did General Short take the precautions that a normal man would take? Did he have his scouting reconnaisance out in force, or did he have them drawn up wing to wing on the ground of the flying field near Schofield Barracks? Did he have additional men at the outlying posts where detection could be made? Not that I know of.

I know that most of what has been said here during the past 10 days has been innuendo and based on rumor, but innuendo and rumor are dangerous things in times such as these when the Nation should be united. True is true and false is false, but the Hall of Congress is not the place that should act as a sounding board for innuendo and rumor that will do nothing but disunite our people. Could it be that the gentlemen on the other side of the aisle are defending General Short because he is one of the few Army officers who have placed into Who's Who that he is a member of the Republican Party, or can their motives be solely due to the fact that the election is 6 or 7 weeks away? They are charging the defeat at Pearl Harbor to the Commander in Chief. Let us use our common sense. Suppose there is a conflagration in the city of Washington and the fire department responds; does the chief of the fire department take every precaution to stop it, or does he stand back and say, "No; I cannot do anything until I receive my orders from Congress, which is my governing body"?

Kimmel and Short have been educated for 30 years by the taxpayers of this country. They have been trained in schools we maintain to face a situation such as they did. They were conversant with the danger and in any nation of the world but these United States they would have been held to a very grave responsibility. I know—I am not a neophyte myself—that politics is played in this Chamber, but politics should never be played to the detriment of the people of a country. Their faith should not be shaken on mere rumor and innuendo.

It seems strange to me that suddenly, 7 weeks before a Presidential election, the other side becomes the champion of Kimmel and Short. We all know that the morning after November 7 Kimmel and Short will be dropped like a hot cake by their champions and they will drift into the mumbo-jumbo of forgotten things. I have not heard a word said on the other side of the aisle as to what happened 24 hours after Pearl Harbor was bombed. Has anyone raised his voice in this Chamber to tell how 95 percent of General MacArthur's air force was destroyed on the ground in the Philippines despite the known fact that the Hawaiian Islands had been bombed 24 hours before? Is politics being played there? Is it because of the fact that many Members on the other side of the aisle think that General MacArthur has a large following in this country and it might affect the vote? General MacArthur has gone forward and proven himself a great soldier. We are proud of him as Americans. We hope to see the day when he leads his troops back triumphantly to the Philippine Islands, but he too was guilty of carelessness, yet the other side of the aisle treads softly on that score.

I appeal to all the Members of this House in these trying days not to allow partisan politics to go so deeply as to affect the foundations and strength of our country, for rumor which has no foundation in fact will disunite our people and ultimately destroy our Nation.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, if there are no further special orders, I ask unanimous consent to address the House at this time for 4 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, the partisan political speech to which we have just listened proves beyond doubt the necessity of the country being told the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth about the attack on Pearl Harbor, and the incidents leading up thereto.

The attack on Pearl Harbor resulted in the greatest disaster in our naval history. General Short and Admiral Kimmel were in command and, under the Commander in Chief of the Army and the Navy, directly responsible for the protection of Pearl Harbor. A mistake was made somewhere and by somebody. The Commander in Chief immediately removed Kimmel and Short from their respective commands and placed them on the inactive list. Since that time they have had no connection with or part in the carrying on of the war.

Immediately following Pearl Harbor, the Presidential commission, headed by Mr. Justice Roberts, of the Supreme Court, proceeded to Pearl Harbor and presumably made a careful and complete investigation as to the cause and the effect of that terrible catastrophe. It was the job of this commission to find out who erred, who was to blame, and the circumstances making this attack possible. This investigation was properly conducted in a secret manner. The testimony of the witnesses was transcribed. At the conclusion of the taking of this testimony a report was made by the commission to the Commander in Chief. The detailed report made was revised and, my understanding is, that only such parts were included in the report made public as were approved by the Office of War Information. No one can object to the proceedings thus far. No one even suggested that any information that might aid the enemy should be made public. However, almost 3 years have elapsed, and it would seem that releasing the facts at this time could in no way give comfort to any enemy. The time for court-martialing Short and Kimmel has elapsed. The Congress has taken action to legally extend the time. Short and Kimmel have voluntarily waived the statute of limitations; that is, rather than attempting to avoid court martial and trial, they are demanding trial by any agency that will furnish a forum making it possible for the world to know the truth.

The remarks of the gentleman from New York indicate that he is not familiar with all of this. Be it remembered, that both Kimmel and Short, in season and out of season, have asked the Congress, the President, as well as the Army and Navy authorities, for an opportunity to be heard. Is there anything unfair about that? Is it not in keeping with

the American concept of justice and fair play?

Here are the reputations and standing of two of the highest military officers in the land being shunted about as a political football. It is fundamentally wrong. There is no practical excuse for the continuation of this type of conduct on the part of our Government.

Mr. Speaker, as I said on the floor the other day, out of an abundance of caution I have refrained from making reference, publicly or privately, to this Kimmel-Short incident. There comes a time, however, when patience ceases to be a virtue, and when fairness requires strong language. The time when the developing of the story of Pearl Harbor will hinder our military effort is long since past. Mr. Speaker, here are two men who, before Pearl Harbor, were outstanding leaders in our armed forces. Are they guilty of misconduct in connection with Pearl Harbor, or did they follow instructions? Are they innocent or culpable? I do not know. The country does not know. But there are those who do know, and they should be permitted or required to speak.

Yes, this is an election year and speeches like the one delivered by the gentleman from New York add nothing to national unity and are based on rumor and conjecture.

Again I say the necessities of the hour require consideration of this matter now. The Commander in Chief selected these men for the positions which they held. Both were educated in our great service schools. Each acquitted himself well before Pearl Harbor, and with records of this kind back of them it is only right that the cloud now hanging over them should be removed if they are innocent. On the other hand, if they are guilty, then they cannot be too severely condemned and even punished.

It has been said that Kimmel at least was promoted over officers who outranked him by the President in order that he might represent the Commander in Chief in the Pacific. It is true that he was selected by the President as his representative for this particular mission and, if he disobeyed instructions given by the Commander in Chief with reference to the defense of Pearl Harbor, then the country should know it.

The military rules and regulations, the honor of our military men, and the law of the land close their lips at this time. There they are, held up to scorn and disdain, hoping, praying, beseeching, that they be given an opportunity to tell the truth. Is there anything unfair about that?

Mr. Speaker, let there be action. Turn on the light of publicity. Give the whole story to all the people, and do it now.

Mr. O'TOOLE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MICHENER. Surely, I yield.

Mr. O'TOOLE. I admit with the gentleman, that Kimmel and Short were taken out of their regular order, but I also admit that the President of the United States took General Marshall, General Arnold, Admiral King, Admiral Nimitz, and Admiral Halsey out of their regular order, for the betterment of our country. Will the gentleman deny that some of the men who get up on this floor and defend Kimmel and Short are the very men who 2 or 3 years ago did everything within their power on this floor to stop this Nation from preparing, who did everything in their power to beat conscription, to defeat lend-lease, and to defeat everything that would save hundreds of thousands of American lives in the days that were to come? And they now get up and fight the battle of Kimmel and Short because they are trying to drag a red herring across their own records.

Mr. MICHENER. As I understand, no charges have as yet been filed against these men. They are just suspended in air, and, when demands are made for fair treatment, responses like the one just made by the gentleman from New York are entirely irrelevant. That kind of talk is the red herring to which the gentleman refers. It is a wonder he did not call attention to the myth about fortifying Guam and some other similar matters. The fact that some of those who are demanding justice now did not want to get into this war has not a single thing to do with this issue. This whole controversy can be satisfactorily settled in the minds of all the people if we are just permitted to have the facts. The inference that those in authority are afraid to have the truth known is not good for the morale of our people.

Mr. O'TOOLE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MICHENER. I do not yield any further.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SPARKMAN). The time of the gentleman from Michigan has again expired.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 3 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, it is very seldom that our distinguished friend from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER] makes other than factual utterances, which he has, to some extent, made during the last 4 or 5 minutes. There are some things my friend said with which I think we all agree. One thing about my friend from Michigan, whatever he says he firmly and honestly believes. This entire body has profound respect for the gentleman. My friend engaged in some nonfactual expressions, in part, during his 4-minute speech.

I do not know whether Kimmel and Short are guilty or innocent. As far as I can remember, this is the first time I have ever mentioned their names on this floor. I am not going to mention their names any more, because the outcome of their cases is a matter which must and will be determined upon evidence that will be produced at the right time. As far as I am concerned, I proceed upon the theory that the War Department and the Navy Department are charged with the actual conduct of the war; the war on the land and in the air where the land forces are involved; the Navy, at sea, in the air, and under the sea.

I assume that for practical reasons those who determine policies in both the War Department and the Navy Department in relation to the conduct of the war have felt it was advisable in connection with the conduct of the war to have the courts martial of these men held in abeyance. I make that statement upon no information I have had from anyone but drawing my own personal deductions.

I cannot challenge the opinions of those charged with the responsibility of conducting the war; I have got to accept the word, expressed or implied, of General Marshall, of Admiral King, and those associated with them on legislation and on matters concerned with their conduct of the war. I can remember sitting in conference with others one time with General Marshall before Pearl Harbor when my views somewhat differed from his. General Marshall said, in substance: "Gentlemen, as Chief of Staff and charged with the responsibility of conducting our land forces, our Army, in my opinion such and such a thing is necessary, such and such a bill in my opinion should be passed by Congress." And I said: "General, I cannot challenge your statement; I cannot take a position in opposition to you. No matter what my opinions are, General, they are laid on the table and I shall do what you, as Chief of Staff, think I should do as a Member of Congress having in mind the imminent danger that confronts our country."

So far as lifting and promoting men over others are concerned, I am sure my friend from Michigan did not want to leave the wrong impression. That is done repeatedly; it has been done in peacetime. As I understand it there are selection boards in both the Army and Navy, and they have regular procedures in making their recommendations. If I am wrong or if my friend from Michigan disagrees with me I shall be very pleased to yield for correction.

Mr. MICHENER. No; I would not say that the gentleman was wrong. I know he would not knowingly be wrong. I do not think it is important as to whether or not these men were lifted out of their order, but the gentleman from New York attempted to justify that by saying that General Marshall was lifted out of his order. If he was it was a mighty good lift, for he is doing a mighty good job of carrying on this war. If these two men were just as good as the others who were lifted, simple justice demands that they be given a fair show.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 3 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. No one will contradict the statement of my friend from Michigan; on the other hand if in the past, or conducting the trials openly now, would have been or would be inconsistent with the best interests of our country I know my friend from Michi-

gan will agree that the course of action to be taken should be that for the best interest of our country. The best interest of the country overshadows the interest of any individual, particularly in matters of this kind.

Mr. MICHENER. That is why I refrained and never said a word.

Mr. McCORMACK. I am refraining now; I know the gentleman has. I assume the War Department and the Navy Department for reasons of state, the state being our Government, have not taken any other course of action.

Secretary of War Stimson is a great American. I do not agree with him all the time; I do not have to in order to respect him. We all know he was a member of the Cabinet under previous Presidents; assuredly he is serving as an American. He is not a Democrat, and I do not bring that in for the purpose of saying he is a Republican, but certainly he is a member of the Republican Party; nevertheless he is Secretary of War, and I assume he has a voice in determining when the trials shall take place; and I assume that up to the present time for reasons connected with the best interests of our country these trials have not taken place.

As far as General Marshall is concerned and the statement that he was selected over officers of greater seniority let me tell you of a little incident that occurred. I was sitting one evening at an informal dinner alongside of a vice admiral of the Navy. It is unnecessary to mention his name, but he is a fighting man. He said to me, "McCORMACK, an officer takes care of his enlisted men first. When we are out on duty we think of them first. An officer eats last, an officer goes to bed last, when he and his men are out."

That is the kind of an officer I was talking to. He is a vice admiral. He also spoke to me about a gentleman up in an east coast navy yard who is a captain and he asked me: "McCORMACK, do you know him?" I said, "No, but I know of him." He said, "He and I went through Annapolis together. He is one of my closest friends. I consider him the best all around officer in the Navy, and I cannot understand why it is I am a vice admiral and he is only a captain. This was a man who is a vice admiral today speaking. He told me, "He is a far better man than I am but for some reason I am a vice admiral through selection and this man is still a captain, yet I consider him one of the best, if not the best, all around officer in the Navy today."

I just give that as an illustration. You and I may not agree with the action that has been taken on some promotions but, nevertheless, it is something which is exclusively within the Army and Navy, and I refer to the selection of officers for promotion.

It would probably be best if for the remainder of the time between now and election day we let the matter of General Short and Admiral Kimmel rest with the proper authorities.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 42 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, September 14, 1944, at 12 o'clock noon.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Under clause 2 of rule XXII, the Committee on Invalid Pensions was discharged from the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4527) granting a pension to Laura E. Silvey, and the same was referred to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana:

H. R. 5349. A bill to permit weekly newspapers to suspend publication for not more than two issues in any one calendar year without loss of second-class mail privileges; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. BLOOM:

H. R. 5350. A bill to amend the act of May 25, 1938, as amended, relating to the temporary detail to certain foreign governments of United States employees, and to render closer and more effective the relationship of the United States with other countries, in technical, professional, and scientific matters; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HARE:

H. J. Res. 309. Joint resolution to provide for the appointment of expert employees to assist major standing committees of the Senate and House of Representatives; to the Committee on Accounts.

By Mr. HARTLEY:

H. J. Res. 310. Joint resolution requesting the President to establish friendly diplomatic relations with Italy; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BUCK:

H. R. 5351. A bill for the relief of Michael Abarno; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. FOGARTY:

H. R. 5352. A bill for the relief of Joseph O. Mello and Antonio Mello as next of kin of Michael O. Mello; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 5353. A bill for the relief of Joseph E. Alarie; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 5354. A bill for the relief of Christian O. Mello; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. GORE:

H. R. 5355. A bill for the relief of Charlie Powell; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HOBBS:

H. R. 5356. A bill for the relief of the Southern Bitumen Co., of Ensley, Ala.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. McGEHEE:

H. R. 5357. A bill for the relief of Ensign Frederick Matthews McCord, United States Naval Reserve; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. O'TOOLE:

H. R. 5358. A bill for the relief of the legal guardian of Rose Mary Ammirato, a minor; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. TARVER:

H. R. 5359. A bill for the relief of Adell Brown and Alice Brown; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. THOMAS of Texas:

H. R. 5360. A bill for the relief of the legal guardian of Mona Mae Miller, a minor; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WOLFENDEN of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 5361. A bill for the relief of Harold J. Grim; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WORLEY:

H. R. 5362. A bill for the relief of the Jay Taylor Cattle Co., Amarillo, Tex.; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

6102. By Mr. BRYSON: Petition of Mrs. Perley M. Hall and 12 other citizens of Carthage, N. Y., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

6103. Also, petition of Earl H. Elliott and 18 other citizens of DeBeque, Colo., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

6104. Also, petition of A. Evert Walter and 110 other citizens of Chicago, Ill., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

6105. Also, petition of Mrs. Henry Goings and 72 other citizens of Jenkins Jones, W. Va., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

6106. Also, petition of Ethel Bennett and 50 other citizens of Mayfield, N. Y., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

6107. Also, petition of Mrs. O. H. Berlekamp and 61 other citizens of Bettsville, Ohio, urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

6108. Also, petition of Flora L. Ries and 37 other citizens of Barberton, Ohio, urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the

duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

6109. Also, petition of Ethel Hulick and 44 other citizens of Albuquerque, N. Mex., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

6110. Also, petition of E. F. Glenn and 60 citizens of Glendale, Ky., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

6111. Also, petition of Gertrude B. Gates and 74 other citizens of Wilmington, Del., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

6112. Also, petition of Ora C. Pennebaker and 43 other citizens of Muskegon, Mich., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

6113. Also, petition of J. B. Chisum and 446 other citizens of Altus, Okla., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

6114. Also, petition of Rev. R. Gordon Given and 27 other citizens of Westover, Md., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

6115. Also, petition of Mrs. T. M. Strong and 40 other citizens of Dodgeville, Wis., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

6116. By Mr. COCHRAN: Petition of the Barry Wehmiller Machinery Co., signed by 30 St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082, which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

6117. Also, petition of the Barry Wehmiller Machinery Co., signed by 30 St. Louis citizens protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

6118. Also, petition of Peter Eisel and 30 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

6119. By Mr. FOGARTY: Petition of American citizens of Polish descent in the State of Rhode Island, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to aid to Poland; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

6120. By Mr. HANCOCK: Petition submitted by Taxpayers' Local Option Committee, John Timothy Smith, attorney, signed by 945 citizens of central New York, in opposition to any prohibition legislation on the ground that it would impede the war effort and bring back the evils of bootlegging and racketeering; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

6121. By Mr. ROLPH: Petition of National Association of County Officials, Resolution No. 1, dated July 26, 1944, regarding payment of taxes on property acquired by the Federal Government; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

6122. Also, petition of National Association of County Officials, Resolution No. 2, urging passage of House bill 2241, abolishing Jackson Hole National Monument; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

6123. Also, petition of National Association of County Officials, Resolution No. 3, dated July 27, 1944, requesting Senate bill 1940 be changed from permissive to directive; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

6124. Also, petition of National Association of County Officials, Resolution No. 6, supporting Senate bill 2045, as amended, for distribution and sale of war surplus commodities; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 14, 1944

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Eternal One, unto whom all hearts are open and all desires known, who art the glory of day and the master of night, hear our humble prayer. Through the revelation of Thy truth, let us clear our minds of ignorance, prejudice, and intolerance. O spirit of God, heavenly tide, flow wider and deeper, cleansing the thoughts of every section of our broad land.

We pray that with patriotic zeal and devotion our fellow citizens may reach those altitudes of reason where they shall hear the clarion voice of right whereby our Government was conceived in liberty and dedicated to the proposition that all men are created equal. In Thy divine nearness, grant that every decision may disclose the counsels of an all-wise mind. O create within us the sincerest conviction as to the dire need and peace of the world. At eventide may we take comfort in the realization that in the depths of a good, clean conscience there can be no failure. As we have tasted the sweet and the bitter cup of human experience, inspire us to throw out the challenge, building our lives, not on time but on the magnificence of big and enduring realities, knowing that our Saviour will hold and help us until the morning breaketh. In His holy name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Gatling, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 312. An act for the relief of Freda Utley;

H. R. 527. An act for the relief of Mary Hertz;

H. R. 1623. An act to amend an act entitled "An act to provide fees to be charged by clerks of the district courts of the United States," approved February 11, 1925 (43 Stat. 857), as amended (28 U. S. C., secs. 548–555);

H. R. 1680. An act to amend the Nationality Act of 1940 to permit the Commissioner to furnish copies of any part of the records or information therefrom to agencies or officials of a State without charge;

H. R. 1708. An act for the relief of Perley M Silver;

H. R. 2134. An act for the relief of Paul Szeliga;

H. R. 2387. An act for the relief of John Salfi;

H. R. 2390. An act for the relief of Joseph Scarpella and Dorothy Scarpella;

H. R. 2509. An act for the relief of Marie Engert;

H. R. 2792. An act for the relief of Arvo Kari, Lempi K. Holm, and Burt Johnston;

H. R. 3033. An act for the relief of Tressie Spring and Mrs. Hazel Stutte;

H. R. 3038. An act for the relief of Mrs. Grace Page;

H. R. 3296. An act for the relief of R. Guy Dorsey;

H. R. 3384. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to accept property for the Moores Creek National Military Park, and for other purposes;

H. R. 3464. An act for the relief of Ralph W Cooley;

H. R. 3496. An act for the relief of Ernest A. Grottke;

H. R. 3722. An act to amend section 342 of the Nationality Act of 1940 in respect to fees for the issuance of certificates of arrival; and

H. R. 5025. An act to allow credit in connection with certain homestead entries for military or naval service rendered during World War No. 2.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 1569. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to amend the act creating the circuit court of appeals in regard to fees and costs, and for other purposes," approved February 19, 1897 (29 Stat. 536; 28 U. S. C. 543); and

H. R. 2707. An act for the relief of Henry White.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 725. An act to provide for the punishment of persons conspiring to violate the laws relating to counterfeiting and certain other laws;

S. 1062. An act to authorize certain employees of the General Land Office to administer or take oaths, affirmations, affidavits, or depositions in the performance of their official duties;

S. 1392. An act for the relief of Dewey H. Davis;

S. 1557. An act for the relief of Joel A. Hart;

S. 1732. An act for the relief of Arthur M. Sellers;

S. 1766. An act for the relief of C. C. Thornton;

S. 1780. An act to exempt certain officers and employees of the National War Labor Board from certain provisions of the Criminal Code;

S. 1784. An act for the relief of Leola Evans;

S. 1785. An act for the relief of Alex Wylie;

S. 1807. An act authorizing and directing the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain land to the city of Duluth, Minn.;

S. 1853. An act for the relief of Dr. Frank K. Boland, Sr.;

S. 1869. An act for the relief of Mrs. Mamie Dutch Vaughn;

S. 1897. An act for the relief of Mrs. Sophia Tannenbaum;

S. 1942. An act for the relief of Dr. E. S. Axtell;

S. 1959. An act for the relief of Mrs. Amy McKnight;

S. 1987. An act for the relief of Gordon Lewis Coppage;

S. 2008. An act for the relief of Herman Philyaw;

S. 2028. An act to amend the Naval Reserve Act of 1938, as amended, and the Coast Guard Auxiliary and Reserve Act of 1941, as amended, so as to permit service of members of the Women's Reserve in the American area, the Territories of Hawaii and Alaska, and for other purposes;

S. 2069. An act for the relief of Irma S. Sheridan, postmaster at Rockville, Oreg.; and

S. 2111. An act to provide for the extension of certain oil and gas leases.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to a bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 1250. An act to repeal section 2 of the act approved May 17, 1926, which provides for the forfeiture of pay of persons in the military and naval service of the United States who are absent from duty on account of the direct effects of venereal disease due to misconduct.

DISPOSAL OF GOVERNMENT SURPLUS PROPERTY

Mr. MANASCO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the managers on the part of the House may have until midnight Saturday to file a conference report on the bill, H. R. 5125.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD in two instances; in one to include an editorial, and in the other, statistical data.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

(Mr. COLE of Missouri asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.)

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD in three instances; in one to include a newspaper article, and in the others, two addresses delivered by me, together with statistical data.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that today, at the conclusion of the legislative program and following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday next, at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day and following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 30 minutes; and I further ask unanimous consent to revise and extend those remarks and include certain extracts from statements and records.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a timely appeal received from the office of the executive committee of the Polish-American Congress of Chicago.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. DILWEG. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a radio address delivered by Martin J. Young, president of the Green Bay Federated Trades Council.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on three different occasions and in each one to include a portion of the proceedings of the convention of the American Federation for the Physically Handicapped.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include two short editorials.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

NECESSITY FOR WORLD COOPERATION

Mr. OUTLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. OUTLAND. Mr. Speaker, last week, I, along with a great many other Members of this House, was privileged to see the first showing in Washington of the new motion picture, Wilson. This picture is wonderful entertainment, but it is far more than that; it is a most instructive lesson in history. President Wilson, at the conclusion of the First World War, came forward with a plan which offered the hope to the people of the world that we would not have to engage in more wars; that an international association of nations would henceforth cooperate to stop aggression wherever it might be found.

That plan was welcomed with enthusiasm by the peoples of the world but not by the diplomats. Our own country did not join, largely because of personal animosities and partisan politics. Furthermore, the League eventually failed to accomplish the purpose for which it was created, because it lacked the power and the authority to back up its findings. For example, the League found Japan guilty of aggression in its 1931 Manchurian invasion, but Japan walked out of the League, and that was that. An international police force would have stopped such invasion in a matter of days; better than that, Japan probably would not have dared to invade Manchuria in the first place.

I hope that the portrayal on the screen of Wilson's life will have two results. I hope it will show the American people the necessity for world cooperation, partisan politics to the contrary. I hope, furthermore, it will convince all of us that this time our post-war League of Nations must have the power to back up its decisions, as only in that way will we prevent World War No. 3. I realize that the isolationists will howl at such talk, but that is an unimportant consideration. Even the Chicago Tribune is an unimportant consideration.

DISPOSAL OF MATERIALS ON THE PUBLIC LANDS OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 2697) to provide for the disposal of materials or resources on the public lands of the United States which are under the exclusive jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Interior, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 1, line 4, strike out "materials or resources, including."

Page 1, line 8, strike out "or resources."

Page 1, line 10, strike out "or resources."

Page 2, line 11, strike out "or resources."

Page 2, lines 14 and 15, strike out "or resources."

Page 2, line 20, strike out "or resources" where it occurs the first time.

Page 2, line 20, strike out "or resources" where it occurs the second time.

Page 2, line 22, strike out "valid."

Page 3, line 2, strike out "or resources."

Page 3, line 2, strike out "valid."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I understand these Senate amendments simply narrow the scope of the materials which can be disposed of.

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. Yes. It is corrective language. I think the Senate amendments are an improvement on the House bill, as a matter of fact.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a short item issued by the Southern Baptists concerning a righteous and lasting peace.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BULWINKLE] is recognized for 30 minutes.

THE ADMINISTRATION RECORD ON NATIONAL DEFENSE PRIOR TO THE WAR

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Speaker, the country must have been surprised to read in the newspapers on September 11 and September 12 a statement given to the press at Des Moines, Iowa, by the Republican nominee for the Presidency, Governor Dewey.

In that statement Governor Dewey said, among other things:

> The tragedy is that we have an administration seeking continuance in office which was in control for 8 years while the events leading to war were shaping.

He further said:

> At the end of 8 years or in 1940, it still had a limping, unproductive economy, with 10,000,000 unemployed, and absolutely no preparation for the war, which it now claims it foresaw.

Mr. Speaker, I wish first to touch on the statement of Mr. Dewey's in which he said that in 1940 there were 10,000,000 unemployed. Evidently this candidate for the Presidency became confused as to which year there were 10,000,000 unemployed. He must have gone back and thought of 1930—one of the years during the last Republican administration. Of course, we all know that the Governor never says anything in any of his speeches of happenings prior to March 4, 1933.

Believe me when I say that I am very much surprised at the extremely reckless statements which are absolutely unfounded that the press attributes to Governor Dewey. You have noticed that the good Governor makes no mention of the happenings in Washington prior to 1933. Surely there is some comparison that he could make—or should make—between any 4 years of the Roosevelt administration and the 4 years of the Hoover administration. We are all familiar with the information that Mr. Hoover was Governor Dewey's sponsor prior to, and at the Republican convention. Should he make any statement about the years from 1929 to 1933, he might say something—and the chances are that he would—against his sponsor for the nomination.

It is hard to believe that any man selected by a great political party as its nominee for the Presidency should fail to inform himself of the facts before he attempts to make charges, and before he makes statements, that are not true in fact. I am referring to the statement which I quoted at the beginning of this speech from the Washington Star of September 11:

> The tragedy is that we have an administration seeking continuance in office which was in control for 8 years while the events leading to war were shaping * * * and absolutely no preparation for war which it now claims it foresaw.

Upon that statement, I again challenge what the Governor says. If there was a tragedy in the Nation during these years it was the tragedy of the greater number of Republicans who failed to listen and the tragedy was the record of his own party which attempted in every way possible to vote down many of the President's requests for the various items for national defense.

May I not ask you if Governor Dewey was not critical of the efforts made by the President for national defense?

Has he forgotten his own statements?

Has he forgotten the record of the majority of the Republican Members of the House?

Is his memory so faulty that he cannot remember the happenings of these years and the words of the President who never minimized the international situation and who constantly attempted to awaken the American people to the dangers that faced the Nation from abroad?

A number of these Presidential statements stand out in my mind today. Surely someone should have told the Governor that on March 27, 1934, the President issued a statement upon signing the Vinson Navy bill telling the people that he had signed the bill which had for its purpose the building up of our Navy to the strength authorized by the Washington Naval Limitation Treaty of 1922 and, secondly, by the London Naval Limitation Treaty of 1930. Under this bill a 4-year program was laid down, and even before this funds were made available in 1933 to commence construction of 37 vessels—in 1934 for 24 vessels—in 1935 for 24 vessels—and in 1936 for 20 vessels. Ah, yes, Governor Dewey, the record of your party is that prior to 1933 and after the Washington Naval Limitation Conference of 1922 that your party was in power failed to keep the strength of the United States Navy up to that authorized by the treaty. You forget this tragedy.

As to the Army, the President had recommended that the Army be brought up to at least peacetime strength and on the 8th day of April, 1935, the President in an appropriation for the War Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1936, called the attention of the country to two things. First. That the Army contained only 118,750 enlisted men and that the peacetime strength was 165,000 enlisted men. He further said in that statement, which apparently someone has forgotten:

> In recent years, this peacetime strength average (of 120 enlisted men to a company, troop, or battery) has been whittled away until it now barely averages 70 enlisted men per company, troop, or battery. And that this law restores the basic units to their peacetime strength.

Ah, Governor Dewey, was it intentional when you failed to mention the tragedy of whittling down the Army under the three former administrations?

Year after year the President, in messages to Congress, in statements on bills, or in talks to the American people, called their attention to the dangers that existed overseas. The American people will remember what the Governor has forgotten, but it might be advisable for me to remind some of the adherents of the Republican nominee for the Presidency of some things that happened. So if it pleases you, I ask you, Have you forgotten the million or more rifles and the ammunition that we, the United States, let defenseless England have after the retreat from Dunkerque?

Has he—your nominee for the Presidency—forgotten the agreement that the United States made with Iceland? I shall never forget it, for I can remember the moans of anguish that went up from the Republicans.

Has the Governor forgotten the Chicago speech of the President—the quarantine speech—and the abuse which was heaped upon the President when he warned the Nation of the approaching danger?

Has he forgotten the very severe and unjustified criticism which was turned upon the President because his administration continued diplomatic relationships with the so-called Vichy government of Marshal Petain? Now we know—and most of the Republicans should know—that the purpose of this relationship was to prevent the French Fleet from falling into the hands of Nazi Germany. I think it was said by John Barry, writing for the Boston Globe:

> Had the Nazis taken, or obtained, the French Fleet, the naval superiority of Great Britain in the Mediterranean might have been upset and the whole course of the war altered and its length prolonged.

Has the Governor forgotten, in the stress of his campaigning, the 50 destroyers that the President let Great Britain have at the time Hitler and the Nazis were preparing to invade England?

Can anyone forget the flood of criticism turned loose on the President by many Republicans in the Nation?

Are all of these acts of the President, and the legislation passed by the Democratic Congress, not preparing for a strong national defense? Are they the acts of an administration and a man who did nothing?

Mr. Speaker, the record of this administration in national defense prior to the war, and in production, training, equipment, and everything else needed for success during the war, is a record of which every American, unless he is biased by partisan views, can be proud of.

All during these trying days there was a tragedy, and the record will show it—the record will show who supported the efforts of the administration. It will show who was preparing and who was not. Very truly, the Governor must have spoken without thinking of the record of his party in the Congress.

Suppose, then, we examine the record, not the individual record of each and every Member but the record of the two major parties on some of the most important votes that were cast in the House. Any citizen of the country can easily find out how his Representative voted on these most important roll calls.

(a) Let us go back to the naval appropriation bill of 1938, when the great majority of the Republicans voted against an appropriation for $1,000,000 for harbor improvements at Guam; and, then, in February 1939, by a vote of 205 to 168, an amendment carried, striking out an appropriation for $5,000,000 for the harbor improvement at Guam. On this vote for the amendment, 138 Republicans voted for it—15 voted against it.

(b) Everybody today realizes the great work of the Army Air Force but on June 22, 1939, the military airplane appropriation bill was before the House for consideration. An amendment was offered by a Republican reducing the number of planes to be built from 5,500 to 4,217, or a reduction of 1,283. On that roll call, only 5 Republicans voted against it and 122 voted for the cut. Mind you, this was just a few months before Germany attacked Poland. That amendment was defeated 217 to 150. Which party, may I ask you, on that roll call was making no preparations?

(c) On the repeal of the mandatory arms embargo on June 30, 1929, the House adopted an amendment of the gentleman from Ohio providing for a mandatory embargo on the exports of arms and ammunition to belligerent states. This, of course, made it impossible to ship supplies to England after war was declared on Germany. On this roll call 61 Democrats voted for the embargo, 165 voted against it, while 150 Republicans voted for it and only 8 against it. Later on, on December 2, 1939, the embargo was defeated by 243 to 181. On this vote 140 Republicans voted against the bill for the repeal, none voted for it, and 244 Democrats voted for the bill and 31 against it. Which party, then, was the one which did not want any preparations?

(d) Then we come to a very important bill—the conscription bill, which was one of the most important. It was one which really meant something. All preparations centered around it. This bill was absolutely necessary to national defense. Everyone knew that you could not get enough voluntary enlistments and on September 9, 1940, the vote was 263 for the bill and 150 against it. Two hundred and ten Democrats voted for it, 53 Republicans voted for it, 112 Republicans voted against it, 34 Democrats voted against it, and 4 of other parties voted against it. Surely Governor Dewey must have known that 112 Republicans wanted no preparation at all.

(e) On February 6, 1941, another very important bill which was necessary both in the preparations for national defense and the preparation for any eventuality that might take place passed the House. This was the lend-lease bill. Its provisions would give those countries fighting Hitler, nazi-ism, and all the abominable things it stands for, a credit in the United States for arms, ammunition, materials of war, food, and clothing. The vote upon this bill was very important to the welfare of the Nation and its preparation and yet we find that 236 Democrats voted for it—25 Democrats voted against it—135 Republicans voted against it and I think only 25 for it and 5 from other parties voted against it. Most assuredly the Des Moines statement would not have been given out if the Governor had thought of this vote. When the appropriation bill came up for consideration for the first lend-lease bill there were 55 votes cast against it, 45 of whom were Republicans.

(f) Just less than 4 months before Pearl Harbor the bill for the extension of the selective service, or draft bill, was considered by the House on August 12, 1941. Let me give you that vote because the bill extended the selective service, otherwise, all men would have been discharged: 182 Democrats and 21 Republicans voted for it; 65 Democrats and 133 Republicans, along with 4 others, voted against the extension. In analyzing this vote, one will see the tragedy of it: 203 Members voted for continuing the selective service and 202 voted against it. One wonders how this vote was advertised in Japan, and then one wonders if in the oriental Japanese mind—thinking that America would not fight—that it brought on the treacherous attack on Pearl Harbor.

Who, may I ask you, were the ones who did not want this preparation? It was not the majority, and it was not the President.

(g) On October 17, 1941, a bill was passed repealing the ban on the arming of our ships. The vote was 259 to 138—220 Democrats and 39 Republicans voted for the bill while 113 Republicans and 21 Democrats and 3 others voted against it. This was a bill permitting the Nation to prepare. Which party voted against it?

May I not remind the Governor that it is a tragedy for anyone, whether he is seeking public office or not, to make statements without first investigating all the facts. The American people realize what this administration has done and what it attempted to do over obstacles in the Congress for national defense and in the war effort.

Mr. Speaker, the Nation is still in the war. For months now—ever since we have been in the war—I have heard little praise on this floor of the magnificent courage, bravery, and fortitude of the men and women of our armed forces. It seems to me that the greater part of the minority think only of the small things that have happened in this country.

I came back around the 1st of September. I had visited many points in the country. I had seen many people engaged in various kinds of work for the war effort thinking and talking about the war and what our soldiers are doing—not just about some minor sacrifice that we had made here at home. As I said, I came back and I heard here on the floor about the speech that the President made at Bremerton Navy Yard being a political speech. Up in Alaska I listened very carefully to that speech. There was nothing political in it. The only thing that might be construed in any way political was the President's statement about victory. Sometimes I wonder if some of those who criticized that speech do not like victory to come to the United States on account of Mr. Roosevelt being the President. Among other things, I heard the piffle talk about a dog being lost in the Aleutians and having to send back after it when there was not anything to it. I heard the talk about a great number of battleships and cruisers accompanying the President on the trip that he made as Commander in Chief. I heard the talk about Mrs. Roosevelt and how much gasoline had been used on her trip to Australia. Someone evidently did not take the time to investigate the facts—all the facts about that trip. They did not undertake to find out how many soldiers were on the plane or whether or not the plane was going that way. All of this could have been found out, but it seems to me that the greater part of the talk that I have heard on this floor is mere gossip. Gossip ill befitting men who have a serious task confronting them. The more I think about what is ahead of us the more I think of the poem which I shall repeat:

God give us men! A time like this demands
Strong minds, stout hearts, true faith, and ready hands;
Men whom the lust of office does not kill;
Men whom the spoils of office cannot buy;
Men who express opinions and a will;
Men who have honor; men who will not lie!

SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON POST-WAR ECONOMIC POLICY AND PLANNING

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of House Resolution 639.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That 6,000 additional copies of House Report No. 1855, current session, containing the fourth report of the Special Committee on Post-War Economic Policy and Planning of the House of Representatives,

entitled "Economic Problems of the Reconversion Period," be printed, with illustrations, of which 3,000 shall be for the use of the special committee and 3,000 for the House document room.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

Mr. BOREN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the special committee set up under House Resolution 98 may have until midnight tonight to file a report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. PITTENGER] be permitted to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. KERR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an excerpt from an address delivered by Dr. Paul B. Kern recently at the second southeastern jurisdictional conference of the Methodist Church.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

(Mr. WORLEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.)

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that today, following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a set of questions and answers given over the radio by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK].

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Rhode Island?

There was no objection.

Mr. STIGLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the Atlanta Constitution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDER

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] is recognized.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BULWINKLE] concluded his remarks with an appeal prayer, "God give us men." I join him in that. I would add to it a prayer that while the Lord is giving us men, He does not give us too many Earl Browders or Sidney Hillmans; we have enough of those.

In the Chicago Tribune of yesterday I notice this cartoon, which seems to be the gist of the gentleman's speech. It says, "State of the Nation according to the Democrats." Here is shown a flag on the top of the Capitol. It reads, "The indispensable man." It shows Uncle Sam marching down the road with the aid of a cane, head bowed, and at the top is the caption "A nation of 135,000,000 people and only 1 person fit to run it—what am I going to do in the years and the centuries to come? Oh, woe is me!" Back of Uncle Sam stands an Indian, quoted as saying, "No give 'um country back to Indian—too much 'um heap big debt."

The thought of the New Deal, the Communists' candidate seems to be that he is the only man among 135,000,000 capable of being President.

A sorry state would we be in if that were true. As the gentleman from Alabama told us yesterday, General Marshall is doing, has done, and will continue to do a magnificent job of winning the war; and, as for the home front, the record shows the occupant of the White House has failed at every turn, that his contribution consists in giving to one individual or group what another has earned and saved. As a distributor of other people's earnings and savings he is a master.

The gentleman correctly stated that Presidential candidates—may I add to that "all candidates for public office"—should be careful about their statements, should be accurate; for, do our best, most inadvertently slip into inaccuracies.

What a strange request to come from anyone advocating a fourth term, that is, a statement that candidates should be accurate, that candidates should be, may I say, truthful.

I do not have before me the figure as to the number of unemployed in 1940—it was given by Mr. Dewey, the Republican candidate, and the record will show whether or not he was accurate—but I do know this, as does every Member of this House, that in spite of all the leaf raking, in spite of the expenditure of millions, yes, billions of dollars, the unemployment problem was not cured by the New Deal, and that the anticipated coming of war, only the coming of war itself, gave jobs to millions of unemployed.

It is a fact with which most of our people are familiar.

The figures I have show that during Mr. Roosevelt's first term the average number of unemployed was 11,466,250. The average number of unemployed during his second term was 12,532,000.

I do recall that, in 1936, the President made these boastful statements:

Recovery is with us. Federal revenues are increasing, emergency expenditures are decreasing. A balanced budget is on the way.

The Government has sought and found practical answers to the problems of industry, agriculture, and mining.

* * * Factories singing the song of industry, markets humming with bustling movement, ships and trains running full.

But by January 20 of 1937, the President sang a different song, set to a different tune. Listen to his words:

I see millions of families trying to live on incomes so meager that the pall of family disaster hangs over them day by day.

I see millions whose daily lives in city and on farm continue under conditions labeled indecent by a so-called polite society half a century ago.

I see millions denied education, recreation, and the opportunity to better their lot and the lot of their children.

I see millions lacking the means to buy the products of farm and factory and by their poverty denying work and productiveness to many other millions.

I see one-third of a nation ill-housed, ill-clad, ill-nourished.

And on March 4, 1937, he said:

Here is one third of a nation ill-nourished, ill-clad, ill-housed—now.

And on March 9, 1937, he added for good measure:

I want to talk with you very simply about the need for present action in this crisis—the need to meet the unanswered challenge of one-third of a nation ill-nourished, ill-clad, ill-housed.

"Factories singing the song of industry, markets humming with bustling movement, ships and trains running full"—all the President's creation, according to his view—had reduced to ill-nourished and ill-clad and ill-housed a third of our population. Was it because he planned it that way?

Talk about accuracy. I remember that after Pearl Harbor the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT] made a statement about our losses at Pearl Harbor, and that a day or so after, the President charged that Member of Congress with falsehood, and stated that we had lost no such number of ships, that the damage was not near what the gentleman from Michigan had stated. Then a year later the facts came out, and the Member from Michigan was sustained in every word he had said, and the statement of the President that the Member from Michigan was not telling the truth was shown to be, shall I say, inaccurate.

Then, time and again the President has said that he never interfered in legislation. There is not a Member on the floor or a Member of the House but who knows that that statement is not correct, because time and again he has dictated legislation. On one occasion—

March 13, 1944—I put in the RECORD a list of 17 specific instances where the President had interfered and made certain demands. In fact, Congress, in the past few years, has become so willing to go along and follow his orders that we became known as the "rubber stamp" Congress, as the "yes men" of Congress, and the people began to think that perhaps there was no use at all in having a Congress as long as we had the man in the White House to tell us what we must do.

Then it may be, too, that if there were actually 10,000,000 men unemployed on the date named by Mr. Dewey, perhaps Mr. Dewey or some of those who got the figures for him were thinking of the thousands, the hundreds of thousands of Federal employees who were on the roll but who were not actually employed, were not actually working. Some might class those as unemployed.

I do not know where he got the figures, but I rather think from his record in prosecuting racketeers successfully, that he was as near the facts as anyone.

Someone, a new dealer, as I recall—and this is a little out of the line of what I want to talk about—said that Mr. Dewey is nothing but a prosecuting attorney or racket buster.

Well, if ever there was a country on God's green earth that needed a racket buster, it is the United States of America, and this is the time. For if there ever was, in Washington or throughout the country, a bunch of racketeers, then we have them today. And talking about the political end of it, I note last night a radio announcer said there was going to be a political speech by the President in the latter part of September. As I recall it, it was to be delivered before the teamsters' organization, of which Dan Tobin is the head. Mr. Tobin is the man, you remember, who is backing this scheme or this policy up in New York of charging every teamster who goes into the city with a load $8 or $9 per truck. That is a racket which, I hope, when Mr. Dewey is President, he will break up. The Supreme Court said the Congress did not intend to reach that kind of racketeering when it passed a certain act. This House thereafter passed an amendment to the act which, if made a part of the law, would have stopped it. But it never got through over on the other side. Yes; there is in this country a task for a racket buster. It may be that some new dealers fear they will find themselves in jail if Mr. Dewey enters the White House. Then the gentleman went on and he talked about the appropriations which the Republicans voted against. Now, this occurs to me, if the President knew what he was talking about in the days gone by, and he said he did, on one occasion he told the Congress that it should keep its nose out of foreign affairs. He, not the Congress, is responsible for any lack of preparedness. He said, without any qualification, that he knew more about the facts which have to do with the foreign situation and the foreign policy which this country should follow than any one else. He said that he had means of information which were closed to the Congress of the United States. Well, coming from the President of the United States, some folks accepted that statement as true and thought that he knew what should be done. So they went along with many of his statements and some of his demands. Some of us voted against some of his demands, for if we believed him, his requests were wholly unreasonable, and unnecessary appropriations would have been passed. If he was using the information which was available to him when he told us, as he did, on that 30th day of October 1940, in Boston, that our boys were not going to be sent to fight on foreign soil, if he knew what he was talking about, if he was telling the American people the truth, then there was no need for conscription. If he meant what he said when, prior to that, he told us that there was no excuse for nations going into war if they had the courage to say "No," I say, if he meant it, if he had the courage to which he made reference, then there was no need for many of the things for which he asked; no need for the appropriations which he was asking for at that time. And the gentleman talks about lend-lease. Was lend-lease devised to get us into war, or was it not? I voted against lend-lease, and I have not the slightest regret for any vote I cast in the previous sessions of Congress. More recently, after we were in the war, we were told by the publisher and the owner of the New York Times, that lend-lease put us into the war.

Many of us when we voted against it, believed it was a step toward war. I, for one, regret no vote of mine which would have aided in keeping our boys at home. Maybe some folks treat the fact that hundreds of thousands of Americans are being killed across the seas, is not too great a price to pay for a place in the sun of world power politics, but I am telling you now, as I have said before, I would not sacrifice one single American boy to save some war-minded power politicians across the seas. I would not give the life of one American boy for all of Germany and all of Russia. We have no need, we want neither country nor anything they have. When they told us, as they did, that the British Navy was the first line of defense, I wonder whether they had in mind the South Pacific. I wonder now whether our first line of defense against the Japanese is the British Navy, or whether it ever will be. I wonder whether all the things we have given to Russia, all the lives that have been sacrificed for the cause of Russia, are going to be paid for, insofar as they can be—of course, they never can be—by aid which Russia will give us in our war against Japan.

I could go on down through the talk made by the gentleman from North Carolina if time permitted and show that every vote cast by Republicans was designed to keep us out of war; that the things demanded by the President tended to get us into war. The gentleman from North Carolina said something about Guam. We all know the record of that vote and what the proposition was. What would it have availed to have spent more money and sent more men and more ships to Guam if it was to share the fate of Pearl Harbor and Singapore? Will the President today come forth and lift the bar which has kept from the American people the facts as to who was at fault in the disaster that happened at Pearl Harbor? Was the President to blame because our ships were caught like sitting ducks? They criticize us because we voted against an appropriation for airplanes. Before me sits the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. ENGEL] who told you when that appropriation was under consideration, he being a member of the subcommittee that handled it, that the planes they wanted were then, at that very time, outmoded, out of date, and inefficient, and could not be effectively used in modern warfare. No doubt he will have something to say on that subject today.

Let us get down to today, to tomorrow. Yet there are some things in the past that tell us, if we consider them, what kind of a future we will have. Do you remember the sit-down strikes? They were all pulled by an organization controlled by Communists. That was the beginning of the Communist drive to by force take over industry, take over our Government, and the C. I. O. was not rebuked by the President. In fact his hand-picked governor aided it. I see before me the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. LESINSKY] who belongs on the majority side, nodding his head. If anyone in this House is more familiar than he with the C. I. O., and its inside workings, I do not know the name of the gentleman. He has discovered in recent months, in recent days, that the C. I. O. is controlled by Communists. I do not mean the rank and file, because nine-tenths of the membership are loyal and patriotic and do their utmost, but I refer to the leaders in it; the fellows who pull the wires, who control their political action.

Now, the thing has been brought down to date and you have what? You have the indispensable man. Do you remember when he talked to us and said he wanted to be the quarterback directing the plays? Oh! He has lost that job. Sidney Hillman and Earl Browder are the quarterbacks. The Communists are calling the plays. I do not say "Birds of a feather flock together," because that is a loose, broad expression and is seldom accurate or true, is often abused, but I do say that people do not bite the hand that feeds them. Sidney is now repaying the awarding of the contracts for the manufacture of servicemen's clothing.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] has expired.

EXTENSION OF CERTAIN OIL AND GAS LEASES

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for

the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 2111) to provide for the extension of certain oil and gas leases.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

Mr. MICHENER. Reserving the right to object, that is the bill that was brought up yesterday, and the Senate amendments were agreed to?

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. No, sir; this is a Senate bill. This is the bill I discussed with the gentleman yesterday. We intended to call up the House bill, but the Senate bill has been passed. The House bill was reported unanimously. It simply does for another year what we did a year ago. We thought we might be able to extend the time for drilling and operation. They have had a hard time in getting drilling equipment, leases, and so forth.

Mr. MICHENER. I remember. It is a bill in which the gentleman from Wyoming is interested.

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. Yes; the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. BARRETT], and the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. FERNANDEZ]. The committee held rather extensive hearings and reported the bill unanimously.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MICHENER. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. This is a bill sponsored in the Senate by Senator O'MAHONEY.

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. Yes; Senator O'MAHONEY sponsored the bill in the Senate. It has passed the Senate.

Mr. McCORMACK. I merely wanted to identify it.

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. Yes. The gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. FERNANDEZ] and the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. BARRETT] are interested in the House.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

S. 2111

An act to provide for the extension of certain oil and gas leases

Be it enacted, etc., That the last sentence in the first section of the act entitled "An act to grant a preference right to certain oil and gas leases," approved July 29, 1942, as amended, is hereby amended to read as follows: "The term of any 5-year lease expiring prior to December 31, 1945, maintained in accordance with the applicable statutory requirements and regulations and for which no preference right to a new lease is granted by this section, is hereby extended to December 31, 1945."

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider and a similar House bill (H. R. 5283), to provide for the extension of certain oil and gas leases, were laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I also ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a letter signed by 11 men at the front.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD a speech delivered by Charles Rozmarek, president of the Polish-American Congress, on the fifth anniversary of the invasion of Poland. I consider it a very pertinent speech at this particular time.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT OF NATIONALITY ACT

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. LESINSKI] desire recognition?

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk a concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 99) for immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the Clerk of the House of Representatives in the enrollment of the bill H. R. 4271, to amend the Nationality Act of 1940 to preserve the nationality of citizens residing abroad, is authorized and directed to strike out the word "six" which appears in the proviso and insert in lieu thereof the word "five."

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, is this the bill that was considered yesterday and amended, reducing the time from 6 years to 5?

Mr. LESINSKI. That is correct. The difficulty arises because of the fact that the correction was made in one section of the bill, but not in the other. The second correction should be made on page 2, line 4, changing the word "six" to "five." It can be done only by a concurrent resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There was no objection.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ANNA M. KOHLER

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 1434) for the relief of Anna M. Kohler, with a Senate amendment and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill and the Senate amendment, as follows:

Senate amendment: On line 7 strike out all after the word "insofar", down to and including the word "concerned", in line 9 and insert "As her admission that she had previously sworn falsely in connection with her applications for admission and an extension of stay may be concerned."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an article recently appearing in the Boston Globe.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include therein an editorial from the Shenandoah Evening Sentinel.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. ENGEL] is recognized for 20 minutes.

PENTAGON BUILDING COSTS

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, on February 29, 1944, I made a report to the House on the total cost and on March 6, 1944, I made a report on the operating cost of the Pentagon Building.

WAR DEPARTMENT PROPOSES TO PURCHASE 67 ACRES FOR PENTAGON AREA—WE END UP BY PURCHASING 400 ACRES

At the time these reports were made, I pointed out the fact that when the War Department first came before the Appropriations Committee they represented that 67 acres of land known as the Agricultural Experimental Farm would be adequate for their purpose without the purchase of additional land, providing it could have 146 acres known as the old Hoover Airport.

I further stated:

We now find that they are purchasing some 400 acres of land at an estimated cost of $4,547,084, of which $3,877,301 has already been marked as expended.

I stated at that time that I had not completed my investigation on these rights-of-way, but would make a supplemental report as soon as that part was completed.

Mr. Speaker, I am including a statement giving a report on approximately 400 acres of land which were purchased by the Federal Works Agency in the Pentagon area. I have a copy of the individual descriptions, but as they are rather lengthy, I did not include them in the report, but gave only the tract number. In addition to the descriptions, I also have the acreage purchased in most instances. This table shows the tract number, the name or names of the owner from whom purchased, the latest assessed valuation, the upset price, the percentage of the upset price over the assessed valuation and the final award and the percentage of the award over the assessed valuation. I am informed that property in Virginia is assessed at from

30 to 40 percent of actual cash value. While it is true that these tracts were bought through the United States District Court in and for the Eastern District of Virginia, I understand that the values were fixed as a rule by the Commissioners and then consented to by the owners and a value arrived at by stipulation.

TAXPAYERS PAY AS HIGH AS 26 TIMES THE ASSESSED VALUATION

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD a table compiled under my direction giving the tract numbers of all lands purchased in the Pentagon area and other information heretofore referred to. This table contains the following information:

Tract No. 53 was owned by one Mary J. Norris. The assessed valuation was $240. The final award was $6,250 or 2,640 percent of the assessed valuation, or more than 26 times the assessed valuation.

Tract No. 52 was owned by one Luther Edwards. The assessed valuation was $240. The final award was $6,150 or 2,563 percent of the assessed valuation or nearly 26 times the assessed valuation.

Tract No. 349 was owned by one R. E. Cline. The assessed valuation was $380. The final award was $9,354 or 2,435 percent of the assessed valuation. The Government paid 24⅓ times the assessed valuation.

Tract No. 133 was owned by Pearl Mitchell Willis. The assessed valuation was $60. The final award was $1,110 or 1,850 percent or 18½ times the assessed valuation.

Tract No. 251 was owned by Louis A. Johnson, also known as Jackson. The assessed valuation was $480. The final award was $5,400 or 1,125 percent or more than 11 times the assessed valuation.

Tracts Nos. 94 and 95 were owned by Max Hyman. The assessed valuation was $3,380. The final award was $35,000 or more than 10 times the assessed valuation.

Tracts Nos. 30 and 30–A were owned by the West Bros. Brick Co. The upset price or appraised valuation was $542,-610. The final award was $1,100,000, or twice the appraised value. Due to the complicated description, I was not able to get the assessed valuation of this tract.

Out of 118 tracts where I was able to obtain both the assessed valuation and the award price, I found that as per the table following:

Eight owners were paid more than 10 times the assessed valuation.

Nine owners were paid from 7 to 10 times the assessed valuation.

Nine more owners were paid from six to seven times the assessed valuation.

Nineteen owners were paid between five and six times the assessed valuation.

Twenty-nine owners were paid between four and five times the assessed valuation.

The remainder were paid up to four times the assessed valuation.

TAXPAYERS PAID FIVE AND ONE-THIRD TIMES THE ASSESSED VALUATION ON 118 TRACTS

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD another table compiled under my supervision and direction showing the relation of the award price to the assessed value on 118 tracts where both the award price and the assessed value were known. This table shows that for these 118 tracts the total assessed valuation was $338,135, while the total award price was $1,802,-877 or five and one-third times the assessed valuation of the property. There were 19 tracts for which no assessment was found and for which the award price was $1,347,013. These 2 groups of 137 tracts where the assessment was known and unknown and where the award price had been made, aggregated a total of $3,149,890. I wish to repeat again that I am informed that in Virginia the assessed value is approximately from 30 to 40 percent of the actual value of the property assessed. It is my opinion and recommendation that some congressional committee make a thorough investigation into the purchase of these lands. I am satisfied that the taxpayers obtained value received for the vast majority of the smaller tracts. I believe, however, that we are entitled to have the reasons why some owners received as high as 26 times the assessed valuation.

The following statement gives the name of the owner, the tract number, assessed valuation, percent upset over assessed, percent award over assessed, and the amount of final award of each parcel of land purchased by the Federal Works Agency in the Pentagon area. I have the individual descriptions of each tract number in my files, but due to the fact that these descriptions are rather lengthy, I did not include them in the report:

EXHIBIT A

Statement giving information on land purchases in the Pentagon Building area

Tract No.	Name	Assessed valuation	Upset price	Percent upset over assessed	Percent award over assessed	Final award
19	Paul Collins, John S. Wynne, Eugene L. Vidal, Sam J. Solomon	$6,400	$14,800	66		
20	National Airport Corporation		19,350			$26,500.00
21	Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey		24,650			35,000.00
22	William H. Lipcomb, H. Rozier Dulaney, Jr.	8,240	33,915	412	498	41,000.00
23	American Oil Co	32,680	96,725	296	688	225,000.00
24	Southern Oxygen Co	26,020	122,000	469	826	215,000.00
25	Mrs. Charles Baum	13,680	30,000	220	378	51,650.00
26	Norton & Co	20,380	72,300	354	696	142,500.00
18	Estate of George D. Horning	29,740	108,300	364		
27	The Texas Co	33,120	79,700	241	332	110,000.00
28	G. D. Horning	4,200	13,000	310		
29	The Separate Recovery Co	16,220	44,000	271	462	75,000.00
30	West Bros. Brick Co		447,000			[1] 1,100,000.00
30A	do		95,610			
32	M. Siegal		16,000			20,000.00
33	The Georgetown Corporation	17,000	47,153	276	582	100,000.00 [1] 104,156.00
33A	Carrie P. Ford	6,660	16,500	248	[1] 322	21,500.00
33B	Esther K. Julian	1,960	2,788	[1] 142		
33C	Benjamin S. and Dorothy C. Kilmaster	1,600	2,526	158		
34	Harris Levy	9,080	30,445	335	354	32,145.00
35	Elsie Younger	1,700	6,000	353	382	6,500.00
36	Frank Nelson	1,700	5,500	323		
37	Ellen Craig	1,500	5,500	366	383	5,750.00
38 and 51	Edwin C. Worden	1,400	4,500	321	1,250	23,500.00
39	Commonwealth of Virginia		5,000			
40	Irving A. Goodwin	1,860	6,000	322	349	6,500.00
41	See No. 34 (par. of this)					6,200.00
42	do			(2)		18,000.00
43	Eva Mae Walters	1,700	5,500	323	418	7,100.00
44	Robert A. Linton	1,700	5,500	323	382	6,500.00
45	See No. 34					
46	Paul and Mary Scandone		5,500			5,800.00
47	See No. 34					
50	W. S. Worden	2,100	10,500	500	619	13,000.00
51 and 38	Sarah Tavenner	480	12,500	269		23,500.00
52	Luther Edwards	240	6,000	2,500	2,563	6,150.00
53	Mary J. Norris	240	6,000	2,500	2,640	6,250.00

[1] Plus.
[2] See 45 and 47.

Statement giving information on land purchases in the Pentagon Building area—Continued

Tract No.	Name	Assessed valuation	Upset price	Percent upset over assessed	Percent award over assessed	Final award
54	Ralph & Olive C. Compton	$1,900	$6,000	315		
55	Charles I. Greer	1,640	1,700			
56	Hydraulic Pressed Brick Co					$60,000.00
	See No. 51					
	See No. 38					
57	Charles E. Kenney	1,000	5,000	500	600	6,000.00
58	Frank Riffius	400	1,200	300		
59	Eliza Barbour	1,200	4,000	333⅓	375	4,500.00
60	William D. Edmonson	500	2,000	400		
61	Edward G. Duncan	600	1,500	250		
62	Jessie A. Richards (98, 218–219)	7,900	12,500	158	399	31,500.00
63	M. R. O'Sullivan	400	450	113		
64	Harry Seigel	200	650	325	488	975.00
65	Katie Siegal	1,000	3,000	300	318	3,175.00
66	Harry Siegal	1,000	2,000	210	410	4,100.00
67	Albert Shanklin	1,200	3,500	292		
68	Rosa Wood	500	1,600	320		
69	Albert Shanklin	500	1,600	320		
70	W. E. Richmond (110)	1,000	1,600	160	515	[3] 5,150.00
71–72	Wilby and Wilhelmina Fisher	1,100	3,500	318		
73	George Taylor	600	2,350	392		
74	Sarah E. Gibson	200	500	250		
75	Lewis Dixson	800	2,700	338		
76	Rachel Muse	400	1,000	250	300	1,200.00
77	Wil iam . Brittain	1,200	3,000	250		
78	Isaac H. Rives		800			1,050.00
79	Harry Thomas	440	1,100	250		
80	James and Lillian Johnson		1,400			2,000.00
81	Bertha O. Jackson	1,180	4,000	339	406	4,800.00
82	William D. Jackson	1,100	3,100	280	527	3,600.00
83	Joseph Hyman	200	500	250		
84	Harry L. Carpel	1,800	6,500	361	389	7,000.00
85	H. B. Fields	700	1,200	171		
85	Edward Duncan					
85	William C. Gloth					
86	Willie Marshall	200	600	300		
87	Addie Houchin	200	500	250		
88	Willie Marshall	860	4,500	523		
89	Wilfred Charles Gilbert, Jr	400	1,250	313		
90	Minnie W. Corbett	1,100	1,100	None		
90	Edith L. Corbett					
91	Roger F. Jones	3,200	4,500	140	344	11,000.00
92	Clarence R. Ahelt		3,000			
93	Fenton O. and Helen O. Goldman		1,800			
94	Max Hyman	520	1,000	192	1,033	35,000.00
95	Max Hyman	2,860	19,000	664		
96	Lucy S. Coran	900	4,250	472		
97	William Thomas	700	1,900	271		
98 (62, 218–219)	Jessie A. Richards	4,200	5,400	129		
99	Isaac E. Clinkett	300	1,100	367	467	1,400.00
100	Garnett H. Ward	500	3,000	600		
101	Benjamin E. Foster	820	4,850	591		
102	Abraham Patoon		2,100			
103	Herman Kadan	200	900	450		
104	Edward G. Dunan	200	1,200	600		
105, 106	Carrie M. Edwards	600	3,150	525		
107	Edward G. Duncan	900	2,400	267		
108		100	350	350		
109	Eugene and Nellie V. Lee	200	1,050	350		
110	(70)	500	1,600	320		
111	Parker Overton	400	2,250	563		
112	Pinkie F. Jenkins	500	2,200	440		
113	Harris Leroy	500	1,500	300	320	1,600.00
113	A. Jack and Rossie Williams	400	1,350	338		
114	Everett and Florence Hutton	300	1,550	517	533	1,600.00
115	United House of Prayer		2,500			
116	John F. Brooks	100	400	400		
117	William Whiteside	100	625	625		
118	Home Owners' Loan Corporation	700	1,750	250		
119	Mary A. and Clayton Dorsey	600	1,600	267		
120	Mamie O. Hughes	600	1,550	258	272	1,700.00
121	Aimes G. Rucker	300	1,000	334		
122	Ida Farnce	700	2,600	371		
123	Lizzie Washington	500	1,600	320		1,800.00
124	Pearl Mitchell Willis	300	1,700	567		
125	John Minor	100	300	300		
126	Mary Anderson	100	300	300		
127	Washington and Eliza Towels	400	1,650	413	444	1,775.00
128	Walton and Eva Harris	300	1,400	467	533	
129	Sarah Ewell	100	300			
130	Katie Austin	100	300	300		
131	Isabella Drummond	100	350	350		
132	Charles Harris	780	1,400	180		
133	Pearl Mitchell Willis	60	900	1,500	1,850	1,110.00
133-A	James L. Robinson	260	800	308		
134	Ida Gray	700	1,500	214		
135	Washington and Eliza Towels	460	1,400	304	348	1,600.00
136	Elizabeth Gray Mitchell	660	1,800	273		
137	Elva Brooks	240	1,200	500		
138	Thomas and Rachel Johnson	520	850	163		
139	William Crown	400	1,350	338		
140	Carrie Sims	300	900	300		
141	Cornelius Lyon	100	300	300		
142	Aaron M. Lyon	100	300	300		
143	Lewis Parker	600	2,200	367		
144	Unknown		300			[3] $3,900.00
145	East Arlington Volunteer Fire Department		3,500			
146	Robert Ware	200	650	325		
147	John A. Thorp	200	600	300	450	900.00
148	Royal D. Moorsman	200	600	300		
149	Virginia Whitney	400	2,000	500		
150	Julia Avery	200	1,100	550		
151	Martha Bailey	600	3,500	583		

[3] Includes tract 110.

Statement giving information on land purchases in the Pentagon Building area—Continued

Tract No.	Name	Assessed valuation	Upset price	Percent upset over assessed	Percent award over assessed	Final award
152	N. J. Rogers	$160	$1,100	688		
153	Ruth Maude Broks	160	600	[4]375		$800.00
154	Kate Nepper	500	1,659	330		
155	Blanche Owens	200	1,800	900		
156	Edward and Addie Conoroy	1,200	5,950	458		
157	T. D. Sims	780	2,150	276		
158	Charles Watzman	200	500	250		
159	Max Hyman		100			
160	do	3,180	6,000	191	267	8,500.00
161	Fillmore Peyton	600	2,000	333		
162	Evelyn Muse	1,000	2,650	265		
163	William Dabney	500	1,500	300	370	1,850.00
164	Major Dabney	100	400	400		
165	Louis Rose Jackson	400	900	225		
166	Isaac Clinkett	100	600	600		
167	William H. Walker	800	4,500	563		
168	Lavina Gray and Mrs. Lavinia Holmes	720	3,300	458		
169	Charles E. Kenny	1,320	3,400	258	303	4,000.00
170	Washington and Julia V. Dean	940	4,000	426	567	5,328.00
171	Abraham Patton	180	400	222	556	1,000.00
172	Unknown		300			
173	Mary Barnes	100	900	900		
174	John and James Madison	520	2,150	413	433	2,250.00
175	Archie and Maxie Rowe	520	2,000	385	481	2,500.00
176	Anne Hunter	1,320	6,000	455	500	6,600.00
177	East Arlington Citizens Assembly	200	400	200		
178	Vietta Douglas	480	950	198		
179	Federal Finance & Realty Co		1,900			2,500.00
179	Rebecca Bowman					
180	Fred Odom	700	1,600	229	307	2,150.00
181	Eva Harris	400	1,100	275	400	1,600.00
182	Moalboard Co	200	1,500	750	900	1,800.00
183	William Odum	900	2,750	306		
184	William Heayden	200	700	350		
185	Maria Nichols	100	1,600	1,600		
186	William H. Lomax	700	350	50		
187	Nellie V. Tibbs	800	2,500	313		
188	Eva and Walter Harris	600	2,750	458		
189	Nothing listed					
190	Virgie Veneg	1,760	4,600	261	284	5,000.00
191	George E. Tollins	800	1,400	175		
192	Robert Hill	320	1,200	375		
193	Alice Green	320	1,300	406		
194	Cabin Lee and Alrealia Hargrove	420	2,500	595		
195	Gertrude Miller	560	1,600	286		
196	Core R. Brown	660	3,300	500		
197	Home Owners' Loan Corporation	760	3,000	395		
201	Ike and Emme Veney	700	4,250	607		
200	John Isaac Veney	900	2,000	222		
199	Viogee Veney	1,020	2,300	225		
203	Wilfred and Ella Peyton	460	1,750	380	435	2,000.00
204	Sam S. and Dora Smith	460	2,100	380	489	2,250.00
205	Virgie Veney	700	3,000	429		
208	Richard Simmons					
209	Annie Campbell	600	300	50		
209A	Arlington County		2,000			3,300.00
210	John J. P. Young	160	500	313		
211	Isaac Jackson	400	1,500	375		
212	Jane Scott	100	650	650		
213	Lee Hargrove	200	760	380		
214	Ella Lewis and First Federal Savings Loan	700	3,500	500		
215	Unknown		1,900			
216	Aaron Brown	200	800	400		
217	Ashton C. Jones	80	1,080	1,350		
218	Jessie A. Richards (62 and 98)	4,900	8,400	171		
219						
220	Eva Harris	940	1,900	202		
221	Josephine B. Smith	100	350	350		
222	Walter Harris	1,100	3,600	327	345	3,800.00
223	Eva Harris	600	1,300	217		
224	Charles Watkins Lee	100	900	900		
225	Eliza J. Towell	260	885	340		
226	Dennis Watkins	1,160	2,850	246		
227	Lewis Johnson	360	1,300	361		
228	Blanche Berry	500	2,400	280		
229	Fascination Smith	260	1,150	442		
230	Abe Smith	500	1,700	340		
231	Eliza Hill	100	415	415		
232	Susie Beverly	140	1,200	857		
233	Mary Jane Smith	100	415	415		
234	Susie Beverly	500	1,600	320		
235	Elizabeth Simons	160	535	334		
236	Alice Lee	720	2,012	280		
237	Dan Beverly	760	2,000	263		
238	Carl and Theodore J. Heller	2,880	12,000	417	520	15,000.00
239	Joseph T. Gibbon	2,940	16,000	578	901	26,500.00
239A	Max Hyman	520	2,000	385	433	2,250.00
239B	Richard B. Dolph	660	3,000	455		
239C	James and Earl Barke (formerly owned by F. Bucholz)	1,160	6,000	517	828	9,600.00
239D	Estate of J. Bowen	900	2,500	278	333	3,000.00
239E	W. E. Burke	600	6,000	1,000		
240	Frederick Bucholz	12,260	35,000	285	971	119,000.00
241	Christina Bucholz	8,320	14,000	168	313	26,000.00
242	Mount Zion Baptist Church		30,000			
243	Heirs of F. R. Windson	3,180	10,000	314		
244	Riggs National Bank	12,920	25,000	193	406	52,500.00
245	Sidney R. Johnson	11,900	16,000	134	453	53,881.00
246	George A. Stoner	2,320	5,000	211	332	7,700.00
247	Robert F. Nichols	2,580	7,000	271	533	13,750.00
248	Nannie M. Rollins		9,000			25,000.00
249	William H. Skinner	7,700	6,000	78	519	40,000.00
250	Rachel Richardson	1,140	3,000	263	404	4,600.00

[4] Change 500 percent.

Statement giving information on land purchases in the Pentagon Building area—Continued

Tract No.	Name	Assessed valuation	Upset price	Percent upset over assessed	Percent award over assessed	Final award
251	Louis A. Johnson (Jackson)	$480	$3,000	625	1,125	$5,400.00
252	Harriet I. Thomas	80	1,500	1,875		
253	Laudimia Jackson	300	250	83		
254	William Jones	100	250	250		
255	Nancy Johnson	200	250	125		
256	Dallis Jones	220	250	114	136	300.00
256A	do	140	50	36		
256B	Mary H. Hines	640	100	16	23	150.00
256C	Jobie R. Parks	540	100	18		
256D	Ida Summerville	200	50	25	224	3,775.00
256E	do	200	25	13		
257	Joseph W. Wormley	1,200	3,500	292		
258	Richard Contee	140	300	214	357	500.00
259	Rufus Dade	250	1,500	600		
263	William Minor Estate	140	75	54		
263A	Jerry Samuels	440	50	11		
	See 256E, 266-277					
263B	W. M. Minor estate	112	25	22		
264	F. P. Bachus		100			
265	James A. Ball	280	50	13		
266	Ida Summerville	1,160	2,500	216		
267	Grant Hines	40	100	250	500	200.00
268	M. Harcum	320	300	93		
269	Emma Jackson	520	1,200	230	673	3,500.00
270	Martha Goldman	180	400	222	472	850.00
271	Grant Hines	120	225	187	792	950.00
272	Isaac Hines	60	225	370	417	250.00
273	Benjamin Hines	120	300	250		
274	Georgianna Jackson	80	250	313		
275 (?)	Columbus Brown	280	200	71	429	1,200.00
276	John H. Caster	460	800	174	261	1,200.00
277	Ida Summerville	125	500	400		
278	Lillian Lore	140	150	107		
279	Elmer R. Duncan	460	200	43		
280	Ida Summerville	125	100	80		
281	Louis Ward	240	200	83		
282	I. Sanders	140	200	143		
283	Maggie Fields	80	750	938		
284	Ernest Pollard	220	150	68	773	1,700.00
284A	Julia Jackson	500	1,200	240	505	2,525.00
285	Susie Willis	240	100	42		
286	Unknown		700			
287	Cecelia Henderson	140	100	71	154	215.00
288	Martha Wilder	140	150	107		
289	C. L. Pritchard	100	250	250		
290 (?)	Florence Green	440	1,000	227	511	2,250.00
291 (?)	Disney Peim	540	800	148	537	2,900.00
292 (?)	H. W. Mitchell	920	1,000	109	533	4,900.00
293 (?)	Amelia Smith	160	300	188		
294 (?)	Katherine Brown	460	700	152	370	1,700.00
295 (?)	Joseph Richardson	560	850	152	482	2,700.00
296 (?)	Unknown		1,000			2,400.00
297 (?)	James A. Bell	160	300	187		
298	William H. Pollard	320	650	203		
301	Mary Bowers	640	1,500	234		
302	William F. Tindell	140	50	36		
305	Harvey Mitchell	140	500	359	571	800.00
306, 307, 308, 309, 310, 311.	Mary Bowers	2,240	775	346		
312	Army, Navy, and Marine Corps Country Club, Inc	1,400	8,000	571		
313	Elmer J. Ewing	4,500	10,000	222		
298A	Lizzie Pollard Teogman	160	150	93		
245A	Phillip Anderson	800				
278	Lillian B. Lore					
279	Elmer H. Duncan					
280	Ida Summerville					
306A	Mary Bowers					
284A-1	Susie Willes					
284A-2	Lewis K. Green					
314-316	Wrennetta Watson, Nathaniel Madden, Wrennetta Watson	4,060	7,800	192	268	10,900.00
315	Nathaniel Madden	2,160	5,000	231		
316	Wrennetta Watson					
317	John H. Castor	380	1,200	316	526	2,000.00
318	Sarah E. Montague	800	2,000	245	406	3,250.00
318A	Moses Dade	220	1,000	455		
319	Lorenzo J. Palmer	680	1,700	250	603	4,100.00
320	Moses Dade	780	4,500	577		
321	James Ward	1,200	3,250	271	500	6,000.00
322	Delano Ward	1,120	3,500	313	446	5,000.00
323	Solomon H. Thompson	280	1,000	357		
24	Roberta H. Osburn	400	50	12		
325	Lottie Edwards	400	250	62		
326	James Hart	1,500	3,500	233	433	6,500.00
327	Minnie Green	1,040	1,500	144		
328	Lizzie C. Rucker	740	1,250	169		
329 (347)	Frank Bettins	180	400	222	277	500.00
329	A. Theodore B. McMullen	180	25	24		
330	B. M. Smith	260	450	173		
331-333	Robert R. Bye	160	200	125	625	1,000.00
332-334	B. M. Smith					
333-335-337-339	Robert R. Dye	480	650	135	208	1,000.00
336-338-340	B. M. Smith					
341	J. Edmund Harrell		500			6,000.00
342	Ashton C. Jones		2,000			
343	Mabel G. Hooker	400	200	50		
344	Arlington Fair		1,500			
345	Herman Rosin		7,500			12,000.00
346	Anna Mallinoff	1,880	5,500	293	559	10,500.00
347	Frank Bettins	2,200	8,500	326	804	18,500.00
348	Ashton G. Jones	240	400	167		
249	R. E. Cline	380	1,000	263	2,435	9,354.00
350	Wyatt A. Cline	1,740	5,000	287		
351	John G. Graham	240	800	333	664	1,594.00
251-A	Paul Glover	2,780	2,000	94	146	6,250.00
352	E. E. Perkins	1,500	2,000			

Statement giving information on land purchases in the Pentagon Building area—Continued

Tract No.	Name	Assessed valuation	Upset price	Percent upset over assessed	Percent award over assessed	Final award
353	Marjorie Stimson	$580	$3,000	517		
354	William D. Davidson	540	1,750	225		
355	Amy A. Bustins	800	1,250	281	313	$2,500.00
356	Joseph D. McDonnell		15,000			
357	James S. Boyd	3,340	20,000	599		
358	Frank W. Burnett	820	5,000	610		
359	Mary E. Neff		3,000			4,713.19
360-362	W. M. Stone		750			
361	Jesse W. Stuart	2,700	2,000	74		
263	Katherine F. Lawson	8,060	20,000	248		
364	Simon Bube	2,900	12,500	431		
365	Unknown		1,250			
366	Alvina Drew	650	2,500	385	615	4,000.00
367	Colliflower Coal Co. and Fredericksburg & Potomac R. R		125,000			
368	William B. Yowell	2,500	6,000	240	320	8,000.00
X-369	Mrs. Clinkett	260	1,000	385		
X-370	Martha or Nathaniel Smith	180	1,500	833		
X-371	R. L. Smith and Daisy Hunter	420	1,200	250	250	1,200.00
X-372	F. Washington	180	500	278		
X-373	Mary Smith	100	600	600		
X-374	Nathan Dowell	180	400	222		
X-375	Florence Smith	520	1,100	212		
X-376	Elizabeth Wagnor	260	1,000	385	462	1,200.00
X-377	Lucinda Baily	80	500	625		
X-378		180	350	194		
X-379	Clinkett	80	350	438		
380	Stella Loftus		650			
X-381	Levi Barkin	180	850	472		
X-382	Eliza Barber	240	700	292	[1] 380	1,900.00
383	Unknown		700			
384	F. Pollard-Betsie Lewis	440	1,000	227		
385	George E. Vollin	100	700	700	800	800.00
386	Liza Wede Lettie Vollin	160	600	375		
387	William Jackson	80	500	625		
388	Fanny Joyce		650			850.00
389	Mary Taylor		850			
390	Julia Johnson	160	600	375		
391	Emma Barber	260	1,000	385	510	1,325.00
392	Eliza Barber-Hill	480	2,000	417		
393	Dora Pollard	200	800	400	600	1,200.00
394	Eliza Barber-Hill	260	700	270		
395	Lavinia Henry	120	300	250		
396	First Mount Olive Baptist Church		22,500			42,000.00
359	A. C. Jones (erroneous)					

[1] See No. 394.

EXHIBIT B

Increase over assessment

[Basic assessment=100 percent]

Relation of award price to assessed value	Plots		Assessed value	Award price	Average increase for group
	Number	Percentage distribution			
					Percent
100 percent and under	1	0.8	$640	$150	23
101 to 200 percent	2	1.7	360	515	143
201 to 250 percent	4	3.4	5,425	12,225	225
251 to 300 percent	7	5.9	10,640	29,000	273
301 to 350 percent	16	13.6	65,860	215,125	328
351 to 400 percent	14	11.9	40,800	154,895	380
401 to 450 percent	15	12.7	23,800	98,475	414
451 to 500 percent	14	11.9	41,560	195,356	470
501 to 600 percent	19	16.1	39,140	217,828	557
601 to 700 percent	9	7.6	57,930	397,694	687
701 to 1,000 percent	9	7.6	45,320	393,850	869
Over 1,000 percent	8	6.8	6,660	86,764	1,303
Total	118	100	338,135	1,802,877	533

Mr. Speaker, I have heard the statements made time and again giving misinformation regarding an appropriation for the fortification of Guam; appropriation for the construction of 5,500 planes; statements contending that the Republican Party opposed the President's request for national defense appropriations and other statements of a similar character such as were made today by the gentleman from North Carolina. Now let us get the record straight.

WAS IT THE PRESIDENT OR CONGRESS WHO CUT THE WAR DEPARTMENT'S REQUEST FOR FUNDS?

The gentleman speaks about the Republican Party opposing national defense and the President's effort being thwarted by the Republican Members of Congress.

The record shows that the last budget submitted by Mr. Hoover for the War Department was for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1933, and ending June 30, 1934. Mr. Hoover recommended $277,730,000. Congress appropriated $277,050,000. Later on there were alloted from the emergency funds $96,688,000 more. The record shows that Mr. Roosevelt impounded that year $62,618,000 of the War Department funds. In February 1942 the gentleman from New Jersey, Mr. LANE POWERS, and I, both members of the War Department subcommittee of the Appropriation Committee, insisted that the War Department furnish the subcommittee with a statement giving the following information since 1934:

First. The amount of money the War Department asked the President for.

Second. The amount of money the President asked Congress to appropriate through his Budget officer.

Third. The amount of money that Congress actually did appropriate.

This statement was furnished and locked up in the Appropriation Committee safe on orders from the chairman of that committee where it lies peacefully reposing and where it now is. Just why did the Democratic chairman of the Appropriation Committee order that statement locked in the safe? Was it because the President of the United States cut the War Department's request for appropriations? If the President had increased the amount asked for by the War Department the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BULWINKLE] would have been boasting about it on the floor of this House.

REPUBLICAN MEMBERS OF CONGRESS OPPOSED THE CONSTRUCTION OF OBSOLETE PLANES

The gentleman from North Carolina also accuses the Republican Party of opposing the building of 5,500 planes requested by the President in 1939. The gentleman's speech on the floor of the House was undoubtedly written by the Democratic National Committee, because an examination of it will show that it follows almost word for word the keynote speech delivered at the Democratic National Convention by Governor Kerr, of Oklahoma. Again let us examine the record.

In January 1939 Gen. Henry H. Arnold, Chief of the United States Air Corps, testified before the War Department

Subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee that the United States was from 3 to 5 years behind Germany in research and development. We were then operating under a 2,500-plane program for the Army, a program recommended by the President's board known as the Baker board. We had approximately 1,800 planes in the Army at that time, such as they were. In January 1939 General Arnold testified that he had the money to build 907 planes and had had some of that money as far back as July 1937. These planes would have brought our Air Force up to the 2,500-plane program set by the Baker board. He further testified that he did not build these planes because he was waiting for modern development. In other words, he did not want to build obsolete planes. He said the policy he was following was quality first and then quantity. Some months later the President asked Congress and our committee for the money to build 5,500 planes, 3,300 to be in the air or active, 1,000 as a normal reserve, and 1,200 to be placed in storage for some reason. Congressman LANE POWERS, of New Jersey, and I took the position that, in spite of the fact that these planes were to be obsolete, we had to have some kind of an Air Force. We did not oppose the building of the 3,300 planes for actual use. We did not oppose building 1,000 planes for the normal reserve. We did oppose the building of 1,200 additional reserve planes which were to be placed in storage and not used. The fact is that while some of the 3,300 planes were built, the 1,200 planes to be placed in storage were never built and thus were never put into reserve. All of this occurred in the winter and spring of 1939.

The planes which they were building at that time had no self-sealing gas tanks. The gasoline tanks are located in the wings of the planes and the first explosive bullet that went through the wing caused the gas to leak out and the plane went up in flames. The German planes were equipped with self-sealing gas tanks and when they were finally brought down some of them had as high as 150 bullet holes through the wings and the self-sealing tanks kept the plane from going up in flames. Our planes had no armored pilot seats. They were too slow and they lacked fire power. The Republican Members of Congress did oppose the building of some of these obsolete planes because they did not want our boys to go up in these suicide planes which meant death to the pilots flying them. They wanted our boys to be protected, to have planes with self-sealing gas tanks and armored pilot seats. They wanted our men to have fast planes with fire power equal to that of the German planes which they had to meet in aerial combat.

Let me give you a little illustration of just what these obsolete planes which did get to the front meant and did to our boys who were flying them. In 1941 a Muskegon, Mich., boy named Dick Haring wrote to me asking me for information as to how he might enlist in the Navy Air Corps. He was given the information, enlisted in the Navy, qualified as a pilot, and was commissioned. I have before me the original letter written by this boy dated July 16, 1942. It was written from the Pacific theater of war. This letter describes in detail just how the boys over there felt about these planes. It reads in part as follows:

> As you may recall I wrote to you a year ago asking how I might enlist in the Navy Air Corps. * * * I finished my training as a naval cadet, was transferred into the Marines, and we are now out in the vast Pacific. I am with a fighter squadron and we certainly have a grand outfit. I just wonder what you people in Washington know about the planes we are flying. Has propaganda convinced you people as it has most everyone that our planes are the best in the world? As aviation cadets we were led to believe this was the truth, but now as fighter pilots we know better. Our planes, the type that was flown by the Navy officer who received a promotion for shooting down six enemy bombers, does not stand a ghost of a chance against a Zero (a Zero fighter is the Jap pursuit plane). How would you or anyone in Washington feel if they were going into combat with the odds against you? I am sure everyone of us is willing to do his part, but we all wonder what they are doing about this in Washington. I don't want you to think letter is a personal gripe, but would like to acquaint you with some of the facts. Regardless what you have to say about this letter, please don't associate my name with it. Someone may not like it.

This letter was written July 16, 1942, and somehow was passed by the censor. It was written in the boy's own handwriting and signed by him. This boy was shot down and killed in action on September 13, 1942, flying one of these obsolete planes to which he refers in this letter. It is because we Republicans did not want to send our boys up in the kind of planes Dick Haring refers to, because we wanted them to have a chance for their lives, because we knew that the building of obsolete planes meant that many brave boys like Dick Haring would be shot down in unequal aerial combat, that we opposed building of these obsolete planes for which we are now being criticized.

WHAT ARE THE FACTS ABOUT THE FORTIFICATION OF GUAM

The gentleman from North Carolina states that the Republican Party opposed the fortification of Guam. Just what are the facts of the case and again let us examine the record. There was an appropriation in the Regular Navy appropriation bill to permit the expenditure of $5,000,000 to dredge the harbor at Guam.

The Democratic chairman of the Naval Affairs Committee of the House in a speech in February 1939, used the following language:

> Opposition to this item has been based on the belief that Guam is to be fortified and made a defense naval base for airplanes and submarines. In view of this opposition the committee has gone into this matter at great length and I can assure you that there is no intention on the part of the Navy Department to fortify Guam or to do anything further than is included in this bill.

The island of Guam lies 5,500 miles west from the west coast, much farther than New York lies from Berlin and Rome, and almost as far from Alexandria, Egypt. It lies about 1,500 miles east of Manila, 1,400 miles south of Tokyo and 1,600 miles southwest of Wake Island. South of the island of Guam are the Caroline Islands and east are the Marshall Islands and many other islands then controlled by the Japanese. Guam is in the midst of hundreds of islands and is the only American possession in that area, with Japanese fortified islands surrounding it. The question of spending $5,000,000 to dredge a harbor on that island is so insignificant as compared to the real issue that it is not worth mentioning. The real question that should be discussed is, Did Congress neglect to fortify islands in the Pacific Ocean? The opposition fails to tell you that from September 1939 to April 1942, Congress actually authorized and appropriated $439,578,000 to fortify islands in the Pacific Ocean and the following are some of the expenditures made for that purpose:

Guam	$325,000
Hawaii	103,386,465
Johnston Island	5,687,000
Midway	21,679,783
Palmyra	4,112,000
Philippine Islands	269,150,000
Samoa	10,688,500
Fourteenth Naval District	9,316,000
Wake Island	15,233,500

Our opponents "strain at a gnat" and "swallow a camel." Hundreds of millions of dollars have been spent by England and the United States in fortifying islands and points in the Pacific. Manila and Corregidor fell, Bataan fell, Singapore fell, and we lost the entire southwest Pacific, not because of lack of fortifications, but because of lack of adequate, modern air power and other military reasons which I am sure the opposition will not be in any haste to discuss.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS] is recognized for 10 minutes.

THE UNEMPLOYMENT PROBLEM

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I would like to revert to the discussion that was had previously today about the figures on unemployment. I believe the figure of 8,000,000 unemployed in 1940 is approximately correct. One reason there were 8,000,000 unemployed in 1940 was that we had not solved the problem of unemployment. But for the same reason we had 15,000,000 unemployed in 1931 and 1932, under the Hoover administration, a fact which, in all fairness, the gentlemen on the other side of the aisle ought sometimes to mention.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Not at this time.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Let me make a correction in my own statement.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I did not refer to the gentleman's statement.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I know, but let me make a correction in the statement I made a while ago on the floor.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. All right.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I want to correct my statement. Instead of 10,000,000 unemployed, the average during Roosevelt's

first term was 11,466,000, and during the next term it was 12,532,000. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I am certain the number of unemployed in the second Roosevelt term was substantially less than in the first term, but in any case these figures were true only because when Mr. Roosevelt became President he inherited the economic depression which was the inevitable and inescapable result of the kind of policies that were pursued through the decade of the 1920's, a decade, if there ever was one, when prosperity was built upon false foundations and false assumptions, when, as a matter of fact, the only reason we were able to continue with production was because of the accumulation of $11,000,000,000 of consumer indebtedness and the fact that billions upon billions of dollars were loaned abroad and American goods shipped over there, but never paid for.

The truth about the matter is, if it is possible to get a consideration on this plane—and I do not know whether it is or not—but if it is possible to get a consideration on this high plane, the truth about it is that anybody, Republican or Democrat, who wants to face honestly the future of his country has to say that we have not yet got the answer to this economic problem, and that the future lies with that group of people who are courageous enough and honest enough to admit that fact, first, and to start to work from that point on.

I have a column here from Walter Lippmann, a column that appeared in the papers of September 8, and which I ask unanimous consent to include in full in my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I can assure you it is a very nonpartisan column. I want to read it:

TODAY AND TOMORROW

(By Walter Lippmann)

NEW YORK, September 7.—There is not much dispute as to what is the paramount question on the home front. It is how to achieve and then maintain full employment for all who are able and willing to work. A public man fitted for the post-war world might almost be defined as one who knows that full employment is in time of peace what the national defense is in time of war, an obligation which must be met, and no excuses or explanations for failure accepted.

Like the national defense, the problem of full employment is beyond partisanship and we shall not go far to solve it if the Democrats declaim about the Hoover depression and the Republicans about the Roosevelt depression. For at the end of about 8 years of Republican administration the country fell into the worst depression in its history, and at the end of 8 years of the New Deal (in 1940) there were still 8,000,000 unemployed. So the pot need not call the kettle black. We are confronted with a national problem. Neither party has as yet solved it. Neither has offered a well-considered proposal for dealing with it.

THE GREAT PARADOX

A nonpartisan approach is indispensable because we cannot even begin to define the real problem unless we think of the 20 years between the two wars as one period, in which first the Republicans and then the Democrats dealt unsuccessfully with the same question. Throughout this period of peace the United States had at all times a greater capacity to produce food, raw materials, and manufactures than it knew what to do with. The country was baffled, and men suffered, not because there was famine and scarcity but because there were unsalable and unusable surpluses of all the elements of economic well-being.

This paradox of poverty in the midst of plenty has become, in the literal sense of the word, intolerable to the modern democratic conscience—all the more so because we have been able to achieve in two wars that full employment which we could not achieve in peace. This war, moreover, has shown that the American capacity to produce is beyond any previous estimate of any responsible economist or industrialist. The industrial miracle of wartime is, therefore, the promise of a great rise in the well-being of the Nation. But it is also a threat that if we do not conduct our economy better than we did in the twenties and thirties, the unemployment, the economic surpluses, and the discontent will be greater.

REAL PROBLEM

There has been as yet little, if any, candid and informative discussion of the problem by the leaders of either party. Neither platform has anything whatever to say on the subject, and the debates in Congress on reconversion and surplus property disposal and interium placement benefits are concerned with important but only with immediate and transient questions. The real problem which will almost certainly become paramount before the next President finishes his term is how to reconvert and how to find and keep a volume of employment greater than any which this country has ever known in time of peace.

It may be useful to fix in our minds an estimate of the size of the problem. I believe I am right in saying that in time of peace, the largest number who found employment was 46,000,000. We had that many employed in 1929 and again in 1940. Because our population is increasing and technology advancing, 46,000,000 jobs in 1929 meant full employment whereas the same number of jobs in 1940 left us with 8,000,000 unemployed. Now if at the end of this war we provide only the same number of jobs as in 1929 and 1940, we shall, it is estimated, have from 12,000,000 to 15,000,000 unemployed. This will be due both to the increase in the population and to the technological progress made during the war. We must, therefore, find between 55,000,000 and 60,000,000 jobs if there is to be full employment after the war.

WHENCE THE DEMAND?

We may then ask ourselves where the demand is to come from which will employ that many people. During the war year 1943, the latest for which we have figures, $186,000,000,000 was spent, and of this $105,000,000,000 was civilian demand and $81,000,000,000 military demand. Not all, but much the largest part of the war purchases will cease when Japan has been defeated. For stable employment in peacetime with shorter hours, we shall not need or desire the full wartime demand. But we may suppose that we shall want half the military demand, say $40,000,000,000, to continue in the form of civilian demand.

Our problem then is how to get that much money wisely invested and wisely spent. How much of that necessary $40,000,000,000 can free enterprise use, not once, but annually—assuming ideal conditions, a friendly administration, a revised tax system, and the like? And what is to be done about the portion which free enterprise cannot invest and cannot spend?

These are questions which President Roosevelt and Governor Dewey might well discuss.

Note, Mr. Speaker, that Mr. Lippmann says that if we are to face this problem we have to think of it in terms of the entire period between the two wars. And he goes on to say:

Throughout this period of peace, the Nation had, at all times, a greater capacity to produce food, raw materials, and manufactures than it knew what to do with. The country was baffled and men suffered, not because there was famine and scarcity, but because there were unsalable and unusable surpluses of all the elements of economic well-being.

This paradox of poverty in the midst of plenty has become in a literal sense of the word intolerable to the modern democratic conscience, all the more so because we have been able to achieve in two wars that full employment which we cannot achieve in peace. This war, moreover, has shown that the American capacity to produce is beyond any previous estimate of any responsible economist or industrialist.

He might almost have said it was twice the amount of any estimate of that sort.

The industrial miracle of wartime is therefor the promise of a great rise in the well-being of the Nation. But it is also a threat that if we do not conduct our economy better than we did in the twenties and thirties, the unemployment, the economic surpluses, and the discontent will be greater.

Now I challenge Members of the House to accept that at face value.

Unless, Mr. Speaker, we conduct our economic business better than we did in either the twenties, which were the groundwork and cause of the depression of the thirties, or in the thirties, when our methods were not adequate to meet the problem, unless we can do better than either one, we will not be keeping faith with the men in uniform whom today we promise every day that they will have jobs and opportunity when they come back. I have quoted this Lippmann column because I agree with it so substantially and because it seems to me to lead inescapably to the very conclusions regarding the necessity of certain constructive changes in our monetary system which I have been advocating for years.

Mr. Lippmann points out that during the whole period between wars we had a greater capacity to produce than we knew what to do with. Then he states the country was baffled and men suffered, not because there was famine and scarcity but because there was an unsalable and unusable surplus. He points out we shall have to replace at least half of our present military demand with increased civilian demands for goods and services if we are to conquer the economic problem. Now, it is not going to do any good to say we are going to go back to some day in the past and that the methods which were used then were the answer to the problem, because they were not. It is only good to face the future with our heads up and our eyes on that future and to say that America is big enough to conquer that problem.

Mr. Lippmann has put in this column the very core and kernel of America's problem. Is it not, then, perfectly obvious that the best answer to this problem must lie in the adoption of a program whereby we can be certain that the active demand for goods expands to

the extent required to absorb a volume of goods and services at least equal to that which America itself can so easily produce? That never has happened, and it has got to happen. And since this expansion of the demand will, at all times, be secured in a monetary sense by the very goods and services which it will be used to purchase, is it any longer possible to continue to justify a system which requires the national debt of the country to be continuously increased and renders it impossible for us to secure the additional demand necessary without increasing that debt? Personally, I do not believe we can be true to the future of our country and the best interests of its people if we permit such a system to continue. The Constitution gives to the Congress the power to coin money and regulate the value thereof. But Congress today exercises neither of those powers. It must do so if the problem described by Mr. Lippmann is to be solved. Either by purchasing the capital stock of the 12 central Federal Reserve banks and making them an agency of the Congress, performing the express function of maintaining a stable relationship between supply and demand in this country or by some other equally effective method. We must put ourselves in the position to expand the active demand in this country to a constant equality with potential supply without the necessity of increasing the public debt.

During the war we have seen that full production and full employment of every person in America is possible, if only there is a sufficient demand for what they can produce. The economists will tell you that goods produced constitute in essence buying power. Therefore the monetary tokens in the hands of the people to purchase these goods will be valuable to the extent that their quantity never exceeds the volume of the potential output.

If it is less than the volume of potential output we will get a declining price level, unsalable surpluses, and unemployment.

The trouble has been that the so-called war prosperity has rested not only upon the tragedy of war, but also upon a vast expansion of the national debt. A great proportion of that debt expansion has been totally unnecessary.

I have here a $1 bill. I ought to have a bigger one, but I did not have one in my possession today. If I take this $1 bill and use it to purchase a Government bond, I get $1 worth of Government bonds. If I happen to be a banker and I put this in my till, or deposit it as a reserve with the Federal Reserve bank, I can buy $5 worth of Government bonds with this $1, by creating on my books the other $4. That is where America's money comes from. Ninety percent of it comes from that source. That is where inflationary money has come from during this war. As long as you depend solely upon that kind of money, it is just as easy at a time when deflation may be desired, by the financial interests for the money to be destroyed by refusing to make or renew loans, by demanding immediate repayment and by increasing rates of interest. It is just as easy for this bank-credit money to be destroyed by billions upon billions of dollars and cause a depression.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ZIMMERMAN). The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 3 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. The fact of the matter is that bank-created money is as easily destroyed as it is created, and our Nation's prosperity ought not to be dependent upon a type of money that is inextricably and inevitably tied to debt. Our country may be prosperous if there are enough private borrowers to borrow from the banks enough to induce the creation of this fiat bankers-book money. But if that does not happen, then under the present system the only recourse is to increase the public debt, to create buying power in the hands of the public by inducing the banks to create money without cost to them and giving them interest-bearing bonds in exchange for it. The function of creating money ought to belong to the Government in any nation that really wants to be free.

Had the Congress created this war money itself it would not have changed the situation with regard to inflation one single bit. But it would have meant that approximately one-third of the present national debt of the Nation would not have been a debt at all.

I refer Members to my book Out of Debt, Out of Danger, and to other speeches which I have made on this general subject to fill in the details. All I want to do today is to point out that the problem which Mr. Lippmann so properly poses for us is not insoluble, but that it is inextricably tied to the necessity for changing our monetary system in this country, and that upon its solution rests also our hope for finding an orderly and proper answer to the problem of national debt and for avoiding the twin dangers of run-away inflation and repudiation.

Once we do have an adequate volume of money in circulation, and the assurance that it will continue to be, and that deflation can actually be prevented without multiplying the public debt, then we have the key to the solution of our problem. Not the entire solution, but we have a basis upon which we can proceed with confidence. Upon that point I honestly believe that we need a national system of old-age pensions to give us an orderly method throughout the Nation, whereby that buying power can be dispensed. But, goods are not produced unless there is a market for them. The productive capacity of America is almost unlimited. We can have unlimited production if one thing is done, and that is that we have such policies pursued that we can be certain that the buying power of consumers is not allowed to lag; that it remains constant in relation to the power of the Nation to produce.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from California has again expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY] may extend his own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that after the other special orders I may address the House for 10 minutes today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include therein an editorial from the Oil City Derrick.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD] is recognized for 20 minutes.

THE SUGAR SITUATION

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, two telegrams which came to my desk this morning and two press reports, one in a Washington paper, the other in the New York Journal of Commerce of today, prompt me to make these remarks. The first telegram I have is from Charles Figy, commissioner of agriculture, Lansing, Mich., and reads:

> Reports of sugar shortages in many areas of the State indicate we are going to have serious losses of peaches and grapes unless an ample supply of sugar is made available immediately. The peach season is soon over, but the grape season is just starting. Please see what can be done to release sugar supplies for State for immediate distribution.

That is signed by Commissioner Charles Figy. The other telegram is from Detroit and reads:

> The Food Industry Committee of Detroit representing all branches of manufacturing and distribution of food products in metropolitan Detroit direct your attention to the critical shortage of sugar in this area. Enormous quantities of peaches, grapes, apples, and plums in addition to victory-garden produce will be wasted. The loss to farmers has already amounted to several million dollars. Detroit's thousands of war workers cannot be fed unless the sugar shortage is immediately relieved. Restaurants and bakeries are down to a few days' supply. The area requires a minimum of 250,000 bags of sugar now. We urge you to use every possible means to remedy the situation.

That is signed by the food industry committee, Walter F. Haefele, chairman.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I yield.

Mr. DONDERO. I may say that I have received similar telegrams this morning also including one from a business house in my own home city, Mr. Bowen, of Royal Oak, Mich., making practically the same statement: Either they must be able to get sugar or they go out of business.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Yesterday I had a telegram from the wholesale jobbers out through the State of Michigan complaining that in the upper portion of the southern peninsula the situation is just as grave.

In the Washington Daily News we have this headline: "Complaints of sugar shortage are confirmed." The article proceeds to give the situation today in the city of Washington.

In the New York Journal of Commerce we find that the sugar use is 12½ percent ahead in 7 months this year as compared with last year. Then the article proceeds to give considerable statistics. Below that article is another headline: "Government sees sugar supply ample."

Sugar users of the country, people who have fruit to sell, people who run restaurants, and manufacturing plants which use sugar might just as well get down to the nub of the situation and realize that they are going to have less sugar. Government bureaus have a habit when they get into a pinch of issuing a lot of optimistic reports. I am going to make a number of charges in the next few minutes and I believe I have the documentary evidence to support them. If I have not the evidence, it is in the report which was prepared by the Bunker committee, a confidential committee selected by the President of the United States, Mr. Roosevelt; and that report was submitted to the President. The President has not dared make it public because that report saddles the responsibility for this sugar shortage on the Government bureaus. By Government bureaus I mean the Department of the Interior, the War Production Board, the State Department, and the O. P. A., the War Shipping Board, the War Food Administration, the Commodity Credit Corporation, Lend-Lease, and the Anglo-American committee which deals with the sugar situation in the Caribbean Sea area.

We find a few facts developing like this, for instance: On January 1, 1943, we had reserve stocks of sugar here in the United States of about 2,136,000 tons.

On January 1, 1944, this dropped down to about 1,746,000 tons and we now have an estimate which is reliable that on January 1, 1945, it will drop down to perhaps as low as 1,607,000 tons. So each day your reserve supply of sugar becomes less.

If you want to take and study the accumulated reserve supply of sugar under British control, which is a clear-cut example of where the British are trading our people out of their socks, shirts, and underwear, this is just another illustration. You will find their reserve stocks of sugar are going up and our stocks are going down, while these raw sugars come from the Western Hemisphere area, Hawaii, the continental cane and beet fields, Puerto Rico, Cuba, the Virgin Islands, Santo Domingo, Haiti, Martinique, and a few smaller production areas down in the West Indies.

The Government agencies have had full authority on this; they must assume total responsibility, and the critical sugar situation can be put at the very door of these agencies which I have named.

I now and here demand that the President of the United States make public to the people of this country the Bunker report.

Ellsworth Bunker is president of the National Sugar Refining Co., one of the best-informed men in the United States on sugar. He was selected by President Roosevelt to head the committee to prepare that report and the report was so devastating that the President has not dared make it public to the people so they will know what is going on. We have only to go back to the July 1943 statement of the President, at which time he announced that the ration points on coffee were going off, and I think you will find the record shows that at that time he made this exact statement:

> We also expect within a short time that we shall get greatly increased allowances of sugar.

Why did not those increased allowances of sugar for the housewives and for the commercial sugar users of this country come forth? They did not come forth because of these declining stocks of sugar that were occurring, the declining production of sugar that was occurring in the United States and in Puerto Rico in particular. The President made his statement in July because he had been misinformed by his experts and the Bunker report was so devastating against the estimates made by the experts that the President has not dared make the information public to the people of the United States.

If you want to go back to a statement that came out in Business Week of a few days ago you will find this in the record:

> On orders from the White House a special, and very hush-hush, star-chamber committee was set up. It was headed by Ellsworth Bunker, president of the National Sugar Refining Co., and included both industry and Government sugar experts. The committee's job was to get to the bottom of the sugar mess and submit a full report within 90 days. Either sugar was to be found to make good the President's word or an adequate explanation of the sudden reversal in sugar prospects was to be developed.

We who follow this sugar situation somewhat know that in connection with the 1942 crop of the continental sugar production, the War Food Administration and Commodity Credit Corporation and the Department of Agriculture were negligent in using unnecessary time in announcing to the sugar growers of this country the program under which they were to operate. That is for the year 1943, which programs, plans, and announcements should have been completed before December 31, 1942. Those errors were again recorded in 1943 in that the program for 1944 was not properly worked out and announced in sufficient time to the growers of this country, and I mean the sugarcane growers and sugar-beet growers, in sufficient time for them to get the large acreage lined up for the crop of 1944. So you had a greatly reduced production of beet sugar in continental United States in the 1943 crop year and also in the 1944 crop year because agriculture today is so hogtied by Government rules and regulations that the farmers cannot proceed until Washington first gives the O. K. We had a great reduction in 1943, we had a reduction in 1944, and the usual sugar stocks of refined sugar historically available in the inland markets of the United States are not there today in the factory warehouses and the sugar-beet processing plants in this country. The result is that the load is on the seacoast refineries, and therefore the sugar is not available to the people.

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I yield.

Mr. CHENOWETH. I commend the gentleman from Michigan for the very fine statement that he is making. I wonder if he would like to look back a little prior to the year 1942, when I believe he said the Government started its negligent attitude toward the sugar-beet industry?

Mr. CRAWFORD. The more flagrant errors were begun to be committed at that time.

Mr. CHENOWETH. I wonder if the gentleman would care to comment on the acreage restriction in 1940 and 1941. At that time the Department of Agriculture was restricting the production of sugar in this country.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Yes; we can go to 1937 and get down to the quotaized period, that was when the administration program was generally in the direction of slipping the industry out of existence. The United States is still dependent primarily on continental production for its foodstuffs. We might as well get it out of our minds that we are going to get our foodstuffs from other parts of the world at low prices and as we need the stuff.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN. The gentleman will recall that in 1935, when our distinguished colleague, Mr. Mapes, since deceased, was with us, and we worked together over in the New Office Building, HENRY WALLACE sent up to room 1705 two of his experts and they told the Michigan beet-sugar growers—the gentleman represented some of them and I represented others—that we would have to decrease or hold down our acreage, and we would have to plant that increased sugar-beet acreage to other crops.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I think the RECORD supports that substantially.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I yield.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. May I ask the distinguished gentleman from Michigan if it has not been irritating to him to see the present food set-up raising millions of acres of cotton for which

they evidently do not have any use during this time, and even had to give $6,000,000 worth of it away this year to make insulating materials out of, and also to pay an export subsidy on wheat of 25 or 30 cents a bushel right during this time, increasing our tobacco acreage 16 percent and then turning around and giving 25 percent of the crop away when we could just as well have had crops needed in this country like sugar beets. That also applies to certain of the dairy products as well. I would like to ask the gentleman from Michigan whether I am right.

Mr. CRAWFORD. The gentleman is about as well informed on agricultural operations in this country as any man I have ever met, and I think we can always rely on his observations. I think the analysis he has just made is very important to this discussion.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I yield.

Mr. DONDERO. The gentleman addressing the House is perhaps the best-informed Member on this floor on the subject of sugar. May I ask him, in spite of the restrictions placed on domestic growers of beet sugar and cane sugar, whether or not it is a fact that we produce about 27 percent of the sugar that we consume in the United States, and the rest is imported?

Mr. CRAWFORD. Perhaps I should say it this way. The domestic sugar industry consists of Hawaii, an organized Territory under the American flag, citizens of the United States, contributing to the Federal tax fund just the same as a citizen of Michigan; Puerto Rico, an unorganized Territory under the flag of the United States; the Virgin Islands, and the continental sugar-beet and sugarcane industry. That constitutes the domestic sugar industry.

When we throw the entire domestic sugar industry together we have a production of about 875,000 tons in Hawaii, about 750,000 to 850,000 tons in Puerto Rico, about 3,000 to 5,000 tons in the Virgin Islands, about 1,250,000 tons of beet sugar in the continental United States, and about 450,000 to 500,000 tons of cane sugar in Florida, Texas, and Louisiana. Add those figures up and compare them to a total of about five and three-quarters to six million tons consumption at the present time and you get an idea of what we are producing under the American flag. We depend primarily on Cuba and one or two other West Indian areas for the balance of our consumption requirements.

Mr. CLEVENGER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I yield.

Mr. CLEVENGER. The gentleman is familiar with the sugar-beet situation in my district where normally there are some 30,000 acres of sugar beets. I am informed this year there is somewhere less than 2,100 acres of beets. Approximately 90 percent of the sugar production has been lost in the district that I represent.

Mr. CRAWFORD. That forces your factories into the position where if they operate they will suffer a tremendous financial loss, and after 1 or 2 years of operation of that kind they have to cease and go through bankruptcy. They now have that terrible problem hanging over them in a number of communities.

Mr. CLEVENGER. The deterioration of the machinery is almost worse when the factory does not operate than when it operates, is not that correct?

Mr. CRAWFORD. Yes.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. MICHENER. The gentleman from Michigan has made a special study of this matter. The House is familiar with his knowledge along these lines. I am quite familiar also with the things the gentleman has said today. They are undoubtedly true. I know personally that the gentleman has been working for the last 10 or 15 days to get some sugar into Michigan to take care of our canning industry. My home town has not had any sugar in the stores. What success has the gentleman had in getting sugar presently delivered to Michigan?

Mr. CRAWFORD. This is what we are really up against. The people in Washington are up against it just the same as we are out in the Central West. Your stocks of raw sugar at the seacoast refineries have been by these Government agencies permitted to drop to so low a point, your stocks of refined sugar in the warehouses of the seacoast refineries have dropped to so low a point, and the stocks of cane refined sugar from the seacoast points that should be out through the territory in warehouses ready for this quick rush have so completely disappeared that if you now had the raw sugar at the refinery and the refining capacity and the manpower, the bags of sugar coming from the refiners' spouts would overtax your transportation facilities from the refineries to the inland points to such a degree that you could not get the sugar there, so we are just not going to get the sugar there in time.

Here are reports in the newspapers today where Dr. Joshua Bernhardt and some of the other boys talk about what the situation will be 7 weeks from now. What good is sugar in the first part of November to take care of fruit in Michigan in the first half or the second half of September? The timing element in the minds of too many economic planners is so far away when geared to the actual facts that it causes a debacle just like we face at the present time.

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. CHENOWETH. I wonder if the gentleman could give us any estimate of the shortage which we will have this year in the sugar-beet crop in this country because of the attitude taken by the administration throughout the sugar-beet industry.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I should have put in the list of agencies responsible for all this, one other organization, the War Manpower Commission. As a result of the work of these agencies to which I have referred and the War Manpower Commission, I would say that the production of beet sugar alone this year is at least 600,000 tons below what it would have been had the whole situation been met. Six hundred thousand tons of sugar inland ready to spread out toward the seacoast in all directions, is one proposition. The absence of that sugar inland with the load on your seacoast refineries and transportation to move inland to the consuming public is a different proposition entirely. That is what we are up against. These things have all been pointed out repeatedly to these Government agencies. This did not just drop on them the other day. For instance, to go back to this bunker report—and I wish we could get copies of it—here are some of the comments I have on that.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 10 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAWFORD. We hear words to this effect: That the Bunker report makes a case that the W. F. A. was either far off the mark statistically when it advised the President last July 1943 or else derelict in its duty to get the sugar into this country subsequently to back up the President. It is the last charge which packs the wallop. Bernhardt—that is referring to Dr. Joshua A. Bernhardt—is the sugar expert sitting on the sugar section of the Combined Food Board which determines the international allocation of sugar. Last year, while the United States sugar stock pile was falling off to extremely low levels, British sugar stocks were rising to all-time highs. United Kingdom stock increased in 1944 from 880,000 tons to 1,325,000 tons, about 70 percent of 1944 requirements, which is the largest amount ever held in Great Britain, and over twice the pre-war average.

At the beginning of 1944 United States stocks were 1,761,000 tons, against 2,138,000 tons at the beginning of 1943. The Bunker report implicitly condemns our representative on the Combined Food Board, either for not protecting the United States interests or for being outmaneuvered by superior British talent.

Among other things the Bunker report points out, our representatives gave their approval to the British liftings of sugar, even from Puerto Rico, in 1943, despite our steadily deteriorating position. I was in Puerto Rico almost an entire month, and I am positive the record will show that in no less than half a dozen cases I openly discussed that very movement of sugar in open hearings on the second floor of one of the principal hotels there in Puerto Rico and continually interrogated Puerto Ricans as to what they proposed to do in protecting their market in the United States should their sugar be channeled to Britain and should Cuba slip its sugar into the United

States, filling that vacuum, and when Puerto Rico comes back and demands its share in the American market to have Cuba tell them, "Well, you let your sugar slip over to Britain, and now just leave us alone and let us enjoy the American market with our sugar." That is how far reaching these things become.

The reason I mention the State Department as one of these agencies and also the War Shipping Board is that the War Shipping Board has to do with the ships engaged in the movement of raw sugars from the West Indies to the mainland of the United States. The State Department has to do with the movements of Puerto Rican sugar in Puerto Rico to Great Britain. The Economic Warfare Administration, or whatever the name of the agency is at the present time, also had something to do with these trades. Lend-lease has something to do with this, because after we sent the Commodity Credit Corporation down to Cuba and they purchased the 1943 crop of sugar, as they did, they purchased the 1944 crop of sugar, as they did—I mean sugar produced in Cuba—and they are now negotiating for the purchase of the 1945 crop of sugar to be produced in Cuba. When we do these things we also permit Government agencies to sit down around the Board and determine how those sugars are to be allocated as to lend-lease and as to other operations—U. N. R. R. A., for instance.

So all of these agencies enter into this. The rich and the poor, the well and the ill, the old and the young of the people of the United States who have so delicately woven the food item, sugar, into their daily diet, become interested when they awaken in the middle of the fruit canning season and find that Government money in the form of blue or green points cannot be cashed at the grocery counter in the form of a 2-pound bag of sugar.

Sugar is news. Sugar is politics. It has been for a thousand years and I think it will be for the next thousand years. The President of the United States has no right to shove the Bunker report in a pigeon-hole and withhold it from the public of the country at this time. It is politics of the highest order and involves the highest policy of the United States.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAWFORD. Yes; I yield to the gentleman from Idaho, one of our great beet-sugar States.

Mr. WHITE. Is it not a fact that if there were no restrictions on the importation of sugar from our offshore possessions, the Philippines, in normal times, the Hawaiian Islands and Puerto Rico would smother our local sugar industry. The only solution is the allocation of sugar to the several countries and to the domestic industry.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Now, let us keep ourselves straight. The people of Hawaii are citizens of the United States the same as my people in Michigan. They contribute to the Federal Treasury the same as my people in Michigan. I insist upon Hawaiians having the same rights as I have, first, last, and all the time. The people of Puerto Rico are citizens of the United States. There is no way by which Hawaii, Puerto Rico, or the Virgin Islands can smother the production of sugar in Michigan, any more than my friend from California, can smother our production.

Mr. WHITE. But could they not make the price so low that we could not compete?

Mr. CRAWFORD. Now, just wait a minute.

Mr. ROLPH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. ROLPH. I just want to agree with the gentleman that the Territory of Hawaii is as much a part of the United States as any part of continental United States.

Mr. CRAWFORD. It certainly is. Now let us go a step further.

Mr. WHITE. Let us talk about sugar.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Now, let us come down to the Philippine Islands. The Congress, under the present administration, voted the Philippine Islands their independence. At that time they placed no tariff duty against sugar coming into this country from the Philippine Islands. My guess is, based upon the economic clause carried in that independence bill, that after the Philippines are given their independence and when General MacArthur gets through driving the Japs out of there, which he will do, there will be a resolution or a bill brought into this Congress further permitting the Filipinos to ship their sugar in here free of duty. My guess is that the Congress of the United States will agree with that proposition.

Mr. WHITE. Faced with that proposition, with the unrestricted importation of sugar from the Philippine Islands, the Hawaiian Islands, and Puerto Rico is it not a fact that if they are permitted to send all the sugar they can produce into this country, we will have no sugar industry in Louisiana, Michigan, or any other sugar-beet section of the United States.

Mr. CRAWFORD. There is not any way that the Hawaiians, even if they were not a part of us, could drive us out of the sugar business, because there is a limitation on land in Hawaii. There is no way that Puerto Rico, even though it were not a part of the United States, could drive us out of the sugar business, because there is a limitation on land in Puerto Rico. There is only four or five thousand tons of production in the Virgin Islands, so there is no need discussing that. You might just as well drop Puerto Rico, Hawaii, and the Virgin Islands out of the discussion, because they are a part of the United States, and you cannot do anything about it. The Philippines is a different story.

Mr. WHITE. But, is it not a fact——

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, a point of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HOFFMAN. No one has yielded to the gentleman from Idaho. The gentleman from Michigan has not recognized him.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The point of order is sustained.

Mr. WHITE. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD] graciously yielded to me and we were developing the facts on sugar.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Now, let us take the Philippines specifically. Having traveled over a great part of the sugar lands of the Philippine Islands, it is my firm opinion that modern science and industry can take the Philippines and produce in those islands, over 7,000,000 tons of sugar, which is considerably greater than the total amount we are now consuming. The Congress of the United States will, in due course, have to take a position on whether or not sugar is to come from the Philippine Islands into the United States free of duty, or whether it shall come in under a protective tariff for the producers in the continental United States and its insular possessions. We might as well get our minds straightened out on this proposition now, as at some later date. It is a question on which we shall, in due course, have to act.

Furthermore, Mr. Speaker, it is important for us to now recognize that this sugar shortage throughout the whole country can have very bad effects on our economy next winter and spring. If commercial and home canners cannot now get the sugar for the purpose of preserving, canning, and jellying the present fruit crops, we can appreciate what will be the situation this coming winter when the housewife wants to buy canned fruits, preserves, and jellies. What will her blue or green points be worth? How can she purchase something that is not on the market? The commercial canner is involved in this situation just the same as is the home canner. Here are errors that involve the whole population. It illustrates how an error on the part of a Government agency can run the whole gamut of a people's economy; while an error made by one single unit of industry may only affect a very, very small part of the population.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. My suggestion is that the quota system is the only solution for protecting our domestic sugar industry. We produce only 30 percent of the sugar we consume, but to get that 30 percent we have got to go to a quota system.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I disagree with the gentleman 100 percent because the quota system protects the production of sugar in other parts of the world, and holds down production in the United States.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix

of the RECORD and to include therein a letter to my constituents.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein an article by Arthur Krock.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES] is recognized for 15 minutes.

FOR A STRONG POST-WAR AGRICULTURE

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, perhaps no segment of our national economy requires more careful study than agriculture as post-war plans are developed. The prospects which the farmer sees beyond the war are not bright. True enough, farm crop prices are protected by legislation for a period after the war ends. Present law directs that price supports insuring at least 90 percent of parity on major crops continue for 2 full calendar years following the year in which the war ends. This is a wise provision whereby Congress has protected the farmer against any sudden collapse of crop-price structures.

However, there are basic ills which parity price legislation alone cannot cure. They are the ills of overproduction which were with us throughout the decade prior to the war and which soon may be back with us.

Handicapped almost beyond measure, the Nation's farmers have produced in the 3 years of war the greatest crops in history. They have demonstrated that this country can feed the world. But soon there will be no need for this country to feed the world. Officials believe that the American farmer stands to lose most of his export market in the post-war world and perhaps quickly. They see no large permanent world markets for cotton, wheat, corn, and most other farm crops which once were exported on a large scale. Soon our domestic food and fiber consumption will start downward. Then what of the high-volume production already in motion, what of the manpower which is returning to the farms from the services and the industrial plants, what of the increased availability of machinery and fertilizers?

The rapid accumulation of post-war surpluses of farm crops is inevitable under existing conditions. But the farmer does not want to return to the A. A. A. crop-curtailment program. He knows that blind alley leads only to partial starvation for the Nation's agriculture. He is convinced that a courageous and realistic approach by his Government may find new avenues for agriculture.

Throughout the years the farmer has been taught means by which to augment his natural bent to produce abundantly. He requires no one to tell him that his productive ability has long since bypassed normal demands for many of his products. We cannot solve this problem by telling him to produce less and less, so that his products will be worth more and more. We cannot eliminate surpluses by ignoring their existence. What, then, are the possible solutions?

For more than a decade, some of the best brains of the Nation have sought the answer to that question. Let us have no illusions about the magnitude of the problem or the difficulty of its solution. It should be evident that a combination of factors, almost a crop-by-crop approach, must be enlisted. And let me say frankly that I do not in this statement attempt a complete analysis or feel capable of offering one. I do know that some day a start must be made, that we cannot indefinitely postpone this problem which is of greatest moment to so many of our people.

There are crops for which domestic requirements have been greatly scaled up during wartime by stoppage of importations. Among these are the oil crops, important to the Midwest and the South. Peanuts, which have sold for $200 per ton during the present crisis, sold as low as $25 per ton in the depression. Adequate tariff protection from cheap foreign oils will insure a great domestic market for oil crops in this country in the post-war period. It will help to bolster sick King Cotton, for cottonseed is a valuable source of oil and feed.

Timber, frequently overlooked as an important source of farm income, has assumed new value since paper and newsprint and other timber products from abroad have been shut out. Most farms include waste-land acreage which will produce marketable timber in a short period. But its value, and the presence of industries to utilize it, may depend upon the protection which is given to American producers and workmen.

Expanding fields of use, stimulated by wartime research, have given us new markets. Industrial use of farm products can insure a substantial field for the consumption of post-war surpluses. This use should be encouraged by subsidies where necessary. Our overworked mineral resources which have been seriously depleted by the requirements of war will benefit as well as the farmers. We have learned in the South to take advantage of dehydration to save shipping costs, to eliminate bulkiness, and to improve keeping qualities. Sweetpotatoes for starch or for livestock feed possess a greater value for the grower when dehydrated. Our domestic production of sugar can be expanded greatly. I do not attempt to treat these fields with the detail they merit. But I insist that development of new uses, and industrial utilization for crops are subjects deserving more vigorous support from Congress and from the administration.

Tariff protection of the American grower is a matter which is wholly within the reach of Congress. It should receive prompt attention and it should be decided solely on the basis of its effect on our own people. We should not forget that the healthy condition of American industry largely was made possible by a half century of tariff protection.

Those crops of which the domestic consumption is greater than production can be made the principal base of farm prosperity. Already we have the precedent for floor prices established at levels sufficiently high to encourage needed domestic production, and to cause acreage to be diverted from less profitable or less needed crops. It is also true that we have a precedent in the peanut crop which may well be followed in dealing with surplus crops.

For 2 years the Government through Commodity Credit Corporation has purchased the peanut crop at a standard price listed in advance of the season. Some of the crop the Government has caused to be diverted to the edible trade at a higher price than that paid to the growers. The bulk of the crop, however, has gone to the oil trade at a price lower than that paid to the farmers. Receipts from the two uses were balanced against each other so that the program has operated without cost to the Government.

Cotton is probably our top ranking problem child. After years of stringent crop control, we had at the beginning of the war more than 2 years' supply of short staple in the warehouses. The prewar price clung consistently to levels too low to permit any degree of grower prosperity. To the credit of the Government's farm program, those prices were higher than the world market. But as a result we were undersold on the foreign markets until most of that market was lost to American producers. Yet cotton is so strongly entrenched that it remains the major southern cash crop.

Cotton is produced far in excess of American needs, and because of that excess, the price must be determined in part by world demand. A crop dependent upon world demand, and not produced at figures conforming to the world market is living on borrowed time. But only the American market will pay the farmer prices which permit him to enjoy the American standard of living. Shall we embrace a quota system held rigidly to American requirements? It has been proposed that we combine quotas for domestic needs with excess planting permits to allow foreign shipments at the will of the grower. Or shall we abandon quota control of cotton and allow the normal forces of world supply and demand to reestablish American cotton prices and control its production? Are there other solutions?

I believe there is another solution and that it is a better one. The Government cannot solve cotton surpluses by buying and holding them indefinitely. But the Government can establish a price for cotton, divert into domestic mills their normal requirements at prices commensurate with the American standard of living, and sell the remainder on the world market at world-market prices. Obviously such a system will not pay its way. It will require Government subsidies. The larger the subsidy, the higher price for cotton, but I think Congress will not be too liberal for cotton processors and cotton consumers as well as cotton growers will be represented among those who vote the subsidy.

What is said of cotton can in large measure be said of other surplus crops.

One point should be very clear. Nothing that has been advanced here requires crop allotments, crop control, or complicated records. The regimentation, the crop measurements, the form filling, the endless trips to the county agent's office are eliminated. And those who are honest enough to admit it know that American farmers are heartily sick of form filling and the crop curtailment of the A. A. A. program.

In this program the Government need not be purchasing agent for the farmer. I believe it will be sufficient that the Government fix prices to the grower and put a floor on prices to the domestic processor, that it reimburse the dealer from the subsidy pool for his loss in export sales, and that it provide tariff protection from foreign cotton.

There is a place for consumer subsidies in the post-war agricultural picture, particularly in the fields of school lunchrooms and in the stamp plan, both of which have been successfully operated.

Livestock production can go much further in the national picture, particularly in the South. In many sections timber farming goes hand in hand with livestock production and timber farming is coming into its own.

The Department of Agriculture possesses in the soil-conservation program a popular agency which can be made a much more valuable weapon in the crop-control program. Unquestionably this is one of the finest pieces of work that has come out of Washington. To further reduce farmer dependence upon cotton and other annual surplus crops, the soil-conservation program may be adapted to a sliding-scale program, with payments to be stepped up or down from year to year as crop surpluses require that more or fewer acres be retired from production. Big carry-over of surplus crop plus increased soil-conservation payments equal smaller following crop.

There is a place for crop control, but it should be control from the top. Present control programs start at the bottom and work through the individual producers. That kind of program regiments farmers to a stereotyped pattern. Whether the individual is spurred by need or initiative, his ambitions and his abilities must be subordinated to a paper pattern from a Washington bureau. Control from the top operates through market demand, and it permits the farmer to enjoy freedom as an individual to expand or improve his operations.

Price fixing at profit-permitting levels, in combination with a revised soil-conservation program, could go far to make that type of crop control possible. These two can be operated to form a natural stimulus or a natural check on production, as conditions may warrant, and to materially reduce dependence upon cotton and other surplus crops.

To summarize, I see a need for tariff protection on oil crops, sugar crops, timber products, and other farm and forest products of which we produce less than domestic requirements. I propose more widespread industrial utilization of the products of our soil, encouraged by subsidies when necessary. I urge Congress and the administration to place greater emphasis on the search for new uses for farm products. I should deplore a return to the crop-curtailment program of the A. A. A. It can lead only to partial starvation for American agriculture. In its stead I endorse price fixing ahead of each growing season, with prices to be based on domestic requirements, probable world prices, and amount of subsidy made available by Congress. By this method the farmer will know what he is to receive and he can base his production accordingly. I propose the complete elimination of crop allotments, and the tiresome and endless form-filling of previous Government agricultural programs. There is no necessity for them. There is a place for an expanded soil-conservation program. The Nation's soils have benefited tremendously under the present program. Consumer subsidies can be used advantageously to encourage greater consumption by the low-income brackets and to improve health and living standards.

This is a many-sided problem, but whatever the remedy, America's farm ills must be cured. The courage and ingenuity of the American farmer are sufficient to meet the requirements of any farm program which offers him a chance of success. With proper guidance and support from the Nation's farm experts he can work out a new agriculture if need be. But he must have that guidance and support.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. RAMSPECK] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include in my remarks a letter from Mr. Arthur Flemming, a member of the Civil Service Commission.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION FOR GOVERNMENT WAR WORKERS

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, the subject I want to discuss here for a few minutes is not a political question, not a party question, nor a partisan question; the question I want to propose to the membership of this body is: Why should we accord the employees of the United States Government different treatment from that given to employees of corporations and other private employers under the George bill in relation to the payment of unemployment compensation?

I am placing in the RECORD a letter from the minority member of the Civil Service Commission which has a breakdown of the employees of this Government which I think will be of interest and will give information to the membership of the House.

Four years ago we had approximately 900,000 people working for this Government. Today we have approximately 2,000,000 more than that. In the continental United States those 2,000,000 employees are war workers just as much as the employees of General Motors or any other large corporation engaged in the manufacture of things for this war.

As I understand it, the unemployment compensation laws of the various States make no distinction between industrial workers and so-called white-collar workers; they are all covered by unemployment compensation. I believe it is also true that with the possible exception of one or two States no contribution is required from the employees themselves to an unemployment compensation fund. They do contribute to the social-security fund but not to any unemployment-compensation fund. The relative position of Government employees and private employees is the same. You will find if you read this letter that as of March 31 of this year we have 1,791,000 civilian employees, or 63 percent of the grand total working in the field establishments of the Army and Navy; 349,000 of these employees were in Government navy yards building battleships, submarines, cruisers, and other naval craft as well as performing repair and service work on naval vessels. I ask you what is the difference between the war services of those employees and the services of the employees working in the Kaiser shipyards and other shipyards?

Eighty-four thousand one hundred were engaged in procurement; 51,600 in naval ammunition depots; 71,880 in naval air stations; 22,800 in naval training stations; 51,700 employees were engaged in miscellaneous naval activities such as hospitals, medical supply depots, and so forth.

When you get to the Army, there are 176,300 in the Air Service Command, 34,700 in the Material Command, 59,600 in the Training Command, 13,500 in the Air Transport Command, 35,900 in the First, Second, Third, and Fourth Air Forces, and 10,000 in the other commands, stations and centers, and 330,100 were in the service commands of the Army Service Forces. Then we list those in the Chemical Warfare, with the Engineers and Medical Corps. There are 170,500 of them in ordnance, many of them manufacturing ammunition and guns. I will not take the time to read the various other figures that are given in this letter.

The point I am trying to make is that most of these 2,000,000 employees who have been on the pay roll because of our activity in the war effort and the preceding national defense program are in exactly the same category as the employees who are working for General Motors, General Electric, or any other war contractor. It is true some of them are doing white-collar work, but so are the employees of General Motors, General Electric, and other contractors, whose money is coming out of the United States Treasury and whose employees are indirectly being paid by the taxpayers of the United States. Frankly, I cannot see why we should make "fish" of one and "fowl" of the other, why we should discriminate against those patriotic citizens who have served their Government in time of war and who on the whole have done an outstanding job, many of whom have passed up an opportunity to make more money in private employment.

As I said in the beginning, this is not a partisan question nor a political question. Nobody knows whether these employees are Democratic or Republican. These 2,000,000 extra employees who came into the Government service on account of the war activities were selected under civil-service procedure. They are not permanent employees; they do not have a permanent civil-service status and it is my expectation that they will be separated as rapidly as possible when the need for them is over. I am sure that will be the case.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAMSPECK. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Did not these employees, when they accepted this employment, know what the law was with respect to them? Why does the gentleman want to change the law and change the contract and give them money that it was not intended to give them by the law at the time they accepted the employment? Why did not the gentleman raise the issue earlier? Why should not the gentleman have raised the issue about this when the Social Security Act was passed? Why not cover school teachers and all other employees throughout the country who have stayed home patriotically and who have not had the benefit of high wages and time and a half? Why does the gentleman raise the issue now? The principle is the same with all these other people. Why does the gentleman raise the issue now? The principle is the same, the gentleman is bound to admit, whether they are war workers now or whether they were in the Government service before the war. This class was not covered before the war under the civil service. Why should it be done now? Why give them money which they did not understand they were to get at the time they accepted the employment?

Mr. RAMSPECK. I will be glad to give the gentleman my opinion about it. In the first place, I did not raise the issue. It was raised in the Senate bill and it is a part of the Senate bill. The issue is before us and we have to meet it.

In the second place, I think these 2,000,000 employees I am talking about are in a different situation from the regular or permanent Government employees. We have no laws to take care of the Government employees who have no civil-service status, but who are war workers only. They are in a different category.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Are they any more war workers than the people back home who have been keeping the industries going? Why are they any more war workers than the school teachers, for instance?

Mr. RAMSPECK. If the gentleman wants to talk about school teachers, I have a bill pending here to help the school teachers and I would like for the gentleman to support it.

Mr. DOUGHTON. This is an issue that confronts us right now.

Mr. RAMSPECK. I think there is this difference between these people and the people the gentleman refers to. I am in favor of doing something for the school teachers, but they are not going to lose their jobs and these people are.

Mr. DOUGHTON. How does the gentleman know they are not when these people come back? That is assuming a great deal.

Mr. RAMSPECK. The school teachers are not going to lose their jobs. There will be more people going to school when the war is over than now, because a lot of them will come back from the service and go back to school.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAMSPECK. I yield.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Does not the gentleman believe that with regard to the desire of many people to reduce the Federal employment after the war, from that point of view if there is provision made for a reasonable unemployment compensation to tide people over for the period of readjustment, it will be more likely that that will take place in an orderly and speedy manner than would take place otherwise?

Mr. RAMSPECK. I think that is a fair assumption to make.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAMSPECK. I yield.

Mr. DONDERO. Can the gentleman give the House any estimate of what it will cost the United States to carry out the program the gentleman advocates?

Mr. RAMSPECK. No; I cannot, because there will be a great many factors involved, the largest factor, of course, being how long they were unemployed; how long it took them to find other employment. I have not estimated it.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. RAMSPECK. I hope when this question comes before the House next Monday that we will vote to agree with the Senate on this provision, and give to those faithful employees who served our Government just as faithfully as the others who are to be given this benefit, the same privilege and the same consideration that we are giving to the private workers.

There is one other point that I want to make. If we turn this down we are going to be faced with a situation where a man working in the navy yard or a Government arsenal is going to say to himself, "Why shouldn't I quit this job and go out and get a job in a war factory where I will get unemployment compensation when this war work is over?" You are going to have a worse personnel problem than you have now.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Does the gentleman look for any great unemployment any time in the immediate future?

Mr. RAMSPECK. I hope not, but nobody knows.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Does the gentleman look for it?

Mr. RAMSPECK. I do not know what the future is going to bring.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Should we not wait until we get further information than we have now? At the present time the air is saturated with politics. Why not wait and let us go into the whole subject and let us ascertain something about what it is going to cost, and where the money is coming from?

Will the gentleman do this, when he extends his remarks? Will he put in some estimate of the cost and his views as to how he is going to raise the additional money? That question must be met. Why not meet it now?

Mr. RAMSPECK. These 2,000,000 people are certainly going to be unemployed when the war is over. We will not need them. The employees of General Motors will have a chance to make automobiles, but these people that I am talking about are going to have to get out of their jobs. If there is no unemployment after the war they will not be paid and there will be no cost.

Mr. DOUGHTON. The gentleman knows they will go back into other employment. There is a shortage of labor practically everywhere now.

Mr. RAMSPECK. That is true, but I think that some of the other jobs will not be in existence then

Mr. DOUGHTON. Have they not laid something aside for a rainy day to tide them over?

Mr. RAMSPECK. I do not know whether that is true.

Mr. DOUGHTON. The gentleman knows that they ought to.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Yes; all employees should have, but in many cases the Government employee has been paid less than the private employees.

(The letter of Mr. Flemming follows:)

UNITED STATES
CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION,
Washington, D. C., May 13, 1944.

Hon. ROBERT RAMSPECK,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. RAMSPECK: The following statement is submitted in response to your verbal request for statistics on Federal civilian employment classified by various types of activity.

Paid civilian employment in the United States total 2,839,366 in all executive departments and agencies combined as of March 31, 1944. Of this number, 1,193,641 were in the War Department; 652,470 in the Navy Department; 173,831 in emergency war agencies; 348,076 in the Post Office Department; and 471,348 in all other departments and agencies. These figures do not include 285,000 persons serving without compensation or at the nominal compensation of $1 per year or per month—90 percent of these are local board members of the Office of Price Administration and Selective Service. Also these figures do not include approximately 415,000 persons who are employed outside continental United States.

A total of 1,791,000 civilian employees, or 63 percent of the grand total, were working in field establishments of the War and Navy Departments throughout all sections of the country. These civilian workers were performing services directly related to the war program and were engaged in industrial types of work concerned with war production, construction, storage, distribution, supply, communication, inspection, testing, repair service, and other related war activities

(this figure excludes all civilian employees in departmental headquarters' offices of the War and Navy Departments but includes all workers in these field establishments regardless of whether performing white collar, mechanical, or manual work).

A break-down of the 1,791,000 civilian employees reported in field establishments of these two Departments, according to type of work, is as follows:

Approximately 349,400 were employed in Government navy yards building battleships, submarines, cruisers, and other naval craft as well as performing repair and service work on naval vessels.

Approximately 84,100 were engaged in naval procurement activities concerned with supply and maintenance work and the inspection of naval machinery, ordnance, aircraft, and material.

Approximately 51,600 were employed in naval ammunition depots, torpedo stations, and other naval ordnance plants.

Approximately 71,800 were employed at the naval air stations and reserve aviation bases.

Approximately 22,800 were in naval training stations, reception and induction centers, and other field personnel activities.

Approximately 51,700 employees were engaged in miscellaneous naval activities such as hospitals, medical supply depots, dispensaries, operating bases, proving grounds, research, etc., including civilian personnel in Marine Corps and Coast Guard.

Civilian employees in various operating activities of the Army Air Forces were distributed as follows:

Air Service Command	176,300
Matériel Command	34,700
Training Command	59,600
Air Transport Command	13,500
First, Second, Third, and Fourth Air Forces	35,900
All other commands, stations, and centers	10,000

Approximately 330,100 were in service commands of the Army Service Forces.

Civilian employees in the technical services of the Army Service Forces concerned with such activities as the manufacturing, storage, and distribution of tanks, guns, bombs, bullets, and other material; construction, repair, and maintenance of utilities; procurement of munitions of war and related work were distributed as follows:

Chemical Warfare	25,200
Engineers	78,700
Medical	8,500
Ordnance	170,500
Quartermaster	74,200
Signal	46,700
Transportation	76,800
Miscellaneous	17,000

Approximately 1,900 in miscellaneous services.

It should be noted that these figures include all civilian employees working in field establishments in the above categories of work and represent therefore an industrial or activity classification as distinguished from an occupational distribution of employment. Only a small proportion of such workers in the above categories were working in the Washington, D. C., metropolitan area.

In addition to such industrial types of employment in the War and Navy Departments it should be pointed out that many other Federal agencies also are doing work of an industrial nature. For example, Tennessee Valley Authority; Government Printing Office; Bureau of Reclamation and Bonneville Power Administration, Interior Department; Procurement Division and Bureau of Engraving and Printing, Treasury Department; Post Office Department; Panama Canal; Weather Bureau and National Bureau of Standards, Commerce Department; and other organizational branches whose work relates directly or indirectly to the war program. An enumeration of employment in these categories will, of course, include not only production workers in skilled, semiskilled, and unskilled classes of work but also all clerical and administrative personnel required for the conduct and maintenance of these industrial activities. No break-down into specific occupational groups is currently available.

The bulk of the 173,831 employees in other war agencies—i. e., those created specifically for the war emergency—is accounted for largely by local selective-service boards, war price and ration boards, and employment offices in all of the 48 States and the District of Columbia. This figure for war agencies does not include employment in such agencies as the Veterans' Administration, Maritime Commission, National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, State Department, etc., which are likewise geared almost completely to the war program. It does not include personnel in certain branches of other regular departments and agencies, viz, Justice Department (F. B. I.), Agriculture Department (War Food Administration), National Housing Agency (Federal Public Housing Authority), Treasury Department (War Finance Division, Foreign Funds Control), and others, concerned either directly or indirectly with war or national defense activities.

I trust that this break-down of the composite employment figures published in our regular Monthly Report of Employment will provide you with additional detailed information on the functions and activities on which United States Government personnel are engaged.

Sincerely yours,

ARTHUR S. FLEMMING,
Commissioner.

AMERICAN PRISONERS OF WAR

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 4 minutes, to revise and extend my remarks, and include a petition; and also to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an interesting newspaper article by Gladstone Williams.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, today's news dispatches bring us the encouraging news that our heroic fighting American armies, together with our allies, have invaded the German borders on an 85-mile front. We are told that our invincible and victorious armies are routing the enemy on every front and continue to take many prisoners of war, including several German generals and other high-ranking officers. We are told that the First, Third, and the Seventh Armies alone, now fighting in France, Belgium, and Germany, have taken more than 320,000 enemy prisoners of war.

Every true American is proud of our gallant men on every front and of the great record they are making. There is no question but that we now have the greatest army and the most powerful navy in the world. Our Air Force is superb. Their wonderful record of accomplishments is a source of great satisfaction. The mounting number of enemy prisoners taken and supplies captured spells early defeat for at least one of the gangster nations.

As we rejoice over the progress that our armies are making, especially along the Siegfried line, that Hitler has boasted was impregnable, and while we are elated at the capture of so many prisoners of war and are jubilant over the prospects of an early capitulation of Germany, I am fearful that this Congress has been somewhat negligent with reference to our own American prisoners of war. As we all know, a rather large number of our American prisoners of war are now languishing in Japanese prisons and German prisons. A number of bills pending in Congress are now before the Committee on Military Affairs for the purpose of giving some degree of assistance to those prisoners of war. Most of such bills propose to give automatic promotions to those who have been prisoners of war for a period of 1 year or more.

Last week Senate bill 1374, by Senator CHAVEZ, was passed by that body unanimously providing that effective December 8, 1944, all officers of the Army, Navy, and Coast Guard below the grade of colonel who were serving in the Philippine Islands, or on Wake or Guam on December 8, 1941, and who were now prisoners of war, shall be automatically advanced one grade from the grade he held on that date and shall receive similar promotions each year thereafter as long as such imprisonment continues.

When the bill reached the House this week, it was very properly referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

This proposed legislation has created considerable interest throughout the country. I know there is a very definite feeling not only among the friends and relatives of our honored prisoners of war who have suffered deprivations, hunger, and physical and mental anguish in prison camps, but also among our citizens generally, that this Congress should enact legislation so that our prisoners of war and their loved ones may know that they have not been forgotten. It seems that the least this Congress could do would be to give these courageous and heroic members of our country's defenders the same consideration with reference to promotions that they would have received had they remained in active service and not suffered the humiliation of becoming prisoners of war. I am hopeful that legislation to give recognition and encouragement to all our prisoners of war will be enacted before this Congress adjourns or recesses. But all prisoners of war, in my judgment, should be treated alike and an amendment should be added to the Chavez bill for that purpose before final passage by the House.

Mr. Speaker, I have received a rather voluminous petition signed by many of the leading citizens of El Reno and Canadian County, Okla., urging that action by the Congress be enacted providing for promotions of our honored prisoners of war the same as if they had been permitted to remain in active service. The petition follows:

PETITION URGING PROMOTION OF AMERICAN PRISONERS OF WAR

We, the undersigned, are citizens of Canadian County, Okla. We respectfully bring attention to the fact that our prisoners of war in Germany and Japan are unable by reason of censorship and imprisonment to speak for themselves. Therefore, we present, in their behalf, our petition, that further action be made on either bill, No. 4284, introduced in the House of Representatives February 29, 1944, by Mr. BUSBEY, and No. 3760,

introduced in the House of Representatives by Mr. COURTNEY. These and similar bills were referred to the House and Senate Committees on Military Affairs. Neither bill has been reported on by either committee. They both deal in provision for promotion of American prisoners of war.

We feel, although any prisoners of war in Germany and Japan are restricted, through no fault or failure of their own, from engaging in active warfare, they still maintain their desire to do so. In fact, they suffer day by day greater hardships than the average comrade on the fighting front, yet have little or no hopes of higher rating, rank, or pay status. Their official status as prisoners of war is an undisputed fact that they have demonstrated their bravery and valor in performance of their duty toward their country, the United States of America.

We, therefore, petition that some action be made on either of the above bills to automatically give them promotions as are given their contemporaries who are still in active service.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. HORAN, until October 1, on account of official business.

To Mr. HOLIFIELD, from September 15 to October 1, on account of official business.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I gathered from statements which were made on the floor today that a statement going back as far as 1920 and containing information as to the amounts of money requested by the military establishments of the Government, as to the amounts that had been recommended by the executive department, and as to the amounts finally appropriated by Congress, had been sent to the Committee on Appropriations, but for some 2 years it had been in the safe over there, inaccessible to Members of the House. By what authority or what rule of Congress or what rule governing committees was that suppressed?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ZIMMERMAN). The present occupant of the chair has no knowledge of any such facts, and therefore is not in a position to answer the gentleman's inquiry.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Does the Chair mean he does not have any knowledge that that is true?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has no knowledge of that, except that somebody has said it is true, according to the gentleman's statement.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Submitting that then as a hypothetical question.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair does not entertain a hypothetical question, and does not think that the parliamentary inquiry is pertinent at this stage of the proceedings and at this particular time in the absence of the Speaker.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I might inquire, then, of the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations about that.

Mr. RAMSPECK. I make the point of order, Mr. Speaker, that the gentleman is not propounding a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. HOFFMAN. With the indulgence of the gentleman, I am just trying to get information to answer the false charge that the Republicans, at a time when the Democrats had, as they now have, complete control of Congress, are to blame because the appropriations were cut down, the appropriations for preparedness and for carrying on the war.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 725. An act to provide for the punishment of persons conspiring to violate the laws relating to counterfeiting and certain other laws; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1062. An act to authorize certain employees of the General Land Office to administer or take oaths, affirmations, affidavits, or depositions in the performance of their official duties; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

S. 1557. An act for the relief of Joel A. Hart; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 1732. An act for the relief of Arthur M. Sellers; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 1766. An act for the relief of C. C. Thornton; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 1780. An act to exempt certain officers and employees of the National War Labor Board from certain provisions of the Criminal Code; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1784. An act for the relief of Leola Evans; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 1807. An act authorizing and directing the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain land to the city of Duluth, Minn.; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

S. 1853. An act for the relief of Dr. Frank K. Boland, Sr.; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 1869. An act for the relief of Mrs. Mamie Dutch Vaughn; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 1897. An act for the relief of Mrs. Sophia Tannenbaum; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 1942. An act for the relief of Dr. E. S. Axtell; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 1959. An act for the relief of Mrs. Amy McKnight; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 1987. An act for the relief of Gordon Lewis Coppage; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 2008. An act for the relief of Herman Philyaw; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 2069. An act for the relief of Irma S. Sheridan, postmaster at Rockville, Oreg.; to the Committee on Claims.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. KLEIN, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 4278. An act to provide for the control and eradication of certain animal and plant pests and diseases, to facilitate cooperation with the States in fire control, to provide for the more efficient protection and management of the national forests, to facilitate the carrying out of agricultural conservation and related agricultural programs, to facilitate the operation of the Farm Credit Administration and the Rural Electrification Administration, to aid in the orderly marketing of agricultural commodities, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 4780. An act to fix the fees for domestic insured and collect-on-delivery mail, special-delivery service, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 10 minutes p. m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, September 18, 1944, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1809. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting estimates of personnel requirements for the Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard, covering the second quarter, fiscal year 1945; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

1810. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a revised estimate of the number of employees required for the proper and efficient exercise of the functions of the General Accounting Office during the quarter ending December 31, 1944; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

1811. A letter from the Acting Director, Office for Emergency Management, Division of Central Administrative Services, transmitting copies of the quarterly estimates of personnel requirements for the Division of Central Administrative Services for the quarter ending December 31, 1944; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

1812. A letter from the Assistant Secretary-Treasurer, the American Commission for the Protection and Salvage of Artistic and Historic Monuments in War Areas, transmitting a copy of the report on the quarterly estimate of personnel requirements; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

1813. A letter from the Administrative Officer, the White House, transmitting the quarterly estimate of personnel requirements for the White House Office; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

1814. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, transmitting a copy of quarterly estimate of personnel requirements for the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics for the second quarter of the fiscal year 1945, ending December 31, 1944, together with copy of letter of transmittal to the Director of the Bureau of the Budget; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

1815. A letter from the Chairman, United States Tariff Commission, transmitting a copy of the estimate of personnel requirements of the United States Tariff Commission for the quarter ending December 31, 1944; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

1816. A letter from Charles B. Shaw, major, Army of the United States, officer in charge, the American Battle Monuments Commission, transmitting a copy of the quarterly estimate of personnel requirements for the American Battle Monuments Commission for the quarter ending December 31, 1944; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

1817. A letter from the Director, Selective Service System, transmitting an estimate of personnel requirements for the quarter ending December 31, 1944; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

1818. A letter from the Director, the Office of Censorship, transmitting a copy of the quarterly estimate of personnel requirements for the Office of Censorship for the quarter ending December 31, 1944; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

1819. A letter from the Director, Division of Administrative Management, National War Labor Board, transmitting a quarterly estimate of the personnel requirements of the National War Labor Board for the second

quarter of the fiscal year 1945; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. PETERSON of Florida: Committee on the Public Lands. Interim report pursuant to House Resolution 281. Resolution authorizing a study of certain public-land problems and the use of public lands in the rehabilitation of veterans (Rept. No. 1884). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. PETERSON of Florida: Committee on the Public Lands. H. R. 4286. A bill to relinquish the title of the United States to certain lands in the county of Los Angeles, State of California; without amendment (Rept. No. 1885). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. PETERSON of Florida: Committee on the Public Lands. H. R. 4697. A bill providing for the appointment of a United States commissioner for the Big Bend National Park in the State of Texas, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 1886). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. PETERSON of Florida: Committee on the Public Lands. H. R. 4917. A bill conferring upon the State of Montana authority to exchange for other lands certain lands selected by the State of Montana for the use of the University of Montana for biological station purposes pursuant to the act of March 3, 1905 (33 Stat. 1080); without amendment (Rept. No. 1887). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. PETERSON of Florida: Committee on the Public Lands. H. R. 5232. A bill to transfer jurisdiction over the Chattanooga National Cemetery, Chattanooga, Tenn., from the Department of the Interior to the War Department, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1888). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. BOREN: Special Subcommittee on Investigation of Restrictions on Brand Names and Newsprint of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. Interim report pursuant to House Resolution 98. Resolution to conduct an investigation with respect to contemplated requirements with respect to labeling, production, marketing, and distribution of articles and commodities (Rept. No. 1889). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BLOOM:

H. R. 5363. A bill to amend the joint resolution of January 27, 1942, entitled "Joint resolution to enable the United States to become an adhering member of the Inter-American Statistical Institute"; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. DWORSHAK:

H. R. 5364. A bill to authorize the construction and operation and maintenance of the initial unit of the Mountain Home project; to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

By Mr. GOODWIN:

H. R. 5365. A bill to repeal the automobile-use tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LEWIS:

H. R. 5366. A bill to amend an act known as an act to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 (Public, No. 316, 73d Cong.), approved June 12, 1934, as extended by Public Resolution No. 10, Seventy-fifth Congress, approved March 1, 1937, by withdrawing from the President power to decrease existing rates of duty or transferring any article from the dutiable to free lists; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 5367. A bill to provide a quota for earthenware, crockeryware, china, porcelain, and other vitrified wares imported into the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 5368. A bill to provide a quota for articles made wholly or in chief value of glass imported into the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 5369. A bill to amend section 1402 of title 19 United States Code so as to require all customs duties on merchandise imported into the United States to be based upon the United States value thereof; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

H. R. 5370. A bill to provide that periods of vocational training undertaken by disabled veterans in preparing for employment by the United States shall be credited for retirement purposes; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

By Mr. VOORHIS of California:

H. R. 5371. A bill to amend the act of July 15, 1940, pertaining to emergency officers' retirement benefits; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. IZAC:

H. R. 5372. A bill to further amend the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HOFFMAN:

H. Res. 640. House resolution requesting information from the Secretary of Labor as to number, etc., of plants taken over by Government departments under Executive order; to the Committee on Labor.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the United States of Venezuela, sending a fervent message of good will to the legislative bodies of the United Nations, and the expression of its hope for the victory of the democratic armies today engaged in the liberation of Europe; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Memorial of the President of the National Congress of Venezuela, expressing his sincere good wishes and hopes for the victory of the armies who are fighting with such courage for the liberation of Europe; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ROLPH:

H. R. 5373. A bill for the relief of the Van Arsdale-Harris Lumber Co., Inc.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. ROONEY:

H. R. 5374. A bill to grant an honorable discharge from the military service of the United States to William Rosenberg; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

6125. By Mr. BRUMBAUGH: Resolution of members of the Fraternal Order of Police, Mountain City Lodge, No. 8, Altoona, Pa., requesting the enactment of the Townsend bill, H. R. 1649; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

6126. By Mr. CANNON of Missouri: Petition of sundry resident of St. Charles, Matson, Augusta, Defiance, West Alton, and Berger, Mo., requesting that dikes constructed in the Missouri River be removed as the narrow channel will not permit the escape of floodwaters; to the Committee on Flood Control.

6127. By Mr. COCHRAN: Petition of the Barry Wehmiller Machinery Co., signed by 210 St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

6128. By Mr. GRAHAM: Petition of the Lawrence County, Pomona Grange of Lawrence County, Pa., favoring the discontinuance of all unnecessary Government regulations and regulatory agencies thus giving the law of supply and demand an opportunity to function again; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

6129. Also, petition of the Lawrence County, Pomona Grange of Lawrence County, Pa., favoring Government assistance to the veterans in securing homes of their own choice; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

6130. By Mr. HERTER: Petition signed by sundry citizens of Roslindale, Mass., protesting inhuman treatment accorded Italian prisoners of the service units in Seattle, Wash., at the hands of Negro soldiers; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

6131. By Mr. PLOESER: Petition of Homer D. Cooke and 30 other petitioners of St. Louis, Mo., protesting against the enactment of any and all prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

6132. By Mr. GWYNNE: Petition of Mrs. D. L. Stamm and numerous other residents of Cedar Falls, Iowa, in favor of the bill S. 860; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

6133. Also, petition of Mrs. A. C. Dillon and numerous other residents of Cedar Falls, Iowa, urging passage of the Bryson bill, H. R. 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

6134. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the Bar Association of Hawaii, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the trials of all members of the civilian population of the Territory of Hawaii charged with crimes or offenses against other than the laws of war in order that the trials shall be by the duly constituted and functioning civil courts of said Territory or the Federal court of said Territory and not by provost courts maintained in said Territory by the military authorities; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE

FRIDAY, SEPTEMBER 15, 1944

(Legislative day of Friday, September 1, 1944)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Eternal and blessed God, in the midst of the toiling days when the fever and fret of perilous times have taken their toll of our spirits, we are grateful for quiet arbors where at an altar of contrition we may bow for Thy forgiveness and cleansing. With the refreshing dew of Thy strengthening grace upon us, may we go forth on our way attended by the

vision splendid as we lift up our hearts with the glad Te Deum, "He restoreth my soul."

Save us from the peril of forgetting that we are restored so that we may restore, that we are strengthened in order that we may strengthen. History is Thy message to warn that selfish bread will choke us and the unshared cup of water will turn to salt upon our lips. Deliver us from every wrong thought we have had of Thee and from every poor or partial view of Thy children, our brothers. Through all the changing pattern of the years may there come Thy kingdom of peace with justice and good will in all the earth. We ask it in the Saviour's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Wednesday, September 13, 1944, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed without amendment the following bill and joint resolution of the Senate:

S. 2111. An act to provide for the extension of certain oil and gas leases; and

S. J. Res. 150. Joint resolution making an appropriation to pay the necessary expenses of the inaugural ceremonies of the President of the United States, January 20, 1945.

The message also announced that the House had severally agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the following bills of the House:

H. R. 1434. An act for the relief of Anna M. Kohler;

H. R. 4257. An act to expatriate or exclude certain persons for evading military and naval service; and

H. R. 4271. An act to amend the Nationality Act of 1940 to preserve the nationality of citizens residing abroad.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2697) to provide for the disposal of materials or resources on the public lands of the United States which are under the exclusive jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Interior.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to a concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 99), in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the Clerk of the House of Representatives, in the enrollment of the bill (H. R. 4271) to amend the Nationality Act of 1940 to preserve the nationality of citizens residing abroad, is authorized and directed to strike out the word "six" which appears in the proviso and insert in lieu thereof the word "five."

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the Vice President:

H. R. 4278. An act to provide for the control and eradication of certain animal and plant pests and diseases, to facilitate cooperation with the States in fire control, to provide for the more efficient protection and management of the national forests, to facilitate the carrying out of agricultural conservation and related agricultural programs, to facilitate the operation of the Farm Credit Administration and the Rural Electrification Administration, to aid in the orderly marketing of agricultural commodities, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 4780. An act to fix the fees for domestic insured and collect-on-delivery mail, special-delivery service, and for other purposes.

USE OF WAR-MAKING POWER BY THE PRESIDENT—ARTICLE BY WALTER LIPPMANN

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, in recent Senate debate I submitted certain observations in response to a question posed by the distinguished Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD] regarding the use of the war-making power by the President under the contemplated terms of the Dumbarton Oaks agreement. Mr. Walter Lippmann, one of our most favorably known columnists, subsequently submitted an inquiry to me seeking more specific clarification of one point in my argument. I responded in writing. Mr. Lippmann made my response the subject of report and comment in his Thursday morning column, September 14. I wish to present his article this morning and to say that it is an accurate reflection of my views. I do this because I want to make my supplementary statement to Mr. Lippmann an official part of my earlier reply to the question laid before the Senate by the Senator from South Dakota.

It will be recalled that we were discussing at that time the extent of the plenary power which the President, acting through an American delegate to the contemplated peace league, might exercise in taking us into overseas foreign wars. I indicated at that time to the Senator from South Dakota that I thought perhaps a regional line could be drawn to identify the constitutional distinction between the war-making power which is exclusively resident in the Congress and the other constitutional power which clearly rests in the President in the case of incidental defense emergencies.

I assumed that it would be understood that I also included in the powers which the American delegate and the President unquestionably should be allowed to use without referendum would be any power necessary to implement the continuous restraint of the Axis Powers in respect to all phases of rearmament. It was upon that subject that Mr. Lippmann particularly addressed me, and, inasmuch as it seems to be a very important part of the contemplation, I want to read from Mr. Lippmann's article, as a supplement to my reply to the able Senator from South Dakota, the following:

When I say that "the world's criminals of today must be so permanently demilitarized that they can never become the criminals of tomorrow," and when I say "to this end the immediate and continuous availability of Allied [military] force is indispensable," I mean to set this problem off by itself as separate from any other problem which may require the use of force. There must never be an instant's gap in the availability of this particular force, and there must never be an instant's doubt about its availability. If we have learned anything from the tragedies of yesterday, we must have learned that. I would most certainly include these disciplines within the power of the President, speaking through his delegate on the new league council, without any necessity for reference back to Congress.

Mr. President, I also want to make this article a part of the RECORD because of my deep conviction that the final conclusions reached by Mr. Lippmann are sound. I hope that no one doubts the unqualified sincerity with which I am cooperating in the desperately necessary effort to organize world security against military aggression and to underwrite organized peace in a free world of free men. Indeed, I am so irrevocably committed to this aim that I hate to see it needlessly jeopardized by needless controversy over immovable obstacles to what otherwise might well prove to be at least 99 percent unity upon this tremendous adventure in human welfare. I hasten to add that I believe the matter can and will be amicably adjusted without derogation of essential peace authority in the new league and equally without derogation of the Constitution of the United States. It will be of course exclusively our problem here in the Senate, and not the problem of Dumbarton Oaks, although the international conference should be on notice.

I want to ask that the Lippmann article be printed at this point in the RECORD in full as a part of my remarks; and I want particularly to emphasize his concluding wisdom when he says that "to stir up a debate by asking for blanket authority when you do not need it, and would not use it if you had it, would be a reckless thing to do."

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The article by Mr. Lippmann is as follows:

DUMBARTON OAKS: THE AMERICAN PROBLEM

(By Walter Lippmann)

It is not so certain as it might be that Mr. Stettinius and his American associates at Dumbarton Oaks have taken fully into account the meaning of the Senate debate on August 21 and of Governor Dewey's Louisville address. There is at issue the crucial question of how far bipartisan agreement can be had now to authorize the President to enforce peace.

Governor Dewey took the position, which Senator VANDENBERG, who speaks for the Republicans, has now made unequivocally clear, that they advocate giving the President full power to enforce the demilitarization of Germany and of Japan without coming back to Congress for authority in each concrete case. But Senator VANDENBERG also made it clear that it is highly improbable that Congress will once and for all give this President and

all his successors sole authority to enforce peace in circumstances not now foreseeable. In other words, specific authority to enforce German and Japanese demilitarization can be had by bipartisan agreement; general authority beyond that to enforce peace anywhere and everywhere cannot be had without a prolonged debate of which the outcome is by no means certain.

Mr. Stettinius and his chief, Secretary Hull, are now face to face with the same question that was put to President Wilson shortly after the armistice of 1918. Before Mr. Wilson left for Paris, the French Government said to him that "the settlement of the war properly so-called," by putting into effect a preliminary peace with Germany, should be divided from "the organization of the Society of Nations" because "the settlement of the concrete questions should not be confounded with the enforcement of the stipulations of general public law." This was the view, publicly expressed at the time, of ex-President Theodore Roosevelt, of Senator Lodge, and of Senator Knox, all of them strong interventionists, none of them isolationists. It was also the view of Mr. Winston Churchill, who wrote later that "there is no doubt that the French plan was at once logical, practical, and speedy." This became also the mature view of Colonel House, as it is now the considered judgment of such deep students of the problem as Messrs. Moulton and Marlio, the authors of The Control of Germany and Japan.

But President Wilson rejected the plan and insisted in uniting in one legal instrument the powers for dealing with Germany and the powers for dealing with all other possible outbreaks of trouble. This was President Wilson's cardinal error. He could have got immediately ample power to keep Germany disarmed. But when he asked for just as much power to deal with all hypothetical aggressions in the future, the Senate refused. As a result he got neither the power to police Germany nor did he get the League. The power which Congress would have granted to police Germany was more power than it would grant to police the world. The power it would have granted to police the world was not enough power to police Germany.

The administration is now on clear notice from the Senate debate that if it does not separate the policing of Germany and Japan from the enforcement of peace elsewhere in the world, it will jeopardize the whole settlement. Mr. George Santayana once said that "those who cannot remember the past are condemned to repeat it."

Lest there be any doubt that the regular Republicans in the Senate agree with Governor Dewey and will grant unequivocal authority to enforce the disarmament of our chief enemies, I have made a direct inquiry of Senator VANDENBERG and have received from him the following statement:

"When I say that 'the world's criminals of today must be so permanently demilitarized that they can never become the criminals of tomorrow' and when I say 'to this end the immediate and continuous availability of Allied (military) force is indispensable,' I mean to set this problem off by itself as separate from any other problem which may require the use of force. There must never be an instant's gap in the availability of this particular force, and there must never be an instant's doubt about its availability. If we have learned anything from the tragedies of yesterday we must have learned that. I would most certainly include these disciplines within the power of the President, speaking through his delegate on the new League Council, without any necessity for reference back to Congress."

I can find no weasel words in this commitment, and I take it to mean that a convention to enforce German and Japanese disarmament can be had by overwhelming bipartisan agreement.

What then are the prospects of similar agreement to enforce peace against aggressors other than Germany and Japan? Agreement can be had for the United States, as a government, to play its part. But what cannot be had without a convulsive and destructive and, I think, a useless debate, is a blank check in advance to the President to use the armed forces of the United States in unforeseeable and hypothetical disputes. The specific mandate which Senator VANDENBERG offers is in complete harmony with the letter and spirit of the Constitution. But a generalized mandate to use armed force would be an abdication by Congress of its prerogative in the making of war. It would be the height of folly to challenge this ancient and cherished prerogative, and it is entirely unnecessary.

The authority to deal swiftly with a German or Japanese rebellion is essential to making peace secure in the next two decades. If during this period, or later, another great power aggressor shows itself, the world situation will be very grave indeed. But it will be so grave that the actions of the Government should be supported from the first appearance of the threat by the informed advice of Congress. For no President who was in his right mind would want to engage in hostilities against a great power without the full support of Congress. Therefore, there is no point in asking for authority to act in such a grave matter without consulting Congress. To stir up such a harumscarum debate by asking for blanket authority when you do not need it, and would not use it if you had it, would be a reckless thing to do.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

AUDIT OF TRANSACTIONS OF FEDERAL CROP INSURANCE CORPORATION

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting copy of a report of the audit of the transactions of the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation from July 1, 1940, to June 30, 1941 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

PERSONNEL REQUIREMENTS

Letters from the Acting Administrative Assistant to the Secretary of Commerce, Director of the Division of Administrative Management of the National War Labor Board, officer in charge of the American Battle Monuments Commission, Director of the Office of Economic Stabilization, Chairman of the National Labor Relations Board, Assistant Secretary of the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, Chairman of the United States Tariff Commission, Director of the Selective Service System, Director of the Office of Censorship, Acting Chairman of the War Production Board, Chairman of the National Mediation Board, Acting Administrator of the Federal Works Agency, assistant secretary-treasurer of the American Commission for the Protection and Salvage of Artistic and Historic Monuments in War Areas, Director of the Bureau of the Budget, administrative officer for The White House, administrative officer of the President's Committee on Fair Employment Practice, Director of Office of War Mobilization, Chairman of the War Manpower Commission, Acting Director of the Office for Emergency Management, Division of Central Administrative Services, Acting Director of the Committee for Congested Production Areas, and the Liaison Office for Personnel Management, transmitting, pursuant to law, estimates of personnel requirements for their respective offices for the quarter ending December 31, 1944, and also a letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a revised estimate of personnel requirements for the quarter ending December 31, 1944 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Civil Service.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, and so forth, were laid before the Senate by the Vice President and referred as indicated:

A resolution by the executive committee of the Bar Association of Hawaii, favoring trial before the Federal or Territorial courts of Hawaii of nonmilitary personnel for all alleged crimes or offenses other than violations of the laws of war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A resolution by the board of directors of the Golden Legion, Los Angeles, Calif., favoring the waging of a speedy, direct, and efficient war in the Far East against Japan; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

RESOLUTION BY EASTERN IOWA LIGHT & POWER COOPERATIVE—RURAL ELECTRIFICATION ADMINISTRATION

Mr. GILLETTE. I ask consent to present a resolution adopted by the Eastern Iowa Light & Power Cooperative relating to Senate bill 2034, which I request may be printed in the RECORD and appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the Eastern Iowa Light & Power Cooperative, an Iowa cooperative, is a Rural Electrification Administrative cooperative; and

Whereas the board of directors of the Eastern Iowa Light & Power Cooperative is vitally interested in the expansion and growth of rural electrification in this area, as well as throughout the United States; and

Whereas this board of directors is of the opinion rural electrification will expand and grow more favorably and efficiently under an independent federally controlled agency rather than an agency within and under the control and domination of another Federal department: Now, therefore, be and it is hereby

Resolved by the board of directors of the Eastern Iowa Light & Power Cooperative:

(1) This board of directors of the Eastern Iowa Light & Power Cooperative hereby go on record favoring and demanding the immediate passage of the Senate bill 2034 making the Rural Electrification Administration an independent agency of the Federal Government.

(2) That this resolution be signed by the members of the board of directors of this cooperative and copies of the same be mailed to Hon. GEORGE WILSON and Hon. GUY GILLETTE, United States Senators from the State of Iowa, and the Honorable THOMAS MARTIN, Congressman from this district, and the Honorable HENRY O. TALLE, from Decorah.

Dated this 21st day of August 1944.

John H. Hendriks, Hugo Lenich, R. C. Hill, Alfred F. Meyer, Herman Treimer, Kenneth Helfert, Frank Myatt, Lee E. Dotson, George Butler, W. C. Anderson, J. Earl Dickersen, W. C. Hendrix, Frank Kiser, Carl J. Mitzner.

These being all the directors of the Eastern Iowa Light & Power Cooperative.

RESOLUTIONS BY CONVENTION OF CONNECTICUT FEDERATION OF LABOR

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to present for appropriate reference and to have printed in

the RECORD at this point two letters and accompanying resolutions, which I have received from Mr. John J. Egan, secretary-treasurer of the Connecticut Federation of Labor, Bridgeport, Conn.

The resolutions were adopted by the members of the Connecticut Federation of Labor at its fifty-ninth annual convention at Bridgeport, Conn., and urge the passage of legislation embodying the chief features of the rejected Murray-Kilgore and Celler-Dingell bills, the passage of the Wagner-Murray-Dingell bill, and the establishment and maintenance of a grade labeling program for the canning industry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the letters and resolutions presented by the Senator from Connecticut will be received, appropriately referred, and printed in the RECORD.

To the Committee on Banking and Currency:

CONNECTICUT FEDERATION OF LABOR,
Bridgeport, Conn., September 12, 1944.

Hon. FRANCIS T. MALONEY,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: Enclosed find copy of Resolution No. 19 entitled "Wagner-Murray-Dingell bill" and Resolution No. 20 entitled "Grade Labeling," both of which were passed at the fifty-ninth annual convention of the Connecticut Federation of Labor held at Bridgeport, Conn., September 8, 9, and 10.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN J. EGAN,
Secretary-Treasurer.

RESOLUTION 20

Grade labeling

Whereas the threat of inflation is present both during and immediately after the war; and

Whereas effective price control is necessary in order to protect the consumer from runaway inflation; and

Whereas proper establishment and maintenance of prices requires an adequate description of the products sold, particularly such commodities as clothing and food; and

Whereas grade labeling is the only effective and fair method of describing canned products: Therefore be it

Resolved, That this convention go on record as favoring the establishment and maintenance of a grade labeling program for the canning industry; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to the congressional Representatives from this State.

To the Committee on Finance:

RESOLUTION 19

Wagner-Murray-Dingell bill

Whereas freedom from want is impossible without security against the loss of working time and the high expense caused by sickness; and

Whereas the health of the people is a necessary condition of national safety and prosperity; and

Whereas the experience of the Selective Service has revealed a shameful failure of our Nation at the point of providing for the health and strength of the people; and

Whereas the Wagner-Murray-Dingell bill, which was introduced with the endorsement of the American Federation of Labor and other branches of the labor movement, has not yet had fair attention: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the fifty-ninth annual convention of the Connecticut Federation of Labor hereby calls upon our Senators and Representatives to insist upon the prompt consideration and passage of the Wagner-Murray-Dingell bill, by which the health and security of the worker and his family are protected during their entire lifetime; and be it finally

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to our Senators and Representatives, and to the Connecticut State Medical Association.

Ordered to lie on the table:

CONNECTICUT FEDERATION OF LABOR,
Bridgeport, Conn., September 12, 1944.

Hon. FRANCIS T. MALONEY,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: Enclosed find copy of Resolution No. 23, entitled "The Kilgore Bill," passed at the fifty-ninth annual convention of the Connecticut Federation of Labor held at Bridgeport, Conn., September 8, 9, and 10.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN J. EGAN,
Secretary-Treasurer.

RESOLUTION 23

The Kilgore bill

Whereas the Senate has rejected the Kilgore bill and passed the inadequate George bill; and

Whereas the House of Representatives has passed a bill even less satisfactory than the George bill passed by the Senate; and

Whereas widespread unemployment and distress, destroying the finest fruits of victory, will accompany the reconversion of war industries and the demobilization of the armed forces, unless far more adequate measures are taken than those provided by the bills passed by the Senate and the House of Representatives; and

Whereas the great shifts of population from State to State in response to the needs of wartime production have made it impossible for the States, acting separately, to meet this emergency: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the fifty-ninth annual convention of the Connecticut Federation of Labor hereby demands a full and fair reconsideration of these issues by the Senate and the House of Representatives, and the passage of legislation embodying the chief features of the rejected Murray-Kilgore and Celler-Dingell bills; and be it finally

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to our Senators and Representatives in Washington.

INVESTIGATION OF SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION AND LAWS ADMINISTERED BY IT

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, on June 22 last, I submitted Senate Resolution 316, which looked toward an investigation by the Committee on Banking and Currency of the law and the rules and regulations of the Securities and Exchange Commission, with a view to determining whether in the post-war period it might not be advisable to relax the S. E. C. restrictions to simplify the process of incorporation for small business.

The resolution was offered with no thought of robbing the public of any protective advantage in the S. E. C. law and regulations, but with a view to determining whether it might not be possible to simplify the rather burdensome process which is involved, and which is particularly repressive to small business.

I presented the resolution to the Securities and Exchange Commission itself, and I am very happy to say that Chairman Purcell, of the Commission, has been most cooperative in his reply. I have a long letter from him, under date of September 13, enclosing an analysis, which is too long to be put into the RECORD, but which I wish to have referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency in connection with its consideration of Senate Resolution 316.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the matters will be referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I merely wish to state publicly for the RECORD that Chairman Purcell suggests—

If, however, it should be deemed by Congress to be sound policy to relax the registration provisions of the act in an effort to stimulate the flow of capital into small business enterprises, we believe it would be preferable to do so by raising to $300,000 the exemption provided by section 3 (b)—

The present exemption limitation being $100,000—

as outlined previously, rather than by relaxing the disclosure requirements generally. It seems reasonable to suppose that most enterprises that might fairly be called small businesses would come within such an exemption.

Mr. President, I think Mr. Purcell's comment is pertinent and highly helpful. I am very hopeful that the Committee on Banking and Currency will take cognizance of this situation without much more delay.

LUM JACOBS

Mr. O'DANIEL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the votes by which yesterday Senate bill 2007, for the relief of Lum Jacobs, was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, be reconsidered.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the votes are reconsidered.

Mr. O'DANIEL. Mr. President, I wish to offer an amendment to the bill, on page 1, line 6, to strike out "$1,030" and to insert in lieu thereof "$1,500."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. WALSH of New Jersey, from the Committee on Commerce:

H. R. 3704. A bill to amend the Coast Guard Auxiliary and Reserve Act of 1941, as amended; without amendment (Rept. No. 1093).

By Mrs. CARAWAY, from the Committee on Commerce:

S. 1645. A bill relating to the administration of the Glacier National Park Fish Hatchery, at Creston, Mont., and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1094);

H. R. 4206. A bill to authorize the construction and operation of a free highway bridge across the Monongahela River in the county of Allegheny, Pa.; without amendment (Rept. No. 1095); and

H. R. 4207. A bill to authorize the construction and operation of a free highway bridge across the Monongahela River in the county of Allegheny, Pa.; without amendment (Rept. No. 1096).

By Mr. BURTON, from the Committee on Commerce:

H. R. 2752. A bill to authorize the acquisition of additional lands and flowage easements for the Pleasant Hill Reservoir, Ohio,

and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1097).

By Mr. TYDINGS, from the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs:

H. R. 5144. A bill to authorize the city of Ketchikan, Alaska, to issue bonds in a sum not to exceed $150,000 for the purpose of constructing and acquiring additions and betterments to and extensions of the electric light and power system of said city, and to provide for the payment thereof, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1098).

By Mr. STEWART, from the Committee on Immigration:

S. 963. A bill relating to the imposition of certain penalties and the payment of detention expenses incident to the bringing of certain aliens into the United States; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1099).

By Mr. MEAD, from the Committee on Civil Service:

H. R. 4114. A bill to amend section 3 (b) of Public, 49, Seventy-eighth Congress, first session (War Overtime Pay Act of 1943); without amendment (Rept. No. 1100).

REPORT ON DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

Mr. BARKLEY, from the Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers, to which was referred for examination and recommendation a list of records transmitted to the Senate by the Archivist of the United States that appeared to have no permanent value or historical interest, submitted a report thereon pursuant to law.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. CAPPER:

S. 2146. A bill to provide for the acquisition of certain property in the District of Columbia for use by the Children's Museum of Washington, Inc.; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

(Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma introduced Senate bill 2147, which was referred to the Committee on Finance, and appears under a separate heading.)

(Mr. KILGORE introduced Senate bill 2148, which was referred to the Committee on Finance, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. McCARRAN:

S. 2149. A bill to increase the rates of compensation of certain postal employees, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

By Mr. HILL:

S. 2150. A bill for the relief of Frances Eubanks Oates; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. DAVIS (for himself, Mr. BROOKS, Mr. WILLIS, and Mr. CAPPER):

S. J. Res. 153. Joint resolution requesting the President to proclaim February 1 as National Freedom Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EMPLOYMENT OF ADDITIONAL CLERKS FOR VETERANS' MATTERS

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, out of order, I ask unanimous consent to introduce a bill authorizing each Senator and Representative in the Congress to appoint a special clerk to have charge of the interests of veterans of all wars. The bill likewise authorizes the appointment of a stenographer to work in the special veterans' set-up in each congressional office.

Briefly, the reasons for this bill are as follows:

At the present time we have a few veterans and their dependents of the War between the States; second, in my State of Oklahoma we have a number of Indians who served as scouts in the early days of Indian Territory and Oklahoma; third, we have the veterans and their dependents of the Spanish-American War and the Philippine Insurrection; fourth, we have the veterans and their dependents of World War No. 1, and now we are having to serve the veterans and their dependents of World War No. 2.

In World War No. 1 we had approximately four and one-half million men in the armed service, and in this war, by the time it is over, we will probably have had 14,000,000 men and women enlisted in the armed forces of our country.

I think it is obvious that any member who has served in the Congress for any considerable time is well acquainted with the demands made upon the several congressional offices for assistance to the veterans and their dependents. These requests are such as claims for travel pay and for various forms of reimbursement. The correspondence coming to our offices embraces such matters as claims for compensation, applications for pensions, applications for admission to veterans' hospitals and facilities.

Such correspondence embraces such matters as claims for dependents' allotments for Military and Naval Academy appointments, applications for commissions in the Army and the Navy, applications for admission into the several officer candidate schools, applications for advancement, transfers, and furloughs, and likewise applications for discharges from the military service.

I represent, in part, a State which has approximately two and a quarter million population, with approximately 175,000 men and women in the armed services.

During the first 14 years of my service in the Senate my office secured approval of 1,526 compensation and pension claims, and, in addition, we secured 742 lump-sum settlements, making a total of 2,268 claims approved.

Our estimate is that we secured approval of 1 out of each 4 claims filed, which shows that during this 14-year period we handled over 9,000 claims for veterans. This record shows that my office processed some 642 claims per year. Each claim called for an average of 10 letters, so that it required some 6,420 letters to follow the claims through to final adjudication. This veterans' work required some 535 letters per month, or 21 letters per day.

In addition to the necessary correspondence there were telephone calls, personal interviews, and personal appearances and hearings before the administrative boards.

As stated, in World War No. 1 we had some four and one-half million men in the armed forces. In this war the number certainly will reach some 14,000,000 or 3 times the number in the First World War.

The number being larger and the term of service being longer, we may expect a substantial increase in the percentage of persons who will need assistance.

In the past the local Red Cross units and the American Legion posts rendered most valuable services to the veterans, but as a rule such local organizations worked through and depended upon the Representatives and Senators to clear their claims through the Veterans' Administration.

The Congress has just enacted legislation providing for hospitalization, rehabilitation, education, and loans to veterans. This valuable program will increase the work coming to congressional offices.

During the next few years our most important task will be to take proper care of our returning soldiers, sailors, and members of the other component units of our fighting forces. The future success of our country depends upon the health, education, and efficiency of these men and women. Every possible facility should be provided for their speedy reentrance into our civilian life and the expenses necessarily incurred should be added to the costs of this war.

I ask that the bill be referred to the Finance Committee, and I express hope for prompt and favorable action.

As a part of my remarks I ask that a copy of the bill be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 2147) to authorize the appointment of additional clerks to assist Senators, Representatives, and Delegates in attending to matters relating to veterans, introduced by Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That (a) each Senator, Representative, and Delegate in the Congress is hereby authorized to appoint an additional clerk to assist him in attending to matters relating to the interests, needs, and requests of veterans of any war in which the United States has been engaged or to the dependents of such veterans. It shall be the duty of each such clerk to assist the Senator, Representative, or Delegate by whom he is appointed in attending to such matters in such manner as such Senator, Representative, or Delegate may direct. The basic rate of compensation for each such clerk shall be $3,900 a year.

(b) Each Senator, Representative, and Delegate is further authorized to appoint an additional assistant clerk to provide stenographic and clerical assistance to the clerk appointed by him under subsection (a). The basic rate of compensation for each such assistant clerk shall be $1,800 a year.

SEC. 2. The appropriation of such sums as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this act is hereby authorized.

EDUCATION OF VETERANS

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to introduce for appropriate reference a bill intended to clarify the educational features of the so-called G. I. bill which I feel are not clarified, and to remove what I consider the abominable 25-year limitation on education of returned soldiers whose education has been interrupted by the war.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 2148) to provide that the education and training provided for by the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 shall be made available to veterans on an equal basis

without regard to their age was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

RIVER AND HARBOR FLOOD-CONTROL WORKS—AMENDMENT

Mr. SHIPSTEAD submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 4485) authorizing the construction of certain public works on rivers and harbors for flood control, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

CLAIM OF THE McCULLOUGH COAL CORPORATION—AMENDMENT

Mr. TYDINGS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 1519) conferring jurisdiction on the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of the McCullough Coal Corporation against the United States, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

CORRECTION IN ENROLLMENT OF HOUSE BILL 4271—PRESERVATION OF THE NATIONALITY OF CITIZENS RESIDING ABROAD

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate House Concurrent Resolution 99, which was read as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the Clerk of the House of Representatives, in the enrollment of the bill (H. R. 4271) to amend the Nationality Act of 1940 to preserve the nationality of citizens residing abroad, is authorized and directed to strike out the word "six" which appears in the proviso and insert in lieu thereof the word "five."

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, this concurrent resolution merely corrects a clerical error in an immigration bill which the Senate passed on a previous call of the calendar. I hope the resolution may be agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the House concurrent resolution?

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution was considered and agreed to.

CORRECTION IN ENROLLMENT OF HOUSE BILL 4257—EXPATRIATION OR EXCLUSION OF CERTAIN PERSONS FOR EVADING MILITARY AND NAVAL SERVICE

Mr. RUSSELL. There also was an error in House bill 4257, which relates merely to the numbering of the section. Instead of having been numbered (h) it should have been numbered (i) because the Senate enacted a bill which corrected the section. I ask consent to submit a concurrent resolution to correct the error, and to have the resolution immediately considered.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 51) was considered and agreed to as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Clerk of the House of Representatives, in the enrollment of the bill (H. R. 4257) to expatriate or exclude certain persons for evading military and naval service, be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to strike out on page 1, line 7 "(h)" and insert in lieu thereof "(i)"; and on page 1, line 8, strike out "(i)" and insert in lieu thereof "(j)."

FREEDOM FOR TRANSMISSION BY PRESS AND RADIO OF NEWS IN CONNECTION WITH INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

Mr. CONNALLY submitted the following concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 52), which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Congress of the United States believes in the world right of all men to write, send, and publish news at uniform communication rates and without interference by governmental or private monopoly and that right should be protected by treaty;

That the representatives of the United States at the peace conference and at the conference called to create an international organization for the maintenance of peace be requested to urge that there be incorporated in the peace treaty or in the treaty creating the international organization for peace provisions to guarantee that each nation signatory to the treaty shall give to all responsible press and radio representatives the same access to information at the source and the same freedom from censorship as may be accorded to press services and radio representatives of such country;

That such agreements provide for the freedom for accredited press and radio representatives to write, transmit, and publish the news without private or governmental interference and at the same rates of charge for communications, national and international, as are given to the press or radio representatives of such nation.

TAXATION FOR PUBLIC EDUCATION IN VIRGINIA (S. DOC. NO. 238)

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, at the request of the senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] I ask unanimous consent to have printed as a Senate document an address entitled "Taxation for Public Education in Virginia," being an address delivered by Christopher B. Garnett, president of the Virginia State Bar Association.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

RECONVERSION REPORT TO THE PRESIDENT BY DIRECTOR OF WAR MOBILIZATION (S. DOC. NO. 237)

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the report on the subject of reconversion, submitted to the President by the Director of War Mobilization, Hon. James F. Byrnes, be printed as a Senate document.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF THE NAVY (S. DOC. NO. 236)

Mr. WALSH of New Jersey. Mr. President, the Honorable James V. Forrestal, Secretary of the Navy, has written a comprehensive exposition of certain accomplishments of our great Navy and a clear statement of his views as to the kind of Navy we should have after the war. The Secretary's report and beliefs are brilliantly set forth in two statements and one article. One statement is entitled "Training the People"; the other "Building the Ships and Planes." The article which is entitled "What To Do With Them: Will We Choose Naval Suicide Again" was recently published in the Saturday Evening Post.

I ask unanimous consent to have the two statements and the article printed in the RECORD.

I also ask unanimous consent to have this valuable material made a Senate document.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the matter presented by the Senator from New Jersey will be printed as a Senate document, and also printed in the RECORD.

The matter referred to is as follows:

TRAINING THE PEOPLE

During the past fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, the Navy trained 1,303,554 personnel, manning 4,063 new vessels—or 11 ships each day—plus more than 20,000 landing craft and keeping pace with the naval air arm which doubled the number of planes on hand.

The magnitude of the Navy's training task stems from the necessity of manning the world's greatest naval force predominantly with men who have had no previous seagoing experience. Of a total of 2,987,311 personnel in the Navy on June 30, less than 12 percent were in the service prior to Pearl Harbor and 2,478,002, or approximately 83 percent, are members of the Naval Reserve.

In addition to continuing the extensive training of personnel now in the service, the Navy will be required, in the current fiscal year, to train approximately 600,000 new personnel who are expected to be drawn into the service from civilian life by June 30, 1945. The collapse of Germany will result in no curtailment of the Navy's training program. The continued successful prosecution of the war against Japan will require, according to present estimates, that the Navy continue to expand until it reaches a strength of 3,389,000 by June 30, 1945.

The complexity of the Navy's training activities is reflected in the fact that new personnel must be trained to proficiency in more than 450 enlisted specialties and petty-officer ratings which are indispensable to man, fight, and maintain the highly complicated mechanism of a modern navy.

The measure of the Navy's training accomplishment depends upon whether men are ready and trained to man the ships and planes as they come off the ways and out of the factories. The evidence of success lies in the fact that no vessel or unit has been delayed in commissioning through lack of trained personnel. In 2½ years the Navy has trained the greatest citizen naval force in history. And it has produced seasoned reserve personnel with extensive combat experience.

The training of the Navy of 1944 has been achieved by a great expansion of the naval training establishment, the channeling of aptitude by careful selection and classification of previously acquired civilian skills and abilities, standardized curricula, practical instruction, the use of training aids, and intensified team training of groups ashore prior to duty afloat and abroad.

Prior to the inception of the Navy's intensive shipbuilding program in 1940, the Navy had in operation a training establishment which consisted of approximately 75 schools with an average attendance of 10,000 personnel. In addition, the Navy operated two air training schools with an attendance of 865 men which produced an average of 350 pilots a year.

The Navy now has a total of 947 schools with a daily average attendance of 303,000 personnel.

Up to the end of 1943–44 fiscal year, of this number 136 were basic and advanced air-training schools with an average attendance

of 35,000 and a monthly output of 1,700. It is estimated that the Navy spends close to $30,000 on the training of each naval aviator who is in training for 18 to 24 months.

The Navy's schools for training officers and officer candidates fall into two groups:

1. Six Naval Reserve midshipmen's schools have sent a total of 41,689 deck and engineering officers to duty assignments throughout the Naval Establishment. These schools, established since 1940 for the training of officer candidates from civil life and from the enlisted ranks, are the Navy's principal source of young seagoing officers and 95 percent of their graduates are serving at sea.

2. With the knowledge that selective service would in time sharply diminish or eliminate the supply of young men between the ages of 18 and 21 years upon which the Navy would have to depend for additional officer candidates, the Navy on July 1, 1943, instituted the Navy college program (V–12) for the preliminary training of young officer candidates. At this time the Navy college program (V–12) is operating 264 units at 202 colleges and universities and has a current attendance of 65,000 officer candidates. Since the establishment of the V–12 program, it has delivered more than 23,000 qualified officer candidates to the Reserve midshipmen's schools, Supply Corps school, and marine officer candidates' schools. In addition to this number, 2,600 officers were commissioned directly from Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps, now a part of the V–12 program, and the medical and dental schools have supplied the Navy with 1,400 doctors and dentists.

Of the Navy's training schools, 310 are devoted to the instruction of enlisted personnel. These schools also fall into 2 groups:

1. Recruit training—or "boot" training—is provided to new enlisted men at 7 of these training activities which have a total attendance of 219,387 and which in the past year passed 1,046,912 into service or into advanced enlisted training schools.

2. For the purpose of providing advanced instruction for enlisted specialists, 305 of these schools are maintained with an average capacity of 163,482 men and an output last year of 383,689 specialists.

During peacetime an average of 4 years was required to train a petty officer, third class. A young officer was not usually assigned to take a deck watch under way until he had spent 2 years at sea following his 4 years at the Naval Academy. Today, by the utilization of civilian skills and by intensification of training, petty officers, third class, are sent to specialized duty as early as 7 months after their first enlistment, and young officers stand watch in the vessels for which they have been qualified in an average time of 6 months. By the continuation of training at sea it has been possible to develop seasoned veteran personnel in a matter of months rather than years.

Since Naval Reserve personnel must be essentially specialists the Navy's method of classification and selection is of primary importance to a highly geared training program. A series of tests, based upon the type of duty to be performed in the Navy, is given to each recruit to determine his general classification, abilities, aptitudes, and any knowledge of specific work. Through a system of personal interviews these tests are supplemented by considering the background and experience of the individual so that the special qualifications of each recruit may be evaluated. This information, indexed and recorded, is used in establishing quotas for the detail of men to service schools or to any other duty for which they seem best qualified.

Class work study and workshop or laboratory application at training schools is in all cases augmented by the extensive use of training aids such as posters, graphs, pamphlets, models, photographs, strip films, recordings, and motion pictures. The wide use the Navy has made of training aids is reflected in the figures on motion pictures and strip films. The Navy has used more than 5,000 separate film subjects and has distributed more than 1,000,000 prints of photographic film. Most of the principal classes of naval vessels carry extensive libraries of basic training motion picture and strip films—in the case of a major combatant ship as many as 500 separate titles—and instruction by use of these films continues until the vessel enters combat. Visual education is used to establish basic doctrine in such new fields as amphibious warfare, to standardize procedure and to save training time—in some cases between 25 percent and 50 percent—by visual presentation of complicated mechanisms and processes. The Navy considers motion pictures an invaluable aid, rather than a substitute, for training.

To give crews actual experience in shipboard and combat conditions without unduly drawing combatant vessels and equipment from the war zones, elaborate models, simulated battle conditions on typical beach heads, special devices for surface and air navigation, and hundreds of other aids are employed.

The magnitude of the shipbuilding program and the urgent need for crews with maximum team training before going to sea made advisable the establishment in January 1943 of operational and precommissioning training activities, a development unique in naval instruction methods. Instead of sending officers and men already skilled in a specialty directly to sea after preliminary training at officers' and enlisted service schools, naval personnel are assigned to train as teams ashore at operational and precommissioning training activities.

Prior to the commissioning of a new vessel the new crew is assembled and becomes a ship's organization on land. Composed of a nucleus of experienced personnel drawn from the fleet and the remaining personnel direct from training schools with no previous sea or combat experience, the men of the crew live together and in all respects operate together as if in fact they were at sea. As members of teams who will later serve together in combat, officers and men are given advanced training in the scores of specialties required to master the complicated mechanism of the modern naval vessel. It is the responsibility of the veteran personnel to bring the new men, lately from indoctrination and training schools, quickly to the high point of efficient team operation which conditions in action require. As a result, when assigned to their new vessels, members of the crew possess far more practical training as fighting units than was possible under previous methods of instruction ashore.

At the outset of its program to build the greatest fleet in history the Navy had had no previous experience to indicate whether it was possible in limited time to train to expert proficiency the large number of civilian reserves necessary to man the great new sea and air force. But the job is being done. The trained competence of naval officers and men afloat and their ability to learn quickly and to work and fight together with skill and courage are reflected in the commendatory reports of commanding officers. Their quality is being demonstrated in combat. The Japs know it.

The success of the Navy in the war to date is a direct result of the high state of training of its officers and men. The Navy's training system has not only taught naval skill but in a greater accomplishment has produced seasoned fighting men.

Building the Ships and Planes

Day after tomorrow—September 1, 1944—is the fifth anniversary of the outbreak of war in Europe. In order to meet its obligations in the past 5 years of armed neutrality and war the Navy has increased the size of its fleet and air arm until the United States has become, for the first time in its history, the greatest naval power on earth. During this period the Navy increased the number of warships in its fleet over three times, built a huge new fleet of supporting vessels and landing craft, much more than trebled its fire power, and multiplied its air force 20 times.

Since the beginning of hostilities in Europe, the Navy added almost 65,000 vessels of all types to the fleet, or a total of over 9,000,000 displacement tons. Nearly 36 percent of the total represents combatant ships, 29 percent auxiliaries, and 22 percent landing craft. At the end of this period the Navy had on hand over 5 times the tonnage of all types that was on hand on September 1, 1939.

During the same period the Navy accepted a total of 57,600 planes. Monthly production of Navy airplanes 5 years ago averaged only 12 per month as contrasted with recent acceptances of 78 per day. This total number of Navy planes on hand today is 20 times as great as the planes on hand at the beginning of the European war. The Navy aircraft production job is far from complete. In the next 12 months the Navy requires and has scheduled for delivery over 30,000 planes, of which 93 percent are in the combat class, or more than half the number accepted during all of the past 5 years combined.

Production of ordnance material has been expanded immensely to meet the demands of arming the ships and planes of the Navy. The monthly production rate of torpedoes is now approximately 40 times the average rate in 1939. Depth charges are now produced at a monthly rate 60 times that of the average monthly production rate 5 years ago. In an average month the Bureau of Ordnance now expends almost 3 times the total amount expended in the entire first year of the period. New weapons have been developed to meet modern battle conditions so that our ships could repel enemy air attack. Over 125,000 1.1-inch, 20-millimeter, and 40-millimeter antiaircraft guns have been produced. Production of ammunition for these guns has totaled over 1,000,000,000 rounds.

For every person serving in the Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard in September 1939 there are over 24 today, and this figure will be increased when authorized strength is reached the middle of next year. Combined strength has grown from 152,086 officers and enlisted personnel on September 1, 1939, to 3,717,000 today.

Congress has authorized the Navy during the past 5 years to spend over $113,000,000,000. Not all of this sum has been committed or expended. Commitments, or those sums which the Navy has had or will have to pay, now amount to over $91,000,000,000. Expenditures to liquidate these commitments have amounted to nearly $65,000,000,000. They are now running at an annual rate over 25 times the 1939 rate.

Lend-lease to our allies amounting to over $5,000,000,000 in materials and services has already been transferred by the Navy and requests are now in process for an even greater sum. Vessels account for approximately 40 percent, petroleum and coal products for 25 percent, and aircraft for 15 percent. The British Empire received 92 percent, while the U. S. S. R. received 5 percent of all Navy transfers.

The expenditures remaining emphasize the point that the Navy program is only a little more than half finished. A substantial task still lies ahead. Planned operations are dependent upon the speed with which we obtain assault-troop and cargo ships. These ships are the Navy's most urgent need, and rank in importance with a few of the other most vital military programs. Also needed

are vast quantities of bombardment ammunition, 40-millimeter antiaircraft guns, and numerous special devices to make certain the final defeat of our enemies.

WHAT TO DO WITH THEM—WILL WE CHOOSE NAVAL SUICIDE AGAIN?

(By James Forrestal, Secretary of the Navy)

(A distinguished Navy spokesman warns that we invite national disaster if we follow our unrealistic custom of destroying our own ships after the shooting stops.)

On a hot, sunny morning in February, I had the privilege of landing on the Kwajalein Islets of Roi and Namur, one day after our amphibious forces had begun to get the situation well in hand. The islets were smoking, stinking heaps of rubble, with the blasted stumps of palm trees sticking out like giant toothpicks in disarray. For 3 days, Army, Navy, and Marine planes and Navy ships had plastered the whole 700-mile perimeter of the Marshall Islands, pinning down the Japs while the attack group prepared to strike at the heart of the Marshalls, the atoll of Kwajalein. Onto this atoll, and particularly onto its islets of Roi, Namur, and Kwajalein proper, we had poured during these same 3 days the heaviest concentration of bombs and naval shell fire that the world had ever seen.

To storm the Marshalls we had assembled the mightiest fleet of warships, transports, and landing craft ever floated on the Pacific; it was a new fleet, most of which had come off the building ways within the past 3 years. We had sent ashore gallant young Americans who, 3 years before, had never thought of storming a beach. Three hundred of them were killed at Kwajalein.

This is the price we paid for a coral atoll which, although it lay athwart our life line to the Philippines, we had allowed to pass from German to Jap hands 25 years ago. This is a part of the price we are paying for a rosy 20-year dream that we had outlawed war. Enjoying that dream, we did not awaken until December 7, 1941, to the meaning of the illegal Japanese fortifications in the Marshall Islands, including Kwajalein, or in the Carolines and Marianas. Indeed, we had never understood the importance of these atolls, for in 1899 we let slip a chance to buy the Carolines, Marianas, and Palau from Spain.

Obviously, we have made a fundamental mistake which the war is beginning to make clear to us. Our understanding of history and our comprehension of geography have, by and large, been unrealistic. The evidence of history indicates that war is a normal, not an abnormal, affliction of man. I am not defeatist enough to believe that we should reconcile ourselves to this condition as permanent or that we should surrender our ideals of world peace. But I do most emphatically believe that, until firm foundations are laid guaranteeing world peace, we must assume that there will be aggressors, that those aggressors will have to be curbed, and that force will be necessary to do the curbing. As Premier Jan Smuts, of South Africa, said in November, "Peace not backed by power remains a dream."

We have been preoccupied with abstractions about world affairs. We satisfied our aspirations for peace by thinking of the most wishful order. We ignored history. On the one hand, we denied the possibility of an ordered world under the League of Nations. On the other hand, we denied ourselves the weapons to protect ourselves in a disordered world.

All this may read as if this article were about to launch into a plea for the reconstitution of the League of Nations—a league with teeth—or, failing that, to propose some similar framework for international comity. I have no such purpose. It is beyond my desire, if not my powers, to indicate the broad outlines upon which an international organization is to be built. This article proposes, purely and simply, to put forward this thesis:

That, whatever international agreements or associations may be sponsored by the United Nations, one of the cornerstones of peace must be the maintenance of armed force in being by the United States; more particularly, maintenance of that part of our force for which I speak, the sea and air power of the United States Navy.

In the past, at the conclusion of every war, during some of which our naval power had been built to formidable proportions, we have invariably destroyed that power. How did we carry out this destruction which brought us, in the recent past, face to face with an armed world, while we, potentially the most powerful Nation, were one of the least armed? We did it in three main ways.

First, we did after World War No. 1 what we had done after other wars in the past. We destroyed a large part of our Navy. This was done under agreements reached at the Naval Disarmament Conference of 1922.

Second, under the terms of that agreement, and under agreements arrived at in subsequent conferences, we accepted limits on our sea and air power, thereby abdicating the position which our building program in World War No. 1, plus our great national resources and industrial capacity, had given us. This policy was helped by the reaction against martial thinking which came after World War No. 1. Large appropriations for the Army and Navy were hard to get. Public attack and contempt went far to destroy the industries necessary to build armament.

Third, we stood by without acting, and sometimes without protesting, while other nations broke international agreements.

In the two decades after the First World War we scrapped or sank, under our treaty obligations, 30 of our own battleships, including 7 partially completed new ones. We junked 15 cruisers, 139 destroyers, and 52 submarines. A sizable American Navy went to the bottom of the sea or to the scrap pile. Moreover, we agreed to clamp a ceiling on our new-ship construction, and, as I shall explain later, accepted some incredible technical limitations.

Although some of the vessels stricken in 1920–38 were second-line ships, others were the newest and best of their kind. Naval officers still wince at the recollection of the *Washington*, a good fighting ship 75-percent completed, being towed to sea and sunk by our own guns and torpedoes on November 25, 1924. The foresight of our then Chief of Naval Operations, Admiral R. E. Coontz, saved for us in the 1922 Disarmament Conference two partially completed battle cruisers which we converted into the aircraft carriers *Lexington* and *Saratoga*. But we tore up four sister cruisers which would have made equally good carriers—and four more carriers would have been a vast comfort in 1942.

REPEATING PATTERN

Such an era of self-destruction, as I have said, is not new to the American Navy. The Navy had its beginning in the Revolution. John Paul Jones, John Barry, and others commanded frigates that for 7 years harassed British commerce. At the end of the Revolution, the Navy ceased to exist. We revived it to resist the French spoliations and the Barbary coast pirates in the Mediterranean. Later, in the administration of Jefferson, the Navy built only squadrons of small coastal vessels, which Jefferson thought sufficient to protect the country from invasion.

Not until the War of 1812 was 6 months old did we start building some of the capital ships which Jefferson and his successors in the Presidency had thought unnecessary. They had failed to grasp the principle, later stated by Alfred Thayer Mahan, that whenever a naval war is conducted off the coasts of your own country, the chances are that the war already has been lost. Big ships with long cruising range are needed to carry war to an enemy wherever in the world his ships may be.

When the War of 1812 ended, the shipbuilders of Maine, New York, and the Delaware River had given us quite a respectable Navy. A few years after the war, however, interest in the Navy declined and our ships went to dry rot. As was true in later years, the States remote from the seaboard could see no point in spending money for ships that sailed in distant seas.

The Civil War repeated this pattern. We had nothing much to begin with. We built a sizable fleet, and one development had a profound effect on naval warfare—the *Monitor* and the *Merrimac* and the ironclads that followed were the beginning of the modern armored ship. From 1865 on, however, interest in the Navy again ebbed, and we did not make even a pretense of matching the development of armored and heavily gunned ships as they were built by European navies. In fact, during Grant's administration we went so far as to return to sail because Admiral Porter, then the dominant figure in the Navy, felt that steam, which required the use of coal, made for dirty ships.

American naval development, both in numbers and design of ships, dragged until the mid-1880's, when a revival started. Beginning in 1897, Theodore Roosevelt, as Assistant Secretary of the Navy, and subsequently as President, gave it new impetus. Manila Bay, the building of the Panama Canal, and the world cruise of the fleet were parts of the "manifest destiny" which some people called imperialism. We began then to talk about "a navy second to none," an ambition which we did not realize until 35 years later.

After Theodore Roosevelt's administration we went forward with some new dreadnoughts, but we did not build the cruisers, destroyers, and auxiliaries that round out a balanced navy. Above all, we did not build naval bases, because we still failed to appreciate Mahan's basic concept—naval warfare must be conducted, not at one's own seacoast but on the enemy's, and warfare in distant waters calls for bases near those waters.

In 1916, in the shadow of World War No. 1, we started what was for us a gigantic naval expansion. That year Congress allowed the Navy to contract for 813,000 tons of new vessels, the biggest step toward naval power that we had taken in our history. In 1916–22 we added to our fleet 10 battleships, 1 aircraft carrier, 287 destroyers, and 88 submarines.

We ended the First World War with a very respectable Navy afloat, with more ships still building and with a fair prospect for an adequate number of Pacific bases.

What was our course and policy after the First World War? It was precisely the same, in principle, as that after other wars. Having rejected the League of Nations, we initiated the call for the naval disarmament conference of 1922. The result was, as I have already indicated, a series of treaties which caused us to sink 25 percent of our fleet, to stop building additional ships, and, finally, to accept qualitative as well as quantitative limitations on our future naval program. Some of the things we did under the terms of the treaties and under subsequent agreements seem unbelievable now.

New battleships were limited to 35,000 tons each, thereby preventing construction of the new 45,000-ton superships of the present Iowa class. This was one of the provisions of the 1922 treaty.

We accepted, in the 1930 treaty, a ceiling per ship would be added to any existing battleship for defense against air or submarine attack, although modern antiaircraft batteries alone would add 1,400 tons to a battleship. The result: Our fleet was highly vulnerable to the sort of attack that sank the Prince of Wales.

We accepted, in the 1930 treaty, a ceiling of 18 cruisers with guns larger than the 6.1 caliber. Result: The shortage of heavy cruisers was a limiting factor in the early days of the present war.

In destroyers, we accepted a total limit of 150,000 tons, and we also agreed in 1930 that no one could build any other surface warship between 600 and 2,000 tons if that vessel carried torpedo tubes or had a speed of more than 20 knots.

This almost unbelievable restriction prevented construction of antisubmarine vessels. The exclusion of torpedo tubes wasn't so important, but the speed limitation of 20 knots was serious. German submarines travel on the surface at 18 or 19 knots, and some are believed to be able to do better than 20 knots.

The 1922 treaty also asserted that no provision could be made for the conversion of merchant vessels into naval auxiliaries in case of war. The single exception was deck strengthening for 6-inch guns. When, in 1940, the United States, in need of auxiliary aircraft carriers, wanted to convert some of its large, fast liners into that kind of warship, we found that they would have to be rebuilt from the keel up. Result: We had to turn to the conversion of half-built C–3's, a slower, smaller merchant vessel being produced for the Maritime Commission. They were not designed for aircraft-carrier purposes, nor were they as useful as the liners might have been. Nevertheless, and most fortunately, they are doing splendid service in the Atlantic war against the U-boats.

The 1922 treaty restricted our naval air strength in a more serious way. We were limited to 135,000 tons of aircraft carriers with an additional general restriction of 27,000 tons imposed on each new carrier. Result: We are just now building 45,000-ton carriers, which will enable us to step up the size and power of our air strikes from the sea.

TAKING OFF OUR ARMOR

In retrospect, it is plain that we lightly gave away in these two treaties the means by which we could have kept the peace of the world, or, at any rate, by which we could have swept from the seas—assuming a public willingness to do so—anyone who dared to start trouble.

Secondly, we decided not only to sink part of our Navy and hamstring the rest, we also discredited the industries and individuals upon whom we relied for ships and guns and aircraft. In 1935 the armaments industry was hit broadside by a wave of merchants-of-death criticism.

As a result of it, the Bethlehem Steel Corporation, which had in its plant at Bethlehem, Pa., the finest big-gun-forging units in the world—its only rival was the Krupp works of Germany—scrapped that forging capacity almost entirely. The Navy had to rehabilitate it in 1940 at a cost of $2,500,000.

Du Pont, one of the largest manufacturers of explosives in the world, likewise was attacked, and subsequently it tried to divest itself, to a large extent, of its powder-making capacity. Only at the urgent request of the Army did du Pont continue in the manufacture of explosives.

Nor was the aircraft industry exempt. The Morrow Board, reporting to the President in 1926, in a document notable for its brevity and good sense, had recommended the encouragement of a large and vigorous private aircraft industry. The competitive energies of private designers of planes and engines gave to the infant American aviation industry an impetus that sent its products around the world. But it was accused of being an international salesman of death.

Private shipbuilding likewise met discouragement. New naval vessels were required to be built largely in navy yards. Therefore, the so-called 11-percent expansion of the Navy in 1939 found us with only 6 private yards capable of building combatant vessels. Today there are 23 with adequate facilities and skill.

No person or group is responsible for this emasculation of our strength. It was part of a national dream in which we all shared.

In the meantime, the Japanese were building their Navy to the full limits of the 1922 and 1930 agreements—how much more, we won't know until after this war is over. Not until the first year of President Franklin Roosevelt's first administration did we take our naval-building program out of camphor and begin construction of a really modern navy. Up until that time, we had not built as many vessels as the treaties permitted us, and even then we began construction on a modest scale. But let it be recorded as one of the byproducts of the Federal spending policy then initiated that the President allotted $238,000,000 of the first National Industrial Recovery Act appropriation for construction of naval vessels. Out of these sums there were built 2 aircraft carriers, 4 cruisers, 20 destroyers, 4 submarines, and 2 gunboats. However, we balanced even that step forward by disposing of a total of 139 old destroyers between the years 1930–38 to carry out previously entered-into treaty agreements.

We undermined our potential power in a third way by accepting limitations on our freedom of action. This acceptance grew out of a striking national indifference to military geography. To be specific: After the Spanish-American War we acquired the Philippines from Spain. If we had insisted, we also could have bought from Spain the Mariana, Caroline, and Palau Islands for around $4,500,000. We took only Guam. The Germans bought the rest, and after the First World War they, along with the Marshalls, were mandated to Japan under the Treaty of Versailles—which bound Japan not to fortify them.

The American Navy endeavored, at various times in the 1920's, to visit these islands athwart our Pacific life line, but the inquiry that went from the State Department to our Ambassador in Japan, and from him to the Japanese foreign office, thence to the Japanese Navy, brought the obvious refusal of permission. Thus by inertia we accepted a fatal limitation on our freedom of action in the Pacific. As far as the agreement not to fortify is concerned, the pill boxes, the guns, and barbed wire on Kwajalein, where I landed February 2, indicated that the Japanese, to say the least, had an elastic view of the verb "to fortify."

No one individual is to blame for this inertia. It was a national characteristic. It was part and parcel of our reliance on abstractions and of our lack of understanding of geography. We did not understand that moral suasion would not impress Japan, and we failed to realize that, without an adequate bridge of bases across the Pacific, we could not defend the Philippines or support our open-door policy in China. In other words, while continuing to assert an opinion and influence in Asiatic affairs, we denied ourselves the military means to hold the Philippines or to operate effectively in the western Pacific.

Nearly 4 years have elapsed since July 1940, when America embarked upon its defense program, becoming the greatest sea and air power on earth. We have, besides building warships for our allies, added to our own fleet 9 battleships, over 70 aircraft carriers, 34,500 planes, a score of cruisers, more than 500 destroyers and destroyer escorts, over 100 submarines, and thousands of landing craft, auxiliaries, and patrol and mine craft. America has turned out naval ships and planes in quantities and at a rate that even the Navy itself thought impossible.

We have had time to do it—time gained for us by the single-handed defense of England in 1940–41, and the mighty resistance of colossal Russia. Next time there may be no such breathing spell, and whatever our potential power may be, the swift tempo of modern war will not permit that potential strength—manpower, raw materials, manufacturing capacity—to be made into the weapons that war demands. In the next war, the enemy may be over our homes on the first day of hostilities.

What shall we do with these armadas of sea and air that we have built and are still building? Shall we sink or destroy them again and go back to the dream that peace is the natural state of man and that geography insulates us from war? If we do, we are tempting fate.

The peace of the world and our own security demand the retention of the sea and air power which America will hold in its hands when the war is over. Just how much, in terms of numbers of ships and planes and other equipment, needs to be kept in active operation as our contribution to the peace which we and our allies evolve, is a matter for skilled judgment by professional naval officers. But the fundamental assumption—that we need to keep our relative naval sea and air power—must, I submit, become a matter of national doctrine. It must be understood by the people of Indiana and Kansas and Montana—by the people who live in the central part of the country—as well as by the residents of California and New York and all our other maritime States.

If we accept the postulate of a strong sea-air power and the premise that potential enemies must be beaten before they reach our coasts, then seven corollaries inevitably follow:

1. We must have adequate bases wherever our strategists and tacticians advise us they are necessary.

2. We must have access to adequate raw materials, especially oil and iron ore, both in this country and abroad. With the advent of air power, mechanized land armies and oil-burning ships, the control of large oil reserves became of paramount military importance.

3. We also should keep intact, under grease if necessary, the key munition plants which we have built since 1940. I have in mind factories like the torpedo plants at Highland Park, Ill., and St. Louis, Mo.; the aircraft-engine plant at Kansas City, Mo.; the ordnance plants at Detroit, Mich., and Columbus, Ohio; and the heavy forges at South Charleston, W. Va.

4. An alert Navy must have appropriations from Congress for extensive research in time of peace. Research before a war is the only research which will do us any good on the day the enemy strikes.

5. To avoid becoming outmoded, the Navy must have funds to build the new weapons which its research discovers. Perhaps construction of new weapons can be limited to a few prototypes; volume of new construction will depend upon the importance of the new inventions and upon the current blood pressure of the world community.

6. If we are to keep our Navy and naval air arm in fighting trim, we must maintain reserve-naval-training courses in the leading colleges, and, what is possibly more important, must see to it that we have ample numbers of those men who are the backbone of any fleet—petty officers and chief petty officers. Ships and planes and guns are the bone and sinew of a navy, but trained men are its heart and brain.

7. We must maintain such a navy as I have described in continuous training. That again means spending moderate sums of money. In peacetime, it was an epochal event to have a live torpedo fired in practice, because torpedoes cost $13,000 apiece. Yet the only way

to be sure that our torpedoes have the lethal punch which we expect of them is to try them out in peacetime. Although the American Navy had more adequate gunnery practice than any other, the total amount available for gunnery, bombing, and torpedo practice for the fleet in 1937 was $4,000,000. Even in 1939 it was only $7,000,000.

In contrast, I saw surface vessels alone pump $3,000,000 worth of shells into the tiny Kwajalein islands of Roi and Namur in 3 days.

In spite of this war, we shall continue to be a peace-loving Nation, with neither greed nor desire for world domination. The very concept of imposing our rule upon other people is not consistent with our national character and would be repugnant to our people. Therefore, it is good and desirable that we keep the dream that someday, somehow, a framework of permanent peace will be evolved by men of sense and good will throughout the world.

In the meantime, we dare not forget an anonymous admiral's words after the last war: "The means to wage war must be in the hands of those who hate war." That should be on the desk of every Representative and Senator, at the masthead of every newspaper and in the mind of every voter.

INTER-AMERICAN RELATIONS AND DISCRIMINATORY LABOR PRACTICES—ADDRESS BY SENATOR CHAVEZ

[Mr. CHAVEZ asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address by him on the subject Inter-American Relations and Discriminatory Labor Practices in North American Business and Industry, broadcast over Station WOL, Washington, D. C., September 9, 1944, which appears in the Appendix.]

FACING FORWARD—ADDRESS BY SENATOR WILLIS

[Mr. WILLIS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "Facing Forward," delivered by him at a meeting of the Republican Editorial Association at French Lick, Ind., on September 9, 1944, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE INDIANA FARMER AND THE POST-WAR PERIOD—ADDRESS BY SENATOR JACKSON

[Mr. JACKSON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "The Indiana Farmer and the Post-war Period," delivered by him to an audience of farmers in Indiana, which appears in the Appendix.]

FARM PROGRAM: THE FARM PROBLEM IS A PRICE PROBLEM—STATEMENT BY SENATOR THOMAS OF OKLAHOMA

[Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement by him entitled "Farm Program," made to the farmers of Oklahoma, which appears in the Appendix.]

COMMENT BY SENATOR LUCAS ON GOVERNOR DEWEY'S VIEWS ON DEMOBILIZATION PLAN—ARTICLE FROM CHICAGO SUN

[Mr. HATCH asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "LUCAS Assails Dewey View on Demobilization Plans," published in the Chicago Sun for September 12, 1944, which appears in the Appendix.]

GENERAL MACARTHUR'S ROLE IN THE WAR AGAINST JAPAN—BROADCAST BY MARTIN AGRONSKY

[Mr. HATCH asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the script of a radio broadcast relating to General MacArthur's role in the war against Japan, delivered by Martin Agronsky on September 13, 1944, from Washington, D. C., which appears in the Appendix.]

THE LIVESTOCK AND MEAT SITUATION—ADDRESS BY WILLIAM B. WRIGHT

[Mr. ROBERTSON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by William B. Wright, vice president of the American National Livestock Association, at Jackson, Wyo., June 7, 1944, before the convention of the Wyoming Stock Growers' Association, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY QUENTIN REYNOLDS BEFORE DEMOCRATIC NATIONAL CONVENTION

[Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the address delivered by Quentin Reynolds before the Democratic National Convention in Chicago on July 20, 1944, which appears in the Appendix.]

DON'T GIVE UP SCHOOL—MESSAGE FROM GOVERNOR SCHOEPPEL OF KANSAS

[Mr. CAPPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a message entitled "Don't Give Up School," addressed to Kansas young folk of high-school age by Gov. Andrew F. Schoeppel, which appears in the Appendix.]

ANGLO-AMERICAN OIL AGREEMENT—MEMORANDUM BY GEORGE A. HILL, JR.

[Mr. MOORE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a discussion of the Anglo-American oil agreement by George A. Hill, Jr., before the Petroleum Industry War Council, which appears in the Appendix.]

BLUE PRINT FOR A VIRILE CONGRESS—ARTICLE BY PROF. WALTON HAMILTON

[Mr. SHIPSTEAD asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Blue Print for a Virile Congress," written by Walter Hamilton, professor of law at Yale University, and published in the magazine section of the New York Times of September 10, 1944, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE SIOUX INDIANS IN SOUTH DAKOTA—ARTICLE BY WESTBROOK PEGLER

[Mr. BUSHFIELD asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article by Westbrook Pegler relating to the Sioux Indians in South Dakota, from the Washington Times-Herald of September 15, 1944, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE LINE AGAINST INFLATION—EDITORIAL FROM THE NEW YORK TIMES

[Mr. WALSH of New Jersey asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "The Line Against Inflation," from the New York Times of September 12, 1944, which appears in the Appendix.]

A NON-JEW SPEAKS—POEM BY RICHARD W. HOGUE

[Mr. HILL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a poem entitled "A Non-Jew Speaks," by Richard W. Hogue, which appears in the Appendix.]

DISTRIBUTION OF ELECTRIC LIGHT AND POWER FROM FORT PECK

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, a week ago today I introduced Senate bill 2140 providing for distribution of electric light and power from Fort Peck among the farmers of North Dakota and Montana and the Missouri Valley States.

The response I received from the farmers there indicates their tremendous interest in the speedy passage of this measure.

Particularly are the farmers of North Dakota interested because they followed with intense interest the fight I put up as Governor of the State for rural electrification. When the legislature passed the first bill, I refused to sign the measure unless the bill was enlarged to take in more territory and enable the projects to have more customers on their lines and thereby cheapen the estimated cost. Then we established an R. E. A. project at Kindred, Cass County, N. Dak., and in a short space of time had 1,400 farmers signed up with the power being furnished by the municipal plant at Valley City, N. Dak., and at the end of 1940 we had 3,218 farmers, but we were still, out of the 48 States, the lowest in the Nation.

Since then I have assisted in the establishment of other projects, and at the end of 1943, 5,100 farmers were receiving such service, but there we are today still the lowest in the United States.

Some Senators may wonder why in a great agricultural State like North Dakota, noted for its progressive laws, such a condition can exist. It exists, Mr. President, because of the fact that those whom the farmers' wives depended upon to take the drudgery out of much of the farm life, paid no attention to their needs or wants. The power logically should come from the Fort Peck Dam, that great project which already has cost the taxpayers $118,000,000 but it has not been utilized, and the more I have investigated the situation in the interest of the farmers and the people living in small towns, the more disgusted I have become. The Fort Peck Dam was created, the farmers thought, to provide them electricity for power and light and water for irrigation. That is what I thought when, as Governor of the State, I signed the bill creating the first State water board for North Dakota, but to my amazement I discovered that not a single drop of water from the Fort Peck Dam could be used for irrigation purposes, with the result that the other States have irrigation projects in larger amounts than North Dakota.

The record is as follows:

Lands irrigated in various States based upon 1940 census of irrigation

State:	*Acreage irrigated*
Montana	1,711,409
Nebraska	610,379
Wyoming	1,486,498
North Dakota	21,615

So, you see, Mr. President, not only do we stand the lowest in the number of farmers receiving electric service of any State in the Union, but we have the additional unforgivable, undeniable disgrace of having only 21,615 acres irrigated, when our neighboring State of Montana has 1,711,409. Land that during the drought sold as low as $1 per acre became worth $200 an acre overnight when water was placed on it, and North Dakota has 1,266,440 additional acres that can be irrigated, but North Dakota farmers have secured none of the increase, although as of June 30, 1942, a total of $12,460,054.17 has been paid into the Reclamation fund; from the sale of public lands in the State of

North Dakota $12,219,646.27, and from oil royalties and rentals $240,407.90.

When I was Governor and head of the State water commission we succeeded in getting two projects established, the lower Yellowstone project and the Buford-Trenton project, but even those were very slow in being realized because we had to start from scratch, having had to hire engineers and make investigations of those projects and others, so that of the $12,000,000 that has long, long been available, less than 25 percent has been spent and the rest of the money has been lying in Washington for years.

Mr. President, this situation should have been taken care of years ago, and certainly during the last 10 years when the R. E. A. was in existence, but nothing was done. I have taken care of the electric and power situation in my bill S. 2140, and some months ago I introduced a bill, Senate bill 1889, to take care of the irrigation situation.

Frankly, Mr. President, I apologize to the people of North Dakota for the lack of interest shown in them by those who they thought were representing them here in Washington [but an apology is a small recompense to those poor housewives who have had to slave by the light of a kerosene lamp and break their backs over washboards and churns, and the husbands who had to pump their water and do hard chores because of the fact they could not get electric power]. I apologize, Mr. President, to each and every farmer in the Northwest who has been without power and light, to each and every farmer's wife and to each and every farmer's child whose eyesight has been hurt because of not having a proper lighting system. Almighty God placed the water and power for farmers to use, and the fact that it was not used is a disgraceful, unforgivable fact and the men responsible for it cannot be too severely condemned. I hope, as a Senator, to put in my time here in Washington and not go about speaking all over the United States at so much a speech—while neglecting the farmers, their wives and children, and the folks in the little towns.

THE DUMBARTON OAKS CONFERENCE

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, about a week previous to the making of the dynamic statement on the floor by the distinguished senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] a number of Senators were catechised by a member of the press as to their position in relation to conferring blanket power upon the representative of this Government in the so-called authority or league or council, whatever will come into being as the result of the Dumbarton Oaks Conference and action by the Senate of the United States. My answer then was substantially as follows:

In connection with the subject of what power should be lodged in the organization or the league or the authority which is being contemplated, necessarily a great number of questions arise. So far as we are concerned the question is, What authority can Congress confer? Can Congress, if it sees fit, confer blanket authority upon its representative on the council to vote to use military force to preserve the peace? The Constitution provides that Congress alone has authority to declare war. We know that down through our history the Executive has used the armed forces of this country to preserve the peace in the Western Hemisphere and elsewhere without congressional authority, as was demonstrated clearly the other day by the distinguished senior Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY].

There is perhaps no clear line of demarcation between instances in which the President has used force to preserve the peace, and actual war, requiring a declaration by Congress. However, it would seem that when a treaty is made and approved by Congress, which includes provisions for the preservation of world peace, authority might be conferred which would be somewhat analogous to the constitutional power of the President, but not in derogation thereof, to preserve the peace and enforce treaty obligations, short of making war.

It has been said that the American people would not consent to confer upon an international authority the power to declare war, involving the need of American military forces outside the Western Hemisphere; but I repeat that there are numerous instances of military force being used, under constitutional Executive authority, which did not require a declaration of war by the Congress. Of course, speaking from a strictly constitutional viewpoint, such a power to declare war could not be conferred by Congress. It would require a constitutional amendment. However, there is a difference between "declaration of war" and conferring power in a treaty "to enforce the peace.". That is the idea with respect to which Americans must be clear. As a result of the Dumbarton Oaks Conference, and other conferences among the representatives of this Nation and other members of the Big Four or Big Five, which will soon include France, I trust that before long a definite policy will be laid before this body. Then we can thresh out this whole subject.

Only last week I introduced a resolution providing for a report to the Senate, the copartner in treaty making, by the Secretary of State, of the steps which were in contemplation and of the commitments, if any have been made. Taking language out of the mouth of the distinguished senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG], who used it in relation to another matter today, I am hoping that the committee will soon act on that resolution.

FEDERAL AID FOR POST-WAR HIGHWAY CONSTRUCTION

The Senate resumed consideration of the bill (S. 2105) to amend and supplement the Federal Aid Road Act, approved July 11, 1916, as amended and supplemented, to authorize appropriations for the post-war construction of highways and bridges, to eliminate hazards at railroad grade crossings, to provide for the immediate preparation of plans and acquisition of rights-of-way, and for other purposes.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, at meetings yesterday and the day before, considered numerous amendments to the bill submitted by various Senators, which amendments had been printed and referred to the committee. The committee, on its own motion, acted on a number of suggestions and recommended certain changes in the text of the bill. At the direction of the committee I have had prepared a committee print, dated September 15, which shows the amendments recommended by the committee. The amendments recommended by the committee are printed in italic. I am sure that it would save the time of Senators if I could obtain unanimous consent to have the text of the committee print considered in lieu of the text of the bill as reported to the Senate. We could then take up the committee amendments and dispose of them in that way.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Arizona?

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, as I understand, the Senator is asking that the committee print, either improving or marring the bill as originally reported, be considered in lieu of the bill as reported to the Senate?

Mr. HAYDEN. That is correct.

Mr. WHITE. I am in complete harmony with the request. I believe the Senator's suggestion would make a contribution toward the disposition of the bill.

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. MALONEY. I should like to ask the Senator a question. I have not had an opportunity to study the committee print carefully. However, I have heretofore submitted certain amendments. If we follow the procedure now suggested, it will be necessary to change all those amendments. Would it be agreeable to the Senator to have amendments submitted for consideration at the proper place in the bill?

Mr. HAYDEN. The idea I had in mind was that we should first consider the committee amendments. The bill would then be open to further amendment.

Mr. MALONEY. I thank the Senator.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Arizona that the committee print be considered in lieu of the bill as originally reported from the committee? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be read for amendment, and that the amendments of the committee be first considered.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The first amendment reported by the committee will be stated.

The first amendment of the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads was, in section 1, on page 2, line 4, after the word "mapping", to strike out "costs of rights-of-way"; and in line 5, after the word "crossings", to insert "but does not include costs of rights-of-way."

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator make a statement showing what the committee has accomplished?

Mr. HAYDEN. I think before we consider the committee amendments I should perhaps make a brief statement.

Senators will notice that the first amendment strikes out the words "costs of rights-of-way." That amendment was recommended by the committee on the suggestion of the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL]. Senators will remember that he discussed the question on the floor of the Senate. The committee took that action because heretofore the Federal Government has never contributed anything toward the costs of rights-of-way. That has always been a State expense.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. BRIDGES. Is the committee print available?

Mr. HAYDEN. It is on the desks of all Senators.

The first amendment, to which I have just referred, involves a series of amendments, on page 2, page 3, and page 12. It even involves an amendment to the title of the bill.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. WILEY. Just what does that amendment mean? Does it mean that the matter of rights-of-way is now entirely a State matter?

Mr. HAYDEN. It has always been a State matter. The bill which was reported to the House—and in the beginning we adopted the House view—proposed that the Federal Government contribute toward the costs of rights-of-way; but now, by action of the committee, wherever that term appears in the bill it is to be stricken out, leaving the situation as it is under existing law.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a general inquiry?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. Do the amendments which appear in the committee print come to the Senate with the unanimous approval of the committee; or was there a division with respect to some of them?

Mr. HAYDEN. Undoubtedly there is a division with respect to some of them. I know that there is a division with respect to the question of rights-of-way. There is a very decided division of opinion. I am merely stating what is in the bill. When we come to consider whether or not any particular amendment shall be adopted, undoubtedly discussion will ensue.

Mr. WHITE. I had the impression that the amendments were unanimously agreed to by the committee. I wished to make sure whether that was true.

Mr. HAYDEN. No.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. The committee was practically unanimous in the end. The Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] objected to the rights-of-way provision, and I believe also with respect to the defintion of "urban area." He will explain his position when the time comes; but, with that exception, I believe that the committee was practically unanimous.

Mr. HAYDEN. The next amendment of consequence, suggested by the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR], is on page 3. It makes it perfectly clear that no money will be appropriated under this authorization until after the war is over. The suggested proviso reads as follows:

Provided further, That except for the sum appropriated pursuant to the preceding proviso, no part of the funds made available pursuant to this act shall be used to pay costs incurred under any construction contract entered into by any State before the beginning of the first post-war fiscal year.

The "sum appropriated pursuant to the preceding proviso" is a comparatively small sum.

The first post-war fiscal year is defined as follows:

The first post-war fiscal year shall be that fiscal year which ends on June 30 following the termination of the present war emergency, or as otherwise directed by the Congress.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. WILEY. If I correctly understand, no funds will be appropriated until after the last shot is fired and either the Congress or the President declares that the war is terminated.

Mr. HAYDEN. That is correct.

Mr. WILEY. In other words, if as a matter of fact we were in possession of Japan and were fighting there for some time, this provision would not go into operation unless the Congress declared that the war was over; is that correct?

Mr. HAYDEN. That is correct.

Mr. WILEY. Or unless the President so declared?

Mr. HAYDEN. That is correct.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. BALL. I am not sure that the language "before the beginning of the first post-war fiscal year" is quite clear. For instance, does it mean that if the war is over in January, contracts entered into up to June 30 of that fiscal year will be eligible for assistance, under the provisions of the bill? Or would it be in the following year?

Mr. HAYDEN. One enters into a contract when he has authority to do so. The provision granting the authority states:

Provided, That of the sum authorized to be appropriated for the first of such fiscal years $100,000,000 may be appropriated to become available immediately upon apportionment—

And so forth. Then it says—

Provided further, That except for the sum appropriated pursuant to the preceding proviso, no part of the funds made available pursuant to this act shall be used to pay costs incurred under any construction contract entered into by any State before the beginning of the first post-war fiscal year. The first post-war fiscal year shall be that fiscal year which ends on June 30 following the termination of the present war emergency, or as otherwise directed by the Congress.

Mr. BALL. Does that mean that if the termination of the war emergency occurs in, let us say, January 1946, any contract entered into in the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, would be included, under the bill as now written? Or would it be contracts entered into in the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947?

Mr. HAYDEN. It is bound to be those entered into in the following fiscal year, because, so far as the appropriation is concerned—the paying out of money, which is what we are concerned with—the money could not be paid out until the State made a contract, until that contract was approved by the Federal Works Administration in Washington, and the State did the work. Then we would pay our share. So it follows about a year behind. There is generally about a year's lag.

Mr. BALL. If the war ends in January, we do not want to make the States wait until the following June 30 to let contracts under this authority. If they are going to do work immediately after the war, they will have to let the contracts before that.

Mr. HAYDEN. The Senator is correct.

Mr. BALL. I am not clear what that language means.

Mr. HAYDEN. Let us say that the war ends on the 15th of January; then it will be the fiscal year ending June 30 following.

Mr. BALL. So within 6 months they will be able to let the contracts?

Mr. HAYDEN. That is correct.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. BURTON. I understand that it means any time after the end of the war.

Mr. HAYDEN. That is correct.

Mr. BURTON. That is, it is not to be postponed to any time after the war is at an end.

Mr. HAYDEN. When the war is at an end, it will go into effect.

Mr. BURTON. That is correct, because the first post-war fiscal year is going on at the time when the war ends. Immediately after the war ends the expenditure can be made, and the contract can be made at any time before that.

Mr. McKELLAR. That is correct.

Mr. HAYDEN. That is right.

The next important change in the bill is in respect to the reduction in the amounts. The bill as introduced authorized the appropriation of $650,000,000 a year for 3 years. The committee made a change, first, by providing that the contribution of the States and the Federal Government should be 50–50; in other words, that it should be equal, instead of 60 percent Federal and 40 percent by the States. When that change was made, of course it reduced the ability of the States to match, because they will have to put up an equal sum, rather than 40 percent. That was one reason why the amount authorized to be appropriated was reduced. Some question was raised as to whether the States could match $650,000,000 on a 50–50 basis. So that was one reason why the reduction was made.

In apportioning the amount left after the proposed reduction, the $450,000,000 is proposed to be divided as follows:

Two hundred million dollars a year for projects on the Federal-aid highway system, instead of $250,000,000, as heretofore proposed.

One hundred and twenty-five million dollars a year to be available for projects

on the principal secondary and feeder roads—the farm-to-market roads—instead of $200,000,000.

And $125,000,000 for projects on the Federal-aid highway system in urban areas.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. I should like to inquire whether under the authorization for appropriations for urban areas—let us say, for instance, the city of New York—when it receives its quota or share of that allotment, will it also receive part of the Federal-aid funds, the $200,000,000 the Senator just mentioned?

Mr. HAYDEN. Oh, yes.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. That would be giving them a double allotment, would it not?

Mr. HAYDEN. Oh, no.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Why not?

Mr. HAYDEN. Every State has the same status.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. I do not mean only in New York; I mean in any State. Why should an urban area or city participate in the general Federal-aid funds, in addition to what is allowed for the area or city?

Mr. HAYDEN. The same principle is applied to other areas. The rural areas participate in the Federal-aid fund. The farmer or merchant or rancher comes into town on a Federal-aid highway. He participates in its use just as much as does the city resident through whose city the Federal-aid highway goes. It can be improved within the city limits, as well as outside of them. I do not think a double amount is provided for at all. Certainly I think it would not be advantageous to the rest of the Nation to say that Federal funds could not be used to improve a road within a city, for, in that event, the farmer himself could not get through the town if the road or streets there had not been improved.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Is the authorization confined merely to the main street, or would it apply to all the streets of the city?

Mr. HAYDEN. No; it is confined to the Federal-aid system going through the city.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Then it would be confined to one or two or perhaps three streets going through a city; is that correct?

Mr. HAYDEN. That is correct.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. They would be the only ones on which the money could be expended; is that correct?

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes; they would be the only ones on which the money could be expended.

Mr. TUNNELL. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield to me, I should like to inquire whether a State must raise the full amount of its quota, or will it be able to benefit to the extent of the amount it does raise?

Mr. HAYDEN. The Senator's last statement is correct. No State is obligated to raise any particular amount of money at all, but it is assured that its proper share will be available if it matches it 50–50.

Mr. TUNNELL. And it will benefit only according to the amount it does raise; is that correct?

Mr. HAYDEN. That is correct.

Mr. TUNNELL. I thank the Senator.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, in connection with the question asked a moment ago by the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD], I call attention to the language on page 4, lines 7 to 11. Of course, we should not have any misunderstanding about this matter. In towns of less than 5,000 population, not only one street, but all the streets, can be improved.

Mr. HAYDEN. That is correct. So far as the smaller towns are concerned, they come under the secondary system.

Mr. MALONEY rose.

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield to the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. MALONEY. I wish to ask the able senior Senator from Arizona if the provisions of the bill do not go beyond the anticipation of the Senator from Delaware [Mr. TUNNELL]. Is it not possible for the States under certain conditions to obtain more than the amount of money suggested by him, if they do not raise by taxes a sufficient amount?

Mr. HAYDEN. There is an amendment, offered by the Senator from Pennsylvania, which I had intended to discuss in a moment. In connection with the secondary-road funds, it has been urged, particularly in respect to the Northeastern States, which are primarily concerned with the city-traffic problem, that they have already improved their secondary roads to such an extent that they do not need the Federal aid-money. For instance, in States such as Connecticut or Massachusetts one town practically runs into another. So the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DAVIS] offered the following amendment, which was adopted by the committee:

Provided further, That in any State having a population density of more than 200 per square mile, as shown by the latest available Federal census, the said system may be selected without regard to included municipal boundaries.

In other words, in the case of a secondary highway which comes up to a municipal boundary, at the present time none of the money can be spent within the limits of the town if the town has 5,000 population or more. The amendment would permit the secondary-highway money to be used to improve roads within town limits in the very thickly settled States. The argument was that it was of no concern to the other States. It did not affect their portion of the money to be used. It was necessary to handle it in that way in order to meet the existing situation.

The States which would be affected by the amendment are Rhode Island, with a density of population of 674.2 a square mile; New Jersey, with a density of population of 533.9 a square mile; Massachusetts, with a density of population of 545.9 a square mile; Connecticut, with a density of population of 348.9 a square mile; New York, with a density of population of 281.2 a square mile; and Pennsylvania, with a density of population of 219.8 a square mile.

Following that amendment was the proposal made by the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BUCK]. He stated that the State highway departments of Delaware, North Carolina, and Virginia had taken over control of all the roads in those States. There is no county authority, or any other authority, with respect to the supervision of the roads. The State highway department looks after all the roads in each of those States. Under those circumstances, it was stated, there was no occasion or necessity for a division into the categories to which I have referred. So the Senator from Delaware made the following proposal:

That any of such funds for secondary and feeder roads which are apportioned to a State in which all public roads and highways are under the control and supervision of the State highway department may, if the State highway department and the commissioner of public roads jointly agree that such funds are not needed for secondary and feeder roads, be expended for projects in such State on the Federal-aid highway system.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. McCLELLAN. That would enable, would it not, every State to obtain the full benefits which are provided in the pending bill, whether the money were used on secondary roads, or on the Federal-aid highway system?

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes; provided that the State highway department has control of all the roads within the State. There are only three States in that category, namely, Delaware, Virginia, and North Carolina. I understand that the State of West Virginia is rapidly approaching such a status.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. Under the language of the bill to which the Senator has referred, there would be no penalizing of any other State in its allotment of funds, would there?

Mr. HAYDEN. No.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield in order that I may propound a question to him?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. BYRD. Am I to understand that funds appropriated for secondary roads within the States to which the Senator has referred might be used on primary roads?

Mr. HAYDEN. Not unless the State highway department and the Public Roads Administration so agree.

Mr. BYRD. In Virginia the State constructs and maintains all roads. As I understand, the funds could be diverted only at the discretion of the bodies referred to by the Senator?

Mr. HAYDEN. If the State highway department and the Public Roads Administration should agree that such a diversion were necessary in the State of Virginia, it could be made.

Mr. BYRD. But it would not be mandatory?

Mr. HAYDEN. No.

Mr. BYRD. Personally, I wish to see the farm-to-market roads given as much help as possible.

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes.

Mr. BYRD. But such help would be entirely discretionary.

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes.

Mr. BYRD. Would the fund be available for grading and maintenance as well as construction?

Mr. HAYDEN. No.

Mr. BYRD. Then I believe this would raise a very serious objection. Many of our secondary roads are only maintained and graded. They are not constructed. They are scraped and graded and kept in good condition by minor repairs. In Virginia there are certain types of soil which have a solid surface. Why would it not be proper to use a portion of the funds for maintenance?

Mr. HAYDEN. In so doing we would depart from a principle which was adopted many years ago.

Mr. BYRD. Who would determine the specifications for secondary roads?

Mr. HAYDEN. That would be done by agreement.

Mr. BYRD. Would not the Federal Government have a final voice in the matter?

Mr. HAYDEN. No.

Mr. BYRD. I think it would, because it could refuse funds for any construction of which it did not approve.

Mr. HAYDEN. The following provision relating to secondary roads will be found on page 4 of the bill:

Provided, That these funds shall be expended on a system of such roads selected by the State highway departments in cooperation with the county supervisors, county commissioners, or other appropriate local road officials and the Commissioner of Public Roads.

Mr. BYRD. I am speaking of the various types of construction. Under this bill, would not the Federal Government have control over the type of construction of secondary roads?

Mr. HAYDEN. I think that the answer could be put in this way: The Federal Government is interested in seeing that the money is not wasted, and for that reason it should have something to say about the width and the type of the road to be constructed.

Mr. BYRD. The Government will have control of the type of construction.

Mr. HAYDEN. No.

Mr. BYRD. Yes; it will. The Government has control in connection with primary roads at the present time. The Federal Government can now refuse to allot funds for any construction project the type of which it does not approve. Is that not true?

Mr. HAYDEN. Technically, it is true.

Mr. BYRD. It is true, whether technically or not.

Mr. HAYDEN. Would not the Senator from Virginia be opposed to the expenditure of money from Federal funds if the Government did not approve of it?

Mr. BYRD. I think the Federal Government can veto any type of construction of roads which the State may recommend.

Mr. HAYDEN. Would the Senator take away entirely such veto power and say that we should appropriate money from the Federal Treasury without the right to exercise any supervision over it hereafter?

Mr. BYRD. I am not now concerned with the question of primary roads. The construction of such roads has been standardized, and it is well understood. But we are being asked to consider projects in a comparatively new field, relating to secondary or farm-to-market roads, many of which do not require construction and have many types of construction. It is possible for the Federal Government to establish standards with which the State cannot comply.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. From the very beginning that has been the law with regard to primary roads. I have never heard of a difference existing between the State authority and the Federal Government which has not been adjusted. It will be so with regard to secondary roads. I am sure that whatever standards may be set up, they will be set up in such a manner as to carry out the provisions of the proposed act according to its purpose, and it will be exceedingly beneficial to the States, in my judgment, for them all to agree to the standards and carry them out just as has been done with regard to primary roads which, in my judgment, have been the greatest success of any road system that was ever inaugurated in the world.

Mr. BYRD. At the beginning of the construction of primary roads there was a great deal of dissension between the States and the Federal Government. At one time we had accumulated in Virginia a fund of five or six million dollars because the State and the Federal Government could not agree upon types of construction. This was a long time ago, it is true.

In Virginia we have 50,000 miles of roads, about 10,000 in the primary system and 40,000 in the secondary system. It would be impossible to construct all of such mileage with solid construction. Why should not some of the proposed funds be used for maintenance as well as construction?

Mr. HAYDEN. Only because the Federal Government has never, up until now, adopted such a policy.

Mr. BYRD. Has it ever embarked on a program of this magnitude and character to improve farm-to-market roads?

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes; the Government started to do so about 10 years ago.

Mr. BYRD. How much money was appropriated?

Mr. HAYDEN. Up until now the Government has appropriated a total of approximately $150,000,000.

Mr. BYRD. How much did it appropriate last year?

Mr. HAYDEN. I believe it appropriated approximately $25,000,000.

Mr. BYRD. It is now being proposed to increase the appropriation to $125,000,000.

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes.

Mr. BYRD. I think we should consider the advisability of using some of those funds for maintenance. What objection could there be to doing so?

Mr. HAYDEN. The objection is that if we begin paying for maintenance of any kind of a road we will not have a highway system, and our money will be frittered away.

Mr. BYRD. Our money will not be frittered away if we use it efficiently for the purpose of maintenance of roads.

Mr. HAYDEN. How many miles of secondary highway does the Senator estimate there are in Virginia?

Mr. BYRD. Of the approximately 50,000 miles, about 10,000 miles are in the primary system, the remaining 40,000 miles in the secondary system.

Mr. HAYDEN. How much of the 40,000 miles can be handled by maintenance?

Mr. BYRD. A great deal of it can be; in lower Virginia where the soil is sandy much of it can be.

Mr. HAYDEN. It cannot be done in a clay area.

Mr. BYRD. No; not in a clay area, but it can be in a shale area and in a sandy area.

Mr. HAYDEN. What is the cost of maintenance of the State of Virginia primary roads in the sandy section?

Mr. BYRD. At the moment I cannot give the Senator the figures, but dragging or scraping the roads every 60 or 90 days will keep them in good condition.

Mr. HAYDEN. If it is not expensive, then the local authorities can take care of it; but when it is necessary to do work that will keep vehicles out of the mud and out of the clay so that they will not bog down it is necessary to use gravel.

Mr. BYRD. Will the Senator accept the amendment offered by the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD] providing that secondary roads shall be constructed under plans and specifications approved by the State highway department for each State?

Mr. HAYDEN. Does the Senator seriously recommend that we shall appropriate money out of funds in the Treasury and shall have no supervision over its expenditure and as to how the work shall be done?

Mr. BYRD. I asked the Senator if he would accept the amendment of the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. HAYDEN. I doubt if it would be acceptable to the Senate.

Mr. BYRD. There may be some supervision, but I do not think the Federal Government should be permitted to make an allocation of $125,000,000 for the purpose of constructing costly types of secondary roads, and determine the whole matter itself. If that is done, I fear it will destroy the entire project.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, let me call the attention of the Senator from Virginia to a fact. The Senator recalls, as we all recall, the authorization for W. P. A. roads. They were built virtually without supervision by anybody; they were built for a different purpose, largely to create employment, and in that way they probably did some good. But the difficulty of maintaining them, of dragging the roads, and things of that sort almost brought on a scandal at the time. We do not want to repeat it. The Government in handling this money has handled it well and has cooperated with the States in a most proper fashion, it seems

to me, in establishing a great system of primary roads. I am quite sure that if the Senator will permit this bill to go through as the committee has recommended it, he will find that it will afford the best possible means of providing roads in the various States.

Mr. BYRD. I may say to the Senator from Tennessee there is no comparison whatever between W. P. A. and what they did and the roads built by the State highway departments. The roads built by the State highway departments are efficient, and, so far as maintenance is concerned, there are thousnads and hundreds of thousands of roads which require nothing but maintenance, and probably never will require anything but maintenance for years to come. The money spent on maintenance is the most effective that can be spent.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, if the Senator from Arizona will yield, I think it was true, it certainly was in my State, that the W. P. A. roads were worked out and constructed and improved in conjunction with the county road authorities. I do not know of any road in my State that was simply taken over; the W. P. A. had no jurisdiction over the roads; they had to work out their plans with the county road authorities, and in many cases with the State highway departments. Some of the best roads built in my State were built by W. P. A. in cooperation with the county authorities and all the more important roads which were improved were improved largely in cooperation with the State highway commission. So I do not think it is quite fair to say that the W. P. A. just barged in, and did a lot of unnecessary work merely to give people jobs.

Mr. HAYDEN. It depended upon what kind of an arrangement was made with the States——

Mr. BARKLEY. It had to be a cooperative arrangement.

Mr. HAYDEN. Because the county sponsored the project. The W. P. A. in many States utilized the engineering advice and skill of the State highway department, and did a good job; in other places they did not; there was no uniform rule.

Mr. BARKLEY. I do not know of any case in which even when the W. P. A. took charge and spent all the money necessary to improve a road the county did not sponsor it and put up a certain amount.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, in regard to the matter of veto power brought up by the distinguished Senator from Virginia, let me call the attention of the Senate to the fact that the original draft, on line 11, page 4, provided:

> That these funds shall be expended on a system of such roads selected by the State highway departments in cooperation with the county supervisors, county commissioners, or other appropriate road officials, subject to the approval of the Commissioner of Public Roads.

The committee not wanting that power to be lodged in the Commissioner of Public Roads in the case of secondary roads struck out the words "subject to the approval of the Commissioner of Public Roads."

Mr. HAYDEN. And made it a cooperative arrangement.

Mr. LANGER. Yes; it was made a cooperative enterprise.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, the next item——

Mr. REED. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. REED. While the Senator from Virginia was on his feet I wanted to ask him a question to clear up in my mind a statement he made about the State of Virginia. I understood the Senator from Virginia to say that in the Virginia primary system there were some 10,000 miles of roads. May I inquire of the Senator from Virginia if he meant by that Federal-aid roads?

Mr. BYRD. No; only a small part of them are Federal-aid roads. I was speaking of what we classify as the primary system which are the main roads of the State. Only a small part of them are designated as Federal highways.

Mr. REED. According to a statement I have in my hand, the Federal-aid highway mileage in Virginia is 4,640.

Mr. BYRD. I was speaking of the State system of primary roads.

Mr. REED. If the Senator from Arizona will yield for a moment further, I wish to express my complete concurrence with the Senator from Arizona and the Senator from Tennessee in their position that when we appropriate money from the Federal Treasury certainly the Federal Government must exercise some supervision over its expenditure. Any other policy would be unthinkably unsound.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. Is it not true, so far as the veto power is concerned, the power which it is claimed the Commissioner of Public Roads has, that under the provision between lines 12 and 16 on page 4 the county supervisor has a veto power and the county commissioners have a veto power and other appropriate road officials have a veto power just as great as that of the Commissioner of Public Roads?

Mr. HAYDEN. Of course, he cannot force anything they do not want.

Mr. BYRD. The difference is the Commissioner of Public Roads can withhold the funds; that is where the power lies. The local people cannot withhold anything. They may disagree, and not get any allotment at all if there is a difference between the two.

Mr. HAYDEN. The Senator would not take that Federal authority away, would he?

Mr. BYRD. If there is a difference between the two the Federal authorities prevail.

Mr. HAYDEN. The Federal authorities approve a project. That is the way it has been done heretofore.

Mr. BYRD. And so the Government controls.

Mr. HAYDEN. No; I do not think so.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Before we leave this subject, I want to express complete concurrence with the Senator from Virginia. My conviction comes from personal experience of 4 years in dealing with the Bureau of Federal Roads as Governor of my State. When the Senator from Tennessee says that the road-building program will be worked out satisfactorily, it will be worked out satisfactorily if the State highway commission and the State absolutely agree to what the Federal Bureau of Roads and its engineers tell them. That is the only way it will be worked out. It is all right for the Senator from Arizona to smile, but I am talking from personal experience. I know what the conditions are in my State. We have not used any of the secondary road money in our State simply because we will not and cannot build the type of road the Federal engineers demand. That was the point the Senator from Virginia was making. We want to use the money for farm-to-market roads so that some benefit may be derived from it by the farmers as well as by the tourists who travel through the States. If the bill is put in such a form that we cannot comply with it, we will not get the money.

I have offered an amendment to permit the State highway departments of the various States to determine the plans and specifications for secondary roads. The committee disagreed. I think they have made a mistake in that respect.

So far as the statement of the Senator from Kansas about supervision is concerned, the amendment does not provide for supervision of the money; but the State highway commissions in the various States are a high-type body of men, who have built a wonderful system of roads in this country, and I ask only that they have the power to design the specifications and blueprints for roads which will suit the needs of each particular State and not the views of those who make the decision in Washington.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, the next principal change made by the committee appears on page 5. As the bill was reported originally it provided that money for Federal aid for secondary roads should be apportioned in accordance with the provisions of section 21 of the Federal Highway Act; that is, one-third according to the area of the State, one-third according to the population of the State, and one-third according to the mileage of post roads.

The junior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. STEWART] suggested that the proper basis on which to apportion the money was one-third on the area of the States, one-third on the mileage of post roads, and one-third on the ratio the rural population of the State bears to the rural population of the United States. So Senators will see that the amendment provides for that.

> The $125,000,000 per year available for projects on the secondary and feeder roads shall be apportioned among the States in the following manner: One-third in the ratio which the area of each State bears to the total area of all the States; one-third in the ratio which the rural population of each State bears to the total rural population of all the States, as shown by the Federal census of 1940; and one-third in the ratio which the

mileage of rural delivery and star routes in each State bears to the total mileage of rural delivery and star routes in all the States.

The argument for that was persuasive, too, because we have taken an equal sum of money, $125,000,000, and apportioned it among the States according to the population of cities and towns of 5,000 and more. So we emphasize in the authorization for the appropriation, which goes to the cities, that the population of the cities is the sole factor. In the case where the money is to be expended on highways utilized by the rural population, mileage facilities are the principal factor.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JACKSON in the chair). Does the Senator from Arizona yield to the Senator from Tennessee?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. STEWART. The Senator was discussing paragraph (b)?

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes; which is based upon an amendment which the Senator himself offered.

Mr. STEWART. That is the same wording, I believe, found in the amendment I intended to propose, and as I understand, the committee has accepted the amendment.

Mr. HAYDEN. We recommend the provision to the Senate.

Mr. STEWART. In order that I may understand the situation, in the reprint the matter printed in italics is new matter?

Mr. HAYDEN. I have obtained unanimous consent that when I conclude my discussion in general, the bill shall be read for amendment, and we will take up the amendments in their order as they appear in the bill. The one to which the Senator refers will be reached in due course.

Mr. STEWART. Let me propound a parliamentary inquiry. It will not now be necessary for me to offer this amendment, in the light of the statement the Senator has made?

Mr. HAYDEN. Not at all. This amendment comes recommended by the committee as a committee amendment.

Mr. STEWART. As a part of the bill itself?

Mr. HAYDEN. When adopted by the Senate.

Mr. STEWART. If and when adopted, of course. I think the formula is quite correct. The urban money is being spent on urban population basis and distributed among the towns of over 5,000 population. Therefore it should not be unfair to distribute money to be spent on rural roads under a formula based upon rural population. Of course, this would increase the amount going to strictly rural States, but, on the other hand, the cities get all the money from the urban funds. It is about balanced. I thank the Senator and the other members of the committee for accepting my amendment.

Mr. HAYDEN. The Senator made a very persuasive argument, which impressed the committee.

Mr. President, the next amendment of serious importance is on page 6, an amendment suggested by the junior Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], wherein he proposes to strike out the figures "60" and insert "50." In other words, he would provide that "the Federal share payable on account of any project provided for by the funds made available by this act shall not exceed 50 percent of the construction cost thereof."

Mr. BYRD. That is existing law.

Mr. HAYDEN. That is the existing law.

Mr. BYRD. It is in harmony with all the other Federal grants.

Mr. HAYDEN. The committee recommends that the amendment proposed by the Senator from Virginia be agreed to.

Mr. LANGER. Will the Senator from Arizona yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. What is to become of the States which simply cannot match?

Mr. HAYDEN. The problem is partly met by the recommendation of the amount in the bill. If they had to match $650,000,000, it would be harder than if they had to match $450,000,000, and the 50–50 arrangement makes it easier for them to go as far as they can. I admit it is going to be a hardship on some States, but all the States can do is to go as far as they can. Just as I indicated to the Senator from Delaware, if a State runs out of money, it cannot any longer match.

Mr. LANGER. I thought it was understood the other day at the committee meeting that it would be left at 60–40.

Mr. HAYDEN. It was, but the committee reversed itself after considering the amendment offered by the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD].

Mr. BURTON. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. BURTON. Am I to understand that the amendment suggested by the Senator from Virginia will apply to all 3 years?

Mr. HAYDEN. Oh, yes.

Mr. BURTON. The bill which was passed by the House made it 60–40 for the first year, but this will apply for all 3 years?

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes. On page 7 of the bill there are two provisions to which I think I should direct attention.

Mr. WHERRY. Is the Senator about to proceed to page 7?

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes.

Mr. WHERRY. Does that relate to the restrictions on the amendment just referred to?

Mr. HAYDEN. No; it relates to railway-grade crossings.

Mr. WHERRY. I beg pardon.

Mr. HAYDEN. The junior Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] exercised a very persuasive influence on the committee, and in several places in the bill the committee recommended striking out any reference to the acquisition of rights-of-way. That is why the language from line 10 to line 16 on page 7 is stricken out. It is to eliminate the words "except that not more than 50 percent of the right-of-way and property damage costs," and so forth. We reinserted that language, leaving out the right-of-way provision.

Then there is a proviso at the end of the paragraph, for which I think the Senator from Georgia will also take some responsibility, namely, "That no Federal funds shall be expended on any such project unless the railway or railways involved pay not less than 15 percent of the construction cost of such project."

During the depression, when we had two objects in mind, one to prevent the terrific loss of life occurring throughout the United States at railroad-grade crossings, the other to provide work for the unemployed, knowing that the railroads were in very poor financial condition, we provided for a 50-percent Federal contribution. In the judgment of the committee, the railroads should be required to pay 15 percent of the cost.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I appreciate the Senator's reference to me. I wish I could have been more persuasive in the committee in regard to some other amendments.

I merely wish to say that up until recent years the railroads were required to pay 50 percent of the cost of the elimination of the crossings. I think they should pay as much as 25 percent now. However, the provision for 15 percent does require some contribution on the part of the railroads, which benefit tremendously from the elimination of the crossings.

Mr. HAYDEN. The railroads benefit and lose. It works both ways.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I am sure the Senator from Georgia meant to say that there was no Federal provision requiring participation by the railroads. Different laws existed in different States, and generally the States required a 50-percent contribution from the railroads when a grade-crossing separation was to be made.

Mr. RUSSELL. No; the first bill, as I recall, that we passed, specifically providing for elimination of grade crossings, was either in 1933 or 1934, and it required a 50-percent participation by the railroads. The railroads were unable to participate at that time, and the funds were not expended until after the law was changed and we provided for the Federal Government bearing all the cost of the construction. That change occurred just after a very tragic accident which took place near Washington, when a school bus was struck by a train and some 15 or 20 school children were killed. The bill came before the Senate just following that terrible accident, and the law was changed to permit the Government to pay all the cost.

Mr. REED. If my understanding was in error I am glad to have it corrected.

Mr. BYRD. What is the present contribution made by the railroads in grade-crossing elimination?

Mr. HAYDEN. The present contribution by the railroads is very small. We have been eliminating grade crossings entirely at the expense of the United States. The cost, except for rights-of-way, has been borne by the United States.

Mr. BYRD. That is not true in my State. I think the railroads there have been bearing 50 percent of the cost of elimination of grade crossings.

Mr. HAYDEN. The State can require such a contribution.

Mr. BYRD. Does the proposal in the committee amendment make a change in the amount the railroads were previously paying?

Mr. HAYDEN. The situation as it has existed up to now is that the railroads were not paying anything. The provision contained in the committee amendment is that the railroads shall pay at least 15 percent of the cost of elimination of railway crossings.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Some State laws require railroads to make contribution.

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes; some State laws require them to make contribution, but if they do not make contribution nothing can be done.

Mr. BYRD. The State can compel the railroads to put up 50 percent of the cost of such grade-crossing elimination as the bill proposes.

Mr. HAYDEN. I do not say that the States cannot require such payment.

Mr. RUSSELL. This would not affect the State law. The provision merely requires that no Federal funds shall be expended on any such project unless the railway pays not less than 15 percent of the cost.

Mr. BYRD. Should not that particular point be made more clear?

Mr. HAYDEN. We have had no difficulty about it, so far as I know. The proposal in the amendment was simply to do two things: One that the Federal Government would not expend anything for rights-of-way, as it was proposed that the railroad or the State would have to furnish the right-of-way, and the other that the railroad would have to contribute at least 15 percent to the cost of elimination of railway-grade crossings. It works both ways. The railroad undoubtedly gains an advantage in eliminating a grade crossing, because in proceeding through the towns its trains can go at greater speed. That is an asset to it. But in many instances it was shown to the committee that where the tracks are elevated and the railroad has been put to considerable expense, the total cost is added to the taxable value of the railroad property, and the city and the State proceed to tax the railroad for the improvement that was made. Also, if it is handled that way, it enters into the amount of the capital investment of the road for rate-making purposes. So it is not all a one-sided affair. The bill as it is represents the best compromise the committee could make, and it recommends it to the Senate.

Mr. BYRD. The Senator does not think the adoption of the provision would prevent a State from requiring a 50-percent contribution?

Mr. HAYDEN. No.

Mr. BURTON. Under the bill as first introduced it was provided that the Federal Government might pay up to 50 percent of the cost of rights-of-way and under the amendment it would pay nothing for rights-of-way.

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes.

Mr. BURTON. And under the terms of the bill as originally introduced the Government would pay 100 percent of the construction costs exclusive of rights-of-way, and under the amendment the Government would pay not more than 85 percent of such construction cost.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. In view of what the distinguished Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] said in response to the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] what is the objection to placing at the end of line 23 on page 7 the following language:

Provided further, That nothing herein shall prevent any State from requiring a railroad to contribute 50 percent?

Mr. HAYDEN. The difficulty, as was explained by the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED] to the committee, is that when this 50-percent construction charge was imposed against the railroads generally throughout the States, the hazard to life was not eliminated, because the railroad companies argued that actually the benefit is more to the public than it is to the railroads. The railroads were there first. Then we have come along and built a highway system, and then people have bought millions of automobiles, and many of those who are killed ride in automobiles. I would not want to place anything in the bill which would impede the action we desire. I think the important thing is to remove the hazard to life at grade crossings. Getting money out of the railroads is not the important thing.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I agree entirely with the Senator from Arizona. I come from a State which has the fourth largest highway mileage in the United States, and which has a very large railroad mileage. Kansas had a law which required 50-percent participation by the railroads whenever a grade crossing was separated, and as a result we did not obtain any separation of grade crossings. We did eliminate a great many grade crossings, but we did it as we built new roads, and straightened out the angles and built the roads as far from the railroads as possible.

The question here is to get as much grade separation as we can. That benefits the railroads to some extent, but the benefit to the railroads is rather slight. It results mostly in reduction of personal damage cases arising from highway-crossing accidents. The principal benefit accrues to the public safety. The question arises, How much grade separation do we want, and how much can we obtain? I may say, as the Senator from Arizona is well aware, that 15 percent was selected by the committee as the highest percentage of participation that we could hope to obtain from the railroads and still have grade-crossing separations.

Mr. HAYDEN. I understood the Senator from Kansas to say before the committee that the State of Kansas repealed the law which required a 50-percent contribution on the part of the railroads.

Mr. REED. At least that provision of law is a dead letter. I would not say that the State law has been repealed. I was Governor of Kansas when the present State-highway program was inaugurated, and we worked earnestly to bring about grade separation, but so long as 50-percent participation was required on the part of the railroads—and in most cases the railroads could show us that they had a very slight interest in the matter—no separation resulted. The Senator will remember that we set 15 percent as the highest figure at which we could get participation and still obtain grade separation. I am more interested in grade separation than almost anything else.

Mr. LANGER. That is all interesting, but what about underpasses in towns and cities, for which the State government is asked to pay or for which the local governments are asked to pay?

Mr. REED. They fall in the same category.

Mr. LANGER. They fall in the same category, and millions of dollars are taken from State and local governments to pay for such underpasses. Why should not the States have the right to say, "We are going to ask the railroads to contribute?" The Senator from Arizona said a moment ago that the States can call on the railroads to contribute. Why not include such a provision in the proposed law.

Mr. HAYDEN. I do not want to encourage the States to stick the railroads, because I think it is more important to quit killing people than it is to get money out of the railroads. Perhaps it is not, but that is my judgment. There has been great butchery, the killing of men, women, and children on highways. In the last 20 years 500,000 people have been killed on our highways. We were killing more of our citizens on our roads every day, up to the present great offensive in France, than were killed in our armed forces all over the world. But we did not seem to think of the great loss of life on the highways. Life is just as sweet to a man or to a woman or to a child who is killed on the highway as it is to a man fighting on the battle front. Yet we seem to think nothing of it. This butchery which has gone on should be stopped, and the way to stop it is to get together and do a good job of railroad-crossing elimination, rather than to say "We will never do it unless we can stick the railroads and make them pay for it" when they will not pay for it.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, the language I propose does not stick the railroads. I am just as interested as is the distinguished Senator from Arizona in saving human life, but in response to a question asked him by the Senator from Virginia, the Senator from Arizona stated that a State could require contribution on the part of the railoads.

Mr. HAYDEN. It can.

Mr. LANGER. Then, why not make provision therefor in the pending legislation?

Mr. HAYDEN. It is not necessary to give the State permission in this measure. We have had no trouble about it heretofore. I do not wish to encumber the bill any more than necessary. In my judgment, such a provision is wholly unnecessary. We could not give the State authority which it does not already have in this respect.

The next amendment, Senators will notice, on pages 7, 8, and 9, is of considerable length. It relates to the inability of States to match Federal aid under certain conditions. It was sponsored by the junior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN], who will undoubtedly be glad to explain it when it comes up for consideration.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I am sure the Senator from Arizona will be interested in knowing that the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] and I also desire to utter a few words with respect to the amendment.

Mr. HAYDEN. I have no doubt that the matter will be subject for discussion.

In section 11, on page 12, there was a question with respect to flight strips, and at the suggestion of the chairman of the committee, the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR], we provided that no flight strip should be developed until after approval of the location by the Civil Aeronautics Authority, so as to have proper coordination in such cases.

Then, at the very last of the bill, in section 12, there is a provision which everyone agrees is highly desirable for uniformity in highway-marking signs throughout the United States.

The junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WEEKS], being a careful legislator, thought that we had gone too far, and so an amendment was inserted to provide that on highways and streets hereafter constructed under the Federal-aid system the form and character of informational, regulatory, and warning signs, curb and pavement or other markings, and traffic signals shall be subject to a standard code approved by the State highway department and the Commissioner of Public Roads.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. BYRD. I have received several letters with reference to a 100-foot right-of-way. Is there any such provision in the bill?

Mr. HAYDEN. The acquisition of rights-of-way is a matter for the State highway department. I think what the Senator has in mind is that in some places the State highway department is trying to obtain additional right-of-way. Under existing law, the State acquires the right-of-way. We have eliminated from the bill the provision for Federal participation in payment for rights-of-way.

Mr. BYRD. As I understand, there is no requirement for it?

Mr. HAYDEN. No; there is no requirement for it.

Mr. President, I believe that covers the principal items in the bill.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. ANDREWS. Am I to understand that the State highway commissions in the various States will still provide the rights-of-way?

Mr. HAYDEN. Oh, yes.

Mr. ANDREWS. Of whatever width they may deem proper?

Mr. HAYDEN. They will have to obtain whatever they think is needed. That is a matter which the Congress does not dictate. There is no requirement that there must be a 50-foot, 60-foot, 100-foot, or 200-foot right-of-way.

Mr. ANDREWS. Rights-of-way as wide as 200 or 300 feet have been mentioned. Suppose the National Association of Road Commissioners should lay down a rule that the right-of-way should be 200 feet wide?

Mr. HAYDEN. With respect to rights-of-way, the only interest of the Public Roads Administration is in having some control along each side where so-called free-ways are being built. Such roads are built with the object of permitting greater speed between cities. Unlimited access to such roads cannot be permitted. There must be limited access. In order that there may be limited access, the sides of the road for some distance must be controlled. Aside from the question of limited access to so-called free-ways, I have heard no discussion with respect to the width of rights-of-way.

Mr. ANDREWS. For example, if a 200-foot right-of-way were prescribed through my State for national-aid roads, I do not know how many millions of dollars it would cost, because the orange groves were there before the roads were built, and many millions of dollars' worth of property would be destroyed, even by a 100-foot right-of-way.

Mr. HAYDEN. I can conceive of no substantial reason for anything of the kind, unless a road were being widened. For example, it might be desired to make a four-lane highway out of a two-lane highway, and it might be necessary to cut down some orange trees.

Mr. ANDREWS. Would that be in the discretion of the State highway commission?

Mr. HAYDEN. Certainly. They initiate all such projects under the Highway Act.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. I notice that the junior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD] is not at the moment present in the Chamber. I wonder whether the Senator in charge of the bill would have any objection to letting the amendment of the junior Senator from South Dakota go to conference.

Mr. HAYDEN. It cannot be considered at the moment, under the unanimous-consent agreement that we first consider the committee amendments. We must first dispose of them. Then the Senator will have an opportunity to offer the amendment. As a matter of principle, I hesitate to say that we should not have some control over the manner in which Federal funds are to be expended.

Mr. LANGER. After all, the States are putting up half of the money, under the 50–50 rule. So far as secondary roads are concerned, would it not be possible to adopt an amendment under which the Federal Government would have no control, and let the amendment go to conference?

Mr. HAYDEN. It is a question of principle. Shall the Congress appropriate money for an undertaking, and have nothing to say about the type of undertaking? As the Senator knows, the bill provides for cooperation between the county and State governments and the Federal Government. They must get together.

I should like to point out another feature in connection with the secondary-road proposal. Heretofore we have appropriated comparatively little for such roads. In 1937 or 1938 we started with $25,000,000. We have spent only a little more than $150,000,000 in the years since. That is only a little dab of money. We are now proposing to spend a substantial sum of money in each State; and it is only common sense to expect, when we provide in the bill that the county commissioners, the State highway commissioners, and the Bureau of Public Roads shall cooperate, that they will find some method of agreement, and will cooperate, as provided in the bill. Heretofore we have had only a little money for secondary roads, which did not begin or end anywhere in particular. We said, "We will use the standard specifications." This is a different picture, because we are approaching the problem from a different angle. I believe that the various agencies will cooperate.

Mr. LANGER. The State highway commissioners are very familiar with their State. They may spend the money in the eastern part of the State, whereas in the western part of the State there may be a road 3 miles long which the farmers could use, except for one short stretch. I certainly dislike to see a standard set-up which would require the whole 3 miles to be graded and constructed according to certain specifications, when perhaps there is only one hole in the 3-mile stretch which needs to be repaired, so that farmers could use the road to get their grain to market.

Mr. HAYDEN. It is simply a question of give and take, and common sense. If the various agencies cooperate, I believe that the problem can be solved.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. Certainly.

Mr. FERGUSON. As I understand, the first amendment involves the question of including the costs of rights-of-way in the amount of money to be appropriated by the Federal Government.

I appreciate the argument made by some, that if the Federal Government is required to pay a part of the costs of rights-of-way, juries in condemnation proceedings will be found awarding larger prices because the Federal Government is appropriating the money. I realize also that there is a feeling that so long as the Federal Government is paying the money, the individual does not have to pay it. He feels that it is a Federal tax, and he does not feel that he is paying it directly.

However, I believe that we, as Members of the Senate, should understand that so far as the bill relates to the appropriation for urban areas, to the extent of $125,000,000 a year, this plan will not work. In other words, the cost of con-

demning land for widening a highway is so great in relation to the cost of construction of the highway itself, that instead of the State paying one-half the cost, as suggested by the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], we shall find that the State will be paying 80 percent of the cost, and the Federal Government 20 percent of the actual cost of the highway, because the cost of condemning the land for widening the highway, aside from the actual cost of laying the highway, will be so great that the States will not be able to use effectively the $125,000,000 a year.

As I understand, it is proposed to appropriate this money now because it is essential for the future of our country that roads be widened, not only in the rural sections, but also in the urban sections. If we are doing it for that reason, then, at least in the urban centers, we should pay one-half the cost of the condemnation of land, as well as one-half the cost of construction of the roads.

I believe that in the past too little attention has been paid to the urban centers on Federal-aid highways. At first it was proposed to appropriate $650,000,000 a year for Federal aid in the construction of highways. We must not forget that the people of this country were paying directly, in gasoline taxes and other taxes in connection with the operation of automobiles, $650,000,000 a year. In 15 States there are constitutional provisions prohibiting the States from diverting to any other purpose than the building of roads any of the funds raised by taxation of automobile operators. We in the Senate propose that the Federal Government raise $650,000,000 a year from the automobile owners of this country. I think that is too much.

I have felt that the use tax, for instance, is one which should not have been placed. There are farmers, workingmen, and other persons in the country who own automobiles which are worth not much in excess of $25 or $30, but they are compelled to pay $5 a year for the privilege of using those cars. They pay just as much as is paid by a man who owns a high-priced car. But let us say that may be justified because there is an emergency at the present time.

If we are going to use $125,000,000 a year for roads in urban areas—and I know we are appropriating it for that exact purpose—we should not provide that it cannot be used by the States in their urban districts. We should think twice before we vote to eliminate the provision for the Federal Government to share in the cost of acquiring rights-of-way for highways, because, after all, one of the defects in the entire highway system is that we have not paid enough attention to limited access roads and to the widening of roads, so as to be able to care for the traffic in the years to come.

So, Mr. President, the Senate should reject the committee amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 2, line 4.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I wish to say a few words on the amendment. I think it would be a very unwise precedent for the Government to set, if we were now to change our policies with respect to highway construction, by contributing and appropriating Federal funds for the acquisition of rights-of-way. It would set a precedent which would necessarily have to apply in a number of other cases, and would result in unnecessary outlays from the Federal Treasury.

We have been consistent in one thing in all of our highway and State aid legislation, in that from the very beginning we have required either the city, the county, or the State to provide the rights-of-way or the land which was to be used for any construction purpose. We have done that in connection with our highway system. Even in the very depths of the depression, when we were appropriating huge sums of money for public-works programs, all the bills carried provisions that the rights-of-way had to be provided by the counties or other political subdivisions benefiting from the appropriations.

In connection with the construction of airfields throughout the country we have adhered strictly to the policy that the local government—the city or the county government—is required to provide the lands in connection with which the funds for such fields are to be expended. It would be very dangerous to depart from that principle at this time.

The cities have had no such requirement, because heretofore the cities have not benefited directly from any appropriation for public roads or streets. For the first time we are now asked to appropriate $125,000,000 to be expended for the benefit of the cities, within the cities, on the city streets. Mr. President, I think the cities should be willing to provide the rights-of-way, just as the counties have done in the past, just as the counties have done in connection with airfields, and just as the cities have been required to do before, in connection with the expenditure of public funds for State and county highways through the cities.

There are very sound reasons for that policy. The argument is made that the cities receive tremendous benefit from the expenditure of funds obtained from the taxes on gasoline. We all know that in the past 15 or 20 years when we have had these huge Federal-aid road programs, when we have constructed the magnificent highway system in this country we have practically dried up all the smaller communities, those with a population of 2,000 or less, so far as conducting any business is concerned. In my State there are any number of small towns which heretofore have had populations of 800, 1,000, or 1,500, but which today are practically deserted villages, because we have constructed the highway systems, and the people prefer to trade in the larger cities. The cities have derived more benefit from the construction of the highway systems than any part of the rural population has derived.

There is another very substantial reason why we should not deviate from the policy we have always followed with respect to requiring the sponsor of the project to acquire the lands on which it is to be constructed. That is the difference in cost. There will be a tremendous difference in the cost of the lands if we require that the Federal Government pay for the rights-of-way. We all know that if a city is acquiring property for a park or for any other civic project, it makes an appeal to the owners of the land. As a contribution to the welfare of the city, it requests that they ask only a very modest sum for the land. People who have that pressure brought upon them usually contribute their lands through a sense of civic pride, and sell them much more cheaply under such circumstances. In cases in which a local government is acquiring land, the land is sold much more cheaply than it is in the cases in which it is acquired by the Federal Government. In my judgment, if this provision is left in the bill, more than half of the $125,000,000 will be used for the purchase of lands.

I submit that the Federal Government should not contribute to the purchase of lands, when, in addition, it is appropriating funds to defray the cost of construction of the city streets—something we have never done in the past. The policy was adopted after careful study, and it should not be disturbed at this date.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 2, line 4.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The next committee amendment will be stated.

The next amendment was, on page 2, line 5, after the word "crossings", to insert a comma and the words "but does not include costs of rights-of-way."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 2, line 22, to strike out "$1,950,000,000" and insert "$1,350,000,000."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I should like to ask a question of the distinguished senior Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN]. I wonder if he gave any consideration to the question of decreasing the amount of the appropriation of $1,950,000,000 so that all States of the Union could match these amounts on the 50–50 basis now proposed in the committee print. I wish it to be clearly understood on the floor of the Senate that I am in favor of highways and that I wish to have the Government do everything it can do to obtain, in Nebraska, as well as all other States, the kind of highway system which is recommended as well as one the Nation can afford. There is also the question whether some States can even match their share of the $450,000,000. It becomes a problem. What provisions will the States have to make, to provide their portion of this huge sum?

I do not desire to offer at this time an amendment proposing to decrease the amount; but I will ask the Senator again if the committee gave consideration to the amendment of the distinguished junior Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], which the distinguished Senator from Arizona told me about on the floor of the Senate last Tuesday. It provided for a return to the old formula and for the

appropriation of approximately the amount we have appropriated in the years gone by.

Mr. HAYDEN. This amendment amounts to that.

Mr. WHERRY. I wish to call the Senator's attention to the fact that the proposed new basis of 60–40 presented a considerable problem to the State of Nebraska. Now, on the old 50–50 basis, it will be exceedingly difficult for our State to match so large an amount as its share will be under the proposed budget.

Mr. HAYDEN. Under the allotment, Nebraska has to match $7,404,000 today. I dare say the income of the State of Nebraska received from its gasoline taxes is nearly twice as much as that. Is that correct?

Mr. WHERRY. I have the figures for the total receipts from the gasoline tax in 1941, which was the peak year. We do not have available the best figures to use in order to arrive at the answer in the years to come.

Mr. HAYDEN. Of course, we know that with gasoline rationing and tire rationing those tax receipts have fallen off.

Mr. WHERRY. That is correct.

Mr. HAYDEN. But these bills have to be paid after the war. When the war is over, and when there no longer is tire rationing and gasoline rationing, the gasoline-tax income is bound to increase.

Let me inquire what the gasoline tax revenue of the State of Nebraska has been.

Mr. WHERRY. In 1941, which was our banner year of the receipts of all years, we received $12,396,000.

Mr. HAYDEN. Out of that $12,000,000, does not the Senator believe his State could match $7,000,000?

Mr. WHERRY. For the information of the distinguished senior Senator from Arizona, that is why I asked whether the committee considered a lower figure. I do not want Nebraska to have to raise its tax on gasoline—which is now 5 cents a gallon—in order to be able to match the appropriation.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I will yield to the distinguished Senator from Kansas, and will later answer the question of the Senator from Arizona.

Mr. REED. I inquire of the distinguished Senator from Nebraska if the State of Nebraska did not divert $2,455,000 in 1941 from taxes on highway users in order to pay old-age pensions, or something of that nature. I do not wish to be misunderstood. What the State of Nebraska does with its money is its own business, but I do not think that it is very consistent to raise a question concerning the size of an appropriation for highway purposes, and the inability of a State to match, when that State diverts a part of the highway users' tax for other purposes.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I thank the able Senator from Kansas for his remarks. We have personally discussed the subject, and I believe we decided that possibly there was involved a question of diversion. The State of Nebraska did divert money out of its gasoline tax fund in order to pay expenses not connected with roads. But regardless of that, we still have the problem of matching the proposed appropriation. No one knows in what financial condition the States will be in 1945. In our State we have a constitutional provision which I think is a good one, that the credit of the State cannot be pledged without a vote of the people. We have no sales tax. We have no State income tax, and we are proud of the fact that we do not have such a tax. We like good roads in Nebraska, and we want to pay for them. We believe that the users of automobiles should help pay for them but should not be required to pay more than 5 cents a gallon on gasoline.

Mr. HAYDEN. I suggest that the State of Nebraska adopt a provision which has been adopted by approximately 15 other States, insuring that receipts from the tax on the sale of gasoline shall be applied to roads.

Mr. WHERRY. Whether we should do that or not is beside the question. We are confronted with the fact that if the pending bill is passed, in 1945 we shall lack nearly a half a million dollars of being able to match under our present tax-program. The second year we would lack more than $3,000,000, and the third year we would lack nearly $6,000,000. Those figures are on the basis of estimated receipts and testimony submitted by Mr. McDonald in hearings before the House committee.

As I have already said, I do not desire to provoke a great deal of debate or controversy with regard to the amount which has been arrived at by the committee. I am at a loss to know why the committee reduced the amount from $650,000,000 to $450,000,000 annually. But so long as that has been done, would it not be possible further to reduce the amount by another $150,000,000 annually, and prorate it accordingly? Then the States could match, and it would not be necessary to make provision for the Federal Government to help any State make up the difference it was unable to pay.

Mr. HAYDEN. In the great majority of States, even with diversion, they can match the amounts provided in the bill. So far as I am concerned, I am sorry that the amount was reduced from $650,000,000 to the present figure. I believe that we have a job to perform in improving the highways of the Nation. However, I follow what the committee did, and I stand on its recommendation. I would certainly object to further reduction of the amount.

Mr. WHERRY. Inasmuch as the Senator from Arizona has made the statement that he was sorry that the committee reduced the sum to $450,000,000, I am convinced that probably no figure less than $450,000,000 was considered. Am I correct?

Mr. HAYDEN. Oh, yes; the committee had under consideration a lesser amount, which was suggested by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL].

Mr. WHERRY. Is there any particular reason why the committee arrived at $450,000,000? If an amendment were to be offered reducing the amount to $300,000,000, would it so affect the distribution of funds as to be mechanically unworkable?

Mr. HAYDEN. The ratio of distribution is exactly the same whether $50,000,000 be appropriated or $10,000,000. The State highway departments, through their engineers, looked into the problem and told us that there was a tremendous amount of work to be done, and that the only way to get it done was to establish a highway program.

So far as the diversionary problem in Nebraska is concerned, allow me to make this suggestion: If the Nebraska State Legislature next year would favorably act upon a proposal that, by proper matching, they could give to their highways the benefit of a program which would amount to twice $750,000,000, or approximately $1,500,000,000, I believe the State would stop diverting and could match.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I thank the Senator for his statement.

I wish to make a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. WHERRY. In order that an amendment may be offered, must it be offered now or should it be offered later to the bill?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If the Senator has an amendment to the committee amendment, which he desires to offer, it should be offered before the committee amendment has been acted upon.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I have an amendment which I desire to offer. On page 2, line 22, after the words "sum of", I move to strike out "$1,350,000,000" and insert "$900,000,000"; and on the same page, at the beginning of line 24, I move to strike out "$450,000,000" and insert "$300,000,000."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the first amendment offered by the Senator from Nebraska.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 2, line 22, after the words "the sum of", it is proposed to strike out, in the committee amendment, "$1,350,000,000" and insert "$900,000,000."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Nebraska to the committee amendment.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Arizona how much money the Federal Government has appropriated for highways during the past 4 years.

Mr. HAYDEN. During the past 4 years the Government has spent practically nothing on highways.

Mr. AIKEN. Has the appropriation been as much as $180,000,000 a year? I am going back to the period when we started to reduce our road program in getting ready for the war.

Mr. HAYDEN. We appropriated practically nothing for secondary roads. Under the act of 1934 we appropriated $400,000,000 for Federal aid to the States, which is the largest sum of money for the purpose that was ever appropriated at any one time.

Mr. AIKEN. Was that in 1934?

Mr. HAYDEN. It was in 1933. The amount was included in the $3,300,000,-

000 Federal-aid unemployment program. In that measure $400,000,000 was earmarked by Congress at one time for Federal aid to highways. It was the largest sum ever appropriated at any one time for Federal aid only.

In the pending bill there are two new elements. There is the element of secondary roads in addition to the element of Federal aid in connection with urban highways. What makes the total proposed to be expended under this bill look so large is that we are proposing to help the cities. At one time in 1933 we apportioned to the States $400,000,000. Considering that fact, the bill would not seem to be out of line at all.

Mr. AIKEN. In 1940 and 1941 we appropriated how much?

Mr. HAYDEN. Normally we ran along with Federal aid of approximately $125,000,000 a year.

Mr. AIKEN. What I should like to know is how much we are behind in a normal highway program by reason of the suspension of our expenditures over a 3 or 4 year period.

Mr. HAYDEN. I understand what the Senator means.

Mr. AIKEN. How much have we got to make up to bring us back to where we were in 1940 or 1941? Of course, we should make some allowance for the expansion of our national economy, unless we are willing to admit that we stopped our national growth in 1940.

Mr. HAYDEN. The last appropriation we made was for 1942–43 of $100,000,000 a year for Federal aid only.

Mr. AIKEN. Was that all spent?

Mr. HAYDEN. No; it has not all been spent because we could not get the priorities, the manpower, the labor, and so forth. Some of that money remains in practically every one of the States.

Mr. AIKEN. If we should appropriate $600,000,000 for Federal aid during the next 3 years, that would not quite catch up, would it, to what we have fallen behind, plus the appropriations which would normally be made for the next 3 years had there been no war?

Mr. HAYDEN. That is true. We are very much behind in Federal aid because nothing has been done about it since 1940, and we have gone 4 years during the war period without additional authorizations.

Mr. AIKEN. Actually, then, the proposal of the committee is not an extravagant program, but is simply designed to catch up in what we have fallen behind and to make allowance for the normal program which would ordinarily have proceeded if there had been no war.

Mr. HAYDEN. That is correct.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. REED. I hold in my hand a letter from the Public Roads Administration which says that for access roads—and I am sure the Senator from Arizona is familiar with them—the amount of $150,000,000 in 1941 was increased to $260,000,000 in 1942 and to $290,000,000 by the end of April 1944. That money was all spent on access roads leading to plants or to the places where strategic materials were located. There has been virtually nothing spent—virtually, I do not say literally, but virtually nothing spent—on the Federal highway system for 3 years.

The committee that drafted this bill and submitted it to the Senate started a year ago last spring to confer with the State highway officials, whose unanimous recommendation to us was that to catch up with the deferred construction and deferred maintenance—for our highway system has definitely deteriorated in the last 3 years—we should appropriate a billion dollars a year for 3 years. The first bill written cut that to $500,000,000 annually, because the States could not match a billion dollars a year, and there was no use making the effort.

I did not happen to be in the city at the time this bill was first considered, but I am familiar with its philosophy. $650,000,000 was originally selected because the Government of the United States has collected from highway users during the last 3 years an average of about $650,000,000. In my State, and in 14 other States, there is a constitutional restriction under which money collected from highway users must be used for no other purpose than highways. There is no reason in the world why the Federal Government should be allowed to go into Kansas and collect money from the highway users and divert that money to a use which the State of Kansas does not permit on the part of its own citizens or its own government. That is where the $650,000,000 came from. The Government of the United States has for the last 3 years collected about $2,000,000,000—that is only an estimate, but it is in the neighborhood of being correct—and in the last 3 years has returned to the highway systems of the country less than $300,000,000.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REED. In a moment I shall be glad to yield to the Senator from New Hampshire.

There is much misapprehension and some unreasonable criticism about the bill.

Now I may say to the Senator from Nebraska that I hope he did not mean to intimate that I have taken advantage of personal conversation. I hold in my hand a document which I have used all through this controversy, which shows that the State of Nebraska diverted from its highway users' tax money $2,455,000 for other purposes. That is its own business.

I may say further to the Senator from Nebraska it is hardly reasonable for a State that diverts money out of its highway users' fund for highway purposes to other purposes to come here and ask to have lowered an appropriation authorization which other States can and want to match because his own State diverts the money and cannot match what is proposed to be appropriated by this bill. His State does not have to match it; there is no damage done. This is a permissive authority in Nebraska to build roads to the extent that the State can match the funds authorized under the bill.

Mr. WHERRY. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. CARAWAY in the chair). Does the Senator from Kansas yield to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. REED. In a moment I shall be very happy to yield. Let me say frankly we have 3 years of deferred maintenance and 3 years of deferred construction, with no construction except on strategic highways and strategic networks and Government access roads. The highway system of the country is the most important thing there is. It is inadequate to carry the present traffic and will be much more inadequate to carry the traffic that is bound to travel the highways after the war.

Some have criticized us because I have been voting billions of dollars a year, but I have found no substantial sentiment expressed in the country in opposition to the bill as was first proposed. If the Senator from Nebraska wants to know, I am the member of the committee that made the suggestion that the amount be reduced from $650,000,000 to a smaller sum; and, if the Senator from Nebraska wants to know, I am trying to get this bill through the Senate and to meet the objections as can best be done without destroying the useful purposes of the bill. We reduced the amount to $450,000,000, which was as low as those who wanted more money were willing to go. I was willing to go that far. That is where the $450,000,000 comes in. I now yield first to the Senator from New Hampshire, although I do not think I have the floor.

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes; the Senator has the floor.

Mr. BRIDGES. Madam President, I should like to make two comments. First, I agree with what the Senator from Kansas has had to say about the Federal Government collecting funds, we will say, from highway users and diverting the money for other purposes. I agree with him that in the field of automobile taxes, so far as gasoline and other taxes are concerned, they should be limited to State use; but if I may tell the distinguished Senator so, the way to correct that is to change the tax laws fundamentally and not attempt to appropriate more money to catch up with the lag.

Secondly, in relation to the question raised by the distinguished Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], who took the position that we had been failing to appropriate money to catch up with our highway program, I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Arizona whether or not there is a considerable sum already appropriated and frozen which will account for a part of the catching up process which the Senator from Vermont mentions.

Mr. HAYDEN. No; sums of money were appropriated, as the Senator from Vermont and the Senator from Kansas have said. Of the appropriations made during the war period for access roads, so as to reach camps and raw materials and things of that kind, there are no great balances left.

Mr. BRIDGES. How much of the road money is frozen?

Mr. BYRD. As of July 1st last, the amount was $144,334,000.

Mr. BRIDGES. I suppose $144,000,000 is a small sum to the Senator from Arizona.

Mr. HAYDEN. When we need a billion dollars' worth of work it is by comparison a very small sum.

Mr. BRIDGES. The Senator from Arizona is a big spender. He would spend every cent he could get his hands on. One hundred and forty-four million dollars perhaps to a New Englander looks like a big sum, and it may look so to the Senator from Arizona before he is through.

Mr. AIKEN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Kansas yield, and if so to whom?

Mr. REED. I yield to the Senator from Nebraska, if I have not lost the floor.

Mr. WHERRY. Madam President, I wish to say that I find myself in almost complete accord with the remarks of the junior Senator from Kansas relative to the need for building roads. If there is one State which wants roads, it is my own State. But that is entirely beside the question as to why I offered the amendment. I want Nebraska to be able to take advantage of matching dollars with Federal-aid money so that every dollar of Federal tax the people of Nebraska pay they can match and get the Federal funds; and they cannot do it under the pending bill. I do not want Federal taxes taken out of Nebraska if Nebraska cannot match and thus get some of the money back.

Mr. REED. Does the Senator from Nebraska expect that every State should measure its capacity to match Federal funds by the limited capacity of the one State of Nebraska?

Mr. WHERRY. If the Senator will yield further, I do not know what the other States wish to do, but representing in part Nebraska, I want to get as much money back to Nebraska as I possibly can. I want to match the appropriations so that we can get the best highway system in Nebraska we possibly can get.

Mr. REED. Then let Nebraska stop diverting her highway taxes for the payment of old-age pensions.

Mr. WHERRY. Each and every State has a right to do what it pleases with the money it collects. If the States want to divert the tax money to other purposes besides work on roads, they have a right to do it, and they are the heaviest contributors to the Federal taxes.

Madam President, have I the floor?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nebraska has the floor.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. During this most interesting discussion about big spending, I have been wondering whether some of us have not forgotten that we are spending about a hundred billion dollars a year to carry on this war, and if we are to adopt the policy of now appropriating sufficient money to replace all the hundreds of things we have had to do without during the war, it seems to me we are headed toward disaster. Because we have not kept up the highway appropriations for the last 2 or 3 years is no reason why we should now appropriate three times the usual amount we have been appropriating heretofore. I think the Senate should give serious consideration to the fact that this is no time to start out on a big spending program merely to make up what we have been missing for the last 3 years.

Mr. WHERRY. Madam President, I should like to say, further, relative to the work that is being done by the junior Senator from Kansas, that I highly appreciate it, and I want him to know—and I wish to say it in the presence of every Member of the Senate—that there is no one for whom I have a higher regard than the Senator from Kansas. I know that his State collects a great deal of revenue, and Kansas can do many things, and we are very proud that it can. In Nebraska we have a little different philosophy about spending our money. We possibly do not have the sources from which to collect taxes other States have. The $300,000,000 is based on what we can collect in 1945, and it is all problematical what we can raise. We do not know what we can raise in 1945. In connection with the pending bill, we have to assume that Nebraska will get $10,000,000, and no one knows whether they will get $10,000,000 or not. For that reason I should like to recall to the Members of the Senate the remark made by the distinguished Senator from Georgia, that if $300,000,000 is not enough after the first year, we can come to the Senate and raise the appropriation at any time we want to.

Mr. HAYDEN. The Senator must realize that the Legislature of the State of Nebraska will meet in January, and it has to be in a position to know what it can do. We cannot come in at any time we desire and raise money.

Mr. WHERRY. Nebraska would be glad to have the appropriation, I am sure, on a basis on which it could match it.

Mr. BRIDGES. Madam President, will the Senator from Nebraska yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. BRIDGES. The distinguished Senator from Arizona says we cannot come in at any time we desire to and raise money. I hope that time will come, but in the 8 years I have been in the Senate I have not seen it come.

Mr. WHERRY. I should like to conclude my remarks in behalf of the amendment by stating that I certainly do not want to be in a position, as I hope the distinguished Senator from Arizona will understand, of resisting. I did not intend to resist. I want to do the best I can for my State. I should like to match the Federal dollars along with all the other States; but in Nebraska we do not have the population and do not have the revenue, and for that reason I believe that if we double the appropriation—$300,000,000 is double what we spend in the average year on the highway system—that would be sufficient, and if more is needed, if the question of unemployment arises, I shall be willing to do everything I can to assist. I do not say we do not need it. So far as the Federal system is concerned, it does need more money, and I would be the first to vote to give it more money. I think investment in roads is probably the soundest investment we can make, and I want good roads in Nebraska. I do not wish to be placed in the position of resisting, or as against the program, but it is the matching of dollars which makes me apprehensive of voting for more than I think my State can match. I should like to see the amendment agreed to on the basis on which it is offered.

Mr. AIKEN. Madam President, we have learned that the Federal Government has somewhat over $100,000,000 frozen in highway funds.

Mr. BRIDGES. I thought it was $144,000,000.

Mr. AIKEN. It is between a hundred and a hundred and fifty million. I assume that is not a great deal more than would ordinarily be found in the Federal Treasury allocated for highway purposes at this time of year. But I think that if the Senator from Arizona can give us the information, it is quite important that we know how much the 48 States have frozen in their highway funds at the present time—money ready immediately to be used in matching Federal funds.

Mr. HAYDEN. Unfortunately, I do not have the statistics from the States. All I can say to the Senator in that regard is that the bill originated in the Association of State Highway Officials. They held a hearing before the Senate Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, and representatives appeared from the States and urged that the highway systems were being shot to pieces, and that we had to do something about the postwar program. The proposal for the legislation comes from these State highway departments, who say they can match. The committee in the House held hearings for several months. Every State in the Union put in its testimony about its ability to cooperate on a program of this kind. Their recommendation was a billion dollars a year. The House cut it to $500,000,000.

I have not the slightest doubt in the world about the ability of the States to match the funds, especially in view of the reduction which has been made. I was satisfied they would match and could match the $650,000,000.

The trouble has been with respect to the diversion of the funds, due largely to the fact that money was lying around for which there was no use. In one State I understood the governor, who had control of the budget, paid a bonus of $200 to each school teacher in the State out of the highway fund, or out of the gas tax. But when we pass a bill which really provides a sound program, the States are going to match the funds.

So far as the State of Nebraska is concerned, I do not think the Senator from that State has any cause for worry whatsoever. The income of his State normally has been $12,000,000 from the gasoline tax, and I think the Senator need not worry about his State matching whatever the Congress may provide.

Mr. AIKEN. I understand that even the smaller States have several million dollars earmarked for matching pur-

poses which they have been unable to spend in the last few years, and the total for the entire United States must be a tremendous sum. It seems to me that if the Federal Government does not appropriate a sufficient amount to put the roads of the different States in good condition, and to construct the new highways which are normally required, the States will find themselves in the position of themselves having to spend the money which they have earmarked for building roads, and will get only half as much out of it as they would if the funds were matched by Federal funds.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. It is not necessary for me to point out to the Senator that for the past 3 or 4 years there has been very little road work done in the United States, which makes it necessary to have so much more appropriated now to catch up with what has been worn out, and to rebuild and reconstruct. We are facing a more than ordinary year, or 2 or 3 or 4 years, and the money is needed. It seems to me that when we are voting money to build roads all over the world, including the Balkan countries, we should not neglect our own roads in this country.

Mr. AIKEN. I agree absolutely with what the Senator from Minnesota has said. I know that the States have fallen behind very greatly in their construction of main roads. They have kept up the farm-to-market roads as best they could, but after the war a tremendous demand will be placed upon them. Many roads are in such condition they cannot be used for heavy traffic. In many cases access roads have been built into timber lots and many other places, roads which after the war will not be of great public benefit except to the owner of the particular property.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Let me remind the Senator that we spent $150,000,000 on one road in Canada, and the road is not yet finished. Then we quibble about a few dollars to be spent on roads in the United States. I can take Senators to places in some of the agricultural sections of the United States where roads are, in many places, almost impassable. I know, for I have tried to use them.

Mr. McKELLAR. Madam President, will the Senator allow me to make a little explanation of what was done in committee?

Mr. AIKEN. I should like to have an explanation.

Mr. McKELLAR. I shall take only a moment. After the criticisms which were aimed at various parts of the bill, especially the amount of money it provided, the committee had an unusually well attended meeting. I think there were 12 or 15 members of the committee present. I do not think I ever saw a committee try harder to adjust the matter and to consider every argument that was made respecting the amount. There were several members who thought the amount carried by the bill was too large. At one time it looked as if the committee were going to agree to $500,000,000, as suggested by the distinguished Senator from Kansas. Later on, after considering the problem in every possible way, we agreed on $450,000,000.

We cannot frame a bill which is exactly what each Senator wants. We have to give and take, especially in a case of this kind. After the matter has been considered in the Senate for a day or two, and after the committee has considered it and gone over it in a painstaking way, and reached an adjustment and compromise which cut the amount down $200,000,000, or nearly one-third, about 30 percent, it seems to me it would be best to accept the committee's action. I earnestly hope the Senate will not disagree concerning this matter, but will allow the amount to remain as it is.

Madam President, I have had quite a long experience in the matter of roads. Practically all my legislative life in the Senate has been spent on the committee which deals with the question of roads, the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads. As I stated the other day, I was one of the authors of the original roads bill. I sincerely hope we may not disagree at this time over passing this very necessary bill. Senators who thought the amount was too large have cut it down one-third. I do not think it ought to be cut any more. I think that the money ought to be spent wisely, and it will be spent wisely, and I sincerely hope that Senators will agree to follow the best judgment of the committee. On the subject of the amount the committee's action was entirely unanimous. The committee first agreed to it tentatively, and then agreed to report the bill in its present form. I sincerely hope the amount reported by the committee will be allowed.

Mr. REED. Madam President, I wish to make a comment upon what the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] said. If there is one point upon which the highway officers of the States have laid emphasis over and over again it is the desirability of the Congress of the United States declaring the policy it intends to follow so that the States may know exactly what they have to do and how much they have to match. They have urged us over and over and over again that whatever we do we should do it early enough for them to know and for the State legislatures which meet only once in two years to know what they must do.

It is easy to be a critic. Sometimes the critic seems to fall into the category of a carping critic who criticizes for the sake of criticism. Here is a case where we are asking for prompt action at the request of the State highway officials themselves. That is the principal reason why we are urging expedition in consideration of the proposed legislation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JACKSON in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] to the committee amendment, on page 2, line 22, which has already been stated.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, does the amendment of the Senator from Nebraska propose to reduce the amount from $450,000,000 a year to $300,000,000 a year?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment of the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] to the committee amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 2, line 22, it is proposed to amend the committee amendment by striking out "$1,350,000,000" and inserting "$900,000,000."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now recurs on the committee amendment on page 2, line 22, to strike out "$1,950,000,000" and insert "$1,350,000,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next committee amendment.

The next amendment was, on page 2, line 23, after the words "rate of" to strike out "$650,000,000" and insert "$450,000,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 3, line 4, after the word "plans", to strike out the comma and the words "the acquisition of rights-of-way."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 3, line 5, after the word "construction", to insert the following proviso: "*Provided further*, That except for the sum appropriated pursuant to the preceding proviso, no part of the funds made available pursuant to this act shall be used to pay costs incurred under any construction contract entered into by any State before the beginning of the first postwar fiscal year."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on the same page, line 23, after the word "plans", to strike out the comma and the words "the acquisition of rights-of-way."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 4, line 5, after "(a)", to strike out "$250,000,000" and insert "$200,000,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on the same page, line 7, after "(b)", to strike out "$200,000,000" and insert "$125,000,000".

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on the same page, line 16, after the word "Roads", to insert the following proviso: "*Provided further*, That in any State having a population density of more than 200 per square mile, as shown by the latest available Federal census, the said system may be selected without regard to included municipal boundaries: *Provided further*, That any of such funds for secondary and feeder roads which are apportioned to a State in which all public roads and highways are under the control and supervision of the State highway department may, if the State highway department and the Commissioner of Public Roads jointly agree that such funds are not needed for secondary and feeder roads, be expended for projects in

such State on the Federal-aid highway system."

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the effect of this amendment, and what States it would affect?

Mr. HAYDEN. The amendment is in two parts, as the Senator will realize. The first proviso was an amendment offered by the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DAVIS], with respect to States having a population density of more than 200 per square mile. Those States are Rhode Island, New Jersey, Massachusetts, Connecticut, New York, and Pennsylvania.

The second amendment was offered by the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BUCK]. As I understand, it would apply to the States of Delaware, North Carolina, and Virginia, which have control of all the roads within their borders. It probably will apply to West Virginia before the effectiveness of the proposed act ends, because that State has obtained control of practically all its highways.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. President, is that the amendment to which the Senator from South Dakota refers?

Mr. BUSHFIELD. No; I have not submitted it yet. I intend to do so as soon as I can obtain the floor.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. President, my interest in this amendment, which was accepted by the committee, arose from the fact that in my State—and I believe the same situation prevails in some of the other States where the roads are under the complete control of the State highway department—we shall not need the money appropriated for secondary roads, for such roads. The amendment provides that, with the approval of the Commissioner of Public Roads, those funds may be used to supplement the funds used on the State highway system.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Delaware yield to the Senator from South Dakota?

Mr. BUCK. I yield to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. I should like to ask the Senator from Delaware a question. Is the proposal to which he has referred now incorporated in the bill?

Mr. BUCK. It is in the bill. It is the second proviso.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. As I understand, it applies only to cases in which the State has control of all the highways.

Mr. BUCK. That is true.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. It would not apply to most of the States of the country.

Mr. BUCK. No. That would not be fair. In counties where there are county highway departments, the State highway department and the Commissioner of Public Roads should certainly not take away from them the money which Congress has provided for their use. If the county highway departments were not needed, they would not exist.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Mr. President, in connection with the section which we are now considering, on page 4 of the bill, I submitted to the committee considering the bill an amendment whereby the preparation for the building of secondary roads would be handled by the State highway commission. I do not refer to the funds, but preparations for building the roads. Under the present arrangement, the law provides that the Public Roads Administration shall have supervision of all highways. That is right and proper, and I have no fault to find with that provision. However, it works out in this way: Heretofore we have made appropriations for secondary roads. The State of South Dakota has never used those secondary road funds, simply because the Public Roads Administration demanded a higher type of road than we wanted to build. I propose to offer the same amendment, in effect, which I submitted to the committee, to insert *"Provided,* That such secondary roads shall be constructed under plans and specifications approved by the State highway department for each particular State." I suggest that that language follow the word "population" in line 11, on page 4.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from South Dakota will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 4, line 11, after the word "population", it is proposed to insert *"Provided,* That such secondary roads shall be constructed under plans and specifications approved by the State highway department for each State."

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BUSHFIELD. I yield.

Mr. STEWART. I am interested in the Senator's amendment, because I have an amendment which is very similar to it. It differs only in that it gives the right to the counties to participate in the preparation of specifications for the roads, and does not leave that matter entirely in the hands of the State highway department. It requires that the county or particular political subdivision in which the roads are to be constructed shall agree with the State highway department.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. I have no objection to that.

Mr. STEWART. I invite the attention of the Senator to my amendment, which is a printed amendment lying on the desk. In the committee print of the bill the pages and lines have been somewhat changed, so I cannot refer to the exact line and page in the committee print. However, my amendment is, on page 4, line 1, of the bill as originally reported, beginning with the word *"Provided,"* to strike out down to and including line 5, and in lieu thereof insert the following: *"Provided,* That these funds (1) shall be expended upon systems of such roads selected exclusively by agreement between the State highway departments and the county supervisors, county commissioners, or other appropriate road officials of the counties in which such roads are located, and (2) shall be expended for the construction of roads upon such systems in accordance with plans and specifications determined upon exclusively by agreement between the State highway departments and such supervisors, commissioners, or other officials."

Mr. BUSHFIELD. In substance it is the same as my amendment.

Mr. STEWART. It is substantially the same as the Senator's amendment.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. I am willing to accept the Senator's amendment. However, the point which I wish to make clear, if I possibly can, is that objection was made by some members of the committee to the provision that the Federal Government must retain control of the funds.

My amendment is in almost the same wording as that of the Senator from Tennessee. I had no intention of taking away from the Federal Government supervision over the building of secondary roads, and I do not believe that any ordinary construction of the words used in the amendment would take supervision away from the Government. My amendment would merely permit the State highway department in each of the respective States to decide what kind of a road it wished to build. Supervision over the construction of the road and the expenditure of the money would remain in the Federal Public Roads Administration.

I repeat that South Dakota has never used any of the secondary-road money, simply because the Public Roads Administration would not permit us to build the type of road which our people wanted for farm-to-market roads. I believe that the money should be expended to help that class of our population in building farm-to-market roads, and that we should be permitted to build the kind of roads which we want, rather than the kind which the Public Roads Administration wants. Let the Public Roads Administration supervise the construction, but let the counties and States decide upon the types of roads they want.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BUSHFIELD. I yield.

Mr. STEWART. I believe that the Senator is reaching the important part of the construction of farm-to-market roads by the amendment which he has offered. However, I believe—not from the standpoint of pride of authorship—that my amendment covers the situation a little more completely. We are both driving in the same direction.

The other day I stated on the floor of the Senate, without being critical of the Public Roads Administration—and I do not mean to be, because I think it is doing an outstanding job—that the chief criticism which I had heard in the past few years concerning the construction of farm-to-market roads was just what the Senator from South Dakota has stated, and that is that every time a State, county, or political division attempted to construct a rural road the standards which have been heretofore adopted and controlled by the Public Roads Administration were made entirely too high, and the cost of construction of such roads as the Public Roads Administration would approve was out of line with what the particular community to be served thought the road should cost.

I saw no way to correct that situation except by following the same thought which the Senator from South Dakota

has followed, that is, to require that the specifications for rural roads—and this particular provision applies only to rural or farm-to-market roads—shall be determined by the community in which the road is to be built. Conceivably a rural road in the vicinity of a great city such as Chicago would bear heavier traffic than one in a more remote part of the country would bear; and the community in which such a road is constructed should have the right, since it is the community which is to be served and the one to be aided in paying for the road, to determine the plans and specifications and kinds of road to be built. I think that is a fundamental principle which should remain in the bill, so far as such roads are concerned.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will my colleague yield to me?

Mr. STEWART. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. I should like the best in the world to agree with my colleague in this matter. One of the best and most powerful friends I have in the State of Tennessee is very anxious to have such a provision inserted in the bill. But the matter is one of principle, with me. I simply cannot do it. I simply cannot bring myself to the policy or the principle of having the Federal Government furnish the money but retain no supervision over its expenditure. That is what the amendment, if adopted, would amount to. I simply cannot see how we would be doing our duty to our Government and to our country, if we turned over $125,000,000 to be spent in that way.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. McKELLAR. I shall yield in a moment.

Mr. President, the Senator has said it is a matter of principle and policy. It is. It is a matter of the highest principle and policy. If it is good as to secondary roads, why would it not apply in equal measure to principal roads? The principle is exactly the same.

The other principle has worked splendidly. The system of building roads on the principle of equal contributions and Government supervision has worked wonders. Never before has such a system been built anywhere. Why should we now depart from it to the extent of $125,000,000 a year, and turn that money over to the States? I simply cannot bring myself to reach that conclusion, although I should like to do so, for the personal reasons I have just mentioned. As I said, one of the most powerful, one of the finest, and one of the grandest men I ever knew is earnestly in favor of letting the States and counties have absolute control of the farm-to-market roads. Ordinarily, I would be of the same opinion. But as a member of this Government and as a Senator in this body, I simply cannot bring myself to vote to turn $125,000,000 over in this way, without retaining control as to the system and as to the plans and specifications and kinds of roads to be built.

I should also like to favor the amendment on account of my able friend, the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD]. I should like the best in the world to agree to its adoption. The Senator is making a grand Senator, and he is a grand man. But I cannot bring myself to vote for it, and I hope to heaven the Senate will not agree to it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The present occupant of the chair understands that the Senator from South Dakota has not offered an amendment to the committee amendment.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Mr. President, I am about to offer an amendment, not a committee amendment. The amendment was considered in the committee, however.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, under the unanimous-consent agreement, were not the committee amendments to be first considered?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment of the Senator from South Dakota apparently, from his own statement, is an amendment to the bill, not a committee amendment. Therefore, it is not to be considered at this time. Under the unanimous-consent agreement, the committee amendments are to be first considered.

The pending question is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 4, beginning in line 16. The Chair hears no objection to the amendment. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, I should like to ask a question of the Senator from South Dakota. I ask whether I correctly understood him to state that the amendment which he will later offer will include the words "in cooperation with the county supervisors, county commissioners, or other appropriate local road officials". I should like to have the Senator accept an amendment which would include road officials of the counties being served.

I understand that some of the States of the Union do not have any county highway commissioners. Of course, we are dealing with 48 different States and, probably, 48 different road systems. But, after all, many of them are somewhat akin. However, some of the States do not undertake to maintain separate county road systems. Some of them do maintain separate county road systems. After all, if the amendment is to meet the situation in every State, not merely in those where independent county road systems are not maintained, it should be so drawn that the independent county road systems would not be forced to comply with standards adopted by the State highway commissions alone.

Under the Senator's amendment, the State highway departments would make the entire selection. For instance, in the State of Tennessee, regarding whose road system I have more knowledge than with respect to that of any other State, the State commission has no interest in roads which are merely a part of a county system.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Mr. President, I do not wish to be misunderstood. I said I accepted the Senator's idea in principle. I did not say I accepted the exact wording which was stated, because I had not read it.

Mr. STEWART. I should like to have the Senator consider that point.

Before I take my seat, I desire to state that this matter goes to the fundamentals of the provisions of the bill which control the construction of rural roads. Let me add that I am in favor of it because of the fact that almost every year for possibly 6, 8, or 10 years, bills providing funds for highway purposes, which have been passed by the Senate and by the House, have contained provisions for farm-to-market road air or rural road aid. I understand that it began about 1936, more or less as an experimental matter.

Mr. McKELLAR. That is correct. It was in a very small amount and did not amount to much. This is the beginning of the system.

Mr. STEWART. I understand that each road bill since 1936 has contained some such provision.

Mr. HAYDEN. But the amounts of money so appropriated have been very meager, nothing substantial.

Mr. STEWART. I understand that to be correct; but very few country roads have been built. So, if we continue to give authority to the Federal Government to have complete control over the construction of these roads, I am afraid it will not accomplish what we would like to have accomplished.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next amendment of the committee.

The next amendment of the committee was, on page 5, line 3, to strike out "$200,000,000", and insert "$125,000,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next committee amendment was, on page 5, line 9, to strike out "$250,000,000", and insert "$200,000,000."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the committee. Without objection——

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, I desire to offer an amendment to the amendment. I will read it. On page 6, strike out the period after the word "census", and insert a comma and the following language——

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, we have not yet reached that point.

Mr. HAYDEN. We have not yet reached that place. We are on page 5.

Mr. MALONEY. I beg the pardon of the Chair. I meant to refer to page 5.

Mr. HAYDEN. The Senator has been referring to page 6, but the pending committee amendment is on page 5.

Mr. MALONEY. I have the committee print before me. I understand that the amendment now pending is on page 5, in line 9.

Mr. HAYDEN. That is correct.

Mr. MALONEY. I desire to offer the following amendment: On page 5, in line 14, strike out the period after the word "act" and insert a comma and the following language: *"Provided,* That no State shall receive less than an apportionment equal to six-tenths of the percentage of the Federal gasoline tax collected in the State, as measured by the total net amount taxed value in Public Roads Administration Statistical Report G–2 for 1941."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair advises the Senator from Connecticut that the amendment he has just stated would constitute an amendment to the bill, and is not now in order, since it would not constitute an amendment to the committee amendment on page 5, in line 9.

After all the committee amendments have been considered, the Senator's amendment will be in order.

Mr. MALONEY. I thank the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 5, in line 9.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The next committee amendment will be stated.

The next amendment was, on page 5, line 10, after the word "system", to strike out "and the $200,000,000 per year available for projects on the secondary and feeder roads shall each" and insert "shall."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 5, after line 14, to insert the following new subsection:

(b) The $125,000,000 per year available for projects on the secondary and feeder roads shall be apportioned among the States in the following manner: One-third in the ratio which the area of each State bears to the total area of all the States; one-third in the ratio which the rural population of each State bears to the total rural population of all the States, as shown by the Federal census of 1940; and one-third in the ratio which the mileage of rural delivery and star routes in each State bears to the total mileage of rural delivery and star routes in all the States.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on the same page, line 25, to strike out "$200,000,000" and insert "$125,000,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. MALONEY. I am raising the question in order to protect my position. I have a feeling that the Chair may rule as he did a moment ago. I desire to amend, on page 6, in line 7, after the word "census", by striking out the period, inserting a comma, and the following language: *"Provided,* That Connecticut towns shall be considered as municipalities regardless of their incorporated status."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair rules that the amendment offered by the Senator from Connecticut would constitue an amendment to the bill, and would not be in order until after all committee amendments had been considered, and amendments to the bill were called for.

The next amendment of the committee will be stated.

The next amendment was, on page 6, line 22, after the word "exceed", to strike out "60" and insert "50", and in the same line after the words "of the" to insert "construction."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, on page 5, line 25, and on page 6, lines 8 and 11, the subdivisions were not changed so as to be in their proper alphabetical order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair passed over those amendments as having been unanimously agreed to, but in order to make the RECORD clear, without objection, subparagraph (b) on page 5, and subparagraphs (c) and (d) on page 6 will be changed to (c), (d), and (e), respectively.

The next committee amendment will be stated.

The next amendment was, on page 7, line 10, after the word "classes", to strike out:

And provided further, That the entire construction cost of projects for the elimination of hazards of railway-highway crossings may be paid from Federal funds, except that not more than 50 percent of the right-of-way and property damage costs, paid from public funds, on any such project, may be paid from Federal funds.

And insert:

And provided further, That any part of the construction cost of projects for the elimination of hazards of railway-highway crossings, except the part of such cost which is paid by the railway or railways involved, may be paid from Federal funds: *Provided further,* That no Federal funds shall be expended on any such project unless the railway or railways involved pay not less than 15 percent of the construction cost of such project.

(b) If within any of the three post-war fiscal years referred to in this act the Federal Works Administrator shall find with respect to any State (1) that the proceeds of all special taxes on motor-vehicle transportation, as referred to in section 12 of the act of June 18, 1934 (48 Stat. 995), as amended, are applied to highway purposes as defined in said section; (2) that at least 90 percent of such proceeds are applied to the administrative and operating expenses of the State highway department, the maintenance of the State and Federal-aid highway systems, and the payment of interest on, and the amortization of, bond obligations of the State for the payment of which such revenues have been continuously pledged since January 1, 1942; (3) that the rate of none of such taxes has been reduced after September 1, 1944; and (4) that the portion of the proceeds of all such special taxes then available for construction, together with funds available to the State from any other sources for highway purposes, will be insufficient to match all, or any part of the funds apportioned to such State for such fiscal years in accordance with the provisions of this act, then such portion of such apportionments as the Federal Works Administrator shall find the State is unable to match shall be made available for expenditure in such State in accordance with the Federal Highway Act, as amended and supplemented, without being matched by the State. Any finding made by the Federal Works Administrator under this subsection shall be made by him only after a full and complete investigation of the facts and records upon which such finding is based.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, in the committee I opposed this amendment and I wish to oppose it on the floor of the Senate.

If we adopt the proposed amendment, in my opinion we will be passing class legislation which will accommodate and be for the benefit of but one State in the Union. We should know that if we agree to the amendment we will say, in effect, to the States of the Union that in the future if they wish to violate the rules, if they wish to appropriate money and misuse it on highways, and later find themselves in such financial condition that they will not be able to match with the other States, then the Federal Congress will take care of them notwithstanding their conduct in the past. The proposed amendment goes so far as to say that a State may appropriate to other uses 10 percent of its revenue. Arkansas will be benefited by this section. It can divert to other uses 10 percent of its highway funds and still not match the Federal fund.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, does the Senator refer to the language in line 5 on page 8?

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes.

Mr. McKELLAR. It would not be diversion. The language states:

That at least 90 percent of such proceeds are applied to the administrative and operating expenses of the State highway department, the maintenance of the State and Federal-aid highway systems, and the payment of interest on, and the amortization of, bond obligations of the State for the payment of which such revenues have been continuously pledged—

And so forth.

Mr. FERGUSON. It would allow the States to use 10 percent for other uses provided they used 90 percent in the manner provided in the bill. They could divert 10 percent of the money.

Mr. McKELLAR. The language provides that all the proceeds from special taxes——

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. McCLELLAN. The provision to which reference has been made is contained in the former Road Act. This is a copy of the former act. But, in order that there may be no misunderstanding with reference to the State of Arkansas, which the Senator seems to be discussing, I state that there is no diversion of funds in Arkansas. There is not even 1-percent diversion. All the money which is collected there for highway purposes is expended for highway purposes. As I interpret the proposed amendment, which is a copy of a provision in highway legislation heretofore enacted by Congress, the language with respect to the proceeds from all special taxes under clause (1) is a condition precedent. The language to which I refer reads:

That the proceeds of all special taxes on motor-vehicle transportation, as referred to in section 12 of the act of June 18, 1934 (48 Stat. 995), as amended, are applied to highway purposes as defined in said section.

If the section means anything, it requires all and not merely 90 percent.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I have read section 12 of what has been referred to as the act of June 18, 1934, 48 Statutes 995, and there is nothing mentioned in relation to what the Senator has said. The language reads:

SEC. 12. Since it is unfair and unjust to tax motor-vehicle transportation unless the proceeds of such taxation are applied to the construction, improvement, or maintenance of highways, after June 30, 1935, Federal aid for highway construction shall be extended only to those States that use at least the

amounts now provided by law for such purposes in each State from State motor-vehicle registration fees, licenses, gasoline taxes, and other special taxes on motor-vehicle owners and operators of all kinds for the construction, improvement, and maintenance of highways and administrative expenses in connection therewith, including the retirement of bonds for the payment of which such revenues have been pledged, and for no other purposes, under such regulations as the Secretary of Agriculture shall promulgate from time to time: *Provided*, That in no case shall the provisions of this section operate to deprive any State of more than one-third of the amount to which that State would be entitled under any apportionment hereafter made, for the fiscal year for which the apportionment is made.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. That language the Senator from Arkansas says was taken from a former act. It will be remembered once or twice or maybe several times we used such language. I wonder, may I not bring about another compromise between the Senator from Arkansas and the Senator from Michigan? Suppose it were made to read "99 percent" instead of "90 percent"; would that be satisfactory?

Mr. FERGUSON. I cannot agree to any compromise of this section because, in my opinion, it is very bad legislation, and should not be passed at all.

Mr. McKELLAR. I understand the Senator is going to vote against the entire section. That is my understanding from what he has told me.

Mr. FERGUSON. Making it 99 percent would help 9 percent.

Mr. McKELLAR. If there is some confusion about it, let us do away with the confusion by making it 100 percent.

Mr. FERGUSON. I think it should be a hundred percent.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I wish to say to the Senator that the 90-percent provision, if construed as the Senator interprets it, is not militating in favor particularly of the State of Arkansas. At the time it was originally enacted it was made broad enough to favor some States that might have some slight diversions. Arkansas did not have, but it was not an effort to single out merely one State, as the Senator says. Neither is this, because there will be in this program before it is completed other States, in my judgment, that are not going to be able to match this money and that possibly are not diverting, and they ought not to be precluded from participating in this program, to whatever extent their proper allocation of Federal funds may be, merely because they may have expended in the past for highway purposes the full limit of their revenues of the present.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, again in the interest of harmony, I am going to ask unanimous consent that the figure "90" be stricken out and the figure "100" be inserted.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I may say, in all fairness, that other States may have a little fraction of diversion somewhere which no one would regard as substantial.

Mr. McKELLAR. I should think the Bureau of Roads would pass upon that in an entirely proper way.

Mr. McCLELLAN. If it is made 100 percent and there should be a dollar diversion, that would knock the whole section out so far as some States are concerned.

Mr. McKELLAR. That would make the officials very particular, and that is all the Senator wants, and all anyone should want.

Mr. McCLELLAN. That is all I want. I think if we make it 98 or 99 percent the protection desired would absolutely be afforded.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, why should any percentage of money that is raised for highway purposes be diverted and in the next breath the Federal Government be asked to appropriate money without the State even matching the sum?

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield there?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. McCLELLAN. On that basis, if we are going to follow that principle in this legislation, we should put in this bill a provision that no State that diverts gasoline taxes or revenues derived from motor vehicles may be permitted to participate in the program. We ought to bring it all in line now if that is the principle to be followed. Because a State has a slight diversion, or some diversion, if we are going to say that after it has gone the limit in the road-building program, as my State has done, it cannot participate in this program unless it can go to some other source and find additional revenue, when it has gone as far as it can go—if we are going to hew to the line in the matter of diversion we certainly ought not to appropriate money for States that are diverting from gasoline taxes and give them a huge amount under this particular program, as is proposed to be given to them. If this proposed law is to be predicated on such a principle, then I am afraid this bill cannot pass.

Mr. FERGUSON. I cannot think that that is at all in line with this provision. If a State raises money and is able, notwithstanding some diversion of its funds, to match the Federal money, there is no reason why the Government should say that under no circumstances may the State divert. We merely say in this act that it cannot divert if it wants the Federal Government to match its money or the stake it is putting up. That is all that it is proposed to say by the bill.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, again in the attempt to harmonize, I ask unanimous consent to strike out "90" and insert "100." Will the Senator from Michigan yield to me for that purpose?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield for that purpose.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the motion of the Senator from Tennessee?

Mr. McKELLAR. It is a request for unanimous consent, and not a motion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request of the Senator from Tennessee?

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I understand that the bill has been amended now to read that "at least 100 percent" of such proceeds are applied to administration. I presume we should strike out by unanimous consent the words "at least," so that it would read "100 percent of such proceeds."

Mr. McKELLAR. I agree that that should be done.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. For the sake of clarity, the clerk will read the amendment as it now reads.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 8, line 5, it is proposed to strike out the words "at least 90" and insert "100," so as to read "that 100 percent of such proceeds are applied to the administrative and operating expenses of the State highway department," and so forth.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the amendment, as it has just been stated, to the committee amendment? The Chair hears none, and the amendment to the committee amendment is agreed to.

The question recurs on agreeing to the committee amendment as amended.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, at least we have remedied one defect to the extent of 10 percent, but I still think that this is bad legislation, because we are saying to the State of Arkansas and to every other State in the Union that if the State places its highway department in such a position that the State will not be able to match the Federal money to the extent provided, namely, 50 percent, each State and the Federal Government putting up the same amount, which is 50 percent, it is going to be the policy of the Congress to give the State 100 percent.

Mr. President, I appreciate what happened to Arkansas in her road-building program a number of years ago. A few years ago Arkansas built a great mileage of highways under so-called district road building, and it was found that the districts could not pay for them. A tax was levied directly against the land, and it became necessary for the State to take up that indebtedness and make it a State indebtedness, and we are now attempting to allow that State to pay off that indebtedness and share in the Federal fund without matching the Federal fund with State funds.

They are now saying to the Federal Government that, notwithstanding an absolute provision in the pending bill, they will pay money only up to the extent of 50 percent, that in their particular case we are to put up 100 percent. If this is going to happen in the State of Arkansas, we are going to say to the other States in the Union, "We are not concerned with the way you handle your funds next year and the year after, we are not concerned with the amount of money you raise. If you use 100 percent of it for your roads, we will not only match it to the extent of 50 percent, but we will match it to the extent that we match any other State in the Union."

Mr. President, I do not know what we can do here but strike out this provision and say to the States of the

Union, "We believe in the use for highways of money that is raised for highway purposes, and we, the Federal Government, are willing to match the amount you provide, but we are not going to let you divert your money collected in previous years, or even to place proper taxation upon the books and say we will extend you credit notwithstanding 45 or 47 other States are getting it only to the extent of 50 percent."

Mr. President, I think we should vote down this particular amendment. It has no place in the bill, because the bill is founded upon the fundamental principles that the Federal Government will match funds, and will only match funds, and is not going to make an exception of one State and make a donation of a certain amount of money to that State because other States are able to match.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, as I stated a moment ago, Arkansas is not the only State that is not going to be able to match the entire program.

Mr. FERGUSON. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. So that the RECORD may be clear, let me say that my reason for using the State of Arkansas was that I talked to Mr. McDonald this morning, and I understood him to say that at the present time Arkansas is the only State which would be unable to match on the basis of a $450,000,000 appropriation per annum. That was why I used the one State. I anticipate that in the future other States may take advantage of the same provision.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I do not know about the $450,000,000, since the figure has been reduced, but it was anticipated that some 12 or 15 States would not be able to match on the basis of the original bill, that is, through the 3-year period.

The Senator refers to how my State has spent its money. Let me say to him that it is true, possibly, that in our ambition to try to have roads we made some mistakes in the early period of our road-building program, but I do not believe the Senator can find that anywhere or at any time Arkansas has diverted road money for any other purpose. The truth is that we burdened our people in an effort to build roads. The tax to which the Senator referred was placed on the land values adjacent to the various roads in our effort to build up a road system. I agree with the Senator that it did not prove to be a good system or a good policy. Thereafter, as automobile transportation developed, Arkansas went into a road-building program and took over the bonds, where the taxes were on the real property.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I gladly yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. On the same basis, if we enact the proposed legislation, and other States have the same situation, having an indebtedness which is against particular land, what would prevent such a State from transferring such indebtedness to a State basis, and thereafter saying to the Federal Government, "We are going to pay that off as a State, and we are going to share a hundred percent with any other State and not put up $1"? What is to prevent that very thing happening, under this section?

Mr. McCLELLAN. It is not happening anywhere now. That period of road construction is over, as the Senator knows.

Mr. FERGUSON. I am positive that in Michigan we have some bonds which are outstanding under the Covert Act which could be transferred to the State. I know that other States must have the same situation, the indebtedness being a lien upon the land, which could be transferred from districts and counties to the State. Then they would share under this section of the proposed act, and not have to put up one cent.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I am sure we have the same situation, particularly with respect to urban roads. The Senator is complaining about a provision, this amendment, which has been a provision in two previous highway laws, in the 1936 act, and also in the 1938 act. In the pending bill we have an innovation, an appropriation for strictly urban highways, in cities of 5,000 population or more. The bill sets up a formula which gives tremendous advantage to States which are small in area, and have large numbers of communities of 5,000 and more, whereas a State like Arkansas will receive practically no benefit.

What the Senator is today opposing is not new legislation, but there is new legislation proposed in the bill which he is supporting. We are starting a new program from which my State will receive practically no benefit.

Mr. FERGUSON rose.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Let me point out one other thing to the Senator, then I shall be glad to yield to him, because he may desire to comment upon it. Arkansas pays into the Federal Treasury in the way of motor-vehicle taxes, under the Federal tax laws, approximately a million and a half to two million dollars a year at the present time. In my State the tax rate is next to the highest in the Nation. We have a 6½-cent tax on gasoline, plus a 1½-cent Federal tax, which makes the tax we are paying on gasoline 8 cents. We are carrying this road program and retiring this indebtedness, and since there has been no construction program in the last 2 or 3 years, we will have some four or five million dollars in the beginning of the program with which we can match Federal funds. To that extent we can begin, and over the whole period of time we can probably match a total of $8,000,000, of the $19,000,000 plus of Arkansas' allocation of funds provided in the bill.

If we are to say to a State, "We are going to tax you and just because you have already expanded your road system and builded it up to the point where all the revenue under the high taxation is consumed, yet we are going to continue to tax you and not permit you to receive any money back," on the basis of equity I think there should be an amendment to the bill providing that when a State has expended its revenue and is unable to match, certainly such a State should be reimbursed the Federal taxes it pays and which otherwise would be allocated and used for other States under this program.

In reference to his remark about favoring a State, I suggest to the Senator that if we are to go into this new program of urban highways, and under the program which we are now initiating with respect to the urban highways Arkansas would receive 30 cents per capita if it were able to match, while other States received as high as $2 and more per capita. That is what I would regard as discrimination. Yet, as has been said on the floor of the Senate, in trying to pass a bill such as this we have to do some giving and some taking. Therefore I have gone along with these provisions which would help others in order to meet the peculiar situations of other States.

I do not want an act which is, in part, to meet the needs of the country, next to provide a works program, possibly in the post-war period, with my State continuing to pay the Federal tax but not being permitted to participate in the program on the same basis practically on which other States are receiving benefits.

Mr. REED. I inquire if the Senator from Arkansas has yielded the floor?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I yield the floor.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, the acceptance of this amendment by the committee was a very fine compliment to the Senator from Arkansas. I do not believe there is any other circumstance that would have secured its acceptance. At the same time, Mr. President, it is thoroughly unsound legislation. Reduced to the very simplest terms, this proposal means that when a State reaches the end of its ability to match—and for the moment I am disregarding the cause, or what the State does with its money—the fact remains that the adoption of this amendment means that when a State reaches the end of its ability to match, the Federal Government will build the roads and pay for them 100 percent. That is not good legislation.

Mr. President, I have no criticism of Arkansas as a State. I have no right to criticize it. I would not criticize it if I had a right to do so. The State did make an earnest effort. Whether its action was wise or not does not change the fact that it did make a very earnest effort some 10 or 12 years ago to construct a high-class system of roads, and the State spent a great deal of money, and it had a great deal of trouble. To me, however, that does not enter into the equation.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REED. If the Senator from Tennessee will be good enough to wait I will finish in a moment or two. I am not considering the reasons why Arkansas finds itself in this dilemma any more than I have a right to criticize Nebraska or New York—and New York is the worst offender of all, for it diverts $64,000,000 a year.

I will state the fundamental principle involved in this legislation. We have gone along over a period of years on a basis of matching Federal contributions

by State contributions 50–50. Now we are saying by this provision that when a State reaches the end of its ability to match—and again I desire to call the attention of the Senate to the fact that I am not discussing the reason for it—the Federal Government shall come forward and build the roads 100 percent. If we are going to do that for Arkansas, there is no reason why we should not do it for Nebraska when Nebraska reaches the end of its ability to match, though the reasons may be different.

Mr. President, I am just as fond of the Senator from Arkansas as is any member of the committee who voted to accept his amendment. What I now say is said because I profoundly believe that even though such a provision has been included in some previous act, yet it is unsound legislation, and in the absence of some extraordinary catastrophe, some act of God, some circumstance beyond the control of a State, the Federal Government ought not to go into a State and construct roads 100 percent out of Federal funds merely because the State has reached the end of its ability to match.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REED. I will now yield the floor unless the Senator desires to ask me a question.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I wish to ask the Senator one question.

Mr. REED. I yield.

Mr. McCLELLAN. The Senator says he feels it would not be right for the Federal Government to go into a State and build the roads on the basis he has described. Does the Senator feel that in cases where States are diverting considerable of their road taxes it is right for the Federal Government to go into them and put up some of the money to build up their road systems?

Mr. REED. The Senator from Arkansas propounds a very interesting and a very important question. It is none of my business what the State of New York does with its excess.

Mr. McCLELLAN. The Senator suggested the State of New York. I did not. I am talking about any State.

Mr. REED. I took the State of New York because it is the largest. It is none of my business either as a Senator or as a citizen of Kansas what New York does with its excess collections from highway users. The only reason why I have a right to interest myself in what New York does is that we have a program of matching State funds with Federal funds 50 percent each. If New York can match Federal funds up to the full limit offered in the construction of the road program, no matter whether I think it is wise or unwise, no matter whether I think New York may be mistreating and misusing its highway users, no matter whether I think New York is following an unwise policy, it is none of my business as a Senator of the United States. Does that answer the Senator's question?

Mr. McCLELLAN. Except this, that I am not undertaking to criticize New York or any other State for the use of its money as it may choose, but the fact remains that we still make a contribution from Federal funds for the construction of roads in those States, and we are doing it not because the particular State needs it so much, because the State has revenues coming in for that purpose, with which to construct roads, but simply because it is equitable in an all-out road-construction program or a Federal road-construction program.

Mr. REED. I may add to what the Senator from Arkansas has said, that what we are doing is to construct a national system of highways. In order to carry out that purpose and to bring about that end, the Federal Government says to the States, "Now in order to create this system of highways we will pay half the cost, and you pay the other half." My interest as a Senator must cease when the State matches the money which is available and which is offered to the State. What it may do with the excess over the amount necessary to match the Federal funds, whether the State be Georgia or New York or Nebraska, or any other State, is none of my business. But, if I may be permitted to say so, I think the answer to the question asked by the Senator from Arkansas, is that when the ability of a State to match the funds offered by the Federal Government is exhausted, when the State has reached its limit or capacity, then the Government should stop building Federal-aid roads in that State.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, the committee amendment, of course, is a departure from the general practice, but we have had the same arguments made twice before on the floor, and the Congress has agreed to the proposal after arguments were made. That is probably no reason why it should be done now. This bill however is a matter of compromise. It is remarkable——

Mr. REED. Mr. President——

Mr. McKELLAR. Wait one moment. The Senator declined to yield a moment ago, and now I will ask him to wait for a moment.

Mr. REED. I was going to remind the Senator of his devotion to a principle from which he would not yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. Wait one moment. The Senator has yielded and made several departures from principle. It is remarkable that this discussion arises between two States apparently, and one of them has an advantage over the other.

The wonderful State which my good friend, the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] represents, one of the greatest States in the Union, is getting a very decided advantage in this bill, a very large advantage, as compared with the advantage that is given to the State of Arkansas, for the reasons which have been stated. Of the $125,000,000 for urban roads, New York, Massachusetts, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, California, and Michigan together receive over one-half of the $125,000,000.

Mr. FERGUSON rose.

Mr. McKELLAR. Just one moment. Let that statement sink in. I did not think such a division was proper. Theoretically it is not. But we have had to adjust these differences, we have had to agree respecting these differences. We all agreed upon the amendments yesterday, with the exception of the one relating to payment for rights-of-way. I did not know that the Senator had disagreed with respect to this amendment. I misunderstood him. However, the other members of the committee all agreed to it.

I am pointing this out not for the purpose of casting any reflection upon my friend, or for the purpose of criticizing, but merely for the purpose of showing that we have had to yield something in order to get a road bill. I think it is rather unfair that six States in the Union should receive approximately sixty-two and a half million dollars of the appropriation for urban areas; but I certainly shall carry out my agreement. I shall not speak against that provision. There are some things about it which I do not like, but I shall not speak against it. I shall carry out my agreement. That is the only way in which we can arrive at a satisfactory bill. We cannot enact a bill if we continue to fight. We have compromised, yielded, and made adjustments in the committee, and I think the adjustments have been excellent. I am not quarreling over the small matter of the State of Arkansas, or the large matter of the State of Michigan, the State of New York, and other States. I am perfectly willing for them to have this advantage, because that is the way to compromise and adjust.

Therefore, as I did a while ago, I ask the Senate again, as earnestly as I know how, with as good grace as I can command, and in as kindly a way as I know how, to pass the bill today. For heaven's sake, let us not quarrel over the question whether one State or another obtains a slight advantage, because they are all being dealt with very generously by the Government.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. President, I believe that this is an unwise amendment, and I hope it will be defeated. I should like to ask the distinguished chairman of the committee to refresh my memory. Was not this amendment approved in the committee by a margin of one vote?

Mr. McKELLAR. I believe it was. I do not remember exactly.

Mr. BUCK. My recollection is that the vote was 6 to 5 or 7 to 6.

Mr. McKELLAR. It was tentatively agreed to in that way. Then we tentatively agreed to all the amendments, and finally reported the measure without opposition, except that the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] desired to be recorded against the amendment dealing with rights-of-way.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, it is my understanding that the amendment was approved by a margin of one vote; but I believe I should say something about the so-called favoritism shown to certain States in this bill.

The State of Michigan is interested in good roads. Most of the automobiles of the country are manufactured in Michigan. We have some large cities in Michigan. Some of the other States which have been mentioned have large cities. This is the first time that it has ever been recognized that Federal highways even went near or through the large cities of the country.

It is my understanding that the Federal Government collects from the automobile owners and drivers of this country $650,000,000 a year. In my opinion, the people in the large cities of the country pay a great percentage of that $650,000,000. Then we hear from the State of Arkansas and from the State of Tennessee that because there is an appropriation in the bill of $125,000,000, the first appropriation the cities have received, favoritism is being shown to certain States because they happen to have within their borders large cities. I think it ill becomes the States which have been receiving Federal aid for many years to say that Federal aid should be extended only with respect to rural roads, when the war effort of this country has worn out many of the streets of the cities of Detroit, Flint, Saginaw, Muskegon, Grand Rapids, Kalamazoo, and other cities of this Nation.

Mr. President, the cities will not be able to use the $125,000,000 a year, because the State highway departments will not be able to furnish the money necessary to widen streets and highways to accommodate the people from the rural sections. The committee has eliminated from the bill the aid which would otherwise have been given to the large cities by reason of the Federal Government sharing in the costs of condemnation.

Mr. President, the fact that in the past we have twice included a provision similar to the pending amendment in bills appropriating small sums of money is no reason why we should do it a third time, and favor one State. In my humble judgment, this is merely an opening wedge for every highway department in the United States to have its lawyers look into the possibility of avoiding the 50–50 ratio of contributions, and still receive the full amount. We should not make available to State highway departments this loophole by which they can change the 50–50 arrangement and receive appropriations from the Federal Government without matching them.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I believe the Senator unintentionally included Tennessee when he should not have done so. Tennessee has matched Federal funds every time, and will continue to do so.

The Senator seems to think that a horrible example would be set by this amendment. This provision has been in the law for nearly 10 years, and nothing very harmful has resulted from it, and probably nothing harmful will result from the fact that six States in the Union will receive half of the appropriation for urban areas. I wished to adjust, compromise, and arrange this matter so that if possible the country would be pleased, Senators would be pleased, and the Congress would be pleased at being able to enact a highway bill.

This is a serious matter. We ought to improve the roads of our country. Some of them are now in bad condition, and we ought not to quarrel over small troubles in a few States. All this trouble arises in seven States.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I rise only because of the inferential criticism implied by the Senator from Tennessee with respect to not always following the committee.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I withdraw it. I did not mean it in that way.

Mr. REED. I am a member of the committee, and I participated in its action. I ask the Senator from Tennessee to testify as to whether or not I gave and took as much as any other member of the committee. However, the compromises related entirely to details, such as the question of how much money should be appropriated, and so forth. When it comes to the question of whether the Federal Government should share in the costs of rights-of-way, it is my opinion that from a practical standpoint it should do so. It is proposed to appropriate $125,000,000 for urban areas, which means taking the national highways into or around large cities. The largest part of the cost of such an operation lies in the acquisition of rights-of-way. If the Federal Government does not participate in the cost of purchasing rights-of-way for that purpose, there will be no improvement, and the $125,000,000 will not be spent. The Senator from Michigan is correct in that respect.

With respect to the elimination of grade crossings, I desire to see railroad grade crossings eliminated. I believe that injury to the people of the country is the main factor. But I yielded on all those questions.

However, the pending provision deals with a question of principle, and sound legislation. I remember the distinguished Senator from Tennessee smiling earlier in the day when he was asked if he would yield on the minor question involved in the Stewart amendment, which will be before the Senate for consideration later, and the Bushfield amendment. He assured them that he was sticking to his principles. So I say to the Senator from Tennessee that I am sticking to my principles.

Mr. McKELLAR. That is all right.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment as amended.

The committee amendment as amended was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The next amendment of the committee will be stated.

The next committee amendment was, on page 12, line 12, after the word "highways", to strike out "or roadside development areas along such highways", and insert "after approval of the location by the Civil Aeronautics Administration."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment of the committee was, on page 12, in line 21, after the word "necessary", to insert "construction."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 12, line 22, after the word "therefor", to strike out the comma and the words "including the cost of acquiring the land necessary for such facilities."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 13, in line 8, after the word "the", to strike out "location, form", and insert "form."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 13, line 12, after the words "subject to", to strike out "the approval of", and insert "a standard code approved by."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 13, line 13, after the words "concurrence of the" to insert "Commissioner."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 13, line 14, after the word "Roads", to strike out "Administration; and the Commissioner of Public Roads is hereby directed to concur only in such installations as will promote the safe and efficient utilization of the highways."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I was absent in the cloakroom a moment ago when action was taken on the so-called McClellan amendment. I am told that it was agreed to before my return to the floor, and that there was no opportunity to request a yea-and-nay vote on the amendment, that action on it was taken very quickly.

Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate reconsider the vote by which the amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, let me say that we have been debating this matter for some time. I do not have any particular objection, if some Senator desires to have further debate on it.

Mr. BRIDGES. I wish to be heard on it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request of the Senator from New Hampshire? The Chair hears none; and, without objection, the vote by which the committee amendment beginning in line 24 on page 7 and extending through page 8 and through lines 1 and 2, on page 9, was agreed to is reconsidered, and the amendment is before the Senate.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I wish to say that this particular amendment, it seems to me, establishes a bad precedent. We insert in the bill a provision for a 50–50 matching of funds, as between the Federal Government and the States. Then, when we proceed to include this particular amendment, we automatically kill the theory of the 50–50 matching amendment. I think we are getting into a type of legislation which will have an extremely bad reaction as a precedent to be followed during this time of critical necessity, and I believe we will rue the day when we adopted it.

Therefore, Mr. President, I hope the amendment will be rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment beginning in line 24 on page 7.

Mr. BRIDGES. On this question I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. WHITE. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	George	Reed
Andrews	Gillette	Revercomb
Austin	Hatch	Reynolds
Ball	Hayden	Robertson
Bankhead	Hill	Russell
Barkley	Jackson	Scrugham
Brewster	Johnson, Calif.	Shipstead
Bridges	Johnson, Colo.	Stewart
Buck	Kilgore	Thomas, Okla.
Burton	Langer	Thomas, Utah
Bushfield	McCarran	Tunnell
Byrd	McClellan	Vandenberg
Capper	McKellar	Walsh, N. J.
Caraway	Maloney	Weeks
Chavez	Maybank	Wherry
Clark, Mo.	Mead	White
Connally	Millikin	Wiley
Cordon	O'Daniel	Willis
Danaher	O'Mahoney	
Ferguson	Radcliffe	

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HAWKES], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. HOLMAN], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. NYE], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. THOMAS], and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. WILSON] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is absent on official business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Fifty-eight Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, what is the question before the Senate?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 7, beginning with line 24 and extending through line 2 on page 9, as amended. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. FERGUSON. The only amendment which has been made to the committee amendment was on page 8, line 5, to strike out "90" and insert "100."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. FERGUSON. And a "nay" vote would be to strike out the entire amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. REED (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER]. On this vote I transfer my pair to the senior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER] who would vote as I am about to vote. I am therefore free to vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. STEWART (when his name was called). I have a pair with the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. HOLMAN]. I transfer that pair to the senior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. BILBO], and will vote. I vote "yea."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. HAYDEN (after having voted in the affirmative). I have a pair with the senior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. NYE]. I transfer the pair to the junior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], and allow my vote to stand.

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. BILBO], the Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE], and the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] are absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CLARK], the Senators from Rhode Island [Mr. GERRY and Mr. GREEN], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. GUFFEY], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH], and the Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCFARLAND], the Senator from Utah [Mr. MURDOCK], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON], the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER], the Senator from Washington [Mr. WALLGREN], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] are detained on public business.

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] is necessarily absent.

Mr. WHERRY. I announce the necessary absence of the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DAVIS] on official business. He has a pair with the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER].

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is absent on official business.

The following Senators are necessarily absent:

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HAWKES], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. HOLMAN], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MOORE], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. NYE], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. THOMAS], and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. WILSON].

The result was announced—yeas 30, nays 28, as follows:

YEAS—30

Aiken	Hatch	Mead
Andrews	Hayden	O'Mahoney
Bankhead	Hill	Radcliffe
Barkley	Jackson	Reynolds
Caraway	Johnson, Colo.	Russell
Chavez	Kilgore	Scrugham
Connally	Langer	Stewart
Cordon	McCarran	Thomas, Okla.
George	McClellan	Thomas, Utah
Gillette	McKellar	Tunnell

NAYS—28

Austin	Danaher	Shipstead
Ball	Ferguson	Vandenberg
Brewster	Johnson, Calif.	Walsh, N. J.
Bridges	Maloney	Weeks
Buck	Maybank	Wherry
Burton	Millikin	White
Bushfield	O'Daniel	Wiley
Byrd	Reed	Willis
Capper	Revercomb	
Clark, Mo.	Robertson	

NOT VOTING—38

Bailey	Green	Pepper
Bilbo	Guffey	Smith
Bone	Gurney	Taft
Brooks	Hawkes	Thomas, Idaho
Butler	Holman	Tobey
Chandler	La Follette	Truman
Clark, Idaho	Lucas	Tydings
Davis	McFarland	Wagner
Downey	Moore	Wallgren
Eastland	Murdock	Walsh, Mass.
Ellender	Murray	Wheeler
Gerry	Nye	Wilson
Glass	Overton	

So the amendment as amended was agreed to.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I offer an amendment which I will ask to have stated at the desk. This identical amendment was adopted by the Senate in 1940 as an amendment to the highway bill, and I understand there is no objection to it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I wish to move to reconsider the last yea-and-nay vote which was taken.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Texas has the floor.

Mr. MAYBANK. I move to reconsider the vote which was just taken.

Mr. MCCLELLAN. I move to lay that motion on the table.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I yield if there is to be no debate.

Mr. MAYBANK. I merely move to reconsider the vote just taken on the amendment of the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN].

Mr. MCCLELLAN. I move to lay that motion on the table.

Mr. BRIDGES. I ask for the yeas and nays on the motion.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from South Carolina, not having voted on the prevailing side, does not have the right to make the motion.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, under the circumstances I think I shall refuse to yield further. I ask that the amendment offered by me be stated.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 13, after line 17, it is proposed to insert the following:

SEC. 13. The term "highway" as defined by the Federal Highway Act shall not be deemed to include any bridges hereafter to be constructed if located within 5 miles of an existing toll bridge, unless a reasonable offer is made to acquire the facilities of such toll bridge and such offer has not been accepted, and unless a finding as to the reasonableness of said offer, the failure of acceptance and the percentage of amortization of such toll bridge has been made after public hearing by the Federal Works Administrator: *Provided*, That such finding by the Federal Works Administrator shall not be subject to review.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, the text of that amendment is identical with the text of an amendment offered by the late Senator from Texas, Mr. Sheppard, when the Senate last had the highway bill under consideration. The amendment was considered by the committee at that time and recommended. So far as I am concerned, I am willing to take the amendment to conference.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Texas.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, earlier in the afternoon an amendment on page 2, after line 5, was adopted, with very few Senators present, and the action was taken by voice vote. I refer to the amendment which eliminates the cost of rights-of-way from the urban program which is contemplated by the pending bill. The able junior Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] fully presented the case. I simply assert that in my own view there is little or no sense in providing for an urban program except that the costs of rights-of-way may be included.

I do not want to reargue the question, but, in view of the very great importance of the matter to the larger cities of the country—and I am thinking in particular of the instance of Detroit at the moment—I am going to take the liberty of asking unanimous consent to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was adopted, simply for the purpose of asking for a yea-and-nay vote in respect to action upon it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Michigan?

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I do not object to having a yea-and-nay vote and having the matter decided, but it seems to me that we might take the record vote on the motion to reconsider and arrive at the same conclusion.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I am perfectly willing to proceed in that fashion.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I wish to say a few words on the question involved.

This matter has been considered by the committee, and the committee has recommended that the authorization for the use of Federal funds to purchase rights-of-way be eliminated from the bill. I think the committee's action was wise. I do not wish to belabor the question, but I do desire to point out again, Mr. President, that in all Federal aid legislation up to this good hour it has been required of the sponsor of the project and the beneficiary of the Federal funds that such sponsor acquire the rights-of-way. There is a very substantial reason for this. We all know that the local community, the county or the city, can acquire a right-of-way, when it appeals to the civic obligation of the owner, for one-half of what it will cost the Federal Government.

If we open up the question of rights-of-way, and provide that the Federal Treasury shall bear the costs of the acquisition, we will be opening up a Pandora's box which will plague us in the future, and will cost millions of dollars, which will be expended unnecessarily in the years to come.

We have required the States and the local communities to acquire the lands before we would build airfields, and we should properly have done so, because they can get the land for much less than the Federal Government can buy it. We have always required all sponsors under public works projects to finance the cost of the acquisition of the land, and since the creation of the Bureau of Public Roads that has been required before the Federal Government would contribute Federal funds for the improvement of highways.

As practical men, we all know that if we go into condemnation proceedings, and a county has to pay for land, the jurors are going to scrutinize the case with great care. Go into a city condemnation, and if the city taxpayers have to pay for the land, they will return a verdict of less than what they will give if they know that the Federal Government is contributing to the acquisition of land. In such a case the defendant will be urging that the land is worth $300, and the plaintiff will say it is worth a hundred. The defendant's attorney will say, "Why, of course, this land is worth $300. Did not the Federal Government take cognizance of the value of all these lands by appropriating $125,000,000, which can be expended here to buy these rights-of-way?" There will be but one verdict in the case. The jurors will return a verdict for just what the individual fixes as the value of his land, if we are to let the Federal Government go into the business of acquiring rights-of-way, in addition to building the roads.

In my opinion the cities come with very poor grace asking the Federal Government to buy buildings and to buy lands for the building of public streets through the cities of this Nation. I have heard the argument about the cities contributing to the gas taxes, but as I undertook to point out when this matter was up a few minutes ago, the cities are the ones who benefit from the building of the highways wherever they are built. It is something new to give the cities $125,000,000 out of Federal funds for the building of streets. If the motion shall prevail, we will not only give them $125,000,000 for the building of streets, but we will provide that the Federal Government is going to buy the streets and then pay for building them. We have never done this in the past for any county, we have never done it in the past in all the Federal-aid system, but the cities are coming in and not only demanding $125,000,000, to which I do not think they are entitled, but are saying that the Federal Government should buy the lands for the streets of the cities.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, the argument was made a little earlier in the afternoon that the $125,000,000 will not be used. Let me say that, in my judgment, if this $125,000,000 appropriated by the Government should not be used, it would be about the first appropriation ever made by the Government that was not used. It will be used. In my judgment, every dollar of it will be used, and will be used for a good purpose, under the terms of the bill.

Mr. RUSSELL. Certainly we do not wish now to deviate from a policy to which we have adhered strictly in every public-works program we have ever had; that is, requiring the sponsors of a project to acquire the necessary lands.

The cities should be well satisfied with this $125,000,000 to pave city streets, because it is the first time we have ever made an appropriation for this purpose, without asking Congress to pay for all the damages to the properties adjacent to the rights-of-way and also acquire the lands for the rights-of-ways.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair would ask the Senator from Michigan whether his motion to reconsider included only the amendment on line 4, or whether he included also that amendment on lines 5 and 6.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I take it we can have a test vote. I have moved to reconsider, and I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I should like to say a few words on this particular amendment. It is the opinion of the highway department that if we do not include, insofar as the urban districts are concerned, a part of the cost of the rights-of-way—and the pending bill, if the test vote shall be taken and this provision is allowed to remain in, would provide for payment up to 50 percent—we will to a great extent nullify the appropriation to the large urban areas.

I should like here to read the definition of the term "urban area," because this is what it would mean in relation to such an area:

> The term "urban area" means an area including and adjacent to a municipality or other urban place, of 5,000 or more, as shown by the latest available Federal census. The boundaries of urban areas, as defined herein, will be fixed by the State highway department of each State subject to the approval of the Public Roads Administration.

I wish to return to the proposition of who is to pay the $450,000,000 we are now proposing to appropriate. It is said we are now collecting from the automobile owners and the users of automobiles $650,000,000 a year. The large urban centers, where the proposed law is to apply, are paying a great amount of the $650,000,000, and if we do not pay for the costs of the rights-of-way, then, so far as the urban areas are concerned, we are not paying on a 50–50 basis, because as part of the cost of a highway a great sum is always necessary for condemnation and widening, and the necessary and limited access, let us call it, to the highway that is essential. So it comes down to this, that, so far as the urban areas are concerned, Congress is to say to them, "You put up 80 to 90 percent and we will put up 10 to 20 percent," but we come to the rural sections, we say, "We will put up 50 or 55 percent if any widening is necessary." The amount is so small that it does not enter into the actual cost of the highway.

Again I say that to be fair with the urban areas, which are helping to pay for this large road construction, we should change this and should provide that 50 percent of the cost of condemnation shall be paid by the Federal Government. Then we would be doing something for the large urban areas, which have supported the war effort, and worn out their roads so that America might be defended.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. If the Senator will yield, does he mean that this amendment

would involve an additional 50 percent on the urban areas?

Mr. FERGUSON. No; it would merely come out of the $125,000,000 that is appropriated.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. For what?

Mr. FERGUSON. For urgan areas. In the bill $125,000,000 per annum is appropriated for urban areas, which I have described.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. For the purposes the Senator has outlined?

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes. If we took out the rights-of-way, provided that no part of the money could be used for rights-of-way, then we would be saying to the cities, "You can only use it for paving purposes, or building up roads," and the States which desire to put these roads through the city would say, "We cannot put up the money for condemnation, and therefore we cannot use the appropriation."

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. By force of circumstances the cities, the large urban centers, have had the greatest share of all this Federal-State fund program, because they have had the most roads, and the country district roads and the rural mail routes have been very much neglected.

Mr. FERGUSON. Up until today the cities have had no part of this appropriation.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. But they have had it in their approaches.

Mr. FERGUSON. It must be outside the corporate limits.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Perhaps it has been.

Mr. FERGUSON. But here we are giving to the rural areas, which I very much favor, $125,000,000, which matches what is done for the urban areas.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. The Senator means to say that the regular fund of 50–50 is not disturbed by this provision.

Mr. FERGUSON. That is true.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Mr. President, during the debate this afternoon I asked the question of the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] upon what highways or streets this $125,000,000 could be used. The Senator answered, "Only on the Federal-aid highways which now run through the cities," or so I understood him to say. I suppose that also includes new highways which might be run through a city. At the present time every large city in the United States has Federal highways running through it. The Government has taken part in the building of all those highways to a certain width. I am wondering now what this $125,000,000 is going to be used for in urban areas? Most of the highways there are already built. Are we going to pave the whole width of the streets in those cities?

In that connection, Mr. President, I read last night a survey made of the great State of Michigan, and the city of Detroit, which 10 years ago spent about $60,000,000, as I recall, for its streets and city lighting; last year spent $5,000,000; and I have been wondering how Detroit would keep up its streets if someone did not provide help.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I understood the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] to say that this related only to the purchase of rights-of-way in the cities. Am I correct in my understanding?

Mr. FERGUSON. No.

Mr. RUSSELL. I wish to point out that if Senators vote "yea" to reconsider the vote by which the amendment on page 2 was agreed to, they not only place the Federal Government in the business of buying rights-of-way in the cities, but they place the Government in the business of buying rights-of-way for rural roads. I do not think the Senate wants to do that, because it is an absolute reversal of the policy we have always adhered to. If Senators vote to reconsider, it means that Senators vote for Federal funds to be used to acquire rights-of-way on all the other Federal-aid projects. It will be necessary to adopt the same rule to the airfields and to all Federal projects. In my opinion it will result in an absolutely unnecessary waste of Federal funds.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point, in connection with the various discussions which have just taken place, a telegram which I received today from J. S. Williamson, chief highway commissioner of South Carolina, which in short sets forth South Carolina's financial status in connection with the pending issue.

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COLUMBIA, S. C., *September 15, 1944.*
Senator BURNET R. MAYBANK,
United States Senate:

Understand S. 2105 up for consideration in Senate today. Please use your influence toward getting this bill passed without reducing the amount. South Carolina can match its portion.

J. S. WILLIAMSON,
Chief Highway Commissioner.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I have in mind that if the motion to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was agreed to should prevail, and if the Senate were then to allow the provision with respect to cost of rights-of-way to remain in the bill, I shall offer an amendment, on page 2, line 4, after the words "cost of rights-of-way" to insert "in urban areas", and then in line 6, after the words "include costs of rights-of-way", to insert the words "except in urban areas", which answers the question asked by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL].

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, it does answer the question, but it certainly does not remove my objection. I would prefer to have the provision apply to all items rather than to confine it to urban areas. Certainly I am not going to agree to a proposal which would in effect say to our counties, "We will not give you a dime to apply on the cost of rights-of-way, but we will give the city of Detroit $12,000,000 with which to buy rights-of-way."

Mr. FERGUSON. I am glad to hear the Senator say that it is his judgment that if this provision should apply to any it should apply to all.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. President, in support of the contention made by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] that to provide Federal funds for the purchase of rights-of-way will lead to excessive costs, I should like to read from the RECORD of yesterday some figures with respect to the purchase of rights-of-way for the Pentagon Building. For one property assessed at $8,200 the Government paid $41,000. For another property assessed at $32,680 the Government paid $225,000. For another property assessed at $26,000 the Government paid $216,000. Getting down into smaller figures, we find one assessed at $7,900 for which the Congress paid $31,500. And so it goes all through the list. I think that bears out the Senator's contention very well.

Mr. RUSSELL. I thank the Senator from Delaware for bringing that out, and if Senators wish to multiply that expense by three hundred or four hundred times all over the United States, then Senators should vote to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was agreed to, and include the deleted language in the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] to reconsider the vote by which the committee amendment in the first paragraph on page 2 was agreed to. The yeas and nays have been ordered and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. STEWART (when his name was called). Making the same announcement as before, I will vote. I vote "nay."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. HAYDEN. I have a general pair with the senior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. NYE]. I transfer that pair to the junior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], and will vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. BILBO], the Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE], and the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] are absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CLARK], the Senators from Rhode Island [Mr. GERRY and Mr. GREEN], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. GUFFEY], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. SCRUGHAM], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH], and the Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCFARLAND], the Senator from Utah [Mr. MURDOCK], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON], the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER], the Senator from Washington [Mr. WALLGREN], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] are detained on public business.

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] is necessarily absent.

Mr. WHERRY. I announce the necessary absence of the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DAVIS] on official business. He has a pair with the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER].

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is absent on official business.

The following Senators are necessarily absent:

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HAWKES], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. HOLMAN], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MOORE], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. NYE], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. THOMAS], and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. WILSON].

The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER] would vote "nay," if present.

The result was announced—yeas 8, nays 47, as follows:

YEAS—8

Bridges	Langer	Weeks
Cordon	Reed	White
Ferguson	Vandenberg	

NAYS—47

Aiken	George	O'Daniel
Andrews	Gillette	O'Mahoney
Austin	Hatch	Radcliffe
Ball	Hayden	Revercomb
Bankhead	Hill	Reynolds
Barkley	Jackson	Robertson
Brewster	Johnson, Calif.	Russell
Buck	Johnson, Colo.	Stewart
Burton	Kilgore	Thomas, Okla.
Bushfield	McCarran	Thomas, Utah
Byrd	McClellan	Tunnell
Capper	McKellar	Walsh, N. J.
Caraway	Maloney	Wherry
Chavez	Maybank	Wiley
Connally	Mead	Willis
Danaher	Millikin	

NOT VOTING—41

Bailey	Green	Scrugham
Bilbo	Guffey	Shipstead
Bone	Gurney	Smith
Brooks	Hawkes	Taft
Butler	Holman	Thomas, Idaho
Chandler	La Follette	Tobey
Clark, Idaho	Lucas	Truman
Clark, Mo.	McFarland	Tydings
Davis	Moore	Wagner
Downey	Murdock	Wallgren
Eastland	Murray	Walsh, Mass.
Ellender	Nye	Wheeler
Gerry	Overton	Wilson
Glass	Pepper	

So Mr. VANDENBERG's motion to reconsider was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is before the Senate and open to further amendment.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Mr. President, I offer an amendment on page 4, in subsection (b), line 11, after the word "population" to insert *"Provided,* That such secondary roads shall be constructed under plans and specifications approved by the highway department, in cooperation with the county supervisors, county commissioners, or other appropriate local road officials for each particular State."

Mr. President, the bill proposes to appropriate $125,000,000 for secondary roads. In many States no secondary roads have been built, for the sole reason that farm-to-market roads of the high type of construction demanded by the Public Roads Administration cannot be built, and our State has never built any of them. Many other States are in the same situation.

I wish to pay my respects to the very distinguished and able Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR], who commented upon this matter a little while ago. I love him like a father, and I like to agree with him in most of the things he proposes. In fact, I love every hair of his clever head.

Mr. MCKELLAR. Mr. President, what did the Senator say?

Mr. BUSHFIELD. I said that I love every hair of the Senator's clever head.

Mr. MCKELLAR. I thank the Senator. I am very glad I asked the question.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. I said some other things.

Mr. MCKELLAR. Of course the Senator did not mean the other things. [Laughter].

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Mr. President, the opinion has been stated on this floor that I am proposing to take away from the Public Roads Administration jurisdiction or supervision over Federal appropriations for highways. I intend nothing of the kind; I had no such thought in mind, and I do not believe the language of this amendment, which is a combination of my amendment and the one submitted by the junior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. STEWART] can be so construed. I invite the attention of the Senate to the fact that the provision of the amendment is that secondary roads shall be constructed under plans and specifications approved by the State highway departments, county commissioners, or other local road officials. That refers only to the preparation of the plans. It does not refer to the expenditure of the money. The Federal Public Roads Administration can still supervise the construction of the roads, and approve or reject them as it sees fit; but they must be constructed under plans prepared and approved by local agencies. The reason for that is that the people in the various States do not all want the same kind of roads. My people, living upon the farms of South Dakota, are satisfied at the present time with gravel roads from their farms to markets. Only in the urban areas are hard-surfaced roads demanded. We do not need them. We want all-weather roads, and I believe that we should have the right to decide that question for ourselves, without the Public Roads Administration dictating to us that we must have roads built according to the specifications for State highways, which require a 100-foot right-of-way and a 30-foot strip of completed highway with a hard surface upon it, either oil or concrete. We do not want that type of road for our farmers. We want a road over which we can get through the mud. Therefore I urge that the combination of the amendment of the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. STEWART] and my amendment be adopted.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, I should like to add a word to what the Senator from South Dakota has said with respect to the amendment which he has offered.

It is not my purpose to take anything away from the Public Roads Administration. I believe that it has done a great job. It is doing excellent work, and I believe that its personnel is entirely high class. However, the Senator from South Dakota and I are trying to emphasize the need for farm-to-market roads at reasonable cost. I introduced a bill on this subject in November of last year, a rather comprehensive bill, which had the approval of several county highway organizations, and I believe also of the National Road Builders' Association, or the county division of that association. I have had approving letters with respect to it from numerous States, and county highway departments of various States.

I do not believe that the amendment would take away from the Public Roads Administration any authority in connection with the construction of roads. I presume that it could refuse to contribute its part on any reasonable ground which might be presented. However, I am told by the county highway authorities interested in the construction of that type of cheap road that in the past it has been impossible to build farm-to-market roads because the requirements and specifications of the Public Roads Administration have been entirely too high, and have made the cost prohibitive.

That is the practical situation with which we are confronted. As I view the question, it is a practical matter. There is no personal feeling against the Public Roads Administration, or against any individual. I wish to see a permanent type of farm-to-market road built, if it is possible to build it on a cheap basis. I think it is a responsibility which the Congress owes to the farmers of the Nation to make it possible for them to bring their products to market. I am in favor of this amendment because I think it is fair. Certainly there is no purpose, on the part of either the Senator from South Dakota or myself, to take away from the contributing authority, the Federal Government, any right it may have in connection with the construction of roads, except with relation to the question of specifications.

I think that the community which seeks to have the road constructed, and which also would contribute a portion of the cost, should be permitted to specify the type of road it desires to have built and the amount of money it is willing to contribute to the cost of the road. I think that is a practical proposition.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I regret that I cannot see my way clear to accept the amendment. Federal money is involved. A road which is built according to specifications which result in the construction of a road which is worth the money and which will last long enough to pay out the investment in the course of its use is a well-designed road, and should be built that way. No one would insist that a farm-to-market road or other secondary road should be built with a base similar to that required for a road carrying heavy traffic. But no one would agree to have such a road be merely a dirt road.

I took up with Mr. MacDonald, the Commissioner of Public Roads, the charge that it was the fault of the Public Roads Administration that hereto-

fore it has been impossible to obtain what are termed reasonable specifications. I have received from Mr. MacDonald a letter which I shall read into the RECORD. I think it is well to have this discussion, regardless of whether the amendment is agreed to, because now, for the first time, we have a substantial amount, namely, $125,000,000, which is proposed to be appropriated for this particular purpose. Heretofore the amount of money has been very small, and the funds have been scattered among all the States. I think the cause of the difficulty has been, not the fact that the money has come from Washington, but the fact that the State highway departments have not wished to bother to change their specifications.

The letter I have received from Mr. MacDonald, and which I wish to read to the Senate, is as follows:

FEDERAL WORKS AGENCY,
PUBLIC ROADS ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, September 9, 1944.

Hon. CARL HAYDEN,
United States Senate.

MY DEAR SENATOR HAYDEN: You recently advised me that representations had reached you that the Public Roads Administration had required unreasonable or unnecessary construction on secondary roads.

These are absolute misrepresentations. The specific requirements on individual projects, in the past, have been left very largely for the determination of the States in cooperation with our field engineers. The types constructed have ranged from graded roads with sand-clay, gravel, or other local surfacing material, up to higher types.

On the limited mileage of important secondary roads thus far constructed under Federal aid secondary appropriations we issued instructions that the design requirements for alinement and grade should be consistent with the topography and the purpose to be served by the improvement; with due regard to the cost of the work, the amount and kind of traffic to be handled, and to the cost of yearly maintenance. The minimum graded width out to out of shoulders has varied from 20 to 26 feet.

Abbreviated plans have been accepted when the character of the improvement has so warranted, the governing requirement being that they be in sufficient detail to show the quantity and kind of work involved.

The enclosed references to memoranda will give you more detailed information on the very general guiding instructions issued in 1937, 1939, and 1940.

Very truly yours,
THOS. H. MACDONALD,
Commissioner of Public Roads.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the data referred to in the letter printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the data were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MAY 17, 1940.

General Administrative Memorandum No. 102 (superseding General Administrative Memorandum No. 66).

Subject: Width and capacity of bridges on Federal-aid secondary highway projects.

To facilitate the planning of Federal-aid secondary highway projects and to avoid possible delay as a result of lack of agreement between the several Sstates and field representatives of Public Roads regarding acceptable roadway width and capacity of (1) new bridges, (2) existing bridges which are to be reconstructed, and (3) bridges to be retained in place, all within the limits of proposed secondary projects, it is desirable to outline a policy on these subjects.

The speed of traffic on secondary highways is determined largely by the character of the highway alinement and the width and type of the roadway surface, and under favorable conditions may be fully as great as the speed of traffic on main highways. While traffic safety is dependent upon a number of factors, bridges that are inadequate as to strength for prospective loads and as to width for the speed and character of traffic served, constitute definite hazards.

The following policy shall obtain for bridges on secondary or feeder roads:

1. New bridges: Roadway width: Preferably not less than 24 feet between curbs for highway design speeds in excess of 30 miles per hour and for maximum traffic densities in excess of 30 vehicles per hour. Minimum acceptable width for these highway classifications, 22 feet between curbs. For highway design speeds of 30 miles per hour or less and for maximum traffic densities less than 30 vehicles per hour, minimum acceptable width 20 feet between curbs. Single lane bridges will be considered only under exceptional conditions when the maximum expected traffic density is in the neighborhood of 5 vehicles per hour. Capacity: Preferably not less than H 15 loading: Minimum acceptable not less than H 10 loading on roads not expected to be subject to heavy loads.

2. Existing bridges which are to be reconstructed with Federal aid: Same requirements as for new bridges.

3. Bridges to be retained in place: Existing bridges of lesser width than indicated for new bridges for the respective highway classifications that have an anticipated life of a number of years and a load-carrying capacity of not less than 6 tons, or strengthened to this capacity without Federal funds may be retained in place, provided they are posted for the indicated load limits and that the highway alinement approaching such birdges affords visibility of approach conditions for a sufficient distance to permit the stopping of vehicles at the speed at which the road ordinarily will be used and that reflectorized buttons are installed at the ends of bridges of less than 20-foot roadway in addition to advance reflectorized signs to warn traffic of the approach to such bridges. Federal funds may not be used for the strengthening of any existing bridge having a roadway width less than would be acceptable for reconstruction.

THOS. H. MACDONALD,
Commissioner.

STANDARDS FOR FEDERAL-AID SECONDARY HIGHWAY IMPROVEMENTS WHICH HAVE BEEN ISSUED BY THE PUBLIC ROADS ADMINISTRATION

Under date of February 12, 1937, a memorandum was issued to district engineers which includes the following provisions concerning design requirements:

"The design requirements for alinement and grade for secondary or feeder roads shall be consistent with the topography and the purpose to be served by the improvement. The minimum graded width of roadbed from out to out of shoulders shall be not less than 26 feet in easy topography; not less than 24 feet in rolling topography; and not less than 20 feet in mountainous topography, with a greater width than the 20-foot minimum on through fills. Where roadbed slopes are flattened to 3 or 4 to 1 the minimum graded width in easy topography may be reduced to 24 feet. Abbreviated plans may be accepted when the character of the inprovement warrants, provided they are in sufficient detail to show the quantity and kind of work involved."

The following is quoted from the regulations approved by the Secretary of Agriculture January 13, 1939, section 11.3, paragraph (c):

"No projects shall be undertaken which do not provide for a surfacing or stabilization of the roadbed which shall be reasonably satisfactory for the traffic served. Grading and drainage as first stage construction may be accepted: *Provided*, The State Highway Department will enter into a satisfactory agreement for future surfacing or stabilization of the road bed."

Under date of May 17, 1940, General Administrative Memorandum No. 102 was issued on the subject Width and Capacity of Bridges on Federal-Aid Secondary Projects.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I do not think we will have any trouble about this matter. I think it was based on a situation in which a small amount of money was available, and in which the State highway departments have said that it did not amount to anything, and that they would approve their own specifications for some important secondary roads.

This is the first time we have gotten down to providing a considerable sum of money for the farm-to-market roads. Under the supervision of Mr. MacDonald, I think the money will be handled wisely. However, I do not think it would be wise to provide that specifications which might result in the wasting of Federal funds could be permitted.

Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the amendment.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from South Dakota. On this question the yeas and nays have been demanded? Is there a sufficient second?

The yeas and nays were not ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from South Dakota. [Putting the question.] The noes appear to have it.

Mr. BRIDGES. I ask for a division.

On a division, the amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, I desire to offer the following amendment: On page 6, line 7, strike out the period after the word "census" and insert a colon and the following language: "*Provided*, That Connecticut towns shall be considered municipalities regardless of their incorporated status."

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, there is a peculiar condition in the State of Connecticut with respect to what constitutes a town. It differs from the condition in any other State. I shall be very glad to accept the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Connecticut?

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, before action is taken on the amendment, I should like to say, because of something which has just happened, that when I originally proposed the amendment, the words "New England" were used rather than the word "Connecticut." In the committee there was objection on the part of two New England States, not to the amendment, but to having those States covered under the amendment,

because of a fear that it might confuse things there.

Now it has been suggested to me by the able junior Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] that he might like to have Vermont included.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I think Vermont towns have the same status as towns in Connecticut, and I think Vermont towns should also be included. I would feel much better if my colleague the senior Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN] were here to corroborate that. I admit that I should know at once.

Mr. HAYDEN. Let me say that the committee was told that in Maine great townships are called towns. However, that is a different matter, and the amendment would not apply to the State of Maine.

The junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WEEKS] also objected to it.

Mr. AIKEN. A town in Vermont is a township.

Mr. HAYDEN. That is what makes the trouble. But that is not true in Connecticut.

Mr. AIKEN. Is it true that in Connecticut a town does not include the whole township?

Mr. MALONEY. We have what people in other States might call a rather complicated system.

When the amendment was first proposed, I could not understand how it would do harm to any New England States. It was proposed following consultation between the highway commissioner of my State and the Bureau of the Census in Washington.

I would respectfully suggest to the Senator from Vermont that he ask that Vermont be included under the amendment. I would be willing to accept such a modification of my amendment. Then, if it is subsequently found that Vermont should not be included, the name of Vermont could be removed from the amendment in conference, if there is a conference.

Mr. HAYDEN. That will be satisfactory.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I am very grateful to the Senator from Connecticut for his suggestion. I think the amendment should be applicable to Vermont, but I am not sure. Therefore, I ask that Vermont be included, with the right to request that it not be included, when the matter is in conference, if it is found that it should not be included.

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, I so change my amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the modified amendment of the Senator from Connecticut.

The amendment as modified was agreed to.

Mr. DANAHER subsequently said: Mr. President, while amendments offered by my colleague were under consideration I several times sought recognition. I wish particularly to ask unanimous consent that there be inserted in the body of the RECORD at the point where we had under consideration his first amendment, a letter from Governor Baldwin sent to me, transmitting a copy of the Governor's letter to the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], and I ask that it appear in the RECORD at that point.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the letter will be printed in the body of the RECORD at the point requested by the Senator from Connecicut.

The letter is as follows:

STATE OF CONNECTICUT,
EXECUTIVE CHAMBERS,
Hartford, September 11, 1944.

Hon. JOHN A. DANAHER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR DANAHER: I am enclosing herewith a copy of a letter which I have written to the Honorable CARL HAYDEN, United States Senator, concerning his bill, S. 2105 regarding post-war highway construction.

Very sincerely yours,
RAYMOND E. BALDWIN,
Governor.

SEPTEMBER 11, 1944.

Hon. CARL HAYDEN,
United States Senator,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: I am informed that in a conference on September 8 between you and Mr. Edward W. Staves, especially representing Governor Saltonstall of Massachusetts but authorized to speak for Connecticut as well, there was some discussion of the provisions in your bill, S. 2105, as they apply to the "urban" population of Connecticut; and that through Mr. Staves you have invited me to present our situation to you and to suggest a means of meeting it.

Throughout New England there is a strong tendency for us to cling to the "town" as the active elementary unit of government. Consequently in all of the New England States there are unincorporated communities which are urban in fact but which maintain the same ancient form of government that exists in towns which are wholly rural. In Massachusetts, and perhaps in other New England States, there are no political subdivisions within towns—the town is absolutely the basic unit. In these States, it is the practice of the Census Bureau to classify all towns as urban places if their population exceeds 2,000.

Connecticut, however, differs from Massachusetts in that, with us, while the town is prevailingly the basic unit it is not invariably so. We have a comparatively small number of towns within which there have been set up unincorporated boroughs or cities. Because of this incorporation of smaller areas within these towns, the Census Bureau does not consider an unincorporated town in Connecticut as having an urban population unless it has a total population exceeding 2,500 persons and also a population density over the entire area of the town that exceeds 1,000 persons per square mile. Four towns in the State meet both of these requirements and are classed as urban even though they are neither incorporated nor include incorporated areas within their borders.

On the other hand we have within the State 25 towns with populations exceeding 5,000 each and totaling nearly 300,000, most of which population is urban in fact, but which is classed by the Census Bureau as not being urban because the average population density over the entire town areas does not equal 1,000 persons per square mile. Many of these towns—for example, Greenwich with a population of 35,509, Hamden with a population of 23,373, and Manchester with a population of 23,799—are areas that present us with very acute traffic problems. Greenwich is the extreme case. Across that town, which is a bottleneck between New York and New England, it is estimated by the highway department that there will soon be need of the construction of a four-lane or six-lane expressway at a cost of substantially $10,000,000. In both Hamden and Manchester, and indeed in most of the 25 towns listed, money must be spent in enormous amounts for the relief of urban traffic congestion. If these towns were outside of New England, without doubt the communities in them would have been incorporated. Were they in our neighboring State of Massachusetts, they would be classed as urban regardless of their unincorporated status.

This is a situation which has been discussed by our highway commissioner with Chairman ROBINSON of the House of Representatives Committee on Roads, as it was discussed with you by Mr. Staves. Apparently it is the intent of neither the House nor the Senate bill to discriminate against us because of the unfortunate peculiarity of our political structure. I understand that both you and Mr. ROBINSON have stated that the language in your bills is designed to meet this situation, and that if it does not meet it, you are eager to correct the deficiency.

Apparently the language does not meet the situation. From a discussion we have had with authorities of the Census Bureau, and from the urban allocation as tabulated on page 3 of your report to the Senate on S. 2105, it appears that the apportionment of urban funds, under existing wording of the bill, will not recognize the nearly 300,000 persons in Connecticut who live in unincorporated towns with populations of 5,000 or more.

Solution of this problem has been discussed informally at considerable length with officials of the Census Bureau. From such discussions we have the understanding that in order to correct the situation, a provision somewhat as follows would have to be added to section 4, paragraph (b), of your bill:

"*Provided,* That New England towns shall be considered municipalities regardless of their incorporated status."

I hope it will be possible to amend your bill in that way.

Sincerely yours,
R. BALDWIN,
Governor.

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, I offer a further amendment: On page 5, line 14, strike out the period after the word "act" and insert a comma and the words "*Provided,* That no State shall receive less than an apportionment equal to six-tenths of the percentage of the Federal gasoline tax collected in the State, as measured by the total net amount taxed value in Public Roads Administration Statistical Report G–2 for 1941."

Mr. President, I shall at least briefly explain the amendment, although it almost explains itself. I am asking that in this bill a floor shall be placed relative to the allocations made to States. For my State and for three or four other States—not more than four—which would be favorably affected, I ask that we receive, in return for our gasoline-tax money, at least 60 percent of that money.

Mr. HAYDEN. What are the four States, let me ask the Senator?

Mr. MALONEY. As a matter of fact, I am informed that there are a total of five States. It would affect the States of New York, New Jersey, Connecticut, California, and Ohio. I have just obtained that information from the distinguished Senator from New Jersey. New Jersey is very much interested in this amendment. I had been informed that the State of Michigan was favorably affected, Mr. President, and I think that somewhere I have the figures as they were presented to me.

Mr. HAYDEN. Let me suggest that I can understand how it would affect California and I can understand how it would affect New Jersey, because in each of those States there are large oil refineries. The gasoline tax is paid at the source. If there were refineries in the State as there are in New Jersey and California, the amount of the gas tax collected by the Federal Government in the State would be large. The gas may or may not be consumed within the State—using California as an illustration—but distributed in other States. It seems to me that it would be very unfair to allow credit for a tax collected in the State of Virginia upon the sale of cigarettes when cigarettes are smoked all over the United States.

In all other apportionments of money, the amounts have been based on known facts which affected the entire United States. We took as a basis the area of the State, or the population of the State as determined by the census, or the road mileage of the State. I may say that this relates merely to a report made in 1941 called Road Statistical Administration Report G–2. Perhaps report G–2 for 1940 would establish something else, and report G–2 for 1944 would establish still another basis. I do not know what is contained in the report. Under the circumstances, I do not feel that it would be wise for the Senate to agree to the amendment.

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, I have my own figures before me at the present time. I cannot be sure they are more accurate than those presented to me by the able Senator from New Jersey. But in answer to the able Senator in charge of the bill, I am able to say that the difference in the case of California, to which the Senator specifically referred, is in an increase of $3,450,000. In the case of Massachusetts there would be a favorable difference of $2,345,000. In the case of New Jersey there would a favorable difference of $3,802,000. According to my figures the States which I have mentioned are the only ones which would be affected. The State of Connecticut would have an increase of $1,534,000.

For the purpose of my statement I should like to base my argument upon figures which I have presented myself, rather than upon those handed to me by the Senator from New Jersey. My figures were compiled by the highway commissioner of the State of Connecticut. On the basis of the compilation, it does not seem to me that the facts expressed by the able Senator in charge of the bill are justifiable. It does not seem to me that the refineries would come into the situation.

Mr. President, I have always doubted the wisdom of our procedure with regard to road bills. They have always brought about intense controversy. Those of us who come from the part of the country in which I live have long felt—and as a Member of the House a number of years ago I tried to do something about it—that we have been discriminated against. Argument has been heard here that this proposal is primarily a measure intended to overcome unemployment after the war. It could not come further from such an objective, Mr. President. The dollars allocated for each motor vehicle would, under this bill, give to the State of Nevada, for example, $331. My State, about which I know the most, would receive $21. Under the proposal, the dollars per demobilized person would be $16.50 for the State of Nevada. I use the State of Nevada as an example only because it heads the list. The proposal would provide $35 per demobilized person for the highly industrialized State of Connecticut, which is actually leading as the Nation's wartime arsenal. On that basis, Mr. President, the bill does not make sense. It is not a bill designed to overcome unemployment after the war. If it were, the situation would be reversed.

Mr. President, while the pending bill would provide approximate justice to the States which I have named, it would not provide complete justice. It would not discriminate harshly against any State; it would not discriminate at all.

I am not asking for complete justice, Mr. President. I am asking only for an approach to fairness. Under my amendment no State would lose very much. The heavily industrialized States, the States with a heavy traffic situation, and the States threatened more than others with serious unemployment after the war, if there is to be unemployment, should be given the small bit of consideration which is proposed by my amendment. I am very hopeful, Mr. President, that the Senate will be willing to accept this mild and modest amendment, which comes a little closer to fairness for the four States which I have mentioned.

I do not know whether the Senator from Arizona has asked me to yield to him.

Mr. HAYDEN. No. I merely suggest that we cannot give money to four or five States without taking it away from all the other States.

Mr. MALONEY. Yes, indeed; and I said that. I would be very glad to tell the Senator what the difference would be. In the Senator's own State of Arizona which would receive an appropriation under this bill of $6,886,000, the State would lose $200,000, which is an insignificant amount. That would be comparable to what would happen in the other States. Every Senator is most concerned with regard to his own State, and is interested in its proper protection. However, I cannot believe there are Senators who would wish an extra special consideration to be given their States at the expense of other States. It would require only a small amount from the subsidies of 44 States to bring up to a nearly reasonable amount the funds which would be allocated to the four States which I have mentioned. I can not believe the Senate will reject that kind of an amendment.

Mr. President, on my amendment I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were not ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GILLETTE in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, I ask for a division.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, before the vote is taken I wish to make a few observations with respect to the subsidies to which the Senator from Connecticut has referred.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri is recognized.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I do not have any prejudice against the State of Connecticut. As a matter of fact, my own family lived in Connecticut for four generations before the Revolutionary War. I live in Missouri. I believe the Senator from Connecticut referred to subsidies. I believe the State of Connecticut has had enough in the way of subsidies through the establishment of war production industries to last it for a long time.

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I yield.

Mr. MALONEY. I should like to point out to the Senator from Missouri that the factories and industries to which he has referred were in existence in Connecticut for centuries; that they were not special plants established in Connecticut; but that we carried on as we had been carrying on for many years. Our position as a war-industry State did not start in this war, but started before the Revolutionary War. We did not ask for any plants and did not ask for any additional industries. Although a few have come to us, it may develop that they have come to the detriment of my State. I expressed that feeling to the War and Navy Departments before we were forced into this war.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, I think that was a very unfortunate situation for the United States. When we got into war I was personally the head of a committee composed of all the Senators from the Mississippi Valley, who went to the various departments which had to do with the establishment of the war agencies, and they told us that there was a concerted effort on the part of heads of corporations which had plants on the Atlantic seacoast, who were very unwilling to remove them, although everybody agreed that both for strategic and tactical reasons it would be much better to locate them in the Middle West. The Senator who now occupies the Chair (Mr. GILLETTE) knows that statement to be true, because he went with me in connection with those matters.

Mr. President, I had no purpose at this time to enter into a dispute as to where these wartime production agencies should have been created; I shall do that at a later time. But this is not a war production bill. This happens to be a highway bill.

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I yield.

Mr. MALONEY. It has been described to us on many occasions as an unemployment measure, too. While I am on my feet, I should like to say to the Senator, because of his reference to subsidies, that all I have asked is 60 percent of what we pay, and we are willing to give the other 40 percent as a subsidy to States which are in this instance a little less fortunate than my own.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, I have had many arguments on this floor with the distinguished Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY], one of the greatest Senators who has ever sat in this body, and he tells occasionally how much the State of North Carolina pays into the Treasury. If we examine the figures, we find that they relate to a tobacco tax, which we in Missouri also pay, and which citizens of Maine pay, and someone else pays in Montana, and someone else pays in Iowa, and someone else pays in California. So the contribution about which the Senator from Connecticut is talking now is not a contribution from Connecticut, it is a contribution from the United States.

Mr. MALONEY. Will the Senator yield further?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I am glad to yield.

Mr. MALONEY. The Senator is not quite correct. I entirely share the view he holds as to the cigarette tax in North Carolina.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. And it is paid in Connecticut.

Mr. MALONEY. I shall come to Connecticut. For a great many years I have been among those criticizing opponents of my political party in my State because they attempted to persuade the people of the State at election time that we were paying more taxes than our share. I have resisted that argument during all the years. We have never paid more than our share. The man in Connecticut pays the same tax as does the man in Arizona. I thoroughly understand that. But the argument is made in connection with the pending bill that the money is provided by the automobile owner, by the man who pays automobile taxes, by the man who pays gasoline taxes, and we do pay more of such taxes than does Arizona, and all we want is 60 percent of our share back. There is no relationship between the argument which I made and that made by the distinguished Senator from Missouri.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Missouri yield to me?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I yield.

Mr. HAYDEN. I think it is hardly fair to compare the automobile registration of Connecticut with the automobile registration of Nevada or Arizona, because the highways which have been built across Arizona and Nevada are just a land bridge to get to the great Pacific coast, and the use of those highways primarily is by people from Connecticut and other parts of the United States who are transcontinental travelers. That is why we built the roads.

Mr. MALONEY. Will the Senator from Missouri yield?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I yield.

Mr. MALONEY. I quite agree. I have traveled over those roads. I have been very appreciative of them, and I do not ask that the program be destroyed. I ask that we try to be fair about the matter. The State of Nevada, under the pending bill, would get $5,837,000. All I ask is that the State of Nevada, and other States in proportion, take off $187,000 of that five million plus and put it in a place where the bill will be permitted to do what it is allegedly designed to do, that is, to take care of traffic conditions, and to do the other things the sponsors of the bill argue they are trying to do. I am not asking for an equal division, I am not asking 100 percent of what the automobilists of my State pay. I want to get a floor for them. I want to get 60 percent, under the arguments made by the sponsors of the bill.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, I cannot hope to equal the Senator from Connecticut either in eloquence or violence. All I say is that when he begins to talk about the actual contributions of the various States, he is getting on an entirely different subject, he is getting on to a subject which the senior Senator from North Carolina and I have frequently debated in this body, as to who pays the taxes. When the Senator from Connecticut says that the benefits should be apportioned on the basis of the contribution, I say he is getting on exactly the same ground the Senator from North Carolina and I have frequently covered on this floor, as to who pays the taxes.

We are on an entirely different subject now. We are on the subject whether it is beneficial for the people of the United States to have a great highway system, available for military purposes, post-road purposes, for every other purpose, even civilian purposes of travel. If every State is going to reserve to itself the right to have a kick-back in proportion to its gasoline sales, or on any other basis, it means the ruination of the whole system. The only justification for such a bill as this is that we shall have a great national highway system on which any citizen in the United States can be perfectly free to travel at any time he desires. If we begin to put up State restrictions, State kick-backs, we will ruin the program. I represent one of the largest States in the Union numerically, and a very large State in area. I am interested in having highways go across that State and go up and down the State. I am not at all interested in exactly how much we "kick in" the Federal pot which will make those highways possible. I am interested in having highways. The Senator who occupies the chair represents a great State, one of the greatest States in the Union. He is interested in having highways across his State, going north and south throughout the State.

The proposition of the Senator from Connecticut, as I understand it, is to restrict the construction of a Federal highway system to the contributions made by individual States, and I do not believe that if that principle is to be adopted there is any justification for the bill at all.

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, everyone here knows I am devoted to the distinguished Senator from Missouri, and I am never happy when I am in conflict with his views; but I do not think he clearly understands my position, and I assume that is my fault. I am not asking for a "kick-back." I want to give to the Federal Government 40 percent more than we get, because I want Connecticut to make a proper contribution to the Federal highway system of which the Senator speaks. I wish to contribute to the bridge across the Nevada desert, to which the distinguished manager of the bill, the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], refers. But it does not seem right to me that some of the States of the Union should get 300 and 400 and 500 percent and more than what they themselves contribute by way of gasoline taxes.

The gasoline taxes collected from the people of the State of Connecticut are tremendous, and that State, too, is in a sense a bridge over which the rest of the people of the country cross as they go down into the other beautiful States of New England. Our traffic is tremendously heavy. We are in need of additional highways now, part of which needs are brought about by the very heavy travel of people from some other States. I cannot understand how anyone thinks the suggestion is unreasonable when all that is asked here is that we get 60 percent of the money paid for gasoline taxes by the people within the State of Connecticut. No one will say that it is a harsh proposal insofar as the other 44 States are concerned. I do not ask for a division. Again I use Nevada as an illustration because it is the No. 1 State on the list. It is all right with me that Nevada gets 500 percent of what it pays in gasoline taxes. But at the same time I must insist with all the strength I have that my own State get 60 percent of what it pays.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MALONEY. I yield.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I had the experience of driving over the roads of the State of Mississippi a few years ago at a time when the State had probably the worst roads of any State in the Union. I had just come out of the hospital suffering from an abscess, and was not strong enough to change a tire which needed to be changed. I had to sit alongside the road until someone came along to change a tire for me. A few years ago I had the pleasure of driving down there again, and in the meantime from her gravel roads Mississippi had changed into the very finest system of roads in the United States. I do not know exactly what it cost me, but I would have been very glad if I had been privileged to make a contribution to improve those roads in a national system of highways.

I feel the same way about Connecticut and about Missouri and about every other State. I think the highway system ought to be a national system. I think it is a matter of national taxation. I do not think there is any reason for saying that 60 percent of the fund should be raised by Connecticut. I have no idea at the moment as to what contribution Missouri makes. The Senator has the figures on his desk. But if we are going to have a national system of highways I think there should be a State contribution up to the limit of the State's ability. I do not see any reason, however, why we should say that Connecticut or New Jersey or Missouri should be earmarked and have 60 percent or 70 percent or 50 percent or any other particular figure earmarked for them.

The Senator has indicated—which I did not know before—that this proposal affects only five States. I do not see why five States should be earmarked. I think if we are to pass this bill at all, it ought to be passed on the basis of a national necessity.

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, I should like to point out to the Senator that these States are not earmarked. A little later Missouri might be in the same category. It just happens that these States would come under this formula now.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. It would not make the slightest difference to me if Missouri were affected.

Mr. MALONEY. In this respect, Mr. President, I do not think that anyone with whom I have served here regards me as a partisan Senator. I have never asked for special favors for my own State. I have been concerned with legislation on a national basis. It seems to me that the bill in its present form is in many respects unfair, and I am trying in one instance to bring it closer to fairness.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MALONEY. I yield.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. The Senator certainly knows that there is no one in the State who has a higher regard for his disinterestedness and his patriotism and great ability than I have. I simply disagree with him on this particular matter.

Mr. MALONEY. I am fearful that there may be others who have a warm spot in their hearts for what at the moment are the favored States of other parts of the country, but I feel compelled to do what I can to afford, as nearly as possible, proper protection for my State. I do not ask for special consideration, or for anything unfair, nor do I think I ask for more than my State is entitled to.

Mr. President, it is obvious we cannot have a record vote, and I ask for a standing vote on the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Connecticut on page 5, line 14. A division has been asked for.

On a division the amendment was rejected.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment which I ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 7, line 10, it is proposed to strike out the words "on highways of the respective classes" and insert in lieu thereof the words "until hazards are eliminated."

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, this matter has been discussed between the senior Senator from Nevada and the Commissioner of Public Roads, and also between myself and the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], and I am hopeful that the Senator will at least take the amendment to conference, because it has the approbation of the Commissioner of Public Roads.

Mr. HAYDEN. The effect of the amendment is, as I understand it, that at the present time 10 percent of the secondary roads money could be used for elimination of highway hazards on secondary roads, 10 percent of the Federal-aid money could be used for similar purposes on Federal-aid roads, and 10 percent of the money available for urban use could be used for similar purposes in that way. The Senator's suggestion is that the money be used in that way until the hazards are removed, and the Senator wants to strike out the words "on highways of the respective classes." That would enable the hazards to be removed anywhere, and not be confined to the separate segments.

Mr. McCARRAN. That is correct.

Mr. HAYDEN. I can see no harm in that. We can take the amendment to conference at least.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Nevada.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, with reference to the second amendment which my colleague offered, I took no part in the debate because of the magnificent presentation he had made with reference to the entire matter. Under no circumstances would I wish any comment of mine to have any impingement upon the splendid presentation which the Senate heard. It is a matter of regret to me that the action has been taken adversely to the representations made by my colleague.

We have been told in reference to this measure that it is designed to aid the prospective unemployment in the postwar period, at least that suggestion has been offered as one of the grounds upon which we should adopt the measure.

Obviously, if it were to deal in terms of unemployment, it should have some relation to the expectancy of unemployment in terms of the localities in which industrial displacements will occur. Viewed in that light, Mr. President, it is perfectly preposterous to ascertain, as the bill provides, the standards which have been created, without regard to their effect on unemployment. We could ask no more clarifying evidence of the dislocation of the bill on that basis than is to be found in an exhibit which I have before me, and which has been submitted to me by the Commissioner of Highways in the State of Connecticut. If we are talking about appropriations, in terms of dollars per demobilized person in the respective States, it will be found that under the bill Nevada would receive $584, and Connecticut would receive $18. Had the amendment offered by my colleague been adopted, Nevada would have received $566, and Connecticut would have received $23. While we are groping for some standard, the difference would at least reasonably take into account the situation, without causing distress to Nevada and without causing adverse impact to the State of Connecticut, in that Connecticut would have been advantaged reasonably, pro rata, according to the number of demobilized persons, by a sum sufficient to aid in the road program there.

If we are talking in terms of improving the highway system, and in terms of the amount of traffic, it is reasonable to judge by the number of automobiles per State. On that basis, Mr. President, under the terms of the bill Nevada would receive $117, while Connecticut would receive $11. Under the language of the amendment offered by my colleague Nevada would have received $113, and Connecticut would have received $13.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that both of the tables to which I have made reference be inserted in the body of the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the tables were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Dollars per motor vehicle

S. 2105, AS WRITTEN

1. Nevada	117
2. Wyoming	62
3. New Mexico	58
4. Montana	47
5. Arizona	46
6. Utah	38
7. North Dakota	36
8. South Dakota	36
9. Idaho	34
10. Delaware	32
11. Mississippi	30
12. Arkansas	29
13. Alabama	28
14. Colorado	26
15. Georgia	25
16. Vermont	25
17. Nebraska	24
18. Tennessee	23
19. Kansas	21
20. Kentucky	21
21. Louisiana	21
22. Maine	21
23. New Hampshire	21
24. Oklahoma	21
25. North Carolina	20
26. Oregon	20
27. Rhode Island	20
28. Missouri	19
29. Texas	19
30. New York	18
31. South Carolina	18
32. Virginia	18
33. West Virginia	18
34. Massachusetts	17
35. Minnesota	17
36. Florida	16
37. Illinois	16
38. Iowa	16
39. Pennsylvania	15
40. Washington	15
41. Wisconsin	15
42. Indiana	14
43. Ohio	14
44. Michigan	13
45. Maryland	13
46. New Jersey	12
47. Connecticut	11
48. California	10

S. 2105, IF AMENDED

1. Nevada	113
2. Wyoming	60
3. New Mexico	56
4. Montana	46
5. Arizona	45
6. Utah	36
7. North Dakota	35
8. South Dakota	35
9. Idaho	33
10. Delaware	32
11. Mississippi	29
12. Arkansas	28
13. Alabama	27
14. Colorado	25
15. Vermont	25
16. Georgia	24
17. Nebraska	23
18. Tennessee	23
19. Kansas	21

20. Louisiana	21
21. Maine	21
22. New Hampshire	21
23. Kentucky	20
24. Massachusetts	20
25. Oklahoma	20
26. Oregon	20
27. Rhode Island	20
28. North Carolina	19
29. Texas	19
30. Missouri	18
31. New York	18
32. South Carolina	18
33. Virginia	18
34. West Virginia	18
35. Minnesota	17
36. Florida	16
37. Illinois	16
38. Iowa	16
39. New Jersey	16
40. Pennsylvania	15
41. Washington	15
42. Wisconsin	15
43. Indiana	14
44. Ohio	14
45. Connecticut	13
46. Maryland	13
47. Michigan	13
48. California	12

Dollars per demobilized person

S. 2105, AS WRITTEN

1. Nevada	584
2 Wyoming	323
3. Montana	246
4. New Mexico	226
5. Arizona	209
6. South Dakota	190
7. North Dakota	177
8. Idaho	173
9. Utah	107
10. Nebraska	104
11. Colorado	103
12. Vermont	96
13. Minnesota	74
14. Delaware	72
15. Iowa	71
16. Oregon	68
17. Arkansas	64
18. Oklahoma	64
19. Texas	63
20. New Hampshire	62
21. Kansas	60
22 Mississippi	60
23. Florida	58
24. Maine	57
25. Georgia	56
26. Kentucky	54
27. North Carolina	54
28. South Carolina	53
29. Missouri	52
30. Tennessee	52
31. Louisiana	45
32. Wisconsin	45
33. Alabama	44
34. Rhode Island	43
35. Virginia	40
36. West Virginia	40
37. New York	37
38. Illinois	36
39. Massachusetts	34
40. Washington	34
41. Indiana	30
42. Ohio	30
43. California	29
44 Pennsylvania	29
45 New Jersey	24
46. Maryland	22
47. Michigan	21
48. Connecticut	18

S. 2105, IF AMENDED

1. Nevada	566
2. Wyoming	313
3. Montana	238
4. New Mexico	219
5. Arizona	203
6. South Dakota	185
7. North Dakota	171
8. Idaho	169
9. Utah	104
10. Nebraska	101
11. Colorado	100
12. Vermont	96
13. Delaware	72
14. Minnesota	72
15. Iowa	69
16. Oregon	66
17. Oklahoma	63
18. Arkansas	62
19. New Hampshire	62
20. Texas	62
21. Mississippi	59
22. Kansas	58
23. Florida	57
24. Maine	56
25. Georgia	55
26. Kentucky	52
27. North Carolina	52
28. Missouri	51
29. South Carolina	51
30. Tennessee	51
31. Louisiana	44
32. Wisconsin	44
33. Alabama	43
34. Rhode Island	43
35. Virginia	39
36. West Virginia	39
37. Massachusetts	38
38. Illinois	36
39. New York	36
40. Washington	34
41. California	33
42. Indiana	30
43. New Jersey	30
44. Ohio	29
45. Pennsylvania	29
46. Connecticut	23
47. Maryland	22
48. Michigan	21

Mr. DANAHER. As the bill now stands, Mr. President, in view of the rejection by the Senate of the second of the amendments offered by my colleague, I most certainly will not vote for the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is before the Senate and open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill (S. 2105) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, when used in this act, unless the context indicates otherwise—

The term "construction" means the supervising, inspecting, actual building, and all expenses incidental to the construction or reconstruction of a highway, including locating, surveying, and mapping, and elimination of hazards at railway-grade crossings, but does not include costs of rights-of-way.

The terms "urban area" means an area including and adjacent to a municipality or other urban place, of 5,000 or more, as shown by the latest available Federal census. The boundaries of urban areas, as defined herein, will be fixed by the State highway department of each State subject to the approval of the Public Roads Administration.

The term "rural areas" means all areas of the State not included in "urban areas."

The term "secondary and feeder roads" means roads in rural areas, including farm-to-market roads, rural-mail routes, and school-bus routes, and not on the Federal-aid system.

SEC. 2. For the purpose of carrying out the provisions of the Federal Highway Act, approved November 9, 1921, as amended and supplemented, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of $1,350,000,000 to become available at the rate of $450,000,000 a year for each of 3 successive post-war fiscal years: *Provided*, That of the sum authorized to be appropriated for the first of such fiscal years $100,000,000 may be appropriated to become available immediately upon apportionment of the authorization for said fiscal year for the making of surveys and plans and for construction: *Provided further*, That except for the sum appropriated pursuant to the preceding proviso, no part of the funds made available pursuant to this act shall be used to pay costs incurred under any construction contract entered into by any State before the beginning of the first post-war fiscal year. The first post-war fiscal year shall be that fiscal year which ends on June 30 following the termination of the present war emergency, or as otherwise directed by the Congress. The authorization for the first post-war fiscal year shall be apportioned among the States within 30 days from the passage of this act. The authorizations for the second and third post-war fiscal years shall be apportioned among the States not later than January 1 next preceding the beginning of each such fiscal year. As soon as the funds for each of the post-war fiscal years have been apportioned, the Commissioner of Public Roads is authorized to enter into agreements with the State highway departments for the making of surveys and plans and the post-war construction of projects for such year. His approval of any such agreement shall be a contractual obligation of the Federal Government for the payment of its pro rata share of the cost of construction.

SEC. 3. The sum authorized in section 2 for each year shall be available for expenditures as follows:

(a) $200,000,000 for projects on the Federal-aid highway system.

(b) $125,000,000 for projects on the principal secondary and feeder roads, including farm-to-market roads, rural free delivery mail and public-school bus routes, either outside of municipalities or inside of municipalities of less than five thousand population: *Provided*, That these funds shall be expended on a system of such roads selected by the State highway departments in cooperation with the county supervisors, county commissioners, or other appropriate local road officials and the Commissioner of Public Roads: *Provided further*, That in any State having a population density of more than two hundred per square mile, as shown by the latest available Federal census, the said system may be selected without regard to included municipal boundaries: *Provided further*, That any of such funds for secondary and feeder roads which are apportioned to a State in which all public roads and highways are under the control and supervision of the State highway department may, if the State highway department and the Commissioner of Public Roads jointly agree that such funds are not needed for secondary and feeder roads, be expended for projects in such State on the Federal-aid highway system.

(c) $125,000,000 for projects on the Federal-aid highway system in urban areas.

SEC. 4. After making the deductions for administration, research, and investigations as provided in section 21 of the Federal Highway Act of 1921, the sums authorized shall be apportioned as follows:

(a) The $200,000,000 per year available for projects on the Federal-aid highway system shall be apportioned among the States as provided in section 21 of the Federal Highway Act.

(b) The $125,000,000 per year available for projects on the secondary and feeder roads shall be apportioned among the States in the following manner: One-third in the ratio which the area of each State bears to the total area of all the States; one-third in the ratio which the rural population of each State bears to the total rural population of all the States, as shown by the Federal census of 1940; and one-third in the ratio which the mileage of rural delivery and star routes in each State bears to the total mileage of

rural delivery and star routes in all the States.

(c) The $125,000,000 per year available for projects on highways in urban areas shall be apportioned among the States in the ratio which the population in municipalities and other urban places, of five thousand or more, in each State bears to the total population in municipalities and other urban places, of five thousand or more, in all the States as shown by the latest available Federal census: *Provided*, That Connecticut and Vermont towns shall be considered municipalities regardless of their incorporated status.

(d) As used in this section the term "State" includes the District of Columbia and the Territories of Hawaii and Puerto Rico.

(e) Any sums apportioned to any State under the provisions of this section shall be available for expenditure in that State for 2 years after the date of apportionment, and any amount so apportioned remaining unexpended at the end of such period shall lapse: *Provided*, That such funds shall be deemed to have been expended if covered by formal agreement with the Commissioner of Public Roads for the improvement of a specific project as provided by this act.

SEC. 5. (a) The Federal share payable on account of any project provided for by the funds made available by this act shall not exceed 50 percent of the construction cost thereof: *Provided*, That in the case of any State containing unappropriated and unreserved public lands and nontaxable Indian lands, individual and tribal, exceeding 5 percent of the total area of all lands therein the Federal share shall be increased in each of the 3 post-war years by a percentage of the remaining cost equal to the percentage that the area of all such lands in such State is of its total area: *Provided further*, That no less than 10 percent of any sums apportioned to any State for projects on the Federal-aid highway system, for projects on secondary and feeder roads, and for projects in urban areas shall be available for projects for the elimination of hazards of highway-railway crossings until hazards are eliminated: *And provided further*, That any part of the construction cost of projects for the elimination of hazards of railway-highway crossings, except the part of such cost which is paid by the railway or railways involved may be paid from Federal funds: *Provided further*, That no Federal funds shall be expended on any such project unless the railway or railways involved pay not less than 15 percent of the construction cost of such project.

(b) If within any of the three post-war fiscal years referred to in this act the Federal Works Administrator shall find with respect to any State (1) that the proceeds of all special taxes on motor-vehicle transportation, as referred to in section 12 of the act of June 18, 1934 (48 Stat. 995), as amended, are applied to highway purposes as defined in said section; (2) that 100 percent of such proceeds are applied to the administrative and operating expenses of the State highway department, the maintenance of the State and Federal-aid highway systems, and the payment of interest on, and the amortization of, bond obligations of the State for the payment of which such revenues have been continuously pledged since January 1, 1942; (3) that the rate of none of such taxes has been reduced after September 1, 1944; and (4) that the portion of the proceeds of all such special taxes then available for construction, together with funds available to the State from any other sources for highway purposes, will be insufficient to match all, or any part, of the funds apportioned to such State for such fiscal years in accordance with the provisions of this act, then such portion of such apportionment as the Federal Works Administrator shall find the State is unable to match shall be made available for expenditure in such State in accordance with the Federal Highway Act, as amended and supplemented, without being matched by the State. Any finding made by the Federal Works Administrator under this subsection shall be made by him only after a full and complete investigation of the facts and records upon which such findings is based.

SEC. 6. If the Commissioner of Public Roads shall determine that it is necessary for the expeditious completion of projects undertaken pursuant to this act, he may advance to any State from funds heretofore or hereafter made available the Federal share of the cost thereof to enable the State highway department to make prompt payments for work as it progresses. The funds so advanced shall be deposited in a special trust account by the State treasurer, or other State official authorized under the laws of the State to receive Federal-aid highway funds, to be disbursed solely upon vouchers approved by the State highway department for work actually performed in accordance with plans, specifications, and estimates approved by the Public Roads Administration under the provisions of this act. Any unexpended balances of funds so advanced shall be returned to the credit of the appropriation from which funds have been advanced.

SEC. 7. There shall be designated within the continental United States a System of Interregional Highways not exceeding 40,000 miles in total extent so located as to connect by routes, as direct as practicable, the principal metropolitan areas, cities, and industrial centers, to serve the national defense, and to connect at suitable border points with routes of continental importance in the Dominion of Canada and the Republic of Mexico. The routes of the System of Interregional Highways shall be selected by joint action of the State highway departments of each State and the adjoining States, as provided by the Federal Highway Act of November 9, 1921, for the selection of the Federal-aid system. All highways or routes included in the System of Interregional Highways as finally approved, if not already included in the Federal-aid highway system, shall be added to said system without regard to any mileage limitation.

SEC. 8. With the approval of the Federal Works Administrator, not to exceed 1½ percent of the amount apportioned for any year to any State under the Federal Highway Act as amended and supplemented, except sections 3 and 23 thereof shall hereafter be used with or without State funds for surveys, plans, engineering, and economic investigations of projects for future construction in such State, on the Federal-aid highway system and extensions thereof within municipalities, on secondary or feeder roads, urban highway or grade-crossing eliminations, and for highway research necessary in connection therewith.

SEC. 9. For the purpose of carrying out the provisions of section 23 of the Federal Highway Act (42 Stat. 218), as amended and supplemented, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated (1) for forest highways the sum of $25,000,000 for the first post-war year and a like amount for each of the second and third post-war years; and (2) for forest development roads and trails the sum of $12,500,000 for the first post-war year and a like amount for each of the second and third post-war years: *Provided*, That the apportionment for forest highways in Alaska shall be for each year $1,500,000 and that such additional amount as otherwise would have been apportioned to Alaska for each of said years shall be apportioned among those States, including Puerto Rico, whose forest highway apportionment for such year otherwise would be less than 1 percent of the entire apportionment for forest highways for that year.

SEC. 10. (a) For the construction, reconstruction, improvement, and maintenance of roads and trails, inclusive of necessary bridges, in national parks, monuments, and other areas administered by the National Park Service, including areas authorized to be established as national parks and monuments, and national park and monument approach roads authorized by the act of January 31, 1931 (46 Stat. 1053), as amended, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of $12,750,000 to become available at the rate of $4,250,000 a year for each 3 successive post-war years.

(b) For the construction and maintenance of parkways, to give access to national parks and national monuments, or to become connecting sections of a national parkway plan, over lands to which title has been transferred to the United States by the States or by private individuals, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of $15,000,000 to become available at the rate of $5,000,000 a year for each 3 successive post-war years.

SEC. 11. The Commissioner of Public Roads is authorized, notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, to cooperate with the State highway departments and any Federal agency in the location, development, construction, and maintenance of flight strips adjacent to public highways, after approval of the location by the Civil Aeronautics Administration, in order to insure greater safety for traffic on the public highways by providing additional facilities to be available for the landing and take-off of aircraft. When requested by the State highway department, funds authorized by this act are hereby made available, in addition to any funds that may be available under any other appropriation, for carrying out the provisions of this section and for paying all or any part of the necessary construction costs incurred therefor. Federal highway funds shall not be used for the reconstruction or relocation of any highway giving access to a flight strip or airport, or for the reconstruction or relocation of any highway which has been or may be closed or the usefulness of which has been or may be impaired by the location or construction of any flight strip or airport, unless the officials in charge have first concurred with the State highway department and the Public Roads Administration in the location of such flight strip or airport.

SEC. 12. On any highway or street hereafter constructed with Federal aid in any State, the form and character of informational, regulatory and warning signs, curb, and pavement or other markings, and traffic signals installed or placed by any public authority, or other agency, shall be subject to a standard code approved by the State highway department with the concurrence of the Commissioner of Public Roads.

SEC. 13. The term "highway" as defined by the Federal Highway Act shall not be deemed to include any bridges hereafter to be constructed if located within 5 miles of an existing toll bridge, unless a reasonable offer is made to acquire the facilities of such toll bridge and such offer has not been accepted, and unless a finding as to the reasonableness of said offer, the failure of acceptance, and the percentage of amortization of such toll bridge has been made after public hearing by the Federal Works Administrator: *Provided*, That such finding by the Federal Works Administrator shall not be subject to review.

SEC. 14. This act may be cited as the "Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1944."

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to amend and supplement the Federal-Aid Road Act, approved July 11,

1916, as amended and supplemented, to authorize appropriations for the post-war construction of highways and bridges, to eliminate hazards at railroad-grade crossings, to provide for the immediate preparation of plans, and for other purposes."

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD at this point a table showing the apportionment of funds among the several States, as the bill provides.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Approximate apportionment of $450,000,000, Federal-aid highway system—sec. 21 of Federal Highway Act, Farm to Market Roads—one-third area, one-third rural population, one-third post roads—urban highways—population of urban places of 5,000 or more

[Thousands of dollars]

State	Federal-aid highway system	Farm to market roads	Urban highways	Total
Alabama	4,187	3,109	1,310	8,606
Arizona	2,873	1,863	264	5,000
Arkansas	3,427	2,586	561	6,574
California	8,010	4,298	8,166	20,474
Colorado	3,593	2,267	939	6,799
Connecticut	1,241	639	1,985	3,865
Delaware	975	609	205	1,789
Florida	2,873	1,804	1,608	6,285
Georgia	5,020	3,591	1,631	10,242
Idaho	2,472	1,621	213	4,306
Illinois	7,874	3,974	9,562	21,410
Indiana	4,803	3,021	3,082	10,909
Iowa	4,962	3,325	1,601	9,888
Kansas	5,037	3,315	1,113	9,465
Kentucky	3,734	2,836	1,307	7,877
Louisiana	2,987	2,098	1,540	6,625
Maine	1,732	1,170	564	3,466
Maryland	1,628	976	1,800	4,404
Massachusetts	2,615	655	6,649	9,919
Michigan	6,076	3,446	5,713	15,235
Minnesota	5,381	3,475	2,218	11,074
Mississippi	3,591	2,778	603	6,972
Missouri	5,922	3,803	3,168	12,893
Montana	4,041	2,589	309	6,939
Nebraska	3,982	2,635	787	7,404
Nevada	2,551	1,602	61	4,214
New Hampshire	975	609	478	2,062
New Jersey	2,546	868	5,558	8,972
New Mexico	3,229	2,096	259	5,584
New York	9,636	3,563	18,878	32,077
North Carolina	4,822	3,706	1,501	10,029
North Dakota	2,982	2,014	216	5,212
Ohio	7,026	3,881	7,581	18,488
Oklahoma	4,517	3,109	1,356	8,982
Oregon	3,315	2,121	815	6,251
Pennsylvania	8,172	4,396	10,574	23,142
Rhode Island	975	609	1,129	2,713
South Carolina	2,709	2,098	658	5,465
South Dakota	3,139	2,095	223	5,457
Tennessee	4,237	3,056	1,602	8,895
Texas	12,666	8,364	4,488	25,518
Utah	2,250	1,405	436	4,091
Vermont	975	609	187	1,771
Virginia	3,656	2,659	1,499	7,814
Washington	3,148	1,993	1,475	6,621
West Virginia	2,196	1,732	812	4,740
Wisconsin	4,814	3,057	2,669	10,540
Wyoming	2,488	1,583	134	4,205
Hawaii	975	609	395	1,980
District of Columbia	975	609	1,153	2,737
Puerto Rico	987	944	839	2,770
Reserved for administration and engineering	5,000	3,125	3,125	11,250
Total	200,000	125,000	125,000	450,000

NORTH DAKOTA SENATORIAL PRIMARY—NOTICE OF SPEECH BY SENATOR LANGER

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, on last Tuesday the senior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. NYE] made certain statements on the floor of the Senate. At that time I stated that I would reply within a short time. I now give notice that on next Tuesday, which I understand will be the first day the Senate will be in session after the recess, I expect to reply to his statements.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. BARKLEY. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GILLETTE in the chair) laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations in the Navy, which was referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. WALSH of New Jersey, from the Committee on Commerce:

Several employees of the Coast and Geodetic Survey to be junior hydrographic and geodetic engineers with rank of lieutenant (junior grade) in the Coast and Geodetic Survey.

By Mr. CLARK of Missouri, from the Committee on Commerce:

Theodore P. Wright, of the District of Columbia, to be Administrator of the Civil Aeronautics Administration, vice Charles I. Stanton, resigned.

By Mr. McKELLAR, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads:

Sundry postmasters.

RECORDER OF DEEDS FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA—REPORT

Mr. WALSH of New Jersey. Mr. President, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, I report favorably the nomination of Marshall L. Shepard to be Recorder of Deeds for the District of Columbia.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I do not know the parliamentary procedure in connection with a matter of this kind, but I wish to point out for the benefit of the Senate, first, that there has been no meeting of the Committee on the District of Columbia in connection with this nomination. For nearly 8 years I have been a member of that committee. Many times nominees of the President have appeared before either the full committee or a subcommittee, and committee members have had an opportunity to question them to determine their qualifications and their fitness. On other nominations the committee members have had at least a chance to look over their record. This is the first time, to my knowledge, that we have seen an attempt made to railroad through a nomination. It is plainly politics.

Mr. President, there has been no meeting of the committee in connection with this nomination, so I ask the distinguished Senator just how he makes a favorable report.

Mr. WALSH of New Jersey. Mr. President, I was officially delegated by the chairman of the Committee on the District of Columbia [Mr. BILBO] to report favorably this nomination, after he had polled the committee and received proxies from the majority of the members. Since the chairman wrote to me, I have been informed that the distinguished Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN] has also added his approval to the nomination.

I should also like to say that I do not believe that the Senator from Mississippi could possibly obtain a patent on his procedure in polling the committee. It certainly is not unique. Of course, the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire is much more familiar than I am with the rules, procedures, and policies of the Senate. However, in the few months I have been a Member of the Senate I have been polled a great many times in connection with bills and nominations. Again and again I have seen them reported after such a polling procedure was followed; and I think it would be unfortunate if we were to decide at this time to change the rules in connection with the nomination of Marshall Shepard.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President——

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I have the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire has the floor.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, in this connection let me say that the chairman of the committee made no attempt to call a meeting of the full committee. Neither did he, so far as I know, delegate to any member of the majority the authority to call a committee meeting. This nomination is being put through at this time for purely political purposes. The nominee is a Negro from Philadelphia, who has been appointed to this position in the District of Columbia.

To begin with, I believe that the position should go to a Negro from the District of Columbia. However, if we are to appoint someone from outside the District, from Pennsylvania or some other State, at least we should have an opportunity to pass upon his fitness and qualifications. The appointment should not be rammed down the throats of the people of the District of Columbia merely to help Roosevelt attempt to carry the Negro vote in some of the States. That is the plain issue. We cannot dodge it.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, I know nothing whatever about this nominee. Personally I recommended another man for the job. The vacancy was caused by the death of a constituent of mine from Missouri. I recommended another citizen of Missouri to fill the vacancy.

When the Senator from New Hampshire tears passion to tatters over the practice of polling Senate committees, he is perfectly within his rights under the rules, because the rules do not specifically authorize the polling of committees. However, it is a precedent which has been followed in the Senate for at least a hundred years.

Without any reference to this particular case, from the Committee on Commerce today I reported the nomination of an extremely important officer, the Administrator of Air Commerce, after a poll of the subcommittee. I had held the matter in abeyance for some time,

because of the absence of the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] who had asked that the matter be held up until he returned to the city.

Having talked to all other Senators on the subcommittee, and having authority to report directly to the Senate, when the Senator from Nevada today gave his approval of the nomination, I without hesitation reported it.

Now the Senator from New Hampshire is attempting to make a political issue of something which has been a Senate practice for over 100 years, namely, the practice of polling committees. I do not undertake to say whether it is right or wrong. I take the law as I find it. I have polled many committees of which I have been chairman, and at times among the membership of those committees the Senator from New Hampshire himself has been included. When it is easier to poll a committee than to assemble the committee, it has long been the practice of the Senate to obtain on the nomination report the initials or signatures of various members of the committee, and to take that as the ground for making the report.

I recall that when the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY] became chairman of the Committee on Commerce, he appointed a subcommittee headed by the present distinguished minority leader, the Senator from Maine [Mr. WHITE], and including the distinguished senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON], to formulate rules about the use of proxies. As I recall, they reported against the use of proxies. The Senator from Maine had long held that view. The matter was submitted to the full committee; and, with the exception of their votes, it was unanimously rejected.

I ask the Senator from Maine if that is not true?

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield to me, let me say that I think the Senator from Missouri has stated the situation with his customary accuracy. The practice has been one of long standing in the Senate. But I think it has become a more reprehensible practice with every passing year.

So far as my recollection goes, in the years during which I have been in the Senate I have never consented to be polled. I do not intend to be, as long as I am here. I do not like the practice or anything about it, and I am in sympathy with the criticism the Senator from New Hampshire makes of it.

I cannot help saying, although perhaps this is gratuitous, that I assume that action on the nomination is not in order at this time, if the report is now being made.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I yield.

Mr. KILGORE. I wish to call attention to the fact that I do not think the nomination of a single officer of general rank in the United States Army has been confirmed by the Senate within the past 3 years except following a poll of the Committee on Military Affairs or a subcommittee thereof. I do not remember a single meeting of the committee in which the committee passed on such matters with a full quorum present, or except by polling the committee.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I yield.

Mr. BRIDGES. The Senator from West Virginia is very much mistaken about that, or else he has not been in attendance at some of the meetings of the Committee on Military Affairs, because I recall, as other Members of the Senate who are now present will recall very well, occasions on which votes have been taken in the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I do not think any rule of the Senate has been violated in the present instance. The only observation I should like to make in this connection is that officials of the District of Columbia should, in my opinion, be from the District of Columbia. I never did like carpetbaggers, either in 1865 or in 1944. I care not whether the procedure be the present one, which I think is correct, or otherwise, I still think that the committees should pay some attention to the question whether the nominee is from the jurisdiction in which he is to serve. I take that view, regardless of the particular position involved. For instance, consider the judiciary. If the Committee on the Judiciary finds that a particular nominee does not come from the jurisdiction in which he is to serve, I want such a nomination rejected. My objection is, not to the procedure in this matter, but because of my belief that Washington is able to govern itself.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I gladly yield.

Mr. BRIDGES. I join the Senator from New Mexico insofar as his statement is concerned. I believe the nominees should be from the District of Columbia if they are to serve in the District of Columbia. A District of Columbia Negro should be appointed to this position.

I also point out that the only way citizens of the District of Columbia have a voice in their government——

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I should like to answer the Senator, if I may do so.

Mr. BRIDGES. Certainly.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Certainly.

Mr. CHAVEZ. The only difference between the Senator from New Hampshire and myself is that I do not object to the procedure taken in this particular instance.

Mr. BRIDGES. I object to both the procedure and the appointment.

Mr. President, let me say regarding the poll that, in the first place, no committee meeting was called by the chairman of the committee. In the second place, no endeavor was made to have any other majority member call a committee meeting. In the third place, not all the members of the committee were polled. Members who are now on the floor of the Senate were not even polled. They were not shown the courtesy of being polled.

If that is not a high-handed procedure a few weeks before the election, to get a political hack appointed register of wills for the District of Columbia, I do not know what is.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I am glad to yield.

Mr. HATCH. I may say to the Senator that I am not going to discuss the pending matter. I wish to mention another matter. I was very much interested in what the Senator from New Hampshire said about the nominations being purely political. Let me ask whether the Senator said "purely" or "poorly"?

Mr. BRIDGES. Perhaps I used the word incorrectly. Perhaps it would be better to say that it is simply a political nomination.

Mr. HATCH. In obtaining the floor, I did not desire to inject a partisan or political question into the present discussion. However, Mr. President, let me say, as in legislative session, that I observed the statements recently made at Valentine, Nebr., by the civilian candidate for President on the Republican ticket—a civilian, I repeat—who characterized civilian influence in the war effort as being something—shall I say—"damnable"? I accept the amendment of the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, what was the amendment? I should like to hear it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Missouri yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. WHERRY. I repeat, Mr. President, that I should like to hear the amendment.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I yield to anyone who desires to be heard.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri has the floor.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, as I said, I do not desire to inject a partisan note at this particular time.

I do wish to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD some observations, first, by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] commenting on Mr. Dewey's views on the demobilization plan.

Further, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD the script which I have before me at this moment by Mr. Martin Agronsky, discussing quite learnedly the views expressed by Mr. Dewey as to how he is going to—and at this very moment—interfere with the conduct of the war.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Now, Mr. President——

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for a brief observation?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, the Senator from New Hampshire has animadverted vigorously that the appointment of this outstanding Negro from Pennsylvania was made purely for

political reasons. Of course, I do not know how the Senator from New Hampshire arrived at such a conclusion. He certainly did not arrive at it because the nominee is not a citizen of the District of Columbia, because the distinguished recorder of deeds, Dr. Thompkins, who held the position for many years and recently died, was not a citizen of the District of Columbia. He was a citizen of the State of Missouri, and, if I correctly recall, of the city of Kansas City.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President——

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I do not wish to interrupt the Senator; but the Senator from New Hampshire has talked about this appointment being one only for a Negro who is a citizen of the District of Columbia. The Senator from Kentucky has been here a long time, as have I. Does he recall any recorder of deeds of the District of Columbia under any Republican administration who was ever appointed from the District of Columbia?

Mr. BARKLEY. I do not recall any such instance.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. There never has been such an instance. Furthermore, there is no partisan question that should arise over the appointment of a man outside the District of Columbia in any position, whether the position be that of United States marshal, recorder of deeds, or a member of the judiciary. I recall that under Republican administrations of Harding, Coolidge, and Hoover, judges were appointed in the District of Columbia who did not live here. I recall a distinguished former Member of the House of Representatives who died recently while still upon the bench. I refer to Judge Luhring, of the State of Indiana, who was not a citizen of the District of Columbia when he received his appointment.

He was appointed by a Republican President. There was no objection made to him, and no one said here that the appointment was made for political reasons. Time after time, under both Democratic and Republican administrations, appointments have been made to official positions in the District of Columbia of men who did not reside within the District of Columbia. There is no law against it. Congress has never required the President to make his selections from those residing in the District of Columbia.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I shall yield in just a moment. I am sure that appointments to District offices are made on the theory that the District of Columbia does not belong merely to the people of the District of Columbia, but that the District is the National Capital. Every citizen of America is interested in it, and has a share in the Capital foundation. I imagine that for that reason the Congress has never seen fit to bar citizens of other States from receiving appointments to positions in the District of Columbia, and I doubt whether it ever will.

I now yield to the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. BRIDGES. I should like to ask the Senator from Kentucky whether he thinks that President Roosevelt made this particular appointment for a particular purpose.

Mr. BARKLEY. I think he made this particular appointment because it has been recognized from time immemorial that the position was one which could be fittingly filled, and the duties of the position be performed, by a member of the Negro race, and that the present nominee has all the qualifications necessary for the position. I am quite certain that the President did not appoint Dr. Shepard for any political reason, any more than that the Senator from New Hampshire has raised the question for reasons of political partisanship and in order to inject into the situation the question of the political equation.

Regarding the polling of committees, of course we all know that it has been done not only with regard to nominations, but with regard to proposed legislation. We all know the difficulty of obtaining a quorum of a committee at a juncture in the Senate proceedings such as the present, when we can assemble only a bare quorum of the Senate, and have to resort to every parliamentary device in order to preserve a quorum. Always under such circumstances Democrats or Republicans, whichever party is in the majority, undertake to obtain action on nominations. After all, the test is whether a majority of the committee approves the nomination. If the committee meets formally and approves the nomination, that is one thing. If the committee members are unable to meet and are willing to approve the nomination by being polled, as we say, that is another thing, like obtaining a majority consent of the committee to make a report. The rule itself does not specifically designate that as one of the methods by which nominations may be approved by committees, but long and universal custom has made it as much a part of Senate practice as any of the customs and practices which have been followed through the years, more or less by unanimous consent.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. I have no disposition to further question the validity of the report made by the Senator from New Jersey, but I do not admit it to be properly authorized. The Senator from Missouri has stated that the practice has been a long-established one.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. The Senator does not question that, does he?

Mr. WHITE. The Senator has said that it has been long established in connection with nominations and legislation coming to this body by polling the members of a committee.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. The Senator does not question that fact, does he?

Mr. WHITE. I believe that the Senator is correct. It has been done for many years. The difficulty with the situation is that it is a habit which is growing in this body, and it has come to the point that in a committee the committee chairman can almost dispense at will with the presence of a majority of the committee members, and resort to this method to which reference has been made.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, I do not wish to interrupt the Senator from Maine. I know that the opinion he has expressed is the true opinion which he holds with regard to the situation. But the assertion of the Senator from New Hampshire that this particular report of the nomination is entirely outside the ordinary practice of the Senate, and that it has been made for political purposes, is one with which I know the Senator from Maine, with his great honesty, would not aline himself.

Mr. WHITE. I have no knowledge of what led up to this nomination. I think that the practice to which I have referred is a reprehensible one, and should be curtailed and limited except in most extreme circumstances. We cannot find in the written rules of the Senate, we cannot find in any precedents of the Senate, where the question has been raised, and we cannot find in parliamentary law any authority for counting as present in a committee a member who is not physically present. We cannot find authority for voting a Member who was not present at a committee, when some matter was before the committee and subject to determination by a vote.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. The Senator knows that such things are done every day in committee, does he not?

Mr. WHITE. That happens so frequently that I am protesting against it. It is a thoroughly bad practice. I do not assume that it will be stopped except by a rule of the Senate, but I think that we should limit it in every possible way.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I yield.

Mr. KILGORE. I wish to agree with the minority leader. I vigorously protested against the system for many years. I do not think we should make fish of one and fowl of another. I think we should serve notice that we are going to change the custom. I think the notice should be served in advance and not after the nomination has been reported to the Senate.

Mr. WALSH of New Jersey. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I yield.

Mr. WALSH of New Jersey. I had not expected a debate on the pending nomination until the appointee's name appeared on the calendar, after lying over for a day or two. But since the nomination has disturbed the Senator from New Hampshire because the President's nominee was not personally interviewed by members of the committee, and because the Senator from New Hampshire has referred to Marshall Shepard as a political "hack," I should like to make it clear at this point that apparently he had to take a recess at times from his "hacking" as shown by a few facts I have discovered regarding him.

Mr. President, this man was educated in the public schools of Oxford, N. C.; Winston-Salem Teachers College, Winston-Salem, N. C.; Virginia Union University, Richmond, Va.; Temple University, Philadelphia, Pa. He did graduate work at Pendle Hill, Quaker Graduate Center, Wallingford, Pa.

He was religious-work secretary of the West One Hundred and Thirty-fifth Street Branch Y. M. C. A., New York.

He was assistant pastor of the Abyssinian Baptist Church, New York, N. Y.

He has been since 1926 minister of the Mt. Olivet Tabernacle Baptist Church, Philadelphia, Pa.

He was assistant secretary of the National Baptist Convention, Inc.; chairman, Foreign Mission Board, National Baptist Convention, Inc.

He served three terms as member of the Pennsylvania State Legislature, and was chairman of Committee on Congressional and Legislative Apportionment.

He was assistant to the Treasurer of the city of Philadelphia, a rather eminent man, as I recall, Dr. Luther A. Harr.

He was recipient of the Meritorious Service Medal of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, cited by Gov. George H. Earle, January 14, 1939.

Mr. President, that is a rather impressive career of political hacking.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator from Missouri yield?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. In just a moment. I have had the floor for some time, and I have yielded to every Senator who desired to interrupt, but I am getting tired of it, and I wish to make a few brief remarks. Then I shall be glad to yield to any Senator who desires to take the floor.

I took the floor in this matter merely because of the charge of the Senator from New Hampshire that a very unusual proceeding was being resorted to in this matter by polling the committee, that that was a very unusual proceeding, an attempt to railroad something in behalf of the ticket of Roosevelt and Truman. I took the floor merely with the idea of exploding that theory, which I think I very effectively did.

Then other Senators asked me to yield to them, and in the course of the debate the Senator from New Hampshire suggested that the Office of Recorder of Deeds was one which belonged as a matter of right to some Negro from the District of Columbia. Of course, as a matter of fact it does not belong to a Negro from the District of Columbia, any more than it does to any other citizen of the District of Columbia. The only way in which it could be said to belong to a Negro was that it was one of the two offices which from time immemorial have been set up as symbols, as belonging not to Negroes of the District of Columbia, but belonging to the Negroes of the United States. That was a policy established by the Republican Party, the Senator's own party, when it was in power.

There is no particular reason for saying that the Register of the Treasury should be a Negro, certainly not a Negro from the District of Columbia, but it was a symbol set up to the Negroes of the United States, and very properly, as an office they could hold.

I remember very well when I was a boy being at the White House attending a reception, and I saw a very large and very black colored man, in a dress suit, standing in line. I said to my father, "Who is that, dad?" He said, "Have you a dollar bill in your pocket?" I took one out and he said, "Look at the signature on the lower left-hand corner." That signature was "William T. Vernon." He said, "That man is William T. Vernon."

William T. Vernon was not from the District of Columbia, and I challenge the Senator from New Hampshire now, when he says that the office of Recorder of Deeds belongs to a native of the District of Columbia, to name a single Negro from the District of Columbia his party ever appointed to this office.

Mr. BRIDGES. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I am glad to yield.

Mr. BRIDGES. I think the Senator misinterpreted what I said. I said that it should go to a Negro from the District of Columbia.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. When the Senator's party was in power for so many years, did it ever go to a Negro from the District?

Mr. BRIDGES. When my party does come into power, it will.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. That will be a long time.

Mr. BRIDGES. No; I think it will be on January 20 next.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. It will be a long, long time from now. The Senator cannot tell me of a single instance when the Republican Party was in power—and he says this office belongs as a matter of right to a Negro from the District of Columbia—when a Negro from the District of Columbia was appointed to the office.

Mr. BRIDGES. I cannot at this time, because I have not checked it one way or the other.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. The Senator can check it for 2 weeks, and report at any time he desires.

Mr. BRIDGES. I certainly shall; but let me say again that I still think that the man should come from the District of Columbia. He should be a resident here.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. As a matter of fact, neither the Democratic Party nor the Republican Party has ever appointed a resident of the District of Columbia to that particular office, for the reason that both parties have regarded it, not as a local appointment, but as a symbol of recognition of a great race.

Mr. BRIDGES. Does the Senator believe that a simple district appointment in the District of Columbia is a great national office, or is it an office in the District of Columbia?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I think that it has been considered by both parties heretofore as a national office. It might very well be that there should be a change in the policy of both parties, but I say it has been considered for more years than either of us is old as a symbol of national recognition of a great race. That has been the rule, which has been followed by the Senator's party and by my party.

I do not know this appointee, I never heard of him, but I resent the Senator undertaking to make it appear that there has been a change in senatorial procedure in the matter of reporting the nomination. I myself have taken the Senator's poll on nominations.

Mr. BRIDGES. I should not have given it to the Senator, I now know.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I think the Senator did well to give it to me, because I never misled him. But for the Senator to come in at this late hour and try to make it appear that there was any diversion from ordinary senatorial practice in the method of polling the committee, or make it appear that it was unusual to appoint someone from outside the District of Columbia, is unworthy of the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I do not wish to leave the floor this afternoon without making my position clear on the particular matter now before the Senate. I have no objection whatsoever to the procedure taken by the committee. I believe that the assertion made by the Senator from New Hampshire that the appointment might have been political was rather unfortunate. Of course, I am not doubting his sincerity of purpose. The point I am trying to make, as stated by the Senator from Missouri, is that the practice of appointing outsiders to positions in the District of Columbia has been carried out by Democrats and Republicans. I do not care how long they have done it, I still think it is wrong. I know that the Republicans have done that very thing, and I know that the Democrats have selected from States persons who could not be elected constable in their home town and made them officials of the District of Columbia. I know that the Republicans have done the same thing, and I am not complaining of their authority to do it and I am not complaining of the authority exercised in this particular appointment. Under the practice, it was correctly made. In my opinion, under the system which prevails in the Senate, the procedure taken to report the nomination was correct. The point I am trying to make is that Republicans and Democrats have gone outside the District of Columbia to select for positions in the District persons who in their own States or precincts could not occupy a position of trust, which is a wrong practice. I know that such has been the system, Mr. President. I know that similar actions have previously been taken under that system.

I am not objecting to Dr. Shepard. Personally I shall vote for the confirmation of his nomination. What I object to is the nominating of men from other States to serve in the District of Columbia, just as I would object to the nomination for service in the State of New Mexico of individuals from other States.

The District of Columbia has grown. Under our system of government, under our theory of self-rule it is about time that we do away with the practice of going to New York or Kentucky or Massachusetts or Iowa and there selecting justices to serve in the District of Columbia. The District of Columbia still has a pretty good bar. If the District did not have a good bar it would not deserve to have a justice appointed from the District.

I repeat, I am not objecting to Dr. Shepard; I shall vote for the confirmation of his nomination; but I object to the system which is now prevailing. Why load a man from Missouri onto

the District of Columbia? If he is a good man and suitable for a job in the District of Columbia he is also suitable for a job in the State of Missouri. Why load a man from Massachusetts onto the District of Columbia? Why not appoint him to a position in the State of Massachusetts? The same is true with respect to an individual from Iowa. Why bring him to the District of Columbia? That is the point I wish to make and I leave it to the consideration of the Members of the Senate.

PERSONS EMPLOYED BY COMMITTEES WHO ARE NOT FULL-TIME SENATE OR COMMITTEE EMPLOYEES

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that as reports come in monthly from the different Senate committees, either special or standing, about the number of employees who are carried on part time, or are detailed from governmental organizations, they be printed in the body of the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TUNNELL in the chair). The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] has asked unanimous consent, as in legislative session, that in the future when there are reports submitted under Senate Resolution 319 they be printed in the RECORD.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I make the point of order that that request is not proper in executive session.

Mr. BARKLEY. I wish to find out what the resolution is. What is the resolution?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution calls for a report on part-time employees of committees.

Mr. BARKLEY. Of Senate committees?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Of Senate committees.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, I have no particular objection to the request, but it seems to me it ought not to be submitted in executive session.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator from Nebraska asked that, as in legislative session, his request might be acted upon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The clerk will state the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

THE ARMY

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Army.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask that the nominations in the Army be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations are confirmed en bloc.

THE NAVY

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Navy.

Mr. BARKLEY. I make the same request with respect to the nominations in the Navy.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations in the Navy are confirmed en bloc.

That concludes the Executive Calendar.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask that the President be immediately notified of all nominations this day confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be so notified.

REPORT ON PART-TIME EMPLOYEES OF SENATE COMMITTEES

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I have no objection to the request made by the Senator from Nebraska. He made the request as in legislative session. I have no objection to the printing of these reports. I hope the Senator from Missouri will not continue his objection.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I have no objection to the printing of the reports, Mr. President, but I do not think it is in place to inject such a request into the business of an executive session. For that reason I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. BARKLEY. Frequently requests are made when we are in executive session that something be done as in legislative session.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, as chairman of the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys I have been a little bit disturbed concerning the request of the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], because I did not know how to make the report. So I think now that as chairman of that committee I shall make a report. We have no outside employees, part-time employed or otherwise utilized, in that committee. Is that a sufficient report?

Mr. BRIDGES. I think that is very satisfactory, and I hope the Senator will keep that record clean.

Mr. HATCH. No, no, I object to the remark "clean," because I think these employees from the executive departments render very efficient and useful service, and I do not like to have them smirched.

Mr. BRIDGES. I am not smirching them. When I say "clean" I refer to the committee being free of further employees.

Mr. HATCH. Well, anyway the answer is "No" to any question the Senator from New Hampshire asks.

RECESS TO TUESDAY

Mr. BARKLEY. As in legislative session, I move that the Senate take a recess until next Tuesday at 12 o'clock noon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 5 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until Tuesday, September 19, 1944, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate September 15 (legislative day of September 1), 1944:

PROMOTIONS IN THE NAVY

The following-named officers of the Naval Reserve to be lieutenants (junior grade) in the Navy, to rank from the date stated opposite their names:

Chester P. Smith, October 1, 1939.
Bruce S. Weber, October 1, 1940.
Herbert N. Houck, November 1, 1940.
William F. Dawson, December 1, 1940.
John P. Conn, Jr., December 1, 1940.
John L. Elwell, January 1, 1941.
Charles H. Crabill, Jr., August 1, 1941.
Lee W. Mather, November 1, 1941.
Dennis M. Szabo, November 1, 1941.
William W. Soverel, December 1, 1941.
Donald F. White, January 1, 1942.
Laurens A. Whitney, January 1, 1942.
George E. Chalmers, January 1, 1942.
Lester E. Hubbell, June 1, 1942.

The following-named officers of the Naval Reserve to be ensigns in the Navy, to rank from the date stated opposite their names:

Guy N. Cagle, Jr., August 1, 1939.
Martin P. MacNair, September 1, 1939.
Edgar F. Hazleton, Jr., October 20, 1939.
Ross C. Barney, October 20, 1939.
Arthur L. Jacobson, November 1, 1939.
Edward W. Bergstrom, November 20, 1939.
Walter E. Clarke, November 20, 1939.
Nelson E. Harris, November 20, 1939.
Lester E. Geer, November 20, 1939.
William P. Tanner, Jr., April 1, 1940.
Willard R. Kaufman, April 15, 1940.
Robert L. Donley, April 15, 1940.
August A. Barthes, April 15, 1940.
Barton F. Jones, June 7, 1940.
Stanley R. Stanul, June 7, 1940.
Robert W. Savage, July 1, 1940.
William C. Rivers, August 10, 1940.
Claude R. Phillips, Jr., September 1, 1940.
Robert McD. Nelson, October 21, 1940.
Joseph F. Dorrington, November 1, 1940.
Frederick W. Snyder, November 1, 1940.
Chester V. Zalewski, November 25, 1940.
Robert J. Perkinson, December 3, 1940.
Fred H. Mamer, January 6, 1941.
Guy D. Mulford, January 6, 1941.
Odin H. MacPhee, January 20, 1941.
Ira Dye, January 27, 1941.
Joe C. Davis, February 10, 1941.
James P. English, Jr., February 10, 1941.
Benjamin E. Hood, February 10, 1941.
Maxwell "D" McDonald, February 10, 1941.
John B. Stahl, February 10, 1941.
Ernest M. Beauchamp, February 14, 1941.
Irving Kahn, February 14, 1941.
Donald LaG. Jackson, February 24, 1941.
Lloyd E. Sloan, February 24, 1941.
Robert L. Abbott, March 16, 1941.
Joseph O. Buchanan, Jr., March 16, 1941.
John A. Goodwin, March 16, 1941.
Harold J. Kicker, March 16, 1941.
Donald J. Rankin, March 16, 1941.
Robert K. Campbell, April 3, 1941.
Clement J. Cassidy, April 3, 1941.
Vincent A. Dahlstrom, April 3, 1941.
Harold H. Denery, April 3, 1941.
Van V. Eason, Jr., April 3, 1941.
Albert O. Morton, April 3, 1941.
Harry F. Stanford, April 3, 1941.
Donald S. Chay, April 10, 1941.
Anthony J. Denman, April 10, 1941.
Melvin E. Hirschi, April 10, 1941.
Robert C. Mayo, April 10, 1941.
Herbert M. Dowsett, Jr., April 21, 1941.
Arthur E. Lundgren, May 1, 1941.
Morris E. Haller, May 5, 1941.
Edward McM. Hollister, May 5, 1941.
Harvey Larson, May 5, 1941.
Roger F. Noyes, May 5, 1941.
Maurice M. Stone, May 5, 1941.
Harry Wood, May 5, 1941.
John F. Curran, May 12, 1941.
Halsey Hines, May 12, 1941.
Will "H" Kilgore, May 12, 1941.
Laurence A. Lauratis, May 12, 1941.
James E. Little, May 12, 1941.
William L. Perry, May 12, 1941.
Edgar J. Rook, Jr., May 12, 1941.
Carlton E. Soderholm, May 12, 1941.
Alexander W. Belikow, May 24, 1941.
Halbert K. Evans, May 24, 1941.
Leo F. Frick, May 24, 1941.
Lewis R. Hardy, Jr., May 24, 1941.
Edward B. Johnson, Jr., May 24, 1941.
John E. White, Jr., May 24, 1941.
Verne E. Geissinger, May 31, 1941.
Herbert H. Hassenfratz, May 31, 1941.
Donald E. Weissenborn, May 31, 1941.
Henry B. Bassett, June 3, 1941.
Gordon B. Bjornson, June 3, 1941.
Lewis W. Chick, June 3, 1941.
Fred C. Hamilton, June 3, 1941.
Jefferson Kennedy, Jr., June 3, 1941.
Gerald V. Knudson, June 3, 1941.
Ivan L. Swope, June 3, 1941.

Ralph B. Varner, June 3, 1941.
Clifford M. Whitmore, June 3, 1941.
Thomas J. Ball, June 6, 1941.
Harry M. Cocowitch, June 6, 1941.
Milton R. Dahl, June 6, 1941.
Clark H. Gates, June 6, 1941.
Cleland S. Hattaway, June 6, 1941.
James N. Howell, Jr., June 6, 1941.
Ernest J. Knoche, June 6, 1941.
Donald G. Miller, June 6, 1941.
John N. Phelps, June 6, 1941.
James R. Wilson, June 6, 1941.
Clayton E. Fisher, June 21, 1941.
John Magda, June 21, 1941.
William A. Matthews, Jr., June 21, 1941.
George W. Maxwell, Jr., June 21, 1941.
Albert Miller, Jr., June 21, 1941.
John R. Stewart, June 21, 1941.
Herbert E. Thayer, June 21, 1941.
David J. Walkinshaw, June 21, 1941.
Robert W. Dickinson, June 28, 1941.
Harold W. Johnston, July 7, 1941.
George H. Goldsmith, July 16, 1941.
George A. Griffith, Jr., July 16, 1941.
Wilbur K. Karter, July 16, 1941.
Russell P. Lecklider, July 16, 1941.
Robert J. Monahan, July 16, 1941.
Harry J. Mueller, July 16, 1941.
Robert E. Rau, July 16, 1941.
Allard G. Russell, July 16, 1941.
Robert W. Calland, August 4, 1941.
John W. Carter, August 4, 1941.
Gordon G. Brady, August 4, 1941.
Sidney A. Brown, August 4, 1941.
Jack A. Miller, August 4, 1941.
Jack R. Penfold, August 4, 1941.
Theodore C. Schaible, August 4, 1941.
Thomas H. Abbott, August 18, 1941.
Stanley M. Arnold, August 18, 1941.
John W. Crowe, August 18, 1941.
George H. Earle, IV, August 18, 1941.
Lewis A. Hopkins, August 18, 1941.
Arthur E. Linder, August 18, 1941.
Thomas W. Ramsay, August 18, 1941.
Thomas J. Rennemo, August 18, 1941.
Millard C. Thrash, August 18, 1941.
Neil S. Weary, August 18, 1941.
Robert B. Russell, August 29, 1941.
Paul L. Holmes, August 30, 1941.
Kenneth J. Mathis, August 30, 1941.
Dewey A. Ostrom, August 30, 1941.
John F. Richey, August 30, 1941.
Eldor E. Rodenburg, August 30, 1941.
Harold W. Schwerdt, August 30, 1941.
Richard F. Wolfe, August 30, 1941.
Loraine S. Adams, September 6, 1941.
Waldo W. Clark, Jr., September 6, 1941.
Claude A. Crow, Jr., September 6, 1941.
Roy M. Gunsolus, September 6, 1941.
Robert A. Mayo, September 6, 1941.
John D. Petersen, September 6, 1941.
John F. J. Stinson, September 6, 1941.
John M. Wesolowski, September 6, 1941.
Earl F. Wright, Jr., September 6, 1941.
Burton F. J. Albrecht, September 10, 1941.
Romane C. Anderson, September 10, 1941.
William H. Cullin, September 10, 1941.
George M. Davidson, September 10, 1941.
Robert E. Dimmitt, September 10, 1941.
Sidney Engelhardt, September 10, 1941.
Robert B. Fellmeth, September 10, 1941.
Hugh A. Kelley, September 10, 1941.
Andrew J. Kelly, September 10, 1941.
Theodore E. Maurer, September 10, 1941.
Robert P. McDonald, September 10, 1941.
Arthur N. Melhuse, September 10, 1941.
Claude O. Roberts, September 10, 1941.
Robert E. Smith, September 10, 1941.
Warren E. Spradling, September 10, 1941.
Samuel Stoddard, September 10, 1941.
Sid W. Shelton, September 22, 1941.
William D. Biggers, October 8, 1941.
Robert B. Blodgett, October 8, 1941.
James L. Daily, October 8, 1941.
Albert K. Earnest, October 8, 1941.
Walter L. Fisher, October 8, 1941.
Claude R. Frazier, October 8, 1941.
Tobias Funt, October 8, 1941.
Harlan I. Gustafson, October 8, 1941.
Laurence L. Hamrick, October 8, 1941.
John B. Jorgensen, October 8, 1941.
John A. LaPay, October 8, 1941.
John W. Mason, Jr., October 8, 1941.
Donald R. Newby, October 8, 1941.
Richard H. Shireman, Jr., October 8, 1941.
Harold C. Stirling, October 8, 1941.
John D. Carter, Jr., October 10, 1941.
Willard D. Dietz, October 10, 1941.
Don G. Douglas, Jr., October 10, 1941.
Lawrence E. Flint, Jr., October 10, 1941.
Gaylord T. Forrest, October 10, 1941.
Matthew R. Gromada, October 10, 1941.
Robert J. Hunt, October 10, 1941.
Cecil D. Kephart, October 10, 1941.
Rodger R. H. Lade, October 10, 1941.
James F. Oliver, October 10, 1941.
Nelson Puett, Jr., October 10, 1941.
Marvin L. Ramsey, October 10, 1941.
Lawrence H. Reagan, October 10, 1941.
Claredon H. Sigley, October 10, 1941.
Arthur E. Simmons, October 10, 1941.
Frank E. Standring, October 10, 1941.
Charles S. Tanner, October 10, 1941.
Charles C. Aikins, October 14, 1941.
William D. Baird, October 14, 1941.
Martin D. Carmody, October 14, 1941.
Charles R. Ellwood, October 14, 1941.
Winfield S. Munro, Jr., October 14, 1941.
Glenn M. Revel, October 14, 1941.
Gordon M. Riddick, October 14, 1941.
Robert L. Thienes, October 14, 1941.
Francis X. Timmes, October 14, 1941.
Gaines B. Turner, October 14, 1941.
Wayne T. Wilcox, Jr., October 14, 1941.
Edward W. Austermuehle, Jr., October 16, 1941.
Edward S. Buchanan, October 16, 1941.
Maurice A. Coleman, October 16, 1941.
Paul D. Culver, October 16, 1941.
Archibald W. Curtis, October 16, 1941.
Hugh R. Everett, October 16, 1941.
LeRoy B. Fraser, Jr., October 16, 1941.
Ronald P. Gift, October 16, 1941.
Eugene R. Hanson, October 16, 1941.
William F. Krantz, October 16, 1941.
Donald F. Rader, October 16, 1941.
Eugene W. Seitz, October 16, 1941.
Joseph E. Sheehan, October 16, 1941.
Robert R. Sparks, October 16, 1941.
Robert R. Stoinoff, October 16, 1941.
Robert J. Baxter, November 14, 1941.
Edward A. Arnold, Jr., December 16, 1941.
Norman E. Berg, December 16, 1941.
Ray C. Boswell, December 16, 1941.
Jack A. Derby, December 16, 1941.
Hugh M. Hall, December 16, 1941.
Richard P. Howe, December 16, 1941.
Charles W. Hubbell, December 16, 1941.
William M. Knight, December 16, 1941.
Wade W. Lape, December 16, 1941.
Warren L. McNett, December 16, 1941.
Frank P. Morrison, December 16, 1941.
William H. Neal 3d, December 16, 1941.
Robert D. Oakley, Jr., December 16, 1941.
Thomas H. Ragsdale, December 16, 1941.
Herbert C. Rand, December 16, 1941.
Armistead B. Smith, Jr., December 16, 1941.
Harry E. Sorenson, December 16, 1941.
Gustave "A" Sundquist, Jr., December 16, 1941.
Jon E. Thomas, December 16, 1941.
Charles A. Turner, December 16, 1941.
Edward M. Volz, December 16, 1941.
Roy M. Voris, December 16, 1941.
Millard J. Wooley, December 16, 1941.
Robert L. Ashcraft, January 9, 1942.
Roy B. Dalton, January 9, 1942.
Thomas C. Deans, January 9, 1942.
Norman W. Dunzweiler, January 9, 1942.
Robert L. Gates, January 9, 1942.
John W. Hetherington, January 9, 1942.
Travis L. Imus, January 9, 1942.
Randall E. Larson, January 9, 1942.
Grange B. McKinney, January 9, 1942.
Arthur D. Nicholson, January 9, 1942.
Wayne D. Robinson, January 9, 1942.
Paul Schenk, Jr., January 9, 1942.
Roy H. Tabeling, Jr., January 9, 1942.
John G. Thompson, January 9, 1942.
Robert M. Westfall, January 9, 1942.
Maurice N. Wickendoll, January 9, 1942.
Berton H. Hickman, January 15, 1942.
Thomas H. York, January 15, 1942.
Lawrence W. Bunce, February 7, 1942.
Harry P. Carten, February 7, 1942.
Andrew B. Conner, Jr., February 7, 1942.
William A. Jernigan, Jr., February 7, 1942.
Floyd F. Reck, February 7, 1942.
Roy E. Reed, February 7, 1942.
Leonard Robinson, February 7, 1942.
Vance A. Schweitzer, February 7, 1942.
Hugh W. Shelden, February 7, 1942.
Byron G. Shepple, February 7, 1942.
Hubert L. Worrell, February 7, 1942.
Albert Yoxall, February 7, 1942.
John G. Baker, Jr., February 9, 1942.
William J. Bonneau, February 9, 1942.
Russell F. Craig, February 9, 1942.
Darold W. Davis, February 9, 1942.
Roger W. Erskine, February 9, 1942.
Richard A. Haase, February 9, 1942.
Eugene R. Hall, February 9, 1942.
Marvin B. Harper, February 9, 1942.
Benjamin K. Harrison, February 9, 1942.
Hamilton McWhorter 3d, February 9, 1942.
Grady L. Mullins, February 9, 1942.
Robert J. Ney, February 9, 1942.
Wallace J. Ottomeyer, February 9, 1942.
Willis Parker, Jr., February 9, 1942.
John W. Ramsey, February 9, 1942.
Dixon B. Rice, February 9, 1942.
Lewis B. Sanders, February 9, 1942.
James F. Sands, February 9, 1942.
William C. Smith, February 9, 1942.
Allan M. Trankley, February 9, 1942.
Conrad G. Welling, February 9, 1942.
William A. James, March 12, 1942.
James K. Alleman, March 12, 1942.
Douglas "M" Birdsall, March 12, 1942.
Harold W. Borer, March 12, 1942.
Ferdinand L. Brand, March 12, 1942.
Alfred E. Brown, March 12, 1942.
Jules M. Busker, March 12, 1942.
Richard D. Chamberlain, March 12, 1942.
Edwin C. Ensley, March 12, 1942.
Marvin J. Franger, March 12, 1942.
Ralph W. Hart, Jr., March 12, 1942.
William K. Keller, March 12, 1942.
Herbert V. Ladley, March 12, 1942.
Louis A. Menard, Jr., March 12, 1942.
Francis G. Mulvihill, March 12, 1942.
Harry S. Rodgers, March 12, 1942.
Robert L. White, March 12, 1942.
Edward H. Bagley, Jr., March 14, 1942.
James F. Carroll, March 14, 1942.
George L. Cassell, March 14, 1942.
Harry J. Dobbs, March 14, 1942.
James T. Dungan, March 14, 1942.
Frank C. Hearrell, Jr., March 14, 1942.
Ralph E. Hoskins, March 14, 1942.
Lloyd H. Johnson, March 14, 1942.
Samuel L. Lanier, March 14, 1942.
Albert H. Magie, Jr., March 14, 1942.
George W. McDonald, March 14, 1942.
Robert G. Nester, March 14, 1942.
Paul S. Ravey, March 14, 1942.
Ben Sparks, Jr., March 14, 1942.
James E. Toliver, March 14, 1942.
Robert T. Tolleson, March 14, 1942.
James O. Weimer, March 14, 1942.
Paul Wolcott, Jr., March 14, 1942.
Lawrence R. Yarnell, March 14, 1942.
Earle B. Abrams, March 17, 1942.
Harry E. Butterfield, Jr., March 17, 1942.
Elmer W. Dailey, Jr., March 17, 1942.
George E. Ford, March 17, 1942.
John C. McCollum, Jr., March 17, 1942.
Lavern M. Nelsen, March 17, 1942.
James W. Shaw, March 17, 1942.
James H. Stephens, March 17, 1942.
Thomas F. Tavernetti, Jr., March 17, 1942.
Micajah R. Wyatt, March 17, 1942.
Malvern H. Bell, March 25, 1942.
John L. Burge, March 25, 1942.
William T. Cain, March 25, 1942.
Edward L. Graham, March 25, 1942.
Thomas L. Hine, March 25, 1942.
William H. Huff, March 25, 1942.
Carl S. Johansen, March 25, 1942.
Berendt E. Johnson, Jr., March 25, 1942.
John Magee, March 25, 1942.
Edward H. Potter, Jr., March 25, 1942.
Kenneth T. Sanders, March 25, 1942.
Glenn E. Simmons, March 25, 1942.

James J. Stevens, March 25, 1942.
Christian G. Timmins, March 25, 1942.
James H. Todd, March 25, 1942.
Roy Anderson, April 3, 1942.
Burton L. Bardeen, April 3, 1942.
Kilmer S. Bortz, April 3, 1942.
James S. Brown, April 3, 1942.
Stanley H. Castleton, April 3, 1942.
Richard L. Cormier, April 3, 1942.
Nelson W. Dayhoff, April 3, 1942.
Frank T. Donahoe, Jr., April 3, 1942.
Mark T. Essling, April 3, 1942.
Paul Haas, Jr., April 3, 1942.
Robert S. Hardwick, April 3, 1942.
William T. Henderson, April 3, 1942.
Merle M. Hershey, April 3, 1942.
Terry H. Holberton, April 3, 1942.
Fred W. Holcomb, Jr., April 3, 1942.
Robert C. Hopping, April 3, 1942.
Charles H. Jaep 3d, April 3, 1942.
James M. Johnson, April 3, 1942.
Arthur L. Leppert, April 3, 1942.
Walter G. Maerki, April 3, 1942.
Charles N. McCauley, April 3, 1942.
Otis E. McCutcheon, April 3, 1942.
Harold R. Megrew, April 3, 1942.
William H. B. Millar, April 3, 1942.
Edward M. Peck, April 3, 1942.
Thomas W. Reilly, April 3, 1942.
Carl Santti, April 3, 1942.
Frederick G. Tyler, April 3, 1942.
Edward B. Webb, April 3, 1942.
Edward J. Winter, April 3, 1942.
Peter I. Culbertson, April 17, 1942.
Patrick Doyle, April 17, 1942.
George Center, April 23, 1942.
Richard V. Donahue, April 23, 1942.
Robert N. Flath, April 23, 1942.
George H. Fuller, April 23, 1942.
Robert C. Hoffman, April 23, 1942.
Kenneth J. Mackie, April 23, 1942.
Paul H. McGinnis, April 23, 1942.
George "L" Musick, Jr., April 23, 1942.
William T. Shelton, April 23, 1942.
Harold C. Skinner, April 23, 1942.
James S. Swope, April 23, 1942.
Edward Van Vranken, April 23, 1942.
Alton P. Adams, May 1, 1942.
Jacob O. Bach, May 1, 1942.
John B. Barcalow, May 1, 1942.
John A. Cork, Jr., May 1, 1942.
Frederick A. Graber, Jr., May 1, 1942.
Glenn "A" Hansen, May 1, 1942.
Floyd L. Harris, May 1, 1942.
John C. Hart, May 1, 1942.
Lloyd P. Heinzen, May 1, 1942.
Charles W. Johnson, May 1, 1942.
Robert W. Koberg, May 1, 1942.
William J. Marshall, May 1, 1942.
Herbert W. Pickering, May 1, 1942.
Arthur P. Pomatti, May 1, 1942.
John R. Rutledge, May 1, 1942.
Robert B. Toof, May 1, 1942.
Thomas "J" Whitlow, May 1, 1942.
Robert G. Wissman, May 1, 1942.
Robert M. Witmer, May 1, 1942.
Benjamin H. Browning, May 15, 1942.
Frank L. Danowski, May 15, 1942.
Harry S. Holt, May 15, 1942.
Denman W. Knight, May 15, 1942.
William R. Kreitzer, May 15, 1942.
Charles T. Larsen, May 15, 1942.
Samuel L. Morton, May 15, 1942.
Charles C. Sanders, May 15, 1942.
William J. Slone, May 15, 1942.
Warren E. Westrup, May 15, 1942.
William H. Armstrong, May 22, 1942.
Howard J. Boydstun, May 22, 1942.
George Flanagan, May 22, 1942.
Richard F. Fletcher, May 22, 1942.
Philip E. Golden, May 22, 1942.
John "T" Griffith, May 22, 1942.
Robert A. Hobbs, May 22, 1942.
John M. Kistler, May 22, 1942.
James W. Lamm, May 22, 1942.
Edward LeR. Miller, May 22, 1942.
Arthur E. Mix, May 22, 1942.
Michael J. Onofrio, May 22, 1942.
James W. Perkins, May 22, 1942.
Hubert P. Prather, May 22, 1942.
Kay P. Rehnberg, Jr., May 22, 1942.
Erwin J. Wagner, May 22, 1942.
William S. Webster, Jr., May 22, 1942.
Eugene Pridonoff, May 25, 1942.
James E. Wright, May 27, 1942.
John H. Henderson, June 8, 1942.
Henry L. Basler, Jr., June 8, 1942.
Roger W. Becker, June 8, 1942.
Roger A. Bisbee, June 8, 1942.
Charles F. Blakslee, Jr., June 8, 1942.
Richard F. Cyr, June 8, 1942.
Raymond J. DeVito, June 8, 1942.
Frank Larsen, June 8, 1942.
Paul E. McNamara, June 8, 1942.
John P. Propis, June 8, 1942.
George F. Rodgers, June 8, 1942.
Harry G. Sharp, Jr., June 8, 1942.
Robert E. Warner, June 8, 1942.
Harold V. Weed, June 8, 1942.
Verle C. Austin, June 18, 1942.
William P. Blackwell, June 18, 1942.
John T. Burkes, Jr., June 18, 1942.
Eugene H. Marley, June 18, 1942.
Robert Marvel, June 18, 1942.
Joseph B. Mongogna, June 18, 1942.
Harvey G. Odenbrett, June 18, 1942.
John O'Looney, June 18, 1942.
Joseph A. Pariseau, June 18, 1942.
James R. Preis, June 18, 1942.
Donald I. Santure, June 18, 1942.
David A. Scott, June 18, 1942.
Howard J. Spencer, June 18, 1942.
David L. Staley, Jr., June 18, 1942.
William P. Toohey, June 18, 1942.
Robert McR. Tuft, June 18, 1942.
James B. Verdin, June 18, 1942.
Richard Watson, June 18, 1942.
James J. Delhom, June 19, 1942.
Irvine N. Donahue, Jr., June 19, 1942.
Edward C. McGowan, June 19, 1942.
Franklin Metzner, June 19, 1942.
Weimer B. Tracy, Jr., June 19, 1942.
Arthur G. Newton, June 24, 1942.
Boynton Barrett, June 25, 1942.
Charles S. Brookes, June 25, 1942.
Vlada D. Bursik, June 25, 1942.
Arthur J. Denzel, June 25, 1942.
Raymond L. Earl, June 25, 1942.
Larry W. Frawley, June 25, 1942.
Sammy H. Hanson, June 25, 1942.
Martin H. T. Kollmorgen, June 25, 1942.
Douglas B. LaPierre, June 25, 1942.
Ernest H. Leggett, June 25, 1942.
Donald J. Ludwig, June 25, 1942.
Earl P. McBride, June 25, 1942.
Robert J. Nelson, June 25, 1942.
William P. Phelps, June 25, 1942.
Robert W. Raddatz, June 25, 1942.
Randolph H. Reece, June 25, 1942.
Edward M. Smith, June 25, 1942.
Charles E. Snyder, June 25, 1942.
William L. Adams, July 13, 1942.
Rowland McW. Fairlie, July 13, 1942.
Ralph Hein, Jr., July 13, 1942.
Philip W. Knights, July 13, 1942.
William J. McDonell, July 13, 1942.
Alton W. Payne, July 13, 1942.
James L. Pearce, July 13, 1942.
John D. Smith, July 13, 1942.
Wilbur A. Carton, July 14, 1942.
Gerald F. Boyle, July 18, 1942.
Channing H. Cox, July 18, 1942.
Charles W. Demoss, July 18, 1942.
John D. Frank, July 18, 1942.
Donald R. Gillespie, July 18, 1942.
Glenn L'H. Gould, July 18, 1942.
Charles F. Hallums, July 18, 1942.
Robert E. Irons, July 18, 1942.
Noble R. Kean, July 18, 1942.
Arthur R. Keeneth, July 18, 1942.
Alfred C. Mobus, July 18, 1942.
Cleveland LeR. Null, July 18, 1942.
Gordon R. Otis, July 18, 1942.
Vincent G. Quillen, July 18, 1942.
Chester L. Robertson, July 18, 1942.
Raymond M. Roland, Jr., July 18, 1942.
Frederick W. Silverthorne, July 18, 1942.
Hovey D. Smith, July 18, 1942.
George A. Spikes, July 18, 1942.
Donald C. Stanley, July 18, 1942.
Robert J. Stegg, July 18, 1942.
Paul Tangas, July 18, 1942.
George S. Von Weller, July 18, 1942.
Guy H. West, Jr., July 18, 1942.
Curtis J. Zane, July 18, 1942.
Leon B. Blair, July 23, 1942.
Jay R. Ellenberger, July 23, 1942.
Daniel R. Harris, July 23, 1942.
Paul E. Hill, July 23, 1942.
Dale C. Klahn, July 23, 1942.
Gilbert L. Knight, July 23, 1942.
Alexander J. Kostrzewsky, July 23, 1942.
George B. Meldrum, July 23, 1942.
Clifford R. Sawyer, July 23, 1942.
John P. Schenck, July 23, 1942.
Arthur P. Whiteway, July 23, 1942.
Alfred G. Bolduc, August 5, 1942.
Samuel McK. Kevan, Jr., August 5, 1942.
Paul H. Anderson, August 5, 1942.
Milner L. Andrews, August 5, 1942.
Robert C. Bailey, August 5, 1942.
George H. Belk, August 5, 1942.
Wayne R. Cheal, August 5, 1942.
John A. Dingle, August 5, 1942.
Harlo D. Fechtelkotter, August 5, 1942.
James Ferris, August 5, 1942.
Rollin E. Gray, Jr., August 5, 1942.
Jack S. Hall, August 5, 1942.
Felix G. Hampton, August 5, 1942.
Delbert G. Karr, August 5, 1942.
Edgar T. Keller, August 5, 1942.
Vincent F. Kelley, August 5, 1942.
William S. Lewis, Jr., August 5, 1942.
Robert Linwick, Jr., August 5, 1942.
Richard H. Martin, August 5, 1942.
Robert C. Mason, August 5, 1942.
Charles H. McCabe, August 5, 1942.
James S. Muir, August 5, 1942.
Donald E. Pearse, August 5, 1942.
Joe E. Pierce, August 5, 1942.
Thomas E. Reilly, August 5, 1942.
Thomas R. Sedell, August 5, 1942.
John F. White, August 5, 1942.
Charles B. Clayton, Jr., August 11, 1942.
Irving G. Cockroft, August 11, 1942.
Thaddeus T. Colman, Jr., August 11, 1942.
William L. Garrett, Jr., August 11, 1942.
Joseph P. Herr, August 11, 1942.
Robert M. Dougherty, August 11, 1942.
John C. Fox, August 11, 1942.
Dean S. Laird, August 11, 1942.
Charles C. McBratnie, August 11, 1942.
Delos B. Reeve, August 11, 1942.
William H. Simon, Jr., August 11, 1942.
George G. Smith, August 11, 1942.
Roy P. Sullivan, August 11, 1942.
Rodney C. Tabler, August 11, 1942.
Thomas F. Wilson, August 11, 1942.
Dean W. Houck, September 16, 1942.
Harley G. Noland, September 16, 1942.
Joseph P. Smith 3d, September 16, 1942.
Henry H. Stiles, September 16, 1942.
George P. Yonkers, September 16, 1942.
Robert W. Anderson, October 1, 1942.
Oliver S. Burnette, October 1, 1942.
Robert C. Carlson, October 1, 1942.
Joseph E. Coberly, Jr., October 1, 1942.
Henry H. Dearing, Jr., October 1, 1942.
"O" "B" Gray, October 1, 1942.
Adler M. Larsen, Jr., October 1, 1942.
Earl May, Jr., October 1, 1942.
Thomas W. Oliver, Jr., October 1, 1942.
Thomas B. Smith, October 1, 1942.
Armin H. Williams, Jr., October 1, 1942.
Harry W. Worley, October 1, 1942.
Edgar R. Britt, October 16, 1942.
John Dick, October 16, 1942.
Ardis H. Durham, Jr., October 16, 1942.
Herbert C. Francisco, October 16, 1942.
Alfred J. Henry, Jr., October 16, 1942.
Thomas B. Logan, October 16, 1942.
William T. Marshall, Jr., October 16, 1942.
Norman K. McInnis, October 16, 1942.
Jay L. Perrin, October 16, 1942.
Rockford L. Phillips, October 16, 1942.
Charles S. Porter, October 16, 1942.
Clifford K. Spaulding, October 16, 1942.
James R. Sprague, October 16, 1942.
John W. Topliff, October 16, 1942.

Joseph W. Allen, Jr., November 1, 1942.
Courtland T. Babcock, November 1, 1942.
Eugene M. Barry, November 1, 1942.
Robert L. Braddock, November 1, 1942.
John L. Bratten, November 1, 1942.
Edward D. Bruffey, November 1, 1942.
John E. Darden, Jr., November 1, 1942.
John H. Dick, November 1, 1942.
James H. Douthit, November 1, 1942.
Blake L. Foard, November 1, 1942.
Kenneth J. Kier, November 1, 1942.
Howard "C" Lee, November 1, 1942.
Charles R. Lindler, Jr., November 1, 1942.
John W. Miller, November 1, 1942.
Ralph W. Mitchell, November 1, 1942.
John H. Murray, November 1, 1942.
Glyndol W. Pace, November 1, 1942.
Lloyd A. Payne, November 1, 1942.
George A. Schilling, November 1, 1942.
Julius L. Sloan, Jr., November 1, 1942.
Henry O. Timm, Jr., November 1, 1942.
Edvard F. van Lier Ribbink, November 1, 1942.
James H. Arquette, November 16, 1942.
John W. Bartol, November 16, 1942.
William R. Bauhof, November 16, 1942.
Allie W. Callan, Jr., November 16, 1942.
Oyd L. Dauphin, November 16, 1942.
Paul C. Durup, November 16, 1942.
William J. Hubbach, Jr., November 16, 1942.
George J. Jogan, November 16, 1942.
William R. Knopke, November 16, 1942.
Lynn H. McCreary, November 16, 1942.
William J. Murphy, November 16, 1942.
Wilfred S. Schlaefer, November 16, 1942.
Clifford N. Seaver, November 16, 1942.
Jack H. Stewart, November 16, 1942.
Theron J. Taylor, November 16, 1942.
Felix E. Ward, Jr., November 16, 1942.
Anderson Bowers, Jr., December 1, 1942.
James E. Bryan, December 1, 1942.
William H. Dewey, December 1, 1942.
William C. Diehl, Jr., December 1, 1942.
James N. Elens, December 1, 1942.
Louis J. Papas, December 1, 1942.
Dale M. Shear, December 1, 1942.
Gordon K. Sherman, December 1, 1942.
Clayton F. Staffel, December 1, 1942.
John D. Warner, December 1, 1942.
Dallas Webb, Jr., December 1, 1942.
Harry T. Brownscombe, December 16, 1942.
John K. Davis, Jr., December 16, 1942.
Hubert D. Easler, December 16, 1942.
Robert "W" Fisher, December 16, 1942.
Rueben D. Larson, December 16, 1942.
Walter B. Longino, December 16, 1942.
John A. Montgomery, December 16, 1942.
Joe D. Robbins, December 16, 1942.
Russell E. Snow, December 16, 1942.
George D. Switzer, December 16, 1942.
Harold J. Treon, December 16, 1942.
Arthur Wachtel, December 16, 1942.
William H. Woodson, December 16, 1942.
John W. Kelly, January 1, 1943.
Ralph S. Smith, January 4, 1943.
Selwyne R. Rackoff, February 15, 1943.
Robert McH. Pond, February 18, 1943.
Frank C. Dunham, Jr., June 14, 1943.
Palmer D. Nycklemoe, June 26, 1943.
John N. Cummings, June 28, 1943.
Harold W. Stevenson, June 28, 1943.
Loren A. McIntyre, June 30, 1941.
Cartier Blackburn, July 15, 1941.

The following to be assistant surgeons in the Navy, with the rank of lieutenant (junior grade), to rank from the date stated opposite their names:

William H. Requarth, March 2, 1942.
James A. Addison, March 13, 1943.
Leonard H. Roach, August 4, 1943.
Warren W. Moorman, January 8, 1944.
Walter F. Harrison, Jr., January 10, 1944.
Joseph C. Bacon, August 8, 1944.
John W. Du Chez, September 1, 1944.
Henry T. Nichols, September 1, 1944.
Norman C. Johnson, September 1, 1944.
Richard S. Graves, September 4, 1944.
Don L. Andrus, September 4, 1944.
Thomas W. Simpson, September 5, 1944.
Robert F. Minkus, September 5, 1944.
George S. Bova, September 6, 1944.
Charles H. Hine, September 7, 1944.
Walter C. Babcock, September 9, 1944.
William Province, Jr., September 13, 1944.
Carlo B. Marcum, Jr., September 13, 1944.
Joseph Q. Perry, September 16, 1944.
Lloyd F. Miller, September 29, 1944.
George V. Z. Miller, September 29, 1944.
Webb S. Alsop, Jr., September 30, 1944.
Thomas C. Pomeroy, September 30, 1944.
William J. B. Liles, September 30, 1944.
Alfred M. Bongiovanni, October 1, 1944.
Paul J. Elmlinger, October 1, 1944.
Horace G. Butler, October 1, 1944.
Robert K. Moxon, October 1, 1944.
Bernard L. Rhodes, Jr., October 1, 1944.
Robert W. Curry, October 2, 1944.
Harry C. Barton, Jr., October 2, 1944.
Floyd R. Stauffer, October 2, 1944.
Harvey C. Anderson, October 2, 1944.
Zondal R. Miller, October 2, 1944.
Clifton G. York, October 3, 1944.
Richard S. Osterholm, October 3, 1944.
Morton H. Leonard, October 3, 1944.
Reed R. Haeger, October 3, 1944.
Charles F. Samelson, October 3, 1944.
Adrian W. Davis, October 3, 1944.
Joseph L. Jernegan, Jr., October 3, 1944.
Haydon J. Spidell, October 3, 1944.
William J. Schewe, October 3, 1944.
Raymond A. Brandt, October 3, 1944.
Thomas E. Furlow, Jr., October 3, 1944.
Emil P. Thelen, October 4, 1944.
Joseph Sataloff, October 4, 1944.
Kay N. Ostergard, October 4, 1944.
George W. Hyatt, October 4, 1944.
Benjamin H. Glover, Jr., October 4, 1944.
Joseph T. Leach, October 5, 1944.
Allen E. Berndt, October 5, 1944.
Joseph F. Conolly, October 5, 1944.
Edward T. Humphreys, October 5, 1944.
William Kennett, Jr., October 5, 1944.
Robert E. Shiflet, October 5, 1944.
William G. Skipper, October 5, 1944.
William Ridder, October 6, 1944.
Gordon D. Arnold, October 7, 1944.
Hubert Hecht, October 7, 1944.
James V. McNulty, October 7, 1944.
Dwight W. Burney, Jr., October 8, 1944.
Robert H. Delafield, Jr., October 8, 1944.
James J. Mulcahy, Jr., October 9, 1944.
John G. Converse, October 9, 1944.
Charles R. Locke, October 9, 1944.
Richard T. Atkins, Jr., October 10, 1944.
Carl D. Lusty, October 10, 1944.
Carl P. Carlson, October 10, 1944.
Albert T. Profy, October 10, 1944.
Charles J. Holt, Jr., October 10, 1944.
Robert W. Unangst, October 10, 1944.
William E. Morris, October 10, 1944.
Edward E. Banta, October 10, 1944.
John F. Seybolt, October 10, 1944.
Larry B. Mathes, October 10, 1944.
Wallace W. Gist, October 10, 1944.
George A. Sheehan, Jr., October 11, 1944.
Donald J. Casey, October 11, 1944.
George MacM. Brown, Jr., October 11, 1944.
Harold J. Byrne, October 12, 1944.
John A. McIntyre, October 12, 1944.
Herbert A. Holden, October 12, 1944.
Clarence M. Donaldson, October 12, 1944.
Frank W. Norman, October 13, 1944.
Robert E. Berner, October 13, 1944.
Jack V. D. Hough, October 13, 1944.
Donald McQ. Clough, October 13, 1944.
Donald E. Cowen, October 13, 1944.
William T. Burns 3d, October 13, 1944.
Joseph D. Wilson, October 14, 1944.
William R. Grannis, October 14, 1944.
William H. Hall, Jr., October 14, 1944.
George M. Adams, October 14, 1944.
Robert E. Sumner, Jr., October 18, 1944.
Gordon P. Van Buskirk, October 19, 1944.
Page W. Acree, October 19, 1944.
Jack H. Hirsch, October 19, 1944.
Frederick J. McDermott, October 20, 1944.
William D. Francisco, November 13, 1944.
William A. Slentz, November 16, 1944.
Harold L. Low, November 16, 1944.
Edwin R. Shapard 3d, November 18, 1944.
George C. Manning, Jr., November 19, 1944.

The following-named officers of the United States Naval Reserve to be assistant paymasters in the Navy, with the rank of ensign, to rank from the date stated opposite their names:

Francis H. McGee, July 8, 1940.
Kent D. Algire, October 7, 1940.
Edward E. Brighton, August 15, 1940.
Robert T. Cosby, March 17, 1941.
William W. Gay, Jr., June 16, 1941.
Frederick C. Mathis, June 16, 1941.
Frank G. Jordan, June 16, 1941.
Joseph W. Hatch, June 16, 1941.
Robert E. Howell, June 16, 1941.
Carl A. Culver, June 17, 1941.
Robert H. Rich, June 19, 1941.
Robert S. Ersted, June 22, 1941.
Johnie L. DeLany, June 23, 1941.
Horace W. Blaine, June 27, 1941.
Dwight M. Botkin, July 28, 1941.
Edward J. Shaughnessy, September 24, 1941.
Walter J. Ancker, December 24, 1941.
Vincent P. Giuli, March 23, 1942.
William T. Chambers, March 23, 1942.
Lawrence R. Lee, March 23, 1942.
Walter C. Claassen, April 17, 1942.
Dove W. Green, Jr., June 20, 1942.
Frank A. Baldwin, June 23, 1942.
Peter H. Grayum, June 29, 1942.
Harold R. Logan, June 29, 1942.
Robert W. Wildung, June 29, 1942.
George H. Byrom, July 8, 1942.
Charles W. Huntsberry, July 13, 1942.
Marvin Ostrowsky, July 15, 1942.
Harold E. Beckmeyer, July 27, 1942.
Ira A. Giles, Jr., July 29, 1942.
Albert J. Russell, July 30, 1942.
Alvin F. Beumer, August 6, 1942.
John A. Scott, August 7, 1942.
Robert G. Winden, August 10, 1942.
Philip G. Moon, August 10, 1942.
Harold W. Simpson, August 13, 1942.
Edward C. Oldfield, Jr., August 15, 1942.
Marion T. Hvidt, August 15, 1942.
Neil Richardson, August 21, 1942.
William J. Gray, August 23, 1942.
Carl A. Fischer, August 24, 1942.
Robert VonChristierson, August 25, 1942.
James W. Ramsay, August 25, 1942.
Arthur W. O'Connell, Jr., August 27, 1942.
Grover D. Rogers, August 31, 1942.
Fred W. Shaffer, August 31, 1942.
Raymond C. J. Reiner, September 18, 1942.
Clement E. Daley, September 26, 1942.
William M. Lohse, September 30, 1942.
Sidney M. Vickers, October 6, 1942.
Charles S. Berger, October 8, 1942.
David S. Pool, October 17, 1942.
Robert B. Jeppson, Jr., October 30, 1942.
Fred L. Heyes, November 14, 1942.
Robert M. Stampley, November 14, 1942.
Glover H. Cook, November 15, 1942.
John C. Busby, Jr., November 15, 1942.
Joseph S. O'Neill, November 15, 1942.
Richard M. Slettvet, November 15, 1942.
Charles M. Withrow, November 15, 1942.
Harold H. Hammer, November 16, 1942.
William J. Sheehan, November 23, 1942.
Dale C. Huebner, January 1, 1943.
Eugene F. Ratliff, January 1, 1943.
Oswald J. Brosseau, Jr., January 1, 1943.
Edward P. O'Rourke, January 6, 1943.
Kenneth M. Ross, Jr., January 6, 1943.
Edward S. Schroering, January 11, 1943.
Charles A. Kirschbaum, Jr., January 11, 1943.
Kenneth S. Law, January 11, 1943.
Louis J. Reilly, January 11, 1943.
Daniel A. Kelley, January 11, 1943.
Evans J. Karpenko, January 11, 1943.
Donald L. Mulit, January 18, 1943.
Kenneth H. Olsen, February 2, 1943.
Herbert C. Cornuelle, April 5, 1943.
Francis J. Sausen, April 21, 1943.
Stanley R. Maslowski, May 11, 1943.
Mendel L. Peterson, May 29, 1943.
Robert W. Hutchison, June 1, 1943.
Harold C. Gwynne, Jr., July 1, 1943.

Ensign Edward G. Cunney, United States Coast and Geodetic Survey, to be an assistant civil engineer in the Navy, with the rank of lieutenant (junior grade) to rank from the 1st day of July 1944.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate September 15 (legislative day of September 1), 1944:

IN THE ARMY

APPOINTMENT IN THE REGULAR ARMY

To be major general

Omar Nelson Bradley

PROMOTIONS IN THE REGULAR ARMY

To be colonels, Corps of Engineers

Ralph Gillett Barrows
Holland Luley Robb

To be colonels, Field Artillery

Hamilton Ewing Maguire
William Roscoe Woodward

To be colonel, Corps of Engineers

William Morris Hoge

TEMPORARY APPOINTMENTS IN THE ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

To be lieutenant generals

Thomas Troy Handy
Lucian King Truscott, Jr.
Daniel Isom Sultan

To be major generals

Edwin Daviess Patrick
Norman Daniel Cota
Frank Dow Merrill
Eugene Warren Fales
Robert Wilkins Douglass, Jr.
Francis Bernard Mallon
Gilbert Xavier Cheves
Maurice Rose

To be brigadier generals

Henry John Dick Meyer
Truman Everett Boudinot
Wayne Cliffton Zimmerman
Philip Guillou Blackmore
Franklin Babcock
Thomas Wade Herren
George Robert Acheson
Cuthbert Powell Stearns
Kenner Fisher Hertford
William Stevens Lawton
Willard Ames Holbrook, Jr.
Charles Bishop Lyman
Hugo Peoples Rush
Charles Conrad Brown
Harlan Leslie Mumma
Tom Christopher Rives
Don Emerson Carleton
Joseph Sladen Bradley
Henry Davis Jay
David Nathaniel Hauseman
Fay Roscoe Upthegrove
Richard Clark Lindsay
Elmer Forrest Wallender
John Perry Willey
Junius Henry Houghton
Joseph Theodore Morris
Hamilton Ewing Maguire
Henry Jeffrey Matchett
Burton Murdock Hovey, Jr.
William Robert Clayton Morrison
Frederick Smith Strong, Jr.

To be major generals

Joseph Wilson Byron
Cyrus Rowlett Smith

To be brigadier generals

William James Williamson
Paul William Johnston
Charles Merville Spofford
John Stetson Allard
Wayne Russell Allen

IN THE NAVY

TEMPORARY SERVICE

Chester W. Nimitz to be an admiral in the Navy, for temporary service, to rank from December 31, 1941.

Royal E. Ingersoll to be an admiral in the Navy, for temporary service, to rank from July 1, 1942.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, SEPTEMBER 18, 1944

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Praise ye the Lord, for His mercy endureth forever. As the watchmen wait for the morning so we wait for divine guidance; bring our souls into the mood of hoping and trusting in Thee. Unite joy and duty, privilege and responsibility, for we cannot offer a more convincing testimony before our Republic. As the world today is struggling in the shadow of a great crisis, bless our whole land and lead it to seek not only its own aggrandizement but the universal peace and good of mankind.

Eternal God, so often our weakness is more conspicuous than our strength. Man, with his boasted power, weighs the mountains and the hills, yet his immortal soul needs a refuge. We would open our hearts to Thee that they may become the temples of Thy spirit and the vessels of Thy grace. Continue, blessed Lord, our allegiance to the soul and spirit of our dear homeland and grant that our determination may never swerve nor fail until the light of freedom breaks over the dark lands of this striving world. In the name of our blessed Redeemer. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, September 14, 1944, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a concurrent resolution of the House of the following title:

H. Con. Res. 99. Concurrent resolution relating to the enrollment of H. R. 4271.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills and a concurrent resolution of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 2007. An act for the relief of Lum Jacobs;

S. 2105. An act to amend and supplement the Federal Aid Road Act, approved July 11, 1916, as amended and supplemented, to authorize appropriations for the post-war construction of highways and bridges, to eliminate hazards at railroad-grade crossings, to provide for the immediate preparation of plans, and for other purposes; and

S. Con. Res. 51. Concurrent resolution authorizing a change in enrolling the bill (H. R. 4257) to expatriate or exclude certain persons for evading military and naval service.

CONSENT CALENDAR

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the call of the Consent Calendar today be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

WAR MOBILIZATION AND RECONVERSION ACT OF 1944

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DOUGHTON].

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the action of the House taken on last Wednesday, I offer a motion, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. DOUGHTON moves to instruct the managers on the part of the House in the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the bill (S. 2051) entitled "An act to amend the Social Security Act, as amended, to provide a national program for war mobilization and reconversion, and for other purposes," to insist on their disagreement on section 303 of said Senate bill relating to transportation of civilian workers.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DOUGHTON] is recognized for 1 hour.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order there is not a quorum present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently no quorum is present.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 111]

Baldwin, Md.	Fitzpatrick	Norton
Baldwin, N. Y.	Ford	O'Brien, N. Y.
Barry	Fulbright	O'Connor
Bates, Ky.	Furlong	O'Neal
Bell	Gale	Patman
Bennett, Mich.	Gallagher	Phillips
Bennett, Mo.	Gibson	Ploeser
Blackney	Gifford	Poage
Bloom	Gilchrist	Poulson
Bolton	Granger	Pracht,
Boykin	Hagen	C. Frederick
Bradley, Mich.	Halleck	Reece, Tenn.
Brehm	Harris, Va.	Richards
Brooks	Hartley	Rizley
Brumbaugh	Hays	Robsion, Ky.
Buckley	Hendricks	Rogers, Mass.
Burgin	Hoeven	Russell
Busbey	Holifield	Sabath
Cannon, Fla.	Holmes, Wash.	Satterfield
Cannon, Mo.	Horan	Sauthoff
Capozzoli	Izac	Schwabe
Carrier	Jackson	Sheppard
Carter	Jennings	Sheridan
Case	Johnson,	Sikes
Clark	Ward	Slaughter
Clason	Judd	Smith, W. Va.
Courtney	Kennedy	Somers, N. Y.
Curtis	King	Stefan
Dewey	Klein	Stevenson
Dickstein	Kunkel	Stockman
Dies	Lambertson	Sullivan
Douglas	LeCompte	Tolan
Drewry	Lemke	Treadway
Elliott	McCord	Vinson, Ga.
Ellis	McKenzie	Wadsworth
Ellsworth	McLean	Wasielewski
Elmer	Miller, Mo.	Weaver
Engle, Calif.	Morrison, La.	Weiss
Fay	Morrison, N. C.	Welch
Fisher	Mundt	Willey

The SPEAKER. On this roll call 312 Members have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

Further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

WAR MOBILIZATION AND RECONVERSION ACT OF 1944

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 10 minutes and ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the motion of the gentleman from North Carolina be again read at this time for the information of the House.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

The Clerk again read the motion.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DOUGHTON] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, the House conferees on the bill S. 2051 have found it necessary to come back to the House for instructions on two provisions contained in the bill as passed by the Senate but not in the bill passed by the House. These two provisions are, first, transportation pay for war workers, including Federal employees; and second, unemployment compensation for Federal employees.

This is the first time in my more than 11 years as chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means that our conferees have found it necessary to come back to the House for instructions. I believe this record of the conferees on bills from our committee proves that we are not unreasonable or unwilling to consider and accept proper and equitable adjustments and compromises which are not in direct conflict with the action of the House.

The House has before it today two important issues which should be seriously considered in order that they may be wisely acted upon. The Committee on Ways and Means reported, by a large majority, this legislation, omitting, after full discussion and consideration, these two provisions for what our committee considered sound reasons, as fully set forth in the committee report. Efforts were made on the floor of the House to restore these provisions, but they were ruled out on points of order. However, I have every reason to believe that had a vote been taken in the House the position taken by the Committee on Ways and Means would have been sustained. It is, therefore, an undeniable fact that the House, by a large majority, passed the bill substantially as reported by the Committee on Ways and Means. The proponents of these two provisions could not muster sufficient support for a yea-and-nay vote on final passage.

Confronted with this situation, your conferees did not feel, as agents of the House, they could or should agree to the inclusion of either of the provisions as passed by the Senate. Both of these provisions certainly are a departure from well-established and long-standing Government policy.

The transportation pay for war workers, which, of course, would include Government employees, is now under consideration. This proposes to give every civilian employed in activities essential to the war effort up to $200 for his transportation back home, or to another job. This would include his family and household effects.

Now, what are activities essential to the war effort?

Can anybody tell just what activities are essential to the war effort? I have never been able to get a satisfactory definition of what is meant by "activities essential to the war effort." I think that under those words almost anyone could build up a case and receive free transportation under this provision.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOUGHTON. I yield for a brief question.

Mr. KNUTSON. Under that liberal construction the grocery clerk who measured out 5 pounds of sugar for a war worker would be contributing toward the war effort.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Certainly. In my judgment there would be no place to draw the line.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOUGHTON. I am sorry; I do not have the time.

Transportation would be provided regardless of need, amount of wages earned, or length of time employed. No limit is placed on the number of times free transportation might be provided a war worker.

To me this is an undisguised raid on the Treasury for which I can see no justification whatever. These workers have been drawing the highest wages and salaries in history; they knew what their wages would be when they accepted employment, and this would be simply a bonus out of the Federal Treasury which they did not expect and for which no valid reason can be assigned. It is equivalent to Congress saying to Federal employees or workers: "Do not worry about saving money, the Government will pay your way home or to another job and when you get there, your unemployment compensation will pay you for sitting down in idleness—eat, drink and be merry—take no thought of tomorrow—your Government will take care of that." No private industry has ever adopted any such loose policy, and certainly it is no time now for the Government with an empty Treasury, a huge debt, and heavy taxes, to embark upon such an unprecedented and unjustifiable course.

Nobody knows, although the question has been asked repeatedly, what the cost of this provision would be. The only answer has been, "We have no idea as to the cost." From the discussions we have heard, it appears that the only excuse for such a provision is to take care of a prospective, or possible social problem which may arise in certain sections of the country which have been, and are doing, the majority of the manufacturing for the war. These communities have benefited greatly from such war activities and should be in a position, if help is needed, to deal with the problem. These communities have enjoyed great prosperity as a result of war work and war business, which in most cases they have solicited and which other communities were not so fortunate as to enjoy. For these, and many, many other reasons, too numerous to mention in the brief time at my disposal, I trust the House will overwhelmingly sustain the position taken by its conferees on this proposition.

Since I do not intend to take up the time of the House later on today, I will refer briefly to the other issue on which instructions are being requested. This relates to unemployment compensation for Federal employees. Those favoring the Senate provision dealing with this subject justify their position by saying that there is discrimination in favor of employees in private industry against Government workers. If there be such discrimination—I think it is greatly overstated—it has existed since the enactment of the Social Security Act and is not restricted to Federal Government workers, as they are not the only group not covered by unemployment insurance. If a change in policy on this matter is needed, it has not been sufficiently studied and the matter has not had the consideration necessary to pass upon it either intelligently or equitably. If Federal employees are covered, leaving out school teachers who work for low salaries and are unemployed 2 or 3 months in the year, white-collar workers by the thousands, domestic servants, merchant seamen, farm laborers, and all who, as a rule, have worked for lower wages or salaries will justly complain that the discrimination against them has been accentuated.

Moreover, Federal employees, while not receiving unemployment compensation benefits, do receive benefits that no worker in private industry enjoys. A few days ago the House passed a bill that would give the Federal worker, in either an office, shipyard, or arsenal, his accumulated annual leave in a lump sum payment. It will also be remembered that the Government's policy as to annual leave is much more favorable than that of industry. In addition, there is a refund of his retirement contribution, if he has worked for the Government less than 5 years, which is a sizeable amount. With this money the Federal employee will have available, at the time of discharge, more money to carry him over the adjustment period until he gets another job, than the worker in a private plant.

Certainly this unemployment insurance was not taken into consideration by the Government when salaries were fixed, as was the case with respect to private employment.

So far as I can see personally there is no reason at this time for enacting such a provision. According to recent statements by highly respected Government officials, to-wit: Justice Byrnes, Administrator Paul McNutt, and the new head of W. P. B., Mr. Krug, no serious unemployment problem in the near future is foreseen.

A few days ago the Gallup poll showed that more than 70 percent of the public did not favor the Government giving the war workers money when the war is over, and this of course means Federal employees doing war work. This poll, in my judgment, bears directly, and reflects

the sentiment of the people, on both issues involved here today.

No one has attempted to estimate the cost of the two matters in disagreement. One of my colleagues, a few days ago, on this floor, estimated the cost of unemployment insurance for Federal employees to be from four hundred million to $1,000,000,000 annually. The Senate has passed a $1,300,000,000 road-bill and there are other proposals being advanced to dig deeper into the United States Treasury. At the same time the taxpayers throughout the country are justly clamoring for relief from burdensome and oppressive taxes; business is urging that lower taxes are necessary in order to give business an opportunity to expand and thereby employ more and more people to produce the things necessary to meet civilian demands, and unless such relief is afforded that we may have a very serious unemployment problem. Every day I receive letters and calls that we should reduce taxes and give business a chance, but this will be impossible if we continue to authorize additional and increased appropriations. Our Government must make certain the redemption of the bonds our people have been urged to buy, and now, with our huge debt rapidly approaching $300,000,000,000, our unbalanced budget, our oppressive taxes, it is no time to be making new departures in Government policies which call for larger and larger Government expenditures.

State and local governments are in a much stronger position financially today than the Federal Government. The people have increased their savings since the war started nearly $100,000,000,000. They can and should be expected to help themselves. The individuals and the local governments must become more self-reliant, and not look to Washington for assistance on every matter that arises.

If the unemployment situation should become acute, which I hope it will not, Congress will be in session and no one will be more ready than myself and more earnest in his efforts to meet and deal with the problem when it arises and when it can be done with a greater degree of justice to both the taxpayer and those for whom relief is sought.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from North Carolina has consumed 10 minutes.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2 additional minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I realize that the time is short to cover this subject thoroughly. I also realize there is an honest difference of opinion on this subject. There are Members who conscientiously believe that the provision in the Senate bill should be embodied in this bill. However, there are fundamental problems involved—problems of the expansion of the Social Security Act and many other problems that could not properly be considered in the short time the committee had for the consideration of this bill. In view of this honest difference of opinion, and the fact that we did not have sufficient time to go into this question fully and conduct hearings, it is my purpose, Mr. Speaker, if the action of the conferees is sustained, and I hope it will be, at the first practical date to call the Committee on Ways and Means together for further consideration of this very involved and very important matter. When these hearings can be had, and the matter gone into fully, we can perhaps arrive at a satisfactory conclusion. There is a further related question, which is more important than all, and that is the question of the estimated cost and where the money is coming from. The country is clamoring, business is clamoring, for tax reduction. If we continue piling up authorization after authorization blindly to meet every excuse and every request that is made, we cannot expect any relief from the burden of taxation. It is time that consideration be given not only to tax relief but also to some action for the people at large. Somebody will speak for these people. It is well to realize that more and more people are becoming tax conscious every day. People are watching our actions today more so than ever in the history of this country since we have increased the tax burden and have brought in so many people on the tax rolls with small incomes. They are going to hold us responsible for any reckless and unjustifiable authorizations.

Mr. Speaker, I hope the conferees of the House will be sustained.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. KNUTSON].

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, first of all, I want to pay tribute to that wonderful American and legislator, the chairman of our committee, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DOUGHTON]. In my long service in this body he stands out as one of the towering giants. I have not served with him for all these years without becoming very well acquainted with his sterling qualities, his incorruptible integrity, and his unimpeachable Americanism.

A peculiar situation exists in the House at the present time in that the two parties are so closely on a level that neither side can escape responsibility for what we here do today. The two propositions that we have before us offer something new in the way of legislation, and they propose to establish precedents in government. The gentleman from North Carolina, the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, very ably set forth in the limited time allotted to him the two points of difference between the body at the other end of the Capitol and this body—that is, the award of travel pay to war workers and the proposal to cover all Government employees not now in the regular classified service into social-security benefits.

It is significant that none of the Senate conferees could give us any idea as to what the two proposals would cost. That is most unusual, especially in view of the fact that each one of you now has a share in the national debt amounting to about $2,000; not only is that your share but it is the share of every man, woman, and child in this country. Today the national debt is rapidly approaching the quarter-of-a-trillion-dollar mark. Think of it! At the rate we are traveling it will not be long before we will talk in terms of trillions instead of billions. I have seen that transition take place right in this body in the last 27 years. When I first came here we talked of millions, and then, following World War No. 1, we began to talk in terms of billions. It was necessary. Now we are rapidly approaching the point where we will have to discuss Federal finances in terms of trillions.

My friends, the time has come to stop, look, and listen. The next administration, whichever it be, will have to balance the Budget, or this country will go bankrupt, if it is not already so. When you stop to consider that the total value of the United States of America is about $330,000,000,000, which includes everything visible and invisible, and that we are going to owe before the end of the next fiscal year $250,000,000,000, it behooves the elected representatives of the people to stop and pause and contemplate where we are going. There is not a man or woman within the sound of my voice who wants to hand this country over to the returning veterans a wrecked country and a bankrupt Treasury. There is not a man or woman on this floor who would knowingly contribute to such an unhappy and tragic event. You and I know it is they who will have to pay the debt after having fought the war.

I say to you, Is it fair, can you justify enacting legislation here today that is going to cost—how much? No one can tell us. If we want to do a thing like this—and I hope we will not—but if the House in its wisdom decides that we should do something for the Government war workers in addition to what has already been done—and let me say parenthetically that we increased their salaries 15 percent some time back—but if we want to do something further for them, let us first find out what it is going to cost.

When you spend your own money, when you go into a store to buy a suit of clothes or an overcoat, one of the first things you ask is, "What is the price?" Are you going to have it said that you have less regard for the people's money than you have for your own? If that is to be the attitude of this body, then the Congress of the United States has indeed fallen on evil ways, and all we can do is to pray God that He will stay with us.

I shall not take much more time, except to make this proposal or to amplify what the chairman said: If you feel that we should establish these new precedents, let us first find out what it is going to cost. In order to ascertain that cost, it will be necessary for the Committee on Ways and Means to hold hearings and to examine this proposal from all angles. Is there any man within the sound of

my voice who can tell us how many it will affect? No. Is there a man within the sound of my voice who can tell us what it is going to cost? No, no; unfortunately, no.

Let it not be said that we blindly vote to spend hundreds and hundreds of millions of dollars of the taxpayers' hard-earned money without first finding out whether it is necessary; and if it be, what it is going to cost.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL].

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I regret that on such an important subject so little time is available. For this no one is to blame. It is the rule, and we have to abide by it. The fact remains that the question ought to be more thoroughly explored. You ought to know more about it before you vote.

My chairman, my very dear friend, stated that the House conferees were in a compromising mood. I dislike to dispute that, but there was no disposition to compromise. It was either take the House view or nothing, else we shall withdraw, and that is precisely what was done.

The Senate conferees generously offered a compromise by way of the Taft amendment. The Senate through its conferees was willing to recede from its original proposal. It was willing to limit the maximum total travel allowance to $100, to restrict it to hardship cases, applying a means test, and to allow it as transportation by bus or train only to those who received when employed $50 a week or less. Several other restrictive features were in that amendment, but the House would have nothing at all. The idea was to make provision for industrial reconversion, but to forget all about the human side of the problem.

I cannot go into detail very extensively because I want to cover specifically what the problem really is which we face. Of the three thousand and some counties in the United States, something like 300 in the industrial areas, have been the center of great industrial expansion because of the war effort. To these counties millions of men and women from the Cotton Belt and from the Corn Belt and from the rural areas have flocked for patriotic and for financial reasons. We can foresee just one thing, and that is that after the war when employment recedes there may be a large number of these men and women stranded. I want the Members who come from industrial areas to remember and to know what you are voting on. If you vote "aye" to support the motion of the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, you are going to shoulder upon your constituency and upon your industrial areas a responsibility which rightfully and properly belongs to the Nation. So the move is to vote against it. The situation we face might be mild as the result of stranded unemployed or it may be desperate. It is going to be acute, I predict, in the industrial areas, and no area will altogether escape it. Under the Taft amendment, and Senator TAFT certainly is no radical, he intended to limit aid to those who actually are going to need the assistance. But, as I said before, the House conferees would have nothing of the kind. They chose to ignore the whole matter. The fact, Mr. Speaker, is that that problem is going to present itself and we will not be prepared to meet it. Had the Taft suggestion been accepted in conference, it would have been limited strictly to those who need it, to hardship cases, to men and women who receive $50 or less per week. It would have relieved us of the possibilities of a nasty situation, which we contemplate. As I said at the time the bill was considered, it is going to be bad in the Corn Belt and bad in the Cotton Belt, because they are not there, and similarly it is going to be bad for us, because they are going to be stranded in these industrial areas and be on our necks. It is going to be bad for us because they are there. Now the sound, sensible solution as a part of the entire war picture, is to make provision for these people to be sent back. So the thing for you to do here now, to justify your position with your constituencies, is to make this conference committee go back to the House and Senate conference and to bring back the Senate provisions.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DINGELL. I yield.

Mr. KNUTSON. As I recall, the gentleman made identically the same argument in favor of the war displacement bill which would have provided for $300,000,000 for unemployment benefits during the transition, and the gentleman pleaded with tears in his eyes, for favorable consideration of that provision.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, is the gentleman making a speech or asking a question?

Mr. KNUTSON. I am asking the gentleman, does the gentleman think the situation is any more serious now than it was then?

Mr. DINGELL. There is no relationship between the two.

I will say this to the gentleman—I have corrected him once before—I have made my plea before the committee with regard to unemployment compensation, due to the transition from peacetime to wartime production, on this basis, that the State funds, whether the State was able to bear the load or not—and I assumed that all States were able to bear it—should not be used entirely; that it was a matter that we in Michigan, the people in Ohio, and States like California and other great industrial States, were not to shoulder that responsibility, that cost, whether they were able to do so or not.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has again expired.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. DINGELL. I held at that time that it was a part of the war cost; a part of the preparation; that the State funds should be reimbursed from a Federal appropriation for whatever the amount happened to be. That was my plea. Now I have explained this to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. KNUTSON] so many times, and seemingly he fails to understand exactly what I said.

Mr. KNUTSON. Well, unfortunately——

Mr. DINGELL. I refuse to yield, Mr. Speaker. The gentleman persists in bringing this thing up every time he gets a chance to ask a question. I hope he will understand that henceforth I am going to ask him what his question is before I agree to yield to him.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has again expired.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. KNUTSON] 2 minutes.

Mr. KNUTSON. I think, Mr. Speaker, after the very excellent presentation by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL], I should be permitted at this point to read a statement that he made when the war displacement bill was before our committee, at which time he argued for setting aside $300,000,000 in order to tide over the workers from peacetime to wartime production. These are the touching words that the gentleman indulged in at that time. I read from the record, page 425, hearings before the Committee on Ways and Means on the war displacement bill:

> Mr. DINGELL. That may be, but in the meantime there is going to be a great deal of suffering and injustice, particularly in such a great locality and great State as Michigan, where the Federal Government has peremptorily and arbitrarily, under direction of Congress, ordered the automobile industry to cease operations and cease the production of automobiles and go into the production of war matériel.

Thank God the gentleman's doleful prophecies never happened.

Mr. DINGELL. That is not what you brought up here a moment ago.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. GEARHART].

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Speaker, the proposition before us is a very simple one, a delightfully, deliciously, delectably, deliriously simple one. All that it provides is that when war work ceases in the United States, every war worker shall have the right to return to his home, if he is away from home, or if he is at home, to another place in the United States—all this at Uncle Sam's expense.

We do not know what this is going to cost. We do not know how many people are going to avail themselves of this privilege which, I think, should be denominated "the national joy ride," but we can estimate what it will cost Uncle Sam if everyone who is eligible avails himself of this most generous travel opportunity.

There are 22,000,000 people in the United States engaged in war work. You will all agree with me, I am quite sure, that nearly all of them will have at least some dependents, a wife, a couple of children, perhaps, who will want to go

along. Of course, they will have a little household furniture to which they have become attached to take along for comfort's sake. With an allowance of $200 for the jobless wage earner, $200 for his dependents, and $200 for his household furniture, the total allowance of each worker's family might be $600. Assuming that the 22,000,000 people would avail themselves of the privilege of going home or going some place away from home, a little quick calculation with pencil and pad will reveal that this very simple proposal of the overgenerous other body might cost Uncle Sam the tidy sum of $13,200,000,000.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GEARHART. I yield.

Mr. KNUTSON. Does not the gentleman believe the bill is woefully deficient in that it does not provide for the creation of a sort of Cook's travel bureau?

Mr. GEARHART. I am not at all optimistic that that would not occur; certainly, every transportation company in the United States, the railroads, the air lines, the trucks, and the busses will be quick to sense the opportunity which this section would offer. It is not difficult to picture the mad rush of their agents, the clamor for this business which the enactment of this proposal would inspire. Cannot you hear them expanding on what a wonderful place southern California is in the winter, what a magnificent place Florida is when the snow is flying in the north? Yes; I believe we shall have a Cook's tour on a grander scale than ever before, a magnificent one, one that would defy discription in any words I might choose—if this Senate provision is written in this measure.

Mr. ROWE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GEARHART. I yield.

Mr. ROWE. Do the gentleman's figures contemplate the Taft amendment or are they exclusive of that?

Mr. GEARHART. I am confining myself to a discussion of the motion that is before us, to what would happen if the House were to recede and accept the section the Senate wrote into the bill when it was before that body.

Mr. ROWE. The one that was in the original bill as it first came here?

Mr. GEARHART. The one that was in the bill when it came here.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GEARHART. I yield.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Is that $200 per person or $200 per family and household goods? I understood it was not to exceed $200 per family, including the transportation of household goods. That would not amount to more than 200 times 22,000,000.

Mr. GEARHART. If the gentleman's interpretation of the section is correct my figure must be reduced to one-third of the figure I gave—to $4,400,000,000, still a tidy sum. The section is highly ambiguous. It lends itself readily to two interpretations, each very different from the other.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Is that the gentleman's interpretation?

Mr. GEARHART. Because I am opposed to the principle involved, I naturally interpret it so as to best illustrate the absurdity which is involved.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Does it apply to every person or is it limited to hardship cases, to people who are stranded and have no money of their own?

Mr. GEARHART. There is no "needs" provision in the section; but if there were, just consider what a tremendous job it would throw on the Government. Uncle Sam would have to employ tens of thousands of investigators to ascertain whether or not each individual war worker did or did not have sufficient money of his own. That would increase the cost of this national joy ride by, perhaps, another $13,000,000,000. Who can say how much?

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GEARHART. I yield.

Mr. DINGELL. I assume the gentleman from California has taken as a base for his figure the supposition that each individual employed in war work would receive $200 for himself and $200 for two dependents and, likewise, $200 for his wife; is that correct?

Mr. GEARHART. That is the broad interpretation which I have given the measure. If the gentleman will read the text I am sure that he will agree that my interpretation is sound.

Mr. DINGELL. That is the only way the gentleman's figures could be reached. The gentleman knows that not everybody who has engaged in war work is going to receive this benefit. Under the Taft provision it is limited to hardship cases, and indigence would have to be proved. As a consequence, it could not amount to more than $130,000,000 at the most.

Mr. GEARHART. The gentleman's opinions are entitled to and should at all times be accorded the highest respect of the membership, but, with all due deference, I am sure that if he will but refer to the text of the section we have under consideration, he will agree that there is no "needs" or "hardship" provision in it; that there is no limitation in amount below $600 per man, family, and furniture.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GEARHART. I yield.

Mr. KNUTSON. Carrying the thought of the gentleman from Michigan just a step further, if a man lived in Pittsburgh and had engaged in war work decided he would get a job out in Los Angeles, under the Senate provision of this bill, the Government would have to provide him that transportation to Los Angeles.

Mr. GEARHART. That is precisely what I have been arguing—$200 for the man, $200 for his dependents, $200 for the transportation of his household effects.

Mr. DINGELL. If the transportation were necessary and if he had been engaged in the war effort.

Mr. GEARHART. Again I repeat, there is no "needs" clause. That is what causes us the shivers out in California, the State of my birth. The distinguished senior Senator from California has oft said, and, I must confess, I agree with him, that there are only two kinds of people in the world: Those who live in California and those who want to. Frankly we are afraid that all of those who engaged in the war effort will suddenly avail themselves of this generous opportunity which the Senate would extend and, within the period of time fixed by the act, if one is fixed, rush out to California, to "crash" the Golden Gate before we can get "the old home fires" burning brightly for them.

No; we are not concerned, as the gentleman from Michigan has assumed, over our ability to absorb those who have already emigrated to the State of the Golden Bear. We are concerned with the hordes which, like an avalanche might descend upon our fertile plains, encouraged to do so by the generosity of this proposal. About California we have built no Chinese wall. The latch key of hospitality is ever out. We want everyone to come to California. Our gates are open and our hearts are big; from no one would we withhold this priceless privilege of living in this fair land. But we do not want all of you to come at once.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GEARHART. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. Does the gentleman have any figures on what it is going to cost the Government for reconversion of industry and the amount of compensation that will be paid to corporations for termination of war contracts?

Mr. GEARHART. The gentleman is referring to another proposition that will come before the House after this one is disposed of.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. I am talking about the taxpayers.

Mr. GEARHART. Let us consider the one proposition before us. It is the great national joy ride which this measure would give legality to which now gives me concern. Forgive me if I decline to be drawn into a discussion of another subject, as the time allotted me is about to expire.

Mr. Speaker, there is a serious phase involved in this great question. There may be at some time in the unhappy future a condition of widespread unemployment. Any reasoning person who contemplates the conditions of today will agree with me, I am quite sure, that there is no immediate prospect of any such a dire calamity overtaking us. If ever so unfortunate an eventuality is to befall our country, it will not be in less than 4, 5, or 6 years from now, maybe 10 years. Experience acquired in the last war has taught us that the beginning days of reconversion are days of prosperity and plenty of jobs rather than of depression and unemployment. In view of this patent fact, is not this action premature? Should we endeavor to legislate upon this

subject at the present time? If at some time in the distant future, not when the war in Europe has ended in victory for our arms, but long after the last shell has been fired in the Far East, a condition should arise that requires legislative treatment, this Congress, on call of the President if we are in recess or, upon our own motion if we are in session, can then meet and find the answer to the problems of that day. Manifestly we should not endeavor to blindly legislate for the yet unrevealed future. Unless there is one amongst us who is a prophet, a seer, or a seventh son of a seventh son who can determine precisely in advance that which the future is to unfold, we should leave the problems of the future for the future to solve as we leave to the past the burying of its dead.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. EBERHARTER].

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I have a great deal of respect for my colleagues on the conference committee who take the position that they do, which, in my opinion, is that this Congress should do nothing whatsoever at this time to cushion the shock which will immediately occur when the shooting stops. If anybody will deny the fact that there will be inevitably mass unemployment when that happens, I would like to know on what basis they make such contention. It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that these gentlemen fail to realize the magnitude of the shock that is going to occur in this country. It seems to me they are only considering this matter from the standpoint of cost. They are failing to look forward to the future with any vision. They are failing to attack the problem now because it requires a little bit of courage.

Mr. Speaker, we can do something at this time in a practical way to cushion that shock which everybody realizes must come. It has been said here this morning that this travel allowance is a departure, something different, something entirely new. From time immemorial that has been the stock answer, that is the usual phraseology and attitude of those who are always against something progressive, who are always questioning the wisdom of any suggestion that leans toward liberalism. I also submit, Mr. Speaker, that the cost is not the only angle to be taken into consideration.

I call your attention to the fact that every person who appeared before the Ways and Means Committee favored this proposition of allowing travel pay.

If we are to disregard the recommendations of every person studying this subject, then the Congress is going along in a bullheaded way. Mr. Speaker, it will be said of this Congress that when it came to passing legislation to take care of the post-war readjustment and the reconversion period, that it failed; that it only considered things which were relatively unimportant. Take the matter of cost, Mr. Speaker. It will cost many, many times as much if we allow these dislocated war workers to remain in congested areas and allow slum conditions to arise. It will create additional crime problems. It will cause a depletion of labor in the sections of the country where it is most needed, such as the farm sections and in the Cotton Belt. The dislocation of available employees will be great. This is a subject that we failed to take care of after the last war, and look what we faced. Are we going to say now, "Yes, we will do no more until we are overwhelmed with demands that will come down upon us and descend upon this Capitol"? That will cost many, many more times as much. Mr. Speaker, I submit that this travel allowance will not of itself cushion the shock entirely. It will help just in a small way, in the same way that the payment of larger amounts of unemployment compensation will help. It is not an over-all proposition.

The other body is not composed of a radical membership that is insisting on something which is altogether insensible and has no logic to it. I think we ought to consider this proposal with favor, especially in view of the fact that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL] said the Senate conferees are willing to compromise. They are willing to throw more restrictions around it. They are willing to cut down the amount. Mr. Speaker, I submit that the Economic Stabilization Director, or whoever is in charge of this program, is not going to throw away the funds of the United States of America. He is only going to take care of the hardship cases. He is not going to squander our money. We must give him a little discretion, a little leeway.

I submit, Mr. Speaker, that we ought to look forward a little bit and not just say, "Well, we do not know how much it is going to cost." Mr. Speaker, I hope that the motion of the gentleman from North Carolina is voted down.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WRIGHT].

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I would like to say something about the legislative situation which confronts us. If we support the motion of the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means we are closing the door to any compromise between the House and the Senate. On the other hand if the motion which now is presented to us is defeated, a compromise is still possible.

I was impressed by the statement of the gentleman from Michigan that the Senate was willing partially to recede from its position and to adopt the amendment which was suggested by Senator TAFT. That amendment, it seems to me, throws all the safeguards possible around the giving of travel allowance and at the same time takes care of situations which are undoubtedly going to exist in several large industrial areas after the war is over. Senator TAFT'S amendment would reduce the amount of allowance from two to one hundred dollars, and would confine payments to those industrial workers who had earned less than $50 per week, and who were actually indigent. Some people say that we are not going to have any unemployment after the war, that we are going to have prosperity. I believe that we are going to have prosperity in certain districts in certain types of industry, but who is there in this House that can say when we stop the manufacture of aircraft and stop the building of ships both of which we have been building in such great abundance that we are not going to have localized areas where we are going to have widespread unemployment. We are going to have unemployed workers in these areas, some of whom I admit have been making good money, but some of whom have not been making a great amount of money—if their living expenses be considered—who will be stranded, who will be left as a burden upon the industrial and the economic structure of the communities in question.

I read in the paper the other day that the Governor of California had expressed considerable concern over the Federal employees who were going to be left there after some of the plants are shut down and had recommended in a statement to the papers that Federal employees be included in the unemployment compensation provisions. Of course, that is the other motion we are going to dispose of today, and I am in agreement upon it with Governor Warren. But another way of alleviating the very same situation which addressed itself to the concern of the Governor of California is to give a reasonable allowance to the people who need it to get back home or to get another job.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. HARE].

Mr. HARE. Mr. Speaker, I judge from the remarks made by those preceding me that the fundamental idea involved in this issue is that if provision is not made for the return of persons employed in war industry, it will create increased or enlarged social problems in those communities.

I am wondering whether it would not be easier and better to take care of these social problems in the highly industrial areas rather than send these transient individuals back home and into communities which have not had an opportunity to enjoy the privileges and profits derived from these great industrial enterprises.

It may be a question of mathematical computation as to whether city A or community A, for example, is better able financially to handle its social problems following this great era of prosperity where everybody has prospered than in community B, or some other community where they have not had an opportunity to increase or enlarge their financial resources and are, therefore, not able to properly take care of their own social problems without having to be burdened further with those who return to their bona fide homes but possibly with hundreds or thousands of other people foreign to the community who may be merely prospecting for new opportunities and feeling that upon failure to find them the Federal Government will take care of them in some way.

There is a great deal more involved in this motion than merely paying the transportation of war workers back to

their homes. The provision in the Senate bill not only provides for the return of workers to their bona fide residence but provides for paying travel expenses "to any other location of new employment arranged by the worker" and "at the election of such worker." This quotation is from page 14, lines 13, 14, and 15 of the Senate bill.

It has been suggested by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. EBERHARTER] that a large percentage of the people will be needed in the cottonfields of the South. That may be true, but I can see the possibility of the surplus labor problem in the South becoming greater than the problem of labor scarcity. I know we are greatly in need of additional labor in my State, but I am not certain but what we will be better able to solve the problem with a normal return of native labor than to let down the bars by giving the Employment Service the right to flood the country with a great horde of people who do not know a stalk of cotton from an okra plant and know little or nothing about growing cotton, and when this is found out they will become easy competitors with native labor in our textile plants.

You would, therefore, not only increase the social problems and the ability to take care of those problems in communities where they are less able to do it by agreeing to the Senate bill, but we may create a much larger problem. Some here do not seem to consider the responsibility and the capacity of others. The thing they want to do is relieve themselves of this problem after these 3 years of unprecedented production, unprecedented prosperity, and unprecedented accumulation of profits.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. HINSHAW].

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, in my district one war plant has increased in number of employees from 2,500 to 65,000 since this war started. I am sure I cannot tell you how all of these people are going to get back to the various places from whence they came. They came at the instance of the War Manpower Commission and the advertising of these concerns who advertised all over the United States seeking employees, and upon the urging of the U. S. E. S. Some of them may have had their fares paid by a war contractor, as I know was the rule in transporting workers from the East to the Kaiser shipyards in Bremerton, Wash. Many of them traveled on their own tires and thousands hitch-hiked or "rode the rods." Even now the Boeing Co. in Seattle is advertising for workers in my district in southern California.

I do not know where they got the money to get to California in the first place, from Texas, from Louisiana, from Oklahoma, Iowa, Wisconsin, and all of the other points of the Middle West and even from as far east as Georgia. Some fair means should be supplied so that if they are stranded on the west coast they can get home again at war's end. If a fair alternate proposal has been made by Senator TAFT, as has been said here, then I think we should have an opportunity to consider that proposal in this body.

I cannot vote to agree with the Senate provision for travel pay as it is far too loosely drafted. No one here can tell from the language in the Senate bill who may or may not be included. I think some provision of travel allowance should be made for those whose fares were paid from home to distant places of employment by war contractors who sought their services. If the United States Employment Service assisted, then the U. S. E. S. should get them home again. For distress cases likewise provision should be made. There is no reason why stranded ex-war workers should become a burden upon my county or State. Their case is a Federal Government problem. In my mind these matters have been inadequately considered. I shall therefore vote to further disagree with the Senate provision in hope that a fair compromise may be reached.

Mr. Speaker, the Governor of California, Hon. Earl Warren, has addressed a letter to me on the subject of unemployment compensation provision for Government employees which I include at this point:

STATE OF CALIFORNIA,
GOVERNOR'S OFFICE,
Sacramento, September 6, 1944.

Hon. CARL HINSHAW,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: The provision of some form of unemployment compensation for Federal employees is a matter of unusual interest to the State of California. Federal employment on war activities in this State has represented almost 10 percent of our total employment at times during the war years.

We must anticipate the eventual possibility of large-scale unemployment of such workers. While they will not constitute a liability on our State unemployment compensation fund, their unemployment without compensation will create a serious problem. Its magnitude will be sufficient to affect seriously the economic situation in the State.

While many of these Federal employees have accumulated deferred annual leave, and some of them will be entitled to refunds of their contributions to the retirement fund, such benefits do not serve the same purpose as unemployment compensation.

Your consideration is respectfully invited to the importance of the final retention in Senate bill No. 2051 of some form of equitable provision for unemployment compensation for Federal employees.

Sincerely,

EARL WARREN, *Governor.*

Concerning the Federal employees, in California there are 280,000 of them, which is 10,000 more than there are right here in Washington, D. C. Two hundred and twenty-two thousand of those employees are what are known as war-service temporaries. I say 222,000; there are that many working in the War and Navy Departments alone. They are all contributing 5 percent of their salaries to a retirement fund. It seems to me that the Committee on Ways and Means might very well consider allowing them the right to transfer some part of that amount of money which has been set aside for retirement to unemployment benefits as their contribution toward unemployment benefits, if they see fit, or to give it to them outright in cash, as they are entitled and at their option when they are released. At all events, no one can know whether there will be unemployment, nor how much unemployment there will be, if there is any. We have many Government war-service temporary employees in my State and in my congressional district, literally thousands upon thousands of them citizens of your districts, gentlemen, and they are entitled to your consideration.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS].

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, the choice before the House is whether it shall vote up or down the motion to insist upon the position of the House. I happen to believe that a provision with regard to this matter similar to that which has been described as the Taft amendment is the right kind of provision rather than the present Senate language. What I want is a possibility of the United States Employment Service having the means, in an orderly fashion, of shifting people who become unemployed in an area where they have gone for the purpose of doing war work, to another place where employment is actually available for them. I think we need such a provision as part of the machinery of reconversion. In order for the Taft amendment, or any similar provision, to be considered at all it is necessary that we vote down the motion to insist upon the position of the House, which is a flat insistence that there should be no provision on this matter at all. It is with that position in my mind that I shall vote against the motion to insist upon the position of the House. This is a national problem, as I view it, and not a matter of entitlement of the individual at all. We need an element in our reconversion program so that we will not have concentrations of large numbers of unemployed people in one place, unable in certain instances to move to another place when there is a need for workers in those other sections. That is the problem which I would like to see dealt with. If the House position is sustained, that problem will be dodged instead.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER].

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, it might be well to have a look at the Republican platform and see how the Republicans in Chicago, in writing that platform, threw their arms literally around labor and told labor how much they loved it. Now are these assertions in the Republican platform to be mere pious platitudes and pontifical nothings? It would seem so from the speeches made on the Republican side of this Chamber.

Mr. Dewey tonight will address the Nation over the radio on the subject of labor. He will tell us how much he loves labor. Yet I challenge Mr. Dewey, the leader of the Republican Party, to say that he will refuse the granting of transportation to indigent war workers and their families, either to their homes or

to another job. I challenge Dewey tonight, likewise, to say that he will refuse compensation to Federal workers who are thrown out of employment as the result of cut-backs and the cessation of war's exigencies. Mr. Dewey dare not say what you Republicans today are doing by your reactionary votes and observations.

We have an anomalous situation here. Dewey will say lovely things, but his honeyed words will be soured and nullified by what those on the Republican side of the aisle will do today. Thus the Republican Party like Janus would face in two directions.

As for my colleagues on the Democratic side, all I can say is, if they vote for the proposal of the distinguished chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, they are enthusiastically misguided. As for them, the chickens will eventually come home to roost.

The human element, as far as I can see that element in the Ways and Means Committee motion, is utterly and totally obliterated. Those who voted for the George bill, as brought up by the Ways and Means Committee, and as finally adopted by this House, only kept their eye on the property rights. Property rights were protected. The financial situation was thoroughly canvassed, and those financially interested in war contracts were properly protected, but the laboring man and the laboring woman were shunted aside and given the least possible consideration. In contract termination, surplus property legislation and in all reconversion bills we take care of the man with the money, but we do not give a tinker's dam, apparently, for the working man and woman.

I say this, I have said it before and I repeat it, the C. I. O., the A. F. of L., and the railroad brotherhoods at last got together and agreed upon a bill, the so-called Dingell bill. The C. I. O., the railroad brotherhoods, and the A. F. of L. want you ladies and gentlemen to vote down the proposal of the Ways and Means Committee that is offered to you today. It runs counter to the Dingell bill. They want justice to the Federal worker. They want justice to the civilian war worker so that he may go to his home and go to a new job.

The gentleman from North Carolina, the distinguished chairman of the Ways and Means Committee [Mr. DOUGHTON], says that the term "war work" or "work essential to the war," is too indefinite and therefore to attempt to give transportation costs home or to another job to the war worker involves impossible interpretations.

My answer is that the terms "war work" and "work essential to the war" have been definitely interpreted. The War Production Board in granting priorities had to wrestle with that terminology and they have specific regulations as to what is or is not war work or work essential to the war. Likewise, the O. P. A. has specific regulations with reference to these terms. The Foreign Economic Administration permits imports and exports in accordance with such terminology. The Office of Strategic Services has determined those terms with minute detail. They have to designate what is or what is not "strategic material." To determine "strategic material," they define "war work" and "war material." Likewise the Selective Service and the War Manpower Commission, and numerous other war agencies have their regulations concerning these terms. I think the distinguished chairman of the Ways and Means Committee is looking for ghosts under the bed.

My gallant friend the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. KNUTSON] is worried about our war debt. I am not worried about it. It has reached great magnitude. But, our war effort has reached great magnitude. That huge debt is due to the war. But, there are some things that cannot be helped, cannot be avoided. He says we will soon be figuring the Federal budget in trillions. What would he have us do? Go back to horse and buggy days? "Time marches on." The country marches on. The United States will not stop because of the worries of the gentleman from Minnesota. That gentleman wants a status quo forever. In Washington's time our national debt was figured in the thousands. In Lincoln's time, it was figured in the millions. Now it must of necessity be figured in billions. That cannot be helped. We are growing in many ways, in production, purchasing power, and so forth.

With the Lilliputian concept of the gentleman from Minnesota we could not have beaten the Nazis. We had to widen our vision. We had to widen our international concepts. We had to enlarge our military outlook, all of which necessitated the widening of our national debt.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. KNUTSON. Will the gentleman yield? Is the gentleman speaking for Sidney Hillman?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman cannot yield because his time has expired.

Mr. KNUTSON. I am sorry. I did not hear the Speaker.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. COOPER].

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, in the very brief time remaining I simply want to invite attention to the language in this bill upon which you are called to vote. That is the important thing to bear in mind. We have heard much discussion, a great deal of it not bearing on the question under consideration at all.

On page 14, I invite your attention to these 14 lines, which is the thing upon which you will have to vote. The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DOUGHTON] has made a motion that the House conferees be directed to further insist on disagreement to this provision.

Page 16, line 7:

SEC. 303. The Administrator shall have power to provide transportation, including transportation of dependents and household effects for civilian workers who have been employed in activities essential to the war effort, from the place of such employment to the location of their bona fide residence within the continental United States prior to their migration to war employment, or, at the election of such worker, to any other location of new employment arranged by the worker: *Provided*, That the cost of such transportation shall not exceed $200 for any one worker, his dependents, and household effects, and shall not exceed the amount allowable for civilian employees of the several departments and independent establishments of the Federal Government in the Standard Government Travel Regulations.

That provision is as wide open as a bootjack. There is no way in the world to tell how much a thing like that will cost. Civilian workers could include almost everybody except those in the armed forces. It could include people of wealth and independent means; they would be entitled to qualify for this transportation pay; those who have been employed. How long? A month, a week, a day, or an hour? Just so they have been employed.

Certainly the motion of the gentleman from North Carolina should be sustained, and the position of your House conferees should be supported.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee has expired; all time has expired.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, on that, I demand the yeas and nays.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and there were—yeas 241, nays 91, answered "Present" 0, not voting 101, as follows:

[Roll No. 112]

YEAS—241

Abernethy	Cooley	Hale
Allen, Ill.	Cooper	Hall,
Allen, La.	Costello	Edwin Arthur
Andersen,	Cox	Hall
H. Carl	Cravens	Leonard W.
Andresen,	Crawford	Halleck
August H.	Cunningham	Hancock
Andrews, Ala.	D'Alesandro	Hare
Andrews, N. Y.	Davis	Harness, Ind.
Arends	Dilweg,	Harris, Ark.
Arnold	D'rksen	Hébert
Auchincloss	Disney	Heidinger
Baldwin, Md.	Dondero	Herter
Baldwin, N. Y.	Doughton	Hess
Barden	Drewry	Hill
Barrett	Durham	Hinshaw
Bates, Mass.	Dworshak	Hobbs
Beall	Eaton	Hoffman
Beckworth	Ellis	Holmes, Mass.
Bishop	Elston, Ohio	Hope
Bland	Engel, Mich.	Howell
Bonner	Fellows	Jarman
Boren	Fenton	Jeffrey
Brown, Ga.	Fernandez	Jenkins
Brown, Ohio	Fish	Jennings
Brumbaugh	Folger	Jensen
Bryson	Fuller	Johnson,
Buck	Fulmer	Anton J.
Buffett	Gamble	Johnson,
Bulwinkle	Gathings	Calvin D.
Burch, Va.	Gavin	Johnson, Ind.
Butler	Gearhart	Johnson,
Camp	Gerlach	Luther A.
Canfield	Gillespie	Johnson,
Cannon, Fla.	Gillette	Lyndon B.
Carlson, Kans.	Gillie	Johnson, Okla.
Carson, Ohio	Goodwin	Jones
Chapman	Gore	Jonkman
Chenoweth	Gossett	Kean
Chiperfield	Graham	Kearney
Church	Grant, Ala.	Keefe
Clevenger	Grant, Ind.	Kerr
Cole, Mo.	Gregory	Kilburn
Cole, N. Y.	Griffiths	Kilday
Colmer	Gross	Kinzer
Compton	Gwynne	Kleberg

Knutson	Patton	Stigler
Landis	Peterson, Ga.	Sumner, Ill.
Lanham	Pittenger	Sumners, Tex.
Larcade	Plumley	Sundstrom
LeFevre	Powers	Taber
McConnell	Pracht,	Talbot
McCowen	C. Frederick	Talle
McGehee	Pratt,	Tarver
McGregor	Joseph M.	Taylor
McMillan, S. C.	Price	Thomas, N. J.
McMillen, Ill.	Priest	Thomas, Tex.
McWilliams	Randolph	Thomason
Maas	Rankin	Tibbott
Mahon	Reed, Ill.	Towe
Maloney	Reed, N. Y.	Troutman
Manasco	Rees, Kans.	Vincent, Ky.
Mansfield,	Rivers	Vorys, Ohio
Mont.	Robertson	Vursell
Mansfield, Tex.	Rockwell	Ward
Martin, Iowa	Rodgers, Pa.	Weichel, Ohio
Martin, Mass.	Rohrbough	West
Mason	Sasscer	Whelchel, Ga.
May	Satterfield	White
Merrow	Schiffler	Whitten
Michener	Scott	Whittington
Miller, Nebr.	Scrivner	Wickersham
Miller, Pa.	Shafer	Wigglesworth
Mills	Short	Wilson
Monkiewicz	Simpson, Ill.	Winstead
Monroney	Simpson, Pa.	Winter
Morrison, N. C.	Smith, Ohio	Wolcott
Mott	Smith, Va.	Wolfenden, Pa.
Murray, Tenn.	Smith, Wis.	Woodruff, Mich.
Murray, Wis.	Sparkman	Woodrum, Va.
Newsome	Springer	Worley
O'Hara	Stanley	Zimmerman
O'Konski	Starnes, Ala.	
Pace	Stewart	

NAYS—91

Anderson, Calif.	Hart	Norton
Anderson,	Heffernan	O'Brien, Ill.
N. Mex.	Hoch	O'Brien, Mich.
Angell	Hull	O'Toole
Bender	Johnson,	Outland
Bloom	J. Leroy	Peterson, Fla.
Bradley, Pa.	Kee	Pfeifer
Buckley	Kefauver	Philbin
Burchill, N. Y.	Kelley	Rabaut
Burdick	Keogh	Ramey
Byrne	Kirwan	Ramspeck
Cannon, Mo.	LaFollette	Robinson, Utah
Celler	Lane	Rolph
Cochran	Lea	Rooney
Coffee	Lesinski	Rowan
Crosser	Lewis	Rowe
Curley	Luce	Sadowski
Dawson	Ludlow	Scanlon
Day	Lynch	Sheridan
Delaney	McCormack	Smith, Maine
Dingell	McMurray	Snyder
Eberharter	Madden	Somers, N. Y.
Ellison, Md.	Magnuson	Spence
Feighan	Marcantonio	Stearns, N. H.
Flannagan	Merritt	Stevenson
Fogarty	Miller, Conn.	Torrens
Forand	Mruk	Voorhis, Calif.
Gordon	Murdock	Walter
Gorski	Murphy	Wene
Green	Myers	Wolverton, N. J.
Harless, Ariz.	Norman	Wright

NOT VOTING—101

Barry	Fitzpatrick	McKenzie
Bates, Ky.	Ford	McLean
Bell	Fulbright	Miller, Mo.
Bennett, Mich.	Furlong	Morrison, La.
Bennett, Mo.	Gale	Mundt
Blackney	Gallagher	Norrell
Bolton	Gibson	O'Brien, N. Y.
Boykin	Gifford	O'Connor
Bradley, Mich.	Gilchrist	O'Neal
Brehm	Granger	Patman
Brooks	Hagen	Phillips
Burgin	Harris, Va.	Ploeser
Busbey	Hartley	Poage
Capozzoli	Hays	Poulson
Carrier	Hendricks	Reece, Tenn.
Carter	Hoeven	Richards
Case	Holifield	Rizley
Clark	Holmes, Wash.	Robsion, Ky.
Clason	Horan	Rogers, Mass.
Courtney	Izac	Russell
Curtis	Jackson	Sabath
Dewey	Johnson, Ward	Sauthoff
Dickstein	Judd	Schwabe
Dies	Kennedy	Sheppard
Douglas	King	Sikes
Elliott	Klein	Slaughter
Ellsworth	Kunkel	Smith, W. Va.
Elmer	Lambertson	Stefan
Engle, Calif.	LeCompte	Stockman
Fay	Lemke	Sullivan
Fisher	McCord	Tolan
Treadway	Wasielewski	Welch
Vinson, Ga.	Weaver	Willey
Wadsworth	Weiss	

So the motion was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Ploeser for, with Mr. Morrison of Louisiana against.

Mr. Hoeven for, with Mr. Paulson against.

Mr. Miller of Missouri for, with Mr. Tolan against.

Mr. Wadsworth for, with Mr. Lemke against.

Mr. Elmer for, with Mr. Sabath against.

Mr. Wasielewski for, with Mr. Dickstein against.

Mr. Vinson of Georgia for, with Mr. Klein against.

Mr. Schwabe for, with Mr. Holifield against.

Mr. Dewey for, with Mr. Izac against.

Mr. Fulbright for, with Mr. Sauthoff against.

Mr. Norrell for, with Mr. Weiss against.

Mr. Bennett of Missouri for, with Mr. Ford against.

Mr. Bradley of Michigan for, with Mr. Granger against.

Mr. Courtney for, with Mr. Capozzoli against.

Mr. Curtis for, with Mr. Fay against.

General pairs:

Until further notice:

Mr. Richards with Mr. Stefan.

Mr. Sheppard with Mr. Douglas.

Mr. Kennedy with Mrs. Bolton.

Mr. Slaughter with Mr. Willey.

Mr. Weaver with Mr. Brehm.

Mr. Hendricks with Mr. Horan.

Mr. Engle of California with Mr. Phillips.

Mr. McCord with Mr. Holmes of Washington.

Mr. Smith of West Virginia with Mr. Stockman.

Mr. Bell with Mr. O'Brien of New York.

Mr. O'Neal with Mr. Carrier.

Mr. Sullivan with Mr. LeCompte.

Mr. Poage with Mr. Kunkel.

Mr. Sikes with Mr. Judd.

Mr. Gibson with Mr. Ward Johnson.

Mr. McKenzie with Mr. Gifford.

Mr. Fitzpatrick with Mr. Ellsworth.

Mr. Clark with Mr. Reece of Tennessee.

Mr. Fisher with Mr. Mundt.

Mr. Hays with Mr. Robsion of Kentucky.

Mr. Burgin with Mr. Welch.

Mr. Elliott with Mr. Rizley.

Mr. Boykin with Mr. Hartley.

Mr. Russell with Mr. Gale.

Mr. Bates of Kentucky with Mr. Clason.

Mr. King with Mr. Blackney.

Mr. Brooks with Mr. Busby.

Mr. BENDER changed his vote from yea to nay.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the action taken by the House on Wednesday last, I send to the Clerk's desk the following motion.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. DOUGHTON moves to instruct the managers on the part of the House in the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the bill (S. 2051) entitled "An act to amend the Social Security Act, as amended, to provide a National program for war mobilization and reconversion, and for other purposes," to insist on their disagreement to section 403 of said Senate bill relating to unemployment compensation for Federal employees.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DOUGHTON] is recognized.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE].

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, I think we should clearly have before us just exactly what is involved in the present motion of the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina, chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means.

In talking with many Members of the House there appears to be a good deal of misapprehension as to just what is involved. May I say, however, that if the motion of the gentleman from North Carolina is voted down that will be an instruction to the House conferees to include unemployment compensation coverage for Federal employees for a period not to exceed 2 years. This proposal does not mean the establishment of a Federal system of unemployment compensation, it means simply that the emergency employees of the Government shall be given the benefits of unemployment compensation to be administered pursuant to the laws of the State in which the service rendered by that Federal employee took place; in other words, when a person left my State and went down to work in a shipyard in Alabama he left a covered employment where had he remained working for the Allis-Chalmers Co. and cessation of employment had thrown him out of a job he would have been paid unemployment compensation by the laws of the State of Wisconsin. When he went to work for this shipyard in Alabama in response to the patriotic impulse which he had and he is thrown out of a job working for the Federal Government he does not have the benefit of unemployment compensation.

All this proposal involves is this, it says to that shipyard worker: "We will pay you unemployment compensation the same as the employees in the State of Alabama who are working for private industry the same amount of unemployment compensation per week, the duration of the unemployment compensation payments to be as provided by Alabama law."

What is this going to cost? my friend from Kansas asks. Who can say what it is going to cost? Who can say how much unemployment there is going to be?

Let us not be deceived by any grotesque figures. Assuming there are 3,000,000 Federal employees, and that they all go out on unemployment compensation, the most that any one of them could draw in any one year would be the average throughout the States, which is less than $20, for a duration of 20 weeks, less than the average. Twenty weeks at $20 is $400 apiece. That is the most any one could draw in any one year. If 3,000,000 of them went on unemployment compensation, if you can conceive of anything that absurd taking place, the cost would be $1,200,000,000 per year, and for the 2-

year period $2,400,000,000. I do not believe there is a person in this room who can conceive of any such ridiculous, grotesque thing taking place as to have 3,000,000 Federal employees go off the Federal pay roll.

The best evidence we have been able to obtain is that the maximum would not be in excess of 1,000,000. If this be true it would cost $400,000,000 a year, assuming that the million Federal employees were unable to secure employment and that each one received the maximum benefit for the maximum duration of 20 weeks each. Mr. Speaker, I cannot conceive that even that situation can possibly be brought about. I do not think we are going to have that unemployment in the post-war period. A person must report for a job to the U. S. E. S. and must respond to an employment opportunity. The employment compensation is cut off when they fail to respond to an employment opportunity.

THE SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. MILLS].

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, when S. 2051 came to the Ways and Means Committee from another body it included a provision for social-security unemployment benefits for Federal employees. The full cost of the inclusion of Federal employees under Title III of the Social Security Act would fall upon the Federal Government.

I have had many Members ask me why the Ways and Means Committee saw fit to exclude from the bill reported to the House recently that provision of the bill as reported by the other body. To me there appears to be a basic difference between employment by the Federal Government and private business. The Congress must have thought so when it originally passed the Social Security Act. Furthermore, it occurred to us in our deliberations on this matter that we could not, under the information we had, without witnesses, without expert testimony from anyone in the executive branch of the Government or anyone on the outside, without testimony from those in charge of the social-security programs in the various States, reach out and include in social security any one group of people from among the vast number in the United States who are not included in the act and be fair to other groups. Those of us on the committee who supported the amendment to exclude Federal employees thought it would be much better if the Ways and Means Committee would deliberate on the social-security program separately and determine whether or not there are among those who are not included certain groups that should be included. We have the idea advanced by the Merchant Marine Committee of the House that employees in the merchant marine should be included, and there is a lot of justification for that; but the amendment placed in the bill by the other body will not include all of those employees, it will not include State employees, and it will not include those employees of an employer working less than eight individuals, it will not include school teachers.

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLS. I yield.

Mr. LYNCH. Was there any evidence before our committee that there were any State employees who would be thrown out of employment as a result of the cessation of hostilities?

Mr. MILLS. Of course, there will be some thrown out of employment, the gentleman knows that, regardless of whether the war is over or not. The State employees will have need if the Federal employees have need.

The gentleman from Wisconsin overlooks the fact that the section under discussion proposes to put under the Social-security program not only war workers in war plants being paid by the Federal Government but every employee of the Federal Government working in a civilian capacity. Do you not know that there must be at least a million of those employees that are going out when this war is over? They would be paid under the programs of the different States at varying rates for varying periods of unemployment. They would not be paid the same amount for the same period. When you put one stenographer under Social Security because she worked for the Federal Government, what excuse will you offer the young lady working in some law office in your district for not being placed under it also? She not being included in this provision.

So I point out, Mr. Speaker, that we cannot, in the short time that we have to consider this matter, without any determination of the cost involved, reach out and select one group from this vast number of groups that are not included under title III of the Social Security Act and say "We are going to include you to the exclusion of all others who may need it just as much as you need it, and for whom there may be more justification for inclusion. Or pick a selected group and say "We are going to take care of you just because you carry the title of being a Federal employee." That is not the way to do it, for it is apparent that greater injustice will result if the section under discussion is left in the bill than if it is deleted.

The chairman of our committee has already said that just as soon as we can possibly get to the matter we are going to review and look into the subject covered by title III to see whether or not others may or should be included. I trust the gentleman's motion will be sustained.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL].

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, this second motion really is the most important thing that we have to consider today, and I trust that it will be overwhelmingly defeated.

The unemployment compensation question which is before us at the present time is unanswerable as Senator GEORGE of Georgia stated. There has been no argument offered that adequately combats the presentation of Senator GEORGE's statement. Take an employee in his own State of Georgia working in a Government arsenal or shipyard performing same kind of work, and for less money, in many instances, than the employee who is engaged in war work in a similar shipyard under private ownership. The employee in the federally owned shipyard, when his work is terminated and he becomes unemployed, is just out and will receive no benefits. The employee in the privately owned shipyard will receive the unemployment compensation benefits according to State law.

It is just all wrong, it is without any justification, and I do not see how anybody in this House can voice approval of such discriminatory treatment under the circumstances.

The fact of the matter is that in the privately owned shipyard the contractor pays into the Federal Treasury 3 percent of the wages or salaries paid to the employees, out of which, of course, the unemployment benefits are then paid. In the Government-owned shipyard no tax has been levied nor any amount in lieu of tax, has been collected and therefore it is argued now that these men and women when so employed are entitled to no benefits. That holds good whether it is in Georgia or New York State or California or the State of my friend from Wisconsin, in the shipbuilding industry there, or in my own State. Whether it is in an arsenal or in a shipyard or any other plant, the discrimination is clearly against the worker who is on the Federal pay roll, and it was never so intended. Congress was derelict, it was not farsighted enough to make proper provision for all employees. Therefore, they are to be left out in the cold. But it is possible to remedy this discrimination at this time.

The question will be asked. How much is it going to cost? According to the statistical department of the Social Security Board, it will cost far less than the amount which would have gone into the Treasury had we treated the employer and the employee in Government shipyards in a way similar to their treatment in private industry.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield

Mr. DINGELL. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. RAMSPECK. I want to give the gentleman an illustration in my own State which I think is even stronger than the one he gave the House. In Macon, Ga., in the district of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON] the Navy has an installation operated under a fixed-fee contract by the Reynolds Metals Co. The Army has an installation operated directly by the Government. In the Army installation the employees are not covered, but in the Navy installation they are covered, and the Navy pays for it through the Reynolds Metals Co. How can the gentleman justify that?

Mr. DINGELL. That is correct. More than that, while there is a maximum possible of 3,500,000 persons who might be covered by the terms of the Senate bill, the fact of the matter is that not more than 2,000,000 of them, the maximum possible according to the figures of Senator GEORGE, would receive any

benefits. I say that is the maximum possible, but it will likely be less than that.

To give you some idea of how adamant were our House conferees, it was 6 to 1 throughout, and no compromise. The Senate conferees, again, were willing to compromise, and here is how far they were willing to go. In lieu of any unemployment compensation which might be paid to Federal employees, it was sought to provide a severance-of-pay allowance. It started with 30 days' pay, and then it was thought that perhaps 21 days or even 15 days would be advisable. We spoke of possibly limiting it to employees receiving $2,000 or less per annum. If the total number of employees who would receive severance-of-pay benefits for 15 days at $5 a day, or $75, were 1,000,000, that would be $75,000,000, and for 2,000,000 it would be $150,000,000 at the very most.

I am assured that the higher rate of unemployment compensation which would be applicable under the original Senate provisions would be less than the amount of tax money which should have been levied on the salaries of that same class of employees. If you were to apply a severance-pay provision to these people, the Federal Government then would be far ahead of the deal. But the House conferees were absolutely determined that under no circumstances would this matter be considered. Now let us not be kidded about these provisions being taken care of sometime in the future, because it will be difficult to get at the problem at any time. I do not know just when we are going to be able to get at the question of considering social-security amendments. Some of us have been talking about that for the last 2 or 3 years. The committee has been swamped with work and has been unable to get at it. This is an emergency. It is necessary to make some immediate provisions. This will not wait for somebody's proposal in the future. It ought to be tackled now for the reason that any other proposal will not touch the problem when it arises. Undoubtedly proposals will be made here that these people can get this money out of their accumulated leaves, and the like. I want to say to you, from the best information we had before the committee, that it will take anywhere from 2 months to a year before such a thing could be put through, before the money would be available to these employees. And by that time they may not need it. Besides, remember this, you would be giving them nothing except their own money and taking it out of their own fund.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I think it is fair that we should try to look at this whole picture as we come to a vote on this situation. For my own part I shall support the motion made by the chairman of the committee. I cannot take what seems to me to be a defeatist position. I believe I know and we all know that there is going to be plenty of work when this war is over. Most of these Federal employees are going to be let out very gradually. Most of them are going to be let out in that way because the war with Japan, unquestionably, will last a very considerable time longer than the war in Europe. They are going to be let out in accordance generally with rules of seniority and those who are let out last will be those who have worked the longest. They have a great many privileges, that is, those who work directly for the Government, which are greater and larger than those privileges which the ones who are working on war work for private industry will receive.

In most places they receive higher pay. In a great many cases they are women who have never worked before and never expect to work again after the war contribution they are making is over.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. TABER. Not at this time. I will yield later.

A great many of them intend to go back home just as soon as this thing is over. Most of them are receiving more money than they ever received before. Most of them are being thrifty and are saving the money. All of them are contributing to the Federal retirement proposition on the basis of 5 percent of their salary. Now, just how does that compare with the contributions that are made with reference to those who are in private industry? It means that they are contributing 5 percent against 1 percent that is being contributed by those in private industry. They would receive larger retirement if they continued on the Federal pay roll to the end. When they are discharged they will receive their accumulated payments to the retirement fund, plus 4 percent interest from the date of withholding. Five hundred and seventy-four thousand of those people have already received those payments. Those who would receive smaller payments because of short periods of employment, have pretty well received theirs. Those who will be paid from this time on will receive larger sums.

If a man had worked a year at a salary of $2,000, he would receive $200, plus $4 interest. If he had worked 2 years he would receive $400, plus $8 interest. Where they have been working at one job in one place for one department, and that is what the picture is in most cases, those items would be more than the regular unemployment insurance. It would be enough to tide those people over until they moved back into regular work.

In my opinion if we put people on unemployment insurance where it is not necessary, instead of promoting reconversion you make this bill an antireconversion bill, and a bill designed to prevent reconversion by preventing the people from going to work, because there are a lot of them who will not go to work if they get this unemployment insurance.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. KEEFE. Is it not a fact that under every State law in this Union, a person to be entitled to unemployment compensation, must register at the employment office and continue to report at least once a week in most States and once in 2 weeks in other States, and any person who refuses to accept a job tendered by the employment office is immediately severed from the unemployment compensation rolls?

Mr. TABER. That is not the rule. That is not what they do. I have had people working for me solicited by this outfit to go on unemployment insurance and stay on when they were actually working and had a job. I know how that thing works. I cannot be fooled by it, because I have been up against it and have had experience. I do not want to get into a controversy with the gentleman but when I know what has happened and when I have had it happen to me, with this outfit going out soliciting people to go on unemployment insurance, I cannot let it go without calling it to the attention of the House.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. CRAWFORD. The gentleman has developed a very important point in my estimation. Do I understand that where a mechanic in Milwaukee, for instance, goes to Mobile, Ala., leaves a private industry job in Milwaukee and goes into a Government-owned shipping institution at Mobile, that when that worker goes on the Mobile pay roll he begins to put up 5 percent of his salary?

Mr. TABER. The minute he goes on the Federal pay roll.

Mr. CRAWFORD. And the gentleman from Milwaukee would stand here and have us go directly to the Treasury for specific grants to give that employee who receives a higher pay in Mobile—I do not think there is any question about that at all—and who has been setting aside 5 percent, and whose wages and salaries were made sufficiently high to enable him to do that considering his dislocation, considering his increased cost of living. The gentleman from Wisconsin would have us now go to the Treasury and make direct grants to pay that fellow another premium when under the War Manpower Commission ruling a man who goes from a private industrial pay roll to a farm in connection with the production of food gets no benefit whatever.

Mr. TABER. That is correct.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Are we to stand here and justify that discrimination? If we give it to one should we not give it to the other?

Mr. TABER. Certainly it would be discrimination, discrimination in favor of the Federal employee.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. KNUTSON. Confirming what the gentleman said a few moments ago, I read from hearings held by the Senate Committee on Post-War Economic Policy and Planning testimony given by Mr.

Williams, the head of the Texas Unemployment Insurance Bureau. He said:

But the top administration here in Washington issued instructions to the Employment Service to find jobs and place people only in jobs essential to the war effort and not to find jobs for unemployment compensation claimants who are not qualified to work in essential war industry.

That bears out what the gentleman said a moment ago.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. Was any commitment made on the part of any Government agency to these people that unemployment insurance would be available to them if they went to work for the Federal Government?

Mr. TABER. There never has been any such commitment; and on top of that they have been treated better than people in private industry, because they have greater leave with pay and they have sick leave with pay; and on top of that, as I have stated, there is set aside a large retirement fund, a fund that is a great deal larger than that set aside for workers in private industry.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from New York [Mr. LYNCH].

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, I am in favor of extending unemployment benefits to Federal employees. I believe the Federal Government should do for its own employees what it insists industry do for the employees of industry.

It is estimated that after the termination of hostilities we will have upward of 1,500,000 employees in the Federal departments who will lose their jobs. To me it is no answer to say that the Government has been deducting 5 percent from their salaries for the retirement fund and that when they lose their jobs they should withdraw their retirement money and live on that during their unemployment period. In the first place, it will take from 6 months to a year for them to receive their checks covering their retirement accumulation.

Secondly, as a mere matter of simple justice, the Federal Government, like private industry, should make provision for its employees. Under the Social Security Act the employers must pay 3-percent tax for unemployment, 2.7 percent going to the State funds and three-tenths percent to the Federal Government. It matters not whether the private concern has an employees' pension fund. Is there any justice in taxing industry for unemployment compensation for the benefit of its employees and to take the position that the Federal Government should not be compelled to contribute for unemployment compensation?

I fail to see any difference in the needs of employees who lose their jobs in private industry and those who lose their jobs in Government service as a result of the war effort. I confess that I cannot see the logic in the position of those who say that the welders, machinists, riggers, and other mechanical and clerical help in the Todd shipyard in New York should be entitled to unemployment compensation and the welders, mechanics, riggers, and other mechanical and clerical help in the Brooklyn Navy Yard, only a mile or two distant, in the same county and along the same river front, should not be entitled to unemployment compensation. Do not forget that the 3 percent contributed by the private shipyards is included in the cost of construction of the ships built for the Government, so that, in reality, the Government is paying the tax of the private shipyard.

Is there any wonder that we are having difficulty in getting labor for Government shipyards and ordnance plants? As the war progresses it will be more difficult to get labor and clerical help for Government service, because if we, today, vote against extension of unemployment benefits to Federal employees, it will be to the advantage of these people to give up their jobs in the Government service which needs them badly, and get back into private industry where they know that in the event they lose their jobs, they will receive unemployment benefits for a definite period of time, during which they can seek new employment.

I previously said, when this bill was originally before the House, that it was wholly inadequate. I was one of the four on the Ways and Means Committee who signed the dissenting report, because inadequate as the bill was when it came to our committee, it was only a skeleton of its original self when our committee reported it to the House and as it passed the House.

It looks to me as though the House is deliberately and painstakingly doing everything in its power for business, but not one single thing for the worker. We have passed a bill for reconversion for the benefit of business; we have passed the surplus-property bill for the benefit of business. There is already a strong movement to reduce the tax on corporations, but we have not done a single thing for the protection of the war worker when hostilities cease.

We have been regaled here with statements of the great cost. Let those who speak that way consult the RECORD and see whether they did not vote last year for the Ruml plan which forgave a year's taxes while we were in the midst of our fight for survival as a great Nation of the world. We look upon the loss the Government will suffer in the disposal of surplus property as a cost of the war. We look upon the cost of reconversion as a cost of the war. These have to do with industry; these have to do largely with big business. But when it comes to the human side of the war, when it comes to seeing that the Government acts as fairly to its employees as it compels industry to act toward the latter's employees, we are suddenly apprehensive of the cost. To my mind, unemployment compensation for Federal employees who have been engaged in war work—and I believe only those who have been engaged in the war agencies will lose their jobs—should be as much a cost of the war as the cost of reconversion and the disposal of surplus property. The only difference is that one helps the worker, the others help industry.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FORAND].

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Speaker, I am one of those who believe very strongly that the item now before us is worthy of much greater consideration than it is apparently receiving.

Opponents of the idea of extending unemployment insurance coverage to employees of the Federal Government have this afternoon passed over the item in a rather light vein in some instances; in fact, some ridicule has been indulged in on the floor in order to try to draw a red herring across the trail. We must be honest with ourselves and consider the fact that this is a temporary measure, that the life of the bill before us is at the outside for only 2 years after the war ends and that the number of jobs now being held by Federal employees according to the latest figures is somewhere around 3,000,000, and surely not the entire 3,000,000 of them will be thrown off the Federal pay roll at the end of the war. There is a considerable number of Federal employees right here in the District of Columbia, including white-collar workers. We also have those in the arsenals, in the navy yards, and in the torpedo stations who will be thrown out of employment. Many of these people have taken those jobs at the insistence of the Civil Service Commission that sent recruiters throughout the country telling the people that it was their patriotic duty to work for Uncle Sam, and there was an urgent need for their services. In fact, they have gone so far as to send them to the Rhode Island State College, where only last week a class of 42 or 45 graduated. Those secretaries were young ladies from throughout New England who had been brought down to Rhode Island under the auspices of the Government, trained to be secretaries, and upon their graduation to come to Washington to help serve the war effort.

Under these circumstances every one of those persons who responded to the call and who, upon termination of their employment, find themselves out of a job, should be eligible for unemployment compensation to tide them over until they find a job. I think this is directly a war expense.

Someone asks, "Where are you going to get the money to pay for this? How many people are going to be affected? How much is it going to cost?" My answer to those questions is that I cannot tell you what the cost of that is going to be any more than you can tell me what the cost of the war will be. This is part of the war expenditure and as such should be paid out of war funds. We are all hoping that within the next few days the war in Europe will have reached its end. When that time arrives there will be unexpended funds in the War and Navy Departments, funds that we have appropriated for the current fiscal year. Out of those funds we should find a way to pay this unemployment compensation.

Something was mentioned a few moments ago regarding the retirement money that these people will draw. It has been brought to your attention this afternoon that the retirement money coming to people leaving the Federal service is not just there waiting for them when they get their discharge slips. Every one of you, I am sure, has had case after case he has had to handle for his constituents and that it has taken not only from 2 to 3 weeks but up to a year. In fact, last week I had one come across my desk that has been pending for a year and a half. Nobody is to blame for that particularly because we realize the great turmoil the war has caused. We know that these people working for the war agencies would like to get their money back, but within the war agencies it seems impossible to get the records out in time for the Civil Service Commission or the Retirement Board to make quick settlement.

Mr. Speaker, I beg of the Members that they give serious consideration to this item and to extend this coverage to the Federal employees about to be let out.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED].

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REED of New York. I yield to the gentlewoman from Illinois.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Is the rumor true that if this passes and it is permitted to include Federal employees that Congressmen and their secretaries will also get it?

Mr. REED of New York. There are quite a number of people here who are against this.

Mr. COOPER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REED of New York. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. COOPER. I am sure the gentleman will recall that this will not include Members of Congress because Members of Congress under the law are not employees of the Government. They are officers of the Government.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. How about the secretaries?

Mr. REED of New York. It would include secretaries, though.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REED of New York. I would like to say a few words here myself.

Mr. MICHENER. Does it include the secretary?

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I can imagine nothing that would be more gratifying to any Member of Congress than to vote unemployment compensation to every person in the United States.

How I would thrill at the prospect of going into my district and telling my constituents that through my efforts their working days were over; that every week a check would be forthcoming from Uncle Sam.

Can you imagine the temporary joy with which such an announcement would be received?

Not alone that, but how such a move would garner in the votes!

Who are left out of unemployment compensation? Agricultural labor, domestic service, casual labor not in course of the employer's trade or business, services on both American and foreign vessels, services in the employ of a foreign government or its instrumentalities, employees of Federal, State, and local governments, and certain of their instrumentalities, family employment, service by insurance agents, service by newsboys under 18, services for fraternal and benefactory associations, services for certain charitable, religious, educational, and scientific organizations not organized or conducted for profit.

How about the old people?

They are unemployed. Why not go the length?

There is a bill pending to provide every adult citizen in the United States with equal basic Federal insurance, permitting retirement with benefits at age 60, and also covering total disability, from whatever cause, for certain citizens under 60; to give protection to widows with children; to provide an ever-expanding market for goods and services through the payment and distribution of such benefits in ratio to the Nation's steadily increasing ability to produce, with the cost of such benefits to be carried by every citizen in proportion to the income privileges he enjoys.

It would be an inspiration to vote benefits for all these groups of splendid people. What restrains some of us from supporting these proposals to cover the classes not now covered? Do we not have to exercise restraint, even though it would mean votes were we to surrender to our desire to vote subvention to all. As stewards of the people, who are taxed to pay, should we commit the people to a burden of millions to add to a national debt of $211,236,403,023.19 of a few days ago? The debt is growing by leaps and bounds, and the war and its expenditure still continues.

Must we, without thought of the future, and only with thought of increasing our own majority at the polls, throw discretion and prudence to the winds? It must be remembered that the returning soldiers will have to shoulder a portion of every financial commitment made by Congress which appears on the deficit side of the ledger.

We face a fiscal crisis in this country, and it behooves us as trustees of the people that there be a closer teamwork when it comes to appropriations and the revenue to pay for them.

If today were tax-paying day, and if there were not a national election on November 7, I doubt if there would be a vote against the position taken by the Ways and Means Committee. The war still rages. The ultimate size of the debt cannot be estimated. The end of hostilities is any person's guess.

This proposal should be explored and then voted upon in the orderly way after full and fair hearings. It must be remembered that Federal employees, if granted unemployment benefits, as is here urged, would also get their accumulated sick leave and the 5-percent benefits under civil-service retirement. The question of discrimination should be carefully studied before passing such a far-reaching piece of legislation.

Any person who shall have rendered service as a civilian in the employ of the United States Government, after September 16, 1940, shall be entitled, in accordance with the applicable provisions of the unemployment compensation law of the State in which claim for compensation is filed, to receive compensation for each week of unemployment commencing after September 30, 1944, in the same amounts, on the same terms, and subject to the same conditions, as though the unemployment compensation laws of the several States did not exclude services performed in the employ of the United States Government.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. SASSCER].

Mr. SASSCER. Mr. Speaker, I hope that the provisions of this bill will be broadened to include within its scope Federal employees. As I listened to the debate, the argument against such inclusion seems to be directed more against unemployment compensation as a system than against including Federal employees. We have had men leaving private employment contributing to the war by going into Government powder factories, Government shipyards, Government ordnance gun factories, and other Government agencies, working frequently in the same block with men in private employment who often get a few dollars more a day than the Federal employees in similar work.

When the former are included is it just to exclude the latter? A greater percentage of the latter are maintaining homes in local communities. They would have qualified for unemployment compensation had they not gone into Government work.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON].

Mr. CARLSON of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, today we are trying to do something on the floor of this House that the Committee on Ways and Means should do. That is, we ought to go into this proposition thoroughly. I have said time and again that the present Social Security Act is unfair to millions of our citizens. If we are going to have a national social-security program, it should be national in scope and cover all our people. Under the present law millions of our citizens are contributing directly and indirectly to a national social-security program, under which they can receive no benefits. These same individuals are taxed both directly and indirectly for the cost of the program. Contributions for unemployment compensation are paid by the employer by a 3-percent tax on pay roll. No one is so naive as to believe the employer pays the tax. He is merely the collector. If he produces goods for the Government, the Government pays the tax. If he produces goods for peacetime consumption, the consumer pays the tax. In any event, the citizen is taxed directly or indirectly for the entire cost. Old-age and survivors' insurance are paid for by contributions of 1 percent each by employer and em-

ployee. Certainly no one would argue that the Government or citizens generally do not pay for a large portion of the cost of this program. At the present time State unemployment laws are so written that farm labor, the self-employed, domestic servants, Government employees, military service, employees of very small employers, and maritime employees are not covered.

Today we are asked to include a large group of workers, namely, the Federal employees. There may be justification for their inclusion, but it should not occur by just a haphazard approval of an amendment that is as wide open as this one. Why do I say that? There are a number of folks who want to include the maritime employees under this coverage, and I think they can make a good case for it, but if you adopt this amendment today you do not include all the maritime workers, you include only those who work for the United States Maritime Commission and the United States Shipping Service. Maritime workers who are working for private shipping concerns would not be covered. This would be a rank discrimination against these individuals.

This same situation applies time and again as you cross lines of employment in the Federal Service. You go out into the rural sections, for instance, and, the way this amendment is drawn, you take care of certain employees in the triple-A offices of this Nation who began work after February 16, 1940. Employees who began work in these same offices previous to that date and whose work terminates would not be eligible. The basis of coverage should not be limited to those individuals who began work after a certain date. It would be most unfair to cover those employees who work only a few days and whose positions were terminated, and discriminate against those who had worked for a longer period of time than the period of the war.

These are some of the problems we should study in our committee. The chairman of our committee when he took the floor this afternoon made the direct statement that if the committee is sustained he will immediately call the Committee on Ways and Means together to study this problem and bring a report back to the House. That is a fair proposition.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CARLSON of Kansas. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. KNUTSON. Under the gentleman's construction of the bill, would it include operators in the Pentagon Building who will be let out immediately after the war?

Mr. CARLSON of Kansas. If this amendment is approved, if an elevator operator is hired in this Capitol today and released tomorrow, he could be included in this bill. That is how far reaching it is in its construction.

Mr. DINGELL. If the gentleman will yield, as I understood him he stated unequivocally that if the position of the conferees proposed here by the chairman is sustained, we will have hearings on social-security problems and particularly on these problems. Is that the assurance of the gentleman?

Mr. CARLSON of Kansas. I stated that the chairman, as I understood him, said that if the position of the committee is sustained he will call the committee together to consider immediately that section dealing with the coverage of Federal employees.

Mr. DINGELL. I did not understand that.

Mr. DOUGHTON. There is no question of trying to delay this matter. My statement was that at the first practicable date I would call the committee together to determine what course we should take.

Mr. DINGELL. The first practicable date? That is no assurance at all that we will consider it.

Mr. CARLSON of Kansas. I am just as anxious to go into the entire social-security program as is the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL].

Mr. DINGELL. I do not doubt that. The gentleman from Kansas has always insisted on a thorough overhauling of the entire social-security program.

Mr. CARLSON of Kansas. I think that is one thing Congress and the committee should do. We might just as well be fair about this. We cannot get into the social-security program and make a fair study and revision of it in a month or two. That is a job that takes several months. It is a job that should be done.

We must remember that our Nation has had a very limited experience with social security. The original act was passed in 1935 and in my opinion it is time we stop and take stock. Foreign countries have had greater experience and we should be able to benefit from the experience they have had with it. Unemployment compensation is but one of the features that should have the benefit of a thorough study by the Ways and Means Committee. Title 1 of the Social Security Act, or the old-age and survivors insurance program, should also be studied with a view of expanding and improving it. Many of us believe that we are accumulating an accrued liability that will sooner or later impair the entire old-age and survivors insurance fund. It is unfair to future generations to build on a false premise.

In Germany, national unemployment insurance, which was introduced on a large scale in 1926, produced a situation where many people would rather claim 10 or 12 marks a week in benefits and go on a hike, than make 20 or 25 marks and go to work. The lack of jobs alone could never have accounted for the tremendous rise in the cost of unemployment insurance, from 525,000,000 marks in 1928, to over 1,000,000,000 marks in 1931.

C. A. Kulp—Social Insurance Coordination, page 240—says:

The Federal Treasury was obliged to begin payment of special subsidies to local governments for support of the unemployed. In 1930 it gave RM. 3,700,000; in 1931, RM. 233,800,000; in 1932, the high mark of Germany's postwar financial crisis, the enormous sum of RM. 652,000,000. Even with this aid from the Federal Treasury the load on the local governments was insupportable, was a direct cause of their nearly universal bankruptcy. (Figures relate to unemployment insurance as well as unemployment relief—G. H.)

The British experience paralleled that of Germany. In 1923 about 11,200,000 persons were insured, and in 1931 about 12,500,000, an increase of a little over 10 percent. In contrast, expenditures on account of unemployment insurance rose from £41,200,000 in 1923 to £122,200,000 in 1931, a rise of nearly 200 percent, or 20 times the increase in coverage (Insecurity, by Abraham Epstein, p. 363).

Although the depression was an important factor, the rise in cost was due in no small degree to the way in which unemployment-insurance benefits were taken advantage of.

As a result of this enormous cost, the British unemployment fund contracted a debt of £115,000,000 by 1932. The fund was near bankruptcy. The exchequer stepped in and practically took over its obligations.

It was plain to everyone—

Says C. A. Kulp—Social Insurance Coordination, page 97—

that things could not go on much longer at this rate and in this direction. The May committee was a committee on national expenditure and its report reviewed the entire national financial structure; it is significant of the importance of unemployment costs that more than two-thirds of its proposed savings were to come from drastic reforms in the unemployment-insurance scheme. Unemployment had become a national issue; the failures of the second Labour Government to meet it led largely to its downfall in the summer of 1931. The period (1927–31, G. H.) had opened optimistically, with the hope, if not of abolishing, at least of sharply reducing noncontractual payments to the insured victims of unemployment. It ended by reassumption of central responsibility for a large part of unemployment relief.

Neither Germany nor Great Britain were able to solve the problem of unemployment insurance. In Great Britain benefits were reduced, contributions raised, the needs test reintroduced for traditional benefit recipients, and other changes made, but most of all the new prosperity made for a rapid decline in the number of unemployed.

In Germany, Adolf Hitler did away with unemployment by the simple means of conscripting labor. From 6,000,000 the number of unemployed was reduced, within a short time, to a few hundred thousand, most of whom were unemployable.

Our country is different, in many respects, from either Germany or Great Britain. But whether this difference extends to unemployment compensation is very doubtful. For reasons best known to the Social Security Board, our system follows the same generous pattern of providing not only for all those covered who at some time or other may be idle, but also for all the varieties into which such idleness may be divided. It should therefore surprise no one if our system would produce results similar to those produced in Germany and Great Britain, namely, an accumulation of expenditures so tremendous as to make it unworkable as a permanent system.

It is my hope that Congress will, in the near future, have an opportunity to go into this problem thoroughly.

Mr. Speaker, I hope the position of the chairman of our committee will be sustained.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. EBERHARTER] such time as he may require.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, the House is today being given an opportunity to correct what is an obvious discrimination against the faithful war workers who have made such a splendid record in production of the matériel needed for the war in Government owned and operated arsenals, plants, shipyards, offices, and in many and varied other civilian capacities in the war effort. How can we say with justification that a discharged employee of a private business is entitled to unemployment compensation of a certain amount and for a certain period of time, and at the same time say that the discharged employee of a Government-operated plant shall not be entitled to any unemployment compensation whatsoever. Thousands upon thousands of these employees of Government-operated plants heeded the pleadings of the Government to accept employment in a Government plant purely from patriotic motives and often at a personal sacrifice, and let me say that there are many, many Government-operated plants which have paid a lower rate of wages or salary than an employee could receive from a private employer for doing exactly the same work.

The Government of the United States by law practically forced every State in the Union to pass unemployment-compensation laws by laying a 3-percent tax on pay rolls, and now can we say in the next breath that the Federal Government should not pay unemployment compensation to its very own employees?

Mr. Speaker, the least the House can do is to accept the provisions in the Senate bill, providing for the payment of unemployment compensation to those who worked in Government-operated plants who are unable to find reemployment when the post-war readjustment and reconversion period commences.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JENKINS].

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, I will say I expect to support this motion.

The conferees on the part of the House and those on the part of the Senate have labored long and faithfully in an effort to compose the differences between the legislation passed by the Senate and that passed by the House.

The Senate after long debate amended the much discussed Murray-Kilgore bill by passing what was known as the George bill. The George bill came to the House and was referred to the Ways and Means Committee, which considered it for several days but because of pressure from the membership to hasten the consideration the Ways and Means Committee did not take time to hold public hearings on two or three very important matters and for that reason and other sufficient reasons the committee reported the bill back to the House with some very drastic changes. The House supported the action of the Ways and Means Committee in a very substantial manner. When the bill went to a conference composed of Members of the Senate and House the House conferees were strong in their support of the action of the House. A majority of the Democratic Members supported the House action and the Republican Members were unanimous in their support of the bill as it passed the House.

When the bill was taken up for consideration by the conferees it was only natural each group would contend for the action taken by its respective body. The conferees by a give-and-take policy were able to compose all differences but two. The House conferees decided to return to the House to ask for further instructions with reference to these two differences since it appeared that the conferees could not agree. We are now about to decide what kind of instructions we shall give them. Mr. DOUGHTON, the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, has brought the matter before us by a motion to further insist on the disagreement and maintain the position heretofore taken by the House.

One of the matters upon which the conferees failed to agree we have already disposed of this afternoon. I shall only refer to it in passing. That was the provision providing for travel pay to employees. The House stood by its former action by a vote of nearly 3 to 1. The House would have favored travel pay to deserving cases but why vote millions of dollars when we don't know how much will be needed and whether any will be needed.

The other matter in disagreement is to my mind very important and more important than the travel pay matter. The matter of the payment of unemployment compensation to Federal workers is very important because it is an entirely new matter. Congress has never done it before.

I know that it is easy enough to say as one of our colleagues said a few minutes ago, "Since workers employed in the States are paid unemployment compensation why not pay it to the Federal employees?" This raises the real issue in the whole controversy. Let me ask you how does it come that workers in the States are covered by unemployment compensation? It is for the simple but profound reason that the workers in the States have an unemployment insurance carried for them by reason of a compulsory law which requires every employer to deduct from the earnings of the employee a sum equal to 3 percent of the wages which he pays to his employees. In other words industry in the States pays a heavy tax of 3 percent to maintain an insurance that can be paid to the workers when they become unemployed. But the Federal Government has no such insurance program. The Federal Government cannot levy a tax on itself. The Federal Government is a tremendous business but it cannot tax itself. A more appropriate question for my colleague to have asked would have been, "Do we pay unemployment compensation to our State and county and municipal employees?" The answer would have been "No." Then Mr. Speaker, if we do not pay our State, county, or municipal employees by what logic should we pay our Federal employees?

Mr. Speaker, my colleagues will remember that when this matter was before the House an effort was made to amend the bill by inserting a section which would provide for the payment of unemployment compensation to Federal employees and a point of order was raised to it on the ground that the matter of appropriating money must come before the House only after it had been passed on by the Appropriation Committee of the House. The point of order was sustained and the proposed amendment was declared out of order. Now, Mr. Speaker, we are here trying to do exactly what we had no parliamentary right to do before and we could not do it then because the proper committee had not passed on it. That proper committee has not passed on it yet. I appreciate that the parliamentary situation has changed but the reasons have not changed.

I would call the attention of the membership to the fact that the original Social Security Act was prepared and started on its legislative way, in the Ways and Means Committee of the House. It could not have been originated in the other branch of the Congress because the Constitution specifically provides that all bills for raising revenue must originate in the House. Yet, this whole fight concerning the unemployment compensation originated in the Senate. That should have been left to the House. The Ways and Means Committee did not consider this from a tax standpoint, although it involves the raising of millions for it provides for the spending of millions and never yet has the Government been able for long to spend millions that it has not raised by some kind of taxes.

Mr. Speaker, when Congress in 1935 passed the social-security law, which carried the first provision for a tax for unemployment-compensation purposes, it by that very act and in a most emphatic manner set up the unemployment compensation as a State function. If it had intended that the Federal Government should go into that field, why did it not provide as much at that time? The reason was that it was never intended that the Federal Government should go into that field. In fact, the whole movement was one to compel the States to provide unemployment compensation for the workers in the States. It was compulsory, and the compulsion was a stiff tax of 3 percent of all pay rolls. The philosophy upon which the unemployment compensation theory was built is directly antagonistic to the theory that there should be unemployment compensation for Federal employees. That is why the States are all opposed to the Federal Government entering this field.

Mr. Speaker, those of my colleagues who have so valiantly and loyally heretofore defended the State unemployment compensation systems against the threatening encroachments of the Social Security Board in its efforts to Federalize all unemployment compensation systems should awake to the realization that this

is an effort to get the camel's head in the tent on the part of those who would Federalize all unemployment compensation systems. I would have you know that if we fail to stand by our former decision we will be playing directly into the hands of Altmeyer and all those who want to bring this great program with all its potential sources of revenue under the hands of the Federal Government. You surely have not been blind to this insatiable money-grabbing influence that has been so much in evidence in the past few years.

Mr. Speaker, let me ask you, my colleagues, if you vote down this motion and thereby undo your previous action, what will you put in its place? You will in effect give approval to setting up a plan to pay unemployment compensation to all Government employees of all kinds. You will include men who have been employed here in Washington for 20 or 25 years and who have been drawing large salaries of say $5,000 per year and who have built up large retirement protection and who are protected by civil service. You will include postal employees and diplomats living in foreign countries and altogether about three and one-half million persons. When you listen to pleas that this will apply only to war workers—meaning men and women who do what is generally considered as factory or shop work—you are only fooling yourself. Personally I have been willing and anxious to support some plan that will give assistance to this class of Government employees, but I am not in favor of including about three and one-fourth million people who are well protected, many of whom are violently opposed to being included, just to take care of a few who will not then be adequately cared for. I am in favor of supporting the former action of the House and then stand in readiness to take appropriate action to assist those who may need assistance when the war is over. We can then be better able to ascertain just what will be the best way to assist that group if there be any group needing assistance. Many of these war workers who made sacrifices by leaving their homes and families and moving to distant places to assist in war work should be assisted when they need it. As yet there is no serious unemployment. Only a few days ago Justice Byrnes made a statement to the effect that unemployment threats were greatly exaggerated. Let us wait until we can better judge what the problem will be and then act immediately and effectively. Let this be no idle promise but let it be a serious intention to give the matter full consideration.

Mr. Speaker, let nobody be misled into believing that the defeat of this motion is the best way to bring relief to stranded working men and women, or to working men and women who are not stranded but who were formerly employed by the Government and who find themselves unemployed. That condition has not developed yet. The best way to meet that problem is for the Ways and Means Committee to take that matter up for public consideration when it develops. And I would favor that the committee take the matter up for consideration as soon after the election recess as is practicable with the idea of anticipating any such situation that might arise. I think that Mr. DOUGHTON has already signified his willingness to call the committee together to consider such a plan. In fact, several members of this committee including myself, repeatedly, in committee and in public, have signified our willingness to make provision for deserving war workers if a plan or formula could be developed that would do it. Our committee made serious efforts and attempts to get from well-known experts on the subject some plan or formula but in each instance we were advised it was impossible to evolve such a plan because it was impossible to determine where to draw the line that would include the persons that should be included and exclude those that should be excluded.

By reason of these facts I feel that our proper course is to sustain the motion and at the same time hold ourselves in readiness to meet the situation as it develops. Yes, and to go far enough to provide plans when the same can be evolved on just and reasonable bases.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. DISNEY].

Mr. DISNEY. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Ways and Means besides trying to do what ought to be done in each specific instance, has also been standing guard over the Treasury of the United States. We could not swallow the travel-pay feature of this bill. When we struck out retraining with a vision ahead of a vast N. Y. A., even the gentlemen who are most interested, or especially interested, in labor problems realized that they did not want a vast number of people retrained by Government to compete with the jobs which your constituents already have and for which they are now being paid. The wisdom of the committee has been justified in that. We think the vote of the House today justifies the wisdom of the committee in rejecting travel pay. We beseech you most earnestly to give us a chance to work this matter of Federal employees' compensation out properly. When social security first came on the horizon, the original recommendation of the Social Security Board was that Government employees should not be included. The Board now recommends it. But at the outset it recommended that Government employees be not included under social security. This is a sneaking way to bring in the Federal employees by the back door and not the forthright way in which it ought to be done, taking into consideration everybody's interest.

Touching on the subject of expenditure of money, this incubus of extravagance that has spread over this Hill breeds things like travel pay and the retraining program that was proposed. You must remember we started this war with a public debt of $65,000,000,000. I notice some of my colleagues smiling at my talking about these things, because I have ridden economy in expenses as a hobby, but wait until the wrath of the small taxpayers comes along and then you will not smile.

Mr. DINGELL. What about the oil subsidies?

Mr. DISNEY. I was against the oil subsidy 10,000 percent. I think it was a wrong, un-American thing to do. That is the answer to that. Please do not bring in your local ideas on that. While I am still on that subject, we ought to have great respect for the Colmer report which was made recently. It was thoroughly done and it states we will probably have a Budget of at least $20,000,000,000 annually shortly after the war. It goes on further with this statement:

> If spread evenly over the entire population, the post-war Budget means that the cost of supporting the activities of the Federal Government alone would be over $550 a year for a family of four. State and local governments after the war are likely to need approximately $350 per family, in addition, or a total of something like $900 a year for a family of four.

In Federal, State, and local taxes, if you please.

I believe we ought to stop, look, and listen, and save the people's money at every opportunity.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for an observation?

Mr. DISNEY. Yes; I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. KNUTSON. The gentleman says all this spending breeds such propositions as travel pay, and so forth. I was very much surprised to note in the RECORD the other day that a distinguished statesman in another body has introduced a bill to furnish each Member of Congress with an additional clerk at $3,900 a year, whose sole duty shall be to handle veterans' cases.

Mr. LYNCH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DISNEY. I yield.

Mr. LYNCH. The gentleman is familiar with the fact that the Colmer report also suggests an extension of the consolidated returns.

Mr. DISNEY. Yes, sir; and on page 28 it says in a footnote that some members of the committee feel, that in view of the present public debt and the additional heavy drain on the Government, that additional obligations of an undetermined amount like this plan for Federal employees' unemployment compensation should be abandoned.

Not a soul in the executive department has given the slightest estimate of how much this will cost, how much the travel pay will cost. Not even a guess.

Mr. LYNCH. The gentleman will recall that when certain members of the Ways and Means Committee endeavored to have the head of Social Security appear before the committee and give information with respect to social security, the committee voted it down and he was not allowed to appear.

Mr. DISNEY. Well, that does not convey a fair impression to the Members of the House, if the gentleman does not mind my saying so.

Mr. LYNCH. Well, it is a fact.

Mr. DISNEY. Now, let us get at the point of the Federal worker's welfare in facts and figures. I want the Members to know my earnest desire to have all the

facts before you. I believe this table is correct I have before you on the easel. I know the reference to stenographers' pay is correct—1 2, and 3 years for stenographers' pay—and what they receive on dismissal. I have not had a chance to completely verify it, but on my honor I believe it is correct as to industrial Federal workers. I shall put it in the RECORD and if there are any figures there that are not correct, I will correct them.

Government employee: 1 year

Stenographer—$1,440 per year:	
26 days leave less 12 days leave=14 days	$68.13
Retirement fund—refund	72.00
Total, with 2 weeks vacation	140.13
If no leave taken	58.40
Total—no vacation	198.53
Navy yard or Government arsenal—$1.26 per hour:	
Accumulated leave 14 days	141.12
Retirement fund contributions—refund	131.54
Total, if 2 weeks vacation taken	272.66
If no leave taken	120.96
Total, if no vacation	393.62

Government employee: 2 years

Stenographer:	
52 days accumulated leave less 24 days vacation taken=28 days	$136.26
Retirement fund contributions—refund	150.09
Total—2 weeks vacation taken each year	286.35
If no vacation taken	116.80
Total—no vacations	403.15
Navy yard or Government arsenal, at $1.26 per hour:	
52 days accumulated leave less 24 days vacation=28 days	282.34
Retirement fund contributions—refund	273.28
Total—2 weeks vacation taken each year	555.52
If no vacations taken	241.92
Total maximum, no vacation	797.44

Government employee: 3 years

Stenographer:	
78 days accumulated leave less 36 days vacation=42 days	$204.40
Retirement fund—refund	229.53
Total with 2 weeks vacation each year	433.93
If no leave taken	175.20
Total, maximum, no vacations taken	609.13
Navy yard or Government arsenal worker drawing $1.26 per hour:	
78 days accumulated leave less 36 days leave taken=42 days	423.36
Retirement fund contributions—refund	418.36
Total with 2 weeks vacation each year	841.72
If no vacations taken	332.64
Total—no vacations	1,174.36

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Will the gentleman yield? It is not correct. That should be $403 in the second column.

Mr. DISNEY. Each Federal worker gets 26 days leave with full pay. The Government during wartime has cut that down to 12 days. But, it works out for a $1,440 stenographer, 26 days leave, less 12 days taken, is 14 days. Fourteen days accumulated leave is $68.13. The retirement refund is $72. In all fairness and frankness we must admit that the retirement fund is the employee's money, but it is money with which to tide her over. When we see statements in the Washington press that stranded Government employees are going to be adrift in the country, we must remember they get their retirement and their annual leave with pay. If they have not worked more than 5 years they can take the retirement fund in a lump sum or by distribution. So, with 2 weeks' leave, the total is $140.13. If no vacation is taken, $58.40, or a total of $198.53. Does that leave the employee in such a terrible plight as compared with compensation to other employees in private industry?

Now let us take the industrial worker at a Government plant. Twenty-six days less 12 days' leave taken is 14 days. This is conservative because overtime is not calculated in this table in accumulated leave. The amount to the worker would be larger if I took the overtime into account. Fourteen days accumulated leave at $10.08 a day equals $141.12; refund of retirement $131.54; for a total with 2 weeks' leave of $272.66. If no vacation is taken $120.96 additional or a total of $393.62. That compares very favorably with any employee in a private plant. Where they work for 2 years a $1,440 stenographer gets $303.14.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. That should be $403.

Mr. DISNEY. The figure here is wrong. It should be $403.15.

The worker in an industrial Government plant gets $797.44, if he works for 2 years; a stenographer working 3 years gets $609.13. If the worker in an industrial Government plant has worked 3 years he gets $1,174.76.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, this table is correct. These figures as to the stenographer have all been verified by letter with the Civil Service Commission. As to industrial workers they are nearly, if not literally, accurate. These Government workers get 26 days' annual leave; they get 15 days' sick leave. They are free from garnishment. There are many things they are entitled to that the ordinary worker in private industry does not get.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DISNEY. In just a minute; my time is short.

This Senate bill provides that every civilian worker, every worker, if you please, after a certain date is going to be paid compensation just as if he were being employed privately; and if the States do not make an agreement to pay it, you will see from the provision on page 21 that the Civil Service Commission has to pay it out of the Treasury. Now, are you going to turn us down on this? Are you going to give these people this money, this compensation? There is no exception in this bill or in what we have asked for instructions on. They get their accumulated leave and will get paid for it as well as their compensation. No matter if they have worked only 2 or 3 days instead of 2 or 3 years they have their turn at compensation plus accumulated leave.

You are not going to do that with the Treasury in the condition it is. These Government people are not bad off. They will probably be better taken care of than those in private employment. Let us use a little sense about this, instead of talking in generalities. These figures show they are not entitled to more than they are getting. They should not have accumulated leave with pay, and also unemployment compensation.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DISNEY. I yield.

Mr. KNUTSON. In justice to the other body I think the RECORD should show that this idea was the brainchild of a man named Schemple connected with the C. I. O.

Mr. DISNEY. I do not know how we can do justice to the other body when they bring a bill like this to the House of Representatives.

Mr. KNUTSON. Let us be charitable to them at least.

Mr. DISNEY. I like to be charitable, but it appears the other body does not get the facts, and reason them out, and sift them like we do in the House. We cannot escape our duty.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DISNEY. I yield.

Mr. DINGELL. It strikes me as not being, I should say, fair——

Mr. DISNEY. It is perfectly all right with me to say "unfair"; I can take it.

Mr. DINGELL. Where a man has sick leave that they will have benefit of payment for that. Hundreds and thousands of employees will not be getting that leave.

Mr. DISNEY. They get 15 days' sick leave outside of the 26 days' annual leave.

Mr. DINGELL. I know that.

Mr. DISNEY. The 15 days' sick leave is in addition to the 26 days' annual leave.

If you look into the history of this provision, you will find that the original intent was to give these benefits to Federal employees in navy yards and arsenals. However, it soon emerged covering all civilian employees of Uncle Sam:

> Employment by a State government or its instrumentalities must continue to be excluded from Federal unemployment compensation provisions for the reasons cited in connection with old-age insurance (constitutional). The Board does not believe there would be any great advantage in including Federal employees under the unemployment compensation provisions. Civil-service employees are, for the most part, already protected against the hazard of unemployment, and it would probably be more practical to provide for noncivil-service employees through some form of dismissal wage rather than through establishing a special Nationwide unemployment compensation system,

(Hearings, Ways and Means Committee, 1939. Social Security, vol. 1, p. 11.)

The Committee on Ways and Means spent more time in considering this question than any other. A majority of the committee was not convinced that this was a sound policy to be adopted at this time. I, personally, am still of the same opinion.

It is difficult to draw an accurate comparison between a worker in a private industry and a Government worker. Employment in each have certain inherent advantages and disadvantages. Generally speaking, the employees knew what these were when they entered employment. However, I think it well to recall how we treat the Federal employees, since the proponents of this provision have sponsored them.

Uncle Sam is most generous in his treatment of employees. He provides them with 26 days vacation a year. If they are unable to take only a portion of this vacation, he allows them to accumulate this vacation, up to a maximum of 90 days. He also provides them with sick leave of 15 days a year, in addition to the vacation leave. Then, too, there is the retirement system that has been provided. Workers in private industry do not receive anything like this on the average.

It seems to me that Federal employees will be in a most favorable position to finance their way home and to have funds to tide them over to a new job. A worker in private industry would have only unemployment compensation that would vary according to the State from $210 to $480 at the maximum.

A few days ago, the House passed a bill providing for lump-sum payment of accumulated vacation time. To me, this emphasizes the fact that payment of such accumulated leave or vacation amounts to a dismissal pay. No one to my knowledge has ever advocated that workers should receive both dismissal pay and unemployment compensation. This would happen if this provision is retained in this legislation.

The most serious objection that can be levied against this provision is the preferential treatment given Federal employees. We would be sneaking them in the back door without consideration for the folks who are still left in uncovered employment. We would be discriminating against the clerk in the small store, the typist in a city hall, the farmer, and his help. Can we afford to do this? But it appears to me that it would be the height of political stupidity to single out an already unpopular group for preferred treatment at this time.

Seriously, Mr. Speaker, we must not lose sight of reasonable and sound objectives. We are still faced with tremendous expenditures for the war. We are collecting taxes to cover only about one-half of the cost as we go along. Can we conscientiously authorize appropriations—a billion for this, a billion for that, without providing some means of financing these sums?

When this war is over, we will be faced with the problem of financing a budget of twenty or twenty-five billion a year. The interest on the national debt will be six billion. Payments to veterans will amount to six billion. We cannot reduce taxes and at the same time pay these obligations along with billions of dollars for special treatment for this or that group. In my opinion, a small taxpayers' strike is in prospect in the not too distant future. We all think taxes are high now, and they are, but if the Congress permits continued raids on the Treasury for every high-sounding plan that comes along, they will have to be even higher.

Surely, this is the time for the exercise of common sense. Do not be swept away by eloquent but unsound arguments.

Mr. Tawney, minority clerk of Ways and Means Committee, has prepared a discussion of Federal Employees Compensation as follows:

Inauguration of the wage and salary stabilization program in October 1942 substituted very largely public control of wages and salaries in all major industries for private regulation by individual employers. In launching the program, the President, by a series of Executive orders issued under the Stabilization Act of October 2, 1942, conferred over-all jurisdiction of the program in the newly created Office of Economic Stabilization which, in turn, was established in the Office for Emergency Management.

The initial major step, following establishment of broad administrative policies, was the classification of employers and employees into certain categories and the assignment of jurisdiction over these classes to specific Government agencies for the purpose of carrying out the stabilization plan. In this process, Federal employees became divided into two broad groups, "graded" and "ungraded", the former consisting of employees whose wages were fixed by law, the latter embracing those whose work was compensated on a prevailing rate basis.

Under regulation No. 4001.2, the Director of Economic Stabilization authorized the National War Labor Board to administer the program with respect to all employees covered under the program who were receiving less than $5,000 per annum, who were represented by a labor union and not engaged in work of an executive, administrative or professional character. The Commissioner of Internal Revenue was given jurisdiction over employees receiving more than $5,000 per annum, or whose work was of an executive, administrative or professional character and no labor union was involved. Similarly the War Food Administration was given jurisdiction over agricultural employees. Federal, State and other public employees whose compensation was fixed by statute, under regulation No. 4001.18 were expressly exempt from the operation of the wage and salary stabilization program.

Accordingly we find in the case of so-called industrial war workers employed by the Government, paid on a prevailing rate basis and receiving less than $5,000, the National War Labor Board given exclusive jurisdiction in determining their rates of compensation. On the other hand, Federal employees coming under the Classification Act of 1923 and those employed under so-called war-service appointments who are not in the classified service but whose compensation is fixed by law, are totally exempt from the operation of the wage-stabilization program. Nevertheless, both groups of Federal employees, the industrial or ungraded and the classified or graded group, being employees of the Federal Government are subject to certain basic civil-service provisions and requirements, sharing equally in respect to annual and sick leave privileges, for example, to retirement privileges, freedom from garnishment proceedings, and similar advantages.

In the application of the stabilization program to Federal employees in the ungraded class, it was deemed advisable by the National War Labor Board to delegate its authority to certain wage-administration units within various departments and establishments of the Government employing personnel of this class on a prevailing rate-pay basis. Accordingly, in a series of general orders, the Board created such units in the Departments of War, Navy, Agriculture, Treasury, and in certain independent agencies, notably the Tennessee Valley Authority.

These departmental units are, in effect, regional war labor boards, operating as such in a direct relationship with the National War Labor Board. The regular regional war labor boards created before the wage-stab'lization program came into effect, operate with respect to that class coming within the Board's exclusive jurisdiction who are employed in three types of establishments: (1) Government-owned, privately operated, (2) privately owned, Government operated, and (3) privately owned, privately operated. The departmental wage-administration units are concerned solely with Federal employees of the same category employed in plants and facilities owned and operated by the Government.

The War Labor Board and its several regional boards and departmental branches are uniformly bound by certain zone wage-stabilization agreements as to basic rates of compensation. They approve wage-payment or salary-administration plans drawn by employers for their own plants, approve changes in pay rates, prepare schedules, and otherwise administer the program in their particular field. Both Federal and non-Federal wage earners are subject, accordingly, to identical base-pay schedules. Changes in rates affecting either group are immediately reflected in the schedules applicable to the other.

Beyond this point, however, certain differences occur in the conditions of employment between the Federal and non-Federal production workers. The most important of these, in the opinion of some wage administrators, is the Government's inability to pay its workers incentive or bonus compensation, other than certain premium pay allowed for extra hazardous work. Another factor operating to the disadvantage of the Federal employee, generally, is the Government's rule for computing overtime on the basis of a 40-hour workweek, rather than on the basis of an 8-hour day which is customary in private employment. This is the case particularly with per diem employees on a 40-hour week and ungraded employees paid on a monthly or per annum basis where the workweek is set at 48 hours. A small group of War Department employees, however, laborers and certain engineering workers, are exempt from this general rule in computing overtime under Executive Order No. 9290.

The prohibition against bonuses and premium pay is found in annual departmental appropriation acts. The following excerpt from the Naval Appropriation Act of 1945 has been described as typical:

"SEC. 105. No part of the appropriations made in this act shall be available for the salary or pay of any officer, manager, superintendent, foreman, or other person or persons having charge of the work of any employee of the United States Government while making or causing to be made with a stop watch or other time-measuring device a time study of any job of any such employee between the starting and completion thereof, or of the movements of any such employee while engaged upon such work; nor shall any part of the appropriations made in this act be available to pay any premiums or bonus or cash reward to any employee in addition to his regular wages except for suggestions resulting in improvements or economy in the operation of any Government plant."

Wage administrators point out that the principal advantages enjoyed by Federal employees engaged in production work are the following:

1. Annual leave, 12 working days each year plus 14 working days of accrued annual leave for each year of employment, which is granted on a 5-day week basis, with accrued leave being reimbursable in the form of extra compensation upon termination of employment.

2. Sick leave, 15 working days each year at full pay.

3. Retirement benefits which are refundable under certain conditions, or if paid result in somewhat higher retirement benefits than allowed under other retirement systems.

4. In some cases higher compensation insurance benefits than may be obtained under State laws.

5. Wages and salaries not subject to garnishment.

In general, wage administrators point out that these advantages are not susceptible of easy measurement in terms of actual dollars and cents when compared with equivalent benefits received by non-Federal workers. Their relative value will vary with each individual case. State laws, for example, largely govern the value of the non-Federal worker's unemployment compensation and retirement or injury benefits. In the matter of paid vacations, the value of these will vary with the management policy of his particular employer.

In the opinion of competent observers the outstanding disadvantages experienced by Federal workers in the ungraded class are: (1) The lack of bonus or incentive compensation, and (2) the computation of overtime on a work-week basis. In all other respects they believe the Federal and non-Federal employee, performing equivalent work in mines, arsenals, shipyards, and similar production facilities are substantially on a par with one another and that the Federal employee, although not receiving unemployment compensation as such receives equivalent or nearly equivalent privileges.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma has expired, all time has expired.

Without objection, the previous question is ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, on that I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk called the roll; and there were—yeas 174, nays 157, answered "Present" 0, not voting 100, as follows:

[Roll No. 113]

YEAS—174

Abernethy	Camp	Ellis
Allen, Ill.	Cannon, Fla.	Elston, Ohio
Andersen, H. Carl	Carlson, Kans.	Fellows
Andrews, Ala.	Carson, Ohio	Fuller
Andrews, N. Y.	Chapman	Fulmer
Arends	Chenoweth	Gamble
Arnold	Chiperfield	Gathings
Auchincloss	Church	Gavin
Baldwin, Md.	Clevenger	Gearhart
Barden	Cole, Mo.	Gillette
Barrett	Cole, N. Y.	Gillie
Bates, Mass.	Compton	Goodwin
Bishop	Cooley	Gore
Bland	Cooper	Gossett
Bonner	Costello	Graham
Boren	Cox	Grant, Ala.
Brown, Ga.	Cravens	Grant, Ind.
Brown, Ohio	Crawford	Gregory
Brumbaugh	Dirksen	Griffiths
Bryson	Disney	Gross
Buck	Dondero	Gwynne
Buffett	Doughton	Hall, Leonard W.
Bulwinkle	Drewry	Hancock
Butler	Durham	Hare
Byrnes, Wis.	Dworshak	Harness, Ind.
Camp	Ellis	Harris, Ark.
Cannon, Fla.	Elston, Ohio	Hébert
Carlson, Kans.	Fellows	Heidinger
Carson, Ohio	Fuller	Hess
Chapman	Fulmer	Hill
Chenoweth	Gamble	Hobbs
Chiperfield	Gathings	Hoffman
Church	Gavin	Holmes, Mass.
Clevenger	Gearhart	Hope
Cole, Mo.	Gillette	Howell
Cole, N. Y.	Gillie	Jarman
Compton	Goodwin	Jenkins
Cooley	Gore	Jennings
Cooper	Gossett	Jensen
Costello	Graham	Johnson, Anton J.
Cox	Grant, Ala.	Johnson, Calvin D.
Cravens	Grant, Ind.	Johnson, J. Leroy
Crawford	Gregory	Johnson, Luther A.
Dirksen	Griffiths	Johnson, Okla.
Disney	Gross	Jones
Dondero	Gwynne	Jonkman
Doughton	Hall, Leonard W.	Kean
Drewry	Hancock	Kerr
Durham	Hare	Kilburn
Dworshak	Harness, Ind.	Kinzer
Byrnes, Wis.	McConnell	Scrivner
Harris, Ark.	McCowen	Short
Hébert	McGehee	Simpson, Ill.
Heidinger	McGregor	Simpson, Pa.
Hess	McMillan, S. C.	Smith, Ohio
Hill	McMillen, Ill.	Sparkman
Hobbs	McWilliams	Springer
Hoffman	Maas	Starnes, Ala.
Holmes, Mass.	Manasco	Stewart
Hope	Mansfield, Tex.	Stigler
Howell	Martin, Iowa	Sumner, Ill.
Jarman	Mason	Sumners, Tex.
Jenkins	May	Sundstrom
Jennings	Merrow	Taber
Jensen	Michener	Talle
Johnson, Anton J.	Miller, Nebr.	Tarver
Johnson, Calvin D.	Miller, Pa.	Thomas, N. J.
Johnson, J. Leroy	Mills	Tibbott
Johnson, Luther A.	Monkiewicz	Troutman
Johnson, Okla.	Morrison, N. C.	Vincent, Ky.
Jones	Murray, Tenn.	Vorys, Ohio
Jonkman	Newsome	Vursell
Kean	O'Konski	Ward
Kerr	Pace	Weichel, Ohio
Kilburn	Patton	West
Kinzer	Peterson, Ga.	Whelchel, Ga.
Kleberg	Plumley	Whitten
Knutson	Price	Whittington
Landis	Rankin	Wigglesworth
Lanham	Reed, Ill.	Wilson
LeFevre	Reed, N. Y.	Winstead
Lemke	Rees, Kans.	Winter
Lodge	Rivers	Wolcott
Lyle	Rockwell	Woodruff, Mich.
Mahon	Rodgers, Pa.	Zimmerman

NAYS—157

Allen, La.	Hart	Pfeifer
Anderson, Calif.	Heffernan	Philbin
Anderson, N. Mex.	Herter	Pittenger
Angell	Hinshaw	Powers
Baldwin, N. Y.	Hoch	Pracht, C. Frederick
Beall	Hull	Pratt, Joseph M.
Beckworth	Jeffrey	Priest
Bender	Johnson, Ind.	Rabaut
Bloom	Johnson, Lyndon B.	Ramey
Bradley, Pa.	Kearney	Ramspeck
Buckley	Kee	Randolph
Burch, Va.	Keefe	Robertson
Burchill, N. Y.	Kefauver	Robinson, Utah
Burdick	Kelley	Rohrbough
Byrne	Keogh	Rolph
Canfield	Kilday	Rooney
Cannon, Mo.	King	Rowan
Capozzoli	Kirwan	Rowe
Celler	LaFollette	Sadowski
Cochran	Lane	Sasscer
Coffee	Larcade	Satterfield
Colmer	Lea	Scanlon
Crosser	Lesinski	Schiffler
Cunningham	Lewis	Scott
Curley	Luce	Shafer
D'Alesandro	Ludlow	Sheridan
Davis	Lynch	Smith, Maine
Dawson	McCormack	Smith, Va.
Day	McMurray	Smith, Wis.
Delaney	Madden	Snyder
Dilweg	Magnuson	Somers, N. Y.
Dingell	Mahon	Sponce
Eaton	Maloney	Stanley
Eberharter	Mansfield, Mont.	Stearns, N. H.
Ellison, Md.	Marcantonio	Stevenson
Engel, Mich.	Martin, Mass.	Talbot
Fay	Merritt	Taylor
Feighan	Miller, Conn.	Thomas, Tex.
Fenton	Monroney	Thomason
Fernandez	Mott	Torrens
Fish	Mruk	Towe
Flannagan	Murdock	Voorhis, Calif.
Fogarty	Murphy	Walter
Folger	Murray, Wis.	Wene
Forand	Myers	White
Gerlach	Norman	Wickersham
Gillespie	Norton	Wolfenden, Pa.
Gordon	O'Brien, Ill.	Wolverton, N. J.
Gorski	O'Brien, Mich.	Woodrum, Va.
Green	O'Hara	Worley
Hale	O'Toole	Wright
Hall, Edwin Arthur	Outland	
Harless, Ariz.	Peterson, Fla.	

NOT VOTING—100

Andresen, August H.	Brehm	Dewey
Barry	Brooks	Dickstein
Bates, Ky.	Burgin	Dies
Bell	Busbey	Douglas
Bennett, Mich.	Carrier	Elliott
Bennett, Mo.	Carter	Ellsworth
Blackney	Case	Elmer
Bolton	Clark	Engle, Calif.
Boykin	Clason	Fisher
Bradley, Mich.	Courtney	Fitzpatrick
Brehm	Curtis	Ford
Brooks	Dewey	Fulbright
Burgin	Dickstein	Furlong
Busbey	Dies	Gale
Carrier	Douglas	Gallagher
Carter	Elliott	Gibson
Case	Ellsworth	Gifford
Clark	Elmer	Gilchrist
Clason	Engle, Calif.	Granger
Courtney	Fisher	Hagen
Curtis	Fitzpatrick	Halleck
Ford	Fulbright	Harris, Va.
Furlong	Klein	Hartley
Gale	Kunkel	Hays
Gallagher	Lambertson	Hendricks
Gibson	LeCompte	Hoeven
Gifford	Lemke	Holifield
Gilchrist	McCord	Holmes, Wash.
Granger	McKenzie	Horan
Hagen	McLean	Izac
Halleck	Miller, Mo.	Jackson
Harris, Va.	Morrison, La.	Johnson, Ward
Hartley	Mundt	Judd
Hays	Norrell	Kennedy
Hendricks	O'Brien, N. Y.	Klein
Hoeven	O'Connor	Kunkel
Holifield	O'Neal	Lambertson
Holmes, Wash.	Patman	LeCompte
Horan	Phillips	Lemke
Izac	Ploeser	McCord
Jackson	Poage	McKenzie
Johnson, Ward	Poulson	McLean
Judd	Reece, Tenn.	Miller, Mo.
Kennedy	Richards	Morrison, La.
	Rizley	Mundt
	Robsion, Ky.	Norrell
	Rogers, Mass.	O'Brien, N. Y.
	Russell	O'Connor
	Sabath	O'Neal
	Sauthoff	Patman
	Schwabe	Phillips
	Sheppard	Ploeser
	Sikes	Poage
	Slaughter	Poulson
	Smith, W. Va.	Reece, Tenn.
	Stefan	Richards
	Stockman	Rizley
	Sullivan	Robsion, Ky.
	Tolan	Rogers, Mass.
	Treadway	Russell
	Vinson, Ga.	Sabath
	Wadsworth	Sauthoff
	Wasielewski	Schwabe
	Weaver	Sheppard
	Weiss	Sikes
	Welch	Slaughter
	Willey	Smith, W. Va.
		Stefan
		Stockman
		Sullivan
		Tolan
		Treadway
		Vinson, Ga.
		Wadsworth
		Wasielewski
		Weaver
		Weiss
		Welch
		Willey

So the motion was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Ploeser for, with Mr. Morrison of Louisiana against.

Mr. Hoeven for, with Mr. Poulson against.

Mr. Miller of Missouri for, with Mr. Tolan against.

Mr. Wadsworth for, with Mr. Lemke against.

Mr. Elmer for, with Mr. Sabath against.

Mr. Halleck for, with Mr. Gallagher against.

Mr. Schwabe for, with Mr. Holifield against.

Mr. Dewey for, with Mr. Izac against.

Mr. Norrell for, with Mr. Weiss against.

Mr. Bennett of Missouri for, with Mr. Ford against.

Mr. Bradley of Michigan for, with Mr. Granger against.

Mr. Fulbright for, with Mr. Sauthoff against.

Mr. Curtis for, with Mr. O'Connor against.

Mr. Courtney for, with Mr. Wasielewski against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Richards with Mr. Stefan.

Mr. Sheppard with Mr. Douglas.

Mr. Weaver with Mr. Brehm.

Mr. Slaughter with Mr. Willey.

Mr. Hendricks with Mr. Horan.

Mr. Engle of California with Mr. Phillips.

Mr. McCord with Mr. Holmes of Washington.

Mr. Smith of West Virginia with Mr. Stockman.

Mr. Bell with Mr. O'Brien of New York.

Mr. O'Neal with Mr. Carrier.

Mr. Sullivan with Mr. LeCompte.

Mr. Poage with Mr. Kunkel.

Mr. Sikes with Mr. Judd.

Mr. Gibson with Mr. Ward Johnson.

Mr. McKenzie with Mr. Gifford.

Mr. Fitzpatrick with Mr. Ellsworth.

Mr. Clark with Mr. Reece of Tennessee.

Mr. Fisher with Mr. Mundt.

Mr. Hays with Mr. Robsion of Kentucky.

Mr. Burgin with Mr. Welch.

Mr. Elliott with Mr. Rizley.

Mr. Boykin with Mr. Hartley.

Mr. Russell with Mr. Gale.

Mr. Bates of Kentucky with Mr. Clason.

Mr. Jackson with Mr. Blackney.

Mr. Brooks with Mr. Busbey.

Mr. Vinson of Georgia with Mrs. Bolton.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia changed his vote from yea to nay.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by inserting an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the war mobilization and reconversion bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

SURPLUS PROPERTY DISPOSAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. MANASCO. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 5125) to provide for the disposal of surplus Government property and plants, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. MANASCO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers be read in lieu of the report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5125) to provide for the disposal of surplus Government property and plants, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate to the text of the bill and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following: "That this Act may be cited as the 'Surplus Property Act of 1944.'

"OBJECTIVES

"SEC. 2. The Congress hereby declares that the objectives of this Act are to facilitate and regulate the orderly disposal of surplus property so as—

"(a) to assure the most effective use of such property for war purposes and the common defense;

"(b) to give maximum aid in the reestablishment of a peacetime economy of free independent private enterprise, the development of the maximum of independent operators in trade, industry, and agriculture, and to stimulate full employment;

"(c) to facilitate the transition of enterprises from wartime to peacetime production and of individuals from wartime to peacetime employment;

"(d) to discourage monopolistic practices and to strengthen and preserve the competitive position of small business concerns in an economy of free enterprise;

"(e) to foster and to render more secure family-type farming as the traditional and desirable pattern of American agriculture;

"(f) to afford returning veterans an opportunity to establish themselves as proprietors of agricultural, business, and professional enterprises;

"(g) to encourage and foster post-war employment opportunities;

"(h) to assure the sale of surplus property in such quantities and on such terms as will discourage disposal to speculators or for speculative purposes;

"(i) to establish and develop foreign markets and promote mutually advantageous economic relations between the United States and other countries by the orderly disposition of surplus property in other countries;

"(j) to avoid dislocations of the domestic economy and of international economic relations;

"(k) to foster the wide distribution of surplus commodities to consumers at fair prices;

"(l) to effect broad and equitable distribution of surplus property;

"(m) to achieve the prompt and full utilization of surplus property at fair prices to the consumer through disposal at home and abroad with due regard for the protection of free markets and competitive prices from dislocation resulting from uncontrolled dumping;

"(n) to utilize normal channels of trade and commerce to the extent consistent with efficient and economic distribution and the promotion of the general objectives of this Act (without discriminating against the establishment of new enterprises);

"(o) to promote production, employment of labor, and utilization of the productive capacity and the natural and agricultural resources of the country;

"(p) to foster the development of new independent enterprise;

"(q) to prevent insofar as possible unusual and excessive profits being made out of surplus property;

"(r) to dispose of surplus property as promptly as feasible without fostering monopoly or restraint of trade, or unduly disturbing the economy, or encouraging hoarding of such property, and to facilitate prompt redistribution of such property to consumers;

"(s) to dispose of surplus Government-owned transportation facilities and equipment in such manner as to promote an adequate and economical national transportation system; and

"(t) except as otherwise provided, to obtain for the Government, as nearly as possible, the fair value of surplus property upon its disposition.

"DEFINITIONS

"SEC. 3. As used in this Act—

"(a) The term 'Government agency' means any executive department, board, bureau, commission, or other agency in the executive branch of the Federal Government, or any corporation wholly owned (either directly or through one or more corporations) by the United States.

"(b) The term 'owning agency', in the case of any property, means the executive department, the independent agency in the executive branch of the Federal Government, or the corporation (if a Government agency), having control of such property, otherwise than solely as a disposal agency.

"(c) The term 'disposal agency' means any Government agency designated under section 10 to dispose of one or more classes of surplus property.

"(d) The term 'property' means any interest, owned by the United States or any Government agency, in real or personal property, of any kind, wherever located, but does not include (1) the public domain, or such lands withdrawn or reserved from the public domain as the Surplus Property Board (created by section 5) determines are suitable for return to the public domain for disposition under the general land laws, or (2) naval vessels of the following categories: Battleships, cruisers, aircraft carriers, destroyers, and submarines.

"(e) The term 'surplus property' means any property which has been determined to be surplus to the needs and responsibilities of the owning agency in accordance with section 11.

"(f) The term 'contractor inventory' means (1) any property related to a terminated contract of any type with a Government agency or to a subcontract thereunder; and (2) any property acquired under a contract pursuant to the terms of which title is vested in the Government, and in excess of the amounts needed to complete performance thereunder; and (3) any property which the Government is obligated to take over under any type of contract as a result of any change in the specifications or plans thereunder.

"(g) The term 'care and handling' includes completing, repairing, converting, rehabilitating, operating, maintaining, preserving, protecting, insuring, storing, packing, handling, and transporting, and, in the case of property which is dangerous to public health or safety, destroying, or rendering innocuous, such property.

"(h) The term 'person' means any individual, corporation, partnership, firm, association, trust, estate, or other entity.

"(i) The term 'State' includes the several States, Territories, and possessions of the United States, and the District of Columbia.

"(j) The term 'tax-supported institution' means any scientific, literary, educational, public-health, or public-welfare institution which is supported in whole or in part through the use of funds derived from taxation by the United States, or by any State or political subdivision thereof.

"(k) The term 'veteran' means any person in the active military or naval service of the United States during the present war, or any person who served in the active military or naval service of the United States on or after September 16, 1940, and prior to the termination of the present war, and who has been discharged or released therefrom under honorable conditions.

"DISPOSITION OF SURPLUS PROPERTY—GENERAL RULE

"SEC. 4. Surplus property shall be disposed of to such extent, at such times, in such areas, by such agencies, at such prices, upon such terms and conditions, and in such manner, as may be prescribed in or pursuant to this Act.

"SURPLUS PROPERTY BOARD

"SEC. 5. (a) There is hereby established in the Office of War Mobilization, and in its successor, a Surplus Property Board (hereinafter called the 'Board'), which shall be composed of three members, each of whom shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, and shall receive compensation at the rate of $12,000 per annum. The term of office of the members shall be two years, except that the term of office of the members first appointed shall expire two years from the date of the enactment of this Act, and the next succeeding terms shall then begin, and any person appointed to fill a vacancy caused by the death, resignation, or removal of a member prior to the expiration of the term of such member shall be appointed only for such unexpired term. The President shall designate one of the members of the Board as Chairman.

"(b) The Board may, within the limits of funds which may be made available, appoint and fix the compensation of such officers and employees, and may make such expenditures for supplies, facilities, and services, as may be necessary to carry out its functions. Without regard to the provisions of the civil-service laws and the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, the Board may appoint such special assistants, and may employ such certified public accountants, qualified cost accountants, industrial engineers, appraisers, and other experts, and fix their compensation, and may contract with such certified public accounting firms and qualified firms of engineers, as may be necessary to carry out its functions.

"DUTIES AND AUTHORITY OF BOARD

"SEC. 6. The activities of the Board shall be coordinated with the programs of the armed forces of the United States in the interests of the war effort. Until peace is concluded

the needs of the armed forces are hereby declared and shall remain paramount. The Board shall have general supervision and direction, as provided in this Act, over (1) the care and handling and disposition of surplus property, and (2) the transfer of surplus property between Government agencies.

"COOPERATION WITH INTERESTED GOVERNMENT AGENCIES

"SEC. 7. The Board shall advise and consult with other interested Government agencies with a view to obtaining all aid and assistance possible in coordinating the functions of the several agencies affected by the disposition of surplus property.

"DELEGATION OF AUTHORITY

"SEC. 8. The head of any Government agency, except the Board, may delegate, and authorize successive redelegations of, any authority conferred upon him or his agency, by or pursuant to this Act to any officer, agent, or employee of such agency or, with the approval of the Board, to any other Government agency.

"REGULATIONS

"SEC. 9. (a) The Board shall prescribe regulations to effectuate the provisions of this Act. In formulating such regulations, the Board shall be guided by the objectives of this Act.

"(b) Regulations issued pursuant to subsection (a) may, except as otherwise provided in this Act, contain provisions prescribing the extent to which, the times at which, the areas in which, the agencies by which, the prices at which, and the terms and conditions under which, surplus property may be disposed of, and the extent to which and the conditions under which surplus property shall be subject to care and handling.

"(c) Each Government agency shall carry out regulations of the Board expeditiously and shall issue such further regulations, not inconsistent with the regulations of the Board, as it deems necessary or desirable to carry out the provisions of this Act.

"(d) Regulations prescribed under this Act shall be published in the Federal Register.

"DESIGNATION OF DISPOSAL AGENCIES

"SEC. 10. (a) Except as provided in subsection (b) of this section, the Board shall designate one or more Government agencies to act as disposal agencies under this Act. In exercising its authority to designate disposal agencies, the Board shall assign surplus property for disposal by the fewest number of Government agencies practicable and, so far as it deems feasible, shall centralize in one disposal agency responsibility for the disposal of all property of the same type or class.

"(b) The United States Maritime Commission shall be the sole disposal agency for surplus vessels which the Commission determines to be merchant vessels or capable of conversion to merchant use, and such vessels shall be disposed of only in accordance with the provisions of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, as amended, and other laws authorizing the sale of such vessels.

"DECLARATION AND DISPOSITION OF SURPLUS PROPERTY

"SEC. 11. (a) Each owning agency shall have the duty and responsibility continuously to survey the property in its control and to determine which of such property is surplus to its needs and responsibilities.

"(b) Each owning agency shall promptly report to the Board and the appropriate disposal agency all surplus property in its control which the owning agency does not dispose of under section 14.

"(c) Whenever in the course of the performance of its duties under this Act, the Board has reason to believe that any owning agency has property in its control which is surplus to its needs and responsibilities and which it has not reported as such, the Board shall promptly report that fact to the Senate and House of Representatives. Each owning agency and each disposal agency shall submit to the Board (1) such information and reports with respect to surplus property in the control of the agency, in such form, and at such reasonable times, as the Board may direct; (2) such information and reports with respect to other property in the control of the agency, to such extent, and in such form, as the Board may direct and as the agency deems consistent with national security.

"(d) When any surplus property is reported to any disposal agency under subsection (b) of this section, the disposal agency shall have responsibility and authority for the disposition of such property, and for the care and handling of such property pending its disposition, in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Board. Where the disposal agency is not prepared at the time of its designation under this Act to undertake the care and handling of such surplus property the Board may postpone the responsibility of the agency to assume its duty for care and handling for such period as the Board deems necessary to permit the preparation of the agency therefor.

"(e) The Board shall prescribe regulations necessary to provide, so far as practicable, for uniform and wide public notice concerning surplus property available for sale, and for uniform and adequate time intervals between notice and sale so that all interested purchasers may have a fair opportunity to buy.

"(f) No surplus property which was processed, produced, or donated by the American Red Cross for any Government agency shall be disposed of except after notice to and consultation with the American Red Cross. All or any portion of such property may be donated to the American Red Cross, upon its request, solely for charitable purposes.

"(g) Each disposal agency shall maintain in each of its disposal offices such records of its inventories of surplus property and of each disposal transaction negotiated by that office as the Board may prescribe. The information in such records shall be available at all reasonable times for public inspection.

"UTILIZATION OF SURPLUS PROPERTY BY FEDERAL AGENCIES

"SEC. 12. (a) It shall be the duty of the Board to facilitate the transfer of surplus property from one Goverment agency to other Government agencies for their use; and the transfer of surplus property under this section shall be given priority over all other disposals provided for in this Act.

"(b) It shall be the responsibility of all Government agencies, in order to avoid making purchases through commercial channels, continuously to consult the records of surplus property established by the Board and to determine whether their requirements can be satisfied out of such surplus property. It shall also be the responsibility of the head of each Government agency to submit to the Board such estimates of the needs of the agency and such reports in relation thereto as the Board may deem necessary to promote the fullest utilization of surplus property. It shall be the responsibility of the Board to determine whether Government agencies are acquiring surplus property to the fullest possible extent, and to notify agencies whenever, in its judgment, they are not so doing.

"(c) The disposal agency responsible for any such property shall transfer it to the Government agency acquiring it at the fair value of the property as fixed by the disposal agency, under regulations prescribed by the Board, unless transfer without reimbursement or transfer of funds is otherwise authorized by law.

"DISPOSAL TO LOCAL GOVERNMENTS AND NONPROFIT INSTITUTIONS

"SEC. 13. (a) The Board shall prescribe regulations for the disposition of surplus property to States and their political subdivisions and instrumentalities, and to tax-supported and nonprofit institutions, and shall determine on the basis of need what transfers shall be made. In formulating such regulations the Board shall be guided by the objectives of this Act and shall give effect to the following policies to the extent feasible and in the public interest:

"(1) (A) Surplus property that is appropriate for school, classroom, or other educational use may be sold or leased to the States and their political subdivisions and instrumentalities, and tax-supported educational institutions, and to other nonprofit educational institutions which have been held exempt from taxation under section 101 (6) of the Internal Revenue Code.

"(B) Surplus medical supplies, equipment, and property suitable for use in the protection of public health, including research, may be sold or leased to the States and their political subdivisions and instrumentalities, and to tax-supported medical institutions, and to hospitals or other similar institutions not operated for profit which have been held exempt from taxation under section 101 (6) of the Internal Revenue Code.

"(C) In fixing the sale or lease value of property to be disposed of under subparagraph (A) and subparagraph (B) of this paragraph, the Board shall take into consideration any benefit which has accrued or may accrue to the United States from the use of such property by any such State, political subdivision, instrumentality, or institution.

"(2) Surplus property shall be disposed of so as to afford public and governmental institutions, nonprofit or tax-supported educational institutions, charitable and eleemosynary institutions, nonprofit or tax-supported hospitals and similar institutions, States, their political subdivisions and instrumentalities, and volunteer fire companies, an opportunity to fulfill, in the public interest, their legitimate needs.

"(b) Under regulations prescribed by the Board, whenever the Government agency authorized to dispose of any property finds that it has no commercial value or that the cost of its care and handling and disposition would exceed the estimated proceeds, the agency may donate such property to any agency or institution supported by the Federal Government or any State of local government, or to any nonprofit educational or charitable organization, or, if that is not feasible, shall destroy or otherwise dispose of such property, but, except in the case of property the immediate destruction of which is necessary or desirable either because of the nature of the property or because of the expense or difficulty of its care and handling, no property shall be destroyed until thirty days after public notice of the proposed destruction thereof has been given (and a copy of such notice given to the Board at the beginning of such thirty-day period) and an attempt has been made within such thirty days to dispose of such property otherwise than by destruction.

"(c) No airport and no harbor or port terminal, including necessary operating equipment, shall be otherwise disposed of until it has first been offered, under regulations to be prescribed by the Board, for sale or lease to the State, political subdivision thereof, and any municipality, in which it is situated, and to all municipalities in the vicinity thereof.

"(d) Whenever any State or political subdivision thereof, or any State or Government agency or instrumentality certifies to the Board that any power transmission line determined to be surplus property under the provisions of this Act is needful for or adaptable to the requirements of any public or cooperative power project, such line and the right-of-way acquired for its construction shall not be sold, leased for more than one year, or otherwise disposed of, except as pro-

vided in section 12 or this section, unless specifically authorized by Act of Congress.

"(e) In disposing of any surplus real property, as defined in section 23, on or across which highways or streets had been established and constructed and were being maintained by the States or their political subdivisions or instrumentalities at the time such surplus real property was acquired by the Government, and where such highways or streets were vacated, destroyed, or shut off from general public use in order to meet the requirements and serve the purposes of the Government, the States or their political subdivisions or instrumentalities first shall be given a reasonable time, to be fixed by the Board, in which to repurchase the original rights-of-way on which such highways or streets were established and in which to purchase such new or additional rights-of-way as may be required for reestablishing, in whole or in part, such highways or streets of greater width or on new and more adequate locations, at a price not exceeding that paid therefor by the Government.

"(f) The disposal of surplus property under this section to States and political subdivisions and instrumentalities thereof shall be given priority over all other disposals of property provided for in this Act except transfers under section 12.

"DISPOSITION BY OWNING AGENCY

"SEC. 14. (a) Subject only to the regulations of the Board with respect to price policies, any owning agency may dispose of any property for the purpose of war production or authorize any contractor with such agency or subcontractor thereunder to retain or dispose of any contractor inventories for the purpose of war production. The Board may empower any owning agency subject to the regulations of the Board, to authorize any contractor with such agency or subcontractor thereunder to retain or dispose of any contractor inventories for any other purpose which in the opinion of the Board is not contrary to the objectives of this Act. Where any owning agency takes possession of any contractor inventory from any contractor with the agency or subcontractor thereunder, such property shall be disposed of only in accordance with the provisions of this Act.

"(b) Subject only to subsection (c) of this section, any owning agency may dispose of—

"(1) any property which is damaged or worn beyond economical repair;

"(2) any waste, salvage, scrap, or other similar items;

"(3) any product of industrial, research, agricultural, or livestock operations, or of any public works construction or maintenance project, carried on by such agency;

"which does not consist of strategic minerals and metals, as defined in section 22.

"(c) Whenever the Board deems such action necessary to effectuate the objectives and policies of this Act, the Board, by regulations, shall restrict the authority of any owning agency to dispose of any class of surplus property under subsection (b) of this section.

"METHODS OF DISPOSITION

"SEC. 15. (a) Notwithstanding the provisions of any other law but subject to the provisions of this Act, whenever any Government agency is authorized to dispose of property under this Act, then the agency may dispose of such property by sale, exchange, lease, or transfer, for cash, credit, or other property, with or without warranty, and upon such other terms and conditions, as the agency deems proper: *Provided, however,* That in the case of raw materials, consumer goods, and small tools, hardware and nonassembled articles which may be used in the manufacture of more than one type of product, no extension of credit under this Act shall be for a longer period than three years.

"(b) Any owning agency or disposal agency may execute such documents for the transfer of title or other interest in property or take such other action as it deems necessary or proper to transfer or dispose of property or otherwise to carry out the provisions of this Act, and, in the case of surplus property, shall do so to the extent required by the regulations of the Board.

"DISPOSITIONS TO VETERANS

"SEC. 16. The Board shall prescribe regulations to effectuate the objectives of this Act to aid veterans to establish and maintain their own small business, professional, or agricultural enterprises, by affording veterans suitable preferences to the extent feasible and consistent with the policies of this Act in the acquisition of the types of surplus property useful in such enterprises.

"DISPOSITIONS IN RURAL AREAS

"SEC. 17. The Board shall devise ways and means and prescribe regulations in cooperation with the War Food Administrator providing for the sale of surplus property in such quantities in rural localities and in such manner as will assure farmers and farmers' cooperative associations equal opportunity with others to purchase surplus property: *Provided, however,* That in cases where a shortage of trucks, machinery, and equipment impairs farm production, a program shall be developed by the Board in cooperation with the Agricultural Adjustment Agency whereby a reasonable portion of the surplus supply will be made available for sale in rural areas to farmers and farmers' cooperative associations.

"SMALL BUSINESS

"SEC. 18. (a) It shall be the duty of the Board to devise ways and means and prescribe regulations to prevent any discrimination against small business in the disposal and distribution and use of any surplus property.

"(b) The Board shall by regulations determine, or provide for the determination, as to all surplus property in the hands of each disposal agency, the size of lots in which, and the areas in which, the various classes of such property should be offered consistently with the usual and customary commercial practice with respect to such class. The available supply of each class in each area shall be so disposed of as to give to prospective purchasers, within such area, of any particular amount (not smaller than the smallest lot consistent with such commercial practice) preference (by affording them reasonable opportunity to acquire the desired amount) over prospective purchasers of larger amounts.

"(c) The Smaller War Plants Corporation is hereby specifically charged with the responsibility of cooperating with the Board and with the owning and disposal agencies, of making surveys from time to time, and bringing to the attention of the agencies and the Board the needs and requirements of small business and any cases or situations which have resulted in or would effect discrimination against small business in the purchase or acquisition of surplus property by them and in the disposal thereof by the agencies.

"(d) The Smaller War Plants Corporation is hereby authorized and directed to consult with small business to obtain full information concerning the needs of small business for surplus property.

"(e) The Smaller War Plants Corporation shall have the power to purchase any surplus property for resale, subject to regulations of the Board, to small business (and is empowered to receive other property in exchange as partial or full payment therefor), when in its judgment, such disposition is required to preserve and strengthen the competitive position of small business, or will assist the Corporation in the discharge of the duties and responsibilities imposed upon it. The provisions of subsections (a) and (c) of section 12 shall be applicable to purchases made by the Smaller War Plants Corporation under this subsection.

"(f) The Smaller War Plants Corporation is hereby authorized for the purpose of carrying out the objectives of this section, to make or guarantee loans to small business enterprises in connection with the acquisition, conversion, and operation of plants and facilities which have been determined to be surplus property, and, in cooperation with the disposal agencies, to arrange for sales of surplus property to small business concerns on credit or time bases.

"DISPOSAL OF PLANTS

"SEC. 19. (a) The Board, in cooperation with the various disposal agencies, shall prepare and submit to the Congress within three months after enactment of this Act, a report as to each of the following classes of surplus property (not including any plant which cost the Government less than $5,000,000): (1) aluminum plants and facilities; (2) magnesium plants and facilities; (3) synthetic rubber plants and facilities; (4) chemical plants and facilities; (5) aviation gasoline plants and facilities; (6) iron and steel plants and facilities; (7) pipe lines and facilities used for transporting oil; (8) patents, processes, techniques, and inventions, except such as are necessary to the operation of the plants and facilities herein listed; (9) aircraft plants and facilities and aircraft and aircraft parts; (10) shipyards and facilities; (11) transportation facilities; and (12) radio and electrical equipment:

"(A) Describing the amount, cost, and location of the property and setting forth other descriptive information relative to the use of the property;

"(B) Outlining the economic problems that may be created by disposition of the property;

"(C) Setting forth a plan or program for the care and handling, disposition, and use of the property consistent with the policies and objectives set forth in this Act.

"(b) In the event that it is not possible within such period to prepare and submit a complete report to the Congress as to any class of property, the Board shall submit an interim report three months after the enactment of this Act, and shall submit a complete report as soon thereafter as possible. If the Board determines that it is desirable to alter or change any such plan or program or to prepare a report on any other class of property, it shall prepare in accordance with the provisions of this subsection and submit to the Congress an additional report, setting forth the altered or changed plan or program or a plan or program relating to the new class of property.

"(c) Whenever the Board may deem it to be in the interest of the objectives of this Act it may authorize the disposition of any surplus property listed in classes 9 to 12, inclusive, of subsection (a) of this section. With respect to the property listed in classes 1 to 8, inclusive, no disposition shall be made or authorized until thirty days after such report (or additional report) has been made while Congress is in session, except that the Board may authorize any disposal agency to lease any such property for a term of not more than five years.

"(d) The Board may authorize any disposal agency to dispose of any materials or equipment related to any surplus plant covered by this section, if such materials and equipment are not necessary for the operation of the plant in the manner for which it is designed.

"(e) This section shall not apply to any Government-owned equipment, structure, or other property operated as an integral part of a privately owned plant and not capable of economic operation as a separate and independent unit.

"APPLICABILITY OF ANTITRUST LAWS

"SEC. 20. Whenever any disposal agency shall begin negotiations for the disposition to private interests of a plant or plants or other property, which cost the Government $1,000,000 or more, or of patents, processes, techniques or inventions, irrespective of cost, the disposal agency shall promptly notify the Attorney General of the proposed disposition and the probable terms or conditions thereof. Within a reasonable time, in no event to exceed ninety days after receiving such notification, the Attorney General shall advise the Board and the disposal agency whether, in his opinion, the proposed disposition will violate the antitrust laws. Upon the request of the Attorney General, the Board or other Government agency shall furnish or cause to be furnished such information as it may possess which the Attorney General determines to be appropriate or necessary to enable him to give the advice called for by this section or to determine whether any other disposition of surplus property violates the antitrust laws. Nothing in this act shall impair, amend, or modify the antitrust laws or limit and prevent their application to persons who buy or otherwise acquire property under the provisions of this Act. As used in this section, the term 'antitrust laws' includes the Act of July 2, 1890 (ch. 647, 26 Stat. 209), as amended; the Act of October 15, 1914 (ch. 323, Stat. 730), as amended; the Federal Trade Commission Act; and the Act of August 27, 1894 (ch. 349, secs. 73, 74, 28 Stat. 570), as amended.

"DISPOSAL OF SURPLUS AGRICULTURAL COMMODITIES

"SEC. 21. (a) Subject to the supervision of the Board, the War Food Administrator, or his successor, shall be solely responsible for the formulation of policies with respect to the disposal of surplus agricultural commodities and surplus foods processed from agricultural commodities, which shall be administered by the disposal agency or agencies designated by the Board. Such policies shall be so formulated as to prevent surplus agricultural commodities, or surplus food processed from agricultural commodities, from being dumped on the market in a disorderly manner and disrupting the market prices for agricultural commodities.

"(b) The Board shall not exercise any of its powers under this act with relation to disposal of surplus cotton or woolen goods except with the approval in writing of the War Food Administrator or his successor.

"(c) Surplus farm commodities shall not be sold in the United States under this Act in quantities in excess of, or at prices less than, those applicable with respect to sales of such commodities by the Commodity Credit Corporation, or at less than current prevailing market prices, whichever may be the higher, unless such commodities are being disposed of, pursuant to this Act, only for export; and the Commodity Credit Corporation may dispose of or cause to be disposed of for cash or its equivalent in goods or for adequately secured credit, for export only, and at competitive world prices, any farm commodity or product thereof without regard to restrictions with respect to the disposal of commodities imposed upon it by any law: *Provided*, That no food or food product shall be sold or otherwise disposed of under this subsection for export (1) if there is a shortage of such food or food product in the United States or if such sale or other disposition may result in such a shortage, or (2) if such food or food product is needed to supply the normal demands of consumers in the United States.

"STOCK PILING

"SEC. 22. (a) All Government-owned accumulations of strategic minerals and metals, including those owned by any Government corporation, shall be transferred by the owning agency, when determined to be surplus pursuant to this Act, to the account of the Treasury Procurement Division and shall be added to the stock pile authorized by the Act of June 7, 1939 (53 Stat. 811), as amended, and shall be subject to its provisions: *Provided*, That contractor inventory shall be so transferred only when the owning agency has taken possession of and determined such inventory to be surplus. The minerals and metals may be transferred in any form in which they are held, but the owning agency or the Treasury Procurement Division is authorized either before or after such legal transfer to cause such minerals or metals to be put into forms best suited for storage and use for the common defense. As used in this section the phrase 'strategic minerals and metals' means copper, lead, zinc, tin, magnesium, manganese, chromite, nickel, molybdenum, tungsten, mercury, mica, quartz crystals, industrial diamonds, cadmium, fluorspar, cobalt, tantalite, antimony, vanadium, platinum, beryl, graphite (and to which may be added aluminum or any other minerals or metals in such quantities or amounts as the Army and Navy Munitions Board may determine to be necessary for the stock pile authorized by the Act of June 7, 1939), and shall include ores, concentrates, alloys, scrap, and partially and completely fabricated articles of which the principal components by value consist of such minerals and metals, but shall not include such fabricated articles as the Army and Navy determine are not suitable for their use in the form in which fabricated and which may be disposed of commercially at value substantially in excess of the metal market price of the component minerals and metals of such fabricated articles.

"(b) Pending a determination by the War Production Board that the supplies of the respective strategic minerals and metals available to the industry are sufficient to meet the current requirements of industry, the owning agency subject to the regulations prescribed by the Surplus Property Board shall withhold from transfer under this section an amount of such minerals and metals equal to the deficiency, if any, estimated by the War Production Board as likely to exist for the requirements of industry for a period of six months for purposes other than war production; and may dispose of the minerals and metals so withheld to the extent necessary to meet any such deficiency actually found to exist by the War Production Board, at the market price of the respective minerals and metals.

"(c) Any Government-owned accumulations of strategic materials shall at the request of the War and Navy Departments be transferred by the owning agency, when determined to be surplus pursuant to this Act, to the account of the Treasury Procurement Division and shall be added to the stock pile authorized by the Act of June 7, 1939 (53 Stat. 811), as amended, and shall be subject to its provisions. The materials may be transferred in any form in which they are held and they shall thereafter be put into forms best suited for storage and use for the common defense. The term 'strategic materials' as used in this subsection means all materials except strategic minerals and metals as defined in subsection (a) of this section and includes all materials in group A or in group B of the list of strategic and critical materials determined upon by the Army and Navy Munitions Board on March 6, 1944, as amended from time to time, but shall not include any of such materials which the Army and Navy determine do not meet the specifications suitable for common defense or are in excess of the needs thereof. The Army and Navy Munitions Board is authorized to direct the removal from the list of any of the materials as defined in this subsection, in which event they shall be disposed of under the provisions of this Act.

"(d) Within three months following the enactment of this Act the Army and Navy Munitions Board shall submit to Congress its recommendations respecting the maximum and minimum amounts of each strategic mineral or metal which in its opinion should be held in the stock pile authorized by the Act of June 7, 1939. After one year from the submission of such recommendations, unless the Congress provides otherwise by law, the Board may authorize the proper disposal agencies to dispose of any Government-owned accumulations of strategic minerals and metals including those owned by any Government corporation when determined to be surplus pursuant to this Act.

"DISPOSAL OF SURPLUS REAL PROPERTY

"SEC. 23. (a) As used in this section—

"(1) The term 'real property' means property consisting of land, together with any fixtures and improvements thereon, located outside of the District of Columbia, but does not include war housing, industrial plants, factories, or similar structures and facilities, or the sites thereof, or land which the Board determines is essential to the use of any of the foregoing; and

"(2) The term 'surplus real property' means real property which has been determined under section 11 to be surplus property.

"(b) Surplus real property which is not disposed of to Government agencies under section 12 or to States or their political subdivisions or instrumentalities under section 13 shall be disposed of in accordance with this section.

"(c) Immediately after the reporting of surplus real property to the Board under section 11, the Board shall classify such property as agricultural, grazing, forest, mineral, or otherwise, as it may deem advisable. The classification may be revised from time to time.

"(d) (1) (A) In the case of any surplus real property which was acquired by any Government agency after December 31, 1939, the person from whom such property was acquired shall be given notice, in such manner (which may include publication) as the Board by regulation may prescribe, that the property is to be disposed of by the United States and shall be entitled to purchase such property, in substantially the identical tract as when acquired from such person, at private sale at any time during the period of ninety days following such notice: *Provided*, That such period shall be extended in any case when it appears that such extension is necessary or appropriate to facilitate the sale of any surplus real property under this subsection.

"(B) In the case of real property acquired by any Government agency after December 31, 1939, which either—

"(i) has not been determined under section 11 to be surplus property, or

"(ii) has been disposed of under section 12 or 13, or

"(iii) is classified as suitable for a purpose different from that for which it was used when acquired by the Government, and with respect to which the person from whom it was acquired has signified an intention not to exercise the privilege granted under subparagraph (A),

"the person from whom such property was acquired may be offered other surplus real property in the same area for purchase at private sale, if such other property is classified as suitable for the purpose for which the property so acquired was used when so acquired, and is otherwise similar to the property so acquired.

"(2) In the case of surplus real property which was acquired by any Government agency after December 31, 1939, and which

is classified as suitable for agricultural use, if any tenant (who was a tenant at the time of acquisition) of the person from whom such property was acquired, signifies, within a period of ninety days following public notice of sale, his intention to purchase such property, and no person has exercised his privilege under paragraph (1) (A), such tenant shall be entitled to purchase such property, in substantially the identical tract as when acquired by such Government agency, at private sale at any time during such ninety-day period.

"(3) The price to be paid for surplus real property sold under this subsection shall be a price not greater than that for which it was acquired by the United States, such acquisition price being properly adjusted to reflect any increase or decrease in the value of such property resulting from action by the United States, or a price equal to the market price at the time of sale of such property, whichever price is the lower.

"(4) The Board may by regulation prescribe methods for the identification of persons entitled to exercise the privileges conferred by this subsection.

"(e) If any surplus real property is not disposed of under subsection (d)—

"(1) such property, if classified as suitable for agricultural use, shall be subdivided, as provided by the Board, whenever practicable into economic family-size units (taking into consideration the variations in sizes of economic units in different localities); and

"(2) such property, if not classified as suitable for agricultural use, shall be subdivided into the appropriate units in which the Board deems the property should be disposed of, giving due consideration to the character of the property, the economic use to which it is likely to be put, and the objectives of disposition as set forth in this Act.

"(f) (1) Whenever any surplus real property classified as suitable for agricultural, residential, or small business purposes is to be disposed of, except as provided in subsection (d) of this section, veterans shall be granted a preference in the purchase of such property over nonveterans.

"(2) The following procedure shall govern the exercise of veterans' preference rights under this subsection: The disposal agency, under regulations prescribed by the Board, shall fix the price of each unit into which the property is subdivided under subsection (e) after taking into consideration the then current market value, the character of the property, and, if income producing property, the estimated earning capacity thereof. Before any such property is disposed of, except under subsection (d), any veteran may apply for the purchase of any or all units offered for sale at the price so fixed. The Board shall prescribe the time within which application shall be made and shall give such notice thereof as it deems reasonable to enable veterans to exercise their rights under this subsection. The Board shall provide for the selection of the purchaser of each unit by lot from among the applicants for the unit. If any applicant is selected as the purchaser of more than one unit, he shall elect which one to take, whereupon the right to purchase the remaining units shall go to the remaining applicants in the order in which their names were drawn. No veteran may apply for the purchase of any property under the provisions of this subsection if he has previously exercised a preference right under this section and has acquired property pursuant thereto. Sales to veterans under this subsection shall be upon such terms as the Board may prescribe.

"(g) In the case of the death of a person entitled under this section to rights as a former owner or veteran, his spouse and children, in that order, shall succeed to such rights of the decedent existing at the time of his death. Any preference right under subsection (f) to which a person would have been entitled except for his death while in the active military or naval service of the United States, shall be extended to his spouse and children, in that order. No preference right may be assigned or exercised by power of attorney or through a power to select except as may be permitted by regulations prescribed by the Board in order to prevent the loss of such right by the holder thereof.

"(h) A certificate by the disposal agency that the provisions of subsections (d), (f), and (g) have been complied with in the case of any property and that no qualified applicant has made application to exercise his privilege to purchase within the time limits fixed by or pursuant to this Act, shall terminate all privileges to purchase such property.

"(i) In the case of surplus real property which is classified as suitable for agricultural use and which is not disposed of under subsection (d) or (f), such property (after subdivision as provided in subsection (e) (1)) shall be disposed of insofar as possible only to persons who expect to cultivate the land and to operate it for a livelihood. The Department of Agriculture is authorized and directed, within the limits of its current functions under the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, to extend needed financial and other assistance to persons eligible for such assistance under the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act and the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, in connection with the disposal of surplus agricultural lands pursuant to this subsection.

"(j) In the case of sales of real property under this section or under any other provision of this Act, the form of deed or instrument of transfer shall be approved by the Attorney General. Deeds or other instruments containing general or special warranties of title may be issued and delivered to purchasers provided such warranties have been recommended and approved by the Attorney General. In determining whether general or special warranty deeds to properties may be issued and delivered, the Attorney General is authorized to approve the issuance and delivery of warranty deeds where titles are subject to infirmities of such character that in his opinion the interests of the United States will not be jeopardized under its warranty.

"REPORTS TO CONGRESS

"SEC. 24. Within three months after the enactment of this Act, and thereafter in January, April, July, and October of each year, the Board shall submit to the Senate and House of Representatives a progress report on the exercise of its authority and discretion under this Act, the status of surplus property disposition, and such other pertinent information on the administration of the Act as will enable the Congress to evaluate its administration and the need for amendments and related legislation.

"TITLE OF PURCHASER

"SEC. 25. A deed, bill of sale, lease, or other instrument executed by or on behalf of any Government agency purporting to transfer title or any other interest in property under this Act shall be conclusive evidence of compliance with the provisions of this Act insofar as title or other interest of any bona fide purchasers for value, or lessees, as the case may be, is concerned.

"CIVIL REMEDIES AND PENALTIES

"SEC. 26. (a) Where any property is disposed of in accordance with this Act and any regulations prescribed under this Act, no officer or employee of the Government shall (1) be liable with respect to such disposition except for his own fraud or (2) be accountable is determined to be uncollectible by the for the collection of any purchase price which agency responsible therefor.

"(b) Every person who shall use or engage in or cause to be used or engaged in any fraudulent trick, scheme, or device, for the purpose of securing or obtaining, or aiding to secure or obtain, for any person any payment, property, or other benefits from the United States or any Government agency in connection with the disposition of property under this Act; or who enters into an agreement, combination, or conspiracy to do any of the foregoing—

"(1) shall pay to the United States the sum of $2,000 for each such act, and double the amount of any damage which the United States may have sustained by reason thereof, together with the costs of suit; or

"(2) shall, if the United States shall so elect, pay to the United States, as liquidated damages, a sum equal to twice the consideration agreed to be given by such person to the United States or any Government agency; or

"(3) shall, if the United States shall so elect, restore to the United States the property thus secured and obtained and the United States shall retain as liquidated damages any consideration given to the United States or any Government agency for such property.

"(c) The several district courts of the United States, the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia, and the several district courts of the Territories of the United States, within whose jurisdictional limits the person, or persons, doing or committing such act, or any one of them, resides or shall be found, shall wheresoever such act may have been done or committed, have full power and jurisdiction to hear, try, and determine such suit.

"(d) The civil remedies provided in this section shall be in addition to all other criminal penalties and civil remedies provided by law.

"PRACTICE BY FORMER EMPLOYEES

"SEC. 27. No person employed by any Government agency, including commissioned officers assigned to duty in such agency, shall, during the period such person is engaged in such employment or service, or for a period of two years after the time when such employment or service has ceased, act as counsel, attorney, or agent, or be employed as representative, in connection with any matter involving the disposition of surplus property by the agency in which such person was employed, if such person during his employment with such agency ratified, approved, or authorized the disposition of any surplus property pursuant to the provisions of this Act or recommended any such approval, authorization, or ratification as part of his official duties. Any person violating the provisions of this section shall be fined not more than $10,000, or imprisoned for not more than one year, or both.

"STATUTE OF LIMITATIONS

"SEC. 28. The first section of the Act of August 24, 1942 (56 Stat. 747), as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"'The running of any existing statute of limitations applicable to any offense against the laws of the United States (1) involving defrauding or attempts to defraud the United States or any agency thereof whether by conspiracy or not, and in any manner, or (2) committed in connection with the negotiation, procurement, award, performance, payment for, interim financing, cancelation or other termination or settlement, of any contract, subcontract, or purchase order which is connected with or related to the prosecution of the present war, or with any disposition of termination inventory by any war contractor or Government agency, or (3) committed in connection with the care and handling and disposal of property under the Surplus Property Act of 1944, shall be suspended

until three years after the termination of hostilities in the present war as proclaimed by the President or by a concurrent resolution of the two Houses of Congress. This section shall apply to acts, offenses, or transactions where the existing statute of limitations has not yet fully run, but it shall not apply to acts, offenses, or transactions which are already barred by provisions of existing law.'

"MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

"SEC. 29. Surplus property disposals may be made without regard to any provision in existing law for competitive bidding, unless the Board shall determine that disposal by competitive bid will in a given case better effectuate the policy of the Act.

"DISPOSITION OF PROCEEDS

"SEC. 30. (a) All proceeds from any transfer or disposition of property under this Act shall be covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts, except as provided in subsections (b), (c), and (d) of this section.

"(b) Where the property transferred or disposed of was acquired by the use of funds either not appropriated from the general fund of the Treasury or appropriated from the general fund of the Treasury but by law reimbursable from assessment, tax, or other revenue or receipts, then upon the request of the interested agency the net proceeds of the disposition or transfer shall be credited to the reimbursable fund or appropriation or paid to the owning agency. As used in this subsection the term 'net proceeds of the disposition or transfer' means the proceeds of the disposition or transfer minus all expenses incurred for care and handling and disposition or transfer.

"(c) To the extent authorized by the Board, any Government agency disposing of property under this Act (1) may deposit, in a special account with the Treasurer of the United States, such amount of the proceeds of such dispositions as it deems necessary to permit appropriate refunds to purchasers when any disposition is rescinded or does not become final, or payments for breach of any warranty, and (2) may withdraw therefrom amounts so to be refunded or paid, without regard to the origin of the funds withdrawn.

"(d) Where a contract or subcontract authorizes the proceeds of any sale of property in the custody of the contractor or subcontractor to be credited to the price or cost of the work covered by such contract or subcontract, the proceeds of any such sale shall be credited in accordance with the contract or subcontract.

"(e) Where the disposal agency acquires or retains any mortgage, lien, or other interest as security in connection with any transfer or disposition of property under this Act, the disposal agency shall retain, preserve, and manage such security and may enforce and settle any right of the Government with respect thereto in such manner and upon such terms as it deems in the best interest of the Government. The Board may prescribe regulations to govern the exercise of the authority granted under this subsection.

"USE OF APPROPRIATED FUNDS

"SEC. 31. (a) Any Government agency is authorized to use for the disposition of property under this Act, and for its care and handling pending such disposition, any funds heretofore or hereafter appropriated, allocated, or available to it for the purpose of production or procurement of such property.

"(b) Any Government agency is authorized to use for the acquisition of any surplus property under this Act any funds heretofore or hereafter appropriated, allocated, or available to it for the acquisition of property of the same kind.

"(c) There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary or appropriate for administering the provisions of this Act.

"DISPOSITIONS OUTSIDE UNITED STATES

"SEC. 32 (a) Nothing in this Act shall limit or affect the authority of commanders in active theaters of military operations with respect to property in their control.

"(b) The provisions of this Act shall be applicable to dispositions of property within the United States and elsewhere, but the Board may exempt from some or all of the provisions hereof dispositions of property located outside of the continental United States, its Territories and possessions, whenever it deems that such provisions would obstruct the efficient and economic disposition of such property in accordance with the objectives of this Act.

"RESTRICTIONS ON IMPORTATION OF SURPLUS PROPERTY INTO UNITED STATES

"SEC. 33. (a) It is the policy of this Act to prohibit, so far as feasible and necessary to carry out the objectives of this Act, the importation into the United States of surplus property sold abroad or for export. The Board shall prescribe regulations to carry out such policy, and the importation of surplus property into the United States is hereby prohibited to the extent specified in such regulations. The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to provide for the enforcement of such regulations.

"(b) Surplus property sold to members of the armed forces abroad may be brought into the United States without regard to the provisions of subsection (a) if brought in by the original purchaser and upon certificate by him that he is bringing the property into the United States for his personal use.

"SAVING PROVISIONS

"SEC. 34. (a) The authority conferred by this Act is in addition to any authority conferred by any other law and shall not be subject to the provisions of any law inconsistent herewith. This Act shall not impair or affect any authority for the disposition of property under any other law, except that the Board may prescribe regulations to govern any disposition of surplus property under any such authority to the same extent as if the disposition were made under this Act, whenever it deems such action necessary to effectuate the objectives and policies of this Act.

"(b) Nothing in this Act shall impair or affect the provisions of the Contract Settlement Act of 1944; the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended; the Act of October 2, 1942 (ch. 578, 56 Stat. 765), as amended; section 301 of the Second War Powers Act, 1942; the Act of March 11, 1941 (55 Stat. 31), as amended; the Tennessee Valley Authority Act of 1933, as amended: Public Law 849. Seventy-sixth Congress, as amended, respecting war housing and facilities; the Act of June 7, 1939, relating to the acquisition of strategic and critical materials (53 Stat. 811); the Trading With the Enemy Act, as amended; section 43 of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, as amended; Acts supplemental to any of the foregoing: any law regulating the exportation of property from the United States; the internal-revenue laws; the statutes relating to the public lands; or any criminal law of the United States.

"(c) Nothing in this Act shall be deemed to impair or modify any contract, or any term or provision of any contract, without the consent of the contractor, if the contract or the term or provision thereof is otherwise valid.

"TEMPORARY APPLICABILITY OF EXISTING PROCEDURES

"SEC. 35. All policies and procedures relating to surplus property prescribed by the Surplus War Property Administration, created by Executive Order Numbered 9425, dated February 19, 1944, or any other Government agency, in effect upon the effective date of this Act, and not inconsistent with this Act, shall remain in full force and effect unless and until superseded by regulations prescribed under this Act.

"TERMINATION INVENTORIES

"SEC. 36. (a) The Congress recognizes that upon termination of war contracts, the plants of war contractors will be filled with vast termination inventories which until removed or disposed of will prevent or interfere with the resumption of civilian production and reemployment, and that so far as possible decisions should be made in advance of termination for the disposition and removal of such termination inventories without delay when termination occurs. Measures should be taken to realize the greatest possible value from termination inventories.

"(b) In advance of termination, to the maximum extent practicable—

"(1) each contracting agency shall advise its war contractors of the classes of termination inventory the contracting agency will wish to retain for military purposes; and

"(2) the Board shall establish procedures for advising war contractors as to the care and handling and disposition of termination inventory not required for military purposes, in order to effectuate the policies stated in subsection (a) of this section and the policies of section 11 (a) (3) of the Contract Settlement Act of 1944.

"(c) To the extent that it is impracticable so to advise war contractors in advance of termination, the contracting agencies and the Board shall be prepared to give such advice as soon as practicable after termination of the war contract.

"(d) The Board and the Director of Contract Settlement shall cooperate in carrying out the provisions of this section.

"(e) For the purposes of this section, the terms 'contracting agency', 'termination inventory', and 'war contractor' shall have the meanings assigned to such terms by section 3 of the Contract Settlement Act of 1944.

"INCREASE ON LOAN RATE ON COTTON

"SEC. 37. (a) Section 8 (a) (1) of the Stabilization Act of 1942, as amended (relating to loans upon certain agricultural commodities), is amended by striking out 'at the rate in the case of cotton of 92½ per centum' and inserting in lieu thereof 'at the rate in the case of cotton of 95 per centum'.

"(b) The amendment made by this section shall be applicable only with respect to crops harvested after December 31, 1943, but shall not apply to crops planted after 1944. In the case of loans made under such section 8 upon any of the 1944 crop of cotton before the amendment made by this section takes effect, the Commodity Credit Corporation is authorized and directed to increase or provide for increasing the amount of such loans to the amount of the loans which would have been made if the loan rate specified in the amendment made by this section had been in effect at the time the loans were made.

"EXPIRATION DATE

"SEC. 38. Unless extended by law, this Act shall expire at the end of three years following the date of the cessation of hostilities in the present war. For the purposes of this section the term 'date of the cessation of hostilities in the present war' means the date proclaimed by the President as the date of such cessation, or the date specified in a concurrent resolution of the two Houses of Congress as of the date such cessation, whichever is the earlier.

"SEPARABILITY OF PROVISIONS

"SEC. 39 If any provision of this Act, or the application of such provision to any person or circumstance, is held invalid, the remainder of this Act or the application of such provision to persons or circumstances other than

those as to which it is held invalid, shall not be affected thereby."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amend the title to read as follows: "An Act to aid the reconversion from a war to a peace economy through the distribution of Government surplus property and to establish a Surplus Property Board to effectuate the same, and for other purposes".

CARTER MANASCO,
JOHN J. COCHRAN,
WILL M. WHITTINGTON,
CHARLES L. GIFFORD,
By C. M.,
GEORGE H. BENDER,
By C. M.,
Managers on the part of the House.

ELBERT D. THOMAS,
EDWIN C. JOHNSON,
LISTER HILL,
ALBERT B. CHANDLER,
By E. C. J.,
WARREN R. AUSTIN,
CHAN GURNEY,
CHAPMAN REVERCOMB,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5125) to provide for the disposal of surplus Government property and plants, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

ADMINISTRATION

The House bill provided for the administration of the disposition of surplus property by a single Administrator who was to be appointed by the President, by and with the advice of the Senate, and to receive compensation of $12,000 per annum.

The Senate amendment provided for administration by a board of eight members to be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, and to receive compensation at the rate of $10,000 per annum. In the selection of members of the Board, the President was directed to give due consideration to the various geographic areas and economic interests of the Nation. The Chairman of the Board was to be elected by the Board itself. In case of a tie vote, the Director of War Mobilization was to have the deciding vote. The Board was authorized to appoint an Administrative Director at a salary of $10,000 per annum and was authorized to delegate any of its "administrative" authority to the Administrative Director.

Both the House bill and the Senate amendment provided for an advisory council consisting of certain named Government officials with which the Administrator (under the House bill) and the Board (under the Senate amendment) were to advise and consult.

Both under the House bill and under the Senate amendment, provision was made for the organizing of industry advisory committees to furnish advice with respect to the disposition of various classes of surplus property.

The conference agreement (sec. 5) creates a Surplus Property Board consisting of three members, to be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, and to receive compensation at the rate of $12,000 per annum. The term of office of the members is 2 years. The President is to designate one of the members as Chairman of the Board. The Board is authorized to employ such personnel as may be necessary to carry out its functions. Special assistants, certified public accountants, qualified cost accountants, industrial engineers, appraisers, and other experts, are authorized to be appointed by the Board without regard to the civil-service laws and the Classification Act of 1923. The Board is given (sec. 6) general supervision and direction over the care and handling and disposition of surplus property and the transfer of surplus property between Government agencies.

The conference agreement does not contain any provision for an advisory council of named Government officials, but does (sec. 7) require the Board to advise and consult with other interested Government agencies affected by the disposition of surplus property. Similarly, no provision is made in the conference agreement directing the organization of industry advisory committees.

DECLARATION OF SURPLUS PROPERTY

Both under the House bill and the Senate amendment, property could be declared surplus only by the owning agency, and the Administrator (under the House bill) and the Board (under the Senate amendment) were given power only to bring to the attention of Congress any case in which it appeared that an owning agency had property in its control which was, in fact, surplus to its needs and responsibility, but which had not been reported as such by the owning agency. The conference agreement (sec. 11) contains provisions similar to both the House bill and the Senate amendment in this respect.

UTILIZATION BY OTHER FEDERAL AGENCIES

Both the House bill and the Senate amendment had the effect of providing that surplus property of one Federal agency should first be made available to other Federal agencies for their use prior to its disposition. Under the House bill it was specifically provided that transfers between Government agencies were to be made at the fair value of the property as fixed by the disposal agency, under regulations of the administrative authority, unless transfer without reimbursement or transfer of funds was otherwise authorized by law. There was no comparable provision in the Senate amendment.

The conference agreement (sec. 12) provides that transfers of surplus property between Government agencies are to be given priority over all other disposals provided for in the act; but the provision of the House bill requiring reimbursement or transfer of funds is retained. Thus no Government agency can acquire surplus property of any other Government agency unless it has appropriations available to pay for the property.

DONATIONS AND PRICE PREFERENCES

Under the House bill only property which had no commercial value could be given away and then only to public and nonprofit educational and charitable organizations. Under the House bill it was provided that the following were, to the extent feasible and to the public interest, to be afforded an opportunity to fulfill their legitimate needs: Public, governmental, educational, charitable, and eleemosynary institutions, States, Territories, their political subdivisions, insular possessions, and the District of Columbia, volunteer fire companies, and cooperative organizations.

Under the Senate amendment it was provided that surplus property that was appropriate for school, classroom, or other educational use could be donated to the States and their political subdivisions and tax-supported educational institutions, and also to certain nonprofit educational institutions. Similarly, surplus medical supplies and other equipment and property suitable for use in the protection of the public health could be donated to the States and their political subdivisions and to tax-supported medical institutions, as well as certain nonprofit hospitals and other similar institutions. It was also provided in the Senate amendment that any surplus property could be disposed of to States, political subdivisions thereof, tax-supported institutions, people's utility districts and rural electrification cooperatives, and certain specified nonprofit institutions at discounts up to 50 percent.

The conference agreement (sec. 13) retains the provision of the House bill with respect to the donation of property having no commercial value. This is the only case in which donation is authorized. The conference agreement further provides that the Board shall prescribe regulations for the disposition of surplus property to States and their political subdivisions and instrumentalities, and to nonprofit institutions, and shall determine on the basis of need what transfers are to be made. In formulating such regulations the Board is to be guided by the objectives of the act and to give effect to the following policies to the extent feasible and in the public interest:

(1) Surplus property appropriate for educational use may be sold or leased to the States and their political subdivisions and to tax-supported educational institutions, as well as to certain other nonprofit educational institutions.

(2) Surplus medical supplies, etc., may be sold or leased to States and their political subdivisions, and to tax-supported medical institutions, as well as to hospitals and other similar nonprofit institutions.

(3) In fixing the sale or lease value of property to be disposed of in each of the above cases, the Board is directed to take into consideration any benefit which has accrued or may accrue to the United States from the use of such property by any such State, political subdivisions, instrumentality, or institution.

(4) Surplus property is to be disposed of so as to afford public and governmental institutions, nonprofit or tax-supported educational institutions, charitable institutions, nonprofit or tax-supported hospitals and similar institutions, States, their political subdivisions and instrumentalities, and volunteer fire companies, an opportunity to fulfill, in the public interest, their legitimate needs.

The conference agreement (sec. 13 (c)) provides that no airport and no harbor or port terminal is to be disposed of until it has been first offered for sale or lease to the State, political subdivision, and any municipality in which it is situated, and to all municipalities in the vicinity. It is also provided (sec. 13 (d)) that no power transmission line shall be sold, leased for more than 1 year, or otherwise disposed of, except to another Federal agency, or to a State or political subdivision or instrumentality thereof, unless specifically authorized by an act of Congress if any State or political subdivision thereof, or any State or Government agency or instrumentality certifies that it is needful for or adaptable to requirements of a public or cooperative power project.

PRICE

The conference agreement (sec. 2 (t)) provides that it is the objective to obtain, except as otherwise provided in the act, as nearly as possible the fair value of surplus property upon its disposition. What constitutes a fair value must, of course, be determined with reference to the character of the disposition (such as wholesale, as contemplated by the objective to utilize commercial channels of distribution), as well as all other appropriate factors.

The only exceptions in the conference agreement to the fair-value objective are—

(1) a provision (sec. 13 (e)) authorizing States and their political subdivisions to repurchase original rights-of-way on which highways or streets were established at a price not exceeding that paid therefor by the Government, and

(2) a provision (sec. 23 (d)) authorizing the former owner of real property (and his tenant) to reacquire such property at the price paid by the Government, adjusted for any increase or decrease in the value of the property by reason of action by the United States.

The provision (sec. 13 (a) (1) (C) authorizing the Board to take into consideration any benefit which has accrued or may accrue to the United States from the use of educational property and surplus medical supplies, etc., by States, political subdivisions, instrumentalities, and institutions, described under the heading "Donations and Price Preferences," simply has the effect of treating the benefit so accruing to the United States as a medium of payment.

MERCHANT VESSELS AND NAVAL VESSELS

Both the House bill and the Senate amendment provided that in the case of merchant vessels and vessels capable of conversion to merchant use, the United States Maritime Commission should be the sole disposal agency of such vessels, and that such vessels should be disposed of only in accordance with the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, and other law authorizing the sale of such vessels. The conference agreement (sec. 10 (b)) also contains this provision.

The House bill provided that no combat naval vessels, stations, or establishments should be disposed of except in accordance with existing law specifically authorizing their disposition, and in all cases where such disposition had not been so specifically authorized that no disposition of any combat naval vessel, station, or establishment should be made unless Congress by law so authorized. It was further provided in the House bill that the Navy Department should be the sole disposal agency for such combat vessels, stations, and establishments. The conference agreement (sec. 2 (d)) excludes from the definition of the term "property" naval vessels of the following categories: Battleships, cruisers, aircraft carriers, destroyers, and submarines. This has the effect of excluding vessels of these categories entirely from the operation of any of the provisions of the act, and their disposition, if any is to take place, must take place under provisions of existing law and not under the provisions of the act. No special provision is made in the conference agreement with respect to naval stations or establishments, and the provision in the House bill making the Navy Department a disposal agency is omitted from the conference agreement.

DISPOSITIONS TO VETERANS

Under the House bill it was provided that the Administrator in formulating regulations to govern the disposition of surplus property should be guided by the objectives and should give effect to a number of specified policies, among which was the policy to afford returning veterans an opportunity to establish themselves as proprietors of agricultural, business, and professional enterprises and to afford those serving in the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and all war veterans an opportunity to purchase single units or small lots of surplus property at the same price for which such property has been sold or offered for sale in large lots. Under the Senate amendment it was made one of the functions and duties of the Board to effectuate the objectives of the act to aid honorably discharged veterans to establish and maintain their own small business, professional, or agricultural enterprise by affording such veterans suitable preferences in the acquisition of types of property useful in such enterprises.

The conference agreement (sec. 16) directs the Board to prescribe regulations to effectuate the objectives of the act to aid veterans to establish and maintain their own small business, professional, or agricultural enterprises by affording them suitable preferences to the extent feasible in the acquisition of the types of property useful in such enterprises.

The preference to veterans in the purchase of real property is discussed under the heading "Disposition of surplus real property."

DISPOSITIONS IN RURAL AREAS

The Senate amendment made it one of the functions and duties of the Board to devise ways and means and prescribe regulations in cooperation with the War Food Administrator providing for the sale of surplus property in such quantities in rural localities and in such manner as would assure farmers and farmer's cooperative associations equal opportunity with others to purchase surplus property. It was further provided that in cases where a shortage of trucks, machinery, and equipment impairs farm production that the Board develop a program in cooperation with the War Food Administrator whereby a reasonable portion of the surplus supplies would be made available for sale in rural areas to farmers and farmer's associations. There was no similar provision in the House bill.

The conference agreement (sec. 17) contains provisions similar to those of the Senate amendment in this respect, except that the truck program is to be developed by the Board in cooperation with the Agricultural Adjustment Agency rather than with the War Food Administrator.

SMALL BUSINESS

The House bill directed the Administrator to provide for the disposal of all surplus property in the smallest practicable lots consistent with the usual and customary commercial practice and provided that so long as an opportunity existed for the disposal of property to prospective purchasers of smaller lots preference was to be given to such purchasers over prospective purchasers of larger amounts. It was also provided in the House bill that in formulating regulations to govern disposition of surplus property the Administrator was to give effect, so far as feasible, to the policy affording business concerns, both small and large, opportunities to purchase surplus property on equal terms and to provide for uniform and wide public notice concerning surplus property available for disposition and providing for adequate time between the notice and disposition so that all interested persons should have a fair opportunity to acquire, and to utilize commercial channels of distribution.

The conference agreement (sec. 18), which follows closely the provisions of the Senate amendment, contains the following provisions relating to small business:

(1) It is made the duty of the Board to devise ways and means and prescribe regulations to prevent any discrimination against small business in the disposition of surplus property.

(2) The Board is to issue regulations determining, or providing for the determination, as to all surplus property in the hands of each disposal agency, the size of lots and the areas in which the various classes of such property should be offered consistently with the usual and customary commercial practices. The available supply of each class in each area is to be so disposed of as to give to prospective purchasers within such area of one or more lots reasonable opportunity to acquire the desired amount in preference to prospective purchasers of a larger number of lots.

(3) The Smaller War Plants Corporation is given the responsibility of cooperating with the Board and with the owning and disposal agencies and bringing to the attention of the agencies and the Board the needs and requirements of small business, and to consult with small business to obtain full information concerning their needs for surplus property.

(4) The Smaller War Plants Corporation is also given the power to purchase surplus property for resale to small business, subject to regulations of the Board, when in the judgment of the Corporation such disposition is required to preserve and strengthen the competitive position of small business. Such purchase by the Smaller War Plants Corporation is to be at the fair value of the property, as in the case of purchase by other Government agencies. The Smaller War Plants Corporation is given power to make or guarantee loans to small business in connection with the acquisition, conversion, and operation of plants and facilities which have been determined to be surplus property and in cooperation with the disposal agencies, to arrange for sales of surplus property to small business concerns on credit or time bases.

DISPOSITION OF PLANTS

The House bill prohibited the disposition of any surplus Government-owned plant for the production of synthetic rubber or aluminum or any pipe line for the transportation of oil, which cost the Government $5,000,000 or more, until after 6 months from the submission to Congress of a report with respect thereto. If within that time Congress did not provide otherwise by law, disposition was authorized in accordance with a plan or program proposed in such report. It was also provided in the House bill that no Government agency could dispose of any surplus plant of any character which cost the Government $1,000,000 or more without the approval of a majority of the members of the Advisory Board, provided for in the bill, which consisted of certain named Government officials.

The Senate amendment directed the Board to prepare and submit to Congress within 3 months after the enactment of the act a report of each of the following classes of property: (1) Aluminum plants; (2) magnesium plants; (3) synthetic rubber plants; (4) chemical plants; (5) aviation gas and gasoline plants; (6) iron and steel plants; (7) pipe lines for transporting oil; (8) patents, processing techniques, and inventions; (9) aircraft plants, and aircraft and aircraft parts; (10) shipyards; (11) transportation facilities; (12) radio and electrical equipment. The Board was authorized, if it deemed it to be in the interest of the objectives of the act, to provide for the disposition of any surplus property listed in classes (9) to (12), above, but with respect to the property listed in classes (1) to (8), above, no disposition was permitted until 30 days after the report had been made to Congress while Congress was in session.

The conference agreement (sec. 19) contains provisions similar to those contained in the Senate amendment with the following exceptions:

(a) There is excluded from the operation of this scetion of the conference agreement any plant which cost the Government less than $5,000,000.

(b) The report is limited to surplus property.

(c) With respect to the property listed in classes (1) to (8), above, an exception is made to the limitations on the disposition of such property under which the Board may authorize any disposal agency to lease any such property for a term of not more than 5 years.

(d) The Board is authorized, as under the House bill, to provide for the disposal of any materials or equipment related to any plant covered by this section, if such materials and equipment are not necessary for the operation of the plant in the manner for which it was designed.

(e) A provision is included from the House bill providing that the section is not to apply to any Government-owned equipment, structure or other property operated as an integral part of a privately owned plant and not capable of economical operation as a separate and independent unit:

DISPOSITION OF SURPLUS REAL PROPERTY

The House bill provided that in formulating regulations to govern the disposition of surplus property, the Administrator was to give effect, to the extent feasible, to the policy of disposing of lands in the United States, acquired by the United States after July 2, 1940, which the Administrator deemed suitable for agricultural use, by affording to the person from whom such land was acquired a reasonable opportunity to purchase the land at a price not greater than that at which it was acquired by the United States, such acquisition price being properly adjusted to reflect any increase or decrease in the value of the land resulting from any action of the United States. If the land was not disposed of to the former owner, and if the Administrator deemed that the land should be disposed of for agricultural uses, then it was the policy of the House bill to dispose of it in parcels not larger than suitable for the needs of a one-family unit.

The Senate amendment contained detailed provisions with respect to the disposition of surplus real property. It provided for establishing a central inventory in the General Land Office of all lands held by the United States and provided that the disposition of all surplus real property was to be either by the Secretary of Agriculture or the Secretary of the Interior, depending upon its classification. The former owner and his lineal heirs were given a right to acquire any surplus real property acquired by the Government after December 31, 1939, at a price equal to the price paid by the United States, adjusted for any increase or decrease in the market value of the land by reason of any improvements or changes made thereon, by reason of the use thereof by the United States, or at the market price—whichever was the lower. Similar privileges were extended to tenants. Veterans were given a preference in the acquisition of surplus real property after the former owner and tenant had been given an opportunity to exercise their preference. The Senate amendment also provided for the disposition of Moore Field, in Cleveland County, Okla., to the former owner. For the purpose of the section of the Senate amendment relating to the disposition of surplus real property, the public domain and lands withdrawn or reserved from the public domain were excluded.

Under the conference agreement (sec. 23), surplus real property which is not disposed of to Government agencies or to States, their political subdivisions or instrumentalities, is to be disposed of giving effect to section 23 of the conference agreement. Surplus real property is defined as real property which has been determined under section 11 to be surplus property, and real property is defined as excluding—

(1) Land located in the District of Columbia;

(2) War housing, industrial plants, factories, and similar structures and facilities; and

(3) The public domain or land withdrawn or reserved from the public domain, except to the extent that the Board determines lands so withdrawn or reserved are not suitable for return to the public domain for disposition under the general land laws.

When an owning agency reports real property to the Board as surplus, the Board is directed to classify the property, and is given power to revise its classification from time to time. The disposition of the property is to be effected by the disposal agency designated by the Board under section 10 of the conference agreement. In the case of surplus real property which was acquired by the Government after December 31, 1939, the former owner, or in the event of his death, his wife or children, in that order, are given the right to purchase the property at a price not greater than that for which it was acquired by the United States, adjusted to reflect any increase or decrease in the value of the property resulting from action by the United States, or at the market price, whichever is lower. If a former owner's property is unavailable or is classified as suitable for a purpose different from that for which it was used when acquired by the Government, then the former owner may be offered other surplus real property in the same area at a corresponding price.

If the former owner, or in the event of his death, his wife or children, in that order, do not exercise the privilege of repurchase of their property, then any tenant (who was a tenant at the time of acquisition by the Government) is given the right to purchase the property at the price for which it could have been purchased by the former owner.

If any surplus real property is not disposed of to the former owner or his tenant, the property, if classified as suitable for agricultural use, is to be subdivided into family-size units. If it is not classified as suitable for agricultural use, it is to be subdivided into appropriate units for disposition.

In the case of surplus real property classified as suitable for agricultural, residential, or small-business purposes, except as provided in the case of the former owner and the tenant, veterans are to be granted preference in the purchase of such property over nonveterans. In the case of the death of the veteran, his wife and children, in that order, succeed to his preference rights. A certificate by the disposal agency that the provisions of section 23 of the conference agreement relating to preferences have been complied with in the case of any property, and that no qualified applicant has made application to exercise his preference, operates to terminate all such preferences and has the effect of removing any cloud which might otherwise exist on the title of another purchaser.

Surplus real property which is classified as suitable for agricultural use, which is not disposed of pursuant to a former owner or veteran preference is to be disposed of insofar as possible only to persons who expect to cultivate and operate it for a livelihood. The Department of Agriculture is authorized, within the limits of its current functions under the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, to extend needed financial assistance to persons eligible for such assistance under the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act and the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, in connection with the disposal of surplus agricultural lands pursuant to these provisions.

The form of the deed or other instrument of transfer in the case of sales of real property is to be approved by the Attorney General. Specific authority is granted, with the approval of the Attorney General, to deliver to purchasers deeds containing general or special warranties of title.

AGRICULTURAL COMMODITIES

The House bill provided that surplus farm commodities should not be sold in the United States under the bill in quantities in excess of, or at prices less than, those applicable with respect to sales of such commodity by the Commodity Credit Corporation, unless the commodity were being disposed of pursuant to the bill for export at competitive world market prices. The Senate amendment contained a similar provision with the added limitation that such commodities could not be sold at prices less than the prevailing market prices, if such market prices were higher. The Senate amendment in addition authorized the Commodity Credit Corporation to dispose of or cause to be disposed of for cash, for export only at competitive world prices, any farm commodity or product thereof without regard to restrictions imposed upon it by any law.

The conference agreement (sec. 21) follows the provisions of the Senate amendment with the following exceptions:

(1) In disposing of any farm commodity for export, the Commodity Credit Corporation is authorized to dispose of the commodity not only for cash but for its equivalent in goods or for adequately secured credit; and

(2) It is provided that no food or food products shall be sold or otherwise disposed of under these provisions for export if there is a shortage of such food or food product in the United States, or if such sale or other disposition may result in a shortage, or if such food or food product is needed to supply the normal demands of consumers in the United States.

The Senate amendment also contained a provision making the War Food Administrator solely responsible for the formulation of policies and the carrying out of programs with respect to the disposal of surplus agricultural commodities. The Senate amendment further provided that the Board could not exercise any of its powers with relation to disposal of surplus cotton or woolen goods without approval in writing of the War Food Administrator. There were no comparable provisions in the House bill.

The conference agreement (sec. 21) provides that, subject to the supervision of the Board, the War Food Administrator is to have sole responsibility for the formulation of policies with respect to the disposal of surplus agricultural commodities and surplus foods processed from agricultural commodities. Such policies are to be so formulated as to prevent such commodities and food from being dumped on the market in a disorderly manner and disrupting the prices for the agricultural commodity. The conference agreement also contains the limitations of the Senate amendment on the power of the Board with relation to the disposal of surplus cotton or woolen goods.

STOCK PILING

The Senate amendment directed that all Government-owned accumulations of strategic minerals and metals be transferred, when determined to be surplus, to the account of the Treasury Procurement Division and added to the stock pile authorized by the act of June 7, 1939, and when so added be subject to its provisions. The term "strategic minerals and metals" was defined as all minerals and metals included in either group A or group B on the list of strategic and critical materials determined upon by the Army and Navy Munitions Board on March 6, 1944, and any other minerals and metals which the said Board determined should be added thereto. It included ores, concentrates, alloys, scrap, and partially and completed fabricated articles, of which the principal components by value consisted of such minerals and metals. Exceptions were made in the case of fabricated articles which the Army and Navy determined not to be suitable for their use in the form in which fabricated and which could be disposed of commercially at a value substantially in excess of the metal market price of the component minerals and metals of the fabricated articles. It was further provided that transfers to the Treasury Procurement Division of the stock pile should be made without reimbursement or transfer of funds, subject to the exception that if the Reconstruction Finance Corporation or any of its subsidiaries was the owing agency the Secretary of the Treasury was to cancel notes of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation in an amount equal to the cost

of the property so transferred. There were no stock-pile provisions of any kind in the House bill.

The conference agreement (sec. 22) provides that all Government-owned accumulations of strategic minerals and metals shall be transferred by the owning agency, when determined to be surplus pursuant to the act, to the account of the Treasury Procurement Division and be added to the stock pile authorized by the act of June 7, 1939, and be subject to its provisions. The provision (contained in the Senate amendment) that such transfer was to be made without reimbursement or transfer of funds is omitted from the conference agreement. Contractor inventories are to be transferred to the stock pile only when the owning agency has taken possession of and determined such inventories to be surplus. The term "strategic minerals and metals" is defined as meaning copper, lead, zinc, tin, magnesium, and a number of other named minerals and metals. The Army and Navy Munitions Board is given power to add to the list of named minerals and metals, aluminum or any other minerals or metals in such quantities or amounts as the Army and Navy Munitions Board determines to be necessary for the stock pile authorized by the act of June 7, 1939.

The term also includes ores, concentrates, alloys, scrap, and partially and completed fabricated articles, of which the principal components by value consist of such minerals and metals but does not include such fabricated articles as the Army and Navy determines are not suitable for their use in the form in which fabricated and which may be disposed of commercially at a value substantially in excess of the metal market price of the component minerals and metals of such fabricated articles. In order to make the provisions relating to the transfer to the stock pile effective, it is also provided in section 14 (b) of the conference agreement that the owning agencies may not dispose of any property under section 14 (b) which, if declared surplus, would be subject to being added to the stock pile under section 22 of the conference agreement.

The conference agreement provides that pending a determination of the War Production Board that the supplies of strategic minerals and metals available to industry are sufficient to meet the current requirements of industry, the owning agency, subject to regulations prescribed by the Surplus Property Board, shall withhold from transfer to the stock pile an amount of such minerals and metals equal to the deficiency, if any, estimated by the War Production Board as likely to exist for the requirements of industry for a period of 6 months for purposes other than war production; and the owning agency may dispose of the minerals and metals so withheld to the extent necessary to meet any such deficiency actually found to exist by the War Production Board, at the market price.

The conference agreement also provides that any Government-owned accumulation of strategic materials shall, at the request of the War and Navy Departments, be transferred by the owning agency, when determined to be surplus, to the account of the Treasury Procurement Division and be added to the stock pile. For the purposes of this provision the term "strategic materials" is defined as meaning all materials except strategic minerals and metals, and includes all materials in group A or in group B of the list of strategic and critical materials determined upon by the Army and Navy Munitions Board on March 6, 1944, as amended from time to time, but does not include any of such materials which the Army and Navy determine do not meet the specifications suitable for common defense or are in excess of the needs thereof.

Within 3 months following the enactment of the Act, the conference agreement provides that the Army and Navy Munitions Board shall submit to Congress its recommendations respecting the maximum and minimum amounts of each strategic mineral or metal which in its opinion should be held on the stock pile. After 1 year from the submission of such recommendation, unless the Congress provides otherwise by law, the Surplus Property Board may authorize the proper disposal agencies to dispose of any Government-owned accumulations of strategic minerals and metals including those owned by any Government corporation when determined to be surplus pursuant to the Act.

DISPOSITIONS OUTSIDE UNITED STATES

The conference agreement (sec. 32 (a)) retains the provision found in both the House bill and the Senate amendment, that the act is not to limit or affect the authority of commanders in active theaters of military operations with respect to property in their control.

The House bill provided that in the case of property not located in the 48 States or the District of Columbia, the Administrator might exempt such property from some or all of the provisions of the act whenever he deemed such provisions would obstruct the efficient and economic disposition of such property.

The Senate amendment had a similar provision but confined to property located outside the United States, its Territories and possessions.

The conference agreement (sec. 32 (b)) embodies the policy of the Senate amendment.

REIMPORTATION OF SURPLUS PROPERTY

The House bill provided that to the extent feasible and in the public interest the reimportation of surplus property sold for export should be prohibited.

The Senate amendment provided that surplus property sold for export or disposed of abroad could not be reimported, and directed the Secretary of the Treasury to prescribe necessary regulations.

The conference agreement (sec. 33) states that it is the policy of the act to prohibit, so far as feasible and necessary to carry out the objectives of the act, the importation of surplus property sold abroad or for export. The Board is to prescribe regulations to carry out this policy, and the importation of surplus property is prohibited to the extent specified in such regulations. The Secretary of the Treasury is directed to provide for the enforcement of such regulations.

The same section of the conference agreement also provides that surplus property sold abroad to members of the armed forces may be brought in, without regard to the above prohibition, by the original purchaser upon his certificate that it is brought in for his personal use.

INCREASE IN LOAN RATE ON COTTON

The conference agreement (sec. 37) retains the provision of the Senate amendment increasing from 92½ to 95 percent the loan rate on cotton in the case of crops harvested after 1943, but not in the case of crops planted after 1944. If a loan on the 1944 crop has been made before the enactment of this act the loan shall be increased to the amount which would have been loaned if this provision had been in force at the time of the loan.

EFFECT ON OTHER LAWS AUTHORIZING DISPOSAL OF PROPERTY

Both the House bill and the Senate amendment contain provisions to the effect that the authority conferred by the act was in addition to any authority conferred by any other law and that the act should not impair or affect any authority for the disposition of property under any other law. The conference agreement (sec. 34 (a)) contains similar provisions. As an example of its operation nothing in the act would impair or affect the provisions of Public Law 587, Sixty-eighth Congress, or sections 101 and 102, Public Law 346, Seventy-eighth Congress, authorizing the transfer of necessary lands, buildings, vessels, supplies, equipment, and material for affording adequate hospital and domiciliary care for veterans.

EXCLUSION OF PERMANENT MILITARY RESERVATIONS, POSTS, AND FORTS

The House bill provided that nothing therein was to impair or to affect so much of the Military Appropriation Act, 1945, as was contained in the last two provisos of the second paragraph under the heading "Corps of Engineers," which placed limitations on the disposition of real property acquired by the War Department prior to July 2, 1940.

The Senate amendment provided that any real property which is part of any permanent military reservation, post, or fort should be excluded from the provisions of the act and not be disposed of except upon authorization hereafter granted by law.

The conference agreement does not contain any provision distinguishing between the kinds of property which may be declared surplus and that which cannot, except in the case of public domain and certain naval vessels, discussed above.

EXPIRATION DATE

The House bill provided for the expiration of the act at the end of 3 years following cessation of hostilities in the present war, as proclaimed by the President, or upon such date as might be fixed by concurrent resolution of the two Houses of Congress. The Senate amendment provided no expiration date.

The conference agreement (sec. 38) provides that the act shall expire at the end of 3 years following the cessation of hostilities, the date of such cessation to be the date specified by (1) proclamation of the President, or (2) a concurrent resolution of the two Houses of Congress, whichever specified date is the earlier.

CARTER MANASCO,
JOHN J. COCHRAN,
WILL M. WHITTINGTON,
CHARLES L. GIFFORD,
By C. M.,
GEORGE H. BENDER,
By C. M.,
Managers on the part of the House.

Mr. MANASCO. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 9 minutes. Mr. Speaker, since the 7th day of August the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments has been studying, debating, and arguing surplus property. For 3 weeks the conferees sat in session from 10 o'clock in the morning until 5:30 and 6 o'clock every afternoon. About 9 o'clock Friday night the conferees reached an agreement. We did not want to stay in session all night. We realized that there were quite a few members who wanted to go home. Many of us have important business at home. For that reason I do not believe there has ever been a conference committee that worked as hard and as diligently as we did, because we were interested in cooperating with the membership of the House. We thought that the bill as it passed the House was a much better bill than the bill we agreed to, but in 3 weeks' time, when you go up against men who have ideas different from your own, you finally get worn down. I have talked

surplus property all day. My phone rings until midnight every night about surplus property. I am tired of it and I want to get rid of it.

At the present time we are operating under an Executive order of the President for the disposal of this surplus. Many of us have criticized Executive orders from time to time. Many of us say that we are having some of the functions of the Congress taken away by Executive order. For that reason it is imperative that we pass legislation to dispose of this surplus at once.

It is imperative that we pass legislation to dispose of this surplus at once, because if we do not pass legislation now we will have to continue to operate under Executive order. Surplus is being sold every week, and we hope that the war in Europe will be over in the next 3 or 4 weeks—we shall have enormous surpluses on hand when that part of the war is over. We do not want to go to the country and tell them that Congress cannot legislate.

Of course, we did not get everything we wanted, but we got the best we could get. I think every member of the committee of conference will tell you that. Unless we do adopt this conference report, I say that Congress itself will be subject to the just criticism of the country that Congress cannot legislate, therefore it is necessary to operate under Executive order.

We had all kinds of proposals before our committee. We have had requests from our own States and local political subdivisions to give this property away. They use the argument that this is property bought with our money, that we are the same taxpayers that pay State, county, and Federal taxes. Our committee took the position that when the Federal Government took property away from the States it paid them full value. We took the position that some sums should be converted into the Treasury of the United States to retire our staggering war debt. Of course, a lot of people do not believe that. A lot of people think we should give everything away. I do not think we should pass on a debt of $250,000,000,000 to unborn generations without making some effort to apply to the retirement of that debt as much as possible of the funds derived from the sale of surplus property.

The conference report is different from the House bill in many respects. Our bill provided for a single Administrator. Most of us thought the program could be handled more expeditiously by a single Administrator. However, our views did not prevail.

At first we agreed to what was known as the hydra-headed agency, a board composed of eight members, and a single Administrator. After reading the print over, it was almost impossible to tell where the jurisdiction of the Board ended and that of the Administrator began, so we made another effort to get a single Administrator and were defeated. Then the House conferees offered a proposal to establish a three-man board, a workable board. Some people wanted a four-man board, with the Director of War Mobilization having a vote in case of a tie. We realized that the Director of War Mobilization would be too busy with other matters to know how to vote intelligently to break a tie. Of course, the Director of War Mobilization could not vote intelligently on these questions unless he attended every meeting of the Board. For that reason we made it a board having an odd number of members. We imposed the same duties on the Board as the House bill imposed on the Administrator. We gave it a lot of authority.

Some people have been alarmed over the objectives in the bill. They fear that they are not policies. If you will read section 9 of the conference report, you will find that we made the objectives policies, and the Board must be governed by these objectives.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANASCO. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WALTER. If I understand the gentleman correctly, the conferees on the part of the House proposed a Board. We in the House were very definite in the position we took, namely, that there ought to be one Administrator.

Mr. MANASCO. That is true, but we tentatively agreed to a four-man board. After reading over what we had agreed to, we found that it could not work, it was just impossible, so we agreed then on a three-man board instead of an even-numbered board.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANASCO. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. I understand the House conferees maintained their position for an Administrator and that this three-man Board is a compromise. The House conferees did not propose the Board, but they adhered to the position taken by the House for a single Administrator. Then the first tentative draft was a compromise for an Administrator and a four-man Board which did not place responsibility anywhere?

Mr. MANASCO. That is right.

Mr. McCORMACK. Then the three-man Board is a compromise between the House and Senate conferees and the Board places definite responsibility upon those who comprise the Board?

Mr. MANASCO. That is absolutely correct.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANASCO. I yield.

Mr. MURDOCK. Do I understand this report is a unanimous report of the conferees of the House?

Mr. MANASCO. It is a unanimous report of the conferees on the part of the House and the Senate.

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANASCO. I yield.

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. On the top of page 3 there is some definition with respect to the disposition of surplus property which relates to the public domain. Those of us who live in States which have large areas of the public domain want to know whether this public domain is to go back the way the Surplus Property Board wants it to go back or whether it will consult with the various agencies involved? We understand it will consult with the various agencies involved.

Mr. MANASCO. We intended to exclude from the operation of the Surplus Property Act the public domain.

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. But the clause reads:

> The public domain, or such lands withdrawn or reserved from the public domain as the Surplus Property Board determines are suitable for return to the public domain.

Is the Surplus Property Board the one that is going to determine that or would the people within the State or the various agencies determine that?

Mr. MANASCO. Of course, the Board will consult with the interested people and agencies.

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. The various interests involved will have a chance?

Mr. MANASCO. That is true.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for another point?

Mr. MANASCO. I yield.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I wish the gentleman would explain to the House what the provisions of the conference report on the disposal of property to schools and States and instrumentalities of States and subdivisions mean. I am not sure I understand that.

Mr. MANASCO. Under the terms of the conference agreement, these machines, tools, equipment, and so forth that are suitable for classroom use may be leased to the schools, taking into consideration the common good that accrues from that lease as part of the consideration.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Does that mean that can be taken into account in determining what the terms of the lease or sale might be?

Mr. MANASCO. That is correct.

Section 8 of the conference agreement gives express authority to the head of any owning agency or disposal agency to delegate, and authorize successive delegations of, any authority conferred upon him or his agency by or pursuant to the act to any officer, agent, or employee of the agency, or with the approval of the Board, to any other Government agency.

The Board was excepted because it is not the policy of the act that the Board should delegate its important policy-making functions. It was thought unnecessary—and likely to be unduly complicated—to attempt to specify the extent to which the Board may provide for carrying out the act by its agents and other Government agencies. It is obvious that efficient administration requires the delegation to officers and agents of executive agencies of a certain degree of responsibility. This is done by all executive agencies without any express statutory authority. While the Board may not delegate its important duty of making policy regulations to carry out the act, obviously in such regulations it

may provide for the carrying out of its regulations by its agents and by disposal agencies and owning agencies, including provisions as to what shall be done by such agents or agencies in the event that particular conditions arise or emergencies occur, such action by the agent or agency to be in conformity with the policies set forth, or described in the regulations.

Mr. MANASCO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLMER].

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, obviously one cannot discuss this conference report in 1 minute. I take the opportunity to express my appreciation to the House conferees for the fight that they did make. I am sorry they did not succeed in the position they took. I regret very much, in view of my humble efforts in sponsoring the original bill, that passed the House, that I cannot go along with this conference report.

I am not one of those who believe that in our haste to recess and go home that we should surrender our views and take just any kind of legislation. In my opinion, this is a bad piece of legislation, which they have brought back to us; and I predict that the taxpayer is going to be hurt in the disposal of this huge stock of Government property.

Mr. MANASCO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I realize and appreciate the tremendous amount of work that the conferees had on this bill and the difficulty of getting the two bills into one report. However, I do want to express my disappointment that the conferees felt it necessary to leave out of the bill an amendment adopted by the House that would have allowed men in the service and veterans of this war to buy single units of surplus equipment at the same price for which that same equipment will be sold to dealers in large lots. Frankly, I was not aware of any opposition to that proposal except from one source.

I was contacted by the representative of a manufacturer of jeeps; but first let me say that there is a lot more to surplus war material than jeeps. There are many things the men would like to buy in single units other than jeeps. I have had letters from every battle area and from practically every camp in the country mentioning a thousand and one different items these servicemen would like to buy in single units at the same price for which they will be sold in large lots: Cameras, light aircraft, trucks, jeeps, clothing, organs, and a hundred and one other things. This representative of a manufacturer of jeeps came to me and was opposed to allowing servicemen to buy individual jeeps. He said they should be sold by the Government back to the firm which manufactured them, so that the manufacturer could change the steering apparatus and make it safe, could put legal headlights on them, could put a different type of windshield on them, a different type of hood, different generator and battery, take off the heavy-duty generator, and put on a lighter generator. He then wanted the manufacturer to sell them through his own dealer outlets after they had been overhauled, thus two profits before the soldier buys one jeep. If these jeeps are too dangerous to permit the individual serviceman to buy one from the Federal Government at a reasonable price, then they are too dangerous to be driven by anyone on the streets of Washington, New York, Boston, Hartford, or elsewhere. If that is the only reason jeeps cannot be sold singly to servicemen, then it is the responsibility of the War Department now to take them off of our highways and put them in safe operating order. That seems to be the only objection I have received in the past 3 weeks as to why surplus material should not be sold direct to servicemen through the post exchanges.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Connecticut has expired.

Mr. MANASCO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BLAND].

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, section 10 (b) retains a provision of the House bill—section 8 (a)—which made the Maritime Commission the sole disposal agency for merchant vessels or vessels capable of conversion to merchant use. The provision as contained in the conference report—section 10 (b)—makes it clear that the legislation under consideration applies only to vessels which are surplus under the legislation, and thus whether a merchant vessel is surplus or not does not affect the jurisdiction and authority of the Maritime Commission. The conference text also makes it clear that when a vessel is surplus and is determined by the commission to be a merchant vessel or capable of conversion to merchant use, such vessel will be disposed of only in accordance with the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, and other laws authorizing the sale of such vessels, and that the provisions of the 1936 act and such other laws will govern the disposal of these vessels in place of other provisions of the conference measure relating to procedure for disposal of surplus property.

I note also the savings provisions in section 34 (a) of the conference report protect the operation of other laws containing authority for the disposition of property. This is eminently desirable, because I take it that there is no intent to supersede or affect such enactments of Congress addressed to specific subjects and problems such as Public Law 101, Seventy-seventh Congress, acquisition and disposition of idle foreign-flag merchant vessels; Public Laws 44 and 305, Seventy-eighth Congress, relating to return of fishing and other small vessels to their former owners; and Public Law 46, Seventy-seventh Congress, relating to charter and sale of merchant vessels.

Mr. MANASCO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. MOTT].

Mr. MOTT. Mr. Speaker, you will recall that when this bill passed the House an amendment offered by the gentleman from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] and myself, which prohibited the sale, transfer, lease or other disposition of combat naval vessels, stations, and establishments without the consent of Congress, was adopted, after full debate, by a unanimous vote.

The conference committee scuttled that amendment. The conference report excludes from the definition of property battleships, cruisers, destroyers, and submarines; but as the bill is reported back by the committee it allows the disposal agency to trade, sell, assign, lease or otherwise dispose of any naval station, any naval base, or any naval establishment that the United States has erected either in continental United States or in any part of the world, without the consent of Congress and without even consulting the Congress.

That was an unwarranted concession on the part of the House conferees in the face of a unanimous mandate from the House. It would have been an unwarranted concession even if such a concession had been demanded by the Senate, and I doubt if such a demand was ever made by the Senate conferees. If it was, then, certainly the House conferees should have told us so and they should have asked for further instructions.

The conference report should be voted down and the bill sent back to conference. Let them report a bill back to us which has at least some resemblance to the bill which the House passed originally.

I say to you now, what I said when the bill was last before us, that this provision is vital to the security and preservation of our Navy, and that if the executive department of the Government is permitted to sell, lease or trade, our naval bases and stations, here at home and throughout the world, without the consent of Congress, we will then by this bill have taken the first step toward a repetition of what we did after the First World War, when, in effect, we divided our Navy with the rest of the world through an executive agreement to bring its strength down to that of the other nations and through a further executive agreement not to establish naval bases in certain outposts belonging to the United States.

That executive agreement, Mr. Speaker, was ratified by the Senate. But unless you restore this amendment the same thing can be done again by the executive departments alone, without ratification by the Senate and without consulting either House. I ask the House to recommit the bill with instructions to restore this amendment.

Mr. MANASCO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN].

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, may I say to the House that the gentleman from Oregon did not correctly state the situation. He said that any disposal agency could give away shore stations, and so forth, but if he will read the conference report he will find that is not correct.

Mr. MOTT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COCHRAN. I cannot yield. The gentleman will find that there are no give-away provisions in this bill. Furthermore, no disposal agency will be enabled to dispose of any shore station or any other facility if it cost the Government more than $5,000,000 without coming to the Congress.

Mr. MOTT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COCHRAN. No; I cannot yield.

Mr. MOTT. There is no such language in this conference report.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, this does prevent the sale of battleships, cruisers, carriers, and destroyers. We want to maintain our Navy and I think the Navy wants to maintain it also. As the gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH] stated, we found that under the terms of the Mott-Magnuson amendment you would not be able to sell even a yacht.

Mr. MOTT. Will the gentleman yield? That is an incorrect statement.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I decline to yield.

Some say they cannot vote for the report because we did not get an administrator. It was not until Friday morning last that we gave up, and we gave up when all seven conferees of the Senate held out against an administrator. What were the House conferees going to do? Those of you who have sat on conference committees know that when there is disagreement between the two bodies you must effect a compromise. So the three-man board, all members to be appointed by the President and with a chairman to be named by the President, was the best solution at which we could arrive.

We felt that we should bring back some kind of a report. Under the existing parliamentary situation we could consider but one amendment. We could bring nothing back in disagreement. It was a case of bringing back this report or none.

Mr. Speaker, the Members of the House should carefully consider this matter. Let us legislate from a national standpoint, not from a local standpoint. The provisions of this bill affect Government property in my own city just like it affects Government property in Washington, Oregon, or any other State or city. But we must legislate from a national standpoint.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to speak about the provisions of the report. As one of the House conferees I signed this report, not because I am entirely satisfied with its provisions, but because I realized it was the best agreement we could arrive at. It was the desire of the House conferees to have a single administrator as the bill provided when it passed the House. The Senate unanimously refused to recede from its position that a Board handle surplus property. It therefore was necessary to effect a compromise and the three-man Board was finally agreed upon. The Senate gave in on its eight-man Board and an administrator who would have been little more than a messenger.

The Board will have general supervision over and direct the handling and disposition of surplus property which will actually be disposed of by Government agencies selected by the Board.

Congress directs in the act its objectives which are to give maximum aid in the reestablishment of a peacetime economy and to stimulate full employment, to discourage monopolistic practices, to assist small business concerns, to encourage family-type farming, to assist veterans to reestablish themselves, to prevent speculators from securing the property, to provide for wide distribution to consumers at fair prices, to use normal channels of trade in distribution, to prevent excessive profits, to provide for prompt disposal without competing with private business which would cause unemployment.

At the present time there should be no delay in disposing of this property, especially consumers' goods because the type of goods being declared surplus is not available on the market. Provisions are made for certain priorities. First, Government agencies will be recognized, then States and legal subdivisions, tax-supported institutions, nonprofit educational institutions, also hospitals or similar institutions not operated for profit that are exempt from taxation, as well as veterans.

Under the terms of the act there will be no donations of property that has a commercial value nor will there be any discounts. Government agencies can only secure surplus property within the limits of their appropriations. Thus Congress controls the purse strings. Those granted priorities are limited to their legitimate needs. States and municipalities will have an opportunity to secure airports, harbor or port terminals if they desire to purchase or lease them.

The Smaller War Plants Corporation is directed to consult with small business concerning their needs for surplus property and to purchase such property for resale when in its judgment such disposition is required to preserve and strengthen the competitive position of small business. In this connection let me say no group will receive more consideration than small business if the act is administered as intended.

The Government owns various types of plants of tremendous value. Recognizing this, provisions are made that no aluminum, magnesium, synthetic rubber, chemical aviation gasoline or iron and steel plants and facilities nor aircraft plants and facilities, shipyards and facilities, transportation facilities, or radio and electrical equipment which cost the Government over $5,000,000 can be disposed of until after reports are made to Congress.

The War Food Administrator will have charge of disposing of agricultural commodities. Wool and cotton cannot be disposed of without the approval of the War Food Administrator.

The stock-piling provisions inserted by the Senate was debated for days. Under the Senate amendment all strategic minerals and metals declared surplus were to be transferred to the stock pile authorized by the Stock Pile Act of 1939, to remain there indefinitely. At present the stock pile is subject to the War and Navy Munitions Board. From every corner of the country your conferees were urged to accept the amendment just as written by the Senate. This we refused to do. The amendment was practically rewritten and in its present form it does not freeze all strategic minerals and metals, as the original Senate amendment did.

Provisions were made that if the War Production Board finds sufficient strategic metals and minerals are not available to industry to meet the requirements, then the owning agency may dispose of an amount sufficient to meet the deficiency. This will protect private industry and assure it sufficient minerals and metals. If this provision was not in the bill, industry would be handicapped if there was not a sufficient supply, could not operate, which would result in unemployment.

Another Senate provision that caused several days discussion was the provision providing for the disposal of surplus real property. This too was practically rewritten. Under the agreement reached where the property was acquired either by sale or condemnation, the former owner will have a priority to purchase, if it is declared surplus. Priorities are also extended to a tenant who might have been on the property if the former owner does not exercise his or her right and a third preference is extended to veterans.

Provisions are made for reports to Congress from time to time of the disposition of surplus property.

The civil and criminal remedies section protects the Government from fraud.

The provision relating to those who handle the disposition of surplus property in my opinion is too broad. It will, I feel, make it extremely difficult to secure experienced businessmen to assist the Government in disposing of this property in an orderly way. Under the original Senate provision I doubt if a stenographer who wrote letters or a typist who listed surplus property could have been employed by a corporation or firm purchasing surplus property for 2 years. This was rewritten but even the amendment agreed upon goes too far. The Treasury Department, acting for the Procurement Division, said the provision agreed upon would seriously cripple that agency which will dispose of billions of dollars of consumers goods. I favored the changes recommended by the Treasury but they were not accepted.

The section providing for all moneys derived from the sale of surplus property to be used to reduce public debt was stricken out because the Treasury showed it would work in reverse. The Treasury would probably be called upon to retire bonds drawing a low rate of interest and at the same time borrow money and issue additional securities drawing a higher rate of interest as there would be no market for bonds after the war bearing the same low rate of interest payable on bonds issued during the war.

It will be necessary to pass legislation at a future date dealing with the retirement of public debt.

Special provisions were made for the sale of surplus property abroad. It is

understood the Foreign Economic Administration will be delegated to handle sales abroad, as it has an organization already set up. No property sold abroad or for export can be returned to the United States for sale except where members of our armed forces certify they are bringing it back for their personal use.

The Senate rider increasing the loan rate on cotton had no place in this bill, as it in no way applied to surplus property. I stated to the conferees, if it was adopted, the price quotations on the New York Exchange would go up. They did. I opposed the amendment, but a majority of the conferees voted for it and it was retained. It should have been considered in a separate bill and not included in this legislation.

When the conferees sat down the bill was referred to by some Members on both sides, myself included, as the great monstrosity. It was our job to destroy the great monstrosity. I feel that we did, but I likewise feel, if the House bill had prevailed, with several exceptions, we would have had a much better law than we will have under this agreement. The House bill was predicated to a large extent on the testimony given by expert witnesses before a number of congressional committees, on the Baruch-Hancock report, and the recommendations of Mr. William Clayton, at present Surplus Property Administrator under the President's Executive order.

Mr. Clayton, as you know, announced last week he would not accept an appointment under this act. I deeply regret he came to that decision before we completed our labors. He has proved to be a most efficient Administrator, an outstanding executive. I sincerely hope the President can prevail upon him to reconsider his decision.

I admit this report can properly be criticized, but your conferees were faced with many difficult situations. Therefore it was necessary to compromise or there would have been no legislation. There is nothing to prevent Congress from changing this law at any time it desires.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COCHRAN. I yield.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Why is it that the committee found it necessary to separate our shore stations from the combat ships in the disposal provisions of this bill? They are part of the military system of this country and bound up completely with the foreign policy of this Nation. The Navy for years has always reported such matters to the Committee on Naval Affairs which in turn made their recommendations to Congress.

Mr. COCHRAN. If you want to, put the blame on me and I will tell you why.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Go ahead and tell us why.

Mr. COCHRAN. I will, if the gentleman will wait. I fought that provision because this Government has set up shore stations all around the shores of this country. They have put modern equipment into them; they have put up new houses and new buildings of every character.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. And we spent millions of dollars to do it. Now you want to give them away.

Mr. COCHRAN. Under the gentleman's plan the new stations would have to be sold and the obsolete shore stations would have to be kept.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. MANASCO. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. MURDOCK] such time as he may desire.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN] has given us a splendid statement of the work of the conferees and of the necessary compromises in order to have any legislation at all. A considerable portion of the gentleman's statement concerned stock piling of the strategic and critical metals and minerals. I confess that I was more in favor of the original Senate provision than I am of the provision in this report. However, the House bill had no provision at all of this kind, and it does seem to me that the provision in this measure is far better than nothing at all concerning minerals and metals. Therefore I favor the provision as found in this report.

The gentleman from Missouri seemed to think that the Senate provision would not be wise or proper, because he believed that under it a great supply of minerals and metals now on hand would be denied to industry for the manufacture of peacetime goods, and thus a certain amount of unemployment would result, and a certain amount of peacetime demand would go unsatisfied. I certainly never had any such object or plan in sanctioning the Senate provision on this. I assure the country that every member of our Select Committee on Post-War Policy and Planning has had as his chief aim the furnishing of maximum employment after the war. That certainly was my aim, and that was in the back of my thoughts when I urged a stock piling of the strategic minerals and metals, for I feared that at the behest of fabricators this great supply of war minerals, especially copper, might be dumped on the market in such a way as to break the price and bring to an end all employment in the copper mines and other mines of our country. Such a policy would work against full employment rather than for it in the long run.

I have watched with great concern for the past 8 years the uphill struggle to procure for our national defense the proper and adequate supply of the strategic and critical war minerals. The first official word I ever uttered in this effort was before the House Military Affairs Committee on May 18, 1937, when I begged for an American or domestic supply of manganese in the interest of national defense. I think I could name at least half a hundred other moves during the past 8 years, with which I have had some connection, in favor of an adequate supply of one or another of these strategic and critical materials. Now that we have an adequate supply of practically all of them, we ought first to turn off the foreign supply as soon as it is not needed and carefully reserve an adequate supply for our Army and Navy.

I can assure you that if the Board will pursue the wise policy in regard to the timely release of these stocks in such way as not to break the price, that the mining industry will supply adequate raw material for all of the boomtime construction which may follow the war. The mining industry is just as anxious to have full employment in the manufacturing industry as any of us could possibly be. In this hope and expectation I shall support this conference report.

Mr. MANASCO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 12 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BENDER].

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, some weeks ago a great wave of sentiment was crystalized for a bill providing for reconversion and another bill to facilitate and regulate the orderly disposal of surplus property. A recess of the House was terminated and Members were called back here to consider these two problems. The House Committee on Ways and Means came back here and wrestled with the bill on reconversion, and after due consideration it was passed by this body. The bill relating to surplus commodities was considered by the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments for some time, and for practically a whole week this measure was discussed on the floor of the House. Every Member of the House who desired to do so had an opportunity to discuss the bill. Finally, we passed a bill, the Senate passed another bill, and the matter was submitted to the conferees.

This conference report comes back to you with the unanimous approval of the conferees, not only of the House but of the Senate as well. On the Senate side there were seven members, four members of the majority party and three of the minority party. On the part of the House three members of the majority party and two members of the minority party were named.

As has been stated here, this measure was discussed and revised for 3 solid weeks. I do not know of a bill that has been gone over more thoroughly, and with a fine-tooth comb, than this one. There is nothing left to the imagination here. If the gentlemen who have raised some of these objections will read the document I hold in my hand, and which is available to them, I am sure the questions raised are fully answered here.

For example, let us consider the matter of the creation of a board rather than a single administrator.

The farm labor groups, small business, the National Grange, big business, all of them, the chambers of commerce, manufacturers' associations, and labor as well, asked for a board rather than a single administrator. If you will recall, there was considerable support on the House side for the board plan, rather than the idea of a single administrator. Therefore some of your conferees, particularly

the members on the minority side, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GIFFORD] and myself agreed with the Senate side on this proposition. The majority membership of the House was not very much in accord with the board plan. But frankly I do not believe there is any indispensable man in this country. A certain gentleman, it has been pointed out, and a very fine gentleman, has indicated he would not accept service on this board as is provided for in the conference report. Well, frankly, I believe in this country there are not indispensable men and I believe there is plenty of good material for this board. Frankly, if you do not like what is provided for in this bill or if you do not like the personnel of this board, there is an election coming on November 7 and you can change all that. But under the circumstances this is the best possible method. We have done the best possible job we knew how to do. Most of the language contained in this bill was written by a minority member of the committee. We felt he did an excellent job. Every member of the conference went into great detail in trying to meet every possible objection. This bill is not all things to all men. This report does not satisfy everybody. It does not entirely satisfy me. You will never be able to satisfy everybody. But you will recall the pious phrases which were referred to in the House bill. Those pious phrases are eliminated and instead we have objectives written into the bill which indicate exactly what we are attempting to accomplish here and what we are endeavoring to do.

Regarding the veterans, I am sure that this conference committee endeavored to give every consideration to veterans and they so indicated in the report. Read what they say regarding the rights of the veterans in the surplus property disposal report, which was signed by the House Members. You will find on page 26 where preference is given to veterans. Regarding the small-business provision of this conference report, small business has preference under this report. Small business receives first consideration under this report and we saw to it that small business had that consideration before we signed it.

I do not mind a criticism of a measure if it is based on a statement of fact.

If you base your argument on a false premise, or if you have hallucinations about it naturally your objection is not valid.

This conference report is up to you. It is your baby. It is not my baby now. It has been my baby for the last 3 weeks and the baby of every one of these conferees. If you do not want to stay here from now until January 1 to discuss a substitute bill, vote for this measure now. I have had so many of you on both sides of the House ask me, "When are you going to get through with this so that we can get out of there?" Well, just read this report. It is available here. You have 25 or 30 minutes before the vote will be taken. This whole thing is available to you. You can digest it in that time, I am sure. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GIFFORD] and the gentlemen in the other body on the minority side, as well as the majority side, after the consideration they have given this measure, would not sign a report that they did not believe in, and if they were not thoroughly convinced that it was a good report.

It is easy to demagog on anything. It is easy, by talking in headlines and talking loud, possibly, to puncture holes through any measure before you. But, before voting on this proposition I wish you would read it and understand it. I wish you would read it with me and know exactly what each provision calls for. The Navy has been referred to. Unless the Navy declares any item surplus it is not surplus. The Navy must agree to what is surplus property before this Board can handle such disposal.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BENDER] has expired.

Mr. MANASCO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Maine [Mr. HALE].

Mr. HALE. Mr. Speaker, I should like very much to add my tribute to the patience and industry which was displayed by the conferees in discussing this very important measure. I share the dissatisfaction of members of the committee of conference that the substitution of a Board for a single administrator was made. But I should be willing to stomach many of the features of the bill as agreed upon in conference but for one thing. That is with respect to the amendment adopted in the House with almost no dissent, and adopted unanimously in the Senate, which provided that the proceeds from the sale of surplus property should be covered into the Treasury as a fund to be used exclusively for the reduction of the National debt. No feature of the bill was more highly commended by the press of this country than that. It was a step and the most affirmative and valuable step by the Congress in a long time in the interest of a sound fiscal policy in this country.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALE. I will yield momentarily.

Mr. STEWART. I wish the gentleman would explain the significance of the language in section 22.

Mr. HALE. I have not time to do that. It can better be explained by one of the conferees.

The objections of the Treasury Department to the vision which requires the use of proceeds from the sale of surplus property for the repayment of the National debt are not weighty objections. The only inference that can be drawn from the Treasury's attitude is that someone in the Administration wants to get his hands on the money and spend it as current income. To be sure, the money must be reappropriated; but the pressure to spend this money if it is available for expenditure will be tremendous; it puts a tremendous temptation into the hands of the Administration.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALE. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MASON. I wish the gentleman would explain why this provision was eliminated when both the Senate and the House were in agreement upon it.

Mr. HALE. That question can better be answered by one of the managers on the part of the House. Inferentially there was a yielding to pressure from the Treasury Department, but I must say it seems extraordinary to me that when a provision appeared in both the House bill and the Senate bill it should be omitted in conference. Personally, I know of no precedent for such an omission in conference.

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALE. I yield.

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. In view of the gentleman's statement, I call attention to the fact that subsection (g), appearing on page 69, of the House bill, which would have allowed the taxing by local units of property, a provision that had been agreed to by both the House and the Senate, was changed in conference.

Mr. HALE. I thank the gentleman for the contribution.

There is abundant precedent for applying moneys solely for the reduction of the debt, notably in the case of the capital of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. I understand the Treasury Department admits that it will not put a single additional employee on the Government pay roll if the provision which was adopted in both the House and the Senate bills remains in this bill; and I propose at the proper time to move to recommit this bill in the hope that the managers on the part of the House will insist on the provision adopted by the House requiring that the proceeds of the disposal of surplus property be covered into the Treasury in a special fund to be used solely for the reduction of the national debt.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Maine has expired.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, the time has been equally divided; 30 minutes have been allotted to the minority. There remains to me 10 minutes but, Mr. Speaker, I now yield of that 10 minutes 2 to the gentleman from New York if he desires it.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I cannot vote for a bill which sets up a board to manage the disposition of surplus property. There will be no responsibility anywhere and we can get nowhere with that kind of set-up. Another thing, I will not vote for a bill which provides, as this bill does on page 14, that the lowest price which possibly can be obtained shall be taken for the sale of agricultural property. If a situation arises as arose in Oklahoma where oil was discovered on a piece of property, it would have to be

turned back to the former owner from whom it was taken either at the price he was paid for it or at a lower price, not a higher price based upon the current value of the property. I cannot be a party to that kind of a bill and to that kind of a performance. I shall vote against the conference report and I hope the House will reject it.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes of the time allotted to me to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Maine [Mr. HALE] stated that he intends to offer a motion to recommit with instructions to the conferees. Of course, this is not instructions to a House committee. If his motion prevails, then the whole matter is reopened, everything in dispute between the two branches is reopened, and it is not confined to one question.

We are faced with a very practical situation. I can stay here right along because I come from a safe district. I am nominated, and anyone nominated in my district is elected. There are others, members of both parties, in the same position, but there are a number here who are not in that enviable position.

If this conference report is accepted—and the conferees have done the best they can; they have done a good job—then the situation in relation to the other bill is such that Members probably can leave with the strong probability that the leadership may arrange for a recess at the proper time.

In relation to the observation made by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], who says he cannot vote for the conference report with a board in it, may I say that the Republican Members in the other branch are for a board. The House conferees certainly fought for an administrator. Those of us who have been on conference committees know that we have at times to get together and compromise. The House conferees came the nearest possible to the single administrator in a board of three. Speaking for myself—and this is the first time I have spoken on the question—I prefer a board in peacetime activities to an administrator. In wartime I believe in delegating all the power possible to a single person because we have to. In wartime we are faced with the law of self-preservation, but in a democracy, under normal peacetime conditions, I want satisfaction, as well as efficiency, and I think it is more satisfactory to the people of the country to have a board administer matters, particularly matters of this kind. Generally speaking, a board should do the administering in peacetime rather than to have the authority vested in the hands of an individual.

Mr. Speaker, I hope the conference report will be agreed to.

Mr. MANASCO. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of the time on this side to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTINGTON].

SURPLUS PROPERTY ACT OF 1944

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I shall endeavor to reply to some of the objections and criticisms of the conference agreement and arguments in favor of recommittal. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD] stated that we have abandoned policies. The gentleman is in error. In the House bill we had objectives and policies, but they have been combined under the name objectives and the policies and objectives of the two bills are contained therein.

The gentleman stated, secondly, that we have disregarded policies with respect to the execution of the powers. I refer him to section 9 (a) of the conference agreement and I quote the following from said section:

> In formulating such regulations the board shall be guided by the objectives of this act.

The gentleman stated that no provision is made for advisory committees, and he is correct to the extent that the so-called Patman amendment of the House bill was not retained. I favor advisory committees, but under the conference agreement there is the same provision generally for advisory committees there was when this bill passed the House because we provide that the rules and regulations of the administrator under the Executive order shall continue and there is, therefore, the authority for the advisory committees that have been appointed and that have functioned so well under the Executive order of the President. Personally, I urged affirmative provision for such committees, but the other conferees would not agree. Mr. Clayton and his attorney believed he had the power to appoint such committees under section 35 of the conference agreement taken from the House bill.

I am in agreement with the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], with respect to land, and with respect to a single Administrator. I am in agreement with the gentleman from Maine [Mr. HALL] who will move to recommit generally, but for instructing the conferees to insist upon proceeds being used to retire the public debt. When we came to look into the matter we found out from the Treasury that it would cost the Treasury money, that we were issuing bonds now and selling them at a smaller rate of interest than we probably could if we used this money to retire bonds at present low rates, and borrowed after the war. So the Treasury, whatever is said about the matter, is protected, and I am urging that this money be paid into the general fund of the Treasury so that there may not be the multiplied deficits and borrowings specifical in peacetime following this war. I advocate that all Treasury receipts not needed for current expenses be used in retiring as fast as possible the public debt. The motion to recommit involves a psychological question, and is not one of the important or material issues involved.

Moreover, something has been said about an Administrator and a Board. From the first to the last day of a 3-week conference, the House majority conferees contended for a Board, and after we tentatively agreed to a hybrid four-member Board and Administrator under the Director of Demobilization, after it had been submitted to the Drafting Service and put into shape, they were so absurd the House majority Members came to the conclusion that—and I use my language and I measure my words—no self-respecting Administrator would or could accept the position. I speak for myself when I state to you as I said in substance to the conferees that no self-respecting member of the House majority conferees could sign a conference report with such a monstrosity or hybrid Board and Administrator, with no power or discretion in it. Thereupon the House majority conferees, before Mr. Clayton had written a letter that he could not be considered in connection with the position of Administrator, agreed upon the language for a three-man Board, the smallest possible Board, with the exact qualifications of the Administrator, as it appears in the conference agreement, and it was subsequently agreed to in the conference after Mr. Clayton wrote each conferee a letter, which I shall insert in my remarks.

May I read you from a letter that Mr. Clayton wrote before the provision for a three-man Board was agreed to and after the hybrid monstrosity of a four-man Board and an Administrator was tentatively agreed to? I quote:

> My decision not to accept appointment under the bill springs from the conviction growing out of the Senate hearings and debates on the bill that the surplus property disposal program is no longer to be conducted in a businesslike manner.

He has put the blame where it belongs; it is on the other body. We stood for the single administrator. We stood for the House single administrator for 3 weeks. Mr. Clayton in this letter, which I shall, as stated, insert as a part of my remarks, said, and I quote:

> My views on all such questions have been stated over and over in many hearings before committees of Congress, and are incorporated in the bill as it passed the House.

What about the Army and what about the Navy? No single item of Navy property will be disposed of unless it is declared surplus by the Navy Department. No man within the sound of my voice, as long as the war continues with Japan, expects the Navy to declare any needed plant establishment or vessel surplus, but to make assurance doubly sure, I call your attention to the fact that we prohibit the Navy—and that is the only prohibition—against the Navy Department from declaring any battleship, cruiser, aircraft carrier, destroyer or submarine as surplus property. No Army property can be disposed of unless the Army declares it to be surplus. If there is a Navy establishment or plant costing $5,000,000 or more, a plant established by the Navy costing that amount, there will be a report to the Congress, and the Congress must have that report 30 days before any disposition can be made. The only plants authorized to be disposed of by the Board are plants costing under $5,000,000,

without waiting 30 days on Congress. However, reports on all plants and facilities are to be submitted to Congress.

I would like to speak further. I would like to say that in my judgment the so-called stock-piling provision in this bill is unjustified and indefensible. We modified it as best we could. There was an absolute freezing of aluminum and copper in the Senate bill, no matter how great the surplus. We argued for 3 weeks about that provision, notwithstanding the fact that the Army and the Navy, according to the best estimate we could obtain, would have a surplus that might approximate from 525,000,000 to 1,650,000,000 pounds of aluminum—and that this might be the surplus over and above that required by the stock pile. There is an estimated surplus of from 300,000 to 1,000,000 tons of copper. Under the Senate bill, all metals, including aluminum and copper, whether needed in the stock pile were frozen.

This conference agreement is not as good as the House bill. It is much better than the bill that passed the Senate, and in my judgment, unless we want to shoulder the responsibility of continuing the disposition of surplus war property under the Executive order of the President, we should vote for this conference report.

The motion to recommit is in opposition to the bill. If recommitted, the great probability is there will be no bill. Surplus property will thus be disposed of under the Executive order of President Roosevelt. Those who vote to recommit are thus voting for disposal under Executive order rather than under an act of Congress. An unsatisfactory bill is better than no bill at all, for we have been advised an act is necessary to pass at least some titles to surplus property. I trust that the conference report will be adopted.

The letter which I include under leave granted is as follows:

SEPTEMBER 14, 1944.

Hon. JAMES F. BYRNES,
Director, Office of War Mobilization,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR JUSTICE BYRNES: I have seen a copy of the Surplus Property Act of 1944 (H. R. 5125) which I understand the conference committee has tentatively agreed to report. However, I am also informed that at a meeting which the committee will hold tomorrow morning, the conferees will still be free to make changes in the bill.

Whatever form the bill may finally take, I have come to the conclusion after mature consideration that I cannot accept appointment under it should such appointment be tendered me.

I hope, therefore, that the conferees, each of whom will receive a copy of this letter, will accept the views herein expressed as being completely disinterested.

My attempts at assisting in writing surplus property legislation were made at the urgent request of Congress. My only concern has been to get workable legislation drawn in the national interest.

My decision not to accept appointment under the bill springs from the conviction growing out of the Senate hearings and debates on the bill that the surplus property disposal program is no longer to be conducted in a businesslike manner. Under these circumstances, since all my experience has been in business, the responsibility for administering whatever bill may finally be passed belongs in other hands than mine.

The latest draft of the bill provides for a four-man board and an administrator with no clear definition of their respective jurisdictions and with the votes of the board decided by the Director of War Mobilization.

No agency of this type with diffused responsibility among a number of appointees with equal authority working through an administrator with conflicting powers could ever get the job done. It would be better to omit altogether any statutory provision for an administrator than to adopt this unworkable compromise.

Unless the bill is changed in this respect it not only will not work, but its impracticability will be so obvious on its face that the task of getting good men to accept appointment under it may be impossible.

I have never advocated the granting of unfettered discretion to one man.

I myself suggested to the conferees that all regulations and all single sales of any property which cost the Government $1,000,000 or more should be subject to the approval of the Policy Board (consisting of Government officials like the present board functioning under Executive Order 9425).

One man rule is thus not the issue.

The issue is administrative workability.

There are so many other unworkable provisions in the bill which appear to me to be contrary to the national interest that I will not attempt to comment on them.

My views on all such questions have been stated over and over in many hearings before committes of Congress, and are incorporated in the bill as it passed the House.

I only want to add that whatever the final form of the bill, the administrative agency for which it provides should be set up and begin to function without delay. Momentous decisions may have to be made at any time.

If desired, I shall of course be glad to help out unofficially in every way that I can until the new administration is functioning.

Sincerely yours,

W. L. CLAYTON.

Mr. Speaker, I extend my remarks by saying that it will be recalled that the House passed the bill for the disposal of surplus property on August 22, 1944, and that the Senate passed a similar bill on August 25, 1944. The conferees have submitted in lieu of the two bills so passed, the bill contained in the conference report. The conferences lasted almost 3 weeks. The conference agreement is by no means wholly satisfactory, but it represents the agreements of the conferees.

THE TWO BILLS

The House bill provided for an administrator. The surplus property belongs to the people. The House bill contemplated its orderly disposition without dumping, with wide distribution, without speculation, in aid of little business and in promotion of national defense. It contemplated the orderly disposition of surplus property so as to promote employment, and it prohibited the reimportation of surplus property sold abroad. Transfers to Government agencies, to States, to educational and charitable institutions were established, and a fair price for the property was contemplated. No donations were provided. All were treated alike. There were preferences to the former owners of agricultural lands and to veterans where feasible and practicable. Provision was made for the orderly disposition of Government plants without violating the anti-trust laws and without restraining trade. Competition was to be encouraged. No property was to be disposed of unless the proper agencies of the Government declared it to be surplus to the needs of the agencies. Details were avoided in the House bill, but the policies and objectives in connection with the limitations protected the domestic economy and the public interests.

Under the House bill there were not only no donations, but definite provision was made for Congress to retain the purse strings. There could be no transfers to any Government agency unless that agency reimbursed the owning agency from funds heretofore or hereafter appropriated by the Congress.

The Senate amendment provided for a Board composed of eight members. There was no place for an Administrator with real power and with discretion. There was provision only for a Director and other minor officials. The board was at once cumbersome and would have thus been inefficient. Decisions would have been replaced by delays. Property would not have been disposed of.

The Senate amendment provided for donations to schools, hospitals, and public health. There was no provision for the reimbursement for lands. They might or might not have been added to the public domain. At all events the transfer would have been to the Interior Department and agricultural lands ultimately to the Department of Agriculture with no definite provisions for reimbursement. The preferences to former owner and former tenants would have resulted in clouds upon titles. The disposition of plants was wholly inadequate. The result would have been the plants would have been idle rather than converted from war to peacetime economy. The result of the Senate amendment was to delay the disposition of property that was not donated. There was no definite requirement for reimbursement for transfers to Government agencies. The approaches and the handling of the surplus property in the House bill and the Senate amendment were thus widely different.

The majority of the House conferees insisted that the House bill was more practical and urged adoption by the conferees. Unable to secure its adoption, the House conferees undertook to have the views of the House bill incorporated in the conference agreement as fully and completely as practicable. We are not wholly satisfied. The conference agreement is not perfect. It is not as workable as it was in our opinion when it left the House. It is a compromise, as is the case with most legislation.

THE BOARD

In place of the single Administrator of the House bill and the Board of eight in the Senate amendment, the conference agreement provides for a Board of three, and it adopts the language of the House bill as to the powers and functions of the Board. All three members of the Board are appointed by the President and the President designates the Chairman. The

Chairman of the Board is comparable to the Administrator in the House bill. The House conferees believe that a Board of three is the next best thing to an Administrator and far better than an unwieldy Board of eight, with the want of qualifications as stated in the Senate bill and refer to economic interests and geographical areas.

PURSE STRINGS

All transfers to all Government agencies must be reimbursed. Congress thus retains the purse strings. This was fundamental in the House bill. It is probably the most solid provision in the conference agreement. There is a requirement for reimbursement in all cases of transfers and no transfer can be completed without reimbursement.

SCHOOLS AND HOSPITALS

The conference agreement provides for most generous treatment of schools and hospitals. Transfers from one Federal agency to another must be reimbursed at the fair value. Property suitable for schools, public health, and hospitals may be leased or sold to States, political subdivisions, tax-supported institutions, and nonprofit institutions. In the sale or lease the Board is to give consideration to any benefit which has accrued or may accrue to the United States from the use of such property by the State or institution. It was thus the intent of the conferees that schools, educational institutions, and hospitals should receive most generous treatment and that the sales or leases might be for the values determined by the Board when they took into consideration the benefits stipulated.

Donations are not authorized, but most reasonable and generous sales or leases, especially where the need is great, to schools and hospitals, were contemplated by the conference agreement.

Under the House bill there were no donations, but schools and hospitals were given a priority so surplus property suitable for their needs would be made available to them before it was made available to the public or to dealers. The House bill thus contemplated generous consideration for schools and colleges. As I have stated, it did not provide for donations. Many interests requested donations. If the practice had been laid down in the case of schools and hospitals, Soil Conservation and other interests would have insisted upon donations. The surplus property belongs to the taxpayers. Citizens, including widows and orphans, have purchased bonds. It should be disposed of for the benefit of the citizens. The surplus property belongs to the people. They have been taxed to provide it. The purpose in disposing of the property was to promote the public interest, including the Public Treasury.

No man can be more sympathetic with schools and hospitals than I. The United States through the Army and the Navy has dealt most generously with educational institutions and has provided most generously for hospitals during the war. In many cases equipment has been leased to the schools by the Navy. Such leases may be continued. It is not too much to say that if it had not been for the educational policy of the Army and the Navy many educational institutions would have closed their doors during the war. Moreover, they are supported by the State and the local institutions. The States have surpluses. The Federal Government has deficits and unparalleled debts incurred to wage war.

Under the conference agreement surplus property is made available to Government agencies for Government functions. If there had been a donation to schools and hospitals they would have had a priority over agencies for which appropriations are made by Congress and for which Federal taxes are levied.

Under the conference agreement there may be sales or leases. Schools and hospitals are accorded more generous treatment than any other agencies, including the public and dealers. They follow the Federal Government and the States in priority, and at a smaller value or consideration. Fair value obtains with respect to Federal agencies, but under the conference agreement the board, in disposing of surplus property to schools and hospitals, is to take into consideration any benefit which has accrued or may accrue to the United States from the use of such property.

Physicians and dentists have made a notable contribution to the war effort. In many cases their equipment was made available to the Government. As veterans they must reestablish themselves. The committee was of the opinion that such veterans should have an opportunity to acquire dental and medical supplies and equipment. They are entitled to be considered along with hospitals. I favored such a policy. I emphasize however that schools and hospitals are given a priority. They are accorded more generous treatment than any others. In substantially all other cases, fair value obtains, but in sales or leases to schools and hospitals the value is to be fixed by the board in consideration of the public benefits of schools and hospitals.

Ordinary schools and hospitals must buy from dealers as do individuals. Under the terms of the conference agreement such is not the case. They are accorded not only better treatment but the consideration in the lease or sale may be materially less than the case of the public, including dealers and individuals.

I repeat that there were sharp distinctions between the policies of the House bill and the Senate amendment. There were no donations in the House bill. There were not only donations in the Senate amendment, but the Senate amendment contemplated, in the case of returning soldiers and in the case of purchasers of lands, supervision over purchasers and as contemplated by the Jones-Bankhead Act. That act provides under appropriations made by Congress for a few farms in each county. The Senate amendment contemplated that governmental supervision over purchasers of lands, including purchases by veterans, should continue. I am among those who believe that veterans who fought for their country can farm their own lands. I believe that citizens should be encouraged to own and operate their lands without governmental supervision. I supported the Bankhead Act, but it would be unfair for the appropriations accruing to any State to be utilized in a small area where an Army camp is abandoned. I believe in individual initiative, and I want to promote landowners. Congress retains the purse strings, and may or may not appropriate money, notwithstanding the use of the term Jones-Bankhead Act in the conference agreement.

FAIR VALUE

Generally, except in the case of schools, hospitals, and similar institutions, and except in the case of former owners of lands, the conference agreement provides that the Board shall obtain for the Government the fair value of surplus property upon its disposition. A yardstick in thus prescribed.

LANDS

Surplus lands, except warehouses, industrial plants, factories, or similar structures and facilities or the sites thereof, or the land which the Board determines as essential to their use, are to be disposed of, but no part of the public domain, consisting of many millions of acres used during the war, is to be disposed of. The former owner, where feasible, is given the option of reacquiring at the price for which it was condemned by the Government, subject to depreciations or appreciations, his former lands, and in the event he does not so reacquire, the tenants of the former owner are given the privilege of acquiring the lands they formerly worked.

Veterans of the present war are given preferences in acquiring lands as well as other property.

In the event the preferences are not exercised by the former owner or his wife or children, or by former tenants or veterans, there will be no cloud upon the titles of other purchasers, as the bill provides that the certificate of the Board and the conveyance shall be conclusive that the preferences have been given. The purchaser is thus vested with a good title.

Family-sized farms are contemplated. The Board will select the agency for the disposal of the lands. The Department of the Interior may dispose of pasture lands in the far West, and the Department of Agriculture may dispose of agricultural lands, and the Federal land banks may dispose of other types of lands. The agencies are left to the Board. No land, however, is to be added to the public domain unless Congress has heretofore appropriated or hereafter appropriates for acquiring such lands.

PLANTS

The Board is to submit reports covering plants within 3 months to Congress and is authorized to dispose of any plants which cost the Government less than $5,000,000, but in the case of plants costing $5,000,000 or more, no disposition is to be made until 30 days after such reports have been made while Congress is in session, except that Congress may authorize a lease of such plants.

Adequate provision is made in any case for the disposal of material or equipment not necessary to the operation of the plant, and any property not capable of economic operation as a separate and independent unit operated as an integral part of a privately owned plant may be disposed of.

The Attorney General is to advise respecting the applicability of the antitrust laws in the disposal of plants or other property which cost the Government $1,000,000 or more.

EXPORTS

Strictly speaking, the conference agreement should not have provided any legislation except for the disposition of surplus property when declared surplus property as provided by the act. It was urged that the Stabilization Act had not provided for parity prices for cotton and that farm commodities could not be sold abroad for less than parity prices. It was insisted that only an additional loan on cotton of 2½ percent could effectuate the parity price contemplated by the Stabilization Act as amended. The additional loan on cotton is for only 1 year. It was urged that surplus agricultural commodities or the products thereof could not be exported for less than parity price without authority. Provision was thus made for the exports of surplus agricultural commodities or the products thereof with the equivalent benefits to textile manufacturers that were provided when the export program was in effect from 1939 to 1941.

STOCK-PILING

Personally, I believe that the so-called stock-piling provision of the conference agreement is the most unsatisfactory, inefficient, and the least justifiable provision in the agreement. Congress wisely provided in the act of June 7, 1939, for a stock pile of strategic materials. These materials include not only metals and minerals but many other materials, and from time to time the list is added to or diminished as the Army and Navy Munitions Board determines a material to be strategic or not strategic. The stock pile may include lumber, rubber, tin, quinine, and similar materials. There was no division among the conferees that an adequate stock pile should be provided. Under the provisions of the House bill in which no reference was made to an alleged stock pile, no strategic materials, including metals and minerals, would have been disposed of unless they had been declared surplus by the Army and the Navy. It was thus contemplated in the House bill that the stock pile, not only of strategic minerals and metals but all other strategic materials, should be added to as determined by the Army and the Navy, and that only surplus materials, including metals and minerals that were surplus and that were not needed by the stock pile would be declared surplus and thus made available to the civilian population. Minerals and metals have been used for the armed forces during the war. The civilian population has done without. The patriotic citizenship of the United States gladly acquiesced that aluminum and copper should go first to the armed forces. The people agreed to do without.

Stock-piling is not confined to metals and minerals. It is not confined to copper or aluminum. It is not confined to domestic metals and minerals. The real strategic materials are materials that are not produced domestically. The criticism of the stock-piling some 2 years related to rubber, to tin, and to quinine. Of course, it has been imperative to add all materials, including metals and minerals, to the stock pile during the war. The production of lumber has been vastly increased. It was essential to increase the production of aluminum and of copper. There has been a scarcity of rubber. Synthetic rubber has been provided for.

Stock-piling, because of the rubber situation, has become a rather popular slogan. Selfish interests would capitalize on this slogan. In reconversion which will result in the cancelation of contracts, it is estimated that contractor inventories of materials, including metals like aluminum and copper, will vastly increase the stock piles and will result in unprecedented surpluses over and above the maximum requirements of the stock pile in the case of many metals, including aluminum and copper.

The Senate amendment provided that all minerals and metals should be frozen and added to the stock pile, whether they were needed or not and whether they were surplus or not. Selfish interests, and particularly the aluminum and copper interests in the case of surplus metals, would thus have been accorded a protection that would have resulted in a practical monopoly that was not accorded to any other group or class. Property estimated to be valued at from fifty or sixty billions of dollars is to be disposed of. It was all right with these selfish interests for shoes to be disposed of, notwithstanding there were shoe factories and for other surplus items to be disposed of, notwithstanding that similar articles were being produced, but when it came to aluminum and copper, they were to be frozen. Prior to the present World War, the Aluminum Co. of America, supplied substantially all domestic aluminum. Except as war plants were sold and except as the Government has aided operators by furnishing money, the Aluminum Co. of America would have a virtual monopoly on the civilian requirements for aluminum, under the Senate amendment.

I want aluminum and copper to have a square deal. I do not want the products dumped. Neither do I want any other products dumped on the market, but I want the mining interests to be accorded the same treatment that the commercial farming and other interests are accorded. The bill must not confer special favors. I think it would be unwise to prevent the disposition of wheat or corn or cotton. If there is a surplus, the time to dispose of it is when the consumers have the money and when they need it most.

The best estimate I could obtain is that at present there is on hand and would be a surplus of aluminum ingot of from 525,000,000 to 1,650,000,000 pounds, and that there is on hand and would be a surplus of 300,000 to a million tons of copper. The Army advised that no such quantity was required for the stock pile, that there would in all human probability be an enormous surplus and that they urged that any and all not required for the armed services and in the stock pile should be made available to the civilian population. Such was the view of the majority of the House conferees. They opposed the freezing of wholly unprecedented and utterly unneeded quantities of aluminum, copper and other metals when there was no similar provision respecting any other surplus property in the United States. Aluminum is a strategic metal, but not necessary for the stock pile and should be disposed of now when needed.

We were sympathetic with the problems of miners and the mining States. We shared in the premiums and in the bonuses that have been given to the marginal and other mines, although they resulted in a vast increase in the costs of copper to the Government. We oppose dumping. We wanted an orderly disposition of copper and aluminum just as we want an orderly disposition of all other surplus property, but why freeze aluminum and copper without freezing any other of all the 2,000,000 items of surplus property? Whether intended or not, the result would be to revive the monopoly that the Aluminum Company of America had in aluminum before the war when aluminum cost during the depression, with low wages, approximately 7 cents a pound more than it is costing the Government now with the highest wages in the history of the country.

There was no disposition to prevent a wholly adequate stock of any metal, but when we contemplate that the Big Ten in copper mining or, better still, the Big Three in copper mining, would have been the chief beneficiaries of freezing copper, we know that while the spokesmen for the marginal mines are sincere, and while the advocates of stock-piling, so-called, are honest and sincere, nevertheless, the Big Three, especially Kennecott, Anaconda, and Phelps-Dodge, the Big Three of the Big Ten would be the chief beneficiaries of the freezing policy under the guise of stock piling all copper contained in the Senate amendment, and the public would pay more for copper.

The opposition of the majority House conferees resulted in the metals being named and in aluminum being omitted. A howl was made, and finally aluminum was inserted through the back door with a definite statement that it might be added to the stock pile in such quantities as the Army and the Navy Munitions Board may determine to be necessary for the stock pile authorized by the act of June 7, 1939.

There was a second concession to the viewpoint of the House. Provision is made for making available to the civilian population for the current requirements of industry minerals and metals for 6 months at the market price thereof. The provision is not adequate, but it was the best concession that the majority members of the House conferees could obtain.

There was another concession. The conference agreement provides that within 3 months the Army and Navy Munitions Board shall submit to Congress its recommendations respecting the maximum and minimum amounts of each strategic mineral or metal in the stock pile authorized by the act of June 7, 1939. After one year if Congress takes no action, the metals and minerals may be disposed of when declared to be surplus pursuant to the provisions of the act.

The stock-piling section thus becomes ineffective. There will be what I term a partial freezing for 12 months with 6 months provision for the civilian population unless Congress takes action. There would have been an indefinite freeze under the Senate Bill, but under the provision mentioned, if Congress takes no action within a year, the freezing section of the misnamed stock-piling section of the conference agreement will cease to be effective and surplus strategic materials, including minerals and metals, may be disposed of as provided by the House Bill.

One thing more. The stock-piling section provides that for the transfer to the stock pile, but it is significant that there was stricken from the Senate amendment the language which would have made the transfer effective. I quote that language not in the conference agreement:

Transfers under this section shall be made without reimbursement or transfer of funds except that if the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, or any of its subsidiaries, is the owning agency for any property so transferred, the Secretary of the Treasury shall cancel notes of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation in an amount equal to the cost of the property so transferred.

Under the terms of the bill there must be reimbursement for all transfers.

Under section 22 for stock piling there is no provision for reimbursement. It was omitted. Personally, I insisted upon its omission. The majority of the House conferees insisted upon its omission. Their insistence was based upon the fact that the transfer would not be complete without reimbursement. I repeat that while the Senate amendment would have absolutely frozen, the conference agreement is a partial freeze only for the 12 months when Congress takes no action, with 6 months' provision for the civilian population, and with provision for disposal after 12 months, with no congressional action, as if the alleged stock-piling section had not been included in the bill.

The House conferees reluctantly agreed to the alleged stock-piling provision because in all probability the Jap war will continue 12 months longer, and the net result will be that except for surpluses as required by the civilian population, resulting from contractor inventories, there will be no surpluses of strategic metals and minerals declared for 12 or 15 months.

The further net result is and will be that Congress should provide further and additional legislation for stock-piling by amending the act of 1939.

In passing, it is well to observe that subsection (c) was inserted at the insistence of the majority Senate conferees. It is a variation and a modification of the language suggested by the House majority conferees as a substitute for Senate stock-piling section 22 (a), but the modification serves to emphasize, so that he who runs may read, the utter unsoundness of subsection (a) of the stock-piling section 22 of the conference agreement.

Without reimbursement the owning agencies will not declare surpluses, and the designs of the selfish interests to give to aluminum and copper a consideration accorded to no other product or no other property are thwarted.

GENERAL PROVISIONS

As a measure of precaution there is a prohibition against the disposal of any battleship, cruiser, destroyer or carrier. It is my view that such a prohibition is wholly unnecessary. No property would be disposed of unless it was declared to be surplus. It is unthinkable that the Navy would declare any such combat vessels surplus or that they would undertake to dispose of such vessels without an act of Congress. Both the Senate and the House bills contain exceptions with respect to the disposal of Army posts or similar reservations prior to the present war. Such exceptions have been eliminated. The Army and the Navy did not make any request for such exceptions. If there is any reservation, Army posts or Army camps that have outlived their day, the Army has a right to declare them surplus. If there is a modern post or a modern camp that is better for the national defense than one established during the Indian wars in the far west, the Army should have the privilege of retaining the best post for the defense of our common country. We have relied upon the Army and the Navy in the prosecution of the greatest of all wars. We can rely upon them in the material defense of our country.

PERMANENT LEGISLATION

The bill is under consideration primarily for the disposal of surplus war property, but property becomes surplus in both peace and war. The House passed, in June 1943, after careful consideration, a bill for the disposal of Government surplus properties. It took the place of approximately 100 statutes. It provided for inventories, for an orderly disposition, for reimbursement, and contained no donations. The present bill will expire in 3 years following the conclusion of the existing war. I know of no more important legislation than the enactment at an early date of a bill for the orderly disposition of surplus property. The losses that accrued to the Government from the abolition of the Civilian Conservation Corps, the Work Projects Administration, and the National Youth Administration are the best evidence that I can give in behalf of the immediate enactment of much needed permanent legislation for the disposal of surplus Government property.

CRITICISMS

The conference agreement has been criticized as not including constructive agreements, as providing for retail sales, as stipulating economic qualifications for members of the Board, and as eliminating provisions of the House bill against speculation and freezing, and reimportation of goods sold for export and in eliminating advisory committees. As I have stated, the House bill was the better bill. The majority of the House conferees contended for the provisions of the House bill, but in fairness, the criticisms mentioned are without merit.

First. While the conference agreement does not provide for conference committees, they are not prohibited, and under section 35 the Board may utilize as the Surplus Property Administrator has utilized them under the Executive order establishing the Surplus War Property Administration.

Second. Notwithstanding squints at retailing, the normal trade channels are contemplated. The objectives and policies of the House bill are combined under objectives in section 2, the conference agreement. Under subsection (n) of objectives, I quote:

To utilize normal channels of trade.

Again I quote from subsection (q):

To prevent excessive profits.

Again I quote from subsection (h):

To discourage disposal to speculators or for speculative purposes.

I refer to subsection (d):

To discourage monopolistic practices and to preserve the competitive position of small business.

I refer to subsection (j):

To avoid dislocations of the domestic economy.

I especially emphasize subsection (e), section 11, which provides for "uniform and wide public notice so that all interested purchasers may have a fair opportunity to buy."

Again I refer to section 18 (b) providing that the usual and customary commercial practices shall obtain.

Subsection 18 (a) prevents discriminations against small business.

There is a very much stronger provision against reimportations in the conference agreement than obtained in the House bill. It is section 33 of the conference agreement.

There is a squinting at retails in section 17, but they might have been used if necessary, under the House bill. The majority House conferees objected to the language, but this section must be construed in the light of the other provisions of the bill. The Miller House amendment was eliminated.

The conference agreement, while not as good as the House bill, is far better than the Senate amendment. The majority House conferees did their best to obtain the substantial provisions of the House bill. I believe the report should be approved.

(Mr. WHITTINGTON asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and to include a letter from Mr. W. L. Clayton to Director James F. Byrnes, dated September 14, 1944.)

Mr. GOSSETT. Mr. Speaker, I am glad that the conferees struck from section 22 of the Senate bill the provision

requiring a reservation of oil, gas, and mineral deposits in the property to be sold under this bill. To make the matter perfectly clear, in order that there be no mistake hereafter as to congressional intent, I want to say that the Congress intends to preclude any reservation of mineral rights in real property to be conveyed under the terms of this bill. The reference in section 23 of the conferees' report to provisions of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act does not intend to authorize the Government to reserve any part of the minerals under farm lands or other lands to be sold under the terms of this act.

The SPEAKER. All time has expired.

Mr. MANASCO. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

Mr. HALE. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the conference report?

Mr. HALE. Yes; in its present form, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. HALE moves to recommit the bill to the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the bill H. R. 5125.

Mr. MANASCO. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion to recommit.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. WALTER) there were—ayes 93, noes 91.

Mr. MANASCO. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. The Chair has just counted. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant-at-Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 150, nays 169, not voting 112, as follows:

[Roll No. 114]

YEAS—150

Allen, Ill.	Cole, N. Y.	Hale
Allen, La.	Colmer	Hall,
Andersen, H. Carl	Compton	Edwin Arthur
Anderson, Calif.	Cox	Hall,
Andresen, August H.	Cravens	Leonard W.
Andrews, N. Y.	Crawford	Hancock
Angell	Cunningham	Harness, Ind.
Arends	Day	Heidinger
Arnold	Dirksen	Herter
Auchincloss	Durham	Hess
Baldwin, N. Y.	Dworshak	Hoffman
Barden	Eaton	Hope
Bates, Mass.	Ellis	Howell
Beall	Elston, Ohio	Hull
Bishop	Engel, Mich.	Jeffrey
Boren	Fellows	Jenkins
Brown, Ohio	Fenton	Jennings
Buck	Fish	Jensen
Buffett	Fuller	Johnson,
Butler	Fulmer	Anton J.
Carlson, Kans.	Gamble	Johnson,
Carson, Ohio	Gearhart	Calvin D.
Chiperfield	Gerlach	Johnson, Ind.
Church	Gillie	Johnson,
Clevenger	Goodwin	J. Leroy
Cole, Mo.	Grant, Ind.	Jones
	Griffiths	Jonkman
	Gwynne	Kean
	Kearney	Mott
	Kelley	Mruk
	Kilburn	Murphy
	Kilday	Myers
	Kleberg	Newsome
	Knutson	Norman
	LaFollette	O'Hara
	Landis	O'Konski
	Lanham	Patton
	Larcade	Plumley
	LeFevre	Powers
	Lewis	Ramey
	Luce	Rankin
	McCowen	Reed, Ill.
	McGregor	Reed, N. Y.
	McMillen, Ill.	Rees, Kans.
	McWilliams	Rolph
	Maas	Schiffler
	Martin, Iowa	Scrivner
	Martin, Mass.	Short
	Mason	Simpson, Ill.
	Merrow	Smith, Maine
	Miller, Conn.	Smith, Ohio
	Miller, Nebr.	Smith, Va.
	Monkiewicz	Smith, Wis.

NAYS—169

Abernethy	Gorski	Pace
Anderson, N. Mex.	Gossett	Peterson, Fla.
Andrews, Ala.	Graham	Peterson, Ga.
Barrett	Grant, Ala.	Philbin
Beckworth	Green	Pittenger
Bender	Gregory	Pracht,
Bland	Gross	C. Frederick
Bloom	Hare	Pratt,
Bonner	Harless, Ariz.	Joseph M.
Bradley, Pa.	Harris, Ark.	Price
Brown, Ga.	Hart	Priest
Brumbaugh	Heffernan	Rabaut
Bryson	Hill	Ramspeck
Buckley	Hinshaw	Randolph
Bulwinkle	Hobbs	Rivers
Burch, Va.	Hoch	Robertson
Burchill, N. Y.	Holmes, Mass.	Robinson, Utah
Burdick	Jarman	Rockwell
Byrne	Johnson, Luther A.	Rodgers, Pa.
Camp	Johnson, Lyndon B.	Rohrbough
Canfield	Johnson, Okla.	Rooney
Cannon, Fla.	Kee	Rowan
Cannon, Mo.	Keogh	Sadowski
Capozzoli	Kerr	Sasscer
Celler	King	Satterfield
Chapman	Kinzer	Scanlon
Chenoweth	Kirwan	Scott
Cochran	Lane	Shafer
Coffee	Lea	Sheridan
Cooley	Lesinski	Simpson, Pa.
Cooper	Ludlow	Snyder
Costello	Lynch	Somers, N. Y.
Crosser	McConnell	Sparkman
Curley	McCormack	Spence
D'Alesandro	McGehee	Stigler
Davis	McMurray	Sumners, Tex.
Delaney	Madden	Thomas, N. J.
Dilweg	Magnuson	Thomas, Tex.
Dingell	Mahon	Thomason
Disney	Maloney	Tibbott
Dondero	Manasco	Torrens
Doughton	Mansfield, Mont.	Towe
Drewry	Mansfield, Tex.	Troutman
Eberharter	Marcantonio	Vincent, Ky.
Ellison, Md.	May	Voorhis, Calif.
Fay	Michener	Ward
Feighan	Miller, Pa.	Weaver
Fernandez	Mills	Wene
Flannagan	Monroney	Whelchel, Ga.
Fogarty	Morrison, N. C.	White
Folger	Murdock	Whitten
Forand	Murray, Tenn.	Whittington
Gathings	Norton	Wickersham
Gavin	O'Brien, Ill.	Winstead
Gillespie	O'Toole	Woodrum, Va.
Gillette	Outland	Wright
Gordon	Springer	Zimmerman
Gore	Stanley	
	Stearns, N. H.	
	Stewart	
	Sumner, Ill.	
	Taber	
	Talbot	
	Tale	
	Tarver	
	Taylor	
	Voorhis, Ohio	
	Vursell	
	Walter	
	Weichel, Ohio	
	West	
	Wigglesworth	
	Wilson	
	Winter	
	Wolcott	
	Wolfenden, Pa.	
	Wolverton, N. J.	
	Woodruff, Mich.	
	Worley	

NOT VOTING—112

Baldwin, Md.	Case	Ford
Barry	Clark	Fulbright
Bates, Ky.	Clason	Furlong
Bell	Courtney	Gale
Bennett, Mich.	Curtis	Gallagher
Bennett, Mo.	Dawson	Gibson
Blackney	Dewey	Gifford
Bolton	Dickstein	Gilchrist
Boykin	Dies	Granger
Bradley, Mich.	Douglas	Hagen
Brehm	Elliott	Halleck
Brooks	Ellsworth	Harris, Va.
Burgin	Elmer	Hartley
Busbey	Engle, Calif.	Hays
Carrier	Fisher	Hébert
Carter	Fitzpatrick	Hendricks
Hoeven	Morrison, La.	Sauthoff
Holifield	Mundt	Schwabe
Holmes, Wash.	Murray, Wis.	Sheppard
Horan	Norrell	Sikes
Izac	O'Brien, Mich.	Slaughter
Jackson	O'Brien, N. Y.	Smith, W. Va.
Johnson, Ward	O'Connor	Starnes, Ala.
Judd	O'Neal	Stefan
Keefe	Patman	Stevenson
Kefauver	Pfeifer	Stockman
Kennedy	Phillips	Sullivan
Klein	Ploeser	Sundstrom
Kunkel	Poage	Tolan
Lambertson	Poulson	Treadway
LeCompte	Reece, Tenn.	Vinson, Ga.
Lemke	Richards	Wadsworth
McCord	Rizley	Wasielewski
McKenzie	Robsion, Ky.	Weiss
McLean	Rogers, Mass.	Welch
McMillan, S. C.	Rowe	Willey
Merritt	Russell	
Miller, Mo.	Sabath	

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Ploeser for, with Mr. Baldwin of Maryland against.

Mr. Halleck for, with Mr. Vinson of Georgia against.

Mr. Miller of Missouri for, with Mr. Tolan against.

Mr. Curtis for, with Mr. Weiss against.

Mr. Bennett of Missouri for, with Mr. Ford against.

Mr. Hoeven for, with Mr. Izac against.

Mr. Elmer for, with Mr. Granger against.

Mr. Stefan for, with Mr. Fulbright against.

Mr. Schwabe for, with Mr. Norrell against.

Mr. Dewey for, with Mr. Barry against.

Mr. Stevenson for, with Mr. Dickstein against.

Mr. Poulson for, with Mr. Fitzpatrick against.

Mr. Bradley of Michigan for, with Mr. Pfeifer against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Richards with Mr. Willey.

Mr. Clark with Mrs. Bolton.

Mr. Sheppard with Mr. Kunkel.

Mr. Poage with Mr. Busbey.

Mr. Brooks with Mr. Horan.

Mr. O'Connor with Mr. Douglas.

Mr. Morrison of Louisiana with Mr. O'Brien of New York.

Mr. Dawson with Mr. Holmes of Washington.

Mr. Engle of California with Mr. Phillips.

Mr. McMillan of South Carolina with Mr. Stockman.

Mr. Courtney with Mr. Wadsworth.

Mr. O'Neal with Mr. Ellsworth.

Mr. Merritt with Mr. Brehm.

Mr. Hays with Mr. Carrier.

Mr. Sabath with Mr. Keefe.

Mr. McCord with Mr. Ward Johnson.

Mr. Slaughter with Mr. Gallagher.

Mr. Bell with Mr. Murray of Wisconsin.

Mr. Smith of West Virginia with Mr. Robsion of Kentucky.

Mr. Gibson with Mr. Mundt.

Mr. McKenzie with Mr. Reece of Tennessee.

Mr. Wasielewski with Mr. LeCompte.

Mr. Holifield with Mr. Blackney.

Mr. Boykin with Mr. Judd.

Mr. Hendricks with Mr. Rizley.

Mr. O'Brien of Michigan with Mr. Gale.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. ABERNETHY, Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana, Mr. BARRETT, Mr. GILLESPIE, and Mr. GATHINGS changed their votes from "yea" to "nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the conference report.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. TABER) there were—yeas 174, nays 91.

So the conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. POWERS] be allowed to extend his own remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

AMENDING NAVAL RESERVE ACT

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 5067) to amend the Naval Reserve Act of 1938, as amended, so as to permit foreign service of members of the Women's Reserve under certain conditions, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object——

The SPEAKER. The Chair will state to the gentleman from Washington that the Senate bill is on the Speaker's table. Does the gentleman desire to ask for consideration of the Senate bill?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. Speaker, I was going to propound a second unanimous consent request that we substitute for H. R. 5067 the Senate bill S. 2028.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, until the gentleman explains his bill I reserve the right to object. Is this the WAVE bill, or is this the admiral and general bill?

Mr. MAGNUSON. This is the bill to allow WAVES to participate in service in the Western Hemisphere.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, I have no objection.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to substitute the Senate bill.

The SPEAKER. Why should the gentleman do that? If the Chair may suggest, the Chair understands that the Senate bill is in the form which would be passed, and the House bill is not in the form that the House would probably pass.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my request.

The SPEAKER. The Chair makes the suggestion that the gentleman from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] asks unanimous consent for the consideration of the Senate bill.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (S. 2028) to amend the Naval Reserve Act of 1938, as amended, and the Coast Guard Auxiliary and Reserve Act of 1941, as amended, so as to permit service of members of the Women's Reserve in the American area, the Territories of Hawaii and Alaska, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois reserves the right to object. The gentleman from Washington might explain the bill.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, I have no objection.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I understand from the gentleman's explanation there is nothing in the bill which would permit service in the European theater or territories?

Mr. MAGNUSON. If the gentleman will allow me I will explain the bill.

Mr. Speaker, the Senate bill provides that women in the Naval Reserve and Marine Corps and the SPARS are not to be assigned to duty outside of the continental United States or in Hawaii except upon their prior request.

It allows them only to be assigned to duty outside the American area; that is the Western Hemisphere, in the Territories of Hawaii and Alaska, and only upon their request.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. In other words, it is voluntary action on the part of members of the WAVES. There is nothing compulsory about the bill.

Mr. MAGNUSON. No; I may say that the gentlewoman from Maine [Mrs. SMITH], who has been very diligent and zealous in this matter, introduced a bill in the House. In the meantime, the matter was amended in the Senate to take care of some objections of WAVES or SPARS or Marine Corps women serving in the actual combat areas, and the Senate passed the bill unanimously. We are substituting that bill. It provides that they shall only serve in the Western Hemisphere and only upon their request.

Mr. COLE of New York. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. COLE of New York. The gentleman mentioned the possibility that the WAVES might serve in Alaska and Hawaii. Does the bill exclude their service in the Panama Canal Zone or in any of our Caribbean possessions, or does it permit them?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield to the gentlewoman from Maine [Mrs. SMITH]. I am sure she can explain the geographical limitations.

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Mr. Speaker, this provides for service in what is known as the Western Hemisphere, Alaska, and Hawaii, only upon voluntary action; the voluntary provisions for girls in the service and for future service.

I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Mr. Speaker, S. 2028 was passed by the Senate and permits the women reserves of the Navy, Marines, and Coast Guard to serve in the American area, Hawaii, and Alaska. My bill, H. R. 5067, did not contain such limitations but permitted service anywhere except on board ships and in combat areas, after billets in Washington were filled.

As you know, twice before the House has passed legislation to permit these women to serve overseas. Each time the proposal has died in the Senate Naval Affairs Committee. A compromise has been worked out between the Senate and House Naval Affairs Committees at the request of the Secretary of the Navy to meet the present needs. The bill passed by the Senate last week and now before the House makes service outside of continental United States strictly voluntary. This applies to future enlistments as well as to those women now in naval services.

As a member of the House Naval Affairs Committee, I have visited training stations and naval establishments and watched the women of the Naval Reserve, the Marines, and the Coast Guard perform their duties. They are efficient and effective, dependable and devoted to duty.

Data on women in naval services

	WAVES	MARINES	SPARS
Stationed in Washington, D. C., area:			
Officers	2,777	120	25
Enlisted women	13,658	2,126	752
Stationed outside Washington, D. C., area:			
Officers	5,574	[1]142	621
Enlisted women	50,235	13,359	6,063
In training	14,530	1,747	1,573
Total	76,744	17,994	9,134

[1] Includes inactive.

Initially the Navy quota called for 100,000 WAVES, 1,000 a week by January 1945. This has been cut back to 75,000 as to November 31, 1944. This cut-back is temporary and occasioned by the return of disabled servicemen who wish to be retained in the service and are filling billets in limited service.

Although the quota for the MARINES was 19,000—1,000 officers and 18,000 enlisted women—it was found that this number was not needed now and recruiting stopped in June 1944, when 17,994 were in the service.

The quota for the SPARS is 11,000, 1,000 officers and 10,000 enlisted women. It is anticipated that the quota for the SPARS will be reached by the SPARS' second birthday, November 23, 1944. After that date recruiting will be directed toward replacement and the special need of the Coast Guard.

There has been a sustained and spontaneous response on the part of the women of America to the recruiting program of the Navy. Fortunately recruiting of women for naval services has not fallen off, but rather has increased in the past 2 months. All quotas have been met.

This bill is in direct response to the urgent request of Admiral Nimitz for several thousand WAVES in Hawaii. The Navy has practically completed its combat work in the European area. The remaining job is to keep up the supply lines. The future work of the Navy is in the Pacific, as the Japanese war will be predominantly a naval war. Consequently, the most important task of this work is in the immediate future. This staff will require every bit of trained manpower that the Navy can muster under Admiral Nimitz, the commander of the Pacific Fleet. The war is not over and the end is not in sight.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The question was whether or not this would allow these women to serve in the Panama Canal Zone. I do not have the bill before me.

Mr. MAAS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. MAAS. The bill provides that they may serve anywhere within what is known as the American defense area, which is even less than the Western Hemisphere. It would permit service in Panama and in the Caribbean area. It specifically includes Hawaii and Alaska, and any service outside of the continental United States must be upon the woman's own application.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. Reserving the right to object, does that refer to future enlistments also?

Mr. MAAS. It refers to future enlistments as well. It will be all voluntary, outside of the country itself.

Mr. BLAND. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. BLAND. It includes the SPARS, as I understand?

Mr. MAGNUSON. It includes the Women's Auxiliary of the SPARS.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON]?

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I presume there will be debate on the bill if the request is granted?

The SPEAKER. The Chair was intending to say, "Without objection the Senate bill is ordered to be read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider laid on the table."

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I do not want to object, but there are some Members, including myself, who have some very definite ideas on this subject. I want to say for the RECORD, as far as I am concerned, while I do not wish to object to the bill in view of the recommendation of the Secretary of the Navy, the Navy Department has never at any time given to the Committee on Naval Affairs of the House of Representatives any information with respect to figures as to the service of men in the Naval Establishment in continental United States that would justify their making this recommendation. I think that should be shown in the RECORD and I want it shown.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, the remarks I have heard from different Members concerning this bill convinces me that no Member here knows anything about it. Therefore, I object.

Mr. MAAS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman withhold that?

Mr. SHORT. I object, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Objection is heard.

RESIGNATION FROM THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication:

SEPTEMBER 15, 1944.

Hon. SAM RAYBURN,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

SIR: I beg leave to inform you that I have this day transmitted to the Governor of Virginia my resignation as a Representative in the Congress of the United States from the Second District of Virginia, effective as of today.

Respectfully yours,
WINDER R. HARRIS.

BOARD OF VISITORS, UNITED STATES MERCHANT MARINE ACADEMY

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication, which was read by the Clerk:

SEPTEMBER 14, 1944.

The SPEAKER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I have been advised by Congressman WELCH that he will be unable to attend the meeting of the Board of Visitors to the United States Merchant Marine Academy at Kingspoint, N. Y., on September 28, 29, and 30, and that he has so advised you.

I am, therefore, appointing Congressman DANIEL ELLISON, of Maryland, to fill the vacancy occasioned by the resignation of Mr. WELCH.

Yours very sincerely,
S. O. BLAND, *Chairman.*

EXPATRIATION FOR EVASION OF MILITARY SERVICE

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. LESINSKI].

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table Senate Concurrent Resolution 51 for immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Clerk of the House of Representatives, in the enrollment of the bill (H. R. 4257) to expatriate or exclude certain persons for evading military and naval service, be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to strike out on page 1, line 7 "(h)" and insert in lieu thereof "(i)"; and on page 1, line 8, strike out "(i)" and insert in lieu thereof "(j)."

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, as I understand this just corrects a typographical error.

Mr. LESINSKI. The gentleman is correct. We passed a bill last week. This Senate resolution changes the lettering the paragraphs from "h" to "i" and from "i" to "j".

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. It does not make any change in the legislation itself?

Mr. LESINSKI. None at all.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 30 minutes on Wednesday next after the disposition of business on the Speaker's table, on a few matters which some may construe to be politics.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

EXTENDING FROM 40 TO 90 DAYS TIME WITHIN WHICH VETERANS MAY APPLY FOR REEMPLOYMENT

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK].

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (H. R. 5386) to amend the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, to extend the time within which application may be made for reemployment, and for other purposes, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, as I understand it this extends from 40 to 90 days the time within which a veteran may make application for reemployment.

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes. Under the present law a veteran after his discharge from the service must apply for reemployment in private or public employ within 40 days. That is what they call the 40-day period of grace. Selective Service has recommended that this time be extended to 90 days.

This matter has been passed upon by the Bureau of the Budget, by Mr. James F. Byrnes, and Gen. Frank T. Hines. I will incorporate in the RECORD a copy of a letter sent to the Speaker.

This bill provides a 90-day period of grace for veterans discharged from the service within which to apply for reemployment in their old jobs. In the case of a man hospitalized it provides a 90-day period after the end of his hospitalization providing the hospitalization is not for a period longer than 1 year.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Does the gentleman think that is a long enough period?

Mr. McCORMACK. I have my serious doubts, to be perfectly frank with my friend, but this has been recommended. Extending it to a 90-day period will take care of the present needs and then if a problem arises we can easily extend it to meet that situation.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I think the gentleman will agree that we shall probably have to extend it further.

Mr. McCORMACK. I am inclined to agree with the gentleman.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts for the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 8 (b) of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, Public Law 783, Seventy-sixth Congress, approved September 16, 1940 (50 U. S. C. 308), as amended, be further amended by striking out the word "forty" therefrom and substituting the word "ninety" therefor, and by adding after the words "relieved from such training and service" the following: "or from hospitalization continuing after discharge for a period of not more than 1 year."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include at this point in the RECORD a letter sent to the Speaker by General Hershey, the head of the Selective Service System.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

(The letter referred to follows:)

SELECTIVE SERVICE SYSTEM,
Washington, D. C., September 11, 1944.

The honorable the SPEAKER OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

MY DEAR MR. SPEAKER: There is respectfully submitted to you herewith a draft of a proposed bill to amend section 8 (b) of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, the purpose of which is to extend the time within which veterans may make application for reemployment.

Under section 8 of the Selective Service Act, there are several conditions precedent with which the veteran must comply in order to be entitled to employment by his former employer. Two of these conditions precedent are (1) that the veteran be qualified to perform such employment and (2) that he apply to his former employer within 40 days after discharge from the armed forces.

Obviously, a veteran who is hospitalized for more than 40 days following his discharge cannot meet these conditions precedent, and, therefore, under existing provisions of section 8 of the Selective Service Act is not entitled to reemployment benefits. In order to extend the coverage of section 8 to include a veteran who is hospitalized for not more than 1 year after discharge from the armed forces, the Selective Service System hereby respectfully recommends the enactment of the enclosed proposed bill to amend section 8 of the Selective Service Act.

The enclosed amendment, in addition to conferring reemployment rights and benefits to veterans who are hospitalized for not more than 1 year following discharge from the armed forces, increases the time within which a veteran can apply to his former employer for employment from 40 days to 90 days following discharge from the armed forces or release from hospitalization subsequent to discharge.

A draft of this letter and the proposed legislation has been submitted to the Bureau of the Budget, which has informed us that it has no objection to the submission to you of this proposed legislation. Prior to submission to the Bureau of the Budget, the proposed legislation was approved by Mr. James F. Byrnes, the Director of War Mobilization, and Brig. Gen. Frank T. Hines, the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs.

Sincerely yours,

LEWIS B. HERSHEY, *Director.*

DEMOBILIZATION OF MEN IN THE ARMED SERVICES

Mr. COSTELLO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. COSTELLO. Mr. Speaker, some days ago General Hershey made a statement in regard to the demobilization of men from the service.

Because that statement has been widely circulated, I believe it should be clarified at this time. He is charged with having made the remark that it would be cheaper to keep the men in the armed forces rather than to release them and make them, therefore, subject to some agency of the Government.

What he wanted to get across to the public was that demobilization should not be rushed and ill-considered but should be done in a very orderly manner. Because of the comment that has been made in this regard, the special committee of the Committee on Military Affairs investigating draft deferments called Colonel Keesling down for an explanation and, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include Colonel Keesling's testimony as given to our committee as part of my remarks, and I also ask unanimous consent to include in my remarks an editorial from the Washington Post which will also help clarify the situation and which indicates that this should not be made a political question. The Selective Service has been kept out of politics and should remain out of politics.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California [Mr. COSTELLO]?

There was no objection.

(The matter referred to follows:)

Mr. COSTELLO. There is one more matter I meant to question you about and that deals with this problem of demobilizing the men as the men return from the war theaters. I believe the matter has been pretty much discussed back and forth the last couple of days, in view of the statement which is attributed to General Hershey. I understand that he is supposed to have made a statement to the effect that we can keep people in the Army about as cheaply as we could create an agency for them when they are out.

I would like to know if that statement was made by General Hershey, and, if it was made by General Hershey, if it was made prior to our meeting of last week, or subsequent to that meeting.

Colonel KEESLING. That statement you refer to there was not made following the meeting of last week. That was made sometime in August when the general was going around the country meeting with some of the local boards and State directors.

Mr. COSTELLO. In other words, the meeting we had last week, at which it was indicated that the men would be demobilized in orderly fashion, would supersede any statement that General Hershey might have made prior to that time.

Colonel KEESLING. That is right, and I would like to go into a little bit more detail on that if I may, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. COSTELLO. It was my undersanding that at the time the statements were made before the committee last Tuesday the Army, the Navy, and Selective Service were in agreement as to the procedure they might endeavor to use in demobilizing the men.

Colonel KEESLING. I understand that was the purpose of last Tuesday's meeting, namely, to have the Army and Navy in, who were primarily interested in demobilization and who have paramount authority with respect to who is to be demobilized, and at what times they are to be demobilized, and in what numbers they are to be demobilized, and, also, to have Selective Service there in view of its interest by reason of its veterans' employment responsibilities.

Mr. HARNESS. May I ask a question there? General Hershey has been sitting in with the Army and Navy in formulating these plans for demobilization, has he not?

Colonel KEESLING. Yes.

Mr. HARNESS. And they have been working on that for several months, have they not?

Colonel KEESLING. Longer than that.

Mr. HARNESS. It was after they started these plans for demobilization that he made that statement out in Denver, was it not?

Colonel KEESLING. I recall that General Tompkins had stated that the plans had been under consideration for some time. Now, just when the general entered into the picture personally in connection with the plans I do not know.

I know that the Selective Service, the Army, and the Navy have, necessarily, been working together on it. The Selective Service has a definite interest in demobilization, and the rate of demobilization. There is no question about that because of our responsibilities to get jobs for veterans and hence our interest in the time, place, and rate of demobilization.

We called the attention of the Army and Navy, and will continue to do so, to certain possible pitfalls that may come into the picture which might adversely affect the veteran and our operations.

Mr. HARNESS. You see, Colonel, he made the statement in August, and that is last month.

Colonel KEESLING. That is right.

Mr. HARNESS. And they have been meeting in conference on this for at least 2 or 3 months.

Colonel KEESLING. That is right.

Mr. HARNESS. Formulating these demobilization plans.

Colonel KEESLING. That is right.

Mr. HARNESS. And the plan is that the men serving abroad are not going to get out of the Army for at least a year.

Colonel KEESLING. I do not know exactly what the rate is, but I understood that, at this meeting we all participated in last week, General Tompkins stated that it was the War Department's policy that the men would be released as rapidly as possible, limited only by the factors of military necessity and the shipping facilities available.

In the course of that meeting, which was last Tuesday, when General Hershey was called upon after the Army and Navy had testified, General Hershey stated—because he has an interest in the rate of demobilization, and he has to help to get jobs for these men as they come out—that some thought should be given to the capacity of the facilities that would be available to help to get these men jobs, and that if it were possible to release them all at once, and if they were all released at once, it might be to their own detriment if the facilities couldn't handle them; whereas if demobilization were on a staggered basis, we could handle them, and they could be absorbed in an orderly manner into reconverting industry.

General Tompkins at that point stated that the factors of military necessity and the shipping facilities available necessarily, in his opinion, required an orderly demobilization on a staggered basis. As this was the result General Hershey was seeking, he indicated general approval of the demobilization plans.

Also, General Hershey in his testimony indicated very definitely that he recognized and

accepted the fact that the War Department and the Navy Department have primary responsibility for saying what the demobilization rates should be, and he indicated agreement that the War Department plan would be put into effect regardless of anything he might say.

Mr. HARNESS. Do you think he had in mind when he made that statement that the plan would call for the demobilization of these men in a staggered manner and that it would be at least a year after hostilities before they got out of the Army?

Colonel KEESLING. I do not know what was in his mind because I have not gone into the matter in detail.

My only point today was that regardless of what General Hershey may or may not have stated, or what he may or may not have meant by his statement, that matter was water over the dam by the time of the hearing last Tuesday, or certainly by the next day when the plan was announced by those who had authority to make it and was definitely in existence. Unfortunately some of the factual information I have given to you today may not have been known in all quarters. In any event, although the issue was closed with the announcement of the War Department plan, it was unfortunately brought into the limelight again subsequently. I hope the matter which already has been made so much of will be clearly understood as a result of the facts I have just presented, and that it will be a closed issue once and for all.

* * * * *

Colonel KEESLING. With respect to that statement of General Hershey which we were discussing earlier, after additional thought, I have decided it would be advisable for me to make some further comments. I have hesitated to make these comments, but have concluded that it might be for the best of all concerned to do so.

It has been my opinion throughout the 4 years the Selective Service System has been in operation that the subject matter of selective service must be kept out of politics. Also, the Selective Service officials, while they are connected with Selective Service, must remain political agnostics and, regardless of party affiliation, must keep their Selective Service functions completely away from political matters. In addition, Members of Congress, representatives of other branches of Government, and others outside the Selective Service System must maintain a hands-off policy insofar as bringing political or discriminatory pressures to bear upon Selective Service operations and decisions.

These three points I consider to be musts because Selective Service deals with the most vital matters of life and death and affects millions of men, their families, and friends. The morale of those persons must be maintained, and they must have continued confidence that Selective Service operations and decisions are made impartially and without any discrimination on account of a man's race, creed, color, religion, party affiliation, or his affiliation with labor or management.

As to the first point, the subject of Selective Service has, in my opinion, been kept out of politics for 4 years as a result of the efforts of all concerned, both within and without the Selective Service System. Four years ago on the eve of the Presidential election, both President Roosevelt and Mr. Willkie expressly came out for the enactment of the selective-service legislation, thereby removing that subject as an issue in the Presidential campaign.

With respect to the second point, namely, that Selective Service officials must, in view of their position of unusual trust, submerge their political affiliations during their connection with the Selective Service System, it is my firm conviction that General Hershey and the rest of the officers of the Selective Service System have, regardless of party affiliations, leaned over backward to keep out of political matters. We have recognized the necessity for our getting and remaining behind the veil of political agnosticism while connected with Selective Service in addition to any such requirements imposed by being in uniform. In this connection, when legislation was being considered, the enactment of which we did not deem advisable, we have always been most careful not to oppose the individual Members of Congress sponsoring the legislation, but rather merely to oppose the legislation. We, therefore, have fought principles rather than personalities wherever it was necessary for us to make known our opposition Our experience reveals that we have thereby gained the friendship and respect rather than the enmity of those Members of Congress whose legislative proposals we have opposed from time to time.

A personal acquaintance of mine gave me some excellent advice 4 years ago when I first arrived in Washington to serve with Selective Service. At that time he advised me and cautioned me that so long as I was connected with Selective Service I should be an agnostic as far as politics were concerned.

The officers at national headquarters have felt so strongly about this point that we have continually fought the various proposals that have been made from time to time to compensate local board members. One of the main reasons for our objection to such proposals was the possibility that we would lose valuable personnel while at the same time run the risk of having a suspicion of politics and patronage creep into our operations. Even a suspicion of any discrimination cannot be countenanced where decisions of life and death are involved.

With respect to the third point, namely, the activities on the part of persons outside the Selective Service System, Members of Congress and other governmental officials have, so far as is within my knowledge, meticulously refrained from using political pressure to influence our decisions with respect to classification, selection, and deferment. In my capacity as chief liaison and legislative officer I have had first-hand knowledge on that score. It is with the greatest of satisfaction that I can say without qualification that the Members of Congress, whether they be Democrats, Republicans, or affiliated with other parties, have maintained a very definite hands-off policy and have even leaned over backward in refraining from any action on their part which might even be suspected of being political pressure for the deferment or induction of any man. This attitude on their part has been a source of great personal satisfaction to me. As a result of our mutual endeavors in this regard, a very fine relationship has existed between Selective Service and Members of Congress, regardless of political affiliation.

I feel very deeply about these matters and, consequently, in view of the foregoing, I sincerely trust that the issue which has been raised over General Hershey's statement will henceforth be closed and that all concerned will take care so that we will not be confronted with any similar situation in the future.

[From the Washington Post of September 16, 1944]

BRONX CHEER

It would be highly unfortunate if, on the basis of an unfortunate comment by General Hershey, Selective Service were to be used as a football in the political arena. General Hershey's comment that "we can keep people in the Army about as cheaply as we could create an agency for them when they are out" was made at Denver on August 21. At the time we said the remark was highly unfortunate, and when Mr. Dewey picked it up and flayed the administration with it, we remarked that we could see no result but the undermining of soldier morale. Proof is contained in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of September 14, wherein Representative WOODRUM includes a letter from a group of soldiers in France expressing sarcastic thanks for the pledge to keep them "in the bloodstained hedgerows of France, the fox holes of Italy, the damp darkness of the jungle, and (under) the shrapnel-torn skies of the world." It is a very lively, but distressing, Bronx cheer that is sent up and, though General Hershey asked for it, nevertheless we feel he will regret to see the effect that his comment has created. What he had in mind was the need for orderly reconversion and demobilization. That need was recognized in the demobilization plan as issued just before Mr. Dewey made the speech at Philadelphia in which he pilloried the Hershey comment. The plan, which was based on a soldiers' poll, has been widely approved, and no doubt Mr. Dewey, after studying it, will not withhold his own backing.

It has been said that General Hershey, besides being inept in his phraseology, was straying beyond his province in talking about demobilization. His job, according to this view, is to raise an army, not to dispose of it. The fact is that Congress has charged Selective Service with very specific duties in connection with demobilization. It is empowered to see that veterans are reinstated in their own jobs. To be sure, the duty might seem to trench upon the authority of other agencies, but there is now a coordinating body made up of General Hines, administrator of retraining and reemployment; W. M. C. chief McNutt, and General Hershey, which will prevent duplication of effort. Clearly Selective Service can be useful in helping to get veterans reinstated in civilian industry through the draft board machinery.

That machinery, of course, is composed of the 6,500 draft boards, the members of which have given prodigally of their time and services without compensation. It is not suggested that they should be asked to stay at their posts. If any members of the community deserve demobilization, it is these public-spirited citizens. But General Hershey seems to have persuaded them to take an interest in getting the veterans reinstated, and he has arranged to have a reemployment counselor attached to every board. Obviously these boards would be highly embarrassed, and the work of resettling the veterans would be retarded, if Selective Service were not kept above politics.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Wednesday next, after any previous special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. DILWEG. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a letter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague the gentleman from Montana [Mr. O'CONNOR] may be permitted to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include copy of a

keynote speech delivered by him at Lewiston, Mont., on September 9, 1944.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD, and to include therein copy of a resolution I have offered today, also an article entitled "The Lapsus Watchus," taken from the Washington Squirrel Cage, and also to include an editorial from the San Antonio Express.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

THE PEARL HARBOR CATASTROPHE

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I have today offered a resolution for an immediate congressional investigation of the greatest disaster that this Nation ever suffered, the Pearl Harbor catastrophe. The facts and allegations set forth in this resolution, and charges and innuendos published in numerous newspapers and magazines, make it mandatory for Congress to act with the utmost speed to ascertain the truth of the whole Pearl Harbor tragedy. The people have a right to be informed fully before the November election.

If the President of the United States is not responsible for this disaster, he should be cleared promptly of such grave and serious charges. On the other hand, if, as Commander in Chief of the armed forces, he has been culpable in directing our military activities in Hawaii, the American people should have the true facts before they are called upon to pass judgment on his fitness for reelection to a fourth term as President.

Three thousand eight hundred lives were lost at Pearl Harbor; thousands of others have been lost in the Pacific since that terrible day because we were rendered almost helpless and deprived of the fighting planes and vessels to resist the advancing Japs. The war with Japan has been unduly prolonged, and it is impossible to estimate the loss of lives and material yet to be suffered in the Pacific partly, if not altogether, due to the stupid and criminal negligence of someone in high office.

Whereas on January 27, 1942, Prime Minister Winston Churchill, addressing the House of Commons, said:

"But this question, serious and large as it is by itself, cannot be wholly decided without some attempt to answer the further question, What was the likelihood of the far eastern theater being thrown into war by a Japanese attack. I have explained how very delicately we walked, and how painful it was at times, how very careful I was every time that we should not be exposed single-handed to this onslaught which we were utterly incapable of meeting. * * *

"On the other hand, the probability, since the Atlantic conference, at which I discussed these matters with Mr. Roosevelt, that the United States, even if not herself attacked would come into a war in the Far East, and thus make final victory sure, seemed to allay some of the anxieties. That expectation has not been falsified by the events. It fortified our British decision to use our limited resources on the actual fighting fronts. As time went on, one had greater assurance that if Japan ran amok in the Pacific, we should not fight alone,"; and

Whereas the Atlantic conferences wherein assurances were given as set forth in the above paragraph took place in the month of August, 1941; and

Whereas if for no other reason that the giving of such assurance and the reasonable possibility that they would in some way reach the ears of Japan, with the result that the Japanese would reasonably be expected to begin plans at once not only for increased defense but also for such a surprise attack as that which occurred at Pearl Harbor on December 7, 1941, all possible precautions against attack should have been taken promptly and maintained constantly and every conceivable measure taken for strengthening the defenses of the Nation, both continental and territorial; and

Whereas Ambassador Joseph C. Grew in Tokyo gave repeated warnings to the State Department and the White House as early as January 27, 1941, of the possibility of Japan's adopting measures with dramatic and dangerous suddenness which might make inevitable a war with the United States, and again on November 3, 1941, he cabled the State Department to watch for Japan's moving to war with dramatic and dangerous suddenness, and finally on November 17, 1941, warned that Japan might attack us by surprise in regions not involved in Chino-Japanese conflict; and

Whereas it was stated on the floor of the House, "It has been frequently reported here in Washington and in the public press, that the Korean Independence Group, not only in October, but on frequent other occasions, fruitlessly sought to call the attention of somebody in the American Government to the fact that the Korean underground had complete plans of the Japanese intended attack"; and

Whereas it has been stated on the floor of the House that there is evidence "that 72 hours before the attack on Pearl Harbor, the Australian Government advised the American Government in Washington that an aircraft carrier task force of the Japanese Navy had been sighted by Australian reconnaissance headed toward Pearl Harbor; that our Government was notified again 48 hours before the attack that this Japanese task force was still in progress toward Hawaii and the same notification was sent 24 hours before Pearl Harbor"; and

Whereas on November 29, 1941, Secretary of State Hull conferred with the British Ambassador and stated, "The diplomatic part of our relations with Japan was virtually over and the matter will now go to the officials of the Army and Navy," and further that, "Japan may move suddenly and with every possible element of surprise and spread out over considerable areas and capture certain positions and posts before the peaceful countries interested in the Pacific would have time to confer and formulate plans to meet these new conditions," and

Whereas it is recorded that due to the critical state of affairs between our Government and the Japanese Government, and the imminence of an attack by the Japanese, the President of the United States sent a message direct to the Emperor of Japan; and

Whereas it has been alleged that Admiral James E. Richardson, commander in chief of the Pacific Fleet in 1941, was relieved of his command by the President of the United States for failure to comply with Presidential orders to keep the fleet more frequently concentrated within Pearl Harbor, that policy having been insisted upon by the Japanese Government; and that Admiral Husband E. Kimmel, who was assigned to succeed him, did comply with such orders, whereby the destruction of the fleet by Japanese bombing resulted; and

Whereas it has been charged on the floor of the House that the Pacific Fleet was kept in Pearl Harbor at the insistence of the Japanese Government; and

Whereas it is alleged that between September and November 1941, after Admiral Richardson had been removed from command of the fleet at Pearl Harbor, a high-ranking naval officer called at the White House and urged the President to evacuate the fleet from Pearl Harbor, pointing to the surprise attack of Japan on the Russian naval base in the Russo-Japanese War as a warning analogy; yet the fleet remained in Pearl Harbor despite this and other warnings; and

Whereas it is stated that Lt. Gen. Walter C. Short repeatedly asked the War Department for additional men and equipment, and for priorities and critical supplies, in view of the imminence of danger, emphasizing the urgent need of the aircraft warning system in Honolulu, the absence of essential portions of which was set forth in the report of the Committee on Military Affairs; and

Whereas it has been reported to the House by its Committee on Military Affairs that the construction of the aircraft warning system and the construction of highly secret national defense projects in the Hawaiian and South Pacific areas were let to one Hans Wilhelm Rohl, a German alien until September 15, 1941, and that there were unexplained delays, confusion and lack of planning in the construction of such defense projects prior to December 7, 1941, and that the said Hans Wilhelm Rohl had access to the secret plans and specifications of these projects prior to the time he became a citizen of the United States; and

Whereas as a result of an order by Harry L. Hopkins of the Munitions Assignment Board, 250 of the 300 PBY airplanes promised to Admiral Kimmel just prior to the attack on Pearl Harbor were diverted to Great Britain, whereby our Navy was unable to conduct, for the protection of the fleet, an adequate 360 degree reconnaissance of the area around the Hawaiian Islands; and

Whereas it is alleged to have been common talk in the War and Navy Departments in Washington that Japan planned to attack our Pacific bases by surprise and that an agreement existed between Japan and Germany that Germany would declare war on us within 1 week after the Japanese attack on our Pacific bases; and

Whereas it is alleged that at no time prior to the attack on Pearl Harbor were General Short and Admiral Kimmel adequately warned or given the information in the hands of the President and the Secretary of State concerning the preparation by the Japanese of an attack upon Pearl Harbor; and

Whereas it is alleged that Lieutenant General Short received a message from the Chief of Staff in Washington about 8 hours after the Japanese attack stating that the Government in Washington expected a Japanese ultimatum at 1:30 p. m., December 7, 1941, and the Government had learned very confidentially that instructions were sent out from the Japanese Government to all Japanese emissaries in this hemisphere to destroy the code; that this message was sent at 1:30 a. m., December 7, from Washington, which was about 6 hours before the attack, but was not delivered to General Short until 2:30 p. m., December 7, approximately 7 hours after the attack occurred; and

Whereas it is alleged that at about 9 p. m., December 6, 1941, the night before the attack, the Army dispatched 12 B-24 bombers from San Francisco to Honolulu for use in the general defense of the islands; that these bombers were sent with their defense equipment completely inoperative and arrived that way in Honolulu about half an hour

after the attack started; that several of them were shot down and the crews killed; and

Whereas it is alleged that the Army had been flying bombers from San Francisco to Honolulu in this same manner prior to this date and Lieutenant General Short had vigorously protested against the flights being made without the proper defense mechanism but his protests were unheeded; and

Whereas it is reported that on Saturday night, December 6, 1941, a ship sailed from San Francisco bound for Singapore and points west; that on Sunday morning, December 7, the passengers awoke to find the ship's engines stilled and back at their dock in San Francisco; and

Whereas it has been stated on the floor of the House that the Roberts report had been "doctored at the White House and that parts referring to orders to stop watching the Japs deleted," and it is further alleged that the President of the United States has suppressed and declined to make public the full Roberts report; and

Whereas Admiral Kimmel has publicly stated that the report of the Roberts committee does not contain "the basic truths" of the disaster and that the Nation will be amazed by the true story; and

Whereas Lieutenant General Short and Admiral Kimmel have not been court martialed, nor have official charges been filed against them within the period of the 2-year statute of limitations, dating from the commission of the alleged offense, and that said offenses, if any, are now barred by the statute of limitations, and that resolutions of Congress attempting to extend the period of the statute of limitations in these cases are of doubtful constitutionality, and that the only way in which the people may learn the truth of Pearl Harbor is by a congressional investigation; and

Whereas Lieutenant General Short and Admiral Kimmel have both indicated a desire to appear publicly before an official tribunal or a committee of Congress; and

Whereas it has been repeatedly charged on the floor of the House of Representatives that the Pearl Harbor disaster of December 7, 1941, which resulted in the loss of 3,800 American lives and the practical destruction of our Pacific Fleet, was due to the culpability and criminal negligence of someone to whom the safety of the country had been entrusted; and

Whereas it is the desire of Congress and the demand of the American people that the blame of this, the greatest catastrophe that ever occurred to the United Sates, be fixed: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Speaker of the House be, and is hereby, authorized to appoint a special committee of five members for the purpose of conducting an investigation of these charges; and that this committee shall within 30 days report its findings to the people of the United States through their duly elected House of Representatives; and be it further

Resolved, That this special committee shall have the power to subpena all records of the State, War, and Navy Departments and the White House, and any person or document, bearing on the Pearl Harbor disaster, whether these records were prepared prior or subsequent to December 7, 1941; and it shall have the power to subpena all military and naval personnel whose current locations are not necessary to the war effort.

The expenses of the committee, which shall not exceed $5,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the House, upon vouchers approved by the chairman.

[From Washington Squirrel Cage]

THE LAPSUS WATCHUS

This chapter is too serious to sugarcoat with verbological bon mots.

It is the story, pieced together with facts at hand and tied in with the logic of events, of why 3,000 American boys were needlessly slaughtered at Pearl Harbor by the Japrat sneaks on the morning of December 7, 1941.

It is the story of why our Hawaiian defense forces deliberately left the island undefended upon orders from Washington.

It is the story of history's biggest sucker—a man whose itch to belong to the ages has prolonged the war in the Pacific at least 1 year.

It is the story of why this war will cost the taxpayers an extra hundred billion and why 100,000 more American boys may be killed and maimed in the Pacific end of it.

It is the story of why the political scapegoats of the affair—Admiral Kimmel and General Short—have not yet been court-martialed for their part in this lapsus watchus crime.

And it is the story of why their super-Commander in Chief will not permit them to be given a fair and open hearing until after the close of his fourth-term campaign on November 7, 1944.

Frankly, our armed forces at Pearl Harbor and Schofield Barracks were trapped, caught with their guards down upon orders from Washington. The reason: Their super-Commander in Chief was so egotistical and incredibly naive as to let the Japanese envoys sell him a 1941 version of the Trojan horse.

On Saturday night, December 6, 1941, a ship sailed from San Francisco, bound for Singapore and points west. On the passenger list of the ship were a number of consular and diplomatic officers and personnel of the United States.

On Sunday morning, December 7, the passengers awoke to find the ship's engines stilled and the vessel apparently becalmed. Those with outside rooms looked through their portholes and were amazed that they were back at their dock in San Francisco. No explanation was forthcoming from the ship's officers.

At approximately 1 o'clock that afternoon they knew the answer. Newspaper extras and radio flashes told them that the Japanese had, for some reason, attacked both Pearl Harbor and Manila. As the news was pieced together the consular officers thanked their lucky stars that they were working under a Cabinet officer who knew what the score was.

Secretary Hull had heeded the warnings and knew that the Japs were actually on their way to the attack. Secretaries Stimson and Knox were apparently sound asleep and their commanders at Hawaii were obeying their orders. Instead of a Japanese disaster on their foolish venture it was the Americans who suffered a disaster—a terrible one and a disgraceful one.

Secretary Hull had been getting accurate reports from his representative in Tokyo—Ambassador Grew. He had been passing them on, of course, to the President to be passed on to the War and Navy Departments.

As early as January 27, 1941, Mr. Grew reported to the State Department that the Japanese military forces were planning a surprise attack on Pearl Harbor, our great naval bastion hard by Honolulu in the Mid-Pacific, in case of trouble with the United States.

On August 26, 1941, Mr. Roosevelt returned from an oceanic conference with Prime Minister Churchill. Later events indicated that his purpose was to get the King's orders as to what American arms should do to protect the British rubber and oil investments in Malaya and the Dutch East Indies.

On August 27, 1941, he sent an ultimatum to Japan along lines laid down for the benefit of the British investments. This ultimatum was kept secret from the American people and the American Congress and only leaked out months after the crime of Pearl Harbor by way of London. A well press-agented red-herring was drawn across the trail of this secret ultimatum by use of the words "Atlantic Charter" and the overpublicization of this myth.

Ambassador Grew then vainly tried to get the President to consent to an audience in Washington with Prince Konoye, the Japanese Prime Minister. Failing, he wrote an appealing letter on September 30 in which he said "It is not appeasement that I now advocate, but constructive conciliation."

On November 3—5 weeks before the Lapsus Watchus—Grew cabled the State Department to watch for Japan moving to war with dramatic and dangerous suddenness.

On November 17 he cabled the State Department urging vigilance against sudden Japanese naval or military attack in "regions not involved in Chino-Japanese conflict."

On both November 25 and November 29 Secretary Hull warned the President of the critical nature of United States-Japanese relations. Fearing that his warnings were falling on deaf (or dumb) ears Secretary Hull disclosed to the British Ambassador in Washington that diplomatic negotiations with Japan had virtually ended, and that United States-Japanese relations were passing to the Army and Navy. This was on November 29.

It is a known fact that some sort of instructions went out from Washington November 27, 1941, to the Army and Navy commanders in Hawaii. As a result of these instructions the defenses of the island were taken off the No. 3 alert (ready for anything) and put on the No. 1 alert (watch out for acts of sabotage within the island only).

The link in this picture which had been missing since the morning of December 7, 1941, was supplied by a Democrat of high position and long standing in Washington—one who was a voting and working Democrat when Franklin Roosevelt and Wendell Willkie didn't know what they were. His information came from a source that is hardly impeachable and it fits into the rest of the known facts like the last scrap of a jigsaw puzzle.

The Army and Navy had been heeding the warnings of Ambassador Grew for weeks and maintaining a close watch on all avenues of attack by the Japanese. Baron Nomura and his partner came to Washington in November, and the first thing they did was to tell our gullible President that this alertness was irritating the Japanese people and making difficult the task of Tojo's plenipotentiaries.

Nomura told Mr. Roosevelt that this close watch was embarrassing them, it indicated suspicion and ill feeling toward Japan, and that if the watch was "lowered" and an attitude of confidence in Japan displayed their task of averting war would be much easier.

History's biggest sucker swallowed the bait and lowered our watch, after telling Mr. Churchill that he was "babying Japan along," and the American people that "every man is at his battle station from Singapore to Honolulu."

Then the Japrats struck, and Mr. Churchill had accomplished his purpose of getting the vast industrial resources and cannon fodder of the United States openly into England's war against Germany.

The ease with which the incredibly naive Mr. Roosevelt was fooled gave the Japs a distorted picture of the American people. It made them unduly cocky. That was apparently why a bombastic Japanese admiral boasted that he would dictate the terms of peace in Mr. Roosevelt's own boudoir.

Had our Hawaiian forces still been on the No. 3 alert, divided command or not, they could have annihilated the attacking Japanese planes before they reached their objective, followed this up by sinking the Japanese carriers and destroyers which were lurking off the islands and changed the whole picture of the war in the Pacific.

It would have been Japan that was crippled—not the United States. Lacking our resources, Japan would have been polished off in a few months, for during the Roosevelt administration, 1933 to 1940, Department of Commerce figures show that we sent Japan 10,164,844 tons (not pounds) of

scrap metal to be made into bullets and planes and tanks and ships with which to kill Americans. To make the picture all the more ludicrous we shipped 2,573,202 tons of scrap metal to Italy during the same period.

Two years later we were caught shipping vast quantities of gasoline (millions of American motorists were walking because of it) to the Spanish Dictator Franco with no safeguards against his transshipping it to his ally Hitler, which is just what he was doing. Two hundred thousand barrels left one port (Philadelphia) in one single week consigned to the Axis stooge, Franco.

On the exact hour he started his fourth term campaign, Mr. Roosevelt began to pose as a "war director." He visited west coast naval bases, Pacific defenses and conspicuously conferred with real war leaders, all for the purpose of creating the illusion that he was a red hot Commander in Chief, busily engaged in winning the war for us. But he assiduously refrained from mentioning the one piece of directing he did, directing that our defenses of the Hawaiian Islands be withdrawn on November 27, 1941.

Before the res gestae had lapsed, it was so obvious that American higher-ups were even more to blame for the disaster than the Japs, that a commission headed by Supreme Court Justice Roberts was sent to Hawaii to investigate.

The Roberts Commission did its work, returned to Washington and rendered a report which—as published—left much to be guessed at. Its net result was the dismissal from their commands of Admiral Kimmel and General Short, and their "retirement" on munificent pensions of $6,000 a year.

Congressman SHORT, of Missouri (no relation to the general), charged in open session that the Roberts report was doctored at the White House, and that part referring to orders to stop watching the Japs deleted. No official denial of this damning charge has yet emanated from any high quarter.

But there two are high-type men and the suspicion that has been cast upon them by the Roberts report has preyed on their minds. Their lifetime of training has been dominated by the theory that we should always be ready for just such a day. It is unthinkable that they should have gone to sleep on that particular occasion. It could hardly have been a coincidence.

So Admiral Kimmel, unable to stand it any longer, risked being cashiered of his $6,000 pension by writing to Senator FERGUSON, of the Senate Judiciary Committee, asking for a free, open, and public court martial. Evidently his request to the Navy Department and the White House had been turned down.

With sentiment in Congress and all over the country demanding a court martial, the administrationites in Congress succeeded in quieting down this demand when the White House announced that these men would be tried on December 7, 1944—30 days after their super-Commander in Chief had gone before the electorate in his quest for a fourth term.

This action on his part indicates that he knows a fair, open, and impartial trial of Kimmel and Short will reveal the real reason for the "lapsus watchus" and that an angered American public will swamp him at the polls.

[From the San Antonio Express of September 13, 1944]

HARNESS' CHARGES IN THE KIMMEL-SHORT CASE

It appears increasingly clear that more than national security considerations underlie administration reluctance to court martial Rear Admiral Husband E. Kimmel and Maj. Gen. Walter C. Short—respectively commanding Navy and Army forces at Hawaii when Pearl Harbor was attacked.

More than one public official has asserted that the administration fears a court martial's revelations. Both Admiral Kimmel and General Short have demanded such a trial, in public, to clear their names. They have assured the citizenry that their names would be cleared and the people amazed.

Now, Representative FOREST A. HARNESS, of Indiana, becomes the latest national official to turn up with information reputedly bearing on the situation, and with a demand that the court martial be held immediately. He claims to have evidence that Australia notified the War and Navy Departments at Washington, 72 hours in advance of the Pearl Harbor attack, that a Japanese task force was on its way—and that the Departments did not so notify the Hawaiian ocmmanders.

General Short additionally lately asserted Washington's dilatoriness—apparently on the theory that he has nothing more to lose. He may also be indulging in retaliation for the Departments' contentions that they notified the commanders long in advance that Japan might attack at "any moment."

The point for the administration is that with both those officers becoming more outspoken in their charges and demands, and reinforced therein by more than one Washington official, further dilly-dallying in the matter is sure to react adversely on the Commander in Chief.

The second point is that when the court martial shall be held, it must be public. No one in Washington must be permitted to push Kimmel and Short under without trace.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend the remarks I made today and to include therein a letter from the Governor of California.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a short article from the Fort Wayne News Sentinel.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

(Mr. KNUTSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.)

LUMBER DIVISION OF WAR PRODUCTION BOARD

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, recently we were advised that Mr. Donald Nelson, head of the War Production Board, had left the W. P. B. to take an extensive trip to China and it is to be regretted that he did not take a lot of minor executives of the Lumber Division of the War Production Board along with him.

I am in receipt of a letter from the Rockland Township Schools, Venango County, Rockland, Pa., in which they advise me that their high-school vocational agricultural shop and bus garage burned down last December. They are now striving to rebuild the school before the winter sets in so that they can provide the children with the school facilities to which they are entitled and give housing to the school busses, all of this before the snow flies.

Their letter reads, and I quote:

We have been stalled, however, because the W. P. B. prohibits us the use of wood sheathing for the roof of our proposed building, a cement block building 42 by 109 feet, consisting of nine bus stalls, five of which are to be used as vocational agriculture classroom and shop. Contractors tell us that no substitute for wood sheathing is satisfactory. We are allowed to use up to 23,000 feet of lumber, which includes all the heavy pieces, as 2 by 10 inches and 2 by 12 inches. We need only 10,000 feet of this type and 8,500 feet of 2-inch wood sheathing, totaling 18,500 feet, well under the 23,000-foot maximum.

The lumber yards in Oil City have enough 2-inch sheathing on hand for us if we are allowed to purchase same.

Contrast this now with the private apartment house project here in Washington, now being completed for the exclusive use of naval executives, patterned along the lines of a tomato can, for which materials for this project were obtained, according to a newspaper article, from the W. P. B. because of the experimental possibilities.

The article states that the "tomato can" building, both inside and outside, looks nautical and masculine and that it was designed for comfort. Each bedroom has single innerspring beds, with washable corduroy spreads, a wash basin, complete with mirror, light, and a plug for an electric razor, desk, chest of drawers, wardrobe, medicine closet, single chair, and four mirrors.

It goes on to say that along the entire side of one-half of each room is a large dun-colored map of the world, and when priorities permit, each room will be equipped with a telephone.

Color schemes for the rooms were arranged with the male guests in mind. No pinks or lavenders or light blues. Some are in bright blue, some in green and yellow, some in deep rose, and some in dark red. All have spice-colored rugs and cream walls.

It also goes on to state that the basement, reached by a separate entrance, consists of one large room with a tempered-glass floor space for dancing, wall space for the showing of movies, and space enough for a large dinner party or for game equipment to be put up. Leading off from this room is the kitchen with its oversized stove, refrigerator, and electric dishwasher. Through another hallway is the ladies' room—only feminine touch in the building, decorated in light green and dubonnet.

But the pay-off comes when we get down further in the story where it states:

That another light touch is the dry refrigerator. We got one that keeps the inside of the refrigerator dry, so that in case the admiral calls for a beer and the waitress is in a hurry and forgets to wipe it; why the bottle is dry.

Would not the boys out in the fox holes in the South Pacific enjoy that luxurious, unique tomato-can apartment?

Now compare this story with a little schoolhouse in rural Pennsylvania. Here is a group of honest patriotic Americans trying to get enough lumber to finish their building so as to educate the youth

of America and fortify them with the necessary weapons to take their place in life. They are stalled with a maze of bureaucratic red tape, and they cannot get 2-inch wood sheathing although it is available to complete their job before winter snows are upon them; although the apartment project here in Washington can get the materials under the guise that it has experimental possibilities.

Certainly I can understand why Donald Nelson was glad to get off to China and Charles E. Wilson was glad to get back to his General Electric Co.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MANASCO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks on the conference report on the surplus property bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague the gentleman from New York [Mr. COLE] be permitted to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address by Clarence Budington Kelland.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include certain proceedings before committees of the House.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD in two instances.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include two brief editorials.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an article by R. O. Lawton.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD in two instances; in one to include a newspaper advertisement and in the other, a letter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD in three instances, and include editorials on the subject of relations between the United States and Soviet Russia, appearing in the California Union Labor News.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an article from our home newspaper.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a resolution passed at the fifth annual convention of the Polish Civilian War Relief Unit, a chapter of the Red Cross, of Chicago, Ill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MILLER] be permitted to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wyoming?

There was no objection.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a short quotation, and an article from the Washington Herald.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD in three instances; in the first to include a Constitution Day address by the Honorable Maury Maverick; in the second, an editorial from the Washington Times-Herald of a few days ago; and in the third, an editorial which appeared in the Merced Sun a few days ago.

The SPEAKER. In there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I have two unanimous consent requests to make; first, that I may extend my remarks in the RECORD and, second to restore to the Private Calendar the bill S. 1477, for the relief of Carl M. Frasure. I have taken the matter up with the leaders on both sides and they are in accord.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. GAMBLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD in two instances, and include in each an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask that on tomorrow, at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day and following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wyoming?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. OUTLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include in each certain excerpts.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include certain excerpts.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. GORE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend by remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial appearing in the Dayton Daily News.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. OUTLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that tomorrow, at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day and following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. GORE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that today, following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LYNDON B. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include certain excerpts.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an article by Rev. Frank J. Niles of Indianapolis, Ind.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. GERLACH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an address delivered by me.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD in two instances; in the first, to include a letter, and in the second, to include a radio address.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

(Mr. COMPTON and Mr. HERTER asked and were given permission to extend their remarks in the RECORD.)

Mr. MONKIEWICZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include resolutions adopted by the United Polish Societies of Hartford, Conn.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. CLEVENGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD in two instances.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. MURRAY] be permitted to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN] be permitted to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and to include articles in each.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, and further to extend my remarks and include a poem from Labor magazine.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow, at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day and following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Idaho?

There was no objection.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow, following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

AMENDING NAVAL RESERVE ACT

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, since objecting a few minutes ago to the immediate consideration of the bill, S. 2028, several members of the Committe on Naval Affairs have spoken to me and have explained satisfactorily the content of that particular measure.

Because a similar measure has passed this House on two previous occasions and because this Senate measure is simply a restriction on the former measure passed by the House, I see no particular objection to it. It simply permits the SPARS, the WAVES, and the MARINES in the naval service, on their own request, voluntarily, to be allowed to go to the Aleutians, Hawaii, or the Canal Zone, to act more or less in the capacity of medical corpsmen or as nurses to relieve many men in those theaters of war.

Because of these provisions, I think there should be no discrimination between any women in our armed services. Personally, I have never been convinced that it is a wise thing to send any of the women in our armed services abroad, but since the WACS are already permitted to go, I am perfectly willing to allow the SPARS, WAVES, and MARINES to go also.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I object to the consideration of the bill.

The SPEAKER. No request is pending at this time.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. Speaker, I am grateful to the gentleman from Missouri for his explanation.

Mr. SHORT. I should like the gentleman from Washington to verify whether or not my understanding of the bill as stated is correct.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The gentleman's understanding is exactly correct.

May I say to the House that the main purpose of this bill is to fill a great need, particularly in the Hawaiian area and the Aleutian area, for hospital corpsmen. Women can do those jobs much better than men, who are now stationed there. I only hope that on tomorrow or the next succeeding day, when this bill is brought up again, there will be no objection.

INVESTIGATION OF PEARL HARBOR DISASTER

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include an article from the Philadelphia Inquirer, under date of September 15, and an editorial from that newspaper under date of September 17, together with a resolution I have introduced.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, because the rules of the House do not permit two Members to offer the same resolution jointly, I have today, after consultation with the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HARNESS], offered precisely the same resolution as offered by him in which it is proposed that an immediate congressional investigation be held of the Pearl Harbor tragedy. I make no effort to prejudge any of the allegations or any of the rumors which are now so widely prevalent, but it seems to me, in simple justice to the American people and to those officers who have not been court martialed, the whole matter should be brought to an early termination. The public should have the facts. I may further comment that the Pearl Harbor tragedy has reached the proportions of a national scandal. We ought to have the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, and we ought to have it without further delay.

The resolution referred to is as follows:

Whereas on January 27, 1942, Prime Minister Winston Churchill, addressing the House of Commons, said:

"But this question, serious and large as it is by itself, cannot be wholly decided without some attempt to answer the further question, what was the likelihood of the far eastern theater being thrown into war by a Japanese attack, I have explained how very delicately we walked, and how painful it was at times, how very careful I was every time that we should not be exposed single-handed to this onslaught which we were utterly incapable of meeting * * *.

"On the other hand, the probability, since the Atlantic Conference, at which I discussed these matters with Mr. Roosevelt, that the United States, even if not herself attacked would come into a war in the Far East, and thus make final victory sure, seemed to allay some of the anxieties. That expectation has not been falsified by the events. It fortified our British decision to use our limited resources on the actual fighting fronts. As time went on, one had greater assurance that if Japan ran amok in the Pacific, we should not fight alone"; and

Whereas the Atlantic Conference wherein assurances were given as set forth in the above paragraph took place in the month of August 1941, and

Whereas if for no other reason than the giving of such assurance and the reasonable possibility that they would in some way reach the care of Japan, with the result that the Japanese would reasonably be expected to begin plans at once not only for increased defense but also for such a surprise attack as that which occurred at Pearl Harbor on December 7, 1941, all possible precautions

against attack should have been taken promptly and maintained constantly and every conceivable measure taken for strengthening the defenses of the Nation, both continental and territorial; and

Whereas Ambassador Joseph C. Grew in Tokyo gave repeated warnings to the State Department and the White House as early as January 27, 1941, "of the possibility of Japan's adopting measures with dramatic and dangerous suddenness which might make inevitable a war with the United States", and again on November 3, 1941, he cabled the State Department to watch for "Japan's moving to war with dramatic and dangerous suddenness", and finally on November 17, 1941, warned that Japan might attack us by surprise "in regions not involved in Chino-Japanese conflict"; and

Whereas it was stated on the floor of the House, "It has been frequently reported here in Washington and in the public press, that the Korean Independence Group, not only in October, but on frequent other occasions, fruitlessly sought to call the attention of somebody in the American Government to the fact that the Korean underground had complete plans of the Japanese intended attack"; and

Whereas it had been stated on the floor of the House that there is evidence "that 72 hours before the attack on Pearl Harbor, the Australian Government advised the American Government in Washington that an aircraft carrier task force of the Japanese Navy had been sighted by Australian reconnaissance headed toward Pearl Harbor; that our Government was notified again 48 hours before the attack that this Japanese task force was still in progress toward Hawaii and the same notification was sent 24 hours before Pearl Harbor"; and

Whereas on November 29, 1941, Secertary of State Hull conferred with the British Ambassador and stated, "The diplomatic part of our relations with Japan was virtually over and the matter will now go to the officials of the Army and Navy," and further that, "Japan may move suddenly and with every possible element of surprise and spread out over considerable areas and capture certain positions and posts before the peaceful countries interested in the Pacific would have time to confer and formulate plans to meet these conditions"; and

Whereas it is recorded that due to the critical state of affairs between our Government and the Japanese Government, and the imminence of an attack by the Japanese, the President of the United States sent a message direct to the Emperor of Japan; and

Whereas it has been alleged that Admiral James E. Richardson, Commander in Chief of the Pacific Fleet in 1941, was relieved of his command by the President of the United States for failure to comply with Presidential orders to keep the fleet more frequently concentrated within Pearl Harbor, that policy having been insisted upon by the Japanese Government; and that Admiral Husband E. Kimmel, who was assigned to succeed him did comply with such orders, whereby the destruction of the fleet by Japanese bombing resulted; and

Whereas it has been charged on the floor of the House that the Pacific Fleet was kept in Pearl Harbor at the insistence of the Japanese Government; and

Whereas it is alleged that between September and November, 1941, after Admiral Richardson had been removed from command of the fleet at Pearl Harbor, a high ranking naval officer called at the White House and urged the President to evacuate the fleet from Pearl Harbor, pointing to the surprise attack of Japan on the Russian naval base in the Russo-Japanese War as a warning analogy; yet the fleet remained in Pearl Harbor despite this and other warnings; and

Whereas it is stated that Lt. Gen. Walter C. Short repeatedly asked the War Department for additional men and equipment, and for priorities and critical supplies, in view of the imminence of danger, emphasizing the urgent need of the aircraft warning system in Honlulu, the absence of essential portions of which was set forth in the report of the Committee on Military Affairs; and

Whereas it has been reported to the House by its Committee on Military Affairs that the construction of the aircraft warning system and the construction of highly secret National defense projects in the Hawaiian and South Pacific areas were let to one Hans Wilhelm Rohl, a German alien until September 15, 1941, and that there were unexplained delays, confusion and lack of planning in the construction of such defense projects prior to December 7, 1941, and that the said Hans Wilhelm Rohl had access to the secret plans and specifications of these projects prior to the time he became a citizen of the United States; and

Whereas, as a result of an order by Harry L. Hopkins of the Munitions Assignment Board, 250 of the 300 PBY airplanes promised to Admiral Kimmel just prior to the attack on Pearl Harbor were diverted to Great Britain, whereby our Navy was unable to conduct, for the protection of the fleet, an adequate 360 degree reconnaissance of the area around the Hawaiian Islands; and

Whereas it is alleged to have been common talk in the War and Navy Departments in Washington that Japan planned to attack our Pacific bases by surprise and that an agreement existed between Japan and Germany that Germany would declare war on us within 1 week after the Japanese attack on our Pacific bases; and

Whereas it is alleged that at no time prior to the attack on Pearl Harbor were General Short and Admiral Kimmel adequately warned or given the information in the hands of the President and the Secretary of State concerning the preparation by the Japanese of an attack upon Pearl Harbor; and

Whereas it is alleged that Lieutenant General Short received a message from the Chief of Staff in Washington about eight hours after the Japanese attack stating that the Government in Washington expected a Japanese ultimatum at 1:30 p. m., December 7, 1941, and the Government had learned very confidentially that instructions were sent out from the Japanese Government to all Japanese emissaries in this hemisphere to destroy the code; that this message was sent at 1:30 a. m., December 7 from Washington, which was about six hours before the attack, but was not delivered to General Short until 2:30 p. m., December 7, approximately seven hours after the attack occurred; and

Whereas it is alleged that at about 9:00 p. m. December 6, 1941, the night before the attack, the Army dispatched 12 B-24 bombers from San Francisco to Honolulu for use in the general defense of the islands; that these bombers were sent with their defense equipment completely inoperative and arrived that way in Honolulu about half an hour after the attack started; that several of them were shot down and the crews killed; and

Whereas it is alleged that the Army had been flying bombers from San Francisco to Honolulu in this same manner prior to this date and Lieutenant General Short had vigorously protested against the flights being made without the proper defense mechanism but his protests were unheeded; and

Whereas it is reported that on Saturday night, December 6, 1941, a ship sailed from San Francisco bound for Singapore and points west; that on Sunday morning, December 7, the passengers awoke to find the ship's engines stilled and back at their dock in San Francisco; and

Whereas it has been stated on the floor of the House that the Roberts report had been "doctored at the White House and that parts referring to orders to stop watching the Japs deleted," and it is further alleged that the President of the United States has suppressed and declined to make public the full Roberts report; and

Whereas Admiral Kimmel has publicly stated that the report of the Roberts committee does not contain the "basic truths" of the disaster and that the Nation will be amazed by the true story; and

Whereas Lieutenant General Short and Admiral Kimmel have not been court-martialed, nor have official charges been filed against them within the period of the 2-year Statute of Limitations dating from the commission of the alleged offense, and that said offenses, if any, are now barred by the Statute of Limitations, and that resolutions of Congress attempting to extend the period of the Statute of Limitations in these cases are of doubtful constitutionality, and that the only way in which the people may learn the truth of Pearl Harbor is by a congressional investigation; and

Whereas Lieutenant General Short and Admiral Kimmel have both indicated a desire to appear publicly before an official tribunal or a committee of Congress; and

Whereas it has been repeatedly charged on the floor of the House of Representatives that the Pearl Harbor disaster of December 7, 1941, which resulted in the loss of 3,800 American lives and the practical destruction of our Pacific Fleet, was due to the culpability and criminal negligence of someone to whom the safety of the country had been entrusted; and

Whereas it is the desire of Congress and the demand of the American people that the blame of this, the greatest catastrophe that ever occurred to the United States, be fixed: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Speaker of the House be, and is hereby, authorized to appoint a special committee of five Members for the purpose of conducting an investigation of these charges; and that this committee shall within 30 days report its findings to the people of the United States through their duly elected House of Representatives; and be it further

Resolved, That this special committee shall have the power to subpena all records of the State, War, and Navy Departments and the White House, and any person or document bearing on the Pearl Harbor disaster, whether these records were prepared prior or subsequent to Decembe 7, 1941; and it shall have the power to subpena all military and naval personnel whose current locations are not necessary to the war effort.

The expenses of the committee, which shall not exceed $5,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the House, upon vouchers approved by the chairman.

The article and editorial referred to are as follows:

[From the Philadelphia Inquirer of September 15, 1944]

PEARL HARBOR TRUTH TO BE MADE PUBLIC—CAPITAL LEADERS SAY FACTS CLEAR KIMMEL, SHORT

(By Hugh Morrow)

WASHINGTON, September 14.—The "whole story" of the Pearl Harbor catastrophe has leaked out despite rigid White House censorship. It is in the hands of President Roosevelt's political opponents and shortly will be told to the Nation—at least that part which does not involve national security.

"It is a story far more shocking than the public now suspects—a story which will completely clear Rear Admiral Husband E. Kimmel and Maj. Gen. Walter C. Short, the Pearl

Harbor commanders at the time of the Jap attack which plunged this Nation into war.

"WHITE HOUSE INVOLVED

"Instead, the blame for the greatest military disaster in American history will be charged to five men in Washington—involving the White House, the Army and the Navy—for alleged failure to transmit vital information on time."

That is the gist of what I was told by multiple sources on Capitol Hill today, by both Senators and Representatives, Democrats and Republicans. They are all responsible men.

TO BE REVEALED

The only point of disagreement is on the question of who will "break" the story. Some say Gov. Thomas E. Dewey, the Republican candidate for President, will tell it to the Nation on a coast-to-coast hook-up in one of his forthcoming major campaign speeches. Some say it will be Gov. John W. Bricker, Vice Presidential candidate. There are even reports that a Democratic Senator, sometimes a new dealer, will be the man.

The purpose of telling the story now, with a national election less than 2 months distant, will frankly be political—to counteract Mr. Roosevelt's "Commander in Chief" candidacy.

"You won't hear another word about the Commander in Chief when this gets out," one source said.

"DESERVE DAY IN COURT"

But even among those Congressmen who feel that the subject is one which should not be made a political issue—and this includes some Republicans—there is a definite feeling that Admiral Kimmel and General Short long since should have had their day in court, since they are the men blamed in the Roberts report on the disaster.

The administration has refused to court-martial the two officers on the ground that national security is involved. From information I obtained today, I am convinced that this is absolutely true insofar as the most sensational part of the Pearl Harbor story is concerned.

But, one Member of Congress said; "There are many things which are just being withheld to avoid political embarrassment."

No one here professed to know whether anyone would go so far as to violate national security.

"It won't lose the war if it gets out," I was told, "but it won't help the war effort."

But, it was added, there are many things which can be told now that "won't hurt the war effort a bit, and the public has a right to know them."

TWO HELD NOT TO BLAME

One Senator told me that certain Army and Navy officers in very high posts were convinced that Admiral Kimmel and General Short were not to blame for Pearl Harbor. He added that these officers were nonpolitical professionals—graduates of West Point and Annapolis—with no ax to grind.

Army and Navy officials are at Pearl Harbor now, conducting an investigation ordered by act of Congress last June. Not until Congress ordered it was there any investigation other than that of the Roberts Commission, I was told, except for the taking of a few affidavits by the Navy. The Army did nothing, it was said.

COURTS MARTIAL LIKELY

The law directs the services to "proceed in accordance with the findings." This means courts martial for Admiral Kimmel and General Short if there is sufficient evidence to warrant such procedure.

However, there is a legal question involved as to whether the services could now court martial the two officers, or whether they could compel the services to court-martial them. Both officers are said to be desirous of being court-martialed at the earliest possible moment.

DEBATED IN HOUSE

For the past several weeks, virtually every day the House has been in session, at least one Republican has taken the floor and made a speech about Pearl Harbor. The sense of these speeches has been that Admiral Kimmel and General Short deserve an opportunity to clear their names if, in fact, they are not guilty, and that the real responsibility rests in Washington.

Observers have had a growing feeling that the persistence of this theme in the House was not accidental—that it was a build-up for something more sensational. It was this feeling, and this alone, that prompted me to start asking questions in the privacy of Congressional offices.

"PUNCH" WITHHELD

One of the Congressmen with whom I talked declared that the speeches thus far made "merely skirt around the story"—that while the implications were broader than those of the Roberts report, and therefore must be based on new information, the "punch" was being withheld.

One Congressman professed in his speech to be quoting a man who had been talking to General Short. It was also noted that Admiral Kimmel had issued a public statement recently denying a statement in a magazine article by Senator HARRY S. TRUMAN, the Democratic candidate for Vice President, that the two December 7, 1941, commanders at Pearl Harbor were not on speaking terms, and adding that the whole story of Pearl Harbor had not been told.

Charges have also been made on the House floor that only a part of the "real Roberts report" was made public, and that the Office of War Information had done the editing job.

One Congressman told me that Supreme Court Justice Owen J. Roberts, chairman of the Presidentially appointed commission which investigated the disaster, was said to have been stunned at what they left out of the report to the public.

Considerable doubt has been expressed that Admiral Kimmel and General Short ever will be court martialed. This doubt has been based on the suspicion that the administration wants the story hushed up permanently—a suspicion voiced by Republicans—but it has also been based on the complicated legislative and legal history of the case.

The statute of limitations expired December 7, 1943, in the Pearl Harbor case. Congress rushed through a bill at the last minute extending the statute 6 months in this case, but President Roosevelt did not sign the bill on or before December 7, 1943, because Congress didn't get it to the White House in time in the first place, and Mr. Roosevelt was in north Africa, anyway.

Last June 7, Congress again passed an extension bill, and under extraordinary procedure it went to the White House the same day. But Mr. Roosevelt did not sign that bill until June 13. This, incidentally, was the bill which also contained orders to the Army and Navy to begin investigating.

Therefore, technically speaking, the statute of limitations had twice expired.

[From the Philadelphia Inquirer of September 17, 1944]

TAKE THE LID OFF PEARL HARBOR

For nearly 3 years a lid has been clamped down tight upon the complete story of the disaster of Pearl Harbor.

It is time, in the interests of national security, that the lid be ripped off.

It is to be hoped that reports from Washington that the detailed facts of the debacle will soon be made public are borne out.

The ones who stand to gain most from maintaining the cloak of secrecy are those whose negligence and mistakes were to blame for our unpreparedness at the Hawaiian base.

The ones who stand to lose most are the American people, who are entitled to the whole truth, so that they can take the necessary steps to prevent recurrence of a terrible military catastrophe.

Surrounding the whole Pearl Harbor episode and the cases of the American commanders in Hawaii on that fateful day is the suspicion of many that the courts martial of Admiral Kimmel and General Short have been put off for partisan reasons.

The Roberts report, submitted in the month after Pearl Harbor, charged the Army and Navy commanders with "dereliction of duty."

Those officers, however, have never been given a chance to tell their side of the story. They have been muzzled. They have had to bear the onus of blame without an opportunity to disprove guilt. The treatment of these two high-ranking men has been directly contrary to the American spirit of fair play.

The argument employed by Washington to justify such tactics is the familiar one of military security.

This argument, nearly 3 years after Pearl Harbor has entered history, and after the Japs have been thrown back thousands of ocean miles to their own front yard, has taken on a very feeble appearance.

Any part of the Kimmel-Short story that might honestly violate national security in the telling could be left untold until a more appropriate time. But national security should not be confused with political security.

There are questions pressing for an answer: Whether, for instance, the real dereliction of duty was not so much Kimmel's and Short's as it was that of some higher-ups in Washington, who failed at a time of crisis. Why, additionally, our forces at the base were not on the alert at the moment of attack, why there was inadequate air patrol, why a major portion of the Pacific Fleet was crowded together at anchorage, offering convenient targets for the enemy's bombing attacks?

What about the reports, which naturally have been denied, that warnings had come from Australia of a Japanese naval force approaching the Hawaiian Islands? What about the reputed lack of supervision over the several hundred Jap consular agents on the islands prior to December 7, 1941?

And what about the report that portions of the original Roberts report were omitted in the version furnished for public consumption?

Army and Navy officials are now conducting an investigation finally ordered by Congress last June. Is there any good reason why their findings could not quickly be made public?

What are the reasons, other than political, for further depriving Kimmel and Short of an opportunity to state their case?

Saving persons in official Washington from embarrassment vanishes to insignificance beside the injustice inflicted upon the American people by locking up the true and complete story of Pearl Harbor.

Open it up.

HIS NAME IS DEWEY

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Vermont?

There was no objection.

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield to no man in my respect and administration for England's great statesman than whom it never had a greater. I am genuinely appreciative of the part he has played in this war as the dominating

force and of the genius that is his to compel others to follow where he undertakes to lead.

However, Mr. Speaker, while all I have said is true, it is true that even the gods nod at times, and Winston Churchill was obviously asleep when he undertook by innuendo to try to tell the American people to reelect Franklink D. Roosevelt as President.

We will not "clear everything through Sidney Hillman" nor through Winston Churchill. We will elect our own President without suggestion or advice from Mr. Churchill or anybody else. Incidentally, his name will be Dewey.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks and include an editorial from the Brattleboro Reformer.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Vermont?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WORLEY] is recognized for 30 minutes.

There was no objection.

JOAQUIN M. ELIZALDE

Mr. WORLEY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to avail myself of this opportunity to pay tribute to a Filipino who is probably the most successful Representative the Philippines ever sent to this Congress, the recently resigned Commissioner "Mike" Elizalde. He has given the country of his adoption everything that is within the power of man to offer. The industries he and his family have built up are firm and indispensable pillars of Philippine economy, giving employment to thousands of Filipinos. When the late President Quezon insisted that he serve the Government, Elizalde offered unreservedly his time and his abilities.

"Mike" Elizalde came to Washington as Philippine Resident Commissioner in September 1938. Up to that time his service in the Government had been relatively short but intense, varied and fruitful to the interests of the Filipino people. He first entered public life on October 1, 1934, when he was appointed by Gov. Gen. Frank Murphy president of the National Development Co. and all subsidiary government corporations. Until his resignation in 1936 he set the course to various government activities of fundamental import to the future of the Philippines. He planned and effected closer cooperation between government departments and research agencies; he submitted a detailed study for the organization of a merchant marine; recommended an agricultural banking system which was subsequently established. He submitted a plan for the development of raw cotton and also provided the National Development with a complete study for the establishment of a cotton mill, which later on was built and operated by the government. He initiated the development of fisheries and canneries; promoted coal and iron mining. Under his supervision the Cebu Portland Cement Co. broke all existing production records and for the first time showed profits. Under his direction large agricultural lands in the province of Nueva Ecija, which had been the cause of bitter friction between owners and tenants, were sold to the latter on the installment basis. Elizalde sponsored the governmental policy of a semi-industrial and agricultural system of economy which would make the Philippines materially self-sufficient. In 1937 the Philippine Government again called on Elizalde to represent it at the International Sugar Conference in London, and he attended these conferences for 2 successive years.

In 1937 the Joint Preparatory Committee on Philippine Affairs was created by President Roosevelt to make a thorough study of the economic provisions of the independence law and to recommend to Congress the necessary measures to assist the economy of the Philippines. Elizalde is the only Filipino now in the United States who was a member of that committee. Following up the work and recommendations of this committee, Commissioner Elizalde handled in Congress the work of enacting the amendatory legislation granting respite to the coconut oil, embroidery, cigar, and pearl button industries which he felt could not have withstood the general application of the export duties originally provided for.

Commissioner Elizalde assumed his post as Resident Commissioner with proper vision. Whereas his predecessors generally limited their activities to service in the Congress, Elizalde interpreted that the Tydings-McDuffie independence law meant to make of the Resident Commissioner the representative of the Filipino people before the Government of the United States with the attributes and mission in effect of a diplomatic representative. This point of view was confirmed by the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia when, ruling on the power to determine the qualifications of the Resident Commissioner, it declared that he "is like a diplomatic representative, because the Philippines, during the Commonwealth regime, partakes of the characteristics of a diplomatic representative of a foreign power." Elizalde was able to sell his idea to the Philippine National Assembly, which acceded to larger appropriations for his office than it had ever made. He actually initiated the pattern of what is to be the foreign service of his country when independence is attained by organizing his offices along the lines of a regular American Embassy. As an indication of his vision is the fact that a week before war broke out between the United States and Japan, he purchased for the Philippine Government a building on Massachusetts Avenue to house the office of the Resident Commissioner and its different departments. Subsequently this building was utilized by the Commonwealth government in exile.

The limitations of time prevent me from detailing the varied and successful activities of Commissioner Elizalde on behalf of his Government. In the House, hardly ever raising his voice on the floor, without fanfare, he labored hard, made many and good friends. To his tireless efforts the Philippines owes much, because of the important legislation passed within the last 6 years. While many of us did not agree with Mike's position on many controversial matters affecting the Philippines, it is interesting to recout some of his major accomplishments.

He has fought decidedly against legislation discriminatory to Filipinos and Philippine interests. In 1939 he appealed against the Gibson bill, which proposed to deny employment in the Federal services to any but United States citizens. His insistence that those owing allegiance to the United States be given equal rights, saved the day for Filipinos in government service.

He obtained an amendment to the work relief appropriation bill so as to include Filipinos among those eligible to Federal work relief.

He convinced the Senate against the enactment of the bill providing for a 2-cent additional excise tax on vegetable oil imports from the Philippines, which he thought would have killed the Philippine oil industry.

Successfully opposed time and again in the House the Adams bill repealing an authorization for payment of $23,800,000 to the Philippines on account of the so-called gold refund on Philippine deposits in the United States.

Defeated the Alexander resolution calling for a congressional investigation of the Philippine Government.

Ably protected Philippine sugar interests in the Congress. During his term of office the Sugar Act was enacted and subsequently renewed in 1944. He defended the rights of Filipino producers to an equitable share in the quota and successfully opposed all attempts to reduce the entry of Philippine sugar in the United States. He negotiated the loan of $40,000,000 from a Federal agency to finance the sugar crops and stocks piled due to shortage of shipping, a transaction of tremendous importance to the economy of the Philippines, which was not realized because of the outbreak of war.

Repeatedly clarified and protected the rights of Filipinos resident in the United States.

Repeatedly pleaded with Congress for the enactment of legislation granting to Filipinos the right to become citizens of the United States. At his insistence, various bills are now pending the consideration of the Congress pertaining to such matters.

Appealed for the maintenance of the necessary merchant-marine service between the Philippines and the United States during times of world crisis and shipping shortages.

Laid the ground work for the favorable endorsement and approval by the President of the United States of the amendments in 1940 to the Constitution of the Philippines.

Supported a measure authorizing the Navy Department to sell naval equipment and supplies to the Philippine Commonwealth in an effort to strengthen the defense of the Philippines.

Submitted to the Philippine government a civil defense plan similar to that proposed to President Roosevelt by the United States Conference of Mayors.

Obtained the suspension of Philippine export taxes for a period of 1 year on July 1941.

Aware of the broad problems faced by the 100,000 Filipinos residing in Hawaii and continental United States, Elizalde proceeded to organize a nationals division in his office and placed at its head the late Francisco Varona, possibly the greatest Filipino labor leader. Filipino labor in the United States has never had as good a friend as Commissioner Elizalde. Among his achievements in their behalf are the following:

Organized Filipinos throughout the United States by the creation of councils wherever the size and importance of the Filipino communities warranted it; in California alone 15 communities were established.

Protested and defeated a bill submitted in the territorial legislature of Alaska which prohibited salmon canneries to employ more than 50 percent nonresident workers—this bill threatened the jobs of some 2,000 Filipinos.

Negotiated the settlement of the first organized strike of Filipino labor in the Pacific coast. Six thousand Filipino asparagus pickers were affected; under the terms of the settlement the growers agreed to restore 45 percent of the wage cut they had imposed.

At about the same time, a large automobile manufacturer which had announced that all noncitizens would be dismissed by the company, agreed upon the protest of Commissioner Elizalde to amend the dismissal order to exempt Filipinos.

Scored a victory in 1940 in the form of increased wages for all strawberry pickers in Sacramento, Calif.

Other matters in which Commissioner Elizalde has intervened on behalf of his Government:

Obtained from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals in New York an affirmation of a lower court's ruling releasing claims on $10,000,000 deposited by the Philippine Government with the Chase National Bank.

Argued vigorously before the Federal Trade Commission for the use of the trade name "Philippine Mahogany" for Philippine hardwoods in the United States market.

At the peak of the anti-Semitic sentiment in Europe, Commissioner Elizalde exerted every effort to induce his Government in Manila to allow the legal entry and extend haven to 10,000 of these peoples. A plan was evolved to resettle these political refugees in the island of Mindanao, capable of supporting a considerable increase in population and favorable climatically. To implement this project, substantial sums were made available for general development purposes. These negotiations were carried out in cooperation with the chairman of the House Immigration and Naturalization Committee.

Commissioner Elizalde is the best friend the Filipino seamen have had in this country. Born of a family engaged in the shipping business, Elizalde has always had a natural affection for the sea. Many have been his efforts in behalf of Filipino seamen before the House Merchant Marine Committee. His initial representation was to oppose and defeat legislation which, classifying Filipinos as aliens, would have denied them employment in fishing vessels of the United States. This would have particularly affected Filipino fishermen in Alaska and throughout the Pacific coast.

Since the war started Elizalde was able to obtain from the Secretary of the Navy the waiver of regulations denying to Filipinos the opportunity of serving as officers in vessels of the United States. Today, at least a score of Filipinos are in actual command of United States merchant vessels engaged in supplying our armed services throughout the world, and may I say that many Filipinos have given their lives in this risky venture. Also, Elizalde negotiated with the War Shipping Administration for the recognition of Philippine marine licenses, so as to permit Filipinos to serve in the American merchant marine with the same rank as in that of the Philippines. Immediately prior to the war, when critical shortage of shipping resulted because of the elimination from the Pacific of British, Dutch, Norwegian, and other foreign vessels, Elizalde time after time insisted on the necessity of increased American tonnage between the Philippines and the United States in order to carry products essential to the war effort, like manila hemp, chrome, coconut oil, and sugar. At this insistence, Admiral Land increased the tonnage of shipping to the Philippines.

Having been engaged in the hemp business and the manufacture of manila rope all of his life, his technical knowledge gained through long years of practical experience proved invaluable when "Mike" Elizalde was summoned to appear on several occasions before the Navy Board and the W. P. B. His advice was sought on the matter of conservation of manila hemp stocks held in this country, a critical and essential material of war. When the plan for stock piling was initiated by the United States, he made strong and expert recommendations on the different grades of abaca necessary to the successful prosecution of a prolonged war and advised on the amounts of available stocks in the Philippines at the time.

On August 13, 1941, he made a radio broadcast over C. B. S. which I should like to quote in part because it seems almost prophetic:

> In the Southwestern Pacific lie a group of small countries encircling the China Sea. Today that area is of tremendous importance to American policy and to the future of the American people. Surrender of this area to control by imperialistic powers, by appeasement or as a result of war, would have a permanently crippling effect upon the efforts of the United States and other democracies to preserve a free world. Freedom of trade routes in every part of the world, and the accessibility of essential raw materials for American industry are among the immediate interests at stake.

It was providential that when war broke out in the world and subsequently in the Pacific, Elizalde was in Washington attending to the interests of the Philippines. In spite of the fact that his mother and brothers are in the Philippines, Elizalde did not waver a single moment in his course. Early in 1941 he offered on behalf of the Philippine Government to cut off exports of strategic materials from the Philippines to all countries except the United States. He then requested from the Congress the appropriation of the sugar excise taxes, amounting to around $30,000,000 for Philippine civilian defense and besides this amount, obtained from the Appropriations Committee an additional $10,000,000 for the same purpose.

Immediately after Pearl Harbor, Commissioner Elizalde addressed himself to President Roosevelt and Secretary Stimson with the proposition that Filipinos in the United States be organized as a unit in the Army of the United States. The plan was warmly accepted and the result was the formation of the Filipino Infantry Regiments, one of which is now in service overseas.

Commissioner Elizalde followed this up by obtaining from the Secretary of War the change of regulations so as to permit citizens of the Philippines to enroll in the Army Air Forces. Some Filipinos have already served with distinction as pilots and in various other capacities in this mighty arm of our fighting services.

Also Elizalde obtained from Congress legislation permitting Filipinos to join the United States Coast Guard. The records of the Coast Guard give evidence of the extent and measure of Filipino participation in its activities. There are Filipinos today who are in command of transports and fighting vessels of the United States.

In the first grim days of the war, at the time the Filipinos were carving a niche in history in the fields of Bataan and the ramparts of Corregidor, Elizalde voiced the unshakeable loyalty of the Filipino; he exhorted his people to have faith, even though he knew that every time he did so one of his brothers was incarcerated by the Japanese in Manila. Commissioner Elizalde shared in the fateful decision to evacuate President Quezon from the Philippines, as is evidenced by this cable from General Marshall to General MacArthur in the last day of December 1941, when Manila was about to be occupied by the enemy:

> The Philippine Resident Commissioner and Secretary of War in conference with President Roosevelt feel that it is highly desirable to evacuate President Quezon from the Philippines to the United States. President Quezon could here function as the head of the commonwealth government in exile and as the symbol of the redemption of the Philippines.

Many have been the honors showered on Commissioner Elizalde by his government. Even before the war he was a member of the national Philippine cabinet, being the only Commissioner ever given this distinction. President Osmeña is the only other person outside the Philippines today who belonged to that cabinet.

On April 12, 1944, Elizalde was appointed by the late President Quezon to represent the Government of the Philippines not only in the United Nations Re-

lief and Rehabilitation Administration, the Interim Commission on Food and Agriculture, the International Sugar Council, and the Institute of Pacific Relations, but was detailed to take charge of all matters affecting Philippine relations with the United Nations.

Largely through his personal efforts Senate Joint Resolution 95, better known as the succession bill, was passed. This bill was highly controversial due to partisan considerations, and was opposed by small groups of Filipinos supporting the Vice President. It is a recognized fact that Elizalde was able to steer this extremely important law which maintained President Quezon, the George Washington of the Philippines, in office until the day of his death.

In the case of Resolutions 93 and 94, one authorizing the advance of independence and the other creating the Filipino Rehabilitation Commission, Elizalde worked incessantly for their passage. As a member of the Committee on Insular Affairs, I know that there were innumerable objections to the passage of Senate Joint Resolution 93; in fact, there was a time when the passage of the resolution by the committee appeared impossible. After Elizalde appeared before the committee in executive session, he being the only representative of the Philippine Government to appear on the last day, Senate Joint Resolution 93 was voted out favorably. It is to the credit of Commissioner Elizalde that all points of controversy were cleared up with Members on both sides of the aisle and Senate Joint Resolution 93 finally passed unanimously.

We all recognize Gen. Douglas MacArthur as a great American. To him, in Manila, Mike Elizalde went for advice when he was first offered the post of Resident Commissioner and the General counseled its acceptance. To him Elizalde informed of his decision to resign. And in the midst of his difficult campaign in the approaches to the Philippines, General MacArthur paid him the great compliment in a letter dated August 29:

> You have performed a difficult and arduous job over a most critical period and need have no regrets in the matter.

Elizalde has served 6 years in the Congress. We are his friends. His tenure of office in the House has been honorable and effective. We shall miss him on the floor, and his country has lost the services of a successful and loyal public servant. I know that you all join me in wishing "Mike" Godspeed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN] is recognized for 30 minutes.

THE NEW DEAL

AMERICAN CITIZENS WILL DETERMINE THE FUTURE COURSE OF OUR REPUBLIC

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, with victory in sight on the battle fronts of the world, achieved through the heroic sacifices of American fighting men, supported by an all-out effort on the part of American citizens in the production of war materials and food, we have come to the time when definite plans must be made for reconversion to a peacetime economy. As enemy armies are crushed and completely disarmed, it is estimated that a comparatively small armed force of United Nations' troops will be necessary as an army of occupation to keep order until permanent plans are made in our effort to secure a lasting peace. I am enumerating some of the important problems confronting our country.

First. While Members of Congress are not permitted to participate in the secret conferences now taking place at Dumbarton Oaks between diplomats from the United States, England and Russia, it is my hope and that of every American, that out of these discussions satisfactory plans will be perfected so that we as a Nation can participate with other allied nations in an organized and honest plan, free from world power politics, which will forever put an end to the tragedies and horrors of devastating wars. Since no good will ever come from secret understandings and the hiding of truth from the people who make the sacrifices and stand the cost of all wars, I insist that the American people be given the whole truth on all commitments to which they will be asked to subscribe.

Second. After hostilities have ceased, our policy should be to bring our boys back home as quickly as possible, doing everything within the power of a grateful country to take care of those who have suffered disabilities, and to adequately provide for the dependents of those who have given their lives in the cause of freedom. While it is our primary obligation to adequately take care of the disabled and dependents, of equal importance is our duty to maintain an economy that will provide satisfactory work for millions of returning veterans in American business, industry, agriculture, and profession. Such a plan must be made to work if we are to build a better and stronger free America.

The first step to carry out such a policy is the so-called G. I. bill of rights, unanimously passed by Congress, which seeks to provide over-all opportunities in business, industry, agriculture, and profession for all who served in the armed forces, including additional education or vocational training in the best schools of our country. We can never fully compensate them for the sacrifices they have made, but as for myself, I will stand by them for a square deal when the heat of battle and patriotism has died down.

Third. Of utmost importance to our peacetime economy, will be the perfection and administration of plans for a return of millions of men and women from war industries to civilian pursuits to again engage in the production of goods and services for the people of America and the world. I am convinced that American business, industry, agriculture, and profession are big enough to provide employment in all fields under an American scale of compensation which will afford the highest standard of living for everyone willing to work, provided we have an intelligent and cooperative administration in Washington that believes in our form of Government and the system of opportunity which has made our people the envy of the world.

Fourth. I fully recognize the difficulties confronting our country when the war is finally terminated. We must pay for the cost of this terrible war. We must pay our tremendous debts in the hard way to avoid bankruptcy and ruin for everyone. We must free our country from its present dictatorial bureaucracy, eliminate regimentation, and drastically cut all expenditures which are not essentially vital to government operation. We must restore confidence in our system of enterprise and government, so people and business can earn good money in order to pay necessary taxes to liquidate our debts, and at the same time enjoy a high American standard of living. We must provide policies which will insure a successful and prosperous agriculture, and make possible a restoration of opportunity for the professional and small businessman, so that this large group in America's middle class may again take its important place in our economy. These groups, with the rank and file of workingmen, are the backbone of American democracy.

These and many other things must be done, including the establishment of an adequate and self-sustaining system for old-age retirement. It is not a one-man job, for there is no indispensable man in America. It will take the united will and effort of all who believe in our country and its future. We must put the same fight and effort into this battle on the home front, as we are unitedly doing to win the war. An all-out effort will win, and we can do it as Americans without resorting to national socialism or dicatorship as some openly urge today. These schemes were tried in Europe. They brought misery and war, and American boys have again sacrificed to destroy it. Let us do our job in the American way and save freedom for future generations.

PRESIDENT ROOSEVELT HAS CONTROLLED OUR GOVERNMENT FOR NEARLY 12 YEARS

Mr. Speaker, President Franklin D. Roosevelt and his New Deal Party have been in complete control of the Government of the United States for nearly 12 years. In addition to having absolute control over all executive agencies and Federal employees—now numbering 3,000,000—since March 4, 1933, Mr. Roosevelt has had a substantial majority of his own party in both Houses of Congress. All but 2 of the present membership of the United States Supreme Court and 65 percent of all other Federal judges have been appointed by him.

In other words, for nearly 12 years, last past, the present Chief Executive as President and Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy, has had and exercised unlimited power to run the affairs of the country and shape its domestic and foreign policies. If mistakes have been made in the administration of these policies, full responsibility must be placed on him and his party. Congress does not administer laws. That power is placed in the hands of the President by the Constitution.

FOURTH-TERM PROMOTERS

I am citing the above facts for the reason that a small, but powerful group of left-wing, fourth-term promoters,

spearheaded by Sidney Hillman's Political Action Committee of New York, about which I will have more to say later, are out to becloud the real issues of this campaign by spreading false and malicious propaganda to arouse class hatred and distrust against a majority of your Representatives. They seek to cause a political revolution in this country with the objective that the people will select them and their fellow travelers to take control of our Government and a Congress dominated by them.

Many of the fellow travelers in Sidney Hillman's left-wing organization do not believe in our form of government. They are cleverly, and on a well-financed Nation-wide scale, concealing their real objective, which is to supplant Americanism with some foreign "ism." They have teamed up with the corrupt city-bossed political machines of Pendergast, Hannegan, Hague, Kelly, and Flynn. Since I and a majority of the Members of the House of Representatives have refused to "clear everything with Sidney Hillman," and be dominated in our acts and votes by Communists and other left-wing minorities, we have been placed on their purge list for the November election. They cannot control us because we believe in our American system, and they therefore seek to destroy. Like in my district in Minnesota, they are backing and financing our opponents. They want men in Congress whom they can control and move around like puppets.

FELLOW AMERICANS, THE TIME HAS COME FOR YOU TO CHOOSE—DO YOU WANT NATIONAL SOCIALISM OR COMMUNISM TO SUPPLANT AMERICAN DEMOCRACY?

Mr. Speaker, we have reached the time when the people must decide as to the future course of our country. Failure to make the right decision will surely determine as to whether or not our country is to remain a republic under a constitutional system of representative government, or if we are to be unwittingly forged into some kind of a state of national socialism or communism by a few who seek to perpetuate themselves in power and gain permanent control over the lives of the American people. I hope that every American, whether engaged in labor, business, profession, or agriculture, will reflect for a moment on what the situation would be in our country with Sidney Hillman and his communistic fellow travelers directing our economy and Government. To say nothing of boss-selected TRUMAN, who may be elevated to the office of President during the next 4 years by circumstances over which no mortal man has control, if the New Deal wins on November 7. This is the issue for 1944, and I therefore regard the coming Presidential and congressional elections as the most important in the history of the United States.

SIDNEY HILLMAN'S POLITICAL ACTION COMMITTEES

It is no secret that New York's Sidney Hillman, the organizer and head of two political action committees, has taken over the Democratic Party and is the spearhead for the fourth-term Presidential campaign and the election of a Congress that will be dominated by him and his communistic fellow travelers. Surrounding Hillman will be found a score of New Deal officeholders, extreme leftists, some Socialists, a few millionaire radicals, and all followers of Earl Browder, America's No. 1 Communist, who make up the driving force in the political action committees. Many of these fellow travelers are working to overthrow our American form of government and system of economy. Before Hitler invaded Russia these Communists and some of their misled fellow travelers, and there are a few of them taking a leading part in the campaign in my district against me, tried to stop all appropriations for the security of our country. They want to rule and direct the lives and activities of every citizen. To accomplish their objective of taking over our Government and Congress, Hillman has organized two political action committees to operate on a Nation-wide scale, with millions of dollars in their political treasure chest to be used in misleading voters by often spreading false and malicious propaganda, and in having high pressure Communists and their fellow travelers scour the country to extract dollars from patriotic American workers by intimidation and coercion, and by inciting class hatred and distrust. And these are the persons who want to take over our Government and socialize the economy of our country.

I know that a large majority of workers, both men and women, affiliated with the C. I. O., A. F. of L., railroad brotherhoods, and other organized and unorganized groups, are good patriotic Americans, who believe in our country and want to keep it free from political or economic domination by any individual or group. They joined their union to improve their working and economic conditions. They resent being dictated to and used as rubber stamps by a New York political boss, who is primarily interested in securing political power for himself and his communistic fellow travelers. They also recognize that anyone who tries to make a labor union into an auxiliary to a political party may destroy the labor union if he succeeds, or jeopardize both if he fails. Labor union members with the exception of the radical fringe, do not want to run the Government, and they do not want the Government to run the unions. They want and are entitled to a square deal from their Government, whichever party is in power. I am satisfied that the rank and file of American labor will not follow the dictation of Sidney Hillman, and when they vote in November, they will vote as they please. Several laboring men in my district have told me of their resentment against Hillman's attempt to use them and their unions as political pawns. I might also state that 99 percent of the laboring men in Minnesota believe in our American system and will fight against scrapping it, or in having an outside political boss attempting to force them to vote for candidates of his picking.

The attitude of American labor toward Sidney Hillman is best stated by Mr. Philip Pearl, a leading writer and spokesman for the American Federation of Labor, when he recently wrote in the official newspaper of the A. F. of L., in these words:

> The Sidney Hillman Political Action Committee is the strongest antilabor force in America. The Communist affiliations of many key figures in the P. A. C. will be thoroughly exposed. The unsavory association with the racketeers by some leading lights of the P. A. C. will be brought to light. * * * it will hurt the cause of the Nation's workers for many years to come. The P. A. C. and its leader, Mr. Hillman, is trying to buy this election.

Prior to the time that I began the practice of my profession, I was a member of two American Federation of Labor unions. I have always believed in and advocated the right of labor to organize and bargain collectively for the improvement of working conditions and living standards. I believe I understand the problems confronting the rank and file of American workers, and I want them to have and enjoy all of the comforts and opportunities available to every other citizen. Labor will always secure a square deal at my hands, but I detest racketeering and will fight it wherever it is found.

Since our country became involved in war, I have opposed unlawful and unjustified strikes in war industries. I am unwilling to condone any illegal strike which will deprive an American soldier or sailor from having the necessary implements to combat our enemies. Millions of man-hours have been lost in the past 2 years due to unnecessary strikes in plants engaged in the production of tanks, planes, guns, and other essential war materials.

My legislative record in behalf of labor is best stated by William Green, the president of the American Federation of Labor, when he sent a copy of a letter addressed to me to his affiliated unions in my district, about a year before the war, which read in part as follows:

> MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN ANDRESEN: Your legislative record on measures of interest to labor proves that you have consistently supported measures sponsored and approved by the American Federation of Labor. In committees and in conferences you have aided our representatives by your advice and counsel.
>
> WM. GREEN,
> *President, American Federation of Labor.*

When I offered my amendment on June 14, 1944, to the wage stabilization bill, which would permit employers and employees to agree on a weekly wage up to $37.50 per week without submitting the proposal to the War Labor Board, I was astounded when Mr. Roosevelt's leader in the House, Representative JOHN MCCORMACK, led the fight against the amendment. The proposal became known as the Andresen white-collar amendment, but it took care of all workers who received less than $37.50 a week. The Democrats defeated the amendment by a vote of 98 to 70. Republicans furnished nearly all of the support, and the one hope for the so-called white-collar workers and others who were not receiving any benefits from war expenditures went glimmering.

THE SMEAR CAMPAIGN

I am discussing the record today because certain smear artists and backers of the fourth term candidate are seeking to blame a majority of the Members of Congress, Democrats and Republicans, for the disaster at Pearl Harbor and for involvement in the war. They will flood the voters of the country with last minute false and vicious propaganda in an attempt to prejudice and confuse the people.

FORTIFICATION OF GUAM

Following the smear technique used by the Union for Democratic Action in 1942, the Communist-tainted New Republic magazine, the newspaper PM of New York—called the Uptown Communist publication—the Daily Worker which is the official organ for the Communist Party and kindred publications, Sidney Hillman's Political Action Committees, Communist Earl Browder, and his fellow travelers, and leftish New Dealers, are charging that the disaster at Pearl Harbor on December 7, 1941, was caused because Congress failed to fortify the island of Guam. What are the facts, and what does the record show?

First. That Franklin D. Roosevelt has been Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy since March 4, 1933, and in his official capacity he has been in full and complete control of the Army and Navy and all of their policies since March 4, 1933. Under the Constitution, the President is obligated to keep Congress informed as to the state of the Nation and condition of our country's defenses. A study of the following table of expenditures for the Army and Navy prior to the disaster at Pearl Harbor discloses that Congress had appropriated more money for our national defense than ever asked for by President Roosevelt. And I supported the appropriations to make our country strong.

Fiscal year	
Asked by F. D. R.:	
1935	$288,960,155
1936	320,459,277
1937	391,065,510
1938	428,870,336
1939	618,541,016
1940	868,948,168
Appropriated by Congress:	
1935	292,719,772
1936	368,601,408
1937	419,984,465
1938	514,011,757
1939	647,996,490
1940	879,554,059

The record will also show that since our entry into World War No. 2, Congress has by a unanimous vote authorized and approved every dollar requested by the War and Navy Departments to carry on the war to victory for our country. A large majority of us in the House have also voted for every lend-lease appropriation since the Congress adopted this policy in 1940, on the theory that it would help shorten the war and save American lives.

Second. The record shows and the truth is that there never was a request to Congress from March 4, 1933, to December 7, 1941, from President Roosevelt or from the Army or Navy for any appropriation to fortify Guam. As a matter of fact, the Roosevelt administration was consistently against fortifying Guam. Had President Roosevelt given Congress the confidential information which he received from Ambassador Grew, our diplomatic representative in Japan, beginning with April 1933, and up to Saturday, December 6th, 1941, definitely warning that Japan was arming and preparing to perpetrate a sneak attack on the United States, we could have tried at least, as some of us did, to stop the sending of billions of dollars' worth of scrap iron, gasoline and other war materials to Japan.

After the sinking of the United States gunboat *Panay* by the Jap air force in 1937, I and other colleagues in Congress did our utmost to stop the selling of war materials to Japan. While we did not have the information made available to the President by his diplomatic staff, we nevertheless strongly urged an arms embargo against Japan under the provisions of the Neutrality Act.

On October 5, 1937, at Chicago, President Roosevelt was apparently thinking more about the W. P. A. and the C. C. C. projects than he was about preparing for the defense of our country, when he said:

> How happy we are that the circumstances of the moment permit us to put our money into bridges and boulevards, dams and reforestation, the conservation of our soil, and many other useful works rather than into huge standing armies and vast supplies of implements of war.

Also, in support of the neutrality law President Roosevelt said in a New York speech delivered on August 14, 1936:

> Nevertheless, if war should break out again, in another continent, let us not blink the fact that we would find in this country thousands of Americans who, seeking immediate riches—fools' gold—would attempt to break down or evade our neutrality.

During this time scrap iron and other war materials were being sold to Japan and Germany in tremendous quantities by international operators. The President refused to invoke the neutrality law against Japan.

Belgium and Holland were invaded by Germany on May 10, 1940, and France fell on June 14, 1940. Still, on June 4, 1940, Mr. Roosevelt said he "saw no reason why Congress should stay in session." The Republican Members of Congress prevented adjournment of Congress at that time, as we felt that it was vital for our country to arm itself for defense, in order to stop any possible invasion.

Third. Who is responsible for the disaster at Pearl Harbor? Why does the Commander in Chief refuse to begin the court-martial trial of Admiral Kimmel and General Short? The people want and are entitled to the truth. A majority of us in the House have tried for more than 2 years and 9 months to have the administration institute court-martial proceedings, and both Admiral Kimmel and General Short want to be tried in court so that they can tell the truth and have their names cleared. Who ordered our Pacific Fleet into Pearl Harbor on the night of December 6, 1941? Every attempt by Congress to get the truth has been frustrated.

Fourth. The smear artists do not mention that President Roosevelt opposed the building of a two-ocean Navy, authorized by Congress, which I and a majority supported. In this connection, the New York Times of May 15, 1940, reports the President's views on the enlarged Navy, as follows:

> Mr. Roosevelt brushed aside as utterly stupid suggestions that developments in the European struggle and their implications in the Pacific strengthened the arguments for a two-ocean American Navy. If it ever had any merit, that theory became outmoded with the acquisition of California in 1847, he said. Such a conception of the Nation's floating defense was just plain dumb, he added.

Fifth. The smear experts state with fiendish glee that I and a large majority of the Congress voted against the soldier's vote bill. Nothing could be said which is further from the truth. The record will show that I and an overwhelming majority in Congress voted for an honest soldier ballot, which all of the men and women in the armed services are receiving and using by the millions, and which gives the names of every candidate from the President down to the county sheriff. State election experts estimate that more than 5,000,000 men and women of voting age in the armed forces will cast their ballots by mail by November 7.

Sixth. The professional smearers try to make something out of my vote to abolish the W. P. A. and the C. C. C. when there was no longer any need for this type of pump-priming. They wanted to continue these agencies and keep workers on leaf raking and boulevard projects when every bit of manpower was required at high wages in the production of war materials. It appears that the Hillman crowd want to put everyone on a Government dole after the war is won, instead of joining with most Americans in helping formulate plans which will provide constructive work at an American wage scale in business, industry, and agriculture.

LIQUIDATION OF SMALL BUSINESS

Mr. Speaker, for more than 10 years the present administration has made many promises to come to the rescue of the small businessman, but thus far, the only result has been lip service. I want to call your attention to a Department of Commerce survey for July 1944, which shows that in the 1942–43 period, 1,073,000 business enterprises, or over 30 percent of a total of 3,370,000 closed their doors. They were liquidated. In the 1940–41 period, 914,000 business places were forced to close. This is a grand total in small business casualties of around 2,000,000 since the country began its preparation for war. Ninety percent of these were small business enterprises. This liquidation must stop, and the small businessman, who, after all is the real builder of every community, must be assured of a right to operate without being strangled by large monopolistic concerns and bureaucratic regulations.

The small businessman of our country has had a terrible job to keep his business

operating during the war. Shortage of manpower, scarcity of merchandise, and complexity of hundreds of unnecessary Government forms, have given him high blood pressure to the boiling point. In addition, Government snoopers, who frequently did not understand the problems of any business, and a thousand and one other things, were enough to drive him to an early grave.

For him I will fight to the limit, as I will for the farmer, the professional man, and the worker. These groups make up the backbone of American democracy, and they will again save our country from the threat of dictatorship, communism, or any other kind of ism that is not Americanism.

AGRICULTURAL PROSPERITY FOR THE FUTURE

Chairman FULMER of the House Committee on Agriculture, recently appointed me and eight other Representatives on a special congressional committee to work out plans for the future prosperity of agriculture. I welcome the opportunity to serve on this post-war committee in behalf of the Nation's greatest industry. As most farmers know, I have been a member of the Committee on Agriculture in Congress for many years.

I have consistently urged abundant food production with decent and profitable prices for farm products in the market place and will do my utmost to secure the adoption of such a policy. More than 55,000,000 Americans are directly or indirectly dependent upon agriculture for their living, and the future prosperity of the entire country will largely depend upon the degree to which our farmers prosper.

We have had many battles in Congress over farm problems, and there will be greater problems to solve when the war terminates. They must and will be solved to the best of our ability in cooperation with the farmers. There are literally hundreds of millions of hungry people in the world to eat our surplus farm products, and when ways are found, as they will be, to export these surpluses, the American farmer will be placed in a position to receive an American price level for the products of his soil. Export trade for American surpluses can be developed with countries that need our products, and in return, we can receive such of their products as we do not produce in sufficient quantity to take care of domestic needs. We must also develop new products for the soil and additional uses in industry for farm surpluses.

The farmer has a right to demand equality of treatment in our American economy without being regimented by a governmental bureaucracy. He is also entitled to enjoy all of the comforts and conveniences of a modern home and the American standard of living that goes with it.

The farmers and their families of America have done a magnificent job in the production of food to win the war, despite the shortages of manpower and machinery, and unnecessary restrictions placed on them by bureaucratic Washington. The contribution made by the farmers in the past 3 years has hastened victory on the battle fronts.

Those of us who are carrying on the fight in Congress for a square deal for American agriculture will not let them down.

CARTELS AND MONOPOLIES

I have always fought cartels and monopolies, domestic and foreign, dealing in commodities and products vital to our economy and way of life. Such schemes are undesirable and in restraint of world trade and often cause shortages and price-gouging operations.

Time will not permit further discussion of many other problems confronting our country and the world when the war ends. Our immediate task is to stand united in the winning of the war. Our American boys and our allies are doing a magnificent job to crush our enemies by making sacrifices which we can never compensate. They are winning the war, and when it is over and the living return, let us hear them say that we, at home, kept American freedom secure, when they sacrificed to again make the world free.

THE PARTNERSHIP BETWEEN FARMERS AND THE DEMOCRATIC PARTY

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. RAMSPECK). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. GORE. Mr. Speaker, the people of the United States, as well as our grateful allies, are proud of the American farmer's job of war production. He has not only produced the food to feed the American civilian population more and better food than they have ever before consumed, but he has also supplied enormous quantities of food for our own armed forces, as well as for millions of our allies.

Even though they worked under the severe difficulties of both labor and machinery shortages incident to a great war, the farmers produced last year one-third more than the average of the 5-year period before the outbreak of war.

The farmers attained this record production through hard work, good management, and because of the excellent condition of his soil, which has steadily improved over the last 10 years through soil-conservation practices. The farmers were aided, too, by the Government through loans, commodity purchases, price-support programs, over-all planning of production needs and goals, informational services, and equitable distribution of critical items of production.

Despite this magnificent and patriotic production during the war, farmers look to post-war days with apprehensive concern. The reason is not hard to find. Farmers remember what happened after the First World War.

During the First World War, farmers were called upon for peak production. They responded then, as now, with record production. After the war ended, prices continued at high levels for a brief time, and farmers maintained high production. Then, in the 1920's, prices fell disastrously low. Farmers, in a desperate effort to maintain cash income sufficient to pay taxes, liquidate high indebtedness, and to live decently, continued efforts to increase their production. This only caused their prices to fall lower. In other words, they produced more only to get less.

During that disastrous period the Government did little to help the farmer in his desperate plight. To be sure, the Federal Farm Board was created, but even its Chairman finally said its program could not possibly succeed.

Not until farm programs were set up by a Democratic administration for price-supporting commodity loans and to make it possible for farmers themselves to adjust production to demand was there any improvement in the farmer's economic condition.

Today, as farmers see military victory drawing nearer, they cannot help but wonder what will be their plight in the years following this World War.

Farmers full well know that the Nation's agricultural industry is now geared to a record high rate of war production—a rate of production out of all proportion to any normal demand we have ever experienced. For instance, it seems conservative to say that we shall end the European war with farmers producing at least 25 percent more for sale or use on farms than the average for the 5 years 1935–39.

Farmers are wondering therefore, what we shall do with this enormous production and the surpluses already on hand after lend-lease purchases end, after the bulk of soldiers and sailors are demobilized. They fervently hope they will be saved from a repetition of the awful depression days which followed World War No. 1.

The ideal of every farmer, of course, is unlimited production and good prices. We can achieve this ideal only during a period of full employment. We have seen that demonstrated. When the Nation's people work and earn money, they eat—eat more and better food.

When there is not sufficient demand for unlimited production we farmers then have the choice between unlimited production at ruinous prices or limited production at better prices—that is, under this Democratic administration, that has been our choice.

In the 1920's, during three Republican administrations, the farmer found himself and his neighbors struggling for unlimited production but with prices that brought ruin to the Nation's agriculture. The Republican administration during those years only talked while farmers lost their homes. It was only after a change in administration in 1933 that the farmers themselves were given an opportunity to make a sensible adjustment of production and receive better prices.

These better prices were brought about not alone by bringing production more nearly in line with demand but also through commodity loans by which prices were supported and because of increased employment of the people.

Now, during World War No. 2, additional price support programs have been written into law under the leadership of the present administration. These floor prices have been helpful, indeed. For

instance, immeasurable benefits have resulted to farmers from floor prices under hogs, eggs, and butterfat, as well as others.

It was my privilege to be the author of one of the principal wartime price support programs, floor prices under nonbasic as well as basic agricultural commodities. These support prices, for every farm commodity of which the Government called upon farmers for an increased production, are guaranteed for 2 years after the war ends.

I am proud that this is written into law. But let us not be fooled. Practical measures must be taken to make the law effective.

The best assurance of good farm prices is full employment of our people. This is the aim of the Democratic Party.

But there are other safeguards available to farmers.

Through the leadership of the Democratic Party, machinery for adjusting production and supporting prices has been established. That progressive leadership is still available and I think it is badly needed to protect the interest of the American farmer during the postwar years.

In its platform, the Democratic Party has solemnly pledged "price guarantees to farmers with all practical steps." What are those practical steps?

In addition to a program of maximum employment, a Democratic must, practical steps to guarantee the effective working of floor prices under farm commodities mean, to me, four things: First, new and expanded markets; second, adequate Government funds for both commodity loans and purchases; third, adequate means of storing and marketing of substantial quantities of surplus farm commodities; and fourth, machinery by which farmers themselves can make a sensible, practical adjustment of production within reasonable proximity to demand and marketing opportunities.

Our experience in supporting and stabilizing farm prices will, I believe, prove invaluable when peace comes. The farmer can look to the future with more assurance of protection because he and his Government have had satisfactory experience in both production adjustment and price-support programs.

The farmers and the Democrats know how to work together, especially when the farmers need help.

What does the Republican Party offer to the farmer? Well, its record in the 1920's was one of faltering timidity and dismal failure.

The present Republican platform on the farm problem begins by saying: "We salute the American farmer." Well, the farmer has been saluted before. The Republican Party saluted him with the Farm Board and Herbert Hoover's indecision and inaction. Because of the dismal failure of that party to provide intelligent and effective leadership, the farmer was saluted in the market place by 2½ cents a pound for his hogs, 5 cents for his cotton, by 30-cent wheat, 18-cent corn, 7-cent tobacco, and by untold mortgage foreclosures.

Yes, it is a nice platitude and a noble gesture to salute the American farmer. Undoubtedly the American farmer will return the salute in his usual courteous manner but, knowing full well on which side his bread is buttered, he will, I believe, want to retain his traditional friend, the Democratic Party, in national leadership during the critical post-war period when the farmer will really need a friend—a friend who will do something more than salute him.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence were granted as follows:

To Mr. BARRY (at the request of Mr. KEOGH), for 1 day, on account of illness.

To Mr. WEISS (at the request of Mr. EBERHARTER), for 2 days, on account of religious holiday.

To Mr. GALLAGHER (at the request of Mr. SCOTT), for week of September 18, on account of illness in family.

To Mr. WASIELEWSKI, for 1 week, on account of official business.

To Mr. WADSWORTH (at the request of Mr. ARENDS), indefinitely, on account of illness.

To Mr. HOEVEN (at the request of Mr. CUNNINGHAM), indefinitely, on account of illness in his family.

To Mr. HOLMES of Washington (at the request of Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts), indefinitely, on account of official business.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 2007. An act for the relief of Lum Jacobs; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 2105. An act to amend and supplement the Federal-Aid Road Act, approved July 11, 1916, as amended and supplemented, to authorize appropriations for the post-war construction of highways and bridges, to eliminate hazards at railroad-grade crossings, to provide for the immediate preparation of plans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Roads.

SENATE ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills and a joint resolution of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 1250. A bill to repeal section 2 of the act approved May 17, 1926, which provides for the forfeiture of pay of persons in the military and naval service of the United States who are absent from duty on account of the direct effects of venereal disease due to misconduct, and to amend Veterans Regulation No. 10, as amended, to define line of duty and misconduct for pension and compensation purposes;

S. 2111. A bill to provide for the extension of certain oil and gas leases; and

S. J. Res. 150. Joint resolution making an appropriation to pay the necessary expenses of the inaugural ceremonies of the President of the United States January 20, 1945.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. KLEIN, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee did on September 15, 1944, present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 4278. A bill to provide for the control and eradication of certain animal and plant pests and diseases, to facilitate cooperation with the States in fire control, to provide for the more efficient protection and management of the national forests, to facilitate the carrying out of agricultural conservation and related agricultural programs, to facilitate the operation of the Farm Credit Administration and the Rural Electrification Administration, to aid in the orderly marketing of agricultural commodities, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 4780. A bill to fix fees for domestic insured and collect-on-delivery mail, special-delivery service, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 16 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, September 19, 1944, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1820. A letter from the Administrator, Federal Works Agency, transmitting the information for the purpose of making a determination of the number of employees necessary for the proper and efficient exercise of the functions of the Federal Works Agency for the quarter ending December 31, 1944; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

1821. A letter from the Administrative Assistant to the President, transmitting a quarterly estimate of personnel requirements of the Liaison Office for Personnel Management for the quarter ending December 31, 1944; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

1822. A letter from the Executive Secretary, Office of Scientific Research and Development, Office for Emergency Management, transmitting an estimate of the personnel requirements for the Office of Scientific Research and Development during the quarter ending December 31, 1944; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

1823. A letter from the Acting Chairman of the War Production Board, transmitting a report of the personnel requirements of the War Production Board for the second quarter of the fiscal year 1945; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

1824. A letter from the administrative assistant to the Secretary of the Department of Commerce, transmitting revised estimate forms of the ceiling units "Salaries and aeronautical charts," and "Working funds," Coast and Geodetic Survey, and "Salaries and expenses," Weather Bureau, for the quarter ending December 31, 1944, which are requested to be substituted for the estimate forms submitted with letter of September 9, 1944; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

1825. A letter from the Director of the Executive Office of the President, Bureau of the Budget, transmitting a report concerning the number of persons needed for the proper and efficient exercise of the functions of the Bureau of the Budget for the quarter ending December 31, 1944; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

1826. A letter from the Director of the Office of War Mobilization, transmitting a report of the quarterly estimate of personnel requirements for the Office of War Mobilization for the quarter ending December 31, 1944; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

1827. A letter from the Acting Director of the Committee for Congested Production

Areas, Executive Office of the President, transmitting a report of the personnel requirements for the Committee for Congested Production Areas for the period October 1, 1944, through December 31, 1944; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

1828. A letter from the third vice president, Panama Railroad Company, transmitting quarterly estimate of personnel requirements for the quarter ending December 31, 1944; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

1829. A letter from the Director, Office of War Information, transmitting a revised quarterly estimate of personnel requirements for the Office of War Information covering the second quarter of the fiscal year 1945; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

1830. A letter from the Chairman, National Labor Relations Board, transmitting the quarterly estimate of personnel requirements of the National Labor Relations Board for the second quarter of the fiscal year 1945; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

1831. A letter from the acting administrative assistant to the Secretary, Department of Commerce, transmitting the estimates of personnel requirements for the various ceiling units of the Department of Commerce for the quarter ending December 31, 1944; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

1832. A letter from the Director, Office of Economic Stabilization, transmiting a copy of the quarterly estimate of personnel requirements for the Office of Economic Stabilization for the quarter ending December 31, 1944; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

1833. A letter from the Alien Property Custodian, transmitting a quarterly estimate of personnel requirements for the period ending December 31, 1944; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

1834. A letter from the Director of the Office of Defense Transportation, transmitting a quarterly estimate of personnel requirements for the anticipated number of employees to be engaged by that agency during the quarter ending December 31, 1944; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

1835. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution, transmitting a quarterly estimate of personnel requirements for the Smithsonian Institution for the quarter ending December 31, 1944; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

1836. A letter from the Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs, transmitting a copy of the estimates of the number of employees required for this Office during the period ending December 31, 1944; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

1837. A letter from Frank A. McNamee, Jr., colonel, Field Artillery, the Director of Civilian Defense, transmitting copies of quarterly estimate of personnel requirements for the quarter ending December 31, 1944, covering regular operations of the Office of Civilian Defense and its protective property program; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

1838. A letter from the Chairman, National Mediation Board, transmitting quarterly estimate of personnel requirements for the National Mediation Board, including the National Railroad Adjustment Board and the National Railway Labor Panel, for the period ending December 31, 1944; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

1839. A letter from the administrative officer, President's Committee on Fair Employment Practice, transmitting the quarterly estimate of personnel requirements covering the quarter ending December 31, 1944, for the Committee on Fair Employment Practice; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

1840. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report of the financial transactions of the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation, Department of Agriculture, for the period July 1, 1940, to June 30, 1941; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1841. A letter from the Acting Chairman of the War Production Board, transmitting a report from the chairman and general manager of the board of directors of the Smaller War Plants Corporation from June 1 through July 31, 1944; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1842. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a report covering activities under the Federal Aid to Wildlife Restoration Fund for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1944; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1843. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Strategic Services, transmitting a quarterly estimate of personnel requirements for the Office of Strategic Services; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

1844. A letter from the Chairman, War Manpower Commission, transmitting quarterly estimate of personnel requirements for the War Manpower Commission, for the second quarter of the fiscal year 1945; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

1845. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting a report on records proposed for disposal by various Government agencies; to the Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers.

1846. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a report stating all of the facts and pertinent provisions of law in the cases of 302 individuals whose deportation has been suspended for more than 6 months under the authority vested in him, together with a statement of the reason for such suspension; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

1847. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmiting a report reflecting the number of employees estimated to be required during the second quarter of the fiscal year 1945; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. McKENZIE: Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads. H. R. 4893. A bill to provide for the carrying of mail on star routes, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1891). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. WHITTINGTON: Committee on Flood Control. H. R. 5338. A bill to provide for naming the lake formed by waters of the Red River impounded by Denison Dam (Rept. No. 1892). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. BULWINKLE: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. Report pursuant to House Resolution 307. Resolution to study and investigate present and future air navigation and commerce (Rept. No. 1893). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. BLAND: Committee on Flood Control. H. R. 5255. A bill to amend the Coast Guard Auxiliary and Reserve Act of 1941, as amended; with amendment (Rept. No. 1896). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. BLAND: Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries. S 1807. An act authorizing and directing the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain lands to the city of Duluth, Minn.; without amendment (Rept. No. 1897). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. ABERNETHY: Committee on Claims. S. 1766. An act for the relief of C. C. Thornton; without amendment (Rept. No. 1894). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. SCRIVNER: Committee on Claims. S. 1959. An act for the relief of Mrs. Amy McKnight; without amendment (Rept. No. 1895). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. RAMEY: Committee on Claims. S. 1477. An act for the relief of Carl M. Frasure; without amendment (Rept. No. 1898). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BUSBEY:

H. R. 5375. A bill to provide for the retirement of certain veterans who served in both World War No. 1 and World War No. 2; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CANNON of Florida:

H. R. 5376. A bill to reduce juvenile delinquency by providing for the care and prompt return home of runaway, transient, or vagrant children of juvenile age, going from one State to another without proper legal consent, through the use of funds appropriated under the provisions of the Social Security Act for aid to dependent children, under certain conditions; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COCHRAN:

H. R. 5377. A bill to establish a Missouri Valley Authority to provide for unified water control and resource development on the Missouri River and surrounding region in the interest of the control and prevention of floods, the promotion of navigation and reclamation of the public lands, the strengthening of the national defense, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. MAY:

H. R. 5378. A bill to amend the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, to extend the time within which application may be made for reemployment, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 5379. A bill to authorize the course of instruction at the United States Military Academy to be given to not exceeding 20 persons at a time from the American republics, other than the United States; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. OUTLAND:

H. R. 5380. A bill to amend certain provisions of the Social Security Act and the Internal Revenue Code in order to bring within the scope thereof service performed in handling, planting, drying, packing, etc., agricultural commodities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RIVERS:

H. R. 5381. A bill to provide for a temporary increase in the age limit for appointees to the United States Military Academy; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 5382. A bill to provide for a temporary increase in the age limit for candidates for admission to the United States Naval Academy; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. PATTON:

H. R. 5383. A bill to transfer certain land in Nacogdoches County, Tex., to the United

States Forest Service; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. AUCHINCLOSS:

H. R. 5384. A bill making an appropriation for the relief of areas in the State of New Jersey damaged by the recent hurricane; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. McMILLAN of South Carolina:

H. R. 5385. A bill to provide for the acquisition of certain property in the District of Columbia for use by the Children's Museum of Washington, Inc.; to the Committee on District of Columbia.

By Mr. McCORMACK:

H. R. 5386. A bill to amend the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, to extend the time within which application may be made for reemployment, and for other purposes; to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

By Mr. BLAND:

H. R. 5387. A bill to amend sections 101 (a) and 212 (b) (2) of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, as amended; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 5388. A bill relating to the traveling expenses of members of the armed forces transferred from one hospital to another at their own request; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. RANKIN:

H. Con. Res. 100. Concurrent resolution authorizing that the pamphlet containing information as to the rights and benefits that are available to veterans of the armed forces and their dependents be published as a document and providing for the printing of additional copies thereof; to the Committee on Printing.

By Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas:

H. Res. 641. Resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of a report from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on the re-examination of Columbia and Snake Rivers, Oreg., Wash., and Idaho; to the Committee on Printing.

By Mr. LEA:

H. Res. 642. A bill authorizing the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce of the House of Representatives to have printed for its use additional copies of the hearings on the bill (H. R. 4184), to amend the Transportation Act of 1940, with respect to the movement of Government traffic; to the Committee on Printing.

By Mr. HARNESS of Indiana:

H. Res. 643. Resolution to investigate the Pearl Harbor disaster; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. SCOTT:

H. Res. 644. Resolution to investigate the Pearl Harbor disaster; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. COFFEE:

H. R. 5389. A bill for the relief of George S. Hawley; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. ELLISON of Maryland:

H. R. 5390. A bill for the relief of James P. Arthur; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. GREEN:

H. R. 5391. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Clifford W. Prevatt; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 5392. A bill for the relief of Ruth Grossman; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HERTER:

H. R. 5393. A bill for the relief of Annie M. Lannon; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. KEARNEY:

H. R. 5394. A bill for the relief of Margaret Gudzin; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MILLER of Missouri:

H. R. 5395. A bill to extend Letters Patent No. 1,645,643; to the Committee on Patents.

By Mr. MONKIEWICZ:

H. R. 5396. A bill for the relief of William H. Shultz; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SHERIDAN:

H. R. 5397. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Agnes M. Burke; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. TOWE:

H. R. 5398. A bill for the relief of the Hatheway Patterson Corporation; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

6135. By Mr. KEARNEY: Petition containing the signatures of 172 citizens of the Thirtieth Congressional District, State of New York, protesting against the enactment by the Congress of prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

6136. By Mr. ROLPH: Resolution of the County Supervisors Association of California, dated August 25, 1944, and asking investigation by Congress of war industries to reconvert for post-war to avoid unemployment; to the Committee on Rules.

6137. Also, resolution of the Downtown Association of San Francisco urging Defense Plant Corporation to make certain that steel mill at Geneva, Utah, be maintained in operation; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

6138. By the SPEAKER: Petition of William B. Spaun, chairman of the Citizens' Committee of Hannibal, Mo., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to a request that the Government keep the German prisoners of war out of the city of Hannibal, Mo., and from laboring therein, and to restore their ball park to its original condition and use; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

6139. Also, petition of the secretary, Board of Liquidation, City Debt, New Orleans, La., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement of the Boren bill, H. R. 1502; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

6140. Also, petition of William Pabodie, Charlotte, N. C., petitioning consideration of his resolution with reference to the impeachment of E. Y. Webb, judge of the United States District Court for the Western District of North Carolina, that citizens may no longer be denied their constitutional rights by the de facto and improperly constituted court in that district; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE

TUESDAY, SEPTEMBER 19, 1944

(Legislative day of Friday, September 1, 1944)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Eternal Father, from the anguished earth where innocent blood cries from the ground, through the voice of woe Thy voice to us is calling. We cannot be true to ourselves and to our heritage if in a crucified world we refuse the cross. In the agony of humanity, we could not hold ourselves safe and apart. Thou knowest we have no choice save to break the bread of sacrifice and spill the sweet wine of youth in that eternal sacrament forever crimsoned with the cleansing love that seeketh not its own and gives itself a ransom for many.

Grant to us a sustaining vision of life, personal life and national life, as it was made and meant to be, gladly losing itself in high and holy causes, in singing toil, in waste places transformed, in shackles broken, in hunger fed and in thirst quenched, in braver and better things. Lead us for Thy name's sake, even in the valley of the shadow of pain and loss, if the cross but lift us and our willful and wistful humanity nearer, our God, to Thee, nearer to Thee. We ask it in the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Friday, September 15, 1944, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. McLeod, one of its clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5125) to provide for the disposal of surplus Government property and plants, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 5386) to amend the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, to extend the time within which application may be made for reemployment, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 51) authorizing a change in enrolling the bill (H. R. 4257) to expatriate or exclude certain persons for evading military and naval service.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills and joint resolution, and they were signed by the Vice President:

S. 1250. A bill to repeal section 2 of the act approved May 17, 1926, which provides for the forfeiture of pay of persons in the military and naval service of the United States who are absent from duty on account of the direct effects of venereal disease due to misconduct, and to amend Veterans Regulation No. 10, as amended, to define line of duty and misconduct for pension and compensation purposes;

S. 2111. A bill to provide for the extension of certain oil and gas leases; and

S. J. Res. 150. Joint resolution making an appropriation to pay the necessary expenses

of the inaugural ceremonies of the President of the United States January 20, 1945.

NORTH DAKOTA SENATORIAL PRIMARY—NOTICE OF SPEECH

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, some data which I sent for in North Dakota so that I might have proof of statements I might make in reply to the charges of my colleague [Mr. NYE] has failed to arrive and will not arrive until this afternoon. Therefore, I give notice that I will reply to the charges made by my colleague at the next meeting of the Senate.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following communication and letters, which were referred as indicated:

SURPLUS GOVERNMENT PROPERTY AND MATERIALS—SECOND QUARTERLY REPORT (S. DOC. NO. 239)

A communication from the President of the United States, submitting, in response to Senate Resolution 195, requesting an investigation concerning Government property and materials no longer needed for war purposes, agreed to March 14, 1944, a second quarterly report concerning surplus Government property and materials; to the Committee on Military Affairs and ordered to be printed.

PERSONNEL OF THE LAND FORCES

A confidential letter from the Secretary of War, reporting, pursuant to law, relative to the personnel of the land forces on July 31, 1944, under section 3 (b) of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF CERTAIN ALIENS

A letter from the Attorney General, submitting, pursuant to law, a report stating all of the facts and pertinent provisions of law in the cases of 302 individuals whose deportation has been suspended for more than 6 months under authority vested in the Attorney General, together with a statement of the reason for such suspension (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Immigration.

PERSONNEL REQUIREMENTS

Letters from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, the Secretary of Labor, Administrator of the War Shipping Administration, Acting Director of the Office of Strategic Services, Chairman of the Interstate Commerce Commission, Administrative Assistant to the Secretary of Commerce, and Director of War Information, transmitting, pursuant to law, estimates of personnel requirements for their respective departments and offices for the quarter ending December 31, 1944 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Civil Service.

DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a list of papers and documents on the files of the Departments of War (7), Navy (2), Interior (2), and Agriculture (2); United States District Court for the Eastern District of Wisconsin, Federal Security Agency, General Accounting Office, Selective Service System, and the Federal Works Agency which are not needed in the conduct of business and have no permanent value or historical interest, and requesting action looking to their disposition (with accompanying papers); to a Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Papers in the Executive Departments.

The VICE PRESIDENT appointed Mr. BARKLEY and Mr. BREWSTER members of the committee on the part of the Senate.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate by the Vice President, and referred as indicated:

A resolution by the Board of Liquidation, City Debt, New Orleans, La., favoring the enactment of the so-called Boren bill, being House bill 1502, proposing to amend the Security and Exchange Act of 1934 by providing that the issuance and sale of municipal bonds be not under the jurisdiction of the Securities and Exchange Commission; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

A resolution by the City Council of Minneapolis, Minn., requesting inclusion in any proposed coal-control act of a provision preserving benefits of water transportation to communities located on or adjacent to tidewaters, lakes, or rivers; to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

A resolution adopted by a meeting of citizens of Hannibal, Mo., favoring the adoption of measures to keep German prisoners of war out of the city of Hannibal, Mo., or from laboring therein, and to restore the city ball park to its original condition and use; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A petition of sundry citizens of New York City and vicinity, praying for the enactment of the so-called Mead bill, being Senate bill 1882, to increase the compensation of letter carriers; to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

PROHIBITION OF LIQUOR SALES AROUND MILITARY CAMPS—MEMORIALS

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I ask consent to present for appropriate reference memorials signed by 3,090 citizens of Vermont, remonstrating against the enactment of Senate bill 860, relating to the sale of alcoholic liquors to members of the land and naval forces of the United States, or any similar prohibition legislation.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the memorials will be received and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

PETITION FOR PEACE FROM THE UNITARIAN SOCIETY, LAWRENCE, KANS.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to present for appropriate reference a petition for peace, sent to me by Homer A. Jack, Ph. D., minister, the Unitarian Society of Lawrence, Kans., just before the Senate recessed in July. It is signed by 23 citizens of Abilene and Newton, Kans., and reads as follows:

Since the declared purpose of the United Nations in the war is the achievement of political, cultural, and spiritual freedom throughout the world, and economic justice and a higher standard of living for all peoples.

We urge our Government to formulate specific proposals for such a peace and to make them known to the governments and peoples of all lands, with a view to ending this war honorably at the earliest possible moment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the petition will be received and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

RESOLUTIONS OF WATER CONSERVATION CONFERENCE, MODIFICATIONS OF AMENDMENTS TO FIVERS AND HARBORS AND FLOOD CONTROL BILLS, AND LETTER FROM THE PRESIDENT

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, on the 7th and 8th of September there was held in the city of Chicago a conference on the conservation of water. Delegates came to that conference from all parts of the United States, and there studied some of the amendments which have been suggested to the pending river and harbor bill and to the pending flood-control bill. Engineers and lawyers representing some 29 States, as I recall, were there.

The result of the conference was to make certain suggestions with respect to the modification of some of the pending amendments. Resolutions were adopted, all of which, I think, are of such great importance that they should be available to all Members of the Senate and to be called particularly to the attention of the Committee on Commerce.

There is also a statement by President Roosevelt with respect to the importance of reclamation and irrigation in connection with the development of the water resources of the various river basins.

At my request Mr. F. O. Hagie, secretary-treasurer of the Water Conservation Conference, has submitted to me the resolutions and the modifications of the various amendments. I ask unanimous consent that his letter transmitting these matters to me, together with the letter from President Roosevelt, may be printed at length in the RECORD, and then referred to the Committee on Commerce for its consideration.

There being no objection, the letters and accompanying papers were ordered to be referred to the Committee on Commerce, and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, August 7, 1944.

Hon. JOHN H. OVERTON,
United States Senate.

MY DEAR JOHN: I am glad to learn from your letter of June 23 that the Senate Commerce Committee adopted a progressive provision for the marketing of power from navigation and flood control projects in the bills that have been reported to the Senate.

The dam and reservoir projects in the Central Valley of California, which would be authorized by H. R. 4485 for construction by the Army engineers, should, for purposes of sound administration and coordinated operation, be constructed by the Bureau of Reclamation in the Department of the Interior. These projects constitute logical extensions of the existing Central Valley project of the Bureau of Reclamation. California, in common with the other Western States, has a flood-control problem and a need for water. The basic and best solution of her flood control problem lies in the maximum storage and use of water for irrigation. Every flood control project and every navigation project in the West should therefore be made, so far as practicable, to play its part in the great scheme of conservation of water for beneficial consumptive use.

It may well be that testimony before your Committee in favor of the construction of these projects by the Corps of Engineers was a reflection of the desire of certain large land interests in California to obtain irrigation and other benefits without being subjected to the repayment requirements and to the other public safeguards that are a part of the reclamation law, but I do not believe that this should be allowed to obscure the fundamental objectives of that law. In this connection, I was pleased by the inclusion of the irrigation amendment. But this amend-

ment will not assure that the planning, design, construction and operation of these reservoirs shall be such as to fulfill the primary need for conservation and beneficial consumptive use of water. I hope, therefore, that the Congress will see fit to place in the Bureau of Reclamation the authority and the responsibility for accomplishment of the great objectives that the Federal Government should achieve in California.

I am convinced of the soundness of the amendment designed to assure that the respective States have opportunity to have their views formally recorded in reports on proposed projects of interest to them. While I appreciate your concern over the provision of that amendment that would allow the States to hold up construction of projects already approved by the Congress, this appears to be the case only with respect to projects in the present bill and is necessary to permit transition to the procedure that would be effective for future projects. This amendment seems to me to be no less constitutional than other limitations written by the Congress from time to time on the extent and manner of the execution of powers vested in the Federal Government by the commerce clause of the Constitution.

With respect to the Missouri River, specifically, I am hopeful that a method can be found for the settlement of differences between the proponents of irrigation and of navigation so that the needed over-all development of the basin can proceed expeditiously.

I appreciate your having given my views consideration and having made them available to your committee. You have undertaken an important job and one that is particularly close to my heart. I am grateful and I am sure the Nation as a whole will be grateful for the great effort you are putting into this task.

Sincerely yours,

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

WATER-CONSERVATION CONFERENCE,
Washington, D. C., September 14, 1944.

Hon. JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: Last week 123 representatives from 29 States convened in Chicago for a water-conservation conference called by 4 widely scattered groups to perfect amendments to the river-harbor and flood-control bills now pending before the Senate.

We have the honor of conveying to you in compliance with resolutions passed at that conference the following:

1. Copies of two resolutions unanimously approved by the conference.

2. A proposed revision of the O'Mahoney-Millikin amendments, together with other amendments to H. R. 3961 and H. R. 4485, all of which were approved by the conference.

3. A list of the delegates by States who registered for the conference and who participated in the deliberations, together with the name of the organization or agency for which they were authorized to speak.

4. A list of the committees and the temporary officers chosen by the conference.

All participants in the conference were most grateful to you and Senator MILLIKIN for your interest and participation and for your counsel and advice to the committees and to the conference as a whole.

Any help which you can give in bringing the above material and information to the attention of interested parties throughout the Nation will be greatly appreciated by every member of the conference and especially by the undersigned.

Sincerely yours,

ALBAN J. PARKER, *Chairman.*
F. O. HAGIE, *Secretary-Treasurer.*

RESOLUTIONS APPROVED BY THE WATER CONSERVATION CONFERENCE

RESOLUTION 1

Whereas the omnibus rivers and harbors bill (H. R. 3961) and the omnibus flood-control bill (H. R. 4485), as passed by the House of Representatives and as now pending before the United States Senate, providing for public works to serve the interests of the Nation and of the States and their local regions, contain, in their present form, various provisions inimical to the sovereign rights and interests of the States and the people thereof; and

Whereas we, representatives from 29 States of the United States, are now in session in Chicago on September 7 and 8, 1944, at the call of the Interstate Commission on the Delaware River Basin, the Texas delegation in attendance at the New Orleans meeting of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress, the Committee on Preservation of Integrity of State Water Laws of the National Reclamation Association, and the Northeastern States Conservation Conference for the following purposes:

1. To assure local and State participation in plans for water-resources development;

2. To preserve the integrity of State water laws;

3. To perfect amendments to the omnibus rivers and harbors bill (H. R. 3961) and the omnibus flood-control bill (H. R. 4485) now pending before the United States Senate; and

4. To insure adoption of such amendments by the Congress; and

Whereas such perfecting amendments to be offered in substitution for and in addition to the so-called O'Mahoney and Millikin amendments to said bills have been prepared with the advice of Senators O'MAHONEY and MILLIKIN and approved by this conference; and

Whereas said amendments, if adopted by the Congress, will protect the rights and interests of the several States and provide for the full use of the facilities of the States and the Federal agencies concerned with the development and control of the water resources of the country in that they recognize and would preserve the correct distinction between the functions of the States and the United States and require full cooperation on the part of the Federal agencies involved and between them and the various States: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That this conference calls to the attention of all interested in the control and development of the Nation's water resources the action of this conference, and urges them to take all steps necessary to secure the adoption at the present session of Congress of said amendments and the two bills as so amended; and be it further

Resolved, That the Secretary of this conference is instructed to give general circulation to said proposed amendments to the bills H. R. 3961 and H. R. 4485, and to this resolution and to mail copies to all persons and organizations here represented.

RESOLUTION 2

Be it

Resolved, That this conference, having been honored by the presence of Senators JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY, of Wyoming, Senator EUGENE D. MILLIKIN, of Colorado, Senator HUGH BUTLER, of Nebraska, and Congressman FRANCIS CASE, of South Dakota, and aided by their counsel in its deliberations, expresses to them its gratitude for their attendance and advice; and be it further

Resolved, That the thanks of the conference are extended to Senators O'MAHONEY and MILLIKIN for their untiring efforts on behalf of the amendments perfecting H. R. 3961 and H. R. 4485 supported by this conference; and

The secretary of this conference is directed to present copies of this resolution to Senator O'MAHONEY, Senator MILLIKIN, Senator BUTLER, and Representative CASE.

O'MAHONEY-MILLIKIN AND OTHER AMENDMENTS TO THE RIVER-HARBOR AND FLOOD-CONTROL BILLS NOW PENDING BEFORE THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES AS APPROVED BY THE WATER CONSERVATION CONFERENCE

(Attended by water representatives of 29 States and interested Senators and Congressmen)

1. At the proper place in the bill insert the following:

"In connection with the exercise of jurisdiction over the rivers of the Nation through the construction of works of improvement, for navigation or flood control, it is hereby declared to be the policy of the Congress to recognize the interests and rights of the States in determining the development of the watersheds within their borders and likewise their interests and rights in water utilization and control; to preserve and protect to the fullest possible extent established and potential uses, for all purposes, of the waters of the Nation's rivers; to facilitate the consideration of projects on a basis of comprehensive, basin-wide development; and to limit the authorization and construction of navigation works to those in which a substantial benefit to navigation will be realized therefrom and which can be operated consistently with appropriate and economic use of the waters of such rivers by other users.

"In conformity with this policy:

"(a) Plans, proposals, or reports of the Chief of Engineers, War Department, for any works of improvement for navigation or flood control not heretofore or herein authorized, shall be submitted to the Congress only upon compliance with the provisions of this paragraph (a). Investigations which form the basis of any such plans, proposals, or reports shall be conducted in such a manner as to give to the affected State or States, during the course of the investigations, information developed by the investigations and also opportunity for consultation regarding plans and proposals, and, to the extent deemed practicable by the Chief of Engineers, opportunity to cooperate in the investigations. If such investigations in whole or part are concerned with the use or control of waters arising west of the ninety-seventh meridian, the Chief of Engineers shall give to the Secretary of the Interior, during the course of the investigations, information developed by the investigations and also opportunity for consultation regarding plans and proposals, and to the extent deemed practicable by the Chief of Engineers, opportunity to cooperate in the investigations. The relations of the Chief of Engineers with any State under this paragraph (a) shall be with the Governor of the State or such official or agency of the State as the Governor may designate. The term 'affected State or States' shall include those in which the works or any part thereof are proposed to be located; those which in whole or part are both within the drainage basin involved and situated in a State lying wholly or in part west of the ninety-eighth meridian; and such of those which are east of the ninety-eighth meridian as, in the judgment of the Chief of Engineers, will be substantially affected. Such plans, proposals, or reports and related investigations shall be made to the end, among other things, of facilitating the coordination of plans for the construction and operation of the proposed works with other plans involving the waters which would be used or controlled by such proposed works. Each report submitting any such plans or proposals to the Congress shall set out therein, among other things, the relationship between the plans for construction

and operation of the proposed works and the plans, if any, of the affected States and of the Secretary of the Interior. The Chief of Engineers shall transmit a copy of his proposed report to each affected State, and, in case the plans or proposals covered by the report are concerned with the use or control of waters which rise in whole or in part west of the ninety-seventh meridian, to the Secretary of the Interior. Within 90 days from the date of receipt of said proposed report, the written views and recommendations of each affected State and of the Secretary of the Interior may be submitted to the Chief of Engineers. The Secretary of War shall transmit to the Congress, with such comments and recommendations as he deems appropriate, the proposed report together with the submitted views and recommendations of affected States and of the Secretary of the Interior. The Secretary of War may prepare and make said transmittal any time following said 90-day period. The letter of transmittal and its attachments shall be printed as a House or Senate document.

"(b) The authorizations for projects described as follows in this act shall be subject to the provisions of this paragraph (b):

"Rowlesburg Reservoir on the Cheat River.

"Youghiogheny River Basin.

"Raystown Reservoir on the Juniata River.

"Connecticut River Basin.

* * * * *

"If a written objection to the authorization of any of the above described projects if filed with the Secretary of War within 90 days after the date of such authorization by the Governor of any affected State (as defined in paragraph (a) of this section), then the Chief of Engineers (1) shall give opportunity to be heard to representatives accredited by the Governor of each affected State; (2) shall undertake such investigations or reinvestigations as he deems appropriate in the circumstances; and (3) shall prepare a review report and recommendations in the light of said objections and hearings and shall transmit a copy thereof to each affected State. The review report shall be of such scope as the Chief of Engineers deems appropriate in the circumstances. Thereupon, within 90 days from the date of receipt of said review report, the written views and recommendations of each such State may be submitted to the Chief of Engineers. The Secretary of War shall transmit to the Congress, with such comments and recommendations as he deems appropriate, the review report together with the submitted views and recommendations of such States. The Secretary of War may prepare and make said transmittal any time following said 90-day period. The letter of transmittal and its attachments shall be printed as a House or Senate document. The authorization in question, with such modifications of the plans for works as may have been recommended in the review report of the Chief of Engineers, shall be effective on the date when said document is printed, if the Secretary of War concurs in said review report and if there is no objection thereto set forth in a submission of views and recommendations made by a State in accordance with the above procedure. The authorization, if objections thereto are set forth in such a submission, shall not be effective unless and until otherwise provided by subsequent act of Congress.

"Any authorization hereafter made based on a plan, proposal, or report which has been made to the Congress prior to the date of this act but which has not been heretofore or herein authorized, shall likewise be subject to the provisions of this paragraph (b).

"(c) The use for navigation, in connection with the operation and maintenance of such works herein or hereafter authorized for construction, of waters arising in States lying wholly or partly west of the ninety-eighth meridian shall be only such use as does not conflict with any beneficial consumptive use, present or future, in States lying wholly or partly west of the ninety-eighth meridian, of such waters for domestic, municipal, stock water, irrigation, mining, or industrial purposes.

"(d) The Secretary of the Interior, in making investigations of and reports on works for irrigation and purposes incidental thereto shall, in relation to an affected State or States (as defined in paragraph (a) of this section), and to the Secretary of War, be subject to the same provisions regarding investigations, plans, proposals, and reports as prescribed in paragraph (a) of this section for the Chief of Engineers and the Secretary of War. In the event a submission of views and recommendations, made by an affected State or by the Secretary of War pursuant to said provisions, sets forth objections to the plans or proposals covered by the report of the Secretary of the Interior, on grounds not inconsistent with paragraph (c) of this section, the proposed works shall not be deemed authorized except upon approval by an act of Congress; and subsection 9 (a) of the Reclamation Project Act of 1939 (53 Stat. 1187) and subsection 3 (a) of the act of August 11, 1939 (53 Stat. 1418), as amended, are hereby amended accordingly."

Section 4 of bill as passed by House:

"SEC. 6. That the Secretary of War is authorized to contract for water storage for any beneficial uses or purposes with States, legal subdivisions thereof, State and interstate agencies, municipalities, public, quasi public, or private corporations, firms, associations, or individuals on such terms and conditions as he may deem reasonable, when storage capacity for any such uses or purposes is or may be made available at any reservoir now or hereafter constructed by the War Department: *Provided*, That the right to the use of water for such purposes shall have been established by proceedings in conformity with State laws: *And provided further*, That no such water storage shall be in conflict with, or adversely affect, then existing lawful uses of water. All moneys received from such contracts shall be deposited in the Treasury of the United States as miscellaneous receipts."

Section 6 of bill as passed by House:

"SEC. 8. Hereafter, whenever the Secretary of War determines, upon recommendation by the Secretary of the Interior, that in connection with any dam and reservoir project constructed or to be constructed by the Secretary of War additional works for the diversion and distribution of water may be utilized for irrigation, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to make a report and findings on the construction of such additional works for the diversion and distribution of water as he may deem necessary for such purposes. Such report and findings shall be made in accordance with and subject to the provisions of the Federal reclamation laws (act of June 17, 1902, 32 Stat. 388, and acts amendatory thereof or supplemental thereto). Within the limits of the water users' repayment ability, such report may be predicated on the allocation to irrigation of an appropriate portion of the cost of structures and facilities used for irrigation. After authorization as provided by law, the Secretary of the Interior shall construct, operate, and maintain such additional works in accordance with said Federal reclamation laws and shall be authorized to deliver to such lands such portion of the water made available by said dam and reservoir project as may be set forth in said report and findings of the Secretary of the Interior or as may be otherwise provided by law. The provisions of this section shall not prejudice lawful uses then existing nor water rights or priorities established under applicable State laws, and shall not apply to any dam or reservoir heretofore or hereafter constructed which supplements any existing locally operated irrigation system or other locally operated water facilities, nor shall this section nor the provisions of section 6 hereof apply to any dam or reservoir heretofore constructed in whole or in part by the Army engineers, which provides conservation storage of water for irrigation purposes."

Section 15. Delete the entire section.

(This section relates to the authority and supervision of the Chief of Engineers over dams on navigable rivers and tributaries thereof.)

Section 9. Missouri River Basin.

Delete line 5, page 20, to line 2, page 22, inclusive, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"Subject to such revision and coordination as the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Interior may agree upon in a joint report to the Congress hereby directed to be made on or before —— 1945 (and to be printed as a House or Senate document), the general comprehensive plans set forth in House Document 475 and Senate Document 191, Seventy-eighth Congress, second session, are hereby approved and the initial stages recommended therein are hereby authorized, provided, said joint report shall include, among other things, (a) the allocations to various purposes of the estimated costs of the works comprising the plan, said allocations to be made on a basin-wide basis in general conformity with the provisions and principles of section 9 of the Reclamation Project Act of 1939 (53 Stat. 1187) as modified with respect to flood control and navigation by the practices of the Secretary of War; (b) provision for regulations by the Secretary of War to govern operation of the flood control or navigation capacity of any reservoir which, although agreed to be operated by the Bureau of Reclamation, includes some capacity dedicated and allocated for purposes of navigation or flood control; and (c) provision that water stored in Fort Peck Reservoir shall be made available for irrigation and other beneficial uses as additional multiple-purpose reservoirs are constructed and placed in operation; said multiple uses to include irrigation and other beneficial consumptive uses, power, and navigation."

The foregoing amendments apply to H. R. 4485, as reported by the Senate Commerce Committee on June 22, 1944, Report No. 1030, Calendar No. 1047.

RIVERS AND HARBORS BILL (H. R. 3961)

Amendments in accordance with the foregoing are to be made to H. R. 3961, as reported by the Senate Commerce Committee on May 25, 1944, Report No. 903, Calendar No. 915, in all instances where appropriate. In addition thereto, the following amendments are recommended to H. R. 3961:

1. Delete that portion of section 1, page 28, line 10, to page 28, line 23, inclusive, and insert the following in lieu thereof:

"Snake River, Oreg., Wash., and Idaho: The construction of such dams as are necessary and open channel improvement for purposes of providing slack-water navigation and irrigation in accordance with the plan submitted in House Document No. 704, Seventy-fifth Congress, with such modifications, as do not change the requirement to provide slack-water navigation, as the Secretary of War may find advisable after consultation with the Secretary of the Interior and such other agencies as may be concerned: *Provided*, That surplus electric energy generated at the dams authorized in this item shall be delivered to the Secretary of the Interior for disposition in accordance with existing laws relating to the disposition of power at Bonneville Dam: *Provided further*, That nothing in this paragraph shall be construed as conferring the power of condemnation of transmission lines."

2. Restore to the bill that portion thereof appearing from line 24, page 35, to line 3, page 36, inclusive, in strike-out type, the same constituting section 4 of H. R. 3961 as the

same was passed by the House of Representatives, reading as follows:

"SEC. 4. The excess land provisions of the Federal reclamation laws shall not be applicable to lands which will receive a water supply from the Central Valley project, California, reauthorized by section 2 of the River and Harbor Act, approved August 26, 1937."

LIST OF DELEGATES REGISTERED AT WATER CONSERVATION CONFERENCE AT STEVENS HOTEL, CHICAGO, SEPTEMBER 7 AND 8, 1944

ARIZONA

A. C. Williams, State of Arizona.

CALIFORNIA

G. L. Henderson, Kern County Canal & Water Co.
S. T. Harding, Tulare Lake Basin Water Storage District.
R. W. Stanfield, County of Riverside.
R. B. Harris, Irrigation Districts of California.
C. L. Kaupke, Kirgs River Water Association.
M. E. Salsbury, Los Angeles County Flood Control District.
S. B. Robinson, Colorado River Board of California.
W. A. Smith, Los Angeles County.
Howard A. Miller, Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce.
E. F. Scattergood, Colorado River Board of California.
A. B. Shaw, Jr., Attorney General of California.
James H. Howard, Colorado River Board of California.
L. H. Hauser, Colorado River Board of California.
Earl Redwine, Riverside County.
W. V. Pittman, Riverside County.
Edward Hyatt, State of California.
E. C. Reynolds, United States Chamber of Commerce.
F. H. Mogle, County Flood Control.
Raymond Matthew, State Department of Public Works.
Rolan Curran, Central Valley Project Association.
W. C. Penfield, Santa Barbara County.
C. W. Bradbury, Board of Supervisors, Santa Barbara County.
F. H. Fowler, Colorado River Board of California.
Burnham Enersen, North Kern Water Storage District.
L. H. Adam, Santa Maria Valley Water Conservation District.
W. R. Bailey, Tulare County.
Leroy McCormick, Tulare County.

COLORADO

EUGENE D. MILLIKIN, United States Senator from Colorado.
R. L. Carr, Colorado.
Clifford H. Stone, State of Colorado.
Glenn G. Saunders, State of Colorado.
W. P. Redding, Denver Chamber of Commerce.
A. P. Gumlick, Denver Water Board.
Roscoe Fleming, National Farmers Union.
Gail L. Ireland, Attorney General of Colorado.
George M. Corbett, Colorado.
A. W. McHendrie, Colorado.

CONNECTICUT

S. W. Wadlams, State of Connecticut.

DELAWARE

R. C. Beckett, Interstate Commission on the Delaware River Basin.

IDAHO

Earl Murphy, State Chamber of Commerce.
E. W. Rising, State of Idaho, and Governor of Idaho.

ILLINOIS

J. B. Lamson, C. B. & Q. R. R.
H. J. Gramlich, C. & N. W. R. R.
Leon H. Robbins, Milwaukee Railroad.
A. J. Meseroe, Attorney General.
G. A. Haggander, C. B. & Q. R. R.
R. W. Booze, Federal Power Commission.
Paul E. Carneck, G. T. M. Southern Pacific Co.
D. J. McGanney, G. T. M. Southern Pacific Co.
L. M. Fisher, United States Public Health Service.

KANSAS

C. A. Munger, Republic Valley.
J. E. Kissell, Kansas Reclamation Association.
E. Porter Ahrens, Kansas Reclamation Association.

MAINE

John G. Marshall, State of Maine.

MARYLAND

J. R. Baker, Penn Water & Power Co.
L. H. Sothoron, Interstate Commission on Potomac River Basin.

MASSACHUSETTS

Laurence Curtis, Massachusetts Commission on Interstate Cooperation.

MINNESOTA

W. E. Olson, Minneapolis Civic & Commerce Association.
W. T. Foley, The Farmer.
F. P. Fellows, St. Paul Association of Commerce.
J. W. Haw, Northern Pacific Ry. Co.
A. J. Dexter, Northern Pacific Ry. Co.

MISSOURI

Hugh Denney, State Conservation Commission and State Department Resources and Development.
P. T. Simons, Missouri Pacific R. R.
Sam Shelton, The Post Dispatch, St. Louis, Mo.

MONTANA

W. A. D'Ewart, Montana Reclamation Association.
W. F. Flinn, State of Montana.
Fred Sanborn, Great Northern Ry.
O. S. Warden, State of Montana.

NEBRASKA

John Riddell, State of Nebraska.
George Proud, State Reclamation Association.
E. N. Van Horne, Nebraska Reclamation Association.
Wardner Scott, State Department Roads and Irrigation.
C. P. Peterson, Nebraska.
HUGH BUTLER, United States Senator from Nebraska.

NEVADA

A. M. Smith, State of Nevada.

NEW HAMPSHIRE

Stephen W. Wheeler, State of New Hampshire.

NEW JERSEY

Duane E. Minard, Interstate Commission on the Delaware River Basin.

NEW MEXICO

E. W. Bowen, State of New Mexico.

NORTH DAKOTA

F. J. Fredrickson, Greater North Dakota Association State Water Commission, and Governor Moses.
Harry E. Polk, National Reclamation Association.
R. A. H. Brandt, North Dakota Reclamation Association.
Kenneth W. Simons, State of North Dakota.

SOUTH DAKOTA

M. G. Scott, South Dakota Reclamation Association.
H. M. Pierce, South Dakota Reclamation Association.
Raymond F. Lund, South Dakota Reclamation Association.
A. Svendby, South Dakota Reclamation Association.
FRANCIS CASE, Congressman, South Dakota.

OKLAHOMA

Frank Raab, Division Water Resources.

OREGON

Allan A. Smith, Oregon Reclamation Congress.
Charles E. Stricklin, State Engineer of Oregon.
Robert W. Sawyer, State of Oregon.

PENNSYLVANIA

L. W. Heath, Interstate Commission on the Delaware River Basin.
I. S. Sanli, Pennsylvania Municipal Authorities Association.
Hon. F. Lichtenwalter, Pennsylvania.
J. H. Murdock, Jr., Pennsylvania.
James H. Allen, Interstate Commission on the Delaware River Basin.
C. A. Miller, Interstate Commission on the Delaware River Basin.

TEXAS

J. E. Sturrock, State of Texas.
Max Starcke, Lower Colorado River Authority.
C. S. Clark, Texas Board of Water Engineers.
E. W. Easterling, Lower Neches Valley Authority.
Charles Matula, Lower Colorado River Authority.
A. F. Mitchell, Texas Society of Professional Engineers.
John D. McCall, State of Texas.
R. B. McLeaish, State of Texas.
W. G. Hall, San Jacinto, River Conservation and Reclamation District.

UTAH

E. H. Watson, State of Utah.
S. A. Kennedy, Metropolitan Water Board of Salt Lake City.
Ora Bundy, State of Utah.

VERMONT

F. E. Morrissey, Vermont Conservation Board.
Philip Shutler, State of Vermont.
Alban J. Parker, Attorney General, State of Vermont.
S. R. Waterman, Governor of Vermont.

WYOMING

L. C. Bishop, State of Wyoming.
H. T. Person, Wyoming Reclamation Association.
JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY, United States Senator from Wyoming.

WASHINGTON

Lars Langloe, State Department of Conservation and Development.
Leo E. Lowe, Washington Irrigation Institute; Seattle and State chambers of commerce.

WASHINGTON, D. C.

David J. Guy, Chamber of Commerce of United States.
F. O. Hagie, National Reclamation Association.
E. R. Cotton, Interstate Commission on the Potomac River Basin.

The conference named the following committees:

DRAFTING COMMITTEE

Clifford H. Stone, chairman, Colorado; James H. Allen, Pennsylvania; Philip Shutler, Vermont; John D. McCall, Texas; W. R. Bailey, California; E. W. Rising, Idaho; L. H. Sothoron, Maryland.

COMMITTEE ADVISERS

Senator JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY, of Wyoming.
Senator EUGENE D. MILLIKIN, of Colorado.

RESOLUTIONS COMMITTEE

Robert W. Sawyer, chairman, Oregon; J. E. Sturrock, Texas; Duane E. Minard, New Jersey; Frank Raab, Oklahoma; Fred Fellows,

Minnesota; C. L. Kaupke, California; Franklin Lichtenwalter, Pennsylvania; R. A. H. Brandt, North Dakota; Samuel H. Wadhams, Connecticut; Glenn Saunders, Colorado.

TEMPORARY OFFICERS

Alban J. Parker, conference chairman, Vermont; F. O. Hagie, conference secretary-treasurer, Washington, D. C.

FAIR EMPLOYMENT PRACTICE COMMITTEE

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to place in the RECORD a letter written by Dr. Karl Menninger, one of the leading businessmen of Topeka, urging prompt action on the bill for a permanent Fair Employment Practice Committee. I heartily approve the stand taken by Dr. Menninger.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE MENNINGER CLINIC,
Topeka, Kans., September 7, 1944.

Senator ARTHUR CAPPER,
Senate Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR CAPPER: * * * It appears that the bill for a permanent F. E. P. C. may be sidetracked at this session. It seems to me that this would be a great mistake. It would mean sidestepping an extraordinarily important problem. Evasion by Congress of this issue would appear to be a step in the direction of principles advocated by Hitler instead of a step in the direction of principles advocated by our own Thomas Jefferson. Won't you do what you can to see that the bill is reported favorably as soon as possible?

* * * * *

Sincerely yours,
KARL MENNINGER, M. D.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts, from the Committee on Naval Affairs:

S. 2053. A bill relating to the pay of officers of the retired list of the Navy serving on active duty in the rank of rear admiral; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1101).

By Mr. WHEELER, from the Committee on Indian Affairs:

S. 1925. A bill to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Interior to issue to Charles F. White a patent in fee to certain land; without amendment (Rept. No. 1102); and

S. 2026. A bill authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to Richard Pickett; without amendment (Rept. No. 1103).

By Mr. DANAHER, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. 573. A bill granting jurisdiction to the Court of Claims to reopen and readjudicate the eminent-domain case of John W. Parish, trustee (John H. Bexten, substituted), and revise its judgment heretofore entered therein; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1104).

By Mr. BARKLEY, from the Committee on the Library:

S. J. Res. 141. Joint resolution memorializing the name of Horace Wells; without amendment.

EXEMPTION OF OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES OF NATIONAL WAR LABOR BOARD FROM PROVISIONS OF CRIMINAL CODE

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, from the Committee on the Judiciary, I report back favorably with an amendment the bill (H. R. 4349) to exempt certain officers and employees of the National War Labor Board from certain provisions of the Criminal Code, and I submit a report (No. 1107) thereon.

The bill would correct an unusual situation. I shall not ask to have the bill taken up today; but tomorrow, after opportunity has been had to examine the bill, I shall request unanimous consent to have it taken up for immediate consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the report will be received, and the bill will be placed on the calendar.

NATIONAL SERVICE LIFE INSURANCE ACT OF 1940

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, from the Committee on Finance I report back favorably without amendment the bill (S. 2015) to liberalize certain provisions of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, as amended, and I submit a report (No. 1105) thereon, and also from the same committee I report back favorably without amendment the bill (S. 2053) to liberalize certain provisions of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, as amended, and I submit a report (No. 1106) thereon.

I hope Senators will examine the bills and reports, because tomorrow or the next day, if we shall be in session, I shall ask for consideration of the bills. They both deal with the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, and are both amendatory of the act in very important respects. This is legislation which ought to pass the Senate before we take a recess.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the reports submitted by the Senator from Georgia will be received and the bills will be placed on the calendar.

PART-TIME EMPLOYEES OF COMMITTEES—REPORTS

Mr. MEAD, from the Special Committee to Investigate the National Defense Program, in response to Senate Resolution 319, relative to persons employed who are not full-time employees of the Senate or any committee thereof, agreed to August 23, 1944, submitted a report thereon, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SPECIAL COMMITTEE INVESTIGATING THE NATIONAL DEFENSE PROGRAM SEPTEMBER 1, 1944
(Standing or select committee)

To the Senate:

The above-mentioned committee hereby submits the following report showing the name of persons employed by the committee who are not full-time employees of the Senate or of the committee, in compliance with the terms of Senate Resolution No. 319, agreed to August 28, 1944:

Name of individual	Address	Name and address of department or organization by whom paid	Annual rate of compensation
Joe L. Martinez (investigator)	208 Massachusetts Ave. NW	U. S. Maritime Commission, Commerce Building, 14th St. between E St. and Constitution Ave.	$3,800
Franklin N. Parks (investigator)	2701 Connecticut Ave	Office of Price Administration, Second and D Sts. SW	3,800
Harold G. Robinson (chief investigator)	3446 Highwood Drive SE	U. S. Maritime Commission, Commerce Building, 14th St. between E St. and Constitution Ave.	6,000
Brig. Gen. Frank E. Lowe	1316 New Hampshire Ave	General Staff, U. S. Army, Finance Office, Pentagon Building	6,000
Lt. Col. Harry Vaughan	1609 Oakcrest Drive, Alexandria, Va	do	3,500

JAS. M. MEAD, *Chairman.*

Mr. HATCH, from the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys, pursuant to Senate Resolution 319, supra, submitted a report relating to the subcommittee to investigate public lands, of the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and appears under a separate heading.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado, from the Committee on Finance:

Paul S. Nice, of Denver, Colo., to be assayer in the mint of the United States at Denver, Colo., to fill an existing vacancy.

By Mr. CONNALLY, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

H. Colt MacLean, of Virginia, now a Foreign Service officer of class 2 and a secretary in the Diplomatic Service, to be also a consul general of the United States of America; and

Edward P. Lawton, of Georgia, now a Foreign Service officer of class 4 and a secretary in the Diplomatic Service, to be also a consul general of the United States of America.

By Mr. HATCH, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

Harold Maurice Kennedy, of New York, to be United States district judge for the eastern district of New York, vice Marcus B. Campbell, deceased.

By Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts, from the Committee on Naval Affairs:

Sundry officers of the Naval Reserve for appointment as lieutenants (junior grade) and/or ensigns in the Navy; sundry persons for appointment as assistant surgeons in the Navy, with the rank of lieutenant (junior grade); sundry officers of the Naval Reserve to be assistant paymasters in the Navy, with

the rank of ensign; and Ensign Edward G. Cunney, United States Coast and Geodetic Survey, to be an assistant civil engineer in the Navy, with the rank of lieutenant (junior grade) to rank from July 1, 1944.

By Mr. McKELLAR, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads:

Sundry postmasters.

BILLS AND A JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. BALL:

S. 2151. A bill for the relief of the village of Cold Spring, Minn.; to the Committee on Claims.

(Mr. VANDENBERG introduced Senate bill 2152, which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BAILEY:

S. 2153. A bill conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the Middle District of North Carolina to hear, determine, and render judgment upon any claim arising out of the death of L. W. Freeman; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. REYNOLDS:

S. 2154. A bill for the relief of Edgar B. Grier; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. STEWART:

S. 2155. A bill to transfer jurisdiction over the Chattanooga National Cemetery, Chattanooga, Tenn., from the Department of the Interior to the War Department, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

By Mr. KILGORE (for Mr. WALLGREN):

S. 2156. A bill for the relief of Albert J. Walch; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. PEPPER:

S. 2157. A bill for the relief of Elmer R. Kinsey; and

S. 2158. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. James E. McGhee; to the Committee on Claims.

S. J. Res. 154. Joint resolution providing for paying the expenses of returning certain nationals of the United States from the Philippine Islands to the continental United States; to the Committee on Claims.

INCREASE OF EXEMPTION LIMITATION ON REGISTRATION OF SECURITIES

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, last Friday I referred to a letter received by me from the Chairman of the Securities and Exchange Commission discussing the question of the revision of the Securities and Exchange Commission rules so as to facilitate the financing of small business in the post-war era.

I ask consent to introduce a bill this morning to increase the exemption limit on the registration of securities from $100,000 to $300,000, which, as I understand the Chairman of the Securities and Exchange Commission, has his approval. I also understand that it will cover substantially the field where assistance and encouragement are necessary in connection with the financing of post-war small business.

Therefore, Mr. President, I am introducing the bill and asking that it be referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and I am renewing an expression of the hope that the subject itself may not be much longer entirely ignored by the committee.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 2152) to amend section 3 (b) of the Securities Act of 1933, as amended, so as to permit exemption of security issues not exceeding $300,000 from the provisions of such act, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H. R. 5386) to amend the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, to extend the time within which application may be made for reemployment, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

RIVER AND HARBOR FLOOD-CONTROL WORKS—AMENDMENT

Mr. TAFT submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 4485) authorizing the construction of certain public works on rivers and harbors for flood control, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

CONTINUANCE ON PAY ROLL OF CERTAIN CLERICAL ASSISTANTS TO SENATORS

Mr. WALSH of New Jersey submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 327), which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That the clerical assistants and clerk of any Senator who has been appointed to serve until a vacancy caused by the death or resignation of a Senator is filled at the next general election, and serves until such election, shall, if on the pay roll of the Senate at the time of such election, be continued on such pay roll until the beginning of the next regular session of the Congress: *Provided*, That no such employee shall continue on such pay roll after accepting any other legislative employment or employment with the Federal Government. Payment of salaries authorized by this resolution shall be made from the contingent fund of the Senate at the respective rates now provided by law.

SEC. 2. The provisions of this resolution shall be effective beginning with the Seventy-eighth Congress.

RETENTION OF ROY W. BROWN AS CAPTAIN OF THE CAPITOL POLICE

Mr. GEORGE submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 328), which was referred to the Committee on Rules:

Resolved, That the Sergeant at Arms of the Senate be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to retain Roy W. Brown, of Rochelle, Ga., in the position now held by him as Captain of the Capitol Police until otherwise ordered by the Senate.

PRINTING OF HEARINGS OF SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO STUDY AND SURVEY PROBLEMS OF SMALL BUSINESS ENTERPRISES

Mr. CHAVEZ (for Mr. MURRAY) submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 329), which was referred to the Committee on Printing:

Resolved, That in accordance with paragraph 3 of section 2 of the Printing Act approved March 1, 1907, the Special Committee to Study Problems of American Small Business, authorized by Senate Resolution 66, Seventy-eighth Congress (extending S. Res. 298, 76th Cong.), be, and is hereby, empowered to have printed for its use not to exceed 2,000 additional copies of each part of its hearings.

INVESTIGATION OF EXPANDED UTILIZATION OF FARM CROPS (S. DOC. NO. 240)

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, I present a report from the subcommittee on the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, which was charged with the study and investigation of a broad utilization of farm products. The report of the subcomittee is particularly timely and pertinent and one which we hope may be used as a basis for discussion with the Chief Executive in the near future. I ask that it be printed as a Senate document and that it be printed in the body of the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the report presented by Mr. GILLETTE was ordered to be printed as a Senate document and also to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INVESTIGATION OF EXPANDED UTILIZATION OF FARM CROPS

(S. Doc. No. 240)

Senate Resolution 224, Seventy-seventh Congress, adopted March 5, 1942, and extended by Senate Resolution 80, Seventy-eighth Congress, on February 11, 1943, reads in part as follows:

"*Resolved*, That the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized and directed to make a full and complete study and investigation of the production and means of production and plans for production of industrial alcohol, synthetic alcohol, and synthetic rubber, including the utilization of our natural materials for such purposes, the construction and location of production plants for the necessary processing of materials and resources in the manufacturing of these commodities; also including the organization or organizations now controlling or seeking to control for the future such alcohol and rubber production, together with the use of patents and processes used in such manufacture, and developed or owned in whole or in part by foreign companies, corporations, individuals, or agents, and particularly to inquire into the plans and purposes and policies of our governmental agencies, relative to the full and most economical utilization of grains, canes, fruits, vineyards, and other agricultural materials, in the processing and production of industrial alcohol, synthetic alcohol, and synthetic rubber and further to make inquiry as to contemplated action for settlement or adjudication of pending judicial action, by consent decree or settlement process, involving patent processes or control of such processing and manufacture of synthetic alcohols and rubber."

Pursuant to the above resolution, a subcommittee of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry of the United States Senate was appointed, composed at first of Senators Guy M. Gillette, chairman, Burton K. Wheeler, Elmer Thomas, George W. Norris, and Charles L. McNary. The positions of the late Senators Norris and McNary were filled by Senators Raymond E. Willis and George D. Aiken.

The committee has held extended hearings over the period from March 20, 1942, to date, on the general subject of the broadened or expanded utilization of the products of farm and forest. Because of the war emergency special emphasis was placed upon the matter

of industrial alcohol and synthetic rubber from these sources.

INDUSTRIAL ALCOHOL

This report deals particularly with the problem of greater utilization of the products of farm and forest through the manufacture of industrial alcohol and extending the uses thereof in the organic chemical industry.

The organic chemical industry depends on three principal raw materials, i. e., coal, petroleum, and products of the farm and forest. Coal is principally used in the production of power and heat, petroleum for motive power and heat and agricultural products for feed and foods. The products of farm and forest, through industrial alcohol, have been utilized in the organic chemical industry, but to a very limited extent. One witness described alcohol as the most versatile of all chemical compounds. Dr. R. E. Buchanan, director, Agricultural Experiment Station, Iowa State College, Ames, Iowa, after citing the ability of this country to produce more grain than we can utilize for feed and food, indicated the need for greater dependence of the organic chemical industry on the products of farm and forest by saying:

"With petroleum we are drawing constantly upon our capital and our reserves; with agricultural products we need use only the interest upon our capital stock of land and climate, yet maintain our reserves."

In 1907 this country consumed less than 2,000,000 gallons of industrial alcohol. In the years prior to World War No. 2 annual consumption had grown to from 100,000,000 to 150,000,000 gallons, but this was of little benefit to the domestic farmer because 94 percent of this production and consumption came from petroleum (ethylene) or molasses. Most of the molasses was imported.

In wartime consumption of industrial alcohol has increased many times over the prewar figure. In 1944 it is estimated the consumption will exceed 600,000,000 gallons. Part of this is due to the expanded use of alcohol in the manufacture of synthetic rubber, but large quantities have also been used in the manufacture of other military supplies.

ALCOHOL FOR SYNTHETIC RUBBER

When the committee commenced its hearings in 1942 a program had been laid out by various agencies of the Government to provide this country with synthetic rubber, the normal sources of natural rubber having been almost wholly cut off by the war. That program as originally initiated provided that the entire synthetic rubber program to meet the emergency would be based upon petroleum. After extended hearings, wherein the superiority of the process for making synthetic rubber from alcohol was demonstrated in the matter of speed and utilization of smaller amounts of critical material, the program was changed from week to week until approximately one-third of the scheduled program for synthetic rubber was based on industrial alcohol from farm and forest sources. At the time the committee recommended legislation to set up a rubber director's office. The legislation was passed by the Congress, but vetoed by the Chief Executive. However, the Chief Executive did appoint the Baruch committee whose report brought about the appointment of a rubber director and the solution of the synthetic rubber problem for military purposes, if not entirely for all civilian uses. The plants producing synthetic rubber from alcohol were operating long before the plants using a petroleum base and currently while the alcohol plants were only scheduled to produce one-third of the synthetic rubber they are actually producing almost three-quarters.

The committee believes that maximum production of synthetic rubber from grain should be maintained for, among many others, the following reasons:

1. About $150,000,000 of Government money has been invested in plants for the production of butadiene and styrene from grain alcohol.

2. Millions more of public funds have been invested in grain-alcohol plants for the production of grain alcohol for rubber.

3. Under present legislation the Government is obligated to purchase some $2,000,000 worth of surplus grain in the next few years.

4. Thus, producing synthetic rubber in these Government plants will actually cost no more than the processing charges, since the plants and raw materials will be bought and paid for, regardless. Grain rubber would thus actually cost less than petroleum rubber, and probably less than plantation rubber.

5. Not producing grain rubber would cost much more. The Government investments in plants and grain would be lost and in addition, there would be no usable production to offset these costs.

6. Moreover, grain rubber could undoubtedly be sold at a price adequate to cover processing costs and return at least part of the Government's investments in plants and grains.

7. Not only would a substantial part of our rubber requirements be met at minimum real cost, since we have the alternatives of getting rubber from our surplus grain, or nothing, but an economically sensible market for grain surplus would be created by grain rubber.

8. Producing rubber from grain, and thereby keeping men employed on the farm and in rubber factories is certainly a better solution of our farm problem than paying farmers not to produce the grain, thus in effect buying unemployment on the farm and in the factory, or than buying the grain and letting it rot, with consequent unemployment in rubber factories, and no usable production in either case.

9. Moreover maximum production of rubber from grain would serve to keep international prices of crude rubber from becoming exorbitant thus constituting a net saving to the Nation. Grain rubber would save the American people the difference between its cost and what would otherwise be the international price for crude rubber and would stabilize rubber prices.

10. Synthetic rubber should be produced principally from grain rather than petroleum because grains are replaceable and in constant surplus, whereas petroleum reserves are irreplaceable and being constantly depleted.

11. From the standpoint of military security a grain-rubber industry should be maintained to assure us of a source of supply of rubber and to assure us of maximum reserves of oil products in the event of war.

MANUFACTURE OF ALCOHOL

In eight of the nine printed volumes of testimony taken by the committee, totaling almost 2,500 printed pages, will be found a fund of information on all phases of the production and utilization of the products of farm and forest in the manufacture of industrial alcohol, the uses of industrial alcohol, and possibilities for other commercial uses of farm crops.

Dr. William J. Hale, President of National Argol Co., told the committee that:

"Alcohol is the only outlet in mass form for agricultural products that we have. There is no other way in which you can bring agricultural products in enormous quantities into the chemical-industrial world save through alcohol."

Industrial alcohol can be manufactured from any of the farm or forest products that have sugar or starch. Principally the sources are: in the southern States, sugarcane, corn, sweet potatoes and rice; in the northern States, corn, wheat, rye, barley, potatoes, and grain sorghums; and wherever timber is grown in quantity the sources are the sawdust of the sawmills and the sulphite liquors of the paper pulp mills.

Additional products entering into the organic chemical industry, other than industrial (ethyl) alcohol, can likewise be produced from the products of farm and forest. They include such products as cellulose, acetone, acetic acid, butyl alcohol, glycerol and manitol. The development of 2-3 butylene glycol holds promise of opening up vast fields.

To meet the heavy demands for industrial alcohol, approaching six times the normal pre-war consumption, four steps were taken:

1. The seaboard molasses plants were converted to the handling of grain and the production of industrial alcohol therefrom.

2. The beverage distilleries were converted from the manufacture of beverage liquors to the manufacture of industrial alcohol from grain.

3. Several closed breweries were converted to the manufacture of industrial alcohol from grain.

4. The Defense Plant Corporation built three plants in the grain producing areas, one at Kansas City, Mo.; one at Omaha, Nebr., and one at Muscatine, Iowa, to manufacture industrial alcohol from grain. In addition there is being built on the west coast a plant to manufacture industrial alcohol from waste sulphite liquors and one to manufacture industrial alcohol from sawdust.

FUTURE USES OF INDUSTRIAL ALCOHOL

Of the wartime expansion of industrial alcohol, one of the bright possibilities is the continued use of this product in at least a portion of the permanent synthetic rubber industry of the United States.

However, if the Nation is to make full use of its ability in raising grains, it must find a market therefor beyond the normal requirements for feed and food. The alternatives are either bankruptcy of the farmer or a permanent plow-under dole, which, continued long enough, spells bankruptcy for the Nation.

Bankruptcy of the Nation or the farmer is unnecessary if that portion of grain which the farmer raises over and above the requirements for feed and food is channeled into the industrial and commercial market. True, it will have to replace some of the market now controlled by petroleum. But, as has been so often pointed out, the oil wells do not reproduce themselves from year to year as do crops, and the economy of the Nation dictates a conservation of petroleum reserves, whereas we can be quite generous with the yearly crop of grain produced over and above our needs for feed and food.

ALCOHOL AS MOTOR FUEL

The balance wheel of our agricultural economy can be the utilization of our surplus grains for motor fuel. Ample testimony throughout the record of the committee hearings indicates that industrial alcohol can be used satisfactorily. It can be used as a blend with gasoline or, the testimony indicates, there are distinct prospects of enlarged uses in the way of a vapor injection direct to the motor though the principal motive power remains gasoline. One of the wartime developments of aviation motors uses this particular technique.

Numerous witnesses were heard with reference to the experience of other countries and the studies in this country in this matter of using alcohol as a motor-fuel blend, or, as some have characterized it, power alcohol.

In order to give the Congress and the people of the country an insight into this problem of power alcohol, a brief résumé of some of the pertinent testimony seems advisable.

Mr. M. M. Rosten, a citizen of Poland, appeared before the committee on several occasions. From 1927 to 1939 Mr. Rosten developed a power-alcohol industry in his

native land. By the end of 1938 he was producing 12,000 gallons of industrial alcohol daily from agricultural products—grain, potatoes, and beet-sugar molasses—all of which was blended with petroleum and sold by the larger oil companies as a motor fuel. Mr. Rosten testified that there were around 1,500 small agricultural alcohol plants in Poland and 36,000 in Germany. He also testified that the quality of the motor fuel was improved by the blend because for each 1 percent of alcohol added the octane rating was increased one point. Mr. Rosten admitted that to secure proper thermal efficiency in using alcohol exclusively as a motor fuel, new engines would have to be built. However, "in using a 10- to 15-percent power alcohol with gasoline, a change in gasoline engines is not needed." Reference will be found in list 1 to the many special articles and reports submitted by Mr. Rosten. Also in list 2 will be found several additional articles pertinent to the subject.

List 1:

Alcohol From Waste Sulfite Liquors in North America, by M. M. Rosten, 50–51.

Alcohol From Waste Sulfite Liquor and the New Role of Alcohol in the Economic Life, by M. M. Rosten, 52–54.

Power Alcohol in Canada, by M. M. Rosten, 60–73.

Alcohol From Waste Sulphite Liquor—An Important and Timely Subject for Consideration by the Pulp Industry, by M. M. Rosten, 74–79.

Statement, by M. M. Rosten, 1736–1742.

Can Power Alcohol End Our Wheat Surpluses?, by M. M. Rosten, 2190–2194.

Letter from Mr. M. M. Rosten, September 12, 1943, 2248–2251.

List 2:

Letter from John N. Cole, president, Vita-Meter Corporation, New York, N. Y., June 9, 1943, 1798–1800.

History of Development of Wood Sugar Process (Scholler) in the United States, by Carl A. Rishell, 2002–2007.

Report of United States Tariff Commission, January 1944, on Industrial Alcohol, 2323–2350.

Section on Possible Use of Alcohol for Motor Fuel, at p. 2339.

Alcohol—How Farming, Forestry, and the Alcohol Industry Can Cooperate for the Good of the Country During Wartime Emergency and in Post-War Reconstruction, by Erwin M. Schaefer, 2364–2365.

Other information before the committee indicates that in addition to Poland and Germany, the countries of France, Italy, the Philippines, and about 20 different countries have utilized alcohol extensively as a motor fuel. During the present war, our neighbor, Cuba, resorted to the utilization of alcohol as a motor-fuel blend as is indicated by the following letter from p. 2405 of the record:

FOREIGN ECONOMIC ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D. C., April 4, 1944.

Hon. GUY M. GILLETTE,
United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR GILLETTE: This is in reply to your letter of February 26, 1944, asking for information regarding the use of alcohol as motor fuel in Cuba. It is understood that the information is desired for the use of the Senate Subcommittee to Investigate the Use of Farm Crops, of which you are the chairman.

Cuba adopted a mixture of alcohol and gasoline for motor fuel shortly after shipping difficulties in the Carribbean threatened to cut off supplies of petroleum products, nearly all of which must be imported. The official formula at first was 35-percent gasoline and 65-percent alcohol. This formula was changed by a decree dated November 5, 1943, to 25-percent gasoline and 75-percent alcohol. This is still the official ratio. (Unofficial advices indicate as high as 95-percent alcohol is being used.)

The performance of these mixtures in motor vehicles in Cuba appears to have been satisfactory, and the use of blended motor fuel is increasing. Cork floats in carburetors must be replaced by metal floats, and minor adjustments are necessary. Users are cautioned to clean out tanks and fuel lines thoroughly the first time the mixture is used since alcohol tends to loosen dirt which had not been dissolved by gasoline. Gasoline-alcohol mixtures are not used in tractors to any significant extent in Cuba.

Tests indicate that when gasoline motors are adjusted by raising the compression ratio (to offset the British thermal unit deficiency of alcohol as a motor fuel), alcohol can be used with an efficiency comparable to that of gasoline. In Cuba, however, this adjustment has not been generally made, and as a result the mileage obtained with the current gasoline-alcohol mixture is reported to be only 60 to 80 percent of that obtained with gasoline.

Cuban observers have expressed the opinion that blended fuels tend to cause cylinder walls to become pitted. Recent tests in the United States, however, are reported to have shown that there is considerably less pitting when alcohol is used for fuel than occurs when gasoline is used.

Sincerely yours,

LEO T. CROWLEY,
Administrator.

An actual experience related before the committee follows:

"I have driven 23,000 miles with a car, without adjustment of carburetor or without any cleaning of carbon or anything of that kind—our firm has been in automotive engineering and I know it thoroughly—we tore our motors down, examined them and put them back into operation without any cleaning or anything of that kind, and at the end of 23,000 miles, with a 10 to 15 percent blend, I had a car that was running 100 percent right and with no carbon in the motor."

Actual copies of advertisements used by American oil companies in foreign advertising praising the benefits of alcohol blend motor fuels, are in the record. Other advertisements show prominent domestic truck and tractor manufacturers advertising their products in the Philippine Islands to operate on Philippine alcohol.

In the committee record will be found copy of a letter written in 1936 by the Honorable HENRY A. WALLACE, then Secretary of Agriculture, pointing out among other things that the automobile threw out of use 35,000,000 acres once needed to feed horses and mules. He pointed out that:

"One of your major projects, the manufacture of fuel alcohol from corn and other agricultural products has been the subject of considerable investigation and thought. We have favored carrying out a practical test of the possibilities on a small commercial scale, but so far the necessary funds have not been made available to the Department. We believe that such a test is a sound approach to the problem."

Since that letter was written funds have been made available and the scientific work is under way. In an appendix hereto will be found a report on the interest of the Department of Agriculture in ethyl alcohol as a motor fuel, showing the research program that is under way. A bibliography is made a part of this report.

In addition to the research work under way at the Northern Regional Research Laboratory at Peoria, Ill., as described in the appendix, the Congress at the present session enacted special legislation authorizing the construction and operation of demonstration plants to produce synthetic liquid fuels from coal, oil shales, agricultural and forestry products, and other substances, in order to aid the prosecution of the war, to conserve and increase the oil resources of the Nation, and for other purposes (Public Law 290, 78th Cong., Apr. 5, 1944). The legislation provides specifically for the construction, maintenance, and operation (in addition to plants to produce synthetic fuels from coal and oil shale) of one or more demonstration plants to produce liquid fuels from agricultural and forestry products and that any activities under this act relating to the production of liquid fuels from agricultural and forestry products shall be carried out in cooperation with the Department of Agriculture and subject to the direction of the Secretary of Agriculture.

THE PROBLEM

The committee, as indicated, has received a vast amount of testimony from which it is convinced that from a technical standpoint alcohol from grain can be successfully used as a motor fuel. Dr. O. R. Sweeney, chemical engineer, Iowa State Agricultural College, Ames, Iowa, told the committee that he didn't think the making of alcohol for use as gasoline was an economic proposition. Likewise the report of the northern regional laboratory appearing in the Appendix, states that the use of alcohol as a motor fuel posed an economic rather than a technical problem.

That is, in the view of the committee, the crux of the whole problem, Is it economic?

The answer is not as simple as appears at first blush. It involves determinations of such questions as (1) whether the production of grains will be limited to the food and feed requirements with a plow-under dole to prevent an oversupply from ruination and bankruptcy of the farmer; (2) whether unlimited and unrestrained production of grain to supply an industrial market, as well as the feed and food market, is preferable to a restricted production; (3) whether that portion of the grain raised over and above the food and feed requirements of the Nation should be subsidized by the Government, or (4) whether a dual pricing system be devised to permit the surplus grain to move into industrial markets; (5) whether, in an overall way, it would be cheaper to turn our surplus grains into the industrial market thus providing wide employment, than to continue a policy of restriction to maintain prices.

CONCLUSION

The committee will continue to carry on its investigations and studies of the above problem. However, as the problem is of such far-reaching importance to the future welfare of the Nation, the committee invites the President to appoint a special committee of three or more outstanding persons to make an impartial study in the manner in which the Baruch committee supplemented the work of this committee in the review of the synthetic rubber problem 2 years ago.

APPENDIX

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Washington, June 17, 1943.

Hon. GUY M. GILLETTE,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR GILLETTE: In accordance with our letter to you of June 9, 1943, there is enclosed a copy of the report, Interest of the Department of Agriculture in Ethyl Alcohol as a Motor Fuel. This report was prepared by our Northern Regional Research Laboratory at Peoria, Ill., and forwarded to the Bureau of Agricultural and Industrial Chemistry., Agricultural Research Administration, in Washington.

Sincerely yours,

PAUL H. APPLEBY,
Under Secretary.

[Enclosure.]

INTEREST OF THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE IN ETHYL ALCOHOL AS A MOTOR FUEL

SUMMARY

The earliest studies conducted in the Department of Agriculture on the use of alcohol as a motor fuel were performed in 1907, when an extended series of tests were conducted with gasoline engines. The results obtained indicated that alcohol could replace gasoline, though 165 parts of alcohol were required to do the work of 100 parts of gasoline. The conclusions reached from those studies are still valid today. Further work on the use of alcohol for power was not done until 1933, when the Bureau of Agricultural Engineering, with the cooperation of the United States Navy Department, investigated the use of 10- to 20-percent alcohol blends in trucks, tractors, and stationary engines. The alcohol-gasoline blends were found to be comparable to gasoline. Several reports and bulletins have been prepared in investigation of the alcohol-gasoline problem, and, in general, the main conclusion was that the use of alcohol posed an economical rather than a technical problem. However, it was recognized that depletion of petroleum reserves and the possibility of subsidizing agriculture might favor the introduction of power alcohol. Therefore, with the establishment of the regional laboratories, the study of alcohol production and its use as a motor fuel was set up as a research project and a pilot plant and motor fuel testing laboratories were installed at the Northern Regional Research Laboratory.

The program of research conducted in the Agricultural Motor Fuels Division of the Northern Regional Research Laboratory has been pursued for only a short period, but results important to the problem have already been obtained. General studies now in progress include the stability of alcohol-gasoline blends toward water; the elimination of aircraft carburetor icing by alcohol injection; determinations of octane ratings of alcohol and alcohol blends; studies on blends of alcohol with gasolines obtained from cracked vegetable oil; investigations of the effects of various additives on the rating of alcohol; and the testing of alcohol under supercharging conditions. Furthermore, full scale testing of alcohol and blends with gasoline is being planned, and equipment for this purpose is now being installed. The program also includes investigation of the corrosiveness of alcohol solutions with respect to alcohol alone, common impurities, corrosion inhibitors and additives.

HISTORICAL

The possibility of using alcohol as a motor fuel, either by admixture with gasoline or as alcohol alone, received study as early as 1907 by the Office of Experiment Stations (Office of Experiment Station Bulletin 191). Tests were run on 8 different engines in cooperation with the department of mechanical engineering of Columbia University, New York City (October 1, 1906–February 1, 1907). This work was in the nature of "block tests" rather than roads tests, and was done principally at the university. The scope of the work was fundamentally wide, about 190 separate runs being made. Results showed that while alcohol had only about 0.6 the thermal value of gasoline, the actual relative consumption of the fuels depended upon engine adjustment, load, rate of speed, and other factors. With engines as then designed, about 165 parts of alcohol were required to do the equivalent work of 100 parts of gasoline. Despite the state of existing knowledge of internal-combustion engines at that date, the principal findings of the work still remain relatively sound.

This work was stimulated by the fact that the industrial-alcohol law was passed in 1906, making tax-free alcohol available in the United States for the first time, and by the fact that similar experimentation was being conducted in Germany. However, practically no data were available in the English language. Because of the fundamental nature of this early work, and of some similar work by the United States Bureau of Mines at about this same date, and due to the fact that the motor industry, as well as the gasoline industry, was in a constant state of change, expansion, and improvement, no further work was done by the Department until after World War No. 1, except for processing and cost studies on the production of alcohol from various farm commodities and from wood.

Subsequent to the armistice and coincidental with the rapid expansion of motorization, the question of the use of alcohol as a motor fuel gradually became increasingly prominent. This was stimulated to some extent by the fact that foreign countries, particularly Germany, which possessed inadequate petroleum resources, which were confronted with agricultural problems, and which had large stocks of alcohol from the war, evolved mixtures of alcohol and petroleum for use in motor fuel in an endeavor to solve various problems of domestic economy simultaneously. In the case of France, such activity developed to the point where the alcohol industry, which was normally small, was virtually maintained by the Government for future national defense reasons, and the excess alcohol produced (largely from wine, sugar beets, and artichokes) was diverted to motor-fuel use by a system of allocations. Similar activities occurred in Italy and Poland, and to a lesser degree in perhaps 20 different countries.

All this foreign activity renewed interest in the United States in similar uses of alcohol as a solution to the surplus-crop question; this interest was greatly stimulated by the effects of the financial depression, and by the low prices then obtainable for cereal grains, and by lack of adequate markets. Much proposed legislation was introduced into the legislatures of the middle-western agricultural States, as well as into Congress, aimed at stimulating the conversion of crops to alcohol through motor-fuel use.

The Bureau of Agricultural Engineering made tests on 10- to 20-percent alcohol blends in cooperation with the United States Navy Department in 1933, using trucks, tractors, and stationary engines (Journal of the Society of Agricultural Engineers, 1933–34). Operation of a standard sedan passenger car for several thousand miles showed mileage performance slightly favoring gasoline. Tests of three trucks (½-, 1½-, and 3½-ton) gave results that indicated gasoline and alcohol blend were relatively equal, depending somewhat upon conditions. On continued road operation, over-all mileages on a 10-percent blend were slightly below those of gasoline. Tractor tests were made under conditions of field plowing as well as brake tests, using four different tractors. Again the blends were comparable with the gasoline used, and, in some instances, were better.

In 1933 the status of existing knowledge and opinion was condensed by the Department into a report to the United States Senate. This report (S. Doc. 57) summarized costs and methods of producing alcohol from corn, and discussed the behavior of alcohol in motor engines as surveyed in existing literature. It was shown that, with corn at 50 cents per bushel, the over-all cost of 10-percent alcohol-gasoline blends would be about 2.7 cents per gallon more than the cost of equivalent straight gasoline. Economics of the use of surplus crops for production of alcohol were extensively discussed. Effects on grain costs, stock raising, and on agriculture as a whole, were analyzed. Effects on the alcohol industry, as well as the oil industry, were considered, as well as ways and means of meeting the increased cost. Because of the complexity of the problem, over-all conclusions as to the advisability of embarking on a national power-alcohol program could not be drawn, the proposal being apparently desirable in many ways but of debatable economic value.

At about this same time, experimentation was conducted by the Iowa State College, where road tests on alcohol-fuel blends were tried out. A road test was also made at Washington, D. C., by the Bureau of Standards in conjunction with the American Automobile Association, in which the Department of Agriculture participated.

During this same general period the activities of the Chemical Foundation, Inc., in establishing and operating a plant at Atchison, Kans., to produce motor-fuel alcohol, increased public interest in the subject, as publicized by the farm chemurgic groups.

In 1935 the Bureau of Chemistry and Soils investigated the possibility of the acquisition by the Government of a raisin sirup plant in Fresno, Calif., for operation as an alcohol plant, inasmuch as the Government already had a large financial lien upon this plant. The idea was never carried out, but by this time the Bureau of Chemistry and Soils was devoting a portion of the time of several persons constantly to the study of possible motor-fuel developments.

In 1936, because of the conflicting nature of the data, and opinions concerning the chemistry and economics of the use of alcohol as motor fuel, the Bureau of Chemistry and Soils begar a renewed survey of the problem, which was reported in 1938 (Miscellaneous Publication No. 327). In general, it was again shown that the question was more economic than chemical in nature, and that under existing conditions, with gasoline available at low prices, alcohol could not be produced from farm crops at motor-fuel prices to yield the farmers an adequate return on the crop raw materials. It was realized, however, that with the elimination of unfavorable differentials through increases in petroleum costs, as well as establishment of agricultural subsidies, the use of alcohol in motor fuel might become of economic interest.

Study was therefore commenced on the design of a modern pilot plant for studies on alcohol production to determine whether costs of alcohol production could be sufficiently reduced so as to advance the possible future date when the economic border line would be crossed.

With the establishment of the regional laboratories, the alcohol production and motor-fuel work was organized as a complete research project, and a pilot plant for producing alcohol was built at the Northern Regional Research Laboratory, Peoria, Ill. Laboratories for testing motor-fuel blends were also established. During the interim, members of the staff of the Bureau of Chemistry and Soils made many trips studying the several alcohol plants and the entire industrial alcohol industry and various engineering laboratories. Addresses to interested groups, including testimony before congressional investigating committees, were also made. Many journal articles were released, and innumerable conferences held with interested groups.

RECENT RESEARCH

In the agricultural motor fuels division of the Northern Regional Research Laboratory, an integral part of the studies includes the subject of fuel testing. Because of delays in obtaining certain necessary equipment, initial operation on fuel testing was delayed until November 1942.

The stability of alcohol in gasoline blends varies greatly with different gasolines. In some cases, relatively small amounts of water introduced into the blend will cause separation, even at normal room temperature. As it was considered impractical to study all

possible gasolines, the present plan is to study the stability of mixtures of alcohol with representative compounds selected from the four characteristic types of constituents of gasoline. Stability with respect to water is being studied for these various mixtures, alone and in the presence of stabilizers, such as isoamyl alcohol. Using the data so obtained, it should be possible, either on the basis of simple physical laws or empirical relations, to predict the stability of alcohol-gasoline blends when the approximate composition of the gasoline is known. It should also be possible to predict which gasolines will be most suitable for blending with alcohol and to specify gasoline compositions for such blending. So far, experiments have been completed for 2 representative gasoline constituents. Furthermore, more than 30 compounds have been studied with respect to their suitability as stabilizers, and it was found that the higher alcohols, such as butyl, etc., were most desirable in this application.

Under certain atmospheric conditions, aircraft engines are subject to carburetor icing, which, of course, causes loss of power and actual stopping of the engine. One method of combating carburetor icing consists of injection of alcohol or solutions of it with aniline, butanol, etc. This method has been studied theoretically in the agricultural motor fuels division, and experimental work is now in progress to test the conclusions reached by theoretical study. When this program is completed, it will be possible to predict the amount of alcohol necessary to prevent ice formation in carburetors.

The octane ratings of alcohol and alcohol blends are also being studied, and it has been found that the pure alcohol has a rating of 90 to 91 O. N. when determined by the CFR-ASTM motor method. It was further found that the addition of water to alcohol increased the octane number to a maximum of 99 at a level of 15 percent water.

In connection with studies performed for China Defense Supplies, Inc., tests were carried out on blends of alcohol with the gasoline obtained by cracking rapeseed oil. A blend of 20 percent alcohol with this gasoline gave an increase of 15 O. N., which indicates a blending value for alcohol of 123 O. N. These results may be of value in alleviating the present serious fuel situation in China.

Since alcohol shows no lead susceptibility, numerous types of compounds have been studied to investigate the possibility of increasing the octane number of alcohol and to clarify the reasons for differences between alcohol as well as certain other types of compounds and hydrocarbon fuels. So far, aniline has proved to be most effective in increasing the knock rating of alcohol. Various chemical modifications of aniline proved to be ineffective or actually lowered the rating of alcohol. The effects of common impurities of alcohol are now under study.

Experimental work on testing of alcohol under supercharging is also in progress. A number of mechanical difficulties have been encountered in supercharged testing, and these mechanical difficulties are gradually being eliminated. So far no conclusions can be drawn.

Full-scale testing of alcohol and alcohol-gasoline blends is also being planned. Part of the equipment for this program is already installed and experimental work will soon be started. The results of these tests with a standard automobile engine will give important information both with respect to engine performance characteristics as well as with respect to the corrosiveness of alcohol and blends.

Some objections have been voiced with respect to the corrosiveness of various alcohol solutions, but available data are very contradictory. A preliminary qualitative survey on this problem has been completed. Though the results obtained are not conclusive, they are being used as a guide to further more extensive studies. This extended program is being designed to yield quantitative data on alcohol and mixtures with water, manufacturing impurities, corrosion inhibitors, and additives designed to improve the fuel characteristics of alcohol.

Calculations on the theoretical limits of power output, where alcohol is burned in an internal combustion engine, have been published (Industrial and Engineering Chemistry, No. 5, 1942). On the basis of these studies, it is possible to ascertain the limiting efficiency of various combustion processes as well as maximum temperatures and pressures existing in engines where alcohol is used as fuel.

Past reports on the use of alcohol as motor fuel are contradictory in the extreme. This is mainly due to the fact that much past experimentation has not been done under accurately established or controlled test conditions. Much of this work must be repeated. It is the purpose of the program now in progress at the Northern Regional Laboratory to investigate the problem so thoroughly and under such well controlled conditions that such disagreements may be clarified and explained. Because it has been pursued for such a limited time, the research program so far has yielded only a limited amount of information, but such a broad attack is planned that authoritative data can be expected to result.

(The following chronological list of publications, dealing with alcohol production or motor fuel uses, is presented:)

BIBLIOGRAPHY ON ALCOHOL — WORK OF THE UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

1904–7. Report on distilled liquors. Chas. Albert Grampton. Bur. of Chem. Buls. 81, 90, 99, 105.

1906. Industrial alcohol: Uses and statistics. Farmers Bul. 269. By H. W. Wiley, 29 pp., Ill.

1907. Alcohol, specific gravity tables. Chem. Bul. 107, pp. 203–208.

1907. Industrial alcohol, sources and manufacture. By H. W. Wiley. Originally issued in 1906. Farmers Bul. 268, revised and reissued August 5, 1907.

1907. The use of alcohol and gasoline in farm engines. By C. E. Lucke and S. M. Woodward. Farmers Bul. 277.

1907. Tests of internal combustion engines on alcohol fuel. By Chas. E. Lucke and S. M. Woodward. Office of Expt. Stations Bul. 191.

1907. Chemical methods for utilizing wood. By F. P. Vietch. Bur. of Chem. Circular 36.

1907. Alcohol, preparation from sawdust. Chem. Circular 36, p. 40.

1907. Alcohol, manufacture from cassava. Chem. Bul. 106, p. 29.

1908. Alcohol, byproduct of starch factory. Farmers Bul. 334, p. 14.

1908. Model denatured alcohol distillery. By H. E. Sawyer. No number. Printed.

1910. Manufacture of denatured alcohol, based on the operations of an experimental still at Washington, D. C. By H. W. Wiley. Bur. of Chem. Bul. 130.

1910. Potato culls as a source of alcohol. By A. O. Wente and L. M. Tolman. Farmers Bul. No. 410.

1910. Alcohol, making, from yautias and taros, investigations. Bur. Plant Industry Bul. 164, p. 17.

1911. Industrial alcohol: Sources and manufacture. Farmers Bul. 429 (reissue of Farmers Bul. 268).

1913. Alcohol, manufacture from raisin seeds. Bur. Plant Industry Bul. 276.

1915. Agricultural alcohol: Studies on its manufacture in Germany. By Edward Kremers. U. S. D. A. Bul. 182.

1920. Manufacture of ethyl alcohol from wood waste. By E. C. Sherrard. Mimeo. Circular L9–668 Forest Products Laboratory.

1921. Forest products as motor fuels. By E. C. Sherrard. Forest Products Laboratory. Jour. Amer. Soc. of Lubrication Engineers.

1921. Manufacture of ethyl alcohol from wood waste. By E. C. Sherrard, Forrest Products Laboratory. Chemical Age, Vol. 29, No. 2.

1922. Ethyl alcohol from Western Larch. By E. C. Sherrard. Jour. Ind. Eng. Chem., Vol. 14, No. 10. Forest Products Laboratory.

1922. Alcohol, grain, production from wood waste. Dept. Circular 231, pp. 34–35.

1922. The manufacture of ethyl alcohol from wood waste. By F. W. Kressman, U. S. D. A. Bull. 983.

1922. Information on industrial alcohol. By W. W. Skinner. (Circular, mimeog.) Unnumbered. Revised May 1, 1936 (unnumbered). Revised January 1, 1938, by P. Burke Jacobs and reissued as MC–22. Revised March 1943 by P. Burke Jacobs and reissued as AIC–3.

1933. Use of alcohol from farm products in motor fuel. A report by the Secretary of Agriculture. Senate Document 57, 73d Congress, 1st session.

1933. Performance tests on alcohol-gasoline fuel blends. R. B. Gray Jour. Amer. Soc. Agric. Engineers, Vol. 14, p. 185.

1934. Alcohol-gasoline blends as engine fuel. By R. B. Gray. Jour. Amer. Soc. Agric. Engineers, Vol. 15, No. 3, pp. 106–109.

1938. Alcohol motor fuel in the United States. In the Agricultural Situation. Vol. 22, No. 12 (December 1938), pp. 20–23, by P. B. Jacobs.

1938. Motor fuels from farm products. By P. B. Jacobs and H. P. Newton. Misc. Publ. No. 327, 129 pp., Ill.

1939. Use of alcohol from farm products in motor fuel. Hearings on S. 552, a bill to remove the Federal tax on alcohol motor fuel, before a subcommittee of the Committee on Finance. United States Senate, May 23–25, 1939. (Contains testimony of department representative.)

1939. Motor fuels from agricultural products. By P. B. Jacobs. Report, National Resources Committee, 1939. (Section: Energy Resources and National Policy, pp. 332–337.)

1940. Agricultural motor fuels. By W. P. Van Arsdel. Prepared for National Resources Bulletin, B. A. E. and Yearbook of Agriculture, 1940.

1942. Mollier diagrams for theoretical alcohol—air and octane—water-air mixtures. By R. Wiebe, J. Schultz, and J. Porter. Jour. Ind. Eng. Chem., Vol. 34, No. 5 (pp. 575–580), May 1942.

1943. Recovery of byproduct feed at alcohol plants. By P. B. Jacobs and Gordon W. McBride. Mimeo. Cir. NM–233. March 1943. Report to (Gillette) subcommittee of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, United States Senate.

THE JACKSON HOLE AND OTHER NATIONAL MONUMENTS

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, apropos of the recent discussion in the newspapers and other organs of publicity relative to the Jackson Hole National Monument, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter received by me from Mr. Irving Brant, an eminent journalist, which refers to the outstanding conservation record of Maj. John F. Lacey, former Republican Member of the House of Representatives from Iowa, who was the author or sponsor of the Antiquities Act on which the action relative to the Jackson Hole area was based. Mr. Brant's letter includes a brief excerpt from an address delivered by former Representative Lacey and a letter addressed to Representative Lacey by former President Theodore Roosevelt.

There being no objection, the matters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SEPTEMBER 8, 1944.

The Honorable GUY M. GILLETTE,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR GILLETTE: As you undoubtedly know, one of the greatest of American conservationists was your fellow Iowan, Maj. John F. Lacey, who had a long and distinguished career in the National House of Representatives. He was the author of the Lacey Act which suppressed the traffic in bird plumage; was one of the chief promoters of national forest reserves; and wrote the Antiquities Act of 1906 under which the President is empowered to establish national monuments.

Major Lacey's opinion of the scope of this last act is of public importance today, because bills are pending in Congress to abolish the Jackson Hole National Monument, on the theory that President Roosevelt distorted the purpose of the 1906 act in setting up this monument. This on the face of it is an extraordinary assumption, since national monuments similar in nature have been established by all Presidents from 1906 onward, most notably by President Theodore Roosevelt, who signed the Antiquities Act and exercised authority under it while its sponsors were still in Congress.

Much of the confusion today is due to the fact that the only public hearings on this subject were held in 1904 on two Senate bills which related solely to the preservation of historic and prehistoric ruins and antiquities. In 1906, Congressman Lacey wrote a bill which was introduced in both Houses as H. R. 11016 and S. 4698, the Senate bill becoming law. No hearings were held on either bill. Lacey's measure broadened previous proposals by providing that not only antiquities but "objects of historic or scientific interest" might be proclaimed national monuments by the President. Lacey at that time had a bill pending to create the Petrified Forest National Park, and part of his purpose (as he told Dr. T. S. Palmer of the Bilogical Survey) was to make it possible to proclaim that area a national monument instead of making it dependent on separate legislation. He said nothing about this either in the report of the House Committee on Public Lands or in debate on the floor, but to realize the effect of what he wrote into the bill after the hearings on the original proposal, one need merely start making three tabulations of objects covered by the bill:

1. All aboriginal ruins on the public domain.
2. All objects of historic interest.
3. All objects of scientific interest.

It is obvious that the first list, whether long or short, must be definite. The second and third are limited only by the scope of history and science, unless, as some people are now arguing, the word "objects" applies only to dead and ancient things.

Thinking that the Iowa Congressman might have left a record of his meaning, I took occasion during a recent visit to Iowa City to go to the State historical society and look into the John F. Lacey Memorial Volume, compiled by your old friend, Prof. L. H. Pammel, of Iowa State College. From it I send you two excerpts:

1. The opening paragraphs of a speech by Major Lacey making the broadest statement I have ever seen of the purposes of the Antiquities Act, and specifically citing and endorsing the establishment, under its provisions, of a 600,000-acre national monument for the protection of the Olympic elk.

2. A letter from President Theodore Roosevelt to Major Lacey, written only 5 weeks after the President signed the Antiquities Act, congratulating Lacey on his great services for the preservation of objects of natural and historical interest.

Lacey described "my bill for the preservation of aboriginal ruins and places of scenic and scientific interest." Theodore Roosevelt used the words "natural and historic interest." Both of them thus interpreted the law in terms of living science, of wildlife, scenic beauty, rather than the dead and ancient things to which present-day challengers of the law would limit it. To Lacey objects meant places. Theodore Roosevelt created, and Lacey endorsed, the particular national monument which most nearly resembles the one at Jackson Hole—the earlier monument protecting the Olympic elk range, the later one the Yellowstone elk range, for which purpose John D. Rockefeller has spent $1,500,000 in a proffered gift to the Nation. Had these acts been contrary to the purposes of the law which Major Lacey wrote, would not he, as well as others, have protested instead of endorsing the actions taken while he was still in Congress?

I have no doubt that the campaign against the Jackson Hole National Monument, largely founded on misinformation, will give way to cordial support of the action taken by President Franklin D. Roosevelt when the facts are understood, both as to this specific monument and the law under which it was created. It will be fitting if in the process, renewed attention is brought to the work of the great Iowan who made these national monuments possible, and who worked so ardently throughout his life for the preservation of forests and wildlife.

IRVING BRANT.

THE PAJARITO—AN OUTING WITH THE ARCHEOLOGISTS

(By Maj. John F. Lacey)

It was in August 1902 that Prof. Edgar L. Hewett urged me to visit the ruins of the cliff dwellers and cave dwellers and see for myself the necessity and propriety of the enactment of a law to protect and preserve the ancient aboriginal ruins of the Southwest; and so Dr. Hewett, Congressman B. S. Rodey, Land Commissioner Keen, and myself visited the Pajarito region; slept in the deserted caves, explored the communal ruins, and then pursued our journey to the still-living Pueblos of Santa Clara, San Ildefonso, Cochiti, ending with Santa Fe and Acoma.

It was this trip that led to the introduction and passage of my bill for the preservation of aboriginal ruins and places of scenic and scientific interest upon the public domain, under which the Petrified Forest, the Olympic Range Elk Reserve and about 200 places of ethnological interest have been designed as "monuments" and preserved to the public. And it was the enactment of this law which led to the formation of the School of American Archeology.

OYSTER BAY, N. Y., *July 16, 1906.*

Hon. JOHN F. LACEY, M. C.,
Oskaloosa, Iowa:

MY DEAR MR. LACEY: Certain gentlemen interested in the preservation of the forests of this country, and also interested, though to a less degree, in the preservation of the wildlife of the country, and the objects of natural and historic interest which should be kept unharmed for the sake of those who come after us, have written to me expressing their deep sense of obligation to you for all that you have done in Congress to further these matters. They have spoken to me of presenting some memorial to you so that their sense of appreciation may be put in permanent form. I do not know whether this will be done, but I sympathize so cordially with their feelings that I desire to take advantage of this occasion to write you and say how much it means to any man who believes in hard, intelligent, and disinterested public service to see such a career as yours has been in Congress. It has been my privilege to be closely associated with you and to watch the many different ways in which, without any hope or expectation of personal reward, you have rendered efficient public service. I give utterance to the feelings of very many men when I express to you my cordial thanks and extend to you my earnest good wishes.

Sincerely yours,

THEODORE ROOSEVELT.

NOTE.—Published in Maj. John F. Lacey memorial volume.

FORUM DISCUSSION BY SENATOR AUSTIN AND SENATOR VANDENBERG ON THE REPUBLICAN PARTY'S FOREIGN POLICY

[Mr. AUSTIN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a discussion by himself and Senator VANDENBERG in the People's Forum, broadcast on Saturday, June 24, 1944, relative to the Republican Party's foreign policy, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY SENATOR CONNALLY, NOTIFYING SENATOR TRUMAN OF HIS NOMINATION AS VICE PRESIDENT

[Mr. HATCH asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the address delivered by Senator CONNALLY at ceremonies notifying Senator TRUMAN of his nomination as Vice President, at Lamar, Mo., on August 31, 1944, which appears in the Appendix.]

TRIBUTE TO THE LATE GEORGE W. NORRIS BY RICHARD L. NEUBERGER AND STATEMENT BY SENATOR CAPPER

[Mr. CAPPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a tribute to the late George W. Norris, former Senator from Nebraska, by Richard L. Neuberger, published in the Progressive Magazine, and a brief statement made by him after the death of Senator Norris, which appear in the Appendix.]

THE INVASION AND AMERICA FIRST—ARTICLE FROM THE CATHOLIC WORLD

[Mr. WHEELER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitle "The Invasion and America First" from the Catholic World for July 1944, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE 1944 QUEBEC CONFERENCE—EDITORIAL FROM CONCORD DAILY MONITOR

[Mr. BRIDGES asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Another Brush-Off," dealing with the 1944 Quebec Conference, published in the Concord (N. H.) Daily Monitor of September 14, 1944, which appears in the Appendix.]

POST-WAR WORLD SECURITY

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the second Quebec Conference is now a matter of history. The future strategy of the war was considered and planned there, and undoubtedly Russia and China will play their part in the plan there discussed. Our great war leaders, General Marshall, Admiral King, and General Arnold, and British war experts were there. President Roosevelt and Winston Churchill, as the Executives of our two nations, gave approval to the plan there outlined. It was the experts, the men of war, the men of strategy, who submitted the outline and the plan.

Every day brings us closer to a victory in Europe and when that day comes we shall see what we shall see will happen to Poland and the smaller nations that have

found themselves in the path of the juggernaut of war. Undoubtedly, besides the war strategy, the two leaders discussed also what is to happen to Poland and the other smaller nations, but the decision of Russia will determine the course of history in relation to most of these nations. It is for America and Britain to use their influence to see that Poland lives again, and that other peoples get fair and just treatment. I have repeatedly stated that the mere signing of a treaty, or the creation of some international authority by virtue of appropriate national action, will not suffice. There must be back of the instrument the will of the people of the agreeing nations and the leaders of those nations to live up to the letter and the spirit of the treaty or agreement. Nations will have to take the blinders from their eyes so they can see that the world has been contracted by the genius of men—some have called it the evil genius—and that every nation is neighbor to others, and that unless each puts into operation the rule, that it is its neighbor's keeper instead of its neighbor's destroyer—chaos, worse confounded, will result.

Have we learned lessons from our past mistakes? I hope so. We in America, because of our fortunate geographic situation, are in a position to contribute much to a realization of that vision, but we know that unless other peoples catch the gleam, our vision will not be sufficient.

I ask, Mr. President, Will the Baltic States be willing to be incorporated into Russia? Will Russia be satisfied without the control of the Dardanelles? Will the Polish issue be settled amicably and durably? Will the Balkan States still remain the boiling pot for war? What about French Indochina and India? When Germany is defeated, what then? Should smaller states be created out of her territory?

While we have the assurance from Mr. Churchill that Britain will join wholeheartedly with us in defeating Japan, will Russia give us bases in Siberia? What shall be done with the imperial possessions of France and Holland in the Far East, and their subject peoples?

I raise all these issues because it appears to me, especially from the correspondence which comes day by day that there is much loose thinking, much wishful thinking, which indicates that our people seem to feel that all we have to do is to adopt a resolution and join some international authority or league. Mr. President, it was only a few years ago that we joined with the other nations of the world in the Kellogg-Briand Pact, and by that instrument we sought to outlaw war. Did we do so? No; we merely indulged in some synthetic thinking and procedure. It is not possible to outlaw war by any legislative process. It is not possible to get rid of war merely by passing a measure and getting other nations to agree to it.

Mr. President, the nations could have made the Kellogg-Briand Pact good if they had willed it so. I repeat, no mere legislation, no mere treaties, no mere instruments, are sufficient. We must remember that world order will be brought about only when the qualities of mind and soul of the Master become real and operative in the nations. The peoples of earth have an opportunity now to go forward in a great progression toward human betterment.

There will be no practical solution of the world's problems until the peoples of earth look beyond their short-range vision, away from selfishness and hate and greed, and act their part as good neighbors. My own personal opinion is that the nations are ready to try to find the way, but it is no magic road; it is a road which the peoples of earth must pave themselves by getting rid of the causes of war.

Whether that attempt to make good will be effectual will depend upon whether or not they can purge themselves of those things that make for war. America can lead the way, but because she is the custodian of the "great lights" of the race she must lead on with faith, but ever remembering to remain constantly alert and on guard. We cannot afford to have any more Pearl Harbors in the days that are to come. If we do, the next Pearl Harbor will mark the downfall of the Nation.

At the Moscow Conference last October, two important decisions were made by the Foreign Secretaries of the United States, Great Britain, and the Soviet Union. The first and more immediately important decision was to fight the present war against Germany and her European satellites through to a victorious finish in the closest cooperation.

Mr. President, General Marshall was quoted over the radio last night somewhat to the effect that if we are to solve our post-war international problems we must demonstrate in peace the very qualities that have been demonstrated among the Allies in war. We must learn to iron out our differences, we must learn to go forward in harmony so as to effectuate the purpose we have in mind.

The decision to which I referred as having taken place in the Moscow Conference was later affirmed by the governments of these three Allied nations, and let me emphasize that nothing has since occurred which would in any way indicate that any one of the three allies has had a change of heart. Let me further emphasize that the Government and the peoples of Great Britain, the United States, and the Soviet Union are alike determined to smash Hitlerism completely on the continent of Europe, and to eradicate the ideas of Hitler and Hirohito, Nazi thought, Fascist thought, everywhere on the globe. Let me also emphasize that the governments and the peoples of the three major allies will continue the war in close cooperation until they have accomplished their primary objective.

The second and ultimately important decision was to establish "at the earliest practicable date, a general international organization, based on the principle of the sovereign equality of all peace-loving states, and open to membership by all states, large and small, for the maintenance of international peace and security."

This decision has also been ratified by the governments of all three major allies. Nor is there any evidence anywhere that any of the three major allies has had a change of heart about the necessity for close post-war cooperation in the building of a world of security and peace.

There is, however, and there is bound to be, debate and discussion about the ways and means of accomplishing this necessary purpose.

I have pointed out in previous talks that before any of the three major allies can undertake to cooperate in a system of world security, each must be reasonably assured of its own security. And I have emphasized that one of the most hopeful prospects of building a world-wide security system follows from the fact that each of the three major allies can achieve its own reasonable security without expense to either of the other two. But the Moscow declaration proposes to build the post-war security system around the principle of the sovereign equality of all peace-loving states, large and small.

Moreover, at the Teheran Conference, President Roosevelt, Prime Minister Churchill, and Premier Marshal Stalin ratified this principle, in effect, in these plain words:

> Emerging from these friendly conferences we look with confidence to the day when all peoples of the world may live free lives untouched by tyranny and according to their varying desires and their own consciences.

If the Moscow and Teheran declarations mean anything at all, they mean that the peoples of all peace-loving states, large and small, shall be assured a reasonable security to live according to their own varying desires and their own consciences.

If these declarations mean anything at all, they must mean particularly that the small states of Europe which were once accepted in the family of nations as sovereign equals must have their sovereignties restored, or should at least be given opportunity freely to say whether they want their sovereignties restored.

Now it would be easy enough for the United States to overstress and oversimplify this principle of equal sovereignty and equal security. It would be easy for the United States to do this because this country can achieve its own reasonable security without expense to the reasonable security of any other state, large or small.

But our two major allies are not in the same fortunate position as we find ourselves. Our two major allies are not separated from other states, particularly other large and potentially powerful states, by two broad oceans. Our two major allies are next-door neighbors to the German Reich, which has twice within a single generation attempted to impose its will on them with an iron hand. And since none of the major Allies proposes to destroy Germany, since we propose only to destroy Hitlerism, our European allies are faced with the prospect of again living as next-door neighbor to a potentially powerful German state. They are faced with the prospect of estimating as closely and as wisely as they know their own reasonable security

needs in the explosive and uncertain Europe which will come out of this war.

That is why it is understandable that prominent British leaders should be looking forward to the possibility of a closer relationship with the democracies of western Europe.

That is why it is understandable that the Soviet Union should show a lively concern with the national geography of post-war eastern Europe.

Events of recent months have stressed all too clearly the gravity of the problem posed by Soviet security in relation to any proposed system of post-war world security or even post-war European security.

The problem is clear enough. Simply stated, it is this:

To what extent is the Soviet Union justified in seizing upon the indubitably favorable opportunity which will exist after the certain and total defeat of Germany in achieving the security of her European borders?

The problem is a problem because the Soviet Union insists that her own reasonable security demands that she retain within her own sovereign state certain smaller European states and parts of states along her western and southwestern borders.

The problem is aggravated by the fact that the Soviet Union acquired possession of these states and parts of states during the period between August 23, 1939, and June 21, 1941, when she had a nonaggression pact with Hitler's Third Reich.

Specifically, the Soviet Union occupied the tiny Baltic states of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania in late September and early October 1939, and as a result of unilateral elections in the three States, formally incorporated them as union republics in August 1940. Specifically, the Soviet Union sent troops into Poland on September 17, 1939, as a result of a prior agreement with Germany, and on September 28 established with Germany the Ribbentrop line, which divided fallen Poland between the two great powers. And on October 22 and October 26, 1939, as the result of unilateral elections in occupied Poland, Polish White Russia and the Polish Ukraine asked to be incorporated in the White Russian union republic and the Ukrainian union republic, and on November 1, 1939, the Supreme Soviet Union recommended that these requests be granted.

Again specifically, on March 31 at the close of the war with Finland, the Soviet Union incorporated certain one-time Finnish territory in the Karelo-Finnish union republic and on August 2, 1940, it incorporated most of Bessarabia, for a time a Rumanian province, into the Moldavian union republic.

Now whatever we may think of the nonaggression pact signed by the Soviet Union with the Third Reich on August 23, 1939, we must grant that in rushing into these Baltic, Polish, and Bessarabian territories in those grave and hectic days when Hitler's Wehrmacht was trampling all western and southeastern Europe, Soviet Russia was merely taking obvious and desperately necessary precautions to defend herself against the day when Hitler would strike eastward into her own heartlands.

Putting the matter bluntly, but putting it in all fairness, Soviet Russia acted in urgent self-defense in 1939 and 1940. She undertook desperate and extreme measures to meet a desperate and extreme situation. She did no more or no less than any other great state would do when threatened with a fight for very existence.

It does not matter too much that in 1939 and 1940 the Soviet Union acquired these border states and border provinces with the tacit consent of Hitler. As Hitler himself so frankly confessed in 1941, when he finally hurled his armies against Russia, he had been merely "going along" with Soviet policy in 1939 and 1940 until such time as he felt strong enough to have a final accounting with the Russian colossus.

What does matter, however, is whether the 22,000,000 people involved were incorporated into the Soviet Union in 1939 and 1940 according to "their varying desires and their own consciences."

What does matter is whether these people regard their states and provinces as equally sovereign members of the Soviet Union.

Let us, as Americans, approach this difficult problem frankly and honestly. And let us first of all admit its difficulty.

Let us admit that the Soviet Union has as much right to take every precaution against the future as we have or as the British have or as a reborn France one day will have.

Let us admit that the farther westward and southwestward Russia can push her borders, the safer will be the Russian heartland.

But having granted all this, we are still confronted with the inescapable fact that in pushing her borders westward and southwestward, the Soviet Union is doing so at the expense of the states and provinces which once were sovereign states or parts of sovereign states.

Having granted the Russian needs for every reasonable security, we are still confronted with the question whether the peoples of Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, western Poland, and Bessarabia were incorporated into the Soviet Union as a result of their own choice, freely expressed.

The overwhelming majority of the people of the western democracies are not convinced that the elections held in Poland in the fall of 1939 or the elections held in the Baltic states in the summer of 1940 were free elections. They are not convinced that even granting the elections represented an actual choice by the peoples then involved, the choice would be the same in a reasonably secure post-war Europe. The choice of 1939 and 1940 was quite obviously a narrow one. It was the choice between Soviet occupation and savage Nazi domination.

There is an obvious solution of the difficulty, a solution which seems to rest entirely with the Soviet Union.

The solution, of course, would be to offer these peoples full opportunity as soon as this war ends, again to express their choice. Should they vote in such new elections to remain within the Soviet Union, the Soviets would then have not only a sound political right, but a sound moral right to retain them.

Due to a clause in the Russian Constitution of 1936 the Soviet Union could offer such free elections without any violence to constituent union membership. The 1936 constitution specifically provides that any member republic can legally withdraw from the Union at anytime. Because of the unique conditions under which the states and provinces in question were incorporated into the Soviet Union, this constitutional provision would be particularly applicable.

It is scarcely necessary for me to point out what such a free gesture on the part of Moscow would mean to the post-war world. It is scarcely necessary to point out what a firm foundation of mutual trust and confidence such special elections would build for our world-wide post-war security system.

Such action on the part of Moscow would not only prove beyond reasonable doubt to any reasonable person the sincerity of Soviet purpose, it would commit the entire post-war world to an actual policy of permitting all subject peoples everywhere actual opportunity to live according to the principles laid down at Teheran. It would commit not only Soviet Russia but Great Britain and the United States to speeding the day "when all peoples of the world may live free lives untouched by tyranny and according to their varying desires and their own consciences."

The recent action of the Supreme Soviet in amending the constitution of 1936 to permit the 16 member republics of the Soviet Union to deal directly with other countries and to raise their own armies, should facilitate plebiscites in the regions in question. Such free elections would, in fact, be a logical next step in the development of the policy announced by the Supreme Parliament of the Soviet Union on February 1.

Nor would such free elections prevent the Soviet Union from entering into mutual assistance treaties, such as the one with Czechoslovakia, with any states which might vote for separation. On the contrary, they would lay the soundest possible foundation for all such treaties.

Should the Soviet Union refuse to offer this obvious solution to the Baltic and Polish problem, what then?

In that event, I can only say that we should continue to make every reasonable effort to work out our pledged system of post-war world security despite all difficulties. We must do so because we cannot afford to accept the dreadful alternative, the prospect of still another world war before we shall have repaired the ravages of this one.

SALE OF DOMESTIC GOLD AND SILVER IN FOREIGN MARKETS

Mr. SCRUGHAM. Mr. President, on September 1, I introduced in the Senate of the United States Senate bill 2125, a bill which proposes that all gold and silver domestically produced which may be in excess of any requirements of the war effort, may be freely sold in

foreign markets. If this bill were to become law, such sales would, of course, be subject to any restrictions placed on the sale of gold or silver by foreign countries.

It is my belief that there is an avid demand for the precious metals in various foreign countries. This belief is substantiated by the various reports which come to me of both regular market quotations and black market quotations in various foreign countries, showing the demand for gold and silver to be so great that various people of the world are willing to pay prices for gold and silver far in excess of the so-called world price, which world price really is a figure set by two countries, the United States and Great Britain.

I believe the sale of our gold and silver produced currently in excess of our requirements would have a beneficial effect not only accruing to those countries where such sales might be made, but also in adding to the income of our domestic mining industry.

I am aware that most of the gold and silver now produced is a byproduct of the strategic and critical minerals which we are mining for the war effort. A great part of these minerals are being produced only under a subsidy program. If higher prices could be obtained abroad for the byproducts, gold and silver, these subsidies could be reduced at a considerable saving to the Public Treasury. To increase the income of companies mining strategic and critical minerals and metals which also produce gold and silver as a byproduct would certainly help to accomplish this desirable result.

Mr. President, those who believe that our Treasury has already acquired enough gold and silver certainly should have no objection to currently mined metal being sold in foreign countries. When the restrictions imposed upon the mining industry by the illogical and onerous gold closing order, L–208, are finally removed by the War Production Board, the possibility of obtaining higher prices for gold with which to offset the tremendously increased costs of mining undoubtedly would help to stimulate the revival of this major western source of income.

Mr. President, when the strategic and critical minerals industry begins to feel the inevitable cut-backs already affecting other industry, we must turn to other sources of jobs to take care of our workers, and other sources of taxes to help pay for the war. We should do everything within our power to stimulate the gold and silver mining industry in order that it may help take up the slack. While the manufacturing industries can look forward to reconversion, the mining industry can only look forward to reopening of gold and silver mines and to the initiation of new mining ventures.

Mr. President, my information that foreign countries are desirous of obtaining gold and silver has received corroboration from an important and rather startling source.

In the London Financial Times for Tuesday, August 22, 1944, is reprinted an article from the South African Mining and Engineering Journal. This article was written by that eminent financier, formerly a member of the central board of the Reserve Bank of India, a past president of the Federation of Indian Chambers of Commerce and Industry, and a director of several banking, commercial, and shipping companies, Sir Chunilal B. Mehta.

I wish to quote a few paragraphs from the gentleman's authoritative article:

India has always been an importer of both gold and silver. It is a well-known fact that the Indian masses, whenever they have any savings, are accustomed to buy gold and/or silver. * * *

After the start of the First World War the Government of India prohibited imports of gold, with the result that the internal price of gold began to advance. On the other hand, the Government of India slowly raised the exchange value of the rupee, according to which the internal price of gold should have declined. But owing to the prohibition of imports of gold the internal price did not decline, though the rupee value was being raised.

In order to bring down the internal price of gold, the Government of India began to sell small quantities of gold in India at rupee exchange parity price. All this gold was taken up by the public, and as soon as sales were discontinued prices again advanced.

Following some discussion of the financial situation with respect to gold after the First World War, the article states:

After the start of the present war, gold imports were again prohibited, as in the First World War, with the result that the internal price of gold began to rise. India being one of the most important bases for supplies of men, money, and material in this war, huge purchases of articles, materials, and services were, and are, being made in India by Allied Governments.

Payments for all these materials and services are to be made in India in terms of rupees. This resulted in a large increase of currency notes in circulation in India. Notes in circulation on September 1, 1939, were about Rs. 182 crores, and about the end of July 1943 the notes in circulation were about Rs. 740 crores, with all the indications of a further increase.

A considerable rise had taken place in the prices of all commodities, and consequently in the cost of living. A severe type of inflation was coming into existence, and it seems that both the Government of India and the British Government realized that if they did not check the rapid inflationary trend in India it would adversely affect the whole war effort. They were not in a position to supply either consumer goods or capital goods.

All measures of rationing, restrictions, quotas, etc., were found to be only temporary expedients, and when they found that there was no other alternative to control the situation they set up a program of selling gold in India.

It is a well-known fact that the world gold price is a fixed one. In terms of sterling it is 168s per ounce and in terms of dollars it is $35 per ounce. The rupee exchange is at 18d and the sterling dollar exchange is at $4 per pound. On this basis the price of gold in India should be about Rs. 42 per tola. Therefore, in the ordinary course of events, the Government of India should have insisted upon the United Kingdom and the United States Governments selling their gold in India at about Rs. 42 per tola. But that is not the case.

Instead the United Kingdom and the United States Governments are allowed to sell gold in India at the rate of Rs. 71 or even higher per tola, thus allowing them to sell gold at a considerable premium. The argument put forward is that the United Kingdom and the United States Governments are buying different commodities and articles in India at a substantial premium, and therefore those Governments are allowed to sell gold at a substantial premium in order that they may secure a sufficient number of rupees to meet their expenditure in India. Anyhow, what is more surprising is that India, which sold large amounts of gold at the average rate of Rs. 35 per tola, is not now supplied with sufficient quantities of gold even at more than double the price.

I particularly want to observe that Rs. 42 per tola at present rate of exchange means in our money $33.73 per ounce. Rs. 71 per tola means $57.03 per ounce. This, Mr. President, as you well know, is a figure greatly in excess of the $35 per ounce set by the Government of the United States.

I particularly want to emphasize the statement:

Instead, the United Kingdom and the United States of America Governments are allowed to sell gold in India.

Why, if the eminent gentleman is correct in his statement, should the United States Government be permitted to sell gold at a price greatly in excess of $35 in India and perhaps, for aught I know, in other countries, when the domestic producer is limited to a price of $35 per ounce in the face of excessive costs which undoubtedly will continue for some years subsequent to the war?

Mr. President, we are not alone in believing that our gold producers should benefit from high foreign prices. A state of unrest is noted in South Africa because of the British restrictions on the gold price. Corroboration of this is seen in a further quotation from the article:

A new and very interesting controversy seems to have arisen recently in regard to the sales of gold in India by the United Kingdom and the United States of America at a premium of about 70 percent. Some of the South African leaders have begun to claim that they should also have a share in the profits that are being secured from the sales of gold in India. The issues at stake are being discussed by the financial papers of London, extracts of which are being telegraphed to India.

Mr. President, I do not want to take up the time of the Senate to discuss Sir Chunilal B. Mehta's article in great detail, but I do want to quote his closing paragraph:

The present war has resulted in important changes in the international distribution of the world's monetary gold stocks.

The appetite for gold is more discernible in western countries than in eastern countries. The only difference is that western countries want to acquire gold at certain fixed prices, while the eastern countries are prepared to pay higher prices. India has recently acquired gold at double the price, to the extent of about 3,000,000 ounces, and still there is a very big gap to fill to place her on her pre-1931 basis as regards private gold stocks.

I think a very definite inference can be read into this closing statement, with regard to silver. If the appetite for gold is more discernible in western countries than in eastern countries, certainly the appetite for silver is more discernible in eastern countries than in western countries.

At this point I wish to call the attention of the Senate to an agreement recently negotiated by the British authorities in behalf of the Indian Government, resulting in lend-leasing 100,000,000 ounces of treasury seigniorage silver. This silver was intended to be used largely for coinage purposes. I call attention to the fact that this lend-lease silver is now being sold on the Bombay market in quantities of 200 bars per day and that prices range from $1 to $1.09 per fine ounce. If the rate of exchange of the Indian rupee were at parity with the dollar, these prices would be in excess of the monetary value of silver in the United States, now $1.29 per ounce.

Mr. President, I believe the whole article from which I have quoted should receive the attention of the Congress and the mining industry. I believe it supplies substantial reasons why my bill, S. 2125, should pass the Congress. I ask, therefore, unanimous consent that the entire article entitled "Battle of the Rupee and Gold" be printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Financial Times of August 22, 1944]

BATTLE OF THE RUPEE AND GOLD—RIVAL CLAIMS OF SOUTH AFRICA AND INDIA

(By Sir Chunilal B. Mehta)

[Much discussion has taken place lately on the sale of gold in India and South Africa's claim to a portion of the enhanced price.

[India's point of view is set out in the following article, which suggests that India should be allowed to buy at the fixed price. The author, Sir Chunilal B. Mehta, is a former member of the central board of the Reserve Bank of India, a past president of the Federation of Indian Chambers of Commerce and Industry, and a director of several banking, commercial, and shipping companies.]

Possibly the most-discussed subject in the world today, apart from the war, and one which has been engaging the attention of the leading governments of the world, is gold. There are predictions that the war will soon be over, yet no one is in a position to say when it will actually end.

But preparations for peace are being diligently made by the Allied Governments, and the pride of place in those preparations is being occupied by gold.

Talks have centered on the subject of gold in post-war international monetary and exchange arrangements or agreements. South Africa is the largest gold-producing country in the world; the United States of America is the largest individual holder of stocks of gold; the United Kingdom is between the two as leader and mother country of the British Empire. Russia is also interested as a substantial producer of gold, but India is not allowed to take any direct active part in those talks, though India is the one country which has played, and will continue to play, a most important part in world's gold economy.

CONVERTED SAVINGS

India has always been an importer of both gold and silver. It is a well-known fact that the Indian masses, whenever they have any savings, are accustomed to buy gold and/or silver. Before the First World War the exchange value of the rupee was fixed at 16d. Accordingly, the internal price of gold was Rs. 24 per tola.

After the start of the First World War the Government of India prohibited imports of gold, with the result that the internal price of gold began to advance. On the other hand, the Government of India slowly raised the exchange value of the rupee, according to which the internal price of gold should have declined. But owing to the prohibition of imports of gold, the internal price did not decline, though the rupee value was being raised.

In order to bring down the internal price of gold, the Government of India began to sell small quantities of gold in India at rupee exchange parity price. All this gold was taken up by the public, and as soon as sales were discontinued prices again advanced.

STABILIZED RUPEE

After the end of the First World War, the Government of India stabilized the exchange value of the rupee at 18d. gold, which meant an internal price of about Rs. 21–5–0 (rupees 21 and annas 5) per tola of gold. This price was well maintained until 1931, when Great Britain abandoned the gold standard, and by a stroke of pen the then Secretary for India in London altered the link of the rupee from 18d. gold to 18d. sterling, thereby saving a number of exchange banks, who had entered into rupee exchange contracts, from considerable losses.

Not only that, but by that action he maintained the previous currency relationship between Great Britain and India. Owing to the abandonment of the gold standard by Britain, sterling began to depreciate, and the rupee being linked to sterling, also depreciated, thereby raising the internal price of gold. The Indian masses, who were accustomed to consider the price of Rs. 24 per tola of gold as a fair one, began to sell gold at every advance in the price of gold in terms of rupees, and increasing exports of gold began to take place.

The Indian commercial community requested the Government of India, with one voice, to prohibit the exports of gold and to buy it against the issue of currency notes. The United Kingdom was in great need of gold, and in order to meet her obligations to the United States of America she was interested in seeing that gold continued to be exported from India, and no export ban on gold was placed.

Thus, it was India's gold that came to the rescue of the British credit at a critical juncture. These exports of gold continued until sometime after the commencement of the present war. It is generally estimated that gold worth about Rs. 500 crores has been exported from India since September 1931, and the average price realized would not be more than Rs.35 per tola. This means that at the present price of Rs. 71 per tola, the value of gold exported would be more than about Rs. 1,000 crores.

RISING PRICE

After the start of the present war, gold imports were again prohibited, as in the First World War, with the result that the internal price of gold began to rise. India being one of the most important bases for supplies of men, money, and material in this war, huge purchases of articles, materials, and services were, and are, being made in India by Allied Governments.

Payments for all these materials and services are to be made in India in terms of rupees. This resulted in a large increase of currency notes in circulation in India. Notes in circulation on September 1, 1939, were about Rs. 182 crores, and about the end of July 1943, the notes in circulation were about Rs. 740 crores, with all the indications of a further increase.

A considerable rise had taken place in the prices of all commodities, and consequently in the cost of living. A severe type of inflation was coming into existence, and it seems that both the Government of India and the British Government realized that if they did not check the rapid inflationary trend in India, it would adversely affect the whole war effort. They were not in a position to supply either consumer goods or capital goods.

All measures of rationing, restrictions, quotas, etc., were found to be only temporary expedients, and when they found that there was no other alternative to control the situation, they set up a program of selling gold in India.

It is a well-known fact that the world gold price is a fixed one. In terms of sterling it is 168s per ounce and in terms of dollars it is $35 per ounce. The rupee exchange is at 18d and the sterling dollar exchange is at $4 per pound. On this basis the price of gold in India should be about Rs. 42 per tola. Therefore, in the ordinary course of events the Government of India should have insisted upon the United Kingdom and the United States Governments selling their gold in India at about Rs. 42 per tola. But that is not the case.

Instead, the United Kingdom and the United States Governments are allowed to sell gold in India at the rate of Rs. 71 or even higher per tola, thus allowing them to sell gold at a considerable premium. The argument put forward is that the United Kingdom and the United States Governments are buying different commodities and articles in India at a substantial premium, and therefore those Governments are allowed to sell gold at a substantial premium in order that they may secure a sufficient number of rupees to meet their expenditure in India. Anyhow, what is more surprising is that India, which sold large amounts of gold at the average rate of Rs. 35 per tola, is not now supplied with sufficient quantities of gold even at more than double the price.

PREMIUMS AND PROFITS

A new and very interesting controversy seems to have arisen recently in regard to the sales of gold in India by the United Kingdom and the United States of America at a premium of about 70 percent. Some of the South African leaders have begun to claim that they should also have a share in the profits that are being secured from the sales of gold in India. The issues at stake are being discussed by the financial papers of London, extracts of which are being telegraphed to India.

The London papers say that the British Government is spending large amounts in terms of rupees in India, and as such they should have this premium. They also say that for purchases made by South Africa in India in terms of rupees they would have no objection to South Africa taking the advantage of the premium price of gold in India.

But any further sales of gold in India by South Africa over and above their rupee requirements would result in accumulations of rupees in India on behalf of the South African Government. That will mean running the risk of having the rupees accumulated in India, which, owing to the purchasing power of the rupee being much less internally, might become depreciated after the war, and thus the South African Government would suffer loss.

At the same time, they also say that the rupee is not likely to depreciate after the war, but that the internal prices of commodities in India will decline. They further say that they are not prepared to convert the surplus rupees of the South African Government in terms of sterling and pay in sterling to South Africa.

Full details of all the arguments of the South African leaders are not available in India, but it is felt that they might be claiming that they should be allowed to convert rupees into sterling. They might also argue that as there is no probability of the rupee being depreciated after the war, they will be

able to utilize the accumulated rupees to their advantage. The British financial papers also point out that if the United States authorities do not reconsider their tariff policy after the war, the one-way traffic would be continued, meaning that the United States of America will always have a favorable trade balance, and, as such, it will be difficult to have dollar exchange after the war, and therefore they advise South Africa to accumulate dollars against gold instead of rupees.

MARKET VALUE

Not only that, but it is reported that the South African Minister of Mines has put forward a claim to the effect that after the war South Africa expects to be paid the full market price for her gold instead of an artificially fixed price. It is argued in London that if such a claim is adopted and carried out it would mean that the whole of the South African gold output will be swallowed by the bottomless pit of the Indian, Chinese, and other eastern hoarding demand.

The result will be that the post-war world reconstruction will be gravely handicapped, as the sterling, dollar, and other currencies would have to be adjusted on the basis of gold prices in eastern countries, which would upset the entire economic system of western countries. In order to meet such a situation, a suggestion has been made that the embargo on the import of gold ino India should continue even after the war, or there should be a high duty on gold imports into India; which would check the Indian demand for gold on the one hand and would deprive South Africa of the advantage of the high price in India on the other, thus forcing South Africa to sell her gold output to the western countries at their official prices.

After the end of the First World War, when the post-war depression set in, one of the main causes brought forward for the then depression was the maldistribution of gold. The United States of America had become a creditor country after the end of the First World War, and the closing of its doors to imports of goods and services from outside was the main cause of most of the gold being attracted to United States of America.

After the devaluation of the franc, France was able to accumulate a considerable amount of gold, but except for that the maldistribution continued. India played its part most prominently in adjusting this world maldistribution of gold by exporting huge quantities from 1931 onwards. But ultimately all this gold found its way to the United States of America, and the maldistribution continued. The result was that the different continental countries adopted economic nationalism, barter system for import and export of goods, quotas, and restrictions.

THE WESTERN APPETITE

The present war has resulted in important changes in the international distribution of the world's monetary gold stocks.

The appetite for gold is more discernible in western countries than in eastern countries. The only difference is that western countries want to acquire gold at certain fixed prices, while the eastern countries are prepared to pay higher prices. India has recently acquired gold at double the price, to the extent of about 3,000,000 ounces, and still there is a very big gap to fill to place her on her pre-1931 basis as regards private gold stocks.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. BARKLEY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Ferguson	Radcliffe
Andrews	George	Reed
Austin	Gillette	Revercomb
Bailey	Green	Reynolds
Ball	Guffey	Robertson
Bankhead	Gurney	Scrugham
Barkley	Hatch	Shipstead
Brewster	Hawkes	Stewart
Bridges	Hayden	Taft
Buck	Johnson, Calif.	Thomas, Idaho
Burton	Johnson, Colo.	Thomas, Okla.
Bushfield	Kilgore	Tunnell
Butler	Langer	Tydings
Byrd	McCarran	Vandenberg
Capper	McClellan	Wagner
Caraway	McKellar	Walsh, Mass.
Chavez	Maloney	Walsh, N. J.
Clark, Idaho	Mead	Wheeler
Clark, Mo.	Millikin	Wherry
Connally	O'Daniel	White
Cordon	O'Mahoney	Wiley
Danaher	Pepper	Willis

Mr. BARKLEY. I announce that the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. BILBO], the Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE], and the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] are absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JACKSON], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], the Senator from South Carclina [Mr. MAYBANK], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCFARLAND], the Senators from Utah [Mr. MURDOCK and Mr. THOMAS], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN], and the Senator from Washington [Mr. WALLGREN] are detained on public business.

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], and the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] are necessarily absent.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator from Oregon [Mr. HOLMAN], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. NYE], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WEEKS], and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. WILSON] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DAVIS] and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MOORE] is unavoidably absent.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Sixty-six Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

EXTENSION OF UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. GEORGE submitted the following report:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 2051) to amend the Social Security Act, as amended, to provide a national program for war mobilization and reconversion, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the House amendment insert the following:

"TITLE I—OFFICE OF WAR MOBILIZATION AND RECONVERSION

"SECTION 101. (a) There is hereby established the Office of War Mobilization and Reconversion, which shall be headed by the Director of War Mobilization and Reconversion (hereinafter called the "Director"). The Director shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, shall receive compensation at the rate of $15,000 per year, and shall serve for a term of two years.

"(b) The following agencies shall be placed within the Office of War Mobilization and Reconversion and shall exercise their functions subject to the general supervision of the Director:

"(1) Office of Contract Settlement, created by the Contract Settlement Act of 1944.

"(2) Surplus War Property Administration, created by Executive Order Numbered 9425 (if such Administration is in existence after the Office of War Mobilization ceases to exist), and the Surplus Property Board created by the Surplus Property Act of 1944.

"(3) Retraining and Reemployment Administration, created by Executive Order Numbered 9427 (if such Administration is in existence after the Office of War Mobilization ceases to exist), and the Retraining and Reemployment Administration created by title III of this Act.

"Nothing in this subsection shall imply any derogation of the powers of the Director under subsection (c) with respect to the agencies placed within his office or with respect to other agencies not specifically placed within his office.

"(c) In addition to any powers which the President is authorized to and does delegate to the Director for the purpose of more effectively coordinating the mobilization of the Nation for war, the Director shall, subject to the direction of the President—

"(1) formulate or have formulated such plans as are necessary to meet the problems arising out of the transition from war to peace;

"(2) issue such orders and regulations to executive agencies as may be necessary to provide for the exercise of their powers in a manner consistent with the plans formulated under this section or to coordinate the activities of executive agencies with respect to the problems arising out of the transition from war to peace. Each executive agency shall carry out the orders and regulations of the Director expeditiously and, to the extent necessary to carry out such orders and regulations, shall modify its operations and procedures and issue regulations with respect thereto. Nothing contained in this section shall be construed as authorizing any activities to carry out any plans formulated under this section which are not within the scope of the powers possessed by the President or the executive agencies under provisions of law other than this section;

"(3) recommend to the Congress appropriate legislation providing authority to carry out plans developed under this section but not authorized under existing law;

"(4) promote and assist in the development of demobilization and reconversion plans by executive agencies; develop procedures whereby each executive agency is kept informed of proposed demobilization and reconversion plans and proposals which relate to its work and which are being developed or carried out by other executive agencies; and settle controversies between executive agencies in the development and administration of such plans;

"(5) cause studies and reports to be made for him by the various executive agencies which will enable him to determine the need for the simplification, consolidation, or elimination of such executive agencies as have been established for the purposes of the war emergency, for the termination, or establishment by statute, of executive agencies which exist under Executive order only, and for the relaxation or removal of emergency war controls;

"(6) institute a specific study, for submission to the President and the Congress, of the present functions of the various executive agencies in the field of manpower, and develop a program for reorganizing and consolidating such agencies to the fullest extent practicable;

"(7) consult and cooperate with State and local governments, industry, labor, agriculture, and other groups, both national and local, concerning the problems arising out of the transition from war to peace; and

"(8) submit reports to the President, the Senate, and the House of Representatives on the 1st days of January, April, July, and October, on the activities undertaken or contemplated by him under this Act. Such reports shall summarize and appraise the activities of the various executive agencies in the field of demobilization and post-war adjustment, and may include such legislative proposals as he may deem necessary or desirable.

"(d) The Director shall, within the limits of funds which may be made available, employ and fix the compensation of such Deputy Directors and other officers and employees, and may make such expenditures for supplies, facilities, and services, as may be necessary to carry out his functions. All such officers and employees shall be appointed in accordance with the civil-service laws and their compensation fixed in accordance with the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, except that Deputy Directors and expert administrative, technical, and professional personnel may be employed and their compensation fixed without regard to such laws. To the fullest extent practicable, the Director shall perform the duties imposed upon him through the facilities and personnel of other executive agencies; and for that purpose only he is authorized to delegate to the appropriate agencies and provide for the redelegation of the powers and duties vested in him, except the power to issue orders and regulations to other executive agencies. The Director may require such reports and information from executive agencies as he deems necessary to enable him to carry out his functions under this Act, and each executive agency shall furnish any information and reports so required.

"SEC. 102. (a) There is hereby created an advisory board, which shall consist of twelve members who shall be appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. All of the members of the Board shall represent the general public and the public interest, but in order that the Board may have the benefit of experience in the matters with which it will deal under this Act, three members of the Board shall have had experience in business management, three members shall have had experience in matters relating to labor, and three members shall have had experience in agriculture. The President shall designate one of the remaining three members as chairman of the Board.

"(b) It shall be the general function of the Board to advise with the Director with respect to war mobilization and reconversion and make to him such recommendations relating to legislation, policies, and procedures as it may deem necessary.

"(c) Members of the Board shall receive a per diem allowance of $25 for each day spent in actual meetings of the Board or at conferences held upon the call of the Director, plus necessary traveling and other expenses incurred while so engaged.

"TITLE II—DEMOBILIZATION AND RECONVERSION POLICIES

"SEC. 201. The War and Navy Departments shall not retain persons in the armed forces for the purpose of preventing unemployment or awaiting opportunities for employment.

"SEC. 202. Any contracting agency shall terminate prime contracts for war production whenever in the opinion of the agency the performance under such contracts will not be needed for the prosecution of the war, and shall not continue performance under such contracts merely for the purpose of providing business and employment, or for any purposes other than the prosecution of the war, unless the Office of War Mobilization and Reconversion finds that the continuation of some or all of the work in process under any such contract will benefit the Government or is necessary to avoid substantial physical injury to a plant or property.

"SEC. 203. Curtailment of war production or terminations of war contracts shall be integrated and synchronized with the expansion, resumption, or initiation of production for other war purposes, and, to the greatest extent compatible with the effective prosecution of the war, of production for nonwar use. To effectuate this policy—

"(a) the contracting agencies shall continuously survey their product and material requirements and report to the Director, in such form and detail as he may determine, on current and anticipated changes in requirements and on all anticipated curtailments of war production or terminations of war contracts;

"(b) the executive agencies exercising control over manpower, production, or materials shall permit the expansion, resumption, or initiation of production for nonwar use whenever such production does not require materials, components, facilities, or labor needed for war purposes, or will not otherwise adversely affect or interfere with the production for war purposes. Such production for nonwar use shall be permitted regardless of whether one or more competitors normally engaged in the same type of production are still engaged in the performance under any contract which is needed for the prosecution of the war, and shall not be made dependent upon the existence of a concern or the functioning of a concern in a given field of activity at a given time;

"(c) the Director shall—

"(1) establish policies to be followed by the contracting agencies in selecting individual contracts or classes of contracts for curtailment, nonrenewal, or termination.

"(2) establish policies providing for full and prompt consultation between the executive agencies, war contractors, and the representatives of the employees of war contractors with regard to obtaining the most effective use in other war production or in production for nonwar use of facilities and manpower to be released through anticipated curtailments in war production or terminations of war contracts.

"SEC. 204. (a) Whenever the expansion, resumption, or initiation of production for nonwar use is authorized, on a restricted basis, by any executive agency having control over manpower, production, or materials, the restrictions imposed shall not be such as to prevent any small plant capable and desirous of participating in such expansion, resumption, or initiation of production for nonwar use from so participating in such production.

"(b) Whenever such executive agency allocates available materials for the production of any item or group of items for nonwar use, it shall make available a percentage of such materials for the exclusive use by small plants for the production of such item or group of items. Such percentage shall be determined by the head of such agency after giving full consideration to the claims presented by the chairman of the board of directors of the Smaller War Plants Corporation and shall be fair and equitable.

"(c) In allocating the materials thus set aside among such small plants, such executive agency shall establish criteria, standards, quotas, schedules, or other conditioning factors after consultation with the chairman of the board of directors of the Smaller War Plants Corporation. Such executive agency shall allocate such materials directly to such small plants and shall, to the fullest extent practicable, provide for making such allocations through local offices easily accessible to such small plants. For the purposes of this title, a small plant means any small business concern engaged primarily in production or manufacturing either employing two hundred and fifty wage earners or less, or coming within such other categories as may be established by the head of such executive agency in consultation with the chairman of the board of directors of the Smaller War Plants Corporation. Such other categories shall be defined by taking into consideration the comparative sizes of establishments in a particular industry as reflected by sales volumes, quantities of materials consumed, capital investments, or by other criteria which are reasonably attributable to small plants rather than medium or large size plants.

"SEC. 205. The Attorney General is directed to make surveys for the purpose of determining any factors which may tend to eliminate competition, create or strengthen monopolies, injure small business, or otherwise promote undue concentration of economic power in the course of war mobilization and during the period of transition from war to peace and thereafter. The Attorney General shall submit to the Congress within ninety days after the approval of this Act, and at such times thereafter as he deems desirable, reports setting forth the results of such surveys and including recommendations for such legislation as he may deem necessary or desirable.

"TITLE III—RETRAINING AND REEMPLOYMENT

"SEC. 301. There is hereby established a Retraining and Reemployment Administration (hereinafter referred to as the 'Administration'), the functions of which, subject to the general supervision of the Director of War Mobilization and Reconversion, shall be exercised by a Retraining and Reemployment Administrator (hereinafter in this title referred to as the 'Administrator'), to be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, and to receive a salary at the rate of $12,000 per annum. The same person may serve as Administrator and as Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, but in such case he shall receive only the salary provided by this section.

"SEC. 302. It shall be the function of the Administration—

"(a) to have general supervision and direction of the activities of all existing executive agencies (except the Veterans' Administration and the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs) authorized by law relating to retraining, reemployment, vocational education, and vocational rehabilitation for the purpose of coordinating such activities and eliminating overlapping functions of such agencies. To the extent necessary to achieve such purposes the Administrator shall have power to issue regulations in connection with the work of such executive agencies, but nothing in this title shall be deemed to confer any power or authority upon any such agency or authorize any activities by any such agency not authorized by provisions of law other than this title, or to extend any existing power beyond the date upon which it would otherwise expire; and

"(b) to confer with existing State and local agencies and officials in charge of existing programs relating to retraining, reemployment, vocational education, and vocational rehabilitation for the purpose of coordinating the activities of existing Federal agencies with the activities of such State and local agencies.

"SEC. 303. The Administrator shall, within the limits of funds which may be made available, employ and fix the compensation of such Assistant Administrators and other officers and employees, and may make such expenditures for supplies, facilities, and services as may be necessary to carry out his functions and the functions of the Administration. All such officers and employees shall be appointed in accordance with the civil-service laws and their compensation fixed in accordance with the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, except that Assistant Administrators and expert administrative, technical, and professional personnel may be employed and their compensation fixed without regard to such laws. To the fullest extent practicable, the Administrator shall perform the duties imposed upon him through the facilities and personnel of other executive agencies.

"TITLE IV—ADVANCES TO STATE UNEMPLOYMENT FUNDS

"SEC. 401. (a) Section 904 (a) of the Social Security Act, as amended, is further amended by inserting, immediately before the period at the end of the second sentence of the subsection, a comma and the following: 'or deposited pursuant to appropriations to the Federal unemployment account'.

"(b) Section 904 (e) of the Social Security Act, as amended, is further amended by inserting, after the words 'a separate book account for such State agency' a comma and the following: 'the Federal unemployment account,'.

"(c) Section 904 of the Social Security Act, as amended, is further amended by adding, at the end of the section, the following new subsections:

"'(g) The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed, prior to audit or settlement by the General Accounting Office, to make transfers from the Federal unemployment account to the account of any State in the Unemployment Trust Fund in accordance with certification made by the Board pursuant to section 1207, not exceeding the amount on deposit in the Federal unemployment account at the time of such transfer.

"'(h) There is hereby established in the Unemployment Trust Fund a Federal unemployment account. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated to such Federal unemployment account a sum equal to the excess of taxes collected prior to July 1, 1943, under title IX of this Act and under the Federal Unemployment Tax Act, over the total unemployment administrative expenditures made prior to July 1, 1943; and there is hereby authorized to be appropriated to such account for the fiscal year 1945 and for each fiscal year thereafter (1) a sum equal to any excess of taxes collected in the preceding fiscal year under the Federal Unemployment Tax Act over the unemployment administrative expenditures made in such year, and (2) such further sums, if any, as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of title XII. Any amounts in the Federal unemployment account on October 1, 1947, and any amounts repaid to such account after such date, shall be covered into the general fund of the Treasury. As used in this subsection, the term 'unemployment administrative expenditures' means expenditures for grants under title III of this Act, for the administration of that title by the Board, and for the administration of title IX of this Act and of the Federal Unemployment Tax Act by the Department of the Treasury and the Board. For the purposes of this subsection there shall be deducted from the total amount of taxes collected prior to July 1, 1943, under title IX of this Act, the sum of $40,561,886.43 which was authorized to be appropriated by the Act of August 24, 1937 (50 Stat. 754).'

"SEC. 402. The Social Security Act, as amended, is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following new title:

"'TITLE XII—ADVANCES TO STATE UNEMPLOYMENT FUNDS

"'SEC. 1201. (a) In the event that the balance in a State's account in the Unemployment Trust Fund on June 30, 1945, or on the last day in any ensuing calendar quarter which ends prior to July 1, 1947, does not exceed a sum equal to the total contributions deposited in the Unemployment Trust Fund under the unemployment compensation law of the State during that one of the two calendar years next preceding such day in which such deposits were higher, the State shall be entitled, subject to the provisions of subsections (b) and (c) hereof, to have transferred from the Federal unemployment account to its account in the Unemployment Trust Fund an amount equal to the amount by which the unemployment compensation paid out by it in the calendar quarter ending on such day exceeded 2.7 per centum of the total remuneration which was paid during such quarter and was subject to the State unemployment compensation law.

"'(b) The Social Security Board is authorized and directed, on application of a State unemployment compensation agency, to make findings as to whether the conditions for the transfer of moneys provided for in subsection (a) hereof have been met; and if such conditions exist, the Board is directed to certify, to the Secretary of the Treasury, from time to time, the amounts for transfer in order to carry out the purposes of this title, reduced or increased, as the case may be, by any sum by which the Board finds that the amounts transferred for any prior quarter were greater or less than the amounts to which the State was entitled for such quarter. The application of a State agency shall be made on such forms, and contain such information and data, fiscal and otherwise, concerning the operation and administration of the State law, as the Board deems necessary or relevant to the performance of its duties hereunder.

"'(c) Any amount transferred to the account of any State under this section shall be treated as an advance, without interest, to the unemployment fund of such State and shall be repaid to the Federal unemployment account from the unemployment fund of that State to the extent that the balance in the State's account in the Unemployment Trust Fund, at the end of any calendar quarter, exceeds a sum equal to the total contributions deposited in the Unemployment Trust Fund under the unemployment compensation law of the State during that one of the two calendar years next preceding such day in which such deposits were higher. The Secretary of the Treasury shall, after the end of each calendar quarter, transfer from the unemployment account of each State in the Unemployment Trust Fund to the Federal unemployment account the amount required to be repaid from the unemployment fund of such State at the end of such quarter under this subsection.'

"TITLE V—PUBLIC WORKS

"SEC. 501. (a) In order to encourage States and other non-Federal public agencies to make advance provision for the construction of public works (not including housing), the Federal Works Administrator is hereby authorized to make, from funds appropriated for that purpose, loans or advances to the States and their agencies and political subdivisions (hereinafter referred to as "public agencies") to aid in financing the cost of architectural, engineering, and economic investigations and studies, surveys, designs, plans, working drawings, specifications, procedures, and other action preliminary to the construction of such public works: *Provided*, That the making of loans or advances hereunder shall not in any way commit the Congress to appropriate funds to undertake any projects so planned.

"(b) Funds appropriated for the making of loans or advances hereunder shall be allotted by the Federal Works Administrator among the several States in the following proportion: 90 per centum in the proportion which the population of each State bears to the total population of all the States, as shown by the latest available Federal census, and 10 per centum according to his discretion: *Provided*, That the allotments to any State shall aggregate not less than one-half of 1 per centum of the total funds available for allotment hereunder: *Provided further*, That no loans or advances shall be made with respect to any individual project unless it conforms to an over-all State, local, or regional plan approved by competent State, local, or regional authority.

"(c) Advances under this section to any public agency shall be repaid by such agency if and when the construction of the public works so planned is undertaken. Any sums so repaid shall be covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

"(d) The Federal Works Administrator is authorized to prescribe rules and regulations to carry out the purposes of this section.

"(e) As used in this section, the term 'State' shall include the District of Columbia, Alaska, Hawaii, and Puerto Rico.

"TITLE VI—MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

"SEC. 601. When used in this Act—

"(a) The term 'executive agency' means any department, independent establishment, or agency in the executive branch of the Government, including any corporation wholly owned by the United States.

"(b) The term 'contracting agency' means any Government agency which has been or hereafter may be authorized to make contracts pursuant to section 201 of the First War Powers Act, 1941, and includes the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and any corporation organized pursuant to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act (47 Stat. 5), as amended, and the Smaller War Plants Corporation.

"SEC. 602. There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary or appropriate to carry out the purposes and provisions of this Act.

"SEC. 603. The provisions of this Act shall terminate on June 30, 1947.

"SEC. 604. If any provision of this Act, or the application of such provision to any person or circumstance, is held invalid, the remainder of this Act or the application of such provision to persons or circumstances, other than those as to which it is held invalid, shall not be affected thereby.

"SEC. 605. (a) When the Director first appointed under section 101 has taken office, the Office of War Mobilization established by Executive Order Numbered 9347, dated May 27, 1943, not including the Surplus War Property Administration or the Retraining and Reemployment Administration, shall cease to exist; and such records and property of the Office of War Mobilization, and such unexpended balances of appropriations or other funds available for its use, as the President shall determine, shall be transferred to the Office of War Mobilization and Reconversion.

"(b) When a majority of the members of the Surplus Property Board first appointed under the Surplus Property Act of 1944 have taken office, the Surplus War Property Administration created by Executive Order Numbered 9425 shall cease to exist; and such records and office equipment of the Surplus War Property Administration, and such unexpended balances of appropriations or other

funds available for its use, as the President shall determine, shall be transferred to the Surplus Property Board.

"(c) When the Retraining and Reemployment Administrator first appointed under section 301 has taken office, the Retraining and Reemployment Administration created by Executive Order Numbered 9427, shall cease to exist; and such records and property of the Administration created by such Executive order, and such unexpended balances of appropriations or other funds available for its use, as the President shall determine, shall be transferred to the Retraining and Reemployment Administration established by this Act.

"SEC. 606. All orders, policies, procedures, or directives prescribed by the Director of War Mobilization, in effect upon the effective date of this Act, and not inconsistent with this Act, shall remain in full force and effect unless and until superseded by the Director in accordance with this Act, or by operation of law.

"SEC. 607. This Act may be cited as the 'War Mobilization and Reconversion Act of 1944'."

And the House agree to the same.

WALTER F. GEORGE,
DAVID I. WALSH,
ALBEN W. BARKLEY,
A. H. VANDENBERG,
ROBERT TAFT,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

R. L. DOUGHTON,
JERE COOPER,
WESLEY E. DISNEY,
JOHN D. DINGELL,
HAROLD KNUTSON,
DANIEL A. REED,
ROY O. WOODRUFF,
Managers on the part of the House.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I send to the desk, and ask to have read, a statement on the part of the Senate conferees, which will explain precisely the effect of the conference report.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the statement will be read.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

SEPTEMBER 19, 1944.

STATEMENT OF THE CONFEREES ON THE PART OF THE SENATE

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses to the bill (S. 2051) to amend the Social Security Act, as amended, to provide a national program for war mobilization and reconversion, and for other purposes, reached satisfactory agreement on all differences between the two Houses except as to two points.

The House struck from the bill as it passed the Senate section 303 providing transportation for migratory war workers and section 403 providing unemployment compensation for Federal employees. We insisted upon the retention of these two provisions in the bill and upon failure to secure an agreement on this basis insisted upon the question being passed upon by the House.

The House having voted to insist upon its disagreement, we were confronted with two alternatives—to accept the provisions of the bill upon which there was agreement, or have no bill at all.

Title I of the bill sets up an Office of War Mobilization and Reconversion to coordinate all of the activities of the various agencies dealing with these problems. It is believed that such an office is vitally necessary to the orderly reconversion from war to peace.

Title II prescribes sound policies to be followed by the Office of War Mobilization and Reconversion in the transition from war to peace.

Title III provides for the coordination of the activities of all agencies dealing with employment and vocational training.

Title IV provides for a revolving loan fund to guarantee the solvency of all of the State unemployment compensation funds.

Title V provides for advances to States and their political subdivisions for architectural and engineering fees for the planning of public works.

Feeling that it is vital that titles I and II be enacted and that the other titles are very desirable, we reluctantly receded from the Senate position.

We deplore the fact that it was not possible, in this bill, to care for these two highly desirable steps in the program for human demobilization but call attention to the fact that the way is still open to enact these two provisions by separate legislation.

WALTER F. GEORGE,
ALBEN W. BARKLEY,
DAVID I. WALSH,
A. H. VANDENBERG,
ROBERT A. TAFT,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, it will be seen from this statement, which is signed by all the conferees on the part of the Senate, in the nature of a report from the conferees to the Senate, that the two principal features of the bill on which the House disagreed, and on which the House took separate record votes yesterday, one relating to the transportation costs of workers engaged in war work, and the other relating to unemployment compensation for civilian Government employees, were finally eliminated in order that we might inaugurate the general program recommended by various committees of the Congress, but especially by the Senate Special Committee on Post-war Economic Policy and Planning, as early as November last year, and subsequently expanded in a report filed with the Senate even before the publication of the report known as the Baruch-Hancock report.

The general program set up in the bill as it comes from conference, with respect to the over-all central agency, is in substantial accord with the recommendations made by the Senate Special Committee on Post-war Economic Policy and Planning, and by Mr. Baruch in his more comprehensive report dealing with post-war problems and problems of reconversion from war to peace.

The conferees concluded that it was necessary to have this over-all agency set up in order that there might be merged into the central agency the Administrator of Contract Termination and Settlement, Plant Clearance, and such administrative agency as is provided in the conference report presently to be presented to the Senate, on disposal of surplus property and plants.

As this statement has emphasized, the Senate conferees most reluctantly agreed to recede from the position of the Senate with respect to the transportation of workers from the war areas of the country back to their homes, or to places where suitable job opportunities exist. Especially were we reluctant to recede from the Senate's position on unemployment compensation for civilian Federal workers. It is true, of course, that by separate legislation these and other phases of human demobilization in the period of transition back to peace may be dealt with; but we regret very much that we were compelled to eliminate from this bill the provisions to which I have particularly referred, and which are referred to in the report filed by all the conferees on the part of the Senate.

We do not indicate that we have abandoned the conviction that the Federal civilian employees should be cared for, that is, should be afforded unemployment compensation benefits, as the Senate originally decided, at the State levels and on the same conditions as the unemployment benefits for workers in covered employment in private industry. We believe that this was an eminently just provision; moreover, we are thoroughly convinced that it is in the interest of general economy. Actually the savings to the Government would be greater under some reasonable and adequate unemployment compensation system for Federal workers than if no such provision were made. The tendency undoubtedly will be—and it is a very understandable tendency—that the Federal authorities and agencies will be disposed to retain in their employ workers who have gone to work for the Government during the war period and who have been taken in on a temporary basis. The disposition to retain such workers will cost fully as much as, if not more than, the total cost of unemployment-compensation benefits at State levels and upon the same conditions as fixed for employers in covered industries within the States.

However, we were unable to persuade the House conferees to accept this view; and after insisting that the House conferees take the matter back to the House for a separate vote upon these two provisions, and the House having taken a separate record vote and instructed its conferees to insist upon the amendments made by the House, we most reluctantly eliminated these controversial provisions from the bill in order to set up the general over-all central authority essential for the guidance and direction of all the agencies of government which will be responsible for the important job of reconversion to peacetime conditions, as we approach the end of the war, and after the end of actual hostilities.

Mr. President, I believe that is all I have to say upon the subject at this time, except to call attention to the fact that the Senate receded because of the unyielding position taken by the House to one or two other provisions which were contained in the original Senate bill. One of them was with respect to a Board of Appeals to pass upon the question of priorities to small industries in the disposition of surplus war properties. That, however, was in part covered by a provision inserted by the House which gives to the Smaller War Plants Corporation a substantial recognition in requiring full consideration for the small business interests of the country in the distribution or disposal of surplus war materials. Another provision to which we most reluctantly acceded, and without requiring the House to take a separate vote on it—because the House had already voted upon it—was the provision for training or retraining for able-bodied workers; that is to say, workers who suffered no physical or mental defects and workers

who were not in the categories of members of the armed forces. Of course, training or retraining is provided for all the men and women in the armed services, and there is also reasonable provision for State and Federal vocational training or retraining for the physically and mentally handicapped. But there is no provision in our law as it stands today, since we were compelled to eliminate the provision from the Senate bill in order to reach an agreement, for training of the able-bodied worker so as to fit him for some new type of work which may be available to him in peacetimes.

Mr. President, I have no disposition further to expand my statement. I anticipate that individual members of the conference committee will desire to make statements with respect to the provision for transportation of workers and also relative to unemployment compensation for civilian Federal employees.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McCLELLAN in the chair). The question is, Shall the Senate proceed to the consideration of the report of the committee of conference on Senate bill 2051? Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 2051) to amend the Social Security Act, as amended, to provide a national program for war mobilization and reconversion, and for other purposes.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I should be less than frank with my colleagues if I did not state my personal view that this conference report in two particulars is substantially unsatisfactory. I say this with greatest respect for the earnestness and good faith of the House and its conferees. The fact remains, as indicated by the able senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] that in the final analysis the Senate conferees had no alternative, after the House voted by roll call yesterday, except to yield upon the two questions of travel allowances and unemployment compensation for Federal employees. We had no alternative except to yield, unless we were willing to sacrifice the essential legislation in titles I and II, which represent the creation of the over-all reconversion authority, which is the key to the entire, indispensable reconversion formula which Congress is undertaking to establish.

It was our united view, my own included, that we have no right to withhold our consent to titles I and II simply because of our very great disappointment that the House persisted in its hostility to the Senate's position in respect to unemployment insurance for Federal employees and travel allowances for migratory workers.

Mr. President, the direct human element in reconversion is not covered in this conference report. I repeat that it is a matter of regret to me and to all the other Senate conferees. However, it is a fact that we have saved a great, fundamental thing in respect to the human element which is the Federal guaranty of the solvency of all the State unemployment funds.

I wish particularly to emphasize the final sentence in the statement formally presented by the conferees. The two controversial subjects to which I have referred and to which the Senator from Georgia has referred are by no means dead because of this action. They are not dead so far as I am concerned, at any rate; and at the first opportunity I shall join in undertaking their resurrection.

Under the circumstances I say that the Senate conferees, after 2 weeks of uncompromising resistance to the attitude of the House, were finally forced into a position, by the roll-call votes in the House on yesterday, where we had to sacrifice the creation of the over-all reconversion authority or else yield to the view of the House in respect to these two propositions. That is the sole reason why we yielded.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, having been one of the Senate conferees, I wish to make a very brief statement regarding my own personal attitude toward this proposed legislation. I am sure the Senate will recall that when the original measure was before this body I voted against the substitution of the George amendment which had been offered to the Murray-Kilgore bill, which in substance was the original George bill as reported by the Committee on Finance. When the bill was under consideration in the Finance Committee, I stated then that, in my judgment, the proposed legislation was not satisfactory and not adequate. I have not yet been able to reconcile myself to the selection of Government employees in civil employment under the Government for unemployment compensation, while leaving out the vast number of civilian employees who have been working in war plants, which activity has been, of course, as everyone knows, as essential as any other on the part of our people. We all hope there will be no great unemployment after the war ends. I believe that if business, agriculture, labor, the Government, and all other elements of our people work together and in cooperation in the reconversion and post-war period there need not be any great unemployment. It is my belief that while we may not be able to maintain our national income at its present level we can maintain it at a level which will guarantee employment to all those who are willing and able to work, at remunerative wages, under conditions which will be reasonably satisfactory.

Not only is there a great background of need in our own country for articles which we have been doing without for the past 4 or 5 years but, in view of the destruction which has taken place in all the occupied countries of the world, there will no doubt be a great demand upon our inventive genius and our mechanized industries to supply a large portion of the articles which the world will need. I believe that all this will mean a high level of national income, a high level of prosperity, and a high level of wages and employment. It certainly is the duty of all elements of our people to work to that end. Yet there are those who believe that such a view is a little too optimistic. I am one of those who believe that, regardless of the result of such optimism and cooperative effort, we should be as well prepared for peace when it comes as it is possible to be prepared, and better prepared, for it than we have ever been for any war in which our Nation has engaged.

While I hope there will be no need for a great amount of unemployment compensation because of a high level of unemployment, I believe it is our duty to be prepared for it if it should unfortunately come. In preparing for it I cannot visualize any justice in segregating only Government employees and providing for them without at the same time providing for the body of war workers generally, many of whom have been uprooted from their homes. They were not uprooted by any compulsion of the Government, but certainly under its persuasion and under an impulse to do their duty. That was especially true on the part of those unable to serve in our military and naval forces.

In this limited bill, which, as I have indicated, was inadequate, in my judgment, because it did not provide for others beside Government employees, we held out for the Senate provision, namely travel pay, and we finally reduced it to the irreducible minimum in our suggestions in the conference with respect to unemployment compensation provided for civilian employees of the Government.

The House had not had a record vote on the matter. Under its rules, as we all know, in the Committee of the Whole there is no way to obtain a record vote. The only way for the Members of the House to obtain a record vote is to do so after they come out of a meeting of the Committee of the Whole. Any amendments adopted in the Committee can then receive a record vote if a sufficient number of Representatives demand it, or upon a motion to recommit. Neither of those courses was pursued in the House, so no record vote was taken there upon the subject. The House struck out entirely the provisions to which I have referred, and made no substitution. Yesterday there was a record vote. On that vote it was shown that the sentiment in the House in favor of unemployment compensation for civilian Government employees had increased considerably since the teller vote, or standing vote which had been taken in the Committee of the Whole in the House. So a great deal of progress had been made toward House concurrence in the provisions of the Senate bill. But, be that as it may, the House went on record in opposition, fortifying the adamant position of the House conferees, who had stood out during the 2 weeks of conference against the provision in any form.

As the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] have said, the Senate conferees all realized that we had either to yield or have no legislation.

It seems to me that we cannot afford to defeat the legislation so far as we have been able to agree. Not only can we deal with other subjects in separate legislation but, in my judgment, we must deal with them. The House takes the position that any amendment to the Social Security Act which involves any additional coverage by taxes, or any change in the tax rate on the subject of social security, must originate in the House. We are not in a position to dispute that constitutional requirement. The bill which we passed in the Senate did not involve any taxation, or additional coverage by taxes, and therefore it did not contravene the constitutional provision.

Yesterday in the House the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee asserted that it was the intention of the committee, I believe immediately after election when all Members shall have returned, to take up the question, hold hearings, and deal with the matter in a broad and comprehensive way. I have no doubt of the good faith of the chairman and other members of the commit- in the assertion which the chairman made.

As a Member of the Senate, I wish to say, for whatever it may be worth, that we cannot afford, as a legislative body, to give even the impression that we are contenting ourselves with taking care of the physical reconversion of our country as a result of the war, and abandoning or showing a lack of interest, or showing even a lukewarm interest, in the human problems which must arise out of the question of reconversion and the question of migration. Congress never enacted a law authorizing or empowering the Government to reach its arms into any community, take men and women out of the community, and transport them elsewhere in order to engage in war work. We have relied on the voluntary method. That method has succeeded. It has succeeded almost beyond what our dreams were when the war began.

While there was no compulsion, there was a patriotic persuasion on the part of the Government and our people, and it was recognized and accepted accordingly. Hundreds of thousands, if not millions, of our people moved their families away from their lifetime homes and went into strange communities. They found living conditions which made them not altogether happy. But they moved into those communities because of a patriotic motive, although there are those who claim that they did it only because they were to receive higher wages than they had been receiving where they were living. There is no doubt that in many instances they did receive higher wages, but I think there was just as much of a patriotic urge upon the part of those men and women to do their duty, even at a sacrifice, as there was on the part of any other group of people during the war. Therefore I felt, and I still feel, that in cases which we undertook to delineate in our suggestion, a reasonable amount of transportation from where those people are now living back to their homes, or to some other place where they may obtain employment, would not be out of place.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. What will happen if the Senate refuses to recede from its position? What will happen if we have no new legislation upon the subject for the next 2 or 3 months?

Mr. BARKLEY. There will be no over-all set-up for physical reconversion of plants, as the bill in titles I and II provides. The consideration of the entire subject will, in all likelihood, have to be postponed until a later date. Personally, I do not believe that even the human element would gain by such a postponement. I believe that when we concentrate our attention upon that phase of the subject it will be entirely possible to do a better job than was done in the proposed legislation.

Mr. AIKEN. Does the Senator believe that we should accept this bill, which we all know is not full and adequate, but which is as far as the House will go, rather than refuse to recede from the position of the Senate?

Mr. BARKLEY. That is my position. We cannot, in my judgment, afford to abandon the legislation, and, therefore, we ought to adopt the conference report, which will get out of the way these two titles which are a part of the legislation, clean them up, and then when we come back, or at the earliest possible date, take up the other phases of the matter in either House where it can be most appropriately done and legislate upon it as promptly as possible.

Mr. AIKEN. If we cannot get consideration for human beings now but we can get consideration for property reconversion, is there any reason to believe that we will get any greater consideration for the human element 2 or 3 or 4 months from now?

Mr. BARKLEY. I think so, for the reason that the House conferees and the House Ways and Means Committee and the House itself feel that this subject ought to be dealt with in a proper way by an amendment to the Social Security Act itself, by broadening the base, and by increasing the number that will be covered by it; and they have given every assurance that they will take that up and deal with it. There is a constitutional restraint upon our action here, if there is involved any tax feature or taking into the system men and women who are not now in it upon whom there would have to be a tax levied.

Mr. AIKEN. The Senator may be right about that and probably is, but it seems to me when we are talking about preservation of fundamentals that there is nothing more fundamental to the welfare of the country than the welfare of the human beings who make up its population.

Mr. BARKLEY. I agree with that.

Mr. AIKEN. I know I cannot do anything about it.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator knows what my view about this legislation has been all along, but we cannot always get at any one time all we want, and so we have to take what we can get, and press with more determination at an appropriate time to get what we want to get by means of legislation.

Mr. AIKEN. It seems rather peculiar that men can work day and night over property and dollars and cents, but cannot give consideration to human beings.

Mr. BARKLEY. That does seem peculiar, but there are many types of peculiar people, and some of them find their way into legislative halls.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, as one of the conferees, I wish to say that I also regret that the Senate has had to recede on these two amendments. Of course, we must recognize the fact, however, that they are separate pieces of legislation, and that, under the Constitution, legislation cannot be enacted unless both Houses agree to it.

On the general question, I think we should approve the conference report, because, after all, the question of demobilization of the human element is primarily a question of administration, and we do here set up a proper organization of administration to deal with it and that organization will have 90 percent, perhaps, of the powers it ought to have. We think it ought to have some additional powers, but, nevertheless, after all, in dealing with the human element the chief consideration is to get people jobs and the getting of jobs involves the stimulation of industry to go to work. The question of taking care of people if they do not get jobs is also important, but what the human element wants is jobs, not unemployment compensation when they do not work.

As the Senator says, I think we will have time to deal with the unemployment compensation before we reach the period at which there will be any serious difficulty. Both parties have agreed that unemployment compensation shall be extended to agricultural workers, to employers of one or more instead of eight or more, and to domestic servants as well as those who are already covered. That is an extensive program. I see no reason why the Federal employees cannot be dealt with at the same time.

So far as travel pay is concerned, I believe personally that, if there is any difficulty whatever with employment, we will have that problem put to us very shortly, and that it will have to be met directly. I think it can be met, however, when the emergency arises.

So I believe the Senate should adopt the report, set the machinery in motion, create an organization that can come back to us and tell us what additional powers they think should be added to their powers, in order to deal both with the human element and the business element. I think in that way we will make far more progress than if we delay this whole matter for several months, and then have to do the entire job over again. So, I trust the report will be agreed to.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Mr. President, my colleagues who represented the Senate on the conference committee on this bill have so fully and so adequately explained my own position that there is no need to amplify what they have already said.

It was with great reluctance and only after long discussion and record vote

taken by the House of Representatives that the Senate conferees agreed to the conference report which has now been submitted to the Senate. We did it, as I have said, reluctantly because we were unanimously of the opinion that the situation in this country today and the situation that is likely to develop as the war approaches an end necessitated something being done to pay at least the traveling expenses of war workers who are stranded in different sections of the country, and also to extend unemployment compensation to war workers in the Federal service.

It has been impossible for us to persuade the conferees of the House that this legislation is war legislation and that the situation we were seeking to relieve was the result of the war. It would be unthinkable to pass these two provisions if we were not at war; no one would conceive of it being done; but in the exigencies of the war situation, and in view of the upset that has taken place by reason of employment opportunities being scattered all over the country and workers being sent far away from their homes it seemed to us but fair and just that these two provisions should have been retained in the bill. As indicated, however, in view of the action of the House yesterday in rejecting our provisions, we have now no choice except to ask the Senate to accept the conference report.

I am pleased because it expresses our unanimous judgment, that the chairman has seen fit to have put in the RECORD the joint statement made by the Senate conferees expressing their views with respect to this legislation and respecting their purpose and intent to continue agitation to obtain the relief that has been denied by the elimination of these two provisions.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TUNNELL in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

PROPOSED EQUAL RIGHTS CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT—ARTICLE FROM NEW YORK HERALD TRIBUNE

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I regret to have to call the attention of the Senate to a very erroneous and I think unfair article in yesterday morning's issue of the New York Herald Tribune, a newspaper with which I frequently disagree but for whose journalistic integrity I have always had the greatest respect. I shall read the article in order that the Senate may know its import. It is an article written by the Washington bureau of the Herald Tribune. The headline reads:

Ferguson says P. A. C. bars vote on equal rights—Asserts Democratic chiefs in Senate bow to flood of C. I. O. pressure mail.

The article proceeds:

WASHINGTON, September 17.—The Democratic leadership of the Senate stood charged today by Republican Members of bowing to the Congress of Industrial Organizations Political Action Committee in sidetracking consideration of the equal rights for women constitutional amendment last week.

Union opposition to the amendment, which had been scheduled for Senate consideration last week, is based on the contention of the Women's Trade Union League that it will end legal restrictions on hours, pay, and other conditions of employment necessary to protect the health and prevent exploitation of women.

Senator GUY M. GILLETTE, Democrat, of Iowa, told the Senate he was postponing consideration of the amendment because many interested Members were away from Washington, and objected to any action until they could be on hand for debate.

Charging flatly that the C. I. O. instead of congressional absenteeism is responsible for the delay, Senator HOMER FERGUSON, Republican, of Michigan, disclosed that pressure mail is being received by Senators taking the union line on the amendment.

Now quoting the junior Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON]:

"The majority is afraid to bring it up because of the flood of C. I. O. telegrams and letters," Senator FERGUSON declared.

Both the Republican and Democratic platforms contain endorsements of the equal rights for women idea, but Senator FERGUSON continued—

Now quoting him:

"It just shows how they (the Democrats) are going to live up to their party platform. This was a good opportunity for them to show how the whole party could line up behind a good plank, but they've muffed it."

That ends the quotation from the Senator from Michigan. The article continues:

The Democratic leadership, according to one report, sought out Sidney Hillman, P. A. C. chairman, during the week and protested against the C. I. O. pressure to defeat the equal rights bill, but were told by Mr. Hillman that if there was any such campaign, he was unaware of it.

The amendment is backed by the National Women's party, which contends that protective laws for women make job-hunting more difficult and deprive women of their full rights as citizens.

Mr. President, I do not know whether the Senator from Michigan was correctly quoted in what is attributed to him, but there is scarcely a truthful sentence in the entire article quoted from the New York Herald Tribune. I suppose that when the Senator from Michigan referred to the Senate leadership he might have had in mind that I had something to do with the matter, for, at least, I occupy a modest place in that category, but the imputation that either I or any one else connected with the majority of the Senate may have been intimidated, influenced, persuaded, or otherwise controlled, in our action with respect to this matter, is without the slightest foundation in fact.

I have not seen Mr. Sidney Hillman anywhere, at any time, on any subject, I should say, for at least a year. I do not know when I last saw him on any subject. He has not visited me, he has not sought me out, on any subject. So far as I know, no letter or telegram has come from him to me on the subject of the equal-rights amendment since it has been under consideration. I do not even know the attitude of the C. I. O., the P. A. C., or any other organization of that sort, in regard to that amendment, except that a few days ago I did receive a copy of Labor, which is a weekly journal published by the railway brotherhoods of the United States, in which it expressed itself in opposition to the equal-rights amendment.

I also saw in the newspaper sometime ago a statement, I think attributed to Mr. William Green, president of the American Federation of Labor, in which he opposed the amendment, for reasons which were given. But neither Mr. Green, Mr. Hillman, Mr. Murray, nor anyone else, has approached me with respect to when this matter should be taken up, or whether it should be taken up at all.

I desire, of course, to deal fairly with my colleagues in the Senate, and I shall do so, and I think I have a right to expect the same sort of fairness on their part toward me.

When I was at home, about a month ago, on account of the very serious illness of my wife, I was called up over long-distance telephone from nearly all over the United States, by persons interested in this amendment, stating that it was up to me to determine whether the amendment should be voted upon immediately after Labor Day. They had fixed that as a time when they wanted a vote. I also received a number of telegrams to the same effect.

I replied to all those interested that it was not within my province to determine when an amendment to the Constitution of the United States should be voted upon, that the joint resolution proposing the amendment had been reported by the Committee on the Judiciary sometime ago, that no one had ever asked that it be taken up, that no one had come to me, from either side of this Chamber, and asked that it be taken up. The committee made no move to take it up. It seems that at the two political conventions planks were inserted in the platforms endorsing the equal-rights amendment. Following that the good ladies and others who were interested in the amendment—and I pay due tribute to their sincerity—felt that it would be an excellent idea to have a vote now, both parties having declared in favor of the amendment, and they wanted a vote taken right after Labor Day.

I told them that when I returned to Washington I would confer with Members of the Senate, including the majority leader, the Senator from Maine [Mr. WHITE], and other Senators on the minority side, that I would confer with members of the Committee on the Judiciary, which reported the joint resolution, that I would confer with the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], the author of the joint resolution, to determine when it would be best to take it up and vote upon it. I explained that in all likelihood we would have difficulty in maintaining a quorum of the Senate after the reconversion and surplus-property measures had been disposed of, that the House had already agreed, on both sides, to consider no further legislation of any kind after the conference reports on the reconversion and surplus-property bills had been disposed of, and that intention on their part has been reiterated to me time and time again since the Congress returned to Washington.

After conferring with Members of the Senate on both sides of the Chamber,

taking into consideration the difficulty of keeping a quorum here, not only now and up to now, but the even greater difficulty after these conference reports have been disposed of and the emergency legislation has been gotten out of the way, it seemed to me, and it seemed to all those with whom I conferred, without exception, on both sides of the Chamber, that it might be unfortunate to attempt to force the joint resolution before the Senate with a bare majority of the Senate present.

Amending the Constitution of the United States is an important procedure. The Constitution provides that an amendment must in the first place be submitted by a two-thirds vote. Two thirds of 49, which is a bare majority, would be 33. If 49 Senators were voting, it would require 33 to pass the joint resolution. If, of the 49 Senators, 17 voted against the measure, it would not receive the required majority. I have explained, and I feel now that the amendment, when submitted, ought to go before the country with a substantial backing, not of a bare two-thirds of a bare majority, but a two-thirds vote of a substantial attendance of the Senate and of the House also when the joint resolution is acted on. Thirty-three voting for it out of 49 would be only 1 more than one-third of the Senate, and I have assumed, and I now assume, that those interested in the joint resolution want it to pass, and want the amendment to be ratified by the required number of States.

One day last week I was handed a letter which I shall read in a moment, and also read my reply. A couple of charming ladies called me from the Senate Chamber and handed me this letter signed by representatives of a number of organizations. I tried to explain our predicament here, and said that if we took up this joint resolution with only a bare majority of Senators present it might be defeated, because there is opposition to the joint resolution. One of the ladies replied that she did not mind it being defeated. I said, "I thought you wanted it passed. I did not know that you simply wanted to get a vote on it in order to have it defeated."

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. I wish to endorse what the Senator from Kentucky has said about the importance of the proposed legislation. It has such widespread possibilities and ramifications that it seems to me it should be debated thoroughly before being taken up for final decision by the Senate.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, judging from expressions I have heard in my conference with Senators, the measure will be debated. At what length, I do not know, but undoubtedly it will be debated.

The letter which was handed to me one day last week is very brief, and I shall read it:

DEAR SENATOR BARKLEY: The undersigned organizations urge you to use your great influence as leader of the majority to pass the equal-rights amendment through the Senate, and fulfill the promises made by the Democratic Party in their national platform.

I take it for granted that the Senator from Maine [Mr. WHITE] received a similar letter referring to the plank in the Republican platform, and urging him to use his great influence as minority leader to obtain action upon the measure and have it adopted because I have a copy of his reply to one of the ladies who signed the letter to me. The Senator's reply reads as follows:

This will acknowledge the communication of September 15 signed by you and others urging the passage of the equal-rights amendment before recess. It is my understanding that the Senate majority has determined to postpone action on this matter until after the election. I think the matter will be taken up and disposed of when Congress reconvenes following the election.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield to the Senator from Maine.

Mr. WHITE. I regret if anything I have said or anything I have written should disturb in any respect the serenity of the Senator's disposition or the sweetness of his temper.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I hope I have shown no indication that either the sweetness of my temper or the serenity of my disposition has been disturbed.

Mr. WHITE. The Senator has not. I think the Senator preserves those admirable qualities under almost every conceivable condition and in spite of great——

Mr. BARKLEY. But I have frequently great provocation to do otherwise.

Mr. WHITE. In spite of great provocation.

May I say a word more?

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes.

Mr. WHITE. I think I am within the bounds of truth when I say that the decision to postpone this matter was the decision of the majority. I would not want to admit that the Senator from Kentucky, the majority leader, is not the leader of the majority of this body. I think membership upon that side of the aisle is the majority of this body, and I have always believed that a majority had not only rights, had not only power, but had responsibilities, and until next January 20, or thereabouts, in any event——

Mr. BARKLEY. At least.

Mr. WHITE. Or thereabouts, I hope——

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator simply hopes.

Mr. WHITE. I hope the majority will meet its responsibilities. I think I did say on a number of occasions that the majority reached this decision. I do not mind adding now publicly that that decision of the majority had my complete concurrence. I agreed fully with the sentiments expressed by the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE] when he announced that he would not pursue the matter at this time, and I say that the decision not to take it up was wholly justified, and that I concurred, so far as I had any voice or any authority in the matter, in that decision.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator may have used the word "majority" in his reply to the letter as indicating a political or partisan majority. I recognize the responsibility of the party in power in the Senate to assume the responsibility for legislation, and I have never, I think, shunned that responsibility so far as I am concerned, and I do not shun it now. I have never called any conference of the steering committee to decide upon the question, because I did not regard it and I do not now regard it as a partisan matter, and when the Democratic steering committee is called together to decide on whether legislation should come up it frequently is regarded as a political or partisan decision. After conferring with Members of the Senate on both sides I expressed the views that I am going to read now in my reply to the letter which I received the other day from these organizations. Of course any Senator on the floor of the Senate, whether he be Democrat or Republican, any time he can obtain recognition can move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of any measure in which he is interested. Everyone knows that, and it is frequently done. I think I ought to say that there is not a Senator in this Chamber, on either the Democratic or the Republican side, who has either urged or requested or suggested to me that we ought to attempt to vote on this matter at this particular time, in view of the legislative situation.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield again?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. I may add to what I have already said that in many letters and on numerous occasions I have said to these good ladies that I thought it of very doubtful wisdom to try to act upon the joint resolution before election, and that action on it should be deferred.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, the letter to which I referred a moment ago was signed by Mrs. Harvey W. Wiley, chairman of the department on legislation of the General Federation of Women's Clubs; the National Woman's Party, by Miss Alice Paul, national chairman; the National Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs, signed by Margaret A. Hickey, president; and a number of other organizations, all of which I shall place in the RECORD at this point.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the list may be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Women's Joint Legislative Committee for Equal Rights, Alva Belmont House, Capitol Hill, Washington, D. C., telephone ATlantic 1210; General Federation of Women's Clubs, Mrs. Harvey W. Wiley, chairman, department on legislation; National Woman's Party, Alice Paul, national chairman; National Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs, Margaret A. Hickey, president; St. Joan Society, Dorothy Shipley Granger, chairman; National Association of Colored Women, Mary Church Terrell, past president; American Alliance of Civil Service Women, Mary Hamilton, president; National Association of

Women Lawyers, Ethel Ernest Murrell, fourth vice president; American Medical Women's Association, Alma Jane Speer, M. D., vice chairman, legislative committee; Association of American Women Dentists, Dr. Rosalind Moore Bain; Osteopathic Women's National Association, Dr. Rachel H. Woods, president; National Council of Women Chiropractors, Dr. Gertrude Hinshaw; American Woman's Society of Certified Public Accountants, Grace Schwartz Keats, president; American Society of Women Accountants, Jane E. Good, president; Woman's National Relief Corps, Auxiliary to Grand Army of the Republic, Myrtle L. Burke; Ladies of the Grand Army of the Republic, Mrs. Theo C. Redfern, president; Mary Ball Washington Association of America, Elizabeth Moore; American Federation of Soroptimist Clubs, Lois Sandall, president; Pilot International, Helen Hoffman; Alpha Iota Sorority, Dorothy Matthew Spinks; We, the Mothers, Mobilize for America, Elizabeth Forbes; Mothers and Women of America, Inc., Cecil Norton Broy; Avalon National Poetry Shrine, Elizabeth F. Osgood; Women's Auxiliary to the National Chiropractic Association, Mrs. A. W. Schwietert.

Katharine A. Norris, convener.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I undertook to send an identical reply to all these organizations, and I shall read the one which I addressed to Mrs. Harvey W. Wiley, chairman of the Federation of Women's Clubs. The letter is dated September 16. The letter to which it is a reply was dated September 15, the same day on which the Senator from Maine [Mr. WHITE] received a similar letter. My letter is as follows:

SEPTEMBER 16, 1944.

Mrs. HARVEY W. WILEY,
Chairman, General Federation of Women's Clubs, Alvc Belmont House, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MRS. WILEY: I was handed on yesterday at the Senate Chamber, a letter sent to me by you and other members of women's organizations, with reference to the possibility of a vote on the equal-rights amendment.

While I was at home in Kentucky, 3 or 4 weeks ago, on account of the serious illness of my wife, I received many calls from persons interested in this amendment, urging that a vote be had immediately after Labor Day.

I stated that I was not in a position, without consulting Members of the Senate on both sides, and without consulting Senator GILLETTE, author of the resolution, to determine when it would be advisable to attempt to take action on the resolution, but that I would consult Senators on both sides and Senator GILLETTE as soon as I returned to Washington.

I have consulted the Members and I find that there is a doubt in most of their minds as to the wisdom of bringing the resolution up at this time. This attitude is without regard to the position of the Senators on the resolution itself.

It is extremely difficult to maintain a quorum in the Senate. To many of the Senators it seems unfortunate, if not unwise, to bring up an amendment to the Constitution, requiring a two-thirds vote, with practically one-half of the Senators absent. Senator GILLETTE apparently shares this view as indicated in his remarks on the floor of the Senate a few days ago. There is a general feeling in the Senate that in passing an amendment to the Constitution there ought to be as full attendance as possible in order that a vote may be regarded as significant of public sentiment. We have had great difficulty in getting a bare quorum in the Senate, and keeping that quorum for a few days after obtaining it. It seems unlikely that we will be able to maintain a quorum for any purpose after the report is completed by the conferees on the reconversion and surplus property measures. Under these circumstances there is a question which arises, involving the wisdom of trying to force action on the equal-rights amendment under present conditions.

Personally, I am ready to vote on the resolution at this time, or any time, and I am anxious to bring it up at the earliest possible date. But in view of the considerable opposition which seems to exist to the resolution, I am presenting to you in all frankness the serious question involved—whether it would be wise under present conditions to attempt to bring it up. The situation which I have disclosed and the suggestions I have made appear to me to represent a fairly accurate cross section in the Senate including the members of the Judiciary Committee, who reported the resolution, as well as the author of the resolution itself.

If you desire to comment upon these suggestions which I have made in this letter, I shall be very glad to have the benefit of them.

Cordially and sincerely yours.

I have received no further communication in reply to this letter, although I am informed by my office that this morning, while I was in the conference on the reconversion bill, a delegation of ladies came to my office to see me about the matter.

I regret the necessity of taking up the time of the Senate in discussing a matter which involves me. I am not in any way attempting to shun any responsibility. I have expressed my views on the subject. I believe they are the views of the Senate. I believe I can say this: As soon as it is possible for a vote to be had on the joint resolution, under circumstances which will represent the views of the Senate by a two-thirds majority, when there is a sufficient attendance of Senators really to represent the Senate and to give the amendment the kind of send-off which I presume its supporters would like to have when it is submitted to the States, I shall cooperate with the Senator from Iowa, with the chairman of the Judiciary Committee, and with anyone else, including all these organizations, in undertaking to obtain a vote upon the joint resolution at the earliest possible date.

I do not know that I need say anything further. I am sure that without undue delay, and long before the legislatures meet in the 45 States in which legislatures will meet in January or February of the coming year, or at least early in the year, which will be the earliest possible date upon which any legislature could take action, the United States Senate will have acted in ample time for the House of Representatives to take such action as it may see fit to take.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Will the Senator yield before he takes his seat?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I should like to add a word to the discussion, because it was initiated by a published allegation that the failure of the Senate to act has been due to pressure brought upon Democratic Senators by the C. I. O.

I have always been a supporter of the equal-rights amendment. I have always advocated that it be submitted to the people of the United States. I believe that now; and I believe it should be submitted without delay.

During the absence of the Senator from Kentucky from the city because of the unfortunate illness of his wife, one day on the floor of the Senate I consulted the minority leader, the distinguished, affable, and always kind Senator from Maine [Mr. WHITE], and asked him what his opinion was with respect to the possibility of bringing the matter up. At that time he stated to me substantially what he has said today during the colloquy with the Senator from Kentucky, namely, that, in his opinion, with such a small proportion of the membership present, a bare quorum, he doubted the advisability of submitting any constitutional amendment to a vote for precisely the reasons which have been stated by the Senator from Kentucky.

I mention that because the Senator from Maine himself has mentioned it. Furthermore, I mention it as an illustration of the fact that, so far as I have been able to determine, the feeling which exists in the Senate has no relation whatsoever to any activities on the part of the C. I. O., the P. A. C., or any other organization. Certainly, so far as I am concerned, no letter, telegram, or oral communication has been received by me or by my office from anyone asking that this joint resolution should not be voted upon.

Mr. BARKLEY. I believe that to be true. There have been expressions here and there by persons who are opposed to the amendment itself on its merits, but I have received no communication from anyone objecting to the submission of the amendment to the States. After all, they are to determine whether the Constitution is to be amended in any such way. What I very seriously object to and what I think I have a right to object to, and what the Senate has a right to object to, is the effort to make some sort of political capital out of the fact that this amendment has not been submitted. Certainly it is not worthy of any Senator, no matter what communications he may have received, to try to impute to other Senators a cowardice on the subject which does not exist.

I am sorry that I was compelled to discuss this matter. I feel sure that the Senator from Michigan, whether he was correctly quoted or not, did not intend to cast any such reflection upon the Senate or upon any Member of the Senate. I have asked him to be present while I made these remarks, so that he might speak for himself.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I am sure that what was said was not an attempt to cast any reflection upon the able majority leader. However, I believe that the record should be clear on this particular matter. The quotation from the newspaper of September 18 does not attempt to quote me in connection with the statement of Sidney Hillman. It states:

The Democratic leadership, according to one report, sought out Sidney Hillman, P. A. C. chairman, during the week and protested against the C. I. O. pressure to defeat the equal-rights bill, but were told by Mr.

Hillman that if there were any such campaign he was unaware of it.

I appreciate the attitude of the majority leader and other Senators on the majority side, that when the name of the Democratic Party is connected with that of Mr. Hillman, it is to be regretted so far as they are concerned. Perhaps I should make an explanation of what the record really shows.

It seems significant that the joint resolution providing for a constitutional amendment was approved by both major parties at their conventions, and in effect has become a part of their platforms. The joint resolution was reported to the Senate on May 28, 1943. It was sponsored by the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE] and 23 other Senators. When the joint resolution went to the Judiciary Committee 24 Senators were supporting it, and, as I have said, it was reported to the Senate on May 28, 1943. Since that time there have been many calls of the calendar, and many other measures have been acted upon.

On the question as to whether labor is opposed to the proposed constitutional amendment, I should like to cite two telegrams which I have received. They are dated September 6, 1944, and are addressed to me in Washington. I should like to read them into the RECORD. The first one reads as follows:

DETROIT, MICH., *September 6, 1944.*
Senator HOMER FERGUSON,
Washington, D. C.:

In name of 400,000 war workers in Detroit area wish to indicate that we oppose equal-rights amendment which we feel will nullify all protected measures which women in industry now have and which they must continue to have in order to safeguard their well being.

C. PAT QUINN,
President, Greater Detroit and Wayne County Industrial Union Council, C. I. O.

The other telegram is from Detroit, Mich., and is addressed to me at the Senate Office Building. It is dated September 6, 1944. Mr. President, it seems significant that I should receive these two telegrams dated the same day. The second telegram reads as follows:

DETROIT, MICH., *September 6, 1944.*
SENATOR FERGUSON, OF MICHIGAN,
Washington, D. C.:

As representative of 250,000 auto workers I strongly urge that you oppose the proposed equal-rights amendment resolution for women unless this bill specifically guarantees that it will not nullify protective labor legislation.

LEO LAMOTTE,
Codirector, Region No. 1 7-2-C. I. O. and National Chrysler Director, U. A. W.-C. I. O.

So, Mr. President, at the time when consideration of the joint resolution was deferred, not only the majority party but both parties had approved the proposed legislation in their conventions, by making it in effect a part of their platforms; and at the particular time when the measure was coming up, and when the C. I. O. was opposing it, another bill, the road bill, was brought before the Senate. It was voted upon. The Senate has been here for action.

I merely wish to say that the facts are as I have stated. If the majority leader says he has received no mail or no intimation that the C. I. O. wanted this matter postponed or did not want it voted upon or was opposed to it, I accept his statement as absolutely true. I am only quoting from my own mail.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. I am sure the Senator will say that I could not possibly be influenced by telegrams he received from Michigan.

Mr. FERGUSON. I appreciate that.

Mr. BARKLEY. I never received any such telegrams from Michigan or from my own State or from any other State.

Mr. FERGUSON. I am accepting it as a fact that the Senator has not. The Senator has told me during today's session of the Senate that he has not, and I accept that as a fact.

Mr. BARKLEY. But in the article which has been printed because of what the Senator did say, we are all blanketed into the class of those who have received telegrams and protests on the part of the C. I. O. and the P. A. C., none of which we have received. It seems that the fact that the Senator from Michigan received a couple of telegrams from Detriot, Mich., has caused him to repute to all of us receipt of similar telegrams from the State of Michigan or some other State. I desire to refute any such suggestion, because it is not so.

Mr. FERGUSON. I did not mean to imply that that was the case.

Mr. BARKLEY. I also wish to point out that in the article printed in the New York Herald Tribune it is stated that the leaders have sought out Mr. Hillman.

Mr. FERGUSON. The article does not quote me.

Mr. BARKLEY. No; it does not. But I am denying the accuracy of the whole article, no matter what the source of it may have been.

Mr. Hillman is the head of a well-known organization in this country. In the past he supported Republican candidates, and his support was welcomed with glee and éclat. I have no doubt that if he were now supporting the Republican ticket, we would hear no outcry against him because of his activities or the activities of his organization in politics. I regret that the slightest excuse is taken advantage of to inject Mr. Hillman in some way into the campaign and into the Senate debate, when nothing that he has said or done has anything to do with the action on the matter in question. Even the telegrams received by the Senator from Michigan opposing the equal-rights amendment express no objection to having it taken up. They express opposition to it on its merits, and are not opposed to its consideration by the Senate.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, the able majority leader, the Senator from Kentucky, says that if Mr. Hillman were now ably espousing the cause of the Republican Party, no one on this side of the aisle would object to such leadership for the Republican Party. Mr. President, the Senator from Kentucky must speak for himself in that respect, as I have spoken for myself in stating my opinion as to the reason why this measure has not yet been voted upon. But I wish to say on the floor of the Senate that if Sidney Hillman were espousing the cause of the Republican Party, as he is now espousing the cause of the Democratic Party, from this very chair I would denounce such support, on behalf of the Republican Party. The Republican Party does not need the support of Sidney Hillman and those whom he wants to bring into the Democratic Party.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes; I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. It has not been so many years since Sidney Hillman, as the head of an organization, contributed $5,000 to the campaign of the present Republican nominee for President, in his campaign in New York for district attorney. There was no objection at that time to his contribution, although then he was head of the Amalgamated Clothing Workers or Garment Workers of the United States. I am informed that he was even asked for another donation, in addition to the $5,000.

In politics it frequently depends upon whose ox is gored. I am not saying who the ox is or who is doing the goring. But there was no outcry against that contribution on the part of Mr. Hillman only a few years ago.

Therefore, I congratulate the Senator from Michigan upon his courage and frankness in telling the Senate that if Mr. Hillman were supporting Mr. Dewey in his campaign for President, he would rise in his place in the Senate and would denounce him.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I have no personal knowledge as to what Sidney Hillman has contributed by way of campaign funds in the past; but I do know that I have heard the personal testimony of Sidney Hillman before a Senate committee, and I know whose cause he is now espousing.

It has not been officially denied, except by the chairman of the Democratic National Committee, that Mr. Hillman was the man through whom "everything was to be cleared."

Today the Democratic Party do not like to hear those words, and I do not blame them. As I have said today on this floor, if Mr. Hillman were representing the Republican Party or were the mover of the Republican Party, I would be standing here denouncing him, not only denying that everything was to be cleared through him. The Republican Party does not want the aid and support, personally, of Sidney Hillman or those whom he uses in the C. I. O.

Mr. President, the people will have to draw their own conclusions. I have drawn mine. The Senator from Kentucky, the majority leader, has drawn his.

It is apparent, and I have said that I will take his word for it, that so far as he was personally concerned the C. I. O. and the P. A. C. had absolutely nothing to do with it. As a matter of

fact, the majority leader did not adjourn this cause. Several weeks ago the Senator from Iowa rose and said that he would like to have a joint resolution brought up upon the floor. After that I received the telegrams to which I have referred. Subsequently the able Senator from Iowa rose upon the floor and said in effect that so far as he was concerned the proposed constitutional amendment would not be brought up.

Mr. President, we have had other important legislation before us for consideration. I hope the people will be able to have the result of a vote upon this subject at some early date. Not being a member of the majority party, I know that a motion upon my part to bring the matter up at the present time would be of no avail.

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, I do not wish further to take the time of the Senate in order to discuss the question which has been under discussion for the past few minutes. But it seems apparent that a statement upon my part is indicated because of the discussion which has been precipitated here.

It is regrettable that the subject has come before the Senate in the way in which it has arisen. I am ready to plead guilty to an action which apparently precipitated the matter in the first place.

Mr. President, the joint resolution proposing an equal-rights amendment to the Constitution was introduced as a bipartisan measure. If my memory serves me correctly, 16 members of the majority party and 8 members of the minority party joined in its sponsorship. There cannot be the remotest suggestion of party feeling or party interest in connection with the proposal.

After having introduced the measure I subsequently returned to the Senate and perhaps assumed an authority which I did not have. On the day following Labor Day I rose in the Senate and gave notice that it was my hope and purpose that at some time during the following week, if it conformed to the program of the Senate, I would move to proceed to the consideration of the joint resolution. At that time the eminent majority leader was absent from the city. I had not conferred with him, and I had not conferred with the distinguished minority leader or with anyone else. I merely gave notice that it was my hope and purpose to move to proceed to the consideration of the proposal.

Mr. President, of the 24 Members who sponsored the proposed legislation, 13 were absent from the city at the time to which I refer. At the present time I believe that a large number of Senators are absent from the city. But Senators who were out of the city, as well as Senators who were in the city, told me that they had understood that no controversial legislation was to be taken up. They called attention to the inadvisability of proceeding on a matter so important as a proposed constitutional amendment when a bare quorum of the Senate was present, if an actual quorum were even present.

During the following week, in deference to the statements or requests which had been presented to me, I rose and said that I did not intend that week to move to take up consideration of the measure, but that I hoped that at some time before the approaching recess of the Senate, when a working quorum was present, it would permit the joint resolution to be brought up.

Mr. President, today 49 Senators were announced as being present. When the Senator from Kentucky started to speak, by actual count, 31 Senators were in the Chamber. At the present moment approximately 18 or 19 Senators are present. The prevailing circumstances must give the supporters of an important measure of this kind reason to pause when it comes to the question of taking it up.

Mr. President, at no time has the distinguished majority leader, the distinguished minority leader, or any of the leadership on this side of the Chamber approached me with the suggestion that I postpone calling up the measure, as I had suggested I hoped to do. Neither has anyone representing the C. I. O., the A. F. of L., the Brotherhood of Railway Trainmen, or any other labor group approached me with a suggestion that the matter be postponed, or attempted to influence me in any way.

I have the highest respect for the Senator from Michigan, the Senator from Maine, and the Senator from Kentucky. I know they are proceeding with the utmost sincerity. Whatever blame there may be for failure to call up the joint resolution, as I announced was my intention to do, is mine. I assume responsibility for it. By making such a statement, Mr. President, I do not by any distortion of words mean to say that I am associating myself with the leadership of the minority side of the Senate or with the leadership of the majority side of the Senate. I am here to speak as one who, with my fellow Senators, introduced the joint resolution. The action which was taken was mine. It was not taken at the request of anyone else, and, in closing, I merely say that I am confident that no one else, especially outside the membership of the Senate, would dare to approach me with such a suggestion.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Megill, one of its clerks, announced that the House had passed a joint resolution (H. J. Res. 268) to provide for the reappointment of Harvey N. Davis and Arthur H. Compton as members of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the Vice President:

H. R. 312. An act for the relief of Freda Utley;

H. R. 527. An act for the relief of Mary Hertz;

H. R. 1434. An act for the relief of Anna M. Kohler;

H. R. 1623. An act to amend an act entitled "An act to provide fees to be charged by clerks of the district courts of the United States," approved February 11, 1925 (43 Stat. 857), as amended (28 U. S. C., secs. 548–555);

H. R. 1680. An act to amend the Nationality Act of 1940 to permit the Commissioner to furnish copies of any part of the records or information therefrom to agencies or officials of a State without charge;

H. R. 1708. An act for the relief of Perley M. Silver;

H. R. 2134. An act for the relief of Paul Szeliga;

H. R. 2387. An act for the relief of John Salfi;

H. R. 2390. An act for the relief of Joseph Scarpella and Dorothy Scarpella;

H. R. 2509. An act for the relief of Marie Engert;

H. R. 2697. An act to provide for the disposal of materials or resources on the public lands of the United States which are under the exclusive jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Interior;

H. R. 2792. An act for the relief of Arvo Kari, Lempi K. Holm, and Burt Johnston;

H. R. 3033. An act for the relief of Tressie Spring and Mrs. Hazel Stutte;

H. R. 3038. An act for the relief of Mrs. Grace Page;

H. R. 3296. An act for the relief of R. Guy Dorsey;

H. R. 3384. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to accept property for the Moores Creek National Military Park, and for other purposes;

H. R. 3464. An act for the relief of Ralph W. Cooley;

H. R. 3496. An act for the relief of Ernest A. Grottke;

H. R. 3722. An act to amend section 342 of the Nationality Act of 1940 in respect to fees for the issuance of certificates of arrival;

H. R. 4257. An act to expatriate or exclude certain persons for evading military and naval service;

H. R. 4271. An act to amend the Nationality Act of 1940 to preserve the nationality of citizens residing abroad; and

H. R. 5025. An act to allow credit in connection with certain homestead entries for military or naval service rendered during World War No. 2.

DISPOSAL OF GOVERNMENT SURPLUS PROPERTY—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado submitted the following report:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5125) to provide for the disposal of surplus Government property and plants, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate to the text of the bill and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following: "That this Act may be cited as the 'Surplus Property Act of 1944'."

"OBJECTIVES

"SEC. 2. The Congress hereby declares that the objectives of this Act are to facilitate and regulate the orderly disposal of surplus property so as—

"(a) to assure the most effective use of such property for war purposes and the common defense;

"(b) to give maximum aid in the reestablishment of a peacetime economy of free independent private enterprise, the development of the maximum of independent operators in trade, industry, and agriculture, and to stimulate full employment;

"(c) to facilitate the transition of enterprises from wartime to peacetime production

and of individuals from wartime to peacetime employment;

"(d) to discourage monopolistic practices and to strengthen and preserve the competitive position of small business concerns in an economy of free enterprise;

"(e) to foster and to render more secure family-type farming as the traditional and desirable pattern of American agriculture;

"(f) to afford returning veterans an opportunity to establish themselves as proprietors of agricultural, business, and professional enterprises;

"(g) to encourage and foster post-war employment opportunities;

"(h) to assure the sale of surplus property in such quantities and on such terms as will discourage disposal to speculators or for speculative purposes;

"(i) to establish and develop foreign markets and promote mutually advantageous economic relations between the United States and other countries by the orderly disposition of surplus property in other countries;

"(j) to avoid dislocations of the domestic economy and of international economic relations;

"(k) to foster the wide distribution of surplus commodities to consumers at fair prices;

"(l) to effect broad and equitable distribution of surplus property;

"(m) to achieve the prompt and full utilization of surplus property at fair prices to the consumer through disposal at home and abroad with due regard for the protection of free markets and competitive prices from dislocation resulting from uncontrolled dumping;

"(n) to utilize normal channels of trade and commerce to the extent consistent with efficient and economic distribution and the promotion of the general objectives of this Act (without discriminating against the establishment of new enterprises);

"(o) to promote production, employment of labor, and utilization of the productive capacity and the natural and agricultural resources of the country;

"(p) to foster the development of new independent enterprise;

"(q) to prevent insofar as possible unusual and excessive profits being made out of surplus property;

"(r) to dispose of surplus property as promptly as feasible without fostering monopoly or restraint of trade, or unduly disturbing the economy, or encouraging hoarding of such property, and to facilitate prompt redistribution of such property to consumers;

"(s) to dispose of surplus Government-owned facilities and equipment in such manner as to promote an adequate and economical national transportation system; and

"(t) except as otherwise provided, to obtain for the Government, as nearly as possible, the fair value of surplus property upon its disposition.

"DEFINITIONS

"SEC. 3. As used in this Act—

"(a) The term 'Government agency' means any executive department, board, bureau, commission, or other agency in the executive branch of the Federal Government, or any corporation wholly owned (either directly or through one or more corporations) by the United States.

"(b) The term 'owning agency', in the case of any property, means the executive department, the independent agency in the executive branch of the Federal Government, or the corporation (if a Government agency), having control of such property, otherwise than solely as a disposal agency.

"(c) The term 'disposal agency' means Government agency designated under section 10 to dispose of one or more classes of surplus property.

"(d) The term 'property' means any interest, owned by the United States or any Government agency, in real or personal property, of any kind, wherever located, but does not include (1) the public domain, or such lands withdrawn or reserved from the public domain as the Surplus Property Board (created by section 5) determines are suitable for return to the public domain for disposition under the general land laws, or (2) naval vessels of the following categories: Battleships, cruisers, aircraft carriers, destroyers, and submarines.

"(e) The term 'surplus property' means any property which has been determined to be surplus to the needs and responsibilities of the owning agency in accordance with section 11.

"(f) The term 'contractor inventory' means (1) any property related to a terminated contract of any type with a Government agency or to a subcontract thereunder; and (2) any property acquired under a contract pursuant to the terms of which title is vested in the Government, and in excess of the amounts needed to complete performance thereunder; and (3) any property which the Government is obliged to take over under any type of contract as a result of any change in the specifications or plans thereunder.

"(g) The term 'care and handling' includes completing, repairing, converting, rehabilitating, operating, maintaining, preserving, protecting, insuring, storing, packing, handling, and transporting, and, in the case of property which is dangerous to public health or safety, destroying, or rendering innocuous, such property.

"(h) The term 'person' means any individual, corporation, partnership, firm, association, trust, estate, or other entity.

"(i) The term 'State' includes the several States, Territories, and possessions of the United States, and the District of Columbia.

"(j) The term 'tax-supported institution' means any scientific, literary, educational, public-health, or public-welfare institution which is supported in whole or in part through the use of funds derived from taxation by the United States, or by any State or political subdivision thereof.

"(k) The term 'veteran' means any person in the active military or naval service of the United States during the present war, or any person who served in the active military or naval service of the United States on or after September 16, 1940, and prior to the termination of the present war, and who has been discharged, or released therefrom under honorable conditions.

"DISPOSITION OF SURPLUS PROPERTY—GENERAL RULE

"SEC. 4. Surplus property shall be disposed of to such extent, at such times, in such areas, by such agencies, at such prices, upon such terms and conditions, and in such manner, as may be prescribed in or pursuant to this Act.

"SURPLUS PROPERTY BOARD

"SEC. 5. (a) There is hereby established in the Office of War Mobilization, and in its successor, a Surplus Property Board (hereinafter called the "Board"), which shall be composed of three members, each of whom shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, and shall receive compensation at the rate of $12,000 per annum. The term of office of the members shall be two years, except that the term of office of the members first appointed shall expire two years from the date of the enactment of this Act, and the next succeeding terms shall then begin, and any person appointed to fill a vacancy caused by the death, resignation, or removal of a member prior to the expiration of the term of such member shall be appointed only for such unexpired term. The President shall designate one of the members of the Board as Chairman.

"(b) The Board may, within the limits of funds which may be made available, appoint and fix the compensation of such officers and employees, and may make such expenditures for supplies, facilities, and services, as may be necessary to carry out its functions. Without regard to the provisions of the civil-service laws and the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, the Board may appoint such special assistants, and may employ such certified public accountants, qualified cost accountants, industrial engineers, appraisers, and other experts, and fix their compensation, and may contract with such certified public accounting firms and qualified firms of engineers, as may be necessary to carry out its functions.

"DUTIES AND AUTHORITY OF BOARD

"SEC. 6. The activities of the Board shall be coordinated with the programs of the armed forces of the United States in the interests of the war effort. Until peace is concluded the needs of the armed forces are hereby declared and shall remain paramount. The Board shall have general supervision and direction, as provided in this Act, over (1) the care and handling and disposition of surplus property, and (2) the transfer of surplus property between Government agencies.

"COOPERATION WITH INTERESTED GOVERNMENT AGENCIES

"SEC. 7. The Board shall advise and consult with other interested Government agencies with a view to obtaining all aid and assistance possible in coordinating the functions of the several agencies affected by the disposition of surplus property.

"DELEGATION OF AUTHORITY

"SEC. 8. The head of any Government agency, except the Board, may delegate, and authorize successive redelegations of, any authority conferred upon him or his agency, by or pursuant to this Act to any officer, agent, or employee of such agency or, with the approval of the Board, to any other Government agency.

"REGULATIONS

"SEC. 9. (a) The Board shall prescribe regulations to effectuate the provisions of this Act. In formulating such regulations, the Board shall be guided by the objectives of this Act.

"(b) Regulations issued pursuant to subsection (a) may, except as otherwise provided in this Act, contain provisions prescribing the extent to which, the times at which, the areas in which, the agencies by which, the prices at which, and the terms and conditions under which, surplus property may be disposed of, and the extent to which and the conditions under which surplus property shall be subject to care and handling.

"(c) Each Government agency shall carry out regulations of the Board expeditiously and shall issue such further regulations, not inconsistent with the regulations of the Board, as it deems necessary or desirable to carry out the provisions of this Act.

"(d) Regulations prescribed under this Act shall be published in the Federal Register

"DESIGNATION OF DISPOSAL AGENCIES

"SEC. 10. (a) Except as provided in subsection (b) of this section, the Board shall designate one or more Government agencies to act as disposal agencies under this Act. In exercising its authority to designate disposal agencies, the Board shall assign surplus property for disposal by the fewest number of Government agencies practicable and, so far as it deems feasible, shall centralize in one disposal agency responsibility for the disposal of all property of the same type or class.

"(b) The United States Maritime Commission shall be the sole disposal agency for surplus vessels which the Commission determines to be merchant vessels or capable of conversion to merchant use, and such vessels shall be disposed of only in accordance with the provisions of the Merchant Marine

Act, 1936, as amended, and other laws authorizing the sale of such vessels.

"DECLARATION AND DISPOSITION OF SURPLUS PROPERTY

"SEC. 11. (a) Each owning agency shall have the duty and responsibility continuously to survey the property in its control and to determine which of such property is surplus to its needs and responsibilities.

"(b) Each owning agency shall promptly report to the Board and the appropriate disposal agency all surplus property in its control which the owning agency does not dispose of under section 14.

"(c) Whenever in the course of the performance of its duties under this Act, the Board has reason to believe that any owning agency has property in its control which is surplus to its needs and responsibilities and which it has not reported as such, the Board shall promptly report that fact to the Senate and House of Representatives. Each owning agency and each disposal agency shall submit to the Board (1) such information and reports with respect to surplus property in the control of the agency, in such form, and at such reasonable times, as the Board may direct; (2) such information and reports with respect to other property in the control of the agency, to such extent, and in such form, as the Board may direct and as the agency deems consistent with national security.

"(d) When any surplus property is reported to any disposal agency under subsection (b) of this section, the disposal agency shall have responsibility and authority for the disposition of such property, and for the care and handling of such property pending its disposition, in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Board. Where the disposal agency is not prepared at the time of its designation under this Act to undertake the care and handling of such surplus property the Board may postpone the responsibility of the agency to assume its duty for care and handling for such period as the Board deems necessary to permit the preparation of the agency therefor.

"(e) The Board shall prescribe regulations necessary to provide, so far as practicable, for uniform and wide public notice concerning surplus property available for sale, and for uniform and adequate time intervals between notice and sale so that all interested purchasers may have a fair opportunity to buy.

"(f) No surplus property which was processed, produced or donated by the American Red Cross for any Government agency shall be disposed of except after notice to and consultation with the American Red Cross. All or any portion of such property may be donated to the American Red Cross, upon its request, solely for charitable purposes.

"(g) Each disposal agency shall maintain in each of its disposal offices such records of its inventories of surplus property and of each disposal transaction negotiated by that office as the Board may prescribe. The information in such records shall be available at all reasonable times for public inspection.

"UTILIZATION OF SURPLUS PROPERTY BY FEDERAL AGENCIES

"SEC. 12. (a) It shall be the duty of the Board to facilitate the transfer of surplus property from one Government agency to other Government agencies for their use; and the transfer of surplus property under this section shall be given priority over all other disposals provided for in this Act.

"(b) It shall be the responsibility of all Government agencies, in order to avoid making purchases through commercial channels, continuously to consult the records of surplus property established by the Board and to determine whether their requirements can be satisfied out of such surplus property. It shall also be the responsibility of the head of each Government agency to submit to the Board such estimates of the needs of the agency and such reports in relation thereto as the Board may deem necessary to promote the fullest utilization of surplus property. It shall be the responsibility of the Board to determine whether Government agencies are acquiring surplus property to the fullest possible extent, and to notify agencies whenever in its judgment, they are not so doing.

"(c) The disposal agency responsible for any such property shall transfer it to the Government agency acquiring it at the fair value of the property as fixed by the disposal agency, under regulations prescribed by the Board, unless transfer without reimbursement or transfer of funds is otherwise authorized by law.

"DISPOSAL TO LOCAL GOVERNMENTS AND NONPROFIT INSTITUTIONS

"SEC. 13. (a) The Board shall prescribe regulations for the disposition of surplus property to States and their political subdivisions and instrumentalities, and to tax-supported and nonprofit institutions, and shall determine on the basis of need what transfers shall be made. In formulating such regulations the Board shall be guided by the objectives of this Act and shall give effect to the following policies to the extent feasible and in the public interest:

"(1) (A) Surplus property that is appropriate for school, classroom, or other educational use may be sold or leased to the States and their political subdivisions and instrumentalities, and tax-supported educational institutions, and to other nonprofit educational institutions which have been held exempt from taxation under section 101 (6) of the Internal Revenue Code.

"(B) Surplus medical supplies, equipment, and property suitable for use in the protection of public health, including research, may be sold or leased to the States and their political subdivisions and instrumentalities, and to tax-supported medical institutions, and to hospitals or other similar institutions not operated for profit which have been held exempt from taxation under section 101 (6) of the Internal Revenue Code.

"(C) In fixing the sale or lease value of property to be disposed of under subparagraph (A) and subparagraph (B) of this paragraph, the Board shall take into consideration any benefit which has accrued or may accrue to the United States from the use of such property by any such State, political subdivision, instrumentality, or institution.

"(2) Surplus property shall be disposed of so as to afford public and governmental institutions, non-profit or tax-supported educational institutions, charitable and eleemosynary institution, nonprofit or tax-supported hospitals and similar institutions, States, their political subdivisions and instrumentalities, and volunteer fire companies, an opportunity to fulfill, in the public interest, their legitimate needs.

"(b) Under regulations prescribed by the Board, whenever the Government agency authorized to dispose of any property finds that it has no commercial value or that the cost of its care and handling and disposition would exceed the estimated proceeds, the agency may donate such property to any agency or institution supported by the Federal Government or any State or local government, or to any nonprofit educational or charitable organization, or, if that is not feasible, shall destroy or otherwise dispose of such property, but, except in the case of property the immediate destruction of which is necessary or desirable either because of the nature of the property or because of the expense or difficulty of its care and handling, no property shall be destroyed until 30 days after public notice of the proposed destruction thereof has been given (and a copy of such notice given to the Board at the beginning of such 30-day period) and an attempt has been made within such 30 days to dispose of such property otherwise than by destruction.

"(c) No airport and no harbor or port terminal, including necessary operating equipment, shall be otherwise disposed of until it has first been offered, under regulations to be prescribed by the Board, for sale or lease to the State, political subdivision thereof, and any municipality, in which it is situated, and to all municipalities in the vicinity thereof.

"(d) Whenever any State or political subdivision thereof, or any State or Government agency or instrumentality certifies to the Board that any power transmission line determined to be surplus property under the provisions of this act is needful for or adaptable to the requirements of any public or cooperative power project, such line and the right-of-way acquired for its construction shall not be sold, leased for more than 1 year, or otherwise disposed of, except as provided in section 12 or this section, unless specifically authorized by act of Congress.

"(e) In disposing of any surplus real property, as defined in section 23, on or across which highways or streets had been established and constructed and were being maintained by the States or their political subdivisions or instrumentalities at the time such surplus real property was acquired by the Government, and where such highways or streets were vacated, destroyed, or shut off from general public use in order to meet the requirements and serve the purposes of the Government, the States or their political subdivisions or instrumentalities first shall be given a reasonable time, to be fixed by the Board, in which to repurchase the original rights-of-way on which such highways or streets were established and in which to purchase such new or additional rights-of-way as may be required for reestablishing, in whole or in part, such highways or streets of greater width or on new and more adequate locations, at a price not exceeding that paid therefor by the Government.

"(f) The disposal of surplus property under this section to States and political subdivisions and instrumentalities thereof shall be given priority over all other disposals of property provided for in this act except transfers under section 12.

"DISPOSITION BY OWNING AGENCY

"SEC. 14. (a) Subject only to the regulations of the Board with respect to price policies, any owning agency may dispose of any property for the purpose of war production or authorize any contractor with such agency or subcontractor thereunder to retain or dispose of any contractor inventories for the purpose of war production. The Board may empower any owning agency, subject to the regulations of the Board, to authorize any contractor with such agency or subcontractor thereunder to retain or dispose of any contractor inventories for any other purpose which in the opinion of the Board is not contrary to the objectives of this Act. Where any owning agency takes possession of any contractor inventory from any contractor with the agency or subcontractor thereunder, such property shall be disposed of only in accordance with the provisions of this Act.

"(b) Subject only to subsection (c) of this section, any owning agency may dispose of—

"(1) any property which is damaged or worn beyond economical repair;

"(2) any waste, salvage, scrap, or other similar items;

"(3) any product of industrial, research, agricultural, or livestock operations, or of any public works construction or maintenance project, carried on by such agency;

which does not consist of strategic minerals and metals, as defined in section 22.

"(c) Whenever the Board deems such action necessary to effectuate the objectives and policies of this Act, the Board, by regulations, shall restrict the authority of any owning agency to dispose of any class of surplus property under subsection (b) of this section.

"METHODS OF DISPOSITION

"SEC. 15. (a) Notwithstanding the provisions of any other law but subject to the provisions of this Act, whenever any Government agency is authorized to dispose of property under this Act, then the agency may dispose of such property by sale, exchange, lease, or transfer, for cash, credit, or other property, with or without warranty, and upon such other terms and conditions, as the agency deems proper: *Provided, however,* That in the case of raw materials, consumer goods, and small tools, hardware and nonassembled articles which may be used in the manufacture of more than one type of product, no extension of credit under this Act shall be for a longer period than three years.

"(b) Any owning agency or disposal agency may execute such documents for the transfer of title or other interest in property or take such other action as it deems necessary or proper to transfer or dispose of property or otherwise to carry out the provisions of this Act, and, in the case of surplus property, shall do so to the extent required by the regulations of the Board.

"DISPOSITIONS TO VETERANS

"SEC. 16. The Board shall prescribe regulations to effectuate the objectives of this Act to aid veterans to establish and maintain their own small business, professional, or agricultural enterprises, by affording veterans suitable preferences to the extent feasible and consistent with the policies of this Act in the acquisition of the types of surplus property useful in such enterprises.

"DISPOSITIONS IN RURAL AREAS

"SEC. 17. The Board shall devise ways and means and prescribe regulations in cooperation with the War Food Administrator providing for the sale of surplus property in such quantities in rural localities and in such manner as will assure farmers and farmers' cooperative associations equal opportunity with others to purchase surplus property: *Provided, however,* That in cases where a shortage of trucks, machinery, and equipment impairs farm production, a program shall be developed by the Board in cooperation with the Agricultural Adjustment Agency whereby a reasonable portion of the surplus supply will be made available for sale in rural areas to farmers and farmers' cooperative associations.

"SMALL BUSINESS

"SEC. 18. (a) It shall be the duty of the Board to devise ways and means and prescribe regulations to prevent any discrimination against small business in the disposal and distribution and use of any surplus property.

"(b) The Board shall by regulations determine, or provide for the determination, as to all surplus property in the hands of each disposal agency, the size of lots in which, and the areas in which, the various classes of such property should be offered consistently with the usual and customary commercial practice with respect to such class. The available supply of each class in each area shall be so disposed of as to give to prospective purchasers, within such area, of any particular amount (not smaller than the smallest lot consistent with such commercial practice) preference (by affording them reasonable opportunity to acquire the desired amount) over prospective purchasers of larger amounts.

"(c) The Smaller War Plants Corporation is hereby specifically charged with the responsibility of cooperating with the Board and with the owning and disposal agencies, of making surveys from time to time, and bringing to the attention of the agencies and the Board the needs and requirements of small business and any cases or situations which have resulted in or would effect discrimination against small business in the purchase or acquisition of surplus property by them and in the disposal thereof by the agencies.

"(d) The Smaller War Plants Corporation is hereby authorized and directed to consult with small business to obtain full information concerning the needs of small business for surplus property.

"(e) The Smaller War Plants Corporation shall have the power to purchase any surplus property for resale, subject to regulations of the Board, to small business (and is empowered to receive other property in exchange as partial or full payment therefor), when in its judgment, such disposition is required to preserve and strengthen the competitive position of small business, or will assist the Corporation in the discharge of the duties and responsibilities imposed upon it. The provisions of subsections (a) and (c) of section 12 shall be applicable to purchases made by the Smaller War Plants Corporation under this subsection.

"(f) The Smaller War Plants Corporation is hereby authorized, for the purpose of carrying out the objectives of this section, to make or guarantee loans to small business enterprises in connection with the acquisition, conversion, and operation of plants and facilities which have been determined to be surplus property, and, in cooperation with the disposal agencies, to arrange for sales of surplus property to small business concerns on credit or time bases.

"DISPOSAL OF PLANTS

"SEC. 19. (a) The Board, in cooperation with the various disposal agencies, shall prepare and submit to the Congress within three months after enactment of this Act, a report as to each of the following classes of surplus property (not including any plant which cost the Government less than $5,000,000): (1) aluminum plants and facilities; (2) magnesium plants and facilities; (3) synthetic rubber plants and facilities; (4) chemical plants and facilities; (5) aviation gasoline plants and facilities; (6) iron and steel plants and facilities; (7) pipe lines and facilities used for transporting oil; (8) patents, processes, techniques, and inventions, except such as are necessary to the operation of the plants and facilities herein listed; (9) aircraft plants and facilities and aircraft and aircraft parts; (10) shipyards and facilities; (11) transportation facilities; and (12) radio and electrical equipment:

"(A) Describing the amount, cost, and locaiton of the property and setting forth other descriptive information relative to the use of the property;

"(B) Outlining the economic problems that may be created by disposition of the property;

"(C) Setting forth a plan or program for the care and handling, disposition, and use of the property consistent with the policies and objectives set forth in this Act.

"(b) In the event that it is not possible within such period to prepare and submit a complete report to the Congress as to any class of property, the Board shall submit an interim report three months after the enactment of this Act, and shall submit a complete report as soon thereafter as possible. If the Board determines that it is desirable to alter or change any such plan or program or to prepare a report on any other class of property, it shall prepare in accordance with the provisions of this subsection and submit to the Congress an additional report, setting forth the altered or changed plan or program or a plan or program relating to the new class of property.

"(c) Whenever the Board may deem it to be in the interest of the objectives of this Act it may authorize the disposition of any surplus property listed in classes 9 to 12, inclusive, of subsection (a) of this section. With respect to the property listed in classes 1 to 8, inclusive, no disposition shall be made or authorized until thirty days after such report (or additional report) has been made while Congress is in session, except that the Board may authorize any disposal agency to lease any such property for a term of not more than five years.

"(d) The Board may authorize any disposal agency to dispose of any materials or equipment related to any surplus plant covered by this section, if such materials and equipment are not necessary for the operation of the plant in the manner for which it is designed.

"(e) This section shall not apply to any Government-owned equipment, structure, or other property operated as an integral part of a privately owned plant and not capable of economic operation as a separate and independent unit.

"APPLICABILITY OF ANTITRUST LAWS

"SEC. 20. Whenever any disposal agency shall begin negotiations for the disposition to private interests of a plant or plants or other property, which cost the Government $1,000,000 or more, or of patents, processes, techniques or inventions, irrespective of cost, the disposal agency shall promptly notify the Attorney General of the proposed disposition and the probable terms or conditions thereof. Within a reasonable time, in no event to exceed ninety days after receiving such notification, the Attorney General shall advise the Board and the disposal agency whether, in his opinion, the proposed disposition will violate the antitrust laws. Upon the request of the Attorney General, the Board or other Government agency shall furnish or cause to be furnished such information as it may possess which the Attorney General determines to be appropriate or necessary to enable him to give the advice called for by this section or to determine whether any other disposition of surplus property violates the antitrust laws. Nothing in this Act shall impair, amend, or modify the antitrust laws or limit and prevent their application to persons who buy or otherwise acquire property under the provisions of this Act. As used in this section, the term "antitrust laws" includes the Act of July 2, 1890 (ch. 647, 26 Stat. 209), as amended; the Act of October 15, 1914 (ch. 323, Stat. 730), as amended; the Federal Trade Commission Act; and the Act of August 27, 1894 (ch. 349, secs. 73, 74, 28 Stat. 570), as amended.

"DISPOSAL OF SURPLUS AGRICULTURAL COMMODITIES

"SEC. 21. (a) Subject to the supervision of the Board, the War Food Administrator, or his successor, shall be solely responsible for the formulation of policies with respect to the disposal of surplus agricultural commodities and surplus foods processed from agricultural commodities, which shall be administered by the disposal agency or agencies designated by the Board. Such policies shall be so formulated as to prevent surplus agricultural commodities, or surplus food processed from agricultural commodities, from being dumped on the market in a disorderly manner and disrupting the market prices for agricultural commodities.

"(b) The Board shall not exercise any of its powers under this Act with relation to disposal of surplus cotton or woolen goods except with the approval in writing of the War Food Administrator or his successor.

"(c) Surplus farm commodities shall not be sold in the United States under this Act in quantities in excess of, or at prices less than, those applicable with respect to sales of such commodities by the Commodity Credit Corporation, or at less than current prevailing market prices, whichever may be the higher,

unless such commodities are being disposed of, pursuant to this Act, only for export; and the Commodity Credit Corporation may dispose of or cause to be disposed of for cash or its equivalent in goods or for adequately secured credit, for export only, and at competitive world prices, any farm commodity or products thereof without regard to restrictions with respect to the disposal of commodities imposed upon it by any law: *Provided*, That no food or food product shall be sold or otherwise disposed of under this subsection for export (1) if there is a shortage of such food or food product in the United States or if such sale or other disposition may result in such a shortage, or (2) if such food or food product is needed to supply the normal demands of consumers in the United States.

"STOCK PILING

"SEC. 22. (a) All Government-owned accumulations of strategic minerals and metals, including those owned by any Government corporation, shall be transferred by the owning agency, when determined to be surplus pursuant to this Act, to the account of the Treasury Procurement Division and shall be added to the stock pile authorized by the Act of June 7, 1939 (53 Stat. 811), as amended, and shall be subject to its provisions: *Provided*, That contractor inventory shall be so transferred only when the owning agency has taken possession of and determined such inventory to be surplus. The minerals and metals may be transferred in any form in which they are held, but the owning agency or the Treasury Procurement Division is authorized either before or after such legal transfer to cause such minerals or metals to be put into forms best suited for storage and use for the common defense. As used in this section the phrase 'strategic minerals and metals' means copper, lead, zinc, tin, magnesium, manganese, chromite, nickel, molybdenum, tungsten, mercury, mica, quartz crystals, industrial diamonds, cadmium, fluorspar, cobalt, tantalite, antimony, vanadium, platinum, beryl, graphite (and to which may be added aluminum or any other minerals or metals in such quantities or amounts as the Army and Navy Munitions Board may determine to be necessary for the stock pile authorized by the Act of June 7, 1939), and shall include ores, concentrates, alloys, scrap, and partially and completely fabricated articles of which the principal components by value consist of such minerals and metals, but shall not include such fabricated articles as the Army and Navy determine are not suitable for their use in the form in which fabricated and which may be disposed of commercially at value substantially in excess of the metal market price of the component minerals and metals of such fabricated articles.

"(b) Pending a determination by the War Production Board that the supplies of the respective strategic minerals and metals available to industry are sufficient to meet the current requirements of industry, the owning agency subject to the regulations prescribed by the Surplus Property Board shall withhold from transfer under this section an amount of such minerals and metals equal to the deficiency, if any, estimated by the War Production Board as likely to exist for the requirements of industry for a period of six months for purposes other than war production; and may dispose of the minerals and metals so withheld to the extent necessary to meet any such deficiency actually found to exist by the War Production Board, at the market price of the respective minerals and metals.

"(c) Any Government-owned accumulations of strategic materials shall, at the request of the War and Navy Departments, be transferred by the owning agency, when determined to be surplus pursuant to this Act, to the account of the Treasury Procurement Division and shall be added to the stock pile authorized by the Act of June 7, 1939 (53 Stat. 811), as amended, and shall be subject to its provisions. The materials may be transferred in any form in which they are held and they shall thereafter be put into forms best suited for storage and use for the common defense. The term 'strategic materials' as used in this subsection means all materials except strategic minerals and metals as defined in subsection (a) of this section and includes all materials in group A or in group B of the list of strategic and critical materials determined upon by the Army and Navy Munitions Board on March 6, 1944, as amended from time to time, but shall not include any of such materials which the Army and Navy determine do not meet the specifications suitable for common defense or are in excess of the needs thereof. The Army and Navy Munitions Board is authorized to direct the removal from the list of any of the materials as defined in this subsection, in which event they shall be disposed of under the provisions of this Act.

"(d) Within three months following the enactment of this Act the Army and Navy Munitions Board shall submit to Congress its recommendations respecting the maximum and minimum amounts of each strategic mineral or metal which in its opinion should be held in the stock pile authorized by the Act of June 7, 1939. After one year from the submission of such recommendations, unless the Congress provides otherwise by law, the Board may authorize the proper disposal agencies to dispose of any Government-owned accumulations of strategic minerals and metals including those owned by any Government corporation when determined to be surplus pursuant to this Act.

"DISPOSAL OF SURPLUS REAL PROPERTY

"SEC. 23. (a) As used in this section—

"(1) The term 'real property' means property consisting of land, together with any fixtures and improvements thereon, located outside of the District of Columbia, but does not include war housing, industrial plants, factories, or similar structures and facilities, or the sites thereof, or land which the Board determines is essential to the use of any of the foregoing; and

"(2) The term 'surplus real property' means real property which has been determined under section 11 to be surplus property.

"(b) Surplus real property which is not disposed of to Government agencies under section 12 or to States or their political subdivisions or instrumentalities under section 13 shall be disposed of in accordance with this section.

"(c) Immediately after the reporting of surplus real property to the Board under section 11, the Board shall classify such property as agricultural, grazing, forest, mineral, or otherwise, as it may deem advisable. The classification may be revised from time to time.

"(d) (1) (A) In the case of any surplus real property which was acquired by any Government agency after December 31, 1939, the person from whom such property was acquired shall be given notice, in such manner (which may include publication) as the Board by regulation may prescribe, that the property is to be disposed of by the United States and shall be entitled to purchase such property, in substantially the identical tract as when acquired from such person, at private sale at any time during the period of 90 days following such notice: *Provided*, That such period shall be extended in any case when it appears that such extension is necessary or appropriate to facilitate the sale of any surplus real property under this subsection.

"(B) In the case of real property acquired by any Government agency after December 31, 1939, which either—

"(i) has not been determined under section 11 to be surplus property, or

"(ii) has been disposed of under section 12 or 13, or

"(iii) is classified as suitable for a purpose different from that for which it was used when acquired by the Government, and with respect to which the person from whom it was acquired has signified an intention not to exercise the privilege granted under subparagraph (A),

"the person from whom such property was acquired may be offered other surplus real property in the same area for purchase at private sale, if such other property is classified as suitable for the purpose for which the property so acquired was used when so acquired, and is otherwise similar to the property so acquired.

"(2) In the case of surplus real property which was acquired by any Government agency after December 31, 1939, and which is classified as suitable for agricultural use, if any tenant (who was a tenant at the time of acquisition) of the person from whom such property was acquired, signifies, within a period of ninety days following public notice of sale, his intention to purchase such property, and no person has exercised his privilege under paragraph (1) (A), such tenant shall be entitled to purchase such property, in substantially the identical tract as when acquired by such Government agency, at private sale at any time during such ninety-day period.

"(3) The price to be paid for surplus real property sold under this subsection shall be a price not greater than that for which it was acquired by the United States, such acquisition price being properly adjusted to reflect any increase or decrease in the value of such property resulting from action by the United States, or a price equal to the market price at the time of sale of such property, whichever price is the lower.

"(4) The Board may by regulation prescribe methods for the identification of persons entitled to exercise the privilege conferred by this subsection.

"(e) If any surplus real property is not disposed of under subsection (d)—

"(1) such property, if classified as suitable for agricultural use, shall be subdivided, as provided by the Board, whenever practicable into economic family-size units (taking into consideration the variations in sizes of economic units in different localities); and

"(2) such property, if not classified as suitable for agricultural use, shall be subdivided into the appropriate units in which the Board deems the property should be disposed of, giving due consideration to the character of the property, the economic use to which it is likely to be put, and the objectives of disposition as set forth in this Act.

"(f) (1) Whenever any surplus real property classified as suitable for agricultural, residential, or small business purposes is to be disposed of, except as provided in subsection (d) of this section, veterans shall be granted a preference in the purchase of such property over nonveterans.

"(2) The following procedure shall govern the exercise of veterans' preference rights under this subsection: The disposal agency, under regulations prescribed by the Board, shall fix the price of each unit into which the property is subdivided under subsection (e) after taking into consideration the then current market value, the character of the property, and, if income producing property, the estimated earning capacity thereof. Before any such property is disposed of, except under subsection (d), any veteran may apply for the purchase of any or all units offered for sale at the price so fixed. The Board shall prescribe the time within which application

shall be made and shall give such notice thereof as it deems reasonable to enable veterans to exercise their rights under this subsection. The Board shall provide for the selection of the purchaser of each unit by lot from among the applicants for the unit. If any applicant is selected as the purchaser of more than one unit, he shall elect which one to take, whereupon the right to purchase the remaining units shall go to the remaining applicants in the order in which their names were drawn. No veteran may apply for the purchase of any property under the provisions of this subsection if he has previously exercised a preference right under this section and has acquired property pursuant thereto. Sales to veterans under this subsection shall be upon such terms as the Board may prescribe.

"(g) In the case of the death of a person entitled under this section to rights as a former owner or veteran, his spouse and children, in that order, shall succeed to such rights of the decedent existing at the time of his death. Any preference right under subsection (f) to which a person would have been entitled except for his death while in the active military or naval service of the United States, shall be extended to his spouse and children, in that order. No preference right may be assigned or exercised by power of attorney or through a power to select except as may be permitted by regulations prescribed by the Board in order to prevent the loss of such right by the holder thereof.

"(h) A certificate by the disposal agency that the provisions of subsections (d), (f), and (g) have been complied with in the case of any property and that no qualified applicant has made application to exercise his privilege to purchase within the time limits fixed by or pursuant to this Act, shall terminate all privileges to purchase such property.

"(i) In the case of surplus real property which is classified as suitable for agricultural use and which is not disposed of under subsection (d) or (f), such property (after subdivision as provided in subsection (e) (1)) shall be disposed of insofar as possible only to persons who expect to cultivate the land and to operate it for a livelihood. The Department of Agriculture is authorized and directed, within the limits of its current functions under the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, to extend needed financial and other assistance to persons eligible for such assistance under the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act and the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, in connection with the disposal of surplus agricultural lands pursuant to this subsection.

"(j) In the case of sales of real property under this section or under any other provision of this Act, the form of deed or instrument of transfer shall be approved by the Attorney General. Deeds or other instruments containing general or special warranties of title may be issued and delivered to purchasers provided such warranties have been recommended and approved by the Attorney General. In determining whether general or special warranty deeds to properties may be issued and delivered, the Attorney General is authorized to approve the issuance and delivery of warranty deeds where titles are subject to infirmities of such character that in his opinion the interests of the United States will not be jeopardized under its warranty.

"REPORTS TO CONGRESS

"SEC. 24. Within three months after the enactment of this Act, and thereafter in January, April, July, and October of each year, the Board shall submit to the Senate and House of Representatives a progress report on the exercise of its authority and discretion under this Act, the status of surplus property disposition, and such other pertinent information on the administration of the Act as will enable the Congress to evaluate its administration and the need for amendments and related legislation.

"TITLE OF PURCHASE

"SEC. 25. A deed, bill of sale, lease, or other instrument executed by or on behalf of any Government agency purporting to transfer title or any other interest in property under this Act shall be conclusive evidence of compliance with the provisions of this Act insofar as title or other interest of any bona fide purchasers for value, or lessees, as the case may be, is concerned.

"CIVIL REMEDIES AND PENALTIES

"SEC. 26. (a) Where any property is disposed of in accordance with this Act and any regulations prescribed under this Act, no officer or employee of the Government shall (1) be liable with respect to such disposition except for his own fraud or (2) be accountable for the collection of any purchase price which is determined to be uncollectible by the agency responsible therefor.

"(b) Every person who shall use or engage in or cause to be used or engaged in any fraudulent trick, scheme, or device, for the purpose of securing or obtaining, or aiding to secure or obtain, for any person any payment, property, or other benefits from the United States or any Government agency in connection with the disposition of property under this Act; or who enters into an agreement, combination, or conspiracy to do any of the foregoing—

"(1) shall pay to the United States the sum of $2,000 for each such act, and double the amount of any damage which the United States may have sustained by reason thereof, together with the costs of suit; or

"(2) shall, if the United States shall so elect, pay to the United States, as liquidated damages, a sum equal to twice the consideration agreed to be given by such person to the United States or any Government agency; or

"(3) shall, if the United States shall so elect, restore to the United States the property thus secured and obtained and the United States shall return as liquidated damages any consideration given to the United States or any Government agency for such property.

"(c) The several district courts of the United States, the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia, and the several district courts of the Territories of the United States, within whose jurisdictional limits the person, or persons, doing or committing such act, or any one of them, resides or shall be found, shall whereso'ever such act may have been done or committed, have full power and jurisdiction to hear, try, and determine such suit.

"(d) The civil remedies provided in this section shall be in addition to all other criminal penalties and civil remedies provided by law.

"PRACTICE BY FORMER EMPLOYEES

"SEC. 27. No person employed by any Government agency, including commissioned officers assigned to duty in such agency, shall, during the period such person is engaged in such employment or service, or for a period of two years after the time when such employment or service has ceased, act as counsel, attorney, or agent, or be employed as representative, in connection with any matter involving the disposition of surplus property by the agency in which such person was employed, if such person during his employment with such agency ratified, approved, or authorized the disposition of any surplus property pursuant to the provisions of this Act or recommended any such approval, authorization, or ratification as part of his official duties. Any person violating the provisions of this section shall be fined not more than $10,000, or imprisoned for not more than one year, or both.

"STATUTE OF LIMITATIONS

"SEC. 28. The first section of the Act of August 24, 1942 (56 Stat. 747), as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"'The running of any existing statute of limitations applicable to any offense against the laws of the United States (1) involving defrauding or attempts to defraud the United States or any agency thereof whether by conspiracy or not, and in any manner, or (2) committed in connection with the negotiation, procurement, award, performance, payment for, interim financing, cancelation or other termination or settlement, of any contract, subcontract, or purchase order which is connected with or related to the prosecution of the present war, or with any disposition of termination inventory by any war contractor or Government agency, or (3) committed in connection with the care and handling and disposal of property under the Surplus Property Act of 1944, shall be suspended until three years after the termination of hostilities in the present war as proclaimed by the President or by a concurrent resolution of the two Houses of Congress. This section shall apply to acts, offenses, or transactions where the existing statute of limitations has not yet fully run, but it shall not apply to acts, offenses, or transactions which are already barred by provisions of existing law.'

"MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

"SEC. 29. Surplus property disposals may be made without regard to any provision in existing law for competitive bidding, unless the Board shall determine that disposal by competitive bid will in a given case better effectuate the policy of the Act.

"DISPOSITION OF PROCEEDS

"SEC. 30. (a) All proceeds from any transfer or disposition of property under this Act should be covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts, except as provided in subsections (b), (c), and (d) of this section.

"(b) Where the property transferred or disposed of was acquired by the use of funds either not appropriated from the general fund of the Treasury or appropriated from the general fund of the Treasury but by law reimbursable from assessment, tax, or other revenue or receipts, then upon the request of the interested agency the net proceeds of the disposition or transfer shall be credited to the reimbursable fund or appropriation or paid to the owning agency. As used in this subsection the term "net proceeds of the disposition or transfer" means the proceeds of the disposition or transfer minus all expenses incurred for care and handling and disposition or transfer.

"(c) To the extent authorized by the Board, any Government agency disposing of property under this Act (1) may deposit, in a special account with the Treasurer of the United States, such amount of the proceeds of such dispositions as it deems necessary to permit appropriate refunds to purchasers when any disposition is rescinded or does not become final, or payments for breach of any warranty, and (2) may withdraw therefrom amounts so to be refunded or paid, without regard to the origin of the funds withdrawn.

"(d) Where a contract or subcontract authorizes the proceeds of any sale of property in the custody of the contractor or subcontractor to be credited to the price or cost of the work covered by such contract or subcontract, the proceeds of any such sale shall be credited in accordance with the contract or subcontract.

"(e) Where the disposal agency acquires or retains any mortgage, lien, or other interest as security in connection with any transfer or disposition of property under this Act, the disposal agency shall retain, preserve, and manage such security and may enforce and settle any right of the Government with respect thereto in such manner and upon such

terms as it deems in the best interest of the Government. The Board may prescribe regulations to govern the exercise of the authority granted under this subsection.

"USE OF APPROPRIATED FUNDS

"SEC. 31. (a) Any Government agency is authorized to use for the disposition of property under this Act, and for its care and handling pending such disposition, any funds heretofore or hereafter appropriated, allocated, or available to it for the purpose of production or procurement of such property.

"(b) Any Government agency is authorized to use for the acquisition of any surplus property under this Act any funds heretofore or hereafter appropriated, allocated, or available to it for the acquisition of property of the same kind.

"(c) There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary or appropriate for administering the provisions of this Act

"DISPOSITIONS OUTSIDE UNITED STATES

"SEC. 32. (a) Nothing in this Act shall limit or affect the authority of commanders in active theaters of military operations with respect to property in their control.

"(b) The provisions of this Act shall be applicable to dispositions of property within the United States and elsewhere, but the Board may exempt from some or all of the provisions hereof dispositions of property located outside of the continental United States, its Territories and possessions, whenever it deems that such provisions would obstruct the efficient and economic disposition of such property in accordance with the objectives of this Act.

"RESTRICTIONS ON IMPORTATION OF SURPLUS PROPERTY INTO UNITED STATES

"SEC. 33. (a) It is the policy of this Act to prohibit, so far as feasible and necessary to carry out the objectives of this Act, the importation into the United States of surplus property sold abroad or for export. The Board shall prescribe regulations to carry out such policy, and the importation of surplus property into the United States is hereby prohibited to the extent specified in such regulations. The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to provide for the enforcement of such regulations.

"(b) Surplus property sold to members of the armed forces abroad may be brought into the United States without regard to the provisions of subsection (a) if brought in by the original purchaser and upon certificate by him that he is bringing the property into the United States for his personal use.

"SAVING PROVISIONS

"SEC. 34. (a) The authority conferred by this Act is in addition to any authority conferred by any other law and shall not be subject to the provisions of any law inconsistent herewith. This Act shall not impair or affect any authority for the disposition of property under any other law, except that the Board may prescribe regulations to govern any disposition of surplus property under any such authority to the same extent as if the disposition were made under this Act, whenever it deems such action necessary to effectuate the objectives and policies of this Act.

"(b) Nothing in this Act shall impair or affect the provisions of the Contract Settlement Act of 1944; the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended; the Act of October 2, 1942 (ch. 578, 56 Stat. 765), as amended; section 301 of the Second War Powers Act, 1942; the Act of March 11, 1941 (55 Stat. 31), as amended; the Tennessee Valley Authority Act of 1933, as amended; Public Law 849, Seventy-sixth Congress, as amended, respecting war housing and facilities; the act of June 7, 1939, relating to the acquisition of strategic and critical materials (53 Stat. 811); the Trading With the Enemy Act, as amended; section 43 of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, as amended; Acts supplemental to any of the foregoing: any law regulating the exportation of property from the United States; the internal-revenue laws; the statutes relating to the public lands; or any criminal law of the United States.

"(c) Nothing in this Act shall be deemed to impair or modify any contract, or any term or provision of any contract, without the consent of the contractor, if the contract or the term or provision thereof is otherwise valid.

"TEMPORARY APPLICABILITY OF EXISTING PROCEDURES

"SEC. 35. All policies and procedures relating to surplus property prescribed by the Surplus War Property Administration, created by Executive Order Numbered 9425, dated February 19, 1944, or any other Government agency, in effect upon the effective date of this Act and not inconsistent with this Act, shall remain in full force and effect unless and until superseded by regulations prescribed under this Act.

"TERMINATION INVENTORIES

"SEC. 36. (a) The Congress recognizes that upon termination of war contracts, the plants of war contractors will be filled with vast termination inventories which until removed or disposed of will prevent or interfere with the resumption of civilian production and reemployment, and that so far as possible decisions should be made in advance of termination for the disposition and removal of such termination inventories without delay when termination occurs. Measures should be taken to realize the greatest possible value from termination inventories.

"(b) In advance of termination, to the maximum extent practicable—

"(1) each contracting agency shall advise its war contractors of the classes of termination inventory the contracting agency will wish to retain for military purposes; and

"(2) the Board shall establish procedures for advising war contractors as to the care and handling and disposition of termination inventory not required for military purposes, in order to effectuate the policies stated in subsection (a) of this section and the policies of section 11 (a) (3) of the Contract Settlement Act of 1944.

"(c) To the extent that it is impracticable so to advise war contractors in advance of termination, the contracting agencies and the Board shall be prepared to give such advice as soon as practicable after termination of the war contract.

"(d) The Board and the Director of Contract Settlement shall cooperate in carrying out the provisions of this section.

"(e) For the purposes of this section, the terms 'contracting agency', 'termination inventory', and 'war contractor' shall have the meanings assigned to such terms by section 3 of the Contract Settlement Act of 1944.

"INCREASE IN LOAN RATE ON COTTON

"SEC. 37. (a) Section 8 (a) (1) of the Stabilization Act of 1942, as amended (relating to loans upon certain agricultural commodities), is amended by striking out 'at the rate in the case of cotton of 92½ per centum' and inserting in lieu thereof 'at the rate in the case of cotton of 95 per centum'.

"(b) The amendment made by this section shall be applicable only with respect to crops harvested after December 31, 1943, but shall not apply to crops planted after 1944. In the case of loans made under such section 8 upon any of the 1944 crop of cotton before the amendment made by this section takes effect, the Commodity Credit Corporation is authorized and directed to increase or provide for increasing the amount of such loans to the amount of the loans which would have been made if the loan rate specified in the amendment made by this section had been in effect at the time the loans were made.

"EXPIRATION DATE

"SEC. 38. Unless extended by law, this Act shall expire at the end of three years following the date of the cessation of hostilities in the present war. For the purposes of this section the term 'date of the cessation of hostilities in the present war' means the date proclaimed by the President as the date of such cessation, or the date specified in a concurrent resolution of the two Houses of Congress as the date of such cessation, whichever is the earlier.

"SEPARABILITY OF PROVISIONS

"SEC. 39. If any provision of this Act, or the application of such provision to any person or circumstance, is held invalid, the remainder of this Act or the application of such provision to persons or circumstances other than those as to which it is held invalid, shall not be affected thereby."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amend the title to read as follows: "An Act to aid the reconversion from a war to a peace economy through the distribution of Government surplus property and to establish a Surplus Property Board to effectuate the same, and for other purposes."

ELBERT D. THOMAS,
EDWIN C. JOHNSON,
LISTER HILL,
ALBERT B. CHANDLER,
By E. C. J.,
WARREN R. AUSTIN,
CHAN GURNEY,
CHAPMAN REVERCOMB,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

CARTER MANASCO,
JOHN J. COCHRAN,
WILL M. WHITTINGTON,
CHARLES L. GIFFORD,
By C. M.,
GEORGE H. BENDER,
By C. M.,
Managers on the part of the House.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD rose.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I understand the senior Senator from Minnesota must leave shortly in order to take a train and desires to have the floor for a few minutes.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. That is true, Mr. President, and I apologize to the Senate for interrupting the Senator and for having to leave in order to take a train.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, am I to understand that the distinguished Senator from Colorado will not ask for consideration of the conference report until after the Senator from Minnesota has completed his remarks?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. That is correct.

AMERICAN FOREIGN POLICY SINCE 1932

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President, from time to time during this session, and the first session of the Seventy-ninth Congress, I intend to discuss, from various points of view, the foreign policy of the United States. I am going to take up the relation between the powers of Congress, and those of the President, with regard to foreign affairs. I am going to review the foreign economic policy of this country, particularly in the two decades during which I have been a member of this body and of its Committee on Foreign Relations. I shall take up our record in each of the fields mentioned, and in others as well. I shall discuss those questions in a nonpartisan

spirit. I am fully aware that ever since 1899 our foreign policy has been a severance from the traditional policy which was inaugurated by President Monroe and followed down to that time. That traditional policy has been violated not only by Republicans but by Democrats as well. So I wish to assure Senators that I shall try to discuss those matters objectively. At some future time I shall go further back into history than I expect to go today, because we are confronted now with certain problems in connection with the war.

This afternoon, I propose to discuss the proposition that Mr. Roosevelt's experience and his knowledge of foreign affairs, and his skill in handling foreign policy, make his indefinite tenure of office indispensable. What I am going to say is submitted in order to get the real issue squarely before this body, where some grave decisions will have to be made within the next year or two.

There is one feature of this war which makes it unique in history. The states with which we are at war have achieved their military might and force only since 1933. Twelve years ago, Europe was at peace. Germany was not a military power in any sense of the word. German armament was still restricted, and German armies were no overpowering threat to her neighbors. Economic unrest and unemployment disturbed Europe, but the menace of war was remote.

There was war in Asia. Japan had commenced her seizure of Manchuria within a few weeks of the suspension of convertibility of the pound sterling by the Bank of England in September 1931. Japanese aggression on the mainland was still in progress when the great year 1933 began. But Japanese military resources were as yet limited. The mineral resources of the mainland had not been organized. Doubtless the plans existed in the files of the Japanese Army and Navy staffs for the upbuilding of a great military establishment. Such plans exist in the files of nearly all such staffs. But, in Japan's case, their realization called for the importation of vast quantities of petroleum, iron ore, scrap iron and steel, and many other commodities, and their fabrication. The funds to buy these things had to be earned by extensive trade, liberal credit, and over a long period. In 1932, Japanese conditions were anything but favorable to large-scale importation of expensive raw materials from abroad. Japan had no exchange.

In order to show the state of the economy of Japan in 1932, I quote from Ambassador Joseph Grew's report to the Secretary of State, August 13, 1932, published by the Department of State, in War and Peace, page 174:

> The internal economic and financial situation in Japan is serious and may become desperate. The plight of the farmers is very bad, many industries are at low ebb, unemployment steadily increasing. Money cannot be obtained from abroad. It will become increasingly difficult to obtain domestic loans. Meantime, millions of yen are being squandered to support the Manchurian venture, of which the eventual economic advantage is highly problematical; and when the full purport of these expenses becomes known to the people, in their own serious deprivation, there is no telling what effect it will create.

At the end of 1932 Japan was a third-rate power, hampered by economic distress, barely able to carry on her predatory operations on the mainland in a limited and intermittent fashion. Germany was undergoing a severe depression, with political agitation seething month in and month out. War on a great scale existed nowhere, not even in east Asia.

A conference for the economic pacification of Europe was soon to be held in London. The mistakes of a dozen years were to be reviewed by responsible men, disposed to cooperate in repairing the damage. Economic balance was to be restored to Europe, to the whole world. The limitation of armament, discussed in halting and distrustful fashion during the preceding 4 or 5 years, was to be taken up resolutely and frankly.

I do not expect this afternoon to review the Life and Adventures of the London Economic Conference of 1933, which I prefer to take up on another occasion in connection with monetary policy, stabilization funds, and similar aspects of our foreign economic policy. I merely call attention to the fact that in the first half of 1933 the chief aspect of the world's affairs which interested the people of all countries was economic, and they were all looking forward to a great advance in the process of getting rid of the worst of the many burdens left by the war which ended in 1918.

At the beginning of 1933 the United States was the most important economic and financial power on the face of the earth. It is true that we were hard-pressed by widespread destitution and lack of employment. These things were deplorable, but they were the result of internal factors in sharp conflict with each other. The depression which came at about that time was an aftermath of the financing of World War and the production incident to the World War, and it came as a climax to bad policies which had been pursued. Compared to the rest of the world, the United States was the foremost financial power. Our economic policies, as to tariffs, wage levels, immigration, and credit, affected every country in the world. No country could move very far in any direction 11 or 12 years ago without considering how far its action would be affected by the policies of the United States. It would be natural to suppose that this great financial and economic power would be used to assure world peace. It would be equally natural to suppose that the mighty leverage of the war debts of 1917–19 would be used to enforce world-wide limitation of armament. When Mr. Roosevelt entered upon his duties, the United States, as the world's chief creditor and one of its principal suppliers, was in a position to see to it that no unbridled militarism should becloud the horizon during the period of economic reconstruction at home and abroad.

Yet, in just the following half-dozen years the remilitarization of Germany took place. In precisely the same period, from 1933 to 1939, Japan emerged from her desperate straits of 1932 to become the war lord of greater East Asia. Where was the vast experience, and knowledge of foreign affairs, and skill in handling them, of Mr. Roosevelt while all this was going on? What, concretely, did we do to help or hinder this sudden conversion of a nightmare into a hideous reality?

Mr. Roosevelt's policies have been of great importance in the terrible changes that have come over the world since 1932. The diplomacy of the United States, the greatest economic and financial power on the face of the earth, has had decisive influence both in European and Asiatic affairs, in one development after another. Mr. Roosevelt's declaration of June 15, his "great design," as revealed in the articles by Forrest Davis—Saturday Evening Post of May 13 and 20, 1944—and the several statements which have been given out in connection with the security conference at Dumbarton Oaks make it clear beyond question that he expects to continue and increase his influence, as one of a council of three men who are to dominate the world. In the "pursuit of peace"—if I may quote his expression—we are expected to rely primarily upon the armed forces of a world council dominated by the spokesmen of three great powers.

Mr. Roosevelt's conversion to this idea is quite remarkable, when we consider how greatly he contributed to the breaking up of the world organization which existed in 1932, in which Britain and France played leading roles. I am not here today to defend the League of Nations. But we must bear in mind that the League and its World Council were devoted to the aims which Roosevelt now avows—at least it was so stated and avowed at the time—namely, the international organization of security, with powers that could be effectively used against an aggressor if the dominant powers in its Council should agree to such use. But when Mr. Roosevelt campaigned for the Presidency of the United States for the first time, in 1932, he came out emphatically against the League of Nations—this world organization within which larger nations were supposed to work absolutely in unison in preventing war.

In this case I want to give Mr. Roosevelt such credit as is due him for keeping this particular promise. He did oppose the League of Nations. And so tremendous was the weight of the United States in world affairs that his election in 1932 had immediate repercussions everywhere. It was accepted everywhere as assurance that the American Government would not support the League in international affairs. Even before he took office the chancelleries of the world were figuring the possibilities of this anti-League attitude. The German Reichswehr made their deal with Hitler, who became Chancelor. A few months later, Germany left the League of Nations when that body declined to acquiesce in Hitler's remilitarizing of Germany. The Japanese, resentful of the League's condemnation of Japan's brutal aggressions in China, and now assured that the American Government would not side with the League,

also withdrew from the organization. Nothing but a shell was left of this attempt at international organization.

But Mr. Roosevelt's notable reversal of policies with regard to world organization during the past 12 years is only one of many serious moves and reversals. I call attention to a speech by Robert A. Lovett, Assistant Secretary of War for Air, before the wartime conference of the National Association of Broadcasters, at Chicago, on August 29:

> We must know by now what it means to mankind to allow gangsters to build up and command a modern air force. This has provided us with the costliest education in all history.

What Mr. Lovett says of air force is equally applicable to naval and land force. Why did the coalition government in England sit quietly by, refusing to join France and Italy when those powers sought to compel Germany, by force if necessary, to desist from rearmament? Why did the coalition government of England hasten to make a naval agreement with Germany which put the seal of respectability upon everything the German Government was doing? No "quarantine speech" was made in June 1935, nor made at all until 28 months later, just at the time when another Prime Minister in England was undertaking to repair the mischief his predecessors had caused, by reconstructing Anglo-Franco-Italian unity with respect to Germany. Our Secretary of State solemnly upbraided the downtrodden and terrorized Austrians the other day for not rising before now against their Nazi tyrants. This utterance is almost fantastic when we recall that not one word was publicly uttered by this same official or his chief when Nazi gangsters murdered the Austrian Prime Minister in 1934, or when they kidnaped his successor 4 years later, in outrageous violation of all the laws of nations. Even if the Austrians had the means to start an insurrection, what help could they reasonably expect from the United States, which was one of the first powers to recognize formally the extinction of Austrian independence, and to accept the incorporation of Austria in greater Germany? Did Mr. Roosevelt or his Secretary of State lift a finger to influence Great Britain's policy on the Continent while Mr. MacDonald, Sir John Simon, Lord Baldwin, and Sir Samuel Hoare were running British foreign policy? Is there any sign that the immense financial and economic power of the United States was used in any way to head off the ruinous race of rearmament and war?

When, in consequence of personal intrigue, Sir Samuel Hoare was forced from office, and Mr. Eden replaced him, did our influence with the British Government contribute to bring about peace on the Continent? Were we pulling wires to make certain that the new Prime Minister, Mr. Chamberlain, should not work out arrangements for a common policy between Great Britain, France, and Italy? From the autumn of 1937 on, an increasing influence in shaping the policy of Britain was exerted by Mr. Roosevelt, through official, unofficial, and personal channels, British and American. Was it directed to check the militarists and imperialists of Berlin?

These are questions which historians will one day answer. I am convinced that their unanimous verdict will place the great responsibility for the unrestrained rise of German military power upon at least one man whose experience, knowledge, and skill are now represented to his fellow citizens as indispensable to their salvation. All the warnings were disregarded. Military observers furnished reports which were scoffed at, or, at best, filed away. George Messersmith, now Ambassador in Mexico, was Consul General in Berlin in 1933. Here is what he reported on June 26, 1933, as published in the Department's Peace and War monograph:

> The Department must be exceedingly careful in its dealings with Germany as long as the present Government is in power as it has no spokesman who can really be depended upon and those who hold the highest positions are capable of actions which really outlaw them from ordinary intercourse.
>
> What they want to do, however, definitely is to make Germany the most capable instrument of war that there has ever existed * * * If this Government remains in power for another year and carries on in the same measure in this direction, it will go far toward making Germany a danger to world peace for years to come. * * * What I do want to say really is that for the present this country is headed in directions which can only carry ruin to it and will create a situation here dangerous to world peace.

So our State Department knew these things in 1933. The French Government also knew them, as well as the British Government and every other government. Continuation of such restrictions as still existed on German armaments would not require our going to war. It meant merely our continued diplomatic cooperation with the French Republic and with other free peoples who saw the urgent necessity of continuing the Versailles restrictions. The only civilized and sane alternative to cooperation with them was to withdraw altogether from the situation, and let them take care of it themselves, which they were still in a position to do. It was certain that Germany, with a population and resources twice those of France, would launch a new war against France as soon as she was strong enough. Hitler was already mobilizing and drilling his military formations. He had declared openly, in Mein Kampf, his intention of crushing France, and his desire for cooperation with Britain and Italy in this and other aggressions.

How did the Nazis gain the power to crush France, as they did for the past 4 years? What prevented the French and their allies from maintaining in 1933 the restrictions which kept the murderous brutality of the Nazis confined within the borders of Germany? Who was it who befriended the Nazis and opposed the French Republic in those critical years?

These questions are answered in the record of the Disarmament Conference of 1933. The American and British Governments flatly refused to cooperate with the French Government in the continuation of restrictions on German armaments. The late Norman Davis, chairman of President Roosevelt's delegation to the Disarmament Conference, took the position that one of the "main obstacles to disarmament" was the "apprehension that Germany proposed to rearm." At a time when Chancellor Hitler was flatly declaring his intention of rearming Germany and already drilling and regimenting the youth of Germany, the American delegate declared that this was an unfortunate "apprehension." And he proposed, formally, that "the military strength of the most heavily armed nations"—by which he meant, as he made clear, the defensive forces of the French Republic and its allies—should be "progressively reduced." He even found "most helpful" Hitler's furious speech before the Reichstag declaring that Germany would no longer sign agreements continuing such limitations as remained on German armaments.

I want to read one short paragraph from his address to that Conference. He said:

> A few days ago the Conference met a serious obstacle to further progress in its detailed examination of the British plan. Since then there has been an appreciable change. The recent speech by the German Chancellor before the Reichstag clarifying the German attitude and policy with regard to disarmament and endorsing the proposal of President Roosevelt has been most helpful. This, and also the subsequent announcement made here by our colleague, Herr Nadolny, of Germany's acceptance of the British plan as the basis of the future convention, have so altered the situation as to justify us in assuming that we can now resume our consideration of this plan with real hope of agreement.

But they did not come to an agreement.

The entire diplomatic and moral strength of the American Government, Mr. President, was thrown against the French Republic, and on behalf of the remilitarization of Germany by Hitler and his gangsters. The British Government, abandoning the stand it had taken only 3 months previously, alined itself with the American Government. It was this situation which enabled Hitler, on October 14, 1933, to announce Germany's withdrawal from the Disarmament Conference, and also from the League of Nations. The French, Czech, and other governments insisted that the conference continue. But the American and British Governments desired that it should adjourn, to give Hitler an opportunity "to reconsider." Which meant, in effect, to give him a free hand to carry on his remilitarization of Germany—which he did.

For almost 3 years, Mr. President, we have been fighting to crush Germany, to put her back in the position of 1932, before Mr. Roosevelt became President of the United States and Adolf Hitler became Chancellor of Germany. Germany was militarily weak, and also disarmed, then. Why was she not kept that way? Why do we have to give the lives of our sons to put Germany back in the position she occupied before Mr. Roosevelt became President of the United States, and began to exercise his influence in world affairs?

What was the record of the Roosevelt administration on the other side of the world—the side from which we were attacked? How were the Japanese able to climb out of the desperate situation which Mr. Grew described as of 1932? Where did they get the military and industrial equipment, the scrap iron and the fuel oil and the other things they need in order to build up their military machine and to carry on their brutal wars of aggression? How was it that the Japanese were able to charter American oil tankers to take fuel oil to crush the desperately fighting forces of the Chinese into mangled flesh and submission, and to build up adequate stock piles to bomb us at Pearl Harbor?

We know where they got these things. The United States was their main supplier. For years, there was a neutrality act in effect, passed by the Congress of the United States, authorizing an embargo on the sale of war materials to belligerent countries. But this was never applied to Japan. We were told that they had not declared war upon China. Japan, sensing the desire of Mr. Roosevelt to evade the Neutrality Act, did not declare war. So the Neutrality Act remained a dead letter, and the President never saw fit to declare a state of war to exist in Asia, although hundreds of thousands of soldiers were fighting there year after year. Even the British were appalled by this fantastic situation.

In a very real sense, Mr. President, the United States subsidized Japanese rearmament. It is just as real a subsidy as the lend-lease formula later developed for Great Britain, Russia, China, and a dozen other countries. The United States adopted in 1933 a policy of revaluation which I shall discuss in greater detail on another occasion. This policy involved the purchase of gold and of silver at prices substantially above those in effect when Mr. Roosevelt took office.

We bought 509,429,943 ounces of gold from foreign countries from January 1, 1934, to December 31, 1941, and 2,047,039,000 ounces of silver from June 17, 1934, to April 18, 1942. For all the gold we acquired from abroad, we paid $17,830,048,000, which huge sum exceeded what we would have paid if the mint price of gold had remained at $20.67 per ounce, in the sum of $7,300,131,079. That is, we paid a bonus to foreign countries of $7,300,131,079 in purchasing the gold the value of which we had raised 69 percent.

We paid $1,020,000,000 for the silver, at an average cost of about 50 cents per ounce. We paid to Japan $711,000,000 for such gold as we purchased from her, which included a bonus of $291,283,804. That included gold we bought from Japan which she stole from China and Manchuria. That is what is shown from the record of the Treasury as given to me. However, the sale of gold through London and Canada is so overwhelming that I cannot believe but that a great deal of Japanese gold went to Canada from Japan and also went to London, the great metal market of the world, from Japan.

But this much we do know, that we paid $711,000,000 for gold so as to give Japan exchange with which to build up her armaments. That is a minimum figure; undoubtedly, Japanese profits were enhanced by participation in the Chinese sales, and other Asiatic sales in which Japanese financial and political intervention could occur. The Chinese could not sell for a long time. They had little gold and much silver. We would not buy from China direct for a long time. The sales were made particularly through London. Certainly our immense purchases of silver from London were in part on Japanese account. We paid about $302,000,000, at about 61 cents per ounce, to London for 493,000,000 ounces of silver, and to China direct, $220,000,000 for 502,000,000 ounces. I think it reasonable and even conservative to estimate that, through gold and silver alone, we put over $1,000,000,000 of purchasing power at the disposal of Japan between 1934 and the middle of 1941; and much of this was actually a gratuity, in the form of the increased price of gold and silver. Of course, the Japanese derived other billions of dollars of purchasing power through their sales of commodities and services to our people. And most of this purchasing power went into the purchase of equipment, technical installations, scrap metal, oil, and numerous other materials essential to military preparation on a great scale.

The silver problem was of such importance that, in this connection, it is in order to quote from the work of a responsible authority, Mr. Harry Paxton Howard, one of the economists consulted by Mr. Roosevelt's personal envoy, Professor Rogers, when the latter looked into the situation in China in 1934. In his book, America's Role in Asia, Mr. Howard says certain things which I wish to read:

> Most of the silver bought by the American Government has been acquired from China—much of it via London. The United States Treasury has paid out more than $1,000,000,000 for foreign silver (mostly from China), and only about one-fifth of this amount for American-mined silver. * * * They have drained China of its monetary silver, and made its Government our financial dependency. During the first year their ruinous effect upon China's economy faced the Chinese with desperate alternatives: financial subjection to the United States, or military subjection to Japan. * * *
>
> Our subsidies were at first mainly to the British, who shipped the silver out of China: we refused to buy from the Chinese direct. * * * Silver was the main commercial currency of China. Early in 1933 the white metal was worth about 26 cents an ounce; we started buying it abroad in 1934 at 64½ cents an ounce. It was rich business for British silver dealers, but China was faced with disastrous deflation and a ruinous drop in prices. Nanking tried to meet the grave internal situation by an export duty and equalization charge on silver, and severe penalties for smuggling, but it had no control over the British and other nationals with extraterritorial privileges, who openly shipped Chinese silver out of Shanghai and other ports. * * * Until December 1935 our Government patronized this foreign smuggling by even greater purchases of the silver. * * *
>
> By the latter months of 1935 the Japanese were smuggling out more silver than were the British. This new business was a veritable windfall to the Japanese, whose internal economy was heavily strained by the big costs of the Manchurian occupation, and the military industrialization of the subject country. The Japanese obtained some $50,000,000 of our subsidies, enabling them to increase their expenditures on Manchuria and on other military (and naval) requirements, and to increase their purchases of military and industrial requirements from the United States—while reducing their issues of domestic loans.

That was how the Japanese militarists pulled out of the serious economic difficulties that resulted from their bloody and costly adventures in China.

More than $700,000,000 in gold was dumped here. Japan has little gold. She stole it in China. She stole the gold out of Manchuria, which she had taken from China.

The United States Treasury pulled them out, and did not even call it "Lend-Lease." The Treasury paid an inflated price for the gold stolen from Chinese Manchuria, and for the silver they smuggled out of China. And we shoveled out military and industrial equipment to them in ever greater quantities. Japan could not have paid for it. We paid for it by financing, and by bonuses in the sale of stolen metals, and of course, by buying heavily of her commodities to give her more exchange. But this gold must be paid for. The American taxpayers will get the final bill, but since debts which they owe themselves do not really count for anything, we are told that the matter is of small consequence.

What I have said relates only to gold and silver purchases. I have already explained both. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks certain tables which I obtained from the Treasury Department relating to purchases of silver and gold from all the countries of the world and showing also the total amount which we paid in premiums or bonuses.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the tables may be printed in the RECORD.

(See exhibit A.)

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. What the administration did in the Far East was of even more direct consequence than what it did in Europe. For generations, the United States has been the economic lifeline of Japan. It was the biggest purchaser of Japanese goods. Under this administration we were the economic basis and backbone of Japanese military and naval expansion. Mr. Grew has pointed out in his recent book, Ten Years in Japan, how completely Japanese economic life became paralized when we launched economic war against Japan 3 years ago—after the Japanese committed the "unforgivable crime" of moving in a white man's colony, French Indochina. But that economic action in 1941 was extremely late, if we did not want war. Why did the administration wait until then? Already in 1932, Japanese economic life was in terrible distress. Why did the administration build up Japanese militarism until the summer of 1941, and then completely reverse its policy?

Down to 1940–41, we were steadily building up and strengthening the German and Japanese militarists. The German armed forces had grown from moderate levels up to the most powerful

fighting machine of any single nation on the face of the earth. The Japanese had grown from a second-rate power to a first-rate military state, successfully exploiting Chinese Manchuria, dominating the China coast, and with naval bases clear down to French Indochina.

I shall not today go into detail as to our Government's reversal of its previous policies in 1940–41. In September 1940 it concluded what was in effect an Anglo-American entente, supplying the British with destroyers and tankers for use in the war. The British gave us the use of naval bases to enable us to assist them, and—of much greater importance—agreed to reopen the route through Burma, then a British colony, to American shipments of war materials to the Chinese Government. The British action regarding Burma meant that they were subordinating their Far Eastern policy to that of the American Government, in the areas east of India.

As a matter of fact, when we went through Burma into China we undertook to fight a war in defense of China, against Japan, and at the same time we were supplying both China and Japan with war materials.

Mr. President, I shall not today analyze the immediate antecedents to the declarations of war in 1941. Secretary Hull's own statement 10 days after the Japanese attack upon Pearl Harbor that he "felt sure that the reply of Tokyo to the proposals of November 26 would be an expansion of the war somewhere in the Pacific area at the first moment that appeared to be propitious," and that he "issued a private warning to his associates to look for it at any time," shows the real significance of the American note to Japan of November 26, 1941, to which the attack upon Pearl Harbor was the Japanese reply.

I shall not now take up time by discussing that note of November 26 and the previous measures taking us steadily into war with Japan as well as Germany. But it is of deep importance that we realize that if these policies were justifiable and right, as some of my colleagues believe, then the entire foreign policy of the administration down to 1940 was utterly and completely wrong. The pre-1940 policies and the post-1940 policies cannot both be right, but they might both be wrong.

So we went to war against two great powers which had become great powers in the course of the previous 9 years with the diplomatic, financial, and economic assistance of the United States. This is something new in history. If the administration really knew what it was doing all that time, if it possessed the wisdom and foresight which it claims to possess, the only rational conclusion is that it was building up our enemies so it could have a "good long war" which is what we have now. That is a conclusion which surely no one can wish to believe.

Of course, none of us will believe anything of that kind, but that was the effect.

I have spoken of the remarkable shifts and turns and reversals of American Government policy during the 12 years of the present administration. There was the building up of Nazi Germany and militarist Japan to the position of great powers, then the switch-over to the other side and the building up of the Stalinist Union against Germany—and against all eastern Europe, and possibly against China. We have seen support to Japanese militarism supplemented and then replaced by support to Chinese militarists, though these latter may now be turned over, like the Poles and Finns, and Balkan peoples, to the tender mercies or Marshal Stalin. We may yet see Moscow dominant in western China as in eastern Europe. What a reward to China for having fought the Japanese, always with our encouragement, for 7 years.

Mr. President, the record of this administration in world affairs will be its own everlasting judgment.

It was said proudly of the Emperor Augustus that he found Rome a city of brick, and left it a city of marble.

I am inclined to think that the opinion of a fair proportion of posterity about Mr. Roosevelt will be to the effect that he found the world in grave economic distress, trying to recover from the consequences of the war of 1914–1918, and that he left it in total war, with 50,000,000 men and women in uniform.

The people who sent us here assume that we will tear away the veil of secrecy from these international political agreements that have been discussed and even put into effect in some instances. It is we in Congress, not the motley horde of subordinate officials, whom the people of this Nation will condemn for our inaction in allowing the foreign affairs of this country to be handled as they have been handled for the last 12 years.

EXHIBIT A

Foreign silver acquired from June 17, 1934, to Apr. 18, 1942, under the Silver Purchase Act of 1934

Origin	Fine ounces	Cost	Average cost per ounce (cents)
China	502,297,000	$220,142,000	43.8
Japan	2,875,000	1,017,000	35.4
Great Britain	492,798,000	301,917,000	61.3
India	3,687,000	1,961,000	53.2
Total (all countries, including above)	2,047,039,000	1,020,722,000	49.9

Highest price paid for silver under this program was 76.55 cents per fine ounce on Apr. 25, 1935.

Lowest price paid for silver under this arrangement, 35.062 cents in 1941.

Figures showing net gold imports (at $35 per fine ounce) from Jan. 1, 1934, to Dec. 31, 1941 (latest date on which the Government has released any import figures)

Origin	Fine ounces	Cost
China and Hong Kong	1,550,700	$54,275,000
Japan	20,326,860	711,440,000
Great Britain	158,771,228	5,556,993,000
Canada	128,623,771	4,501,832,000
India	11,919,314	417,176,000
Total (all countries, including the above as well as others not named)	509,429,943	17,830,048,000

The lowest price paid by Treasury for foreign silver from 1934 to date, 35.062 cents per fine ounce, in 1941.

Highest price paid by the Treasury during that entire period, 76.53 cents per fine ounce, in 1935.

Premium: Difference between the old gold price of $20.67 per fine ounce and the new price of $35 per fine ounce.

	Premium
China	$21,222,031
Japan	291,283,804
Great Britain	2,275,191,718
Canada	1,843,116,654
India	170,803,780

Total premium for all countries (including the above and all other imports), $7,300,131,079.

This is calculated on the basis of the net number of ounces that have been imported and multiplied by the old price of $20.67, and deducting that amount from the total cost, which is shown at $35.

Mr. BALL obtained the floor.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for a moment?

Mr. BALL. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. I desire at this time to read an article, and I wish to have the senior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. SHIPSTEAD], particularly, listen to what I am about to read. I have in mind the speech the Senator has just made, and I also have in mind very vividly the speeches I heard the Senator make on foreign policies and affairs throughout the years preceding our entry into the war. I happened to pick up this article by the columnist Mark Sullivan. It is entitled "Will Our Mood Last?" I wish to read it, for every Senator who asks questions such as have been asked today to pause and consider:

THE PUBLIC AND PEACE

(By Mark Sullivan)

WILL OUR MOOD LAST?

Merely as a convenient way of expressing an idea simply, I address this to the American people.

You earnestly wish to prevent war in future. Your Government shares the wish. It is painstakingly busy to accomplish this end by a covenant with other governments, setting up an international organization for preserving peace, for preventing any future aggressions by any war-making nation.

You, the American people, feel that this organization will accomplish the result. And perhaps it will—provided it is accompanied by something else.

But you tend to think that the covenant alone will do the work; that once the covenant is made, and the international organization set up, perpetual peace will be assured. In thus thinking, you run the risk of relying wholly on a mechanism, a ritual. Almost you are in the mood of supposing that once the covenant is adopted and the ritual subscribed to, nothing else need be done—that thereafter you can go your peaceful ways serene in confidence that any future aggression will be stopped before it gets under way.

This is your present mood. But I ask you to recall what was your mood in the summer of 1939, when the present aggression by Germany was getting under way? Were you at that time willing that your Government should join other nations in resisting that aggression? You were not. On the contrary you preferred to believe Senator Borah, who assured you there would not be any war. Your mood, far from being one of urging your Government to help prevent war, was rather one of, so to speak, aggressive neutrality.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HATCH. I yield.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. The Senator has referred to certain statements I made. Was the Senator referring to statements I made in 1939?

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I have been reading a column addressed to the American people by Mark Sullivan, but I am asking the Senator to answer the questions from his own mind, from his own speeches, and from his own conduct on the floor of the Senate during that period of time.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Ever since the last war I had feared that we were on the road to another war, coming as a result of the treaty of peace after the last war, and I so stated, and I never retracted that statement.

In 1938 I returned from a trip to Europe. While I was abroad I wrote a letter to an editor friend of mine, and in it I said:

I do not think there will be a war this year, but I have all the time felt that there was a danger, because of our diplomacy, not only that of this administration but that of previous ones, that we will be led into a world war because of the international tie-up and the secret policies which we have undertaken from time to time, ever since 1898, down to 1906, when we interfered with the Moroccan question and the balance of power in Europe and down to the last war. With the possible exception of President Coolidge, that has been our policy of international politics.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I continue to read the article, which I am anxious to finish quickly, so that the junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL] may proceed. But I want these questions to sink deeply into the minds of all Senators. The article continues as follows:

You preferred to believe there was not going to be any war, and if there was to be one, you were determined to stay out of it.

Recall further your mood in the summer of 1940. By that time Germany's aggression was under way—she had conquered several countries, and only Britain stood against her.

Were you at that time willing to help Britain, with force, to resist Germany? You were not. You were hardly willing to help her even with a transfer to her—not as a gift but for compensation—of 50 old destroyers and other obsolete military material.

There was good reason to believe that the man who was President of the country at that time thought we should help Britain. But so strong was your opposition that he did not dare act nor even say that we ought to.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for an answer to the questions?

Mr. HATCH. I must defer to the wishes of the junior Senator from Minnesota, who has the floor, and has kindly yielded to me.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. The Senator has been asking me a question. I will answer that question by saying that in 1940 we did not suspect at that time the secret commitments the President had already made to foreign countries.

Mr. HATCH. The Senator has fully answered these questions in his speeches upon the floor of the Senate, access to some of which I have just had.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. They are very good ones, too.

Mr. HATCH. I will proceed with the reading of the article:

He happened at that time to be running for reelection, and in that position was peculiarly subject to the mood of the people, had to defer to them. So much so, that throughout his campaign he felt again and again obliged to say that we would not send our boys to fight abroad, that we would not join Britain in resisting the aggression of Germany.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Whom is the Senator now quoting?

Mr. HATCH. I am still reading the column by Mr. Mark Sullivan.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. The Senator is not quoting either the President or me; is he?

Mr. HATCH. Oh, no; I have not attempted to do so.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Very well.

Mr. HATCH. The article continues:

Now turn to the future. Some time there will be another threat of aggression by some nation. We will have, we expect, a covenant to stop the aggression. But no covenant can operate automatically. It must be started by human hands, and the human hands will include whoever is at the time our President.

I, too, say "our President," whether he be Republican or Democrat.

I continue to read from the article:

He will have power to decide whether we do or do not join in resisting the aggression. Only by an affirmative act on the part of our Government at the time can we assent to a decision that the aggression should be resisted, and assent to the use of our armed forces to help.

Our Government at that time will be as subject to the mood of our people as it was subject to their mood in 1940. It will at all times be an elected Government, and subject to defeat or victory in a future election. There may be an election pending in the very year in which the aggression comes and the test is presented, as there was in 1940.

Can you, the American people, promise that in the future condition your mood will be one of support for a government that wishes to help prevent aggression?

I close with some words by a writer in the Baltimore Sun, Mr. Newton Aiken: "* * * Covenants will afford no safeguard. * * * What is important * * * is the mood of determination [of] public officials and [of] people from whom they derive their powers. * * * Eternal vigilance is as thoroughly the price of peace as it is of liberty."

Mr. President, my only purpose in interrupting the junior Senator from Minnesota, to whom I now relinquish the floor, was to read the article into the RECORD, not with any invidious reflection upon any Senator who might have adopted a course which he thought to be correct at that time but because I resented, and I shall continue to resent, any statement on the floor of the Senate by any Senator who says that the President of the United States is responsible for the might and power of the German military machine, and likewise responsible for this war, as I interpreted the remarks of the senior Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. President, I merely wish to add that the responsibility of this war is heavy and terrible upon all of us, and it behooves none of us to try to fix the blame or the responsibility upon others. My sole thought at this date, my sole hope at this hour, is that we may turn our backs on the past; not criticize or find fault with each other from political, partisan, or any other motives, but from this date look forward, and be eternally sure that the Senator from Minnesota, and I, from New Mexico, and all other Senators, with the heavy responsibility which will be ours within the next few months, shall discharge that responsibility in the light of conditions as they then exist, and not stand here and find fault.

I thank the Senator from Minnesota for yielding to me.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. I merely wish to say we cannot forget the past. We must know the past in order to prepare and act in the future. Cicero said, in effect, that not to know what happened before one was born was always to remain a child. We can only judge the future and be guided in the future by an understanding of the past. I do not mean to refer only to the past 10 years of President Roosevelt's administration. I refer to the mistakes of the Republican administrations in respect to foreign policy, and I intend with full vigor to debate them in the future just as vehemently as I shall debate the mistakes of what I consider to be the Democratic administration. The Senate knows that I never take a partisan view; at least I try not to do so. I sometimes vote for a Republican measure and sometimes for a Democratic measure. When a Republican Senator sponsors a measure I sometimes vote for it. When a Democratic Senator sponsors a measure I sometimes vote for it. I believe that, in such a position, it is beyond the privilege of anyone to accuse a Senator of partisanship. So long as he maintains respect for the oath which he took as a Senator, he has the right to vote and speak according to his judgment.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield? I do not wish to make a speech.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The junior Senator from Minnesota has the floor. Does he yield to the Senator from Montana?

Mr. BALL. I am sorry, but I cannot yield any further.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, I merely wish to make one statement.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, I have the floor.

Mr. WHEELER. Does the Senator from Minnesota refuse to yield to me in order that I may make a statement?

Mr. BALL. How long will the Senator take?

Mr. WHEELER. Only 2 minutes.

Mr. BALL. Very well.

Mr. WHEELER. I should like to have the opportunity of asking the Senator from New Mexico what would be his mood under certain conditions arising as the result of the war, but I do not wish to take time of the junior Senator from Minnesota. However, at a future date, and I hope before Congress takes a recess, I shall answer some of the statements which have been made on the floor

of the Senate by the Senator from New Mexico.

THE DUMBARTON OAKS CONFERENCE

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, it is my purpose to comment on the Dumbarton Oaks Conference. In that conference responsible representatives of the United States, Britain, Russia, and China are trying to hammer out agreements on the basic principles of a world security organization to maintain peace after this war. It is the same general international organization which was envisaged in the Atlantic Charter, the Moscow Agreement, and the Fulbright and Connally resolutions.

Frankly I had hoped that this sort of debate, while this momentous conference was in progress, might have been avoided. It was my conviction, and that of some of my colleagues, that the time for the Senate and the House and the people of America to have made clear and specific their position on the principles of such an organization was many months, even years, ago, and not at the very last moment after international discussions were well under way. Because of that belief I, with other Senators, submitted the so-called B_2H_2 resolution a year ago last March. We discussed the resolution in completely nonpartisan fashion at public meetings throughout the Nation. Later we sought to amend the Connally resolution to make its meaning clearer and more specific. However, the Senate decided otherwise, and the language of the Connally resolution as passed last November is quite general.

As a result the position which the United States Senate will take when the basic instrument for a world security organization is presented to it for ratification remains one of the biggest question marks confronting the statesmen who are working to draft that instrument. The importance of the Senate's position is being underlined daily by discussions and reports in the press and on the radio of the Dumbarton Oaks Conference. A number of Senators have commented, on and off this floor, on reports of what is being done at Dumbarton Oaks. As a result, certain aspects of the proposed international security organization have become issues here in the Senate and in the Nation before agreements on them have been reached or published. It is to three of those particular aspects that I shall devote my comments today.

One of them is the so-called secrecy surrounding the Dumbarton Oaks Conference. Despite all the charges, if one were to judge by the rather detailed reports appearing in the press and aired on this floor as to what is happening at Dumbarton Oaks, the secrecy seems to be more of fancy than of fact.

Nevertheless, the charge that the American doctrine of open covenants among nations openly arrived at is being violated is a serious one and deserves comment. I interpret open covenants openly arrived at to mean that international agreements or treaties shall be negotiated at times and places announced publicly, and when negotiated shall be published so the whole world knows their contents. The doctrine clearly is aimed primarily at secret treaties between nations, the very existence of which, let alone the terms, is kept from the world and from the peoples concerned.

To term the Dumbarton Oaks Conference a violation of this doctrine and a return to secret diplomacy is unwarranted. If there is anyone in the United States or the world who does not know that the conference is being held, who does not know its specific purposes, and who does not have a very good idea of the type of agreements being reached, it is because he has not bothered to read the newspapers or listen to the radio.

The only way in which the discussions at Dumbarton Oaks could be more in the open would be by having those participating, instead of being diplomats representing sovereign nations, be representatives in the legislature of a world state, conducted as the Senate is conducted, with press, radio, and public galleries. Of course, even then, probably a great deal of the work would be done by committees in executive session, just as it is in this Senate. If any of those who are making such an issue of the Dumbarton Oaks secrecy want to propose that sort of system as an alternative, I can assure them of my sympathetic consideration.

Seriously, the demand that the press and public be invited to listen in on the detailed discussions at Dumbarton Oaks strikes me as not well grounded, growing perhaps out of previous events rather than the present case. I speak as a former newspaperman and as a Senator, from my personal experience in both jobs. Senate committees hold public hearings, but act on legislation—that is, reach some kind of agreement—in secret, executive sessions, from which the press and public are barred. Conference committees of the House and Senate do their work in executive sessions. Why? Because we know that for a majority of 96 Senators and 435 Representatives to reach agreement on any major issue requires inevitably many compromises and adjustments of varying views and convictions. And to require that process—the comments, arguments, and viewpoints expressed during it—to take place in public would make it almost unworkable. Individuals who compromised their views would be involved in endless explanations as to why they yielded, and the very human reluctance to change one's mind in public would add to the difficulties. That situation is greatly intensified in a conference such as that at Dumbarton Oaks, because there national prides and prejudices are involved. Having once taken a strong position on any particular issue, American, British, Russian, or Chinese representatives might find it impossible later on to recede and compromise because of probable political repercussions back home.

I will grant that Members of the Congress, particularly Members of the Senate, are in a somewhat different position from the general public because we eventually must either share or repudiate responsibilty for what is agreed upon by our Government at Dumbarton Oaks.

However, I want to pay tribute to Secretary of State Cordell Hull for his untiring efforts both to lift this issue out of partisan politics, in which Governor Dewey happily has joined, and to consult with and keep Congress informed regarding our Government's position. All Senators know of his constant meetings during the past year or more with a bipartisan subcommittee of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. I know from personal experience that his door is always open to Senators seeking information on foreign policy, because I have many times availed myself of the opportunity to discuss with him American foreign policy and to get answers to specific questions bothering me. I believe, Mr. President, that any Senator seeking information can get it from Secretary Hull if the Secretary possesses the answers.

Mr. President, the second aspect of the Dumbarton Oaks discussion on which I wish to comment is the demand in some quarters that any final action on establishing a world security organization be postponed until after final peace terms are agreed upon. It is coupled, either directly or by implication, with the threat that the United States will not join in efforts to maintain the peace unless we are convinced that the peace is a just one according to our views.

The fact that there are probably 96 different ideas in the United States Senate alone as to what would constitute a just peace which we might agree to underwrite would make that requirement an impossible one for any peace organization to meet. Viewed in the light of history, the Versailles Treaty probably was one of the fairest and mildest peace treaties ever imposed by victors on vanquished. In spite of some mistakes and injustices, it gave the peoples of Europe, as distinguished from their rulers, the best break in history. Yet it was bitterly attacked on the floor of the Senate, and its alleged injustices were one reason we refused to join the League of Nations.

One Senator might demand independence for India as an essential to a just peace. Another might require restoration of all pre-Nazi boundaries in Europe. And still another might view as unjust any peace settlement that failed to provide for United States ownership of scores of military bases throughout the world. Many of us will be inclined to disapprove any substantial failure to apply in the peace settlements the principles of the Atlantic Charter, which in the main are the same as Woodrow Wilson's Fourteen Points. Already there are literally scores of different viewpoints in this country as to what should be done about policing Germany and Japan after the war, about reparations, trial of war criminals and other issues that will arise, to say nothing of the economic and social problems that will face the peace makers.

I cite these points only to indicate the basis for my own conviction that the chances of the peace terms being even reasonably satisfactory to all or even a majority of Americans are very remote. In World War No. 1, a relatively small area of the world was affected; civilian

life, except in Belgium and parts of France, was not greatly disturbed. Yet the hates and fears engendered by that war played major roles in the settlements finally reached at Versailles, and their influence in the main was bad. In this war, the fighting is taking place all over the globe, whole peoples have been enslaved, brutality has reached new and undreamed of depths, and the repercussions on the daily lives of hundreds of millions of people are terrific. Hate, anger, and fear, many times more intense than in 1919, will again sit at the peace table.

The primary agreements in that peace must be hammered out between four great powers, each with its own interests, its own attitudes and goals, and, in addition, the demands of many other peoples must and will be considered before final decisions are made. The United States will not dictate the peace terms. Neither will Russia nor Britain. And in the process of compromise and adjustment, it is inevitable that many agreements will be made which we of America will not like. Probably they will be completely satisfactory to no one, as is usually the case with compromises. While I have confidence in the high purpose of our own Government and those of our allies, I frankly believe that many decisions we might consider mistakes or unjustified departure from principle inevitably will be made.

I believe that a world security organization offering effective means for peaceful change and adjustment of international frictions is our best means of correcting such mistakes at the earliest possible date and correcting them by peaceful procedures and not by war.

But let us assume that we dislike the peace terms intensely. Are we then justified in turning our backs on the world and deciding that we will assume no responsibility for stopping future attempts at aggression, leaving nations no alternative except old-fashioned diplomacy, power politics, or war to adjust their differences? I think not. All of us are agreed that wars, and certainly modern wars, always create more problems than they ever solve. I believe most of us are agreed that another great war will spell the end of our kind of individualistic society. And most of us are on record, including the two great political parties and their candidates, as being convinced that a general international organization, providing peaceful facilities for change and prohibiting attempts at change by war, is the best answer to this great problem facing civilized man. No one can guarantee its success or its complete justice. No one that I know of has attempted to do so. But it offers the best hope for civilization and no alternative plan has even been proposed seriously. To condition America's joining such an organization on complete acceptance of our views regarding peace terms, assuming we could agree on views, would break every pledge given the people of the United States and the world in the Fulbright and Connally resolutions, the Mackinac declaration, and the platforms of both political parties. We do not have utopia or perfect justice here in the United States. To demand a world utopia as a condition to our participation in an organization created to maintain peace is begging the question and dodging the issue.

It seems to me that fear—fear of nations for their sovereignty, fear of potential aggressors, fear of fatal weakness in case of war—has in the past been one of the greatest forces acting against peace and stability in the world. If, by organizing as soon as possible an effective world security organization, in which nations and peoples can and will have confidence, we can lessen or eliminate the influence of fear psychology at the peace table, we will have done more than any other one thing could accomplish to bring a greater degree of decency and justice into the peace settlements.

Mr. President, the third aspect of the current debate concerning what is being done at Dumbarton Oaks to which I address myself is the question of whether the United States shall pledge itself in advance to do its share to stop future aggressions, by force if necessary, or whether we will insist on a reservation that Congress will decide in each particular instance whether or not we will assume that responsibility.

It is reported—and I do not believe I am revealing any secrets—that under at least one tentative plan being discussed at Dumbarton Oaks, responsibility for action to eliminate threats to world peace would reside in a council of 11 members, 4 representing the United States, Britain, Russia, and China, all having permanent membership, and the other 7 rotating among other nations. Any decision on action, whether imposition of sanctions or use of force against a would-be aggressor, would require a majority vote of the council, which majority would have to include all the permanent members. In other words, any one of the Big Four could veto any action, or any use of its own or other nations' forces by the organization.

Unquestionably, the requirement of unanimity among the Big Four weakens somewhat the effectiveness of the organization. I do not think it is a fatal weakness, because I recognize, as I believe all of us do, that the success of any organization is dependent, for some decades ahead at least, on the continued cooperation of the Big Four. If they fall apart, the organization will fall apart. If one of them decides to embark on world aggression, we will have another world war. So that this provision, in effect, merely recognizes the present-day realities of the world. In any event, should the question of stopping aggression by one of the Big Four ever arise, it would obviously require all-out, total war, and there would be no question whatever about a declaration by Congress, to say nothing of appropriations, being necessary.

The chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, the distinguished Senator from Texas, indicated the other day that after the general international organization has been established, the council will work out and submit to member nations detailed plans as to the quota of force and matériel each will be expected to supply to halt aggression in event of a call for such action by the council.

Ruling out the Big Four, and assuming the complete disarmament of Germany and Japan, on which again there is no disagreement, what sort of aggression is the council likely to have to meet? I think there are only two probable sources for such aggression. One threat would be an attempted rearmament by either of the Axis Nations. The other would be an attempt at aggression by one of the several nations which now have governments with clearly Fascist characteristics and tendencies, governments which may remain in power after the defeat of Germany and Japan. In neither instance would the world council require large forces in the sense in which we use the word today, to handle the situation. The maximum quota of the United States, while it would be large as compared to other nations, undoubtedly would be relatively small even as compared to our peacetime forces, and it would be infinitesimal as compared to those we now have.

The question raised here by several Senators is whether even such a United States quota force should be used to stop aggression at the direction of the council, our representative agreeing, unless Congress had formally declared war.

I cannot see how the Constitutional authority of Congress to declare war is concerned in the slightest. The world security organization would not be making war, but preserving the peace. Its whole purpose is to eliminate war from the world, not make it. It appears to me that either under the general welfare or the national defense clause, the Congress has full constitutional authority, in the light of the world situation today, to provide in advance for whatever world policing is considered necessary to prevent another great war.

More important is what would be the effect of such a reservation by the United States on the purpose and possible success of the international security organization. Many factors are involved in achieving and maintaining world peace and stability. There must be the greatest possible degree of justice, liberty, and equality of economic opportunity among nations and peoples. There must be peaceful procedures for settlement of international disputes—the means whereby the inevitable pressures and frictions in a changing world can be relieved and adjusted before they explode into war. But without minimizing in the least the importance of these other factors, the whole house of world security will tumble down if one essential pillar is missing—a strict international law against military aggression and the means to enforce it.

Occasionally there do come to power in nations international gangsters, who are deaf to all pleas of reason and civilization, determined to achieve their goals by force. They are like our habitual criminals, impossible to rehabilitate, and a constant danger to society until they are caught by the police. The world community must be prepared to deal with

these occasional international criminals when they first show their heads, not after they have grown great and strong on conquest and only a world war can stop them. We have learned to our cost that would-be aggressors are not deterred by adverse world opinion, nor can they be appeased into decency and peace. They respect only one argument, force—force which they know can and will be used to stop their depredations.

The certainty that such a force was available and would be used in case of aggression would, in 9 cases out of 10, make its use unnecessary, just as the relative certainty of capture and punishment keeps many persons from committing crimes. Therefore, it is essential that there be no question about the force being available to do the job. How effective would our laws against murder be if we had no police and courts to enforce them? The decent people would obey them, just as the decent nations lived up to the Kellogg-Briand pact, and the murderers would have a field day.

But what if, as some Senators have demanded, the United States, instead of pledging itself clearly in advance to do its share of world policing, says in effect, "We will do our share, but in each individual case the Congress must declare a war before our forces can move"? If we make that kind of a crippling reservation, so will every other nation reserve the right to decide what it will do in each particular case, and we will have no more certainty of international law enforcement than we had in the twenties and thirties. The international organization will be simply a debating society, with no power to act, and future aggressors will sneer at it just as Hitler sneered at the League of Nations.

As a matter of fact, it is extremely unlikely that Congress would ever declare war unless the United States were attacked or our own vital interests clearly threatened by aggression. Congress and the American people regard a declaration of war, and rightly so, as the gravest step the Nation can take. It is extremely doubtful whether we would take that step to help stop an aggression, perhaps on the other side of the world, which had no direct effect on us. Remember that we entered the present war against aggression only after Japan had attacked us at Pearl Harbor and left us no alternative. Our reluctance to go to war was so great that we overlooked repeated insults to American citizens and the sinking of an American gunboat by Japan, to say nothing of hostile acts by Germany. In view of that record, who would argue that there could be any certainty that the United States would do its share of maintaining peace if a declaration of war by Congress were required before we could join other nations in action?

And I wonder if those advancing this reservation have considered what the situation and problem would be if Congress were not in session when an emergency arose. In normal times, Congress is adjourned about half of the year. Would we require the President to call a special session if an international emergency arose during a recess, and how long would action by Congress take if that were done? And what would the aggressor be doing while we and the international organization delayed action?

But granting for the sake of argument that once undertaking the obligation, Congress was in session and eventually would approve use of our forces in a glaring case of aggression, even though we were not attacked, Mr. President, can anyone who went through the debate prior to Pearl Harbor, who witnessed the depth of America's hatred for war, believe that the necessary declaration of war in such a case, or even a joint resolution authorizing use of our forces, could be passed by Congress in less than a month? There are three individuals in this Senate who could and would stop it for a week at least and we all know it. What then becomes of our pledge? Hitler conquered Poland in 26 days. While Congress debated and other nations waited for us to act, the aggressors would move, their conquests would be made, and the council and we would then face the task of ousting the conqueror instead of stopping his aggression.

Look at it from our own national interest. Suppose there is a clear case of aggression in South America. Obviously, the United States would want it stopped and stopped quickly. If the position on this question taken by some prevails, the United States Congress would have to declare war on the aggressor nation before our forces could act. Under the proposed plan, the international organization would use an international force, of which United States units would be only one of many components, to stop the aggression. There would be no declaration of war, but instead joint international action to preserve peace.

Under which method would we be most likely to retain the good will of our South American neighbors? Senators know the answer. Our individual declaration of war would liquidate the good-neighbor policy overnight, and Congress probably would never make it.

Under one plan, we force each individual nation to declare war in order to preserve peace. Under the other, the world community of nations does a policing job on international outlaws. Which makes better sense and which is most likely to preserve peace?

Mr. President, there seems to be a great fear that the council of the proposed international organization would operate like a great bully, resorting to the use of force indiscriminately and without sufficient justification. I submit that the record of history indicates just the opposite. Responsible leaders of nations, with rare exceptions, have shown the greatest reluctance to resort to force. The League of Nations, for instance, had a terrific time reaching a decision to use even the mild instrument of economic sanctions. There is far greater danger that the council of the proposed organization will be too slow to employ force rather than too hasty.

The Kellogg-Briand pact outlawed war as an instrument of national policy but provided no means of enforcing that international law. It proved to be an empty gesture. The League of Nations left the decision as to whether force would be used to stop aggression up to each individual nation. It also failed. Millions have died because of those failures.

This time let us keep faith with those who are fighting and dying to make this second chance for a lasting peace possible. Let the United States shoulder, without fear or equivocation, its share of the job of maintaining peace in the world.

Finally, Mr. President, may I humbly plead with my colleagues and the people of America not to judge hastily, not to make irrevocable decisions before the issue is actually before us.

None can tell how many millions of lives yet unborn hang on the decisions we and others with similar responsibilities make in the next few months and years. The robot bombs, the rocket guns, and the superfortresses afford us a slight glimpse of the horror of destruction that will visit this earth in World War No. 3 if it happens.

Both Governor Dewey and Secretary Hull have emphasized that the structure of peace and the machinery to maintain it cannot and will not be the work of any one man or any single nation. Many individuals and many nations must contribute. The inevitable corrollary to that approach to this great task is that neither can any individual or nation insist on his or its formula being accepted before putting his shoulder to the wheel.

The agreements being hammered out at Dumbarton Oaks may be far from what I would like had I the chance to write them. But I have had my say long ago. I have exerted whatever small influence I might, and now I shall support the best agreements which can be reached.

Mr. President, it seems to me that for any individual, and particularly one with the responsibility of a United States Senator in this matter, to burn his bridges behind him, to make the flat statement that unless such and such a formula is adopted, he will be unalterably opposed to United States participation in a world security organization, is to grossly distort the major question at issue.

The great question at issue is whether the United States shall reverse the decision it made in 1919 and this time join a world organization having the authority and the force necessary to outlaw aggressive war. Let us not permit some fancied encroachment on the prerogatives of Congress to distract our attention from that major question, Should the United States help preserve peace? It is on the main issue, and not the secondary questions, that we must answer to our own consciences and to posterity. The peace of the world and of these United States, for generations to come, may depend on our answer.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield before he takes his seat?

Mr. BALL. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. The Senator made a statement in closing which prompts me to ask a question. The Senator stated that no one man and no one nation

could build the structure of peace. In substance those were his words. With those words I am in complete agreement. The point I wish to emphasize is this: While no one man and no one nation can build the structure of peace, I ask the Senator from Minnesota whether our Nation can destroy any possible hope of a peace to be built in the future?

Mr. BALL. As I stated a few moments ago, I believe that the whole structure of peace rests on the foundation of continued cooperation among the four great powers which will emerge from this war, namely, the United States, Great Britain, Russia, and China. If any one of those drops out, in my opinion the whole structure will collapse.

Mr. HATCH. To bring the point a little closer to home, is it not entirely possible that a very few men—one-third of the membership of this body plus one—can destroy any hope of peace for the world in the future?

Mr. BALL. Obviously, I think it is possible. I intend to do what I can to prevent it.

Mr. HATCH. Of course, the Senator understands that I was merely trying to emphasize those things of which he has so eloquently and ably spoken, and to bring home to us in this body again the responsibilities which rest upon the shoulders of each and every one of us.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I agree with much of what the Senator from Minnesota has said; but I do not agree that we can make a treaty of peace on the basis of any territorial or national settlement which may be made.

I was somewhat concerned when I read last Thursday of the manner in which we seem to be proceeding in making such settlements. I have before me the text of the armistice terms granted to Rumania. It states that it is an armistice or agreement between Rumania, the U. S. S. R., the United States of America, and Great Britain. It is said to be signed by authority of the Governments of the U. S. S. R., the United Kingdom, and the United States, by Malinovsky.

The armistice is not a purely military agreement. In fact, it contains a very important territorial decision, because it states that the Allied Governments consider the decision of the Vienna award as nonexistent, and agree that Transylvania, the whole or major part of it, is to be returned to Rumania, which action is to be confirmed in the course of a peaceful settlement.

Below this text, on the same page, is an interview with Secretary Hull, in which he says, according to the New York Times reporter:

> Secretary of State Cordell Hull reserved comment today on the terms of the armistice with Rumania pending study. Some time will be required for the study in view of the length of the terms. They were not received from the American Embassy in Moscow until late in the day.

I presume that Mr. Malinovsky acted under the authority of Averill Harriman, the American Minister to Russia. Apparently we have agreed that Rumania is to have Transylvania, without the Secretary of State even knowing what the terms of the Rumanian armistice are. That seems to me to be an extraordinary situation, and one which is not calculated to encourage us to believe that we can reach a generally satisfactory agreement on matters dealing with the peace.

I do not know whether Transylvania ought to be attached to Hungary or Rumania, and I do not intend to express any opinion on that subject; but certainly it is an important question. The nationality of that area should be settled in such a way that in the future peace is more likely to occur than war in the Balkans and in the Hungarian plain. It seems to me that the idea that we can proceed with territorial settlements while the Secretary of State does not even know what is being done, is an extraordinary condition which threatens the success of any peace settlement into which we may enter.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks the text of the armistice with Rumania and the interview with Secretary Hull, from the New York Times of Thursday, September 14, 1944.

There being no objection, the matters referred to were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TEXT OF ARMISTICE TERMS GRANTED TO RUMANIA

The Government and High Command of Rumania, recognizing the fact of Rumania's defeat in the war against the Soviet Union, the United Kingdom, the United States, and other United Nations, accepts the terms of armistice presented by the governments of the above-mentioned three Allied Powers, acting in the interests of all the United Nations.

On the basis of the afore-mentioned, the represented of the Allied [Soviet] High Command, Marshal of the Soviet Union Malinovsky, duly authorized by the Governments of the Soviet Union, the United Kingdom, and the United States, acting in the interests of all the United Nations, on one side, and representatives of the Government and High Command of Rumania, Minister of State and Justice Patrascanu, the Deputy Minister of the Interior and aide de camp to His Majesty the King of Rumania, General Damacianu, and Mr. Stirbey and Mr. Popp—on the other side, empowered with the authority, have signed the following terms:

1. From 4 p. m., August 24, 1944, Rumania has completely ceased military operations against the U. S. S. R. in all theaters of war, ceased war against the Allied Nations, broken relations with Germany and her satellites, entered the war and will wage war on the side of the Allied Powers against Germany and Hungary with the aim of restoring her independence and sovereignty, for which purpose she will put in the field not fewer than 12 infantry divisions, with relative replenishments. Military operations of the Rumanian armed forces, including the navy and the air force, against Germany and Hungary will be conducted under the general direction of the Allied [Soviet] High Command.

TO INTERN ENEMY CIVILIANS

2. The Government and the High Command of Rumania undertake to carry out measures for disarmament and internment of the armed forces of Germany and Hungary who are on Rumanian territory and also for the internment of civilians of both above-mentioned powers who are living there. (See appendix to par. 2.)

3. The Government and the High Command of Rumania will insure for Soviet and other allied troops means of free movement on Rumanian territory in any direction should this be required by military conditions. In doing so the Government and the High Command of Rumania will provide every kind of assistance to this movement by their means of communication at their own expense, on land, on sea and in the air. (See appendix to par. 3.)

4. The state frontier between the U. S. S. R. and Rumania established by the Soviet-Rumanian agreement of June 28, 1940, is restored.

5. The Government and the High Command of Rumania will at once hand over to the Allied [Soviet] High Command for repatriation all Soviet and Allied prisoners of war whom they are holding, as well as internees and citizens who have been taken to Rumania by force. From the moment of the signing of the present terms and until their repatriation, the Government and the High Command of Rumania undertake to supply at their own expense to all Soviet and Allied prisoners of war, as well as citizens who had been carried away by force and interned persons who had been transferred and refugees, sufficient food, clothing, and medical attention in accordance with health requirements, as well as with means of transport for repatriation of all these persons.

6. The Rumanian Government will liberate at once all persons, independently of their civil status and nationality, who are kept under arrest owing to their activity to the advantage of the United Nations or for their sympathy with the cause of the United Nations, or owing to their racial origin, and will also abolish all discriminatory legislation and restrictions resulting therefrom.

7. The Government and the High Command of Rumania undertake to deliver as booty at the disposal of the Allied [Soviet] Command all military equipment on Rumanian territory belonging to Germany and her satellites, including vessels of the fleets of Germany and her satellites that are in Rumanian waters.

ALIEN PROPERTY CONTROLLED

8. The Government of Rumania and the High Command undertake not to permit the export or expropriation of any sort of property, including valuables and currency belonging to Germany and Hungary or to their citizens or persons living on their territory, or on territories occupied by them, without permission of the Allied [Soviet] High Command. They will keep this property according to rules established by the Allied [Soviet] High Command.

9. The Government and the High Command of Rumania undertake to hand over to the Allied [Soviet] High Command all ships that belong or belonged to the United Nations and that are lying in Rumanian ports, without regard to the fact at whose disposal these ships are destined for use by the Allied [Soviet] High Command for the duration of the war against Germany and Hungary in the common interests of the Allies, with subsequent restitution of these ships to their owners. The Rumanian Government bears full material responsibility for all damage to or destruction of the above-mentioned property until the moment of handing it over to the Allied [Soviet] High Command.

10. The Rumanian Government will be obliged to pay regularly sums of money in Rumanian currency required by the Allied [Soviet] High Command in order to carry out its functions and will also secure in case of need use on Rumanian territory of industrial and transport enterprises, means of communication, power stations, public-utility enterprises and institutions, stocks of fuel, food products, and other materials, and personal services in accordance with instructions issued by the Allied [Soviet] High Command. Rumanian merchant ships that are either in Rumanian or in foreign waters are subject to operative control of the Allied [Soviet] High Command for their use in the

common interests of the Allies. (See appendix to par. 10.)

REPARATION PAYMENTS SET

11. Damages caused to the Soviet Union by military operations and occupation of Soviet territory by Rumania will be compensated by Rumania to the Soviet Union. Considering that Rumania has not merely withdrawn from the war, but has declared war and is in fact waging it against Germany and Hungary, the contracting parties agree that compensation for the above-mentioned damages shall not be paid by Rumania in full, but only in part, namely, in the sum of 300,000,000 American dollars, to be paid in the course of 6 years in kind, in oil products, grain, timber, sea and river ships, various machine equipment, and similar products. Rumania will compensate damages caused to property of other Allied countries and to their citizens in Rumania during the war and the sum of compensation will be established later. (See appendix to par. 11.)

12. The Government of Rumania undertakes to return intact to the Soviet High Command all valuable articles and materials that had been removed from its territory during the war and that belong to state, public and cooperative organizations, enterprises, offices, or individual citizens, such as equipment of factories and works, locomotives, railway carriages, tractors, motor vehicles, historic monuments, museum pieces, and all other goods.

13. The Government of Rumania undertakes to reestablish all lawful rights and interests of the Allied Nations and their citizens on Rumanian territory as they existed before the war and also to return intact their property.

14. The Government and the High Command of Rumania undertake to collaborate with the Allied [Soviet] High Command in the task of detention of persons accused of war crimes and in trial of such persons.

15. The Rumanian Government undertakes immediately to disband all pro-Hitlerite political, military, militarized and other organizations of Fascist type on Rumanian territory who are conducting propaganda hostile to the Allied Nations, in particular to the Soviet Union, and not to tolerate the existence of such organizations in the future.

16. Publication, import, and distribution in Rumania of periodical and nonperiodical literature, production of theater plays and films, and the work of the radio stations, of the post, telegraph, and telephone are to be carried out in accordance with an agreement with the Allied [Soviet] High Command. (See appendix to par. 16.)

CONTROL BODY SET UP

17. Rumanian civil administration is being reestablished in the whole zone of Rumania not less than 50 to 100 kilometers from the front line according to respective conditions of the terrain. Rumanian administrative bodies undertake to carry out, in the interest of reestablishment of peace and security, instructions and directives of the Allied [Soviet] High Command given to them in order to insure realization of the present terms of armistice.

18. An Allied control commission will be set up that, up to the time of conclusion of peace, will assume the regulating and control of the execution of the present terms under the general guidance of, and according to instructions of, the Allied [Soviet] High Command, acting on behalf of the Allied powers. (See appendix to par. 18.)

19. The Allied Governments consider the decision of the Vienna award as nonexistent and agree that Transylvania, the whole or major part of it, is to be returned to Rumania, which is to be confirmed in the course of a peaceful settlement. In this connection the Soviet Government agrees that Soviet troops should take part for this purpose, together with Rumania, in military operations against Germany and Hungary.

20. The present terms come into force from the moment of their signature.

Made in Moscow in four copies, each of them in the Russian, English, and Rumanian languages, the texts in Russian and English languages being authentic, on September 12, 1944.

Signed by the authority of the Governments of the U. S. S. R., the United Kingdom, and the United States: Malinovsky. Signed by the authority of the Government and the High Command of Rumania: Lucretiu, Patrascanu, Damaceanu, Stirbey, Popp.

APPENDEXES

Appendix to paragraph 2: Measures laid down in paragraph 2 concerning internment of German and Hungarian citizens on Rumanian territory are not to apply to citizens of these countries of Jewish nationality.

Appendix to paragraph 3: Assistance to be afforded by the Rumanian Government and the Rumanian High Command mentioned in paragraph 3 is to be interpreted as placing at the disposal of the Allied [Soviet] High Command, to be used at its discretion for the period of the armistice, of all those Rumanian Army, air force, and naval installations, and facilities—ports, harbors, barracks, stores, airdromes, means of communication, and meteorological stations—in perfect order and with personnel that may be needed for military purposes.

Appendix to paragraph 10: The Rumanian Government is to withdraw from circulation and to redeem all currency on Rumanian territory issued by the Allied [Soviet] High Command within the time limits and on the terms to be fixed by the Allied [Soviet] High Command and is to hand over currency withdrawn in such manner to the Allied [Soviet] High Command without any compensation.

Appendix to paragraph 11: Calculation of payment of the compensation fixed in paragraph 11 of the present agreement is to be based on the American dollar at its gold parity on the day of the signing of this agreement, viz., $35 equaling 1 ounce of gold.

Appendix to paragraph 16: The Rumanian Government undertakes to insure that radio communications, telegraph and postal correspondence, coded correspondence, and messenger service, as well as telephone communications with abroad of embassies, legations, and consulates in Rumania will be carried out in a manner to be laid down by the Allied [Soviet] High Command.

Appendix to paragraph 18: The Allied Central Control Commission that is to be set up in conformity with paragraph 18 of the armistice agreement is to be entrusted with control of the exact execution of the armistice conditions. Rumanian Government authorities are obliged to carry out all instructions issued by the Allied Control Commission having their origin in the armistice agreement.

The Allied Control Commission will set up special bodies or sections and entrust them respectively with the discharge of various functions. In addition, the Allied Control Commission may station its officers in various parts of Rumania. The Allied Control Commission will have as its residence the town of Bucharest.

Moscow, *September 12, 1944.*

HULL RESERVES COMMENT

WASHINGTON, September 13.—Secretary of State Cordell Hull reserved comment today on the terms of the armistice with Rumania pending study. Some time will be required for the study in view of the length of the terms. They were not received from the American Embassy in Moscow until late in the day.

LOSS OF LIFE ON AMERICAN RAILROADS

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks a statement which I gave to the press today, with reference to some of the wrecks which have occurred recently on American railroads. I call attention to this matter because I feel that the railroads of the country ought to adopt certain safety devices which they have not adopted, and that the Interstate Commerce Commission should take a more active part in compelling certain railroads to adopt safety devices which they have not adopted.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

In the early morning, five days ago, many soldiers of the Army Air Forces as well as civilians and railroad employees were killed or seriously injured in a train wreck near Terre Haute, Ind. This was one of a long series of preventable wrecks. Safety devices have long been available to the railroads. In this particular case, the wreck is particularly tragic. These were very precious lives. These men had faced death on many missions against the enemies of our Nation. The Army sent them back to this country either to freshen them up for further missions against the enemy, or else to utilize their peerless experience and skills in fields where they could be of the greatest use in winning the war. And while traveling, in accordance with this Army plan, in our land, they were killed because our railroad systems have not adequately installed available safety devices.

Every year we have similar loss of life on the railroads. Small railroads and big railroads, weak railroads and strong railroads contribute to this unnecessary death toll. Nor is there any indication that the directors of our railroads are ready to change their policies. Meetings of those directors should have been called on the day on which the news was flashed that these aviators had been killed.

Railroad boards of directors ought to call special meetings at once to authorize the placing of contracts and, where necessary, the raising of funds for installing these safety devices. The railroad managements should bend every effort to get delivery of these devices as soon as the lifting of wartime priorities permits.

The railroads should be made to understand that if they do not act within a specified number of days, then the Government will act. Twenty-four years ago Congress empowered the Interstate Commerce Commission to command the railroads to install safety devices. The Commission has very largely left the matter to the companies. Sharp disagreement with this attitude of inaction was expressed by a distinguished member of the Commission, the late Joseph B. Eastman, 8 years after Congress had given the Commission the power to act. He said he would give the railroads just 6 months to submit definite plans to the Commission. That was 16 years ago. Since then the Commission's attitude has not sufficiently changed for the better.

The Commission should now quickly ascertain whether the railroads are going to place the contracts for these safety devices, how soon this will be done, and whether this time they will move in dead earnest. If the Commission does not take such steps, if it does not awaken from its long lethargy,

then it may become necessary to repeat action taken against inadequate commissions in the past.

Employees and managements have loyally, and with devotion to the public and to the Nation, contributed to the transportation system all the efficiency obtainable from human beings They, like the traveling public, are entitled to all the safety now and long since obtainable from science and invention.

I appreciate the difficulties which the railroads have been under during the war. They have done an excellent job in handling traffic under great difficulties.

RECEPTION OF HOMECOMING SERVICEMEN

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, before the war is over, more than one-tenth of our population will have seen service in the armed forces of this country. This one-tenth is the cream of the crop. They will be coming home soon. For them homecoming is what they are all talking about, praying about, and dreaming about. While they have been fighting our battles we had it relatively easy here at home. Sometimes I think that many of us have no conception of what these fighting sons of ours have been undergoing. They have been living in a different world from us, but all the time the matter of coming home has been the big thing in their lives. They will be changed in many ways. For all their suffering and sacrifice, Mr. President, for all they have done and accomplished, they are entitled to a square deal from us at home.

In This Week of September 17 there appeared an article giving some very worth-while suggestions to us stay-at-homers as to how we should act "when he comes home." It is an article by Arthur Bartlett, which all of us can read with profit. He lays down four guideposts for you and for me to follow:

First. Be appreciative; show it; live it.

Second. Be natural and take a natural interest in the experiences of our boys. Let them tell about them when they feel like talking, but do not make a maudlin fuss over them.

Third. Be patient; this calls for a great deal of tact, patience, and understanding.

Fourth. Work for him. He has given up a year or two or three. He may have been forced to give up his career; others who have stayed at home have hit the jackpot, even snatched his girl and cleaned up on the war. Help him get on his feet so he will be a soldier in civil life as he was on the battle front.

In a word, we at home must make sure that their homecoming is a real reunion, in terms of simple family relationships. There will be chatterers and demagogues ready to capitalize on the disappointments of these boys, offering them something "just as good" in the form of special-interest blocs, the haves versus the have nots.

I ask unanimous consent that the entire article be printed in the RECORD following my remarks. I recommend the earnest consideration of this article by all Americans.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHEN HE COMES HOME

(By Arthur Bartlett)

HIS READJUSTMENTS WILL BE TOUGH—BUT YOU CAN HELP

They called me a war correspondent. They let me wear a uniform and go places where the war was going on. They let me live and talk with the men who were doing the fighting, and even, on occasion, go into combat with them. Then they let me have the greatest privilege of all: They let me come home.

That is when my Army friends over there really envied me. "You lucky so-and-so," they said. "Boy, wish I were going with you. How about stowing me away in your baggage?"

Going home! That is what they dream about. No matter where you find American soldiers, no matter what they are doing, the one unfailing common denominator is the urge to get on with the job, get it done, and get home. Thinking about it and talking about it, they have built up homecoming in their minds to a point where it compares, roughly, with entering into Paradise.

I wonder if it is going to work out that way? It can—or it can be a terrific let-down. Which it will be, depends on whether or not we can make those men feel, as they come home, that they are at home, among their own people, and not among strangers.

NEW LINE-UP

The war has divided us into two groups, a new line-up of "haves" and "have-nots"—those who have shared actual war experience and those who have not. At home we have taken the war seriously; we have done our war jobs and put up with the difficulties of wartime living; we have read about war and seen pictures of it. But something has happened to your men who have actually gone to war—something that just doesn't happen to people at home. In Britain, blitzed and bombed by robots, civilians have had to share the experience. They will understand their men better as they come home than we will. Yet our men are coming home with a deep faith that they will be understood—that you will think as they think and feel as they feel.

It is not going to be easy to live up to that faith.

When I got out of the Army airplane that brought me back from the European theater of operations I was handed some mimeographed instructions. They warned, particularly, against talking like a big shot. A sergeant, back from combat, looked up and grinned as he read his copy. "That's a laugh," he said. "Who wants to be a big shot? All I want is a chocolate ice cream soda."

Together we made our way to the nearest soda fountain. The girl behind the counter glanced at the sergeant's service ribbons. "Home from the war, eh?"

The sergeant nodded. "And mighty glad to be back," he answered.

"Yes," said the girl, "I'll bet it will seem good to do something useful again."

HOMECOMING TURNS SOUR

The sergeant's face grew red, and I thought he was going to choke. But the girl didn't notice. She turned, and tossed the sergeant a friendly smile as we left, though he was glowering at her.

"Something useful!" he repeated disgustedly as we walked away. "I suppose she thinks this war was just a pastime."

I tried to kid him. "I thought you didn't want to be a big shot."

"I don't," he snapped. "But if people back here think * * *." He let the sentence go, and just shook his head. His homecoming was already turning sour.

Rule No. 1 for the soldier's homecoming: Be appreciative. Those men have lived the war, 24 hours a day, 7 days a week. Fighting, working, sleeping, playing, the war has always been there, the whole reason for existence, the one thing so overpowering in its importance that comfort, pleasure, profit, even life itself could not be considered as items of relative weight. When they come home they are coming with the deepest sort of conviction that they have been in on the making of history so momentous that everything else that has happened in the meantime is trivial. They take that for granted; they assume that you do, too.

Rule No. 2: Be natural. Don't make a maudlin fuss over the returning serviceman. On the other hand, take a natural interest in their experiences; let them tell you about them when they feel like talking.

They don't want to be big shots. They don't want to play hero. Shortly after I arrived home I met a young friend of mine who had served 2 years with the marines in the South Pacific. He had just received his discharge and was in civilian clothes again. "If I'd had to wear that uniform another day," he told me, "I'd have gone nuts. People made me feel like a one-man parade. They gushed, and gooed, and made speeches at me. Even my draft board, when I notified them of my new status, talked like a bunch of Fourth of July orators. People wouldn't let me take my share of the checks. An old lady insisted on holding a door open for me, instead of letting me hold it for her, because I had 'been through so much.' It all made me feel so self-conscious that I got the jitters. I felt as if there were a conspiracy to keep me from doing the one thing I wanted—which was to get back to being myself in normal, ordinary life."

Rule No. 3: Be patient. I have talked since my return with psychologists in the office of the Surgeon General of the Army and with officers and counselors at the separation center at Fort Dix. What the average returning serviceman wants, they seem to agree, is the kind of harmonious life, in the kind of peaceful surroundings, among the kind of understanding people he has been dreaming about. But that is a large order—too large, undoubtedly, in all but the most exceptional cases. Even if we do our best to make his homecoming satisfactory, he is going to have disillusionments and disappointments, and will have to readjust some of his ideas and habits of thought. That is going to call for a lot of tact, patience, and understanding.

COP VERSUS MARINE

A few weeks ago in Washington a marine, back from the South Pacific, started to cross a street against the lights. The policeman on the post blew his whistle. The marine kept going. The cop yelled, ordering him back. The marine refused angrily. No doubt the whole idea of having his safety protected while crossing a street seemed silly to him after having crossed those South Pacific beaches; no doubt, too, he felt he had earned his freedom of action. When the cop, merely doing his duty, tried to enforce his command, the marine reacted as he would have done in the jungle—only this was an American policeman he was pushing around, not a Jap. The marine won and the cop went to the hospital; but it doesn't take much profound thinking to see what that kind of brawling could do to our reunion with the servicemen.

Obviously, they must meet us halfway. But they will have expert guidance along these lines. In the separation centers, the hospitals, or wherever they get their discharges, experts in all phases of civilian life will counsel them. It will be impressed on them that in the time they have been away, they have grown older, they have lived a different kind of life, they have seen things and done things which few of the rest of us have seen or done. All this has changed them, and they will be given the best possible advice about how to make allowances for that.

MAKE ALLOWANCES

But we—those to whom they are returning—must make allowances, too. We must remember that not only have they changed, but so have we. We must realize that they probably have built up an idealized picture of what we are like, what our homes and our communities and our ways of life are like. "Absence not only makes the heart grow fonder," one Army psychologist put it, "but it makes the mental image grow more vague and beautiful. The soldier from some little crossroads town, for example, may remember it as something pretty grand; but when he gets back, perhaps after seeing Rome, it is likely to look strangely unimpressive. And his girl friend may not look quite as glamorous as he remembers she used to be, either."

It will take time to find out just how the war has affected your men, and it will take time for them to get reacquainted with home. Give them—and yourself—the time that is needed before saying or doing anything that might raise an issue

Rule No. 4: Work for him. Remember he's given a year, 2 years, 3 years of his life. He's been forced to give up a career, a good job. He'll come back and find friends who have hit the jackpot, snatched his girl, cleaned up on the war. He'll be resentful. It's up to us to help correct the balance. You must fight to get him set again—see that his career picks up and goes on. On the other hand, you must see to it that the pendulum doesn't swing too far. Help him get on his feet but also help him battle against the "gimme" spirit; the idea that the world—the civilian world—owes him a living.

BE GENEROUS WITH HIM

Concretely, what can you do? Your responsibility doesn't end with a "glad to see you" welcome-home speech. It means you have to take off your coat and go to work. Maybe it means digging down into your pockets for a loan to start a serviceman in business. Maybe it means taking time out to discover or open up a job for him. Maybe it means letting him know that he can come to you to talk out his troubles and get the kind of advice he needs to reintegrate himself in civilian life.

Whether you're a boss, a union leader, a shopkeeper, or just a next-door neighbor, you can go to work. We must be generous with our time, our money, our sympathy. Then the problem of 11,000,000 men fades into the simple, everyday problem of giving a boost to the kid next door.

I saw those kids next door in action. They risked their lives with as much seeming casualness as if they were going to work in an office or factory. I will never forget the way the members of the flying crews whooped on D-day when Col. Gerald Williams told them they were going on the invasion bombing mission over Cherbourg—the way Joe Kelly picked up the briefing forms and began shouting, "Scorecards! Scorecards! You can't tell the plays or the players without a scorecard." As Capt. "Doc" Parsley said to me in the midst of the hubbub, "You'd think they didn't know what it's all about, wouldn't you—if you didn't know better?"

DON'T BE FOOLED

Soon they'll be coming home—Joe Kelly and millions like him. They are still going to be casual. They are going to be kidding and wisecracking and joking. But don't let it fool you. They will still be fully aware of what they have been doing. And they will be hurt to the point of bitterness if the folks at home fail to show due appreciation—not with brass bands but with the warmth of understanding.

I have heard a lot of discussion, since I got back, about helping the 11,000,000 readjust themselves to civilian life, about absorbing them into our domestic economy, about getting them jobs. But first of all, I submit, we must make sure that their homecoming is a real reunion, in terms of simple human relationships. Be appreciative. Be natural. Be patient. And work for them. Otherwise, you can be sure, there will be agitators and demagogues ready to capitalize on their disappointment, offering them "something just as good" in the form of special-interest blocs: The "haves" versus the "have nots."

And that isn't what they have been fighting for at all.

AMERICA'S PART IN MAINTAINING PEACE AND SECURITY

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, I wish to thank the distinguished junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL] for the statements he has just made in the Senate. It has been my privilege to be associated with him in the past in undertakings along this same line. I am happy to join with him at this time in order that we in the Senate may work together in establishing a just and lasting peace.

I rise at this time to comment upon what I conceive to be America's part in maintaining peace and security.

The Senate has a serious obligation to share substantially in determining the foreign policy of the United States as expressed in its treaties. The time is near when the Senate will deliberate further on a treaty to establish the general international organization to maintain international peace and security, the necessity for which this Senate recognized unequivocally on November 5, 1943.

In the hope of contributing to the correct analysis of certain issues which then will face the Senate, I present this preliminary comment on three material subjects.

They are: First, the term "International armed force"; second, the occasions when the United States should join in the enforcement of international obligations by the use of international armed force; and third, the relative positions of our President, the Senate, and the House of Representatives in authorizing the United States to join in the use of international armed force.

ABOVE PARTISANSHIP, PERSONALITIES, AND PREJUDICES

Before discussing these subjects, I wish to emphasize with all the force and seriousness at my command, first, the necessity that the Senate lift its discussion of them above partisanship, personalities, and prejudices; and, second, the necessity that the President and the Senate shall find their way to genuine agreement, in the best interests of the United States, upon some clear-cut policy that will include the establishment of that general international organization to maintain international peace and security, the necessity for which this Senate recognized last November, by a vote of 85 to 5.

One reason why it is absolutely necessary to lift this discussion above partisanship is that whatever treaty is made will require, under our Constitution, the consent of two-thirds of the Senators present, and it is obvious that neither now nor then will two-thirds of the Members of this Senate belong to the same party. If the voting follows party lines, the treaty will fail, no matter how good it may be and no matter which party supports it, because although it received the approval of the majority of the Senate, it would not receive the required votes of two-thirds of the Senators present.

Equally clear, if two-thirds of the Senators are to agree on this treaty, aside from partisan issues, it is essential that every other avoidable ground of disagreement be removed. There must be no basis of partisanship, personality, or prejudice to divert a single vote from the real merits of the issue. The natural and genuine disagreements among men seeking any common purpose threaten the possibility of taking any constructive step in a new field of grave importance if the vote must be over two to one, as is here required. To emphasize this, Mr. President, it is only necessary to recall that if the two-thirds rule had been in effect in the conventions which ratified the Constitution of the United States, the Constitution would have failed of ratification in 6 of the original 13 States, where it received a majority vote but failed to receive the favorable votes of two-thirds of those present.

Finally, it is a sacred obligation of this Senate to reach an agreement upon a policy which shall make the greatest possibi contribution that man can make toward establishing and maintaining a just and lasting peace when once the war has been won. The action or inaction of the Senate on this issue will be its primary contribution to the peace or the wars of the future. The opportunity for this action is being won by the men and women of America and of the world at the price of their very lives. "It is for us the living * * * to be dedicated here to the unfinished work which they who fought (this war) have thus far so nobly advanced."

Our objective and the objective of those who will have won this war is a just and lasting peace among ourselves and with all nations. This objective has been assigned by the people of the United States to this Senate. If we fail to so unite our efforts, direct our attack, and drive ourselves forward as to gain this objective, we will have failed to do our share in this sacred cause, and there is no possible excuse for such a failure.

On the other hand, if we do so unite our efforts, direct our attack, and drive ourselves forward that we shall gain a just and lasting peace, then, and only then, shall we have done our share for our brothers, our forefathers, and our children's children.

By day and by night the common man throughout the world for centuries has been seeking hopefully for justice, peace, and good will. For hundreds of years he has prayed that the will of God be done on earth as it is in heaven. Today, at the price of the lives of millions of young, brave men and women and of untold human suffering, the opportunity to translate this faith into the foundations of future peace rests in part on the desks of the United States Senate. Accordingly, in the discharge of this high trust

to God and man, there must be no touch of partisanship, personalities, or prejudices. It is in this spirit that I urge the study now of the issues I shall present.

In the same spirit, I urge upon us the necessity of our reaching an agreement not only among ourselves but between ourselves and the President. Our affirmative obligation to reach such an agreement, establishing the foundation for a just and lasting peace worthy of the price paid for it, is just as strong as is the negative obligation to lay aside partisanship, personalities, and prejudices in the consideration of it. Following the thought recently expressed by General Marshall, let me say that we have been winning the war as members of the United Nations team, the greatest the world has ever known, and it now remains for us to develop a correspondingly orderly procedure to resolve the conflicting peacetime interests of our respective nations in a manner that will be worthy of the teamwork of our fighting forces.

I turn now to the three subjects which I have selected from the many that present themselves. They are: first, the term: "international armed force"; second, the occasions when the United States should join in the enforcement of international obligations by the use of international armed force; and third, the relative positions of our President, Senate, and House of Representatives in authorizing the United States to join in the use of international armed force.

If two-thirds of this Senate agree on these issues, we shall have gone far toward our objective. I believe there is ample room and good reason for agreement on these issues within the policy declared in the Senate resolution of November 5, 1943, within the Constitution of the United States, and within the scope of the conference now being held at Dumbarton Oaks in this city, insofar as the scope of that conference has been made known to the public. In this discussion, I shall be concrete, rather than general. Accordingly, I take as my text the one official statement which has been made by the Senate on this all-important issue of post-war peace and stability. This statement was carefully considered, thoroughly debated, and approved on November 5, 1943, by far more than two-thirds of the entire membership of the Senate. It says:

> That the Senate recognizes the necessity of there being established at the earliest practicable date a general international organization, based on the principle of the sovereign equality of all peace-loving states, and open to membership by all such states, large and small, for the maintenance of international peace and security.
>
> That, pursuant to the Constitution of the United States, any treaty made to effect the purposes of his resolution, on behalf of the Government of the United States with any other nation or any association of nations, shall be made only by and with the advice and consent of the Senate of the United States, provided two-thirds of the Senators present concur.

I. INTERNATIONAL ARMED FORCE

I use the term "international armed force" in place of the term "international police force" because the latter has been given many special meanings which are misleading and quite unnecessary for carrying out the policy of the Senate resolution. As the resolution recognizes the necessity for the establishment of a general international organization for the maintenance of international peace and security, it is obvious that under some circumstances force will be needed to resist attacks upon the peace and security of the world, just as force is needed under other circumstances to resist attacks upon the local peace and security of any community.

I believe, therefore, that the use of armed force to enforce international obligations is essential to the durability of those obligations. On the one hand, I believe that many means of applying such armed force to such a purpose would be unwise and impracticable. On the other hand, I believe that some means of applying such armed force on a basis of international cooperation can be found which will be practical, and which will enable the peace-loving nations of the world, large and small, to go far toward maintaining the international peace and security of the world. It is our responsibility in the Senate to discover, define, and develop those means.

To discover such means, we will do well to use the simplest common sense. On the day of the unconditional surrender of the enemy either in Europe or in the Far East, within the effective area of the surrender, there admittedly will be military peace and security insofar as it can be secured by international armed force. It will have been secured by the cooperation of the armed forces of the United Nations. We do not need to go further for a demonstration of the most successful type of international armed force in all history. The armed force of the United Nations, on that day in that area, will have defeated the greatest attack upon international peace and security that has occurred in the history of the world, or is likely to occur for many years to come.

Therefore, when and where such surrender has come there will be in actual operation an effective international armed force fully capable, from a military point of view, of maintaining for the moment, at least, international peace and security. It will be the cooperating armed force of the respective United Nations working together. It wil be the undisputed championship team, and the best way to retain any championship is to retain the membership of the championship team intact and in condition. Our problem, therefore, will not be to find something strange or to create something new. Our problem will be to retain what we have but to cut down its size to the greatly reduced needs resulting from the unconditional surrender of practically the only militarily powerful states in the world which are not already members of the team.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HATCH in the chair). Does the Senator from Ohio yield to the Senator from Florida?

Mr. BURTON. I yield.

Mr. PEPPER. I do not know whether I correctly understood the able Senator from Ohio, but I thought he said that it was a good idea to keep a championship team intact. Does he mean by his statement that he will join us in November in supporting the President?

Mr. BURTON. We need a new pitcher. [Laughter.] I was speaking of a team of nations. We need to keep those nations together, but there is a point at which a team member sometimes becomes old and quarrelsome.

Mr. BARKLEY. In quotations.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BURTON. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator means that it is not well to use the same pitcher four times in a row.

Mr. WILEY. Not if he has lost his pitch.

Mr. BURTON. That is it.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Ohio yield to the Senator from Michigan?

Mr. BURTON. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. Does not the Senator believe a wrong impression is created when persons speak of a team? The Senator was referring to the United States of America, not one individual man. The team consists of the fighting forces of America, and America is comprised of the whole of its population, not merely one man.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Ohio yield to the Senator from Florida?

Mr. BURTON. I should prefer to proceed, if I may, unless what the Senator from Florida wishes to say is material to the issue which I am discussing.

Mr. PEPPER. I was merely somewhat amazed at the able Senator from Michigan who seemed to be contemplating a body without a head, a nation without a leader, and an army without a commander in chief.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, this international armed force of the United Nations is in fact a team of nations themselves. If we can keep those nations together it will not be difficult to keep their armed forces, facilities, and bases coordinated in time of peace as well as in time of war. But if these nations separate, then their forces separate with them and the team is destroyed.

On the other hand, to think of a separate international police force in the sense of an international gestapo policing the streets of the world and concerned with the internal affairs of each nation, is preposterous. It is precisely the type of dictatorial regimentation against which our armed forces have fought, and which must be destroyed if freedom is to survive.

Likewise, to conceive of an international police force even in the sense of a single united military force, with a new common uniform and a new common flag, responsible only to a new international organization, separated from its

member nations, is equally unnecessary and unsound.

The impossibility of such a single international police force is obvious in a military sense. Today substantial military power is not made up merely of men marching in common uniform. It is made up largely of sources of petroleum, steel, and aluminum, supported by manufacturing plants and food-producing farms, and supplemented by ships, airplanes, landing fields, and countless forms of weapons and ammunition. Today an international armed force is much more than a group of soldiers. It is a group of nations. If, therefore, we separate the soldiers from their sources of food, clothing, equipment, and transportation, they soon become ineffective. At the same time the natural sources of food and supplies without the cooperating soldiers, would be ready booty for the first international bandit to discover them.

The problem of finding a successful working model of an international armed force suited to the needs of our time is, therefore, really no problem at all. We have that model close at hand in the armed forces of the United Nations if we but make proper use of our opportunity to adapt and reduce those forces to the lesser needs of peace.

In this adaptation of this international armed force lies an important part of the secret of the economic recovery of the world. That recovery can come within America and within other nations, if, but only if, there is peace and security in the world and also reasonable assurance of continuing peace and security in the world for a number of years to come. It is only then that nations can afford to recall their men from military to civilian pursuits, and convert their materials and products from miltary to civilian uses. It is because the recognized championship team remains ready and able to preserve the peace that the world will not hesitate to return to that constructive program of productive economy that is essential to its own salvation. It is because of the known existence of this friendly force that each allied nation will feel free to reduce its own forces to its own peacetime needs.

The international armed force, by thus continuing its reduced but recognized power, thus becomes the protector of peace against lawlessness, while at the same time releasing from military duties the very men upon whose peacetime productivity the economic recovery of the world will depend.

America's fair contribution to such a force is readily understandable by America. The contribution of each nation to such a force is simply a contribution, on a reduced scale, of what it is now contributing. All nations joining the general international organization to maintain international peace and security will readily find a way to make an appropriate contribution. Materials, equipment, food, bases, rights of passage, funds, and men can all be put to appropriate uses in appropriate places.

Such a force would not conflict with the local forces maintained by each nation to insure its own domestic tranquillity or even to provide for its reasonable national defense. The existence of such a force and the opportunity for its use will help the respective nations to reduce the size of their independent forces required for their common defense.

Having thus conceived of a practical and understandable kind of cooperating and well-distributed international armed force, with which we already are familiar and which we already are using on a scale far greater than any that is likely to be used again, we should consider occasions for its use.

II. OCCASIONS WHEN THE UNITED STATES SHOULD JOIN IN THE ENFORCEMENT OF INTERNATIONAL OBLIGATIONS BY THE USE OF INTERNATIONAL ARMED FORCE

I do not here discuss the internal constitutional procedure which will decide which agencies within our own Government shall authorize us to join in the use of such force. I here assume that whatever action is to be taken on our behalf will be taken only by constitutionally authorized procedure and I shall discuss that purely domestic question of procedure under my third and final heading.

The issue here presented is that of determining when the United States, after receiving appropriate authorization from its duly constituted authorities, should join in the enforcement of international obligations by the use of international armed force, of the type and kind previously discussed, including its own contribution to such force.

I use the term "international obligations" in a broad sense, including international agreements between one or more nations to which we shall be a party and also including obligations to which we shall have subjected ourselves through acceptance of a rule of general international law. For the sake of simplicity in presenting a concrete issue, I shall first limit my discussion to such international obligations as shall be included in the treaty of peace with our present enemies or in the terms of unconditional surrender which we shall impose upon them.

This class of obligations presents not only the clearest but also the most practical and the most important example of an occasion when the United States should join in the enforcement of an international obligation through the use of international armed force.

Unconditional surrender does not mean the absence of terms to be observed by the enemy. It means the absence of conditions dictated by the vanquished, while it expressly contemplates the imposition of terms dictated by the victors.

The United States will assist in the dictation of these terms. The terms will be such as the combatant allies shall have agreed upon. They may appear in military orders, or in an armistice, or subsequently in a treaty of peace duly ratified by appropriate constitutional authorities. These terms of surrender and these obligations imposed upon the enemy will provide clearly appropriate occasions for their enforcement by the use of the very same international armed force that originally helped to impose them.

The United States, appropriately, will welcome international cooperation not only in securing the victory and imposing the terms of peace, but also in the enforcement of those terms in the interests of the Allied victors.

The enforcement of such terms is easily distinguishable from other terms. In the sense that peace is the absence of war, it is these terms that define and protect that peace. Our enforcing officers are peace officers and our acts of enforcement are acts to preserve and keep the peace rather than new acts of war. The military terms of the peace are a natural and integral part of the conduct of the war and the consolidation of the victory gained.

ENFORCEMENT OF TREATY OF PEACE

To be more specific, one obvious term of the surrender is bound to be the disarmament of the Axis nations and the continued prohibition of their rearmament. The agencies of inspection and enforcement of this term of the peace will be an exercise of the police power of the United Nations through the armed forces of the respective nations acting with the same unity and coordination as in war. This use of them will be essential to the maintenance of international peace and security. I believe that such a term of the peace and such a use of international armed force to enforce it would be entitled to receive and would receive substantially as unanimous support in the Senate as does the conduct of the war itself.

Recognizing the world-wide character of the present war, the enforcement of these terms of disarmament upon the enemies of the United Nations will mean, for practical purposes, the automatic maintenance of the general international peace and security of the world as a whole, as long as the United Nations shall remain united and at peace with each other.

In this enforcement of the terms of surrender and the treaty of peace with our enemies, we face something which can be separated from all other international obligations. The policy involved in the enforcement of these terms with whatever force may be necessary is inherent in our determination to wage this war to complete and lasting victory in both hemispheres. This policy has long had the substantially unanimous approval of our Nation. To whatever extent the terms of surrender or of the treaty of peace are formally approved by the executive and legislative branches of our Government they will thus receive further confirmation of their validity. The enforcement of these terms, I believe, Mr. President, will be administrative in character. They will not present a need for new authorization of the use of our military forces, either independently or in conjunction with others, to enforce them.

It is important, then, that we appreciate the high practical value of this feature of the problem. If the terms of surrender and of the treaty of peace are implemented in such a way as to secure assurance of their enforcement, it will mean from a military point of

view, the international peace and security of the world will have been temporarily attained. Due to the scope of the present war, the United Nations are now fighting practically all the nations of the world that are not members of or associated with the United Nations and that have any reasonable likelihood of developing into a threat to the peace of the world in the present generation. Accordingly, if the United Nations and their associates shall remain united and at peace with one another, the enforcement of the terms of the peace against our enemy nations will overcome, from a military standpoint, what may be said to represent 80 to 90 percent of the threat to the peace of the world from military sources.

The successful enforcement of these terms will so far promote the chances of peace in the world that, whatever else shall or shall not be done, we should make sure to take this step and to do all that is possible to assure the unity of the United Nations and of their associates in their joint enforcement of these terms of the peace.

We must not, however, overlook the remaining 20 to 10 percent of military risk that will remain. Also we must not overlook the many economic, social, and political elements in the world that may lead to war from new causes, unless those causes are by other means brought under control.

It is not my purpose to discuss these economic, social, or political dangers of the future except to suggest that much can be done to overcome them and that a general international organization to maintain international peace and security will naturally seek to guard against such dangers as well as against purely military dangers.

While the enforcement of these terms of surrender or of the peace treaty will rest in the first instance with the principal combatant powers that shall have won the victory, it will be natural to extend the responsibility for the continued enforcement of the peace and the continued security of the world over the broadest possible base. It will be natural to extend it to the general international organization, including in its membership all the peace-loving nations large and small. In the event that the general international organization is thus brought into being and made to provide an added mechanism for the enforcement of the terms of peace against our enemies, it will become an agency of great international value. It will afford a new means for maintaining that unity among the United Nations which is the all-important formula for the continuing peace of the world.

Because of the importance of the enforcement of the terms of the peace to all of the nations of the world and because of the importance of the establishment of a general international organization to provide some flexible means of meeting the economic, social, and political problems of the future, it will be well worth all the effort of establishing the general international organization if, in fact, the only commitment it shall impose upon us for the use of international armed force shall be limited to the enforcement of the terms of the peace against the Axis Nations.

USE OF FORCE AGAINST FUTURE AGGRESSORS

It, however, is appropriate also to consider whether it is not wise and beneficial from the very beginning of the general international organization to include certain other occasions where international armed force appropriately might be applied by us. There are at least two extensions of this policy which I wish to present. One is the use of such force against future international aggressors, whoever and wherever they may be; and the other is the use of such force to enforce all settlements and decisions of the various agencies of the general international organization, reached within their respective jurisdictions.

In both of these cases, the use of force might be extended too far or the mechanism for applying it might be so loosely organized as to be detrimental rather than beneficial to the interests of the United States. Our problem, Mr. President, therefore, is to find such a definition of the occasions and such a means of adjusting the authority to make use of the force, that it shall be definitely beneficial to the interests of the United States. Our Nation has thriven upon a system of checks and balances which, while not perfect, has contributed tremendously to the general peace, prosperity, and freedom of the people of the United States. I am hopeful that we shall find it possible to extend the powers of the general international organization to the forceful resistance of properly defined aggression in such a manner that doing so shall be beneficial to the cause of peace. We, as well as other nations, may well find it advantageous to contribute our armed forces, under the definitions and limitations of a proper plan to prevent aggression in certain cases.

The definition should be simple and broad. Aggression might perhaps be defined as the employment of military force by any state within another state without the permission of that state and without the authorization of the general international organization. Aggression under those circumstances presumably would be unlawful military aggression of the kind which must be stopped in the interests of the peace and security of the world.

Assuming that some such definition might be developed, it then becomes equally important to produce a mechanism for authorizing joint international action. This involves questions of representation and authority within the general international organization. Without attempting to go into detail, there seems to me to be merit in the ingenious combination of representation and of veto power which is reported to have been discussed at the Dumbarton Oaks Conference.

Accordingly, for purposes of illustration, I shall assume that the general international organization shall consist, for policy-making purposes, primarily of an assembly including all peace-loving states, large and small, and of an executive council consisting of 11 states.

I shall further assume that 4 of the 11 states on the executive council shall be permanent members of it. These would be the United States of America, Great Britain, Russia, and China. At an early date France might be added to the 4. I shall assume also that the remaining 7 shall be chosen from other members of the assembly for terms of 1 or more years. Discretion probably will dictate that these temporary representatives shall serve for overlapping terms, generally shall not succeed themselves, and shall be so distributed geographically that they will roughly represent all parts of the world.

I shall further assume that on any issue of aggression the alleged aggressor state shall have no vote. Then, in order to authorize joint use of force through the general international organization, there must be a majority assent among the voting states and such majority must include all of the permanent members—exclusive of the alleged aggressor, if one of them be such alleged aggressor.

In this class of cases we are not dealing with the enforcement of the terms of the treaty of peace against the Axis nations as a mere matter of automatic administrative enforcement. In this class of cases we are dealing with new aggression presumably arising on the part of one of the hitherto friendly or neutral states. In order that the peace of the world be maintained, it is important that such aggression be checked promptly. Undoubtedly the state against which the aggression is directed will in any event and on its own account resist the aggression as it would have a right to do.

The question is, under what circumstances should the international armed force, consisting of the cooperating armed forces of one or more of the member nations, be called to its support? Individual states in the immediate region of the attack might join in the resistance to it on their own account apart from the action of any international armed force. It might be that the aggression would amount to a direct or indirect threat to the peace of the whole world. On the other hand there might be some confusion as to who in fact was the aggressor, because it is rare that the attacker will not have some theory of action in self-defense. To bring the international armed force into action will require competent decision by some one.

The plan proposed would provide that the concurrence of the four permament members of the council would not be enough. There must be at least two of the temporary members also in agreement with the policy. On the other hand, no one of the four permanent members could be forced into the joint use of its armed forces in a world effort without its own consent. This would provide a conservative check in the case, for example, of the United States. It would mean that we could not be forced into military action without our own consent, and the important internal questions would be who should decide whether or not our consent would be

given. This domestic issue I shall consider later. It, of course, will be determined primarily by the terms of our own Constitution.

Practically every man in our armed forces, if given the chance, would today insist that some plan of action be provided so that the United Nations of tomorrow, including the United States, could promptly and effectively extinguish the next threat of world war at an early, instead of a late, stage of conflagration. The proposed plan suggests a way that permits us to decide for ourselves whether or not to use it at the time. It is a combination of checks and balances that recommends itself to Americans who believe in the maintenance of peace, and strengthens our hands when using it.

USE OF FORCE TO ENFORCE INTERNATIONAL DECISIONS

Another extension of the application of force through the general international organization might be the use of international armed force to enforce settlements or decisions made by some of the agencies of that organization. The definition of the obligation and the mechanism for its enforcement again would be of primary importance.

If such use were limited to the enforcement of decisions of an international court of justice dealing solely with justiciable questions, there probably would be as good reason for so using force as there is for using a sheriff to enforce the decisions of our local courts. On the other hand, if such use were to extend to enforcement of decisions of policy of a social or economic nature, it might carry with it more threat of war than promise of peace. Accordingly, here again, the mechanism of consent might well be so adjusted as to vary with the nature of the obligation to be enforced.

The United States might accept the decisions of an international court of justice on justiciable questions as final authority and might regard the use of force for their enforcement as quite distinguishable from acts of war. However, in going beyond this limited field of justiciable cases, it might be well, as a matter of policy, and under the Constitution of the United States it might be necessary as a matter of law, to reserve to the United States and the other permanent members of the council the right of veto of the use of force. This would preserve to the United States the right to determine through its own constitutional processes whether in the specific instance it would join in the enforcement effort.

In considering any extensions of the use of international armed force beyond the enforcement of the terms of peace upon our present enemies, we should keep the thought clearly before us that the establishment of a general international organization which will enable us to secure the benefits of international armed force in the enforcement of those terms of peace and enable us to secure international cooperation in meeting many economic, social, and political issues of the future, will be of such substantial value to the United States and to the world that no controversial issues should be allowed to interfere with our attaining at least that limited and justifiable goal.

III. THE PRESIDENT, SENATE, AND CONGRESS

Finally, my third subject is that of the relative positions of the President, Senate, and Congress of the United States in authorizing the participation of the United States in the enforcement of international obligations by the use of international armed force.

This subject is of vital importance to the United States, and the answer to it is in the Constitution of the United States. The representative of the United States on the general international organization executive council presumably would be an appointee of the President and appointed with the advice and consent of the Senate. The language of the Constitution probably is sufficient to require this, and certainly the importance of the appointment is such as to make the confirmation by the Senate essential to the appropriate relations between him, the President, and the Senate.

As between the President, including his appointee on the general international organization executive council, and the Congress or the Senate, the lines of authority are drawn by the Constitution. They cannot be enlarged or reconstructed by statute or by treaty.

Accordingly, when an issue is presented to the United States, either through its representative in the executive council of the general international organization or otherwise, and that issue is one which, in the reasonable discretion of the President, calls for use of our armed forces in providing for the common defense of the United States, he has the constitutional power and obligation to meet that issue directly. Neither his power nor his responsibility can be taken from him by statute or by treaty.

For example, if the United States is attacked or if other nations are attacked in a manner which, in the reasonable discretion of the President, seriously threatens the peace and security of this Nation the President has the responsibility of providing for the common defense against such attacks, be they immediate or remote, and in spite of any limitations or reservations which Congress or the Senate, or any Presidential predecessor, may have attempted to place upon his constitutional power and responsibility. He is the constitutional guardian of the safety of the Nation and of its interests. He is under obligation to provide for the common defense with all the means available to him. This power is inherent in his office.

This means that in the case of international aggression directly attacking the United States or its possessions, the answer would be simple, and the use of our own armed forces would be necessary and obvious, regardless of the action of the international armed force.

We might, however, well welcome the help of an international armed force in our own defense, and it is for such cases that such force is provided.

On the other hand, if the act of aggression were not directly upon the United States or its possessions, the authority of the President to act without a declaration of war by Congress would be no greater with a treaty than without a treaty. Congress and Congress alone has the right to declare war; and if the action to be taken would amount to a declaration of war, our representative on the executive council of the general international organization would require such a congressional declaration in order for him to vote to permit the use of our armed forces if his vote were to bind the United States.

As a practical matter, however, it has been our experience, particularly in more recent years, that Congress has recognized an already existing state of war rather than has declared war in the first instance. Conditions in the future may take on the same character as they have in the past. The issues will be as easy or as difficult to identify in the future as they have been in the past. If an overt act of aggression takes place anywhere in the world it may well be such an act that the executive council of the general international organization will quickly recognize it as a threat to the peace of the whole world and will seek to act promptly in defense of the world against it.

It is for such a case that each of the permanent members of the council is enabled to exercise a veto over the use of a joint international armed force, as distinguished from individually operated armed forces. In the case of the United States, if the President became convinced, in his reasonable discretion, that his use of our armed forces was necessary to provide for the common defense of our Nation, he would have the same constitutional authority so to use them with or without action of the general international organization. I regard, therefore, the authority of the President to use our independent forces in defense of this Nation as falling under the same constitutional authority as his right to use our forces jointly with the forces of an international armed force. He has the constitutional authority to use our forces either with or without allies.

Accordingly, insofar as our own internal relationships, between the President, the Senate, and the Congress, are concerned they remain as the Constitution has fixed them regardless of the general international organization.

Then, so long as the general international organization provides only for automatic enforcement of the terms of the surrender or the peace treaty, it adds nothing to the danger of our position but improves the teamwork of the world in enforcing the terms of the peace.

Insofar as the general international organization shall reach beyond the terms of the surrender or of the treaty of peace, into fields of new aggression threatening the peace of the world or otherwise, the general international organization again does not carry with it the right to use our armed forces against our veto of their use. The organization treaty cannot increase the power of the President to take us in or the right of Congress to keep us out of war. It may change the mechanism of international negotiations; it may reduce the occasions

for war; but it cannot change the division of powers between the President and the Congress.

In effect, therefore, the general international organization should help the United Nations to continue their wartime teamwork in the enforcement of the terms of the treaty of peace. It should also clarify the procedure to be followed in the case of new threats to the peace and security of the world. It will help to provide us with allies, and it will continue our teamwork with our allies. It may well include much procedure, and some declarations of policy that will be helpful in preventing future wars. It should not deprive us of our legal right of discretion to enter or stay out of a new war. The type of the circumstances under which our President or our Congress may be called upon to act may thus be changed so as to reduce the likelihood of war, but the dividing line between their respective jurisdictions will remain as determined by the Constitution.

The general international organization should contribute greatly to the elimination of causes of war by improving the mechanism for overcoming economic, social, political, and military friction. The general international organization, within the scope of the Senate commitment of November 5, 1943, is capable, therefore, of being a substantial factor in securing a just and lasting peace, although neither it nor any other mechanism can provide an absolute guaranty of that peace. The only guaranty of peace lies within the mind, the heart, and the soul of man. Peace can be assured only in the same proportion that the leadership of God is recognized, justice is secured, and the spirit of the Golden Rule is practiced among nations and among men.

Our obligation, Mr. President, to those who are winning the war is to see to it that we eliminate partisanship, personalities, and prejudices from our consideration of the issues, and that we develop a constructive policy of self-respecting teamwork in our international relations which shall be worthy of the opportunity which those who have given their lives have provided for us in order that this Nation and the world might live. In the phrases of Lincoln:

> It is rather for us to be here dedicated to the great task remaining before us—that from these honored dead we take increased devotion to that cause for which they * * * gave the last full measure of devotion—that we here highly resolve that these dead shall not have died in vain—and that this Nation [and this world], under God, shall have a new birth of freedom.

PART-TIME EMPLOYEES OF COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC LANDS AND SURVEYS

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, there is a matter which I approach with a little chagrin. However, inasmuch as the statements I made the other day were made publicly on the floor of the Senate, I think that today I should likewise make just as publicly the explanation of a matter which I shall now discuss.

On Friday, as I recall, in debate on the floor of the Senate with the distinguished senior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] and the distinguished junior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY], I rather vehemently, in my position as chairman of the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys, said that that committee has not borrowed, has not utilized, and has not employed the services of anyone from the executive branch of Government. I think I emphasized the statement rather strongly.

Mr. President, I am sure Senators will not take it amiss if I alibi just a little. In making those remarks I was referring to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys, the general committee, of which I am chairman. That committee as such has never, to my knowledge, employed or utilized the services of anyone from the executive branch of Government. But, Mr. President, I overlooked the fact that there are subcommittees of that committee. After I had made those rather vehement declarations—and I made them very positively; there was no doubt in my own mind about the matter at all—in fact, the next day I was told, "Why, Senator, there is a subcommittee of the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys, headed by the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], which perhaps has utilized the services of employees from the executive branch of Government."

I immediately consulted the Senator from Nevada and he said, "Certainly; my committee was authorized by a special resolution of the Senate. It was also specifically authorized to utilize services of employees of the executive branch of the Government."

I said, "I wish you would give me a report showing their names." He has furnished me with such a report and today I submit it to the Senate as showing the names of employees now serving the subcommittee of the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys, who were borrowed from the executive branch of the Government. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the body of the RECORD at this point.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CHAVEZ in the chair). Is there objection?

There being no objection, the report was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC LANDS AND SURVEYS,
September 19, 1944.

To the Senate:

The above-mentioned committee hereby submits the following report showing the name of persons employed by the committee who are not full-time employees of the Senate or of the committee for the month of ———, in compliance with the terms of Senate Resolution No. 319, agreed to August 23, 1944:

[See attached memorandum.]

CARL A. HATCH, *Chairman.*

Memo from Senator MCCARRAN, chairman, subcommittee, Public Lands and Surveys Committee, to investigate public lands

To Senator CARL HATCH, chairman, Committee on Public Lands and Surveys, United States Senate:

Those detailed from Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, to assist with work of above subcommittee, are:

E. S. Haskell, senior administrative officer, Forest Service, CAF–12; basic salary, $5,000 per year.

Elizabeth Heckman, clerk, CAF–5; base salary, $2,000 per year.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HATCH. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I wish to thank the distinguished Senator from New Mexico for his statement which he has given. He has been very fair about the matter and I appreciate his explanation. I accept it 100 percent. I join in asking that the report be printed in the body of the RECORD, and I also ask unanimous consent that future reports coming to the Senate be printed in the body of the RECORD.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, the Senator's resolution calls for monthly reports. I never have liked that because it causes too much bookkeeping. However, I wish to present a unanimous consent request that so far as the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys is concerned it shall be relieved from the duty of making any monthly reports, upon the assurance that if the condition changes at any time, a report will be submitted to the Senate. So long as the situation remains as it now is, the effect of my request would include the committee of which the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN] is a member.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, as I now understand the situation, the Senator from Nebraska has asked that all such reports made in the future be printed in the body of the RECORD. I think it would be rather unusual, although I am not at all certain about it, to grant such authority running into the indefinite future. I think it would be much sounder practice, as the reports come in in each instance, to have them incorporated in the body of the RECORD, because it might well be that as time goes on there will be less interest in the publication of the reports. On the one hand, we have the request of the Senator from Nebraska that all such reports be printed in the RECORD, and, on the other hand, we are confronted with the request of the Senator from New Mexico that the reports from his committee be not included. Is not that the situation?

Mr. HATCH. Oh, no; my request is simply this: A report has been made for my committee, and I am quite sure that the report will not be changed in several months. I merely ask that the report stand, that it be printed in the body of the RECORD from month to month as it is presented, or even if it be presented from day to day. But if a change takes place at any time the change will be reported to the Senate.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HATCH. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I do not wish to be unfair or impatient. I ask the Senator from New Mexico if he will withdraw his request and give me time in which to see if we can compile what I should like to have compiled out of the records in the form of a monthly

report. If not, I should like to have them furnished, and we will make a study of them. I will agree with the Senator from New Mexico that if he will permit me to do that, I will see that it is done.

Mr. HATCH. As I have already said, my objection was based merely on the physical work and bookkeeping which would be involved, and I wished to avoid it. I shall certainly be glad to confer with the Senator from Nebraska and ascertain if something cannot be worked out which will correct a situation which has become general.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the Senator.

Mr. HATCH. With that in mind, Mr. President, I withdraw my request, but I think I may renew it tomorrow or on some other day.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the request of the Senator from Nebraska is agreed to.

THE HOG PRICE SITUATION

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, I am informed that certain provisions of the Stabilization Act of 1944 are being considered in connection with changes in price levels for livestock and livestock products. In that connection let me say that some months ago the Congress passed and the President signed the Stabilization Extension Act of 1944. Section 3 of that act directs the President of the United States to take all lawful action to assure that the farm producer receives not less than parity or the highest price of the first 9 months of 1942, whichever is higher.

The language in the bill is very specific. It constitutes a mandate to the President and his assistants.

Now let us examine what is in prospect for the hog producer. It is asserted that on October 1 the support price for hogs, which has been at $13.75 a hundred, basis, Chicago, will be lowered to $12.50. Then let us see if a support price of $12 50 would give the farmer the equivalent of the highest price received during the first 9 months of 1942, as required by the Stabilization Extension Act of 1944.

The United States Department of Agriculture reports that hogs sold for $15.40 in September of 1942, and under the law the President must take all lawful action to assure the producer of hogs that price.

I have been informed that the War Food Administration, realizing that the $12.50 flat floor will be unfair to hog producers, is recommending to the Office of Price Administration that the packers be compelled to pay an average of $13.75 drove cost, under penalty of reducing the packer's subsidy in the amount that the average drove price is below the $13.75 level. I understand that they are also recommending a flat ceiling price of $14.75. However, it is reported that the Office of Price Administration is fighting against raising the present ceiling of $14 on heavyweight hogs.

I wish to commend Judge Marvin Jones and the War Food Administration for taking this reported stand in favor of an average drove cost of $13.75 and in favor of a flat ceiling at $14.75. War Food Administration does not go as far as some of us feel that equity to the hog producer requires, but at least it has gone a long way toward giving farmers a better break than they would have received if the flat floor of $12.50 were to be put into effect without any other cushion, such as the requirement that the packers pay an average drove cost of $13.75.

Let us look at this matter realistically. All calculations with respect to hog prices are based on what is known as the corn-hog ratio. The corn-hog ratio is the number of bushels of corn, or its equivalent, required to produce 100 pounds of pork. Using the Department of Agriculture's own figures, Midwest pork producers over a 20-year period have produced 100 pounds of pork on the average from 12.9 bushels of corn. Now it is true that under extremely favorable conditions, such as the State agricultural experiment stations are able to create in test demonstrations, they have been able to produce 100 pounds of pork from 12 bushels of corn, or its equivalent, from 11 bushels of corn, and even from 10 bushels of corn. However, everyone knows that optimum conditions simply cannot be created on all the farms or even on all the best farms which are producing pork in the Corn Belt. The low corn-hog ratio attained under experimental conditions is an ideal to shoot at, but it is silly to use it as a basis for establishing prices for hogs that must be produced under widely varying conditions and at great variation in expense.

Furthermore, any farmer will tell you that when he suddenly increases his pork production as much as 25 percent or even 50 percent, as many farmers have done during the past few years, the added production is achieved at unusually high cost. It cannot be otherwise. The farmer must buy additional equipment or he must use beyond its capacity the equipment which he already has, and he assumes added risk when he attempts to care for 30 sows at farrowing time when his manpower is normally able to take care of only 20 sows. Losses at farrowing time are invariably greater when a sudden increase in production is attempted. The disease and parasite problems are intensified at a mathematical ratio.

Now let us see where we arrive by using a 13 to 1 ratio in calculating the price that farmers should receive for their hog production of this year. Bear in mind that the 13 to 1 ratio is practically the same as the 12.9 to 1 ratio which has prevailed over 20 years, on the average, in the Corn Belt. Using the 13 to 1 ratio, the ceiling on hogs should be $16.65, and I submit that the farmers are richly entitled to this price. Instead of $16.65, the farmers are asked to submit to a $14.75 ceiling for hogs weighing 180 to 240 pounds and only $14 for the hogs exceeding 240 pounds. The 13 to 1 ratio would indicate that at present corn prices the average which farmers should receive for all weights of hogs would be $15.20. Compare that with the $13.75 average drove cost which is recommended by the War Food Administration and the $14 ceiling for heavyweight hogs which the Office of Price Administration is insisting on.

I wonder if we in the Senate believe that the hog producers of this country should be given such shabby treatment.

When Government officials begged and pleaded with farmers to increase the production of hogs in order to help save England from starvation, and in order to make it possible to win the war, pork producers responded by performing one of the greatest production feats of the war. They increased pork production even beyond the volume asked by the Secretary of Agriculture. When they came to market the tremendous crop of 1943, they did not receive prices which the Government assured them they would receive if they increased the production of pork. Conditions in the hog market during the period of heavy receipts amounted almost to a national scandal. The Government asked farmers to make their hogs heavy so that more pounds of pork would be available for our armed forces and for our gallant allies. What happened? Countless farmers fed out their hogs to heavyweights and, when the time came to market them, they found their markets embargoed. For weeks thousands of pork producers held their hogs at home because there was no market outlet available, and when finally they were able to market them after prolonged feeding of high-priced corn, they found that the hogs had acquired enough additional weight to put them beyond the weight bracket on which a minimum price was guaranteed, and they took what the market would pay. Furthermore, I am informed on reliable authority that some meat packers deliberately refused to bid on hogs in the support bracket and filled their requirements from lightweight and heavyweight hogs, the prices of which were not supported. In the meantime, the bracket weight hogs were held over in the stockyards day after day, losing weight, many of them dying, and their average quality rapidly deteriorating. How many millions farmers lost as a result of the chaotic conditions in the hog market no one can estimate.

After going through all that, the hog producers are asked now to submit to floor prices which are entirely inadequate and ceiling prices which certainly are unjust to the producer.

I submit that the hog producers of this Nation are entitled to better treatment than they are about to receive at the hands of the Office of Price Administration.

Farmers have done their part magnificently in meeting the food problem, in spite of grossly inept handling of the situation by Government. The administration has gone from one extreme to the other. First they wanted every last pound of pork that could be produced, and they used every device of publicity and exhortation to get farmers to make their hogs heavy. Then they became frightened about the feed situation and demanded lighter hogs. Then they decided that pork production must be reduced, and they slashed the price floor.

In the latter instance, I am certain in my own mind that they have gone too far. The U. S. D. A. crop estimates for

1944 indicate huge crops of wheat and feed grains almost coincidentally with the lowering of the floor price of hogs. I feel sure that drastically curtailed hog production which is now certain for next year will mean huge surpluses of grain and shortages of meat. Thus we go from one extreme to the other, bewildering the farmer and upsetting normal relationships of price and supply. Tampering with long-established forces which tend to keep supply and demand in balance has brought great regional hardships for feeders of all classes of livestock. Experience during the past 2 years should have been enough to convince all the administrators of these programs that economic laws must be handled with careful consideration of realities and not in theory only. If food prices were high in relation to wages, I am sure that farmers would not generally complain; but when the Bureau of Labor Statistics assures us that food was never cheaper, in relation to wages, then I think that the farmers have just cause for complaint.

I am certain that many farmers believe that the entire meat program, with all of its consumer subsidies, roll-backs and rationing, has played into the hands of the meat packers. Packers have been assured of the subsidy on all the pork they handle, provided they pay support prices only on the bracket hogs, namely, those falling within the 180- to 240-pound bracket. We can see clearly how the system worked to the advantage of the packers. They bought non-bracket hogs to fulfill their requirements as nearly as possible, and they let the 180- to 240-pound hogs stay in the pens until they got ready to bid on them. Can anyone blame farmers for their resentment toward that type meat program?

When we examine the substance of the farmers' demands, we find that they are simply asking that the provisions of the Stabilization Act of 1944 be fully carried out. Are we going to take the stand that the law directing the executive department to do certain things is nothing but empty words? Let me call your attention to another provision of the same act. It consists of a new paragraph which was added to section 3 of the Stabilization Act of 1942. It reads as follows:

> On and after the date of the enactment of this paragraph, it shall be unlawful to establish, or maintain, any maximum price for any agricultural commodity or any commodity processed or manufactured in whole or substantial part from any agricultural commodity which will reflect to the producers of such agricultural commodity a price below the highest applicable price standard (applied separately to each major item in the case of products made in whole or major part from cotton or cotton yarn) of this act.

That is the law. You will note that the law specifically states that the taking of any other action which will not reflect to producers the price as set forth in the law is an unlawful action. It is hard to conceive of stronger language than has been used in this paragraph. The intention of Congress is clear. The duty of administering the law in accordance with congressional intention is clear. What are we going to do about it?

DISPOSAL OF GOVERNMENT SURPLUS PROPERTY—CONFERENCE REPORT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5125) to provide for the disposal of surplus Government property and plants, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, several hours ago I sent to the desk a conference report from the Senate Military Affairs Committee on the problem of surplus-property disposal. The conference report was signed by all members of the conference committee. I do not believe that any of us were entirely satisfied with all its provisions, but after nearly 3 weeks of conferences on the subject we found there was only one way in which to arrive at a conference report, and that was for us to give way here and there. In doing so we arrived at a conclusion of our work.

In working out the provisions of the conference report I do not want any Senator to think that we made any trades. Each provision was decided upon its merits, and we did not say, for example, "Very well; we will accept this if you will accept something else." Every issue from beginning to end was determined on the basis of its merits.

The conferees were men of strong convictions. They were determined men. They were men who clung to their position with great tenacity. Three weeks were consumed in meetings from 10 o'clock in the morning until 5:30 in the afternoon; and finally last Friday at 9:30 o'clock in the evening we arrived at an agreement, and all the members of the conference signed the report.

Mr. President, when the bill was before the Senate it was debated at length, and every Senator had an opportunity to take a position with respect to it and say what he had to say. Many amendments were accepted on the floor of both the Senate and the House. The Senate conferees did their best to uphold the position of the Senate with respect to the floor amendments. We met with some success. We lost some of the amendments, but for the most part we were able to prevail upon the conferees to retain the Senate proposals in the conference report. I shall refer briefly to some of the amendments which were offered on the floor of the Senate.

As will be recalled, there was the McKellar amendment, the so-called anti-profiteering amendment. In conference it was considerably modified, but provisions against profiteering have been retained.

There was the Aiken amendment with respect to power lines and rights-of-way. The amendment was retained in the bill in practically the same language in which it was offered upon the floor.

There was the so-called Hayden amendment with respect to returning streets and highways to the original owners. The amendment was retained in the bill practically as it was agreed to on the floor.

There was the so-called Langer amendment which provided for jeeps and trucks to be furnished to farmers. While it was modified considerably, it was also retained in the bill in section 17 on page 9. Representatives of the triple A came to us and said that the language as it was adopted on the floor was not satisfactory inasmuch as it made the triple A a disposal agency, and therefore they asked that the Langer amendment be modified in the form in which the conferees have framed it.

There was also the Ellender amendment with regard to airports and harbors, the Downey amendment with regard to priorities of purchase which were given to the States, their subdivisions and their municipalities, and the La Follette amendment, all of which, or at least modifications of their amendments, will be found in the bill.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator from Colorado yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TUNNELL in the chair). Does the Senator from Colorado yield to the Senator from New Mexico?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. With reference to the La Follette amendment, I understand the junior Senator from Colorado to say that that amendment, which purported to take care of municipalities and either State, county, or district governments, is included in the conference report.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Yes; it is, in substance. I call the Senator's attention to section 13 (a) of the conference report bill.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Colorado yield for a moment, although I do not wish to interrupt the sentence?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. A moment ago the Senator was talking about the disposition of cars. Yesterday my attention was called to a rumor which has been floating around, as do many other rumors, to the effect that, with regard to the disposition of passenger cars, they were to be turned back to some syndicate which would have control of their sale to the public. Because of my absence at the time the bill was under consideration in the Senate, and in the fact that I have been occupied on another conference, respecting another bill, I have not been able to keep in touch with the details of the proposal now being discussed. Is there anything in the bill as reported by the conferees which deals with the disposition of passenger cars as such, or are they separated in any way?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. No; they are not separated in any way.

Mr. BARKLEY. They all come under the general direction of the board, if they are surplus property in the hands of any agency of the Government?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. That is correct.

Mr. BARKLEY. They are to be disposed of under the authority of the board of three?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. That is correct, and the bill does not provide for

turning over anything to syndicates. It contains a provision against monopolies.

Mr. BARKLEY. I should certainly oppose such a provision as I have indicated, and I am satisfied the Senator from Colorado and other Senators would also. It was inconceivable to me that the conferees had brought in a report which carried a provision, or even permission of the law, to turn over perhaps thousands or hundreds of thousands of passenger cars to a syndicate, out of which the syndicate could make profit because they were on the inside. It would be incredible to me that anything such as that could happen, although I heard from a source which I know was sincere in the belief that it was about to happen that large numbers of passenger cars were on the verge of being turned over to a syndicate, or a number of syndicates, to be disposed of by them to the public.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. The antimonopoly provisions of the bill would certainly not permit such a disposal as that, and there is no provision in the bill anywhere which, by any stretch of the imagination, can be interpreted to provide for such a disposal.

Mr. BARKLEY. I appreciate that. It may be merely one of those rumors which circulate around Washington.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Colorado yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I yield to the Senator if he desires to follow up the subject just touched on by the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Precisely. I think it might be well to call to the attention of the Senator from Kentucky, in connection with the report, the provisions of section 27 of the bill as reported by the conferees, which is found on page 17, and is designed to make it utterly impossible for any employee of the Government, or any former employee of the Government, to make any profit from the disposition of any surplus property.

Mr. BARKLEY. This rumor did not involve any employee of the Government.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I am commenting because the Senator referred to insiders. Here is a clear provision intended to make it impossible for insiders of that category to participate in making any profit.

Mr. BARKLEY. I appreciate that, but the rumor related itself more to a suggestion that some outside syndicate, or a number of such syndicates, might be able to get possession of these cars through disposition by the different departments, and in that case, of course, unless the Price Administration should be continued, so as to be able to regulate prices, the public would be at the mercy of such a syndicate which might get any large number of these cars.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. The anti-speculation provisions and the anti-monopoly provisions I am sure will take care of that point.

Mr. AIKEN. Will the Senator from Colorado yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Does the Senator from Vermont wish to discuss the point just raised?

Mr. AIKEN. I wish to ask whether there is anything in the bill as it is now written which would preclude a group with plenty of money getting together and purchasing 5,000 passenger cars, if they were available, and where speculation begins and legitimate purchase and resale leaves off?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I think that sort of procedure would be entirely contrary to the objectives and purposes of the bill. While it does not in so many words prohibit that kind of a transaction, I am sure that the whole spirit of the bill is contrary to such disposition.

Mr. President, I should like to read a paragraph on page 9, section 18, in regard to small business. It reads:

SEC. 18. (a) It shall be the duty of the Board to devise ways and means and prescribe regulations to prevent any discrimination against small business in the disposal and distribution and use of any surplus property.

I might proceed and quote from many other provisions of the bill which would bear out my contention that there is no such provision in the bill.

On page 5, in section 11, paragraph (e), it is prescribed:

(e) The Board shall prescribe regulations necessary to provide, so far as practicable, for uniform and wide public notice concerning surplus property available for sale, and for uniform and adequate time intervals between notice and sale so that all interested purchasers may have a fair opportunity to buy.

Then there are provisions against speculation.

Mr. AIKEN. The board should understand that it is definitely the intent of Congress that they shall not sell to groups of speculators when the sales could be made through the regular channels of trade to retail dealers and other smaller concerns.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Yes. The board is instructed to adhere to the objectives of the bill, which are written into the bill itself.

Mr. AIKEN. Then, if the board sold to speculators, it would clearly violate the intent of Congress?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. That is correct; it would violate the spirit of the act.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President——

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. The Senator from New Mexico has a question in regard to the so-called La Follette amendment.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Will the Senator yield to me for a question?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Certainly.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I notice that on August 25 the La Follette amendment was adopted by the Senate. The amendment is as follows:

The Board may provide, by regulation for reserving for sale or lease to States, political subdivisions thereof, including municipalities, and to tax-supported institutions, such amounts of surplus property as the War Production Board finds necessary to meet their essential needs.

The question is, Is that amendment in the bill now, or is the matter left to the board to decide as an administrative proposition?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. The amendment is not in the bill in that exact language, but it is in the bill in even stronger language than that the Senator has read. Let me quote now from the bill, page 6, section 13 (a):

SEC. 13. (a) The board shall prescribe regulations for the disposition of surplus property to States and their political subdivisions and instrumentalities, and to tax-supported and nonprofit institutions, and shall determine on the basis of need what transfers shall be made.

Then, couple that with the language on page 8, paragraph (f):

(f) The disposal of surplus property under this section to States and political subdivisions and instrumentalities thereof shall be given priority over all other disposals of property provided for in this act except transfers under section 12.

Section 12 pertains to Federal agencies.

Mr. CHAVEZ. That answers the question. I thank the Senator.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. The point was raised on the floor of the Senate, when the La Follette amendment was proposed, that States and their subdivisions, particularly counties and municipalities, had to work on budgets, and therefore they could not bid against business houses which were dealing on a cash basis, and that they would need a little more time. The conferees considered that complaint very carefully, and thought that the language which I have read in section 13 made it possible for States and their subdivisions to make their purchases. They were given priorities, and the board will have to work out the provisions so that the States will have sufficient time in which to act, because we recognize the fact that they are working on budgets and are not in a position to compete with cash dealers and traders.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator answer just one more question?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I will endeavor to do so.

Mr. AIKEN. It would appear to me that the R. E. A. cooperatives have been eliminated from this section of the act. Does the conference committee consider that they are properly covered in section 17, or are they simply eliminated?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Is the Senator from Vermont referring to section 17 or to section 12? Section 12 provides for the utilization of surplus property by Federal agencies, and Federal agencies are given priority in the purchase of surplus property.

Mr. AIKEN. Is the R. E. A. considered to be a Federal agency?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. It is in the Department of Agriculture, and the Department of Agriculture is a Federal agency.

Mr. AIKEN. But each cooperative makes its own purchases. The cooperatives are local cooperatives. They may be advised by the Department of Agriculture or by the R. E. A. Federal agency, but that agency can make no purchases for them or secure any property for them.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. No; they are not given the same status as States and their subdivisions or the Federal Government and its subdivisions, but

under the provision dealing with smaller war plants, the Smaller War Plants Corporation could very well take care of them.

Mr. AIKEN. But the only place that I see where they are covered is in section 17.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. That is correct.

Mr. AIKEN. Where it is provided that they are not to be deprived of the opportunity to purchase surplus property. The provision is:

SEC. 17. The Board shall devise ways and means and prescribe regulations in cooperation with the War Food Administrator providing for the sale of surplus property in such quantities in rural localities and in such manner as will assure farmers and farmers' cooperative associations equal opportunity with others to purchase surplus property.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Yes; and then the proviso that follows.

Mr. AIKEN. But that is the only section of the bill which would carry any reference to the R. E. A. cooperatives, is it not?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Yes.

Mr. AUSTIN. My colleague's amendment is included.

Mr. AIKEN. That amendment applies only to constructed lines. It would not apply to material such as wire or insulators or transformers.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. That is correct. The reference to cooperatives found in section 17 is the only reference to cooperatives in the bill. The difficulty is in selecting between cooperatives. There are a great many cooperatives. Most of them, I presume, are not organized for profit, and yet some of them are. At any rate the conferees left the cooperatives out of the bill, and placed them on the same plane, on the same level, and having the same opportunities, as other business.

Mr. AIKEN. It is assumed though that under section 17 they would be given at least an equal or perhaps a little better chance to purchase the surplus property?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Yes; the farm cooperatives.

Mr. AIKEN. Because that is the purpose of section 17.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Yes. Section 17 pertains to farm cooperatives. That is correct.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator a question?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Yes.

Mr. VANDENBERG. What happened to the amendment which I submitted particularly on behalf of the automotive industry, seeking to instruct the cancelation agencies, so far as practicable, to identify in advance the determination of inventories which are to become surplus at the time of cancelation?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. That is to be found in section 36, page 20.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Does it remain substantially in the bill as submitted by me?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Yes. I do not think the language has been changed very much from that submitted by the Senator.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I should like to ask the Senator one other question while I have his attention?

Referring to the substitution of a three-man administrative head for this organization in place of a one-man head, I noticed an editorial in the Washington Post this morning which said flatly that inasmuch as that ran counter to the recommendations of Mr. Clayton, and inasmuch as Mr. Clayton had said he could not continue to serve under the new relationship—

He—

Mr. Clayton—

was quite right, we think, interpreting the position taken by the Senate as a vote of no confidence in himself.

Mr. President, I happen to be one of those who think Mr. Clayton is a very able Administrator in the position he has occupied. I happen to be one of those who had hoped that Mr. Clayton would continue. I do not subscribe to the "indispensable man" theory in any branch of the Government, but I think Mr. Clayton has demonstrated his unusual availability for this particular assignment. I should like to hear the Senator say, because I am sure it is so, that the action of the Senate, or its conferees, or the conference committee, is in no sense a vote of no confidence in Mr. Clayton; that there is nothing of the sort involved. Is not that true?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I am sure that it is. The letter which Mr. Clayton wrote was with respect to the proposal that there be created a board of four, with a tie vote to be broken by the Director of Mobilization, and also an administrator appointed by the President. Mr. Clayton pointed out that, in his opinion, such a plan would not be workable, and he stated that he was not interested in being connected with an organization of that kind. He was not talking about the three-man administrative policy-making board upon which the committee finally agreed upon.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Since the three-man board has been substituted nothing further has been heard from Mr. Clayton?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Yes; he was quoted in the press, and I presume correctly, that the provision was very much better—I think that was his language—or very much improved, something to that effect, by the change to a three-man administrative policy-making board instead of having both an administrator and a board.

Mr. VANDENBERG. In other words, it might be that the final arrangement would not be so offensive to him that he would still decline to function if it should be the desire of the President to appoint him?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I should not think that the present set-up would be obnoxious to him at all.

Mr. VANDENBERG. In any event, the Senator has not said what I hoped he was going to say.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I cannot speak for the Senate; I cannot speak for the Senate conferees; I can speak only for myself. So far as I am concerned, I will say there was no effort to reflect upon Mr. Clayton in any way. I had no such intention and I heard a great many complimentary statements with respect to Mr. Clayton. I do not think the Senate is entirely unanimous on the question of Mr. Clayton. I think some of us feel that he took a rather arbitrary position in this matter. The House passed a bill which he approved from beginning to end. It backed the bill which he wrote. He seemed to think that that bill was the one which ought to be adopted in all its provisions. I do not think the Congress ought to be expected to build a bill around any man, whoever he may be. So I think that Mr. Clayton was talking a little bit out of turn, if I may be permitted to say so, in saying whether he would take this position or not before it had been offered to him and before the Senate could pass upon his confirmation.

Mr. VANDENBERG. That all well may be, but it is beside the point I am making. It will be extremely difficult to find a man as eligible as is Mr. Clayton to serve this tremendous responsibility. I should be unable to support the conference report if it were correctly asserted in the newspapers that I should be thus voting "no confidence" in Mr. Clayton. I will not vote "no confidence" in Mr. Clayton.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. If the Senator places that kind of an interpretation on the conference report, it is most unfortunate, because the conference report contains no such condemnation, either by inference or in any other way. There is no reflection upon Mr. Clayton anywhere in the conference report, and I am sure that that is true of the position of the conferees personally, although I can speak for only one member of the conference committee.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Let me ask the Senator if, in his judgment, the decision of the Military Affairs Committee, which was followed by the Senate, namely, to support the idea of a Board rather than a one-man Administrator, would have been followed regardless of who the one man might have been.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Most certainly.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I served on the committee which drafted the bill, although I was not a member of the conference committee. This is the situation, as I see it: The Senate Committee on Military Affairs was convinced that in a matter of such great importance, involving so much property of such great value, we should not establish a one-man control, but, rather, should establish a control more likely to be representative of the views and needs of all the people of the country, in all their economic and geographical groupings.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. That is the reason why the Senate adopted the Board approach, rather than that of a one-man Administrator. There was no reflection upon any one man.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. As I stated a while ago, I was not in a position to be present during the consideration of the bill in the Senate, and therefore I am not so familiar as I should like to be with its details and with the differences between the Senate version and the House bill.

From every standpoint of public service and personal relationship, I should regret to see the conference report, or any legislation which we might enact, interpreted as a vote of "no confidence" in Mr. Clayton. I fear that the editorial in the newspaper this morning went afield in saying that the proposed legislation was equivalent to a vote of "no confidence" in Mr. Clayton. We all know that administrators, even as high as the President of the United States, frequently recommend legislation which, in their judgment, is wise, but with respect to which Congress may have a different opinion. To change a bill from that which is recommended, even by so high an officer as the President, is never regarded as a reflection upon him, or as a vote of "no confidence" in the President.

I have known Will Clayton practically all his life. He started years ago as a young stenographer, about the time I started in the same capacity, at a very modest salary. He has been a very successful businessman. I regard him as a man of the utmost integrity. He does not need an office. He has no financial interest in retaining an office. When he came to Washington under the appointment of the Secretary of Commerce as Assistant Secretary of Commerce and the head of the lending agencies, he disposed of all his interests which would in any way conflict with his duties to the public in the various relationships which he held. I have the greatest personal admiration for his ability, integrity, and good faith. I may not always agree with him. I have not always agreed with him, and probably will not always agree with him hereafter in matters of public policy. But certainly, in my judgment, he is a man of the highest integrity, and of extraordinary ability in his administration of any public office. During World War No. 1 he came here under the appointment of President Wilson, and even a quarter of a century ago occupied a high and responsible position in the First World War economic organization.

I hope that this modified bill is not so contrary to Mr. Clayton's viewpoint as to the proper methods of administering surplus property as to preclude him from accepting responsibility under it. I certainly hope that that is not true. I make that statement with a background of long acquaintance with him and great personal confidence in his ability, integrity, and good faith as a public servant. I am sure that what the Senator says is true; namely, that in the minds of the conferees, other Members of the Senate, and Members of the House, regardless of any changes which may be made in the original bill as recommended by Mr. Clayton, the action of the Congress is not equivalent to a vote of "no confidence" in Mr. Clayton.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, proceeding with the discussion of other amendments which were offered on the floor of the Senate, the so-called Bankhead amendment with regard to loan rates on cotton, found in section 37, on page 20 of the report, was kept in the bill intact.

The next amendment was the amendment offered by the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS]. He offered an amendment with respect to a most unfortunate oil-land situation in his State, which he explained to the Senate. While the Senate conferees were unable to persuade the House conferees to agree to the language submitted by the Senator from Oklahoma, we were permitted to cover the condition described with general language. In subsection (d) (1) (A) on page 13, and subsection (d) (3) on page 14, I think we have covered, in general language, the matter in which the Senator from Oklahoma was interested. I regret that we were not able to preserve the amendment in the language proposed by the Senator and agreed to by the Senate, but we did the very best we could with it.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I yield.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I desire to make a very brief statement, and then ask one or two questions.

The case referred to is as follows: The Navy Department, in establishing training bases throughout the country, condemned a tract of land in Oklahoma embracing approximately 532 acres. The land was to be used as an auxiliary airfield for the training of Navy fliers at the Norman Naval Base.

About the time the land was condemned and the Navy took possession of it, an oil well was brought in close to this particular tract. Immediately the adjacent land was sought after by oil companies and others interested in the development of oil properties. The Navy Department saw that the land would become an oil-producing territory, and decided that it would not be feasible to continue the use of this tract with oil wells surrounding it, because oil wells involve the presence of derricks, which rise to a considerable height. If the trainees had to dodge oil derricks in making landings, the use of the land as an air field would not be feasible, of course; whereupon the Navy Department abandoned the use of the tract, served notice on the House Committee on Naval Affairs that it was through with the land, and suggested that the land be disposed of as surplus land.

A bill was introduced in the House to direct the Secretary of the Navy to return the land to the original owners. The land had all been condemned. None of it had been sold voluntarily. Some of the farmers did not even accept their checks, because in their opinion the purchase price or the condemnation price was not sufficient to justify them in voluntarily accepting the awards.

The Navy Department appropriation bill when it was passed by this body last June, as I recall, contained an amendment directing the Secretary of the Navy to deed this property back to the original owners, who were farmers. The House conferees refused to accept the amendment, because they claimed it was legislation on an appropriation bill, and they were not favorable to approving Senate legislation on an appropriation bill. So the Senate conferees had to yield, and the amendment went out of the bill.

When the bill now pending came before the Senate recently, the same amendment was offered to the Senate bill. Again the Senate accepted the amendment, and it went to conference.

Now the chairman of the committee of conference explains why the Senate conferees had to give up the amendment and let it go out of the bill. But instead of accepting the concrete amendment directing the Secretary of the Navy to turn the property back to the original owners, the conferees have included some general language which I understand will apply not only to this tract but to other tracts as to which the circumstances might be similar.

On page 13, in section 23 (1), real property is defined. It is defined as land, in the main.

Under subdivision (2) the conference report defines surplus real property as real property which has been determined under section 11 to be surplus property.

Under subsection (c) there is a definition of surplus real property. It is defined as being agricultural, grazing, forest, or mineral lands.

Then, under subsection (d), there is the provision for the disposal of such property. The section provides, as I understand, that the Administrator or the Board, whichever the case may be—in this case the Board—is authorized to return the property to the original owners under one of two conditions: Either at the price which was paid for the land or, if the land has been damaged in any way by the Government, its present price shall be taken into consideration, and whichever is the lower is the price the farmer should pay in order to regain possession of the land.

In this case at Norman, or, more properly, at Moore, the Navy Department hauled and dumped on these farms a vast amount of gravel which, of course, is on the land. The farms on which the gravel has been placed are valueless unless the gravel is removed, and, of course, that would entail vast expense. So that land has been definitely damaged.

As I understand, under the terms of the bill the Board will be authorized to turn the property back to the farmers, if

they want it, at one of these two prices: Either the price at which the Government acquired the property or at the present sale price, allowing for any damage, if damage has been done.

The question is—and I direct this question to the Senator in charge of the bill—Does the Senator believe that the conference report, if adopted, will authorize the Board under the terms of the bill to deal directly with the original owners and to turn back the property under a conveyance—either a warranty or a quit claim—at either the price the Government paid for the property or at the price it is now worth, making allowance for any damage done by the Government?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. That is correct, except for the fact that it is not authorized to do so, but is told or directed to do so. In other words, there will be no discretion in the matter.

Mr. AUSTIN rose.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I yield to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AUSTIN. I suggest one change in the formula. The provision about price is found on page 14 of the report, in subdivision (3), reading as follows:

(3) The price to be paid for surplus real property sold under this subsection shall be a price not greater than that for which it was acquired by the United States, such acquisition price being properly adjusted to reflect any increase or decrease in the values of such property resulting from action by the United States, or a price equal to the market price at the time of sale of such property, whichever price is the lower.

So there are three factors.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator whether that provision applies to all lands which have been taken by the Government in the establishment of training camps all over the country.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Yes; it applies to all surplus lands.

Mr. BARKLEY. As the Senator knows, in many sections of the country, and especially in my own State, some of the finest farming land in certain communities was taken for the establishment of such camps. I have in mind two camps for which the best land in the section concerned was taken because from the topographical standpoint and the physical standpoint it was most suitable for use in connection with the training of men. In one case 40,000 acres were taken, and in another case 36,000 acres were taken. Of course, if and when the camps are abandoned, that land will still remain farm land, and should be returned to the farmers who sold it to the Government, if they still want it. If they do not any longer want it, of course then it will be sold under other conditions.

What I am asking is whether this provision applies to all the lands taken, all over the country, for the establishment of training camps and other facilities which are regarded as more or less temporary.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. That is correct, except that the Federal Government and its agencies and the State governments will have a priority ahead of the original owner, if they should happen to want it for some public purpose.

Mr. BARKLEY. Of course, if the Federal Government wants it, it simply keeps it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. That is correct.

Mr. BARKLEY. It does not have to have a priority, does it?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Oh, yes; it does. Because if it is declared to be surplus, and if some other agency wants it, that agency will have a chance to get it. That is also true with respect to State governments and agencies which desire to have the land for public purposes.

Mr. BARKLEY. If a camp should be continued either as a training school, under our vocational or rehabilitation provisions under laws already enacted, or for hospital purposes, under direction of the Federal Government, they could retain it; is that correct?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. That is correct. Otherwise, it will go to the original owner, as has been indicated.

Mr. REVERCOMB rose.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Does the Senator from West Virginia desire to have me yield to him?

Mr. REVERCOMB. I shall be glad to have the Senator do so for a moment.

Mr. President, the Senator has very clearly brought out the point upon which I started to comment. In other words, the land must be surplus, and the Government must not want it, before it can be disposed of; is that correct?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. That is correct.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, it looks to me as if the provision works both ways, and that if the Government purchased some farm land and greatly improved it, perhaps it was converted into a local airport which will be declared surplus, the former owner could recover it, improvements and all, at the price at which it had been acquired by the Government.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. The bill reads—

such acquisition price being properly adjusted to reflect any increase or decrease in the value of such property resulting from action by the United States.

Mr. AIKEN. Yes; but can it be purchased at the lower price, the original price?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. The purchaser has to pay for the improvements.

Mr. AIKEN. Is the Senator sure that the purchaser has to pay for the improvements, under the language now contained in the report?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. The market price would reflect the improvements which had been made, of course.

Mr. AIKEN. I thought he could buy, under paragraph 3——

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. The sentence then reads—

or a price equal to the market price at the time of sale of such property, whichever price is the lower.

Mr. AIKEN. The sale price may be the market price or the price at which it was acquired by the United States, whichever is lower; is that correct?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Yes.

Mr. AIKEN. Therefore, if the land is worth $10,000, and if the improvements are worth $100,000, the purchaser can insist upon buying it for $10,000.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. No. "Land," as here referred to, does not apply to plants, plant facilities, and things of that kind. They are in a separate category.

Mr. AIKEN. That is what I wanted to make sure of.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Oh, yes. Plant facilities are placed in an altogether different category.

Mr. AIKEN. Does this provision apply only to the land itself and perhaps to temporary or comparatively useless buildings which are on it?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. It applies to agricultural land.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I am not sure I did not overlook the provision about war housing. Is that covered by the terms of the Lanham Act?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Yes; it is. War housing will be handled by its own agency and will be excluded from the matter of surplus-property disposal under the bill.

Mr. PEPPER. For example, I have in mind that the Coast Guard has a number of small craft, some of which were taken over from private owners during the war. What agency would have charge of the disposal of property of that nature? Would the craft have to be declared surplus property by the Coast Guard, for example, and then come into the hands of the Board for distribution?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Such vessels as the Senator from Florida has mentioned may be disposed of by the disposal agency established for such purpose. The Maritime Commission, however, would be the sole disposal agency for merchant ships and other ships which may be converted into merchant ships.

Mr. PEPPER. Vessels which are normally classified as pleasure craft would not be included, would they?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. No. The disposal agency would dispose of such craft as the Senator has in mind under the general provisions of the bill.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I wish to ask the Senator, in connection with the matter of real property, whether or not the conferees intended that the Board which is to be established should have the power of determining whether or not any particular land should be returned to the public domain.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. No; the conferees intended that all land taken from the public domain should be returned to the public domain, and that would apply also to land withdrawn from other governmental sources, except land improved by the Government. For example, there might be swamp land or brush land which the Government had improved and made into good agricultural land.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. As the bill passed the Senate, it was clear that lands which had been set aside from the public do-

main for the purposes of war should be restored to the public domain, or to the reservations. I think it is very important, therefore, to have a clear legislative understanding that the conferees did not intend to change that provision. The Senator will remember that as the bill passed the Senate it contained a provision for the classification of lands by the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture. As the bill now comes from the conference committee it places the duty of classification in the Board.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Yes; but the Board is directed to go to the Federal agency affected, and it was understood by the conferees that in this particular matter the Board would seek assistance from the Department of the Interior and the Department of Agriculture in classifying the lands.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I am glad the Senator from Colorado has called specific attention to that fact. I was about to allude to paragraph (d) of section 3, which appears on page 3 of the report. It reads as follows:

(d) The term "property" means any interest, owned by the United States or any Government agency, in real or personal property, of any kind, wherever located, but does not include (1) the public domain, or such lands withdrawn or reserved from the public domain as the Surplus Property Board (created by section 5) determines are suitable for return to the public domain for disposition under the general land laws, or (2) naval vessels of the following categories: Battleships, cruisers, aircraft carriers, destroyers, and submarines.

That would seem to clothe the Board with complete power to determine whether or not lands should be returned to the public domain. I understood the Senator to say that it was the intention of the conferees that the proper Government agency—in this instance the Department of the Interior—would be consulted with respect to the classification of lands and that, unless its character had been changed by the Government agency which had charge of or used the land, it would be returned to the public domain.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. The Senator is correct. I should like to invite his attention to section 7, on page 4, of the report, reading as follows:

SEC. 7. The Board shall advise and consult with other interested Government agencies with a view to obtaining all aid and assistance possible in coordinating the functions of the several agencies affected by the disposition of surplus property.

With regard to the point of how much discretionary power the Board is given in connection with the return of land, as I understood, the conferees took the position that public domain land would be returned to the agency which had formerly possessed it, except such land as had been changed in character by the Government after the Government had taken over the land. A question regarding that matter was asked by Mr. MANASCO, chairman of the House conferees, and he clarified the point in debate yesterday in the House.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. I have before me Representative MANASCO's reply. To my mind it does not clarify the matter at all. Representative MANASCO was asked, "Is the Surplus Property Board the one that is going to determine that?" The reference, of course, was to the land to be returned to the public domain. Representative MANASCO replied, "Of course, the Board will consult with the interested people and agencies."

That is a long way from what the Senator from Colorado has said. The Surplus Property Board will determine what land is to be returned to the public domain, but it may or may not consult with the agencies concerned. I like the explanation which the Senator from Colorado has made, but I am not clear in my own mind as to what he means by changing the character of the land.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. For example, some of the land which has been taken over by the Government has been improved. It may have been swampland or brush land, and during the Government's occupation of it, may have been drained, and may now be good agricultural land.

I should like to invite the attention of the Senator from Wyoming and the Senator from New Mexico to the additional fact that the department, or any other agency which receives the land, will have to pay for it. They cannot get it merely by having it turned over to them; they have to purchase it.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, if that point has been settled, I should like to ask a question. Will the Senator state whether or not the bill takes the place of present laws which allow certain departments or agencies to sell their surplus property? For instance, let us take any one of the agencies, such as the War Production Board, or any other board or independent agency, or even department of the Government. As I understand, a number of these now have the power to sell. When this bill shall have been enacted, will that power be transferred to the board provided for in the bill, or what will the situation be? Will the other independent agencies or departments be able to sell their surplus property as before?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. The answer is found in section 34 (a) on page 19, which reads as follows:

The authority conferred by this act is in addition to any authority conferred by any other law and shall not be subject to the provisions of any law inconsistent herewith. This act shall not impair or affect any authority for the disposition of property under any other law, except that the Board may prescribe regulations to govern any disposition of surplus property under any such authority to the same extent as if the disposition were made under this act, whenever it deems such action necessary to effectuate the objectives and policies of this act.

Mr. McKELLAR. Then I understand that this is merely in addition to all the laws giving the several agencies and departments the right to dispose of their property.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Yes, except that the Board by regulation may bring the disposal of other lands under the provisions of the proposed act.

Mr. McKELLAR. I will state very frankly to the Senator what is running through my mind. I had hoped that this would be an exclusive law, because I think the sale of all surplus property should be in the hands of one agency. It would be very much better than to have each agency of the Government selling its own surplus property, and the proposed board merely being an additional agency for that purpose.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. The effect of paragraph (a) is to centralize all the authority for the disposal in the Board during the 3 years of the life of the act.

Mr. McKELLAR. It merely says they "may" do it. It does not say they "shall" do it. It would be necessary to go to court to get a determination that "may" in that particular sentence meant "shall", and I do not know whether a court would give such a decision. It would depend on circumstances. It seems to me it is very unfortunate that the Board should not have complete authority, and state the rules and regulations under which the sales should be made.

The selling of Government property is always attended with trouble, insofar as the agencies of the Government are concerned. The Senator may not recall, because he was not a Member of the Senate at the time, but after the last war many scandalous things occurred about the sale and resale of Government property, and I had very much hoped that the bill before us would provide that the agency to be set up, and that agency alone, should be responsible for the sale of surplus property.

Mr. GEORGE. May I ask the Senator from Colorado a question?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I yield.

Mr. GEORGE. As the bill passed the Senate, my recollection of it was that lands acquired even under the Weeks law might be sold by the disposal agency.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Under what law?

Mr. GEORGE. Under the Weeks law, lands acquired at the headwaters of navigable streams, national forests. In other words, it was not confined to lands purchased by the Government for military purposes, or for war purposes, but it was broad enough by its terms to cover, and actually did cover, lands acquired under the Weeks law.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. If they were declared surplus, but they would have to be declared surplus before the proposed law could affect them, because the law will be confined entirely to surplus property and surplus land.

Mr. GEORGE. It is confined to surplus military property, or property acquired for military purposes?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. No, surplus United States property, which the owning agency itself declares surplus.

Mr. GEORGE. Is there a limitation put upon property as to the time when it was acquired?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. No.

Mr. GEORGE. The Forestry Service, which administers the national forest reservations, called my attention to the matter, and I brought it to the attention of the conference. I think I submitted

a letter to the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], who was on the conference. I understood that the matter had been corrected in conference, so that no lands, for instance, acquired for reforestation purposes, at the headwaters of navigable streams, under what we know as the Weeks law, which law has been in existence for quite a number of years, could be taken over and sold or turned over to any other agency.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. It could not be unless it were declared surplus.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Let me interrupt to say that I saw the protest on the part of the Department of Agriculture to which the Senator from Georgia referred, and I felt at the time that there was nothing in the Senate bill which justified the position which was taken with respect to such lands purchased under the Weeks law, because any land held by the Department of Agriculture, under whatever law acquired, could not possibly be affected by the bill as it passed the Senate, unless the Department of Agriculture itself positively declared it surplus. There was nothing in the bill as it passed the Senate which authorized the Surplus Property Administration to reach over into the Department of Agriculture or into any other department and take land and declare it surplus.

Mr. GEORGE. I know that the Department of Agriculture had very great concern about it.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I know they were disturbed about it.

Mr. GEORGE. The Forestry Service took the matter up with me personally.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Let me call the attention of the Senator to the language in section 18, subsection (a), on page 5, which provides:

SEC. 11. (a) Each owning agency shall have the duty and responsibility continuously to survey the property in its control and to determine which of such property is surplus to its needs and responsibilities.

At no place in the conference report is the Board given any authority to go into any owning agency and declare property surplus. They can complain to Congress; they can make a report to Congress that they think an owning agency is holding out on them.

Mr. GEORGE. As I understand, then, the bill abrogates the entire scheme set up under the Weeks law, to provide for the sale and exchange of property which the Forest Administration does not wish to keep for forestry purposes; it supersedes that entirely?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. If I may interrupt, my opinion is that it does not. As a matter of fact, I will say to the Senator from Georgia—and this is a matter to which I have personally called the attention of the Senator from Colorado—the bill as reported by the conferees lays a positive injunction upon the disposal authority to give any Government agency any land it wants, which seemed to me to be an utter abandonment of the position which the Senate had originally taken. If the Senator will bear with me, I shall point out what I have in mind.

Section 12 (a) of the conference bill, found on page 6, reads as follows:

SEC. 12. (a) It shall be the duty of the Board to facilitate the transfer of surplus property from one Government agency to other Government agencies for their use; and the transfer of surplus property under this section shall be given priority over all other disposals provided for in this act.

Surplus property has been defined to include real property. So in section 12 (a) there is a positive injunction to the Board making it its duty to facilitate the transfer of surplus real property from one Government agency to another, and such a transfer is given priority over all other demands.

On page 13 of the report, in section 23—the section which deals with the disposal of surplus real property—paragraph (b), we find this provision:

Surplus real property which is not disposed of to Government agencies under section 12 or to States or their political subdivisions or instrumentalities under section 13 shall be disposed of in accordance with this section.

So, in two portions of the bill it is stated in words which cannot possibly be misunderstood, that surplus real property goes first to Government agencies which want it; that it is the duty of the Board to facilitate the transfer to such agencies; and moreover that surplus property cannot be disposed of to anyone if any Government agency or any State or municipality sets up a prior claim.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. That is correct, and there is another provision in section 12 (c) requiring that land be paid for, and, therefore, so as far as a Government agency is concerned, Congress would have to appropriate the money before some other agency of Government could take land which was declared surplus.

Mr. GEORGE. No; not under the Weeks law. That is a well-worked-out program under which the Forest Service, which is in the Department of Agriculture now, could exchange land which it held for other land. If under the Weeks law it had bought certain land in a national forest, and after having purchased the land it discovered that it could make an exchange for an equal or possibly superior number of acres of other land which was better suited for that particular forest and the particular purpose, the Forest Service could make the exchange. As I understand the present language, in that sort of a situation the Board takes over the full authority to handle the piece of property.

Mr. JOHNSON of Calorado. No; I am sure that is not the case.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. There is nothing in the bill which would uphold any such interpretation.

Mr. GEORGE. It has become surplus for that purpose.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. It cannot become surplus unless the Forest Service declare it to be surplus.

Mr. GEORGE. They do declare it to be surplus and make an exchange for other land.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. No; they have authority of law now under the Weeks law to make transfers of property. Nothing in this bill would affect that.

Mr. GEORGE. That is what I am inquiring about.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. And I am trying to allay the Senator's fears, because the provisions of this bill with respect to the action of any Government agency in declaring any property surplus would apply only where for the purposes of the bill the agency desires to declare it surplus, and certainly would not apply where the agency was otherwise authorized by law to use land for the purpose of exchange in acquiring other land.

Mr. GEORGE. Yes; but I understood the Senator from Colorado to say a moment ago that this language superseded all other provisions of law with respect to the handling of any properties which the Government agency desired to get rid of.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. No.

Mr. GEORGE. Then I misunderstood the Senator.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. The Senator from Colorado did not say that. If I may call the attention of the Senator from Georgia to section 11, subsection (a) again, he will note that the language is "and to determine which of such property is surplus to its needs and responsibilities."

That responsibility refers directly to the Weeks law, and it is the responsibility of the agency to make the transfer if it thinks it is in the public interest.

Mr. GEORGE. I had the general impression that this bill was supposed to deal with surplus war properties; that is, properties acquired for war purposes.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Colorado yield to me?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I yield.

Mr. GURNEY. There is a provision in the bill which I think will settle the question. If the Senator will turn to page 19 of the conference report, section 34 (b), he will find a saving clause, "Nothing in this act shall impair or affect the provisions of." Then a number of laws are mentioned. And the next to the last line in that clause begins "the statutes relating to the public lands."

So nothing in this measure would affect the Weeks law. It is so stated, I believe.

Mr. GEORGE. That was the point of my inquiry.

Mr. GURNEY. I believe that section 34 covers the point exactly.

Mr. GEORGE. There was very grave concern as to whether the bill would not apply to land acquired for reforestation purposes under the Weeks law.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I will ask the distinguished Senator from Colorado if he has reached the point of stating what became of the amendment which was presented in the form of a bill, which amendment would require that all moneys received or recaptured from the sale of surplus property should be applied upon

the Government war debt? Has the Senator reached that point yet?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Yes; I am ready to discuss that point. That was one of the matters upon which the conferees on the part of the Senate had to compromise with the conferees on the part of the House. The House conferees objected to that provision remaining in the bill, and the Senate conferees had to recede.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I yield.

Mr. AUSTIN. I want the distinguished Senator from Colorado to bear me out in this particular, that every Republican vote in conference on both the Senate and House side was in favor of that provision, but the Republican conferees on both the House and the Senate side were unsuccessful.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. That is correct. The minority party representatives, both of the House and the Senate, supported the position of the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Yes.

Mr. WHERRY. I should like to make a statement with respect to the amendment, if the Senator will indulge me. We have been here a long time this afternoon, and we have talked about many subjects. I think, however, there is none more important to the home front. I think the amendment to which I refer should not be deleted from the bill. I should like to review briefly the amendment.

The amendment was first introduced in the form of a special bill by Representative HERTER, of Massachusetts, and referred to the Committee on Ways and Means in July of this year. As is customary with such bills, it was sent to the Treasury Department for comment. The Treasury comment, as received a few days later by the Ways and Means Committee, indicated that the Treasury Department did not agree with the theory of the amendment.

When the surplus property disposal bill was reported from the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, Representative HERTER, of Massachusetts, was urged by members of the Ways and Means Committee to offer his bill in the form of an amendment. It was so offered, and received the approval of the House of Representatives by an almost unanimous vote.

An identical amendment was offered in the Senate by me to the surplus property disposal bill when we were considering that measure. It received the approval of this body with almost no objection. I shall have to state that the senior Senator from Colorado certainly voted against the amendment, and we could all hear his voice in the Senate that afternoon when he voiced objection, but the amendment was adopted almost unanimously by the Senate.

That is, generally, the history of this amendment. It would require the earmarking of funds realized from the sale of surplus property.

It might be well to note in passing that W. L. Clayton, to whom we have heard such flattering and glowing compliments paid on the floor of the Senate today, testified before the Military Affairs Committee. He expressed his full approval of having the proceeds from the sale of surplus property apply to the reduction of the debt. The pending legislation, after having been passed by both Houses of Congress, then went to conference, and we now find the conference report back before us for our consideration, with the amendment concerning which I am speaking, deleted—an amendment which, generally speaking, had the almost unanimous endorsement of both Houses of Congress.

In that connection, I should like to point out to Members of the Senate rule XXVII, section 2. Let me read it:

> Conferees shall not insert in their report matter not committed to them by either House, nor shall they strike from the bill matter agreed to by both Houses. If new matter is inserted in the report, or if matter which was agreed to by both Houses is stricken from the bill, a point of order may be made against the report, and if the point of order is sustained, the report shall be recommitted to the committee of conference.

Let me say to the distinguished Senator from Colorado that I shall not make the point of order. I realize that there are some highly controversial provisions in the bill, and in the main I feel that the conference committee has done a fine job. I wish to go along with them.

However, I believe that under rule XXVII a point of order could be made. It might not be sustained, but I point out to the membership of the conference committee that the identical amendment passed both Houses of Congress. That being true, it seems to me that the conferees should have retained the amendment, and that it should not have been deleted from the bill.

As I stated a moment ago, I do not expect to make the point of order against the conference report. The hour is growing late, and the Senators are restless to get away.

I repeat that it is as important that we take up matters on the home front as it is to discuss things on the foreign front. This conference report deals with property disposal to the extent of $103,000,000,000. It is one thing to recapture the funds, and it is another thing to apply them to the reduction of the debt, where they should be applied.

The Treasury Department opposes this amendment. It passed the House and the Senate, and then the Treasury Department said, "No." I read an editorial on this subject in a Washington newspaper the day after the bill passed the Senate. The Treasury Department stated, in a press release, that the amendment would be ineffectual, and should be deleted from the bill. It has opposed the amendment from that time until the present, and it has finally succeeded in having it eliminated from the bill. I believe it is a good thing. I believe that we should become debt conscious in the United States.

Mr. President, we shall come out of this war with a Federal debt of between $250,000,000,000 and $300,000,000,000. It will be incomparably the greatest debt that was ever placed on the shoulders of the American people, or any other people.

I assume that no Senator will disagree with the statement that a nation's credit is exactly like that of an individual, in that there must be the intention to pay honest debts, whether they be private or public. We owe this money. Do we mean to pay it back? Do we mean to liquidate any part of the national debt? If we do, do we mean to give the American people evidence in the Congress that we intend to do so?

Finally, Mr. President, could there be a better time to start, or a better way of starting to evidence the intention of paying the debt than to recover these moneys from the sale of surplus property and materials and place them in a special fund to be devoted to the reduction of the Federal debt? That debt hangs like a millstone around the neck of the Nation and of every citizen of the Nation.

An editorial was recently published in the Washington Pathfinder which pointed out that every baby in this land owes approximately $2,000 the day he is born. That is his or her share of the Federal public debt. If we assume a family of five, that means that every such family in the United States has a $10,000 mortgage on the family assets and the future family earnings to pay the present debt in this country.

The American people will be made conscious of the tremendous public debt if these huge sums are collected and placed in a fund to be devoted to the reduction of the debt. If the funds are not so devoted there is no reason why the American people should be debt-conscious. There would be no reason why they should not join in the fallacious, vicious, and thoroughly dangerous theory that we can go on spending and spending, and never think about the national debt. In that direction lies national insolvency and bankruptcy. No less an authority than Franklin Delano Roosevelt himself has made that statement over and over again.

The Congress, acting for the American people, appropriated moneys for the prosecution of the war. Those moneys were expended for plants, tools, ships, materials, and machinery of all kinds. More plants were built than will be needed. More tools were built than will be needed. More raw materials were bought than will be needed. We have no quarrel with that policy because in war we must play safe.

However, let me point out to the membership of the Senate that as soon as such materials become surplus, after having served the purpose for which the moneys were spent, the proceeds from the sale of surplus properties and materials ought, in normal course, to be recaptured and paid on the public debt.

The whole point of my amendment is that the theory of deficit spending—the idea that we can borrow and spend ourselves back into a condition of solvency—is so dangerous that I believe that the American people will rise up

and demand that, like any prudent citizen, the Government apply all the assets it receives from the sale of surplus property to the reduction of the public debt. That debt will demand interest service. Interest service means taxes. So instead of encouraging spendthrifts in the bureaus to use billions of dollars to start new political W. P. A.'s or to give the money away to U. N. R. R. A., or use it to start a world W. P. A., let us apply these funds, when received, to the reduction of the debt, and at the same time reduce the interest burden which the taxpayer must carry through untold generations.

If there is a single, solitary argument of any validity against this money being so applied, it has not been advanced on this floor. American citizens have been persuaded to buy billions of dollars' worth of bonds. How long can the Government continue to sell bonds and pledge its credit if no start is made and no intention is evidenced toward reducing the huge debt, or toward an early effort to stop deficit spending and managed credit in this country? If we make provision now to start retiring the public debt, and we in Congress, along with the American people, become debt conscious, it will naturally follow that the credit of our Government will be much improved.

Mr. President, the greatest danger which exists today to the solvency of this Nation is the grab-bag system now in effect, and the "gimme" attitude of the executive departments of government toward the Congress. Unless the general funds of the Treasury are appropriated by the Congress, there will be no check on their expenditure. Unless the special funds under discussion are converted into a fund for the reduction of the debt, we shall see years pass before any attempt is made to set up such a fund. There could be no better time than now to make a start in that direction; and no source of funds is more ideally adapted to the reduction of the public debt than funds derived from the sale of surplus property. Let us remove from the executive departments of the Government both the temptation and the power to use these funds under the grab-bag system. Let us apply them to the reduction of the public debt.

I do not see why these moneys should not be covered into a special fund for the reduction of the debt. I do not believe that a valid argument could be made against the purpose of the amendment or the way in which it would operate.

In discussing the Treasury Department's objections to this amendment, I invite the attention of the Senate to a paragraph taken from the Baruch-Hancock report dealing with this subject. It appears on page 64 of the report, under the heading "Lower Debt":

LOWER DEBT

All of the war surpluses will have been paid for by the American public either through war taxes or the increase in the national debt. Therefore, the proceeds of all sales should go to reduce that debt, lowering the post-war carrying charges which will have to be met through taxation. Certainly no agency should be permitted to sell surpluses and use the proceeds for other purposes.

It is a matter of common knowledge that it has long been a legislative practice to earmark funds. Even in appropriating funds, Congress sets forth how the funds shall be used. In effect, this amendment would reappropriate the funds recovered, and would provide for their application in the reduction of the national debt.

There is nothing unusual about this procedure or this legislative practice. It is the experience not only of our National Government, but also of our State governments, counties, municipalities, and all other governmental subdivisions. It is a very good private practice.

One theory is that all the money goes into the Treasury, payments are made from the Treasury on the debt, and it makes no difference whether these funds are recaptured and placed in a special fund or whether they are placed in the general fund of the Treasury and then paid out. There is as much difference between that theory and the theory of this amendment as there is between day and night. If a person wishes to pay a private debt, if he has a salary of $3,000, he sets aside $100 a year, or $100 a month, and places it in a special fund. When the debt becomes due, he pays it. If he depends upon putting it in the general fund with the rest of his $3,000, when the time comes to pay the debt he will not have the money. He will have used it for something else. The general fund is the grab bag.

During an appearance by Mr. Warren, Comptroller General, before the House Committee on the Civil Service, in the course of his testimony at the hearing on June 3, 1943, in speaking generally of appropriation and accounting practices, he stated:

Under the gentle guise of war, the word "economy" has been deleted from the dictionary (p. 458).

Thrift and prudence, ordinary prudence in the expenditure of other people's money, has gone out of the window.

The country is in the grip of the cost-plus-fixed-fee contractor. He is writing his ticket and he is getting what he writes.

* * * it is a fact that thousands of people are down here in the Government from private business. I do not mean to condemn their actions or motives, but I do say that sometimes the contracting officials for the Government are either nitwits or else.

I do not want to see anyone lose, and I realize that in mammoth undertakings that are going on they have to be treated more or less sympathetically; but some day, sometime, I want to see more people in the employ of the Government who are looking out for the Government. It is time some of them are concerned about the people who pay the taxes.

My observation is that Congress has practically no information on how the appropriated money is being spent. Members of the Appropriations Committee will tell you that it is a hit-or-miss affair with them in the development of the various appropriation bills (p. 459).

You have practically no idea of what is going on in any agency, including the General Accounting Office, when you vote these enormous appropriations; it is merely a hit-or-miss affair (p. 460).

I think Congress ought to be informed.

Congress has created a Frankenstein that has become greater and more powerful than its creator. (Referring to want of respect for law and want of cooperation with Congress (p. 465).

Mr. President, the money spent for the purchase of the materials which are now surplus is already a part of the national debt. The people are already paying taxes on that debt. This is the one way which will not cost the American people a dollar, but will save them money, by starting to reduce the Federal debt. If we place the money obtained from the sale of the surplus property in a special fund for the reduction of the public debt—we do that in the case of other Government agencies, and there is just as much reason to say that in the case of those agencies such action is unnecessary because otherwise the money goes into the General Treasury anyway, as it is to say that would be the case in this instance—it will cause the American people not only to know how much money is being received from the sale of their surplus property, but how much money is being paid annually to reduce the debt. That is the way to make them debt conscious. That is the way to make a start toward stabilizing our financial economy, which certainly is sadly bent on the home front.

For 10 years we have been under the spend-and-spend, tax-and-tax doctrine. The attempt to kill this amendment is an indication of the attempt to perpetuate that doctrine into the post-war period which is to come. This deficit spending, this credit management, will be continued in the post-war period if the administration is to have its way relative to this amendment.

There is no reason why we should be extravagant in time of war, except that the administration has lost all sense of proportion. But there is every reason, because war is a colossal waste, that the most rigid economy consistent with the war effort should be practiced.

Let us not forget that every dollar that is wasted must be paid back in toil; it must be paid back in sweat; it must be paid back in sacrifices by our citizens and privations of our citizens, just the same as every dollar which is well spent. Wasted billions, as well as other billions, all comprise the colossal public debt of which we are speaking.

Some Senators argue to the membership of the Senate that it is sound simply to say that the theory to which they subscribe is different from the theory of the Treasury, whose theory it is that the size of the public debt does not make any difference; that it is merely a bookkeeping proposition; that there is no difference. But that is no reason why the conferees should delete the amendment from the provisions of the bill. Both Houses passed this measure. Both of them felt that it was in the interest of stabilizing our economy. Both Houses felt that it would make the public debt-conscious. After all, that is the point of the amendment. If we are going to make a start toward paying our debt, and if we are going to have our Government continue to keep its credit good and be able to sell bonds somewhere, somehow, we must have a balanced Budget, and we

must take in more than we spend, and we must realize that a private debt and a public debt are the same, and must be paid.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I would concur in the views of the Senator from Nebraska if he would accompany his proposal regarding the public debt with a proposal for a reduction in the debt limit or if he would couple his proposal with one for curtailment of appropriations by Congress. But he does not do so.

I do not care to discuss the matter any further at this time, but I now request unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a statement by the Treasury Department relative to this proposal.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TREASURY DEPARTMENT,
Washington, September 1, 1944.

Hon. ELBERT D. THOMAS,
Acting Chairman, Committee on Military Affairs, United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: We wish to present for the consideration of the conferees on H. R. 5125 the urgent recommendation of the Treasury Department for the deletion of the requirement that proceeds from the disposition of surplus property be credited to a special fund which shall be used exclusively for the reduction of the public debt.

The acceptance of this recommendation would call for the deletion from section 27 (a) of H. R. 5125, as passed by the Senate with amendments, at page 75, lines 6 to 8, of the words "to the credit of a special fund which shall be used exclusively for the reduction of the public debt," and the substitution therefor of the words "as miscellaneous receipts."

The requirement for the creation of a special fund purportedly for public-debt reduction would be wholly ineffective to accomplish that purpose and would not make available a single dollar for the actual reduction of the public debt. Giving that provision its most extravagant application, then during the present period of deficit financing it would have to be fulfilled by the futile mechanical measures of applying the special fund to retire a given amount of outstanding public debt while simultaneously offering additional public-debt obligations to recoup the same funds in order to meet Government expenditures required by congressional appropriations not covered by the proceeds of revenue measures enacted by Congress. A more reasonable interpretation, and the one which would be adopted by the Treasury Department, would result only in a series of complicated book entries without any actual debt reduction until such time as current receipts should exceed expenditures. In sum, the provision would be void of any substantive result; it would be misleading if it were currently received as a measure which would realize its stated objective; and its sole effect would be to require complex and unnecessary book entries.

The Treasury Department, in previously recommending against the enactment of this proposal, stated its purpose to present to Congress, so soon as relief from the burden of extraordinary war expenditures would permit, recommendations for the establishment of a sound sinking-fund policy in the light of conditions then existing. It is neither timely nor desirable during the current deficit period to enact purported sinking-fund or debt-retirement provisions which must necessarily be futile and which might militate against the establishment of adequate and sound provisions at the appropriate time.

Very truly yours,

D. W. BELL,
Acting Secretary of the Treasury.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a communication in the form of a telegram received by me from the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] relative to having the bill require observance by the Board of the provisions of the civil-service laws and the Classification Act. I also ask unanimous consent to have my telegraphic reply to the telegram of the Senator from Utah printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the telegrams were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *September 17, 1944.*

Hon. EDWIN C. JOHNSON,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

I have sent the following telegram to Congressman MANASCO of the House conferees. I trust that it will meet with your approval and that you can meet at the specified time.

"On reading over the final print of H. R. 5125 I notice on page 8, lines 4 to 12, that we have probably inadvertently copied the wording of the original R. F. C. law which would make it possible for the Board to ignore the provisions of the civil-service laws and the Classification Act. Neither the House bill nor the Senate bill, as I remember them, carried this provision as it is stated here. I am sure, therefore, that before the conference report is presented to the two Houses the conferees would like to reconsider changing these lines. I am, therefore, asking if you will please preside Monday the 18th at a meeting in the Senate Military Affairs room at 10 o'clock and put this matter to the conference. I am sending a copy of this telegram to all the conferees and to the respective legislative counsels so that they may consider it a call for a meeting before the reports are made. I am leaving for the train so I cannot meet with you. Whatever action you take I shall be happy to sign with you, thus the signature blanks will not have to be changed. I trust that these words can be changed in such a way that we will not do violence to our governmental policies of the past many years."

Regards.

ELBERT D. THOMAS,
United States Senate.

SEPTEMBER 18, 1944.

Senator ELBERT D. THOMAS,
Care of F. Gerald Thomas,
Chicago, Ill.:

Upon receipt of your telegram I got in touch with the vice chairman of the conference, Mr. MANASCO. He had already received a similar telegram and had talked with other House conferees. He refused to call another conference because the conference report had already been filed in the House and therefore the conferees were powerless to make changes. He furthermore said that the language on page 8 was discussed at length in conference and was agreed upon as written and that language was the way a majority of the House conferees wanted it. He pointed out also that all the ordinary employees of the Board would be taken from civil-service lists under the present language and only the specialists selected outside of civil service.

ED. C. JOHNSON.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TUNNELL in the chair) laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

RECESS

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, in view of the lateness of the hour, I shall not move an executive session.

I now move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 17 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Wednesday, September 20, 1944, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate September 19 (legislative day of September 1), 1944:

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

George Wadsworth, of New York, now diplomatic agent and consul general at Beirut and Damascus, to be Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary of the United States of American to the Lebanese Republic and to serve concurrently and without additional compensation as Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Syria.

POSTMASTERS

The following-named persons to be postmasters:

ALABAMA

Mary M. Davis, Chunchula, Ala. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Lee J. Clayton, Jr., Eufaula, Ala., in place of H. L. Upshaw, resigned.

Sallie J. Richardson, Krafton, Ala. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Ruth P. Carter, Myrtlewood, Ala. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Annie B. Fitch, Snow Hill, Ala. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

ARKANSAS

Wayne S. Ross, Gillham, Ark. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

William E. Surginer, Hensley, Ark. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Lucile D. Hopper, Leola, Ark. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Jesse A. Poynor, Maynard, Ark. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

John M. Freeman, Mount Holly, Ark. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Loys V. Halbert, Prattsville, Ark. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

John C. Howe, Wabash, Ark. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

CALIFORNIA

Marie A. Shane, Boyes Hot Springs, Calif. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Charles E. Faulhaber, Mira Loma, Calif. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Mila Galbraith, Ridgecrest, Calif. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Carolyn H. Campbell, Tustin, Calif., in place of S. H. Long, removed.

COLORADO

J. Glenn Bell, Rye, Colo. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

George R. Simon, Seibert, Colo., in place of Meryl D. Haynes, transferred.

CONNECTICUT

Warren A. Wilcox, East Granby, Conn. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Philip T. Lewis, East Killingly, Conn. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Edgar J. Proulx, Goodyear, Conn. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

William Liberty, Voluntown, Conn. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

FLORIDA

Edward O. Sawyers, Zolfo Springs, Fla. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

GEORGIA

Hardy L. Holland, Register, Ga. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

IDAHO

George H. Wylie, Deary, Idaho, in place of Emory Olson, deceased.

John E. Trimming, Pocatello, Idaho, in place of A H. McGuire, removed.

ILLINOIS

E. Loraine White, Donnellson, Ill. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Levi C. Robinson, Gardner, Ill., in place of T. E. Horrie, deceased.

Jananne McDonnell, Laura, Ill. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Genevia L. Guess, Thebes, Ill., in place of M. B. Youart, deceased.

Florence R. Anderson, Wood Dale, Ill. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

INDIANA

Hazelle C. Becher, Corunna, Ind. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Joseph L. Peters, Marysville, Ind. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Robert Ervin Stephens, Sr., New Richmond, Ind. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Eileen Studer, Shelby, Ind. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

IOWA

Harry Eckhardt, Avoca, Iowa, in place of Daisy Oldham. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Benjamin H. Rowe, Beaman, Iowa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Loretto Erickson, Duncombe, Iowa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

Harry W. Christians, Grafton, Iowa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Edward J. Dowling, Lanesboro, Iowa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

John Schneider, Popejoy, Iowa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Alfred T. Guddall, Thor, Iowa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Lora L. Johns, Tracy, Iowa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

KANSAS

Elizabeth C. Keating, Fulton, Kans. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Joseph A. Trudell, Morganville, Kans. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

KENTUCKY

George C. Cawood, Cawood, Ky. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Benjamin S. Berger, Coalgood, Ky. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

LOUISIANA

Louis F. Siadous, Duson, La. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Elizabeth M. Brooks, Rosepine, La. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

MAINE

Charles B. Lewis, Springfield, Maine. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

MARYLAND

Mary D. Rice, Maugansville, Md. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

MINNESOTA

Lizzie A. Schmidt, Dundee, Minn. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

MISSISSIPPI

Annie L. Womack, Marietta, Miss. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Sarah L. Brewer, Steens, Miss. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

MISSOURI

Donald M. Barrow, Clarksdale, Mo. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Mabel Cunningham, Dawn, Mo. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Gideon Ward Miller, Edgerton, Mo. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

M. Marguerite Shineman, Fillmore, Mo. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Leonard D. Smith, Fremont, Mo. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Lawrence W. Bartee, Holt, Mo. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Mary E. Staples, Houstonia, Mo. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Mary E. B. Black, Rivermines, Mo. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

MONTANA

Olive M. Griffith, Grassrange, Mont. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Anne Helen Sebastian, Joplin, Mont., in place of B. O. Wilson, resigned.

Mabel M. Jimerson, Nashua, Mont., in place of F. L. Jimerson, deceased.

Gail H. Fry, Park City, Mont., in place of F. D. Stoltz, resigned.

NEBRASKA

Vera F. Knickerbocker, Verdon, Nebr., in place of O. P. Veal, deceased.

NEW MEXICO

Mack W. Urioste, Raton, N. Mex., in place of J. C. Leonard, deceased.

NEW YORK

Asa Camp, Apalachin, N. Y. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Ruth T. Savory, Beaver Dams, N. Y. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Oliver H. Hanson, Celeron, N. Y. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Edward F. Curtis, Eagle Bridge, N. Y. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Pearl S. Wood, Felts Mills, N. Y. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Lillian L. Johnson, Findley Lake, N. Y. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Mary H. Whalen, Fort Johnson, N. Y. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

John J. Hickey, Gainesville, N. Y. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Joseph P. Hertz, Glenmont, N. Y. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Martha M. Ward, Great Valley, N. Y. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Elizabeth P. Williams, Henrietta, N. Y. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Ada McDonald, Jay, N. Y. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Earl Hendershott, Lakeville, N. Y. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Mary E. A. Mayesky, Lincolndale, N. Y. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Dudley P. Hall, Little Genesee, N. Y. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Donald W. Mott, Martville, N. Y. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Leon D. Tucker, McDonough, N. Y. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Hazel C. Fiala, Millport, N. Y. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Walter L. Pepper, Moriah, N. Y. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

James W. Van Alstine, Nelliston, N. Y. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Alexander R. Knowlton, Rexford, N. Y. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Florence E. Smith, Sterling Station, N. Y. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

George E. McEvoy, Tillson, N. Y. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Donald B. Kentner, Turin, N. Y. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Otto I. Mayne, West Edmeston, N. Y. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Iva R. Puffer, Wynantskill, N. Y. Office became Presidential July 1, 1941.

NORTH CAROLINA

Alda McClure, Boiling Springs, N. C. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Ralph G. Goode, Connellys Springs, N. C. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Frank McMillan, Crumpler, N. C. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Mamie B. Williams, East Lumberton, N. C. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Guy R. Cutrell, Fairfield, N. C. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

William D. Sloop, Harrisburg, N. C. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Anne Lee Vannoy, Highshoals, N. C. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Eugene S. Edwards, Hookerton, N. C. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Lola A. Carter, Jackson Springs, N. C. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Mitsn O. Saunders, Kure Beach, N. C. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Henry R. Gerald, Pine Level, N. C. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Helen B. Hemphill, Rhodhiss, N. C. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Glenn E. Ritchie, Richfield, N. C. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Henry M. Cates, Saxapahaw, N. C. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Margaret I. Siler, Staley, N. C. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Ella K. Phillips, Swepsonville, N. C. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Robert F. Rash, Union Grove, N. C. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

William I. Rowland, Willow Spring, N. C. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Orion M. Click, Woodleaf, N. C. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

J. Bryan Boswell, Woodsdale, N. C. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

NORTH DAKOTA

M. Marvin McKeever, Hamilton, N. Dak., in place of H. J. Rock, resigned.

Celeste M. Reiman, White Earth, N. Dak. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

OHIO

Robert B. Leslie, Latty, Ohio. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Guy Miller, Morral, Ohio. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Beverly Bradley, South Lebanon, Ohio. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Clara C. Kugler, Stone Creek, Ohio. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Hazel E. Clark, Syracuse, Ohio. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Archie C. Reynolds, Waldo, Ohio. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

OKLAHOMA

Roy R. Hardway, Hugo, Okla., in place of Hugh Johnson, resigned.

John H. York, Indianola, Okla. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Joe R. Kyle, Macomb, Okla. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Frederick M. Shaw, Oklahoma City, Okla., in place of J. S. Morris. Incumbent's commission expired March 10, 1941.

PENNSYLVANIA

Thomas J. Murphy, Ashville, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Sophie M. Winebrenner, Bradenville, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Mildred V. Miller, Chadds Ford, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Edward Dworak, Kelayres, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Walter H. Davis, Klingerstown, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Eli R. Witmer, Lampeter, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Fred W. Patterson, Lattimer Mines, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.
Elen Nora Robinson, Lloydell, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.
Anna Belle Smith, Madison, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.
Edgar J. Burkett, Manns Choice, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.
Katherine M. Norton, Marsteller, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.
Ida L. Buskirk, Martins Creek, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.
Edwin Zimmerman, Newmanstown, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.
Ralph B. Fields, Newton Hamilton, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.
Noah B. Becker, Perkiomenville, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.
Anna Bissey, Pipersville, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.
Robert D. Hoffecker, Ronks, Pa. Office bebecame Presidential July 1, 1944.
Viola Cleland, Rutledge, Pa., in place of P. B. Thompson, resigned.
Edith M. Frey, South Heights, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.
Francis R. Murphy, Swedeland, Pa. Office came Presidential July 1, 1944.
Sara M. Gilpin, Tarrs, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.
Margaret Melva Mains, Westmoreland City, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.
Theresa A. Giacomelli, Willock, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

PUERTO RICO

Victor M. Monrouzeau, Arecibo, P. R., in place of M. O. Reyes, transferred.

SOUTH CAROLINA

Grace H. Bagnal, Aynor, S. C. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

SOUTH DAKOTA

Florence M. Hausman, Chester, S. Dak. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.
Annie McBride, Harrisburg, S. Dak. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.
Allen A. Benson, Ravinia, S. Dak., in place of C. F. Silvis, transferred.
Tulla H. Simpson, Veblen, S. Dak., in place of J. L. Simpson, deceased.

TENNESSEE

Clyde Zimmerman, Belvidere, Tenn. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.
Ruth J. Way, Bloomington Springs, Tenn. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.
Ova Allred, Crawford, Tenn. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.
Etoile Johnson, Doyle, Tenn. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.
Belle Emert, Walland, Tenn. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.
Mabel B. Baggett, Whitehouse, Tenn. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

TEXAS

Mattie G. Brown, Centerville, Tex., in place of V. D. Brown, deceased.
Henry M. Hollis, Frankston, Tex., in place of S. M. Perry. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.
Ethel C Key, Desdemona, Tex. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.
Jim B. Dickey, Pottsboro, Tex., in place of W. P. Hardwick, retired.
Clara M. Davis, Ringgold, Tex., in place of M. L. Carlton, transferred.

UTAH

John R. Sorenson, Emery, Utah. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

VIRGINIA

Roy G. Boatwright, Coeburn, Va., in place of C. D. Lay. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.
J. Herbert Norton, Deltaville, Va. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.
Lillie M. Biggs, Patrick Springs, Va. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

WASHINGTON

Joseph F. Ladley, Elma, Wash., in place of L. F. Nelson, removed.

WEST VIRGINIA

Robert L. Martin, Branchland, W. Va., in place of Mabel M. Messinger, removed.
Doris Altizer, Ethel, W. Va. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.
Ercell C. Hutchinson, Salt Rock, W. Va. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

WISCONSIN

Erna M. Dohm, Dane, Wis. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.
John C. Esse, DeForest, Wis., in place of Carl Newton, deceased.
Nicholas A. Braun, Eden, Wis. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.
Arthus Nortwen, Conover, Wis. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

WYOMING

Vernon M. Sandman, Albin, Wyo., in place of J. A. Anderson, retired.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, SEPTEMBER 19, 1944

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou who art the living, creative God, whose spirit throbs in this universe and quivers in every atom, we rejoice that Thou art our Father. In the quiet depths of the vast eternal may all the exiles of earth return and find rest. Grant that our careers may be inspired by a passionate aspiration for our country and blended with an earnest, spiritual life. Let us take heed and keep ourselves free from all covetousness and greed, for one's life consists not in the things he possesses.

Hold the world to the basic truth of the Holy Bible, that whatsoever a man soweth that shall he also reap. Persuade us that this truth is not only a prophecy but a fulfillment. Wickedly dead is that nation which cauterizes the soul of the individual; its reward shall be the fruits of falsehood, avarice, and godlessness, and its right to live in Christian communities cannot be vindicated. O Lord God of the ages, be a great, sounding voice for the deathless soul of China which is fighting and warring against death and those crimson terrors which have stalked her soil by midnight and stormed it by day. Undefeated and unbroken by wrongs from time immemorial, O make Thy righteous acts manifest that she may walk again her own sacred land, tearless and painless in her own right. Through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

REPORT ON REEXAMINATION OF COLUMBIA AND SNAKE RIVERS

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Speaker, from the Committee on Printing, I report back favorably without amendment (Rept. No. 1899) a privileged resolution (H. Res. 641) authorizing the printing of additional copies of House Document No. 704, Seventy-fifth Congress, third session, a report from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on the reexamination of Columbia and Snake Rivers, Oreg., Wash., and Idaho, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That there be printed with illustrations 1,400 additional copies of House Document No. 704, Seventy-fifth Congress, third session, entitled "A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated May 26, 1938, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on a reexamination of Columbia and Snake Rivers, Oreg., Wash., and Idaho, authorized by section 6 of the River and Harbor Act, approved August 30, 1935, and requested by resolutions of the Committee on Commerce, United States Senate, adopted May 21, 1938, August 21, 1935, and June 10, 1936," of which 1,000 shall be for the use of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, 200 for the use of the House document room, and 200 for the use of the Senate document room.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TO AMEND THE TRANSPORTATION ACT OF 1940 WITH RESPECT TO THE MOVEMENT OF GOVERNMENT TRAFFIC

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Speaker, from the Committee on Printing, I report back favorably without amendment (Rept. No. 1900) a privileged resolution (H. Res. 642) authorizing the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce of the House of Representatives to have printed for its use additional copies of the hearings on the bill (H. R. 4184) to amend the Transportation Act of 1940 with respect to the movement of Government traffic, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That in accordance with paragraph 3 of section 2 of the Printing Act approved March 1, 1907, the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce of the House of Representatives be, and is hereby, authorized and empowered to have printed for its use 500 additional copies of the hearings held before a subcommittee of the said committee during the current session on the bill (H. R. 4184) to amend section 321, title III, part II, Transportation Act of 1940, with respect to the movement of Government traffic.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RIGHTS AND BENEFITS OF VETERANS OF THE ARMED SERVICES

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Speaker, from the Committee on Printing, I report back favorably without amendment (Rept. No. 1901) a privileged resolution (H. Con. Res. 100) authorizing that the pamphlet containing information as to the rights and benefits that are available to veterans of the armed forces and their dependents be published as a document and providing for the printing of additional copies thereof, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the pamphlet containing information as to the rights and benefits that are available to veterans of the

armed forces and their dependents, published by the Office of War Mobilization, be printed as a document, and that 200,000 additional copies be printed for the use of the House of Representatives, 65,000 additional copies be printed for the use of the Senate, and 5,000 additional copies be printed for the use of the House Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JARMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I understand these are to go into the folding room and be credited to the individual Members?

Mr. JARMAN. Five thousand will go to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation. The remainder of them are to be divided equally among the Members.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow, at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day and following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I have two unanimous consent requests, one that at the conclusion of the legislative program and any other special orders today, I may address the House for 10 minutes, and the other, that on Thursday next, after the disposition of the legislative program, and any other special orders, I may address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

AMENDING NAVAL RESERVE ACT

Mr. DREWRY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (S. 2028) to amend the Naval Reserve Act of 1938 as amended, and the Coast Guard Auxiliary and Reserve Act of 1941, as amended, so as to permit service of members of the Women's Reserve in the American area, the Territories of Hawaii and Alaska, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 504 of Title V—Women's Reserve, of the Naval Reserve Act of 1938, added by the act entitled "An act to expedite the war effort by releasing officers and men for duty at sea and their replacement by women in the shore establishment of the Navy, and for other purposes," approved July 30, 1942 (56 Stat. 730; U. S. C., 1940 edition, Supp. III, title 34, sec. 857c), is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 504. Members of the Women's Reserve shall not be assigned to duty on board vessels of the Navy or in aircraft while such aircraft are engaged in combat missions and shall not be assigned to duty outside the American area and the Territories of Hawaii and Alaska, and may be assigned to duty outside the continental United States only upon their prior request."

SEC. 2. Section 404 of Title IV—Women's Reserve, of the Coast Guard Auxiliary and Reserve Act of 1941, as added by the act entitled "An act to amend the Coast Guard Auxiliary and Reserve Act of 1941, as amended, so as to expedite the war effort by providing for releasing officers and men for duty at sea, and their replacement by women in the shore establishment of the Coast Guard, and for other purposes," approved November 23, 1942 (56 Stat. 1020; U. S. C., 1940 edition, Supp. III, title 14, sec. 384), is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 404. Members of the Women's Reserve shall not be assigned to duty on board vessels of the Navy or Coast Guard or in aircraft while such aircraft are engaged in combat missions and shall not be assigned to duty outside the American area and the Territories of Hawaii and Alaska, and may be assigned to duty outside the continental United States only upon their prior request."

SEC. 3. As used in this act the term "American area" means the area geographically defined as follows:

"East boundary: From the North Pole, south along the seventy-fifth merdidian west longitude to the seventy-seventh parallel north latitude, thence southeast through Davis Strait to the intersection of the fortieth parallel north latitude and the thirty-fifth meridian west longitude, thence south along that meridian to the tenth parallel north latitude, thence southeast to the intersection of the Equator and the twentieth meridian west longitude, thence along the twentieth meridian west longitude to the South Pole.

"West boundary: From the North Pole, south along the one hundred and forty-first meridian west longitude to the east boundary of Alaska, thence south and southeast along the Alaskan boundary to the Pacific Ocean, thence south along the one hundred and thirtieth meridian to its intersection with the thirtieth parallel north latitude, thence southeast to the intersection of the Equator and the one hundredth meridian west longitude, then south along the one hundredth meridian west longitude to the South Pole."

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill was laid on the table.

HENRY WHITE

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 2707) for the relief of Henry White, with a Senate amendment, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment as follows:

Line 8, after "States." insert "Upon the enactment of this act the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the quota for the Chinese of the first year that the said quota is available."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman explain this amendment?

Mr. LESINSKI. It charges the alien to the quota of the respective country.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. It is simply a case of one person of Chinese descent, is that it?

Mr. LESINSKI. That is correct.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDING THE VETERANS' REGULATIONS

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (H. R. 5041) to amend the Veterans' Regulations and I ask unanimous consent that the same be considered in the House, as in Committee of the Whole.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman explain what this legislation provides?

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, this bill has the green light from the Veterans' Bureau and the Bureau of the Budget.

The purpose of this bill is to remove an existing inequality between the monthly additional rate of pension paid to a disabled peacetime veteran and that paid to a disabled wartime veteran who as a result of a service-incurred disability has suffered the anatomical loss or the loss of the use of one foot, or one hand, or one eye. Under the present law for the disabilities just named a peacetime veteran receives an additional pension of $18.75 whereas for similar disabilities a wartime veteran received $35 per month additional compensation. The peacetime service-connected disability rates are generally 75 percent of the war service-connected disability rates. The exception exists in this class of cases, and this bill proposes to increase the additional pension of $18.75, which is 75 percent of the $25 monthly rate which formerly prevailed for veterans of wartime service. The increase for peacetime veterans under this bill would be from $18.75 per month to $26.25 per month.

COST OF THE LEGISLATION

The Veterans' Administration has informed the committee that it is estimated that the bill would affect approximately

1,700 veterans of the Regular Establishment at an additional annual cost of $152,600 for the first year.

ADMINISTRATIVE APPROVAL

This bill, H. R. 5041, has the so-called green light as it has the approval of the Veterans' Administration and the Bureau of the Budget because the legislation is based upon the principle of an agreed ratio of benefits between peacetime and wartime service-incurred disabilities.

Mr. McGREGOR. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I yield.

Mr. McGREGOR. I may say to the gentleman from Massachusetts we have carefully gone over this bill. It is simply clarifying an inequality that has existed between peacetime and service-connected veterans.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. And it is approved by the Veterans' Bureau?

Mr. McGREGOR. Yes.

Mr. RANKIN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. This applies only to peacetime veterans?

Mr. LESINSKI. This applies only to peacetime veterans.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That effective on the first day of the month following the month in which this act is enacted, subparagraph (k) of paragraph II, of part II of Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a), as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"II. * * *

"(k) If the disabled person, as the result of service-incurred disability, has suffered the anatomical loss or the loss of the use of only one foot, or one hand, or one eye, the rate of pension provided in part II, paragraph II, (a) to (j), shall be increased by $26.25 per month."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COAST GUARD AUXILIARY AND RESERVE ACT OF 1941

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 5255) to amend the Coast Guard Auxiliary and Reserve Act of 1941, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman explain the bill?

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this bill is to enlarge the Coast Guard Auxiliary, which has heretofore existed so as to make effective with it not only boats and yachts but also airplanes and amateur radio stations. I am informed and the committee was informed that there are a considerable number of private airplanes and amateur radio stations whose owners could come into the Coast Guard voluntary service just as the auxiliaries at the present time, and render considerable help in the saving of life at sea and the saving of property at sea.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Is this approved by the Department and by the gentleman's committee?

Mr. BLAND. Yes; it is approved by the Department and by my committee.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Coast Guard Auxiliary and Reserve Act of 1941, as amended, be, and the same is, hereby further amended as follows:

Section 2 of said act is hereby amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 2. It is hereby declared to be the purpose of the auxiliary to assist the Coast Guard (a) to promote safety and to effect rescues on and over the high seas and on navigable waters; (b) to enforce laws of the United States applicable to motorboats and yachts; (c) to promote efficiency in the operation of motorboats and yachts; (d) to foster a wider knowledge of, and better compliance with, the laws, rules, and regulations governing the operation of motorboats and yachts; and (e) to facilitate other operations of the Coast Guard."

SEC. 2. Section 3 of said act is hereby amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 3. The auxiliary shall be composed of citizens of the United States and of its Territories and possessions, including the Philippine Islands, who are owners (sole or part) of motorboats, yachts, aircraft, or radio stations or who by reason of their special training or experience are deemed by the Commandant to be qualified for duty in the auxiliary, and who may be enrolled therein pursuant to regulations prescribed under the authority of this act."

SEC. 3. Section 6 of said act is hereby amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 6. The Coast Guard is authorized to utilize in the conduct of duties incident to the saving of life and property, including air-sea rescue operations, in the patrol of marine parades and regattas, or for any other purpose incident to the carrying out of the functions and duties of the Coast Guard which may be authorized by the Secretary of the Treasury (or by the Secretary of the Navy when the Coast Guard operates as part of the Navy), any motorboat, yacht, aircraft, or radio station placed at its disposition for any of such purposes by any member of the auxiliary, by any corporation, partnership, or association, or by any State or political subdivision thereof."

SEC. 4. Said act is hereby amended by adding thereto a new section 7A and a new section 7B, to read as follows:

"SEC. 7A. Any aircraft, while assigned to Coast Guard duty as herein authorized, shall be deemed to be a vessel of the United States Coast Guard within the meaning of the act of June 15, 1936, as amended (49 Stat. 1514; U. S. C., title 14, sec. 71), and shall be deemed to be a public aircraft within the meaning of the act of June 23 1938 as amended (52 Stat. 973; U. S. C. title 49, sec. 401 et seq.).

"SEC. 7B. Any radio station, while assigned to Coast Guard duty as herein authorized, shall be deemed to be a radio station of the United States Coast Guard and a Government station within the meaning of the act of June 19, 1934, as amended (48 Stat. 1081; U. S. C., title 47, sec. 151 and the following)."

SEC. 5. Section 8 of said act is hereby amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 8. Appropriations of the Coast Guard shall be available for the payment of actual necessary traveling expenses and subsistence of members of the auxiliary assigned to specific duties as herein authorized and for actual necessary expenses of operation of any motorboat, yacht, aircraft, or radio station when assigned to Coast Guard duty, but shall not be available for the payment of compensation for personal services, incident to such operation, to other than personnel of the Regular Coast Guard or Coast Guard Reserve established by title II of this Act. The term 'actual necessary expenses of operation', used herein, shall include payment for fuel, oil, power, water, supplies, provisions, replacement or repair of equipment, repair of any damaged motorboat, yacht, aircraft, or radio station and for the constructive or actual loss of any motorboat, yacht, aircraft, or radio station where it is determined, under applicable regulations, that responsibility for the loss or damage necessitating such replacement or repair of equipment, or for the damage or constructive or actual loss of such motorboat, yacht, aircraft, or radio station rests with the Coast Guard."

SEC. 6. Section 9 of said act is hereby amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 9. No member of the auxiliary, solely by reason of such membership, shall be vested with or exercise any right, privilege, power, or duty vested in or imposed upon the personnel of the Coast Guard or the Reserve, except that any such member may, under applicable regulations, be assigned specific duties, which, after appropriate training and examination, he has been found competent to perform, to effectuate the purposes of the auxiliary. No member of the auxiliary shall be placed in charge of a motorboat, yacht, aircraft, or radio station assigned to Coast Guard duty unless he has been specifically designated by authority of the Commandant to perform such duty. Members of the auxiliary, when assigned to specific duties as herein authorized, shall, unless otherwise limited by the Commandant, be vested with the same power and authority, in execution of such duties, as members of the Regular Coast Guard assigned to similar duty. When any member of the auxiliary is assigned to such duty he may, pursuant to applicable regulations, be paid actual necessary traveling expenses, including a per diem allowance of not to exceed $6 in lieu of subsistence, while traveling and while on duty away from his home: *Provided, however,* That no per diem shall be paid for any period during which quarters and subsistence in kind are furnished by the Government: *Provided further,* That no per diem shall be paid for any period while such member is performing duty on a vessel."

SEC. 7. Said act is hereby further amended by adding thereto a new section 11, to read as follows:

"SEC. 11. When any member of the auxiliary is physically injured or dies as a result of physical injury incurred while performing patrol duty or any other specific duty to which he has been assigned as herein authorized, such member or his beneficiary shall be entitled to the same benefits as are now or as may hereafter be provided for temporary members of the Coast Guard Reserve who suffer physical injury or death resulting from physical injury incurred in line of duty. Members of the auxiliary who contract sickness or disease while performing patrol duty or any other specific duty to which they have been assigned as herein authorized shall be entitled to the same hospital treatment as is afforded members of the Regular Coast Guard."

SEC. 8. Said act is hereby further amended by adding thereto a new section 12, to read as follows:

"SEC. 12. Members of the auxiliary shall be entitled only to such rights, privileges, and benefits as are specifically set forth in this act for them or as may be specifically provided for them in any other law. Any law

which grants rights, privileges, or benefits generally to military personnel or, among others, to personnel of the Coast Guard and the Reserve component thereof, without specifically granting such rights, privileges, or benefits to members of the auxiliary shall not be deemed applicable to members of the auxiliary."

SEC. 9. Section 302 of said act is hereby amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 302. The Secretary of the Treasury, when the Coast Guard is operating in the Treasury Department, and the Secretary of the Navy, when the Coast Guard operates as part of the Navy, are hereby authorized to prescribe one or more suitable distinguishing flags, penants, or other identifying insignia to be displayed by the motorboats, yachts, aircraft, and radio stations owned by members of the auxiliary or the Reserve, one or more suitable insignia which may be worn by such members, and one or more suitable uniforms which may be worn by members of the auxiliary. Such flags, pennants, uniforms, and insignia shall be furnished by the Coast Guard at actual cost, and the proceeds received therefor shall be credited to current appropriations from which replacements are purchased. Any person who shall without proper authority, fly from any building, aircraft, motorboat, yacht, or other vessel, any flag or pennant or display any identifying insignia or wear any insignia of the auxiliary or Reserve, or wear any uniform of the auxiliary shall, upon conviction thereof, be punished by a fine not exceeding $500."

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, line 1, strike out all after the word "waters;" down to and including the letter "(c)" in line 2; and in line 4 strike out "(d)" and insert in lieu thereof "(c)"; and in line 6 strike out "(c)" and insert in lieu thereof "(d)."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DEMOBILIZATION AND RECONVERSION—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. DOUGHTON filed a conference report and statement on the bill (S. 2051) to amend the Social Security Act, as amended, to provide a national program for war mobilization and reconversion, and for other purposes, for printing under the rule.

TRANSFER OF CERTAIN LAND TO CITY OF DULUTH, MINN.

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 1807) authorizing and directing the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain lands to the city of Duluth, Minn.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I understand this simply transfers to the city of Duluth land that is not used by the Government for military purposes?

Mr. BLAND. It transfers about 1⅙ acres of land and is in effect an easement of land so as to straighten the highway.

The bill was introduced by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. PITTENGER].

The transfer of this land will not in any way interfere with the 6 acres of land owned by the Bureau of Fisheries but will enable the highway people to work better.

The bill contains amendments recommended by the Secretary of the Interior which provide for reconversion of title if not used and that it shall be used so as not to interfere with the Bureau's fish hatchery.

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, the statement of the chairman of the committee is absolutely correct. There ought to be no objection whatever to this bill.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to convey to the city of Duluth, Minn., the following-described land, now a part of the fisheries station in said city: Beginning at a point on the east line of Sixtieth Avenue East in the city of Duluth, State of Minnesota, said point lying forty-three and four one-hundredths feet in a northerly direction from a point at the intersection of the center line of London Road, extended with the said east line of Sixtieth Avenue East; thence extending in an easterly direction at an angle of sixty-six degree of fifteen minutes to the left of said east line of Sixtieth Avenue East a distance of sixty-one and fifty-seven one-hundredths feet to a point of curve; thence continuing on a curve to the left whose radius is one thousand three hundred and forty-five and seven-tenths feet a distance of three hundred and sixty-four and eighteen one-hundredths feet, to the center line of Lester River as now located; thence in a southeasterly direction along the center line of said Lester River a distance of one hundred and thirty-two and thirty-six one-hundredths feet to a point; thence westerly parallel to the curve above described and distant therefrom one hundred and twenty feet, a distance of one hundred and seventy-eight and twenty one-hundredths feet to a point; thence northerly on a radial line a distance of eight and five-tenths feet to a point; thence westerly parallel to the curve first above described and distant therefrom one hundred and eleven and five-tenths feet a distance of two hundred and seventy-eight and ten one-hundredths feet to a point of tangency; thence westerly on a tangent line a distance of twelve and fifty-one one-hundredths feet to a point on the east line of Sixtieth Avenue East; thence northerly on said east line of Sixtieth Avenue East a distance of one hundred and twenty-one and eighty-two one-hundredths feet to a point of beginning and there terminating, containing an area of one and one-hundred-and-seventy-six one-thousandths acres; said land being located in sections 5 and 8, township 50 north, range 13 west, of the fourth principal meridian. The said conveyance to the city of Duluth shall be made subject to the conditions that the land be used for the construction of and maintenance of a public highway free of any expense to the United States, that the highway be constructed and maintained so as not to interfere with the operations of and access to the fish hatchery station, and that in the event of the discontinuance by the city of Duluth of the use of the above-described property as a public highway, or upon failure to maintain the same in accordance with the conditions of the deed, title to said land shall revert to the United States.

SEC. 2. Nothing herein contained shall affect the applicability of the Federal Highway Act, approved November 9, 1921 (42 Stat. 212), as amended, to the public highway to be constructed on the land authorized to be conveyed hereunder.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JURISDICTION OVER CHATTANOOGA NATIONAL CEMETERY TRANSFERRED FROM INTERIOR DEPARTMENT TO WAR DEPARTMENT

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 5232) to transfer jurisdiction over the Chattanooga National Cemetery, Chattanooga, Tenn., from the Department of the Interior to the War Department, and for other purposes.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman explain the bill?

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, this bill transfers the Chattanooga National Cemetery to the War Department. At the present time under Executive order the Park Service has jurisdiction over it, but inasmuch as it is an active cemetery and interments are being made now by the War Department, jurisdiction should be transferred to the War Department.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. As I understand it, when a cemetery is changed from an inactive status to an active status it comes under the jurisdiction of the War Department.

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. Yes; the gentleman is correct. Most of them are on historical ground and in this case the historical ground is a national monument.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. But it is being used now for burial purposes?

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. It is being used now for burial purposes, and the Interior Department will transfer it to the War Department.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I yield.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I may also point out to the gentleman from Massachusetts that this change in status is recommended by all the Legion posts in Chattanooga and everybody who knows anything about it.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Chattanooga National Cemetery, Chattanooga, Tenn., is hereby transferred from the jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Interior to the jurisdiction of the Secretary of War for administration in accordance with the laws and regulations applicable to national cemeteries administered by the War Department.

The unexpended balance of any funds available for administration of the Chattanooga National Cemetery, as determined by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, shall be transferred to the Secretary of War, and may be expended hereafter by him for

the same purposes for which such funds were made available.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

UNITED STATES COMMISSIONER FOR BIG BEND NATIONAL PARK, TEX.

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 4697) providing for the appointment of a United States commissioner for the Big Bend National Park in the State of Texas, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman explain this bill?

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, recently some land pursuant to a previous act of Congress was conveyed to the Big Bend National Park. This confers Federal jurisdiction, but there is no commissioner. This is in line with the procedure that has been followed over a long period of time. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMASON] is familiar with the situation and recommends our doing this.

Mr. THOMASON. Mr. Speaker, I may say to the gentleman from Massachusetts that Congress some years ago established what was known as the Big Bend National Park in Texas. It was established in the tradition that the State of Texas would give to the Federal Government the land. The deed to that park has been delivered and the National Park Service has taken possession, but it is necessary to have a commissioner to be appointed by the United States district judge for that district.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. How much of a salary would the commissioner receive?

Mr. THOMASON. That is up to the Congress. It is very nominal. It is simply to look after depredations within the park. In all the parks for many, many years there have been commissioners appointed, which commissioners have been appointed by the Federal judge for the particular district.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Are there many of them in the country?

Mr. THOMASON. Every park has a commissioner to look after depredations, the commissioner being appointed by the Federal judge. He is paid a nominal salary and it is the same in all the parks.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. What is a nominal salary these days?

Mr. THOMASON. Eighteen hundred dollars to two thousand dollars. I do not know. I am not sure what is paid in the other national parks.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. This comes with a unanimous report?

Mr. THOMASON. Yes.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That upon the establishment of the Big Bend National Park in the State of Texas pursuant to the provisions of the act of June 20, 1935 (49 Stat. 393), entitled "An act to provide for the establishment of the Big Bend National Park in the State of Texas, and for other purposes," the United States District Court for the Western District of Texas shall, upon the recommendation and approval by the Secretary of the Interior of a qualified candidate, appoint a commissioner for the said national park. The district court shall prescribe the rules of procedure and practice for the commissioner in the trial of cases and for appeal to the district court. The commissioner shall be paid an annual salary, as appropriated for by the Congress.

SEC. 2. The commissioner shall have jurisdiction to issue process in the name of the United States for the arrest of any person charged with a violation of any of the rules and regulations made by the Secretary of the Interior in pursuance of law for the government and protection of the park, or with the commission within the park of a petty offense against the law, and to try the person so charged, who, if found guilty, shall be subject to the punishment prescribed by section 3 of the act of August 25, 1916 (39 Stat. 535; U. S. C., title 16, sec. 3), as amended. For the purposes of this act, the term "petty offense" shall be defined as in section 335 of the Criminal Code (U. S. C., title 18, sec. 541). In all cases of conviction an appeal shall lie from the judgment of said commissioner to the district court.

SEC. 3. The commissioner shall have power to issue process in the name of the United States for the arrest of any person charged with the commission within said park of any criminal offense not covered by the provisions of section 2 of this act, and to hear the evidence introduced. If he is of the opinion that probable cause is shown for holding the person so charged for trial, he shall commit such person for further appropriate action, and shall certify a transcript of the record of his proceedings and the testimony in such case to the district court, which court shall have jurisdiction of the case.

SEC. 4. All fees, costs, and expenses arising in cases under this act and properly chargeable to the United States shall be certified, approved, and paid as are like fees, costs, and expenses in the courts of the United States. All fines, fees, costs, and expenses imposed and collected shall be deposited by the commissioner, or by the marshal of the United States collecting the same, with the clerk of the United States District Court for the Western District of Texas.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, line 1, after the comma, strike out the words "upon the recommendation and approval by the Secretary of the Interior of a qualified candidate."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXCHANGE OF CERTAIN LANDS IN THE STATE OF MONTANA

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 4917) conferring upon the State of Montana authority to exchange for other lands certain lands selected by the State of Montana for the use of the University of Montana for biological station purposes pursuant to the act of March 3, 1905 (33 Stat. 1080).

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, what is this bill?

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, this involves a small tract of land which was originally conveyed by the Federal Government with other tracts of land.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Where is it located?

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. In the State of Montana. There is other land nearby which is better fitted for the purpose and we merely want to consent to the exchange of this land for the other. No funds of the United States will be involved and the land involved in the exchange will serve the same purpose.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. We are simply making a trade with the State?

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. The State already owns the land, but we gave it to them for certain purposes. Now we are authorizing them to trade for some other land for the same purposes. It is authorizing an exchange within the State. The State authorities advocate it, the gentleman from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] is urging its immediate passage, and the bill has the unanimous report from all members of the committee.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Are the State authorities in favor of this?

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Yes; they are.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That there is hereby conferred upon the State of Montana the power and authority to exchange for such other lands in private ownership, as the Governor of the State of Montana may select, lot 1 of section 13, in township 24 north, range 21 west, of the Montana principal meridian, which was selected by the State of Montana for the use of the University of Montana for biological station purposes, pursuant to the act of Congress of March 3, 1905 (33 Stat. 1080). The State of Montana is hereby authorized to convey the said lot 1 herein described in fee simple to such person or persons with whom such exchange may be effected.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RELINQUISHMENT OF TITLE TO CERTAIN LANDS IN THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, CALIF.

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 4286) to relinquish the title of the United

States to certain lands in the county of Los Angeles, State of California.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, how many more bills has the gentleman?

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. This is the last one.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. What does this bill do?

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, this bill corrects the title to certain lands in California. A survey ran to the river from one side, a survey ran to the river from the other side, but the river varied its course. There is a little error in the description. The Federal Government made a survey. No land is claimed and this is for the purpose of correcting those titles. The bill was introduced by the gentleman from California [Mr. HINSHAW], who represents that district and has the unanimous report of the committee and of the department.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That all the right, title, and interest of the United States in and to any lands supposed to exist between the east boundary of the Rancho San Francisquito and the west boundary of the Rancho La Puente, in township 1 south, range 11 west, San Bernardino meridian, according to the plats of survey on file in the General Land Office, be, and the same are hereby, released and relinquished by the United States to the equitable owners of the equitable titles thereto and to their respective heirs and assigns forever, as fully and completely, in every respect whatever, as could be done by patents issued according to law: *Provided*, That this act shall amount only to a relinquishment of any title that the United States has, or is supposed to have, in and to any of said lands, and shall not be construed to abridge, impair, injure, prejudice, or divest in any manner any valid right, title, or interest of any person or body corporate whatever, the true intent of this act being to concede and abandon all right, title, and interest of the United States to those persons, estates, firms, or corporations who would be the true owners of said lands under the laws of California, including the laws of prescription, in the absence of the said interest, title, and estate of the United States.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NAMING OF LAKE FORMED BY WATERS OF THE RED RIVER IMPOUNDED BY DENISON DAM

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table and its immediate consideration the bill (S. 2137) to provide for naming the lake formed by waters of the Red River impounded by Denison Dam.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I understand that this is simply giving a lake a name.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. It is. May I say that under the Flood Control Act of June 28, 1938, a lake was formed above the Denison Dam along the Red River, and that is the boundary between the States of Texas and Oklahoma. The purpose of this bill is to name that lake Texoma.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. It has no name at this time?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. No; the name of the dam is not changed, but this names the lake. I may say that there is an identical bill unanimously reported by the Committee on Flood Control of the House.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object—and I shall not object—I call the attention of the gentleman from Mississippi to the fact that this is likely to result in confusion. You will have a dam with one name and the lake immediately behind it with another name. It seems to me the dam and the lake both ought to have the same name.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, with deference to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN], I would say the purpose is to prevent the very confusion about which the gentleman speaks. The name of the dam remains, and the name of the body of water formed by the dam is called Texoma in accordance with the desires of the people of Texas and Oklahoma.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, I realize the ambition of local individuals to have certain things named to suit themselves, or after their particular locality or State, but I submit that every student who undertakes to find the whereabouts of Texoma Lake is going to then have to go and look it up to see what dam provides it with water, and, as I said, this is going to result in confusion.

The SPEAKER. The Chair may state that there has been quite a lot of controversy as to how this lake should be named, and if the Congress would name it, it might relieve the Chair of some embarrassment.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, I want to say now that if I had my way both the dam and the lake would be named "Rayburn" after the distinguished Speaker who is largely responsible for that great project.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That from and after the enactment of this act the lake formed by the impounding of waters of the Red River by Denison Dam, the construction of which was authorized by the act of June 28, 1938 (52 Stat. 1219), shall be known and designated on the public records as Lake Texoma.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill, H. R. 5338, was laid on the table.

BOARD OF REGENTS OF THE SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Library be discharged from the further consideration of the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 268) to provide for the reappointment of Harvey N. Davis and Arthur H. Compton as members of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution, and that the joint resolution now be called up for consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, is this something unusual for the House to be appointing two regents by resolution?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. No. Under the law providing for the government of the Smithsonian Institution the Board of Regents of the Institution includes six "citizen regents" who are to be "appointed by joint resolution of Congress." Two of the six are selected biennially in order to constitute continuous representation on the Board and this joint resolution provides for the two whose terms expire this year.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. This does not in any way increase the size of the Board of Regents?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. No. These men are now serving on the Board and under the terms of this joint resolution are reelected or appointed for an additional term of 6 years.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON]?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the joint resolution as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the vacancies in the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution, of the class other than Members of the Congress, which will occur by the expiration of the terms of Harvey N. Davis, of New Jersey, and Arthur H. Compton, of Illinois, on June 14 and 19, 1944, respectively, be filled by the reappointment of the present incumbents for the statutory term of 6 years.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, the two savants proposed for reelection to the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution, Dr. Harvey N. Davis, of New Jersey, and Dr. Arthur H. Compton, of Illinois, are among the most eminent of American scientists. Each is distinguished in his particular field, and both are men of the highest scholastic and professional standing.

In order to give the Members of the House something of their background and attainments, I include a brief biographical résumé of each:

HARVEY N. DAVIS

Mechanical engineer, born June 6, 1881. A. B., Brown University, 1901, A. M., 1902; A. M. Harvard, 1903, Ph. D., 1906; Sc. D., Brown University, 1928, Northeastern University, 1938, Columbia University, 1940; LL. D., Rutgers, 1928; D. Eng., New York University, 1936, Rose Polytechnic Institute, 1938.

Instructor in mathematics, Brown University, 1901–02; instructor physics, 1904–10, versity, 1901–02; instructor physics, 1904–10; assistant professor, 1910–19; professor mechanical engineering, 1919–28, Harvard University; president, Stevens Institute of Technology, since 1928.

Engineer in turbine department, General Electric Co., 1917–18; aeronautical mechanical engineer, Air Service, 1918–22; consulting engineer, United States Bureau of Mines, 1921–25, Franklin Railway Supply Co., 1920–27, Air Reduction Co., 1922–25.

Regent, Smithsonian Institution, 1938–44; member Board of Visitors to United States Naval Academy, 1939; member advisory council, Cumberland University; trustee, Blair Academy.

Fellow, American Society of Mechanical Engineers (president 1937–38); American Academy of Arts and Sciences; American Physical Society; American Association for the Advancement of Science; member, American Mathematical Society (life); Franklin Institute (honorary); American Philosophical Society; Washington Academy of Sciences; Phi Beta Kappa, Sigma Xi, Tau Beta Pi, Delta Pi.

Author: Steam Tables and Diagrams 1908 (with L S. Marks); Practical Physics for High Schools, 1913; Elementary Practical Physics, 1938 (with N. Henry Black).

ARTHUR H. COMPTON

Physicist. Born September 10, 1892. B. S., College of Wooster, 1913, Sc. D., 1927; M. A., Princeton, 1914, Ph. D., 1916; Cambridge University, England, 1919–20; Sc. D., Ohio State University, 1929, Yale, 1929, Princeton, 1934, Brown, 1935, Harvard, 1936, University of San Marcos, 1941, University of Arequipa, 1941; Dr. Humane Letters, University of Tampa, 1941; LL. D., Washington University, 1928, University of California, 1930; M. A., Oxford University, 1934.

Porter Ogden Jacobus fellow, Princeton, 1915–16; instructor physics, University of Minnesota, 1916–17; research physicist, Westinghouse Lamp Co., East Pittsburgh, Pa., 1917–19; natural research fellow in physics, Cavendish Laboratory, Cambridge, 1919–20; professor physics and head of department, Washington University, 1920–23; professor physics, University of Chicago, 1923–29, Charles H. Swift distinguished service professor since 1929, also chairman department of physics and dean division of physical sciences since 1940; John Simon Guggenheim fellow, 1926–27; special lecturer Punjab University, Lahore, India, 1926–27. Eastman visiting professor, Oxford University, 1934–35; fellow Balliol College, 1934–35; research associate, Carnegie Institution, since 1931; Walker-Ames visiting professor University of Washington, 1940.

Consulting physicist General Electric Co. since 1926. Civilian associate United States Signal Corps, developing airplane instruments, 1917–18.

Fellow American Physical Society (vice-president 1933; president 1934); American Optical Society; American Association for the Advancement of Science (vice president, Sec. B, 1927); Western Society Engineers (honorary); member American Philosophical Society, National Academy of Sciences, 1927, National Research Council (chairman committee on X-rays and radioactivity, 1922–25), Solvay International Congress of Physics, 1927 and 1939. Alpha Tau Omega, Sigma Xi, Phi Beta Kappa, Gamma Alpha, foreign member Reale Accademia dei Lincei, Rome, 1925; Prussian Academy of Sciences, Berlin, 1932; Royal Akademie, Amsterdam, 1938; Royal Society of Sciences, Upsala, 1938; honorary member Royal Society of New Zealand, Deutsche Akademie der Naturforscher, Indian Academy of Sciences, Akademie der Wissenschaften in Wien.

General chairman, Laymen's Missionary Movement since 1934; cochairman, National Conference of Christians and Jews since 1938; member, National Cancer Advisory Board since 1937; vice president, Chicago Tumor Institute since 1937.

Regent, Smithsonian Institution, 1938–44. Discovered change in wavelength of X-rays when scattered; total reflection of X-rays; (with C. H. Hagenow) complete polorization of X-rays; (with R. L. Doan) X-ray spectra from ruled gratings; electrical character of cosmic ray; directed world cosmic ray survey, 1931–33.

Awarded Rumford gold medal by American Academy of Arts and Sciences, 1927; Nobel prize for physics by Swedish Academy of Sciences, 1927; gold medal, Radiological Society, North America, 1928; Matteucci gold medal, Italian Academy of Sciences, 1933.

Author: (Monograph) Secondary Radiations Produced by X-rays, 1922; X-rays and Electrons, 1926; The Freedom of Man, 1935; X-rays in Theory and Experiment (with S. K. Allison), 1935; Human Meaning of Science, 1940. Coauthor: On Going to College, 1938. Contributor of numerous articles on scientific subjects.

Mr. Speaker, the fact that after 6 years on the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution, their retention on the Board is desired, as provided in the pending resolution, is sufficient testimonial to the value of their service on the Board and the necessity of taking action on the joint resolution at this time.

Mr. Speaker, if no one else desires to be heard, I move the previous question.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK] be permitted to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. TALBOT] be permitted to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article entitled "Peace Under God."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include some excerpts.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

WAR DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday last in addressing the House I referred to a statement furnished the Committee on Appropriations by the War Department at the request of Representative LANE POWERS and myself showing the amount of money the War Department asked the President for, the amount of money the President had asked Congress to appropriate for the War Department, and the amount that Congress appropriated. We asked for this information for each year since 1921. I did not at that time, nor have not at any time since, given out any figures pertaining to that statement. I was asked by a newspaper friend of mine where he could obtain the figures showing the amount of money the President had recommended, through his budget officer, that the Congress appropriate for the War Department, and the amount that Congress did appropriate. I referred him to a statement inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD under date of June 23, 1942, by Congressman Ross Collins of Mississippi, then a member of the War Department subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations. The figures which appeared in the press recently, attributed to me, were not mine and were not given out by me, but were the figures that Mr. Ross Collins placed in the RECORD at that time giving the information found therein. I just want to give Mr. Collins credit and to keep the record straight in the matter.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Vermont?

There was no objection.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an article by Capt. Richard L. Neuberger, appearing in the New York Times of July 17, 1944, and dealing with Alaska.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on two subjects and to include in one a release by the State Department with reference to the treatment of American prisoners by the Japanese Government, and in the other an address delivered by Gen.

George C. Marshall before the American Legion convention in Chicago yesterday.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the Newport News Daily Press.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that today, at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day and following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

LANDING OF AMERICAN AIR-BORNE TROOPS IN HOLLAND

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, it is probable that the military operation whereby large numbers of our troops were landed across the Rhine River to constitute the greatest threat against Germany up to this time will go down in history as one of the most brilliant maneuvers that war history records. I rise at this time to express my profound gratitude, and I am sure that of the House, for the gallantry of the men who took part in that action, for the brilliance of the leadership that made it possible, for the over-all plan conceived by the Allied command that made it possible, and for the supplying of our troops with the best equipment that any Army ever had, which also made it possible.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that tomorrow, after other special orders that have been heretofore granted, and the disposition of business on the Speaker's desk, I may be permitted to address the House for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WHITTINGTON). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

SURPLUS FEDERAL EMPLOYEES

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, this morning early there was a release from the White House of a directiye to the Bureau of the Budget to investigate conditions of employment in the Federal service with the idea of cutting down to a million employees after the war is over. Now we have a situation which calls for immediate action. That statement said that the War Production Board was not hiring new employees as those who were employed left. There are places in the War Production Board and in other departments of this Government where they have surplus employees. What we need is action by the Budget now to get rid of these surplus employees and get them off the pay roll and back into productive employment while there is a shortage of labor. Let us have real action and not so much planning for things that might happen ahead of us. Let us do it now.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

GOLD STAR MOTHERS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I think this is a fitting moment to inject a nice note into the deliberations of today, when we constantly hear so much criticism, particularly of the President. About a month ago I received a letter from a dear lady in my district who has lost a son in the Far East. It was a beautiful letter. In her letter she made inquiry about the intention of the Government, after the war is over, to permit the dear ones of those who have paid the supreme sacrifice, particularly the Gold Star Mothers, and other near relatives, where the mother is dead, to visit the graves of their loved ones. The letter from that dear lady impressed me so much, and moved and touched me so deeply, recalling to my memory, as it did, the visit of the Gold Star Mothers after the last war, that I sent it to the President of the United States. On September 15 I received a letter, signed by the President, which I think it is proper to read at this time. I know that the mothers, fathers, and loved ones of those who are serving and who have and who will pay the supreme sacrifice will be very glad to know the contents of that letter. Under date of September 15, President Roosevelt, in his letter to me, said:

> DEAR JOHN: I have read with great interest the letter you forwarded from Mrs. Sheehan, in which she suggests that the near relatives of boys who have given their lives overseas should be given an opportunity to visit their graves at the Government's expense. It will be desirable for Congress to consider, at an appropriate time, legislation permitting families who wish to do so to visit the graves of their relatives overseas after the war at Government expense. Such a proposal will have my complete support.

Then this good lady, Mrs. Catherine Sheehan, of 92 Emerson Street, South Boston, Mass., wrote me about a vessel being named in honor of her late son, with reference to which the President said:

> I hope you will tell Mrs. Sheehan when you write to her that we will keep her good suggestion in mind. I am glad that a combatant ship of our Navy has been named for her son John, and I predict that the *Sheehan* will make as fine a record as did the *Gregory*.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure we are all interested in this matter of the near and dear ones, particularly the Gold Star Mothers, visiting the graves of their sons who make the supreme sacrifice, without regard to what party is in control of the Government, as soon as possible after the war is over.

I read this letter at this time to show the reaction of the President of the United States to that fine letter sent to him by that mother who has made such a great sacrifice.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. OUTLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] may extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include therein an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. OUTLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix and include a recent radio statement.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks by including a petition received from my district.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

CRIME COMMISSION

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I call for a report of the United Nations War Crimes Commission in London.

It is 11 months old. What has it done?

It lists only 350 atrocity criminals. There have been no trials, although we have dragnetted thousands of Nazi rats. It has been said that this is progress. I call it unjustifiable procrastination.

Already all sorts of legalistic mumbo-jumbo is heard as to definition for war crimes and type of war courts. While this Commission pettifogs, the Russians and French act. They have tried and punished Nazi jackals already.

Is the farce of unpunished Huns of the last war to be reenacted?

What about Rudolph Hess?

Has this Commission decreed that the Nazis who butchered Jews and Catholics

in Axis countries are guilty of no definable war crimes? That they were barbarous?

I call upon Mr. Herbert C. Pell, our delegate to respond to my challenge.

Unless concrete and expeditious action is taken, I, for one, shall proscribe against any appropriation or support for this Commission.

Further delay on its part—and more abracadabra as to whether the Gestapo brutes are guilty of murder, rapine, and rape and deserve to be garrotted—would in turn be criminal.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANE. I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include therein a letter I received from Chairman George Walsh, of the legislative committee of World War Veterans of the American Merchant Marine, on the bill H. R. 4846.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. COFFEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include therein a resolution adopted by the department of the State of Washington, American Legion.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include an editorial from the Danbury Recorder, published at Danbury, N. C.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include some quotations.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include an editorial from the Paterson (N. J.) Morning Call.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

FEDERAL HIGHWAY CONSTRUCTION

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, last Friday the Senate passed the road bill, authorizing an appropriation of $450,000,000 a year for 3 years for post-war highway construction.

I followed with a great deal of interest the lengthy and constructive hearings held by the House Committee on Roads preparing this same legislation. There are several Members of the House who feel that the time has come to revise the formula adopted many years ago for the allocation and distribution of Federal road funds. In other words we feel that before this huge program is adopted, a fair and equitable method for the allocation of funds should be devised by the Congress. We feel that the program is needed. The problem today is a great deal different than it was in 1916, when this program was adopted. Then we had the problem of building roads from State to State. It was then a question of getting the country out of the mud. Now we have a very excellent system of Federal-aid highways, running from State to State and from principal city to principal city. The real problem today is one of congestion in and near the larger cities. There is no use of building four- and six-lane highways if they are to run into bottlenecks as they approach our principle cities. Personally, I feel we should devise a fair and equitable formula for distributing Federal aid or defeat the whole program.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Connecticut has expired.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. ELSTON of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. ELSTON of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago I called it to the attention of the House that the United States Employment Service was violating the provisions of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, usually referred to as the G. I. bill, by requiring returning service men and women to apply to the U. S. E. S. for assignment to such positions as that agency might designate. It was brought to the attention of the Military Affairs Committee that a veteran was given but 60 days after his discharge from the service to obtain a job of his own choosing. If within that period of time he did not obtain employment, he was required to make application to the United States Employment Service for placement. He was thereafter barred from accepting work which he himself might find, and no employer could hire him unless he presented a certificate of availability from that agency. This, in our judgment, was a clear violation of that part of the G. I. bill that provided that veterans should be accorded the maximum of job opportunity in the field of gainful employment. Congress plainly intended that no restrictions should be placed against a veteran who wants a job. He is entitled to a job of his own choosing and while he should be permitted to avail himself of the facilities of the United States Employment Service, it was not intended that he be ordered around by the U. S. E. S.

When it was brought to the attention of General Hershey, the Selective Service Director, he indicated to the Military Affairs Committee that he would investigate and take corrective measures if the will of Congress was being circumvented. I am now pleased to inform the House that Colonel Keesling, of General Hershey's office, has reported to me that General Hershey has conferred with General Hines, of the Veterans' Administration, and with Mr. Paul V. McNutt, of the War Manpower Commission, as a result of which the 60-day restriction will be lifted. Under the circumstances no veteran is now required at any time to apply to the United States Employment Service for a job, and no employer has a right to insist that he present a certificate of availability before giving him employment.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 15 minutes today after the disposition of the legislative program for the day and other special orders.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an article on the U. S. O.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. GAMBLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD in two instances, in one to include an editorial and in the other a newspaper article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include some telegrams about the recent disaster in New Jersey.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. J. LEROY JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD concerning the employment of Italian prisoners by the Benecia Arsenal in California.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

ADVICE FROM THE SOLID FUELS DIVISION

Mr. ROWE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House

for 1 minute and to revise and extend my own remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROWE. Mr. Speaker, I hold in my hand a poster that is put out by the Solid Fuels Division making the following announcement:

Prepare now for winter. Take dealer's advice on the kind and amount of fuel to buy and when to accept deliveries.

In reference to that, in my district the dealer has no voice now in saying what kind of fuel he can advise his customers to buy, for the only solid fuel that is being furnished them now is the kind that resulted rather disastrously in the last war.

This poster continues with the following advice:

Check your heating plant, clean and repair your equipment and installation.

With the kind of solid fuel being allocated, 25 percent of the heating equipment will be destroyed as a result of its use because of its low fusion point.

The poster continues:

Insulate walls and ceilings, install storm sash, weather strip. Calk cracks.

Two of the largest storm-sash manufacturers are located in my district and their salesmen, who also act as construction technicians, are now denied sufficient gasoline to do their work, according to their employers.

It would seem to me that if Solid Fuels Administration attempts to advise our people how to save fuel in time of war, they should adjust their own directives so that their advice can be carried out.

Here we find our governmental agencies attempting to promote the sales of storm sash, and so forth, and then issuing directives and orders which prevent their manufacture. The people will jump any way our Government asks them to in time of war, but they are not agile enough to jump two different directions at the same time. These posters show that some of our agencies are doing something but they do not show that anything is being accomplished.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague the gentleman from California [Mr. ANDERSON] may extend his own remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan.

There was no objection.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. GRANT] may extend his own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks on three different subjects and to include certain excerpts in each.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include an article entitled "Facts to Remember" written by one of my constituents, Mr. J. W. Mullin, of Mount Vernon, Ohio.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

PROMOTION IN RANK OF PRISONERS OF WAR IN THE HANDS OF THE JAPANESE

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Mexico?

There was no objection.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Speaker, on September 8, Senate bill 1374 came down from the Senate, and it is now in the House Committee on Military Affairs. This bill provides for the promotion in rank of the prisoners of war in the hands of the Japanese.

It so happened that the Bataan Relief Federation, a national organization devoted to the interests of those unfortunate men, was having a meeting in Washington at the time. My colleague the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] and I requested the committee for a hearing so that Dr. V. H. Spensley, president of the organization, and others of his group could be heard. Although the chairman of the committee was at the moment away from Washington, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMASON], as ranking member of the committee, kindly arranged with the chairman for such a hearing, and we were advised that my colleague the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] and I, as well as other Congressmen, would be given an opportunity to be heard at a later date.

I wish to thank the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMASON], of El Paso, for his prompt action, and to express the hope that the membership of the House may have the opportunity of voting on this bill before too long.

Before the bill comes to the House, however, careful consideration should be given to its wording so as to make sure that all prisoners of war in the same situation are covered. At the hearing the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILDAY] called attention to what is known as the lost battalion, which included the Thirty-sixth Division, consisting of members of the National Guard from Texas. That battalion was on its way to the Philippines at the time and was unable to land, but was deployed to Java. Undoubtedly all survivors of that battalion are prisoners of the Japanese.

It is the intent of the bill to cover all prisoners of war in the hands of the Japanese, and, if necessary, the wording should be so amended as to leave no doubt of its intent.

The very fact that the bill has passed one branch of the Congress is some recognition of the appreciation of the Nation for the heroic stand of these men. Promotion in rank is only a token of the Nation's gratitude for the valor of all those men who held the Japanese at bay for many months without hope of rescue. Men who surrendered under those circumstances could expect nothing but death or treatment worse than death. They surrendered only when their food, ammunition, and everything else had failed; and they were subjected to the death march and to treatment that is worse than death.

Promotion will bring to them additional compensation, but that does not even begin to pay for the suffering they endured and will continue to endure under circumstances which cannot be compared with the fate of other prisoners of war elsewhere.

Every State in the Union is affected, and the mothers and fathers and wives of these men, from every part of the Nation, look to Congress for some recognition of the aggravated circumstances under which they fell. Many of these men have children, for they were not drafted but were members of the regularly organized voluntary National Guards of various States.

On last week I inserted in the RECORD an editorial from the Las Vegas Daily Optic, published in Las Vegas, N. Mex., commending the Senate for its action. I now desire to read another editorial from one of the leading daily newspapers of the State, the Albuquerque Journal, under date of September 12, which reads as follows:

Blanket promoting in rank for American soldiers taken prisoners by the Japanese in the Philippines and on Guam and Wake Island at the beginning of the war have been approved by the Senate in a bill which now goes to the House, and despite the opposition of the War and Navy Departments.

This is a measure in which New Mexico people are vitally interested, as some 2,000 of our boys were in the Philippines at the time the Japanese began their undeclared war. They fought through the battles of Bataan and Corregidor, the great majority now being prisoners.

The promotions are deserved recognition of their services and heroism in the critical days of the war. The House should give the measure as speedy approval as did the Senate, and send it on its way to the President for his signature.

I earnestly hope that this Congress will not adjourn without first taking action on this bill. The fact that these brave men have not been forgotten will be some consolation to the parents, the wives, and the children of those brave men, from many of whom not a word has been heard.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House on tomorrow for 20 minutes after disposition of business on the Speaker's desk and at the conclusion of any special orders heretofore entered.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes today at the conclusion of any special orders heretofore entered.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include therein an address delivered in my home city of Pittsburgh at the convention of the United Mine and Mill Workers.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

PUNISHMENT OF PERSONS CONSPIRING TO VIOLATE THE COUNTERFEITING AND CERTAIN OTHER LAWS

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 725) to provide for the punishment of persons conspiring to violate the laws relating to counterfeiting and certain other laws.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman state what the bill does?

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the bill proposes to make the offense of conspiring to counterfeit punishable as is the major basic offense of counterfeiting. I may state for the benefit of the Members of the House that this bill passed the Senate unanimously, as I understand it. An identical bill passed the House during the last Congress but was not acted on by the Senate and was not reintroduced in this Congress; so when the Senate bill came back here we find no House bill.

This bill is urged by the Treasury Department as being essential with reference to this particular offense. We happen to have a member of our committee who has had a good deal to do with the prosecution of offenses of this character and he tells the members of the committee, and I assume he will tell the House, that the crime of counterfeiting is a sort of crime that a goodly number of people have to do with in connection with the basis of the crime before it is consummated.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. GRAHAM. I have tried a number of counterfeiting cases and it takes quite a number of factors. First, there is the paper, the photographic operations and apparatus, the stone on which the engraving is made and also certain sands that are mixed in there. All of these must blend together in order to make a perfect conspiracy. Heretofore, the counterfeiter was sentenced for the overt act of counterfeiting, whereas those who entered into the conspiracy and lent themselves to it escaped with a lesser penalty. It was almost impossible to prove their connection with it. A conspiracy will bring them all together.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. As I understand from the gentleman, these various things are done by different persons.

Mr. GRAHAM. That is correct.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. I have spoken to those members of the Committee on the Judiciary who are available, and this is agreeable to them. Everyone seems to feel this bill is a matter of importance.

Mr. MAY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. MAY. As I understand it, the bill merely provides that where a conspiracy is formed, even though no overt act other than the forming of the conspiracy is committed, those engaged in the conspiracy would be as guilty as if they had obtained the plates and actually printed and circulated the money?

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. I am not sure that I am able to follow the gentleman in the definition of what constitutes conspiracy but, as I understand it from what has been stated by the gentleman from Pennsylvania and as we understood it in the committee, the offense of counterfeiting requires the cooperation of quite a number of people each one of whom does perhaps one particular thing connected with the consummation of the whole thing. One man does the plate, another does something else, and so on.

Mr. MAY. Of course, under the law, a conspiracy is a corrupt combination of two or more persons.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Yes.

Mr. MAY. For the purpose of doing an unlawful act.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. That is right.

Mr. MAY. Or for doing a lawful act by unlawful means.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. That is right.

Mr. MAY. My point is this: If two parties get together and agree that they will go into the counterfeiting business, even though they do not make a plate, even though they do not obtain one, even though they do not talk to anybody else, and if that were proven, would that sustain a conviction under this bill?

Mr. MICHENER. All that this bill does, it makes the conspiracy penalty uniform and conviction not so difficult. I would not, for one, permit a bill to come in by unanimous consent to change the conspiracy law, because that is a very important matter and should not be handled by unanimous consent. But this is just a question of increasing the penalty, as I understand.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I do not so understand it.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. May I state to my distinguished colleague from Kentucky that this bill does not attempt at all to modify in any way the conspiracy law. The definition of conspiracy is not dealt with.

Mr. MAY. It does not increase the penalty at all, but it just includes more people that may be engaged in it.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. It makes each of the people that are engaged in the conspiracy subject to the same penalty as though one person committed the unlawful act himself.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, of course I have no knowledge about this matter, but what is the necessity for it?

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. This is the explanation, if I may make it. The conspiracy statute punishment, generally speaking, is limited to 2 years. The person who is perhaps the most guilty is punished for only 2 years, and maybe other people connected with the transaction get 15 or 20 years.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. McCORMACK. I have no objection, of course, but I just wanted to have the RECORD clearly show. This does not in any way change the existing law in relation to conspiracy?

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Not at all.

Mr. McCORMACK. The purpose of this bill is to change the punishment for those found guilty of conspiracy in connection with this particular offense, counterfeiting?

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Yes. Counterfeiting is an offense, as has been stated by my colleague from Pennsylvania, which is committed by conspirators. That is the peculiar nature of this particular sort of a thing.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That chapter 7 of the Criminal Code, as amended (U. S. C., 1940 edition, title 18, ch. 7), is hereby further amended by adding at the end thereof the following section:

"SEC. 178a. If two or more persons conspire to violate any provision of this chapter, or of sections 205, 218, 219, or 220 of chapter 8 of the Criminal Code, as amended (U. S. C., 1940 edition, title 18, ch. 7, and secs. 328, 347, 348, and 349 of ch. 8), or of the act of August 26, 1935 (49 Stat. 866; U. S. C., 1940 edition, title 18, sec. 349a), and one or more of such persons do any act to effect the object of the conspiracy, each of the parties to such conspiracy shall, on conviction thereof, be subject to the same fine or imprisonment, or both, as is applicable in the case of conviction for violating such provision."

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MISSOURI VALLEY AUTHORITY

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

[Mr. RANKIN addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

GOVERNOR DEWEY'S ASTONISHING STATEMENT

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, Candidate Dewey in his Seattle address last night continued his past policy of making statements that are not based upon facts. As the Richmond, Va., Times-Dispatch says—I quote:

Governor Dewey made at least one astonishingly misleading claim as to the reason for strikes.

This misleading claim resulted from Candidate Dewey's language wherein he said:

Democratic Congressman SMITH and Democratic Senator CONNALLY produced the Smith-Connally Act—

That statement is correct because the bill was introduced in the House by Congressman SMITH of Virginia and in the Senate by Senator CONNALLY of Texas. But Candidate Dewey proceeded—and I again quote—

which he promised would solve all problems. Honest men were willing to believe that nothing could make the situation worse so the statute was passed. It has not solved the problem. In the 12 months prior to the passage of the Smith-Connally Act there were 3,359 strikes. In the 12 months following the passage of that act there were 4,448 strikes. In other words, the number of strikes after the Smith-Connally Act was passed increased by one-third. That law, the Smith-Connally Act, will expire with the termination of the war, as it should. The provisions of this law and the other New Deal interferences with free collective bargaining should never be renewed.

Continuing, Candidate Dewey said:

The right of workers to leave their jobs individually or together, the right to strike, is one of the fundamental rights of freemen. It has sometimes been abused, but what has caused that abuse? Let's get the answer to this one straight for the record—the New Deal is exclusively responsible for most of the serious wartime strikes. The chief blame goes directly into the White House and to its agency created at the top of all this chaos of agencies, the War Labor Board.

Mr. Speaker, that part of Candidate Dewey's speech which I quoted is responsible for the language that he made at least one astonishingly misleading claim as to the reason for strikes.

I say too, Mr. Speaker, let us look at the record. What does it disclose? The President vetoed the Smith-Connally bill. When it was returned to the House under the Constitution the question was, "Shall the bill pass, the objections of the President of the United States to the contrary notwithstanding?" That question required a yea-and-nay vote. It was taken. There were 244 yeas, 108 nays, and 79 members not voting. Of the 244 yeas, 116 were Democrats, and 128 Republicans. Of the 108 nays, 70 were Democrats, and 34 Republicans, while 4 members of minor parties also voted nay. As the record shows there were more Republicans voting to override the veto and less Republicans voting to sustain the veto than there were Democrats.

Seventeen Republicans were paired to override the veto and six Republicans were paired to sustain the veto. Seven Democrats were paired to override the veto and six Democrats were paired to sustain the veto.

A similar vote was taken in the Senate on the same motion and there were 56 yeas and 25 nays. Twenty-seven Republicans voted to override the President's veto, and 29 Democrats voted to override the veto. There were 25 nay votes. Five Republicans voted to sustain the veto, 19 Democrats voted to sustain the veto, and 1 Progressive voted to sustain the veto. It was announced on the floor that 4 Republican Senators who were absent would have voted to override the veto if they had been present.

That, Mr. Speaker, are the votes as recorded in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of June 25, 1943.

How Candidate Dewey could place the blame on the President for the enactment of the Smith-Connally Act is beyond me to understand in view of the fact that President Roosevelt refused to sign the bill.

Although this statement was only made last night the newspapers are already, even the morning newspapers, criticising this portion of Candidate Dewey's speech. I quote from the Richmond, Va., Times-Dispatch of September 19, 1944:

And now for Candidate Dewey's misleading explanation of the strikes which have occurred during the war. He strongly implied last night that the Smith-Connally Act is partly to blame, for he said that there were 3,359 strikes in the 12 months, prior to its passage, as against 4,448 in the 12 months which followed its adoption. "The provisions of this law and the other New Deal interferences with free collective bargaining should never be renewed," he said.

Doesn't Governor Dewey know that President Roosevelt vetoed the Smith-Connally Act, and that the bill was passed over the President's veto by the well-nigh solid vote of the Republicans in Congress? In the light of these facts his action in terming the act "New Deal interference with collective bargaining" is a pure piece of impudence.

Mr. Dewey's Seattle speech represents a tremendous effort to woo the labor vote to his standard, and it contained some truth. On the other hand, Dewey displayed either dense ignorance or intellectual dishonesty in his attempt to saddle President Roosevelt and the Democrats with the Smith-Connally law. Furthermore, it is impossible to believe that he really believes the National Labor Relations Act ought not to be amended in any way.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a letter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order on tomorrow, Calendar Wednesday, be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

TRANSFER OF WOUNDED SERVICEMEN BETWEEN HOSPITALS

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday I introduced a bill to correct a situation which I think has inflicted a terrible injustice upon our wounded servicemen. I found out the other day that the War and Navy Departments, due to the fact that they could not reconcile their viewpoints with that of the Comptroller General, had adopted the policy of making wounded servicemen who are transferred from one hospital in this country to another at their own request pay the travel expenses involved. I am not sure that legislation is needed to correct this practice. I realize there is no time to have a bill passed between now and the time we will recess. However, I have been informed by the Navy Department as a result of my representations to them that they are going to change their policy and not charge this travel expense to the servicemen involved. I think that if enough Members of the House contact the War Department we might get them to reach some agreement with the Comptroller General that would permit a change in their policy, also.

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. BARRETT] is recognized for 30 minutes.

DEWEY WAS RIGHT

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today, not because the Republican candidate for President is involved, not to defend him, because he needs no defense. I rise, rather, because what I have to say relates to what I consider a national scandal and one of the gravest matters before the Congress.

The great State of Wyoming, which I have the high honor to represent, is justly proud of Jackson Hole. Much as we dislike the wholly disgraceful and un-American manner in which the people of Jackson Hole were treated by this administration, still I undertake to say to you that the issue involved here reaches out from that great spot of America to every corner of the land. The question is, Do we live under a government by law or must we meekly submit to a government by men? How long will Congress tolerate the effrontery of a bureaucracy that overrides its expressed will? How long will we stand by and permit these bureaus to usurp the powers of the Congress? By what stretch of the imagination can a bureaucrat contend he has the right or is better qualified to determine what should be done within the boundaries of a sovereign State of this Union, than the representatives of the people? Let us consider what is happening in the Jackson Hole case.

Suppose you are a farmer living in Pennsylvania, Kentucky, Indiana, Illinois, Missouri—any other State. Suppose one day a neighbor of yours for whom you have high regard announces that he has been asked to represent a big land syndicate, the Snake River Land Co., that wants to buy up a large number of farms. The name is selected so the

people will not know the real purchaser nor the design or purpose in buying the farms. Suppose after a while, you find this Snake River Land Co. has bought up many of the farms around you, and you are hemmed in. Then suppose you learn that this Snake River Land Co. all along has been doing this purchasing not for any farming operation, as you might have believed, but that unknown, even to your neighbor purchasing agent, the land was turned over to the New Deal government in Washington. To cap this climax, Mr. Roosevelt proclaims the entire area a national monument.

The area comprises thousands upon thousands of acres, a little domain one-third the size of the entire State of Rhode Island. But it is now entirely outside your own State and its laws. It is under the regulation of Mr. Roosevelt and, directly, of Secretary of Interior Ickes.

Laws? Laws do not mean anything much to you now. You live not by laws framed by your own chosen legislators, but by regulation and ukase pronounced by Mr. Ickes and his bureaucrats. And no matter the personal assurances the bureaucrats give you that your life will not be disturbed, you know this is just a little sugar coating on a bitter pill. For you know that at the same time these same bureaucrats are declaring openly for the record in Washington that the over-all New Deal policy is to squeeze out farmers such as yourself who have kept your homes in the middle of a Government domain, to forbid you to hunt anywhere, to carry your gun anywhere on the reservation. Indeed, it is Government policy even to forbid you or anyone to drive a truck across lands in the Park Service control.

At the suffrance of Mr. Ickes, you still have the right—thank you, kind sir—to let your cattle trail across the area to the forest where your father pastured his cattle in the summertime. Your heirs' cattle can use graze also—maybe, unless Mr. Ickes changes his mind. But who knows what that policy will be tomorrow or a year or two from now? Mr. Ickes says you cannot assign the grazing rights that are an integral part of your farming operations to anyone else despite the fact that they are an important factor in the valuation placed on your farm.

You can carry on as usual—at the personal suffrance of Mr. Ickes and of the other bureaucrats who have taken away the birthright your father handed down to you. You are doomed and you know it.

I said "suppose" this happened to you—you people who have farms in Pennsylvania, Kentucky, Indiana, Illinois, Missouri, or any other State.

But, gentlemen, it already has happened to the people of my State. And it is part of a movement sanctioned by this administration which is spreading. Gentlemen, what I have said here is borne out by the record. It is on the record, in the hearings before the Public Lands Committee of this House. The hypothetical case I have described has happened in the Jackson Hole Monument case.

If what is happening to us of the West now were happening to you of the more populous States, east and north and south—the situation would constitute a scandal that would rock the Nation. I say this because the entire grab is contrary to the will of the people. The New Deal feels it can do this to Wyoming now because we do not count. We do not have enough electoral votes. But it will happen throughout the West unless this movement is stopped now.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in an appeal to this Congress and to the people of the East and the North and the South. I appeal not as a member of any political party but on behalf of such States as my own Wyoming, of Arizona, of Nevada, Colorado, California, and Utah. I speak, moreover, for both conservatives and liberals, rich and poor, farmer, rancher, and businessman. If you please, I speak for countless Democrats as well as Republicans.

I appeal to you to save us from this plot to nationalize our rural life and areas and change the economy of our people against our own expressed wishes and demand. I appeal to you of the North, East, and South to save us from the fate which the national planners under Mr. Ickes have chosen for us.

And let me warn you, it will be difficult for you to save us and our ranches and our farms. I say this because these planners are so determined to take away our land, to make us slaves of its bureaucracy—even do away with our State governments—that it is resorting to any means to achieve its ends.

The most recent example of this smoke-screening double dealing was directed at Governor Dewey because he dared raise his voice in our defense.

Let me brief some of the record. You then of the East and the South and the North, who have farms you want to pass on to your sons who come back from the war, give heed to the record, and you will know why Ickes attempted to picture Governor Dewey as not knowing whereof he spoke, although he spoke the truth. Mr. Ickes makes the fantastic charge that credit for this monument belongs to the Republicans, and that Presidents Coolidge and Hoover persuaded Mr. Rockefeller to purchase certain lands for a monument.

The facts produced at the hearings show conclusively that Horace M. Albright, then director of Yellowstone National Park, that the Republican administration inherited from Woodrow Wilson's regime imbued with the bureaucratic zeal to enlarge the holdings of the Park Service, conceived this plan and prevailed upon John D. Rockefeller to buy up thousands of acres of land for park purposes, with the thought that the people would welcome the land as an addition to the National Park Service. He suggested that the Snake River Land & Cattle Co. be organized so that the people of Wyoming would not know of Rockefeller's interest in the project, and also suggested that it be kept a dark secret that the lands were being acquired for park extension. Albright informed Rockefeller that Congress would have to pass on the matter, and if Congress did not approve park extension, then Rockefeller could resell the land.

During the Coolidge administration, Albright advocated the creation of the Grand Teton National Park with an area of 320,000 acres, including the identical 221,610 acres involved in this monument. The President appointed a commission to investigate the matter and to consult the people of Wyoming. A subcommittee from the House also investigated the matter. They recommended adversely as to the lands now included in the monument, but did recommend that the Grand Teton Park be created with an area of 98,000 acres. The people of Wyoming were glad to see the majestic Tetons made into a national park, and in 1929 Congress passed the bill establishing the Grand Teton National Park. All of the scenic beauty in that area is now included in this park. It is the most inspiring mountain scenery in the world. The people in Wyoming wanted to share this with all Americans as their common birthright. But Congress during the Hoover administration refused to include in the park the 221,610 acres now incorporated in this so-called monument because this area included farms and ranches which provided living for the people and made it possible for them to pay the taxes to keep up their schools, their county, and their State.

The record shows that the people having expressed themselves, the Republican administration from 1929 on repulsed all efforts to incorporate this land in the national park system. The area included in this monument is mostly grazing and farm lands and sagebrush flats that afford a view to the Tetons, but nothing more, and the view will always be there regardless of what the status of the land might be.

Up through the years the farmers and ranchers and businessmen of the West have opposed nationalization of land of no particular scenic value, because such nationalization has so encroached on taxpaying properties that little remains with which to pay the taxes necessary for local and State government. The United States Government today owns 51 percent of all Wyoming's 62,000,000 acres, and in addition the mineral rights covering another 30 percent. It thus owns a substantial interest covering 81 percent of all the acreage of our State.

Small wonder that we of Wyoming and the people of other Western States where the same Federal encroachment is taking place have balked. And least of all you can blame the small ranchers and the small farmers.

Sure the New Deal is glad to pay out your income taxes to purchase land, but this is land which their fathers not too many years ago literally carved out of a wilderness. They have nurtured their land until it produces 60 to 115 bushels of grain to the acre. They do not want to lose it any more than you people who farm in the East, the North, or the South would want to see your own homesteads torn up simply because Washington demands it.

No, the Republicans would not go for a larger park than the people wanted.

But there came along this administration with its Tugwells, its expressed designs for a new way of life. Came the New Deal National Resources Board with an announced plan looking to elimination of State governments as antiquated and substituting in their stead a dozen or so national divisions, each with a capital which would be a branch of the Washington bureaucracy. Counties, of course, were to be eliminated in the interest of efficiency and, incidentally, greater power for the bureaucrats in Washington.

This fantastic scheme perhaps did not register on you easterners, southerners, and northerners as anything serious enough to consider, even though you read about it in the National Planning Board's reports. But it registered with us of the West. From that time on the efforts of the Washington bureaucracy to take over our land found a new significance. Not even Vice President WALLACE could stomach this Jackson Hole grab. In a letter to the Acting Director of the Bureau of the Budget he wrote on April 13, 1936, when he was Secretary of Agriculture, that "such proposals, if adopted, profoundly would change the established order of Federal management and markedly affect the existing economic set-up."

In 1938 Mr. Ickes came to Congress and asked for a law to add these same identical 211,610 acres to Teton National Park—acreage in the exact amount and in exact location which the Republican administration and Congress back in 1929 had refused at the time of the park's founding.

It is not scenic land, picnic land, tourist land. It is just land on which Americans earn their living and which furnishes State and county revenues. Again Congress inquired if the people of Wyoming had changed their minds. Indeed they had not. Congress turned the plan down.

Congress alone has the power to establish a national park or make an addition thereto. It so happens, however, that there is a law which permits a President by proclamation to take over as national monuments small areas which may be of historic interest, lest they become commercialized—the birthplace of a national hero, a petrified forest, a prehistoric structure—such as the Devil's Tower in Wyoming—with the understanding—and here I quote from the law—that "the limits of which in all cases shall be confined to the smallest area compatible with the proper care and management of the objects to be protected."

Having found it impossible to obtain legislation nationalizing these 221,610 acres, Mr. Ickes then betrayed all westerners. Despite their previous statements of record opposing the nationalization, and in open defiance of Congress, he prevailed upon the President to take over all the 221,610 acres by proclaiming them the Jackson Hole National Monument.

A monument, if you please, that is one-third the size of Rhode Island.

And what was this monument to preserve? The law states that when a President proclaims a national monument he is seeking to protect something for posterity. So what, I asked Mr. Ickes, did Mr. Roosevelt seek to protect on these 221,610 acres? "To me," he replied, "my personal observation would be the size of the mosquitoes."

That, gentlemen, is a statement of record at hearings before the House Committee on Public Lands.

This was the facetious explanation given to people whose livelihood depended on that land. This was the reply I had to report to a mass meeting of 603 Wyoming citizens at Jackson, who journeyed many miles to register how they felt about the nationalization plan. When those against it were asked to stand and be counted, 600 rose and voted "No." Only three failed to stand.

After the President issued his orders creating the monument I introduced a bill to abolish it. Notwithstanding that it was referred to the Public Lands Committee, dominated by Democrats, the committee approved it 12 to 7. The House Rules Committee, composed of nine Democrats and five Republicans, could have killed it; instead, these men sent it to the House for action, where it is now pending.

The platform adopted by the Republicans at Chicago commits the Republican Party to "restoration of long-established public-land policy which provides opportunity of ownership by citizens to promote highest land use." It condemns the tendency of the New Deal government to withdraw the great sections of the public domain from economic use for inclusion in national parks, wildlife refuges, and wilderness areas.

Governor Dewey, at Sheridan, Wyo., said that the Jackson Hole land grab by Presidential proclamation was "characteristic of the deviousness of the New Deal and its lack of responsibility for the rights and opinions of the people affected."

That was hitting too close to home. Mr. Ickes knows how the West feels about this land grab. There could be no explanation attacking Mr. Dewey which would be convincing to westerners, for they know that Mr. Dewey spoke the truth. It is on the record that they perverted the old antiquities law when they used it as a means to override the will of a sovereign State and to seize by proclamation and subterfuge vast acreage which Congress had refused to give them by legal means.

Right now the State of Wyoming is challenging their grab in a suit in Federal court.

Governor Dewey's stand was fundamentally sound. No answer could be given except the smear attack by Ickes that "the trouble with Mr. Dewey is that apparently he knows so little about the West."

Does Mr. Ickes also contend that the Democratic members of the Public Lands Committee and the House Rules Committee know as little about the West? These representatives of the people approved and brought to the House floor my bill designed to abolish the Jackson Hole Monument created by the President.

Gov. Lester C. Hunt, Democrat, Wyoming, favors my bill and made the following statement:

Strongly urge House Public Lands Committee report favorably your bill, H. R. 2241. Every newspaper in this State, every county, State, and national elective official, and our citizens, 100 percent, resent action sponsored by National Park Service through the Interior Department and accomplished by Presidential Proclamation No. 2578. I strongly protest procedure of Park Service in accomplishing its objectives by secret means. Knowing as they did that the creation of the monument could not be had in an open and above-board manner in the usual democratic processes, namely, action by Congress. Creation of the monument serious economic handicap to Teton County and the State of Wyoming.

Does Ickes contend that the trouble with Governor Hunt is "that he knows so little about the West"?

In order to get down to the grass roots and find out how the West really feels about this Jackson Hole affair, listen to the following resolution adopted by the Governors of six Western States—Hon. Lester C. Hunt, Democrat, Wyoming; Hon. Sidney P. Osborn, Democrat, Arizona; Hon. E. P. Carville, Democrat, Nevada; Hon. Herbert B. Maw, Democrat, Utah; Hon. John C. Vivian, Republican, Colorado; and Hon. Earl Warren, Republican, California:

Now, therefore, it is resolved, That protest should be and hereby is made to the President of the United States against said Proclamation 2578, and against all similar actions which may hereafter be considered, and the President is hereby requested to rescind his proclamation for the Jackson Hole National Monument. * * *

Although the area affected by such proclamation is entirely within the State of Wyoming, all western and public-land States feel a real concern on account of the implications of it. If, by Executive order, an area like this can be set aside as a national monument, upon recommendation of the Secretary of the Interior, then there is no limit to the lands in Wyoming and other States which might be treated likewise.

Reservations and withdrawals like the one involved in the case of the Jackson Hole Monument are always a gross injustice to the State affected.

Gov. C. A. Bottolfsen, Republican, of Idaho, also vigorously protested this grab.

Does Mr. Ickes contend that these western governors also know little about the West?

After reading the following statement made by Senator JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY, Democrat, Wyoming, before the Public Lands Committee in support of my bill, I wonder if Mr. Ickes will say that the Senator also knows little about Wyoming and the West:

Senator O'MAHONEY: Gentlemen of the committee, I appear before you today to heartily endorse, without reservation or qualification of any kind, a bill introduced by Congressman BARRETT and which is now before you to repeal the creation of Jackson Hole National Monument.

I do that on two grounds: First, I regard it as an invasion of the rights of the sovereign State of Wyoming; secondly, I regard it to be utterly and completely an unwarranted invasion of the rights of the Congress. It is an attempt to do by indirection what the Department of the Interior was unable

to do by direct recommendation to the Congress of the United States.

Hundreds of organizations in the West have gone on record against the Jackson Hole National Monument, among them being Wyoming State Chapter Izaak Walton League, Utah members Izaak Walton League, 11 Western States federated sportsmen, and the National Association of County Officials. It seems incredible, but I have no doubt that these Washington bureaucrats will say that the trouble with these organizations is that they know so little about the West. The proclamation creating the Jackson Hole National Monument was issued without notice or hearing of any kind. Senator O'Mahoney, Senator Robertson, Governor Hunt, and Representative Barrett were astounded when informed of the action. Ickes had tried to get a bill through Congress to add the lands included in the monument to Teton National Park, but failed to get the job done, so in defiance of Congress and the people, he accomplishes his purpose by Executive decree. That is bureaucracy running wild.

No, sir; Mr. Ickes, Governor Dewey understands the West, and what is more, the West understands him and they like him.

And so, Mr. Speaker, let me repeat again what those Governors of the West—four of them Democrats—said:

> If, by Executive order, an area like this can be set aside as a national monument, upon recommendation of the Secretary of the Interior, then there is no limit to the lands in Wyoming and other States which might be treated likewise.

They called it a grave injustice.

And let me repeat the strong words of Democratic Senator O'MAHONEY of Wyoming, who testified for the record that the seizure should be repealed because it is "an invasion of the rights of the sovereign State of Wyoming" and "utterly and completely an unwarranted invasion of the rights of Congress. It is an attempt to do by indirection what the Department of Interior was unable to do by direct recommendation to the Congress."

With this on the record, the New Deal could not call on any reputable westerner to attack Governor Dewey's statement on the Jackson Hole grab. Ickes not only attempted to belittle the Republican candidate for President but all of the people of the West, Republicans and Democrats alike. He attempts to make fools of us, betrays us lest you of the North, the South, and the East become interested. And, let me tell you, there is a reason why you should. The Byrd committee in a recent report pointed out that the Government now owns one-fifth of the entire land area of the United States. The implications of this statement are staggering. For a number of years the trend was from public ownership to private ownership. Now the trend has reversed and the question is whether or not a large part of our population may not ultimately be reduced to a condition of tenancy under a government which has already become the greatest landlord in the history of the world. Much of this gigantic domain has been taken over by the present administration, some on the grounds that it was necessary for war purposes. Whole counties have been emptied of their population.

In Teton County, Wyo., the county government will find it impossible to perform its normal functions because the Government seizure for the monument takes in about one-third of the county's assessed valuation and requires the remaining two-thirds to pay two-thirds more in taxes. Similar loads have been thrown on other State subdivisions throughout the country as a result of Government wartime land acquisition.

If it were just us of the West, this might be merely a sectional question and issue, but today this is what the New Deal Government controls in your State: The Public Lands Committee of the House, in its recent report, gives the area in acres of lands in Federal ownership: Alabama, 4 percent; Arizona, 73 percent; Arkansas, 8 percent; California, 46 percent; Colorado, 38 percent; Delaware, 2 percent; Florida, 7 percent; Georgia, 5 percent; Idaho, 64 percent; Indiana, 1 percent; Kentucky, 4 percent; Louisiana, 4 percent; Maryland, 2 percent; Michigan, 7 percent; Minnesota, 7 percent; Mississippi, 5 percent; Missouri, 3 percent; Montana, 35 percent; Nebraska, 1 percent; Nevada, 87 percent; New Hampshire, 12 percent; New Jersey, 1 percent; New Mexico, 44 percent; North Carolina, 5 percent; North Dakota, 6 percent; Oklahoma, 8 percent; Oregon, 53 percent; Pennsylvania, 2 percent; Rhode Island, 3 percent; South Carolina, 5 percent; South Dakota, 18 percent; Tennessee, 6 percent; Texas, 1 percent; Utah, 72 percent; Vermont, 3 percent; Virginia, 8 percent; Washington, 35 percent; West Virginia, 6 percent; Wisconsin, 6 percent; Wyoming, 51 percent.

In view of what is happening to us, do you think that the Federal Government is going to readily relinquish this wartime land back to the States? Do you not think under the circumstances that you rather have reason to fear, as do we of the West?

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Gatling, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 2051) entitled "An act to amend the Social Security Act, as amended, to provide a national program for war mobilization and reconversion, and for other purposes."

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HARLESS of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an address delivered by General Arnold before the American Legion National Convention at Chicago last evening, and further to extend my remarks and include an address delivered by Hon. Robert Lovett, Assistant Secretary of War for Air, before the National Association of Broadcasters on Tuesday, August 29.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona?

There was no objection.

(Mr. JENNINGS asked and received permission to extend his own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. OUTLAND] is recognized for 20 minutes.

POLITICAL CAMPAIGNING IN WARTIME

Mr. OUTLAND. Mr. Speaker, in many ways it is unfortunate that this coming national election must take place during the greatest war in America's history. Our political problems become intertwined with much greater ones, and sometimes perspective is difficult to attain. Prejudice and emotions are aroused, issues are beclouded by personalities, and that national unity which is so essential to the all-out prosecution of the war and that national viewpoint which is so essential to a just post-war settlement are dimmed by sectional and economic and racial red herrings.

Viewed from another standpoint, however, we should be thankful that an election is being held during this critical war year. It is a test in itself of the democratic way of life; the obvious evidence that this Nation has not turned totalitarian, and that as a free people we are still free to determine our own destiny. Those who would poison our minds by daring to make a comparison between American democracy and the dictatorships of Europe are given the lie by the very fact that we can have a national election now. Do I recall the solemn warnings, laughable now, that 1940 would be the last year in which an election would be held in this country?

As we draw nearer to November there are certain points which it seems to me it is essential that all of us, regardless of political affiliation, should keep constantly in mind. Even though we should be thankful that we can have an election in wartime, it should not be a case of politics as usual. We cannot afford the luxuries in which we have generally indulged during political campaigns; the luxuries of personal attacks and smear campaigns; the luxury of indulging in trivialities and petty details rather than in the broad, main issues of the day. We must keep at a minimum those political factors which would divide us as Americans—such factors as race, national background, economic status, sectional jealousies, and many others. The truth should be paramount; untruths and half-truths only lead to retaliation, and bitterness becomes more acute.

Our national political system has traditionally been one of two parties; other countries have seen the development of a multiparty system, but in the United States even a third-party movement has very quickly died. In reality we can say we do have a majority party and a minority one. It is the duty of the majority party to initiate legislation, to formulate national policy, to guide the ship of state. This is a solemn responsibility. If the party in power allows itself to become concerned chiefly with maintaining itself

in office and ignores the major duty, it is failing the American people. On the other hand, it is the duty of the minority party to act as a watchdog; to criticize, and to help return the ship of state to a normal course if it tends to wander. Such a function implies an intelligent and farsighted minority; one that is not criticizing simply for the sake of finding fault; selfish, narrow criticism; blind, unknowing criticism; and narrow, partisan criticism are worse than none at all, and the extent to which this takes place indicates the degree to which the minority party is failing the American people.

As we draw nearer to the national election I am more and more concerned about the type of campaign that increasingly is being waged. As a Democrat, I am proud of the record my party has made during the past 12 years. I am proud of the way in which it stepped into a national crisis in the midst of the worst of all depressions and attempted to meet that crisis by more than simply promising that prosperity was just around the corner. I am proud of the way it has attempted to bring the more abundant life to the great mass of the American people, instead of constantly harping about returning to normalcy. I am proud of the way my party, through its President and administration, attempted to warn the American people of the international dangers ahead and, once the crisis was upon us, met the war challenge. I am proud of the conduct of the war, the fact that we are not only winning on all fronts, but that we have had the courage to face the home front realistically, and at the cost of political popularity to initiate rationing, price control, priorities on raw materials, wage stabilization, and the other measures so essential to the preservation of an unnatural war economy.

I say I am proud of this record. I see nothing in it of which to be ashamed. It is a record of constructive achievement. Mistakes have been made. Such mistakes have grown fewer and less serious as experience has brought out badly needed lessons. Mistakes will continue to be made, but I am convinced that they will continue to grow fewer in number and less severe in intensity. The minority party has the constant obligation to point out these mistakes; but it has even a greater obligation, that of trying to correct them. It is not enough to orate about the dangers of bureaucracy; something better must be found. It is not enough to damn the O. P. A.; it is the duty of the minority party to help the O. P. A. function more effectively.

As I analyze the campaign to date I am struck by several extremely dangerous tendencies in the tactics of the opposition party. I see the tendency to indulge in glittering generalities and vagueness rather than in concise and definite points. I see the tendency to criticize the majority party without bringing forth a constructive platform of its own. I see the tendency—which has been going on for years and has only become intensified by the election year—to indulge in bitter and wholly unjustified vituperation against the President of the United States, his wife and his family. Surely this type of tactics is unworthy of the great Republican Party. Perhaps most dangerous of all in a war year, I see the tendency to use political devices deliberately calculated to arouse the prejudices of various groups in this country; to set one group against another, and to bring about increasing disunity on the very eve of military victory.

I should like to discuss briefly several specific examples of the Republican campaign; examples which illustrate the dangerous tendencies to which I have been referring. I welcome the criticism of members of the minority party in helping to eliminate such tendencies; I for one do not intend to indulge in similar ones, and I would be the first to criticize Democrats who did.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OUTLAND. I yield.

Mr. EBERHARTER. I have been listening with great interest to the remarks of the gentleman. I have carefully read the speeches of the candidate for the Republican Party, but I have yet failed to find any constructive suggestion in any of those speeches. I wonder if the gentleman has been able to find any constructive suggestion whatsoever in any speech made by the Republican candidate?

Mr. OUTLAND. In answer to the gentleman from Pennsylvania, I shall attempt to deal with that in the time I have left, and will take it up point by point.

Mr. EBERHARTER. I am very glad the gentleman is going to do that.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OUTLAND. Yes; I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. KNUTSON. The gentleman insinuates that Candidate Dewey is trying to sow class hatred. Let me ask the gentleman who first coined the phrase "economic royalists"? Who is it that has been setting labor against capital all through the years? I grant that what Mr. Dewey says is fraught with great danger, but it is not to the Republic. It is to Candidate Roosevelt.

Mr. OUTLAND. I may say in response to the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota that I have said nothing yet about race hatred, although I intend to in a moment.

Mr. KNUTSON. I said "class hatred."

Mr. OUTLAND. I have not said anything about class hatred. I said "one group against another group." I shall give concrete examples to bring out what I mean.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OUTLAND. I yield to the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. McCORMACK. Immediately after the Republican Convention in a press conference Governor Dewey said that none of the New Deal legislation would be repealed. The Securities and Exchange Commission, collective bargaining, labor's declaration of independence and proclamation of emancipation, all of the other legislation passed during the years, the Presidential candidate on the Republican ticket said none of them would be repealed.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Dewey did not say any such thing. I deny that.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman's denials, of course, do not mean anything.

Mr. KNUTSON. I deny that. That is not true.

Mr. McCORMACK. Of course, the gentleman's denials do not mean a thing, because he has exposed himself heretofore on several occasions by making statements that are so far removed from the truth that his veracity on this occasion would not be given much consideration.

Mr. OUTLAND. Mr. Speaker, I should like to continue to have the various points debated but my time is very limited and I must continue.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Would the gentleman yield right there?

Mr. OUTLAND. I yield briefly to my colleague from California.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. In my district some of the Republican press and my Republican opponent have criticized me for voting against the Smith-Connally Act, which I did. They have criticized my vote in support of the President's veto of that measure.

Last night in Seattle Governor Dewey said that the Smith-Connally Act was an administrative measure and a very bad bill. I am a little at sea as to whom I should believe, the opponents in my district who seem to think the Smith-Connally Act was a very fine bill and the majority of Republican Members of the House who voted for it, or the Republican candidate for President, Governor Dewey. I wanted to ask the gentleman to help me out of my confusion and to tell us whether the Smith-Connally Act was an administration measure or was not an administration measure. Of ccurse the answer is rather obvious.

Mr. EBERHARTER. I should like to answer that.

Mr. OUTLAND. The gentleman has raised two points. I, too, have sometimes been accused of being too close a supporter of the administration. I say in answer that I would rather be accused of that than of being an obstructionist. However, I try to analyze each bill on its own merits, and vote accordingly.

To the second point I say that President Roosevelt vetoed the Smith-Connally bill, as the gentleman knows.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. OUTLAND. And when that bill was brought back to the House the main effort to override the President's veto was made here by the minority party.

I am glad to have Mr. Dewey correct the mistake that his party made, by saying he will see that it is repealed.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield right there?

Mr. OUTLAND. I will yield very briefly.

Mr. EBERHARTER. I thought last night Governor Dewey repudiated the majority of the Republican Members of the House and the Republican Members of the Senate when he stated that was a Democratic measure, because a great

majority of the Republicans in the House and in the Senate voted for that bill and it was their votes that passed it over the President's veto.

Mr. OUTLAND. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OUTLAND. I have very little time; the gentleman has his own special order to follow me. If the gentleman will yield me some of his time I shall be pleased to yield.

Mr. REES of Kansas. The gentleman may have 5 minutes of my time.

Mr. OUTLAND. I thank the gentleman. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I understood that the authors of the bill both were members of the Democratic Party. Am I correct in that?

Mr. OUTLAND. The gentleman certainly is.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I wondered about that.

Mr. OUTLAND. And I may say further that when the responsibility of putting a bill like that on American workers is analyzed, that responsibility must be evaluated not upon authorship but upon the final voting record of the Members of this House. A few moments ago our colleague, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN], gave the exact vote upon that bill. The record is clear.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to take up now several myths that have been engendered in the campaign so far. The first and one of the most amusing is the myth that has been called the Roosevelt depression.

1. THE ROOSEVELT DEPRESSION

In his first major speech at Philadelphia the Republican candidate for the Presidency stated that "the New Deal prepares to keep men in the Army because it is afraid of the resumption of its own depression." On other occasions also the phrase "Roosevelt depression" has been used. Such phraseology is unfortunate in view of the fact that the American people have memories. There is a name of a particular President associated with the great depression, but it is certainly not that of Roosevelt. That name has become almost a synonym for depression in this country, which is unfortunate, because any student of economics realizes that no one person, not even President Hoover, could cause a depression. Depressions are caused by tremendous economic forces far beyond the control of a single individual. It is generally recognized, however, that the economic anarchy that was permitted to run rampant during the Harding and Coolidge administrations built up a situation which caused our economic structure to collapse during the Hoover regime. The point that is pertinent, however, is the manner in which an administration takes steps to meet a depression, to combat the suffering and misery that accompany it.

What is the record in this connection? I ask the Members of the opposition to tell the American people the concrete steps that were taken from 1929 to 1933 to alleviate the suffering of the victims of the depression in this country. A little help to the banks and the promise about prosperity were about all.

Contrast this with the record of the Roosevelt administration. Mr. Roosevelt was inaugurated on Saturday, March 4, 1933. At 1 o'clock in the morning of Monday, March 6, 1933, the new President issued an Executive order declaring a bank holiday. Steps were immediately taken to stop the run on banks, confidence came rushing back to a people very near to panic, and a series of national measures was passed which helped to stimulate employment and to relieve the sufferings of our people. Oh, yes, mistakes were made, but not the mistake of inaction. Contrast the situation in a few specific instances. During the so-called prosperous twenties there was not one single year when fewer than 376 banks did not fail. During 1931 and 1932 nearly 4,000 failures occurred, with the loss of hundreds of millions of dollars to the American people. The steps taken by the Roosevelt administration, including the establishing of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, cut the failures to 333 in 10 years, or fewer by far in a decade than failed during 1 year of Republican administration. In view of such a situation why do you say "Roosevelt depression," Mr. Dewey?

Farmers constitute a most important segment of American economy. How did the depression affect them? In 1929 the net income of American farmers was less than $7,000,000,000; in 193?, under President Hoover, it had dropped to two billion; by 1943 it had risen to fourteen billion under President Roosevelt. An even more impressive story is found in the statistics on distressed sale of farms, for it is through farm ownership that we preserve the American way of life so far as agriculture is concerned. Even during the "prosperous twenties," distress sales were from 20 to 23 per thousand annually; in 1933 they rose to the appalling figure of 54 per thousand. Since 1933 each year has seen a decline until in 1942 it was as low as 9 and in 1943 6½ per thousand. Surely, Mr. Dewey, the American farmer cannot agree with you that the name that should be associated with the word "depression" is that of Roosevelt.

Figures on employment, on business income, on business failures—in fact any criteria desired—will show the same result. Depression cannot be blamed on any one man, but the one man under whose administration depression has been most successfully met and defeated is that of Franklin D. Roosevelt. The record speaks for itself.

2. THE FAILURE-TO-PREPARE-FOR-WAR MYTH

This ranks with the "Roosevelt depression" myth as one of the most laughable of the campaign to date and also as one of the most stupid, because here again the American people do not relish having their intelligence insulted; they have memories. In Des Moines on September 11, Mr. Dewey made the following astounding statement:

> The tragedy is that we have an administration seeking office now that was 8 years in office while the forces of war were gathering, but did nothing to prepare us for war. It made absolutely no military preparations for events which it now claims it foresaw.

Again let us look at the record. That record is so clear that it is inconceivable that such a statement as the above should be made. Mr. Roosevelt became President in 1933. We were not a member of any League of Nations because President Wilson's program had been killed in the Senate on a partisan basis several years before. Moreover, we had a small fleet because under President Harding we had scrapped the major portion of our Navy, taking as security the word of other nations, including that of Japan. The building up of the great fleet that is now chasing the Japs back to Tokyo did not take place in a single year; the battleships and plane carriers and cruisers were gradually constructed during the Roosevelt administration. Their keels were laid down years before we actually were in the war. Certainly the credit for seeing ahead that they were needed must be given to the President and his advisers.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. OUTLAND. I yield.

Mr. KNUTSON. I take it the gentleman is referring to the depression that was the direct outcome of the war that the gentleman's party promised to keep us out of in 1916.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OUTLAND. No; I should like to answer the gentleman's question myself; then I will yield to the gentleman.

I was not referring to the depression that occurred during President Harding's term that the gentleman mentions, but I am referring to the one that followed the collapse of the banks in 1929. Let me repeat again, I believe it is very unfair to use the term "Hoover depression." There is no one man ever responsible for a depression; but the economic policy of the 1920's when it was pretty much a case of "the public be damned" laid the foundation for the depression that followed the bank crash in 1929. I now yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. The gentleman has said just exactly what I wanted to say, that the depression in 1929 was after a period of Republican domination of our Government which lasted all during the period of the 1920's and was undoubtedly the result of policies pursued by them.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OUTLAND. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman from Minnesota made an observation that shows again his lack of a knowledge of the historical facts and a disregard of the truth. President Wilson recommended action of an international nature which, if adopted, would probably have prevented this war. We know what the history of that is; we know those who opposed it. We know that even in 1920, William Howard Taft, Herbert Hoover, Charles Evans Hughes, and 40-odd other prominent Republicans assured the people of America that President Harding, if elected, would try to

have the plan of Woodrow Wilson ratified by the Senate.

No sooner was he elected than he issued the statement that the League was dead. When that statement was issued all hopes of peace of an international and permanent nature were killed and we have now to go forward and try to save the next generation from undergoing the horrors of another destructive war.

Mr. KNUTSON. Will the gentleman yield for one further question?

Mr. OUTLAND. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. KNUTSON. I wonder if the distinguished majority leader is prepared to promise the American people again, again, and again, that their sons will not be sent to fight on foreign soil?

Mr. McCORMACK. When the gentleman makes that statement he makes a statement of approval of the Jap attack. The only construction to be placed upon that statement is that he approves the Jap attack at Pearl Harbor. The gentleman overlooks the fact that the Japanese attacked the American people. Germany and Italy immediately declared war upon the United States. That statement has been quoted a considerable number of times. What were we to do, stand up here when we were attacked and let the Japs come in and invade the country? If that is what the gentleman from Minnesota stands for, there are enough red-blooded Americans in this country who do not stand for it.

Mr. KNUTSON. Will the gentleman yield for one more question?

Mr. OUTLAND. I am sorry, I cannot yield.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. Will the gentleman yield for a brief observation?

Mr. OUTLAND. I am sorry that I cannot yield. I want to go on to the point to which the majority leader referred, that of preparation for war. It is quite true Mr. Wilson's plan for a League of Nations was destroyed on a partisan basis. Once the League of Nations was destroyed we had to rely on force. What did we do then? We then proceeded to destroy the major portion of the American Fleet. If we had belonged to a league of nations that might have been a logical step. Without collective international planning it was the most illogical step possible.

As the war clouds in Europe grew darker the President again and again tried to prepare this Nation for what lay ahead—without very much cooperation, it must be stated, from the Republican Party. When he made his quarantine speech against the Fascist aggressors in 1937 he was attacked as a warmonger.

The steps in our rearmament program once war did break in Europe are not such that Mr. Dewey can stand off and blame the administration. My colleague the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BULWINKLE] has already told this House what the voting record was on some of the most essential bills prior to Pearl Harbor. Can you look at that record, Mr. Dewey, and honestly then blame the administration for failing to prepare for the inevitable? Rather should you not compliment that administration on doing as well as it did, in view of the isolationist opposition, as you well know, centered within your own party ranks? An example or two may be refreshing.

By September 1940 France had fallen. England was in the midst of fighting the Nazis single-handed, with the prospects for victory remote indeed. General Marshall told the Congress that, "We have to have a great many men very quickly. I cannot conceive of being able to obtain them on a voluntary basis." Conscription was imperative if we were to have an adequate army of defense. Read over the debate, my colleagues, and see for yourselves who was trying to prepare this Nation for war and who was trying to obstruct such preparations. "This bill imposes on our country the national socialism of Nazi Germany" solemnly stated one Republican leader. It "means military dictatorship and despotism" said another. The gem of the entire debate was probably this one, again by a prominent minority Member, "I consider new dealers more dangerous to the United States than are the totalitarian leaders." The Republican side of the House gave a rising ovation to its Member who proclaimed that "Even if Britain succumbs do we need this bill? I say no." Fortunately for America the bill passed. The vote was 263 to 145. Two hundred and eleven Democrats voted for it and 33 against; the Republican score was 52 for and 112 against. Again I ask the question: Who was responsible for delaying our defense preparations? Which party? Once again the record speaks for itself.

Take one more vital issue in war preparations; it is all we have time for here. By early 1941 it was obvious that if democracy were to survive this Nation would have to help. In his annual message to Congress the President stated that—

> We are committed to the proposition that principles of morality and consideration for our security will never permit us to acquiesce in a peace dictated by aggressors and sponsored by appeasers.

He asked for a program of lend-lease which would help Britain in her struggle for existence. During the debate upon the bill, the howls of the isolationists rent the heavens.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. OUTLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OUTLAND. I yield.

Mr. HINSHAW. I have been spending considerable time over the past several years in reading the history in regard to the Versailles Conference and other matters of that sort, and I find that members of both parties took very active positions in opposing the League of Nations, among them being, of course, Secretary Lansing, and Ambassador to France Bullitt. Even Mr. Roosevelt in 1932, 1933, and 1934 made the statement, "We are not members of the League and do not intend to become." I think it is one of those things that everyone looks back upon a lot easier than they can look forward to in the future.

Mr. OUTLAND. Will the gentleman from California look forward with me in urging that when this war is over there will not be a single member opposing our entry into the League of Nations and one that has teeth in it?

Mr. HINSHAW. I hope this, too, that when we get ready to organize internationally to prevent war, we do so on a basis of right and justice and on a basis that will be acceptable to all the nations and all the people.

Mr. OUTLAND. I thank the gentleman.

Returning to our discussion of the lend-lease program, may I quote one of the minority party during the discussion?

"If the bill passes," said one of them, "I predict that within 6 months we will have dictatorship comparable to the Nazis and Communists." Another Republican declared, "This bill is a war bill, a dictatorship bill, and a bankruptcy bill." The lend-lease bill passed the House on February 6, 1941, by a vote of 260 to 165. Only 24 Republicans voted for the bill while 135 voted against it. Probably no single measure has been more important in the over-all war picture than lend-lease; the program has enabled our allies to fight off the Nazi hordes, and, in all probability, to save hundreds of thousands of American lives. Again the picture is clear, Mr. Dewey, as to the administration's record and that of its opponents on war preparation. What was your own position? The record here, too, is clear. You stated on March 11, 1941, that "the lend-lease bill will bring an end to free government in the United States" and that "it would permit the President to give away the whole Navy." Yes; the record is clear; condemningly, accusingly clear.

3. THE BLAME FOR PEARL HARBOR

This is a real below-the-belt blow. While the Presidential candidate has not directly charged Mr. Roosevelt with being responsible for Pearl Harbor, he has not tried to stop his henchmen from doing so. I have already stated what I thought of such reckless charges as those of Mr. Kelland up in Vermont; I only regret that the English language is limited so that adjectives to describe such tactics cannot be wholly adequate. Here on the floor of the House similar statements have been made, and have always found a receptive audience among the anti-Roosevelt newspapers. One illustration will help to demonstrate the unfairness of such political tactics.

On September 11 a member of the Republican Party charged in a statement on this floor that the Australian Government had warned the American Government several days before the Pearl Harbor attack that a Japanese task force had been sighted headed eastward toward Hawaii, and that this warning was later repeated. The Prime Minister of Australia promptly branded this for what it was—a rumor without the slightest foundation. The early accusation received tremendous publicity; the denial,

very slight space. This is a good example of political tactics of an unfair nature, and a type which I sincerely trust will not be used by members of either party during the next few weeks. Similar comment might be made regarding the now notorious Fala story, which created such a tempest and was found to be not even a gentle zephyr.

4. THE CHARGE THAT GENERAL MAC ARTHUR HAS NOT BEEN PROPERLY TREATED

In a statement to the press on September 13 Mr. Dewey remarked that General MacArthur has "performed miracles with inadequate supplies, inadequate air power, and inadequate force." He implied directly that the President had looked upon General MacArthur as a political rival, and implied further that were he President he would see that this particular general received more attention. This type of political tactic has received almost universally the condemnation that it so richly deserves. It combines in one example the tendency to destroy the confidence of the American people in their military leadership, to appeal to the prejudices of those in particular sections as well as to isolationists, and to draw red herrings across the major campaign issues. I shall not take the time to answer this charge in detail. Rather do I ask unanimous consent to insert at this point in the RECORD, as part of my remarks, editorials on this subject from diverse sources. I call especial attention to the one by Maj. George Fielding Eliot, in the New York Herald Tribune, entitled "Dewey Statement on MacArthur Is Called Disservice to Country." I feel certain that when the press comments upon this particular statement reach the Dewey special, that there will be a huddle of strategists, and that we shall hear nothing more at all on this subject. One news account from the train states that already certain Republican strategists are counseling Mr. Dewey to stick to the decision announced in his acceptance speech in Chicago. At that time the Republican candidate stated that—

> The military conduct of the war is outside the campaign. It is and must remain completely out of politics. * * * Let me make it crystal clear that a change of administration next January cannot and will not involve any change in the conduct of the war.

Those words were well spoken, Mr. Dewey; now if you will only stand by them in practice you will be doing a great service to the American people.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert the editorials in the RECORD at this point.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

[From the New York Herald Tribune of September 16, 1944]

DEWEY STATEMENT ON MACARTHUR IS CALLED DISSERVICE TO COUNTRY—MAJOR ELIOT SAYS GOVERNOR LACKS SUFFICIENT FACTS ABOUT GENERAL'S ACCOMPLISHMENTS TO JUDGE HIS QUALIFICATIONS FOR THE PACIFIC COMMAND

(By Maj. George Fielding Eliot)

Governor Dewey has contributed greatly to our national unity in the matter of post-war foreign policy and to the confidence of our allies in our future intentions regarding the enforcement of the common peace by his very evident determination to lift these vital questions above the level of partisan debate. For this the country may well be grateful to the Republican candidate. His course in this respect seems to this writer to be wise, unselfish, and statesmanlike. But his gratuitous interference in the matter of the high command in the Pacific is neither wise nor helpful.

In his statement at Valentine, Nebr., on Wednesday, Governor Dewey brought forward the name of Gen. Douglas MacArthur in such a way as to render unavoidable the conclusion that the Governor was urging the appointment of that officer to the over-all Pacific command. In so doing he ventured into a field which he is not qualified to discuss either on the ground of information or that of responsibility. Governor Dewey cannot possibly know the facts as to General MacArthur's accomplishments and abilities, as displayed in the present war, except as these have been reported in the press or as they are told to him by persons of varying degrees of military competence who have visited the southwest Pacific. He does not have access to the only sources of information and advice on this subject which would enable him to pass judgment on General MacArthur as a possible over-all Pacific commander in chief. Those sources are to be found in the Combined Chiefs of Staff, under whose direction General MacArthur functions, and to whom he is responsible.

DEWEY IS QUOTED

Governor Dewey said, as quoted by correspondents: "Any study of his (MacArthur's) offensives up from Australia reveals the most extraordinary brilliance of his generalship. Time after time he has made landings on heavily defended, long-prepared islands, and almost every time he has managed to land at the exact spot where the Japanese were not." It is perfectly true, of course, that General MacArthur has conducted a skillful campaign, and has gained distance toward his objectives in a steady step by step advance which has now brought him to the Halmahera Islands. But the inevitable implication of the Governor's remarks is that General MacArthur has handled his part of the westward march toward Japan more skillfully than others—more skillfully, for example, than Admiral Nimitz has handled his great central Pacific offensive. In this writer's judgment—and that of other observers, it may be added—this is most decidedly not the case.

The Governor suggests that "adequate recognition and supply commensurate with General MacArthur's great talents are long overdue." But the supply of the southwest Pacific area is a part of the general supply problem in the Pacific, which is based on the proportion of the total was resources available to the American forces which can, in view of the over-all strategic picture, be allotted to the Pacific campaign.

SHORTAGES WIDESPREAD

In the beginning of that campaign, General MacArthur was undoubtedly very short of supplies, men, planes, and everything else. So were all the rest of our Pacific forces. The decision to dispose of Germany first and Japan second was the reason. The vast offensive power of which we now dispose in the Pacific was not there then; it had to be built up by slow, heartbreaking, painful effort, and meanwhile those who fought to hold back the enemy's offensive thrusts had to do the best they could with what they had plus the trickle of help that could reach them. MacArthur did that; Halsey did that; the marines at Guadalcanal did that—and they all did it well. Now things are different, very different. Germany is going down; Japan's turn is coming. Governor Dewey is not well informed in suggesting that General MacArthur lacks the forces and the equipment which he requires for the accomplishment of his present objectives. The very facts of MacArthur's recent progress tend to put this matter in quite another light than does Governor Dewey.

As to the suggestion that General MacArthur should now be appointed commander in chief of the whole Pacific war effort—and surely despite careful hedging, Mr. Dewey could hardly have imagined that his words would be otherwise interpreted—it seems difficult to suppose that the Governor could have given any great study to the strategic conditions which now confront the Allied forces, or he would have realized that for a long time to come the war against Japan must continue primarily a naval and amphibious campaign in which everything depends on the Navy, in which sea-borne power is the foundation upon which the whole structure of our offensive operations must rest.

STILL FIGHTING FOR ISLANDS

It is, of course, true that we are now coming to larger land masses, that we shall need more troops, that land operations will assume a higher proportionate importance; but we are still fighting for islands, even though they are bigger islands than Tarawa or Saipan, and we are very far as yet from the day when our principal objective will be the destruction of the main Japanese Army in a great land campaign. Until that day has been reached, or is clearly in sight, the chief command of the Pacific operations ought to remain in the hands of a naval officer. Neither by his own experience, nor by having access to adequately informed professional advice, is Governor Dewey qualified to say otherwise.

And, finally, there remains, when all is said and done, the question of General MacArthur's own fitness for the suggested appointment—one in which he would have to command not only American and Australian land and air forces, but also the most tremendous naval armament which this world has ever seen—the United States Pacific Fleet—and in which, likewise, he would eventually have to command very considerable British land, air, and naval forces. Aside from his professional abilities and experience, an officer appointed to such a command requires personal attributes which are not found in many men.

SELFLESSNESS A REQUIREMENT

Of these attributes, perhaps the most important is an utter selflessness. No man can, by reason of an appointment made out in the name of several governments, exercise efficient command over the fighting men and the destinies of nations other than his own unless, at the very beginning, he is prepared to put aside all thought of self and to conduct himself with a firm impartiality which shall be apparent in his every thought and action. This quality of selflessness is rare. There are American officers who possess it and display it. General Marshall is a conspicuous example; so is General Eisenhower; so is Admiral Nimitz. There may be others. But is General MacArthur one of them?

It may yet fall to the lot of Governor Dewey to bear the responsibility for choosing a commander in chief in the Pacific, or suggesting an American candidate for that office to the governments of the other Allied powers; but until that time comes, and he is in possession of all the facts and all the professional advice necessary to guide him, it is a disservice to his country's cause for him to make widely publicized suggestions which can only add to the difficulties of those who, in the present critical days, are in fact charged with that responsibility.

[From PM of September 15, 1944]

DEWEY AND MACARTHUR

Governor Dewey's campaign hit its low with his press conference statement on MacArthur. It was the clearest effort he has made so far to win votes by playing with the war. Dewey fell all over himself in calling MacArthur extraordinary and magnificent.

No doubt MacArthur is a good general. But while Dewey was about it, why didn't he say something about Eisenhower and Bradley, Stilwell and Chennault and Patch? Why single out MacArthur?

The answer is that MacArthur has, whether rightly or wrongly, become the darling of the isolationists. He is the leader-symbol of the McCormick-Patterson press. In planting the MacArthur question at the press conference, and in going out of his way to praise him elaborately, Dewey made the most direct bid he has thus far made for the isolationist and pro-fascist vote.

It wasn't just the praise. The nub of the matter lay in Dewey's adopting the favorite battle cry of Colonel McCormick and Gerald Smith: the charge that President Roosevelt had played politics with the war, had sidetracked MacArthur because he was (as Dewey put it) a political threat, and had given him "inadequate supply, inadequate airpower, and inadequate force."

If this charge is true, it is damning. If it is false, it is vicious. Does Dewey have any proof He has offered not a shred. He has only taken the frayed and worn invective of the isolationist press, and offers it to us again as if it were a bright and dazzling garment.

In doing so, Dewey is himself playing politics with the war. It is true that MacArthur could have used more men, planes, supplies. So could Stilwell. So could Chennault. They did not get them because the President and his military staffs made a crucial decision. That decision was to concentrate the main Allied force in crushing Nazi power in Europe first, and then turning to Japan.

The final decision on this score was made by President Roosevelt, as Commander in Chief, and he must take the responsibility. Does Dewey doubt that it has worked out well? Let him look at Europe, where Hitler's power is being crushed with lightning speed. Let him look at the East, where Japan—shorn of its Axis partner—is trembling before coming events.

Does Dewey think the decision to concentrate on the European war first was a mistake? If he does, he should have the courage to say so.

But he won't. For he doesn't mean any of this stuff seriously. It is a way of getting votes. The idea is to show the isolationists and Fascists that he is, after all and despite Dulles' pious talks with Secretary Hull, one of the boys. And the idea is at the same time, to keep telling the internationalists (through Dulles) that he is really one of their kind.

If the voter who is as yet undecided lets Dewey get away with this, he is more of a fool than anyone has a right to be.

MAX LERNER.

[From the Washington Post of September 17, 1944]

MACARTHUR'S NOT ABUSED, SAYS WRITER

(By Ernest Lindley)

The charge that General MacArthur has been discriminated against because the President regarded him as a political threat has been made familiar by the isolationist press.

Now Governor Dewey has picked it up. He says that MacArthur should be given greater scope and recognition and more supplies.

What greater scope and recognition should General MacArthur be given? For 2½ years he has been Allied commander in the southwest Pacific, an area which embraces the approaches to the Philippines from Australia and New Guinea.

The next step up would be commander in chief of all Pacific operations.

These operations are, at the core, naval. Can anyone deny that they have been brilliantly conducted under the direction of Admirals King and Nimitz? Does anyone think that any general could conduct them any better, or even as well? Ask any naval officer.

Some sort of joint command might be rigged up. But that would be a dangerous step backward.

The only other posts which are more important than the one already held by MacArthur are Chief of Staff of the Army and supreme commander of Allied forces in Europe.

Does any sane person really think that General Marshall should be replaced, or, for that matter, General Eisenhower?

WILL REDEEM PLEDGE

If the defeat of Japan requires large-scale use of ground forces in China or in Japan proper, an Army general probably will be placed in command of them. If the Philippines have been liberated, meanwhile, General MacArthur might be named to such a command; although, if there is a major campaign in China, General Stilwell, who speaks Chinese and is, among other things, chief of staff to Chiang Kai-shek, presumably would be considered for this responsibility.

General Eisenhower, who has proved so skillful in handling of forces of diverse nationality, also might be available.

But, meanwhile, General MacArthur is well on his way back to the Philippines for the redemption of his pledge to liberate them. That in itself is a large and honorable task and one that it is altogether fitting that he should perform.

As to supplies, it is well known that they are distributed in accordance with the strategic decisions of the Combined Chiefs of Staff. Those available for the Pacific have been distributed under the direction of the American Chiefs of Staff.

TWO BASIC REASONS

When MacArthur first began shouting for more supplies, more planes, and more of everything, he was probably no worse off relatively than other theater commanders. The main difference was that he made his demands more or less in public, whereas the others went through channels.

The hard fact in early 1942 was that there were not enough planes, supplies, and men to go around or enough ships to carry them.

As time passed there were two basic reasons why MacArthur did no receive all that he wanted. The first was the combined Anglo-American decision to beat Germany first. This was taken by Messrs. Roosevelt and Churchill with the full support of General Marshall.

The Navy's attitude was mixed.

This was probably the most critical decision of the war. It was the one which evoked the strongest protests from isolationist quarters and, with the loss of the Philippines, generated the boom to make General MacArthur Chief of Staff or commander in chief of all American forces. Its essential wisdom is hardly debatable any more even though some of the individual subdecisions—such as the sacrificing of a larger and earlier campaign to Burma to the defensive in Italy—are open to challenge.

SUPPLIES NOW ADEQUATE

The second basic reason why MacArthur did not get all he thought he should have was that his views on Pacific strategy did not altogether jibe with the Navy's. The Navy was working toward the great march across the Central Pacific.

MacArthur has had in recent months adequate forces to perform the tasks assigned to him. Unquestionably, he will be given enough for the next jump on his route. In fact, some naval officers feared that when Roosevelt went to Pearl Harbor he might make verbal commitments to MacArthur to provide forces in excess of those tentatively allotted by the Joint Chiefs of Staff—thus possibly delaying or weakening the main drive across the Central Pacific.

Dewey's criticism of the treatment of MacArthur is, although he may not know it, a fundamental criticism of the wisdom of the American Chiefs of Staff.

In his acceptance speech he said he was against "civilian interference" with the conduct of the war and that, if elected, he would retain General Marshall and Admiral King.

Now he sets himself up as a man whose judgment on matters of military strategy is superior to theirs.

[From the Washington Star of September 15, 1944]

DEWEY HELD MISTAKEN ON PACIFIC CHARGES—DECISIONS ON MACARTHUR SUPPLIES MADE BY STAFF CHIEFS, SAYS WRITER

(By David Lawrence)

Governor Dewey made an unfortunate mistake—perhaps the first in his campaign speaking tour—when he attacked President Roosevelt for allegedly denying aid to General MacArthur in the Southwest Pacific. The New York Governor says that since General MacArthur is "no longer a political threat," supplies can be speeded to the Southwest Pacific.

This is not in accord with the facts. If Governor Dewey had had better sources of information in Washington, he would have learned that whatever decisions of strategy have been made or whatever allocations of supplies have been determined on were the nonpolitical, impersonal decisions of the Joint United States Chiefs of Staff so far as areas were concerned, and not the decisions of Mr. Roosevelt.

He would also have learned that the so-called MacArthur plan for operating the war in the Pacific has been opposed by the United States Navy high command for months. This opposition has had nothing to do with politics or General MacArthur's position.

Almost everybody who has studied the warfare in the Pacific knows that from the beginning there have been differing lines of strategy proposed and that it was very difficult, for example, to get the Army Air Forces to believe that much of their planes and supplies should be diverted from Europe. This was due to a deep-seated conviction that Germany should be beaten first, possibly from the air, and then attention should be given to the Pacific.

NEVER ANY POLITICS IN IT

If General MacArthur and his staff officers were disappointed some months ago in the amount of supplies then being given them—it is not the case now—they had only the decisions of the United States Joint Chiefs of Staff to blame. There never was any politics in it so far as the high command of the Army or Navy was concerned.

Governor Dewey might better have made his point in connection with the decisions reached as between the Prime Minister of Great Britain and President Roosevelt. It has long been believed in Washington, for instance, that Mr. Roosevelt on more than one occasion had conceded a point of global strategy to the British Prime Minister over the protest of his own chiefs of staff.

Governor Dewey, of course, suffers under the disadvantage of not knowing what goes on or has gone on as between the Prime Minister of Great Britain and the President of the United States. The work of these conferences is not only conducted secretly, but,

so far as is known, there are no records made of what is said between these two heads of states.

The military men, to be sure, know when decisions have been reached and when, of course, they have been reversed. There have been some important reversals of the point of view of the United States chiefs of staff, but these have been solely because of the pressure of the British Prime Minister to get the war in Europe over with first.

No one can justly say, however, that the British Government has not wanted the Japanese beaten as quickly as possible, though there has been some pointed criticism here that the British Government failed to mount the proper expedition from India to Burma and thus has delayed operations against the Japanese because of the meager aid given to China.

TIME WILL TELL STORY

In time more of the story will come out, but again it is not a matter that has anything to do with domestic politics in the United States. It has more to do with the persuasive powers of the British Prime Minister and the anxiety of Mr. Roosevelt to preserve Allied solidarity all along the line by acquiescing. History may prove that Mr. Roosevelt was mistaken in some of these judgments, but nobody will be able to prove that they had anything to do with domestic political consideration or any other kind of partisanship.

It's bad enough to have Mr. Roosevelt going around the country giving the impression that he is the great master of military strategy which, of course, he isn't. Military men resent the artificial impression being built up in this campaign that Mr. Roosevelt is running the war. But it would be an even worse mistake if Governor Dewey fell into the trap of trying to discuss in public the personnel of military command.

* * * * *

5. CHARGES THAT CERTAIN PARTS OF THE COUNTRY ARE BEING NEGLECTED BY THE ADMINISTRATION

Mr. OUTLAND. "Divide and conquer" is still a good maxim if you can get away with it. To divide one section of America against another, to play off country against city, New England against the South, or West against East, however, is not a very dignified type of campaigning in wartime. I shall not even take the time to refute the charge made by Mr. Dewey about the Jackson Hole National Monument in Wyoming. Secretary Ickes, in his own inimitable style, has already done that; he has shown how this national monument has a history going back into the years of Coolidge and Hoover; how Mr. Rockefeller bought thousands of acres of land for the public use; and how the statistics used by Mr. Dewey are entirely incorrect. His refutation is complete on this charge.

More basically important as a campaign technique is that illustrated by Mr. Dewey's statement in Spokane, Wash., on September 16 that the west coast has been "deserted by the administration." As a Representative from one of the west coast States, I personally resent this charge. I resent the implications back of it. Those of us who remember the distress and inaction of the Hoover administration, even with a California Secretary of the Interior, cannot help but contrast the change that has taken place there since President Roosevelt was inaugurated. We know only too well about the immense reclamation projects, the power developments, the harbor and coastline improvements, to say nothing of the tremendous industrial expansion that has come there in recent years. Certainly I would like to see more westerners in the Cabinet. Certainly I would like to see another western judge on the Supreme Court. But to me there are some things bigger than sectional pride. My pride in being a Californian is great, but greater is that of being an American. I refuse to allow myself to be appealed to on the basis of sectionalism, and I am confident that the vast majority of people from the West feel likewise. If Mr. Dewey expects to gain votes by playing one part of the United States off against the others, he is in for a sad awakening.

6. INNUENDOES AGAINST THE FOREIGN-BORN

If American democracy stands for anything, it stands for equality of opportunity regardless of race, religion, or national background. We are proud of the fact that our Nation has been built by peoples from all the countries of the world. To stir up campaign heat on this basis is running counter to the principles of Americanism. I compliment Mr. Dewey for promptly repudiating one such smear attempt upon the Jews from a member of his own party. I compliment, too, the national chairmen of each party for their recent statements that they will not resort to such smear tactics during this campaign.

Sometimes, however, national prejudices can be raised not openly but subtly. For example, the work of the Political Action Committee has been greatly discussed in the press of this country. Its chairman, Mr. Hillman, was born in another country, and that fact is almost always brought into news stories concerning his organization. Furthermore, Mr. Hillman is a Jew, and that fact too is not very cleverly disguised in discussing his activities. I am not especially interested in the fact that in 1937, when Mr. Dewey was running for district attorney of New York, he accepted with gratitude a contribution of $5,000 for his campaign from the Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America, a C. I. O. organization of which Mr. Hillman was president. I have no doubt that he will be perfectly willing this time to accept contributions from Mr. John L. Lewis. The matter of political contributions is not the one under discussion here; that issue is that of prejudice, and I here and now call upon Mr. Dewey to demand that his leaders and campaign managers keep race and religious prejudices out of all of their remarks, not simply out of those where Mr. Dewey will get favorable publicity thereby.

Marquis Childs has well summarized the situation in this connection. I ask unanimous consent to have his editorial entitled "Racial Poison," which appeared in the Washington Post of September 16, 1944, inserted at this point in the RECORD as part of my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

[From the Washington Post of September 16, 1944]

WASHINGTON CALLING

(By Marquis Childs)

RACIAL POISON

Sidney Hillman, the chairman of the C. I. O. Political Action Committee, was born in Lithuania. He came to this country as a young man and very quickly carved out for himself a position of personal power and authority through his efforts in building up the Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America. He speaks with a rather pronounced foreign accent.

Back of the campaign directed against Sidney Hillman is the effort to make him appear a foreigner, an alien; to try to make it seem that what he is doing is foreign and alien.

The smear attack directed at Sidney Hillman is essentially un-American. Whether or not it is done deliberately, the effect is to capitalize on latent anti-Semitism in this country. That is plainly implied in much of the anti-Hillman propaganda. They do not say that he is a Jew, but they speak of his early "rabbinical training."

This is a dangerous thing to do. It's playing with the fire of racial hatred. It's encouraging those who would like to make it respectable.

Sometimes it seems to me that this racial poison is like molten lava under the crust of the volcanic mountain on which we live. And sometimes it seems that the crust is very thin.

It can be put down partly, I suppose, to the tensions growing out of the war. In the boiling turbulence of the vast war boom, frustrations develop and fester. Frustrated people look for a scapegoat. They put the blame on a fiction, an illusion, a shadow created in their own unhappy minds—the Jew with all the legend that hatred and malice have attached to him.

But we ought to look clearly at this thing right now. It's a poison that can destroy our society just as surely as it destroyed Nazi Germany. We are not immune to the virus. It is a poison that feeds on itself, and the end is self-destruction.

Some people say: "But Hillman, a Jew, should never have put himself out in front." That is no answer, really. There were those who said the same thing when Felix Frankfurter was appointed to the Supreme Court. "Oh, he shouldn't make himself so prominent."

To accept that would be to accept an inferior status; to say that brains and ability, if they are Jewish brains and ability, can go only so far. Such a doctrine cuts across everything we've cherished in this country. It denies all that the noble men who founded this Nation stood for and believed in. We are all the creeds and the peoples of the earth in miraculous balance, and if we're not that, then we're nothing; we're what Hitler called us—mongrels; those of us who came two centuries ago and those who came 20 years ago.

There are good reasons, it seems to me, why Sidney Hillman should not have taken the C. I. O.'s front political position. But they have nothing to do with his race.

In my limited observation, he has always seemed maladroit in handling people. His own union has been kept carefully under his thumb and he has been accustomed to taking an authoritative line which does not go down in politics.

Somewhat the same thing happens when a big business executive tries to get into politics below—or above—the checkbook level. He's accustomed to pushing buttons, to telling people what to do. It doesn't work that way when you're out for the vote of the average John Q. Citizen.

Those who deliberately make a bogey of Sidney Hillman are doing the country a deep disservice. They are appealing to primitive prejudices which have no place in a political campaign in America.

The manipulators who are waving the Hillman scarecrow on the political horizon know it's largely false. They believe it will frighten independent voters into the Dewey camp, and maybe it will. But at the same time it will stir hatreds that will long outlast this campaign.

7. VAGUE ATTACKS UPON BUREAUCRACY

Mr. OUTLAND. Pity the poor bureaucrat. Especially pity him in an election year. Then, more than ever, he becomes the personification of all the gripes of all people against the Government. He is personally responsible for the war. He is the one that takes your income-tax money. It is the bureaucrat who has a deliberate grudge against you, and is responsible for your failure to get priorities, for rationing, and for all strikes. Seriously, I think that this whole problem of bureaucracy has been distorted to the American people. A modern complex government cannot possibly function without administrative agencies, which is only a more polite term for bureaus.

A few weeks ago, while debating with some well-known Republicans on the Town Meeting of the Air, the question of bureaus arose. My opponents constantly repeated that there were over 2,000 Federal bureaus, "yes, ladies and gentlemen, think of it, more than 2,000 bureaus." I asked them several times to tell me and to tell the audience which ones of these 2,000 they would get rid of. No answer. Finally in desperation, I asked it again, and one of the opposition guessed he would get rid of the United States Employment Service. Out of 2,000 and more bureaus so fulsomely denounced, he could think of only 1 that he would abolish if he had the chance. That, I replied, was a pretty good batting average. But it illustrates a point that I brought out early in my remarks today: The minority party is dealing so much in glittering generalities, and so little in concrete suggestions. What does Mr. Dewey propose to substitute for present-day administrative agencies if he comes into office? I should like to ask him just what bureaus he would abolish. The answer will be extremely interesting, I am sure.

In his Philadelphia speech, Mr. Dewey spoke as follows:

> Of course we need bank security deposit. Of course we need price support for agriculture. Of course the farmers of this country cannot be left to the hazards of a world price while they buy their goods on an American price. Of course we need unemployment insurance and old-age pensions and also relief whenever there are not enough jobs. Of course the rights of labor to organize and bargain collectively are fundamental.

Others have pointed out that this constitutes a hearty endorsement for the fundamentals of the program of the Roosevelt administration, and I need not elaborate upon that point. Of course it does. What does concern me is this: How does Mr. Dewey propose to carry through these things which he so enthusiastically desires without Government bureaus? Can we have bank insurance without an F. D. I. C.? Can we have farmers protected without the many bureaus of the Department of Agriculture? Can we have social security without a social-security agency? Can we have labor protected without the bureaus established by the Wagner acts and other legislation? This is fundamental, Mr. Dewey, and you know it. To carry on the business of a modern government you must have administrative agencies. I will agree with all who state that we must eliminate waste and duplication; that we must hold administrative agencies responsible to Congress; that we must constantly evaluate, revise, eliminate, and improve our administrative agencies, I refuse to be a demagogue by making a blind and partisan attack on bureaucracy. It does not hold water.

I have attempted to portray here, through discussing a few concrete cases, the unfairness of the type of campaign that is being waged against President Roosevelt and his administration, to show its futility as well as its dangers. I close with a plea not only to the members of the minority party but to the members of my own: In the name of all that is decent and just, in the name of fair play that is so basic to American tradition, let us keep this political campaign clean, let us confine it to issues, let us avoid personalities. Let us not refer to Mrs. Roosevelt or to Mrs. Dewey; neither of them is a campaign issue. Let us rise to the test of our Nation in its most critical year, and show the rest of the world that America cannot only hold an open and free election, but that it can keep that election campaign on a sound basis. In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include as part of my remarks at this point an excellent editorial from the Santa Barbara News-Press of September 9, 1944.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

[From the Santa Barbara News-Press of September 9, 1944]

DEWEY FAILS TO OFFER CONSTRUCTIVE CRITICISM

Franklin D. Roosevelt has not yet got around to campaigning for reelection. Nor has Senator TRUMAN done more than a preliminary warm-up speech.

Nevertheless, the Roosevelt fourth term candidacy got off to a rousing start Thursday night when the opposition candidate, Gov. Thomas E. Dewey, spoke with such extravagant criticism of the administration that he must have swung many undecided voters to the Democratic camp.

Among other things, Dewey said:

The Roosevelt administration is "afraid to let men out of the Army when peace comes because Washington is getting all set for another depression."

He was quoting the Director of Selective Service as saying it will be necessary to demobilize the armed forces very gradually when Germany and Japan have been defeated because "we can keep people in the Army about as cheaply as we could create an agency for them when they are out."

Then Dewey declared the Roosevelt administration was "conceived in defeatism, failed for 8 straight years to restore our domestic economy, has been the most wasteful, extravagant, and incompetent administration in the history of the Nation, and, worst of all, has lost faith in itself and in the American people.

"The war is the only thing that saved it. They are deadly afraid that they will go back to resumption of their own failures. That is why they are afraid to let the men out of the Army."

Of course, there were other angles to the speech. He voiced great, but vague, faith in America's capacity to produce, to prosper—if only the "right" government were in office. He offered very broad, but still very vague, general promises to maintain necessary Government regulations of industry and finance, maintain support for farm prices, and encourage labor to seek and gain high living standards—and offered just as broad and vague criticisms of "Government control" by which these goals have been sought in the past.

But nowhere did he offer the detailed, factual, constructive criticism of Government policies which the people as a whole have a right to expect from an aspirant for the highest office in the land. And nowhere did he discuss with balanced judgment and intellectual honesty administration policies or attitudes with which he and undoubtedly a great number of other Americans—of both parties—are in definite disagreement.

The bulk of American voters do not feel that President Roosevelt is afraid to let the men out of the Army, when they are no longer needed for the defense of our country or of our far-flung interests in maintaining world peace, particularly when the Army itself has just announced a carefully worked out, nonpolitical schedule for releasing all surplus Army men as soon after the defeat of Germany as is practicable from a military standpoint.

Nor can the people have much confidence in Dewey's proposal that only volunteers remain in the armed forces to police Japan and Germany. This might or might not prove practical—but in any event it is a military, not a political question.

Does Governor Dewey honestly think that any administration, under any President, would be so foolish as to try to hold millions of men in uniform long after there was any military need for them?

And as for the administration fearing and preparing for a post-war depression—since when was it a crime for any government to prepare against such a possibility? A mere statement of "faith" by a Republican President or aspirant in the fundamental soundness of America and in its productive capacity is not enough.

The economic dislocation which will mark transition from wartime to peacetime production is an inevitable development. No statesman can shrug it off with a pious hope. Honest men may differ on measures to handle the dislocation and prevent or ease a depression, but it is not enough merely to cite the well-known backlog of consumer demand for houses, automobiles, and electrical goods.

Governor Dewey has the opportunity—and the obligation—of pointing real flaws and weaknesses in the administration he hopes to supersede. He has the opportunity—and obligation—of suggesting constructive and workable policies to meet coming problems.

He does not serve either his country or his party well when he offers only irresponsible, extravagant, and generalized accusations against a President who has, after all, retained the confidence of a majority of voters through a decade or more of the most difficult years this Nation has ever known.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by placing therein the remarkably able address of Mr. Dewey last evening.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. DWORSHAK] is recognized for 20 minutes.

FEDERAL CIVILIAN PAY ROLLS SHOW BIG INCREASE

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. Speaker, I listened with a great deal of interest to the comments offered by the gentleman who preceded me concerning the recognition which the West has received from the New Deal administration. I prefer to let the record speak for itself. With the exception of the State of Texas, there is no member in the New Deal Presidential Cabinet from west of the Mississippi.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DWORSHAK. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. EBERHARTER. The Republican candidate is not appealing for votes on the basis of patronage that he promises certain sections of the country, is he?

Mr. DWORSHAK. No, he does not have to do that, because in the West they recognize his sterling qualities and realize that under his regime beginning next January the great western country can expect a square deal.

Mr. EBERHARTER. In ward politics you get votes by promising patronage. I just wondered whether the Governor was following the same plan.

Mr. DWORSHAK. I realize the gentleman from Pennsylvania is well acquainted with the patronage system which prevails in Tammany and in the various wards, because he is very astute and experienced in that kind of politics.

Mr. Speaker, we learned today that President Roosevelt has ordered the Budget Bureau to begin planning demobilization of the Government's vast wartime machinery through liquidation of emergency bureaus and agencies and reduction of the Federal pay roll to a "peace footing."

In reading the letter of the Chief Executive to the Director of the Budget Bureau, I want to quote the concluding paragraph, as follows:

> In general, recommendations should include the methods for effecting the proposed changes and the appropriate timing of these changes. Immediate attention should be focused on the adjustments needed upon the termination of the war in Europe.

The most significant aspect of the letter which the Chief Executive has written to Director Smith is that there is no hope given to Congress or to the American people that we may expect early action looking toward the drastic curtailment of the civilian Federal pay roll. This letter points out that action must be deferred until after the termination of hostilities, so it is very apparent that notwithstanding the agitation on the part of the people throughout the country to reduce the Federal pay roll, the Chief Executive is merely offering a campaign promise to do something about this after the war ends; but, of course, he may prefer to defer action until a Republican administration takes control of our Federal Government.

Mr. Speaker, about 10 days ago the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. RAMSPECK] who is chairman of the House Committee on the Civil Service, questioned the accuracy of some figures which I interpolated into the debate concerning the number of civilian employees on the Federal pay roll. At that time I called to the attention of my colleagues, the report of the United States Civil Service Commission as of June 30, 1944, showing that approximately 3,300,000 paid employees were listed. However, he contended that the paid employees numbered about 2,850,000, including those in the continental United States and in Alaska and the Panama Canal Zone. The chairman of the House Committee on the Civil Service also contended that his group which had been investigating the status of civilian employment in the Federal Government, had checked the increase which had been going on at the rate of about 100,000 per month after we got into the war and that "we got a net reduction of 200,000" in the 3 months following July 1, 1943. There has been widespread misunderstanding in regard to civilian employment in various Federal departments and agencies. There have also been several changes in the methods of compiling the monthly records with different classifications, but we must rely upon the accuracy of the United States Civil Service Commission for those statistics. Therefore I am taking this time so that the record will show that the remarks I made recently in this body were substantially correct and that the figure advanced by the gentleman from Georgia was almost a half million under the actual total of paid civilian employees of the Federal Government.

The Civil Service Commission has just released its official report for July 31, 1944, which shows the total employment in all agencies of 2,938,602 in the continental United States. But the number of paid employees serving in Alaska and the Panama Canal Zone and elsewhere outside of the United States on June 30, 1944, was approximately 384,700, or a total of 3,323,302. This does not include 295,433 uncompensated employees and dollar-a-year men at the end of July. The reports of this Federal Commission show that the net increase in paid civilian employment during the first 7 months of this calendar year, was more than 100,000.

However, in view of the fact that my colleague from Georgia prefers to take July 1, 1943, as the basis of his alleged curtailment in civilian employment, I have checked the monthly reports during the past year and I have some interesting data to submit to the House at this time. On July 1, 1943, the Commission reported a total of 3,188,625 paid civilian personnel, to which must be added the Commission's figure of civilian employment outside the continental United States, which was listed by the Commission as 154,500.

But as 100,483 of this number were included in the previous tabulation, a total of 51,012 must be added, showing that there were 3,239,637 paid civilian employees on the Federal pay roll. These same compilations on July 31, 1944, 1 year later, show 2,938,602 employees in the continental United States, and a total of 384,700 outside the continental limits, making a grand total of 3,323,302, or a net increase of 83,665.

Regardless of what the Civil Service Committee of the House was able to accomplish in its efforts to effect retrenchment in the number of civilian employees of the Federal Government, the reports submitted by the United States Civil Service Commission show that there was a sizable gain during the past year instead of the alleged reduction of 200,000 which has been referred to frequently on this floor by my colleague from Georgia.

The July report just issued by the Civil Service Commission shows these figures:

Total paid continental United States	2,938,602
Outside continental limits	384,700
Uncompensated and $1-a-year employees	295,433
Grand total	3,618,735

The report of the Commission as of July 1, 1943, 1 year prior, shows that the comparable figure for all such classifications was 3,269,125, or a gain of 350,000 in the past year. As the basis for the figure of July 1, 1943, which I submit herewith, I quote from the Civil Service Commission report for June 1943 as follows:

> With the enactment of the War Overtime Pay Act of 1943, approved May 7, 1943, it was necessary to revise the existing employment reporting system to provide for reporting certain categories of employees not previously reported, to determine the number of employees subject to and excluded from the act, and to determine the number in various categories such as regular, temporary, wage, when actually employed, without compensation, dollar-a-year, etc. As a result of this required revision and the more detailed reporting, it was developed that some groups of employees had not been totally reported in the past by some of the agencies and certain other groups, particularly persons serving without compensation and dollar-a-year, were not previously included in the employment figures. These reporting adjustments plus the net increase in employment indicate that a total of 3,269,125 civilian employees were actively employed in the executive departments and agencies of the Federal Government as of June 30, 1943.

That is what the records of the United States Civil Service Commission show, and not the alleged reductions which have been claimed on the floor of this body.

I know you are not interested in a lot of these statistics, which will read much better, I hope, than they sound at this time. So I shall proceed just briefly and give you one or two other points in connection with this controversial issue.

It may be pointed out by administration spokesmen that most of this increased civilian personnel is required by the War and Navy Departments. Of course, we have been told that on numerous occasions on the floor during the past year. The report just released shows that the War Department on July 31, 1944, employed 1,244,514, and the

Navy Department 674,845, or a total of 1,919,359. When this is deducted from the total of 2,938,602, the continental pay roll, it will be shown that all other agencies of the Government within the United States were employing in July, a total of 1,019,243, slightly in excess of 1,000,000 employees outside of the War and Navy Departments.

During the peak of employment in the First World War, the total employment for the War and Navy Departments and all other agencies was approximately 918,000—less than 1,000,000. This means that at the present time, if you eliminate the War and Navy Departments, other Federal agencies are employing about 100,000 more civilians than the entire Federal establishment at the peak of the First World War.

These figures conflict with the statements and allegations which have been offered on the floor of this House in defense of the manpower hoarding and the Federal use of civilians at a time when the country is facing many difficulties in meeting the demands of the war program. While private employers have been forced to operate under great handicaps, it is obvious that the Federal Government has constantly added more civilians to the pay roll, and thus has not been cooperating in the best use of the Nation's manpower.

The Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures headed by Senator BYRD, and of which the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DOUGHTON] is the vice chairman, has repeatedly demanded a reduction of at least 10 percent in the civilian pay roll. Apparently the executive departments have interpreted this as actually meaning an increase of 10 percent, because such an increase has been made during the past year. Anyone who is conversant with employment conditions in the scores of Federal departments and agencies, with overlapping and duplication of duties, knows that not 10 percent, but probably one-third—or a million—of the civilian employees could be eliminated, with resultant greater efficiency in the conduct of the Government's business.

Mr. ROWE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DWORSHAK. I yield briefly.

Mr. ROWE. I note in the Washington Daily News, today, an article on page 2, as follows:

President Roosevelt today ordered the Budget Bureau to begin planning demobilization of the Government's vast wartime machinery through liquidation of the emergency bureaus and agencies and reduction of the Federal pay roll to a "peace footing."

Mr. DWORSHAK. I referred to that letter which the President sent to the Director of the Budget Bureau, but I should like to call the attention of my friend from Ohio to the fact that that refers merely to the promise of "planning" to effect curtailment after the war ends.

As I have already pointed out, several changes have been effected by the United States Civil Service Commission in compiling these statistics. Up until about 1 year ago the total amount of the Federal pay roll for civilians was listed in the monthly reports, but this data has not been available during the past year. The June 30, 1943, report showed the civilian pay roll for that month as $657,791,453. This amounts to an annual pay roll of almost $8,000,000,000.

That is on the basis of the civilian employees on the rolls 1 year ago. When the increased personnel is considered it is apparent that at the present time between eight and nine billion dollars are required annually to meet the civilian pay roll of the Federal Government.

I have endeavored to give you these figures in an accurate manner, based upon reports of the United States Civil Service Commission. If my colleagues, and particularly the chairman of the House Committee on the Civil Service, believe that they are not reliable and authentic, I invite them to submit the information and likewise to notify the Civil Service Commission so that its records may be changed accordingly.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and to include therein a table from the current report issued by the United States Civil Service Commission, showing the distribution of the approximately 3,000,000 civilian employees on the Federal pay roll in continental United States.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Idaho?

There was no objection.

(The matter referred to follows:)

TABLE IV.—*Civilian employment in the executive branch of the Federal Government, by agency and employment group, July 1944 (preliminary) (Continental United States only, excluding Alaska and Panama Canal Zone)*

Agency	Number of paid employees									Number of unpaid employees (W. O. C. and $1 per annum)
	Total	Full time						Part time	Intermittent W. A. E.	
		Salaried			Wage					
		Total	Regular	Temporary	Total	Regular	Temporary			
Total, all agencies	2,938,602	1,837,101	1,801,327	35,774	949,929	917,375	32,554	20,471	131,101	295,433
Executive Office of the President:										
White House Office	50	50	50							
Bureau of the Budget	551	549	542	7					2	4
Liaison Office for Personnel Management	3	3	3							
Executive Mansion and Grounds	58	53	52	1					5	
Emergency war agencies:										
Alien Property Custodian	866	853	817	36					13	
Central Administrative Services	3,668	3,637	3,606	31	17	17		11	3	
Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs	1,002	988	938	50				10	4	61
Fair Employment Practice Committee	111	104	100	4					7	6
Foreign Economic Administration	3,904	3,849	3,777	72				23	32	23
National War Labor Board	3,564	2,378	2,349	29				7	1,179	389
Office of Civilian Defense	146	146	146							30
Office of Defense Transportation	4,764	4,756	4,710	46				2	6	242
Office of Economic Stabilization	10	10	10							
Office of Scientific Research and Development	902	865	730	135				15	22	435
Office of War Information	4,176	4,017	3,968	49				15	144	98
Office of War Mobilization	52	52	48	4						6
Smaller War Plants Corporation	1,606	1,603	1,596	7					3	141
War Manpower Commission	26,295	26,158	25,902	256				117	20	1,963
War Production Board	15,164	14,927	14,815	112				61	176	683
War Shipping Administration	12,073	11,917	11,716	201				16	140	2
Committee for Congested Production Areas	80	77	76	1					3	
Office of Censorship	10,423	10,402	10,275	127				9	12	17
Office of Price Administration	59,254	58,498	58,129	369	9		9	261	486	94,627
Office of Strategic Services	2,204	2,134	2,023	111	2	2		50	18	28
Petroleum Administration for War	1,227	1,220	1,184	36				6	1	
Selective Service System	21,793	20,167	19,875	292				96	1,530	175,281
War Refugee Board	31	30	29	1					1	
Executive departments:										
State	3,604	3,462	3,296	166	123	108	15	8	11	11
Treasury	93,069	84,271	81,084	3,187	8,451	8,312	139	119	228	954
War	1,244,514	807,473	795,993	11,480	416,331	393,253	23,078	4,258	16,452	141
Justice	28,891	28,756	28,543	213	14	14		46	75	586
Post Office	360,331	270,501	270,120	381	240	240		6,565	83,025	
Navy [1]	674,845	170,351	166,905	3,446	500,997	494,838	6,159	1,746	1,751	155

[1] Partially estimated.

TABLE IV.—*Civilian employment in the executive branch of the Federal Government, by agency and employment group, July 1944 (preliminary) (Continental United States only, excluding Alaska and Panama Canal Zone)* —Continued.

Agency	Number of paid employees									Number of unpaid employees (W. O. C. and $1 per annum)
	Total	Full time						Part time	Intermittent W. A. E.	
		Salaried			Wage					
		Total	Regular	Temporary	Total	Regular	Temporary			
Executive departments—Continued.										
Interior	39,955	26,949	24,471	2,476	6,658	3,713	2,945	377	5,971	1,503
Agriculture	77,132	62,958	55,734	7,224	218	134	84	243	13,713	2,549
Commerce [2]	30,802	24,416	23,706	710	400	375	25	4,371	1,615	9,131
Labor	6,176	5,426	5,244	182				39	711	706
Independent agencies:										
American Battle Monuments Commission	1	1	1							
American Commission, Protection Monuments in Europe	3	3	2	1						
Board of Governors, Federal Reserve System	462	455	431	24				4	3	
Board of Investigation and Research	17	15	14	1					2	
Civil Service Commission	6,893	6,884	6,754	130				6	3	35
Employees' Compensation Commission	482	482	480	2						
Export-Import Bank	55	55	55							
Federal Communications Commission	1,442	1,424	1,394	30				4	14	
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation	1,690	1,404	1,395	9	3	3		282	1	
Federal Power Commission	668	667	659	8				1		
Federal Security Agency	30,300	29,072	28,266	806	67	52	15	1,030	131	4,466
Federal Trade Commission	444	444	430	14						
Federal Works Agency	19,768	18,476	18,334	142	318	314	4	8	966	
General Accounting Office	12,463	12,238	11,592	646				5	220	
Government Printing Office	7,026	1,316	1,298	18	5,710	5,702	8			
Interstate Commerce Commission	2,098	2,098	2,062	36						
Maritime Commission	10,768	10,633	10,351	282	56	12	44	67	12	6
National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics	6,168	6,164	6,070	94				4		15
National Archives	363	361	343	18				2		
National Capital Housing Authority	244	244	234	10						
National Capital Park and Planning Commission	4	3	3						1	
National Housing Agency	17,812	16,939	16,461	478	440	411	29	50	383	12
National Labor Relations Board	702	675	657	18				1	26	
National Mediation Board	87	81	79	2					6	
Panama Canal	209	208	202	6	1	1				
Panama Railroad Company	60	53	53		7	7				
Petroleum Reserves Corporation	10	10	10							
Railroad Retirement Board	1,805	1,805	1,733	72						
Reconstruction Finance Corporation	8,197	8,182	7,859	323				12	3	
Securities and Exchange Commission	1,139	1,139	1,116	23						
Smithsonian Institution	787	773	736	37				1	13	1
Tariff Commission	301	301	300	1						
Tax Court of the United States	122	122	122							
Tennessee Valley Authority	21,143	11,112	10,875	237	9,867	9,867			164	
Veterans' Administration	51,573	49,256	48,394	862				523	1,794	1,128

[2] Includes 2,667 employees of the Inland Waterways Corporation not previously reported.

Mr. DWORSHAK. I urge my colleagues to study this report so they will know what the facts are concerning this highly important issue at a time when the manpower needs of the Nation have confronted all of our people.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HALE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include in the RECORD an address given by my colleague the gentlewoman from Maine [Mrs. SMITH] last week.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maine?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 10 minutes today following the other special orders.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES] is recognized for 15 minutes.

GOVERNMENT PRINTING SHOULD BE UNDER PROCUREMENT AGENCY

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, there has been considerable discussion on the floor this afternoon charging that some of us in criticizing the manner in which the Government is performing in certain fields do not seem to offer it in a constructive way; that is we are accused of criticizing without offering a cure-all.

A few days ago I introduced in this House a bill to provide for an Office of Printing Control in the Procurement Division of the United States Treasury. Under that bill the Printing Control Office would have general control of printing in our Government dealing especially with the policy exercised in the various agencies and would supervise Government printing with a view of standardizing forms and preventing unnecessary duplications and waste.

I am today submitting a further bill to establish control of all printing that is done outside of the Government Printing Office in the Procurement Division of the Treasury Department, where it rightfully belongs. It is my contention that Government contracts and purchases for printing ought to be done through the Procurement Division, which is the purchasing division of the Treasury. We do not have a central agency through which our total printing bill can be computed. It is almost impossible to secure accurate figures, but it is my opinion that our annual bill runs into figures of approximately $1,000,000,000. As I suggested some time ago our Government agencies are operating under printing laws which for the most part were adopted in 1895, 50 years ago, when the costs and volume were only a fraction of present requirements.

Since these laws were adopted many technological improvements have been achieved in printing equipment. New inventions and processes, expanded facilities, and perfected techniques have created a situation in the graphic arts which could not possibly have been anticipated by the able gentlemen who wrote the existing laws. The result is that Government agencies are frequently prevented, by illogical and inconsistent restrictions, from utilizing the most efficient and most economical methods for producing or procuring essential printing requirements.

When the Printing Act was passed in 1895, it was anticipated all Government printing would be done through the Government Printing Office in Washington. Conditions have changed so much that today about 10 percent of our Government printing is done at the Government Printing Office. The other 90 percent is done by private concerns. I want to make it clear that the Government Printing Office is essentially a producing agency.

I do not believe it was the intent of Congress to place power and authority in the hands of the Public Printer to purchase and direct the purchase of hundreds of millions of dollars of printing

that is done clear outside the Government Printing Office. The Public Printer cannot possibly efficiently handle hundreds of millions of dollars in a Government spending activity that rightly belongs in the procurement or purchasing division of our Government. As I understand it, the Public Printer is expected to run the Government Printing Office and to run it efficiently.

Under the present set-up hundreds of agencies in our various departments purchase printing and contract for printing on their own, except they go through a formality of securing a waiver from the Public Printer. Millions of dollars' worth of printing is purchased by agencies with approval only of the head of a division or department. I am informed almost any agency of Government can contract its own printing without the contract being passed upon by anyone except probably the formality of a waiver from the Public Printer. There is no real working central purchasing agency.

As I said a moment ago, the public has a misconception that nearly all Government printing is done at the Government Printing Office in Washington. This misunderstanding comes about partly because when contracts are "farmed out" to commercial printers the printing bears the inscription "Printed by the Government Printing Office." It would be more accurate to say "Printed at the direction of the Government Printing Office."

Mr. Speaker, I believe that outside of certain specific items, including printing for the legislative department, Government printing could be placed on a competitive basis. The Government Printing Office could compete with private concerns except with respect to items that for certain and particular reasons should be printed at the Government Printing Office. Certainly the Government Printing Office with no rent, no taxes, no utilities, and a lot of other expenses paid ought to be able to do the ordinary regular work at no greater expense to the taxpayers than when it is done by commercial concerns. I am informed there are periods of time when printing work is being done by commercial concerns while Government equipment that could do it is idle. Of course, if the Government can get the work done at less expense outside the Government Printing Office, then it ought to be handled that way.

Mr. Speaker, I believe the Government Printer should be the superintendent of the Government Printing Office and it ought to be his job to see that the Government Printing Office is operated efficiently and to its full capacity. Government printing that is purchased or contracted for outside the Government Printing Office ought to be centered in the Government purchasing department which is the Procurement Division of the United States Treasury.

Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a bill to help correct this intolerable situation. This bill will establish the Government Printing Office as a production agency. It will place it on a competitive basis with the printing industry. The bill places the functions of procurement in the purchasing department of the Treasury. This measure does not prevent the use of modern duplicating machines or Government equipment by Government agencies when it is the economical thing to do. It does place purchase and procurement of printing on a business basis and puts it in the hands of one over-all agency. This measure will help prevent a tremendous amount of extravagance and excessive expenditure in our Government.

Mr. Speaker, I firmly believe this bill merits the immediate and earnest consideration of this House. It is a common-sense solution of a problem which is subjecting our Government to increasing criticism.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PRIEST] is recognized for 10 minutes.

PUBLIC IMPROVEMENTS

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I am sure Members of the House were pleased to learn from the majority leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK], that it is the intention of the leadership to bring up the road bill for House consideration immediately after the November election.

The impact of war has been felt throughout the country in a variety of ways affecting public improvements. We are aware that a great many developments in the public interest have of necessity been delayed during the past 4 years.

It should be the policy of the Government to have ready immediately the necessary authorizations for proceeding with numerous programs and projects which may be justified on their merits.

I wish to call attention of the House today, and particularly of the Committee on Military Affairs to a program which, in my opinion and in the opinion of many others, can in every way be justified at an early date.

This House, and the Nation, have come to appreciate the real significance of the T. V. A. development of the Tennessee River Valley. With the closing of the gates at Kentucky Dam recently, the major portion of that great construction program has been completed.

The Tennessee River now is harnessed; its floods controlled; its current working for millions in that great valley.

As gentlemen familiar with the geography and the topography of that region know, there is another river valley in Tennessee that fits into the Tennessee Valley in much the same manner as the meat of a watermelon fits into the rind.

The Cumberland River rises in Kentucky, flows southwestward into Tennessee, turns back and runs northwestward again into Kentucky and empties into the Ohio River a few miles north of the junction of the Tennessee and the Ohio.

The two rivers run so closely together near their mouth that it is possible since the completion of Kentucky Dam, to stand on a ridge and fire a rifle into either stream.

The Army engineers have for some time had a plan for the development of the Cumberland River for flood control and navigation. Some of the dams contemplated in this plan; and at least two now under construction, would be power-generating dams.

Most of the territory through which the Cumberland River flows is served at this time by the T. V. A. power-distribution systems.

It has been obvious for some time that the logical program in that area would be one in which the two river valleys were integrated and given common jurisdiction. Obviously, also, that jurisdiction should be the Tennessee Valley Authority.

In January 1941 I introduced a bill to place the Cumberland River Valley under T. V. A. jurisdiction. The bill also directed the T. V. A. to make a survey and report to Congress recommendations for a unified plan for the development of the Cumberland River Valley.

In 1941 we were pressing our program of preparedness, and no great pressure was applied to bring this bill out. Then near the end of that year we were drawn into war after Pearl Harbor.

In order, however, to keep the legislation before the committee as one important and worthwhile project to be turned to when circumstances were favorable, I reintroduced that bill at the beginning of the Seventy-eighth Congress. My colleague the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] has had similar bills pending for some time, and there have been others in the Senate.

This is the type of a project, which if it had previously been developed, would have been a valuable asset in war production.

But it was not of such pressing nature as to be pushed as a war necessity, and therefore no action has been taken by the Committee on Military Affairs.

The time has come, however, when circumstances call for action.

The T. V. A. engineering and construction staff has completed the job at Kentucky Dam. The entire organization now is in position to move into the Cumberland River Valley.

The worthiness of the development has been attested by various engineering reports. It is to be presumed that construction of at least three dams will be resumed by the Army engineers when critical materials will permit.

All of the facts in any comprehensive study of this proposal are on the side of development by a single agency and the one logical agency for this development and jurisdiction is the Tennessee Valley Authority.

I respectfully call on the Committee on Military Affairs to consider this legislation at the earliest possible date and to consider it, not merely as a local project, but one of national importance in the whole picture of flood control, navigation, and power development.

I hope action by the committee will bring this bill to the floor of the House for consideration when we reconvene in November, and that it may be enacted before the end of this session.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS] is recognized for 15 minutes.

WE WILL BE ONLY HALF THROUGH

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, every American is filled with a profound thankfulness for the almost unbelievable success which has crowned the efforts of our armed forces in their invasion of Europe and their attack upon Germany. We now dare to hope that the war against Germany may be ended before a great many weeks have passed.

In this connection I cannot refrain from sounding a warning, however, with every bit of earnestness at my command. The defeat of Germany will not mean that the war is over for our country. It will mean that only half the war is over, the half in connection with which we have had the greatest amount of common effort from other nations. The war against Japan will still lie ahead of us. I am deeply concerned over what may happen after Germany has been defeated. A great mountain of feeling has been built up in this Nation against wartime control, understandably enough. The controls of the War Production Board and other war agencies are such that we would not tolerate them in peacetimes, and all of us want to see them removed as soon as possible. But I wonder about the wisdom of an announcement by the War Production Board that many of these wartime controls are to be swept completely away when Germany has been defeated. Although I expect it is an unpopular position to take, I cannot refrain from saying that I believe a more specific program would have been wiser, one whereby controls which could specifically be done away with or relaxed would be relaxed; one whereby in certain areas of the country controls might be relaxed. But surely this whole program must be handled so as to be certain that we do not have a general let down of effort until victory is finally ours.

Reconversion should not only be allowed but encouraged as rapidly as cutbacks in military orders are made by military decision, but until all the war is won, it appears to me it would be wiser to take specific action abolishing this or that particular control whenever possible, or making regional exceptions in accord with contract cancelations, rather than to sweep away a large part of this structure all at once and then possibly have to resume a part of it again in the future—a move far more difficult to make.

Already powerful industrial and financial groups are insisting upon the breaking of price ceilings and other controls and preparing in some instances to attempt a deflation of both labor and agriculture. Although it was finally overcome, and wiser and more patriotic counsels finally prevailed, I was nothing short of alarmed at the amount of support evidenced in the recent convention of the United Automobile Workers—C. I. O.—for abandonment of the no-strike pledge. Nothing would have pleased the sworn enemies of labor more than for that convention to have adopted the resolution abrogating that pledge. I am glad, indeed, and thankful that it did not do so.

Finally, I have read in the press plans for celebrations when the news is received of the defeat of Germany. We certainly should show our whole-souled thankfulness in every way we can when that glad news comes, but unless observances are conducted in the spirit of solemn rededication to the still unfinished tasks, I am fearful these celebrations will be such as would be appropriate when America's war has actually and finally been won, but which will be anything but appropriate at an hour when millions of American soldiers still face the shells of an enemy. For whatever evidences there may be of a relaxation of our country's earnest effort in this war, and whatever movements there may be away from a national all-out war effort, there will still be, in Asia and the Southwest Pacific, American soldiers, sailors, marines, and airmen fighting an enemy at least as determined and as bitter as the Nazi has ever been. While these things may be happening here at home, Japanese bullets will wound our men just as severely as German bullets have done, and the green hell of the jungle will inflict even greater suffering, if that is possible, than our men have known on the battlefields of Africa and Europe.

What will these men think if they learn that any group among us, whatever it may be, whether Government, whether employers, whether labor, whoever, is relaxing its efforts in their support?

Mr. Speaker, I hope and pray this is not going to happen. For that reason I have made this speech, for the war with Japan will still demand guns and shells and tanks and planes maybe for some time to come. While controls on manpower can and should be relaxed because with the defeat of Germany the manpower situation will change not only because of less need for war production, perhaps, but also because, thank God, some men will be coming home, this, too, must not be taken as evidence that any less effort should be made by all of us to keep all our people employed and doing each our utmost.

Mr. Speaker, the real test of our patriotism and devotion lies ahead, not behind us. Once Germany has been defeated, we will know to an absolute certainty that the defeat of Japan is only a matter of time. But the question will be whether our Nation will continue to share insofar as it possibly can the deadly serious and sacrificial efforts of those still in our Army and Navy, or whether the rest of the Nation will insist on a return to peacetime ways before our national task of ridding the world of this Axis despotism is more than half complete. I most earnestly hope we will not take this latter course. Each of us has a duty to see it does not happen.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] may extend his own remarks and include a letter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. CALVIN D. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Thursday next, at the close of other business and other special orders heretofore entered, I may have permission to address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SMITH] is recognized for 15 minutes.

UNITED NATIONS RELIEF AND REHABILITATION ADMINISTRATION

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, on September 11 I addressed the House on the subject of the administrative cost of U. N. R. R. A. In that address I showed that U. N. R. R. A. employees receive higher salaries than the employees of any other Federal agency and perhaps of any governmental agency in the world. In that speech I listed the salaries of employees in U. N. R. R. A.'s headquarters office, of those connected with the Balkan missions, bureau of areas, bureau of supply, Italian mission observers, and so forth.

Before presenting those data I had heard from reliable sources that allowances provided for U. N. R. R. A. employees, over and above their salaries, in the field, were in most cases and perhaps in nearly all of them sufficient to pay living costs. I made an attempt to obtain from U. N. R. R. A. officials the facts relating to this particular question but was unable to do so. Since then I have been successful in securing the facts relating to this matter.

Before showing what these allowances are I wish to say that I have also succeeded in obtaining a copy of the Director General's September 1944 report, covering the period to July 17, 1944. On page 82 of that report the following reference is made to the allowances we are presently considering:

> A system of per diem allowances has also been devised for employees of the Administration who are sent to countries other than their country of residence. Under this system allowances are paid to defray the difference between the average current out-of-pocket expense at the employee's post of duty and the comparable expense that would have been incurred in his country of residence or at the office from which he is assigned. In addition a modest allowance is paid to all such employees who are compelled to maintain a separate establishment for their families while they are away from their country of residence. The size of these allowances varies with the circumstances.

Nothing, however, is said in the report as to the amount of per diem allowances U. N. R. R. A. employees in the field are to receive. The following shows what those allowances amount to:

> (1) Single persons stationed at Cairo, Egypt, receive an allowance not to exceed $3.50 per day. Married persons stationed at Cairo, Egypt, receive an allowance not to exceed $7.50 per day, including $4 separation allowance. If food is provided free in Cairo, the above rates will be reduced $3.50 per day. If lodging is provided in Cairo, free, the

above rates will be reduced $2.50 per day. However, the maximum reduction for free food and lodging shall not exceed $3.50 per day.

(2) Single persons stationed at Mahdi, Egypt, are supplied with free food and lodging. Married persons stationed at Mahdi, Egypt, are supplied with free food and lodging plus $4 per day separation allowance.

(3) Single persons stationed at Cairo or Mahdi while away from post of duty on official business in Egypt or other countries in the Near East receive an allowance not to exceed $9 per day. Married persons stationed at Cairo or Mahdi while away from post of duty on official business in Egypt or other countries in the Near East receive an allowance not to exceed $12 per day (including $3 separation allowance). Such persons will not receive the per diem allowance attributable to their being stationed at Cairo or Mahdi while away from such station traveling on official business.

In addition to the above-mentioned allowances, U. N. R. R. A. employees are provided all transportation costs in connection with official business away from their post.

Still other special favors are provided U. N. R. R. A. employees and officials. On page 82 of the report referred to, we read:

One of these special benefits is the provident fund, which is intended to solve the problem of interruption of pension rights caused by taking up employment with the Administration and to provide a form of severance compensation because of the temporary character of the Administration's operations. This fund is made up of deductions of 5 percent from the salary of each employee plus an additional 7½ percent contributed by the Administration, the total to be available to the employee upon leaving the Administration with an honorable record after at least 6 months of service.

Compare this annual contribution rate of 7.5 percent paid by U. N. R. R. A. to provide a provident fund for its employees with a rate of something less than 5.5 percent paid by the Federal Government into the civil-service retirement fund.

Further, civil-service employees are not privileged to draw out any part of the Federal contribution as is provided for in U. N. R. R. A.'s arrangement.

Other invidious aspects of U. N. R. R. A. will, in all probability, reveal themselves after this agency begins its operations. Evidence seems to be making its appearance which indicates that certain foreign countries intend to take every possible advantage of this international set-up to further their commercial interests.

With one hand he put a penny in the urn of poverty and, with the other, took a shilling out.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KELLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an address by Mr. Millard W. Rice, of the Disabled American Veterans, made at a recent convention of the American Federation of the Physically Handicapped.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BONNER). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. EBERHARTER] is recognized for 5 minutes.

THE INDISPENSABLE MAN

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, this morning I heard a radio news commentator say that the candidate for President of the United States on the Republican Party ticket would make a radio address tonight, the subject of which will be There Is No Indispensable Man.

Mr. Speaker, it occurred to me that perhaps this theme might have some appeal to some people, but I should like to place myself in the position of being an independent voter and an independent thinker. I wondered whether or not that was a subject which, if discussed at length by the Republican Presidential candidate, would bring him any votes from an independent thinker. An independent thinker might well say, "Well, I agree there is no indispensable man to run and operate and administer the laws of this great country. Suppose there is no indispensable man. So what!" Then the question would resolve itself as to a comparison between the two candidates for the Presidency of the United States. It resolves itself into who is best qualified to administer the laws of this country.

The American people have always wanted the best they can possibly get. In fact they want nothing but the best if it can be had, and they will accept nothing less than the best that can be had.

Mr. Speaker, we are facing times that are crucial in the history of the United States. So we must decide whether we shall take the best of two choices. On that basis, Mr. Speaker, the American people can have only one answer. The answer is the President of the United States, who has proven himself able, throughout the past critical period and throughout past emergencies, to rise to the occasion. On the contrary, consider the Republican candidate who has been in the limelight of the entire country for the past 2 months. Just recently, he started an active campaign to convince the people that he was the best qualified.

Mr. Speaker, it seems to me if the demonstration he has made is any indication of his capability we are indeed faced with a choice which is easy to make. I have never known any candidate to conduct such a fumbling, bungling, stumbling, and bumbling campaign as this Republican Presidential candidate. Time after time, in speech after speech, and on occasion after occasion he has demonstrated that he has no conception of the vast and intricate problems that confront the country today and will confront the country in the future.

Mr. Speaker, this gentleman has on various occasions so tripped himself up that within the next few days he has found it necessary to hedge a little further and a little further. So it seems to me that it will be very, very easy for the American people to make their choice and on that I think there is no danger whatsoever that the Republicans will even make a good showing. The longer the campaign continues, the greater and greater becomes the margin of votes which the present President will have. I hope only that the Republican Presidential candidate will make a speech every day from now until November 7. I hope he will appear before thousands and even millions of people.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for one-half additional minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. EBERHARTER. I hope he will appear in every village and hamlet in the United States, that he will make hundreds and hundreds of speeches and that millions and millions of people will have an opportunity to see and hear him. I hope particularly that he will make frequent incursions into my home State of Pennsylvania for if he does I believe we of the Democratic faith will sleep more and more soundly as day after day rolls by.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has again expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BOYKIN] may extend his own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a newspaper article.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. KLEIN, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 312. An act for the relief of Freda Utley;

H. R. 527. An act for the relief of Mary Hertz;

H. R. 1434. An act for the relief of Anna M. Kohler;

H. R. 1623. An act to amend an act entitled "An act to provide fees to be charged by clerks of the district courts of the United States," approved February 11, 1925 (43 Stat. 857), as amended (28 U. S. C., secs. 543–555);

H. R. 1680. An act to amend the Nationality Act of 1940 to permit the Commissioner to furnish copies of any part of the records or information therefrom to agencies or officials of a State without charge;

H. R. 1708. An act for the relief of Perley M. Silver;

H. R. 2134. An act for the relief of Paul Szeliga;

H. R. 2387. An act for the relief of John Salfi;

H. R. 2390. An act for the relief of Joseph Scarpella and Dorothy Scarpella;

H. R. 2509. An act for the relief of Marie Engert;

H. R. 2697. An act to provide for the disposal of materials or resources on the public lands of the United States which are under

the exclusive jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Interior;

H. R. 2792. An act for the relief of Arvo Kari, Lempi K. Holm, and Burt Johnston;

H. R. 3033. An act for the relief of Tressie Spring and Mrs. Hazel Stutte;

H. R. 3038. An act for the relief of Mrs. Grace Page;

H. R. 3296. An act for the relief of R. Guy Dorsey;

H. R. 3384. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to accept property for the Moores Creek National Military Park, and for other purposes;

H. R. 3464. An act for the relief of Ralph W Cooley.

H. R. 3496. An act for the relief of Ernest A. Grottke;

H. R. 3722. An act to amend section 342 of the Nationality Act of 1940 in respect to fees for the issuance of certificates of arrival;

H. R. 4257. An act to expatriate or exclude certain persons for evading military and naval service;

H. R. 4271. An act to amend the Nationality Act of 1940 to preserve the nationality of citizens residing abroad; and

H. R. 5025. An act to allow credit in connection with certain homestead entries for military or naval service rendered during World War No. 2.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I move the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 53 minutes) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, September 20, 1944, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1848. Letters from the Chairman, Board of Investigation and Research under the Transportation Act of 1940, transmitting, pursuant to law, reports of its studies on the following subjects: Federal Regulatory Restrictions Upon Motor and Water Carriers; The National Traffic Pattern; The Economics of Iron and Steel Transportation; A Carload Traffic Study, 1939; Technological Trends in Transportation; Public Aids to Domestic Transportation; Taxation of Carriers by Federal, State, and Local Governments; Interstate Trade Barriers Affecting Motor-Vehicle Transportation; The Economics of Coal Traffic Flow; Railroad Consolidation and Employee Welfare; Comparisons of Rail, Motor, and Water Carrier Costs; and a final report on the Relative Economy and Fitness of the Carriers, which, with the accompanying reports, were referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1849. A letter from the Chairman of the Interstate Commerce Commission, transmitting a quarterly estimate of personnel requirements for the second quarter of the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1944; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

1850. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a draft of a resolution, suggesting legislation to amend the Nationality Act of 1940; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. JARMAN: Committee on Printing. House resolution 641. Resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of a report from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on the reexamination of Columbia and Snake Rivers, Oreg., Wash., and Idaho; without amendment (Rept. No. 1899). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. JARMAN: Committee on Printing. House Resolution 642. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce of the House of Representatives to have printed for its use additional copies of the hearings on the bill (H. R. 4184) to amend the Transportation Act of 1940, with respect to the movement of Government traffic; without amendment (Rept. No. 1900). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. JARMAN: Committee on Printing. House Concurrent Resolution 100. Concurrent resolution authorizing that the pamphlet containing information as to the rights and benefits that are available to veterans of the armed forces and their dependents be published as a document and providing for the printing of additional copies thereof; without amendment (Rept. No. 1901). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. MAY: Committee on Military Affairs. Second general report pursuant to House Resolution 30. Resolution to study the progress of the war effort (Rept. No. 1903). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. RAMSPECK: Select Committee to Investigate the Seizure of Montgomery Ward & Co.'s Property. Report pursuant to House Resolution 521. Resolution creating a select committee to investigate the seizure by the United States of property of Montgomery Ward & Co. (Rept. No. 1904). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BONNER:

H. R. 5399. A bill to further amend the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. REES of Kansas:

H. R. 5400. A bill to amend the Printing Act of January 12, 1895, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Printing.

By Mr. FAY:

H. R. 5401. A bill to provide for the reinstatement of certain lapsed United States Government life-insurance policies; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

H. R. 5402. A bill to authorize the erection of a Veterans' Administration general medical and surgical hospital and domiciliary facility in the borough of Manhattan, city of New York; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. COFFEE:

H. J. Res. 311. Joint resolution authorizing the broadcasting of the proceedings of the Senate and the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. KNUTSON:

H. J. Res. 312. Joint resolution making the last Thursday in November a legal holiday; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CAPOZZOLI:

H. Res. 645. Resolution favoring immediate relief to the people of Italy by the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANTON J. JOHNSON:

H. R. 5403. A bill for the relief of Margaret M. Meersman; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. PRIEST:

H. R. 5404. A bill for the relief of E. H. Duke; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 5405. A bill for the relief of M. D. Neely; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. TARVER:

H. R. 5406. A bill for the relief of L. S. Strickland, of Buchanan, Ga., and Mrs. Marguerite Boggs; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

6141. By Mr. BRYSON: Petition of Harriet Colwell and 24 other citizens of Dryden, N. Y., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

6142. Also, petition of John D. Atkins and 30 other citizens of Elmhurst, N. Y., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

6143. Also, petition of Mary Lea Smith and 52 other citizens of Birmingham, Ala., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

6144. Also, petition of L. D. Kerr and 37 other citizens of Gouverneur, N. Y., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

6145. Also, petition of Edna M. Frazier and 32 other citizens of Gouverneur, N. Y., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

6146. Also, petition of Cora Fultz and 25 other citizens of Williams, Ind., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the War; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

6147. Also, petition of Mrs. Christie Fisk and 32 other citizens of Cortland, N. Y., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

6148. Also, petition of Ernest Allen and 17 other citizens of Cold Spring, N. Y., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to

reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

6149. Also, petition of Carrie E. Spaid and 7 other citizens of Martindale, N. Y., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

6150. Also, petition of Pvt. Vernon O. Wethey and 25 other citizens of Fresno, Calif., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

6151. Also, petition of Mrs. Frank Cash and 13 other citizens of Cincinnatus, N. Y., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

6152. Also, petition of Nona Lee and 12 other citizens of Rockford, Ohio, urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

6153. Also, petition of W. J. Wildman and 16 other citizens of Pitcher, N. Y., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

6154. Also, petition of Elizabeth E. Lown and 13 other citizens of Rhinebeck, N. Y., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

6155. Also, petition of Rose Nelsen and 25 other citizens of Minden, Nebr., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

6156. Also, petition of Miss Emma Rudd and 26 other citizens of Syracuse, N. Y., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

6157. Also, petition of A. A. Douglas and 25 other citizens of Lansing, Mich., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

6158. Also, petition of Rev. R. E. DeKay and 34 other citizens of Warwick, N. Y., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

6159. Also, petition of Anna M. Fraser and 52 other citizens of Newburgh, N. Y., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

6160. Also, petition of Anne C. Craven and 43 other citizens of DeLand, Fla., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

6161. By Mr. FITZPATRICK: Petition signed by 300 residents of the State of New York, particularly Westchester County, protesting against the enactment of any and all prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

6162. Also, petition signed by 200 residents of the Twenty-fourth Congressional District, New York, protesting against the enactment of any and all prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

6163. Also, petition signed by 600 residents of the Twenty-fourth Congressional District, New York, protesting against the enactment by Congress of any prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

6164. By Mr. ROHRBOUGH: Petition of Lucille White, of Camden, W. Va., and 22 other citizens of Lewis County, W. Va., urging the enactment of House bill 682 (the Johnson bill) prohibiting alcoholic beverage advertisement; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

6165. By Mr. RAMEY: Petition of the council of the city of Toledo, Ohio, requesting a review, by the proper officials of the United States Government, of the reports on Toledo Harbor, Toledo, Ohio; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, SEPTEMBER 20, 1944

(Legislative day of Friday, September 1, 1944)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Eternal God, in this hour of the world's desperate need we turn to Thee, mindful of our insufficiency. We are but broken reeds lashed by wild winds that mock our boasting pride uttered in days of calm; the arm of flesh is futile. Thou only art a covert from the wind, a shelter from the storm, the shadow of a great rock in a weary land. Thine alone, O Lord, is the greatness and the power and the glory and the majesty and the victory; for all that is in the heaven and in the earth is Thine. Thine is the kingdom and Thou art exalted as head above all.

With that flaming vision of the Holy One high and lifted up, we come in deep humility, for the contrite heart is Thy only dwelling. We ask only that our hearts, emptied of dross, may burn with Thy presence; that our faith, purged of unbelief, may flame with hope undimmed; that Thy strength may be made perfect in our weakness; and that the music of Thy victory may bring songs to our darkest night. We ask it in the Saviour's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Tuesday, September 19, 1944, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. McLeod, one of its clerks, announced that the House had passed without amendment the following bills of the Senate:

S. 725. An act to provide for the punishment of persons conspiring to violate the laws relating to counterfeiting, and certain other laws;

S. 1807. An act authorizing and directing the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain land to the city of Duluth, Minn.;

S. 2028. An act to amend the Naval Reserve Act of 1938, as amended, and the Coast Guard Auxiliary and Reserve Act of 1941, as amended, so as to permit service of members of the Women's Reserve in the American area, the Territories of Hawaii and Alaska, and for other purposes; and

S. 2137. An act to provide for naming the lake formed by waters of the Red River impounded by Denison Dam.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2707) for the relief of Henry White.

The message further announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 4286. An act to relinquish the title of the United States to certain lands in the county of Los Angeles, State of California;

H. R. 4697. An act providing for the appointment of a United States commissioner for the Big Bend National Park in the State of Texas, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4917. An act conferring upon the State of Montana authority to exchange for other lands certain lands selected by the State of Montana for the use of the University of Montana for biological station purposes pursuant to the act of March 3, 1905 (33 Stat. 1080);

H. R. 5041. An act to amend the Veterans Regulations;

H. R. 5232. An act to transfer jurisdiction over the Chattanooga National Cemetery,

Chattanooga, Tenn., from the Department of the Interior to the War Department, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 5255. An act to amend the Coast Guard Auxiliary and Reserve Act of 1941, as amended.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to a concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 100) authorizing that the pamphlet containing information as to the rights and benefits that are available to veterans of the armed forces and their dependents be published as a document and providing for the printing of additional copies thereof, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (H. R. 2707) for the relief of Henry White, and it was signed by the Vice President.

REPORTS OF BOARD OF INVESTIGATION AND RESEARCH UNDER TRANSPORTATION ACT OF 1940

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate 13 letters from the Board of Investigation and Research under the Transportation Act of 1940, transmitting, pursuant to law, reports of its studies on the following subjects: Federal Regulatory Restrictions Upon Motor and Water Carriers; The National Traffic Pattern; The Economics of Iron and Steel Transportation; A Carload Traffic Study, 1939; Technological Trends in Transportation; Practices and Procedures of Governmental Control of Transportation; Public Aids to Domestic Transportation; Taxation of Carriers by Federal, State, and Local Governments; Interstate Trade Barriers Affecting Motor-Vehicle Transportation; The Economics of Coal Traffic Flow; Railroad Consolidation and Employee Welfare; Comparisons of Rail, Motor, and Water Carrier Costs; and a final report on the Relative Economy and Fitness of the Carriers, which, with the accompanying reports, were referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. TUNNELL, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

H. R. 4625. An act to extend the existence of the Alaskan International Highway Commission for an additional 4 years; without amendment (Rept. No. 1108).

By Mr. WALSH of New Jersey, from the Committee on Commerce:

H. R. 5255. A bill to amend the Coast Guard Auxiliary and Reserve Act of 1941, as amended; without amendment (Rept. No. 1110).

By Mr. McCARRAN, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

H. R. 3270. A bill to affirm the intent of the Congress that the regulation of the business of insurance remain within the control of the several States and that the acts of July 2, 1890, and October 15, 1914, as amended, be not applicable to that business; without amendment (Rept. No. 1112).

By Mr. O'DANIEL, from the Committee on Claims:

H. R. 1040. A bill for the relief of Frank Henderson and Frances Nell Henderson, his wife; without amendment (Rept. No. 1113);

H. R. 1042. A bill for the relief of Frank J. Recely and Mary T. Recely; without amendment (Rept. No. 1114);

H. R. 1886. A bill for the relief of Charles Fred Smith; without amendment (Rept. No. 1115);

H. R. 1915. A bill for the relief of Carl W. Bucey; without amendment (Rept. No. 1116);

H. R. 2014. A bill for the relief of the Winston-Salem Southbound Railway Co.; without amendment (Rept. No. 1117);

H. R. 2236. A bill for the relief of Roberta Ramsey; without amendment (Rept. No. 1118;

H. R. 2315. A bill for the relief of Ethel Phillips and Mary Hurley; without amendment (Rept. No. 1119);

H. R. 2384. A bill for the relief of Frank A. McMenamin; without amendment (Rept. No. 1120);

H. R. 2473. A bill for the relief of James Wilson; without amendment (Rept. No. 1121);

H. R. 2873. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. D. F. Still; without amendment (Rept. No. 1122);

H. R. 3101. A bill for the relief of George E. O'Loughlin; without amendment (Rept. No. 1123);

H. R. 3549. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Emily Reily; without amendment (Rept. No. 1124); and

H. R. 3813. A bill for the relief of J. Ralph Datesman; without amendment (Rept. No. 1125).

By Mr. STEWART, from the Committee on Claims:

H. R. 933. A bill for the relief of Conrad H. Clark; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1126);

H. R. 2624. A bill to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of J. R. Dixon; without amendment (Rept. No. 1127); and

H. R. 2874. A bill for the relief of Robert Will Starks; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1128).

By Mr. ROBERTSON, from the Committee on Claims:

H. R. 3000. A bill for the relief of Clara E. Clark; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1130);

H. R. 3152. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Cicero B. Hunt; without amendment (Rept. No. 1131); and

H. R. 3535. A bill for the relief of the legal guardian of Billie Stooksberry, a minor, and Lon L. Stooksberry; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1132).

By Mr. WHERRY, from the Committee on Claims:

H. R. 2919. A bill for the relief of Michael Eatman, Jr., and Mrs. Michael Eatman, Jr.; without amendment (Rept. No. 1133).

By Mr. WILEY, from the Committee on Claims:

H. R. 1774. A bill for the relief of Cyri Doerner; without amendment (Rept. No. 1134);

H. R. 2845. A bill for the relief of John J. Beaton; without amendment (Rept. No. 1135);

H. R. 3595. A bill for the relief of Robert Futterman; without amendment (Rept. No. 1136);

H. R. 3898. A bill for the relief of Frank Gay; without amendment (Rept. No. 1137); and

H. R. 4712. A bill for the relief of John Duncan McDonald; without amendment (Rept. No. 1138).

By Mr. TUNNELL, from the Committee on Claims:

S. 2031. A bill for the relief of Lt. (T) P. J. Voorhies; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1139).

By Mr. RADCLIFFE, from the Committee on Commerce:

H. R. 4163. A bill to amend section 2 of Public Law 17, Seventy-eighth Congress, relating to functions of the War Shipping Administration, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 1140).

By Mr. WHEELER, from the Committee on Interstate Commerce:

H. R. 5196. A bill to amend section 22 of the Interstate Commerce Act by authorizing common carriers to grant reduced fares to personnel of armed services; without amendment (Rept. No. 1141).

PROHIBITION OF EMPLOYMENT DISCRIMINATION BECAUSE OF RACE, CREED, COLOR, AND SO FORTH

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, from the Committee on Education and Labor, I report back favorably without amendment the bill (S. 2048) to prohibit discrimination in employment because of race, creed, color, national origin, or ancestry, and I submit a report (No. 1109) thereon.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the report will be received and the bill will be placed on the calendar.

Mr. CHAVEZ. While the committee unanimously voted to report the bill to the Senate, there were several members of the committee who indicated that they might submit amendments to the bill before it was considered. It was also suggested, and it meets with the approval of the Senator who is now reporting the bill, that the bill be not taken up before the coming election. I ask if that meets with the approval of the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. TAFT. It does.

RELIEF OF BEARDSTOWN, ILL.

Mr. WHERRY. I have been directed by the chairman of the Committee on Claims to report favorably with an amendment on House bill 4931, and I submit a report (No. 1111) thereon. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (H. R. 4931) for the relief of the city of Beardstown, Ill.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, this bill was unanimously ordered reported by the Committee on Claims this morning. It came over from the House of Representatives where it was unanimously passed. It proposes an appropriation of $65,000 to help the town of Beardstown, Ill., build a span to a bridge which was recently destroyed by a naval vessel which ran against the fenders of the bridge as it went down the Illinois River. Beardstown has a population of only about 5,000 people, and cannot go ahead and build a new span without this claim being paid. The Navy Department, over the signature of the Secretary of the Navy whose letter is found in the report, admits negligence, and recommends that the bill be passed in the amount of $65,000. No one has objected to it either in the House or in the Senate. The money is needed, and the committee feels it is important that the bill be passed now. A camp is located nearby and the bridge is a part of the

main section of a highway. I ask that the bill be passed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

The amendment of the Committee on Claims was, on page 1, at the beginning of line 6, to strike out "$75,000" and insert "$65,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

PRINTING OF HEARINGS OF SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO STUDY AND SURVEY PROBLEMS OF SMALL-BUSINESS ENTERPRISES

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, from the Committee on Printing I report favorably Senate Resolution 329 and ask for its immediate consideration.

I should like to say in explanation that the resolution provides for printing of 2,000 additional copies of each part of the hearings before the special committee to study and survey problems of small-business enterprises. There has been a tremendous demand for the hearings before the committee, and the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], who is chairman of the committee, said that he could not supply the demand unless when hearings are printed the committee be allowed to print an additional 2,000 copies at the run of the press, which makes it much less expensive to do than to go back for a reprint.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, this is a request for the printing of 2,000 copies additional to those which have already been authorized?

Mr. HAYDEN. No; from now on, when the committees hold hearings, the committee is entitled to print 1,000 copies. One thousand copies is not sufficient to meet the demand. The resolution would provide authority that when they go to press 3,000 copies of the hearings be printed instead of 1,000 copies.

Mr. WHITE. That is quite a substantial increase.

Mr. HAYDEN. The subject of small business, as the Senator knows, is of very widespread interest throughout the United States.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 329), submitted by Mr. CHAVEZ (for Mr. MURRAY) on September 19, 1944, was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That in accordance with paragraph 3 of section 2 of the Printing Act approved March 1, 1907, the Special Committee to Study Problems of American Small Business, authorized by Senate Resolution 66, Seventy-eighth Congress (extending S. Res. 298, 76th Cong.), be, and is hereby, empowered to have printed for its use not to exceed 2,000 additional copies of each part of its hearings.

REGULATION OF THE INSURANCE BUSINESS—MINORITY VIEWS

Mr. O'MAHONEY, as a member of the Committee on the Judiciary, submitted the views of the minority of that committee on the bill (S. 3270) to affirm the intent of the Congress that the regulation of the business of insurance remain within the control of the several States and that the acts of July 2, 1890, and October 15, 1914, as amended, be not applicable to that business, which were ordered to be printed as part 2 of Report No. 1112.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED

Mrs. CARAWAY, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that on September 19, 1944, that committee presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills and joint resolution:

S. 1250. A bill to repeal section 2 of the act approved May 17, 1926, which provides for the forfeiture of pay of persons in the military and naval service of the United States who are absent from duty on account of the direct effects of venereal disease due to misconduct, and to amend Veterans Regulation No. 10, as amended, to define line of duty and misconduct for pension and compensation purposes;

S. 2111. A bill to provide for the extension of certain oil and gas leases; and

S. J. Res. 150. Joint resolution making an appropriation to pay the necessary expenses of the inaugural ceremonies of the President of the United States January 20, 1945.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. SCRUGHAM:

S. 2159. A bill creating an Office of Naval Research, Development, and Patents in the Navy Department; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. SCRUGHAM (for himself and Mr. BREWSTER):

S. 2160. A bill authorizing the promotion of Rear Admiral Harold Gardiner Bowen; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. MALONEY:

S. 2161. A bill to correct the military record of Charles C. Fenwick; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BUTLER:

S. 2162. A bill to provide for the refund of all penalties paid with respect to the 1941 and 1942 crops of wheat; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

(Mr. O'MAHONEY (for himself and Mr. FERGUSON) introduced Senate bill 2163, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. HAYDEN:

S. 2164. A bill repealing subsection (c) of section 1001 of the Revenue Act of 1932, relating to the determination of the class of post offices; to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

S. 2165. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain lands on the Gila reclamation project, Arizona, to the University of Arizona; to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

INCORPORATION OF THE MEDICAL WOMEN, ARMY-NAVY CLUB

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, on behalf of the junior Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] and myself I ask consent to introduce a bill to incorporate the Medical Women, Army-Navy Club, and I request that this measure may be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 2163) to incorporate the Medical Women, Army-Navy Club, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, the bill has been prepared by a group of patriotic ladies in the District of Columbia and throughout the United States for the purpose of providing a living memorial to the Army and Navy nurses in the Army, in the Navy, in the Air Corps, and in the Marine Corps, who are serving in World War No. 2 upon the battle fronts.

After World War No. 1 some $50,000 was collected to erect a memorial statue in Arlington Cemetery to the battle-front nurses of the First World War. That statue was erected. The ladies who have been working upon the proposal to erect a memorial for those who are serving in this World War conceived the idea that it would be much more effective if this memorial should be in the form of a home in the District of Columbia which could be used as a headquarters for the service nurses. That, Mr. President, is the purpose of the bill.

As a part of my remarks I ask unanimous consent that there may be printed at this point in the RECORD a series of letters which have been addressed by various women to Mrs. Barnet Nover, who has been chosen as the chairman of the national committee to erect this memorial to the medical women of the armed forces.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEAR MRS. NOVER: I shall be happy to have my name included on your honorary committee to obtain a headquarters for the Army and Navy war nurses of the armed forces.

Best wishes for great success in this new venture.

Sincerely,

MARTHA E. KING
(Mrs. Ernest J. King).

MY DEAR MRS. NOVER: I would be delighted to be on the honorary committee for the nurses' club.

As I am at the United States Naval Hospital nearly every day I have many friends among the Navy nurses. They are a fine lot of women. I wish you all possible success in your venture.

Most cordially,

CATHERINE NIMITZ
(Mrs. Chester W. Nimitz).

MY DEAR MRS. NOVER: It is a pleasing privilege to join the committee to assist in establishing a memorial dedicated to the Army and Navy nurses of World War No. 2.

These splendid women are caring for our soldiers in all parts of the world, sharing their hardships and dangers and in many cases giving their lives in the performance of their duties.

I am happy to accept.

Most sincerely,

ELIZABETH L. IRELAND
(Mrs. Merritt W. Ireland).

(General Ireland was the Surgeon General of the U. S. Army during the last World War.)

MY DEAR MRS. NOVER: I think it so wise to establish a home for these fine women instead of some commemorative monument

and feel assured such a choice will meet with universal approval.

With sincere wishes for success, believe me,

Very truly yours,

EDITH BOLLING WILSON
(Mrs. Woodrow Wilson).

WAR DEPARTMENT,
OFFICE OF THE SURGEON GENERAL,
Washington, July 5, 1944.

MRS. BARNET NOVER,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MRS. NOVER: I am writing you in the absence of General Kirk, who is in Europe.

I know how he feels about the establishment of a nurses' club here in Washington—that it would be much better to have some place of this sort for these splendid women who are on duty here than to wait until after the war and erect a monument in their honor. He also greatly appreciates the efforts that you have made in attempting to secure such a club.

With best wishes for the success of this venture, I am

Sincerely yours,

GEORGE F. LULL,
Major General, United States Army,
Deputy Surgeon General.

THE SURGEON GENELAL OF THE NAVY,
Washington, July 10, 1944.

MY DEAR MRS. NOVER: It has come to my attention that a move is being made to establish an officers' club for the medical women of the armed forces. I think this is a splendid move and I can assure you that this Department will be very glad to see it come about. As you know, our Navy nurses have never had a place in Washington where they could gather and have the opportunity of meeting the other women of the armed forces. This proposed club will be of great value to the Navy Nurse Corps during the war and in the years following.

May I express the hope that this club will come into being during these war years?

Sincerely yours,

ROSS T MCINTYRE,
Vice Admiral, Marine Corps,
United States Navy.

JULY 13, 1944.

DEAR MRS. NOVER: The establishment of a clubhouse for the nurses of the armed forces such as you propose would indeed be a wonderful tribute to the women of the profession.

This form of honor bestowed on the nurses who are taking such an important part in this gigantic world conflict would be a deserving recognition of their courage and unselfish service. The generosity of our citizens in the form of a clubhouse would bring these women untold comfort and pleasure and convenience. In their own individual appreciation of all this they will experience a subconscious joy in the fact that it will bring the same comfort and pleasure to many nurses who may follow in their footsteps.

I am wishing for you all success and harmony in your undertaking; may it materialize in all that you now hope to accomplish.

Very sincerely yours,

SUE S. DAUSER,
Captain (N. C.) U. S. N.,
Superintendent, Navy Nurse Corps.

JULY 6, 1944.

MY DEAR MRS. KIRK: Your suggestion for a memorial in the form of a clubhouse for women officers of the Medical Department is an excellent one. Certainly for the duration of the war such a building is most urgently needed and will be greatly appreciated by all who are eligible to use whatever accommodations it will afford.

There are over 40,000 nurses in the Army Nurse Corps, with approximately 2,500 Medical Department dietitians and physical therapists, and a small number of women doctors, all of whom will be delighted to know that this project has the approval of the Surgeon General and is being promulgated by a committee of women under your direction. With the difficulties encountered by the traveling public in securing hotel accommodations, many women officers of the Medical Department who pass through Washington for the first time have been unable to secure overnight accommodations which would enable them to see more of Washington en route to their post of duty. For these women the club will fill a great need. For the women who are stationed in and about Washington it will provide the club facilities enjoyed by most officers through the Army and Navy Club, which, due to the expansion, is too limited to allow for the extension of its courtesies to women officers.

As Superintendent of the Corps, I wish to express my own appreciation for the consideration that is being shown the members of the Army Nurse Corps, and I am sure I express the sentiment of every nurse officer in saying "Thank you and all others who have so generously given of their time and money in the furtherance of this project."

Very sincerely yours,

FLORENCE A. BLANCHFIELD,
Superintendent, Army Nurse Corps.

JULY 15, 1944.

DEAR MRS. NOVER: I will be glad to have you use my name on your honorary committee for the proposed Army and Navy War Nurses' Club. I hope to see you during one of my brief moments in town during the summer.

Cordially,

JOSEPHINE FORRESTAL.

JULY 27, 1944.

MY DEAR MRS. NOVER: I am enclosing a brief statement for the Medical Women's Army and Navy Club.

I feel greatly honored to be on the honorary committee for Medical Women's Army Army and Navy Club, a memorial dedicated to the Army and Navy nurses of World War No. 2. I know of no group in the war service who so deservingly should have our support and gratitude as this heroic group of women. Their unselfish service should be an inspiration to the women of this country.

I send them my greetings and deepest admiration.

MRS. GEORGE C. MARSHALL.

JULY 24, 1944.

MY DEAR MRS. NOVER: I am especially glad to serve on your honorary committee for the Medical Women's Army and Navy Club. It is a fitting memorial to the fine work done by the Army and Navy nurses of World War No. 2, and to the other women who are working so valiantly in the medical field for the Army and Navy.

May the club be very successful and may your good work be appreciated to the full.

Very sincerely yours,

MARGARET W. PATTERSON.

MY DEAR MRS. NOVER: I shall be most happy to serve on the honorary committee for the Medical Women's Army and Navy Club.

No other group of women have proved more heroic or performed a greater service to our armed forces than the nurses of the Army and Navy, and I feel this memorial will be one way to perpetuate the glory of their services in the years to come.

Sincerely yours,

ELEANOR P. ARNOLD
(Mrs. Henry H. Arnold).

DEAR MRS. NOVER: I am very happy to serve on the Honorary Committee for the Medical Women, Army-Navy Club, a memorial dedicated to the Army-Navy nurses of World War No. 2.

I wish for you every success in this fine undertaking.

Most sincerely,

LOUISE H. SOMERVELL
(Mrs. Brehon Somervell).

JULY 24, 1944.

DEAR MRS. NOVER: It is with pleasure that I serve on the Honorary Committee for the Medical Women, Army-Navy Club.

It is entirely fitting that these valiant women be honored by a tangible, lasting remembrance. I feel that their service to the Army and Navy and to humanity is a monument of great respect and admiration.

Cordially yours,

PATRICIA TYSON YOUNG
(Mrs. W. B. Young).

JULY 14, 1944.

MY DEAR MRS. NOVER: I have been advised that you are the chairman of a committee whose worth-while purpose is to provide a club for the splendid medical women in our armed forces when they are present in Washington.

Although the Marine Corps does not have its own medical department, this being accomplished by the Medical Department of the United States Navy, we are vitally interested in assuring these Navy nurses adequate recreational facilities.

As Commandant of the Marine Corps, I heartily endorse this excellent proposal and express my personal hope that it be activated at an early date and be maintained during and after the war.

Sincerely yours,

A. A. VANDEGRIFT.

AUGUST 14, 1944.

DEAR MRS. NOVER: I am very happy to serve on the Honorary Committee for the Medical Women, Army-Navy Club.

This memorial dedicated to the Army-Navy nurses of World War No. 2 is a wonderful tribute and I know will be a great success.

MAMIE D. EISENHOWER
(Mrs. Dwight D.).

Acceptance letters of blessing from Mrs. Henry L. Stimson, Mrs. Harlan Fiske Stone, and Mrs. Robert H. Jackson.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I wish to approve what was said by the senior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY]. The bill is one which I think deserves the careful attention of the Senate and it should be approved and passed. It deals with a great cause, and as cosponsor I hope it will receive the favorable consideration of the Senate.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles and referred as indicated:

H. R. 4286. An act to relinquish the title of the United States to certain lands in the county of Los Angeles, State of California;

H. R. 4697. An act providing for the appointment of a United States commissioner for the Big Bend National Park in the State of Texas, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4917. An act conferring upon the State of Montana authority to exchange for other lands certain lands selected by the State of Montana for the use of the University of Montana for biological-station purposes pursuant to the act of March 3, 1905 (33 Stat. 1080); and

H. R. 5232. An act to transfer jurisdiction over the Chattanooga National Cemetery, Chattanooga, Tenn., from the Department of the Interior to the War Department, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

H. R. 5041. An act to amend the Veterans Regulations; to the Committee on Pensions.

H. R. 5255. An act to amend the Coast Guard Auxiliary and Reserve Act of 1941, as amended; to the Committee on Commerce.

RIVER AND HARBOR IMPROVEMENTS—AMENDMENT

Mr. CORDON submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 3961) authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

ADDRESS BY SENATOR WAGNER BEFORE INTERNATIONAL LADIES GARMENT WORKERS UNION

[Mr. MEAD asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by Senator WAGNER before the International Ladies Garment Workers Union, on September 14, 1944, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY SENATOR TAFT BEFORE OHIO REPUBLICAN STATE CONVENTION

[Mr. TAFT asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the address delivered by him before the Ohio Republican State Convention on September 14, 1944, which appears in the Appendix.]

POWER TO DECLARE WAR—ADDRESS BY SENATOR CAPPER

[Mr. CAPPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio address on the subject Too Much Power to Give to Any One Man, delivered by him on September 3, 1944, which appears in the Appendix.]

AID TO SMALL BUSINESS—LETTER FROM HON. JESSE JONES TO SENATOR JOHNSON OF COLORADO

[Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter addressed to himself by the Honorable Jesse Jones, Secretary of Commerce, on the subject of assistance extended to small business, which appears in the Appendix.]

PAY OF LETTER CARRIERS—STATEMENT BY WILLIAM C. DOHERTY BEFORE COMMITTEE ON POST OFFICES AND POST ROADS

[Mr. WAGNER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the statement made by William C. Doherty, president, National Association of Letter Carriers, at public hearings before the Senate Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads on September 20, 1944, which appears in the Appendix.]

BENEFITS AND MUSTERING-OUT PAY UNDER G. I. BILL OF RIGHTS

[Mr. PEPPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD articles entitled "Veterans Must Ask for G. I. Benefits" and "Amount of Mustering-Out Pay Depends on Type of Service," published in the Washington Post, which appear in the Appendix.]

ATTACKS AGAINST THE POLITICAL ACTION COMMITTEE—EDITORIAL COMMENT

[Mr. MEAD asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Time To Call a Halt," printed in the Providence Visitor, of Providence, R. I., for September 14, 1944, and an editorial entitled "Racial Poison," by Marquis Childs, printed in the Washington Post for September 16, 1944, which appear in the Appendix.]

GOVERNOR DEWEY'S OPENING CAMPAIGN ADDRESS

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, as all Members of the Senate know, I am a strong party man and a good Democrat. I differ with the Republicans in politics, but I like most of them, especially those here in the Senate. There are some other Republicans besides those in the Senate who sometimes say things that make me feel kindly toward them. I read in the opening campaign speech of Mr. Dewey at Philadelphia on September 7 several things which were very pleasing to me. I had hoped that some one of the Republican Senators would put that speech in the RECORD. I was waiting for that to be done. That is why I have delayed this long in making these remarks. I was just waiting for a Republican Senator to ask unanimous consent to have the Philadelphia speech of Mr. Dewey printed in the RECORD. I was not going to object to such a request, but I wanted to say then just what I intend to say now. I wanted to call attention to some of the statements made by Mr. Dewey. But no Republican Senator asked to have the speech printed in the RECORD. Congress is about to adjourn and I am taking the liberty of showing my appreciation of some things stated by Mr. Dewey just the same.

I jotted down at the time some of the things Governor Dewey said in that speech. I think of all the fine endorsements that any administration ever received in the history of the country the endorsement given by Mr. Dewey to the Roosevelt administration for its conduct of the war was one of the finest, best, and most generous endorsements I have ever read. Indeed, I am wondering how a man who so thoroughly endorsed President Roosevelt's conduct of the war would want to interfere with the conduct of the war by offering himself as a candidate against Mr. Roosevelt. It is a marvelous endorsement. No wonder no Republican Senator offered to put that speech in the RECORD. But I feel that it is not fair to the generous Mr. Dewey not to put it in the RECORD.

Certainly I want to put portions of it in the RECORD. It is not my intention to put it all in; but there are certain excerpts in which Mr. Dewey so powerfully, so unexpectedly, so vigorously, so earnestly, and so genuinely endorsed Mr. Roosevelt's conduct of the war that I feel that his generosity should be repaid by my putting in the RECORD certain of his statements, which I now read. I hold them up to Senators so that they can see the actual newspaper excerpts which I now propose to read. This is Mr. Dewey speaking, not the Senator from Tennessee:

> For nearly 3 years our Nation has been engaged in a world war. Today our armed forces are winning victory after victory.

Remember this speech was delivered on September 7, and we are winning victory even faster now. I continue to read:

> Total smashing victory is in sight. Germany and Japan shall be given the lessons of their lives—right in Berlin and Tokyo.
>
> America—our America which loves peace so dearly—is proving once again that it can wage war mightily. * * * That it can crush any aggressor who threatens the freedom which we love even more than peace. The American people have risen to the challenge. The war is being won on the battle fronts.

I call especial attention to this; not only is it being won on the battle fronts, but listen to Mr. Dewey:

> It is also being won in the factory, the office, the farm, the mine, and the home—

And the home.

> Yes; we are proving that we can wage war.

I am quite sure my Democratic friends will agree with me when I say to the Republicans, what a wonderful endorsement of Mr. Roosevelt as Commander in Chief of the American forces. Did anyone ever hear a finer endorsement? I do not believe any Democrat has ever uttered a finer or more complete or more all-embracing endorsement of the conduct of the war than was uttered by Mr. Dewey in Philadelphia on September 7.

What an endorsement of Mr. Roosevelt and his Cabinet. What an endorsement of Mr. Roosevelt and his associates. What an endorsement of General Marshall, General MacArthur, General Arnold, General Eisenhower, General Clark, and General Patton, and all the other generals and leaders and all the boys engaged in the war. Mr. Dewey has certainly endorsed the conduct of the war as no other man has done.

I wish to commend Mr. Dewey for being honest and sincere in telling the American people how well the war has been conducted. Let me say that since his speech was delivered on September 7, we have made even greater strides, and I am expecting Mr. Dewey almost any night to utter another endorsement of the conduct of the war, and give his approval in a major speech, not a minor one. It seems he has major speeches and minor speeches.

I am expecting to hear Mr. Dewey again turn loose almost any time about the continued great leadership of his distinguished opponent, Mr. Roosevelt.

Not only does he in the excerpt from which I have read commend President Roosevelt's conduct of the war in foreign fields all over the world, but he goes beyond that, he goes far beyond that; he commends the conduct of the present administration in winning the war in the factory, the office, the farm, the mine, and the home. It is hardly conceivable that any man in America could deliver a finer encomium of the Roosevelt administration as it is operating either at home or abroad.

But these are not all the commendations the Republican candidate, Mr. Dewey, showered on Candidate Roosevelt in his opening speech. He evidently felt that the words "in the factory, the office, the farm, the mine, and the home" were not sufficiently broad.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Tennessee yield to the Senator from South Dakota?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield. I promised to yield to the Senator from Wisconsin, but I am willing to yield to any Senator on the other side.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. I always love to listen to the very distinguished Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. McKELLAR. I thank the Senator with all my heart.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. For the most part we can agree upon things that are coming before us in the Senate, but I wonder whether the Senator means to imply that the boys working on the farms, in the mines, in the factories, and the boys who are carrying on over in Europe and in the Southwest Pacific, are all new dealers.

Mr. McKELLAR. Oh, no; probably very few are. I do not know how many are; I have not the slightest notion. I am now merely referring to the wonderful encomium the distinguished Republican candidate for President, Mr. Dewey, has delivered on the conduct of the war, and stating how much I as a Democrat appreciate his approval of the conduct of the war in all its operations.

Mr. BARKLEY. Will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. I gather that the Senator feels that in view of this wholehearted, enthusiastic endorsement, Mr. Dewey should vote for Mr. Roosevelt for President.

Mr. McKELLAR. He may do so before he is through, if he continues in the way he began. Listen for a moment. I repeat, I have not read all the commendations Candidate Dewey showered upon Candidate Roosevelt in his opening address. He evidently felt that the words "in the factory, the office, on the farm, in the mine, and the homes" were not sufficiently broad. He wanted to be more specific in his endorsement of the great work of this administration. I shall refer to what he said a little later in the same speech. The speech is not found in the RECORD. I have here the report of it in a Philadelphia newspaper just as Mr. Dewey delivered it and shall be glad to show Senators a copy of it.

Mr. Dewey wanted to be more specific, and a little later in his speech he made the endorsement of Mr. Roosevelt's domestic policies more pointed and more specific and even stronger when he said what I am about to read. I hold up the paper so that Senators can see it; I am taking no chances. I am reading from Mr. Dewey's language. I do not want anyone to misunderstand me. I want to quote exactly what he said. It is here in newspaper type. Every Senator can see it.

Mind you, the Democratic administration has already put certain domestic policies into force, and here Mr. Dewey names them and says:

> Of course, we need security regulation. Of course, we need bank deposit insurance. Of course, we need price support for agriculture. Of course, the farmers of this country cannot be left to the hazards of a world price while they buy their goods on an American price. Of course, we need unemployment insurance and old age pensions and also relief whenever there are not enough jobs. Of course, the rights of labor to organize and bargain collectively are fundamental.

All those things have been put into law under the administration of Mr. Roosevelt, and here is a specific endorsement of many and perhaps of most of the great acts the President has put into force.

I am asking Republican Senators, all of whom are my friends, I believe, whether they can imagine anything stronger than the endorsement just read. It covers a very large portion of the Democratic legislation of the present administration. We have security regulation. We have bank deposit insurance. We have put through price support for agriculture. We have protected the farmers against high prices. We have brought about unemployment insurance and old age pensions and relief all along the line. The Governor, it is true, did not mention all we have done, but he gave his approval to all he mentioned.

Mr. President, if we have done all the things Governor Dewey commends, why in the world is he a candidate? That is a wonder to me. He says we have done everything well in the war, we have done everything well on the domestic front. He approves all the legislation we have passed. Well, I am just wondering about the necessity of his going to the trouble to run against the man who has put into force everything he declares to be good.

Governor Dewey endorses all of his opponent's foreign policies; he endorses all of his domestic policies, and his policies dealing with the homes, the factories, the farms, and the mines. Ah, Mr. President, if ever a man was telling the truth when he uttered those words of commendation of Mr. Roosevelt's war policies and his peace policies, his domestic policies, Mr. Dewey was telling the plain truth all along the line. I suppose he was giving utterance to his honest-to-God sentiments, and certainly I want to say that they have struck a very responsive chord in my breast. I am frank to tell Senators that I greatly enjoyed reading those excerpts.

Then Mr. Dewey, for a Republican, made one of the most remarkable admissions I have ever read. I wonder if there are any Senators present who actually remember the Hoover administration from 1929 to 1933, just prior to the Roosevelt administration. I will digress long enough to say that I know my friend the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CAPPER] remembers it, because I recall that he was in the Senate then. Let me see if there is any other Senator present who was in the Senate at that time. I think my friend the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN] was in the Senate, too. That makes two Senators. I do not see any more Senators on the Republican side now who were in the Senate then, but on this side my friend the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] was in the Senate from 1929 to 1933, as was my friend the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE]. I believe the four I have mentioned are the only Senators now present who were in the Senate at that time.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. Oh, yes.

Mr. REED. I rise because in a committee session with the distinguished Senator from Tennessee within a few minutes before we came to the Senate floor, the Senator said he was going to make a speech, and then he assured me that in that speech he intended to praise the Republicans.

Mr. McKELLAR. I am praising them. I am praising the Senator's candidate to the skies. I think he has made a wonderful statement approving all Mr. Roosevelt's policies. I want not only Democratic Senators, but Republican Senators and everyone in the country, to know how thoroughly he praised policies and performances of the present administration in his first major speech.

Mr. REED. But I thought the Senator from Tennessee was going to give Senators on this side of the aisle some praise on their own account. I am very much more interested in praise of Republicans by the Senator from Tennessee than anything else just now.

Mr. McKELLAR. I will say how I feel about every Republican in the Senate. I like the Republicans here just as I like the Democrats in the Senate.

Mr. REED. That is damning us with faint praise, Mr. President.

Mr. McKELLAR. Oh, no; it is not faint praise. It is grand praise. I imagine some Democrats remember the Hoover administration, but I thought perhaps some Republicans had forgotten it—by accident, of course. Senators will remember that it was a pretty tough time.

Now after giving the Democratic administration all this praise, listen to what Mr. Dewey says. He makes excuses for the Democratic administration not having been even better. He praises the administration to the skies, and then he makes excuses for its having not been better. Listen to this. In my judgment, it is the most remarkable statement I have ever heard in a political speech, and it is an absolutely correct statement, and I endorse it. I think every Senator who was in the Senate at the time will endorse it. After telling how much the Democratic administration has accomplished, Mr. Dewey said:

> When this administration—

Meaning the Roosevelt administration—

> took office the depression was already over 3 years old.

Mr. President, just think what Roosevelt has accomplished with that handicap. Roosevelt had the handicap of a depression which was 3 years old, and he has overcome it, and has done all the things that Candidate Dewey said he has done. But that is not all.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. Surely I will yield.

Mr. TAFT. Perhaps the Senator misses the point. The point is that in every previous depression the country always recovered within 5 years, merely through the normal processes of recovery which have occurred always in the

United States, but in this case, after its first 3 years, the depression, by reason of the methods applied by the New Deal, continued for another 8 years thereafter. That is the point. Perhaps the Senator missed that point.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, my good friend, the kindly, the generous, the smiling Senator from Ohio, did not happen to be in the Senate during that depression. He should remember that that was the depression of all time, the depression of all depressions, just as certified by the distinguished Republican candidate for the Presidency, Mr. Dewey. It was the greatest depression we have ever had. It took the present administration some little time to get rid of it, but this country has never been more prosperous in its history than it is today and has been for years and years before the war.

Mr. TAFT. It took a world war to get rid of it.

Mr. McKELLAR. Oh, no; it did not take a world war to get rid of it. We had gotten rid of it long before that.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes.

Mr. WHERRY. That prosperity, that shot in the arm, has not been paid for.

Mr. McKELLAR. What is that?

Mr. WHERRY. That shot in the arm, or so-called prosperity, has not been paid for yet.

Mr. McKELLAR. No.

Mr. WHERRY. We owed $50,000,000,000 before we ever got into the war.

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes; that is true. But we have gotten along before, and we are going to get along again.

Mr. President, I now want to call attention to another remarkable endorsement, and this is really more remarkable than any of them. I shall return to my notes for a minute so as to be accurate. Just think of a Republican candidate being so fair as to admit the 3-year depression handicap, after praising the Roosevelt administration as he praised it. Just think of his being fair enough, Senators, to say that Mr. Roosevelt had done all this splendid work, had had passed all these many bills, had brought peace and prosperity to the homes and the mines and the farms and the factories, and to the wage earners after having had to start out under a handicap of 3 years' depression under Mr. Hoover.

I want to tell Senators that, whatever else may be said about Mr. Dewey, he is a frank and truthful man when he talks about the splendid conduct of the Democratic Party and the Democratic administration under Mr. Roosevelt.

But he did not stop there. We would all have thought he would have stopped there, but he took no chances, he made no mistake about it. He wanted to make his endorsement complete. He had left out one feature, so he wanted to make his endorsement of the Democratic administration complete, and he sent his friend, Mr. Dulles of the cartel house of Cromwell, Sullivan & Co., or Sullivan, Cromwell & Co.—I do not know which it is—of New York City, to Washington to attend in his name the Dumbarton Oaks Conference, and after Mr. Dulles, acting for Mr. Dewey, had thoroughly gone into the foreign policies of President Roosevelt, Mr. Dewey announced that he endorsed them all, and that Mr. Roosevelt's foreign policies would be his foreign policies. That completed this wonderful, this magnificent, this generous, this truthful endorsement of President Roosevelt.

Mr. President, I cannot commend too highly to all Senators and to the public to read this remarkable speech by our friend, Mr. Dewey, which he made in the very opening of his campaign. It was not a minor speech. Oh, no. It was a major speech. It was the most major of major speeches, because it was his first speech. At the very beginning of his campaign he endorses the Roosevelt policies all along the line. He has endorsed the policies and acts of the Democratic administration all along the line, and I congratulate him on it. I commend him for it. I believe that if I had said that much about an opponent's welldoing, I should have said, "The war is not yet over. This man has done so well in his domestic policies, his foreign policies, and his war policies, and we have been winning so consistently all along the line, on hundreds of fronts all over the world, that I think I will just ask my supporters to let me withdraw and let my opponent head the Government until the war is over and the peace terms completed."

Mr. REED. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I have finished, but I am glad to yield.

Mr. REED. I hope the Senator from Tennessee will remain on his feet long enough for me to express my very deep personal disappointment. At 10 minutes to 12 the Senator, in his capacity as chairman of the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, where I sat on his right, leaned over and said to me, "I am going to leave the committee meeting. I intend to make a speech praising the Republicans." Here I am, following the Senator. I excused myself from the committee meeting and came into the Senate Chamber. I have been listening anxiously, wistfully, and hopefully for the promised praise of the Republicans. Surely the Senator from Tennessee is not going to take his seat and leave one of his best friends and most devoted followers in a condition of disappointment and disillusionment.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I would not do that for the world. Let me say that I cannot wish for Republican Senators anything better, and I do not believe they could serve themselves and the country better than by taking to their hearts the wonderful endorsements by Mr. Dewey of the Democratic administration and its policies as then approved by Mr. Dewey. We will let the matter rest there.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. Am I to understand that the Senator is thinking of voting for Mr. Dewey because of the likeness of his views to those of the Democratic candidate? I know many southern Democrats who intend to vote for Mr. Dewey, and I am hoping that perhaps the Senator will do so. I should think the Senator would prefer a man elected for a first term rather than a man elected for a fourth term, to which the Senator has always been opposed.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Democratic candidate for President has not had as many terms as my friend from Tennessee has had. [Laughter.]

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator from Kentucky is correct. I am not complaining too much about terms. I may run for another.

Mr. BARKLEY. I myself am running for a fourth term.

Mr. McKELLAR. That is an additional reason.

Mr. President, Mr. Dewey made a very excellent speech. There was only one thing in it to which I objected. Perhaps I ought not to mention it. I told the Senator from Kansas that I was going to praise the Republicans, and not criticize them. The only thing in the speech of the Republican candidate for President, Mr. Dewey, that bothered me was the statement which he made about getting rid of old men in office. I wonder just what steps he would take to get rid of elderly gentlemen, especially those in the Senate. I can speak with authority on this subject, because I am getting along in years.

Let us take one example. I refer to that grand, honorable, eloquent, and honest man, HIRAM JOHNSON, one of the finest men I have ever known in this body. I do not believe there is a more honest man in the world today. There is not a grander man anywhere than good HIRAM JOHNSON. I believe he is 81 years old. HIRAM JOHNSON ought to be working for the Government. It is an inspiration to work with an honest man like HIRAM JOHNSON. I rather resent the idea of getting rid of old men.

I am now looking at one of the finest and most honorable men I have ever known. For the moment I am not talking about the minority leader [Mr. WHITE]. I am talking about one of the best, noblest, and most efficient Members of either House of the Congress. He is one of the most efficient men ever to sit in either the Senate or the House. He was also governor of his State for a long time. I have lived at the same hotel with him for many years. He is one of the finest characters I have ever known. His name is ARTHUR CAPPER. My God! How could anyone who knew ARTHUR CAPPER and HIRAM JOHNSON ever think that we ought to get rid of old men in our Government?

A while ago the junior Senator from Kansas said something about my not paying him a compliment. Let me say that the junior Senator from Kansas comes within Mr. Dewey's definition of old men who ought to be eliminated so that the Government could be turned over to the hands of young men.

Mr. WILEY. In what connection was that phrase first used?

Mr. McKELLAR. I do not believe in that idea. I serve on the same committee with the junior Senator from Kansas. He is an excellent Senator. He is worthy to represent the great State of Kansas; and I do not believe that he should be turned out because he is approaching the age which I myself have attained. I take off my hat to the Senator from Kansas, and I hope he will think that I have fulfilled my promise to the last word when I said that I would say something complimentary about him. Mr. Dewey ought not to want to get rid of him.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I am sorry that I was detained from the Chamber and missed the opening remarks of the Senator. I am wondering what he is talking about. Is he criticizing President Roosevelt for his attack on the nine old men on the Supreme Court?

Mr. McKELLAR. No; he limited his criticism to the nine old men on the Supreme Court. Possibly he made a mistake in thus describing them. I believe he did. But when a man is against any and all old men having anything to do with our Government as Mr. Dewey says he is, because they are alleged to be feeble and decrepit, I do not agree with him at all. I did not agree with President Roosevelt when he mentioned the nine old men, if he ever did so; and I do not agree with Mr. Dewey on that subject, much as I admire him for the statements which he made in his speech.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. I invite the attention of the Senator to the fact that the President never referred to the Supreme Court, in any communication or any word he ever uttered, as the nine old men. That designation was given to them by some distinguished and celebrated authors in the District of Columbia, who wrote a book on the subject.

Mr. McKELLAR. I do not remember the facts, but I remember reading in the newspapers that he had said something about the nine old men. To that extent I believe he was mistaken if he said it.

Mr. BARKLEY. If the Government is to be turned into a kindergarten, does the Senator know of any man better qualified to head it than Mr. Dewey?

Mr. McKELLAR. After all the complimentary things I have said about Mr. Dewey, I dislike to criticize him. I do not know Mr. Dewey. I do not know whether he would be a good man to head a kindergarten government or not; but I believe that the Government which we have is the greatest government in the world, and I believe that the old men who participate in it are just as capable as many of the younger men, and more so than some of them.

Mr. WHERRY and Mr. TAFT addressed the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Tennessee yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield first to the Senator from Nebraska. I shall be glad to yield to the Senator from Ohio in a moment.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I want the distinguished senior Senator from Tennessee, who apparently has asked me for verification of his statement regarding the age of the senior Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON], to know that he is only 78 years old. He was born September 2, 1866. So that takes him out of the "old men" class. The Senator from Tennessee is talking about a young Senator when he talks about the senior Senator from California.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I am very much obliged to the Senator for correcting me about that, and I ask that the reporters be certain to correct it. If there ever was a man on earth whom I admire, love, and respect for being one of the most honest men God ever created on this earth, it is HIRAM JOHNSON, of California. He and I came here at about the same time. We have been friends all our lives, and I pray God we may always be friends. I wish I were half as good a man as he is.

I yield now to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I understand that the Senator said in his opening remarks, when I was not in the Chamber, that Governor Dewey's speech had not been endorsed by Republicans.

Mr. McKELLAR. No, Mr. President; I said it had not been placed in the RECORD at the request of Republican Senators.

Mr. TAFT. Let me call attention to the fact that I asked and obtained leave, by unanimous consent, to have it printed in the RECORD. It appears at pages A3988, A3989, and A3990 of the Appendix.

I may also say that I endorse everything the Governor said, and I have fought more New Deal measures than perhaps almost anyone else in Congress has done. So I do not think the main point raised by the Senator from Tennessee is correct. I myself fully agree with Governor Dewey's philosophy.

Mr. McKELLAR. Does the Senator from Ohio even agree with his philosophy regarding old age?

Mr. TAFT. Yes, absolutely. In Ohio we had an old-age law before Congress and the New Deal ever began to pass one.

Mr. McKELLAR. I thank the Senator for calling my attention to the fact that the Governor's speech was printed in the RECORD. The reason why I happened to make the statement I did make was that it just happened—I believe it is the first time it ever did—that the senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS], the President pro tempore of the Senate, wrote me a note and asked me to serve in his place. The Vice President was unhappily away for a week or two at the time. It was at the very time when I served as Presiding Officer, on September 7, that I had cut out the very excerpts from the newspaper I have on my desk. I had an arrangement of them made; and when any Senator asked unanimous consent to have the speech printed in the RECORD. I was going to refer to these splendid encomiums of the Democratic administration. The request to have Governor Dewey's speech printed in the RECORD must have been made at some time when I was not in the Chamber. I was here for several days after that, and I know that such unanimous consent was not obtained during that time.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President——

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield to the Senator from Maine.

Mr. WHITE. I simply wish to comment that the Senator from Tennessee is not usually so far behind the times.

Mr. McKELLAR. No, sir. But the Senator will forgive me, I am sure, because he knows that both he and I have been very busy these last few days.

Mr. WHITE. Let me say another word, Mr. President, either in the Senator's time or in my own.

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes; I am through.

Mr. WHITE. The Senator from Tennessee has spoken in such laudatory terms of Mr. Dewey, and of particular Republican Senators on this side of the aisle, that I am completely disarmed. I gathered from what the Senator said concerning Mr. Dewey that he believes that usually when Mr. Dewey speaks, it is as a great, able, patriotic American, and that when he does not speak in those terms he is something substantially different. [Laughter.]

Mr. McKELLAR. I have not criticized Mr. Dewey at all except concerning what he said about old men, and that might be regarded as something of a personal criticism, and not in any other way. I tried to be very complimentary to Mr. Dewey, for I certainly admire his full, complete, ample, and perfect endorsement of the Democratic administration, and its policies and accomplishments, foreign and domestic.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, what the Senator from Tennessee has said reminds me of an incident which occurred in the Senate a number of years ago, when I was a young man. Perhaps it is not inappropriate to tell of it on this occasion. I can remember very well that the then Senator from South Carolina, Benjamin Tillman, sat in a seat next to the aisle, I believe, where the junior Senator from Texas [Mr. O'DANIEL] is now sitting, or in the seat to the rear. Across the aisle, on the Republican side, and I believe where the present Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN] now sits, or where the senior Senator from Wisconsin sits, was the seat of Senator John C. Spooner, of Wisconsin. They were two great Senators. Senator Tillman was one of the rugged characters who has served in this body, a man of great force, a man of great industry, a man of character, a man of intense feelings. Senator Tillman and Senator Spooner were intimate friends, having a deep affection each for the other. But Senator Spooner used to enjoy prodding the then Senator from South Carolina this way, that way, and the other way, always exciting the Senator from South Carolina to seeming wrath. The face of the Senator from South Carolina, lined and florid, was a face of power, and bespoke the feelings of the man.

On one particular occasion Senator Spooner engaged in this torment of the Senator from South Carolina. Then, following the pattern, Senator Spooner

spoke in such kindly and complimentary terms of the Senator from South Carolina that the Senator from South Carolina was wholly mollified, and with a smile on his face he turned to the Republican side of the Chamber and to the President of the Senate, and said, "Mr. President, one of the things I have never been able to comprehend is how gentlemen on the other side"—meaning the Republican side—"could be so agreeable personally and so rascally politically."

I take it that is the feeling of the Senator from Tennessee toward us. [Laughter.]

Mr. McKELLAR. Oh, no, Mr. President. I have a very deep and abiding affection for all Senators on the other side of the aisle. I do not know that I have ever criticized one of them. If I did do so, I did it in the course of debate, which would have been proper. I hope I have never done so in such a manner as to hurt anyone's feelings. I would not do that for anything. I am like the late President Harding was, to this extent: I have found this body one of the most delightful bodies in which I have ever served. Of course, I have served in only two such bodies, but my service in this body has been a very great delight to me, and I really and truly like every Member of the Senate, both those on this side of the aisle and those on the other side. I have nothing but the highest admiration and esteem for all the Republican Senators, beginning with the distinguished minority leader, the Senator from Maine [Mr. WHITE], and including the last Senator who has come to this Chamber.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, the Senator from Tennessee has always been kind and gracious to me, and I appreciate that. I think I will say to him what I have said behind his back before now. I have said that if I understood anything of the history of Tennessee there have been four outstanding characters who have represented that State in public places. First of all was Andrew Jackson, one of the great figures produced in this country.

Then came Mr. Johnson. Those of us of Maine looked with not complete favor upon Mr. Johnson, for he supplanted Hannibal Hamlin, of Maine, as Vice President of the United States. But Andrew Johnson was the second great public servant from the State of Tennessee. The third is Cordell Hull, now Secretary of State.

I have always had the opinion in late years that the fourth member of that group is the present senior Senator from Tennessee [KENNETH MCKELLAR]; for in all the years which have passed since I have known anything about public life and public men, there has been no Member of the Senate of the United States who has served his State with more faithfulness and greater distinction, who has been more a Senator of the United States, than KENNETH MCKELLAR.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I thank the Senator with all my heart.

JACKSON HOLE NATIONAL MONUMENT

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, after the delightfully humorous remarks of the very lovable Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR], I am afraid the Chamber will find the remarks which I am about to make of a very different order.

On Thursday last, September 14, Gov. Thomas E. Dewey, in a trip across the Nation to the west coast in the interest of his candidacy for President, stopped and spent a large part of the day at Sheridan, Wyo. I read to the Senate an Associated Press dispatch from Sheridan, Wyo., as follows:

> Gov. Thomas E. Dewey told reporters today that President Roosevelt's Executive order creating the Jackson Hole National Monument was "characteristic of the deviousness of the New Deal and its lack of respect for the rights and opinions of the people affected."
>
> Dewey said he was informed that Wyoming people were "violently opposed" to the Executive order which set aside 220,610 acres of land in the Jackson Hole area as a national monument, thus removing it from local and State tax rolls. He said Congress had defeated legislation to accomplish the result which had been achieved by the Executive order. The State of Wyoming has brought suit to set aside the order.

I omit several paragraphs of the dispatch as they deal with land matters other than the Jackson Hole National Monument to which I particularly wish to address myself at this time.

When Governor Dewey says that the people of Wyoming were "violently opposed to the Executive order which set aside 220,610 acres in the Jackson Hole area as a national monument," he was expressing the views of the people with great moderation.

The following day, on September 15, 1944, a reply came from the administration—at least I presume that the Secretary of the Interior speaks for the Administration—and the reply is so misleading, so full of trickery, so far from the whole truth, and yet contains a smattering of truth and false assumption, as to bring forth the contempt of every decent-minded citizen. I quote from Mr. Ickes' statement of Friday, September 15, 1944:

> When the late Calvin Coolidge was President, he persuaded Mr. Rockefeller to purchase land in the Jackson Hole area for an enlargement of our National Park system. When Mr. Dewey's political godfather, Mr. Hoover, succeeded President Coolidge he encouraged Mr. Rockefeller to continue to buy these lands. When this administration came in in 1933, Mr. Rockefeller had already purchased all of the lands that Presidents Coolidge and Hoover had persuaded him to buy. If Mr. Dewey in his beagle-like snuffing about for votes has any criticism to make of this national monument, it should be directed, not at this administration, but at those of the last known Republican Presidents, and Mr. John D. Rockefeller, Jr., who is not notable for his support of Democratic administrations.

I say to the United States Senate, Mr. President, that Presidents Coolidge and Hoover never in the years of their Presidencies had anything whatsoever to do with, or in any manner whatsoever considered the withdrawal of 220,610 acres of the Jackson Hole country for the creation of a national monument. It is true that during their terms of office bills to enlarge the Teton National Forest were introduced in the Congress, but never succeeded in passage, and, Mr. President, such bills never will succeed in passage.

Mr. President, I shall take a few minutes of the time of the Senate very briefly to review this situation so that it can be a matter of record. What I am about to tell the Senate is all a matter of record in the hearings of the House Committee on Public Lands on House bill 2241, introduced by Representative FRANK A. BARRETT, of Wyoming, a bill to abolish the Jackson Hole National Monument. Those hearings were held during May and June 1943.

In 1919 the first civilian superintendent of Yellowstone Park since 1886 was appointed. Previously the management and operation of the park had been in the hands of the United States Army. When it was decided that the operation of the Yellowstone Park should be turned over to the Department of the Interior, Horace M. Albright was appointed superintendent, and from that moment trouble developed. I do not know what Mr. Albright's politics is. It makes no difference. He is—or perhaps I should say that he was—first and foremost a bureaucrat, and, being superintendent of Yellowstone National Park, he, in typical bureaucratic manner, early sought to extend the area of his domain. He envisioned a greater Yellowstone by extending the east line farther east and moving the south line so as to include, not only the great Teton Range, with its beautiful lakes, but the great stock-grazing, wildlife, and hunting areas of the entire Jackson Hole, Buffalo Park, and the great Thoroughfare country—the whole a vast area of northwestern Wyoming.

This dream of bureaucrat Albright's—or, as he refers to it, his "ideal"—met with opposition from the very start; but, in the usual manner of bureaucrats, Albright was persistent and ever had before him the idea of this mighty national park empire. As superintendent of Yellowstone Park, he was in a position to entertain many distinguished visitors who might be of use in advancing his ideal. Senators, Representatives, Governors, wealthy men from the East, writers, princes and princesses, and countless others were well taken care of when they visited the Yellowstone. I may say that the advent of the automobile into Yellowstone Park took place a year or two prior to Albright's appointment as superintendent.

Bureaucrat Albright attained some success when in 1929 a bill was introduced in Congress by our late, beloved Senator Kendrick to create a Teton National Park. Senators know that no national park can be created or enlarged except by congressional action. The bill to create Teton National Park finally became law, and as a result the Teton range of mountains and four very beautiful lakes at their foot were included in this park, which had a total area of 91,000 acres. There had been considerable opposition to the creation of this park from various sources. One was the stockmen, particularly the sheepmen from the west, who had for many years grazed

their sheep on the western slope of the Teton Mountains. In order to meet this objection, the western line of this newly created Teton National Park was placed almost on the top ridge of the mountains so as to leave out that valuable grazing area to the west, so that it could be operated by the National Forest Service and the grazing of livestock continued.

At the time of the creation of this park, our able Senator, the late John B. Kendrick, who sponsored the bill, did so on the understanding that the creation of this park by the Congress would be the final answer to the whole situation of park extension in northwestern Wyoming. In spite of this, bureaucrat Albright continued to work.

There was, however, a difficult problem which he had to face in the realization of his bureaucratic "ideal," and that was some 50,000 acres of deeded land in the Jackson Hole, all in the vicinity of the newly created Teton National Park, some of it even adjoining it. Before this bureaucrat could proceed any further with his ideal, that 50,000 acres of deeded land had to be eliminated. How could this be done? It was a tough proposition; but with the ready cunning of a bureaucrat he thought he found a solution. He had read and heard of, as we all had read and heard of—and admired—the munificence of John D. Rockefeller, Jr. So Albright went to work.

Apparently the first recorded visit of Mr. John D. Rockefeller, Jr., to the Yellowstone National Park was in 1924, and at that time he provided some funds for cleaning up some of the dead and down timber on the roadsides. In July 1926 Mr. Rockefeller, as a guest of bureaucrat Albright, again visited the Yellowstone, and apparently for the first time he went into the Jackson Hole country south of the Yellowstone. In his report Albright says that they spent the night at Jackson Lake Lodge, and "during the evening we saw moose in the swamps near Jackson Lake." I am interested in that visit, because I happened to be at Jackson Lake Lodge that night and met Albright and Mr. Rockefeller, and also saw the moose in the meadows. Little did I dream of what was evidently going on in Albright's mind at that time. However, the result of that trip must have been very gratifying to Albright, because Mr. Rockefeller shortly afterward agreed to purchase the 50,000 acres of deeded land with a view of presenting it to the Federal Government so as to clear the way for the next step of Horace Albright's dream or "ideal."

I wish to make it very clear at this point, Mr. President, that I am satisfied that Mr. Rockefeller's action was activated by the highest motives, and I, with a great majority of people in Wyoming, deeply regret that his name ever had to be brought into this matter.

During the winter that followed, bureaucrat Albright began to have some misgivings. At all costs he had to keep the idea of this proposed Rockefeller land purchase from the people of Wyoming.

On February 16, 1927, which was early in the year following the visit of Mr. Rockefeller to Jackson Hole, bureaucrat Albright wrote to Mr. Rockefeller, and I quote from that letter:

Should you feel that this is a matter that you would like to proceed with, I am sure it can be handled with excellent results along the following lines:

1. Say nothing, at the present time, about the larger or ultimate plan of acquiring all of the private holdings in the Jackson Hole.

2. Confine all activities to acquisition of holdings west of the Snake River in that area colored on the map you had, and which I return herewith.

3. Buy in this area, through an agency or agencies, under a plan to organize a recreation and hunting club. If there were more grazing lands on the west side of the river, I would advocate operating as buyers for a land and cattle company, but obviously there is no room on that side for cattle. A cattle company to operate on the east side later would be an ideal agency.

That, Mr. President, I might say, would be an "ideal agency" for fooling the people of Wyoming.

4. Employ a firm of attorneys in Salt Lake City to coordinate buying operations and disburse funds. I have in mind the firm of Fabian & Clendenin, men of unimpeachable integrity and judgment.

Mr. President, evidently their integrity was not sufficiently unimpeachable to cause them any hesitancy about fooling the public.

I continue with Mr. Albright's letter:

They are sportsmen, very public spirited, and intensely interested in Yellowstone. Mr. Clendenin I have known from childhood. We were classmates in college, and closest chums. He and his partner would act in this matter on a very narrow margin of cost.

Mr. President, here was one of the wealthiest men in the country buying large areas of land through them. Why should the firm of attorneys operate at a very narrow margin of cost?

I could go to Salt Lake City as soon as possible and put them in possession of all necessary facts and papers. They could deal with my Jackson Hole operators, one of whom I would have meet me in Salt Lake City.

Mr. President, I am wondering what the Superintendent of the Yellowstone Park was doing with Jackson Hole operators when he was in the pay of the United States Government as superintendent of the park. To continue the letter:

They could also coordinate the efforts of dude ranchers, like Burt and Stewart. I could be in constant and confidential touch with them and they could also communicate with your confidential agent in New York.

5. Through these attorneys—

That is, those of unimpeachable integrity—

acting for a "recreation and hunting club" or some other hypothetical organization if a better one can be found, the lands could be acquired for cash, but on a policy of getting a month's time to get word back and forth between interested parties.

6. As soon as possible, the National Park Service and General Land Office will plat on maps all of the other private holdings in the Jackson Hole. I have the list of holdings as of December 1923. There were then 402 owners of a little over 100,000 acres of land. The situation has not materially changed since then. That land, which included the west side of Snake, too, is worth on an earning basis, perhaps $1,000,000, including value of improvements. I cannot say what it could be acquired for, but investigations of value can be quietly secured this coming summer.

No doubt, Mr. President, that would be quietly secured by the attorneys of unimpeachable integrity.

The whole letter is set out on pages 163 and 164 of the hearings to which I have already referred. In spite of the camouflage and deceit that was being practiced on the people of Wyoming, Albright's fake company, with the aid of said attorneys of unimpeachable integrity and his Jackson Hole operators, succeeded in purchasing 31,000 acres of land out of a possible 50,000 acres which he desired.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I wonder if my colleague would permit an interruption at this point.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Certainly.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Does the Senator have any information with respect to the political position held at the time to which he refers, or shortly thereafter, by Mr. Harold P. Fabian, one of the two lawyers mentioned in the letter he has just read?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I have not, offhand, Mr. President. I do not know whether it is in the record or not. If the senior Senator from Wyoming has any information as to that, I should be glad to have him put it in the RECORD at this time.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. In a spirit of sweet reasonableness, I think it should be called to the attention of all and sundry that Mr. Harold P. Fabian was a leading Republican of Utah, and, if my information is not incorrect, he was serving as Republican National Committee man from that State. It is rather significant, inasmuch as this whole matter has been presented now by the Republican candidate for the Presidency during his campaign tour, that not only was the lawyer who handled the purchases for Mr. Rockefeller a Republican and a leading official of that party, but Mr. Rockefeller himself was one of the principal contributors to the Republican Presidential campaign in 1940 and, I understand, is now contributing to the campaign of 1944 also.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I know nothing of any contributions by Mr. Rockefeller, or the connections of Mr. Fabian with the Republican Party. I feel that this matter is not a matter of politics. What I have to say is, I hope, beyond the scope of politics. The question is purely one of the manner in which land in Wyoming was acquired by the Federal Government.

Things began to get pretty hot out in that section of the country at this time. The citizens there realized that the purchase of this deeded land and turning it over to the Federal Government would remove it from the tax roll of Teton County, and the livestock men knew that, once this area was created a park, grazing of all livestock would be at an end. It was further realized that hunting the vast herd of elk, the greatest herd in the United States, which must be hunted to be kept within bounds, would be prohibited; that summer homes would be

eliminated; that all possible future irrigation works for raising of crops would be ended; and that countless bureaucratic restrictions would be placed on the entire area. In view of this opposition, the purchase of further lands stopped.

In January 1929 Horace Albright succeeded Stephen Mather as Director of National Parks. After August 1933 he was no longer with the National Park Service, and went into private business. That would seem to have been more or less the end of the picture. It will be seen that neither President Coolidge nor President Hoover had had anything to do with creating this national monument; and I now come to the portion of my statement which will show the Senate whose idea it was, and who actually created this national monument.

The situation was that in November 1942 John D. Rockefeller, Jr., had over 30,000 acres of land in the Jackson Hole on his hands, and it is not necessary for me to tell the Senate whose administration that was, nor is it necessary for me to tell who was Secretary of the Interior at that time, and who still is.

On November 27, 1942, Mr. Rockefeller wrote to Secretary of the Interior Harold L. Ickes, and I read that letter to my colleagues:

Nearly 15 years ago I purchased some 30,000 acres in the Jackson Hole country on the earnest recommendation of the then Director of National Parks. This I did for two reasons: First, having in mind the winter feeding of great quantities of game which was being gradually exterminated by starvation; and, secondly, never for a moment doubting that the Federal Government would gladly accept the land as a gift for addition to its national park system and would forthwith take whatever steps were necessary to that end. During the years that have intervened there have been, as you know, numerous negotiations with Government representatives in regard to the matter. As you also know, all of these negotiations have come to naught. Over this period I have expended in connection with the property, which cost me $1,000,000, half as much again for taxes, maintenance, handling, etc. Today it stands me in at a total cost of roughly, $1,500,000.

In view of the uncertainty of the times, like everybody else, I am and have been for some time reducing my obligations and burdens insofar as I wisely can. In line with that policy I have definitely reached the conclusion, although most reluctantly, that I should make permanent disposition of this property before another year has passed. If the Federal Government is not interested in its acquisition, or being interested, is still unable to arrange to accept it on the general terms long discussed and with which you are familiar, it will be my thought to make some other disposition of it, or failing in that, to sell it in the market to any satisfactory buyers.

Because you have been desirous of having this property added to the national park system and have given so generously of your time and thought in an effort to bring that result about—

I should like to interject to remind Senators that this is a letter from John D. Rockerfeller, Jr., to Harold Ickes, Secretary of the Interior:

Because you have been desirous of having this property added to the National Park System and have given so generously of your time and thought in an effort to bring that result about, I would not for a moment think of proceeding to carry out the program above outlined without having first advised you of my decision. Having done that, I am confident that, being so familiar with the situation as you are, you will be the first to say that I have shown every consideration in the matter. Moreover, because you know so well how eager I have been to have this great area preserved for the benefit and enjoyment of the people of the Nation under the wise control and operation of the National Park Service, with which it has been my pleasure to cooperate so closely in many of its national parks and for which I have long had such high admiration, you will realize better than most people with what regret I now face the possible abandonment of that dream.

This letter can be found on page 76 of the hearings to which I have already referred.

Now, Mr. President, we are going to find out who is responsible for the creation of the Jackson Hole National Monument. I particularly call to the attention of Senators that up to this time, and even in Mr. Rockefeller's letter, no mention is made of a national monument. Monuments are created by Executive order. As I have said, national parks or enlargements to existing national parks, can only be created by congressional action. Ickes was up against the real thing. Apparently he could only get the Rockefeller land by enlarging a national park—in this case the Teton National Park—which would take congressional action, and that was impossible, as Congress, representing the people, would never pass such a bill. So some bright mind thought of the Antiquities Act, an act for the preservation of American antiquities, and only by the greatest stretch of imagination could any part of the 221,600 acres in Jackson Hole be construed as coming within the scope of that act.

I can see bureaucrat Albright hurrying from New York, and I can see the conference when someone hit on the idea—"Make it a monument; sidetrack Congress, bypass Congress. We must get the Rockefeller land. We must relieve this man of a serious tax situation." And so on the morning of March 15, 1943, a little more than 3 months after the receipt of Rockefeller's letter by Ickes, a proclamation, signed by Franklin Delano Roosevelt, President, proclaimed 220,610 acres of land adjoining the Teton National Park a national monument. It was really an enlargement of Teton National Park, if you please, which can only be created by congressional action; but the proclamation signed by the President proclaiming that area a national monument was published in the Federal Register.

I hope I have made it clear to the Senate that the man who sponsored and promoted, approved, and sent to the President for his signature this proclamation creating the Jackson Hole National Monument was Harold L. Ickes, Secretary of the Interior in the Roosevelt Cabinet, a man who Mr. Dewey rightly says is at the top of the list for dismissal in January 1945.

LIBERALIZATION OF CERTAIN PROVISIONS OF NATIONAL SERVICE LIFE INSURANCE ACT

Mr. LANGER obtained the floor.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I wonder if the Senator from North Dakota will yield to me so I may place before the Senate two bills for which I shall ask immediate consideration. The bills will not require debate. I think they can be speedily disposed of. They are bills recommended by the Veterans' Administration to cure certain defects in the National Service Life Insurance Act.

Mr. LANGER. I yield for that purpose.

Mr. GEORGE. I thank the Senator from North Dakota very much.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to call up Calendar No. 1123.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ANDREWS in the chair). The bill will be reported by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (S. 2015) to liberalize certain provisions of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, as amended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2015), which was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That subsection (j) of section 602 of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, as amended, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(j) No installments of such insurance shall be paid to the heirs or legal representatives as such of the insured or of any beneficiary, and in the event that no person within the permitted class survives to receive the insurance or any part thereof no payment of the unpaid installments shall be made, except that if the reserve of a contract of converted national service life insurance, together with dividends accumulated thereon, less any indebtedness under such contract, exceeds the aggregate amount paid to beneficiaries, the excess shall be paid to the estate of the insured unless the estate of the insured would escheat under the laws of his place of residence, in which event no payment shall be made."

SEC. 2. That portion of subsection (3) (A) of section 602 (d) of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, as amended, which precedes the first proviso is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(3) (A) Any person in the active service who on or after October 8, 1940, and prior to April 20, 1942, becomes totally disabled as a result of injury or disease incurred in line of duty and such disability continues without interruption for a period of 6 months or until death intervening prior to the end of such 6 months' period without having in force at time of incurrence of such disability at least $5,000 insurance issued under the War Risk Insurance Act, as amended, or the World War Veterans' Act, 1924, as amended, or this act, shall be deemed to have applied for and to have been granted, effective as of the commencement of such total disability, national service life insurance in an amount which together with any such insurance then in force shall aggregate $5,000 and such gratuitous insurance shall continue in force without payment of premiums until 6 months after the insured ceases to be totally disabled or until 1 year after the date of enactment of this amendatory act, whichever is the earlier date."

SEC. 3. Section 602 of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940 is hereby amended by adding thereto a new subsection (r) to read as follows:

"(r) In any case in which premiums are not waived under subsection (n) hereof solely because the insured died prior to the continuance of total disability for 6 months, and proof of such facts, satisfactory to the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, is filed by the beneficiary with the Veterans' Administration within 1 year after the enactment of this amendment, or 1 year after the insured's death, whichever is the later date, his insurance shall be deemed to be in force at the date of his death, and the unpaid premiums shall become a lien against the proceeds of his insurance: *Provided*, That if the beneficiary be insane or a minor, proof of such facts may be filed within 1 year after removal of such legal disability."

SEC. 4. Subsection (5) of section 602 (d) of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940 is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(5) If any person deemed to have been issued insurance under subsection (3) (A) or (B) hereof died without filing application and within the time limited therefor, death insurance benefits shall be payable in the manner and to the persons as stated in subsection (2): *Provided*, That no application for insurance payments under subsection (2) or (3), as hereby amended, shall be valid unless filed in the Veterans' Administration within 5 years after the date of death of the insured and the relationship and dependency of the applicant, where required as a basis for such claim, shall be proved as of date of death of insured by evidence satisfactory to the Administrator: *And provided further*, That persons shown by evidence satisfactory to the Administrator to have been mentally or legally incompetent at the time the right to apply for continuation of insurance or for death benefits expires, may make such application at any time within 1 year after the removal of such disability."

SEC. 5. Section 602 (h) (1) of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940 is hereby amended by substituting a colon for the period at the end thereof and adding the following: "*Provided*, That the Administrator, under regulations to be promulgated by him, may include a provision in the insurance contract authorizing the insured or the beneficiary to elect in lieu of this mode of payment, a refund life income in monthly installments payable for such period certain as may be required in order that the sum of the installments certain, including a last installment of such reduced amount as may be necessary, shall equal the face value of the contract, less any indebtedness, with such payments continuing throughout the lifetime of such beneficiary: *Provided further*, That such optional settlement shall not be available in any case in which payments of insurance installments have been commenced prior to the date of this amendatory act."

SEC. 6. Section 602 (h) (2) of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940 is hereby amended by substituting a colon for the period at the end thereof and adding the following: "*Provided*, That the Administrator, under regulations to be promulgated by him, may include a provision in the insurance contract authorizing the insured or the beneficiary to elect, in lieu of this mode of payment, a refund life income in monthly installments payable for such period certain as may be required in order that the sum of the installments certain, including a last installment of such reduced amount as may be necessary, shall equal the face value of the contract less any indebtedness with such payments continuing throughout the lifetime of such beneficiary: *Provided further*, That such optional settlement shall not be available in any case in which such settlement would result in payments of installments over a shorter period than 120 months, nor in any case in which payments of insurance installments have been commenced prior to the date of this amendatory act."

SEC. 7. Subsection (n) of section 602 of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, as amended, is hereby amended as of October 8, 1940, by substituting a colon for the period at the end of the second proviso and inserting before the last sentence of said subsection the following as a third proviso: "*And provided further*, That in the event of death of the insured without filing application for waiver, the beneficiary, within 1 year after death of the insured or the enactment of this amendment, whichever be the later, or, if the beneficiary be insane or a minor, within 1 year after removal of such legal disability, may file application for waiver with evidence of the insured's right to waiver under the conditions of this section."

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, rather than to take the time of the Senate, I ask to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the unanimous report on the bill from the Finance Committee. It fully explains the amendment proposed to be made by the bill.

There being no objection, the report (Rept. No. 1105) was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The Committee on Finance, to whom was referred the bill (S. 2015) to liberalize certain provisions of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, as amended, having considered the same, report favorably thereon without amendment and recommend that the bill do pass.

The enactment of this legislation would authorize payment of meritorious claims which must now be denied under the provisions of existing law, and since many of the persons who would be benefited are in needy circumstances, the committee recommend early consideration of this bill. Its various provisions are explained in detail in the attached letter from the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs:

VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, June 15, 1944.

The PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE,
The Capitol, Washington, D. C.

SIR: There is transmitted herewith draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to liberalize certain provisions of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, as amended" with the request that the same be introduced and considered for the enactment at the earliest practicable date.

Experience gained in administration of the act, and developments resulting from amendatory legislation enacted during the period of the war, demonstrate the desirability of further amendments.

Section 1 of the bill would amend subsection (j) of section 602 of the National Service Life Insurance Act to provide that in any case in which the reserve of a contract of converted national service life insurance, together with dividends accumulated thereon, exceeds the aggregate amount paid in installments to any or all persons within the permitted class of beneficiaries, the difference between such amounts shall be paid to the estate of the insured unless the estate of the insured would escheat under the laws of his place of residence, in which case no payment would be made. Under the provisions of existing law no payments of national service life insurance in force at the date of the insured's death may be made in case the insured is not survived by any person within the permitted class of beneficiaries even though there are persons in being who are entitled to his estate under the provisions of his will or under the laws of descent and distribution of his place of residence. In certain cases the designated beneficiary will predecease the insured after he has carried insurance over a considerable period of time and there will be no one within the permitted class of beneficiaries living at the time of the insured's death. In such cases, it is believed that the reserve of the converted policy, which represents the amount paid as premiums in excess of the amount required for the protection afforded, together with any accumulated dividends, should be paid to the estate of the insured except where the estate would escheat.

Section 2 of the proposed bill would amend subsection (3) (A) of section 602 (d) of the National Service Life Insurance Act, effective as of October 8, 1940. Under subsection (3) (A) as now enacted, one who became totally disabled subsequent to October 8, 1940, and prior to April 20, 1942, as the result of injury or disease incurred in line of duty, which disability continued without interruption for 6 months or more, was granted $5,000 gratuitous insurance under certain circumstances and premiums due thereon were waived until 6 months after termination of total disability or until April 20, 1943, whichever was the earlier date. If death occurred before total disability continued 6 full months, no insurance can be deemed to have been granted, or if the disabled person for some reason such as mental incompetency could not apply for waiver of premiums prior to April 20, 1943, his insurance protection ceased. The amendment proposed in section 2 of the bill would grant relief in cases in which death occurs within the required 6-month period and would extend the time for making application for continuance of waiver of premiums until 1 year after the date of enactment of the bill.

Section 3 of the bill would add a new subsection (r) to section 602 of the National Service Life Insurance Act to prevent lapse of insurance in a case in which an insured is not entitled to waiver of premiums on account of total disability because death occurred prior to the continuance of such total disability for 6 months. Under existing law, waiver cannot be granted unless a total disability continues for 6 months.

Section 4 of the bill proposes an amendment of subsection (5) of section 602 (d) of the National Service Life Insurance Act to permit application for insurance payments under subsection (2) or (3) of section 602 (d) to be filed within 5 years after the date of death of the insured. Under the provisions of subsection (5) as now enacted claim must be filed within 1 year after the death of the insured or 1 year after July 11, 1942, whichever is the later date. The Veterans' Administration has been required to deny insurance benefits because application was not timely filed in cases in which the insured's death was not announced by the service departments until more than 1 year after death had occurred. The need of this amendment is apparent.

Sections 5 and 6 of the bill would amend section 602 (h) (1) and section 602 (h) (2) of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940 to authorize the election of a refund life income in lieu of the mode of payments now provided. Under the provisions of section 602 (h) (1) if the beneficiary is under 30 years of age at the time the contract matures the insurance is payable in 240 intallments, and payments will terminate after such payments are completed even though the beneficiary may continue to live many years thereafter. Under the provisions of section 602 (h) (2) if the beneficiary is 30 years or more of age at the time of the insured's death, insurance is payable in 120 installments certain with such payments continuing throughout the remaining lifetime of the beneficiary. In case a widow having a minor child, who is entitled to payments as provided in section 602 (h) (2), dies after having received one

or more installments of insurance, payments under the contract will cease after payment of 120 installments has been completed even though the total amount of the installments paid or payable is less than the face value of the policy and even though the child is too young to be capable of self-support at the time payments expire. The proposed amendments will authorize the payment of the full face value of the insurance in every instance and will also insure an income throughout the lifetime of the first beneficiary under the policy. In most instances insurance payments would continue until the child is self-supporting.

The following tables show the number and amount of the monthly guaranteed installments purchased by $1,000 on the basis of the American Experience Table of Mortality at 3 percent under a life annuity plan and the number and amount of the guaranteed installments for 120 months certain as provided in section 602 (h) (2) at the ages stated:

Refund life income

Age	Number of guaranteed installments	Amount of each installment	Sum of guaranteed installments
6	309	$3.24	$1,001.16
10	304	3.29	1,000.16
15	296	3.38	1,000.48
20	288	3.48	1,002.24
25	277	3.62	1,002.74
30	265	3.78	1,001.70
40	235	4.26	1,001.10
50	199	5.04	1,002.96
60	158	6.34	1,001.72
70	116	8.64	1,002.24

PAYMENTS FOR 120 MONTHS CERTAIN UNDER SECTION 602 (h) (2)

6	120	$3.40	$408.00
10	120	3.45	414.00
15	120	3.54	424.80
20	120	3.65	438.00
25	120	3.79	454.80
30	120	3.97	476.40
40	120	4.50	540.00
50	120	5.39	646.80
60	120	6.81	817.20
70	120	8.51	1,021.20

Section 7 of the bill would amend subsection 602 (n) of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940 to authorize the beneficiary to make application for waiver of premiums in the event an insured dies after having been continuously disabled for 6 or more months without having made application for a waiver which could have been granted upon his application. It is provided that the Administrator shall not grant waiver of premiums becoming due more than 1 year prior to receipt in the Veterans' Administration of application for the same, except that in any case the Administrator finds that failure to make timely application was due to circumstances beyond the control of the insured, or of the beneficiary if the insured is dead, an application may be accepted at a later date. It is also provided that if the failure to submit evidence of the existence or continuance of total disability was due to circumstances beyond the control of the applicant, such evidence may be accepted at a later date.

Under existing laws waiver of premiums cannot be granted except upon application by the insured. In certain cases it appears that failure to make timely application was due to the mental incompetency of the insured and in case the insured died without filing application, waiver could not be granted on application made by the beneficiary. The proposed amendment would authorize application for waiver by the insured for a longer period than 1 year after the commencement of total disability and in such cases, in the event of the insured's death, would authorize application for waiver of premiums to be made by the beneficiary.

Enactment of the provisions of the proposed bill would authorize payment of many meritorious claims which must now be denied under the provisions of existing law, and as many of the persons who will be benefited under the proposed bill are in needy circumstances the need of early consideration of the proposed legislation is apparent.

Advice has been received from the Bureau of the Budget that there would be no objection by that office to the submission of this proposed legislation to the Congress for its consideration.

Respectfully,

FRANK T. HINES, *Administrator.*

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GEORGE. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. Am I correct in my understanding that the measure is amendatory of the present law, and remedial in character, and that it comes before the Senate with the unanimous approval of the Finance Committee?

Mr. GEORGE. The Senator from Maine is entirely correct. Not only that, but it has been urgently pressed by General Hines, of the Veterans' Administration by reason of certain hardship situations which have arisen because many active men in the armed services have thought their Government insurance protected their beneficiaries and now have become somewhat disturbed. This bill is intended to remedy that situation.

Mr. WHITE. The other bill which the Senator from Georgia intends to ask to be taken up is in practically the same situation, that is, it comes to the Senate with the unanimous approval of the Finance Committee, and the earnest urging of General Hines, of the Veterans' Administration?

Mr. GEORGE. The Senator is correct.

Mr. WHITE. I hope both bills will be passed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ELIMINATION OF HARDSHIPS AND INEQUALITIES UNDER NATIONAL SERVICE LIFE INSURANCE ACT

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I now ask for the present consideration of Senate bill 2058, calendar No. 1122.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The title of the bill will be read for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (S. 2058) to liberalize certain provisions of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, as amended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That any person granted national service life insurance under Public Law 97 and Public Law 99, Seventy-seventh Congress, approved June 3, 1941, shall be deemed to have continued such insurance in force by payment of premiums whether or not such premiums were or were not paid so long as he remains in active military service as a commissioned officer and not permanently relieved from duty involving participation in regular and frequent aerial flights: *Provided*, That any premiums due and unpaid at the death of such person whose insurance is deemed to have been in force under the provisions of this section shall constitute a lien against the proceeds of such insurance.

SEC. 2. Section 602 of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940 is hereby amended by adding thereto a new subsection (s) to read as follows:

"(s) Payment of insurance benefits shall not be denied in any case in which the applicant for insurance died prior to July 1, 1942, and the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs finds that the failure to pay premiums or to effect deductions thereof as provided in section 602 (m) hereof, could in any way be attributed to the inadequacy of the Service Department's procedure for authorizing deductions of premiums from active service pay prior to that date, or to want of proper instructions as to the requirements of such procedure: *Provided*, That premiums due on such insurance shall be deducted from the proceeds of the insurance unless otherwise adjusted."

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I ask that the brief report of the Finance Committee to the Senate on this bill be incorporated in the RECORD at this point, so that the reasons for the bill may be clearly indicated.

There being no objection, the report (Rept. No. 1106), was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The Committee on Finance, to whom was referred the bill (S. 2058) to liberalize certain provisions of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, as amended, having considered the same, report favorably thereon without amendment and recommend that the bill do pass.

The purpose of this bill is sufficiently explained in the letter from the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs incorporated herein and made a part of this report. In short, the proposed amendments are necessary to eliminate hardships and inequalities resulting from the National Service Life Insurance Act, as amended to date:

VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, July 5, 1944.

The PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE,
The Capitol, Washington, D. C.

SIR: There is transmitted herewith draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to liberalize certain provisions of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, as amended," with the request that the same be introduced and considered for enactment at the earliest practicable date.

The amendments included in the proposed draft are designed to supplement the proposed amendments contained in a draft of a bill forwarded to you by the Veterans' Administration under date of June 15, 1944, and should be considered in connection with the same.

Section 1 of the draft would presume premiums were paid on the $10,000 insurance granted to aviation cadets and aviation students by Public Law 97 and Public Law 99, Seventy-seventh Congress, approved June 3, 1941. These acts granted $10,000 insurance at Government expense to aviation cadets and aviation students while undergoing training until commissioned. Until enactment of Public Law 658, Seventy-seventh Congress, approved July 8, 1942, persons so insured were not required to continue insurance after being commissioned. In many in-

stances, due to misunderstandings, such persons failed to continue such insurance by payment of the premiums after being commissioned and consequently had no insurance in force at the time of their deaths. Since enactment of Public Law 658 aviation students and aviation cadets are required to continue their insurance after being commissioned and while on duty involving participation in regular and frequent aerial flights. The proposed amendment would provide insurance for those officers who failed to continue insurance granted them under Public Law 97 or Public Law 99, Seventy-seventh Congress, and who died prior to enactment of Public Law 658, Seventy-seventh Congress.

Section 2 of the draft would add a new subsection (s) to section 602 of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, as amended, to provide that payment of insurance benefits shall not be denied in any case in which the applicant for insurance died prior to July 1, 1942, and the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs finds that the failure to pay premiums or to effect deductions thereof as provided in section 602 (m) hereof, could in any way be attributed to the inadequacy of the Service Department's procedure for authorizing deductions of premiums from active service pay prior to that date, or to want of proper instructions as to the requirements of such procedure, provided that premiums due on such insurance shall be deducted from the proceeds of the insurance unless otherwise adjusted.

There are many cases in which, for some reason or other, particularly in case of officers, premiums were not in fact deducted although the applicant for insurance clearly indicated his intention to pay premiums by means of having deductions made from his active-service pay. This was due to the inadequacies of the system of deductions of premiums from pay for active military service prior to July 1, 1942. These inadequacies have been eliminated since that date and section 2 of the draft will obviate the hardships resulting from the former system.

As heretofore stated, all of the proposed amendments have been shown by experience to be necessary to eliminate hardships and inequalities resulting from the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, as amended, to date.

Advice has been received from the Bureau of the Budget that there would be no objection by that office to the submission of this proposed legislation to the Congress for its consideration.

Respectfully,

FRANK T. HINES,
Administrator.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, the Veterans' Administration has today addressed a letter to me in which is suggested an amendment to the bill, and I shall now offer that amendment from the floor. The amendment is at the end of the bill to insert a new section as follows:

SEC. 3. Any liability under this amendatory act shall be chargeable to the National Service Life Insurance appropriation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Georgia.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I desire to thank the Senator from North Dakota for having yielded to me for this purpose.

BOARD OF REGENTS OF THE SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from North Dakota yield to me?

Mr. LANGER. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, yesterday the House passed House Joint Resolution 268, providing for the reappointment of two members of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the joint resolution, without reference to the Committee on the Library.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Kentucky?

There being no objection, the Presiding Officer laid before the Senate the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 268) to provide for the reappointment of Harvey N. Davis and Arthur H. Compton as members of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution, which was read twice by its title, considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. McLeod, one of its clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 2051) to amend the Social Security Act, as amended, to provide a national program for war mobilization and reconversion, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 1569) to amend the act entitled "An act to amend the act creating the circuit court of appeals in regard to fees and costs, and for other purposes," approved February 19, 1897 (29 Stat. 536; 28 U. S. C. 543).

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (H. R. 5125) to aid the reconversion from a war to a peace economy through the distribution of Government surplus property and to establish a Surplus Property Board to effectuate the same, and for other purposes, and it was signed by the Vice President.

POSTPONEMENT OF COURT-MARTIAL PROCEEDINGS AGAINST GENERAL SHORT AND ADMIRAL KIMMEL

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from North Dakota yield?

Mr. LANGER. I yield.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, letters continue to come to me asking why Congress has postponed the court martial of General Short and Admiral Kimmel. Apparently recent discussions in the House have not clarified that situation or definitely established the fact that Congress has not postponed the court martial. Congress has no authority to order a court martial. That is the function of the Commander in Chief, or of his Secretary of War or Secretary of the Navy. They alone could have ordered the court martial of General Short and Admiral Kimmel.

What the Congress did when the Commander in Chief did not order the court martial, and the statute of limitations would have run against an alleged offense, was only to extend the time in which the court martial might be had. We have no satisfactory answer as to why the President, the Secretary of War, or the Secretary of the Navy, has delayed ordering the court martial.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILEY. Let me finish.

I repeat that the Congress simply extended the life of the statute of limitations. Otherwise the time within which these officers could have been tried would have expired. The statute of limitations runs for 2 years, and there is some question as to whether or not the time has expired anyway. Of course, Congress could have investigated, but such procedure would have proved inadequate, as every lawyer knows. There was no way by which Admiral Kimmel and General Short could have been forced to testify. In my opinion there should have been a court martial long ago, not immediately after Pearl Harbor, but within the 2-year period, so that all the facts could have been brought out, but the Commander in Chief thought otherwise. That is his province. He has made the decision.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILEY. I shall be through in a moment, and then I shall be very happy to yield.

The lives of 3,000 of our men were snuffed out. In my opinion the American people had a right to know the truth, and the guilty persons, no matter who they may be, should not escape. Someone failed America. That is very apparent. Three thousand lives were lost, and millions of dollars of property damage resulted. Someone is chargeable with neglect which put the war in the Pacific back at least 1 year. Pearl Harbor should have been in reverse. The Japs should have been taught the lesson there that they were taught at Midway.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator now yield?

Mr. WILEY. I am very happy to yield.

Mr. HATCH. Just now the Senator said that Pearl Harbor should have been in reverse.

Mr. WILEY. Yes.

Mr. HATCH. Does the Senator intend to say, on the floor of the United States Senate, that our armed forces and our flyers should have attacked Japan as Japan attacked us? Is that his philosophy?

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I think the Senator is entirely off his base. He asks two or three questions in one. I stated that Pearl Harbor should have been in reverse.

Mr. HATCH. Yes.

Mr. WILEY. And I say that it could have been in reverse if those responsible had been on the alert, if they had been on guard. The American people have a right to know who was to blame for their

not being on guard. If they had been on guard, the 400 planes which were there would have done the job which was done at Midway. They could have dealt with the Japanese carriers and other forces which the Japanese had in that area when they attacked Pearl Harbor. That is what we did at Midway. That is what I mean by saying that Pearl Harbor should have been in reverse.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. WILEY. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. I do not wish to engage in a discussion——

Mr. WILEY. I am happy to have the Senator engage in a discussion.

Mr. HATCH. I do not wish to engage in a discussion of what might have been, because, such discussions are hopeless and confusing. I am about to say something which the Senator will resent very much at this particular moment. Such discussions are viciously partisan. I have said that, and I am not going to back up on it.

Mr. WILEY. I do not ask the Senator to back up. He is making his own bed, and he can lie in it. I have no objection to that. He can either mess it or muss it, as he chooses; but the people are entitled to know the facts.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. WILEY. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. The Senator is a member of the Committee on the Judiciary, is he not?

Mr. WILEY. I am.

Mr. HATCH. If I may say so, he is a very able member of that committee.

Mr. WILEY. I thank the Senator.

Mr. HATCH. I really think so. I never have any trouble with the Senator on the committee.

Mr. WILEY. I never have any trouble with the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. HATCH. I find him very fair, and we get along very well together. However, when he takes the floor of the Senate he assumes a different attitude when he says that the Commander in Chief is responsible for postponing the court martial. Has the Senator forgotten our committee hearings when he says that no satisfactory answer has been given?

Mr. WILEY. No; I have not forgotten what took place there. In fact, I discussed the matter with an admiral of the Navy today. I remember that what was said in executive session was for executive session only.

Mr. HATCH. And the Senator still says, on the floor of the United States Senate, that no satisfactory reason was given?

Mr. WILEY. Yes.

Mr. HATCH. Let the Senator's conscience be his guide.

Mr. WILEY. I trust the Senator also has a conscience to guide him. I am very happy to have one.

Mr. President, I realize that we are in a political campaign; but I realize, too, that every time a Senator on this side of the aisle rises to make a statement, some Senator on the other side takes it as a sort of personal affront, as if we were trying to do something in the campaign that we should not do.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President——

Mr. WILEY. Just a moment. I have allowed the Senator to interrupt. I have the floor, at least for the time being.

Mr. President, all America has been waiting for the answer. After the discussion in the House, and after a certain list of questions was submitted, which implied that the fault for Pearl Harbor was in high places and not with Admiral Kimmel or General Short, the people of America should have the answer. They should have the facts. It seems to me that the time has long since passed when the excuse can be made that witnesses from the four corners of the earth could not be summoned to testify in a court martial. That excuse does not make sense now. The people want to know why those at Pearl Harbor who had the obligation of protecting the lives and property of Americans, and the future of America were not on the alert and on guard. History shows that America was warned months before. The Secretary of State was warned that the Japanese were ready to strike. That is the only point which I make in this connection.

Mr. HATCH. The point I make——

Mr. WILEY. I make these remarks at this time because my constituents are writing to me. They have read statements in the newspapers implying that Congress has delayed this court martial, and that Congress does not want a court martial. My explanation is that Congress has had nothing to do with the deferment and delay. In the first place, it has no jurisdiction to order a court martial or if the President order one, to delay it. However, Congress did extend the time by extending the life of the statute of limitations, hoping that the time would come, in the judgment of the Commander in Chief, when the truth would be made known to the people of the country.

I now yield to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I think the Senator has fully covered his own explanation.

Mr. WILEY. I thank the Senator.

Mr. HATCH. He has made it perfectly plain that he is talking to his constituents in Wisconsin, which he has a perfect right to do.

Mr. WILEY. There are no exceptions to that, Mr. President.

Mr. HATCH. Of course there are no exceptions to the Senator's right to do so.

Mr. WILEY. I thank the Senator; I am glad he corrected himself.

Mr. HATCH. But Congress did have a responsibility, and Congress exercised its responsibility. The Senator's committee and mine sat and listened to very confidential and very secret information from both the Army and the Navy, and we—the Senator and I—decided——

Mr. WILEY. What did we decide?

Mr. HATCH. Republicans and Democrats alike——

Mr. WILEY. What did we decide?

Mr. HATCH. We decided that it would not be wise to hold a court martial at that time; and because we did not think it was wise. I did not hear the Senator's voice raised in challenge to that decision at all.

Mr. WILEY. I deny that statement. We had no jurisdiction to decide whether there would be a court martial or not, Mr. President.

Mr. HATCH. The Senator may deny his jurisdiction, but I accept my full responsibility.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, there is a difference between jurisdiction and responsibility.

Mr. HATCH. Very well; the Senator may say so if he wishes to.

Mr. WILEY. Does not the Senator agree that there is a difference?

Mr. HATCH. I say to the Senator that he and I sat in the committee and heard the story.

Mr. WILEY. Whose duty was it to order a court martial?

Mr. HATCH. The Senator may lay it on the President if he wishes to do so.

Mr. WILEY. The statute defines that. I am laying nothing on the President. He, the Secretary of War, and the Secretary of the Navy have the power to order the court martial. The Congress does not have that power. That is the law.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I seek to make no point of this controversy, except I happen to know what transpired in our committee, and I know that not a voice, either a Republican or a Democratic, was raised. I rather gloried in that. I liked the nonpartisan approach we made to that question. We extended the statute of limitations, because we did not think it would be wise, we did not think it would be in keeping with the war effort, to have the court martial held at that time. We thought the first job was to win the war, and that later if any responsibility was to be fixed, we could fix it.

But, Mr. President, now there seems to be a different attitude; the present attitude in the minds of some persons is that the first job is, not to win the war, but to win the election.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, it can be inferred from the statement just made by the distinguished Senator that, first, we—the Congress—had jurisdiction to determine when a court martial should be had, and that we determined that question. That is absolutely incorrect. We had no such jurisdiction. We, in committee, discussed the period the statute of limitations should be extended and we listened to explanations of Navy and Army heads why it would be difficult to hold a court martial.

The only issue was whether we would extend the statute. The argument was made in the committee and on the floor of the Senate by the distinguished junior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER] that the statute had run, that we could no longer even extend it.

But I agree with the distinguished Senator that in committee we did hear the testimony of admirals and generals giving reasons why they thought the President did not order the court martial. But the only issue that committee had to de-

termine was whether we should vote a 6 months' or 12 months' extension of the statute of limitations. That is what I want the people of this country to have clearly in mind. I do not want the people of the country to believe, as certain newspapers and magazines have inferred, that the Congress of the United States has deferred this court martial. We did nothing of the kind. We had no jurisdiction or authority to defer the court martial. All we did was to extend the time, so that the statute of limitations would not run against these officers, so that they could be tried when and if the higher-ups determined that a court martial should be had.

I thank the Senator for yielding to me.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from North Dakota yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TUNNELL in the chair). Does the Senator from North Dakota yield to the Senator from Michigan?

Mr. LANGER. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. As a member of the Committee on the Judiciary, I deem it my duty to say a few words on this matter, in order that the action of the Judiciary Committee may not be misinterpreted because of what has been said.

The resolution extending the time was presented in the Senate by me, and was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary. After it went there, the question of time became involved. The question was as to how long an extension should be made, whether it should be 3 months, 6 months, a year, or any other period.

I believe it cannot be said that the Committee on the Judiciary did as a matter of fact, pass on the issue whether the court martial should have been held prior to that time or should not be held during that particular period of time, because that matter was not germane to the compromise measure which finally was reported from the committee. As a matter of fact, the resolution speaks for itself when it says that, in the opinion of the Senate, the Army and Navy should forthwith proceed by inquiry into the facts, and should ascertain the facts, and should then proceed as the facts might justify. I can find nothing in the record of the committee or in my own conscience which will show that the committee or the Congress has been responsible for or has sanctioned the delay of the court martial of anyone in connection with the proceedings and the catastrophe at Pearl Harbor. I do not think it is fair to the Judiciary Committee to intimate now upon the floor of the Senate that the Committee on the Judiciary has said to the President or to anyone else that the court-martial proceedings should not have proceeded.

Mr. President, this is a serious matter. The country should know that, after all, under the Articles of War and the law which binds the Army and the Navy, court-martial proceedings are their duty, and their duty alone, and that they should not hide behind the action of the Congress.

Mr. President, let us review some of the facts in relation to the Pearl Harbor incident in respect to what happened in the Congress. I shall not take the time of the Senate to say anything about what are the actual facts at Pearl Harbor. I do not want to make this matter political. I do not want it to become a political issue, because I believe that for the people of America what actually happened at Pearl Harbor is over and above politics, and that the time will come when the people of America will know exactly what happened and, if there is any blame, upon whom that blame should fall.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. FERGUSON. I merely wish to say a few words, and then I shall yield the floor.

In the United States, the statute of limitations for courts martial was 2 years. There was an investigation. The period of 2 years elapsed, and no court martial of which I have any knowledge was ever started within that period. On the last day of the 2-year period the Congress, sensing its duty, extended the statute of limitations. There are in this body certain Senators, some of whom are lawyers, who will doubt the validity of that extension of the statute of limitations. A very serious legal problem is involved, although I personally hope it will never reach a court. It is whether the President of the United States, being out of the country, signed that extension statute within the 2-year period. There are in this body Senators who are lawyers who would say that because the President did not sign it within that period, the statutory period ran, and that therefore no proceeding can now be had under that statute. I am not one of the lawyers who share that view, because I think the Congress of the United States intended to enact that law within the statutory 2-year period, and that a court should hold that the extension is a good extension of the period.

Mr. President, I wish to say to the Senate and to the people of America that something else happened on the 7th of June 1944. On that date the Congress provided for another extension of 6 months within which the courts martial might be held so that the time now expires on the 7th of next December. I remember rising in the Senate at the close of the day's session on the 7th of June 1944, realizing my responsibility as a legislator, and wishing to see to it that no step or act be taken which would prohibit the bill extending the time from being signed on the 7th day of June 1944, providing that the last 6-month period would be a valid extension of time. I rose and obtained unanimous consent that the Vice President, our presiding officer, might sign the bill, and that it would go to the White House on that particular day, and that there would be no legal question involved as to the signing of the bill on the last day of the session. But notwithstanding the care which was taken by the Senate, the President of the United States saw fit not to sign the bill within the period, and he allowed it to go over for quite a number of days.

Mr. President, I think the people of the United States should know of that fact. If the matter ever reaches the highest court of our land, the responsibility for the time not being extended ought to be upon the doorstep of the Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy, because he alone was responsible for not signing the bill and making it law on the day it was passed by the Senate.

I shall not go into the facts as to what happened at Pearl Harbor. I shall go into the matter of the extension of time, and the question of whether the Senate, and the Judiciary Committee of the Senate, extended the time because they believed that the courts martial should not be held. I, for one, say to Senators and to the world, Mr. President, that I have no facts in my mind which brought me to a conclusion that the court martial in any particular case with regard to what happened at Pearl Harbor should not have been held. I know, however, were I not transgressing upon the time of the Senator who has yielded to me, that I could present many facts which I believe would convince every Senator who would impartially weigh the facts that the courts martial should have proceeded.

In arriving at that conclusion I have taken into consideration the words of the Commander in Chief, as well as the words of the Secretary of the Navy, when Admiral Kimmel and General Short were retired that court-martial proceedings should be held. I think the country is entitled to know if there are any other persons who were negligent, or who in any degree contributed to what took place at Pearl Harbor. I hope the time may soon come when such information may be revealed. I for one will not do anything which, in my opinion, may harm or in any way interfere with the war effort, because I think the greatest task we have confronting us is to win the war in order that we may achieve victory and return our men to their homes.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I assert, Mr. President, that the holding of a court martial with regard to the occurrences at Pearl Harbor would not in the slightest degree interfere with the war effort. So far as bringing men back to this country to testify is concerned—and I have gone into those facts—I believe that the greater part of the testimony could be given here in the Capital.

Mr. DANAHER and Mr. HATCH addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. DANAHER. I should like to speak for only a moment, if the Senator from New Mexico will pardon me. I wish to point out to the Senator from Michigan one fact which I think he could and properly should mention in connection with the action of the Judiciary Committee.

Those of us who were not members of the subcommittee received a report from the members of the subcommittee who had investigated the situation.

Mr. FERGUSON. That is correct.

Mr. DANAHER. We were advised that one of the great branches of the service had conducted no investigation whatever into the facts as to what happened at Pearl Harbor. That was why I personally penciled out and handed to a member of the subcommittee the amendment, adopted by the Congress, which called upon the services forthwith to proceed with their investigation in order that we might be given the facts. Does the Senator recall that?

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes; and I thank the Senator from Connecticut for calling that matter to my attention, because I think it should be made a part of the RECORD. What he has stated is exactly what happened.

Mr. President, I feel restrained in mentioning what happened in the subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary. I was a member of the full committee and of the subcommittee. Because it was in executive session, I feel restrained in giving my version at this particular time of what took place in the committee. I am sure the Senator from Connecticut has not revealed any secret, because the matter was of a procedural nature.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President——

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, if I have the floor I yield to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I have only a word to say. I merely wish to express my appreciation of the very good work which was done in the Committee on the Judiciary by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], by the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DANAHER], and also by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY].

Mr. WILEY. And by the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. HATCH. There was no difference of opinion among the members of the committee. The Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] introduced the resolution to which reference has been made. He sat in the committee with me and others, and listened to the testimony of representatives of the Army and the Navy. We reached a perfectly unanimous conclusion. I say to the Senator from Michigan that I never worked with a more cooperative man than he was on that occasion. There was no difference of opinion between us. The political discussions which have been taking place back and forth did not then occur because we were convinced—perhaps I should not say "we," but should say merely that I was convinced—after listening to the testimony that no good purpose could be served by insisting upon an immediate trial of Messrs. Kimmel and Short.

Mr. President, I wish also to say something in their favor. The delay and postponement of their trials has worked a very great hardship upon them. When the trials are held perhaps they will come forth with proof and evidence showing that no responsibility existed upon their part. I hope that they can produce such evidence. I know neither man, but I certainly hope that those men will be able to show, and that the evidence will disclose that there was nothing wrong in what they did and that no culpable negligence existed on their part. I much prefer always to say a good word in behalf of a fellow man than to condemn him without affording him the right of a hearing and the opportunity to produce evidence. But, Mr. President, we hear condemnation on the floor of the United States Senate today.

I am perfectly willing to accord to Admiral Kimmel and General Short every reasonable presumption of innocence, and I pray and hope that that presumption may be sustained. But Senators on the other side of the Chamber are not willing to accord such courtesy to the President of the United States. They are willing to stand on the floor of the United States Senate and without hearing, without testimony, without evidence, find him guilty and send out word to the people of America and to the world that the President was responsible for Pearl Harbor.

Mr. President, that is an attitude I condemn. Certainly I am sure that Mr. Roosevelt has made mistakes; I am quite sure he has made many of them. I am quite certain that the Secretary of State, Cordell Hull, has made many mistakes; but I should like to see the man in this Chamber who has not made mistakes.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from North Dakota yield to me?

Mr. LANGER. I think I have been most generous in yielding my time, but I will yield to the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I do not know whether I interrupted the Senator from New Mexico before he had concluded his statement.

Mr. HATCH. I had not concluded, but I do not think it is material that I conclude. My thought is, as it was in the committee, that these things ought to be determined upon a judicial basis far and aside from partisan political considerations, and I hope that may be done.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I rise because I also was a member of the subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee which considered the extension of the period of limitation for the courts martial in the cases of General Short and Admiral Kimmel.

I think it ought to be made clear that there are two questions involved. There is a question of judgment and there is a question of law. With respect to the question of law, that is to say the technicality as to whether or not the extension of the statute of limitations was made within the proper time, that, it seems to me, is a matter not of pressing importance.

Concerning the matter of judgment, however, as to when and how the courts martial in these two cases should take place, that being solely a question of judgment, we ought to take into consideration the facts which existed at the time. Hindsight always is much better than foresight. It is particularly easy in the midst of a campaign for the Presidency for those who are so minded to seek to create the impression in the minds of the people of the country that some great wrong was committed by the Commander in Chief. Members rise upon the floor of both the House and the Senate to discuss this matter and to give out inferences from which the people may draw a conclusion that delay in the courts martial was for the purpose of concealing important facts. I have in mind one gentleman who made such a statement, and, after having made the statement, he qualified it all by the clear declaration that he himself had no knowledge of the facts, but was merely talking upon information and belief.

Mr. President, the disaster at Pearl Harbor took place upon the 7th of December 1941. We were suddenly plunged into this greatest and most appalling of all global wars. A substantial part of our Navy was destroyed. We did not know what the Japanese Navy was capable of doing. Rumors were spreading up and down the Pacific coast that Japanese submarines were off the coast. The people of California and of Washington and Oregon were expressing fear lest their coast be attacked. I remember well that the distinguished late beloved minority leader, Senator McNary, of Oregon, was one of those who came before the Appropriations Committee in an effort to secure special appropriations to protect the forests of Oregon and Washington against possible disaster by reason of enemy attacks. It is easy to forget these facts.

It was a matter of judgment whether or not in such circumstances we should run the risk of exhibiting to our enemies the condition to which our naval strength had been reduced from the point of view of the Navy. If the courts martial had been held at that time we would have been spreading abroad to all the world knowledge of our weakness and we would have invited the very attack upon our coast which the residents of those States were fearful might come. It was a matter of judgment that in the circumstances then existing it was not a wise thing to bring those officers to trial. It was not a question solely of the difficulty of calling witnesses. It was also a question of calling the members of the court, because it would have been necessary to have tried General Short by a court martial, I understand, composed of general officers. It would have been necessary to try Admiral Kimmel by a court composed of officers of the same grade, unless I am very much mistaken. In other words, there was the danger that officers of the Army and of the Navy, whose time and attention and energy might best be devoted to laying plans to repel the enemy and preparing the Army and the Navy for carrying on that work, would have to sit down and hold a court martial of these two officers.

Mr. President, it is not without significance that there was no clamor in the public press or upon the floor of either House of Congress to proceed with these courts martial until the political campaign began. The extension was granted at the expiration of the first 2 years. Certainly it was done at the last moment, but the whole country, the Army and the Navy, and I imagine also the Commander in Chief, were very much concerned about other matters at that time.

Now, Mr. President, I wish to add just another word. In the conduct of a war

of this kind, a total war, we know that it is fought not only upon the battle fronts by the Army and the Navy, it is also fought upon the home front, and he who can break down the morale of the enemy upon the home front is serving a great purpose in winning victory. Any American citizen, any British citizen, any citizen of any of the United Nations who can contribute to destroying the confidence of the people of Germany in their government is serving the cause of the United Nations. Any citizen of America, or of Britain, or of any of the United Nations who can contribute to breaking down the confidence of the people of Japan in their government, is serving a great purpose in support of our war effort.

Mr. President, can it be said that those citizens of America who spend their time going up and down the country attempting to destroy the confidence of the people of America in their leadership are serving the cause of America in this war? For my part, Mr. President, I believe that such efforts to undermine our confidence in our leadership are not serving the interests of the war effort, particularly when we can look at the record which has been achieved under the leadership of the Army and the Navy.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. McLeod, one of its clerks, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled joint resolution (H. J. Res. 268) to provide for the reappointment of Harvey N. Davis and Arthur H. Compton as members of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution, and it was signed by the Vice President.

THE NORTH DAKOTA SENATORIAL PRIMARY

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I very much regret the necessity in this critical period to take the time of this body in answering an unjustified and unwarranted attack made by my colleague for reasons that could be described in no other manner than that of a purely political nature.

I might say at this point that at the time my colleague was speaking, I served notice that I would promptly answer what he said. I then gave notice last Friday that I would speak yesterday, and yesterday that I would today, and I am now speaking pursuant to that notice.

On Tuesday, September 12, my colleague from North Dakota attempted to blow up into an important incident a conversation that took place 1 year ago in this city. By the time he had finished his own interpretation of the statements contained in some affidavits made more than 6 months after the occasion referred to, he came out with a blast that a disabled veteran of foreign wars had been offered the sum of $110,000 to enter the senatorial Republican primary in the State of North Dakota as a candidate for the United States Senate in June of 1944.

I feel a personal obligation to answer this unwarranted attack. His analysis, consisting of distortions and cunning innuendoes was built upon a conversation like those which have taken place for scores of years past in our history in every other part of this country, namely a free and informal discussion of politics, national issues, and candidates.

My colleague chose to attribute the alleged offensive conduct to one of my friends, who is not at all unknown to the Members of this body, Mr. Joseph B. Keenan, who is not unknown, especially to those who have served here for a long period of time.

I wish to relate as briefly as possible the facts as I recall them and describe to the Senate what happened, that the Members thereof may form their own judgment.

On the 14th of September 1943, following an old custom in our family, I invited my wife and children to dine with me on the occasion of the birthday of one of my daughters at the Mayflower Hotel in Washington. Entirely by chance, Mr. Joseph B. Keenan, formerly the Assistant to the Attorney General, came by my table, and I invited him to sit down and visit with my family. After dinner, I requested him to meet some of my friends from North Dakota, some disabled veterans of the last war. These men came to Washington to confer on certain measures that I had introduced for the benefit of members of their organization. They had complained to me that their interests had been neglected and were kind enough to say that they felt I had shown interest in their needs and recognized the value of their services so often forgotten as time passes by, and they were grateful for my efforts. I had invited them to dinner as a group, unmindful of our family gathering set for that same evening, and I went over to see them at the Hamilton Hotel, where they were stopping, for the purpose of discussing their needs and their views, and renewing my acquaintance with many of them.

Knowing that Mr. Keenan had served in the last war overseas, that he had enlisted in the Army as a private and had earned his promotion as an officer and had received favorable comment from General Pershing and the French Government for his war services, I felt he would be interested in meeting this group of men. I told him nothing more about them other than that they were disabled war veterans from my State. As it happened, no politics of any kind was discussed between us on our way in the cab from one hotel to the other. He came with me without any thought, to say nothing of a plan, to discuss or consider any political matters of any kind. Of course, I need not add that under such circumstances no one by the wildest stretch of imagination could conjure up any plan to bring about any political coup of any kind, and the thought that under such circumstances that Mr. Keenan, who had not even planned to meet me would provide himself with a sum of money running into thousands of dollars for such a meeting would appear to be so illogical or unreasonable as to deserve no further comment. Of these facts, there can be no doubt, and they are true.

When we got to the hotel some of the men were scattered and were undoubtedly conducting themselves as any other veterans in something of the nature of a holiday away from home. Eight or nine of us were gathered in a single room in this hotel. When I came in I introduced my friend as Mr. Keenan. I am sure that he did not know the name of a single individual he was to meet nor did he know anything about them other than they were from North Dakota and were disabled war veterans.

We discussed matters concerned with these resolutions. They were profuse in their appreciation of my attention and they brought up the subject matter that they had received no such consideration from my colleague.

During the conversation that followed, which was entirely informal and participated in by almost everyone present—sometimes the men speaking in groups and sometimes listening to one person—the gathering was reminiscent of many that happened throughout this country which we might call the "hot stove" league or "cracker-barrel" league. I knew some of these men quite well and others incidentally. They did not apparently know Mr. Keenan and, of course, he did not know them.

I shall later describe somewhat more in detail the matters discussed, but because of this blown-up episode as presented by my colleague, I shall refer to the basis of his complaint.

The question of politics arose—what was being done for the veterans, when the war would be over, what the losses would be, what the reaction of the people would be, and how the soldiers would feel when they came home.

You may rest assured, Mr. President, that this subject matter was uppermost in the minds of these men. They had borne the suffering and hardship of the battlefields and carried the mark with them of the conflict. Neither myself nor my colleague had ever encountered the hardships they suffered. They knew the cruelties and hardships of war. It had been indelibly impressed upon their minds and they had known the indifference of the people at home when they were mustered out of service and left to contrive and to earn a living by their own efforts in a dislocated world.

We from North Dakota discussed the likely candidates for office. The question came up as to whether or not Lynn Stambaugh would become a candidate. I have not seen Mr. Stambaugh or at least have not conversed with him for many years, but I have considerable respect for him as a man although his political views, as expressed, have not been mine.

Some of the men spoke up and said they did not think that he would become a candidate. I talked to various members of the group, suggesting the possibility that one of their number might become a candidate for the United States Senate. For greatly as I respect the members of this body, Mr. President, I am satisfied that there are hundreds

and even thousands of good men and women in my State that could faithfully and efficiently represent North Dakota in this body. No one has a patent on a position here. No one, including Senator NYE, I hope, considers himself an indispensable man. There was a good deal of criticism from these men about the indifference of Senator NYE to their problems and his failure to do much of anything for the citizens of his State during his long tenure of office in this body.

Mr. President, candor requires me to state directly that they were the ones who complained of Senator NYE and brought up the subject matter of a candidate running to represent the veterans' views. It is well known that I have found myself unable to support Senator NYE or to agree with him on the value of his record to the citizens of our State.

I suggested to Mr. Williams, who is an employee of the Chamber of Commerce of Fargo, N. Dak., that he might become a candidate to represent the views of this organization and his members, but he said that he had a job which paid him $7,200 per year and he did not want to leave it. I talked to Mr. DeWitt, who although he was not prominent generally in North Dakota, was a recipient of the Purple Heart and of a well-known family in his State, that he might become a candidate. The field, Mr. President, even in that small group was a very wide and open one. Mr. DeWitt replied that he, too, had a job which he would risk in running for office and that he realized that for any type of campaign, some funds would have to be raised. Mr. President, I was the one who suggested and stated that I believed a fund as high as $10,000 could be raised in North Dakota to support a worth-while candidate. I initiated that conversation—not Mr. Keenan. And I might state in passing that in North Dakota I raised $11,000—mostly in small and insignificant amounts among the people of my own State—in this last campaign. Of course, I make no apology for this nor do I apologize for stating that a similar sum could be raised for the necessary expenses to make known to the people of North Dakota the views of the veterans of wars.

Mr. Keenan was asked by me what he thought were the chances for a veteran—particularly a disabled one who wore the honored Purple Heart, in seeking office in this body. Mr. Keenan replied generally that he felt the time had come in this country where the men who bore the brunt of battle and come home with the wounds and scars not alone should be, but would be, heard of and listened to since twice in one generation our men had been sent overseas, away from their farms and their shops and their ordinary peaceful way of life. He talked a good deal on this subject and he said that regardless of what the views were of any State in the Union, he did not see how their appeal would fail to register in the families and households of North Dakota and every other State of the Union because he said that there was hardly a family in this country that did not have a father, son, brother, or nephew, or a cousin, or son-in-law in the Army, or Navy, or Air Corps. He said that when this had been dramatically brought to the very hearth and hearthstones of every American family, the subject matter would be no longer academic. That every mother and father would know that what went on on the floor of this Senate was something that concerned them deeply as to whether or not there would be a vacant chair or two at their dinner table or whether their loved ones would walk on two limbs or see out of both eyes. I am deeply stirred at the remarks which he made, and I realized that he knew something of what it was to leave his law practice and his home and travel overseas and live the life of an enlisted man.

Mr. President, I, too, deeply detest and abhor wars and fighting. My views may well differ from those of my friends who conversed on this occasion and of the others who were present during these conversations, but all of us could unite upon one fact, and that is, that these wars must stop if we are to remain civilized human beings. No one, Mr. President, is more interested than myself and the constituents of my State in preventing this horrible outbreak by which our families are disseminated and our treasures and savings are dissipated into the winds. Mr. President, these conversations were not sinister ones. It would have been good and wholesome if instead of being more or less of a gossipy meeting among a dozen men, it could have taken place on the floor of the Senate. There was not a corrupt, sinister, unethical, or improper remark made during the entire evening by anyone.

Mr. President, the subject matter of campaign expenses for one running for a State-wide office is a delicate one. But our radios, our newspapers, and common carriers are still collecting fees and fares, making profits, and declaring dividends. The wheels of business and the profits of big corporations and medium sized ones are still going on. Even a disabled veteran, attempting to present his views to the public, cannot use the facilities of a radio station, board a train, or hire an automobile free. It costs money, as every Member of this body knows; and I regret to say that as time goes on it costs more and more. That is a subject which I should like to discuss on some other occasion, but the realities of life teach us that if we are not to be hypocritical these expenses must be met by anyone who seeks to present his views to the public. If he hedges and does not wish to enter this field of brambles and pitfalls, he had better make up his mind to stay out of public life. It was for such reason that I made the suggestion that a sum of $10,000, which every Member of this body will realize to be a modest one, could be raised and should be raised for such wholesome purposes and for an entirely legitimate and necessary purpose.

Mr. Keenan stated that he felt that a veteran would have a peculiar appeal at this time. He was not wrong, because a veteran did run, and came within less than a thousand votes of becoming the nominee of the last Republican primary in my State. Undoubtedly, he did say that he felt that many people of this country would be interested in procuring the necessary expenses for such purposes, and I am sure he would make no apology for this remark. But I wish to emphasize that there is a sharp difference between stating that one believes a necessary sum of money would be subscribed to present the views of the veterans in a State-wide campaign and offering a sum of money to an individual to put in his pocket as compensation for entering into any political contest. Mr. President, no such statement or proposal was either directly or indirectly made to any person at that meeting. The events leading to this informal meeting, unplanned, undesigned and unexpected by Mr. Keenan, to turn into even a political discussion, would negate the claim of anyone that $10,000 or any other substantial sum was present at that meeting or in the possession of any individual, including, of course, Mr. Keenan, who was my guest. Of course, my colleague knows that what I am stating is true; and from his long political experience, he should well know that what I am stating is the truth.

Think of it, Mr. President. Think of the proposition that the Senator puts to this body and asks it to take seriously—that Mr. Keenan, an absolute stranger, would come into a meeting before a group of men whom he had never met and whose names he did not know, and single out an unknown man and attempt to press upon him the acceptance of $110,000 for his own very self, as some kind of sinister gesture or bribe, to persuade him to become a candidate for office, and offer him, before this group of strangers, $110,000 for his own very self. Mr. President, everyone at that meeting knows that no such thing happened, nor anything like it. It does not even square with ordinary common sense or the action of those of high-school age.

Mr. President, some of the events that transpired since that incidental meeting or gathering a year ago are important to review. Although Mr. Williams states that he reported promptly to Senator NYE after the meeting took place, nothing whatever happened until the eve of the primary in North Dakota, approximately 10 months later. Then, for the first time, rumbles occurred and testimony was given exparte by Mr. Williams before the Subcommittee on Privileges and Elections of this body. He did not mention Mr. Keenan's name but referred to a "Mr. McSheehan" and he spoke of $10,000 and gave a distorted version of that sum of money being offered to Mr. DeWitt, who, Williams said, would have accepted it, he believed, had not Williams, the guardian angel, been present. Mr. NYE, in his public appearances—and I have before me the newspaper accounts—time and again, not in one meeting, but in several—at Minot, at Grand Forks, and all over North Dakota—10 months after he had heard this story with all of the lurid elaborations, constantly referred to the sum of $10,000. Never once, as the newspaper accounts will demonstrate, did he mention $110,000. This was not a new theme for my colleague. In his last primary election

he claimed that he was being persecuted by the munition manufacturers who were after his scalp, for they were the ones he said were dead set against him, and Senator NYE was Horatius at the bridge defeating their sinister propositions. The sworn truth was that they did not contribute a penny, as was shown by my sworn report to the committee. He complained of scrap that was being sent to Japan, but he never introduced any measure for its embargo. So in this late primary he used the figure of $10,000 and left out names until he was severely shocked and frightened by slipping through by only a little more than 900 votes.

Then when he realized that he had a sharp contest on his hands by a vigorous campaigner who could state the views of the veterans, he evidently made up his mind to blow up the situation and get some national publicity, which should be concentrated in his own State; and again he adopted the martyr role. Presto. The $10,000 is now blown up to $110,000. Surely this is an amount that would hit the headlines; and again he could pose as a martyr chief, with the forces of evil pouring money into his State to deprive the United States of America in general of his valiant services. So he took the occasion of this talkfest and haphazard meeting to attempt to put across on the American Nation a story that is as absurd as anyone could read in Grimm's Fairy Tales. This time, Mr. Keenan, whom he attempted to connect in a nebulous way with the administration, had come into the meeting before many strangers to offer another stranger $110,000. Mr. President, if the affidavits are examined carefully by the subcommittee, it will be found that even the $110,000 is left open at one end to be blown up into an unlimited sum. Later I shall read some of the testimony to prove this point. Of course, it is necessary in his role of martyr to affix some sinister purpose to this entire affair. Let us analyze it for a moment. What is the crime which he charges? Even if this fairy tale could come about by the touch of a wand, was Mr. DeWitt asked to do anything corrupt or wrongful? What did these great powers of money expect to get from Mr. DeWitt if he were elected? Was he to vote to lower corporate taxes or to support the Republic Steel Co. in engaging strikebreakers to curb labor? Was he to sell out our country? Was he to join some subversive group or affiliate himself with the paid agents of foreign countries? Was he to become a stooge for money of subversive interests? Not at all. In this fantastic story one can reach from one end of these affidavits to the other and he will find that no one at that meeting even remotely suggested that he do anything other than become a candidate to represent the views of the wounded veterans of our wars. Mr. President, since when did that become a high crime and misdemeanor? That is all there is to this charge. Should these interests be represented?

Should the soldiers be aided in telling the people of their own communities and even throughout the Nation of the horrors of war and the necessities of those who had suffered all types of horrors from shell shock to the loss of limb? Mr. President, if it were true that an individual were offered a sum of money to present these views of the American people, I do not know how money could be better expended. You will note that this stranger to Mr. Keenan was not importuned in this gathering to represent any party or group other than the most worth-while and long-suffering and deserving members of our community, those who had actually shed their blood on the field of battle. Mr. President, it is an unwholesome act, and I am bound to designate it as utterly reprehensible, to attempt to distort the objects of this conversation and make them appear to the American people as some type of corrupt, sinister conduct upon the part of any individual. Mr. President, the rules of this body state "that no Senator in debate shall directly or indirectly by any form of words impute to another Senator or to other Senators any conduct or motive unworthy or unbecoming a Senator." But here, on the floor of this important body, Members thereof can directly or indirectly impute to others than Senators conduct or motives unworthy or unbecoming, but they are cloaked with immunity and cannot be questioned therefor elsewhere. I do not propose, Mr. President, to have a friend of mine like Mr. Keenan treated in that way by any Senator upon this floor, without raising my voice in protest.

I wish to affirm again directly and without equivocation that no sum of money was offered to any individual present by any other individual including Mr. Keenan or myself. The situation was of the nature that I have described above, and I believe it will be apparent to everyone who hears or reads my remarks that the very nature of this meeting could have produced nothing else but the situation I have described.

Regardless of the fact that I have no affiliations whatsoever with Lynn Stambaugh, I resent this action upon the part of any Member of this body to attempt by inuendo to affect his own candidacy for office. As I interpret it, this is an attempt to hit at Lynn Stambaugh, who is a candidate against Senator NYE, over my shoulder. I regard it as a brazen, unprincipled attack for purely political purposes. I cannot do otherwise, because I was present throughout this entire meeting and I know everything that took place.

I have been used to the tactics of my colleague—not alone here on the floor of the Senate since I was elected to this office by my people, but while I was Governor of North Dakota. I have known of the scurrilous charges that have been made against me, where I have been shot at and hunted through Government agents, private individuals—always with politics as the background. But when the matter has come to culmination in each and every instance, I have been vindicated, as I was in being seated in the Senate after a wierd and unheard-of type of investigation, my record peered into by investigators for a period of more than 20 years, my private life investigated, my professional career as a lawyer attacked; but when the smoke all cleared away and the wheat was separated from the chaff and the grease smear dissolved, I was vindicated. My colleague impelled the present Secretary of the Interior, Harold Ickes, to send a force of detectives to North Dakota to investigate my record as Governor. This was done, and I was cruelly brought into court at a cost to our Government of over one-half million dollars to answer fantastic and trivial charges. But when the smoke had cleared away and great damage had been done to me, the United States Circuit Court of Appeals found that the charges against me were unfounded.

I say today that I know of few men in the history of this country more often and more thoroughly investigated than myself. But, somehow or another, my colleague has been on the very threshold of acts that warranted the sharpest types of investigation, and he has remained free from all investigation. I would suggest that in the paper shortage that is heralded throughout the Nation we look into the tens of thousands of copies of rotogravure nature of the Chicago Tribune that were flooded into the State of North Dakota during the last primary campaign. There are countless other activities that might warrant a careful search of his record.

Mr. President, I make no bones of my position. There is nothing that I regard more highly than loyalty to this country, but I have always contended that free speech should be left untrammeled, and I have objected to notable efforts to curtail it in this country. I have visited the sedition trial where several of those who have been under Government attack are former cronies of Senator NYE's. When they were exercising what they believed to be their privilege in this country, they were welcomed; but when they were being shot at, Senator NYE was strangely absent from their side.

Mr. President, my record in behalf of war veterans did not begin at the informal gathering held 1 year ago. I am glad some members of the subcommittee are now in the Chamber, because I want them to know that in September 1942, in Monroe, Wis., the President endeavored to remove a disabled war veteran, Jack Burkhardt, as postmaster. It was charged that while he was department commander of the American Legion he had given some speeches in Wisconsin, and by doing so that he had neglected his duties as postmaster. In his place the President appointed an ex-brewery owner. The Senators from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE and Mr. WILEY] protested, but over their protest the Senate Post Office Committee reported against Mr. Burkhardt. Single-handed, I brought in a minority report on the Senate floor, and, with the help of the two Senators from Wisconsin, succeeded in throwing out the ex-brewery man named by the President, and Mr. Burkhardt stayed in as postmaster, and is still postmaster at Monroe, Wis., today.

The speech I gave upon that occasion pleased the disabled war veterans of North Dakota. Andy Nomland and Neal

Williams, two of the men who made the affidavits, were especially interested, and requested many copies of that speech. Mr. President, I made no attempt to turn this into a political advantage at election time. In replying to their request for copies of that speech, I wrote Mr. Williams, the man who testified before the subcommittee, and who then was department commander, on October 9, as follows:

Hon. NEAL E. WILLIAMS,
Senior Vice Commander,
Disabled American Veterans,
Grand Forks, N. Dak.

DEAR NEAL: I wrote you at the request of Andy Nomland on October 7 and stated that some additional copies of the speech given in behalf of Disabled War Veteran Jack Burkhardt, postmaster of Monroe, Wis., were available.

However, it seems to me that we had better not get these out until after election, November 3, because it might possibly be interpreted as involving the Disabled War Veterans in politics and I do not want to do this. I am interested in seeing that the Disabled War Veterans get a square deal whether in the post office or any other capacity.

With kind personal regards and every good wish to you and yours, I am,

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM LANGER.

Upon receipt of this letter, Mr. Williams wrote Mr. Nowland sending me a copy, which I now hold in my hand, and which you will note bears Mr. Williams' signature in ink, together with a notation at the bottom which reads as follows:

DEAR BILL: Many thanks for what you are doing for us. Keep up the good work. In due time you will be rewarded.

N. E. W.

My fellow Senators will note the exceptional care I exercised even at this time not to take political advantage in any way which might militate against these brave men who sacrificed so much for this country.

In June 1943 at the convention of the Disabled American Veterans, Department of North Dakota, the resolutions committee, consisting of Neal E. Williams, chairman, Norman G. Scharblie, Fred Gaglie, Herbert Turner, and F. C. DeWitt, all of whom have been officials of the Disabled War Veterans of North Dakota, sent me 40 resolutions and 40 bills carrying these resolutions into effect, and I therefore, on June 9, upon the Senate floor stated:

Mr. President, I wish to state that, as I have said before, all the bills were carefully drawn by the disabled war veterans of the State of North Dakota. After having gone over them and examined them with experts who have been in touch with the Veterans' Bureau, there does not seem to be any disputing the fact that the disabled war veterans of the United States have not been receiving the kind of treatment to which they feel they are entitled and to which I think they are entitled, in view of the fact that they were disabled in World War No. 1.

The bills introduced by Mr. LANGER were severally read twice by their titles, and referred, as indicated.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the list of bills and the numbers, being Senate bills 1176 to 1215, inclusive, be printed at the end of my remarks, coming exactly in the same manner as they appeared on page 5535 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of June 9, 1943.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, the RECORD shows that I introduced more measures for disabled war veterans on that 1 day than Mr. NYE has introduced during the 18 years he has been here. On that day I also called attention to the fact that I had gone over these bills "with experts who have been in touch with the Veterans' Bureau."

As commerce counsel for the Chamber of Commerce at Fargo, N. Dak., Mr. Neal Williams wrote me on November 9, 1942 asking me personally to call on the President and urge the reappointment of Claude Porter, a Democrat from Iowa, and Clyde Acheson, a Republican from Oregon, as members of the Interstate Commerce Commission and I took care of that request promptly.

Thereafter, in March 1943, when I was endeavoring to get an alcohol plant located in North Dakota, Neal Williams again wrote me commending my efforts. Shortly before that, I had cooperated with Senator GEORGE in eliminating from the 1942 revenue bill a House provision providing a 5 percent sales tax on freight and express charges, and Mr. Williams wrote me, "It pleases me to know that you can step in to block this unfair measure."

On February 29, Mr. Williams wrote me:

DEAR BILL: First I want to thank you for the prompt action you gave us in getting refrigeration cars for the movement of seed potatoes out of the Red River Valley.

Then, after writing me about getting the alcohol plant located somewhere between Fargo and West Fargo, he closed his letter thus:

With every good wish and again thanking you for the good work you did in jarring these refrigerator cars loose for the movement of seed potatoes, I remain,

Sincerely yours,

NEAL B. WILLIAMS,
Commerce Counsel.

On July 25, a year before, he wrote me about legislation dealing with the readjustment of pay for soldiers and sailors, thanking me for voluntarily sending this to him.

On June 11, 1943, Mr. Williams telegraphed Millard W. Rice, national service director, Disabled American Veterans, Munsey Building, Washington, D. C., with reference to the 40 bills I had introduced. I ask unanimous consent that the telegram be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

There are many American Legionnaires in Senate located there whom I am satisfied would help if the matter was put squarely to them by members of Legion and a hard earnest intelligent presentation of the inequalities your comrades are now suffering should be presented. Will make arrangement for appearances and suggest you wire whom to contact in Washington who in your judgment will give most efficient and enthusiastic assistance. Have you contacted Senator LANGER?

Mr. LANGER. Within a few days, Mr. Rice came to see me.

Mr. President, how does it happen that the disabled war veterans are involved here after I had advised against the suggestion of Nomland to distribute a speech which might have involved their organization in politics?

On October 3, after I had given the Monroe speech, among other things, Mr. Nomland wrote me as follows:

DEAR BILL: I have your speech made to the Senate September 14, 1942, regarding veterans' preference. Thank you very much. I am glad to know that we have at least one "he-man" in Washington that has gut-enough and sufficient brains to tell our so-called honest politicians how they have sidetracked the war veterans for the past 24 years.

* * * * *

May I suggest that you mail a copy of your speech to each of the gentlemen whose names appear on this letterhead and one to the Disabled American Veterans, care of the adjutant, at Bismarck, Fargo, Minot, and Devils Lake; also, mail one to the adjutant of every American Legion in North Dakota.

He then stated:

Politics will start humming around here in about a week. I am treasurer of the Grand Forks County Republican Committee so I'll be right in the midst of it.

Thanking you again for hearing from you, I am,

Yours truly,

ANDY NOMLAND.

Mr. President, let the Senate decide whether he kept his word when he said, "Politics will start humming around here in about a week. I am treasurer of the Grand Forks Republican County Committee, so I'll be right in the midst of it."

He was "in the midst of it" when he made the affidavit for Mr. NYE.

In accordance with his request, I wrote to the following: Hon. E. D. Johnson, Grand Forks; Hon. W. R. Johnson, Fargo; Hon. Arthur M. Johnson, Fargo; Hon. F. F. Patterson, Woodworth; Hon. A. V. Sheppard, Grand Forks; Hon. H. L. Turner, Grand Forks; Hon. Victor Thom, Goodrich; Hon. C. T. Hoverson, Fargo; Hon. Jans Claussen, Minot; Hon. Theodore Martell, Bismarck; Hon. Frank Mazzoni, Grand Forks; Hon. Don Daelley, Devils Lake; Hon. F. C. DeWitt, Minot; Hon. Floyd Castle, Grand Forks; Hon. N. P. Bergquist, Fargo; Hon. Thomas M. Geragherty, Fargo; Hon. Charles Wilson, Fargo; Hon. William H. Johnson, Minot; Hon. Erick Keck, Devils Lake; Hon. William Kennedy, Grand Forks; Hon. H. M. Leonhard, Bismarck; Hon. Elmer J. Pearson, Minot.

All are officials of the Disabled American Veterans with the Department of North Dakota, and to each and every one of them on October 9 I wrote:

I wrote you at the request of Andy Nomland on October 7 and stated that some additional copies of the speech given in behalf of Disabled War Veteran Jack Burkhardt, postmaster of Monroe, Wis., were available.

However, it seems to me that we had better not get those out until after election, November 3, because it might possibly be inter-

preted as involving the Disabled War Veterans in politics, and I do not want to do this. I am interested in seeing that the Disabled War Veterans get a square deal whether in the post office or any other capacity.

With kind personal regards and every good wish to you and yours, I am

Sincerely.

So, Mr. President, it is quite obvious that it is not I who is endeavoring to embroil the disabled veterans in politics.

Following the above correspondence, a group of those veterans came to Washington on September 13, 1943, among them being Neal Williams, Mr. DeWitt, and Andy Nomland. The delegation arrived in Washington on September 13. They came to my office to thank me for what they termed the "splendid services." I was giving them, and stated that for the first time they had someone in the Senate from North Dakota who was interested in legislation for the disabled war veterans. This made me feel pretty good and I invited them to have dinner with me that evening.

Mr. President, as I have said, politics was mentioned quite incidentally. Andy Nomland, not I, as you will note from the letter from the State department adjutant, had first mentioned politics, and I challenge anyone—Mr. NYE or anyone else—to find a single political letter that I have written to any of them, or to any disabled war veteran anywhere. Mr. President, they, not I, stated that Mr. NYE was "no good" to the returned disabled soldiers, and that they wanted another Senator from North Dakota who would be interested in their welfare. It was then I said that anyone in their group would make as good a United States Senator as either Senator NYE or myself, and that thousands of men and women in North Dakota could capably fill the job. Certainly there were thousands who would take more interest in North Dakota than Mr. NYE has since he has been a Member of the Senate.

It was then that I was asked whom the Nonpartisan League was going to support. I told them I had met several league leaders in the State, and that they were groping about for a candidate, mentioning several names and stated further that of course I would support whomsoever the Nonpartisan League endorsed, but I thought there was an excellent chance of the league supporting a veteran of either World War No. 1 or World War No. 2, and especially so if some of the heroes of Guadalcanal were available.

I also said it seemed to me that Mr. DeWitt had nothing to lose by running, and the league might endorse him. But even, if not, that if he ran and lost, the history of North Dakota politics showed that ever since the primary election system was inaugurated there had always been a three-way senatorial fight. That disposes of the charge that there was something wrong on my part getting Mr. DeWitt to run—going to make a three-way fight out of it, and this conversation was 10 months before the primary. When Mr. McCumber ran for reelection, Ormsby McHarg and Lynn Frazier also ran; when Mr. A. J. Gronna ran, Andy Hiller and John Worst also ran; and coming to the League days, Senator NYE himself had been the first to inaugurate the three-way split. After USHER BURDICK had defeated Mr. Sinclair for Congress, Mr. NYE supported Mr. Sinclair on the Independent ticket. I mentioned that one of the men had become Treasurer of the United States and NYE's unsuccessful candidate, Sinclair, was put on the Mexican Claims Commission. Evidently successful candidates had seemed to see to it that opponents who conducted a clean campaign would likely be appointed to some job and mentioned the collector of internal revenue, the United States marshal, and other positions. For example, Nygaard, who ran against NYE and myself in 1938 had been rewarded by a Federal job—the very man who ran on the Democratic ticket against Mr. NYE and myself. I liked DeWitt and I urged him or some other liberal disabled war veteran to run.

Mr. President, it was heartbreaking to sit there listening to the alleged ill-treatment that these disabled war veterans of World War No. 1 had received for years at the hands of politicians holding office, the lack of attention to their wishes, the cold, brutal treatment of the men who had risked their lives, who had been wounded and gassed, and some even sent to insane asylums. This callousness toward the men who had been wounded and gassed was reason No. 1 they said for looking about for a sympathetic fighting candidate.

Mr. Williams said in his testimony that we met at 15 minutes to 9 and left the hotel at 12:30, which would be a little less than 4 hours, and during that 4 hours of conversation, many, many things were, of course, discussed. I have read Mr. Williams' testimony which Mr. NYE placed in the RECORD on Tuesday, and read it in 10 minutes.

Early in the conversation one of the gentlemen from Fargo stated he had recently talked with former Gov. L. B. Hanna and that the former Governor had been most complimentary in his remarks concerning me. Hanna had commented that some folks thought he had given North Dakota a good business administration, but that he had been Governor in good times, whereas Governor LANGER had been Governor during 4 years of drought when nobody was paying taxes, including the railroads, and he marveled how the State had gotten by without issuing a single dollar in bonds. The speaker, who I believe was Mr. Williams, continued, saying that Governor Hanna had stated that not only "had LANGER not permitted the State to issue bonds but he had gone to New York to meet with the financiers there with the result that for the first time in the history of North Dakota, the State bonds rated A, making them available to insurance and trust companies for reserves, which automatically made them worth considerably more." Since North Dakota owned eleven or thirteen million dollars worth, he earned the taxpayers just that much. Mr. Hanna also said he had been a very good friend of my father's and that although he was not in agreement with me politically, he had lived neighbors with the LANGER family in Cass County for 50 years, and considered them one of the finest families in the State. Of course, I was pleased to hear this from one of my political opponents.

Andy Nomland stated at various times that he was treasurer of the Republican Party at Grand Forks and had a great deal to say about the politics, not only of the county of Grand Forks, but of the whole northeastern part of the State.

Someone else said that a short time ago he had visited someone who had been talking to the superintendent of the State hospital for insane at Jamestown, Dr. Fisher, and Dr. Fisher stated that he had never voted for LANGER, but you have to give the devil his due, he certainly did a good job cleaning up this hospital when he was Governor and it took a lot of guts to do it.

During the evening someone mentioned that he had met "Happy" Paulson of the Fargo Forum at the Elks Club. He said, "We were over there drinking" and politics came up and Happy had said, "I hate that man LANGER. I used to think I hated him the worst of any fellow in the State but now I hate Oscar Erickson worse; that the League is through; LANGER is never going back. The Fargo Forum will see to that. We are going to reelect NYE and I know what I am talking about because the Fargo Forum controls this part of the State. Our subscription list is way up. We talk to over 100,000 people a day. Since LANGER has left the State, the League has gone to hell and we are going to keep it there, and NYE's fight to unseat him down there in Washington didn't do him any good." Whoever the fellow was that was talking to Happy said, "Will you note that the Senate seated him 2 to 1 with all of the Progressives voting for him. Doesn't that clear up his situation pretty well?" "Well," Happy said, "you may think so but you wait until we turn loose when he runs again and we rehash all those bond deals." Then Happy was asked, "Didn't Bob Stangler testify to those bond cases that LANGER had nothing to do with them, that the bonds were all sold in 1934, 1935, and 1936, while Welford and Olson were Governors?" Happy said, "Yes, that's true all right, but how many people know it." Then the speaker continued, "But I tell you I don't believe Happy. LANGER has certainly helped the veterans, and the farmers, and the small-business fellows. Only the other day I heard a letter carrier say that the national magazine had an article that you were one of the best friends the post-office employees had, so you may know a lot of those letter carriers and post-office employees and rural mail carriers will know what you have been doing for them. I don't believe the Fargo Forum can beat you. Why I even talked to Francis Murphy recently and he says even a fellow like Angus Frazer, who has always fought you is getting to be kind of neutral and isn't as bitter as he was. You know when a fellow is out of the State the people kind of forget about him and they say, 'Well, he isn't such a bad fellow after all.' But don't get me wrong, you

are not going to carry Fargo. Don't think you will carry Cass County, but you are going to get a better vote than you got last time, because us veterans will never forget what you did for us, how you went to bat for us on these 40 bills. Isn't that right fellows?"

Several times they came back to the fight that had been made to unseat me in the Senate, and of them said Happy Paulson told them he felt very badly, that the majority leader, Senator BARKLEY, had told Governor Moses not more than 15 Senators would vote to seat me and they could rely upon that statement. Some of the fellows in Fargo had bet some money and lost it, and they thought that the majority leader certainly ought to know more than to say that LANGER was only going to get 15 votes, when he ended up with getting over 50.

During the discussion it was taken for granted that Senator NYE was going to run again, although he was not yet a candidate. Statements were also made that NYE would have an awful lot of money back of him, that Jaffrey, the president of Soo Railroad at the time NYE had his automobile accident, had placed his own special private railroad car at NYE's disposal, had taken him to Washington, and that the Fargo Forum had printed a picture of NYE in Jaffrey's special railroad car with a nurse taking care of him, and someone said, "How are you going to beat Senator NYE when the Soo Railroad is back of him, and when you remember that this man Jaffrey is also the head of one of the chain of banks all over the Northwest, and worth millions upon millions of dollars? Someone else also spoke up and said that Brandt, of Minot, head of the First National Bank there, had stated that his bank controlled Ward County and that he and a man named Christianson were going to see that NYE carried it by a large majority.

They asked me what I thought about the situation, and I said I thought NYE would have the solid backing of big business. Judging from LA FOLLETTE'S Progressive magazine, the Girdler of the Republic Steel Co., and others like him, would back him.

Mr. NYE is the last man who should have risen on the Senate floor to make these charges. He must indeed think the voters of North Dakota have short memories. The ridiculousness of the charge must be all the more apparent to North Dakota people when they remember that only a few years ago he went all over the State saying in his speeches that I was "greedy for nickels, dimes, and quarters." Certainly my political enemies must laugh in derision at NYE when they hear him saying that $110,000 was being paid out by BILL LANGER and his friends, and was for once not being received by BILL LANGER.

Mr. President, I am pained to have to give this speech. Mr. NYE knows I had more to do with his entrance into public life in North Dakota than almost any other man. The newspaper, the Tower City Topics, whose policy I directed at that time, as I can prove by correspondence, was the first newspaper in the State to mention him for Congress. This was done in the form of an editorial. I lived in that congressional district, and helped secure his endorsement for Congress at the hands of the Nonpartisan League. Later, when he was appointed to the Senate, I assisted the Women's Club of the Nonpartisan League in buying him a suit of clothes, socks, shoes, and ties, and helped get money for his railroad fare down here. I contributed to his milk and grocery bills left unpaid at Fryburg when he moved from there to Cooperstown. I also wrote to the senior Senator from California (Mr. JOHNSON), whose campaign for President I had helped manage in North Dakota, saying I believed NYE was a man with liberal views and I hoped he would vote to seat him in the Senate.

In his speeches in North Dakota, Mr. NYE had said many times, "When the Fargo Forum supports me for office, you will know I have sold the people out," but, Mr. President, some 9 years ago the Fargo Forum, which had bitterly hated Mr. NYE, which had continuously ridiculed him, suddenly started supporting him, which culminated finally in their open advocacy of him and the appointment of Gerald Novius, the Forum's political writer, and one of the worst enemies of the Nonpartisan League in North Dakota, as Mr. NYE's secretary.

Mr. President, Mr. NYE has a perfect right to his views. If he thinks he was wrong in the earlier years of his office in the Senate, when he used to vote with the farmer, when he used to vote with the common people, he has a right to change. I realize that here in Washington, where a man gets away from his constituents and instead of mingling with hard-working, calloused-hand farmers and laborers, he spends his time in a city infested with slickers and blondes and cocktail parties and special-pressure groups, a man may change. I may not have changed, because I have not been here long enough, but it is significant that when LA FOLLETTE'S Progressive and the Nonpartisan League supported the Senator, the Fargo Forum was fighting him, and that now the positions are exactly reversed.

Then there is the Chicago Tribune, formerly a bitter enemy of the Nonpartisan League, calling us "free lovers, Socialists, and what not," yet in the last election, as I have said, I was informed that thousands upon thousands of editions of the Chicago Tribune were sent all over North Dakota containing a rotogravure page about my colleague. I suggest to the Elections Committee that the connection of the Chicago Tribune and its officials with the Senator might be most interesting.

Among other things mentioned by the veterans that evening was Mr. NYE's inability to get anything for North Dakota, since he would not cooperate with any President. It was said Mr. NYE fought with Republican President Harding, he fought with Republican President Coolidge, and he fought and ridiculed President Hoover, and has been fighting President Roosevelt ever since he took office. No wonder North Dakota cannot get anything. I remarked that there might be a lot of truth there, and that I thought a Senator should try to get along the best way he can with the President and with department heads. Another man spoke up and said, "I notice you have been voting with President Roosevelt pretty much," and I simply replied that I voted with the President when I thought he was right, and against him when I thought he was wrong.

I was then asked what I thought of Mr. NYE's foreign policy and I said that Mr. NYE gave a radio speech against Mr. Roosevelt's foreign policy in 1938 criticizing Mr. Roosevelt because he was friendly to Germany and Italy. One of the fellows, who was a Catholic and proud of it, said Mr. Roosevelt was condemned by Mr. NYE because the Catholics were in control in Spain and Mr. NYE wanted to arm the Germans so they could throw the Catholics out.

Of course, the Ku Klux Klan was mentioned and one man said he had seen a membership card of Mr. NYE's in the K. K. K. Then it was remarked that the speaker doubted that, because Mr. Stern, a Jew, had been Mr. NYE's best man at his second wedding, and if Mr. NYE had been a Ku Kluxer, Stern would not have been his best man. Then a veteran spoke up and said he lived in Grand Forks when F. Halsey Ambrose was the grand kleagle of the K. K. K., and that Ambrose had stated that Mr. NYE had sent for him to come to Washington at the time his seating was in doubt, and that he spent 2 months down here getting Mr. NYE seated.

As Mr. Williams testified, the conversation lasted nearly 4 hours, and as shown a great deal was said, and it is a bit difficult to remember all the various subjects now, a year later. But the general impression seemed to be that the disabled war veterans had not received the consideration and help from NYE they felt they were entitled to, and that the 40 bills I had introduced were what they liked, and that I had done a good job for them.

Now I direct myself particularly to the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], chairman of the subcommittee. To show the confusion in the affidavits of these men and in Williams' evidence, let us examine the testimony of Mr. Williams, which was not given under oath. He states that I introduced Mr. Keenan as "Tom McSheehan," but Mr. DeWitt contradicted that, and under oath stated:

> At about 9 o'clock Senator LANGER put in his appearance with an individual who he introduced to all those assembled as Mr. Keenan, or a name somewhat similar, whom he explained was a friend of his who lived in Washington.

So I say to the chairman of the subcommittee that we have the man who testified before the subcommittee saying that I introduced a man by the name of "Tom McSheehan," but he did not testify under oath. Mr. DeWitt testified under oath that I brought the man into the room, and when everybody was there assembled, introduced his as Mr. Keenan.

Oscar Winter, of Grand Forks, says under oath "that he understood the name of Senator LANGER'S friend to be Joe

Keenan, instead of Tom McSheehan," as Mr. DeWitt stated.

So that two of the men who were present made oath and said that Mr. Williams was mistaken when he said that I brought in Tom McSheehan.

Nor, Mr. President, do they agree on this $110,000. After Senator NYE first heard this story from Mr. DeWitt at Minot, NYE said it was $10,000. When Mr. NYE spoke at the Labor Hall in Minot his talk was reported in the press, and I have a copy of one of the newspapers here. He said that the sum mentioned was $10,000. That was 10 months after Mr. DeWitt and Mr. Williams had seen Mr. NYE. When Senator NYE spoke at Grand Forks later, he said he had talked the matter over with Mr. Nomland as well as Mr. DeWitt, and the report came out in the papers and it was still $10,000. Mr. NYE, although he was not present at the "party," as he called it, Tuesday, apparently refreshed Mr. Williams' recollection. Mr. Williams then alleged that he understood Mr. DeWitt was to get "$10,000, and then $50,000 more if he makes good," as appear on pages 7 and 9 of this testimony of Mr. Williams which I hold in my hand.

By this time DeWitt had evidently become even more enthusiastic than Mr. Williams, because he said that Mr. Keenan had stated:

> As a matter of fact, we are prepared to start the thing off with $10,000 cash right now, to be followed by an additional sum of $50,000, and, if necessary, an additional $50,000 will be made available.

So we now have $110,000.

Upon reading the affidavit Senators will find that Charles Gran and Oscar Winters hedged. They did not say the affidavit is true and correct. Out of their hazy recollections of the many things that took place at that party is true only in what they remember of it. Mr. Shirley says he was not present in Mr. DeWitt's room while this party was on and so knows nothing.

Apparently Mr. Nomland was the most enthusiastic of all the affidavit signers. He says that Mr. Keenan's statement was:

> We will start him out with $10,000 cash immediately, with an additional $50,000 as the campaign progresses and any additional amount necessary. Of course, that depends upon the kind of showing he makes.

So what have we here? We have one man who says that Mr. DeWitt was to get $10,000. Then 10 months later, when Mr. NYE squeezed through by the skin of his teeth, we find the same man saying "It was $10,000 plus $50,000 more if a showing was made." Then we have Mr. DeWitt making affidavit that it was to be $10,000, followed by an additional sum of $50,000, and, if necessary, an additional $50,000, or $110,000. Then, finally, we have Mr. Nomland, who says:

> It was $10,000 plus $50,000, and any additional sum necessary. Of course, that depends upon the kind of showing he makes.

There we have the statements of men who attended the party—that two of them at first said it was $10,000; then one increased it to $10,000 plus $50,000 "if a showing was made"; and the next gentleman says it was $10,000 plus $50,000 plus $50,000, or $110,000; and the last man Mr. NYE produced says "there was no limit at all," only the sky, so it might be as high as a million or $2,000,000 or a billion.

Mr. President, this expresses better than I can possibly describe it, just exactly the kind of a party this was. Fortunately, everyone in North Dakota knows that I do not touch intoxicating liquor, and all I and Mr. Keenan had to drink was some Pepsi-Cola, and it was not spiked.

Out West we have a saying that "you do not have to eat a whole beef to know whether or not it is tainted."

In 1938 Mr. NYE was fooling the voters by accusing the munitions makers of financing my campaign, when, as I have said, they did not contribute one dime to my campaign fund in any shape or form. In the last primary election he raved about the money from the eastern interests, but when Mr. Oppegaard, of the Grand Forks Herald, challenged him to name them, he retreated into silence. Now, when he won by only 942 votes in the primary, he descends upon the Senate floor in the outrageous performance of last Tuesday. He apparently fears the candidacies of Governor Moses and Lynn Stambaugh.

The inferences Senator NYE is trying to make is that when Mr. DeWitt did not desire to become a candidate, my support was shifted to Mr. Stambaugh. May I say on that point, Mr. President, that I neither contributed one penny, collected one penny, nor diverted one penny or any other sum, towards Mr. Stambaugh's campaign. I was not then and I am not now in his confidence. I do not know where Mr. Stambaugh received a single penny of his campaign fund if he had one. I do not know anything about a campaign fund, if he has one, for this fall's election. I do know that NYE moved heaven and earth to get the League endorsement for the Senatorship—that he spent thousands of dollars and offered to pay thousands more for the League endorsement and could not induce the farmers to give it to him.

I quote from Mr. NYE's Grand Forks speech on the 22d of June. He said:

> The C. I. O.-Communistic-Langer League is out to get me.

That was 6 days before the election.

> The C. I. O.-Communistic-Langer League is out to get me.

This is typical of the campaign Mr. NYE made. In spite of that, if it had not been for a terrific rainstorm the night before election he would have been overwhelmingly defeated. Of course Mr. NYE is fully aware of this fact. Everyone in North Dakota knows I am not a Communist and every Senator upon this floor knows the Daily Worker, the Communist official paper, twice has characterized me as the most dangerous man in the United States Senate. As far as the C. I. O. is concerned, I have never met Mr. Murray. I knew Mr. Baldwin when he was at the head of the Farm Security Administration. I have met him only upon two occasions. I do not know Sidney Hillman.

At Chicago the time when I met Mr. Baldwin with Mr. Erickson, then publisher of the Leader, who was endeavoring to negotiate a loan to save the newspaper, I advised Mr. Erickson not to accept the offer and he did not accept it.

Mr. President, indeed this charge of my being a Communist, or being associated with communism, comes with ill grace from the lips of my colleague; and again I convict him, not by what I say or do, but by what he himself has said and done. At the very time when the fight against communism was at its height in America, it is shown that on the 23d of May, 1938, my colleague joined the Communists; who at that time were all opposed to taking up arms, even in defending this country. He introduced a bill, Senate bill 4054, a bill which had been previously introduced in the House by the Communist member from New York, entitled "A bill authorizing the naturalization of certain aliens." It reads as follows:

> *Be it enacted, etc.*, That any alien otherwise eligible for citizenship under the naturalization laws who has attained the age of — years shall not be denied a certificate of citizenship for the reason that such alien is conscientiously opposed to war as a method of settling international controversies or has expressed an unwillingness to serve in the armed forces of the United States in time of war with a foreign country.

So, Mr. President, if an alien had expressed his unwillingness to serve in the armed forces of the United States at a time of war with a foreign country, even if this country were attacked, under the terms of this bill he would nevertheless be admitted to citizenship. Any alien who had already said that in time of war he would not serve in the armed forces, even if America were attacked, even if a force should come from Mexico, South America, Canada, or Germany to attack this country, would nevertheless be admitted to citizenship under the terms of the bill. My colleague would have the sons of the old pioneers fight the attackers to protect the aliens. He wants aliens, who have said that they would not fight even if this country were attacked, to have the privilege of voting and the pioneer's son to do the fighting. And no wonder, Mr. President, that these disabled veterans, who had fought and bled to protect Mr. NYE and his family wrote me that they had been sidetracked for 24 years.

At the Republican National Convention he stated that he had won the nomination despite a campaign of the Communists, the American Legion, the C. I. O., and the Langer forces, when he knew it was the rain that saved him.

However, Mr. President, I do not believe that Mr. NYE fooled anyone in North Dakota by linking the American Legion with the Communist Party. Everyone who knows the history of North Dakota knows that in the last World War more men voluntarily enlisted in the Army and Navy from that State than from any other State in the Union; and everyone knows that in proportion to its population, more boys from North Dakota lie buried in the soil of France as the result of World War No. 1 than from any other

State. Everyone knows that the American Legion in North Dakota is a loyal organization. I say that it comes with ill grace from the senior Senator from North Dakota, at the Republican National Convention, to give an interview stating that the C. I. O., the American Legion, and the Communist-Langer forces were joined together to beat him.

Mr. President, these charges with respect to Mr. Keenan's offer to donate $110,000 to defeat him are running true to form. In 1938, as the newspaper accounts show, Mr. NYE went up and down the State charging that the munitions manufacturers were raising huge slush funds to defeat him. The truth of the matter is that not a single munitions manufacturer or any other group of persons from outside the State contributed a single dollar to my campaign, as was shown by my sworn report to the Committee on Privileges and Elections, and yet, Mr. President, no less a man than Charles A. Beard, the historian, believed these charges, and sent letters to newspapers as far west as Oregon, begging for money for Mr. NYE. I have one such letter printed in the Oregonian, in Oregon, begging for money for Mr. NYE.

A Nation-wide committee was organized to solicit funds all over the United States for him. I hold a copy of such a form letter in my hand. They did not trust the people of North Dakota to raise money to elect him. In that campaign I was faced with money raised in New York, where Wall Street is located; and if any Senator is interested, I suggest that he look at Mr. NYE's sworn report on file with the Committee on Privileges and Elections, and see from whom the money that he got in New York in that campaign came.

In the primary campaign last June, Mr. NYE pursued the same tactics which he used in 1938 when he was yelling about munitions manufacturers financing me. So outrageous did those charges become that on May 22, last, I wrote a letter to the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], chairman of the Committee on Privileges and Elections, requesting the committee to investigate campaign expenditures. The letter reads as follows:

MAY 22, 1944.

HON. THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN,
Committee to Investigate Campaign Expenditures, United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR GREEN: Confirming our telephone conversation this morning, I am herewith enclosing an editorial which appeared in the Lidgerwood Monitor published at Lidgerwood, N. Dak., dated February 3, 1944, and call your attention to the fact that Senator NYE's secretary stated:

"That certain eastern interests, sort of an unholy alliance of left-wingers and the ultra-wealthy, are out to 'get NYE' and are pouring money and propaganda into North Dakota."

Also an article that appeared in the Times-Herald, published at Washington, D. C., for Sunday, February 13, in which the charge is made by H. T. Lillehaugen, of Brocket, N. Dak., "that thousands of copies of Under Cover are being distributed free" to smear Senator NYE.

Also an article which appeared in the Grand Forks Herald, published at Grand Forks, N. Dak., on January 7, in which it states that Senator NYE—

"Quite solemnly he warned citizens of this State that the open letter I wrote the other day was part of an insidious 'smear campaign' inspired by some vague 'eastern interests' bent on spending vast sums of money in an effort to defeat him from reelection this year."

On the same date and in the same paper it states:

"In connection with the smear campaign he suggested in his address, the Senator warned that within a month he expected that 50,000 copies of the best seller, Under Cover, pretending to show a widespread plot to displace the American form of government with a Fascist form, would be circulated in North Dakota by interests who seek to defeat him for reelection."

Also an article which appeared in the Fargo Forum in which Senator NYE stated:

"The New Deal had charged the C. I. O. Political Action Committee with the responsibility of electing a Congress favorable to the New Deal and that at last reports it had an $8,000,000 fund to work with."

These charges of spending huge sums of money to defeat Senator NYE are so serious that, in my opinion, there should be the fullest investigation. If this money is actually being spent, the voters of the State of North Dakota are entitled to know it. Likewise, if these charges are false, the propaganda that this money is being sent in by so-called eastern interests and others should, for the benefit of the voters of North Dakota, be exposed.

Yours very truly.

Another favorite campaign cry of NYE was his statement that 50,000 copies of Under Cover were distributed free in North Dakota.

Certainly no one believes that nearly every family in North Dakota received a copy of Under Cover free, because it just is not true. The "eastern interests" he mentioned in his speech at Grand Forks are just as illusionary, just as vague, just as nonexistent, just as much figments of the imagination, as were the munitions manufacturers' contributions that he raved about in 1938.

Mr. President, as I said before, the opposition to Mr. NYE on the part of so many North Dakota people has nothing whatsoever to do with eastern interests. When I met with those disabled war veterans we discussed other reasons why Mr. DeWitt should win, and I believe, Mr. President, that Mr. DeWitt would have won had he been the candidate, in spite of the rain. For example, let us consider the giving away, without protest on the part of Senator NYE, of the water from the Missouri River.

While I was Governor, I had set up a board to get water on these parched lands. I found that our neighboring State of Montana has nearly a million and a half acres of irrigated land, while in North Dakota, after 20 years of NYE in the Senate, we have only 21,000 acres of irrigated land. In Montana there are 1,711,409 acres of irrigated land. In North Dakota there are only 21,615 acres of irrigated land. There is nearly 100 times as much irrigated land in Montana as there is in the neighboring State of North Dakota. The same rivers flow through both States and Senator NYE had been in the Senate almost as long as had the now senior Senator from the State of Montana and he was there under Republican and Democratic Presidents.

Some of the parched land was bought for less than $1 an acre, but it became worth over $200 an acre the minute water touched it. Fort Peck had been built, not near Garrison, N. Dak., where President Roosevelt desired it to be built, because that would catch the water from the Yellowstone River, but by an agreement of the Senators in which NYE joined, not only was the dam built at Fort Peck, but, unbelievable as it may seem, the law creating the Fort Peck Dam provided that the water should not be used for irrigation, but for navigation purposes only. The result was and is that over a million acres in North Dakota which could have been irrigated from Fort Peck lay idle through 9 years of drought, with the farmers going broke. While irrigation projects were built in Montana, Colorado, Nebraska, Wyoming, and other semiarid States, North Dakota got nothing for irrigation. There are people out our way who say the farmers' problems were neglected and forgotten while the Senator was out speaking at $250 a night.

Others want a new Senator because the rural electrification program has not been pushed in North Dakota. In many States the farmers through the Federal Government had secured light and power for their farms to do much of the hard work and to relieve the women folks of a considerable amount of the back-breaking drudgery. I told the veterans that I had cooperated, as Governor, with State Senator Max Strehlow, of Kindred, in the formation of the first rural electrical organization in North Dakota, which has over 2,000 members. I signed the bill making it possible for North Dakota to conform to the Federal regulations, but at no time did I receive any help from the two men, then in the United States Senate from North Dakota, one of them being Mr. NYE.

I might add, Mr. President, that I have introduced a bill in the Senate, Senate bill 2140, and if that bill becomes law, every farmer in North Dakota will have light and power at cost as soon as the war ends and materials become available. In spite of the Kindred and a few other R. E. A. projects, only 7 farmers out of every 100 in North Dakota get electric light and power—by far the lowest number of any State in the entire Union. In terms of the number of farmers who are able to obtain electricity, our State is at the bottom of the list; in such a list, North Dakota is the forty-eighth State in the Union. Even in barbaric Japan, 95 out of every 100 farmers have electricity.

Really it is strange how the Senator leaves his friends. He told the farmers in the 1938 campaign, as some of the reasons why he should be reelected, that he was for irrigation and reclamation and that he was on the committee and was very powerful. But suddenly, when there was a chance to get an irrigation and reclamation project for North Dakota, he resigned from the committee, and let the farmers of North Dakota and the Northwest run along the best they could in their efforts to get Missouri Valley improvement. When they were floundering around helplessly, I resigned from

the Printing Committee to get on the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation, to help them out.

Mr. President, the six gentlemen who signed the affidavits have served their country long, honorably, and well, and they continued to be my friends long after that meeting in the Hamilton Hotel on September 14. I want the Subcommittee of the Committee on Privileges and Elections to listen to the reading of a letter which I received in March, 1944, over 6 months after Neal Williams now alleges I had wrongfully suggested that one of his comrades be a candidate for office as United States Senator. On March 30, 1944, over 6 months after the meeting at the Hamilton Hotel, he wrote me as follows:.

DISABLED AMERICAN VETERANS,
March 30, 1944.

Hon. WM. LANGER,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR BILL: Ever since the receipt of your letter of March 20, I have been checking to find whether there has been a revised list of disabled American veterans from World War 2.

The next attached bulletin from Washington, D. C., March 22, 1944, is the latest attempt made by our organization to obtain list of World War 2 veterans.

I am on the North Dakota Defense Council but we have no complete list. I will continue my efforts and let you have the benefit of anything I can turn up for you.

With every good wish, believe me to be,
Very sincerely yours,
NEAL E. WILLIAMS,
North Dakota Department Commander and Tenth District National Executive Committeeman.

Do you think this is the kind of a letter, Mr. President, Mr. Williams would have written me, if there was the slightest truth in these charges? Oh, Mr. President, politics, politics, politics. This letter was written to me at the end of March 1944. About 40 days later he signed an affidavit for Senator NYE about something that took place more than one-half year before. Politics, politics, politics. Is it any wonder that one who endeavors to do his duty here in the Senate, who works hard to protect the people, sometimes becomes weary and discouraged?

So, Mr. President, I now leave the Senator to get what comfort he can out of the charges he made on Tuesday. His own speeches in North Dakota, after he had talked with these men and had been quoting them in his speeches, showed that only the sum of $10,000 was mentioned. The Senator said so himself. But the campaign is on now, and $110,000 looks so much larger in the newspapers than does the $10,000 which I offered to raise in North Dakota for the disabled war veterans if one of their men wanted to be candidate for the Senate—and with which Mr. Keenan had had absolutely nothing to do. At that time I said to the veterans that Mr. NYE had cost the farmers and businessmen of North Dakota millions, and that it would be cheap to get rid of him at $10,000. Far, far be it from me to advise the people of North Dakota how to vote. That is their prerogative, just as it is their duty and responsibility. If they want the same man that Wall Street is supporting, to represent them, if they want their interests neglected, their Missouri water given away, their wives to continue to break their backs over scrub boards and washing machines, far, far be it from WILLIAM LANGER to protest. They, Mr. President, are the masters of their fate, and the captains of their souls. They get just exactly what they vote for.

The Senator has made his own record. There it is. The Bible says that a man cannot serve two masters. One cannot serve the people of North Dakota and Wall Street. Will the Senator deny that fewer farmers in North Dakota today have less electricity and power than in any other State in the Union?

Will the Senator deny that only 21,615 acres of land are irrigated in North Dakota, while 1,711,409 acres are irrigated in Montana?

Will the Senator deny that he voted for the bill establishing the Fort Peck Dam, with the provision that not one single drop of water could be used for irrigation?

Will the Senator deny that over 1,200,000 acres of land has laid idle in North Dakota because of lack of irrigation projects?

Will the Senator deny that he resigned from the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation and abandoned the farmers to their fate?

Will the Senator deny that thousands of women are doing household drudgery because of the lack of electricity in North Dakota, where there are more women in proportion than in any other State in the Union?

Will the Senator deny that more fathers, mothers, and children on the farms there have to read by kerosene lamps than in any other State?

Will he deny that he voted against the bill to limit salaries at $75,000 a year while the profiteers were making the most money in the history of the country?

Will he deny that he voted for the Ruml plan, making a present of over eight billion to the wealthy? An amount equal to nine times the value of all the assessed valuation of both real and personal property in North Dakota?

Will he deny that more multimillionaires are being created in World War No. 2 than in World War No. 1, and that he opposed the President's bills to prevent this?

Will he deny that he did not vote for an extension of Lend-Lease under which combines, tractors, grain binders, and other farm machinery has been exported wholesale to foreign countries while the farmers of our own State have been in want and begging for them?

Will he deny that he voted for the bill this year which raised money-order fees at post offices to 37 cents a piece, while banks sell them at 15 cents?

Will he deny that he voted for the bill to raise the cost to the farmers of sending articles by parcel post 33⅓ percent?

Will he deny that he knew so little about foreign relations that as a member of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations he so neglected his duty that at the very moment when thousands of our boys were being killed he was giving a speech at Pittsburgh saying we would not be attacked, and when informed by the newspapermen that we were being attacked at Pearl Harbor, he stopped long enough to say, "That sounds fishy to me"?

Will he deny that he offered James Malloy $5,000 to get LANGER, whom the people had elected, unseated?

Will he deny that he paid Attorney Howard Fuller, of Fargo, the attorney's fees for drawing up charges against LANGER, who had been elected Senator by the people?

Will he deny that in this campaign he is the darling of the two big chain banks which are doing business all over the Northwest, and that they are moving heaven and earth to reelect him?

Will he deny that in the old days he stated to the people that "when the Fargo Forum supports me you will know that I have sold you out"?

Will he deny that 6 years ago he appointed the Fargo Forum's political writer, Gerald Movius, as his private secretary, and that Movius still has that job?

Mr. President, I submit that the unwarranted attack made upon me by Mr. NYE has been unanswerably answered. I say this matter has no place upon the Senate floor. I submit that the proper place for it to be determined is before the Senate Committee on Privileges and Elections.

Therefore, I challenge Mr. NYE to waive all immunity, and under oath come with me before that committee and their counsel for cross-examination. I am ready now, Mr. President, for that pleasant experience as far as I am concerned. Does he dare to accept the challenge?

EXHIBIT 1

S. 1176. A bill to provide for liberalized adjudication of claims of veterans for service connection for disabilities with which they may be suffering;

S. 1177. A bill to remove limitations on time for making application for veterans' benefits;

S. 1178. A bill to authorize and direct the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to include provision for payment of total disability benefits in national service life insurance policies; and

S. 1179. A bill to amend section 19 of the World War Veterans' Act so as to provide that insurance judgments shall be binding upon the Administrator until modified by court order; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 1180. A bill to require the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy to furnish copies of medical records to persons discharged from the armed forces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

S. 1181. A bill to amend paragraph V of Veterans Regulation No. 10;

S. 1182. A bill to amend paragraph III of part II of Veterans Regulation 2 (a) so as to extend the time within which appeals may be taken to the Administrator;

S. 1183. A bill to amend paragraph IV of Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a) so as to provide increased pensions to surviving dependents of deceased veterans who, at the time of their death, were suffering from permanent and total service-connected disabilities, but whose death resulted from other causes;

S. 1184. A bill to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to furnish orthopedic or prosthetic appliances to any honorably discharged veteran in need thereof;

S. 1185. A bill to prohibit the reduction of permanent disability ratings except in case of fraud or clear and unmistakable error;

S. 1186. A bill to extend eligibility for adjusted compensation to certain World War provisional, temporary, or probationary commissioned or warrant officers;

S. 1187. A bill to provide full payment of compensation or pension to hospitalized veterans having neither wife, child, nor dependent parent;

S. 1188. A bill to increase the amount of the compensation or pension payable to veterans having service-connected disabilities who have dependent spouses or children; and

S. 1189. A bill to authorize payment of pensions at combined rates to veterans entitled to benefits for both partial service-connected disabilities and permanent total non-service-connected disabilities; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 1190. A bill to provide for a national cemetery in the State of North Dakota; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

S. 1191. A bill to require certain persons within the United States to carry identification cards and be fingerprinted, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1192. A bill to change the definition of permanent total disability for pension purposes, as to World War veterans, so as to base it upon an individual, rather than an average, basis;

S. 1193. A bill to provide that inability of the individual veteran to follow any substantially gainful occupation resulting from service-connected disability shall be deemed to be permanent total disability;

S. 1194. A bill to change interest rates on loans secured by liens on United States Government life (converted) insurance to 3½ percent;

S. 1195. A bill to authorize the Veterans' Administration to correct erroneous adjudications;

S. 1196. A bill to extend the time within which applications for benefits under the World War Adjusted Compensation Act, as amended, may be filed up to January 2, 1950;

S. 1197. A bill to increase the pension payable to war veterans suffering from permanent total non-service-connected disabilities from $40 to $60 per month;

S. 1198. A bill to so amend the World War Veterans' Act, 1924, as amended, as to eliminate all statutes of limitations on automatic, yearly renewable term, or United States Government life (converted) insurance policies;

S. 1199. A bill to increase to $60 per month the amount of compensation otherwise payable to widows of deceased World War veterans whose deaths were caused by their service-connected disabilities;

S. 1200. A bill to provide for adjudication of any claim for compensation, pension, or retirement pay upon evidence in file at time of death of the veteran;

S. 1201. A bill to provide that veterans now receiving compensation for certain so-called presumptive disabilities equivalent to 75 percent of the amount to which they were previously entitled shall henceforth have such compensation restored to 100 percent thereof, and for other purposes;

S. 1202. A bill to define misconduct, for compensation and pension purposes, as limited to felonious misconduct;

S. 1203. A bill providing for the establishment of minimum ratings for disabled World War veterans;

S. 1204. A bill to provide for increasing or decreasing the compensation or pension payments, payable to veterans of all wars, campaigns, and expeditions, or of peacetime service, and to their dependents, under laws administered by the Veterans' Administration, by 10 percent for every 10 percent increase or decrease in the cost of living above the basic cost of living during the first 6 months of 1940, as computed each 6 months, provided that such compensation and pension payments shall not be reduced below the basic amounts provided for under such laws, and for other purposes;

S. 1205. A bill to provide that the compensation or pension of service-connected disabled veterans shall be increased by 20 percent of the basic amounts, payable for each 5 years of age beginning with the fortieth birthday, and for other purposes;

S. 1206. A bill to liberalize existing laws as to forfeitures of rights as to claims for certain benefits by veterans and their dependents;

S. 1207. A bill to provide that Government life-insurance policies shall be incontestable after 1 year, and for other purposes;

S. 1208. A bill to amend the World War Veterans' Act, 1924, as amended, to provide continuation of insurance benefits (under certain conditions) to persons permanently and totally disabled, and for other purposes; and

S. 1209. A bill to provide death compensation for dependent parents of deceased World War veterans under the Act of June 28, 1934 (Public Law No. 484, 73d Cong.), as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 1210. A bill to give honorably discharged veterans, their widows, and the wives of disabled veterans, who themselves are not qualified, preference in employment where Federal funds are disbursed; to the Committee on Civil Service.

S. 1211. A bill to extend eligibility for compensation to the widows and children of deceased World War veterans who had disabilities caused or aggravated by examination, hospitalization, or medical treatment; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 1212. A bill to establish a Board of Appeals and Reviews in the Army for hearing and passing upon petitions for correction of records of persons discharged under other than honorable conditions; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

S. 1213. A bill to establish boards of appeals and reviews in the Navy and Marine Corps for hearing and passing upon petitions for correction of records of persons discharged under other than honorable conditions; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

S. 1214. A bill to provide for a statutory award of $10 per month to any war veteran who was wounded, gassed, injured, or disabled by an instrumentality of war in a zone of hostilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 1215. A bill to liberalize the bases of eligibility for receipt of disability retirement benefits as to emergency, provisional, probationary, and temporary officers of the World War; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I understand that the Committee on Printing usually makes provision for publication of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an indefinite number of days following a recess or adjournment of the Senate. I assume that such practice will continue.

Because of that understanding, I ask unanimous consent that the senior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. NYE] be permitted to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD what he may deem to be an appropriate reply to the statements made this afternoon by the junior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER].

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I am sorry to say that I must object. I notified the junior Senator from North Dakota, on this floor as soon as he had finished his remarks, that I would reply to them as quickly as I could. Six days ago I said here in the Senate that I would speak yesterday. Yesterday I rose again and said that I would speak today. I know of no reason why the senior Senator from North Dakota should not have been present if he was interested, and I assume that he is. I am therefore obliged to object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

PRICES OF CHEESE—LETTER FROM SENATOR SHIPSTEAD TO CHESTER BOWLES

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, at the request of the senior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. SHIPSTEAD] and the junior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a letter from the senior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. SHIPSTEAD] to Chester Bowles, Administrator, Office of Price Administration, dated September 18, 1944, relative to prices of cheese.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *September 18, 1944.*

Mr. CHESTER BOWLES, *Administrator,*
Office of Price Administration,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BOWLES: Thank you for your letter of September 6 which I have read with interest. I am sorry that I cannot agree with you on some of the matters covered by your letter, and particularly the following:

1. It is not correct to state that cheese of Italian types is "generally consumed by people who have, or whose ancestors have immigrated from that area." Parmesan cheese, for instance, is used in volumes of millions of pounds by American processors of food and for general American consumption. Blue cheese and Gorgonzola are found on almost every train in the country, and the Provolone cheese is used in a great many American eating places for sandwiches.

2. If you look at the enormous volume of cheese of Italian varieties imported from South America since 1940 you will come to realize that in a large measure the supply that used to come from Italy has been substituted by Argentina.

3. The statistics quoted in your letter do not agree with the figures which the Italian cheese industry furnished to the committee on reciprocal information in 1939, a copy of which may be obtained from the Tariff Commission.

4. The justification which you give in your letter relative to the reasons which prompted your office to cause a roll back on cheese of Italian varieties does not hold true if you take into consideration the following facts:

(a) The largest increase in the production of any single type of foreign cheese is found in the cream cheese which has increased more than 50 percent from 1941 to 1944. The volume of production of cream cheese is now twice that of Italian cheese of all types. The cream cheese producers are the ones that have diverted to their production the largest volume of milk from Cheddar. They are, therefore, the biggest offenders.

(b) Nothing has been done to curtail the price of Camembert, Liederkranz, and Brie, which are selling at prices that permit a return to the manufacturer far in excess of the one permitted either the Cheddar or the Italian cheese producer.

In addition to this, it must be said that these cheeses are produced almost exclusively by integrated cheese companies which are not only capable but should be willing to make some sacrifice in this emergency.

(c) The most critical dairy item at this time is butter, produced in large volumes in my State, and not Cheddar cheese. Please take into account the fact that the manufacturers of cream cheese are using butterfat equivalent to 40,000,000 pounds of butter, while the producers of Italian cheese, at the level of 1942 production, are using less than 15,000,000 pounds of butterfat. I would, indeed, be very much interested in having an explanation of this matter for the benefit of my constituents, the producers of butter.

5. Please permit me to call to your attention that the Senate Subcommittee on Small Industry has received the assurance that this matter would be attended to not later than 3 weeks from August 25. The Italian cheese industry and the dairy industry cannot continue to sustain the terrific losses caused by said roll-back for much longer time.

6. I have taken due and proper notice and sincerely wish to thank you for your promise that "if these accounting studies reflect that the manufacturers of Italian-type cheeses are not in a competitive position for the available milk supply, necessary adjustments in the maximum prices will be made."

Time is the essence of this matter and I hope and trust that, by this time, you have finished your cost studies. If you have, I trust that necessary adjustments in the maximum prices will be made at the earliest possible moment.

I believe it my duty to inform you that leading dairy product manufacturers and numerous dairy farmers have, during the last few weeks, expressed to me their serious and earnest concern about impending surpluses of dairy products, and what action the Government will take to overcome them. The welfare of the dairy farmers who have done such a marvelous job during the depression and during the war emergency concerns me deeply. I have, therefore, looked about for facts and information and I find the following:

(a) Milk powder is piling up very rapidly and in volume far in excess of civilian, armed forces, and lend-lease requirements. Many concerns in my State are already begging for new avenues of distribution.

(b) The evaporated milk industry seems to be in the same position. Consumption of evaporated milk, because of past and present rationing, and because the civilian seems to have lost the habit of using it, is decreasing. With the current production of 75,000,000 cases per year, and a normal civilian consumption of about 55,000,000, when the war ends and New Zealand, Australia, and Argentina will again absorb the foreign market for dairy products, the fluid milk, no longer being evaporated, must be diverted to something else.

(c) I am told that New Zealand has large inventories of cheese that must be consumed or be lost, that the Mediterranean basin has certain varieties of cheese of long curing ready for shipment here, that Argentina has warehouses bulging with cheese that must be sold. Our present export of cheese for lend-lease will, we hope, be stopped or reduced with the collapse of Germany. What are we going to do with the cheese that we have been exporting? We have increased our cheese production since 1940 to the extent of 60 percent. The rationing and the various orders which are hampering and disturbing the normal and historical distribution of cheese have reduced the consumption of cheese and are depriving the rural population of the country from the possibility of receiving its customary volume of cheese. Most of the cheese orders are tailored to suit the wagon jobber distributors and completely ignore the rural consumers. This will inevitably injure and reduce the per capita consumption of cheese in the Nation.

There is no doubt in my mind that by the end of 1945 we will be confronted by a large and damaging surplus of cheese. We must face this problem before it is too late.

7. Concluding: During the last 30 years, more than one-half of the cheese of all varieties imported to America was cheese of Italian varieties. This importation knocks at our doors again. It will be up to the Italian cheese industry in America to stem this importation. To do this our domestic industry must be strong financially and adequately implemented. To weaken this industry either at the level of production or at the level of distribution will mean to throw open our domestic market to dairy products from foreign competitors. This must not happen. You have the opportunity of rendering the dairy industry a service of great importance by preserving the production of Italian cheese in America. This industry was ruined by the short-sighted policies put into effect in the period that followed the last war. It took 20 years to correct said mistakes and it probably could never have been corrected had it not been for the assistance of the R. F. C.

You will oblige me if you will let me know when the protest filed by this industry will be heard.

Sincerely,

HENRIK SHIPSTEAD.

EDITORIAL TRIBUTE TO THE LATE SENATOR NORRIS

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I have before me a few of the editorials which recently appeared in Nebraska newspapers following the death of a former distinguished Member of this body, Senator George W. Norris. The editorials show the great respect which all Nebraskans had for the late Senator. I ask that they be printed in the body of the RECORD immediately following my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Lincoln (Nebr.) State Journal of September 4, 1944]

GEORGE NORRIS, OF NEBRASKA

George W. Norris was more widely admired and respected nationally than in his home State of Nebraska. It can be said with entire truth that he was at the same time the best loved and the most reviled man in the history of Nebraska politics. His following in this State transcended party lines. It was devoted to him almost to the point of fanaticism. His opposition, on the other hand, was unsparing in its criticism of him and personal in its attacks.

This same sort of paradox cropped out during his long political ascendancy. At the outset of his career a product of the machine politics that was dominant for many years, he later became nationally known as a tribune of the people, a man "in there" at all times fighting for their rights as against entrenched privilege, to borrow from the vocabulary of the crusading liberal point of view he represented.

The political career of Mr. Norris has had no parallel in either State or National history. For 10 years he represented Nebraska in the lower House of Congress, and for 30 years in the Senate. He first attracted national notice when in the House he led in the revolt against Cannonism, a system which gave to the Speaker a breadth of power that Norris regarded inimical to the public interest. From that day he was a marked man.

The boldness with which he attacked an ancient institution attracted to him a support among the liberal elements of the Nation that grew with the years, and which, in turn, endowed him with a courage to thrust his lance at many privileges and practices that he believed merited his scorn and opposition.

Norris also became a marked man in the councils of the Republican Party in Nebraska. While deliberately choosing the role of a party irregular, he repeatedly filed as a Republican and, each time that he did so, walked off with the nomination. Eight years ago he threw off this party disguise, and was elected as an independent. Two years ago he again ran by petition, but he lost because many who had followed him unwaveringly for his independence, resented his complacent acceptance of most that Nebraskans regarded as wrong in the policies of the New Deal.

Norris was a fighter. His appearance on the scene of action was the signal for a battle royal. That he did not always fight fair was the criticism most frequently launched against him. His chief fault lay in the fact that he was easily angered by opposition and too prone to ascribe unworthy motives to those, even among former supporters, who disagreed with him. The explanation probably lay in the character of the fighting into which Norris was constantly plunged, and in which his opposition itself pulled no punches.

Over the years he won for himself high honors in the role he had chosen. Experience and knowledge bred an ability that all came to recognize, and a sincerity of purpose that not a great many denied. Joined in the Senate with such men as Borah, Johnson, and the elder La Follette in forwarding the cause of progressivism in the ranks of the Republican party, in his earlier years he performed a distinctive service to that organization.

But repeatedly his interest flagged; repeatedly he told his lieutenants here that it was useless to struggle against conditions as they were, and repeatedly they had to draft him for a continuance in office. This bred in many minds the belief that at heart Norris was a lonely man. The courage with which he clung to his convictions led him to vote against the Nation's entrance into the first World War, and so frequently left him in the minority that if it is true that loneliness was his lot here lay the explanation.

Now that life's fitful fever has ended for him, the truncheons of political warfare have been laid aside. The people of Nebraska join with the people of the Nation in honoring the memory of a man who was faithful to his ideals, brave in defense of his beliefs, valiant in battling for what God gave him to see as right—an able man who has left a lasting impress on the lives of two generations of Americans and contributed to the structure of democracy "in this State and in the Union" bricks and mortar that will endure.

[From the Omaha World-Herald of September 4, 1944]

GEORGE W. NORRIS

Nebraska's George W. Norris will long be remembered as one of the most illustrious figures, perhaps the most illustrious figure, of what in his lifetime was called the liberal movement. If he shared some of its weaknesses, he also contributed greatly to its undeniable strength.

It is too early, on this day when his countrymen are preparing to pay their final sorrowful respects at his bier, to attempt to estimate his final place in American history.

But one key fact about his career has been made luminously clear. The people of Nebraska and the people of America believed him implicitly when he said: "My lips have never told a lie and my hands never touched a bribe." That is why he was sent to serve in Washington for 40 consecutive years, why in time he became the most powerful public

official of his State and, in a sense, stronger than either of the great political parties. The people did not always, perhaps, agree with the causes he espoused; sometimes they did not even have a speaking acquaintance with the issues he discussed. But they were convinced in their hearts that George Norris was majestically honest, and gratefully they sang the praises of his name.

Press biographers opine that Senator Norris will be remembered because of his gallant fight on Cannonism, because of the Tennessee Valley works which resulted from his tireless labors, because of the lame-duck amendment which he proposed, and because of the unicameral legislature which the people of Nebraska accepted on his recommendation.

But important as those various issues may prove to be in the long perspective of time, we surmise that generations which never looked upon his face will honor George Norris, first of all, because he gave dignity and a fierce integrity to the public service.

[From the Lincoln (Nebr.) Star of September 4, 1944]

PILLAR OF FAITH: GEORGE W. NORRIS

Among the tributes paid to a great American, Senator George W. Norris, of Nebraska, whose death took place late Saturday afternoon, that by President Roosevelt seemed to offer the most discriminating, complete measure of the Nebraskan's service.

"A pillar of state has fallen," the President said in Washington; "a tower of strength has been laid low, and a grand old champion of popular rights has made his journey. * * * He was an uncompromising foe of special privilege who never wavered in his belief that the welfare of the majority is the responsibility and the duty of the Government."

There were others from among his colleagues in Congress. "'Greatest Roman of them all' in matters of American liberal thought," said CHAVEZ, of New Mexico. "The common man and the underprivileged in the United States never have had a more stalwart champion," RUSSELL, of Georgia, added. "One of America's real noblemen," Vermont's Republican AIKEN observed, concluding that "America is infinitely better today because George Norris lived and devoted 40 years to the service of his country."

"He was a great American and rendered his country invaluable service. I deeply deplore his loss," Senator BARKLEY, of Kentucky, declared. And in New York another great leader, Senator WAGNER, summed it up: "America has lost its greatest advocate of justice for the common man, irrespective of race, creed, or color. He was one of God's noblemen. His loss is irreparable."

And so it is an irreparable loss as well as a precious heritage and memory.

We believe that, as richly deserved, honestly earned, and excellently expressed as these tributes are, there is still one even greater and more impressive.

It was the unuttered sense of loss that came to millions of Americans when word spread throughout the country that Senator Norris had passed away. We know that it echoed among the men—the strong, sturdy young men—fighting America's battles on distant battle fields. We know that it entered the doors of thousands of homes in the mining regions of the United States. We know that in the valley of the Tennessee River there was a hush as its people paused to think of the man who was their benefactor. We know that all over this country, where men and women lived humbly and simply, the affection and respect which men in high places expressed so splendidly was mingled with a throb of regret and sadness that a great warrior had fallen.

Simple words are those which best describe it. Men build their lives in different molds. Those who think less of themselves and more of others in the labors of life invariably are greatly loved for their unselfishness. The accomplishments which they achieve in the common interest endure. The memory of such a man becomes imperishable, even as his influence upon public thought continues through the years.

So it has been with this distinguished Nebraskan, and so it will continue to be.

Long after his death, the ideals which he represented in American life will continue to sustain millions of his countrymen.

In this democracy, which is America, government obtains its license and its vitality from the people. Their loyalties to its representative institutions rest upon their faith.

And what is their faith? Is it something tangible or intangible? Is it something physical and material, or is it something unseen unmeasured, and spiritual?

How is it fed and sustained?

What is it that waters it?

Their faith is such a fragile thing, and yet so strong. Their faith is so sensitive to what is right and what is decent. In all of his greatness, it was Senator Norris' intuitive appreciation of right and wrong and his unswerving, passionate devotion to conceptions of conscience that constituted the greatest armor of a man of simple tastes and habits.

Whether it was on the floor of the Senate in the midst of heated debate, whether it was in the committee room during hearings, whether it was in his office in the Senate Office Building, or whether it was in the quiet serenity of the associations of his friends or his home, conscience dictated his thoughts and guided his speech.

He was kind and gentle.

He was stern and wrathful.

But he always was just, according to his lights.

And he could say with another great commoner that the privilege of agreeing with others was the greatest joy that came to him; the necessity of disagreeing, his greatest pain.

Truth, honest purpose, and integrity in the methods he used were the lances which he carried into battle. They gave him a stoutness of heart, an amazing courage.

They consoled him in his defeats; they made him humble in his triumphs. They guarded him against the unseen dangers which beset so many men in American public life who fall victim to self-ambition, lust for power, or the spirit of personal greed.

They made him ever so eager to learn, ever so young, ever so curious to dig into the facts of constant changes in thought and living which constitute the American scene. He knew that life is ever-changing. He knew that all of the processes of science, machinery, and the physical earth itself called for constant readjustments by the individual. Changes created no bitterness and no resentment in him. They were logical and they were inevitable. Happily, it was his faith that they represented true American progress.

So many times in recent months he had said to us that love of humanity was the earth's salvation. So many times he had emphasized his belief that the first duty in a democracy is the protection of the weak from oppression and injustice by the strong. So many times he had affirmed his simple, sweet faith that, given the opportunity, people will work out their destiny with due regard for the rights of all.

It would be untrue to say that any single battle which he waged in Congress held his interest to a greater degree than any other battle. That was the surprising quality of his fights. He fought no sham battle. He fought no battles except those to which he could give the full force of his strength, energies, and mind.

In the heat of those battles, each one was real, each one forthright, each one vitally important. It was this spirit that made him feared on the floor of the Senate by his antagonists and respected by friend and foe alike.

Because he was a man without pretense or guile, because he was straightforward and direct, because of the depths of his sympathies and the great magnitude of his compassion and understanding when the rights and the liberties and the welfare of peoples were concerned, each reform in which he became engaged spread itself in front of the eyes of the American people in clear and bold outline.

There were times when he talked to us most about the conservation of natural resources. It commanded his complete enthusiasm. There were times when he talked most about war—this war, with all of its destruction and its casualty lists—and then his eyes would fill with tears at the thought of the sacrifice of young American boys. How he hated war in all of its barbarism. How he hated the evil, brutal tyranny that had endeavored to fasten itself upon this earth. How he dreamed of peace—an enduring peace, a perpetual peace—when the labors of the men in the fields and the men in the factories would be devoted solely to the graces of living instead of to the arts of destruction.

What is the measure of his influence upon American thought; what the practical results of his statesmanship?

There is T. V. A. In its realization, it belongs to him. He created it against misunderstanding and powerful, selfish interests. It represented a 12-year fight. It began when American tides were running strongest, perhaps, of any time in American history in the opposite direction from Government ownership and operation of one of the major resources of a great region. But it stands there today against all of the tides, and it has spread to other sections of the country, including his own State of Nebraska, and to other parts of the world.

There was the fight for the lame-duck amendment, for the anti-injunction law, for the unicameral Legislature of Nebraska, and there were the fights for a hundred other just and worthy causes.

The amazing thing was that frequently Senator George W. Norris was engaged in not merely one major battle but a half a dozen at the same time. Actually he was fighting the fight of T. V. A., of the lame-duck amendment, and of the anti-injunction law—three great measures of reform generally associated with his name—and at least for a portion of the time these three great battles were in progress simultaneously.

From its earliest beginning, no man ever occupied a seat in either branch of Congress who fought with more steadfast purpose or with more bulldog tenacity. To him, a defeat in one Congress was merely the postponement of victory in the next, or in the one that was to follow the next. In one instance reactionary influences smothered one of his great reforms for five successive sessions of Congress, but it made no difference. He kept on fighting. Other men came and left. He remained to fight on.

That is faith in an ideal. That embodies courage. That explains why, in time, Senator George W. Norris came to be looked upon by the American people as the outstanding Member of the American Congress. That truly reveals his amazing accomplishments through which an American legislator honestly may be said to have affected the course of American life more profoundly than the majority of men who have occupied the cloistered rooms of the White House.

He was a believer in liberty. How fully he believed in liberty and freedom for the individual best is revealed in his sustained fight for the preservation of American civil liberties. Time and time again he raised his voice and threw himself into a battle to preserve the liberty of some unknown man or woman.

He was a believer in democratic government, and throughout his life he sought zealously to improve the machinery through which democratic ideals are maintained.

He was a believer in humanity, and the depth of his love for people is known only to those who shared fully his thoughts. For a timid and shy man was he; quiet and reserved in strange and unfamiliar surroundings; but the most delightful and companionable of beings in the circle of his home.

It was 2 weeks ago that in the late afternoon we sat for 2 hours out under the boughs of a pear tree in his back yard, reviewing steps in connection with an autobiography in which the two of us had been engaged the past year.

It was an afternoon of mellow sunshine. There was just enough coolness in the breeze to suggest that before many weeks fall would paint the leaves and then garb the countryside in rich golden browns. The talk flitted from Washington to a lake in Wisconsin; from the bluffs that line the Republican River Valley to those singing brooks of the Blue Ridge and the Smokies which form the tributaries of the Tennessee; from figures now prominent on the national scene to recollections of Smith and Lardin of college days.

But through it all ran the thread of his faith in the ultimate triumph of justice and of decency. He said then, as he had said so many times:

"Right will win."

This is the pillar of faith of all men and women the world over who believe in the dignity of man and in his capacity to govern himself wisely.

THE ST. LAWRENCE-GREAT LAKES SEAWAY

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, tomorrow I shall offer, on behalf of some of my colleagues and myself, two amendments to House bill 4485, which is the so-called rivers and harbors bill. The two amendments which I intend to offer would include in the bill what is known as the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence seaway. I wish to take just a few minutes to explain my reasons for offering these amendments, and asking to have them printed at this time. I do want it done before the end of the present session.

I had hoped that the senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON] would be present today so that he might hear what I have to say. However, I understand he does not expect to return to Washington before the recess of the Congress. Therefore I must proceed, as the matter should be presented now, and the amendments I intend to propose should be printed before the Congress recesses.

On September 28, 1943, I introduced a bill providing for the ratification of the agreement entered into between the United States and Canada on March 19, 1941, looking to the early completion of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence waterway. This bill was referred to the Commerce Committee.

On October 27, 1942, I was advised by the chairman of the Commerce Committee that he had appointed a subcommittee consisting of Senators OVERTON, RADCLIFFE, MEAD, VANDENBERG, and BURTON to hold hearings on this very important bill, with the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON] as chairman. My regard for the members of this committee is such that I had not the slightest doubt that the bill would be given a prompt and fair hearing, and the recommendations of the subcommittee made on the basis of the testimony as presented by witnesses.

I was advised that the War Department and State Department had been asked to give their opinion of the bill. Under date of March 3, 1944, President Roosevelt advised me that he thought the time had come to urge the passage of this bill, and that he had notified his department heads that he was giving it his approval.

Shortly thereafter, on April 10, Secretary of State Hull wrote the committee giving his approval to the passage of the bill, and on April 15 Secretary of War Stimson also expressed his approval to the committee. There was no reason why hearings should not have then been held.

On April 18 the chairman of the Sub-Committee on Rivers and Harbors made this statement to the Senate:

> Mr. President, as chairman of the subcommittee of the Committee on Comerce having in charge the rivers and harbor bill, H.R. 3961, I wish to give notice that hearings on the bill will begin before the subcommittee on Tuesday, April 25. I have charge of the naval appropriation bill, and hope to get through with that bill Friday of this week, and then I should like to take up the rivers and harbors bill immediately afterward, because after that will come the flood control bill, which we hope will be sent over to the Senate from the House by the time we conclude consideration of the rivers and harbors bill. Following that will be the bill relating to the St. Lawrence seaway.

I did not protest against the delay in holding hearings on the St. Lawrence development although the bill was introduced into the Congress months before either of the other bills, and had a definite expression of approval by the Government.

When the rivers and harbors hearing were being held, I observed that 2 days had been set aside to hear testimony on the proposed Tombigbee waterway, a project which was not included in the bill which came from the House. In view of this action, it occurred to me that the committee might be willing to hear testimony relating to the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence seaway development with a view to incorporating it in the rivers and harbors bill and I requested the chairman of the committee, to grant that hearing. It appeared to me that this was entirely proper since in 1941 the St. Lawrence development was incorporated in the rivers and harbors bill by the House committee, and reported to the House by a vote of 17 to 8. The bill, however, was reported out just before Pearl Harbor, and was never acted upon.

The chairman of the subcommittee denied my request to present testimony favoring the St. Lawrence in connection with the rivers and harbors bill, although he had readily granted time to proponents of other projects which were not included in the bill.

Later, during the course of the hearing on rivers and harbors, I attended a session in company with the senior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. SHIPSTEAD]. At that time we officially, and for the record, requested that we be given 1 hour in which to present a case for the St. Lawrence. It was my belief that in 1 hour we could present such convincing evidence in favor of this development that the committee would gladly grant whatever time should be necessary to complete the testimony.

The chairman of the committee, however, definitely refused to grant any time whatsoever to consideration of the development of the greatest natural resource and most important undeveloped waterway in the world in connection with the river and harbor bill. The formal request and the chairman's denial were taken down by the Official Reporter. Yet, when the report of this hearing was printed, I was amazed to find that the testimony relating to the official request, which I had made on behalf of the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. SHIPSTEAD] and myself, and the official denial of our request by the chairman of the committee, the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON], had been completely stricken from the record.

Hearings on the very important river and harbor bill were concluded within a reasonable time, and the bill was reported out. Hearings on the flood-control bill were then begun. These hearings were protracted, and considerable delay developed.

On June 12 the matter of hearings on the St. Lawrence development was again brought up, and at that time the Senator from Louisiana was less assuring in his statement on the floor. He did, however, advise me orally that he would not delay the hearings on the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence development. This same assurance, I understand, was given to others also.

Congress recessed on June 23. The gentleman from Louisiana [Senator OVERTON] advised me orally that he would hold hearings on the St. Lawrence as soon as Congress got to work again.

Congress reconvened August 1. There was no indication of hearings on the St. Lawrence being held. As the Senator had, in the meantime, become engaged in a primary contest for reelection, I did not urge him to hold hearings then. I had confidence that he would hold such hearings, as he had assured me he would, and at no time did I question his good faith.

Now, Mr. President, I hold in my hand a full-page political advertisement which appeared in the New Orleans Times-Picayune-States on Sunday, September 10, 1944. It is not editorial matter. It is not the work of a news reporter. It is political advertising, and clearly labeled so. In this advertisement we find the people of Louisiana urged to reelect the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON] to the Senate because through his position as chairman of the subcommittee he had defeated the passage of the St. Lawrence bill, and stating that he will continue to do so if reelected.

Mr. President, when I read this I was shocked and hurt, for I had given the Senator the benefit of every doubt for the delay in holding a fair hearing on the

bill. I now read from the advertisement itself:

OPPOSE ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY

With JOHN H. OVERTON in the Senate, Louisiana and the South need have no fear that the freight traffic that justly should pass through our ports will be diverted by greedy combinations and unfair legislation to the so-called St. Lawrence seaway.

THREAT TO NEW ORLEANS

New Orleans knows that the proposed St. Lawrence channel is a threat to the export and import business that means so much to the Crescent City. The proposal means that hundreds of millions of taxpayers' dollars will be spent to make an artificial sea channel through the ice-bound North to carry freight to the eastern seaboard that now more easily and economically moves down the great Mississippi through New Orleans. The proposal is doubly unfair because Federal taxes levied on Louisiana would be used to destroy Louisiana commerce.

OVERTON STOPS PROJECT

Senator JOHN H. OVERTON has successfully prevented the passage of this measure, because he is chairman of the Senate special committee in charge of legislation concerning the St. Lawrence seaway. Senator OVERTON declared his opposition to this visionary scheme when the chairmanship was tendered him; but his colleagues in the Senate, knowing his thoroughness and uprightness, insisted that he accept the appointment. This compliment to JOHN H. OVERTON'S character has hardly been surpassed in the annals of the American Congress. The compliment to Louisiana should not be lightly tossed aside. But more than that, if JOHN H. OVERTON does not return to the Senate, into whose hands would this project fall?

Today JOHN H. OVERTON is the stalwart and successful defender of Louisiana's rights. Louisiana must return him to the Senate.

This appeal for the reelection of Senator OVERTON is based upon his having successfully prevented the passage of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence seaway bill, through his chairmanship of the subcommittee. What we can expect in the future can only be indicated by his platform and I quote again from this advertisement:

My platform will be the record of my service and the promise that such a record holds for the future. Upon that platform I submit my candidacy to all the people and all the factions of Louisiana.

This can be interpreted as nothing more or less than that the same obstructive and delaying tactics will be continued in the future.

Mr. President, if we are to believe this advertisement published in behalf of the Senator from Louisiana, there never has been any intention on his part to permit a fair consideration of the St. Lawrence bill, and that the proponents of this great development must now pursue another course in their efforts to obtain its approval by the Congress.

This is all my country, Mr. President. I am not here to work simply for my State to the disadvantage of other States. I believe in the development of our national wealth wherever we find it, in whatever form we find it.

I believe in the development of waterways in any part of this country where they will be practicable and will materially increase the resources and wealth of the area wherein they are located. When we create new wealth in one State of the Union, it cannot but increase the wealth of the United States as a whole, unless, Mr. President, the development of one State is used to delay and destroy the development of equal or greater wealth-producing projects in other States.

I say in full sincerity that I would not have hestitated in the least to vote for developments of waterways in Louisiana, in Alabama, in Pennsylvania, on the Missouri or any other part of this country where they are needed. But I must say that if any State, seeking developments for itself, indicates its intention to turn against developments in other parts of the country, I cannot support such self-seeking local interests. If we follow this practice, then we will soon find we have an unbalanced national economy.

I do not know how any person or group can be so shortsighted as to believe that they can increase the wealth of their community only by taking it away from some other part of this country.

I do not believe that we have reached the limit of our national growth. I do believe that that growth can best be promoted by a balanced development of our resources over the entire country. We must not plan our developments on a basis of sectional advantages.

There is no use in any longer ignoring the situation which appears to exist in the subcommittee having the St. Lawrence bill in charge. There is nothing to do now but to consider the development of waterways for our entire Nation at one and the same time. We cannot afford to let any one proposed development receive our approval when we are informed by paid advertising that the sponsor of such development will use every effort to deprive other parts of the country of the growth that is rightly theirs.

The only recourse left for the people of the Northeast and Great Lakes Basin, including 40 percent of the Nation's population, is to insist upon the inclusion of the St. Lawrence seaway and power project in the rivers and harbors bill.

As I stated before I shall, tomorrow, offer the St. Lawrence project as an amendment to the rivers and harbors bill in the hope that my colleagues from all over the country will give it the serious and sympathetic consideration which it deserves.

Although the neglect of the subcommittee of the Commerce Committee to hold hearings on the St. Lawrence bill has been an obstruction in the parliamentary procedure to bring the measure before the Senate, it does not, fortunately, deprive us of any substantial information regarding this project. This is the most thoroughly and exhaustively surveyed public resource in the country, and in addition to the many official studies of Federal departments and international commissions, there are available to the Senate exhaustive hearings and the reports of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee in 1933 and the House Rivers and Harbors Committee in 1941. In that one House hearing alone there are 2,300 printed pages of testimony. We know all there is to know about this project, and it is time to act.

PRINTING OF PAMPHLET OF INFORMATION AS TO RIGHTS OF AND BENEFITS TO VETERANS AND THEIR DEPENDENTS

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MCCLELLAN in the chair) laid before the Senate House Concurrent Resolution 100, which was read, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the pamphlet containing information as to the rights and benefits that are available to veterans of the armed forces and their dependents, published by the Office of War Mobilization, be printed as a document, and that 200,000 additional copies be printed for the use of the House of Representatives, 65,000 additional copies be printed for the use of the Senate, and 5,000 additional copies be printed for the use of the House Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

Mr. HAYDEN. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the resolution. It provides for the printing of a document which explains the rights of servicemen under what is called the G. I. bill of rights.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. Does this document contain an explanation prepared by the Veterans' Administration?

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes.

Mr. WHITE. And it is descriptive of the rights of the servicemen under the terms of what we know as the G. I. bill?

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes. It has been worked out by the Veterans' Administration and the War Department.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the concurrent resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the concurrent resolution.

Mr. HAYDEN. I move that the Senate concur in the House concurrent resolution.

The motion was agreed to.

RELINQUISHMENT OF TITLE BY THE UNITED STATES TO CERTAIN LANDS IN LOS ANGELES COUNTY

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, from the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys I report favorably without amendment House bill 4286 to relinquish the title of the United States to certain lands in the county of Los Angeles, State of California. The bill involves one-tenth of an acre in the city of Los Angeles.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HATCH. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. Is this the bill in which the senior Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON] is interested?

Mr. HATCH. It is.

Mr. WHITE. It is sufficient for me to know that.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I now ask for the present consideration of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the bill (H. R. 4286) to relinquish the title of the United States to certain lands in the county of Los Angeles, State of California, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

REDUCTION OF FARES TO PERSONNEL OF ARMED SERVICES

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of House bill 5196.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H. R. 5196) to amend section 22 of the Interstate Commerce Act by authorizing common carriers to grant reduced fares to personnel of armed services.

Mr. WHEELER. I may say that this bill, Mr. President, was passed by the House, I think, unanimously. The Senate Interstate Commerce Committee has favorably reported it. The present situation is that the railroads give reduced fares to the boys in the armed services and also to boys who have been furloughed and are returning home, or who have been discharged and are returning home. There is some question, however, as to whether the railroads can grant these reduced fares legally. The bill would clear up the technical question of the legality of the reduced fares. The Interstate Commerce Commission, the railroads, and others are very much interested in having the bill passed.

Mr. WHITE. As I understand, the bill would simply legalize a practice which is now in force?

Mr. WHEELER. That is correct.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana for immediate consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill (H. R. 5196) was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

NORTH DAKOTA SENATORIAL PRIMARY—LYNN W. STAMBAUGH

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, it has come to my attention that an attempt is being made, by innuendo, to involve Lynn U. Stambaugh, Fargo attorney and independent Republican candidate for Senator in the November 7 election, in the charges reported in the transcript of a hearing held by the Special Senate Committee to Investigate Campaign Expenditures, and inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD last week by the senior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. NYE].

Mr. President, as a member of the special committee, I was present at all its meetings on the North Dakota primary charges. Not one bit of evidence involving Mr. Stambaugh, directly or indirectly, was presented to the committee. Any implication to the contrary is a deliberate smear. The special committee took that same position when its members unanimously instructed the chairman, the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], to send a press release to that effect to all candidates in the North Dakota senatorial primary, of whom Mr. Stambaugh was one.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the committee release printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the release was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The Special Senate Committee to Investigate Campaign Expenditures has received testimony concerning an alleged attempt to induce a candidate to file in the North Dakota primary. The facts as alleged would constitute a serious violation of election laws and the committee has decided not to release the testimony taken until a more thorough investigation has been made.

However, because the committee's activities in this connection have been made an issue in the current primary campaign in North Dakota, the committee believes that fairness requires the statement that none of the candidates in the present North Dakota primary is involved in the testimony taken by the committee.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, I have met Mr. Stambaugh, and through many mutual friends in the American Legion, I know that he is a man of character, integrity, and conviction. It is for that reason that I make this brief statement.

EMPLOYMENT OF ENGINEERS AND ECONOMISTS FOR CONSULTATION PURPOSES ON RECLAMATION WORK

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent, out of order, for the present consideration of House bill 3429, Calendar 871.

The other day I took this matter up with the majority leader and also the minority leader. The bill is a departmental measure. It was unanimously reported by the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD] from the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation. It is the bill which the Senator from Maine discussed with the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN]. I discussed it with the Senator from Maine the other day, and also with the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, the Senator spoke to me about this bill, and I conferred with a number of the minority members of the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation, including the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN]. I have consulted other Senators and, so far as I know, there is no objection to the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H. R. 3429) to amend section 1 of an act entitled "An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to employ engineers and economists for consultation purposes on important reclamation work," approved February 28, 1929 (45 Stat. 1406), as amended by the act of April 22, 1940 (54 Stat. 148).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That section 1 of the act of February 28, 1929 (45 Stat. 1406), as amended by act of April 22, 1940 (54 Stat. 148), authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to employ engineers and economists for consultation purposes on important reclamation work, is hereby amended to read as follows: "That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized, in his judgment and discretion, to employ for consultation purposes on important reclamation work 10 consulting engineers, geologists, appraisers, economists, and lawyers, at rates of compensation to be fixed by him but not to exceed $50 per day for any engineer, geologist, appraiser, economist, or lawyer so employed: *Provided*, That the total compensation paid to any engineer, geologist, appraiser, economist, or lawyer during any fiscal year shall not exceed $5,000: *Provided further*, That notwithstanding the provisions of any other act, retired officers of the Army or Navy may be employed by the Secretary of the Interior as consulting engineers in accordance with the provisions of this act: *Provided further*, That notwithstanding the provisions of any other act, retired personnel of the Department of the Interior employed by the Secretary of the Interior as consultants in accordance with the provisions of this act, may be so employed without deductions from compensation for retirement, without loss of or redetermination of retirement status, and without loss or reduction of retirement annuity or other benefits by reason of such employment, except that there shall be deducted from the compensation otherwise payable to any such retired employee sums equal to the retirement annuity or benefit allocable to the days of actual employment hereunder: *Provided further*, That within 60 days from the expiration of each fiscal year the Secretary of the Interior shall report to the Congress the names of individuals employed for consultation purposes pursuant to the authority of this act, the period or periods of their employment during said fiscal year, the nature of the services rendered, and the amounts paid during said fiscal year to each of such individuals for such consultation services."

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

ISSUE OF BONDS BY CITY OF KETCHIKAN, ALASKA

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, in the absence of the chairman of the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs [Mr. TYDINGS], I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of House bill 5144, Calendar 1114.

As we know, Alaska has no representative in this body. The bill has already passed the House. It was reported unanimously from the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs. It would merely authorize the city of Ketchikan, Alaska, to issue bonds for municipal purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be read by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H. R. 5144) to authorize the city of Ketchikan, Alaska, to issue bonds in a sum not to exceed $150,000 for the purpose of constructing and acquiring additions and betterments to and extensions of the electric light and power system of said city, and to provide for the payment thereof, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I believe this is the bill about which the Delegate from Alaska spoke to me. He seemed

very much interested in it, and he persuaded me that it was appropriate legislation. I have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

POSITION AND VOTES OF CANDIDATES FOR POLITICAL OFFICE ON MAJOR QUESTIONS

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, I have many letters requesting information with respect to statements made or alleged to have been made by candidates for major offices and for a record of the votes of Members of the House and Senate on major proposals pending before the respective bodies of the Congress.

In an effort to answer these questions, I have had compiled a statement which I ask to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GOVERNOR DEWEY AND ISOLATION

On March 30, 1940, Governor Dewey declared, "We must elect a Republican administration which will keep completely out of European affairs."

Even after France had fallen and 2 days before Winston Churchill's famous "blood, sweat, and tears" speech, Dewey opposed any further aid to Britain because it "might lead to involvement."

On January 20, 1940, Dewey said: "Insofar as the present administration has adhered to the policies of its predecessors, it has met with the general approval of the American people. But it has occasionally strayed from the path. A conspicuous and most unfortunate departure was the recognition by the New Deal of Soviet Russia." Again in 1940 he declared: "At last I think our administration will stop trying to make deals with Russia. We need no such partnerships."

GOVERNOR DEWEY AND LEND-LEASE

As late as January 16, 1941, after Britain had barely survived the blitz, Dewey said the "lend-lease bill will bring an end to free government in the United States" and added that "it would permit the President to give away the whole Navy." The statement "give away the whole Navy" was a sarcastic reference to the President's exchanging 50 antiquated destroyers for the privilege of leasing many naval and air bases and the outright gift of the privilege for bases in Newfoundland and Bermuda, which would protect us from enemy aggressors, and which we so sorely needed.

GOVERNOR DEWEY AND RUSSIA

The President recognized Russia as a friendly nation on November 16, 1933, 8 months and 12 days after his inauguration. It was in January, 1940, that Dewey called the recognition of Russia by the United States "a conspicuous and unfortunate departure from our foreign policy," and Russia itself "a perversion of government abhorrent to the conscience of mankind."

Russia declared war on Germany June 22, 1941. Russia was declared eligible for lend-lease November 7, 1941. The lend-lease agreement between Russia and United States was made June 11, 1942.

In a dispatch from Cairo, quoted in the New York Times December 7, 1942, the Soviet Premier said at a dinner party, "Without American machines the United Nations never could have won the war."

Without lend-lease, which Mr. Dewey opposed, the United States could not have furnished the machines and airplanes to Russia, without which, Stalin said, "the United Nations never could have won the war."

GOVERNOR DEWEY ON PREPAREDNESS

When the President, in 1940, called for an air force of at least 50,000 planes and an annual production of 50,000 planes, Dewey said in a speech at Dallas, Tex., May 27, 1940:

"What is the good of talking about 50,000 planes unless we know what we are talking about? To produce 50,000 planes a year it will take a plant four and a half times as large as our present plant, including all plant capacity under construction. Experts estimate it would take 4 years to accomplish this."

Within 3 years, it turned out, America was producing 100,000 planes a year.

In Gen. Sir Bernard L. Montgomery's message of August 11, 1944, paying high tribute to the Allied Armies in northwest France, he declared: "As soldiers we all want to pay our tribute to the Allied Air Forces. I doubt if ever in the history of war air forces have had such opportunities or have taken such good advantage of them." He further said, "The brave and brilliant work of the pilots has aroused our greatest admiration. Without their support we soldiers could have achieved no success."

The above statement of General Montgomery's tribute to the air forces is in diplomatic language. However, the last paragraph, "Without their support we soldiers could have achieved no success," means in plain, frank language that without their support we would be losing this war. Without superiority in the air the aviators could not give him any support, and Governor Dewey criticized the President for requesting the appropriation to build at least 50,000 airplanes a year, which makes us supreme in the air.

CONGRESSIONAL VOTES

In the House the Republicans voted against the naval expansion bill. In March, 1939, they voted against a bill to increase our air forces to a total of 6,000 planes. In June, 1939, in the House, they voted 144 to 8 to reduce the appropriation for the Army Air Forces. In September, 1939, they voted 6 to 1 against the repeal of the embargo. In September, 1940, after France had fallen and the blitzkreig against England had begun, the Republicans in the House voted 112 to 52 against the Selective Service Act.

In February, 1941, the Republicans in the House voted 135 to 24 against lend-lease.

In August, 1941—4 months before Pearl Harbor—the Republicans in the House voted 133 to 21 to disband that part of the armed forces built from the selective-service personnel.

Comparison of House and Senate votes

	For	*Against*
LEND-LEASE		
House:		
Republicans	24	135
Democrats	236	25
Senate:		
Republicans	10	17
Democrats	49	13
ARMING MERCHANT SHIPS		
House:		
Republicans	22	137
Democrats	189	53
Senate:		
Republicans	6	21
Democrats	43	15
SELECTIVE SERVICE		
House:		
Republicans	52	112
Democrats	211	33
Senate:		
Republicans	7	10
Democrats	40	15

IF DEWEY HAD BEEN PRESIDENT

Now let us visualize a picture of what would be the condition of the world today in general and the United States in particular if Dewey had been President in the last 8 years instead of Roosevelt.

Poland was invaded by the Germans September 1, 1939, and fell within 27 days, on September 27, 1939. France was invaded by the Germans June 6, 1940. France fell, with 5,000,000 armed soldiers, June 22, 1940. The evacuation and horrible slaughter at Dunkirk of the British was May 29, 1940. Russia declared war on Germany June 22, 1941. You will note that the German hordes, with the largest and best trained army in the world, superior in arms and ammunition and especially in airplanes, were running pell-mell over Europe., England was tottering to her fall May 13, 1940, and it seems that Hitler was on the way to reach his goal to be the emperor of the earth.

President Roosevelt realized that we would soon be engrossed in this terrible holocaust, and began to prepare. He asked for at least 50,000 airplanes per annum, and Mr. Dewey criticized him. He asked for lend-lease, and Mr. Dewey criticized him. Without this action on the part of the President, which gave him authority to extend lend-lease, which he did to England when England was tottering to her fall, we could not have furnished England arms, ammunition, and especially airplanes. He extended lend-lease to Russia when it looked like Russia would fall. He extended lend-lease to the French underground and all European underground forces of the Allies. And the most powerful weapons of all that he furnished our allies were airplanes. And with our superiority and unlimited capacity to produce airplanes, ships, and tanks, we are winning this war. If Mr. Dewey had been President he would have opposed all of this legislation; therefore, we would be losing the war. After Hitler would have conquered England, Russia, France, Poland, and all the other European countries, what next? Portugal, Spain, and Turkey, neutral, would have fallen all over one another to get into the German bandwagon for victory. Then on to South America, where he had his bund and satellites in every country. Also, the same applies to Mexico. He would have overrun those countries which rebelled and were helpless on account of the lack of arms, ammunition, and airplanes, and he would have conquered them. He would have also destroyed or taken the Panama Canal, and we, without any doubt, would have had to ask for an armistice or continue a long, costly, and cruel war to save our liberties. This would have been our end if Mr. Dewey had been President of the United States in the last 8 years.

HOSPITAL SHIP "CHARLES A. STAFFORD"

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, I had the opportunity on the 9th of September to inspect one of the Army's newest hospital ships at the port of New York. The vessel is named for the late Capt. Charles A. Stafford, of the United States Medical Corps, who was killed in action on March 3, 1942, during the evacuation of Java.

I was escorted on this interesting and impressive tour of the *Stafford* by the Commanding General of the Port of Embarkation of New York, Maj. Gen. Homer M. Groninger, members of his splendid staff, and Mr. John Brownlie, president of the A. B. C. Steel Equipment Co., of New York, whose firm of marine joiners completed for the Army the *Stafford's* interior accommodations.

In every detail this magnificent vessel is a tribute to the genius of Army plan-

ning for every eventuality, and Lt. Col. George Schuhmann, the port's surgeon, pointed out to me the completeness of the medical arrangement. No hospital on land offers more in the way of facilities for our wounded soldiers than does the *Charles A. Stafford*, hospital ship.

As it went into service the other day, the *Stafford* was the twenty-second such vessel to be converted from former passenger liners to hospital ships. The *Stafford* was the former luxury liner *Siboney*, which operated between New York and Havana, and today is the fastest hospital ship afloat. It was converted rapidly and efficiently at the Bethlehem Steel Corporation's 56th Street shipyards at Brooklyn from plans prepared by the Conversions, Maintenance, and Contracts Branch of the Port of Embarkation's Water Division.

The *Siboney* saw service as a troop ship in World War No. 1, as well as in this war, before being sent to drydock to be converted and equipped as a 700-bed hospital ship. Designed as a fast passenger ship for the line operating between New York and Havana, the vessel, upon completion early in 1918, was taken over by the Army for use as a troop ship. It established outstanding records as one of the fastest United States transports in World War No. 1.

Following the war, the ship was taken over by the New York & Cuba Mail Steamship Line, and for a number of years operated on the New York to Havana run. In 1941, when the need for additional Army transports became apparent, the *Siboney* again was requisitioned as a troop ship, and made several voyages. About a year ago it became evident that the *Siboney's* boilers were beyond repair and that replacements were necessary. When new boilers were delivered early in 1944, the Office of the Chief of Transportation decided, in view of the length of time required for reboilering, to convert the ship concurrently into a hospital ship. With the installation of new boilers, the ship has been modernized in appearance. The reboilering has made it possible to eliminate one of the ship's two stacks.

Col. G. P. Cross, who, I understand, is responsible for much of the interior engineering and planning of these hospital and troop ships, explained to me in considerable detail the vast amount of labor and ingenuity so necessary to such conversion jobs. I was particularly impressed with the ship's accommodations—the modern operating rooms, the galleys, wards for the wounded, and staterooms for the medical personnel—in short, with everything which has been done to make the voyage home for our ill and wounded as comfortable as possible.

AMERICA'S PART IN FUTURE RELATIONS AMONG NATIONS

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, both yesterday and today I very much desired to discuss some questions regarding the part which this Nation is to play in the future relations among the nations of the world, in order to devise some plan which might prevent, or at least tend to prevent, war.

So, Mr. President, I have prepared, and have on my desk, what I think to be an interesting discussion of this most important question. In the manuscript which I have before me I say that on yesterday two notable speeches were made relative to the part this country should play with other nations of the world in forming an organization to prevent war.

Mr. President, I am sorry that question does not attract more attention on the floor of the Senate. I regret that Senators are so much more interested in their own personal concerns that they hold private conversations. I do not say that because anything I could say would be at all important, Mr. President, and I am not going to attempt at this late hour in the afternoon to state the thoughts which I have written on paper, and which are deep and burning in my own mind and heart.

Mr. President, yesterday, as I said, two notable speeches were delivered on the floor of the Senate. They were not delivered from this side of the Chamber; they were not uttered by Democrats. Frankly, I wish they had been. Those speeches were made by two Members of the minority party, by the junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL] and the junior Senator from Ohio [Mr. BURTON].

My purpose today is merely to associate myself with those Senators and with the sentiments they have expressed, and to say, among other things, that I hope that Senators of the United States—and, Mr. President, I am still looking at other Senators who are talking, who are not at all interested in what is being said, who are holding their own private conversations—I repeat that I hope that some time Senators of the United States will be as honest and as brave and as courageous as are the boys of America who are fighting and dying while Senators talk.

Mr. President, I yield to anyone who desires to have the floor.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. BARKLEY. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TUNNELL in the chair) laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. BAILEY, from the Committee on Commerce:

Edward Macauley, of California, to be a member of the United States Maritime Commission for the term of 6 years from September 26, 1944 (reappointment).

By Mr. BARKLEY, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Walter Thurston, of Arizona, now Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to El Salvador, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Bolivia;

John F. Simmons, of New York, a Foreign Service officer of class 1 and counselor of embassy at Rio de Janeiro, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to El Salvador;

Arthur Bliss Lane, of New York, now Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Colombia, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to the Government of Poland now established in London;

Charles Sawyer, of Ohio, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Belgium and to serve concurrently and without additional compensation as Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary to Luxembourg;

Stanley K. Hornbeck, of Colorado, now Special Assistant to the Secretary of State, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to The Netherlands;

Richard C. Patterson, Jr., of New York, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to the Government of Yugoslavia now established in London;

Lithgow Osborne, of New York, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to the Government of Norway now established in London;

John C. Wiley, of Indiana, former Minister to Latvia and Estonia, now assigned to the Department of State, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Colombia; and

George Wadsworth, of New York, now diplomatic agent and consul general at Beirut and Damascus, to be Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Lebanese Republic and to serve concurrently and without additional compensation as Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary to the Republic of Syria.

By Mr. McKELLAR, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads:

Sundry postmasters.

THE FOREIGN SERVICE

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, today, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, I have reported a number of nominations of ministers and ambassadors. They are all nominations of career men, and are routine promotions and transfers. I have consulted the Senator from Maine [Mr. WHITE] about them. It is very important that the nominations be confirmed before the call of the calendar. I ask that they be now considered.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I join in the expression of the hope that the nominations will be considered and acted upon at this time. I understand, in addition to what the Senator from Kentucky has said, that the Senators from the several States concerned have been contacted and that they have indicated approval.

Mr. BARKLEY. That is true. All such Senators have been contacted and they have expressed their approval.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations will be considered en bloc; and, without objection, the nominations are confirmed en bloc.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of the nominations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

THE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the nominations on the calendar.

CIVIL AERONAUTICS ADMINISTRATION

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Thedore P. Wright, of the District of Columbia, to be Administrator, Civil Aeronautics Administration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

RECORDER OF DEEDS, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Marshall L. Shepard, of Pennsylvania, to be Recorder of Deeds, District of Columbia.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, on this nomination I believe a statement should be made to the Senate on behalf of the several members of the Committee on the District of Columbia, and I wish to follow the statement with a motion that the nomination be recommitted to the committee, with a request that the committee hold a hearing on it.

If I may now proceed with the statement, it is to this effect: There is nothing closer to the welfare of the Nation than local government; and, peculiarly enough, the United States Congress has a certain assignment of local government. That is the assignment in the District of Columbia. It is perfectly clear that the most important function of local government is good administration. Although the Senate and the House may act on questions of legislation, the Senate has a peculiar responsibility with respect to appointments to positions within the District of Columbia when they come before us for confirmation, because the government of the District of Columbia can be no better and no sounder than the character of the officials appointed to administer that government.

We have a peculiar responsibility, because under the present law Congress has not permitted the residents of the District of Columbia to vote. At one time they were able to vote and to elect their officers, or some of them. At the present time they do not have that right.

Naturally, Congress must depend upon committees in its work affecting the District. It has been my assignment since I have been a Member of the Senate to serve on the Senate Committee on the District of Columbia for the past 4 years.

I realize thoroughly that the Senate must depend upon that committee for a good deal of its material relating to the District of Columbia. When it comes to appointments, the Senate must depend upon its committee, because, of course, the House of Representatives has no jurisdiction of that matter.

Therefore, it seems to me peculiarly important that in the case of appointments in the District of Columbia which require confirmation by the Senate, there be a meeting of the Committee on the District of Columbia, and that in cases in which there is any kind of a protest, particularly one from the people of the District of Columbia, there be an opportunity to have such protest heard before that committee, before the Senate undertakes to act upon the appointments. Otherwise, the people of the District of Columbia most directly affected by the appointments are in effect deprived of an opportunity to make known their point of view on the particular vital appointments having to do with the administration of their affairs.

I believe that special care should be used in a case of this kind. The office of Recorder of Deeds of the District of Columbia is one which deals with local conditions in the District. When charges or objections are raised in connection with such an appointment, I believe it to be unfair to the nominee, to the District, and to the Senate, not to afford an opportunity for consideration of the charges on their merits.

In this case, therefore, my reason for raising the objection is that the position is an important one, and the Senate is entitled to a recommendation from the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Protests have been filed. I am not familiar with the basis of the protests, because no opportunity has been afforded for members of the committee to meet with the nominee, or to hear the protests in committee.

There appeared in the Washington Times-Herald of August 22, 1944, a statement quoting Dr. Edward F. Harris, president of the Federation of Civic Associations. The membership of the Federation consists primarily of Negroes of the District. Dr. Harris is quoted as saying:

> I think this job should go to a Washingtonian, instead of being a national political plum awarded for vote-getting purposes. I have advocated its being placed under the District Commissioners.

I have also received a telephone message from Harry Wender, president of the Federated Citizens Associations of the District of Columbia, which is interested in civic affairs, and the membership of which consists primarily of white citizens of the District of Columbia. They have acted through their District board. Mr. Wender reported to me that he wished to communicate through me to the Senate that the position of his organization is that the office in question is one of importance to the community, is peculiarly a local office, and one which has been filled in the past by a Negro appointee. The members of this organization do not have the slightest objection to the office being held by a representative of the Negro race. They rather advocate that it be so held, but that the appointment be made from among the eligible and competent Negroes of the District of Columbia.

That is not all, Mr. President. Protests have been twice expressed in the newspapers of the District of Columbia. The newspapers naturally represent, to some extent, at least, the opinion of those residing in the District with regard to the pending appointment. It seems to me that the character of the criticism is such that the Senate owes it to the people of the District of Columbia, and to itself, to see that an opportunity is afforded for a hearing on the merits of the question.

Mr. President, I refer to an editorial entitled "A Spoilsman's Office," appearing in the Washington Star of August 23, 1944, in which the following statement is made:

> Washington Negroes, who since the days of Frederick Douglass have regarded the office of recorder of deeds as reserved for deserving colored citizens, were anxious that a Washington man be appointed to succeed the late Dr. William J. Thompkins. Vain hope!
>
> This office is a political plum at the disposal of the politicians. The recorder is never selected because of any special equipment for the duties involved, nor in any recognition of the fact that the voteless taxpayers of the District pay his salary. The real administrative work is done by the deputies, not the recorder, who, being a free spirit, is left to wander as he wills on political missions hither and yon. It is said that the most recent incumbent spent a third of his time out of Washington. Since Mr. Douglass, every man who held the job save one has been a Negro citizen, but none of these has been a Washingtonian.
>
> The political complexion of this office has given it a unique status among District agencies. While the Commissioners are legally responsible for the expenditure of its funds, the recorder has successfully resisted an audit of the accounts by the District—in spite of a threat from the House District Appropriations Subcommittee this year that unless one were made, funds for the office would be cut off.

I also quote from an editorial appearing in the Washington Post of September 16, 1944, as follows:

PATRONAGE GRAB

> Nomination of the Reverend Marshall L. Shepard, of Philadelphia, to be recorder of deeds in the District is one of the most flagrant pieces of political jobbery that has come to our attention this year. Only one explanation of the appointment can be made. This Philadelphia preacher is being paid off for his services as head of the Negro section of the Democratic Speakers' Bureau. Through the influence of Senator GUFFEY, he is to be put on the District pay roll at $8,000 a year in the hope of swinging Pennsylvania into the Democratic column in November.
>
> By tradition the Recorder of Deeds in the District is a Negro. The position is one of a limited number in the local government to which Negroes are customarily appointed. That makes it all the more outrageous that many well-qualified colored citizens of the disfranchised District were passed over in order to use this important post to pay a political debt. And to cap the climax the Senate District Committee bowed to this patronage grab by proxy without so much as a hearing on the nominee's qualifications or even a meeting of the committee.

I have before me another editorial, but I shall not take the time of the Senate to read it. I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD at this point, as a part of my remarks, an editorial appearing in the Washington Post of September 19, 1944, entitled "Carpetbagging in D. C."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CARPETBAGGING IN DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

> Senator MCCARRAN'S reply to the "carpetbag" appointment of a Philadelphia clergyman to be recorder of deeds in the District is to propose a law requiring the appointment of bona fide local residents to such municipal positions. The former chairman of the Sen-

ate District Committee is properly disturbed by this misuse of an important local office as a political reward on the eve of a national election. Along with many Members of the Senate and thousands of local residents, we share his resentment. But we would much prefer to see the objective he has in mind accomplished in some other way.

It is true that many District jobs are given to nonresidents. That fact is especially noticeable from the list of judges serving the District. Local men are seldom appointed because residents of the disfranchised Capital City are not in a position to bring pressure upon the appointing officials. We have often cried out against this unreasonable and unfair practice, and are thus inclined to look with favor upon any means of insuring the appointment of more District residents to local positions. At the same time we recognize that a rigid statute requiring all local officeholders to be bona fide District residents might at times work to the disadvantage of the community.

Occasionally it may be desirable to seek specialists, such as a health officer or a director of public welfare, from other cities. We do not think the door should be closed to such appointments, when made on the basis of merit alone, although it is certainly the best practice to put local men in local jobs if their qualifications are equal to those of experts who might be obtained elsewhere. It is possible, of course, that Senator McCARRAN'S proposed bill may be qualified so as not to substitute the disadvantages of provincialism for those of carpetbagging. At least in the present instance, however, a more direct remedy is at hand.

It is absurd, in any event, to have the President appointing a local recorder of deeds. That unnatural arrangement is an invitation to use the position for the payment of political debts. The office should be brought under the local government and the appointment left to the District Commissioners. That would not disturb the tradition that this office is held by a Negro. On the contrary, the Commissioners could be expected to select for this $8,000 job an outstanding Washington Negro. As matters stand, the position can scarcely be regarded as a local office, but only as a bit of spoils awarded for the benefit of whatever party happens to be in power.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, I do not necessarily endorse everything stated in those editorials, and I do not have all the information set forth in them, but they reflect statements made in behalf of the people of the District of Columbia by responsible citizens of the District. It seems to me that it would be appropriate to afford an opportunity for consideration of the arguments in favor of the nominee, and also of those in behalf of the people of the District of Columbia, before final action on the appointment is taken.

The recorder of deeds of the District of Columbia is not required by law to be a citizen of the District. But since becoming a Member of the Senate I have recognized that there is a distinct policy of Congress bearing upon appointments in the District which emphasizes the value of drawing the appointees from the District. By statute it is required that civilian Commissioners of the District shall have resided in the District 3 years before appointment; that members of the Public Utilities Commission shall have resided for 3 years in the District before appointment; that the people's counsel shall have resided for 5 years in the District before appointment; that judges of the municipal court shall have resided in the District for 5 years before appointment, or shall have served as judges in another District court; and that members of the Municipal Court of Appeals shall have resided in the District for 5 years. As to the juvenile court, it is stated that the appointment shall be made preferably from residents of the District. Notaries public are required to reside in the District of Columbia, or have their sole place of business in the District of Columbia.

Among appointees in the District only the following are not subject to the requirements which I have stated:

The Engineer Commissioner, who comes from the Engineer Corps of the Army, and three assistant commissioners, who come from the Engineer Corps of the Army and who of course are not required to have the qualifications which I have stated; the recorder of deeds, the register of wills, members of the United States district court, and members of the Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia. They are all, however, subject to approval by the Senate.

As to Federal court appointments, we know that there is a precedent in the Judiciary Committee whereby, whether a protest has been made or not, a time is always set for a hearing upon the qualifications of a nominee for the Federal court. As stated, the recorder of deeds and the register of wills are not required to have residence within the District of Columbia.

When the nominee is not a resident of the District, I believe the Senate owes a peculiar obligation to hold a hearing on his appointment, because the people of the District cannot possibly know the personal qualifications of the nominee. They should have a forum in which they may present their views, and the nominee himself should have a forum in which he may present his qualifications.

The Senate has a special responsibility in the present instance because the office in question does not operate under the control of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia. It is practically an independent office and operates under its own control. Neither does its audit come under the jurisdiction of the District Commissioners. Members of the Senate have considered for some time proposing legislation which would require the office to be brought under the same audit to which other District offices are subjected.

Finally, Mr. President, it has been customary to appoint a Negro to this position. I regard that as a commendable policy. But to put the office on a political basis and not afford an opportunity to the nominee to present his merits is not a compliment to the nominee or to the process.

Mr. President, it seems to me that it is vitally important to the welfare of the District, and to the standard of service which should be associated with the office, that the Senate should require that an opportunity be given to the nominee to present his merits to the committee, so that when the question arises as to whether there may be an audit of the accounts of his office, he may recognize the fact that such a question is one for the Senate to consider on its merits and not on a political basis. It seems to me that if it appears to him from the start that the only qualification he must have for this office is one of political expediency, proper protection will not be provided for the incumbent, nor will the Senate render proper service to the public in connection with the matter.

I may say, therefore, that I feel the obligation to make this motion, because four members of the Committee on the District of Columbia have joined in a letter to the chairman of the District Committee under date of September 18, signed by the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CAPPER], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD], and myself, four members of the Senate committee, as follows:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
Washington, D. C., September 18, 1944.

Hon. THEODORE G. BILBO,
Chairman, Committee on the District of Columbia, United States Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

Recommital of nomination of Marshall L. Shepard

DEAR SENATOR BILBO: The undersigned members of the Senate Committee on the District of Columbia respectfully request that an opportunity be given to the committee to consider, in a meeting of the committee, the nomination of Marshall L. Shepard for Recorder of Deeds for the District of Columbia. There was submitted to the Senate on September 15, to the surprise of the undersigned, by Senator ARTHUR WALSH of New Jersey a report recommending confirmation of this nomination in which it was reported that a majority of the members of the committee had joined although no meeting of the committee had been called to consider the nomination and although, in one or more cases, no request for approval of the nomination nor any notice of a meeting on the nomination was submitted to the Senators signing this request.

Inasmuch as this appointment carries with it a salary of $8,000 per year and large responsibilities over which the Commissioners of the District of Columbia exercise little, if any, authority, a special obligation rests upon the Senate and the Senate Committee on the District of Columbia in acting upon the nomination. Also, in view of the policy repeatedly expressed in recent legislation to the effect that holders of appointive offices in the District of Columbia shall be residents of the District for several years prior to the appointment, an especial obligation rests upon the Senate and this committee to consider this nomination as the nominee is not a resident of the District, and, therefore, the citizens of the District do not have an opportunity to familiarize themselves with his qualifications and must rely upon the Senate and this committee to make such investigation on their behalf.

Under these circumstances, the undersigned request that the chairman of the committee join with them in asking the Senate to recommit this nomination to the committee in order that a meeting of the full committee may be held to consider the same and that consideration may be given to the holding of hearings either by the full committee or a subcommittee thereof on this nomination.

Yours respectfully,

ARTHUR CAPPER.
STYLES BRIDGES.
HAROLD H. BURTON.
HARLAND J. BUSHFIELD.

Mr. President, I wish to add that I was interested a few days ago when the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WALSH]

presented this matter. He did present to the Senate a statement as to the qualifications of this particular nominee, and that was the first time those qualifications had come to my attention. There is no doubt much can be said for the nominee. As a matter of fact, the making of my motion at this time is quite as much to prevent this action becoming a precedent for further cases as it is to bring this matter to the attention of the Senate at this time.

I particularly call the attention of the Senate to another letter in which four Members of the Senate have joined and sent to the Committee on the District of Columbia, dealing with another nomination which is now pending before the committee, and in order that there may be notice of this nomination, I wish also to read this letter. It is for this reason that I take this occasion of emphasizing this subject as a precedent.

The letter is addressed to the chairman of the Committee on the District of Columbia, the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. BILBO], dated September 18, signed also by the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CAPPER], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD], and myself. It relates to the nomination of Guy Mason for reappointment as Commissioner of the District of Columbia. The letter reads:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
Washington, D. C., September 18, 1944.

Hon. THEODORE G. BILBO,
Chairman, Committee on the District of Columbia, United States Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

NOMINATION OF GUY MASON FOR REAPPOINTMENT AS COMMISSIONER OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

DEAR SENATOR BILBO: The undersigned members of the Senate Committee on the District of Columbia respectfully request that before any recommendation is filed with the Senate on behalf of the Committee on the District of Columbia as to the confirmation of the reappointment by the President of Guy Mason as a Commissioner of the District, a meeting of the Senate Committee on the District of Columbia be held to consider the question.

Your attention is respectfully invited to the fact that in October 1943 a subcommittee of the Senate Committee on the District of Columbia, consisting of Senators RUFUS C. HOLMAN, C. DOUGLASS BUCK, and HARLAN J. BUSHFIELD, following an investigation of conditions at Gallinger Hospital, recommended the immediate removal of Commissioner Mason from office. Senator PAT MCCARRAN, then chairman of the Senate Committee on the District of Columbia, strongly endorsed the findings of this subcommittee and all of its recommendations. The report was reviewed in detail in one or more meetings of the full committee. Its findings were approved and certain of its recommendations were recommended, while action on others, including that of the removal of Commissioner Mason, was postponed, but not disapproved.

At that time it was pointed out that the committee shortly would have an opportunity to take action on Commissioner Mason's reappointment when his 3-year term expired if he was renominated for the office.

Under these circumstances, the undersigned feel that the nomination of Commissioner Mason should be considered fully by the committee in a regularly called meeting, and that in justice to the people of the District of Columbia, Commissioner Mason, and the subcommittee of this committee, consideration should be given to the holding of hearings on his nomination.

The undersigned especially request that no recommendation as to this nomination be filed with the Senate as a result of polling the committee or otherwise acting on behalf of the committee without a meeting of it.

Yours respectfully,

STYLES BRIDGES.
ARTHUR CAPPER.
HAROLD H. BURTON.
HARLAN J. BUSHFIELD.

Mr. President, I therefore move to recommit the nomination of Marshall L. Shepard to the Committee on the District of Columbia, and request that the committee hold a hearing on the nomination. I again emphasize that the special object in making this motion is to prevent a precedent being established in this case which might trouble us in the future.

Mr. WALSH of New Jersey. Mr. President, I do not intend to burden the Senate with a lengthy discussion. There is little I can add to my remarks of a few days ago when I read into the RECORD certain qualifications of Dr. Shepard.

I explained that the chairman of the Committee on the District of Columbia, the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. BILBO], had been ill. He did poll the committee, and I was delegated to report favorably on the nomination.

The distinguished Senator from Ohio [Mr. BURTON] I believe quoted from an editorial in which Mr. Edward F. Harris, president of the Federation of Civic Associations, attacked the nomination of Dr. Shepard.

Mr. BURTON. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. WALSH of New Jersey. I yield.

Mr. BURTON. The quotation with regard to Dr. Harris was not an editorial, it was a news item, in which he recommended that the appointment be made from the District of Columbia rather than from outside the District.

Mr. WALSH of New Jersey. I thank the Senator. It seems it might be appropriate to read into the RECORD two or three paragraphs from an editorial which appeared in the Washington Tribune of Saturday, September 2. The Washington Tribune, I am informed, is the only colored newspaper published in the District of Columbia. I quote:

Negroes in Washington are content with the manner and method by which the holder of this post is selected, and we are glad that the Presidents, with but one exception, have seen fit to honor the Negro race for the past 50 years, in making the appointment.

By the same yardstick that other prominent Negroes have been measured in the selection of a recorder, the Reverend Mr. Shepard meets every test eminently.

A fearless leader—no Uncle Tom—Negroes will be well represented by his presence in Washington. Well educated, with enough degrees to bury Mr. Harris, the Reverend Mr. Shepard has worked the better part of his life for political, social, and civic betterment of our people, with a marked degree of success, and whether he comes from Pennsylvania, the District, or West Hell, he is welcome to his new post, Mr. Harris to the contrary notwithstanding.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have placed in the RECORD following my remarks a list of the former holders of the office of Recorder of Deeds since 1881, and the names of the Presidents who appointed them. In all but 1 out of 12 instances, the appointee was from outside the District of Columbia.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request?

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Members of the colored race appointed to the position of Recorder of Deeds of the District of Columbia, the States they were from, and by whom appointed, are as follows:

Recorder	State	President	Year
Frederick Douglass	Maryland	James A. Garfield	1881
James Monroe Trotter	Massachusetts	Grover Cleveland	1887
Blanche K. Bruce	Mississippi	Benjamin Harrison	1890
Charles H. J. Taylor	Kansas	Grover Cleveland	1894
Henry P. Cheatham	North Carolina	William McKinley	1897
John C. Dancy	do	Theodore Roosevelt	1902
Henry L. Johnson	Georgia	William H. Taft	1910
John F. Costello (white)	District of Columbia	Woodrow Wilson	1916
Arthur G. Froe	West Virginia	Warren G. Harding	1922
Jefferson S. Coage	Delaware	Herbert Hoover	1930
William J. Thompkins	Missouri	Franklin D. Roosevelt	1934
Marshall L. Shepard	Pennsylvania	do	1944

Mr. WALSH of New Jersey. I cannot quarrel with the sincere beliefs of the able Senator from Ohio that it is preferable to have nominees appear before a committee, and to avoid the practice of polling members of committees. However, I think it would be unwise in this case to change the procedure between nomination and confirmation when the nominee involved is a distinguished member of the colored race. So I urge that the motion of the able Senator from Ohio be not agreed to.

Mr. MCCARRAN. Mr. President, inasmuch as my name has been mentioned by my good friend the able Senator from Ohio, and inasmuch as I served for some time as chairman of the Committee on the District of Columbia, I wish to say that the statements made in the letter read by the Senator from Ohio are correct.

When the renomination of Commissioner Mason comes before the Senate I shall make it a point, if I am then a Member of this body, to be present, and to oppose with all my strength confirmation of the nomination of Mr. Mason. My reason for that attitude is Mr. Mason's conduct before the Committee on the District of Columbia when he practically scoffed at the idea of giving any statement, explanatory or otherwise, pertaining to a public institution over which he had control.

As regards the immediate subject, I shall vote against the motion of the Senator from Ohio, because I joined in vot-

ing for the confirmation of the nominee. I did so reluctantly but, nevertheless, emphatically; reluctantly because I have learned to believe, from 12 years of service on the District of Columbia Committee, that appointees to positions within the District should come from among the body of the people of the District of Columbia.

Let me deal with the subject now at hand. The Recorder of Deeds has for a long time been selected from the Negro race, and the occupants of that office have served the office and the people well. Nearly one-third of the population of the District of Columbia is of the colored race. I say without fear of contradiction that there are in the District of Columbia, among the people of the colored race, those who are as outstanding from an educational standpoint in that race as any in the world. So the selection could well have come from among that portion of the colored race which abides in the District.

Mr. President, the population of the District of Columbia at the present time is nearly 1,000,000—men, women, and children—many of whom have lived here for many years, many of whom were born and reared here, and are the product of the schools of the District of Columbia. They have lived here all their lives. They love and live, marry and give in marriage, and then at the end of their time die and are buried here in the District of Columbia. The District is a great center of the very finest citizenry in the world. Out of that citizenry there could with entire propriety be chosen those who would serve in public office.

I shall speak frankly, Mr. President, without any idea of drawing political lines, because both parties have indulged from year to year and from time to time in the practice of appointing to office in the District of Columbia men from outside the District whether a Republican administration or a Democratic administration was in office; so there is no party line to be drawn in this respect. In my judgment no appointee for public office in the District should come from outside the District. Nominees for positions in the District, from the judiciary down to the lowest office in the District of Columbia, should be selected by the President or the appointive power from among the people of the District of Columbia.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I fully agree with the Senator from Nevada, but so long as the present system exists, whether the administration in power be Republican or Democratic, the Senator's desire and my desire that officials of the District of Columbia be selected from the population of the District of Columbia will not be acquiesced in, and such a thing will not happen until the Congress assumes the responsibility and passes a law to that effect.

Mr. McCARRAN. I agree with the Senator from New Mexico, and I am grateful for his interruption, because that is exactly the thought I wish to express. If I shall continue to be a Member of this body I shall introduce a bill to the effect that appointees to public office in the District of Columbia shall be from among the population of the District of Columbia.

Mr. President, so far as this particular appointment is concerned, while I would rather that the nominee had come from the District of Columbia, I shall vote for the confirmation of the nomination, because if we reject this nominee the President is not bound to appoint another individual from any particular section of the country. He could even go to Nevada for a nominee, or to Ohio. So there is no point to be gained by turning down the present nominee, because undoubtedly he is well qualified. His whole career shows that he is eminently qualified. So nothing is to be gained by rejecting the nomination.

The point I wish to stress, and that is the reason why I took the floor on this occasion, is that appointees to public office in the District should come from among the population of the District of Columbia.

That is all I desire to say at this time.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, as soon as Congress reconvenes after the recess about to be taken, I propose to sponsor a measure which will give the people of the District of Columbia the right of self-government, and the right to have officials appointed to office in the District from among the people of the District of Columbia, and not elsewhere.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I think the case has been presented very ably by the distinguished Senator from Ohio [Mr. BURTON], and I am delighted that the distinguished Senators from New Jersey [Mr. WALSH], Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN], and New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] are going to join with us in the future when similar appointments are made. The Senator from New Jersey has indicated that he at least is going to ask that full hearings be had on nominations sent to the Senate in the future. The Senators from New Mexico and Nevada have indicated their willingness to support the principle that District men and women should be appointed to occupy District positions.

My objections to this particular appointment, as I indicated the other day, are two. First, because of the procedure followed in the committee, which I thought was railroading through a nomination without proper consideration, when certain members of the committee were not even polled and when all members of the committee had no opportunity to question the fitness of the individual concerned.

Secondly, my position is due to the fact that I think there are in the District of Columbia Negroes competent to fill this office. To that end I asked some of the representative groups in the District if there were outstanding Negroes in the District of Columbia who would make competent recorders of deeds, and they were very enthusiastic about two names which they gave me as being typical of the outstanding Negroes of the District. The names were those of the Honorable James A. Cobb, who for many years served as municipal court judge in the District of Columbia, and also as an Assistant Attorney General of the United States; and a Mr. John R. Pinkett, who is in the insurance business, and who is a member of the District of Columbia Welfare Commission at the present time. Both men, they said, might be interested in the post, and were eminently qualified to fill it.

For that reason I believe we could well consider at this time, to serve as an administrative officer of the District, a District of Columbia Negro. For the two reasons mentioned I support the motion of the distinguished Senator from Ohio to recommit the nomination.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TUNNELL in the chair). The question is on the motion of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BURTON] that the nomination be recommitted.

The motion was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now is, Will the Senate advise and consent to this nomination?

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I shall cast my personal vote against the confirmation of this nomination, because of the reasons which have been advanced on the floor of the Senate this afternoon, and at an earlier date. However, I feel an obligation to place before the Senate the views of the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DAVIS] with respect to the nomination. The Senator from Pennsylvania makes the following statement for inclusion in the RECORD:

> Mr. President, the nomination of Dr. Marshall L. Shepard to be the Recorder of Deeds for the District of Columbia meets with my sincere approval.
>
> I have known Dr. Shepard over the years and I consider him an outstanding and straightforward citizen, as well as a sincere and faithful minister of the gospel. And I know that he is highly respected by the citizens of his community in the great city of Philadelphia.
>
> I believe him to be eminently qualified to fill and properly carry out the position for which he has been designated. Therefore, I urge my colleagues in the Senate to confirm his appointment.

I repeat that personally I am unable to yield to the persuasions of my Pennsylvania colleague.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Marshall L. Shepard to be Recorder of Deeds for the District of Columbia?

The nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next nomination on the calendar.

COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Howard S. Cole to be junior hydrographic and geodetic engineer with rank of lieutenant (junior grade) from May 17, 1944.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of John T. Guthrie to be junior hydrographic and geodetic engineer with rank of lieutenant (junior grade) from May 17, 1944.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Robert W. McCarty to be junior hydrographic and geodetic engineer with rank of lieutenant (junior grade) from May 21, 1944.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

FOREIGN SERVICE

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Foreign Service.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask that the nominations in the Foreign Service be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations in the Foreign Service are confirmed en bloc.

THE JUDICIARY

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Harold Maurice Kennedy to be United States district judge for the eastern district of New York.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

ASSAYER IN THE MINT OF THE UNITED STATES

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Paul S. Nice to be assayer in the mint of the United States at Denver, Colo.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

POSTMASTERS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask that the nominations of postmasters be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations of postmasters are confirmed en bloc.

THE NAVY

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Navy.

Mr. WALSH of Massachussetts. I ask that the Navy nominations be confirmed en bloc, and because of the long list, I also ask that the names be not printed in full, but that reference be made to the dates on which the nominations were submitted to the Senate.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, there seem to be scores of Navy nominations. Will the Senator indicate what they are?

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. They are routine promotions in the Navy.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Navy nominations are confirmed en bloc.

Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Massachusetts with respect to printing the list of names? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

That completes the calendar.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask that the President be immediately notified of all nominations confirmed today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

AUTHORIZATION FOR THE SECRETARY OF THE SENATE TO REFER NOMINATIONS TO APPROPRIATE COMMITTEES

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I should like to have the attention of the able majority leader. We anticipate a message from the White House. If such a message should be received, could the nominations, if there were any in the message, be referred to the appropriate committees by unanimous consent?

Mr. BARKLEY. Does the Senator mean that he anticipates the receipt of nominations today?

Mr. McCARRAN. Yes.

Mr. BARKLEY. We are planning to take a recess until tomorrow. I am sure that by unanimous consent the Senate could authorize the Secretary to refer to the appropriate committees any nominations received. I make that request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

HONOR FLAGS ON V-E-DAY

The Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I shall detain the Senate for only a few moments.

For the past 33 months the United Nations have been marching shoulder to shoulder toward victory. Now that they are about to arrive at victory in Europe it is of concern to all of us that they continue to maintain the same solidarity of action and of purpose in peace that they have developed in war. It appears to me that V-E-day, by which we mean victory-in-Europe day, provides a golden opportunity to further strengthen the friendly relations which now exist among the United and Associated Nations. It may well be a time when the people of this Nation can demonstrate to the world their appreciation for what other nations have done to help achieve this first step toward the peace so earnestly desired by this country and those associated with her in a common purpose.

A simple, practical, and in my estimation, a very desirable method of demonstrating this appreciation is now available. It is the two-flag idea—the flying of the national flag in the position of honor, of course, with the United Nations honor flag flying beside or beneath it.

Let America honor her own flag first, but may she not forget on V-E-day that other nations have helped and must continue to help to create and maintain the kind of world for which she stands.

It is at this time when the combined moral, military, material and financial might of the 44 United and Associated Nations is shaping the victory that I make this suggestion as to the way in which I believe the people of the United States should celebrate the momentous occasion. It seems to me that this country should bear in mind on "victory in Europe day" that America did not win the struggle alone, but that she was buttressed by the efforts of many other nations.

I can think of no finer gesture to the world and no finer way for this Nation to cement her friendly relations with other nations than by demonstrating her appreciation on V-E-day by flying the Stars and Stripes from every building in America and in addition thereto flying the secondary flag which pays honor and respect to all her friends and allies.

For the past 2 years this United Nations honor flag has been developed as a symbol of friendship and cooperation among the peoples dedicated to creating and maintaining the type of world for which our Nation stands. It has made friends for us among other nations. This white flag, with its four upright red bars, is familiar to us in Washington who have seen it flying from the principal private buildings of this capital city and fluttering from the marquees of the downtown theaters for the past year.

The highlights of the development of this flag are interesting, and I take this opportunity of mentioning a few of them. The flag was chosen in 1942 by representatives of all the United Nations in unofficial conversations conducted by Brooks Harding, originator of the two-flag idea. Let it be said to the credit of Mr. Harding that he gave up his own employment and occupation to devote himself exclusively to the development of this symbol. This design and idea was later unanimously approved by leaders and prominent members of more than a score of nationally known patriotic, fraternal, civic, and religious organizations. The new flag was first used to pay honor and respect to the other United Nations when it was introduced by the Department of the District of Columbia American Legion in 1943 Flag Day ceremonies. Under the auspices of the United Nations Club, on June 20, 1943, it was first raised to the top of a flagpole at Dumbarton Oaks, where the United Nations post-war conferences are now being held.

I may add, Mr. President, that I was present on that occasion, I saw the inspiring sight of this symbol of international unity raised, and later was permitted to make a few remarks in the Senate concerning the occasion.

The popular use of the flag was inaugurated in the Nation's Capitol during Atlantic Charter Week, August 14–21, 1943. Since then it has been reported that this flag has been used in many of the United Nations and in the liberated areas. On Memorial Day of this year, the flag was used at the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier to pay honor and respect to all those of other countries who have sacrificed their lives in common cause with Americans.

Before this 2-flag idea was evolved, 44 flags were required to indicate the United and Associated Nations. Now the 1 flag with the 4 red bars emblazoned on its field of white—which, mind you, always flies secondary to the national emblem—has made it possible for every citizen and every organization throughout this Nation to honor every one of the other United and Associated Nations. It provides a simple way of showing appreciation to other nations without slighting any. It is the symbol of common aspiration among like-minded peoples of the world.

This symbol is not a product of America alone. Since its development in association with all the other United Nations, it has remained the only symbol of solidarity in use among these same nations.

This flag has been found to be acceptable in practice, and its very distinctiveness of design precludes the suggestion of influence by any particular country. Later if it should appear desirable to alter the present design, it could be done. It is not the design, but the idea, that is important. However, the white flag with the four upright red bars has received favorable acceptance to date, and is the one design now available for V-E-day. Let me repeat that unofficially and informally representatives of all the other United Nations have given approval to the present design of our common flag.

Some of you may know this honor flag by its other name—the United Nations flag of four freedoms, as represented by the four upright bars. The "four freedoms," as we all have come to discuss and know them, have been much discussed and variously defined. Among the numerous definitions, there are the "four freedoms" of the Atlantic Charter, the "four pillars of freedom," as enunciated by Madam Chiang Kai-shek, and the "four freedoms" suggested by the President. Because of these variations, the symbolism of the four upright bars of the United Nations honor flag remains undefined and open to future interpretations by individual nations or by the whole group of the cooperating countries.

The flag of which I speak is not an official flag, as I have indicated. This body or any similar body in any other nation has not taken formal action upon the two-flag idea. However, such action has not been necessary in order to fly the flag or to make it an effective way by which we can pay honor and respect to all the friends and allies of any one of the United and Associated Nations. Perhaps, as it comes from the hearts of the people and as it becomes popular through their desire to show appreciation to other nations, it may even mean more to the world than if it were to first come by official action.

But regardless of all the virtues of the two-flag idea, I would consider the suggestion that it be flown on V-E-day wholly impractical at this time, if it were not for the fact that the simplicity of design permits it to be easily made in the school or in the home. Any white-and-red material at hand can serve the purpose for this particular day and later these home-made honor flags may be replaced by those of a more permanent nature when proper material or factory-made flags are available. For individuals, schools, or organizations who wish to make this flag, I will state the proportions. The bars are six-tenths as long as the flag is wide, and the width of the bars is one-tenth the length of the flag. The spacing of the bars is equal to the width of the bars, and the bars are placed in the center of the flag. The honor flag is one-half to three-quarters the size of the national emblem when flown beneath it, and the same size when flown beside it.

When so little effort and expense are involved to honor those who have helped to make victory possible, it is my hope, and I know it is shared by my colleagues, that every citizen of this Nation will display the United Nations honor flag secondarily to the national emblem, beginning on V-E day, and will continue the practice during the years to follow, when friendship and cooperation among all nations will mean so much to the future peace and security of the world.

RECESS

Mr. BARKLEY. I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 24 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Thursday, September 21, 1944, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate September 20 (legislative day of September 1, 1944):

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

I nominate Walter Thurston, of Arizona, now Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to El Salvador, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Bolivia.

John F. Simmons, of New York, a Foreign Service Officer of Class 1 and Counselor of Embassy at Rio de Janeiro, Brazil, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to El Salvador.

Arthur Bliss Lane, of New York, now Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Colombia, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Government of Poland now established in London.

Charles Sawyer, of Ohio, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Belgium and to serve concurrently and without additional compensation as Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Luxemburg.

Stanley K. Hornbeck, of Colorado, now Special Assistant to the Secretary of State, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Netherlands.

Richard C. Patterson, Jr., of New York, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Government of Yugoslavia now established in London.

Lithgow Osborne, of New York, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Government of Norway now established in London.

John C. Wiley, of Indiana, former Minister to Latvia and Estonia, now assigned to the Department of State, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Colombia.

UNITED STATES PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

The following named officer for promotion in the Regular Corps of the United States Public Health Service:

PASSED ASSISTANT SURGEON TO BE TEMPORARY SURGEON EFFECTIVE SEPTEMBER 15, 1944

Roy E. Wolfe

The following named officers for appointment and promotion in the Regular Corps of the United States Public Health Service:

TO BE ASSISTANT SURGEONS EFFECTIVE DATE OF OATH

John H. Pritchett, Jr. — Arthur Kornberg
John K. McBane — Harold B. Alexander
Roland K. Iverson — Harry Leaffer

SURGEON TO BE TEMPORARY SENIOR SURGEON EFFECTIVE SEPTEMBER 1, 1944

Henry A. Holle

SANITARY ENGINEER TO BE TEMPORARY SENIOR SANITARY ENGINEER EFFECTIVE SEPTEMBER 1, 1944

Omar C. Hopkins

IN THE NAVY

Capt. John H. Cassady, United States Navy, to be a rear admiral in the Navy, for temporary service, to rank from the 15th day of August 1943.

IN THE MARINE CORPS

The following-named naval aviators of the Marine Corps Reserve to be second lieutenants in the Marine Corps, in accordance with the provisions of the Naval Aviation Personnel Act of 1940, as amended:

John H. King, Jr., from the 4th day of August 1941.

Robert R. Baker, from the 6th day of September 1941.

Francis H. Smyth, from the 10th day of September 1941.

Jack R. Moore, from the 10th day of October 1941.

Robert T. Whitten, from the 16th day of October 1941.

Thomas H. Mann, Jr., from the 12th day of March 1942.

Alton W. McCully, from the 1st day of May 1942.

Bernard L. Josephson, from the 22d day of May 1942.

Oscar C. Hauge, Jr., from the 8th day of June 1942.

Henry M. Bourgeois, from the 18th day of June 1942.

John F. Begert, from the 18th day of June 1942.

Arthur R. Boag, from the 19th day of June 1942.

George E. Wasson, from the 25th day of June 1942.

Curtis S. Harrison, from the 11th day of August 1942.

Thomas B. Wood, from the 16th day of October 1942.

Robert "F" Foxworth, from the 1st day of November 1942.

Bobbie G. Bauder, from the 1st day of November 1942.

Technical Sgt. Robert W. Lowe, a meritorious noncommissioned officer of the Marine Corps, to be a second lieutenant in the Marine Corps from the 2d day of June 1943.

Charles J. Keen, a citizen of Ohio, to be a second lieutenant in the Marine Corps from the 29th day of October 1943.

The below-named citizens to be second lieutenants in the Marine Corps from the 2d day of May 1944:

John R. Jones, a citizen of Virginia.

Howell T. Heflin, a citizen of Alabama.

Hugo A. Oswald, Jr., a citizen of New Jersey, to be a second lieutenant in the Marine Corps from the 8th day of August 1944.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate, September 20 (legislative day of September 1), 1944:

FOREIGN SERVICE

Walter Thurston to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Bolivia.

John F. Simmons to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States to El Salvador.

Arthur Bliss Lane to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the

United States of America to the Government of Poland now established in London.

Charles Sawyer to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Belgium and to serve concurrently and without additional compensation as Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Luxemburg.

Stanley K. Hornbeck to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Netherlands.

Richard C. Patterson, Jr., to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Government of Yugoslavia now established in London.

Lithgow Osborne to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Government of Norway now established in London.

John C. Wiley to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Colombia.

George Wadsworth to be Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Lebanese Republic and to serve concurrently and without additional compensation as Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Syria.

TO BE CONSULS GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

H. Coit MacLean
Edward P. Lawton

CIVIL AERONAUTICS ADMINISTRATION

Theodore P. Wright to be Administrator, Civil Aeronautics Administration.

RECORDER OF DEEDS, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Marshall L. Shepard to be Recorder of Deeds, District of Columbia.

COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY

TO BE JUNIOR HYDROGRAPHIC AND GEODETIC ENGINEERS WITH RANK OF LIEUTENANT (JUNIOR GRADE) FROM INDICATED DATES

Howard S. Cole, from May 17, 1944.
John T. Guthrie, from May 17, 1944.
Robert W. McCarty, from May 21, 1944.

THE JUDICIARY

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

Harold Maurice Kennedy to be United States district judge for eastern district of New York.

ASSAYER IN THE MINT OF THE UNITED STATES

Paul S. Nice to be Assayer of the Mint of the United States at Denver, Colo.

IN THE NAVY

APPOINTMENTS IN THE NAVY

The nominations of Chester P. Smith et al. for appointment in the Navy were confirmed today.

(NOTE.—A full list of all persons whose nominations for appointment in the Navy were confirmed today may be found in the Senate proceedings of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for September 15, 1944, under the caption "Nominations," beginning with the name of Chester P. Smith on page 7818 and ending with the name of Edward G. Cunney, on page 7822.)

POSTMASTERS

COLORADO

J. Glenn Bell, Rye.
George R. Simon, Seibert.

CONNECTICUT

Warren A. Wilcox, East Granby.
Philip T. Lewis, East Killingly.
Edgar J. Proulx, Goodyear.
William Liberty, Voluntown.

FLORIDA

Alma Nall, Azucar.
Isaac W. West, Chosen.
Sarah J. Burns, Enterprise.
Vivian P. Snyder, Floral City.
Jesse C. Womble, Highland City.
John B. McGill, Lake Helen.
Edward J. Courtoy, Nokomis.

IDAHO

Harold S. Bailey, Grand View.
Clara Hand, Roberts.
Alvin L. Ralphs, Rockland.

KENTUCKY

Mary Lou Harris, Adolphus.
Ruth M. McPherson, Beech Creek.
Romie E. Weisbrodt, Bradford.
Estill Hurt, Bulan.
Raymond C. Morgan, Closplint.
Mollie L. Allphin, Crittenden.
Hollis M. Smith, Fonthill.
Lillian N. Coombs, Graham.
Hattie Koenen, Hanson.
Alice Scott, Hardy.
Dorsey C. Rose, Hazel Green.
Anna O. Stephens, Hi Hat.
Raymond L. Renfrow, Horse Branch.
Willie Hall, McDowell.
Uel S. Morgan, Nebo.
Gertrude Scott, Pinsonfork.
Charles E. Branson, Robards.
Minnie B. Tiller, Rush.
James P. Hudson, St. Charles.
Ruth M. Keck, Sandy Hook.
Roy Dye, Scottsville.
Mossie L. Winters, Twila.
Marion H. Brashear, Viper.
Emma L. Hudson, Wheatcroft.

MICHIGAN

Esther I. Geroux, Bergland.
George A. Wright, Jr., Big Rapids.
Bennett Taylor, Dansville.
Charles N. Stone, Dorr.
Olaf Albin Olson, Gaastra.
William Herschel Miller, Hartford.
Coral Estep, Muir.
Lorene D. Fosket, Potterville.
Anne M. Polich, West Olive.

MISSOURI

John S. Smith, Williamstown.

MONTANA

Lawrence E. Osness, Huntley.
May M. Beckman, Lame Deer.
Keith Hane, Power.
Wilma Givogre, Wisdom.

NEBRASKA

Vera F. Knickerbocker, Verdon.

NEVADA

Edward D. Gladding, Virginia City.

NEW MEXICO

Mack W. Urioste, Raton.
John F. Lopez, San Juan Pueblo.

OHIO

Inez S. Winget, Edison.

OKLAHOMA

Harvey L. Sanderson, Burbank.
Frederick M. Shaw, Oklahoma City.

PUERTO RICO

Victor M. Monrouzeau, Arecibo.

RHODE ISLAND

Joseph E. Daneault, Albion.
Arthur J. Stokes, Forestdale.
Charlie H. Arnold, Greene.
Charles H. Williams, Kenyon.
Ann A. Dillon, La Fayette.

WISCONSIN

Dorothy J. Steckbauer, Aniwa.
Ethel Y. Hogenson, Chili.
Arthur Nortwen, Conover.
Erna M. Dohm, Dane.
John C. Esse, DeForest.
Nicholas A. Braun, Eden.
Werner W. Wolfinger, Eland.
Emma M. Olson, Mindoro.
Bertha Peterson, Ogdensburg.
Ray L. Truskowski, Sobieski.
Magdalene Grimsrud, Stoddard.
Leo J. Velten, Tony.
John R. Lesar, Willard.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, SEPTEMBER 20, 1944

The House met at 12 o'clock noon and was called to order by the Speaker.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Eternal and merciful Father, we bow at Thy altar and ask Thee to open our minds and hearts to Thy holy presence. As each day brings its varied experience do Thou help us to subdue pride and passion and turn to Him who made a path through the night for the morning, and whose sacrifice and example live through the ages. He is our hope, higher than the heavens, broader than the earth, and boundless in its scope.

Almighty God, many minds there are contriving untried and unwise highways for peace and good will, omitting the real solution of life and destiny. Let us hear the word of the Lord: "What shall it profit a man if he shall gain the whole world and lose his life?" Though evil is sweeping its pall over this sad earth, yet the good cannot die; the patriarchs, the prophets, the disciples, and the martyrs, these are royally alive today. We pray Thee to companion us with their spirit and courage and to hold fast the imperiled soul of our country. "Blest with victory and peace, may the heaven-rescued land praise the power that hath made and preserved us a nation. Then conquer we must, when our cause it is just, and this be our motto, 'In God is our trust'." Through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5125) entitled "An act to provide for the disposal of surplus Government property and plants, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Vice President has appointed Mr. BARKLEY and Mr. BREWSTER members of the joint select committee on the part of the Senate, as provided for in the act of August 5, 1939, entitled "An act to provide for the disposition of certain records of the United States Government," for the disposition of executive papers in the following departments and agencies:

1. Department of Agriculture.
2. Department of the Interior.
3. Department of the Navy.
4. Department of War.
5. Federal Security Agency.
6. Federal Works Agency.
7. General Accounting Office.
8. Selective Service System.
9. United States District Court for the Eastern District of Wisconsin.

WAR MOBILIZATION AND RECONVERSION ACT OF 1944

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (S. 2051) to amend the Social Security

Act, as amended, to provide a national program for war mobilization and reconversion, and for other purposes, and I ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House may be read in lieu of the full report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement of the managers on the part of the House.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 2051) to amend the Social Security Act, as amended, to provide a national program for war mobilization and reconversion, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the House amendment insert the following:

"TITLE I—OFFICE OF WAR MOBILIZATION AND RECONVERSION

"SECTION 101. (a). There is hereby established the Office of War Mobilization and Reconversion, which shall be headed by the Director of War Mobilization and Reconversion (hereinafter called the 'Director'). The Director shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, shall receive compensation at the rate of $15,000 per year, and shall serve for a term of two years.

"(b) The following agencies shall be placed within the Office of War Mobilization and Reconversion and shall exercise their functions subject to the general supervision of the Director:

"(1) Office of Contract Settlement, created by the Contract Settlement Act of 1944.

"(2) Surplus War Property Administration, created by Executive Order Numbered 9425 (if such Administration is in existence after the Office of War Mobilization ceases to exist), and the Surplus Property Board created by the Surplus Property Act of 1944.

"(3) Retraining and Reemployment Administration, created by Executive Order Numbered 9427 (if such Administration is in existence after the Office of War Mobilization ceases to exist), and the Retraining and Reemployment Administration created by title III of this Act.

"Nothing in this subsection shall imply any derogation of the powers of the Director under subsection (c) with respect to the agencies placed within his office or with respect to other agencies not specifically placed within his office.

"(c) In addition to any powers which the President is authorized to and does delegate to the Director for the purpose of more effectively coordinating the mobilization of the Nation for war, the Director shall, subject to the direction of the President—

"(1) formulate or have formulated such plans as are necessary to meet the problems arising out of the transition from war to peace;

"(2) issue such orders and regulations to executive agencies as may be necessary to provide for the exercise of their powers in a manner consistent with the plans formulated under this section or to coordinate the activities of executive agencies with respect to the problems arising out of the transition from war to peace. Each executive agency shall carry out the orders and regulations of the Director expeditiously and, to the extent necessary to carry out such orders and regulations, shall modify its operations and procedures and issue regulations with respect thereto. Nothing contained in this section shall be construed as authorizing any activities to carry out any plans formulated under this section which are not within the scope of the powers possessed by the President or the executive agencies under provisions of law other than this section;

"(3) recommend to the Congress appropriate legislation providing authority to carry out plans developed under this section but not authorized under existing law;

"(4) promote and assist in the development of demobilization and reconversion plans by executive agencies; develop procedures whereby each executive agency is kept informed of proposed demobilization and reconversion plans and proposals which relate to its work and which are being developed or carried out by other executive agencies; and settle controversies between executive agencies in the development and administration of such plans;

"(5) cause studies and reports to be made for him by the various executive agencies which will enable him to determine the need for the simplification, consolidation, or elimination of such executive agencies as have been established for the purposes of the war emergency, for the termination, or establishment by statute, of executive agencies which exist under Executive order only, and for the relaxation or removal of emergency war controls;

"(6) institute a specific study, for submission to the President and the Congress, of the present functions of the various executive agencies in the field of manpower, and develop a program for reorganizing and consolidating such agencies to the fullest extent practicable;

"(7) consult and cooperate with State and local governments, industry, labor, agriculture, and other groups, both national and local, concerning the problems arising out of the transition from war to peace; and

"(8) submit reports to the President, the Senate, and the House of Representatives on the 1st days of January, April, July, and October, on the activities undertaken or contemplated by him under this Act. Such reports shall summarize and appraise the activities of the various executive agencies in the field of demobilization and post-war adjustment, and may include such legislative proposals as he may deem necessary or desirable.

"(d) The Director shall, within the limits of funds which may be made available, employ and fix the compensation of such Deputy Directors and other officers and employees, and may make such expenditures for supplies, facilities, and services, as may be necessary to carry out his functions. All such officers and employees shall be appointed in accordance with the civil-service laws and their compensation fixed in accordance with the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, except that Deputy Directors and expert administrative, technical, and professional personnel may be employed and their compensation fixed without regard to such laws. To the fullest extent practicable, the Director shall perform the duties imposed upon him through the facilities and personnel of other executive agencies; and for that purpose only he is authorized to delegate to the appropriate agencies and provide for the redelegation of the powers and duties vested in him, except the power to issue orders and regulations to other executive agencies. The Director may require such reports and information from executive agencies as he deems necessary to enable him to carry out his functions under this Act, and each executive agency shall furnish any information and reports so required.

"SEC. 102. (a) There is hereby created an advisory board, which shall consist of twelve members who shall be appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. All of the members of the Board shall represent the general public and the public interest, but in order that the Board may have the benefit of experience in the matters with which it will deal under this Act, three members of the Board shall have had experience in business management, three members shall have had experience in matters relating to labor, and three members shall have had experience in agriculture. The President shall designate one of the remaining three members as chairman of the Board.

"(b) It shall be the general function of the Board to advise with the Director with respect to war mobilization and reconversion and make to him such recommendations relating to legislation, policies, and procedures as it may deem necessary.

"(c) Members of the Board shall receive a per diem allowance of $25 for each day spent in actual meetings of the Board or at conferences held upon the call of the Director, plus necessary traveling and other expenses incurred while so engaged.

"TITLE II—DEMOBILIZATION AND RECONVERSION POLICIES

"SEC. 201. The War and Navy Departments shall not retain persons in the armed forces for the purpose of preventing unemployment or awaiting opportunities for employment.

"SEC. 202. Any contracting agency shall terminate prime contracts for war production whenever in the opinion of the agency the performance under such contracts will not be needed for the prosecution of the war, and shall not continue performance under such contracts merely for the purpose of providing business and employment, or for any purposes other than the prosecution of the war, unless the Office of War Mobilization and Reconversion finds that the continuation of some or all of the work in process under any such contract will benefit the Government or is necessary to avoid substantial physical injury to a plant or property.

"SEC. 203. Curtailments of war production or terminations of war contracts shall be integrated and synchronized with the expansion, resumption, or initiation of production for other war purposes, and, to the greatest extent compatible with the effective prosecution of the war, of production for nonwar use. To effectuate this policy—

"(a) the contracting agencies shall continuously survey their product and material requirements and report to the Director, in such form and detail as he may determine, on current and anticipated changes in requirements and on all anticipated curtailments of war production or terminations of war contracts;

"(b) the executive agencies exercising control over manpower, production, or materials shall permit the expansion, resumption, or initiation of production for nonwar use whenever such production does not require materials, components, facilities, or labor needed for war purposes, or will not otherwise adversely affect or interfere with the production for war purposes. Such production for nonwar use shall be permitted regardless of whether one or more competitors normally engaged in the same type of production are still engaged in the performance under any contract which is needed for the prosecution of the war, and shall not be made dependent upon the existence of a concern or the functioning of a concern in a given field of activity at a given time;

"(c) the Director shall—

"(1) establish policies to be followed by the contracting agencies in selecting individual contracts or classes of contracts for curtailment, nonrenewal, or termination;

"(2) establish policies providing for full and prompt consultation between the executive agencies, war contractors, and the representatives of the employees of war contractors with regard to obtaining the most effective use in other war production or in production for nonwar use of facilities and manpower to be released through anticipated curtailments in war production or terminations of war contracts.

"SEC. 204. (a) Whenever the expansion, resumption, or initiation of production for nonwar use is authorized, on a restricted basis, by any executive agency having control over manpower, production, or materials, the restrictions imposed shall not be such as to prevent any small plant capable and desirous of participating in such expansion, resumption, or initiation of production for nonwar use from so participating in such production.

"(b) Whenever such executive agency allocates available materials for the production of any item or group of items for nonwar use, it shall make available a percentage of such materials for the exclusive use by small plants for the production of such item or group of items. Such percentage shall be determined by the head of such agency after giving full consideration to the claims presented by the chairman of the board of directors of the Smaller War Plants Corporation and shall be fair and equitable.

"(c) In allocating the materials thus set aside among such small plants, such executive agency shall establish criteria, standards, quotas, schedules, or other conditioning factors after consultation with the chairman of the board of directors of the Smaller War Plants Corporation. Such executive agency shall allocate such materials directly to such small plants and shall, to the fullest extent practicable, provide for making such allocations through local offices easily accessible to such small plants. For the purposes of this title, a small plant means any small business concern engaged primarily in production or manufacturing either employing two hundred and fifty wage earners or less, or coming within such other categories as may be established by the head of such executive agency in consultation with the chairman of the board of directors of the Smaller War Plants Corporation. Such other categories shall be defined by taking into consideration the comparative sizes of establishments in a particular industry as reflected by sales volumes, quantities of materials consumed, capital investments, or by other criteria which are reasonably attributable to small plants rather than medium or large size plants.

"SEC. 205. The Attorney General is directed to make surveys for the purpose of determining any factors which may tend to eliminate competition, create or strengthen monopolies, injure small business, or otherwise promote undue concentration of economic power in the course of war mobilization and during the period of transition from war to peace and thereafter. The Attorney General shal' submit to the Congress within ninety days after the approval of this Act, and at such times thereafter as he deems desirable, reports setting forth the results of such surveys and including recommendations for such legislation as he may deem necessary or desirable.

"TITLE III—RETRAINING AND REEMPLOYMENT

"SEC. 301. There is hereby established a Retraining and Reemployment Administration (hereinafter referred to as the 'Administration'), the functions of which, subject to the general supervision of the Director of War Mobilization and Reconversion, shall be exercised by a Retraining and Reemployment Administrator (hereinafter in this title referred to as the 'Administrator'), to be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, and to receive a salary at the rate of $12,000 per annum. The same person may serve as Administrator and as Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, but in such case he shall receive only the salary provided by this section.

"SEC. 302. It shall be the function of the Administration—

"(a) to have general supervision and direction of the activities of all existing executive agencies (except the Veterans' Administration and the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs) authorized by law relating to retraining, reemployment, vocational education, and vocational rehabilitation for the purpose of coordinating such activities and eliminating overlapping functions of such agencies. To the extent necessary to achieve such purposes the Administrator shall have power to issue regulations in connection with the work of such executive agencies, but nothing in this title shall be deemed to confer any power or authority upon any such agency or authorize any activities by any such agency not authorized by provisions of law other than this title, or to extend any existing power beyond the date upon which it would otherwise expire; and

"(b) to confer with existing State and local agencies and officials in charge of existing programs relating to retraining, reemployment, vocational education, and vocational rehabilitation for the purpose of coordinating the activities of existing Federal agencies with the activities of such State and local agencies.

"SEC. 303. The Administrator shall, within the limits of funds which may be made available, employ and fix the compensation of such Assistant Administrators and other officers and employees, and may make such expenditures for supplies, facilities, and services as may be necessary to carry out his functions and the functions of the Administration. All such officers and employees shall be appointed in accordance with the civil-service laws and their compensation fixed in accordance with the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, except that Assistant Administrators and expert administrative, technical, and professional personnel may be employed and their compensation fixed without regard to such laws. To the fullest extent practicable, the Administrator shall perform the duties imposed upon him through the facilities and personnel of other executive agencies.

"TITLE IV—ADVANCES TO STATE UNEMPLOYMENT FUNDS

"SEC. 401. (a) Section 904 (a) of the Social Security Act, as amended, is further amended by inserting, immediately before the period at the end of the second sentence of the subsection, a comma and the following: 'or reposited pursuant to appropriations to the Federal unemployment account.'

"(b) Section 904 (e) of the Social Security Act, as amended, is further amended by inserting, after the words 'a separate book account for each State agency' a comma and the following: 'the Federal unemployment account,'.

"(c) Section 904 of the Social Security Act, as amended, is further amended by adding, at the end of the section, the following new subsections:

"'(g) The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed, prior to audit or settlement by the General Accounting Office, to make transfers from the Federal unemployment account to the account of any State in the Unemployment Trust Fund in accordance with certification made by the Board pursuant to section 1201, not exceeding the amount on deposit in the Federal unemployment account at the time of such transfer.

"'(h) There is hereby established in the Unemployment Trust Fund a Federal unemployment account. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated to such Federal unemployment account a sum equal to the excess of taxes collected prior to July 1, 1943, under title IX of this Act and under the Federal Unemployment Tax Act, over the total unemployment administrative expenditures made prior to July 1, 1943; and there is hereby authorized to be appropriated to such account for the fiscal year 1945 and for each fiscal year thereafter (1) a sum equal to any excess of taxes collected in the preceding fiscal year under the Federal Unemployment Tax Act over the unemployment administrative expenditures made in such year, and (2) such further sums, if any, as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of title XII. Any amounts in the Federal unemployment account on October 1, 1947, and any amounts repaid to such account after such date, shall be covered into the general fund of the Treasury. As used in this subsection, the term "unemployment administrative expenditures" means expenditures for grants under title III of this Act, for the administration of that title by the Board, and for the administration of title IX of this Act and of the Federal Unemployment Tax Act by the Department of the Treasury and the Board. For the purposes of this subsection there shall be deducted from the total amount of taxes collected prior to July 1, 1943, under title IX of this Act, the sum of $40,561,886.43 which was authorized to be appropriated by the Act of August 24, 1937 (50 Stat. 754).'

"SEC. 402. The Social Security Act, as amended, is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following new title:

"'TITLE XII—ADVANCES TO STATE UNEMPLOYMENT FUNDS

"'SEC. 1201. (a) In the event that the balance in a State's account in the Unemployment Trust Fund on June 30, 1945, or on the last day in any ensuing calendar quarter which ends prior to July 1, 1947, does not exceed a sum equal to the total contributions deposited in the Unemployment Trust Fund under the unemployment compensation law of the State during that one of the two calendar years next preceding such day in which such deposits were higher, the State shall be entitled, subject to the provisions of subsections (b) and (c) hereof, to have transferred from the Federal unemployment account to its account in the Unemployment Trust Fund an amount equal to the amount by which the unemployment compensation paid out by it in the calendar quarter ending on such day exceeded 2.7 per centum of the total remuneration which was paid during such quarter and was subject to the State unemployment compensation law.

"'(b) The Social Security Board is authorized and directed, on application of a State unemployment compensation agency, to make findings as to whether the conditions for the transfer of moneys provided for in subsection (a) herof have ben met; and if such conditions exist, the Board is directed to certify, to the Secretary of the Treasury, from time to time, the amounts for transfer in order to carry out the purposes of this title, reduced or increased, as the case may be, by any sum by which the Board finds that the amounts transferred for any prior quarter were greater or less than the amounts to which the State was entitled for such quarter. The application of a State agency shall be made on such forms, and contain such information and data, fiscal and otherwise, concerning the operation and administration of the State law, as the Board deems necessary or relevant to the performance of its duties hereunder.

"'(c) Any amount transferred to the account of any State under this section shall be treated as an advance, without interest, to the unemployment fund of such State and shall be repaid to the Federal unemployment account from the unemployment fund of that State to the extent that the balance in the State's account in the Unem-

ployment Trust Fund, at the end of any calendar quarter, exceeds a sum equal to the total contributions deposited in the Unemployment Trust Fund under the unemployment compensation law of the State during that one of the two calendar years next preceding such day in which such deposits were higher. The Secretary of the Treasury shall, after the end of each calendar quarter, transfer from the unemployment account of each State in the Unemployment Trust Fund to the Federal unemployment account the amount required to be repaid from the unemployment fund of such State at the end of such quarter under this subsection.'

"TITLE V—PUBLIC WORKS

"SEC. 501. (a) In order to encourage States and other non-Federal public agencies to make advance provision for the construction of public works (not including housing), the Federal Works Administrator is hereby authorized to make, from funds appropriated for that purpose, loans or advances to the States and their agencies and political subdivisions (hereinafter referred to as 'public agencies') to aid in financing the cost of architectural, engineering, and economic investigations and studies, surveys, designs, plans, working drawings, specifications, procedures, and other action preliminary to the construction of such public works: *Provided*, That the making of loans or advances hereunder shall not in any way commit the Congress to appropriate funds to undertake any projects so planned.

"(b) Funds appropriated for the making of loans or advances hereunder shall be allotted by the Federal Works Administrator among the several States in the following proportion: 90 per centum in the proportion which the population of each State bears to the total population of all the States, as shown by the latest available Federal census, and 10 per centum according to his discretion: *Provided*, That the allotments to any State shall aggregate not less than one-half of 1 per centum of the total funds available for allotment hereunder: *Provided further*, That no loans or advances shall be made with respect to any individual project unless it conforms to an over-all State, local, or regional plan approved by competent State, local, or regional authority.

"(c) Advances under this section to any public agency shall be repaid by such agency if and when the construction of the public works so planned is undertaken. Any sums so repaid shall be covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

"(d) The Federal Works Administrator is authorized to prescribe rules and regulations to carry out the purposes of this section.

"(e) As used in this section, the term 'State' shall include the District of Columbia, Alaska, Hawaii, and Puerto Rico.

"TITLE VI—MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

"SEC. 601. When used in this Act—

"(a) The term 'executive agency' means any department, independent establishment, or agency in the executive branch of the Government, including any corporation wholly owned by the United States.

"(b) The term 'contracting agency' means any Government agency which has been or hereafter may be authorized to make contracts pursuant to section 201 of the First War Powers Act, 1941, and includes the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and any corporation organized pursuant to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act (47 Stat. 5), as amended, and the Smaller War Plants Corporation.

"SEC. 602. There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary or appropriate to carry out the purposes and provisions of this Act.

"SEC. 603. The provisions of this Act shall terminate on June 30, 1947.

"SEC. 604. If any provision of this Act, or the application of such provision to any person or circumstance, is held invalid, the remainder of this Act or the application of such provision to persons or circumstances, other than those as to which it is held invalid, shall not be affected thereby.

"SEC. 605. (a) When the Director first appointed under section 101 has taken office, the Office of War Mobilization established by Executive Order Numbered 9347, dated May 27, 1943, not including the Surplus War Property Administration or the Retraining and Reemployment Administration, shall cease to exist; and such records and property of the Office of War Mobilization, and such unexpended balances of appropriations or other funds available for its use, as the President shall determine, shall be transferred to the Office of War Mobilization and Reconversion.

"(b) When a majority of the members of the Surplus Property Board first appointed under the Surplus Property Act of 1944 have taken office, the Surplus War Property Administration created by Executive Order Numbered 9425 shall cease to exist; and such records and office equipment of the Surplus War Property Administration, and such unexpended balances of appropriations or other funds available for its use, as the President shall determine, shall be transferred to the Surplus Property Board.

"(c) When the Retraining and Reemployment Administrator first appointed under section 301 has taken office, the Retraining and Reemployment Administration created by Executive Order Numbered 9427, shall cease to exist; and such records and property of the Administration created by such Executive order, and such unexpended balances of appropriations or other funds available for its use, as the President shall determine, shall be transferred to the Retraining and Reemployment Administration established by this Act.

"SEC. 606. All orders, policies, procedures, or directives prescribed by the Director of War Mobilization, in effect upon the effective date of this Act, and not inconsistent with this Act, shall remain in full force and effect unless and until superseded by the Director in accordance with this Act, or by operation of law.

"SEC. 607. This Act may be cited as the 'War Mobilization and Reconversion Act of 1944'."

And the House agree to the same.

R. L. DOUGHTON,
JERE COOPER,
WESLEY E. DISNEY,
JOHN D. DINGELL,
HAROLD KNUTSON,
DANIEL A. REED,
ROY O. WOODRUFF,
Managers on the part of the House.

WALTER F. GEORGE,
DAVID I. WALSH,
ALBEN W. BARKLEY,
A. H. VANDENBERG,
ROBERT A. TAFT,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 2051) to amend the Social Security Act, as amended, to provide a national program for war mobilization and reconversion, and for other purposes submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

When the House passed this bill, it struck out all after the enacting clause of the Senate bill and inserted, in lieu thereof, an amendment in the nature of a substitute. This statement indicates the respects in which there were substantial differences between the Senate bill and the House amendment and the action recommended by the conferees with respect thereto.

TITLE I—OFFICE OF WAR MOBILIZATION AND RECONVERSION

Section 101 of the Senate bill contained a declaration of the objectives of the act. The House amendment contained no comparable provision. The conference agreement follows the House amendment in this respect.

Section 102 of the Senate bill contained the provisions establishing the Office of War Mobilization and Reconversion and prescribing the powers and duties of that Office. The comparable provisions in the House amendment were in section 101. While most of the provisions in these sections were identical in the Senate bill and the House amendment, there were some substantial differences.

The House amendment contained a provision, which was not in the Senate bill, providing that the agencies which were placed within the Office of War Mobilization and Reconversion should exercise their functions subject to the general supervision of the Director of that Office. The conference agreement retains this provision. The Senate bill included the Retraining and Reemployment Administration among the agencies placed within the Office of War Mobilization and Reconversion. The House amendment omitted this provision, as the House amendment terminated the existence of that Administration. The conference agreement restores this provision with technical changes.

The House amendment omitted from this section the provisions of the Senate bill which specifically authorized the Director to issue directives to the executive agencies and required such agencies to comply with such directives. The conference agreement authorizes the Director to issue regulations and orders, rather than directives, to the executive agencies and requires such agencies to comply with such regulations and orders. The conference agreement also makes clarifying changes in the language of this section for the purpose of indicating that the agencies within the Office of War Mobilization and Reconversion, as well as the agencies outside of that Office, are to be subject to the authority vested in the Director by subsection (c) of this section.

The House amendment made a clarifying change in the provision of subsection (d) of this section, relating to the employment of personnel and the making of expenditures, for the purpose of indicating that the Director of War Mobilization and Reconversion is to employ only such personnel and to make only such expenditures as may be necessary for carrying out the functions vested in him and is not to employ the personnel and make the expenditures necessary for carrying out the functions of the other agencies placed within his office. The conference agreement follows the House amendment in this respect. The House amendment omitted a provision of the Senate bill which would authorize the Director to employ expert administrative, technical, and professional personnel without regard to the civil-service laws. The conference agreement restores this provision. The House amendment contained a provision, which was not in the Senate bill, providing for the delegation of the powers and duties vested in the Director. The conference agreement retains this provision, but provides that the power to issue regulations and orders to executive agencies may not be so delegated.

Section 103 of the Senate bill and section 102 of the House amendment, respectively, created an advisory board to advise with the Director with respect to war mobilization and reconversion. The principal difference between the Senate and the House provisions was that the membership of the board, under

the Senate provision, was to include representatives of different economic groups, while, under the House provision, all of the members of the board were to represent the general public and the public interest, but its membership was to include persons with experience in different economic fields. This section in the conference agreement follows the provisions of the House amendment.

Section 104 of the Senate bill established a Joint Congressional Committee on Postwar Adjustment. The House amendment contained no such provision. The conference agreement follows the House amendment in this respect.

TITLE II—DEMOBILIZATION AND RECONVERSION POLICIES

Section 201 in the Senate bill and in the House amendment provided that the contracting agencies should terminate prime contracts for war production whenever in the opinion of such agencies performance under such contracts will not be needed for the prosecution of the war. The section also provided that performance under such terminated contracts should not be continued merely for the purpose of providing business and employment or for any other purposes other than the prosecution of the war; except that in the Senate bill the section contained a provision which was not in the House amendment and which would permit the continuation of some or all of the work under any such contract if it would benefit the Government or if it should be necessary to avoid substantial injury to a plant or property. The conference agreement retains this provision of the Senate bill in a modified form which provides that performance shall not be continued under such contracts for any purpose other than the prosecution of the war, unless the Office of War Mobilization and Reconversion finds that the continuation of some or all of the work in process under any such contract will benefit the Government or is necessary to avoid substantial physical injury to a plant or property.

Section 203 (b) of the Senate bill created a board of appeals to hear and act upon the complaints of persons aggrieved by the action of Government agencies in allocating scarce materials for production for nonwar use. The House amendment contained no such provision, but it did contain (sec. 203 (b) and (c)) provisions requiring that whenever materials are allocated for production for nonwar use, a percentage of such materials should be made available for exclusive use by small plants. The percentage to be set aside among small plants and the manner of allocating materials among such small plants, was to be determined after consultation with the chairman of the board of directors of the Smaller War Plants Corporation. The conference agreement follows the House amendment in this respect.

TITLE III—RETRAINING AND REEMPLOYMENT

The House amendment omitted all of the provisions of title III of the Senate bill. The nature of these provisions and the conference action with respect to them is as follows:

Section 301 of the Senate bill established a Retraining and Reemployment Administration, the functions of which, subject to the general supervision of the Director of War Mobilization and Reconversion, were to be exercised by an Administrator, to be appointed by the Director of War Mobilization and Reconversion, and to receive a salary of $12,000 a year. The conference agreement retains this section, but provides that the Administrator shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, rather than by the Director of War Mobilization and Reconversion. The conference agreement also provides that the same person may serve as the Retraining and Reemployment Administrator and as Administrator of Veterans' Affairs.

Section 302 of the Senate bill provided that it should be the function of the Retraining and Reemployment Administration, with the assistance of a board composed of representatives of various executive agencies, to have general supervision and direction of the activities of all Government agencies relating to the retraining and reemployment of persons released from war work, and to develop plans and programs relating to such retraining and reemployment. Section 302 of the conference agreement contains the provisions prescribing the functions of this Administration. The section omits the policy board which would have been established under the Senate bill and provides that it shall be the function of the Administration to have general supervision and direction of the activities which existing executive agencies (except the Veterans' Administration and the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs) are authorized by law to carry out with respect to retraining, reemployment, vocational education, and vocational rehabilitation, for the purpose of coordinating such activities and eliminating overlapping functions of such agencies. The purpose of the section is to provide for the coordination of the activities of Government agencies in this field, and the section expressly provides that this title shall not be deemed to authorize any additional activities by the executive agencies whose activities are to be coordinated by the Administrator. The section also makes it the function of the Administration to confer with existing State and local agencies and officials in charge of existing programs relating to retraining, reemployment, vocational education, and vocational rehabilitation for the purpose of coordinating the activities of Federal agencies with the activities of such State and local agencies.

Section 303 of the Senate bill provided that the Administrator should have power to provide transportation, at a cost not exceeding $200 in any one case, for war workers from the place of their employment to the location of their bona fide residence or to the location of new employment arranged by the worker. The conference agreement omits this provision.

Section 304 of the Senate bill provided that the War and Navy Departments should discharge persons from the armed forces as rapidly as it was determined that their services were no longer needed for the prosecution of the war or for the national defense, and should not retain such persons in the armed forces merely for the purpose of preventing unemployment or awaiting opportunities for employment. A modified form of this provision is retained as section 201 of the conference agreement, which provides that the War and Navy Departments shall not retain persons in service in the armed forces for the purpose of preventing unemployment or awaiting opportunities for employment.

Section 305 of the Senate bill provided that the Retraining and Reemployment Administrator should confer with Federal, State, and local agencies and officials in charge of programs relating to vocational education and rehabilitation, training in industry, and other similar programs, and secure the expansion of such programs when and if necessary. If he found that such expansion could not be secured, or could be secured only by additional Federal legislation or assistance, he was to recommend to Congress such legislation as he considered necessary. These provisions are omitted from the conference agreement; however, as indicated above, section 302 of the conference agreement contains provisions relating to consultation with State and local agencies.

Section 306 of the Senate bill authorized the Administrator to employ personnel and make expenditures for the purpose of carrying out his powers and duties, and provided that, to the fullest extent practicable, he should perform his duties through the facilities and personnel of other executive agencies. The provisions of this section are retained as section 303 of the conference agreement.

TITLE IV—UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION PROVISIONS

Section 401 of the Senate bill amended the Social Security Act to provide for the establishment in the unemployment trust fund of a Federal unemployment account, and authorized the appropriation to such account of sums necessary to carry out the unemployment compensation provisions of this bill. The provisions of section 301 of the House amendment were substantially the same, except that the amendment made by this section in the House amendment contained a provision, similar to one of the provisions of section 404 of the Senate bill, providing that any amounts remaining in the Federal unemployment account upon the termination of the effective period of this act and any amounts thereafter repaid to such account should be covered into the general fund of the Treasury. The conference agreement (sec. 401) follows the House amendment in this respect, except that it provides that these moneys are not to be covered into the general fund of the Treasury until after September 30, 1947.

Section 402 in the Senate bill and section 302 in the House amendment, respectively, amended the Social Security Act to provide for advances to State unemployment funds for the purpose of preventing the exhaustion of such funds in the event of heavy demands upon them by reason of widespread unemployment during the reconversion period. The House amendment made no substantial changes in this section of the Senate bill, however, it did make a number of clarifying and technical changes for the purpose of facilitating its administration. The conference agreement (sec. 402) follows this section of the House amendment with a change which, in conformity with the action fixing June 30, 1947, as the termination date for other provisions of the act, provides that the period for which such advances may be made shall end on June 30, 1947, and with other minor clerical changes.

Section 403 of the Senate bill amended the Social Security Act by adding at the end thereof a new title providing for unemployment compensation for Federal employees. Under the Senate bill such compensation would have been payable for unemployment occurring after September 30, 1944, and prior to the end of the second full calendar year after the termination of hostilities in the present war. The compensation payable to Federal employees would be in the same amounts, on the same terms, and subject to the same conditions as though the State unemployment compensation laws of the States in which their service in the employ of the Federal Government was performed were applicable to such service. The Senate bill provided for making agreements with the States under which the unemployment compensation payments would be administered by State agencies, but the entire cost of such payments was to be borne by the Federal Government. The House amendment contained no provisions relating to unemployment compensation for Federal employees. The conference agreement follows the House amendment in this respect.

Section 404 of the Senate bill provided that this act and the amendments to the Social Security Act made thereby should cease to be effective at the end of the second full calendar year after the termination of hostilities in the present war, except that the obligation of State unemployment compensation agencies to repay advances made to sustain their State unemployment compensation

funds should remain effective until such advances were repaid. This provision, as such, was not in the House amendment and is not contained in the conference agreement. A general termination date for the act is contained in section 603 of the conference agreement. No termination date is provided for the amendments made to the Social Security Act because the period during which advances may be made to the States under such amendments is limited in the amendments themselves. Since no termination date is provided for these amendments, the obligation of the States to repay advances made to them will, of course, be a continuing one. This section of the Senate bill also provided that amounts in the Federal unemployment account upon the expiration of the time when advances might be made to State unemployment funds, and any amounts thereafter repaid to the Federal unemployment account, should be covered into the general fund of the Treasury. A similar provision was contained in the amendments to the Social Security Act made by section 301 of the House amendment and is retained in the conference agreement (section 401).

TITLE V—PUBLIC WORKS

Section 501 of the Senate bill and section 401 of the House amendment, respectively, contained provisions authorizing advances or loans to non-Federal public agencies to encourage advance planning for public works. The principal difference between the Senate and House provisions related to interest on such loans or advances and the time of repayment. Under the Senate bill advances under this section were to be without interest and were to be repaid only if and when construction of the public works which had been planned with the advance was undertaken. Under the House amendment, the loans or advances would bear interest at the rate of 2½ percent a year and were required to be repaid within 5 years or, if construction was undertaken before the end of 5 years, to be repaid when construction was undertaken. The conference agreement follows the Senate bill in this respect.

The House amendment provided that loans or advances under this section should be available to public agencies in Alaska, Hawaii, and Puerto Rico, which were not included in the Senate bill. The conference agreement follows the House amendment in this respect.

Section 502 of the Senate bill provided that the Secretary of Labor should make a study and investigation and a report to Congress with respect to annual wage systems. The House amendment and the conference agreement omit this provision.

TITLE VI—MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

Section 603 of the Senate bill provided that the provisions of the act should be terminated at the end of 24 months after the termination of hostilities. Section 503 of the House amendment provided that the provisions of the act should terminate at the end of 1 year after the termination of hostilities in the present war, as proclaimed by the President, or at such earlier time as the Senate and the House shall have passed resolutions declaring that no emergency exists which requires the further continuance of the provisions of the act. The conference agreement (sec. 603) provides that the act shall terminate on June 30, 1947. This section, of course, is not applicable to the amendments to the Social Security Act which are made by this act, as those amendments will be provisions of the Social Security Act and contain within themselves provisions limiting their effective period.

Section 605 of the Senate bill provided that the Office of War Mobilization, established by Executive Order No. 9347, should cease to exist when the Director of War Mobilization and Reconversion first appointed under this act had taken office. The comparable provision of the House amendment (sec. 505) also provided that the Surplus War Property Administration and the Retraining and Reemployment Administration, which were created within the Office of War Mobilization by subsequent Executive orders, should cease to exist at the same time. The conference agreement contains separate provisions for terminating the existence of the Office of War Mobilization, the Surplus War Property Administration, and the Retraining and Reemployment Administration, respectively. Section 605 (a) provides that the Office of War Mobilization, not including the two Administrations referred to above, shall cease to exist when the Director of War Mobilization and Reconversion has taken office. Section 605 (b) provides that the Surplus War Property Administration, created by Executive order shall cease to exist when a majority of the members of the Surplus Property Board have taken office pursuant to appointment under the Surplus Property Act of 1944, which is now under consideration by the Congress. Section 605 (c) provides that the Retraining and Reemployment Administration, created by Executive order, shall cease to exist when the Retraining and Reemployment Administrator appointed under this act has taken office. In each case the President is authorized to transfer records and property and unexpended funds from the Executive-order agency to the successor agency created by statute.

Section 607 of the Senate bill provided that no alien should be employed in the administration of this act unless he had served honorably in the armed forces of the United States. The House amendment contained no comparable provision, and this provision is omitted from the conference agreement.

R. L. DOUGHTON,
JERE COOPER,
WESLEY E. DISNEY,
JOHN D. DINGELL,
HAROLD KNUTSON,
DANIEL A. REED,
ROY O. WOODRUFF,
Managers on the part of the House.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DOUGHTON] is recognized.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. DOUGHTON. I yield.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that today, after the other special orders, I may address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Will the gentleman yield for a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. DOUGHTON. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by inserting an address I expect to deliver on September 25.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DOUGHTON] is recognized.

WAR MOBILIZATION AND RECONVERSION ACT, 1944—CONFEPENCE REPORT

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, the conferees met yesterday to consider the matters in disagreement with the Senate, namely, the matter of transportation for war workers and Federal employees, and unemployment compensation for Federal employees. In view of the action taken by the House on last Monday, the Senate conferees receded on these two provisions. The statement, which has just been read, explains the provisions more fully than I could in a short time. Unless some information is desired at this point, I do not see that it is necessary to make any further statement about the matter.

Mr. CARLSON of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOUGHTON. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. CARLSON of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, when the House passed this legislation it contained a provision that the employees, with the exception of assistant administrators, should be selected or secured through the classified civil service. I note in the report that the employees shall be appointed in accordance with the civil-service laws and their compensation fixed in accordance with the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, except that deputy directors and expert administrative, technical, and professional personnel may be employed and their compensation fixed without regard to such laws. I think someone has stated that an expert is an individual working away from home.

I wonder if the chairman could advise us what this word "expert" means and what group of individuals it will include that will not be under civil service.

Mr. DOUGHTON. We thought there would be a few to be called in from time to time who would not be regular employees. We felt that the Administrator in charge of enforcing the act would have knowledge about whom to call in as experts who could furnish him information that would be helpful. We considered that it would not be necessary to cover that class of people under civil service. But all regular employees, of course, are included under civil service. The Administrator of this act should, of course, have some latitude and discretion in matters of this kind. It cannot be fully outlined and restricted in the legislation.

Mr. CARLSON of Kansas. The same language for selection of employees is also included in title III, retraining and reemployment. I believe the provision for the selection of employees is too wide open and not in accord with what we want to do. Personally I would want to try to restrict this as much as possible to the classified civil service and at least not leave it wide open to what you might call strictly political appointments. Let us not make a political football out of this agency.

Mr. DOUGHTON. I think the gentleman may rest assured that that will not be done.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOUGHTON. I yield.

Mr. REED of New York. That was the intention of the committee, was it not? To restrict it as much as possible. That is the way it should be construed by those administering the act.

Mr. DOUGHTON. That is correct; and I thank the gentleman for his observation.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for one question?

Mr. DOUGHTON. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. JENKINS. I am sorry I was not here when the gentleman started his statement. I should like to ask: Does the gentleman expect to outline all the changes that were made since the House passed on the bill a few days ago?

Mr. DOUGHTON. The statement just read outlined and explained the changes in full. I do not believe it is necessary to repeat that.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOUGHTON. I yield.

Mr. EBERHARTER. In my opinion, as the gentleman knows, this measure does not go nearly far enough. I have very carefully read the conference report. It gives me a great deal of pleasure to say that, in my opinion, the bill as it comes to us now is better than it was when it passed this body a few weeks ago. In its present form I think it will do some good and certainly it can do no harm. I hope the membership will see fit to support it unanimously.

Mr. DOUGHTON. That corroborates the statement I made when the conferees asked for instructions; that the House conferees were always ready, willing, and anxious to agree to any compromise or adjustment they believed was not in conflict with the action of the House.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOUGHTON. I yield.

Mr. SABATH. Mr Speaker, I was pleased to hear the gentleman from Pennsylvania make the statement he did. I am furthermore pleased to be informed that the great chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means has assured some Members who are interested in the workers and in the legislation that has been stricken out in sections 2 and 3, that shortly, as soon as conditions permit, those matters will be given careful consideration by his committee. Do I understand it correctly?

Mr. DOUGHTON. I did state in my remarks on last Monday that in view of the limited time at the disposal of the committee, and in view also of the honest difference of opinion of some Members of the House, that it would be my purpose at the first practical time to call the committee together to consider further these two questions in dispute, one with respect to transportation and travel pay and the other with respect to unemployment compensation for Federal employees.

Mr. SABATH. I was greatly interested in both these matters and I am indeed grateful that the chairman has made this statement, because this bill, with all due respect to those who sponsored it, appears to take care of property rights and interests and does not provide relief and assistance to the several millions of war workers who have rendered efficient and honorable service to our war effort and made it possible to abundantly supply our armed forces with the necessary war materials in the successful prosecution of the war.

Mr. DOUGHTON. I assure the gentleman the subject is not finally dropped and that it will get further consideration, such consideration as our committee may deem justified.

Mr. SABATH. I realize that you as chairman of the great Committee on Ways and Means have your trials and tribulations and that you cannot control the Republicans who are opposed to such relief.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Or the Democrats either.

Mr. SABATH. Yes; I concede there may be a few Democrats, but I feel that you will succeed in having your committee report this necessary and needed legislation and assure you of my earnest coooperation until such time when it is enacted.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOUGHTON. I yield to the gentleman from Idaho.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Executive Order No. 9427 was issued by the President on February 24 of this year, under the provisions of which authority was granted for the retraining of war workers in war industries. Will the gentleman kindly advise the House whether there is any provision in section 101 in reference to the Retraining and Reemployment Administration concerning the retraining of war workers? I understand, of course, that provision is made for the retraining of veterans, but I should like to know if there is anything in this conference report that refers to retraining of war workers?

Mr. DOUGHTON. Nothing new on that. The only provision here is for the purpose of coordination. There is nothing new as far as any retraining is concerned.

Mr. DWORSHAK. What is the status of the authority granted under Executive order of the President No. 9427 when this legislation is enacted? What will be the status of that Executive order?

Mr. DOUGHTON. That is terminated.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. NEWSOME. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow after disposition of business on the Speaker's desk and at the conclusion of any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 1 hour and 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROMULO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 10 minutes on tomorrow at the conclusion of any special orders heretofore entered for that day.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the Resident Commissioner from the Philippines?

There was no objection.

FEES AND COSTS IN CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 1569) to amend the act entitled "An act to amend the act creating the circuit court of appeals in regard to fees and costs, and for other purposes, approved February 19, 1897 (29 Stat. 536; 28 U. S. C. 543)," with Senate amendment and agree to the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment as follows:

Page 2, line 4, after "appeals" insert "and in the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman explain this?

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, this is a bill that relates to the costs to be charged and collected in each of the circuit courts of appeals in the United States. Mr. Chief Justice Groner of the District of Columbia Circuit Court of Appeals wished it amended so as to name that court specifically. That amendment was adopted in the Senate. The request now being made is that the bill may be taken from the Speaker's table and that the House concur in that Senate amendment.

Mr. MICHENER. As I understand it, the only thing it does is to make clear that the District of Columbia is treated the same as the other district and circuit courts of appeals?

Mr. HOBBS. That is all, sir.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow after disposition of matters on the Speaker's table and at the conclusion of any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

SURPLUS PROPERTY BOARD

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, the conference report providing for the establishment of a Surplus Property

Board has been finally approved. The conference agreement provides for a board consisting of a chairman and two members to be appointed by the President. Following a tentative agreement for an administrator and a board of four members, all to be under the supervision of the Director of War Mobilization, wholly unworkable in the view of the House majority conferees, Mr. W. L. Clayton, the very able, capable, and courageous Surplus Property Administrator, advised the conferees that the said tentative, hybrid board-administrator was unworkable and that he would neither be an applicant nor would he accept the position of Administrator if offered to him. Subsequently, upon the proposal of the House majority conferees, the Board, consisting of a chairman and two members, with the qualifications and with the duties and authority of the Administrator in the language of the House bill providing for an administrator, was agreed to by the conference and is embodied in the conference agreement. The Board takes the place of the Administrator in the House bill. The Chairman of the Board would take the place of the Administrator as contemplated by the House bill with the approval of at least one of the two other members. There was universal regret when Mr. Clayton, who has been acting as Administrator with outstanding success, announced he would not continue. I believe I express the unanimous sentiment of the Congress when I say that the provision for a board composed of three members was not intended, nor does it reflect upon the administration of Mr. Clayton or upon him personally. I further believe I express the sentiment of the Congress and of the country when I say I trust that inasmuch as the unworkable hybrid board-administrator monstrosity was eliminated in conference he will reconsider and accept the appointment as Chairman of the Surplus Property Board.

WAR CRIMINALS

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago I spoke on the subject of Axis war prisoners and Axis war criminals. I notice from the press, and from numerous articles I have had time to read, that the United Nations War Crimes Commission after 11 months has been able to discover only 350 war criminals, when everybody in civilization knows that Hitler's Gestapo and most of his officers are all war criminals. In the list of 350 discovered by that Commission—constituted how, I do not know—they never sought to name one of the higher-ups in the German armed forces. I think war criminals are criminals, whether they include lieutenant generals, major generals, or buck privates. Murder is murder whether committed by a field marshal or buck private and ought to be dealt with accordingly, and I now call upon the Allied Nations to see to it that the guilty are brought to justice. The cruel and merciless slaughter of defenseless men, women, and children by German militarists has shocked the conscience of all mankind.

RE: THE PUNISHMENT OF NAZI FASCIST WAR CRIMINALS

Every prisoner of war should be examined to ascertain if any of them took part in the atrocities and persecution of minority groups, regardless of their race or religion, whether they be Protestant, Catholic, or Jew.

According to the United Nations War Crimes Commission, after 11 months of activity, the Commission's actual list of war criminals consists today of about 350 names. Among the arch criminals so far totally omitted from the list are Hitler, Himmler, Goering, Goebbels, Robert Ley, Wilhelm Frick, and Fritz Saukel.

Because of legal objections raised particularly by British and Norwegian members, the commission has failed to agree on any punishment for Nazis and other Axis citizens for persecuting or butchering Jews, unless they happen to be of Allied nationality or the crimes were committed on Allied soil. Some semi-official estimates put the number of war criminals to be dealt with at hundreds of thousands. At least one Allied government assessed the total at 6,000,000 including 1,500,000 Gestapo and SS men and 4,500,000 SA militia. The same government emphasized that, besides their guilt for past misdeeds, it is these same men that provide the greatest potential force and manpower reserve for a Nazi military rebirth.

Even the meager attainments of the commission are made largely meaningless by Russia's absence from membership. While all the British Dominions have fortunately escaped enemy occupation and have representatives on the commission, Russia has no one on this same commission. The Russians have their own ideas and plans. They contemplate the coralling of up to 4,000,000 Germans as forced laborers to repair the destruction inflicted on the Soviet Union. The German groups especially identified with war crimes will perhaps enjoy preference.

Millions of people, especially in the countries that Hitler victimized, would fail to understand why he should be treated in accordance with lofty political decisions, while lesser scoundrels come before criminal courts or other Allied tribunals. Some declaration, unless amended, ties the commission's hands in dealing with Nazi exterminators of the Jews. The legal basis of the commission's work now bars punishment of Nazis for maltreating and slaughtering of the Jews of Germany or of other Axis nationality, stateless persons, or German-Jewish citizens of Polish, Czech, French, or other Allied origin.

The Hague convention defines a war crime as an offense by one belligerent against the army or citizenry of another belligerent. Herbert Pell, the American delegate to the commission, proposed as a solution that the commission include among war crimes all offenses against the persons because of race, religion, or political beliefs, irrespective of the victim's nationality or the territory on which the crimes were committed. A subcommittee adopted Pell's suggestion, but on the commission itself, the British and Norwegian jurists solemnly announced that governments really ought to be asked to grant the commission greater powers to deal with such questions before anything is done about it.

As affairs now stand, the commission would ignore the instigators or actual murderers of many of the two or three million Jews who met death at Nazi hands. Similarly, the commission would refrain from touching the Germans who jailed, tortured, and killed Gentile anti-Nazis.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a letter I received from Hon. Jesse Jones, Secretary of Commerce, in regard to the disposition of surplus property and loans less than $10,000 to small business.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from this morning's Washington Post.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on the subject entitled "How About Dan Tobin?"

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. MAAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a radio address I delivered last night.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include excerpts from an article by Lou Gardner, of Des Moines, Iowa.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a letter from the Federal Works Agency.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROWE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the Akron Beacon-Journal.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to

include an editorial from the Washington News.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I received unanimous consent to address the House for 20 minutes today. I now ask unanimous consent that that time may be transferred to tomorrow.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. PACE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that tomorrow, at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day and following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROWE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that today, following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

LABOR AND DEMOCRACY IN THE AMERICAS

Mr. COFFEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. COFFEE. Mr. Speaker, working men and women of the Americas today face an extraordinary political opportunity at a time of world crisis. They can see to it that the United Nations win the peace. Labor has achieved the enormous war production which insures victory. Labor's immense war contribution was praised by our Commander in Chief, Franklin D. Roosevelt, and other administration leaders on Labor Day. Labor's chance to help win world peace has been made possible by the Roosevelt administration, which has done more than any other in United States history to give working men and women their rightful role in national affairs. The President and Secretary of State Hull by creating hemisphere cooperation and understanding through the Good Neighbor policy have likewise done more than any previous administration to permit the participation of workers and the common people of Latin America in hemisphere and world affairs.

I would like to review some of the accomplishments of the Roosevelt administration in strengthening labor and democracy in the Americas and to suggest what further needs to be done. This is a topic which concerns laboring men and women of my city of Tacoma, of the Evergreen State of Washington, and of the continent. Labor unions of my State and of the Nation have a vital stake in whether the Democratic Party and the Roosevelt administration continue in office as the bulwark of labor and democratic progress in the Americas.

LABOR FEARS A REPUBLICAN VICTORY

Latin-American labor is even more fearful of a possible Republican victory than is North American labor. Bitter past experience has shown workers in both halves of the hemisphere what to expect when Wall Street and reactionaries run this country. Certain Republican statesmen, despite all the explanations of alleged G. O. P. good intentions, have alarmed labor and liberals in Latin America and the United States. Republican promises to respect and continue the Good Neighbor policy of Mr. Roosevelt do not impress our southern neighbors.

President Roosevelt enjoys as tremendous popularity in Latin America as among North American workers. Hemisphere labor regards the President as the world's foremost defender of democracy and as the most dynamic of the statesmen leading the United Nations to victory. Our Commander in Chief is admired by more Latin Americans than any other foreigner in history.

It is impossible to imagine a Republican First Lady contributing even a fraction as much in the next 4 years to inter-American understanding as Mrs. Roosevelt. She has devoted much of her extraordinary charm and constructive energy to making a success of such gatherings as the 1944 sessions of the Inter-American Commission of Women.

The foremost Latin-American labor leader, Vicente Lombardo Toledano, of Mexico, head of the Latin-American Confederation of Labor, voiced the fears of all workers. He is afraid that a Republican triumph would seriously menace cordial continental relations, since the Republican Party contains so many Wall Street imperialists anxious to exploit hemisphere labor. By contrast, declares Lombardo Toledano, the Democratic Party represents "a progressive force favoring fulfillment of the Atlantic Charter and guaranties of world democracy and aid to weaker nations." The Mexican leader considers Roosevelt, because of his brilliant war record, to be "a great spokesman for world democracy."

REPUBLICANS ENTRENCHED IN STATE DEPARTMENT

Republican-minded reactionaries entrenched in our Department of State have sabotaged the efforts of new dealers to create an effective inter-American labor program. These gentlemen have blocked or whittled down projects for strengthening hemisphere labor ties like my proposal for the publication of a Who's Who in Latin-American Labor. These foes of labor are a type of bureaucrat that dominates the entire Federal Government during G. O. P. regimes, as Latin America well knows. They have been termed nineteenth-century tory types by Fortune editor Joseph M. Jones in his little book, A Modern Foreign Policy for the United States. Similar criticism of betrayers in the State Department of Roosevelt's ideals is contained in Irving Brant's book, Road to Peace and Freedom.

Republicans and reactionaries in the all-powerful State Department have seriously undermined the Good Neighbor policy. Hubert Herring, the distinguished writer, and head of the Committee on Cultural Relations with Latin America, wrote in the July Inter-American as follows:

> We have spent millions in the effort to persuade Latin America that we must travel together. We have sent some thousands of diplomats and every breed of experts under the sun to South America. Our embassies have bulged with busy people. I could count on my toes, however, the names of those who in any effective fashion have lifted their voices for a vital union of the free peoples of the Americas.

Mr. Herring, while denouncing State Department failure to practice the preachments of Roosevelt and Vice President WALLACE, likewise assails our diplomacy for bolstering dictators in power. He says our tory ambassadors are never known to cultivate Latin-American progressives, labor leaders, and other contributors to the victory over world fascism. An exception is Ambassador Bowers in Chile. I criticized the sending of the wrong kind of diplomat, expert and good-willer to Latin America in a statement appearing in the hearings of the House Committee on Appropriations in June 1941.

If the President allows Mr. Hull to retire full of honors, one of the most respected men in the administration, hemisphere labor would rejoice to see appointed to the fourth term cabinet men like Henry Wallace, Wendell Willkie, or John Winant, long head of the International Labor Office and a leading Republican liberal, now ambassador in London. These men would know how to handle appeasers of Franco and of Latin-American tyrants and the inside saboteurs of labor relations between the Americas.

UNHEEDED WARNING TO STATE DEPARTMENT

For several years before Pearl Harbor I urged an embargo on scrap metal and other materials now being used by Japan to kill our young men. Many unions did likewise. Eight months before Pearl Harbor I urged our complacent Department of State to abandon its diplomacy of expediency and warned lest the Axis prepare unpleasant surprises for which we are not forewarned and well prepared. But my warning of March 25, 1941, went unheeded. Now I warn the Department again to cease appeasing dictatorships in Spain and Latin America and to create a pro-labor and prodemocratic foreign policy.

LABOR DIVISION IN STATE DEPARTMENT

The Department of State, despite the departure of Sumner Welles and the liberal Laurence Duggan—both highly esteemed in Latin America—is at last do-

ing something about labor and social welfare, although not nearly enough. Since my speeches in Congress of early 1941, I have been asking for such activities. The Labor Relations Division was created on January 15, 1944, and labor attachés have been sent to three of the most industrialized countries—Brazil, Chile, and Mexico.

I understand that Mr. Edward Rowell has been sent to Rio, and that he rendered excellent service for years in the Farm Security Administration and with Mexican-American farm labor, and more recently with Senator HARRY TRUMAN'S splendid committee. I hope the Labor Relations Division will follow this up by sending labor attachés to many other capitols, not overlooking men and women from the ranks of A. F. of L. and C. I. O. officialdom.

The Labor Relations Division is headed by an expert, Dr. Otis E. Mulliken. He and Miss Bonnie Farber represented the division at the International Labor Office Conference in Philadelphia. Dr. Mulliken and another assistant have contributed articles to the survey entitled Inter-American Affairs, 1943, just published by Columbia University. Mulliken's article in the Department of State Bulletin of August 13, 1944, is a full description of what he hopes to accomplish. He feels that all activities of working men and women abroad influence foreign policy, the vitality of democratic institutions, and world peace. He says that labor affairs are acquiring more and more international importance. The division in addition to advising on foreign labor and social welfare conditions and activities, hopes to send information to our embassies on labor matters here, thus contributing to a better understanding of the United States. Dr. Mulliken plans to keep closely in touch with such bodies as U. N. R. R. A., the Inter-American Committee on Social Security, and the important Institute of Inter-American Affairs, set up by Coordinator Nelson A. Rockefeller to carry on health, sanitation, and related projects of the Office of Inter-American Affairs for a year or two after the war. I heartily approve of Mr. Mulliken's program.

Perhaps his division can undertake the compilation and publication of a Who's Who in Labor and Social Welfare in Latin America to answer criticism by progressive publications of the paucity of inter-American labor information and ties in a period of crisis. Such a work would prove an invaluable reference for the A. F. of L., C. I. O., and many United States Government agencies.

OFFICE OF INTER-AMERICAN AFFAIRS

The Office of the Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs—C. I. A. A.—has carried out a number of projects highly beneficial to labor and has distributed much labor information. The C. I. A. A. recently set up a division to handle the inter-American training program under which Latin Americans receive advanced training here in industry, agriculture, and public health.

The C. I. A. A. along with the A. F. of L. arranged for 1,000 Mexican railroad mechanics to take training here so that more minerals from Mexico can be shipped over Mexican lines to our war plants. A recent C. I. A. A. survey disclosed that 10 United States cities are planning improved economic relations with Latin America in addition to the cultural and educational activities carried out by inter-American centers. In Philadelphia, for example, a commercial guide book in Spanish and Portuguese is planned. The C. I. A. A. Press Division continues to distribute inter-American labor news, published only in the small, struggling labor publications, since the so-called free big city press largely ignores labor news when it does not deliberately distort it for selfish political reasons. George Seldes' little weekly In Fact regularly exposes the partisan bias of the big-business-controlled press and radio.

Marshall Field's pro-labor New York paper PM on July 2 carried a story by Gardner Jackson to the effect that the labor clauses in our procurement contracts in Latin America are about done for because of the betrayal of labor to our financial interests by American ambassadors. These clauses in 200 contracts were introduced by the Board of Economic Warfare under Vice President WALLACE and Milo Perkins to improve health and working conditions, and were hailed by the International Labor Office—I. L. O.—which said:

> It is the first time in history that one nation, in negotiating for the products of another, has given an express guaranty against the exploitation of labor; has realistically recognized that laboring men and women who receive a fair wage and work reasonable hours under decent conditions actually produce more and better products than those who do not.

COORDINATOR NELSON A. ROCKEFELLER

The youthful and talented Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs, Nelson A. Rockefeller, has made a most favorable impression on Members of the House and Senate during his 4 years in office. I hope that after the C. I. A. A. ceases to exist, Nelson Rockefeller, as a rising business leader of the Americas, will continue to set an example for other capitalists of liberal, fair-minded appreciation of the problems of labor.

Nelson Rockefeller in April told the House Committee on Appropriations, of which I have the honor to be a member:

> I have gone into labor meetings in various Latin American countries, and sat in cabinet meetings. I found exactly the same frankness and desire to discuss common problems, hopes, and fears in both these groups.

Probably no one could better have answered the extravagant and violently partisan charges against the Good Neighbor policy made by the misguided Republican Senator from Nebraska in the tory Reader's Digest. It has been rumored that Mr. Rockefeller was prevented by certain Republicans in the State Department from publicly replying to Senator BUTLER. But Senator MCKELLAR did not hesitate on behalf of the administration to make a sweeping refutation.

The House Committee on Appropriations on May 25 released a report complimentary to the C. I. A. A.'s record and citing Rockefeller's statements on the serious dislocations of Latin-American economy and transportation, complicated by grave shortages of fuel and goods. The result of these conditions and of bad inflation is "severe hardships, social unrest, and political instability," Rockefeller pointed out. He has been seeking to alleviate these factors which cut Latin-American labor's contribution to victory, and to combat Axis and Argentine efforts to disrupt hemisphere unity and security.

Nelson Rockefeller organized and ably chaired the Conference of Commissions of Inter-American Development in New York City in May, which passed a resolution on labor urging the American republics to provide greater vocational and technical training for workers and apprentices; to improve diet, health, and sanitation; to protect rights of unionization and collective bargaining; and to pass more and better labor legislation. Finally the gathering asked that employers and employees of the Americas cooperate fully with each other and with their governments for the economic progress of all. Mr. Rockefeller is to be congratulated on the success of the conference, which recognized labor's importance in hemisphere development by recommending that labor be represented on the national development commission of each of the 21 American republics. The chief Brazilian delegate, Valentim Bouças, with whom I have corresponded, at the end of the conference sent President Roosevelt a message reaffirming the solidarity and spirit of cooperation of the Americas.

On September 5 Rockefeller said at the Pan American Union that Latin America wants to develop industrially to raise its standards of living. It will be good business for us to aid them, thereby assuring ourselves export markets which will help employ United States labor.

AMERICAN FEDERATION OF LABOR

The A. F. of L.'s excellent Spanish-language clip sheet, Noticiero Obrero Norteamericano, is well disseminated in Latin America, where it reports events of interest to workers, such as my recent request for more labor attachés. It has stressed colossal war production here—an answer to the lies in Republican papers about strikes. The September 11 issue emphasized the need for fair pay after victory, for more liberal reconversion and unemployment legislation, ample aid to returning veterans, William Green's Labor Day salute to Latin-American workers, and the A. F. of L.'s significant statement that it will seek to register its 7,000,000 members and encourage them to vote for labor's friends in November.

The I. L. O. is expected by William Green to play an increasingly important post-war role in the great conflict against the forces of hate and oppression. Mr. Green and United States Secretary of Labor Frances Perkins on August 20 broadcast a tribute on the tenth anniversary of our membership in the I. L. O. Mr. Green predicted a period of unexampled international cooperation and efforts to abolish poverty among all races and nations.

A. F. of L. leaders in July asked Mr. Hull to protest to the Fascist government of Argentina, which is following Hitler's technique of destroying labor unions, the chief bulwark of democracy.

Robert J. Watt, as A. F. L. international representative, gave a statesmanlike speech in May before the Conference of Commissions of Inter-American Development. Mr. Watt said that labor here is keenly interested in mutually beneficial use of continental resources and rising standards of living. Peace depends on the practice of civilized economics, the sharing of common prosperity to avoid common poverty. Labor must create economic democracy, says Bob Watt. In many Latin lands the economy is feudal. With millions of workers' families in serf-like conditions. This is a political, social, and ecclesiastical problem as much as economic. Industry and the public must help. Watt concluded by asking, "Let us join with men of good will everywhere and prosper by common effort and mutual aid."

CONGRESS OF INDUSTRIAL ORGANIZATIONS

The C. I. O. was represented at the same session of the conference by James B. Carey who spoke of the importance to our workers of increased productive power in Latin America and the improvement of its internal market. Carey feels we should enter the fields of nutrition, public health, education and the enjoyment by workers of trade union organization. Our workers want poverty ended throughout the hemisphere. They want a sound basis for living standards and no post-war doles. The C. I. O. backs the labor clauses aimed at safeguarding Latin-American production for our war plants. The C. I. O. resents the undercover sabotage of these labor clauses by certain Government officials and diplomats.

Jim Carey asked why labor had been denied to date a voice in hemisphere councils. The C. I. O. intends to watch any tendency of Wall Street to move industries to South America to profiteer from sweatshop labor there. Industrialization everywhere should be sound and built on fair labor policies. Under the name of continental solidarity labor in Latin America must not lose its few hard-won rights. Carey suggested that labor share in every phase of the planning and direction of inter-American economic activity to achieve genuine security. Labor is opposed to imperialism and political interference in Latin-American affairs. The C. I. O. wants no subtle combinations of United States economic power with local dictatorships. The victories of peace are as hard to win as those of war. The chief struggle ahead is the battle against the poverty that grips most of the population of the Americas.

Jacob S. Potofsky, the capable chairman of the C. I. O. Committee on Latin-American Affairs and an official of the Amalgamated Clothing Workers, in line with what Jim Carey said about labor's interest in the proposed Inter-American Technical Economic Conference, wrote Mr. Hull that organized labor here wants higher Latin-American living levels because our prosperity is involved in theirs. Mr. Potofsky wants suitable labor representation.

Other members of the C. I. O. committee are George Baldanzi of the transport workers, who went to Italy this year to study labor conditions along with Luigi Antonini of the A. F. of L.'s International Ladies Garment Workers Union; J. P. Selly of the communications union; O. A. Knight of the oil workers; Milton Murray of the Newspaper Guild; Joseph P. Curran of the militantly progressive maritime union; S. J. Hogan of the marine engineers; L. J. Clark of the packinghouse workers; L. S. Buckmaster of the rubber workers; D. J. McDonald of the steel workers; and Martin C. Kyne of the store workers, a noted liberal Catholic labor figure.

In May, Jacob Potofsky and Sidney Hillman went to Chicago for their union's convention, which passed a resolution backing the good-neighbor policy and asking for closer relations between workers of the hemisphere. Fascist plots and Argentine tyranny were denounced for suppressing the free labor movement. The convention resolved to urge our Government to help labor and peoples' movements in Latin America to establish democracies. Sidney Hillman asked that an international labor conference be called in which Soviet trade unions could participate, and that labor sit at the peace table. Mrs. Roosevelt addressed the clothing workers and was enthusiastically applauded when she asked for close American collaboration with the other United Nations for world stabilization to raise our national income level.

Lombardo Toledano and some other strongly anti-Fascist Latin labor delegates to the I. L. O. conference were guests in May at a C. I. O. luncheon in New York. Lombardo declared that workers south of the border greatly admire United States labor and are worried about the November elections. "To assure the reelection of President Roosevelt is to reassure the whole world," he asserted. The visiting Latins were likewise entertained by the Council for Pan-American Democracy, which publishes a magazine, the Americas, and pamphlets on the C. T. A. L. and labor's Good Neighbor policy.

Like Latin-American labor, the New York weeklies, Pueblos Hispanos and The Americas, are deeply concerned over the plight of nearly 2,000,000 Americans of Spanish speech in Puerto Rico, where hunger, unemployment, and misery are rife. As President Roosevelt has told Congress in urging legislation, Puerto Rico deserves aid and more self-government. Until we really help poor Puerto Rico or grant self-government, this country will continue to be criticized severely in Latin America. The forthcoming book on Puerto Rican problems and solutions by New Deal Gov. Rex Tugwell should help clarify this bad situation, about which the C. I. O. is deeply sympathetic.

Out in my part of the country, the C. I. O. mine and smelter union is doing fine work to remove discriminations against Americans of Mexican ancestry. Racial discrimination against Mexican-Americans from Texas to California greatly injures our reputation. Forthright Secretary Ickes has assailed our intolerance to minorities. Senator CHAVEZ, of New Mexico, is demanding a permanent Fair Employment Practice Committee. He has broadcast in Spanish to Latin America trying to explain our still insufficient efforts to halt prejudice against non-Caucasians and to combat Axis short-wave radio propaganda to Latin America, which is largely non-Caucasian. The A. F. of L. has also helped in this struggle against racism. The labor movement is the chief hope of all minorities. Their next best friend is the Roosevelt administration. Republicanism offers almost nothing to either labor or minorities but broken platform promises.

LABOR DEPARTMENT'S WOMEN'S BUREAU

In previous speeches on inter-American labor relations, I inadvertently omitted to mention the helpful work of the Bureau of Labor Statistics in the Department of Labor and of Dr. E. D. Owen, who has devoted many years to compiling information on Latin-American labor. The Bureau issues a pamphlet on labor conditions.

Miss Mary Anderson has retired after 25 years as director of the Women's Bureau, during which time interest in Latin America has grown steadily. This year Miss Anderson and I participated in the conference called by the tireless reformer Benjamin C. Marsh, head of the People's Lobby, on the Century of the Common Man versus the Century of Cartel Control. Miss Anderson is a splendid type of Scandinavian-American, like thousands of residents of my State.

Miss Frieda Miller on August 17 succeeded Mary Anderson as Director of the Bureau, and said that the Division of Inter-American Affairs is one of its chief activities. Under a new cooperative program with Latin America, the Labor Department has invited the republics to send qualified women here to study and exchange information. Brazil, Chile, and Mexico have accepted. I hope these women observers can visit the State of Washington, one of the most progressive in labor affairs.

The director of women's education in Colombia lunched recently with Mrs. Roosevelt. The First Lady does more to promote pan-Americanism than any dozen tory ambassadors and State Department bureaucrats. She is one of the world's outstanding women, and will be so described by future historians, Republican smears notwithstanding.

LOMBARDO TOLEDANO ASSAILS ARGENTINA

Vicente Lombardo Toledano, as Latin America's top laborite, dramatically focused this country's attention on the menace of Argentine fascism at the I. L. O. conference. Allied Labor News, a progressive New York news agency, has been the chief distributor of information about Lombardo's crusade against Argentina on the danger to the Americas of Franco. Their August 26 story from Mexico City is captioned, "Spain revolt will follow Nazi defeat, says Lombardo." Excellent. Franco will soon fall unless our State Department appeasers further

bolster his tottering tyranny. Lombardo terms Colonel Peron the real master of Argentina, who can count on the support of Franco.

Today Lombardo is worried about rightist elements in Brazil. This year he visited Brazil and talked to leaders of the Vargas regime and the long-quiescent labor and democratic movements. Lombardo said then that Brazil's active war role not only improved her international standing but aided her progress toward democracy, since President Vargas has repeatedly promised elections after victory. In April Lombardo saw Brazilian labor holding the key to Brazilian democracy, despite the absence of labor's right either to organize or strike. In 1941, and again this year, I made speeches analyzing Brazilian affairs and its deep friendship for us. Hence, in spite of the resignation of pro-American Foreign Minister Aranha and the alarm of progressive publications here, I cannot believe that Brazil will ever desert this country. Roland Hall Sharp, in the Christian Science Monitor, says that the real danger is that Brazil, armed by us, may drift into war with Argentina.

It is significant that Lombardo, without any encouragement or thanks from the State Department Republicans, has done more than any other man in Mexico to win friends for us and the United Nations among laborers, leftists, and the common people. The Mexican leader has united Mexican progressives in a new liberal league which seeks national economic autonomy and progress and will publish a paper and progressive magazine.

THE DEBATE ABOUT QUARANTINING ARGENTINA

Labor has a big stake in the outcome of the current debate over whether economic sanctions or a quarantine should be enforced against Argentina. Moderates like Sumner Welles and Laurence Duggan oppose the risk of inciting the proud and intensely nationalistic Argentineans to supporting their disliked dictatorship, which might happen if we got tough. The Argentineans are 80 percent democratic and perhaps can be more subtly helped to overthrow their tyrants.

Dr. Felix J. Weil, of the Institute of Social Research at Columbia University and the Latin American Economic Institute, is an Argentine-born economist who has sent me the galley proofs of his valuable book, Argentine Riddle, containing much data on or of interest to labor, being published October 19 by John Day. Dr. Weil declared in a debate in print with Ray Josephs for Fred G. Clark's American Economic Foundation that a boycott of Buenos Aires cannot be undertaken anyway, because of Britain's dependence on Argentine trade and food and her vast investments there. Moreover, our striped-pants diplomats, who now aid many dictators, would never encourage a revolution against fascism in Argentina, even though Americans are dying on battle fronts to defeat fascism outside this hemisphere.

Ray Josephs, long Marshall Field's correspondent in Buenos Aires and author of Argentine Diary, takes the same tough position as most hemisphere labor leaders. Argentina is still prosperous because Britain and we continue to buy her meat and grains, the basis of the national life. Josephs says it is therefore up to London and us to boycott Argentina until depression forces an internal housecleaning to regain trade and prosperity.

Many who are anxious about Argentina have read Josephs' piece in PM of September 11 and see an unhappy parallel between political apathy among workers here and beside the River Plate. He writes that Argentine workers largely ignore their political fate because it is hard to arouse men with full stomachs and heavy purses. Nevertheless, reaction is being fought by courageous Argentine labor leaders and political patriots underground and in exile. And in our country, labor statesmen like William Green, Philip Murray, Sidney Hillman, Dave Beck, and Daniel Tobin are trying to arouse our workers to their political opportunity and fate. I hope they succeed.

Possibly Argentine fascism will be destroyed by labor and liberals through the political weapon of a general strike for democracy. Publications like the Nation, Commonsense, New Republic, and Free World remind us that such general strikes overthrew tyranny in Ecuador, Guatemala, and El Salvador this year. The pioneer Latin American general strike which turned out a tyrant occurred in 1931, when students were joined by unions and professional men in Chile to oust a dictator despite his backing by the army and special police and by Wall Street, where he had floated huge, usurious, and unsound loans.

For the United Nations to refuse to do business with Argentina is not interference in its internal affairs, but is simply a refusal to subsidize fascism. Argentina threatens to become a haven of Fascist criminals and Nazi cartels plotting another world war. Two Assistant Attorneys General have spoken out against the Nazi cartel menace. They are Norman Littell, of Seattle, and Wendell Berge, whose new book, Cartels: Challenge to a Free World, was published by the Public Affairs Press. Cartels, as I have warned on many occasions, threaten labor everywhere.

In my speech, Defense and Democracy in Latin America, of March 25, 1941, I declared, and it still applies:

> Hispanic America's harassed democrats cannot be expected to continue their faith in our system of government if the officials of the great democracy of the North betray them while its people sleep.
>
> George Seldes (In Fact, March 10, 1941) says this republic can extend its aid and open its markets in exchange not only for promises of democracy from Latin America's dictators, but for actions establishing democracy there now. Those who block this are the betrayers of the good neighbors.

NEWSPAPERS AND LATIN-AMERICAN LABOR

I wish to pay tribute to some of the few writers in this field. But first I want to point out that the three chief means of information—the press, radio, and motion pictures—have showed their subservience to Wall Street by shamefully ignoring or deliberately maligning labor. Marshall Field's Chicago Sun and PM have been notable exceptions among newspapers. So has the great international daily, The Christian Science Monitor, which recently carried a penetrating series of 39 articles by Roland Hall Sharp entitled Uncensored South America, which is soon to appear in book form.

The Monitor under the splendid editorship of Erwin Canham carries much material useful to the Government on labor. Unlike most Republican papers, it is honest, never smears labor, and sharply criticizes the State Department's appeasement of Franco. The Monitor reported my efforts to get the Department to break with Spain and help restore the Spanish Republic, which would have magnificent repercussions in Latin America. The Monitor maintains one of the finest bureaus in the capital of any paper, and carries correspondence of progressives like Selden Menefee of the State of Washington. Moreover, it is not subservient to reactionary pressure groups which think they can brow-beat labor into refraining from political activity by hiring expensive talent to plant phony arguments in the kept press and magazines which smear the National Citizens Political Action Committee. The same groups are pouring millions into the G. O. P. campaign while howling about labor's collection of a few thousand dollars.

One example will suffice to show how radio rigs things against labor. Mrs. Maria Hoge, former director of the Office of Inter-American Relations at Stanford University and now a lecturer in California cities and colleges, has been denied radio time to tell Americans about labor and democracy in Latin America. Yet California stations and the national networks are able to find time for conservative commentators on far less vital topics.

PROGRESSIVE WRITERS ON LATIN AMERICA

An example of a book of value to both labor and management is the new volume on the development of Brazil with American aid, by Morris L. Cooke, the distinguished engineer who headed the technical mission to Brazil in 1942 for WALLACE's B. E. W. Along with Philip Murray, Mr. Cooke did a book on organized labor and production. Both Mr. Cooke and I are members of the Cooperative Forum in the capital. Earlier this year it was suggested that Morris Cooke might be named ambassador to Bolivia to replace the tory whose bungling finally proved too much even for the State Department to stomach. I can think of no abler expert to represent us in a land which badly needs help.

Charles Anderson Gauld, of the State of Washington and now in New York, has told me often of the importance of Brazilian-American economic cooperation, especially in the development of Brazilian iron and alloy meals, on which we must now increasingly rely. Mr. Gauld has written articles on Brazil and inter-American relations, several of which I have called to the attention of Congress and had reprinted for distribution throughout the hemisphere. Gauld is now preparing a major study on Brazil's great mining state. He and

I share membership in the Latin American Economic Institute.

The Latin American Economic Institute and its parent organization, the Research Bureau for Post-war Economics, in addition to sponsoring Dr. Felix Weil's book, Argentine Riddle, are issuing other studies which concern labor. Among them are surveys of post-war migration to South America, Caribbean economic problems, and Brazil's textile industry and post-war problems. Dr. J. F. Normano, research director, is an authority on Brazil and has developed close ties with the Brazilian Society of Political Economy of Rio.

Allan Chase, author of the best study of Falangist penetration in Latin America, wrote in the August Coronet that a democratic revolution in Spain would lead to an immediate democratic and trade-union revival in Latin America. Mr. Chase says such events would end fascism there and, by raising living levels, create greater markets for our exports and stymie Nazi cartel plans in Argentina.

A book of interest to labor writers is Pan American Economics, by Paul R. Olson—not to be confused with my capable secretary, Paul A. Olson, of Tacoma, who is well known to many Members of Congress, and whose equally pro-labor brother, Ernest Olson, is running for the State senate from Tacoma, with strong union support.

PAY-OFF IN NOVEMBER

The fate of labor in this hemisphere will be deeply affected by the November elections. Labor has until then to marshal its forces and save itself from disaster. The pattern of the economic development of the Americas for years to come will soon be decided. It is up to labor to make that decision one for cooperative pan-American progress through Roosevelt liberalism.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a eulogy of the Reverend Dominic Ternan, late a chaplain of the United States Army.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROMULO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a broadcast made by President Sergio Osmena to the Philippines.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the Commissioner from the Philippines?

There was no objection.

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an address delivered at the U. A. W. convention at Grand Rapids.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

THEN AND NOW

Mr. HOCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOCH. Mr. Speaker, the other day on the floor of the House a Member shouted: "Clear everything with Sidney." In view of that action the following lines might not be out of place:

THEN AND NOW

THEN

Oh, Sidney, why only five thousand?
And why not a little more?
I want to be district attorney
And perhaps can't make the score
Unless you're a bit more liberal
And open your purse again.
So come across, dear Sidney,
Support me with might and main.

NOW

Oh, Sidney, why do you forsake me?
You helped me that other day.
Now you've transferred your affection
And are helping another, they say.
What you now do is very wicked.
You've no right to turn about face.
I'll tell the voters about it
And yours will be the disgrace.

ITALIAN RELIEF

Mr. CAPOZZOLI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. CAPOZZOLI. Mr. Speaker, much has been said concerning the unfortunate plight of the Italians of occupied Italy. By this time we may well say that the sufferings of the Italians, and the terrific destruction wrought upon their land, are common knowledge. Italy ranks high on the list of countries tortured and ravaged by the Nazis.

Italy knows the meaning of having innocent persons torn away from their families, held as hostages and later killed. It also knows the meaning of workers' battalions filled with many of its people, transferred to Germany against their wishes, and made to slave for the glory and future of Hitler's dream world.

There is hardly any cruelty inflicted by the Nazis on the people of other countries that has not been duplicated against Italians, especially since the time that they have come over to our side. The knowledge on the part of the Nazis, that the Italians were eagerly coming over to our side, worked them to such a fury that no cruelty or torture was spared to wreak vengeance.

It was well known by the Allies that the Italian people were never given a voice as to whether they should get into this war at all. And, certainly, they had no choice as to sides. They had no voice whatever in their government and they were as much victims of Hitler, by virtue of his domination of Mussolini, as have been the people of Belgium, Denmark, Holland, and other Nazi occupied countries.

Italy was thrown into the conflict on the side of Hitler by the Italian politicians, acting under Hitler's order and certainly against the wishes of its people. In this connection I should like to recall the words of Prime Minister Churchill, uttered on December 23, 1940, and addressed to the Italian people. They are as follows:

> One man and one man alone, against the crown and the royal family of Italy, against the Pope and all the authority of the Vatican and the Roman Catholic Church, against the wishes of the Italian people, has arrayed the trustees and inheritors of ancient Rome upon the side of the ferocious pagan barbarians.

Two and one-half years later, more particularly on June 11, 1943, President Roosevelt said as follows:

> The irresponsible acts of which the United Nations complained were not committed by the Italian people. * * * They were the acts of Premier Mussolini's personal Fascist regime, which did not actually represent the Italian people.

During the time that Italy was an unwilling partner of Hitler, many Americans addressed the people of Italy by short wave, imploring them to rise and rebel against the Fascist rulers and holding out to them the promise of Allied succor. I do not think that it is idle speculation to say that the Italian people have the greatest trust in the United States. They trust our country. They trust our President and they believe that we are anxious to help them. However, the time has come for us to review the record in order that we may arrive at a conclusion relative to the advisability of continuing the present relief scheme in Italy as it has thus far been in force.

Italy presents an immense emergency relief problem. Unfortunately, it has not been treated as such. It seems that the underlying principle for the present treatment of Italy is the fact that it is a former enemy country. It is still a battleground and the Army is the deciding factor on the question of essential supplies for the Italian civilian population. However, this is definitely the wrong approach. The Italian people are fighting alongside of the Allies and, while we have coined the word "cobelligerent" to designate Italy, the fact remains that she is to all intents and purposes an out-and-out ally. Certainly as to the question of relief for its civilian population, it should be treated as such.

That the present practice is far from satisfactory is attested by General O'Dwyer's visit to our country, made for the purpose of advising the proper authorities of the necessity for a change in the system of civilian assistance. Unless we bring about a definite improvement soon, Anglo-American prestige will suffer a terrific blow. This is likely because the ability of the Allies to bring about order and proper living in the first country placed under their control will go a long way toward the establishment of harmonious relations between the Allies and the other countries of Europe.

The first thing to be done, and I hope done soon, is to increase the relief which is presently available to the Italians. No one contends that the relief program is

adequate. The best indication of the inadequacy of allied assistance is to be found in the infant mortality rate, published by the allied medical authorities as being 50 percent.

The member nations of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration are now meeting in Montreal, Canada. The first order of business should be the immediate consideration of aid to Italy. This step would be in keeping with the underlying principle on which the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration was organized, viz: To relieve the sufferings of civilian populations in the war zone and to help them build their lives anew. The United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration was created solely for charitable purposes and it should not be kept from doing its work because of some technicality, raised by some member nation, which may still be harboring an unfounded prejudice against innocent victims. The failure to give proper aid to Italy will result in chaos, social unrest and, possibly, open revolution. We must not fail in demonstrating to the world that we keep the promises which we have heretofore made. Our failure in Italy at this time will amount to our failure in Europe.

With these thoughts in mind I introduced a resolution yesterday which seeks to put the House of Representatives on record as favoring immediate aid to the people of Italy by the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration. I hope that this resolution be adopted as soon as possible.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

(Mr. COCHRAN asked and received permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.)

Mr. HEFFERNAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therewith a report on the Corps of Army Engineers.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow, after other special orders heretofore entered, I be permitted to address the House for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, in the Charlotte Observer of September 9, there appeared a message which it states has been signed and endorsed by thousands of southern Democrats and is submitted by them to the Democrats of America. This is a message which should be read by every American. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have this declaration printed in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

JOHN STEVEN McGROARTY, 1862–1944

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, the Honorable John Steven McGroarty has passed to the bosom of his Maker. He was my predecessor here in this Hall, having served in the Seventy-fourth and Seventy-fifth Congresses. His death occurred on August 7, 1944. The green Verdugo Hills of California will be lonely without him, but gentle echoes of his footsteps will linger there.

A kindly man, a real and true friend, who spoke in humble phrases that pleased God and man; he was poet laureate of California, author of the Mission Play, and writer of soul-stirring prose.

While a Member of this honorable body, he wrote a weekly column for the Los Angeles Times entitled "Under the Capitol's Dome," which brought the people nearer to their Government and the men who comprise it. He had been a staff writer of the Times for 40 years.

Those here who served with him will mourn the passing of this distinguished citizen, their former colleague, and will treasure sweet memories of him.

While John McGroarty and I differed in politics, we were good friends personally. He held my highest respect and esteem for his honesty and integrity, forthrightness, and consummate courage. He did not fear to oppose his own party when he believed them wrong. He was a true American. May God rest his strong yet gentle soul.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. McGroarty's death occurred at a time when I was necessarily away from Washington on official business. I have waited until now to enter this official notice in order to include in my remarks the beautiful euology of Monsignor Keating, archbishop of Los Angeles. I therefore ask unanimous consent to include that eulogy, an editorial from the Los Angeles Times, and a biography of John Steven McGroarty with my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

IN MEMORIAM

JOHN STEVEN M'GROARTY, 1862–1944

(Eulogy by Msgr. Martin Cody Keating at funeral mass in St. Vibiana's Cathedral. The Most Reverend John J. Cantwell, D. D., archbishop of Los Angeles, presiding)

"My brothers," as St. Francis would say, "God give you peace"

Love of God and love of country are the two noblest motives that can inspire a human act. To these add a love for every human being, everywhere, because made in God's image by the Father of all, regardless of race, or creed, or social condition, and you have a symphony of life, with God's peace in your heart.

This truth John Steven McGroarty learned in childhood from his saintly Irish mother in the Pennsylvania he liked to refer to as "Penns Woods." His constant fidelity to this Christian and American ideal of human brotherhood, under the fatherland of God, is the key to his Franciscan spirit and his legacy to California.

The twelfth and last child of Mary McGinty and Hugh McGroarty, he was born on the 20th day of August 1862. When he was old enough to observe a birthday he and his mother kept his birthday on her own birthday, the 15th of August, the Feast of Our Lady's Assumption into Heaven. Because the babe was so frail the priest baptized him the day of his birth in his father's house at Buck Mountain. John was a month old when Lincoln proclaimed the emancipation of the slaves. He was 11 months old when the Battle of Gettysburg in his native State orphaned the baby girl who was destined to become his bride.

His mother was a native of Glenties, Donegal. Years ago, when "a loan from God," as he called it, enabled him to seek out the cottage where his mother was born, he brought a flagstone from the garden path her girlish feet had trod for his own hearth high in the Verdugo Hills. His father, from the same county but a neighboring parish, was the child of Nancy Montgomery and kin to Gen. Richard Montgomery, of Donegal, the friend of Washington, the hero of the Plains of Abraham, outside Quebec, and the first general to die for American independence. The brilliant General Montgomery of the British Army, now battling in France, is a native of Ireland and of the same family.

Forty years ago he came to Los Angeles where he began his unique Apostolate for God and America. In the columns of the Los Angeles Times he presided, every Sunday, over an imaginary synagogue of the faithful wherein membership was open to all who believe in God and talk with God in morning and evening prayer, each according to the formula of his or her own creed.

From his schooling in Penns Woods he had never lost the echo of the voice of the gentle English Quaker who had been obliged to defend himself against the charge of being a Jesuit because his charter of religious liberty for Pennsylvania in 1682 was of the broadest character. That tree of liberty, planted by William Penn in the woods of Pennsylvania, brought within its benign shade and protection all who professed belief in one Almighty God, and excluded only atheists and polytheists. To that tree of liberty from Penns Woods our poet laureate engrafted the California oak to keep sentinel watch over his synagogue of the faithful.

It was with vision almost prophetic that this humble Knight of the Holy Cross mapped the strategy, even 40 years ago, that now we understand must become the spirit of American education if the Americanism of the founding fathers is to withstand the attacks of atheistic Marxian communism. Thanks to the conductor of the synagogue, as he titled his role, countless thousands understand today that it is the American way to believe in the Creator—God as the source of the citizen's rights; that it is not the American way to say there is no God, as the Marxians teach; that it is the American way to leave everyone free to define the Supreme Being according to the light God gives one—not because one definition of God is as good as another—but because God will not save any man at the expense of man's freedom. How often our beloved conductor of the synagogue repeated the warning of William Penn—"Liberty, without obedience, is confusion; and obedience, without liberty, is slavery."

To the conductor of the synagogue came one day an invitation from Frank Miller, the founder of the Mission Inn, Riverside. The kind Quaker wanted this gifted Catholic poet and dramatist to write a nativity play to be shown each Christmas season at the inn. Three months John McGroarty was Frank Miller's guest. What a host. What a guest. They loved each other as brothers. Each hailed the poor man of Assisi—the

most poetic because the most realistic of all the saints—as his patron saint. The Mission Play, the passion play of California, was born.

Frank Miller, the Quaker, raised the Father Serra Memorial Cross on Rubidoux Mountain for the eloquent Bishop Conaty to bless and President Taft to honor by unveiling a bronze plaque to the memory of the brave soldier of Christ who first preached on these shores the brotherhood of man under the fatherhood of God. John McGroarty, the Catholic, with chaste and restrained art, dramatized the beauty and the romance and the faith that was Spain and the unequaled charity that was Franciscan California. We shall not look upon their like again.

Father Junipero and his tireless brethren our poet laureate loved to salute as "Dreamers of God." He, too, was a dreamer of God. His faith was as simple as that of a child. Because he was a poet his faith was dramatic in its expression. Who will ever forget his gentle reverence of manner, bespeaking the faith in his heart, when, accompanied by the two altar boys carrying lighted candles, his very presence in the prologue of the Mission Play, even before he uttered a word, converted the hum of a theater into the hush of a church, so respectful was the attention he spontaneously and so sweetly received?

When, as Congressman, he was financially able to make one of his dreams come true and he and his beloved wife were able to donate the property that is now graced by the rarely beautiful church and rectory of Our Lady of Lourdes in his dear Verdugo Hills, he said to his faithful shepherd, his padre of the hills: "When I assist at mass, Father Falvey, I can see our divine Lord walking down the dusty roads of Galilee, giving sight to the blind, hearing to the deaf, speech to the dumb, life to the dead, and pardon to poor sinners like me."

All who knew John McGroarty will agree that he did not need to tell you that he loved his fellow men. Instinctively you felt it as he looked at you so kindly, as he listened to you so intently and so patiently. His was a forthright conviction that you were God's child as surely as he was. Somewhere in this city today—and if able to attend I am sure not far from this cathedral altar—is a young Negro girl, whose ambition to become a writer found new encouragement from the friendship of our poet laureate. One day she wrote to ask the privilege of an interview to get his counsel. His reply was an invitation for her and her mother to join him and the padre of the hills in luncheon in his gray house in the hills.

John McGroarty's hand was never closed against his brother's greater need. How sweetly the bread of his charity came back to him in his need. His life cheered by the presence, love, and care of his nieces and nephews. He so appreciated being loved by those he loved. How deep the gratitude of his heart when he told the niece who had crossed the continent to see him ere he died: "I am glad you came. It will show them here you thought well of me at home."

What greater tribute could be paid to any man than to have his archbishop and Mr. Harry Chandler, his employer of 40 years, rivals for the privilege of giving comfort to him in his last days? He never tired telling his intimates that "Mr. Chandler is a grand man to work for." In his last years, when his trips to Los Angeles were less frequent, he never failed to call on Mr. Chandler. Always he came away refreshed and with a heart full of gratitude for such a kind employer.

The thrill of his Catholic life came when his archbishop conferred on him, at the command of His Holiness, the Knighthood of St. Gregory in acknowledgment of his labors for God and America. This tribute received the enthusiastic approval of all who knew him and by none more whole-heartedly than his countless non-Catholic friends.

His two terms in Congress found him happiest when he could remedy injustice done his beloved Indian brothers and the little people of America, the great mass of the workers, threatened by an irreligious capitalism. His devotion to the veterans of World War No. 1 amounted to a passion. He never forgot the memory of the tragedy of his boyhood when the wounded of the Civil War were returned to their communities in freight cars to become again in the mines the victims of ruthless unregulated competition. With all the force of his ardent nature he often said: "The man who bares his breast to the foe, even though he never is wounded, even though he never takes part in actual combat but has offered his services at any price his country may demand, deserves the complete gratitude of his country; nothing is too good for the veteran."

Nothing in his life was so worthy of him as his death. A day or two before he died his pastor asked him: "John, how do you feel?" "Father Falvey," he replied, "when I close my eyes at night I don't know on what side of Jordan I shall be when they open in the morning. But, Father, I am ready." As the hour of his passing approached he complained to his niece that he was not able to see the crucifix hanging on the wall. "Margaret, fix me so I can see the crucifix." Tenderly she changed his position and he was content, his eyes fixed on the symbol of his only hope. A Sister of Charity, skilled in the angelic art of robbing death of its fears, pressed a small crucifix to his lips, saying: "Sir John, kiss the cross." The gentle caress of his Saviour's image was the last conscious act of the grand soul who made his beloved Father Junipero the revered neighbor of every Californian.

The night before, when his nephew John McHale, asked him: "Uncle, how do you feel?" he answered in the lines of his last poem—

"When I have had my little day,
My chance at toil, my fling at play,
And in the starry silence fall
With broken staff against the wall,
May someone pass, God grant, that way,
And, as he bends above me, say:

"Good night, dear comrade, sleep you well,
Deep are the daisies where you fell;
I fold your empty hands that shared
Their little all with them that fared
Beside you in the rain and sun—
Good night, your little day is done."

And now, Sir John, uniting my voice with that of your revered archbishop, with the voices of the beloved ministers of your funeral mass and the faithful friends who crowd this venerable sanctuary, as well as the priests who whisper your name this day at every mission altar from San Diego to Sonoma, I pray: "May the angels lead thee into Paradise, may the martyrs receive thee at thy coming and take thee to Jerusalem, the Holy City; may the choir of the angels receive thee and mayest thou, with thy beloved Father Junipero, find rest everlasting. Amen."

[From the Los Angeles Times of August 9, 1944]

LIFE OF JOHN STEVEN MCGROARTY COMES TO END

John Steven McGroarty, poet, philosopher, lawyer, playwright, sometime politician, and friend of man, has gone to his last reward. Had he lived to August 20, he would have been 82 years of age. The poet laureate of California—a post to which he was named by action of the legislature in 1933—lived a full and fully useful life and his passing leaves a void that will not be filled. There could only be one McGroarty.

The Times, with which he had been continuously associated for more than 40 years, feels a particularly poignant sense of loss. McGroarty became acquainted with the late Gen. Harrison Gray Otis through a poem he wrote on the death of Krupp, German cannon manufacturer, and soon joined the staff of the paper.

In 1911 he took leave of absence to write his best-known work, the Mission Play, the story of Fr. Serra and the establishment of the California missions. This play, first produced in 1912, played altogether to an audience of more than 2,500,000 persons. The recovery and restoration of the ancient missions—some of which were being used as stables when he began his campaign—was one of his most notable achievements.

McGroarty's essay in politics came when he ran for Congress in 1934. He was elected and reelected in 1936, but retired at the close of his second term. Many honors came to him including honorary degrees and a decoration from the Pope; but he valued nothing so much as the friendship and respect of his neighbors—in which category he included the whole southern California community, without respect to race or creed.

He devoted his whole life to making friends. It is impossible to imagine him having an enemy.

BIOGRAPHICAL

California, Eleventh District: Los Angeles County. Assembly districts 42, 43, 47, and 48. Population (1930), 264,952.

John Steven McGroarty, Democrat, of Tujunga, Calif.; native of Pennsylvania, in which State he was elected justice of the peace when 21 years of age; treasurer of his native county of Luzerne at 26, admitted to the bar of Pennsylvania at 32, later served on the legal staff of the Anaconda Copper Mining Co. in Montana; removed to California in 1902, joining the editorial staff of the Los Angeles Times that year; author of books, California: Its History and Romance, The Kings Highway, Songs Along the Way, Wander Songs, Just California, and Other Poems, and The Mass; author and producer of plays—The Mission Play, which has had a consecutive run of 21 years, La Golondrina, and El Dorado—which three plays form a trilogy of California historic dramas—Osceola, Babylon, and Romany; honorary degrees of doctor of literature (Litt. D.) from the University of Southern California and Loyola University; honorary degree of doctor of laws (LL. D.), University of Santa Clara; created Knight of St. Gregory by Pope Pius XI; created Knight Commander of Isabella the Catholic by King Alfonso XIII of Spain, and later confirmed by the Spanish Republic; made the third poet laureate of California by action of the State legislature; married; elected to the Seventy-fourth Congress, and reelected to the Seventy-fifth Congress.

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Speaker, it is with regret, genuine sorrow, that we receive the sad tidings of the passing of our dear friend and former colleague, the Honorable John Steven McGroarty, late a Member of the Congress of the United States, one who served with distinction in this historic Chamber as a Representative from the State of California during the Seventy-fourth and Seventy-fifth Congresses.

Of all of those with whom I have labored in legislative halls, moved with in friendly association, struggled with in moments of disagreement, there was never one whom I held in higher respect or warmer affection. I never knew a kindlier, gentler, more lovable man. May his soul rest in that peace which he hath earned.

In the fullness of life there came from his facile, inspired pen, a poem of exaltation, one oft repeated wherever the Eng-

lish language is spoken. "Just California," he entitled it. Later, as the sum total of his years grew greater, when the burdens of life were heavier on his aging shoulders, he once again poised his pen to write a Requiem, this in contemplation of life's inevitable conclusion.

In these two poems, Mr. Speaker, is revealed the true, the real John Steven McGroarty, his gentle nature, his kindly philosophy, the man that is within the man. I know of no better way to pay tribute to our departed friend than to read them into the RECORD of these sad proceedings. For, indeed, in these immortal lines the John Steven McGroarty whom we knew and learned to love lives on.

Permit me to recite:

JUST CALIFORNIA

'Twixt the seas and the deserts,
'Twixt the wastes and the waves,
Between the sands of buried lands
And ocean's coral caves;
It lies not East nor West,
But like a scroll unfurled,
Where the hand of God hath flung it
Down the middle of the world.

It lies where God hath spread it
In the gladness of His eyes.
Like a flame of jeweled tapestry
Beneath His shining skies;
With the green of woven meadows,
The hills in golden chains,
The light of leaping rivers,
And the flash of poppied plains.

Days rise that gleam in glory,
Days die with sunset's brize,
While from Cathay that was of old
Sail countless argosies;
Morns break again in splendor
O'er the giant, new-born West,
But of all the lands God fashioned,
'Tis this land is the best.

Sun and dews that kiss it,
Balmy winds that blow,
The stars in clustered diadems
Upon its peaks of snow;
The mighty mountains o'er it,
Below, the white seas swirled—
Just California, stretching down
The middle of the world.

—*John Steven McGroarty.*

—

REQUIEM

When I have had my little day,
My chance at toil, my fling at play,
And in the starry silence fall
With broken staff against the wall,
May someone pass, God grant, that way,
And, as he bends above me, say:

"Good night, dear comrade, sleep you well,
Deep are the daisies where you fell;
I fold your empty hands that shared
Their little all with them that fared
Beside you in the rain and sun—
Good night, your little day is done."

Or, when my little hour has sped,
When night comes, and 'tis time for bed,
The windows closed and locked the door,
And I lie down to wake no more,
May someone at the break of day,
That comes to rouse me, wait to say:

"Farewell, dear comrade, mine no more;
A bird is singing at your door,
And all the highways are athrong
With steps you lightened with your song;
They come to call you from your bed—
Farewell, your little hour is sped."

—*John Steven McGroarty.*

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include therein an address by Dr. Louis J. Karnosh.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

(Mr. LEFEVRE asked and received permission to extend his own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.)

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks on two separate subjects in the Appendix of the RECORD in two instances.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. GRANT of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks and to include an article from the South Bend Tribune.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

"CLEAR EVERYTHING WITH SIDNEY"

Mr. GRANT of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. GRANT of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, Sidney Hillman and his little band of willful men have set out to tell our workers in American industry how to vote. They are moving into congressional districts over the country to tell the people of the respective districts what is best for them. Armed with lavish funds collected from the workers of America, they are trying to fasten their hold upon the Congress of the United States. Where does all their money come from? It comes from the pockets of men and women in American industry—from your family and mine—from people of every race, every creed, every color, yes, every political belief—Republicans and Democrats alike, but all to fasten on America the grip of Sidney Hillman. Does anyone believe that it is really voluntary? Let us look at the facts.

My dad belongs to the C. I. O. One brother does likewise. If I were employed in one of those plants, I, too, would belong to the C. I. O., because I, too, believe in organized labor. I would endeavor to become an active member of my union and to keep it in sound and progressive hands.

I have here a copy of my dad's dues receipt for last April. It is also the official receipt for an extra dollar marked, "International union assessment." That is the kind of money that Sidney Hillman and his original Political Action Committee of eight men used to fasten their grip on America. On the reverse side of this receipt is printed an excerpt from the international constitution of the United Automobile Workers, which says:

ART. 16, SEC. 3. Any member in arrears in dues or assessments, regardless of the method by which such dues or assessments may be collected, within the time required by a local union, which in no case shall be more than 2 calendar months, unless officially exonerated from the payment of same by the local union, shall automatically be suspended from membership and can be reinstated only by paying a reinstatement fee and such other penalties as may be imposed by the local union in which he is suspended.

You know what that means in a union maintenance shop—either you pay the assessment or you are out of a job. Was there anything voluntary about that? To argue that any workman should refuse to pay such an assessment is to say that a man and his family can live without bread.

That is the kind of money that Hillman used in his preconvention campaign and in the various primaries throughout the country. In an effort to escape the whiplash of public opinion and to keep from being prosecuted under the plain words of existing law, Mr. Hillman now tells us that the hundreds of thousands of dollars still unspent from the above collections are frozen. He announces a new National Citizens' Political Action Committee and tells us that contributions will be accepted from American workers on a voluntary basis.

Just how voluntary will that be? Sidney Hillman and his little carbon copies down the line will attempt to use their power over their members to separate them from their dollars. A union member must make this "voluntary" payment through one of his superiors, or risk the chance of losing the assistance of his union in his contacts with management.

Such an attempt is producing resistance in the ranks of the men and women in the shops of America. Sidney Hillman must learn that he cannot lead Americans around as though he held a ring in their noses. The traditional independence of the American working man and woman is going to rise up against this sort of political bossism.

Hillman and his little band of followers are doing untold damage to the cause of organized labor in America. A prominent labor publication has described it as a fearful boomerang.

It has been said, and rightly so, that Hillman has learned a lot about pressure politics, but not enough about the American people.

When Sidney Hillman and his little band can use the power of their high office to shake down the workers of America to further their own selfish political ambitions, it is high time the people of America roll up their sleeves and get in the fight to save this Republic.

GOV. THOMAS E. DEWEY

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, I simply take this opportunity to rise for a moment to make a prognostication. When this House convenes after the recess I understand we are going to take in a few days, I predict that the next President will be known by the name of Thomas E. Dewey, of New York.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include therein a brief letter from the Secretary of the Treasury.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Idaho?

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I want to say many Members will agree with the gentleman from New York [Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL], who has just spoken, that it will be "Governor Dewey" after the election.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. GAMBLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD to include a series of six separate articles by Luman Long, which appeared in the New York Sun, beginning on Monday, September 11, 1944.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein an article from the Washington Star of last evening.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

SIDNEY HILLMAN

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I have not cleared what I am going to say with Sidney, and I do not expect to. I recognize that he is the mainspring back of Mr. Roosevelt's campaign for a fourth term. I recognize that it is very difficult for our Democratic brethren to take the curse of Sidney Hillman's leadership on their shoulders; and how they are smarting under it. Sidney Hillman was able to produce the largest majority in history for the Republican ticket in Maine. Sidney Hillman and the kind of support he is giving to the President will carry the President down to defeat in his effort for a fourth term.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

CANNING SUGAR

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, sugar is as hard to obtain in my congressional district at this time as is butter in the City of Washington. We all know what that means.

On September 3 this acute sugar shortage was presented to me by my constituents. I immediately contacted the Sugar Director of the O. P. A. in Washington who showed every desire to be helpful. As a result, some sugar under the regular quota was immediately delivered to retail outlets in my home city of Adrian. This supply, however, is not sufficient for the normal consumption. The peach-canning season is upon us back home. The quantity of peaches is large and the quality is splendid. These peaches and other fruit, all of which is sorely needed at this time, are bound to be lost unless sugar is available immediately. I do not mean 10 days from now, or 30 days from now, but now.

I am speaking today more in behalf of the home canners than of the commercial processors and factories. The method of getting sugar for the two groups can be different. The importance of supplying each group is imminent.

This morning I received a telegram from Michigan as follows:

Following our telegram of September 13 may we offer this suggestion as a possible source from which emergency sugar might be secured. The South generally received adequate sugar during their heavy fruit-canning period. It is within the power of War Food Administration to issue an emergency order now diverting sugar presently destined for normal consumption requirements in the Southern States to Michigan and other States now facing an acute sugar shortage and resultant heavy fruit loss which will fall upon growers and the consuming public. This diversion would necessitate setting back all such orders intended for States which have completed their fruit season such change in priority of orders would have to be routed through to Michigan on a dispatch basis. The element of time is tremendously important but much of the loss can be avoided if the action outlined is taken at once. Please present this suggestion to agencies involved with all possible urgency.

FOOD INDUSTRY COMMITTEE,
WALTER F. HAEFELE, *Chairman.*

I have just conferred again with the O. P. A., and am advised that offshore refined sugar is being routed in carload lots to those sections in the country in the North, where perishable fruit requires attention. The supply will not be adequate, but some relief can be given. It is fair to presume that these shipments will go largely to the processors and will not be available to the home canners. I cannot too strongly stress the advisability of home-canning sugar. First, the food is essential. Second, the manpower problem, which is acute in our section, is not disturbed when the canning is done at home.

Mr. Speaker, I happen to represent one of those districts where many of the sterling virtues of the pioneer and the people of yesterday have not entirely disappeared. Our farm folks and most of the homemakers still know how to can. War necessities have revived this spirit and it is just too bad that all this fruit is to be lost, and all for the lack of sugar. The spirit of thrift, saving, and living-off-the-land has been lacking in recent years. These frugal habits, however, are not forgotten and now is the time for revival. Our people are willing and anxious to help, but with no beet sugar available and no cane sugar in sight, they are naturally discouraged. Every Member of Congress from our section is concerned. We are jointly and severally doing everything in our power to alleviate the situation. Canning sugar will not help any when the canning season is passed. Of course, a mistake has been made in sugar planning and regulation. It is just too bad that our people who have worked and saved must now have their peaches and other fruit go to waste.

This is just another case where locking the stable after the horse is gone will not accomplish much.

The Bureau of Home Economics in the Department of Agriculture advises that there is a method of canning peaches where very little, if any, sugar is used. Of course the taste is different, the color of the canned fruit is different, but the substance is retained. To me, this information is of very little value, and I make clear the unreasonableness of attempting to change the canning habits and customs of a lifetime and embark upon a new method while the peaches are decaying in the baskets.

In short, the Michigan peach canners are not going to get the sugar they need at the moment, every effort of their Representatives in Washington to the contrary notwithstanding.

BOTH ROOSEVELT AND DEWEY SHOULD REPUDIATE SIDNEY HILLMAN

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from New York [Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL] a moment ago predicted that after election it would be "Governor Dewey, of New York," with emphasis on the word "Governor." Many on our side will agree with him.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], who has just spoken, referred to Sidney Hillman. Since predictions are in order, I am going to make one. I predict that President Roosevelt will repudiate Sidney Hillman within the next 30 days. It seems to be inevitable. We cannot afford to have a corrupt organization like that of Sidney Hillman's fastened onto the body politic of America. Now since President Roosevelt has found out that Hillman began his political skullduggery back when Mr. Dewey was a candidate for district attorney, in the light of what is going on in the country now, and the resentment of decent American citizens, both he and Governor Dewey are justified in repudiating Sidney Hillman and his entire gang.

The SPEAKER. The time of the genleman from Mississippi has expired.

The SPEAKER. Under special order of the House, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BULWINKLE] is recognized for 30 minutes.

THE RECORD OF THE DEMOCRATIC PARTY

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Speaker, I speak today of a wonderful record of achievement. You will recall on Monday that I requested, and was granted unanimous consent, to speak for 30 minutes today. In making the request, I stated that I desired to speak on a few matters which some might construe to be politics. What I shall speak about is a record that every American should be extremely proud of unless he be one who, for various reasons, can see no good coming from the White House at this time.

Mr. Speaker, it is my desire today to speak upon the record of achievement of the United States Government during the war and prior to the war. This record that I speak to you of was under the leadership of the President of the United States.

It was in May 1940 that the President called upon the Congress for 50,000 planes and for other materials of war necessary for national defense. It was in the same year that the Selective Service Act was passed. It was the same year that the National Guard of the United States was called into service. There were those who said—and quite a number of them—that we could not manufacture 50,000 planes, for they were thinking of the 800 which were produced in 1938.

Since the first day of July 1940, and up until the first day of August 1944, this country—under the leadership of the President and with the cooperation of industry and labor—has produced 224,805 airplanes.

In addition to this, from July 1, 1940, up to August 1, 1944, the record shows that there has been produced in this country 68,515 tanks; 2,092,500 machine guns; 10,120,000 rifles and carbines; 38,920 motor carriages for self-propelled artillery; 630,000,000 rounds of Army artillery ammunition; 1,973,801 military trucks from January 1, 1940, to August 1, 1944; 88,800 armored cars, scout cars, and carriers through July 1944; 3,522 merchant ships; 993 combat naval ships; 45,296 subsidiary naval ships, including 40,620 landing crafts.

During the past 4 years 11 aircraft carriers of the 10,000-ton converted-cruiser type, as well as 74 aircraft carrier escorts, have been completed.

In 1943 United States shipyards turned out 1,881 vessels for the Maritime Commission, of which 1,238 were the 16-knot and upward Liberty ships. In the first 7 months of 1944, 1,052 new ships have been delivered to the Maritime Commission. From a production standpoint, I think you will agree with me that during the last 4 years production has been simply tremendous in materials of war. I could give you the facts also as to the enormous quantities of textiles that were manufactured in this country—an output which could well be termed enormous. This great production in all lines could not have been had if it had not been for the cooperation of labor and industry with the Government. While there have been some strikes, yet I say to you that the record of American labor is one of which every American should be proud—whether it was in industry, in transportation, or anything else. Speaking of transportation, the American railways, American coastwise and river shipping, motor busses, trucks, and commercial aviation have transported an immense tonnage of materials of war and supplies as well as many, many millions of passengers. When history is written, the history of transportation will be a most remarkable achievement in this war.

LEND-LEASE

It may interest you to have the figures on lend-lease. The total lend-lease aid to our allies from March 11, 1941, to June 30, 1944, amounts to $28,270,351,000. In addition to this amount, $678,241,000 worth of supplies were consigned to United States commanding generals in the field for subsequent lend-lease transfer to Allied forces.

You and I have frequently heard it expressed by unthinking persons that we were not giving enough to our soldiers and too much to our allies. I wanted to find out about this, and I did. I discovered that our armed forces received 82 percent of our production. Our allies received 15 percent of our production under lend-lease and that our allies purchased 3 percent of our total war production. These figures should refute any of these foolish statements.

Now the next thing that should be brought to your attention is that 54 percent of the amount of lend-lease consists of materials of war, ammunition, and ships. Twenty-one percent of what they get consists of industrial material and products. Thirteen percent consists of food and agricultural products, and the remainder of 12 percent consists of services, such as the repair and rental of ships, the ferrying of aircraft, and the building of factories in the United States to produce lend-lease supplies.

The United States has leased 511 cargo ships of 1,000 gross tons or over, and 1,284 merchant and auxiliary craft of under 1,000 gross tons. All ships are leased for the duration of the war only, and they remain the property of the United States.

Every American knows of the gallant fight that has been made by Russia in driving the Nazis from their soil. We Americans can take pride in the courage and fortitude and the great fighting qualities of the Russians, and we also can take pride in the aid which we let Russia have. The total amount of lend-lease to this great country has amounted to $5,900,000,000, and of that amount $1,650,000,000 has been shipped to Russia during the first 6 months of 1944.

Three hundred thousand trucks and other military vehicles.

Eighty-four thousand military vehicles were shipped during first 6 months of 1944.

By June 30, 1944, we had sent the Soviet Union 339 locomotives, and 1,649 flatcars under a program begun last year.

By June 30, 1944, we had shipped more than 455,000 tons of railroad rails and accessories, car and locomotive wheels and axles, 934,000 miles of field telephone wire, and 325,000 field telephones.

From October 1, 1941, to June 30, 1944, 11,000 planes have been flown or shipped. Three thousand planes in the first 6 months of 1944.

Three million, seventy-nine thousand short tons of food—this includes 588,000 tons of wheat and flour, 572,000 tons of canned and dried milk, 356,000 tons of vegetable oils, 17,000 tons of seeds, and 7,600,000 pairs of Army boots.

I have, as briefly as possible, tried to impress upon you the great magnitude of the undertaking in which the United States has engaged in this global war. You may be interested in some short statements of facts which will still further impress upon you the magnitude of the undertaking that our Nation has engaged in.

To date, I would estimate that approximately 50,000,000 tons of army cargo has been shipped overseas.

More supplies were shipped to north Africa alone for that invasion than were transported during the entire period of our participation in the last war.

To transport one armored division overseas it requires at least 15 Liberty ships for its equipment as well as the necessary ships for troops in addition.

In World War No. 1, one piece of artillery was produced for every 1,100 soldiers. We now manufacture one for every 46 soldiers.

In 2 weeks of operations in the Marshall Islands the Navy expended 58,800,000 gallons of fuel oil and gasoline. I have been informed that approximately 1 ton of gasoline is required to keep a flying fortress in the air 1 hour.

As a comparison between this war and the Spanish-American War, I call to your attention that in the Battle of Manila Bay in 1898, Dewey's fleet expended 73 tons of shells. At Tarawa, in 1943, naval vessels fired 2,200 tons of shells and our aircraft dropped 500 tons of bombs.

Let me state to you just a part of one Army front-line supply order: 100 pneumatic drills, 60 sheepfoot rollers, 40 pile drivers, 80 rock crushers, 40 power shovels, 200 water pumps, 100 tractors, 100,000 feet of 36-inch metal culvert pipe, 4 shops complete for general service regiment, 235,000 pairs of shoes, 50,000 rounds of mortar ammunition, 100 miles of 4-inch pipe, sedans, wheat, dry batteries, and nurses' overshoes and underwear.

For every 100 rifles the Army sends to combat areas, the annual replacement is 60 rifles. For every 100 machine guns the Army must count on replacements of 85. For every pair of shoes, every helmet, every truck, every shelter half, replacements must be kept flowing.

OIL AND GASOLINE

A tremendous amount of oil and gasoline is used by our armed forces, and we must be pleased with what has been accomplished by the Nation in this field. Without gasoline and oil the Nation would be helpless. For use in tanks, ships, planes, and machines for industries, as well as other things, we require enormous quantities.

Firepower decides battles but remember this—that firepower cannot be obtained without oil.

When General Eisenhower gave his Normandy invasion order, 11,000 planes started whirling. Hundreds of transport planes dropped 24,000 parachute troops behind German lines.

More than 460 domestic refineries are now in operation in this country. The United Nations now have available to them operation facilities which produce more than 500,000 barrels per day of special fuels.

In 30 months of war this Nation has built over 60 domestic plants at a cost of approximately $1,000,000,000 and production has multiplied more than 10 percent.

Army consumption represents approximately 40 percent of the daily output of gasoline. This is more than 10 times as much as was consumed in the last war.

The total requirements of the United States and her allies at the present time is approximately 7,000,000 barrels daily, or approximately two and one-half billion barrels per year. None of us can conceive of how much—or what size pile—two and one-half billion barrels is, but let me put it this way: If the two and one-half billion barrels were emptied into tank cars and these tank cars were placed into one single train, that train would be 100,000 miles long.

I have touched on some of the highlights in the production field. I have done this for the specific purpose of reminding you that somebody had to be at the head—somebody had to be the final arbiter, the one that directed all the production and all the transportation, both in this country and abroad. Who was that someone? You and I know that it was the President of the United States. If he had failed in these things, in this campaign he would have been charged with the failure; so in this campaign he and his administration must be given the credit for what has been done. There were many who helped him—men of both parties—men of all groups have cooperated with him; but finally, he alone had to assume the responsibility for this vast undertaking. We can give credit to all but especially must we give credit to the President of the United States.

Again and again I want to remind you, however, that this war is not yet won. No war is ever won until the last shot is fired. Production must go on as called for. Men must be trained as are called for. We must win. We will win a final and complete victory over our enemies.

Having soldiered in the last war, I have had, of course, experience in the training of troops and of being with troops in battle. I believe that I can say without fear of contradiction that never in any country—in any period of history—have the armed forces been mobilized so well and received such training or been so well prepared as they are in this war.

We have an Army of approximately 8,000,000 men. We have a naval personnel, including the Marine Corps and the Coast Guard, of approximately 3,250,000 men. We have overseas in the Army and Navy something over 5,000,000. Wherever these men are—wherever they have been—they have measured up to, if not surpassed, the high standard set for them by American soldiers and sailors of former wars. They have fought as Americans have always done, with initiative and courage—they have endured all privations that a soldier has to endure—and each and every one of them has been a man. In addition to the men, praise of necessity must be given to the nurses of the various armed services and to all of those in the other women's organizations. When victory is finally won and the history of this war is written, it will contain a glorious record of the achievements of our armed forces.

Many of our men have made the supreme sacrifice. Many are wounded for life. Many are missing, and a great many are prisoners of war. The total casualties up to the 1st of September were 389,125.

Wounded, 195,106; missing, 54,565; prisoners, 52,647.

It may be well to give you the British losses. Since September 1939 the battle casualties of the British armed forces were 925,963, in addition to a total of 132,092 British civilians who have been killed or wounded during air raids.

The United States armed forces have been diminished by 1,607,366 officers and men. This total includes all casualties and wounded who have been returned to civilian life as well as those who were discharged for various reasons from the armed services.

Our armed forces are meeting with success. Only the other day we heard over the radio the description of General Brereton's air-borne troops landing in Holland. It was a description that thrilled and filled every American with pride of the American troops.

Up to date Cherbourg and Le Havre have been captured. Yesterday we had the report that Brest has fallen. Antwerp is now in Allied hands and awaits only the clearing out of the Germans between the port and the mouth of the Scheldt. General Patch's army moves closer toward the sealing of the Belfort Gap.

In Italy the Allied troops are striking close to Rimini, key point along the Germans' Gothic Line which guards the approaches to the Po Valley. There is hard fighting and everywhere our troops are engaged they are getting results. The Russians have captured Praga, a suburb of Warsaw, and the siege of Warsaw is underway. Rumania and Bulgaria and Finland are now fighting the Axis. It is clear that it is just a question of time before final victory in Europe.

In the Pacific Saipan and Guam have been conquered. A landing has been made in the Palau group. Another landing has been made on Morotai, northernmost island of the Moluccas, 300 miles from Mindanao.

In southeast Asia Chinese and British troops have long since captured the important Japanese supply base at Mogaung. Allied troops, since the capture of Myitkyina have further tightened their grip on all of north Burma. In Manipur across the Indian border, British and Indian troops have entirely eliminated all Japanese forces.

Each day the picture changes and one to keep abreast must read the papers and listen to the broadcasts. Praise is due the Secretary of War, Mr. Stimson, the Under Secretary of War, Judge Patterson, and the other Assistant Secretaries of War, the former Secretary of the Navy, the late Frank Knox, the Secretary of the Navy, Mr. Forrestal, the Under Secretary of the Navy, and the Assistant Secretaries of the Navy for the efficient and patriotic way in which they have done their jobs and in which they have fulfilled every expectation. We, as Americans, can be proud of General Marshal, Admiral King, General Eisenhower, General MacArthur, Admiral Nimitz, and the other great Army and Navy officers who have performed their duties so well.

We must remember, gentlemen, that above all of these there has been a Commander in Chief—the President of the United States—who deserves praise for the part that he has played in hastening victory. President Roosevelt—like the other wartime Presidents—history will record, has magnificently upheld every American tradition and rendered a high degree of patriotic service to the Nation. He has made a great President and as equally a great Commander in Chief.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BULWINKLE. I will be glad to yield.

Mr. EBERHARTER. I want to compliment the gentleman on the remarkable address he has just made and also thank him for the time and energy he has expended in preparing those figures for the benefit of the Members of the House and of the public.

Mr. BULWINKLE. I thank the gentleman.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include certain extracts.

The SPEAKER pro tempore [Mr. MONRONEY]. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my time may be transferred to tomorrow. I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow, after the completion of business on the Speaker's table, I be permitted to address the House for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO]?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. JARMAN] is recognized for 15 minutes.

THE NATURAL IRRESPONSIBILITY OF INEXPERIENCED YOUTH VERSUS THE ALLEGED WEARINESS OF TIRED OLD AGE

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Speaker, on last Wednesday I indulged in a few comments relative to the outstanding issue

of this campaign as put forth by the Republican nominee and his associates early therein. I commenced my remarks by stating that when this issue was first injected into it I did not consider it a consequential one. But I told my friends on the Republican side of the aisle that I have finally been thoroughly converted to the idea that Governor Dewey's statements on his present tour have thoroughly convinced me of its appropriateness as the main issue of the campaign. I refer, of course, to that paramount issue, the natural irresponsibility of inexperienced youth versus the weariness of alleged tired old age. In concluding those remarks I stated, after referring to Governor Dewey having waived aside responsible statements from such men with knowledge of the facts as General Marshall; such tired old men as former Supreme Court Justice Byrnes; Acting Chairman Thomas, of the Military Affairs Committee of the Senate; and Chairman May, of the Military Affairs Committee of the House, and taking the offhand and irresponsible statement of a junior major general who happens to be a Republican, whereas all these other gentlemen were Democrats, on which to base his charge that this administration would keep men in the Army unnecessarily after the war is over; in concluding I charged that Governor Dewey was guilty of one of three errors in making that statement, either of which would be unpardonable. First, that he was guilty of discussing something of which he was entirely ignorant, criticizing it and stating that he would remedy it; or, second, that it merely resulted from the natural irresponsibility of his inexperienced youth; or, third, which I was loathe to believe and would not then believe, that it was a deliberate effort to mislead the people of America and play on the heartstrings of the sad and lonely mothers, wives, sweethearts, sisters, and daughters of our soldiers for political purposes.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield right there?

Mr. JARMAN. I gladly yield to my friend the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. McCORMACK. In the conference report, which the House adopted today, in section 201, it provides:

> The War and Navy Departments shall not retain persons in the armed forces for the purpose of preventing unemployment or awaiting opportunities for employment.

That is congressional action, in addition to the general order of the War Department; and this matter has been under consideration in one form or another by committees of the House and Senate since last June.

Mr. JARMAN. I thank the distinguished gentleman very much for that contribution. He will recall that Justice Byrnes told a press conference in June that the orderly release of our fighting men at the earliest possible moment consistent with the war effort will be the primary consideration of both the President and the Joint Chiefs of Staff, but you see, he is a tired old man.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. JARMAN. I yield briefly.

Mr. TABER. Why was it then that the person in charge of Selective Service, General Hershey, was not kept within better bounds?

Mr. JARMAN. I imagine he is an irresponsible Republican youth who has been placed in a position of too great responsibilities by the War Department, but demobilization is not one of those responsibilities. He is an Army officer and this administration does not punish Army officers for political purposes.

Mr. TABER. Well, but the gentleman said he was a youth. He is an old man, as old as I am.

Mr. JARMAN. Well, the gentleman from New York is a youth.

Mr. TABER. And a great deal older than the gentleman from Alabama, who is speaking.

Mr. JARMAN. The distinguished gentleman from New York is very young himself.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JARMAN. I yield to the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. McCORMACK. I wonder how my good friend the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] feels with reference to the expression "tired old man," because I certainly never considered him tired; but it must have been rather embarrassing to him to have the leader of his own party use that phrase.

Mr. JARMAN. I have never seen any evidence of weariness on the part of the gentleman from New York. On the other hand, he is always exceptionally alert, sometimes too much so.

Mr. TABER. "Tired" represents the condition of the subject. I never claimed to be in that class, but where the coat fits, generally you have to put it on.

Mr. JARMAN. If the gentleman will remain, I am going to mention him again directly.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JARMAN. I will yield briefly to my good friend the gentleman from Pennsylvania, after which I must proceed or I will be unable to conclude my remarks.

Mr. EBERHARTER. I just wanted to say that nearly everybody in Washington knows that General Hershey has no jurisdiction whatsoever over the discharging of any person in the armed services, but that is purely the function of the Army and the Navy. General Hershey's jurisdiction absolutely ends the minute a person is sworn in, and Governor Dewey should know that fact.

Mr. JARMAN. He is charged with that responsibility. His position charges him with it, and I believe practically everyone in America except Governor Dewey is aware that what you say is quite true. Of course, Justice Byrnes and these others do have responsibility for it. Furthermore, he is sufficiently close to the President to be frequently referred to as Assistant President, whereas Hershey is a Republican.

No paper I have read, no commentator I have heard, no Member of Congress I have heard refer to the matter, has commended Governor Dewey for bringing demobilization into the campaign. On the other hand, he has been generally criticized. Certainly he must have heard of some of that criticism. Yet last Saturday he repeated it in an interview. Consequently, difficult though it be for me to realize and although I dislike to do it, I must eliminate the first two alternatives and reluctantly reach the conclusion that Governor Dewey was indulging in the last alternative that I mentioned when he brought that into the campaign. That is playing on the heartstrings of the Nation for political purposes.

Since then, of course, he has continued with his ridiculously irresponsible remarks. For instance, Secretary Ickes and Secretary Perkins vying for top positions on the purge list. Did anybody ever hear of a Republican President retaining a single member of his Democratic predecessor's Cabinet, or vice versa? Is it not the normal, the regular, the reasonable, the proper procedure for a new President if he is of a different party from his predecessor to appoint an entirely new Cabinet? And why talk irresponsibly and ridiculously about a purge list for Cabinet members?

He referred to General MacArthur. I have seen no compliment anywhere, nor have I heard of his desire to take charge of the war effort and say what the general should do. I have two columns about it, which are merely illustrative of all the comments, from each of which I will read excerpts; and I ask unanimous content, Mr. Speaker, to insert the two articles at this point in my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

(The matter referred to follows:)

[From the Washington Evening Star of September 16, 1944]

DEWEY AND WAR COMMAND

(By Maj. George Fielding Eliot)

Governor Dewey has contributed greatly to our national unity in the matter of postwar foreign policy, and to the confidence of our allies in our future intentions regarding the enforcement of the common peace, by his very evident determination to lift these vital questions above the level of partisan debate.

For this the country may well be grateful to the Republican candidate. His course in this respect seems to this writer to be wise, unselfish, and statesmanlike, but his gratuitous interference in the matter of the high command in the Pacific is neither wise nor helpful.

In his statement at Valentine, Nebr., on September 13, Governor Dewey brought forward the name of Gen. Douglas MacArthur in such a way as to render unavoidable the conclusion that the Governor was urging the appointment of that officer to the over-all Pacific command. In so doing, he ventured into a field which he is not qualified to discuss either on the ground of information or that of responsibility.

Governor Dewey cannot possibly know the facts as to General MacArthur's accomplishments and abilities, as displayed in the present war, except as these have been reported in the press or as they are told to him by persons of varying degrees of military competence who have visited the Southwest Pacific. He does not have access to the only source of information and advice on this subject which would enable him to pass judgment on General MacArthur as a possible

over-all Pacific commander in chief. Those sources are to be found in the Combined Chiefs of Staff, under whose direction General MacArthur functions, and to whom he is responsible.

Governor Dewey said, as quoted by correspondents: "Any study of his [MacArthur's] offensives up from Australia reveals the most extraordinary brilliance of his generalship. Time after time he has made landings on heavily defended, long prepared islands, and almost every time he has managed to land at the exact spot where the Japanese were not."

It is perfectly true, of course, that General MacArthur has conducted a skillful campaign and has gained distance toward his objectives in a steady step-by-step advance which has now brought him to the Halmahera Islands. But the inevitable implication of the Governor's remarks is that General MacArthur has handled his part of the eastward march toward Japan more skillfully than others—more skillfully, for example, than Admiral Nimitz has handled his great Central Pacific offensive.

In this writer's judgment—and that of other observers, it may be added—this is most decidedly not the case.

The Governor suggests that "adequate recognition and supply commensurate with General MacArthur's great talents are long overdue." But the supply of the Southwest Pacific area is a part of the general supply problem in the Pacific, which is based on the proportion of the total war resources available on the American forces which can, in view of the over-all strategic picture be allotted to the Pacific campaign.

In the beginning of that campaign General MacArthur was undoubtedly very short of supplies, men, planes, and everything else. So were all the rest of our Pacific forces. The decision to dispose of Germany first and Japan second was the reason. The vast offensive power of which we now dispose in the Pacific was not there then. It had to be built up by slow, heartbreaking, painful effort, and meanwhile those who fought to hold back the enemy's offensive thrusts had to do the best they could with what they had plus the trickle of help that could reach them. MacArthur did that; Halsey did that; the marines at Guadalcanal did that, and they all did it well.

Now things are different, very different. Germany is going down. Japan's turn is coming. Governor Dewey is not well informed in suggesting that General MacArthur lacks the forces and the equipment which he requires for the accomplishment of his present objectives. The very facts of MacArthur's recent progress tend to put this matter in quite another light than does Governor Dewey.

As to the suggestion that General MacArthur should now be appointed commander in chief of the whole Pacific war effort—and surely, despite careful hedging, Mr. Dewey could hardly have imagined that his words would be otherwise interpreted—it seems difficult to suppose that the Governor could have given any great study to the strategic conditions which now confront the Allied forces, or he would have realized that for a long time to come the war against Japan must continue primarily a naval and amphibious campaign in which everything depends on the Navy, in which sea-borne power is the foundation upon which the whole structure of our offensive operations must rest.

It is, of course, true that we are now coming to larger land masses, that we shall need more troops, that land operations will assume a higher proportionate importance, but we are still fighting for islands, even though they are bigger islands than Tarawa or Saipan, and we are very far as yet from the day when our principal objective will be the destruction of the main Japanese Army, in a great land campaign.

Until that day has been reached or is clearly in sight, the chief command of the Pacific operations ought to remain in the hands of a naval officer. Neither by his own experience nor by having access to adequately informed professional advice is Governor Dewey qualified to say otherwise.

[From the Washington Post of September 17, 1944]

MACARTHUR'S NOT ABUSED, SAYS WRITER

(By Ernest Lindley)

The charge that General MacArthur has been discriminated against because the President regarded him as a political threat has been made familiar by the isolationist press.

Now Governor Dewey has picked it up. He says that MacArthur should be given greater scope and recognition and more supplies.

What greater scope and recognition should General MacArthur be given? For 2½ years he has been Allied commander in the southwest Pacific, an area which embraces the approaches to the Philippines from Australia and New Guinea.

The next step up would be commander in chief of all Pacific operations.

These operations are, at the core, naval. Can anyone deny that they have been brilliantly conducted under the direction of Admirals King and Nimitz? Does anyone think that any general could conduct them any better, or even as well? Ask any naval officer.

Some sort of joint command might be rigged up. But that would be a dangerous step backward.

The only other posts which are more important than the one already held by MacArthur are chief of staff of the Army and supreme commander of Allied forces in Europe.

Does any sane person really think that General Marshall should be replaced, or, for that matter, General Eisenhower?

WILL REDEEM PLEDGE

If the defeat of Japan requires large-scale use of ground forces in China or in Japan proper, an Army general probably will be placed in command of them. If the Philippines have been liberated, meanwhile, General MacArthur might be named to such a command; although if there is a major campaign in China, General Stilwell, who speaks Chinese and is, among other things, chief of staff to Chiang Kai-shek, presumably would be considered for this responsibility.

General Eisenhower, who has proved so skillful in handling of forces of diverse nationality, also might be available.

But, meanwhile, General MacArthur is well on his way back to the Philippines for the redemption of his pledge to liberate them. That in itself is a large and honorable task and one that it is altogether fitting that he should perform.

As to supplies, it is well known that they are distributed in accordance with the strategic decisions of the Combined Chiefs of Staff. Those available for the Pacific have been distributed under the direction of the American Chiefs of Staff.

TWO BASIC REASONS

When MacArthur first began shouting for more supplies, more planes, and more of everything, he was probably no worse off relatively than other theater commanders. The main difference was that he made his demands more or less in public, whereas the others went through channels.

The hard fact in early 1942 was that there were not enough planes, supplies, and men to go around or enough ships to carry them.

As time passed there were two basic reasons why MacArthur did not receive all that he wanted. The first was the combined Anglo-American decision to beat Germany first. This was taken by Messrs. Roosevelt and Churchill with the full support of General Marshall.

The Navy's attitude was mixed.

This was probably the most critical decision of the war. It was the one which evoked the strongest protests from isolationist quarters and, with the loss of the Philippines, generated the boom to make General MacArthur Chief of Staff, or commander in chief of all American forces. Its essential wisdom is hardly debatable any more, even though some of the individual subdecisions—such as the sacrificing of a larger and earlier campaign to Burma to the defensive in Italy—are open to challenge.

SUPPLIES NOW ADEQUATE

The second basic reason why MacArthur did not get all he thought he should have was that his views on Pacific strategy did not altogether jibe with the Navy's. The Navy was working toward the great march across the central Pacific.

MacArthur has had in recent months adequate forces to perform the tasks assigned to him. Unquestionably he will be given enough for the next jump on his route. In fact, some naval officers feared that when Roosevelt went to Pearl Harbor he might make verbal commitments to MacArthur to provide forces in excess of those tentatively allotted by the Joint Chiefs of Staff, thus possibly delaying or weakening the main drive across the central Pacific.

Dewey's criticism of the treatment of MacArthur is, although he may not know it, a fundamental criticism of the wisdom of the American Chiefs of Staff.

In his acceptance speech he said he was against civilian interference with the conduct of the war and that, if elected, he would retain General Marshall and Admiral King.

Now he sets himself up as a man whose judgment on matters of military strategy is superior to theirs.

Mr. JARMAN. I quote from the conclusion of Ernest Lindley's column in the Washington Post of September 17:

Dewey's criticism of the treatment of MacArthur is, although he may not know it (in the irresponsibility of his youth), a fundamental criticism of the wisdom of the American Chiefs of Staff. In his acceptance speech he said he was against "civilian interference" with the conduct of the war and that if elected he would retain General Marshall and Admiral King.

Now he sets himself up as a man whose judgment on matters of military strategy is superior to theirs.

I also quote briefly from Maj. George Fielding Eliot, a military man, in the Star of September 16:

Governor Dewey is not well informed in suggesting that General MacArthur lacks the forces and the equipment which he requires for the accomplishment of his present objective. The very fact of MacArthur's recent progress tends to prove this matter in quite another light than does Governor Dewey.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JARMAN. If the gentleman will excuse me, I am afraid I am not going to get through in the time at my disposal. I hope to have an opportunity to yield later.

Governor Dewey, of course, would not know anything more about war than he would about demobilization. I will say this in his behalf, however: His analysts,

his people who read the papers for him, have told him about the criticism of his irresponsible reference to MacArthur because I believe it was Monday night he made the statement again that if he were elected there would be no change in military leadership. He is learning at least to that extent and I congratulate him on it.

But most ridiculous of all—and all of you recognized that fact who heard his speech Monday night—was when he said—and I quote from the press verbatim:

> That law, the Smith-Connally Act, will expire with the termination of the war, as it should. The provisions of this law and the other New Deal interferences with free collective bargaining will never be renewed.

Mr. Speaker, that is the first time I ever heard my good friend, the distinguished gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH], referred to as a new dealer; nor do I recall ever having heard Senator CONNALLY showered with such references. Do you believe it is possible, my colleagues on the left, that Governor Dewey did not know that the New Deal was absolutely opposed to that legislation to such an extent that the President vetoed it and that it was passed in this House over his veto with a great many Republican votes for it?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Will the gentleman yield for just a brief question?

Mr. JARMAN. I gladly yield to my friend, the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Does the gentleman remember that it was the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HARNESS] who offered the substitute plan here on the floor which was adopted by the House?

Mr. JARMAN. I thank the gentleman. That is true, and he is a good Republican.

Mr. Speaker, did the Governor of New York, and I think he will remain Governor of New York for 2 more years, know that the following outstanding new dealers voted to override the President's veto and therefore contributed toward the passage of the bill:

That outstanding new dealer, the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts, the minority leader [Mr. MARTIN], the distinguished gentleman from Michigan, assistant minority leader [Mr. MICHENER], the distinguished gentleman from Illinois, the minority whip [Mr. ARENDS], the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. KNUTSON], ranking minority member of the Ways and Means Committee, the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH], ranking minority member of the Rules Committee, the gentleman from New York [Mr. ANDREWS], ranking minority member of the Committee on Military Affairs, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MAAS], ranking minority member of the Committee on Naval Affairs, the honorable gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. EATON], ranking minority member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the distinguished gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK], who placed Mr. Willkie in nomination at Chicago 4 years ago.

Mr. EBERHARTER. And if the gentleman will yield, Mr. HALLECK was also chairman of the Republican National Congressional Committee.

Mr. JARMAN. Yes; also chairman of the Republican National Congressional Committee. And, finally, the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN], who was Governor Bricker's floor leader at Chicago this time.

As a matter of fact, I wonder if he did not know, and if he did not I charge him with the responsibility of having been able to know—he should have known—that the ranking Republican of no major committee failed to vote to override that veto? Only 7 ranking minority members of minor committees so voted, and only 36 Republicans out of the more than 200 were among the 108 who voted against the Smith-Connally act.

Mr. MCCORMACK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JARMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts, the majority leader.

Mr. McCORMACK. It seems too bad that Governor Dewey does not take into account the feelings of our distinguished Republican colleagues.

Mr. JARMAN. Yes, indeed. Of course, it makes his references last night absolutely ridiculous, ludicrous, and irresponsible in the extreme. I refer to his talk about cooperation between the Chief Executive and the Congress when he treats his own people, all of whom are running for reelection, that way. I say to him that is some cooperation. However, his attitude toward his own interests, his own opinions, as compared with those of others, is quite obvious.

Mr. Speaker, in conclusion, having already convicted himself to my complete satisfaction on the demobilization matter, I repeat the charge with reference to this MacArthur, and particularly the Smith-Connally matter, that Governor Dewey in making those statements was guilty of one of three errors, either of which is far beneath the position he occupies and the position his party has unfortunately for its members, placed him in. Either he was absolutely ignorant about the whole Smith-Connally bill, how it was passed, who voted for it, who sponsored it, and who fought it, with which he should have been familiar before he began to criticize people and tell the country that he was going to do better. Or it was just another illustration of the natural irresponsibility of inexperienced youth that flits about like a butterfly from flower to flower, indulging in indiscriminate charges, claiming everything, attempting to be all things to all people all the time everywhere, either one of those two, or Governor Dewey was deliberately attempting to mislead the people of this country, and particularly the laboring people, in his search for votes.

Think of it, my colleagues. Think of his lack of confidence in their judgment. Think of the respect he showed the laboring men last night when he said to them:

> You do not know anything about this Smith-Connally bill that you have been talking about for 6 months. You do not know who voted for it or who sponsored it. I, the great Governor of New York, am charged with all knowledge on that matter, and you little, insignificant laboring people, in whom I have no interest whatever except in your votes, I will tell you about it.

I ask you, my colleagues, and I ask the people of America, whether a candidate for President who has been guilty of such errors, regardless of their prompting cause, is the least bit capable, the least bit competent, the least bit worthy of presiding over the destinies of this great country at any time, and certainly at such a critical period as this?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Alabama has expired.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous special order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] is recognized for 5 minutes.

OFFICE OF PRICE ADMINISTRATION

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, when the last deficiency bill providing funds for the O. P. A. was up, the Appropriations Committee adopted an amendment, and the House and Senate followed through, restricting O. P. A. operations on canned fruits and vegetables to commercial grades and prohibiting the Administrator of O. P. A. from establishing other grades.

Mr. Bowles has seen fit to make certain statements in a letter to Chirman CANNON of the Appropriations Committee with reference to this amendment.

Agricultural Marketing Administration grades have been established by the Agricultural Department with reference to canned fruits and vegetables. These are not in general use. It is absolutely impossible for canners and processors to accurately reflect the true grade according to A. M. A. The commercial grades have been in effect for 60 years and there has never been any difficulty with reference to their interpretation or use.

Mr. Bowles states in his letter that the proviso which prohibits the use of anything other than commercial grades "made impossible the proper enforcement of price ceilings on canned fruits and vegetables."

In his letter Mr. Bowles gives no facts about enforcement. He states no instance or instances in which the O. P. A. found it difficult to enforce maximum prices based on established commercial grades. Likewise, he gives no instance or instances in which the O. P. A.'s improper use of A. M. A. grades in 1943 made enforcement easier or better.

Of course whatever facts are available, O. P. A. has in its Enforcement Division headed by Mr. Emerson. The failure to advance any facts in an 11-page statement issued by Mr. Bowles in and of itself would make one suspicious as to the existence of such facts.

What information is available outside the O. P. A. leads to very grave doubts

as to the accuracy or candor of what Mr. Bowles has said.

In 1942 O. P. A pricing was based on established commercial grades rather than these Government grades. According to information available to me, O. P. A. had little difficulty in enforcing these regulations. In numerous instances it secured treble-damage settlements, in one instance in the Middle West it obtained injunctions against violation of the price ceilings, and in a pending California case it has brought a very large treble-damage suit based on price regulations according to established commercial grades.

In an affidavit filed by Mr. Tom Emerson, Deputy Administrator for Enforcement, in November 1943, he reported that there had been 308 investigations of alleged price violations in the sale of processed foods of the 1942 pack, which were priced according to commercial grades, and that out of this total of 308, sanctions had been imposed in 139 cases. By sanctions I suppose he means either treble-damage settlements or successful court action. This seems to me to be rather effective enforcement, and far better than the average.

It is not necessary, however, to make one's own judgment because Prentiss Brown, the former O. P. A. Administrator, himself, has summed up O. P. A.'s experience in 1942 under regulations based on commercial grades.

In an opinion rendered on February 27, 1943, Prentiss Brown stated, regarding the operation of the canning industry under MPR 152 during the 1942 pack:

> It is a matter of record that the great majority of approximately 3,000 canners have been, and are, operating successfully under price control. In view of this fact, it must be apparent that the regulation is generally fair and equitable and by arresting the upward trend of prices, has effectuated the purpose of the act. (In the matter of C. S. Kale Canning Co., opinion on order No. 20 under Reg. MPR 152, Feb. 27, 1943.)

In 1943 some of the O. P. A. prices were based on commercial grades and some others on these Government grades, which legally the O. P. A. even then had no right to use. Numerous instances have been reported in which the O. P. A. has obtained damage settlements against processors based on these commercial grades. In one case in May 1944, in my own State an applesauce canner was made to pay $20,960.50 in settlement of a treble-damage suit covering sales of applesauce—Hartman Canning Co., Macedon, N. Y., on the 1943 pack based on commercial grades.

In another case involving a Baltimore processor, very substantial sums were obtained in a treble-damage settlement of alleged violations of price regulations which were based on these established commercial grades—Gibbs & Co. The charges were that they had upgraded their product and there was no difficulty in O. P. A.'s enforcement.

These are only some among many instances of effective enforcement using commercial grades which undoubtedly led Mr. Bowles' predecessor, Prentiss Brown, to make the statement which I have quoted.

Whether these facts have been reported to Mr. Bowles by his enforcement staff, I do not know. They certainly lead me to believe that if there was a willingness to proceed with the enforcement of price regulations based on established commercial grades—instead of this insistence upon seeking to do what Congress has prohibited—effective enforcement could be readily secured.

On the other side of the picture I very greatly doubt the honesty of the statement that with these A. M. A. grades O. P. A. could do a better enforcement job. In 1943 some 10 processed fruits and vegetables were priced according to these A. M. A. grades. These included the most important products. Most, if not all, of this 1943 pack has long since been sold by the processors. Most of it was sold before last January.

Yet not one single court case or treble-damage settlement has been reported in which the O. P. A. successfully prosecuted on the basis of these A. M. A. grades. At a meeting last July between the Deputy Administrator for Price and the processors, O. P. A. enforcement lawyers were asked to state what had been O. P. A. experience in price enforcement using these A. M. A. grades. These lawyers could produce nothing, they had no figures, and they could point to no completed case in which A. M. A. grades had served effectively in enforcement.

Throughout this entire controversy, the O. P. A. has failed to produce any facts supporting their insistence upon upsetting the established methods of doing business in the industry.

It is apparent to me that with the difficulty of interpreting the Agricultural Marketing Administration grades which are very difficult to understand and to follow through, that enforcement would be much more difficult and practically impossible if Mr. Bowles were allowed to have his own way.

Why does he not try to do the thing with which he has succeeded, instead of trying to impose some additional regulation which will tend to prevent proper enforcement?

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that following the other special orders today I may address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may address the House for 10 minutes today, following the special orders heretofore entered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH] is recognized for 15 minutes.

SMITH-CONNALLY BILL

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I am sorry I did not hear all the remarks of the distinguished gentleman from Alabama [Mr. JARMAN] when he spoke and criticized Governor Dewey for his views on labor, and particularly in connection with the Smith-Connally bill. The responsibility for legislation in the House of Representatives which has a Democratic majority, must necessarily rest with that party. They control the committees and they control the procedure in the House and they have a majority vote. The Smith-Connally bill was sponsored by two Democrats. No one can deny that. One is a Member of this House and another a Member of the Senate. They are two very distinguished Members of their respective Houses. I thoroughly agree with the views expressed by Governor Dewey when he said in his Seattle speech on September 18, 1944:

> The law, the Smith-Connally Act, will expire with the termination of the war, as it should. The provisions of this law and other New Deal interferences with free, collective bargaining should never be renewed.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield; certainly.

Mr. McCORMACK. Does the gentleman understand that he was criticizing the passage of the Smith-Connally Act?

Mr. FISH. I understand from what I could gather of the speech of the gentleman from Alabama that he was criticizing Governor Dewey on that ground also.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman should have been here. The gentleman from Alabama was criticizing Governor Dewey in trying to create the impression that the Smith-Connally Act was New Deal legislation. Now Governor Dewey condemned the act, the passage of it. Did the gentleman from New York vote for the passage of the bill over the veto of the President?

Mr. FISH. That is just what I am coming to, to tell the gentleman the situation at that time.

Mr. McCORMACK. If the gentleman did, he defended him.

Mr. FISH. I understood he criticized Governor Dewey for stating that he condemned the act.

Mr. McCORMACK. No; he criticized Governor Dewey for claiming that it was New Deal legislation when, of course, everyone knows that it was not. You know that as well as I do.

Mr. FISH. I thought you just said, or at least I heard you say, that he criticized Governor Dewey for condemning the act itself?

Mr. McCORMACK. That is, that Governor Dewey claimed that it was New Deal legislation. Well, then, Governor Dewey condemned the act.

Mr. FISH. We agree on that, that Governor Dewey condemned the act.

Mr. McCORMACK. There is no question about that.

Mr. FISH. That is why I intend to defend him from unjustifiable criticism.

Mr. McCORMACK. Governor Dewey also tried to create the impression that it was New Deal legislation.

Mr. FISH. That is secondary.

Mr. McCORMACK. Oh, no; it is not secondary; that is primary. It may be secondary to you.

Mr. FISH. You admit that the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. JARMAN] stated that Governor Dewey condemned the Smith-Connally bill or act.

Mr. McCORMACK. And Governor Dewey tried to charge it was New Deal legislation; that is primary.

Mr. FISH. No; it is not primary. Has he not a right to condemn the act and was he not right in doing so?

Mr. McCORMACK. Of course he has, but he does not have a right to claim it was New Deal legislation because that is inconsistent with the truth.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 5 additional minutes because I want to continue this argument a little further.

Mr. McCORMACK. When he condemned the act he condemned all those who voted to pass the bill over the veto of the President. I asked the gentleman from New York, Did he vote to pass the bill over the President's veto?

Mr. FISH. That is exactly why I took this time, to make the statement that I thoroughly agree that Governor Dewey is right in his condemnation of the act, and that I was wrong on certain phases in the consideration of that legislation. Confession is good for the soul. If the gentleman can recollect that far back he will remember that as ranking Republican member of the Committee on Rules, I led the fight not to take up the Smith-Connally bill, but urged the defeat of the rule, so that the bill could not be considered at that time, because it was being brought up in the midst of the miners' strike. I knew of the pressure and hysteria that existed, and I thought it was utterly unfair to consider that type of legislation then. The gentleman from Massachusetts voted for the rule to take it up. I tried to prevent it being brought up.

Mr. McCORMACK. Who?

Mr. FISH. The gentleman from Massachusetts himself, the majority leader.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman did not vote for the passage of the bill in the House.

Mr. FISH. The gentleman voted to take the bill up. I was trying to prevent the bill being brought up. I tried to prevent it being brought up at that time in the midst of the miners strike, because I knew of the hysteria that existed and that it would not receive fair consideration. The rule was passed by a very small majority, and the gentleman from Massachusetts helped pass the rule to bring it up at that time. Now, that is the gentleman's record. I tried to prevent it being brought up. Then I voted for the bill after it was amended in the House. I voted against it when it came back with the Senate amendments, and then I later voted to override the President's veto.

Mr. McCORMACK. And that is when it became law.

Mr. FISH. That is when it became law. Many months ago I signed the petition to repeal the Smith-Connally Act. That signature was attached many months ago. I believe that Governor Dewey is thoroughly justified in opposing this legislation, in opposing the enactment of it, and in saying that it is bad legislation, because it has worked that way and has created strikes. Some of us who voted that way regret the vote. I am not ashamed to say that I regret that vote. I was just on the border-line. I think it was that hysteria about the miner's strike that brought me over. I suspected it might work out badly. As I said, I actually led the fight on the floor of the House not to bring it up under the rule, but to defeat the rule. I have no apologies for my vote. I voted the way I wanted to vote at the time, but I was not very keen about it and I was rather fearful of it, and it worked out the way I feared it would. Therefore, I have done the only thing I could do about it, and that is to sign the petition for repeal. I signed that petition many months ago. That type of legislation has not worked out well and Governor Dewey is thoroughly justified in what he said.

Now, as to the primary responsibility, I do not say it is New Deal legislation. I say the Democrats are in charge of the House. They sponsored the legislation in the committee. They were the authors of the legislation in the House and in the Senate. It was passed by a large majority, both Republicans and Democrats. Naturally, the majority leader is the last person to try to deny Democratic responsibility for legislation in this House. I charge that the Democrats are responsible for that legislation and all other legislation that passes the House of Representatives in their own name. They are in control of the House organization and cannot evade that responsibility and obligation.

Call it New Deal legislation or Democratic legislation or what you will, I do not think it is justifiable for anyone to criticize Governor Dewey for his views on the Smith-Connally Act in view of the way it worked out.

Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing several bills to which I desire to call attention. One provides for the release of married enlisted men from active service in the United States Army who have attained the thirty-fifth anniversary of their birth within 30 days of the termination of the war with Germany. I believe that all those married men over 35 years of age in the Army should be given priority and preference of returning to their families and their businesses. They are the forgotten men of the war. They were taken away from their families, their homes, and their children, and from the businesses they built up over 10 or 15 years and had large investments in, some of them making three, four, five, and ten thousand dollars a year. They were thrown into the service, and those overage men have filled our hospitals. It seems to me that when the war with Germany is terminated these men should be given priority in being released first to get back to their families and their children and to save their businesses. I think it makes sense and I hope if the War Department does not act accordingly that the Congress will when it comes back after the recess.

I also am introducing a bill to establish a game farm in Orange County, N. Y., a regular-type game farm for the propagating and distributing of game birds and animals in that area, the cost not to exceed $50,000.

Orange County, N. Y., is a large farming county within 50 to 75 miles of New York City. There is enough game for their own purposes and in the shooting season for the sportsmen who live in Orange County—and there are many of them; but at our doorstep is the great city of New York and part of New Jersey, with a population of about 20,000,000 people. They come up into our area and shoot off our game. If that is to continue, I feel that at least the National Government should establish a game farm there to take care of these people who live outside of our country and district who come up every year and hunt in Orange County, come in such numbers that they actually endanger the lives of our people and kill off our pheasants, rabbits, and other game.

I am also introducing a bill to establish 2 fish hatcheries, 1 in Sullivan County on the Neversink River, the other in Delaware County on the Delaware River. There is some of the best fishing in America in Sullivan and Delaware Counties, but the people of New York City and New Jersey come up every year in large numbers to fish in our streams and lakes. We welcome them—in some of our counties they are the best crop we have; they spend their money there. But on the other hand they catch a large part of our fish and we think we ought to have some help from the Federal Government in establishing fish hatcheries right there so that we can take care of our own people in our own counties, but also the thousands upon thousands that come from the city of New York to fish in our district—over 500,000 come annually into Sullivan County—not to fish but for a summer vacation and many of them do fish.

Mr. Speaker, I received the following telegram, and this being almost the last day of Congress I want to get it into the RECORD. It is dated yesterday from Chicago and comes from Philip S. Levy, of Newburgh, N. Y., a delegate to the American Legion national convention at Chicago. It reads as follows:

National Americanism reports unanimously adopted including repeal of Omaha resolution No. 296 relative to franking privilege.

Some of you Members of Congress who read the newspapers about a year ago when the American Legion was in session will remember there were big columns in the newspapers in reference to a resolution passed by the American Legion condemning me for alleged misuse of my franking privilege. It went into details, all kinds of various charges, without ever having given me an opportunity to deny the charges. The resolution was adopted without any substantiating evidence of any kind. I am a member of the Legion. I believe it is a great patriotic organization, courageous, fearless, and when it makes a mistake it is not afraid to say so.

The national executive committee of the American Legion appointed a committee of three to investigate these charges, and did investigate them for

many months' time, and submitted a 12-page report refuting every single one of the charges in every detail. The Legion national convention yesterday passed a resolution exonerating and vindicating me of all these charges and did the unusual thing of rescinding and revoking their position of a year ago and wiping it out completely. Naturally I am proud of that act. But you do not see anything about that in the newspapers. You saw a great deal about it when the charges were first made by the Legion, but when a repudiation of it comes, when it is revoked after a thorough, detailed investigation, you see almost nothing in the papers. I have looked at two or three of the leading newspapers. For instance, I looked at the early edition of the New York Times today which had a whole column about the action of the Legion in condemning me a year ago, but not one word about the refutation and exoneration. That is a great newspaper, it is one of the greatest newspapers in America. My people read it, but they will not see anything in that paper about the action of the national convention of the American Legion repudiating by unanimous vote their action of a year ago.

I have just done the same thing on the floor of the House, and I am not a bit ashamed in saying that I regard my vote for the Smith-Connally Act as a mistake. I think the bill worked out badly. That is all I can do about it, and that is all the Legion can do about it as far as this particular resolution is concerned.

Mr. Speaker, I hold in my hand a circular from the National Citizens Political Action Committee in which there is taken to task a number of Members of the House and of the Senate, including such distinguished Members as the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN], the minority leader; the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER]; the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT]; and others, as well as a number of Senators. There is a whole paragraph devoted to a special reference to me, and I am very honored, because, I believe condemnation from Sidney Hillman's P. A. C. is the highest possible commendation; at least it is in my congressional district.

Mr. Sidney Hillman admitted before a congressional committee that the P. A. C. contributed $2,000 to my opponent in the recent primary campaign, which contribution is the kiss of death for the election when the people are made acquainted with the facts, as they will, that my opponent received $2,000 from Sidney Hillman. The result will be exactly the same as the recent congressional elections in Maine.

Mr. Speaker, this country belongs to the American people and they do not propose to let Sidney Hillman run the United States of America. The American people are Americans, they are American at heart, they are American in soul, body, and mind, and they have no use for any Russianized propaganda emanating from Sidney Hillman to Russianize America. They want nothing to do with the Communists or their fellow travelers such as the American Labor Party and Sidney Hillman's Political Action Committee. The American people do not propose to let a coalition of these evil and Red forces elect a Congress which they can dominate and control.

Here is what Sidney Hillman's P. A. C. has to say about me, and I want to comment for a few minutes on these charges. Its official pamphlet states that I, Representative FISH, returning from a talk with Van Ribbentrop, announced that the German claims were just. That is a complete misstatement of fact. I never discussed German claims with Von Ribbentrop. The statement referred to here evidently was made long afterwards when I said that the German claims to Danzig, in my opinion, were just. I have always thought that. I thought it then and I think so now. But that is how such statements are twisted around to mean the opposite.

Then it goes on to say, "Representative FISH has spoken at meetings of Bundists." I have never spoken or been invited to speak at any meeting of Bundists. I will give anybody $1,000 to show where I ever spoke at any meeting of Bundists in my life. I spoke at a German Day rally in 1938, but the Bundists refused to come and boycotted the meeting because of some reference I had made at that time to persecution by Hitler.

Only a little while ago I was attacked in my district as being a bosom friend of Fritz Kuhn, who was the leader of the Bundists.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 3 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. FISH. The Communists, the Reds, the American Labor Party, dominated and controlled by the Communists, the liberal party of pinker shade, and Sidney Hillman P. A. C. circulated all over my district material to the effect that Fritz Kuhn, as Bundist leader, was an intimate associate of mine. What are the facts? I met Fritz Kuhn once in my life. I met him in 1938 when I was chairman of the Military Affairs Committee of the State constitutional convention, where I had put in a resolution to prohibit the arming, the drilling, and the uniforming of the bund and other like organizations. We held open hearings in the assembly chamber, almost as large as this Chamber, and I presided. Fritz Kuhn came there to oppose my resolution to put the bund practically out of business, to prevent it from arming, drilling, and uniforming. Some photographer took a picture of Fritz Kuhn and myself at that meeting, and 100,000 copies were sent out reading—Congressman FISH associated with Fritz Kuhn the Bundist leader—a man I never had seen in my life before or since, but who came there to oppose the resolution I introduced and tried to get through to put his organization out of business. This P. A. C. continues to spread those types of lies and falsehoods and wicked and malicious propaganda that I attended bund meetings when there is no foundation whatever for such statements.

Only yesterday the Legion put an end to these charges of the alleged abuse of my franking privileges. I have repeatedly stated that no one has used my franking privilege except myself, and that has been for my own speeches, 100 percent American. They were in favor of keeping out of war before Pearl Harbor, but they were 100 percent American. Now the American Legion comes out in national convention and after a thorough investigation admits that there was no violation or abuse of my franking privilege.

As far as Sidney Hillman's P. A. C. is concerned, they have a perfect right to come up into my district and spend all the money they want, but my people are not for sale, Republicans or Democrats alike; and the more Sidney Hillman and his P. A. C. comes into my district with his slush funds the bigger vote I will get, both of Republicans and Democrats on election day. We will make Maine look like a piker if he persists in this kind of vicious and false propaganda and sends money and slush funds into the Twenty-ninth Congressional District. I want this Congress to know that our people can deal with Sidney Hillman and his P. A. C. and the American Labor Party dominated and controlled by the Communists and all their slush funds. The people of my district are not for sale and do not intend to let outsiders like Sidney Hillman dictate to them whom they shall elect to represent them in Congress.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ROWE] is recognized for 5 minutes.

A FREE PRESS THROUGHOUT THE WORLD

Mr. ROWE. Mr. Speaker, the insidious forces of evil must of necessity be veiled with what appears to be good intent or completely shrouded by the darkness of secrecy in order that they may thrive and grow. It is my profound conviction that where th light of truth may be cast upon any movement, wherever it may be on the face of this earth, it will be refined to a constructive force or will be destroyed by this light.

I want to lend my complete cooperation in full approval to the resolution offered by the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], which intends that a free press shall be a condition of the peace among the nations of the world. I do not believe there is full realization and appreciation as to what this resolution, if adopted and approved by the nations of the world, will do toward the establishment of a permanent peace. Its force rises above the intrigue and chicanery that must necessarily precede a war as devastating as the last two wars in which this Nation has participated, because it seeks out the ulterior motives in the hearts of men or nations that would sell either other men or other nations to the gods of war and destruction who are bent upon conquest and power. I have an avowed faith in the public press when its rights to seek out the truth of the iniquitous forces are unhindered and untrammeled.

I believe if the power of the press is privileged by the authorities among the nations, more especially the leading ones, that tyrants and despots will fear it far more greatly than the most formidable force of arms yet known to man. It will take from the hearts and minds of all men the fear of those forces which grow within the walls of restriction by censorship set up to cover an embryonic evil which would wilt and die beneath the searching truth. It gives security to the human heart in the knowledge that they may know the truth, and knowing the truth will formulate an irresistible force for fair dealing among the nations of the world. A free and untrammeled press is the foundation of liberty. Where the expression of truth exists, liberty and freedom within the law will always remain unrestricted. If this movement toward a free press throughout the world is adopted, then I know of no words that can better express its worth than those in the Battle Hymn of the Republic:

Mine eyes have seen the glory of the coming of the Lord!
He is trampling out the vintage where the grapes of wrath are stored;
He hath loosed the fateful lightning of His terrible swift sword:
His truth is marching on.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PRIEST] is recognized for 10 minutes.

THE CAMPAIGN OF THE REPUBLICAN CANDIDATE FOR THE PRESIDENCY

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I followed with a great deal of interest the remarks of the distinguished gentleman from Alabama [Mr. JARMAN] and I found myself in rather full accord with the views that he expressed here in the well of the House earlier today.

As the Republican candidate for the Presidency completes his first campaign tour, he has emerged with a political strategy and a forensic tactic which, in the midst of war, seem all the more irresponsible for their studied calculation.

The strategy is to sow disaffection with the conduct of the war.

The tactic is to say nothing constructive, to be all things to all men.

I have come to this conclusion regretfully. The Republican candidate had an unrivaled opportunity to play a constructive role in clarifying both the Republican Party and the people of this country on the major problems of war and peace facing America in this critical period. He seeks to become President of the greatest Nation in the world, in the most momentous period in all the history of the world. It would be difficult indeed to imagine a greater opportunity.

I regret that thus far he has chosen not to accept this opportunity. I regret that he chose instead the path of deliberately sowing confusion and doubt in a nation engaged in its most bitter war. I regret that despite high-sounding words and a masterful presence, he has chosen the part of the catch-penny politician greedy for votes, and not the role of statesman which the times demand.

From the purely partisan standpoint, I should, I suppose, welcome this demonstrated insufficiency of the opposing party's candidate for the tasks of the Presidency. On the contrary, I do not. I can take no partisan pleasure in the sowing of confusion, in the raising of doubts in the minds and hearts of Americans in wartime, in the fanning of wartime irritations to such explosive levels that they may well interfere with the conduct of the war and the making of the peace.

Mr. Speaker, these conclusions concerning the character of the campaign being conducted by the Republican aspirant are based on a careful and searching scrutiny of everything he has said and done during his present tour, starting with the speech in Philadelphia. I do not base these conclusions on the utterances of his followers, his campaign managers, and the smaller fry surrounding him. I do not base them on the cloud of interpretation and explanation which precede and follow his utterances, but on them alone and on his actions.

I say that the underlying pattern of the Republican candidate's progress through the country is a deliberate effort to whip up disaffection with the conduct of the war. I ask you to examine with me a number of his statements and judge for yourself, by asking two simple questions of each:

First. Is it constructive and positive?

Second. Does it help or hinder the war effort by inciting passion and arousing group resentment?

I want you to examine three instances. In his Philadelphia speech the candidate made an unprincipled and false charge, based on the remark of a Republican Army officer, that this administration planned to keep men in the Army after the cessation of hostilities as an alternative to relief. The second is the gratuitous insertion of the Republican candidate into high military policy by his Valentine, Nebr., remarks urging General MacArthur for the command of the Pacific theater of war. Third, and more subtle and perhaps more destructive, has been the candidate's deliberate striking at the heart of the war effort on the home front into which he has traveled through championing the wildly inflationary demands of every disaffected group in every area through which he has traveled.

Let us look at these instances and consider their consequences—something which the Presidential aspirant deliberately ignored. The Philadelphia speech was presumably a delineation of the candidate's domestic program. It said nothing for he had no program to offer. It embraced the program already achieved by the Democratic Party, of course. It could do nothing less. Having nothing to say, having no positive program to offer the country, the Republican candidate then pulled out the one arrow in his quiver, the charge that the Roosevelt administration plans to delay the demobilization of the armed forces because it fears a depression.

What was this based on? On a remark made by the Director of Selective Service, a Regular Army officer who is a Republican and whose job is not primarily concerned with making policy for demobilization.

I will pass over the fact that the day before his speech the Army had issued its plan for demobilization, based on the most democratic of all procedures, the desires of the men in the Army themselves. The Republican candidate had as evidence before him the official Army plan and the remark of an official, not previously identified with the Roosevelt administration and a Republican to boot.

Why did he choose the random remark of General Hershey as the sole evidence on which to base his charge? The answer is obvious. It was a calculated appeal to the fears and hopes of the mothers and fathers, the sisters and brothers and wives of servicemen, and to the servicemen themselves. The charge of delaying demobilization, which was the dominant note in the press throughout the Nation the following day, sought to convey the impression that the Republican candidate would deliver the servicemen home sooner, the further sinister implication that for political reasons the Democratic administration would delay their demobilization.

This is irresponsible political adventurism of the worst sort.

I suggest that you apply the tests which I have urged:

Was the speech constructive?

Of course not. No better evidence can be found than his sweeping conclusion in the same speech that when the W. P. B. "fell apart, so did your chance under this administration for jobs after the war." I need not answer this. Instead, I shall give you the answer of the Washington Post, an independent Republican paper.

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRIEST. I will be glad to yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. JENNINGS. Just when did the Washington Post become an independent Republican paper or any other kind of a Republican paper?

Mr. PRIEST. I am only listing it as I believe it is generally listed in the American Newspaper Association. I cannot answer the gentleman as to when.

Mr. JENNINGS. I am just going by what it says and not how it is listed.

Mr. PRIEST. The gentleman is applying the same test that I am applying in this speech to the candidate on the Republican ticket.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRIEST. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I assume the gentleman understands that the editor of the Washington Post is a distinguished, well-known Republican who had some connection with a former Republican administration.

Mr. PRIEST. That was my understanding.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRIEST. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. MICHENER. I am very much interested in the gentleman's address. It is the fourth or fifth that has been made by representatives of the New Deal Party on the floor of the House since the alleged Hershey utterance. It simply demonstrates that truism that it is the wounded bird that flutters. It is the wounded bird that flutters.

Mr. PRIEST. I thank the gentleman for his comment. Before my time has concluded, I wanted to get to this quotation from the Washington Post.

Mr. McCORMACK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRIEST. I yield to the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. McCORMACK. Of course, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER] who is one of the ablest Republicans in the House, is trying to squirm out. Of course, the ridiculousness of Governor Dewey's statement has justified the argument, has made it so convincing, that a dead bird cannot answer back.

Mr. PRIEST. I thank the majority leader. I now want to quote from the Washington Post.

The Post said:

> Again events offer a rebuttal of (his) suggestion. In the first place, the W. P. B. has weathered the change of leadership without more than minor change in directional personnel. Secondly, the new Acting Chairman, Mr. J. A. Krug, had just announced that, after the collapse of Germany, there will be a slash of 40 percent of our war production, involving the release of 4,000,000 workers. Jobs in private industry will automatically be available for displaced workers in direct relation to this assurance of intention, coupled, as it is in this case, with the assurance of relaxation of W. P. B. controls. As it happens, a smooth transition from war to peace employment depends in greatest measure upon action on Capitol Hill on pending demobilization bills.

I particularly commend this next passage in the Post editorial:

> A reminder of the need for haste and responsibility on the part of Congress would have been in order in the Philadelphia speech.

Did it arouse passion and resentment and hinder the war effort?

It would take an extremely insensitive person to fail to see the deliberate playing on strung nerves and deep sentiments that this appeal made.

I should like at this time to point out some of the more far-reaching implications of his charges and statements. The size of the Army and the date and manner of demobilization are military decisions. They depend on a complex of factors, many of them technical, but some of them so apparent that even irresponsible political adventurers can discern them. One of them is the size of this total war. The other is the necessity of maintaining a military force to assure the peace. Does this implied promise—never was it clearly stated by the Republican candidate—of early demobilization under a Republican regime mean that the Republican candidate is not interested in maintaining the peace?

I have called these charges irresponsible political adventurism. I do it advisedly and with some restraint. I do it because I am deeply concerned that a candidate for the highest office the country can bestow should in the midst of war make charges that are calculated to disaffect not only civilians behind the lines but the soldiers in the lines themselves. It is an attack on the war effort. I do not feel that such charges and such an attack are to be waved aside as youthful exuberance or the rodomontade of the hustings.

Nor am I alone in feeling that this is a fundamental attack on our war effort. The Washington Post, an independent Republican paper which has espoused the cause of the Republican candidate, in an editorial published last Saturday, September 9, 1944, stated:

> The burden of the initial attack on Mr. Roosevelt was far from well advised. He chose to make an issue out of a demobilization plan which, in our opinion, is splendidly conceived in the national as well as the servicemen's welfare. * * * Not content with making a wise and bold transition scheme an issue, (he) proceeded to trace the dirty trail of New Deal politics in it. The charge on its face is unfounded. It is given on the authority of the Director of Selective Service, who has never been renowned for apt phraseology, but who happens to be a Republican.

And I particularly want you to mark the next words. The Post expects the Republican candidate will doubtless change his tack when he reads the demobilization plan and hears from his friends of General Hershey's Republican affiliations. It then goes on to say—and I deliberately emphasize these words:

> But the change is required not only for reasons of political strategy. This war is not yet over, and it is damaging to the morale of the fighting soldiers to allege that this Government is playing politics with their demobilization. Already the feeling is to be encountered among the troops that demobilization may be politically delayed.

These are the words of a Republican newspaper, not mine. I should like to repeat them, however, for the benefit of those who, like children, will play with any instrument that comes to hand, regardless of the consequences to those about him:

> This war is not yet over, and it is damaging to the morale of the fighting soldiers to allege that this Government is playing politics with their demobilization.

Mr. Speaker, let us now consider the comments of the Republican candidate at Valentine, Nebr. On Wednesday, September 13, the Republican candidate gratuitously inserted himself into two purely military problems. One was the choice of an over-all commander for the entire Pacific war for which he nominated General MacArthur. The other was criticism of the administration and its war effort for not giving General MacArthur enough supplies.

Such statements are irresponsible if made by anyone. That they should be made by one who devoted such praise in his acceptance speech to the military leadership of General Marshall and Admiral King, and who so pointedly spoke about keeping the military conduct of the war free from civilian interference, makes them vicious duplicity.

The Republican candidate knows nothing of the military situation in the Pacific that would enable him to pass judgment on the choice of commander in chief.

The Republican candidate knows nothing of the military conduct of the war.

The Republican candidate knows nothing of the supplies given to General MacArthur.

The Republican candidate has not had the benefit of consultation with either General Marshall or Admiral King, whom he professes to admire, or their staffs.

For what purpose are these suggestions then, that General MacArthur be given the post of commander in the Pacific area, made by the Republican candidate? In suggesting General MacArthur the Republican Presidential candidate was not interested in furthering the progress of the war. Is it not obvious that the chief motivation for such a suggestion is wild criticism of the administration that will further inflame that section of the isolationists among his supporters who have been carefully nursing a grievance about the so-called mistreatment of the renowned general?

For whom is the Republican candidate speaking when he makes such suggestions? For the isolationists and bitter-enders who still fight our active participation in the war, or those Republicans who as good Americans want to prosecute this war to a quick victory? And what is the purport of his comments? Were they intended—as some say—to capitalize on the publicity of the Quebec meeting?

Again I suggest, look at his comment in the light of the two fundamental questions I have raised.

Is it constructive?

Does it hinder the war effort by arousing resentments?

These questions were both answered completely and decisively by Maj. George Fielding Eliot, writing on Saturday in that distinguished Republican newspaper, the New York Herald Tribune. I quote from Major Eliot's remarks concerning what he calls the Republican candidate's gratuitous interference in the matter of the high command in the Pacific:

> It may yet fall to the lot of (the Republican candidate) to bear the responsibility for choosing a commander in chief in the Pacific, or suggesting an American candidate for that office to the governments of the other allied powers; but until that time comes, and he is in possession of all the facts and all the professional advice necessary to guide him, it is a disservice to his country's cause for him to make widely publicized suggestions which can only add to the difficulties of those who, in the present critical days, are in fact charged with that responsibility.

Finally, I should like to call your attention to the more subtle manifestation of the Republican candidate's attacks on the war effort. He has been making use of an interesting technique. Throughout his journey in the West, the Republican candidate has been conferring with, and encouraging many groups and individuals who are disaffected by the rigors of the war. Then, the Republican candidate has freely voiced criticism

of the war effort, particularly on the home front, using the cloak of speaking in the name of those groups and individuals with whom he has conferred.

Thus, we have had the spectacle of the Republican candidate criticizing the war effort, but always in the name of the demands of cattle growers, of beet-sugar producers, and of all manner of others. He becomes, in the words of one reporter who has accompanied him, "the spokesman for their grievances."

It is an interesting device and known elsewhere. It is a technique calculated to do two things. It frees the Republican candidate from making any constructive proposals with respect to the subject of the grievances. And it enables the Republican candidate to make all manner of wild and dangerous claims and grievances without taking any personal or political responsibility for asserting these claims and grievances.

But this is of the very essence of political irresponsibility. For what is the effect of this technique?

Let me describe it to you in the words of an experienced political reporter who has seen him at first hand. It is the comment of Thomas L. Stokes, veteran political writer for the Scripps-Howard papers, which are not noted for their unfriendliness to the Republican candidate. Mr. Stokes said in a recent column:

> He raised issues, but did not offer solutions. * * * But at the same time, he spread criticism of the New Deal, the restlessness under war restrictions, far and wide for its effect among the voters * * * just as effectively perhaps as if he had said all these harsh things on his own.

And this is the very heart of the matter. For the Republican candidate is preying upon the natural restlessness of all groups under war restrictions—mind you, not under New Deal restrictions, but under war restrictions, under controls which are imposed by the grim necessity of war. For the burden of these criticisms that are spread so sedulously and cultivated so carefully by the Republican candidate is that war controls must be brushed aside. Now—at the height of the war. I need not tell this body that if these war controls are thrust aside, it would result in a violent irruption of inflation that would seriously endanger the war effort.

Are these criticisms constructive? Obviously not. In the same breath that the Republican candidate finds no point in rationing beef because of the alleged 10,000,000 surplus of beef cattle roaming the ranges, he hedges by disclaiming a desire to do away with beef rationing. If you can find any meaning in this double talk, you are gifted with powers of clairvoyance which are beyond me.

Do the criticisms hinder the war effort by inflaming group resentment? There can be no question that they do, on the testimony of the most competent political writers who accompany the Republican candidate in his trek across the country.

There is something disquieting in the spectacle of a candidate so overcome with ambition for high office that he would pull down the very structure of the Nation's morale, which is the heart of the war effort. And there is something dangerous for the future of the country, both in war and peace, in a candidate displaying such reckless disregard of the economic and political consequences of his statements, and at the same time such a calculated partisan adventurousness.

Perhaps there is a narrow political justification in the Republican candidate's lack of a constructive program, for the politician remains ever he who is all things to all men. And perhaps, too, the Republican candidate had adequate precedent for this lack of constructive vision in the Republican Party's platform which, as a number of commentators—none unfriendly—said at the time, was an elaborate catch-all, contrived so that suitable texts can be selected to support diametrically opposed views.

But it was to be expected that the Republican candidate would do more than lie on this amorphous platform. For his was the challenge presented to few men at such a point in history—a challenge to clarify the vision of the Nation, a challenge to strengthen the basic understanding of the American people concerning the role of America in war and peace.

But the Republican candidate has failed to accept this challenge, and has failed thereby to perform his duty to the American people. Instead he has deepened the confusion, sown more serious doubts in the minds of people, beclouded the vision of the Nation.

Mr. Walter Lippmann said of the Republican platform on July 1 that—

> Quite apart from its intentional ambiguity on foreign policy, [it] is as regards domestic affairs as reckless and as mischievous as irresponsible politicians dared to make it. It is a blueprint for post-war inflation. It is an invitation to all the pressure groups, a permit to all weak-minded and chicken-hearted candidates for office, to plunge the country into the chaos of an uncontrolled and uncontrollable inflation of prices and wages.

Mr. Lippmann, in this same article, found this to be the dominant view, the real views of the Republicans. He hoped that the Republican candidate would find a way to turn the party in another direction. Instead, the Republican candidate, by his actions and speeches, tries with cold and desperate statements to drive the Nation further along the path to chaos laid down by the platform makers.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee has expired.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes this afternoon following the other special orders.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, I have five unanimous consent requests to submit at this time: First, to extend my remarks by inserting in the RECORD the four campaign speeches made to date by Governor Dewey.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I understand the speeches of Governor Dewey have already been placed in the RECORD, so there is no use duplicating them.

Mr. McCORMACK. I may say that if that is so it will be taken care of.

Mr. JENNINGS. I understood they had not been. If they have been that is something else.

Mr. McCORMACK. It will be taken care of.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague from Pennsylvania [Mr. HOCH] may be permitted to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES] is recognized for 10 minutes.

AMERICAN PRISONERS OF WAR ARE ENTITLED TO RECOGNITION FOR PROMOTIONS

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I want to direct the attention of the membership of the House to a policy that I regard as being an unfair discrimination to members of our armed forces who are prisoners of war. I am advised, according to Army regulations, an officer or enlisted man who becomes a prisoner of the enemy through no fault of his own is not entitled to be given consideration for promotion during the period he is a prisoner of war.

Mr. Speaker, I believe this regulation is an extremely harsh one. I do not think it is fair because a man has taken the risks and hazards, and has suffered the consequences of becoming a prisoner of enemy forces, such experience ought to be used as a deterrent in preventing him from a chance for promotion that he might have had if he had not been captured.

Mr. Speaker, it seems to me we could make no mistake in giving recognition to these men by allowing them the promotions that might have been theirs if they had not been prisoners of war. Under the present policy it appears that being a prisoner of war works against a promotion rather than even giving the man an even chance. I understand, of course, these men may or may not have had promotions if they were not prisoners of war, but on the other hand, I think it is manifestly unfair that such men as the heroes of Guam, Wake Island, Corregidor, Bataan, and other places where our men have been taken prisoners by the enemy, that these men should not at least have this little recognition for the bravery and the sacrifices they made for our country.

Mr. Speaker, I realize the question of promotions ought to be left with those in

charge of the armed forces, and, generally speaking, such promotions ought to be earned on account of ability and faithfulness to duty. Certainly these thousands of heroes who are now in the prison camps of the enemy were faithful to duty to the very last. I have no criticism of the hundreds of promotions in the Pentagon and in other places that take place every day, but while such consideration is being given why not permit a little recognition to men who are not in position to speak for themselves.

Mr. Speaker, legislation is now pending before the House on this subject. Senate bill 1374, dealing with this problem, passed the other body by unanimous vote a few days ago. I am informed the principal criticism of the Secretary of War to such legislation is "there might be no way to distinguish between those men who by virtue of having fought to the last might be deserving of a reward in the form of promotion and those who surrendered in circumstances under which they might reasonably have been expected to continue to resist."

Mr. Speaker, I do not believe there are many boys in our armed forces who would not continue to resist to the last ditch, thinking there might be a chance for promotion if they become prisoners of the Germans or Japanese. The granting of this recognition to those boys in the prison camps of the enemy would build their morale and offer encouragement more than we can realize.

Mr. Speaker, I trust the House will give this legislation the meritorious consideration to which it is entitled. I hope it may be passed without too much further delay. While we are granting promotions to soldiers in the Pentagon and in other places in this country, why not give favorable consideration to the approval of promotions to soldiers in Bataan, Wake Island, Corregidor, and other enemy bastilles.

SPECIAL ORDER

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, the people at home sent us to Congress to make, insofar as our abilities may permit, statesmanlike utterances. I regret to see the House of Representatives used as a sounding board for politics; I dislike to see the debate in the House degenerate to the point of taking "cracks" at personalities who are running for high office in this land of ours. I regret that the Governor of New York, the Republican nominee for President, has to be subjected to some of the uncalled-for criticisms that he has suffered on the House floor and elsewhere because of the fact that he has dared to go out and criticize those who have to do with the administration of the Nation's affairs today. Mr. Speaker, all one has to do is to review the record which the Governor of New York has made in his own State. As a young man, as the district attorney of New York County, he went into New York City and cleaned out a veritable nest of the most vicious rats and racketeers that this country had ever known. He reduced the crime situation in New York City from one of the worst that the country had ever known to its present bettered status. So, Mr. Speaker, I regret that when he has dared, like David of old, to raise his voice against some of the Goliaths in the Government today, he has to suffer the backfire, and unfortunate criticisms that have been leveled at him recently.

Mr. JENNINGS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. JENNINGS. Is that not one of the prices that any man pays for rendering a public service?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. It is.

Mr. JENNINGS. It does not hurt. It is like shooting an elephant with a peablower.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I agree with the gentleman. It will make the candidate on the Republican ticket for President all the stronger; nevertheless, there are those who will rise up in indignation and come to his defense. I confess, that as far as I am concerned, he does not need any defense which I may be able to give to him because he is perfectly able, as has been demonstrated in his campaign speeches, to take care of himself. He has been chosen by a higher power above to point out the transgressions and the mistakes which are rife in our Government today. I feel doubly sure that after he has been elected President of the United States in the November election he will come forth and clear the way, just as he has in New York as the chief executive of that State, in the Capital of the United States and do away with all the deadwood and all the unnecessary ruffles that have been added by the present administration.

Mr. Speaker, I am not resorting to political references. I repeat that I do not think we should use the well of this House as a political sounding board, but that statesmanship, insofar as we are able to execute it, should take preference and priority. I simply want to point out the situation as I see it, and I know that the Governor of New York will make an excellent President.

PRICE CONTROL

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 3 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Speaker, I hesitate to take away from the entertaining political discussions to call attention to what I think is a real and threatening danger to our war program as we near the collapse of Germany and the victory on the European front.

Unless all signs that I can read in Washington newspapers and other publicity are mistaken, we face very shortly the most determined drive yet made to break through price control. We have faced, as you Members of the House know, many, many frontal attacks by powerful groups in this country with various degrees of economic interest. Today, luckily, through strong administration and through courage on the part of the Congress in meeting these problems, we have written a record of inflation control that the Congress can well be proud of. But we are not yet through with the war.

I say to you that if the Little Steel formula is broken in the near future we will see the dynamiting of the price-control dam.

I think it is fundamental that you cannot control prices of commodities, the prices that go into the cost of living, unless you also control the cost of the labor that produces them. To take off the ceilings that we now have on wages that go into the cost of production of commodities, and in the cost of living, we will find that we have dynamited away half of the dam that holds back the devastation of the flood of inflation.

I hope the Members of the Congress will inform themselves more of this danger and realize that only by "holding the line" until we have passed beyond the war emergency can we hope to avoid the curse and devastation of wartime inflation that has marked every war in the history of this Nation.

If we have the nerve to hold that line a few more months, until economic conditions can come somewhere near a balance of demand and supply, then we will get through this war without adding untold billions of dollars of cost to Federal expenditures and without the danger and damage that occurs during a war in wiping out the securities and savings of the millions of little people of this Nation.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a joint resolution of the House of the following title:

H. J. Res. 268. Joint resolution to provide for the reappointment of Harvey N. Davis and Arthur H. Compton as members of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with an amendment in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 4931. An act for the relief of the city of Beardstown, Ill.

URGING SUPPLEMENTAL MILK SUBSIDIES FOR THE DROUGHT-STRICKEN DAIRYMEN OF DELAWARE COUNTY, N. Y.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes on a nonpartisan issue.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I am a man of my word, and I shall proceed, therefore, to make a nonpartisan address irrespective of the partisan political speeches that have been made here this afternoon.

Mr. Speaker, I have the honor and distinction to represent a great dairy district, one of the largest dairy districts in the United States of America, if not in the world, which includes Delaware County, the largest single milk-produc-

ing county in the East and second only to Los Angeles County in the United States. That county, surrounded by the counties of Sullivan, Orange, Ulster, and Chenango, apparently is being discriminated against. These counties that surround it, which I have just mentioned, have been given a 10-cent supplemental milk subsidy payment, amounting altogether to 80 cents a hundred, because they are in a drought area, but Delaware County, the greatest of them all in the production of fluid milk, has not yet been included in that drought area.

I see no reason for this discrimination whatsoever. The dairymen there have done a great job during the war in spite of a shortage of labor and agricultural equipment to produce more milk and not less. They have helped to feed the American people, our own armies, and even the armies of our allies, while their sons have been fighting in our own armed forces.

American farmers have done a wonderful job throughout the Nation in producing more and more farm products during the war. They have done an almost incredible and almost miraculous job of producing more farm products than ever before, in spite of all their wartime handicaps and restrictions, and I hope that the program of abundance will continue and that we will not go back to a program of scarcity, plowing under of crops, and slaughter and birth control of pigs.

Mr. Speaker, I happen to be the ranking Republican member of the Subcommittee on Agriculture of the Post-war Economic Policy and Planning Committee. It is our function to try to solve that tremendous problem of conversion from wartime to peacetime production for agriculture. We have only just begun to study that vital and far-reaching issue and to try and help solve the farm problem so that after this war we shall not be confronted with the same disastrous conditions we faced after the last war, when scores of thousands of farmers were forced off their farms and had them sold under their own eyes.

Mr. Speaker, all the farmers are asking for is equality, parity in prices between themselves and industry and labor, which they have not been receiving. That is why it is necessary to give them these milk subsidies and the supplemental subsidies in the drought areas, so that they can continue to produce milk at a reasonable profit and not at a loss.

As a general proposition, we Republicans are not in favor of subsidies. We believe the farmers should receive fair, adequate, and just prices, prices that compare with those of labor and industry. Until that time comes, of course, we must continue milk subsidies, particularly as part of the war effort and the higher costs of production. But as long as the Federal Government is granting milk subsidies and as long as these adjoining counties are receiving those subsidies and in addition a supplemental subsidy of 10 cents a hundred in drought areas, I do not understand this discrimination against the dairymen of Delaware County, the greatest milk-producing county in the United States with the exception of Los Angeles. I hope the Government officials will see the light in the next few days and change their program and include Delaware County in the drought area. Their fields have been singed and burned, their hay crops jeopardized and milk production curtailed.

The farmers and dairymen of Delaware County will continue, as they have in the past, to produce milk for the war emergency, but I think they should be rewarded for their successful contribution toward winning the war and not be discriminated against.

The purpose for which I rose today was to make this complaint and ask for immediate relief.

I have urged Mr. D. A. Fitzgerald, Deputy Director of Production of the War Food Administration, to review the drought conditions in Delaware County and to include it with Ulster, Sullivan, Orange, and Chenango Counties in the drought area for a 10-cent supplemental payment as of September 1, making the total 80 cents instead of 70 cents a hundred pounds.

The time is short and the need is immediate. I hope the War Food Administration will give them the supplementary increase of 10 cents within the next few days as a simple matter of justice. If the Office of War Food Administration fails to act or to provide this needed relief I shall take the matter up again and ask for further study of the conditions in Delaware by Direetor Marvin Jones of the War Food Administration until supplemental relief has been afforded to the drought-stricken dairymen of Delaware County.

I received yesterday the following telegram from Assemblyman Elmer J. Kellam of Delaware County: "Delaware County farmers dissatisfied that they are cut 10 cents per hundred on milk subsidy. Can you help them?" I replied immediately by telegram as follows: "Have been trying to have Delaware included in the drought area to secure 10 cents a hundred supplementary payment for the dairymen. Hope to have some favorable news within the next 24 hours. Will keep you informed. Please notify farm leaders and organizations."

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. JENNINGS. The remarks of the distinguished gentleman from New York with reference to the condition existing in his district in the dairy industry is of great interest to me and to the people whom I have the honor to represent. The State of Tennessee has this year suffered the greatest drought in the history of the State. The production of hay and corn and other dairy feeds has fallen far below normal. Pastures were burned brown during a period this summer, when we ordinarily have an abundance of pasture which will sustain dairy herds and relieve the owners of such herds from undertaking to supply feed and hay during the pasture season. In addition to that, the hay crop, which is ordinarily, especially in my section of the State, adequate for those in the dairy industry, is this year almost a total failure. On top of that, those who have heretofore been able to fill their silos with ensilage crops have not been able to, and will not be able to, fill their silos. Within the last 2 years the dairy industry in my State has had a phenomenal growth. It has increased many hundreds percent. We have some of the finest herds in the land in my home county of Knox. Yet, as a result of this drought and of the shortage of feed and the fact that dairymen can no longer produce milk at a profit, and if they produce it at all, it is at a heavy loss, some of the finest herds in my county have been sold at public auction.

Men have taken their milk cows to the packing houses, as a result of their inability to feed them. An application is now pending before the Office of Price Administration, on the part of the dairy industry in Tennessee—when I say that, I mean the industry throughout the entire State—for such an increase in price to the producers of milk as will enable them to stay in business. Unless the relief asked for by these dairymen is accorded them, and at once, the dairy industry in my State will suffer irreparable injury. The men and women who have put their life's energy and toil and savings into dairy equipment and in dairy herds, will be ruined. I know of one instance where a man in my county, who, prior to the time this drought hit him, had a herd of cattle, not all dairy cattle, but for the most part dairy cattle, some of them were beef cattle, which he valued and could have sold readily at a price of $10,000, who today would be glad to dispose of his cattle for $2,500. Seven thousand five hundred dollars is more than the average farmer can afford to lose. Now, this situation can be met without a loss to anyone. There is being shipped into my district now from Wisconsin, milk to furnish the war workers, some 40,000 of them, who are employed on one project within 30 miles of my home town. It will be a calamity if the dairy industry in my State is destroyed by reason of this drought and by reason of a set of circumstances for which these people are in nowise to blame and over which they have no control. The Office of Price Administration should take immediate and effective action to relieve the people in the drought area, which embraces not only Tennessee, but also Kentucky and Alabama. Such action will conserve both the dairy industry and the health of the people in these States. A further delay will mean disaster such as has not been suffered by any people of this country since the Federal Government has undertaken to control the prices of farm products.

Not only will a great industry be destroyed but the health of the people will be seriously impaired.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentlemen from Tennessee has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix and include two editorials from today's Washington News.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

Mr. KLEIN, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 5125. An act to aid the reconversion from a war to a peace economy through the distribution of Government surplus property and to establish a Surplus Property Board to effectuate the same, and for other purposes;

H. R. 2707. An act for the relief of Henry White; and

H. J. Res. 268. Joint resolution to provide for the reappointment of Harvey N. Davis and Arthur H. Compton as members of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. KLEIN, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee did on September 19, 1944, present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 312. An act for the relief of Freda Utley;

H. R. 527. An act for the relief of Mary Hertz;

H. R. 1434. An act for the relief of Anna M. Kohler;

H. R. 1623. An act to amend an act entitled "An act to provide fees to be charged by clerks of the district courts of the United States," approved February 11, 1925 (43 Stat. 857), as amended (28 U. S. C., secs. 548–555);

H. R. 1680. An act to amend the Nationality Act of 1940 to permit the Commissioner to furnish copies of any part of the records or information therefrom to agencies or officials of a State without charge;

H. R. 1708. An act for the relief of Perley M. Silver;

H. R. 2134. An act for the relief of Paul Szeliga;

H. R. 2387. An act for the relief of John Salfi;

H. R. 2390. An act for the relief of Joseph Scarpella and Dorothy Scarpella;

H. R. 2509. An act for the relief of Marie Engert;

H. R. 2697. An act to provide for the disposal of materials or resources on the public lands of the United States which are under the exclusive jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Interior;

H. R. 2792. An act for the relief of Arvo Kari, Lempi K. Holm, and Burt Johnston;

H. R. 3033. An act for the relief of Tressie Spring and Mrs. Hazel Stutte;

H. R. 3038. An act for the relief of Mrs. Grace Page;

H. R. 3296. An act for the relief of R. Guy Dorsey;

H. R. 3384. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to accept property for the Moores Creek National Military Park, and for other purposes;

H. R. 3464. An act for the relief of Ralph W. Cooley;

H. R. 3496. An act for the relief of Ernest A. Grottke;

H. R. 3722. An act to amend section 342 of the Nationality Act of 1940 in respect to fees for the issuance of certificates of arrival;

H. R. 4257. An act to expatriate or exclude certain persons for evading military and naval service;

H. R. 4271. An act to amend the Nationality Act of 1940 to preserve the nationality of citizens residing abroad; and

H. R. 5025. An act to allow credit in connection with certain homestead entries for military or naval service rendered during World War No. 2.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 52 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, September 21, 1944, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1851. A letter from the President, United States Civil Service Commission, transmitting one set of the Commission's requests for personnel for the second quarter of the fiscal year 1945; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

1852. A letter from the administrative assistant to the Secretary, Department of Commerce, transmitting a revised estimate form of the ceiling unit working funds, Weather Bureau, for the quarter ending December 31, 1944, which is to be substituted for the estimate form submitted with the letter of September 9, 1944; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. McGEHEE: Committee on Claims. S. 2069. An act for the relief of Irma S. Sheridan, postmaster at Rockville, Oreg.; without amendment (Rept. No. 1905). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BULWINKLE:

H. R. 5407. A bill to authorize the appropriation of funds for the development and improvement of devices for the propulsion of aircraft, for national defense, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MAY:

H. R. 5408. A bill to amend the Mustering-Out Payment Act of 1944, to provide a method for accomplishing certain mustering-out payments on behalf of mentally disabled veterans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CHENOWETH:

H. R. 5409. A bill for the exchange of lands adjacent to the Pike National Forest in Colorado; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. RANKIN:

H. R. 5410. A bill to provide for the improvement and development of navigation, irrigation, generation, and distribution of power, and control of floods on the Missouri River and its tributaries, for the promotion of the national defense, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. BUFFETT:

H. R. 5411. A bill to create and expand post-war employment and opportunity by encouraging the establishment of small businesses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DISNEY:

H. R. 5412. A bill relating to the effect of discovery and percentage depletion on the computation of the net operating loss carry-over and carry-back under certain provisions of the Internal Revenue Code; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KING:

H. R. 5413. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code, as amended, and the Federal Alcohol Administration Act, as amended; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 5414. A bill to authorize the construction of a marine hospital in Los Angeles, Calif.; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. FISH:

H. R. 5415. A bill to establish a game farm in Orange County, N. Y.; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H. R. 5416. A bill to establish rearing ponds and a fish hatchery; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H. R. 5417. A bill to establish rearing ponds and a fish hatchery; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H. R. 5418. A bill providing for the release of married enlisted men from active service in the United States Army who have attained the thirty-fifth anniversary of their birth; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. STIGLER:

H. R. 5419 (by request). A bill relating to the status of Keetoowah Indians of the Cherokee Nation in Oklahoma, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN:

H. R. 5420. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Walter M. Johnson; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. DELANEY:

H. R. 5421. A bill for the relief of Jason Meth; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. GOODWIN:

H. R. 5422. A bill for the relief of Harry Cohen; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. McCORMACK:

H. R. 5423. A bill for the relief of James R. Lally; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. RANDOLPH:

H. R. 5424. A bill for the relief of Allen P. Pitsenbarger; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerks' desk and referred as follows:

6166. By Mr. BUCKLEY. Petition of Louis C. Sbordy and 745 other citizens protesting against prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

6167. By Mr. KLEIN: Petition of H. L. Taylor and sundry other New York citizens, protesting against any prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE

THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 21, 1944

(Legislative day of Friday, September 1, 1944)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our fathers' God and ours, Thou art our strong arm every morning and our salvation in time of trouble. Even as we

tread the winepress of anxiety and grief yet we thank Thee that the costly valor of our warrior sons is not in vain as, fronting ferocious foes, they bear in their hands the weapons of freedom which by Thy help we have forged and carry in their hearts the impelling vision of a great cause whose power and glory are Thine. As across crimson fields of battle our eyes see ahead the sunlit hills of victory and peace we would gratefully raise the paean of Thy people of old:

"The wicked have drawn out the sword and have bent the bow to cast down the poor and needy and to slay such as be of upright conversation, but their sword hath entered into their own heart and their bows shall be broken. Yet not by our own sword, neither by our own arm, were we saved, but by Thy right hand and Thy arm and the light of Thy countenance."

In humble hope we lift our yearning, burning desire for those dearer to us than our own lives who, at the Nation's call, are fighting on strange shores for what is just and kind and true, as above their heads waves the white plume of freemen. For those who in this fiery reign of terror must knock at the door of Death, O Lord, let it not be dark for them; let them not feel alone, as Thy rod and Thy staff they comfort them. Whether unscathed by the arrows of war or torn by wounds, our sons return to our waiting hearts and homes, or freed from the flesh in the larger life, wherever victory finds them in the vastness of Thy fatherhood, may they be glad that they served with clean hands in a just and merciful cause whose triumph will be the victory for all mankind.

"So shall Thy people, with thankful devotion,
Praise Thee who saved them from peril and sword,
Singing in chorus from ocean to ocean
Peace to the nations and praise to the Lord."

In the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Wednesday, September 20, 1944, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

REDUCTION OF NONESSENTIAL FEDERAL EXPENDITURES—REPORTS ON UNEXPENDED BALANCES AND REORGANIZATION (S. DOC. NOS. 241 AND 242)

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a letter from Mr. BYRD, chairman of the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures, transmitting, pursuant to law, reports on unexpended balances and reorganization, which, with the accompanying reports, was referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reports of the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures relating to unexpended balances and reorganization, just laid before the Senate, be printed as Senate documents.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the reports referred to by the Senator from Virginia will be printed as Senate documents.

THE HEMP INDUSTRY IN CENTRAL ILLINOIS—PETITION

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, I ask consent to present for appropriate reference a petition numerously signed by citizens of Illinois relating to hearings by the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry as to the hemp industry in central Illinois.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the petition will be received and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. THOMAS of Utah, from the Committee on Education and Labor:

S. 637. A bill to authorize the appropriation of funds to assist the States and Territories in more adequately financing their systems of public education during emergency, and in reducing the inequalities of educational opportunities through public elementary and secondary schools; with amendments (Rept. No. 323).

By Mr. STEWART, from the Committee on Claims:

S. 1002. A bill conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the District of Rhode Island to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Roy W. Olsen; with amendments (Rept. No. 1142); and

S. 1462. A bill for the relief of Solomon and Marie Theriault; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1144).

By Mr. KILGORE, from the Committee on Claims:

S. 1274. A bill for the relief of Vodie Jackson; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1146).

By Mr. TUNNELL, from the Committee on Claims:

S. 1997. A bill for the relief of Jack Stowers, B and O Store, and Cotton County Poultry & Egg Co.; without amendment (Rept. No. 1143).

By Mr. WHERRY, from the Committee on Claims:

S. 1905. A bill for the relief of Captolia Colvin; with amendments (Rept. No. 1145); and

S. 2042. A bill for the relief of the legal guardian of Nancy Frassrand, a minor; with amendments (Rept. No. 1147).

PART-TIME EMPLOYEES OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. PEPPER (for Mr. THOMAS of Utah), from the Committee on Education and Labor, in response to Senate Resolution 319, relative to persons employed who are not full-time employees of the Senate or any committee thereof, agreed to August 23, 1944, submitted a report relating to employees of the Subcommittee on Wartime Health and Education of the Committee on Education and Labor, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR—SUBCOMMITTEE ON WARTIME HEALTH AND EDUCATION, SEPTEMBER 1, 1944

To the Senate:

The above-mentioned committee hereby submits the following report showing the names of persons employed by the above subcommittee who are not full-time employees of the Senate or of the committee, in compliance with the terms of Senate Resolution No. 319, agreed to August 23, 1944:

Name of individual	Address	Name and address of department or organization by whom paid	Annual rate of compensation
Lauretta April	2714 Quarry Rd. NW	War Production Board, 3d St. and Independence Ave. SW	$3,200
Philip C. Curtis	4303 Russell Ave., Mount Rainier, Md	Navy Department, 18th St. and Constitution Ave. NW	3,800
Doris B. Hazur	5018 25th St. North, Arlington, Va	Office of Price Administration, 2d and D Sts. SW	2,600
Jeannette Johnson	3017 G St. SE	Veterans' Administration, Vermont Ave. and I St. NW	2,000
Carl Malmberg	1813 F St. NW	Federal Security Agency, 1825 H St. NW	5,600
Eva Jo Marra	1803 Newton St. NW	Navy Department, 18th St. and Constitution Ave. NW	1,800
Love Morgan	1607 18th St. SE	Veterans' Administration, Vermont Ave. and I St. NW	2,000
Ruth Morgenstein	3022 Rodman St. NW	do	2,600
Dolores Raschella	3028 Wisconsin Ave. NW	Federal Housing Administration, 1001 Vermont Ave. NW	2,000
Renee Roth	1614 North Queen St., Arlington, Va	Federal Works Agency, 18th & C Sts. NW	2,600
Lt. Leslie Falk, Medical Corps, Army of the United States.	2804 Terrace Rd. SE	U. S. Army Pentagon Bldg	2,000
Lt. Comdr. John B. Truslow, Medical Corps, U. S. Naval Reserve.	2007 Peabody St., West Hyattsville, Md	U. S. Navy, 18th St. and Constitution Ave. NW	8,000

CLAUDE PEPPER (for Mr. THOMAS of Utah), *Chairman.*

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. BARKLEY (for Mr. LUCAS):

S. 2163. A bill granting a pension to George Gillibrand; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WHEELER:

S. 2167. A bill for the relief of Lieutenant H. R. Timmel; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. REYNOLDS:

S. 2168. A bill for the relief of certain disbursing officers of the Army of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CONNALLY:

S. 2169. A bill to provide for promotion of American prisoners of war; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HAYDEN:

S. 2170. A bill for the relief of Henry M. Ruiz; and

S. 2171. A bill for the relief of Maria Manriquez Ruiz; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. GURNEY:

S. 2172. A bill to further amend the provisions of the acts authorizing payment of 6 months' death gratuity to widow, child, or dependent relative of persons in the armed forces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

(Mr. ANDREWS introduced Senate bill 2173, which was referred to the Committee on Finance, and appears under a separate heading.)

AMENDMENT OF THE INTERNAL REVENUE CODE

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to introduce a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code to extend the exemptions now permitted to those in the armed services to the amount of $1,500 for a period of 2 years beyond the close of the war.

The second section allows an abatement or refund of tax for members of the armed forces upon their death or total disability.

I realize that this bill pertains to revenue, but it is introduced at this time for printing and printing in the RECORD, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD so that it may be considered when a similar bill comes over from the House, where all bills raising revenue must originate, under the Constitution.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 2173) to amend the Internal Revenue Code so as to provide for certain exclusions from gross income for income-tax purposes in the case of persons who served in the armed forces during the present war, and for other purposes, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 22 (b) of the Internal Revenue Code, as amended (relating to exclusions from gross income), is amended by inserting at the end thereof a new paragraph as follows:

"(15) In the case of any person who served in the active military or naval service of the United States on or after December 7, 1941, and prior to the termination of hostilities in the present war, and who has been discharged or released therefrom under honorable conditions, an amount equal to $50 for each of the 24 calendar months next following the date of his discharge or release from active service, or the date of the enactment of this act, whichever date is later. The amount excluded from the gross income of any person for any month under this paragraph shall be excluded from the gross income of such person for the taxable year in which such month occurs."

SEC. 2. Supplement U of chapter I of the Internal Revenue Code, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"SUPPLEMENT U—ABATEMENT OR REFUND OF TAX FOR MEMBERS OF ARMED FORCES UPON DEATH OR DISABILITY

"SEC. 421. Abatement or refund of tax for members of armed forces upon death.

"In the case of any individual who dies while in active service as a member of the military or naval forces of the United States or of any of the other United Nations on or after December 7, 1941, and prior to the termination of the present war as proclaimed by the President—

"'(a) the tax imposed by this chapter shall not apply with respect to the taxable year in which falls the date of his death;

"'(b) the tax under this chapter and under the corresponding title of each prior revenue law for preceding taxable years (including interest, additions to the tax, and additional amounts) which is unpaid at the date of his death shall not be assessed, and if assessed the assessment shall be abated, and if collected shall be credited or refunded as an overpayment; and

"'(c) any tax paid by him under this chapter while in such service for any taxable year beginning after December 31, 1939 (including interest, additions to the tax, and additional amounts), shall be credited or refunded as an overpayment.'

"SEC. 422. Abatement or refund of tax for members of armed forces who become disabled.

"In the case of any individual who, while in active service as a member of the military or naval forces of the United States or of any of the other United Nations on or after December 7, 1941, and prior to the termination of the present war as proclaimed by the President, suffers a disability of a degree which is ratable as total and permanent under laws administered by the Veterans' Administration—

"'(a) the tax imposed by this chapter shall not apply with respect to the taxable year in which he suffers such disability or any subsequent taxable year which begins prior to his discharge from such forces;

"'(b) the tax under this chapter and under the corresponding title of each prior revenue law for preceding taxable years (including interest, additions to the tax, and additional amounts) which is unpaid at the date of such discharge shall not be assessed, and if assessed the assessment shall be abated, and if collected shall be credited or refunded as an overpayment; and

"'(c) any tax paid by him under this chapter while in such service for any taxable year beginning after December 31, 1939 (including interest, additions to the tax, and additional amounts), shall be credited or refunded as an overpayment.'"

RIVER AND HARBOR IMPROVEMENTS—AMENDMENTS RELATING TO THE ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY AND POWER PROJECT

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I send to the desk and ask to have printed two amendments which I intend to propose, one to House bill 3961, and the other to House bill 4485, both being river and harbor bills, on behalf of the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. SHIPSTEAD], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], and myself. These amendments have the effect of attaching the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence seaway proposal to the river and harbor bills now on the Senate calendar.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendments will be printed and lie on the table.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, in connection with the amendments I have just offered, I wish to read a letter which I have received this morning from Leo T. Crowley, of the Foreign Economic Administration. It is as follows:

Hon. GEORGE D. AIKEN,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR AIKEN: Thank you for your letter of August 31 and the enclosure. I want to take this opportunity to reaffirm my support of the St. Lawrence seaway and power project. Your bill, S. 1385, is identical in all respects to H. R. 4927 which I supported before the House Rivers and Harbors Committee in 1941. As Chairman of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, I stated then that there was no danger of any adverse effect from the construction of this project on the security obligations of railroads and public utilities. With regard to the transportation aspects, our analysis then showed that in the importation of raw materials and the export of agricultural and manufactured products the seaway would give substantial savings in transportation costs both to consumers and producers. The power supply provided by this project is needed in the northeastern section of the United States in an area that contains 20 percent of the population and nearly 25 percent of manufactures in the United States. This power is also among the cheapest new sources of power in continental United States and will, when developed, help bring great prosperity to New York and the New England States.

Coming as I do from Wisconsin, I understand and sympathize with the urge of the people of mid-continental United States to have direct access to the open seas by cheap water transportation. As we return to peacetime commerce we are going to need this facility more than ever before because greater international exchange of goods and services must be one of the foundations of peace. A basic factor in industrial progress and improvement in standards of living is reduced cost of production and transportation. The ability to provide goods at reasonable cost on a commercial basis in international trade is an important element in the maintenance of full employment in the United States and we must do everything within our power to promote such trade.

Let me say in conclusion that I know of no instance where lower transportation costs and lower power rates have hurt either those providing such services or those receiving them. It is a basic tenet of economics that lower costs stimulate consumption, trade, and employment.

I know of Mr. Danielian's comprehensive work on this project and I consider it both economical and proper that you should avail yourself of his knowledge.

I want you to know that I appreciate the bipartisan support this project is receiving, as it is truly a project for the national welfare.

I have been advised by the Bureau of the Budget that this matter has been considered by the President and he favors the authorization of the St. Lawrence project at this time as a post-war project.

Sincerely yours,

LEO T. CROWLEY,
Administrator.

FREEDOM OF INTERNATIONAL INTERCHANGE OF NEWS

Mr. CONNALLY. I ask unanimous consent to submit a concurrent resolution, and I desire also to ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the concurrent resolution will be received and read for the information of the Senate.

The Chief Clerk read the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 53), as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Congress of the United States expresses its belief in the world-wide right of interchange of news by news-gathering and distributing agencies, whether individual or associate, by any means, without discrimination as to sources, distribution, rates, or charges; and that this right should be protected by international compact.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] submitted a resolution on this subject and I, the Senator from Texas, submitted a resolu-

tion on the same text. The Committee on Foreign Relations considered the resolutions and delegated authority to the subcommittee to consider them or, if necessary, to report a new resolution. The concurrent resolution now before the Senate is in effect a substitute for both the Taft resolution and the Connally resolution. I ask unanimous consent for the consideration and adoption of the concurrent resolution.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the concurrent resolution?

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution was considered and agreed to.

CONDITIONAL ADJOURNMENT OF CONGRESS TO NOVEMBER 14, 1944

Mr. BARKLEY. I send to the desk a concurrent resolution and ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The concurrent resolution will be read.

The Chief Clerk read the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 54), as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That when the two Houses adjourn on Thursday, September 21, 1944, they shall stand adjourned until 12 o'clock meridian on Tuesday, November 14, 1944, or until 12 o'clock meridian on the third day after their respective Members are notified to reassemble in accordance with section 2 of this concurrent resolution, whichever event occurs first.

SEC. 2. The President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives shall notify the Members of the Senate and the House, respectively, to reassemble whenever in their opinion legislative expediency shall warrant it or whenever the majority leader of the Senate and the majority leader of the House, actingly jointly, or the acting minority leader of the Senate and the minority leader of the House, acting jointly, file a written request with the Secretary of the Senate and the Clerk of the House that the Congress reassemble for the consideration of legislation.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the concurrent resolution?

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution was considered and agreed to.

AUTHORIZATION FOR SIGNING OF ENROLLED BILLS

Mr. BARKLEY. I send to the desk another concurrent resolution and ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The concurrent resolution will be read.

The Chief Clerk read the resolution (S. Con. Res. 55), as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That notwithstanding the adjournment of the two Houses, as authorized by Senate Concurrent Resolution 54, the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives be, and they are hereby, authorized to sign enrolled bills and joint resolutions duly passed by the two Houses which have been examined by the Committee on Enrolled Bills of each House and found truly enrolled.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the concurrent resolution?

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution was considered and agreed to.

ACCEPTANCE OF PORTRAIT OF DANIEL WEBSTER

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, some weeks ago a very public-spirited gentleman named Lester Martin sent to the Senate a full-sized portrait of Daniel Webster as a gift to the Senate. This portrait is so large that there is only one place around the Senate end of the Capitol where it can be hung, namely, in the space at the left of the Chamber as we go down the steps. I wish to have a resolution agreed to accepting the portrait on the part of the Senate, which resolution I now submit and ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will read.

The Chief Clerk read the resolution (S. Res. 330), as follows:

Resolved, That the Architect of the Capitol is authorized and directed to accept the portrait of Hon. Daniel Webster, late Senator from the State of Massachusetts, as a gift to the Senate of the United States from Lester Martin, and to cause such portrait to be hung in a suitable place in the Senate wing of the National Capitol.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the resolution was considered and agreed to.

ANALYSIS RELATING TO TREATIES AND EXECUTIVE AGREEMENTS (S. DOC. NO. 244)

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, as chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations I ask unanimous consent for the printing of a brief as a Senate document. This is a brief treating with the difference between executive agreements and treaties, and in view of the many treaties which will probably come before the Senate, I think it would be useful to have this document in the hands of Senators.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

THE ELECTORAL COLLEGE (S. DOC. NO. 243)

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, as chairman of the Special Committee to Investigate the Can paign Expenditures of all candidates for President, Vice President, and United States Senator in 1944, I wish to ask that a pamphlet on the Electoral College, compiled by the Secretary of the Senate, Edwin A. Halsey, together with data furnished by the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress on the nomination and election of Presidential electors, be printed as a Senate document. We have already had many inquiries for information of this sort and I think such a document would be very useful in connection with the present campaign. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent for the printing of the pamphlet as a Senate document.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the pamphlet will be printed as a document.

MISUSE OF TIRE RATION CERTIFICATES

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, there has come to my attention a release issued by the Office of Price Administration on August 26 which describes charges against one of the larger tire manufacturing concerns of the country. These charges involve the alleged misuse of tire ration certificates. I express no opinion as to whether or not the company is guilty of these charges. However, without going into the technicalities of the matter, the charges, if true, mean that this company has been permitting a greater flow of rubber tires into the channels of public consumption than the law permits. Such a practice is harmful to the independent dealers in the rubber-tire industry.

The independent tire servicing agencies in the automotive industry, including tire dealers, automobile dealers, filling stations, and garages, have been apprehensive over the position they will occupy in the economic scheme of our Nation when the war has come to a close.

Senators will recall that the Banking and Currency Committee, of which I am chairman, has before it a bill, S. 1122, designed to protect the independent position of these dealers. Numerous witnesses representing the trade appeared before the committee and presented information concerning alleged unfair practices operating against the independent dealers and which, they said, were destroying the independent small businessman in the industry. In substance these charges hinge on what has been called the factory-inspired, unfair trade practices of the larger producers in the tire industry.

I think all Senators will agree that for the welfare of our entire economy the businesses of these independent servicing agencies, now approximately 300,000 in number, must be safeguarded and preserved for the future good of the Nation. I refer at this time to the release issued by the O. P. A. on August 26 only because it seems to bear out the numerous complaints which I have received from representative retail dealers throughout my own State of New York.

I ask unanimous consent to have this release printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

There being no objection the release was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TIRE RATIONING SUSPENSION ORDER HEARINGS

On August 28 and September 12, two suspension-order cases, involving alleged misuse of tire-ration certificates to make possible the outflow of more tires than the certificates called for, are scheduled to be heard by Office of Price Administration hearing commissioners in Denver and Chicago. We are calling these hearings to your attention as we believe you may want to check on the results, and to report them to your readers and members. You may also find useful the following background information:

The cases involve the Chicago and Denver regional branches of the Firestone Tire & Rubber Co. The case of the Denver branch (Firestone Tire & Rubber Co., Twenty-fourth and Blake Streets, Denver, Colo.) will be heard before Commissioner Henry A. Hicks, on August 28. Commissioner John R. Allen,

on September 11, will hear the case of the Chicago branch (Firestone Tire & Rubber Co., 26 East Sixteenth Street, Chicago).

Both hearings (like all O. P. A. suspension-order hearings) are open to the public. The Firestone branches will have an opportunity to employ counsel, call witnesses, and present evidence in their behalf.

In both cases the company is charged with failing to void parts B of tire certificates that they had received in exchange for tires and tubes sold to dealers, and with transferring these unvoided parts B back to dealers. This practice would permit the dealers to increase their own inventories by reusing the unvoided certificates to buy tires from other dealers or manufacturers, and to sell tires and tubes to consumers who do not hold certificates.

The Chicago branch is charged with using uncanceled parts B of tire certificates to purchase approximately 400 heavy-duty truck tires and 900 truck tubes from 5 Chicago dealers.

The Denver branch office is charged with transferring unvoided parts B to a broker, who used them to procure tractor tires of another brand for the branch office.

If the charges are sustained, the branches may be forbidden to sell rationed tires for a period up to the duration of rationing.

A tire certificate issued by a local ration board comes in three parts: A, B, and D. Part D is kept by the customer; the dealer retains part A in his own files; and he uses part B to buy another tire to replenish his stock. He may buy this replacement tire directly from a manufacturer, or he may buy it from another dealer. If he does the latter, the second dealer in turn may replenish his stock either from a manufacturer or from a third dealer.

In other words, part B of a tire certificate may be used at will for exchanges of tires among dealers. But it may be used only once to cover transfer of a tire from a manufacturer to a dealer. As soon as a manufacturer—or a manufacturer's regional branch—receives the part B, he is required to stamp it "Void except for replenishment by ---------- (name of manufacturer)."

The manufacturer is permitted by the regulations to keep the certificate, properly voided, to use in case he himself finds it necessary to buy a tire—if, for example, he has contracted to deliver a certain type of tire and has not produced enough of that type to fulfill his commitment. But he may not legally use a part B for this purpose unless he has voided it so that no retail dealer can use it again.

The part B must be endorsed by each dealer or manufacturer who receives it, so that it is possible to trace the hands through which it has passed before being voided.

TRIBUTE TO GEORGE W. NORRIS BY JOHN BEECHER

Mr. GUFFEY. Mr. President, I should like to offer for insertion in the main body of the RECORD a poem entitled "White Foam Breaking," by John Beecher. This is a beautiful poem about our former colleague, Senator George W. Norris, of Nebraska.

There being no objection, the poem was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHITE FOAM BREAKING

(By John Beecher)

Hearing that he is dead,
All I can think of
Is the white foam breaking
Over the spillway
And the lights in the hills.

Who are these boys and girls reading by these lights,
What lessons are they studying?
Nebraska,
Thanks for 40 years of George Norris,
Who nourished the spirit of all this land,
As your wheat the growing bodies of our children.
How you must feel today,
Nebraska,
We know,
Who have also struck down blindly
The ones who loved us;
And when it was too late
Repented.

Nebraska, your treeless earth
Spreads level to the sky's edge;
Your golden grain upturned to the sun and the blue;
It's a long, long way from here
To Tennessee's hills,
The rain-blackened cabins in the coves,
The thin corn clinging to the slopes,
The haggard children,
The white water of the rushing streams.

What is Tennessee to us?
You said;
We want a man who will work for Nebraska,
First, last, and all the time.

George Norris grew too big for you,
Nebraska;
Your great plains bred a vision,
Vast as themselves and as bountiful.

The hills and the plains
Are one earth,
George Norris saw,
And the people of both,
One Nation indivisible.

Omaha, Lincoln, McCook, and Grand Forks;
The neighbor up the block;
Or beside the windmill whirling on the far horizon,
Are Nebraska, you said;
And when the sheriff came to seize Jim's farm,
You grabbed the pitchfork and went over.

But when the people of Prague,
Of Warsaw, Paris, Athens, Kharkov,
Wept in the streets as the hobnails rang on their cobbles,
George Norris grabbed his pitchfork.

Perhaps you understand him better,
Nebraska,
Now that the neighbor up the block,
Or beside the windmill whirling on the far horizon,
Has a gold star in his parlor window.

"I intend to do as much as I can * * *"
George Norris said;
The old man of 83,
With the young heart.
You tried to break it, Nebraska;
But it was too big for you,
You were in it,
But it had room for all the rest of us besides.

He is gone;
The simple citizen who marched at the head of us,
But the march goes on,
Gathering the people from every street,
Every house that we pass,

From the churches and colleges,
From the farms and factories,
From the tall buildings of cities,
From ships in the harbors,
From the plains and the hills.

We march toward that America
Which sleeps in the seeds he planted and others before him,
As sure to grow
As wheat on Nebraska plains.

He is dead;
But the white foam breaks
Over the spillway,
And the lights in the hills
Come on.

CANADIAN EQUALIZATION FEE AND EXPORT TAX

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I have in my hand a table entitled "Canadian Equalization Fee or Export Tax as of Dates Following," which I ask to have printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Canadian equalization fee or export tax as of the following dates

	Oats		Barley	
	East	West	East	West
	Cents	*Cents*	*Cents*	*Cents*
Feb. 29, 1944	41	35	45	41
Mar. 3, 1944	41	35	46	42
Mar. 11, 1944	41	35	47	43
Mar. 15, 1944	41	35	48	44
Mar. 16, 1944	42	36	48	44
Mar. 17, 1944	43	37	48	44
Mar. 22, 1944	46	40	49	45
Mar. 23, 1944	47	41	50	46
Apr. 18, 1944	45	38	50	46
May 5, 1944	45	39	50	46
May 10, 1944	45½	39	50	46
May 15, 1944	46	39	50	46
May 19, 1944	46	39	50	50
May 20, 1944	47	47	50	50
July 4, 1944	46	46	50	50
July 6, 1944	45	45	50	50
July 11, 1944	45	45	51	51
July 12, 1944	44	44	53	53
July 13, 1944	44	44	54	54
July 14, 1944	42	42	54	54
July 15, 1944	41	41	54	54
July 19, 1944	40	40	54	54
July 24, 1944	38	38	54	54
July 25, 1944	37	37	54	54
July 26, 1944	37	37	55	52
July 27, 1944	37	37	53	50
July 29, 1944	35	35	51	48
July 31, 1944	33	33	49	46
Aug. 1, 1944	32	32	49	46
Aug. 9, 1944	31	31	49	45
Aug. 11, 1944	29	29	49	45
Aug. 15, 1944	29	29	47	43
Aug. 17, 1944	30	30	49	45
Aug. 18, 1944	30	30	49	45
Aug. 19, 1944	31	31	50	46
Aug. 21, 1944	31	31	50	46
Aug. 24, 1944	21	21	50	46
Aug. 25, 1944	20	15	50	46
Aug. 30, 1944	18	13	50	46
Sept. 1, 1944	17	12	50	46
Sept. 2, 1944	16	11	50	46
Sept. 5, 1944	15	10	50	46
Sept. 6, 1944	14	9	50	46
Sept. 7, 1944	8	4	50	46
Sept. 8, 1944	6	2	50	46

GRAIN PRICES

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I have received a letter from S. M. Culbertson relating to grain prices in the Northwest, which I ask to have printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SEPTEMBER 9, 1944.

Senator WILLIAM LANGER,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR BILL: Wired you this afternoon that I was writing you fully in regard to the matter which I phoned you about last evening, and that same would reach you through air mail.

When I reached the office this morning I found it difficult to secure all of the facts and information in connection with this matter, which I felt you should have, and I also found it impossible to incorporate the same in a single telegram, as you requested. I am sure you will agree, after reading this letter and referring to the attached records, as well as the references made herein, that it would not have been possible to lay the picture in your mind through telegraphic means, as much as I would like to rush it there so that you could digest the same and act quickly.

Now, BILL, I have just returned this past week from a 2-week swing through central and western North Dakota, calling on farmers and independent grain shippers, as you would surmise. My trip was shortened considerable when I learned about what was going on in the coarse-grain market and the belief that I could be of more help to these shippers and North Dakota farmers right here in Minneapolis.

I did not have the idea that I could stop the downtrend in these coarse-grain prices, no matter where I was located, but after hearing what these farmers and shippers had to say about the reason for these grains going down, whereas wheat and flax stayed practically at the former levels, I felt like they, that a great injustice had been dealt out to these coarse-grain producers and that the only way to correct it would be to let the powers in Washington know what was going on and how they felt about it. In order to do this effectively, a leader is needed to present these facts, and also the way these farmers feel about this matter—and personally I know of no one more qualified to do this than you, BILL LANGER; and from many phone calls I have had with farmers and shippers of the Northwest since my return home, they have agreed with me that you are the man to take this matter in hand. In fact, I have suggested to them that they get in touch with you on this matter by wire and letters, so I feel sure that you have already heard from some people out there, and will within the next few days hear from many more.

I realize that you are not seeking any special publicity at this time and that it is not necessary that you do so; however, I also realize that you are vitally interested in the welfare of all of the farmers in North Dakota and will not stand idly by and see any injustice inflicted on these farmers if it is within your power to check. As a personal friend of yours, I feel it my duty to bring this matter to your attention, and also to assure you that your leadership in this matter at this time will not only make you many new friends in our grand old State of North Dakota but will cement more closely those many thousands you now have.

It is my hope that after you have read the story of what has taken place and is now going on, which I have written up separately, that you will act quickly and let the press know of your stand in respect to this matter and also that you plan to act. I will in the meantime continue to contact farmers in the Northwest and request that they file their complaints with you. If this is not agreeable, you may wire me on receipt of this letter requesting that I refrain from these solicitations.

Yours very truly,

S. M. CULBERTSON.

It is a well-known fact that the farmers of North Dakota in particular, and most of the farmers of the Northwest, raised a very large crop of grain on increased acreage last year. They did this in compliance with request made by the United States Government that more food was needed because of the war. They were rewarded to some extent by higher prices for their products, although a ceiling was placed on all grains. A loan price was established on wheat, rye, and durum, and the farmers were told this spring that even though the war might end this summer or later that this price program would continue for 2 years following.

The Department of Agriculture, with whom all the farmers of the Northwest have been fully cooperating during the past several years, made a special request to the farmers of the Northwest late last winter in which they asked that a reduction be made in their wheat acreage for this year and that they increase their planting of oats and barley as there had been such a shortage in these grains the past year that it was necessary to import these coarse grains from Canada.

As far as I have been able to find, no guaranteed price was ever made by our Government for these coarse grains, but the general impression made was that with wheat on a guaranteed price for even 2 years after the war that this would naturally be reflected in all other grains.

Last year there was, as I have previously stated, a shortage of feed grains such as corn, oats, and barley, and because of this shortage we did import considerable grain for feeding from Canada. Our prices had naturally gone up with this demand for feed grains and as a result Canada was able to sell their grains in this country at prices far above their value in that country, or any other country as far as that is concerned. Considerably above their ceiling prices, in fact.

Canada made the most of the opportunity, you may be sure, and through their Canadian Wheat Board they established an equalization fee or tax on all grains sold for export, which they were at liberty to change every day to suit themselves. They claimed that all of these tax funds so collected would be returned to their producers at the end of the crop year on the basis of the grain each of them marketed and the entire story of which is set forth in a pamphlet which I am attempting to secure for you this week. It is possible that you may secure this more quickly yourself if you personally request it from our own Department of Agriculture down there, as I am sure they have copies of all such kind. Please ask for the pamphlet put out by the Canadian Wheat Board, Winnipeg, Canada, as of August 1944. The subject heading of this pamphlet is, "Equalization funds and farm-to-farm transactions." The one I am trying to get for you may not reach you for several days and while this has no particular bearing on the matter which we are trying to solve, it does give you that much more information about Canadian protection to their producers.

Attached herewith is a copy which I built up today with respect to the export tax, or fee, which the Canadians imposed upon all of the grain (feed grains) which they shipped into the United States last year and up to the present time. These export fees or taxes were paid for by the Americans who were forced to buy feed in the way of higher prices which they were forced to pay for this Canadian grain.

It goes without saying that we in this country have no regulation over what is done in Canada with respect to export taxes or any other regulations they may impose from time to time, but in view of what has taken place just recently and which I will cover shortly herein, doesn't it look like we in this country are a bunch of saps not to take a few of the advantages offered in protection to our own interests?

This year our farmers complied with the requests and pleadings of the Department of Agriculture and sacrificed their wheat acreage in order to raise more feed grains. They did this in face of the promise that the price of wheat would not go lower than the loan value and they supposed that the Government would also support the value of feed grains on about the basis which it was last spring. They were fairly successful in raising a crop of feed this year and especially so in North Dakota. The wheat did not turn out as big as last year and this you may know by the figures that will be shown in the Government report to be published on the afternoon of September 11, next Monday.

Prices of both barley and oats held fairly firm until about 10 days ago when marketing of Canadian feed grains took place. Buyers of feed were of course taking the cheapest feed that was offered and naturally took the early marketing of some of this Northwest grain. Farmers in the Northwest did not complain when the price of both barley and oats went down 6 or 8 cents, as they had a good crop to market and were most willing to discount the price, some in view of the fact that feed had been a good price most of last year.

Canada realized that in order to sell her surplus of feed which she had raised this year she would have to do something quick in order to move her crop in advance of this Northwest feed and so she quickly cut the export tax on her oats and immediately sold some very large lots of this grain to United States importers. This being the cheaper feed it is natural to see why the Middle West and Eastern feeder bought their grain in preference to what the Northwest was offering. If you will now refer to the accompanying sheet, which shows the amount of export tax on both the east and west ports of Canada, you will note in the column under oats that it was cut from 41 cents east and 35 cents west on the 3d of March this year to where it now is only 6 cents east and 2 cents west as of September 8. That is an approximate cut of 35 cents per bushel on oats.

The result of that cut has been just this: Our market has gone down on the cash article over 30 cents a bushel on oats and the effect has also caused our market on barley to go down even more than that as there are no buyers for this grain of any consequence in either Minneapolis or Chicago at the present time. As a matter of fact, with no buyers around for these grains, unless a great sacrifice was made in price, the loaded cars stood in the yards both here and in Chicago with no place to go and thus tying up box-car equipment at a time when it is already a very limited quantity. It is further a fact and can be substantiated here by any and all in the grain business that in order to dispose of this grain it was necessary in hundreds of instances to sell this barley at prices of as much as 40 cents per bushel less than they were a month ago. Oats also were sacrificed and other feeds to such an extent that even though those who might have hedged their grain in the futures were compelled to take a severe loss. It was the cash article that went at a sacrifice in other words, and, while it is true that futures went down as well, they did not go down like the cash grain itself. This is going to mean that in addition to farmers all over the Northwest getting a licking, practically every elevator in which most of the farmers are interested is also going to take a beating. In fact, I understand that even the line elevators are taking a real licking as well, as they have no place to take it in down here at the terminals. In the face of this situation being bad 10 days ago, the Canadians kept cutting their export tax each day and there was no action taken by our own Government in Washington to act in protection to the American producer.

From the story I have so far given you on this injustice dealt out to those loyal North Dakota and northwestern farmers I am certain that you already recognize the avenue through which we could have and should have gone 10 days ago to cure this ill. It is not too late yet to act in their behalf and at least save them some of the losses they are bound to take if this continues and that I hope you will attend to just as soon as possible. Embargo on all feed from Canada. We have enough to supply our own feeders this year with the grain which the Government requested these farmers to raise this year right here in the Northwest and again I say, in particular, North Dakota.

In trying to learn just how many bushels of this Canadian feed had already been exported to this country I learned only that, while millions of bushels of oats have already arrived here, that there is one lot of around 40,000,000 bushels at the present time in one loading spot on the Canadian side of the Lakes ready to be loaded and shipped within the next week or 10 days. Some of the best

informed grain men claim that at the present price it is yet possible that they may ship some of these oats right into our own port of Duluth, Minn. Would not that be a swell situation for these farmers to hear about with feed grains of all kinds to sell and our own ports filled with Canadian feed grains?

Again, I cannot help but emphasize, BILL, this is one grand opportunity for you to shoot the works on and let those back home know that you know what is going on and that you are on the job at all times for their protection.

I could write you more at length than I have on this matter, but I think I have made it all clear so that you will understand it and that you will step right out and act quickly on the same. Do not forget: Let the press know of your plans so that those boys back home will know that you are on the job and acting in their behalf not later than Tuesday the 12th.

If there is any further information that you desire, you may call me at my office phone here in Minneapolis, Main 0389.

My home address is now at 3804 Pillsbury Avenue.

Wishing you every success and trusting to hear from you very soon I remain,

Sincerely,

S. M. CULBERTSON.

MARKET FOR OATS, BARLEY, AND WHEAT

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I have in my hand a telegram received from Mr. W. A. Plath, president of the North Dakota Farm Bureau, relating to the market for oats, barley, and wheat, which I ask to have printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JAMESTOWN, N. DAK.,
September 16, 1944.

Hon. WILLIAM LANGER,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

The board of directors of the North Dakota Farm Bureau, meeting at Jamestown September 16, call your attention to the fact that the market on oats, barley, and wheat is badly demoralized. That the farmers of this State are now being paid ruinous prices for these grains; that such prices are much below parity. We urgently request that you use your influence with the Commodity Credit Corporation to the end that the market for these grains be supported at the parity level in accordance with the provisions of the Steagall amendment.

W. A. PLATH,
President, North Dakota Farm Bureau.

DISCHARGE OF ARMY PERSONNEL

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed as a part of the RECORD, a letter I have just received from a businessman in Salina, Kans. I do not wish to embarrass my friend or his customers so I am withholding his name:

SALINA, KANS., *September 12, 1944.*

Senator CLYDE M. REED,
Senate Chamber, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR REED: I have a shop near Camp Phillips and Smoky Hill Air Base. I have from five to six hundred servicemen and their wives in my place every month. These people are from every part of the United States. I make it a point to talk to them and find out how they feel about things.

The other day two lieutenants, two sergeants, and one corporal from the same bombing crew came in and asked me if I knew you. I told them I did. They asked me to write you and tell you how the boys felt about the administration's plan to keep them in the Army after the war is over. They feel that the labor unions are back of this plan and that it would put the servicemen at a disadvantage in getting jobs.

I had not thought about that myself. I have talked to many more servicemen since then and find all of them feel that way about it. One of these boys was from New York, one from Michigan, one from Arkansas, one from New Jersey, and one from Colorado. Not one of them was from Kansas, yet they all knew about you.

I promised them I would write you. I felt they gave you a great compliment and I have always admired you very much myself. If Thomas E. Dewey will only hit this thing hard, and come out definitely for getting the boys out of the Army as soon as possible, he will get 80 percent of the servicemen's vote and all their relatives'.

Very truly yours,

(Writer's name withheld.)

ADDRESS BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES ON SEPTEMBER 23, 1944

[Mr. BARKLEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address to be delivered by the President of the United States on September 23, 1944, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE NEW LIBERALISM—ADDRESS BY THE VICE PRESIDENT

[Mr. BARKLEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address on the subject The New Liberalism delivered by the Vice President in New York City, September 21, 1944, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESSES BY SENATOR LUCAS

[Mr. BARKLEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by Senator LUCAS before the American Legion convention in Chicago, and three brief radio addresses delivered by Senator LUCAS in Illinois, which will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

DEWEY LOVES THE NEW DEAL BUT HE HATES NEW DEALERS — EDITORIAL FROM THE PHILADELPHIA RECORD

[Mr. BARKLEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Dewey Loves the New Deal But He Hates New Dealers," from the Philadelphia Record of September 20, 1944, which appears in the Appendix.]

WORLD POLICE FORCE—ADDRESS BY SENATOR WHEELER

[Mr. WHEELER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio address delivered by him at Los Angeles, Calif., which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY GOV. THOMAS E. DEWEY ON SEPTEMBER 21, 1944

[Mr. WHITE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address by Gov. Thomas E. Dewey on September 21, 1944, which appears in the Appendix.]

RICHARD LYONS FOR SENATOR—EDITORIAL FROM PEORIA (ILL.) MORNING STAR

[Mr. WHITE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Richard Lyons for Senator," published in the Peoria (Ill.) Morning Star, which appears in the Appendix.]

RESOLUTIONS ADOPTED BY AMERICAN LEGION IN CONVENTION AT CHICAGO

[Mr. CONNALLY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD resolutions adopted by the American Legion convention in Chicago, which appears in the Appendix.]

THREE-POINT PROGRAM OF THE AMERICAN FEDERATION OF LABOR TO HELP NEGROES

[Mr. CAPPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement entitled "A. F. L. Present Three-Point Program To Help Negroes Win Better Break," by William Green, president of the American Federation of Labor, which appears in the Appendix.]

RACIAL DISCRIMINATION—ARTICLE FROM THE WASHINGTON POST

[Mr. CAPPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Economic Bigotry," by Malvina Lindsay, published in the Washington Post of September 6, 1944, which appears in the Appendix.]

AMERICAN LEGION ADDRESS BY GEN. GEORGE C. MARSHALL

[Mr. O'MAHONEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the address delivered by General Marshall to the American Legion at their convention in Chicago, which appears in the Appendix.]

TRIBUTE TO HON. JAMES A. FARLEY

[Mr. O'MAHONEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a resolution adopted by the Democratic State Committee of New York in recognition of the services of James A. Farley as chairman of the New York State Democratic Committee, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE MOST TERRIBLE TRAGEDY—EDITORIAL FROM THE NEW YORK HERALD TRIBUNE

[Mr. O'MAHONEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "The Most Terrible Tragedy," published in the New York Herald Tribune of September 20, 1944, which appears in the Appendix.]

JAMES A. FARLEY'S RESIGNATION

[Mr. BYRD asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "James A. Farley's Resignation," published in the Batavia (N. Y.) Times of June 15, 1944, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY SIDNEY HILLMAN TO C. I. O. CONVENTION AT SARATOGA SPRINGS, N. Y.

[Mr. MEAD asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by Sidney Hillman to the C. I. O. State convention at Saratoga Springs, N. Y., September 9, 1944, which appears in the Appendix.]

NATIONAL INDUSTRIAL INFORMATION COMMITTEE

[Mr. GUFFEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter from Allen M. Pope, president, the First Boston Corporation, and a subscription blank of the National Industrial Information Committee, which appear in the Appendix.]

REPORT OF THE TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE OF POTOMAC GRANGE NO. 1

[Mr. BUTLER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the report of the Transportation Committee of Potomac Grange No. 1, dealing with transportation problems, which appears in the Appendix.]

SINCE YOU WENT AWAY—LETTER FROM SENATOR LANGER

[Mr. LANGER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter written by him on September 18, 1944, to Mr. David O. Selznick, which appears in the Appendix.]

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

THE CALENDAR

Mr. GUFFEY obtained the floor.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I suggest to the Senator from Pennsylvania and other Senators who are to deliver addresses that I had contemplated a call of the calendar. The calendar is very brief, and I wish to have it called as early as possible today, because many Senators are interested in it. I do not wish to interfere with the Senator from Pennsylvania, but I hope we may have the calendar called before we complete the roster of speakers who have indicated their desire to address the Senate, because there are other Senators who do not intend to speak, who are attending committee meetings and transacting other public business, and they are all anxious to know when the calendar is to be called, and to dispose of it as soon as possible.

Mr. GUFFEY. Mr. President, I am perfectly willing to wait until the calendar has been called.

Mr. BARKLEY. If the Senator is willing to do that, it will facilitate business.

Mr. GUFFEY. I am willing, if others who are to address the Senate are likewise willing.

Mr. BARKLEY. Subject to the right of the Senator from Pennsylvania to the floor, I ask that the Senate now proceed to the consideration of the calendar for measures to which there is no objection, beginning at the end of the last call.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the clerk will proceed to call the measures on the calendar beginning with Calendar No. 1106.

LAND PATENT TO PETER A. CONDELARIO

The bill (S. 1746) authorizing and directing the Secretary of the Interior to issue to Peter A. Condelario a patent in fee to certain land, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to issue to Peter A. Condelario, a Sioux Indian of the Pine Ridge Indian Reservation, South Dakota, a patent in fee to the northeast quarter of section 31, in township 40 north, range 35 west, of the sixth principal meridian, South Dakota.

AUTHORIZATION TO CONTRACT WITH THE MIDDLE RIO GRANDE CONSERVANCY DISTRICT OF NEW MEXICO

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1953) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to contract with the Middle Rio Grande Conservancy District of New Mexico for the payment of operation and maintenance charges on certain Pueblo Indian lands.

Mr. CHAVEZ. This bill was introduced at the request of the Department of the Interior. It is an Indian bill and has to do with matters in my State. There is no objection to it whatsoever. It has been reported unanimously by the Committee on Indian Affairs, and I trust the bill may be passed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the provisions of the act of August 27, 1935 (49 Stat. 887), as amended by section 5 of the act of June 20, 1938 (52 Stat. 779), authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to provide by agreement with the Middle Rio Grande Conservancy District, a subdivision of the State of New Mexico, for the payment of operation and maintenance charges on newly reclaimed Pueblo Indian lands and lands purchased by the United States by virtue of the act of June 7, 1924 (43 Stat. 636), as amended, for certain Pueblo Indians, are hereby extended for an additional period of 10 years to 1955.

PURCHASE OF LUMBER FOR THE OPERATION OF RED LAKE INDIAN MILLS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 2185) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior, in carrying out the purposes of the act of May 18, 1916 (39 Stat. 137), to purchase logs, lumber, and other forest products, which had been reported from the Committee on Indian Affairs with amendments.

The first amendment of the committee was on page 2, after line 3, to strike out section 2, as follows:

SEC. 2. This act shall terminate 6 months after cessation of the hostilities in which the United States is now engaged or at an earlier date by proclamation of the President.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 2, after line 7, to insert the following:

SEC. 2. That no conveyance made by an Indian of the Five Civilized Tribes on or after April 26, 1931, and prior to the date of the enactment of this act, of lands purchased, prior to April 26, 1931, for the use and benefit of such Indian with funds derived from the sale of, or as income from, restricted allotted lands and conveyed to him by deed containing restrictions on alienation without the consent and approval of the Secretary of the Interior prior to April 26, 1931, shall be invalid because such conveyance was made without the consent and approval of the Secretary of the Interior: *Provided*, That all conveyances made after the date of the enactment of this act must have the consent and approval of the Secretary of the Interior.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 2, after line 20, to insert a new section, as follows:

SEC. 3. That the act entitled "An act relative to restrictions applicable to Indians of the Five Civilized Tribes in Oklahoma," approved January 27, 1933 (47 Stat. 777), is amended by adding at the end thereof new sections, 9, 10, 11, as follows:

"SEC. 9. That the following words in section 8 of this act, 'any interest in land of any full-blood Indian heir', shall not be construed to include any interest in land which was not restricted in the person from whom such full-blood Indian heir inherited the same.

"SEC. 10. In the case of any interest in land acquired by purchase with restricted funds after the date of enactment of this section, such interest shall not be deemed a restricted interest unless the deed conveying such interest shows upon its face that such purchase was made with restricted funds.

"SEC. 11. No conveyance, subsequent to January 27, 1933, and prior to the date of enactment of this act, of any interest in land of any full-blood Indian heir, which was not restricted in the person from whom such full-blood Indian heir inherited the same, shall be invalid because such conveyance was not presented for approval in open court as provided in section 8 of this act."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was on page 3, after line 18, to insert a new section, as follows:

SEC. 4. That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to convey to Colony Union Graded School District Numbered 1, of Colony, Oklahoma, all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the following-described lands, together with the improvements thereon and such equipment as may be designated by the Secretary of the Interior, situated at Colony, Oklahoma, and known as the Seger Indian School:

Beginning at a cross in the concrete pavement at the road intersection in the town of Colony, Oklahoma, said to be over a tablet marking the northwest corner of section 15, township 10 north, range 14 west, and running thence east with the north line of said section eight hundred and ninety-two and two-tenths feet to a stake in the center of the county road, thirty-three feet south of the transmission line along said road;

Thence turning an angle of ninety-three degrees twenty-six minutes to the right a distance of nine hundred and fifty-four and nine-tenths feet to a twenty-inch locust tree, passing a twenty-one-inch locust at nine hundred and thirty-three and nine-tenths feet;

Thence at an angle of thirty degrees forty-nine minutes to the left from said line, passing a five-inch locust tree at nineteen feet, whole distance two hundred and eighty and seven-tenths feet to an eighteen-inch locust, passing a six-inch locust at two hundred and forty-seven and seven-tenths feet;

Thence at an angle of sixteen degrees forty-eight minutes to the left from said line seventy feet to a twenty-two-inch broken locust;

Thence at an angle of thirty-three degrees twenty-four minutes to the left from said line one hundred and twenty-two and four-tenths feet to a post, witnessed by a twelve-inch locust tree at an angle of forty-four degrees to the right and distance of fifty-eight feet from said line;

Thence to an angle of sixteen degrees eight minutes to the left from said line seven hundred and eighty-three and one-tenth feet to a post, witnessed by a thirty-four-inch oak at an angle of sixty-two to fifty to the left and distance of fifty feet from said line, a twenty-six-inch oak at angle to right of two to forty and distance forty-four feet from said line, a twenty-eight-inch black walnut at angle of one hundred and twenty to forty to right and distance of twenty-eight feet from said line;

Thence at an angle of ninety-six degrees to right from said line a distance of three hundred and ninety and five-tenths feet to a post;

Thence at an angle of seventy-two degrees thirteen minutes to the right from said line a distance of two hundred and forty-four and four-tenths feet to a post;

Thence at an angle of eight degrees thirty-five minutes to the right from said line a distance of three hundred and forty-eight and six-tenths feet to a post; witnessed by a black jack at an angle of seventy-three degrees five minutes from the line as run a

distance of thirty-two feet and a black jack at an angle of sixty-one degrees fifteen minutes to right from the line as run a distance of forty-two feet;

Thence at an angle of fifty degrees twenty-eight minutes to the right from a line as run a distance of three hundred and fifty feet to a post;

Tnence at an angle of twenty degrees forty-seven minutes to the right from said line a distance of three hundred and nineteen and two-tenths feet to a post;

Thence at an angle of two degrees fifteen minutes to the left from said line a distance of two hundred and seventy-seven feet to a post, passing a twenty-four-inch locust at one hundred and ninety-nine feet;

Thence t an angle of thirty degrees twenty-five minutes to the right from said line a distance of nine hundred and forty-three and three-tenths feet to a point in the center of the county road;

Thence east with the center line of said road and the north line of section 15 to the place of the beginning, containing five acres, more or less: *Provided*, That in the case of abandonment of said property for school purposes the title of ownership shall revert to the United States.

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior carrying out the purposes of the act of May 18, 1916 (39 Stat. 137), to purchase logs, lumber, and other forest products, Red Lake Indian Reservation, Minn., to validate titles to certain lands conveyed by Indians of Five Civilized Tribes, amend the act of January 27, 1933 (47 Stat. 777), relative to restrictions applicable to Indians of the Five Civilized Tribes, authorizing conveyance of the Segar Indian Schools, and for other purposes."

ADJUSTMENT OF CERTAIN LOANS UNDER FARM CREDIT ADMINISTRATION

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Mr. President, a few days ago calendar No. 1087, Senate bill 1638, was passed over upon objection of the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE] when the calendar was being called. I understand that now the Senator from Iowa has no further objection to the bill, and I ask unanimous consent that it be taken up at this time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from South Dakota?

Mr. GILLETTE. I did not understand the request.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. The request is that calendar 1087, Senate bill 1688, be taken up on this call, as it was passed over at the last call on the Senator's objection.

Mr. GILLETTE. I have no objection to the bill being taken up and passed.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, let it be taken up at the conclusion of the call of the calendar.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, I join in the request of my colleague. I had hoped we could act upon this bill at this time. I wonder if the Senator from Kentucky would not permit that to be done.

Mr. BARKLEY. I suggest that when we reach the end of the call we can then go back and take up the bill. There will be no difficulty about it. That is the usual way in which we proceed.

THE SEDITION TRIAL IN WASHINGTON, D. C.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, last week I called the attention of the Senate to the so-called sedition trial now in progress in the United States District Court for the District of Columbia. On that occasion I emphasized the obvious injustice done to the 30, now reduced to 26, defendants in this mass trial; the injustice of trying them all together, the injustice of trying them on a conspiracy charge, when the only evidence of the conspiracy charge is certain similarity between the things they said and——

Mr. GUFFEY. Mr. President, I yielded the floor so that the calendar might be called, but did not yield for a general free-for-all, consisting of speeches, and submission of resolutions, and so forth. If we are not going to stick to the agreement to call the calendar, I shall insist on assuming my right to the floor.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, in that connection may I express the hope that Senators will forego the pleasure of addressing the Senate, and that the Senate may forego the pleasure of listening, until we shall have completed the very brief calendar. There will be considerable time today for extensions of remarks or placing matters in the RECORD or for speeches.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I did not realize the situation to be as has now been stated. I came in after the agreement had been made to call the calendar. I have no objection to speaking later in the day.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the next bill on the calendar.

AMENDMENT OF COAST GUARD AUXILIARY AND RESERVE ACT

The bill (H. R. 3704) to amend the Coast Guard Auxiliary and Reserve Act of 1941, as amended, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MONONGAHELA RIVER BRIDGE, PENNSYLVANIA

The bill (H. R. 4206) to authorize the construction and operation of a free highway bridge across the Monongahela River in the county of Allegheny, Pa., was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

PURCHASE OF LUMBER FOR THE OPERATION OF RED LAKE INDIAN MILLS

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, I did not know that the calendar was being called, and action was taken on Order No. 1108, House bill 2185, prior to my arrival in the Chamber. I ask unanimous consent that the votes by which the amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read the third time and passed may be reconsidered.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the votes are reconsidered.

Mr. DANAHER. Will the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] please advise us what is the purpose in section 1 of dispensing with compliance with section 3709 of the Revised Statutes in the acquisition of the logs, lumber, and other foreign products which are to be processed at the Red Lake Indian Mills?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I presume the inquiry has to do with the bill which was just reconsidered.

Mr. DANAHER. Yes.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. This is the situation: The bill which came from the House had to do with certain Indians in Minnesota. To this bill the Senate committee added three amendments intended to clarify a vast number of land titles which are now clouded by virtue of either a circuit court decision or a Supreme Court decision.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Yes.

Mr. DANAHER. I did not inquire as to that point. I am calling the Senator's attention particularly to page 2, lines 2 and 3, and I am not directing my question to the amendments added by the Senate committee. As it now reads, the bill dispenses with compliance with section 3709 of the Revised Statutes, and that section provides safeguards with reference to the acquisition of certain property, and it requires, as I recall, competitive bids, and that sort of thing.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. The bill relates to a sawmill on an Indian reservation in Minnesota. The sawmill is in operation, and is being managed by the Indians themselves under the supervision of the Office of Indian Affairs. The mill is very busy, but still the work could be increased and additional lumber could be supplied. In order to get an increased supply of lumber it is necessary to go outside the reservation and buy some lumber, and the bill authorizes the Department to use the revolving fund to buy logs outside the reservation, to be processed through this mill, because the Government and the war effort are very much in need of dditional lumber.

Now as to the specific provision; it is to authorize, as I understand, the purchase of logs outside the reservation.

Mr. DANAHER. But without bidding, let me say.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Of course, if they are going to buy the lumber from some other owner they ought to have the right to buy it without bidding.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I yield.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. It is my understanding of this particular provision that the Indians of the Red Lake Indian Reservation own the mill themselves, that it was paid for with their own money, and this is largely a transaction for themselves and by themselves, rather than the Government being interested in it. The Government agency simply supervises.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, perhaps the Senator can clear up another point. As one reads the report and the letter of the Secretary of the Interior

with reference to the operations of this mill, it becomes apparent that during the entire history of operations there never were milled more than 3,500,000 feet on the average, a year. With that thought in mind, and because there is a war effort being served at the present time by the Red Lake Indian mills, it is suggested that the mill's capacity be stepped up to 6,000,000 feet a year, and that would make it necessary for them to go outside the reservation to acquire the timber. All that I can understand. But obviously the House had placed in the bill an alternative, that if Congress authorized the increase of the operation to 6,000,000 feet it should be for the duration of the war only; it was not to be a post-war expansion of capacity, which historically has never been reached throughout the mill's entire existence. Therefore the House added section 2, and I notice that the Senate committee has stricken out the language which the House inserted which would limit the operations to the period of the war. Will the Senator explain why that step was taken?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. The Senate committee thought that if this was a good proposal at this particular time it would be a good proposal at any time. Personally I have no objection to agreeing to an amendment along the line of the thought of the Senator from Connecticut. If the Senator will suggest an amendment I will accept it.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the vote by which the committee amendment on page 2, striking out lines 4 to 7, inclusive, was agreed to, be reconsidered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the vote is reconsidered.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, in lieu of the first committee amendment on page 2, which eliminates section 2 from the bill as it came from the House, I offer the following amendment:

SEC. 2. The authorization created under section 1 of this act shall terminate 6 months after cessation of the hostilities in which the United States is now engaged or at an earlier date by proclamation of the President.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I shall be very glad to accept that amendment on behalf of the committee.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Connecticut to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, I have one question, and only one further question with reference to the bill. It pertains entirely to section 2, which will now be renumbered section 3; commencing in line 8 on page 2. Will the Senator explain for the RECORD how many conveyances will be validated which have hitherto been permitted without the approval of the Secretary of the Interior.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, it is impossible to answer that question, for this reason. Formerly the Office of Indian Affairs received a vast amount of money due to individual Indians. The Office of Indian Affairs thought that this money was unrestricted. Then the Office used the money in purchasing other lands. According to the law, if unrestricted money is used to purchase lands the lands so acquired thereby become unrestricted. The Department thought the lands had been purchased with unrestricted money and that the lands so acquired were unrestricted, and therefore the lands were sold, some in town lots. Thereafter the Supreme Court held that the money in question was not unrestricted; that it was in fact restricted. Therefore, any land purchased with restricted money became restricted land. Therefore, the money being restricted money, the lands had to be acquired under the rules and regulations prescribed by law, and sold under rules and regulations prescribed by law, which required the deeds to be issued with the approval of the Secretary of the Interior. The deeds in question did not have such approval, and so they were void. Under the decision of the Supreme Court it is impossible to tell with respect to any transaction whether or not the seller of the land was a full-blooded Indian.

So, Mr. President, the decision of the Supreme Court has, in a measure, placed a cloud on every land title in the United States. To sustain that statement I send to the desk a report from the Department of Agriculture which was received yesterday, too late to incorporate in the report on the bill. I ask that the letter be read. If the Senator will carefully follow the reading of the report from the Secretary of Agriculture, he will find that that decision clouds every title in the United States which was issued after certain dates.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MCCLELLAN in the chair). Without objection, the letter will be read.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

SEPTEMBER 19, 1944.

HON. ELMER THOMAS,
Chairman of the Committee on Indian Affairs, United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR THOMAS: The attention of this Department has been drawn to Senate bill 1579 entitled "A bill to amend the act entitled 'An act relative to restrictions applicable to Indians of the Five Civilized Tribes in Oklahoma,' approved January 27, 1933."

It is understood that the bill is designed to overcome ill effects which will result from the interpretation of the act of January 27, 1933 (47 Stat. 777), handed down in *Murray* v. *Ned*, 135 F. (2d) 47 (cert. den., U. S. Sup. Ct. Nov. 8, 1943, Docket No. 340). The relevant language in the 1933 act is to the effect that "no conveyance of any interest in land of any full-blood Indian heir shall be valid unless approved in open court."

Prior to the authoritative judicial interpretation of this provision, the opinion was widely accepted that the restrictions in the 1933 act merely carried forward the prior restraints contained in the acts of 1906 (34 Stat. 145), 1908 (35 Stat. 312, 315), and 1926 (44 Stat. 239), applicable to lands allotted to an Indian ancestor as his share of the tribal lands, and created no new general restraint on land inherited by full-blood Indians.

The meaning now attributed to the act of 1933 by the courts, however, makes extremely difficult the determination of the validity of the title to land from an abstract of the record if the grantor of any conveyance since 1933 acquired his interest through inheritance. Whenever a conveyance by an heir since January 27, 1933, is shown in the abstract, the examiner must determine, from evidence not appearing in the abstract, whether the grantor heir was a full-blood Indian. There appears to be no way to answer conclusively the question of ancestry and the quantum of Indian blood of all persons inheriting lands except by obtaining a decree from a court having jurisdiction over the land and over all persons in interest. To require the expense of obtaining such a decree in connection with title examinations is impractical, and evidence such as affidavits would be of doubtful reliability.

Since there are more members of the Five Civilized Tribes living in the State of Oklahoma than anywhere else, the land titles in Oklahoma have, of course, a greater chance of being affected by this decision than do the land titles in other States. However, by this decision every record title to real estate in the United States in which a grantor in the chain of title inherited his title and conveyed it by conveyance made since 1933 is clouded. If such a grantor who had acquired his interest through inheritance happened to be a full-blood Indian, then his conveyance, to be valid under the decision of *Murray* v. *Ned*, would have to be approved in open court in accordance with the statutes, regardless of whether the property was located in Maine, California, or Florida.

For example, if a full-blood Indian named Jones or Smith, or any other common American name—and many of the Indians do have such common names—moved from Oklahoma to the State of Colorado in 1934 and there married a white woman who owned considerable property in Colorado, and if shortly after the marriage the wife died, and her husband, the full-blood Indian, was her sole and only heir who under the Colorado law inherits all her property, and if the estate proceedings in the State of Colorado were regular, and there was nothing in any record which would cause a title examiner even to suspect that Jones was a full-blood Indian, the purchaser of the land, no matter how prudent he might be, would have no means of safeguarding himself against the possibility of purchasing a void title.

In fact, it seems impossible for anyone dealing with real-estate titles to guard against not only this situation but also the numerous other situations under which a full-blood Indian could by inheritance become the owner of property without there being anything whatever to indicate to a title examiner that the title had come through the hands of a full-blood Indian heir.

Titles to much of the land in Oklahoma, and some elsewhere, are directly affected, and unless a clarifying amendment to the law is adopted, work of the Farm Credit Administration and the Farm Security Administration in lending money on the security of land in Oklahoma will be seriously hampered. Land acquisition in Oklahoma by the United States for Forest Service and Soil Conservation Service programs will also be complicated and impeded.

In providing through the Federal Farm Loan Act for the creation of the Federal land banks, which are under the supervision of the Farm Credit Administration, Congress established the policy of endeavoring to make available to agriculture land mortgage credit at the lowest rates of interest consistent with the cost of money obtainable on the security of high-grade collateral. Mortgages taken by the Federal land banks are pledged as collateral security for farm loan bonds, from which the bulk of the loanable funds of the land banks is derived. The mortgage rates are geared to the bond rates. Any condition contributing to the instability of land

titles must in greater or less degree eventually be reflected in the interest rates on Federal land-bank loans, whether as a result of a weakening of public confidence in the strength of the security underlying the bonds or as a result of the necessity of augmenting interest income in order to offset increased losses.

I believe it is clearly in the national interest to correct a statute which, like the act of January 27, 1933, casts a cloud upon all land titles in the country and must have a tendency to burden agriculture by putting an obstacle in the way of the extension of inexpensive credit.

This Department recommends passage of the bill.

The Bureau of the Budget advises that it has no objection to the submission of this report.

Sincerely,

CLAUDE R. WICKARD,
Secretary.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, let me make one further statement. This opinion from the Department of Agriculture relates to the second section of the amendment. The first section of the amendment was made necessary by the decision in the recent case of *John C. Murray* v. *Buster Ned et al.*, No. 2626 in the United States Circuit Court of Appeals, Tenth Circuit, decided February 19, 1943, in which a petition for rehearing was denied on March 24, 1943, and a second petition for rehearing was denied on June 12, and in which case a petition for writ of certiorari in the Supreme Court of the United States was denied on November 8, 1943, was whether the latter act reimposed restrictions on land from which restrictions had been removed when the lands descended to full-blood Indian heirs of the Five Civilized Tribes. The section seeks to validate all Indian-transacted titles up until the time this bill becomes law. If and when the bill becomes law, all titles must be approved by the Secretary of the Interior. That is section 1 of the amendment. Section 2 of the amendment is the one which the Secretary of Agriculture has reported upon. The force of his report is this: That from this time on, and now, no person in the United States can give a warranty deed with prima facie evidence of title unless he or she states that he or she is not a full-blood Indian. As the Secretary says, Indians have common names such as Smith, Jones, Brown, and Barnett, for example, and they have money scattered throughout the country. They purchase land and resell it. Under the decision of the Supreme Court, all such titles are clouded, as the Secretary states. This section is intended to clarify the cloud which is placed upon Indian titles.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I yield.

Mr. DANAHER. A brief comment by way of rejoinder would necessitate recognition of the fact that the Indians are wards of the Government, and that the statute was placed on the books in the first place to protect them and to make certain that title was validated by requiring the approval of the Secretary of the Interior to the original transfer. This bill, through this section, is designed to validate those transfers in cases in which no such approval has hitherto been given.

Obviously the full force and intendment of the original statute is preserved by the proviso, which clearly requires that all future conveyances shall still be subject to approval by the Secretary of the Interior. Therefore that much of the letter which has just been read from the desk loses its force so far as it pertains to future transactions. I am not alarmed on that score.

Does not the Senator feel, however, that very properly we ought, in the interest of the Indian wards themselves, to insert a clause providing that the Secretary shall now approve such prior transfers and file an appropriate certificate accordingly? In that way he would have the opportunity to review the individual transactions, and if in fact some Indian ward has been overreached, and if in fact the Secretary has good ground for withholding his approval, he may do so, and thus avoid validating the transfer. Would not that reach the evil which the Senator seeks to correct?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, these titles were passed under instructions of the Office of Indian Affairs, because the Office held that the moneys were unrestricted, and therefore the Indians could do what they saw fit with them. If they saw fit to invest the money in land, they had the privilege of doing so, under the rules and regulations of the Office of Indian Affairs. Later the matter got into court, as I stated, and the court held otherwise.

So what has been done has been done with the approval of the Office of Indian Affairs. Now to put in the clause the provision the Senator suggests would bring about a complicated condition. No title would pass until the corrective measure goes through; none of the titles would be approved until they were presented to the Secretary and approved by him.

Mr. DANAHER. That is correct.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I do not think that would be in the interest of the public. I may say that numerous suits on this matter are pending in my State. Since the titles were voided, the Indians have been informed that their titles are no good. It is an intolerable situation to have the Indians advised that because of the Department's mistake they cannot have these lands back.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will please suspend. The Chair announces that the Senate is proceeding under the 5-minute rule, and the time on the bill has expired.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, in lieu of offering an amendment, which would give me an additional 5 minutes' time, I think we can end the consideration of the bill very quickly. Let me inquire whether the Secretary of the Interior has approved this measure.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I cannot answer that question. The Secretary of the Interior acts through the Office of Indian Affairs. The Office of Indian Affairs is located in Chicago, and it is very difficult to get reports from Chicago on these bills.

Mr. DANAHER. Very well; I will offer no further objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment to section 2, as amended.

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

GLACIER NATIONAL PARK FISH HATCHERY

The bill (S. 1645) relating to the administration of the Glacier National Park Fish Hatchery, at Creston, Mont., and for other purposes, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the property at Creston, Mont., acquired by the United States for the establishment of a fish hatchery for restocking the waters of Glacier National Park and administered as a part of the park pursuant to the act of July 31, 1939 (53 Stat. 1142), together with the improvements and equipment utilized in connection with the hatchery property, is hereby eliminated from the park.

The functions of the National Park Service with regard to the administration of the aforesaid properties for the benefit of the park are hereby transferred to and shall be exercised by the Fish and Wildlife Service for the same purposes: *Provided, however*, That such fish propagated at the hatchery as may be in excess of the number necessary to restock and maintain an optimum fish population in the waters of the park at all times may be utilized for the restocking of other waters.

BRIDGE ACROSS MONONGAHELA RIVER, ALLEGHENY COUNTY, PA.

The bill (H. R. 4207) to authorize the construction and operation of a free highway bridge across the Monongahela River in the county of Allegheny, Pa., was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ADDITIONAL LANDS AND FLOWAGE EASEMENTS FOR PLEASANT HILL RESERVOIR, OHIO

The bill (H. R. 2752) to authorize the acquisition of additional lands and flowage easements for the Pleasant Hill Reservoir, Ohio, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. GUFFEY. Mr. President, let me inquire where the reservoir is located.

Mr. BURTON. It is in connection with the Muskingum River project.

Mr. GUFFEY. Has it any relation to the Youngstown Ship Canal?

Mr. BURTON. It has no relation to it whatever.

Mr. GUFFEY. Very well.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

PENALTIES AND EXPENSES INCIDENT TO BRINGING ALIENS INTO THE UNITED STATES

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 963) relating to the imposition of

certain penalties and the payment of detention expenses incident to the bringing of certain aliens into the United States, which had been reported from the Committee on Immigration, with an amendment, on page 1, line 3, to strike out all after the enacting clause, and insert:

That section 15 of the Immigration Act of February 5, 1917 (39 Stat. 885; 8 U. S. C. 151), is hereby amended by changing the period after the word "hereof," as it appears in the next to the last sentence of the said section, to a colon, and adding the following: *"Provided further*, That in cases of aliens who arrive in possession of unexpired visas issued by United States consuls within 60 days of the aliens' foreign embarkation, detention expenses and expenses incident to detention shall not be assessed against the vessel if the inadmissibility of the aliens could not have been ascertained by the exercise of reasonable diligence at the time the visas were issued and the sole cause of exclusion is one arising under section 13 of the Immigration Act of 1924 (43 Stat. 161–162; 50 Stat. 165; 46 Stat. 581; 8 U. S. C. 213 (a)–213 (f)."

SEC. 2. Section 18 of the Immigration Act of February 5, 1917, as amended (39 Stat. 887–889; 45 Stat. 1551; 8 U. S. C. 154), is amended by changing the period after the last word in the second sentence thereof to a comma and adding the following: "except that detention expenses and expenses incident to detention, shall not be assessed against the owner or owners of the vessels on which they respectively came when the aliens are in possession of unexpired visas issued by United States consuls within 60 days of the aliens' foreign embarkation if the inadmissibility of the aliens could not have been ascertained by the exercise of reasonable diligence at the time the visas were issued and the sole cause of exclusion is one arising under section 13 of the Immigration Act of 1924 (43 Stat. 161–162; 50 Stat. 165; 46 Stat. 581; 8 U. S. C. 213 (a)–213 (f)."

After the word "land" as it appears in the third sentence of this section, which reads: "or to fail to pay the cost of their maintenance while on land", add the following: "as required by this section or section 15 of this act."

SEC. 3. Subsection (b) of section 16 of the Immigration Act of 1924 (43 Stat. 163; 8 U. S. C. 216 (b)), is hereby amended by substituting a colon for the period after the word "assessed" and inserting the following: *"Provided*, That no fine nor refund, as provided for in this subsection, nor any expense incident to detention in connection with an application for admission to the United States, shall be assessed or required for bringing into the United States any alien, if such alien holds an unexpired visa issued by a United States consul within 60 days of the alien's foreign embarkation if the inadmissibility of the alien could not have been ascertained by the exercise of reasonable diligence at the time the visa was issued."

SEC. 4. Subsection (a) of section 20 of the Immigration Act of 1924 (43 Stat. 164; 8 U. S. C. 167 (a)), is amended by adding at the end thereof the following: "The Attorney General may, upon application in writing therefor, mitigate such penalty to not less than $200 for each seaman in respect of whom such failure occurs, upon such terms as the Attorney General in his discretion shall think proper. This section, as amended, shall apply to all penalties arising subsequent to June 5, 1940."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

XC——508

AMENDMENT OF WAR OVERTIME PAY ACT OF 1943

The bill (H. R. 4114) to amend section 3 (b) of Public, 49, Seventy-eighth Congress, first session (War Overtime Pay Act of 1943) was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

PAY OF RETIRED NAVAL OFFICERS SERVING AS REAR ADMIRALS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2053) relating to the pay of officers of the retired list of the Navy serving on active duty in the rank of rear admiral, which had been reported from the Committee on Naval Affairs, with an amendment, on page 1, line 2, to strike out all after the enacting clause, and insert:

That each officer who, while on the retired list of the Regular Navy or Regular Coast Guard, has performed or shall perform active naval service beyond the continental limits of the United States in time of war or national emergency in the rank of rear admiral, shall be paired with the line officer of the active list of the Regular Navy or of the Regular Coast Guard, as the case may be, of the rank of rear admiral (other than an officer with the rank as rear admiral of the upper half solely by virtue of the duty to which he is assigned) whose length of service as rear admiral most nearly equals such officer's total length of active service as rear admiral, both prior and subsequent to retirement, and for purposes of pay and allowances such retired officer shall be deemed a rear admiral of the upper half from the date the officer with whom he is paired became or shall become a rear admiral of the upper half.

SEC. 2. When not employed on active duty, the retired pay of any officer deemed a rear admiral of the upper half pursuant to section 1 of this act shall equal 75 percent of the active-duty pay of a rear admiral of the upper half.

SEC. 3. No officer shall be entitled by reason of this act to any increase in pay or allowances or retired pay prior to the date of approval of this act.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ISSUANCE OF LAND PATENT TO CHARLES F. WHITE

The bill (S. 1925) to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Interior to issue to Charles F. White a patent in fee to certain land was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to issue to Charles F. White, Crow allottee No. 1444, a patent in fee to lots 5, 6, 7, 8, south half of section 9; lots 5, 6, north half of the north half of the southwest quarter of section 10, township 1 south, range 38 east, Montana principal meridian, Big Horn County, Mont., containing four hundred and twelve and thirty-seven one-hundredths acres.

AUTHORIZATION OF ISSUANCE OF PATENT IN FEE TO RICHARD PICKETT

The bill (S. 2026) authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to Richard Pickett was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized and directed to issue to Richard Pickett, a patent in fee to the following-described lands allotted to him on the Crow Indian Reservation, Mont.: The east half of section 11, the east half of the northwest quarter and the west half of the northeast quarter of section 14, township 2 south, range 30 east, and the west half of the northeast quarter and the north half of the southeast quarter of section 28, township 2 south, range 32 east, Montana principal meridian.

JOHN W. PARISH, TRUSTEE

The bill (S. 578) granting jurisdiction to the Court of Claims to reopen and readjudicate the eminent-domain case of John W. Parish, trustee (John H. Bexten, substituted), and revise its judgment heretofore entered therein was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Court of Claims of the United States be, and it is hereby, vested with jurisdiction and directed to reopen and readjudicate the following eminent-domain case on its docket, heretofore disposed of by said court, to wit: John W. Parish, trustee (John H. Bexten, substituted), against the United States (No. 34450); and to ascertain and determine from the special findings of fact and judgment as therein made and recorded by said court and in such other manner as the court may determine, and with due regard to the requirements of the act applicable thereto under which such properties were taken, and the fifth amendment to the Constitution of the United States, due regard being given to the decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States in the cases of *United States* v. *Rogers*, and *United States* v. *Highsmith*, decided February 28, 1921 (255 U. S. 163 and 170), and other like cases, the amount of just compensation by way of interest, if any, alleged to have been due and owing by the United States to the plaintiff therein, but not paid on the payment to him of said judgment on February 20, 1923, for his property situate at Kansas City, Mo., and taken for public use by the United States on December 28, 1917, by authority of the act of Congress approved March 4, 1917 (39 Stat. L. 1193).

SEC. 2. If said court in such determination from the record in said case shall find that said judgment failed to include interest at a proper rate, as a matter of law, as an element or part of just compensation then due said party plaintiff for his said property taken for public use by the United States, then it shall have power and jurisdiction to revise its judgment and adjudge to said party plaintiff and against the United States such additional sum of money as may be determined by the court under section 1 of this act, with interest thereon at the proper rate, as shall now constitute the balance of just compensation when paid for the property so taken, irrespective of any existing statute of limitation, or any other law to the contrary notwithstanding, except that either party litigant shall have the right to petition the Supreme Court of the United States for a writ of certiorari, as in other cases in the Court of Claims.

SEC. 3. The said court shall proceed in said cause upon motion filed therein by the party plaintiff, or his successor, if any, with the clerk of said court, if so filed within 4 months after the date of the approval of this act.

SEC. 4. Nothing hereinbefore appearing shall be deemed to state a policy of the Congress with respect to the merits of such claim or similar claims.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill granting jurisdiction to the Court of Claims to reopen, review, and readjudicate the case of John W. Parish, trustee (John H. Bexten, substituted), against the United States No. 34450."

MEMORIALIZING THE NAME OF HORACE WELLS

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 141) memorializing the name of Horace Wells was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Whereas for centuries a way to make the human body safely insensible to pain during surgical operations and related conditions of suffering had been a hopeful dream; and

Whereas that dream came true when, in Hartford, Conn., on December 11, 1844, Dr. Horace Wells, a member of the dental profession, having concluded that nitrous oxide gas breathed into the lungs would induce general harmless insensibility to pain, voluntarily tested this belief by inhaling in the presence of colleagues enough of that gas to cause temporary unconsciousness, and by submitting to a dental extraction while under its effects; and

Whereas in the spirit of exalted public service, Dr. Wells promptly thereafter gave to patients in his private practice the benefits of his method of inducing general anesthesia and also made freely and widely known this simple yet extraordinary means of pain prevention, thereby favoring universal extension of its beneficence and also facilitating improvement of its technique by numerous further tests, thus becoming one of the world's greatest benefactors; and

Whereas the centenary of the first steps in the development of present-day methods of anesthesia, by the man who not only had the distinction to conceive a successful fundamental procedure but also the courage and unselfishness first to subject himself to all of its possible dangers, will soon be celebrated to express the abiding gratitude of mankind for the priceless blessing that Dr. Wells' endeavors initiated: Therefore be it

Resolved, etc., That in commemoration of the life and achievements of Dr. Horace Wells, the Congress hereby pays tribute to him and to his deeds of service to humanity.

EXEMPTION OF OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES OF NATIONAL WAR LABOR BOARD FROM PROVISIONS OF CRIMINAL CODE

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 4349) to exempt certain officers and employees of the National War Labor Board from certain provisions of the Criminal Code, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment, on page 1, line 3, to strike out all after the enacting clause, and insert:

That nothing contained in sections 109 and 113 of the Criminal Code (U. S. C., title 18, secs. 198 and 203) shall be deemed to apply to any person heretofore or hereafter appointed to the National War Labor Board or any of its agencies under the authority of the War Labor Disputes Act, any Executive order or regulation issued under the provisions of the act of October 2, 1942 (56 Stat. 765), or Executive Order No. 9017, dated January 12, 1942, as amended from time to time, because of intermittent service as a member of the National War Labor Board or of a regional board, industry commission, tripartite panel or similar agency of the National War Labor Board, or as a hearing officer or arbitrator of such Board, if such person is serving or has served in such capacity without compensation, or with compensation on a per diem when actually employed basis for not in excess of 90 days a year: *Provided, however*, That the provisions of this act shall not apply to any representation before the National War Labor Board or any of its said agencies while such person is an officer or employee of the National War Labor Board or for 90 days thereafter.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, I ask that that bill go to the foot of the calendar.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

BILLS PASSED OVER

The bill (H. R. 4625) to extend the existence of the Alaskan International Highway Commission for an additional 4 years was announced as next in order.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the bill? Is it intended to make the Commission a permanent matter?

Mr. TUNNELL. The bill extends the time from 6 years to 10 years—a 4-year extension.

Mr. McKELLAR. I think the bill should go over until we can look into it. We cannot make the keeping up of this highway a permanent matter.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection being heard, the bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 2048) to prohibit discrimination in employment because of race, creed, color, national origin, or ancestry was announced as next in order.

Mr. CONNALLY. Let the bill go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

AMENDMENT OF COAST GUARD AUXILIARY AND RESERVE ACT OF 1941, AS AMENDED

The bill (H. R. 5255) to amend the Coast Guard Auxiliary and Reserve Act of 1941, as amended, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

REGULATION OF INSURANCE BUSINESS

The bill (H. R. 3270) to affirm the intent of the Congress that the regulation of the business of insurance remain within the control of the several States and that the acts of July 2, 1890, and October 15, 1914, as amended, be not applicable to that business was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. BARKLEY subsequently said: Mr. President, at the time when House bill 3270 was reached on the calendar, I was otherwise engaged. I think the bill ought not to be passed, under the conditions, during the call of the calendar. I wish to ask that it go over, and I now ask that the vote by which the bill was passed be reconsidered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Kentucky that the vote by which House bill 3270 was passed be reconsidered?

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I, too, desire to have the vote by which the bill was passed reconsidered.

Mr. BARKLEY. Let me say that at the time when the bill was reached on the calendar, my attention was distracted by another matter. The bill should not be passed on the call of the calendar. If the vote by which it was passed is reconsidered, I shall ask that the bill be passed over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the vote by which the bill was passed is reconsidered, and, without objection, the bill will be passed over.

FRANK HENDERSON AND FRANCES NELL HENDERSON

The bill (H. R. 1040) for the relief of Frank Henderson and Frances Nell Henderson, his wife, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

FRANK J. RECELY AND MARY T. RECELY

The bill (H. R. 1042) for the relief of Frank J. Recely and Mary T. Recely was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

CHARLES FRED SMITH

The bill (H. R. 1886) for the relief of Charles Fred Smith was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

CARL W. BUCEY

The bill (H. R. 1915) for the relief of Carl W. Bucey was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

WINSTON-SALEM SOUTHBOUND RAILWAY CO.

The bill (H. R. 2014) for the relief of the Winston-Salem Southbound Railway Co. was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ROBERTA RAMSEY

The bill (H. R. 2236) for the relief of Roberta Ramsey was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ETHEL PHILLIPS AND MARY HURLEY

The bill (H. R. 2315) for the relief of Ethel Phillips and Mary Hurley was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

FRANK A. McMENAMIN

The bill (H. R. 2384) for the relief of Frank A. McMenamin was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

JAMES WILSON

The bill (H. R. 2473) for the relief of James Wilson was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MR. AND MRS. D. F. STILL

The bill (H. R. 2873) for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. D. F. Still was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

GEORGE E. O'LOUGHLIN

The bill (H. R. 3101) for the relief of George E. O'Loughlin was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MRS. EMILY REILY

The bill (H. R. 3549) for the relief of Mrs. Emily Reily was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

J. RALPH DATESMAN

The bill (H. R. 3813) for the relief of J. Ralph Datesman was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

CONRAD H. CLARK AND ROCCO CELLETTE

The bill (H. R. 933) for the relief of Conrad H. Clark was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "An act for the relief of Conrad H. Clark and Rocco Cellette."

ROBERT WILL STARKS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 2874) for the relief of Robert Will Starks, which had been reported from the Committee on Claims, with an amendment, on page 1, in line 6, after the words "sum of", to strike out "$5,000" and insert "$1,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

CLAIM OF J. R. DIXON

The bill (H. R. 2624) to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of J. R. Dixon was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MR. AND MRS. CICERO B. HUNT

The bill (H. R. 3152) for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Cicero B. Hunt was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

CLARA E. CLARK

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 3000) for the relief of Clara E. Clark, which had been reported from the Committee on Claims, with an amendment, on page 1, line 5, after the words "sum of", to strike out "$3,000" and insert "$2,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

LEGAL GUARDIAN OF BILLIE STOOKSBERRY AND LON L. STOOKSBERRY

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 3535) for the relief of the legal guardian of Billie Stooksberry, a minor, and Lon L. Stooksberry, which had been reported from the Committee on Claims with an amendment, on page 1, line 5, after the words "sum of", to strike out "$3,500" and insert "$2,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

MICHAEL EATMAN, JR., AND MRS. MICHAEL EATMAN, JR.

The bill (H. R. 2919) for the relief of Michael Eatman, Jr., and Mrs. Michael Eatman, Jr., was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

CYRIL DOERNER

The bill (H. R. 1774) for the relief of Cyril Doerner was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

JOHN DUNCAN McDONALD

The bill (H. R. 4712) for the relief of John Duncan McDonald was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ROBERT FUTTERMAN

The bill (H. R. 3595) for the relief of Robert Futterman was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

FRANK GAY

The bill (H. R. 3898) for the relief of Frank Gay was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

JOHN J. BEATON

The bill (H. R. 2845) for the relief of John J. Beaton was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

LT. (T) P. J. VOORHIES

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2031) for the relief of Lt. (T) P. J. Voorhies, which had been reported from the Committee on Claims with an amendment, on page 1, line 5, after the words "sum of", to strike out "$3,743.05" and insert "$3,243.05", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $3,243.05 to Lt. (T) P. J. Voorhies, United States Coast Guard Reserve, of Lafayette, La., as agent for Lafayette Flotilla and Iberia Flotilla, United States Coast Guard Auxiliary, in full settlement of all claims against the United States as reimbursement for certain building facilities used in connection with the Louisiana Gulf Coast Guard Auxiliary headquarters and for material and passenger transportation expenditures during the years 1942 and 1943: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

BENEFITS TO MERCHANT SEAMEN

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 4163) to amend section 2 of Public Law 17, Seventy-eighth Congress, relating to functions of the War Shipping Administration, and for other purposes which had been reported from the Committee on Commerce with amendments.

The first amendment was, on page 2, line 15, after the word "make", to strike out "adequate."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on the same line after the word "payments", to insert "in accordance with rate schedules provided by the United States Employees' Compensation Act."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in the same page, line 25, after the word "exists", to insert "such payments to commence if and when insurance benefits provided by the War Shipping Administration for such person shall have been exhausted."

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

EXEMPTION OF OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES OF NATIONAL WAR LABOR BOARD FROM PROVISIONS OF CRIMINAL CODE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The call of the calendar having been completed, House bill 4349, which was amended and ordered to be placed at the foot of the calendar, will now be taken up, and the clerk will read the bill by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (H. R. 4349) to exempt certain officers and employees of the National War Labor Board from certain provisions of the Criminal Code.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, earlier in the day the reading clerk read the committee amendment. I invite attention to page 3, line 6, and move to strike out the words "ninety days thereafter" and insert "a period of one year after the cessation of the service of such person: *And provided further*, That the immunity herein created shall not apply as to any matter in which such person shall have been employed."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the vote by which the committee amendment was agreed to is reconsidered. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DANAHER] to the committee amendment.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, the purpose of the amendment will become clear if we recall that the bill would exempt certain so-called intermittent employees of the National War Labor Board, or of any of its regional boards or tripartite panels, from the prohibitions contained in sections 109 and 113 of the Criminal Code. The proviso at the end of the bill on page 3 states that the provisions of this act shall not apply to any representation before the National War Labor Board by any such person, nor to the appearance by any such person before any of the agencies of the Board while such person is an officer or an employee of the National War Labor Board. Thousands of cases are pending before the Board. I recognize the value of the intermittent service of those employees in whose behalf the immunity is being created; I realize that the bill is necessary, and I believe it should be passed; but I assert that no employee should be permitted to take before the War Labor Board a case in connection with which he has already rendered service, or a matter on which his employment has already been directed, when perhaps because of his confidential relationship he therefore would be in a position unduly

and improperly, perhaps, but not conscientiously, to represent the interests of the particular client involved. I therefore say that if we limit the immunity to a period of one year from the service of any such person, and also exclude him from participating in any way in a matter in which he has been engaged, we will strike at what might be an unethical situation.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, the situation presented by this bill is purely a parliamentary one. It happens that the Senate has already passed a bill identical in terms with the bill which is now before us. That bill went to the House of Representatives on about the same day the House of Representatives passed a bill dealing with the same subject. What happened was that the bill from the House came to the Senate, and the Senate bill went to the House. Both bodies having acted upon the matter, there seemed to be no chance of obtaining legislation except through the method which I myself employed, namely, to have our committee report the House bill after first striking out the House language and inserting the bill which the Senate had already passed.

Mr. President, I believe that perhaps the objections which the Senator from Connecticut has raised are important, but not sufficiently important to cause the legislation to be killed at this time. I only hope, in obtaining legislation, to adopt the procedure of passing the House bill with the Senate amendment. I am told that the House will agree to the amendment. Merely a parliamentary situation is involved. If the Senator persists in his objection, there will be no legislation on this matter at the present time.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, that would not follow at all. I am willing to cooperate in every respect. The bill could be messaged over to the House for action and taken up after the recess. The Senator is eminently correct in suggesting that the amendment which I have offered is based upon merit. There is no reason why an individual who has been employed by the War Labor Board, and has severed his connections, should be permitted within 90 days thereafter to appear before the Board in a representative capacity.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I am thinking only of the parliamentary situation.

Mr. DANAHER. The parliamentary situation does not justify us in passing a bad bill.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I think perhaps it would be well for the Senate to agree to the amendment of the Senator from Connecticut, let it go to the House, and allow the House to do what it wishes with it.

Mr. DANAHER. That would be satisfactory to me. That is why I offered the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Connecticut to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

DEVELOPMENT OF THE MISSOURI RIVER BASIN

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McCLELLAN in the chair) laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read by the Chief Clerk:

To the Congress of the United States:

I enclose a copy of a resolution adopted by all but one of the Missouri River States, represented in a recent meeting of their governors and the members of the Missouri River States Committee. In general, the resolution asks for executive and legislative action toward procuring a single, coordinated plan for the development of the Missouri River Basin "for the greatest benefit of its citizens both present and future, and for the greatest benefit to the United States."

As the Congress knows, I have for many years advocated the establishment of separate authorities to deal with the development of certain river basins where several States were involved. The general functions and purposes of the Tennessee Valley Authority might well serve as a pattern for similar developments of other river basins. The Tennessee Valley Authority was charged by the Congress with the development of practically all of the factors which are important in establishing better living standards and a better life for the people throughout that great watershed.

The benefits which have resulted in the Tennessee River Valley include flood prevention, irrigation, increased electric power for farms and shops and homes and industries, better transportation on land and water, reforestation and conservation of natural resources, the encouragement of small businesses, and the growth and expansion of new businesses, development and widespread use of fertilizers and improved agricultural methods, better educational and recreational facilities—and many kindred improvements which go to make for increased security and greater human happiness.

The Congress has at all times retained the final authority over the Tennessee Valley Authority, for the Authority comes before the Congress each year to obtain appropriations to continue its work and carry out its plans.

I have heretofore suggested the creation of a similar authority for the development of the Arkansas River watershed from the Mississippi all the way west to its source in Colorado.

I have also suggested the creation of an authority to render a similar service in the Columbia River watershed, including the States of Washington, Oregon, Idaho, and Montana.

I now make a similar recommendation for the Missouri River Basin.

The resolution very properly asks that the legislation dealing with matters relating to the waters of the Missouri River Basin recognize that it is dealing with one river and one problem; and points out the necessity of a comprehensive development of the Missouri River, indicating that there can be no piecemeal legislative program. The resolution asks that "the Congress should recognize now the problem in its entirety as it affects the people of the Missouri Basin, and their economic destiny and that of the United States."

I am in hearty accord with these principles. I hope that the Congress will give careful and early consideration to the creation of this Federal authority to consider the problem in its entirety, remembering always that any appropriations to carry out any plan are and will be within the complete control of the Congress, and that the interest of each of the States in the basin will, of course, be given full consideration. I am sure that none of the States in the Tennessee River Basin have lost any of their rights because of the creation of the Authority in that valley.

May I also ask that renewed consideration be given to a study of the Arkansas and Columbia River Basins? The fact has been established that such legislation can do much to promote the welfare of the great mass of citizens who live there—as well as their fellow citizens throughout the United States.

I need hardly point out to the Congress, in addition, how helpful this legislation will be in the creation of employment and in the stimulation of industry, business, and agriculture throughout the areas involved, in the days which will follow the end of the war.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *September 21, 1944.*

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair would like to be informed as to the proper reference of the message, whether it should be referred to the Committee on Commerce or the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, it seems to me, in view of the fact that there is involved a compact among the States for the improvement and development of rivers, probably the Commerce Committee would be the appropriate reference.

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, in that connection may I call attention to the fact that the able Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] and I, acting independently, have already introduced bills for the creation of a Missouri Valley Authority. These bills have been referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and are now awaiting a report from the Department. While the President's message suggests rather broader action than the one covering the one valley, it would seem to me, in view of the fact that these measures have already been introduced and are already pending before the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, that it would be a very appropriate reference to have the message referred to that committee.

Mr. BARKLEY. Personally I have no choice as between committees. It only illustrates the vicious practice which has grown up in recent years in the Senate of having bills referred to committees to which their authors desire them referred. That frequently happens, and I can understand why it is done, especially if the authors of the proposed legislation are members of the particular committee. Nevertheless, there ought to be a well-defined rule in the Senate as to the jurisdiction of committees. Inasmuch as the Committee on Commerce has jurisdiction of the navigation of rivers, the improvement of rivers, flood control, and all kindred subjects, it seems to me that that is the committee to which the message should be referred. I have no dogmatic view about it, but I think we ought to settle the question.

Mr. GILLETTE. I can understand very well that there would be every logic for referring the message to the Committee on Commerce, but the action taken by the Senate originally in referring the bills to which I have called attention was not taken at the request of the Senator from Iowa, who was not present, and I do not believe it was taken at the request of the Senator from Montana. But, in view of the fact that the reference was made by action of the Senate and legislation is pending, I made the suggestion as to reference to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will entertain a motion for the proper reference of the message. If no such motion is offered, then the Chair will refer the message, without objection, to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

ADJUSTMENT OF CERTAIN LOANS UNDER FARM CREDIT ADMINISTRATION

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Mr. President, at the beginning of the call of the calendar I asked unanimous consent for the consideration of Calendar 1087, Senate bill 1688. At the suggestion of the distinguished majority leader I agreed to let the bill go to the foot of the calendar. I should like to have that bill considered now, and I renew my request for its consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. GUFFEY. I object.

Mr. BARKLEY. I hope the Senator from Pennsylvania will not object. It was a matter that should have been disposed of at the time, but I asked that it go to the foot of the calendar.

Mr. GUFFEY. Very well, I withdraw the objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is withdrawn. Without objection, the bill will be considered.

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1688) to authorize the Governor of the Farm Credit Administration and the Secretary of Agriculture to compromise, adjust, or cancel certain indebtedness, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That the Secretary of Agriculture, hereinafter referred to as the Secretary, is hereby authorized and directed to compromise, adjust, or cancel indebtedness arising from loans and payments made or credit extended to farmers under the provisions of the several acts of Congress or programs enumerated in section 2: *Provided*, That the Secretary finds, after such investigation as he deems sufficient to establish the facts, that (1) said indebtedness has been due and payable for 5 years or more; (2) the debtor is unable to pay said indebtedness in full and has no reasonable prospect of being able to do so; (3) the debtor has acted in good faith in an effort to meet his obligation; and (4) the principal amount of said indebtedness is not in excess of $1,000. The Secretary is hereby further authorized at his discretion to cancel and discharge indebtedness arising under said acts of Congress or programs when the amount of said indebtedness is less than $10, or the debtor is deceased and there is no reasonable prospect of recovering from his estate, or his whereabouts has remained unknown for 2 years and there is no reasonable prospect of obtaining collection, or he has been discharged of the indebtedness in any proceeding under the act entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States." The compromises, adjustments, or cancelations authorized by this section shall be effected through such agencies, upon such terms and conditions, and subject to such regulations, as the Secretary may prescribe, and the Secretary may delegate the exercise of any such powers and functions to such officers or employees of the Department of Agriculture as he may designate.

SEC. 2. The provisions of this act shall apply to any indebtedness of farmers arising from loans or payments made or credit extended to them under any of the following acts or programs: (a) July 1, 1918 (40 Stat. 635); March 3, 1921 (41 Stat. 1347); March 20, 1922 (42 Stat. 467); April 26, 1924 (43 Stat. 110); February 25, 1927 (44 Stat. 1245); February 28, 1927 (44 Stat., part II, 1251); February 25, 1929 (45 Stat. 1306), as amended May 17, 1929 (46 Stat. 3); March 3, 1930 (46 Stat. 78–79), as amended April 24, 1930 (46 Stat. 254); December 20, 1930 (46 Stat. 1032), as amended February 14, 1931 (46 Stat. 1160); February 23, 1931 (46 Stat. 1276); January 22, 1932 (47 Stat. 5); March 3, 1932 (47 Stat. 60); February 4, 1933 (47 Stat. 795); February 23, 1934 (48 Stat. 354); June 19, 1934 (48 Stat. 1056); February 20, 1935 (49 Stat. 28); March 21, 1935 (49 Stat. 50); April 8, 1935 (49 Stat. 115); (Executive Order No. 7305); January 29, 1937 (50 Stat. 5); and February 4, 1938 (52 Stat. 27); (b) Agricultural Adjustment Act (of 1933); Bankhead Cotton Act of April 21, 1934, on account of the several cotton tax-exemption certificate pools; Jones-Connally Cattle Act of April 7, 1934; Emergency Appropriation Act, fiscal year 1935, approved June 19, 1934; Kerr Tobacco Act of June 28, 1934, and Public Resolution No. 76, approved March 14, 1936; section 32 of the act of August 24, 1935, and related legislation; Supplemental Appropriation Act, fiscal year 1936; sections 7 to 17 of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act; Sugar Act of 1937; sections 303 and 381 (a) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 and related or subsequent legislation authorizing parity or price adjustment payments; title IV and title V of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 and related legislation; any amendment to any of the foregoing acts heretofore or hereafter enacted; and any other act of Congress heretofore enacted authorizing payments to farmers under programs administered through the Agricultural Adjustment Agency; (c) loans made by or through the Resettlement Administration or the Farm Security Administration out of funds appropriated or made available by or pursuant to the following acts: April 8, 1935 (49 Stat. 115); June 22, 1936 (49 Stat. 1608); February 9, 1937 (50 Stat. 8); June 29, 1937 (50 Stat. 352); the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, July 22, 1937 (50 Stat. 522 et seq.); the Water Facilities Act of August 28, 1937 (50 Stat. 869 et seq.); March 2, 1938 (52 Stat. 83, Public Res. No. 80); June 21, 1938 (52 Stat. 809); June 30, 1939 (53 Stat. 927); June 26, 1940 (Public Res. No. 88); flood-restoration loans, Second Deficiency Appropriation Act, 1943 (57 Stat. 537, 542); and subsequent legislation appropriating or making available funds for such loans; commodity loan, purchase, sale, and other programs of the Commodity Credit Corporation; and crop-insurance programs formulated pursuant to title V of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 (the Federal Crop Insurance Act), and any amendment or supplement thereto heretofore or hereafter enacted. This act shall also apply to any indebtedness of farmers evidenced by notes or accounts receivable, title to which has been acquired in the liquidation of loans to cooperative associations made under the provisions of the act of June 15, 1929 (46 Stat. 11).

SEC. 3. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such amount as may be necessary to enable the Secretary to carry out the provisions of this act, and the current and subsequent appropriations to enable the Secretary to administer the respective acts of Congress or programs to which the aforesaid payments or loans or extensions of credit relate shall also be available for the administrative expenses of carrying out this act.

SEC. 4. (a) Whoever makes any material representation, knowing it to be false, for the purpose of influencing in any way the action of the Secretary, or of any person acting under his authority, in connection with any compromise, adjustment, or cancelation of indebtedness provided for herein, shall, upon conviction thereof, be punished by a fine of not more than $1,000 or by imprisonment for not more than 1 year, or both.

(b) No officer or employee of the United States, and no person to whom the Secretary may delegate any power or function under this act, shall accept any fee, commission, gift, or other consideration, directly or indirectly, for or in connection with any transaction or business related to the compromise, adjustment, or cancelation of indebtedness hereunder. Any person violating the foregoing provision shall, upon conviction thereof, be punished by a fine of not more than $1,000 or by imprisonment for not more than 1 year, or both.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, on page 8, line 20, I move to strike out the words "or hereafter enacted."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Connecticut to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, on page 10, after line 23, I move an amendment to read as follows:

SEC. 5. A complete report to Congress shall be submitted at intervals of 6 months of all settlements, cancelations, or adjustments authorized and completed pursuant to this act.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. There is no objection to the amendment on the part of the committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Connecticut to the amendment reported by the committee.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to compromise, adjust, or cancel certain indebtedness, and for other purposes."

DISCHARGE OF NAVAL PERSONNEL

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, in view of the widespread interest in the policy which has been announced by the Navy with reference to the severance of personnel from the service, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a letter addressed to the distinguished chairman of the Naval Affairs Committee by the Bureau of Personnel, Navy Department, dealing with that subject.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NAVY DEPARTMENT,
BUREAU OF NAVAL PERSONNEL,
Washington, D. C., September 19, 1944.

Hon. DAVID I. WALSH,
Chairman, Committee on Naval Affairs,
United States Senate.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Reference is made to this Bureau's letters of August 28 and September 5, 1944, concerning provisions regulating the discharge of certain personnel of the naval service and stating that you would be advised of any future action in this matter.

Accordingly you are advised that the Bureau of Naval Personnel on September 15 issued instructions revising and clarifying previous provisions governing voluntary severance. This action anticipates future curtailment in certain specialized naval activities and projects which are being progressively reduced or terminated.

The Navy has a small surplus of specialist personnel with limited naval qualifications and a shortage of personnel qualified for combat. While the Navy's personnel strength is not expected to be reached until June 30, 1945, there are a limited number of specialist Reserve officers serving in specialized billets and a limited number of enlisted men of the Naval Reserve whose services can be spared upon the termination of their present assignments.

Current directives provide that Reserve officers who are not physically qualified for other duty, or who are not qualified for other duty without considerable training, and whose services can be spared, may request transfer to inactive duty or submit resignations from the service.

While any Reserve officer who is eligible by these standards may apply for release, the granting of release, with few exceptions, is limited to those over the draft age. Reserve officers within the draft age who can be spared may apply for release but they are required to submit their resignations and upon release are advised to report immediately to their local selective-service boards. For the most part, release of Reserve officers within the draft age is limited to a few officers who, although unable to meet all physical or professional requirements, were commissioned to perform special duties which have been completed.

Enlisted personnel of the Naval Reserve who are 42 years of age and over and whose services can be spared may apply through their commanding officers for discharge. If release is authorized after final review by the Bureau of Naval Personnel, discharge papers certify that severance from the service is under honorable conditions.

How many personnel will become eligible for release cannot be accurately estimated although it is expected that, for the present, the number will be small, will be governed largely by the rate of contraction of miscellaneous activities no longer necessary, and will include, for the most part, personnel in middle age not qualified for duty afloat.

The paramount consideration in each case is the needs of the service. A large number of older Reserve officers have only limited naval qualifications and training and are not adaptable to sea duty involving technical responsibilities, while enlisted men, for the most part, perform the same duties afloat or ashore and many older enlisted men therefore may be detailed to new duty without additional training. In acting on applications for release the test is whether the applicant can be spared.

In the case of both officers and men applications are considered only when initiated by the personnel concerned. Personnel awaiting trial by court martial, undergoing punishment as a result of court martial, or under treatment in hospitals are not eligible to apply for discharge.

It is clearly not the intention of the Navy at this time to release any officer or man trained and physically qualified for sea duty or any other personnel whose services are essential. The need for young officers and men to man the great number of new ships going into commission in the next year is a No. 1 item on the list of critical Navy requirements. Providing an opportunity for certain older personnel to apply for release carries with it no implication that the end of the Navy's job in this war is in sight nor that the defeat of Germany will measurably affect the number of personnel made eligible for release. Every officer and man who can be effectively used anywhere in the Naval Establishment will be retained.

Sincerely yours,

L. E. DENFELD,
Acting Chief of Naval Personnel.

PROMOTION OF RETIRED ARMY OFFICERS CALLED TO ACTIVE SERVICE

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to return to Calendar No. 936, Senate bill 1100, which was previously passed over. It happens that at the time it was reached on the calendar no Senator was present to explain the bill. If there is objection to the request I shall not proceed with it, but it is a very simple bill and affects only retired officers who were called back to active service. The bill provides that such officers be allowed the time they have served in active service in computing their promotion. It would not increase their pay in any way, but since other officers receive similar consideration it is only fair that retired officers who are returned to active service should have that privilege.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, in further explanation of the bill let me say that, as a matter of fact, under this bill officers on the retired list of the Regular Army who are recalled to active duty would have rights as to permanent status, grade, and pay on the retired list similar to those provided by law for officers on the active list who may subsequently be retired.

The bill will give to a retired officer who performs or has performed periods of active duty the right to promotion on the retired list to a higher grade he would have reached had such duty been performed while he was on the active list.

Since the beginning of this war the War Department policy has been to retain on the active list all officers, except those whose retirement is mandatory by law, who are qualified to perform limited service. Prior to that time officers not fitted for general service were retired. Many officers of the latter category who had been retired during the months preceding the outbreak of war were forthwith ordered to active duty in their retired status, in many cases to perform the same duties they were performing immediately prior to retirement. Such officers are now performing duties similar to, and in many cases identical with, those being performed by limited-service officers who have been retained on the active list by virtue of above-mentioned policy.

The War Department recommends this bill. It would give a retired officer, who performs or has performed periods of active duty, the right to promotion on the retired list to a higher grade he would have reached had such duty been performed while he was on the active list.

The bill will be effective from August 27, 1940, the date upon which general authority to order retired officers to active duty was granted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is informed that the committee amendment has already been agreed to. The question, therefore, is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

THE PLACE OF JOHN FOSTER DULLES IN THE PRESIDENTIAL CAMPAIGN

Mr. GUFFEY. Mr. President, the two great political parties in America having expressed themselves as of one mind and one hope for a true peace created and enforced by a banded neighborhood of nations, our Secretary of State, Mr. Cordell Hull, has, with the concurrence of the President, and at the request of the Republican nominee for the Presidency, duly counseled together with the chosen representative of the Republican Party in this matter.

We consider it to be a matter of life-and-death concern to ourselves and the future citizenry of our Nation.

And in especial regard for the protection of our children and of later generations against the dread possibility of still another world conflict, we have considered it the duty of our own generation to hold the making of peace above the plans or influence of political rivalries.

Here, then, was an act of good faith.

On the part of the Secretary of State, this unprecedented admittance to high counsel of a private citizen bearing no other credential than the endorsement of a political aspirant to Federal office was a manifest and inspiring evidence of the desire to go about this vital task with nonpartisan detachment from any interest narrower than the interest of our whole people.

The Secretary of State and the President assumed a commensurate good faith on the part of the political opposition.

To Mr. Thomas E. Dewey and his personal representative in this matter, Mr. John Foster Dulles, they have attributed a complete political disinterest, and a complete freedom from the influence of any economic or financial interest.

That disinterest is, of course, prerequisite.

Without it, no man is qualified to advise or sit down with the spokesmen for the American people in a world peace program, for it is these very influences that destroy peace.

Mr. President, my purpose in addressing my colleagues at this stage of the preliminary but vital work at the peace table is to ask—in time—whether certain facts and statements that have since come to light may not indicate that the administration has placed a high trust where it is not deserved.

My purpose is to warn this House—in time—that in our search for peace we must not only keep the matter of our work at the peace table out of the reach of party politics, we must also preserve this crucial effort from hands that have been soiled at the table of the money changers.

In 1920, while the people trusted in their Government and reordered their lives to the ways of peace, politics murdered peace before their eyes.

In 1944, the people are forewarned of politics.

But what is going on behind their backs, Mr. President?

In the offices of Wall Street's bankers and lawyers, what is cooking?

Instead of a peace strangled by politics, are we going to have, this time, a peace crucified on a cross of gold?

We have long known that the Republican aspirant to the Presidency is being materially aided in his political campaign by the banking interests of Wall Street, and by those Wall Street bankers who call themselves lawyers.

And unless I am misinformed on our Nation's history, we have some rather sorry precedents for expecting any administration which is aided by those interests in coming into power to be responsive to the wishes of their financial benefactors once they have attained power.

We have expected this of Thomas E. Dewey and the national ticket on which he is running.

We would expect him to be responsive to the interests that are now backing him in such matters as an attack on the position gained by labor in the past 12 years, or in an undoing of the other social gains which recent reform legislation has afforded the people of this country, or in other matters distasteful to the privileged few.

This we would expect, if the favorite of Wall Street should prove to be the choice of the people.

But we have expected, too, that Mr. Dewey and his party would voluntarily make an exception of the life-and-death decisions that will have to do with the peace of the world.

We have thought of these decisions as too important—even to a candidate whose party leadership is to this day shot through with isolationism—too important to subordinate to any position of vantage that our large banks and aggregations of corporate capital may seek for themselves in the post-war world.

Are we being too sanguine? If so, Mr. President, now is the time for us to ascertain this—not after we have hung out our gold stars for more millions of young Americans who will have to be sent into World War No. 3.

Not being taken into the councils that are being held today in those towers of Wall Street, I am in no position to advise this House of what is going on behind the backs of the American people.

But there are certain things that I want to know, and that I believe my colleagues in this body should know.

We will find the qualifications of Mr. John Foster Dulles for the part that he has been conceded as representative of Mr. Dewey in these peace conversations, and as the spokesman for Mr. Dewey's party. We will find these qualifications listed in Who's Who or in other contemporary biographies.

But authorized biographers are as notorious for what they do not say as they are convenient for what they do say.

For my part, I want to know more about Mr. Dewey's hypothetical Secretary of State before he is allowed to proceed in the concession that our real Secretary of State, Cordell Hull, has made to him.

I want to know, and I think it is certainly the business of this House to know, more about the activities of this spokesman for the Republican Party as a partner in the Wall Street corporation law firm of Sullivan & Cromwell.

I want to know, and I want my colleagues to know, what part this man has taken in the foreign bond flotations and other ventures into international finance in which the firm of Sullivan & Cromwell has been instrumental.

I want to know how far this man went, and what he may have done, in abetting the international operations of American and foreign bankers for which the people of America have paid in both treasure and in blood.

And I want to know how extensive may be the personal interest of this man, as an individual and as a representative of Wall Street, in the kind of system of international monetary exchange that is to be approved and adopted by us after this war.

I want to know whether the kind of financial machinery this man and his associates want coincides with the kind of machinery that will be essential in the keeping of world peace.

And if the system of international exchange and control that he advocates is inimical to the foreign relations that make for permanent peace, then I want to know his reason for advocating it.

The more I learn of the attitudes and intentions in this respect of that community which is known as Wall Street, Mr. President, the more disturbed I become over the confidence and responsibility that has been placed in this man, in the man who sent him to Secretary Hull, and in the men who are backing the man who sent him to Secretary Hull.

There can be no honest and workable peace plan, of course, without an honest and workable set-up by which the nations of the world can do business with each other and maintain severally their financial integrity.

A system of international finance which is controlled by the private banking interests of Wall Street and their connections abroad is not that kind of a set-up.

We know this because under that kind of set-up our neighbor nations were not able to maintain their financial integrity. We know it because under the kind of set-up men who were willing and eager to subordinate the security of their own people and the world to their pursuit of personal gain have time and again endangered peace and have even imperiled the defenses of this country in the event of war.

No, if we are to have a people's peace we cannot have a pirate's paradise.

If we are to have adherence to the will of the people not to countenance aggression, we must have control by the people over the channels and well springs of aggression.

We must have a people's control, not a private bankers' control, over the flow of world finance.

It was for this reason that last July at Bretton Woods the representatives of 44 governments conferred and undertook to lay the foundations of an economic stability in the post-war days.

These conferences were conducted on a high technical plane, and the United States representatives included both Democratic and Republican members of the Banking and Currency Committees of both Houses of the National Congress.

At the conclusion of these deliberations my colleague the senior Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] expressed the hope that the preliminary work that had been done would be kept free from any partisan debate during this Presidential campaign.

The broad area of agreement that was there established among the liberty-loving nations of the world was of great significance.

The fact that these representatives could and did outline the base of economic and financial collaboration in the days of reconstruction that are ahead gave rise to a new hope that the nations of the world could and would work together to establish a permanent peace and banish war from the earth.

For my part I had intended, during the course of this political campaign, to refrain from discussing the accomplishments of the historic meetings at Bretton Woods.

I hope that even now there is no essential difference between the thinking of the rank and file memberships of the major parties upon the objectives of international monetary and economic stabilization.

I had envisioned a new day of bipartisan or nonpartisan collaboration in

which all could work together to achieve the great purposes of a new world order.

I still believe this to be possible.

There was, however, a development last week that impels me to speak out.

I would feel remiss in my duty to the people of this country if I did not raise a flag of warning that the supporters of Governor Dewey are even now beginning to undermine and may seek to destroy the very fundamentals upon which, in my judgment, the future of world peace rests.

Last Friday in Chicago Mr. Winthrop Aldrich, a distinguished New York banker and a financial supporter and adviser of Governor Dewey, came out flatly against the proposals developed at Bretton Woods.

He advocated a unilateral agreement with Great Britain and the United States which would exclude all other nations, large and small, from participation in the financial affairs of the post-war world.

This philosophy, advocated by the man who, it is reported, would become Secretary of the Treasury in the event Dewey were to become President, is simply a return to those conditions which cause wars.

Thus we have the paradox of Governor Dewey giving lip service to an international political organization which would seek to prevent wars while his principal financial adviser speaks out against the kind of economic measures which would remove the cause of wars.

It is my opinion that the spokesmen for Mr. Dewey reveal the Dewey approach much more definitely than do the candidate's own glittering generalities in his campaign speeches or in his clever and evasive parries at press conferences.

Mr. Aldrich, representing the point of view of the international bankers, is at least forthright.

He says that he is against the Bretton Woods proposals because he fears that they would lead to post-war inflation.

But this advice of the banking spokesman has a familiar ring. It is the same advice that was given to President Hoover in 1930—that the only way out of the depression was by stringent economies and a balancing of the Budget.

This banking group in 1937 was successful in persuading the Government to increase reserve requirements, sterilize gold, drastically curtail Government relief spending, and put the brakes on our developing prosperity to prevent the run-away inflation which the bankers saw just around the corner.

As the result of these repressive measures the Nation lost valuable time in making its recovery under the New Deal.

And when the disastrous results of their mistaken monetary policies were obvious, the Wall Street group had the effrontery to blame it all on the S. E. C.

When the President reversed the measures which this group advocated we again started on the road to recovery.

Mr. Aldrich offers as a substitute for the Bretton Woods proposals a return to the gold standard and Hoover economy.

This obviously would be Governor Dewey's program if, by chance, he were to become President.

Mr. Aldrich says:

> We must be prepared to reintroduce gold redemption. The dollar must be free from all foreign exchange controls.

This is the same advice, the same economic isolationism, that was given Mr. Hoover by the Wall Street bankers in 1930.

The terrible depression years, the subsequent recovery under the Roosevelt administration, and the Second World War have apparently left no imprint upon the minds of these private bankers who would return to power if Governor Dewey were elected.

The private bankers—Mr. Dewey's political mentors—are against Government regulation of international exchange or investment. They want private bankers to be in complete control as they were in 1914.

They refuse to recognize, and Mr. Dewey refuses to recognize, what the rest of the world has long realized—that you cannot separate international diplomacy from international money.

Governor Dewey pays lip service to an international organization to work for permanent peace while at the same time his prospective Secretary of the Treasury demands that the international monetary relations be left in the same hands that brought the world into a tailspin.

It is understandable that the private bankers want foreign exchange left free from Government regulation because that is one of the most lucrative departments of the big New York banks.

Of course, they want a return to the rigid gold standard, but they want it only as a substitute for Government control of credit, of currency, and of foreign exchange.

Either we have Government regulation of foreign exchange or we return to the horse-and-buggy system of settling international balances, in gold—the system that proved so disastrous during the Hoover administration.

We either develop a workable, cooperative plan among nations or we set the stage for another war.

Why this insistence by the large banking group that we reestablish the old gold standard system?

To those not engaged in finance it seems a very remote and technical problem. We have seen Germany, without any gold at all and declared bankrupt by financiers, build up the greatest armaments in the world.

We ourselves have locked all our gold in Fort Knox and forbidden our citizens to hold it or traffic with it as though we recognized the scriptural warning that it is the "root of all evil."

Then why, we may ask, this repeated effort to return to a system which proved so disastrous to this country and to the world during the Hoover administration?

Here is an answer which is necessarily a simplification of a complex problem.

The only substitute for the gold standard is Government control of domestic credit and foreign exchange.

The farther we depart from the gold-standard system the more we must rely upon Government control and the less power is left in the hands of private bankers.

That is apparently what Mr. Aldrich had in mind when he said last Friday that—

> Both England and the United States shun totalitarian tactics in international trade and both give full support to the principle of economic liberalism.

What this spokesman for Mr. Dewey was really asking was that we scrap the Bretton Woods proposals and abandon Government regulation of our money system and return it to the hands of the private bankers who led us into the orgy of speculation in the twenties and then were helpless to stem the disastrous depression of the early thirties.

This policy, which would return us to the days of Hoover, would be a dangerous and costly experiment with the welfare of our citizens and of the world.

Mr. Aldrich urges that we "balance the Federal Budget and refinance the floating debt." This, of course, would spell a drastic deflation and result in high interest rates.

In common with most private bankers, Mr. Aldrich wants money scarce and interest rates high. This is a kind of a monetary astigmatism which makes it impossible for most bankers to see that such a policy leads to depression, ultimately injuring the creditor as well as the debtor.

In striking contradiction to Dewey's demand that smaller nations be recognized in the world peace organization, his financial spokesman proposes as a substitute for the Bretton Woods plan the stabilization of the dollar-pound rate.

What would such a proposal mean?

It would leave the United States and Great Britain in control of the monetary systems of the world. Since this war will leave Great Britain heavily in debt to the rest of the world, the United States would be the dominant partner in that combination.

Going further—since Mr. Aldrich would abolish Government regulation of foreign exchange—this would mean that a small group of Wall Street banks would control the world monetary exchange. In my judgment, this would mean that the seeds of a third world war would be sown before the guns of this one are cold.

Of course, Mr. Aldrich does propose organizing an international institution where central bankers could meet regularly to discuss monetary and credit problems of mutual interest.

But this international institution is to have a capital of only $500,000,000, which is too small to have any real influence on world monetary affairs.

In fact, Mr. Aldrich, himself, says its influence would be exerted by persuasion—not by coercion. A kind of international banking club tucked away in some pleasant corner of Switzerland which would afford the gentlemen bankers an excuse to get away from home, at the expense of their depositors.

There is too much involved in the principles of economic and political collaboration not to raise this issue at this time. A war-torn world demands definite measures to insure against another holocaust. The conversations at Bretton Woods were an important step in that direction.

Either we return to the old days of international financial anarchy or the people of the nations of the world evolve a plan, not for the private benefit of private bankers, but for our mutual welfare.

Either Governor Dewey should repudiate this pronouncement of his financial mentor and benefactor, or the American people should be forewarned that he would return us to the conditions which breed wars and depression.

THE BRETTON WOODS CONFERENCE—J. WINTHROP ALDRICH AND JOHN FOSTER DULLES

Mr. VANDENBERG subsequently said: Mr. President, I very much regret that the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. GUFFEY] has left the floor. The Senator from Pennsylvania is always sententious and always partisan, though always interesting, in his belligerent observations. I wanted immediately to respond to his smudgy effort to smear Governor Dewey by attacking John Foster Dulles and J. Winthrop Aldrich, of New York.

Mr. President, I want to refer only briefly to Mr. Aldrich, who does not speak with authority for Mr. Dewey on the basis of any credentials with which I am familiar. Nevertheless, Mr. Winthrop Aldrich is one of the distinguished and honored leaders in the financial life of America and he can stand on his own feet and be weighed on the basis of his own merits.

It is true that he made a speech—a very able speech, in my opinion—questioning in a constructive way the work of the International Monetary Conference at Bretton Woods. Well, Mr. President, there is a very serious question in the minds of a very great many earnest Americans—myself included—whether Bretton Woods and its agreement do not entirely ignore the basic necessities prerequisite to stabilizing currency values in other countries, whether it also does not put the American dollar at the mercy of international raids in the proposed stabilization fund, and whether it may not stifle instead of stimulate our foreign trade. These are not questions of politics. They are questions of fact.

Mr. President, it has not yet become treason for an American citizen to challenge an international agreement made by this administration; it has not yet become treason to submit an honest inquiry as to whether the agreements are in the interest of America or not. The fact of the matter is that America's representation at Bretton Woods—and I speak with the greatest respect for it—did not include any delegates who have ever had any substantial experience in the active world of international exchange, and if there ever was a technical problem on the earth it is the problem of international exchange in all of its related phases. I do not know whether the Bretton Woods agreement is good or bad; I do not assume to say; I withhold my judgment until my studies are complete; but I want to condemn without reservation the idea that the men of America who know the subject of international exchange, ever though they may be that whipping boy called a Wall Street banker, should not be encouraged to give us the benefit of their constructive thought on this highly technical subject to the utmost limit. I am not afraid of information.

The address made by Mr. Aldrich in Chicago did not have a syllable of politics in it. The address made by Mr. Aldrich was a constructive discussion of a technical question concerning which he knows more than the Senator from Pennsylvania or the Senator from Michigan will ever know in their lifetimes. I think his contribution is to be welcomed for whatever it may prove to be worth in the determination of this terrifically difficult problem.

But that, Mr. President, is not the primary reason I rose. The Senator from Pennsylvania undertook to condemn John Foster Dulles as an American spokesman in international affairs. Mr. President, the Senator from Pennsylvania seems to be ready to castigate Mr. Dulles simply because he has an office in Wall Street. Well, Mr. President, Franklin D. Roosevelt also had an office in Wall Street at one time. But that is not conclusive in the condemnation of either.

The Senator from Pennsylvania also says that Mr. Dulles' legal business may have involved him in international contacts in the past. I do not know; but I do know that, in a totally different way, so did the business of Franklin D. Roosevelt who after World War No. 1 helped organize a corporation to deal in "busted" German marks. I decline to measure either of these men by any such utterly superficial and prejudicial methods; but one would be just as legitimate as the other, and neither is legitimate.

The Senator from Pennsylvania neglected to say that John Foster Dulles has had a long and honorable diplomatic experience. Even more important, he neglected to say that for years Mr. Dulles has been chairman of the committee on international affairs of one of the greatest organizations in the Christian life of America, to wit, the Federated Council of American Churches. I wonder if the Senator from Pennsylvania wants to attack those credentials. If Mr. Dulles has any symbol or trade-mark on him in respect to international affairs, it is the trade-mark of the solemn dedications to peace of the churches of our country, and I submit there can be no finer relationship in its honesty and its honor.

Yes; Mr. Dulles does represent Governor Dewey. Mr. Dulles undoubtedly will be the next Secretary of State.

Mr. President, I very much doubt whether the Senator from Pennsylvania could get the present Secretary of State—our very great, present Secretary—to join him in this torpedo attack upon his probable successor.

I know of no finer American under the flag than John Foster Dulles. I know of no American of finer ideals and higher purposes, of loftier objectives. I know of none more entitled to the confidence of his fellow citizens. I know of none now engaging more earnestly and honestly in the effort to plan an international organization to stabilize the security and peace of freemen in a free world.

John Foster Dulles is one of the great Americans, and it does not lie in the mouth of the Senator from Pennsylvania to defame him.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the statement just made by the senior Senator from Michigan appear in the RECORD immediately following the statement made by the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. GUFFEY].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. (Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado in the chair). Is there objection? There being no objection, it is so ordered.

MCCULLOUGH COAL CORPORATION

Mr. REED obtained the floor.

Mr. TUNNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kansas yield to me?

Mr. REED. I yield to the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. TUNNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of House bill 1519, Calendar 888. This bill was introduced by the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS]. At the time it was reached on the call of the calendar the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DANAHER] objected to its consideration. Since that time the Senator from Maryland and the Senator from Connecticut have agreed on an amendment with which they are both satisfied.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Delaware?

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, will the Senator again indicate what the bill is?

Mr. TUNNELL. It is House bill 1519, Calendar 888. The purpose of the bill is to confer jurisdiction on the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of the McCullough Coal Corporation against the United States. The Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] asked me to bring it up.

Mr. WHITE. If the Senator can assure us that the matter has been taken up with the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DANAHER], and that it is agreeable to him to pass the bill at this time, I have no objection.

Mr. TUNNELL. I consulted both the Senator from Connecticut and the Senator from Maryland, and they both say that the proposed amendment meets their desires.

Mr. WHITE. I have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H. R. 1519) conferring jurisdiction on the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of the

McCullough Coal Corporation against the United States.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. TUNNELL. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Maryland and myself, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Delaware will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. After the period at the end of line 7, on page 2, it is proposed to insert the following:

In determining such depreciation, the court shall consider the amount of unmined coal in the properties of said corporation at Friendsville, Md., the possibility, if any, of profitably mining and marketing said coal in the future, the life of said mine if said coal could be so mined and marketed, the average profits of said mine for the years 1936 to 1939, both inclusive, and the fair market value of said mine on the date the above-mentioned railroad was abandoned; and the court shall allow as the depreciation in value of said mine the loss in value occasioned by said abandonment of said railroad, taking into consideration all of the above factors.

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

Mr. TUNNELL. I thank the Senator from Kansas.

LIVESTOCK PRODUCTION AND LIVESTOCK FEED IN THE MIDWESTERN STATES

Mr. REED. Mr. President, of all the acute situations arising in agricultural production through 1943 and up to the summer of 1944, probably the most acute and most disastrous to the farmer was that which concerned the corn-hog States and the corn-hog farmer. Something like 10 or 11 informal conferences were held between Senators from the corn-hog States and the principal officers of the War Food Administration, the Office of Price Administration, and the Office of Defense Transportation, during the 18 months ending with July 1 of this year. At these conferences appeared the late Joseph B. Eastman, Hon. Marvin Jones, and others.

A full history of the various phases of this situation was set out in a letter dated June 1, 1944, addressed to Hon. Marvin Jones, Hon. Claude R. Wickard, Secretary of Agriculture, and Hon. Chester Bowles, Price Administrator. This letter was signed by 16 Senators.

Reply to this letter was received only from the O. P. A. in a letter dated July 26, signed by James G. Rogers, Jr., Acting Administrator. No reply was received from the Department of Agriculture or the War Food Administration. I ask unanimous consent that a copy of the letter of June 1, 1944, be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE COMMERCE,
June 1, 1944.

Hon. MARVIN JONES,
War Food Administrator.
Hon. CLAUDE R. WICKARD,
Secretary of Agriculture.
Hon. CHESTER BOWLES,
Price Administrator.

GENTLEMEN: This letter is not written in the hope of affirmative action on the part of any of the agencies named that would tend to relieve the distressing situation regarding livestock production and livestock feed, especially in Mid-Western States, known as the Corn-Hog Belt. To these areas, where livestock production is in chaos, should be added the cattle-raising and cattle-fattening areas. Feeders of poultry, the country over, have also experienced disastrous conditions.

In the absence of any hope of beneficial action, this letter is prepared more as a history of what has transpired under clumsy and unintelligent bureaucratic attempts to regulate livestock feed and livestock production. It might well be termed, with due apologies to the late immortal William Shakespeare, "A tragedy of errors."

Anticipating an increased need for meat for food, and fats for all purposes, Secretary of Agriculture Wickard, who had not yet been shorn of the powers of his office, on November 27, 1942, announced a hog-price-support program. The support price at Chicago was fixed at $13.25 per 100 pounds for good to choice butcher hogs weighing from 240 to 270 pounds. Support prices at other markets were related to the Chicago base price. In addition to placing a floor under hog prices, Secretary Wickard consistently followed, while any power was left to him, a policy of keeping livestock prices relatively high and livestock feed grain prices relatively low. This is the surest way known to increase livestock production, and especially hog production.

In April of 1943, Mr. Chester Davis, who had been appointed War Food Administrator, increased the support price of hogs at Chicago to $13.75. Being of an independent turn of mind, and having a lot of common sense, as well as the confidence of agricultural interests, generally, Mr. Davis did not last long as War Food Administrator. This is not said in disparagement of the Honorable Marvin Jones who succeeded Mr. Davis as War Food Administrator. It is simply a statement of the facts.

In July 1943, Judge Jones, in a move to induce the marketing of hogs at lighter weights, changed the support price basis to include "good to choice" butcher hogs weighing from 200 to 240 pounds. This was to continue until March 31, 1944. The original announcement by Secretary Wickard and the Davis amendment, was for a period ending September 30, 1944.

In September 1943, Judge Jones amended his program so as to apply to 200- to 270-pound butcher hogs, and changed the period of expiration to September 30, 1944, which was the same expiration date as the Wickard and Davis orders.

In December 1943, the order was again amended so that the support weight of heavy hogs was increased to 300 pounds for a temporary period. Later, on January 27, 1944, the top weight was further increased to 330 pounds. On March 18, 1944, a further change was made. The top weight was reduced to 270 pounds, to be effective April 15, 1944.

On Monday, May 8, Judge Jones announced a lowering of the minimum support weight from 200 pounds down to 180 pounds.

We may assume that if there were not more than 10 or 12 individuals concerned in hog production and marketing, that number might have been kept well advised as to the circumstances surrounding their production and marketing. Considering the fact that some hundreds of thousands, perhaps more than a million farmers raise and market corn and hogs, it is hardly surprising that the corn-hog-belt farmer became utterly bewildered as to the best course for him to follow.

Let us turn now to the corn-hog program for the production angle. In 1941, 71,397,000 hogs were slaughtered. In September 1941, the Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Wickard, seeing need for an increase, asked that the number of hogs for the 1942 slaughter be increased to 79,300,000. In January 1942, he asked for an increase in the goal mentioned to 83,000,000. As a matter of fact, the hog slaughter in 1942 turned out to be approximately 78,000,000 head. The hog slaughter goal for 1943 was set at 97,000,000. The actual slaughter was 95,273,000.

There is always a decrease from the number of pigs brought into the world, as compared with the number that are fed and slaughtered. Not all of the litter produced by the mamma pig attains maturity. So, in October 1941, the Secretary of Agriculture requested a 10-percent increase in the spring pig crop of 1942. The actual increase was somewhat larger than that.

In November 1942, the Secretary of Agriculture set the pig crop goal of 1943 at 121,000,000 head. The actual pig crop of 1943 was 122,000,000—only a fraction of 1 percent above the goal set. Considering the fact that pig birth control has not yet reached the proportions of an exact science, this is a remarkably close approximation to what was desired. The pig farmer was doing his best. Of the total pig crop about 60 percent is produced in the spring, and 40 percent in the fall.

This statement is made because of the constant insinuations made by the War Food Administration, O. P. A., and other bureaucratic agencies, that the greedy, grasping corn-hog farmer, in an inordinate desire for profit greatly exceeded the goal set by the Secretary of Agriculture and the War Food Administration. The facts do not justify any such conclusions. The truth is that the corn farmer and the hog growers were doing their best to meet the goal set by official authority.

Along with the increase in the number of hogs, which had been asked for, there was also an increase in the number of poultry in the country, which had been asked for. The number of cattle, both dairy and beef, also increased.

The years 1942 and 1943 produced phenomenal crops of corn and other feed grains. However, along after the middle of 1943 some doubt arose as to the sufficiency of feed grains to finish out all of the livestock which had been brought into existence through the urging of the Secretary of Agriculture and the War Food Administrator.

PROTEIN FEEDS

Along in the latter part of 1942 a shortage in the availability of protein feeds for livestock producers became evident. As time went on these feeds became more and more scarce. There was universal complaint from all the Middle Western States. Cattle producers were unable to obtain a sufficient supply through the winter of 1942 to keep their breeding stock in proper shape. Livestock feeders were unable to obtain the protein feeds usually available for finishing out their high-grade market cattle. Senators and Representatives from all the Western States discussed this situation numerous times with officials of the various agencies, beginning with the Secretary of Agriculture. Kansas delegation memorandums alone show about 18 conferences of various sorts, with various officials, all dealing with the same subject matter. Other States had about the same experience. Little, if any, relief was afforded from 1942 through practically all of 1943.

If an ample corn supply had been available for feeding purposes, in the absence of protein feeds, the situation would not have been so completely disastrous. This was

one of the most vexatious phases of the whole problem. All of us who participated in the discussions felt helpless in the face of the inadequacies of the bureaus and bureaucratic personnel handling these questions.

CORN

We now come to what is perhaps the sorest point among all sore points in the corn-hog-feed situation:

The corn crop of 1942 was the largest on record. Notwithstanding the enormous crop of that year, it soon became evident, even after the size of the crop was determined, that corn was not moving into consumptive channels. Complaints from cattle feeders, outside the principal corn-producing territory, over their inability to buy corn in anything like their normal requirements, became more and more numerous. Unfavorable conditions for the planting of the 1943 crop, in the spring of 1943, increased the stringency in available corn. By this time the number of cattle and hogs had reached record proportions. Most favorable corn-growing weather, after a late start, produced a corn crop second in size only to the 1942 crop. Notwithstanding these two record crops in succession, it became fully evident, as 1943 went by, that the whole corn situation was out of joint. Not in the memory of those of us who have been in the public service through most of our lives, have we ever witnessed so much dissatisfaction, confusion, and uncertainty. This naturally produced many complaints from livestock producers, which came to us in the latter part of 1943, continuing through the winter of 1943–44. These complaints would still be coming in except that the complainants apparently have given up any hope for relief and, therefore, cease to take the trouble to make complaints. Otherwise, the loud cries from all over the Midwest would be continued to this day in even a larger volume.

In an effort to reach the situation, conferences of Midwestern Senators and Representatives, with officials of the W. F. A., C. C. C., O. P. A, O. D. T., and other agencies were numerous. These conferences ran through the entire year of 1943 in a more or less informal manner. We have a memorandum record of the conferences, beginning with November 30, 1943, in which 17 Senators from 15 States participated. Other conferences, of which we have record, were held on December 28, January 6, January 12, May 6, and May 12. While discussion in these conferences covered the entire range of trouble, and each of the agencies named were represented by men in more or less authority, no relief of any consequence, at any time, was given.

The primary difficulty lies in an inept handling of all phases of this subject.

The price of No. 2 corn, and the price of "good to choice" hogs, weighing from 200 to 270 pounds, at Chicago, on the following dates was:

	No. 2 Corn	"Good to choice" 200 to 270 pound hogs
Jan. 4, 1943	$0.95	$14.60 to $15.
May 3, 1943	1.07	$14.65 to $14.85.
July 1, 1943	1.07	$13.70 to $13.95.
Oct. 1, 1943	1.07	$14.85 to $15.10.
Dec. 1, 1943	1.07	$13.75.
Jan. 3, 1944	1.16	Do.
Mar. 1, 1944	1.16	$13.75 to $13.90.

Source: Department of Agriculture, War Food Administration.

A glance at the prices quoted above, will show the main reason why corn did not move into commercial channels. We have previously mentioned the policy of Secretary Wickard to keep livestock prices high, and feed prices low so as to increase the number of livestock available for all purposes. This policy succeeded all too well. Normally, the value of 11.2 bushels of No. 2 corn, at Chicago, should equal the value of 100 pounds of hog. At the maximum spread between these values, 100 pounds of hog was worth as much as 15.8 bushels of corn. Of course, the corn farmer is not going to sell corn at 95 cents a bushel when by feeding it he can get $1.34 per bushel for his crop. Time after time, the importance of reconciling the values between corn and hogs was urged upon those in authority in the O. P. A. and W. F. A. Perhaps we were mistaken, but we thought at the time that we made some impression on the W. F. A. No impression was made at any time upon these all-wise men, almost wholly without experience, handling these matters in the O. P. A. They knew all the answers except the right answer. The general inexperience and lack of understanding of the O. P. A. officials was only exceeded by their self-assurance.

On one occasion, the chairman of the conference was informed by an O. P. A. spokesman:

"Senator, we know how to handle these matters and you do not."

That remark came at a time in January 1944, when hogs were pressing on the market in such a volume as to congest the stockyards, requiring embargoes at different markets. It was wintertime. The best market for fresh pork is, of course, in cold weather. We were urging that a surplus of pork existed at that time; that attempting to ration a surplus makes no sense at all. We asked that rationing be raised for a temporary period until the hog glut could be relieved. As often as such a suggestion was made, it was disdainfully rejected. Senator THOMAS of Idaho went so far as to introduce Senate Resolution 231, requiring that pork rationing be temporarily suspended.

A completely unsatisfactory situation existed throughout this entire period. Then came the corn-freeze order. In 125 counties in Illinois, Iowa, Nebraska, Minnesota, and Indiana, producing the major part of the surplus corn of the country, farmers having surplus corn were forbidden to sell it—even to their neighbors needing it—except through the cumbersome red-tape method of securing a special permit through a special county board. That was the last blow. The markets couldn't handle all the hogs offered. Those that were sold were at the largest discount ever known under what might be termed "normal prices." At Chicago, Kansas City, and other markets, discounts on light hogs ran as high as $4. per hundred pounds. On the heavy hogs, over the "support weight," the discount was as high as $3.50 per hundred pounds. In recent weeks, a peculiar situation has numerously appeared. The offering of hogs has been so heavy that on some occasions as many as 76,300 were held over because of an inability of buying to absorb the offerings. Surprising as it may be, the majority of the hold-overs were support-price hogs. A second glance will determine why that was the case. Packers were buying hogs lighter and heavier than the support-price range, at these great discounts, with greater profit to themselves. The farmer took the beating, even with his support-price hogs. Frequently, these support-price hogs had been held over from Saturday to Monday, after perhaps a previous delay of a day preceding Saturday.

Illustrating this situation, an Iowa farmer, under date of May 8, 1944, wrote:

"The price support program on hogs has been a farce since last December. Today there are 11,000 hold-overs in Chicago, practically all of them Government weights. At least the market news on WHO said packers didn't even touch Government weights today. With the exception of a couple of weeks in April, packers have bought their requirements from the nonsupport weights first and the hold-overs, which have been mostly Government support weights, are bought 1 to 4 days later as medium hogs at $1 to $2 discount. This was the case at Sioux City and Chicago, at least, through January and February. In interior Iowa markets it worked differently, but just as bad."

The corn-hog farmers have taken the worst beating in their history, measured by what should have been normal market conditions.

Finally, after warm weather came, and heat producing meat no longer in great demand, the O. P. A. suspended rationing. That was precisely what the Senators signing this letter had been urging upon the O. P. A. for 5 months previously, but had been told they didn't know how to run this business and that the smart men in the O. P. A. did.

For weeks past, the freeze order has made it impossible for the farmer to buy corn to feed his hogs and, on the other hand, the market could not absorb them without terrific losses to the hog producer. What is the farmer supposed to do under these circumstances?

At the last conference on May 12, Judge Jones made the statement that he "hoped to be able to raise the freeze order on corn in a few days." The reason given for applying the freeze order was to get some 80,000,000 bushels of corn for various processors, including production of munitions. On the date of the conference, Judge Jones stated that the C. C. C. had succeeded in obtaining 45,000,000 bushels of corn out of the 80,000,000 stated to be necessary. (At other times, 72,000,000 bushels has been given as the goal to be reached for that purpose.) We are informed that on May 31, the total amount of corn actually bought, or under contract, by the C. C. C. is 51,350,000 bushels. In other words, the C. C. C. has increased the 45,000,000 bushels stated by Judge Jones on May 12, to 51,350,000 bushels on May 31. At this rate, the corn-freeze order will not be lifted much before the next corn crop comes in, if the W. F. A. insists upon retaining its rigid ban upon all corn marketing, other than corn sold to the C. C. C. Various devices have been used to increase the flow of corn, but apparently none of them has been markedly successful.

This letter could be drawn out to an indefinite length. There is an unlimited amount of material of the same quality as that already included herein.

On the relation between the price of corn and the price of hogs, existing from the beginning of this year, farmers marketing hogs of support weight, received slightly more than the value of the grain. If the hogs were over the support weight, or under the support weight, the corn-hog farmer did not even receive the value of his grain. He took a ruinous loss. This is also true of farmers who took to market hogs of the support weight, but whose hogs could not be sold and were not sold at the support prices on the day he took them to market. Selling these good to choice hogs on the basis available, after being held 2 or 3 days, involved a loss to this class of farmer also. These effects are far reaching and touch a majority of livestock farmers.

So far as we know, not in all of agricultural history is there a record of Government bureaus attempting to carry out an important program that has been attended with so much stupidity, ineptitude, and general all-around disregard of equities as this. Government bureaus, in these wartimes, are clothed with authority to impose their will and their ideas, no matter how mistaken, on the farmer, and that authority has been used.

As stated in the beginning, we realize the time has passed when there is any hope for a correction of these mistakes, even if the bureaus were willing. The farmers have

taken the loss. We do feel, however, that in justice to this important class of citizens, upon which the country depends in so many regards, the facts that we have set out, and the views we have expressed herein, should be spread on the record for all time to come.

That is the sole purpose of this letter.

Cordially yours,

CLYDE M. REED, KENNETH S. WHERRY, HARLAN J. BUSHFIELD, E. V. ROBERTSON, JOSEPH H. BALL, JOHN THOMAS of Idaho, RAYMOND E. WILLIS, GERALD P. NYE, CHAN GURNEY, HENRIK SHIPSTEAD, ARTHUR CAPPER, RUFUS C. HOLMAN, HUGH BUTLER, ALEXANDER WILEY, C. WAYLAND BROOKS, E. H. MOORE.

Mr. REED. Failing to obtain any satisfactory explanation from any officials of the agencies named, Senate Resolution 309 was submitted on June 15. This resolution was offered by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY]. Twenty-two other Senators joined the Senator from Nebraska. Of these, 17 were Republican; 5 were Democrats, namely, the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] and the Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER]; and one was an Independent, namely, the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE].

This resolution was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. On June 20, 1944, 5 days after it was submitted, it was favorably reported to the Senate by the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. The Senator making the report was the senior Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE].

The resolution was then referred, under the rules of the Senate, to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate.

In order that the full text of the resolution may appear as a part of these remarks, I ask unanimous consent that Senate Resolution 309 be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 309) was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolved, That a special committee of five Senators, to be appointed by the President of the Senate, is authorized and directed to make a full and complete investigation with a view to determining—

(1) the conditions prevailing in the production, processing, distribution, and marketing of livestock, livestock feed, poultry, eggs, milk, and the products thereof;

(2) the effects of regulations, orders, and directives issued by governmental agencies upon the production, processing, marketing, distribution, and supplies of such commodities;

(3) any practices wherein processors and distributors of such commodities are circumventing the purposes and objectives of price floors, price ceilings, and subsidies at the expense of the producers and the Public Treasury;

(4) reasons for the failures to support prices to producers as required by existing law;

(5) alleged adverse effects of maladjustments in maximum prices established on different grades of meat and particularly the extent to which livestock feeders have been penalized because of an inadequate allowance on the better grades of meat to encourage the feeding of livestock;

(6) alleged adverse effects upon the livestock, poultry, and dairy industries of the price and other policies relative to corn and other feed grains and the maladjustments resulting therefrom.

Such committee shall report to the Senate as soon as practicable the results of its investigation, together with its recommendations for any necessary legislation.

For the purpose of this resolution the committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to hold such hearings; to sit and act at such times and places during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Senate in the Seventy-eighth Congress; to employ such experts and such clerical, stenographic, and other assistants; to require, by subpena or otherwise, the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such correspondence, books, papers, and documents; to administer such oaths; to take such testimony; and to make such expenditures as it deems advisable. The cost of stenographic services to report such hearings shall not be in excess of 25 cents per hundred words. The expenses of the committee, which shall not exceed $10,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman.

Mr. REED. Now, Mr. President, I beg leave to remind the Senate that it was on the 20th of June that the resolution was reported to the Senate from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and was then referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate. The resolution is still in the bosom of the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate. Here is a resolution sponsored by 23 Senators, favorably reported by a standing committee of this body, but still held up, without a meeting of the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, without any consideration being given by the membership of that committee, so far as I have been able to ascertain, and I have made inquiry of members of that committee. The senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] is chairman of that committee.

This matter was so important that the distinguished Democratic Senator from Indiana [Mr. JACKSON], who was the permanent chairman of the Democratic Convention in Chicago, took the floor in this body on June 23, 1944, and discussed this very situation, which other Senators from the corn-hog States had been discussing for 18 months, and on which they had held a dozen or more conferences with the principal officials of the agency dealing with this question. I was present at all those conferences; I presided at most of them. If the Senator from Indiana was ever present at any of them, thereby evincing his interest in the catastrophe threatening the corn-hog farmers, I have no recollection of it.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REED. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. The Senator referred to the Senator from Indiana. Did not he mean the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. REED. No; I meant the junior Senator from Indiana [Mr. JACKSON].

Mr. AIKEN. I wished to make sure that the Senator from Kansas did not mean the senior Senator from Indiana [Mr. WILLIS].

Mr. REED. I am going to talk about both the junior Senator from Indiana [Mr. JACKSON] and the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] in the course of these remarks.

Mr. AIKEN. I understand that the senior Senator from Indiana [Mr. WILLIS] has most assiduously attended those conferences.

Mr. REED. Oh, yes; the senior Senator from Indiana [Mr. WILLIS] has attended all these conferences; and if my recollection serves me right, he is one of the sponsors of the resolution. But that is not so in the case of the junior Senator from Indiana [Mr. JACKSON].

Mr. AIKEN. That is correct.

Mr. REED. I cannot describe the corn-hog situation in any clearer terms than to use the words used by the junior Senator from Indiana on June 23. I quote from page 6628 of the RECORD, wherein the Senator stated in part, when he was describing the deplorable experience of the corn-hog farmer, as follows:

> The farmer starts to town with his truckload of that which has consumed his corn and other valuable feed. His money, Mr. President, is in his truck body as he pulls into the stockyard. In good faith he has placed it there. He is firm in the conviction that he will be paid a floor price or better for these hogs upon duly established weight classifications. But when he is ready to unload his hogs, or when he has unloaded them, he finds he is no longer the master of his own plans. He has been in error in his mental calculations as to the amount of money he will have in his pocket when he pulls his truck out empty. He finds that he is the victim of circumstances beyond his control, and apart from his prudent, honest expectations. He can take his hogs back home, he can let them stand around the stockyards a day or so, wearing off weight, or he can take a price below the floor price established for the area and promised by the Government.

The Senator made further comment, and I desire to refer particularly to this:

> The fact is, the intent of the floor regulations is being evaded, and the farmer suffers. Pork products are retailed to consumers on the basis of O. P. A. ceiling prices, independent of prices paid to the farmer.

Mr. President, at about that time the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] could contain himself no longer, and he broke in on the junior Senator from Indiana [Mr. JACKSON], and colloquy ensued between the Senator from Indiana and the Senator from Illinois. The senior Senator from Illinois is chairman of the committee which is still holding this resolution. Here is what he said about it:

> A long-winded congressional investigation with the holding of hearings in Indiana and Illinois (p. 6628 of the RECORD).

He referred to this resolution as providing "a long-winded congressional investigation, with the holding of hearings in Indiana and Illinois."

Further along the Senator from Illinois said:

> We do not need a senatorial investigation of the question. * * * Everyone knows what is going on. Those in the War Food Administration have their investigators in the field.

Further along, he said:

> I know what I am talking about because I am chairman of the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate.

I freely grant that the Senator from Illinois knew what he was talking about. He is the one who defied the Senate, ignored the Senate rules, snubbed and treated with contempt the 23 Senators who had sponsored this resolution, and ignored the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry which had favorably reported the resolution to the Senate. Certainly, the Senator from Illinois knew what he was talking about.

Then the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER] made the following comment, which is found on page 6629 of the RECORD:

I also gather from the remarks of the Senator from Illinois that he already has all the answers to the problems which face the corn and hog producers, more especially the hog producers. I should like to get the answer to the situation in which the hog producer finds himself at the moment. He has been guaranteed a price by the Government. He is not getting it. What I want is the answer to that problem.

Mr. President, I now wish to quote the remarks of the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JACKSON] relative to the answer he suggested to this problem. He very lucidly described the deplorable condition of the corn-hog farmer, the bad faith being accorded him in respect to the price he received for his hogs, and on page 6628 of the RECORD he suggested the following remedy:

So, I say, in response to the distinguished Senator from Illinois that I do not suggest any process of senatorial or House investigation. I do commend the present existing agencies for what they have done so far, and urge them vigorously and persistently to continue in an immediate and direct determination of what situations actually exist in the matter of hog marketing. That is what I plead for.

Of all the drivel which could be put into the RECORD, this is entitled to priority. Here is a group of agencies which have been under continual criticism by virtually every Senator, regardless of party, from the whole Midwest. This group of agencies produced a disastrous situation for the corn-hog farmer. Bad faith was practiced by the Government. Yet the only remedy the Senator from Indiana has to suggest, and the only remedy suggested by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], who had refused to permit his committee to act on the resolution, is that "I do commend the present existing agencies for what they have done so far, and urge them vigorously and persistently to continue"—I presume he means to continue the policies they had been following.

Mr. President, the situation was fully described in the letter written on June 1, signed by 16 Senators, and which I have requested unanimous consent to have made a part of the RECORD.

I do not need to go into the history of that matter any further at this time.

I wish, however, vigorously to point out a certain fact. The time about which I am speaking was June 20, when the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry reported favorably the resolution, and the colloquy to which I have referred took place on the floor of the Senate on June 23. That was approximately 3 months ago.

I now quote from the remarks of the senior Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE] which he made on Tuesday of this week, and which will be found on page 7931 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. He was telling about the experiences of farmers in connection with the corn-hog problem. He said:

When they came to market the tremendous crop of 1943, they did not receive prices which the Government assured them they would receive if they increased the production of pork. Conditions in the hog market during the period of heavy receipts amounted almost to a national scandal.

The language is that of the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], not mine, although I approve it and adopt it. I continue reading:

The Government asked farmers to make their hogs heavy so that more pounds of pork would be available for our armed forces and for our gallant allies. What happened? Countless farmers fed out their hogs to heavyweights and, when the time came to market them, they found their markets embargoed. For weeks thousands of pork producers held their hogs at home because there was no market outlet available, and when finally they were able to market them after prolonged feeding of high-priced corn, they found that the hogs had acquired enough additional weight to put them beyond the weight bracket on which a minimum price was guaranteed, and they took what the market would pay. Furthermore—

I am still quoting from the remarks of the Senator from Iowa—

I am informed on reliable authority that some meat packers deliberately refused to bid on hogs in the support bracket and filled their requirements from lightweight and heavyweight hogs, the prices of which were not supported.

At this point I wish to say that a concrete example of that practice is contained in the letter of June 1, to which I have referred, and which will be made a part of the RECORD. An Iowa farmer has given precise illustrations of the very practice to which the Senator from Iowa referred.

I now resume reading from the remarks of the Senator from Iowa:

In the meantime, the bracket-weight hogs were held over in the stockyards day after day, losing weight, many of them dying, and their average quality rapidly deteriorating. How many millions farmers lost as a result of the chaotic conditions in the hog market no one can estimate.

The Senator from Iowa further said:

After going through all that, the hog producers are asked now to submit to floor prices which are entirely inadequate and ceiling prices which certainly are unjust to the producer.

For the information of Senators from the corn-hog States, I suggest that unless something is done the support price of hogs on October 1 will be reduced $1.25 a hundred pounds from the present support price.

I continue to quote from the remarks of the Senator from Iowa:

I submit that the hog producers of this Nation are entitled to better treatment than they are about to receive at the hands of the Office of Price Administration.

The Senator from Iowa further said:

Farmers have done their part magnificently in meeting the food problem, in spite of grossly inept handling of the situation by Government. The administration has gone from one extreme to the other. First they wanted every last pound of pork that could be produced, and they used every device of publicity and exhortation to get farmers to make their hogs heavy. Then they became frightened about the feed situation and demanded lighter hogs. Then they decided that pork production must be reduced, and they slashed the price floor.

Mr. President, I wish to make a comment which may be a trifle aside from the subject matter under consideration. No Member of this body enjoys a higher reputation for ability, character, intelligence, patriotism, and nonpartisanship, than the senior Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE]. The Nation could be no more fortunate than to have as Members of this body 96 Senators with such a high average of character and ability.

Some Senators may say that those Midwest conferences were partisan conferences. The Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON], who now occupies the chair, participated in some of the conferences. The Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE] was occasionally present. The Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] was present once, I believe.

Mr. President, the pork of this country is produced largely in 12 States known as the Midwest States. The Census Bureau and the Bureau of Agricultural Economics has called them the east north central and the west north central regions. Representing those 12 States in this body are 24 Senators. Eighteen of them are Republicans and 5 are Democrats. One is an Independent. That is why conferences of that section are attended by those who are mostly from the Republican side. I believe it is safe to say that the number of Republicans from that section in the next Congress will be increased.

Mr. President, there is an important factor which concerns all the people of this country, namely, that the inept and incompetent handling of the matter under discussion has today reduced the number of hogs to the point where hogs offered for the market are hardly able to supply the market demands. There is an immediate stringency, not an entire shortage, but an immediate partial shortage in meat, particularly in prime beef and pork. By about the middle of December the country as a whole will be facing a shortage of pork of all kinds, as well as of prime beef. That condition will be due to the unintelligent and incompetent handling of the problem by the agencies which I have been discussing.

There are 25 percent fewer hogs in this country available for placing upon the market next December than there was a year ago at this time. From that situation, Mr. President, there can be but one result. There will be a shortage of pork beginning some time in the winter, probably in December. There will also be a shortage of prime beef. These shortages will likely continue until order is brought out of the chaos existing in the livestock industry.

Allow me to say to those who may not be familiar with the way in which prime beef is produced, that there are various kinds and qualities of cattle. Prime beef comes from steers which are finally "finished out" in the feed lots of the Corn Belt. Only from those feed lots do steers come which, when slaughtered, produce prime beef.

Mr. President, at this time in the feed lots of the Corn Belt there are only 59 percent as many steers on feed as there were a year ago. The feeders as well as the producers of cattle are in such a state of uncertainty and confusion, due to the lack of confidence in administrative agencies of the Government, particularly O. P. A., that they have diminished the chances they are taking by refusing this year to attempt to feed out cattle which are necessary to make prime beef. When there is a reduction of 41 percent in that class of cattle in the feed lots at the present time it is a matter so serious as to challenge the attention of the country.

Mr. President, I agree with what the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE] said the other day that in this situation the War Food Administration has made a very much more intelligent approach and has given the subject a more sympathetic understanding. The principal difficulty lies in the Office of Price Administration. The high esteem in which the O. P. A. and its so-called experts hold themselves and their self-assurance are only equaled by their incompetence and inexperience. I speak from personal knowledge, because personally in conferences I have time and again discussed these questions with the O. P. A. so-called experts, and I never yet have found a single man charged with authority in meat distribution who had a clear, correct, and comprehensive understanding of the problem with which he was dealing.

Mr. President, I wish to close by expressing a feeling of complete dissatisfaction with the action of a committee of the Senate, the chairman of which has held himself so superior to the ordinary rules of courtesy in the Senate that, notwithstanding a resolution submitted by 23 Senators and favorably reported by a standing committee and referred to his committee on June 20, the resolution still lies in that committee without action. That situation, Mr. President, I think calls for severe criticism and condemnation. At least the Members of this body should have a chance to approve or disapprove a proposal made by 23 of its membership upon such an important matter.

This opportunity was denied by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], chairman of the committee.

Mr. BUTLER subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask to have inserted in the RECORD immediately following the remarks of the junior Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED] a letter addressed to my colleague the junior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] from Mr. George A. Williams, of Fairmont, Nebr., former Lieutenant Governor of the State, a very distinguished citizen, civic leader, and agriculturist, which pertains to the subject which was under discussion by the Senator from Kansas.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FAIRMONT, NEBR., *September 10, 1944.*

Hon. KENNETH S. WHERRY,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR KENNETH: There is a strong impression throughout the agricultural West that the administration at Washington is about to knock the farmer's ears down. The New Deal is in very bad odor out here and will not get the farmer's vote so we must be taught a lesson. Wheat and corn prices are declining and Government support is not to be used to help the situation.

Hundreds of millions of bushels of wheat and oats are shipped in from Canada and untold millions of bushels are shipped from the United States to Europe in the lend-lease program at the expense of the farmer. Almost daily the press carry stories from New Deal sources telling of the tremendous income accruing to the farmer without a word of the greatly increased cost of labor and production the farmer has to bear. It is made to appear that the farmer is rolling in wealth when the facts are that the farmers of the Great Plains States are working day and night to feed our boys at the front and the hungry people of the war-torn nations with an income barely sufficient to break even. Machinery is worn out, buildings are in dire need of paint and repair, and no class of people in the United States is doing more to support the war, with less encouragement and help, than is the farmer.

Multiplied strikes by other classes of workers are the order of the day all over the Nation and they are invariably rewarded by an increase of wages, while the Commander in Chief takes frequent occasion to give them credit for the progress made toward the winning of the war. The farmer never strikes and no credit accrues to him for his faithful devotion to duty.

For the first time in the history of the United States the farmer is, and has cause to be, afraid of the Government. For the first time in the history of the Nation the farmer is ashamed of, and has lost his respect and reverence for, the administration of government at Washington. I am happy to say that this statement does not apply to our representatives from Nebraska, nor the many other noble men who are doing their best to uphold the ideals and fundamental principles of our National Government. But it does apply to those in positions of power who are doing their utmost to destroy the best government the world has ever seen.

I know I need not urge you to continue your efforts in our behalf and in behalf of good government.

Sincerely yours,

GEO. A. WILLIAMS.

AVIATION

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, a great deal of interest has been manifested by my colleagues on both sides of the aisle in recent debates on the subject of postwar aviation. It is a very interesting subject, a very vital subject, and one which will of necessity have the rapt attention of the committees and the Congress during the next 6 months, or until the aviation policy which will govern this country in the international sphere shall have been determined by the Congress.

Mr. President, in both our domestic and in our foreign commerce the future prospects of civil aviation are bright. Those of us who have been privileged to participate in shaping of legislation affecting the development of civil aviation recall the pessimism with which predictions of aviation's growth were received a few years back. However, prophecies which seemed exaggerated only a few years ago have proved modest, if not conservative.

I recall as a member of the House Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads and later as its chairman considering legislation for the carrying of the mail by air, and the subsequent invitation for bids, in response to which no bids were submitted. As a result, there was no air mail service in those years, until it was instituted by the Government itself, on lines operated by the Government itself.

So the prophecies of those years and of subsequent years have proven that at least we never exaggerate.

Therefore, Mr. President, in looking ahead, we should plan boldly to make sure we do not undershoot the mark.

One mistake frequently made in predicting the future possibilities of civil aviation is in measuring them in terms of the amount of present day surface traffic. Very frequently an assumption governing predictions of aviation's growth is that the total traffic potential must be realized from the volume of traffic presently moving by air and surface means.

If in 1910 anyone had attempted to predict the total number of passenger automobiles that might be used in this country, and had based his prediction upon the horse-and-buggy traffic and the modest automobile traffic then existing, his conclusion would have been that a top ceiling of 10,000,000 passenger automobiles would be the most that this country could ever absorb. This would have been an outside maximum, figuring 1 car for every city horse and there were 3,100,000, 1 car for every farm, of which there were 6,400,000, and 1 car for every automobile in use in 1910, numbering 459,000. A more reasonable estimate would have been 5,000,000 passenger automobiles, allowing for the cases in which an automobile would be substituted for more than 1 horse, or more than 1 horse and buggy, and for the cases in which an automobile would have seemed too expensive a proposition.

As a matter of fact, the figures show that as early as 1920 we had over 8,000,000. The figure jumped to over 23,000,000 by 1930, and by 1940 it had increased to nearly 27,500,000.

Even if one predicting a situation in 1910 had included the amount of intercity railroad travel as a basis for his estimate, his estimate would have been increased by only about 500,000 automobiles over the 5,000,000 or 10,000,000 based upon the number of horses and buggies. Actually, less than 500,000 passenger automobiles, of 5-passenger capacity, operating at less than 50 percent capacity, could have provided the 32,000,000,000 passenger-miles of intercity railroad travel performed in 1910.

These figures prove that a new and swifter means of transportation creates new travel and new demands for travel. Therefore, it is a mistake to think of the future of aviation in terms of the amount of travel occurring today. The

airplane will unquestionably lead more people to travel more frequently for more miles, and for more different purposes than ever before. Many Members of the Senate will be operating their own airplanes in traveling from their homes to the sessions of the Senate in a very few years. Already a number of the Members of Congress are either qualified or are taking instructions to operate their own airplanes.

In our own pre-war experience, even within this country, we have seen instances of this creation of new travel. Before the war many cases had already appeared where business or professional men were maintaining places of business both on the east coast and on the west coast, spending half the week in one place and half the week in the other, able to do so because of the airplane, traveling in circumstances where without the airplane nothing of the sort would have been attempted. They were able, only because of the airplane, to travel under those circumstances. This is only a slight indication of a great revolution in our business and living habits which will be wrought by civil air transportation in a few years more.

Now, let us look for a moment at the actual advance which has been made in air transportation in the last 10 years.

During the year 1930 the revenue passenger miles flown by our domestic air carriers was less than 85,000,000. Eleven years later there had been an increase to nearly 1,400,000,000—a total increase of more than 1,500 percent.

There were similar dramatic increases in our international air transportation. For the year 1930 the passenger miles flown by our international air carriers under the American flag were less than 20,000,000. Yet, for the year 1941 the passenger miles flown by these carriers had increased to over 185,000,000.

Another very important index of growth is that of the number of persons employed on the ground by our air transportation companies for each plane in the air. For our domestic air lines in 1930 there were only 5 persons employed on the ground for each airplane operated. But by 1942 the number of persons employed on the ground for each airplane operated had increased to 54—an increase of nearly 1,100 percent. This index, together with traffic figures I have just referred to, gives us a slight indication of the tremendous possibilities there are for growth in our air transportation industry and for the furnishing of new employment to new millions of young men and women during the post-war period.

It must be remembered, also, that the air carrier industry covers only the common carriers by air, and the traffic figures I have given relate only to that phase of the industry. Actually, however, the major part of civil aviation has always been, and will always be, the miscellaneous and private flyers—the John and Mary Smiths who fly for the fun of it or who use the airplane in their own business. Just as the automobiles in private ownership vastly exceeded the numbers owned by common and contract motor carriers, so the airplanes in private and miscellaneous use have exceeded, and will always exceed, the numbers engaged in common carrier or contract carrier operations.

A recent careful estimate made by the Government authorities dealing with future problems of air traffic control indicates that by 1950 we can anticipate between 8,000,000 and 10,000,000 aircraft movements annually by the common carriers by air. Yet, the same careful estimates contemplate that entire aircraft movements, both military and civil, will total between 45,000,000 and 50,000,000 a year by 1950 and, obviously, the overwhelming majority of these movements will be by civil aircraft. This indicates a use of our airways by the established airport operators representing only a sixth, or less, of the total use of such airways in the predictable future. Moreover, the estimate I refer to dealt only with the movements along the regular civil airways. Obviously, upon the airways there will be a tremendous increase in ordinary pleasure and miscellaneous flying. Indeed, our Government traffic control administrators today are actually laying plans for a total of 500,000 aircraft, civilian and military, by 1950.

These figures and estimates are not wild guesses. They are carefully calculated and were included in an address recently given by the Honorable William Burden, the special aviation assistant to the Secretary of Commerce, before the Institute of Aeronautical Sciences. The calculations had been made in connection with the very responsible job of getting ready to gear-up our air traffic control facilities for the immediate post-war period.

One factor of particular uncertainty in trying to assess the future is that of the possible development of the helicopter. It has recently been pointed out that even if the helicopter is developed as a feasible aircraft, its operation will be too technical and complicated for use by the ordinary private flyer, but improvements in simplicity of operation are presently receiving the attention of aeronautical engineers. Furthermore, there are those who believe the helicopter has a prominent place in the future of aviation.

When we come to consider the utility of the airplane, the possibilities are startling. In military service today the airplane is performing functions of a variety and a nature which no one dreamed of as recently as 2 or 3 years ago. The same will be true in civil life.

The most startling fact of all is the amount of work which can be done by a single airplane. The Board of Investigation and Research tells us that the average freight car on our rail system is in movement for only about 2½ hours a day. Our rail system has a splendid record of efficiency, yet when we come to the domestic air lines we find a record of utilization which is nothing short of amazing.

The domestic air carriers were required to turn over to the Army in May 1942 all but 165 of their airplanes. The domestic air lines have turned over to the military services a total of 335 planes which were in operation. In addition the air lines also gave up to the military services a total of 315 airplanes which were on order with aircraft manufacturing companies. Title to those planes passed directly to the military services upon delivery from the production line. Thus, a total of 650 airplanes have been given up by the air lines during the war. In this same period the air lines lost 18 airplanes through domestic accidents. Eight of these have been replaced by the War Department and replacements for the remaining 10 were obtained from new production. Thus, our whole domestic air transport system for the carriage of passengers, express, and mail, was reduced to a paltry 165 airplanes. Since that time a total of only 107 airplanes have been returned to the air lines.

Prior to May 1942, the domestic air lines had 325 airplanes in service.

By wise planning, the air lines were able to handle a volume of traffic, with only about half of their airplanes remaining to them, which not only compares favorably with the traffic previously handled but, in important respects, actually represents a marked increase.

In the year ending June 30, 1942, approximately the last year during which the domestic airlines had all their airplanes, the revenue passenger miles flown were a little over 1,500,000,000. With only about half the airplanes remaining, for the year ending June 30, 1943, the same airlines flew revenue passenger miles of a little over 1,400,000,000, a decrease of only 6 percent, despite the decrease of nearly 50 percent in the available equipment.

What happened? Prior to the reduction in equipment the total scheduled flying hours per airplane on the domestic air-lines system was about 8 hours a day. That, in itself, compares very favorably with the record of the average freight car of only 2½ hours a day on the railroad system. But, with the decrease in equipment, schedules were reshuffled and the whole air transport system was placed on an even more efficient basis. The result was that by September 1943, the average daily scheduled flying time for each airplane on the domestic system was increased to over 11 hours.

Thus, the increase in the efficiency of utilizing equipment in the face of a grave national emergency was nearly 40 percent.

At the same time there was a similar increase in the revenue passenger load factor. For the first 6 months of 1942 on our domestic airlines system the load factor was about 67 percent—a figure which was commendable, and which no one at that time thought it possible to better. Yet, for the first 6 months of 1943 the load factor was increased to the surprising figure of 86 percent.

When it is borne in mind that these figures are over-all industry figures, it is evident what a magnificent record of management there has been. All of this has been accomplished without relaxing safety standards, and the standards of passenger handling and of service have been kept at a remarkably high level as well.

In this experience there is an important lesson for the future. It is a lesson which has been learned by our military forces on far-flung fronts. That is that the airplane is capable of most intensive utilization, so that 1 airplane can be made to go a long, long way. In terms of cheap transportation for both passengers and cargo this simple fact will some day mean a great deal. If our air transport system is built up in the future as we have tried to build it in the past, on a basis which will assure that it can be operated in the most efficient manner, and with improvements constantly encouraged, we have very high stakes, indeed, to win. The stakes are a new system of transportation, Nation-wide and world-wide, having peculiarly inherent advantages, capable one day of providing service at very low cost, and bringing both to passengers and to shippers opportunities for travel, trade, and communications never before dreamed of.

Plans for post-war civil aviation are now receiving consideration by the civil agencies in the executive department, as well as by the several interested committees in the House and Senate.

The question of international aviation has been the subject of preliminary conversations in Washington, London, and other United Nations' capitals. Such fundamental questions as the right of innocent passage over a friendly nation and the right of technical stop for servicing and repairs are among the basic problems discussed at these conferences.

Congress is wrestling with the problem of determining the policy of the United States concerning international aviation. There are many sides to the question, and therefore it requires considerable time and study, but it is hoped that the legislature will have established a well-defined international aviation policy before the end of this year. That seems to be necessary because of the problems which will have to be discussed in these international conferences and because it may be possible—at least we hope so—that the war will be over in great part, and that these trade areas will be available for penetration by air.

Among the problems which are to be considered in the matter of fixing our own legislative policy, a responsibility which is yours and mine, I wish to quote from a very enlightening speech delivered by Oswald Ryan, a member of the United States Civil Aeronautics Board, before the New York Board of Trade, in New York City on January 27, 1944. In discussing these problems he made the following observations:

> The fulfilment of our responsibility in this respect is beset with problems of great complexity and difficulty; and many of them are the special concern of the Civil Aeronautics Board. They include such questions as the so-called freedom of the air; whether there should be established by agreement among the nations the right of nonstop passage through the air space of foreign countries, the right of technical stop for the purpose of refueling or repairs, and the right to discharge and take on passengers—that is, to engage in air commerce. Another question concerns the right of nations to the equal use of airports built in foreign lands with the resources of nations other than the nation in whose jurisdiction the airports lie. Another major issue involves the nature of our international air lines: Shall we have a single-company system, a chosen instrument to conduct all American air commerce in the international field with no competition other than that provided by the air lines of other nations, or shall we authorize a number of American air carriers to compete with each other as well as with the foreign lines? Still another question before us is whether steamship carriers shall be permitted to control or operate air lines in the international field.
>
> Another problem presents the question whether our international air terminals shall be located on or near our national coast lines or borders as they are at present, or whether they shall be established in the interior of the country. Should our international air lines be authorized to pick up and discharge international traffic only at ports of entry on or near our coasts or borders, or should they be permitted to do so at cities in the interior? This problem of the inland terminal is, I am informed, a matter of particular interest to you of the metropolis and I pause to discuss it briefly. I should add that any views here expressed are my own and not necessarily the official views of the Civil Aeronautics Board.
>
> Here we have a problem with a historical background. The rivers and sea coasts were the early sites of our great commercial centers; then with the appearance of the railroad and automobile we saw the development of inland centers. Foreign trade, however, still required the maintenance of great transshipping centers at the seaports.
>
> The peculiar ability of the airplane to overcome the barriers of oceans and shore lines has led some to predict a revolutionary effect upon the great seaports of the world; some have foreseen the virtual abandonment of the great seaport cities and the establishment of inland terminals to take their places.

He then proceeded to relate that cities such as the city of New York, because of their preeminence, their geographical location, and their nearness to the pulse of the industrial area of this country, will maintain their preeminence in the post-war aviation world.

Whether our air lines in the international field will be Government-owned—and that is not likely—or include Government participation with private participation—and that may not be a reality either—or whether they will be built around a private monopoly referred to as a chosen instrument, or awarded competitively with protection zones as are air-mail contracts in our domestic field, are questions currently under discussion. In the United Kingdom the Government participates and directs the policy. In our own country prior to the war, one carrier, Pan-American, enjoyed a monopoly in the international field. What our policy will be in the post-war period is the big problem now before the Congress. I may point out here that the Civil Aeronautics Board has been diligent in discharging its responsibility, and awaits only congressional direction to award permanent contracts. I understand that already a great many hearings have been held preliminary to the awarding of contracts, and that such hearings are continuing, so that the Civil Aeronautics Board will be ready whenever the Congress enacts a policy. The State Department also has been cooperative, and from time to time has informed our committees of their activities in the matter of the deliberations of international conferences on aviation.

The question of our foreign air bases has been discussed in the Congress. Only a few days ago the distinguished Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS] took the floor and delivered a speech on this particular subject.

The airfields constructed in Africa, the Middle East, China, and the South Pacific were constructed in aid of military operations, often under the greatest requirements of speed. One could not take the position that we would not attack our enemies or prosecute our war unless we were given permanent rights in those fields. The Army blasted right ahead, as it should have done.

But, Mr. President, the State Department has laid the foundation for protection of our rights, even in these fields. An informal arrangement between Britain and the United States provides that neither power will make arrangements exclusive in character as against the other with any other power; this is world-wide. It affects every airport in which both countries might become concerned. The British and others have indicated their willingness to discuss mutual aviation rights, including rights in these fields, whenever we are ready to discuss them.

The United States possesses, in Pan-American Airways, by far the largest international air transport company in the world, serving in peacetime 62 countries and colonial possessions, where it had rights in the pre-war period, and where it also will have them in the post-war period. Those rights are ours, through that air carrier. As of the outbreak of the war, we were the only country with lines that reached all the five continents. Naturally, the Pan American retains its former rights in these countries.

There is no such thing, standing by itself, as a right in an air base, anyway, apart from general rights of air transit, or else we should have air bases, but no means of getting our planes to them. So it is one thing to have a right in an air base, but it is quite another thing to have a right to fly over that country and to utilize that air base.

Until their liberation, aside from holding general conferences, nothing can be done as to aviation rights in the Continent of Europe; and the rights in the Mandated Islands of the Pacific we expect to get largely as a result of conquering the Japanese.

To state that our aviation policy has been inadequate to protect American interests, and to cite as an example that we have constructed huge airfields in various parts of the world but we have no rights in their use after the war, would be, unless clarified, to accuse the War Department of not having put business ahead of winning the war. A business-as-usual or a dollar-diplomacy policy would have suggested that we demand commercial rights to fields installed for military purposes, either as a condition to doing the work or while in military possession. No one would urge that we hold up needed military work for one

minute—and no one has—in order to talk about commercial advantages. It should be equally obvious that to press commercial claims parallel with the military work, while in military possession and without going into the far wider considerations having to do with comprehensive international air agreements necessarily involving commitments on both sides, could only arouse distrust of our ultimate purposes and in the long run impair our ability to get the general rights of commercial air entry, to which the fields we have built are only incidental, and without which they would be worthless for commercial purposes.

What we want to do right now, Mr. President, more than anything else is to make sure that a system is set up whereby those rights will be protected in an orderly manner, by perhaps having them transferred by the military to the State Department, and perhaps by the State Department to the Foreign Economic Administration, where, particularly in the case of lend-lease countries, our rights can be well protected. I have every reason to believe, Mr. President, that our State Department is pressing our just claims in current negotiations. From what we learn from the State Department, that is being done.

At the outbreak of the war the United States was in better shape for overseas civil aviation than any other country in the world. We are today better off, and indeed have increased our lead. We have more extensive landing rights presently in existence than any other country. We now have preliminary understandings which will further enable us to negotiate on a fair basis for rights in the fields which we now occupy.

Remember, we have not scattered or disbanded our commercial aviation companies. We have planned, and have now under construction, the newest types of aircraft in the world, which will be available for civil use if they are not required for war transport.

One of the new passenger types, the *Constellation*, visited Washington a short time ago. It is now in the service, and sister ships are under production on our assembly lines.

The Curtiss-Wright Corporation and the Kaiser-Hughes Co.—although I am not certain about the latter—are turning out giant freight ships, while the Glenn L. Martin Co. is turning out a huge hydroplane for overseas service.

As one gets more deeply into the subject, he will find that we are better prepared for post-war aviation than any other country is.

I should like to have printed in the RECORD at this point an article taken from the December 1943 issue of the Atlantic Monthly, by William A. M. Burden, Special Aviation Assistant to the Secretary of Commerce. I call attention to his closing remarks, that Americans need have no fear of competition from abroad, least of all that the American air transport industry will be overwhelmed by foreign-government lines.

There being no objection, the excerpts from the article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXCERPTS FROM "THE FUTURE OF AIR TRANSPORT"—AN AMERICAN VIEW

(By William A. M. Burden)

Our plans for the future must begin with these three premises:

1. International air transport has been transformed by the war from a government-subsidized experiment into an economically sound transportation industry.

2. The growth of air transport does not constitute a military menace. Nor does the passage of foreign commercial airplanes over a country's territory constitute a threat to its security.

3. If, therefore, restrictions are imposed on international air transport, it must be for reasons of trade policy—not because the airplane is an airplane.

AIR TRANSPORT BEFORE 1939

Air transport operations between countries began immediately after World War No. 1, and they began in Europe, where the distances were short and the geographical obstacles few. By the outbreak of World War No. 2 some 108,000 miles of intercontinental air routes were in operation and practically every independent state or major colonial possession had regular air connection with its neighbors. The United States was the leader in the field; ours was the only country with lines that reached all the five continents.

AIR TRANSPORT AND GOVERNMENT

The business organization of international air transport was about what might be expected in an infant industry which was not only heavily dependent on state support but of acute interest to the military and diplomatic branches of government. Most European countries had already established the principle of state ownership of transportation facilities; and as table 2 indicates, most of their international air lines were government-owned monopolies or at least had a substantial percentage of government stock ownership and government representation on the board.

United States international operations, on the other hand, were in effect carried out by a single privately owned company, Pan American Airways.[1] Pan American was operated more nearly as a commercial enterprise and less under government control than any other international air transport company in the world.

The commercial services operating to Latin America and Europe are naturally limited in volume because of lack of equipment, but they are filled to capacity. Despite the fact that they are perforce operated with aircraft which were designed 10 years ago, they are not only highly profitable but are for the first time completely independent of subsidy.[2] Moreover, a ready-made travel market is being developed without cost to the air lines. Hundreds of thousands of soldiers and civilians are making long-distance flights on military or commercial services which in peacetime they could have been persuaded to take only by expensive advertising campaigns backed by a long record of safe and efficient transoceanic air transport operation.

Even conservative economists are now convinced that with the improved aircraft which will be available after the war international air lines on heavy traffic routes will require practically no subsidy unless the operating country has an unusually high cost level or unless more companies attempt to operate on each route than the traffic warrants. (Light traffic routes, some of which must be operated for strategic or other reasons, will need government help until traffic develops, but they will be exceptions.) This is a landmark in the history of international air transport. It means that for the first time the industry is capable of standing on its own feet.

HOW FREE IS THE AIR?

There is a natural tendency to compare air transport, as the international travel medium of the future, with ocean transport, the present backbone of international trade. This has led to a comparison of the existing "freedom of the seas" with a hypothetical "freedom of the air."

Since the early part of the nineteenth century the civilized nations of the world have generally removed all restrictions covering the entrance of commercial vessels into their ports. This has made it possible for a shipowner to start a steamship line to any port in the world, operating as many trips a year as the traffic and his own ingenuity in getting business permit.

This does not mean, of course, that the shipping nations of the world have competed on an equal basis. Prior to 1850, the British limited or prohibited the use of non-British vessels in trade between their colonies or between the colonies and the mother country. Since that time the British Government's assistance to shipping has been confined to limited operating or construction subsidies granted after 1929. The United States on its part has subsidized its shipping industry to meet the lower operating costs and labor standards of foreign ships and has forbidden foreign vessels to engage in our coastwise traffic (cabotage). But generally speaking, shipping companies have enjoyed a substantial degree of freedom of operation and world trade has profited thereby.

In contrast, the international arrangements in air transport before 1939 were characterized by their extreme restrictions. The air over the oceans has remained free, but the sovereignty of nations over their air space is an accepted principle,[3] and their right to exclude foreign commercial aircraft from the air above their territory has been unquestioned. This right of exclusion has been exercised to a degree which has seriously obstructed the development of international air commerce. All nations have refused to allow commercial airplanes en route to other countries to pass over their territories or to land for refueling or emergency purposes without first obtaining special governmental permission. The right to conduct business in foreign countries, that is, to pick up and discharge traffic, which steamship lines enjoy without securing any special permission, could only be obtained after complicated government negotiations.

Air transport companies were completely at the mercy of governments. The rights which they requested might be denied if bad feeling existed, or they might be refused—and this was a more common cause—if the government from which the rights were asked feared that its own air lines would suffer competitively from the new service.

---

[1] Pan American-Grace Airways, which operated the route down the west coast of South America from Panama to Argentina via Chile, was 50 percent owned by Pan American and 50 percent by W. R. Grace & Co.

[2] That is, revenues from the sale of air mail stamps on the letters carried are higher than the amount paid by the Government for the service.

[3] The basis of present international air law is the International Convention of Air Navigation (commonly known as the Paris Convention) of 1919, to which 26 nations, including the United States, are signatories. It provides: "The high contracting parties recognize that every power has complete and exclusive sovereignty over its air space," and further, "Every contracting state may make conditional on its prior authorization, the establishment of international airways and the creation and operation of regular international air navigation lines, with or without landing, on its territories."

When operating rights were granted, it was customary to hedge them around with restrictive conditions. The granting government might refuse to let the foreign service start until its own air line was ready to fly a return service. At the very least, it might demand reciprocal rights to fly as many schedules to the country requesting permission as it granted itself. The possibilities of delay and restriction inherent in this method of controlling international air transport came to their full flower in Europe, where national animosities were acute and where air transport companies were to a large degree instruments of national policy. To quote a standard work, International Air Transport and National Policy, by Oliver J. Lissitzyn:

"The necessity to bargain for landing rights has exercised a retarding effect upon the development of world air commerce. Routes which are technically feasible and commercially promising have remained unopened. * * * Italy, at a time when Italian air transport was weak and highly unprofitable, refused to grant landing rights to the British Imperial Airways on their way to the east, unless the British company's receipts on a certain run were divided equally with the Italian company, which had much less traffic. Iran compelled Imperial to shift its route to the southern shore of the Persian Gulf by insisting that in flying over Iran the company's planes follow an inland route over mountains and deserts that was found to be too difficult and dangerous for utilization. Turkey barred all foreign air lines from passing over it in an east-west direction, primarily for military reasons, and as a result European services to southern Asia were deprived of the use of the shortest route. Turkey's attitude redounded to the advantage of Greece, which, it was reported, required all foreign air liners passing over its territory to land at Athens and to coordinate their schedules with those of the internal Greek air services. Similar illustrations could be multiplied indefinitely."

Regardless of the rights and wrongs of these complicated international wrangles, it is apparent that the atmosphere in which international air transport was endeavoring to develop at the outbreak of the war was incredibly restrictive. It was restrictive largely because of certain fears and phobias which were the inheritance of World War No. 1. These fears have increased during the present war, and other vague apprehensions have been added to them.

AIR TRANSPORT IS NO THREAT

Such fears can only be dispelled by common sense firmly applied. We must begin by recognizing that the airplane is no longer a mysterious device fraught with unfathomable possibilities; on the contrary, it is a commonplace and accepted part of our daily life, like the automobile, the steamship, or any other transport vehicle.

The most commonly expressed fear is that future aggressor nations may build up huge air transport fleets which will in fact be military air forces in disguise or at least the basis for a large aircraft manufacturing industry which can easily be converted to building military airplanes. Such anxieties ignore the fact that civil and military design have sharply diverged and that the transport aircraft of the future will be no more useful as a bomber than the *Queen Mary* would be as a battleship. They also overlook the fact that the largest air transport industry that can be foreseen in the next decade or two will be very small in terms of military aircraft requirements.

A large part of the success of American air transport, both domestic and international, has been due to the fact that our air lines have been operated by businessmen, with a minimum of interference or control by Government. To date, the performance of European companies, most of which operated under direct control of Government departments, has been far from outstanding. High costs, an unnecessarily large number of different types of equipment, and average safety records have been the rule rather than the exception—a showing which can be attributed in part, at least, to the fact that essential commercial problems were approached from a bureaucratic or military rather than the business point of view.

To sum up, there seems no more reason to expect that competition in air transport will cause "economic wars" than that competition in shipping or other forms of trade will produce the same result. A substantial degree of competition between companies of different nationalities is not only inevitable in any international business but is necessary if air services are to develop in a healthy fashion, to improve their technique, and to serve the world public efficiently.

AMERICAN POLICY IN THE MAKING

In the United States, air transport is a concern of the average citizen to a much greater degree than in any other country in the world. Americans think in terms of what an expanding air transport industry will mean to the millions of our trained airmen who will be seeking occupations after the war. The effect of airline development on international trade is secondary in their minds.

The United States is in a unique position in that it alone had a large, privately managed air transport industry in operation for at least 10 years before the war. In operating techniques, excellence of aircraft design, and soundness of Government organization dealing with air transport matters our position is outstanding. Moreover, our air forces have made far greater use of air transport than have those of any other country. Important from the standpoint of our future policy is the fact that several of our larger domestic lines are operating outside the country for the first time, flying important transoceanic services under contract to the Army and Navy.

To supply planes for all these military operations, including the contract services, we are producing transport aircraft at the rate of 15,000 a year. Although most of these airplanes are not ideal for post-war international service, they are satisfactory stopgaps until new types can be put in production. Finally, the United States has constructed large, modern airports along strategic air routes throughout the world. Over 2,000,000 Americans are serving in our air forces, and many of them hope to make peacetime careers in aviation after the war.

Air transportation is thus an established and accepted business in the United States, and we naturally believe that Americans will operate a very extensive international airline system after the war, and operate it along business lines. The air transport issues about which Americans are exercised at the moment involve both our relations with other countries and the internal organization of our own air transport structure.

We are vitally interested in the ultimate disposition of the important airfields which have been built on foreign territory during the war either by Americans or with American funds. This issue has been somewhat obscured by the common practice of referring to all these airports as bases, perhaps because the first that were constructed were built under the 1940 agreement with Great Britain for the construction of defense bases in the Caribbean. Although some of the airfields in question are located at such strategic points that they may eventually be developed into military strong points comparable with the Gibraltars and Singapores of the days of sea power, the vast majority of them will always remain primarily commercial airports.

Concern has been expressed as to whether we shall be able to use these airports for commercial purposes in the post-war period, and it has been suggested that we should retain sovereignty over them. Actually, it is the right to utilize these facilities, not ownership of them, which is important. We do not talk about owning the foreign harbors which are ports of call for our merchant ships. Similarly we ourselves should certainly not welcome other countries holding sovereign rights over airports in the United States, even if they had been built by our allies with their own funds. It is probable that the working out of international agreements for the use of these fields, or even actual international ownership, may prove a more practical solution. If the principle of innocent passage is accepted by the leading nations of the world, our aircraft will be able to use all airports in the countries subscribing to such an agreement, for stopping or refueling points, without further special agreements.

A further fundamental problem affecting America's position in international air transport is the question of whether foreign operating costs, because of lower wage levels, will be so much lower than our own as to force us to subsidize our air transport industry as heavily as we have subsidized shipping. Conclusive evidence is not available, but the consensus of experts is that this will not be the case and that, because of the large home market provided by our domestic industry, and because of our superior operating techniques, we shall be able to hold our own in open competition, with a minimum of assistance.

On the home front there have been two burning questions: The possibility of Government ownership or Government control and the question of private monopoly. President Roosevelt reiterated his position in favor of private ownership as recently as October 1943, and Congress, although it has not expressed itself formally, has never been sympathetic to Government control of our air-transport system.

The American policy in regard to freedom of innocent passage, the desirability of creating an international judicial body to control the economic aspects of international aviation, and other such matters, has not yet been made clear. However, the 16 domestic air lines have endorsed the principle of innocent passage, and President Roosevelt in a recent press conference not only approved the idea but indicated that it had the informal acquiescence of Mr. Churchill.

It is for Congress to decide the final regulation of these issues and to determine the principles which will guide the international air-transport policy of the United States. The President is of course especially concerned, and among the executive agencies the Civil Aeronautics Board is charged with the economic aspects and the Department of State with the diplomatic aspects of the problem. A special Interdepartmental Committee on International Aviation Policy, consisting of representatives of the State, War, Navy, and Commerce Departments as well as the Civil Aeronautics Board, has been studying the subject since January 1943 and recently made its recommendations. The raw material on which policy can be formulated is available and it is hoped that it will not be long before a definite policy emerges.

GREAT BRITAIN DECIDES

In Great Britain the approach toward air-transport problems is in many respects quite different from ours. Until recently the public has taken much less interest in air transportation than has been shown in the United States. In the case of the officials, members of Parliament, and businessmen who determine air-transport policy, nonaeronautical considerations often carry very great weight. The British are keenly aware of the impor-

tance of air-transport development to Empire communications and Empire unity. Moreover, looking to the far-distant future, they foresee a day when air transport may develop to the point where it will provide an important source of foreign exchange or "invisible imports." In the long run, no country has more to lose from international restrictions in all spheres than Great Britain, the only one among the major powers dependent for her well-being on a large volume of international trade.

The problem of coordinating British air-transport policy with that of the Dominions is not a simple one. Each independent member of the Commonwealth has one or more air lines of its own, though none of these lines has yet engaged in international operations on any considerable scale. Canada, because of her strategic geographical position, has perhaps the most important stake in the international field and also possesses the largest and technically most advanced of the Dominion companies. An Empire air conference was held in London in October 1943, and once the results of this meeting have been digested, British policy will presumably take more concrete form.

RUSSIA

Though the Russian Government has not expressed itself publicly, its past policy toward foreign visitors does not suggest that the Russians would welcome the idea of "freedom of innocent passage," which would permit foreign commercial aircraft to cross Russian territory. Fortunately Russia's position in relation to the world's future air routes is not so strategic that her failure to adhere to such a doctrine at this time would seriously impede the development of world airways.

FOR INTERNATIONAL CONTROL

International aviation can be operated on an increasingly commercial basis. We can liberalize the pre-war attitude toward the establishment of new air services without relaxing the principle of national sovereignty over air space. All that is necessary is for the nations of the world to make mutual concessions to their common advantage, in the same manner that they permit merchant steamship to pass through their territorial waters. Once these general principles are defined, they can best be formalized by embodying them in a new world convention on air navigation.

If the climate of world opinion appears favorable to a bolder experiment in international regulation, the soundest step might be the creation of an international civil aeronautics commission with powers over rates and competitive practices. The powers of such a commission would be delegated to it by the subscribing states on a basis which they consider fair and reasonable. The commission would have to act in a neutral and judicial fashion. Its individual members could not represent the interests of particular countries any more than the members of our own Civil Aeronautics Board represent the States in which they were born. To achieve this end, the international commissioners might be selected in a manner similar to that in which the judges of the World Court were chosen—a manner designed to insure that they represented the interest of the world public rather than their own countries.

The way ahead is clear, once we rid ourselves of nameless fears and recognize that air transport is a business—not a weapon—and must be treated as such. If we are to have sense in transportation, we must relax the pointless restrictions which slowed the development of international air lines before the war, and accept the fact that there will be competition in air transport as there is in all forms of international business. We Americans have no need to fear such competition, either from the standpoint of our own world position or from that of the international friction which it may create.

In particular, we need not fear that the American air transport industry will be overwhelmed by foreign government airlines. History is not replete with instances of forceful administration or of rapid technical progress where government monopolies have existed; and those countries which place prestige above efficiency may suffer competitively as a result. If we throw our weight in the international scale for the organization of air transport along commercial lines, we can have confidence that the young Americans who make air transport their life work will have the greatest possible opportunity to carve out careers for themselves and to build up a new industry for the United States which will be of tremendous world significance.

Mr. MEAD. Let me also help to allay some of our fears by putting in the comments of some of our foreign friends. They at least are under no illusions that the American interest has not been adequately protected.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McKELLAR in the chair). Does the Senator from New York yield to the Senator from Maine?

Mr. MEAD. I am glad to yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. Let me ask the Senator whether he had completed the quotation from the article which says we need have no fear of foreign competition?

Mr. MEAD. Yes; I completed that quotation. Those were the words of Mr. William Burden at the conclusion of his statement.

Mr. BREWSTER. That is the sort of statement which gives me very great concern, in view of the productive capacity of certain foreign countries and their demonstrated technical skill. The statement, it seems to me, is well calculated to serve—although it is not so intended—the interests of some other countries which do not desire America to continue its present preeminence in the air. I may say that I have discussed the matter with those who manufacture the planes—with the Douglas Co., Curtiss-Wright, and others—and none of them feel that without adequate protection and proper policy we could expect to retain our preeminence, and that we will have the same challenge in the air, ultimately, that we formerly had on the sea, and, as the Senator knows, our merchant marine has suffered very greatly.

I interpolate this comment because I know the Senator from New York shares the concern of all of us that America shall continue its present preeminence.

Mr. MEAD. I welcome the timely contribution made by the Senator from Maine, and I will point out for my colleagues of the Senate that the emphasis which he, and perhaps myself, to a more humble degree, placed upon the value of our investment throughout the world had much to do with the determination and the decision of certain departments of the Government to go into the matter of evaluating those assets and providing a system whereby they will in an orderly manner revert from the military, perhaps through State Department channels, to a proper agency which will in its conferences with foreign governments represent our best interests.

With reference to fears, I realize that it is quite natural for the industry and for the air line, both of whom are interested in legislation which Congress will enact with reference to aviation, and both of whom are interested in maintaining during the post-war period, to be concerned about their present volume and activity which has been enlarged tremendously as a result of the war. Those fears, of course, are only natural. They are prevalent in all countries which are air-minded. I shall presently read into the RECORD a few excerpts from statements and editorials which show that similar fears have been expressed in other countries.

I still contend that prior to the war we maintained an international and domestic air service unequaled in the world, and that we are maintaining it now. Since the start of the war we have expanded it clear around the globe. It is necessary for us to maintain its preeminence by the speed, perhaps, and by the careful consideration which we give in Congress to pending legislation with reference to the matter. I know that my colleague is very much interested in that particular phase of the subject.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MEAD. I yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. I was out of the Chamber during a part of the discussion. I wish to inquire whether the Senator from New York has referred to the contemplated international conference on aviation which will be held perhaps early in November.

Mr. MEAD. I shall come to that subject. I have an item prepared on that particular point.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MEAD. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. In connection with the recent sale of airports which had been constructed by us through the Canadian Government, does the Senator from New York know whether there was any provision whatsoever for future use of those airports by commercial ships making intercontinental flights? I am referring to our own commercial ships.

Mr. MEAD. In the matter of flights in Canada and Labrador I understand that inasmuch as we have no lend-lease arrangement with Canada, as we have with the rest of the United Kingdom, Canada elected to pay the United States for the share which we had in the construction of the airports to which the Senator has referred, and to take them over in their entirety as the property of the Dominion of Canada. I recall that Canada elected to pay us approximately $225,000,000.

Mr. AIKEN. I believe the sum was approximately $270,000,000.

Mr. BREWSTER. It was only $70,000,000.

Mr. AIKEN. Then it was only $70,000,000.

Mr. MEAD. We have no way of changing the arrangement. We have no lend-lease arrangement with Canada. Canada elected to pay for the entire cost of the construction of the airport, and

therefore we have no financial interest in it, although in one case I wish we had had an interest.

Mr. AIKEN. Will it not be absolutely necessary that we use the Canadian and Labrador airports if we successfully compete with the post-war intercontinental air commerce?

Mr. MEAD. I think the Senator is correct. We certainly will need rights and privileges in the Dominion of Canada. We already have them in Alaska. Perhaps we will require them in Greenland and Iceland. But I am of the opinion that negotiations, which have already started in connection with Iceland, will perhaps be started shortly in connection with the Dominion of Canada and will be successfully negotiated. In other words, I do not look for any difficulty with Canada because in the prewar days we got along very well with Canada in matters involving aviation.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MEAD. I yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. Out of approximately $70,000,000 which was paid by Canada for the air bases to which reference has been made, which was to our advantage, there was contained a $7,000,000 item for the Goose Bay Airport in Labrador. I should like to inquire from the Senator from New York whether he has ever been able to secure any information with regard to how Canada acquired or asserted an interest in the Goose Bay Airport in Labrador which, as I understand, is a part of Newfoundland, and therefore a part of the Crown colony of Great Britain.

Mr. MEAD. It is my understanding that Canada made preliminary arrangements with the Government of Newfoundland, which the Senator knows is a British Crown colony governed by a commission appointed by the King. After those arrangements were made we entered into an oral agreement, or arrangement of some kind, with the Dominion of Canada. I understand that we obligated ourselves to pay 50 percent of the costs, and in doing so we were to be allowed to retain our rights and privileges in the Goose Bay Airport, but Canada elected to pay the entire cost. Canada, having made the original arrangements with the Government of Newfoundland, had the right to do so.

Mr. BREWSTER. Does the Senator understand that the arrangement between Canada and Newfoundland antedated the agreement between the United States and Great Britain that neither side would extend its air operating rights during the period of the war?

Mr. MEAD. No; I do not know as to that; and I do not know whether Canada was involved in the agreement between Great Britain and the United States. It may have been or may not have been. If Canada was not involved in the agreement she did nothing of an unfriendly nature.

Mr. BREWSTER. Canada would not be bound by the agreement with Newfoundland, as a Crown colony of Britain would be bound, and Great Britain would be bound not to yield rights to Canada in violation of the understanding.

Mr. MEAD. It occurred to me that it was an unfortunate occurrence, although I do not know what the original contractual agreement between Canada and Newfoundland was, or whether Canada was bound by the agreement between the United States and Great Britain.

As the Senator well knows, the value of the airport to which reference has been made was pointed out to us when we visited it, and that it was separated from the several airports which we constructed in another part of Newfoundland at a tremendous cost to our military activities. We built an airport at Argentia at a cost of approximately $7,000,000. On that airport we have a 99-year lease as one of the bases which came to us as a result of the transfer of title to 50 over-age destroyers.

Mr. BREWSTER. And we learned that the airport was accessible for only 50 or 60 percent of the year on account of the climate.

Mr. MEAD. Yes.

Mr. BREWSTER. And Goose Bay is accessible for approximately 360 days of the year because of favorable climatic conditions.

Mr. MEAD. Yes.

Mr. BREWSTER. It may be one of the important spots in the North Atlantic which will be available to aerial traffic.

Mr. MEAD. We were most favorably impressed on the occasion to which I have referred with the Goose Bay Airport.

Mr. BREWSTER. And we saw developments which indicated that they were not incident to war necessities.

Mr. MEAD. Oh, yes. They were evidently preparing for the post-war period, because of the ease with which material was available during the war.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mahogany bureaus, and so forth.

Mr. MEAD. In speaking of Labrador we begin to feel the necessity of warm clothing. But in an aside statement I confess to my colleagues that one member of our committee which visited Labrador in the late summer enjoyed a very comfortable plunge in the Hamilton River, and told me that the water was not nearly so cold as it sometimes was in Maine.

Mr. President, there is a good deal of fear, and properly so, throughout the world in countries where aviation is a predominant industry as to the position they may occupy in post-war aviation. While we have expressed our fear lest we be denied some of our rights, let me quote some excerpts from Foreign Air News Digest compiled by the Office of Air Transportation Information Division, Economic Bureau, Civil Aeronautics Board.

The first excerpt is as follows:

[From the London Sphere of February 27, 1943]

A SWISS VIEW

An article in a recent issue of the Swiss Interavia is quoted by Charles Graves in The Sphere. According to Interavia, the American Government and Pan American Airways are taking every advantage of the present world situation "in order to establish a powerful hegemony for the American air carriers on the world's commercial air routes."

Here is another one:

[From the London Times of April 16, 1943]

AIR TRANSPORT AFTER THE WAR

(By Maj. Gen. Sir Frederick Sykes)

Maj. Gen. Sir Frederick Sykes, British Controller General of Civil Aviation from 1919 to 1922, urges the British Government to give real leadership to the world in air transport.

One of Britain's difficulties will be to avoid collision with the interests of the United States, whose air transport has received strong financial and political support from the Government. With round-the-world routes already staked out, and a high wartime output of transport planes, the United States would have advantages—if the war were to end tomorrow—against which no other country could compete.

Mr. President, I have before me an article from the News Chronicle, of London, entitled "The World's Airways—Where Britain Stands," by Ronald Walker. It is dated May 5, 1943, and is as follows:

[From the London News Chronicle of May 5, 1943]

THE WORLD'S AIRWAYS: WHERE BRITAIN STANDS

(By Ronald Walker)

Mr. Walker states that discussion of post-war air transport has revealed "not altogether unexpected imperial ambitions on the part of Americans suddenly become conscious of the rest of the world: A typical lack of concern for the future by the British authorities; and unwelcome deposits of rancour and suspicion on both sides of the Atlantic."

Since the introduction of the twin-engined Douglas DC 2 air liner, the United States has led in the design and construction of commercial aircraft. Now Americans have invented the word "global," and established a system of world services "which handed to America's air transport tsars not the vision but the fact of a world air empire."

At the outbreak of the war the British monopoly, BOAC, which was operating a "tolerable" network of services with a small and aging fleet, came at once under the direction of a government that did not realize the vital need for air transport in modern warfare, or ignored it, or both. The supply problems of the distant battle fronts and recent spectacular American air transport developments have aroused Britain, however, to the realization of the true value of air transport now and in the future.

Today Britain continues to struggle along with a transport fleet which can only increase by American supply. The United States has imperial ambitions in the air, and on the ground the factories are turning out the airplanes to satisfy these ambitions.

I have before me, Mr. President, an editorial entitled "Shipping and the Air," which comes from Fair Play, London, and is dated April 22, 1943. It is as follows:

[From the London Fair Play of April 22, 1943]

SHIPPING AND THE AIR

The United States will supply competition in the air that "will take us all our time and skill to cope with. Not only will it be a question of organizing ability and staff work, but of financial resources."

We have Australian suggestions. I quote from the Evening Post of Wellington, New Zealand, of May 7, 1943, as follows:

Mr. Taylor also advocates the development of a second air route across the Pacific. "A good deal has been said of American aims toward domination of post-war air transportation. The facts are that the United States alone energetically developed bases and provided air communication and transport which form an essential part of the United Nations' war operations." Though individual Australians pioneered the trans-Pacific route, the United States followed these flights with an organized route, without which Australia would be in a very different position today.

The situation of Australia and New Zealand, in my judgment, is very favorable insofar as post-war aviation expansion is concerned.

I have here an editorial entitled "The Eagle and the Lion" from the Liverpool Daily Post of June 2, 1943. It is as follows:

Apparently it is fear of American dominance in air communications of the future that awakens a counter-attacking spirit of enterprise in some of the government's present critics.

I have an excerpt from another editorial entitled "American versus British Plans," from the Syren and Shipping, of London, of June 9, 1943, which reads as follows:

Whatever smokescreen may be put up in Parliament by government spokesmen answering the demands that commercial air transport be freed from state control, "the fact remains that the Americans are fully aware of the unique opportunities we are giving them and are moving heaven and earth to establish their air transport system on a sound basis before the end of the war."

The Sydney Morning Herald, in an article entitled "Australia States Its Position," of June 7, 1943, gives us this illuminating observation:

The position of the Australian Government on international air transport has been explicitly stated to high British officials. Australia recognizes that international collaboration in post-war aviation is essential for her preservation and that, except for her association with the United States, she would have been defeated and destroyed.

Mr. President, I have here a number of other excerpts from articles and editorials which I should like to have inserted in the RECORD. One of them is entitled "Air Carriers' Statements," from the Aeroplane, of London, of August 13, 1943. Another one is entitled "No Competition, No Monopoly," from the Liverpool Daily Post, of Liverpool, August 6, 1943, and Transport World, London, August 14, 1943. There are also a number of others.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the excerpts may be printed in the RECORD.

The excerpts are as follows:

AIR CARRIERS' STATEMENTS

[From the London Aeroplane of August 13, 1943]

The Joint Air Transport Committee (representing the Associated British Chambers of Commerce, the Federation of British Industries, and the London Chamber of Commerce) has issued a report commenting on the recent joint announcement of 16 United States air companies and on the rival announcement of P. A. A., American Export, and United Airlines.

The proposal of free and open competition on the international routes after the war should be reconsidered. Because of sacrifices made in the common cause, Britain will be unable to compete freely with the United States for some time after the war.

The two statements by the American airline companies show the grave danger of the British Empire's lack of recognized policy.

[From the Liverpool Daily Post of August 6, 1943, and the London Transport World, of August 14, 1943]

NO COMPETITION—NO MONOPOLY

Commenting on the recent statement by a majority group of 16 air lines in the United States, the Joint Air Transport Committee states: "* * * there is not a single one of the European countries among the United Nations which will not for some little time after the war be in a gravely embarrassed position to join in 'free and open competition' with the United States."

[From the (London) Times of August 10, 1943]

LETTERS TO THE TIMES

A letter from another correspondent remarks: "However, even if we in this country underestimate the importance of flying, I feel certain that our friends in the United States lack neither the vision nor the courage to implement it."

[From Canadian Aviation (Toronto), of October 1943]

CANADA'S POST-WAR CONCERN

(By Thomas Wayling)

There has been steady and persistent propaganda on the part of the United States' air lines which wish to obtain a dominant position in world air transport.

[From the (London) National Review of September 1943]

A CHALLENGE TO BRITAIN

(By Ronald Pearce)

The United States has a common policy. The Soviet Union has a definite policy. But the British Commonwealth and Empire have no common policy, nor are they near securing one.

[From the (London) Aeroplane of September 3, 1943]

THE UNITED STATES AS AN EXAMPLE

The British Government still adheres to the principle of the "single chosen instrument" in the field of air transport, while the United States Government is encouraging private enterprise in the international field. Monopoly slows up and limits development and the British would do well to consult and encourage private aviation interests, as is being done in the United States.

[From the Syren and Shipping (London) of August 11, 1943]

BRITISH SHYNESS

The discussions in the House of Commons last week showed that the British Government is still afraid to take the lead in post-war civil aviation and is timidly waiting for other nations to show it the way.

[From Great Britain and the East (London) of September 4, 1943]

A TIME FOR DECISION

(By A. James Payne)

The part that Great Britain will play in the post-war international set-up has been settled only by conversationalists. It is distressing that the Government has announced no plans comparable to those made by the United States.

United States air companies have indicated their interest in Pacific, trans-Atlantic, and South American routes. "While neglecting no part of the world, it is to be hoped that Great Britain is equally jealous of her claim to operate through the Mediterranean to the Near and Middle East, while also taking part in the Far Eastern services to the Pacific via India and China." British aviation interests are confused by "altruistic ministerial reticence" on Empire air transport. On the other side of the Atlantic, operators enjoy "the blessing of their legislators and the confidence of the people."

United States' claims are positive and are based on the practical economics of immediate post-war absorption of American air transport and service facilities. Britain's autumn planning of air transport should be as sensible and vigorous as has been the spring planning of America's independent aviation interests.

AMERICAN AMBITION FEARED

American independent operators are virtually building and operating a world-wide air transport network on the strength of present wartime arrangements.

Post-war air transport will differ little from air transport today. The economy will be different, but American air transport was founded on pre-war economies, which presupposes post-war continuation. The Americans predict their air future in luxurious superlatives. American operators claim an air transport mileage and tonnage exceeding that of all pre-war air lines of the world combined, and moreover have astronomic extensions of facilities scheduled for the near future. This threatens to become an incurable habit more than a wartime necessity.

Britain's plight is not chiefly a question of public or private ownership, sovereignty or freedom of the air. It is the hard fact that Britain cannot hope to supply needed transport aircraft in the near future to its unwanted orphan, the chosen instrument, or to the Empire. This vacillation gives an advantage in economic recovery to the United States, Russia, and perhaps to Germany.

A MEMBER OF PARLIAMENT BERATES THE UNITED STATES

[From the Daily Herald, the Financial News (London), and the Liverpool Daily Post of October 11, 1943]

In a speech at Wigan, E. Shinwell, Laborite M. P., demanded a plain declaration from the war cabinet on the future policy of the nation. He said that the United States seemed to be determined to lead the world in both shipping and air transport. Superhuman efforts are made in America to make the people airminded, while England must be content with Churchill's assent to the statement of President Roosevelt.

[From the Daily Mail (London) of March 10, 1943]

CONTROL EUROPE'S AIR ROUTES

Mr. W. L. Runciman, until recently Director General of British Overseas Airways, said at Bristol: "After the war * * * if you are not careful you are going to have airline competition between governments with a disarmament-political complex." America would have all the advantages.

[From Parliamentary Debates (London) of May 12, 1943]

HOUSE OF LORDS

Lord Sempill agreed with Lord Londonderry and Lord Bennett, he said, that the most vital aspect of the whole question is that of planning the program for world air transport with the United States. The bulk of the operating and manufacturing experience available in the world is in the hands

of the United States, but Great Britain and the Empire have important contributions to make technically and territorially.

[From K 3754 (London) of June 2, 1943]

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Throughout the debate on civil aviation in the House of Commons on June 1, "there appeared a realization of the possibility of conflict with the United States over policy, and a sense of the necessity of avoiding it if possible."

[From the Daily Mail (London) of July 26, 1943]

AMERICA WORRIES OVER US

The Washington correspondent reports growing American awareness that Britain may start the post-war era a poor second in commercial aviation and merchant shipping as a result of the way the war is being waged and supplied.

[From Flight (London) of August 12, 1943]

CARDS ON THE TABLE

The hesitancy of the British Government with regard to air transportation is hard to understand since America is now openly laying plans. The C. A. B. is already empowered to dispose of surplus aircraft. America's aircraft manufacturers, through the post-war development committee of the Aeronautical Chamber of Commerce, have advanced proposals to avoid dumping military aircraft on the market.

Jack Frye, president of T. W. A., reveals that his firm is studying plans to start foreign national airlines with American aircraft and personnel until such time, perhaps in 10 to 20 years, as these nations are able to operate their own airlines. He states frankly that thus "American equipment would be in actual use in many parts of the world, and these countries would look to the United States for replacement."

These open declarations contrast with "our own feeble talk" as shown by Sir Archibald Sinclair's "threadbare statement" in the Commons on August 4 that "consultations are going forward about these matters with His Majesty's Government in the dominions and with the government of India, and we are awaiting replies to certain communications."

[From the World Review (London) of October 1943]

BRITAIN MUST ADVERTISE

(By W. Hudson Fysh)

In America the people are being taught that the United States is first in the air and will continue to be so in the future. The outpouring of "air-age" advertising is so vast and well conceived that it has to be seen to be believed. It will have the most profound effect upon the people of the United States. Air-conscious Americans will demand that their Nation be first in the air. "Governments will stand or fall by their air policy."

On the other hand, Britain, whose future is as bound up in air transport as it was in shipping, is not even making available the paper on which to conduct such publicity.

[From the Evening Post (Wellington) of September 29, 1943]

A SERIES OF CONFERENCES

The British Government is getting much public and private criticism for its alleged "do nothing" policy with regard to post-war aviation. This scolding arises from a feeling that delay now means loss of opportunity to compete later with the rest of the world, especially the United States.

Mr. MEAD. One of the excerpts I desire to read. It is entitled "Britain Must Catch Up", and is from the Sunday Times of London of October 3, 1943:

"American air transport is, at present, the best in the world." Development of American aircraft is proceeding apace, aided by the most complete scientific equipment in existence. Britain must concentrate a great deal more on scientific training and research if her aircraft are to hold their own with the best America can produce.

With its vast distances, the United States is the "ideal breeding ground for transport aircraft." The British Empire must attain the same level as the United States, but in friendly rivalry, not with cutthroat competition. "All that is needed is a still further understanding of each other's problems and potentialities."

Mr. President, I believe that proper arrangements will be made and that air transport will develop with the friendly support of air-minded nations.

Mr. President, I have before me a memorandum which gives the percentage of aircraft production to the total war program. It occurs to me that it is a valuable contribution to be contained in any general statement such as the one I have been making. The memorandum gives an idea of the vastness of this new industry.

The airplane has been the outstanding weapon of World War No. 2 and consequently aircraft production has represented a sizable percentage of total war production. I do not mean to say that it is the only weapon, but it is by far a superior weapon and in comparison with the weapons of other wars it is obvious that it is the outstanding weapon developed in World War No. 2. For the 4-year period from the middle of 1940 to 1944, aircraft production has represented 24 percent of war procurement and 15 percent of all war expenditures. That is a colossal total.

For the first half of 1944 aircraft production has represented 33 percent of all production and 20 percent of total war expenditures.

TOTAL DOLLAR VALUE OF AIRCRAFT PRODUCTION

The total dollar value of aircraft delivered since 1942 is as follows:

1942	$6,300,000,000
1943	13,800,000,000
First half 1944	10,000,000,000
Estimate for the total year 1944	20,000,000,000

The figures indicate the plant, the machinery, the personnel and the ability of this country to produce.

Mr. President, I have here a table showing deliveries of aircraft.

DELIVERIES OF AIRCRAFT

A total of 227,094 airplanes have been produced and delivered in the United States since January 1940, as set forth in the following schedule:

1940	6,086
1941	19,290
1942	47,873
1943	85,946
Through August 1944	67,899

BACKLOG OF AIRCRAFT PRODUCTION

The present total unliquidated obligations of the Army Air Forces on aircraft production contracts is $24,000,000,000. The total for the Navy is $4,500,000,000, making a grand total of $28,500,000,000.

Aircraft-production employment is a problem which will have to enter any post-war employment program we may discuss. The total estimated employment in the aircraft-production industry for August is approximately 1,910,000, distributed as follows——

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. MEAD. I am glad to yield.

Mr. AUSTIN. I inquire who makes that estimate?

Mr. MEAD. This estimate was prepared by one of the representatives of the special committee investigating the war effort. We are gathering among other things all the facts and figures relating to this particular activity, including the bases all over the world, so that at some later date we may make a detailed report to the Senate with reference particularly to the disposition of bases, the disposition of aircraft material, and the disposition of Government-owned airplane plants. So, one of the agents or employees of the committee gathered this information as to this one item, in conference with one of the departments.

Mr. AUSTIN. Does the Senator think it proper to give his name? Does the Senator know the name?

Mr. MEAD. No; but it is one of the men who worked for our committee, and this information was secured by him by contacting the various aviation agencies of the Government. I will say that if the Senator or anyone else wants his name, I shall ask for it, but we are gathering all this information, and I thought it would be a good item to include in a speech which I had prepared several months ago, because it gives one an idea of the enormity of this industry, and it at once brings to mind the problem which will face us on X-day, when these orders are canceled.

Mr. AUSTIN. It faces us already.

Mr. MEAD. The Senator is correct. We know that the problem is imminent.

Mr. President, I repeat the statement I was making when interrupted.

AIRCRAFT PRODUCTION EMPLOYMENT

The total estimated employment in the aircraft-production industry for August is approximately 1,910,000 distributed as follows:

Airframe industry	808,000
Engines	335,000
Propellers	57,000
Gliders	10,000
Special-purpose aircraft	2,000
Modification centers	43,000
Subcontracting and G. F. E. (estimated)	655,000
Total	1,910,000

AIRCRAFT-PRODUCTION FACILITIES

Total facilities for aircraft production for both the Army and Navy, including facilities for producing basic metals such as magnesium, have cost to date nearly $4,500,000,000, of which one-third represents investments in buildings and land and the remaining two-thirds represents cost of machine tools, other production equipment and miscellaneous items.

The Army Air Force personnel, personnel we have trained in aviation, is

another factor into which our committee will inquire.

I may say for the benefit of my distinguished colleague, the senior Senator from Vermont, that I am on the Subcommittee on Aviation of the Committee on Commerce, and I secured much of the information I have given from the testimony which was presented to that committee. Our committee investigating the war effort is making a study only of the disposition of surpluses of Government-owned plants, and other assets, including our air bases, and a report on that will be made to the Senate in a separate and I hope rather detailed report later on.

Mr. AUSTIN. Will the Senator yield further?

Mr. MEAD. I yield.

Mr. AUSTIN. My interest was particularly attracted to the item relating to manpower. As the Senator knows, I have made a special study of manpower for a long time, practically throughout this session of the Congress, and for more than half of the last session, and I am continuing the study, and I realize that we will have about as difficult a problem in demobilization as we have had to solve thus far in mobilization.

Mr. MEAD. The Senator is quite correct, and I shall take the liberty, if it is agreeable, of asking the gentleman who compiled these factual figures to leave a copy in the Senator's office.

Mr. AUSTIN. I thank the Senator.

Mr. MEAD. The Army Air Force personnel numbers under approximately 350,000 officers and 2,050,000 enlisted men, a total of 2,400,000 officers and men. The Navy Air Forces total approximately 1,000,000 officers and men. Or there is a total of 3,400,000 officers and enlisted personnel found in the Army and Navy Air Forces.

Mr. President, I have here a letter addressed to the Honorable Franklin D. Roosevelt, President of the United States, by the chairman of our Committee on Commerce, the senior Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY], and by the chairman of our subcommittee, the senior Senator from Missouri [Mr. CLARK]. These two distinguished colleagues of mine have been working at great length, very arduously and studiously, as has been true of all the members of the subcommittee, in an effort to perfect a policy which will be reported to the Senate when it is available for consideration by the Senate.

They, too, along with the State Department, through its Foreign Economic Administration, are attempting in this letter, and I believe successfully so, to protect our over-all interests, because in the letter they are explaining to the Chief Executive that—

> The committee is deeply impressed with the importance of the decisions which must now be reached: Whether there should be any change in the United States policy in the matter of regulating international air transport with foreign countries and whether the United States should have a number of American-flag airlines operating abroad or concentrate American operations under a single system in which all transportation interests able to contribute would be permitted to participate. In these decisions, the advantage of any one air line or group of air lines must be subordinated to the paramount national interest. Policies which will best assure the United States retaining the position of leadership in international air transport, to which its resources and geographical situation entitle it, should be adopted.

I think we are all in agreement with that statement addressed to the President by the chairman of the Committee on Commerce of the Senate and by the chairman of the subcommittee studying aviation.

Mr. AUSTIN. Will the Senator further yield?

Mr. MEAD. I yield.

Mr. AUSTIN. I have listened to this report with much interest believing that it is timely. We have only recently passed the surplus property disposal bill, which has not yet become law. In that bill the Committee on Military Affairs, and subsequently the Senate, found it wise to postpone any decision upon the disposal of surplus property which will be found in this general subject of aviation. That includes aircraft, airfields and facilities, and all that sort of thing. A policy was adopted by the Senate, on the recommendation of the Committee on Military Affairs, which involved the reporting to Congress by the distinguished Committee on Commerce, and any other committee which has legislative proposals bearing on this subject, before Congress decides finally on the manner of disposal of surpluses in that category.

Mr. MEAD. I appreciate the valuable contribution made by the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MEAD. I yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. Does not the Senator from New York think it would be helpful, in connection with his most instructive discussion of the subject, to incorporate in the RECORD as a part of his remarks the letter to which he has just referred?

Mr. MEAD. I should be glad to do as the Senator has suggested. I think the letter would be helpful.

The letter concludes by saying:

> In view of this time lag, the committee feels no prejudice to the national interest wou'd be involved in deferring definitive decisions on international applications until the Congress shall have had opportunity for considering all phases of the situation and for taking such legislative action as might then seem wise.

So, as I said before, I believe that the committee, which included my distinguished colleague the junior Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] and several other Senators, which made the trip around the world, and the several departments of the Government involved, have contributed to the perfection of a policy which will protect America's post-war position.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the letter from which I have quoted be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE,
August 19, 1944.

The Honorable FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT,
President of the United States,
The White House,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: The profound significance of international air transport in the post-war world has led the Committee on Commerce of the Senate to appoint a subcommittee to consider appropriate changes in legislation dealing with this subject in order to assure the position of the United States in post-war air transport overseas.

The subcommittee has been holding extended hearings throughout the past year with thorough presentation of all points of view from Government officials and agencies concerned, and also from various private interests involved.

We have been advised by the Chairman of the Civil Aeronautics Board that there are now pending before the Board approximately 500 applications for authority to operated domestic service within the territorial limits of the continental United States, as well as some 100 applications for authority to operate internationally or overseas between the United States and its Territories; also, that the Board has denied the application for approval of the control of American Export Airlines, Inc., by American Export Lines, Inc., a surface carrier. This decision seems sound and in line with the long-established policy of Congress that one form of transport shall not control a competitive form of transport.

The committee is deeply impressed with the importance of the decisions which must now be reached: Whether there should be any change in United States policy in the matter of regulating international air transport with foreign countries and whether the United States should have a number of American-flag air lines operating abroad or concentrate American operations under a single system in which all transportation interests able to contribute would be permitted to participate. In these decisions, the advantage of any one air line or group of air lines must be subordinated to the paramount national interest. Policies which will best assure the United States retaining the position of leadership in international air transport, to which its resources and geographical situation entitle it, should be adopted.

The question of whether or not the United States should now modify its historic position as to sovereignty of the air above its borders and to what extent the United States may wisely go in subscribing to the various doctrines being proposed that contemplate general agreements with another nation or group of nations concerning freedom of the air or freedom of innocent transit seem to the committee to invite the most careful consideration by both the executive and legislative branches of the Government and particularly of those concerned with the determination of policy.

Whether or not operating franchises in foreign countries should in general continue to be secured by direct application of the American flag airline concerned or through governmental negotiation is also pressing for a decision. Prior to the war, operating franchises in approximately 50 foreign countries and colonies had been granted to the American flag airline system by the foreign governments concerned. The advantages or disadvantages of any change in this previously prevailing practice may well be weighed carefully.

All the evidence before the committee has indicated that approximately 75 percent of international air travel may be expected to be of United States origin. Under these circumstances, the United States would seem to be entitled to expect a position of preeminence in international air operation.

In the special report of the Civil Aeronautics Board on international air transport policy under date of April 12, 1944, it is recommended that the governmental agreements suggested "should place no limitation on the total volume of operation on particular routes agreed upon." The consequences of such a policy, if adopted, seem to the committee to offer great dangers to the development of United States international air transport. Under such a policy under the lower operating costs of foreign carriers with lower wage levels traffic of United States origin might well come to be monopolized by foreign flag lines to the very great prejudice of the national interests of the United States.

International air transport commenced at the conclusion of the last war in 1919. For the first few years, competition abroad existed between air lines of the same nationality. This competition between international air lines of the same nationality soon gave way in most countries to a system of zone monopolies whereby competition was restricted to foreign-flag services. Prior to the Second World War, however, all the principal foreign trading nations had entirely abandoned competition abroad between their own air lines and had also given up even their zone monopolies. Without exception, they had merged their international air-transport operations into single national airline systems or chosen instruments to strengthen their competitive position in the field of international air transport. In the United States a similar development had occurred, although without formal legislative declaration but as a result of administrative action under existing law. As a result in the last decade the United States system came to lead the world in route mileage and in commercial service.

The Civil Aeronautics Board has indicated certain routes that it considers to be in the national interest and consideration of operations on these routes is now being urged.

Whether or not American international air transport should follow the pattern that has been adopted by all principal foreign trading nations, or should develop several independent systems, each to serve a separate trade area abroad, presents a question of policy for legislative as well as executive consideration.

A number of important American companies concerned with air as well as surface transportation have presented the advantages of creating a community company to represent the United States effort abroad in which all transportation interests able to contribute by air, sea, and land may pool their resources and facilities to present a united and coordinated air-transport system to meet the undoubted severe competition of other nations that the United States must face in the post-war period and American labor organizations have shown great interest in the advantages of such a plan.

The alternative proposal is for what would approximate regional monopolies serving the principal world areas originating air traffic, with competition supplied by foreign air lines.

The Commerce Committee concerned with this situation are very appreciative of the cooperation of the various Government agencies and the advices which have been received regarding the pending situation and prospective developments.

The committee will appreciate continuing to be kept advised, and meanwhile would request that no action be taken regarding international air-transport applications for new routes or acquisition of existing services outside the continental United States and Canada until full consideration of Government policy can be had by Congress.

The Civil Aeronautics Board advises the committee "that if an important international proceeding should be concluded within 8 months from the time it started we would feel that a very satisfactory time schedule had been maintained."

In view of this time lag the committee feels no prejudice to the national interest would be involved in deferring definitive decision on international applications until the Congress shall have had opportunity for considering all phases of the situation and for taking such legislative action as might then seem wise.

The committee further feels that any hearings at this time on applications for certificates of public convenience and necessity for overseas or foreign service should be with the full understanding by all concerned that certain changes in policy may occur and that no action should be taken which would complicate the situation or prejudice the ultimate decision by the legislative authorities concerned with policy. The committee is in full accord with the Civil Aeronautics Board and the other executive agencies concerned in recognizing the advisability of "active consideration of the question of the over-all policy relating to our very important international air transportation services."

This letter is being forwarded to you as the final authority under existing law on the issuance of certificates for the operation of United States air lines in overseas and international transportation. A copy is being forwarded to the Civil Aeronautics Board who must approve applications for acquisition or mergers of American flag carriers in the international field.

Cordially yours,

JOSIAH W. BAILEY,
Chairman, Committee on Commerce.
BENNETT CHAMP CLARK,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Civil Aeronautics.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, in connection with the continuity of control over our foreign air bases—and this is information which I have elicited over the telephone from several departments—there is a directive by the President, I learned, which requires that the Foreign Economic Administration take over after the military determines that bases are no longer required, having in mind protecting the American interests. I have been informed by the Foreign Economic Administration that it has no jurisdiction over air bases abroad until the War Department determines that the bases are no longer needed for its purposes and assigns them to the Foreign Economic Administration.

We brought this matter up on the occasion of one of the meetings of the special investigating committee, and I do not know, but I hope that as a result of that discussion this system will be developed. However, under Presidential directive the Foreign Economic Administration is required to obtain all facts regarding expenditures abroad and the agency at this time is obtaining such information regarding these bases pursuant to my request made at a public hearing held by our committee on August 24, 1944. We shall have all that information, and it will be contained in the special committee's report to the Senate.

In addition I have requested the War Department to supply certain data regarding these bases, and at the appropriate time it is expected that this information will be furnished. These data will include the following items:

First. A list of the air bases and their locations.

Second. Their present status with an indication of whether they are owned or leased by the United States.

Third. Any improvements contemplated.

Fourth. Plans for ultimate disposition.

Fifth. Cost information where it is readily available, and if not readily available, an indication of the date when the same will be forwarded.

I am not requesting any of this information if it in any way interferes with the war effort, but if it does not, and when it does not, our committee would like to have this information, in order to transmit it to the Senate.

The requested information will cover air bases in the following places: North Africa, particularly the Lyautay Air Base, New Zealand, Australia, New Guinea, Fiji Islands, Samoa, Iran, Iraq, the United Kingdom, Egypt, India, China, New Caledonia, Iceland, Greenland, and Canada.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MEAD. I yield.

Mr. BUTLER. In the list of countries given by the Senator no Latin-American countries are included?

Mr MEAD. No.

Air bases built in countries wherein we have lend-lease agreements will be turned over to the Foreign Economic Administration when the military no longer requires their use, and will become part and parcel of the lend-lease—lend-lease-in-reverse determination.

We have lend-lease agreements with a number of countries. With some countries we have no lend-lease agreements. The list is as follows:

Canada and Newfoundland: Both pay cash; no lend-lease agreement; both covered by lend-lease with United Kingdom.

Greenland: No lend-lease arrangements with Greenland. (Army has been taking in some material.)

Iceland: Has lend-lease agreement.

United Kingdom: Has lend-lease agreement.

North Africa: Portion controlled by France, covered by lend-lease agreement with French National Committee of Liberation.

Egypt: Declared eligible for lend-lease; no agreement.

Iran: Declared eligible for lend-lease; no agreement.

Iraq: Declared eligible for lend-lease; no agreement.

India: Covered by United Kingdom agreement.

Ceylon (Crown colony): Covered by United Kingdom agreement.

Australia and New Zealand: Governed by principles of United Kingdom agreement. Each has separate reciprocal aid agreement.

New Guinea: Portion controlled by Dutch, covered by Dutch lend-lease agreement. Portion controlled by British, covered by United Kingdom agreement.

New Caledonia: Covered by lend-lease agreement with French National Committee of Liberation.

Fiji Islands: British. Covered by agreement with Great Britain.

Samoa: Area split between United States and New Zealand.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MEAD. Yes; I shall be glad to yield.

Mr. WILEY. I suppose that the purpose of this exploration by the committee is to ascertain two things: First, in what way American investments are protected; and, second, in what way we have failed, if we have failed, to obtain rights which would aid and protect America in the future. Am I correct in my statement of the objective of the exploration?

Mr. MEAD. In the statement which I am leaving with the committee I am attempting to apprise the Senate of the present position of the United States in the post-war aviation picture or program. I gather my material both from the departments and agencies of the Government and from my observation as a member of the Subcommittee on Aviation of the Committee on Commerce, as well as from my trip around the world with the special Senate committee, and also from the hearings of the special investigating committee. It seems to me that because of the attitude of the Congress, the attitude of the agencies of the Government, and the agreements which we have with certain countries of the world, we are fairly well protected, and that all we need to worry about is the enactment of a law by the Congress which will definitely fix the policy to guide the executive departments and good continuing administration by the several agencies which have to do with our aviation assets abroad. The system is there, supplemented by a directive of the President; and the policy will be there as soon as Congress enacts the policy.

However, I point out that I believe that the Congress ought to devote considerable time and energy, beginning now, to the adoption of an effective policy, because that is very necessary. If we have no policy, when the war is over what will be the substance of the negotiation between the State Department and certain countries in the world wherein we desire certain rights? The agencies of the Government require the determination of this policy. So it occurs to me that a number of problems are involved. The first is an explanation of the work which the Congress is doing in effecting a policy. It is a fine work, and I believe it will be well done.

Secondly, I point out—and in all humility I do not appropriate to our committee any of the credit—that there has been a directive set-up and an orderly procedure whereby the War Department yields war bases, when they are no longer necessary, perhaps through the State Department, to the Foreign Economic Administration. They then become involved in lend-lease—and perhaps lend-lease in reverse—adjustments. They also become the objects of the State Department in international negotiations which are now in progress in connection with post-war rights.

I also point out that even if Congress should fix the policy tomorrow, and we should have 100 applications for international services under existing law, many months of hearings would be required to determine the question of convenience and necessity with respect to such applications. The Civil Aeronautics Board is now holding hearings in the hope that it can put most of the applications behind it and be ready when Congress fixes the policy. So we are not losing any valuable time. It must be borne in mind that Pan American Airways is now maintaining and reopening its foreign air mail services all over the world as the lights go on. Se we are not losing any valuable time, because the governmental agencies, the Congress, and this company are all "on their toes" and evidently doing all they can to further the interests of the United States in the post-war period.

It would be enlightening to know that, for example, Pan-American is maintaining commercial service on a number of lines out of Miami to the Caribbean, to Buenos Aires, to Habana, Balboa, Barranquilla, and Nassau; from Brownsville to Balboa; from New Orleans to Balboa; from Balboa to Port-of-Spain; from Balboa to Buenos Aires; from San Francisco to Honolulu; from Juneau to Whitehorse in Alaska; from Fairbanks to Whitehorse; from New York to Hamilton, Lisbon, and the Mediterranean area; and from New York to Foynes, which is in Eire. From there a shuttle service operates civil air lines to London. As I understand, arrangements have been made to open up a South Pacific air line to New Zealand. So as the situation in the world improves, we advance and extend our international aviation.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WALSH of New Jersey in the chair). Does the Senator from New York yield to the Senator from Maine?

Mr. MEAD. I yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. I know that the Senator feels that the subcommittee which has been holding hearings during the past year has been most diligent in seeking information from all agencies and companies concerned. Is not that the case?

Mr. MEAD. That is correct.

Mr. BREWSTER. There has been some occasional comment in the press regarding the executive character of our hearings, which was apparently necessitated by the confidential character of some of the testimony, both from Government officials and from companies, regarding war operations. We were obliged to take that factor into account. I assume that the Senator from New York has been in full accord with that policy, as best calculated to place before the subcommittee all the essential information.

Mr. MEAD. That is correct. Let me point out that we have girdling the world today the greatest system of international air lines that has ever existed. It is operated by Pan American and by a number of other air lines which have contracts with the military, and also by the Army Transport Service. It seems to me that it would not interfere in any way with the request of our committee or with any international arrangements if Pan American were permitted to extend its lines as the lights go on and the war is restricted to a smaller and smaller area, and if the Army Transport Service were permitted to maintain the skeleton service which will be very valuable, both to the military, and perhaps to our future rights in those countries.

Mr. BREWSTER. There have been various published reports to the effect that the Army Transport Service is undertaking the transportation of passengers for hire in commercial operation. Has the Senator informed himself as to what legal authority there is for such action?

Mr. MEAD. I do not know whether or not it has any legal authority, but if Congress has not determined a policy, if Pan American has no rights, if no other international air line has any rights, and we are flying into certain countries throughout the world with the Army Transport Service, and there is some military work to be done in the nature of maintenance of bases, it seems to me that something could be done to protect our interests by permitting the Army Transport Service to continue to fly even after the war in Europe is over.

Mr. BREWSTER. I am sure the Senator does not mean to imply that it should do so without authority of law.

Mr. MEAD. Oh, no.

Mr. BREWSTER. I recognize the considerations which the Senator suggests. It seems to me that it would be appropriate for the Army Transport Service to come before the proper committee and obtain authority.

Mr. MEAD. That is correct. Its operations should be in accordance with existing law, or authority granted by the Congress.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MEAD. I am glad to yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. I may have misunderstood the Senator a few moments ago. I hope I did. Did the Senator say that the Army and Navy are releasing, at various points in the world, air bases they have been using?

Mr. MEAD. No. It is my opinion that generally speaking, they are not doing so. But there is a system—

Mr. McKELLAR. I certainly hope they are not doing so, either generally speaking or specifically speaking. I do not think they should do so. The settlement should be made altogether, and they should not give up airfields which have been granted.

Mr. MEAD. I was talking about the situation in foreign countries.

Mr. McKELLAR. I am talking about the situation in foreign countries, too. Since we have been good enough to establish those fields to help our allies in the war, I do not think we should abandon those fields under any circumstances.

Mr. MEAD. I wish to point out to my distinguished colleague from Tennessee that what I was bringing out is the fact that a system has been set up, by directive, I presume, providing that whenever the military authorities decide they have no further use for an air facility, it will be turned over in some manner to the Foreign Economic Administration, and for all intents and purposes will remain our air base.

Mr. McKELLAR. I hope it is specifically understood that it is to be retained.

Mr. MEAD. Yes. I think that is correct.

Mr. McKELLAR. Because it would never in the world do, in my judgment, for us, as soon as we temporarily get through with those fields, to yield them up, until there is a general understanding among us all.

Mr. MEAD. In the very beginning of hostilities we were very much afraid that some of them might be given up simply because it might be too much of a problem, from the Army's standpoint, to maintain and man them. We took up the matter upon our return from our trip abroad, and we were assured that it would be looked into. I am assured from the directive that if any have been given up—and I do not think any have been—they will revert to the Foreign Economic Administration.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MEAD. I am glad to yield.

Mr. AUSTIN. I merely wish to point out that under the terms of the Surplus Property Act, if it becomes law, we prohibit that from being done. As I recall, that measure provides for a report to the Congress after a period of 6 months. But I am not sure my recollection on that point is accurate.

However, there is ample time for Congress to pass on the question of policy with respect to the release of these airports or of any other property belonging to the aviation branch of the service, before any can be declared surplus and can be turned over to anyone. We guarded that activity very closely.

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes; I know. I wish to take this occasion to thank the Senator and his committee, and to say that I approve of that provision and I hope it will be retained, whenever the bill comes before Congress. I hope that may become the law.

Mr. AIKEN and Mr. WILEY addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New York yield, and if so, to whom?

Mr. MEAD. I yield first to the junior Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN].

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, the Senator referred to certain agreements under which, whenever the use of the airfields is given up, the use will revert to our airways. Are there any other such agreements which relate to air lines which at present are doing intercontinental commerce?

Mr. MEAD. There are none that I know of.

Mr. AIKEN. Then, for practical purposes, these rights are synonymous with our rights; are they not?

Mr. MEAD. That is as I understand the matter.

Mr. AIKEN. Suppose a foreign interest acquired control of our foreign airways. Where would our rights be then?

Mr. MEAD. Of course, these airways are commercial companies in which we have no financial rights. They are American companies, and I have not anticipated that we would meet any difficulties of that character.

However, a number of companies in Central America and South America have changed financial ownership, and it is a possibility that some one of these airways could be purchased by someone other than an American. I do not know whether that is true or not; it may not be possible under the certificates granted to our foreign airways by the Civil Aeronautics Board.

Mr. AIKEN. However, if that occurred, we would have no rights at all.

Mr. MEAD. Yes. There should be some protection there.

Now I yield to the junior Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the Senator said that when the Army and Navy are through with these particular air bases, under the Presidential directive they will be turned over to the Foreign Economic Administration. The point to which I wish to refer, and the one in which I think our people are interested in reference to this matter, is that unless in the first instance the Army or the Navy or those who dealt for this Government obtained some kind of title, we will have no assurance of any right to use the bases in the future. That matter is what we are interested in. We want to know what interest we will have in these bases when the war is over. What the Army and Navy might turn over is simply what we have gotten under an arrangement with a foreign government. We want that arrangement continued. We have been told that certain bases on which we are expending from $50,000,000 to $100,000,000 we shall have to give up 6 months after the war is over. Anyone knows that, as the Senator has so dramatically stated, the air bases of the world are going to be the future lanes for commerce and also for the war cargoes, if war comes again. The air bases are the outer ramparts which we have taken now in order to defeat the Axis. We feel that we have expended lives and wealth to such an extent that we should have title to the pivotal ones, at least, for use in perpetuity.

I am interested in knowing whether we have title for 6 months or 6 years or 99 years for the entry of our war planes, or whether we can also use them for our commercial planes.

Mr. MEAD. Of course, that is what we must be diligent about and what our committees are concerned with; and to protect and extend our rights I am sure will be the object of the departments and of the committees.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point, as a part of my remarks, a statement concerning the Civil Aeronautics Board and its activities in preparation for post-war aviation.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CIVIL AERONAUTICS BOARD ACTIVITIES IN PREPARATION FOR POST-WAR AVIATION

A. Domestic operations:

1. Decided since June 19, 1943:

Forty-two domestic applications for new services involving 17,768 route-miles. This total of route-miles includes all applications that were granted or denied. The actual mileage authorized is 5,682 additional route-miles, all of which will be opened upon completion of necessary arrangements, compliance with safety standards, etc.

(a) Three merger cases.

(b) Have in process 270 applications for new domestic services.

2. Made an extensive study of local and feeder route problems. Held public hearings thereon and issued an opinion setting up general conclusions with respect to these problems.

3. Advised with the Surplus Aircraft Subcommittee with respect to the committee's report on surplus aircraft.

4. Made an extensive study of aviation insurance and issued a report thereon.

5. Set up a field office in Alaska to meet the aviation problem arising in that area.

B. International operations:

1. Advised with the Interdepartmental Committee on International Aviation: Robert Lovett, Assistant Secretary of War for Air; Artemus L. Bates, Assistant Secretary of the Navy for Air; Adolph A. Berle, Jr., Assistant Secretary of State; Welch L. Pogue, Civil Aeronautics Board; William A. M. Burden, Assistant Secretary, Department of Commerce, also representing Civil Aeronautics Administration.

2. Issued a statement of questions relating to international aviation policies and routes and invited comment thereon from the public and the aviation industry.

3. Participated with the interdepartmental committee in holding informal hearings on international aviation problems.

4. Prepared a report on international aviation and submitted it to the President and interested congressional committees (not yet made public).

5. Prepared and made public an international-route pattern for operation by United States air carriers.

6. Set for hearing all applications by United States air carriers for international routes. The hearing calendar is as follows:

Area:	*Hearing*
Latin America	Sept. 18.
North Atlantic	Oct. 16.
South Atlantic	Nov. 1.
North Pacific	Dec. 13.
Central Pacific	Jan. 10.
Australia	Feb. 1.

7. Participated with the State Department in exploratory discussions on post-war aviation with representatives of Russia, Great Britain, Canada, New Zealand, India, China, the Netherlands, and Belgium.

8. Consulted with the State Department on drafts of aviation agreements with other countries and on the preparation of a draft for a general convention on aviation.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, a statement relative to the activities of some other companies. Among them is Air Cargoes, Inc., with headquarters in New York City. That firm is studying an elaborate post-war plan for cargo-hauling airplanes.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AIR CARGOES, INC.

Air Cargoes, Inc., with headquarters in New York City, is studying a post-war plan for cargo hauling by airplane. It is the study of a new business enterprise and it pertains to the type of plane, the design necessary for economical handling of cargo, and the landing, loading, and similar facilities.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, the Civil Aeronautics Administration is making studies relative to post-war development. I ask unanimous consent to have a statement regarding that activity printed at

this point in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CIVIL AERONAUTICS ADMINISTRATION

Civil Aeronautics Administration studies for post-war development are limited entirely to the technical side of aviation. They have nothing to do with the awarding of contracts, which is the prerogative of the Civil Aeronautics Board. The Civil Aeronautics Administration, however, is preparing a report to be sent to Congress within the next 3 or 4 weeks on the airport requirements of the United States for the next 5 or 6 years. The C. A. A. is also studying plans for the civil pilot-training program for the post-war period. This study is well under way and will be available in the near future.

Mr. MEAD. The civil air lines are also interested in post-war plans, and I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, a statement relative to their activities.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CIVIL AIR LINES

The civil air lines of the United States are anxious to learn the terms of the legislation to be adopted by the Congress with reference to our international air services. In the matter of our post-war policy, the civil air lines, all of whom have appeared before our Commerce Committee, are in definite disagreement. The air lines committee for United States policy favors regulated competition in the international field, somewhat similar to the situation that now obtains in the domestic field. Pan American Airlines favors the chosen instrument method and suggests the formation of a corporation that will include representatives of all forms of transportation on its policy board. The United Airlines, which, like Pan American, favors a chosen instrument, would limit the make-up of the chosen instrument to include on its directorate only representatives of our air lines, including those in the foreign as well as those in the domestic fields.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, an international conference on the matter of the opening of air routes will be held in this country in November. It will include representatives of 50 countries, both the new and the old ones, except Argentina. Let me say that this conference is the biggest international air conference yet scheduled. At the conference the following points will be taken up:

First. Try to make arrangements for civil aviation in areas that have been opened up and freed from enemy restrictions. This is with a view to establishing private operations.

Second. Agree on principles for air navigation committees, as for example the extent of air organization, powers, and so forth.

Third. Set up machinery for handling the technical arrangements for safety.

Mr. President, I desire to have a statement relative to the conference printed at this point in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

An international conference to open air routes will be held in this country on November 1, and will include representatives of 50 countries, both the new and the old countries, except Argentina. The purposes of the conference are summarized as follows:

1. Try to make arrangements for civil aviation in areas that have been opened up and freed from enemy restrictions. This is with a view to establishing private operations.

2. Agree on principles for air navigation committees, as for example the extent of air organization, powers, etc.

3. Set up machinery for handling the technical arrangements for safety.

It is hoped that by the time the conference completes its work, or earlier, plans will be formulated for opening up the Mediterranean and Middle East area.

Pan American Airways have not been disturbed at all during the war in their operations in Central and South America and the Caribbean area. As a matter of fact, they have increased their fleet but they are still inadequately equipped.

Pan American has filed application for a civil air certificate to operate to Alaska.

Pan American now operates to New Zealand, although technically the Navy is in charge of these operations. The forthcoming conference will not interfere with existing rights. As soon as an area is liberated or taken from under the control of the enemy, and the War Department clears the area, any air line which had a certificate can immediately commence operations.

Pan American is running into England right along, the eastern terminus being Foynes in Ireland, with a shuttle from there to England. Pan American is also flying to Lisbon, Portugal.

As a practical matter, Pan American has not been interfered with by the war except in areas such as Hong Kong, etc., under the control of the Japanese.

Our commercial air lines are flying internationally more than any other country and the A. T. C. is flying internationally more than all the countries combined.

All countries that are air minded will demand reciprocal rights from the United States.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, I also hold in my hand a release from the Department of State relative to the forthcoming conference. It explains the invitation to the conference and the purposes of the conference of representatives of the 50 countries to consider international aviation. The conference will be held in the United States in a short time. I ask uanimous consent to have the release printed at this point in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the release was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

More than 50 countries have been invited by this Government to an international conference on civil aviation to take place in this country beginning November 1. Exploratory conversations with several countries which have been held in recent months have indicated the desirability of holding such a conference as soon as practicable. The course of military events has already freed great areas of the world from military interruptions which forced the cessation of civil air traffic. When Germany is defeated, military interruptions will have virtually ended in all areas save those presently held by the Japanese. The approach of German defeat underlines the need for prompt arrangements by which peaceful traffic through the air may be promptly resumed.

The invitation extended by the Department of State suggests that the forthcoming conference make arrangements for immediate establishment of provisional world air routes and services which would operate during a transitional period. The proposal is also made that an interim council with subordinate committees be set up by the conference.

Through this council, the data of practical experience obtained during the transition period could be collected, recorded, and studied, and further recommendations for improving international air-transport arrangements could be made in the light of that experience. Such a council operating through working committees could likewise recommend future action to be taken with respect to technical standardization and uniform procedures.

The conference would likewise discuss the principles and methods to be followed looking toward the adoption of a new over-all aviation convention.

The invitation, as sent to the governments and authorities listed on the attached page, is quoted below:

"The Government of the United States has concluded bilateral exploratory conversations with a number of other governments which have displayed a special interest on the subject of post-war civil aviation, with particular emphasis on the development of international air transport.

"These discussions have indicated a substantial measure of agreement on such topics as the right of transit and nontraffic stops, the nonexclusivity of international operating rights, the application of cabotage to air traffic, the control of rates and competitive practices, the gradual curtailment of subsidies, the need for uniform operating and safety standards, and the standardization or coordination of air-navigation aids and communications facilities, the use of airports and facilities on a nondiscriminatory basis, and the operation of airports and facilities in certain areas. It was also generally conceded that international collaboration, probably by means of an international aeronautical body, would be desirable in achieving and implementing the aforementioned objectives, although there was some diversity of opinion as to the extent of regulatory powers on economic matters which should be delegated to this international body.

"The approaching defeat of Germany, and the consequent liberation of great parts of Europe and Africa from military interruption of traffic, sets up the urgent need for establishing an international civil air service pattern on a provisional basis at least, so that all important trade and population areas of the world may obtain the benefits of air transportation as soon as possible, and so that the restorative processes of prompt communication may be available to assist in returning great areas to processes of peace.

"The Government of the United States believes that an international civil aviation conference might profitably be convened within the near future for the purpose of agreeing on an increase in existing services and on the early establishment of international air routes and services for operation in and to areas now freed from danger of military interruption, such arrangements to continue during a transitional period. This conference might also agree so far as possible upon the principles of a permanent international structure of civil aviation and air transport, and might set up appropriate interim committees to prepare definitive proposals. Definitive action on such proposals, based on practical experience gained during the interim period, might be taken either as a result of a later conference, or by direct approval of the governments without the necessity of conference.

"This Government suggests that the international conference proposed for the immediate future could have the following objectives:

"I. (a) The establishment of provisional world route arrangements by general agreement to be reached at the conference. These

arrangements would form the basis for the prompt establishment of international air transport services by the appropriate countries.

"(b) The countries participating in the conference would also be asked to agree to grant the landing and transit rights necessary for establishing the provisional route arrangements and air services referred to above.

"(It would be highly desirable if each delegation were sufficiently familiar with its country's plans for international air services to permit formulation of an international air transport pattern referred to in paragraphs (a) and (b) above.)

"II. The establishment of an Interim Council to act as the clearing house and advisory agency during the transitional period. It would receive and consider recommendations from each of the working committees referred to in item III; it would report upon desirable revisions in routes and services during the interim period, subject to the approval of the countries served by these routes and services; it would maintain liaison with each of the participating countries; it would supervise studies and submit information to the interested governments concerning the development of air transport during the transitional period; and would make recommendations to be considered at any subsequent international conference.

"III. Agreement upon the principles to be followed in setting up a permanent international aeronautical body, and a multilateral aviation convention dealing with the fields of air transport, air navigation and aviation technical subjects; and, for the purpose of developing the details and making proposals for carrying into effect the principles so agreed, the establishment of the following working committees, which would be under the supervision of the interim council:

"(a) A committee to follow developments relating to the establishment of the routes and services to be established under item I, to correlate traffic data, to study related problems, and to recommend desirable revisions in routes and services. This committee would also make studies and recommendations concerning the future pattern of these routes and services.

"(b) A central technical committee, with subordinate subcommittees, which would work closely with the committee described in subparagraph (c) below, to consider the whole field of technical matters including standards, procedures, and minimum requirements, and to make recommendations for their application and adoption at the earliest practicable time.

"(c) A committee to draft a proposal with respect to the constitution of a permanent international aeronautical body and a new multilateral aviation convention.

"Having in mind the foregoing considerations as a basis for discussion, the Government of the United States extends a cordial invitation to your Government to participate in an international conference along the above lines, to take place in the United States beginning November 1, 1944; and in view of the time element would appreciate receiving an early response as to whether your Government can arrange to have a delegation at such conference.

"This invitation is being extended to the following governments and authorities:

"(a) All members of the United Nations.

"(b) Nations associated with the United Nations in this war.

"(c) The European and Asiatic neutral nations, in view of their close relationship to the expansion of air transport which may be expected along with the liberation of Europe.

"The Danish Minister and Thai Minister in Washington will be invited to attend in their personal capacities."

LIST OF GOVERNMENTS AND AUTHORITIES TO WHOM INVITATIONS HAVE BEEN EXTENDED

Afghanistan, Australia, Belgium, Bolivia, Brazil, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, French Delegation, Great Britain, Greece, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Iceland, India, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Lebanon, Liberia, Luxembourg, Mexico, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Norway, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Saudi Arabia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Syria, Turkey, Union of South Africa, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yugoslavia.

The Danish Minister in Washington.
The Thai Minister in Washington.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New York yield to the Senator from Maine?

Mr. MEAD. I am glad to yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. Let me inquire whether the Senator understands that the conference will contemplate any commitments by our Government as to international aviation policy.

Mr. MEAD. It is my understanding that the State Department will make such determinations as it feels to be in harmony with the attitude taken by the conference.

Mr. BREWSTER. And in harmony with the letter which was sent to the President by the chairman of the Committee on Commerce, and the chairman of the Subcommittee on Aviation?

Mr. MEAD. A delicate problem is involved for which I would not wish to be held responsible so far as my answer is concerned. There may be certain rights which affect our national security and well-being. But insofar as it is consistent with proper procedure, and in keeping with existing law, I am sure that it will——

Mr. BREWSTER. That is the difficulty. The letter which was sent to the President by the Committee on Commerce with, as I understand, the full approval of the Subcommittee on Aviation of the full committee, made it clear that in our judgment no commitments on international aviation policy should be made to foreign governments until Congress has had an opportunity to determine what our post-war policy would be. While existing law might authorize certain actions, it was my understanding that the committee held a very strong view that it would be most unfortunate to assume that commitments on the basis of existing law or authority might not very seriously prejudice the deliberations of the committee and of the Congress.

Mr. MEAD. I trust the deliberations will be well within the limitations of existing law, and the desire of the subcommittee as outlined in the letter. But I would not wish to make a statement of fact that the State Department would yield the national security in any one particular item, or lose an advantage which would affect the national security which it might be called upon to protect in existing law, and stand on the letter as its only defense. In other words, the State Department cannot be called upon to avoid responsibility under the law merely because of a letter directed to it by a subcommittee of the Congress. The law would come first. The national security would be a responsibility the avoidance of which would bring criticism on the part of every committee of the Senate and of the House. So I express the hope that within existing law and within a reasonable request of our committee, it postpone consideration of such matters as will not affect the national security or well-being.

Mr. BREWSTER. It was my understanding from a reading of newspaper reports—I have not had an opportunity to examine the release which I understand the Senator is about to place in the RECORD—that the State Department had made it clear that it did not contemplate commitments in this field. That is reassuring to those concerned.

Mr. MEAD. I am in hopes that such a policy will be carried out, but without first looking up the facts, the law, and the record I would not wish to make a statement that the policy will be pursued.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MEAD. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. Does the Senator have any information with regard to the attitude of the State Department concerning our rights in aviation outside of the United States, whether or not those rights should be secured by executive agreements or by treaties?

Mr. MEAD. I really have no information as to how the State Department may feel in the matter. Representatives of the State Department appeared before our committee on a number of occasions and gave us to understand that they would exert every effort to protect American rights, to establish American rights where they had not already been established, and to secure new rights where we had none before. I do not know how the State Department will proceed, whether within the limitations of a treaty, or an authorization by Congress fixed by law.

Mr. President, I wish to have printed in the RECORD at this point a statement entitled "Civil Aeronautics Board Activities in Preparation for Post-war Aviation."

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CIVIL AERONAUTICS BOARD ACTIVITIES IN PREPARATION FOR POST-WAR AVIATION

A. Domestic operations:

1. Decided since June 19, 1943, 42 applications for new service, involving the certificating of 5,682 additional route-miles, and have in process 270 more applications for new domestic service.

2. Made an extensive study of local and feeder-route problems, held public hearings thereon, and issued an opinion setting out general conclusions with respect to these problems.

3. Advised with the surplus aircraft subcommittee with respect to the committee's report on surplus aircraft.

4. Made an extensive study of aviation insurance and issued a report thereon.

5. Set up a field office in Alaska to meet the aviation problems arising in that area.

B. International operations:

1. Advised with the Interdepartmental Committee on International Aviation.

2. Issued a statement of questions relating to international aviation policies and routes and invited comment thereon from the public and the aviation industry.

3. Participated with the interdepartmental committee in holding informal hearings on international aviation problems.

4. Prepared a report on international aviation and submitted it to the President and interested congressional committees. (Not yet made public.)

5. Prepared and made public an international route pattern for operation by United States air carriers.

6. Set for hearing all applications by United States air carriers for international routes. The hearing calendar is as follows:

Area:	*Hearing*
Latin America	Sept. 18.
North Atlantic	Oct. 16.
South Atlantic	Nov. 1.
North Pacific	Dec. 13.
Central Pacific	Jan. 10.
Australia	Feb. 1.

7. Participated with the State Department in exploratory discussions on post-war aviation with representatives of Russia, Great Britain, Canada, New Zealand, India, China, the Netherlands, and Belgium.

8. Consulted with the State Department on drafts of aviation agreements with other countries, and on the preparation of a draft multilateral convention on aviation.

SEPTEMBER 12, 1944.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, when we talk about our rights in various bases in foreign countries we must remember that Pan American had rights in 54 bases in foreign territories before the war. The bases in the Atlantic which were obtained as a result of the transfer of 50 destroyers are bases on which we have leases running for 99 years. The bases built in countries with which we have lend-lease arrangements will revert from the military to the Foreign Economic Administration, and will become involved in the post-war lend-lease arrangements in reverse items.

DESIGNATION OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary of the Senate will read a communication from the President pro tempore of the Senate (Mr. GLASS).

The Secretary, Edwin A. Halsey, read as follows:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, D. C., September 21, 1944.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate, I appoint Hon. ARTHUR WALSH, a Senator from the State of New Jersey, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

CARTER GLASS,
President pro tempore.

Mr. WALSH of New Jersey thereupon took the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

THE PLACE OF THE RETAILER IN THE WAR EFFORT

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I wish to say a few words in regard to the place of the retailer in the war effort.

The most careful observance and liberal analysis of press releases and trade-bulletin services serve to establish the conviction that few persons in official Washington realize the consistent and effective contribution which dealers and merchants are making in every phase of the war effort. The War Advertising Council has frequently lauded the patriotic job of national advertisers, without mention of retailers.

On occasion—usually following one of the War Loan drives—the Treasury Department has been good enough to voice a perfunctory acknowledgment of retail participation in the promotion and sale of bonds. Yet in the Detroit metropolitan newspapers local advertisers are outdoing national display users in the volume of space devoted exclusively to war-theme promotional copy, in a ratio of 4 to 1.

Newspaper executives report that display space purchased by retail merchants in the 3 Detroit metropolitan dailies exclusively in support of the Fourth and Fifth War Loans approximated 500,000 lines, with an additional 400,000 lines bought in local community, foreign-language, religious, and labor newspapers.

In addition, they have underwritten mass meetings, outdoor boards, and street decorations, sponsored thousands of radio broadcasts, additional thousands of window displays, poster and window decorations, and many hundreds of thousands of direct-mail pieces. For more than 2 years they have paid the staff salaries and expenses of two separate organizations to function for retailers exclusively on the unspectacular but vital day-in, day-out sale of War stamps and bonds.

They have similarly supported all Red Cross and War Chest drives, and are currently spending at a rate in excess of $1,000,000 a year exclusively on war activities.

This cooperation extends to all phases of conservation and salvage as well, some conservation and salvage measures actually having been launched ahead of national directives. The service trades of Detroit and Michigan have likewise cooperated with the various national campaigns initiated by W. P. B., O. D. T., W. M. C., and other Government agencies, and in recruiting drives such as those for Army nurses, WAVES, WAC's, SPARS, blood donors, Victory gardeners, and so on throughout the list of war efforts.

Some stores not only supported those recruiting campaigns with their own advertising money but permitted representatives of the services to set up recruiting booths on their sales floors in order to try to sign up not only customers but the store's own personnel at a time of acute help shortages.

Similarly, the Detroit Auto Dealers Association helped to recruit thousands of dealer servicemen for Army ordnance at a time when the dealers themselves were nearly as badly in need of adequate help to keep aging cars and trucks in operating condition as they are today.

In consideration of those facts, it seems to me that the retail efforts in general—and of Detroit merchants in particular—might well be the subject of some kind of definite official expression before the Nation, and of the especial attention of the heads of governmental agencies who, for various reasons, may not be conscious of what has been taking place.

ROY W. OLSEN

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that we may consider about half a dozen bills reported from the Committee on Claims this morning, which have already been approved by the majority leader, the minority leader, and others interested on the other side of the chamber.

Mr. WHITE. As I understand, these are the bills about which the Senator spoke to me earlier in the day.

Mr. STEWART. Yes.

Mr. WHITE. I may say that I have had an opportunity to give them casual examination, and I may also say that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DANAHER] has gone through them carefully, and I believe to several of the bills amendments have been offered and should be agreed to, and so far as I know there is no objection to the others.

Mr. STEWART. The Senator is entirely correct.

Mr. WHITE. I have no objection to the consideration of the bills, and to the ones with amendments.

Mr. STEWART. There are six bills. There is nothing controversial in any of them as reported by the committee this morning. The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DANAHER] to whom the minority leader just referred, in going over them with me approved all of them except one, and an amendment was suggested to that. The amendment was simply to award a definite amount to a claimant who was injured in the State of Rhode Island, instead of conferring jurisdiction upon the court to hear the case.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Tennessee?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1002) conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court of the District of Rhode Island to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Roy W. Olsen, which had been reported from the Committee on Claims, with amendments, at the beginning of the bill to strike out "That jurisdiction is hereby conferred upon the United States District Court of the District of Rhode Island to hear, determine, and render judgment, as if the United States were suable in tort, upon the claim of," and to insert "That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated the sum of $3,500 to" and on page 2, line 4, after the word "inserted" to strike out the period and to insert "in full satisfaction of his claim against the United States therefor: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated by this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with these claims and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act

shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The amendments were agreed to.

The next amendment of the committee was, on page 2, after line 4, to strike out:

SEC. 2. Suit upon such claim may be instituted at any time within 1 year after the enactment of this act, notwithstanding the lapse of time or any statute of limitations. Proceedings for the determination of such claim, appeals therefrom, and payment of any judgments thereon shall be in the same manner as in the cases over which such court has jurisdiction under the provisions of paragraph 20 of section 24 of the Judicial Code, as amended.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $3,500 to Roy W. Olsen, of the city of Warwick, county of Kent, State of Rhode Island, for damages resulting from personal injuries received by him on September 25, 1938, arising out of the alleged negligent action of certain employees of the Work Projects Administration, as a result of which the said Roy W. Olsen, an innocent bystander, permanently lost the use of his right eye, which eye was later removed and an artificial eye inserted, in full satisfaction of his claim against the United States therefor: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated by this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with such claim and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to compensate Roy O. Olsen for the loss of an eye on account of negligence of employees September 25, 1938, at Cranston, R. I."

JACK STOWERS AND OTHERS

The bill (S. 1997) for the relief of Jack Stowers, B & O Store, and Cotton County Poultry & Egg Co., was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Jack Stowers, of Carter, Okla., the sum of $247.45, to B & O Store, of Temple, Okla., the sum of $240, and to Cotton County Poultry & Egg Co., of Walters, Okla., the sum of $26.74, in full satisfaction of their respective claims against the United States for reimbursement of amounts erroneously collected from them by the Office of Price Administration on account of alleged violations of maximum price regulations relating to the sale of pecans: *Provided*, That no part of the amounts appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with these claims, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

SOLOMON AND MARIE THERIAULT

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1462) for the relief of Solomon and Marie Theriault, which had been reported from the Committee on Claims with an amendment, on page 1, line 6, after the words "sum of", to strike out "$5,000" and insert "$4,000", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Solomon and Marie Theriault, of Caribou, Maine, the sum of $4,000, in full satisfaction of their claim against the United States for compensation for the death of their daughter, Antonia Theriault, who was killed on June 26, 1943, by a United States Army airplane while she was riding on a wagon in a field at Presque Isle, Maine: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

CAPTOLIA COLVIN

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1905) for the relief of Captolia Colvin, which had been reported from the Committee on Claims with amendments, on page 1, line 5, after the word "to" to strike out "Captolia Colvin", and insert "the estate of Walney A. Colvin, deceased"; in line 6, after the words "satisfaction of", to strike out "her claim against the United States for compensation for the death of her husband, the late Walney A. Colvin, who died as a result of personal injuries sustained by him when a United States Army airplane crashed into his automobile in Phoenix, Ariz., on April 22, 1944", and insert "all claims of the said estate for property damage and for the death of Walney A. Colvin which occurred as the result of an accident involving an Army airplane on April 22, 1944, in Phoenix, Ariz.", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the estate of Walney A. Colvin, deceased, of Phoenix, Ariz., the sum of $5,000, in full satisfaction of all claims of the said estate for property damage and for the death of Walney A. Colvin which occurred as the result of an accident involving an Army airplane on April 22, 1944, in Phoenix, Ariz.: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for relief of the estate of Walney A. Colvin, deceased."

VODIE JACKSON

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1274) for the relief of Vodie Jackson, which had been reported from the Committee on Claims with an amendment, on page 1, line 9, after the words "sum of", to strike out "$6,314", and insert "$3,686", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That, in addition to the sum authorized to be paid to Vodie Jackson, of Obion County, Tenn. (post office address, Fulton, Ky.), pursuant to the act approved March 24, 1943 (Private Law 8, 78th Cong.), the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the said Vodie Jackson, the sum of $3,686, in full satisfaction of his claim against the United States for further compensation for personal injuries sustained by him when his wagon, in which he was riding, was struck by a Civilian Conservation Corps truck near Fulton, Ky., on October 18, 1940, such injuries having proved to be of a more serious nature than appeared at the date of enactment of such act of March 24, 1943: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

LEGAL GUARDIAN OF NANCY FRASSRAND

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2042) for the relief of the legal guardian of Nancy Frassrand, a minor, which had been reported from the Committee on Claims with amendments, on page 1, line 6, after the words "sum of", to strike out "$5,000" and insert "$2,000", and in line 10, after the word "June", to strie out "2" and insert "21", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the legal guardian of Nancy Frassrand, a minor, of Winchester, Tenn., the sum of $2,000, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for (1) compensation for personal injuries sustained by her as the result of an accident which occurred when an Army vehicle struck a mail box in front of her home, on June 21, 1943, and (2) reimbursement of medical expenses heretofore or hereafter incurred in her behalf as a result of such injuries: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this

claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives by Mr. McLeod, one of its clerks, announced that the House had passed without amendment the bill (S. 1847) to provide for the payment of attorneys' fees from Osage tribal funds.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the following Senate concurrent resolutions:

S. Con. Res. 53. Concurrent resolution favoring international free press;

S. Con. Res. 54. Concurrent resolution providing for a recess of the two Houses of Congress; and

S. Con. Res. 55. Concurrent resolution authorizing the presiding officers of the two Houses to sign enrolled bills and joint resolutions after adjournment on September 21, 1944.

The message further announced that the House had disagreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3429) to amend section 1 of an act entitled "An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to employ engineers and economists for consultation purposes on important reclamation work", approved February 28, 1929 (45 Stat. 1406), as amended by th eact of April 22, 1940 (54 Stat. 148); asked a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. WHITE, Mr. ROBINSON of Utah, Mr. MURDOCK, Mr. SHORT, and Mr. ROCKWELL were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4931) for the relief of the city of Beardstown, Ill.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4163) to amend section 2 of Public Law 17, Seventy-eighth Congress, relating to functions of the War Shipping Administration, and for other purposes.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the Acting President pro tempore:

S. 725. An act to provide for the punishment of persons conspiring to violate the laws relating to counterfeiting, and certain other laws;

S. 1807. An act authorizing and directing the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain land to the city of Duluth, Minn.;

S. 2028. An act to amend the Naval Reserve Act of 1938, as amended, and the Coast Guard Auxiliary and Reserve Act of 1941, as amended, so as to permit service of members of the Women's Reserve in the American area, the Territories of Hawaii and Alaska, and for other purposes;

S. 2051. An act to amend the Social Security Act, as amended, to provide a national program for war mobilization and reconversion, and for other purposes;

S. 2137. An act to provide for naming the lake formed by waters of the Red River impounded by Denison Dam;

H. R. 1569. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to amend the act creating the circuit court of appeals in regard to fees and costs, and for other purposes," approved February 19, 1897 (29 Stat. 536; U. S. C. 543);

H. R. 4286. An act to relinquish the title of the United States to certain lands in the county of Los Angeles, State of California;

H. R. 5144. An act to authorize the city of Ketchikan, Alaska, to issue bonds in a sum not to exceed $150,000 for the purpose of constructing and acquiring additions and betterments to and extensions of the electric light and power system of said city, and to provide for the payment thereof, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 5196. An act to amend section 22 of the Interstate Commerce Act by authorizing common carriers to grant reduced fares to personnel of armed services.

GOVERNMENT CORPORATIONS

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, a little more than 1 year ago when making a study of our Government organizations operating in Latin America, preparatory to my trip through the 20 governments of the Western Hemisphere, I was surprised at the number of such Government corporations, their complexity, and the lack of uniformity in operation, as well as in some cases their actual secrecy. In one case I was called by telephone and asked where in the world had I obtained the information about them, that it was supposed to be secret, and was requested not to make use of the information I had already obtained concerning them. I respected this request, but my curiosity had been aroused, and following my return from the trip through Latin America and the filing of my report with several Senate committees, on February 11, 1943, I introduced Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 8, calling for a thorough investigation by the Byrd committee of all Government corporations. I continued my own investigation, as well as cooperating with the Byrd committee, whose report was filed recently and published as Senate Document No. 227. Based on the information in this report of the Byrd committee, as well as my own investigations, I desire at this time to speak upon the subject of Government corporations.

INTRODUCTION: THE FIGHT FOR FREEDOM

American soldiers are on war assignments throughout the world. American fighting ships are searching out the enemy on the seven seas. At home here, we have turned a great economic system from the arts of peace to the production of engines of war.

We have done all these things under the battle cry of freedom—to preserve a free way of life for which we have sacrificed American blood and treasure on more than one occasion in our history. Our Fascist and Nazi enemies first set up systems of government that destroyed the freedom of their own people. After they had done this, they loosed their armies on the rest of the world to destroy freedom there too.

We have every reason to rejoice over the brilliant success of our arms. We know now that victory is assured. But defeat of our enemies in war is not the full measure of our task. It will take much longer to stamp out the way of life that lay behind the Nazi armies.

This way of life is the direct opposite of freedom. It rested upon economic and political systems that denied the freedom of individuals and made them the victims of the state. The state planned the lives of its citizens, determined how they should work and what they should produce, told them what they could read in newspapers and books, and what they could listen to over the radio. This system of regimentation was organized by new ideas and instruments in government. And always the goal was centralization of government, government operation and control of economic life, with the people being kept in the dark about what their government was doing.

This totalitarian system was not confined to the lands of our enemies. Some form of those regimented systems found their way into many countries—even those dedicated to democracy. President Roosevelt recognized this when, at the height of the New Deal he said, "We have forged new instruments of government which could be used to shackle the liberties of our people." So that even after we achieve military victory, we have to guard against alien ways of government. Victory would be a hollow mockery if we defeated regimentation abroad only to fall victim to shackles on our liberties here at home.

Americans have learned by bitter experiences that only through democratic processes—only by "government of the people, by the people, and for the people"—can we preserve freedom in the full sense of the word. And we know further that democracy cannot survive unless the people are informed. We know that secrecy and deceit bespeak the downfall of democracy. We know that democracy fails when we flagrantly disregard the right of a people to know the whole truth about their government. In the people's watchfulness lies their safety.

That is why I say to the Senate that our democratic government is endangered today. For we have failed in many instances to inform the people of matters about which they are entitled to know. We have denied to them the chance for careful watching. That is why today we in America find an insidious threat to freedom and democracy—that threat is already with us in the form of new instruments of government about which our people, and even our Congressmen know very little.

NEW INSTRUMENTS OF GOVERNMENT

We all know that our Government in actual operation is vastly different from the government set down on paper in our Constitution. We know that American Government no longer consists of the legislative, the executive, and the judiciary, as established by the fathers of our country. As population has increased, as the Nation has developed economically, and as society has grown

in complexity, so has Government expanded until today it is the largest business in the country, performing more functions and services for people than any single institution in the world. With this tremendous expansion in governmental activities has come an increase in Government agencies. And very often, we find that these new agencies, instead of being integrated within the existing Federal pattern, are supplementary and outside the regular branches. Superimposed on the three regular branches of government, we now have a fourth branch—the independent regulatory commissions which combine many of the features of the original three. And in recent years we have developed a fifth instrument of government—the government corporation. This has developed so rapidly in the 12 years of the New Deal that it now rivals the magnitude and importance of many of the long-standing departments.

GOVERNMENT CORPORATIONS

What is meant when we speak of government corporations? The public corporation is the use in public service of a device developed in private industry. It is used mainly by the Federal Government to undertake economic enterprises. Its attraction for Government administrators seems to lie in its freedom from supervisory and financial control by established agencies. This freedom has made possible the creation of a reservoir of capital enabling the Government corporation to become financially independent and to be free of congressional control. Government corporations can borrow, sell, loan, sue, and be sued. They claim all the features of a private corporation. Those who favor the use of government corporations say that the freedom from ordinary governmental routines and procedures gives corporations the power to act with a speed and economy necessary for those enterprises set up in national emergencies, such as war and panic. They hold that by the use of the corporate form it will be easier to compare public enterprises with private enterprises. They maintain that regular government fiscal supervision is too restrictive and not sufficiently flexible for business operations. Referring to the Government corporation, the President's Committee said, "Its peculiar value lies in freedom of operation, flexibility, business efficiency, and opportunity for experimentation." It offers the advantage of "financial self-sufficiency, including the right to borrow" and the ability to settle and adjust claims. Before we pass critical judgment on the use of corporations by government, we have to consider them from another point of view.

WHY CORPORATIONS?

What are other reasons for the growth of Government corporations? It is clear now that within the last 30 years, we as an American people have acknowledged a changed political philsophy. We have abandoned the theory of our forefathers that "the government which governs least governs best." With the complexity of modern life has come an expansion of governmental activities in the interest of the general welfare of the country. Government today no longer serves merely to assist and regulate the private economy; it is an active operator in the economic field. In carrying out these functions, government has sought to avoid the restrictions and hindrances imposed by the traditional departments. It has found the old-time bureaucracy too hesitant and too lacking in speed and flexibility for new Government functions. And opposition from many other quarters led those who wanted quick change to search for new instruments for Government action. This is one reason for the creation of Government corporations.

A CHILD OF CRISES

The public corporation has, for the most part, been an offspring of crises. During the nineteenth century, the corporation was little used by the Federal Government. Government was a simple affair, limited to essential functions only. The country was young and rich. It was in the process of being developed, and people asked little aid from Washington. Private industry thrived and opportunities existed for every man. It was not until the turn of the century that these conditions changed. The rapid growth of enterprise brought abuses, and to correct them the people turned to Government, demanding control and regulation. A right degree of industrialization, mass production, and the development of a Nation-wide transportation and communication system had bound the United States, from Maine to California, into one interdependent whole. The economic system became supersensitive, and a crisis in any part spread throughout the country. As our problems became Nation-wide, the Federal Government was encouraged to step in where private industry and State operations had failed. This was how we came to have the great independent agencies and regulating bodies like the Interstate Commerce Commission. A few of the new agencies took the form of corporations, but the number remained small. The war emergency of 1917 increased the number of Federal corporations by seven. Only two such concerns were set up during the 1920's. But all these ventures seem small in number and size when we compare them with the extensive growth after 1930.

THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT AS A HOLDING COMPANY

Today the number of public corporations and enterprises stands at 55, compared to only 10 in 1931. Of these 55, some 44 are actual public corporations. We shall speak of the other 11 enterprises later. These corporations have—

Net total assests	$20,400,000,000
Net liabilities	16,300,000,000
Government proprietary interest	3,700,000,000
Loans outstanding, Mar. 31, 1944	6,500,000,000

If we get behind these figures to the real assets, we find that in June 1944, the Federal Government owned $14,400,000,000 in war plants alone. About one-half, or $7,300,000,000, consists of constructed plants, and $7,100,000,000 is in machinery and equipment.

In public corporations the people are the stockholders, but their relation to the public corporation is different than it is with stockholders of private corporations. Control over the private corporation is exercised by a board of directors elected by and accountable to the stockholders, but the people as stockholders of public corporations have little control over them. Public corporations do have boards of directors, but they are appointed in various ways: sometimes by the President, sometimes by Congress, but more often by some regular department or agency.

CORPORATIONS SET UP WITHOUT UNIFORM PATTERN

These public corporations have been established in a very loose fashion. There is no uniform and clear-cut policy for their creation. Some have been directly chartered by congressional statute. Others have been set up by departmental officials through specific authority delegated by statute. In many cases, Congress has given an official or department blanket authority to create them. Some corporations may create others. Some have been chartered in the District of Columbia; others in States; and a few have been purchased from private individuals. There is not and never has been any set pattern. Some corporations have existed for several years before the public, or even Congress, learned about them. This fact may have prompted Mr. Warren, the Comptroller General, to say, "It is only by the merest accident that we hear of them, although we have nothing to do with them." This lack of uniform policy has been responsible to a very great extent for the confusion and diversity that now exist.

EXTENSIVE POWERS OF GOVERNMENT CORPORATIONS

What are the activities in which these corporations engage? The list is exhaustive, and ranges from buying strategic war materials to promoting the Mexican movie industry. They lend huge sums to agriculture, commerce, industry, urban and rural home owners, cooperatives, banks, apartments, hotels, office buildings. They rehabilitate property damaged by flood. They operate barges on the Mississippi River. They produce, buy, sell, and store critical and strategic materials. They provide insurance against war damage. They train and provide employment for prison inmates. They strengthen relations between Latin and North America. They control floods and generate and distribute electric power. They loan money to stimulate foreign trade. There is hardly a part of the national economy that they do not touch.

Although many of these corporations have been set up to meet special emergencies, experience shows that they are not liquidated when the emergency is over. Some are turned to other purposes, and even when liquidation is ordered the process is dragged out for years. The United States Spruce Production Corporation, established during World War No. 1 to meet a purely wartime need, is still in the process of liquidation, 26 years after its need had been fulfilled.

GOVERNMENT CORPORATIONS DRAW THEIR FUNDS FROM MANY SOURCES

There is no more uniform policy in regard to their financial organization than is provided for their creation. It would seem that the sources of revenue come from everywhere, and from anywhere. Some gain their initial capital from congressional appropriation. Some are financed by subscriptions from private associations. Others are capitalized by a Government holding corporation like the R. F. C. Some are enriched by departmental funds, and some from the President's emergency fund. Working capital and administrative expenses are supplied by appropriations, Treasury borrowing, or by corporate operations.

The borrowing power of eight Government corporations and credit agencies as given by the executive budget of 1944 was:

Commodity Credit Corporation	$2,650,000,000
Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation	2,000,000,000
Federal Housing Administration	4,965,000,000
Federal Public Housing Administration	800,000,000
Home Owners' Loan Corporation	4,750,000,000
Reconstruction Finance Corporation	15,750,000,000
Tennessee Valley Authority	70,072,500
United States Maritime Commission	200,000,000

These sums, together with an added billion permitted to the F. H. A., make the total borrowing power $32,185,072,500.

It is amazing how a corporation can pyramid credit far beyond its original capital, by discounting and rediscounting with many credit agencies and banks. The Regional Agricultural Credit Corporation has a capital investment of $44,500,000. The Byrd committee indicated that by borrowing from or rediscounting with other lending institutions the Corporation can then obtain loan funds approximating $225,000,000. In many cases it is difficult to determine what the total borrowing power is. Limits are either vague or purposely left open. Aside from the unethical nature of irresponsible power, such a situation may easily work to destroy the public credit on which national welfare depends.

GOVERNMENT CORPORATIONS MAKE WIDE VARIETY OF LOANS

While the amount of loans made by Government corporations has been reduced in recent years, the total stood at over $6,500,000,000 on March 31, 1944. Even the highly prosperous state of the war economy—with business humming and everyone making good money—has not operated to wipe out these Government corporation loans. If the theory were sound, that Government might lend in depression and be paid back in prosperity, then these outstanding loans should now be reduced to a very low figure. But the amount still remains high, and no doubt will rise very much higher as the post-war reconversion of the economy creates another crisis with a demand for Government money.

These loans range from those with substantial collateral, like Federal land-bank loans, to those where the social purpose supersedes sound business standards and collateral is secondary. In the latter case the chances are that the full amount will never be repaid, and the taxpayers will have to foot the bill. In the case of Government corporations alone, the loss on their operations up to June 30, 1943, totaled $202,959,233. If to these corporations we add the nonincorporated Government credit agencies which function like corporations, the cumulated deficit in their operations up to March 31, 1944, is $5,284,191,744. These figures will have concrete meaning for every wage earner when he sits down to figure his income tax.

Lending money puts these corporations in business on a large scale. Many of them have acquired large amounts of property. Real estate and other property held for sale, as of January 31, 1943, came to $5,638,000,000; and this figure has been greatly altered by the war program. By June 1944, as I have mentioned earlier, the Federal Government owned fourteen and four-tenths billions in war plants alone. Despite the intention of Congress to get the Federal Government out of economic enterprise as early as possible, we can count upon having the Government own vast properties for some time to come. This will mean a paradise for bureaucrats who will find ways of convincing us that we need them to manage, to rent, and to dispose of the Government properties.

UNFAIR COMPETITION BETWEEN GOVERNMENT CORPORATIONS AND PRIVATE BUSINESS

These corporations have an unfair advantage in competition with private business. They have at their disposal vast quantities of Government money at low rates of interest. They are often exempt from Federal, State, and local taxes on securities and property. They have the franking privilege and many similar concessions common to Government agencies. Even where they are independent corporations and should stand on their own feet, they have the power and prestige of the Federal Government behind them, giving them a privileged place which no private corporation can attain.

GOVERNMENT CORPORATIONS PROVIDE LUSH FIELD FOR PATRONAGE AND BUREAUCRACY

Government corporations and special agencies which conduct business enterprises employed over 100,000 persons, and their total monthly pay roll averaged $19,025,787, late in 1942, the last date on which inquiry was made. It is virtually impossible to learn the status of these employees, but by far the greater percentage are not subject to complete Civil Service regulations as is the case in the regular departments. Those who favor such a state of affairs hail this as freedom from red tape of personnel rules.

What they mean is that here is a lush field for patronage and bureaucracy. Government employment feeds on itself, and constantly grows larger. When a Government corporation sidetracks a regular department, the existing employees of the regular department are retained, and a new crop is added by the corporation. If the corporation lends Government money, it will need a large staff to make and service the loans. Later, some of these loans will go sour, and the corporation will have to take over the properties and operate them until they can be resold. This will mean a further enlargement of the bureaucracy. This entrance of Government into business tends to weaken other sections of the private economy, and Government is called for help. In response, the Government opens up another agency or starts another corporation, and that means more bureaucrats. Once the Government commences upon such a road, there is no ending, until we are dependent upon Government for every means of our livelihood. By that time, too, we shall feel the heavy hand of Government regimentation in everything we do. Democracy cannot live in such a climate, and the talk of freedom by those who constantly enlarge the power of Government is bare-faced hypocrisy.

SAFEGUARDS OF DEMOCRACY IMPERILED

The fundamental theory of democratic government rests upon consent of the people. This means that the people ought to know what men and agencies are entrusted with government. The people ought to be able to understand the methods used in the transaction of public business. They ought to be able to hold public servants accountable for official actions. Through the more than 150 years since our Federal system was first established, there have grown up certain methods by which public agents may be held to account. Free elections, for example, are the means of controlling our legislators. By vesting in these elected representatives the power to make laws and by giving them the control of the national purse strings, we have set up one authority to which all other branches may be held responsible.

Certain safeguards, congressional and otherwise, are also provided to protect the people's interests in the hands of Government administrators. Among them are:

First. Appropriation control by Congress.

Second. Budget control through the Bureau of the Budget.

Third. Auditing of accounts for accuracy and legality, and prescribing forms of accounting and accounting investigation by the General Accounting Office.

Fourth. Civil-service rules for qualifying and fixing pay scales for personnel.

Fifth. Cash control by the Treasury.

Sixth. Reports to both the Executive and Congress.

The thing that disturbs me about these Government corporations, and the condition which I think imperils democracy, is that none of these safeguards is adequate to control these corporations in the interests of the people. With few exceptions, their finances are outside the control of Congress. So far as these corporations are concerned, we do not hold the purse strings. These corporations can accumulate funds and can spend them in half a dozen ways, independently of Congress. We have very little control over the charters of these corporations. We have a very weak brake on their borrowing power.

Thirteen corporations are currently under no control by the Congress, the Treasury, the Bureau of the Budget, or the General Accounting Office; 10 are audited by independent public accountants; 9 are partially subject to audit; and 32 corporations do not render any accounts to the General Accounting Office. Supervisory agencies such as the F. C. A. and R. F. C. audit 15 of the corporations, and in this way exert some control over their operations. In many cases, the absence of civil service rules dispels accountability by personnel policy.

At no time have there been adequate reports to Congress about these corporations. There are a few exceptions, but in general Congress has been in the dark in this respect. There have been reluctance and even resistance, upon the part of several of those in charge of these corporations, to tell Congress about them. It should not be necessary for Congress to set up investigating committees in order to learn about the normal aspects of public business. Yet, it has taken the labors of many individual Congressmen and the whole power of the Byrd committee to extract information about these Government corporations from supposedly responsible servants of the people.

In all fairness, I cannot put all of the blame for this darkness on the Government officials. We in Congress have been partly at fault for laxity in creating these corporations. We must shoulder some of the blame for the lack of a uniform policy and for giving such broad powers to administrative officials who, in turn, may have used wide discretion in setting up these organizations.

I was amazed a short time ago to discover the vast powers possessed by a corporation started by the Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs. The name of this corporation is Prencinradio. It was chartered in Delaware, with power to operate throughout the whole Western Hemisphere. A very modest account of the vast powers of Prencinradio Corporation appeared in the Wall Street Journal for May 18, 1944, as follows:

> This Federal firm has most sweeping powers, especially to make, produce, edit, publish, exhibit, broadcast, or distribute motion pictures, radio script, transcriptions and recordings, and/or programs, news, articles, books, magazines. * * *
>
> Beyond this it may issue its own bonds; construct buildings and operate them, sell them or give them away; deal in stocks and bonds of any corporation or government; buy and sell patents, copyrights, trade-marks, trade names, symbols, inventions, discoveries, licenses, processes, and formulas; make gifts and loans, secured or unsecured, to any individual, group, firm, or government; and carry on any other business enterprise or activity in connection with the foregoing. * * *
>
> Most of these powers may be exercised without limitation as to amount or value and whether within or without the United States of America.

When I checked back on the charter and powers of this corporation, the story became even more incredible. But imagine my dismay when I later discovered that in this case, Congress itself was fully to blame. By an appropriation act passed December 17, 1941, Congress gave almost unlimited powers to the Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs to create just such corporations as this Prencinradio. This is not the practice in all instances, but here Congress has only itself to blame for the creation of a corporation which had the power to work havoc with American foreign relations. It is just one more reason why Congress should be far more careful about the laws it passes even in times of emergency where speed and rubber-stamping of executive proposals is demanded.

Unless Congress, as the representative of the people, can bring those corporations under control, Government in this country will become increasingly irresponsible, and secret, and in the end it will be dictatorial over our lives and property.

As I have said before, the essence of democracy implies official accountability. This is no less true in the case of corporations than in the case of regular departments. The stockholders of a private corporation have the right to know the charter powers, the organization, and the activities of the firm.

In the case of private corporations, the charters given to them by the States are open public records. By the Securities and Exchange Acts, the United States compelled private corporations to conduct their financial affairs in the open. We have provided heavy penalties for private corporations which deceive the public or withhold from it essential information. We denounced private holding companies when they got into a position to keep the people in the dark about their interconnections. The Internal Revenue Bureau compels private corporations to file reports on their most intimate financial affairs.

Yet here are those public—Government—corporations, chartered haphazardly, endowed with the widest powers, obtaining their money from more than half a dozen sources, possessing unlimited borrowing powers, some of them clustered in a holding group such as that controlled by the R. F. C., accounting haphazardly to various departments of government or not at all, spending and lending as they please, and reporting adequately to Congress only after we demand an investigation.

We have not tolerated this sort of thing in private corporations, and it is time that Congress ended such irresponsible conduct in Government corporations.

Continuing success of democracy demands effective controls over Government corporations.

To bring this arm of government under proper control of the people it will be necessary to take certain definite steps.

It should not be difficult for Congress to determine which of those public corporations should be liquidated. Many of the functions they now perform may either be eliminated or turned back to private enterprise. The self-reliance and vigorous growth of our people can never be assured if we continue to expect Washington to do everything for us. If we persist in passing everything on to Washington we can expect bureaucracy, confusion, and contradiction in government, high taxation, and eventually Government control and regimentation of our very lives. Why fight a costly war to prevent the philosophy of regimentation abroad if we continue at home to shackle our freedom in strait jackets?

So the first thing to do is to get rid of as many of these corporations as possible.

The second thing is to turn over the business of many other Government corporations to the regular departments of government where Congress can keep track of them in the ordinary examination of the public business.

Finally, it will be found that some Government corporations perform a useful service for the people in a better way than does any other instrument of government. Such corporations should be retained with proper safeguards.

First among the things necessary to be done is to provide a uniform policy and procedure for the establishment of Government corporations. There is no reason for resort to State chartering, and in many ways it is undesirable, since it often requires rechartering in other States, and subjects the Government corporation to taxes from which it is normally exempt. In the future, all corporations should be chartered with specifically defined powers by Congress. The initial appropriation should come from Congress. The charters should be filed in some Government department where they will be available to Congress and the public.

The suggestion of the Byrd committee that "over-all public control be established promptly with reference to current control by the Congress, the Budget, the Treasury, and the G. A. O.," should be carried out. A work program for each corporation should be submitted to Congress along with the executive budget so that the public will know through its elected representatives what those corporations are doing.

Ownership of all corporate stock should be vested in the Secretary of the Treasury. He could then control the issuance and sale of obligations and securities, and render periodic appraisals to Congress of the assets and liabilities of those Government corporations.

Post audits by the Comptroller General would furnish valuable insurance against reckless spending.

An extension of civil-service regulations to all personnel of the corporations must be required for the sake of efficiency, and the reduction of political patronage to the minimum.

The Government corporation is supposedly advantageous as an emergency device, and in the past has been employed as such. But we find that after the crisis has passed and the need is no longer present, either a new excuse is made to justify the continuation of the corporation, or the process of liquidation is unnecessarily drawn out. If the Sec-

retary of the Treasury were empowered to control liquidation proceedings, those corporations would be compelled to do the job assigned to them rapidly and efficiently, and then close up shop, as Congress intended.

No possible objection can be offered to reasonable restrictions on the operations of Government corporations. Such restrictions represent the minimum which the people in a democracy ought to know about what the agencies of their Government are doing, what money they have, where they are getting it, how they are spending it, and how their operations affect the interests of the people and of the country. When conditions are such that the people are kept in the dark about the doings of their Government we are off the clear course essential for democracy, and on the high road to dictatorship and tyranny.

STATE HIGHWAY DEPARTMENT INCOME

Mr. LANGER obtained the floor.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LANGER. I yield with the understanding that the senior Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER] will remain in the Chamber. I wish to say something while he is present.

Mr. WHEELER. I may say to the Senator from North Dakota that I expect to remain in the Chamber.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, when the Commissioner of Public Roads testified before the Roads Committee of the House of Representatives with respect to Federal aid for public highways, he made the following statement:

> If the States were using all of their income from motor vehicles and the uses of motor vehicles of various kinds, they would have more than enough to take care of the main State highways, the Federal-aid system, the major streets within cities, and the main county roads.

During the days immediately preceding action by the Senate last week on the post-war Federal-aid highway bill, a statement was widely circulated among Members of Congress and throughout the country to the effect that the contemplated highway program would require a large number of the States to increase gasoline taxes in order to finance their share of the program.

The statement is untrue. It is based on misinterpretation of Government data. In one instance which has come to my attention the erroneous statement was distributed anonymously, and in conjunction with tabulations credited to the Public Roads Administration regarding estimated receipts of highway revenues by the States in the years 1945, 1946, and 1947. The use of Public Roads data in this manner was unauthorized, and misleading. Unless properly corrected, it may render a great disservice to the country and to the several States.

In order to present the facts of the situation to the public, Mr. President, I have requested the Public Roads Administration to prepare an authentic statement properly interpreting the estimates which have been made of the State highway department income and other road user revenue in relation to the highway program which has been authorized by the Senate. It is my hope that this statement will be carefully read by State and local officials concerned with the highway transportation program, and that they will see that the facts reach the newspapers and other organizations and persons who may have been subjected to the misleading statements recently circulated. The information is contained in tabulations compiled for the years 1945, 1946, and 1947 in the form of estimates of State revenue.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the three tabulations be printed in the RECORD at this point as part of my remarks, together with a statement prepared by the Public Roads Administration in interpretation of the tabulations.

There being no objection, the tabulations and the statement were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Federal Works Agency, Public Roads Administration—Estimate of State highway department income and other road-user revenue

1945

[In thousands of dollars]

State	Estimated receipts of State highway department	Additional road-user revenue: For local roads and streets	Additional road-user revenue: For non-highway purposes	Additional road-user revenue: Subtotal	Total
Alabama	11,203	7,124	841	7,965	19,168
Arizona	4,315	1,319	-------	1,319	5,634
Arkansas	13,212	820	-------	820	14,032
California	39,858	21,697	16,286	37,983	77,841
Colorado	7,333	3,493	-------	3,493	10,826
Connecticut	13,763	2,707	-------	2,707	16,470
Delaware	2,801	-------	-------	-------	2,801
Florida	13,136	6,732	10,258	16,990	30,126
Georgia	16,179	3,440	3,545	6,985	23,164
Idaho	3,294	1,991	-------	1,991	5,285
Illinois	33,307	20,911	2,818	23,729	57,036
Indiana	16,339	15,200	1,250	16,450	32,789
Iowa	17,350	5,389	-------	5,389	22,739
Kansas	10,758	3,600	-------	3,600	14,358
Kentucky	13,344	2,525	1,500	4,025	17,369
Louisiana	16,188	-------	5,140	5,140	21,328
Maine	8,327	500	-------	500	8,827
Maryland	11,271	7,210	-------	7,210	18,481
Massachusetts	14,262	8,000	290	8,290	22,552
Michigan	22,465	26,998	-------	26,998	49,463
Minnesota	20,977	6,512	120	6,632	27,609
Mississippi	6,197	6,812	-------	6,812	13,009
Missouri	21,381	169	75	244	21,625
Montana	4,167	1,059	41	1,100	5,267
Nebraska	5,460	3,792	1,698	5,490	10,950
Nevada	2,217	-------	-------	-------	2,217
New Hampshire	4,420	512	-------	512	4,932
New Jersey	27,343	10,000	1,000	11,000	38,343
New Mexico	4,733	243	565	808	5,541
New York	77,312	16,405	-------	16,405	93,717
North Carolina	33,720	-------	1,213	1,213	34,933
North Dakota	3,090	1,554	-------	1,554	4,644
Ohio	31,381	35,756	12,716	48,472	79,853
Oklahoma	8,812	6,715	5,805	12,520	21,332
Oregon	13,881	2,295	-------	2,295	16,176
Pennsylvania	60,470	10,300	12,600	22,900	83,370
Rhode Island	5,927	-------	-------	-------	5,927
South Carolina	11,661	1,936	513	2,449	14,110
South Dakota	3,815	1,586	93	1,679	5,494
Tennessee	15,325	5,669	4,145	9,814	25,139
Texas	28,556	21,462	10,310	31,772	60,328
Utah	4,461	800	-------	800	5,261
Vermont	1,543	2,706	24	2,730	4,273
Virginia	25,226	387	-------	387	25,613
Washington	11,787	9,416	100	9,516	21,303
West Virginia	17,584	-------	-------	-------	17,584
Wisconsin	14,218	10,861	4,973	15,834	30,052
Wyoming	2,750	608	-------	608	3,358
Dist. of Col	5,247	-------	313	313	5,560
Total	762,366	297,211	98,232	395,443	1,157,809

Federal Works Agency, Public Roads Administration—Estimate of State highway department income and other road-user revenue—Continued

1946

[In thousands of dollars]

State	Estimated receipts of State highway department	Additional road-user revenue: For local roads and streets	Additional road-user revenue: For non-highway purposes	Additional road-user revenue: Subtotal	Total
Alabama	12,252	8,054	978	9,032	21,284
Arizona	4,627	1,424	-------	1,424	6,051
Arkansas	14,341	895	-------	895	15,236
California	42,910	23,727	16,967	40,694	83,604
Colorado	7,802	3,713	-------	3,713	11,515
Connecticut	14,828	2,867	-------	2,867	17,695
Delaware	3,177	-------	-------	-------	3,177
Florida	14,815	7,570	11,408	18,978	33,793
Georgia	17,522	3,739	3,852	7,591	25,113
Idaho	3,822	2,089	-------	2,089	5,911
Illinois	36,199	23,366	2,846	26,212	62,411
Indiana	19,121	15,200	1,250	16,450	35,571
Iowa	19,102	6,010	-------	6,010	25,112
Kansas	11,587	3,600	-------	3,600	15,187
Kentucky	14,985	2,571	3,000	5,571	20,556
Louisiana	17,603	-------	5,625	5,625	23,228
Maine	9,214	500	-------	500	9,714
Maryland	11,650	7,676	-------	7,676	19,326
Massachusetts	16,086	9,000	-------	9,000	25,086
Michigan	25,351	28,626	-------	28,626	53,977
Minnesota	23,343	7,309	120	7,429	30,772
Mississippi	7,038	7,670	-------	7,670	14,708
Missouri	23,325	178	75	253	23,578
Montana	4,813	1,241	43	1,284	6,097
Nebraska	6,023	4,160	1,880	6,040	12,063
Nevada	2,271	-------	-------	-------	2,271
New Hampshire	5,184	511	-------	511	5,695
New Jersey	31,357	10,000	1,000	11,000	42,357
New Mexico	5,278	266	618	884	6,162
New York	88,371	18,706	-------	18,706	107,077
North Carolina	36,582	-------	1,309	1,309	37,891
North Dakota	3,327	1,666	-------	1,666	4,993
Ohio	32,846	37,281	13,418	50,699	83,545
Oklahoma	9,866	7,464	6,434	13,898	23,764
Oregon	14,761	2,444	-------	2,444	17,205
Pennsylvania	66,685	10,994	13,989	24,983	91,668
Rhode Island	6,555	-------	-------	-------	6,555
South Carolina	13,207	2,201	560	2,761	15,968
South Dakota	4,330	1,801	18	1,819	6,149
Tennessee	16,804	6,283	4,634	10,917	27,721
Texas	31,865	23,823	11,582	35,405	67,270
Utah	4,591	800	-------	800	5,391
Vermont	2,301	2,449	23	2,472	4,773
Virginia	27,533	426	-------	426	27,959
Washington	12,425	10,015	100	10,115	22,540
West Virginia	19,520	-------	-------	-------	19,520
Wisconsin	17,315	10,861	5,403	16,264	33,579
Wyoming	2,995	669	-------	669	3,664
Dist. of Col	6,036	-------	329	329	6,365
Total	843,541	319,845	107,461	427,306	1,270,847

1947

State	Estimated receipts of State highway department	Additional road-user revenue: For local roads and streets	Additional road-user revenue: For non-highway purposes	Additional road-user revenue: Subtotal	Total
Alabama	14,598	9,575	1,089	10,664	25,262
Arizona	5,144	1,606	-------	1,606	6,750
Arkansas	15,985	1,008	-------	1,008	16,993
California	47,819	26,963	17,925	44,888	92,707
Colorado	8,592	4,068	-------	4,068	12,660
Connecticut	16,539	3,100	-------	3,100	19,639
Delaware	3,850	-------	-------	-------	3,850
Florida	17,617	8,910	13,070	21,980	39,597
Georgia	19,690	4,227	4,355	8,582	28,272
Idaho	4,623	2,223	-------	2,223	6,846
Illinois	40,702	27,322	2,972	30,294	70,996
Indiana	23,666	15,200	1,250	16,450	40,116
Iowa	21,862	7,037	-------	7,037	28,899
Kansas	12,928	3,600	-------	3,600	16,528
Kentucky	17,573	2,637	3,500	6,137	23,710
Louisiana	19,812	-------	6,394	6,394	26,206
Maine	10,630	500	-------	500	11,130
Maryland	12,548	8,462	-------	8,462	21,010
Massachusetts	19,112	10,000	-------	10,000	29,112
Michigan	30,059	31,032	-------	31,032	61,091
Minnesota	27,025	8,588	120	8,708	35,733
Mississippi	8,359	8,972	-------	8,972	17,331
Missouri	26,341	187	75	262	26,603
Montana	5,800	1,493	46	1,539	7,339
Nebraska	6,928	4,744	2,178	6,922	13,850
Nevada	2,441	-------	-------	-------	2,441
New Hampshire	6,364	510	-------	510	6,874
New Jersey	37,736	10,000	1,000	11,000	48,736
New Mexico	6,203	303	706	1,009	7,212
New York	105,692	22,242	-------	22,242	127,934
North Carolina	41,153	-------	1,467	1,467	42,620
North Dakota	3,710	1,844	-------	1,844	5,554

Federal Works Agency, Public Roads Administration—Estimate of State highway department income and other road-user revenue—Continued

1947—Continued.

[In thousands of dollars]

State	Estimated receipts of State highway department	Additional road-user revenue			Total
		For local roads and streets	For nonhighway purposes	Subtotal	
Ohio	35,255	39,730	14,601	54,331	89,586
Oklahoma	11,535	8,623	7,391	16,014	27,549
Oregon	16,158	2,690		2,690	18,848
Pennsylvania	76,557	12,142	16,283	28,425	104,982
Rhode Island	7,496				7,493
South Carolina	15,710	2,636	630	3,266	18,973
South Dakota	4,933	2,020	19	2,039	6,972
Tennessee	19,390	7,288	5,201	12,489	31,879
Texas	37,033	27,428	13,609	41,037	78,070
Utah	4,808	800		800	5,608
Vermont	3,165	2,434	23	2,457	5,622
Virginia	31,147	488		488	31,635
Washington	13,443	11,003	100	11,103	24,546
West Virginia	22,482				22,482
Wisconsin	22,178	10,861	5,997	16,858	39,033
Wyoming	3,350	763		763	4,113
Dist. of Col.	7,302		345	345	7,647
Total	973,043	355,259	120,346	475,605	1,448,648

(Explanation of table titled "Estimate of State Highway Department Income and Other Road-User Revenue.")

The estimated receipts of State highway departments given in the first column include the legal share of the State highway-user taxes and small amounts of predictable income from sources other than highway-user taxes.

The additional road-user revenues in the second column for local roads and streets is the legal allocation of State highway-user revenues to subdivisions of the States. In some States there is a considerable amount of freedom as to how the local units of government shall expend these shared taxes. In other States the expenditure must be approved by the State. There is no present provision for any of these funds to be used for matching Federal aid. Any matching to be done will be either by the election of local officials or by compulsion (possibly under new legislation). It seems probable that several of the States which share considerable amounts of highway-user tax receipts with local units will require that the local units bear at least a part of the amount required to match any Federal funds which may become available for expenditure on highways under the control of these local units of government. It also seems quite probable that in most, if not in all instances, the local units will be entirely willing to cooperate in this respect.

The additional road-user revenues for nonhighway purposes in column 3 constitute the highway-user tax revenues which will not be available for highway purposes under present laws. While it is not necessary to list all of these, the following form good illustrative examples: In Florida all of the motor-vehicle registration fees (except a small amount for highway patrol) are dedicated by law for education; in Louisiana a substantial portion of highway-user revenues are dedicated to local general funds and for harbor development; in Nebraska, 20 percent of the gasoline tax is dedicated to relief and public assistance; in Pennsylvania, 25 percent of the gasoline tax is dedicated to the State general fund; in Tennessee the debt service on a large amount of nonhighway bonds is paid from gasoline tax, and in Texas the State constitution provides that 25 percent of the highway-user revenues shall be expended for education.

The primary purpose of the table under discussion is to show that the highway-user revenues available to the State highway departments as shown in column one exclude very large amounts of State receipts from highway-user taxes which go directly to counties and municipalities and to nonhighway purposes.

CONSTRUCTION OF FORT PECK DAM

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I was delighted today to note the message sent to the Congress by the President of the United States in which he endorsed the Missouri River Valley T. V. A. According to the recommendations made some time ago by Harold Ickes, Secretary of the Interior, it is going to take about $840,000,000 to develop the Missouri Valley. I hope that when this is done the bill I introduced some time ago will be taken into consideration, and that the thousands of farmers in Montana and North Dakota who are now not getting power and electricity will be taken care of, just as soon as the war is over and materials are available, so that North Dakota at least will not be the lowest State in the Union, having only 7 farmers out of 100 getting electricity and power.

In this connection I wish to pay my very high respects to the senior Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER]. Today in the State of Montana there are 1,711,409 acres of land which are irrigated. In North Dakota, and adjoining State, with just as much water as there is in the State of Montana, only 21,615 acres are irrigated. In other words, during the time the distinguished senior Senator from Montana has been in Washington he has done such a fine job for the State of Montana that there are being irrigated in the State of Montana, nearly 100 times as many acres on which sugar beets and other products are being raised, as are being irrigated in the entire State of North Dakota.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LANGER. I yield.

Mr. WHEELER. I call the Senator's attention to a statement he made yesterday which was not correct. While it did not relate to me, speaking of his colleague, he said:

> Will the Senator deny that he voted for the bill establishing the Fort Peck Dam, with the provision that not one single drop of water could be used for irrigation?

That statement is not correct. I do not wish to let that stand in the RECORD, because I think it is well known to everyone that I was the one who went to the President and urged the building of the Fort Peck Dam, and it was built. The purpose for which the Fort Peck Dam was built was to take care of what I called to his attention, the drought in northeastern Montana, and the necessity for building that dam for irrigation purposes and for power purposes. Because of that, to a large extent, the dam was built. In addition to that, the people living down the river were interested in flood control and irrigation, and joined with us.

I also call attention to the fact that when in 1934 the President made a speech at Fort Peck, he stated definitely that one of the reasons why he wanted to see Fort Peck and other dams of that kind built in that area was in order that the water coming down from the mountain tops could be used to irrigate the land. At that time he made one of the finest speeches on irrigation and reclamation that has been made by anyone in high authority in the Government. So that when the Senator makes the statement he has made, I am afraid he is repeating a statement that was made in the National Farmers Union paper, to the fact that I had "double-crossed" the farmers by voting for a bill which did not provide for irrigation.

Mr. President, the one and sole reason why I was interested in that dam was that it could be used for cheap power and irrigation. I have urged upon the administration time and time again that the power project be completed so that the people could use the electricity for pumping water onto the arid lands in the northeastern part of Montana, and clear down into North Dakota. One portion of the project has been completed, but during the war, because of the shortage of power in the Northwest for the manufacture of war materials, the authorities have sold power to the Montana Power Co., and some of it goes all the way to the State of Washington. But I assume that after the war the chief power will be used for the pumping of water upon the irrigated lands. Apparently the Senator has had misinformation upon that subject, and I wanted to correct it.

Mr. LANGER. Let me say to the Senator that it happens that I am not misinformed about this matter. I heard the Senator using about the same words in a hearing before the committee presided over by the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] about 2 months ago, when the matter of the Missouri Valley Basin was up. He spoke at that time about half an hour and used about the same language he has used today, in almost the same words.

At about the time the Fort Peck Dam was built, I was Governor of my State, and I went with Governor Berry, of South Dakota, and Gov. Floyd Olsen, of Minnesota, to see the President. We discussed with the President the entire matter of the establishment of the Fort Peck Dam, and the President told us that although upon the occasion of its dedication he had used the words the distinguished Senator now imputes to him—and he is right—as a matter of fact, he discovered afterward that that water could not be used for irrigation under the law as it was drawn, and I believe it was admitted at the time of the hearing before the committee presided over by the Senator from Wyoming that that water should be used for navigation and for power.

Mr. WHEELER. Let me say to the Senator that he is just as mistaken as can be, because there is nothing in the law with reference to that at all. The power provision was inserted for the purpose of making it possible to pump water out of the Fort Peck Dam. Of course it is not possible to take the water out and merely let it run over the side of the hills, but it can be pumped out. The Senator is mistaken and does not know what

he is talking about when he says that the President never intended it for irrigation purposes, because I was with the President not only when the bill came up and when the money was allotted, but I know what his views were, and I know he has never changed his opinion about it. When he dedicated the dam he made the statement.

I do not know what he may have told the Senator some years afterward in private conversation, but I know what the purpose of the bill was; I know what the purpose of the building of the dam was; I know what the President said, and I know there is not a piece of legislation on the statute books today which says it can be used only for navigation and power. The Senator is not familiar with the law, and he is not familiar with the facts when he makes the statement.

Mr. LANGER. I have read the law a great many times.

Mr. WHEELER. The Senator had better read it again.

Mr. LANGER. I read it in the presence of the Senator, and there is no doubt at all that when that Fort Peck Dam was built, the thought in the mind of the Senator and in the mind of the President was to use a part of the water for irrigation purposes. If the Senator will read the law again he will discover that the law says that the water shall be used for navigation purposes and for power purposes. I admit that it does not say that none of the water shall be used for irrigation, but it does say that the water shall be used for navigation purposes and for power. Irrigation is not mentioned.

Mr. WHEELER. When it is being built for power, why is it being built for power? The plants were put in with the sole purpose of furnishing cheap power to farmers and for the purpose of pumping water out of the reservoir onto the land. When the Senator made his statement yesterday on the floor, he said:

> Will the Senator deny that he voted for the bill establishing the Fort Peck Dam, with the provision that not one single drop of water could be used for irrigation?

Mr. LANGER. That is true.

Mr. WHEELER. That is not true. That statement is absolutely a wrong statement, because, in the first place, let me say to the Senator, the Fort Peck Dam was not built by reason of the passing of a law. The money for the Fort Peck Dam was allotted by the President out of the funds appropriated by the Congress generally for the building of projects, and it was turned over to Mr. Ickes. I went to see the President in conjunction with a group of other Senators, and it was at that time that he told us that he would build the Fort Peck Dam. The Senator was not present, he was not in the Senate at the time, yet he knows more as to what the reasons were, why it was built, and the purpose of it, than those of us who were in the Senate.

Mr. LANGER. Of course I was not in the Senate at that time, and do not know what the reasons were, but I have read the statute, and it is conceded by the Senator himself, in spite of his speech, in spite of what he said in front of the O'Mahoney committee, the cold-blooded fact remains, that in spite of what he says here, that water can be used only for navigation and power.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, I do not mind the Senator from North Dakota standing on the floor of the Senate and misrepresenting facts with reference to his colleague, but I do object to his making misrepresentation of the facts with respect to me, and what the Senator says is not so. I do not know how I could make the statement any plainer. I have heard the Senator from North Dakota make this misstatement on the floor of the Senate before, but have said nothing in reply. But I am getting weary over the Senator coming to my territory and making statements which are not true with reference to facts pertaining to the Fort Peck Dam.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I wish to say that I rose to compliment the Senator from Montana on the magnificent job he had done in securing irrigation for 1,711,409 acres in Montana, while in North Dakota we have irrigated only 21,615 acres. Certainly that is not a reflection upon the Senator from Montana. It is a very high compliment.

Mr. WHEELER. I thank the Senator for his compliment, Mr. President, but I wish to keep the record straight with reference to Fort Peck Dam. I know that some individuals who have been peddling this story about the Fort Peck Dam, and who do not know anything about it, have done so deliberately for the purpose of misrepresenting me, but they are not going to get away with it with the farmers of Montana and the other people who live in that State.

Mr. LANGER. I will say that whenever the Senator is a candidate again in Montana I expect to gladly come and make a speech for him. I will praise his record, because it is a good record in the Congress. But I wish to say again that in hearings held before the O'Mahoney committee reclamation officers stated that the water in Fort Peck Dam cannot be used for irrigation in the State of North Dakota. I do not know who is to blame, but the net result is that the only purposes for which the water can be used are the purposes I have stated.

RADIO TIME FOR OVERSEAS BROADCASTS BY POLITICAL CANDIDATES

Mr. President, when the soldiers' voting bill was first under consideration in the Senate it will be remembered that as the bill was then drawn it provided only for Republican and Democratic candidates broadcasting overseas to servicemen. At that time I was successful in having an amendment adopted under which the candidates for President of minority parties could also broadcast to the soldiers. Since that time three minority parties have taken advantage of that provision, and now, including the Democratic and Republican Parties candidates for five parties have arranged to broadcast to the soldiers.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point, as a part of my remarks, the Socialist platform of 1944. Although a Republican I feel that the people are entitled to thoroughly consider this platform.

There being no objection, the Socialist platform of 1944 was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FREEDOM FOR ALL—1944 SOCIALIST PLATFORM

In their struggle for freedom, peace and plenty, the American people face four paramount and closely interrelated issues: (1) The winning of the earliest possible peace that will last; (2) the provision of economic security for every American, with the preservation and increase of liberty; (3) the establishment of fraternity among all races, with equality of rights and obligations; (4) the improvement of the techniques of democratic political action.

On this platform for dealing with these issues, the Socialist Party, confident that the development of a strong party with mass support is essential to the struggle against fascism and the winning of the kind of world we want, seeks the support of the American people.

1. WINNING OF THE PEACE

The winning of the peace cannot be the result of appeasement of nazi-ism or of any other aggressive imperialisms.

Neither can it be the consequence of the "unconditional surrender" of the Germans and Japanese to the rulers of the U. S. S. R., Great Britain, and the United States of America. Shouting that slogan, the Roosevelt administration is prolonging this war and inviting the next by underwriting with the lives of our sons the restoration and maintenance of the British, Dutch, and French Empires in the Far East, and the Balkanization of Europe between Moscow and London.

Averting new wars

New war will not be averted by a triple alliance of the major powers—with China as a "poor relation"—even though such an alliance with its already obvious rivalries may be masked behind a plan for a vague association of nations. Yet this is the pattern for the future which most Republican as well as Democratic leaders accept.

The alternative to an uneasy and impermanent triple alliance for policing and exploiting the world is not an America-first or isolationist imperialism equally dangerous to democracy and peace. But toward one or the other of these forms of imperialism and the fascism which accompanies it the policies of both old parties inexorably lead us.

Against so dire a fate, we summon the American people and the people of our allies to demand an immediate political peace offensive based on the offer of an armistice to the people of the Axis Nations on the following conditions:

Conditions for peace

1. The peace should be organized on the acceptance of two fundamental principles: (a) the equal rights of all peoples of every race to order their lives without subjection to any race or nation; (b) the necessity that self-determination be accompanied by organized cooperation, from which no people, enemy, neutral, or colonial, shall be excluded, and the establishment of political and economic arrangements for removing the causes of war, settling disputes, guaranteeing security, and conquering poverty.

2. As a guaranty of good faith and a condition of armistice, the German and Japanese people must (a) replace governments guilty of gross deceit and cruel aggression by governments in whose good faith reasonable confidence may be reposed; (b) withdraw their military forces from all occupied territory and rapidly disarm; and (c) wherever possible, restore loot and give refugees a new economic start.

3. The United Nations, on their part, must pledge themselves specifically (a) to free the European nations overrun by Germany; (b) to help them guarantee their independence through a United States of Europe or strong

regional federations to supplement a world federation; (c) to refrain from interference in the internal affairs of nations thus freed; (d) to extend material aid for immediate relief and reconstruction of devastated countries without using such aid as a weapon for political domination, (e) to reject all demands for Axis slave labor in the post-war world; (f) to decide boundary questions which do not yield to negotiation by plebiscite under international authority; (g) to turn away from imperialism by guaranteeing speedy self-government, not only to lands now occupied by Japan, but to colonial territories under white rule. Where guidance to such independence is necessary, it shall be under international authority.

4. As a guaranty of good faith and a condition of the success of any federation, the United Nations must pledge themselves after the establishment of peace to follow the disarmament of the enemy countries by ending their own competitive armaments and military conscription and working out international guaranties of mutual security.

These points together comprise a peace offensive capable of inspiring revolt against the Axis dictators, winning the confidence of their victims and saving thousands of American lives.

2. ECONOMIC SECURITY WITH LIBERTY

The people of America fear the joblessness and depression which they think that the great boon of peace will bring. They remember that on the eve of the war boom 23 percent of them were dependent on made work or relief, and 40 percent lived just on or below the level of proper subsistence in respect to food.

In spite of this fear, what can be done in war can be better and more democratically done in peace, but only if we will plan for plenty for all as we have planned to meet the insatiable appetite of the god of war.

Poverty and joblessness cannot be conquered by private capitalism under the false alias of free enterprise, which is extolled today, ignorantly or hypocritically, by such diverse groups as the Republicans, the Democrats, the Communists, Wall Street monopolists, little business, farmers—and even labor leaders.

Planning for plenty is wholly incompatible with a return of the control over our great productive machinery to private owners—very largely absentee owners—while the Government commits itself to overcome the periodic crisis of a scarcity economy by maintaining the unemployed at subsistence levels. This has been and is the economic program of the New Deal.

Socialists pioneered in the advocacy of social insurance. We favor its extension and improvement. We endorse all possible help to returning veterans. We demand that the new public domain—the war plants now owned by the Government—be used in the struggle against unemployment and not handed over to big business.

But that is not enough. Only profound social and economic reorganization will enable men to use our marvelous technological resources for the complete conquest of poverty.

Democracy—Not bureaucracy

The commanding heights of our economic order; our system of money, banking, and credit; our natural resources; our public utilities and all monopolies, semimonopolies, and other exploitive industries, must be socially controlled. To be effective that requires social ownership, but not autocratic administration by agents of a bureaucratic state. We do not need to exchange "government of the workers, by the bosses, for the profits of absentee owners" for "government of the workers, by the bureaucrats, for the glory and power of the military state."

Two forms of administration of socialized enterprise will go far to protect us against this danger: (1) public corporations operated for the people's benefit through directors representing consumers and the various categories of workers with hand and brain in each such industry; and (2) growth of consumers' cooperatives on the Rochdale plan.

The democratic state can further play its part by the proper control of the fiscal system and by taxation based on the two principles of the ability to pay and the encouragement of production, both of which exclude the sales tax. A post-war tax program must not be used to support the big business system and hinder the growth of social enterprise. Taxes on the rental value of land should be used to end absentee landlordism; sharply graduated inheritance taxes should prevent the perpetuation of vast estates and a carefully proportioned capital-levy tax should aid socialization. Such taxation will also be found necessary to prevent enormous and growing national debt from leading us into financial disaster.

As against exploitation by private owners or the State, the right of workers to organize and to bargain collectively must be restored and protected. We oppose in war or peace the conscription of labor and the outlawry of the right to strike. Free labor is essential to a free America.

There is no more essential function of labor than the raising of food and fiber. We pledge our support to all measures looking to the conservation of our soil and the production of abundance with adequate reward to American farmers. We pledge our aid to the working farmers against exploitation by absentee landlords, bankers, and middlemen. We recognize the principle of occupancy and use as the only rightful title to farm land.

Where family farming has already been replaced by great plantations and company farms, or where modern technology forces large-scale farming, we demand the social ownership and cooperative operation of such land plus the use of the most modern techniques and tools. Where conditions favor family farming we encourage the security of such farmers through cooperative credit, purchasing, and marketing. We reject the compulsory collectivization of family farms along Russian lines.

We advocate the extension of social insurance to farm workers and provision of social security for farmers and farm workers displaced by age or technological changes. We advocate planning for full and balanced production of food and fiber in a hungry world. We advocate the further development of Government agencies essential to carrying out these proposals, including the upbuilding of a bureau of cooperatives in the Department of Agriculture. We oppose the subversion—often the illegal subversion—of Government agencies, especially the Extension Service of the Department of Agriculture, and agricultural colleges, to promote the profit and power of special interest groups now so dominant in the farm bloc.

3. EQUALITY AND FRATERNITY OF RACES

Democracy requires the application of the principle that each person is to be accorded social, political, and economic equality, and judged solely on the basis of his own deeds, rather than by his race, religion, or national origin.

Specifically, we pledge ourselves to work for American hospitality to war refugees and the end of the exclusion of certain Asiatic peoples. The law applying to the Chinese the general provisions concerning immigration and admitting them to citizenship should be extended to all Asiatic countries.

We demand the complete restoration of their rights as citizens to the 70,000 Americans of Japanese origin on the west coast who were evacuated en masse, without trial or even hearing, and confined in centers which, however humanely run, are concentration camps.

We condemn anti-Semitism, Jim Crowism, and every form of race discrimination and segregation in the armed forces as well as civil life. We urge the passage of anti-lynching and anti-poll-tax laws and the prompt enactment of legislation to set up a permanent Federal Fair Employment Practice Committee.

We reaffirm our historic opposition to any doctrine or practice of a master or favored race, not only in the realm of law, but in such labor unions—fortunately a minority—churches, political parties, and other basic social organizations as today countenance it. One of the conditions that will help make permanent the end of racial prejudice is the maintenance of full employment.

4. DEMOCRATIC POLITICAL ACTION

Year after year, by law and custom, the two old parties tighten their monopoly of the ballot. They are divided by no principles, but only by tradition and desire for office. Their platforms consist of generalities which are designed to prevent intelligent discussion and clear decision of issues. In consequence, pressure groups are the principle effective agencies in legislation and a situation is created which will aid the rise of a Fascist demagog in a period of post-war reaction.

The situation cries aloud for a democratic socialist party with mass support, such as our Canadian neighbors have developed in their Cooperative Commonwealth Federation.

Labor in the United States must establish its independence of current governmental control if it is to bargain freely with employers and government. The interests of a free labor movement are going to be better served as it severs its connections with the old parties, and unites with farm and consumer groups and minority groups seeking justice, to build a new kind of political party.

The issues here discussed are basic; they affect the lives of us all and the destiny of America. They cannot be solved separately.

An America disgraced by racial tensions which occasionally find expression in lynchings and race riots cannot lead the way to a peace which depends upon world-wide reconciliation of races on the basis of equality of right.

An America which cannot or will not provide useful jobs for its own people will easily be led into militarism, imperialism, and new war itself as palliatives for unemployment.

An America which cannot or will not perfect the tools of democracy will be relatively defenseless against a rising fascism.

The struggle for plenty, peace, and freedom is one and indivisible. The success of that struggle alone will prevent the continuing sacrifice of our sons and their sons to an endless cycle of wars.

If you believe these things, you will throw away your vote and your chance to make it count unless you vote the Socialist ticket.

But a Socialist vote is not enough. Socialism is not the winning of an election but the winning of a new life.

If you want to be effective in the long fight for these causes, joint the Socialist Party!

The Socialist candidates

In its candidate for President, the Socialist Party presents a distinguished American whose entire life has been devoted to the cause of the oppressed. As a thinker and writer, as a man of action, a fighter for civil liberties and against every manifestation of class, racial, and religious prejudice, he has won the respect and admiration of all progressive forces throughout the Nation.

Norman Thomas was born in Marion, Ohio, and lives in New York City, but he is at home wherever labor's cause and democracy in general are threatened—in Indiana, where he defied McNutt's martial law; in Florida, where he fought and exposed the Ku Klux

Klan; in Arkansas, where he faced planter mobs in behalf of the sharecroppers; in New Jersey, where he fought and licked Boss Hague on the issue of free speech.

Three times a member of the State Legislature of Pennsylvania, Darlington Hoopes, the Socialist candidate for Vice President, was selected by the newspapermen in Harrisburg as the most able member of the State legislature in 1935. He led the fight in securing passage of the resolution ratifying the Federal child-labor amendment.

Born on a farm in Bel Air, Md., 47 years ago, he studied at public schools, George School, a Quaker preparatory school, and the school of agriculture at the University of Wisconsin. On leaving he worked on a farm in Pennsylvania and studied law at night.

He has been active in the Socialist and labor movement for more than a score of years. He is a member of the board of the Eastern Cooperative League. As a lawyer, he has defended many labor cases. His intimate understanding of the varied problems of workers and farmers makes him an ideal choice for running mate for Norman Thomas.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a radio address entitled "Winning the Peace," one of the addresses in the overseas radio series, by Norman Thomas.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WINNING THE PEACE

(Overseas radio series by Norman Thomas)

This is the first of a series of radio speeches in which I shall discuss the campaign issues of 1944. I want to reach as many voters as I can in civil life and in the armed forces, but I confess that as I write and deliver this set of speeches I am thinking mostly about the men and women in the Army and Navy of the United States and I know that my civilian listeners will understand if sometimes I address myself directly to them. They are our sons and daughters, our brothers and sisters, bone of our bone and flesh of our flesh, for whose safe return after that final victory which their skill and courage have brought so near is our heart's deepest desire.

The war is being won by a nation's effort. What is has cost you men who have borne the brunt of the fighting, your fellow countrymen can only imperfectly guess but never fully know. Victory is sure. It is being won at tremendous price. Will it be worth it?

The question is neither cynical nor irrelevant. The military victory of the Allies certainly means the elimination of the Nazi and Japanese menace to peace and freedom, and hence a magnificent opportunity to build a better world. It does not with equal certainty mean that peace and freedom are secure or that the generation of my grandchildren will not have to face a worse war than their fathers have endured. It is a commonplace but terrible saying that the war may be won and the peace lost.

Are we winning the peace? That I profoundly doubt. I do not even think that the American voters in civil life or in the armed forces are being given the information on which to give an intelligent mandate at the polls. So far the Democratic and Republican Parties in their platforms and in the statements of their leaders have minimized or evaded the real issue. We call ours a democracy, but it is doubtful if the American people, including our citizen soldiers, will say much more about the peace than the Russians and Chinese whose rulers do not pretend that the people are to be consulted in the matter. And this no matter how often Mr. Dulles talks privately to Secretary Hull.

Let us see what is involved in winning the peace. It will take something more than treaties and agreements even if they are better than now seems likely. If America cannot end unemployment and conquer poverty we are almost certain to resort to the old and bloodstained method of alleviating unemployment by conscripting our youth into armies and putting men to work by building bombers and robot planes instead of homes. It is the most ominous sign of the times that before a war that we were told was to deliver us from the curse of militarism is completely won, the drive for conscription and militarism and the imperialism that must accompany them is upon us. No nation yet ever went in for militarism and imperialism and escaped war.

This is a matter to which I shall often return in this radio series. I refer to it now to emphasize the fact that if we cannot employ men and machines for peace we shall follow the example of the European nations and employ them in war and preparation for war. Already General Hershey has warned us that demobilization will be slow because it is cheaper to take care of men in the Army than in the army of the unemployed. That is a principle which will be of far reaching and disastrous application unless we can get rid of the army of the unemployed by harnessing our machinery to life and abundance not death and destruction. And that is a job that can be done when we make it our first business and plan for it intelligently.

Now let's go back to the question of winning the peace with special reference to peace treaties and post-war agreements. I think the present approach to this vital subject is dangerously mistaken. It would appear that President Roosevelt, with at least the tacit approval of Governor Dewey (despite some of the latter's amiable generalities about international justice) believes that the all-important question is machinery for enforcing the peace, and that if only the three great powers—with China as a sort of poor relation—will stick together it doesn't matter much what sort of peace they are to enforce. Such discussion as there has been (between Secretary Hull and Governor Dewey's representative, Mr. Dulles), apparently has concerned the weight to be given to the smaller nations in the projected international organization. That is an important question. It is not the vital question. Considerable weight can be given to smaller nations without altering the fact that the projected international association would be a triple alliance, a cartel of empires, as impermament as alliances have always been and as little suited to peace.

It is absured to say that peace can be guaranteed under some sort of police arrangement by which the competitively armed nations comprising some new league will guarantee in some future time to use force against an aggressor. No such agreement has ever stood the test in history or ever will.

You couldn't maintain peace in the smallest American village simply by the police if that village were not reasonably united in a cooperative effort to do things of common advantage, like looking after traffic and health and education. Police coercion is only effective if it is incidental to the establishment of justice. No police agreement will ever hold nations together who are rivals for profit and power, mutually suspicious of each other. No alliance of such nations ever has endured. To go back no further than to the end of the Napoleonic Wars, history is strewn with the wreckage of holy alliances and quadruple alliances and triple alliances nominally pledged to peace as firmly as any league which may grow out of the Dumbarton Oaks Conference. These alliances did not bring peace because the nations comprising them pursued the economic and political policies that led to war.

Even if a new cartel of empires—Russian, and British, and American—should endure for awhile it would arouse the bitter resentment of the excluded, particularly the hundreds of millions in Asia and Africa and Europe who would be exploited by it. The aggressor against whom the new league might be pledged to use force might well be a whole people seeking justice.

Let me be more concrete. Everything we know about President Roosevelt's conferences with our allies indicates that tacitly, if not openly, he has agreed to use American men and money not only to win back from the Japanese Indo China for the French, the East Indies for the Dutch, and Burma and Malaya for the British, but, through some kind of alliance, called a league of nations, to maintain those empires indefinitely for the benefit of nations which cannot possibly recover, much less maintain them except as they are underwritten by American strength. I hasten to add that I assume that sooner or later American capitalists will become partners in the business of imperial exploitation as part of the price of American underwriting of empire. The partnership will be insecure and unprofitable.

It is possible that there is still some gain for the few in imperialism. But every whole nation on the earth, including the English, would really be better off if they sought their prosperity in conquering poverty at home and in mutual agreement with free peoples. This would be true even if the end of imperial exploitation were not always new war.

Our best hope of lasting peace lies in the organized cooperation of self-governing peoples who will renounce aggressive armaments. I want my country to take a lead in arranging such cooperation but so long as I have voice I shall warn against the attempt to commit America to the underwriting of white supremacy in Asia by baptising an imperialist deal with the blessed name "cooperation" or "internationalism." Few future events are more certain than rebellion against white supremacy in Asia. Sooner or later the rebels against European power in southeast Asia with be strong enough to get the support of Russia or possibly China against a British imperialism or an Anglo-American imperialism which our present allies will have no reason to love forever. I do not want my grandsons to die in a new war to guarantee anybody's empire. They would probably die in vain because there are not enough white folks, much less English-speaking white folks, forever to dominate the world in which the colored races already are restlessly stirring. If either President Roosevelt or Governor Dewey resents my conclusion that their new league of nations will be primarily an imperial alliance, let them give their evidence to the contrary and I shall greatly rejoice.

That evidence, however, must apply not only to Asia but to Europe. The Tehran Conference, Churchill's scrapping of the Atlantic Charter, the poor record of the Allied military government in Italy and everything else we know, point clearly to a Balkanization of Europe. That is to be the treatment of the whole Continent by Russia and Britain as the great powers so long have treated the Balkan states. It is significant that as yet not one representative of that true Europe which lies between the Russian border and the English Channel, so far as we know, has been officially consulted by Stalin, Churchill, and Roosevelt, who are the architects of Europe's fate. Only one thing might make the European nations relatively secure against the power of Moscow and London, and that would be a United States of Europe on the Swiss model or at any rate strong European regional federations. (Let me pause to insist that such federations would not be a substitute for, but an essential condition of, successful world federation.) Neither the President of the United States

nor the Republican aspirant has as yet said one single thing to show that he recognizes this truth. Both are apparently content that Stalin should write his own ticket in eastern Europe, and that sphere-of-influence politics such as have repeatedly drenched Europe in blood, and in two great wars drawn our own sons into the vortex, should be indefinitely perpetuated.

It is possible, though improbable, that nothing the American Government said or did would influence Churchill or Stalin. The tragedy is that so much time has been lost and that our Government has never sought to appeal to the hearts and consciences of the peoples of the world upon whom the hope of lasting peace may depend. I do not think it altogether too late. But if we cannot influence our allies we can at least refrain from underwriting their schemes. The alternative to open conflict with them which must by all means be avoided, is not blind appeasement. Indeed reaction from such appeasement may make war, which ought to be unthinkable, the sternest of realities for the next generation.

What we Socialists insist is that the only sure foundation for international agreement and lasting peace is a steadily increasing understanding between peoples. This understanding should be expressed in organized cooperation to remove the causes of war and settle disputes without war. This great end has not been served by the demand for unconditional surrender. That demand is not wholly sincere as we have seen in the case of Italy. Nominally Italy surrendered unconditionally. Actually, there was a lot of negotiation with the King and Badoglio, and they weren't crusaders for democracy. The demand for unconditional surrender has concealed differences between the Allies and postponed a frank solution of them. It has tended to make the peoples of the Allied Nations satisfied with an emotional orgy rather than with the achievement of the conditions of lasting peace. Worst of all it has tended in Germany and will tend in Japan to prolong popular resistance. The split between Hitler and the Junker generals presented an opportunity for constructive revolution in Germany, although of itself it was no such revolution. If the German people had been offered something besides unconditional surrender, if they had not feared the forcible division of their country, and the conscription of 10,000,000 of them to Russian work camps, who knows what might have happened?

I am not suggesting a soft peace, or any peace at all with Hitler. Germany must be disarmed, restore loot where possible, and compensate refugees. But I add that Germans, 500,000 of whom are already in concentration camps for opposing Hitler, might, if assured of any hope at all, have made a constructive revolution which would have been a far better basis for peace than any agreement between imperialist governments. Even if there had been no constructive revolution, certainly German resistance would have been further weakened. More American boys might have lived to come back to us, and some towns and villages in Europe might have been saved the physical destruction which war, even for liberation, has brought upon them. I should not want upon my conscience responsibility for the cry "unconditional surrender" if it prolonged this war by so much as 1 day or by its passion made the next war in the slightest degree more likely. For the official statement of our Socialist alternative, write for our platform to Socialist Headquarters, 303 Fourth Avenue, New York 10, N. Y.

I do not think it is too late for that priceless boon of lasting peace to be won. I think this political campaign and this election may be a contribution to it. But only if we Socialists can force frank discussion of it and only if by the size of our vote we can demonstrate to the whole world that Americans are concerned not only for victory over Germany but victory over war, not for a brief hour of triumph but for the kind of peace which will permit men everywhere to turn their zeal and their intelligence to the destruction, no longer of their fellows, but of ignorance, preventable disease, and poverty. If you believe as we do you will throw away your votes and your self-respect with them unless you vote the Socialist ticket.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I may add that I have known Mr. Norman Thomas for some years. He is an outstanding, forthright patriotic statesman, of whom America can be proud, and although I am a Republican, I nevertheless believe that whenever those who are nominated for the office of President, or for any other office, desire to be heard, they should have a chance to have their views printed in the newspapers and told over the radio. I am very glad that Congress passed legislation permitting the use of the radio by all parties for overseas broadcasts.

LETTER TO THE FARMERS OF NORTH DAKOTA WHO ARE WITHOUT ELECTRIC LIGHTS AND POWER

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter which I have addressed to the farmers of North Dakota under the heading "To the farmers of North Dakota who are without electric lights and power."

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

To the Farmers of North Dakota Who Are Without Electric Lights and Power:

My bill provides that the power from Fort Peck shall be used immediately after the war ends and building materials are available so that the farmers need not wait 4 or 5 years until the entire T. V. A. project is completed.

As you will have seen from the newspapers, I am supporting the bill creating a T. V. A. for the Missouri Valley, introduced by Senator MURRAY, of Montana.

This bill will be passed in some form; what form this will be will depend much upon the farmers of North Dakota and the Northwest.

The demand is emphatic on the part of the farmers and their wives and children for electric lights for their buildings and power to turn the washing machines, pump the water, saw the wood, and do the other chores on the farm which have been back breaking to both men and women.

I was of the opinion that every farmer wants light and power on his farm, but I have to prove it. For some months I have been working with Mr. R. E. Engen, Tolna, in Nelson County. Some months ago we called together several hundred farmers. Everyone wanted lights and power, and we pledged that we would have an R. E. A. large enough to cover the State if necessary to get our purpose accomplished. In North Dakota only 7 farmers out of 100 have light and power, while in Japan 95 percent of the farmers have light and power.

In order to convince the Congress that the farmers of North Dakota want light and power, I ask you to write me—each one of you—to that effect, so that I may present them on the floor of the Senate and to the proper committees. Just address me care of Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C., and keep us in the fight to get every farmer in North Dakota light and power.

Faithfully yours,

WILLIAM LANGER,
United States Senator.

THE WASHINGTON, D. C., SEDITION TRIAL

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, last week I called the attention of the Senate to the so-called sedition trial now in progress in the United States District Court for the District of Columbia. On that occasion I emphasized the obvious injustice done to the 30, now reduced to 26, defendants in this mass trial; the injustice of trying them all together, the injustice of trying them on a conspiracy charge, when the only evidence of the conspiracy charge is certain similarities between the things they said and did in the propagation of certain political ideas which are as old as the Old Testament, and the injustice of a trial in which the Government needs months and months, thousands of exhibits, and scores of witnesses to make out a case.

Today I want again to discuss this extraordinary trial exclusively from the point of view of the public interest. This trial is not only a gross injustice to the defendants; it is also a public scandal. It is bringing the courts and the law enforcement agencies of the Federal Government into ridicule and contempt. It is costing the taxpayers nearly a million dollars.

Mr. President, when I spoke last week I said it was costing the taxpayers somewhere between one-half and three-quarters of a million dollars. In any event it is going to be very close to a million dollars, provided the Government continues, as an editorial in the Washington Post said it contemplated, to introduce 32,000 exhibits.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LANGER. I yield.

Mr. WHEELER. I wish to compliment the Senator from North Dakota. I just read his speech this afternoon upon the subject of the sedition trial, and I was going to compliment him privately, but I now wish to compliment him publicly for the stand he has taken in reference to that matter. I think it is one of the most disgraceful proceedings that have ever been brought in the United States of America. I do not know any of the defendants, but I do say that it is wrong to conduct a mass trial; it is wrong in principle, and the trial in Washington has demonstrated beyond a question of doubt the unfairness of the whole procedure. It is making a laughing-stock out of the court in Washington, and something ought to be done about it. I wrote a letter to the Attorney General when the case was first presented to the grand jury. I said that in almost any other jurisdiction, the then prosecuting attorney would have been put in jail for contempt of court, for permitting as he did, every piece of evidence that went before the grand jury to be printed in the newspapers the next morning.

I wish to congratulate the Senator for having the courage to stand on the floor of the Senate and take up an unpopular issue of this kind.

Mr. LANGER. I thank the Senator from Montana.

Mr. WHEELER. I think the Senator from North Dakota is rendering a service to the people of the country in taking up this matter.

Mr. LANGER. Again I thank the Senator. I like to work more closely with the distinguished Senator from Montana and hope the time will come when he and I can work together for irrigation, so that Montana will not have 1,711,409 acres irrigated and poor North Dakota only 21,615 acres irrigated.

Mr. WHEELER. I hope that we obtain more irrigation in Montana. We need it. I am very proud of the fact that we have as much irrigation as we have in Montana. A great deal of it came about in years past. But North Dakota does not need so much irrigation as we do. She does not have as much land which can take irrigation as Montana has.

Mr. LANGER. Of course the real answer is that most of the water goes through Montana first before it reaches North Dakota, and Montana grabs it. I do not blame Montana for doing so, but I think North Dakota should get more than one one-hundredth of it.

Mr. President, if the evidence presented during the first 4 months of the trial is representative of the best the Government has to offer in support of its accusation, the probabilities of any convictions are slight. If there should be convictions and if the Supreme Court adheres to the doctrines on which it decided in 1942 the Schneiderman case and only last June the Hartzel case, such convictions must be reversed on appeal.

It would not be proper for me to attempt to prejudge the issues of law or fact before a court in any orderly proceeding based on a sound theory of law. But in this case we have a grave departure from the American way in law enforcement. We have issues of fact which are not justiciable by any jury. The Government charges a world conspiracy, which in the nature of things, cannot be proved under our rules of evidence. The Government seeks to prove participation in and furtherance of this conspiracy by these defendants. If the Government had real evidence of the formation and furtherance of the conspiracy charged, such evidence could be presented to a jury in less than the 4 months the Government has now been introducing evidence—nay, almost 5 months.

Real evidence might consist of documents, letters, or scraps of conversations showing that the specific conspiracy charged was actually in operation. No, the Government proposes to prove this conspiracy by taking thousands of isolated acts and utterances, many of them wild and foolish, by given defendants, and by asking the jury to accept a farfetched theory according to which the totality of these acts and utterances add up to the conspiracy charged.

Mr. President, again I invite the attention of the Senate to an editorial published in the Washington Post a few days ago, which stated that up to that time the Government had introduced 4,000 exhibits, but that before the case was finished it expected to introduce 32,000. I might add that the day I was in court the Government introduced exhibit No. 4121.

Mr. President, it is against our entire theory of jurisprudence and against our American tradition to conduct a political prosecution on any such assumptions. If this prosecution theory should become law by being accepted by our highest courts, there would be no political security for any member of the opposition. Things like this could happen: After President Roosevelt goes out of office, if it could be shown that Mayor Hague's political machine in Jersey or Mayor Kelly's political machine in Illinois ever committed any violations of the electoral laws, our good President could be included in a conspiracy indictment charging that he belonged to and furthered a conspiracy for pursuing the lawful end of three reelections by using the unlawful means of violating electoral laws. All sorts of evidence could be presented linking President Roosevelt with Mayor Hague or Mayor Kelly. On the conspiracy theory, proof that there was a political partnership between our good President and these city politicians would make our good President responsible for any and every unlawful act any one of the city machine politicians or any henchman of any one of them ever committed. Such is the theory and doctrine of conspiracy law as now applied to gangsters, bootleggers, and white-slavers. In this sedition case, the Government is trying to apply this theory and doctrine to political associations, activities, writings, and utterances. If this theory should become law, there would be no political freedom or freedom of speech and the press.

In politics, in political agitation, and political activities, no one can be held responsible for the acts and motives of all those who vote for him, who listen to him, who read him, or who endorse or quote from him. Similarity of aims, ideas, and utterances during a brief period or campaign does not establish a conspiracy. Are President Roosevelt, Prime Minister Churchill, and the leader of the Soviet state, Josef Stalin, in conspiracy to spread communism all over the world merely because they are united against Hitler and because Stalin's political creed calls for communism everywhere? Obviously not.

I am not espousing here any of the ideas or teachings of any of the defendants in the sedition trial. I do not know in detail what they are. From what I know of some of them, I should totally repudiate them. I am here espousing the cause of freedom of speech, freedom of the press, and freedom of political association and activity. If there is freedom only for those who are not crackpots, to suppress anyone the Government has only to call him a crackpot and make the label stick. In this mass sedition trial, the Government, by the nature of its fantastic prosecution theory, has made the cause of these defendants the cause of free speech and political freedom.

I again call on the Department of Justice to stop this prosecution, which strikes at the roots of political freedom, the thing we are fighting for all over the world today. There can be no freedom unless there is security against unreasonable prosecution for all opponents of the administration in power. There is no freedom unless there is freedom to express unpopular ideas and advocate unpopular doctrines. The way to combat what we consider bad propaganda is by education and the making of good propaganda, not by farfetched criminal prosecutions charging a type of world conspiracy which, like any great historical theory, can never be judicially proved under the rules of evidence.

In this connection, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks, bearing out exactly what I have stated and that once this hysteria is permitted to go unchecked that many innocent folks may be irreparably damaged in reputation, an article which appeared in the Washington Times-Herald of Thursday, September 21, 1944, entitled "F. B. I. Once Studied G. O. P. Vets as Subversive, Probers Told."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

F. B. I. ONCE STUDIED G. O. P., VETERANS, AS SUBVERSIVE, PROBERS TOLD—REVELATIONS MADE BY DEMOCRAT "TRYING TO SAVE PARTY FROM HILLMAN, BROWDER"

(By Willard Edwards)

A congressional investigating committee was startled yesterday by testimony that the Department of Justice once began an inquiry into subversive activities of the following organizations:

The American Bar Association.

The Republican National Committee.

The National Association of Manufacturers.

The American Legion Americanization Committee.

The Veterans of Foreign Wars.

INQUIRY LATER ABANDONED

Joseph P. Kamp, of New York City, acting chairman of the Constitutional Educational League, Inc., voiced the accusation before the Special House Committee Investigating Election Expenditures.

Kamp said the Justice Department on an undisclosed date started an investigation into the five prominent organizations at the behest of the Anti-Defamation League of New York City, which he described as "the central unit of an un-American Gestapo which works in close harmony with the Department of Justice."

The inquiry was called off, he testified, when responsible officials "discovered what was going on."

RELATED GROUPS NAMED

Committee members indicated they would inquire into the charge by demanding from Kamp the New York City address of the Anti-Defamation League headquarters. They similarly requested information presumably preliminary to the summoning of five other organizations named by the witness as part of the "Gestapo." These were:

Friends of Democracy, the Non-Sectarian Anti-Nazi League, the American Civil Liberties Union, the American Jewish Committee, and Market Analysts, Inc. All have headquarters in New York City.

Representative MURPHY (Democrat), of Pennsylvania, remarked that the subject matter appeared to be more within the scope of the Dies committee on un-American activities. Other members noted, however, that Kamp's charges were not volunteered but elicited only under prolonged questioning concerning the activities of his organization. The charges having been aired, they commented, ought to be followed up.

HILLMAN, BROWDER ATTACKED

Kamp proclaimed himself a lifelong Democrat who is attempting to "save the party from Hillman and Browder."

"If Sidney Hillman takes over, we will have a Soviet America," he asserted.

Hillman, chairman of the C. I. O. Political Action Committee, was quizzed by the committee last week about his group's slush fund activities in behalf of a fourth term for President Roosevelt.

The 44-year-old witness refused to disclose to the committee any records showing the names of other officials of his organization or of contributors or purchasers of the voluminous literature it distributes. He said his group studiously refrains from political activity.

WITHHOLDS INFORMATION

"We have never indorsed any candidate for public office nor engaged in partisan politics of any nature whatever," he asserted, "and I submit that our activities do not come within the legal scope of your committee's authority.

"Until a court of competent jurisdiction rules our activities political we must withhold any information regarding the finances of the league and the names of its contributors, because such information would come into the possession of the notorious smear bund and would be used by enemies of this country to malign, harass, intimidate, and persecute patriotic citizens who are helping the league to defend and protect constitutional government.

"SMEARING HAS BEGUN"

"The smearing has already begun. The bund's arch-smearer, Walter Winchell, made a lying attack on both myself and the league last Sunday night and the left-wing New York Post began its smear last Wednesday, quoting a committee investigator as accusing us of neglecting the committee's invitation even before we had received the committee's letter.

"If the league, as a publisher, can be subjected to investigation and forced to disclose the purchasers of its publications, is any publisher in America secure from such annoyance?"

BOOK UNDER COVER ATTACKED

"If our publications are political, then such smear books as Under Cover (a purported exposé of fascism in the United States) are political, particularly in attacks upon Members of Congress who are running for election this year. If our publications are to be scrutinized, then the un-American elements which cooperated in the mass distribution of Under Cover and similar publications must be investigated."

Kamp said Hillman was trying to infer that the Constitutional Educational League was partisan to the Republican Party.

"As a lifelong registered Democrat, I have been trying to prevent Sidney Hillman, the C. I. O., and the Communist Party from becoming strong enough to take over my party," he said. "I may have failed.

"As long ago as 1933 I assailed the appointment of radicals to high administrative positions in the New Deal."

Mr. LANGER. I also wish to call the attention of the Senate to one of the defendants in the sedition case, Mr. Frank W. Clark. I should like to say something about his record. I have before me a letter which he wrote to Hon. Thomas Dewey on the 15th day of July. He sent a copy of it to Hon. John Bricker.

This is the kind of man who is on trial: Twenty-seven years ago, in 1917, he became a member of the United States armed forces in the great war referred to as World War No. 1, a member of the Seventh Field Artillery, First Division, United States Regular Army. With the American Expeditionary Forces he fought in France and Germany; was placed upon detached service, then serving with the "Lines of Communication" in the Military Intelligence, and fought through 11 battles—5 major battles and 6 minor battles.

In 1919, after serving with the army of occupation in Germany, he was returned to the United States and was honorably discharged from the service, with an excellent war service record. He was later found to have eight disabilities, which he claims are all attributable to such war service, some of which are still very serious. But to the shame of the Nation he has thus honorably served, 25 years later, in 1944, he is forced to stand trial, not alone or with those whom he knew, but with 25 other men and women most of whom he had never met and with some already convicted and serving penitentiary sentences for other crimes allegedly committed by them before a bar of so-called justice, in a little crowded courtroom in the District of Columbia, charged with being a coconspirator in a group of 26 persons now on trial, charged in an indictment with having "conspired to undermine the morale of the military and naval forces of the United States, to cause insubordination and mutiny, and to set up a Nazi form of government in the United States."

I also wish to call attention to the fact that when the depression was upon us this man was one of those who organized the "Bonus March" on Washington, to obtain justice for their comrades at the hands of the Government for which they had fought, and in whose service many of them were wounded and nearly died.

Mr. President, although I do not agree with all that Frank W. Clark has said in this letter, nevertheless, today, when this man who fought and was wounded eight times, and is suffering under disabilities, is passing over the hill in age, when he has not a dollar with which to hire a lawyer, when he is poor and without friends, and when he wishes to address a communication to the people of the country he fought and bled for, I say that I know of no more appropriate place for that communication, no matter how much I may disagree with him, than in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I believe that Senators will agree with that viewpoint, that they will give this splendid veteran of World War No. 1 an opportunity to show the world that free speech and right of petition prevail in America and grant unanimous consent, which I now ask, to have his letter, less two small delineations to which he has agreed, addressed to Hon. Thomas E. Dewey and Hon. John W. Bricker, together with his letter to me, printed in full in the RECORD at this point as part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SEPTEMBER 11, 1944.

Hon. WILLIAM LANGER,
Senator from North Dakota,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR LANGER: Herein find enclosed typewritten copy of a letter that was written and dispatched to the Honorable Thomas E. Dewey, Governor, State of New York. This copy is for your perusal and to use in any way you may consider and determine.

The original letter was forwarded to the Governor, Thomas E. Dewey, through the Honorable John W. Bricker, Governor, State of Ohio, who also has a copy of the original.

While it is a fact, the Honorable Gov. Thomas E. Dewey has not personally answered this writer's letter—and is not expected to do so, especially at this time, at least the Honorable Governor John W. Bricker has, and as quoted in the following:

"STATE OF OHIO,
"OFFICE OF THE GOVERNOR,
"Columbus, July 28, 1944.

"Mr. FRANK W. CLARK,
"Washington, D. C.

"DEAR MR. CLARK: Thank you for your letter of July 15, enclosing a letter addressed to Governor Dewey. I shall see that the letter reaches him.

"I appreciate your suggestions and your helpfulness.

"Yours sincerely,
"JOHN W. BRICKER."

In the opening address of the Honorable John W. Bricker, Governor, State of Ohio, Saturday, September 9, 1944, this writer was answered in the several statements made by Governor Bricker to a letter written him, also upon the date of July 15.

The address to the United States Senate, as made by yourself, regarding the so-called sedition trial in the District of Columbia on the date of September 8, was food for thought for all concerned, and for which—as one—I want to thank you, Senator LANGER.

Very respectfully,
FRANK W. CLARK.

WASHINGTON, D. C.

JULY 15, 1944.

Hon. THOMAS E. DEWEY,
Governor, State of New York,
State Capitol, Albany, N. Y.

MY DEAR HONORABLE SIR: You have been called upon by a great mass of American people through their chosen delegates to the Republican Party convention in Chicago on June 28 to be the standard bearer for the party, having been selected by them as candidate for the office of Chief Executive of the United States of America, the greatest honor that can be conferred upon a citizen of this Republic.

You have accepted, not only the honor thus conferred upon you, but the challenge and grave responsibility that is involved in undertaking to serve your fellow countrymen in this the darkest hour of our national history, threatened as we are by the enemies of civilization deeply entrenched against us, both without and within; and having accepted the call to campaign for election to such high office, which you are most likely to attain, in such event it will become your sacred trust and duty to lead the American people back to sovereignty and the great benefits to be derived from our republican form of government as established by our founding fathers and as guaranteed to the States by our Federal Constitution. As President of the United States of America you will be duty bound to uphold the Constitution of the United States and constitutional government, which we have not had since the time of Abraham Lincoln.

A gigantic task; a sacred duty; an unparalleled opportunity to serve not only your fellow men but all future generations to come will be yours, to straighten out the national and international affairs of our Republic. This writer believes that you are capable, and that you will not fail us in this agonizing and crucial period.

To quote your own reported statements you "have made no pledges, promises, or commitments, expressed or implied, to any man

or woman." Therefore you are a freeman not beholden to any political machine or to any body politic—free to gain back for the people themselves their lost political, financial, and economic liberties, their rights of free speech, free press, and free assembly (liberties that have been stolen from them by the most dastardly and diabolical scheming, plotting, conniving, and deception that ever could have been conceived by the mind of man). You are free to reestablish under our Constitution a government of, by, and for the people—by law instead of by caprices of alien bureaucrats; that government of, by, and for the people may no longer be just hollow mockery but an established fact.

God willing, when the smoke of the election battle of November 1944 has cleared away, and you will have found yourself elevated to the Presidency, doubtless you will find that the mothers and womenfolk have played an important part in the success of your campaign, through house-to-house, office-to-office, street-to-street, store-to-store, and shop-to-shop canvass.

By holding yourself aloof and without commitments as you have done, you have shown that God Almighty gave you mind and brain to use, and that you intend to use it, not in the way of aping your predecessors imbued with foreign ideologies, nor to deceive those who place their trust and confidence in you and who unite in support of you, but as a trusted public servant of the people (not their master) who constitute this Republic, you will set about your appointed task to put an end to one-man government; that an end also will be made of the little group of rulers who meet together in private conferences, who, heretofore, have been well hidden behind the scenes of world finance, international politics, and economics.

May the writer digress at this point to give you a little of the background of himself?

Twenty-seven years ago (1917) this writer became a member of the United States armed forces in the great war referred to as World War No. 1, a member of the Seventh Field Artillery, First Division, United States Regular Army. With the A. E. F. (American Expeditionary Forces) he fought in France and Germany; was placed upon detached service, then serving with the "Lines of Communications" (Military Intelligence) and fought through 11 battles (5 minor and 6 major battles). In 1919, after serving with the army of occupation in Germany, this writer was returned to the United States and honorably discharged from service, with an excellent war-service record, second to none in the United States. He was later found to have eight disabilities which he claims are all attributable to such war service, some of which are still very serious.

But to the shame and everlasting disgrace of the Nation he has thus honorably served, 25 years later (1944) he is forced to stand trial before a bar of so-called justice, in a little crowded courtroom in the District of Columbia charged (absurdly charged) with being a co-conspirator in a group of 26 other persons now on trial who are also charged in a spurious so-called indictment with having conspired to undermine the morale of the military and naval forces of the United States, to cause insubordination and mutiny, and to set up a Nazi form of government in the United States.

Twelve years ago (1932) this writer, because of the excruciating suffering of our people through the so-called depression of that time, conducted a Nation-wide march of ex-soldiers into the District of Columbia, there to present themselves to the United States Congress in peaceful assembly as a living petition, in support of what had been declared by Congress to be due them as a part of their back salaries under the Adjusted Compensation Act, but which was not payable until 1945.

Simultaneously, because of the suffering the great masses of American people were undergoing as result of the this so-called depression, the Honorable William Randolph Hearst (then of New York City) was advocating and urging the Congress to consider a general public-works program to cost the sum of $5,000,000,000 to relieve those of our people who were suffering the depression beyond all endurance and through no fault of their own.

While it became a fact that this so-called ex-soldiers' Bonus Army did get out of bounds and constructive control of it was lost, due to radical communistic elements which habitually inject themselves into all philanthropic or reform movements of this kind—the word "bonus," by the way was coined by the then Secretary of the Treasury, Andrew W. Mellon, at a congressional committee hearing on the subject, and for the deliberate purpose it is believed to poison the peoples' mind against the ex-servicemen by seeking to give the impression that they were looting the Treasury in time of depression by drawing any of their back pay—nevertheless, it was also a fact that the eventual payment of this so-called bonus broke the spell of depression and brought a wave of temporary prosperity to the country. It is also a historical fact that this episode was a vital factor in the defeat of one candidate for reelection to the Presidency, because he ordered a barrage of gas on the ex-soldiers; and thereby contributed in no small measure to the success of His Excellency, Franklin Delano Roosevelt, in attaining the office of President of the United States that same year.

Yet 12 years later—1944—this unsolicited and unintended political patronage of the writer in 1932 is diabolically reversed into political persecution by the New Deal appointees of Franklin D. Roosevelt, as this writer was served a "John Doe" subpena to come clear across the continent to be trapped in alien jurisdiction to answer to absurd, grossly false, and unjust charges.

In 1933, just after his election to the Presidency, His Excellency, President Franklin D. Roosevelt, in a public address to the Nation stated he was going to drive Wall Street out of Washington. At the same time and while 47 of our honorable State Governors were in the District of Columbia as the President, by proclamation had closed all the State and national banks and Federal (private) banking institutions—this was while we were at the very depth of this so-called depression, all plotted and planned by the global strategists and international financiers—this writer wrote His Excellency, Franklin Delano Roosevelt, President of the United States of America, and in a 7-page letter or document outlined in full detail the legal impossibility of paying off in gold a $59,000,000,000 national debt, with only $5,000,000,000 of gold in the United States Treasury with which to pay it.

His Excellency, President Roosevelt, upon receiving this 7-page letter, acknowledged same to this writer advising that he was immediately referring it to the Treasury Department, which naturally necessitated the Treasury Department officials' going into conference over the situation pointed out to them. Seventy-two hours later, headlines appeared in the newspapers throughout the Nation—America Goes Off Gold Standard.

That letter, among others from this writer, is a matter of record in the White House files. Thus this writer contends that he was instrumental in assisting President Roosevelt at that time in saving the Nation from financial chaos and bankruptcy, and possibly from internal revolution.

Such appreciation. Eleven years later—1944—this patriot is humiliated by a John Doe summons to appear before his political appointees 3,030 miles distant from his habitat or place of residence to answer to a spurious trumped-up charge and to stand before a bar of so-called justice to prove his innocence of such charge, based on a law that was designed against Communists and not against American patriots.

In view of the foregoing experiences, this writer contends that if this be the New Deal brand of democracy, our Republic can well get along without it. For unprovoked and inexcusable political persecution there has never been anything to equal it or compare with it in the annals of American history, not even the infamous alien and sedition trials of 144 years ago which were so unjust they killed the old Federalist Party. The real reason for this writer's persecution is divulged in a former indictment, America First. That is the writer's crime, that he puts his country first just as Churchill and Stalin do.

The astounding part of all this is the fact that as a soldier the Government compelled this writer to take an oath to support the Constitution and defend our country against all enemies, foreign and domestic. When this writer volunteered to fight in World War No. 1, he did so gladly and in that same spirit went through those 11 battles in the A. E. F. in France and Germany. Nor is this writer the only patriotic soldier fighter who is victim of this illegal, cruel, and remorseless persecution of our New Deal critics.

We took that oath to defend our country above all others, and now we are charged with the crime of living up to it.

Winston Churchill is proud of being a Britisher first. Josef Stalin is proud of being for Russia first, and both of them have publicly said so and are praised as great examples of true patriotism.

This writer is proud of giving his allegiance to America First, and if that causes the Army and Navy to revolt, this writer wants to know why the Government made him take that oath.

What have 26 pro-Americans, indicted in the Nation's Capital, been crusading and fighting for, and why the lying smear and false persecution inflicted upon them by the present prointernational New Deal administration?

These two questions Your Honor, sir, may be fully answered by a prophetic warning quoted from *Ex parte Milligan* (71 U. S. 2, at p. 125), decided by our Supreme Court of the United States of America in 1866:

"This Nation, as experience has proved, cannot always remain at peace, and has no right to expect that it will always have wise and humane rulers, sincerely attached to the principles of the Constitution. Wicked men, ambitious of power, with hatred of liberty and contempt of law, may fill the place occupied by Washington and Lincoln; and if this right is conceded (deprivation of civil rights), and the calamities of war again befall us, the dangers to human liberties are frightful to contemplate. If our fathers had failed to provide for just such a contingency, they would have been false to the trust reposed in them. They knew—the history of the world told them—the Nation they were founding, be its existence short or long, would be involved in war; how often or how long continued, human foresight could not tell; and that unlimited power, wherever lodged at such a time, was especially hazardous to free men. For this, and other equally weighty reasons, they secured the inheritance they had fought to maintain by incorporating in a written Constitution the safeguards which time had proved were essential to its preservation. Not one of these safeguards can the President or Congress, or the Judiciary, disturb."

Your Honor, sir, ever since its ascendancy to power the present administration has been insidiously doing by indirection that which it cannot do directly under our Constitution, and by rubber-stamp "must" legislation and F. B. I. "Red Terror" gained dictatorial

powers. Because this small number of 26 pro-American Christian men and women scattered throughout our great country, very few of whom knew each other, independently raised their voices in proclaiming self-evident truths and opposed from time to time the rise to power of alien-minded men of dictatorial and bureaucratic ambitions, they are crucified and forced to endure, and have endured a Valley Forge, not for one winter, but for three, for you, sir, as well as for all other right-thinking and liberty-loving Americans. But, while reduced almost literally to walking barefooted, they still have their chins up and refuse to bow their knees to Baal.

Honorable Sir, if the plotted and contemplated "railroading" of these defendants succeeds, the legal door will be open for mass dragnet convictions of all and sundry critics of this present dictatorship. Therefore, as should be obvious, the outcome of this trial is of vital concern to every American preferring republicanism to plotted and planned deceptive democracy in financial and economic servitude and bondage, or to those who value our priceless heritage of the republican institutions under which our Nation rose to greatness with full enjoyment of life, liberty, and pursuit of individual happiness.

You, Hon. Thomas E. Dewey, can aid in this struggle for true republicanism and individualism in opposition to tyranny, oppression, regimentation, and internationalism by dispatching immediately one or more of your personal investigative aids to the District of Columbia and to this little courtroom, to get a first-hand report of these proceedings; that you may know what kind of justice (?) is here being meted out as result of tyrannical, oppressive, dictatorial power politics running wild, indicative of under cover Ogpu and gestapo processes, all tending to destroy or undermine the existence of the judicial branch of our American constitutional government. Let this writer add, Governor Dewey, that you cannot afford to overlook or neglect your duty to the American Republic and the American people in this history-making political-persecution trial.

Eleven years ago, back in 1933, when these alien-minded internationalists began in earnest to really bore deep into our governmental structure, some of the leaders of international socialism in Bridgeport, Conn., where this writer happened to be at the time, in rejoicing over the election of President Roosevelt, exclaimed: "Good. Now we shall proceed to capture law and order."

About that time—same time—Your Honor, leaders of international communism in the city of Chelsea, Mass., informed this writer that "Now that we are capturing law and order by boring from within one of the major political parties, we shall, one day, turn the courthouses into rooming houses and liquidate such judges, jurists, barristers, and lawyers as will continue to uphold the constitutional principle of American government."

Such bold threats as these caused this writer to become alarmed, and it was then that he decided to fight international communism right out in the open and expose these enemies whenever and wherever possible. From that time until now this writer has clearly seen through the insidious methods and tactics of these international revolutionaries who, though they have never been elected to such positions by the American people, have obtained and usurped nearly all the key positions in this present administration where they have entrenched themselves by their boring in.

Not only have they bored within our structure of government but by cunning and crafty and hypocritical deception they have bored to the very foundations of all established American institutions—schools, churches, colleges, universities, social centers, hospitals, and institutions of mercy and charity. By their artifices they have completely fooled the American people who are blind as to what is going on. Judges, lawyers, barristers, and jurists are no exception, no matter how wise they think they are.

These internationalists, posing as New Dealers, are past masters in the arts of sedition and deception from having practiced for years all over Europe and Asia—are also past masters at charging their opponents of everything of which they themselves are guilty, in order to detract attention from themselves. Thus, they hope to make their own escape while the jury—people—are looking the other way.

With their lying false propaganda through their vermin press which they control through their mighty power of the purse and advertising, through years of building up their hate, hate, hate, and more hate, these alien revolutionists have infected our whole Nation, not only in their so-called class struggle, but creating disunity and disrupting family life—turning individual against individual, son against father, daughter against mother, etc., until our whole Nation is in a state of confusion and cannot see through the fog or smoke screen.

All this plotted persecution of law-abiding citizens has inflicted untold needless suffering; but worse than this, some of our degenerate law-enforcement officers, who have sold their honor for those "thirty pieces of silver" for an easy job, feeling themselves very secure under protection of party politics, as special agents under the badge of authority of New Deal dictatorship, take the law into their own hands and exceed all legal authority, and get away with almost anything, according to their own personal whims and caprices, notwithstanding title 8, section 47, United States Criminal Code regarding conspiracy to interfere with civil rights, or the rights of citizens to privacy and to be secure in their persons and property against espionage and unlawful search and seizure, as guaranteed by the Constitution, in war or in peace.

Viewing this terrible mess into which our once proud Nation has sunk, you, Governor Dewey, as aspirant to leadership, have a great duty as well as the greatest opportunity ever before afforded an American public official. Moreover, the great masses of intelligent and responsible people of this country are now behind you 100 percent, and this battle on election day, November 7, 1944, will be such a political battle as this country has never before seen.

That you may not be in the dark as to any phase of how the enemies of civilization are working to defeat your candidacy and destroy the Republic, this writer believes, Honorable Sir, that it is your duty to dispatch one or more of your legally trained investigators to the District of Columbia and to this little courtroom where this so-called sedition trial is going on—this title having been affixed to it by the persecutors in an effort to deceive the public and detract attention from their own seditious activities.

* * * * *

Our Constitution of the United States of America specifically states that Congress shall have the right to borrow money on the credit of the Government. When one studies or conducts a research investigation in the subject of money, and the seal of the North American Treasury one immediately finds that when the Congress seeks to borrow money on the credit of the Government, all that the Congress does borrow (has borrowed for years and years) is debt which is evidenced upon the very face of the paper by the words: "Notes, certificates."

Your Honor, Sir, a more detailed explanation can be submitted to you by this writer, should you care to have it. However, under your leadership as Chief Executive, President of the United States of America, it should be your duty to seriously request of the Congress the necessity of going into an investigative research on our monetary situation.

Right at this time there is a monetary conference going on in Bretton Woods, N. H. Information has come from that conference via newspaper reports and to quote: "The United States has no official connection with the bank." This bank, meaning the "Bank for International Settlements," Basle, Switzerland, when in fact, an American international financier is president of that bank; a gentleman by the name of McKitterick from Nebraska. Germany owns 71 percent of the world's stock in that bank.

It has been said, Your Honor, that no message can reach you personally and be replied to by you. This writer is determined that this letter shall reach you and it is hoped that you in your reply shall give this writer the privilege of making an open letter of it, that it may do its part no matter how small toward the winning of the election, November 7, 1944, for Mr. Thomas E. Dewey—to that of His Excellency, President of the United States of America, Thomas E. Dewey.

In conclusion, this writer would depose and say: God bless you and preserve you—our coming new Chief Executive and President of the United States of America.

Very respectfully, your Honorable Sir,

FRANK W. CLARK,
One of the Defendants in the Case of the "26."
WASHINGTON, D. C.

EMPLOYMENT OF ENGINEERS AND ECONOMISTS FOR CONSULTATION PURPOSES ON RECLAMATION WORK

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3429) to amend section 1 of an act entitled "An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to employ engineers and economists for consultation purposes on important reclamation work," approved February 28, 1929 (45 Stat. 1406), as amended by the act of April 22, 1940 (54 Stat. 148), and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendment, agree to the request of the House for a conference, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Acting President pro tempore appointed Mr. BANKHEAD, Mr. MCCARRAN, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. GURNEY, and Mr. THOMAS of Idaho conferees on the part of the Senate.

AUTHORITY FOR PRESIDING OFFICER TO SIGN ENROLLED BILLS, ETC.

On motion of Mr. BARKLEY, it was

Ordered, by unanimous consent, That the authority of the present Presiding Officer (Mr. WALSH of New Jersey) to sign enrolled bills and joint resolutions be extended during the remainder of the week, notwithstanding the adjournment of the Senate today.

AUTHORIZATION TO RECEIVE MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE DURING ADJOURNMENT

On motion of Mr. BARKLEY, it was

Ordered, by unanimous consent, That the Secretary of the Senate be, and he is hereby, authorized to receive messages from the House of Representatives subsequent to the adjournment of the Senate today.

AMERICA'S PART IN INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I realize that the hour is late. The Senate is on the point of taking a recess until

early in November. But I feel that there is something to be said on a subject upon which I wish to take the time of the Senate for a few minutes.

During the past few days I have listened to several able addresses on the part of certain of my colleagues urging serious consideration of the responsibilities devolving upon Members of this Senate body, the American people, and the United States, for the organization and preservation of world peace when this grim war ends.

Mr. President, the record clearly shows that for long years before this war broke out—indeed, as far back as I can remember—I have thought and worked toward the end of international collaboration with all other peoples and nations.

I wish to say at the outset that I am in substantial agreement with the objectives of international collaboration recently urged upon this Senate body by my colleagues during the past few days; but, Mr. President, I want to remind my colleagues that there are certain very crucial issues involved in the present situation which, in the speeches I have so recently listened to, have been most conspicuous by their absence. I refer to the American ideals and purposes originally at stake in this great struggle.

Mr. President, the record will plainly show that I was one of the first Americans to see the ominous clouds of this war rolling up on the international horizon, and at that time I urged rearming of America for her defense. It is a matter of the record that even according to President Roosevelt's consistently reiterated declarations national defense included three very definite propositions.

The first of these propositions was that of armed security—the right to make and keep America strong and safe against any enemy or combination of enemies. On December 29, 1940, shortly after the Selective Service Act, which I vigorously supported, had gone into action, President Roosevelt said:

> There is no demand for an American expeditionary force outside our own borders. There is no intention by any member of your Government to send such a force. You can, therefore, nail all talk about sending armies to Europe as deliberate untruth. Our national policy is not directed toward war. Its sole purpose is to keep war away from our country and our people.

The second aspect of national defense as interpreted to the American people by President Roosevelt—at least, as I understood it—was the determination to secure our right to independence of action based on American principles in the conduct of our foreign relations. On January 6, 1941, President Roosevelt said:

> By an impressive expression of the public will and without regard for partisanship, we are committed to the proposition that principles of morality and considerations for our security will never permit us to acquiesce in a peace dictated by aggressors and sponsored by appeasers. We know that enduring peace cannot be bought at the cost of other peoples' freedom.

The third aspect of national defense, as I understood the President to say again and again, was that of our allegiance to the undying principles of decency, justice, and freedom by which this country has become great and mighty. On December 9, 1941, just two days after the attack on Pearl Harbor, President Roosevelt said:

> The true goal we seek is far above and beyond the ugly field of battle. When we resort to force, as now we must, we are determined that this force shall be directed toward ultimate good as well as against immediate evil. We Americans are not destroyers—we are builders.

Mr. President, these were not only the concerns and the convictions of the President; at that time they were held, and are still held, by millions of other Americans. Is it not, then, a matter of serious import to the American people, even through every coursing moment of this great conflict, what means are being used to realize their highest hopes, and how the end results of all their striving and their suffering will conform to the original purposes behind the struggle? I do not believe anyone in America would dare to take the position that it is none of their concern.

Mr. President, I want very much to keep this part of the record straight. Many of my fellow colleagues in this Senate Chamber do not believe that this is the time or the place to speak of these matters or to voice their fears. They have pleaded unity with unmeasured eloquence, and yet in their pleading they have studiously avoided any discussion of the principles originally urged upon the American people by President Roosevelt himself, as the ultimate issue in the war.

Mr. President, again I want to identify myself with the noble objectives so ably presented by my colleagues, but, at the same time, I want to warn my colleagues and my other fellow Americans that it is my solemn and considered judgment that America confronts the gravest crisis in her history, not so much because of what has been said in this Senate Chamber during the past few days, but more so because of what has been left unsaid. Is it not a cause of grave apprehension that all the talk we heard at the beginning of this war about the rights and privileges of small nations, about the struggle between pagan brutality and the Christian ideal, about the "four freedoms," has been lost in a deafening silence?

Mr. President, the principles originally involved in this war have nowhere so clearly and forcefully been stated as in the Atlantic Charter, and yet I have not heard this charter mentioned for so long now that I would be well justified in believing that it had long since been permanently thrown into the discard. Mr. President, what has become of the Atlantic Charter? I wonder if many of my colleagues recall everything it said about the kind of world America was determined to wrest from this world chaos? I want to enter the text of the Atlantic Charter in the RECORD at this point, both to remind my fellow Americans of the nature of the solemn pledge to which the United States of America has subscribed, and, also, to serve as the background for what I have to say further. I ask such unanimous consent.

There being no objection, the Atlantic Charter was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

THE ATLANTIC CHARTER—JOINT DECLARATION OF AUGUST 14, 1941

1. Their countries seek no aggrandizement, territorial or other.

2. They desire to see no territorial changes that do not accord with the freely expressed wishes of the peoples concerned.

3. They respect the right of all peoples to choose the form of government under which they will live; and they wish to see sovereign rights and self-government restored to those who have been forcibly deprived of them.

4. They will endeavor, with due respect for their existing obligations, to further the enjoyment by all states, great or small, victor or vanquished, of access, on equal terms, to the trade and to the raw materials of the world which are needed for their economic prosperity.

5. They desire to bring about the fullest collaboration between all nations in the economic field with the object of securing, for all, improved labor standards, economic advancement, and social security.

6. After the final destruction of the Nazi tyranny, they hope to see established a peace which will afford to all nations the means of dwelling in safety within their own boundaries, and which will afford assurance that all the men in all the lands may live out their lives in freedom from fear and want.

7. Such a peace should enable all men to traverse the high seas and oceans without hindrance.

8. They believe that all of the nations of the world, for realistic as well as spiritual reasons, must come to the abandonment of the use of force. Since no future peace can be maintained if land, sea, or air armaments continue to be employed by nations which threaten, or may threaten, aggression outside of their frontiers, they believe, pending the establishment of a wider and permanent system of general security, that the disarmament of such nations is essential. They will likewise aid and encourage all other practical measures which will lighten for peace-loving peoples the crushing burden of armaments.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.
WINSTON S. CHURCHILL.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, in the light of the declarations contained in this document, and in the light of the fact that 35 nations have seen fit to honor it with the signature of their representatives, I wish to call to the attention of my fellow Americans the fact that, at this very moment as the war hurries on to a final and overwhelming victory for the United Nations, the principles which were originally involved in this struggle are being scattered to the four winds. I was one of those Americans who believed in the Atlantic Charter. I still believe in it. I shall continue to believe that only on the basis of the principles contained therein can any just and honorable and lasting peace come to my fellowmen around the world. This is why, when I see it being ground into the dust by various armistice terms and peace plans, and assuming the aspect of an unsubstantial dream, I cannot be silent. This is the reason why, when I see the Big Three forcing an unjust or vindictive peace upon the peoples of Europe under the guise of armistice terms, I must speak my concern.

Mr. President, this is no time for fear of consequences that might result from an honest and searching challenge of the present course of events threatening to destroy the foundations of any just and lasting peace. This is no time to fear the charge of partisanship and political maneuvering. I am convinced that there never has been a time in American history when practical realism, American idealism, and enlightened self-interest were so completely identified with one another.

What has partisanship to do with matters in which are wrapped the future of America and of civilization?

Mr. President, the secrecy of the Dumbarton Oaks deliberations cannot possibly hide the direction in which the present course of events is moving both in Europe and in Asia. Have not the American people the right to be informed on those matters openly and publicly? Are the American people no longer entitled to the truth concerning their own destiny? Why is it not our sacred obligation to warn the American people that more and more the present trend in international affairs indicates the imminent possibility of climaxing in a travesty of justice, a nightmare of their dreams, and a betrayal of their hopes? This is not idle conjecture on my part. Is it not our duty to be honest with ourselves and with our own people? I for one feel it my duty to warn my fellow Americans that the present course of events, in spite of the military victory which looms ever closer ahead, is pointing in such a direction.

Mr. President, I wish to enumerate several instances in which the ominous trend in international affairs can be substantiated by facts. Let us begin with Finland. The Finnish armistice or peace terms have just been announced. Members of this body know full well what they are. We in America know full well the record of the way in which the Finnish people kept their faith with us, and that they were the one Nation on earth that honored its financial obligations to this country. Americans cannot help remembering that our ally, Russia, which demanded the armistice terms with Finland, was the same Russia which was expelled from the League of Nations on the 14th of December 1939 for an unprovoked attack on Finland which was bitterly condemned by President Roosevelt and other responsible Government officials in this country. When acting Premier Ernst von Born learned of the terms, he remarked: "September 19, 1944, will be one of the hardest days in our history."

The fate of the Baltic republics of Latvia, Lithuania, and Estonia is nowhere better described than in the words of Mr. Molotov himself, found in his report to the Seventh Session of the Supreme Soviet, delivered on August 1, 1940. Said Mr. Molotov:

> The mutual-assistance pact signed with Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia did not produce the required result because this was opposed by the ruling bourgeois groups of these countries. This is the reason why the Soviet Government presented the demands you know of concerning changes in the Government of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia, and dispatched additional Red Army units to those countries. In July democratic elections were held for the Lithuanian Diet, the Latvian Diet, and the Estonian State Duma. The elections proved that the ruling bourgeois cliques of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia did not express the will of their peoples and represented only small groups of exploiters.

Mr. President, I know of no open effort of President Roosevelt to protest the continuing policy of infiltration and aggressive interference with the internal affairs of other countries in Eastern and Central Europe on the part of our allies. Let us recall for a moment what happened to Poland on September 17, 1939, when Russia took advantage of her helplessness to attack from the rear. At present Eduard Morawski, head of the Moscow-sponsored Polish National Committee, is acting as President of Poland on the basis of the 1921 constitution. In his capacity he has just concluded and signed two treaties, one with the Ukraine and one with White Russia.

Unless some action is taken, President Roosevelt will find himself the first President who has successfully concluded a war by turning over one-half of the territory and a large percentage of the population of an ally to another ally. It is encouraging, however, to hear that in spite of the fact that Mr. Stalin does not recognize the Polish Government in exile in London, having refused our good offices to act as arbitrator between the two Governments, President Roosevelt has reestablished diplomatic relations with the Polish Government in the appointment of Arthur Bliss Lane.

The treatment accorded Romania follows the same pattern of unilateral action, of agreements included in the armistice terms which are not of a military nature and properly belong to a treaty of peace, boundary settlements, and the juggling of population.

If one has any doubt as to what is happening to the small nations in eastern and central Europe, one has only to read from the official document containing the armistice terms which the Big Three imposed on Rumania.

Article 18 reads as follows:

> An Allied Control Commission will be set up, that up to the time of conclusion of peace, will assume the regulating and control of the execution of the present terms under the general guidance of, and according to the instructions of the (Allied) Soviet High Command, acting on behalf of the Allied Powers.

What of the treatment accorded Bulgaria, with which the Soviet Government has not been at war? The true story is that Bulgaria sent delegates to Cairo to negotiate armistice terms with the British and Americans. The armistice terms agreed upon included such items as the following: the Bulgarian army to be demobilized after evacuating all territory in Greece and Yugoslavia; the boundary settlements to be reserved to a later date; and Bulgaria to remain neutral with no change in the Government. Under those terms Russian troops would have been unable to occupy Bulgaria. When the Americans forwarded to Russia a copy of the terms, Russia immediately declared war on Bulgaria, voiding the Cairo terms, and imposed surrender and occupation with Todor Paylov, the Bulgarian Communist leader, installed as the King's first adviser.

What of the story of Yugoslavia? The same treatment has been accorded the guerilla bands of General Mikhailovitch by the Allies. It was in the spring of 1941 that Yugoslav forces under Mikhailovitch started fighting Hitler's legions, as an ally of Britain, and with warm encouragement and support from the same quarter. As a result of Russia's pressure during the past year we are now supporting Marshal Tito, whose Communist-led American-supplied forces are now invading Serbia and attacking Mikhailovitch's Serbian Chetniks with such an overwhelming superiority that the Associated Press dispatch of September 16 to the Washington Star of the same date is headlined with the following sentence, "Defeat of Mikhailovitch now appears certain."

Czechoslovakia has already been drawn into the orbit of Russian influence through the agreements reached between President-in-exile Benes and Mr. Stalin.

Mr. President, it seems that America now has become involved in a process of doing just what Mr. Walter Lippmann has suggested, namely, that of perpetuating cynical outrages against the small nations of Europe.

The full significance of this turn of events is best discovered in our treatment of Italy. More than a year ago the American Government, together with the British and Soviet Governments, signed a document formally establishing peace with the Italian Government. It was not called a treaty, it was called an armistice. But it established the peace terms and concluded hostilities with the Italian Government. Those terms have been and are being enforced upon the Italian people without the knowledge or consent either of the American people or of their representatives in either House of Congress.

Mr. President, I must protest the continuation of such policies. Have we already been committed to a foreign policy that is utterly devoid of American interests and principles? What of the Far East? What of China? What of France and Portugal and the Netherlands and their empires? What of Great Britain and her possessions?

Mr. President, I listened with keen interest to the speech recently delivered by the junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL], and I find myself in substantial agreement with the objectives he is striving to attain. But, Mr. President, I disagree with his statement that we know substantially all there is to know about the Dumbarton Oaks Conference. I disagree with him when he says there is no real secrecy involved.

We have been told that the purpose of the Dumbarton Oaks Conference is to determine the machinery which will maintain peace after the war, and work out some of the details concerning it. I am glad that such discussions are going on, but I think it is highly important if we have not worked out any program as to our peace terms and peace conditions to be applied to the various

countries involved in the war, that this should be done immediately. If we have done it, we should be told; if we have not, any setting up now of peace machinery to enforce an unknown and an undetermined peace is like putting the cart before the horse.

Through the press, the radio, and the rumor route, we have been informed that the peace machinery under discussion will consist of a council and an assembly. The council will be composed of representatives from the United States, Great Britain, Russia, and China, and a few other nations representative of the smaller nations of the world, which will alternate in membership, but the Big Four will be permanent members of the council and will always have veto power.

The assembly will be representative of all nations, but it will have no force or authority, but will merely act as a debating society with the right to discuss and advise. All power, therefore, will be in the council which will be in the hands of the Big Four.

Mr. President, I question whether that is a sound set-up for a permanent peace. It could easily be a basis for big-power politics, with the less-powerful nations on the outside looking in, and that means trouble and discord, and not a permanent peace.

Then we have administration representatives who tell us that our Government has no intention of setting up an organization by which these four big powers will run the world.

If, in the United States, all the 48 States were represented in an assembly with merely the power to discuss and advise, with all the power to decide, together with all instruments of force and authority to make war, lodged in a small council dominated by New York, California, Pennsylvania, and Illinois, what, Mr. President, do you think the other States would say if you had the brass to tell them that they were not being dominated by this council of four big States? They would laugh at you, and rightly so.

Mr. President, we are informed that a world court is to be set up. For many long years I have been an ardent believer in and supporter of a permanent court of international justice. But, Mr. President, unless this is a genuinely international tribunal, representative of the strong and the weak, completely divorced from the domination of one or two or three vast military powers it will fail. This institution must be firmly established on enduring and uncompromised principles of decency and justice and fair play in order to succeed.

Mr. President, what kind of a peace is it the organization now being discussed at Dumbarton Oaks is being set up to enforce? Are we, the American people, expected to underwrite the enforcement of any kind of a peace settlement that may issue from this war? Are we expected to sign a blank check with our own blood to provide the military forces with which to enforce and maintain any kind of peace settlement? Why can we not have, as the New York Times of August 22 has suggested, a genuinely international conference to discuss the nature of the peace terms to be imposed, so that the long period of armistice and transition from war to peace may be hastened through the establishment of genuinely international and honorable peace terms upon the vanquished and all nations involved?

The President, speaking on December 29, 1940, said:

> During the past week people in all parts of the country have told me what they wanted me to say tonight. Almost all of them expressed a courageous desire to hear the plain truth about the gravity of the situation. Frankly and definitely there is danger ahead, danger against which we must prepare. But we know that we cannot escape danger, or the fear of it, by crawling into bed and pulling the covers over our heads.

Mr. President, let us not pull the covers over our heads. Let us face the facts.

The American people now want to know where President Roosevelt's conduct of this war has brought them, where it is taking them. They are entitled to know the truth. Why does he not now face them squarely with the dangers they confront? Why does he not tell them that the peace settlement they have waited so long to participate in has already in part been determined? Is it not time that a free people heard from his own lips the true prospects for the kind of peace they have set their hearts on? On the night of September 1, 1944, his running mate, Senator TRUMAN, revealed a part of the picture with amazing frankness when he said:

> The administration of Franklin D. Roosevelt was preparing the ground to support this peace structure when, against the bitter criticisms and dire warnings of the isolationists and their press, Mr. Roosevelt first proposed lend-lease. This peace was in process many months ago when two men met in mid-Atlantic and drew up a charter, a set of principles for peace that have been cited and used as guides by both Democrats and Republicans alike ever since they were first set forth.
>
> This peace was being made at Casablanca, at Moscow, at Quebec, at Cairo, at Teheran. * * * It is a continuing process already years under way, still years in prospect.

Senator TRUMAN evidently has been informed that at least part of the peace terms have been agreed upon. If this statement of Senator TRUMAN'S is accurate, and I assume of course that President Roosevelt's running mate knew what he was talking about, the American Congress and the American people are entitled to know the facts.

Mr. President, on March 16, 1940, President Roosevelt said:

> Today we seek a moral basis for peace. It cannot be a real peace if it fails to recognize human brotherhood. It cannot be a lasting peace if the fruit of it is oppression, or starvation, or cruelty, or human life dominated by armed camps. It cannot be a moral peace if small nations must live in fear of powerful neighbors.

Mr. President, what has now become of these high American principles which President Roosevelt insisted again and again and again were at stake in this struggle? He is the one who said we Americans are builders, not destroyers. He is the one who was determined to have done with appeasement, to have done with urging us to get along with dictators. He is the one who proclaimed to the world again and again and again that America had a stake in this war, that America sought a moral basis for the peace.

The American people have not altered their determination to see this struggle through to an honorable and enduring peace. Many are the political cynics who deride such a position as I am now taking, and yet I ask, Mr. President, is not this cynicism evidence of failure to be honest with the American people in this dark hour of tragedy and suffering, this hour of untold misery and despair? At this turning of the tide of history will not any man have failed his fellow men who now refuses to sound a challenge of hope to the pain-racked desperate peoples of the world?

Mr. Stalin and Mr. Churchill have kept the interest of their peoples ever uppermost in their concern. They are not afraid to inspire the peoples they lead with the record of their achievements. They are not afraid to appeal constantly to the innate love of country in the hearts of their people; but Mr. President, who is speaking for America? Do you think Mr. Stalin and Mr. Churchill are unaware that American food, American arms, American munitions, American locomotives, American tanks, American guns and rifles, American clothing and medicinal supplies, American ships and trucks, and American lives have alone made this gigantic military victory possible?

We are told we must not embarrass our allies, we must not speak of these matters; but, Mr. President, I want the American people to know, and I want the world to know, what my America has done in this war and I am not ashamed of it; I am proud of it. Knowing that our allies are fully aware of their utter and complete dependence on us, both throughout this war and in the peace, are we going to betray, I ask, the very ideals by which our country, great in peace, has become the mightiest nation on earth in war? At this very moment our valiant men under arms have carried on to German soil the living symbols of America's faith in the undying principles of liberty and justice for all. If now, while the fury of war roars toward its victorious climax, President Roosevelt would broadcast to the world our peace aims based on these principles for which America stands, appealing to the German people to rise up and destroy their slavemaster, Hitler, such an appeal might well be the basis for an overthrow of all the Nazi gang by the German people themselves, and at the same time save tens of thousands of American and Allied soldiers' lives by bringing the war to a hastier conclusion.

If American principles are still at stake in this war, why cannot President Roosevelt now broadcast his solemn pledge to uphold these principles in any future dealings we may have with any nation or any race of men in the years ahead.

Mr. President, I want to keep this part of the record straight, very straight. I did not support every measure which would make America strong and every

measure for cooperation with our allies just to win a military victory alone. I wanted more; I want more today. I want a permanent peace. I have always supported, and shall continue to support, any and every attempt to strengthen American participation in international affairs, but Mr. President, always on the basis of principle. I do not believe in the current slogan of unity at any price either in domestic or foreign affairs. I will match with anyone my desire to see America collaborating with the other sovereign nations of the world to the end that a just, honorable, and enduring peace may rise out of the ruins of international relations, but if America is to be maneuvered into compromise with principles; if under any pretence, America is to participate in a world organization, the main purpose of which is to enforce an unjust peace that has already been made or is to be made, we will be building the foundation for another war, not a permanent peace.

Mr. President, at the other end of the Mall there stands a memorial to a man who has become an immortal inspiration, not only to his fellow Americans but to all peoples the world around. Enshrined within the hearts of his fellow men forever, Abraham Lincoln still keeps watch over his beloved country. It was Abraham Lincoln who said in the midst of the great Civil War: "Suppose you go to war, when after much loss on both sides and no gain on either, the fighting ceases, the identical questions as to terms of human intercourse are again upon us."

Mr. President, why does not President Roosevelt broadcast to the peoples of the earth the terms America desires, which every American knows in his heart alone can bring an honorable, just, and lasting peace in the midst of men on this earth, which is the hope of all Americans?

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED

Mrs. CARAWAY, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that today, September 21, 1944, that committee presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills:

S. 725. An act to provide for the punishment of persons conspiring to violate the laws relating to counterfeiting, and certain other laws;

S. 1807. An act authorizing and directing the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain land to the city of Duluth, Minn.;

S. 2028. An act to amend the Naval Reserve Act of 1938, as amended, and the Coast Guard Auxiliary and Reserve Act of 1941, as amended, so as to permit service of members of the Women's Reserve in the American area, the Territories of Hawaii and Alaska, and for other purposes;

S. 2051. An act to amend the Social Security Act, as amended, to provide a national program for war mobilization, and for other purposes; and

S. 2137. An act to provide for naming the lake formed by waters of the Red River impounded by Denison Dam.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. BARKLEY. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. GILLETTE, from the Committee on Naval Affairs:

Capt. John H. Cassaday, United States Navy, to be a rear admiral in the Navy, for temporary service, to rank from August 15, 1943, and;

Sundry naval aviators of the Marine Corps Reserve to be second lieutenants in the Marine Corps, in accordance with the provisions of law.

By Mr. McCARRAN, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

Maurice F. Donegan, of Iowa, to be United States attorney for the southern district of Iowa. Mr. Donegan is now serving in this office under an appointment which expired June 26, 1944;

John E. Hushing, of Illinois, to be United States marshal for the district of the Canal Zone. Mr. Hushing is now serving in this office under an appointment which expired March 29, 1944;

Frederick Elliott Biermann, of Iowa, to be United States marshal for the northern district of Iowa. Mr. Biermann is now serving in this office under an appointment which expires September 28, 1944; and

Wayne Bezona, of Washington, to be United States marshal for the eastern district of Washington. Mr. Bezona is now serving in this office under an appointment which expired May 16, 1944.

By Mr. CONNALLY, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

Daniel E. McGrath, of Texas, to be district attorney for the Canal Zone. Mr. McGrath is now serving in this office under an appointment which expires September 30, 1944.

By Mr. DANAHER, from the Committee on Patents:

Mark Taylor, or Virginia, to be Examiner in Chief, Board of Appeals, United States Patent Office.

By Mr. McKELLAR, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads:

Sundry postmasters.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, before the nominations on the Executive Calendar are taken up I wish to say that a number of nominations have been favorably reported from various committees today which could not be placed on the calendar. Some have come from the Naval Affairs Committee, some from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, and possibly other committees.

Mr. McCARRAN. Certain nominations were reported from the Committee on the Judiciary today.

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes; I ask that the nominations which are on the desk, which were reported today, all of which have been cleared through the Senators from the States to which the nominations apply, be taken up and acted on first.

Mr. WHITE. I understand that what the Senator from Kentucky says is fully justified by the facts. I believe the Senators from the States from which these nominees come have been consulted and have approved the nominations, and I have no objection to the waiving of the rule.

Mr. BARKLEY. I thank the Senator from Maine.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will proceed to state the nominations which have been reported today.

UNITED STATES PATENT OFFICE

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Mark Taylor, of Virginia, to be Examiner in Chief, Board of Appeals, United States Patent Office.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

THE NAVY

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Capt. John H. Cassady, United States Navy, to be a rear admiral in the Navy, for temporary service, to rank from the 15th day of August 1943.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

THE MARINE CORPS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Marine Corps.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nominations in the Marine Corps are confirmed en bloc.

THE JUDICIARY

The legislative clerk read the nomination of John E. Hushing, of Illinois, to be United States marshal for the district of the Canal Zone.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Frederick Elliott Biermann, of Iowa, to be United States marshal for the northern district of Iowa.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Maurice F. Donegan, of Iowa, to be United States attorney for the southern district of Iowa.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Daniel E. McGrath, of Texas, to be district attorney for the Canal Zone.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Wayne Bezona, of Washington, to be United States marshal for the eastern district of Washington.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The nominations on the Executive Calendar will now be stated.

UNITED STATES MARITIME COMMISSION

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Edward Macauley, of California, to be member, United States Maritime Commission, for the term of 6 years, from September 26, 1944.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I regret that the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY] is not present. This nomination should be retained before the Committee on Commerce for further study. Therefore I ask that the nomination go over.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination will go over.

POSTMASTERS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask that the postmaster nominations on the calendar be confirmed en bloc.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nominations of postmasters are confirmed en bloc.

That completes the calendar.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask that the President be immediately notified of all nominations today confirmed.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

SUSPENSION OF THE RULE RELATING TO NOMINATIONS UNACTED UPON

On motion by Mr. BARKLEY, it was

Ordered, by unanimous consent, That paragraph 6 of rule XXXVIII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, relating to proceedings on nominations, be, and it is hereby, suspended with respect to nominations unacted upon, and their status shall not be affected by the adjournment of the Senate under the provisions of Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 54.

CONDITIONAL ADJOURNMENT TO NOVEMBER 14, 1944

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, if there is nothing further to be brought before the Senate, as in legislative session, and pursuant to the concurrent resolution already agreed to, I move that the Senate adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 55 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned, the adjournment being under Senate Concurrent Resolution 54, until Tuesday, November 14, 1944, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate September 21 (legislative day of September 1), 1944:

THE JUDICIARY

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR ALASKA

Joseph W. Kehoe, of Alaska, to be United States district judge for division No. 2 of Alaska, vice Hon. J. H. S. Morison, term expired.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEYS

Maurice F. Donegan, of Iowa, to be United States attorney for the southern district of Iowa. (Mr. Donegan is now serving in this office under an appointment which expired June 26, 1944.)

Charles H. Cashin, of Wisconsin, to be United States attorney for the western district of Wisconsin, vice John J. Boyle, deceased.

DISTRICT ATTORNEY FOR CANAL ZONE

Daniel E. McGrath, of Texas, to be district attorney for the Canal Zone. (Mr. McGrath is now serving in this office under an appointment which expires September 30, 1944.)

UNITED STATES MARSHALS

John E. Hushing, of Illinois, to be United States marshal for the district of the Canal Zone. (Mr. Hushing is now serving in this office under an appointment which expired March 29, 1944.)

Frederick Elliott Biermann, of Iowa, to be United States marshal for the northern district of Iowa. (Mr. Biermann is now serving in this office under an appointment which expires September 28, 1944.)

Wayne Bezona, of Washington, to be United States marshal for the eastern district of Washington. (Mr. Bezona is now serving in this office under an appointment which expired May 16, 1944.)

POSTMASTERS

The following-named persons to be postmasters:

ARIZONA

Hickey Ross Henderson, McNary, Ariz., in place of L. N. Smith, resigned.

ARKANSAS

Don L. Van Horn, Weiner, Ark., in place of L. B. Lynch, resigned.

Alma T. Harnden, Wilson, Ark., in place of S. E. Crain, resigned.

CALIFORNIA

Josie F. Ratto, Calistoga, Calif., in place of Owen Kenny, retired.

Ruby J. Cunningham, Ukiah, Calif., in place of E. P. Thurston, deceased.

COLORADO

Otis Murray, Grand Valley, Colo., in place of L. A. Wheatley, resigned.

Irene E. Lee, Rico, Colo., in place of M. W. Laube, resigned.

FLORIDA

Herman E. Wattwood, Titusville, Fla., in place of M. L. Calder, deceased.

GEORGIA

Oka Eason, Manassas, Ga. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

IOWA

Grover F. Eisele, Malcolm, Iowa, in place of L. E. Maxfield, deceased.

KANSAS

Mattie V. Bohling, Fowler, Kans., in place of A. W. Gerber, transferred.

Frank B. Kumberg, Sawyer, Kans. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Joseph R. Hubbard, Waldo, Kans., in place of J. K. Luder, transferred.

Daniel B. Fogle, Williamsburg, Kans. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

KENTUCKY

John T. Powell, Grahn, Ky. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944

MAINE

Margaret F. Hanson, Lee, Maine. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

MASSACHUSETTS

Ruel S. Thayer, Bellingham, Mass. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

MICHIGAN

Charles F. Greenlease, Biteley, Mich. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Matti Halmet Oja, Pelkie, Mich. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Elgin Quick, Richmond, Mich., in place of L. H. O'Connor, resigned.

Jennie L. Wyman, South Rockwood, Mich. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

MINNESOTA

Edward R. Spink, Mahtomedi, Minn. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Elva M. Franck, Racine, Minn. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Edla M. Hawkinson, Scandia, Minn. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

MISSISSIPPI

Bessie Puckette, Chunky, Miss. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Marshall Carson, Conehatta, Miss. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Esta K. Campbell, Dennis, Miss. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Mamie McGraw Whittle, Gholson, Miss. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Lela Epps, Golden, Miss. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Erie Riggan, Greenwood Springs, Miss. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Nettye B. Eley, Harpersville, Miss. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Euna Clower, Hillsboro, Miss. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Horace H. McRae, Laurel, Miss., in place of C. P. Mallott, deceased.

Thomas S. Doty, Lucedale, Miss., in place of Nettie Dorsett. Incumbent's commission expired August 23, 1941.

Joe G. Ishee, Stringer, Miss. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Nannie Bryant, Summerland, Miss. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

MISSOURI

Everett L. Griffin, Aldrich, Mo. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Clara M. Moore, Avondale, Mo. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Nellie Hamilton, Berkeley, Mo. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944

Edna Walters, Brownington, Mo. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Wade H. Manning, Chula, Mo. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Julia S. Dodge, Commerce, Mo. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Melvin D. Hammons, Dunnegan, Mo. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

John S. Vickers, Ewing, Mo., in place of S. B. Shackleford, transferred.

Rachel Elgiva McCracken, Galt, Mo., in place of D. S. Vencill, transferred.

Myron G. Mann, Kidder, Mo. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944

Alice F. Paddack, Kingsville, Mo. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Mabel E. Trosper, Ludlow, Mo. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Juanita R. Gross, Maryland Heights, Mo. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Jesse H. Letton, Mindenmines, Mo. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Samantha Wilkinson, Patterson, Mo. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

NEBRASKA

Lissa L. Fanders, Diller, Nebr., in place of Gretchen Wohlfarth, deceased.

NEW JERSEY

Samuel J. Billig, Mount Royal, N. J. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

NEW MEXICO

John D. Lane, Lake Arthur, N. Mex. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

NEW YORK

Ray L. Leonard, Dexter, N. Y., in place of B. W. Wood, resigned.

Avis D. Widrig, Richland, N. Y. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Jeneva H. Ashley, Sidney Center, N. Y., in place of M. W. Gehrke, resigned.

Lula E. Joyce, West Hurley, N. Y. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

NORTH CAROLINA

Clen R. Heath, Cove City, N. C. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Carl D. Moore, Mount Ulla, N. C. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

NORTH DAKOTA

Oliver C. Sogard, Alamo, N. Dak. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

James B. McMillen, Hampden, N. Dak. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

OKLAHOMA

Hester E. Hathaway, Grant, Okla. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Nina Murphy, Wirt, Okla., in place of Lorene Epley, resigned.

PENNSYLVANIA

William A. Raffensperger, Arendtsville, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.
Mary R. Guldner, Delano, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.
Edward K. Lennon, Feasterville, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.
Arthur W. Ewing, Industry, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.
Margaret M. Watson, Parkland, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.
Ruth K. Humphrey, Prospect, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.
Mabel B. Weaver, Stevens, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

TENNESSEE

Leona F. McKinley, Buffalo Valley, Tenn. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

TEXAS

Cecil Miracle, Eddy, Tex., in place of Willie N. Cargill, transferred.
William A. Harty, Marietta, Tex. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.
Letha B. Gramer, Panhandle, Tex., in place of L. O. Waldron, resigned.
Mildred W. Carpenter, Pattonville, Tex. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.
Willie J. Allison, Pickton, Tex. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

VIRGINIA

William H. Long, Buena Vista, Va., in place of W. T. Paxton, deceased.

WASHINGTON

William O. Kurth, Grand Coulee, Wash., in place of W. R. Ross, resigned.

WEST VIRGINIA

Hazel M. Oliver, Pratt, W. Va. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

WISCONSIN

Elmer L. White, Browntown, Wis. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.
Wencel A. Mattek, Deerbrook, Wis. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.
Gordon J. Cross, Larsen, Wis., in place of C. D. Cross, retired.
Nora Flynn, Neopit, Wis. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate September 21 (legislative day of September 1), 1944:

UNITED STATES PATENT OFFICE

Mark Taylor to be Examiner in Chief, Board of Appeals, United States Patent Office.

DISTRICT ATTORNEY FOR CANAL ZONE

Daniel E. McGrath to be district attorney for the Canal Zone.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEY

Maurice F. Donegan to be United States attorney for the southern district of Iowa.

UNITED STATES MARSHALS

John E. Hushing to be United States marshal for the district of the Canal Zone.
Frederick Elliott Biermann to be United States marshal for the northern district of Iowa.
Wayne Bezona to be United States marshal for the eastern district of Washington.

IN THE NAVY

TEMPORARY SERVICE

John H. Cassady to be a rear admiral in the Navy, for temporary service, to rank from August 15, 1943.

IN THE MARINE CORPS

TO BE SECOND LIEUTENANTS FROM DATE INDICATED WITH EACH NAME

John H. King, Jr., from August 4, 1941.
Robert R. Baker, from September 6, 1941.
Francis H. Smyth, from September 10, 1941.
Jack R. Moore, from October 10, 1941.
Robert T. Whitten, from October 16, 1941.
Thomas H. Mann, Jr., from March 12, 1942.
Alton W. McCully, from May 1, 1942.
Bernard L. Josephson, from May 22, 1942.
Oscar C. Hauge, Jr., from June 8, 1942.
Henry M. Bourgeois, from June 18, 1942.
John F. Begert, from June 18, 1942.
Arthur R. Boag, from June 19, 1942.
George E. Wasson, from June 25, 1942.
Curtis S. Harrison, from August 11, 1942.
Thomas B. Wood, from October 16, 1942.
Robert "F" Foxworth, from November 1, 1942.
Bobbie G. Bauder, from November 1, 1942.
Robert W. Lowe, from June 2, 1943.
Charles J. Keen, from October 29, 1943.
John R. Jones, from May 2, 1944.
Howell T. Heflin, from May 2, 1944.
Hugo A. Oswald, Jr., from August 8, 1944.

POSTMASTERS

ALABAMA

Mary M. Davis, Chunchula.
Lee J. Clayton, Jr., Eufaula.
Sallie J. Richardson, Krafton.
Ruth P. Carter, Myrtlewood.
Annie B. Fitch, Snow Hill.

ARKANSAS

Wayne S. Ross, Gillham.
William E. Surginer, Hensley.
Lucile D. Hopper, Leola.
Jesse A. Poynor, Maynard.
John M. Freeman, Mount Holly.
Loys V. Halbert, Prattsville.
John C. Howe, Wabash.

CALIFORNIA

Marie A. Shane, Boyes Hot Springs.
Charles E. Faulhaber, Mira Loma.
Mila Galbraith, Ridgecrest.
Carolyn H. Campbell, Tustin.

FLORIDA

Edward O. Sawyers, Zolfo Springs.

GEORGIA

Hardy L. Holland, Register.

IDAHO

George H. Wylie, Deary.
John E. Trimming, Pocatello.

ILLINOIS

E. Loraine White, Donnellson.
Levi C. Robinson, Gardner.
Jananne McDonnell, Laura.
Genevia L. Guess, Thebes.
Florence R. Anderson, Wood Dale.

INDIANA

Hazelle C. Becher, Corunna.
Joseph L. Peters, Marysville.
Robert Ervin Stephens, Sr., New Richmond.
Eileen Studer, Shelby.

IOWA

Harry Eckhardt, Avoca.
Benjamin H. Rowe, Beaman.
Loretto Erickson, Duncombe.
Harry W. Christians, Grafton.
Edward J. Dowling, Lanesboro.
John Schneider, Popejoy.
Alfred T. Guddall, Thor.
Lora L. Johns, Tracy.

KANSAS

Elizabeth C. Keating, Fulton.
Joseph A. Trudell, Morganville.

KENTUCKY

George C. Cawood, Cawood.
Benjamin S. Berger, Coalgood.

LOUISIANA

Vesta T. Remont, Cut Off.
Louis F. Siadous, Duson.
Elizabeth M. Brooks, Rosepine.

MAINE

Charles B. Lewis, Springfield.

MARYLAND

Mary D. Rice, Maugansville.

MINNESOTA

Lizzie A. Schmidt, Dundee.

MISSOURI

Donald M. Barrow, Clarksdale.
Mabel Cunningham, Dawn.
Gideon Ward Miller, Edgerton.
M. Marguerite Shineman, Fillmore.
Leonard D. Smith, Fremont.
Lawrence W. Bartee, Holt.
Mary E. Staples, Houstonia.
Mary E. B. Black, Rivermines.

MONTANA

Olive M. Griffith, Grassrange.
Anne Helen Sebastian, Joplin.
Mabel M. Jimerson, Nashua.
Gail H. Fry, Park City.

NEVADA

Edna M. Hall, Kimberly.

NEW YORK

Asa Camp, Apalachin.
Ruth T. Savory, Beaver Dams.
Oliver H. Hanson, Celoron.
Peter Lebeis, Duanesburg.
Edward F. Curtis, Eagle Bridge.
Pearl S. Wood, Felts Mills.
Lillian L. Johnson, Findley Lake.
Mary H. Whalen, Fort Johnson.
Arthur D Toomey, Fredonia.
John J. Hickey, Gainesville.
Martha M. Ward, Great Valley.
Elizabeth P. Williams, Henrietta.
Ada McDonald, Jay.
Earl Hendershott, Lakeville.
Mary E. A. Mayesky, Lincolndale.
Dudley P. Hall, Little Genesee.
Donald W. Mott, Martville.
Leon D. Tucker, McDonough.
William Diefendorf, Melrose.
Clarence A. Stedman, Middle Grove.
Hazel C. Fiala, Millport.
Walter L. Pepper, Moriah.
James W. Van Alstine, Nelliston.
Florence E. Smith, Sterling Station.
George E. McEvoy, Tillson.
Donald B. Ketnner, Turin.
Otto I. Mayne, West Edmeston.
Iva R. Puffer, Wynantskill.

NORTH CAROLINA

Alda McClure, Boiling Springs.
Ralph G. Goode, Connellys Springs.
Frank McMillan, Crumpler.
Mamie B. Williams, East Lumberton.
Guy R. Cutrell, Fairfield.
William D. Sloop, Harrisburg.
Anne Lee Vannoy, Highshoals.
Eugene S. Edwards, Hookerton.
Lola A. Carter, Jackson Springs.
Mitsn O. Saunders, Kure Beach.
Henry R. Gerald, Pine Level.
Helen B. Hemphill, Rhodhiss.
Glenn E. Ritchie, Richfield.
Henry M. Cates, Saxapahaw.
Margaret I. Siler, Staley.
Ella K. Phillips, Swepsonville.
Robert F. Rash, Union Grove.
William I. Rowland, Willow Spring.
Orion M. Click, Woodleaf.
J. Bryan Boswell, Woodsdale.

NORTH DAKOTA

M. Marvin McKeever, Hamilton.
Celeste M. Reiman, White Earth.

OHIO

Robert B. Leslie, Latty.
Guy Miller, Morral.
Beverly Bradley, South Lebanon.
Clara C. Kugler, Stone Creek.
Hazel E. Clark, Syracuse.
Archie C. Reynolds, Waldo.

OKLAHOMA

Roy R. Hardway, Hugo.
John H. York, Indianola.
Joe R. Kyle, Macomb.

PENNSYLVANIA

Kathryne L. Kline, Adamsburg.
Joseph M. Gallagher, Audenried.

Elva G. Reed, Barto.
John B. Faust, Blandon.
Sophie M. Winebrenner, Bradenville.
Nora Schuch, Cogan Station.
Kathryn McCann, Crabtree.
Edith May Reph, Danielsville.
Estelle M. Lazzari, East Monongahela.
Samuel H. Brinton, Etters.
William T. Smith, Harrison City.
Anne S. Kornides, Hostetter.
Anna Eakins, Hyde Park.
Caroline E. Boyer, Kersey.
Eli R. Witmer, Lampeter.
Lillian L. Landis, Lincoln Park.
LeRoy M. Kutz, Lyon Station.
Anna Belle Smith, Madison.
Ida L. Buskirk, Martins Creek.
Anna Bissey, Pipersville.
Mary E. Callahan, Summerhill.
Francis R. Murphy, Swedeland.
Sara M. Gilpin, Tarrs.
George S. Matyas, Jr., Tresckow.
Leo J. Kennedy, Vandling.
Margaret Melva Mains, Westmoreland City.
Theresa A. Giacomelli, Willock.
Jules V. Vanderscott, Wyano.

SOUTH CAROLINA

Grace H. Bagnal, Aynor.

SOUTH DAKOTA

Florence M. Hausman, Chester.
Annie McBride, Harrisburg.
Allen A. Benson, Ravinia.
Tulla H. Simpson, Neblen.

TENNESSEE

Clyde Zimmerman, Belvidere.
Ruth J. Way, Bloomington Springs.
Ova Allred, Crawford.
Etoile Johnson, Doyle.
Belle Emert, Walland.
Mabel B. Baggett, Whitehouse.

TEXAS

Mattie G. Brown, Centerville.
Ethel C. Key, Desdemona.
Henry M. Hollis, Frankston.
Jim B. Dickey, Pottsboro.
Clara M. Davis, Ringgold.

UTAH

Harold D. Roberts, Centerville.
Margaret C. Hatch, Corinne.
John R. Sorenson, Emory.
Florence M. Manning, Hooper.
Lyle M. McDonald, Orem.

VIRGINIA

Roy G. Boatright, Coeburn.
J. Herbert Norton, Deltaville.
Lillie M. Biggs, Patrick Springs.

WASHINGTON

Joseph F. Ladley, Elma.

WEST VIRGINIA

Robert L. Martin, Branchland.
Doris Altizer, Ethel.
Ercell C. Hutchinson, Salt Rock.

WYOMING

Vernon M. Sandman, Albin.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 21, 1944

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Blessed Lord and Master, Thou who art the hope of all who come to Thee, cleanse Thou us from secret faults. Make us strong to return good for evil and to meet harsh words with quiet talk; subdue all irritations and bid our minds forget. In the midst of problems unsolved, touch the strongest chords of our natures; brood over them that they may be tuned toward the heights of spiritual manhood. O lift us above entanglements and besetting perplexities and grant that honor may ever scorn to compromise with wrong.

Blessed be Thy name, O Lord, for Thy goodness; breathe upon us until our hearts are pure; keep open the pathways of our dearest longings and desires, rebuking our narrow ranges of life. We most gratefully praise Thee that not until love lies dead is memory dead and the door of the past closed; not until hope has lost its outlook and all that makes men noble lies in dust can the flame of infinite love be extinguished. We rejoice that we are not fatherless, drifting on an uncharted and unpiloted sea. O work in us and bring us into unison with the eternal right, striving each day to make the course of our lives one of honorable service, seeking to do what is courageous and noble. O lead us on to where the farthest beacon beckons. May the Lord bless and keep you until we meet again. In the name of Saint Mary's holy Child. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on the following dates the President approved and signed bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

On August 12, 1944:

H. R. 3125. An act for the relief of Paul H. White.

On September 7, 1944:

H. J. Res. 306. Joint resolution authorizing the President of the United States of America to proclaim October 11, 1944, General Pulaski's Memorial Day for the observance and commemoration of the death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski:

H. R. 1506. An act to amend further the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942; and

H. R. 3695. An act for the relief of the estate of Thomas Shea, deceased.

On September 8, 1944:

H. R. 5181. An act to provide a method for compensating certain individuals for damages sustained as the result of the explosions at Port Chicago, Calif.

On September 17, 1944:

H. R. 4780. An act to fix the fees for domestic insured and collect-on-delivery mail, special-delivery service, and for other purposes.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills and a concurrent resolution of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 4286. An act to relinquish the title of the United States to certain lands in the county of Los Angeles, State of California;

H. R. 5144. An act to authorize the city of Ketchikan, Alaska, to issue bonds in a sum not to exceed $150,000 for the purpose of constructing and acquiring additions and betterments to and extensions of the electric light and power system of said city, and to provide for the payment thereof, and for other purposes;

H. R. 5196. An act to amend section 22 of the Interstate Commerce Act by authorizing common carriers to grant reduced fares to personnel of armed services; and

H. Con. Res. 100. Concurrent resolution authorizing that the pamphlet containing information as to the rights and benefits that are available to veterans of the armed forces and their dependents be published as a document and providing for the printing of additional copies thereof.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with an amendment in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 3429. An act to amend section 1 of an act entitled "An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to employ engineers and economists for consultation purposes on important reclamation work," approved February 28, 1929 (45 Stat 1406), as amended by the act of April 22, 1940 (54 Stat. 148).

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 2015. An act to liberalize certain provisions of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, as amended; and

S. 2058. An act to liberalize certain provisions of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, as amended.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 4163. An act to amend section 2 of Public Law 17, Seventy-eighth Congress, relating to functions of the War Shipping Administration, and for other purposes.

RELIEF OF SUFFERING IN EUROPE

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, frequent statements have recently appeared in the press stressing the hunger, starvation, and devastation in far-away Italy and other liberated countries. On every hand we read of the suffering of the Italian people and others no longer under the heel of the Axis.

It is difficult to understand or to justify these reports.

The Congress has provided liberally for the relief of this suffering. Five hundred and sixty-two million dollars have been made available through the War Department. Eight hundred million dollars have been made available through the U. N. R. R. A., a grand total of $1,362,000,000, all within the current fiscal year.

Congress was assured that the sum of $562,000,000 provided through the War Department would be sufficient to meet all foreseeable needs during the full period of 6 months after our military occupation.

Suffering and starving people must have immediate action. Let us give the aid when it will do the most good.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Speaker, I have two unanimous-consent requests, one to extend my remarks in the RECORD on a bill which I introduced yesterday and the other to extend my remarks on the Government rationing program.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

AUTHORIZING SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR TO EMPLOY ENGINEERS AND ECONOMISTS FOR CONSULTATION PURPOSES ON RECLAMATION WORK

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 3429) to amend section 1 of an act entitled "An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to employ engineers and economists for consultation purposes on important reclamation work," approved February 28, 1929 (45 Stat. 1406), as amended by the act of April 22, 1940 (54 Stat. 148), with a Senate amendment thereto, and agree to the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment as follows:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert "That section 1 of the act of February 28, 1929 (45 Stat. 1406), as amended by act of April 22, 1940 (54 Stat. 148), authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to employ engineers and economists for consultation purposes on important reclamation work, is hereby amended to read as follows: 'That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized, in his judgment and discretion, to employ for consultation purposes on important reclamation work 10 consulting engineers, geologists, appraisers, economists, and lawyers, at rates of compensation to be fixed by him but not to exceed $50 per day for any engineer, geologist, appraiser, economist, or lawyer so employed: *Provided*, That the total compensation paid to any engineer, geologist, appraiser, economist, or lawyer during any fiscal year shall not exceed $5,000: *Provided further*, That notwithstanding the provisions of any other act, retired officers of the Army or Navy may be employed by the Secretary of the Interior as consulting engineers in accordance with the provisions of this act: *Provided further*, That notwithstanding the provisions of any other act, retired personnel of the Department of the Interior employed by the Secretary of the Interior as consultants in accordance with the provisions of this act, may be so employed without deductions from compensation for retirement, without loss of or redetermination of retirement status, and without loss or reduction of retirement annuity or other benefits by reason of such employment, except that there shall be deducted from the compensation otherwise payable to any such retired employee sums equal to the retirement annuity or benefit allocable to the days of actual employment hereunder: *Provided further*, That within 60 days from the expiration of each fiscal year the Secretary of the Interior shall report to the Congress the names of individuals employed for consultation purposes pursuant to the authority of this act, the period or periods of their employment during said fiscal year, the nature of the services rendered, and the amounts paid during said fiscal year to each of such individuals for such consultation services.'"

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Idaho?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, this appears to be a new bill. Will the gentleman explain it?

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, this bill has been amended by the Senate, but it has heretofore been explained on the floor of the House. This would authorize and permit the Secretary to recall to the service men who have been retired and who are now drawing the benefits of retirement pay, without disturbing their retirement status or recalculating their retirement pay or retirement benefits. This will not disturb them at all. It will permit them to come back to work and there will be no deductions for retirement and no disturbance of their present retirement status.

Mr MARTIN of Massachusetts. It will not permit them to be paid two compensations?

Mr. WHITE. No.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. What are the changes that the Senate made?

Mr. WHITE. The Senate limited the amount of compensation to $5,000 a year.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. In other words, no one may be reemployed at over $5,000 a year?

Mr. WHITE. Yes.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. What are the other changes?

Mr. WHITE. The Senate put in a per diem rate and a few other things we did not set up.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I think the House should know about all amendments.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, the whole bill is in the nature of a limitation and permits the Secretary of the Interior during the war emergency to recall men back to the service who are experienced and qualified to do the things they had been doing before without having to readjust their retirement pay. This is simply to give them a chance to be reemployed without disturbing their retirement status and recalculating and readjusting their retirement allowances.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. This does not involve employees in the War Department.

Mr. WHITE. No. This simply deals with the Bureau of Reclamation where they are badly needed on these reclamation projects.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, does this bill permit the Secretary of the Interior to employ new employees?

Mr. WHITE. No. This applies to men that have been in the service before. It is just simply to prevent a tedious and long-drawn-out plan to readjust their retirement pay because they come back into the service. They are now retired, and they are proficient and qualified. There is a shortage of men of this character, and this will permit them to go back to work without disturbing their retirement pay.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Has the gentleman shown this amendment to the Republican members on the committee?

Mr. WHITE. I certainly have. It was taken up in the committee and gone into in full detail and reported favorably, and passed in the House and the Senate.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. The gentleman did not speak to me about the bill and the first information I had was when he called it up. I wonder if the gentleman spoke to the Republican members of his committee.

Mr. WHITE. It is a very simple plan. I have conferred with the Republican members of the committee.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. It may be a simple plan, but the gentleman has not yet explained all of the changes.

Mr. WHITE. I did not take them up one by one, but I have explained the essence of the thing, the plan that we have under consideration. The gentleman understands, I think, that today there are a number of qualified engineers with long experience in the Reclamation Service in the Department of the Interior who are retired. They need these men to replace the people that have gone into the Army.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. My desire is to know what are the Senate changes.

Mr. WHITE. This authorizes the Secretary to do that, and avoids a recalculation of their retirement pay.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, this is a very lengthy amendment. There seem to be many parts to it. It seems to be far reaching, much further reaching than the gentleman from Idaho seems to thinks it is. There are a lot of things in there that no one understands.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my request.

CITY OF BEARDSTOWN, ILL.

Mr. SIMPSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 4931) for the relief of the city of Beardstown, Ill., with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "$75,000" and insert "$65,000."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, as I understand, the only change is that the Senate has reduced the amount $10,000.

Mr. SIMPSON of Illinois. That is right.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Is that agreeable to the city which has the claim?

Mr. SIMPSON of Illinois. It is agreeable to the city. I would like to read a telegram which I received this morning:

Ask House to accept Senate amendment to $65,000. Get action before recess. Also signature of President so we can let contract. We appreciate your devotion to our cause.

FRED CLINE, *Mayor.*

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. McCORMACK. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, this is the bill the gentleman from Illinois spoke to me about the other day, as well as the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN]. It has passed the House.

Mr. SIMPSON of Illinois. That is correct.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD in three instances and include short editorials.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. MANASCO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include certain tables and excerpts.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. DILWEG] be given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter sent to him by one of his predecessors in this House, the Honorable Thomas F. Konop.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that today, at the conclusion of the legislative program and following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

NATIONAL DEFENSE

Mr. MANASCO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. MANASCO. Mr. Speaker, when the Republicans assumed the reins of Government in 1921, the United States was possessed of the strongest defense establishment in all its history.

The Army but recently had been demobilized. We had a force of highly trained officers and men running into the millions. We had, and they were not then outmoded, vast stores of military equipment and supplies adequate initially to arm and maintain a force of the magnitude just demobilized. We had just modified the National Defense Act of 1916, establishing a pattern of procedure which would avoid a repetition of the state of unreadiness such as existed when war engulfed the world in 1914.

On the Navy side, in vessels built and building, we were on the threshold of unquestioned naval supremacy. For the first time America was about to become the foremost naval power of the world. And then, what happened? Our Republican brethren viewed military and naval defense preparation as of secondary importance to an immediate economy showing. They were willing to risk national security to save insurance premiums. They proceeded almost immediately to scrap large numbers of vessels of war, built and in various stages of construction. They skeletonized our Army and closed their eyes to progress in military weapons, evidently being willing that our troops, if the need arose, should use again the equipment of the pre-1920 vintage.

During their 12 years of stewardship the national defense record was one of continual retrogression. During the 11-year period between 1922, the year of the Washington Arms Conference, and 1934, the year following our resumption of Government direction, our Government laid down a total of but 38 combatant ships, an average of 3.45 units per year. During the same period the British Government commenced the construction of 110 units of comparable types, and the Japanese Government laid down 98 units. In other words, with the rest of the world building up their first line of defense, our Republican brethren, after the scrapping episode, which looked to the establishment of a 5–5–3 ratio as between the Navies of the United States, Great Britain, and Japan, proceeded to throw that ratio out of the window. During 3 of the years I have named, not a single ship was laid down by our Government.

This was the defense situation when the Democratic Party resumed the reins of government in 1933.

Almost immediately, alarmed by the way our Navy had been neglected, the President allocated $238,000,000 of the National Industrial Recovery appropriation, which became available on June 16, 1933, for the construction of 30 combatant vessels—aircraft carriers, cruisers, destroyers, and submarines. From then on, under the leadership of President Roosevelt, the American Navy went forward and today we are the most powerful Navy the world has ever seen.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PAGÁN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include some newspaper items.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the Commissioner from Puerto Rico?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that today, following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Rhode Island?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a communication from a resident of my district, and further to extend my remarks and include certain editorials and communications.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a short editorial from the Saturday Evening Post.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper article, and further to extend my remarks and insert an article by our colleague the gentleman from Washington [Mr. COFFEE].

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that today, following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an extract from the Herald Tribune of Sunday last.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

PROHIBITING THE SALE OR OTHER DISPOSITION OF CERTAIN NAVAL PROPERTY

Mr. MOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

Mr. MOTT. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill to prohibit the sale or other disposition of certain naval property without specific authorization of Congress. The bill reads as follows:

A bill to prohibit the sale or other disposition of certain naval property without specific authorization by the Congress

Be it enacted, etc., That notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, and regardless of any order, directive, or declaration

designating any naval property as surplus, pursuant to the provisions of any law, no naval combatant vessel, base, station, or establishment shall be sold, leased, transferred, assigned, or otherwise disposed of, unless the Congress shall by law specifically authorize the same.

Mr. Speaker, this is made necessary by the fact that the House conferees on the property-disposal bill, ignoring and violating the direct mandate from the House in the shape of an amendment containing almost this exact language, scuttled that amendment. The committee of conference reported back a bill in which battleships, cruisers, destroyers, and submarines were excluded from the definition of property, and which left the field wide open for the executive agencies of this Government to dispose of every base, station, and establishment we have. This bill, I trust, will go to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the Saturday Evening Post.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an address delivered before the National Republican Club in New York, and further to extend my remarks and include certain clippings from various newspaper accounts.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on two subjects, and include a newspaper article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, there are so many other special orders for today that I thought it might be 6 or 7 o'clock before they finished, so have not asked permission to speak under special order, but I do not like to have the House adjourn without calling attention to the words of the President in 1936:

Recovery is with us. Federal revenues are increasing, emergency expenditures are decreasing. A balanced budget is on the way.

Then in March of 1937 he said:

I want to talk with you very simply about the need for present action in this crisis—the need to meet the unanswered challenge of one-third of a nation ill-nourished, ill-clad, ill-housed.

In 1936 everything was all right, we were going strong, and then in 1937 he suddenly discovered that one-third of the Nation was on the rocks. Too bad.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. FARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a letter from the retiring Director of the O. P. A. in the Territory of Hawaii, regarding the administration of that law in the islands.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the Delegate from Hawaii?

There was no objection.

GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, during the past several months Congress has given favorable consideration to increases in salaries and wages of employees in various fields of service. Retirement benefits have been increased for some groups. Only recently Congress agreed to provide additional special benefits for those who are classified as war workers. The Ways and Means Commitee of the House, I am informed, will in a short time hold hearings to determine whether such benefits should be extended to Federal employees.

RAILROAD RETIREMENT ACT SHOULD BE AMENDED

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I feel there is a large group of workers who are entitled to a lot of recognition but who have been neglected. I am referring to the hundreds of thousands of railway employees who stuck to their jobs and who have been most loyal in the discharge of their duties in the operation of the great transportation systems of this country. By reason of the tremendous load that has been thrust upon them, and because the great deal of equipment with which they are required to operate, they have carried on and are still working under most trying circumstances. Railroad employees are entitled to the gratitude of the American people for their splendid service in the war effort.

Mr. Speaker, the Railway Retirement Act has worked well for several years, but I feel it ought to be amended so that employees who have become totally disabled from performing their duties in the railway service may have fair compensation even though they have not attained the age of retirement or served the full period of years as required by the act. I believe, too, the act should be amended to protect the widows of employees so they may have the benefits of retirement pay that have been accumulated through the years of effort by the head of the family. I believe an employee who has not quite reached the retirement age now prescribed but is separated from service, should have at least a proportionate share of the retirement pay he would have been entitled to, had he served the full period as provided by law.

Mr. Speaker, I am not in favor of weakening the act in any respect, but I do feel amendments along the lines I have suggested are fair and equitable. I trust this House at the earliest date possible may give favorable consideration to the proposals I have outlined in this discussion.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WOLVERTON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD on the subject of Polish freedom and also on the subject of benefits for veterans and their dependents under the G. I. bill, and also on four other subjects with excerpts.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to include certain excerpts.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD on two subjects and to include some newspaper editorials.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include some excerpts.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. THOMASON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

THE MEDICAL WOMEN, ARMY-NAVY CLUB

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this time to address the House to explain the purpose of introducing the bill which I am about to drop in the hopper.

This is a bill to incorporate the Medical Women, Army-Navy Club. The incorporators are Mrs. Norman T. Kirk, Mrs. Barnet Nover, national chairman, and Mr. Arthur H. Johnson, chairman of endowment committee.

This organization is to be set up as a living memorial to the nurses, Army and Navy, of World War No. 2. It has been a dream of Mrs. Norman T. Kirk, wife of the Surgeon General of the United States Army, for many years. Mrs. Kirk was a nurse during World War No. 1 and has worked tirelessly in the interest of the war nurses. This memorial will be a living tribute to the wonderful women of the Army and Navy Medical Corps. It will be in the form of a building furnished and endowed and will be a gift from the medical industry to the women of the Medical Corps of the armed forces. The medical industry has done and is doing a superb service for the armed forces. The men of the industry recognize the gallant service of the medical women. They realize that these war nurses stand next to our sons and loved ones in their hour of need and will consider it a privilege to underwrite this memorial.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include in my remarks the honorary committee of the Medical Women of the Army and Navy Club.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The matter referred to follows:

Honorary committee: Mrs. Norman T. Kirk, chairman; Mrs. Henry H. Arnold, Mrs. Ralph A. Bard, Mrs. Mark Wayne Clark, Mrs. James H. Doolittle, Mrs. Dwight D. Eisenhower, Mrs. James V. Forrestal, Mrs. Merritt W. Ireland, Mrs. Robert H. Jackson, Mrs. Ernest J. King, Mrs. George C. Marshall, Mrs. Ross T McIntire, Mrs. Chester W. Nimitz, Mrs. Robert Patterson, Mrs. Brehon B. Somervell, Mrs. Henry L. Stimson, Mrs. Harlan Fiske Stone, Mrs. Alexander A. Vandegrift, Mrs. Woodrow Wilson, Mrs. William B. Young.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HOEVEN] may extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article relating to the care of our veterans and their dependents.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

PEARL HARBOR

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House on Pearl Harbor for 1 second.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, truth will make us free.

MEMORIAL FOR WAR NURSES

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Maine?

There was no objection.

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing a bill for myself and the gentlewoman from Ohio, Representative BOLTON, to incorporate the Medical Women, Army-Navy Club.

This proposal is to endow a memorial to honor nurses of the Army and Navy of the United States of America serving in the armed forces of World War No. 2, and will be financed by the medical industry. After World War No. 1 a memorial statue was erected in Arlington Cemetery to the battle-front nurses of that war. This time it is proposed to establish a club that will provide a place of meeting and room accommodations for the comfort and service of all women who serve in the medical departments of the Army and Navy.

This project is the result of a life dream of Mrs. Anne Duryea Kirk, the wife of the Surgeon General of the United States Army, Maj. Gen. Norman T. Kirk. Mrs. Kirk has been assisted by Mrs. Barnet Nover, who has been chosen chairman of the national committee to erect this memorial to the medical women of the armed forces, and the following prominent women of the country:

Honorary committee: Mrs. Norman T. Kirk, Mrs. Ross T McIntire, Mrs. Henry L. Stimson, Mrs. James V. Forrestal, Mrs. George C. Marshall, Mrs. Brehon B. Somervell, Mrs. Robert Patterson, Mrs. Harlan Fiske Stone, Mrs. Woodrow Wilson, Mrs. Dwight D. Eisenhower, Mrs. Merritt W. Ireland, Mrs. James H. Doolittle, Mrs. Henry H. Arnold, Mrs. Robert H. Jackson, Mrs. Ralph A. Bard, Mrs. Alexander Archer Vandegrift, Mrs. William Brent Young, Mrs. Ernest J. King, Mrs. Mark Wayne Clark, Mrs. Chester W. Nimitz.

National committee: Mrs. Barnet Nover, chairman; Mrs. Harry L. Willard, secretary; Mr. Arthur H. Johnson, chairman, endowment fund.

Advisory council: Col. Florence Blanchfield, Superintendent, Army Nurse Corps; Capt. Sue Dauser, Superintendent, Navy Nurse Corps; Maj. Emma Vogel, P. T. A.; Maj. Helen Burns, M. D. D.; Maj. Margaret Craghill, M. C.

Like the men at the front there is no group of women more worthy of praise and recognition than the nurses of this country. The medical women of the Army and Navy ask for no special privileges, expect no special consideration, and work alongside of the medical men in relieving and aiding the wounded servicemen in their suffering and pain.

The gentlewoman from Ohio [Mrs. BOLTON] has been overseas during the past few weeks studying hospital services. Few women in civilian life have devoted more time and energy and money in benefiting the profession than has the gentlewoman from Ohio, Representative FRANCES BOLTON. It is regretted that because of transportation difficulties the gentlewoman from Ohio [Mrs. BOLTON] cannot be here today, but she will join with us in this important and commendable proposal upon her return.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

(Mr. DWORSHAK asked and was granted permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.)

DEWEY

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 30 seconds.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, it may not rain, it may not snow on November 7, but it will be Dewey.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an editorial by A. M. Piper, editor of the Council Bluffs Nonpareil.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. WEICHEL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks on two subjects and to include therein a newspaper article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, it is reported that a German Government broadcast yesterday warned neutral countries that while Germany might lose this war, it would wage another when it recovered from the effects of this one, and that the attitude of neutral countries now toward Germany would be remembered and dealt with in the next.

That Germany is already laying plans to fight a third world war is evidenced by a document issued by the German High Command and revealed in an article by Joseph Driscoll, of the New York Herald Tribune, yesterday, revealing Nazi plans to save officers for a third war.

I quote this paragraph from the German document:

> Our final and complete victory was so certain even a short while ago that we can prepare ourselves with fresh courage for a new later fight. In order to prepare for this unavoidable third contest for leadership of the world expertly, we need our officers. At times we have found troops in sufficient quantities.

With this warning, the Allies must make no mistake in taking every step to prevent another war, both in the complete and permanent disarming of Germany and in forming an international organization with power to prevent aggression from the warlike countries such as Germany.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to insert therein certain brief excerpts.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a speech I recently delivered.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

JOAQUIN M. ELIZALDE

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include therein certain quotations.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, recently there left this House a man whom I like to term an "empire builder." I refer to Joaquin M. Elizalde, who rendered such splendid service in this House as Commissioner of the great Philippine Commonwealth. I am sorry the situation was such that he had to leave the House of Representatives or that he did leave, much as I admire and appreciate the able representative of that great people who is here at the present time.

Mr. Elizalde now goes back to private industry, where he will expand industry and give employment to his people. I believe that in the coming months we shall appreciate how valuable a man of his type is to the United States in our insular possessions.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include an excerpt from the National Tribune.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

PAYMENT OF ATTORNEYS' FEES FROM OSAGE TRIBAL FUNDS

Mr. DISNEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (S. 1847) to provide for the payment of attorneys' fees from Osage tribal funds, and its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I understand this bill has been before the House Committee on Indian Affairs and approved?

Mr. DISNEY. Yes. I may say to the gentleman from Massachusetts this was introduced at the request of the Department of the Interior, Bureau of Indian Affairs, and was approved unanimously by the Senate Committee on Indian Affairs, then by the Senate, and is reported favorably by the House Committee on Indian Affairs.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. The fees involved are $1,500?

Mr. DISNEY. One thousand five hundred dollars. One of these boys is in the service and wants to get this money.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That pursuant to the terms of a contract approved by the Assistant Secretary of the Interior February 14, 1938, between Fred Lookout, principal chief of the Osage Tribe of Indians, and certain attorneys named therein, employed pursuant to Osage council resolution No. 82, dated December 6, 1937, and extended for a period of 3 years from February 14, 1941, there is authorized to be expended from any funds collected as a result of any suit brought under said contract such sum as may be necessary to pay the fees of the attorneys so employed, as provided by the terms of the contract.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES—DEVELOPMENT OF THE MISSOURI RIVER BASIN

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

I enclose a copy of a resolution adopted by all but one of the Missouri River States represented in a recent meeting of their Governors and the members of the Missouri River States Committee. In general, the resolution asks for executive and legislative action toward procuring a single, coordinated plan for the development of the Missouri River Basin "for the greatest benefit of its citizens, both present and future, and for the greatest benefit to the United States."

As the Congress knows, I have for many years advocated the establishment of separate authorities to deal with the development of certain river basins where several States were involved. The general functions and purposes of the Tennessee Valley Authority might well serve as a pattern for similar developments of other river basins. The Tennessee Valley Authority was charged by the Congress with the development of practically all of the factors which are important in establishing better living standards and a better life for the people throughout that great watershed.

The benefits which have resulted in the Tennessee River Valley include flood prevention, irrigation, increased electric power for farms and shops and homes and industries, better transportation on land and water, reforestation and conservation of natural resources, the encouragement of small businesses and the growth and expansion of new businesses, development and widespread use of fertilizers and improved agricultural methods, better education and recreational facilities—and many kindred improvements which go to make for increased security and greater human happiness.

The Congress has at all times retained the final authority over the Tennessee Valley Authority, for the Authority comes before the Congress each year to obtain appropriations to continue its work and carry out its plans.

I have heretofore suggested the creation of a similar authority for the development of the Arkansas River watershed from the Mississippi all the way west to its source in Colorado.

I have also suggested the creation of an authority to render a similar service in the Columbia River watershed, including the States of Washington, Oregon, Idaho, and Montana.

I now make a similar recommendation for the Missouri River Basin.

The resolution very properly asks that the legislation dealing with matters relating to the waters of the Missouri River Basin recognize that it is dealing with one river and one problem; and points out the necessity of a comprehensive development of the Missouri River, indicating that there can be no piecemeal legislative program. The resolution asks that "the Congress should recognize now the problem in its entirety as it affects the people of the Missouri Basin and their economic destiny and that of the United States."

I am in hearty accord with these principles. I hope that the Congress will give careful and early consideration to the creation of this Federal authority to consider the problem in its entirety, remembering always that any appropriations to carry out any plan are and will be within the complete control of the Congress, and that the interest of each of the States in the basin will, of course, be given full consideration. I am sure that none of the States in the Tennessee River Basin have lost any of their rights because of the creation of the Authority in that valley.

May I also ask that renewed consideration be given to a study of the Arkansas and Columbia River Basins? The fact has been established that such legislation can do much to promote the welfare of the great mass of citizens who live there—as well as their fellow citizens throughout the United States.

I need hardly point out to the Congress, in addition, how helpful this legislation will be in the creation of employment and in the stimulation of industry, business, and agriculture throughout the areas involved, in the days which will follow the end of the war.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *September 21, 1944.*

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed concurrent resolutions of the following titles,

in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. Con. Res. 53. Concurrent resolution favoring international free press;

S. Con. Res. 54. Concurrent resolution providing for a recess of the two Houses of Congress; and

S. Con. Res. 55. Concurrent resolution authorizing the presiding officers of the two Houses to sign enrolled bills and joint resolutions after adjournment on September 21, 1944.

ADJOURNMENT RESOLUTION

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following Senate concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 54):

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That when the two Houses adjourn on Thursday, September 21, 1944, they shall stand adjourned until 12 o'clock meridian on Tuesday, November 14, 1944, or until 12 o'clock meridian on the third day after their respective members are notified to reassemble in accordance with section 2 of this concurrent resolution, whichever event occurs first.

SEC. 2. The President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives shall notify the Members of the Senate and the House, respectively, to reassemble whenever in their opinion legislative expediency shall warrant it or whenever the majority leader of the Senate and the majority leader of the House, acting jointly, or the acting minority leader of the Senate and the minority leader of the House, acting jointly, file a written request with the Secretary of the Senate and the Clerk of the House that the Congress reassemble for the consideration of legislation.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZATION TO SIGN ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following Senate concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 55):

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That notwithstanding the adjournment of the two Houses, as authorized by the Senate Concurrent Resolution 54, the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives be, and they are hereby, authorized to sign enrolled bills and joint resolutions duly passed by the two Houses which have been examined by the Committee on Enrolled Bills of each House and found truly enrolled.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING THE SPEAKER TO APPOINT COMMISSIONS AND COMMITTEES AUTHORIZED BY LAW OR BY THE HOUSE

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding the adjournment of the House the Speaker be authorized to appoint commissions and committees authorized by law or by the House.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

AUTHORIZING THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE TO RECEIVE MESSAGES FROM THE SENATE DURING THE ADJOURNMENT OF THE HOUSE

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding the adjournment of the House the Clerk be authorized to receive messages from the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

GENERAL LEAVE TO PRINT

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all members of the House shall have the privilege until the last edition authorized by the Joint Committee on Printing is published to extend their own remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on more than one subject, if they so desire, and also to include therein such short quotations as may be necessary to explain or complete such extension of remarks; but this order shall not apply to any subject matter which may have occurred or to any speech delivered subsequent to the adjournment of Congress.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

AUTHORIZING THE SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR TO EMPLOY ENGINEERS AND ECONOMISTS FOR CONSULTATION PURPOSES ON RECLAMATION WORK

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, I renew my request to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 3429) to amend section 1 of an act entitled "An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to employ engineers and economists for consultation purposes on important reclamation work, approved February 28, 1929 (45 Stat. 1406), as amended by the act of April 22, 1940 (54 Stat. 148)," with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment as follows:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert "That section 1 of the act of February 28, 1929 (45 Stat. 1406), as amended by act of April 22, 1940 (54 Stat. 148), authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to employ engineers and economists for consultation purposes on important reclamation work, is hereby amended to read as follows: 'That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized, in his judgment and discretion, to employ for consultation purposes on important reclamation work 10 consulting engineers, geologists, appraisers, economists, and lawyers, at rates of compensation to be fixed by him but not to exceed $50 per day for any engineer, geologist, appraiser, economist, or lawyer so employed: *Provided*, That the total compensation paid to any engineer, geologist, appraiser, economist, or lawyer during any fiscal year shall not exceed $5,000: *Provided further*, That notwithstanding the provisions of any other act, retired officers of the Army or Navy may be employed by the Secretary of the Interior as consulting engineers in accordance with the provisions of this act: *Provided further*, That notwithstanding the provisions of any other act, retired personnel of the Department of the Interior employed by the Secretary of the Interior as consultants in accordance with the provisions of this act, may be so employed without deductions from compensation for retirement, without loss of or redetermination of retirement status, and without loss or reduction of retirement annuity or other benefits by reason of such employment, except that there shall be deducted from the compensation otherwise payable to any such retired employee sums equal to the retirement annuity or benefit allocable to the days of actual employment hereunder: *Provided further*, That within 60 days from the expiration of each fiscal year the Secretary of the Interior shall report to the Congress the names of individuals employed for consultation purposes pursuant to the authority of this act, the period or periods of their employment during said fiscal year, the nature of the services rendered, and the amounts paid during said fiscal year to each of such individuals for such consultation services'."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Idaho?

Mr. JENSEN. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, of course I do not enjoy opposing this legislation, but this amendment has never been heard before the proper committee. To bring legislation so far reaching into this House and expect it to be passed by unanimous consent is just not legislating properly. As a member of the Subcommittee on Appropriations for the Department of the Interior, I know that Mr. Ickes asked for 2,221 deferments. Many of those men were assistant engineers and engineers. A lot of these men were under 25 years of age. I am sure he has an abundance of engineers and assistant engineers in his Department. Certainly I am not going to sit on the floor of this House and let legislation of this nature go through when I am sure they have plenty of help and plenty of engineers and an estimate of the cost is unknown to us.

I see that the chairman of our subcommittee, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. JOHNSON] is on the floor. I am satisfied that my chairman will uphold me in what I have said.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman object to the request of the gentleman from Idaho?

Mr. JENSEN. I object, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill, H. R. 3429, with a Senate amendment thereto, disagree to the Senate amendment, and ask for a conference with the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Idaho?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER appointed the following conferees: Mr. WHITE, Mr. ROBINSON of Utah, Mr. MURDOCK, Mr. SHORT, and Mr. ROCKWELL.

COMMITTEE ON MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding the adjournment of the House from September 21, 1944, to November 14, 1944, the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries be given permission until the House reconvenes to file interim reports on any subject which it may have under consideration, the same to be filed with the Clerk of the House for printing.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, what kind of reports are these to which the gentleman refers?

Mr. BLAND. They will be reports on various matters under investigation. There are some matters we are studying on which we want to file reports. One concerns aviation policy and shipping.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman is not asking consent for the committee to report legislation?

Mr. BLAND. Not at all; it is to file interim reports.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. It is a committee report that is to be filed; not the report of an individual but the report of the committee?

Mr. BLAND. Not necessarily the committee, but a subcommittee. We have a very large subcommittee on post-war aviation that is studying that very important question in connection with the merchant marine, and we probably will want to file that report.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Is this an unusual procedure?

Mr. BLAND. I do not think it is. I do not know.

The SPEAKER. The Chair would think it an unusual request that a subcommittee be permitted to file a report.

Mr. BLAND. Then I ask that the committee may file the report.

Mr. McCORMACK. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, this does not include, as the gentleman said, the reporting of legislation or reports in connection with legislation, but simply reports in connection with investigations and studies.

Mr. BLAND. This refers to reports in connection with investigations and studies.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. The subcommittee report should go to the regular committee before it is filed, anyway. I understand the gentleman has amended his request to make it apply to committee reports.

Mr. BLAND. It is a committee report, but I really would like to file a subcommittee report on post-war aviation.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I think the regular procedure is to have it go to the regular committee before it comes to the House. I think we ought to proceed according to the rules of the House.

Mr. BLAND. I shall certainly try to convene the committee, if possible.

Mr. McCORMACK It is understood, then, that it is going to be a committee report?

Mr. BLAND. It is a committee report.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman of course understands that he cannot file a committee report unless the committee acts on it.

Mr. CHURCH. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, the chairman of our Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BLAND], might make an address on the floor of the House and include therein the substance of the subcommittee report, which would be beneficial to the Members of the House.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Or the gentleman can extend his remarks in the RECORD and do that.

Mr. BLAND. I do not have the report. The matter is now being studied and the report is not yet prepared.

Mr. CHURCH. I hope the gentleman will so extend his remarks before the time expires, because it is very useful information.

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I just overheard the word "aviation." May I inquire from the gentleman from Virginia what this is all about?

Mr. BLAND. It is about aviation in connection with merchant ships throughout the world. The subcommittee is studying the necessity for merchant marine ships to be accorded the privilege of flying airships throughout the world.

Mr. BULWINKLE. Is that under the bill which the gentleman introduced on the 18th?

Mr. BLAND. It is not. It is a general study that is being made.

Mr. BULWINKLE. Has the gentleman conferred with the chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce?

Mr. BLAND. I have not.

Mr. BULWINKLE. Does the gentleman intend to confer with the chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce?

Mr. BLAND. I would like very much to do so. I did not think it was necessary. We are trying to file information for the House. I did not know it was necessary to do that now unless he is present.

Mr. BULWINKLE. Does the gentleman not think it is a quite unusual procedure that he is engaged in?

Mr. BLAND. I do not think so; and, if so, I think the situation as to the necessity for legislation in the immediate future or as soon as we return makes it necessary to file this report in order that the public may be advised as to the need for post-war aviation in connection with ships.

Mr. BULWINKLE. Is the gentleman only undertaking to have a study of this question?

Mr. BLAND. The gentleman is undertaking to have a study, and based upon that study and the study which has been made, but on which the report has not yet been prepared, he will undertake to have legislation at the short session of Congress, if possible.

Mr. BULWINKLE. I want to serve notice on the gentleman that we will be here at that time.

Mr. BLAND. There is no doubt about that.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD on any action to be taken by the Select Committee Investigating the Federal Communications Commission.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. FITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD in connection with the bill passed by Congress in December 1943, having to do with certain uncompleted airports, and to include copies of correspondence in connection therewith.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD on the subject of butter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. DISNEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include a radio address by Col. Stanley Washburn, on Need for Red Cross Nurses' Aides.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDER

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PRIEST] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to yield my place on the calendar of special orders today to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] and change places with him.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] is recognized for 15 minutes.

PEARL HARBOR

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, on September 11 of this year the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HARNESS] delivered a prepared speech in this body entitled "General Short and the Truth About Pearl Harbor." It was a prepared speech and therefore represented the deliberate and intentional thoughts of the gentleman from Indiana.

The gentleman further shows how deliberate his speech was by later introducing a House resolution based upon what he said on September 11, and incorporating as grounds for an investigation the very statements and charges he had made.

The evidence is therefore incontrovertible that what he said, as we would say in law, was expressed "with deliberate premeditation," and so forth.

Among a number of statements based, as he admits, on hearsay, or, in all probabilities, a political hope, the gentleman said:

> There appears to be an abundance of evidence to show that 72 hours before the attack on Pearl Harbor the Australian Government advised the American Government in Washington that an aircraft carrier task force of the Japanese Navy had been sighted by Australian reconnaissance headed toward Pearl Harbor; that our Government was again notified 48 hours before the attack that this Japanese task force was still in progress toward Hawaii, and the same notification was sent 24 hours before Pearl Harbor. None of

this information was, I am informed, given to General Short.

The intended impact of these charges is upon the Chief Executive of the United States. The statements carry unfortunate and incorrect innuendo that the administration had important military information relative to Pearl Harbor at least 72 hours, 48 hours, and 24 hours before the actual attack by the Japanese. As we know, the purveyors of untruth too often rely upon the subterfuge of prefacing scandalmongering by saying "evidence will further show," or "there appears to be an abundance of evidence," or "I am informed."

The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HARNESS] who professes deep concern because certain military leaders have not been brought to trial adds the expression:

> Let me repeat I have no knowledge of the facts related here, but they come from a source I believe to be thoroughly reliable and trustworthy, and they are of such a grave moment that I present them to the House for such action as they merit.

The gentleman would convict upon hearsay evidence, a procedure outlawed in every court of justice since the memory of man. There is no courage in assertions of such nature. They constitute lack of courage since the person who makes them refuses to accept the responsibility for their truth.

The gentleman from Indiana on September 11 last prefaced his remarks attacking the administration in a speech entitled "General Short and the Truth About Pearl Harbor" by stating that he had no personal knowledge, but then in answer to a statement:

> Mr. CALVIN D. JOHNSON. I think the most outstanding statement that I have heard during the argument presented by the gentleman—and I want to be sure that I understand him correctly—is that the Australian Government notified Washington 72 hours prior to the attack; that there was a second call 48 hours, and a third call 24 hours prior to the attack that a Jap carrier force was on its way to Pearl Harbor.
>
> Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. That is right.

The positive assertion of the gentleman from Indiana "That is right" is inconceivable in the face of his previous protestation of lack of personal knowledge. The American people are now entitled to an exhibition of such untrue and dangerous rumors being dignified by a Representative in Congress. We are engaged in a war in which the very preservation of our beloved country is at stake.

Fathers and mothers, wives, sisters, and sweethearts of men who lost their lives in this war are entitled to freedom from the poisonous tongues and pens of those who, for votes or otherwise, with subtle cleverness, paint a word picture faithlessly evidencing responsibility for death and suffering upon those who are blameless and without color of neglect of duty. A dangerous rumor of this kind cannot be treated lightly, or brushed aside, as most political statements are, with a smile.

Now, what are the facts—what is the truth about this vicious and false rumor, the only result of which can be to confuse and divide our people? And, mark you, a false rumor given credence by a Member on the floor of this honorable body.

After that speech was made by the gentleman from Indiana I contacted the War, Navy, and State Departments, who were stunned, as everyone else was, that such a statement should be made by anyone, particularly a Member of Congress. I asked for information. While each Department knew that the charges were baseless, so that definite assurances could be given, a thorough search was made to see if any such radio message, or message or notification of any kind or such a nature was received, and I am authorized by the War and Navy Departments, the Secretaries of both Departments, to make the following statement:

> The Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy have made inquiries as to the existence of any message from the Australian Government indicating that a Japanese carrier task force or any other hostile force was proceeding toward the Hawaiian Islands prior to the Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor. Both have been assured that no such message was ever communicated to or was heard of by anyone in their respective Departments and both of them personally have never seen or heard of such a message and believe that there is no foundation whatever for the charge that such a message was sent.

I am also authorized by the State Department, having discussed this with Assistant Secretary Breckinridge Long, who cleared it with Secretary Hull, to make the following statement:

> The Department of State did not receive prior to December 7, 1941, from the Australian Government or from any other source information as alleged to the effect that Japanese naval units were heading toward the Hawaiian Islands. There was no oral communication to the Department of State on that subject by anybody, either private citizen or official. There was no written communication received by the Department of State on that subject or to that effect. When the allegation was made that information to this effect had been received from Australia, the State Department instructed the American Minister in Canberra to get in touch with the Australian authorities at once and inquire whether they had any information concerning the report that the Australian Government had informed the American Government "that an aircraft carrier task force of the Japanese Navy had been sighted by Australian reconnaissance headed toward Pearl Harbor." The American Minister to Australia replied on September 14, 1944, that the Australian Prime Minister stated: "This is pure invention. Our cables had no data regarding the Japanese Fleet."

As we all know, hardly had the statement been made on this floor by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HARNESS] before Prime Minister Curtin of Australia had termed it as "a pure invention." In other words the rumor upon which the gentleman from Indiana based his statement was a lie—and the rumor is a malicious lie. The rumor is all the more malicious because it comes at a time when our country is engaged in a war of preservation, and at a time when the heat of a political contest exists.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield? The gentleman has just stated that the rumor was a lie. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HARNESS] is not on the floor of the House. Does the gentleman from Massachusetts mean to stick to that statement?

Mr. McCORMACK. I have given the statement of the three departments of our Government and of the Prime Minister of Australia, Mr. Curtin, that there is no foundation; and I stated that the rumor, the rumor upon which the gentleman from Indiana made his remarks—the rumor is a lie according to this incontrovertible evidence.

Mr. CHURCH. The gentleman has so far quoted the Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Navy, and the State Department. He has not yet quoted nor has he yet inquired——

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman is leading himself into trouble. Go ahead; inquired of whom?

Mr. CHURCH. Of the White House.

Mr. McCORMACK. I think that is contemptible. That shows the gentleman's state of mind.

Mr. CHURCH. No.

Mr. McCORMACK. That shows what is running through the gentleman's mind. Three departments of our Government, the State Department, Navy Department, and War Department have been heard from. That shows how the gentleman voted before Pearl Harbor. If the gentleman's votes were the votes of the majority of the Members of this Congress, when Pearl Harbor happened we would have been defenseless. Constantly trying to impugn the high motives of the President of the United States. I think the gentleman ought to be ashamed of himself in view of this evidence to try and inject that into this debate.

Mr. Speaker, I yield no further for that kind of mind to make its contribution.

We have the statements of three departments through three responsible officials, and Prime Minister Curtin, of Australia, against the statements of the gentleman from Indiana based, as he admits, on mere rumor.

The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HARNESS] should have inquired before he spoke, but if he did that, such a course would not have served his purpose. He could have, and, with our country at war, should have, tried to ascertain the truth before he attempted to dignify false rumor with the cloak of truth. He cannot hide behind the cloak that he is a Republican and that it would have been useless for him to make inquiries, or that the Departments would have ignored his request for information. The Secretary of War, Henry L. Stimson, former Secretary of State under former President Hoover, is a great American, serving our country in this crisis, but he is a Republican in politics. From the angle of party politics, the gentleman from Indiana is in a better position to talk with Secretary Stimson than I am. And we all know, without regard to party politics the Departments would have been only too anxious to have advised him of the falsity of the rumor, because they would know the dangerous results of that rumor being dignified by a Member of either branch of the Congress. The State, War, and Navy Departments are in touch, as we know, with members of

both political parties in Congress, and with committees that pass upon matters and legislation concerning these Departments. The fact remains that the gentleman from Indiana dignified a false rumor, giving it credence, and spoke before he inquired, when for our country's best interests, he should have inquired before he spoke.

There would appear to be a bottomless cavern wherein cheap politics begets unforgivable war rumors. Over 300,000 American fighting men have suffered casualties in this war. Death has knocked at the door of thousands upon thousands of families who before Pearl Harbor were content to live their lives in the space they now so prayerfully yearn. Thousands of permanently disabled veterans will carry their cross of war throughout life as potent evidence of their love of country. Men did not so suffer to protect slanderers and vilifiers of the Government for which in the idealism of youth and the realism of manhood they offered their all for liberty of mankind. They believed in freedom of speech but not license of tongue, nor irresponsibility of position and trust.

What does it profit anyone to gain a vote through the tears of bereaved mothers, fathers, wives, other loved ones, because they, with unwarranted faith, believe in the political effulgence of their elected representative in Congress who spends his time castigating the Commander in Chief of our armed forces because he happens to be a candidate for President of these United States?

In war, when the national effort is consecrated to victory, and integrity in public life is an essential of national unity, the unfounded stories of unbridled imagination purloined from the lips of those who lack the courage to manfully proclaim the facts are injurious, speaking mildly, of the war effort.

Mr. WILSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I will not yield just now, until I get through.

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order a quorum is not present.

Mr. McCORMACK. I will yield to the gentleman. What does the gentleman want to say?

Mr. WILSON. I just want to say——

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman withdraw his point of order?

Mr. WILSON. I want to say that the distinguished majority leader has proven nothing by his statement.

Mr. McCORMACK. Is the gentleman going to ask a question?

Mr. WILSON. I did not ask the gentleman to yield for a question.

Mr. McCORMACK. Then I do not yield.

Mr. WILSON. Then I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

Mr. McCORMACK. I will yield for a question.

Mr. WILSON. I did not ask the gentleman to yield for a question.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman is thoroughly acquainted with the rules of the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman from Indiana insist on his point of order?

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I made the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman insist on it?

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I insist on my point of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will count.

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw the point of order.

Mr. McCORMACK. The specific and incorrect charge of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HARNESS] that the Australian Government notified Washington 72 hours before the Pearl Harbor attack approximates an attack upon our Government which even in peacetime would be reckless, and my characterization of "reckless" is a mild one. There is no vagueness in the charge—no doubt as to its purpose. Admittedly made without personal knowledge, the objective of the utterance is accomplished with the speaking of the words. With no possible belief in the truth of the charges, as he admits himself, there can be only one result, to try to undermine national confidence in our Commander in Chief. These untrue statements, based on rumor, were made for political purposes. A statement based on fake rumor is a false statement. Repetition of speeches of this nature produce a clear and imminent danger that will bring about substantive evil unless stopped.

The defamatory power in the hands of the unscrupulous is greater in the time of war than in peace because war harbors lurking dangers to country which do not exist at other times.

The principle underlying free speech is always the same. The inciting of present danger of immediate evil or an intent to bring it about warrants condemnation.

Our Government is founded upon the power of truth. Expressions of thoughts which imminently interfere with the proper and successful prosecution of the war should be checked until Japan is driven to surrender.

In passing, all persons who are intellectually honest know that it is inappropriate for officers of the Army or Navy to comment on charges relating to Pearl Harbor while investigations relating to Pearl Harbor are being carried on, or prior to the starting of the court martial proceedings. All honest minded persons realize that the doing of all things that will bring about the early winning of the war as soon as possible is the course that should be followed.

It would be interesting to know from whom the gentleman from Indiana received this rumor—his alleged information. Who is the source of these vicious and contemptible rumors about the Australian Government giving our Government the advance notice the gentleman alleges in his speech and in his resolution? The gentleman from Indiana owes it to the country, having dignified this cheap rumor, as he has, and he owes it to himself, to make known the source of his information.

I have made known the source of my information—reliable sources, and not rumor or hearsay evidence.

I challenge the gentleman from Indiana to make public the source or sources of the rumors upon which he predicated his speech, and upon which he bases the resolution he had introduced.

I have presented the most dangerous part of his speech, that our Government had been notified by the Government of Australia from 24 to 72 hours, on three different occasions, that a Jap carrier, aircraft carrier task force was heading toward Pearl Harbor, and the evidence of our three departments and the statement of Prime Minister Curtin of the falsity of the rumor.

The gentleman from Indiana presented rumors. I present the facts. This happening shows the American people how far some persons will go in their political emotionalism. I regret very much that the gentleman from Indiana made the statement he did, which prompts me to take the floor to show the falsity of the rumor and to show that each and every one of us, even in a political campaign where rumors affect the best interests of our country, should inquire before we speak.

I want it understood that I have the highest respect personally for the gentleman from Indiana, but he should not have done what he did. He made his speech based upon rumor, and I present to the House and to the country the incontrovertible facts, the best evidence possible, from the War Department, the Navy Department, and the State Department of our own Government, and from the Prime Minister of Australia.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield.

Mr. JENSEN. After listening to the majority leader, I surely must come to the conclusion, and I am sure everybody——

Mr. McCORMACK. Did my friend ask me to yield for a question?

Mr. JENSEN. Yes; I am going to ask a question. I am sure that everybody has come to the same conclusion that he has and are very sure that Short and Kimmel are guilty of the charges placed against them.

Mr. McCORMACK. No; the gentleman is going too far now. I addressed myself to a statement made on the floor of the House, and only to that, that is, the rumor on which the statement was made that notice was given to our Government 72 hours and 48 hours and 24 hours.

I am glad my distinguished colleague asked the question. If there is any such thought in his mind that I was going beyond that, let me disabuse his mind. On the question of General Short and Admiral Kimmel, as I said to my distinguished colleague from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER] the other day, like himself, my mind is quite open. I am not convicting anyone without seeing the evidence. The burden of proof is upon those taking the affirmative to convict a man. The burden of proof is not upon anyone to show that he is innocent.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in

the RECORD in two instances and to include excerpts and statements.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Idaho?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CALVIN D. JOHNSON] is recognized for 15 minutes.

INDIA

Mr. CALVIN D. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak on the subject of India. I do not rise as an idealist seeking to spread the celestial blessings of the Atlantic Charter to that oppressed nation. Rather, I rise as an American whose primary interest is the welfare of more than 100,000 American soldiers, sons of American mothers and dads, who are fighting in that country and to protest the lack of cooperation on the part of our allies whose dilatory tactics have lengthened and altered the course of the entire Pacific war.

The precarious position of the American armies fighting in India and China was brought to the attention of the American public by Drew Pearson through widespread publication of letters from Ambassador Phillips and Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek to President Roosevelt concerning the situation in India. I shall include portions of these letters at the conclusion of my speech. In the light of present events I ask that the American public take cognizance of the admonitions and warnings contained in those letters. Their wisdom has been brought forcefully to our attention in the past few days when we read with alarm that the entire United States military set-up in China is imperiled, and that because of the Japanese advance it has been necessary to destroy airdromes and installations that required years to build, and lately to blast the runways and facilities of the fighter base at Kweilin.

In view of the serious turn of affairs in China, it behooves us to lift the veil of secrecy that enshrouds our activities in India and to discover the reason for the lack of cooperation with our military forces; to find out why the campaign in India is almost 2 years behind schedule; to find out why General Stilwell has been unable to obtain the cooperation necessary to carry on a successful operation; and lastly to focus the searchlight of responsibility on those who are at fault. It is my intention to show that if cooperation had been extended General Stilwell by our allies, China would not now be in danger of being divided and knocked out of the war. It is my intention to show that if cooperation had been given General Stilwell that an open route through Burma into China would now be a reality and as a result, Kweilin would not have fallen and China would not be facing disaster as a military power. I contend that if full cooperation had been given General Stilwell that the war in Asia would have been shortened by many months and thousands of American lives would have been spared.

It is not my intention to spread anglophobia by this speech. I have the greatest admiration for the English and for their personal and national courage. It is no crime for them to serve the interest of their own nation. I would not object to such action in India were it not detrimental to the future of our own country. I admire Churchill for his frankness in stating, "I did not become the King's First Minister in order to preside over the liquidation of the British Empire." Mark well that statement and remember that our diplomats are matching wits with experts of a nation that has played the game of international politics for centuries before we were a republic. Let us remember that we are newcomers in this field and that the stakes are high. The chips are the lives of American soldiers. You and I, the Congress and the State Department, are players, so let us be cautious and play our cards well.

In December of 1941, the Japanese were overrunning Asia. Although the Philippines and Singapore still held, it was obvious to all that the Japanese Army could not be stopped short of the eastern frontier of Burma. General Wavell had been made commander of the Allied forces in southeast Asia, and General Stilwell was made chief of staff of the Allied forces in China.

The three Allied leaders, Wavell, Stilwell, and Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek, met in Chungking to estimate the enemy's capabilities and coordinate their efforts to meet him. Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek realized that Burma was of far more importance to China than it was to Britain, as he was concerned that Burma might fall and thus complete the land blockade of China. He offered at that conference to put two armies under General Stilwell's command and suggested that Wavell accept them for use in the defense of Burma. General Wavell was reported as not even being polite in his refusal and stated: "Chinese troops are not wanted. We can handle the situation." How wrong he was was proved later. Too late Wavell acquiesced to Stilwell's pressure to bring in Chinese troops. These troops, when brought in, arrived too late. They were, as all Chinese troops, excellent in defensive warfare. Had they had time to dig in, they might have held Burma and the war with Japan would have been shortened by many months. I contend that as a result of Wavell's refusal to accept the two Chinese armies offered by Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek, Burma fell, conquered by the Japs with only three regiments, thus completing the land blockade of China.

Why did General Wavell refuse? He is a brilliant commander. His act of refusal was not stupidity. Our own General MacArthur has described him as a brilliant military leader. Others state that there was never a more able and ruthlessly efficient servant of the Crown. Personally, I do not doubt that he was acting under orders; otherwise he would never have made this mistake, as it is fairly clear that the English preferred risking the capture of Burma by the Japanese rather than have Burma defended by Chinese troops who, it is true, might never have been completely withdrawn.

After his retreat from Burma, Stilwell started making preparations for reopening land communications to blockaded China. He believed Chinese troops could be made into effective infantry if they were fed, trained, and equipped. He had the remnants of two Chinese divisions with him in India, Liao's Twenty-second and Sun's Thirty-eighth. He desired to revitalize these divisions by flying Chinese replacements over the hump in India. It was impossible to return these divisions to China and fly enough food and equipment to them. So he asked General Wavell for permission to establish a Chinese training center at Ramgargh, India.

Wavell was not enthusiastic. He said the Chinese, some 30,000 of them, would create a rice famine in Ramgargh. The British interest was unusual, as they later permitted a full-blown famine to sweep Bengal for 3 months before they made a corrective step. Wavell said the Chinese would throw cow bones around and offend the Hindus. He said the Chinese would boast that they had come to save India and embarrass the British and Indians. The objections were so ridiculous that they could not stand, but they provided an argument that had to be compromised by allowing Stilwell to train only two divisions where he could have trained hundreds of thousands of Chinese in the 2 years which were wasted.

Because of Wavell's objections, Stilwell was forced to establish a training center in Yunnan and use precious hump tonnage to get their weapons to China. The cost to General Chennault's Fourteenth Air Force of this diversion of tonnage has been tragic.

The training of Chinese at Ramgargh has been difficult. The Government of India manufactured difficulties that are a tribute to the imagination. The ordinary military rifle stock is too long for a Chinese soldier. It was decided to cut them down a few inches and an American general found an Indian contractor who said he could do the job in 2 weeks. A few days later a representative of the Government of India came to the American general and said the contractor would not be able to cut down the Chinese rifle butts because he was under contract to his Government. It was later discovered that the contractor had tried unsuccessfully for months to get Government work and obtained it only after he had agreed to take the Chinese rifle contract.

The American general went to the Government of India and insisted that the job be done. He was told it would be impossible to have the work done in less than 6 months and finally succeeded after raising hell in having the contract assigned to a section of the Cawnpore Arsenal that had been closed for lack of work.

Last year when the Chinese troops were about to go into action, American forces called for a new rice sack which had been developed to enable a Chinese infantryman to carry a week's ration. An American general went to the Government of India and was told there were no firms available to do the job. He went out and found one and was then advised that the Government of India had refused thread to sew the sacks, on the ground that it was critical war material. I question if it was so critical

that it could not be allocated to the troops that were going to fight the Japanese. The American general finally obtained it.

Conditions became so intolerable that a request was made that Wavell be changed. The names of Gen. Sir Claude Auchinleck and Gen. William Joseph Slim were suggested. The British agreed to appoint Auchinleck. The British submitted and the United States agreed, that southeast Asia was a British sphere and should have a British commander in chief. Churchill proposed Mountbatten and the Americans accepted him. It is rumored that an attempt was made to relieve Stilwell. This the American military authorities refused to do and Mountbatten agreed to accept Stilwell as his deputy. General Stilwell returned to India and Wavell, instead of being removed, was appointed the new Viceroy to India. The Americans were assured that his functions would be purely civil, but that impression was short-lived, as Churchill notified the command in Delhi that Wavell had cabinet rank and was, in fact, War Minister for Asia. The myth was further exploded when the Americans requested permission to maintain a level of 30,000 Chinese troops at Ramgargh. Auchinleck recommended that the request be granted. Wavell recommended that Ramgargh be closed. London radioed authority for Stilwell to keep 15,000 Chinese at Ramgargh.

When the Chinese made the first advance of the Burma campaign into the Hukwang Valley, correspondents were told not to play it up or describe it as important. When demands were made to know the reason why, the only answer was "orders from London."

General Stilwell was invited to the Cairo Conference and submitted a detailed program. His plan met with hearty approval from American military authorities. He called for an increase in the Indian Army which was not unreasonable, as we were then and are now lend-leasing to India, material for 35 combat divisions. The plan was received and pronounced feasible by the combined Chiefs of Staff. The Navy received it enthusiastically. I will not divulge its contents, as part of it may still be carried out, but will state that London raised an objection; first, because it would require a diversion of shipping from the European invasion; second, because it would put Chinese troops in occupation of British held territory in China.

Here, for the first time, British policy in Asia was clearly brought into focus. It proved that Britain will not willingly consent to reoccupation of her Asiastic territory by Chinese troops, even though the result would be to shorten the war and lessen the cost, both to Britain and the United States. Hong Kong itself is only incidentally the pawn. It is true that much of China is economically a part of the British Empire because its wealth can be siphoned off through Hong Kong, and obviously Hong Kong is a prize worth competing for.

The British seem to fear that the use of Chinese armies for major operations in the Asiatic war may give China a stake that must be considered at the peace table, and as a result, if backed by the United States, become a strong Asiatic power which would constitute a threat to the British Empire structure. With a strong China, as an example, India, Burma, and Malaya might be expected to make demands. It is generally known that if the people of India can agree on nothing else, they can agree on their dislike for Great Britain.

Stilwell fought at Cairo and lost, but he fought so hard that a compromise was effected. He returned to India with the intention of carrying out his modified plans. Immediately he encountered difficulties because of deliberate disregarding of the agreed program and lack of cooperation by British and Indian forces. It soon became apparent that unless cooperation was received, the entire Burma campaign would be a failure. The surprising and unusual happened. The Japanese started their attack and forced the battle which automatically put into effect a portion of the program. The American troops, known as the Raiders, and Stilwell's Chinese were advancing according to orders, while the British Army at Imphal had failed to move. Mountbatten pleaded rough country. This was obviously no excuse. General Stilwell, at that time, sent a group of American officers to Washington to ask for a decision, bringing the message that it was impossible to carry out his orders unless his allies fulfilled their part of the campaign. He also asked if his orders had been changed. It was at this time that Time magazine carried an article about a difference of opinion between Mountbatten and Stilwell. It was no difference of opinion between these officers. It was a difference of opinion between the American Army and the British Government. One was trying to defeat Japan at the least cost in life, time, and money. The other concerned with the future of the system by which it lived.

Why the Japanese ordered the attack on Imphal, in which they had only the remotest chance of success, will never be known. When one column of Japanese crossed the Chindwin and started advancing toward Manipur, the information was not relayed to the American leaders and it was necessary to send an American general by plane to the theater of operations in order to learn what was going on. Following the Japs advance into the Imphal Plain, the British proposed to fly out troops who were still holding road blocks. This operation would have required American troop carrier squadrons and the Americans refused to use them for that purpose. Stilwell suggested that the columns fight their way up to his Chinese army in the Mogaung Valley, and for lack of an alternative the British gave him command of the Chindits.

Nine days after Merrill took Myitkyina airdrome, one column of Chindits, enroute to Mogaung, reached the Kachine village of Kazu. Stilwell ordered this column to advance on Myitkyina and gave it the route he wanted them to march. They were 2 days' march from Myitkyina. When he next heard from them, they were 5 days east of that town. They had not taken his orders. Their explanation was the route he had given was too rough. The column did not arrive at Myitkyina until 10 days after Stilwell had ordered it to be there. It pulled up on the east bank of the Irrawaddy River and refused to attack the town. Meanwhile another Chindit column had abandoned the last remaining block on the Mandalay Railroad. Two thousand Chindits, who are known to be among the best troops in Asia, abandoned the block to an equal number of Japanese. The Americans were saved from probable disaster by the Chinese filling their commitment and crossing the Salween River at Myitkyina.

The Burma campaign is so far behind it has lost all semblance of schedule. Thanks, however, to the Japanese commander, the issue has been forced and it may eventually be successful. History will show to generations in the future that had the program of General Stilwell been carried out, as agreed, and full cooperation been given by our allies, American and allied forces would be in Hong Kong today. Supplies would be rolling into China over both land and sea routes, and the war in the Pacific would have been shortened many months, as all are agreed that the logical way to destroy Japan is through China and an open road must be established to supply Chinese troops.

The bitterness that exists in India toward the British is rapidly reaching the flaming point. No cooperation will be extended by the Indians until some recognition is given them by the British. The Cripps proposal, setting forth the terms by which India may gain independence, has been described by H. N. Brailsford as one of the greatest hoaxes in history and is impossible of fulfillment. Both the English and the Indians realize this. The record of the daily proceedings of the India Congress discloses that thousands of Indians have been shot by constabulary police under the pretext of maintaining order. Whole villages have been destroyed and the homes of Indian leaders raided without provocation. The leaders of the Indian people languish in prison, and resentment runs high. Civil war is not an improbability in India.

A definite promise, by Britain, concerning Indian independence at some future date, programed so that it is possible of fulfillment, will place three to four million Indian volunteer troops in Allied armies—troops that will have something to fight for.

The Government of Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek is in dire straits. It has been forced to continue too long on promises and platitudes. America has kept her promises to China as best she could. They were made impossible of fulfillment by lack of cooperation in Burma and India.

Mr. Speaker, I condemn no man in this statement, as I am of the opinion that this issue transcends politics. I have intentionally omitted the names of American and British military and civilian leaders wherever possible. I am, however, in a position to furnish them

to any committee or group this Congress may designate. It is time for America to take her head out of the sand and face the reality that bitter years of war may be ahead in the Pacific if our allies do not stop playing Dominion politics and direct their attention to affairs of today and not their empire of the future.

ESSENTIAL PORTIONS OF LETTER

The essential portions of Chiang Kai-shek's letter to President Roosevelt follow:

For a long time the Indian people have been expecting the United States to come out and take a stand on the side of justice and equality. I therefore venture to lay before you my personal views on this question.

From the point of view of the Indian people, their consistent purpose is to secure national freedom. With this object in view, the Indian National Congress, in seeking national independence, is dominated by sentiment rather than by reason. Consequently, I believe attempts at repression in the form of either public censure or force, whether military or police, with a view toward compelling the Indian people to capitulate, will have the opposite result.

The Indian people as a whole only desire freedom for their country, and their only expectation is that the United Nations will sympathize with them in their aspiration.

For the sake of our common victory, the United Nations must seek to stabilize the Indian situation and to secure the Indian people's participation in the joint war effort.

The United Nations depend upon India to contribute to the war effort, whereas the Indian people have little to depend upon from the outside world. From their own point of view, their movement for independence is not something new that has come into existence after the outbreak of war. Once they abandon hope of an amicable settlement, they are liable to take any risk without hesitation.

The only way is for the United Nations, and especially the United States, which they have always admired, to come forth as third parties and to offer them sympathy and consolation. This will help them regain their sense of proportion and strengthen their faith that there is justice in the world. Once the situation is eased, it can be stabilized and the Indian people, grateful to the United Nations for what they have done, will willingly participate in the war. Otherwise the Indian people, in despair, will have the same feeling toward other members of the United Nations as they have toward Britain and, when this comes to pass, it will be the world's greatest tragedy, in which Britain is not the only loser.

It is my opinion that, in order to uphold the British Empire's prestige and safeguard her real interests, the British should unhesitatingly show extraordinary courage, forbearance, far-sightedness, and resolution by removing the causes which aggravate the situation. In this way the deceptive Axis propagandists will have no occasion to take advantage of those causes.

Should, however, the situation be allowed to drift until an anti-British movement breaks out in India, any attempt on the part of the British to cope with the crisis by enforcing existing colonial laws will only help spread disturbances and turmoil. The greater the oppression, the greater the reaction. Even if such measures should prove effective in curbing the movement, the spiritual loss and blow to the United Nations will far exceed that resulting from any reverse in the field.

I earnestly hope that the United States will advise Britain and India, in the name of justice and righteousness, to seek a reasonable and satisfactory solution, for this affects vitally the welfare of mankind and has a direct bearing on the good faith and good name of the United Nations. The United States, as the acknowledged leader of democracy, has a natural and vital role to play in bringing about a successful solution of the problem.

The war aims of the United Nations and our common interests make it impossible for me to remain silent. An ancient Chinese proverb says: "Good medicine, though bitter, cures one's illness; word of sincere advice, though unpleasant, should guide one's conduct." I sincerely hope that Britain will magnanimously and resolutely accept my words of disinterested advice, however, unpleasant they may be, and believe that they are voiced in the common interests of the United Nations.

CHIANG KAI-SHEK.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HOBBS] may extend his own remarks and include certain excerpts therewith.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may have permission to revise and extend the remarks I will make later today and to include therein certain affidavits and excerpts from certain other statements.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of other special orders today I may address the House for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include therein an editorial from the Washington News.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SPARKMAN). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee.

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under special order of the House the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. NEWSOME] is recognized for 1 hour and 15 minutes.

Mr. NEWSOME. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to include in my statement without the necessity of reading them several newspaper articles and letters which serve to document and prove the falsity of the political smear campaign made against me in my race for reelection to the House from the Ninth District of Alabama.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. NEWSOME. Mr. Speaker, I take the floor today for the purpose of discussing the Democratic primary held in the Ninth District of Alabama last May.

I feel impelled to make this speech so that my friends and supporters may be informed and in justice to myself.

I feel that I must do this also in order to expose the untruthful, malicious, and slanderous statements that were made about me during the campaign, and in so doing, I hope to expose these practices to the end that they will no longer be effective and that honest, upright men will find it possible to offer for public office without having the attempt made to destroy their character and standing.

Unless checked by popular revulsion, the tendency today to revile and smear decent men who dare to stand up for principle and argue against the evils of the hour will lead to a complete deterioration in the character of our public servants.

The honest discussion of public questions must be aimed at reaching sound conclusions and must rise above prejudice, smearing, and personalities.

Debates dealing with personality and prejudice are aimed at the emotions and not at reason, and far too often great decisions are reached on the basis of the emotional response rather than upon logic and reason.

I shall try to handle this subject objectively and with a complete absence of heat and prejudice, even though I have been exposed to tactics which, according to many prominent attorneys, were clearly criminally libelous.

From the mail which I have received since the conclusion of the campaign, apparently there has developed among our people a definite sentiment against, and much comment on, the cheapness, the triviality, and the falsity with which my opposition conducted their campaign.

There was no discussion of the vital issues confronting our Nation, but charges were made that were irrelevant, false, misleading, and dangerous.

They were dangerous because such tactics create doubt about our whole democratic process. They create disunity in place of unity, and they intensify hatred and prejudice at a time when the crying need is for understanding, tolerance, and cooperation.

My opposition based their entire campaign upon the creation of personal and class hatred.

In looking back, it is easy to understand why few upright men will risk their personal character in patriotic public service to their country, even in time of war.

The smear technique itself is not a modern development, but has been going on from the beginning of human affairs. Never before, however, has it had so much money as has been furnished by the C. I. O. Political Action Committee under the leadership of Sidney Hillman, the foreign-born Lithuanian, and his many communistic associates who are trying to control our Government by infiltration into the Democratic Party.

The reports were circulated all over the district that I was against our Government and for prolonging the war.

These reports were circulated by minority groups led and informed by those who have been in this country only a short time, while my ancestors fought in the Revolutionary War for the purpose of establishing this Nation under law and I was reared in the tradition of this democracy and the sacredness of human rights.

I insert here in the RECORD, taking time to read only a part, an editorial from the Birmingham News Age-Herald of Sunday, June 11, 1944, together with a clipping from this same paper and an editorial from the magazine Alabama, under date of June 2, 1944, which express the opinion in our district about the kind of campaign which was conducted:

[From the Birmingham News Age-Herald of June 11, 1944]

SUCH CAMPAIGNING!

The Alabama primary election is now a good many days behind us—thank the Lord. The nominees have been chosen, the fights finished, and our people are thinking about other things. But there is one thing about the campaigning leading up to the voting that will not soon be forgotten. Indeed, we hope it won't be forgotten. That is the extraordinary amount of low-caliber politics that marked this primary in the spring of 1944, when the Nation was at war and facing one of the gravest world crises in all history.

There was a lot of comment on the cheapness, the triviality, the falsity of the campaigning as it proceeded. "I never remember such low stuff," was, in effect, the remark that one heard time and time again.

It is not our purpose now to single out the particular offenders. There were plenty of them. Not all candidates, to be sure, indulged in such tactics. But the general impression was that there was plenty of poor stuff all around—irrelevant, misleading, misrepresenting stuff. What we are concerned to do now is simply to put down one more protest against this kind of campaigning.

It is extremely dangerous. It has insidious, as well as obvious, effects. Such tactics tend to intensify questions and doubts about our whole democratic process. They make for sharper and deeper divisions among our people at a time when fundamental unity of spirit and objective is of the greatest urgency.

Of course, we are well aware that a certain amount and degree of this sort of thing has come to be taken for granted. We know that it is sometimes hard to see where any permanent harm has been done. We realize, too, the importance of preserving the widest latitude for free, responsible discussion. Nevertheless, if low-grade campaigning becomes increasingly dominant in this country, our problems of freedom, already acute, will become much more grave. And the divisions among us, which already are marked by much of deep distrust and bitterness, can become much more disrupting than they already are.

We are glad this campaign is over and done with.

We hope that the excessive degree of cheap politicians in it was partly attributable to the excitement and tension of these times, and that in calmer days such contests will be marked by more of dignity and responsibility.

Of course, some votes are caught by these methods. But we continue to believe that extreme tactics of this kind lose more support than they gain. Some day our politicians generally will learn that lesson—or else we'll be lost.

[From the Birmingham News Age-Herald]

"WITH MALICE TOWARD SOME"

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NEWS:

On May 2 we had a primary election in Alabama. Some 35,000 voters in Jefferson County went to the polls. No candidate having received a majority in the congressional race, a run-off between the 2 highest was, under the law, necessary. This run-off was held May 30.

According to a news item a day or two afterward, a union official announced that labor had nominated its candidate and served notice that henceforth candidates for public office must reckon with labor in Alabama if they expected to be elected. I have seen no announcement of who, if anybody, will represent the balance of us from this congressional district, and, seemingly, the great unorganized majority of our people will have no representation in the Congress of the United States.

However, all of this is now water over the dam. I, like every other good citizen, accept the verdict. There were, however, certain things which occurred in these two primaries that give me serious concern. I would like to review briefly to the good people of this district some of those things that, to my mind, seriously affect their welfare and, if persisted in, will undermine the foundations of our Government.

First, I have been through many political campaigns in my time, but the second primary last passed, to my mind, reached new depths of infamy, falsehood, and character assassination.

Is this to be a new pattern in future campaigns in Alabama? Is the candidate for political office hereafter to have his whole career combed over with a fine-tooth comb and his every act and every deed of his entire past life distorted to suit the purposes of political racketeers? Confronted with such, what incentive is there for any man to enter politics and become a contender for public office, knowing full well that there is no escape from the character assassin?

Second, I have a word for those complacent mortals too busy with their own petty affairs and too indifferent of their country's welfare to even go to the polls and register their choice for candidates for political office on election day. Why all the agitation for the abolition of the poll tax when some 3,000 to 5,000 of our qualified voters are so indifferent to their country's good that they absolutely refuse to exercise the franchise? There were, conservatively, 4,000 voters, who cast their ballots in the first primary, but failed to do so in the second. They are generally classified as good people, people of affairs, and they are the very self-same people who, when things go wrong politically, are most vocal in denouncing the Government.

And every one of these dear, good people have sons, daughters, brothers, and fathers who are on our far-flung battle fronts today, dying by the thousands in fox holes and trenches infested with vermin and filth, scourged by jungle fevers and suffering the most inconceivable agonies and tortures of a living hell. Still, they fight on—at $50 per month—giving up their lives believing with all their souls that they are fighting and dying in the cause of liberty and democracy.

To those complacent souls, let me ask: Do you feel no duty, no responsibility, to those boys overseas? What excuse will you have to offer when those boys come home if you have failed in your duty to protect the home front with the same degree of loyalty and fidelity with which they are giving up their lives on the foreign front?

Have you no sense of shame in the realization of the fact that to them you have betrayed your trust? Do you not realize that you are slackers and shirkers and that you have been guilty of the grossest disloyalty? How can you face these boys when they come back and realize that, in their absence, through your failure to do your civic duty, a small minority of our population has been enabled to gain control of your Government, override our Constitution, and substitute autocracy for democracy?

Our boys, fighting our battles the world over, have every right to expect, to demand, that you do your full duty toward your Government at home, whether in the mill, the factory, or the countinghouse.

R. DUPONT THOMPSON.

A summary of this election is expressed by Alabama, a weekly magazine of Statewide circulation, in its issue of June 2, 1944, which I here insert:

NEWSOME NOSED OUT

In the May 2 primary Ninth District Congressman JOHN NEWSOME polled 15,440 votes, ex-Congressman Luther Patrick 12,879. In this week's run-off Patrick again received slightly less than 13,000 votes—but more than 3,200 NEWSOME backers failed to turn out. Upshot: Alabama's largest district will be represented for the next 2 years by a 100-percent new dealer who, in 1942, spoke and voted for the Federal antipoll tax bill.

Apathy or overconfidence of NEWSOME supporters enabled Patrick to squeeze back in by about 675 votes. It not only was the closest Jefferson County congressional race in many years but the dirtiest. The false and filthy scattersheets circulated against JOHN NEWSOME by the mouthpiece of C. I. O.'s Political Action Committee, from which Patrick received large-scale financial aid, hit an all-time low.

There is no blinking the fact that Luther Patrick's comeback was a victory for radical elements. Leftist groups presented a solid front, and in addition most Federal employees in the district went all-out against unregimented Congressman NEWSOME.

Personally likeable Luther Patrick throughout the campaign made no effort to hide the fact that he had cast his lot with the left-wing. He denounced NEWSOME'S votes for the Smith-Connally Act and the Hobbs antilabor racketeering bill. He made no reference to his support of the Federal anti-poll-tax bill, but declared he would follow the New Deal administration.

But after the run-off ballots had been counted, Luther Patrick sounded a different note: "Despite rumors to the contrary, I have no special affiliation with labor or any other group and I will go back to Congress with the honest intention of doing my best to represent all the people of Jefferson county, with no special emphasis on any group." Obviously, the congressional nominee could not have held his solid leftist front had he made such a statement during the campaign.

During the campaign, I made every effort to discuss the plans and policies affecting the vital issues which confront us during this wartime period, but because of the constant personal attacks based upon prejudice and smearing and aimed at the assassination of my personal character and standing, not only as a public official but as a citizen in my home community, it was impossible to get the campaign out of the gutter.

The opposition campaign was spearheaded and directed by a group who claimed to represent the leadership of the National C. I. O. Political Action Committee, and the criminally libelous charges which they made were put out in my district by the so-called official weekly newspaper of the C. I. O. named

the News Digest, whose editorial policy is financially and morally irresponsible.

This paper I shall present to you for your consideration as an illustration of how defenseless both in our official and personal characters we are against the written and spoken word when it is written and spoken without regard to principles or truth.

Undoubtedly, the methods used misled and confused hundreds of fine, honest, and substantial American citizens who are both members and nonmembers of labor unions, and doubts were planted in their minds as to my loyalty to my country, my honesty, my intentions and purposes, and my ability as their Congressman.

I feel sure that no one questions the right of any American citizen, be he a member of a labor union or not, to be politically active and to vote in accordance with his convictions.

We do not question his right to organize for or against any candidate, or to fight or support him, and to do these things in cooperation with any group or organization, but for minority groups to use unlimited slush funds for the spreading of false propaganda to achieve their own selfish aims is to violate all American standards of justice and fairness, and is corrupt in its intent and purpose, and I shall here insert in the RECORD two newspaper articles which cover the donations by Sidney Hillman's Political Action Committee to my opponent's campaign, the acceptance of which automatically creates an obligation; donations that were made from New York in an attempt to dominate and control a Democratic primary in Alabama. These funds, of course, were in addition to those collected and spent locally.

Dictation to the people of Alabama in local elections from New York is something new in Alabama politics.

[From the Washington Times-Herald of August 29, 1944]

P. A. C. RECEIVED $806,715 FUND, SAYS HILLMAN—DEFIANTLY DEFENDS HIS VOTE ACTIVITIES

(By Willard Edwards)

In defiant mood, Sidney Hillman, chairman of the C. I. O. Political Action Committee, yesterday rendered to Congress an account of his group's slush fund activities, reporting collections aggregating $806,715 and expenditures of $428,397, as of August 15.

An additional $1,500,000 is sought by Hillman in "voluntary" contributions from C. I. O. members, he said, although he admitted that a total fund of $5,000,000 could be raised if every worker kicked in the $1 minimum asked for. The legal limit on major party expenditures in a national campaign is $2,000,000.

VIOLATIONS CHARGED

Two members of the House Campaign Expenditures Committee, before which Hillman appeared, expressed the opinion that the C. I. O.-P. A. C. had "clearly violated" provisions of the Hatch (pernicious political activities) Act. Hillman termed these accusations "ridiculous" and eulogized the "democratic methods" of his organization.

Hillman's account did disclose that the effectiveness of the C. I. O. purge of the House of Representatives had been somewhat magnified. Of 18 candidates for the House given financial backing, in some cases up to $5,000 limit permitted by law, only 3 won nominations in primaries which because of local conditions are equivalent to election.

FISH IS NOT INCLUDED

Two members of this successful trio are listed in the files of the Dies Committee on Un-American Activities as well-known Communist fellow travelers. They are Representative MARCANTONIO (American Labor), of New York, and A. Clayton Powell, a Negro, of New York City, who each received $5,000 from the C. I. O.-P. A. C. The third is former Representative Patrick (Democrat), of Alabama, who was given $2,000.

Four other C. I. O.-P. A. C. candidates, who sought both party nominations, gained only the Democratic nomination. These included the opponent to Representative FISH (Republican), of New York, and Mrs. Helen Gahagan Douglas, of Los Angeles.

The remaining 11 candidates who shared in the C. I. O.-P. A. C. funds ladeled out to House candidates were soundly defeated in contests in California, New York, Virginia, Oklahoma, Maine, Georgia, and Massachusetts.

Hillman said no money was spent in districts in Missouri, South Carolina, Chicago, Michigan, Texas, and Alabama, where the C. I. O.-P. A. C. had been reported to be functioning actively, and where in some instances it was given credit for upsetting candidates in primaries.

THREE HUNDRED THOUSAND DOLLARS FROZEN

Of $671,214 collected from C. I. O. unions, a balance of $300,127 has been "frozen" since July 23, Hillman testified, upon advice of counsel that the money could be spent only in primaries, because of the Smith-Connally Act's prohibition against labor-union contributions in general elections.

Hillman was quizzed at length during morning and afternoon sessions of the committee, wrangling with Representatives CHURCH, Republican, of Illinois, and BROWN, Republican, of Ohio, who commented that his testimony proved illegality of his group's operations.

"Ninety-five percent of the attorneys in the Nation agree you are violating the law," remarked BROWN, "but the Attorney General happens to belong to the remaining 5 percent and nothing is done."

PRESSURE CHARGED

CHURCH gave examples of pressure upon C. I. O. members to contribute to the fourth-term campaign sponsored by the C. I. O.-P. A. C. and Hillman barked sharp denials that there was any coercion of workers in the collection of funds. He also burst out with a declaration that the election of Dewey would be "a national catastrophe."

When the Amalgamated Clothing Workers contributed $100,000 to the C. I. O.-P. A. C., it was placed in an account in Hillman's bank, he testified in response to CHURCH'S question. The workers were not consulted about this contribution, he admitted, but "unanimously endorsed it" at a later convention.

[From the Birmingham News of August 29, 1944]

P. A. C. DONATED $2,000 TO PATRICK CAMPAIGN—C. I. O. LEADER TELLS HOUSE COMMITTEE NO OTHER CONTRIBUTIONS MADE IN STATE CONGRESS CONTESTS

(By Fred H. Taylor)

WASHINGTON.—Sidney Hillman's C. I. O. Political Action Committee contributed $2,000 to Luther Patrick's campaign in which he unseated Representative JOHN NEWSOME in the Alabama Ninth Congressional District, it was brought out here Monday before the Anderson House committee investigating 1944 campaign expenses and practices.

But Hillman and his chief lieutenant, C. B. Baldwin, vice chairman of P. A. C., said no contributions were made by the national organization to candidates in any of the other congressional races in Alabama.

John A. Caddell, Decatur lawyer and special counsel for the Anderson committee, questioned both Hillman and Baldwin, specifically as to whether they made contributions from New York to candidates in the congressional campaigns in the Fourth and Fifth Districts. They replied they did not and that if the C. I. O., which was credited with having helped defeat Representative JOE STARNES in the Fifth, made any campaign contributions, they were made locally.

STARNES was unseated in the Fifth by State Representative Rains, Gadsden lawyer. Representative SAM HOBBS, Fourth District, was renominated, having been opposed by Tom King, Anniston.

Both Hillman and Baldwin were asked by Representative CLARENCE J. BROWN (Republican, Ohio) if the C. I. O. contributed more than the $2,000 listed as given Patrick along with contributions to congressional aspirants in other States, and they replied their committee in New York had not.

BROWN then sought to elicit from them why they had contributed only $2,000 to Patrick when the printed list of contributions showed the P. A. C. had given Adam Clayton Powell, New York Negro, $5,000 in his campaign for Congress, this being listed as the C. I. O.'s largest single contribution.

Baldwin testified in answer to BROWN'S questions that he and Hillman had decided to contribute the $2,000 to Patrick after they had checked in Birmingham and found they didn't have much money down there.

Asked how they checked, Baldwin replied: "We checked through our regional director as to how much they had, and we found they didn't have as much money as they needed or thought they should have."

Questioned further as to how the Patrick campaign money was handled, Baldwin said the transaction was handled by telephone.

When BROWN questioned Hillman and Baldwin as to whether additional funds were raised by the C. I. O. in Birmingham or the Ninth District for his campaign, Baldwin said: "I don't have information about any money collected locally in Birmingham or elsewhere."

Caddell questioned Hillman and Baldwin sharply about other phases of campaign expenditures in the House races, but the committee, limited by the resolution, did not go into the senatorial campaign.

Caddell said, however, the Anderson committee headed by Representative CLINTON P. ANDERSON, New Mexico, Democrat, had been given an itemized report of campaign contributions made by Hillman's committee in the various senatorial races and none was listed for either candidate in the recent HILL-Simpson race. He said the list disclosed, however, that the C. I. O. had contributed $5,000 to Florida Senator CLAUDE PEPPER'S campaign.

Besides Patrick and Powell, other congressional candidates listed by Hillman and Baldwin as receiving P. A. C. campaign contributions were—

California: Helen Gahagan Douglas, $955. Georgia: Smithwick, $4,000; Pope, $1,000. Virginia: Page, $450. Oklahoma: Cartwright, $1,000; Wyatt, $500. Maine: Pettis, $1,000. Massachusetts: Casey, $3,800.40; Elliott, $3,068.04; Maloney, $200; and McCormick, $40. New York: Bennett, $2,000; Haesler, $1,000; and committee for the nomination of the Win the War candidates, $5,000.

The self-styled political leaders of organized labor claim publicly that they won this campaign, and I insert here in

the RECORD an article from the Birmingham Post of June 1, 1944, in which these professional labor political leaders take the credit for victory.

I shall read only a part of the article, and I quote:

A. F. OF L. SECRETARY CALLS ELECTION LABOR VICTORY—NEWSOME DEFEAT SEEN AS TRIUMPH FOR UNION VOTERS BY HARE

(By Al Kuettner)

Organized labor claims a signal victory by the defeat of Representative JOHN P. NEWSOME (Democrat, Alabama), in Tuesday's Ninth Congressional District. It boldly serves notice that political candidates henceforth must reckon with labor in Alabama if they expect to be elected.

Victor in the run-off primary was Luther Patrick, a former Congressman and radio entertainer, who admitted that much of his strength came from the forces of union labor.

"I could not be considered an enemy of labor," he said in a post-election statement.

HARE WATCHES FUTURE

W. O. Hare, executive secretary of the Alabama State Federation of Labor (A. F. of L.), called NEWSOME'S defeat a triumph for one of labor's friends. He said that "our enemies in Alabama would be eliminated systematically if it is necessary to clean the entire Democratic Party out of this State."

Hare apparently referred here to the anti-New Deal Democratic element in the State since Patrick himself is an all-out administration man.

"If political candidates haven't gotten around to the realization that labor has become a force that can elect them or defeat them," Hare asserted, "then they had better realize it if they ever expect to be elected to public office in this State."

Four weeks ago in the May 2 State primary another Alabama Congressman, JOE STARNES, lost his job in the Fifth Congressional District, where labor claimed a big hand in his defeat.

The C. I. O. Political Action Committee endorsed Patrick and was delighted with the results, according to J. P. Mooney, Jefferson County member of the committee, who hailed it as a victory for the Roosevelt administration.

Mooney said the committee "recommended Patrick to all C. I. O. members." In a prepared statement, he added:

"C. I. O. members, along with other labor organizations, are conscious and recognize their duty as American citizens, which was shown by the results of this election.

CALLED F. D. R. VICTORY

"It is apparent that once again people of the Ninth District have repudiated bigotry, intolerance, and unfairness.

"We feel that the election of Mr. Patrick is another victory for the national administration."

Although comparatively few of Jefferson County's union voters actually went to the polls Tuesday, their leaders claimed labor's influence plus what ballots they did cast dictated the outcome.

The A. F. of L. claims 20,000 registered voters in the Ninth District alone, and has heavy voting strength in the industry-dotted Fifth District.

Undoubtedly the support received by my opponent from these self-styled professional political leaders of organized labor made a contribution to his success. However, I do not agree that the election was won because of that.

Many people who did not know either candidate personally and who were not informed as to their personal records either in the Congress or in their community were given false information through the medium of radio, paid advertisements, and the C. I. O. News Digest, to the effect that I advocated the destruction of our domestic economy and was for prolonging the war.

As an illustration of the underhand political tactics, I can cite prominent educators whose reputations are above reproach and who contacted, as the result of the false information they received, every teacher in the district and stated that my opponent had voted for Federal aid to schools and that I opposed this measure. Both were false statements and were released at the last minute and too late in the campaign to be fully answered and corrected.

Prominent leaders in the Congress were repeatedly and publicly quoted as having made derogatory remarks about me and my service in the Congress, and even though these congressional leaders personally by telegram denied flatly and publicly the statements attributed to them, this false propaganda had its effect because it was released only 2 days before the voting, and time did not permit the truth to reach many.

The really deciding factor in the election was the failure of the general mass of voters to go to the polls and cast their ballots. The voting was light. Many were in the armed services; many away on vacations and various duties. Proof that this failure to vote was the deciding factor was, that my opponent received slightly less than 13,000 votes out of 59,000 qualified voters and was elected by less than 22 percent of the total vote. As further proof, approximately 6,000 less votes were cast in the run-off primary than in the first balloting, and I received some 2,700 less votes than I received in the first primary.

The total vote cast was less than 42 percent of those qualified to vote, and I lost by 531 votes, or approximately 1 percent of the total qualified voters.

This general lack of interest would seem to indicate one of the basic failings in our democratic system, and that is the failure on the part of our people to recognize how important government has become in our daily living. It is the failure to recognize that government is no better than the men who run it. It is the failure to recognize that voting is a duty as well as a privilege.

This campaign is an illustration of the developing class warfare being promoted in the Nation by those communistic and irresponsible elements in the country who have resided here for only a few years and who came here for the purpose of enjoying the prosperity and freedom which we have. They are now, through political activities which are supported by huge funds wrung from the honest workingman, trying to take over and change our form of government into a sorry imitation of the traditional European pattern with its class consciousness.

In 1861 we fought a sectional war. In 1944, in addition to our foreign wars, we are developing a group war internally.

I think we can all agree that France was destroyed by its internal political war between groups, each group fighting for its own selfish interest and belief regardless of the cost of the national welfare.

This could happen here, unless there is in the Congress the courage and determination to resist the selfish group pressures in the interest of the public welfare.

In keeping with his oath of office and the responsibility which it imposes, each Member of the Congress is a representative of all the people and must, in spite of political expediency and pressure, resist becoming the delegate in the Congress for any special group or special interest.

I do not presume to offer advice to the distinguished Members of the Congress. I merely state a principle which seems fundamental.

I have here two editions of the News Digest, the allegedly official newspaper of the professional leaders of the C. I. O. in Birmingham, Ala.

This paper has been published on Thursday of each week for several years, and it shows in its regular editions that it is published by the Alabama News Digest, Inc.

According to the date lines on these papers, two editions were published on Thursday, May 25—one apparently their regular edition and the other their political smear edition for use in influencing the voting on May 30.

Although this smear edition bears the date line of May 25, it was not distributed until the Monday before the voting on Tuesday—too late to be answered and undoubtedly a violation of the Corrupt Practices Act of the State of Alabama.

I confine myself to the record and I make no charges. Neither do I contest the outcome of the election. I merely find it necessary to furnish the truth and expose the false and slanderous methods that were used in this campaign.

You will note in the first column on the first page a heading which says "Meet Mr. Big."

This column is written in the first person with quotation marks as statements made by me, and never before did I realize that I was quite such a fellow as they have me confess myself to be in these fantastic first-person declarations. In this propaganda write-up, I supposedly confess bribery, thievery, and dishonesty as well as treason.

Under the rules of the House where a Member has been slandered in his official capacity in the Congress, he is entitled to the rights of personal privilege, and I quote two excerpts from the confessions they made for me in which they have me accuse myself of both treason and bribery. I quote:

I'm the guy who went to Washington and voted with the Republicans and the anti-Roosevelt Democrats against my country and President in time of war. I vote with CLARE HOFFMAN and HAM FISH, the man the American Legion says is un-American, and I have gotten away with that too.

This accuses me of treason in time of war—one of the most horrible crimes which the mind of man can conceive. I quote the second:

I've got a swell racket. The people elect me, the Government pays me, I serve my big

business friends; and I sit in the middle and collect.

In this, they make me accuse myself of accepting bribes in my official capacity.

Mr. ROWE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NEWSOME. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. ROWE. Has the gentleman a previous military record?

Mr. NEWSOME. Yes, indeed.

Mr. ROWE. Will the gentleman state what that is for the information of the House?

Mr. NEWSOME. It so happens I was a private, an infantry first lieutenant, and an infantry captain in the other World War, with overseas combat service.

Both statements are false and criminally libelous, published by an irresponsible, political slander sheet whose policies were dictated by men who would assassinate character for the purpose of accomplishing their own selfish political ambitions.

Decent Americans everywhere will sit in judgment on such political tactics.

Again notice the flaming headlines, quote: "Wouldn't believe NEWSOME on oath ex-partner says. Brother-in-law tells facts on business deals." And further down, a letter purported to be from my former business partner.

To begin with, I have no brother-in-law.

And I think that we may draw the inference that when a political smear sheet such as this publishes a personal letter supposedly written by my former business partner and addressed to my opponent that my opponent approved, engineered, and saw to its publication.

All three of our daily newspapers refused to print this letter even as a paid ad, for the signature on the letter was clearly a forgery. I have in my possession several thousand checks countersigned by my former business partner, and this is not his signature on the letter.

He might, however, have authorized such a letter, and I say this with no feeling of bitterness toward him but with a deep sense of distress and also an understanding of his physical and mental condition. If he did authorize this letter, I am sure that he was given inducements to do so.

Here are the facts, and I support these facts by inserting in the RECORD copies of the letters in which he and his wife request that I buy his interest in our business and in which he selected the auditor to establish the value of the business, and the bill of sale where I paid him in cash without argument or discount the price which his auditor set as being fair and right.

I had nothing to do with or any knowledge of any other business in which he may have engaged or the handling of the estate which he inherited.

BAY PHARMACY,
Panama City, Fla., November 16, 1938.

Mr. JOHN P. NEWSOME,
Watts-Newsome Co.,
Birmingham, Ala.

DEAR JOHN: After considering everything very carefully and knowing my own physical condition, have decided the best thing for me to do is to let you have my interest at book value. Then should anything happen to me Bill would not have any obligations to meet. I prefer R. E. Burks as auditor.

As a personal favor I am going to ask you to advance me $250, which Miss Eaves can deposit at the Exchange Bank so that I can continue operations until the sale is completed without making a local loan. I cannot see why you should have any objection to this and it will certainly help me out greatly.

Will you please advise by return mail as I do not want to give a check that would be turned down, especially in a strange place.

Yours very truly,

TOM WATTS.

WATTS-NEWSOME CO.,
Birmingham, Ala., November 19, 1938.

Mr. THOMAS H. WATTS,
Panama City, Fla.

DEAR TOM: I received your letter of November 16 this morning, and you will find attached hereto a certified check for the $250 which you needed.

I called Mr. Burks and he advises that he will not be able to make our audit before December 5, but will do it by that time.

You will note that I have placed on the back of this check the following statement:

"This sum is advanced the payee as part payment for his stock in the Watts-Newsome Co., the value of such interest to be determined by an audit by R. E. Burks, in accordance with the provisions of the constitution and bylaws of the company, the auditor having been selected by the payee. The balance of such interest of the payee to be paid to him in cash within a reasonable time after completion of the audit."

This was done upon the advice of the bank for the purpose of establishing the fact that this $250 and the $300 which Bill got when she was in Birmingham are to be deducted from what may be due you at the time payment is made.

I will be able to give you a check for the amount due you as soon as Burks completes his audit and you and Bill sign the necessary papers making the sale legal.

I assume from your letter that you have given the matter proper consideration and that you are doing this of your own free will and with Bill's consent.

I would appreciate you and Bill both signing this letter on the bottom with the statement that what I have said herein is correct and confirms the agreement between us.

Just return the letter to me so that I can give it to the bank as they require it, and nothing can be done until it is returned.

Sincerely,

JOHN P. NEWSOME.

I have given the above agreement careful consideration and am signing same of my own free will and with Mrs. Watts consent.

T. H. WATTS.
WILLA S. WATTS.

PANAMA CITY, FLA., *November 25, 1938.*

Mr. JOHN P. NEWSOME,
Watts-Newsome Co., Birmingham, Ala.

DEAR JOHN: Enclosed find paper duly signed by Bill and me. We went over the matter very thoroughly and both of us decided owing to my health it was the best thing to do. Just as soon as R. E. Burks is through we are both ready to sign.

Please see that Miss Eaves gets my last of the month check in the bank around the first, as I have to send to Jacksonville for one license I have to buy and want to do it by the first, since I cannot open up without it.

Yours very truly,

T. H. WATTS.

PANAMA CITY, FLA., *December 9, 1938.*

Mr. JOHN P. NEWSOME,
Watts-Newsome Co., Birmingham, Ala.

DEAR JOHN: Tom received your letter this morning regarding Mr. Burks auditing the books. Tom is sick and not able to write you but has requested me to do so for him. He seemed to have understood from your letter that the books were to have been audited before the 5th and that any papers were to be signed immediately. Because of deciding to sell he has not made any loans and with the building he is doing has found himself badly in need of ready money. I have hesitated to write to you, John, but with his physical condition and worry too he has simply gone to pieces. He has asked you to advance him money, deducting it from whatever he sells for, and I am wondering if you can do so again. He needs badly $150. This would hold him until the sale is completed. We will greatly appreciate this if you feel that you can do it. Please wire him if you can do so and have it deposited in the Exchange Bank.

With kindest regards to you and Lulu, I remain,

Yours very truly,

BILL.

ROBERT E. BURKS,
ACCOUNTANT AND AUDITOR,
Birmingham, Ala., December 12, 1938.

Mr. JOHN P. NEWSOME,
President, Watts-Newsome Co.,
Birmingham, Ala.

DEAR SIR: The balance sheet attached has been prepared from the accounts of Watts-Newsome Co. as at November 30, 1938, and is in accord with the records of the corporation, except for minor adjustments which were made in order to show a true value of the stock at this time.

Having made examinations of the accounts of the corporation since its organization, I am thoroughly familiar with its operations, and believe that the attached balance sheet represents a fair value of its assets and a correct statement of its liabilities. I have not examined the accounts in detail since July 1, 1938.

In my opinion the stock now has a fair value of $206.66 a share, or a total value of $10,333.14 for 50 shares.

Respectfully,

R. E. BURKS.

STATE OF ALABAMA,
Jefferson County:

Know all men by these presents that for and in consideration of the sum of $10,333.14 cash in hand paid by John P. Newsome to the undersigned Thomas H. Watts and his wife, Willa S. Watts, the receipt whereof is hereby acknowledged, we do hereby sell, convey, transfer, assign, and deliver unto John P. Newsome 49 shares of the capital stock of the Watts-Newsome Co., owned by the undersigned Thomas H. Watts, and one share of the capital stock of said Watts-Newsome Co. owned by the undersigned Willa S. Watts.

And it is expressly understood and agreed that for and in consideration of the purchase of said stock by the said John P. Newsome that we and each of us separately and severally do hereby release, relinquish, and discharge any and all interest or claim to any interest in the said Watts-Newsome Co., of any nature, character, or kind whatsoever.

Dated this the 19th day of December 1938.

THOMAS H. WATTS.
WILLA S. WATTS.

Attest:

R. DUPONT THOMPSON.
A. L. EAVES.

Mr. Speaker, now here on the back page of the paper is a headline box which I shall read to you and which I shall also insert in the RECORD:

JOHN NEWSOME'S CREED

I believe in the big ones eating the little ones.

John Newsome, Jim Simpson, Frank Dixon, Ham Fish, Clare Hoffman, Thomas E. Dewey, Herbert Hoover, Adolf Hitler.

For your information, Jim Simpson is the unsuccessful candidate for the United States Senate in this primary and he is also president pro tempore of the Alabama State Senate and is serving his third term there.

Frank Dixon is the immediate past Governor of Alabama.

I am quite sure that the Members of the House recognize the other names of Ham Fish, Clare Hoffman, Thomas E. Dewey, Herbert Hoover, and Adolf Hitler.

The implication in this statement is that everyone named is a supporter of Hitler, is anti-American, and is for losing the war. This is slander of the worst kind—completely malicious in its intent—and can serve no purpose except the creation of disunity, hatred, and bitterness.

Note the next headline on the front page, "NEWSOME pays $60 a week rent at hotel, lives at Wardman Park with big rich and lobbyists."

This is also distorted. I do live at the Wardman Park, but I do not pay such rent.

This is totally unimportant except that it is such a distortion and complete falsehood that it could only have been used as part of the smear program aimed at building prejudice and for the development of the class warfare which is being fostered by Sidney Hillman and his communistic associates.

Again on the first page, note the column of questions headed "Why doesn't John answer these?" And I shall insert these questions in the RECORD, together with my answers thereto.

You will note that these are questions—not statements—and are smears by inference, skirting the libel laws.

I made no attempt to answer these questions during the campaign for it is impossible to deny false charges as fast as they can be made up. I shall, however, now answer them so that the people of my district can be informed of their complete falsity.

WHY DOESN'T JOHN ANSWER THESE?

These questions have been asked JOHN NEWSOME for 3 weeks, but so far he has not answered a single one of them:

1. How much commission did you make out of the sale of radios for State police patrol cars?

2. How much income did you report to the Federal Government from whisky accounts from which you benefited?

3. How many thousands of dollars have you drawn out of the Public Treasury in the form of a pension as a partially disabled captain of World War No. 1?

4. Where did you get the thousands of dollars necessary to buy a sufficiently large interest in one of Alabama's biggest insurance companies to warrant your election as chairman of the board of directors?

5. Why did one of your associates state he hoped you would not run for reelection, as they feared it would lead to an investigation of your insurance business?

6. Did you benefit in any way from the sale of State liquor and cigarette tax stamps in 1939, on which low bids were thrown out?

7. Have you reported to the State Securities Commission the ownership of any distilleries stocks?

8. How many World War No. 1 veterans were discharged at your instance while you were a member of Governor Dixon's so-called Personnel Improvement Shift Committee?

9. Did you benefit in any way from the transfer of the State school-book contract from E. E. Forbes & Sons Piano Co. to Baggett?

10. Why did you let Governor Dixon select your secretary, giving this job to a Dixon henchman instead of any one of a dozen more capable men who had worked for your reelection?

11. Was a fee paid to you by an electrical contractor to secure a priority for him from the Government?

12. Did you benefit in the form of a commission from the purchase of road machinery by the State, and how much?

13. With a $10,000-a-year salary and an equally large expense allowance as a Congressman, a large income from your business, a pension as a partially disabled captain of the United States Army, why did you put your wife on the Government pay roll as a clerk at $125 a month?

14. How did you increase your net worth by $104,000 during Governor Dixon's administration, according to Dun and Bradstreet?

Question 1:

How much commission did you make out of the sale of radios for State police-patrol cars?

Answer. The company in which I am a stockholder, on open bids and in accordance with law, representing a standard radio line which we have handled for years and of which we are exclusive agents, were the low bidders for 12 radio sets which we sold to the State. Many additional radio sets were sold to the State on the same basis by other radio jobbers of the State.

Question 2:

How much income did you report to the Federal Government from whisky accounts from which you benefited?

Answer. This is a deliberate, inferential lie. I have never represented any whisky company, directly or indirectly, and never received any commission from any distilling company.

Failure of those who wrote this question to ask for prosecution for income-tax evasion proves their dishonesty.

Question 3:

How many thousands of dollars have you drawn out of the Public Treasury in the form of a pension as a partially "disabled" captain of World War No. 1?

Answer. Having received my disability in battle in the Argonne Forest while on active combat duty in the First World War, I am not ashamed of my 40-percent service-connected disability for which I draw $40 per month as a pension.

The phrasing of this question also implies fraud on the part of the Veterans' Administration.

Question 4:

Where did you get the thousands of dollars necessary to buy a sufficiently large interest in one of Alabama's biggest insurance companies to warrant your election as chairman of the board of directors?

Answer. By hard work, long hours, and application, together with some measure of thrift, I managed to have enough money to buy a minority interest in the insurance company referred to. My election as chairman of the board of the company was based upon the esteem for my business experience and training by my colleagues who own the controlling interest in the company.

Question 5:

Why did one of your associates state he hoped you would not run for reelection, as they feared it would lead to an investigation of your insurance business?

Answer. No such statement was ever made by any of my associates who actively and sincerely supported me in my campaign.

The conduct of our insurance business is a matter of public record and can be investigated by anyone at any time. It operates as all insurance companies under the supervision of the State director of insurance. We are proud of its progress, its stability, and the protection which it affords its policyholders.

Question 6:

Did you benefit in any way from the sale of State liquor and cigarette tax stamps in 1939, on which low bids were thrown out?

Answer. I not only did not benefit, I had no knowledge nor interest in these bids. I do not know to whom they were awarded.

Question 7:

How many World War No. 1 veterans were discharged at your instance while you were a member of Governor Dixon's so-called personnel improvement shift committee?

Answer. As the campaign manager for the then Governor, Frank M. Dixon, I had nothing to do with any discharges of any personnel who worked for the State. I knew very few of them personally.

Being thoroughly familiar with the Governor's friends and supporters and in keeping with the established political custom of the State, whenever a job vacancy occurred, I did my best to place a suitably qualified supporter of the Governor in that position. The people who held the positions under the preceding Governor received them as a reward for their political support and I have never understood how a political job, earned by political activity, could cause hurt or harm when it was lost the same way it was originally received.

This was prior to the State civil service laws.

Question 8:

Did you benefit in any way from the transfer of the State school book contract from E. E. Forbes & Sons Piano Co. to Baggett?

Answer. No. I expected nothing and received nothing.

According to law, this contract should have been let to Baggett on the basis of the low bid. According to law, no other course could be followed except to award the contract to the low responsible bidder, and this is a matter of public record.

Question 9:

Why did you let Governor Dixon select your secretary, giving this job to a Dixon henchman instead of any one of a dozen more capable men who had worked for your reelection?

Answer. My secretary, Amos Kirby, a man of outstanding reputation for integrity and honesty in our district, is a friend of many years standing. A Con-

gressman and his secretary work very closely together. It was essential that I have a secretary, someone in whom I placed implicit confidence and someone with whom I could work in complete harmony.

Mr. Kirby filled these specifications, was willing to sacrifice his own business in Birmingham to accompany me to Washington and help do a job for our district, and for this I am grateful.

Frank Dixon neither knew nor had anything to do with this appointment. The question of choosing a secretary is purely a personal matter whether you be in private or public life.

Question 10:

Was a fee paid to you by an electrical contractor to secure a priority for him from the Government?

Answer. No fee has ever been received by me for any service to any constituent.

Question 11:

Did you benefit in the form of a commission from the purchase of road machinery by the State, and how much?

Answer. I did not.

Question 12:

With a $10,000 a year salary and an equally large expense allowance as a Congressman, a large income from your business, a pension as a partially "disabled" captain of the United States Army, why did you put your wife on the Government pay roll as a clerk at $125 a month?

Answer. This question is asked to create prejudice and foster the developing class warfare now being promoted by Sidney Hillman and the communistic leaders active in the C. I. O. Political Action Committee with headquarters in New York.

The Federal law establishes an annual expense for clerk hire in each congressional office of $6,500 per year. This money does not go to the Congressman, it goes directly to the employee who works in the congressional office and is paid directly from the Federal pay roll. Any money which is not spent in such clerk hire reverts to the Federal Treasury.

Maximum salary to secretaries, fixed by law, was $3,900 per annum. This was the salary upon which my secretary came to Washington. Added to this was the cost of my assistant secretary which, at that time, was $1,500 per annum.

This left an unexpended balance of $1,100 per annum which was too little to hire a full-time stenographer.

Because of the war and war restrictions, the volume of work in all congressional offices has tremendously increased and to handle the business of the district, extra stenographic help was needed and employed from time to time.

In order that we efficiently handle the official business of our district, it was necessary to build a petty cash fund in the office from which we could officially pay for the needed extra help. My wife was placed upon the pay roll at $91.66 per month. She received the check for this amount, endorsed it, and turned it over to our official petty cash fund in the office. She was on the Federal pay roll 7 months and then removed because we had sufficient funds on hand to serve out the term of office.

At the beginning of the campaign for reelection, when my secretary left his post of duty in Washington, he was removed from the Federal pay roll and the amount he would have received reverted to the Federal Treasury. This was contrary to all precedent.

Mr. RANKIN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NEWSOME. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. Having been one of the men who was marked for purge by this communistic outfit, I hold in one hand a copy of a cartoon which says at the top of the page: "Meet the donkey-phant, the Democrat who votes like a Republican." Below it is a cartoon of an animal with a donkey's head on one end and an elephant's head on the other, under which are the words, "Which is JOHN COSTELLO?" I am told that copies of it were circulated by the thousands in the district in California represented by the gentleman from California [Mr. COSTELLO].

In the other hand I have the same circular which says at the top: "Meet the donkey-phant, the Democrat who votes like a Republican," with the identical cartoon on it, which is communistic, as I said, in its appearance. Below it are these words: "Which is JOHN RANKIN?"

These two cartoons were drawn by the same person. In the case of the gentleman from California [Mr. COSTELLO] I do not know where the money came from to pay for the cartoon circulated in his district, but we do know that the money that paid for untold thousands of these circulars circulated in my district came in from outside the State. That shows a communistic organization stretching entirely across the country by which these un-American activities are used to try to purge Members of Congress who refuse to bow to such influences, whether they are Democrats or Republicans.

I just want to ask the gentleman from Alabama if that same cartoon was circulated in his district.

Mr. NEWSOME. I may say to the gentleman from Mississippi that they went a little further with me. Look at the flaming headlines on this Newsome smear edition—the whole paper being devoted to that purpose.

Mr. RANKIN. I might say that probably nothing ever did me more good politically than the resentment that this kind of stuff stirred in the minds of decent voters in the district I have the honor to represent.

Mr. NEWSOME. I will read the headlines:

Wouldn't believe NEWSOME on oath, ex-partner says.

NEWSOME fired World War No. 1 veterans off State pay rolls.

NEWSOME fortune up $104,000 under Dixon.

Simpson threatens teachers fighting NEWSOME's election.

I am sure we cannot expect that paper to endorse me politically.

Question 13:

How did you increase your net worth by $104,000 during Governor Dixon's administration, according to Dun & Bradstreet?

Answer. This is another distortion of the truth. The $104,000 referred to in this question is taken from the last financial statement of the company of which I am the president. This accumulation of capital is the result of more than 20 years of hard work.

The company financial statements from year to year show its progress has been slow but fairly steady except during the years of the big depression.

I take this opportunity to express gratitude to a kindly Providence, to my associates who have worked with me, and to the fundamental political structure existing in this country of free enterprise and free labor for the modest success which the company has made.

Again, note on the back page of this political smear sheet: "Simpson threatens teachers fighting NEWSOME's reelection," and I am inserting this article in the RECORD without taking the time to read it.

I merely comment on the article with the statement that State Senator Simpson was busy in his own campaign for the United States Senate. He had no part in my race and neither had I any part in his. This was not only true in this campaign but the previous campaign.

"JIM" TRIES TO ELECT "JOHN" FOR BIG MULE CLIENTS—"I'M STILL BOSS OF JEFFERSON COUNTY," SIMPSON RAGED, FORGETTING LISTER HILL CARRIED COUNTY FOR ROOSEVELT

BIRMINGHAM.—Defeated, discredited, and thoroughly whipped in the May 2 primary, Jefferson County's Senator James A. Simpson has nevertheless stuck his big nose into the run-off campaign of JOHN NEWSOME for Congress with a threat against the teachers of Birmingham public schools "I'm still boss of this county, and it will go hard with the teachers if they do anything to hurt JOHN NEWSOME or help Luther Patrick."

Waving the big stick over the heads of the little women school teachers, "Big Jim" Simpson called on Birmingham's school authorities and delivered his ultimatum to do harm to the teachers and their educational improvement measures unless the city school officials and teachers would go along with him in his undercover attempt to elect JOHN NEWSOME for his big business bosses, even though he himself suffered the most humiliating defeat ever handed a would-be big politician in Alabama's history.

While it has been known for some time that Simpson was tied up to NEWSOME hook, line, and sinker, this was the first revelation that Simpson was again attempting to do the bidding of his big business clients in their frantic attempt to retrieve something of their defeat when they put all their money on Simpson and he was so thoroughly trounced by pro-Roosevelt Senator LISTER HILL.

Like NEWSOME, who went into office on a plea of supporting Roosevelt, and voted with the Republicans against the President in wartime, Simpson based his whole campaign against HILL on the voters' repudiating President Roosevelt. Inasmuch as Simpson was beaten and HILL was elected, with the Ninth Congressional District voting to support the President, leaders among the teachers took this to mean Simpson's attempt to help NEWSOME would have the opposite effect and send Simpson's protégé down to defeat along with his would-be benefactor.

Educational leaders in the county were incensed beyond measure at Simpson's sticking his nose into the Newsome-Patrick race, and predicted "Big Jim" would receive another deserved set-back from the teachers and their friends for his attempt to grind them under his heel and keep his hold as the political boss of Jefferson County.

"We are tired of Jim Simpson kicking us around," one of the teachers said, "and we are going to the polls May 30 and show him again that he can't do that to us. Maybe when we beat him again along with his friend, JOHN NEWSOME, he will understand that this time we mean it."

And again I call your attention to the headlines on page 3 together with a clipping from the article, both of which I am inserting in the RECORD:

HIGHWAY MACHINERY, "SPOT BOTTLE" AND OTHER DEALS EYED—CONGRESSMAN CALLED ON TO EXPLAIN WIFE ON GOVERNMENT PAY ROLL; DRAWS VETERAN'S PENSION, INSURANCE BUSINESS

Probably the most famous, or infamous, deal in which NEWSOME was involved was the "spot bottle" liquor deal. This was brought to light when the Federal Government brought action against the State. The deal was arranged between Governor Dixon, Newsome, as patronage manager; Wilbur DeVan, former A. B. C. liquor administrator, and Marshall Johnson, Birmingham represenative of the American Distilling Co.

I have already answered these false charges, but as further proof, I insert here in the RECORD photostats of the original letters written by the Honorable Chauncey Sparks, now Governor of the State of Alabama, and Hayse Tucker, director of finance of the State of Alabama, addressed to former Gov. Frank M. Dixon.

These letters speak for themselves and show how completely false and slanderous these malicious statements were.

This false charge was deliberately made in an effort to influence the feeling of the honest and sincere prohibitionists of my district so that they would no longer support me.

STATE OF ALABAMA,
DEPARTMENT OF FINANCE,
Montgomery, May 4, 1944.

Hon. FRANK M. DIXON,
Bowers, Dixon & Dunn,
Birmingham, Ala.

DEAR SIR: In view of the adverse publicity in certain newspapers in Alabama with reference to the purchase of bulk whisky—so-called spot bottle purchase—from the American Distilling Co. by the State on November 14, 1942, at the request of Governor Sparks I made a complete investigation of this contract and its surrounding circumstances.

My investigation convinced me that the contract was completely free of fraud, taint, or illegality of any kind and that no fees or commissions were received by anyone other than the duly constituted representatives of the American Distilling Co.

That this purchase was for the benefit of the State is unquestioned. One hundred and seventy-five thousand, five hundred and forty-two cases were obtained at a price of $1.65 per original proof gallon, f. o. b., Terre Haute, Ind., with storage charges paid the date of invoice. All this stock has been sold and the State derived a profit of approximately one and one-half million dollars.

My investigation included a report on what effort had been made to obtain liquor from other distillers, and the report shows that every known source of merchandise was contacted—the administrator was sent on a trip to Louisville and New York to contact all distillers in an effort to secure merchandise to offset the curtailment of the necessary supply needed at that time.

Three or four companies agreed to increase their allotment in small amounts, but one distillery canceled a large order.

It was due to this personal contact that the administrator learned of the purchase by the American Distilling Co. of the Ben Burke Co., which made available this quantity of merchandise.

In the face of the present shortage, should such a purchase again be possible it would receive my prompt approval as director of the department of finance.

Very truly yours,

HAYSE TUCKER,
Director of Finance.

STATE OF ALABAMA,
EXECUTIVE OFFICE,
Montgomery, May 5, 1944.

Hon. FRANK M. DIXON,
Birmingham, Ala.

DEAR GOVERNOR DIXON: Since assuming office my contact with and investigation of what has been called the Spot Bottle Liquor Deal in November 1942 leads me to make the following statement: There was no appearance of irregularity on the part of anyone connected with this purchase. The contract appeared free of taint, fraud, or illegality of any kind. In fact, it was a wise business deal which enabled Alabama to offer more liquor for sale and to make a larger profit than otherwise possible.

I make this statement in justice to those connected with the transaction. You are at liberty to use it in any way you see fit.

Sincerely yours,

CHAUNCEY SPARKS,
Governor.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. NEWSOME. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. I hold in my hand a communistic circular that, I am informed by people who seem to know, is being sent out by the thousands, headed "The Black Record of Congress." Therein appears the statement that this Congress is the "worst in American history." I have checked with the American Federation of Labor, and I find that organization had nothing to do with this circular.

It is an attempt to blackmail at least, I would say, 90 percent of the Members of both Houses of the Congress of the United States. No name is signed to it, but it is sent out from New York. I wonder if it was also circulated in the district of the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. NEWSOME. May I advise the gentleman from Mississippi that I received that circular this morning, and I have been attempting to find out who is the Labor Institute of America, who composes it, and who makes it up. Does the gentleman know?

Mr. RANKIN. The best I can find out is that it is a little group of Communists in New York, who have a fellow by the name of Arthur J. Seed in the office sending this stuff out. The object of it seems to be to smear and discredit the Congress in the minds of the American people. I am told that it is being sent out by the thousands. I am asking the Dies committee and also the Anderson committee to investigate and find out where this material is coming from and to call on the Department of Justice to institute proper proceedings to prosecute, if necessary, the instigators of this malicious propaganda. I was wondering if the gentleman from Alabama was familiar with it and if other Members of the House had seen it.

Mr. NEWSOME. The gentleman from Mississippi will recall that my primaries were early in the year, in May, and this is a recent addition to the other things that they have been using.

Mr. RANKIN. This is not only a direct assault upon but it is an infamous insult to at least 90 percent of the Members of both Houses of the Congress of the United States. A member of the American Federation of Labor today told me that he understood that these copies were being mailed out literally by the thousands by this group in New York which, I am informed, is nothing in God's world but a Communist front organization.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NEWSOME. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. The gentleman from Mississippi will find upon investigation that the organization to which he has referred and scores of other similar organizations are all financed and backed by the same group of people, so that it is like an octopus with one head, with many of its tentacles sticking out and operating along the same line and with the same propaganda, but under different names.

Mr. NEWSOME. I now pick up the next regular edition of the C. I. O.-P. A. C. Alabama News Digest of Birmingham in which it expresses its opinion about the election, and I insert this expression in the RECORD for your information.

I shall quote a certain part of this article because I feel that again we have a clear indication of the continuing policy in the promotion of class warfare in our country, and I read from the article and insert it in full in the RECORD:

[From the Birmingham News Digest of June 1, 1944]

HILL, PEPPER, RAINES, AND PATRICK VICTORIES QUELL SOUTHERN REVOLT—PEOPLE REFUSE TO FOLLOW LEADERSHIP OF REACTIONARY BIG BUSINESS LEADERS AND STOOGES, SO REBELLION FAILS

BIRMINGHAM.—The people of the Ninth Congressional District of (Jefferson County) Alabama marched to the polls Tuesday, May 30, and showed a marked preference for corn bread and sleeping at the foot of the bed over spot bottle and black bow ties and dancing slippers.

In other words, Jefferson Countians preferred ex-Congressman Luther Patrick to the incumbent, JOHN NEWSOME.

But more than that, the action of the Ninth District's voters in marking their ballots for Patrick over NEWSOME drove the final nail in the coffin of the long-planned and amply financed revolt against the Roosevelt administration by which they hoped to bring about a virtual secession in the South from the Democratic Party and thereby elect an anti-Roosevelt Congress, if not prevent the reelection of the President himself.

NEWSOME'S election 2 years ago was part of the national drive of the antiadministration forces to deliberately foster chaos by criticizing every act and throwing every possible stumbling block in the path of the administration even in the successful prosecution of the war.

In doing this they followed the pattern of the master psychologist and madman of Europe, Adolf Hitler, who deliberately fostered chaos and deliberately postponed his own rise to power until chaos made him Der Fuhrer.

This is beyond taking:

The number of American lives sacrificed needlessly by the chaos created by antiadmin-

istration forces in wartime will never be known, and they must be put down as martyrs in the cause of preserving our democracy; but America was big enough and had resources ample enough to go on winning the war and not be engulfed by the sabotage at home by interests that did not know what they were doing, that were blinded against the best interests of their country by their hatred of "that man in the White House," or were the tools of the master propagandists of Hitler.

No matter how well they marshaled their resources, their money bags behind the Jim Simpsons, the John Newsomes, the Joe Starnes, and the Ollie Edmunds, they were never able to reach a high enough pitch with their propaganda; they were never able to create sufficient chaos no matter how much they criticized, obstructed, and hamstrung the President in the prosecution of the war so that when "Der Fuhrer" Dewey or Bricker or Stassen reached for power he would be heralded as a saviour of the people as was Hitler when he was drafted by the people of Germany.

The "anti-Roosevelies" chose to make their fight in the South, in the heart of the Democratic Party, but they were repelled by the people when Jim Simpson and JOHN NEWSOME, and all they stand for, were defeated, and CLAUDE PEPPER and LISTER HILL, and the things they stand for, were returned to power.

Labor had little part in Luther Patrick's election because its political activities have not yet gathered sufficient strength to make themselves felt at the ballot box enough to elect any man; but laborites added their strength in a solid block to other groups of Americans who believed like them that JOHN NEWSOME, as a tool of Frank Dixon and his gang of big business interests, is a menace to his country, as the Representative of the Ninth District of Congress.

And so another chapter has ended in the struggle of money power against the free expression of the people in our democracy.

Statements such as these not only imply but state in no uncertain terms that all who disagree with each and every policy which this group advocates are anti-American, are trying to lose the war, and are traitors to this country.

Such warped reasoning certainly does not help unify the Nation, but sows the seeds of internal doubt and mistrust to the point that the harvest could be violence.

With the destruction of the legislative body which is the direct voice of the people, comes the first step in the destruction of democracy.

Articles and statements such as I have just read seem to be part and parcel of the organized campaign, not only to smear and belittle the individual Congressman, but to destroy faith and confidence in the Congress as an institution.

Such propaganda may lead many to believe that this war is not being fought by all Americans, but only by certain groups in America.

It would deny that the cost of the war in both blood and money is paid by all Americans, both Democrat and Republican, as well as both labor and capital.

Such articles are aimed toward the creation of belief that no work, no brains, no intelligence, no truth, no honesty of purpose, no love of country could exist anywhere except in certain groups.

It is a campaign carried on in the name of winning the war by people of warped minds who are filled with intolerance, hatred, and selfish ambition.

It is the kind of public smearing that deters able, honest, and decent citizens from offering themselves for public office, even in the emergency of war.

It is the kind of reasoning that causes strikes and delays production.

It is the kind of reasoning that, carried to its conclusion, would destroy decency, respect for truth and honor, and ultimately our Government and the human freedoms which it guarantees.

Having taken my oath of office when I became a Member of the Congress, which in part, states that I hereby swear to uphold and defend the Constitution of the United States of America from all enemies, both foreign and domestic, and that I take this oath without any mental reservation or purpose of evasion whatsoever, and in keeping with this oath, I have assumed my personal responsibility for its fulfillment and have accounted to my people for my actions.

I have made this accounting without compromise of my fundamental convictions and without promises to any special group or interest.

Having done this, I accept the verdict with a clear conscience—without regret—and with the inner satisfaction that to the limits of my ability and within the soundness of my mortal judgment, I have attempted to represent no interest in my term of office except the public interest.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NEWSOME. I am glad to yield.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I want to say here, and I express the views of practically every Member of Congress, that there has never been a more courageous, a more honest, a more diligent, or a more patriotic Representative on this floor than the distinguished gentleman from Alabama [Mr. NEWSOME] who has just addressed us.

Mr. NEWSOME. I am deeply grateful to the gentleman from Mississippi.

INTERNATIONAL DISSEMINATION OF NEWS

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the resolution, Senate Concurrent Resolution 53.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Congress of the United States expresses its belief in the world-wide right of interchange of news by news gathering and distributing agencies, whether individual or associate, by any means, without discrimination as to sources, distribution, rates or charges; and that this right should be protected by international compact.

Passed the Senate September 21 (legislative day, September 1), 1944.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, this is the so-called freedom of the press resolution?

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. That is correct.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I am certainly in favor of the general principles promulgated here. I would even go further. I would have a little more freedom of the press here in Washington.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. I will say to the gentleman this resolution is an expression by Congress that it is our belief that our press associations should be accorded the same rights in foreign countries which we accord to foreign press associations in this country.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. There is not any question about that.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The Senate concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

WAR SHIPPING ADMINISTRATION

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 4163) to amend section 2 of Public Law 17, Seventy-eighth Congress, relating to functions of the War Shipping Administration, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

(1) Page 2, line 14, strike out "adequate."

(2) Page 2, line 14, after "payment", insert ", in accordance with rate schedules provided by the United States Employees' Compensation Act."

(3) Page 2, line 22, after "exists", insert "; such payments to commence if and when insurance benefits provided by the War Shipping Administration for such person shall have been exhausted."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, this is more of a restrictive measure than was passed by the House.

Mr. BLAND. It is. The language used in the bill that came from the committee to the House was "adequate." Neither myself nor anybody else were entirely satisfied as to just what "adequate" would be, although the testimony showed it was in accordance with certain schedules that had been worked out for the compensation of seamen. These men are totally and permanently disabled.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. This brings them under the regular rules that have been set forth by legislative action?

Mr. BLAND. It brings them in accordance with the United States compensation.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

[Mr. SIKES addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by inserting two newspaper articles.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

THE COMING ELECTION

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Speaker, on November 7, 1944, determination will be made by the voters of America of whether or not there shall be a change in the management of the affairs of the Nation. It will be a momentous decision in many ways.

America is at war and will be at war for many long months ahead. Germany may unconditionally surrender before election day and she may not. When will Japan be brought to terms? Any study of the war situation in the western Pacific leads to the inevitable conclusion that for many months ahead there will be a great expenditure of blood and treasure. The job may be far bigger than the most sanguine among us dares to hope or expect. Its magnitude none can deny.

On November 7, therefore, we may still be at war with Germany or engaged in the immediate tasks that will confront us consequent upon victory, and we will have commenced on a far larger scale the prosecution of the war with Japan. If, by then, the Germans have laid down their arms, we shall be engaged in a tremendous transitional task entailing the establishment and conduct of occupational forces, of demobilizing and returning such elements as are not to be utilized in the western Pacific theater, and of transferring large forces of ground, sea, and air forces to augment the forces presently fighting the Japanese. It is difficult to conceive of any greater task, a task more far-reaching in its consequences, superimposed upon any Government.

The November election will affect practically every department and Federal agency at Washington. A change in the head of the Government means a change right down the line to the lowest non-civil-service executives.

Normally, changes in leading Federal officials would have no marked effect upon the continuity of regular Federal functions, but we are not and will not be faced by a normal situation. Hence, can America, confronted as it is today and as it will be confronted for many months ahead with problems which reach into every household in the land, afford to make such a complete change now? A change would mean inexperienced and floundering leadership for the space of several months. During such period the war and, possibly, the peace, as it would apply to the European theater, would be without positive, knowing direction. Reconversion, which might be upon us to the extent occasioned by a subdued Germany, would be delayed and messed up under untried management—management which would need to find itself and become conversant with problems and procedure. Would such a result be conducive to the best interests of America?

Ten weeks—more than 2 months—intervene between election day and inauguration day. Many additional weeks would elapse between inauguration day and the selection and confirmation of Cabinet officers and lesser executive officials, and many additional weeks before all could capably discharge their responsibilities. The people of America should weigh carefully what such a state of affairs might entail. Here are some likely results:

Prolongation of the war;

Delay of reconversion measures, which must be geared with the progress of the war and the peace;

Delay in the readjustment of employment consequent upon transfer from war to peacetime production;

Delay in the reemployment or placement of members of the armed services as and when they assume a civilian status;

Delay in the prosecution of measures looking to the promotion of world trade in the interest of our farms and factories; and

Delay in exploring and consummating measures looking to the establishment of a lasting peace.

These and many others are matters that concern America; that concern America now and that will concern America down through the years. They should be foremost in the minds of every voter on coming November 7. That which is best for America should be their primary consideration.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the Resident Commissioner of the Philippines is recognized for 10 minutes.

THE PHILIPPINE ISLANDS

Mr. ROMULO. Mr. Speaker, this is in the nature of a brief hail and farewell to my colleagues in Congress before leaving this floor and the United States of America.

I leave shortly for the Pacific on what I trust is my way back to the Philippines.

The present destiny of the Philippines lies in the contested Pacific, but its future remains here with you, and as a Filipino I am content to know that the Commonwealth of the Philippines is safe in your hands.

The passing of the two recent joint resolutions in behalf of the Philippines marks two vital and progressive steps in a great American experiment that has been conducted from the beginning in the truest American tradition. I refer to America's experiment in democracy in the Philippines as climaxed by the setting ahead of the date of Philippine independence prior to July 4, 1946, and the creation of the Filipino Rehabilitation Commission, together with the provision establishing naval and air bases in the Philippines for the mutual protection of the Philippines and the United States.

The passage of these two bills, which were vigorously supported by President Sergio Osmeña, has insured the Philippines not only our long-desired independence but also pledges us the means for the preservation of that independence.

We in the Philippines need no longer live in dread of threats rising in Asia. We will be independent and our strength assured, and we are ready to repay in full this boon of independence and protection.

It is this we have wanted. This is what Manuel L. Quezon asked for upon this floor, pleading for freedom first in a broken English he did not know, later eloquently in the language he made his own. It is this which Sergio Osmeña has toiled to achieve, with unsurpassed ability and patriotism, for the greater part of the past half century in the Philippines. It is the desire of 18,000,000 Filipino hearts.

But the Filipino political leaders, living or dead, who fought so long for independence cannot accept the full honor for its achievement.

Independence was won also by the Filipino who fought and died on Bataan, and by those who today are valiantly opposing Japanese domination in the Philippines.

Today we find ourselves on the threshold of victory. We are about to recover the Philippines. The world will indeed be watching what happens there as the final work begins in America's great democratic experiment. From the start America based its premise in the Philippines upon the human platform. Its framework was built by the Americans who planted the concept of democracy in the Philippines. Its foundations rest deep in Bataan.

Now that victory is nearing we are confronted with the problem of the rehabilitation of the Philippines. America's work there is not wholly done. You cannot wash your hands of us and say "The experiment is over, the work complete." You cannot. Too much that is America is in the Philippines. The blood, faith, and dreams of men of two races were welded together there in the most unique human experiment of all time.

There are pending now in Congress certain bills dealing with the naturalization of Filipinos. Eighty-three thousand six hundred and seventy-seven native-born Filipinos were in the United States, Hawaii, and Alaska on December 11, 1941. Thousands of them are now in the armed services of the United States, in the merchant marine, or are engaged in the war industries, and in agriculture.

Mr. Speaker, take the scales of justice in your hands, balance them with a question. Do you hold unworthy of naturalization the countryman, brother, cousin, father of the Filipino who fought under the American flag to hold the Philippines

for an America that had not yet given him the independence he so desired?

Can you deny the right of citizenship to the countryman, brother, cousin, father of that boy who fought shoulder to shoulder with your own son on Bataan, who shared your boy's handful of rice, his slice of rotten meat, his stinking pit of a foxhole that held a humanity greater than both because it was shared?

That was the best America could offer that Filipino—on Bataan.

Remember, that Filipino who fought on Bataan was not a free soul.

His country was not yet independent. Japan had promised him independence, brown supremacy, Asia for the Asiatics, and the white man in the dust. But the Filipino chose the white man's side—in the dust of Bataan.

Japan had tried for years to lure that Filipino with the crafty bribes of racial discrimination and promised power. Do you not think this was temptation to the Filipino who had fought, and his father and grandfather before him, hundreds of years against first the Spaniards and then the Americans, for a promised independence that always lay on ahead?

Could he be human and not be tempted?

But he did not trust Japan.

The Stars and Stripes was torn down in the Philippines by Japanese hands. Filipino and American hands together caught it up and set it on the peninsula of Bataan and the rock of Corregidor. White hands and brown fell back from it in death.

Call this pragmatism if you choose. Say that the Filipino was siding with the strongest country and the one certain to win in the end. That is not true. I know. From my country on the rim of Asia it seemed to us that the tremendous tide rising in the Far East would wash us out, along with our dream of democracy for which we had fought from Balintawak to Bataan. The white man was whipped and disgraced in the Far East. He had fallen in Hong Kong, Singapore, Burma, Java. The dream of Asiatic empire was dinned into our ears by Japanese propagandists. "Rise and avenge yourselves against the white despots now," they told us.

But in the Philippines we did not know any American despots. We had known only friends.

We were in no position to side with those friends. What were we? A veritable handful of a people by Far Eastern standards—18,000,000 Christian Filipinos among 1,000,000,000 inflamed Asiatics.

But—we had great leaders.

May I pay tribute upon this floor to the courage of our Filipino generals, of whose fate we are in ignorance, four Filipino generals who in Bataan led and directed their Filipino forces from headquarters they had set up in pigpens.

May I pay tribute to the soldier I am leaving the United States to rejoin in Australia, the miracle builder of bricks without straw, he who built those bricks into a rampart that held back the Far East—Douglas MacArthur.

At that time he had nothing.

Nothing to hurl back against those hordes swarming in from the air, the mountains, and the surrounding seas. I have seen him stand under the Japanese planes besieging Corregidor that famous cap pushed back and his eyes on the threatening Zeros, while our decrepit guns on Corregidor tossed up their futile bursts against the enemy.

He had nothing—then. His hands were empty—and he held off the Far East.

He halted the onrush of the Japanese hordes and saved Australia from an imminent invasion. He not only held—he attacked.

And now, with men and materials that he never had before he is staging a series of spectacular victories that will go down in history as classics in military operations.

We are now at the very gates of the Philippines.

Victory is at hand, and when we have achieved it in the Philippines it will be due to Filipino loyalty, to American productivity, to the American boys who came from the farms and cities to turn overnight into the greatest warriors of history, and to their leader, Douglas MacArthur.

It will shortly be my privilege to rejoin him and serve once more beneath the glorious banner of his honor and his name. "The Voice of Freedom" of Bataan and Corregidor will be heard again. In our darkest days in the Philippines, when defeat stared us in the face, I said to my people in repeated broadcasts that America would not let us down. After having gone over the United States these last 2 years and come in contact with all classes of Americans, and now that I have the honor of knowing the elected representatives of the American people in this Congress, I am going back to tell my countrymen that here there is nothing but the kindliest feeling toward them and that they have the warm and genuine friendship of this great American people. I leave Congress temporarily without fear or misgivings, confident that my people's interests are in safe hands.

This is not good-bye to you, my colleagues. It is au revoir until I return from the Philippines.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. CHAPMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a poem.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that today, following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PRIEST] is recognized for 15 minutes.

RATIFICATION OF TREATIES BY A MAJORITY VOTE OF THE SENATE AND THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I feel certain that I express the feelings of all Members of the House in expressing appreciation for the very eloquent address we have just heard from the distinguished Resident Commissioner of the Philippines, and in wishing him Godspeed as he goes back to his homeland.

Mr. Speaker, as we follow the fortunes of war on fiery fields where forces of freedom are forging bands of steel around the enemy, it is only natural that we project our thinking more and more into the realm of peace-making.

Perhaps no generation has been more conscious than we are today that we live in a momentous period in the history of the world. In a very real sense we are keeping our rendezvous with destiny.

Because we dare not fail in the job of making the peace when the fighting is finished and battle flags are furled, I feel that I must call attention once again to what I believe to be an urgently imperative constitutional modification in our treaty-making procedure.

In November 1942 I introduced a joint resolution proposing a constitutional amendment that would permit the ratification of treaties by a majority vote of the Senate and the House of Representatives.

On the opening day of the Seventy-eighth Congress I reintroduced the same resolution. Other resolutions of a similar nature have been introduced in the House and in the Senate.

A few months ago the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GOSSETT], who is the author of one of these resolutions, and I appeared before a subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary, in support of these resolutions. It was impossible, because of a crowded schedule of hearings on other pressing legislation, for the committee to complete hearings at that time.

Circumstances have thrust this matter back into our thinking with powerful impact, and the time indeed seems proper for the correction of what has very appropriately been called a historical accident.

No extraordinary degree of perception is necessary for one to realize today that we tread on dangerous ground if we continue to permit treaties to be vetoed by a minority of another body.

We follow with a great deal of interest the efforts of conferees at Dumbarton Oaks to arrive at a basis of agreement on the machinery and methods of a world organization that will be an effective instrument in preserving peace and preventing wars of aggression.

But if we examine carefully statements made in the press and over the air by

persons of responsibility and authority, we cannot be blind to the fact that there is developing already a nucleus of opposition to any agreement that would be effective. As the days of peace come nearer, and when peace actually comes, that nucleus may be expected to enlarge and exert more force and influence.

In a recent debate in another body a distinguished member from the State of Minnesota pointed out that in that body there were Members who would oppose any plan that would permit a speedy use of any of our armed forces, and he went on to say that the whole house of world security would tumble down if a single pillar is missing.

That we are drawing perilously close to a parallel situation with 1919 is so obvious that I shall not dwell further on that phase of the question.

What I seek is a remedy. What I am asking for is that the American people be given an opportunity through their State legislatures to pass on the question of whether they want the House of Representatives to have a voice in treaty making, or whether they are content to allow the continuation of a procedure wherein a minority of one body of Congress can veto a treaty.

Most of the legislative bodies of the several States will be convening next January. A public opinion poll not so long ago indicated that more than 70 percent of the American people believe treaties should be ratified by a majority vote of both Houses of Congress.

By what authority then, do we withhold from them the right to express that opinion?

Unquestionably the Constitution expressly authorizes Congress acting through both branches to deal with matters relating to international relations. That is particularly true with reference to finance and appropriations.

Treaties frequently have dealt with matters which might have been handled by congressional action, and on the other hand Congress has, in some instances, dealt with matters which might have been the subject matter of a treaty.

As finally adopted in the Articles of Confederation, the provisions for making treaties essentially were that Congress had the sole and exclusive right to perform such a function, and the States were expressly prohibited from entering, without the consent of Congress into any conference, agreement, alliance, or treaty either with foreign states or with other States in the Confederation.

In the Constitutional Convention of 1787 the clause requiring two-thirds of the Senators present to concur in the ratification of a treaty was the subject of prolonged debate.

I have read much of that discussion recently, and it is very interesting. Throughout all the debate there ran one theme which, in the light of the whole year of public debate on the Versailles Treaty, is rather amusing.

The substance of that argument was that the matter of making treaties was a very delicate one, and might frequently require secrecy. In such cases, it was argued, it might be more difficult to obtain that secrecy if the question was submitted to the House of Representatives.

The same arguments that are cogent today were made in that convention against the provision requiring two-thirds of the Senate to ratify, or to put it another way, allowing one-third plus one of the Senate to veto a treaty.

James Wilson, for example, opposed the provision vigorously on the grounds that it would permit the will of the minority to defeat the will of a majority. Rufus King concurred in that viewpoint, and Madison proposed an amendment, which at first was accepted and later rejected, to exempt from the requirement all treaties of peace. Wilson then proposed an amendment adding the House of Representatives, which the Pennsylvania delegation supported solidly, but which was voted down in the end.

There was vigorous opposition to the provision in many of the State conventions called for ratification. But through it all this historical accident came through and remains a part of our Constitution today.

I believe we can do no greater injustice to the men who framed our Constitution than to refuse in our day to go one step farther than they went, if that step is in the direction of the public interest.

In considering this resolution we must measure it by the yardstick of what is best for the United States of America in the year 1944, and succeeding years.

On December 8, 1941, both the House and the Senate, voted a declaration of war against Japan. A few days later both Houses voted similar declarations against Italy and Germany.

When the wars thus declared, and now being waged around the world, shall end, the House of Representatives, under our present constitutional provisions, will have no actual voice in the approval or disapproval of any treaty or treaties that may follow.

Such a situation always has presented to me a paradoxical procedure wherein a majority of both branches of Congress can begin a war, but in which only two-thirds of one body alone can officially end it, and in which one-third plus one of one body actually can prolong it.

If we can trust a majority to declare war, can we not with equal faith in the aggregate wisdom and judgment of the majority, trust it to ratify a peace treaty?

The House of Representatives is composed of 435 Members who represent that many congressional districts in which reside the total population of this country.

Members of the House must stand or fall every 2 years on the basis of their records in that body. Members of the House as presently constituted have voted to send millions of men from their congressional districts to the battlefields of the world. They have likewise voted billions of dollars in appropriations to carry out the pledge made in the declarations of war that all the resources of the Nation would be used if necessary in their prosecution. They have voted the heaviest tax burdens in the history of the country in order to be able to continue necessary war appropriations.

In all of these acts the House has concurrent power with the Senate, and all such measures are approved by a majority vote of both Houses.

But unless we amend the Constitution when the time for making a treaty comes around that body of the Congress closest to the people and more likely to reflect the majority will of all the people, will have not one word to say on the subject.

I wish to point out that it is possible for only 17 Members of the Senate to block a treaty for which a majority might vote. The Constitution provides that two-thirds of those present shall ratify. The Senate can transact business with a quorum which consists of 49 Members. It is therefore mathematically possible that only 17 Members voting "no" might defeat a treaty.

I shall not attempt to take up all the arguments at this time in favor of this resolution, nor to refute all those which might be made against it.

When we strip the question of all precedents, prejudice, and practices I find it very difficult to understand how any person can with logic and reason oppose majority approval of treaties by both branches of Congress.

Treaties are required by the Constitution to become and have the effect of the supreme law of the land. In most cases they require in one way or another the concurrence of the House of Representatives to make them effective.

I ask now very frankly what ground can be found for continuing to deny to at least 80 percent of our National Representatives any real voice in matters of such importance as the making of treaties?

What logical reason may be given for permitting the vote of a Senator who objects to a treaty to be worth twice as much as the vote of a Senator who approves that treaty?

To grant to the House of Representatives an equal voice in the approval of treaties and make it possible by a majority vote to ratify a treaty would certainly minimize or remove the threat of frequent and dangerous deadlocks on matters affecting our foreign policy.

No one will claim that giving treaty-making power to the House of Representatives, in which Members are elected every 2 years, will result in a perfect reflection of the popular will, but no one will deny that it will come much closer to that reflection than is possible under our present regulations and procedure.

Now, I think it is important to consider also that in no other nation is it possible for a minority of one legislative body to veto a treaty.

We cannot overemphasize the significance of that situation now as we approach the time of making a new peace, and one which we hope may be permanent.

Representatives of all other nations are forever mindful of the constitutional fact that our Government, through the executive branch, cannot complete a treaty, even though a majority of the Senate and a great majority of the citizens of the Nation approve, unless at least two-thirds of the Senate approve.

And if we are realistic in any degree we must ask ourselves whether we wish to continue the undemocratic system of war by a majority but peace by a minority.

In referring to the two-thirds ratification provision John Hay at one time described it as "the irreparable mistake of the Constitutional Convention." With his appraisal I agree in part. It was a mistake, but not necessarily an irreparable mistake, not if we today use the means which the Constitution placed in our hands in order to correct it.

I am well aware that proposals to amend the Constitution seldom engender much enthusiasm and frequently are met with indifference. I know that it is not altogether an easy thing to do. But I have always liked the slogan of the Signal Corps of the United States Army, which in effect says that "the difficult we do immediately; the impossible may take a little time."

For one moment let me direct the attention of the committee to the proceedings in the United States Senate on March 19, 1920. The clerk called the roll of that body on one of the most important questions ever before any parliamentary body. The question was on the ratification of the Versailles Treaty with the League of Nations Covenant, amended by the Lodge resolutions.

The result was announced as 49 votes for and 35 against. Across the country and around the world news wires flashed the bulletin that the Senate had defeated the treaty and the League. It was defeated, not because of a lack of a majority, for 49 Senators had voted to approve, but because one-third plus two had voted in the negative.

Mr. Speaker, I sincerely hope that when we reconvene here in November, the Judiciary Committee will report this resolution to the House. I feel certain we can adopt it here by a necessary majority to send it on to the other body.

I hope then it may be passed in that body and submitted to the States for ratification.

Let us pave the way for all the representatives of the people to participate this time in the making of the peace. In no other way can we face the future with the feeling that we have measured up fully to the demands of these times.

Mr. GOSSETT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRIEST. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. GOSSETT. I hold in my hand a copy of today's paper quoting a distinguished Member of the other body as saying there is going to be a hell of a fight on anything that comes out of the Dumbarton Oaks Conference. In line with the gentleman's thinking, the ominous signs on the horizon now indicate that history will repeat itself as far as Senate ratification of any world peace organization is concerned.

Mr. PRIEST. I thank my distinguished colleague from Texas. I know that for some time he has been as tremendously interested in this subject as I have myself. Anyone who today doubts that that trend is setting in can just read the debates in another body in the past 3 weeks, or listen to forum discussions on the air or read the statements that are released for the press, and he will realize that we are perilously near to a situation parallel with 1919, a situation that will increase as we come nearer to the time of making the peace.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRIEST. I am glad to yield to the distinguished gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, I hesitate to interrupt the very learned address of the gentleman from Tennessee. He is making a very intelligent speech which is provocative of thought. We all realize it requires two-thirds of the votes of Members of both Houses of Congress to override a veto of the President. In other words, the framers of the Constitution gave the President a certain check upon the legislative bodies. Does not the gentleman feel that the framers of our Constitution also had in mind when they wrote that great document, giving the legislative body—at least the upper body, or the Senate of the United States—a certain check upon the executive branch of the Government by requiring a two-thirds vote of the Senate for ratification of any treaty?

Mr. PRIEST. That unquestionably was what they had in mind, I will say to the distinguished gentleman from Missouri. Yet, as we recall the language of the Constitution, it provides that the President may make treaties, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. The procedure as anticipated in the Constitutional Convention was that the President would advise with the Senate and make a treaty subject to ratification by two-thirds of those present and voting. However, custom has so discarded that procedure that in my judgment the analogy the gentleman draws between the veto power and the treaty ratification power is not quite apt in this particular situation.

George Washington attempted to carry out what he understood the Constitution to mean. He went down and conferred with the Senate shortly after he became President, about a treaty with one of the Indian tribes. He was so disgusted with it, he met with such a rebuff, the whole matter turned out so unfavorably, that he never again conferred with the Senate. The question of secrecy, which was a vital argument in the constitutional convention, of course has been exploded years and years ago, because all the debate in the Senate on the Versailles Treaty for a year was made public. I am not so sure that we want the secrecy that they attempted. We have heard a lot about the secrecy at Dumbarton Oaks. I do not think we want to uphold that argument, which was one of the main arguments in the constitutional convention. I feel there is a difference, although I agree with the gentleman from Missouri that that is what they had in mind, making a check on the Executive in the field of foreign relations. However, I feel this way, if we can trust a majority of both Houses to declare war, can we not with equal faith, in the aggregate wisdom and judgment of the majority, trust them to ratify a peace treaty?

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee has expired.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may have 5 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. SHORT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRIEST. I yield.

Mr. SHORT. The gentleman has made a very strong point there. Of course, I think he will also admit that the passage of ordinary legislation by a mere majority vote of each House is a little different from ratifying a treaty in which perhaps the future destiny of the Republic is at stake, with one or more foreign powers.

Mr. PRIEST. I agree with the gentleman that there is quite a difference in passing ordinary legislation, and yet I cannot get away from this argument, it appeals to me so strongly, that the more important it is as affecting our generation and succeeding generations, the more important it is that all of the representatives of the American people be in on it, and that we not permit a situation to continue wherein it is possible for only 17 members of another body to veto a treaty and in effect, to dictate our foreign policy, regardless of what the will of the American people may be.

Mr. SHORT. I will admit the gentleman's resolution and his position tend toward a more pure democracy, but I think the framers of the Constitution were as anxious to avoid a pure democracy as they were a monarchy. They knew that a monarchy led to tyranny and oppression. They knew that a pure democracy leads to anarchy and chaos. What they wanted to establish was not a democracy but a republic, a constitutional representative government. That is what I think the American people constantly should bear in mind. If we want a pure democracy, then we should amend the Constitution whereby a bare majority vote in both Houses of Congress could enact any bill into law, and do away with the President's veto power. Why should one man at the other end of Pennsylvania Avenue have the power to veto a bill passed by both Houses of Congress, and require us to pass it over his veto by a two-thirds vote? That is the whole point. I think it is a matter of check and balance, and that it should certainly apply to foreign affairs as much as it does to domestic affairs.

Mr. PRIEST. May I say to the gentleman that I have not made quite as exhaustive a study of the veto provision of the Constitution as I have of this treaty ratification provision.

Mr. SHORT. It is apparent that the gentleman has devoted serious study and much thought to this problem, and he is to be congratulated on his great knowledge of the historical background.

Mr. PRIEST. I thank the gentleman.

May I say to the gentleman from Missouri that I was teaching a history class in the spring of 1920 when word came to me that a majority of the United

States Senate had voted for the Versailles Treaty carrying the covenant of the League of Nations with the Lodge reservations attached to it, but that the treaty was defeated because two-thirds of the Senate had not voted for it. At that moment I paused and told that history class that while I might be mistaken, yet I was going to spend a great deal of time studying that proposition and working toward what to me seemed a far safer procedure here in the twentieth century when it comes to the ratification of treaties. That I shall continue to do.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. DREWRY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein two speeches the President is going to make, one of September 23 and one of October 5.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. FARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a resolution extending the privileges of naturalization to the Filipinos in this country.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the Delegate from Hawaii?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] is recognized for 20 minutes.

PEARL HARBOR—THE REPUBLICAN CAMPAIGN

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I wish in the first place to congratulate the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PRIEST] for his splendid, timely, and intelligent speech. I hope he will succeed in his effort to attain what he has been so diligently and earnestly seeking to accomplish.

Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this time today for the purpose of making some observations relative to two resolutions that were referred to the Committee on Rules—namely, House Resolution 643, introduced by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HARNESS], and the other, House Resolution 644, introduced by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT]. I am wondering how it occurred that both resolutions are identical in language, one introduced within a few minutes of the other. I have come to the conclusion that these resolutions, with all due respect to the gentlemen from Indiana and Pennsylvania, must have been prepared and delivered to them by the Republican propagandists who are working overtime in and around Wall Street.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. No; I am sorry, I cannot yield.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. No; I decline to yield.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois declines to yield.

Mr. SABATH. Personally, I cannot understand how intelligent Members can permit themselves to be used to introduce such a—what I designate it after I read the resolution—such a bunk resolution 3 days before we were to take a recess, of which recess they were informed. I understand that both gentlemen have been absent from the city since a time shortly after they introduced these resolutions and I observe they are not on the floor today. I was thinking I would call attention to some of the 26 whereases in the resolution, none of them based on real facts, none of them containing any real truths, but being merely verbiage to effect, as their framers believed, publicity that might injure President Roosevelt and the administration. It could not have been for any other purpose because only last June, as all the Members who are present must know, we passed a law instructing the War and Navy Departments to proceed immediately with an investigation of the conditions existing immediately prior to and at the time of the attack on Pearl Harbor. Both the Army and Navy have designated their most reliable and intelligent officers to proceed with the investigation. I have stated on the floor before that I feel the Army and the Navy are in better position to investigate this matter than is the Congress; but if the Congress honestly desires to start an investigation, may I ask, Why has not the effort been made before? Why wait until 3 days before the Congress is scheduled to take a recess and only 6 or 7 weeks before the election?

Mr. SHORT and Mr. CHURCH rose.

Mr. SABATH. I am sorry that I cannot yield to you gentlemen. I know I cannot get any real information from you and I want to impart information to you. Therefore, you will pardon me. I love you both, but not to such an extent that I would deprive myself of the privilege of bringing home some real facts which, unfortunately, we cannot get from you. I may say to my colleague from Illinois [Mr. CHURCH], who made a minute speech, when he speaks about truth and states that truth will prevail or truth will win, that he will have to come over to this side of the Chamber to get it, because I feel he cannot obtain it from his Republican colleagues.

Mr. CHURCH. Will the gentleman yield for a correction?

Mr. SABATH. No; I decline to yield.

Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that the majority leader has so splendidly and so thoroughly explained the misstatements in the two proposed investigating resolutions as well as such appearing in the speech of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HARNESS], which speech and resolution were not based on facts, I am not going to waste your time nor mine to go into the matter of the resolution any further, because they are not deserving of serious consideration by intelligent men. Anyone that will take the time to read them will come to the same conclusion as I have that they are pure political buncombe, based on rumors, allegations, and biased statements made on the floor by reckless, political-minded Republican Members.

REPUBLICANS HAVE NO LEGITIMATE ISSUE

Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, the Republicans have no real issue on which to go to the people in this forthcoming election, and they are obliged to manufacture something somehow with which they hope to mislead the American people and gain a few votes for their candidate. Personally I think that the method which they are pursuing under the direction of the Republican Wall Street publicists will not aid them because the people of this country recognize and appreciate the great services that have been rendered to them, to the country, and to the world by President Roosevelt. I feel that President Roosevelt will win by even a greater majority than he did in 1936 or 1940. In fact, I feel from reliable information coming to me from every section of the country that he will be reelected by a still greater majority.

But having the time allotted to me, I am going to call attention to some of the reckless misstatements of Presidential Candidate Dewey and Vice Presidential Candidate Bricker, which misstatements I cannot but regard as unbecoming to men aspiring for such high offices. Mr. Dewey in 1940 and 1941 was against preparedness, as was his Wall Street foreign adviser, Mr. Dulles, asserting at that time that the talk about war was hysteria. However, a few days ago he insinuated in one of his speeches that the President was responsible for this war and his running mate, Mr. Bricker, has likewise been reckless in blaming the President or distorting his position and action in other matters.

REPUBLICAN SUPER DUPER NEW YORK WALL STREET PUBLICISTS

Mr. Speaker, during my short stay in Chicago recently I heard over the radio and read in many Republican newspapers unworthy comments and vicious propaganda emanating from the New York Wall Street Republican Smear Bund, otherwise known as the Republican Super Duper New York Wall Street Publicists, which has reached a new low in political chicanery by continuing its despicable and untenable attacks against President Roosevelt. I have also observed in some of these newspapers pictures of the President expertly retouched and exaggerated to make him appear as an exhausted and worn-out man.

I feel that he can take these shameful, vile attacks without actual injurious effect upon his health, he knowing in his heart that the vast majority of the people of our country realize that very few, if any, men in the United States have ever rendered greater service to our country in such momentous times than he. Very few men or women would have the stamina and tenacity to absorb the vilifications and misrepresentations that are being hurled at him by his political haters. I pause to question whether it is their aim to destroy him physically as they did President Wilson. If so, they will not succeed. I say they

will not succeed because he is a man of courage and great mental and physical vitality; he knows he has given to the country the best that was in him and brought it out of an unprecedented Republican depression; and he knows that he actually saved our country for a time from attack by the Nazi-Jap savages.

Within the last few days, undoubtedly due to the success of our armed forces under the President's leadership, his critics have turned their vituperative attacks to the proposed post-war program. In this they should realize that nothing will swerve the President from devoting all his great energies and powers to winning of the war, which, to him, as it should be to all of us, is the matter of greatest concern. For the time being, these malicious critics have desisted in their efforts to create dissension among the Allied Nations, but they are directing their efforts and activities of destruction to creating dissension and discord among the peoples of the smaller countries and inciting the citizens of the United States of various racial origins to fear and doubt as to what will happen when peace negotiations are undertaken. But, again, their willful and unfair tactics, at a time when unity should prevail, will come to naught because the people themselves, as I have said, have one paramount concern—the early winning of the war—and nothing the Republicans may attempt by way of political chicanery will detract him from this objective; and their complete confidence in the President will prevail.

Yesterday a certain gentleman from the Middle West in the other body where he is a member of the Foreign Relations Committee, stated that Roosevelt aided Japan and Hitler to rearm and tried to place the responsibility for this war upon President Roosevelt, who, as you all know, humiliated himself to such an extent that he appealed to the butcher Hitler, to that miscreant Mussolini, and to the sneaky Japs, to desist in their efforts to cow and control the world. President Roosevelt tried to avoid this war. He was called a warmonger when he called the attention of the country and of the Congress to the need of preparing our defenses.

WHO IS ACTUALLY RESPONSIBLE FOR THE WAR?

I will tell you who was responsible for the war. The Republican Party, the Republican leadership is responsible for the war. If they had not defeated the League of Nations neither Hitler nor Mussolini nor the Japs could have rearmed. It is because they were able to rearm that they felt themselves strong enough to subjugate the world.

Not only that, but the present-day Republican leaders have followed the footsteps of their predecessors in 1919 and 1920. I was a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs in 1919 and 1920. I was present at the conference in the White House when President Wilson made his report after his first return to America, when he explained what the League of Nations would mean for the peace of the world. Not one member of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations who was present, not one member of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs who was present, with the exception of Senator Lodge, who questioned relative to the number of votes that Great Britain would have, four to our one, not realizing that we would have had twice as many votes, because the South American countries without question would have voted with us at all times, offered objection. However, all others present appeared satisfied and approved. But that was the excuse. Only a few months later, when they could not find any real issue to take to the people to defeat Wilson or the Democratic Party, they started a campaign against the League of Nations, scaring the people, saying that it meant sending our boys to Europe and involving us in European affairs when, in fact, the League of Nations intended that there should be no wars in the future. These same leaders in 1917, with their German friends, caused the Kaiser to believe they were so powerful that they would never permit our country to safeguard its rights.

The same was true during 1935, 1936, and 1937. The present-day Republican leaders, with Fascist-Nazi ideologies, made Hitler believe they were strong enough in America to preclude and prevent our entry into a global war and stop Roosevelt arming the Nation to protect and safeguard its interests.

ISOLATIONISTS

Today, many of these gentlemen and organizations who were guilty of these activities giving encouragement to Hitler, Mussolini, and the sneaky Japs to proceed in their designs to control the world, and many of those who voted against the appropriations for the betterment of the defenses of Guam, the Philippine Islands, and other of our island possessions, and against every measure the President recommended to safeguard our interests, continue to criticize and find fault with the splendid accomplishments of the President in winning this war.

DOMESTIC ISSUES

Dewey and Bricker now devote themselves to domestic affairs. Only the day before yesterday Dewey charged that we had 10,000,000 people out of work 4 years ago, notwithstanding the promises the President made in 1932. He forgets that we had 18,000,000 people out of work when President Roosevelt took office, and that in 1940 nearly all who desired to work were employed; that following President Roosevelt's policy and program and by action of the Congress, which had up to that time cooperated with him, we brought about the elimination of unemployment and effected the prosperity we enjoy today, a prosperity greater than ever before in the history of America or any other country in the world. Notwithstanding that fact, they charge, they accuse, and they find fault with this and that.

The candidate for Vice President said we must do something to safeguard the rights and interest of business and labor and make them free in the future. Does he not know that business and labor are today freer than ever before in the history of America, that they are making more money, that the country is more prosperous, and that even the farmers in his section of the country, as in every other section of the country, are more prosperous than ever before in the history of our Nation?

LABOR

Mr. Hillman is being attacked because he has asked for contributions of $1 from members of labor unions to aid in the reelection of the man who has done more for labor, yes, and for the country, than any other man in this or any other country, but nothing is said of the huge contributions of the DuPonts, the Pews, and others to the Republican campaign fund. When history is written Hillman will be acclaimed as was Sam Gompers in organizing the underpaid laboring men and women of this country to obtain a living wage for the support of themselves and their families and for the betterment of working conditions.

I am broad-minded and liberal-minded I hope. I have been here many years, and I understand that sometimes, when people are desperate and hungry for offices, they say and do things and attempt to do things that otherwise they would not do. So I am going to be liberal and say, in view of the fact that their misstatements, sniping, and recklessness cannot do Dewey any good and cannot do the candidacy of President Roosevelt any harm, "Go on, continue your sniping, continue your attacks, notwithstanding that you promised after the Pearl Harbor attack that you would go along with the President. I admit that you have voted for the appropriation bills and that many of you have cooperated otherwise, but there are some who have continually sniped and will continue to snipe and attack without any reason or justification, without any foundation for some of their charges," the same charges that were included in the two resolutions that were introduced 3 days ago.

Oh, they are receiving a great deal of publicity in connection with their resolutions, and I, as chairman of the Committee on Rules, am being blamed for not giving them a hearing. Well, neither of the Members who introduced these political resolutions have made application for a hearing. They know in their own hearts they did not deserve any hearing and that this resolution was introduced by them for the sole purpose of gaining a little cheap publicity and perhaps giving the newspapers additional opportunity for front-page headlines saying we refused to try Short and Kimmel. Personally, I myself believe that both officers and even other officers, were negligent, but how am I to prove it? I for one do not believe that we should take outstanding officers from our fighting fronts or officers from our ships in action, who are aiding in the winning of the war at this most crucial time in our history for the purpose of trying these two officers. Furthermore, this is no time to conduct an open investigation that might in any way tend to create friction or discord

between the officers of our Army and Navy. Since the declaration of war our armed services have cooperated to the highest degree and our successes to date are due to that fine cooperation. I have the information from the War Department and the Navy Department that they have sent their best and most experienced officers to investigate the tragedy of Pearl Harbor. They are investigating it now, and I am of the opinion that within a few months, or by the time we shall have returned after a recess, a report will be here placing the responsibility for the Pearl Harbor disaster on these two officers, where it properly belongs, according to the Roberts Report.

BACK TO 1930

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Rhode Island?

There was no objection.

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Speaker, the Republicans, speaking through their Presidential candidate, have recently professed a great interest in housing and how the other half of America lives.

This came as a great surprise to me until I remembered that this was election year. In other years their indifference to large-scale housing is exceeded only by their indifference to or abysmal ignorance of basic facts in the housing field.

Yes; Mr. Dewey has come out for large construction of new housing after the war.

If we simply build the homes the American people need in order to be decently housed—

He recently remarked—

it will keep millions of men employed for years.

And Mr. Dewey added:

After 12 years of the New Deal, the housing of the American people has fallen down so badly that just to come up to the standards of 1930 we shall need to build more than a million homes a year for many years to come.

It is gratifying that Mr. Dewey, however belatedly, is now giving lip service at least to the policy of the Roosevelt administration in seeking good homes for all American families and in recognizing large-scale housing construction as one of the potential mainsprings of full production and full employment.

But in setting as his goal the housing conditions and standards of 1930 Mr. Dewey has apparently forgotten just what those conditions and standards were.

If the standards of 1930 are to be his goal in housing, then his advocacy of a housing industry adequate to meet the needs of all American families is purely verbal. It would result only in fiasco in the very unlikely event that he ever came to occupy the White House.

In 1930, under the Hoover administration, the housing industry was in a profound depression. In that year it built 330,000 houses—a far cry from Mr. Dewey's million houses a year and almost two-thirds less than the peak record in the twenties.

In 1930 more than 150,000 American families lost their homes through foreclosure, largely because of the unsound home financing practices that flourished under successive Republican administrations.

In 1930 the slums were spreading—and the Hoover administration would not lift a finger to remedy the intolerable housing conditions under which millions of American families were forced to live. These housing standards were not exceptional under the Republican administrations.

In the 12 years of Republican rule, between 1921 and 1933, no effort at all was made by the Republican administrations to attack the ever-growing problem of the slums. Not one effort was made to stimulate and encourage the private building industry to produce better homes at lower costs. Nor was any effort made to plan developments to provide pleasing neighborhoods that would hold their appeal through the years, or to serve the broad mass market of American families with good housing.

There was, to be sure, a short-lived speculative building boom. It began in 1922, reached its peak in 1925, and subsided rapidly until, by 1929, the year of peak Republican prosperity, only 500,000 new houses were built.

Throughout the Hoover depression home building led the ruinous decline in production. In 1933, with the banking system in collapse and industry paralyzed, only 93,000 houses were built.

The Republican building boom primarily benefited the higher-income families rather than the great mass of self-supporting American families. That was one reason why it collapsed so rapidly. It was a boom marked by widespread jerrybuilding and bad planning, resulting in potential blighted areas and future slums.

It was a boom based upon inflated valuations and financed through short-term first, second, and third mortgages at exorbitant interest rates, involving heavy mortgage renewal fees and bonuses, with no provision for orderly retirement of debt by home owners. It is no wonder that home ownership during the period of Republican rule became an extremely hazardous operation. In 1928 and 1929, when deceptive Republican prosperity was at its height, no less than 250,000 American families lost their homes through foreclosure.

With the collapse of the top-heavy financial structure fostered by the Republican administrations, there was a heartbreaking increase in foreclosures. In 1930, 1931, and 1932 almost 600,000 American homes were lost by their owners. During the early months of 1933, homes were foreclosed at the rate of 1,000 a day.

This was the legacy that Republican housing "standards" and practices left to the New Deal.

It was up to the New Deal to halt the ruinous loss of homes by hundreds of thousands of American families and to bring to life the prostrated home-building and home-financing industries.

And the New Deal met the challenge. It stopped the disastrous wave of foreclosures by setting up the Home Owners' Loan Corporation in 1933. The H. O. L. C. refinanced the mortgages on more than a million homes threatened with foreclosure, providing low-interest, long-term loans, which gave the owners a chance to rehabilitate themselves. This rescue operation, necessitated by the bankruptcy of Republican housing policies, was expected to cost the Government at least a half billion dollars. In striking testimony to the qualities of American home owners when given a square deal, the H. O. L. C. has thus far incurred a net loss of less than $100,000,000, and is likely to wind up its affairs with a net profit after paying all losses, expenses, and interest on its borrowings.

It was the New Deal which took the Federal Home Loan Bank System—set up with inadequate powers in 1932 as the Hoover administration's one feeble gesture toward meeting the housing crisis—and transformed it into an effective credit-reserve system for savings and loan associations.

It was the New Deal which overcame the lack of confidence in the shares of savings and loan associations resulting from the large losses by investors during the Hoover depression. It did this by creating a program of insurance for savings and loan investors, similar to that established for bank depositors.

It was the New Deal which revived the home-construction industry and unfroze the mortgage-financing structure by establishing the F. H. A. mortgage-insurance system.

The F. H. A. revolutionized methods and procedures in home financing. In place of the high-cost short-term first, second, and third mortgages of the Republican era, the F. H. A. popularized the single long-term amortizing mortgage with a low interest rate. It established improved building, location, and subdivision standards. It thereby restored the popular confidence in home ownership which had been gravely undermined by the collapse of the Republican housing boom. In addition, it helped private builders find new markets, and provided private lending institutions with safe and sound outlets for their investment funds.

Under the F. H. A.'s long-term peacetime program, more than 1,200,000 families have built, purchased, or refinanced their homes, or rented modern quarters. Another 4,500,000 families have repaired or improved their properties through F. H. A.-insured repair loans. Only 4,000 F. H. A.-insured homes have thus far had to be foreclosed, and the F. H. A.'s income from its insurance premiums and investments is more than sufficient to pay all expenses and to add substantially to its insurance reserves.

And it was the New Deal which made the first drive to clear the slums and to provide decent housing for low-income slum dwellers. Low-rent, modern housing projects were undertaken early in the New Deal by the Public Works Administration. With the passage of the United States Housing Act in 1937, a well-rounded program was launched for Federal assistance to communities in meeting their slum problems.

Before the war temporarily halted this type of construction, 105,000 new dwellings had been built for families of very low income by 439 local housing authorities, and a comparable number of slum dwellings had been eliminated or were scheduled for elimination after the war. The Federal Government furnished loans to aid in the development of these projects and provides annual subsidies to make it possible for former slum dwellers to occupy these houses at rents they can afford to pay. To the middle of 1943, those subsidies had only totaled about $25,000,000. By 1940, home construction had so far recovered from Republican paralysis that it reached a level 20 percent higher than in 1929, which was almost double Mr. Dewey's standard year of 1930.

And in 1939 and 1940, home foreclosures were 30 percent less than in 1928 and 1929, and those that occurred were largely hang-overs from the unsound financing methods that flourished during the Republican era.

During the war the housing industry, like all basic industries, had to concentrate entirely on doing a war job. The Roosevelt administration unified the housing agencies at the outset of the war and gave unified leadership and direction to private industry, private finance, and local communities in meeting the unprecedented housing problems created by the vast migration of labor to war-production centers.

By this integrated attack on one of the most critical wartime problems, 4,000,000 war workers and their families have been provided with housing and thereby enabled to do their share in winning the battle of production and the war to preserve our liberties and free institutions.

While peacetime housing construction had to be put aside until this essential war job was done, plans are already far advanced for a comparably unified drive toward the goal of maximum housing production and decent homes for all American families after the war. In this drive will be marshaled all available resources of capital, labor, and local governments, with Federal assistance to the extent that it is required.

There is still a great deal that has to be done to reach that housing goal.

Housing standards must be further improved.

Housing costs must be reduced.

Methods must be found to permit private capital to serve much broader housing markets than in the past.

Techniques must be established to lick, once and for all, the deep-seated problems of the slums and of urban blight.

The American people deserve to be—and ever more insistently demand to be—decently housed.

It is a big job, one of the biggest we face, and an absolutely indispensable one. It is indispensable not only because we need more and better houses, but as a proper and sound way of providing full employment after the war.

Let us make no mistake at this time about what the problem involves.

The job cannot possibly be done by reverting, as Mr. Dewey suggests, to the housing standards—or rather, want of standards—of 1930. It cannot be done by the bad planning and the sharp and often shady financial practices of the Republican era.

If the job is to be done, we shall need all of the experience and know-how acquired during the past 12 years in a concerted, Nation-wide drive to solve the housing problem.

And the only way to assure that experience and know-how is to continue the Roosevelt administration in office.

This is one good reason, Mr. Speaker, why I am so confident of a great Democratic victory in November.

What the American people want, is performance, not promises, least of all, Republican promises in an election year.

The SPEAKER. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PACE] is recognized for 10 minutes.

GEN. COURTNEY H. HODGES

Mr. PACE. Mr. Speaker, the American people are fortunate in the high caliber of our military leadership during this period of great emergency. The pages of American history are adorned with the names of great military leaders, beginning with General Washington, and with their outstanding campaigns and feats of military strategy. It is indeed reassuring to find that our leaders of today are measuring up in every way to that high standard and are carrying on successfully on the battlefields throughout the world.

As an American and as a Georgian, I wish at this time to express my appreciation for and pride in the high quality of leadership being displayed by a fellow Georgian, Gen. Courtney H. Hodges, who is now in command of the First Army along the German border. His troops were among the first to advance into Germany, a feat which has not been accomplished since the days of Napoleon.

General Hodges is the son of Mrs. John H. Hodges, of Perry, Houston County, Ga., who is today following the advance of the First Army with great interest and pride. His father, the late John H. Hodges, was editor and publisher of the Houston Home Journal in Perry for 45 years. This paper is today published by General Hodges' brother, John H. Hodges, Jr., and is edited by his brother's wife, Mrs. Ruby C. Hodges.

General Hodges' wife was before their marriage Miss Mildred Lee, of Montgomery, Ala. She is now living in Atlanta with her mother and sister.

Many of the good people of Perry and Houston Counties can remember General Hodges as a boy, and they, along with his mother and other members of his family, are following with great pride the brilliant success of the United States First Army.

General Hodges served as a cadet in the United States Military Academy, West Point, N. Y., in 1904–5. He enlisted in the Regular Army on November 5, 1906, and served for 3 years as private, corporal, and sergeant of the Seventeenth Infantry at Fort McPherson, Ga. He was commissioned a second lieutenant of Infantry on November 13, 1909.

He was promoted to first lieutenant on July 1, 1916; to captain on May 15, 1917; to major—temporary—on June 7, 1918; and to lieutenant colonel—temporary—on October 31, 1918. He reverted to his permanent rank of captain on February 13, 1920, and was promoted to major on July 1, 1920; to lieutenant colonel on October 1, 1934; to colonel on October 1, 1938; to brigadier general on April 1, 1940; to major general on May 31, 1941. He was invested with the rank of lieutenant general on February 16, 1943.

He served until March 1916, successively, at Fort Leavenworth, Kans.; San Antonio, Tex.; in the Philippine Islands; and at El Paso, Tex. From March 1916 to February 1917 he was on duty with General Pershing's punitive expedition into Mexico as an officer of the Sixth Infantry.

After training with the Sixth Infantry in southern camps, he sailed for France with that regiment in the spring of 1918. He participated with his regiment, a unit of the Fifth Division, in the occupation of the Anould, St. Die, and Villers-en-Haye defensive sectors in Lorraine in June–September 1918; in the St. Mihiel offensive of September 1918; and in the Meuse-Argonne offensive of October–November 1918. After the armistice he participated in the advance of the American troops toward the Rhineland, and prior to his return to the United States in the summer of 1919, saw service in Germany, Luxemburg, and again in France.

After his return to the United States he served at Camp Gordon, Ga., with the Sixth Infantry until September 1919. In 1920 he entered the Field Artillery School at Fort Sill, Okla., and upon graduation he was assigned to duty at the United States Military Academy, West Point, N. Y. Relieved from duty at West Point in the summer of 1924, he was ordered to Fort Leavenworth, Kans., to enter the Command and General Staff School, from which he was graduated in June 1925.

He was then ordered to Fort Benning, Ga., where he was an instructor at the Infantry School until June 1926, when he was transferred to Langley Field, Va., as the infantry instructor at the Air Corps Tactical School from which assignment he was relieved in the summer of 1929. After his next service which was at Fort Douglas, Utah, with the Thirty-eighth Infantry from August to November 1929, he was ordered to Fort Benning, Ga., as a member of the Infantry board, on which assignment he continued until August 1933, during which period he was also captain of the infantry rifle team at Camp Perry, Ohio.

From August 1933 to June 1934 he was at the Army War College in Washington, D. C., and upon graduation he was ordered to Vancouver Barracks, Wash., where he served until May 1936, as executive officer of the Seventh Infantry, and later as executive officer of the Fifth Infantry Brigade and the Vancouver District of the Civilian Conservation Corps. For 2 years beginning in May 1936, he was on duty at the headquarters of the Philippine Department, Manila. In

August 1938, he reported for duty at Fort Benning, Ga., as assistant commandant of the infantry school. In October 1940 he was appointed commandant of the infantry school. In March 1941 he was assigned to the office of the Chief of Infantry, Washington, D. C., becoming Acting Chief of Infantry. He was appointed Chief of Infantry in May 1941 and in March 1942 he was assigned to Birmingham, Ala., to become commanding general of the Replacement and School Command of the Army Ground Forces. He later became commanding general of the Tenth Army Corps.

He was assigned to the command of the Third Army, Fort Sam Houston, Tex., in February 1943, and served in this capacity until March 1944, when he was assigned to the European theater of operations, where he was placed in command of the First Army in France.

For his services with the American Expeditionary Forces, World War No. 1, he was awarded the Distinguished Service Cross, the citation for which reads as follows:

He personally conducted a reconnaissance of the Meuse River to determine the most advantageous location for a crossing and for a bridge site. Having organized a storming party, he attacked the enemy not 100 paces distant, and, although failing, he managed to effect the crossing of the canal after 20 hours of ceaseless struggling. His fearlessness and courage were mainly responsible for the advance of his brigade to the heights east of the Meuse.

He was also awarded the Silver Star for gallantry in action during the St. Mihiel and Meuse-Argonne offensives.

He was also awarded the Distinguished Service Medal in 1944, with the following citation:

For exceptionally meritorious and distinguished service in positions of great responsibility as commanding general, Replacement and School Command, and as commanding general, X Corps. General Hodges organized the Replacement and School Command initially, displaying sound judgment, professional skill, untiring initiative, and devotion to duty. As a result, the replacement training centers and schools of the Army Ground Forces were organized and expanded so as to meet fully the needs of the Army. General Hodges organized the X Corps initially and established its new units on a sound and progressive basis of development and training, to the great advantage of our war effort.

For his devotion to duty and his high degree of leadership General Hodges has earned the sincere gratitude of the American people.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BUSBEY] be permitted to extend his remarks on Sidney Hillman.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, if that is for the purpose of giving him credit for the fine work which he is doing for the reelection of President Roosevelt, I have no objection to it.

STILL FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A still further message from the Senate, by Mr. Gatling, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 1040. An act for the relief of Frank Henderson and Frances Nell Henderson, his wife;

H. R. 1042. An act for the relief of Frank J. Recely and Mary T. Recely;

H. R. 1774. An act for the relief of Cyril Doerner;

H. R. 1886. An act for the relief of Charles Fred Smith;

H. R. 1915. An act for the relief of Carl W. Bucey;

H. R. 2014. An act for the relief of the Winston-Salem Southbound Railway Co.;

H. R. 2236. An act for the relief of Roberta Ramsey;

H. R. 2315. An act for the relief of Ethel Phillips and Mary Hurley;

H. R. 2384. An act for the relief of Frank A. McMenamin;

H. R. 2473. An act for the relief of James Wilson;

H. R. 2624. An act to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of J. R. Dixon;

H. R. 2752. An act to authorize the acquisition of additional lands and flowage easements for the Pleasant Hill Reservoir, Ohio, and for other purposes;

H. R. 2845. An act for the relief of John J. Beaton;

H. R. 2873. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. D. F. Still;

H. R. 2919. An act for the relief of Michael Eatman, Jr., and Mrs. Michael Eatman;

H. R. 3101. An act for the relief of George E. O'Loughlin;

H. R. 3152. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Cicero B. Hunt;

H. R. 3549. An act for the relief of Mrs. Emily Reily;

H. R. 3595. An act for the relief of Robert Futterman;

H. R. 3704. An act to amend the Coast Guard Auxiliary and Reserve Act of 1941, as amended;

H. R. 3813. An act for the relief of J. Ralph Datesman;

H. R. 3898. An act for the relief of Frank Gay;

H. R. 4114. An act to amend section 3 (b) of Public, 49, Seventy-eighth Congress, first session (War Overtime Pay Act of 1943);

H. R. 4206. An act to authorize the construction and operation of a free highway bridge across the Monongahela River in the County of Allegheny, Pa.;

H. R. 4207. An act to authorize the construction and operation of a free highway bridge across the Monongahela River in the County of Allegheny, Pa.;

H. R. 4712. An act for the relief of John Duncan McDonald; and

H. R. 5255. An act to amend the Coast Guard Auxiliary and Reserve Act of 1941, as amended.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 933. An act for the relief of Conrad H. Clark;

H. R. 1519. An act conferring jurisdiction on the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of the McCullough Coal Corporation against the United States;

H. R. 2874. An act for the relief of Robert Will Starks;

H. R. 3000. An act for the relief of Clara E. Clark;

H. R. 3535. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of Billie Stooksberry, a minor, and Lon L. Stooksberry; and

H. R. 4349. An act to exempt certain officers and employees of the National War Labor Board from certain provisions of the Criminal Code.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CHURCH] is recognized for 30 minutes.

PEARL HARBOR

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK], for whom personally and for whose loyalty and talents as majority leader I have the greatest respect, has taken the floor today to answer those of us who have been urging a complete and impartial investigation of the Pearl Harbor disaster on December 7, 1941. He specifically addressed his remarks to a speech delivered on the floor by the distinguished gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HARNESS], who is the author of a resolution for a congressional investigation.

Unfortunately, the gentleman from Indiana is not on the floor today to make immediate reply to the majority leader's statements. I do not know the extent of the knowledge of the gentleman from Indiana concerning the Pearl Harbor catastrophe, nor the source or sources of his information. But I do know, Mr. Speaker, that the gentleman from Indiana is an able lawyer who is not given to reckless statements and hasty conclusions. I also know that the gentleman from Indiana has served with exceptional ability on the Committee on Military Affairs.

I do not take this time, however, to defend the gentleman from Indiana in the statements he has made with respect to Pearl Harbor and the action he has taken for an investigation. It so happens that I have been deeply interested in this subject. On June 5, on August 21, and again on September 7 I had the privilege of addressing this great body, honestly endeavoring to present the information I have concerning Pearl Harbor and earnestly appealing for a full and complete disclosure of all the facts.

You will recall that Pvt. George E. Elliott, Jr., now a sergeant, who was operating a detector unit at the time of the Pearl Harbor attack and who sent the unheeded warning message of approaching planes to headquarters, is a resident of my district. The young man was never given any recognition. I asked him if he had been called before the Roberts Commission, and he informed me that he had not. I could not understand. And as I inquired further and deeper into the subject it soon became evident that the Roberts Commission did not make a thorough investigation and the full truth concerning Pearl Harbor was not being told. It seemed very strange to me that the lieutenant, Kermit A. Tyler, who dismissed the warning message of Private Elliott which, if

heeded, would have enabled our planes to get into the air, was subsequently promoted to the high rank of lieutenant colonel. It did not make sense. The more I delved into the subject the more it became evident that there are many facts concerning the surprise at Pearl Harbor that have never been made public. I wondered if they were being deliberately hidden.

When I addressed the House on August 21 I called attention to the fact that the Roberts report states that at about noon—6:30 a. m. Honolulu time—or 1½ hours before the Pearl Harbor attack, a warning message was sent to General Short and Admiral Kimmel of an almost immediate break in relations with Japan. I raised the question then as to how long before such a message was sent, Washington knew it was Japan's intention to attack Pearl Harbor. And again on September 7, when I addressed the House I raised the question "whether or not it is true that on Thursday morning before the Sunday morning of the historic December 7, the President of the United States was notified that the Japanese would soon attack," and, further, "whether or not it is true that not later than the Saturday evening before Pearl Harbor another message was delivered to the President of the United States advising him that the Japanese planned to strike at 1 p. m. the following Sunday, or 8 a. m. Pearl Harbor time."

The distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts states that he has checked with the State Department, Navy Department, and the War Department, and that they each authorized him to make certain statements. But the gentleman did not mention the White House. Apparently the gentleman from Massachusetts, who, as majority leader is the administration's spokesman on this floor, accepted a statement from the War and Navy Departments that denied only that a message was received from the Australian Government. The gentleman from Massachusetts does not state that either the War Department, the Navy Department, or the White House have denied that they had information, 3 days before Pearl Harbor, from sources other than Australia, that Japan was to attack the United States.

Apparently the majority leader does now know that Lt. Comdr. A. D. Kramer, U. S. N. R., now serving in the Pacific, was on duty in the Navy Department on Saturday night, December 6, and that he delivered a message to the State Department about 10 a. m. the following Sunday morning, which would be 4:30 a. m. Pearl Harbor time. He commented to the group at the State Department that "This looks like a sunrise attack at Pearl Harbor and midnight attack at the Philippines." He then went to the White House and delivered the message.

The gentleman from Massachusetts will probably say "rumor, just a rumor." But the gentleman is not willing to have an investigation made to ascertain whether the facts I have just recited are true. The able majority leader cannot dismiss the whole matter simply by replying "rumor, mere rumor." The burden is on him to prove it to be a rumor. Why, Mr. Speaker, why does the administration so violently oppose an investigation? Is there any objection to having Lieutenant Commander Kramer testify before a committee of Congress?

The distinguished gentleman contends that the stories which have been circulating about Pearl Harbor are false. He claims, for example, that there is no truth in the statements made by the gentleman from Indiana that Australia knew well in advance of the Japanese attack that such an attack was to be made on December 7.

Let me read to my friend and colleague an affidavit executed by Mr. Sidney C. Graves, a reliable citizen residing in the District of Columbia, who was present at a dinner when the Australian Minister to the United States, Sir Owen Dixon, stated that Australia knew about the coming attack. Is it perhaps not without significance, Mr. Speaker, that Sir Owen Dixon has been recalled to Australia? Has he been guilty of telling the truth?

I now read the affidavit:

To Whom It May Concern:

On December 7, 1943, I attended a dinner in Washington. Among those present were Sir Owen Dixon, then serving as Australian Minister to the United States on duty here in Washington, Senator HOMER FERGUSON, Mr. Frank C. Hanighen, 1737 H Street NW., Washington, D. C., and others whom I do not remember.

After the dinner the Australian Minister stated to myself and the others mentioned above in substance, as follows:

Shortly after the outbreak of war in 1939, I left my judgeship to assume control of coastal shipping in Australian waters. About 72 hours before Pearl Harbor, I received a flash warning from my naval intelligence that a Japanese task force was at sea and Australia should prepare for an attack; 24 hours later this was further confirmed with a later opinion of intelligence that the task force was apparently not aimed at Australian waters and perhaps was directed against some American possession. Finally, on December 7, 1941, my intelligence stated "We are saved, America is in the war, Pearl Harbor has been bombed."

The Australian Minister was questioned by one of the guests as to whether this information was available to American authority and he stated in substance that it was if requested.

I certify that the above is a substance of the statement made by Sir Owen Dixon on the aforesaid date.

SIDNEY C. GRAVES,
Washington, D. C.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA,
Washington, D. C. ss:

Sworn to before me a notary public this 21st day of September 1944.

[Notarial seal] EDNA W. HERBERT,
Notary Public, Washington, D. C.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield right there?

Mr. CHURCH. Just a moment. The gentleman did not yield to me, but I will yield to him.

Mr. McCORMACK. But I did yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CHURCH. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. There is nothing in that affidavit which states that our Government was notified. Is that correct?

Mr. CHURCH. That is correct.

But the gentleman said nothing in his speech with regard to the message being delivered to the White House. I have given him the name and rank of the naval officer who delivered the message, the time delivered, and his interpretation of it.

Mr. McCORMACK. Will the gentleman read what I said about our War, Navy, and State Departments?

Mr. CHURCH. That is simply the statement of interested parties. There are others who have a contrary opinion. What is the truth? What are the real facts? That is all the American people ask. They want to know, not from me nor from the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts, what may be our respective ideas on the Pearl Harbor catastrophe; but they want to know the facts upon which they may form their own opinion as to who should be held responsible for the Japanese success in surprising our forces at Pearl Harbor.

If what the distinguished gentleman has said is correct, an impartial investigation made by a committee of Congress will factually sustain him in his views. Such an investigation will stop the stories and rumors he alleges to be false, if false they are. Let me remind the majority leader that one of the reasons there are so many rumors and stories concerning Pearl Harbor, about which he bitterly complained today, is the fact that the administration he represents has taken such pains to prevent a public investigation. Those who oppose an investigation of their acts and deeds are not above suspicion. If the majority leader is correct in his contentions, then the administration he represents has everything to gain and nothing whatsoever to lose by seeing that the facts pertaining to Pearl Harbor are brought to light by an investigation in which the people have confidence.

It has been almost 3 years since Pearl Harbor, but Admiral Kimmel and General Short have never been given so much as the opportunity to defend themselves. The American people want to know why the delay. The administration first answered that to hold a court martial would reveal to the enemy the extent of the damage at Pearl Harbor and reveal valuable military information. But the Pearl Harbor incident was 3 years ago. The damage done has been repaired and the whole military and naval situation has changed. The administration now argues that the court martial of Admiral Kimmel and General Short would necessitate bringing back to the United States military and naval leaders needed in the theaters of operations. That argument will not stand analysis. It is not even an argument. it is an excuse. But even assuming its validity, what legitimate reason is there for not having a congressional investigation? Such an investigation need not concern itself with military and naval details, the technicalities of military and naval operations, but will serve a real purpose if it looks into the controversial question as to the extent of the knowledge in Washington and at Pearl Harbor of the imminent attack on Pearl Harbor. It will

serve a great purpose if it resolves these many questions in the minds of our people.

It is a matter of public knowledge that in February of this year Admiral Thomas C. Hart was appointed by Secretary Knox, of the Navy Department, to investigate thoroughly the Pearl Harbor catastrophe. Admiral Hart is a distinguished officer. He has had a long career in the Navy. He was Commander in Chief of the Asiatic Fleet in 1941 and at the time of the outbreak of war.

It is common knowledge that Admiral Hart made an investigation. He traveled up and down the Pacific Ocean interviewing witnesses, mostly officers of the Navy, who had knowledge about Pearl Harbor—officers who were on duty then at Hawaii and in Washington.

Admiral Hart has completed his investigation. He has collected the facts as to Pearl Harbor. Why should they be withheld from the public, Mr. Speaker? Why should Admiral Hart's report to the Secretary of the Navy become a part of the secret files when the report pertains to the very question about which the people are so vitally concerned? What conceivable excuse can be given for further concealment of the results of this inquiry? When Secretary Knox publicly announced the appointment of Admiral Hart to sift thoroughly all the facts, the obvious implication was that here, at last, would be the answer to the riddle of who was responsible for Pearl Harbor.

Mr. Speaker, in the name of the American people, in the name of this august body, I call on the Navy Department to release Admiral Hart's report in full. If the majority leader is so anxious to kill so-called rumors about Pearl Harbor, why does he not use his influence for the release of this report?

The administration even opposed the resolution passed by Congress which directed the Army and Navy to make its own investigations. The people simply cannot understand, it is beyond understanding, why each and every attempt, of whatever nature, to bring before the public the facts concerning Pearl Harbor is met with this violent opposition from the administration. And he who opposes impartial investigation cannot be above suspicion. It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that the majority leader should be the last one to complain about so-called rumors and stories with respect to Pearl Harbor. His administration has refused to permit a public disclosure of the facts. By its own policy the administration stimulates the circulation of rumors.

All that is asked, Mr. Speaker, is that the people be given the opportunity to learn the truth. Can it be that the administration is afraid of the truth? Is this a democracy, or have we come to the point where the leaders of our Government permit the people to know only what the Government wants them to know and complains bitterly if someone should have an opinion based upon such knowledge as he can obtain in spite of Government obstruction?

Mr. Speaker, I repeat what I said early this morning at the opening of this session: "The truth will make us free."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO] is recognized for 30 minutes.

ITALY

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, I would have preferred not to make the statement that I am about to make during this time which has been allotted to me. I had hoped that it never would have become necessary for anyone to insist that we act in good faith and live up to the statements and pledges that we have made to the people of Italy.

Events, however, have developed to such a state that conscientious men would be derelict in their duty to the cause of freedom, and to the cause of a democratic and enduring peace, if they remained silent in the face of conditions that now exist in Italy.

On July 25 I addressed a meeting in historic Cooper Union in New York City. I was speaking to an audience of men and women who had consistently opposed Mussolini and fascism prior to and since the march on Rome. At that meeting we were informed of the overthrow of Mussolini. At that meeting hope sprung in our hearts for a free and great Italy for which those of us who had consistently opposed Mussolini for 21 years had been striving. Several days thereafter I made a radio speech. In that radio speech, which I incorporated in the RECORD on September 14, 1943, I stated:

> This RECORD of today and of yesterday disposes with complete finality the falsehood that Italians cannot and do not want to fight. It proves irrefutably that Italians can fight and do fight well for freedom, but will not fight for tyranny. It is precisely because Italian soldiers have refused to fight in the interest of Axis tyranny that the Mussolini regime was rocked to its very foundations to be toppled over by the hammering blows of the United Nations in north Africa, Sicily, and in the Soviet Union. Italy had become a conquered province serving the Nazi government in Berlin in negation of her own destiny. This national enslavement was oppressive to the people of Italy, so oppressive that her soldiers have been revolting against it by laying down their arms. This revolt and the victory of our armed forces have ended the violent career of a man who was a despot to his people and a supine agent to a foreign tyrant.

Since then several declarations were made by responsible leaders of the United Nations in regard to Italy.

The President, immediately after the overthrow of Mussolini, stated:

> Italy will reconstitute herself. It will be the people of Italy who will do that, choosing their own government in accordance with the basic democratic principles of liberty and equality.

Then on November 1 there was released to the world the first declaration of the Foreign Secretaries of the three great United Nations that had met at Moscow—the United States, Great Britain, the Soviet Union. That declaration reads as follows:

> The Foreign Secretaries of the United States of America, the United Kingdom, and the Soviet Union have established that their three Governments are in complete agreement that Allied policy toward Italy must be based upon the fundamental principle that fascism and all its evil influences and emanations shall be utterly destroyed and that the Italian people shall be given every opportunity to establish governmental and other institutions based upon democratic principles.
>
> The Foreign Secretaries of the United States of America and the United Kingdom declare that the action of their governments from the inception of the invasion of Italian territory, insofar as paramount military requirements have permitted, has been based upon this policy.
>
> In the furtherance of this policy in the future the Foreign Secretaries of the three Governments are agreed that the following measures are important and should be put into effect:
>
> 1. It is essential that the Italian Government should be made more democratic by the introduction of representatives of those sections of the Italian people who have always opposed fascism.
>
> 2. Freedom of speech, of religious worship, of political belief, of the press and of public meeting shall be restored in full measure to the Italian people, who shall also be entitled to form anti-Fascist political groups.
>
> 3. All institutions and organizations created by the Fascist regime shall be suppressed.
>
> 4. All Fascist or pro-Fascist elements shall be removed from the administration and from the institutions and organizations of a public character.
>
> 5. All political prisoners of the Fascist regime shall be released and accorded a full amnesty.
>
> 6. Democratic organs of local government shall be created.
>
> 7. Fascist chiefs and other persons known or suspected to be war criminals shall be arrested and handed over to justice.
>
> In making this declaration the three Foreign Secretaries recognize that so long as active military operations continue in Italy the time at which it is possible to give full effect to the principles set out above will be determined by the Commander in Chief on the basis of instructions received through the Combined Chiefs of Staff. The three Governments parties to this declaration will at the request of any one of them consult on this matter.
>
> It is further understood that nothing in this resolution is to operate against the right of the Italian people ultimately to choose their own form of government.

Since then events in Italy have reached such a pass that Mayor Fiorello LaGuardia, in a speech reported back from Rome, made by the mayor to Italy, the mayor said the following:

> It is now 2 years that I have been talking to you. We have been discussing problems every week. We suggested that you get rid of Mussolini. You have done so. We advised breaking relations with the Nazis. You have done so. We declared it was necessary that you abandon facism. You have done so. We expressed the hope that your troops would be fighting alongside of our against the Nazis. You are doing so. What are we waiting for? Perhaps next week I will not speak. You know that unless you have something to say it is difficult to speak. Only the tenor at the opera sings to hear his own voice. I can speak only when I really have something to say. The last sentence is not meant for you Italians. Do I make

myself clear? Therefore, until I have something definite, this is your friend, LaGuardia, saying "Courage, forward."

I can very well understand the mayor's feelings and I can understand exactly why he made this declaration to the people of Italy. Mr. Speaker, the mayor's statement reflects the feelings of 7,000,000 Americans of Italian origin who are shocked at what is happening in Italy. Anyone who believes in what Americans are fighting for will also feel disillusioned when they learn of the betrayal of democratic principles in Italy by the Allied Control Commission and by members of military government there. As an American, it is with a sense of shame that I say that none of the promises we have made to the Italian people, and none of the pledges made to them in the Moscow declaration have been kept.

Our Allied Control Commission and the Military Government there have done everything to convert Italy, not into a free and democratic nation, but to restore her back into the hands of reactionary elements and to subordinate her to such an extent that Italy will be forced to once again become a peninsula servile to the imperialist interests of some other nation.

First, let us examine for a moment the economic conditions in Italy. I want to give you an idea of prices in Italy. There is no country in the world where the black market is more rampant and where black marketeers are permitted to operate with such impunity. This black market is for the benefit of the rich and for those who, through crime and corruption of the Fascist regime, cornered the wealth of this country.

The lira has been pegged by us at 100 lira per dollar. In Rome, for example, according to Mr. Frank Gervasi in Collier's Magazine of September 6, 1944, eggs cost 30 lira each. Meat costs 350 lira per kilo. Wine costs 100 lira per liter. Flour 180 lira per kilo. Sugar 500 lira. Olive oil 500 lira. Butter 750 lira. A suit of clothes costs 20,000 lira; a pair of mediocre shoes, 2,000 lira. A chocolate bar comes at 150 lira. Black-market American cigarettes are 85 cents a package. Italian cigarettes are 60 cents a package. From other sources I have learned that bread is 90 lira per loaf. A loaf is less than a pound, and all of these Italian common staples of the diet of the Italian people have been scarce or have become so scarce that the people of Italy today not only face a winter without fuel, but a bitter winter with famine.

Hunger has already reached the stage of famine in Italy. Children are dying daily in Italy from starvation. Women cannot come out of their homes because they have no clothing. They are in rags. Tuberculosis is in epidemic stage. In addition to that, in one hospital alone in Naples, 4,000 girls of adolescent age have been treated for venereal disease. These youngsters did not get this disease because of pleasure but were forced into prostitution because of hunger. What has the Allied Control Commission or Military Government done to remedy this situation which I have only sketchily described. Its failure to suppress the black market is the tragic comedy of this era. Its failure to appeal on time to the Allied Governments for relief will go down in history as a gross example of arrogant neglect.

I am pleased to see that the President has recently recommended that Italy be included in the U. N. R. R. A. program. However, unfortunately, I am afraid this will be too little and too late. There is only one remedy at this time. One is to keep our pledge to the people of Italy, to give to Italy the recognition that it deserves, recognition as an ally, and to rush to Italy lend-lease aid. The Italian people were not responsible for this war any more than they were responsible for fascism. Fascism was imposed on the Italian people by the contrivance of other nations serving their imperialistic interests. War was forced on Italy, not by the Italian people but against the will of the Italian people. They overthrew Mussolini. They are fighting the Nazis. They fought them before we landed at Salerno. They are fighting them now—300,000 Italian partisans are fighting them in the northern part of Italy. Their fight has been so valiant that a tribute has been paid to them by General Alexander. Yet, despite this, Italy is treated neither as an ally nor as a friend. She is considered and called a cobelligerent. This twilight status of cobelligerency has meant what? It has meant starvation, hunger, black market, and the continuance of an Allied Control Commission and Military Government which has been a complete failure in the field of relief and which has negated every promise in the Moscow Declaration.

In the Moscow Declaration it was declared among other things that all Fascist or pro-Fascist elements shall be removed from the administration and from the institutions and organizations of a public character.

Let us see how the Allied Military Commission and the A. M. G. has flagrantly violated this pledge. The following are just a highlight:

First. One Borriello, a Fascist owner of a cotton trust in Southern Italy, was requested by Italian officials to be jailed. This request was refused by A. M. G. officials on the ground that he was a "confidential assistant" to several Allied generals. Requests were made for his removal by General Alexander. These requests were refused despite the fact that Borriello had been described as a Fascist, a pro-German who had been decorated by the Nazis, who together with his wife had spread Nazi propaganda in Naples until the very entrance of the Allied armies. Borriello is not only free in Naples but he is operating a shipping agency for the Allies. Allied contracts are his monopoly.

Second. The Lainati case has aroused the indignation of all pro-democratic Italians. Lainati was a Nazi labor agent and a representative of a Fascist syndicate. Despite the fact that he was so exposed by anti-Fascists he was placed in charge of the port of Naples. Anyone employed there had to be approved by him.

Third. The LaLoggia case is equally revolting. LaLoggia was the head of the Fascist syndicate and a major in the Fascist anti-area militia. A. M. G. used him as regional director of labor in Sicily. He had the temerity to propose a plan which would have destroyed labor unions, a plan which was accepted by the Allied Control Commission and submitted by it to the Italian Government. The Italian Government refused to accept it.

There are many other instances that I can recite here of similar elevations and rewarding the Italian Fascist scoundrels by the A. M. G., but times does not permit. However, I shall submit to the President if he so requests the names, dates, and places of these flagrant violations of the pledge made in the Moscow Declaration.

Why are these people being kept in control? Is it the desire to follow out a policy of merely having removed Mussolini and now forcing on Italy a reactionary government and perpetuating in Italy fascism and Fascists under different names and in different uniforms? What is the game that is being played there?

In Italy a government has been established composed of all anti-Fascist political parties. All of these parties constitute a government in Italy that is trying to function, but that government is deprived of elbow room, it is not permitted to deal with the problems of the Italian people. With very few exceptions it is not even permitted to punish those who collaborated with the Nazi invaders of Italy. It is not permitted to deal with the black market, it is not permitted to drive from places of control those who have been Nazi collaborators. The Italian Government is paralyzed and we in the United States still refuse to extend to it, in keeping with the pledges made at the Moscow Conference, that recognition to which the Italian people are entitled on the basis of the principle of self-determination.

Time and time again workers in Italy, seeking to better conditions for themselves, have been frustrated by officials of the Allied Control Commission and by members high up in the ranks of American Military Government. In one case, for instance, at the Cirio factory near Naples, women workers engaged in the manufacture of pastries for British headquarters earned from 17 to 19 lira a day. The Italian management of that plant had agreed to a wage increase; the Allied officials had postponed approval of the increases for several months. These women demonstrated for the increases and the Allied Control Commission gave the following order:

If they are men shoot them; if women turn a hose on them.

The workers were finally granted a 1-lira increase and they returned to work. Bear in mind they were earning from 17 to 19 lira a day and that bread per loaf—a loaf which is less than a pound—costs the Italian workers 90 lira,

and bear in mind that the lira has been pegged at 100 lira per dollar.

I do not want to be accused of injecting a political note in this question. That is why I am not going to mention the name of a prominent and top-ranking officer of American Military Government, but I will state what he did in connection with the public-utilities workers in Naples. These workers demanded a wage increase which had already been granted them by the Italian management. It was not approved for 4 months. This official said when the workers wanted to talk to him: "Tell them to go to hell, and if they are anxious to hear from me let them listen to my radio speech."

In a radio speech he blasted the workers. The workers insisted that they were not on strike, that they were actually dying of starvation, one by one.

They were actually being taken to the hospitals, and the records of the hospitals in Naples will reveal that the workers in the public utilities at Naples were taken to the hospital, not from disease or injury but from actual starvation. Many of these workers have died of starvation.

What happened? These workers who were receiving from 25 to 90 lire a day were never given any wage increase. Machine guns were trained on them. They are still working there for from 25 to 90 lire a day and, again I repeat, a loaf of bread costs 90 lire.

It was during this incident that another high official of military government in Italy issued a decree known as the death-sentence decree. It decreed:

a. All demonstrations by public-utility workers forbidden.

b. A. M. G. to take care of all labor disputes.

c. Removal of Fascists was the task of A. M. G. and no concern of the employees.

d. Violation of decree punishable by death sentence.

Mr. Speaker, I could go on and on and tell the tragic story of Italy; I could go on and on and give you names and facts, dates and places, but I do not think that is most important at this time. What is most important is, What are we going to do?

I proposed in a resolution now buried somewhere in the Foreign Affairs Committee to recognize Italy as an ally and the resolution called for an extension of lend-lease aid. This also would have aided our armed forces in Italy, as it would permit Italy to arm and fight against the common enemy. The Italian people want to fight. The Partisans are fighting. What do we do? After we get into some town, the Allied Control Commission disarms the Partisans, while the Fascists are permitted to become directors of the port of Naples, and of the life of many Italian communities, against the will of the Italian people and the Italian Government.

There is only one solution. The first step is to recognize the principle of self-determination and to guarantee that principle to Italy. The Italian people can and will govern themselves. We must grant to Italy recognition as an ally, we must permit the Italian Government to rule in accordance with the will and the best interests of the Italian people, and withdraw the so-called Allied Control Commission, withdraw the military government from Italy, and give to Italy the right to live as a free nation and as a democratic nation.

Here in the United States people of Italian origin are seeking to send packages to Italy. They have collected clothes and various other articles, but we will not permit them to send these packages across. Here in the United States we have thousands and thousands of Italian war prisoners. We are no longer at war with Italy. Why keep these men here who are anxious to go back home to help rebuild their little towns and to aid their families and take part in the reconstruction of a country which has been demolished? Yet we keep them here as war prisoners. Why?

Whose game are we playing in connection with the Mediterranean? In whose interests are we negating the great principles declared at the Moscow Conference? It is not only I, not only 7,000,000 Americans of Italian origin who want to know, but I think it is a question which is directed to the conscience of all freedom-loving people in these United States.

Let me say that on this issue we of Italian origin are completely united. We of Italian origin have cast aside our divisions and have cast aside our differences. We are united on this issue. We demand justice for Italy. We demand that Italy be not discriminated against. We demand that the pledges that have been made be kept. We demand that to these peoples the great United States, the Nation to which we of Italian origin have given 1,000,000 of our sons, a Nation to whose great history we have always contributed with our blood and our toil, do justice. We ask that Italy be accorded recognition. We ask that Italy be accorded lend-lease aid. We ask that immediately we return to Italy her sons who are here as war prisoners. We ask that the Allied Commission be withdrawn and that the military government be withdrawn. The Italians want to fight. Just because they refuse to fight for tyranny does not stamp them as cowards. Their refusal to fight for tyranny and their surrender was an act of revolt against tyranny, a revolt against Hitler, and a revolt against Mussolini. Let us aid them in this period of great world-wide revolt against world tyranny.

McCULLOUGH COAL CORPORATION

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 1519) for the relief of the McCullough Coal Corporation, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 2, line 7, after "abandonment." insert "In determining such depreciation, the court shall consider the amount of unmined coal in the properties of said corporation at Friendsville, Md., the possibility, if any, of profitably mining and marketing said coal in the future, the life of said mine if said coal could be so mined and marketed, the average profits of said mine for the years 1936 to 1939, both inclusive, and the fair market value of said mine on the date the above-mentioned railroad was abandoned; and the court shall allow as the depreciation in value of said mine the loss in value occasioned by said abandonment of said railroad, taking into consideration all of the above factors."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

BILLIE STOOKSBERRY AND LON L. STOOKSBERRY

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 3535) for the relief of the legal guardian of Billie Stooksberry, a minor, and Lon L. Stooksberry, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 1, line 5, strike out "$3,500", and insert "$2,000."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXEMPTION OF CERTAIN OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE NATIONAL WAR LABOR BOARD FROM CERTAIN PROVISIONS OF THE CRIMINAL CODE

Mr. CRAVENS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 4349) to exempt certain officers and employees of the National War Labor Board from certain provisions of the Criminal Code, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert "That nothing contained in sections 109 and 113 of the Criminal Code (U. S. C., title 18, secs. 198 and 203) shall be deemed to apply to any person heretofore or hereafter appointed to the National War Labor Board or any of its agencies under the authority of the War Labor Disputes Act, any Executive order or regulation issued under the provisions of the act of October 2, 1942 (56 Stat. 765), or Executive Order No. 9017, dated January 12, 1942, as amended from time to time, because of intermittent service as a member of the National War Labor Board or of a regional board, industry commission, tripartite panel, or similar agency of the National War Labor Board, or as a hearing officer or arbitrator of such Board, if such person is serving or has served in such capacity without compensation, or with compensation on a per diem when actually employed basis for not in excess of 90 days a year: *Provided, however*, That the provisions of this act shall not apply to any representa-

tion before the National War Labor Board or any of its said agencies while such person is an officer or employee of the National War Labor Board or for a period of 1 year after the cessation of the service of such person: *And provided further,* That the immunity herein created shall not apply as to any matter on which such person shall have been employed."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

Mr. MICHENER. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, this is a very formidable-sounding amendment. That is a substitute for a bill which the House passed, how long ago?

Mr. CRAVENS. The latter part of June. I call the attention of the gentleman, however, to the fact that while they struck out all the House bill and inserted this new matter, all but the last four and a half lines are just exactly the language of the bill as it passed the House; in other words, while apparently they have stricken out the entire House bill, they have reinstated the House bill with this addition:

Or for a period of 1 year after the cessation of the service of such person: *And provided further,* That the immunity herein created shall not apply as to any matter on which such person shall have been employed.

Mr. MICHENER. That is the only change?

Mr. CRAVENS. That is right. The other part of it is the House bill.

Mr. MICHENER. This is the bill that was reported unanimously by the Committee on the Judiciary?

Mr. CRAVENS. Yes. The Senate struck out the entire House bill but put back the same language and added four or five lines to it.

Mr. MICHENER. I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMITTEE ON MINES AND MINING

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Mines and Mining may have until midnight tonight to file a report on the bill H. R. 4852.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona?

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT OF THE NATIONAL SERVICE LIFE INSURANCE ACT OF 1940, AS AMENDED

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk for immediate consideration the bill (S. 2058) to liberalize certain provisions of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

Mr. MICHENER. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman tell us what this bill does?

Mr. RANKIN. It corrects some irregularities in the present insurance law to take care of certain officers, for one thing, whose insurance lapsed between June 30, 1941, and July 8, 1942, by virtue of conditions over which they had no control or of which they were not informed, and who were killed during that time and were not covered by the insurance laws.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MICHENER. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. This bill will cover men in the Air Corps who had insurance allowed them at the time they were in training for their commission. After they were commissioned it was up to them to make application to continue that insurance. In many cases they did not do it because they were not properly advised that they had to do it. They went into action and were killed. As the result of the Government's failure to get them properly advised of what they had to do, their beneficiaries are without the benefit of the proceeds of their insurance. This bill will correct that injustice and inequity.

Mr. RANKIN. Yes. That injustice was corrected in the act of July 8, 1942, but a great many of these men had been killed in the meantime.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Prior to that date?

Mr. RANKIN. Yes.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. This covers only up to that date?

Mr. RANKIN. Yes.

Mr. CALVIN D. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MICHENER. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. CALVIN D. JOHNSON. May I ask concerning an officer who was killed while acting as an instructor at one of the fields in this country and who had been commissioned, would that cover him also? The gentleman stated that it covers those who were killed in action. I presume the gentleman refers to anyone in the service of the Army who lost his life.

Mr. RANKIN. That is right. This bill passed the Senate unanimously, and is approved by the Veterans' Administration.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That any person granted national service life insurance under Public Law 97 and Public Law 99, Seventy-seventh Congress, approved June 3, 1941, shall be deemed to have continued such insurance in force by payment of premiums whether or not such premiums were or were not paid so long as he remains in active military service as a commissioned officer and not permanently relieved from duty involving participation in regular and frequent aerial flights: *Provided,* That any premiums due and unpaid at the death of such person whose insurance is deemed to have been in force under the provisions of this section shall constitute a lien against the proceeds of such insurance.

SEC. 2. Section 602 of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940 is hereby amended by adding thereto a new subsection (s) to read as follows:

"(s) Payment of insurance benefits shall not be denied in any case in which the applicant for insurance died prior to July 1, 1942, and the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs finds that the failure to pay premiums or to effect deductions thereof as provided in section 602 (m) hereof, could in any way be attributed to the inadequacy of the Service Department's procedure for authorizing deductions of premiums from active service pay prior to that date, or to want of proper instructions as to the requirements of such procedure: *Provided,* That premiums due on such insurance shall be deducted from the proceeds of the insurance unless otherwise adjusted."

SEC. 3. Any liability under this amendatory act shall be chargeable to the National Service Life Insurance appropriation.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDMENT OF NATIONAL LIFE INSURANCE ACT OF 1940

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk for immediate consideration the bill (S. 2015) to liberalize certain provisions of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman explain the bill?

Mr. RANKIN. I will say to the gentleman from Michigan this largely corrects the present insurance law. It was taken up by the Senate and passed unanimously, and it is recommended by the Veterans' Administration. It has also been cleared by the Bureau of the Budget.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Is it not also true, may I ask the gentleman from Mississippi, that the bill now under consideration will take care of a very bad situation which has developed as a result of the action at Bataan in the Philippines?

Mr. RANKIN. Yes.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. As I understand it, our boys who were in service there at the time of that attack would have had to apply for waivers of their premiums when they were totally disabled or were in a condition where they could not pay them, or have them deducted from their pay. They were in action in the fox holes and in the trenches, protecting their country, and for that reason were precluded from being able to get word back regarding the waiver with the result that many of them are now declared dead and unless this bill is passed, the proceeds of insurance, which they should have had or would have had, will not be available to the members of their families.

Mr. RANKIN. That is right.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MICHENER. I yield.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I would like to inquire if this bill covers the question of including insurance against permanent and total disability. I mean, in the First World War that was included in national service life insurance and in this war it is not. I wonder whether this bill covers that point.

Mr. RANKIN. This bill does, but I am not sure that it goes as far as I would like to have it go.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I am glad to have the gentleman express that sentiment about the matter. I know how he feels about it.

Mr. RANKIN. I want to say to the gentleman from California that unfortunately this present insurance law did not come to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation, or we would have brought out a bill enacting the same law we had in World War No. 1. Thus it would have taken care of these men where they were permanently and totally disabled. This bill does not go as far, as I have just said to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. CUNNINGHAM] a moment ago; it does not go as far as I should like to go in that direction, but it does go some distance and, as he said, takes care of a great many cases that should be included.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MICHENER. I yield.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. It is because there are cases right now that need attention that we favor this bill, even though we would like to have it go further. It is the best that can be done under the circumstances, and it is a step in the right direction.

Mr. RANKIN. That is right.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That subsection (j) of section 602 of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, as amended, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(j) No installments of such insurance shall be paid to the heirs or legal representatives as such of the insured or of any beneficiary, and in the event that no person within the permitted class survives to receive the insurance or any part thereof no payment of the unpaid installments shall be made, except that if the reserve of a contract of converted national service life insurance, together with dividends accumulated thereon, less any indebtedness under such contract, exceeds the aggregate amount paid to beneficiaries, the excess shall be paid to the estate of the insured unless the estate of the insured would escheat under the laws of his place of residence, in which event no payment shall be made."

SEC. 2. That portion of subsection (3) (A) of section 602 (d) of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, as amended, which precedes the first proviso is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(3) (A) Any person in the active service who on or after October 8, 1940, and prior to April 20, 1942, becomes totally disabled as a result of injury or disease incurred in line of duty and such disability continues without interruption for a period of 6 months or until death intervening prior to the end of such 6 months' period without having in force at time of incurrence of such disability at least $5,000 insurance issued under the War Risk Insurance Act, as amended, or the World War Veterans' Act, 1924, as amended, or this act, shall be deemed to have applied for and to have been granted, effective as of the commencement of such total disability, national service life insurance in an amount which together with any such insurance then in force shall aggregate $5,000 and such gratuitous insurance shall continue in force without payment of premiums until 6 months after the insured ceases to be totally disabled or until 1 year after the date of enactment of this amendatory act, whichever is the earlier date:".

SEC. 3. Section 602 of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940 is hereby amended by adding thereto a new subsection (r) to read as follows:

"(r) In any case in which premiums are not waived under subsection (n) hereof solely because the insured died prior to the continuance of total disability for 6 months, and proof of such facts, satisfactory to the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, is filed by the beneficiary with the Veterans' Administration within 1 year after the enactment of this amendment, or 1 year after the insured's death, whichever is the later date, his insurance shall be deemed to be in force at the date of his death, and the unpaid premiums shall become a lien against the proceeds of his insurance: *Provided*, That if the beneficiary be insane or a minor, proof of such facts may be filed within 1 year after removal of such legal disability."

SEC. 4. Subsection (5) of section 602 (d) of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940 is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(5) If any person deemed to have been issued insurance under subsection (3) (A) or (B) hereof die without filing application and within the time limited therefor, death insurance benefits shall be payable in the manner and to the persons as stated in subsection (2): *Provided*, That no application for insurance payments under subsections (2) or (3) as hereby amended, shall be valid unless filed in the Veterans' Administration within 5 years after the date of death of the insured and the relationship and dependency of the applicant, where required as a basis for such claim, shall be proved as of date of death of insured by evidence satisfactory to the Administrator: *And provided further*, That persons shown by evidence satisfactory to the Administrator to have been mentally or legally incompetent at the time the right to apply for continuation of insurance or for death benefits expires, may make such application at any time within 1 year after the removal of such disability."

SEC. 5. Section 602 (h) (1) of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940 is hereby amended by substituting a colon for the period at the end thereof and adding the following: "*Provided*, That the Administrator, under regulations to be promulgated by him, may include a provision in the insurance contract authorizing the insured or the beneficiary to elect in lieu of this mode of payment, a refund life income in monthly installments payable for such period certain as may be required in order that the sum of the installments certain, including a last installment of such reduced amount as may be necessary, shall equal the face value of the contract, less any indebtedness, with such payments continuing throughout the lifetime of such beneficiary: *Provided further*, That such optional settlement shall not be available in any case in which payments of insurance installments have been commenced prior to the date of this amendatory act."

SEC. 6. Section 602 (h) (2) of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940 is hereby amended by substituting a colon for the period at the end thereof and adding the following: "*Provided*, That the Administrator, under regulations to be promulgated by him, may include a provision in the insurance contract authorizing the insured or the beneficiary to elect, in lieu of this mode of payment, a refund life income in monthly installments payable for such period certain as may be required in order that the sum of the installments certain, including a last installment of such reduced amount as may be necessary, shall equal the face value of the contract less any indebtedness with such payments continuing throughout the lifetime of such beneficiary: *Provided further*, That such optional settlement shall not be available in any case in which such settlement would result in payments of installments over a shorter period than 120 months, nor in any case in which payments of insurance installments have been commenced prior to the date of this amendatory act."

SEC. 7. Subsection (n) of section 602 of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, as amended, is hereby amended as of October 8, 1940, by substituting a colon for the period at the end of the second proviso and inserting before the last sentence of said subsection the following as a third proviso: "*And provided further*, That in the event of death of the insured without filing application for waiver, the beneficiary, within 1 year after death of the insured or the enactment of this amendment, whichever be the later, or, if the beneficiary be insane or a minor, within 1 year after removal of such legal disability, may file application for waiver with evidence of the insured's right to waiver under the conditions of this section."

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to be recognized for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I rise for the purpose of inquiring of the majority leader as to the probable date of the printing of the last CONGRESSIONAL RECORD after we adjourn today for the recess.

Mr. McCORMACK. I am very glad that my friend has asked that question. I have made inquiry, and I know the Members will all be interested to know that the last publication of the RECORD will be on Friday, October 6, including the 6th of October. Therefore, Members will have up to and including Friday, October 6, to extend their remarks in the RECORD. That will be the last publication.

Mr. RANKIN. That will be 2 weeks from tomorrow?

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes; that is 2 weeks from tomorrow.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. Will there be any printing of the RECORD after the recess and before that day?

Mr. McCORMACK. The RECORD will be printed in the meantime. There will be publications of the RECORD in the meantime, but that will be the last publication. I have stated the last day of publication in response to the inquiry of the gentleman from Michigan, so that Members will know the latest date on which they can insert extensions of their remarks for printing in the RECORD.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, do I understand the date given by the gentleman from Massachusetts to be the last date of publishing of the RECORD, but that between now and that date there may be copies printed in the discretion of the Public Printer?

Mr. McCORMACK. Oh, yes.

Mr. MICHENER. But there will not be a copy printed every day unless the Printing Office so determines?

Mr. McCORMACK. I assume that. In other words, this is not the only publication; there will be other publications of the RECORD. But October 6 will be the last publication.

Mr. RANKIN. I understand there are several bills out that the President will undoubtedly sign. One of them is the Pace bill on agriculture. Is provision made for the Speaker to receive these bills when they come back and handle them in the usual way in which they are handled when the House is in session?

The SPEAKER. The Chair always has power to control those things, under the unanimous-consent permission that has already been granted.

SALE AND TRANSPORTATION OF ALCOHOLIC LIQUORS

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, since legislation was introduced in both the House and the Senate which had as its objectives the prohibition of the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States, I have received hundreds of petitions signed by many thousand individuals protesting the enactment by Congress of any type of prohibition legislation.

These petitions come from men and women in every walk of life, but the ones that impressed me most were some letters and some petitions that came from the men and women serving in our armed forces.

We will all recall that during the last war when nearly 5,000,000 men were in the armed forces and on the fields of battle as well as on the high seas protecting our shores that well-meaning citizens started a campaign that eventually ended in wartime prohibition.

The men and women in our armed forces today, judging from what I have read, are fearful that might happen again. These men and women are engaged in a bloody war that our country might enjoy the freedoms and liberty to which it had been accustomed and they feel it would be a great injustice to them if their liberties were taken away from them while they are so engaged.

A strong effort was made to enact legislation to prevent the sale of alcoholic liquors in or near camps or shore stations. In fact, the legislation suggested went so far that if there was even a recruiting office of the Army, Navy, or Marine Corps in a building it would be unlawful to sell intoxicating liquors within the area.

The Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy both said in opposing the enactment of any prohibition legislation that liquor is not permitted to be sold in the camps or shore stations. The sale of beer has been permitted by the Army and the Navy and both Secretaries assured the Congress that it would be a grave mistake if the soldiers and sailors were denied a glass of beer.

While it might not be generally known, nevertheless every brewery in the United States is required to deliver to the Army and Navy one-third of the beer that it manufactures. That beer is not only made available to the men and women serving in this country if they desire it, but it is sent to the Far East and to our armies in every sector in Europe.

I have always taken the position that I never will vote for any type of legislation that would deny to the men and women in the armed forces any privilege that I, as a citizen, might have. It seems to me that instead of agitating, all such moves should be deferred until the men and women who are fighting for the preservation of our country have returned to their homes. Who, may I ask, should have a prior right to voice their opinion upon such a subject than those who are serving their country in time of war?

Mr. Speaker, hundreds of thousands of petitions against the enactment of any prohibition legislation were submitted through the Speaker's desk by various Members of Congress, myself included. Every petition that came to my office was filed at the Speaker's desk and all were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary which has jurisdiction over legislation of this character.

I recently learned that a large number of petitions sent to Members of Congress has not been referred to the Judiciary Committee through the Speaker's desk and recorded in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. The petitions were referred direct to the Judiciary Committee and I have secured the number of signatures on those petitions. The total number of signatures on the petitions referred to the Judiciary Committee direct and not heretofore recorded is 218,063. Thirty-six States are represented in this total. The State and the number of signers of the petitions follow:

State:	Total
Arizona	4,979
Arkansas	333
California	2,729
Colorado	1,623
Connecticut	10,582
District of Columbia	1,261
Georgia	100
Idaho	1,825
Illinois	4,205
Indiana	1
Iowa	425
Kentucky	1,210
Louisiana	3,500
Maine	2,333
Maryland	6,701
Massachusetts	1,178
Michigan	2,312
Minnesota	15,059
Missouri	3,273
New Jersey	3,870
New York	76,077
North Carolina	953
Oklahoma	3,479
Ohio	2,911
Oregon	6,190
Pennsylvania	26,521
South Carolina	500
South Dakota	534
Tennessee	843
Texas	9,385
Utah	1,081
Vermont	2,906
Virginia	6
Washington	4,466
West Virginia	4,123
Wisconsin	10,589
Total	218,063

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that following the other special orders today I may address the House for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix and include the prize winning essay of John H. G. Pierson, in the Pabst post-war employment contest.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS] is recognized for 15 minutes.

THE COMMANDER IN CHIEF

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, America and her allies are winning the greatest war that history records. It is a war fought to preserve the opportunity of common people to be free; a war fought to destroy the philosophy of government that those common people are mere pawns of a superstate, to be sacrificed for the aggrandizement of a ruling caste. It is a war fought for the right of the common man to make progress, to solve his problems and improve his lot in life by his own efforts, instead of being told what he must do, think, and believe by a dictatorial master race or master clique.

Never before has the soul of humanity been tried as it is today. Never before has such great sacrifices been called for from men and women who would be free. Under these circumstances the American people are going to make their decisions and do their thinking on the basis of big facts rather than petty considerations. They are interested in big issues and the broad outlines of the record of political parties and candidates. Above all, they want the simple truth from all of us.

Mr. Speaker, there have been times in the past when I have not agreed with the President and his policies. There will, I know, be such times in the future. But for that very reason I can speak with greater force and feeling concerning the greatest fact of all that confronts our Nation at the present time. And that fact is that our country is today winning the greatest war in history; that it is winning it under the leadership of an American citizen civilian, President Roosevelt, and that it was he who through the years and in spite of bitter attacks, opposition, and criticism warned consistently of the necessity of preparing

this Nation for the war which he feared might come.

Difficult as were the early years of this war for our country, I hate to contemplate what they would have been had it not been for the relentless insistence of the President upon the building up in the critical years before the war broke upon us of our national defenses. In the face of these facts and with the war at a crisis, it is certainly no time for irresponsible talk from any quarter, least of all from one who presently seeks the highest office in our land.

And yet, at Chicago last June in his acceptance speech, Mr. Dewey said:

> Let me make it crystal clear that a change of administration next January cannot and will not involve any change in the military conduct of the war. If there is not now any civilian interference with the military and naval commands, a change in administration will not alter that status. If there is civilian interference, the new administration will put a stop to it forthwith.

Under the Constitution the President as the Chief Executive of the American people is directly charged with final responsibility for the conduct of any war in which we are engaged. It is his constitutional duty to define the large objectives of the war and to devise the over-all strategy for attaining those ends. He must necessarily have a voice in all major military decisions, and as the civilian head of the Government he cannot shift that responsibility without betraying his trust and perverting the functions of his office.

If a war goes badly, he can properly be blamed. If a war goes well, he should properly be praised. America's outstanding military leadership—Admiral King, General Marshall, and all the rest of the men who have so brilliantly led America's forces—is necessarily chosen either by direct action of the President or by the supreme commanders for whose choice he is responsible.

Since 1933 President Roosevelt has been conscientiously performing his duties as Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy. And he is still performing them all too well for the desperate Nazis and Japanese, as even the bitterest of opposition critics are bound to confess.

What, then, did Mr. Dewey mean by his statement at Chicago?

Did he mean that, if elected President, he would not assume his duties as Commander in Chief?

In that case, of course, there would certainly be changes in the military conduct of the war. There would be some equally important and profoundly disturbing changes in the functions of the Presidency as laid down in the Constitution.

Does Mr. Dewey propose to let the military run their own private war—free from all direction and control by the Presidency?

There are states that operate that way—notably Germany and Japan—but that is not our way. It is the antithesis of everything we are fighting for. We want no incubus of militarism saddled upon this country.

Or did Mr. Dewey mean that, if he were elected, he would assume the duties of Commander in Chief?

If he did, does he really mean that he would make no change in the conduct of the war? If so, then he should be big enough to say so and to give credit where credit is due.

Unfortunately, the record shows that Mr. Dewey has found fault with step after step taken in our preparedness program before the outbreak of hostilities and in the war since that time. Although he later reversed himself and came out for the bill, he originally opposed lend-lease, terming it a bill—

> To give away the whole Navy, to give away every gun in the Army, to give away every American airplane. * * * The President's so-called defense bill would bring an end to free government in the United States and would abolish the Congress for all practical purposes. * * * The President's proposal is a grave blow, not only to national unity but to all free government everywhere.

The reckless extravagance of that statement is too obvious to require comment.

When, in 1940, President Roosevelt appointed two members of the Republican Party, Col. Henry L. Stimson and the late Col. Frank Knox, to head the War and Navy Departments, Mr. Dewey's only comment was to say that these appointments were "nothing but a political raid."

It is hard to find things in our Government's preparedness and war programs which have pleased Mr. Dewey. He did not approve the appointment of William Knudsen, one of the country's best-known production men, to direct the Office of Production Management. He called this appointment "mere window dressing."

As the war-production program got into high gear, the present Republican candidate stepped boldly forward in May 1940 to say that the defense program was "a national disgrace and a national calamity, for which President Roosevelt is directly responsible."

These words seemed to be pretty strong, even to the Wall Street Journal, long one of his loudest supporters, and led that journal to comment that if the production program turned out to be effective, "Mr. Dewey will find himself perilously out on a limb."

The fact is that the war production of America has been nothing less than the basic deciding factor, next only to the gallantry of our fighting forces, in the whole war.

Seriously, I wonder what Mr. Dewey now thinks of the war production program and whether he now holds President Roosevelt directly responsible for its unparalleled success as he once did for its alleged failure. What about the amazing feats and overwhelming power of the American air forces in all parts of the world and the magnificent drive across France and the Low Countries. For, second only to the excellence of our military leadership and the gallantry of our troops, these things have been made possible by the production lines of our country.

Back in those dark days when France fell and there seemed nothing to prevent an invasion of England, the President came before Congress to lay down his answer to the Nazi threat of world conquest. Among other measures, he proposed and the Congress quickly approved a program to construct 50,000 airplanes a year.

And what was Mr. Dewey's reaction? Did he applaud this measure of defense, this stout defiance of the Axis, and call upon all Americans to put their shoulder to the wheel and see that this program was carried through as quickly as possible?

On the contrary, he took a purely defeatist attitude, adopting the counsel of despair. What the President proposed, he said, simply could not be done. American industry was not up to the job. Here are his exact words:

> To produce 50,000 planes a year it will take a plant about four and a half times as large as our present plant, including all plant capacity now under construction. Experts estimate that it would take at least 4 years to accomplish this. * * * What is the good of talking about 50,000 planes unless we know what we are talking about?

Exactly. What is the good of talking, Mr. Dewey, unless we know what we are talking about? Instead of taking 4 years, as Mr. Dewey predicted, our goal of 50,000 planes was reached within little more than 1 year. Within 2 years production had been doubled, and the skies over the battle fronts where our boys are writing deeds of immortal glory are now black with our planes—and all this under a war production program that was, according to Mr. Dewey, "a national calamity and disgrace."

Every man of course has made statements in the past and taken positions which later on he wishes he had not made or taken. But at the very least this is true: Either Governor Dewey would have to repudiate a great many things he has said or else he would, if elected, be bound to attempt very considerable changes in the conduct of the war. And that would, I most earnestly submit, be most dangerous.

For in spite of all difficulties and obstructions—yes, in spite, no doubt, of some mistakes, some failures to do things as well as they might have been done—the great overwhelming fact of this hour is that, although there may be, and I am afraid will be, bitter fighting and anxious days ahead, victory for our country in the most terrible and critical war in all history is in sight if we persist in the way we are now traveling. More than any one thing the people of America want to know that we shall attain that victory with the least cost in lives of our men. For that reason, it is my opinion, that, once they set down the criticisms of Mr. Dewey beside the great overwhelming fact I have just related, they will tell the President that they want him to stay with his tremendous task until the last vestige of Axis power has been stricken down.

Here ends my first speech, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I want to devote a couple of minutes of my remaining time to a different subject.

POLITICAL-ACTION GROUPS OF ALL SORTS

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, there has been considerable

talk here in the House and elsewhere bearing upon the political situation involved in the active participation of certain groups in the political contests now current. I take it that every single group of American citizens, whether they be a business group, a farm group, a labor organization, or any other group of American citizens, has a full right as citizens to participate in the open in the political life of the Nation. I do not believe any responsible person will suggest otherwise. There are some considerations in connection with the participation of any organized group in American political life, however, as to which I want to make my own position very clear. No special group has a right to dominate either the policies of this Nation or conduct of any political party. I stated on the floor of this House before this that I do not believe any group is going to dominate any political party in America or the action of our Government, and we should use our efforts to the end of seeing that that never happens. But our duty as candidates for public office goes further than that, and I think all candidates have primary responsibility for dealing rightly with the problem either of attempts on the part of big-business groups to dominate the Republican Party or on the part of political-action committees to be active in the Democratic Party, or any other group which may have an influence in political life. The main responsibility rests upon the candidates for public office, and their duty obviously is to make it plain that they do not seek the support of any special group that expects to come afterward and say: "We elected you to office and now we expect you to make up your mind not on the basis of what you conscientiously believe to be your duty to the people as a whole but on the basis of what we tell you to do."

When a man comes to this Congress he has got to be free to do what he believes to be right on every issue and occasion; and it ought to be his record, the record as written, that is the basis upon which he is judged. I am sure the people of my own district understand my position in this matter. I feel that as this campaign goes along, the principle I am enunciating is going to become more and more emphasized by many people in my own party, and I hope in others. This principle I am enunciating is not limited to a labor organization. It has got to apply also to the relationship of the National Association of Manufacturers to a political party which might in that case be the Republican Party; to the chamber of commerce; yes, to the Political Action Committee, to the United Mine Workers, or any other organization I might mention.

The next thing I should like to make clear about this matter, Mr. Speaker, is that, as a political principle and as a matter of right conduct in American political life, it is clearly wrong for any group other than a political party itself no matter what it may be, to exact from its membership political contributions which are not voluntarily made by those members. In saying that, I do not refer to any particular group; I refer to all groups. As a principle it is obvious, and I want to make my own position very clear with regard to it.

Here, Mr. Speaker, ends my second speech.

INDEPENDENT SOURCES OF INFORMATION FOR CONGRESS

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I have four other speeches I should like to make which I have not time to make this afternoon. This is the last day of this current session of Congress. I should like to have had time to speak about proposals for enabling the Congress to have genuine and effective sources of independent information so it would be less dependent upon information from either the executive department or from any pressure groups that may come before it. I am deeply interested in strengthening the position and the work of the Congress and I will have more to say on this subject when we reassemble. These few words are my third speech.

HOME CONSTRUCTION: NO. 1 HOPE FOR POST-WAR EMPLOYMENT EXPANSION

I should like to make a speech about what I think is the primary industry that might expand after the war is finally won, namely, the housing industry. Congress must develop a carefully worked-out and challenging program in this field. It should be done at once. Very briefly, such a program should place primary emphasis upon encouragement to and broadening the opportunity for private construction of homes and home ownership in our country. I believe F. H. A. should be expanded, interest rates lowered, and every other sound measure taken to bring this about. In the second place, the development of mutual housing through cooperative—as opposed to public—ownership by groups of people of housing projects in which each family would own its own home, where they are not able to afford individual construction, is something that needs to be deeply considered. Finally, there are some areas, such as slum clearance, where private business cannot, unaided, operate profitably. In this field we must frankly face the necessity for public action. Here, Mr. Speaker, ends my fourth speech.

SUPPORT FROM BUSINESS FOR ANTITRUST LAWS

Next, I have some figures on a poll taken by Modern Industry, a magazine in this country, as to the opinion of business managers on the question of the antitrust laws, which shows better than two-thirds of the businessmen of this country are absolutely opposed to any weakening of the antitrust laws. In my own section of the country the poll shows that 76.9 percent so oppose any weakening of the antitrust laws and support their enforcement.

On the question, "Should the antitrust laws be repealed?" New England voted 63.6 percent "No" and 36.4 percent "Yes"; the Middle Atlantic States voted 69.3 percent "No" and 30.7 percent "Yes"; the North Central States voted 70.7 percent "No" and 29.3 percent "Yes"; the South voted 70.4 percent "No" and 29.6 percent "Yes"; the Mountain States voted 71.1 percent "No" and 28.9 percent "Yes"; and the Pacific States—I am proud to report—voted 76.9 percent "No" and only 23.1 percent "Yes." That is my fifth speech.

Obviously, I cannot make all these speeches at this time, but may I say I appreciate both your patient attention, Mr. Speaker, and that of the Members of the House with me. I have addressed the House on numerous occasions in the last few weeks because I feel so deeply the critical nature of the times which our country is facing.

THANKS TO ARMED FORCES

I want to close by expressing once more my profound gratitude to the military leadership and to every single man in the fighting forces of this country for the wonderful record they are writing in the defense of everything our country stands for. That is my last, and perhaps my best, speech of this closing afternoon.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

(Mr. SHORT asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.)

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. WEICHEL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes today at the conclusion of the other special orders heretofore entered.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under special order of the House, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] is recognized for 10 minutes.

HOLD THE LINE ON INFLATION

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Speaker, I wish further to call the attention of the membership of the House to the threatened destruction of effective price control through a breaking of the Little Steel formula.

While I recognize that this formula is not a perfect yardstick for the equitable control of all wages of the Nation, I do feel that it has worked out reasonably satisfactorily, measured by its effect in helping to win the battle against inflation.

I have always insisted that it was fundamental that if prices are to be controlled that wages also had to be controlled, or inflation would be inevitable. The charts showing the stumbling and feeble attempts to have effective inflation control before this was done are known to almost everyone. The impossibility of holding down the cost of living while the production costs of those items were allowed to skyrocket through advancing wage rates became so apparent that Congress was called back to Washington to write the Stabilization Act of October 2, 1942.

SPIRAL VIRTUALLY STOPPED

Since the passage of the Stabilization Act, which puts into legislation the hold-the-line order on prices and limited wage adjustments to the Little Steel formula, the spiral of inflation has been virtually stopped. Thus, if we can continue to hold to these effective controls, for the first time in its history, America will be able to wage a war without having the home front devastated by uncontrolled

inflation. Thus, we can, if we have the will and the courage to finish the good job already started, maintain the purchasing power of our savings dollar virtually intact instead of seeing bonds and other savings of the millions of little people destroyed by run-away inflation.

I need not remind you that this is the first war that we have ever fought where the dollar did not sink to fractional purchasing power, where business, labor, and the farmer as well did not suffer deep economic distress because of war inflation. In the War of the Revolution, the dollar sank to 33 cents; in the Civil War to 44 cents and in World War No. 1, it fell to 40 cents.

By passage in June of an effective price-control bill by the Congress, we have virtually assured that prices can be held well in check against advances, "if."

By permitting the use of nearly $1,000,000,000 in subsidy payments to prevent loss of essential farm production through price squeezes, we have blocked off price increases, "if."

By being realistic and insisting that by saying "no" to all the Nation's most powerful economic interests prices can be held stable and inflation avoided, "if."

That big "if" in the picture is the rock on which effective price control rests. It is: "If the Little Steel formula is held unbroken."

Today, without much fanfare, a big offensive is being waged here in Washington to smash the wage flank of the inflation control line and to start the break-through that will destroy the entire line. And strangely it is being made in a sector where the workers have enjoyed a far better and more comfortable position than the rank and file of employees of the Nation.

USE DANGEROUS TACTICS

To be specific: The break-through sought after is by the C. I. O. Steel Workers Union, who are out to crack wide open the wage formula. Joined by many other well organized union leaders, they have copied the worst of other pressure-group tactics when many of that group once sought to smash control over their prices.

They attack the Department of Labor's statistics on the cost of living index and then glibly produce a nice "home-made" one of their own to make their case. Always before, for a score of years, they have considered the Bureau of Labor Statistics fair and dependable, but now because it fails to serve the purpose of a few ambitious union leaders anxious to improve their prestige and standing with their own unions, they cast it aside.

I believe the Bureau of Labor Statistics, and no quickly conjured set of figures compiled to make their case, is convincing. I believe that the increase in the cost of living, as shown by the Bureau of Labor Statistics, of 25 percent from the period January 1, 1941, to date is correct and that the research and data behind that reflect as nearly as possible the true situation.

Against this 25-percent increase in their cost of living, the steel workers seek to lead the break through on wage control and to assure at least for the most highly organized unions in bottleneck defense positions a higher wartime scale.

Against a 25-percent increase in their cost of living the steel workers take-home pay envelope has increased 33⅓ percent in this same period. The gross hourly earnings, which include overtime, shift differentials, and other added earnings, in January 1941 averaged 86.9 cents and in April 1944, $1.158.

STRAIGHT TIME SHOWS GAIN

Even taken on a straight-time hourly earnings basis with shift differentials and extras but eliminating the bonus of time and a half for overtime, they still have a wage increase of 25.9 percent over January 1941, the base date.

Only on the basic wage rate at straight time average hourly earnings are they behind the cost of living increase. This figure is 18.2 percent increase, but overtime payment and extras for shift differentials greatly add actual earnings of this basic figure.

One of the best guides as to hardship is to weigh the average annual earnings against a pre-war year and now, for steady work at longer hours has greatly increased their real and genuine economic position and their purchasing power. In 1939 before the outbreak of the war, their annual average earnings were $1,514. For 1943, their average annual earnings were placed at $2,612 by the Bureau of Labor Statistics. This is an increase of 72½ percent. Their average weekly earnings of 1939 were $28.88, and for 1943 were $49.77, an increase of 66.6 percent for that period.

I am not arguing for lower wages in the post-war period. I believe that many are mixing up post-war plans with the hard-boiled realistic facts of price control. In so doing, I believe they will do labor an irreparable damage and will lose—even if they win—a break-through against price control.

Any substantial increase, such as is proposed for the basic steel industry, will spread through all the essential industries and through others which are well organized. This will dislocate almost every single price schedule in the Nation and will lead to a broad-front advance of the cost of living. It is inevitable.

These short-sighted labor leaders, by forcing a wage break-through at this time, will find they have forced also upon all labor, big and little, unorganized and organized as well, a greatly increased cost of living. This general price advance is almost sure to outrun the real wage increases that they get. It will surely depreciate greatly the value of their savings which have reached an all-time high.

SITUATION LIKELY TO SOON CHANGE

Two, three, or four months will see the situation on prices and wages change greatly as the forces of normal free competition come into play with the production of civilian goods. Until the forces of supply and demand come somewhere near a balance, we dare not break the dam that has held back the inflationary flood.

A sound, healthy, and prosperous post-war economy, not only for industry but for labor as well, depends for a foundation upon a stable dollar. A home-stretch inflation boom now created by releasing necessary controls on wages or prices would destroy our chances for a real and lasting post-war prosperity.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. PRIEST. May I say that no Member of this body has worked more diligently on the job of holding the line against inflation than the distinguished gentleman from Oklahoma, and may I add also that I hope the warning note he is sounding today will be heeded.

Mr. MONRONEY. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. MURDOCK. I second the commendation of the gentleman from Tennessee. I feel the same way about the efforts of the gentleman from Oklahoma. It is a distinct contribution that he is making now, and it adds to what he has already well done toward holding the line. It took real courage to buck the headstrong forces of inflation from many different directions as our colleague from Oklahoma has so effectively done.

Mr. MONRONEY. I am deeply grateful to the gentleman from Arizona.

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES] is recognized for 5 minutes.

CURTAILMENT IN FEDERAL EMPLOYMENT SHOULD START NOW

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, there has been a considerable amount of publicity concerning a request by the administration to the Budget Director for reduction in Government employment after the war. It appears to be a formal authorization to examine functions of war agencies and determine whether there is a chance for "curtailment and consolidation" some time after the war is over. No reduction is contemplated until many months after hostilities have ceased. Let me suggest right here that there is plenty of chance for curtailment and consolidation right now. To do so would not injure the war effort but would help it.

The letter suggests a possibility of reducing the number of employees to approximately 1,000,000 "when peacetime conditions have been attained." It might be well to review the record just a little with respect to Government employment under the administration, especially during peacetime. At the close of World War No. 1 the high peak of Government employment was 918,000. That number was reduced to approximately 500,000 a few years thereafter. In 1933 when the administration took charge, and when the present Chief Executive stated there were too many employees in Government, the total employment was 567,961. By 1939 the number had increased to 920,979, an increase of more than 70 percent. By 1940 it was 988,100, so Government employment

almost doubled before preparations for war were really under way. I am informed the total civilian employment is now more than 3,300,000. This is approximately 1 for every 3 members in the armed forces. This does not include the thousands of men and women in uniform who are performing civilian duties.

Mr. Speaker, no one objects to employment of people on our civilian pay roll so long as they are needed. It is my contention that by reason of unnecessary activities and agencies and because of overlapping and duplication of authority we have a tremendous amount of waste in manpower as well as in taxpayers' money. Practically no effort is being made to reduce these expenses and hold down employment. We need to start now and cut out a lot of overlapping and duplication of Federal activities that are not necessary either in the war or civilian effort. It could be done if the administration would immediately give attention in that direction.

Mr. Speaker, while we are on this subject I want to call your attention to a matter that relates to the question of employment in Federal Government. In January of this year the United Relief and Rehabilitation Administration was established for the purpose of rendering relief and aid to the suffering people of Europe and elsewhere. Funds were appropriated to provide for the essential necessities of life in the aftermath of the war. In July the organization proceeded to organize its staff and recruit its employees. Let us see what has happened so far. We are not yet ready to pass out relief to these stricken people. The organization to distribute aid to help these unfortunate people has established headquarters office that provides for 1 official at the salary of $15,000, another at $14,000, 5 or 6 more at $12,000, 7 more at $10,000, and 65 from $7,000 to $9,000. More than a hundred get between $5,000 and $6,000, and more than 300 get from $3,000 to $4,500. Hundreds more are to be employed at salaries of $2,000 or more. Hundreds of these employees will go abroad and will, of course, be allowed expense accounts while they are away. We understand that it will require a considerable amount of employment to distribute funds to these unfortunate people, but it just looks as though the administration is going to be pretty liberal with a crowd of employees before it gives consideration to the distribution of food and clothing to the suffering people in the devastated areas of Europe and Asia.

Mr. Speaker, I think a pretty good time for the Administration to look into the curtailment and reduction of Federal employment is right now. It will not hinder but it will help the war effort tremendously to do so. Our Government ought to have every bit of employment required to carry on its affairs, but the waste of manpower and money is destructive and ought not to be allowed.

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. WEICHEL] is recognized for 5 minutes.

CODDLING AND PAMPERING OF ITALIAN WAR PRISONERS

Mr. WEICHEL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, for many months past the War Department has fitted Italian prisoners with American uniforms and on week ends hauls them throughout the various communities of the Nation, with Government trucks, tires, and gasoline, when they are not available to the citizens of the United States and to the soldiers of our own country for amusement and entertainment. In addition, the War Department makes requests upon mayors of cities, members of council, and asks that public officials meet these men who have killed our boys, with an honor escort of police, and preside at a public dinner honoring these Italian prisoners who have boasted of killing Americans.

Mr. Speaker, on July 15, 1944, I protested to the War Department, as follows:

WAR DEPARTMENT,
Washington, D. C.:

The Congress declared war against the Axis Powers. What do you mean by parading around, finely outfitting, especially entertaining, and hauling in Army trucks to Cleveland, Toledo, and other northern Ohio cities the Italian prisoners from Camp Perry and calling them United States Army soldiers? Your officers advertising it as orientation for the Italians. What do you mean by forcing these prisoners on the people as heroes, those who killed our boys in Africa, Sicily, and Italy. I have witnessed no special honor treatment or entertainment by the War Department of the fathers and mothers whose sons are buried in north Africa, Sicily, and Italy. Must the fathers and mothers of those who died in fighting these men suffer such rot? It is desecration and mockery to those who gave their lives in north Africa, Sicily, and Italy. I protest the pampering and hero worship of those who killed our boys. It is an insult to the fathers and mothers who gave their sons. The War Department is not authorized to use our boys as cannon fodder for the enemy and then entertain and make heroes of the killers.

ALVIN F. WEICHEL,
Member of Congress, Thirteenth Ohio District.

Evidently this coddling and pampering of Italian prisoners has been going on throughout the entire country wherever such groups were stationed. They have been permitted the free run of surrounding communities, visiting the taverns, shops, and in some instances were arrested in houses of prostitution. In addition they have attacked police in the city of Boston, and American soldiers are forced to salute Italian prisoner officers.

The parents of those in the armed forces have resented this method of making heroes of those who have killed their sons, and I have received communications from more than 20 States concerning this insult to the American soldier and the fathers and mothers of the men who have been killed in north Africa and in the invasion of Italy.

Mr. Speaker, in answer to that protest I have received the following answer from the War Department:

JULY 24, 1944.

Hon. ALVIN F. WEICHEL,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. WEICHEL: This will acknowledge receipt of your telegram, dated July 15, 1944, relating to the treatment of Italian Service Unit personnel at Camp Perry, Ohio.

Before discussing the situation at Camp Perry permit me to explain the purpose and organization of the Italian Service Units. Upon the surrender of Italy there remained in American custody approximately 130,000 Italian prisoners of war, of whom the great majority were in the north African theater of operations. The great need for labor troops to supplement our military personnel in that theater made it an imperative military necessity to utilize this prisoner pool in the most advantageous possible fashion. To this end, arrangements were concluded early in the fall of 1943 under which selected Italian prisoners of war were enabled to volunteer to serve in the war effort against Germany in every capacity excepting actual combat. Thereby the uses to which these prisoners could be put were very materially diversified and enlarged; the drain on American personnel for guarding the prisoners was substantially reduced; and the morale and working effectiveness of the prisoners were brought to a high level, with manifest benefit to our war operations.

Under these arrangements approximately 75,000 of these prisoners of war held by the United States in north Africa were organized into Italian Service Units. Only carefully selected individuals who declared in writing their desire to volunteer for this type of service were accepted. The units are staffed with Italian officers and noncommissioned officers under the administrative control of American personnel, and are organized along American military organizational lines suitable to the type of task to which they were assigned. Disciplinary control is retained in American hands, and the Italian personnel of these units continues to be subject to American military law. They are paid the rates of pay established by the Army for labor of prisoners of war, pursuant to our obligation therefor under the Geneva Prisoners of War Convention.

At the time we organized these units the British Commonwealth Governments also organized cooperative Italian prisoners of war in their custody into units which later became known as cooperator units, the function and organization of which are similar to ours. In this way the Allies acquired an effective force of well over 100,000 service troops for military service in the communication zones of the north African and European theaters, to do work which would otherwise have to be done by Allied military personnel.

The success of this program in north Africa and the increasingly tight military manpower situation have led us to organize Italian volunteer prisoners of war within the continental United States as an adjunct to our military program, on the same basis as that employed in north Africa. To date, approximately 36,000 Italian prisoners of war within the continental United States have been organized into Italian service units, with very satisfactory results. They have relieved acute military manpower shortages at a variety of military installations and in many types of essential service, both skilled and unskilled, and their removal from the close confinement of prisoner stockades, and the granting to them of reasonable privileges and liberties which as ordinary prisoners they would not receive, has led to an advantageous improvement of morale and efficiency.

The Italian Quartermaster service companies stationed at Camp Perry, Ohio, are performing important and essential work directly contributing to our war effort. Since they are permitted no individual liberty, their occasional group opportunities for recreation off the military reservation must of necessity take the form of planned excursions. The Commanding General of the Fifth Service Command states that as a special reward for the splendid work they are performing, members of these units from

Camp Perry were taken on a supervised trip to Cleveland.

I am certain that with this explanation of the essential and important work being performed, both here and abroad, by members of these volunteer Italian service units, you will not continue in your belief that the War Department is pampering the members of these units. I might add that many members of Italian service units are assisting us at considerable risk to their families in occupied Italy.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN W. MARTYN,
Administrative Assistant.

Mr. Speaker, the answer completely ignores the coddling, pampering, and entertaining of these Italian prisoners by the use of Army automobiles, tires, and gasoline, while the American soldier who is fighting to preserve this country has not been given such entertainment and treatment by the War Department. In many instances our boys have insufficient uniforms, while these Italian prisoners are given American uniforms to parade the streets of our cities.

In addition to the honors requested from city officials, the War Department has gone throughout the country asking private citizens to entertain these Italian prisoners who have cost the lives of thousands of our men. Newspaper stories and pictures show movie stars in California lavishly entertaining Italian prisoners at the request of the War Department.

The answer of the War Department recites that these Italian prisoners are doing noncombat service for the United States and praises them most highly for such service. Why should these men be praised for doing noncombat service after they refuse to take a gun to liberate their own country? While these Italian prisoners are being coddled, pampered, and entertained through the efforts of the War Department, the War Department is sending our boys, many of them with only 4 months' training, across the seas to their death to liberate Italy, while the Italians who refused to carry a gun for Italy are entertained by the War Department of the United States.

I see no reason for the War Department and the administration coddling and especially honoring and entertaining Italian prisoners who will not fight for their own country. Italian prisoners deserve no commendation and entertainment for working in the noncombat forces of the United States Army, while the War Department and the administration are sending our troops to liberate Italy for these Italian prisoners.

How long must the people of this country, the fathers and mothers of our boys, be insulted after giving their sons to preserve our country?

THE DEADLY RISK OF REPEATING THE 1920 DECISION

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 2 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, obviously it is impossible for each Member to read all of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I do not attempt to do so, but for as much time as I can put in I like to read what my colleagues have contributed, not only in debate, but in the Appendix of the RECORD. I picked up the RECORD which was delivered at my office yesterday morning, the RECORD for September 19, and I read the last item in the Appendix, inserted as part of his remarks by my colleague, the gentleman from New Mexico, Mr. CLINTON P. ANDERSON. I wish that every Member of the House would read that editorial thoughtfully. I wish that every American citizen would read it very carefully. It is an editorial from a Louisville paper, pointing out the deadly parallel between 1920 and 1944. I have studied something of American history and I am old enough to remember some of the stirring things that have taken place in recent tragic years.

I particularly see a political parallel between 1920 and 1944. This is another year of decision. We have heard that from several sources, have we not? What will the American people do? An individual can go over Niagara but once, but a nation can go down the road to catastrophe more than once. The great question of this year and this hour is, Will America repeat the decision of 1920 and follow the road which we followed in the decade of the twenties? It is a matter of tremendous concern. This editorial from a Kentucky paper points that out with great clearness and power. I recommend it to every Member of this body.

Even if I were not holding this public office and seeking reelection on the Democratic ticket, I would still fear the results of a Republican victory at the polls on November 7 this year. I believe it would mean a return to the conditions of the Harding administration with its distinctively Republican attitude and action toward both domestic and foreign issues. By this I mean that in foreign matters it would mean a return to isolationism the moment the guns cool, and in domestic matters it would mean an attempt to return to normalcy in business as usual, according to the standards of the prosperous twenties.

How prosperous were the twenties? Well, how many young men have been found physically unfit for military service in this war who were born and spent their childhood in those so-called prosperous twenties? Along with the tragedy of the thousands of young men dying on the battlefields today we must list another tragedy of the many more than that number who have been counted unable to meet the rigors of military life because they did not have enough to eat in the years of Republican prosperity when they were children. The bookkeeping of the twenties was business accounting, with stress upon profits but little consideration given to human accounting. We have today political and business leaders hoping by the events of next November 7 to return America to that same normalcy.

We are told by some that the two major parties are in agreement on foreign policy. I do not believe it. In 1920 a superficial view might show the Democrats and Republicans to be practically together on a great foreign issue. Democrats were for "The League of Nations," and the Republicans said they were "A League of Nations." However, there was a vaster difference between the real intent of the major parties then than is expressed by the two words "the" and "a." Many outstanding Republicans in 1920 did have the right idea concerning a way to have world peace—indeed they probably had taken the lead in sponsoring it. Yet the Republican Party machine evidently gave lip service in that cause in order to win that political campaign that they might return to political power.

That same element in the Republican Party is throwing out a smoke screen today by proclaiming that isolationism is dead and that they would think first of a just and lasting peace if returned to power. They are trying to fool the public into believing that the issues of this election are only domestic issues. Surely the American people will not be fooled by any such campaign argument. The most vital and paramount issue in the coming campaign, one which makes this a year of decision, is the question, Which party seeking support at the polls will best lead America in her proper role in world affairs through the coming years?

I am convinced that a Democratic administration and a Democratic Congress chosen next November 7 can and will bring this war to a speedy and proper conclusion with a fair prospect for a lasting peace. I am equally convinced that a Republican victory at the polls will mean a very doubtful peace and a return to that species of business prosperity which characterized the decade of the 1920's. This is the same opportunity of choice which America had in November 1920 only this time with guaranteed results on a larger scale than before.

PRESIDENTIAL CAMPAIGN

Mr. FOLGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 2 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Without objection it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. FOLGER. Mr. Speaker, this is our last day in Congress until about the 14th of November, which carries us beyond the election. I look with some fear upon the character of the campaign that may be carried on previous to the election on the 7th of November, particularly from what I have heard and read in recent days. This is too serious a time for us to forget that there are men fighting on the battlefields of the world for the freedom and safety and security of Americans and of people of all lands. It may be that up to now this disposition to nag has come about on account of thoughtless youth. Paul said, "When I was a child I spake as a child, I understood as a child, I thought as a child; but when I became a man I put away childish things."

This bickering and attack that seems to be the attitude of some toward this campaign may be ascribable, perhaps, to extreme youth, but I hope there may be improvement.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to quote from the poem of Oliver Wendell Holmes' God Save the Flag, in recognition and realization of the value of the American flag:

GOD SAVE THE FLAG

Washed in the blood of the brave and the blooming,
Snatched from the altars of insolent foes,
Burning with star fires, but never consuming,
Flash its broad ribbons of lily and rose.

Vainly the prophets of Baal would rend it,
Vainly his worshipers pray for its fall;
Thousands have died for it, millions defend it,
Emblem of justice and mercy to all:

Justice that reddens the sky with her terrors,
Mercy that comes with her white-handed train,
Soothing all passions, redeeming all errors,
Sheathing the saber and breaking the chain.

Borne on the deluge of old usurpations,
Drifted our ark o'er the desolate seas,
Bearing the rainbow of hope to the nations,
Torn from the storm cloud and flung to the breeze!

God bless the flag and its loyal defenders,
While its broad folds o'er the battlefield wave,
Till the dim star wreath rekindle its splendors,
Washed from its stains in the blood of the brave!

—*Oliver Wendell Holmes.*

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix and include therein an article by Vardis Fisher, an Idaho author.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Idaho?

There was no objection.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. KLEIN, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 1569. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to amend the act creating the circuit court of appeals in regard to fees and costs, and for other purposes," approved February 19, 1897 (29 Stat. 536; U. S. C. 543);

H. R. 4286. An act to relinquish the title of the United States to certain lands in the county of Los Angeles, State of California;

H. R. 5144. An act to authorize the city of Ketchikan, Alaska, to issue bonds in a sum not to exceed $150,000 for the purpose of constructing and acquiring additions and betterments to and extensions of the electric light and power system of said city, and to provide for the payment thereof, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 5196. An act to amend section 22 of the Interstate Commerce Act by authorizing common carriers to grant reduced fares to personnel of armed services.

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 725. An act to provide for the punishment of persons conspiring to violate the laws relating to counterfeiting, and certain other laws;

S. 1807. An act authorizing and directing the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain land to the city of Duluth, Minn.;

S. 2028. An act to amend the Naval Reserve Act of 1938, as amended, and the Coast Guard Auxiliary and Reserve Act of 1941, as amended, so as to permit service of members of the Women's Reserve in the American area, the Territories of Hawaii and Alaska, and for other purposes;

S. 2051. An act to amend the Social Security Act, as amended, to provide a national program for war mobilization and reconversion, and for other purposes; and

S. 2137. An act to provide for naming the lake formed by waters of the Red River impounded by Denison Dam.

BILLS AND A JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. KLEIN, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 2707. An act for the relief of Henry White;

H. R. 5125. An act to aid the reconversion from a war to a peace economy through the distribution of Government surplus property and to establish a Surplus Property Board to effectuate the same, and for other purposes; and

H. J. Res. 268. Joint resolution to provide for the reappointment of Harvey N. Davis and Arthur H. Compton as members of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 56 minutes p. m.) the House, pursuant to Senate Concurrent Resolution 54, adjourned until Tuesday, November 14, 1944, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1853. A letter from the Chairman, Board of Investigation and Research, transmitting the report on practices and procedures of governmental control of transportation (H. Doc. No. 678); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and ordered to be printed.

1854. A letter from the President, United States Civil Service Commission, transmitting a report on the compensation of customs inspectors and employees performing night, Sunday, or holiday work; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1855. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill for the relief of certain disbursing officers of the Army of the United States and for other purposes; to the Committee on Claims.

1856. A letter from the Chairman, Reconstruction Finance Corporation, transmitting the report of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation for the month of June 1944; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1857. A letter from the Chairman and General Manager, Smaller War Plants Corporation, transmitting a copy of the personnel requirements of the Smaller War Plants Corporation for the second quarter of the fiscal year 1945; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

1858. A letter from the Administrator, War Shipping Administration, transmitting the quarterly estimate of personnel requirements for the second quarter of the fiscal year 1945, for the War Shipping Administration; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

1859. A letter from the Chairman, United States Martime Commission, transmitting the quarterly estimate of personnel requirements for the United States Maritime Commission for the period ending December 31, 1944; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

1860. A letter from the Administrator, Federal Security Agency, transmitting the quarterly estimate of personnel requirements, for the second quarter of the fiscal year 1945 for the Federal Security Agency; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

1861. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated August 14, 1944, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on a review of reports on Great Lakes connecting channels, with a view to making such modifications in the project as may be considered advisable, requested by resolution of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, House of Representatives, adopted on February 11, 1941 (H. Doc. No. 679); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed with two illustrations.

1862. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting copies of reports to the Director of the Bureau of the Budget relative to determining the number of employees required by the various units of the Department of Justice for the proper and efficient exercise of its functions for the second quarter of the fiscal year 1945; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

1863. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting a report on records proposed for disposal by various Government agencies; to the Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers.

1864. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting a report on records proposed for disposal by various Government agencies; to the Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. MURDOCK: Committee on Mines and Mining. H. R. 4852. A bill to insure the preservation of technical and economic records of domestic sources of ores of metals and minerals; without amendment (Rept. No. 1908). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. BARRETT:

H. R. 5425. A bill to grant certain interests in mineral rights, including oil and gas rights, to persons who have acquired or hereafter acquire land pursuant to homestead entry; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. BLAND:

H. R. 5426 (by request). A bill to amend section 511 (1) of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, as amended; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mrs. BOLTON:

H. R. 5427. A bill to incorporate the Medical Women, Army-Navy Club; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CUNNINGHAM:

H. R. 5428. A bill to amend the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 so as to extend the time within which veterans may apply for the loan benefits provided by such act; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. KEARNEY:

H. R. 5429. A bill to permit civilian defense volunteers to retain on the cessation of civilian defense activities certain equipment issued by the United States; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. MALONEY:

H. R. 5430. A bill relating to withholding of tax at source on wages in the case of community income; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. NORTON:

H. R. 5431. A bill to incorporate the Medical Women, Army-Navy Club; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. SMITH of Maine:

H. R. 5432. A bill to incorporate the Medical Women, Army-Navy Club; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JARMAN:

H. R. 5433. A bill to authorize the Secretary of State to continue to completion the collecting, editing, and publishing of official papers relating to the Territories of the United States; to the Committee on Printing.

By Mr. MOTT:

H. R. 5434. A bill to prohibit the sale or other disposition of certain naval property without specific authorization by the Congress; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. DISNEY:

H. R. 5435. A bill relating to the application of the Renegotiation Act to certain construction contracts, payments under which in 1943 were included in computing excessive profits for 1942; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GAMBLE:

H. R. 5436. A bill authorizing appointments to the United States Military Academy and the United States Naval Academy of sons of members of the land or naval forces of the United States who were killed in action or have died of wounds or injuries received, or disease contracted, in active service during the present war; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. GEARHART:

H. R. 5437. A bill to provide for a service credit for veterans for the purposes of title II of the Social Security Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. JARMAN:

H Res. 646. Resolution expressing the approval of the House of Representatives of certain resolutions adopted at Santiago, Chile, on April 15, 1944, looking toward the establishment of an American Interparliamentary Congress; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. KEARNEY:

H. R. 5438. A bill for the relief of Cathrine E. Morris; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey:

H. R. 5439. A bill for the relief of the Borough of Park Ridge, Park Ridge, N. J.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WILLEY:

H. R. 5440. A bill for the relief of Mary Rossiter; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

6168. By Mr. LYNCH: Petition of 120 citizens of the Twenty-second Congressional District of New York opposing the return of prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

6169. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the president, board of directors, Chamber of Commerce, Inc., Beatrice, Nebr., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to supporting the National Educational Association in their stand with regard to the disposal of surplus war materials; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

SENATE

TUESDAY, NOVEMBER 14, 1944

The 14th of November being the day prescribed by Senate Concurrent Resolution 54 for the reconvening of the Congress, the Senate assembled in its Chamber this day.

HENRY A. WALLACE, of Iowa, Vice President of the United States, called the Senate to order at 12 o'clock meridian.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., of the city of Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, eternal love, Thou source of all life and light, we would yield our flickering torch to Thee. After the whirlwind of national debate and decision in the midst of the earthquake of war's dislocations, we bow in this hallowed shrine of our dear-bought liberties to listen for the still small voice. We are grateful for the Republic's inspiring witness that her democratic processes run so deep in her very life that they are undisturbed even by a world aflame, and that our America still stands with lamp held aloft, a beacon of freedom for all the earth.

Facing now unfinished tasks calling for courage and sacrifice and wisdom, upon the President of the United States, the Vice President, the Congress, and all public servants who, sharing the heavy load of these epochal days, shape our policy and guide our destiny, pour in double measure Thy enabling grace. In the global decisions to come temper our criticisms with charity, our convictions with tolerance, our appraisals with magnanimity, our differences with fairness, and even our judgments of disapproval with appreciation for goals reached and work well done. May we attribute to others the white motives and pure patriotism which we claim for ourselves. Make our bodies Thy temple and our hearts Thine altar where the sacred fire is ever burning. We ask it in the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Thursday, September 21, 1944, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF JOSEPH W. KEHOE TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE, DIVISION NO. 2, ALASKA

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, and in accordance with the rules of the committee, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Wednesday, November 22, 1944, at 10:30 a. m., in the Senate Judiciary Committee room, upon the nomination of Joseph W. Kehoe, of Alaska, to be United States district judge for division No. 2 of Alaska, vice Hon. J. H. S. Morison, term expired. At the indicated time and place all persons interested in the nomination may make such representations as may be pertinent. The subcommittee consists of the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN], chairman; the Senator from Utah [Mr. MURDOCK]; and the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD].

REPORT OF OPERATIONS UNDER THE PROPERTY REQUISITIONING ACT

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying report, referred to the Committee on Military Affairs:

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith for the information of the Congress a report of the War Production Board covering operations under the Property Requisitioning Act of October 16, 1941, as amended, for the period from April 16, 1944, through October 15, 1944.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *November 14, 1944.*

ERECTION OF MEMORIALS AND ENTOMBMENT OF BODIES IN ARLINGTON MEMORIAL AMPHITHEATER

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs:

To the Congress of the United States:

In compliance with the requirements of the Public Act No. 397, Sixty-sixth Congress, I transmit herewith the Annual Report of the Commission on the Erection of Memorials and Entombment of Bodies in the Arlington Memorial Amphitheater.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *November 14, 1944.*

[NOTE.—The report accompanied a similar message to the House of Representatives.]

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

PERSONNEL OF THE LAND FORCES

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, pursuant to law, a confidential report of the number of men in active training and service in the land forces on August 31, 1944, under section 3 (b) of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

PERSONS COMMISSIONED IN THE ARMY FROM CIVIL LIFE

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report showing the name, age, legal residence, rank, branch of the service, with special qualifications therefor, of each person commissioned in the Army of the United States without prior commissioned military service, for the period August 1 to September 30, 1944 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Military Affairs.

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF ALIENS

Two letters from the Attorney General, transmitting, pursuant to law, reports stating all of the facts and pertinent provisions of law in the cases of 332 aliens, and 185 aliens, respectively, whose deportation he suspended for more than 6 months, together with a statement of the reasons for

such suspension (with the accompanying reports); to the Committee on Immigration.

Three letters from the Attorney General, withdrawing certain names from reports relating to aliens whose deportation he suspended more than 6 months, heretofore transmitted by him to the Senate pursuant to law; to the Committee on Immigration.

CONTRACTS AWARDED BY THE NAVY DEPARTMENT

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting, pursuant to law, reports of contracts awarded by the Navy Department, containing the names of persons who consummated the making or concluded the negotiation of any such contract on behalf of the Government and of persons who participated in the negotiations on behalf of the contractor, with reasons for award for negotiated contracts and contracts over $150,000, for the fiscal year 1944 (with the accompanying papers); to the Committee on Appropriations.

LEASE OF PUBLIC LANDS IN ALASKA

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to lease certain public lands in Alaska (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

G. F. ALLEN, CHIEF DISBURSING OFFICER, TREASURY DEPARTMENT

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation for the relief of G. F. Allen, Chief Disbursing Officer of the Treasury Department, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Claims.

LAWS PASSED BY MUNICIPAL COUNCILS OF ST. CROIX, AND ST. THOMAS AND ST. JOHN, V. I.

Two letters from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of legislation passed by the Municipal Council of St. Croix, V. I., and the Municipal Council of St. Thomas and St. John, V. I., respectively (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs.

REPORT OF FARM CREDIT ADMINISTRATION

A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the eleventh annual report of the Farm Credit Administration, covering the period January 1, 1943, to June 30, 1944 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

REPORT OF NATIONAL WAR LABOR BOARD ON WAGE STABILIZATION

A letter from the Chairman of the National War Labor Board transmitting, in further response to Senate Resolution 130, agreed to April 9, 1943, a report on stabilization of wages and salaries for the month of June 1944 (with an accompanying report); ordered to lie on the table.

GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES DEFERRED FROM MILITARY SERVICE FOR OCCUPATIONAL REASONS

A letter from the Director of the Selective Service System transmitting, pursuant to law, lists of registrants deferred for occupational reasons because of their employment in or under the Federal Government on August 15, 1944 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Military Affairs.

SMALLER WAR PLANTS CORPORATION (S. Doc. No. 246)

A letter from the Chairman of the War Production Board transmitting, pursuant to law, the fourteenth report of his operations under the Smaller War Plants Corporation Act for the period August 1 to September 30, 1944, submitted to him by the Chairman of the Board of that Corporation (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency and ordered to be printed with illustrations.

REPORT OF WAR CONTRACT TERMINATIONS AND SETTLEMENTS

A letter from the Director, Office of Contract Settlement, transmitting, pursuant to law, the first quarterly progress report of that office (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Military Affairs.

REPORT OF OFFICE OF PRICE ADMINISTRATION

A letter from the Administrator, Office of Price Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the tenth quarterly report of that office for the period ended June 30, 1944 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

COORDINATION OF FORWARDING AND SERVICING OF WATER-BORNE EXPORT AND IMPORT FOREIGN COMMERCE

A letter from the Administrator of the War Shipping Administration transmitting, pursuant to law, the eighth report of action taken to provide for the coordination of the forwarding and similar servicing of waterborne export and import foreign commerce of the United States (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Commerce.

JUNE I. GRADIJAN

A letter from the Administrator of the War Food Administration, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation for the relief of June I. Gradijan (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Claims.

COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION BORROWING AUTHORITY

A letter from the Acting Administrator of the War Food Administration, transmitting a recommendation that the borrowing authority of the Commodity Credit Corporation be increased to effect the program to support commodity prices; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

REPORT OF FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION ON DISTRIBUTION METHODS AND COSTS—ADVERTISING

A letter from the Chairman of the Federal Trade Commission, transmitting a report of an inquiry made by the Commission on distribution methods and costs, Part V, Advertising as a Factor in Distribution (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

HOUSING FACILITIES TRANSFERRED TO TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY

A letter from the General Manager of the Tennessee Valley Authority, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of operations under the transfer of trailers from the Farm Security Agency to the Tennessee Valley Authority for use at Murphy and Fontana Dam, N. C., and Camden, Tenn., for the period March 1 to August 1, 1944 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Appropriations.

FINANCIAL RECORD OF ELECTRIC UTILITY INDUSTRY

A letter from the Chairman of the Federal Power Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual report of the Commission on the financial record of the electric utility industry, for the calendar year 1943 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Commerce.

REPORT OF FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK ADMINISTRATION

A letter from the Commissioner of the Federal Home Loan Bank Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the eleventh annual report of that agency, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1943 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

TRANSFER OF CERTAIN LANDS TO LOS ANGELES, CALIF.

A letter from the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to transfer by quitclaim deed to the city of Los Angeles, Calif., for fire station purposes, the title to certain land located at Veterans' Administration Facility, Los Angeles, Calif. (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Finance.

COMPENSATION OF CUSTOMS INSPECTORS AND EMPLOYEES PERFORMING NIGHT, SUNDAY, AND HOLIDAY WORK

A letter from the President of the Civil Service Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the Commission on the compensation of customs inspectors and employees performing night, Sunday, or holiday work (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Finance.

REPORTS OF RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION

Three reports covering the activities and operations of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation for June and July 1944 and for the period from the organization of the Corporation on February 2, 1932, to June 30, 1944, inclusive, respectively, which had been filed with the Secretary of the Senate pursuant to law.

REPORT OF NATIONAL SOCIETY OF THE DAUGHTERS OF THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution, transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual report of the National Society of the Daughters of the American Revolution for the year ended April 1, 1944 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Printing.

REPORT OF AMERICAN WAR MOTHERS

A report of the American War Mothers, for the period October 1941 to October 1943; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

REPORT OF FOREIGN ECONOMIC ADMINISTRATION

A report for the period September 25, 1943, to September 25, 1944, of the operations of the Foreign Economic Administration, filed with the Secretary of the Senate pursuant to law.

LIMITATION ON EXPENDITURES BY CERTAIN GOVERNMENT AGENCIES

A letter from the Acting Director of the Bureau of the Budget transmitting, pursuant to the National War Agencies Appropriation Act of 1945, copies of letters addressed by him to certain agencies of the Government, establishing limitations of amounts which may be expended for travel, printing and binding, and the purchase of motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicles (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Appropriations.

ESTIMATES OF PERSONNEL REQUIREMENTS OF DEPARTMENTS AND AGENCIES

A letter from the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of his determinations during the first quarter of the fiscal year 1945 of the number of employees required for the proper and efficient exercise of the functions of the executive departments and agencies of the Government (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Civil Service.

Also estimates of personnel requirements, transmitted, pursuant to law, by the following: For the quarter ending December 31, 1944, Department of State; Department of Justice; Department of War; Department of the Interior; Smaller War Plants Corporation; Office of Price Administration; National Housing Agency; Veterans' Administration; Federal Trade Commission; Federal Security Agency; United States Civil Service Commission; United States Maritime Commission; and Securities and Exchange Commission;

Revised estimates for the quarter ending December 31, 1944, Department of Commerce (4); Department of the Treasury (2); Federal Works Agency; Office of Civilian Defense, of the Office for Emergency Management; and War Shipping Administration; and

A revised estimate for the quarter ending September 30, 1944, for the Department of the Interior (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Civil Service.

DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

Two letters from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, lists of papers and documents on the files of the Departments of the Treasury (3), War (4), Post Office (2), Navy (7), Agriculture (2), and Labor (2); Office for Emergency Management, Federal Works Agency (2), Office of Price Administration, Railroad Retirement Board, and Office of Defense Transportation which are not needed in the conduct of business and have no permanent value or historical interest, and requesting action looking to their disposition (with accompanying papers); to a Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of papers in the Executive Departments.

The VICE PRESIDENT appointed Mr. BARKLEY and Mr. BREWSTER members of the committee on the part of the Senate.

PART-TIME EMPLOYEES OF COMMITTEES

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate reports filed with the Secretary of the Senate during the last adjournment, in response to Senate Resolution 319, relative to persons employed who are not full-time employees of the Senate or any committee thereof, agreed to August 23, 1944, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

SEPTEMBER 30, 1944.

To the Senate:

The above-mentioned committee hereby submits the following report showing the names of persons employed by the committee who are not full-time employees of the Senate or of the committee for the month of August 1944, in compliance with the terms of Senate Resolution 319, agreed to August 23, 1944:

Name of individual	Address	Name and address of department or organization by whom paid	Annual rate of compensation
Mrs. Mamie L. Mizen	1434 Saratoga Ave	District of Columbia government	$3,500

EVERARD H. SMITH, *Clerk.*

COMMITTEE ON PENSIONS

SEPTEMBER 27, 1944.

To the Senate:

The above-mentioned committee hereby submits the following report showing the names of persons employed by the committee who are not full-time employees of the Senate or of the committee for the month of September 1944, in compliance with the terms of Senate Resolution 319, agreed to August 23, 1944:

Name of individual	Address	Name and address of department or organization by whom paid	Annual rate of compensation
Louis J. Meyerle	612 Bennington Drive, Silver Spring, Md	Veterans' Administration	$5,000

JAMES M. TUNNELL, *Chairman.*

SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO STUDY AND SURVEY PROBLEMS OF SMALL BUSINESS ENTERPRISE

UNITED STATES SENATE,
SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO STUDY
PROBLEMS OF AMERICAN SMALL BUSINESS,
October 2, 1944.

The VICE PRESIDENT,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. VICE PRESIDENT: Pursuant to Senate Resolution 319 I am transmitting herewith a list of employees of the Special Committee to Study Problems of American Small Business who are not full-time employees of the Senate. Included with this list is the name and address of each such employee, the name and address of the Department paying the salary of such employee, and the annual rate of compensation for each such employee.

Respectfully yours,
JAMES E. MURRAY, *Chairman.*
By CHARLES A. MURRAY,
Executive Secretary.

OCTOBER 1, 1944.

To the Senate:

The above-mentioned committee hereby submits the following report showing the names of persons employed by the committee who are not full-time employees of the Senate or of the committee for the month of September 1944, in compliance with the terms of Senate Resolution 319, agreed to August 23, 1944:

Name of individual	Address	Name and address of department or organization by whom paid	Annual rate of compensation
Brainard Cheney	3418 Highwood Drive SE., Washington, D. C	Foreign Economics Administration, Washington, D. C	$6,500
Agnes E. Crivella	1408 Buchanan St. NW., Washington, D. C	War Production Board, Washington, D. C	2,700
Emerald G. Devitt	2425 27th St., South Arlington, Va	do	2,000
Elsie A. Digges	120 C St. NE., Washington, D. C	do	1,800
F. Preston Forbes	510 Four Mile Road, Alexandria, Va	Department of Commerce, Washington, D. C	4,600
Carol M. Fuller	2101 S St. NW., Washington, D. C	Office of Price Administration, Washington, D. C	2,100
Scott K. Gray, Jr	119 Joliet St. SW., Washington, D. C	Reconstruction Finance Corporation, Washington, D. C	4,600
Stella J. Groeper	1127 Branch Ave. SE., Washington, D. C	War Production Board, Washington, D. C	2,600
Dorothy M. Heckard	2828 Buena Vista Terrace SE., Washington, D. C	do	2,000
Kathleen Kimball	1701 Park Rd. NW., Washington, D. C	do	2,000
Elizabeth P. Lucas	1730 North Quincy St., Arlington Va	do	1,800
Lois M. Miller	3120 Massachusetts Ave. SE., Washington, D. C	do	2,600
John W. Nelson	1445 Ogden St. NW., Washington, D. C	do	5,600
Grace F. Purdy	230 Rhode Island Ave. NE., Washington, D. C	Office of Price Administration, Washington, D. C	3,200
Arthur G. Silverman	719 D St. NE., Washington, D. C	do	5,600
Lt. (jr. gr.) George H. Soule	4020 Beecher St. NW., Washington, D. C	Navy Department, Washington, D. C	2,000
Lillian Evelyn Spicer	1433 Decatur St. NW., Washington, D. C	War Production Board, Washington, D. C	2,600
Frederick W. Steckman	4000 Cathedral Ave., Washington, D C	Maritime Commission, Washington, D. C	4,600
Margie L. Strubel	4632 12th St. NE., Washington, D. C	War Production Board, Washington, D. C	1,800
Allen G. Thurman	201 East Shepherd St., Chevy Chase, Md	Maritime Commission, Washington, D. C	6,500
Alfred J. Van Tassel	1622 Mount Eagle Pl., Alexandria, Va	War Production Board, Washington, D. C	6,500
Olga Yelencsics	2400 13th St. NW., Washington, D. C	do	2,000

WAR CONTRACTS SUBCOMMITTEE, SENATE MILITARY AFFAIRS COMMITTEE

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON MILITARY AFFAIRS,
October 2, 1944.

The VICE PRESIDENT,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. VICE PRESIDENT: Pursuant to Senate Resolution 319, I am transmitting herewith a list of employees of the War Contracts Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Military Affairs who are not full-time employees of the Senate. Included with this list is the name and address of each such employee, the name and address of the department paying the salary of such employee, and the annual rate of compensation for each such employee.

Respectfully yours,
JAMES E. MURRAY,
Chairman, War Contracts Subcommittee.
By CHARLES A. MURRAY,
Executive Secretary.

OCTOBER 2, 1944.

To the Senate:

The above-mentioned committee hereby submits the following report showing the names of persons employed by the committee who are not full-time employees of the Senate or of the committee for the month of September, in compliance with the terms of Senate Resolution 319, agreed to August 23, 1944:

Name of individual	Address	Name and address of department or organization by whom paid	Annual rate of compensation
Marian Banner	1302 Gallatin St. NW., Washington, D. C	Reconstruction Finance Corporation, Washington, D. C	$2,300
Kurt Borchardt	1385 Nicholson St. NW., Washington, D. C	Smaller War Plants Corporation, Washington, D. C	5,600
Marion Fostner	60 Elm Ave., Takoma Park, Md	Navy Department, Washington, D. C	2,600
Grace Mayer	3610 Minnesota Ave. SE., Washington, D. C	Smaller War Plants Corporation, Washington, D. C	2,000
Vernice O'Mullane	Alcott Hall, West Potomac Park, Washington, D. C	War Production Board, Washington, D. C	1,620
Doris Phippen	Frankfort Hall, 40 Plattsburg Court NW., Washington, D. C.	Navy Department, Washington, D. C	2,040
Omer J. Regnier	209 Franklin Ave., Silver Spring, Md	Farm Security Administration, Washington, D. C	3,800
Sigmund Timberg [1]	2215 42d St. NW., Washington, D. C	Foreign Economic Administration, Washington, D. C	6,500

[1] Employed with subcommittee to Sept. 14, 1944.

JAMES E. MURRAY, *Chairman.*

SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON POST-WAR ECONOMIC POLICY AND PLANNING

SEPTEMBER 30, 1944.

To the Senate:

The above-mentioned committee hereby submits the following report showing the names of persons employed by the committee who are not full-time employees of the Senate or of the committee for the month of September 1944, in compliance with the terms of Senate Resolution 319, agreed to August 23, 1944:

Name of individual	Address	Name and address of department or organization by whom paid	Annual rate of compensation
Miss Claire Cahill [1]	Washington, D. C	Bureau of Census	$3,700
Mr. Miles L. Colean [2]	do	Starrett Bros. & Eken, Washington, D. C	Unknown

[1] Miss Cahill performed approximately 4 days of statistical work in connection with a study of post-war housing and was not compensated from committee funds.
[2] Mr. Colean is compensated from committee funds at the rate of $25 a day for work performed as an adviser to a subcommittee of this Committee on Housing and Redevelopment, of which Senator TAFT is chairman. He performed approximately 4½ days' work during the month of September.

WALTER F. GEORGE, *Chairman.*

COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

OCTOBER 2, 1944.

To the Senate:

The above-mentioned committee hereby submits the following report showing the names of persons employed by the committee who are not full-time employees of the Senate or of the committee for the month of September 1944, in compliance with the terms of Senate Resolution 319, agreed to August 23, 1944:

Name of individual	Address	Name and address of department or organization by whom paid	Annual rate of compensation
John F. Feeney	1425 Rhode Island Ave. NW	General Accounting Office, Washington, D. C	$6,400
Harold E. Merrick	906 Aspen St. NW	do	4,800
Thomas J. Scott	3500 14th St. NW	Federal Bureau of Investigation, Department of Justice, Washington, D. C.	4,800
Mrs. Mamie L. Mizen	1434 Saratoga Ave	District of Columbia government	3,500

EVERARD H. SMITH, *Clerk.*

SUBCOMMITTEE ON WARTIME HEALTH AND EDUCATION

OCTOBER 1, 1944.

To the Senate:

The above-mentioned committee hereby submits the following report showing the names of persons employed by the committee who are not full-time employees of the Senate or of the committee for the month of October, in compliance with the terms of Senate Resolution 319, agreed to August 23, 1944:

Name of individual	Address	Name and address of department or organization by whom paid	Annual rate of compensation
Lauretta April	2714 Quarry Road NW	War Production Board, 3d St., and Independence Ave. SW	$3,200
Philip C. Curtis	4303 Russell Ave., Mount Rainier, Md	Navy Department, 18th St., and Constitution Ave. NW	3,800
Billy Gene Durham	1960 Fendall Ave. SE	Federal Public Housing Administration, 1001 Vermont Ave. NW	1,440
Doris B. Hazur	5018 25th St. North, Arlington, Va	Office of Price Administration, 2d and D Sts. SW	2,600
Harald Lund	476 N St. SW	Navy Department, 18th St. and Constitution Ave. NW	6,200
Carl Malmberg	1813 F St. NW	Federal Security Agency, 1825 H St. NW	5,600
Eva Jo Marra	1803 Newton St. NW	Navy Department, 18th St. and Constitution Ave. NW	1,800
Love Morgan	1607 18th St. SE	Veterans' Administration, Vermont Ave. and I St. NW	2,000
Ruth Morgenstein	3022 Rodman St. NW	do	2,600
Dolores Raschella	3028 Wisconsin Ave. NW	Federal Public Housing Administration, 1001 Vermont Ave. NW	2,000
Renee Roth	1614 North Queen St., Arlington, Va	Federal Works Agency, 18th and C Sts. NW	2,600
Lt. Leslie Falk, Medical Corps, Army of the United States.	2804 Terrace Rd. SE	U. S. Army, Pentagon Bldg	2,000
Lt. Comdr. John B. Truslow, Medical Corps, U. S. Naval Reserve.	2007 Peabody St., West Hyattsville, Md	U. S. Navy, 18th St. and Constitution Ave. NW	3,000

CLAUDE PEPPER, *Chairman.*

SPECIAL COMMITTEE INVESTIGATING THE NATIONAL DEFENSE PROGRAM

OCTOBER 1, 1944.

To the Senate:

The above-mentioned committee hereby submits the following report showing the names of persons employed by the committee who are not full-time employees of the Senate or of the committee for the month of October 1944, in compliance with the terms of Senate Resolution 319, agreed to August 23, 1944:

Name of individual	Address	Name and address of department or organization by whom paid	Annual rate of compensation
Joe L. Martinez (investigator)	208 Massachusetts Ave. NW	U. S. Maritime Commission, Commerce Bldg., 14th St. between E St. and Constitution Ave.	$3,800
Franklin N. Parks (investigator)	2701 Connecticut Ave	Office of Price Administration, 2d and D Sts. SW	3,800
Harold G. Robinson (chief investigator).	3446 Highwood Drive SE	U. S. Maritime Commission	6,000
Brig. Gen. Frank E. Lowe	1316 New Hampshire Ave	General Staff, U. S. Army, Finance Office, Pentagon Bldg	6,000
Lt. Col. Harry Vaughan	1609 Oakcrest Drive, Alexandria, Va	do	3,500

JAMES M. MEAD, *Chairman.*

SENATE MILITARY AFFAIRS COMMITTEE, SUBCOMMITTEE ON WAR MOBILIZATION

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC LANDS AND SURVEYS

OCTOBER 2, 1944.

To the Senate:

The above-mentioned committee hereby submits the following report showing the name of persons employed by the committee who are not full-time employees of the Senate or of the committee for the month of ————, in compliance with the terms of Senate Resolution No. 319, agreed to August 23, 1944: (See attached memorandum.)

CARL A. HATCH, *Chairman.*
By W. H. MCMAINS, *Clerk.*

Memorandum from Senator MCCARRAN, chairman, Subcommittee of Public Lands and Surveys Committee, to investigate public lands.

To Senator CARL HATCH, chairman, Committee on Public Lands and Surveys, United States Senate.

Those detailed from Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, to assist with work of above subcommittee, are:

E. S. Haskell, senior administrative officer, Forest Service, CAF-12; basic salary, $5,000 per year.

Elizabeth Heckman, clerk, CAF-5; basic salary, $2,000 per year.

OCTOBER 2, 1944.

To the Senate:

The above-mentioned committee hereby submits the following report showing the names of persons employed by the committee who are not full-time employees of the Senate or of the committee for the month of September 1944, in compliance with the terms of Senate Resolution 319, agreed to August 23, 1944:

Name of individual	Address	Name and address of department or organization by whom paid	Annual rate of compensation
Virginia W. Boyce	3810 W St. SE., Washington, D. C.	Department of the Interior, Washington, D. C.	$1,800
Ann S. Gertler	3721 39th St. NW., Washington, D. C.	do	2,000
Hope C. Heslep	2 East Maple St., Alexandria, Va.	War Manpower Commission, Washington, D. C.	2,000
C. Theodore Larson	3917 North 5th St., Arlington, Va.	National Housing Agency, Washington, D. C.	5,600
Fritzie P. Manuel	1621 T St. NW., Washington, D. C.	War Manpower Commission, Washington, D. C.	3,800
Darel McConkey	R. F. D., Box 153, Alexandria, Va.	War Production Board, Washington, D. C.	4,600
Cora L. Moen	5327 16th St. NW., Washington, D. C.	Office of Price Administration, Washington, D. C.	2,000
Elizabeth H. Oleksy	1620 Fuller St. NW., Washington, D. C.	War Production Board, Washington, D. C.	2,600
Dieyrelis M. Prouty	2006 N St. NW., Washington, D. C.	do	2,000
Francis C. Rosenberger	5814 64th Ave., East Riverdale, Md.	Office of Price Administration, Washington, D. C.	4,600
Herbert Schimmel	3604 Minnesota Ave. SE., Washington, D. C.	War Production Board, Washington, D. C.	8,000

H. M. KILGORE, *Chairman.*

COMMITTEE ON NAVAL AFFAIRS

OCTOBER 2, 1944.

To the Senate:

The above-mentioned committee hereby submits the following report showing the names of persons employed by the committee who are not full-time employees of the Senate or of the committee for the month of September 1944, in compliance with the terms of Senate Resolution 319, agreed to August 23, 1944:

Name of individual	Address	Name and address of department or organization by whom paid	Annual rate of compensation
Capt. James A. Saunders, U. S. Navy (retired).	4105 Oliver St., Chevy Chase, Md.	Office of the Chief of Naval Operations, Navy Department, Washington, D. C.	$6,000 per year plus $162 per month subsistence and rental allowance.
Chief Yeoman Herbert S. Atkinson (A. A.) U. S. Naval Reserve.	2405 Pennington Road, Trenton, N. J.	Bureau of Naval Personnel, Navy Department, Washington, D. C.	$1,512 per year plus $91.50 per month subsistence and rental allowance.

DAVID I. WALSH, *Chairman.*

SENATE NAVY LIAISON OFFICE, ROOM 461, SENATE OFFICE BUILDING

OCTOBER 2, 1944.

To the Senate:

The above-mentioned committee hereby submits the following report showing the names of persons employed by the committee who are not full-time employees of the Senate or of the committee for the month of September 1944, in compliance with the terms of Senate Resolution 319, agreed to August 23, 1944:

Name of individual	Address	Name and address of department or organization by whom paid	Annual rate of compensation
Lt. Frederick A. McLaughlin, U. S. Naval Reserve.	5305 41st St. NW., Washington, D. C.	Bureau of Naval Personnel, Navy Department, Washington, D. C.	$2,400 per year plus $132 per month subsistence and rental allowance.
Lt. Joseph G. Feeney, U. S. Naval Reserve.	2745 29th St. NW., Washington, D. C.	do	Do.
Yeoman (2d cl.) Eleanor W. St. Clair, U. S. Naval Reserve.	2134 R St. NW., Washington, D. C.	do	$1,152 per year plus $91.50 per month subsistence and rental allowance.
Yeoman (2d cl.) Loretto F. Jochman, U. S. Naval Reserve.	do	do	Do.

The above employees are representatives of the Bureau of Naval Personnel, Navy Department, to assist Senators on naval personnel matters.

DAVID I. WALSH, *Chairman.*

COMMITTEE ON MILITARY AFFAIRS

OCTOBER 4, 1944.

To the Senate:

The above-mentioned committee hereby submits the following report showing the names of persons employed by the committee who are not full-time employees of the Senate or of the committee for the month of September 1944, in compliance with the terms of Senate Resolution 319, agreed to August 23, 1944:

Name of individual	Address	Name and address of department or organization by whom paid	Annual rate of compensation
Theodore B. Stothart	3801 4th St. SE.	War Department, Adjutant General's Office	$1,800
Col. Lewis Sanders	1911 R St. NW.	War Department	6,000

ROBERT R. REYNOLDS, *Chairman.*

COMMITTEE ON PENSIONS

OCTOBER 30, 1944.

To the Senate:

The above-mentioned committee hereby submits the following report showing the names of persons employed by the committee who are not full-time employees of the Senate or of the committee for the month of October 1944, in compliance with the terms of Senate Resolution 319, agreed to August 23, 1944:

Name of individual	Address	Name and address of department or organization by whom paid	Annual rate of compensation
Louis J. Meyerle	612 Bennington Drive, Silver Spring, Md.	Veterans' Administration	$5,000

JAMES M. TUNNELL, *Chairman.*

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC LANDS AND SURVEYS

OCTOBER 27, 1944.

To the Senate:

The above-mentioned committee hereby submits the following report showing the name of persons employed by the committee who are not full-time employees of the Senate or of the committee for the month of ——, in compliance with the terms of Senate Resolution No. 319, agreed to August 23, 1944 (see attached memorandum):

CARL A. HATCH, *Chairman.*
By W. H. MCMAINS, *Clerk.*

Memorandum from Senator MCCARRAN, chairman, subcommittee, Committee on Public Lands and Surveys, to investigate certain public-land matters.

To CARL HATCH, chairman, Committee on Public Lands and Surveys, United States Senate.

Those detailed from the Forest Service, Department of Agriculture, to assist with the work of the above subcommittee, are:

E. S. Haskell, senior administrative officer, Forest Service, CAF–12, basic salary, $5,000 per year.

Elizabeth Heckman, clerk, CAF–5, basic salary, $2,000 per year.

SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON POST-WAR ECONOMIC POLICY AND PLANNING

OCTOBER 31, 1944.

To the Senate:

The above-mentioned committee hereby submits the following report showing the names of persons employed by the committee who are not full-time employees of the Senate or of the committee for the month of October, in compliance with the terms of Senate Resolution No. 319, agreed to August 23, 1944:

Name of individual	Address	Name and address of department or organization by whom paid	Annual rate of compensation
Borge Hansen-Moller [1]	Washington, D. C.	Treasury Department	$3,800

[1] Mr. Hansen-Moller performed approximately 4 days' work in connection with the Subcommittee on Housing and Urban Redevelopment of this committee and was not compensated from committee funds.

WALTER F. GEORGE, *Chairman.*

COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

NOVEMBER 1, 1944.

To the Senate:

The above-mentioned committee hereby submits the following report showing the names of persons employed by the committee who are not full-time employees of the Senate or of the committee for the month of October 1944, in compliance with the terms of Senate Resolution 319, agreed to August 23, 1944:

Name of individual	Address	Name and address of department or organization by whom paid	Annual rate of compensation
John F. Feeney	1425 Rhode Island Ave. NW.	General Accounting Office, Washington, D. C.	$6,400
Harold E. Merrick	906 Aspen St. NW.	do	4,800
Thomas J. Scott	3500 14th St. NW.	Federal Bureau of Investigation, Department of Justice, Washington, D. C.	4,800
Mrs. Mamie L. Mizen	1434 Saratoga Ave.	District of Columbia government	3,500

EVERARD H. SMITH, *Chairman.*

SUBCOMMITTEE ON WARTIME HEALTH AND EDUCATION

NOVEMBER 1, 1944.

To the Senate:

The above-mentioned committee hereby submits the following report showing the names of persons employed by the committee who are not full-time employees of the Senate or of the committee for the month of November 1944, in compliance with the terms of Senate Resolution 319, agreed to August 23, 1944:

Name of individual	Address	Name and address of department or organization by whom paid	Annual rate of compensation
Lauretta April	2714 Quarry Rd. NW., Washington, D. C.	War Production Board, 3d St. and Independence Ave. SW.	$3,200
Philip C. Curtis	4303 Russell Ave., Mount Rainier, Md.	Navy Department, 18th St. and Constitution Ave. NW.	3,800
Billy Gene Durham	1960 Fendall Ave. SE.	Federal Public Housing Administration, 1001 Vermont Ave. NW.	1,440
Doris B. Hazur	5018 25th St., North Arlington, Va.	Office of Price Administration, 2d and D Sts. SW.	2,600
Harald Lund	476 N St. SW.	Navy Department, 18th St. and Constitution Ave. NW.	6,200
Carl Malmberg	1813 F St. NW.	Federal Security Agency, 1825 H St. NW.	5,600
Eva Jo Marra	1803 Newton St. NW.	Navy Department, 18th and Constitution Ave. NW.	1,800
Love Morgan	1607 18th St. SE.	Veterans' Administration, Vermont Ave. and I St. NW.	2,000
Ruth Morgenstein	3022 Rodman St. NW.	do	2,600
Dolores Raschella	3028 Wisconsin Ave. NW.	Federal Public Housing Administration, 1001 Vermont Ave. NW.	2,000
Renee Roth	1614 North Queen St., Arlington, Va.	Federal Works Agency, 18th and C Sts. NW.	2,600
Lt. Leslie Falk, Medical Corps, Army of the United States.	2804 Terrace Rd. SE.	U. S. Army, Pentagon Building	2,000
Lt. Comdr. John B. Truslow, Medical Corps, U. S. Naval Reserve.	2007 Peabody St., West Hyattsville, Md.	U. S. Navy, 18th St. and Constitution Ave. NW.	3,000

CLAUDE PEPPER, *Chairman.*

SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO STUDY AND SURVEY PROBLEMS OF SMALL BUSINESS ENTERPRISE

UNITED STATES SENATE,
SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO STUDY PROBLEMS OF AMERICAN SMALL BUSINESS,
November 1, 1944.

The VICE PRESIDENT,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. VICE PRESIDENT: Pursuant to Senate Resolution 319 I am transmitting herewith a list of employees of the Special Committee to Study Problems of American Small Business who are not full-time employees of the Senate. Included with this list is the name and address of each such employee, the name and address of the Department paying the salary of such employee, and the annual rate of compensation for each such employee.

Respectfully yours,
JAMES E. MURRAY, *Chairman.*
By CHARLES A. MURRAY,
Executive Secretary.

NOVEMBER 1, 1944.

To the Senate:

The above-mentioned committee hereby submits the following report showing the names of persons employed by the committee who are not full-time employees of the Senate or of the committee for the month of October 1944, in compliance with the terms of Senate Resolution 319, agreed to August 23, 1944:

Name of individual	Address	Name and address of department or organization by whom paid	Annual rate of compensation
Brainard Cheney	3418 Highwood Drive SE, Washington, D. C	Foreign Economics Administration, Washington, D. C	$6,500
Agnes E. Crivella	1408 Buchanan St. NW., Washington, D. C	War Production Board, Washington, D. C	2,700
Emerald G. Devitt	2425 27th St. South, Arlington, Va	do	2,000
Elsie A. Digges	120 C St. NE., Washington, D. C	do	1,800
Harry J. Evans	3010 Gainsville St. SE., Washington, D. C	Reconstruction Finance Corporation, Washington, D. C	6,500
F. Preston Forbes	510 Four Mile Rd., Alexandria, Va	Department of Commerce, Washington, D. C	4,600
Carol M. Fuller	2101 S St. NW., Washington, D. C	Office of Price Administration, Washington, D. C	2,100
Scott K. Gray, Jr	119 Joliet St. SW., Washington, D. C	Reconstruction Finance Corporation, Washington, D. C	4,600
Stella J. Groeper	1127 Branch Ave. SE., Washington, D. C	War Production Board, Washington, D. C	2,600
Dorothy M. Heckard	2828 Buena Vista Terrace SE., Washington, D. C	do	2,000
Kathleen Kimball	1701 Park Rd NW., Washington, D. C	do	2,000
Elizabeth P. Lucas	1730 N. Quincy St., Arlington, Va	do	1,800
Lois M. Miller	3120 Massachusetts Ave. SE., Washington, D. C	do	2,600

JAMES E. MURRAY, *Chairman.*

SENATE SMALL BUSINESS COMMITTEE

NOVEMBER 1, 1944.

To the Senate:

The above-mentioned committee hereby submits the following report showing the names of persons employed by the committee who are not full-time employees of the Senate or of the committee for the month of October 1944, in compliance with the terms of Senate Resolution 319, agreed to August 23, 1944:

Name of individual	Address	Name and address of department or organization by whom paid	Annual rate of compensation
John W. Nelson	1445 Ogden St. NW., Washington, D. C	War Production Board, Washington, D. C	$5,000
Grace F. Purdy	230 Rhode Island Ave. NE., Washington, D. C	Office of Price Administration, Washington, D. C	3,200
Arthur G. Silverman	719 D St. NE., Washington, D. C	do	5,600
Lt. (Jr. Gr.) George H. Soule	4020 Beecher St. NW., Washington, D. C	Navy Department, Washington, D. C	2,000
Lillian Evelyn Spicer	1433 Decatur St. NW., Washington, D. C	War Production Board, Washington, D. C	2,600
Frederick W. Steckman	4000 Cathedral Ave., Washington, D. C	Maritime Commission, Washington, D. C	4,600
Margie L. Strubel	4632 12th St. NE., Washington, D. C	War Production Board, Washington, D. C	1,800
Allen G. Thurman	201 East Shepherd St., Chevy Chase, Md	Maritime Commission, Washington, D. C	6,500
Alfred J. Van Tassel	1622 Mount Eagle Pl., Alexandria, Va	War Production Board, Washington, D. C	6,500
Olga Yelencsics	2400 13th St. NW., Washington, D. C	do	2,000

JAMES E. MURRAY, *Chairman.*

SPECIAL COMMITTEE INVESTIGATING THE NATIONAL DEFENSE PROGRAM

NOVEMBER 1, 1944.

To the Senate:

The above-mentioned committee hereby submits the following report showing the names of persons employed by the committee who are not full-time employees of the Senate or of the committee for the month of ——— 1944 in compliance with the terms of Senate Resolution 319, agreed to August 23, 1944:

Name of individual	Address	Name and address of department or organization by whom paid	Annual rate of compensation
Joe L. Martinez (investigator)	208 Massachusetts Ave. NW	U. S. Maritime Commission, Commerce Bldg., 14th St., between E and Constitution Ave.	$3,800
Franklin N. Parks (investigator)	2701 Connecticut Ave	Office of Price Administration, 2d and D Sts. SW	3,800
Harold G. Robinson (chief investigator)	3446 Highwood Drive, SE	U. S. Maritime Commission	6,000
Brig. Gen. Frank E. Lowe	1316 New Hampshire Ave	General Staff, U. S. Army, Finance Office, Pentagon Bldg	6,000
Col. Harry Vaughan	1609 Oakcrest Drive, Alexandria, Va	do	4,000

JAMES M. MEAD, *Chairman.*

SENATE MILITARY AFFAIRS COMMITTEE, SUBCOMMITTEE ON WAR MOBILIZATION

NOVEMBER 1, 1944.

To the Senate:

The above-mentioned committee hereby submits the following report showing the names of persons employed by the committee who are not full-time employees of the Senate or of the committee for the month of October 1944, in compliance with the terms of Senate Resolution 319, agreed to August 23, 1944:

Name of individual	Address	Name and address of department or organization by whom paid	Annual rate of compensation
Virginia W. Boyce	3810 W St. SE., Washington, D. C	Department of Interior, Washington, D. C	$1,800
Ann S. Gertler	3721 39th St. NW., Washington, D. C	do	2,000
Hope C. Heslep	2 East Maple St., Alexandria, Va	War Manpower Commission, Washington, D. C	2,000
C. Theodore Larson	3917 North 5th St., Arlington, Va	National Housing Agency, Washington, D. C	5,600
Fritzie P. Manuel	1621 T St. NW., Washington, D. C	War Manpower Commission, Washington, D. C	3,800
Darel McConkey	Rural Free Delivery, Box 153, Alexandria, Va	War Production Board, Washington, D. C	4,600
Cora L. Moen	5327 16th St. NW., Washington, D. C	Office of Price Administration, Washington, D. C	2,000
Elizabeth H. Oleksy	1620 Fuller St. NW., Washington, D. C	War Production Board, Washington, D. C	2,600
Deiyrelis M. Prouty	2006 N St. NW., Washington, D. C	do	2,000
Francis C. Rosenberger	5814 64th Ave., East Riverdale, Md	Office of Price Administration, Washington, D. C	4,600
Herbert Schimmel	3605 Minnesota Ave. SE., Washington, D. C	War Production Board, Washington, D. C	8,000

H. M. KILGORE, *Chairman.*

COMMITTEE ON NAVAL AFFAIRS

NOVEMBER 1, 1944.

To the Senate:

The above-mentioned committee hereby submits the following report showing the names of persons employed by the committee who are not full-time employees of the Senate or of the committee for the month of October 1944, in compliance with the terms of Senate Resolution 319, agreed to August 23, 1944:

Name of individual	Address	Name and address of department or organization by whom paid	Annual rate of compensation
Capt. James A. Saunders, U. S. Navy (retired).	4105 Oliver St., Chevy Chase, Md.	Office of the Chief of Naval Operations, Navy Department, Washington, D. C.	$6,000 per year plus $162 per month subsistence and rental allowance.
Chief Yoeman Herbert S. Atkinson (A. A.) U. S. Naval Reserve.	2405 Pennington Rd., Trenton, N. J.	Bureau of Naval Personnel, Navy Department, Washington, D. C.	$4,512 per year plus $91.50 per month subsistence and rental allowance.

DAVID I. WALSH, *Chairman.*

SENATE NAVY LIAISON OFFICE, ROOM 461, SENATE OFFICE BUILDING

NOVEMBER 1, 1944.

To the Senate:

The above-mentioned committee hereby submits the following report showing the names of persons employed by the committee who are not full-time employees of the Senate or of the committee or the month of October 1944, in compliance with the terms of Senate Resolution 319, agreed to August 23, 1944:

Name of individual	Address	Name and address of department or organization by whom paid	Annual rate of compensation
Lt. Frederick A. McLaughlin, U. S. Naval Reserve.	5305 41st St. NW, Washington, D. C.	Bureau of Naval Personnel, Navy Department, Washington, D. C.	$2,400 per year plus $132 per month subsistence and rental allowance.
Lt. Joseph G. Feeney, U. S. Naval Reserve.	2745 29th St. NW, Washington, D. C.	do	Do.
Yeoman (2d cl) Eleanor W. St. Clair, U. S. Naval Reserve.	2134 R St. NW, Washington, D. C.	do	$1,152 per year plus $91.50 per month subsistence and rental allowance.
Yeoman (2d cl) Loretto F. Jochman, U. S. Naval Reserve.	do	do	Do.

The above employees are representatives of the Bureau of Naval Personnel, Navy Department, to assist Senators on naval personnel matters.

DAVID I. WALSH, *Chairman.*

WAR CONTRACTS SUBCOMMITTEE, SENATE MILITARY AFFAIRS COMMITTEE

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON MILITARY AFFAIRS,
November 1, 1944.

The VICE PRESIDENT,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. VICE PRESIDENT: Pursuant to Senate Resolution 319, I am transmitting herewith a list of employees of the War Contracts Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Military Affairs who are not full-time employees of the Senate. Included with this list is the name and address of each such employee, the name and address of the department paying the salary of such employee, and the annual rate of compensation for each such employee.

Respectfully yours,

JAMES E. MURRAY,
Chairman, War Contracts Subcommittee.
By CHARLES A. MURRAY,
Executive Secretary.

NOVEMBER 1, 1944.

To the Senate:

The above-mentioned committee hereby submits the following report showing the names of persons employed by the committee who are not full-time employees of the Senate or of the committee for the month of October 1944, in compliance with the terms of Senate Resolution 319, agreed to August 23, 1944:

Name of individual	Address	Name and address of department or organization by whom paid	Annual rate of compensation
Marian Banner	1302 Gallatin St. NW., Washington, D. C.	Reconstruction Finance Corporation, Washington, D. C.	$2,300
Kurt Borchardt	1385 Nicholson St. NW., Washington, D. C.	Smaller War Plants Corporation, Washington, D. C.	5,600
Marion Fostner [1]	60 Elm Ave., Takoma Park, Md.	Navy Department, Washington, D. C.	2,600
Grace Mayer	3610 Minnesota Ave. SE., Washington, D. C.	Smaller War Plants Corporation, Washington, D. C.	2,000
Vernice O'Mullane	Alcott Hall, West Potomac Park, Washington, D. C.	War Production Board, Washington, D. C.	1,620
Doris Phippen	Frankfort Hall, 40 Plattsburg Court NW., Washington, D. C.	Navy Department, Washington, D. C.	2,040
Omer Regnier	209 Franklin Ave., Silver Spring, Md.	Farm Security Administration, Washington, D. C.	3,800

[1] Employed with subcommittee until Oct. 8, 1944.

JAMES E. MURRAY, *Chairman.*

COMMITTEE ON MILITARY AFFAIRS

NOVEMBER 6, 1944.

To the Senate:

The above-mentioned committee hereby submits the following report showing the names of persons employed by the committee who are not full-time employees of the Senate or of the committee for the month of October 1944, in compliance with the terms of Senate Resolution 319, agreed to August 23, 1944:

Name of individual	Address	Name and address of department or organization by whom paid	Annual rate of compensation
Theodore B. Stothart	3801 4th St. SE.	War Department, Adjutant General's Office	$1,800
Col. Lewis Sanders	1911 R St. NW.	War Department	6,000

ROBERT R. REYNOLDS, *Chairman.*

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE RECEIVED AFTER ADJOURNMENT OF THE SENATE

Under authority of the order of the Senate of September 21, 1944, the Secretary of the Senate received the following message from the House of Representatives subsequent to the adjournment of the Senate:

The House of Representatives has passed, each without amendment, the following bills of the Senate:

S. 2015. A bill to liberalize certain provisions of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, as amended; and

S. 2058. A bill to liberalize certain provisions of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, as amended.

The House has agreed to the amendment of the Senate to each of the following bills of the House:

H. R. 1519. An act conferring jurisdiction on the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of the McCullough Coal Corporation against the United States;

H. R. 3535. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of Billie Stooksberry, a minor, and Lon L. Stooksberry; and

H. R. 4349. An act to exempt certain officers and employees of the National War Labor Board from certain provisions of the Criminal Code.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED AFTER ADJOURNMENT

Subsequent to the adjournment of the Senate, the Acting President pro tempore (Mr. WALSH of New Jersey), under authority of Senate Concurrent Resolution 55 and the order of the Senate of September 21, 1944, signed the following enrolled bills, which had been previously examined and found truly enrolled by the Committee on Enrolled Bills and signed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives:

S. 1847. An act to provide for the payment of attorneys' fees from Osage tribal funds;

S. 2015. An act to liberalize certain provisions of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, as amended;

S. 2058. An act to liberalize certain provisions of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, as amended;

H. R. 1040. An act for the relief of Frank Henderson and Frances Nell Henderson, his wife;

H. R. 1042. An act for the relief of Frank J. Recely and Mary T. Recely;

H. R. 1519. An act conferring jurisdiction on the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of the McCullough Coal Corporation against the United States;

H. R. 1774. An act for the relief of Cyril Doerner;

H. R. 1886. An act for the relief of Charles Fred Smith;

H. R. 1915. An act for the relief of Carl W. Bucey;

H. R. 2014. An act for the relief of the Winston-Salem Southbound Railway Co.;

H. R. 2236. An act for the relief of Roberta Ramsey;

H. R. 2315. An act for the relief of Ethel Phillips and Mary Hurley;

H. R. 2384. An act for the relief of Frank A. McMenamin;

H. R. 2473. An act for the relief of James Wilson;

H. R. 2624. An act to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of J. R. Dixon;

H. R. 2752. An act to authorize the acquisition of additional lands and flowage easements for the Pleasant Hill Reservoir, Ohio, and for other purposes;

H. R. 2845. An act for the relief of John J. Beaton;

H. R. 2873. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. D. F. Still;

H. R. 2919. An act for the relief of Michael Eatman, Jr., and Mrs. Michael Eatman, Jr.;

H. R. 3101. An act for the relief of George E. O'Loughlin;

H. R. 3152. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Cicero B. Hunt;

H. R. 3535. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of Billie Stooksberry, a minor, and Lon L. Stooksberry;

H. R. 3549. An act for the relief of Mrs. Emily Reily;

H. R. 3595. An act for the relief of Robert Futterman;

H. R. 3704. An act to amend the Coast Guard Auxiliary and Reserve Act of 1941, as amended;

H. R. 3813. An act for the relief of J. Ralph Datesman;

H. R. 3898. An act for the relief of Frank Gay;

H. R. 4114. An act to amend section 3 (b) of Public Law 49, Seventy-eighth Congress, first session (War Overtime Pay Act of 1943);

H. R. 4163. An act to amend section 2 of Public Law 17, Seventy-eighth Congress, relating to functions of the War Shipping Administration, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4206. An act to authorize the construction and operation of a free highway bridge across the Monongahela River in the County of Allegheny, Pa.;

H. R. 4207. An act to authorize the construction and operation of a free highway bridge across the Monongahela River in the county of Allegheny, Pa.;

H. R. 4349. An act to exempt certain officers and employees of the National War Labor Board from certain provisions of the Criminal Code;

H. R. 4712. An act for the relief of John Duncan McDonald;

H. R. 4931. An act for the relief of the city of Beardstown, Ill.; and

H. R. 5255. An act to amend the Coast Guard Auxiliary and Reserve Act of 1941, as amended.

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED AFTER ADJOURNMENT OF THE SENATE

The following enrolled bills, heretofore duly signed by the Presiding Officers of the two Houses, were presented to the President of the United States by the Committee on Enrolled Bills on September 23, 1944:

S. 1847. An act to provide for the payment of attorneys' fees from Osage tribal funds;

S. 2015. An act to liberalize certain provisions of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, as amended; and

S. 2058. An act to liberalize certain provisions of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, as amended.

APPROVAL OF SENATE BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION AFTER ADJOURNMENT

The President of the United States, subsequent to the adjournment of the Senate, notified the Secretary of the Senate that he had approved and signed acts and a joint resolution, as follows:

On September 27, 1944:

S. 725. An act to provide for the punishment of persons conspiring to violate the laws relating to counterfeiting, and certain other laws;

S. 1250. An act to repeal section 2 of the act approved May 17, 1926, which provides for the forfeiture of pay of persons in the military and naval service of the United States who are absent from duty on account of the direct effects of venereal disease due to misconduct, and to amend Veterans' Regulation No. 10, as amended, to define line of duty and misconduct for pension and compensation purposes;

S. 1807. An act authorizing and directing the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain land to the city of Duluth, Minn.;

S. 2028. An act to amend the Naval Reserve Act of 1938, as amended, and the Coast Guard Auxiliary and Reserve Act of 1941, as amended, so as to permit service of members of the Women's Reserve in the American area, the Territories of Hawaii and Alaska, and for other purposes;

S. 2111. An act to provide for the extension of certain oil and gas leases; and

S. J. Res. 150. Joint resolution making an appropriation to pay the necessary expenses of the inaugural ceremonies of the President of the United States, January 20, 1945;

On September 30, 1944:

S. 2015. An act to liberalize certain provisions of the National Service Insurance Act of 1940, as amended;

S. 2058. An act to liberalize certain provisions of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, as amended; and

S. 2137. An act to provide for naming the lake formed by waters of the Red River impounded by Denison Dam.

On October 3, 1944:

S. 1847. An act to provide for the payment of attorneys' fees from Osage tribal funds; and

S. 2051. An act to amend the Social Security Act, as amended, to provide a national program for war mobilization and reconversion, and for other purposes.

ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY PROJECT—RESOLUTIONS

Mr. AIKEN presented resolutions adopted by the Chamber of Commerce of Breckenridge, Minn., and the Vermont State Industrial Union Council endorsing the St. Lawrence seaway and power project, which were referred to the Committee on Commerce and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION BY THE CHAMBER OF COMMERCE OF BRECKENRIDGE, MINN., APPROVING THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE ST. LAWRENCE WATERWAY

Whereas the United States and Canada have negotiated an agreement for the construction of the St. Lawrence waterway; and

Whereas an agreement between the two countries must be signed by the respective heads of the two governments and in turn be ratified by majority votes of the Senate and House in the United States and by a majority vote of Parliament in Canada: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Chamber of Commerce of Breckenridge, Minn., is convinced that the development of this project is an economic necessity in normal times; that it is in accord with the President of the United States in his conclusion that its need of development is greatly enhanced by its value as a national defense project: and be it further

Resolved, That the Chamber of Commerce of Breckenridge, Minn., pledges its support to the President in his efforts to make the early developments of the project a reality, and it urges the united support of Senators and Congressmen in the ratification of the agreement when it is presented to the Senate and House; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of these resolutions be sent to the President of the United States, to Senators SHIPSTEAD and BALL and to all Minnesota Congressmen.

BRECKENRIDGE
CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
By R. N. NELSON, *President*.
LEO DREY, *Secretary*.

Dated this 15th day of September 1944.

RESOLUTION ENDORSING THE ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY AND POWER PROJECT (S.1385) ADOPTED BY THE VERMONT STATE INDUSTRIAL UNION COUNCIL AT THEIR SECOND ANNUAL CONVENTION HELD AT THE CITY OF BURLINGTON, VT., ON SEPTEMBER 16, 1944

Whereas there is pending before the Congress a bill sponsored by Senator GEORGE D. AIKEN, of Vermont, embodying the project known as the St. Lawrence seaway and power project; and

Whereas the construction of this project would bring about employment to discharged veterans and unemployed war workers during the post-war period; and

Whereas the vast supply of inexpensive power which would be created by this project would reduce manufacturing and production costs and in turn be of material benefit to labor in permitting to be passed on to them a share of this saving; and

Whereas there would be a reduction in transportation and shipping costs of materials, commodities, and supplies from the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence agricultural and industrial area and this would be translated to the consumer in lower prices of these materials, commodities, and supplies; and

Whereas although these benefits would affect the national economy and welfare as a whole they would be of direct and immediate

importance to Vermont agriculture, labor, and industry: We therefore

Resolve, That the Vermont State Industrial Union Council endorse this legislation and urge the construction of the St. Lawrence seaway and power project as soon as possible;

That a copy of this resolution be sent to the Honorable Franklin D. Roosevelt, President of the United States of America;

That a copy be sent to Senator GEORGE D. AIKEN, of Vermont;

And further copies be sent to Senators WARREN R. AUSTIN and JOHN H. OVERTON; Congressmen CHARLES PLUMLEY and WILLIAM A. PITTENGER.

This resolution was presented by the executive board of the Vermont State Industrial Union Council and adopted by the council at Burlington, Vt., on September 16, 1944.

HAROLD DAOUST,
President.
JOHN C. LAWSON,
Secretary.

RESOLUTIONS OF THE MISSISSIPPI VALLEY FLOOD CONTROL ASSOCIATION

Mr. OVERTON presented resolutions adopted by the Mississippi Valley Flood Control Association assembled in annual convention at New Orleans, La., October 12, 1944, which were referred to the Committee on Commerce and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The Mississippi Valley Flood Control Association, representing 33 levee and drainage districts in the States of Missouri, Kentucky, Tennessee, Arkansas, Mississippi, and Louisiana, adopted the following resolutions while assembled in annual convention in New Orleans, La., October 12, 1944:

I

Resolved, That in full recognition of the increasing tempo and success of our military offensive and of the increasing urgency for being prepared to give full employment to our veterans and defense workers we urge that, immediately upon the reconvening of Congress, the Senate enact the House-passed river and harbor bill, H. R. 3961, and flood-control bill, H. R. 4485, without making restrictive or reformatory amendments to either bill. The projects contained in these bills are economically sound, they have been thoroughly studied, and when authorized they may be undertaken at any rate that may be determined by the Congress of the United States. This legislation should be vigorously advanced and enacted into law in order that the Nation-wide benefits involved may be authorized and in order that the fine work already accomplished on these bills by Congress, the War Department, and the waterway interests, in general, shall not be lost by default. Furthermore, we submit that there is no better means of providing employment, both direct and indirect, than by the construction of flood control and navigation structures.

II

Resolved, That in the interest of retaining the practical and efficient procedures that have been perfected over a period of years and under which waterway improvements have made such outstanding progress, we are unalterably opposed to the so-called O'Mahoney-Millikin amendments, which constitute a radical departure from the established procedures and would have the effect of largely substituting State control for national control of our great inland waterway system. We believe that any such amendments are without merit and that their doubtful constitutionality would inevitably lead to fruitless litigation and, furthermore, by their very terms they would cause prolonged delay to a number of extremely meritorious projects in the pending bills.

III

Resolved, That since the project for flood control and navigation of the Lower Mississippi River is important to the orderly and efficient progress of the national war emergency and is exceptionally well suited to provide employment during the reconversion period, we recommend that the Congress of the United States provide annually funds adequate to assure appropriate progress, as well as to maintain the works that have been completed; and since adequate allocations of materials by the War Production Board are as essential as adequate appropriations for the efficient prosecution of the project, we further recommend that such allocations be made for the relatively small amounts of supplies, materials, and equipment needed.

IV

Resolved, That the rate of prosecution of the project for flood control of the Mississippi River in its alluvial valley and for its improvement, from the Head of Passes to Cape Girardeau, adopted by the act of May 15, 1928, as amended by subsequent acts, be increased as rapidly as may be consistent with the improvement in the military situation in order that the maximum protection may be secured at the earliest practicable time and in order that returning veterans and workers, no longer needed in defense plants, may be employed on this most important flood-control and navigation project.

V

Resolved, That as pioneers in flood control and navigation and the conservation of water resources in the United States it is our firm conviction that the Federal planning, execution, operation, and maintenance of public improvements for flood control, navigation, and allied purposes are being administered to the best interests of the public and the National Government by the existing departments of the Government. We reaffirm our undeviating opposition to the creation or extension of so-called valley or regional authorities which are vociferously supported by a small minority, seeking radically to change important fundamental principles of our democratic government. Without having any customary governmental check or supervision of revenues, expenditures, employment practices, and operations in a number of unrelated activities, a valley or regional authority is equivalent to a regal principality, in this land of freedom, that can be administered by its directors in a manner inimical to the best interests of the American people, and without proper coordination with other projects in our vast inland waterway systems of which they should be component, and not independent parts.

VI

Resolved, That the Mississippi Valley Flood Control Association hereby reaffirms its faith in the wisdom of the American system through which Army engineers provide an engineering service to the Nation during years of peace, and at the same time increase their experience and develop their talents for meeting the emergency demands of war. Officers like Lt. Gen. Brehon B. Somervell, Lt. Gen. John C. H. Lee, Maj. Gen. Eugene Reybold, Maj. Gen. Thomas B. Larkin, Maj. Gen. Donald H. Connolly, Maj. Gen. Daniel Noce, and many others well known to the lower Mississippi Valley for their superb work in combating the flood menaces, have measured up to the highest standards of military engineering and leadership in this war. We are witnesses to their administrative abilities, their engineering skill, and their general superior abilities to undertake and accomplish large and difficult works for either peace or war. We believe that their accomplishments, in connection with large movements of American and Allied striking forces over sea and land, are in a large measure the result of their peacetime experience in the planning and execution of flood-control and navigation works on the great Mississippi River. In recognition of their magnificent military contributions to the cause of victory, we pay just tribute to officers of the Corps of Engineers who in the past have worked in this and other areas on flood control, navigation, and the conservation of water resources and we attach the utmost importance to having civil waterway improvement under the jurisdiction of the Army engineers.

VII

Resolved, That construction of the mainstem levees to the 1941 grade and section be prosecuted with priority and as rapidly as possible, and that construction be resumed at the earliest practicable time on other features of the adopted plan as modified, that have been suspended due to the war emergency. Whenever improvement in the military situation in the several theaters of this global war makes possible a relaxation of restrictions on nonmilitary work, it is strongly urged that an expedited program be provided for work on the flood-control and waterway-improvement projects for the lower Mississippi River so that this plan may be operated with maximum efficiency and effectiveness for the benefit of the entire alluvial valley.

VIII

Resolved, That flood control is essential to navigation and navigation is essential if the States represented at this meeting are to have their full share of the Nation's prosperity, and if these States are to share in the foreign trade, adequate terminal port facilities should be provided at New Orleans, the port of the entire Middle West. The most important subject before the Nation today is national defense and a tidewater channel from New Orleans to the Gulf of Mexico would be of great economic value to the States we represent as well as of strategic value in time of war. Therefore, this association exprcsses the hope that the tidewater channel will be found, after full investigation, to be economically justified and that the route selected will be from the Industrial Canal eastward through the Intracoastal Waterway; through Lake Borgne, through Grand Island Pass, through Cat Island Pass and Mississippi Sound to deep water north of Chandeleur Island in the Gulf of Mexico at such place as the United States Army engineers shall determine.

COMPULSORY MILITARY TRAINING—LETTER FROM WARREN ZIMMERMAN

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President I have received a letter from Warren Zimmerman, of Lawrence, Kans., an influential businessman of my State, expressing his strong opposition to compulsory military training. I ask that the letter be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATOR ARTHUR CAPPER,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR CAPPER: It seems I can go just about so long without letting off a little steam, and this morning find myself wanting to let off a little surplus indignation.

I don't know how you feel about it, but I want to express myself as against compulsory military training, which Roosevelt wants to put over now in a mild form. My objections to it are based on the experience which its centuries of use have brought in Europe, where it has been tried. All it has done is train youth for war and permit the aggregation to pull off conflicts every 10 to 15 or 25 years. In my judgment it is nothing but a war-breeder and while it may be expensive in a way to handle the situation as we have in decades past, nevertheless, the youth of the land are not spending their formative

years in army camps, but at home in useful, practical application. The mild form prescribed by the President will soon be the full-fledged stuff, for war-bent individuals don't stop at simplicity in such matters. They finally get the real thing. And if the military training of youth hasn't been a colossal failure in Europe in saving nations and preventing war, just what would you call it? Better, far, I believe, to follow the advice of Washington and if necessary, come to their rescue and save them from themselves than to set about making a nation of ours such as prevails in Europe.

On the matter of $35 a month which the new dealers want to spend for election purposes for war workers, already fat on swollen salaries, I suggest it be made $350 a month so the beneficiaries can really live like white folks and rest up from their endeavors. It's a shame to not do the job up right, and what's a few "silly dollars" when it comes to making folks happy at election time. Somebody down there has missed the boat in getting the matter framed up properly, a lot of us out here believe.

* * * * *

Sincerely yours,

WARREN ZIMMERMAN.

REPORTS ON DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

Mr. BARKLEY, from the Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers, to which were referred for examination and recommendation two lists of records transmitted to the Senate by the Archivist of the United States that appeared to have no permanent value or historical interest, submitted reports thereon pursuant to law.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. BALL:

S. 2174. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Walter M. Johnson; to the Committee on Claims.

(Mr. VANDENBERG introduced Senate bill 2175, which was referred to the Committee on Finance, and appears under a separate heading.)

(Mr. WAGNER introduced Senate bill 2176, which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BREWSTER:

S. 2177. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Stephen E. Sanders; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. REYNOLDS:

S. 2178. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act authorizing the President to appoint an Under Secretary of War during national emergencies, fixing the compensation of the Under Secretary of War, and authorizing the Secretary of War to prescribe duties," approved December 16, 1940, for the purpose of making such act permanently effective; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts:

S. 2179. A bill to reimburse certain Navy personnel for personal property lost or damaged as the result of a fire at the Naval Auxiliary Air Facility, Astoria, Oreg., on April 2, 1944;

S. 2180. A bill to provide reimbursement for personal property lost, damaged, or destroyed as the result of an explosion at the Naval Mine Depot, Yorktown, Va., on November 16, 1943; and

S. 2181. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to grant to the city of Canton, Ohio, for highway purposes only, a strip of land situated within the United States naval ordnance plant at Canton, Ohio; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. BILBO:

S. J. Res. 155. Joint resolution establishing a commission to select a site and design for a national memorial stadium to be erected in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

SOCIAL-SECURITY PAY-ROLL TAXES

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I wish to introduce a bill, and I think that the situation requires a brief explanation in respect to it. I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to make a brief explanation.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from Michigan will proceed.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I propose a bill to again "freeze" social security pay-roll taxes at 1 percent each on employers and employees during 1945. If such a bill is not passed, the taxes will automatically double in 1945. In the same connection the bill directs the Joint Congressional Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation to investigate the whole subject of pay-roll taxes for old-age and survivors insurance, and authorizes it to set up an advisory committee of outside experts to assist this study, with a report not later than July 1, 1945. I may say that this is the process which was followed in 1939, the last time the subject was intelligently approached. Congress has annually faced this problem for 3 years. It is high time the whole subject is taken out of controversy and a satisfactory, permanent basis for these pay-roll taxes established.

The present statute is contradictory within itself respecting pay-roll taxes for old-age and survivors insurance. It suggests two totally incompatible rules for determining the necessary level of these pay-roll taxes from year to year. On the one hand it looks toward the so-called Morgenthau rule which says the old-age and survivors insurance reserve is sufficient when it is three times the highest contemplated annual expenditure in the next 5 years. On the other hand, it arbitrarily increases the pay-roll tax rate on employers and employees from 1 percent at present to 2 percent for 1945; to 2½ percent in 1946; to 3 percent in 1948—although no such increases are necessary in order to create an adequate reserve under the Morgenthau rule. One plan or the other is wrong. The question ought to be permanently settled so as to take it out of annual controversy. There should be no uncertainties regarding any phase of social security.

Mr. President, I am very glad to say to the Senate that I have had a friendly and helpful conference with the full Social Security Board on this subject within the week. While the Board opposes another "freeze" of pay-roll taxes at existing levels, it frankly recognizes the contradiction in the present law and agrees that an immediate effort should be made to find one single satisfactory rule which can become permanent, at least for many years to come. I believe the Board will be prepared to offer helpfully concrete suggestions either to committees of Congress or to the special advisory group of experts which is contemplated by my bill introduced today.

I want to say at this point that I cannot too earnestly commend the attitude of the Social Security Board toward this problem as a whole.

I now desire to present the current figures on old-age and survivors insurance finances as furnished by the Social Security Board as of the present time. Total pay-roll tax collections at 1 percent each from employers and employees in the last fiscal year, ending June 30, 1944, were $1,292,122,434. Trust-fund interest added the sum of $103,177,087. In other words, the total income for the year was thus $1,395,299,521. Benefit payments for the year were $184,597,364. I want to repeat that figure in round numbers. The income from the existing pay-roll taxes was in round numbers $1,400,000,000, and the benefit payments for the year in round numbers were $185,000,000. Administrative expense was $32,607,374. Thus, during the last fiscal year, the sum of $1,178,094,783 was added to reserves. This made the total reserves on June 30, 1944, the sum of $5,446,390,767.

Please bear that figure in mind, roughly five and a half billion dollars in the reserve at the end of the fiscal year. Now, under the "Morgenthau rule," this reserve should be 3 times the highest contemplated expenditure in the next 5 years. The Social Security Board estimates this highest expenditure to be between $450,000,000 and $700,000,000 in 1949. In other words, at existing pay-roll rates, the reserve is 12, instead of 3, times the lowest estimate, and it is 8, instead of 3, times the highest estimate. In neither case would the Morgenthau rule justify a 100-percent increase in pay-roll taxes in 1945.

But I am frank to say that I think the time has come when the Morgenthau rule itself should be reviewed. Certainly it is time the contradiction is taken out of the existing statute. It is time this question got out of Congress and onto a justifiedly permanent basis. Therefore, I am proposing that during one final "freeze" of the existing 1-percent tax rate, a special, expert study should again be made of this whole pay-roll tax matter and a final conclusion reached not later than July 1, 1945. I wish to repeat that I know, as a result of my conference with the Social Security Board yesterday, that they are prepared to cooperate wholeheartedly in this effort.

There is one widespread misunderstanding about this matter which I wish might be cleared up. This present pay-roll tax controversy has nothing whatever to do with the question of expanded social security coverage and expanded social security benefits. I favor expansion of coverage and expansion of benefits in obviously equitable directions.

When benefits are expanded, taxes obviously will then have to increase. But today's problem relates solely to what taxes shall be paid for existing benefits.

In conclusion, Mr. President, I wish to state that I recognize the parliamentary situation which is involved. The Senate is not entitled to initiate this legislation. It is revenue legislation, and under the Constitution it must start in the House of Representatives. But upon each of three annual occasions the House has waited upon the Senate to take the initial action by way of amendment to some revenue bill which has come over from the House. Therefore, I have thought that in fairness to the Members of the House, and in fairness to the Members of the Senate, I should present this proposition at the present time, to be printed and to be referred to the Senate Committee on Finance, particularly in view of the fact that the Social Security Board itself is now prepared to discuss the matter in a fashion which I join in hoping may result in a permanent solution.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed in the RECORD, and that it be referred to the Senate Committee on Finance.

The bill (S. 2175) to provide that the automatic increase in taxes imposed in connection with old-age and survivors insurance shall not apply in 1945 and to provide for a special investigation with respect to such taxes, was read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Finance, and, there being no objection, ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That (a) section 1400 of the Federal Insurance Contributions Act (Internal Revenue Code, sec. 1400) (relating to the rate of tax on employees) is amended by striking out clauses (1), (2), (3), and (4) and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"(1) With respect to wages received during the calendar years 1939, 1940, 1941, 1942, 1943, 1944, and 1945, the rate shall be 1 percent.

"(2) With respect to wages received during the calendar years 1946, 1947, and 1948, the rate shall be 2½ percent.

"(3) With respect to wages received after December 31, 1948, the rate shall be 3 percent."

(b) Section 1410 of such act (Internal Revenue Code, sec. 1410) (relating to the rate of tax on employers) is amended by striking out clauses (1), (2), (3), and (4) and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"(1) With respect to wages paid during the calendar years 1939, 1940, 1941, 1942, 1943, 1944, and 1945, the rate shall be 1 percent.

"(2) With respect to wages paid during the calendar years 1946, 1947, and 1948, the rate shall be 2½ percent.

"(3) With respect to wages paid after December 31, 1948, the rate shall be 3 percent."

SEC. 2. (a) The Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation is authorized and directed to make a full and complete study and investigation with respect to taxes imposed in connection with old-age and survivors insurance. The joint committee shall report to the Congress not later than July 1, 1945, the results of its study and investigation, together with such recommendations as it may deem appropriate.

(b) The joint committee is hereby authorized, in its discretion, to appoint an advisory committee of individuals having special knowledge concerning matters involved in its study and investigation to assist, consult with, and advise the joint committee with respect to such study and investigation. Members of the advisory committee shall not receive any compensation for their services as such members, but shall be reimbursed for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in connection with the performance of the work of the advisory committee.

(c) For the purposes of this section, the joint committee is authorized to exercise the powers conferred upon it by the provisions of the Internal Revenue Code.

(d) There is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of $25,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, to carry out the purposes of this section.

CONTROL OF RENTS FOR BUSINESS ACCOMMODATIONS

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, I introduce a bill which I ask to have referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency. It is a bill to amend the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended, with respect to the control of rents for business accommodations, which are not now included in the Emergency Price Control Act.

Mr. President, I am anxious that early hearings be had upon the bill because thousands of business firms, it is reported, have been squeezed by the pressure of increases in rents amounting, in some cases, to more than 50 percent of the prior rents. It is said that we are facing a crisis as a result of these exorbitant demands for increased rents on business property. I repeat, that I hope at the earliest possible time to have hearings on the bill before the Committee on Banking and Currency of the Senate with the hope of having the bill providing for the amendment to the Emergency Price Control Act passed during the present session.

The bill (S. 2176) to amend the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended, with respect to the control of rents for business accommodations, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

MISSOURI RIVER BASIN AUTHORITY—NOTICE OF MOTION FOR CHANGE OF REFERENCE OF BILL

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President, I rise to give notice of a motion to withdraw from the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation further consideration of Senate bill 1915 to establish an authority for the Missouri River Basin, and to refer the bill to the Committee on Commerce. I will not bring forward the motion at this time as the author of the bill is absent from the Senate today. I intend to press for consideration and disposition of the motion, however, at the earliest opportunity, which I understand will be on Thursday next.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The motion will go over, under the rule.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, did I correctly understand the Senator from North Carolina to say that he wishes to press for action on the motion next Thursday?

Mr. BAILEY. Yes, Mr. President.

The resolution (S. Res. 331), submitted by Mr. BAILEY and ordered to lie over, under the rule, is as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation be discharged from the further consideration of the bill (S. 1915) to authorize the undertaking of the initial stage of the comprehensive plan for the conservation, control, and use of the water resources of the Missouri River Basin, and that it be referred to the Committee on Commerce.

AMENDMENTS TO RIVER AND HARBOR IMPROVEMENT BILL

Mr. TYDINGS submitted two amendments intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 3961) authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

PROPOSALS OF THE DUMBARTON OAKS CONFERENCE (S. DOC. NO. 245)

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed as a Senate document the proposals for the establishment of a general international organization as worked out thus far by the Dumbarton Oaks Conference.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADDRESSES DELIVERED BY THE PRESIDENT DURING THE CAMPAIGN

[Mr. BARKLEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the addresses delivered by the President of the United States during the recent campaign, which appear in the Appendix.]

AMERICA'S OPPORTUNITY—STATEMENT BY SENATOR BURTON

[Mr. BURTON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement made by him at the United Nations Forum on America's opportunity, at Philadelphia, Pa., on October 4, 1944, which appears in the Appendix.]

NAVAL ACTIVITIES ON THE WEST COAST—ADDRESS BY SENATOR WALSH OF MASSACHUSETTS

[Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address relating to naval activities on the west coast, delivered by him at Boston, Mass., on Armistice Day, 1944, which appears in the Appendix.]

WYOMING WENT REPUBLICAN—EDITORIAL FROM WYOMING STATE TRIBUNE

[Mr. ROBERTSON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Wyoming Went Republican," published in the Wyoming State Tribune of November 9, 1944, which appears in the Appendix.]

SENATOR FROM INDIANA

Mr. WILLIS presented the credentials of WILLIAM E. JENNER, of Indiana, elected a Senator from that State for the unexpired term of Frederick Van Nuys, deceased, ending on the 2d day of January 1945, which were read, as follows:

To the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES:

This is to certify that on the 7th day of November 1944 WILLIAM E. JENNER was duly chosen by the qualified electors of the State of Indiana a Senator from said State to fill the vacancy in the term ending January 2, 1945,

caused by the death of Hon. Frederick Van Nuys.

Witness His Excellency our Governor, Henry F. Schricker, and our seal hereto affixed at Indianapolis this 13th day of November, in the year of our Lord 1944.

By the Governor:

HENRY F. SCHRICKER,
Governor.

[SEAL] RUE J. ALEXANDER,
Secretary of State.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The credentials will be placed on file.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. President, nearly a year ago the Senate lost one of its most valuable Members in the death of the late Senator Van Nuys, of Indiana. To fill the interim appointment until the election Senator SAMUEL D. JACKSON, of Fort Wayne, was appointed, and his period of service will expire with the swearing in of the Senator elected in Indiana last Tuesday. I should like to take this moment to pay a brief tribute of appreciation of the services of Senator JACKSON.

Senator JACKSON has made a real impression upon the Members of the Senate by his courtesy, his devotion to his duties, and by the fine spirit of loyalty to our country, which he has always manifested. He has been recognized on many occasions as a fair and impartial presiding officer over this body, and I presume it was because of his ability to spread the oil of harmony on the conflicting factions of the Democratic Party that he was chosen to be the chairman of the national convention of that party recently held in Chicago.

In all these capacities Senator JACKSON acquitted himself with a splendid record, and many will regret that we are to lose his services, because as a Senator he has served well. It is no fault of Senator JACKSON that he was not returned; he was not a candidate for reelection to the Senate. He chose other avenues of service, but the tide of political favor was against him in Indiana.

At this time I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD at this point an analysis of the vote in Indiana, made by the very capable correspondent of the Indianapolis News, Mr. Mark Thistlethwaite.

There being no objection, the matter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Indianapolis News of November 9, 1944]

STATE G. O. P. GAIN BIGGEST IN NATION—ELECTION RECORD TOPS THAT IN MAINE, VERMONT

(By Mark Thistlethwaite)

WASHINGTON, November 9.—On the basis of gains, Indiana's G. O. P. established the best State performance record in the entire Nation.

The Hoosier Republicans not only won the Presidential contest, but gained a United States Senator and a Governor and at the same time suffered no loss in their House representation in Congress.

The Republicans of no other State can boast as much. Maine and Vermont, traditionally Republican, Kansas and South Dakota, all of which came through with 100-percent election records, scored no gains.

In Ohio the Republicans lost a governorship and several House seats. In Nebraska, Wisconsin, and Colorado, they lost seats in the House. In Iowa they gained a senatorship and elected a Republican as Governor, but this governorship is not a party gain. In North Dakota, they lost a senatorship.

In the East, the G. O. P., in addition to losing the Presidential contest, lost State offices. Massachusetts Republicans lost a governorship. Connecticut Republicans lost a senatorship and several House seats. New Jersey Republicans gained a senatorship but lost their State to Roosevelt. Pennsylvania Republicans lost a senatorship and several House seats.

Indiana's Republican Governor will succeed a Democrat and will be backed by a full set of Republican officeholders.

The Hoosier G. O. P. elected two Republican Senators (short-term and long-term) to a Democratic seat.

When Capt. WILLIAM E. JENNER, United States Army, retired, is inducted, November 14, Indiana will be represented in the Senate by two Republicans for the first time since January 1935.

JENNER, who will serve until January 3, will be the youngest Member of the Senate and the first veteran of World War No. 2 to take a seat in the Senate.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. President, I should like to say a word about the incoming Senator from Indiana. Captain JENNER is held in high esteem in our State. He led his ticket in Indiana at the recent election. But more than that, this marks a new era. He will be the youngest man in this Senate. He will be the first man elected to the Senate coming out of the ranks of the present World War soldiers. I know Senator JENNER will bring with him the thoughts and the feelings of the great body of loyal soldiers, of whom we are all so proud, and I am sure he will bring valuable support to our efforts to serve our country well in this capacity, as they are serving so magnificently on the fighting fronts throughout the world.

Captain JENNER was a member of the Indiana State Senate for 8 years, and a very worthy member. He resigned the position of floor leader and president pro tempore to enlist in the military service of his country. He served for more than 2 years in the Army Air Corps, and because of the rigors of this overseas service, he developed a physical disability which required his retirement. He left the service only 6 weeks ago with the rank of captain.

While Captain JENNER was still in the hospital, his friends in Indiana nominated him as a candidate for the United States Senate, without his suggestion and without his knowledge, that in honor of his service he might fill out this brief period between the election and the beginning of the next regular session. I join in the feeling of the people of Indiana that this honor has been worthily bestowed, and it is, therefore, a great satisfaction to me to present Captain JENNER to the Senate.

Mr. President, Captain JENNER is present, and desires to take the oath of office.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I do not know that at this particular stage remarks on my part are appropriate, but my Hoosier heart tells me that in the last minutes of my time as a Senator I should welcome my successor.

My distinguished colleague has catalogued the virtues of Captain JENNER, and I would reemphasize each one of them. My colleague has not at all overstated the case. The people of Indiana, of both political parties, admire Captain JENNER. We believe he will make a good United States Senator, and that in the short time in which he will serve in this body in this interim period he will make a name for himself.

I need not tell my colleagues present the value of our associations here, or how painful it is to leave the Senate. My service here has covered 9 precious months. My colleagues have been generous with my shortcomings, they have been kind to me on all occasions, and I am sure Captain JENNER will earn the same courteous treatment which has been accorded me.

The VICE PRESIDENT. If the Senator-elect will present himself at the desk, the oath will be administered to him.

Mr. JENNER, escorted by Mr. WILLIS, advanced to the Vice President's desk, and the oath of office prescribed by law was administered to him by the Vice President.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations (and withdrawing a nomination), which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received and nomination withdrawn, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

ADJOURNMENT TO THURSDAY

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I am unable at the moment to advise the Senate with reference to the legislative procedure for the remainder of this session. There are several bills on the calendar pressing for consideration. I may have some information Thursday as to priority of consideration of bills on the calendar, and in the meantime I do not think it advisable to attempt to suggest what bill will be taken up first.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. Does the Senator anticipate that there will be any legislative work on Thursday?

Mr. BARKLEY. I myself doubt whether there will be on Thursday, but it is simply a doubt. I am not saying definitely. It may be advisable to take up something Thursday, but I am not in position to say today.

With that announcement, if there is nothing further, I move that the Senate adjourn to 12 o'clock noon on Thursday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 12 o'clock and 27 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until Thursday, November 16, 1944, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate November 14, 1944:

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

Jefferson Caffery, of Louisiana, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to France.

Waldo E. Bailey, of Mississippi, to be a Foreign Service officer of class 7, a secretary

in the Diplomatic Service, and a consul of the United States of America.

CIVIL AERONAUTICS BOARD

Harllee Branch, of Georgia, to be a member of the Civil Aeronautics Board for the term of 6 years from January 1, 1945. (Reappointment.)

UNITED STATES PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

The following-named officers for promotion in the Regular Corps of the United States Public Health Service:

DENTAL SURGEONS TO BE TEMPORARY SENIOR DENTAL SURGEONS EFFECTIVE OCTOBER 1, 1944

Leland E. Weyer
Robert A. Scroggie

PASSED ASSISTANT DENTAL SURGEON TO BE TEMPORARY DENTAL SURGEON EFFECTIVE OCTOBER 1, 1944

Vernon J. Forney

SURGEON TO BE TEMPORARY SENIOR SURGEON EFFECTIVE OCTOBER 1, 1944

Harold D. Lyman

PASSED ASSISTANT SURGEONS TO BE TEMPORARY SURGEONS EFFECTIVE OCTOBER 1, 1944

Daniel D. Chiles
James J. Griffitts
Robert R. Smith

ASSISTANT SURGEONS TO BE TEMPORARY PASSED ASSISTANT SURGEONS EFFECTIVE OCTOBER 1, 1944

Frederic C. Bartter
Warren S. Kennison
Joseph E. Maurer

SENIOR SURGEON TO BE TEMPORARY MEDICAL DIRECTOR EFFECTIVE OCTOBER 1, 1944

Guy H. Faget

SENIOR SURGEON TO BE MEDICAL DIRECTOR EFFECTIVE JULY 9, 1944

Lynne A. Fullerton

PASSED ASSISTANT SURGEONS TO BE TEMPORARY SURGEONS EFFECTIVE DATES INDICATED

David B. Wilson, September 1, 1944.
George E. Parkhurst, September 1, 1944.
Joe M. Chisolm, September 1, 1944.

ASSISTANT SURGEON TO BE PASSED ASSISTANT SURGEON EFFECTIVE JULY 11, 1944

James K. Norman

APPOINTMENTS, BY TRANSFER, IN THE REGULAR ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

TO QUARTERMASTER CORPS

Capt. John Francis Farra, Jr., Infantry (temporary colonel), with rank from June 9, 1938.

TO ORDNANCE DEPARTMENT

First Lt. Harry Paller, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from July 1, 1943.

First Lt. Frank George White, Field Artillery (temporary colonel), with rank from July 1, 1941.

TO SIGNAL CORPS

First Lt. Donald Read Bodine, Field Artillery (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from June 12, 1939.

First Lt. George William Rhyne, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from June 14, 1941.

TO FIELD ARTILLERY

Second Lt. Jack Teague, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from June 1, 1943.

TO INFANTRY

First Lt. John Joseph Pavick, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from June 12, 1942.

TO AIR CORPS

First Lt. Andrew D'Elia, Infantry, with rank from June 11, 1943.

Second Lt. Donald Hepburn Bruner, Signal Corps (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from January 19, 1943.

PROMOTIONS IN THE REGULAR ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

To be colonel with rank from September 21, 1944

Lt. Col. Stanley Lonzo Scott, Corps of Engineers (temporary brigadier general).

To be colonel with rank from September 30, 1944

Lt. Col. Henry Crampton Jones, Field Artillery (temporary colonel).

To be colonel with rank from October 1, 1944

Lt. Col. Carl Lee Marriott, Chemical Warfare Service (temporary colonel), subject to examination required by law.

Lt. Col. James Arthur Pickering, Field Artillery (temporary brigadier general).

Lt. Col. James Knox Cockrell, Cavalry (temporary colonel).

Lt. Col. William Spence, Field Artillery (temporary brigadier general).

Lt. Col. Willis McDonald Chapin, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary brigadier general).

Lt. Col. Fred Beeler Inglis, Field Artillery.

Lt. Col. Robert Bruce McBride, Jr., Field Artillery (temporary brigadier general).

To be colonel with rank from November 1, 1944

Lt. Col. Paul Vincent Kane, Field Artillery (temporary brigadier general).

Lt. Col. DeRosey Carroll Cabell, Ordnance Department (temporary colonel).

Lt. Col. William Ewen Shipp, Cavalry (temporary colonel).

To be lieutenant colonel with rank from October 31, 1944

Maj. John James Baker, Infantry (temporary colonel).

To be lieutenant colonel with rank from November 1, 1944

Maj. George Louis Boyle, Finance Department (temporary colonel).

Maj. Robert Brice Johnston, Quartermaster Corps (temporary colonel).

Maj. Paul Ainsworth Berkey, Field Artillery (temporary lieutenant colonel), subject to examination required by law.

Maj. Dana Gray McBride, Cavalry (temporary colonel).

Maj. Donald Boyer Phillips, Air Corps (temporary colonel).

Maj. William Wallace Robertson, Infantry (temporary colonel).

Maj. William Peyton Campbell, Finance Department (temporary colonel).

Maj. Harry Starkey Aldrich, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary colonel).

Maj. Hugh Perry Adams, Field Artillery (temporary colonel).

Maj. Cecil Elmore Archer, Air Corps (temporary colonel).

Maj. Thomas Edward Moore, Field Artillery (temporary colonel).

Maj. Stephen Yates McGiffert, Field Artillery (temporary colonel).

Maj. John Otis Hyatt, Quartermaster Corps (temporary colonel).

Maj. Louis Meline Merrick, Air Corps (temporary colonel).

Maj. Lee Roy Woods, Jr., Finance Department (temporary lieutenant colonel).

Maj. Rox Hunter Donaldson, Field Artillery (temporary colonel).

Maj. Dudley Warren Watkins, Air Corps (temporary colonel).

Maj. Arthur Nathaniel Willis, Cavalry (temporary lieutenant colonel).

Maj. Lyman Perley Whitten, Air Corps (temporary brigadier general).

Maj. Ray Henry Clark, Air Corps (temporary brigadier general).

Maj. Homer Wilbur Ferguson, Air Corps (temporary colonel).

Maj. James Richmond Simpson, Infantry (temporary colonel).

Maj. Philip Schwartz, Ordnance Department (temporary colonel).

Maj. Richard Brown Thornton, Quartermaster Corps (temporary colonel).

Maj. Pacifico Castor Sevilla, Philippine Scouts, subject to examination required by law.

Maj. Charles Nicholas Senn Ballou, Infantry (temporary colonel).

Maj. Samuel Rubin, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary colonel).

Maj. Walden Sharp Lewis, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel).

Maj. Andrew Julius Evans, Infantry (temporary colonel).

Maj. Donald McKechnie Ashton, Infantry (temporary colonel).

Maj. Edward Alfred Mueller, Quartermaster Corps (temporary colonel).

Maj. Robert William Calvert Wimsatt, Air Corps (temporary colonel).

Maj. Amado Martelino, Philippine Scouts, subject to examination required by law.

Maj. Victor Zalamea Gomez, Philippine Scouts (temporary lieutenant colonel), subject to examination required by law.

Maj. Clayton Huddle Studebaker, Field Artillery (temporary colonel).

Maj. Albert James Wick, Quartermaster Corps (temporary colonel).

Maj. Raymond Taylor Tompkins, Field Artillery (temporary lieutenant colonel), subject to examination required by law.

Maj. George Alfred Arnold Jones, Field Artillery (temporary colonel).

Maj. George Evans Burritt, Field Artillery (temporary colonel).

Maj. William Madison Mack, Signal Corps (temporary colonel).

Maj. Walter Jesse Klepinger, Field Artillery (temporary colonel).

Maj. Frank Charles McConnell, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary brigadier general).

Maj. Donald Fowler Fritch, Air Corps (temporary colonel).

Maj. James Madison Callicutt, Field Artillery (temporary colonel).

Maj. Reginald Pond Lyman, Signal Corps (temporary colonel).

Maj. John Sharpe Griffith, Air Corps (temporary colonel), subject to examination required by law.

Maj. Pio Quevedo Caluya, Philippine Scouts, subject to examination required by law.

To be lieutenant colonel, with rank from November 2, 1944

Maj. George Work Marvin, Corps of Engineers (temporary colonel).

To be first lieutenant, with rank from October 25, 1944

Second Lt. Charles Adam Ott, Jr., Field Artillery (temporary captain).

To be first lieutenant, with rank from November 6, 1944

Second Lt. Richard Gates Davis, Corps of Engineers (temporary major).

MEDICAL CORPS

To be colonels

Lt. Col. David Loran Robeson, Medical Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from October 8, 1944.

Lt. Col. Joseph Ignatius Martin, Medical Corps (temporary brigadier general), with rank from October 8, 1944.

Lt. Col. Thomas Randolph McCarley, Medical Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from October 12, 1944.

Lt. Col. Lester Eastwood Beringer, Medical Corps, with rank from October 24, 1944.

Lt. Col. John Moorhaj Tamraz, Medical Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from November 2, 1944.

To be lieutenant colonels

Maj. John Morris Hargreaves, Medical Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from October 1, 1944.

Maj. Don Longfellow, Medical Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from October 20, 1944.

Maj. William Frank DeWitt, Medical Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from November 15, 1944.

To be majors

Capt. Max Naimark, Medical Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from October 28, 1944.

Capt. Vernon James Erkenbeck, Medical Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from November 12, 1944, subject to examination required by law.

Capt. Arthur Herbert Thompson, Medical Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from November 12, 1944.

Capt. Wilson Theodore Smith, Medical Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from November 26, 1944.

Capt. Clarendon Barron Woods, Medical Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from November 26, 1944.

Capt. Joe Alexander Bain, Medical Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from November 26, 1944.

Capt. Cecil Spencer Mollohan, Medical Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from November 26, 1944.

Capt. Francis Whitney Hall, Medical Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from November 26, 1944.

To be captains

First Lt. Todd Merriam Mulford, Medical Corps (temporary captain), with rank from August 26, 1944.

First Lt. Joseph Edward Walther, Medical Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from August 26, 1944.

First Lt. Fred Ries Sloan, Medical Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from August 26, 1944.

First Lt. Colin Francis Vorder Bruegge, Medical Corps (temporary major), with rank from August 26, 1944.

First Lt. Hamilton Boyd, Jr., Medical Corps (temporary major), with rank from August 26, 1944.

First Lt. John Sidney Clapp, Medical Corps (temporary captain), with rank from August 26, 1944.

First Lt. Emil Joseph Genetti, Medical Corps (temporary major), with rank from August 26, 1944.

First Lt. Vernon Charles Kelly, Medical Corps (temporary major), with rank from August 26, 1944.

First Lt. Robert Richard Jones, Medical Corps (temporary captain), with rank from August 30, 1944.

First Lt. Augustus Lynn Baker, Jr., Medical Corps (temporary captain), with rank from September 29, 1944.

First Lt. Thompson Eldridge Potter, Medical Corps (temporary captain), with rank from October 14, 1944.

First Lt. Herman Saul Wigodsky, Medical Corps (temporary major), with rank from October 23, 1944.

First Lt. Camp Stanley Huntington, Medical Corps (temporary captain), with rank from October 28, 1944.

DENTAL CORPS

To be colonels

Lt. Col. Vivian Z. Brown, Dental Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from November 1, 1944.

Lt. Col. Clarence Roy Benney, Dental Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from November 21, 1944.

To be lieutenant colonel

Maj. Walter Edwin Chase, Dental Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from November 12, 1944.

VETERINARY CORPS

To be colonel

Lt. Col. Nathan Menzo Neate, Veterinary Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from November 24, 1944.

CHAPLAINS

To be colonels

Chaplain (Lt. Col.) John MacWilliams, United States Army, with rank from October 31, 1944.

Chaplain (Lt. Col.) Roy Hartford Parker, United States Army (temporary colonel), with rank from November 7, 1944.

To be captains

Chaplain (First Lt.) Randolph Lynn Gregory, United States Army (temporary major), with rank from October 2, 1944.

Chaplain (First Lt.) Arthur Henry Marsh, United States Army (temporary captain), with rank from October 29, 1944.

IN THE NAVY

Capt. Harry L. Merring, United States Navy, retired, to be a rear admiral in the Navy on the retired list, for temporary service, to continue while serving as Deputy Chief of Industrial Readjustment Branch of the Office of Procurement and Material.

IN THE COAST GUARD

Capt. Lyndon Spencer to be rear admiral, for temporary service, in the Coast Guard while serving as assistant chief operations officer or in any other assignment for which the rank of rear admiral is authorized, to rank from the 1st day of October 1944.

Rear Admiral Robert Donohue to be rear admiral for temporary service, to rank from the 30th day of June 1942, while serving as chief, air-sea rescue officer, or in any other assignment for which the rank of rear admiral is authorized.

Rear Admiral Joseph F. Farley to be rear admiral, for temporary service, to rank from the 1st day of November 1943, while serving as chief personnel officer or in any other assignment for which the rank of rear admiral is authorized.

The following captains to be commodores, for temporary service, in the Coast Guard while serving under the conditions specified, to rank from the 1st day of October 1944:

Capt. Frederick P. Dillon, United States Coast Guard, while serving as Chief, Aids to Navigation Division, or in any other assignment for which the rank of commodore is authorized.

Capt. LeRoy Reinberg, United States Coast Guard, while serving as Commandant, Coast Guard Yard, Curtis Bay, Md., or in any other assignment for which the rank of commodore is authorized.

Capt. Norman B. Hall, United States Coast Guard, while serving as Vice Chairman, Merchant Marine Council, or in any other assignment for which the rank of commodore is authorized.

Capt. Raymond T. McElligott, United States Coast Guard, while serving as Assistant Chief Personnel Officer, or in any other assignment for which the rank of commodore is authorized.

Capt. William J. Keester, United States Coast Guard, while serving as Inspector in Chief, or in any other assignment for which the rank of commodore is authorized.

Capt. Halert C. Shepheard, United States Coast Guard Reserve, while serving as Chief, Merchant Marine Inspection Division, or in any other assignment for which the rank of commodore is authorized.

WITHDRAWAL

Executive nomination withdrawn from the Senate November 14, 1944:

POSTMASTER

WISCONSIN

Edgar A. Lubeck to be postmaster at Arpin in the State of Wisconsin.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, NOVEMBER 14, 1944

Pursuant to Senate Concurrent Resolution 54, the House met at 12 o'clock noon, and was called to order by the Speaker.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Eternal and loving Father, as love of God and country are the noblest motives of the human soul, we pray for that faith which looks beyond this sad world. Through dreaming eyes we gaze into the future and pray that Thy spirit may come in fullness of power to possess our minds and hearts that we may add to the redemptive forces of mankind. Do Thou commend us to fidelity, to sincerity, and to honor, signaling our fellow countrymen to the birth of a new day of unity, tranquillity, and mutual understanding.

As old moorings will no longer suffice, anchor all men to the higher rule of brotherhood, supplanting greed and lust for power, heralding the blessed promise of a better code of living. Imbue these, Thy servants, with one purpose, one determination, and one ideal to spread the blessings of good will throughout our land and in all the world, for we know that there can be no real failure save that loss of the human spirit. O mark the pathway of our President, guard him from all peril as he joins in guiding the destinies of men and nations. Let Thy favor be upon our honorable Speaker, the leaders, and the Members of Congress that in all deliberations there may be no expressions of passion, nor of the dominion of selfishness. O Thou who art our ruler and guide, without whom nothing is strong or enduring, hear our humble prayer and give us peace. Through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, September 21, 1944, was read and approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Sundry messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the House by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on the following dates the President approved and signed bills of the House of the following titles:

September 21, 1944:

H. R. 4278. An act to provide for the control and eradication of certain animal and plant pests and diseases, to facilitate cooperation with the States in fire control, to provide for the more efficient protection and management of the national forests, to facilitate the carrying out of agricultural conservation and related agricultural programs, to facilitate the operation of the Farm Credit Administration and the Rural Electrification Administration, to aid in the orderly marketing of agricultural commodities, and for other purposes.

September 28, 1944:

H. R. 3722. An act to amend section 342 of the Nationality Act of 1940 in respect to fees for the issuance of certificates of arrival.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Gatlin, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 2185. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior, in carrying out the purposes of the act of May 18, 1916 (39 Stat. 137), to purchase logs, lumber, and other forest products.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills and a joint resolution of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 578. An act granting jurisdiction to the Court of Claims to reopen, review, and readjudicate the case of John W. Parish, trustee (John H. Bexten, substituted), against the United States, No. 34450;

S. 963. An act relating to the imposition of certain penalties and the payment of detention expenses incident to the bringing of certain aliens into the United States;

S. 1002. An act to compensate Roy W. Olsen for the loss of an eye on account of negligence of Work Projects Administration employees September 25, 1938, at Cranston, R. I.;

S. 1100. An act to provide for the promotion of officers on the retired list of the Army after specified years of service on active duty;

S. 1274. An act for the relief of Vodie Jackson;

S. 1462. An act for the relief of Solomon and Marie Theriault;

S. 1645. An act relating to the administration of the Glacier National Park Fish Hatchery, at Creston, Mont., and for other purposes;

S. 1688. An act to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to compromise, adjust, or cancel certain indebtedness, and for other purposes;

S. 1746. An act authorizing and directing the Secretary of the Interior to issue to Peter A. Condelario a patent in fee to certain land;

S. 1905. An act for the relief of the estate of Walney A. Colvin, deceased;

S. 1925. An act to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Interior to issue to Charles F. White a patent in fee to certain land;

S. 1953. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to contract with the Middle Rio Grande Conservancy District of New Mexico for the payment of operation and maintenance charges on certain Pueblo Indian lands;

S. 1997. An act for the relief of Jack Stowers, B and O Store, and Cotton County Poultry & Egg Co.;

S. 2026. An act authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to Richard Pickett;

S. 2031. An act for the relief of Lt. (T) P. J. Voorhies;

S. 2042. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of Nancy Frassrand, a minor;

S. 2053. An act relating to the pay of officers of the retired list of the Navy serving on active duty in the rank of rear admiral; and

S. J. Res. 141. Joint resolution memorializing the name of Horace Wells.

The message also announced that the Vice President has appointed Mr. BARKLEY and Mr. BREWSTER members of the joint select committee on the part of the Senate, as provided for in the act of August 5, 1939, entitled "An act to provide for the disposition of certain records of the United States Government," for the disposition of executive papers in the following departments and agencies:

1. Department of Agriculture.
2. Department of Labor.
3. Department of the Navy.
4. Post Office Department.
5. Department of the Treasury.
6. Department of War.
7. Office of Defense Transportation.
8. Federal Works Agency.
9. Office of Price Administration.
10. Railroad Retirement Board.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendment to the bill (H. R. 3429) entitled "An act to amend section 1 of an act entitled 'An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to employ engineers and economists for consultation purposes on important reclamation work,'" approved February 28, 1929 (45 Stat. 1406), as amended by the act of April 22, 1940 (54 Stat. 148), disagreed to by the House; agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. BANKHEAD, Mr. MCCARRAN, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. GURNEY, and Mr. THOMAS of Idaho to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Vice President has appointed Mr. BARKLEY and Mr. BREWSTER members of the joint select committee on the part of the Senate, as provided for in the act of August 5, 1939, entitled "An act to provide for the disposition of certain records of the United States Government," for the disposition of executive papers in the following departments and agency:

1. Department of the Treasury.
2. Department of War.
3. Office for Emergency Management.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED AFTER ADJOURNMENT

Mr. KLEIN, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 1040. An act for the relief of Frank Henderson and Frances Nell Henderson, his wife;

H. R. 1042. An act for the relief of Frank J. Recely and Mary T. Recely;

H. R. 1519. An act conferring jurisdiction on the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of *The McCullough Coal Corporation* v. *The United States;*

H. R. 1774. An act for the relief of Cyril Doerner;

H. R. 1886. An act for the relief of Charles Fred Smith;

H. R. 1915. An act for the relief of Carl W. Bucey;

H. R. 2014. An act for the relief of the Winston-Salem Southbound Railway Co.;

H. R. 2236. An act for the relief of Roberta Ramsey;

H. R. 2315. An act for the relief of Ethel Phillips and Mary Hurley;

H. R. 2384. An act for the relief of Frank A. McMenamin;

H. R. 2473. An act for the relief of James Wilson;

H. R. 2624. An act to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of J. R. Dixon;

H. R. 2752. An act to authorize the acquisition of additional lands and flowage easements for the Pleasant Hill Reservoir, Ohio, and for other purposes;

H. R. 2845. An act for the relief of John J. Beaton;

H. R. 2873. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. D. F. Still;

H. R. 2919. An act for the relief of Michael Eatman, Jr., and Mrs. Michael Eatman, Jr.;

H. R. 3101. An act for the relief of George E. O'Laughlin;

H. R. 3152. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Cicero B. Hunt;

H. R. 3535. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of Billie Stooksberry, a minor, and Lon L. Stooksberry;

H. R. 3549. An act for the relief of Mrs. Emily Reily;

H. R. 3595. An act for the relief of Robert Futterman;

H. R. 3704. An act to amend the Coast Guard Auxiliary and Reserve Act of 1941, as amended;

H. R. 3813. An act for the relief of J. Ralph Datesman;

H. R. 3898. An act for the relief of Frank Gay;

H. R. 4114. An act to amend section 3 (b) of Public, No. 48, Seventy-eighth Congress, first session (War Overtime Pay Act of 1943);

H. R. 4163. An act to amend section 2 of Public Law 17, Seventy-eighth Congress, relating to functions of the War Shipping Administration, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4206. An act to authorize the construction and operation of a free highway bridge across the Monongahela River in the county of Allegheny, Pa.;

H. R. 4207. An act to authorize the construction and operation of a free highway bridge across the Monongahela River in the county of Allegheny, Pa.;

H. R. 4349. An act to exempt certain officers and employees of the National War Labor Board from certain provisions of the Criminal Code;

H. R. 4712. An act for the relief of John Duncan McDonald;

H. R. 4931. An act for the relief of the city of Beardstown, Ill.; and

H. R. 5255. An act to amend the Coast Guard Auxiliary and Reserve Act of 1941, as amended.

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 1847. An act to provide for the payment of attorneys' fees from Osage tribal funds;

S. 2015. An act to liberalize certain provisions of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, as amended; and

S. 2058. An act to liberalize certain provisions of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, as amended.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT AFTER ADJOURNMENT

Mr. KLEIN, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee did on the following dates present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

On September 22, 1944:

H. R. 1569. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to amend the act creating the circuit court of appeals in regard to fees and costs, and for other purposes," approved February 19, 1897 (29 Stat. 536; U. S. C. 543);

H. R. 4286. An act to relinquish the title of the United States to certain lands in the county of Los Angeles, State of California;

H. R. 5144. An act to authorize the city of Ketchikan, Alaska, to issue bonds in a sum not to exceed $150,000 for the purpose of constructing and acquiring additions and

betterments to and extensions of the electric light and power system of said city, and to provide for the payment thereof, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 5196. An act to amend section 22 of the Interstate Commerce Act by authorizing common carriers to grant reduced fares to personnel of armed services.

On September 23, 1944:

H. R. 1040. An act for the relief of Frank Henderson and Frances Nell Henderson, his wife;

H. R. 1042. An act for the relief of Frank J. Recely and Mary T. Recely;

H. R. 1519. An act conferring jurisdiction to the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of *The McCullough Coal Corporation* v. *The United States;*

H. R. 1774. An act for the relief of Cyril Doerner;

H. R. 1886. An act for the relief of Charles Fred Smith;

H. R. 1915. An act for the relief of Carl W. Bucey;

H. R. 2014. An act for the relief of the Winston-Salem Southbound Railway Co.;

H. R. 2236. An act for the relief of Roberta Ramsey:

H. R. 2315. An act for the relief of Ethel Phillips and Mary Hurley;

H. R. 2384. An act for the relief of Frank A. McMenamin;

H. R. 2473. An act for the relief of James Wilson;

H. R. 2624. An act to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of J. R. Dixon;

H. R. 2752. An act to authorize the acquisition of additional lands and flowage easements for the Pleasant Hill Reservoir, Ohio, and for other purposes.

H. R. 2845. An act for the relief of John J. Beaton;

H. R. 2873. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. D. F. Still;

H. R. 2919. An act for the relief of Michael Eatman, Jr., and Mrs. Michael Eatman, Jr.;

H. R. 3101. An act for the relief of George E. O'Loughlin;

H. R. 3152. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Cicero B. Hunt;

H. R. 3535. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of Billie Stooksberry, a minor, and Lon L. Stooksberry;

H. R. 3549. An act for the relief of Mrs. Emily Reily.

H. R. 3595. An act for the relief of Robert Futterman;

H. R. 3704. An act to amend the Coast Guard Auxiliary and Reserve Act of 1941, as amended;

H. R. 3813. An act for the relief of J. Ralph Datesman;

H. R. 3898. An act for the relief of Frank Gay;

H. R. 4114. An act to amend section 3 (b) of Public, 49, Seventy-eighth Congress, first session (War Overtime Pay Act of 1943);

H. R. 4163. An act to amend section 2 of Public Law 17, Seventy-eighth Congress, relating to functions of the War Shipping Administration, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4206. An act to authorize the construction and operation of a free highway bridge across the Monongahela River in the county of Allegheny, Pa.;

H. R. 4207. An act to authorize the construction and operation of a free highway bridge across the Monongahela River in the county of Allegheny, Pa.;

H. R. 4349. An act to exempt certain officers and employees of the National War Labor Board from certain provisions of the Criminal Code;

H. R. 4712. An act for the relief of John Duncan McDonald;

H. R. 4931. An act for the relief of the city of Beardstown, Ill.; and

H. R. 5255. An act to amend the Coast Guard Auxiliary and Reserve Act of 1941, as amended.

APPROVAL OF HOUSE BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION AFTER ADJOURNMENT

The President of the United States, subsequent to the adjournment of the House, notified the Speaker of the House that he had approved and signed acts and a joint resolution, as follows:

On September 27, 1944:

H. R. 312. An act for the relief of Freda Utley;

H. R. 527. An act for the relief of Mary Hertz;

H. R. 1434. An act for the relief of Anna M. Kohler;

H. R. 1569. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to amend the act creating the circuit court of appeals in regard to fees and costs, and for other purposes," approved February 19, 1897 (29 Stat. 536; U. S. C. 543);

H. R. 1623. An act to amend an act entitled "An act to provide fees to be charged by clerks of the district courts of the United States," approved February 11, 1925 (43 Stat. 857), as amended (28 U. S. C., secs. 548–555);

H. R. 1680. An act to amend the Nationality Act of 1940 to permit the Commissioner to furnish copies of any part of the records or information therefrom to agencies or officials of a State without charge;

H. R. 1708. An act for the relief of Perley M. Silver;

H. R. 2134. An act for the relief of Paul Szeliga;

H. R. 2387. An act for the relief of John Salfi;

H. R. 2390. An act for the relief of Joseph Scarpella and Dorthy Scarpella;

H. R. 2509. An act for the relief of Marie Engert;

H. R. 2697. An act to provide for the disposal of materials or resources on the public lands of the United States which are under the exclusive jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Interior;

H. R. 2707. An act for the relief of Henry White;

H. R. 2792. An act for the relief of Arvo Kari, Lempi K. Holm, and Burt Johnston;

H. R. 3033. An act for the relief of Tressie Spring and Mrs. Hazel Stutte;

H. R. 3038. An act for the relief of Mrs. Grace Page;

H. R. 3296. An act for the relief of R. Guy Dorsey;

H. R. 3384. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to accept property for the Moores Creek National Military Park, and for other purposes;

H. R. 3464. An act for the relief of Ralph W. Cooley;

H. R. 3496. An act for the relief of Ernest A. Grottke;

H. R. 4257. An act to expatriate or exclude certain persons for evading military and naval service;

H. R. 4271. An act to amend the Nationality Act of 1940 to preserve the nationality of citizens residing abroad;

H. R. 4286. An act to relinquish the title of the United States to certain lands in the county of Los Angeles, State of California;

H. R. 5025. An act to allow credit in connection with certain homestead entries for military or naval service rendered during World War No. 2;

H. R. 5144. An act to authorize the city of Ketchikan, Alaska, to issue bonds in a sum not to exceed $150,000 for the purpose of constructing and acquiring additions and betterments to and extensions of the electric light and power system of said city, and to provide for the payment thereof, and for other purposes;

H. R. 5196. An act to amend section 22 of the Interstate Commerce Act by authorizing common carriers to grant reduced fares to personnel of armed services; and

H. J. Res. 268. Joint resolution to provide for the reappointment of Harvey N. Davis and Arthur H. Compton as members of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution.

On September 28, 1944:

H. R. 4207. An act to authorize the construction and operation of a free highway bridge across the Monongahela River in the county of Allegheny, Pa.

On September 30, 1944:

H. R. 1040. An act for the relief of Frank Henderson and Frances Nell Henderson, his wife;

H. R. 1042. An act for the relief of Frank J. Recely and Mary T. Recely;

H. R. 1886. An act for the relief of Charles Fred Smith;

H. R. 1915. An act for the relief of Carl W. Bucey;

H. R. 2014. An act for the relief of the Winston-Salem Southbound Railway Co.;

H. R. 2236. An act for the relief of Roberta Ramsey;

H. R. 2315. An act for the relief of Ethel Phillips and Mary Hurley;

H. R. 2384. An act for the relief of Frank A. McMenamin;

H. R. 2473. An act for the relief of James Wilson;

H. R. 2624. An act to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of J. R. Dixon;

H. R. 2752. An act to authorize the acquisition of additional lands and flowage easements for the Pleasant Hill Reservoir, Ohio, and for other purposes;

H. R. 2845. An act for the relief of John J. Beaton;

H. R. 2873. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. D. F. Still;

H. R. 2919. An act for the relief of Michael Eatman, Jr., and Mrs. Michael Eatman, Jr.;

H. R. 3101. An act for the relief of George E. O. Loughlin;

H. R. 3535. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of Billie Stooksberry, a minor, and Lon L. Stooksberry;

H. R. 3549. An act for the relief of Mrs. Emily Reily;

H. R. 3595. An act for the relief of Robert Futterman;

H. R. 3704. An act to amend the Coast Guard Auxiliary and Reserve Act of 1941, as amended;

H. R. 3813. An act for the relief of J. Ralph Datesman;

H. R. 3898. An act for the relief of Frank Gay;

H. R. 4114. An act to amend section 3 (b) of Public Law 49, Seventy-eighth Congress, first session (War Overtime Pay Act of 1943);

H. R. 4163. An act to amend section 2 of Public Law 17, Seventy-eighth Congress, relating to functions of the War Shipping Administration, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4206. An act to authorize the construction and operation of a free highway bridge across the Monongahela River in the county of Allegheny, Pa.;

H. R. 4712. An act for the relief of John Duncan McDonald;

H. R. 4931. An act for the relief of the city of Beardstown, Ill.; and

H. R. 5255. An act to amend the Coast Guard Auxiliary and Reserve Act of 1941, as amended.

On October 2, 1944:

H. R. 4349. An act to exempt certain officers and employees of the National War Labor Board from certain provisions of the Criminal Code.

On October 3, 1944:

H. R. 1774. An act for the relief of Cyril Doerner;

H. R. 3152. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Cicero B. Hunt; and

H. R. 5125. An act to aid the reconversion from a war to a peace economy through the distribution of Government surplus property and to establish a Surplus Property Board to effectuate the same, and for other purposes.

RESIGNATION

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following resignation:

OCTOBER 19, 1944.

Hon. SAM RAYBURN,
Speaker of the House,
Congress of the United States,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Effective this date, I have submitted to the Honorable Spessard L. Holland, Governor of Florida, my resignation as a Member of the Seventy-eighth Congress from the Third District of Florida.

I take this step in order to serve in the armed forces of my country.

With personal regards, and with genuine appreciation for the uniform cooperation and splendid leadership which you have given me, I am,

Sincerely,

BOB SIKES.

CERTIFICATE OF ELECTION

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication which was read by the Clerk:

NOVEMBER 14, 1944.

The Honorable the SPEAKER,
House of Representatives.

SIR: The certificate of election in due form of law of Hon. RALPH H. DAUGHTON as a Representative-elect to the Seventy-eighth Congress from the Second Congressional District of the State of Virginia, to fill a vacancy in that district, is on file in this office.

Very truly yours,

SOUTH TRIMBLE,
Clerk of the House of Representatives.

SWEARING IN OF MEMBER

Mr. DAUGHTON of Virginia appeared at the bar of the House and took the oath of office.

EDWARD A. RUMELY AND JOSEPH P. KAMP

The SPEAKER. The Chair desires to announce that during the past recess of the Congress the Special Committee to Investigate Campaign Expenditures authorized by House Resolution 551, Seventy-eighth Congress, reported to and filed with the Speaker statements of facts concerning the willful and deliberate refusal of Edward A. Rumely of the Committee for Constitutional Government and Joseph P. Kamp of the Constitutional Educational League, Inc., to testify and to produce the books, papers, records, and documents of their respective organizations before the said Special Committee of the House, and the Speaker, pursuant to the mandatory provisions of Public Resolution No. 123, Seventy-fifth Congress, certified to the United States attorney, District of Columbia, the statement of facts concerning the said Edward A. Rumely on September 26, 1944, and the statement of facts concerning the said Joseph P. Kamp on November 2, 1944.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, what is necessary to dispose of the document which the Speaker has just read? Will it require a resolution by the House or will it be referred to some committee?

The SPEAKER. That is not necessary under the statute. It is before the court now.

Mr. RANKIN. I understand, but in order to call for court action it will be necessary, as I understand it, to have a resolution from the House.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks not, under the law.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD in two instances, on two subjects, and include therein certain excerpts and one editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include three editorials.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

SAM ESPY

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House briefly.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, during the congressional recess just ended death struck close to the House of Representatives and in doing so touched many hearts and bowed many heads with sorrow and grief.

Sam Espy, who will be well remembered by many Members here today as a page of this body for 4 years by my appointment, was killed in action in Italy on October 18.

That was all the message from The Adjutant General to the boy's mother said, but those who knew Sam will never doubt that when the supreme moment came he faced death with sublime courage and resolution.

For Sam, though still in his teens, was every inch a man. It seems only yesterday when he moved among us performing the many and varied errands and duties of a page. When he reached military age he responded eagerly to the call of his country. After a brief experience in the merchant marine he was transferred at his own request to the Army. It was his nature to crave action.

He left behind many friends who for months besieged me with such questions as "What do you hear from Sam?" "How is Sam getting along in the Army?" and "Where is Sam now?" Never have I heard so much interest and concern expressed in a boy who has gone to the front. His friends were legion.

All I knew about Sam's whereabouts was his New York A. P. O. number which meant that he might be serving anywhere in the European theater. Then a few weeks ago, when I was at Indianapolis in the midst of the campaign, someone called me over the telephone in the dead of night and without identifying himself informed me that Sam had died in action. The news imparted by the mysterious informant proved only too true.

The death of this fine, manly boy has brought the war very close home to Indianapolis as well as to the House of Representatives. The people of our city are showering upon the parents, Mr. and Mrs. George Espy, all of the sympathy that loving hearts can bestow. Mr. and Mrs. Espy are among our finest citizens who have shown in their daily lives the faith that overcomes all doubt and let us hope that they will find comfort and solace in the words of the poet Whittier:

Alas for him who never sees
The stars shine through his cypress trees;
Who, hopeless, lays his dead away
Nor looks to see the breaking day
Across the mournful marbles play.
Who has not learned in hours of faith
The truth to flesh and sense unknown
That life is ever lord of death
And love can never lose its own.

ADJOURNMENT OVER

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it stand adjourned until Thursday next, and that when the House adjourns on Thursday next it stand adjourned until the following Monday.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I am not going to object, I understand the committee is not ready to report a program before next week.

Mr. COOPER. That is my understanding, and this request is pursuant to an agreement reached by the Speaker and the leadership of the House.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I withdraw by reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WEISS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in two particulars, in one to include an address by Rear Admiral Thomas L. Gatch of the United States Navy, and in the other to include an address by Mr. C. Bedell Monro, president of the Pennsylvania Central Airlines Corporation.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the record and include an editorial and a resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. HEFFERNAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include a letter pertaining to reapportionment, which I mailed to my constituents of the Eleventh Congressional District of New York.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

(Mr. O'BRIEN of Michigan asked and was granted permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.)

NOEL COWARD

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, it has been called to my attention that Mr. Noel Coward has been using his latest so-called literary venture to impugn the fighting qualities of the boys from Brooklyn. I think it is pretty bad taste for anyone—but especially for a roving Britisher—to criticize the fighting qualities of any of our American boys—no matter from what part of this great country of ours they come. At a time when unity among all Allied soldiers, as well as the people of the United Nations, is of the greatest importance, Coward contributes his questionable part to the war effort by creating disunity and resentment.

The families of the Brooklyn boys now fighting in the four corners of the world, as well as the entire population of the great State of New York, deeply resent the slur upon the fighting ability of their boys as contained in the latest brain storm of Noel Coward, a book entitled "Middle East Diary."

Mr. Coward, whose own patriotism is not above reproach, if one is to judge it by his attempt to withhold some taxes from his own war-torn, struggling country—3 years ago he was found guilty on two charges of failing to register American securities and cash with the Bank of England and was fined more than $7,000—should think twice before using his money-making cynicism in an effort to discredit the fighting spirit and ability of other people. He certainly should have thought twice before making such an accusation against boys from Brooklyn, a borough which is reported to have more men in the armed forces than 39 of the 48 States. As a matter of fact, Mr. Coward, who has been traveling around the various fronts to collect material for future literary outpourings, should have been the last person on earth to have anything but praise for any and all the boys who were out there risking their very lives so that people like Coward can live in free countries and have audiences of free people to see their plays and an uncensored people as readers of their often rather questionable type of literature. Instead of cynical appraisal he should have felt a deep sense of admiration and gratitude for these boys. How, after visiting the various fronts, he could have written a paragraph such as appears in his Middle East Diary is difficult to understand. I quote:

I talked to some tough men from Texas and Arizona; they were magnificent specimens and in great heart, but I was less impressed by some of the mournful little Brooklyn boys living there in tears amidst the alien corn with nothing worse than a bullet wound in the leg or a fractured arm.

So Mr. Coward does not think that the little Brooklyn boys are good fighters? How did he determine, if I may ask, whether there was a greater proportion of little boys among boys from Brooklyn? And since when, may I ask, Mr. Coward, have courage and ability been measured and determined by physical size alone; especially in the service of one's country? Has the great playwright forgotten about little David and the Philistine giant, Goliath? Has he forgotten about all the great military men who were very small in physical stature? I suppose if he had lived in Napoleon's time he would have looked upon Napoleon as a mournful little boy who did not come up to the magnificent specimens of some of the generals of his opponents.

American boys, whether they come from Brooklyn or any other part of this great country of ours, do not need any defense. Their magnificent fighting in all parts of the world speaks for itself, and speaks much more eloquently than any book written by Mr. Coward or anyone else. It is not in defense of our boys that I have taken the floor today but in protest against a person who thinks that we are good enough to get rich on—Mr. Coward clears quite a little sum every time he honors us with his visit—but not quite good enough when they get back and look at us from the security of their own surroundings. I am sure that the Brooklyn people will remember when Mr. Coward returns to Broadway—if he will ever be able to return.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD, and include an article from the Washington Star.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD, and include therein excerpts from newspaper articles.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Vermont?

There was no objection.

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, and include therein a newspaper story written by Elizabeth M. Craig, a war correspondent.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Maine?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD, and include an address delivered before the American Meat Institute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein the remarks delivered at a Furlough Club program recently.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD on two subjects and include certain excerpts in each.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD in three instances; in one to insert a sermon delivered by the Reverend Timothy J. Mulvey; in the second to insert an address delivered by Rear Admiral Macauley; and in the third to insert a lecture delivered by Judge Grover Moscowitz. This latter insertion will exceed the limit; it will take 4½ pages and cost $234. Notwithstanding the estimate, I ask unanimous consent to insert it.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the requests are ordered.

There was no objection.

CODIFICATION OF THE LAWS

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and ask that they may appear at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, 20 years have passed since work was begun on the United States Code. During all of those years your Committee on Revision of the Laws was charged with the responsibility of classifying, codifying, and revising the general and permanent laws of the United States. As this great work progressed we were constantly guided by the principle that "making laws understandable is as important as making the laws."

You will recall Congress enacted the United States Code in 1926. The great body of permanent and general law of the United States was divided into 50 logical titles and these were then alphabetized. We are today proud of the fact that this modern system of classification has easily and accurately accommodated 20 years of Federal legislation without the necessity of making any substantial changes in the original framework.

The United States Code was enacted as prima facie evidence of the laws set out in the Revised Statutes and Statutes at Large. It was to be subjected to the test of time. If it proved accurate and satisfactory, it was the intention of Con-

gress to enact it, title by title, into positive law.

Long ago the United States Code passed the test of accuracy and utility. It has become the handbook of governmental officials and the bench and bar of the Nation. It has been improved upon, checked and rechecked, and expanded to include current enactments through 16 annual cumulative supplements and two new editions, one in 1934 and the other in 1940. Surely the time has arrived when the Code itself should become, after careful title by title revision, the absolute and positive law of the United States.

With this goal in mind and as part of the preliminary work of the next edition of the Code, the Committee on Revision of the Laws, asked for and received an authorization from Congress on June 28, 1943 to prepare a revision and codification of title 18, Crimes and Criminal Procedure, and title 28, the Judicial Code and Judiciary, of the United States Code.

On June 22, 1943, I told the House that we proposed to bring to it for final approval and enactment into positive law, "a model judiciary code and criminal code, the kind of codes that this great body should present to the people of the greatest country."

The first of these two projects is now complete and is represented by a bill to revise, codify, and enact into absolute law title 18 of the United States Code, entitled "Crimes and Criminal Procedure," which I have just introduced. The second great project, the revision of Title 28, the Judicial Code and Judiciary, is well under way.

HISTORY OF THE CRIMINAL CODE

Our first Federal criminal laws were enacted by the Crimes Act of 1790—act of April 30, 1790, chapter 9, 1 Statutes 112. That act defined, among others, such offenses as treason, misprision of felony, forgery, and bribery, and prescribed the punishment for each. Many of these offenses and their punishments have survived the years almost verbatim. It was a small act and defined only the most general and heinous crimes against the United States, but our Nation was also small then, with a population of only 3,000,000.

At first our body of Federal criminal law developed gradually, act by act, and without any real attempt to reconcile the conflicting provisions of one act with those of another. These acts were scattered through the Statutes at Large, which, by the time of the Civil War, numbered 12 volumes. That war and the reconstruction period which followed, with all of its social implications, gave new impetus to Federal criminal legislation. Many new crimes were defined by Congress during the decade beginning in 1860.

The whole of this expanding body of Federal criminal law was carefully examined by the commissioners empowered by Congress in 1866 to prepare the Revised Statutes of the United States. Obsolete and superseded provisions which had accumulated during the 87-year period from 1790 to the date of the final approval of the Revised Statutes in 1877 were repealed. Inconsistent provisions were reconciled. And all of the vital, living provisions were analyzed, revised, and consolidated into Title 70, "Crimes," of the Revised Statutes. That title was divided into nine chapters under such broad headings as "Crimes Against the Existence of Government" and "Crimes Against Justice." These nine chapters were subdivided into 225 sections.

In 1897 Congress authorized a commission to revise and codify the criminal and penal laws of the United States. However, by subsequent acts Congress empowered this commission to examine the entire field of Federal statutory law; consequently, it was not until 1909 that the commission was ready with its bill to revise and codify the penal laws of the United States. The bill became the Criminal Code of 1909 by Act of March 4, 1909, chapter 321, 35 Statutes 1088.

In preparing the Criminal Code of 1909 the commissioners followed the analysis used in the Crimes title of the Revised Statutes. For example, the old chapter division "Crimes Against the Existence of Government" was retained, and the old chapter "Crimes Against Justice" became "Crimes Against Public Justice." The changes in Federal criminal legislation between the years 1878 and 1909 induced the Commission to divide the Criminal Code into 15 chapters and 345 sections, instead of the 9 chapters and 225 sections in the Crimes title of the Revised Statutes. It brought together statutes relating to the same subject, and omitted redundant and obsolete laws. However, no sweeping changes were made in our criminal laws. Actually, the commission added just 21 new sections, only 10 of which created new offenses.

It was 35 years ago that our criminal laws were overhauled and enacted as the Criminal Code of 1909. That is a longer period than the elapsed time between the revisions of 1878 and 1909. It is a period which has witnessed unprecedented changes on the national scene. During those years our population leaped from 91,000,000 to 133,000,000; our Nation sprang from a fledgling to a world power; and twice we experienced the tremendous social changes that accompany war. It is a tribute to the draftsmen of the Criminal Code of 1909 that it has not crumbled under this terrific impact. However, there can be little doubt in the mind of anyone that the changes of the last 35 years make imperative the revision of our Federal criminal laws at the present time.

STAFF OF EXPERTS ASSEMBLED

From the first the Committee on Revision of the Laws realized that this great undertaking would require the full time and study of many highly trained experts, as well as the wholehearted cooperation of the bench and bar.

The committee obtained the services of the West Publishing Co., of St. Paul, Minn., and the Edward Thompson Co., of Brooklyn, N. Y., thus bringing to this undertaking the combined editorial resources and experiences of two of the Nation's leading law publishing firms. These are the companies which, under the supervision of this committee, have edited the United States Code and its supplements for almost 20 years.

In addition to their staffs of editors, these companies engaged as chief reviser, W. W. Barron, Esq., former chief of the Appellate Section of the Criminal Division of the Department of Justice, and also secured the services of Frank J. Parker, assistant United States attorney for the eastern district of New York, and Theodore W. Graske, author of Law of Government Defense Contracts, and so forth.

The Committee on Revision of the Laws has exercised close and constant supervision over this work through its general counsel, Charles J. Zinn, of the New York and District of Columbia bars, and its special counsel, John F. X. Finn, member of the Law Revision Commission of New York and a recognized expert on procedure. These men have cooperated in shaping policies, revising text, and checking proofs.

ADVISORY COMMITTEE

The law publishing firms were anxious to supplement their own staffs with an impartial advisory committee composed of outstanding men with years of practical experience at the bar and on the bench. They were indeed fortunate in obtaining the enthusiastic assistance and advice of such public-spirited men as Judge Floyd E. Thompson, former chief justice of the Illinois Supreme Court and president of the Chicago Bar Association; Judge Justin Miller, associate justice of the United States Court of Appeals, and John T. Cahill, former United States attorney for the southern district of New York. The diversified experience and training of these men meant that the views of defendant, prosecutor, and judge had its advocate at every advisory committee meeting; although not always the same advocate.

This advisory committee was ably assisted by two special consultants, Alexander Holtzoff, special assistant to the Attorney General of the Department of Justice, and George F. Longsdorf, of Oakland, Calif. Both of these men were members of the Advisory Committee on Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure; consequently, besides the years of experience in Federal legislation which they brought to this work, they rendered invaluable service in the technical task of singling out for repeal or revision the statutory provisions made obsolete by the new Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure, now awaiting the approval of the Supreme Court.

Three times during the course of this revision the advisory committee and its special consultants met for week-long periods with the revision staff and the counsels for your committee—once in Brooklyn, N. Y.; later in Washington, D. C.; and finally in Chicago, Ill. At each meeting the revision staff submitted to the advisory committee a draft of its work, containing the proposed text of this bill, and supplemented with notes explaining in detail each change and the

reason for it. This procedure guaranteed the careful examination of each section by the advisory committee. Several times they recommitted a section to the reviser for further study. The Committee on Revision of the Laws had these preliminary drafts printed and distributed to the Federal bench and bar for criticisms and suggestions.

COOPERATION WITH BENCH AND BAR

When work first began on title 18, I mailed some 1,500 letters to the Federal judges, United States attorneys, deans of law schools and presidents of bar associations, explaining our work and asking for their advice and assistance. We were more than gratified by the many helpful replies. Many of them contained concrete recommendations for the improvement of the criminal code. These were cataloged, studied, and made available to the revision staff. As will be seen by the reviser's notes which will appear in our committee report, more than one of these suggestions helped shape our work, and all of them made easier the task.

We were delighted to have our belief in the timeliness and importance of this revision confirmed by members of the bench and bar. As an example, I would like to quote several very brief excerpts from some of our letters.

Justice Felix Frankfurter, of the Supreme Court, said:

I share your conviction as to the great importance of the work upon which you are engaged.

United States District Judge Shackelford Miller, Jr., of the western district of Kentucky, wrote:

The work * * * is a most important one and comes at a time when * * * such a revision will be very helpful.

United States District Judge William J. Campbell, of the northern district of Illinois, wrote:

Permit me to congratulate you upon your splendid and practical approach to a most important and difficult problem.

Prof. James W. Moore, of Yale School of Law, wrote:

Your proposal to revise the substantive criminal law is certainly timely.

The bench and bar were kept informed of our progress on the revision of Federal criminal laws through copies of the committee print containing the preliminary draft of title 18. The suggestions provoked by this draft received the careful study of the revisers and, in many instances, were incorporated in our final draft.

It was most heartening to learn that our months of hard and painstaking labor found general approval with the bench and bar. For example, United States District Judge Paul J. McCormick, of the southern district of California, wrote:

I congratulate you and your committee on the thorough and helpful service rendered in the preparation of the preliminary draft.

And United States Circuit Court of Appeals Judge Albert B. Maris wrote:

I have examined with interest the preliminary draft. The work seems to me to be well conceived and executed and I have, so far, no changes to suggest.

Also, the criminal section of the American Bar Association, meeting in Chicago last September, received a report on this preliminary draft from our general counsel, Mr. Zinn. The section thereupon passed a resolution approving this draft.

COOPERATION WITH FEDERAL AGENCIES

As the work of revision progressed, the advice of Government officials was sought in problems affecting particular departments or agencies. We found it advisable to ask questions and to submit the text of proposed sections. Occasionally the revisers conferred with the heads of agencies. It was our constant concern to see that the officials in charge of a department or agency which might be affected by this revision were kept fully informed of our progress. Copies of the preliminary draft were sent to all Government officials who might have the slightest interest in this work.

Naturally the Department of Justice was more concerned with a revision of the Federal criminal laws than any other governmental body. Consequently, members of that Department were informed of every step of the revision from the first preliminary analysis to the final draft. Mr. Alexander Holtzoff, special assistant to the Attorney General of the Department of Justice, attended each meeting of the advisory committee in his capacity as special consultant. When the preliminary draft was submitted to the Department of Justice the Attorney General asked the heads of the various divisions and bureaus to examine the portions of the draft affecting their work. The findings of these officials were set out in a detailed and comprehensive memorandum which the Attorney General forwarded to me with the following letter:

MY DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: In accordance with your request I have examined the tentative draft of part I of the proposed revision of title 18 of the United States Code and have caused it to be scrutinized intensively by members of the staff of this Department.

There is a real need for a revision of the Federal Criminal Code, and your committee is to be commended for undertaking this project. The proposed revision appears to be very capably prepared.

As a result of studies in this Department, a memorandum has been prepared containing certain suggestions in regard to the text of the revision. Copies of this memorandum are enclosed for your consideration.

With kind personal regards,

Sincerely yours,

FRANCIS BIDDLE,
Attorney General.

This memorandum was submitted to the advisory committee at its final meeting in Chicago and was studied item by item by that body. The Department was asked to have a representative at that meeting so that the views expressed in the Department's memorandum could be fully explained to the members of the advisory committee. The Department sent Mr. George F. Kneip of the Criminal Section.

COMMITTEE REPORT

When our revision bill is reported out of committee I propose to outline to this body the scope of our work. At that time I would like to discuss the modern alphabetical chapter arrangement, the numbering system designed to accommodate future criminal enactments, changes in punishments, and other important features of this bill. Then we will have available for your study, as a part of the committee report, the exhaustive reviser's notes prepared for each section of new title 18, as well as various tables to facilitate research.

CONCLUSION

We believe that our efforts, first in soliciting the advice and cooperation of the bench, bar, and Government officials, and second, in keeping all interested parties informed of the progress of our work, has resulted in one of the most comprehensive codifications of Federal laws ever to be submitted to Congress. We further believe that we have established a new standard in statutory draftsmanship which will make easier the task of future legislative drafting and revisions, as well as bring us nearer to our avowed goal of making laws understandable.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include a patriotic song written by a constituent.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks on five different subjects.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. CELLER. Would it be in order to ask for a special order of 15 minutes today?

The SPEAKER. We have a resolution on the death of a Member under which resolution we are going to adjourn.

Mr. CELLER. Then, Mr. Speaker, I will not submit the request.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. DIMOND. Mr. Speaker, I have two unanimous-consent requests, one to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a resolution adopted by the Benevolent and Protective Order of Elks, Lodge No. 1429, of Ketchikan, Alaska, and also to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a short editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the Delegate from Alaska?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own

remarks in the RECORD and include therein a letter with some statistics from the Veterans' Administration.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include therein a letter from Admiral Land together with a summary of shipbuilding.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. THOMAS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a newspaper editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

RELIEF OF MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES OF CERTAIN TAX LIABILITIES

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill to relieve members of the armed forces who left their occupations to enter the service in World War No. 2 of certain pending tax liability to the United States Government on earned income.

A large number of our boys left their jobs and went to war without having the opportunity to clear up their debts or to stabilize their personal business and financial status. When these boys return it will be very helpful not to face old tax liabilities carried over from previous years by the Government.

The bill also contains a provision to extend tax credits to those whose tax bills have been fully paid in order to work no discriminations.

The provisions of the bill are applicable only to earned income and will not affect income from other sources in the nature of unearned increment. The credit features of the measure will apply to all tax returns filed 1 year after discharge.

I believe that this measure will materially lighten the burdens of very many of our returning veterans and surely the American people desire to extend this type of assistance to those who have made and are making such tremendous sacrifices to preserve our established way of life.

The proposed bill follows:

A bill providing a special credit against certain income-tax liability of members of the armed forces

Be it enacted, etc., That section 322 of the Internal Revenue Code (relating to credits and refunds) is amended by inserting at the end thereof a new subsection as follows:

"(g) Special credit for members of armed forces.—In the case of any individual who entered upon active service in the military or naval forces of the United States on or after September 1, 1940, the sum of $500 shall be credited—

"(1) First, against any liability for tax under this chapter for any taxable year or years beginning prior to his entering upon such active service which remains unpaid; and

"(2) Next (to the extent of the amount of the credit remaining) against any liability for tax under this chapter for the first taxable year beginning after the date upon which he is discharged from, or released from active duty, in such forces, to the extent that such liability is attributable to the inclusion in computing net income of earned net income (as defined in section 25 (a) (4) prior to the amendment thereto made by section 107 of the Revenue Act of 1943). This subsection shall not apply in any case in which the individual is convicted of any criminal offense with respect to the tax for any such taxable year or in which additions to the tax for any such taxable year are applicable by reason of fraud. The credit provided in this subsection shall in no event exceed the liability against which it may be taken."

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES—REPORT OF WAR PRODUCTION BOARD

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs and ordered printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith for the information of the Congress a report of the War Production Board covering operations under the Property Requisitioning Act of October 16, 1941, as amended, for the period from April 16, 1944, through October 15, 1944.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *November 14, 1944.*

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES—ANNUAL REPORT OF THE COMMISSION ON THE ERECTION OF MEMORIALS AND ENTOMBMENT OF BODIES IN THE ARLINGTON MEMORIAL AMPHITHEATER

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following further message from the President of the United States, which was read and referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds:

To the Congress of the United States:

In compliance with the requirements of the Public Act No. 397, Sixty-sixth Congress, I transmit herewith the annual report of the Commission on the Erection of Memorials and Entombment of Bodies in the Arlington Memorial Amphitheater.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *November 14, 1944.*

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

(Mr. LEA asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.)

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. WOLVERTON of New Jersey (at the request of Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts), indefinitely, to attend as a United States delegate the Civil Aeronautics Convention.

To Mr. KILBURN (at the request of Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts), indefinitely, on account of illness.

To Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin (at the request of Mr. HULL), until Monday, on account of official business.

To Mr. KEEFE (at the request of Mr. HULL), until Monday, on account of illness.

THE LATE HAMPTON P. FULMER

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. HARE].

Mr. HARE. Mr. Speaker, the Reaper of Death has no particular harvest season; he is busy every hour of the day and every day of every year executing the orders of the Creator; he makes no compromises and permits no delay in the execution of orders as planned. Since we last met here he appeared and removed our friend and colleague the Honorable HAMPTON P. FULMER who successfully served 12 successive terms in the Congress and was recently renominated without opposition to serve in the Seventy-ninth Congress. He was stricken and died suddenly in his home here in Washington, October 19, lacking only about 2½ months of continuous service for 24 years.

Mr. FULMER was a man of many parts. He was born on a farm near Springfield, S. C., June 23, 1875, about 10 years after the close of the War between the States, a time when there were few and limited opportunities for higher education in our section of the country. Mr. FULMER'S academic training, therefore, was confined almost exclusively to that furnished in the public-school system of the State. However, he was endowed with unusual natural ability and applied himself to the mastery of many lines of work. Before being elected to Congress in 1920 he had demonstrated his ability as a farmer, merchant, and banker. He had wide and varied experience in all these activities and had marked success in each. He knew people; he knew their virtues and political reactions; he knew their problems and was, therefore, fitted by training and experience to represent them in the Congress of the United States. If my memory serves correctly he had opposition in every race made for Congress except the last two, but he always won with handsome majorities.

During his stay in the Congress he gave the country the benefit of his wide and successful experience by devoting his talents, energies, and efforts largely to legislation dealing primarily with the agricultural or farm problems. As a member of the Agriculture Committee for 20 years and as chairman of the committee for the past 4 years he aided and assisted, or engineered through the committee and the House of Representatives all worth-while legislation relating to agriculture enacted by the Congress within the last quarter of a century. One of his outstanding contributions to the cotton farmer, the cotton trade, and the public generally was when he sponsored and became author of the United States Standard Cotton Grading Act, standardizing the grading of American cotton, now accepted by the users and manufacturers of cotton throughout the world.

Mr. FULMER was a man of strong conviction and always alert and loyal to the interests of the people he represented. His devotion and loyalty to those engaged in agriculture stand out as one of the great virtues and characteristics of his political life and in his death that great group of people who live by the product of their hands have lost a loyal friend in the Congress of the United States.

It was my privilege to know Mr. FULMER a number of years before he became a Member of this body; I served with him here for 14 years and learned to admire and have great respect for his sound and dependable judgment. The sudden call to his reward is a source of great sorrow and grief to those of us who knew him. He was a man of fine character, many virtues, and with few, if any, faults.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to my colleague the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RICHARDS].

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Speaker, as my colleague the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. HARE] has informed you, during the recess of Congress there passed from the mortal scene one of the veteran and outstanding Members of this body, the dean of the South Carolina delegation in the House, the Honorable HAMPTON PITTS FULMER. At the call of the Creator, after a full and honorable life of public service, he was stricken as he entered the elevator at his apartments near the Capitol on Thursday afternoon, October 19, and passed away within a few minutes.

Shortly we will welcome into this body his wife and helpmeet, who loyally stood at his side in sunshine and storm and who was his constant companion. I consider it not improper that in one breath we extend our sympathy and then, as he would have wished it, we welcome her here in his stead.

Mr. FULMER was my senior in service by many years, for his service in Congress as a Representative of the Second South Carolina District went back 25 years, a tenure of office unequaled in that district. But for the past 12 years I have been privileged to serve here with him. Thus I felt I knew him well; and in his passing I mourn the death of a true friend.

As chairman of the House Agriculture Committee and in his other congressional activities, Mr. FULMER rendered a great service to his district and to the Nation. He was an able statesman and an indefatigable worker for his district. The burdens of his office rested heavily upon him, and he was incessantly at his labors. The strain at length was too much for him, as it has been for many another man who has served here for so long.

He was the fourth member of our own State delegation to be removed from office by the summons of death during my own service in this House. In one brief decade the Honorable J. J. McSwain, the Honorable Allard H. Gasque, and the Honorable Thomas S. McMillan have been taken from us by heart attacks while they were about the Nation's business. Now, Representative FULMER.

He died in harness, as he always had wished, I think—his life certainly shortened by his conscientious application to his office and the needs of his constituents.

May his rest be sweet.

Mr. HARE. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE].

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, I was very much shocked and saddened when at my home in Kansas I learned of the sudden death of our late colleague, HAMPTON P. FULMER. I had, of course, known of his ill health for some time past, but the last time I saw him he seemed to be improved and feeling much better. It was indeed a shock for me to learn of his untimely death.

For almost 18 years I have served on the Committee on Agriculture with our departed colleague. You learn to know a man pretty well in the course of service of that kind.

I do not believe the American farmer ever had a better friend in or out of Congress than HAMPTON P. FULMER. He was always alert to the interests of the farmer and he was ready and willing to fight for those interests. As chairman of the Committee on Agriculture he was the author of much important legislation, and even before that time he had distinguished himself as the author of the Cotton Grading Act, the original Agricultural Adjustment Act, and other legislation of vital importance to agriculture. Mr. FULMER was a strong exponent of conservation. He took a great interest in our forest resources and served as vice chairman of the Joint Committee on Forestry. One of his greatest ambitions was to improve the marketing system for farm products so as to bring a greater return to the producer. His constant concern was for the little independent farmer.

As chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, Mr. FULMER was just, tolerant, and wise. He made a special effort to be helpful to other members of the committee. We did not agree on all matters and there were frequent differences of opinion on the committee, but I cannot recall an instance where this ever affected the kindly consideration shown all members of the committee by our chairman. As a man he had our respect and affection as well. His passing will be mourned by all of us.

Mr. HARE. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN].

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, it was a profound and a sad shock to me to learn of the passing of my friend and colleague, HAMPTON P. FULMER.

We entered the Congress at the same time. There were 105 Members elected to the Sixty-seventh Congress who had never served in this body before. He and I were the only two who had stuck it out during all these years. There are two Members in the House who came at that time, who have been out and come back—the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BULWINKLE] and the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. REECE].

There is also one Member who came in at that time, who had served in a previous Congress, and who has been here the entire time—the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOODRUFF].

One Member came in at a special election in the latter part of the Sixty-seventh Congress and has been here from that day to this—the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GIFFORD].

But of all that number of 105 Members who came to the Sixty-seventh Congress and entered on their service in this body on March 4, 1921, and who had never served in Congress before, only two of us survived the vicissitudes of politics and the whims of fate—the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. FULMER], and your humble servant.

Mr. FULMER lived in the same building for more than 20 years. We both lived at Congress Hall for many years. For the last few years we have been living in the same apartment house. I knew him in his home; I saw his children grow up. A more ideal father could not be imagined. A more ideal citizen, a more ideal American, has never served in the Congress of the United States.

As was said by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE], he was one of the best friends the American farmers ever had. He believed in looking after the man who tills the soil.

His death is a great loss to the Congress of the United States. We have lost one of our most faithful Members.

America has lost one of her finest and most valuable public servants.

Mr. HARE. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL].

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, I rise upon this occasion of extreme sadness to pay my tribute to a Member of this body who I always considered to be one of the finest types of Americans, who represented his district in the country. It was my privilege to serve on the Committee on Agriculture with the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. FULMER], for several years. Although on the other side of the fence, so to speak, I always considered him a fine friend. He was fair and impartial in all matters, concerning the welfare of the country; and for that reason I think the House is sustaining a double loss, due to the fact that he always kept the welfare of America foremost in his thoughts. I had a profound admiration for his personal character. I thought a great deal of the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture. It will be many years before the membership of the Committee on Agriculture will find a man to fill his shoes.

One of the unfortunate things we must experience in this life is the thought that we are going to lose these close and cherished friends. When a man like Mr. FULMER passes everyone of his friends suffers a loss which cannot be reconciled or made up.

This House will be long in obtaining a man with ability and services such as his.

Mr. HARE. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 647), which I send to the desk and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the House has heard with profound sorrow of the death of Hon. HAMP-

TON P. FULMER, a Representative from the State of South Carolina.

Resolved, That the Clerk communicate these resolutions to the Senate and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Resolved, That as a further mark of respect, the House do now adjourn.

The resolution was agreed to.

ADJOURNMENT

Accordingly the House (at 12 o'clock and 41 minutes p. m.), pursuant to its order heretofore entered, adjourned until Thursday, November 16, 1944, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1865. A letter from the Director, Selective Service System, transmitting a report of the registrants deferred as of July 15, 1944, because of their employment in or under the Federal Government; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

1866. A letter from the Director, Selective Service System, transmitting a report of the registrants deferred as of August 15, 1944, because of their employment in or under the Federal Government; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

1867. A letter from the quartermaster general, United Spanish War Veterans, transmitting the proceedings of the stated convention of the Forty-sixth National Encampment of the United Spanish War Veterans, held in Cincinnati, Ohio, August 13 to 17, 1944 (H. Doc. No. 685); to the Committee on Military Affairs and ordered to be printed with illustrations.

1868. A letter from the national service director, The Military Order of the Purple Heart, transmitting the proceedings of the Twelfth National Convention of the Military Order of the Purple Heart, held at Lancaster, Pa., August 6, 7, 8, and 9, 1944 (H. Doc. No. 686); to the Committee on Military Affairs and ordered to be printed with illustrations.

1869. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting an estimate of appropriation for the Employees' Compensation Commission for the fiscal year 1945 (H. Doc. No. 688); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1870. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a draft of a proposed provision pertaining to existing appropriations of the National Housing Agency for the fiscal year 1945 (H. Doc. No. 689); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1871. A communication from the President of the United States transmitting a draft of a proposed provision pertaining to an existing appropriation of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation (H. Doc. No. 690); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1872. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a draft of a proposed provision relating to the appropriation for the Selective Service System for the fiscal year 1945 (H. Doc. No. 691); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1873. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the Rural Electrification Administration, Department of Agriculture, for the fiscal year 1945, in the amount of $696,000 (H. Doc. No. 692); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1874. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a draft of a proposed provision pertaining to an existing appropriation of the American Commission for the Protection and Salvage of Artistic and Historic Monuments in War Areas (H. Doc. No. 693); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1875. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation and draft of a proposed provision pertaining to an existing appropriation for the Tariff Commission (H. Doc. No. 694); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1876. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting an estimate of appropriation and a draft of a proposed provision relating to existing appropriations for the Veterans' Administration, both for fiscal year 1945 (H. Doc. No. 695); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1877. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a draft of a proposed provision pertaining to an existing appropriation of the White House (H. Doc. No. 696); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1878. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a draft of a proposed provision pertaining to an existing appropriation of the Securities and Exchange Commission (H. Doc. No. 697); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1879. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a draft of a proposed provision pertaining to an existing appropriation of the National Capital Park and Planning Commission (H. Doc. No. 698); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1880. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting drafts of proposed provisions pertaining to existing appropriations of the American Battle Monuments Commission (H. Doc. No. 699); to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

1881. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a draft of a proposed provision pertaining to an existing appropriation of the Office of Defense Transportation (H. Doc. No. 700); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1882. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the Office of Contract Settlement of the Office of War Mobilization and Reconversion for the fiscal year 1945 in the amount of $289,700 (H. Doc. No. 701); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1883. A communication from the President of the United States transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the Interstate Commerce Commission for the fiscal year 1945, in the amount of $25,000 (H. Doc. No. 702); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1884. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a draft of a proposed provision pertaining to an existing appropriation for the War Production Board (H. Doc. No. 703); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1885. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation in the amount of $3,000 for the National Capital Housing Authority for the fiscal year 1945 (H. Doc. No. 704); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1886. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a draft of a proposed provision pertaining to an existing appropriation for the Office of Censorship (H. Doc. No. 705); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1887. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a draft of a proposed provision pertaining to an existing appropriation for the Office of Economic Stabilization (H. Doc. No. 706); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1888. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a draft of a proposed provision pertaining to an existing appropriation for the Smaller War Plants Corporation (H. Doc. No. 707); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1889. A communication from the President of the United States transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for The National Archives, for the fiscal year 1945, in the amount of $25,000 (H. Doc. No. 708); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1890. A communication from the President of the United States transmitting a draft of a proposed provision pertaining to an existing appropriation for the Office of Civilian Defense (H. Doc. No. 709); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1891. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the legislative branch, Architect of the Capitol, for the fiscal year 1945, amounting to $10,000 (H. Doc. No. 710); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1892. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a draft of a proposed provision pertaining to an existing appropriation, and a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the Smithsonian Institution, in the amount of $8,600, for the fiscal year 1945 (H. Doc. No. 711); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1893. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a draft of a proposed provision pertaining to an existing appropriation of the Federal Trade Commission (H. Doc. No. 712); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1894. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a draft of a proposed provision pertaining to an existing appropriation of the Federal Communications Commission (H. Doc. No. 713); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1895. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a deficiency estimate of appropriation for the fiscal year 1943 in the sum of $5,500, and supplemental estimates of appropriations for the fiscal year 1945 in the sum of $85,180, amounting in all to $90,680, for the judiciary (H. Doc. No. 714); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1896. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a draft of a proposed provision pertaining to an existing appropriation for the Office of War Information (H. Doc. No. 715); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1897. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a draft of a proposed provision pertaining to an existing appropriation for the Petroleum Administration for War (H. Doc. No. 716); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1898. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a draft of a proposed provision for the Foreign Economic Administration (H. Doc. No. 717); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1899. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting supplemental estimates of appropriation for the Civil Aeronautics Board for the fiscal year

1945, in the amount of $20,500 (H. Doc. No. 718); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1900. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a proposed provision pertaining to an appropriation for the Committee on Fair Employment Practice of the Office for Emergency Management contained in the National War Agency Appropriation Act, 1945 (H. Doc. No. 719); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1901. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a draft of a proposed provision pertaining to an existing appropriation for the Office of Price Administration (H. Doc. No. 720); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1902. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the Department of Labor for the fiscal year 1945, amounting to $116,500 (H. Doc. No. 721); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1903. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the National Labor Relations Board for the fiscal year 1945, amounting to $17,700 (H. Doc. No. 722); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1904. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the Railroad Retirement Board, for the fiscal year 1945, in the amount of $30,000 (H. Doc. No. 723); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1905. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting deficiency estimates of appropriations for the fiscal year 1940, amounting to $62,454.11, and for the fiscal year 1943 amounting to $36,550,000, and supplemental estimates of appropriations for the fiscal year 1945, amounting to $302,500,000, for the Navy Department and naval service, together with proposed provisions affecting certain existing naval appropriations (H. Doc. No. 724); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1906. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation in the amount of $35,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1945, for the Department of State for public works planning activities of the International Boundary Commission, United States and Mexico (H. Doc. No. 725); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1907. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a proposed provision pertaining to an appropriation for the National War Labor Board of the Office for Emergency Management contained in the National War Agency Appropriation Act, 1945 (H. Doc. No. 726); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1908. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting supplemental estimates of appropriations for the National Mediation Board for the fiscal year 1945, amounting to $15,175 (H. Doc. No. 727); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1909. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the Federal Power Commission for the fiscal year 1945, amounting to $4,900 (H. Doc. No. 728); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1910. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting supplemental estimates of appropriations for the legislative branch for the fiscal year 1945, amounting to $319,300, together with a draft of a proposed provision pertaining to an existing appropriation (H. Doc. No. 729); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1911. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting supplemental estimates of appropriations for the Treasury Department for the fiscal year 1945 amounting to $20,358,000, and drafts of proposed provisions pertaining to existing or expired appropriations for the Treasury Department (H. Doc. No. 730); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1912. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting deficiency estimates of appropriations for the fiscal year 1944 and prior years in the sum of $198,422.41, and supplemental estimates of appropriations for the fiscal year 1945 in the sum of $597,300, amounting in all to $795,722.41, for the Department of Justice (H. Doc. No. 731); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1913. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a draft of a proposed provision pertaining to the appropriation for the Office of Strategic Services for the fiscal year 1945 (H. Doc. No. 732); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1914. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a draft of a proposed provision pertaining to an existing appropriation for The Tax Court of the United States for the fiscal year 1945 (H. Doc. No. 733); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1915. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a draft of a proposed provision pertaining to the appropriation for the Office of Scientific Research and Development for the fiscal year 1945 (H. Doc. No. 734); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1916. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the Federal Works Agency for the fiscal year 1945, in the amount of $15,000,000 (H. Doc. No. 735); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1917. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the War Manpower Commission for the fiscal year 1945, amounting to $618,000 (H. Doc. No. 736); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1918. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation in the amount of $23,300, and draft of a proposed provision pertaining to an existing appropriation, for the Supreme Court of the United States, fiscal year 1945 (H. Doc. No. 737); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1919. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting supplemental estimates of appropriations for the General Accounting Office for the fiscal year 1945 amounting to $105,000 (H. Doc. No. 738); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1920. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the Office of War Mobilization and Reconversion (H. Doc. No. 739); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1921. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a draft of a proposed provision pertaining to an existing appropriation for the Office of the Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs (H. Doc. No. 740); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1922. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a proposed provision of law and a supplemental estimate of appropriation in the amount of $10,400 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1945, for the Panama Canal, to remain available until expended (H. Doc. No. 741); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1923. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation in the amount of $33,000, together with drafts of proposed provisions pertaining to existing appropriations for the Federal Works Agency, fiscal year 1945 (H. Doc. No. 742); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1924. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting supplemental estimates of appropriations in the amount of $2,609,450, together with provisions affecting existing appropriations for the Post Office Department for the fiscal year 1945 (H. Doc. No. 743); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1925. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting supplemental estimates of appropriations for the District of Columbia for the fiscal year 1945, amounting to $681,893.55, together with drafts of proposed provisions pertaining to existing appropriations (H. Doc. No. 744); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1926. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a proposed provision increasing the limitation on expenditures for payments of services of technical and clerical personnel in the Office of the Chief of Engineers for the fiscal year 1945, and two supplemental estimates of appropriation for the War Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1945, for improvement of existing river and harbor works and for flood control, general, to remain available until expended, amounting to $10,010,000 (H. Doc. No. 745); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1927. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting supplemental and deficiency estimates of appropriations for the fiscal year 1945 and prior fiscal years, for the Department of the Interior in the amount of $7,176,682.77, together with drafts of proposed provisions pertaining to existing appropriations, and proposed authorization for the expenditure of Indian tribal funds (H. Doc. No. 746); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1928. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting three supplemental estimates of appropriations for the fiscal year 1945 for the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, amounting to $7,401,000 (H. Doc. No. 747); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1929. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a draft of a proposed provision pertaining to the Office of Alien Property Custodian of the Office for Emergency Management for the fiscal year 1945 (H. Doc. No. 748); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1930. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate for the appropriation "Foreign-Service Pay Adjustment, Appreciation of Foreign Currencies, 1945," amounting to $200,000 (H. Doc. No. 749); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1931. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the Department of Labor for the fiscal year 1945, amounting to $1,162,000 (H. Doc. No. 750); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1932. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the Department of the Interior, for the fiscal year 1945, in the amount of $3,660,000 (H. Doc. No. 751); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1933. A letter from the Acting Administrator, War Food Administration, transmitting a recommendation for the passage of legislation to give the Commodity Credit Corporation certain additional authority in connection with price control, and recommending that the borrowing authority of the Commodity Credit Corporation be increased by $2,000,000,000; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1934. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to reimburse certain Navy personnel for personal property lost or damaged as the result of a fire at the Naval Auxiliary Air Facility, Astoria, Oreg., on April 2, 1944; to the Committee on Claims.

1935. A letter from E. G. Allen, rear admiral, United States Navy, Director of Budget and Reports, transmitting a report showing the name, age, legal residence, rank, branch of service, with special qualifications therefor, of each person commissioned from civilian life into the Coast Guard Reserve, and in the Marine Corps Reserve, during the period August 1 to September 30, 1944, who have not had prior commissioned military service, and in the United States Naval Reserve for the period July 29 to September 30, 1944, inclusive; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

1936. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to provide reimbursement for personal property lost, damaged, or destroyed as the result of an explosion at the Naval Mine Depot, Yorktown, Va., on November 16, 1943; to the Committee on Claims.

1937. A letter from the Administrator, War Shipping Administration, transmitting in accordance with the provisions of section 217 (b) of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended (Public Law 498, 77th Cong.); Report No. 8 of action taken under section 217 of such act, as amended; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

1938. A letter from the Administrator, Veterans' Administration, transmitting two copies of a draft of a proposed bill to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to transfer by quitclaim deed to the city of Los Angeles, Calif., for fire-station purposes, the title to certain land located at Veterans' Administration facility, Los Angeles, Calif; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

1939. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to grant to the city of Canton, Ohio, for highway purposes only, a strip of land situated within the United States naval ordnance plant at Canton, Ohio; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

1940. A letter from the Administrator, War Food Administration, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill for the relief of June I. Gradijan; to the Committee on Claims.

1941. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a report stating all of the facts and pertinent provisions of law in the cases of 332 individuals whose deportation has been suspended for more than 6 months under the authority vested in him, together with a statement of the reason for such suspension; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

1942. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a request for withdrawal of the case of Barth Fred Nigg or Fred Bartholemew Nigg Seidel from the 332 cases involving suspension of deportation, referred to in his letter of October 1, 1944; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

1943. A letter from the president, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill authorizing and directing the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to construct two four-lane bridges to replace the existing Fourteenth Street or Highway Bridge across the Potomac River, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1944. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to amend the law relating to the authority of certain employees of the Immigration and Naturalization Service to make arrests without warrant in certain cases and to search vehicles within certain areas; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

1945. A letter from the Acting Director, Executive Office of the President, Bureau of the Budget, transmitting copies of letters addressed to the heads of the agencies, Office of Scientific Research and Development and War Production Board, which establish limitations on the amounts which may be expended for travel, printing and binding, and the purchase of motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicles from sums set apart in appropriations to these agencies for special projects; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

1946. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to lease certain public lands in Alaska; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

1947. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a request for withdrawal of the case of Ruth Reynolds nee Pelett or Gloria Ruth Reynolds from those 141 cases involving suspension of deportation, referred to in his letter of February 15, 1944; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

1948. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting pursuant to section 16 of the Organic Act of the Virgin Islands of the United States, approved June 22, 1936, one copy each of various legislation passed by the Municipal Council of St. Croix; to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

1949. A letter from the Chairman, War Production Board, transmitting a report from the chairman and general manager of the Board of Directors of the Smaller War Plants Corporation, covering the period from August 1 through September 30, 1944; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1950. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to provide for payment and settlement of mileage and other travel allowance accounts of military personnel; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

1951. A letter from the Attorney General transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to amend section 342 (b) of the Nationality Act of 1940; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

1952. A letter from the Secretary of War transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to amend the act entitled "An act authorizing the President to appoint an Under Secretary of War during national emergencies, fixing the compensation of the Under Secretary of War, and authorizing the Secretary of War to prescribe duties", approved December 16, 1940, for the purpose of making such act permanently effective; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

1953. A letter from the Administrator, Office of Price Administration, transmitting the tenth report of the Office of Price Administration, covering the period ended June 30, 1944 (H. Doc. No. 761); to the Committee on Banking and Currency and ordered to be printed.

1954. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to authorize payment of certain claims for damage to or loss or destruction of property arising prior to May 27, 1941, out of activities of the War Department or of the Army; to the Committee on Claims.

1955. A letter from the general manager, Tennessee Valley Authority, transmitting the report of operating revenues and expenses for the period March 1, 1944, to August 31, 1944; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

1956. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting pursuant to section 16 of the Organic Act of the Virgin Islands of the United States, approved June 22, 1936, one copy each of various legislation passed by the Municipal Council of St. Thomas and St. John; to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

1957. A letter from the National Adjutant and Paymaster, National Headquarters, Marine Corps League, transmitting the annual report for the fiscal period of August 1943 and August 1944 as submitted to the national convention, or, war conference, August 30 to September 2 at Sacramento, Calif.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1958. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill for the relief of G. F. Allen, Chief Disbursing Officer of the Treasury Department, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Claims.

1959. A letter from the Director, Office of Contract Settlement, transmitting the first quarterly progress report of the Office of Contract Settlement; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1960. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting supplemental estimates of appropriations for the Department of commerce for the fiscal year 1945, amounting to $1,514,200 (H. Doc. No. 752); to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

1961. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a draft of a proposed provision relating to the appropriations for certain executive departments and agencies in the fiscal year 1945 (H. Doc. No. 753); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1962. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting estimates of the amount of funds required by the United States Maritime Commission to defray the costs of penalty mail during the fiscal year 1945 (H. Doc. No. 754); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1963. A letter from the Commissioner, National Housing Agency, Federal Home Loan Bank Administration, transmitting the eleventh annual report of the Federal Home Loan Bank Administration for the period July 1, 1942, through June 30, 1943, covering the operations of the Federal Home Loan banks, the Federal savings and loan associations, the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation, the Home Owners' Loan Corporation, and the United States Housing Corporation (H. Doc. No. 763); to the Committee on Banking and Currency and ordered to be printed.

1964. A letter from the Chairman, Reconstruction Finance Corporation, transmitting a report covering its operations for the period from the organization of the Corporation on February 2, 1932, to June 30, 1944, inclusive; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1965. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Trade Commission, transmitting a report of the Federal Trade Commission on distribution methods and costs, part V—Advertising as a Factor in Distribution; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1966. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated July 24, 1944, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on a

study of beach erosion of the shoreline of Harrison County, Miss., made under the provisions of section 2 of the River and Harbor Act approved on July 3, 1930, and an act of Congress approved on June 26, 1936; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

1967. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a report stating all of the facts and pertinent provisions of law in the cases of 185 individuals whose deportation has been suspended for more than 6 months under the authority vested in him, together with a statement of the reason for such suspension; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

1968. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting seven supplemental estimates of appropriation for the Department of Agriculture for fiscal year 1945, totaling $3,694,150 (H. Doc. No. 756); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1969. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting supplemental estimates of appropriations for the Departments of Agriculture, Commerce, and Labor in the amount of $9,672,000 for the fiscal year 1945 (H. Doc. No. 757); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1970. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a deficiency estimate of appropriation in the sum of $10,000 for the Post Office Department for compensation to postmasters for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1943 (H. Doc. No. 758); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1971. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a draft of a proposed provision pertaining to the Tennessee Valley Authority for the fiscal year 1945 (H. Doc. No. 759); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1972. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting supplemental estimates of appropriations for the fiscal year 1945, amounting to $825,000, and a draft of a proposed provision pertaining to an appropriation for the Department of State (H. Doc. No. 760); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1973. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the eleventh annual report of the Farm Credit Administration, covering its operations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944 (H. Doc. No. 762); to the Committee on Agriculture and ordered to be printed.

1974. A letter from the Administrator, Foreign Economic Administration, transmitting a copy of the Foreign Economic Administration's first annual report to Congress; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1975. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated September 19, 1944, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on a preliminary examination and survey of Barren River, Ky. and Tenn., with special reference to a dam in the vicinity of a site known as Barren No. 2, authorized by the Flood Control Act approved on August 18, 1941 (H. Doc. No. 765); to the Committee on Flood Control and ordered to be printed with two illustrations.

1976. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated April 11, 1944, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and an illustration on a review of reports on Mattaponi River, Va., requested by a resolution of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, House of Representatives, adopted on July 18, 1941 (H. Doc. No. 766); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed with an illustration.

1977. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated April 17, 1944, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and an illustration, on a review of reports on Chicago River, North Branch, north of North Avenue, Illinois, requested by a resolution of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, House of Representatives, adopted on June 27, 1941 (H. Doc. No. 767); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed with an illustration.

1978. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated October 9, 1944, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on a review of reports on Hollywood Harbor (Port Everglades), Fla., requested by a resolution of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, House of Representatives, adopted on January 13, 1944 (H. Doc. No. 768); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed with two illustrations.

1979. A letter from the Director of Civilian Defense, transmitting a revised copy of quarterly estimate of personnel requirements for the quarter ending December 31, 1944, covering regular operations of the Office of Civilian Defense; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

1980. A letter from the Administrator, Veterans' Administration, transmitting a copy of the information furnished the Director of the Bureau of the Budget for the purpose of making a determination of the Veterans' Administration personnel requirements for the second quarter of the 1945 fiscal year; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

1981. A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting a copy of the information which has been submitted to the Director of the Bureau of the Budget for his use in determining the number of employees required by this Department during the second quarter of the fiscal year 1945; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

1982. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Trade Commission, transmitting copy of a quarterly estimate of the personnel requirements of the Federal Trade Commission for the second quarter of the fiscal year 1945; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

1983. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a copy of the quarterly estimate of personnel requirements, as transmitted to the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, setting forth the estimate of the number of employees required for the proper and efficient exercise of the functions of the War Department, for the quarter ending December 31, 1944; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

1984. A letter from the Under Secretary, Department of the Interior, transmitting the quarterly estimates of personnel requirements covering the quarter ending December 31, 1944, for the bureaus and offices of this Department; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

1985. A letter from the Director, Bureau of the Budget, transmitting five tables covering the determinations of the Director of the Bureau of the Budget during the first quarter of the fiscal year 1945 of the number of employees required by the executive departments and agencies for the proper and efficient exercise of their respective functions; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

1986. A letter from the Acting Postmaster General, transmitting a copy of a letter addressed to the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, certifying that the Post Office Department is within the quota set by that Bureau under date of September 30, 1944, for each of the appropriation units involved; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

1987. A letter from the Under Secretary, Department of the Interior, transmitting copies of revised estimates of personnel requirements covering the quarter ending September 30, 1944, for various bureaus and offices of this Department; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

1988. A letter from the Administrative Assistant to the Secretary, Department of Commerce, transmitting revision No. 1 of the estimate of personnel requirements for the quarter ending December 31, 1944, for working capital fund, Department of Commerce, requesting an increase of 35 positions; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

1989. A letter from the Administrative Assistant to the Secretary, Department of Commerce, transmitting revision 1 of the estimates of personnel requirements for the quarter ending December 31, 1944, for geodetic control surveys and working funds, United States Coast and Geodetic Survey, requesting an increase of 12 positions in the former, with a corresponding decrease of 12 positions in the latter; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

1990. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting copies of reports to the Director of the Bureau of the Budget relative to determining the number of employees required by the various units of the Department of Justice for the proper and efficient exercise of its functions for the second quarter of the fiscal year 1945; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

1991. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a copy of communication from this Department to the Director of the Bureau of the Budget relating to personnel ceiling of the Secret Service Division; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

1992. A letter from the Administrator, Federal Works Agency, transmitting revised quarterly estimates of personnel requirements for the quarter ending December 31, 1944, for two appropriation units of the Federal Works Agency; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

1993. A letter from the Administrator, Office of Price Administration, transmitting a copy of Budget Bureau Form A-29, estimate of personnel requirements, for the quarter ending December 31, 1944; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

1994. A letter from the Administrator, National Housing Agency, transmitting copies of the requests for personnel needs during the second quarter of the fiscal year 1945, as placed before the Bureau of the Budget; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

1995. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a copy of communication from this Department to the Director of the Bureau of the Budget relating to personnel ceilings of the Procurement Division; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

1996. A letter from the Acting Administrative Assistant to the Secretary, Department of Commerce, transmitting an estimate form for a new personnel ceiling unit (Special Censuses) for the Bureau of the Census for the quarter ending December 31, 1944; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

1997. A letter from the Chairman of the Board, Reconstruction Finance Corporation, transmitting the Reconstruction Finance Corporation report for the month of July 1944; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1998. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting reports from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, on authorized reviews of reports, previously transmitted, removing same from the confidential classification; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

1999. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a report of contracts awarded by the Navy Department for the fiscal year 1944; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

2000. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a report showing the name, age, legal residence, rank, branch of the service,

with special qualifications therefor, of each person commissioned in the Army of the United States without prior commissioned military service, for the period August 1, 1944, to September 30, 1944; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar as follows:

Mr. RIVERS: Committee on Naval Affairs. H. R. 4216. A bill to provide more efficient dental care for the personnel of the United States Navy; with amendment (Rept. No. 1909). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the union.

Mr. PETERSON of Florida: Committee on the Public Lands. H. R. 5331. A bill to authorize the transfer of certain lands within the Colonial National Historical Park, Yorktown, Va., to the Secretary of the Navy; without amendment (Rept. No. 1910). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CANNON of Florida:

H. R. 5441. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to authorize the payment of Federal old-age and survivors insurance benefits to certain individuals who become permanently and totally disabled before attaining the age of 65; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DIMOND:

H. R. 5442. A bill to provide further for the appointment of postmasters for fourth-class post offices in the Territory of Alaska; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

H. R. 5443. A bill to amend the act approved May 7, 1934, granting citizenship to the Metlakahtla Indians of Alaska; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

H. R. 5444. A bill to amend Public Law 304, Seventy-seventh Congress; to the Committee on the Territories.

By Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas:

H. R. 5445. A bill granting to Galveston County, a municipal corporation of the State of Texas, certain easements and rights-of-way over, under, and upon the San Jacinto Military Reservation in Galveston County, Tex.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. PATMAN:

H. R. 5446. A bill to amend section 500 of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. PHILBIN:

H. R. 5447. A bill providing a special credit against certain income-tax liability of members of the armed forces; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RANDOLPH:

H. R. 5448. A bill to permit construction, maintenance, and use of a tunnel for the purpose of carrying lines for petroleum products in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H. R. 5449, A bill to provide for the construction, maintenance, and operation of a national stadium, parade field, swimming pools, and other recreational facilities to be located in the District of Columbia and for the creation of a corporation for effectuating the purposes of the act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. KEOGH:

H. R. 5450. A bill to revise, codify, and enact into absolute law, title 18 of the United States Code, entitled "Crimes and Criminal Procedure"; to the Committee on Revision of the Laws.

By Mr. RANDOLPH:

H. R. 5451. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code to allow the deduction of certain circulation expenditures, and expenditures in defense of or perfecting property rights or title; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 5452. A bill to provide for the gift of war dogs to the servicemen who trained them for their war tasks; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. ROBERTSON:

H. R. 5453. A bill authorizing the conveyance by the Secretary of the Interior to the Chesapeake & Ohio Railway Co., a railroad corporation, of certain perpetual easements near Afton, in Augusta and Nelson Counties, Va., being a portion of the Blue Ridge Parkway Land of the Shenandoah National Park; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. SPRINGER:

H. R. 5454. A bill to amend section 6 of the act of March 20, 1933, to prohibit the requirement of the taking of the so-called pauper's oath by certain applicants for hospital treatment or domiciliary care; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. VINSON of Georgia:

H. R. 5455. A bill relating to the retired rank of certain officers of the Navy; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

H. R. 5456. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to lease certain lands situated in San Diego County, State of California; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

H. R. 5457. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to convey to Oahu Railway & Land Co. an easement for railway purposes in certain lands situated at Halawa, Ewa, Oahu, T. H.; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. WEISS:

H. R. 5458. A bill to provide for the erection of a veterans' memorial stadium in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. RANDOLPH:

H. R. 5459. A bill to amend section 3 (b) of the Securities Act of 1933, as amended, so as to permit exemption of security issues not exceeding $300,000 from the provisions of such act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DICKSTEIN:

H. Con. Res. 101. Concurrent resolution providing for restoration of property confiscated by the Axis and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. LEA:

H. J. Res. 313. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing for the election of President and Vice President; to the Committee on election of President, Vice President, and Representatives in Congress.

By Mr. COX:

H. J. Res. 314. Joint resolution to create a commission to prepare plans for the establishment of a school for the training of women for service as commissioned officers in the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. RIVERS:

H. Res. 648. Resolution providing for the consideration of H. R. 4216, a bill to provide more efficient dental care for the personnel of the United States Navy; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: A memorial of the House of Representatives of Cuba directed to the House of Representatives of the United States and through it to the American people and Government, expressing the former's deep sympathy concerning the death of Alfred Smith and Wendell Willkie; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BLAND:

H. R. 5460. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Luther J. Head; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. TOWE:

H. R. 5461. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Cecilia M. Tonner; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 5462. A bill for the relief of William W. Adams, Inc.; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 5463. A bill for the relief of the county of Bergen, N. J.; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

6170. By Mr. LEONARD W. HALL: Petition of numerous citizens of the First Congressional District of New York protesting against the enactment by Congress of any prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

6171. By Mr. TOWE: Petition of Alexander Summer and 18 other residents of Bergen County, N. J., protesting against prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

6172. By Mr. SCHIFFLER: Petition of Veterans of Foreign Wars, No. 2716, Pan Handle Post, Hollidays Cove, W. Va., urging immediate appropriate action on the part of the proper authorities of the United States Government to acquire and provide sufficient land for the extension and improvement of the National Cemetery at Grafton, W. Va., for the purpose of providing adequate burial facilities for deceased veterans and servicemen entitled thereto; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

6173. Also, petition of Dessie Gough, secretary, Naomi Chapter, No. 12, Order of the Eastern Star, Grafton, W. Va., urging immediate appropriate action on the part of the proper authorities of the United States Government to acquire and provide sufficient land for the extension and improvement of the National Cemetery at Grafton for the purpose of providing adequate burial facilities for deceased veterans and servicemen entitled thereto; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

6174. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the Lincoln Electric Co., recommending the restoration of the Liberty Bell by the carbon electrode welding process; to the Committee on the Library.

6175. Also, petition of the insurance section of the New York Board of Trade, Inc., commending the Select Committee to Investigate Executive Agencies on its sixth intermediate report, pursuant to House Resolution 102 and that the board of trade heartily endorses the principles and practices indicated thereon; to the Committee on Rules.

6176. Also, petition of the Bar Association of Hawaii favoring the fixing the terms of appointment of all judges of courts of record in the Territory of Hawaii namely, judges of the circuit courts, of the Supreme Court of Hawaii and of the United States District Court for the Territory of Hawaii, at 10 years, provided that such terms be made applicable to judges appointed and confirmed after the enactment of such legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

6177. Also, petition of the Executives' Association of Greater New York requesting various Government agencies to avoid overbuying at the present time beyond necessary

and adequate requirements and that they avoid promiscuous unloading of surpluses on hand and that distribution of surpluses be advertised in the public press and be open to public bidding; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

6178. Also, petition of the united Polish organizations requesting that the United States and its allies reaffirm the "four freedoms" annunciated in the Atlantic Charter and Declaration by the United Nations signed January 2, 1942; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

6179. Also, petition of the Polish-American Citizens Committee requesting restoration of Poland territorially, the extension of aid and assistance materially and morally and favoring compulsory 1-year military training in our country for preparedness; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

6180. Also, petition of city of Niagara Falls requesting the adoption of the Federal postwar highway bill as originally proposed without the changes introduced in the companion bill as adopted by the United States Senate; to the Committee on Roads.

6181. Also, petition of Pennsylvania Automotive Association requesting the Congress of the United States give serious consideration that the bulk of financial support for the Government is derived from highly industrialized area, that traffic problems revolve mostly around those areas and that any formula for distribution of Federal highway assistance funds should recognize these facts; to the Committee on Roads.

6182. Also, petition of Casius W. McDonald, protesting against his illegal arrest and conviction; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

6183. Also, petition of Louis Moskovitz requesting the consideration of a resolution to establish a fund through the sale of a peace bond, for the purpose of stopping and preventing all wars; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

SENATE

THURSDAY, NOVEMBER 16, 1944

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou that hearest prayer, to Thee shall all flesh come. Before ever our yearning has broken into speech Thou hearest us. Thou knowest us altogether. As far apart as noontide and midnight, glorious gleams and darkest shadows chase across our strangely divided hearts. Shunning shadows, may we follow the gleam.

Thou hearest the sobs of wounded hearts across all our embattled land. Thou knowest the bitterness of shattering loss and the stabbing sadness of farewell as song is ceased when just begun. By the still forms of the valiant fallen in alien lands facing the withering fire of the foe with a courage that shames and humbles us, by the long days and longer nights when those who wait keep their anxious vigil, hanging in windows of longing the lamps of faith, by the dreaded word so final that turns wistful hopes into ashes of despair, God of pity and of love, of comfort and of healing, we solemnly swear that these dead shall not have died in vain. May the weeping pride that still holds high its head never be cheated and mocked by selfish schemes robbing tomorrow of the promise which today faintly flames in the reddening east. We ask it in the Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, November 14, 1944, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States, submitting nominations, were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. McLeod, one of its clerks, communicated to the Senate the intelligence of the death of Hon. HAMPTON P. FULMER, late a Representative from the State of South Carolina, and transmitted the resolutions of the House thereon.

TRIBUTE TO THE LATE SMITH W. BROOKHART

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, I know that the Members of this body who have served here for some time will with me regret the necessity for the announcement at this time of the passing of a former Senator, who served here for about 8 years, the Honorable Smith W. Brookhart, of Washington, Iowa, who passed away yesterday at Prescott, Ariz. At this time I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, in connection with my remarks, an article which appeared in the Washington Post this morning referring to the unfortunate passing of former Senator Brookhart.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SMITH BROOKHART, EX-SENATOR, DIES IN ARIZONA HOSPITAL

Smith W. Brookhart, 75, veteran of two wars and former Republican Senator from Iowa, died yesterday at the United States Veterans' Hospital in Prescott, Ariz.

Mr. Brookhart went to Arizona in September 1943 because of failing health and took up residence in Prescott, where a daughter, Dr. Florence B. Yount, a physician, lives.

He became a patient of the veterans' hospital shortly after the death of his wife, last December 30.

Mr. Brookhart was born in a log cabin on a farm in Scotland County, Mo., February 2, 1869.

In a varied career, he farmed, taught school, was a lawyer and a soldier.

FARM-BLOC LEADER

He was first elected to the United States Senate in 1922, to fill an unexpired term, and became a colorful farm-bloc leader. Defeated in a contested election in 1924, Mr. Brookhart won his seat again in 1926 and served until 1932. At that time he became a special trade adviser to Russia for Vice President WALLACE, then Secretary of Agriculture. He was an early advocate of Russian recognition.

After campaigning unsuccessfully for the Republican senatorial nomination in 1936, he began the practice of law here. At one time he maintained an office at 1001 Fifteenth Street NW.

Mr. Brookhart came into national prominence in 1924 as chairman of the Senate committee which conducted an investigation of the Department of Justice that led to the resignation of Attorney General Harry M. Daugherty.

ACTIVE IN OFFICERS' RESERVE CORPS

He had a notable record with the Iowa National Guard and the Officers' Reserve Corps, beginning in 1894. He was a veteran of the Spanish-American War and World War No. 1, advancing to the rank of lieutenant colonel in the latter.

The late Senator's chief hobby was marksmanship. During the last war he served as chief instructor in marksmanship at Camp Perry, Ohio.

BURIAL IN IOWA

Funeral arrangements were incomplete Wednesday night, but it was announced that Mr. Brookhart will be buried at Washington, Iowa.

The Senator is survived by four sons, Lt. Col. Smith W. Brookhart, Jr., of 3204 Klingle Road NW.; Charles E. Brookhart, American Consul in Calcutta, India; John R. Brookhart, Duluth, Minn.; and Capt. Joseph W. Brookhart, U. S. A., A. B., Clovis, N. Mex.; and a daughter, Mrs. Edith A. Millard, of Philadelphia.

LINCOLN'S GETTYSBURG ADDRESS

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. President, November 19 will be the eighty-first anniversary of the delivery of what has been and is perhaps today America's most beloved state paper, the Gettysburg dedication address by President Abraham Lincoln. It seems to me it is highly proper on this present occasion, when our country is torn with the emotions of war, that this address should be read before the Senate.

Mr. President, I now send a copy of the Gettysburg Address to the desk and ask unanimous consent that it may be read, because I believe it gives utterance to the sentiment which is appealing to the hearts and emotions of all people of America, and especially to Members of the Senate, that we in this day of our Nation's supreme struggle be dedicated to the cause for which so many brave men have given the last full measure of devotion, and that we here highly resolve that these dead shall not have died in vain, and that a government of freedom shall live among the nations of the earth.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the address will be read.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

Fourscore and 7 years ago our fathers brought forth upon this continent a new nation, conceived in liberty and dedicated to the proposition that all men are created equal.

Now we are engaged in a great civil war, testing whether that nation or any nation so conceived and so dedicated can long endure. We are met on a great battlefield of that war. We have come to dedicate a portion of that field, as a final resting place of those who here gave their lives that that nation might live. It is altogether fitting and proper that we should do this.

But, in a larger sense, we cannot dedicate—we cannot consecrate—we cannot hallow—this ground. The brave men, living and dead, who struggled here, have consecrated it, far above our poor power to add or detract. The world will little note, nor long remember, what we say here, but it can never forget what they did here. It is for us the living, rather, to be dedicated here to the unfinished work which they who fought here have thus far so nobly advanced. It is rather for us to be here dedicated to the

great task remaining before us—that from these honored dead we take increased devotion to that cause for which they gave the last full measure of devotion—that we here highly resolve that these dead shall not have died in vain—that this Nation, under God, shall have a new birth of freedom—and that government of the people, by the people, for the people, shall not perish from the earth.

JOINT COMMITTEE ON SELECTIVE SERVICE OCCUPATIONAL DEFERMENT OF OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES OF LEGISLATIVE BRANCH

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair appoints the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] as a member on the part of the Senate of the Joint Committee on Selective Service Occupational Deferment of Officers and Employees of the Legislative Branch of the Government, to fill the vacancy caused by the expiration of the term of service of Hon. Samuel D. Jackson as Senator from Indiana.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

PUBLICATION OF BRITISH EMPIRE PARLIAMENTARY ASSOCIATION

A letter from the State Department, transmitting a copy of a summary of congressional proceedings, United States of America, published by the British Empire Parliamentary Association (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

REPORT OF NATIONAL WAR LABOR BOARD ON WAGE STABILIZATION

A letter from the Chairman of the War Labor Board, transmitting, in further response to Senate Resolution 130, agreed to April 9, 1943, a report on stabilization of wages and salaries for the month of July, 1944 (with an accompanying report); ordered to lie on the table.

DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a list of papers and documents on the files of the Departments of State, Treasury (3), War (8), Justice, Navy (15), Interior, Agriculture (11), and Commerce; Federal Works Agency (2), The National Archives (3), War Manpower Commission (2), Reconstruction Finance Corporation (6), United States courts (district court, northern district of Ohio), United States Tariff Commission, General Accounting Office, Office of Defense Transportation, Federal Security Agency, National Housing Agency, and War Relocation Authority which are not needed in the conduct of business and have no permanent value or historical interest, and requesting action looking to their disposition (with accompanying papers); to a Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Papers in the Executive Departments.

The VICE PRESIDENT appointed Mr. BARKLEY and Mr. BREWSTER members of the committee on the part of the Senate.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate by the Vice President and referred as indicated:

A resolution adopted at New York City, by Evangelical Ministers and Laymen of Italian Descent, favoring the recognition of Italy as a full-status ally of the United Nations; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A resolution adopted at Middletown, N. Y., by the Hudson Valley Counties Council, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, favoring the enactment of Senate bill 1970, to liberalize the provisions of the National Service Life Insurance Act; to the Committee on Finance.

Petitions of Cassius M. McDonald, of Leavenworth, Kans., praying for an investigation and redress of grievances for alleged crimes and offenses committed against himself, his wife, and witnesses by F. B. I. agents and also bias and prejudice on the part of trial judge Gunnar Nordbye, of St. Paul, Minn.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A resolution adopted by the Executives' Association of Greater New York, Inc., favoring the avoidance of overbuying of consumer commodities by Government agencies at the present time and the orderly disposal by the agencies of all such commodities when they become surplus; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A letter in the nature of a memorial from the executive committee of the California Progressives, Los Angeles, Calif., remonstrating against the enactment of legislation to provide for peacetime compulsory military training of American citizens; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

The petition of the United Mothers of America, Cleveland, Ohio, praying for the early trial of Admiral Kimmel and General Short in connection with the Pearl Harbor disaster and also the return to the United States of Tyler Kent for investigation to ascertain information allegedly in his possession regarding certain purported cable communications; ordered to lie on the table.

Resolutions adopted by the Pennsylvania State Association, N. A. L. C. Convention, at Greensburg, Pa., and the Republican ward chairmen of Pittsburgh, Pa., favoring the enactment of Senate bill 1882, to provide increased compensation for postal employees; to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

Petitions of sundry citizens of the States of Pennsylvania and New Jersey, praying for the enactment of Senate bill 1882, to provide increased compensation for postal employees; to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

A resolution adopted at Philadelphia, Pa., by the Pennsylvania Automobile Association, Inc., favoring due recognition of the more highly industrialized areas of the country in the enactment of any legislation to provide Federal funds for highway purposes; to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

A resolution adopted by the United Rubber Workers of America, C. I. O., Akron, Ohio, demanding the full and untrammeled right of every serviceman to cast a vote in Federal elections; to the Commitee on Privileges and Elections.

The petition of George Biehl, of Union City, N. J., praying for an investigation of certain alleged acts of the special committee of the Senate investigating 1944 campaign expenditures in seizing and failing to return certain records; to the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

A resolution adopted by the Council of the City of Dearborn, Mich., favoring the enactment of Senate bill 2105, to amend and supplement the Federal-aid Road Act to authorize appropriations for post-war construction of highways and bridges, eliminate railroad grade crossings, to provide for the immediate preparation of plans, and for other purposes; ordered to lie on the table.

RESOLUTIONS BY KANSAS YEARLY MEETING OF FRIENDS

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, and appropriately referred, resolutions adopted at the Kansas Yearly Meeting of the Religious Society of Friends, held in Wichita, Kans., October 10 to 15, 1944, and forwarded to me by Frank C. Brown, clerk of the meeting.

These resolutions protest against a world organization of nations based on force for imperialistic aims, and also against universal military conscription in the United States during peacetime.

There being no objection, the resolutions were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

KANSAS YEARLY MEETING OF FRIENDS,
Wichita, Kans., October 14, 1944.

DEAR SIR: We, the members of Kansas Yearly Meeting of the Religious Society of Friends (having meetings in the States of Kansas, Oklahoma, Missouri, Texas, and Colorado), in annual session at Wichita, Kans., deliberating on the work of God, are moved to deplore the present conflict with its exaltation of deception and violence.

In deep penitence we acknowledge that we have fallen short of our own ideals and ask forgiveness for possible guilt and indifference. Yet, we would still bear witness to our faith that the way of the cross is mightier than the way of the sword. Therefore, we present this resolution to the representatives of our Government who are charting the course of our Nation:

Resolved, That we view with deep concern the indications that force will be an ever-increasing factor in the proposed peace plans of the future, rather than a reliance upon the principles of justice, brotherhood, and love. We urge that the United States use its influence toward building some kind of workable world government rather than follow a pattern of imperialism and military power.

Resolved further, That we express our firm belief that universal military peacetime conscription is a reversal of all national traditions and contrary to the best interests of our Government and of the world. The record of history is clear. Such a program has neither preserved the peace of the world nor given security to the nations adopting it. Conscription will undermine the influence of the Christian home by taking its young men before the age of maturity, giving them a philosophy of fear and distrust rather than one of confidence and belief in mankind. We, therefore, believe that it is our duty as citizens and Friends to oppose universal military conscription in the United States.

On behalf of Kansas Yearly Meeting of Friends, held at Wichita, Kans., October 10 to 15, 1944.

FRANK C. BROWN,
Clerk.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEE ON PENSIONS

The following reports of a committee were submitted:

By Mr. TUNNELL, from the Committee on Pensions:

H. R. 86. An act to grant pensions to certain unremarried dependent widows of Civil War veterans who were married to the veteran subsequent to June 26, 1905; with amendments (Rept. No. 1148);

H. R. 4999. An act to increase the service-connected disability rates of pension for certain Regular Establishment veterans and veterans of wars prior to World War No. 1; without amendment (Rept. No. 1149); and

H. R. 5041. An act to amend the Veterans Regulations; without amendment (Rept. No. 1150).

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. GEORGE, from the Committee on Finance:

Sundry officers for appointment and/or promotion in the Regular Corps of the United States Public Health Service.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. BILBO:

S. 2182. A bill to amend the Life Insurance Act of the District of Columbia; and

S. 2183. A bill authorizing and directing the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to construct two four-lane bridges to replace the existing Fourteenth Street or Highway Bridge across the Potomac River, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. HATCH:

S. 2184 (by request): A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to lease certain public lands in Alaska; to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

By Mr. GEORGE:

S. 2185. A bill to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to transfer by quitclaim deed to the city of Los Angeles, Calif., for fire-station purposes, the title to certain land located at Veterans' Administration facility, Los Angeles, Calif.; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. MAYBANK:

S. 2186. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Glenn T. Boylston; to the Committee on Claims.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE OF BILLS—MISSOURI RIVER BASIN

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President, on Tuesday of this week I submitted a resolution (S. Res. 331), which now appears to be defective in that it refers to a bill by the wrong number. It refers to Senate bill 1915. It should refer to Senate bill 2100. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be indefinitely postponed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the resolution will be indefinitely postponed.

Mr. BAILEY. I now send forward two resolutions of the same tenor, relating to bills by their proper numbers.

The effect of one of the resolutions is that the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry be discharged from further consideration of Senate bill 2100, to provide for the improvement and development of navigation, irrigation, and control of floods on the Missouri River and its tributaries, and so forth, and that it be referred to the Committee on Commerce. This bill was introduced by the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE].

The second resolution relates to Senate bill 2089, introduced by the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY].

I submit these two resolutions, and later will ask for their consideration.

The resolutions submitted by Mr. BAILEY are as follows:

Senate Resolution 332

Resolved, That the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry be discharged from the further consideration of the bill (S. 2100) to provide for the improvement and development of navigation, irrigation, and control of floods on the Missouri River and its tributaries, for the promotion of the national defense, and for other purposes, and that it be referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Senate Resolution 333

Resolved, That the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry be discharged from the further consideration of the bill (S. 2089) to establish a Missouri River Authority to provide for unified water control and resource development on the Missouri River and surrounding region in the interest of the control and prevention of floods, the promotion of navigation and reclamation of the public lands, the strengthening of the national defense, and for other purposes, and that it be referred to the Committee on Commerce.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolutions will go over, under the rule.

AMENDMENTS TO RIVER AND HARBOR IMPROVEMENT BILL

Mr. WILEY and Mr. TYDINGS each submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by them, respectively, to the bill (H. R. 3961) authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

COMMITTEE SERVICE

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I send to the desk a proposed order and ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The order will be read.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

Ordered, That the junior Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER] be appointed to serve the balance of this Congress on the following committees: District of Columbia, Education and Labor, Expenditures in the Executive Departments, and Indian Affairs.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I may say that I have conferred with the distinguished majority leader, and I understand he has no objection to these appointments at this time. I wish to emphasize that the appointments are for the remainder of this Congress only and that no implications as to the future are carried in the selections.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, these committee assignments are identical to the ones which were held by Senator Jackson, of Indiana, and are according to the proportion which we have heretofore worked out of minority and majority memberships. These committee assignments would not technically go to the minority. But inasmuch as the proportion of membership in the next Congress will be practically the same as that in the present one, and with the understanding that these appointments do not go beyond the end of this session and that the proportion will revert to what it has been, I have no objection to these appointments.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the order submitted by the Senator from Maine will be entered.

I AM OLD GLORY—POEM BY RAY V. DAVIS

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, in my State, as in every other State of the Union, there are many fathers and mothers who hourly mourn the wounded and missing, and those who have made the supreme sacrifice for their country. But out of the heartache of war's grim tragedy there are sometimes born thoughts which rise above the pain and reach to heights which would not otherwise be attained.

To a New Mexico father, grieving for a brave young son, one of the many heroes of Bataan, there came one day such an inspiration. From his sorrow and poignant memories there was born a vision of America, of Old Glory, which he has penned in beautiful thought and word.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the lines written by Ray V. Davis, of Carlsbad, Eddy County, N. Mex., be printed at this point in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the poem was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I am Old Glory.
I am a thousand furnaces combined to make an airship;
I am a Boy Scout whittling away to make—nothing.
I am an Edison burning away my life to better world living;
I am a tramp choosing to contribute nothing.
I am Old Glory.

I am a big limousine with chauffeur and footman;
I am a jalopy full of kids having the time of their lives.
I am a 10-course dinner; caviar and all the trimmings;
I am an ice-cream cone spread all over a kid's face.
I am Old Glory.

I am a great orator swaying the minds of thousands;
I am a baby's voice doing the same.
I am mansions, yachts, estates;
I am log cabins, tenements, trailers.
I am Old Glory.

I am highways, byways, skyways;
I am paths, streams, torrents.
I am a giant plane from coast to coast;
I am a walk in the woods, or an hour in the garden.
I am Old Glory.

I am a Marshall, MacArthur, Nimitz;
I am Pvt. Jim, Sgt. Gene, Lt. Dwayne.
I am Pearl Harbor, Bataan, Normandy;
I am New Mexico, Santa Fe, Eddy County.
I am Old Glory.

I am church, home, friends;
I am nature, soldier of fortune, hermit.
I am a mother's prayer to bring back her soldier son;
I am a father's aching heart to do the same.
I am Old Glory.

THE CONTROL OF GERMANY AND JAPAN—PUBLICATION BY THE BROOKINGS INSTITUTION

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, one of the most difficult and vital questions which will concern us in the years ahead—and particularly perhaps even in the months ahead—will be the treatment of Germany and Japan. It is of the utmost importance, therefore, that we have the clearest possible conception of the facts and the objects, and that the best common sense be used in connection with any approach to that problem. Therefore, I wish to call to the attention of the Senate a publication, which recently appeared, entitled "The Control of Germany and Japan," published by the Brookings Institution, written by Harold G. Moulton and Louis Marlio. It considers with unusual clearness the economic, political, and military issues involved. It is much too long to be printed in the RECORD, but I believe that attention should be called to it in connection with any consideration of this subject. It seems to me that there is also a human

side to the treatment of the people of Germany and Japan which likewise requires the utmost common sense and balance on the part of those of us who will deal with that matter.

Along that line, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address entitled "Religious Ideals and the Problem of Germany," delivered by the Reverend A. Powell Davies at All Souls Unitarian Church in Washington, D. C., on October 29, 1944. The address slightly exceeds the two-page limit in length. I hold in my hand a written estimate from the Public Printer that the cost of printing the address will be $130. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

AMERICA'S RENDEZVOUS WITH WORLD DESTINY—ARTICLE BY FRED C. CHRISTOPHERSON

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, South Dakota feels particularly fortunate in that we have had one of our finest citizens take a trip to England and France and then come back and be able to tell South Dakota what he has seen over there. Mr. Fred C. Christopherson, executive editor of our largest daily newspaper, the Argus-Leader, spent more than a month on the European front and in England, and I wish to say that Mr. Christopherson is not only an excellent observer but, far and beyond that, he is one man who can write clearly and concisely in an understandable way about what he has seen. Beyond that he is a man of rare judgment. His conclusions are sound. I am particularly happy today to present his final, concluding article, which appears in the South Dakota newspaper, the Argus-Leader. The article outlines the responsibility, as he sees it, of the United States and also the opportunity for our country to be in the forefront of the nations of the world in doing its great part in establishing a permanent peace organization. In the article Mr. Christopherson sets forth the conclusion that it is a responsibility of ours. He states his belief and conclusion that our country should remain strong and should be in a position to take the lead in keeping peace in the world.

So I am happy to present his concluding article. Many other articles written by him have appeared in prior issues of the large South Dakota newspaper, the Argus-Leader, for the last few months. His concluding article, which is entitled "America's Rendezvous With World Destiny," I should like to call to the particular attention of the Senate. I now ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AMERICA'S RENDEZVOUS WITH WORLD DESTINY

(In this concluding article concerning his visit to France, England, Scotland, and Ireland in August and September, Fred C. Christopherson, executive editor of the Argus-Leader, presents some opinions about tomorrow's world and the role the United States must play in it.)

Framed in my mind as I write this is a picture of the Normandy beachhead. Dozens, yes, hundreds of ships. American ships loaded with American cargoes. Ships that traveled across 3,000 miles of water. Big ships. Little ships. Cargoes of tanks, of trucks, of trains, of ammunition, of food, of shells, of engines.

And then in Normandy and in Brittany. More evidences of the might and the vastness of American production. Acre after acre covered with American ammunition. American airplanes in the air. American trains on the railroads. American trucks on the highways. Everywhere the great rumble and the roar of powerful American machinery.

The scene on the highways of France converging toward the battle lines. Again long lines of trucks, American trucks, swiftly pushing onward through the day and the night. The supplies of war in seemingly unlimited quantity.

Long lines of American men—sturdy, erect, bronzed warriors. Men who are capable, competent, and brave. Experienced technicians. Agile mechanics. Trained gunners. Men who are smart, courteous, and strong. Men who march forward with a grave determination and a solid confidence.

It is an impressive demonstration of the strength of America—of our manpower, of our resources, of our productive skills, of our genius for organization. It is the roll call of America's diversity, her vastness and her capacity.

OUR MIGHT RECOGNIZED

As the great parade rolls by, the world marvels. The French see and realize the might of America. Our performance to them is incredible, astounding. They know we are the world's mightiest Nation.

And the German prisoners of war in Normandy. They, too, see all of this and are amazed. They fondle the gigantic bulldozers, new machines to them. Knowing and understanding good machinery, they are dazed by the volume of our equipment, by its quality, by its delivery.

"We didn't know," they tell our guards, "that you could do this. We thought your country was inefficient, that you were idlers, that you were weaklings. But now we see this. It surprises us. This machinery is as good as ours. Some of it is better."

So these Germans, too, recognize the might of America.

The story is the same in Russia, where great shipments of American tanks, American trucks, and American airplanes have played a prominent part in turning the tide of the war. The Russians also know. And in the Pacific Southwest, the Orient now senses the overwhelming strength of American production, the power of American men and American mechanical genius. They, too, know.

And in London. A highly placed businessman said this to me: "For generations we of England have gone forward on the basis that quality goods could not be made on a mass-production basis. You Americans have demonstrated that they can. You are doing it."

So the British, too, realize the might of America.

This picture of American might is not presented in a spirit of braggadocio. It is not boasting. It is a statement of fact—a vital fact, a fact the world comprehends in reality better than Americans do.

TOMORROW'S WAR

Now to something else: The flying bombs and the rockets which were descending on London while I was there—these mechanical robots that flash out of the night and out of the murky daylight skies to rain death and destruction.

The story is now being told piecemeal in official statements. But, be certain, these are not just harmless toys, not just nuisances—I saw what they have done. And it is easy to understand their awful possibilities in future warfare.

The flying bombs and the rockets are to this war what the airplane was to the First World War. It was in its infancy then. Now it is a dominating weapon.

These robot devices are in their early stages today. One can only imagine what Germany could have done with them if she had had them available at the time of Dunkerque. They are a frightful new weapon—a preview of the ghastly thing that another war might and could be.

They are death from the skies in a new and a horrifying form—sudden death; death without warning; devilish mechanical instruments of destruction.

It is easy to visualize the day when it will be possible for a man somewhere to press a button and annihilate cities.

AMERICA MUST LEAD

But that day must not come.

Then, who is to stop it?

Well, who? Not Norway. She has the will but not the way. Not Japan. She doesn't have the way and perhaps not the will.

In truth, it is difficult for any one nation to do it.

But the circumstances suggest an appealing cry—and a need—for the right kind of leadership.

That leadership must come from a nation with the might which the world respects and the righteous principles that are so essential to a just exercise of its power.

As the facts demonstrate and as the world knows, the United States is the mightiest nation. With this might comes a responsibility—a responsibility so grave and so vital that we cannot ignore it.

We are strong but we also must be great, and greatness today imposes a demand upon us to which we must respond.

Another war—the kind of a war that the flying bombs, the rockets, and similar devices will make possible—must not take place if life as we know it on this earth is to survive. Both the forces of self-preservation and the inspiration of noble principle outline the role which we must assume.

We are otherwise qualified to take the leadership. We are an abundant nation and, in consequence, not seeking spoils. We are, too, a nation of people of varied ancestral backgrounds. We of America represent a cross-section of the world—a mixture of the bloods of many peoples.

Thus we are better qualified to understand, better able to promote the spirit of true internationalism. Our blood is the blood of Greece, of Germany, of Belgium, of France, of Spain, of England, of Eire, of Norway, of Poland, of Russia, of Italy, of Africa, of South America, and of the Orient.

THE AMERICAN PROGRAM

So this is our rendezvous with destiny. It is the time for an American creed and an American program of world-wide influence.

It is obvious now that we will become involved in future wars—if there are wars. So it becomes our duty to ourselves and the rest of the world to exert our influence in shaping the forces that may prevent war.

Great Britain looks toward us hopefully. She knows even better than we do what the war of tomorrow can be. She will be an eager and a helpful ally. Other nations, too, will welcome our leadership.

This, then, must be our program—the extension of a firm, directing hand to a troubled and a confused world, pointing the way out, showing the road to permanent peace.

We must persuade. But if persuasion does not suffice, our might must be utilized. This must be made clear to those who might trifle in the years to come with destructive weapons.

Another war cannot be.

ADDRESS BY SENATOR WAGNER ON PRINCIPLES MOTIVATING HIS PUBLIC ACTIVITIES

[Mr. HATCH asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio address delivered by Senator WAGNER in New York City, on Monday, November 6, 1944, which appears in the Appendix.]

REGULATION OF THE INSURANCE BUSINESS

[Mr. HATCH asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the report of the Subcommittee on Federal Legislation to the Executive Committee of the National Association of Insurance Commissioners; the joint statement of Newell R. Johnson, president; Edward L. Scheufler, chairman of the executive committee; and Charles F. J. Harrington, chairman of the Subcommittee on Federal Legislation of the National Association of Insurance Commissioners; the text of the proposed legislation recommended by the National Association of Insurance Commissioners; and a memorandum of explanation of the text of proposed legislation, which appear in the Appendix.]

ARMISTICE DAY ADDRESS BY HON. JAMES F. BYRNES

[Mr. MAYBANK asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an Armistice Day address delivered by Hon. James F. Byrnes, Director of War Mobilization and Reconversion, at an Armistice Day ceremony in Columbia, S. C., on November 11, 1944, which appears in the Appendix.]

NEBRASKA CAMPAIGN RÉSUMÉ—ADDRESS BY HAROLD DAVID WILSON

[Mr. CAPPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "Nebraska Campaign Résumé" delivered by Mr. Harold David Wilson, State executive director of the Allied Dry Forces of Nebraska, at Grand Island, Nebr., on November 9, 1944, which appears in the Appendix.]

PLAN OF ENGINEERS FOR MISSOURI FLOOD CONTROL—ADDRESS BY LT. COL. DELBERT B. FREEMAN

[Mr. BUTLER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address on the subject of flood control and other purposes for the Missouri River, delivered by Lt. Col. Delbert B. Freeman, district engineer, Omaha, Nebr., before the Downtown Kiwanis Club, Omaha, Nebr., on June 23, 1944, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE TREND TOWARD CENTRALIZATION OF GOVERNMENT—EDITORIAL FROM SATURDAY EVENING POST

[Mr. DAVIS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Washington Can't Cure Everything," published in the Saturday Evening Post of November 18, 1944, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE MOTION PICTURE WILSON—LETTER FROM MAURICE F. LYONS

[Mrs. CARAWAY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter from Hon. Maurice F. Lyons, of Cincinnati, Ohio, regarding the motion picture Wilson, which appears in the Appendix.]

INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATION FOR SECURITY AND PEACE

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, I think it is of service to the great cause which is preeminent in the minds of the people of America, namely, the establishment at the earliest practicable date of a general international organization for security and peace, that the Congress should know, and have in its record, the steps in the development of public opinion. I know of no better evidence of progress in public opinion than resolutions adopted by such a great organization as the bar association of a State. I have such evidence of the development and growth in the State of Vermont of an opinion which does not merely follow an idea, does not merely commit itself to an idea, but advocates an idea, and takes a position of leadership for the establishment at the earliest practicable date of such a security organization as will give the highest degree of assurance that our children's children will not be called upon to fight another war, and that we may establish such conditions that peace will be attained, gradually perhaps, but attained, so that it will prevail throughout the world.

Therefore, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point resolutions adopted by the Vermont Bar Association at their annual meeting on October 3, 1944, covering this point.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the resolutions were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas at its annual meeting on October 3, 1944, the Vermont Bar Association had the great honor and privilege of being addressed by Judge Manley O. Hudson and Senator WARREN R. AUSTIN upon the matter of international law and relations and the international organization of nations for a permanent peace; and

Whereas we believe that unless war can be prevented in the future, the continued existence of our civilization with its guaranties of life, liberty, justice, and security will be destroyed by the forces of total war; and

Whereas representatives of the Allied Nations in the Dumbarton Oaks Conference have already considered and approved preliminary plans for an international organization to preserve the peace: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Vermont Bar Association approves some such an international organization as already proposed and forecast by Judge Hudson and Senator AUSTIN and hopes that the Government of this country will cooperate with other nations fully to repel aggression by any nation against another and to preserve the peace of the world; and be it further

Resolved, That our representatives in Congress be informed of these resolutions by our secretary sending them a copy thereof.

VERMONT BAR ASSOCIATION,
H. J. CONANT,
Secretary.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AUSTIN. I have two other requests to make on the same subject, and if I may be permitted to conclude, it will keep the matters unified.

Another evidence of the same spirit of leadership and thought is shown, I think, by recent action of the Vermont State Library. The Vermont State Library has transmitted a circular letter to every public library in the State, accompanied by a copy of the proposals of the Dumbarton Oaks Conference, and advocating study by those libraries of the proposals, with the view to helping in the development of public opinion in favor of the early establishment of such an organization as that proposed.

I therefore request that there be inserted in the RECORD at this point the letter of the Vermont State librarian accompanying this transmission.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

VERMONT STATE LIBRARY,
Montpelier, November 15, 1944.

DEAR LIBRARIAN: Through the courtesy of the Woodrow Wilson Foundation I send you herewith a copy of the report of the Dumbarton Oaks Conference, which certainly is a history-making step toward international cooperation for peace. We are all deeply concerned whether the enormous sacrifices of this war will be in vain or will abolish war from the earth. While we all hope that a lasting peace will follow victory, our hope can be and will be realized only if we believe in it and work to secure it.

As our Senator AUSTIN has said:

"The hope of the world for prolonged peace is grounded on the peace forces other than armed interposition. Their effectiveness must spring from the conscience and sustained active interest of the people. * * * The importance of public opinion in this situation cannot be overemphasized."

Sincerely yours,

H. J. CONANT,
State Librarian.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, it is my purpose, if permitted by the Senate, to have printed at each meeting of the Senate, until they are all printed, copies of articles which I have written during the recent recess, and some of the addresses I have made, upon the subject of the establishment at the earliest practicable date of a strong security organization.

There are several reasons why I intend to take this course. One reason is that I want the record of the Republican Party kept straight. Of course, the primary reason is that I want the cause supported, and I am particularly anxious that the Republican Party in the United States Senate should take a strong, constructive position on this subject, not merely a position of following, but that it should help in the development of the further foreign policy or international policy of this Government, notwithstanding that it is the minority party.

I have no idea of advocating that as a minority we waive or give up or neglect our duty to criticize. That, I can give assurance, we will do; but I think these times offer a challenge to the minority party to do something more than that, for they are in a situation where they can advocate and try to forward objectives which the administration, because of its relation to its vis-à-vis, various countries of the world, cannot very well do. We have a great responsibility here as a minority party in the formulation of our international policy, and in the leadership of thought of the American people, as Americans, not as Republicans or as Democrats. Moreover, I think the time has come when the rest of the world will have due regard for the opinion of the minority in the Congress of the United States.

Therefore, Mr. President, I shall start this morning by asking leave to print in the RECORD an article which was published in Foreign Policy Reports of October 1, entitled "United We Stand."

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED WE STAND

(By Senator WARREN ROBINSON AUSTIN, member, Senate Committees on Foreign Relations and Military Affairs; member, special committee of Republican Post-war Advisory Council, which drafted Mackinac Declaration; chairman, subcommittee of committee on resolutions of Republican National Convention of 1944, which drafted foreign-policy plank of Republican Party platform)

This article is intended to express a Republican's views on our international policy. It is not offered as a blueprint. It undertakes only to sketch informally possibilities of achievement in the vital and commanding purposes of the military, political, social, and religious efforts of the American people to "lay the bases of just and enduring world peace securing order under law to all nations," as stated by the United Nations.

Two obvious demands of the hour are to speed the complete winning of the war, and to establish, at the earliest practicable date, an organization having all the powers required to prevent or repel military aggression.

Americans, irrespective of their political affiliations, are united in the determination to meet these demands. The broad area of accord on this first step toward peaceful living is manifested by the platforms of both great political parties, and the numerous projects presented by organizations such as chambers of commerce, trade-unions, farm groups, bar associations, churches, and other religious and educational institutions.

THE REPUBLICAN RECORD

The Republican Party officially recorded the progress of its service in developing public opinion by the following actions:

On April 20, 1942, at Chicago, the Republican National Committee adopted policies for relentless prosecution of the war, unconditional surrender, no appeasement or compromise, and commitment of the United States to responsible cooperation among the nations of the world to preserve liberty and good order. Thereby the committee answered the question whether the Republican Party had rejected isolationism and favored cooperative action.

A year and a half later, at Mackinac, it answered the question how the United States ought to cooperate by taking its stand for responsible participation in a post-war cooperative organization.

Finally, at the national convention of the Republican Party in June 1944, it embodied cooperative forces in the policy of the party in the following language:

"We favor responsible participation by the United States in post-war cooperative organization among sovereign nations to prevent military aggression and to attain permanent peace with organized justice in a free world.

"Such organization should develop effective cooperative means to direct peace forces to prevent or repel military aggression. Pending this, we pledge continuing collaboration with the United Nations to assure these ultimate objectives.

"We believe, however, that peace and security do not depend upon the sanctions of force alone, but should prevail by virtue of reciprocal interests and spiritual values recognized in these security agreements."

This section of the plank on war and peace deals with the first step first.

SCOPE OF "PEACE FORCES"

"Peace forces" includes whatever force—whether diplomatic, moral, economic, or military—is necessary to keep the peace whatever emergency may arise. Designation of military forces alone would have excluded other means for preventing war. If the specific problem which threatens the peace could be readily solved through the time-honored channels of diplomacy, that method would be used. If the moral power of international tribunals administering justice should be required, it would be used. If commercial sanctions, embargoes, or exchange blockades should be needed, they would be used. But if the threat involved military action, then military force would be used.

The phrase "peace forces" is analogous to the phrase "peace officers," as embracing, in national life, all conservators of the public peace. It came to us, with the common law, from England. Where the common law prevails in this country, the special powers entrusted to peace officers as conservators of the peace have been extended by decisions of courts, by statute, and by municipal ordinance, to police officers and constables, to de facto officers as well as de jure officers. These special powers relate specifically to conservation of the peace. They look to prevention of commission of a felony, as well as to the stopping of a felony already begun. The special authority which exists under the common law, to arrest without warrant persons believed to have committed a felony, persons in the act of committing a felony, persons about to commit a felony, has been extended to authority to make arrests without warrants in case of a misdemeanor involving a breach of the peace committed in the presence of the officer making the arrest.

The League of Nations marked progress in world education for pacific settlement of controversies. It was in line with American leadership from 1887, when Secretary of State Blaine called together the Pan American Union, to 1917, when William Howard Taft promoted a league to enforce peace. The failure of the Senate to consent to the United States joining the League of Nations was not repudiation of internationalism for security. That failure impaired what little prestige the League enjoyed, but to it cannot be attributed the League's lack of power to prevent Japan's seizure of Manchuria, or Italy's conquest of Ethiopia or Germany's assault on the world.

DEFECTS OF LEAGUE OF NATIONS

The infirmities of the League which made it ineffectual—namely its lack of authoritative membership, its diplomatic method for settling disputes, its lack of effective power, its lack of capacity to direct peace forces to prevent military aggression—all prove the need for an organization invested with the authority necessary to conserve peace. The principal claim to progress in international cooperation results from the practice of continuity and constant availability of the facilities of the League for conference, conciliation, and adjudication. On the other hand, the futility of the League was caused by the limitation of its authority under article X to "advise," and under article XVI to "recommend." Articles X and XVI are the provisions for coercion: but they do not coerce. It is now intended to overcome this weakness by the use of cooperative means to "direct."

Another striking defect in the League's sanctions is that, regardless of the relative capacities of League members to prevent or repel aggression, the covenant provides that both economic and military coercion be exercised by members, rather than by the League acting through agencies of its own. Note the difference in the language between articles X and XVI of the League and the Republican plank:

"Article X. In case of any such aggression or in case of any threat or danger of such aggression the Council shall advise upon the means by which this obligation shall be fulfilled [preservation of territorial integrity and political independence]."

"Article XVI. 2. It shall be the duty of the Council in such a case to recommend to the several governments concerned what effective military, naval, or air force the members of the League shall severally contribute to the armed forces to be used to protect the covenants of the League."

By contrast, the Republican platform states: "Such organization should develop effective cooperative means to direct peace forces to prevent or repel military aggression." The phrase "to direct" marks a change from futility to potential effectiveness.

NEED FOR EFFECTIVE WORLD ORGANIZATION

The brutalities of this war will have unified the world on the question of guaranties and coercion, making obsolete the provisions of the League for advice and recommendation. We have seen that the cost of war for civilian noncombatants, and for victor and vanquished alike, is so high that it cannot be recompensed by any benefits to be attained by war.

Horrible mass murders, poignantly instanced in the town of Lidice, must sweep away resistance to cooperative means for protection. The bestiality of blindly shooting robot bombs to fall indiscriminately on nonmilitary objectives so shocks the moral sense that it unites all people on the doctrine of external guaranties and coercion. It has been seen that trouble anywhere in the world concerns all nations. We are at last, I believe, united in the willingness to pay the costs of peace.

International coercive sanctions must have the consent of the governed to the same extent as peace officers in national life must have voluntary cooperation. In fact, we abjure the theory of enforced submission alone in all our theories of free government. As free people, we depend on voluntary cooperation as the real basis of social behavior. In both national and international life this voluntary cooperation is willingly effected through organized formal means of government.

The Republican platform also provides against any hiatus or time-lag in directing peace forces to prevent or repel military aggression. It recognizes the immediate and continuous need for this service. If the general international organization referred to should not be established before the cessation of hostilities, there should be no interruption under the policy of the Republican Party, which states: "Pending this, we pledge continuing collaboration with the United Nations to assure these ultimate objectives."

The policy of the Republican Party that the United States shall remain a strong collaborator in the attainment of these objectives is found in the Mackinac declaration providing for permanent maintenance of trained and well-equipped armed forces at home. This declaration should be considered in connection with other declared policies to disarm and disband the armed forces of the Axis and to disqualify the Axis from constructing facilities for the manufacture of the implements of war.

There is no nation in the world so great and powerful that it can afford isolation. The United States needs the organization for security and peace as much as that organization needs the United States. That this principle is applicable to all nations is exemplified by the world scope of the present war, and by its costs in life and welfare.

The Four-Power Moscow Declaration proclaimed a new principle; that is, cooperation in international policy. It was a positive change from the former attitude of each

of the parties, namely unilateral nationalism.

In the establishment of a general international organization based on the principle of the sovereign equality of all peace-loving states, and open to membership by all such states, large and small, for the maintenance of peace and security, there is no idea of preferring peace to justice, or of seeking peace through supine surrender to injustice. We do not propose to suppress American freedom. We do not propose to ignore the legitimate self-interest of Americans.

Our use of external sovereignty for the preservation of our own peace, as well as the peace of the world, requires no change in our relative independence, or in the relative independence of any of the members of the family of nations. All would be yielding the same degree of nationalism for the common peace and security.

If a yardstick could be defined, it might be in such terms as the following: The principle of cooperation among the nations should be such as requires the least degree of limitation of nationalism consistent with adequate assurance of security for the whole. In any event, however, the course taken should always be one by which peace may be most effectively guaranteed.

We are firmly persuaded that vigorous efforts on the home front to establish the international organization for security and peace is a factor of morale for our fighting men and women. They are doing a magnificent job in carrying on the war. They look to us to do the complementary job of insuring the permanency of that for which they have sacrificed so much. They have made this clear. They know that, should we fail to establish this security, we will be failing to secure to their posterity freedom and opportunity.

They realize, too, that, should we fail to maintain a healthy economy in this country, we would fail to establish conditions of security and peace. As a war effort supporting the morale of our men, therefore, our foreign policy is grounded upon a domestic policy of special planning for conversion from war to peace.

POSITION OF REPUBLICAN PARTY

The Republican Party is determined that the free institutions of our Republic shall be fostered and strengthened, and that the economy of our capitalistic system shall be adapted to the progressive demands of humanity. We are determined that the returning members of our armed forces shall have jobs, and that they shall have opportunities and incentive for launching their own enterprises. It is our purpose to create that atmosphere of confidence in which the citizen who has been in the service may dare to be as enterprising in peace as he was daring in war.

The plank on war and peace proclaims a liberal policy toward world-wide economic stability. The Republican convention grounds its judgment that the essential interests and resources of the United States must at all times be protected upon the conviction that foreign policy and domestic policy are closely related to each other. Security and peace should be promoted by commitments which do not run counter to the essential interests of any individual party to the basic treaty. Commitments that exploit or impoverish any party to the treaty would sow dragon's teeth. Therefore, we have declared: "We shall seek, in our relations with other nations, conditions calculated to promote world-wide economic stability not only for the sake of the world, but also to the end that our own people may enjoy a high level of employment in an increasingly prosperous world."

A tenet of the Republican plank on international policy is found in the provision: "It should promote a world opinion to influence the nations to right conduct, develop international law, and maintain an international tribunal to deal with justiciable disputes." The importance of this policy consists in the effort to have the international organization charged with responsibilities that are "curative and creative and not merely repressive." [1]

Another important policy in the plank on international relations is as follows: "The treaties of peace should be just; the nations which are the victims of aggression should be restored to sovereignty and self-government; and the organized cooperation of the nations should concern itself with basic causes of world disorder."

This is a program in broad terms for carrying out the principles of the Atlantic Charter. Moreover, with an international organization established before hostilities have ended, the machinery for determining legal controversies, boundary disputes, political questions, and other issues requiring calm, independent, and just appraisal for conciliation or adjudication would be ready to function. It would deal rationally, and on the merits, with issues as they stood at the outset of the war. When new controversies arose, many of the basic causes of world disorder would have been eliminated through adequate facilities in which all peace-loving nations would have cooperated.

MAIN PRINCIPLES OF BASIC TREATY

If security should be provided for, in the form of a general international organization already agreed upon through constitutional processes, the cause for seeking to set up buffer states or zones of influence would be eliminated. The solid rock upon which this fortress of security shall be erected must be a basic treaty. The Republican platform did not overemphasize this. Not only is a basic treaty important to constitutionalism, which ordains free government, but it affords an opportunity, while common danger unites nations, to come to an agreement on the fundamental principles necessary for peace.

Some of the principles which each state ought to bind itself to undertake in such a treaty are as follows:

"To employ pacific means exclusively to settle its disputes with other states and, in default of such settlement, to abide by the decision of a competent agency of the organization;

"To authorize the use of military force by a state to oppose military aggression upon itself by another state, or by any member of the organization, upon specific approval or direction by the competent agency of the organization;

"To prohibit the use of armed force by any state against another in conflict with the provisions of the basic treaty; and

"To subject other use of military force to direction of the international organization for the purpose of security.

"The cooperative organization should be authorized to advise the reconsideration of treaties by members of the organization, and to otherwise continuously promote peaceful changes in the relations of the peoples of the world."

ORGANS OF WORLD ORGANIZATION

Since the principal aim of our present effort is to win the war by establishing conditions in which peace can be attained and maintained, it is important that the organization should have, as one of its organs, an assembly whose characteristics, jurisdiction, rules of conduct, and authority should be defined in the basic treaty.

Such an assembly should be competent to maintain continuous collaboration among the nations in developing conditions essential to security and peace, and in arranging for reciprocal economic and other specialized activities. It should be authorized to act in matters of concern to the international organization which are not allocated to other organs by the basic treaty.

Within the assembly there should be established and maintained a perpetual committee which shall meet at frequent stated times, whose secretariat shall be in constant touch with conditions throughout the world in order that it may have prompt information of controversy. Promptness in bringing the issues up for amicable consideration under the guidance of the organization would promote voluntary cooperation of the interested nations. The world organization should also have an executive council, with primary jurisdiction and competence over the subject of security and peace.

RIGHTS AND DUTIES OF MEMBER STATES

The relative rights, duties, and services of members of the organization can be safeguarded by provisions of the basic treaty establishing the organization. Suppose, for example, that the basic treaty obligates each state to promptly mobilize such peace forces to prevent or repel military aggression as may be directed by the competent organ of the world organization. The specific application of such an order or direction could be subject to a right to veto in the executive council, which would have jurisdiction to pass on such questions as the conditions that threaten a breach of the peace, the sanctions that are applicable and necessary, and the particular peace forces that shall be directed against the disturbance. Decisions on such questions could be held by the basic law to special majorities. Assuming a council of four permanent members and four nonpermanent members, the basic treaty could limit decision to a majority consisting of all four of the permanent members, and one of the nonpermanent members. Under such circumstances, obviously the decision of such a council could be vetoed by any one of the permanent members, or by all four of the nonpermanent members.

If any member of the Council should be a party to the controversy, the basic treaty should disqualify it from voting. These safeguards would carry out the cooperative principle, preventing the great powers from dominating the lesser ones and requiring a high degree of voluntary action. However, once a decision has been reached, and direction given, the effect would be legally final.

In the basic treaty, each nation should obligate itself to authorize its delegate to the Executive Council to participate in mobilizing appropriate military forces, allocated for organization use. His commission should be limited, however, to such degree that he may not, for his country, declare war.

The element of promptness in application of sanctions is the primary reason for vesting this authority in an organization animated by the cooperative principle of the United Nations. After the defeat of the militarists of Germany and Japan, a standard of international conduct commanding respect must be established. The dreadful brutality of robot bombing of innocent civilians points to the grave ethical problems before us. Security cannot be maintained by mechanisms of government alone. Peace cannot be attained by negotiation alone. The most perfectly devised treaties are not self-executory. We need to stress the value and integrity of the individual by a clear, simple, enlightened understanding of his rights and duties in the great family of mankind. Moral

[1] See A Just and Durable Peace—statement of political propositions which underlie a just and durable peace and which the United States ought now to accept for itself and begin forthwith to realize in cooperation with others, formulated by the Commission to Study the Bases of a Just and Durable Peace instituted by the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America.

forces that redeem individuals and nations must animate the law. Reason, justice, the divine law within, must be the spirit of the fundamental rules of conduct among nations.

In the present state of civilization, however, it is impracticable to depend upon self-discipline alone. There must be laws to live by. Such laws must be administered. Therefore, courts are necessary. They must be sanctuaries in which security is certain. Submission of international disputes to their jurisdiction should be obligatory. The prestige of the American Bar Association gives persuasive effect to its statement of that principle: "If injustice and violence are to be supplanted by a reign of law in international society, the members of the family of nations must provide orderly processes whereby any suitor or claimant, right or wrong, may have his day in court before an impartial judicial body."

The Permanent Court for International Justice could be adapted to the new theory of compulsory jurisdiction, and other needed changes could be made from time to time by amendment of the statute of the World Court. If the moral power of such a court should not be adequate to maintain order, then the cooperative means to direct military forces, to prevent or repel military aggression, should be exercised promptly.

The United Nations, and such other states as may associate with them for the purpose, could launch the organization, having in view its development and expansion, and the need for creating or continuing special agencies to facilitate international cooperation in trade, finance, transportation, communications, food and agriculture, public health and nutrition, narcotics, population and migration, cultural and scientific interchange.

There have developed regional organizations, international practices, and in some areas formal policies, such as the good-neighbor policy. Such regional organizations and others that may be created, and such policies, should be conformed and adapted to the purposes, character, and authority of the general international organization. The basic treaty should provide for either integration or cooperation of such regional organiztaions as exist, or may thereafter be created. It should keep the door open to initiative and endeavor to improve the structure and service of regional organizations. The Republican platform declares: "We shall develop pan-American solidarity."

Any general international organization for security and peace will depend upon a sustained willingness of peoples to work and sacrifice to make it effective. The Republican post-war advisory council, in its Mackinac declaration, recognized this principle in the following language: "The council invites all Americans to adhere to the principles here set forth to the end that our place among the nations of the world and our part in helping to bring about international peace and justice shall not be the subject of domestic partisan controversy and political bitterness."

The potentialities for harmony among Americans is indicated by the great area of agreement already existing among Democrats and Republicans on the foregoing principles. The conflict between the assertion of national power and the desire for international peace is near decision. If we insist upon the unrestricted power of individual nations and refuse to cooperate, the desire for common peace must be surrendered. Both cannot prevail.

The politics proclaimed in the Republican platform represent a major advance of the home front toward the kind of victory for which we fight. In determining Republican policy we have turned from "advice" and "recommendation" to "direction." We have made the performance of sanctions a function of the world organization instead of leaving it to member states. We have substituted, for unilateral nationalism, cooperation among nations. We have declared that we are willing to pay the price of peace.

The establishment of an international organization competent to prevent or repel military aggression through the application of such policies represents a positive advance in international policy.

We have made possible the first objective—security. After we have attained security, all nations can climb to higher planes of political, economic, social, and spiritual achievement.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Vermont yield?

Mr. AUSTIN. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. I wish to say to the eminent Senator from Vermont that I am highly gratified by the remarks which he has uttered and by his request for printing in the RECORD these various illuminative and instructive articles.

I wish to take this occasion further to say that the attitude of Governor Dewey in the recent campaign attracted my admiration, when he took such a forward-looking and liberal attitude with relation to the establishment of an international organization in behalf of peace.

I wish to say further that the declarations of the Republican platform adopted at the Chicago convention, while probably not so clear-cut and far-reaching as I personally would have preferred them to be, were pointed, however, in the right direction, and I have taken the expressions of Governor Dewey and the expressions of the platform as a pledge of the party of the eminent Senator from Vermont to further and to advance and to aid in the establishment at the earliest practicable date of an international organization in behalf of peace, and to prevent aggression.

While Governor Dewey in his speeches probably did not go so far as the Senator from Texas would have liked him to go, still I take his statements as evidence of the fact that he was approaching this problem with sympathy and with a desire to further the ends of international peace.

Mr. President, I congratulate the distinguished Senator from Vermont upon his labors in this behalf. I am very happy that he is a member of the Committee on Foreign Relations. I wish to say that before he became a member of that committee he aided us very materially in conferences had with the Secretary of State over a period of probably more than 2 years.

I also wish to congratulate the eminent Senator from Maine [Mr. WHITE], the minority leader, who has at all times been most helpful, and with his great ability has contributed materially to the cause for which I hope we can all stand united in the great enterprise on which we have embarked—a cause which is not ours alone, which is not one for our own selfish aggrandizement, but which is a universal cause, for the peace of the entire world and for the protection of innocent and law-abiding nations all over the globe.

I thank the Senator from Vermont for permitting this interruption.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator from Vermont yield?

Mr. AUSTIN. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. The statement made by the Senator from Texas concerning the respective party platforms reminds me that I saw somewhere a document which contained an analysis by the Senator from Vermont of the Republican platform declaration on foreign relations, and also contained a similar analysis by the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] of the Democratic platform declaration. Does the Senator from Vermont intend to place that document in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD?

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, I intend to do so on Monday next.

CONFIRMATION OF NOMINATION OF JAMES F. BYRNES TO BE DIRECTOR OF WAR MOBILIZATION AND RECONVERSION

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I am advised that the President has this morning transmitted to the Senate the nomination of the Honorable James F. Byrnes to be Director of War Mobilization and Reconversion, under an act passed by the Congress just before the adjournment taken prior to the election, which act was approved by the President during the adjournment of Congress. Inasmuch as the bill which was the foundation of the act came out of the Finance Committee of the Senate, the nomination of Mr. Justice Byrnes would probably be referred to the Finance Committee of the Senate. Inasmuch as Mr. Justice Byrnes, as we now know him, is well known to the Senate, having served with distinction in this body for a number of years, as well as having served in the House of Representatives with equal distinction for a period, and inasmuch as he was appointed to the Supreme Court of the United States and his nomination at that time was considered by the Senate, I have conferred with members of the Senate Finance Committee on both sides, the majority and the minority, and I am now, as in executive session, submitting the unanimous request of the committee that the nomination be presently considered.

Mr. President, I do not think it appropriate to offer a eulogy upon Mr. Justice Byrnes at this time. He is unusually well equipped for this particular work, because of his intimate and accurate knowledge of the Government itself and the machinery of government, and because of his great familiarity with the problems with which he must deal as Director of War Mobilization and Reconversion.

I therefore ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to consider the nomination at this time without having the nomination referred to the Committee on Finance.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Georgia?

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I express the hope that the request made by the senior Senator from Georgia may be concurred in and that the nomination will be confirmed by the Senate.

Those of us who have served in the other body of Congress with Mr. Justice Byrnes, and who have served with him in the Senate, have a keen appreciation of his outstanding abilities, of his amazing industry, of his high personal character and his high ideals of public service. I think no happier appointment could have been made than that which is presented to us at this time. To repeat, I hope the request of the Senator from Georgia will be approved by the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The nomination will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of James F. Byrnes to be Director of War Mobilization and Reconversion.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection, as in executive session, to the present consideration of the nomination? The Chair hears none. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. BARKLEY subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent, as in executive session, that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of the nomination of Mr. Justice Byrnes, which was acted upon a few moments ago.

While I am on my feet, and before the request is put, I wish to add a word in regard to my own appreciation—and I am sure the appreciation of the Senate and of the country—of the fact that Mr. Justice Byrnes has consented to serve in this appointment for a period which I suppose is indefinite, but which we are led to believe will be until the defeat of Germany.

We all know of the desire of Mr. Justice Byrnes to retire to private life. It has been expressed publicly as well as privately. In view of that desire, he is to be commended for his willingness to serve his country in the high position to which he has been appointed and for which he is so adequately qualified. I compliment him and the country upon his decision, and I express great personal gratitude that he has decided to accept this assignment for the period for which his services may be required.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Kentucky? The Chair hears none, and the President will be notified forthwith.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, it is my privilege to express the deep appreciation of the people of South Carolina for the unanimous confirmation by my colleagues here today of the nomination of Mr. Justice Byrnes.

We appreciate more than mere words can express the confirmation without reference to a committee, and the many generous statements that have been made with respect to his brilliant accomplishments. For a generation Mr. Byrnes has faithfully served the people of the United States with honor, ability, and integrity.

It is my opinion—and I am sure it is shared by many here—that his willingness to carry on certainly is a step forward to early victory, and the continued successes of our armed forces.

Naturally, of course, it was Mr. Justice Byrnes' desire to return to his home, to his own people, and to private life, but realizing his responsibility to the United States, he has put aside any personal wish or desire he might have had. This, of course, is as it should be, because no one has done more on the home front to help keep the morale of our people at a high level and to protect the country against inflation than has Mr. Justice Byrnes.

His office, with the aid of such outstanding Americans as Judge Vinson, Judge Jones, and Mr. Bowles, as well as the War Production Board, has made possible the successful prosecution of the war on the home front and assisted our armed forces toward victory.

For years Mr. Byrnes served in this body, the greatest deliberative body in the world. He is one of us. He understands our trials and our problems. He will continue to do much to cement the friendship between the Executive and those of us here who are jointly charged with the prosecution of the war and the permanent peace to outlaw aggression and to destroy the military governments of our enemies.

Mr. President, let me again personally express my appreciation to each and every one of my colleagues and say that I hope the able leadership on the home front will continue to be carried on by our distinguished South Carolinian until all our enemies are defeated and until the peace terms recommended by our Commander in Chief, President Roosevelt, and the State Department have become the law of the world.

Mr. President, many editorials will be written in commendation of Mr. Justice Byrnes. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the editorials appearing in the Washington Post and the Washington Evening Star.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Evening Star of November 15, 1944]

MR. BYRNES STAYS ON

The disclosure that James F. Byrnes will remain at his governmental post until Germany has been beaten comes as no great surprise.

His desire to return to private life was well known. Testifying several weeks ago before a congressional committee considering reconversion legislation, Mr. Byrnes said that he would not seek the directorship of the new office of War Mobilization and Reconversion and that, indeed, he would not accept the post if it were offered to him.

His purpose then was to eliminate any possible suspicion that the views he was expressing in his testimony were influenced by personal ambitions, and his change of mind is not inconsistent with that position.

In staying on, Mr. Byrnes is not accepting a post that was "offered" to him. The President's announcement makes it clear that the matter was not put to Mr. Byrnes on that basis. Instead, Mr. Roosevelt made a strong personal appeal to his principal aide to remain at his post for the duration of the war against Germany. In that situation, Mr. Byrnes, as a good American, had no alternative but to remain. Another factor entering into his decision may have been his recent trip to France. He saw the war there at first hand—an experience which is not conducive to the placing of personal desires ahead of duty.

Whatever the reasons, however, the important thing is that Mr. Byrnes has decided to remain. He gave up a place on the Supreme Court to take over a big job in our domestic war effort. He has done that job faithfully and well—so well, in fact, that it may have cost him his party's vice presidential nomination. Yet there is much that remains to be done, and it is good to know that Mr. Byrnes has decided to see it through.

[From the Washington Post of November 16, 1944]

FOR THE DURATION

It is good news that the President has persuaded Mr. Byrnes to remain at his post as Director of War Mobilization and Reconversion. This means continuity in the management of our domestic economy—a continuity of particular importance as the war approaches its final climacteric. It affords assurance that the new Office of War Mobilization and Reconversion, which picks up where the old Office of War Mobilization left off, will be guided, at least in its initial stages, with the same firmness and understanding of economic problems as in the past. Justice Byrnes, through his supervision of the several facets of the stabilization program on the home front, has been one of the great architects of our military effectiveness.

As much as any individual in public office, Justice Byrnes has earned the privilege of retirement. His has been a long record of service, and its culmination in the role of Assistant President has been peculiarly arduous and demanding. In consenting to stay in office until the final elimination of Germany from the war, he has offered an object lesson to all the rest of us. Some months ago when he announced his intention to retire, it was a reasonable expectation that the war would be won before this year's end. Now the winter presents a grimmer prospect and we know that the enemy can be crushed only through unremitting effort. The time has not yet come for relaxation. Every American, civilian as well as serviceman, must stay on the job.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I desire to ask the able senior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] whether he intends to make any statement regarding the legislative program which is in contemplation.

Mr. BARKLEY. It is impossible to make a full and comprehensive statement in regard to all the matters which may come before the Senate during the remainder of this Congress, but I may state that it is the program to take up first the flood-control bill. It is the intention of the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON] to move to have it taken up today; but to have it go over until Monday for discussion, and to follow that with the river and harbor bill, which is also on the calendar.

Of course, we must deal with the extension of the Second War Powers Act, which expires on the 31st of December. Whether we will take up that bill in the Senate first or whether we will await action on the part of the House has not been determined.

There is also another War Powers Act which will expire, namely, the act providing for the purchase of silver by the Government for war purposes. The

measure providing for the extension of that act is now pending before the Committee on Banking and Currency and an effort will be made to obtain action upon simply an extension of it for a further period on account of the war.

There will probably be a deficiency bill coming over from the House a little later. In that bill there probably will be nothing of a controversial nature.

The House is going to take up next week the roads bill which the Senate passed before the recess. That is a measure affecting post-war problems. There is the question of a vote on the proposed constitutional amendment advocated by a large number of persons known as the equal-rights amendment. I stated before the recess that an effort would be made to consider the proposed constitutional amendment at the earliest possible date after we returned from the recess. I have received definite information that the House will not act upon that proposed amendment during the present session. Therefore, the question will naturally arise whether, in view of that fact, it would be a futility for the Senate to act upon it.

So far as I personally am concerned, I expect to keep my word with the advocates of the proposed amendment and with those who wish to obtain a vote on it, even though action by us on it may turn out to be futile. But that is the situation at the moment which surrounds that proposed constitutional amendment, even though I did not anticipate it before the recess.

Of course, there is a matter in the offing in which the distinguished senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] is interested, namely, the question of freezing the present rate of the social security tax. Such legislation would have to originate in the House. As the Senator knows, it could not be added as an amendment in the Senate unless it were added to some revenue-raising bill. It is not likely that there will be such a bill before the Congress during the remainder of this session. The Senator from Michigan is more familiar than I am with the efforts which are being made and which have been made to arrive at some modus vivendi on the subject, so as to eliminate it from any future controversy. Whether it will come to us in any concrete form, I am unable to say. I do not know whether the Senator from Michigan is able to do so.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Kentucky for his statement. My interest was inspired chiefly in respect to knowing what was the plan relative to submitting the equal-rights amendment to the Senate, quite regardless of one's attitude toward the proposed amendment. My attitude will be disclosed when I vote on it, and not before then.

However, regardless of one's attitude, when a large body of the people of the country endorse such a proposed constitutional amendment and when the leaders of both parties have endorsed it, it seems to me that the advocates of such a measure are at least entitled to a yea-and-nay vote in the Senate, without much more delay.

Mr. BARKLEY. I feel the same way about it. Of course, we cannot assume responsibility here for what may happen in another body. I will state, because I always try to be frank with the Senate and with all persons who are interested in a measure of any kind, that I myself am ready to vote on the proposed amendment at any time when it can be brought up, and I hope it can be brought up in the very near future and can be considered by the Senate.

It would not be the first time that one body had passed a measure which the other body had not considered at the session at which it was passed. Frequently we have seen even amendments to the Constitution of the United States passed by the Senate before they were taken up in the House. Therefore, I do not feel myself obligated by the knowledge or information, and so I am not responsible for it. We are responsible only for our own actions in the Senate. It is my hope that at a very early date we can take up in the Senate the matter to which reference has been made and dispose of it.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I thank the Senator for his statement. As the Senator from Kentucky knows, the able Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE] is the sponsor of the amendment, and I should like to see him have an opportunity at some time during the final weeks of his service to present the proposal to the Senate. I repeat that I am withholding my own judgment pending the debates, and I am not advocating this step for any reason of partisan affiliation for or against the movement. I think, in fair play, that the time has come when there are very few excuses left to justify a failure to permit a vote upon the proposal. I am sure the Senator agrees with me.

Mr. BARKLEY. I agree.

PROPOSED EQUAL-RIGHTS AMENDMENT TO THE CONSTITUTION

Mr. GILLETTE subsequently said: Mr. President, there has been on the Senate calendar for some months a joint resolution proposing to amend the Constitution of the United States relative to the so-called equal-rights status of men and women. The resolution was sponsored in the Senate by some 22 or 23 Senators, in addition to myself. Shortly before the recent recess of Congress, in September, as I recall, I had given notice on the floor of the Senate of my intention to call up the measure for consideration by the Senate. After consultation with the leadership on the respective sides of the aisle, it seemed unwise to attempt to obtain consideration of the measure at that time because of the difficulty of obtaining a quorum, inasmuch as so many Members of the Senate were then absent from the city. Consequently, those of us who were interested in the measure thought it best to let its consideration be postponed until after the election. At that time I gave my word that I would move to call it up at the first opportunity. I understand that a short time ago during the session of today the distinguished senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] in a colloquy with the majority leader brought up this question. I have since consulted with both the majority leader and the minority leader. They have always been very cooperative. I wish now to state, for the information of the Senate, that it is my intention again to move to have the joint resolution taken up for consideration by the Senate at the earliest possible moment the legislative program of the Senate will permit. I simply have requested recognition at this time so that the statement I have made may appear in the RECORD for the information of the Senate.

THE CAPITAL STADIUM PROJECT

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, various Members of the Senate have expressed personal views with regard to matters which will come before the Senate for definite consideration within a short while. In view of that fact, I take the liberty of expressing my own personal opinions with regard to a matter which has been given attention in the newspapers during the past 2 weeks, namely, the proposed National Capital stadium.

The Washington newspapers and Capital opinion generally appear to be very enthusiastic about the project. I think the enthusiasm is wholly warranted. The project is an excellent one. The Nation's Capital would find innumerable occasions to put such a stadium to good use.

But I cannot sit here as a representative of the people in these trying times without pointing out that the proposal for the stadium, even as a topic for discussion, is very badly timed. Throughout the country there are shortages of materials. People cannot get the simplest of building materials for the most essential repairs to their homes without certificates of necessity and other priorities. Farmers have great difficulty in obtaining materials to repair homes, barns, storage sheds, and essential farm tools and machines. Industrialists are not yet relieved of the headaches they have suffered because of priorities and scarce materials.

Only this morning the great shipbuilder, Henry Kaiser, remarked upon the critical situation regarding manpower shortages. Many Government agencies have reported similar tendencies of men leaving war jobs for other nonessential occupations.

This is no time for the Nation's Capital to set a bad example by a fanfare of discussion about a stadium when men are still risking their lives against our foreign enemies. No matter how desirable the stadium may be, even the talk of it now is destructive of the Nation's need to concentrate on winning the war.

Even though one of the bills is silent on the question of timing, I realize that the immediate object is not to build the stadium now, but simply to plan for it as a post-war project. By all means, let that be done where the expense and the use of architects and other skilled draftsmen can be spared from the war effort. But in the interests of the people outside Washington, who are concentrating on war production and who will not understand what all the stadium fanfare is about, let us use more restraint here. Let us not convey the impression that we are all steamed up over projects

which bear no relation to the life-and-death struggle we are waging overseas. If men are leaving war industries for less-essential employment, it may well be because they see that the Nation's Capital is setting the same bad example by talking too much about stadiums and not enough about the needs for victory.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ELLENDER in the chair). Morning business is completed.

FLOOD-CONTROL PROJECTS

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, as has been stated by the able majority leader today, it is contemplated that the Senate shall dispose of two bills which are now on the calendar, the first of them being the flood-control bill. After that bill has been disposed of it is my intention to move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the river and harbor bill.

Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 4485, the flood-control bill, with the understanding that there will be no discussion of the bill until next Monday.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (H. R. 4485) authorizing the construction of certain public works on rivers and harbors for flood control, and for other purposes.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is out of order. The motion cannot be debated during the morning hour.

Mr. AIKEN. I wish to speak on the motion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion is not debatable during the morning hour.

Mr. AIKEN. Does the Chair mean that the motion is not debatable?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion would not be debatable until 2 o'clock.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Louisiana.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Commerce, with amendments.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I admit that I do not like that way of doing business. I asked for recognition of the Chair in order that I might put a parliamentary inquiry. I wish to know whether any motion made during the morning hour is debatable.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is not debatable.

Mr. BARKLEY. Under the rule, a motion to take up a bill during the morning hour is not debatable.

Mr. AIKEN. That is what I wished to ask.

Mr. BARKLEY. That is the rule.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair so stated to the Senator. Rule VIII provides, in part, as follows:

All motions made before 2 o'clock to proceed to the consideration of any matter shall be determined without debate.

Mr. AIKEN. I thank the Chair.

WORK OF SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE THE NATIONAL DEFENSE PROGRAM

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, the Special Committee to Investigate the National Defense Program, of which I am chairman, has continued its activities without any slackening during the Senate recess.

Our work is divided about equally between the continuing problems of war production and the new problems having to do with the cessation of war production and the disposition of matériel which is no longer needed. These problems are indivisible. They are also intimately connected with the forthcoming reconversion of our economy to a peacetime basis.

Our committee has done considerable work on post-war reconversion. As early as November of 1943, we reported on the subject to the Senate. Since then, in our third annual report, we devoted considerable attention to problems relating to reconversion. It is not possible to talk about this change-over to civilian economy as though it were a single subject any more than it is possible to talk about war production as a single subject.

Perhaps as early as 1939 or 1940 before the problems of war production were broken down into a number of specific fields, it would have been possible to conduct an intelligible study called war production. Similarly, up to about this time, it has been possible to study post-war reconversion as a single problem, mainly because, up to this time, the prime objective has been to define the scope and nature of the problem.

Today we know the questions we must solve. Each of them covers enough ground so that each one of these problems is worthy of exhaustive study and comprehensive treatment on its own account, just as war production was broken down into many subjects such as plant construction, procurement of strategic materials, manpower, and so on.

This can best be illustrated by stating just what our committee is doing. We are studying the operations of the surplus property disposal agencies and their functioning under the statutes of the Congress. This problem has its roots in the past, its solution in the present, and it will most vitally affect the future. For that reason, our committee intends to divide its study of the subject into three major categories. We are first studying the manner in which surpluses are accumulated. This includes a survey of the procurement policies of the executive agencies. It includes an understanding of the inventory system, the depot system, and, to a considerable extent, that phase of logistics which applies to the procurement and distribution of matériel in sufficient quantity to supply the armed forces wherever they may be and whatever might be their needs.

The second phase of the surplus-property study will include the disposition of surplus products. This subject has already been studied very fully by the Congress in connection with its legislative function. Our committee has no intention of duplicating such work, but for many months we have been studying the actual operation of the surplus-disposal agencies. We have exposed and stopped many improper conditions, the most notorious of which were the operations of the racketeer, Waxey Gordon, and his confederates, who set up a surplus-property syndicate on a shoestring and operated through their connections and friends in Government jobs. These operators obtained property which legitimate, well-established firms were unable to buy.

The committee is continuing this work and from time to time will find it necessary to expose the operations of others.

The final phase of the committee's surplus property study will involve the disposition of capital equipment and plants. This, with the disposition of most of the other surplus goods, will have a very important effect on our post-war economy.

The committee is also continuing to study the manpower problem. It is almost 2 years since we last reported to the Senate on this subject. Once again we are in the middle of a critical situation. Some war industries are suffering from a lack of manpower, so much so that in certain war plants manpower is a No. 1 problem. In other places unemployment is already beginning to prove a serious difficulty.

Paradoxically these two situations can arise side by side in the same area. The shutting down of one large war plant may release several thousand people. These people may not have the skills needed by other war plants which are being hampered because of lack of manpower. An effort to set these people up in new civilian production invariably has a bad psychological effect on those remaining in the war plants. The war plant workers, seeing others getting what look like permanent peacetime jobs, become restless and want to leave their work.

Those problems must be solved. I know that Mr. McNutt, Chairman of the War Manpower Commission, and Mr. Krug, Chairman of the War Production Board, and others are working on them. We are planning to call hearings with them shortly.

Our own committee has sent into the field investigators who are making studies of manpower problems in selected areas. They are going into places where unemployment has already appeared.

The committee is designating a subcommittee to study this subject and we hope to report on it in the near future.

We are also continuing our function as watchdogs for the Senate. We are continually on the lookout for defects in production, for inefficiency, and for waste. Our investigators are working on dozens of such problems. In order that each Member of this body may be fully acquainted with our program, I have ordered our chief counsel to write to each of them and tell them just what the staff has been doing so that the entire Senate may have this information for its use.

DEVELOPMENT OF THE ST. LAWRENCE RIVER

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, when I rose a few minutes ago, out of order, it was not for the purpose of delaying consideration of the flood-control bill, and I appreciate that the Chair was within his rights in ruling me out of order. I desire, however, to make a few remarks concerning a subject which is closely related to the flood-control and river and harbor bills and which may very likely come under consideration in connection with one or the other of those bills.

Fourteen months ago, I introduced S. 1385, a bill to provide for the improvement of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Basin.

On September 21, 1944, when it appeared that the Committee on Commerce, to which the bill was referred, would not hold hearings on it in time to permit its passage at this session of Congress, the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. SHIPSTEAD], and I proposed this bill as an amendment to H. R. 4485, the river and harbor bill.

On October 24, I spoke before the Detroit Board of Commerce and the Adcraft Club, and at that time presented messages from President Roosevelt and Gov. Thomas Dewey reemphasizing their support of the St. Lawrence development. I mention this to show the nonpartisan character of the effort to authorize the construction of this great and beneficial public work and to call attention to the fact that the heads of both political parties are endorsing this development. In confirmation of this, I ask to have inserted at this point a news dispatch and an editorial from the Watertown (N. Y.) Times of October 30, 1944.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The dispatch and editorial are as follows:

[News dispatch from the Watertown (N. Y.) Times of October 30, 1944]

SUPPORT FOR SEAWAY PROJECT IS GAINING—GAINS NOTED IN WAKE OF SENATOR AIKEN'S CONFERENCES IN WEST

CHICAGO, October 30.—Construction of the St. Lawrence seaway and power project has gained substantial support in the Midwest as the Nation's No. 1 post-war project, it appeared here today, in the wake of a series of conferences held during the past week by United States Senator GEORGE D. AIKEN, of Vermont.

The author of the Senate bill, S. 1385, authorizing post-war construction of the project, delivered major speeches at Detroit and at Duluth, at meetings attended by leading industrialists, bankers, chamber of commerce officials, and farm and labor representatives in both cities. At each meeting, Senator AIKEN presented messages from President Roosevelt and Governor Dewey which stamped the St. Lawrence project with approval and lifted the improvement above the level of partisan politics and the controversial issues of the 1944 campaign.

"I consider it highly significant," Senator AIKEN said, as he wound up his Midwest tour, "that a few days before this election, both the Republican and the Democratic standard bearers have publicly stated their full agreement upon one of the greatest post-war measures before the country, both strongly recommending the construction of the St. Lawrence seaway and power project. I am convinced that the position taken by the leaders of the two parties is sound and that it will be acceptable to candidates for the Senate and the House. I do not believe the pledges made by the President and Governor Dewey will be repudiated by congressional candidates running on either of the two major party tickets and therefore I look with confidence to nonpartisan approval of the project by Congress after the election."

At Detroit last Tuesday, Senator AIKEN was introduced by United States Senator HOMER FERGUSON, of Michigan, Republican, who joined with Senator AIKEN and Senator HENRIK SHIPSTEAD, of Minnesota, Republican, on September 21 in offering the St. Lawrence project bill as an amendment to the river and harbor bill now pending in the Senate. At Duluth Thursday, Senator AIKEN was introduced by Senator SHIPSTEAD, and also conferred with Representative WILLIAM A. PITTENGER, of Minnesota, author of the companion bill and the leader of the St. Lawrence forces in the House. Each of the four sponsors of the legislation to authorize construction of the project expressed confidence that the bill can be brought to an early vote, with better than an even chance of adoption by the spring of 1945.

Preceding his address at Detroit, Senator AIKEN conferred with a group of leading mid-westerners, all supporters of the St. Lawrence project, including Governor Kelly, of Michigan; Mayor Jeffries, of Detroit; Julius H. Barnes, of Duluth, former president and chairman of the board, United States Chamber of Commerce; Harvey J. Campbell and Allen Dean, Detroit Board of Commerce and representatives of Detroit automotive and allied industries.

Following the Detroit meeting, Senator AIKEN and Senator FERGUSON conferred with Henry Ford and made an inspection of the Willow Run bomber plant.

Among New Yorkers who attended the Detroit meeting were Chairman James C. Bonbright, of the New York Power Authority; Fred J. Freestone, president of the National Seaway Council and former chairman of the executive committee of the National Grange; Gerald V. Cruise, trustee of the authority; and E. J. Crosby, Massena, representing the Northern New York Federation of Chambers of Commerce.

At the request of Senator AIKEN, R. G. Sucher, executive secretary of the power authority, accompanied him to Duluth after the conclusion of the Detroit conferences.

Col. H. A. Montgomery, Corps of Engineers, United States Army, in charge of the Great Lakes division, and Dr. N. R. Danielian, director of the St. Lawrence survey, Department of Commerce, assisted Senator AIKEN in inspection trips to view harbor facilities and connecting channels at Detroit, Chicago, and Duluth.

The full text of the message presented by Senator AIKEN on behalf of Governor Dewey at his Detroit and Duluth meetings was as follows:

"Before coming to Detroit I wrote Governor Dewey at Albany, advising him of my engagement to speak here on the St. Lawrence seaway and power project, as authorized by the pending bill, S. 1385.

"Governor Dewey on Saturday, October 21, requested me to deliver a message at the Detroit meeting reaffirming his previous statement on this subject, which was, 'I favor the St. Lawrence seaway project and always have.'

"A similar statement was publicly made by Governor Dewey in 1940, in 1942, and on May 17, 1944. He made it clear in all these statements that he favors the construction of the entire project, to include both navigation and power, and declared that, as the record shows, he has always supported the development of our power resources by government.

"I am highly gratified to convey this message to the friends of the project in Detroit, with the Governor's greetings and good wishes for our success."

[Editorial from the Watertown (N. Y.) Times of October 30, 1944]

SENATOR AIKEN'S WESTERN TOUR

Senator AIKEN, of Vermont, author of the St. Lawrence seaway bill, has just completed a particularly fruitful trip through the West, delivering major addresses at Detroit and Duluth. He has conferred with scores of political, business, farm, and labor leaders on the trip and finds sentiment all through the Middle West strongly in favor of the seaway as the No. 1 post-war project.

One thing that made Senator AIKEN's tour particularly effective was that he was armed with statements from both President Roosevelt and Governor Dewey reaffirming their support of the seaway. Governor Dewey's statement was secured by Senator AIKEN just before he started his tour.

These two statements lifted the St. Lawrence proposal from partisan politics and have been responsible, to a large degree, for rallying leaders of both parties behind the project. One effect of these joint commitments, as Senator AIKEN sees it, is to sway nominess for Congress, both Republican and Democratic, to the project.

When the seaway was put forth 2 or 3 years ago, certain interests attempted to make it appear that it was a New Deal project. Of course, this was not the case. Every President since Taft has been for the seaway, including President Hoover.

The fact that the Republican Legislature of New York is on record for the St. Lawrence power development and that Governor Dewey has on several occasions gone all out for it, has ended this attempt to attribute the seaway to the New Deal.

But if anything further were needed, the strong Republican support for the seaway and power development which Senator AIKEN found all through the Middle West ought to be most effective in finally silencing the critics.

Mr. AIKEN. I now ask to insert in the RECORD a copy of a letter from the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON] to Senators RADCLIFFE, MEAD, VANDENBERG, and BURTON under date of November 6, 1944, calling an executive meeting of the subcommittee named to consider S. 1385.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the letter will be printed in the RECORD.

The letter is as follows:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
Washington, D. C., November 6, 1944.

Hon. GEORGE L. RADCLIFFE,
Hon. JAMES M. MEAD,
Hon. ARTHUR H. VANDENBERG,
Hon. HAROLD H. BURTON,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATORS: Formal notice will be given to you by the clerk of the Committee on Commerce that a meeting of the subcommittee on S. 1385, "To provide for the improvement of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Basin in the interest of national defense, and for other purposes," will be held on Wednesday, November 15, 1944, at 10:30 a. m., in the Senate Commerce Committee room. I hope that you can be present in person.

It is my purpose to submit to the subcommittee the following two suggestions:

1. That a hearing be called for Monday, November 20, at 10:30 a. m.;

2. That this hearing be confined to the question as to whether or not the proposal is of the character of a treaty, or of the character of an agreement.

If, after hearing, it is decided that the proposal is a treaty, it will in all probability be

referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations for further hearing. If, on the other hand, it is decided that it is an agreement, the Commerce Committee will continue its hearings on the merits.

Assuming that the members of the subcommittee will agree with me as to the propriety of this course, I am notifying representatives of proponents and of opponents of the bill to have a representative or representatives at the November 20 hearing to speak solely to the question of the character of the proposal. I am also requesting the Department of Justice and the State Department to have a representative to be heard on this question. I am also inviting the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee to send, if he so desires, a representative to attend the meeting.

The meeting of November 15 will, of course, be executive; and the hearing November 20 will be a public hearing. I fix the date for the 20th because if on the 16th the subcommittee does not agree with me, a course of action which the subcommittee outlines will be followed and the call for November 20 will be revoked in time to prevent the attendance of witnesses.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN H. OVERTON,
United States Senator.

Mr. AIKEN. I should like to read extracts from the letter addressed by the Senator from Louisiana to the members of the subcommittee, a copy of which was sent to me:

It is my purpose to submit to the subcommittee the following two suggestions:

1. That a hearing be called for Monday, November 20, at 10:30 a. m.

2. That this hearing be confined to the question as to whether or not the proposal is of the character of a treaty, or of the character of an agreement.

Yesterday, in accordance with the call of the chairman of the subcommittee, the subcommittee met, and decided to hold the hearing suggested in the letter of the senior Senator from Louisiana dated November 6. I have received an invitation to make a statement at this hearing. This morning I received a letter addressed to me which reads as follows:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
Washington, D. C., November 15, 1944.

Hon. GEORGE D. AIKEN,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR AIKEN: This letter is to advise you that the subcommittee of the Senate Commerce Committee unanimously directed a hearing to be held, beginning next Tuesday, November 21, at 10 a. m., in the Senate Commerce Committee Room, on your bill S. 1385, on the sole question of whether or not the St. Lawrence seaway proposal is a treaty or an agreement.

The subcommittee further resolved that no one will be permitted at this scheduled hearing to testify on the merits. Only those will be permitted to be heard whose standing and special knowledge qualify them to testify on the questions of constitutional and international law involved or as to the historical policy of the United States with reference to treaties or executive agreements.

The subcommittee will, of course, be pleased to have you, as author of the bill, make any statement that you desire bearing on the issue involved.

Yours truly,

JOHN H. OVERTON,
United States Senator.

At this point I wish to state briefly the record of the hearings which have previously been held on the St. Lawrence project.

No other power and navigation project in the entire history of the United States has received such exhaustive and careful study or has been recommended by so many congressional committees and engineering boards as the St. Lawrence development.

In the last Congress the most extensive public hearings on record, dealing with a proposed river-basin development, were completed by the House Committee on Rivers and Harbors, resulting in a recommendation that the St. Lawrence project bill be enacted into law, to serve post-war as well as defense needs of the Nation. This bill, introduced by Chairman MANSFIELD, of the House committee, was approved by a nonpartisan vote of 17 to 8, and was incorporated in the river and harbor bill reported to the House by the committee on November 21, 1941.

When the attack at Pearl Harbor, on December 7, 1941, suspended congressional action on river and harbor legislation, the St. Lawrence project bill was reoffered as a post-war measure by Representative PITTENGER, of Minnesota; Representative CULKIN, of New York; and Representative WASIELEWSKI, of Wisconsin, early in the present Congress.

On September 28, 1943, I offered a companion bill in the Senate, identical in terms with the bill favorably reported to the House after the prolonged public hearings held in 1941.

The Committee on Commerce of the United States Senate, to which the bill was referred, scheduled no new hearings on the St. Lawrence project over the period from September 28, 1943, to date. The committee did, however, complete hearings on scores of power, navigation and flood control projects for development of other river basins and these projects are now embodied in the legislation reported by the committee. Early in 1944 the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. SHIPSTEAD] and myself appeared before the Committee on Commerce and requested comparable hearings of reasonable length on the St. Lawrence project. This application on behalf of supporters of the St. Lawrence development was denied by the subcommittee chairman.

The St. Lawrence project had previously been overwhelmingly approved by the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate in 1933, and by the Committee on Rivers and Harbors of the House in 1941, after extended public hearings in both cases. In view of this record, and with the reluctant realization that the bill would not be reported out of the Commerce Committee, I publicly announced the intention of offering it as an amendment to the River and Harbor bill, without submitting to further indefinite delay, or awaiting action to schedule new hearings. Accordingly, on September 20, 1944, such an amendment was formally offered in the Senate, under the authorship of the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. SHIPSTEAD], and myself.

On November 6, 1944, just last week, notice was given by the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON] to the press, as well as to the subcommittee which I have mentioned, that the subcommittee of the Committee on Commerce would meet in executive session November 15 to consider whether a public hearing should be scheduled on the St. Lawrence project. This hearing, it was proposed, would exclude any consideration whatever of the merits of the St. Lawrence project, but would be confined solely to the question of whether the pending measure is "of the character of a treaty or of the character of an agreement." In the event that the Committee on Commerce should decide that the measure was "of the character of a treaty," it was proposed that the pending bill be referred to another committee, the Committee on Foreign Relations, for further hearings.

It is unthinkable that any considerable part of the full membership of the Senate would vote to sustain any procedure having the effect of scuttling constructive plans, approved by the United States and Canada, for the utilization of the greatest natural resource in North America. This project has been recommended repeatedly by all Presidents since Woodrow Wilson. Its completion as a post-war measure was pledged on October 24, 1944, by both President Roosevelt and Governor Dewey as the leaders of the two major parties.

The belated scheduling of hearings, confined to a newly injected question which excludes consideration of the merits of the St. Lawrence project, should not be permitted to delay or interfere with a vote on the development.

As to whether the St. Lawrence project is a subject matter for a treaty or an agreement, I have this to say: I do not pose as a constitutional lawyer, but I feel that once in a while a layman can see the difference between right and wrong, between justice and injustice. The instrument of 1941, which Senate bill 1385 and the proposed amendment confirm, was initiated and negotiated by the proper constitutional authorities of the United States and Canada as an agreement, was signed by them as an agreement, and was submitted to both the Senate and the House as an agreement more than 3 years ago.

In formal written communications submitted to the Congress by the President, by Secretary of State Hull, by Attorney General Jackson, by the legal adviser to the State Department, and by numerous other departments and authorities the enactment of the pending bill has been officially recommended to confirm the 1941 instrument as an agreement and not as a treaty. Moreover, after taking jurisdiction of this bill in 1941, and after conducting extensive public hearings on the subject, the Committee on Rivers and Harbors of the House completely upheld the entire regularity and constitutionality of the procedure in agreement form. The committee also completely rejected objections raised at the hearings by certain special interests, interests frankly opposed to the improvement itself, based on

the specious claim that the instrument should have been negotiated as a treaty and not as an agreement.

As a matter of fact, the United States Senate in 1909, by its ratification of the Boundary Waters Treaty between the United States and Canada, gave its consent to the procedure which has been followed by the two Governments in negotiating, signing, and submitting the 1941 instrument in the form of an agreement. The treaty of 1909 was negotiated by Secretary of State Elihu Root, and was proclaimed in 1910 by President Taft. By express terms this treaty sought to settle all international questions related to the use of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence system and other boundary waters then pending, and specifically provided for special agreements and reciprocal or concurrent legislation by Congress and the Canadian Parliament as an appropriate procedure for dealing with projects affecting the use of these waters which might arise in future.

Unquestionably, Congress possesses full power and discretion to approve or reject any agreement in concurrent legislation recommended by the President, just as the Senate possesses the power and discretion to approve or reject any treaty recommended by the Executive. It is equally clear that the President alone possesses exclusive power and discretion under article II, section 1, of the Constitution to negotiate with foreign nations, to determine what form any instruments he may sign with other nations shall take, and to submit such instruments in the form in which they have been signed, subject to their approval by a majority of both branches of Congress, if in the form of an agreement, and subject to approval by a two-thirds vote of the Senate, if in the form of a treaty.

For a subcommittee of the Committee on Commerce of the United States Senate to undertake to determine that the instrument of 1941 is "of the character of a treaty" when the negotiating governments have plainly designated it as an agreement, would be a startling innovation in conflict with the development of our consistent policy for the conduct of foreign affairs under the Constitution. The committee lacks any power, discretion, or authority whatever to change an agreement into a treaty once it has been negotiated, signed, and submitted as an agreement by the President as the proper constitutional authority to decide that question. Such a determination by a subcommittee of the Committee on Commerce would be particularly astonishing, in view of the fact that in 1943 when the pending bill was introduced, that committee insisted upon taking jurisdiction over the pending bill. The subcommittee has retained jurisdiction over the bill for more than a year and has thus far foreclosed the Committee on Foreign Relations or any other committees of the Senate from holding prompt hearings on the merits of the St. Lawrence project and the pending bill.

Considering the legislative history of the bill, it is indeed unusual to find the chairman of the Committee on Commerce, after more than a year since its introduction, challenging the jurisdiction of this committee over a measure referred to it for a report nearly 14 months ago.

A determination that the instrument of 1941 is "of the character of a treaty" would, of course, not change the agreement as signed by the United States and Canada and submitted by the President, into a treaty. If such a determination were sustained by the Senate itself, it would merely serve to set aside an agreement entered into by the United States and our ally, Canada, to provide by concurrent legislation for the construction of needed power and navigation works on both sides of the boundary. To the extent that such a determination influenced the President to start negotiations afresh on a new instrument in treaty form, it would exclude the power and discretion of a majority in both branches of Congress to approve or reject the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence project on its merits. It would place this power and discretion in the hands of one-third of the membership of the Senate, plus one additional Senator, thus making the negative votes of a minority against the project count twice.

Such a determination, moreover, would repudiate the action heretofore taken by the President, by the Secretary of State, by the Attorney General, by the House Committee on Rivers and Harbors, by the Prime Minister of Canada, and by numerous other Federal and State agencies which have strongly recommended the agreement of 1941 and the passage of the pending legislation to give it effect. It would brand these officials and agencies with having approved an agreement and having adopted a procedure to confirm it by concurrent legislation, in violation of law and in conflict with the provisions of the Constitution of the United States.

Furthermore, such a determination, if sustained, would at once set aside the Dominion-Provincial accord of 1941 establishing the rights and the participating costs of Ontario in the St. Lawrence power project. It would also set aside the Federal-State accord on the subject establishing the rights and the participating costs of the State of New York. Both of these accords were reached after years of negotiations among the Federal, Dominion, Provincial, and State authorities proceeding upon and relying in good faith upon the United States-Canadian agreement of 1941. To challenge the regularity of this agreement at this late date, more than 3 years after it was submitted to both the Senate and the House as a basis for the adoption of concurrent legislation, is thus seen to be in the nature of a wholesale repudiation of responsible agencies of both the United States and Canada. It seeks to scrap all the results of the cooperation of such agencies in negotiating, planning, and successfully reaching a complete accord on the construction of a project to utilize for the common benefit of both the American and the Canadian peoples the principal natural resource and major river basin shared by the two great neighboring democracies of this hemisphere.

It is difficult to believe that even a small minority of any committee in either branch of Congress would go to such lengths to obstruct and delay action on the merits of a great public improvement. If such a maneuver were successful in blocking a vote on the St. Lawrence project, the United States would enter the post-war period almost completely isolated among the civilized nations of the earth because of the new inhibitions and restrictions invoked against its power to deal effectively with post-war problems.

It would at one blow strike down the constitutional power of the President to negotiate and the constitutional power of a majority of the Congress to approve or reject public improvements presented in the form of agreements with our neighbors, quite regardless of their merits and the urgency of their need in the public interest.

Finally, Mr. President, I will say that although I have been invited to make a statement before the subcommittee meeting called for November 21, I shall not avail myself of the invitation. The sponsors of the St. Lawrence development will proceed to offer an amendment authorizing this great humanitarian development, which will increase wealth and commerce for all, promote national security, and provide opportunity for the millions of men and women now in the service of their country, to the river and harbor or some other appropriate bill.

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. AIKEN. I may say to the Senator that I am practically through with my statement.

Mr. GILLETTE. I ask the Senator to yield simply for a brief statement. I think an inaccuracy occurred in the Senator's statement.

Mr. AIKEN. I shall be pleased to correct any error I have made.

Mr. GILLETTE. Without agreeing with the Senator's conclusion, the statement which the Senator made, as I understood it, that if this matter was to be considered a treaty its approval could be prevented by one-third of the membership of the Senate plus one, is not quite correct. It could be prevented by one-third of the Senators present on any occasion, plus one.

Mr. AIKEN. I accept the correction made by the Senator from Iowa. He is absolutely correct in his statement.

Mr. President, this morning's newspapers quote three members of the Commerce Committee as having already reached the decision, even before they have heard testimony, that the St. Lawrence development is a subject for a treaty and not an agreement.

This prejudging of the matter alone amply demonstrated the futility of presenting any testimony before these members of the committee, and I say "these members of the committee."

The chairman of the subcommittee has publicly pledged himself to do all within

his power, including use of his official position, to defeat the St. Lawrence measure.

Therefore, Mr. President, the supporters of the measure will at the proper time place this great public cause before the whole Senate.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, it is not my purpose at present to discuss whether the St. Lawrence seaway proposal is in the nature of a treaty or an agreement. It is not my purpose to discuss the merits of the proposal. I happen to be chairman of the subcommittee to which was referred the bill introduced by the able Senator from Vermont. What I am now intending to do is to present the record with respect to the conduct of any hearings on the St. Lawrence seaway bill.

Mr. President, the bill was introduced by the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] on September 28, 1943. Reports from various departments of the Government were requested by the chairman of the Commerce Committee on October 8, 1943. I was appointed chairman of the subcommittee and other members of this subcommittee were appointed by the chairman of the Commerce Committee on October 26, 1943. Rather promptly after my appointment I inquired of the clerk of the Commerce Committee whether any reports had been received from the various departments to which the bill had been referred. I was advised that none had been received. I think that about once a week I called up the clerk of the Commerce Committee to find out whether any reports had been filed by any of the departments, and was advised that none had been filed.

I am not quite so sure about the statement I shall now make, but I think that I asked that renewed requests be made for reports. None, however, were sent to the Commerce Committee until according to newspaper reports, and according to a statement I think made by the Senator from Vermont, the Senator from Vermont called on the President on March 3, 1944. So far as I know the Senator from Vermont had not been active in the prosecution of this bill until March 3, 1944, when he called upon the President, presumably, for the purpose of having the different departments of the Government requested to submit reports upon the bill. At any rate, according to the newspaper accounts, the President then did direct the departments to submit reports upon the Aiken bill. That was on March 3, 1944, or shortly thereafter. The first report came from the Bureau of the Budget on April 7, 1944. The Federal Power Commission submitted a report on April 8, 1944; the Department of State on April 10, 1944; the War Department on April 15, 1944; the Department of Commerce on July 15, 1944; and the Navy Department on September 7, 1944.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TUNNELL in the chair). Does the Senator from Louisiana yield to the Senator from Vermont?

Mr. OVERTON. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. May I ask when the Department of Commerce and the Navy Department were requested to make reports? The Senator made the statement that the reports all came in in April. I had heard that reports were requested of other departments after that time. I understand that at a very late date the Maritime Commission was also asked to make a report—all of which tended to prolong the time when all the reports would have been received. I ask the Senator if it is true that some of the departments were not asked to submit reports until the latter part of the spring or early in the summer?

Mr. OVERTON. I am unable to advise the Senator when the Navy Department and the Department of Commerce were asked to submit reports. The Senator's statement may be correct—that those departments were later asked to make reports. Requests for such reports would come from the chairman of the committee, and not from the chairman of the subcommittee.

Mr. AIKEN. I believe that statement is probably correct, and that the chairman of the full committee made such requests.

Mr. OVERTON. However that may be, and regardless of when the Department of Commerce and the Navy Department were asked to submit reports, and however belated their reports were, the last report, which had been requested in October of the preceding year, did not come in until April 15. The reports all poured in during the month of April—probably under the inspiration of the Senator from Vermont and the direction of the President of the United States. That is the first activity that was shown.

In the meantime, Mr. President, the House had under consideration the river and harbor bills. That bill was passed by the House on March 22, 1944, and was sent to the Senate. I am chairman of the subcommittee handling this bill in the Senate.

When the bill which had been passed by the House came over to the Senate, I immediately began to make preparations for hearings on that bill. The departmental reports on the Aiken bill had not begun to come in. I ordered hearings on the river and harbor bills somewhat in advance of the time they would be held because a great many persons had to be notified, and I, as chairman of the subcommittee, had to make preparations for hearings.

Very promptly after the bill came to the Senate on March 22, 1944, or approximately that date, I began to proceed with hearings on the river and harbor bills. The hearings began on April 25, 1944, and were concluded on May 18, 1944. The hearings had to be printed, and the bill considered by the subcommittee and reported to the full committee, and the full committee had to act upon it, and a report thereon made to the Senate.

While that was going on, the flood-control bill was passed by the House on May 9, 1944, and sent to the Senate. So I prepared for hearings on that bill. Both those bills had been passed by the House. The Aiken bill had not been acted upon and no similar bill had been acted upon by the House. It was a Senate bill. Out of courtesy to the House, I felt that we ought to take up the bills which had passed the House, rather than a Senate bill, which the House had not considered.

Furthermore, the Aiken bill relates to a single project, but the river and harbor bill and the flood-control bill relate to innumerable projects scattered throughout the United States, and each of those bills is of infinitely greater importance than the St. Lawrence seaway project, considering not only the number and magnitude of the projects involved in those bills, but also their quality.

Therefore, Mr. President, I proceeded to conduct hearings on the flood-control bill on May 29, 1944. In the midst of some of those hearings on the river and harbor or the flood-control bills, the Senator from Vermont appeared before the subcommittee—I believe it was the subcommittee conducting hearings on the river and harbor bill—and asked that he be permitted to be heard and introduce testimony in support of the St. Lawrence seaway bill. He was advised by the committee that a special committee had been appointed to consider the St. Lawrence seaway project, and that the committee before which he was appearing was the subcommittee handling the river and harbor bill, which subcommittee had no jurisdiction over the St. Lawrence seaway project. The Senator from Vermont had not offered an amendment to the river and harbor bill. If he had offered his bill as an amendment to the river and harbor bill, certainly I would have conducted hearings upon it as an amendment to the bill. However, he did not do so. His bill was an independent bill, and remains today in the records of the Senate as an independent bill. However, I understand that the Senator from Vermont has now submitted his bill as an amendment to the pending river and harbor bill.

So, Mr. President, there was no fault on my part or on the part of the Commerce Committee of the Senate in dealing with the Aiken bill, which related to a single project, and which was not ripe for action until the latter part of April of this year, because departmental reports had not been received. Certainly the Department of Commerce and the Navy Department should have reported on the bill. It was just as important that they should report on the bill as that the War Department should report on it. However that may be, I wish to keep the record straight, and to show that there was no negligence on the part of the Commerce Committee in undertaking to consider the Aiken bill. The Congress took a recess, and before we reconvened I directed that hearings begin on the Aiken bill.

The subcommittee unanimously resolved that the hearings should begin on November 21, and that they should be confined exclusively to the question whether or not the St. Lawrence seaway proposal is of the character of a treaty or of the character of an agreement. The subcommittee did so because manifestly, if it is of the character of a

treaty, the Senate Committee on Commerce has no jurisdiction, and it should be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations. I had nothing whatever to do with the reference of the bill. I presume the Senator from Vermont, when he introduced the bill, had it referred to the Committee on Commerce. The first question which confronted us was, Shall we undertake to conduct hearings on the merits of the proposal, which hearings would probably last for a number of weeks, or shall we determine whether or not we have any jurisdiction? I believe that that question can be disposed of in probably two meetings of the subcommittee, and a report can be made to the full committee. If the subcommittee and the full committee determine that it is a treaty, not an agreement, of course they will so report to the Senate, and of course the Committee on Commerce may then be discharged from further consideration of the measure, and it will thereupon be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations. Then the question will arise in the Senate whether it is to be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, before which hearings would be conducted on the measure. If the Senate did not agree with a committee report that the measure be considered by the Committee on Foreign Relations, the Committee on Commerce would conduct hearings on the subject. That is a fair statement of the situation.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, in regard to the remarks just made by the senior Senator from Louisiana I wish to state that he is undoubtedly correct about the dates on which the reports were received from the various Government departments.

I may say, too, that I accepted at face value all his statements made last spring about holding hearings at an early date, and I accepted them without doubt until in September I received a copy of the New Orleans Times-Picayune of Sunday, September 10, 1944, and discovered in it a full-page political advertisement on behalf of the senior Senator from Louisiana. After reading the advertisement, I realized that there was no longer any opportunity to have the St. Lawrence seaway bill reported by his committee, because a considerable part of the advertisement is devoted to an argument asking the people of Louisiana to return him to the Senate because of his hostility to the St. Lawrence seaway. Let me read one section of the advertisement:

OPPOSES ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY

With JOHN H. OVERTON in the Senate Louisiana and the South need have no fear that the freight traffic that justly should pass through our ports will be diverted by greedy combinations and unfair legislation to the so-called St. Lawrence seaway.

THREAT TO NEW ORLEANS

New Orleans knows that the proposed St. Lawrence channel is a threat to the export and import business that means so much to the Crescent City. The proposal means that hundreds of millions of taxpayers' dollars will be spent to make an artificial sea channel through the ice-bound North to carry freight to the eastern seaboard that now more easily and economically moves down the great Mississippi through New Orleans. The proposal is doubly unfair because Federal taxes levied on Louisiana would be used to destroy Louisiana commerce.

OVERTON STOPS PROJECT

Senator JOHN H. OVERTON has successfully prevented the passage of this measure, because he is chairman of the Senate special committee in charge of legislation concerning the St. Lawrence seaway. Senator OVERTON declared his opposition to this visionary scheme when the chairmanship was tendered him, but his colleagues in the Senate, knowing his thoroughness and uprightness, insisted that he accept the appointment. This compliment to JOHN H. OVERTON'S character has hardly been surpassed in the annals of the American Congress. The compliment to Louisiana should not be lightly tossed aside. But more than that, if JOHN H. OVERTON does not return to the Senate, into whose hands would this project fall?

Today JOHN H. OVERTON is the stalwart and successful defender of Louisiana's rights. Louisiana must return him to the Senate.

In another column the voters of Louisiana are again asked to return the Senator to the Senate because of his opposition to the St. Lawrence seaway. There is a further subtitle "Can Get Appropriation." I quote:

Senator OVERTON is one of the senior majority members of the Senate Appropriations Committee, and from this committee will come the legislation appropriating the money to pay for the deep-water channel.

These two committee positions, so important right now to New Orleans, will be lost to the city and to Louisiana should Senator OVERTON not be reelected.

NEW ORLEANS NEEDS OVERTON

Because New Orleans needs Senator JOHN H. OVERTON'S influence and prestige in the Senate, and because he will handle the deep-water-channel legislation are only two among many reasons why every loyal citizen of New Orleans and of the State should vote for Senator OVERTON'S reelection on September 12.

New Orleans' one great hope for a deep-sea channel lies in the reelection of Senator JOHN H. OVERTON.

Mr. President, after all, there are 95 other Members of the Senate. I presume that if New Orleans shows a need for a deep-sea channel, a few of us at least will vote for it.

I hold in my hand other excerpts from Louisiana newspapers which came to me later. Here is one from the Shreveport Times of August 9, 1944. It made the following report of a radio address by the Senator from Louisiana, delivered at Washington, D. C., on August 8:

The Louisiana Senator spoke by radio from the Capital where he has been attending to official business of the Senate.

Senator OVERTON pointed out that he began his career as a Member of Congress in the House of Representatives in 1931, serving then on the House Flood Control Committee, and then went on to the United States Senate, where he now occupies such important and key posts as chairman of the Subcommittee on Flood Control, of the Subcommittee on Rivers and Harbors, of the Subcommittee on the St. Lawrence Seaway (which he is fighting vigorously as inimical to southern business interests), of the Subcommittee on Navy Appropriations, ranking majority member of the Army Appropriations Committee, chairman of the Manufacturers Committee, etc.

The following appeared in the New Orleans Times-Picayune for August 2, 1944, at a time when we were expecting to have hearings on the St. Lawrence seaway start any day:

OVERTON OPPOSES SEAWAY PROJECT

Asserting that the people in the Mississippi Valley and "especially in the great port of New Orleans" are justly opposed to the proposed St. Lawrence seaway, United States Senator JOHN H. OVERTON, candidate for reelection, Tuesday night pledged to continue the fight against the United States-Canadian project.

"I was honored in the first part of this year by being appointed chairman of the subcommittee handling the St. Lawrence seaway project," Senator OVERTON said in an address heard over Station WNOE.

"When I was tendered the chairmanship, I frankly stated that I was opposed to entering into any treaty or agreement authorizing the project. The answer came back—it was desired that I head the subcommittee because it was felt I knew as much or more than any other Senator about this great controversial issue.

"If by any chance I shall not be returned to the Senate, this chairmanship will be assigned to another Senator, and perhaps one who favors the project. I shall continue in the future as I have done in the past to fight its authorization by all just and fair means within my power."

I quote now from the Shreveport Times for August 2, 1944:

Senator OVERTON—

Then follows a word which is blurred—

his own work in Louisiana and national waterway legislation, his work in blocking, thus far, the St. Lawrence seaway, which is considered a project inimical to southern business; his successful fight to retain community property tax provisions in Federal tax laws and his opposition to socialized medicine. He spoke strongly for white supremacy and pledged his opposition to all Washington efforts to destroy it.

I have before me other excerpts of the same nature from newspaper articles, but I shall not read them all. Here is one from the Alexandria Daily Town Talk of August 9, 1944, headed "Senator OVERTON reviews flood-control works. Incumbent makes third speech asking reelection." It reads as follows:

WASHINGTON, August 9.—Senator JOHN H. OVERTON made the third of a series of campaign addresses to his Louisiana constituents last night, asking reelection and reviewing flood-control work and rivers and harbors developments authorized by Congress during the 12 years he has been in the Senate.

"If I were to leave the Senate, who from Louisiana would be able to continue where I left off?" Overton asked in a speech for radio broadcast in his native State. "Who would be chairman of the Flood Control and Rivers and Harbors Committee?"

OVERTON said that the general plan of flood control on the Mississippi "has been authorized and is being executed. It remains, however, for necessary appropriations to be made annually by Congress to complete and keep in shipshape this great engineering work," he added.

"Fortunately, I am in a position to get these appropriations," he said. "I am a member of the Appropriations Committee of the Senate and the ranking majority member of the War Department Appropriations Subcommittee, which recommends all allocations to be made for flood control and river and harbor work."

FLOOD-CONTROL WORK

OVERTON said that Congress had appropriated $19,000,000 for the fiscal year 1944 and $26,000,000 for fiscal 1945 for flood-control work on the lower Mississippi Valley, but that "only a token payment of $100" has been allotted for "all flood-control work outside of the Mississippi Valley."

Mr. President, I always want to give every person the benefit of the doubt, but, in view of the fact that the Senator from Louisiana has so openly advertised himself and pledged himself to do all possible to prevent the passage of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence seaway bill, I feel that we are entirely justified in believing that we are not likely to get the bill from the committee and pass it through the Congress. It is for that reason that we shall insist on offering it as an amendment to the bill which is to be voted upon in the Senate, and we believe that we will be fully within our rights in doing so.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, as a member of the minority party on the Commerce Committee of the Senate and as a member of the minority party on the subcommittee having to do with the St. Lawrence seaway project, I regret that this issue has been put upon a political basis or that any question has been raised in a way which would indicate that the subcommittee will not give the matter the full and fair consideration which the Senate is entitled to have with respect to the issues presented before the subcommittee. As a member of the subcommittee, I have not made up my mind either on the merits of the bill or on the difficult legal question of whether the matter should be treated as a treaty or as an agreement. It seemed to me and to the other members of our subcommittee that the Senate was entitled to the judgment of the subcommittee on the difficult legal question of whether the matter should be treated as a treaty, in which event it would require a two-thirds vote of the Senate in order to be passed, or as an agreement, in which event it would be treated quite differently in the Senate. Our subcommittee is not dominated by any one of its members, and I think the Senator from Vermont can depend on a full and fair hearing on the issue before the subcommittee. Hearings will start on Tuesday next and will continue from day to day. I understand that a comparatively small number of persons will appear to discuss the legal question, and I think an early answer will be made with reference to it. I hope the Senator will change his mind, and that he will appear before the committee and present his views on the question.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TUNNELL in the chair) laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

DEATH OF REPRESENTATIVE FULMER, OF SOUTH CAROLINA

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair lays before the Senate a resolution coming from the House of Representatives, which will be read.

The resolution (H. Res. 647) was read as follows:

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, U. S.,
November 14, 1944.

Resolved, That the House has heard with profound sorrow of the death of Hon. Hampton P. Fulmer, a Representative from the State of South Carolina.

Resolved, That the Clerk communicate these resolutions to the Senate and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Resolved, That as a further mark of respect, the House do now adjourn.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I send to the desk a resolution which I ask to have read. Before the resolution is read, however, I wish to say that the people of South Carolina feel that in the death of the chairman of the House Agricultural Committee, Representative Hampton P. Fulmer, of South Carolina, they have lost a cherished friend, and an able statesman. He was greatly beloved by the people of his State.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution submitted by the Senator from South Carolina will be read.

The resolution (S. Res. 334) was read, considered by unanimous consent, and unanimously agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow the announcement of the death of Hon. Hampton P. Fulmer, late a Representative from the State of South Carolina.

Resolved, That the secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased Representative, I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon on Monday next.

The motion was unanimously agreed to; and (at 1 o'clock and 56 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until Monday, November 20, 1944, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate November 16, 1944:

THE JUDICIARY

Hon. Aloysius J. Connor, of New Hampshire, to be United States district judge for the district of New Hampshire, vice Hon. George F. Norris, retired.

DIRECTOR OF WAR MOBILIZATION AND RECONVERSION

James F. Byrnes, of South Carolina, to be Director of War Mobilization and Reconversion for a term of 2 years, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

RETRAINING AND REEMPLOYMENT ADMINISTRATOR

Brig. Gen. Frank T. Hines, United States Army, to be Retraining and Reemployment Administrator, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

Paul A. Porter, of Kentucky, to be a member of the Federal Communications Commission for the unexpired term of 7 years from July 1, 1942.

IN THE MARINE CORPS

William F. Hausman, a naval aviator of the Marine Corps Reserve to be a first lieutenant in the Regular Marine Corps in accordance with the provisions of the Naval Aviation Personnel Act of 1940, as amended, to rank from the 1st day of September 1939.

The below-named naval aviators of the Marine Corps Reserve to be second lieutenants in the Regular Marine Corps in accordance with the provisions of the Naval Aviation Personnel Act of 1940, as amended, to rank from the dates stated:

Jack Cosley, from the 9th day of February 1942.

John W. Beebe, from the 9th day of February 1942.

Kenneth D. Frazier, from the 12th day of March 1942.

Arvid W. Blackmun, from the 12th day of March 1942.

Clayton M. Canfield, from the 14th day of March 1942.

Howard E. Cook, from the 14th day of March 1942.

Taylor R. Roberts, from the 17th day of March 1942.

Robert D. Bachtel, from the 25th day of March 1942.

Robert F. Conley, from the 3d day of April 1942.

John P. Long, from the 1st day of May 1942.

Edwin E. Shifflett, from the 22d day of May 1942.

Harold A. Langstaff, Jr., from the 19th day of June 1942.

Gerald R. Graff, from the 19th day of June 1942.

Ingram R. Rader, from the 13th day of July 1942.

William A. Eddy, Jr., a citizen of New Hampshire, to be a second lieutenant in the Marine Corps from the 7th day of August 1942.

The below-named citizens to be second lieutenants in the Marine Corps from the 4th day of February 1944:

Warren R. Loney, a citizen of Massachusetts.

Fred J. Kendall, a citizen of Kentucky.

Robert W. Tosch, a citizen of Washington.

The below-named citizens to be second lieutenants in the Marine Corps from the 2d day of May 1944:

Richard F. DeLamar 3d, a citizen of Georgia.

Robert P. Barnett, a citizen of Georgia.

James E. Wallace, a citizen of California.

William E. Mack, a citizen of Ohio.

Alfred A. Mannino, a citizen of New Jersey.

Stanley G. Raytinsky, Jr., a citizen of Pennsylvania.

Sgt. Eugenous M. Hovatter, a meritorious noncommissioned officer of the Marine Corps to be a second lieutenant in the Marine Corps from the 26th day of July 1944.

The below-named citizens to be second lieutenants in the Marine Corps from the 8th day of August 1944:

Howard F. Stevenson, a citizen of Maryland.

John F. Graff, Jr., a citizen of New York.

Carl W. Hoffman, a citizen of Iowa.

Leslie A. Gilson, Jr., a citizen of Ohio.

Joseph E. Fogg, a citizen of Arkansas.

Alfred A. Prusick, a citizen of Massachusetts.

Ben E. Baker, a citizen of Louisiana.

Willmar M. Bledsoe, a citizen of California.

Frederick E. Malcolm, a citizen of Massachusetts.

POSTMASTERS

The following-named persons to be postmasters:

ALABAMA

Leon C. Taylor, Deatsville, Ala., in place of Grace Roy, resigned.

Frances M. Beaty, Eldridge, Ala. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Horace P. Haynes, Hodges, Ala. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Leila M. Weekley, Perdido, Ala. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Vira Cox, Wilmer, Ala. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

ALASKA

Ann M. Lange, East Anchorage, Alaska. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

ARIZONA

James M. Owens, Safford, Ariz., in place of Martin Layton, resigned.

Warren E. Ware, Superior, Ariz., in place of Charles J. Moody, removed.

ARKANSAS

William Hall, Widener, Ark. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

CALIFORNIA

Arthur J. Meyer, Atwood, Calif. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Mary Elizabeth Bowden, Canby, Calif., in place of Earl D. Sherer, resigned.

Charles C. Toland, Covina, Calif., in place of George P. Meek, deceased.

Howard P. Heintz, Graton, Calif. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Dorothy M. Stewart, Ione, Calif., in place of David S. Mason, Sr., resigned.

Virgil E. Combs, McFarland, Calif., in place of Cortez B. Combs, transferred.

Delma Lois Justus, Mission San Jose, Calif. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Christine Hansen, Penngrove, Calif. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Leon A. Parker, Rio Dell, Calif. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

John Jolly Jones, Sr., Seal Beach, Calif., in place of Michael L. Collins, deceased.

Ray L. Dowden, Shandon, Calif. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Mary Jane Davis, Stanton, Calif. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Mathus Reed Wolfskill, Suisun City, Calif., in place of W. W. R. Reeves, removed.

Laurence L. Hodge, Tuolumne, Calif., in place of L. J. McNeill, resigned.

Abbie E. Schaeffer, Vernalis, Calif. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

COLORADO

Elmer E. Owen, Minturn, Colo., in place of J. A. Collins, resigned.

Mary E. Harman, Pagosa Springs, Colo., in place of C. G. Marshall, resigned.

Charlotte Coffman, Penrose, Colo. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Alice L. Myers, Roggen, Colo. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

CONNECTICUT

Russell F. Neary, Bridgeport, Conn., in place of P. M. Davey, resigned.

Viola A. Swanson, Grosvenor Dale, Conn. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

S. Henry Acton, Yalesville, Conn., in place of J. E. LaCroix, resigned.

FLORIDA

Harold H. Bryan, Bowling Green, Fla., in place of Reuben M. Colle, removed.

Austin F. Townsend, Chipley, Fla., in place of R. C. Fleming, resigned.

Merle V. North, Jay, Fla., in place of H. W. Harrison, deceased.

Hollon R. Bervaldi, Key West, Fla., in place of F. J. Dion, resigned.

Gladys L. Stalls, Moore Haven, Fla., in place of S. C. Stalls, deceased.

Guy H. Stapp, Oxford, Fla., in place of H. J. Charles, removed.

Weeta M. Brown, Plymouth, Fla. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

GEORGIA

Beatrice B. Baker, Baldwin, Ga. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Warren C. Haynes, Clermont, Ga. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

James P. Pirkle, Hoschton, Ga. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Robert L. Sumner, Poulan, Ga. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Rilla S. Porter, Silver Creek, Ga. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

William A. Ryals, Townsend, Ga., in place of J. I. Ingram, retired.

HAWAII

Manuel F. Xavier, Puunene, Hawaii, in place of Kenichi Tomita, resigned.

ILLINOIS

Lyle F. Connolly, Bath, Ill. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

Irene K. Witt, Broadlands, Ill. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

Hugh Thompson, Dwight, Ill., in place of J. E. Garrett, resigned.

William E. Erfert, Lansing, Ill., in place of A. H. Koselke, resigned.

Paul V. Lancaster, Lowpoint, Ill. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Ralph O. Johns, Madison, Ill., in place of G. K. Brenner, deceased.

Stella B. Bond, New Boston, Ill., in place of J. L. Mead, deceased.

INDIANA

Mary F. Woods, Manilla, Ind. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Anna Jones, Seelyville, Ind. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Willard Miller, Shelburn, Ind., in place of Fonzo Martin, transferred.

Earl J. Myers, Solsberry, Ind. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Louis W. Butler, Straughn, Ind. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

IOWA

Frank E. Barnes, Blakesburg, Iowa, in place of G. H. Abernathy, transferred.

Laura M. Rheingans, Bristow, Iowa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Bert Kirk, Drakesville, Iowa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Ernest H. Brunsvold, Joice, Iowa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

Phoebe E. Stubbs, Lawton, Iowa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Norman L. Meyers, Liscomb, Iowa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

James A. Ward, Melrose, Iowa, in place of G. C. Ward, resigned.

Tom Olson, Okoboji, Iowa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Helen C. Jorstad, Wallingford, Iowa, in place of R. K. Jorstad, resigned.

KANSAS

Albert J. Anderson, Green, Kans. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Clayton B. Barton, Ingalls, Kans. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Louis W. Crady, Lecompton, Kans. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Nellie L. Stark, Linwood, Kans. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Della M. Bailey, Menlo, Kans., in place of G. L. Gillen, transferred.

George B. Viney, Murdock, Kans. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Robert L. Bever, Narka, Kans. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Agnes Lennen, Partridge, Kans. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Grace Benton, Robinson, Kans., in place of R. M. Caldwell, resigned.

KENTUCKY

Jesse B. Pope, Brooksville, Ky., in place of J. B. Pope, transferred.

Louisiana G. Palmer, Ekron, Ky. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Donovan Rogers, Mackville, Ky. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Myrtle B. Withers, Muldraugh, Ky. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Cornelia L. Snyder, Pewee Valley, Ky., in place of Imogene Kilgus, resigned.

Maude H. Brown, Stanley, Ky. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Arley O. Perkins, Woodbine, Ky. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

LOUISIANA

Edward P. Terrell, Jr., Avery Island, La. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Eula M. Ewing, Batchelor, La. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Cleora W. Charleville, Cloutierville, La. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Mollie E. Walther, Gibson, La. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Cecile M. Germany, Loreauville, La. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Nova V. Baker, McDade, La. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Marcella E. Barbier, Paincourtville, La. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Sherman H. McCarty, Roanoke, La. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Monroe Erskins, Sikes, La. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Carl E. Blackwell, Simpson, La. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

MAINE

Florence E. Nunan, Cape Porpoise, Maine. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Joseph M. Tanguay, Greene, Maine. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

MARYLAND

James A. Hayman, Fruitland, Md., in place of J. A. Hayman. Incumbent's commission expired November 30, 1941.

MASSACHUSETTS

William C. Young, Millbury, Mass., in place of J. L. Ivory, deceased.

MICHIGAN

E. Bernice Knisley, Avoca, Mich. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

John H. Hausler, Boyne Falls, Mich. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Ida Belle Telling, Byron, Mich., in place of R. E. Lee, transferred.

Sadie Curran, Caseville, Mich. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Viola M. Meyer, Fair Haven, Mich. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Ambrose J. Powell, Laingsburg, Mich., in place of G. H. Walters, transferred.

John L. O'Brien, Lake Leelanau, Mich. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Harper W. Capman, Lambertville, Mich. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Lillian D. Day, La Salle, Mich. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Basil L. Jankowski, Maple City, Mich. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Blanche McGraw, Napoleon, Mich. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Rolland F. Allen, North Street, Mich. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Elmer M. Clapp, Oshtemo, Mich. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Gerald A. Gale, Owosso, Mich., in place of W. A. Seegmiller, deceased.

Miles S. Ansbaugh, Reading, Mich., in place of C. H. Oxenger, resigned.

Edwin C. Hess, Sanford, Mich. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

MINNESOTA

Vern C. Hansen, Arco, Minn. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

John Wilson Hart, Bethel, Minn. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Hjalmer J. Mattinen, Esko, Minn. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Albert D. McCormack, Garden City, Minn. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Louise M. Muller, Hugo, Minn. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Lucy C. Clark, Kent, Minn. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Irene M. Vizenor, Ponsford, Minn. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Walter R. Dahl, Puposky, Minn. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

MISSISSIPPI

Herd E. Stone, Ludlow, Miss. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Lyman W. Smith, Midnight, Miss. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Luther D. Henderson, Preston, Miss. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Gertrude H. McGee, Vosburg, Miss. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

MISSOURI

Katherine E. Feldmann, Ballwin, Mo., in place of C. O. Peterson, retired.

James D. Elkins, Dixon, Mo., in place of G. W. Shelton, deceased.

Roger M. Roy, Dora, Mo. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Mellie E. Coffee, Fairview, Mo. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Garnet Chappell, Louisiana, Mo., in place of R. L. Chappell, deceased.

Paul J. Casey, Potosi, Mo., in place of W. H. Bust, resigned.

Frank B. Miller, Queen City Mo., in place of Fred King, transferred.

Thomas S. Clayton, Raymondville, Mo. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Earl A. Blakely, Revere, Mo. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

John T. Harrison, Stark City, Mo. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Edward Francis Gorman, Jr., Wentworth, Mo. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Allen B. Alderson, Wyatt, Mo., in place of F. F. Norris, removed.

MONTANA

Hazel B. Gross, Wyola, Mont., in place of W. M. Chapman, resigned.

NEBRASKA

Ora E. Swartz, Byron, Nebr. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Violet P. Adams, Daykin, Nebr. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Leo R. Conroy, Eddyville, Nebr. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

Marie Nielsen, Elba, Nebr., in place of M. E. Welsh, resigned.

Stanley R. Wheeler, Giltner, Nebr. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Faye Morrissey, Grafton, Nebr. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Edwin F. Winter, Hoskins, Nebr. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

James M. McMahan, Inman, Nebr. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Jens W. Jensen, Litchfield, Nebr., in place of Cecil Brundige, resigned.

Harold L. Shepherd, Madrid, Nebr., in place of V. A. Tuey, resigned.

Ruth L. Reinhart, McCool Junction, Nebr., in place of M. E. Sughrue, resigned.

Leroy Buell Gorthey, Murdock, Nebr. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Mamie R. Hale, Naponee, Nebr. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

NEVADA

Harold E. Haviland, Winnemucca, Nev., in place of E. M. Byrne, transferred.

NEW HAMPSHIRE

Charles Myers, Jaffrey, N. H., in place of Charles Myers. Incumbent's commission expired April 16, 1942.

NEW JERSEY

Frances McLaughlin, Blackwood Terrace, N. J. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

NEW MEXICO

Jesse L. Truett, Artesia, N. Mex., in place of J. L. Truett. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Biddie N. Harrelson, Mesilla Park, N. Mex., in place of J. H. Bell, resigned.

Demetrio P. Roybal, Pecos, N. Mex. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Ruth Dorbandt Ware, Rincon, N. Mex. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

NEW YORK

Mable G. Evans, Branchport, N. Y. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Leo F. Sellers, Burke, N. Y. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Hildege N. Cataracte, Cadyville, N. Y. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Francis McDonald, Carle Place, N. Y. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Hollis F. Stowell, Cassadaga, N. Y., in place of H. B. Dye, resigned.

Thomas E. Havens, Center Moriches, N. Y., in place of B. B. Tooker, retired.

Elmer B. Weston, Chemung, N. Y. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Alfred C. Brondstatter, Cold Brook, N. Y. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Ruth Babcock Henry, Congers, N. Y., in place of W. J. Rokos, resigned.

Carl F. Seibel, Durhamville, N. Y. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Emil Peter Luc, East Williston, N. Y., in place of M. F. McDonald, deceased.

Milo J. Delong, Ellenburg Center, N. Y. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Mary A. Murphy, Forestport, N. Y. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Anna G. Prendergast, Hall, N. Y., in place of A. G. Prendergast. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Pauline Trainor, Heuvelton, N. Y., in place of G. S. McBratney, resigned.

Frank H. Tymeson, Maine, N. Y. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Harry B. Ecker, Mount Tremper, N. Y. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Francis T. Callan, Mumford, N. Y. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Mamie C. Foley, Ontario Center, N. Y. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Alice M. Smith, Richford, N. Y. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Alice E. Colburn, Rose, N. Y. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

William E. Worcester, Rotterdam Junction, N. Y. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Leo S. Kittell, Silver Creek, N. Y., in place of J. O. Bennett, retired.

NORTH CAROLINA

Sallie M. Brigmon, Barnardsville, N. C. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Don P. Steed, Candor, N. C., in place of D. P. Steed. Incumbent's commission expired May 16, 1942.

Alice T. Clarke, Columbus, N. C. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Claude M. Schell, Conover, N. C., in place of C. E. Bolick, transferred.

Myrtle U. Wall, Knightdale, N. C. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

William Lee Shoaf, Linwood, N. C. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Frances M. Todd, Plumtree, N. C. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Bessie Caudill, Roaring River, N. C. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Marvin J. Carver, Rougemont, N. C. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Nettie M. Millis, Sneads Ferry, N. C. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Daniel R. Bulla, Sophia, N. C. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Ethelyn G. Hawes, Supply, N. C. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Anna L. McNeill, Wade, N. C., in place of M. B. Culbreth, resigned.

Rubye S. Hood, Welch Cove, N. C. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Basil D. Barr, West Jefferson, N. C., in place of B. D. Barr. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

NORTH DAKOTA

Elder G. Ottis, Abercrombie, N. Dak. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Amelia K. Martin, Goodrich, N. Dak., in place of O. F. Leedy, deceased.

James R. Brown, Heaton, N. Dak. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Edmond M. Ellingson, Kintyre, N. Dak. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Shirley M. Cascaden, York, N. Dak., in place of A. D. Cochrane, retired.

OHIO

Clifford C. Webber, Dexter City, Ohio. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Lenna E. Seaver, Dorset, Ohio. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Mary M. Feltman, Kalida, Ohio. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Laura W. Rice, Lockwood, Ohio. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Frances H. Cernyar, New Middletown, Ohio. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Charles F. Stewart, New Springfield, Ohio. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Winona S. Matson, North Bloomfield, Ohio. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Mary Kathryn Lehman, North Hampton, Ohio. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Edna F. Pierce, North Kingsville, Ohio. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

John P. Statler, Rome, Ohio. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Clarice M. Cowell, Windsor, Ohio. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

OKLAHOMA

May McElroy, Amber, Okla., in place of R. J. Early, resigned.

Lee Nora Simpson, Caney, Okla. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Cara M. Masters, Cardin, Okla., in place of W. R. Chambers, deceased.

William W. Stepp, Headrick, Okla. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

J. Lloyd McLinn, Indiahoma, Okla., in place of M. R. Sargent, resigned.

Juanita I. Taylor, Marland, Okla. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Leona M. Hilliary, Medicine Park, Okla. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Nelle B. Harbin, Mutual, Okla. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Sloan S. Stringer, Ochelata, Okla. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

William M. Etter, Oktaha, Okla. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Sarah L. Stanton, Putnam, Okla. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Paul R. Fulfs, Randlett, Okla. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Oda Smith, Reed, Okla. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Mary McCutcheon, Schulter, Okla. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Ava Waters, Shadypoint, Okla. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Albert W. Shook, South Coffeyville, Okla. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Thomas O. Talla, Sterling, Okla. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

OREGON

Virgie R. Bradley, Aumsville, Oreg. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Walter F. Petersen, Lapine, Oreg. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

James R. Sandford, North Plains, Oreg. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Lorena Lane Bounds, Ordnance, Oreg. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Mary E. Grieve, Prospect, Oreg. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Veva I. Hendricks, Seneca, Oreg., in place of G. F. Kennedy, resigned.

PENNSYLVANIA

Roy H. Tyson, Alderson, Pa., in place of J. B. Newhart, transferred.

Joseph D. McNelis, Beaver Brook, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Mildred G. Cooper, Brownstown, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Clarence T. Johnston, Buck Run, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Samuel J. Bondi, Canonsburg, Pa., in place of E. M. Cockins, transferred.

George A. Crawford, Centre Hall, Pa., in place of C. W. Boozer, deceased.

Lewis S. Helmick, Ernest, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Lawrence C. Nees, Geistown, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Anna T. Connor, Glen Olden, Pa., in place of M. E. Angley, failed to qualify.

Sarah Mitchell, Kennerdell, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Lawrence J. Wood, Lima, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Wilbert R. Adams, New Kingstown, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Marshall E. Yost, Point Pleasant, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Stephen E. Hornberger, Reinholds, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Susan Breene, Reno, Pa., in place of M. M. Hill, removed.

John N. Snavely, Rohrerstown, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Thomas T. Shearston, Shaft, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Mary H. Serrini, Slovan, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

Maude R. Fowler, West Springfield, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

SOUTH CAROLINA

Jackson L. Flake, Swansea, S. C., in place of J. L. Flake. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Katherine M. Ward, Wampee, S. C. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

SOUTH DAKOTA

John A. Druley, Ashton, S. Dak. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

George A. Pitzl, Eden, S. Dak. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Carl H. Weir, Huron, S. Dak., in place of E. H. Bruemmer, deceased.

TENNESSEE

Alleen W. Stansberry, Boyds Creek, Tenn. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

William H. Fox, Graysville, Tenn. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Bessie H. Parrish, Hermitage, Tenn. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Doris P. Lyell, Lyles, Tenn., in place of S. L. Cummins, transferred.

Bernice Cress, Martel, Tenn., in place of N. C. Armstrong, removed.

Finis E. Sims, Medina, Tenn., in place of J. B. Turner, deceased.

Glenn L. Garrison, Niota, Tenn., in place of W. T. Latham, transferred.

Roger Q. Williams, Norris, Tenn., in place of R. G. Crossno, resigned.

Carney B. Thweatt, Orlinda, Tenn. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

William H. Higgenbotham, Riceville, Tenn., in place of J. R. Oliphant, transferred.

James Arthur Medlin, Sardis, Tenn. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Alfred H. Gill, Silver Point, Tenn., in place of A. H. Gill. Incumbent's commission expired May 28, 1942.

Thomas R. Grayson, Trade, Tenn. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

TEXAS

James E. Wallace, Flint, Tex. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Isaac G. Malone, Goodlett, Tex. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Emma Annette Greer, Lake Jackson, Tex. Office became Presidential April 1, 1944.

Tom Hazle Bivins, Longview, Tex., in place of J. K. Bivins, Jr., deceased.

Wilora Damuth, Magnolia, Tex. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Sallie Hudson, Newark, Tex. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Faye Emberson, Pilot Point, Tex., in place of W. E. Whitley, transferred.

Rua M. Arthur, Saltillo, Tex. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Verna Appling, Shepherd, Tex., in place of Louise McElroy, resigned.

John W. Wright, Thalia, Tex. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Gertrude B. Rabke, Tivoli, Tex. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Raleigh C. Spinks, Vera, Tex. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

UTAH

Agnes Ellen Scow, Dragerton, Utah. Office became Presidential April 1, 1944.

James C. Hill, Elsinore, Utah. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Nell M. Ekker, Loa, Utah. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Fenton T. Draper, Moroni, Utah, in place of M. P. Draper, transferred.

Christena G. Frank, Providence, Utah. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Thomas J. Morley, Salina, Utah, in place of Howard Mattsson, transferred.

LaPreal Richards, Spring Canyon, Utah. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Rulon L. Blain, Spring City, Utah. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Lois M. Jones, Sunnyside, Utah, in place of Ray Jones, resigned.

Florence Taylor, Willard, Utah. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

VERMONT

Edward P. Kelley, Danby, Vt., in place of E. P. Kelley. Incumbent's commission expired December 18, 1941.

Anna H. Morrie, East Barre, Vt. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Lester L. Worthley, East Corinth, Vt. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Marguerite C. McKenzie, Hinesburg, Vt. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Edith M. Reed, Jacksonville, Vt. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Marion L. Grover, Londonderry, Vt. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Frances E. Rock, Ludlow, Vt., in place of J. J. Rock, retired.

Merlin B. Ward, Moretown, Vt. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Herbert J. Tute, Newport Center, Vt. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Harold G. Kennedy, St. Albans, Vt., in place of H. B. Butler, deceased.

Olive E. Fullam, Westminster, Vt. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

VIRGINIA

Silas F. Hutchison, Herndon, Va., in place of A. R. Walker, deceased.

Eliza B. Kennedy, Jewell Ridge, Va., in place of L. M. Van Dyke, failed to qualify.

Marvin R. French, Pocahontas, Va., in place of J. L. Whitworth, resigned.

Lillias L. Martin, Toms Creek, Va. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

William R. M. Moss, Virginia Beach, Va., in place of W. P. Ashburn, resigned.

Mazie C. Sanders, Warsaw, Va., in place of A. H. Tyler, resigned.

WASHINGTON

Inez G. Spencer, Creston, Wash. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Edythe Pottratz, Cowiche, Wash. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Carmel L. Bellinger, Gorst, Wash. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Rose Champlin, Kennydale, Wash. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Minnie A. Hubble, Veradale, Wash. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

WEST VIRGINIA

Eugene B. Keenan, Nellis, W. Va. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Myra D. Duncan, Rachel, W. Va. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

D. Watson Oxley, West Hamlin, W. Va., in place of E. F. Midkiff, resigned.

WISCONSIN

Ann J. Karth, Arlington, Wis. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

Francis J. McCarty, Brownsville, Wis. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Everett R. White, Glenhaven, Wis. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Marjorie M. Minten, Menomonee Falls, Wis., in place of T. C. Gran, removed.

Oscar R. Horn, Muskego, Wis. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Gertrude M. Heaney, Poy Sippi, Wis. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Florence M. Van Poucke, South Range, Wis. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

James Ervin Casey, Star Prairie, Wis. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Glennes T. Anderson, Tripoli, Wis. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

WYOMING

Ella G. Kirschbaum, Pavillion, Wyo. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

CONFIRMATION

Executive nomination confirmed by the Senate November 16, 1944:

DIRECTOR OF WAR MOBILIZATION AND RECONVERSION

James F. Byrnes to be Director of War Mobilization and Reconversion for a term of 2 years.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, NOVEMBER 16, 1944

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O blessed Saviour, Thou ever-living One, Thou who are infinite in purity and truth, quicken our moral vision, our intellectual perception, and our emotional discernment. When we allow our range of charity and tolerance to be narrowed, rebuke and forgive us and lead us toward the completeness of a richer life. Unite us in joy and duty, privilege and responsibility, for we cannot offer to Thee and country a more convincing testimony of our patriotic zeal and devotion.

Almighty God, as the naked and tragic face of humanity turns toward our country, crucify in us all hate and low ambition for gain or national aggrandizement, ever holding aloft the cross of Him who is the eternal hope of all races, and who transforms and melts all discord into complete harmony. O keep America free, untroubled, and heroic as our citizens continue unfretted from every kind of restraint, hardship, and sacrifice. May we never grow weary until the curse of the aggressor nations is brought to the dust of defeat.

O let the ebbing tides of the week leave the Congress strengthened and chastened as our hearts throb for the sons and daughters who are fighting and dying for the integrity of our democracy and for the protection of our institutions. O bless us all and keep us in the sacred precincts of our Father's care until we meet again. In Christ's holy name we pray. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, November 14, 1944, was read and approved.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an article written by Mr. Joseph Leib, 3d, vice commander of Costello Post, the American Legion, of Washington, D. C., on the subject Urgent Need for Veterans' Hospitals and Beds, and to include therein an analysis from the Veterans' Administration showing the present facilities for caring for our veterans.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein an address delivered by the national commander of the American Legion at the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier in Arlington Cemetery on Armistice Day, November 11, 1944.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

MRS. WILLA E. FULMER

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Speaker, at the recent general election in South Carolina Mrs. WILLA E. FULMER was elected to fill the unexpired term of her late husband, the Honorable Hampton P. Fulmer. There was no contest in this election. The certificate has not yet come in. I, therefore, ask unanimous consent of the House that, notwithstanding the rules of the House, Mrs. FULMER be allowed to take the oath of office at the present time.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

SWEARING IN OF A MEMBER

The SPEAKER. The Member-elect will present herself at the bar of the House and take the oath of office.

Mrs. WILLA E. FULMER appeared at the bar of the House and took the oath of office.

BILLS ON THE PRIVATE AND CONSENT CALENDARS

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it may be in order to consider the individual bills on the Private Calendar on Tuesday next, and that it may be in order also to consider bills on the Consent Calendar on the following Monday.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I do this merely for the purpose of securing the program for next week.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, it is my understanding that following the call of bills on the Private Calendar on Tuesday next the crop-insurance bill will come up for consideration. Following that will be consideration of a road bill. These are the only measures I am advised are to be considered next week.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Does the gentleman know how much time will be allowed for consideration of the crop-insurance bill?

Mr. COOPER. I am not advised.

The SPEAKER. Possibly the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PACE] may be able to answer that.

Mr. PACE. Mr. Speaker, I regret I do not know.

The SPEAKER. The Chair understands that 2 hours' general debate will be allowed. Rule for the consideration of the so-called road bill has not been granted as yet, but that is expected to come in on Monday.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. That will follow the crop-insurance bill?

The SPEAKER. The road bill will follow immediately.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Thursday happens to be Thanksgiving Day next week. Will we be in session?

Mr. COOPER. There will not be a session on Thanksgiving Day.

Mr. MARTIN. If consideration of the road bill is not concluded on Wednesday, it will be in order on Friday?

Mr. COOPER. Yes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, in view of what the press said yesterday that the findings in the Kimmel-Short matter are expected within 3 weeks, may I ask the gentleman if he can give us any idea as to whether early action will be taken before the 3 weeks is up?

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I am not advised on that matter at the moment.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, I will press my demands on that a little more forcibly later. I think there will be more time by next week. At this time I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. DILWEG. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WEISS] be permitted to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include therein an article. The printer has estimated the cost of the extension to be $130. Notwithstanding that fact, I ask unanimous consent that the article may be printed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

GREAT LAKES-ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY PROJECT

Mr. DILWEG. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend my remarks by including a number of resolutions adopted at the eleventh annual convention of the Wisconsin Farmers Union held at Chippewa Falls, Wis., on October 27, 1944.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. DILWEG. Mr. Speaker, the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence seaway project should be included in the river and harbor bills now before the Senate Commerce Subcommittee. The St. Lawrence waterway would unlock Wisconsin and give us the markets of the world at our front door. It would increase the milk checks, poultry checks, and every other farmers' checks by saving on transportation costs. It is not alone the price the farmer receives, but it is the cost of marketing, too, that determines what net result he has.

As you well know, the grain farmers in the Northwest have one of the largest cooperative elevators in the world located in Superior. If oceangoing vessels could load this grain, it would bring them great additional savings which would be spent for things that factories and labor produce. All of this, in addition to the great industrial benefit it would bring to Wisconsin, especially to our northern area. Many of our workers would be employed on these projects in the post-war period and would help cut the unemployment problem.

Whereas farmers in the Great Lakes Basin have always been landlocked to oceangoing vessels, thus operating at a great handicap compared to those who have water transportation; and

Whereas it is not alone the price that farmers receive but also the advantage of transportation facilities that figure into their net income; and

Whereas the markets of the world could be opened up directly to Wisconsin farmers for their products, as well as the grain farmers of the West since the construction of cooperative grain-terminal facilities at the head of the Lakes; thus this project would not only be advantageous as a works project after the war, but after completion would keep our industries thriving and workers employed; and

Whereas this disadvantage is created by so few miles of the St. Lawrence River and this obstacle has been maintained by a handful of selfish interests who stand in the way of the general welfare of millions of people on the land and in the cities and factories: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Wisconsin Farmers Union request our Congressmen and Senators to make an immediate and vigorous effort to get the St. Lawrence waterway project passed by Congress and request the President to again call to the attention of the Congress the importance of this project for farmers and workers in the Great Lakes Basin as well as the western farmers.

Resolution adopted at the eleventh annual convention of the Wisconsin Farmers Union, held at Chippewa Falls, Wis., October 24–27, 1944.

Whereas there has come into being a strong organization known as the National Tax Equality League, whose chief purpose seems to be the hindrance of expansion of all types of cooperatives by various methods, such as misrepresentation of facts concerning repeal of certain tax legislation now in force as applied to cooperatives: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we go on record as being opposed to passage of any legislation which would repeal tax exemptions now in effect as applied to patron's savings of cooperatives, or any legislation which would seek to tax these savings.

Resolution adopted at the eleventh annual convention of the Wisconsin Farmers Union, held at Chippewa Falls, Wis., October 24–27, 1944.

Whereas national income is the factor which determines the economic condition of any land; and

Whereas there has been no effort on the part of our Nation in the past to maintain a stable national income to avoid so-called depressions and inflations; and

Whereas the National Farmers Union now has devised such a plan and this has been

introduced in the United States as an amendment by John Murray: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Wisconsin Farmers Union, gathered in convention this 25th day of October 1944, do hereby demand that our Congressmen and Senators use every honorable means possible to pass this amendment.

Resolution adopted at the eleventh annual convention of the Wisconsin Farmers Union, held at Chippewa Falls, Wis., October 24–27, 1944.

Whereas inasmuch as the National Farmers Union is asking for an appropriation for a land-purchase program from the Federal Government so that the men in our armed forces may have an opportunity to become established on farms after they receive their discharges: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the delegates assembled here go on record as favoring the support of this program, and ask that Federal funds be immediately appropriated.

Resolution adopted at the eleventh annual convention of the Wisconsin Farmers Union, held at Chippewa Falls, Wis., October 24–27, 1944.

Whereas after this war many people will be minus jobs and the relief columns will swell; and

Whereas we, the Farmers Union, contend many of these people could be used in the field to educate the public cooperatively, such a buying and selling collectively, thus promoting cooperation among the common people, which will raise their standard of living, and help all in the United States to enjoy life in the fullest: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That Federal funds be made available for this undertaking for the betterment of the common people.

Resolution adopted at the eleventh annual convention of the Wisconsin Farmers Union, held at Chippewa Falls, Wis., October 24–27, 1944.

Whereas it appears as though the European phase of the war may soon be won; and

Whereas it is intended that at the conclusion of the European phase of the war many service men can be released from active duty; and

Whereas it appears that some military officials are of the opinion that these servicemen should not be released any faster than they can be absorbed by our economic society and contending that servicemen can be retained in the service cheaper than they can be supported by the Government on relief if they are unable to find adequate employment; and

Whereas many servicemen come from farms which in many cases were left in charge of their elderly parents and younger brothers and sisters for the anticipated duration; and

Whereas many of these old people are unable to continue under present conditions much longer, which fact is attested to by the many auctions and retirement sales: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That all servicemen who are from farms should be released from active duty and be returned to the farm which they left as soon as the European phase of the war is over, so that these farms may be retained; and be it further

Resolved, That if the military authorities advise so, that these men be released for their work on the farm and still be retained as military reserves until such time as a complete discharge shall be advised.

Resolution adopted at the eleventh annual convention of the Wisconsin Farmers Union, held at Chippewa Falls, Wis., October 24–27, 1944.

Whereas the O. P. A. has seen fit to prosecute a great number of Wisconsin dairy plants for so-called violation of commodity price ceilings on products which dairy plants delivered to the public-terminal market places; and

Whereas in no instance have these plants received more than the quoted market price, and in nearly all cases the price received for these products less the cost of processing was reflected back to the producer in price which was not out of line with prices paid producers by other types of dairy plant processors; and

Whereas if these prosecutions are followed through by O. P. A. it will force the dairy plants to either file bankruptcy, mortgage the property, or make direct deductions from the farmers' milk checks, and, in any and all events, the farmers will pay the bill right at a time when they have been giving their greatest effort and contribution to the war effort with no personal Government contract or cost-plus guaranty like many other types of war plants: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Wisconsin Farmers Union recommends that the O. P. A. examine the records of all dairy plants, and wherever the dairy plant has reflected the price received back to the producer, either in cash, patronage dividends, or other patrons' equities, the O. P. A. drop its case in full against such plant.

Otherwise we recommend and pledge our support to these dairy plants to secure joint legal counsel to take these cases to the higher court.

Resolution adopted at the eleventh annual convention of the Wisconsin Farmers Union held at Chippewa Falls, Wis., October 24–27, 1944.

Whereas the Tennessee Valley Authority has brought about the most remarkable feat in the history of mankind to all the people of the United States through its demonstration that devastating waters through rainfall can be harnessed, not only to be rendered harmless to man but to be turned into the most useful implements of progress through flood control, power, navigation, fertilizer plants, rehabilitation of people on the land and in the cities, and malaria control; and

Whereas these accomplishments have been made at no actual cost to the taxpayers of the Nation, inasmuch as T. V. A. has paid not only the principal installments to the Federal Treasury but, in addition, has paid interest on the borrowed capital to its Government, at the same time producing low-cost power and fertilizers, which have restored thousands of farm families to lands which had previously been discarded as worn out and practically worthless, and no private organization or capital could ever accomplish this task: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Wisconsin Farmers Union go on record in favor of immediate passage of the Missouri Valley Authority contained in the Murray bill, which will give, in addition, irrigation to the great western food-producing basin of the United States. The Missouri Valley Authority will open up new avenues of fertilizer production in Montana and neighboring States where we have vast supplies of untouched fertilizing materials; be it further

Resolved, That we recommend to the President and Congress a wider authority to develop all similar river basins as the most constructive and economical means of securing people, property, and progress of our Nation.

Resolution adopted at the eleventh annual convention of the Wisconsin Farmers Union, held at Chippewa Falls, Wis., October 24–27, 1944.

Whereas we realize the importance of "hot school lunches": Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Wisconsin Farmers Union support the continued appropriation for the purpose of "hot school lunches" in rural districts.

Resolution adopted at the eleventh annual convention of the Wisconsin Farmers Union, held at Chippewa Falls, Wis., October 24–27, 1944.

Whereas attacks are being made upon the production-credit system; and

Whereas the system has demonstrated its value in the field of farm credit: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Farmers Union shall continue its full influence to maintain the present status of the production-credit system and to continue it under the Department of Agriculture.

Resolution adopted at the eleventh annual convention of the Wisconsin Farmers Union, held at Chippewa Falls, Wis., October 24–27, 1944.

Whereas we realize the importance to the farmers of Wisconsin that interest rates on Federal land bank loans should not be increased; and

Whereas farmers do not have the benefits of low interest rates that big business can enjoy; and

Whereas it is imperative to the future of agriculture that farmers' debts be lowered: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That interest rates on Federal land bank loans be reduced to 3 percent.

Resolution adopted at the eleventh annual convention of the Wisconsin Farmers Union, held at Chippewa Falls, Wis., October 24–27, 1944.

Whereas we realize the importance of the development of the Wolf River and the importance of proper flood control, including the Fox River and the Embarass River Valley; and

Whereas we realize that this must have a place in the post-war reconstruction period: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the membership of the Wisconsin Farmers Union support such a project; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to all Congressmen and the two Senators from Wisconsin, and also that a copy of this resolutio be sent to the members of the State Legislature of Wisconsin.

Resolution adopted at the eleventh annual convention of the Wisconsin Farmers Union, held at Chippewa Falls, Wis., October 24–27, 1944.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. O'BRIEN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein a short quotation.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein a report by the Attorney General on immigration.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization may sit on Monday during the session of the House, if there is a session.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

ALFRED EMANUEL SMITH

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, we are mourning the passing of a great American. Out of the city streets came Alfred Emanuel Smith, to become the leader of his State and the candidate of his party for the Presidency of the United States. He was the typical product of the teeming metropolis of America, which educates its people, just as the farm and countryside are educational agencies in their own way. Here, in the city of New York, Al Smith learned to love his neighbors, to participate in their life's affairs, to help them in their daily struggles, and to become the man he was, kindly, benignant, friendly, and well-informed.

Smith used to say that he was a graduate of F. F. M., the Fulton Fish Market, and having no other degree, he facetiously attached these initials to his name whenever he encountered people with a string of degrees from colleges or universities. Nevertheless, he lived to receive honorary degrees from many institutions, and he had the right to doctor degrees of all types conferred upon him by universities here and abroad.

Smith's political career began with membership in the assembly, and he rose to be the speaker of the assembly and later a most effective member of the State constitutional convention, which rewrote and modernized our State constitution.

It was Smith's genius which resulted in New York's Constitution becoming the model for other States in the manner in which the work of all executive departments was rearranged, the Governor's term lengthened, the legislature streamlined, and other far-reaching improvements made in the actual trends of official business of New York.

In 1918, by an overwhelming vote, Alfred E. Smith became Governor of the State of New York, and he served with distinction in that office for 8 years. He was one of the most progressive Governors the State ever had, and every paper issued from the Governor's pen during his term of office bears the stamp of enlightened statesmanship and also of far-reaching vision.

In 1928 the people of the State of New York, as well as the other States of the Union, had the opportunity of casting their ballots for Alfred E. Smith for the supreme honor of his career, the Presidency of the United States.

Unfortunately, however, the powers of bigotry were too strong, and were so strong, in fact, that they prevented Al Smith from reaching the Presidency.

Al Smith, however, took his defeat good-naturedly, just as he took his victories on previous occasions. In spite of the fact that he was not elected to the Presidency, he became a wise and able counselor of his party, and it was largely due to his efforts that Franklin Delano Roosevelt was elected Governor of the State of New York, and eventually became President of the United States.

President Roosevelt called Al Smith "the Happy Warrior," this title taken from Wordsworth's famous poem, and indeed Smith's life was that of a happy warrior. While he fought hard for the great reforms which were accomplished in the State of New York, he fought without malice and without rancor. His whole life was based on the philosophy of friendship and cooperation, and one can never imagine Al Smith with a frown. The usual picture was that of a smiling, cigar-smoking man, surrounded by others and settling affairs of great importance, with a big smile and an attitude of benevolence.

Smith was married to a childhood companion, and spent almost a half century with his wife. She died a few months ago, and undoubtedly her death hastened that of Alfred E. Smith.

He has now gone to the land of the great beyond, and paraphrasing the words of St. Paul, he has done the work of a good and faithful servant. His memory will never fade from the memory of men.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that today, at the conclusion of the legislative program and following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 2 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Hampshire?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial appearing in the New York Times.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Hampshire?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOLMES of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD in three instances; in one, to include a set of resolutions adopted by the Golden Blue Star Mothers of Lithuanian Descent, October 11; second, to include an article entitled "Polish Priests Protest Red Influence in Poland"; third, to include an article which appeared in the Worcester Gazette entitled "Czechs Will Not Abandon Democracy."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein an article which appeared in the Idaho Statesman.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Idaho?

There was no objection.

(Mr. LEA asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.)

THE GETTYSBURG ADDRESS

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include the text of a resolution I have introduced.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, the Military Order of the Loyal Legion, a patriotic organization that was founded on the day of Abraham Lincoln's death, has proposed the establishment of an annual custom of having President Lincoln's Gettysburg Address read in both branches of Congress on the anniversary of the delivery of that great address or on the nearest approximate date when the legislative bodies are in session. The idea, which was first proposed by the Indiana commandery, has met with favor among all of the commanderies of the Loyal Legion and among patriotic societies generally throughout the Nation. The consensus of opinion is that it would be a beautiful custom, inspiring and meaningful in its influence and implications. The Gettysburg address was delivered on November 19, 1863, 81 years ago next Sunday. In accordance with the wishes of the Loyal Legion and by unanimous consent of the House I shall read this address, the outstanding literary classic of the ages, as follows:

Fourscore and 7 years ago our fathers brought forth upon this continent, a new nation, conceived in liberty, and dedicated to the proposition that all men are created equal. Now we are engaged in a great civil war, testing whether that nation, or any nation so conceived, and so dedicated, can long endure. We are met on a great battlefield of that war. We have come to dedicate a portion of that field, as a final resting place for those who here gave their lives, that that nation might live. It is altogether fitting and proper that we should do this. But in a larger sense, we cannot dedicate—we cannot consecrate—we cannot hallow this ground. The brave men, living and dead, who struggled here, have consecrated it, far above our poor power to add or detract. The world will little note, nor long remember, what we say here, but it can never forget what they did here. It is for us, the living, rather, to be dedicated here to the unfinished work which they who fought here have, thus far, so nobly advanced. It is rather for us to be here dedicated to the great task remaining before us—that from these honored dead we take increased devotion to that cause for which they here gave the last full measure of devotion—that we here highly resolve that these dead shall not have died in vain—that this Nation, under God, shall have a new birth of freedom—and that government of the people, by the people, for the people, shall not perish from the earth.

By request of the Loyal Legion, I have introduced a resolution designating the anniversary of the famous address as Dedication Day. This resolution is pending before the Committee on the Judiciary and I sincerely hope that it will pass and become a law before the

end of the present Congress. The resolution is as follows:

House Joint Resolution 194

Joint resolution designating November 19, the anniversary of Lincoln's Gettysburg Address, as Dedication Day

Whereas the Gettysburg Address of President Abraham Lincoln is the outstanding classic of the ages; and

Whereas it will touch the hearts of men and inspire them with faith in our matchless democracy as long as time endures; and

Whereas in that address Mr. Lincoln adjured his fellow countrymen to dedicate themselves to the principles of democracy in order that government "of the people, by the people, and for the people shall not perish from the earth": Therefore be it

Resolved, etc., That November 19, the anniversary of the Gettysburg Address, be, and hereby is, designated in our calendar of special days as Dedication Day.

That the President of the United States is requested to proclaim November 19 as Dedication Day and to suggest that the address be read on that day in public assemblages throughout the United States and its possessions, on our ships at sea, and wherever the American flag flies.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. MERROW] is recognized for 2 minutes.

RATIFICATION OF TREATIES

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Speaker, with our superiority in men and materials it is only a matter of time before our enemies will be completely defeated on every battlefront in the world. The complex and intricate problems of the post-war period are already upon us. I wish we were as certain of winning the peace as we are of winning the war. We should begin at once to construct governmental machinery to insure the peace of the future.

The Constitution of the United States places the treaty-making power with the President and the Senate. Article 2, section 2, reads as follows: "He (the President) shall have power, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, to make treaties, provided two-thirds of the Senators present concur. * * *" The House of Representatives is thus excluded from participating in the making of treaties. A third of the Senate may reject treaties. This method is obviously undemocratic. The procedure is antiquated and often results in unexcusable obstruction.

At the moment there are several joint resolutions before the Committee on the Judiciary which propose changing the Constitution in regard to the method of treaty ratification. I hope that these proposals will soon be considered and that a resolution will be presented to the House proposing a constitutional amendment which will give the President the power by and with the advice and consent of the Congress to make treaties provided a majority of the Members present in each House concur. I hope that two-thirds of the Members of the House and the Senate will immediately adopt the resolution and that the country will soon have an opportunity to act upon this much-needed constitutional reform.

A majority of both Houses of Congress is sufficient to take this great Nation into war. Certainly a majority is sufficient to make the peace. By amending the Constitution to permit a majority of the Members present in each House to approve a treaty we would make an inestimable contribution to the construction of a peaceful world. This is a reform that should be made at the earliest possible moment. This would be a step forward in developing a foreign policy to meet the complexities of this scientific era.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MERROW. I yield.

Mr. PRIEST. I appreciate what the gentleman has said, and, as author of one of these resolutions myself, I think we should emphasize the importance of action now because the majority of State legislatures will be in session in January and could, therefore, take ratification action at that time.

Mr. MERROW. I thank the gentleman and I hope that we will act immediately. It is one of the most pressing problems before us.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills and a joint resolution of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table, and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 578. An act granting jurisdiction to the Court of Claims to reopen and readjudicate the eminent-domain case of John W. Parish, trustee (John H. Bexten, substituted), and revise its judgment heretofore entered therein, to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 963. An act relating to the imposition of certain penalties and the payment of detention expenses incident to the bringing of certain aliens into the United States; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

S. 1002. An act conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the District of Rhode Island to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Roy W. Olsen; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 1100. An act to provide for the promotion of officers on the retired list of the Army after specified years of service on active duty; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

S. 1274. An act for the relief of Vodie Jackson; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 1462. An act for the relief of Solomon and Marie Theriault; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 1645. An act relating to the administration of the Glacier National Park Fish Hatchery, at Creston, Mont., and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

S. 1688. An act to authorize the Governor of the Farm Credit Administration and the Secretary of Agriculture to compromise, adjust, or cancel certain indebtedness, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

S. 1746. An act authorizing and directing the Secretary of the Interior to issue to Peter A. Condelario a patent in fee to certain land; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

S. 1905. An act for the relief of the estate of Walney A. Colvin, deceased; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 1925. An act to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Interior to issue to Charles F. White a patent in fee to certain land; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

S. 1953. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to contract with the Middle Rio Grande Conservancy District of New Mexico for the payment of operation and maintenance charges on certain Pueblo Indian lands; to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

S. 1997. An act for the relief of Jack Stowers, B & O Store, and Cotton County Poultry & Egg Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 2026. An act authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to Richard Pickett; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

S. 2042. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of Nancy Frassrand, a minor; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 2053. An act relating to the pay of officers of the retired list of the Navy serving on active duty in the rank of rear admiral; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

S. J. Res. 141. Joint resolution memorializing the name of Horace Wells; to the Committee on the Library.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly the House (at 12 o'clock and 23 minutes p. m.), under its previous order, adjourned until Monday, November 20, 1944, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

THE COMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION

The Committee on Immigration and Naturalization will hold hearings on Monday, Tuesday, and Wednesday, November 20, 21, and 22, 1944, at 10:30 a. m., on public and private bills—unfinished business.

COMMITTEE ON THE POST OFFICE AND POST ROADS

There will be a meeting of the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads on Tuesday, November 21, 1944, at 10:30 a. m., to consider H. R. 4919 (authorizing postmasters in Alaska to administer oaths), H. R. 4892 (relating to clerical assistance in military and naval post offices), and to hold hearings on the subject of a general revision of salaries and other compensation of employees of the Postal Service.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

2001. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the fiscal year 1945, amounting to $150,000, for the War Refugee Board (H. Doc. No. 770); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

2002. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the fiscal year 1945 for the Veterans' Administration, amounting to $10,571,000, together with a draft of proposed provisions pertaining to existing appropriations for said Veterans' Administration (H. Doc. No. 771); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

2003. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting supplemental estimates of appropriation for the fiscal year 1945 for the Federal Security Agency, amounting to $4,433,800, together with a draft of proposed provision pertaining to existing appropriations for said Agency for the fiscal year 1944 (H. Doc. No. 772); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

2004. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the

Executive Office of the President, Bureau of the Budget, for the fiscal year 1945, in the amount of $25,000, together with a draft of a proposed provision pertaining to an existing appropriation (H. Doc. No. 773); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

2005. A letter from the Acting Secretary, Department of State, transmitting copies of Resolutions 53 and 54 of the Council of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Organization; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2006. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to amend section 522 of the Tariff Act of 1930 so as to clarify the procedure in ascertaining the value of foreign currency for customs conversion purposes where there are dual or multiple exchange rates, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2007. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Power Commission, transmitting a copy of its seventh consecutive annual report entitled "Statistics of Electric Utilities in the United States," for the calendar year 1943; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

2008. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting a report on records proposed for disposal by various Government agencies; to the Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. DICKSTEIN:

H. R. 5464. A bill to amend the law relating to the authority of certain employees of the Immigration and Naturalization Service to make arrests without warrant in certain cases and to search vehicles within certain areas; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

H. R. 5465. A bill to amend section 342 (b) of the Nationality Act of 1940; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. DIMOND:

H. R. 5466. A bill to amend section 3 of the act approved June 20, 1936, entitled "An act to extend the benefits of the Adams Act, the Purnell Act, and the Capper-Ketcham Act to the Territory of Alaska, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. FAY:

H. R. 5467. A bill to increase the rates of compensation of certain postal employees and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. MANASCO:

H. R. 5468. A bill to provide for the barring of certain claims by the United States in connection with Government checks and warrants; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. PETERSON of Florida:

H. R. 5469. A bill providing for payments to the State of Wyoming and for rights-of-way, including stock driveways over and across Federal lands within the exterior boundary of the Jackson Hole National Monument, Wyo., and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. PRICE:

H. R. 5470. A bill relating to the imposition of certain penalties and the payment of detention expenses incident to the bringing of certain aliens into the United States; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. RANKIN:

H. R. 5471. A bill to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to transfer by quitclaim deed to the city of Los Angeles, Calif., for fire-station purposes, the title to certain land located at Veterans' Administration facility, Los Angeles, Calif.; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. VINSON of Georgia:

H. R. 5472. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to grant to the city of Canton, Ohio, for highway purposes only, a strip of land situated within the United States naval ordnance plant at Canton, Ohio; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. BEALL:

H. R. 5473. A bill to provide for the completion of the Savage River Dam by the Upper Potomac River Commission; to the Committee on Flood Control.

By Mr. BLOOM:

H. R. 5474. A bill to enable the Department of State, pursuant to its responsibilities under the Constitution and statutes of the United States, more effectively to carry out its prescribed and traditional responsibilities in the foreign field; to strengthen the Foreign Service, permitting fullest utilization of available personnel and facilities of other departments and agencies and coordination of activities abroad of the United States under a Foreign Service for the United States, unified under the guidance of the Department of State; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MAAS:

H. R. 5475. A bill proposing a change to develop a strong Naval Reserve force; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. RANDOLPH:

H. R. 5476. A bill to authorize the dissolution of the Women's Christian Association of the District of Columbia and the transfer of its assets; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. PETERSON of Florida:

H. R. 5477 (by request). A bill to provide aid for the readjustment in civilian life of those persons who rendered war service in the United States Merchant Marine during World War No. 2, and to provide aid for the families of such disabled or deceased war-service merchant seamen; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. LEA:

H. J. Res. 315. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States with respect to the term of office of members of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Election of President, Vice President, and Representatives in Congress.

By Mr. DIRKSEN:

H. Res. 649. Resolution to investigate practices and policies of the Securities and Exchange Commission; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. SMITH of Virginia:

H. Res. 650. Resolution providing additional funds for the Select Committee to Investigate Acts of Executive Agencies which exceed the scope of their power or authority; to the Committee on Accounts.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BARRY:

H. R. 5478. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Catherine Driggers and her minor children; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BRYSON:

H. R. 5479. A bill for the relief of Lander H. Willis; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HALE:

H. R. 5480. A bill for the relief of Percy Allen; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HENDRICKS:

H. R. 5481. A bill for the relief of Edgar Kaigler; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. JOSEPH M. PRATT:

H. R. 5482. A bill granting a pension to Mrs. Katherine I. Goughan; to the Committee on Pensions.

H. R. 5483. A bill granting a pension to Edward Hoffman; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. ROLPH:

H. R. 5484. A bill for the relief of Lt. Thomas J. Twohig; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

6184. By Mr. BARRETT: Petition of Edna Bondurant and 19 other citizens of Torrington, Wyo., protesting against the proposed liquor holiday and also against a tax refund to the alcoholic beverage industry; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

6185. By Mrs. NORTON: Petition of delegates to a convention of the ladies' auxiliary of the Association of the Sons of Poland protesting against the attitude of Russia toward the constitutional government of Poland now in London and demanding the freedom of sovereign Poland without any change of its boundaries; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

6186. By Mr. ROLPH: Resolution No. 4248, series of 1939, of the board of supervisors, regarding House bill 1502, proposing to amend the Securities and Exchange Act of 1934; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

6187. Also, resolution of the Board of Supervisors of Los Angeles County, Calif., referring to housing for returning veterans; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

6188. Also, resolution of the Board of Supervisors of Los Angeles County, Calif., endorsing House bill 1502; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

6189. Also, petition of the Tracy Chamber of Commerce, urging passage of Elliott amendment to the Central Valley water project; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

6190. By Mr. GRAHAM: Petition of 110 members of the Plaingrove Sabbath School of Volant, Pa., urging the passage of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

6191. Also, petition of 40 members of the Baden Methodist Church congregation, Baden, Beaver County, Pa., for the establishment of a Christian world order; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

6192. By Mr. ROLPH: Resolution of County Supervisors Association of California, endorsing Senate bill 1940; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

6193. By Mr. LYNCH: Petition of 174 citizens of the Twenty-second Congressional District of New York, protesting against the passage of the so-called Bryson bill, H. R. 2082, or any other prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

6194. By Mr. ROHRBOUGH: Petition of Mrs. S. D. Windon and 20 other citizens of West Union, W. Va., urging the passage of the Bryson bill, H. R. 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

6195. Also, petition of D. E. Allen and 21 other citizens of West Union, W. Va., urging the passage of the Bryson bill, H. R. 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

6196. By Mr. FAY: Petition of 180 constituents of the Sixteenth District of New York City, protesting against the enactment of House bill 2082, the Bryson bill, or any other prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

6197. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Robert Swibert, contending that the present ballot of the State of Michigan has disfranchised, under certain provisions of the Constitution

of that State, electors coming under said provision from having the qualifications requisite for electors as provided for in the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on Election of President, Vice President, and Representatives in Congress.

6198. Also, petition of Jose E. Perez, of the Mexican National Democratic Legion, suggesting and reviewing suggestions on reorganization and demobilization of United States war industries to a peacetime basis, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

SENATE

MONDAY, NOVEMBER 20, 1944

(Legislative day of Thursday, November 16, 1944)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer.

Gracious Father of our spirits, beyond all the madness of these angry days which devastate the face of our warring earth we turn to Thee who sittest above the floods and in whose balances the nations are weighed. Lift us out of our doubt and cynicism by a great faith to live by and great causes to live for. Teach us once again the everlasting mystery that only as we lose ourselves in something higher than ourselves can we find ourselves. In this difficult and darkened era open our eyes to see, not just the dangers which menace but also the doors which challenge.

We ask today for Thy consoling grace upon those who grieve at the passing from this mortal stage of one who, tarrying for an active decade beyond the allotted span, for a colorful generation played his part in the deliberations of this body. In these Halls of Government which knew him so long we think of one who served his State and Nation with a rugged honesty, scorning the conventional niceties of honeyed speech, which we confess is often the mask of hypocrisy. As familiar figures in the Nation's life join the great majority, solemnize us with the realization that even in the longest career the time is short. May we stand in a dark day, not among those who curse the darkness but among those who light a candle. In the Redeemer's name we ask it. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Thursday, November 16, 1944, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

DEATH OF SENATOR ELLISON D. SMITH, OF SOUTH CAROLINA

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, it is with a sense of deep regret that I am called upon to announce to the Senate the death of my distinguished colleague from the State of South Carolina, Hon. ELLISON D. SMITH, which occurred at his home in Lynchburg in that State on Friday, the 17th instant.

Extended remarks relative to the life, character, and public service of the late Senator are not appropriate at this time, and I shall avail myself of an opportunity at another time to pay a proper tribute to his memory.

I do desire, however, to call attention to the fact that Senator SMITH was the dean of the Senate, and his service in this body comprised a longer continuous period than that of any other Senator in the history of the Government, for he had served in the Senate 35 years 8 months and 13 days.

I now send to the desk a resolution, for which I ask immediate consideration. In view of the fact that Senator SMITH's death and funeral occurred during the recess of the Senate, the formal appointment of a committee to attend the funeral is not called for in the resolution. A committee, however, was unofficially appointed by the Vice President to attend the funeral, which took place yesterday at his home in South Carolina.

(The following committee of the Senate was previously appointed by the Vice President to attend the funeral of the late Senator ELLISON D. SMITH:

BURNET R. MAYBANK, South Carolina, chairman; KENNETH MCKELLAR, Tennessee; ARTHUR CAPPER, Kansas; ELMER THOMAS, Oklahoma; ARTHUR H. VANDENBERG, Michigan; JOSIAH W. BAILEY, North Carolina; JOHN H. BANKHEAD, Alabama; WALLACE H. WHITE, Jr., Maine; RICHARD B. RUSSELL, Georgia; CARL A. HATCH, New Mexico; THEODORE G. BILBO, Mississippi; ALLEN J. ELLENDER, Louisiana; GEORGE D. AIKEN, Vermont.)

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution submitted by the Senator from South Carolina will be read.

The Chief Clerk read the resolution (S. Res. 335), as follows:

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow and deep regret the announcement of the death of Hon. ELLISON D. SMITH, late a Senator from the State of South Carolina.

Resolved, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Resolved, That as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased the Senate do now adjourn.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, in the death of Senator ELLISON D. SMITH, of South Carolina, I feel not only the sorrow of having lost a personal friend but also an appreciation of the loss to our country as well. America needs men who are not afraid to fight for their convictions, regardless of what the outcome to themselves may be. Senator SMITH was one of these. For nearly 36 years he fought to improve the status of the American farmer. Sometimes he won; sometimes he lost; but he never quit. The Senate will not seem quite the same now that he has gone, and American agriculture has lost one of its stanchest champions and truest friends.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I cannot let pass the opportunity to say a word concerning our friend and colleague who has just departed this earth. It is a rare distinction for any man to serve continuously for a period of time beyond any other man who ever occupied a seat in any legislative body. It is certainly a rare honor and privilege for any man to have served longer continuously than any other man in the history of the United States Senate, which was the particular honor enjoyed by the late Senator from South Carolina, Mr. SMITH.

He came to the Senate 4 or 5 years before I was elected to the House of Representatives. When he was first elected to the Senate, I recall as a young man in Kentucky reading about his election, and, because of his colorful character and his originality of expression and his independence of thought, he attracted my attention. Of course, any man of the characteristics of the late Senator from South Carolina would attract the attention of young men, whether in public life or in private life.

I suppose it is not necessary for me to remind the Senate that I did not always agree with Senator SMITH; in fact, I frequently disagreed with him on measures and on the philosophy of government; but no man could deny his honesty or his ruggedness of character; no man could deny that he possessed an independence that transcended partisan politics and that he gave not only color to the Senate but to a career which is unique in the history of the Senate of the United States.

He had many personal qualities which endeared him to his colleagues here and to friends in his own State. No man could be elected to the Senate of the United States continuously for 36 years unless he possessed qualities which appealed to the people of the State which he represented.

We sometimes say and feel, not only in our own individual cases, but in other cases, that men come to Congress by accident, that some fluke occurs which elevates a man to membership in the House or Senate, or to some other distinguished office. No man could contend that Senator SMITH, or any other man who has come to the Senate and served for more than a generation, came by reason of accident or fluke, or for any other reason except that he appealed to the people who, in the final analysis, enjoy the responsibility of deciding upon men and measures of government.

As a personal friend, I regret and mourn the death of Senator SMITH. I am sure that, without regard to politics, we all respected him and held him in cordial affection, and have for his family and friends the utmost sympathy and consideration. I am sure that at a later date the Senate will set aside a day for more pretentious commentaries upon his life and character, but I felt that I should say at least this much now, before the resolution is adopted.

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, it was my privilege to attend the impressive funeral services held at the farm of the late Senator SMITH, near Lynchburg, S. C. The service was attended by a great number of his old friends, including farmers and people of all walks of life in the State of South Carolina. I never saw a group of people more sincere in their expressions of love for and appreciation of a devoted friend. Six

faithful colored men who had worked for the Senator many years on his farm served as pall bearers.

Mr. President, neither the Senate Chamber nor the meetings of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry will seem the same without Senator ELLISON D. SMITH, of South Carolina. I served on that committee with him for more than a quarter of a century, a few months short of 26 years. He had been here a full decade when I was sworn in as a Senator from Kansas.

The word "unique" is often misused, but I would say it applied to Senator SMITH. He was unique in my experience; I never have known, nor do I expect to know, anyone like him. "COTTON ED," as he liked to be called, and as he was known over the Nation, was close to the soil; he never forgot that he was a farmer, and never tried to forget it. He never forgot he was from the South, from South Carolina; that he represented the State of South Carolina; that he represented the farmers of South Carolina.

ELLISON D. SMITH was an individualist; he was a fighter; he was positive in his convictions, his beliefs, and his actions. There was little if any of compromise in his make-up. If he was for something, he was for it 100 percent. If he was against something, he was against it—well, generally considerably more than 100 percent.

We shall miss his homely humor; his pungent statements; his keen characterizations of programs he did not approve, back of all of which was a broad streak of kindly regard for those he castigated.

ELLISON D. SMITH'S loyalty to what he believed in was a fighting loyalty to his State, to his neighbors, to his friends, to the farmers—a fighting loyalty that neither gave nor expected quarter in any contest. In the course of nearly 26 years I came to have a great admiration for his many strong and likeable qualities, and I also had a great liking for "COTTON ED" SMITH as a man and as a colleague.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I join with the distinguished majority leader and with other Senators in their expressions of sorrow occasioned by the death of our colleague, Senator SMITH.

Senator SMITH was a forceful and unique character. His long public service attested the respect and affection in which he was held by the people of his State. His constant and vigorous efforts in behalf of our people resident in agricultural areas, and in particular his devotion to the cotton producers of the South, were conspicuous over long years.

Senator SMITH, Mr. President, had deep convictions upon governmental and political questions, and voiced his views with such power and courage as to command the admiration of his associates in this body. Here he was loved. Here he will be long remembered. His State and the Nation will sadly miss his eminent services.

To the family of Senator SMITH I give assurances of my deep and lasting sympathy in the loss they have suffered.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the resolution was considered and unanimously agreed to.

Under the third resolving clause of the resolution, as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased Senator, the Senate (at 12 o'clock and 15 minutes p. m.) adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, November 21, 1944, at 12 o'clock meridian.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, NOVEMBER 20, 1944

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

In this sacred moment, Father of mercy, we would look into Thy face and discern Thy mind and hear Thy voice; the greater our willingness, the richer the flow of Thy grace. We pray for undisturbed unity in the emergencies of these hours, putting on moral strength like a robe, "for we wrestle against the rulers of darkness of this world and against spiritual wickedness in high places." In the tears of the world and our country's need may we find the forces of true consolidation and forge the links of enduring fellowship, seeking that life which can be found at the feet of God.

Heavenly Father, many a home in our land whose light has been as the glitter of a garish day, is now enveloped in the folds of chilling clouds. We pray that their quest for comfort may be under the guidance of our Lord, who will lead them to living fountains of water. O speak to them with soothing power and give them Thine own sweet rest. As adversity shows its famine-teeth at the very heart of this shaking world, forgive any luxurious sleep and any indecision in our ministry of service. As heroes and heroines, amid criticisms and even mockeries, help us to accept the challenge of an agonizing humanity, giving to our Republic our best strength and the wisest type of statesmanship. Peace be to all, and love with faith, from God the Father and the Lord Jesus Christ. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, November 16, 1944, was read and approved.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include a statement by the archbishops and bishops of the Catholic Church on world peace.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that today at the conclusion of other business I may address the House for 25 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

CHAIRMAN OF THE COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 651), which I send to the desk, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That JOHN W. FLANNAGAN, Jr., of the State of Virginia be, and he is hereby, elected chairman of the standing Committee of the House of Representatives on Agriculture.

The resolution was agreed to.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary may sit today during the session of the House.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

ELECTION RESULTS

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, for many months last past certain of the newspapers, radio commentators, and our friends on the opposite side of the aisle have been shouting anti-New Deal propaganda to the high heavens and predicting the overwhelming defeat of President Roosevelt, and, along with it, boasting that the American people would repudiate the Democratic leadership of the House and elect an overwhelming Republican membership for the Seventy-ninth Congress. I suppose we will hear nothing more from these false prophets for another couple of years now that the votes have been counted and President Roosevelt and the Democratic Party have been given such a magnificent vote of confidence by the American people.

During the last campaign I heard two birds twittering in a tree on the Capitol Grounds. One of them was a lady bird, and she was very much peeved because she had been down to see Sidney Hillman for the purpose of getting the endorsement of the Political Action Committee and it had been denied—in fact, she was so peeved that she just kept repeating over and over again, again, and again what apparently is the shortest speech on record, "Mr. Speaker, clear everything with Sidney." The other little bird was a gentleman bird—he was not peeved; he was very boastful. In fact, just the night before I heard someone using the very same words on the radio. This little bird was shouting to his lung capacity in a most boastful manner for everyone to hear "that the Republicans had the votes and that they should get together and throw the Speaker out and elect their own Speaker and take over the chairmanship of all the committees and elect their own leaders and operate the House according to their own wishes." I do not know whether or not these two little birds have flown away to parts un-

known, but at least—like the false prophets who were predicting the defeat of President Roosevelt and the overwhelming Republican majority for the House—we hear nothing from them today.

The verbal barrage hurled at President Roosevelt and the Democratic Party during the last campaign was no more successful than was the little boy who took his father's blunderbuss out to the duck blind and loaded it with soap bubbles to shoot ducks.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may address the House today 25 minutes after the disposition of business on the Speaker's table and other special orders.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Hampshire?

There was no objection.

Mr. STOCKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House today for 25 minutes following the other special orders.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. WINTER] may have permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include therein certain tables relative to highways and roads.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey.

There was no objection.

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD in two instances, in one to include an article entitled "Congress Should Investigate the Shortage of Work Clothes and Denim Ready-to-Wear"; the other an article entitled "Our Postal Employees Deserve an Increase in Wages."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

(Mr. PLUMLEY asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD, and include a newspaper article.)

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, and include an editorial from the New York Times; also an article printed in the same paper.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. DIMOND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD, and include therein an article written by Capt. Richard L. Neuberger entitled "Northwest Passage."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alaska?

There was no objection.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD, and include therein an address delivered by Commissioner Harry W. Bashore, of the Bureau of Reclamation, Department of the Interior.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Idaho?

There was no objection.

(Mr. REED of New York asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD, and include a newspaper article.)

WHAT NEBRASKA NEEDS

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska.

There was no objection.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, I have just returned from Nebraska. I have traveled over the 24 counties which comprise the Third Congressional District which I have the honor to represent in the House of Representatives. The people of my State are now starting the campaign to subscribe to the new war loan drive. I am sure Nebraska will oversubscribe its quota.

The Almighty has blessed our State this year with abundant moisture and our farmers are harvesting the largest crop of corn ever produced in the Cornhusker State.

The corn will be harvested but our farmers are seriously handicapped by lack of labor, lack of corn-picking machinery, and lack of work clothing. I bring this to your attention now because I believe it is unfair to our farmers to ask them to produce more and more food without giving them more serious consideration in the matter of the tools and clothing with which to work. Most of our farm youth of draft age have gone to war. The farmer, his wife, and children are in the fields today picking corn. Many of them have been to see me regarding the shortage of overalls, work shirts, husking mittens, work clothing for children, work shoes, print cloth, underwear, and many other things which are so badly needed.

I have brought to Washington several pairs of husking mittens and gloves which are frayed and worn out. In many places the farmers can buy no more. The clothing merchants in my district, too, are complaining. Their shelves are empty of the things the farmers need now to harvest this great crop of corn. Although I am taking up these matters with the War Production Board and the Office of Price Administration, I feel it my duty to tell the House of the conditions prevailing among the farmers in my district.

SWEARING IN OF MEMBER-ELECT

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, our former colleague the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. DOMENGEAUX] has been reelected to this House of Representatives, but his certificate of election has not yet arrived. Mr. DOMENGEAUX had no opposition in the general election, and I rise, Mr. Speaker, to ask unanimous consent that he be permitted to take the oath of office pending the arrival of his certificate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, I present my colleague who left our House to enter the armed services, and I may say on behalf of the Louisiana delegation that we are delighted to have him back with us.

The SPEAKER. So say we all.

Mr. DOMENGEAUX presented himself at the bar of the House and took the oath of office.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Gatlin, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had adopted the following resolution (S. Res. 324):

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES,
November 16, 1944.

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow the announcement of the death of Hon. HAMPTON P. FULMER, late a Representative from the State of South Carolina.

Resolved, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Resolved, That as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased the Senate do now take a recess until 12 o'clock noon on Monday next.

The message also announced that the Vice President has appointed Mr. BARKLEY and Mr. BREWSTER members of the joint select committee on the part of the Senate, as provided for in the act of August 5, 1939, entitled "An act to provide for the disposition of certain records of the United States Government," for the disposition of executive papers in the following departments and agencies:

1. Department of Agriculture.
2. Department of Commerce.
3. Department of the Interior.
4. Department of Justice.
5. Department of the Navy.
6. Department of State.
7. Department of the Treasury.
8. Department of War.
9. Federal Security Agency.
10. Federal Works Agency.
11. General Accounting Office.
12. National Archives.
13. National Housing Agency.
14. Office of Defense Transportation.
15. Reconstruction Finance Corporation.
16. War Manpower Commission.
17. War Relocation Authority.
18. United States courts (District Court, Northern District of Ohio).
19. United States Tariff Commission.

The message also announced that the Senate had adopted the following resolution (S. Res. 335):

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES,
November 20 (legislative day, November 16), 1944.

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow and deep regret the announcement of the death of Hon. ELLISON

D. SMITH, late a Senator from the State of South Carolina.

Resolved, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Resolved, That as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased the Senate do now adjourn.

The SPEAKER. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS] is recognized for 25 minutes.

STRENGTHENING CONGRESS—H. R. 5485 AND H. R. 5486

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, the American people confront today four great tasks. First, of course, the winning of the war. Second, the winning of the peace by doing all things necessary to make certain that the sacrifices of this war issue into a firm, lasting, and just peace. Third, the maintaining of full production, full employment, and high national income in the post-war period. And fourth, the preservation into the future of the basic liberties of the people and the democratic constitutional government of our country.

In many respects the last of these four tasks is fundamental to all the rest. And there are few citizens of this country who would believe the future of their children and grandchildren either a safe or a happy one if in the process of either winning the war or solving our economic problems we were to lose those basic freedoms which can only come to a people where democratic constitutional government in its full vigor prevails. But the vigor of this American type of government will depend directly upon the relationships which the Congress of the United States bears in the future to other branches of our Government and to the solution of the Nation's problems.

CONGRESS' JOB MORE DIFFICULT THAN EVER BEFORE

It would be childish indeed for us to conceive the problems of today or tomorrow as anything but vastly different in both nature and scope from the problems confronting American Government and American Congresses even a brief 30 or 40 years ago.

Whatever political party may be in power and whatever particular policies may be pursued by it, it is perfectly obvious that the role of government in the life of our Nation will in the future be far more crucial and important than it has been in the past. For the interdependence of every American citizen upon every other one is manifold greater than it was in the earlier, simpler days of our country; and the economic fate of millions may depend upon events utterly beyond their own control and taking place thousands of miles from their home communities.

TWO POSSIBLE TRENDS IN AMERICAN GOVERNMENT

Under these circumstances there are two possible courses which American Government can take. In my judgment, the decision as to which of these courses is to be followed will be made right here in the House of Representatives and in the Senate Chamber at the other end of the Capitol. The Congress of the United States holds within its own hands the determination of its own future and hence the future of our American Government itself.

For one possible course of development would consist of a continuous extension of the power and authority of the executive branch of the Government, the abandonment by Congress to the executive department of the admittedly difficult and detailed job of conceiving precise legislation to meet the needs and problems of modern America, and the reduction of the Congress to the position of a mere ratifying body, either approving or disapproving executive acts and proposals and occasionally making broad and indeterminate grants of power to the Executive. I doubt that more than a mere handful of Americans would consciously favor such a course for our country's government. It means the gradual growth of a type of government which the whole tradition of our country is against.

But if we are to avoid this course, we must recognize the hard, indisputable fact that the people of every nation, including our own, will always demand first of all reasonable hope of a solution of their everyday bread and butter problems and a sense of continuous progress toward a better life. The people will not for long abandon themselves to economic hopelessness and social confusion for the sake of governmental principles alone.

Therefore, if we are to avoid a concentration of power in the executive branch of government and a corresponding decline in the prestige and importance of the Congress, we must provide for increasing effectiveness on the part of the Congress, we must develop a growing sense of its tremendous responsibilities, and we must equip ourselves with the tools necessary to do the type of job which a national legislature must do in this modern age if it would be a truly coequal branch of government. Either the Congress must resign itself to a subordinate position, or else it must gird itself to do the intricate and difficult job of legislating effectively in the world as it really is.

H. R. 5485 AND H. R. 5486—LEGISLATION OF GREAT IMPORTANCE

For these reasons, Mr. Speaker, it is my sincere belief that the bill about which I shall speak to the House today may well turn out to be as important a bill as has been presented to the Congress in a generation.

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I will be glad to have the gentleman ask a question.

Mr. GIFFORD. Do I understand the gentleman correctly as saying that we should legislate as the world now really is? Does the gentleman want us to do that?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I will read the gentleman what I said:

> Either the Congress must resign itself to a subordinate position or else it must gird itself to do the intricate and difficult job of legislating effectively in the world as it really is.

Mr. GIFFORD. If I may pursue the inquiry further, the point I am trying to make is this: Does the gentleman want to pursue it in the form it is in now, to continue it in its present way, or effectively to check it?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I think my words are very clear, "to legislate effectively in the world as it really is." Of course, I do not want the world to be at war or its people in want or in confusion. I want a very different world, of course, from the present one. I am sure the gentleman will assume that.

Mr. GIFFORD. Leaving out the war entirely——

Mr. VOORHIS of California. That is hard to do.

Mr. GIFFORD. The gentleman says "as now is"; the trends as they now are in this world. The gentleman does not want to legislate in conformity with those trends, does he?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I think the gentleman is picking up a little phrase here, and if he will give me about 8 more minutes' time, he will be well satisfied with the real impact of what I have to say.

Mr. GIFFORD. I am simply trying to preserve order.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I am much obliged to the gentleman.

FIRST TASK OF CONGRESS—PASS LAWS, NOT SPEECHES

As I see it, there are three parts to the problem which the Congress confronts. The first is that measures enacted by Congress must be in the nature of laws rather than speeches. By "speeches" I mean measures which simply orate concerning this or that problem, make broad grants of power to the executive with instructions to solve that problem, authorize the appropriation of sums of money for that purpose and authorize the making of such rules and regulations as may be necessary to accomplish it. Instead of this, it is essential that the Congress meet as many problems as possible by means of definite, basic legislation, clear, understandable and as nearly as may be self-enforcing. And where in the nature of the case this cannot be done and when therefore some discretionary powers must be bestowed upon a Government agency, then Congress must define as exactly as possible the objectives to be reached, the powers to be used in reaching the objective, the limitations on those powers, the manner of their exercise and the redress of citizens when those powers are exercised in improper fashion. And if this cannot or is not done in the first instance it should be done as soon as a period of experience makes such specific legislative action possible.

SECOND TASK OF CONGRESS—GUARD GRANTS OF POWER

In the second place, the Congress must guard zealously in peacetime at least, the principle that under our form of government no power can be acquired by the executive department unless it is granted to that department in the Constitution or specifically granted by Congress in a statute. In wartime it is, of course, necessary to successful prosecution of

the war that broad grants of war power to the Executive be made. I am not discussing that question now. It is, I submit, beyond the scope of our discussion. We have done what we had to do to win the war. Every war power that has been granted will return here once the war has been won. What I am talking about is the long-run problem of American Government, and it seems to me very clear, that the heart of democratic constitutional government is to be found in the principle that I have just enunciated, namely, that the Congress must zealously guard grants of power to the Executive. Congress should make those grants specific in nature; and Congress should see to it that in the carrying out of its important tasks, the executive department does not exceed those grants of power. And if for the accomplishment of a necessary national objective the powers granted are deemed insufficient the remedy should be sought, not in attempts to stretch the meaning of words in a statute, but rather by having the executive agency in question come back to the Congress to ask for amendment to the law.

THIRD TASK OF CONGRESS—TAKE RESPONSIBILITY FOR INITIATING CONSTRUCTIVE PROGRAM OF LEGISLATION

The third part of our problem is that the Congress as the National Legislature of the United States must at least share fully the task and responsibility of devising and initiating legislative programs calculated to meet the Nation's needs. To leave such a function to the Executive is to deny the essential reason for having a Congress at all. We must first know the facts and then we must act constructively and not too slowly upon that knowledge.

A BILL TO ENABLE CONGRESS TO PERFORM THESE TASKS

On today, Mr. Speaker, a bill has been introduced in the House—to be more exact—two bills have been introduced identical with one another with one very minor exception. One of these bills—H. R. 5485—was introduced by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH]. The other—H. R. 5486—was introduced by myself. The bill comes before the House with the unanimous approval of the Committee to Investigate Executive Agencies, of which the gentleman from Virginia is chairman.

Briefly our bill consists of four parts.

Naturally I am gratified that two parts of the bill follow very closely legislation previously introduced into the House by me. I am happy, indeed, that this committee, of which I have the honor to be a member, has seen fit to bring forth this bill.

LEGISLATIVE STAFF SERVICE FOR CONGRESS

The first portion of the bill provides for a joint legislative staff service for the Congress. The purpose of this, I think, is obvious. The Congress is continuously called upon to enact detailed pieces of legislation which require for their proper drafting and passage exhaustive knowledge of a certain field of our national life and its operations. Up to the present time most of the information which Congress has had at its command regarding such matters has come from one of two sources: Either it has come from an executive department staffed as it should be with considerable numbers of expert students in its particular field and armed therefore with an exhaustive array of both fact, opinion, and interpretation, or else the information presented to congressional committees has come from special groups within the country who have had a particular and special interest in the legislation in question, either for or against it.

The purpose of this legislative staff service is to give to the Congress itself in its own right and on its own pay roll a staff of outstandingly competent men and women entirely divorced from politics or partisanship and devoting their entire time and effort to the marshaling in a wholly impartial manner of all the facts bearing upon the fields of legislation with which the Congress and its committees must deal. In the natural course of events various members of this staff would specialize in fields of legislation over which particular committees of the House and Senate have jurisdiction and would work primarily with such committees. I think I need not go into further detail except to point out that the creation and development of this legislative staff service would give to the Congress for the first time a wholly impartial source of reliable and complete information, thus rendering it unnecessary for the Congress longer to rely upon either executive agencies or pressure groups exclusively for the basic knowledge required for effective legislation.

The bill provides for the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress to make its excellent facilities and very worth-while service available at all times in cooperation with the proposed legislative staff service.

This first part of the bill provides almost exactly what I proposed in House Joint Resolution 179, introduced into the Seventy-seventh Congress on May 5, 1941.

Mr. ROWE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I yield.

Mr. ROWE. Is it the gentleman's opinion that the present experts, to which he refers, who are now in the executive agencies, are only providing partial reports of the facts?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. No; I would not say that. I think they do a very excellent job in most cases, but I think that inevitably they come before the Congress as advocates of certain points of view. Inevitably they come before the Congress urging passage of legislation, in many instances of which they themselves have had a part in the preparation, legislation which is to be administered by the department from which they come. What we are proposing here is an independent legislative staff service for the Congress, whereby the Congress can best secure information for itself on all these matters, so as to arrive at a balanced judgment.

Mr. ROWE. Then your position is to abrogate what may be considered a partially unconscious, biased position?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Well, I would not be willing to say "a biased position." I would say this is only to enable the Congress to check on the basis of information of its own, gathered by its own staff, against information which comes to us from either a pressure group or a source of particular interest for or against the bill or from an executive agency.

Mr. ROWE. I do not want the gentleman using the particular words which I used, without also including the qualifying statement. I tried to qualify that by saying "unconsious, biased position." Whether they may know it or not, if they are interested in the operation of the bill, I believe they may have an unconsciously biased position.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. No doubt that might be so, to a certain extent.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I yield.

Mr. WRIGHT. As I understand it, there are some specialists advising the various committees of Congress on matters which the gentleman wishes to increase in number as well as scope?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. That is right.

Mr. WRIGHT. That is, as to the advice which will be given by them?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. That is so that every committee in the Congress would have the benefit of the very best expert opinion it could get, through a continuous operation of a staff, analyzing those problems.

Mr. WRIGHT. There were some rather interesting figures given, I believe it was last year, I do not remember by whom, as to the very small amount which it cost to run the Congress as compared with the amount it cost to obtain information.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. That is right. The investigation of the National Planning Association shows, as a matter of fact, that the cost of running Congress, if translated into terms of, I believe, 1913 dollars, has not increased at all during the past 30 or 40 years.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I yield briefly, Mr. Speaker, as I would like to continue.

Mr. JENSEN. I am most gratified by the gentleman's idea. I take it he would be in favor of my bill which would create an examining staff for each subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I am going to touch on that right now.

Mr. JENSEN. It goes right along the same line that the gentleman is discussing.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Yes; I will explain that in my speech.

INDEPENDENT SOURCES OF INFORMATION ON APPROPRIATIONS

The second portion of the bill would, if enacted, write into permanent law the creation of a committee of the Appropriations Committees of the House and Senate, which would have the function of equipping itself with such staff as might

be necessary in order to enable it to secure, independent of executive agencies, full information as to the expenditure of funds by those agencies and factual data upon which accurate judgment could be based with regard to requests for appropriations by such agencies. This section of the bill covers a matter with regard to which already considerable progress has been made, since we have already passed resolutions from time to time enabling the Appropriations Committee to make investigations of this same character. The obvious purpose once again is to enable the Congress to have an independent source of information regarding the need for appropriations and a means of ascertaining the degree of efficiency with which funds made available by Congress are being used. It is to be hoped that considerable savings might be effected in this way. But the essential thing is once again that of independent accurate sources of information for the Congress.

COMMITTEE ON EXECUTIVE AGENCIES AND PROCEDURES

The third section of the bill proposes that a joint committee be formed to be known as the Joint Committee on Executive Agencies and Procedures, to consist of five Members of the House and five Members of the Senate.

In brief, the purpose of this committee is to give us the basic answers to the problems of administrative law and necessary grants of power to administrative agencies and departments. Such grants of power are going to continue to be a necessary part of our Government during the foreseeable future. I think no one will deny that such functions as those exercised by the Interstate Commerce Commission, the Social Security Board, the Securities and Exchange Commission, the Federal Trade Commission, Farm Credit Administration, Rural Electrification Administration, the National Labor Relations Board, and many other departments and agencies of government, have received so wide an acceptance among the American people that, though of course their work must and should be subject to amendment from time to time, they are basically here to stay.

The problem which the Congress confronts is that of making its grants of power to such agencies so specific, defining the methods of enforcement which they are to use so exactly and providing so effectively for a proper redress from their action on the part of citizens that the necessary creation of administrative agencies will not lead to any weakening of the fundamental nature of democratic government. I have long believed, and, incidentally, embodied my belief in a measure which I introduced on the first day of this session, that the basic method which should be used in solving these problems of administrative law is to be found in congressional agencies which could conduct continuous review of the action of such agencies for the purpose of determining currently whether or not any such agency was exceeding the power duly granted it by the Congress or whether the Congress had failed to grant powers actually needed by the agency for the efficient carrying out of the task given it. Upon such findings by a congressional committee the right remedy could be applied. There have been instances in the past when the wrong remedy has been applied. That wrong remedy is for the executive agency, finding itself unable, in its own judgment, at least, to accomplish the objectives with which it was charged in the statute creating it, to stretch its powers by interpretation or to use its rule-making authority in such a way as to substantially increase the real scope of the powers granted it. The right solution is for such adjustments to be made by amendment to the law itself and for the Congress to be continuously informed of instances where any executive agency exceeds its authority or fails to function in accordance with the intent of Congress in order that amendment to the law may correct such conditions. Conversely, it is necessary for an agency which finds itself in need of modifications or additions in its powers to be able to press its case speedily and have it heard expeditiously by the Congress in order that the Congress itself may decide whether or not it wishes to specifically change the scope of powers granted.

The object of this Committee on Executive Agencies and Procedures is not, in dramatic fashion, to go on periodic searches for things that are wrong with executive agencies. Rather, its function is to take up regularly and continuously all substantial complaints that may be lodged against any Government agency—particularly those indicating failure by such agency to carry out its task in accordance with the intent of Congress—and to report such matters to the Congress for the only correction which is proper in such instances, namely, correction by legislation. In my opinion, the effective functioning of such a committee can do more toward bringing about a solution of the problems of administrative law than any other means.

COMMITTEE ON ORGANIZATION OF CONGRESS

The fourth part of the bill sets up a committee on the organization of Congress. This committee is to be temporary in nature and is for the purpose of making a report to the Senate and House with recommendations as to such improvements as it believes could be made in the committee structure of the House and Senate with a view toward relieving members of unnecessary burdens, so far as possible concentrating and streamlining their activities, and in such other ways as might reasonably recommend themselves, proposing ways in which the functioning of the Congress might be made somewhat more efficient.

I can well imagine that there may be good friends of the gentleman from Virginia, Judge SMITH, who agree substantially with him on most questions of public policy who will speak to him in shocked surprise over the fact that he and I have today introduced virtually identical bills covering the matters which I have discussed. There may even be those who find themselves in agreement with my own point of view on economic and social questions who will raise their eyebrows in corresponding fashion. But should this happen either to the gentleman from Virginia, Judge SMITH, or to me, the people who would speak to either of us in such a vein would have missed a fundamental fact which will become more and more important as time goes on. It is true that the gentleman from Virginia and the gentleman from California have been on opposite sides of a great many legislative fights which have taken place in this House. It is even true that I have dissented rather vigorously from some of the reports which the majority of our committee has issued; though in this connection I want to add that I have never served under a committee chairman who was more fair or considerate of the minority Members of his committee than the gentleman from Virginia has been.

CIRCUMSTANCES OF THIS BILL'S INTRODUCTION SHOW STRENGTH OF AMERICA'S BASIC POLITICAL INSTITUTIONS

But the essential point is that in the introduction of this bill by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH] and myself today is to be found evidence of the fundamental strength of American political institutions and evidence of how foolish has been some of the rather hysterical concern which has from time to time been expressed in certain quarters in our country about the future safety of our fundamental institutions. For here is concrete evidence that, although Members of Congress may differ sharply as to what measures they believe our Government ought in the future to take in dealing with the America's problems, there is no disagreement between us whatsoever in insisting that constitutional democratic processes of government must be the means by which those measures are taken.

Whatever action is taken by future Congresses, we want that action to be taken by an effective Congress, by one which acts upon full and independent knowledge of all the facts and, above all, by a Congress occupying in full measure the completely coequal position which the Constitution of this country accords to the National Legislature. Men can disagree about the measures which they think will bring about the solution of our country's problems and at the same time agree in whole-souled fashion that democratic constitutional processes of government must continue to be the guaranty to the people, that whatever specific laws may be passed by our Government in the future, their basic liberties and the fundamental nature of their Government will remain inviolate.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a short poem.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. PRATT] may be permitted to extend his own remarks and include an article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD, and to include a statement by the commander in chief of the Veterans of Foreign Wars.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. REECE] may have permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD and to include an article by the editor and publisher of the magazine Bataan.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. MERROW] is recognized for 25 minutes.

RATIFICATION OF TREATIES

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Hampshire?

There was no objection.

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Speaker, last Thursday I spoke briefly on the question of changing the treaty-ratifying procedure by means of a constitutional amendment. Today I wish to enlarge upon the subject and present to the House some material which I believe is pertinent to this most vital issue.

We are in the midst of a total war in defense of the democratic way of life. Every person in the country is affected in some manner by this life-and-death struggle. We and our gallant allies are now on the offensive, and the enemy will be utterly defeated in every section of the world. News of the successful current Allied drives in Germany and of our brilliant naval victories in the Pacific cheer our hearts. We know that tyranny and despotism will perish. We know that democracy and freedom will prevail. Even as war touches every human being in this country, so will the peace be a vital personal concern to every man, woman, and child in the United States. Just as we are determined to be victorious on every battle front, so must we be resolved that we will win a complete and total victory at the peace table. The major objective of our people then, following the winning of the war, is the creation of a just and lasting peace so that our children and our children's children will not be required to spend their substance and give their lives in another global war.

If the statesmanship of this Republic does not succeed in pointing the way to permanent peace, then the youth of this Nation who have so nobly defended and are defending our country will have suffered, sacrificed, bled, and died in vain. In the waging of this war the Congress has passed and will continue to pass all the legislation necessary to defeat the enemies of this Nation.

We have assumed our full responsibility and leadership in enacting the legislation requisite to the fighting of a total war. The magnitude of our responsibility in making the peace is so great as to be sobering and to cause us to approach our task with most thoughtful consideration. Our country and the world cries out for leadership. This Congress has an opportunity to lead in laying the foundations for a peaceful society. We must act, and I believe immediately, upon legislation necessary to bring about future international cooperation and to create a world community free from the curse of aggression, destruction, bloodshed, and war. By doing this we will keep faith with those who are today defending the institutions of the Republic, the institutions which have made this Nation great, the very institutions of freedom upon which the happiness of unborn generations depends.

After hostilities have ceased peace treaties will be written. Under our constitutional procedure these treaties will be made by the President and to be effective they must be ratified by a two-thirds vote of the United States Senate. In the words of the Constitution:

He—

The President—

shall have Power, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, to make treaties, provided two-thirds of the Senators present concur.

Thus a minority has a negative on the majority. A third of the Senators present—and this could be only 17 if a bare quorum existed—may prevent the validation of a treaty on which the peace of this world might well depend. A fundamental principle of democracy is rule by the majority. A majority of both Houses of Congress is sufficient to enact Federal statutes. A majority is adequate to make the vast appropriations needed to wage a globe-encircling war. A majority is deemed ample to commit the Republic to such programs as lend-lease and to other policies of great national and international moment. A simple majority of both Houses of Congress is sufficient to declare war. Is there any reason why a majority should not be enough to make the peace? To continue the two-thirds rule for treaty ratification by the Senate is to impair if not to imperil our successful participation in the conduct of foreign affairs. The two-thirds provision is an obstacle in the development of a sane foreign policy for this complex world. It may produce disastrous results not only for the future of the United States but for the future of the entire world.

The majority in both Houses of the Congress ought to have the right to validate a peace treaty. In discussing majority rule Alexander Hamilton in writing for the Federalist used these words:

To give a minority a negative upon the majority—

Which is always the case where more—

than a majority is requisite to a decision, is, in its tendency, to subject the sense of the greater number to that of the lesser.

Wallace McClure in his book International Executive Agreements, has stated:

In democratic voting one more than one-half must be decisive; otherwise the minority rules the majority. The constitutional authorization for the President to enter into treaties, provided the Senate by a two-to-one vote acquiesces, is, accordingly, not democratic. The burden of proof is on him who contends that it is not inconsistent with a system of democratic government. In practice, no less than in theory, it has become an anachronism. To allow the votes of the opposition to count twice as heavily as those for affirmation places upon international collaboration a handicap that history has shown to be dangerous to the public welfare.

The world today under the impact of astounding developments in communication and transportation has become small and is constantly shrinking in size. This Republic can never hope to remain apart from the onrushing stream of world affairs. We must remove the handicap upon international collaboration that history has shown to be dangerous to the public welfare. The minority must not rule the majority.

John W. Davis in his presidential address before the American Bar Association in 1923 made significant remarks in connection with the treaty-making power of the Senate:

There can—

He said—

be little doubt historically that the two-thirds rule was dictated in the Constitutional Convention not only by the prevailing jealousy of executive power but also by recollection of the requirement under the Articles of Confederation that 9 of the 13 States voting as units should assent to any treaties entered into by the "United States in Congress assembled," a provision which, in its turn, derived directly from the mutual jealousy of the Colonies. It was thus, as John Hay once despairingly remarked, that "The fathers in their wisdom ordained that for all time the kickers should rule; * * *" It is not easy to see why either in principle or in policy one man who votes "no" should be considered ipso facto twice as well informed and weighty as one of his colleagues who votes "yes." Nor does it contribute either to national influence, prestige, or safety that the process of ratifying or rejecting treaties should generate into an effort to discover some qualifying formula acceptable to a minority. There is grave danger in forgetting that whether in matters domestic or foreign, the business of government is to govern.

Last Thursday I stated on the floor of the House that the method of treaty ratification as provided by the Constitution is obviously undemocratic. Contemplation of what is possible to occur is most enlightening in the consideration of this phase of the subject. As Kenneth Colegrove has emphasized, under existing procedure if the entire Senate membership of 96 were present, Senators from 17 States voting against a treaty could cause its rejection. Were the Members opposing a treaty to come from 17 of the smallest States rejection would result by the action of Senators representing States with a population of approximately ten and one-half million people, according to the census figures of 1940. If the remaining Senators representing States with a population of approximately one hundred and twenty million people should all vote for the

treaty then their will could be set aside by the Members who represent ten and one-half million.

Pursuing this thought further we should bear in mind that under the Constitution each House may do business if a majority of the Members are present. Should only a quorum of the Senate be present when a vote on a treaty is taken, 17 Members could prevent the validation. If the 17 votes should come from the smallest States and the 32 votes from the 16 largest States then Senators from States with approximately three and one-half million could thwart the will of Senators from States with a population of over 88,000,000. Those who are opposed to amending the Constitution to do away with the undemocratic method of ratifying peace treaties will argue that these illustrations are extremes and will never occur.

My answer to that is, under the present method the situations I have pictured are possibilities, and they emphasize eloquently the undemocratic character of the present procedure for treaty ratification. Under existing machinery the minority is definitely in control. Under our Constitution a treaty of far-reaching importance, a treaty embodying principles on which the structure of world peace might be erected could be rejected by a militant minority even if a majority of the Senate wished to ratify it, even if a majority of this House desired its acceptance; yes, even if a majority of the American people demanded its validation.

This war is being fought that democracy and its processes may not perish. We should no longer delay doing away with the present cumbersome and ineffectual method for making peace. The people are much concerned about this issue and are exceedingly anxious that the Congress assume the leadership in producing this much-needed change. At this point I am including in the RECORD two editorials on treaty making. The first is from the Washington Post of Friday, November 17 and is entitled "Now Up to the House"; the second is from the New York Times of Friday, November 17, and is entitled "The Treaty Making Power." These statements from the press are most excellent. They deserve our careful attention.

[From the Washington Post of November 17, 1944]

NOW UP TO THE HOUSE

We are not impressed by the arguments raised against Representative BLOOM'S appeal for abolition of the two-thirds rule in treaty making. It is true, of course, that this repeal movement would have come with better grace from the Senate. But the Senate Judiciary Committee has been sitting on the Gillette resolutions for many months now, and there is no indication that it has any intention of stirring. If any official move toward ending minority control over our foreign policy is to be made, it will have to come from the House. We think it is eminently desirable for the Democratic and Republican leadership of that body to join in a demand that this issue be submitted to the people.

Excuses for inaction on the part of the Senate may be divided into three chief arguments: (1) Enactment of a constitutional amendment would probably take 2 years; (2) entrance of the United States into an international organization to keep the peace should not wait that long; (3) debate on abolition of the two-thirds rule might arouse bitterness that would jeopardize the peace system. We readily agree that approval of a charter for the United Nations should not await amendment of the Constitution. The international peace system should be brought to life at the earliest possible moment. We have no doubt that the Dumbarton Oaks plan will command more than two-thirds of the votes in the new Senate, but this hopeful outlook does not minimize the necessity of uprooting the undemocratic two-thirds rule.

Senate approval of many treaties in addition to the United Nations charter will be necessary to implementation of the peace system. In each case these issues ought to be decided on the democratic basis of majority approval. We cannot leave the two-thirds rule untouched after the peace system has been established without risking sabotage of that system each time it is in need of extension or modification. Indeed, it may be necessary to sweep away minority control of our treaty-making machinery to convince our allies that we are acting in good faith in joining a league to keep the peace.

Prompt action by Congress could bring ratification of a constitutional amendment in much less than 2 years, since many of the State legislatures will meet next January and others could probably be induced to call special sessions to speed the demise of the two-thirds rule. But in no event is the time it will take to secure an amendment a sound argument for delay in getting started. We do not believe that any Senator will vote against the peace system because progressive-minded colleagues are trying to modify an obsolete and paralyzing clause in the Constitution On the contrary, this move should be a constant reminder to the Senate that the present system is on trial and that the chances for full participation in world affairs will be against us until the two-thirds rule goes out.

[From the New York Times of November 17, 1944]

THE TREATY-MAKING POWER

An Associated Press dispatch from Washington reports that the revived proposal to permit approval of treaties by a majority vote of House and Senate has run into opposition in the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations. Two fears are expressed there. One is that prolonged debate over this question might arouse bitterness that would threaten the peace treaties themselves. The second is that the process of amending the Constitution in this matter would be too slow to be of value in the present circumstances, since it would require not only a two-thirds majority of both branches of Congress but subsequent approval by three-fourths of the States—a matter, it is said, which would require "a minimum of 2 years" for its accomplishment.

We are not much impressed by this argument based on the time factor. In the first place, if the change is worth making—as we believe it to be—then it is worth making for its own sake and regardless of whether it is completed in time for the submission of the treaties which will come when the war ends. In the second place, 2 years seems to us to be an unduly conservative estimate of the time required; the last constitutional amendment to be adopted—repeal of prohibition—was accomplished within 10 months of the vote in Congress, and there is evidence of widespread popular support for the present proposal.

The other objection raised—namely, fear of embroiling the peace treaties themselves in a debate on this subject—is no doubt a factor to be considered carefully. But here, too, estimates of what can be accomplished are often overcautious. This was notably true in the case of the Connally resolution, pledging the United States to active participation in a post-war organization to enforce peace. For many months friends of such a measure were fearful of bringing it to the floor lest it arouse another bitter controversy. When it was finally brought to the floor, it was adopted by an overwhelming vote of 85 to 5.

Certainly there are strong arguments in favor of a change in the present system requiring a two-thirds vote of approval in the Senate for any treaty. This system is illogical, undemocratic, and all but ruinous to the continuity of a foreign policy which aims at international cooperation. It is illogical because there is no sound reason why a two-thirds vote of the Senate should be needed to make peace when a mere majority of both Houses can make war. It is undemocratic because it gives every "no" vote in the Senate twice as much power as a "yes" vote. It is a heavy handicap to an enlightened and successful foreign policy because it puts the power of indefinitely prolonged obstruction in the hands of a minority. No other great country in the world requires a two-thirds vote for the approval of treaties.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that the Committee on the Judiciary will, before the Christmas recess begins, present to the House a measure for amending the Constitution so that a majority of both Houses of Congress will be empowered to ratify treaties. All that we need is a simple measure amending article II, section 2, of the Constitution, giving the President the power by and with the advice and consent of the Congress, to make treaties, provided a majority of the Members present in each House concur. Such a measure should, in my opinion, have enthusiastic bipartisan support, should be passed immediately, by a two-thirds vote of both the House and the Senate, so that the legislatures in the several States will have an opportunity to consider this question during the coming year.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MERROW. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. PRIEST. I believe it is true that at least 40 State legislatures will be in session sometime from January to the 1st of April 1945. It would require only 36 of these, of course, to ratify a constitutional amendment if one were submitted to the States by the Congress. I certainly hope the gentleman will join, and I am sure he will, with many others of us here who believe this should be done and who feel, as the gentleman has so well expressed it, that we should at least make it as democratic to declare peace as it now is to declare war, and that we can pass this resolution and submit it to the people, who want it because a poll recently taken shows that 67 percent of the people are in favor of it. Let us bring our treaty-making machinery up to date to meet the demands of this hour.

The gentleman is making a learned and important contribution to this cause, and I express my appreciation.

Mr. MERROW. I thank the gentleman for his remarks and the important point he has made.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MERROW. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. On the basis argued by the gentleman, it would seem to me that he would have to include the abolishment of the veto power of the President. Is not that true?

Mr. MERROW. I see the gentleman's point. I do not think that the Presidential veto is contrary to majority rule.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. The gentleman argues that the majority should rule. Certainly, as long as the President has the veto power, that cannot obtain.

Mr. MERROW. True, the President has the power to veto any measure we pass. I do not think it can be said that this is contrary to majority rule. We have majority rule in the enacting of Federal statutes, and the President has the power to veto. We have accepted majority rule in this respect ever since the Congress came into existence, have we not?

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. But we have gone along with the rule respecting the treaty-making powers in the Senate, too, have we not?

Mr. MERROW. Yes, but this is a question of changing the two-thirds requirement in respect to treaty making to allow validation by a simple majority of the Congress. I do not believe the President's veto power is a point that needs consideration in discussing majority rule, because we have already accepted majority rule with the veto power of the President.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Could we not give the same argument and say that we have accepted the arrangement with respect to treaty-making powers of the Senate?

Mr. MERROW. One can say that we have abided by the two-thirds rule ever since the Constitution was written, but still the procedure is not democratic, it is not majority rule as majority rule exists with reference to the decisions in enacting other statutes.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. I am just wondering whether or not the gentleman's position is consistent.

Mr. HALE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MERROW. I yield to the gentleman from Maine.

Mr. HALE. I should like to compliment the gentleman on his presentation of the subject, which I think is a most important and timely one. The point that has always interested me—and I wonder whether the gentleman has given it any thought—is the distinction between an executive agreement and a treaty.

I have not reached a satisfactory formula in my own mind to determine the difference, and yet we go on blithely, saying we can ratify an executive agreement by a simple majority but a treaty requires a two-thirds vote of the Senate. The consequence of that reasoning is that we often seek to get things by as an executive agreement when we strongly suspect in our hearts that they are treaties. Does the gentleman grasp my point?

Mr. MERROW. I grasp the point and I am glad that you have mentioned the executive agreement. I shall refer to executive agreements in the course of my remarks. Due to the fact that it has been impossible to obtain ratification of important treaties in the past, there are several instances where a President has evaded the letter of the Constitution by resorting to an executive agreement. If we would put treaty making on a democratic basis where both Houses would have a voice in making treaties, then it would not be necessary to resort to methods of evading the Constitution.

Mr. HALE. If the gentleman has his way, then that tenuous and insubstantial and often embarrassing distinction will be done away with?

Mr. MERROW. I believe it will.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MERROW. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. PRIEST. May I say also, in my opinion that is one of the very strong arguments why it should be done, so that we can do away with that tenuous and uncertain and nebulous position, the effort to make a distinction between Executive agreements and treaties. I think it is one of the strongest arguments for doing this.

Mr. MERROW. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. HALE. I fully agree with the gentleman.

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MERROW. I yield.

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I want to call to the attention of the House that the gentleman from New Hampshire this morning is expressing a willingness to go along with the new majority that you are going to have. I think it is a harbinger of good nature that he would be willing to express himself so quickly, so early, to settle an important matter, that he is willing to abide by a majority decision on such a tremendously important matter. I want to say, while I am on my feet, I am feeling pretty good this morning, inasmuch as that bill has been presented and argued here, that there have been encroachments of the Executive, and it seems to me they agree to it. Now the majority party wants to stop those encroachments that they acknowledge have been so prevalent. May I say, referring to the previous speaker, the majority will still have the appointing power of these experts, and they expect to have nonpartisan, impartial people working for them. Why, what a wonderful situation we are in when both the majority and the minority seem to be so willing to clean house, so to speak, of what you have been doing for the last 12 years.

Mr. MERROW. I appreciate the remarks of my able colleague from Massachusetts. I certainly am willing to accept the decision of the majority, as far as treaty making is concerned. I think that the future of this country will be safe with a majority vote in both Houses, and if it is not safe with a majority vote, then nothing can save it.

It need not take 2 years to bring about this reform. My colleague the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PRIEST] who introduced a resolution on this subject as early as January 6, 1943, made the point on this floor last Thursday that the majority of the State legislatures are to be in session in January and therefore could take ratification action. Every State legislature with the exception of Kentucky, Louisiana, Mississipi, and Virginia are meeting in 1945. If Congress should act at once the proposed amendment could become a part of the Constitution within a few months. Now is the time to do something about this important matter. Now is the time for Congress to make a great contribution to the prosperity and happiness of future generations by forging the machinery necessary to establish a just and lasting peace.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. MERROW. Last year the Seventy-eighth Congress, by an overwhelming vote, went on record as favoring participation by the United States in an international organization to preserve the peace. Undoubtedly a majority of both branches of Congress will favor the Dumbarton Oaks plan or some modification of it for the establishment of an international organization to maintain peace and security. It may well be that more than two-thirds of the Senate will approve the Dumbarton Oaks proposals. Abolition of the two-thirds rule, however, will certainly increase the chances of this Nation joining a world organization to preserve the peace.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MERROW. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from New York.

Mr. BLOOM. The gentleman mentioned the Dumbarton Oaks proposal. Does the gentleman think that the Dumbarton Oaks proposal is a treaty or an agreement?

Mr. MERROW. I think that probably the Dumbarton Oaks proposals will be incorporated in a treaty.

Mr. BLOOM. If the gentleman will permit me, we are talking about the Dumbarton Oaks proposition. The gentleman referred to the approval of the Senate.

Mr. MERROW. That is correct.

Mr. BLOOM. Is the Dumbarton Oaks proposition as written today, a treaty or an agreement?

Mr. MERROW. It is not a treaty but I assume that in the future it will be incorporated in some treaty that will be presented to the Senate for ratification.

Mr. BLOOM. But if the Dumbarton Oaks paper is presented to Congress, is it presented as an agreement or a treaty? It has to be presented. Why is it that everyone today thinks of the Dumbarton

Oaks paper as a treaty, when it is merely an agreement by which a treaty should be written? Is that not right?

Mr. MERROW. That may be.

Mr. BLOOM. Then why should not the House of Representatives have something to say about it and not the other branch only? The other branch seems to be in all the conferences and the House is entirely eliminated. It is merely an agreement and cannot be considered anything else at this time.

Mr. MERROW. I agree that the House should have something to say about it. Does the gentleman contend that proposals as important as the Dumbarton Oaks proposals will be presented as a joint resolution, or as an agreement to the House, and not incorporated in a treaty?

Mr. BLOOM. It cannot be presented in any other way, according to my way of thinking.

Mr. MERROW. Would that not be an evasion of the Constitution?

Mr. BLOOM. No. There is no evasion of the Constitution at all. When is a paper considered a treaty and when is it considered an agreement? How do you differentiate or how does anyone differentiate between a treaty and an agreement?

Mr. MERROW. I think history will show that international agreements of an importance equal to the Dumbarton Oaks proposals have been presented to the Senate in the form of treaties, whereas international agreements in reference to matters of lesser importance are often taken care of by executive agreements. Even joint resolutions of the House and Senate have been used to evade treaties.

Mr. BLOOM. What is U. N. R. R. A.? A treaty or an agreement?

Mr. MERROW. It was not a treaty. It was acted upon by both the House and the Senate. But may I ask the gentleman this question: Does he not think that the proposals of Dumbarton Oaks, after they are fully developed, will be presented in the form of a treaty?

Mr. BLOOM. That is something to be considered later on, but I claim and I think I am right because I have made a study of it, that the Dumbarton Oaks Conference is an agreement and it should go through the same procedure as U. N. R. R. A. or any other agreement that has been presented to the Congress and not be considered as a treaty because it is not a treaty.

Mr. MERROW. I certainly appreciate what the gentleman has said. He has made a long study of foreign affairs, and as chairman of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs he is familiar with these problems. It seems to me we ought to have majority rule of both Houses in treaty making. If the Dumbarton Oaks proposals are presented in the form of a treaty, then under the present procedure the other body would be the one to ratify or fail to ratify it.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from New Hampshire yield to me to ask a question of the chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee?

Mr. MERROW. Yes; if he is willing to answer it.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New Hampshire has again expired.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Hampshire may proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. STEFAN. In his colloquy the gentleman from New York, chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, indicates that the Dumbarton Oaks conference resulted in the issuance of a paper that is nothing but an agreement.

Mr. BLOOM. That is right.

Mr. STEFAN. Does the gentleman from New York mean to say that that conference and its findings have absolutely no real effect on a treaty that should follow later?

Mr. BLOOM. Oh, the gentleman from New York does not mean to state that at all because what is to follow after the Dumbarton Oaks agreement has been approved by the Congress——

Mr. STEFAN. It must, however, come back here for some kind of ratification, must it not? It is not binding upon Congress in its present shape.

Mr. BLOOM. I may say to the gentleman from Nebraska that it does not make any difference what kind of paper it is called, whether it is called an agreement or something else, if the Senate says it is a treaty and will not act upon it except as a treaty, then this House will be foreclosed from acting on it; that is all there is to it.

Mr. STEFAN. Does the gentleman mean to say that the Dumbarton Oaks finding is binding upon the Congress if the Senate ratifies the findings of the Dumbarton Oaks Conference?

Mr. BLOOM. No; the Dumbarton Oaks agreement today is an agreement that must be approved the same as U. N. R. R. A. by both branches of Congress.

Mr. STEFAN. The House as well as the Senate?

Mr. BLOOM. Yes. If we approve of that, if it is put in the shape of a treaty, the only body that has the right to say whether it is a treaty or not is the Senate, because should we act favorably upon it here and the Senate refuses to pass upon it as an agreement saying it was a treaty it could not be ratified until the House relinquished its rights and the Senate considered it as a treaty; and I think that kind of procedure is all wrong.

Mr. STEFAN. I agree with the gentleman up to a certain point. My prediction is that the Dumbarton Oaks Conference and the paper resulting from it will not be ratified until another conference has been held by somebody else.

Mr. BLOOM. I think the House of Representatives should have something to say about it because when there are so many clauses in it and so many things to be agreed upon, it should also be within the jurisdiction of this House and not the other body alone.

Mr. MERROW. May I ask the chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee if it is not entirely possible that the Dumbarton Oaks proposals when completed will be presented in treaty form?

Mr. BLOOM. That I do not know. I have said and I want to make it clear that under the present set-up the Senate has the power to say whether such a paper is a treaty or an agreement. No matter what we pass in this House dealing with international affairs, such as the U. N. R. R. A., should the Senate say it was a treaty, then, according to the Constitution, the House of Representatives would have no jurisdiction; the Senate would not agree to the House action and would consider the matter only as a treaty. To my way of thinking it is all wrong for the Senate to be the sole judge of what is a treaty and what is an agreement; we should have something to say about it. If we have the power to declare war, we, as direct representatives of the people, should also have the power to say something about the future peace of the world.

Mr. MERROW. That is the point I have been trying to make, and I want to take this opportunity to thank the very able chairman of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs for making this splendid contribution on the floor. I have admired his leadership in his attempts to get action on a resolution to amend the Constitution to permit the Congress to ratify treaties by a simple majority of both Chambers.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MERROW. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. The Dumbarton Oaks proposal provides in substance for taking away from the Congress of the United States the power to declare war and vesting that power in the President. Does the gentleman believe that the Congress of the United States ought to pass that part of the Dumbarton Oaks proposal?

Mr. MERROW. I believe the Congress of the United States should give authority, whether it be to the President or to our representative on the Security Council, to take action when action is necessary.

If an aggressor decides to embark on a program of conquest and we have to wait until the Congress decides to act, a war might spread as it has spread before.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. I would like to make this comment: I shall oppose every effort to take away from the Congress of the United States any part of its power to declare war and vest that power in the President or any other authority.

Mr. MERROW. May I say that I will support every effort to form an international organization implemented by sufficient force to preserve the peace. We certainly cannot get into a more difficult situation than we are in at the present time. When some aggressor moves, as Hitler moved in the past, he can, in my opinion, be stopped with much less sacrifice in money and lives than after a major war has begun and we have pledged everything to the waging of a total conflict.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Hampshire?

There was no objection.

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Speaker, it will be necessary to approve many treaties in addition to the charter of the United Nations to implement the peace structure. By amending the constitution to allow a simple majority of those present in both Houses to validate a treaty we would make certain that obstructionists could never prevent the will of the majority from being exercised. Such an amendment would give this House a voice in the formulation of treaties. Such an amendment would prevent the continuation of the evasion of the Constitution by executive agreements and joint resolutions. Such an amendment would democratize our treaty making procedure.

The argument that a debate on the constitutional right of the Senate to ratify treaties might arouse feelings that would imperil the peace proposals cannot stand in the light of recent experience. Last November the Senate adopted the Connally resolution by a vote of 85 to 5. A year ago last September the Fulbright resolution passed this House by a vote of 360 to 29. A debate on foreign policy took place in both branches of the Congress. The passage of these resolutions marked a turning point in the foreign policy of the United States. Their adoption gave the world new hope. For the first time the American Congress agreed that this country should become a member of an international organization to preserve the peace.

If we are to change the treaty-making procedure this House must take the leadership just as it took the leadership in putting Congress on record as approving United States membership in an international organization to halt aggression. The country applauded when this House passed almost unanimously the Fulbright resolution. We now have an opportunity to begin a movement to end the antiquated, obstructive, undemocratic, and indefensible method of ratifying treaties. If the Congress should pass a resolution about which I have been speaking, our Allies would be infused with new hope and the world would know that we believe fully in the democratic principle of majority rule. It would be an announcement to all nations that the United States of America actually intends to make treaties after this war is won.

The House of Representatives elected every 2 years has become increasingly important in the conduct of foreign affairs. We have had a voice in writing the war measures. Why should we not have a voice in writing the peace treaties? Let us begin now to develop the governmental machinery needed to make a just and lasting peace. Let us rise to a position of leadership by passing with more than the two-thirds requirement a joint resolution to permit both Houses of Congress to approve treaties by a simple majority. If this is done I believe that the legislatures sitting next year will act favorably upon the proposed amendment and that the people from one end of this country to the other will hail the Congress as giving leadership, characteristic of statesmen, in this world crisis. Action on this matter is imperative for the future welfare of mankind. Let it not be said by those who will follow us that we hesitated at this important juncture in world affairs.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SPARKMAN). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. STOCKMAN] is recognized for 25 minutes.

VIEWS ON EUROPEAN THEATER OF OPERATIONS

Mr. STOCKMAN. Mr. Speaker, having recently returned from the European theater of operations, I have requested time today to tell you, my colleagues, of some of the most impressive and most striking things I saw overseas.

All of us have sat in this very Chamber and voted vast war appropriations, and I have first-hand information of the results of these expenditures, and a picture that only a field inspection would give.

The limitations of the time granted me for this speech preclude my covering more fully many phases of operations that I would otherwise like to describe to you.

Many modern miracles have occurred in our theaters of war. Outstanding accomplishments are so numerous that nobody could do justice to all of them. For example:

First. The outstanding work of the engineers in rebuilding the docks at Cherbourg.

Second. The Transportation Corps' great accomplishments in transporting unheard of quantities of supplies across the channel.

Third. The magnificent work of the Signal Corps in its establishment of all the types of communications under most severe hardships.

Fourth. The great and devoted work of the Medical Corps in its labor of mercy.

Each and every branch of our fighting forces has done its job, and has done it well. Their outstanding achievements have had no parallel in any war—in any history. I pay tribute to all branches of the Army that I saw functioning in Europe—to those brave men and officers who are daily writing immortal history.

As a farmer and a businessman, however, I found that the problems of food, of clothing, of the things nearest to those boys in the field held my closest attention. I found that the Quartermaster Corps is the service that provides these things, and many others, of course. It is the Quartermaster that feeds and clothes those men—that provides most of the services to them, such as bathing, louse protection, laundries, repair of clothing and shoes; and yes, the Quartermaster also has the sad and reverent duty of burying our heroic dead. His work of caring for the other soldiers never stops, from the moment a man enters the Army to the moment when he is discharged.

The average man or woman who follows the progress of the war in the newspapers or over the radio hears a good deal these days about supply lines. He knows vaguely that "an army travels on its stomach" and that the speed of a fast-moving army is controlled largely by its ability to maintain strong lines of communication.

I know very little about military strategy or tactics; that is in capable professional hands both at home and in the far reaches of the world. But I am interested in supply. I have been concerned all my life with problems of supply, with the techniques of feeding and housing and clothing. And so, when I had the privilege recently of visiting the European theater of operations I tried to pay particular attention to the workings of our system of supply. And I saw a vast, ever-strengthening network that spans out firmly from these very shores, through the great warehouses of England, into France, and up to the front lines themselves with but one objective—to make our fighting man the best equipped soldier in the world.

In peacetime the law of supply and demand tends more or less to take care of itself. But in war the principle is more compelling. It cannot be left to chance. Expressed in terms of military logistics, it is to get the right amount of the right supplies to the right man at the right time. Its force was brought home to me one day last summer by a young German officer who had been taken prisoner at Soissons. "If we just had your equipment," he moaned, "We could beat you. I didn't think it was possible for any army to have so much equipment and supplies. We were told by our leaders and strategists that it would be impossible for you to produce it so quickly, and to bring it where it would do us the most harm. But I saw some of it on the truck taking us to the rear. If the men left on the other side of the line could see it, there would be more surrenders. Against it we can't win."

I could stand here and quote long tables of statistics to list the millions of tons of varying materials procured, stored, delivered, and distributed by the Quartermaster Corps where they would do the most good. But statistics have a way of appearing cold and lifeless. It is the human side of their stupendous achievement that I want to bring to the attention of this House and through it to the people of the country. I have observed these soldiers of supply in operation, and I know the respect front-line fighters have for them.

By special training the quartermaster soldier is essentially a supply man, but before he learns how to operate a laundry, a baking oven, a refrigeration unit, or the other machines of service activity he receives first the basic training given to all soldiers. He must—and is—at all times ready to be a fighter as well as a supplier.

In Paris I met a corporal from my State who had been in a tank unit cut off beyond Coutances, where our forces broke through on the rout that led to the borders of Germany. Many parts

of the town were on fire. "Our unit needed all sorts of supplies," he told me. "We needed gasoline and ammunition and food, and we needed it quick." There was just one way to get it to them—through the burning town and past small pockets of enemy resistance that had not yet been wiped out.

Thirteen drivers from a nearby truck company took the chance. Well spaced out, they maneuvered their vehicles through cratered, torn-up streets at 40 miles an hour and delivered the goods. "Boy, those guys sure had guts," he said proudly.

It was performances like this that made our quick advance in France possible. General Patton recognized this when in a recent letter of commendation to officers and men in the supply service he wrote:

> It is regrettable that your work gets little of the public acclaim it so richly deserves. Yet, without the countless hours of vitally important duty performed in dust and rain, in scorching sunshine and clammy darkness, the gas, the rations, the ammunition, and other stores would not have arrived. The Army would not have conquered.

There is no American who has not put something into the life line of supply to our fighting men. It carries to them the best fruits of our labor, our resources, our ingenuity. But the best is not good enough. Wherever I went I saw observers from the Office of the Quartermaster General inspecting supply installations, interviewing their officers, and talking with privates to collect suggestions, complaints, and gripes that are fed into a hopper of ideas and come out as a warmer field jacket, waterproofed landing togs for amphibious fighters, a new method of pumping gasoline, a more balanced diet, and the countless other innovations and modifications demanded in the battle of supply.

Our formula is simple: Produce well-cared-for and well-equipped soldiers and you have the ingredients of an effective fighting machine that will never stop short of its goal. I saw this formula in operation. I visited our boys at work, in training, and at play, and I can give assurance that there need be no concern about their spirit, their physical state, and their confidence that they hold in their hands the tools of victory.

I also saw captured enemy rations. The ends of the cans were corroded, the vegetables stringy and unpalatable, and the meat so tough it was almost impossible to chew. After eating one of our K-rations, one German prisoner said, "Our Christmas presents weren't half as good as this food." And, please remember, we may not all have turkey on our Thanksgiving tables this month, but, thanks to the Quartermaster Corps, no American soldier, wherever he may be, will go without an old-fashioned Thanksgiving dinner with all the trimmings. And if he should happen to be in a foxhole or standing guard at a bridge, he will get the dinner later on.

Little wonder, then, that a quartermaster bakery company got a cheer when they landed in Normandy shortly after D-day and rolled off the beaches to set up their first field ovens. "That cheer meant everything to our morale," one of them told me, "And we would never let them down after that." And they did not. The first fresh white bread of the invasion was set out to cool by noon of the next day. During their first 3 months in Europe this company produced 2,000,000 pounds of bread often within artillery range, and during that time it was necessary to dismantle its equipment and move forward seven times to keep up with the troops. At one point they had to sift shrapnel out of the flour.

What a boost in morale it is to battle-weary front-line fighters to know that it is possible for them to have hot meals at night and in the morning, that their bread will be fresh, that when they return to the rest area they can look forward to a refreshing shower by a sterilization and bath unit; that a laundry company will provide a fresh change of clothing; that service troops will bring up warm clothes when winter weather sets in, and that they will never stop bringing the goods of war through.

Maintaining a steady flow of supplies is one of the toughest jobs in the Army. I saw drivers in a Negro truck company near Paris who had worked around the clock, dash a bit of cold water in their faces and keep on going. They had been sniped at, strafed at, and pounded by artillery fire, but they had delivered small arms ammunition to an infantry unit in the midst of a street battle. At Cherbourg and other ports and even on the open beaches I saw huge stores of all sorts of supplies and equipment—the sheer magnitude of the Quartermaster's task can be appreciated when it is remembered that he handles more than 70,000 individual items of food, clothing, and general supplies—and I saw the goods going forward in convoys so thick the trucks had to travel bumper to bumper. And I saw them coming back, not empty, but laden with salvageable materials that are reclaimed by repair companies at a saving of precious time and millions of dollars to the taxpayer.

Running from West to East along the breadth of France is the famed Red Ball Express Highway over which pass some 6,000 trucks carrying close to 10,000 tons of supplies daily. At one time a common headache for some of the drivers was the constant forward movements of advanced dumps. One convoy literally had to chase a railhead it was supplying with rations. It called at three different depot locations and each time found the depot had moved forward. It finally reached it 150 miles from its original location, and lived up to the motto of the Red Ball Express, "Keep 'em rolling, keep 'em supplied, keep 'em smiling."

This may appear to be mere routine. The amazing thing is that by ingenuity, daring, and superhuman effort our supply troops have made even the impossible seem routine. Hard-earned experience gained at Bataan, the South Pacific, Africa, and Italy has prepared the Quartermaster Corps for almost any emergency. During the attack on Cassino it was necessary to supply one large unit of the Fifth Army for 5 days by air. The supplies had to be dropped in full view of the enemy and within effective range of their automatic weapons. Because of the rugged terrain and the fact that the supplies had to be released from heights of from 50 to 100 feet, light bombers flying in groups of 8 to 24 planes were used.

The center of the dropping zone was marked by colored smokes, which were furnished by an artillery unit shooting smoke shells into the area. The colors of the smokes used were changed on successive drops to prevent the enemy from confusing pilots by firing the same colored smokes at different locations. Despite enemy fire, bad weather, and a rigid time schedule, the entire operation was successful. More than 80 percent of the supplies dropped were received and usable.

One of the marvels of this war is the great work being done by the Medical Corps in close collaboration with the Quartermaster Corps in controlling diseases and pestilences that have laid waste whole armies throughout history. I saw in France the effects of the development of new methods of insect control and of repellents and insecticides that will find ready use in the post-war household. The work of laundry and sterilization and bath mobile units, which follow combat troops closely, has rendered negligible in the European theater the number of cases of louse infestation—a common, but sad, joke in the last war. Lice carry typhus, the scourge of populations and armies for centuries. But not one case of typhus fever has been recorded by the Fifth Army, according to a report by its chief surgeon.

In order to fulfill their multiple mission, the personnel of this corps must be master craftsmen of a hundred trades and professions and in all the attendant side lines I have seen them shoeing mules, operating fork-lift trucks in supply depots, baking pastries in portable ranges, sending precious gasoline through pipe lines, keeping involved records on electrical accounting machines, digging drainage ditches, and burying the dead. And more often than not, doing all this with their own outguards posted around their bivouac areas and with small arms and automatic weapons within quick reach to stave off enemy attack.

There is a story of seemingly incredible achievement, a story of which the American people may well be proud. The unprecedented expansion of our Army from its token size before Pearl Harbor to mammoth proportions today presented an unprecedented problem. But the job had to be done. Its accomplishment is to my mind one of the outstanding works of the war.

I should like to pay special tribute today to a fine officer who as the Quartermaster General brought together some of the best brains in industry, transportation, warehousing, science, and agriculture and who with some of the best officers in the Army welded together this excellent organization of more than 400,000 fighting men. I am speaking of Maj. Gen. E. B. Gregory, who has been the Quartermaster General since April 1, 1940; at the end of 4 years, the customary period of assignment to that posi-

tion, he was asked to stay on to see the job through.

In Army circles they tell the story that when General Gregory was a young captain stationed in the Philippines, his commanding officer almost from force of habit used to turn over to him all the particularly knotty problems that came up. Finding himself saddled with more duties and responsibilities than a young captain normally carried, he one day summoned up sufficient courage to talk thinks over with the "old man." "Well, Greg," was the colonel's only reply, "every time a job comes up I ask myself, 'Who's the best man to handle this?' and each time you turn out to be the only man I can think of capable of doing the job."

As one who was privileged to see the gigantic warehouses of Britain filled with the munitions of war, who saw our boys on the beaches of France and rolling the supplies through the cities and along the highways to victory, I attest that General Gregory and his gallant quartermasters are "doing the job."

ARMY SUPPLIES FOR ALASKA

Mr DIMOND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SPARKMAN) Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alaska?

There was no objection.

Mr. DIMOND. Mr. Speaker, what I propose to say today may well be considered as a sort of supplement to the able and illuminating speech just delivered by the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. STOCKMAN].

Mr. Speaker, in this war, as in all wars, the kind and quality of clothing and food furnished our soldiers are of high importance. Many an expedition has failed, many a battle has been lost because of faulty or inadequate preparations with respect to such supplies. We have been told much about the excellent arms and armor given our troops. Not so much has been said about their clothing and food.

Having lived for many years in Alaska, I have been and am particularly concerned about the clothing and personal equipment supplied by the Army for the men who must serve in Alaska. In that Territory, as you all know, almost as great a range of climate is to be found as in the 48 States. The southern coast of Alaska has what is called a marine climate, wet and comparatively mild, while most of the great valleys and plains of the interior have the characteristic subarctic climate of cold winters, the temperature sometimes falling to —60° F., or even lower, and hot summers, when temperatures of 120° have been recorded.

To equip properly and train men for service in extremely low winter temperatures of the interior, or for the chill, wet winter conditions of the coastal areas, calls for not only scientific knowledge and resource but also for large experience to determine just what is best under all circumstances.

During the year 1943 I made an extended journey, largely by air, through Alaska and traveled to Attu, the most westerly of the Aleutian Islands, the scene of bitter fighting early in the summer of that year when the Japanese, who had been in possession of the islands since June 1942, were finally overcome and, except for the few who surrendered, were exterminated. While in the Aleutians I learned the sad record of some of the elements of the Attu action where many of our soldiers, trained only in the States and mostly in a desert area of the States, and lacking proper clothing, were compelled to face well-clothed and well-entrenched Japanese in the mountains overlooking the valley rising from Massacre Bay, on the south side of Attu Island. No good point would be served by relating in detail the mistakes that were made. In fact, they have already been told in part by William Gilman in his book, Our Hidden Front, and by Fletcher Pratt in his article entitled "Campaign Beyond Glory" appearing in the November 1944 issue of Harper's magazine, and by others. Our casualties in this action embraced literally hundreds of cases of immersion foot, an affliction entirely preventable by proper clothing and footgear and training in the use of such equipment. It is true that few, if any, of the immersion foot casualties died as the result of that disability, but all of them were obliged to undergo long periods of painful suffering, and it is doubtful if all completely recovered. It should be remembered that immersion foot is not the result of freezing—in fact, there were few, if any, frostbites of our troops in the Attu action—but long periods of immersion of the feet in extremely cold water not much above the point of freezing brings about such disorganization and swelling of the tissues of the feet and lower legs as to disable the sufferer for months, and even, in some cases, necessitate amputations. It is well to say here that the Alaska Army Command was in no way to blame for what happened because that command had no control over the initial action on Attu or in the supply of the troops. I have since been informed that plenty of suitable clothing and personal equipment of all kinds were available in San Francisco, the point of departure of the soldiers who opened the Attu engagement, but through some failure in judgment, or error or oversight, they were not supplied to the troops. In two other cases in Alaska brought to my attention, as the result of lack of knowledge or carelessness of local officers, small numbers of men suffered severely from frostbite and in at least one of those cases amputation was necessary. However, I believe that the lesson has been learned and that there will be no repetition of such misadventures.

It is not fair to dwell long on local failures. In fact, such incidents are the almost inevitable result of lack of preparation during the peacetime period after the First World War. Few, indeed, were the individuals who were willing to prepare for any possible future war.

On several occasions, the last one recently, owing to my intense interest in the equipment of the soldiers in Alaska, I have inquired with some care about such equipment, principally for Alaska but also for other areas in which fighting is going on. I know that since the beginning of the war great advances have been made. At the Quartermaster General's office numerous articles were shown to me and effort was made to explain just what had been undertaken and how far those undertakings have been brought into the area of accomplishment. Therefore, what I say here on the subject is, I believe, in all respects accurate, and the subject itself is deserving of attention by all of our citizens.

When the United States Army entered the war, it was using much the same clothing and equipment that it had in 1918. This equipment was reasonably satisfactory for conditions found in temperate climates, but was unsuitable for operations in extremely hot, extremely cold, or extremely damp climates. The conditions under which the present war is being fought vary widely both climatically and physiographically. The problems of outfitting a soldier for construction work along the Alaska Highway, for combat in the Aleutians, for operations in the jungles of the Southwest Pacific, for the campaigns in Italian mountains, or for the deserts of Africa are far more complex than were those of equipping troops for climatically milder European warfare in 1918.

When a man can choose his own activities, he will stop to warm himself by a fire or go indoors if he gets cold, but soldiers who are forced to keep moving and cannot go inside barracks in the midst of battle must be given clothing with fool-proof protection. Such clothing and equipment differ so greatly from what is manufactured in quantity in peacetime that revolutionary developments were imperative.

I am informed that even before Pearl Harbor the Quartermaster General, Maj. Gen. E. B. Gregory, recognized the problems of equipping the Army and established an organization to study clothing, equipment, and rations which would improve the combat efficiency and comfort of the soldier. The best available technical personnel and consultants were assembled. From industry General Gregory selected men with specialized backgrounds in textile research, plastics, leather, mechanics, and subsistence. From exploration groups he selected outstanding explorers and outdoor men who knew from first-hand experience the problems of mountain climbing, of traveling in the jungle, or of living in the Arctic. In fact, I recall that I was consulted as to proper clothing for use in Alaska. From scientific institutions General Gregory chose climatologists and geographers who were authorities on the climate, terrain, and vegetation of the entire world. From research laboratories were chosen well-known physiologists and physicists who were carrying on research in the fundamental principles of protecting man from heat, cold, insects, and so forth.

This war has moved with such rapidity that provisions for clothing and food for millions of men had to be made well in advance of contemplated operations. It thus became evident that the time-honored method of letting the troops in the

field determine by trial and error what best met their requirements could not be depended upon. The complete burden of responsibility could no longer lie entirely in the hands of field commanders. In order to have enough of the right item on time, the Quartermaster General had to shoulder the prime responsibility for determining the clothing equipment and rations that would be needed for any contemplated operation.

At the outset of the war, the fundamental information necessary for estimating the degree of protection on the human body was not available to the Quartermaster General, because the problem as such had never arisen on so great a scale.

Before the war neither the students of weather and climate, nor the textile experts, nor the physiologists in our country had sufficient knowledge at hand to give the needed information. Therefore, it was necessary to tackle the problem from three different sides: the climatologists to work from the ground up, the physicists to study the clothing from the skin out, and the physiologists to study the mechanisms of the soldier's body from head to toe. These three learned from each other, and together they developed a new aspect of science—an aspect in which the first consideration is the well-being of a soldier within his environment, so he is kept fit and efficient under all conditions.

The climatologists and geographers began to study the climate, terrain, and other geographical features of the world, specifically in their relation to man and his body. World-wide studies were projected in order to determine the intensity and duration of climate, and to isolate those weather factors which were primarily of significance to the comfort of man. I saw a series of 80 published maps which show the climatic conditions for every month on every continent and the oceans. I saw other maps which have been widely used. Some gave the actual thickness of the clothing which would be needed for a winter in Europe; others showed water requirements for the desert and oceans; still others which have just been started will indicate how hard soldiers can work in all types of heat and humidity without running the danger of heat stroke.

At the same time, the physiologists and physicists have explored the basic principles of protection. These are demonstrated in conjunction with the climate maps, charts, and graphs which show how much more clothing will be needed for a man who is sleeping than for a man who is working hard. They show the clothing necessary for any activity at any temperature from 90° above to 60° below. They predict how long a man can withstand the cold without danger even if he is inadequately dressed.

From this scientific research and development have resulted many new items of equipment as well as great improvement in other items, all of which are adding greatly to fighting efficiency of our troops.

I particularly came to the Quartermaster Corps to see what kind of cold weather clothing and equipment the G. I. soldier is getting, so that I might compare it with what we from Alaska have found suitable. I was surprised and impressed with the strides the Army had taken in the development of not only specialized clothing and equipment for areas and climates like Alaska, but in other fields as well. One development which particularly interested me was the face mask which protects the soldiers in wind to 60° below zero, incorporating a device which is said to permit a soldier to undertake violent exercise even at extremely low temperatures. Heretofore, as we have found out in Alaska, such a feat has not been possible because in extremely low temperatures our home-made face masks simply would not work for the reason that they became thickly coated inside with frost and ice from the breath. Personally, I still have some doubt as to whether this unique face mask with breathing apparatus devised by the Army will be actually usable in really cold weather, but I am told that it has been tried out and found to work well.

I was also particularly interested in special cold-climate footwear. I saw the new Army shoepac, a rubber-bottom leather-upper boot, various types of which we have worn in Alaska during the slushy period of the year for many years. However, the new Army shoepac has many improvements I have never seen before which make it a usable and comfortable item of footgear to wear in slushy, wet, cold weather.

For extremely cold weather the Army has developed a mukluk, in general very similar to what is used in Alaska. This item of footwear has a moccasin-type bottom with a fabric top that comes almost up to the knee. In this is worn numerous wool socks and a heavy felt sock. This is not waterproof, like the rubber-bottom shoepac. Instead, it is permeable to permit rapid transmission of perspiration and quick drying, because damp feet will quickly become frostbitten or frozen.

There were also mountain boots with heavy rubber-cleated soles for mountain climbing, as well as jungle boots and various types of G. I. shoes and combat boots. The mountain boot to which I have referred appears to be well designed, but my own considerable experience in prospecting in the mountains of Alaska tells me that no rubber-soled footwear is as safe or as useful in really steep mountains as heavy leather shoes, the soles of which are studded with projecting spikes.

Comfort in any climate depends upon the proper handling of wind, water, and body heat. Each item I examined was not only better than most similar items I have seen but its special features were scientifically explained. The cold-weather fighting uniform, for example, is constructed of a series of layers of material holding together layers of dead air, which is the most important factor of insulation. The outer garments are all made of windproof cloth, which protect this precious dead air, and underneath the windproof outer shell are worn layers of insulation. This principle is not new. It is, in general, what the Eskimos in my part of the world have used for many years.

From the experience of hundreds, if not thousands, of years in the Arctic, the Eskimos have learned how to dress for the climate. Except for footgear, their winter clothing is made almost entirely of the skins of reindeer or caribou. Seldom, indeed, does any Eskimo ever suffer frostbite, and I have never heard of the death of an Eskimo by freezing. If our troops, who are obliged to serve in extremely cold weather, could dress as the Eskimos do and were trained to use the clothing in proper manner, they would be just as successful as the Eskimo in avoiding suffering from the cold. Reindeer and caribou skins are among the best insulators in the line of clothing known to man, far superior to any skin covered with wool. As is well known, the reindeer and caribou are covered with hair which contains no wool. For several years I personally used a caribou skin sleeping bag and have been comfortable in it in temperatures ranging to 60° below zero. But there are not enough reindeer and caribou skins to supply any considerable number of people and, therefore, the Army has been obliged to seek other materials, and has designed a parka with the usual hood that can be pulled forward to protect the face in the wind and can also be worn under the soldier's helmet. It was necessary for the Army to use materials that were available in quantity and to tailor the parka in mass production. In doing this, an article of clothing has been developed that ought to be highly usable from the standpoint of military requirements.

These same clothes have been treated with water repellents and have excellent protection against rain while still permitting the "breathing" which is usually necessary to pass the vapor created by perspiration. Chemical analysis of these water repellents has permitted their development until now they will usually withstand the same amount of wear, tear, and laundering as the material to which they are applied.

The same type of improvements I saw in sleeping bags. The late model sleeping bags made from light cloth and filled with feathers and down provide protection against cold, yet are light and may be rolled into small volume for carrying. Extensive research failed to reveal any filling material available in quantity equal to feathers and down, but disclosed methods of renovating used materials and processing inferior stocks which are used to extend slender stocks of prime material sufficiently to meet requirements without affecting performance.

Various types of sleeping bags have been developed to protect our soldiers even in the lowest temperatures. One of the designs now being developed is intended to protect a soldier whose clothing is wet, who is without a tent, has no shelter from wet snow and rain, and has to lay his bag down in a mud puddle.

The new developments, of course, were not all for cold weather, items I was best able to judge. Great strides have evidently been made in the research and development of items for tropical pro-

tection as well. The poncho, for instance, is a loose, waterproof garment well-liked in tropical areas where it offers better ventilation than a raincoat. I was interested to see that its simplicity makes it suitable also for uses as a foxhole cover, as a shelter tent, or a ground sheet. Its total weight is only 2 pounds.

Plastics have also been used to great advantage in hot humid climates for the protection of food, radio equipment, rifles and machine guns. The corrosion of metal cans is prevented by olive-drab enamel coatings. Guns and equipment are safely guarded against rain and salt spray by thin plastic bags, which at other times can serve as protection for cigarettes or personal toilet articles.

I knew that plastics had been developed as substitutes for critical metals and rubber during the war, but I had not realized to what extent. Plastics have made helmet liners, bugles, canteens, razors, and mess knife handles, rustproof and lightweight. When metals become available after the war, they will be used again for many items, but an equal number of items will continue to be made of plastic.

Synthetic materials are utilized in protection with minimum weight. Fabrics of nylon and high-tenacity rayon coated with synthetic resins provide a weathertight two-man tent weighing only 6 pounds. Wires and yarns of nylon and saran are made into netting much lighter and stronger than cotton, and into screening more durable than that from available metals for essential protection against insects.

Everywhere I went lightness of weight was stressed. Many items have to be transported by air, and that has been made possible. I saw a cooking outfit for six men complete with a stove which weighs only two and three-quarter pounds. One for 30 men can be transported on 2 packboards.

All mechanical units are well designed for lightness, mobility, and compactness. In the last war, there were two groups of mechanical devices, one for a large group of men, the other for a small group. Now, the large units can be broken into sections. There are light refrigerators, and light portable ice-cream plants, which, although they weigh only 1,200 pounds, can serve 1,000 men a day. Textile-repair outfits were previously mounted on 20-ton vans; now they are on two-wheeled trailers weighing 2¼ tons. Notable is the trailer-mounted mobile shower bath unit weighing less than 2 tons and producing hot showers for 240 men per hour.

In this connection it is also interesting to observe that what appears to be practically the ideal soap has been produced. With it a soldier can shave, bathe, and wash his clothes and mess gear in hot or cold, fresh or salt water. Showers and soap promote health, sanitation, and efficiency in all climates. They are particularly valuable in the Tropics where pests and germs abound.

Everyone knows the danger of the malaria-bearing mosquito in the Tropics. But not everyone knows what the Quartermaster, in collaboration with the Office of the Surgeon General, has done to prevent this dread disease. Not only have tightly woven clothes been developed to guard the soldier's body, but chemists have made outstanding contributions in the field of preventive medicine—including the now famous DDT, in spray or dust form, which has been provided the soldiers in the field, a liquid repellent which the soldier spreads on his body, and Aerosol insecticide, popularly called Aerosol bomb, which is used to clear jungle hammocks, tents, and interiors of planes of mosquitoes. As a result, typhus, malaria, and other insect-borne diseases which would raise havoc with military operations have been controlled.

The morale effect of good food both in and out of combat is beyond doubt. If any lesson learned from battle experience is outstanding, it is the fact that the soldier wants and needs variety in what he eats in combat and behind the lines.

We entered the war with three main overseas rations—the B, C, and K. B ration is the ration of nonperishable items for use where regular messing operations can be conducted. C and K as you know, are the combat rations. I have been greatly impressed at the improvements in all three of these rations since the days of the Attu operation. For example, the present dehydrated vegetables are much superior in appearance, stability and ease of preparation. Frozen boneless beef is going to all theaters in increasing quantities. Many new canned meats have been developed. The newest biscuits of the combat rations are rated "good" even by biscuit-weary veterans. Other items such as ready-to-eat premixed cereals, jam, new confections, and beverages assist the many new meat items in the C and K rations to make these rations very acceptable for much longer periods than heretofore.

To meet the new demands of this war a new ration has been developed which is said to be an outstanding proven success in every theater. It is called the 10-in-1 ration and, as the name indicates, is designed to feed 10 men for 1 day. It is used by troops in support areas behind the front lines where large scale messing with the B ration is dangerous or unavailable. It is used in amphibious operations before the much more complicated B ration with its necessary heavy kitchen equipment is brought in. It can be dropped by parachute. It is used to feed large numbers of men easily and quickly, and can be eaten hot or cold, it is simply distributed and prepared, and has considerable variety.

The 10-in-1 ration appears to be a great achievement and advance in the feeding of our troops in battle. It has been produced in response to the demand of our Army for large quantities of especially prepared and especially packed food to meet special tactical needs for which our peacetime Army had no requirement.

Those of you who like to camp out may be interested in the Quartermaster Corps matches which after exposure to damp air or after submersion in water for 6 hours can still be lighted on any hard dry surface.

Not a small part of the quartermaster research and development activities is the testing of new developments, for no matter how clever a designer may be, he is never sure that what he has created will work the way he planned it. Quartermaster items are tested in two ways before they are standardized and issued to the troops: First, by laboratories; and, second, by troops under realistic field conditions.

One of the most interesting and novel test agencies is the Quartermaster Corps' own laboratory—the climatic research laboratory at Lawrence, Mass. There is a cold chamber, the temperature of which may be kept as low as 60° below zero, and which is large enough for 10 men to walk, work, and sleep in. There is also a tropical chamber where high temperatures, high humidities, and downpours can be simulated.

After new items have passed tests in laboratories, they are taken out for field tests. Some of the first field tests were conducted in Alaska. For example, in the summer of 1942, before the climatic research laboratory was ready, quartermaster representatives went to the high slopes of Mount McKinley before the onset of winter to test items of clothing and equipment in cold weather. It is reported that field tests have been conducted on the bleak shores of Hudson Bay, on the California deserts, in the mountains of Colorado and New England, and in a junglelike area in Florida. Tests have also been conducted by actual combat troops. For example, on the Anzio beachhead, the troops of the Fifth Army gave the new combat uniform of the soldier a thorough trial.

I went to the Quartermaster Corps, as I have said, to see for myself just what work is being done to improve the combat efficiency of the soldier in cold climates, and I came away much encouraged. But I also came away impressed with the fact, aided by hindsight, that it was a tragedy that such research and development was only started at the beginning of this war. It is appropriate to recognize the excellent work accomplished by Major General Gregory, his officers and research workers, for their work, which has made such outstanding contributions to the morale, comfort, and efficiency of the Army. When the war draws to a close, Congress should guard against any sweeping curtailment of the great research programs as those being conducted by the Quartermaster General. We must see to it that this work continues.

One of the most heartening things about my inquiry into the subject was the attitude and spirit manifested by the personnel in the Quartermaster's office. No one claimed to have the final answer. No one manifested in the least an attitude of omniscience, and all displayed not only a willingness, but an eagerness to receive and to give careful study to any suggestions for improvement in any of the materials used. It was keenly recognized that all the scientific conclusions were only tentative until verified by the test of actual use and experience. With such an open-minded spirit

of inquiry and a readiness to undertake the examination and test of new things if they should be found practicable, there is reason to believe that constant advances will be made so that as the years pass, the personal equipment of the United States soldier will be steadily improved and its weight reduced.

Congress should require the War Department to maintain such research facilities as the Climatic Research Laboratory, the Subsistence Research Laboratory, and the Research and Development Organization that now exist in the Office of the Quartermaster General, or their equivalents. The study of climate, man, clothing and materials, continuing in close harmony with American industry will not only keep our Army prepared in the future, but will increase the comfort, health, standard of living, and security of the American people in what we hope will be a vast period of peace.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a poem.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

THE LATE ELLISON D. SMITH

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RICHARDS].

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Speaker, for the second time in the space of one short week, it falls my sad duty to announce to the House the death of a distinguished South Carolinian who long had been a member of my State's delegation in the Congress of the United States.

On November 17, far from the halls of debate where he won fame, there passed into eternal rest the senior Senator from South Carolina, the Honorable ELLISON D. SMITH. He was then spending a few quiet days at his ancestral home on Tanglewood plantation; and his death came quite suddenly of a heart attack. Many who loved him were there yesterday to mourn when he was laid to rest in the old country cemetery near Lynchburg, S. C., flanked by the fields of cotton he loved so well and "far from the madding crowd's ignoble strife."

Last week, I remarked, upon the occasion of the announcement of the passing of the Honorable HAMPTON P. FULMER, dean of our House delegation, that South Carolina had lost four of its Congressmen by death in the brief decade just past. Senator SMITH, who was proud in his State's name to be called "COTTON ED" and who liked to refer to himself as an "unreconstructed rebel," was the second Senator and the sixth from our delegation to go.

Senator SMITH had served in the United States Senate longer than any other man in the history of our Nation, first coming to Washington in 1909. In those years he had been the champion of States' rights and of agriculture and the spokesman for cotton—cotton, he liked to say, was "his king" and again "his sweetheart."

With some of his tenets many disagreed; but none doubted that he spoke the strength of his convictions and none questioned his courage and determination. He was not renominated in the recent primary. He gave way to a younger man; but in defeat, as in victory, his head was unbowed and heart unafraid.

So, now, the toga has slipped from his shoulders. The voice which echoed so long through the Senate chamber has been hushed. The great head which wagged so roguishly in sarcasm toward his foes and with such fine good humor toward his friends is stilled. Now he has slipped into the shadows. But his presence, I say, long will linger with those who still serve in the forum of the great; and his achievements there will stand an everlasting monument to his name.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. BRYSON].

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, seldom does a small State such as ours sustain such unprecedented and irreparable loss as we have sustained during the past 10 or 12 days. The passing of these two distinguished statesmen is unusual in that heretofore, our small State has been honored by having the chairmanship of both great Committees on Agriculture in the House and Senate, the committee in in the House having been presided over by our distinguished former colleague, Mr. FULMER and in the Senate by our distinguished Senator ELLISON D. SMITH.

Mr. Speaker, the entire Nation and in fact countries beyond the sea have by this time learned of the passing of our distinguished colleague, Senator ELLISON D. SMITH, of South Carolina. Yesterday as we stood with uncovered heads at the graveside, far removed from the maddened crowds, during the burial ceremonies of this prominent actor on the political stage, it was natural to recall the great changes that have taken place during the fourscore years in which Senator SMITH was permitted to live.

Those of us into whose hands have now fallen the reins of Government would do well to carefully review the lives of our distinguished predecessors, gleaning therefrom the many helpful examples they have left for us. Of course, all of us lament the passing of this distinguished statesman and extend our deepest sympathy to his bereaved family.

In the Florence Morning News appeared an editorial copied from The State which I herewith attach and make a part of my remarks:

ELLISON D. SMITH

With the death of ELLISON D. SMITH there passed from the scene one of the most colorful Senators in the Nation's history, a rugged individualist who fought to the very end for his very pronounced ideas on government, on racial relations, and other matters. He didn't flinch to stand alone; he was a bitter-end fighter of the New Deal, stanch supporter of States' rights, and a frequent spokesman for white supremacy.

Called "COTTON ED" because of his interest in agriculture and his continuous fight for "King Cotton," the Senator liked the sobriquet and was particularly pleased when the King of England, visiting Washington with his Queen, asked especially to meet him, designating him by his nickname.

Elected in 1908 to fill the vacancy caused originally by the death of Senator A. C. Latimer, whose unexpired term had been completed by Judge Frank Gary, Senator SMITH was returned to office in 1914, 1920, 1926, 1932, and 1938 each time over strong opposition. He was in the Senate for a longer continuous period than any other man in the history of the Nation, and his almost 36 years ranks next only to the late Senator Warren's 37 years of Senate service. Senator Warren's tenure was divided. For years Senator SMITH had been chairman of the Agriculture Committee of the Senate, and once when the Democrats and Republicans were evenly divided, was chairman of the Interstate Commerce Committee, despite the fact that chairmanships generally had gone that session to the G. O. P.

Senator SMITH was a marvelous vote getter. He never had a real organization, and in an editorial printed last July we commented that his failure to keep up contacts in the home State, where new generations had grown up, had much to do with his defeat at the hands of Governor Johnston. He did not win, but certainly it can be said that he compromised not one whit in his effort to retain his seat.

A powerful stump speaker, a wonderful teller of stories, and an artist at swaying an audience, Senator SMITH represented a type of political orator that is fast passing from the Senate. He could handle himself with any heckler and was quick in turning a point to his own advantage.

While many disagreed with the Senator's views they respected him as sincere and consistent in them, and, after all, what more of a compliment can be paid to a man in public life?

He loved South Carolina, and if he had to go, we know he would have preferred to pass at home. His family has the sympathy of those who agreed with him and those who didn't—all of whom will join in paying tribute to his long service and in acknowledging his devotion to cause and dogged adherence to the principles he thought right. (The State.)

How sleep the brave who sink to rest,
By all their country's wishes blest.
When Spring with dewy fingers cold,
Returns to deck their hallowed mold,
She there shall find a sweeter sod,
Than fancy's feet have ever trod.

By forms unseen their dirge is sung,
By hands unseen their knell is rung.
Here Honor comes a Pilgrim gray,
To bless the turf that wraps their clay,
And freedom shall awhile repair,
And dwell a weeping hermit there.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Speaker, I send to the desk a resolution (H. Res. 653) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the House has heard with profound sorrow of the death of Hon. ELLISON D. SMITH, a Senator of the United States from the State of South Carolina.

Resolved, That the Clerk communicate these resolutions to the Senate and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Resolved, That as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased the House do now adjourn.

The resolution was agreed to.

ADJOURNMENT

Accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 4 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, November 21, 1944, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON THE POST OFFICE AND POST ROADS

There will be a meeting of the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads on Tuesday, November 21, 1944, at 10:30

a. m., to consider H. R. 4919 (authorizing postmasters in Alaska to administer oaths), H. R. 4892 (relating to clerical assistance in military and naval post offices), and to hold hearings on the subject of a general revision of salaries and other compensation of employees of the Postal Service.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

2009. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting supplemental estimates of appropriation for the Department of Commerce for the fiscal year 1945 in the amount of $9,278,000 (H. Doc. No. 774); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

2010. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting supplemental estimates of appropriations for the Civil Service Commission for the fiscal year 1945 in the amount of $3,069,500 (H. Doc. No. 775); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

2011. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the National Housing Agency for the fiscal year 1945, in the amount of $20,000,000 (H. Doc. No. 776); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

2012. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting his report and recommendation concerning the claim of the New England Telephone & Telegraph Co. against the United States; to the Committee on Claims.

2013. A letter from the administrative assistant to the Secretary of the Department of Commerce, transmitting estimates of personnel requirements for the quarter October 1 to December 31, 1944, for the following ceiling units of the Bureau of the Census: Salaries and Expenses (revision No. 1), Sample Census of Business (new ceiling), Consumer's Income Study (new ceiling); to the Committee on the Civil Service.

2014. A letter from the Director of the Administrative Office of the United States Courts, transmitting the annual report of the Director of the Administrative Office of the United States Courts, for the fiscal year 1944; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2015. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a request for the withdrawal of the case of Sven Peterson or Suen Pettersen from the 238 cases involving suspension of deportation, referred to in his letter of January 15, 1944; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

2016. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a report stating all of the facts and pertinent provisions of law in the cases of 206 individuals whose deportation has been suspended for more than 6 months under the authority vested in him, together with a statement of the reason for such suspension; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

2017. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to further amend section 22 of the act approved March 4, 1925, entitled "An act providing for sundry matters affecting the naval service, and for other purposes," by removing the limitation on the total personnel of the Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

2018. A letter from the Administrator of the War Food Administration, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill for the relief of Mr. Max Hirsch, county Federal Security Administration supervisor, Anderson, Mo., Farm Security Administration, United States Department of Agriculture; to the Committee on Claims.

2019. A letter from the Administrator, National Housing Agency, transmitting the second annual report of the National Housing Agency for the calendar year 1943; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

2020. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill authorizing appropriations for the United States Navy for additional ordnance manufacturing and production facilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. SMITH of Virginia: Select Committee to Investigate Executive Agencies. Seventh intermediate report pursuant to House Resolution 102. Resolution to investigate acts of executive agencies beyond the scope of their authority (Rept. No. 1912). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. McGEHEE: Committee on Claims. S. 2007. An act for the relief of Lum Jacobs, without amendment (Rept. No. 1911). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Under clause 2 of rule XXII, the Committee on Pensions was discharged from the consideration of the bill (H. R. 5421) for the relief of Jason Meth, and the same was referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. SMITH of Virginia:

H. R. 5485. A bill to create a Joint Legislative Staff Service for the Congress, a Joint Committee on Appropriations, a Joint Committee on Executive Agencies and Procedures, a Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. VOORHIS of California:

H. R. 5486. A bill to create a Joint Legislative Staff Service for the Congress, a Joint Committee on Appropriations, a Joint Committee on Executive Agencies and Procedures, a Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. FISH:

H. R. 5487. A bill to provide for the general welfare by further research into the causes, prevention, control, relief, and cure of cancer; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. KILDAY:

H. R. 5488. A bill relating to marine insurance in the case of certain employees of the Army Transport Service who suffered death, injury, or other casualty prior to April 23, 1943, as a result of marine risks; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. VINSON of Georgia:

H. R. 5489. A bill authorizing appropriations for the United States Navy for additional ordnance manufacturing and production facilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

H. R. 5490. A bill to further amend section 22 of the act approved March 4, 1925, entitled "An act providing for sundry matters affecting the naval service, and for other purposes" by removing the limitation on the total personnel of the Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H. R. 5491. A bill to reenact and extend the provisions of the Bituminous Coal Act of 1937, as amended, until the 1st day of July 3 years after the cessation of hostilities in the present war, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MAY:

H. R. 5492. A bill to provide for payment and settlement of mileage and other travel allowance accounts of military personnel; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 5493. A bill to provide for the continuation on the active list of the Regular Army for the duration of any of the wars in which the United States is now engaged, and for 6 months thereafter, of any officer on the active list of the Regular Army who has served as Chief of Staff during the wars in which the United States is now engaged; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 5494. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act authorizing the President to appoint an Under Secretary of War during national emergencies, fixing the compensation of the Under Secretary of War, and authorizing the Secretary of War to prescribe duties," approved December 16, 1940; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CASE:

H. R. 5495. A bill to exempt from certain retailer's excise taxes articles sold by domiciliary members of Veterans' Administration facilities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DICKSTEIN:

H. R. 5496. A bill to amend section 401 (a) of the Nationality Act of 1940; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. RANDOLPH:

H. R. 5497 (by request). A bill to authorize the construction of a parade field, swimming pools, stadium, and other recreational facilities in section F, Anacostia Park, in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. DICKSTEIN:

H. J. Res. 316. Joint resolution to correct an error in section 342 (b) (9) of the Nationality Act of 1940, as amended by the act of September 27, 1944; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. SMITH of Virginia:

H. Res. 652. Resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of the seventh intermediate report of the Select Committee to Investigate Executive Agencies; to the Committee on Printing.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CHURCH:

H. R. 5498. A bill for the relief of Betty Jane Ritter; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 5499. A bill for the relief of Sybil Georgette Townsend; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. IZAC:

H. R. 5500. A bill for the relief of William Ralph Jenkins; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. McGEHEE:

H. R. 5501. A bill to provide reimbursement for personal property lost, damaged, or destroyed as the result of an explosion at the naval mine depot, Yorktown, Va., on November 16, 1943; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 5502. A bill to reimburse certain Navy personnel for personal property lost or damaged as the result of a fire at the naval auxiliary air facility, Astoria, Oreg., on April 2, 1944; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 5503. A bill for the relief of June I. Gradijan; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 5504. A bill for the relief of G. F. Allen, chief disbursing officer of the Treasury Department, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 5505. A bill to authorize payment of certain claims for damage to or loss or destruction of property arising prior to May 27, 1941, out of activities of the War Department or of the Army; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 5506. A bill for the relief of certain disbursing officers of the Army of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. NEWSOME:

H. R. 5507. A bill for the relief of Eli L. Scott; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. RAMEY:

H. R. 5508. A bill for the relief of Daniel B. Johnson; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SCOTT:

H. R. 5509. A bill for the relief of Henry W. Savidge; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. STOCKMAN:

H. R. 5510. A bill for the relief of Sidney B. Walton; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

6199. By Mr. SCHIFFLER: Petition of J. Guy Allender, secretary, Friendship Lodge, No. 8, Knights of Pythias, Grafton, W. Va., urging immediate appropriate action on the part of the proper authorities of the United States Government to acquire and provide sufficient land for the extension and improvement of the national cemetery at Grafton, W. Va., for the purpose of providing adequate burial facilities for deceased veterans and servicemen entitled thereto; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

SENATE

TUESDAY, NOVEMBER 21, 1944

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

All glory and thanksgiving be to Thee, Almighty God, our Heavenly Father, for Thy tender mercy and Thy loving kindness which has followed us all the days of our life. Make us free by the truth which Thou dost reveal to us while our minds are stayed on Thee and our souls, eased of strain and stress, are kept in perfect peace. We humble ourselves before Thee as we come confessing our part, as individuals and as a nation, in the pride and greed which has loosed this terror of cruelty and strife upon the earth. Too often, lulled by our cushioned ease, we have viewed the plight of our enslaved and exploited fellows with indifference. Give us to see with eyes startled by revelations which these fiery days have brought to our own democracy that there are class chasms which must be bridged, there are festering sores which must be healed, there are glaring inequalities which must be leveled, if this Nation under God is to be worthy of her brave warriors now giving their all that liberty trampled by tyrants may arise and shine with healing rays all glorious in beauty and strength, and we lift our noonday prayer in the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

DESIGNATION OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The Secretary, Edwin A. Halsey, read the following letter:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, D. C., November 21, 1944.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate, I appoint Hon. KENNETH MCKELLAR, a Senator from the State of Tennessee, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

CARTER GLASS,
President pro tempore.

Mr. McKELLAR thereupon took the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Monday, November 20, 1944, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

RESIGNATION OF SENATOR BONE, OF WASHINGTON

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a letter of resignation from Senator BONE, of Washington, which was read and ordered to lie on the table, as follows:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON PATENTS,
Pasadena, Calif., November 13, 1944.

Hon. HENRY A. WALLACE,
President of the Senate,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. WALLACE: I have submitted to the Governor of the State of Washington my resignation as a United States Senator from the State of Washington, which resignation is effective at the close of business of the day and date of this letter.

I present this to you for your information and for such disposition of the matter as should properly be made.

Sincerely yours,

HOMER T. BONE.

SENATOR FROM GEORGIA—CREDENTIALS

Mr. RUSSELL presented the credentials of WALTER F. GEORGE, chosen a Senator from the State of Georgia for the term beginning the 3d day of January 1945, which were read and ordered to be placed on file, as follows:

OFFICE OF THE GOVERNOR,
Atlanta, November 13, 1944.

To the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES:

This is to certify that on the 7th day of November 1944 Hon. WALTER F. GEORGE was duly chosen by the qualified electors of the State of Georgia a Senator from said State to represent said State in the Senate of the United States for the term of 6 years, beginning on the 3d day of January 1945.

Witness: His Excellency our Governor, Ellis Arnall, and our seal hereto affixed in the State capitol, in Atlanta, Ga., this 13th day of November, in the year of our Lord 1944.

By the Governor:

ELLIS ARNALL, *Governor.*
[SEAL] JOHN B. WILSON,
Secretary of State.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF ALOYSIUS J. CONNOR TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE, DISTRICT OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, and in accordance with the rules of the committee, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Tuesday, November 28, 1944, at 10:30 a. m., in the Senate Judiciary Committee room, upon the nomination of Aloysius J. Connor, of New Hampshire, to be United States district judge for the district of New Hampshire, vice Hon. George F. Morris, retired. At the indicated time and place all persons interested in the nomination may make such representations as may be pertinent. The subcommittee consists of the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], chairman; the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE]; and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY].

ADDRESS BY THE PRESIDENT ON THE OPENING OF THE SIXTH WAR LOAN DRIVE

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have placed in the RECORD a radio address delivered on November 18, 1944, by the President of the United States in connection with the opening of the Sixth War Loan drive.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The Sixth War Loan drive starting tomorrow is something more than just a money-raising affair.

We cannot all fight the enemy face to face. We cannot all produce the weapons and raw materials so vital to our armed forces.

But there is one front on which all of us—every man, women, and child—can serve, and serve for the duration. We can all practice self-denial. We can all sacrifice some of our comforts to the needs of the men in service, and, yes, even some of our needs to their comforts.

The war in this present month of November alone will cost us seven and one-half billions of dollars. That is two hundred and fifty millions a day.

That is why every War bond you buy is so important.

The war is not over—no, not by many a costly battle. While we have every reason to be proud of what has been done—even optimistic about the ultimate outcome—we have no reason to be complacent about the tough road which still lies ahead.

We have just been through a wartime election, demonstrating to the people of the world the deep roots of our democratic faith.

The Sixth War Loan, I am confident, will be a further example of democracy in action in a world at war.

There is an old saying about sticking to the plow until you have reached the end of the furrow. Every rule of common sense and patriotic thought makes that maxim applicable to our conduct in this war.

In the name of our wounded and sick, in the name of our dead, and in the name of future generations of Americans, I ask you to plow out this furrow to a successful and victorious end.

THE ARMY AND NAVY FOOTBALL GAME

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Mr. President, for the information of Senators I should like to make an announcement with reference to the Army and Navy football game.

The Members of the House of Representatives and the Senate are considered honorary members of the Naval Athletic Association. As such member, each Member of the Senate is entitled to purchase four tickets for this game. The notice which has been sent to all members of the Naval Athletic Association states:

First. The purchase of War bonds is not a prerequisite to obtaining tickets for members of the Naval Athletic Association—which, of course, includes Members of the House of Representatives and the Senate—for the game to be played at Baltimore on December 2.

Second. Each Member of the House of Representatives and the Senate should apply by letter, setting forth the fact that he is a Member of the Congress, his name, and the number of tickets desired—not over four per Member—the address to which tickets should be mailed, and include remittance to cover the cost.

Third. Two tickets may be applied for at the price of $4.80 each, which includes 20 percent Federal tax, and two tickets may be applied for at the special rate of $3.80 each. A fee of 25 cents must be added to the remittance to cover the cost of mailing and handling.

Fourth. The closing time—dead line—for receipt of applications is 5 p. m., Thursday, November 23.

Fifth. Tickets will be placed in the mail as soon after the above date as it is possible to do so. Probably by Monday, November 27.

Sixth. Applications should be addressed to the Secretary-Treasurer, Navy Athletic Association, Annapolis, Md.

THE POLICY ON WAR AND PEACE—ARTICLES BY SENATOR CONNALLY AND SENATOR AUSTIN

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point articles by the distinguished Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate, and by myself, entitled "The Policy on War and Peace." The article by the Senator from Texas is on the Policy on War and Peace in the platform of the Democratic Party, and the article by myself is on the Policy on War and Peace, in the platform of the Republican Party. They were published in the same American Peace Society Bulletin of October 1944.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE POLICY ON WAR AND PEACE IN THE PLATFORM OF THE DEMOCRATIC PARTY

(By TOM CONNALLY, chairman, Committee on Foreign Relations, United States Senate)

The most accurate and graphic statement as to the attitude of the Democratic Party with reference to war and peace is the language itself of the Democratic platform. It reads as follows:

"The primary and imperative duty of the United States is to wage the war with every resource available to final triumph over our enemies and we pledge that we will continue to fight side by side with the United Nations until this supreme objective shall have been attained and thereafter to secure a just and lasting peace.

"That the world may not again be drenched in blood by international outlaws and criminals, we pledge:

"To join with other United Nations in the establishment of an international organization based on the principle of the sovereign equality of all peace-loving states, open to membership by all such states, large and small, for the prevention of aggression and the maintenance of international peace and security.

"To make all necessary and effective agreements and arrangements through which the nations would maintain adequate forces to meet the needs of preventing war and of making impossible the preparation for war and which would have such forces available for joint action when necessary.

"Such organization must be endowed with power to employ armed forces when necessary to prevent aggression and preserve peace.

"We favor the maintenance of an international court of justice of which the United States shall be a member and the employment of diplomacy, conciliation, arbitration, and other like methods where appropriate in the settlement of international disputes.

"World peace is of transcendent importance. Our gallant sons are dying on land, on sea, and in the air. They do not die as Republicans. They do not die as Democrats. They die as Americans. We pledge that their blood shall not have been shed in vain. America has the opportunity to lead the world in this great service to mankind. The United States must meet the challenge. Under divine providence, she must move forward to her high destiny."

In brief, the platform proclaims that the United States will wage the war to final triumph over all our enemies and thereafter will aid in securing a just and lasting peace. It does not stop there, however. It looks toward the future. It envisages the danger of another war by aggressors and conquerors. To circumvent such a holocaust, it proposes the establishment of an international organization embracing the principle of the sovereign equality of all peace-loving states and open to membership by such states, large and small, with the avowed and definite purpose of preventing aggression and preserving international peace and security. It frankly advocates that such an organization must be endowed with authority ultimately to employ armed force when necessary to secure its objectives.

Force, however, should be employed only as a last resort. It is declared that an international court of justice shall be maintained. This may be accomplished by the amendment or modification of the statutes of the present World Court. The plank also advocates the use of diplomacy, conciliation, arbitration, and other similar methods where appropriate in the settlement of international disputes.

This is a brief résumé of the proposed international agreement. The general outline of the American plan now being considered at Dumbarton Oaks was known to the drafters of the Democratic platform. Of course, all of the details upon which agreement may be had by the conference are not known.

It is now understood that the international organization will consist of an assembly which will be composed initially of members of the United Nations and later of such other peace-loving nations as may be admitted. The general authority of the Assembly would include all powers not specifically vested in other departments of the international organization.

The executive and administrative authority of the international organization would rest in an Executive Council. This Council would consist of representatives of the four great powers, the United States, Russia, Great Britain, and China, who would be permanent members. In addition, seven members of the Council would be elected to the Assembly for stated periods of tenure. It is also contemplated that at a later date a fifth nation may become a member of the permanent Council. It is also proposed that a vote on the employment of armed forces must have the approval of all of the permanent members of the Council. In other words, any member of the permanent Council may veto the employment of force in any particular instance. The Executive Council would have general authority to administer the affairs of the international organization and to act in cases of emergency. It would also have authority to refer to the Assembly any matter which is deemed to be appropriate.

While the use of force is sanctioned, it must be borne in mind that the employment of the international court of justice, conciliation, arbitration, and diplomacy and other peaceful means must be resorted to in the settlement of international disputes. The purpose of the international organization is not to promote war and armed conflicts but to preserve peace. Force is to be employed only as a last resort and against ambitious powers which know no law except that of the sword.

There are those who will oppose any form of international organization in behalf of peace. Some of them will base their arguments upon the claim that for the United States to do so would constitute an impairment of our sovereignty. This is a specious claim. It can be easily exploded. If such a claim were tenable, then the United States might not be able to conclude a treaty of any kind with a foreign nation because to do so, according to such a theory, would be to surrender something of American sovereignty. Of course, within the obligations assumed by the Nation in any treaty its liberty of action is restricted within the limits of the terms agreed upon. There is no surrender of sovereignty. On the contrary, there is an exercise of sovereignty. There is an assertion by our Nation of the will and the power to do those things which are for the best interests of our citizens and in a larger fashion in the best interests of the citizens of the world and world peace. That is the very essence of sovereignty. After all, sovereignty involves the authority of a government to achieve governmental objectives and to exercise its own will and independence. The joining in an international agreement in behalf of peace is but the exercise of that governmental power, that governmental will, and that governmental independence which sovereignty suggests.

It must be remembered that when we are contributing to the maintenance of world peace we are contributing to the peace of our own country. World War No. 1 caused us to spend lavishly of our treasure and to sacrifice on the field of battle much of the richest blood of the Republic. World War No. 2 has entailed stupendous expenditure of the public funds and has sacrificed the lives of many thousands of our brave and gallant sons. It has disturbed our domestic economy and has involved sacrifices by our citizens. In striving for the preservation of the peace of the world we are striving for our own peace, for our own security, for our own safety, for our own freedom from having to waste our treasure and spill our blood.

The provisions of the plan which provide a veto power in the hands of each member of the Executive Council and the further provision that the United States shall have a permanent representative on the Council is a guaranty that force will not be used in any international quarrel except with the consent of the representative of the United States. This meets the old argument of

those who have heretofore denounced such an international organization on the ground that it would have authority to plunge us into a foreign war without consultation with the United States. It must be borne in mind that even the employment of force under the conditions in which it will be employed, is not an act of war, but is an act to prevent war. It is essentially a peace measure. The history of international law is full of examples of the use or the display of force in the protection of the rights of nationals and in the defense of property and to repel aggressions upon the high seas which did not actually result in war. It is believed that in any case with the unanimous vote of the great powers, who are permanent members of the Council and by a majority vote of the entire Council, no nation would dare to challenge the decisions of the international organization or would dare to employ armed forces in any campaign of aggression or conquest. The decision of the Council would not only carry the normal influence of world opinion, but the might and strength of the armed forces of the members of the organization would overawe and compel the acquiescence of a recalcitrant or stubborn nation that might contemplate conquest.

It is also provided that the Council shall take steps to bring about an agreement among the nations composing the international organization, which shall stipulate the quota of armed forces and related matters.

The United States independently of the treaty will have authority to provide the method by which the representative of the United States on the Council shall be selected. It is likely that the statute creating such an office would define and if necessary, delimit his authority and power.

The proposed international organization contemplates the organization of all peace-loving nations. It provides a concrete and definite organization. It expresses a determination to employ peaceful means for the settlement of international controversies which might result in war. It realizes, however, that these measures may not be sufficient and it provides in the last analysis for the employment of armed force. It realizes that a court may render a decision and judgment, but that without a sheriff with armed authority, the judgment might not be enforced. Those who submit to law and are amenable to peaceful measures may respect the judgment of the court and abide by it. However, a lawless and arrogant litigant may defy the court unless it exerts a final authority by the employment of armed force.

If we are to secure the preservation of world peace—and that includes our peace—we must be willing to pay the price. That price is our cooperation with other nations of a similar mind. We must join in seeking the employment of peaceful measures. If these fail, we must be willing to assume our share in the obligations imposed upon us.

It is my firm conviction that the overwhelming majority of the American people are for an international organization to preserve the peace and prevent aggression. There will be those who object to this or that detail. I know of no piece of legislation or even any constitution which pleases every citizen in every respect. At every session of the Congress, there are introduced thousands of bills seeking to change existing law. At each session of the Congress, numerous amendments to the Constitution of the United States are proposed. Somebody objects to this feature. Another does not like some other provision.

The proposed treaty, however, must be considered in its entirety, on the ground of its noble objectives and in view of its tremendous effect upon world policy and world peace.

It will be subject to amendment or modification or change in the light of the experience of future years. It cannot be perfect at its inception. It must grow and develop and be shaped to meet the needs of a rapidly moving world.

THE POLICY ON WAR AND PEACE IN THE PLATFORM OF THE REPUBLICAN PARTY

(By WARREN ROBINSON AUSTIN, member, Committee on Foreign Relations, United States Senate)

The American plan for a general international organization for security and peace in its early status was known to those who drafted the Republican plank on war and peace. It is a fair guess that the authors of the Democratic plank had the same plan in mind. At the time these planks were adopted by both political parties the representatives of the United Nations had already been invited to the Dumbarton Oaks Conference, but the plan had not been presented to them. In courtesy to those representatives, as well as in consideration of practical rules of negotiation, both parties guarded the terms of the plan from publicity.

The committee on international policy which drafted the plank for the Republican convention discussed the matter in hypothetical form. No assurances were given that the plan contained any of the specific provisions under discussion. Nevertheless, the Republican plank, and, in my opinion, the Democratic plank, on international policy, both contemplated the American plan so far as it has since become known to the public.

The Republican declaration at Mackinac laid the foundation for the more specific commitments of the party at Chicago. It helped to unify and strengthen the Republican organization. There are, it is true, some members of the Republican Party, as well as of the Democratic Party, who adhere to unconditioned nationalism. Nevertheless, the Republican Party, as an organization, in the Chicago convention, placed itself squarely against isolationism and for an international organization having the capacity to direct peace forces whenever it became necessary to do so to prevent or repel military aggression.

Peace forces include whatever force may be necessary to preserve the peace, such as conciliation, arbitration, litigation, economic sanctions, and interposition.

There are similarities between this program and international practices during the past century. There have been hundreds of cases of the use of pressure, and even of violence, by an aggrieved state for the protection of its citizens living in a foreign country, of its flag on land or sea, or of its boundaries. Such acts have been in accord with the law of nations, and have been the common custom of members of the family of nations.

No practice has been recognized as lawful by which any state imposed its political authority on a weaker state incapable of escaping through fear of the consequences of its resistance. The difference between past practice and the plan is that heretofore the actor has not been an independent organization, but has been an aggrieved state, or, in the League of Nations, a member thereof.

However, it is important to note another difference, viz: In the League of Nations the provision for coercion was limited to advice or recommendation, whereas the present declaration of the Republican Party, and probably of the American plan, provides for direction.

Briefly stated, the Republican plank on war and peace commits the Republican Party to the support of a treaty agreeing upon such provisions for security as the following:

General rules of international conduct binding the nations:

(a) To adopt peaceful methods of determining controversies with each other;

(b) To support the international organization in its execution of the basic treaty;

(c) To use peace forces when directed to do so by the organization;

(d) To refrain from employment of military forces except according to the basic treaty;

(e) To participate in subsequent treaties aimed at removal of causes of war and establishment of conditions in which peace would be attained that would prevail through the world.

A structure of organization containing:

An assembly composed of representatives of all sovereign nations who desire peace, on the basis of sovereign equality, and which would have all of the powers not vested in other departments of the organization.

An Executive Council composed of representatives of the great powers, who would have the capacity to maintain order and who would be permanent members of it; also representatives of lesser powers who would be impermanent members, elected annually. Such a council would have exclusive jurisdiction of the subject of sanctions, and authority to direct military forces if necessary to enforce the basic treaty and maintain peace.

A judicial tribunal to which any nation could bring another for the determination of controversies between them.

The Republican Party, through its plank on war and peace, has definitely advanced toward other sanctions than war in its aim to establish a just peace after the termination of hostilities, and to promote such international arrangements that the vital interests of the parties to the treaties would favor peace rather than war, to avoid provocation to violence, and to develop further the good-neighbor policy.

It is clear to all that even the best devised organization having nothing but military force as sanction for law and order would last only so long as the people of the several countries earnestly desired, and were willing to pay the price of peace. Therefore, we regard the spiritual element in the Republican doctrine as a factor of security.

A large area of agreement upon these doctrines among Republicans is expressed in the plank on war and peace. Some members of each of the political parties advocate delay in the establishment of the organization until after the war and until after the various peace treaties have been definitely made; also, delay in the use of sanctions by the organization.

Under the latter, they raise the issues of sovereignty and constitutionalism.

The Republican plank is founded upon the claim that external sovereignty is not lost, but is strengthened, by its use in combining with other powers to preserve order and peace. A corollary of this is that no nation loses any degree of its independence in relation to other nations joining in the treaty, because each makes the same relative contribution thereof to the common authority.

As to the claimed violation of constitutionalism in authorizing our delegate in the Council to vote for the direction of peace forces, the historic course of this Nation is a practical construction of the Constitution.

In the period from 1813 to 1927, American forces operated on foreign soil within the jurisdiction of a foreign state without any declaration of war on 77 different occasions.[1]

There have been, also, numerous incidents in which protection to American citizens abroad was given by display of armed force.

The premise for the use of force is the obligation of government to its citizens to protect their lives and property and to preserve the state and maintain its honor.

---

[1] Milton Offutt, The Protection of Citizens Abroad by the Armed Forces of the United States.

This is a principle of international law, which is a part of our law.[2]

The duty of the Chief Executive to act before a declaration of war by Congress is based on the provision of the Constitution that "he shall take care that the laws be faithfully executed."[3]

However, too much emphasis on these instances of practical construction of the Constitution ought to be avoided in the matter under discussion. They are referred to here to show that the exercise of the exclusive power of the President to employ armed forces in a foreign country to protect the lives and property of American citizens resident in that country does not constitute an act of war; and is, therefore, not equivalent to a declaration of war.[4] Such intervention has seldom led to war, although it may do so, as in the Boxer disturbance in China.

Emphasis should be laid on the different actor and different cause in the interposition planned. The cause is to prevent or repel aggression. Its character is defensive. Its object is peace.

By cruel experience in two World Wars, which have developed fiendish weapons capable of unprecedented destructiveness in short time over long distances, the fact has been forced upon our recognition, that violence threatening war, in any place on earth, affects the security and peace of this Nation and its citizens.

The important shift is from unilateral right to society's duty to interpose whenever disturbance arises.

The actor is not the aggrieved state alone. It is the organization for security and peace. It represents the conscience of a large portion of humanity. Its decision to act would be free from the infirmity of aggrandizement or imperialism. Its judgment would be independent. So far as it might involve members, its acts would be founded on treaty and law. Its moral power would be tremendous.

These facts have distinct bearing in our consideration, separate from the treaty, of the power to be vested in our delegate on the council.

There is no intention of avoiding or evading the obligation to have a declaration by the Congress of the United States whenever this country goes to war. This is not inconsistent with the basic treaty contemplated. The basic treaty will not raise the issue. Each government will have to decide for itself the limits of its commission to its delegate.

Our delegate to the Council could constitutionally be authorized to vote in the council within the limits of this commission, and in accordance with governmental procedure.[5] His commission would be prescribed by Congress. Congress would have to create his office, define its powers, and appropriate for its maintenance. This would naturally be done independently of the ratification of the treaty. It would not be necessary to delay every application of sanctions while the American delegate came back to Congress on every question upon which he was to vote.

The new international attitude of real cooperation is declared in the Republican plank, and would be provided for in the treaty, if the Council should be composed of, say, eight members, and the decision or directive of the Council should depend upon a majority. If that majority must include all of the votes of the permanent members a veto would, in effect, be provided for the proportionate number of lesser states and for any one of the greater states. In theory, this would do away with world power politics. In theory the smaller countries would not be under the domination of the larger countries. In practice much depends upon the spirit of the people behind their representatives.

As I have said, any plan that is made can fail if it does not have the vital force of strong desire on the part of nations to make the plan succeed.

A special treaty for earmarking the military forces to be available for direction by the organization is contemplated.

If no provision should be made in the basic treaty for the allocation by its members of special military task forces, there should be at least an obligation on the part of those members, who are competent to do so, to maintain sufficient military forces and equipment to respond promptly to the direction of the Council. Our country ought to follow the advice of Gen. George Washington that it maintain a "well-trained militia." I interpret his "well-trained militia" as requiring a universal military training program. As General Marshall has stated it, we would not maintain a large professional army, but would maintain a compact, central organization sufficient to meet the directions of the Council, having on call "a well-trained militia."

We approach the portentous event of ratification of a treaty establishing the general international organization for the prevention or repelling of military aggression.

The hope of the world for prolonged peace is grounded on the peace forces other than armed interposition. Their effectiveness must spring from the conscience and sustained active interest of the people. Any treaty entered into must keep the door open to adaptation, development, and change to unfold and expand the causes of peace.

The importance of public opinion in this situation cannot be overemphasized. I am persuaded that the Senate will ratify such a treaty provided the people of America are ready to pay the price of peace, even though it be a high price. The Senate will not expect, nor would the people approve, a proposal that involved the purchase of peace through the sacrifice of justice, or of the guaranties of freedom. But the Senate and the people, I believe, will be willing to exercise the external sovereignty of this Nation by participating effectively in such an international organization on the basis of fundamental rules of international conduct expressed in the treaty, and the employment by the organization of whatever force is necessary to prevent or repel military aggression.

[2] *The Pasquette Habana* (175 U. S. 677, 700).

[3] *In re Neagle* (135 U. S. 1, 64); see also, *Logan* v. *U. S.* (144 U. S. 263, 294); *U. S.* v. *Mullin* (71 Fed. Rep. 686); *Buster* v. *Wright* (135 Fed. Rep. 947, 957); *Durand* v. *Hollins* (4 Blatchford 451, 454).

[4] *Hamilton* v. *McChaughry* ((1905), 136 Fed. 445).

[5] *Neely* v. *Henkel* (180 U. S. 109, 121).

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

Resolutions by the Council of U. N. R. R. A.

A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting copies of certain resolutions adopted by the second session of the Council of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration, held in Montreal, Canada, being Resolution No. 53, relating to reservations and declarations of the Congress of the United States, and Resolution No. 54, amending its Resolution No. 1, with respect to United Nations areas of importance to the military operations of the United Nations and stricken by famine or disease (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Personnel of the Land Forces

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, pursuant to law, a confidential report of the number of men in active training and service in the land forces on September 30, 1944, under section 3 (b) of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Suspension of Deportation of Aliens

A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting, pursuant to law, reports stating all the facts and pertinent provisions of law in the cases of 206 aliens whose deportation he suspended for more than 6 months, together with a statement of the reason for such suspension (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Immigration.

A letter from the Attorney General withdrawing certain names from reports relating to aliens whose deportation he suspended for more than 6 months, heretofore transmitted by him to the Senate, pursuant to law; to the Committee on Immigration.

Compensation of Postmasters

A letter from the Postmaster General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 2 of the act of May 29, 1923, and section 3 of the act of March 29, 1944, affecting the compensation of postmasters (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

Report of National War Labor Board on Wage Stabilization

A letter from the Chairman of the National War Labor Board, transmitting, in further response to Senate Resolution 130, agreed to April 9, 1943, a report on stabilization of wages and salaries for the month of August, 1944 (with an accompanying report); ordered to lie on the table.

New England Telephone & Telegraph Co. v. The United States

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, his report and recommendation concerning the claim of the New England Telephone & Telegraph Co. against the United States (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Claims.

Report of National Housing Agency

A letter from the Administrator of the National Housing Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the second annual report of that agency for the calendar year 1943 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Education and Labor.

Report of Director of the Administrative Office, United States Courts

A letter from the Director of the Administrative Office of the United States Courts, transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual report of the director of that office for the fiscal year 1944 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Personnel Requirements

A letter from the Administrative Assistant to the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, estimates of personnel requirements for the Bureau of the Census for the quarter ending December 31, 1944 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Civil Service.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A resolution adopted by the board of directors of the American Society of Civil Engineers, New York, N. Y., favoring the selection of at least one member of the Advisory Board created by the War Mobilization and Reconversion Act of 1944, who is an engineer of high ability and broad experience in the fields of professional engineering and administration; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. AUSTIN:

A petition of sundry citizens of the State of Vermont, praying for the enactment of

the bill (S. 860) to provide for the common defense in relation to the sale of alcoholic liquors to the members of the land and naval forces of the United States; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts:

Resolutions of the Polish-American Citizens' Club of South Boston, Mass., and other American-Polish associations in the Eastern States, favoring the relief of and aid to Poland; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. AIKEN:

Three petitions signed by 72 citizens of Irasburg, Vt., praying for the prompt enactment of the bill (S. 860) to provide for the common defense in relation to the sale of alcoholic liquors to the members of the land and naval forces of the United States; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

RESOLUTIONS OF THE VERMONT STATE GRANGE

Mr. AIKEN. I present and ask to have printed in the RECORD, and appropriately referred six resolutions adopted by the Vermont State Grange at its annual meeting last month. I am offering these resolutions particularly at this time because some of the resolutions pertain to bills which are immediately before the Congress and particularly because of the recommendation for action on the St. Lawrence seaway project.

There being no objection, the resolutions were referred to committees and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

To the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

Resolution 1

Whereas Vermont is composed of broken areas by reason of its streams, lakes, hills, and mountains; and

Whereas adjacent to most of our tillable lots other land appears which is well adapted for pasture and woodland; and

Whereas Vermont is valuable for homes in which to rear families; and

Whereas we believe that our natural resources can best be conserved and utilized by conducting farming by what is commonly known as one-family farms, rather than large commercial ventures: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we use our influence to make Vermont a State of farm homes, and to this end, as a long-time program to build rather than rob the soil, by continuing our best practices such as pasture improvements, care of farm-made fertilizers, and especially more intelligent handling of timber land, to include reforestation of open land, not used for other purposes and systematic thinning of young growth commonly called brush land.

To the Committee on Commerce:

Resolution 2

Whereas the Bellows Falls Hydro-Electric Co. is endeavoring to obtain options on flowage rights of certain lands to be flowed by the raising of a dam at Wilder, Vt.; and

Whereas the flowing of said farm lands will destroy their usefulness for agricultural purposes, and inconvenience and menace the operation of many acres of land bordering on the flowed area: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Vermont State Grange go on record as being vigorously opposed to the flowing and destruction of the aforesaid farm lands; that this resolution be spread on the records of this Grange and that a copy be presented to the committee of farm owners organized to oppose the flowing of their farm lands, and the influence of this Grange be expended in their behalf.

Resolution 3

Whereas the inhabitants of the Connecticut Valley are deeply concerned about the proposed power dam project at Wilder: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Vermont State Grange express its hearty approval of the action of the special session of the legislature in appointing a committee and making an appropriation for the study of the situation and to make recommendations.

Resolution 4

Whereas the future agricultural and industrial well-being of Vermont depends to a considerable extent upon the power rates comparable to those available to other parts of the Nation: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Vermont State Grange urge Congress of the United States to take action to provide for the development of the St. Lawrence River waterway and power resources.

Resolution 5

Whereas the West River Dam project near the towns of Dummerston, Newfane, and Williamsville is an unnecessary and destructive project to the surrounding towns and farms; and

Whereas it is totally unnecessary to have this dam as a means of power; and

Whereas the surrounding towns and State of Vermont are willing to support a project of their own to care for spring floods to their fullest extent; and

Whereas this West River Valley is of excellent tillage soil and is greatly needed for agricultural purposes in the State: We, therefore,

Resolve, That the Vermont State Grange strongly feel that this is an uncalled for project and we ask that the National Government do all in its power to protect the farms and homes in this valley and take steps to withdraw this bill.

To the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

Resolution 6

Whereas the cutting off of our forests has increased the danger of serious floods and drought conditions; and

Whereas the demand for hardwood lumber has resulted in many of our sugar maples being cut off for lumber; and

Whereas it takes about 100 years to reforest with sugar maples; and

Whereas Vermont is famous, Nation-wide, for its maple sirup and sugar and at present there is serious danger that the maple industry will soon become a thing of the past: Be it

Resolved, That the Vermont State Grange do all in its power through the public press and our lecturers' programs to educate the public of this existing danger of the destruction of our maples and of the advisability of a long-time program of forest preservation by selective cutting rather than the wholesale slaughter of our maple trees, the pride of our Green Mountain State: Also be it

Resolved, That the Vermont State Grange work for State laws to preserve and protect our forests and maple orchards, Vermont's heritage.

To the Committee on Military Affairs:

Whereas it has been called to our attention that many communities are planning a celebration on the day Germany is defeated; and

Whereas this will not mark the end of the war: Be it

Resolved, That this Grange go on record as favoring a day of meditation, at this time, and save the celebration until the war is over.

SOCIAL-SECURITY PAY-ROLL TAXES—PETITION OF NORTH DAKOTA RETAIL HARDWARE ASSOCIATION

Mr. LANGER presented a telegram in the nature of a petition from the North Dakota Retail Hardware Association, Grand Forks, N. Dak., which was referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GRAND FORKS, N. DAK.,
November 20, 1944.

Hon. Senator LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

We petition Congress continue freeze 1 percent for old age benefit by enacting S. 2175 as now introduced because adequate funds available care for benefits administration during 1945. Please not increase burden on business with unnecessary taxation when further demands upon it anticipated carry on future.

Exorbitant taxation destroy this lucrative source revenue to Government.

NORTH DAKOTA RETAIL HARDWARE ASSOCIATION.

CONFERENCE METHOD OF RATE MAKING

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to present for appropriate reference and to have printed in the RECORD at this point, a letter and resolution, which I have received from Mr. F. G. Farrell, secretary of the Hartford Chamber of Commerce, Conn., favoring the passage of bill H. R. 2720.

There being no objection, the letter and resolution were referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE HARTFORD CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
Hartford, Conn., November 16, 1944.

The Honorable FRANCIS MALONEY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: At a meeting of the transportation bureau, held October 17, upon recommendation of our legislative committee, a resolution was adopted favoring the passage of H. R. 2720.

We enclose a copy of the resolution together with a statement of facts upon which our resolution is based.

When this bill comes up for action we will appreciate your consideration of it and hope that you will go on record for the passage of this measure.

Very truly yours,

F. G. FARRELL,
Secretary.

RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY THE TRANSPORTATION BUREAU OF THE HARTFORD CHAMBER OF COMMERCE, IN MEETING OCTOBER 17, 1944

Whereas some 2 years ago at the request of the late Joseph B. Eastman, in his capacity as Director of the O. D. T., together with the War and Navy Departments, and Donald M. Nelson, Chairman of the W. P. B., the Department of Justice abandoned for the duration its suit bringing criminal action against the railroads, motor-freight lines, and others, charging violation of the Sherman antitrust law; and

Whereas in August 1944 the Assistant Attorney General of the United States, in an address at Kansas City, indicated that proceedings of a civil nature would be filed against the railroads, motor-freight lines, and others; and

Whereas on August 23, 1944, a complaint was filed with the United States District Court at Lincoln, Nebr., charging that the railroads, motor-freight lines, and others were functioning in violation of the Sherman Antitrust Act in that they joined together

through rate conferences in the determination and publication of noncompetitive rates; and

Whereas the transportation bureau of the Hartford Chamber of Commerce being composed of shippers and consignees who pay the freight charges, also of representatives of various carriers who assess the freight charges, is directly interested in this complaint which attacks the principle of the conference method of rate making. We recognize that the present conference method of making rates is not perfect, that there are details which might and should be adjusted. We do, however, believe that the principle of arriving at rates through the conference method has proved most satisfactory and in the interest of both the shipper, consignee, and carrier; that in the absence of this long-established procedure of making rates through a conference, it is reasonable to assume that adjustment of rates would have to be obtained through application to the individual interested carriers who participate in the haul. This latter method would make rate adjustment more difficult to obtain and in all probability would result in a lack of proper relation in rates between different territories. As an example, a manufacturer making an article in one area might obtain more favorable rates from his interested carriers than would a manufacturer producing the same article in another territory; and

Whereas such action on the part of rate-making conferences is in the best interest of all concerned and should not be subject to prosecution under the antitrust laws in the circumstances now under attack by the Department of Justice. The conference method of making rates is of long standing and has the sanction, if not the approval, of the Interstate Commerce Commission.

Whereas House bill 2720 provides an amendment to the Interstate Commerce Act which permits carriers to join together in consideration, determination, rejections, approval, publication, and promulgation of rates under the direction or guidance of committees, associations, rate bureaus, tariff publishing agents, etc., in accordance with the rules and regulations prescribed by the Interstate Commerce Commission: Therefore, be it

Resolved, That the transportation bureau of the Hartford Chamber of Commerce, in meeting October 17, 1944, go on record in favor of the present conference method of rate making. This bureau is of the opinion that this bill (H. R. 2720) would so clear the present Interstate Commerce Act as to preserve for shippers, consignees, and carriers the conference method of rate making, which for many years has not only served but proved satisfactory to all parties of interest.

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to each Senator and Representative in the State of Connecticut and to the chambers of commerce throughout this State.

NATIONAL REPRESENTATION FOR RESIDENTS OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA—RESOLUTIONS OF WASHINGTON BOARD OF TRADE

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, while Senators were back home on November 7, participating with nearly 50,000,000 other Americans in the recent national election, there was no such evidence at the National Capital of the operation of the majestic processes of a national election. Here, at the very heart of the Republic, was the only ballotless spot on the continental and contiguous United States.

Here, as stated by Theodore W. Noyes, editor of the Evening Star, "The day, November 7, 1944, to the un-Americanized Americans of the District of Columbia," was "a day of humiliation and mourning. To other Americans," it was "a day of national enthusiasm and patriotic pride."

I want to say it is to the everlasting credit of the good people of the District of Columbia that they had this feeling of humiliation and frustration at being unable to satisfy the urge to vote in this most important election. They could, through their leaders, the press, and over the radio, only tell the people of the country that, although they are loyal, intelligent and patriotic Americans, they are permitted no part in the government of their country. They are required to pay taxes, obey the laws of the Nation, fight and bleed and die for their country, but they cannot vote for the Chief Executive and for the lawmakers by whom they are governed. And the strangest thing of all is that no one has ever been able to advance any sound American reason, or even an excuse, why so disgraceful a condition is permitted to continue.

What a spectacle it must present to the world at this time, when one of the keynotes accompanying the great global war is that the people of a nation shall be guaranteed full participation in the governing of their nation, to note that at the very heart of our great Republic those living there have no part whatever in the councils of the Nation.

To my knowledge, during my long official residence in Washington, the people here have been much dissatisfied with this un-American condition, and have been urging a perfectly reasonable remedy for the situation. They are not proposing that the control of the Congress over the seat of the National Government be in any way disturbed. However, they seek, through a required enabling amendment to the Constitution, to empower the Congress to permit the people of the District of Columbia to vote for President and Vice President, and to elect such voting Members to represent them in the Senate and House of Representatives as the Congress may by legislation provide.

Mr. President, a proposed amendment to the Constitution for this purpose is now pending in the Committees on the Judiciary of both the House of Representatives and the Senate. In the House of Representatives it was introduced by my friend, Judge HATTON W. SUMNERS, of Texas, and it was my privilege and honor to introduce the same proposal in the Senate.

I am glad to say this proposal has more united support than any other matter affecting the people of the District of Columbia. Theirs has been a long fight, and the supporting resolutions and arguments submitted to Congress by the civic, business, labor, and other groups have been voluminous, and in their appeal are unanswerable.

The most recent action to come to my notice was resolutions adopted on November 6 by the directors of the Washington Board of Trade. This great and enterprising organization of business and professional men has a long record of fine, public-spirited work for the District and the Nation. In the resolutions which follow, I sincerely believe, are voiced the sentiments of organized Washington as truly as if they had originated in each of the many groups which have long been working for the Americanization of the Washingtonian.

I have here a letter from the president of the Board of Trade, and the resolutions adopted on the eve of another voteless national election day at the National Capital, which I ask to have printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks and appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the letter and resolutions were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WASHINGTON BOARD OF TRADE,
Washington, D. C., November 9, 1944.

Senator ARTHUR CAPPER,
United States Senate,
Washington 25, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR CAPPER: Renewing its policy of long standing, the Washington Board of Trade, through its board of directors which met on Monday, November 6, renewed its endorsement of national representation for the District of Columbia and urged passage of the joint resolutions introduced in Congress on this subject by you and by Representative SUMNERS of Texas. A copy of the resolution is attached.

We bring this matter to your attention for your information.

Sincerely yours,
E. BARRETT PRETTYMAN,
President.

NOVEMBER 6, 1944.

The board of directors of the Washington Board of Trade today adopted the following resolution endorsing national representation for residents of the District of Columbia:

"On the eve of a great national election in which some 45,000,000 or more Americans will go to the polls to exercise their traditional right as free Americans, the directors of the Washington Board of Trade take this opportunity to dedicate themselves anew to the effort to obtain comparable rights for Washingtonians, at least to the extent of representation in the Congress and in the electoral college.

"We consider it to be a humiliating disgrace to the Nation and to ourselves, that this intelligent community of over 800,000 Americans, constituting the seat of government of the world's leading democracy, is deprived of any voice in that government; that our sons, fighting wherever other Americans are fighting on every battlefront in the world today, must suffer a degrading discrimination of the polling places, because of the accident of their residence in the Capital of the United States; that we at home are left as the sole surviving victims, in this country, of a system of taxation without representation which contradicts every basic principle of Americanism.

"We believe that the remedy for these injustices lies in a constitutional amendment, sponsored by Representative SUMNERS of Texas, in the House of Representatives, and by Senator CAPPER, of Kansas, in the Senate, which provides that: 'The Congress shall have power to provide that there shall be in the Congress and among the electors of President and Vice President members elected by the people of the District constituting the seat of the government of the United States, in such numbers and with such powers as the Congress shall determine. All legislation hereunder shall be subject to amendment and repeal.'

"We record ourselves again as favoring the submission of that amendment by the Congress to the people of the United States."

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I say the Congress has put off far too long this act

of simple justice to our loyal and able fellow Americans of the District of Columbia. This proposed amendment to the Constitution is an enabling provision which will give Congress the necessary power to right this great wrong. It does not strip Congress of any of its power of exclusive legislation in the slightest degree. But it does give to Congress a new power to make these American citizens really a part of the Nation. It does give the Congress the power to enable these Americans to participate in their National Government through their duly elected Senators, Representatives, and members of the electoral college.

The time has come for Congress to pass the joint resolution proposing this amendment and to submit it to the States for ratification. There is every reason for prompt, favorable action, and neither reason nor excuse for postponing so plain a duty.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. HATCH, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

H. R. 3732. A bill to repeal the prohibition against the filling of a vacancy in the office of district judge in the district of New Jersey; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1151).

By Mr. TUNNELL:

From the Committee on Pensions:

H. R. 4099. A bill to extend the period of the Philippine Insurrection so as to include active service with the United States military or naval forces engaged in hostilities in the Moro Province, including Mindanao, or in the islands of Samar and Leyte, between July 5, 1902, and December 31, 1913; without amendment (Rept. No. 1152).

From the Committee on Claims:

S. 1740. A bill for the relief of Marjorie E. Drake, Edith Mae Drake, Minnie L. Bickford, and Irene M. Paolini; with amendments (Rept. No. 1153);

S. 1899. A bill for the relief of Alfred Files; with amendments (Rept. No. 1154); and

S. 1900. A bill for the relief of Bertha L. Tatrault; with amendments (Rept. No. 1155).

By Mr. O'DANIEL, from the Committee on Claims:

H. R. 2825. A bill for the relief of Sigfried Olsen, doing business as Sigfried Olsen Shipping Co.; with amendments (Rept. No. 1156).

EXTENSION OF STATUTE OF LIMITATIONS—REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. FERGUSON, from the Committee on the Judiciary, reported an original joint resolution (S. J. Res. 156) to extend the statute of limitation in certain cases, which was read twice by its title and ordered to be placed on the calendar; and he also submitted a report (No. 1157) to accompany the joint resolution.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado:

S. 2187. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. William Trebing; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. ELLENDER:

S. 2188. A bill for the relief of June I. Gradijan; and

S. 2189. A bill for the relief of G. F. Allen, Chief Disbursing Officer for the Treasury Department, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. AUSTIN:

S. 2190. A bill to amend the Social Security Act, as amended, so as to provide for supplementing unemployment compensation payable under State laws during the period of reconversion from war to peace; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 2191. A bill to amend section 6 of the act of March 20, 1933, to prohibit the requirement of the taking of the so-called pauper's oath by certain applicants for hospital treatment or domiciliary care; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. REYNOLDS:

S. 2192. A bill to provide for the continuation on the active list of the Regular Army for the duration of any of the wars in which the United States is now engaged, and for 6 months thereafter, of any officer on the active list of the Regular Army who has served as Chief of Staff during the wars in which the United States is now engaged; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

(Mr. REYNOLDS also introduced Senate bill 2193, which was referred to the Committee on Finance, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts:

S. 2194. A bill authorizing appropriations for the United States Navy for additional ordnance manufacturing and production facilities, and for other purposes; and

S. 2195. A bill to further amend section 22 of the act approved March 4, 1925, entitled "An act providing for sundry matters affecting the naval service, and for other purposes," by removing the limitation on the total personnel of the Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

RECOGNITION OF ACTIVE-DUTY MEMBERS OF CIVIL AIR PATROL

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to provide for recognition of active-duty members of the Civil Air Patrol as veterans of World War No. 2.

In connection with this bill I wish to say that it is quite true that C. A. P. veterans originally volunteered as civilian volunteers and fully expected to perform their assigned duties as such, but herein lies the irony of the whole matter. These veterans were called upon by emergency circumstances that were totally unforeseen by the United States armed services to perform as soldiers; not only called upon but commanded by the United States Army and the War Department to bear arms against the common enemy in the form of 100- and 250-pound demolition bombs and depth charges and to attack the armed enemy in offensive action beyond the territorial waters of the United States. This they did, not by choice, nor as volunteers, but by definite command, after they had volunteered and not before they had done so. At this time neither the Army nor the Navy had available either sufficient personnel or equipment to cope with the submarine menace off the shores of the United States; hence, by sheer necessity, the C. A. P. was ordered to seek out and attack the enemy, brazenly destroying our vital coastwise tankers and freight ships.

These attacks were not made in company with, or as support for, any other branch of the armed services, nor at the time of such attacks were they supported directly by other personnel of the armed services; however, many times after the first attack was made, other forces came into the battle and often assisted in its successful conclusion. This situation did not happen just once or even several times, but many times. On one C. A. P. base alone 17 running attacks were made on enemy submarines nearly all of which were unassisted.

The veterans of C. A. P. volunteered for one thing and were commanded to do another by the War Department, but because of their original intentions, there exists an opinion in high places that they are just civilians like many that watched for forest fires or spotted airplanes. Unlike many other civilian organizations which performed admirably, these veterans not only performed their civilian functions, but were further commanded to seek out and attack an armed enemy and to engage him in mortal combat. Upon being commanded to so engage the enemy, these men ceased then and there to be civilians and became combat troops regardless of high opinions or else they were armed guerrillas.

These veterans of C. A. P. were instructed carefully about prescribed uniform insignia, because in event of capture by the enemy they would be treated as soldiers only if such insignia were properly displayed. This would not indicate a status of either civilians or guerrillas according to the concepts of international law. There is one and only one answer to their status; that is, they were soldiers of the United States, and as such they are entitled to all rights and privileges pertaining thereto. Regardless of the original intentions of either the men or the departments of Government, these men were by command of constituted authority made combat troops and so used in the conduct of this war. If any group of men can prove they were combat troops and are not now recognized as such, they too deserve veteran's status regardless of any official rulings or opinions to the contrary.

It is doubtful if other than the veterans of C. A. P. among all other so-called civilian organizations have any basis on which to claim veteran's status. In fact, in the history of the United States, there is no parallel to Civil Air Patrol, not even the Minutemen of 1776. To deny these men veteran's status on the grounds of establishing a precedent for others to seek similar status is a denial not based on justice nor even on practical considerations. These men are comparatively few in number and regardless of deaths, wounds, injuries, or personal sacrifice in line of duty, these men were made combatants not by choice of their own, but by command of the War Department through the Army of the United States. Surely, they could have repudiated their oath of allegiance which they took, not knowing they would be called upon to be combatants; they could have refused on the grounds that they were supposed to be civilians, not soldiers, they could have even been dilatory in the carrying out of such commands because of a feeling of possibly being imposed upon, but not a single man did anything of the kind; every one fought as the soldier he was, and there is not a single case of desertion on record; however, many paid with their

lives in carrying out their orders. These men did not question the right of the War Department to make them combat troops; now who has the right to question whether or not they were soldiers?

These veterans flew 24,000,000 miles over the ocean in line of duty. They are credited with spotting 173 enemy submarines and using either bombs or depth charges or both against 57 of that number. They are credited with sinking or damaging 2 enemy submarines in addition to those sunk by Army or Navy craft called in for the kill by C. A. P. planes. This was offensive action, certainly not defensive.

Should officialdom insist that these soldiers were civilians, then these men were betrayed because they expected and were assured that they would be treated as soldiers in event of capture by the enemy. Only by the grace of God they escaped capture as 90 of their planes went down at sea and the survivors, when there were survivors, were adrift except for the company of their sister ship circling overhead.

Approximately 100 of these men lost their lives, many more were injured, and no few permanently. Help for the widows and for the injured veterans is now by law only temporary. Permanent assistance will only be available if Congress provides veteran's status for these apparently forgotten soldiers who when called upon in times of great need responded with their lives and fortunes. Can a grateful Nation now afford to deny its own?

Mr. President, in this connection I ask to have published in the RECORD a brief history of the Civil Air Patrol, an auxiliary of the United States Army Air Forces; the rules of land warfare as stated from national headquarters of the Office of Civilian Defense on March 12, 1942; also a statement from national headquarters under date of March 30, 1943; together with a statement issued August 23, 1944.

There being no objection, the matters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A BRIEF HISTORY OF CIVIL AIR PATROL, AN AUXILIARY OF THE UNITED STATES ARMY AIR FORCES

Civil Air Patrol was organized in December 1941. The private pilots and plane owners, radio mechanics, engine and aircraft mechanics of the United States, who were not already in the armed forces, were asked to come into the Civil Air Patrol to assist in setting up an organization, whereby the facilities and the airplanes of the private pilots, and their skill, could be used in assisting the armed forces. Civil Air Patrol was organized due to the fact that our armed forces did not have the pilots, the planes, nor the facilities to carry out the various duties imposed upon them when Pearl Harbor was bombed.

Early in April 1942, the submarine menace was so bad on the Atlantic from Maine to Mexico that the Civil Air Patrol was called upon to organize, and to open up, C. A. P. coastal patrol bases, and to use their private planes in search of enemy submarines, convoying merchant ships, and rescuing survivors.

There were 21 of these coastal patrol bases, and they flew a total of 24,000,000 miles, sighted 173 enemy submarines, and were directly responsible, and given credit in Admiral Andrews' report to the Navy, for sinking a number of enemy submarines.

There were between 5,000 and 6,000 men and women attached to these bases. Civil Air Patrol also carried bombs on these airplanes, and dropped them on the enemy, as stated heretofore.

In this coastal patrol work alone, the members of C. A. P. were under the command of the armed forces, were required to wear uniforms 24 hours a day, as well as being subject to Army military rules and regulations, subject to Army court martial, and handled the most secret documents of our armed forces.

These men risked their lives for their country, and in doing so, Civil Air Patrol lost approximately 100 men in the ocean, and some fifty-odd were injured, some of them permanently. Civil Air Patrol had many other activities with the armed forces, such as C. A. P. tow target and tracking units, which towed targets of the United States Army Coast Artillery of the harbor defense inlet where real guns and shells were fired at their targets. Also, in the days when the Army and the Navy did not have the facilities, the Civil Air Patrol had a vast number of C. A. P. planes which carried air express and vital parts necessary to the various bases in the United States for the repairs of the Army planes. Civil Air Patrol has a membership of some 90,000 members who at the present time are working, at the suggestion of the United States Army Air Forces, on a C. A. P. cadet program, in teaching 15-, 16-, and 17-year-old young men and women various courses in aviation, military courtesy and discipline, drilling, navigation, meteorology, theory of flight, Morse code, first aid, and various other courses, whereby the United States may equip these young men and women, so when they are called into the armed forces they will be better able to defend themselves, and will be better educated and better equipped to carry on the work that the armed forces desire. The goal of C. A. P. cadets for this year alone is 250,000 throughout the United States.

OFFICE OF CIVILIAN DEFENSE,
CIVIL AIR PATROL,
NATIONAL HEADQUARTERS,
Washington, March 12, 1942.

OPERATIONS DIRECTIVE NO. 7—RULES OF LAND WARFARE

1. GENERAL

It is imperative that members of the Civil Air Patrol be thoroughly familiar with certain fundamentals of the Rules of Land Warfare and that Civil Air Patrol operations be conducted in accordance with these rules. To this end, unit commanders will regularly bring to the attention of all members of the Civil Air Patrol the Rules of Land Warfare. The extracts from the Rules of Land Warfare presented herewith will be read to all enrollees when the oath of office is given. Unit adjutants will occasionally call attention to these rules at drill formations.

2. TEXT

The accompanying extracts are from War Department Basic Field Manual FM 27-10. Rules of Land Warfare.

3. DISTRIBUTION

Copies of this directive will be distributed to units on the basis of four copies per unit.

4. RULES

As a volunteer corps serving as an auxiliary to the armed forces, the members and units of the Civil Air Patrol will observe the following rules:

(a) Obey their officers.

(b) Wear the Civil Air Patrol shoulder patch sewn on their clothing.

(c) Carry openly such arms as may be required.

(d) Conduct operations according to laws and usages of war.

5. QUESTIONING BY THE ENEMY

Should a Civil Air Patrol member be captured by an enemy, the enemy intelligence officer would probably ask many questions in an attempt to learn as much as possible about our Army and Navy. Under the Rules of Land Warfare, it is not necessary to answer these questions. Prisoners of war under these rules are required to give only the following information to the enemy: Name, grade, and serial number.

6. REQUIREMENT

Due to the importance of this directive, its contents will be impressed upon members of the Civil Air Patrol by frequent reiteration.

By command of Major General Curry.

HARRY H. BLEE,
Colonel, Air Corps,
Training and Operations Officer.

OPERATIONS DIRECTIVE NO. 7—EXTRACTS FROM RULES OF LAND WARFARE (WAR DEPARTMENT BASIC FIELD MANUAL FM 27-10)

1. The rules of land warfare are based on various treaties which the United States has entered into with other nations of the world. As early as 1864 Red Cross conventions were held. The Hague Convention, first held in 1899, relates to the laws and customs of war on land. Such subjects as the treatment of prisoners of war, their parole, the rights of citizens in occupied countries, and the prohibition of the use of certain types of weapons were set forth in treaties to which the United States and other nations became signatories. There are also unwritten rules and laws of war.

2. When an enemy occupies a hostile country the population is divided into two general classes, known as the armed forces and the peaceful population. Both classes have distinct rights, duties, and disabilities. No person can belong to both classes at one and the same time.

3. It is important that lawful belligerents observe the rules of land warfare so that when captured they will be treated as prisoners of war.

4. Lawful belligerents are composed of armies, militia, and volunteer corps. The laws, rights, and duties of war apply not only to armies but also to militia and volunteer corps fulfilling the following conditions:

(a) To be commanded by a person responsible for his subordinates.

(b) To have a fixed distinctive emblem recognizable at a distance.

(c) To carry arms openly.

(d) To conduct their operations in accordance with the laws and usages of war. In countries where militia or volunteer corps constitute the army or form part of it they are included under the denomination "army."

Combatants and noncombatants: The armed forces of the belligerent parties may consist of combatants and noncombatants. In the case of capture by the enemy both have a right to be treated as prisoners of war.

OFFICE OF CIVILIAN DEFENSE,
CIVIL AIR PATROL,
NATIONAL HEADQUARTERS,
Washington, March 30, 1943.

Subject: Military status of C. A. P. coastal patrols.

To: All C. A. P. coastal patrol commanders.

1. The following is in response to requests for a statement as to the military status of C. A. P. coastal patrols received by this Headquarters from several coastal patrol commanders.

2. The coastal patrol units of Civil Air Patrol are operating under authority contained in Letter of Instructions No. 1, Headquarters Army Air Force Antisubmarine Command, November 27, 1942, which charges these units with the following mission:

"To patrol coastal shipping lanes as directed during daylight hours for the purpose of protecting friendly shipping and of locating and reporting enemy submarines, enemy warships or suspicious craft and to take such action as equipment permits in destruction of enemy submarines; to conduct such special antisubmarine missions as are directed by Headquarters Army Air Force Antisubmarine Command."

3. In the opinion of the Judge Advocate General, as expressed in SPJGW 373.1, May 8, 1942, the personnel on duty with C. A. P. coastal patrol units "are accompanying or serving with the Army of the United States in the field and that under the provisions of Articles of War 2 (d) they are amenable to military discipline and subject to the jurisdiction of military courts."

* * * * *

By direction of National Commander Johnson.

HARRY H. BLEE,
Colonel, Air Corps, Operations Officer.

WAR DEPARTMENT,
Washington, D. C., August 23, 1944.

CIVIL AIR PATROL, ARMY AIR FORCES AUXILIARY

1. It is desired to clarify certain misconceptions which have arisen at various points throughout the country as to the status of Civil Air Patrol members and the nature of the activities in which they are engaged.

2. Civil Air Patrol, an auxiliary of the Army Air Forces, is an official A. A. F. agency. The purpose of Civil Air Patrol is to organize public-spirited citizens of civil aviation into a volunteer, semimilitary organization; to give them supplementary training in military and allied subjects (except flight training); and to supervise the utilization of their skills and equipment in the war effort. The C. A. P. organization consists of 48 State wings, with local groups, squadrons, and flights organized throughout each State. The entire organization is administered through a national headquarters staff located at 500 Fifth Avenue, New York 18, N. Y., composed of A. A. F. officers assigned to that duty.

3. Civil Air Patrol was established on December 1, 1941, and has performed many useful services for the armed forces, including 18 months of antisubmarine operations over the coastal shipping lanes in the eastern and Gulf-sea frontiers from Canada to Mexico, southern liaison patrol on the Mexican border, exercise of aircraft-warning systems, camouflage observations, courier missions, radar flight tests, and numerous emergency operations. On these missions, approximately 50,000,000 miles have been flown and over 50 C. A. P. personnel have been killed. At present, C. A. P. is conducting tow target and tracking operations for the First and Fourth Air Forces for antiaircraft gunnery training of the Eastern and Western Defense Commands; is operating for the A. A. F. a Nation-wide missing-aircraft search service; and is engaged in the recruitment of aviation cadets and applicants for the Women's Army Corps and in the preflight training of 15-, 16-, and 17-year-old C. A. P. cadets for possible future service with the armed forces or in civilian aviation. Also, trained crash crews of local C. A. P. squadrons throughout the United States are available for volunteer emergency aircraft crash assistance. In addition to services performed for the War Department, Civil Air Patrol also performs emergency missions for other Federal agencies, State governments, and private industries engaged in the war effort, such as the patrol of forests, pipe lines, and flooded areas and the transportation of critical parts and supplies.

4. Members of Civil Air Patrol engaged in the performance of official missions (although acting as civilian volunteers) are required to wear uniforms and insignia authorized by The Adjutant General, which are the same (officers and enlisted men) as those of the Army Air Forces, with the following distinctive exceptions: Red shoulder loops on outer garments and red piping on garrison caps for both officers and enlisted personnel; red sleeve braid on officers' uniforms and red background for grade insignia of enlisted personnel; silver C. A. P. buttons and insignia, including C. A. P. insignia; silver C. A. P. pilot and observer insignia; and C. A. P. shoulder patch.

5. C. A. P. members are in no instance deferred from service with the armed forces. They are ineligible because of age or physical factors or the fact that they are holding essential jobs in addition to their spare time activity with C. A. P. They are persons who, not being eligible for the armed forces, are nevertheless anxious to contribute to the war effort more than their regular civilian occupations permit. They serve voluntarily without any pay for their services, sometimes receiving allowances to cover their operation and subsistence costs but often standing the expenses of such costs themselves.

[A. G. 324.5 (August 1, 1944).]

By order of the Secretary of War:

G. C. MARSHALL,
Chief of Staff.

Official:

J. A. ULIO,
Major General,
The Adjutant General.

The bill (S. 2193) to provide for recognition of active-duty members of the Civil Air Patrol as veterans of World War No. 2 was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Finance.

FLOOD-CONTROL PROJECTS—AMENDMENTS

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY], who is ill and unable to be present, I submit an amendment to House bill 4485, the flood-control bill.

I have been asked to state that this amendment represents the opinion of his Littleton and north country constituents in New Hampshire, who have petitioned him to have this done and who feel strongly in the matter. It relates to a dam at Sugar Hill, N. H.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be printed and lie on the table.

Mr. O'MAHONEY (for himself, Mr. AUSTIN, Mr. BUSHFIELD, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. CLARK of Idaho, Mr. DOWNEY, Mr. HATCH, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado, Mr. LANGER, Mr. MCCARRAN, Mr. MCFARLAND, Mr. MILLIKIN, Mr. MURDOCK, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. NYE, Mr. ROBERTSON, Mr. SCRUGHAM, Mr. THOMAS of Utah, Mr. THOMAS of Idaho, Mr. WHEELER, and Mr. WILSON) submitted amendments intended to be proposed by them, jointly, to the bill (H. R. 4485) authorizing the construction of certain public works on rivers and harbors for flood control, and for other purposes, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. AUSTIN and Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma each submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by them, respectively, to House bill 4485, supra, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

RIVER AND HARBOR IMPROVEMENTS—AMENDMENTS

Mr. BILBO and Mr. TYDINGS each submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by them, respectively, to the bill (H. R. 3961) authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

INVESTIGATION OF PEARL HARBOR DISASTER

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I submit a Senate resolution providing for the appointment of a special committee of 10 Senators to make a complete investigation of the facts relating to the attack made by the Japanese armed forces on the Territory of Hawaii on December 7, 1941, and ask that it be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The resolution (S. Res. 336), submitted by Mr. FERGUSON, was read, as follows:

Resolved, That a special committee of 10 Senators, to be appointed by the President of the Senate, is authorized and directed to make a full and complete investigation of the facts relating to the attack made by the Japanese armed forces upon the Territory of Hawaii on December 7, 1941. Such committee shall report to the Senate as soon as practicable the results of its investigation, together with its recommendations for any necessary legislation.

For the purposes of this resolution the committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to hold such hearings, to sit and act at such times and places during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Senate in the Seventy-eighth and Seventy-ninth Congresses, to employ such experts, and such clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such correspondence, books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, and to make such expenditures, as it deems advisable. The cost of stenographic services to report such hearings shall not be in excess of 25 cents per hundred words. The expenses of the committee, which shall not exceed $_____, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, let me ask the Chair whether the Committee on the Judiciary is the proper committee to which to refer this resolution? The resolution pertains to naval and military matters. It provides for the investigation of certain matters pertaining to Pearl Harbor, over which the Committee on the Judiciary does not seem to me to have jurisdiction. I should like to inquire of the Chair whether he thinks that on the mere request by the author of the resolution it ought to go to the Committee on the Judiciary which otherwise would not have jurisdiction of it? The Committee on the Judiciary had jurisdiction of the legislation extending the statute of limitations, which is a judicial matter, but the resolution in question is not one dealing with a judicial matter.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, it is not my desire at all to select the committee to which the resolution should go. I want it assigned under the Senate rule. The Committee on the Judiciary did have before it the matter relating to the extension of the statute of limitations. That was a matter which properly came before the Committee on the Judiciary, and I assumed that the resolution now submitted, being along the same line, would properly go to that committee.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, this is not a matter for the extension of the statute of limitations, which is a judicial matter, or a matter which the Committee on the Judiciary properly should handle. It seems to me that an investigation involving the Army and the Navy should go either to the Committee on Military Affairs or the Naval Affairs Committee, or to both, as the case may be. I doubt very much if under the rule the Committee on the Judiciary would have jurisdiction of the resolution.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. I wish to make an observation with respect to the question of jurisdiction in connection with what the Senator from Michigan has said. I am sure no member of the Committee on the Judiciary desires to usurp jurisdiction which would properly belong to another committee. The resolution which the Senator from Michigan has just submitted is one which does in a measure, perhaps stretching it somewhat, fall within the jurisdiction of the Committee on the Judiciary for this reason: There have been before our committee on two or three different occasions various measures touching upon the extension of the statute of limitations with respect to certain persons. Necessarily, in the consideration of those bills, our committee has already had some hearings, and has heard from both the Army and the Navy on this subject, and has entertained jurisdiction for that purpose. The proposed investigation, if it shall be authorized, will be an investigation into both the Navy and the Army, which would quite properly call for jurisdiction on the part of either the Committee on Military Affairs or the Naval Affairs Committee. Each committee is coordinate, and whether the resolution should be referred to the Military Affairs Committee or the Committee on Naval Affairs I do not know. I do not urge the point.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I do not raise any question as to the jurisdiction of the Committee on the Judiciary with respect to extension of the statute of limitations, but the matter dealt with by the resolution is entirely different, and I do not think the Committee on the Judiciary automatically acquires jurisdiction of investigations pertaining to the Army and the Navy simply because it has jurisdiction over a measure to extend the statute of limitations.

Mr. HATCH. I quite agree with the Senator from Kentucky. It is somewhat of a problem as to which committee should entertain jurisdiction of this particular resolution in view of what has already occurred in the Senate Committee on the Judiciary. I believe that committee is more familiar with the subject and would be better able to pass on the question as to whether the resolution should be reported favorably.

In that connection, Mr. President, I wish to say in my own time with respect to this particular resolution that I have talked with the Senator from Michigan about it, and, in common with him and every person in the United States, I want to know the full facts concerning the disaster at Pearl Harbor. I am convinced that probably the only way those facts can be fully obtained is by a congressional investigation.

But on the other hand, Mr. President, I am more deeply concerned with the continuation of the splendid cooperation which now exists between the Army and the Navy and the magnificent victories which are being achieved in the great war effort, and I do not want to start an investigation or do anything else which might impede in any way the war effort which is so all-important at this time. So I am not at all sure that I shall support the resolution submitted by the Senator from Michigan, but I believe that, in view of all that has gone on before, the Senate Committee on the Judiciary is the proper committee to consider the resolution.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, as we all know, the statute of limitations in connection with the Kimmel and Short cases expires on the 7th of December. I understand that a measure has been approved in the other body of Congress, either by a subcommittee or by a full committee, which would extend the statute of limitations for an additional 6 months.

I am as much interested as anyone else can possibly be in obtaining the facts in regard to what happened at Pearl Harbor, but, while that is true, I think it would be unfortunate if public attention should be diverted from the great task which the country now faces of winning the war, by superimposing on that task the effort to obtain through an investigation by a Senate committee or by joint investigation, the facts with respect to what occurred at Pearl Harbor, which cannot be changed. Certainly it is more important now to win the war than it is to find out what happened at Pearl Harbor, much as we are anxious to know what happened. If the measure providing for extending the statute of limitations another 6 months should be enacted into law it seems to me we would have more time to conduct an investigation by the Congress, and I assume that so far as I am concerned I shall have no objection to the extension of the statute of limitations for 6 months more when the measure making such provision shall come before the Senate.

The remark I am about to make has no more reference to the proposed investigation than to any other. We are now nearing the end of the Seventy-eighth Congress. We have only about 4 weeks more of it left. As a general proposition I think we should wait the incoming Congress before any more investigations of any kind are authorized. We know that all sorts of investigations have been carried on by both Houses of Congress during almost the entire life of the Seventy-eighth Congress. What proportion of those investigations have resulted in any good I would not attempt to say. I know that such investigations have taken Members of the Senate of the United States all over the country to such an extent that it has frequently been difficult to obtain a quorum in the Senate by reason of the absence of members of investigating committees conducting investigations. Now we are about to approach the end of the seventy-eighth session of the Congress and the new Congress will come in, and it seems to me it would be unwise now to create new investigating committees which would hang over into the next Congress. I think the slate ought to be wiped as clean as possible at the end of the present session of Congress, so that the new Congress can take such action as it may see fit to take in the matter of further investigations of any kind. For that reason I feel hesitant about giving my personal approval to any new investigation, because a new Congress will convene on the 3d of January.

Investigations which have proceeded up to the present time, and which are no longer needed, ought to be abandoned. Those which are entitled to be continued will no doubt receive a new lease of life from the incoming Congress. I think it would be unwise, as a general policy—and that statement has no more relation to Kimmel and Short than it has to any other subject—for the Senate at this stage of the present Congress to begin to authorize new investigations of any kind whatever, because the incoming Congress can consider such questions. If the extension of the statute of limitations for 6 months more should be granted, Congress would be in a position more leisurely to decide what it wishes to do in regard to the matter.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. The Senator has just suggested the extension of the period of the statute of limitations, which prompts this suggestion: The Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] has today reported from the committee a bill extending the statute of limitations for a period of 6 months. The bill will go on the calendar today. I think it is very important that that measure be taken up and disposed of at the earliest possible moment.

Mr. BARKLEY. I agree to that. My remarks had reference to the action of the Judiciary Committee in another body. I did not know that the Senate Committee on the Judiciary had acted today. I shall be very glad to have action taken on that measure as soon as possible.

Mr. FERGUSON. I shall ask for action on the measure extending the period of the statute of limitations for 6 months as soon as it reaches the calendar.

Mr. BARKLEY. There will be no difficulty in obtaining consideration of that measure.

Mr. FERGUSON. On the other question, as I understand the rule, this is not the time to argue the merits of the resolution. The question now before the Senate is to decide to which committee it should go. I am prepared to argue the merits of the resolution, but I shall not do so at this time, because this is not the appropriate time.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair is advised by the Parliamentarian that under the wording of

the proposed resolution it should go to the Committee on Military Affairs. The language is as follows:

That a special committee of 10 Senators, to be appointed by the President of the Senate, is authorized and directed to make a full and complete investigation of the facts relating to the attack made by the Japanese armed forces upon the Territory of Hawaii on December 7, 1941.

The Parliamentarian is of the opinion that that is a military matter, and that it should go to the Committee on Military Affairs. Has the Senator from Michigan any objection to that?

Mr. FERGUSON. I have no objection. As I stated in the beginning, I thought it was appropriate that it go to the Committee on the Judiciary; but there was no intention to select a committee.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Of course, the Senator would have the right to move that the resolution be referred to any particular committee; but the ruling of the Chair is that it should go to the Committee on Military Affairs. Without objection, it will be referred to that committee.

FUNERAL EXPENSES OF THE LATE SENATOR SMITH, OF SOUTH CAROLINA

Mr. MAYBANK submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 337), which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay from the contingent fund of the Senate the actual and necessary expenses incurred by the committee appointed by the Vice President in arranging for and attending the funeral of Hon. ELLISON D. SMITH, late a Senator from the State of South Carolina, upon vouchers to be approved by the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate.

CONTINUATION OF AUTHORITY FOR INVESTIGATION OF THE PRODUCTION, TRANSPORTATION, AND MARKETING OF WOOL

Mr. O'MAHONEY submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 338), which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That Senate Resolution 160, Seventy-fourth Congress, first session, agreed to July 10, 1935, authorizing a special committee to investigate the production, transportation, and marketing of wool, as extended, is hereby further extended and continued in full force and effect during the Seventy-ninth Congress; and the said committee may report to the Senate at any time prior to December 31, 1946. The said committee hereby is authorized to expend from the contingent fund of the Senate $5,000, in addition to the amounts heretofore authorized for the same purposes.

ANNIVERSARY OF THE STAR-SPANGLED BANNER—SPECIAL POSTAGE STAMP

Mr. RADCLIFFE submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 339), which was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads:

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate that, September 12, 1944, having been the one hundred and thirtieth anniversary of the writing of the Star-Spangled Banner, the Postmaster General should issue a special postage stamp, of such denomination, of such design, and for such period as he may determine, in commemoration of the author of our national anthem, Francis Scott Key.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE OF BILL—MISSOURI RIVER BASIN

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair lays before the Senate a resolution coming over from a previous day, which will be stated.

The resolution (S. Res. 332) submitted by Mr. BAILEY on November 16, 1944, was read as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry be discharged from the further consideration of the bill (S. 2100) to provide for the improvement and development of navigation, irrigation, and control of floods on the Missouri River and its tributaries, for the promotion of the national defense, and for other purposes, and that it be referred to the Committee on Commerce.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President, with reference to both the Senate Resolution 332 and Senate Resolution 333, I believe I can make a statement which will clear them from the calendar.

I have talked with the senior Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE] and he has agreed that Senate bill 2100 may be withdrawn from the committee to which it was referred, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the resolution was considered and agreed to.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE OF BILL—MISSOURI RIVER AUTHORITY

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair lays before the Senate a resolution coming over from a previous day, which will be stated.

The resolution (S. Res. 333) submitted by Mr. BAILEY on November 16, 1944, was read as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry be discharged from the further consideration of the bill (S. 2089) to establish a Missouri River Authority to provide for unified water control and resource development on the Missouri River and surrounding region in the interest of the control and prevention of floods, the promotion of navigation and reclamation of the public lands, the strengthening of the national defense, and for other purposes, and that it be referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President, with respect to the bill introduced by the junior Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], Senate bill 2089, I have had a conversation with the Senator, who is present, and who states that there is no intention at this time to take up the bill in the committee to which it was referred, and that there will be no action at this Congress. He has agreed that prior to introducing the bill and having it referred in the next Congress, he and I will have a conversation to see if we cannot settle the question. It is agreeable to me to allow the resolution to lie on the table until the Congress expires.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, of course, it is understood that I am not committing myself on any question.

Mr. BAILEY. I understand. The Senator and I will have a conversation to try to settle the question. If we cannot settle it, it will be presented again in the form of a motion.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, Senate Resolution 333 will lie on the table.

MISSOURI RIVER BASIN (S. DOC. NO. 247)

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, earlier in the session there was printed as Senate Document No. 191 the report of the Bureau of Reclamation on a plan for the development of certain projects in the Missouri Valley. After the submission of that document the Army engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation had a conference at Omaha, in which the two groups of engineers perfected an integrated report. It is an engineering document, which combines the feasible aspects of the Army engineers' report for the Missouri Valley and of the Bureau of Reclamation report for the Missouri Valley.

I ask unanimous consent that this integrated report be printed as a Senate document for the information of the Senate as a supplement to Senate Document No. 191.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

PRONOUNCEMENT BY AMERICAN CATHOLIC HIERARCHY ON INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATION FOR PEACE

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. President, at the close of a solemn conclave on international order, the American Catholic hierarchy, on Saturday last, released a most profound pronouncement following the deliberations of the Catholic bishops of the United States. It appeared in the Washington Sunday Times-Herald.

It is a statement of principles calling for a post-war world of "freemen and free nations with their freedom secured under law."

Because of the significance of this pronouncement, I had intended to ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, but I am informed that it appears in the Appendix of the RECORD at page A4435.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Mr. President, I also had intended to ask to have printed in the RECORD the statement issued by the Catholic bishops. In view of the statement of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS], of course I shall not ask that it be again printed.

SHAPING THE ECONOMIC FUTURE—EMPLOYMENT OF VETERANS—ADDRESS BY BRIG. GEN. FRANK T. HINES

[Mr. CAPPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address on the subject Shaping the Economic Future—Employment of Veterans, delivered by Brig. Gen. Frank T. Hines, Administrator of Veterans' Affairs and Administrator of Retraining and Employment, before the Academy of Political Science at New York City, November 15, 1944, which appears in the Appendix.]

PROPOSED MISSOURI VALLEY AUTHORITY—ADDRESS BY DAVID E. LILIENTHAL

[Mr. MURRAY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address on

the subject of the proposed Missouri Valley Authority, delivered by David E. Lilienthal, Chairman of the Tennessee Valley Authority, before the State convention of North Dakota Farmers Union in Bismarck, N. Dak., November 3, 1944, which appears in the Appendix.]

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The morning business is concluded.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. McLeod, one of its clerks, communicated to the Senate the resolutions of the House adopted as a tribute to the memory of Hon. Ellison D. Smith, late a Senator from the State of South Carolina.

FLOOD-CONTROL PROJECTS

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 4485, the flood control bill.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (H. R. 4485) authorizing the construction of certain public works on rivers and harbors for flood control, and for other purposes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Louisiana.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Commerce with amendments.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. OVERTON. I am very glad to yield to the Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. BAILEY. I wish to say to the Senate that the Senator from Louisiana, who has the floor and has yielded to me for a moment, will have charge of this bill. I intend to support him so far as possible.

Beginning early in last April, the Senator from Louisiana conducted hearings on the flood control bill and the river and harbor bill, and is now conducting some rather abbreviated hearings on the St. Lawrence seaway proposal. He has worked with great diligence and understanding. I feel that I owe him a great debt of gratitude for his labors. I owe it to him to make a statement on the floor of the Senate.

I do not know of any other Senator so competent to deal with our waterways as is the senior Senator from Louisiana. I doubt if there could be found, in the Senate or elsewhere, a man who could work on this legislation as diligently and patiently through the long summer months, until just recently, as has the Senator from Louisiana. I believe that he knows more than any of us about the waterways of the United States, including canals, rivers, and flood control works. In the committee I lean upon him almost completely in that field. The hearings were very long and tedious. The bills covered the whole country; but the Senator from Louisiana stood to his task day after day, and brought a great deal of intelligence, as well as patience, to his labors. I wish to thank him with all my heart.

I have just one other word to say about the matter. Whenever these bills come up in the Senate, I read in the newspapers that our old "pork barrel" is back. These bills relate to the whole post-war activities. We have had no bills of this character since the President vetoed the last such bill in June 1940. The amounts involved are enormous, but I do not think anyone can justly say that the pending bill is "pork barrel" legislation. On the other hand, every project in the bill has been approved by the Army engineers as an economic undertaking, and nothing has been put into the bill merely to please any Senator or by way of distribution of favor or patronage or "pork."

With that statement, Mr. President, I feel perfectly safe in leaving the whole matter of the conduct of the bill in the Senate to my distinguished friend the senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON].

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, I wish to thank the senior Senator from North Carolina for the very complimentary references he has made to me and to my work on the Commerce Committee. I wish to say that I am very grateful to him for the splendid cooperation he has given me and the other members of the full committee and the members of the subcommittee, and I wish particularly to make acknowledgment to the junior Senator from Ohio [Mr. BURTON] and the junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON] for their very faithful attendance at all times at all meetings of the subcommittee, which, as the Senator from North Carolina has stated, lasted for many days.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. OVERTON. I yield.

Mr. MURRAY. Before the Senator from Louisiana proceeds with the presentation of the bill, I should like to have it made clear that I am opposed to the consideration of this proposed legislation at this time. I believe that the bill as it now stands does not adequately protect the rights and interests of the upper valley States in the Missouri River Basin, and that the bill is another piece of legislation which does not adequately cover the situation in my section of the country. I believe it is just another example of piecemeal legislation. It seems to me that the Congress would be acting wisely if consideration of this legislation was passed over until the next session, at which time we could consider a more comprehensive bill covering these flood-control projects and also providing for a unified development of the large river basins in the country.

Therefore, Mr. President, I wish to have it clearly stated in the RECORD that I am opposed to having the Senate proceed to the consideration of this bill at this time. I think it is unwise; I think it does not adequately cover the problems which should be covered in order to meet the conditions which will confront us when the war is over. If we are to meet the great problems which will confront this country at the end of the war, I think we must have comprehensive legislation for the development of these various river valleys. Especially in the Missouri River Basin there is opportunity for a huge program of reclamation and industrial development through which we may provide homes for many thousands of persons who can be settled in that part of the country after the war is over. But that can only be done by legislation more comprehensive than the bill which is before us at this time.

So, Mr. President, I wish to have the RECORD show clearly that I am not in favor of this legislation at this time.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, the pending bill contemplates that the projects to be authorized will be constructed, for the most part, in the post-war period. It is not exactly correct to say that all the projects provided for in the bill are post-war projects. The provision as now written in the bill is as follows:

> When the existing critical situation with respect to materials, equipment, and manpower no longer exists, and in any event not later than immediately following the cessation of hostilities in the present war, the projects herein shall be initiated as expeditiously and prosecuted as vigorously as may be consistent with budgetary requirements.

It is necessary Mr. President, that the bill be enacted as promptly as possible, because after the various projects have been authorized by Congress, the Army Engineers must proceed with the preparation of detailed plans. That work requires considerable additional investigation and study. Therefore, the sooner the bill is passed the sooner can the Chief of Army Engineers and the Corps of Engineers proceed with the task of perfecting the plans and dealing with the projects which will be authorized.

Mr. President, as the senior Senator from North Carolina has very well pointed out, this bill is in no sense a pork barrel bill. I do not think there is any bill which comes before the Congress—and I say this, not with particular reference to the pending bill, but with reference to flood control bills and river and harbor bills generally—which undergoes more careful scrutiny than do such bills before they are submitted for the consideration of the Congress. The pending measure is not a pork barrel bill, because every project contained in it on which a report has been made has been initiated locally among local interests; and after they had proposed the particular project, the Congress of the United States authorized the making of a preliminary survey and investigation of it.

The Chief of Army Engineers and the Corps of Engineers cannot undertake an investigation of any flood-control projects or any river and harbor projects unless they receive a mandate from the Congress to do so. That mandate is contained in a direction and an authority to make a preliminary examination and survey of the proposed project. When that is done, the Chief of Army Engineers sends the proposal to the district engineer within whose jurisdiction the

project lies. The district engineer begins by collecting all the available data the engineers have with reference not only with respect to the project itself, but with respect to the whole area and with respect to its relation to other projects and other streams. After the district engineer has made this preliminary study, he sets down the matter for public hearing, and at the hearing representatives of local interests and all others who are interested one way or the other are given an opportunity to appear and to be heard, and a record is made of the testimony taken, as given by the proponents and the opponents of the project.

After that is done, the district engineer proceeds to formulate a report on the project, either favorable or unfavorable. He sends it to the division engineer. When it reaches the division engineer, it undergoes close scrutiny at his hands. When the division engineer has completed his work, he sends the report to the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors. The Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors proceeds to the consideration of the project. At the request of anyone in interest, public hearings are conducted, and again the whole subject matter is reviewed and the testimony of witnesses for and against the project is taken down.

After such thorough consideration has been given by the Board of Engineers for rivers and harbors, the board makes such changes and modifications as it desires or recommends with respect to the project, and submits its report.

The report is then sent to the Chief of Engineers, who proceeds to the consideration of the project, and makes such changes and alterations as he deems advisable.

After that has been done, Mr. President, the project is not sent immediately by the Chief of Engineers to the Congress, because if it is a project in which the Bureau of Reclamation is interested, or in which the Federal Power Commission is interested, the Chief of Engineers sends his proposed report to the Commissioner of the Bureau of Reclamation and to the chairman of the Power Commission for their comments and observations.

After that has been done the Chief of Engineers submits the matter to the Secretary of War, who transmits it to the Congress, and it is then printed as a public document, either as a House document or as a Senate document.

In addition to all the careful investigation to which I have referred and all the public hearings which have been conducted in reference to all the projects, monthly meetings are conducted in the city of Washington between the Chief of Engineers and his staff, the Commissioner of the Bureau of Reclamation and his staff, the Chairman of the Federal Power Commission and his representatives, and the Land-Use Coordinator of the Department of Agriculture. The purpose of the monthly meetings is to consider the different projects and the general picture with reference to the proper utilization of the waters of the Nation. The officials to whom I have referred consult and undertake to harmonize their differences and to come to an agreement as to what is best for navigation, for flood control, for irrigation, reclamation, power, and for agricultural development of the territory through which the waters flow.

Therefore, Mr. President, I do not believe any other bill coming before the Congress undergoes such careful scrutiny by experts and is the subject of such extensive public hearings as do the various river-and-harbor bills.

What happens? A bill is introduced either in the House or in the Senate, containing for the most part the various projects which have been recommended by the Chief of Engineers. The Flood Control Committee of the House—if the bill originates in the House, as it usually does—or the Committee on Rivers and Harbors of the House, sets the bill down for hearings and the public is invited to attend. All who are in favor of and all who are opposed to any project contained in either the flood-control bill or the river-and-harbor bill are given an opportunity to be heard before the committee.

Take, for example, the particular bill now before the Senate. The printed pages of testimony covered in the House hearings number 1,248. The period of time covered in the House hearings was from May 13, 1943, to February 23, 1944. After the bill passed the House and came to the Senate, the Senate Committee on Commerce proceeded to conduct hearings, and the period of time covered by the hearings on the bill in the Senate committee was from May 29 to June 15, 1944, and the number of printed pages in the record amounted to 816.

Mr. President, I wish to go back a step with reference to the action taken by the Chief of Engineers. I stated that all projects had to be initiated in Congress under authority for a preliminary examination and survey. They are not all approved, by any means. The majority of them are not approved. The majority of them are rejected. Since we passed the Flood Control Act of 1941, which was the last Flood Control Act to be passed, the total number of proposals which were investigated by the Army engineers was 203. Of those proposals only 78, or 38 percent, were approved. One hundred and twenty-five or 62 percent, were rejected.

So, Mr. President, I do not believe there is any bill which undergoes closer legislative scrutiny, more searching engineering scrutiny, and more diligent expert scrutiny before it reaches the floor of either the House or the Senate—I will include in that statement even our revenue and appropriation bills—than the various flood control and river and harbor bills. I wish to make that statement particularly clear.

As stated by the Senator from North Carolina this is not a pork-barrel bill. So far as the Army engineers are concerned, they have been dealing with navigation projects for 124 years. They have been dealing with flood-control projects ever since flood-control projects became a national obligation. I can say of the Bureau of Reclamation that for 40 years they have been studying what is necessary and proper in connection with the problems of irrigation, and in connection with other similar uses of water. They have become experts in that field. I believe that the Army engineers whom we have trained in peacetime work have justified their training by the services which they have rendered on the battlefields of the world. I believe that the Army engineers are by far the finest group of engineers, not only in the history of this Nation, but in the history of the entire world. The magnificent engineering works which helped the progress of our troops as they moved forward toward the enemy were prepared, planned, and constructed by engineers who had received experience in the United States of America and its territories during peacetime in connection with rivers and harbors, and flood-control work.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD as a part of my remarks a breakdown by States of all the projects contained in the flood-control bill. I make the request so that information on the subject may be made available to Senators who may be interested in the matter. It is obviously impossible to segregate by States the cost of projects which are in more than one State. The tabulation will show the total cost of such projects in each State involved, and allocated to each State, instead of a distribution being made. Such projects in the report are marked with an asterisk.

There being no objection, the tabulation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Projects in H. R. 4485 as reported out by the Committee on Commerce on June 22, 1944

[NOTE.—As it is obviously impracticable to segregate by States the costs of projects which are in more than 1 State, the tabulation below includes the total cost of such project in each State involved. Such projects are marked with an asterisk]

	First cost	Cost of maintenance and operation
Arizona:		
Alamo Reservoir, Bill Williams River	$3,202,000	$4,000.
Arkansas:		
*Mississippi River, Cairo, Ill., to Baton Rouge, La	200,000,000	
Narrows Reservoir and local flood protection on Little Missouri River [1]	3,800,000	$20,000.
Blakely Mountain Reservoir, Ouachita River	11,080,000	$61,000.
*Boeuf and Tensas Rivers and Bayou Macon, Arkansas and Louisiana	5,013,000	Local.
Arkansas River main stem:		
Fort Smith, levee, floodwall, and appurtenances	898,660	Do.
Van Buren, levee, floodwall, and appurtenances	529,000	Do.

[1] Increased authorization for existing project.

Projects in H. R. 4485 as reported out by the Committee on Commerce on June 22, 1944—Continued

		First cost	Cost of maintenance and operation
Arkansas—Continued.			
Arkansas River main stem—Continued.			
Crawford County levee district,[1] levee and appurtenances		$1,546,000	Local.
McLean Bottom levee district No. 3, levee and diversion		517,000	Do.
Dardanelle drainage district [1] (near Dardanelle), levees and appurtenances		122,500	Do.
Pope County levee district No. 1 and Conway County levee district Nos. 3 and 7 [1] (west of Morrilton), levee, cut-off, and appurtenances.		855,000	Do.
Conway County levee district No. 6, levee and appurtenances		371,000	Do.
Conway County levee districts Nos. 1, 2, and 8, levees and appurtenances		1,005,000	Do.
Roland drainage district, levee and appurtenances		339,000	Do.
Little Rock levees [1] (east end Fourche Bayou), levees, intercepting ditch, 2 cut-offs, and appurtenances		465,200	Do.
Little Rock to Pine Bluff [1] (head of Fourche Island to Pennington Bayou),[1] levees and appurtenances		583,000	Do.
Tucker Lake area,[1] levees and appurtenances		207,000	Do.
*White River Basin		45,000,000	$250,000.
California:			
San Diego, San Diego River, levee		370,000	$2,000.
Ventura, lower Ventura River, levee		1,080,000	Local.
Ojai, Stewart Canyon (Ventura River Basin), debris, basin, and channel		520,000	Do.
Santa Ana River Basin, including Lytle and Cajon Creeks [1]		10,000,000	Do.
Los Angeles and San Gabriel Basin and Ballona Creek [1]		25,000,000	Do.
Watsonville, Pajaro River, levee		452,160	Do.
Gilroy, Pajaro River Basin, levee		59,000	Do.
Sacramento River,[1] initial stage consisting of extension of local protection along main stem, levees, and other local protection along tributaries, low Table Mountain Dam, and Black Butte Dam.		15,000,000	$135,000. Local maintenance of levees and channels are additional.
Folsom Reservoir, American River		18,474,000	$50,000.
Isabella Reservoir, Kern River		6,800,000	$25,000.
Terminus Reservoir, Kaweah River, and Success Reservoir, Tule River		4,600,000	$13,000.
Pine Flat Dam, Kings River		19,700,000	$40,000.
Merced County stream group		1,300,000	Local operation and maintenance of all works except reservoirs is additional. $4,000 Federal maintenance of reservoirs.
Burns Creek Reservoir	$171,800		
Bear Creek Reservoir	292,000		
Owens Creek Reservoir	168,800		
Mariposa Creek Reservoir	417,000		
Black Rascal Canal	68,800		
Owens Creek Canal	15,200		
Miles Creek Canal	6,200		
Lower San Joaquin River		8,000,000	
New Melones Reservoir; Stanislaus River, contribution to Don Pedro Reservoir to be built by local interests; channel improvements and levees on San Joaquin River and tributaries.			
Littlejohn Creek and Calaveras River group		3,868,200	$14,600 maintenance and operation for channel by local interests.
Farmington Reservoir, Littlejohn Creek	$1,561,000		
Enlarge Hogan Reservoir, Calaveras River	1,942,000		
Diversions, channels, levees, and dikes	365,200		
Conn Creek Reservoir, Napa River		460,000	Local.
Colorado:			
Colorado Springs, Fountaine Que Bouille River, floodway and appurtenances		500,000	Do.
Trinidad, Purgatoire River, channel and levees		909,000	Do.
*Missouri River Basin [1]		200,000,000	
Cherry Creek Reservoir [1]		7,500,000	$3,000.
Morrison, Bear Creek, channel clearing		220,000	Local.
Creede, Willow Creek, timber flume		68,500	Do.
Connecticut:			
*Connecticut River Basin		30,000,000	
*Thames River Basin		7,200,000	
Thomaston Reservoir, Housatonic River Basin		5,151,000	$15,200.
Georgia:			
*Clark Hill Reservoir, Savannah River		35,300,000	$223,000.
*Allatoona Reservoir,[1] Mobile River Basin		14,400,000	$50,000.
Hawaii: Hanapepe, Kauai Island, Hanapepe River, T. H., local flood protection		73,000	Local.
Idaho:			
Snake River between Heise and Roberts, channel improvement		734,000	Do.
Weiser, Snake River, bank protection		9,000	Do.
Illinois:			
*Ohio River Basin		70,000,000	
*Upper Mississippi River Basin		10,000,000	
Galena, Galena River, local protection		300,000	Do.
Illinois River, floodway at Big Prairie drainage and levee district		111,500	None.
Indiana:			
*Ohio River Basin		70,000,000	
Iowa:			
Red Rock Dam, Des Moines River [1]		15,000,000	$55,000.
Des Moines, local flood protection along Des Moines and Raccoon Rivers		270,000	Local.
Sabula, Mississippi River		25,000	Do.
Elkport, Turkey River		13,000	Do.
*Missouri River Basin [1]		200,000,000	
Denison, Boyer River—local protection		17,830	Do.
Hamburg, Nishnabotna River		236,000	Do.
*Upper Mississippi River Basin [1]		10,000,000	
Kansas:			
*Arkansas River Basin [1]		35,000,000	
*Missouri River Basin [1]		200,000,000	
*Kansas Citys, Kans. and Mo.,[1] local protection		8,445,000	Do.
Kentucky:			
*Ohio River Basin		70,000,000	
The following projects have been added to the comprehensive plan for the Ohio River Basin:			
Taylorsville, Salt River, local protection (maintenance and operation)	$129,350		
Kentucky River Basin,[1] Jessamine and Booneville Reservoirs ($19,000 maintenance and operation)	23,756,000		
Jackson Cut-Off, Kentucky River Basin (local maintenance and operation)	66,000	70,000,000	
Middlesborough, Yellow Creek—local protection (local maintenance and operation)	205,200		
Rough River—channel improvement (local maintenance and operation)	320,000		
Barnett Creek, Rough River Basin—channel rectification (local maintenance and operation)	40,000		
*Mississippi River—Cairo, Ill., to Baton Rouge, La		200,000,000	
Louisiana:			
*Mississippi River, Cairo, Ill., to Baton Rouge, La		200,000,000	
*Boeuf and Tensas Rivers and Bayou Macon, Ark. and La		5,013,000	Do.
Red River, vicinity of Shreveport, bank protection		3,000,000	Do.
Maryland: *Ohio River Basin		70,000,000	
The following project has been added to the comprehensive plan for the Ohio River Basin: *Youghiogheny River Basin ($423,000 maintenance and operation)	$37,970,000		
Massachusetts:			
West Hill Reservoir, Blackstone River Basin		1,070,000	$8,270.
Worcester Diversion, Blackstone River Basin		2,232,000	Local.
*Connecticut River Basin [1]		30,000,000	
*Thames River Basin [1]		7,200,000	

[1] Increased authorization for existing project.

Projects in H. R. 4485 as reported out by the Committee on Commerce on June 22, 1944—Continued

	First cost	Cost of maintenance and operation
Minnesota: Red Lake River channel improvement and Red Lake control structures	$902,940	$2,000 plus channel maintenance by local interests.
Mississippi:		
*Mississippi River, Cairo Ill., to Baton Rouge, La	200,000,000	
Yazoo River tributaries	3,752,000	Local.
Yazoo River, Satartia area	1,952,000	Do.
Missouri:		
*Upper Mississippi River Basin [1]	10,000,000	
*White River Basin [1]	45,000,000	
Ste. Genevieve levee district No. 1,[1] levee extension	141,000	Do.
*Missouri River Basin [1]	200,000,000	
Chariton River, local protection	1,610,200	Do.
*Kansas Citys, Kans. and Mo.,[1] local protection	8,445,000	Do.
*Mississippi River Cairo, Ill., to Baton Rouge, La	200,000,000	
Montana:		
Harlem, Milk River,[1] local protection	21,100	Do.
Havre, Milk River, local protection	313,100	Do.
Nebraska: *Missouri River Basin [1]	200,000,000	
New Hampshire: *Connecticut River Basin [1]	30,000,000	
New York:		
*Ohio River Basin	70,000,000	
The following project has been added to the comprehensive plan for the Ohio River Basin: Lake Chautauqua and Chadakoin ($3,135,500, local maintenance and operation) River area, Conewango Creek.		
*Southern New York and eastern Pennsylvania,[1] Susquehanna River Basin	4,755,000	
Panther Mountain Reservoir, Black River	600,000	Do.
Chittenango Creek, channel improvement	111,000	Do.
Owasco inlet and outlet, and tributaries, channel improvement and appurtenant works	64,200	Do.
Mount Morris Reservoir, Genesee River	5,360,000	$26,800.
North Carolina:		
*Roanoke River Basin, Buggs Island and Philpott Reservoirs	36,140,000	$164,100.
*Yadkin-Pee Dee River Basin, Wilkesboro Reservoir	10,840,000	$62,200.
North Dakota:		
Bald Hill Reservoir, Sheyenne River	810,000	$6,000.
Reservoirs on Tongue and Pembina Rivers	333,800	$5,000.
Reservoir on Park River	358,610	$2,050.
*Missouri River Basin	200,000,000	
Beulah, Knife River, local protection works	26,100	Local.
Hazen, Knife River, local protection works	6,600	Do.
Ohio: *Ohio River Basin	70,000,000	
The following projects have been added to the comprehensive plan for the Ohio River Basin:		
Dillonvale, Short Creek (local maintenance and operation) $94,100		
Adena, Short Creek (local maintenance and operation) 64,100		
Burr Oak Reservoir, Hocking River (plus $6,000 maintenance and operation; local interests to maintain water supply portion in addition) 400,000		
Oklahoma:		
*Arkansas River Basin	35,000,000	
Arkansas River main stem:		
Tulsa and West Tulsa, bridge modification	133,000	Do.
Jenks, levee	264,000	Do.
Near Fort Gibson, levees and appurtenances	260,100	Do.
Dirty Creek bottom, levee and appurtenances	421,000	Do.
Tucker Lake bottom, levee and appurtenances	485,000	Do.
Braden bottom, levee and appurtenances	192,000	Do.
Pig Skin Bayou-Camp Creek bottom, levee and appurtenances	343,000	Do.
Moffett bottom, levees, relocations, and appurtenances	957,000	Do.
Oregon:		
Nehalem River	23,000	Do.
Willamette River Basin [1]	20,000,000	
Arlington, Alkali Canyon	118,000	Do.
Coquille River	143,000	Do.
Pennsylvania:		
Susquehanna River at Harrisburg [1]	2,227,000	Do.
Tyrone, Susquehanna River Basin	1,392,000	Do.
*Southern New York and eastern Pennsylvania,[1] Susquehanna River Basin	4,755,000	
Raystown Reservoir, Susquehanna River Basin	2,000,000	$90,000.
*Ohio River Basin	70,000,000	
The following projects have been added to the comprehensive plan for the Ohio River Basin:		
Latrobe, Loyalhanna Creek (local maintenance and operation) $112,700		
Turtle Creek Reservoir (plus $15,000 maintenance and operation, plus maintenance of channel below reservoir by local interests) 2,613,000		
*Youghiogheny River Basin ($423,000 maintenance and operation) 37,970,000		
Ridgeway, Johnsonburg, Saint Marys, and Brockway.		
Rhode Island:		
Woonsocket, channel improvement, Blackstone River Basin	803,000	Local.
Pawtucket, floodwall, Blackstone River Basin	82,000	Do.
South Carolina:		
Edisto River, channel improvement	139,000	Do.
*Clark Hill Reservoir, Savannah River	35,300,000	$223,000.
South Dakota: *Missouri River Basin [1]	200,000,000	
Tennessee:		
*Ohio River Basin	70,300,000	
*Mississippi River, Cairo, Ill., to Baton Rouge, La	200,000,000	
Texas:		
North Concho River, Colorado River Basin, Tex	4,800,000	$25,000. In addition, local interests maintain local protection works.
Pecan Bayou, Colorado River Basin, Tex	1,560,000	$2,000. In addition, local interests maintain enlarged Lake Brownwood Reservoir.
Whitney Reservoir, Brazos River Basin	15,000,000	$70,000.
Utah: Sevier River at Redmond, Utah	281,000	Local.
Vermont:		
*Connecticut River Basin [1]	30,000,000	
*Winooski River Basin [1]	2,120,000	Do.
Virginia:		
*Roanoke River Basin, Buggs Island and Philpott Reservoirs	36,140,000	$164,000.
*Ohio River Basin	70,000,000	
Washington:		
Pullman, Palouse River Basin	187,000	Local.
Colfax, Palouse River Basin	291,000	Do.
Raymond, Willapa River Basin	127,000	Do.
Hoquiam, Aberdeen, and Cosmopolis, Chehalis River	669,000	Do.
West Virginia: *Ohio River Basin	70,000,000	
The following project has been added to the comprehensive plan for the Ohio River Basin: Rowlesburg Reservoir, Cheat River ($171,500 maintenance and operation) $29,230,000		
Wisconsin: *Upper Mississippi River Basin [1]	10,000,000	

[1] Increased authorization for existing project.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, with that preliminary statement I ask unanimous consent that the formal reading of the bill be dispensed with, that it be considered for amendment, and that the committee amendments be first considered.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The first amendment of the Committee on Commerce will be stated.

The first amendment of the Committee on Commerce was, on page 1, line 3, after the word "assembled", to insert:

It is the purpose of this act to establish a definite policy of making use of existing Federal agencies for the construction, operation, and maintenance of all public improvements in connection with navigation, flood control, and allied activities; to insure coordinated operation of all Federal projects therein for the improvement of navigation and alleviation of flood conditions; to provide for realization of other benefits to be derived from such projects; to facilitate preparations and planning for post-war construction by the Federal Government in the interest of employment; and to secure efficient executive management under the direction and supervision of the permanent executive agencies already established by act of Congress.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, the senior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] has requested that the first committee amendment be passed over temporarily, and that course will be satisfactory.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the amendment will be passed over temporarily. The next amendment reported by the Committee on Commerce will be stated.

The next amendment was, on page 2, line 6, before the word "That", to insert "Sec. 2."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 2, line 20, to change the section number from 2 to 3.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 3, line 10, to change the section number from 3 to 4; in line 12, after the word "operate", to insert "public"; in line 16, after the word "lands", to strike out "structures" and insert "including structure"; in the same line, after the word "facilities", to insert "thereon"; and in line 18, after the word "provided" to strike out:

That licenses to Federal, State, or local governmental agencies for the use of areas suitable for public park and recreational purposes may be granted without monetary consideration when the Secretary of War determines such action to be in the public interest.

And insert:

That preference shall be given to Federal, State, or local governmental agencies, and licenses may be granted without monetary consideration, to such agencies for the use of areas suitable for public park and recreational purposes, when the Secretary of War determines such action to be in the public interest. The water areas of all such reservoirs shall be open to public use generally without charge for boating, swimming, bathing, fishing, and other recreational purposes, and ready access to and exit from such water areas along the shores of such reservoirs shall be maintained for general public use, when such use is determined by the Secretary of War not to be contrary to the public interest, all under such rules and regulations as the Secretary of War may deem necessary.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 4, after line 13, to insert:

SEC. 5. Electric power and energy generated at reservoir projects under the control of the War Department and in the opinion of the Secretary of War not required in the operation of such projects shall be delivered to the Secretary of the Interior, who shall transmit and dispose of such power and energy in such manner as to encourage the most widespread use thereof at the lowest possible rates to consumers consistent with sound business principles, the rate schedules to become effective upon confirmation and approval by the Federal Power Commission. Preference in the sale of such power and energy shall be given to public bodies and cooperatives. The Secretary of the Interior is authorized to construct and acquire only such transmission lines and related facilities as may be necessary in order to make the power and energy generated at said projects available in wholesale quantities for sale on fair and reasonable terms and conditions to facilities owned by the Federal Government, public bodies, cooperatives, and privately owned companies.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, in connection with the amendment just stated the Commerce Committee yesterday authorized the chairman of the committee, the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY], to offer an amendment, which, as I understand, would be a substitute for the committee amendment. I do not see the Senator from North Carolina in the Chamber at the moment.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Section 5 will be passed over temporarily.

Mr. OVERTON. Very well.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The next committee amendment will be stated.

The next amendment was, on page 5, line 8, to change the section number from 4 to 6, and in line 13, after the name "War Department" to insert a colon and "*Provided*, That no sale of such water shall adversely affect then existing lawful uses of such water."

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, there will be some amendments offered to take the place of this section. I wonder if it would not be well to let the whole section go over temporarily.

Mr. OVERTON. Including the Senate committee amendment?

Mr. MILLIKIN. Yes.

Mr. OVERTON. I may say that all we are now doing is to pass on the Senate committee amendments. Is there any objection to the Senate committee amendment? Is the Senator later going to move to strike out this section?

Mr. MILLIKIN. It will later be moved to strike out the whole section. I suggest that it be passed over for the time being.

Mr. OVERTON. Very well. There is no objection to passing over section 6 temporarily.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I take it this provision is something new in our legislation. I may be greatly in error, but I have not known of any previous legislation which authorized the Secretary of War or anyone else to sell stored waters. Am I correct that this is something new in our legislation, or is there a precedent for it?

Mr. OVERTON. The Secretary of War does not engage in the business of selling stored water.

Mr. WHITE. It is provided in the bill that he is authorized to sell surplus water that may be available in any reservoir.

Mr. OVERTON. I beg pardon. I see that amendment. What I was going to say is that all surplus waters stored in reservoirs are turned over to the Department of the Interior for distribution for irrigation purposes. It so happens that in connection with the sale for domestic and industrial uses of surplus water available in any reservoir under the control of the War Department, the committee has recommended an amendment which protects the existing lawful uses of the water. For instance, when a dam is constructed and water is impounded in it and there is nearby a lawful user of that water, we do not want to deprive him of his rights. Therefore, he is permitted to take water from the dam, but, of course, he does it under the direction of the Secretary of War.

Mr. WHITE. Under this provision as it now stands in the bill, I take it that the Secretary of War may first determine whether there is surplus water, what the amount of the surplus water may be, and then he is authorized to sell all he determines to be surplus. Am I correct about that?

Mr. OVERTON. That is substantially correct.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, I should like to say to the distinguished senior Senator from Maine that there will be an amendment proposed which will take away the power to sell water but leave the power to contract water. It is the contention of the western Senators that the Secretary of War has no power to sell water, because he does not own the water.

Mr. WHITE. That was the impression that occurred to me. I did not see, unless the Secretary of War has title to the surplus water, how he was going to have authority to sell and to pass title to someone else or the use of it to someone else.

Mr. OVERTON. The difference between the Senator from Colorado and the committee is a mere technical difference of words. The Senator from Colorado and those agreeing with him prefer using the word "contract" to the word "sale"—contract for the water, instead of sell the water. There will be no objection to that.

Mr. WHITE. That is a distinction without a difference, is it not?

Mr. OVERTON. I think so. However, the whole section 6 has been passed over temporarily and that amendment with it, at the request of the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President, I had stepped out of the Senate Chamber for a moment, and did not know that this matter was coming up.

Mr. OVERTON. Section 5 was passed over temporarily until the Senator could

come into the Chamber. I ask consent that the Senate return to the power amendment, which is section 5, which was passed over temporarily because of the absence of the Senator from North Carolina.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the Senate will return to the consideration of section 5, and the amendment will be again stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 4, after line 13, it is proposed to insert the following:

SEC. 5. Electric power and energy generated at reservoir projects under the control of the War Department and in the opinion of the Secretary of War not required in the operation of such projects shall be delivered to the Secretary of the Interior, who shall transmit and dispose of such power and energy in such manner as to encourage the most widespread use thereof at the lowest possible rates to consumers consistent with sound business principles, the rate schedules to become effective upon confirmation and approval by the Federal Power Commission. Preference in the sale of such power and energy shall be given to public bodies and cooperatives. The Secretary of the Interior is authorized to construct and acquire only such transmission lines and related facilities as may be necessary in order to make the power and energy generated at said projects available in wholesale quantities for sale on fair and reasonable terms and conditions to facilities owned by the Federal Government, public bodies, cooperatives, and privately owned companies.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President, I sent forward in the morning hour an amendment to this section and I intended to have it printed for the information of Senators, but, if the Senate is ready to go ahead with it, I am, and I will ask that the proposed amendment be read at the desk.

Mr. OVERTON. I presume if it proves to be controversial we can pass it over for the time being.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment offered by the Senator from North Carolina to the committee amendment will be read for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 4, in section 5, it is proposed to strike out all after the word "cooperatives" in line 25, and to insert in lieu thereof the following:

The sale of such electric power as may be generated at reservoir projects shall be made at the point of production, without special privilege or discrimination, so as to provide for the complete coordination of such power and energy with other power developments, both private and public, in the area contiguous with such projects. It shall be stipulated in connection with any sale that any and all savings realized by the purchasers shall be passed on under Federal regulation where no State regulation exists, to the consuming public: *Provided*, That unless 90 percent of the firm power produced at such projects shall be demanded or purchased within 3 years after completion of construction of such projects, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to construct transmission lines for the purpose of selling such power at wholesale.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President, this amendment has the status of a committee amendment. It was submitted to the Commerce Committee yesterday morning. It was there thoroughly discussed and altered and the committee voted 9 or 10 to 3 to strike out the amendment as printed in the bill now before the Senate and to insert the amendment I have proposed in lieu thereof.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The committee has a right to modify its amendment.

Mr. BAILEY. So I take it, it would be in order for the amendment to be considered now as a committee amendment, if Senators are sufficiently informed about it.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question will be on the committee amendment as modified.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BAILEY. I think the Senator from Louisiana has the floor.

Mr. OVERTON. I am glad to yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I do not think such a far-reaching amendment as that should be considered without the Members of the Senate having a chance to read it. The amendment deals with the entire power policy of the United States. Although it is worded well and sounds good the effect of it would be to turn over the public power of the United States, all power generated at public dams, to private utility companies, and if they did not want it at the end of 3 years, then the proper authority would have a chance to sell it to the public; but if they wanted it they would get it. I cannot imagine the Senate acting on such an amendment as that without having a chance to read it and study it and let the people of the country know what is going on.

Mr. BAILEY. Let me say to the distinguished Senator from Vermont that I have no intention of perpetrating a crime in the Senate, and I hope I will not be considered as capable of perpetrating a very serious crime anywhere else. Amongst other things, I do not intend, as long as I live, to perpetrate the crime of reflecting on my fellow Senators in a debate.

I said that if the Senate was ready to proceed, I was ready, but if the Senate desires to have the amendment printed and placed on the desks of Senators, that is entirely agreeable to me. I wish to say, however, that I could not agree to the statement which the Senator from Vermont has made, which is about as just with respect to the amendment itself as it was with respect to those of us who are now accused of being about to perpetrate a crime in the Senate.

Mr. AIKEN. I grant the entire sincerity of the Senator from North Carolina in his viewpoint on some of these matters, which happens to differ from mine, but I do think Senators should have time to read the amendment and study it, and I am sure the Senator from North Carolina agrees with me in that.

Furthermore, it appears that if the amendment should be agreed to, it would have an effect on practically all the amendments, as well as all the projects, or most of the projects, authorized by the bill, and it seems to me that this should be one of the earliest matters in the bill to be disposed of, if not the earliest, because it might, and probably would, influence the votes of Senators on the other projects authorized by the bill.

Mr. BAILEY. I agree with the suggestion made that the matter go over until tomorrow, or, if the bill should stay here longer, it might go over for a longer period, but I would much rather dispose of it tomorrow, because I am really under some obligations to return to the aviation conference in Chicago, and I should like to get away. I shall consent that the matter be deferred until tomorrow, if the Senate is to be in session tomorrow. Meantime, I do not wish my amendment to be prejudiced by remarks from any quarter. It is an effort, a sincere effort, to state a proper live-and-let-live power policy, in view of the creation of enormous power by the bill. That is all the amendment is. But I shall defer any discussion until the amendment comes up in regular order, and I take it no one is seriously prejudiced in his mind by what has been said here. I think men do sometimes commit crimes with the utmost sincerity.

Mr. AIKEN. I might say it would be a crime on the part of the Senate, not necessarily on the part of the Senator from North Carolina, to consider the amendment without opportunity for study on the part of Senators.

Mr. BAILEY. I think the assassination of Caesar was sometimes charged to the entire Senate of Rome, but that did not affect the assassination at all, and it did not help the Senate. I do not think the Senate of the United States is remotely contemplating committing a crime now or hereafter, even in the name of liberty.

I merely send the amendment forward, and will let it go over until tomorrow.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the modified amendment of the committee will be printed for the information of Senators, and will lie on the table, and the pending amendment will go over.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, I suggest that this is simply a modification of the committee amendment, and that the entire amendment, beginning with the words "Sec. 5", be printed.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield to me for a question?

Mr. OVERTON. I yield.

Mr. DOWNEY. While this amendment is before the Senate, let me inquire whether its effect would be only on construction by Army engineers, and would not be upon construction by the Reclamation Bureau.

Mr. OVERTON. That is correct. It says "Electric power and energy generated at reservoir projects under the control of the War Department."

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield to me?

Mr. OVERTON. I yield.

Mr. BURTON. A moment ago the Senate approved the committee amendment to section 4, with which I concur, but I wish to ask the chairman of the subcommittee a question or two in order to help clarify the situation, in the interest of some who are much interested in the use

of the War Department reservoirs for recreational purposes.

As I understand the effect of the amendment, it provides that the water areas of the War Department reservoirs shall be available to the public without charge. That would mean the use of the water and the use of access to the water, and that would be without charge. Is not that correct?

Mr. OVERTON. That is correct, for certain recreational purposes.

Mr. BURTON. But the activities on that water would still be subject to the fishing licenses and motorboat licenses of the areas concerned?

Mr. OVERTON. That is my understanding.

Mr. BURTON. And the surrounding park grounds or picnic facilities would not be covered so that they would have to be made available without charge, especially where it might be necessary to have some maintenance charges in order adequately to take care of those areas.

Mr. OVERTON. That is correct. All that is desired is that there may be access for recreational purposes by the public.

Mr. BURTON. The water may be used without charge for boating, bathing, swimming, fishing, and other recreational purposes, together with ready access to and exit from such water areas?

Mr. OVERTON. That is correct.

Mr. BURTON. And this is all limited to reservoirs under the jurisdiction of the War Department?

Mr. OVERTON. That is correct.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield?

Mr. OVERTON. I yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Will the Senator tell us what happened to the committee amendment on page 1?

Mr. OVERTON. That was passed over temporarily.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will state the next amendment of the committee.

The next amendment was, on page 5, line 17, to change the section number from 5 to 7; and in line 18, after the word "storage", to strike out "available" and insert "allocated."

The amendment was agreed to.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Did the Senator from Colorado object to the proviso on lines 13 and 14, page 5?

Mr. MILLIKIN. It was understood that that would go over.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the amendment will be passed over, and the clerk will state the next amendment of the committee.

The next amendment was, on page 5, in line 22, after the word "regulations", to insert a colon and the following proviso: "*Provided*, That this section shall not apply to the Tennessee Valley Authority except in case of danger from floods."

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I have a copy of a letter under date of August 15, addressed to the distinguished Senator from Louisiana, signed by the chairman of the Tennessee Valley Authority, in which he suggests language in lieu of the amendment proposed, the language suggested by the chairman of the Tennessee Valley Authority being language agreed on between the Tennessee Valley Authority and the Army engineers and the War Department. I do not think the language suggested by the engineers and the Tennessee Valley Authority changes the intent or the purpose at all of the amendment reported by the committee, except that I think it makes it clearer and more specific, and is really better language. I hope the Senator has no objection to the language agreed on by the engineers and the Tennessee Valley Authority.

Mr. OVERTON. I have no objection. I think the meaning of both is the same.

Mr. HILL. The meaning is the same. Then, as a substitute for the committee amendment, I offer the following: "*Provided*, That this section shall not apply to the Tennessee Valley Authority, except that in case of danger from floods on the lower Ohio and Mississippi Rivers the Tennessee Valley Authority is directed to regulate the release of water to the Tennessee River into the Ohio River in accordance with such instructions as may be issued by the War Department."

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will state the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. In lieu of the committee amendment on page 5, line 22, it is proposed to insert the following: "*Provided*, That this section shall not apply to the Tennessee Valley Authority except that in case of danger from floods on the lower Ohio and Mississippi Rivers the Tennessee Valley Authority is directed to regulate the release of water to the Tennessee River into the Ohio River in accordance with such instructions as may be issued by the War Department."

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Alabama in the nature of a substitute for the amendment of the committee.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will state the next amendment of the committee.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 5, after line 24, it is proposed to strike out:

SEC. 6. Hereafter, whenever in the opinion of the Secretary of War and the Chief of Engineers any dam and reservoir project operated under the direction of the Secretary of War can be consistently used for reclamation of arid lands, it shall be the duty of the Secretary of the Interior to prescribe regulations under existing reclamation law for the use of the storage available for such purpose, and the operation of any such project shall be in accordance with such regulations. Such rates, as the Secretary of the Interior may deem reasonable, shall be charged for the use of said storage; the moneys received to be deposited into the Treasury to the credit of miscellaneous receipts:

And to insert:

SEC. 8. Hereafter, whenever the Secretary of War determines, upon recommendation by the Secretary of the Interior that any dam and reservoir project operated under the direction of the Secretary of War may be utilized for irrigation purposes, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to construct, operate, and maintain, under the provisions of the Federal reclamation laws (act of June 17, 1902, 32 Stat. 388, and acts amendatory thereof or supplementary thereto), such additional works in connection therewith as he may deem necessary for irrigation purposes. Such irrigation works may be undertaken only after a report and findings thereon have been made by the Secretary of the Interior as provided in said Federal reclamation laws and after subsequent specific authorization of the Congress by an authorization act; and within the limits of the water users' repayment ability such report may be predicated on the allocation to irrigation of an appropriate portion of the cost of structures and facilities used for irrigation and other purposes. Dams and reservoirs operated under the direction of the Secretary of War may be utilized hereafter for irrigation purposes only in conformity with the provisions of this section, but the foregoing requirement shall not prejudice lawful uses now existing.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, that is a controversial section, and I suggest that it go over.

Mr. OVERTON. I did not know it was controversial.

Mr. MILLIKIN. We have proposed a section 8 which is different from the section 8 now appearing in the bill.

Mr. OVERTON. Then, I ask that the amendment be passed over temporarily.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the amendment will be passed over.

The next committee amendment will be stated.

The next amendment was, on page 8, after line 12, to insert:

LAKE CHAMPLAIN BASIN

Modifications of the existing Waterbury, Wrightsville, and East Barre Dams in the Winooski River Basin, Vt., are hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 629, Seventy-eighth Congress, second session, at an estimated cost of $2,120,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 8, after line 19, to insert:

BLACKSTONE RIVER BASIN

The project for the West Hill Reservoir on the West River, Mass., for flood control and other purposes in the Blackstone River Basin is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 624, Seventy-eighth Congress, second session, at an estimated cost of $1,070,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 9, after line 2, to insert:

The project on Blackstone River for local flood protection at Worcester, Mass., is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 624, Seventy-eighth Congress, second session, at an estimated cost of $2,232,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 9, after line 8, to insert:

The project on Blackstone River for local flood protection at Woonsocket, R. I., is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief

of Engineers in House Document No. 624, Seventy-eighth Congress, second session, at an estimated cost of $803,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 9, after line 14, to insert:

The project on Seekonk River for local flood protection at Pawtucket, R. I., is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 624, Seventy-eighth Congress, second session, at an estimated cost of $82,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, at the appropriate time I intend to offer, on page 9, following line 21, "Connecticut River Basin", an amendment which would read:

Section 3 of the act approved August 18, 1941 (55 Stat. 638), paragraph entitled "Connecticut River Basin," is amended by striking out the words "with such further modifications as may be found justifiable in the discretion of the Secretary of War and the Chief of Engineers."

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. That amendment will be taken up when the consideration of individual amendments is reached, as the Chair understands.

Mr. AUSTIN. I thank the Chair. I should like to have notice taken of the fact that I offer the amendment and ask that it be printed.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the amendment will be printed and will lie on the table.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, if I may ask a question of the Senator from Vermont, Is the effect of his amendment to abrogate the authorization affecting the Connecticut River Basin or would the authorization remain with authority for such modifications in the future as may be proposed?

Mr. AUSTIN. The amendment would abrogate simply a special part of the authorization made in 1941 which is rather novel. I believe that there is no other similar authorization in any bill which has ever been passed by Congress. It is a sort of sleeper, a thing which escaped our notice heretofore. Under the provision it is clearly possible that tomorrow, after Congress shall have enacted a bill, it would be entirely in the discretion of the Secretary of War and the Chief of Engineers to undo what Congress has agreed to as a policy. This authorization is exceedingly sweeping, as I interpret it, and as people in the neighborhood of the West River Valley interpret it. The Army engineers, under the Secretary of War, could go down the river and flood Brattleboro, because that would be such a further modification of the plan as is specified in the bill referred to. This is only a part of the issue with which the distinguished Senator from Louisiana is familiar.

Mr. OVERTON. Then the amendment refers only to the modification authority at present vested in the Chief of Engineers?

Mr. AUSTIN. Yes; it relates to a past authority, and I suspect that the distinguished Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] will have a more comprehensive amendment to offer which will reach back to the Connecticut River Basin. So I hope the distinguished Senator from Louisiana will allow this subject of the Connecticut River Basin to be passed over for the present time.

Mr. OVERTON. I shall be very happy to let it be passed over. I was hopeful, however, that the Connecticut River Basin project could be taken up by itself, and not be related in any way to the Missouri River Basin because it does not bear any relation geographically to it, and I would be very happy to consider it by itself as a separate amendment. However, of course, that is entirely within the discretion of the Senate and the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. AUSTIN. Yes; I yield.

Mr. MALONEY. I thank the Senator. I should like to know if the language which he proposes on page 9 would strike out the present language beginning on line 21 "Connecticut River Basin"?

Mr. AUSTIN. No; it would follow those three words "Connecticut River Basin," and it would constitute the first paragraph under that heading.

Mr. MALONEY. Would it have any bearing upon the language now in the bill?

Mr. AUSTIN. Yes.

Mr. MALONEY. Will the Senator tell me what bearing it would have?

Mr. AUSTIN. Yes. Mr. President, the language now in the bill refers expressly to "the comprehensive plan approved in the act of June 28, 1938, as modified by the act approved August 18, 1941, for the Connecticut River Basin."

The language comprehends the authority which is expressed in the amendment which I offer. That is, besides expressly authorizing the appropriation of a sum of money for the construction of specific projects named in the plans there specified, there is this rider hitched on which is peculiar evidently to the Connecticut River Basin. Why it was put there I do not know. But it is extremely effective because it would enable the Secretary of War and the Chief of Engineers to do anything in the Connecticut River Basin if they in their discretion found it justifiable.

The first thing it seems to me for Congress to do is to take away from the Secretary of War and the Chief of Engineers that extraordinary dominion over the plan. All other plans must be submitted to us before an authorization is made. No authorization must be made until Congress approves the plan. But on the Connecticut River, with that sleeper in the bill, we can approve a plan one day, and the Secretary of War and the Chief of Engineers can alter it or amend it under this authority "with such further modifications as may be found justifiable in the discretion of the Secretary of War and the Chief of Engineers." I want that language stricken from the act.

Mr. MALONEY. I should like to ask the Senator a further question, if I may. Does he maintain that under the existing language in the law the Army engineers, if they so desired, could build a dam at Springfield, Mass.?

Mr. AUSTIN. Yes, of course. They could build one anywhere in the Connecticut River Basin. This was called to the attention of the public and to the Government back in June 1944. That was the first notice I had of this extraordinary element that was in the authorization of 1941, and this is the first opportunity we have had to attempt to delete it.

Mr. MALONEY. Is the Senator especially concerned, if I may ask him this question, with the dam on the West River which is already planned? Is that his particular concern now?

Mr. AUSTIN. Yes; we are especially concerned about that dam.

Mr. MALONEY. And would the language of the Senator's proposed amendment, if it were adopted, deny the Army engineers the right to proceed with those plans?

Mr. AUSTIN. No; it would not have that effect, except in this way, that we might today delete from the bill authority to build the Williamsville Dam on the West River, and tomorrow the Army engineers might go right to work on it and build it under a modification authorized by the act of 1941, which reads:

With such further modifications as may be found justifiable in the discretion of the Secretary of War and the Chief of Engineers.

Mr. MALONEY. And does the Senator insist that if we sometime later appropriated the $30,000,000 which is authorized in the pending bill, the Army engineers could spend it in any way they desired on the Connecticut River?

Mr. AUSTIN. That is my interpretation of that sleeper clause. We have given them carte blanche on the Connecticut River Basin by that clause.

Mr. MALONEY. I thank the Senator.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AUSTIN. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. It is true, is it not, that the engineers do not have to give notice to anybody?

Mr. AUSTIN. That is true, as the law stands.

Mr. LANGER. The Governor is not notified, and they simply go ahead and do the work.

Mr. AUSTIN. That is true. There are no hearings.

Mr. MALONEY. That is true with respect to any river and harbor project which the Congress authorizes.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I expect to join my colleague in the effort to strike out the dam at the Williamsville site. I also wish to say that I am opposed to the committee amendment on page 10, beginning in line 5, which reads as follows:

Provided further, That none of the dams herein authorized for the Connecticut River Basin shall be utilized for the generation of hydroelectric power.

In passing over the subject of the Connecticut River Basin, is the proposed amendment also passed over at this time?

Mr. OVERTON. That is correct. It includes everything under the Connecticut River Basin.

Mr. AIKEN. I thank the Senator.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the section under the heading "Connecticut River Basin," including the committee amendment on page 10, line 5, will be passed over.

The Clerk will state the next committee amendment.

The next amendment was, on page 12, after line 2, to insert:

ROANOKE RIVER BASIN

The general plan for the comprehensive development of the Roanoke River Basin for flood control and other purposes recommended by the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 650, Seventy-eighth Congress, second session, is approved and the construction of the Buggs Island Reservoir on the Roancke River in Virginia and North Carolina, and the Philpott Reservoir on the Smith River in Virginia, are hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in that report at an estimated cost of $36,140,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 12, after line 13, to insert:

YADKIN-PEE DEE RIVER BASIN

The general plan for the comprehensive development of the Yadkin-Pee Dee River Basin for flood control and other purposes recommended by the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 652, Seventy-eighth Congress, second session, is approved and the construction of the Wilkesboro Reservoir on the Yadkin-Pee Dee River in North Carolina is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in that report at an estimated cost of $10,840,000.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, the committee has modified its amendment in reference to the Yadkin-Pee Dee River Basin. The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY] will present the modification.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President, the amendment which I offered, and which the committee unanimously approved, reads as follows:

On page 12, after line 14, strike out lines 15 to 23, inclusive, under the title "Yadkin-Pee Dee River Basin" and insert in lieu thereof the following:

The general plan for the comprehensive development of the Yadkin-Pee Dee River Basin for flood control, and other purposes, recommended by the Chief of Engineers in House Document 652, Seventy-eighth Congress, second session, is hereby stricken from the bill and is referred to the Committee on Commerce to the end that hearings may be had from the people concerned and with instructions to report back to the Senate within 6 months.

It may seem a little odd that a Senator should ask to have stricken from the bill an item involving the approval of a $10,000,000 project, and ultimately, I think, over $100,000,000, but there is a good reason for it.

I am satisfied that we need flood control on the Yadkin River in the vicinity of Wilkes County. The engineers propose not only to build a dam there, but to build a long series of dams through the State, where absolutely no flood control is involved. That is the first objection.

The second objection is that the dam proposed at Wilkesboro would flood permanently more land, more homes, and more territory than have even been flooded below the dam. That is a singular statement to make, but it is a true statement. The dam at North Wilkesboro would flood 13,000 acres of land, extending all the way through Wilkes County up to the foothills of the Blue Ridge at the place called Happy Valley, a place with which I am familiar.

We all know Mr. DOUGHTON. I believe he is now the dean of the House. He has been in the House for 36 years. The county of Caldwell, where the Happy Valley region lies, and where this land would be flooded, is in his county of Caldwell. A portion of it is in Wilkes County. Mr. DOUGHTON appeared before the committee yesterday and stated that in his long career in the House of Representatives he had never known the people of his section to be so stirred up, so indignant, and so fearful of the disaster of permanent flooding of their lands and the driving of the people from their homes and farms.

I can corroborate that statement. Ever since this item was placed in the bill—and I was not here when it was placed in the bill—I have received almost endless protests. To give an example, the bishop of the Episcopal Church for western North Carolina wrote me a letter in August, and stated that he thought that the Patterson School, which is a very fine school in Happy Valley, would be destroyed, and he begged me to take some steps which would prevent that disaster.

The Happy Valley and the Valley of the Yadkin above North Wilkesboro, and above the site of the proposed dam, have been occupied and cultivated by the people of that section ever since the days of the Revolution. It is not an abandoned wilderness. It is a valley of fine homesteads and farms, and abundant timber. The people living there do not understand why they should be flooded out forever, and they do not think that the offer of the compensation means anything. Neither do I. No one could pay me enough money to induce me to give up my home for the purpose of building a dam. I love my home and I am attached to it. Those people make their living on those farms. They have never known anything else.

I am in favor of a flood-control project in the neighborhood of North Wilkesboro. I believe that the floods of the Yadkin Valley should be ended. I just voted for a flood-control project on the Roanoke River. That is the section of the bill immediately preceding the one under discussion. But I am not in favor of erecting a power dam where no power is really needed, and where the price to be paid is not $10,000,000, but the welfare and happiness of the population extending from Wilkesboro all the way to Happy Valley in Caldwell County. I am not in favor of that. I do not care who knows it. I will shout it from the house-tops in North Carolina, and my statement will be approved by the people of North Carolina. I am not in favor of destroying the homes of the people. I am thoroughly responsive to the petitions which have been filed with me. I am satisfied that the people of North Wilkesboro, who would profit to some extent by a dam, do not wish to destroy the homes of their fellow citizens all the way up the river to the foothills of the mountains.

I ask that this amendment be adopted in lieu of the language in the bill. If it is adopted, I shall request the engineers to prepare for me a survey with a view to arresting the floods in the Yadkin Valley, and at the same time with a view to preserving the homes of the people in that valley.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, after the representations made by the senior Senator from North Carolina before the full committee in reference to the Yadkin-Pee Dee River Basin, I was in accord with the views expressed by him, as were all the other members of the committee. However, I wish to say that the Corps of Engineers is not at fault in making a report as to what power could be developed on the Yadkin and Pee Dee Rivers. The Corps of Engineers was acting under a direction from the Congress of the United States. The Congress of the United States provided in the resolution adopted on April 1, 1937, and in another one adopted on November 1, 1938, as follows—I will not read all of them:

That the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors—

And so forth and so on—

is hereby requested to review the report on the Yadkin-Pee Dee River of North Carolina and South Carolina, published in House Document No. 68, Seventy-third Congress, first session, with a view to determining the advisability of modifying the existing projects for navigation on the Pee Dee River to provide for improved navigation to Cheraw, S. C., and for the development of hydroelectric power in that vicinity.

Then, in connection with the review of the reports on preliminary examination and survey for flood-control development and development of hydroelectric power on Rocky River—Love's Ford and Crump's Ford—N. C., and at Wilkesboro Dam, Yadkin River, N. C., we find that these reviews were authorized by section 7 of the Flood Control Act of June 22, 1936.

Therefore, the Corps of Engineers simply made a report, as directed by Congress. It contained these power projects as well as the flood-control and navigation projects.

I wish to make the further observation that I regret very much that the senior Senator from North Carolina was not present when the project came up for hearing before the subcommittee. Unfortunately, he was absent because he was not well at the time, and could not be present. But no objection was made by anyone. The testimony in respect to the project was without contradiction that it was feasible, from an engineering standpoint, and economically justified. With that testimony before it, the full committee authorized it. As soon as the senior Senator from North Carolina stated his objections to it, and inasmuch as the project is one wholly within his State, the committee had no objection whatsoever to the amendment he proposed. Therefore, I am perfectly willing

that the amendment as modified be adopted.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, as a minority member of the subcommittee, I wish to join in the same request. When the matter originally came up for consideration, we merely had before us a report of the engineers. No opposition was presented at the hearings by any Member of the Senate or by others, due particularly to the illness of the senior Senator from North Carolina. But on the further consideration by the full committee, both the senior Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY] and Representative DOUGHTON of North Carolina, from the district immediately involved, asked for the adoption of the amendment now proposed, which amounts to a withdrawal of the committee proposal and provision for a further survey in that area. The committee was unanimous in approving the adoption of the modified amendment.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the modified amendment.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President, I wish to say that I am not in the slightest degree disposed to disagree with the Army engineers. I am not bringing accusations against anyone. I am merely pointing out what would be the consequences of construction of the dam.

So far as the matter of being heard is concerned, I believe I am perfectly safe in saying that the report of the engineers was not printed or available, and the people knew nothing about it. I know I am safe in saying that when the people found out what was to happen to their homes they were in utter consternation and dismay, and people from all locations and from every class appealed to me and to Mr. DOUGHTON in the same way.

So there is nothing for me to do except to endeavor to have another survey made. When we get one, I hope we shall have a dam which will prevent floods in the Yadkin Valley. If it is confined to that, the needs of the situation will be satisfied.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BAILEY. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. Can the Senator tell us how many homes are involved in this project?

Mr. BAILEY. No; I am sorry that I cannot do so. I think perhaps Mr. DOUGHTON can. I do not think any census has been taken. The Happy Valley is at the end of the basin in which the water will be backed up. I am perfectly familiar with the Happy Valley. I have passed through it many times. Many other Members of Congress have done so; some other Senators may have passed through it. In the northwestern part of North Carolina is a summer resort known as Blowing Rock. It is a very popular summer resort. In reaching it one passes through the Happy Valley. Our commissioner of agriculture, the late Samuel Patterson, owned a large portion of the valley, and had a very fine home there. Everyone who goes there says, "This is the Happy Valley." It is a beautiful valley of fine land. Going downstream from that point—I shall make an approximation, and I think I am safe in doing so—for 20 miles one finds cultivated land, farm homes, and, of course, woodland. We have woodland all over North Carolina. But I have no way of estimating the number of people who would be seriously affected. I am simply saying that I think about as many people will be found in the valley of the Yadkin River and in that section of North Carolina as will be found in any other section of the State. The valley is not a mountain ravine; it is not a desert section. I think the fact that the valley has been known for about 75 years as the Happy Valley is an indication of its character.

Mr. AIKEN. Is it the expectation of the Senator that a further investigation will result in a plan by which there will be developed appreciable protection from floods, but without great destruction?

Mr. BAILEY. Yes; that is the thought of the people there; namely, to have a dam, but not to back up the water into the Happy Valley. Of course, that is the question, and I am glad the Senator asked it.

Today in America we are not merely controlling floods. In many cases only a 50-foot or a 75-foot dam would be required for flood control. But a 150-foot dam is built for power. There is no right to do so. That is what is going on in America, and I think it has gone far enough. I think we should have more respect for the Constitution and should not spend our time damming our way around it.

But that is aside from the point here involved. All I wish to do is to protect the good people in that locality and then start afresh with a project for the construction of a dam which will prevent floods. When we obtain a measure providing for the construction of such a dam, I shall ask the Senate to vote for it, and probably I shall endeavor to have the measure brought up out of order.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment as modified by the committee will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 12, line 14, through line 23, it is proposed to strike out all the paragraph under the title "Yadkin-Peedee River Basin" and to insert in lieu thereof the following:

The general plan for the comprehensive development of the Yadkin-Peedee River Basin for flood control and other purposes recommended by the Chief of Engineers in House Document 652, Seventy-eighth Congress, second session, is hereby stricken from the bill and is referred to the Committee on Commerce to the end that hearings may be had from the people concerned and with instructions to report back to the Senate within 6 months.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the modified amendment is agreed to.

The next amendment of the committee will be stated.

The next amendment was, on page 12, after line 23, to insert:

EDISTO RIVER BASIN

The project for local flood control on Edisto River, S. C., is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in Senate Document No. 182, Seventy-eighth Congress, second session, at an estimated cost of $139,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 13, after line 4, to insert:

SAVANNAH RIVER BASIN

The general plan for the comprehensive development of the Savannah River Basin for flood control and other purposes recommended by the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 657, Seventy-eighth Congress, second session, is approved and the construction of the Clark Hill Reservoir on the Savannah River in South Carolina and Georgia, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in that report at an estimated cost of $35,300,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Red-Ouachita River Basin", on page 15, after line 7, to insert:

The project on Red River in the vicinity of Shreveport, La., for flood control and bank protection is hereby authorized, substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 627, Seventy-eighth Congress, second session, at an estimated cost of $3,000,000, except that, in view of the large expenditure already made by local interests, they shall not be required to contribute to the construction cost.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 15, after line 15, to insert:

The project for the Blakely Mountain Dam on the Ouachita River, for flood control and other purposes in the Ouachita River Basin, Ark., is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 647, Seventy-eighth Congress, second session, at an estimated cost of $11,080,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Upper Mississippi River Basin," on page 17, line 8, after the word "Basin", to insert a comma and "including the project for the Red Rock Dam on the Des Moines River for flood control and other purposes, substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 651, Seventy-eighth Congress, second session, at an estimated cost of $15,000,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 17, after line 20, to insert:

The project on the Des Moines River for local flood protection at Des Moines, Iowa, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 651, Seventy-eighth Congress, second session, at an estimated cost of $270,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 18, line 13, after the words "cost of", to strike out "$418,000" and insert "$300,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Red River of the North Basin", on page 19, after line 7, to insert:

The project for the Bald Hill Reservoir on the Sheyenne River for flood control and other purposes in the Sheyenne River Basin, N. Dak., is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in Senate Document

No. 193, Seventy-eighth Congress, second session, at an estimated cost of $810,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was on page 19, after line 14, to insert:

The projects for the construction of one reservoir on the Pembina River and one on the Tongue River for flood control and other purposes in the Pembina River Basin, N. Dak., are hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 565, Seventy-eighth Congress, second session, at an estimated cost of $333,800.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 19, after line 21, to insert:

The project for the construction of a reservoir on the South Branch of Park River for flood control and other purposes in the Park River Basin, N. Dak., is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in Senate Document No. 194, Seventy-eighth Congress, second session, at an estimated cost of $358,610.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Missouri River Basin", on page 21, after line 2, to insert:

In the interest of developing the natural resources of the Missouri River Basin there is hereby created a commission to be known as the Missouri River Commission, which shall be in the War Department and shall function in accordance with existing law under the direction of the Secretary of War and the supervision of the Chief of Engineers in planning, constructing, operating, and maintaining improvements for navigation and flood control in the Missouri River Basin. The Missouri River Commission shall consist of the same number of members with the same qualifications and methods of appointment, replacement, and removal as prescribed in the act approved June 28, 1879, for the Mississippi River Commission and the compensation for the members of the Missouri River Commission shall be the compensation presently provided for members of the Mississippi River Commission. The president of the Missouri River Commission shall have the same qualification and shall be designated in the manner prescribed by existing law for the president of the Mississippi River Commission and he shall have the same functions and perquisites including title, pay, allowances, and rank while actually serving as president of the Missouri River Commission as well as the same subsequent retirement privileges under the same conditions as prescribed by law for the president of the Mississippi River Commission.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, I should like to invite the attention of the distinguished senior Senator from Louisiana to the fact that the amendment which has just been read has aroused considerable controversy, and I suggest that it be passed over.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection the amendment will be passed over.

Mr. OVERTON. I assume that the amendment which the Senator from Colorado has in mind is the one with reference to the Missouri River Commission?

Mr. MILLIKIN. That is correct.

Mr. OVERTON. I have no objection to the amendment going over, Mr. President.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be passed over. The next amendment of the committee will be stated.

The next amendment was, on page 23, after line 21, to insert:

The plan of improvement for local flood protection on the Chariton River, Mo., is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 628, Seventy-eighth Congress, second session, at an estimated cost of $1,610,300.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Ohio River Basin," on page 25, after line 9, to insert:

The plan of improvement for flood control and other purposes in the Kentucky River Basin, substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 504, Seventy-eighth Congress, second session, at an estimated cost of $23,822,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 25, after line 14, to insert:

The local flood protection works at Middlesborough on Yellow Creek, Ky., substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 495, Seventy-eighth Congress, second session, at an estimated cost of $205,200.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 25, after line 19, to insert:

The local flood-protection works on the Rough River and tributaries, Kentucky, substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 535, Seventy-eighth Congress, second session, at an estimated cost of $360,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, at the top of page 26, to insert:

The Turtle Creek Reservoir on Turtle Creek, Pa., substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 507, Seventy-eighth Congress, second session, at an estimated cost of $2,613,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Great Lakes Basin," on page 27, after line 21, to insert:

The project for the Mount Morris Reservoir on the Genesee River, N. Y., is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 615, Seventy-eighth Congress, second session, at an estimated cost of $5,360,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 28, after line 23, to insert:

GREAT SALT BASIN

The project on the Sevier River for local flood protection at Redmond, Utah, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 614, Seventy-eighth Congress, second session, at an estimated cost of $281,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 29, after line 4, to insert:

COLORADO RIVER BASIN

The project for the Alamo Reservoir on the Bill Williams River, Ariz., is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 625, Seventy-eighth Congress, second session, at an estimated cost of $3,202,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 30, after line 17, to insert:

PAJARO RIVER BASIN

The plan of improvement for local flood protection on the Pajaro River and tributaries, California, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 505, Seventy-eighth Congress, second session, at an estimated cost of $511,160.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Sacramento-San Joaquin River Basin—Sacramento River," on page 31, after line 2, to strike out:

The projects for the control of floods and other purposes on the Sacramento River, Calif., adopted by the acts approved March 1, 1917, May 15, 1928, August 26, 1937, and August 18, 1941, are hereby modified substantially in accordance with the recommendation of the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors dated February 7, 1944, with such modifications thereof as in the discretion of the Secretary of War and the Chief of Engineers may be advisable, at an estimated cost of $46,056,000; and in addition to.

And in lieu thereof to insert the following:

The projects for the control of floods and other purposes on the Sacramento River, Calif., adopted by the acts approved March 1, 1917, May 15, 1928, August 26, 1937, and August 18, 1941, are hereby modified substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 649, Seventy-eighth Congress, second session, at an estimated cost of $50,100,000; and in addition to.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 32, after line 4, to insert:

The project for the Folsom Reservoir on the American River, Calif., is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the plans contained in House Document No. 649, Seventy-eighth Congress, second session, with such modifications thereof as in the discretion of the Secretary of War and the Chief of Engineers may be advisable, at an estimated cost of $18,474,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "San Joaquin River," on page 34, after line 8, to insert:

The plan of improvement for flood control and other purposes on the Calaveras River and Littlejohn Creek and tributaries, California, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 545, Seventy-eighth Congress, second session, at an estimated cost of $3,868,200.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 34, after line 14, to insert:

NAPA RIVER BASIN

The project for the Conn Creek Reservoir on Conn Creek for flood control and other purposes in the Napa River Basin, Calif., is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 626, Seventy-eighth Congress, second session, at an estimated cost of $460,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 36, after line 15, to insert:

CHEHALIS RIVER BASIN

The project on Chehalis River for local flood protection at Hoquiam, Aberdeen, and Cosmopolis, Wash., is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 494, Seventy-eighth Congress, second session, at an estimated cost of $669,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 36, after line 22, to insert:

TERRITORY OF HAWAII

The project on the Hanapepe River for local flood protection at Hanapepe, Island of Kauai, Territory of Hawaii, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in the report submitted to Congress by the Secretary of War on March 15, 1944, at an estimated cost of $73,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 37, line 5, to change the section number from 8 to 10.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 38, after line 3, to insert:

Pasquotank River, North Carolina.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 38, line 9, after the word "Counties" to strike out "Florida," and insert "Florida."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 38, after line 11, to insert:

For flood control, rice irrigation, navigation, pollution, salt-water intrusion, and drainage on all streams and bayous in southwest Louisiana, west of the West Atchafalaya Basin protection levee, and south of the latitude of Boyce; on all streams and bayous in Louisiana lying between the East Atchafalaya Basin protection levee and the Mississippi River; and on Amite River and tributaries, Louisiana.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 39, after line 13, to insert:

Arkansas River above Pine Bluff, Ark., with special reference to control of caving banks in the vicinity of Hensley Bar and the McFadden Place, in Jefferson County, Ark.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 39, after line 24, to insert:

Corte Madera Creek, Marin County, Calif.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 40, after line 2, to insert:

Elkhorn River and its tributaries, Nebraska.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 40, line 4, to change the section number from 9 to 11, and in the same line, after the word "of", to strike out "$810,000,000" and insert "$959,465,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 40, line 17, to change the section number from 10 to 12, and on page 41, line 11, after the word "requirements", to insert a colon and the following additional proviso: *"Provided further,* That nothing in this section shall be construed as approving or authorizing the acquisition of any land by the Federal Government."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 41, after line 20, to insert:

SANTA YNEZ RIVER WATERSHED

The program on the Santa Ynez River watershed is hereby approved substantially in accordance with the recommendation of the Acting Secretary of Agriculture in House Document No. 518, Seventy-eighth Congress, first session, at an estimated cost to the United States of $418,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Trinity River Basin (Tex.)," on page 42, line 8, after the word "of", to strike out $32,000,000" and insert "$27,348,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Little Tallahatchie River Watershed," on page 42, line 16, after the word "of", to strike out "$4,221,000" and insert "$2,171,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 42, after line 16, to insert:

YAZOO RIVER WATERSHED

The program on the Yazoo River watershed is hereby approved substantially in accordance with the recommendation of the Acting Secretary of Agriculture in House Document No. 564, Seventy-eighth Congress, second session, at an estimated cost to the United States of $12,500,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 43, after line 17, to insert:

BUFFALO CREEK WATERSHED (NEW YORK)
BUFFALO, CAYUGA, AND CAZENOVIA CREEKS

The program on the watershed of Buffalo Creek and its tributaries, Cayuga, and Cazenovia Creeks, is hereby approved substantially in accordance with the recommendation of the Acting Secretary of Agriculture in House Document No. 574, Seventy-eighth Congress, second session, at an estimated cost to the United States of $739,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Washita River Watershed," on page 44, line 17, after the word "of", to strike out "$11,243,000" and insert $7,007,000."

The next amendment was, on page 44, line 19, to change the section number from 11 to 13, and on page 45, line 4, after the word "section", to strike out "10" and insert "12."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 45, line 8, to change the section number from 12 to 14.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 45, after line 23, to insert:

SEC. 15. (a) The Chief of Engineers of the United States Army is authorized and directed to make examinations of any privately owned or operated dam constructed across navigable waters of the United States, or across tributaries thereof.

(b) Whenever it shall appear, after reasonable notice and opportunity for hearing to the person or corporation owning or controlling any such dam, that such dam is being operated or maintained in such a manner as to jeopardize the safety of persons or property either above or below such dam, the Chief of Engineers shall enter orders requiring such changes in the operation or maintenance of such dam as he deems appropriate and necessary, and prescribing a reasonable time within which such changes shall be made. If, at the end of such reasonable time, the changes in operation or maintenance ordered by the Chief of Engineers have not been made, the Chief of Engineers shall notify the United States district attorney for the district in which such dam or any part thereof is situated, who shall forthwith cause criminal proceedings to be instituted against the person, or corporation, owning or controlling such dam.

(c) Any person or corporation willfully failing or refusing to comply with an order of the Chief of Engineers issued pursuant to this section shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and, upon conviction thereof, shall be punished by a fine not exceeding $5,000. Every month during which such willful failure or refusal continues shall be deemed to be a separate offense and shall subject such person or corporation to the penalties herein prescribed.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, I suggest to the Senator from Louisiana that this is a very highly controversial amendment.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, we have the evening before us, and I shall be glad later to return and take up some of the controversial items without wasting the afternoon. We can pass over this amendment temporarily.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the amendment will be passed over.

That completes the committee amendments with the exception of those passed over. The bill is before the Senate and open to further amendment.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment and ask that it be read.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be read.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 14, after line 5, it is proposed to insert the following:

Paragraph (d) of the lower Mississippi River item in section 3 of the Flood Control Act of August 18, 1941, is amended to read as follows:

"The Chief of Engineers, with the approval of the Secretary of War, shall reimburse local authorities for actual expenditures found by the Chief of Engineers to reflect the actual cash value, regardless of State or local assessment valuations, for providing, at the request of the United States, lands, rights-of-way, and flowage easements required for the set-backs of main-line Mississippi River levees: *Provided,* That such lands, rights-of-way, and flowage easements may be provided by local authorities in accordance with local legal procedure or custom: *Provided further,* That this paragraph shall apply to all such lands, rights-of-way, and flowage easements that have been required by the United States for such set-back levees since August 18, 1941, regardless of any reimbursement that may have been agreed upon or made since August 18, 1941."

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, I should like to make an explanation of the amendment. I offer the amendment not as a committee amendment, but in my own behalf. I should have been very glad to submit it to the committee but it did not come to my attention until during the recess. The committee has been so occupied with other matters that I did not have opportunity to present it.

I think the amendment is a simple one. Section 3 of paragraph (d) of the act of August 18, 1941, reads as follows:

The Chief of Engineers, with the approval of the Secretary of War, shall reimburse local authorities for actual expenditures found by the Chief of Engineers to be reasonable, for providing at the request of the United States, in accordance with the local legal procedure or custom, rights-of-way and flowage easements required for the future set-backs of main-line Mississippi River levees.

Pursuant to such provision, where a set-back levee was constructed on any part of the Mississippi River, except in Louisiana, the Secretary of War reimbursed the local authorities for expenditures found by the Chief of Engineers to be reasonable. In other words, the United States Government paid for such flowage easements the actual cash value, which would be the reasonable value. As a matter of fact, that is what the Chief of Engineers determined, namely, the actual cash value. That was done in Mississippi, Arkansas, and other States. But the Constitution of Louisiana provides that the State of Louisiana itself, in acquiring easements for levee rights-of-way, may not pay more than the assessed value of the property. The assessed value is usually far below the actual value.

Because the provision of the act of 1941 requires that when the rights-of-way have been acquired the acquisition shall be made in accordance with the local legal procedure or custom, the legislative branch of the engineering department has construed the language to mean that Louisiana may not pay more than the assessed value. The legislative branch of the engineering department has construed that to mean that Louisiana cannot be paid more than the assessed value for the land.

I think that interpretation is wholly wrong. I know something about the history of it. We had a similar act back, as I recall, in 1934, in reference to certain tributaries of the Mississippi River, and at that time General Markham, who was Chief of Army Engineers, did not want the rights-of-way to be abstracted and title passed on by the attorneys for the Federal Government. He said it took too long; that sometimes they were delayed for years before they could go ahead with the construction they had in mind; but he said, "You have in Louisiana a right of appropriation; a levee board can adopt a resolution appropriating any land needed for easement purposes for the construction of levees, and such appropriation vests title in the levee board regardless of who the owner may be." So I wish it stated in the bill that the lands and the easements are to be acquired in accordance with the legal local procedure or custom, so that we can take advantage of the appropriation provision of the Louisiana law. That is the real meaning of the expression "in accordance with the local legal customs and procedure." The legislative department of the engineers said that means that we cannot pay a bit more than the assessed value because under the Louisiana law the State cannot pay more than the assessed value. They have acquired some rights-of-way since then and have refused to reimburse the levee board more than the assessed value. I want to place Louisiana on a parity with Mississippi, Arkansas, Missouri, and other States up and down the line, where these rights-of-way are acquired, so that the owners can be paid the actual cash value deemed by the Secretary of War to be reasonable. With that explanation I submit the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CHANDLER in the chair). The question is on the adoption of the amendment offered by the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, I offer an amendment which I ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 26, it is proposed to strike out lines 11 to 15 inclusive, as follows:

The Rowlesburg Reservoir on the Cheat River, substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in the report submitted to Congress by the Secretary of War on November 26, 1942, at an estimated cost of $29,230,000; and.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, as will be noted, this amendment deals with what is known as the Rowlesburg reservoir on the Cheat River. I am submitting the amendment because I do not believe that this project at the great expense involved, is justified. It calls for an expenditure of $29,230,000. I think, perhaps, that the item should not be contained in this bill. This project would flood and cover thousands of acres of land with water and create a vast lake where land now exists.

Even with that result I would be less insistent in urging my views on this part of the bill if the project was in fact a flood-control project. But it is more than that, it goes further, under the guise of flood control it creates a power dam, with the result that many workers who earn their living in the production of coal—a principal means of livelihood in my State—would be probably thrown out of work. This provision of the bill is not good for my State or the population. I move the adoption of the amendment.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, I have taken this position in reference to the projects contained in the bill, that where a project relates exclusively to one State and does not affect any other State and the Senators from that State desire that the project be not authorized, I am perfectly willing, if it is a committee amendment, to ask that the Senate reject the committee amendment. In this case this is a provision contained in the bill as passed by the House. I will raise no objection whatsoever to the amendment of the Senator from West Virginia, and we can take the amendment to conference and there thrash the matter out.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I thank the Senator from Louisiana.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment offered by the Senator from West Virginia is agreed to.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I offer an amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 38, after line 10, it is proposed to insert the following:

Clear Fork of the Mohican River, in Richland County, Ohio.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, there will be no objection at all to that amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

Mr. DOWNEY. I offer an amendment for the survey of the Napa River, Calif. I send the amendment to the desk and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 55, between lines 7 and 8, it is proposed to insert "Napa River, Calif."

Mr. OVERTON. That, as I understand, is a survey item?

Mr. DOWNEY. It is.

Mr. OVERTON. I think the page is wrong. There are not that many pages in the bill. I suggest to the Senator from California that he modify his amendment by providing that it be inserted on page 39, after line 22.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, I will ask that the amendment be modified in that respect.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be so modified.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry. Have all the amendments beginning on page 38 been adopted?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is informed they have been adopted.

Mr. OVERTON. Have all the committee amendments been agreed to there?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is so informed. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY], as modified.

The amendment, as modified, was agreed to.

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, I offer an amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 26, between lines 20 and 21 it is proposed to insert the following:

No provision of this or any other act shall be construed to authorize the construction of Shoals Dam on the East Fork of the White River in Martin County, Ind.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, I am sorry, but my attention was diverted and I did not hear the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be restated.

The Chief Clerk restated the amendment.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the amendment?

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, I will say to the distinguished Senator from Louisiana that the situation involved is about the same as that explained on the floor of the Senate by the Senator from

North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY]. It affects a community in which I have lived for the last 10 years. This matter has been discussed publicly for several years, ever since the Army engineers began their survey. I want it understood that I am in favor of flood control; however, this is really not a question of flood control; it is more a question of flood diversion, because this dam would back water up through the valley for miles, damaging farm lands of several counties, railroads, and highways, and affecting more than a thousand farms which, I am informed, contain the best farming land in this community.

The matter has been taken up with the Army engineers and they have promised as soon as possible to bring about a real flood program in this valley by a substitute proposal which involves planting, terracing, strip farming, and the construction of a series of several dams at the headwaters of the tributary to hold the water where it falls. We have a falling water table in this area. For instance, Columbus, Ind., has to go deeper each year for its water. The method proposed by the substitute program would raise the water level, control floods, and protect the best farm land in five counties and save the farmers their homes.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JENNER. I yield.

Mr. OVERTON. This dam is situated wholly in Indiana in the Senator's own State, is it not?

Mr. JENNER. That is correct.

Mr. OVERTON. Very well; and it affects merely the area in the vicinity?

Mr. JENNER. Yes. I now live only 20 miles from the proposed site of the dam.

Mr. OVERTON. I have no objection to the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Indiana.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I should like to ask the chairman of the subcommittee whether the amendment relating to Reno Beach, Lucas County, Ohio, has been inserted in the bill.

Mr. OVERTON. It is a committee amendment. I presume it has been agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The committee amendment has been agreed to. Does the Senator from Ohio wish to have the vote reconsidered?

Mr. TAFT. No. However, there is nothing in the printed bill relating to this project.

Mr. OVERTON. There is no objection to the amendment. I was under the impression it was in the bill.

Mr. TAFT. I offer the amendment which I send to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 39, after line 13, it is proposed to insert the following:

Reno Beach, Lucas County, Ohio, with a view to protection of the Reno Beach-Howards Farm area and adjacent areas from floods caused by frequent windstorms and from increases in the lake level of Lake Erie.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Ohio.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 10, after line 10, it is proposed to insert the following:

The project on the Little Colorado River for local flood protection at Holbrook, Ariz., is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 648, Seventy-eighth Congress, second session, at an estimated cost of $258,000.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, I think the Senator has the paging of the amendment wrong. It should be on page 29, after line 10.

Mr. HAYDEN. I should like to correct the page where the amendment is to be inserted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The correction will be made.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, let me explain the background of the amendment. Proper authorization was made by Congress for investigation of this project in the Flood Control Act of August 27, 1937. Investigation was made, and the project was recommended by the Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of the Budget. All the formalities required by law have been complied with. However, there was a rule of the Senate Committee on Commerce, of which I never before heard, that there must be a finding that the benefits equaled the amount to be appropriated, and that if the benefits were not equal, then an authorization should not be made.

In this case it was found that the benefits would amount to nine-tenths of the appropriation, but not ten-tenths. If it had been ten-tenths, this project would have come within the rule. Because of this one-tenth difference between the cost and the benefits, as found by the Army engineers, the committee, by a rule of its own, omitted this item from the bill. Do I correctly state the situation?

Mr. OVERTON. The Senator's statement is correct as to the facts.

Mr. HAYDEN. The situation is that the Army engineers have found actual benefits equal to nine-tenths of the appropriation. They also found unevaluated or intangible benefits to be exceptionally large. An intangible benefit is something that is very difficult to prove. Through the town of Holbrook runs the main line of the Santa Fe Railroad, a transcontinental line, double tracked. A river runs through the town, and if something is not done, floods will inundate the town, which is a county seat, with values of many hundreds of thousands of dollars, and tear up the railroad. So it is perfectly obvious that the benefits to be conferred are greater than the amount of the appropriation. But because of the words tangible and intangible, the committee has, it seems to me, split a very fine hair. If it could have been shown that the tangible benefits were equal to the amount to be appropriated, then the appropriation would have been allowed. The actual tangible benefits as found by the Corps of Engineers amount, as I have said, to nine-tenths of the amount to be appropriated. The committee does not take into consideration any intangible benefits, does not give us any credit for them at all, whereas as a matter of fact intangible benefits are and must be very much greater where there is a town of 2,500 people, a county-seat town, and there is a transcontinental railroad which is bound to be washed away unless this project is constructed.

Under such circumstances the chairman of the subcommittee should be willing not to split quite so fine a hair, and should consent that the amendment be agreed to by the Senate. It does not seem to me that such a strict adherence to the rule is justified in the light of the facts.

Mr. President, I have been at Holbrook and know exactly what the situation is. At one time the Little Colorado River there had a deep and well-defined channel, but due to overgrazing in the watershed, vast quantities of silt have come down and filled up the river bed, until now the bed of the river is above the level of the land in the town. The local authorities have themselves put in a temporary levee, as best they could, but any big flood, such as those which have occurred at different times on that stream, would bring about such a condition that that weak levee would not hold.

There is one other matter about determining what these benefits are. I think the Corps of Engineers has not adopted a rule which fits our western section of the country at all. Here in the East, where there are annual floods every year or two, where floods are frequent, it is perfectly proper to divide the damage done by the number of years in which the floods occur. In the western section of the country there is a totally different situation. We may run along in that arid section, as we do, with a series of drought years, or with slight rainfall at least, perhaps for 8 or 10 years. Then there will be a tremendous flood which does enormous damage, as I know western Senators will testify, I see before me the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN]. There have been floods in the city of Pueblo in his State from time to time which nearly washed the town away, but by the help of the Federal Government the town was protected.

If we are to divide the amount of damage done, which is certain to be done, at any one particular time, by the number of years in which floods occur, we do an injustice to all the western section of the country, where we have these torrential floods, and then have long dry spells. That kind of a rule can be adopted for the East, where floods are frequent. It is a sound rule in the East, but it does not fit in the West. So such a basic rule for determining the ratio of benefits to appropriations is not applicable. In the second place, if it were applicable, I contend that Holbrook comes nine-tenths within the rule. If

it is that close, this amendment should be agreed to by the Senate.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. McFARLAND. I should like to ask my colleague if it is not a fact that the testimony was to the effect that the last flood did great damage to the town of Holbrook.

Mr. HAYDEN. There is no question about it. At that time the water came up over the part of the town between the railroad tracks and the river and almost broke the tracks.

Mr. McFARLAND. The raising of the river bed would make the damage much greater in the future.

Mr. HAYDEN. I was about to point out that the conditions have grown worse since the time to which I have referred, because of the accumulation of silt in the river bed, which has resulted, as the situation is today, in the bed of the river being higher than parts of the town. The river will just overflow a large part of Holbrook unless something is done about it.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I should like to add that when the subcommittee of the Committee on Reclamation and Irrigation held hearings in Arizona it was testified there that if this flood-control project was not put into effect the result would be that if another flood occurred it would practically wipe out the town of Holbrook.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, the very able Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] a moment ago wanted to know whether the statement he made was correct. It was very correct up to that time, but when he discussed the question of how the cost benefit ratio is calculated the Senator fell into certainly a very pardonable error. It is not a question of how much is to be appropriated or the total cost. The engineers consider what the annual costs are and they amortize them, and then they add the interest, and so on. Then, as against that they take the annual benefits which would be derived from the improvement.

When the annual benefits exceed the annual costs then the project is ripe for authorization. It is necessary that we have some rule about it, and we have had to adhere to it rather strictly, because it may be contended for instance, that if the cost benefit ratio is 50 to 100, then the project ought to be authorized. Such a contention might be made.

What is done in determining the benefits is this: The whole flood history of a particular stream is considered as far back as it can be found, and so far as it affects a particular town, and then there is ascertained the damage which has been caused throughout the years. If a great flood has swept away Holbrook, that would be considered, and that damage would be prorated over the years, and there would be added to it any additional damage that had occurred. That is the only systematic way to go about it.

The Senator from Arizona is very persuasive with me and with the committee, and I think with the Senate, and I am very much in sympathy with him. I wish I could agree with him without departing from the rule respecting authorization of his project. If the Senate agrees to the Senator's amendment, I shall not shed any tears. I simply want to explain that the committee cannot depart from the rule. If we did, we would soon be at sea.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, there is just one point I should like to clear up. Floods are more frequent in the East, where there is plenty of rainfall, than they are in the arid regions, and therefore, if the damage is prorated annually, and if the floods occur on the average every 3 or 4 years in the East, the damage done would be divided by 3 or 4, while if floods occur every 10 or 15 years in the West, the damage done must be divided by 10 or 15, according to the formula stated by the Senator from Louisiana. But when floods come in the West, as they will come and have come from time to time, although not so frequently as in the East, a town is wiped out just as effectively whether it occurs once every 10 or 15 years or once every 5 years. The situation as it exists requires that this protection be given to the community, and to a great transcontinental railroad line so as to avoid disaster. Therefore, Mr. President, I ask that the amendment be adopted.

Mr. OVERTON. There is no evidence that the town has ever been wiped out, is there?

Mr. HAYDEN. As I told the Senate, when the flood occurred considerable damage had been caused before the water ceased to rise, but in the meantime the conditions have changed for the worse. I want the Senate to understand that the amendment is recommended by the Chief of Engineers. When I took it up with him the second time he said, in substance, "We can only repeat our recommendation. We urge the Congress to adopt this amendment. In our judgment it should be adopted."

Mr. OVERTON. I wish to advise the Senate that if there were any changes locally the engineers could easily report them, and a review report could be made. That report could be made very promptly and the item could have been placed in this bill.

Mr. HAYDEN. Why does the Senate need a review report when this project has already been recommended by the Chief of Engineers? In proof of what I have said I ask to include as a part of my remarks an extract from House Document No. 648, Seventy-eighth Congress, second session, and a more recent letter from the Secretary of War approving my amendment.

There being no objection, the matters referred to were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WAR DEPARTMENT,
OFFICE OF THE CHIEF OF ENGINEERS,
Washington, January 2, 1942.

Subject: Little Colorado River, Ariz., and N. Mex.

To: The Secretary of War.

1. I submit for transmission to Congress my report with accompanying papers and an illustration on preliminary examination and survey of Little Colorado River and its tributaries upstream from the boundary of the Navajo Indian Reservation in Arizona, authorized by the Flood Control Act approved August 28, 1937.

2. Little Colorado River rises in northwestern New Mexico and flows northwesterly 315 miles to join the Colorado River in north central Arizona, 293 miles above Boulder Dam. Its drainage area of 27,800 square miles ranges from mountains to relatively flat desert country through which the lower river and its tributaries have cut deep canyon courses. The basin is sparsely populated and its principal development is in farming and stock raising. These activities are limited due to scarcity of water. The average annual precipitation ranges from 7 inches in the downstream desert area to 25 inches in the headwater mountains. Most of the main stream and tributary channels have only intermittent flow.

3. Flood flows of appreciable magnitude are possible throughout the basin and, according to the meager records available, have been of comparatively frequent occurrence, but the threat of serious flood damage is concentrated largely at Gallup, N. Mex., and Holbrook and Flagstaff, Ariz. The possible future flood damage in these localities, on an average annual basis, is estimated at $40,000, $12,600, and $5,800, respectively. There have been no Federal improvements primarily for flood control. The Department of Agriculture is making extensive improvements for erosion control in the vicinity of Gallup, N. Mex. Local interests at Gallup, Holbrook, and Flagstaff have made various improvements for prevention of flooding and bank erosion but none of the measures taken is adequate for major floods. There are 26 reservoirs, ranging from 500 to 22,000 acre-feet in capacity, and numerous smaller reservoirs, primarily for irrigation storage. The total capacity of these projects is estimated at 150,000 acre-feet or more, but their regulatory effect on major flood flows is negligible. Local interests request that consideration be given to improvements for flood control, water conservation, soil-erosion prevention, water-supply and power development. They suggest 18 specific projects for which their partial estimate of costs is $1,421,880.

4. The district engineer reports that a program designed for general control of floods throughout the basin, either with or without conservation or power-development features, would be clearly uneconomical at this time, due principally to the comparatively small extent of development and the wide dispersion of flood damages. Of the 18 specific improvements suggested by local interests, only 3 were found to have sufficient flood-control possibilities to warrant detailed study; namely, the projects for Holbrook, Gallup, and Flagstaff. Several alternate methods of obtaining flood protection at these localities were investigated, but no plan was found to be economically justified at Gallup and Flagstaff. The plan found most suitable for Holbrook is a levee system at an estimated cost of $258,000 for construction, $29,000 for highway bridge and utility alterations, and $1,000 for rights-of-way. The annual carrying charges would be $12,500. The project would provide protection for 95 percent of the town against floods up to the estimated maximum experienced flow and would result in tangible benefits estimated at $11,100 annually. The district engineer considers that these benefits, together with the unevaluated benefit of protecting this community which serves as a supply center for 35,000 inhabitants in the surrounding area, are sufficient to justify the project and he recommends its construction at an estimated cost to the United States of $258,000 subject to certain conditions of local cooperation. The division engineer concurs.

5. The Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors concurs in general in the view of the reporting officers and in their recommendation for construction of the project.

6. After due consideration of these reports, I concur in the views of the Board. Flood control throughout the Little Colorado Basin generally, by measures for which the War Department would be responsible, is not economically justified under existing conditions of development. The only individual project warranted at this time is the construction of a levee at Holbrook, a community which serves as a supply and distribution center for 35,000 inhabitants in the surrounding area. In my opinion, the tangible benefits of the project together with the unevaluated benefits of the increased security and welfare of the inhabitants are sufficient to justify the project at Holbrook, and I recommend its construction, substantially as outlined in plan A in the report of the district engineer, at an estimated cost to the United States of $258,000 for construction; subject to the condition that responsible local agencies give assurances satisfactory to the Secretary of War that they will (a) provide without cost to the United States all lands, easements, and rights-of-way necessary for construction of the project; (b) bear the expense of all necessary highway, highway bridge, and utility alterations; (c) hold and save the United States free from claims for damages resulting from construction of the works; (d) maintain and operate all works upon completion in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Secretary of War; and (e) establish and enforce flood-channel limits and regulations satisfactory to the Secretary of War for protection of the flood-carrying capacity of the channel.

E. REYBOLD,
Major General, Chief of Engineers.

WAR DEPARTMENT,
Washington, September 8, 1944.

Hon. JOSIAH W. BAILEY,
Chairman, Committee on Commerce,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR BAILEY: I refer to your letter of August 10, 1944, requesting a report on an amendment intended to be proposed by Mr. HAYDEN to the bill (H. R. 4485) authorizing the construction of certain public works on rivers and harbors for flood control, and for other purposes.

The purpose of this amendment is to authorize a project on the Little Colorado River for local flood protection at Holbrook, Ariz., at an estimated cost of $258,000.

In pursuance of authority contained in the Flood Control Act approved August 28, 1937, a survey of the Little Colorado River and its tributaries upstream from the boundary of the Navajo Indian Reservation in Arizona, was made and a report giving the results thereof was transmitted to the Speaker of the House of Representatives with the Department's letter of May 31, 1944. In that report a plan for local flood protection at Holbrook, by the construction of a levee system at an estimated cost to the United States of $258,000, was recommended for adoption by Congress. The amendment proposed by Senator HAYDEN would authorize this project substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in that report which is being printed as House Document No. 648, Seventy-eighth Congress, second session.

The War Department favors enactment of this amendment. The page reference should be corrected as indicated on the copy of amendment herewith to insure that the item will go into the bill in its proper sequence.

The Bureau of the Budget advises that there is no objection to the submission of this report.

Sincerely yours,

HENRY L. STIMSON,
Secretary of War.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will my colleague yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. McFARLAND. In answer to the Senator from Louisiana I should like to read a brief portion of the testimony which was taken before the subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation in Arizona last summer. I read from the testimony of Mr. J. R. McEvoy, the president of the bank at Holbrook. He said, speaking of the last flood:

This was just a few of approximately 20 buildings that were destroyed by this flood, and a number of business houses and homes in the residential district were damaged by the water running into the basements. This loss was approximately between $40,000 and $50,000 to the residents of Holbrook.

I do not wish to go into detail in regard to this testimony, but it shows a great loss to the town of Holbrook in the last flood, and, as pointed out by my colleague, this damage will be nothing compared with what it will be in a future flood, because the bed of the river has risen until it is almost as high as the banks.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the testimony of Mr. McEvoy, beginning on page 17 of the record, as well as that of Mr. William Darling, be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the testimony was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. J. R. McEvoy. I realize as Judge Levi Udall said, that time is precious, that you have a good many other counties to hear from. With your permission, I am going to refer to this paper I have prepared here.

From what information of record I have gathered together since 1915 to 1923 the town of Holbrook was in danger of flood water. In 1915 the Lyman Dam went out, causing a flood at Holbrook.

I am going to bring before this committee only the period from 1922 up to the present time, which is approximately 22 years, during which time I have been a resident of Holbrook.

On September 17 and 18, 1923, a big onrush of flood waters engulfed Holbrook buildings. The first house to fall into the river was Judge Crosby's, next the J. C. Manley home, which was owned by L. D. Cadwell, the next two cottages belonging to R. D. Greer were swept away. The Emil Berling bakery was washed away, and the A. C. M. I. warehouse went down the river Tuesday about 4 p. m. in the evening. That was just a few of approximately 20 buildings that were destroyed by this flood, and a number of business houses and homes in the residential district were damaged by the water running into the basements. This loss was approximately between $40,000 and $50,000 to the residents of Holbrook.

During the flood the Little Colorado bridge, built by the Arizona Highway Department, was damaged, and people wondered how it stood up so well. The Apache Railway Co.'s bridge just west of the highway bridge was damaged very badly. On September 21, 1923, the Holbrook paper came out with the heading "Holbrook will dike the Little Colorado River." A meeting was called by the chairman of the chamber of commerce, W. J. Hookway. In attendance were W. J. Hookway, John R. Hulet, Dr. S. Earl Taylor, Adolph Schuster, Julius Wetzler, and Judge Jesse E. Crosby, and a number of other citizens. In fact, it probably was one of the largest meetings of a public kind held in Holbrook. The meeting was held at the Pastime Hall, Wednesday, September 19, 1923. It was decided upon by this group that a dike was the proper thing to build for flood protection to the remaining property located at the south of Porter Street.

Chairman of the board of supervisors Clarence Owens, offered the assistance of the county to the extent of approximately $6,000, and the town of Holbrook contributed approximately $1,000, and with this money some rip-rapping was done for the river, which was of great assistance. However, periodically from 1923 on we were menaced each year with the high water of the river.

The matter was taken up with the State highway department, and they spent approximately $15,000 in building one or two more dikes near the south end of Porter Street which helped divert the water to the center of the river bed, therefore helping to protect the rest of the residents along the north end of the river bank. This helped a great deal, and in addition to this work, the Lions Club of Holbrook planted tamarack trees along the north bank of the river adjacent to Holbrook, which during the past years have grown to a size where they are some protection to that part of town. It should be mentioned that the river over these periods of years has been filling up with silt until it has been almost level with the bank of the river. This means that at flood time the water can easily overflow the bank.

Up until 1925 after doing all we could in Holbrook to protect ourselves from floods, to the extent of our financial abilities, we found that it was more than we could take care of. It was then that this matter of flood protection to Holbrook was taken up with our Senators and Representatives in Congress, and we are glad to say that they have helped us a great deal. About 1928 Army Engineers spent considerable time surveying the river, and at this time easements were signed for rights-of-way on the river bank, and as we understand it, flood protection to the town of Holbrook. This, of course, took several years to work out, and with the war coming on, this project was stopped for the time being.

The flood that caused the damage to our town was only from the Little Colorado River. Less than 3 miles east of town the Puerco River also runs into the Little Colorado. If these two rivers should ever flow floodwaters at the same time, there is no question but that the biggest part of Holbrook would be washed away.

I also might mention that we are unable to purchase flood insurance which signifies that the underwriters must consider it an extraordinary risk.

I wish to state again that it has been through the good help and assistance of our Senators and Representatives in Congress that we have been able, over a period of years, to get over the importance of flood protection to the town of Holbrook. In the Arizona Republic of June 1 an article appeared headed Washington, D. C., that two flood-control projects were recommended: One, Bill Williams River, Ariz., concrete flood-control dam at Alamois site, $3,202,000; Little Colorado River, N. Mex.-Ariz. levees, and others, $288,000. During the month of May on page 4228, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, House, Mr. MURDOCK brought before the House of Representatives that there is a flood-control situation badly needed at Holbrook, Ariz., on the Little Colorado River, which has been looked into and carefully studied by the Army Engineers. They made their complete report some time ago and the only thing left in finishing this report is that it has not cleared the Bureau of the Budget nor the Bureau of Reclamation; however, I happen to know that the Bureau of Reclamation is favorable to it and it would interpose no objection. He asked to have this referred to the Senate after clearance is received and later, if possible, to the conferees in regard to this same bill, because the flood hazard at Holbrook is very, very bad. The Army Engineers' report is complete up to the point indicated.

You can see, gentlemen, that considerable work has been done, money has been spent, but the job has not been completed. There is no question in my mind, and I do not believe there is any question in anyone's mind who has seen our rivers adjacent to Holbrook, that we need flood protection as soon as possible, and it is, without question, an emergency.

There has been introduced in the House of Representatives by Mr. WHITTINGTON, H. R. 4485, authorizing the construction of certain public works on rivers and harbors for flood control, and for other purposes. I have read the bill, and I find that there are approximately 80 different projects set up that stated the amount of appropriation; however, not one cent for the Little Colorado River at Holbrook. It has been suggested that possibly when this H. R. 4485 bill is presented to the Senate that a rider might be placed on the said bill setting up approximately $300,000 protection to the town of Holbrook.

Not being familiar with the procedure of legislation through our Congress, I am not in a position to say whether or not this would be the proper thing to do. I do say this, that if such an amendment could be attached to this bill, it would give us the flood protection that we need at Holbrook.

Now, gentlemen, if this suggestion meets with your approval, we would appreciate your support in our behalf. I feel today, like I have every day since the flood of 1923, that Holbrook is in a vulnerable spot to be washed away some day if high waters come from the Puerco and the Little Colorado Rivers. We have been fortunate over the past several years in not being menaced too much with high waters. This was attributed to the fact that we have had a drought in our vicinity during that period of time, and the rains that we did get came at intervals so that not a great deal of damage was done; however, there were times when the entire river bed filled up from the Little Colorado River.

* * * * *

Mr. WILLIAM DARLING. Mr. McFarland, Mr. Hatch, and Mr. Bashore, I didn't come here to make any particular speech, but I do want to say that I have lived in Winslow on the Little Colorado for some 23 years; and being in the engineering department of the railroad, it has been necessary for me to study the actions of the Little Colorado, and to take such steps necessary to stop erosion and keep our railroad together.

At Holbrook in particular, we have been able to hold our railroad together for the past 23 years, and in doing so, we have afforded the town some protection, but not all the town is entitled to. We have spent the equivalent of seventy to ninety thousand dollars in the part of the river that menaces Holbrook, but as stated by Mr. McEvoy, neither the Rio Puerco nor the Little Colorado which join just above Holbrook has come down in flood stage in the same period. Now, that can easily happen, as all of you who live in the Southwest know, that ordinarily our streams do not all run the same day or the same hour, but if you get a stream from the three directions, you can run all of them together, and when they do, you have a river full of water. And while the river may stay full of water only 1 or 2 hours and all be gone, in that same time all of the damage that could be thought of can be done, because these rivers in the Southwest are not slow-running pleasant streams like they are in the Middle West. They are fast, their stream beds are swift. All of you have seen these big muddy streams and how they just cut banks away like they were sugar. And that can happen to any ordinary protection like that afforded by ourselves.

In the case of the town of Holbrook, the minor portion of the town lies between the river and the Santa Fe Railroad. That portion has very little protection already afforded by the street. But that portion of the town, which we might say is one-fifth of the town, can be washed away very easily.

But the rest of the town north of the railroad is really in a hazardous position also, whether they know it or not. During the past 25 to 30 years the river bed of the Little Colorado for a distance of 5 miles below Holbrook to a distance of 15 to 20 miles above Holbrook has been filling up with sand that has been coming down from New Mexico and part of Arizona.

Senator HATCH. Yes; we know about sand in New Mexico.

Mr. DARLING. And gradually raising this river bed until actually the threat is that the river bed can be higher than the town.

Senator HATCH. That sounds ridiculous, but I know as a matter of fact that it can happen.

Mr. DARLING. We have a case right at the lower end of town where other streams come in. The Leroux wash which 30 years ago a man could ride horseback under. The railroad raised that bridge 5 feet about 2 years ago, and 5 years ago built a new line and raised it another 5 feet.

Senator HATCH. Do you happen to be familiar with San Marcial, N. Mex.?

Mr. DARLING. The sand was up to the second-story windows.

Senator HATCH. That's right.

Mr. DARLING. And this same thing can happen in Holbrook. And as we say, we of the railroad can repair our damage as we always have and keep the railroad. We know we can repair our damage in 48 hours and keep our railroad, but if the levees we have provided for the town break through and the town of Holbrook gets inundated, they cannot repair their damage with a lifetime of work.

I don't think there is a great deal more that I can add to this, because all of you are familiar with the Southwest streams and exactly how they act. But where stream beds rise the hazard grows and creeps up on the people without their knowing it.

I would say that 4 years ago it happened that the Army Engineers had completely developed a plan to take care of this situation, and it is expected that this plan can be put into effect in the following year if the war hadn't come along. But naturally, with the war on, it is necessary to underwrite and pass up other expenditures. But it does appear that this is a logical expenditure for the people of Holbrook right after the war, and whether it is done by the Bureau of Reclamation or by the United State Army Engineers, it is still a Government function because it is caused by streams beyond the control of the town of Holbrook.

Senator MCFARLAND. Thank you.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] on page 29, after line 10.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, I see that the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] is present. He desired the first committee amendment, appearing on page 1, to be passed over temporarily. Is the Senator ready to proceed with it now?

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I asked that the first amendment be passed over. That amendment seems to depart from the legislative course which Congress has heretofore adopted in regard to flood control. I do not know what the committee had in mind, but on the surface it looks as if this amendment was intended to preclude Congress hereafter from establishing for the development of any river valley, such as the Missouri River Valley, which is now very much in the picture, and other valleys, any agency similar to the T. V. A. or patterned after the T. V. A. I do not recall that this provision has been in any previous flood-control bill. I wish to read it so that Senators may understand it, and then I want to inquire of the Senator from Louisiana what the committee had in mind in inserting this language in the bill:

It is the purpose of this act to establish a definite policy of making use of existing Federal agencies for the construction, operation, and maintenance of all public improvements in connection with navigation, flood control, and allied activities; to insure coordinated operation of all Federal projects therein for the improvement of navigation and alleviation of flood conditions; to provide for realization of other benefits to be derived from such projects; to facilitate preparations and planning for post-war construction by the Federal Government in the interest of employment; and to secure efficient executive management under the direction and supervision of the permanent executive agencies already established by act of Congress.

It seems to me that language could have only one meaning, and that is to preclude the creation of any more authorities in any valleys for the development of our natural resources.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. OVERTON. I know the Senator is familiar with the Flood Control Act of 1936, because he was very active on the floor in the passage of the measure. The Senator was very much interested in the passage of that measure at the time. I shall now quote, if the Senator will permit me, from that act, because the Senator desires to know whether there has ever been previous legislation along this line.

Mr. BARKLEY. I was reading the amendment in order to inquire of the Senator——

Mr. OVERTON. Whether there has ever been legislation along the same line?

Mr. BARKLEY. I wished to inquire of the Senator the purpose of reinserting this language, in substance, in the present bill.

Mr. OVERTON. There has been legislation along this line. In other bills we have usually had a general statement of policy. Let me read from the act of 1936:

SEC. 2. Hereafter Federal investigations and improvements of rivers and other waterways for flood control and allied purposes shall be under the jurisdiction of and shall be prosecuted by the War Department under the direction of the Secretary of War and supervision of the Chief of Engineers, and Federal investigations of watersheds and measures for run-off and waterflow retardation and soil-erosion prevention on watersheds shall be under the jurisdiction of and shall be prosecuted by the Department of Agriculture under the direction of the Secretary of Agriculture, except as otherwise provided by act of Congress.

The act further provided for examinations, reports, surveys, and so forth. That is a general declaration of policy, somewhat similar to the language of the pending bill.

Mr. BARKLEY. What was the date of the act from which the Senator just read?

Mr. OVERTON. The act of June 22, 1936.

Mr. BARKLEY. My attention was brought to this provision in the bill by an editorial in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, which may have come to the attention of the Senator from Louisiana. The editorial was published on the 12th of November. It refers to this bill and this particular provision as a grave threat to the Missouri Valley Authority, which is provided for in legislation now pending before the Congress. I believe one bill was introduced by the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] and another by the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY]. Those bills have not as yet been reported by the committee.

Of course, the Senator will recall that only a few days ago the President recommended the creation of seven different valley authorities in the United States, somewhat after the pattern of the Tennessee Valley Authority. I realize that no language in a bill like this would bind future Congresses. It would not prevent a future Congress from establishing a separate authority in any valley in the country, as a matter of law or authority. However, I was wondering whether the language which has been inserted in the bill, declaring it to be the policy that hereafter no improvements of any kind shall be undertaken on any rivers except through existing agencies, was intended to have whatever effect it might have upon future Congresses in determining whether there should be a Missouri Valley Authority, a White River Valley Authority, or some other river valley authority based upon the pattern set by the Tennessee Valley Authority.

I am interested in that question, not particularly because of any geographical situation, but because of the possibility that ultimately the Cumberland River may be included, and such a program might be established under the Tennessee Valley Authority. If the Cumberland River should ever be treated as the Tennessee River has been treated, it might be included under the existing Tennessee Valley Authority. Bills have heretofore been introduced to that effect. They have not been acted upon by the Congress, although one of them did pass the Senate.

I should like to know what was behind the committee's proposal undertaking to freeze all future river improvements, for whatever purpose, in existing authorities, which would be the Corps of Engineers of the Army and the Bureau of Reclamation of the Department of the Interior. We all know that there has been a dispute between the Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation of the Department of the Interior with regard to jurisdiction over rivers. It seems that they have now reached a sort of armistice. Whether that is an agreement of convenience, or whether it is one involving any principle, or whether it works to the more efficient administration of our river valleys, I do not know. However, the discussion of this problem in the editorial in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch rather hints at the idea that the two divisions, one in the Army and the other in the Department of the Interior, have got together in order to forestall the creation of any other authorities or agencies. I should like to know from the Senator from Louisiana just what was in the minds of members of the committee when this amendment was adopted.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, flood-control legislation is progressive. The Federal Government did not take serious charge of flood control until 1928, following the great disaster of 1927 in the lower Mississippi Valley. Then the Congress of the United States declared that the control of floods in the lower Mississippi Valley was a national obligation, and undertook to authorize projects and the appropriation of money. The work was to be done solely under the supervision of the Army engineers.

In 1936 the Congress proceeded much further. It took a very forward step, and declared that flood control generally throughout the Nation was a national obligation. It proceeded to authorize certain projects for that purpose and placed them under the supervision of the Army Engineers, to be assisted by the Department of Agriculture in reference to the headwaters of various streams.

Flood-control legislation is very progressive. It has proceeded step by step under the direction of the Congress, of which the Senator from Kentucky is a very distinguished Member, until we have intertwined it with irrigation, with the generation of power, and with a broader and more extensive agricultural development of lands bordering upon streams or their upper reaches. So various agencies of the Government have come into the picture to deal with this subject. Each time we have had a flood-control bill we have had a declaration of policy, not in this exact language, but in language somewhat similar to it. We have now reached the point where, instead of mentioning all the various agencies, we simply say, as suggested in this amendment:

> It is the purpose of this act to establish a definite policy of making use of existing Federal agencies—

Such agencies include the Bureau of Reclamation, when it comes into the picture in relation to irrigation dams, reservoirs, and so forth. It includes the Federal Power Commission, which enters into the picture when a dam has anything to do with power, and also the Department of Agriculture when it is interested in any of the projects contained in the bill. Therefore, we make use of existing Federal agencies which may be interested—

> for the construction, operation, and maintenance of all public improvements in connection with navigation, flood control, and allied activities; to insure coordinated operation of all Federal projects therein for the improvement of navigation and alleviation of flood conditions; to provide for realization of other benefits to be derived from such projects; to facilitate preparations and planning for post-war construction by the Federal Government in the interest of employment; and to secure efficient executive management under the direction and supervision of the permanent executive agencies already established by act of Congress.

It does not seem to me that that general provision smacks of seven regional authorities or of a blow against seven regional authorities. We use the presently constituted and existing agencies to help in the development of our water resources. At any time Congress wishes to deprive the engineers of control of navigation or flood control, or wishes to destroy the Bureau of Reclamation insofar as it has to deal with irrigation, it can do so, and have one authority after another over the whole Mississippi River and all its tributaries, or can bring it all under one great authority. All that is within the power of Congress.

The newspaper to which the able Senator has referred is one of the St. Louis newspapers—the St. Louis Post-Dispatch—is it not?

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes.

Mr. OVERTON. It is a strong advocate of these authorities, as I understand. If in the opinion of the lay editor of that newspaper any provision of the bill might militate against the future authorization of some authority, I can understand why he would become very much excited about it; but I am surprised that the able senior Senator from Kentucky should become excited about such a provision as this one.

Mr. BARKLEY. I am not excited at all; I was never more calm in my life.

Mr. OVERTON. I am very glad to hear that.

Mr. BARKLEY. I simply endeavored to obtain, in a calm way, a clear statement from the committee about what was in the back of the heads of the members of the committee when they inserted this provision.

I should also like to refer to the report filed by the committee when this provision was inserted. I read the following from the report:

> The committee is of the opinion that the best interest of the country as a whole will be served by fully utilizing Federal agencies in the planning, construction, maintenance, and operation of all improvements for the development of the Nation's water resources.

That is very broad language. If the Senator had said in his amendment and in his report that, insofar as the projects carried in the bill are concerned, they advocate the limitation of jurisdiction over them to existing agencies, that would have been one thing. But it seems to me to be a fair interpretation of this language to say that it projects itself into the future, and attempts to declare a policy on the part of Congress, because, as I read further, it says—

> The established Federal agencies have highly trained personnel that are specialists in their respective fields. The chiefs of the principal bureaus and commissions directly responsible for the preparation of plans and for the administration of the national program for the development of the water resources of the country have entered into an agreement to insure cooperation on multiple-purpose projects.

Those are the Bureau of Reclamation and the Corps of Army Engineers for rivers and harbors, which have been at each other's throats for a long time

over the question of jurisdiction. They have now come to an agreement.

Mr. OVERTON. If the Senator will permit me to interrupt him at this point, let me say that I do not think they have been at each other's throats. I think they have gotten along together quite well.

Mr. BARKLEY. But they have disagreed.

Mr. OVERTON. Perhaps they have disagreed in some instances. But in the case of the Missouri River Basin development, which has caused so much comment, when they got together they found that the differences between them were very few. If the Senator will read the report, he will see that when they got together their differences were reconciled.

Mr. BARKLEY. I do not know under what auspices they have met and have entered into an agreement. I read further from the report:

> Under the terms of that agreement, conferences are held in Washington at least once each calendar month for the purpose of discussing the results of studies and investigations, adjusting differences of opinion, and promoting ways and means for implementing the agreement.
>
> The committee believes that the most effective means of insuring efficient executive management and a uniform administration of the national policies enunciated by Congress with respect to navigation, flood control, irrigation, development of hydroelectric power, water-flow retardation, and soil-erosion prevention is through the utilization of the permanent executive agencies already established by acts of Congress for the administration of these programs and it recommends adoption of the amendment.

Mr. OVERTON. That is a conclusion.

Mr. BARKLEY. I cannot read into that language anything except the purpose, at least, to try to commit the Congress in advance of any separate treatment of any river which might come under the jurisdiction of Congress. Frankly, I do not know what other reason could have actuated the committee in inserting that language.

Mr. OVERTON. Does the Senator disagree with the conclusion that these projects should be under the control of established agencies?

Mr. BARKLEY. I do not disagree.

Mr. OVERTON. Does the Senator disagree with the conclusion that the projects should be under the control of experts long trained and schooled in this kind of work? That is the statement made by the committee.

Mr. BARKLEY. Of course, I do not disagree to that. Neither do I disagree to the proposal or suggestion that, so far as the projects to be carried on under this bill are concerned, which are flood-control projects, or even insofar as the rivers and harbors bill is concerned, which relates to the ordinary and routine improvement of our rivers and harbors, they should be under the jurisdiction of experts.

But the Senator from Louisiana knows what I have in mind. Congress decided to establish the Tennessee Valley Authority. It may decide—I do not know about that—to establish or adopt the St. Lawrence waterways project, in which the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] is vitally concerned. It may decide to establish an Arkansas Valley Authority. It may undertake to set up a separate Government agency hereafter. While I agree that the language used by the committee cannot prevent Congress from doing that in the future——

Mr. OVERTON. Certainly not; I agree thoroughly with the Senator that it could not.

Mr. BARKLEY. Nevertheless, I wonder if it would not normally commit and bind the Congress to the proposition, if any separate valley development should be undertaken, of putting it into the hands of some existing agency, instead of into the hands of a new agency, as we did in the case of the Tennessee Valley Authority.

Mr. OVERTON. It would be futile for the committee in a report or in this bill to undertake to bind the Congress in respect to its action in the future.

Mr. BARKLEY. I realize the futility of attempting to do so.

Mr. OVERTON. We cannot possibly do so.

I wish to state that I really believe that navigation should be under the control of the Board of Army Engineers for Rivers and Harbors. It is one of the presently constituted agencies. I believe that flood control should be under the Board of Army Engineers for Rivers and Harbors. I believe that irrigation projects and other related projects should be under the control of the Bureau of Reclamation, which for 40 years has been dealing with that subject, and has engineers who are now schooled and trained in it and are experts. The Army Engineers have been dealing with navigation projects for more than 120 years, and with flood-control projects ever since we began them. They are the greatest dam builders in the world. They are the greatest levee builders in the world. They are the greatest reservoir builders in the world. As I remarked in my opening statement in connection with the pending bill, I think the splendid schooling we have given our Army Engineers has been of immense value to them in the war in which we are now engaged, and in aiding our soldiers on the battle fronts all over the world.

Now I am expressing and the committee is expressing just what we think—and what I think, too—namely, that we should not overlook the Department of Agriculture. It is doing splendid work. I think these agencies should be recognized. That is just what is said. Congress has not yet undertaken to establish any other authority. If it desires to create some other agency, very well; that would be a matter to be determined by the Congress.

Mr. BARKLEY. I understand that. I raise no question about the competence of the Army Engineers in regard to the improvement of rivers and harbors or in regard to flood control. Neither do I question the ability of the Reclamation Service in matters of irrigation. But we all know that we are reaching a period in the development of our country when we must take into consideration industrial development, hydroelectric-power development, and all sorts of things which are incidental to the improvement of rivers or which may be primarily more important in some sections of the country than the mere improvement of rivers by way of dredging them or otherwise providing deeper channels for navigation. It is impossible to separate flood control from such development.

I think we are rapidly reaching such a point in this country that we must utilize our river resources. Not only must we integrate them simply in order to deepen channels and to dredge harbors but we must integrate them in regard to the whole industrial and agricultural development of the valleys. I think we must soon enter upon a comprehensive program for the utilization of water power.

Mr. OVERTON. If the Senator had attended the hearings he would know, or if he will read the printed hearings he will find, that the bill now before the Senate goes a long way toward doing what the Senator has suggested. The bill deals with hydroelectric energy, irrigation, and reclamation, as well as with navigation and flood control. It interrelates those various activities.

Mr. BARKLEY. I am not a member of the committee and, as the Senator from Louisiana knows, I cannot attend all the hearings which the committee holds, and neither can I attend all hearings which take place before other committees of the Senate.

Mr. OVERTON. That is the reason why I suggested that the Senator read the hearings.

Mr. BARKLEY. I appreciate the Senator's suggestion, and I hope that I can follow it.

In order that the pending amendment may not be misinterpreted by anyone interested in the development of water power, would the Senator object to an amendment at the end of the committee amendment reading substantially as follows:

> *Provided, however,* That this section shall not be interpreted to preclude the right of Congress hereafter to establish different agencies, if it should see fit, for the development of our water resources.

Mr. OVERTON. That would be a pretty broad provision. It would provide that nothing could be construed to inhibit the power of Congress to enact future legislation. Such an amendment would deal very broadly with the subject.

Mr. BARKLEY. I agree that the pending amendment would not bind future Congresses but it is subject to being misinterpreted by those who do not always understand the technicalities of congressional legislation. If the amendment cannot bind Congress in the future——

Mr. OVERTON. Why not say so?

Mr. BARKLEY. Why not say so?

Mr. OVERTON. Why not say so in a broader sense? We want it to apply not merely to future agencies, but in other ways and to new methods. Should we not say, "It will not bind Congress at all in the future with respect to legislation

dealing with flood control, power, navigation, and so forth"? Merely to say "agencies" is to stop too soon.

Mr. BARKLEY. I do not care how the language is framed. I realize that so far as binding any future Congress is concerned, legally or constitutionally, the language of the committee amendment is nugatory. But many people throughout the country, especially in the Middle West, may misinterpret the language in the way which I have indicated. If the Senator will agree to language which would dissipate such fear, I think it would go a long way toward reconciling many of those people to the amendment offered by the committee. The amendment could not and would not bind future Congresses, but notwithstanding that many persons think it would bind future Congresses, I think the language should be made clear. It should be plain that it will not bind Congress in the future regarding the manner of developing our water resources.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. If, in connection with the pending bill, we do what the Senator suggests, it seems to me that language should be written into every future act to the effect that we are not attempting to abolish the Constitution of the United States, and that one Congress cannot bind a future Congress. There is no sense in putting such a provision into this measure unless it is put into every measure proposed in the future. Every person who has any sense, and who has read the Constitution of the United States, knows that one Congress cannot bind a future Congress, or bind itself for the duration of the Congress. To insist on writing into this bill a provision that we are not attempting to bind a future Congress, and that we are still operating under the Constitution of the United States, seems to me to be ridiculous.

Mr. BARKLEY. It may be that the original amendment is ridiculous, but while constitutional lawyers like the able Senator from Missouri understand the bill, there are many millions of people throughout the country who do not understand it. I dare say that the Senator from Missouri is more interested in this matter than I am.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I am certainly very much interested in the proposal. I am interested in it as a matter of the most vital concern to the people of my State, and the people of the Missouri and the Mississippi River Valleys. But picking out peccadilloes, and undertaking to make attacks on the declaration of the flood-control policy on the theory that it might bind some future Congress, seems to me to be an attempt to defeat the whole measure.

Mr. BARKLEY. Of course, if the Senator wishes to do so, he can put an interpretation upon the measure and endeavor to defeat it, but that is not my objective. My apprehensions are aroused by the fears of people in the Senator's own State with regard to the authority being contemplated.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. It is not contemplated by the people of the Missouri River Valley, but only by two newspapers in St. Louis. I intend to discuss their interests in the matter before the discussion on this bill is concluded.

Mr. BARKLEY. In order that the RECORD may show the ground upon which I rose to interrogate the Senator from Louisiana, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial from the St. Louis Post-Dispatch be printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. The Senator should include the editorial of the Star-Times, because it always follows the St. Louis Dispatch about 2 weeks later.

Mr. BARKLEY. I have not seen the editorial to which the Senator refers, but I am sure the Senator from Missouri would be willing to put it into the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Kentucky?

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A GRAVE THREAT TO THE M. V. A.—DEAL IS COOKING IN THE SENATE THAT WOULD PUT OFF INDEFINITELY THE "ONE BIG PLAN FOR ONE BIG RIVER"

A situation which greatly concerns President Roosevelt and Vice-President-Elect TRUMAN is developing in the United States Senate this week.

It is a situation perilous to the creation of a Missouri Valley Authority—perilous to the one big plan for one big river to which the President and Mr. TRUMAN solemnly pledged themselves in the campaign just closed.

It is a situation which threatens to deny the people of the Missouri Valley the blessings and security which unified development of the valley's resources would bring.

What is this situation?

The first order of business before this "lame duck" session of the Senate is two measures—the rivers and harbors bill and the flood-control bill. If they are passed in contemplated form, it may delay M. V. A. for years—indeed, the deal now being cooked up, if successful, may be a fatal stab in the back for the M. V. A. idea.

Last spring an old controversy between the Army Engineers and the Reclamation Bureau burst into flame before Congress on the question of bureaucratic control of the Missouri River. The engineers fought bitterly for the Pick plan. The Reclamation Service Bureau fought for the Sloan plan. And no holds barred.

The resumption of this old and apparently irreconcilable feud between two vested governmental interests convinced many people that the time had come to cut the Gordian knot by advancing the M. V. A. idea. That idea would rescue the Missouri Valley from contending factions and place it under harmonious and scientific, but above all, under unified and nonpolitical management.

As the M. V. A. idea took instant hold upon the imagination of the country, and won the ultimate endorsement of the President in a special message to Congress, a strange and wondrous thing occurred.

The feudists, fearful of the M. V. A., lest it invade their bureaucratic precincts, began to murmur softly to each other. And now—marvelous to relate—a marriage between old and bitter enemies has been arranged. The United States Senate will be asked this week to officiate as clergyman at this odd alliance.

But this is no love match. This is a marriage of convenience, arranged not only to kill off M. V. A. but to save the interests jealously guarded by two powerful Government agencies.

This is what the Senate will be asked to do by Senator OVERTON, of Louisiana, spokesman for the Army Engineers and certain lower river interests, and by Senator O'MAHONEY, who represents the Reclamation Bureau and certain upper river interests.

It will be asked to amend either the rivers and harbors bill or the flood-control bill by the adoption of a written compact between the Army Engineers and the Reclamation Bureau.

What is this compact? It is an attempt to reconcile the hitherto clashing views of the two Government agencies. It is an attempt to pass off as an amicable plan a compromise between two points of view which are necessarily antagonistic.

Broadly speaking, the legal concerns of the Army Engineers are navigation and flood control. The legal concern of the Reclamation Bureau is irrigation. Neither is empowered by law or equipped by experience or tradition to look at the river as a whole, or to formulate one big plan for one big river. Here the fatal impasse rests. Here it has always rested. Here it will continue to rest, despite the last-minute skin-saving deal that has been contrived.

Why would passage of the Overton-O'Mahoney deal vitiate or destroy the M. V. A. idea? It would do so by intrenching through act of Congress the authority over the river of the Army Engineers and the Reclamation Bureau. The preamble of the flood-control bill expressly states: "It is the purpose of this act to establish a definite policy of making use of existing Federal agencies for the construction, operations, and maintenance of all public improvements in connection with navigation, flood control, and allied activities * * *."

It would delay or destroy the M. V. A. idea because, although the two pending bills are only authorization measures, they would set a divided pattern for future development of the river. Passage of the deal would pledge the Nation by law and in honor to the execution of a plan which consigns the Missouri River to the same old pulling and hauling which has cursed it in the past.

The deal now cooking would continue the system of "pork barrel" politics in Missouri River development as against a scientific determination of the valley's needs. It would continue remote control from Washington of the valley's destiny as against the decentralized, regional control that M. V. A. would represent. In a word, it would be to ignore, to repudiate, and defy the basic principles which have made the Tennessee Valley Authority the outstanding success that it is, admired throughout the world.

Is M. V. A. to be delayed or done to death by a "lame duck" Congress which does not fully represent the mandate of the people at the polls? Is this to be done before newly elected champions of M. V. A. like Senator-elect MOSES, of North Dakota, are permitted to be heard? Is it to be done in the hope that the President, burdened with a thousand concerns, will not notice this sabotage of his own idea?

Will President Roosevelt stand for it? Will Vice President-elect TRUMAN stand for it? Will Senator MURRAY stand for it? Will Senator GILLETTE stand for it? Will Senator LISTER HILL stand for it? If it is passed and goes to conference, will Representatives COCHRAN and RANKIN stand for it? All these men stand for M. V. A. Four of them have M. V. A. bills pending in Congress.

This editorial does not propose either delay or defeat of the river and harbor and flood-control bills. These bills are national in scope. They include many worthy developments—in Connecticut, in the Great Lakes region, in Boston Harbor, in the Santa Ana River Basin, and even in Hawaii. Our concern is solely and simply with the Missouri Valley. It is a concern born of a century of failure on the part of existing agencies to control the Missouri River. It is a concern born of a conviction that a Missouri Valley

Authority can control our floods, can provide navigation, conserve our soil, give us low-cost power, and bring the new life of irrigation to our thirsty uplands.

This we urge upon the Senate: Amendment of the river and harbor bill or the flood-control bill, or both, to substitute the President's M. V. A. proposal for every section of both acts that concerns the Missouri Valley.

The written compact made public by Senators OVERTON and O'MAHONEY is, in fact, a substitute for the Missouri Valley provisions of these bills. It is a substitute which would prolong indefinitely an impossible situation by which the river has many masters. If there is to be substitution, it should be the kind of substitution, the kind of amendment that will give this river one master, one plan, one destiny.

The President and a Democratic Congress have just received a mandate of approval for such progressive policies and public works as are typified by the M. V. A. idea. Moreover, that idea was endorsed during the campaign by the President and the Vice President-elect.

In view of this endorsement, how can Congress permit two Government agencies to sneak past it legislation which will vitiate or destroy a specific pledge to the people by the newly elected administration?

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I invite the Senator's attention to the wording of the amendment which was offered earlier in the day by the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY], and approved by the Committee on Commerce. It reads in part as follows:

The sale of such electric power as may be generated at reservoir projects shall be made at the point of production, without special privilege or discrimination, so as to provide for the complete coordination of such power and energy with other power developments, both private and public, in the area contiguous with such projects. It shall be stipulated in connection with any sale that any and all savings realized by the purchasers shall be passed on under Federal regulation where no State regulation exists to the consuming public: *Provided*, That unless 90 percent of the firm power produced at such projects shall be demanded or purchased within 3 years after completion of construction of such projects, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to construct transmission lines for the purpose of selling such power at wholesale.

I believe that the Senator can see that the amendment dovetails into the declaration of purpose which the committee adopted for the bill, and that with the declaration of purpose as contained in this amendment in the bill the effect would be to prevent the setting up of yardsticks in any area where yardsticks for the sale of electric power do not presently exist. It would prevent the expansion of the Tennessee Valley Authority to include the Cumberland River territory, or the setting up of new valley authorities. It would prevent the inauguration of public power distribution at almost any place where it does not exist at the present time, and it would also militate against the expansion of rural electrification cooperatives into sections where they do not presently exist. I think the amendment which has been offered by the Senator from North Carolina goes with the declaration of purposes to which I referred, and that it would have the effect which I have stated.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. BURTON. Speaking as a member of the minority party on the subcommittee, I wish to endorse the provision under discussion. It seems to me that we have endeavored to do a limited thing. We have endeavored to make use of the existing facilities, and to meet questions presented to the committee. Obviously that would not in and of itself prohibit Congress from doing anything else in the future, and neither would the first paragraph of the bill put any limitations upon future Congresses. Furthermore, nothing can be found in the proposal which would prohibit the establishment of such authorities as the T. V. A., the M. V. A., or anything of that nature.

The reason for this first paragraph, as I see it, is this: We have done a good many things in the bill itself, but we have proceeded on the theory of making use of existing facilities. The first paragraph does not prohibit future Congresses, it does not prohibit executive agencies, from establishing new facilities, but it does expressly say that this act shall not be used and cited as authority for an Executive order establishing any kind of a new agency under the act, because here we have set out to do a thing with existing agencies. We do not prohibit Congress from doing something else; we do not prohibit executive authority from doing something else under some other authority, but we do not want this act cited by implication or otherwise as authority for new agencies. I think it is proper for that reason that the provision should be in the bill.

Mr. BARKLEY. If that be the purpose, would the Senator from Ohio and the Senator from Louisiana object to the insertion of a very small amendment, namely on page 1, line 5, after the word "improvements" to insert the words "provided for in this act", so that it would read:

It is the purpose of this act to establish a definite policy of making use of existing Federal agencies for the construction, operation, and maintenance of all public improvements provided for in this act in connection with navigation, flood control, and allied activities.

Mr. OVERTON. I would have no objection to the inclusion of those words.

Mr. BARKLEY. I offer that as an amendment.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I should like to have my amendment adopted.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I want to have the amendment stated again.

Mr. BARKLEY. The amendment I offer is on line 5, after the word "improvements" to insert the words "provided for in this act."

Mr. McCLELLAN. On what page?

Mr. BARKLEY. On page 1. It is an amendment to the committee amendment.

Mr. McCLELLAN. At what point does it come in?

Mr. BARKLEY. It comes in on line 5 after the word "improvements," next to the end of the line.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Very well.

Mr. OVERTON. So that the general declaration of policy would apply to projects provided for in this act.

Mr. BARKLEY. The policy is made applicable to projects carried in this act.

Mr. OVERTON. I do not think it would be applicable to any other projects.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Kentucky to the committee amendment.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, in this connection I wish to say that section 1 now under discussion, which undertakes to formulate a policy, is the same as a section of a bill which I introduced in November 1943, in which I attempted to deal with development of the Arkansas and White River Basins. I believe section 1 of the pending bill is a verbatim copy of the first section of the bill which I introduced for that purpose. My thought in trying to coordinate the development of the lower Arkansas and White River Basins was to establish a definite policy, a legislative policy, with respect to the construction and operation of all the projects which might be authorized on those streams. I had in mind, of course, to deal with those basins separately, but the Commerce Committee, after considering my bill at the time they considered this flood-control bill, did not report it, but merely took this section and some other provisions of it and incorporated them in the pending flood-control bill. I thought, and I still believe, that it is advisable for the Congress to establish an over-all policy dealing with all our river and waterway developments. In other words, if this would be a good policy or a good program for the White and Arkansas River Valleys, probably it would be a good policy in connection with improvements in other valleys throughout the Nation.

However, if we are going finally to proceed under a policy and program of establishing separate authorities for each valley, then, of course, this policy would probably not fit into that scheme. Until, however, we determine and enter upon the course of developing our waterways by the creation of separate authorities for each particular drainage area, I think it is well and advisable and necessary that the Congress itself establish a policy which shall be pursued until that time. I rather favor the policy expressed in the pending flood-control bill and in the bill which I introduced dealing with the White and Arkansas River Valleys, rather than the establishment of separate authorities.

Mr. President, I believe that everything we need to accomplish can be accomplished by the utilization of existing agencies of Government without having to create a new authority for each drainage basin. There are certain functions of different agencies already established by the Congress which are indispensable to the development of the Nation's streams and their proper utilization, and legislation that declares and formulates a policy such as the pending flood-control bill does in section 1, and as was proposed in the bill which I introduced dealing with the White and Arkansas River

Basins, will enable and permit the development of these waterways.

Another reason, Mr. President, why I think that such a policy is sound is that I believe that the supervision of navigation on our navigable streams should remain under the War Department and under the supervision of the Chief of Army Engineers. It is further my judgment, Mr. President, that all projects on navigable streams, on all streams where flood control is a vital problem, should be constructed with a view to controlling floods and in aid of navigation. Those ought to be the primary purposes of the construction. Particularly is that true in the lower valleys of the White and Arkansas Rivers. I realize that upon the upper stretches of the streams the great problem possibly of the people living there is to get water for irrigation purposes; but there is no conflict of interest between the people on the upper stretches of the streams who require water or who need to utilize the water that can be made available for irrigation purposes, and the people downstream, because the interest of those living downstream is to try to control the floods, and certainly the water that is stored in the reservoirs on the upper stretches tends to relieve our burden and problem in the lower valleys. I believe, except for the projects which might be constructed on the upper stretches of the streams primarily for irrigation purposes so as to impound water for that use, that all projects constructed in the lower valleys should be constructed primarily to control the floods, and then for the secondary purpose of generating power.

It matters not, Mr. President, how much cheap power we are able to generate and give to the people in a valley by the construction and operation of a dam, if we do not give them protection from devastating floods we can easily see all the fruits and benefits which come to any section from cheap power washed away and lost when the floods come. The dams ought to be constructed primarily for the purpose of flood control and navigation and secondarily for the purpose of generating power.

I subscribe wholeheartedly to the policy set forth in the flood-control bill, especially in section 1 thereof.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, I should like to ask the senior Senator from Louisiana a question. With reference to the provision of the bill which is now being discussed, the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] and a large group of Senators have proposed amendments which include what might be a supplemental statement of policy, and I am going to ask that this matter go over until the Senator from Wyoming can be present, and perhaps some agreement can be reached as to the other statement of policy.

Mr. OVERTON. Of course, I should be very glad to accommodate the Senator, but I should like to make some progress. I do not think the amendments which the Senator from Wyoming has in mind affect the matter before us at all. They do not relate to it.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I do not believe they conflict.

Mr. OVERTON. He does not undertake to amend the committee amendment.

Mr. MILLIKIN. No, but there is a statement of policy to be included at an appropriate place, which, if included at an appropriate place, might supplement the committee's statement of policy.

Mr. OVERTON. Let us pass on the pending amendment, and when the Senator from Wyoming presents his amendment, we will act on it.

Mr. MILLIKIN. If I am not losing any parliamentary position——

Mr. OVERTON. Not at all.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] to the committee amendment.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I should like to make an inquiry with reference to the first section. I cannot understand the necessity for this language in the bill at all if it is not designed to create the notion in the country that the enactment of the language would preclude the possibility of a program like the T. V. A. program for the various river basins of the country. I cannot see any other purpose, because we have been enacting this character of legislation annually without provisions of this character.

Mr. OVERTON. I think the Senator is in error. We have had provisions in pari materia, not in the exact language.

Mr. MURRAY. This is an attempt through the language employed to create the idea that this will provide for a realization of other benefits to be derived from such projects. Such language was never included in any previous measures which have been enacted, and the sole and only purpose of it can be to create the impression that there is no need for a unified program of development of the various river basins such as was provided under the T. V. A., or under similar authorities which might be created in other sections of the country. It is not relevant to the bill at all except for the purpose of establishing a legislative or moral precedent that this legislation concludes the subject, and makes it unnecessary for the Congress again to consider the proposition of a unified development of these river basins. It is proposed that it can all be done under the arrangement set forth here.

Mr. BARKLEY. I may say to the Senator from Montana that the amendment which I offered a moment ago, I think, takes care of the situation by limiting this declaration of policy to the projects carried in the bill. That was my purpose in offering it, and I understand there was no objection to it.

Mr. MURRAY. I cannot understand why it is necessary to have such provisions in the bill in any form.

Mr. BARKLEY. I argued that here at some length a while ago. I expressed myself as having no objection to having a declaration of policy in regard to the projects carried in the bill. My objection was to the interpretation placed upon the language by those who feared it was an effort to place some moral restrictions upon Congress, although Congress could not be legally restrained as to what it might do in the future. For that purpose I offered the amendment, and to it there is no objection. I thought it had been agreed to, but I am informed it has not yet been agreed to.

Mr. MURRAY. For my part, I do not see the need for this language in the bill at all, and it has only one purpose, that is, to attempt to preclude the country from having developments such as the T. V. A. in the various river basins of the country.

Mr. OVERTON. Does the Senator contend that such a provision would be very effective in hereafter and forever preventing all these developments?

Mr. MURRAY. No, but it is designed to give an approval of the programs which have been carried out thus far, and which have failed to accomplish any material results. It has been piecemeal legislation. I find, too, that many of the Members of Congress who serve on the committees which control this kind of legislation go before the people of their various States claiming that they have special advantages because of their positions on these committees, and they claim they get projects for their sections of the country while other sections of the country are unable to get them.

Mr. OVERTON. I hope the Senator is not referring to the chairman of the subcommittee, to the Senator in charge of the bill, who is myself, because if he looks at the bill he will see that there is scarcely anything in it for Louisiana, as compared with other States.

Mr. MURRAY. I am not referring to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. OVERTON. The Senator was looking me squarely in the eye when he was making the statement.

Mr. MURRAY. I could not look in any other direction. I could not look at the floor. I like to look at the distinguished Senator from Louisiana when I am talking to him. But it seems to me that the record of the Congress in handling these matters over the years has shown a failure. The efforts have been piecemeal efforts to remedy the conditions, and have failed to bring about any real development of the resources or expansion of industry in the various river basins of the country. The only way that can be accomplished is by an authority such as was set up under the T. V. A. That would then give us a unified development of an entire basin, would give us not only a program for flood control and for irrigation and power, but would also give us an opportunity to develop the natural resources of the sections of the country involved. This is going to be especially important in the post-war period, when it becomes necessary for us to bring about a huge expansion of industry in this country, and to provide homes for thousands of new settlers in the western section of the Nation, where these projects can be carried out.

It seems to me this language should be entirely eliminated from the bill so as to prevent any notion that the Congress is approving the record that has been made in carrying out these projects in various sections of the country.

I am opposed to this first section in its entirety.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, I intend to vote against the amendment of the Senator from Kentucky, although I do not intend to make a fight about it, because I do not think it amounts to anything.

The language of the committee amendment, of course, does not attempt to bind any future Congress. Everyone who knows anything knows that one Congress cannot bind another, and that a Congress today cannot bind its own action a week later. I shall vote against the amendment because it is simply intended to curry favor with a couple of editorial writers on the St. Louis Post-Dispatch and the St. Louis Star-Times. Mr. Ralph Coghlan, principal editorial writer on the Post-Dispatch, a few months ago happened to read Dave Lilienthal's book on the Tennessee Valley Authority, and he immediately committed the Post-Dispatch to a very enthusiastic program for a Missouri Valley Authority. He had previously committed the Post-Dispatch in the strongest terms in opposition to the President's foreign policy before Pearl Harbor and then did a complete about face on the return from Canada of Mr. Joseph Pulitzer, the owner of the paper. The last time I saw Coghlan was at a dinner given Colonel Lindbergh on the occasion of his speaking in St. Louis. Shortly after that, I understand, in some manner Mrs. Coghlan, Ralph Coghlan's wife, who was also an editorial writer on the Post-Dispatch, was permitted to fly over the T. V. A. in a Government plane and at public expense, and they began to write articles about the T. V. A., and to suggest that the vast Missouri River Valley should be subjected to the same treatment the Tennessee Valley had received.

Of course the St. Louis Post-Dispatch is a piratical craft, but it is a man o' war. The St. Louis Star-Times always comes in a couple of weeks later as a rowboat in the wake of the piratical craft of the Post-Dispatch. If you want to know what will be in the Star-Times tomorrow all you have to do is to read the Post-Dispatch of 2 weeks ago. So, of course, shortly after Mr. Coghlan had written his editorial, and his wife had flown over the Tennessee Valley in a Government plane, the Star-Times came along to the same effect.

Mr. Coghlan is the fellow who raised the question as to whether we were attempting to bind a future Congress, which, if he had been a lawyer he would have known would have been impossible to happen. The Senator from Kentucky, able lawyer and jurist that he is, certainly knows that. This amendment is simply, in my opinion, a cheap catering to two cheap editorial writers on the St. Louis Post-Dispatch and the St. Louis Star-Times, and for that reason, while I have no objection to it and know that it is entirely innocuous and does not in the slightest degree change the effect of the committee amendment, I intend to vote against it. It is only an exception without meaning of an obvious constitutional fact that one Congress cannot bind another one.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I wish simply to state in reply to the Senator from Missouri that it is a matter of indifference to me as to how cheap he thinks my performance may be here in offering the amendment. Long before I ever heard of any amendment or any editorial in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, I was opposed to the Congress attempting to create the impression that it was holding out the hope that it might bind future Congresses by the continuation of a policy which ought to be limited to a provision carried in a bill.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, if the Senator will permit me, the Senator has supported many measures on this floor which, without attempting to bind any future Congresses, declared a policy of Congress for the guidance of executive bureaus which would be in effect until such a time as the Congress saw fit to change the policy. That is all this amendment attempts to do.

Mr. BARKLEY. I do not claim to be as profound a constitutional lawyer as the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. The Senator from Kentucky is an able constitutional lawyer.

Mr. BARKLEY. But even I know that one Congress cannot bind another Congress. I know that one Congress ought not to create the impression that it is trying to bind another Congress. That is what my amendment tries to save this proposal from.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Then I think we ought to write into the bill an amendment that we should not abolish the Presidency or the House of Representatives or any other constitutional function.

Mr. BARKLEY. Of course, the Senator can carry the suggestion for amendment ad nauseam and ad libitum and ad infinitum if he wishes to.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. It seems to me no example I could give could be more ridiculous.

Mr. BARKLEY. The amendment I offer is no more ridiculous than the effort made by the bill to create the impression that we are trying to settle the policy of Congress for all time.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Of course, that is not intended to be done.

Mr. BARKLEY. I am not so certain that the language here is not an attempt to settle a permanent policy on the part of Congress, otherwise why did not the committee write in the language that is now agreed to by the committee; that it shall only have effect upon the projects carried in this bill?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, I have seen the Senator from Kentucky on at least 40 different occasions since the present administration came into power in 1932, stand on this floor and defend declarations of policy much more binding and much more stringent than anything proposed in this bill. It just so happens that the Senator has read the editorial in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, which he has just put into the RECORD, and was actuated to offer this amendment.

Mr. BARKLEY. I do not know anything about the motives which inspired the editorial carried in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch. I do not know whether the editorial was a cheap one, or whether the editors are cheap editors. I do not know anything about the character of the people who write these editorials. I do not have the honor or privilege of their acquaintance. But long before I ever saw this editorial, in connection with legislation of this kind dealing with rivers and harbors and the permanent improvement of our resources, I objected to one Congress attempting to bind another Congress by a declaration of policy, or, even though it could not do it, at least endeavor to have some moral effect upon the succeeding Congress.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Did the Senator protest against the declaration of policy which was the preamble to the act creating the P. W. A.?

Mr. BARKLEY. No; I do not suppose I did, and it would not have anything to do with the matter now before us whether I did or did not.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Very well. The Senator has defended on this floor many declarations of policy by Congress.

Mr. BARKLEY. That was a declaration of policy dealing with a temporary unemployment condition, and we did undertake to establish a policy and declare a policy of giving men work in a great depression. That is quite a different thing from trying to bind future Congresses with respect to the permanent improvement of our natural resources.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, since the section of the bill now under discussion was taken from a bill which I introduced dealing with the Arkansas and White River Basins in which the same identical policy was set out, I want the record to show that I am opposed to the amendment offered by the senior Senator from Kentucky. Of course, there is no attempt here to do the impossible. We all know, and it is agreed by everyone, that the action taken here today in this legislation cannot bind a future Congress. But I submit that if this is a good policy for the pending bill and the projects which are authorized therein, if it is good for these projects and for this measure, then it is good for all projects heretofore authorized by the Congress with reference to which no previous legislative policy has been established.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President——

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Arkansas yield to the Senator from Florida?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I yield.

Mr. PEPPER. In view of the fact that the Senator was apparently the author of the prototype of this amendment, I should like to know what in the mind of the author is the intention or implication of this language. In what respect does it change the policy which we have followed in the past?

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, in answer to the Senator from Florida I will say that when I drafted the bill from which this section was taken I was not undertaking to formulate or to establish a policy for the Nation as such. I was dealing primarily with river basins that my people are vitally interested in, and in

the absence of a valley authority having been established to deal with the project in those river basins, the White and Arkansas, in order to coordinate the different projects that are now being constructed in those valleys, and those that have heretofore been authorized, and such as may be hereafter authorized, I was trying to establish a definite policy with respect to those projects in those two river basins. I was not undertaking to fix one for the Nation. I do think it would be good until such time as the Congress may decide that it prefers to proceed by the establishment of separate authorities for each drainage basin. In other words, as I understand it now we have no definite fixed policy in many respects. For instance, take the power generated on dams in my section—and we have one just about completed now, the Norfolk Dam. There is no authority, there is no policy, with reference to that power except a directive or an Executive order from the President which deals with it during the emergency period only. When that power becomes available the Southwest Power Authority, which has jurisdiction of it by reason of the Executive order, is unable to make contracts for the power or make any disposition of it for a period of time beyond 6 months after the end of the war. And therefore looking to the development of our waterways I was undertaking, when I drafted the bill, to fix a policy by legislation under which we could operate which would enable those in authority to act, and in the bill which I introduced I placed the power under the Secretary of the Interior for his disposal just as the President had done by Executive order. But it would enable them to make contracts beyond the end of the war. In the absence of a legislative policy, I undertook to deal with the question of fixing a policy by legislation until such time as the Congress, if it should ever wish to change it, might make a change. Apparently the Commerce Committee simply took that section of the bill which I had introduced for the White and Arkansas River Valleys and incorporated it in this general flood control bill, to serve as a declaration of policy until such time as Congress might wish to legislate further.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I yield.

Mr. PEPPER. As I understand, the language was intended to mean only that the policy of universality should apply until Congress might decide to set up a governing authority for a particular area.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Absolutely. In other words, it is an interim provision. If Congress should finally enter upon the program of establishing regional authorities or valley authorities as a general program for the development of our waterways, when such authorities are established these policies would be abrogated, or merged into the new procedure.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Arkansas yield to the Senator from Kentucky?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I yield.

Mr. CHANDLER. As I read the declaration in the bill, it simply states that it is the purpose of the act to establish a definite policy of making use of existing Federal agencies for the construction and operation of such works. In the future would not anyone undertaking to establish some authority be faced directly with an expressed intention of Congress, unless it were changed, to the effect that it is the purpose to be guided by this provision until some Congress changes it?

Mr. McCLELLAN. That is correct.

Mr. CHANDLER. In the future, if the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], for example, should wish to establish a Missouri Valley Authority, he would be faced with the declaration of this Congress that it wishes to handle the program through existing agencies. He might be able to overcome that handicap, but the burden would be distinctly upon him.

I do not know what will happen to the amendment offered by my colleague; but if that is the burden which is to be imposed upon anyone in the future—and I so conceive it—I intend at the proper time to move to strike the entire section, because it is meaningless. We all agree that we cannot even bind this Congress for the remainder of the session. We cannot bind the next Congress. I do not intend to be a party to trying to bind this Congress or any future Congress. I do not wish to place a burden upon anyone who may in the future wish to establish some authority.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I yield.

Mr. MURRAY. The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER] states exactly the position which I sought to state a few moments ago. There should be no need for such a provision in this bill, unless it is intended to declare a policy which is to affect the development of river basins in the future. The record in the case shows that such policies have been a failure in the past and will continue to be a failure in the future. I do not need to depend upon newspapers from St. Louis to tell me that. We know it from our actual experience in the West. I know that during all the years while this work has been going on, the results which have been accomplished have been very poor.

I have before me an editorial from the New York Times, which I should like to submit for the RECORD at this point in my statement. It indicates the great need for unified development of river basins, and the possibilities which might flow from such development. I ask unanimous consent that an editorial entitled "Future of the Northwest" published in the New York Times of July 16, 1944, be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FUTURE OF THE NORTHWEST

Like the rest of the country, the Pacific Northwest is booming, and it is booming, for one reason, because of Columbia River electric power. The region has one-third of the Nation's aluminum capacity. It is producing magnesium, ferro-alloys, calcium carbide, chlorates, metallurgical coke, zinc, copper, mercury, tungsten, antimony. Much lumber comes from its forests, and much grain and fruit from its farms and ranches. But the development is lopsided because it has thus far met the exigencies of war primarily. No region in the country has such a varied climate and such an agricultural and industrial future. If the most is to be made of such possibilities, if the expected post-war slump is to be largely averted, an entirely new administrative structure is needed—a structure clothed with such authority that it will not merely supply electric energy to factories and homes but help knit the Pacific Northwest into an economic fabric in accordance with far-reaching plans already laid.

An example of what can be done is presented by the Tennessee Valley Authority, which has such broad powers that it can carry out a flood-control program, aid navigation, distribute power to factories and households, develop parks for recreation, conserve soil, reclaim land, and engage in about any other activity that does not properly belong to private enterprise. In the Columbia Valley, by contrast, half a dozen separate agencies and bureaus are trying to perform a similar task. Some, like the Bonneville Administration and the Reclamation Service, are part of the Department of the Interior; some fall in the jurisdiction of the Departments of War and Agriculture; others are State bodies.

The Pacific Northwest has resources far richer than those of the Tennessee Valley. Its industrial and agricultural activities are not sufficiently diversified and may decline after the war. Its population is relatively smaller to the square mile than that of the Tennessee Valley and anything but permanent in these war days. Markets are not near at hand. There is no difficulty about selling Columbia River power. The question is how it can be sold to the greatest advantage to selected industries and to farmers who must learn what the region needs. For all these reasons the Bonneville Administration should have the corporation form of administration which has been so successful in the Tennessee Valley, so that it may change its policies to meet new social needs. It should conduct more practical research to make the most of land, water, mineral resources, and forests.

This does not mean that States and local communities must relinquish all their rights, but it does mean that they will have to give up claims for individual consideration. As it is, the Bonneville Administration has the necessary leaders, but they are hampered because they must take orders from Washington and at the same time yield to local ambition. This is the time to reorganize the administration now charged with making the most of Columbia River power. If Congress waits until the war is over and the workers in the shipyards and industrial plants migrate, years may elapse before the Pacific Northwest can march forward with the certainty of reaching its goal.

Mr. MURRAY. I also ask that, following my remarks, there be printed in the RECORD a brief summary of a statement which I have prepared.

There being no objection, the summary was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE OMAHA AGREEMENT OF THE ARMY ENGINEERS AND THE BUREAU OF RECLAMATION

The so-called Omaha agreement between the Bureau of Reclamation and the Army engineers is strictly an engineering agreement providing the basis for comprehensive and integrated development of the Missouri River system only as regards structures to be

built and the capacity of the reservoirs, thereby reconciling the differences between the Army's plan and the Bureau's plan. This agreement resulted from demands of the Congress, the Bureau of the Budget in behalf of the President, and the State Governors' resolutions for presentation of an agreed plan after the Bureau of Reclamation had opposed the authorization of the so-called Pick plan of the Army engineers which the Bureau said would foreclose certain phases of beneficial development of the valley. The basis of the engineering agreement, which has been called the Omaha agreement, is that upstream structures assure certain use of the waters for irrigation and power and that a certain amount of reservoir space provide for protection against flood control and a certain amount of water be available for downstream navigation.

Close observers have noted that the Army's willingness to consider such a compromise increased after opposition by the Bureau of Reclamation before the Senate to the Pick plan and increased again to such a point that a compromise was possible following the introduction of the Murray bill for the establishment of a Missouri Valley Authority and similar bills which were given wide support. The President's message endorsing the principle of an authority for the basin preceded the Omaha agreement by only a few weeks.

DOES NOT FORECLOSE THE MISSOURI VALLEY AUTHORITY

The so-called Omaha agreement does not foreclose the establishment of a Missouri Valley Authority nor does it solve a great number of questions which might be solved by such an authority. While the Omaha agreement provides for comprehensive development of the river system in its entirety, it gives consideration largely to irrigation, power, flood control, and navigation principally. It does not, of course, provide for a singly unified administration of the comprehensive development. The Bureau of Reclamation is on record in testimony before the Senate Commerce Committee and in public statements to the effect that this plan in no way forecloses a single agency administering the development of the whole river. The agreement, however, is intended to end or reduce conflict between the various multiple interests of the Department of the Interior in the valley and the flood-control and navigation interests of the War Department. It is believed that the development contemplated in the so-called Omaha agreement would be a necessary part, but not all, of any development undertaken were the Congress to provide a single authority to administer the resources of the valley.

PENDING RIVERS AND HARBORS AND FLOOD-CONTROL BILLS

There are pending before the Senate omnibus rivers and harbors and flood-control bills. Both of these measures embrace a wide variety of development in no way related to the Missouri Valley, as well as certain items that are related to the valley. These two measures are objectionable on several scores to the Department of the Interior and the Bureau of Reclamation both as to the Missouri River items and the other items. Broadly speaking, the Department of the Interior does not think that they provide for and protect fully the programs of orderly, integrated resource development with which the Department is concerned. Included in the non-Missouri Valley items in both these twin measures on flood control and rivers and harbors are a number of developments in various other areas for which the President has indicated a desire for authority bills to provide for unified basin-wide administration. It is the opinion of the Department of the Interior and the Bureau of Reclamation that more adequate consideration to the needs of the affected areas can be given by the Congress if action on these omnibus measures is deferred until the new Congress is in session.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, in answer to both the Senator from Kentucky and the Senator from Montana, let me say that certainly until some legislation of this character is enacted, we shall be proceeding with the authorization and construction of many valuable projects without a declaration of policy by law. Our policy at present is being fixed by Executive order. As the Senator from Montana says, that is a pretty weak way to do it. Possibly we are not getting the maximum results. Possibly valley authorities would be a better method of procedure. I do not know. But certainly until such time as the Congress acts and creates the authorities, there ought to be a legislative policy with respect to the procedure. This may be a weak policy, but certainly we have none now established by the Congress. Therefore we ought to act so as to take care of the interim period. Then if we find that this policy is not adequate, and the Congress wishes to change it, I do not see that any burden would be placed upon any one in changing the policy as we develop the authority program, if that is the way we later decide to pursue the development. If we decide that that is the better course to attain our objectives, namely, the development and utilization of our water resources, it can be done without any violence whatever. The proposed policy would do no violence to the suggested program, so long as the authorities are not in existence.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I yield.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. It seems to me that in this debate it has been overlooked to a very large extent that this is a flood-control bill, not a navigation bill, not a river and harbor bill, not a power bill. It is a flood-control bill; and the question of flood control, not in Montana, but in the lower region of the Missouri River and of the Mississippi River, is the most acute problem we have to face. It seems to me that it is completely overlooked that the whole theory of Federal responsibility and Federal action in flood control is of comparatively recent origin. It was only after the great floods of 1928 and 1929 that Federal responsibility for flood control was ever assumed, and then only as to the main stem of the Mississippi River, Lake Okeechobee in Florida, and the Sacramento River in California. It has only been since I have been a Member of the Senate, and since the Senator from Louisiana, who is in charge of the bill, has been a Member of the Senate, that there has been established the principle of Federal responsibility for flood control on the tributaries as well as the main stems of the great rivers. That has necessarily been a piecemeal business. We have made an advance from one stage to another. Therefore, it has been largely a matter of specific authorizations by Congress in each particular bill, and a very large measure of discretion has been left to Government agencies.

The pending committee amendment, adopted from the bill of the Senator from Arkansas, represents nothing more than an effort to formulate a general policy as the policy to be pursued by executive agencies in progressive flood-control measures, until such time as the Congress may see fit to change the policy. If the Congress wishes to establish a Missouri Valley Authority, which I think is preposterous, there is nothing to prevent Congress from doing so. But until Congress sees fit to do so, all that it is proposed to do by this amendment, which is adopted from the measure introduced by the Senator from Arkansas, is to establish a general rule for guidance in matters of flood control, in a field which has only recently, within the service of a great many Members of the Senate, been assumed by the Federal Government.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, the Senator from Missouri has well stated the position of the proponents of the amendment. The thing which prompted me to introduce such a measure was the fact that the development of the Arkansas and the White River Valleys was then and is now under way. Projects are under construction, and others are authorized, awaiting the end of the war, when materials can be made available. We are proceeding with this construction without a definite legislative policy.

There should be something to guide us, something to point out what our objectives are, and to point out the manner in which we intend to achieve them.

Now I yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, sometime earlier this afternoon, before a number of the Senators who now are discussing the matter were in the Chamber, a statement was made on behalf of the subcommittee by both the chairman of the subcommittee and myself as a member of it. That statement emphasized the point which the Senator from Arkansas is now making. The Senator from Arkansas introduced a statement of policy in his bill. That statement of policy, which fitted well into the general bill, has been incorporated in the pending bill.

To this statement of policy I understand that the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] is requesting the adoption of an amendment providing merely for the insertion of the words "provided for in this act." This is to make the section refer expressly and only to the improvements provided for in this act. It seems to me that what he has in mind is that, first of all, the Congress cannot now establish a policy which will bind future Congresses, and that, furthermore, this bill does not prohibit the setting up of new agencies. The bill does, however, contain a statement that we wish to make all necessary improvements in America, with the least possible waste of mechanics of government in doing so.

In the pending bill we have attempted to give an illustration of how to accomplish a considerable amount of our objective with existing agencies. We do not wish to have the bill used or cited in an

executive decree or executive order or in any kind of directive as authority for the establishment of a new authority to manage the things which we have said can be managed by existing authorities as provided for in the bill.

Therefore, I think it is important for us to emphasize the fact that we think the work can be done by existing agencies, that we so declare, and that we do not leave the bill as merely authorizing independent projects under no general policy. We should declare that it is our policy to use and coordinate the existing agencies. Such a declaration will make it impossible for this bill to be cited as authority for doing such things in some other way. If the Congress later desires to have the work done in some other way, that will be all right. I think the pending bill is an example of how to do it under existing authority, and I think it highly important to make that statement of policy in the opening paragraph of the bill.

Mr. McCLELLAN. By doing so, Congress would retain the power of saying how it should be done.

Mr. President, with respect to the amendment of the Senator from Kentucky, let me say that his amendment would simply restrict the application of this policy to the projects authorized under the pending bill. In the pending bill we are authorizing projects on streams which are more or less interrelated to other projects already authorized. It seems to me that no legislative policy along that line has been declared as to them at all. They are subject to any sort of Executive order with reference to policy or other matters. But if we adopt the amendment proposed by the Senator from Kentucky, we say that this policy will apply only to the projects covered under the pending bill. And with respect to other projects heretofore authorized on the same streams, there is no legislative policy as to them. Therefore, it seems to me that either the whole committee amendment should be stricken from the bill—I say that in all sincerity—or it should be retained and adopted just as it is, whichever the Congress wishes to do. If we strike out all of it, then we have no legislative policy, and will continue to proceed as heretofore without any adequate legislative policy or direction. If we retain the committee amendment, then Congress has fixed the policy which will control until such time as it may be changed.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I yield first to the Senator from Montana, who has been on his feet for some time.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, I wish to call attention to the fact that the Senator from Missouri stated a moment ago that the pending bill is a flood-control bill. While it is true that it is a flood-control bill, we must bear in mind that its provisions reach much further than do the provisions of a mere flood-control bill, because in the pending bill an effort is made to lay down a policy not only as to flood control but with respect to the development of power, the sale of power, irrigation, and reclamation. While it is true that the next Congress or even the present Congress can change such a policy, in that connection I have a distinct recollection regarding legislation which developed with reference to the Fort Peck Dam. Because of the fact that the War Department desired to have a certain amendment adopted, and it was adopted, I was confronted with the proposition that a policy with reference to the Fort Peck Dam had been laid down by the War Department, even though it was never intended as a policy of the administration when the legislation was enacted. But that was constantly thrown in my teeth by the Senator from Louisiana and the Senator from Missouri——

Mr. OVERTON. Oh, no, Mr. President; the Senator is in error about that.

Mr. WHEELER. I do not think I am in error about it.

Mr. OVERTON. I will make my statement later, but I should like to say now that what I said to the Senator was that the undertaking was authorized as a navigation and irrigation project. That is what I said, and that is all I said. I did not say that future Congresses could not change it.

Mr. WHEELER. Of course, the Senator did not say so.

Mr. OVERTON. Certainly I did not. The Senator from Montana took the position that the undertaking was an irrigation project.

Mr. WHEELER. Oh, no, Mr. President; the Senator is entirely mistaken about that. I did not take the position that it was an irrigation project.

Mr. OVERTON. I so understood.

Mr. WHEELER. I took the position that it was a flood-control, navigation, and irrigation project.

Mr. OVERTON. Yes; but the Senator said that irrigation was transcendental.

Mr. WHEELER. Oh, no; the Senator is mistaken.

Mr. OVERTON. Very well. Then we are both agreed that it was a navigation project. And that is what it is today.

Mr. WHEELER. That is correct—navigation, irrigation, and flood control.

Mr. OVERTON. And power.

Mr. WHEELER. There can be no question about that now. It so happens that I was the Senator who talked first to the President about it, and I know what was in his mind.

Mr. OVERTON. I do not know what the President said, but I know what Congress said when it authorized it.

Mr. WHEELER. But that was after the project had been started. It had been started and projected under the Public Works Administration. Then, after it had been commenced, in order to obtain a further appropriation, in addition to the W. P. A. funds, to be used to complete it, the amendment to which I have referred was suggested. It never for 1 second occurred to me or to anyone else that the amendment would be cited as a declaration of policy, and that the statement would be made that the project was merely for flood control or for navigation, as the Senator and as members of his committee have contended.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, the Senator is in error. Neither the War Department nor I so contended.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, I think I have the floor; the Senator from Arkansas yielded to me.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, as I just said, neither the War Department nor I ever made such a contention. He said it was for all those purposes. That testimony is contained in the hearings.

Mr. WHEELER. I also call attention to the fact that a policy for reclamation, a policy for power, and a policy for the sale of power are being inserted in the pending bill. It provides specifically that power which happens to be generated at such projects cannot be sold except at wholesale. It can be sold at wholesale. A reclamation project can grow out of this project, provided the Secretary of War——

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, that provision is in another section of the bill. It is not contained in this section of the bill.

Mr. WHEELER. Yes; but that is the policy which is being laid down in the bill. If the project can be used for irrigation and reclamation, the Secretary of the Interior will be able to go to the Secretary of War, with his hat in his hand, and if the Secretary of War says that the project can be used for irrigation and that it is proper for irrigation, then it will be agreed that some of the water can be used for irrigation and reclamation, provided, of course, that they come back to Congress, and provided, of course, that the persons concerned can afford to pay for it, and provided, of course, something else.

I submit that when we lay down a policy of that kind, everyone who comes to Congress in the future with an application for a reclamation project or for some similar project will be confronted with this policy, as laid down by the Congress of the United States, and will be told that this is the definite policy which should be followed.

I am interested in flood control projects being favorably considered, because floods occur in my State. Perhaps they are not so devastating as the floods which occur in Missouri, but, nevertheless, we have had some devastating floods in Montana. When, however, it is proposed to regulate irrigation, navigation, and reclamation in Montana, I am opposed to that being done without at least certain restrictions. I am interested in navigation, and I have helped in every way in which I could in the promotion of navigation, but I do not want those who are interested in navigation to come into my State and tell us how our reclamation is to be regulated, or how the sale of power is to be regulated. It seems to me that that is something which should not be laid down as a national policy in this kind of bill. It should be treated as a separate problem.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, the Senator from Montana is far better informed than I with respect to reclamation and irrigation projects, and the need

of water and its uses in the State of Montana. Neither by the section under discussion nor by any other do I wish to do any violence to the State of Montana or any other State which needs and depends on irrigation projects. But with respect to a policy as to power, I believe that it should be the same throughout the Nation. I may be wrong about it. Today the power generated from the dams to which reference has been made is subject to Executive order. If we are to develop our waterways, I believe that the time has come for Congress to say what the policy is to be. If the policy is a wrong one, we should change it. But Congress should assume responsibility for it, and then we can move ahead and make progress.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, I agree with the Senator from Arkansas. We should have a policy for power. It should not be left to the whim of any one of the executive branches of the Government. I am also in thorough accord with the suggestion that we should have a policy with reference to flood control, and that it should not be left to the whim of any executive department, whether it be the War Department, the Interior Department, or any other department. The same thing is true with regard to reclamation.

What I am objecting to, however, is the claim that we should establish a policy with reference to reclamation or power in a flood-control bill. It seems to me that sufficient opportunity is not given us to give the matter the consideration which some of us believe it should have.

I may be in error, and I hope the Senator from Louisiana will correct me if I am, but because of a speech which he made in Louisiana the people in the Northwest were certainly stirred up. He talked about certain uses of the waters which should come first, and stated that irrigation should come next.

Mr. OVERTON. Who said that? Was the Senator present?

Mr. WHEELER. When we come to the question of what is most important in this country——

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President——

Mr. WHEELER. Allow me to finish my statement and then I will yield.

When we come to the question of what is most important for the masses of the people of this country, whether it be to allow a little more water to go down the Missouri River for the Standard Oil Co. and a few other big companies which operate and put the money in their pockets, or to furnish homes for the soldiers who will come back and need homes to live in, I shall want to discuss the problem at some length on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I do not know whether the Senator meant any implication in his remark about the Standard Oil Co.

Mr. WHEELER. No. I read the testimony before the committee. This is what happened with reference to irrigation: When the Standard Oil Co. representative from Kentucky was testifying, he stated that the money which the company had made was not passed on to the consumer, but that it was put into the pockets of the company and never passed on to the consumer in any instance. If the Senator will check up on the oil shipped up the Mississippi River, on the lumber which goes down the river, and on the cement which goes up, he will find that not a single solitary nickel or dime was passed on to the consuming public of this country.

Mr. McCLELLAN. The people of the State of Montana may need water for irrigation and agricultural purposes. In our State we have to keep the water off our lands. There is a line somewhere between Montana and Arkansas where our rights will not conflict, and where the people of the State of Montana may have irrigation and we of Arkansas may restrain the flood waters. That is what I hope to see done. I want to see dams built primarily for flood control. I am speaking of projects farther down the stream. I am sure they would not conflict in any way with the program which the Senator desires to see adopted for his State.

The Senator representing Montana, and I, in my humble effort to represent Arkansas, should have sufficient intelligence to get together on this matter and quit quarreling about it. The Senate should be able to establish a national policy which will enable us to construct the proposed projects, and build up our country.

Mr. WHEELER. I agree with the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I yield.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I agree entirely with what the Senator from Arkansas has said. But in view of what the Senator from Montana has said about the character of the pending bill, I wish to call attention to the fact that the bill originally started as a strictly flood-control measure, and that the whole question of irrigation and reclamation was injected into the measure entirely improperly and irrelevantly, in my opinion, by an amendment introduced by the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], joined in by numerous Senators from other irrigation States. They undertook to establish an absolute priority in futurity, not only as to the use of water for existing irrigation projects, but in all futurity for any project which they might devise, including one which would extend into Canada and divert water from the Missouri Basin into an entirely different watershed.

The controversy concerning that matter was waged not by the people who are interested in flood control, but by Senators who went before the committee, sat with the committee, and, through the courtesy of the committee, proceeded to examine, cross-examine, and browbeat witnesses when they could do so. They were not interested in the slightest degree in flood control, but were interested in establishing a priority for all the future with regard to all water which might fall on the Missouri watershed.

Mr. President, I believe it is unfair for the Senator from Montana, who is my very dear friend, to say at this time that the bill is not a strictly flood-control bill because the provisions which have to do with anything else than flood control were not inserted by those who were interested in flood control, but were inserted in the committee in an effort to compromise with and satisfy the people who are interested in power, irrigation, reclamation, and other subjects.

This controversy originally took place, not on the flood-control bill, but on the river and harbor bill, where it certainly had no place whatever. I repeat, those who were interested in navigation and those who were interested in flood control were not responsible for injecting extraneous issues into those two measures.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President——

Mr. McCLELLAN. I yield to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, awhile ago I asked the Senator to yield to me merely to call attention to the fact that Congress has not been devoid of a policy with respect to the improvement of rivers and harbors, nor as to flood control. There has not been a river and harbor bill passed, as I recall, certainly since I have been a Member of Congress, which did not carry the specific provision that the improvements carried in the bill should be handled by the Secretary of War through the Chief of Engineers. That has always been the policy of Congress, that river and harbor improvements should be carried on through the Corps of Engineers.

The Flood Control Act of 1936 enunciated the policy that the improvements for flood control should be under the direction of the Secretary of War, through the Chief of Engineers, subject to the right of the President to allocate priorities for emergency flood-control projects. In other words, he had the right, under the act of 1936, to designate which projects he thought were most emergent, because they could not all be carried on at the same time, they could not be begun at the same time. But we have had that policy with respect to flood control, and that is still the law, and it is still the law and we had the same policy with respect to the improvement of rivers and harbors. Therefore I do not agree with the observation of the Senator from Arkansas that we have never had any policy with regard to these improvements. We have had a policy.

Inasmuch as it has been the policy, both as to river and harbor improvements and flood control, that these projects be carried on under the directions of the Secretary of War through the Chief of Engineers, it seems to me unnecessary in this bill to reiterate that policy. If it is to be limited to the matters carried in the bill or covered by the policy heretofore adopted, I cannot see any reason for writing in a new policy, which does not contemplate anything else. If it contemplates something beyond river and harbor improvements and beyond flood control, we should know what it is.

It is for that reason that I offered the amendment to the language under consideration, limiting the policy to the

projects carried in the bill, which has always been done heretofore when Congress has passed any sort of flood-control or river and harbor improvement bill, to be administered under the Chief of Engineers, or the Secretary of War through the Chief of Engineers.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Will the Senator enlighten me as to what, under existing law, is the policy established by Congress with reference to the disposition and handling of power derived from these projects?

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator would require me, in answer to that question, to coordinate from memory the provisions of the Federal Power Act. Many years ago we passed the Federal Power Act, setting up the Federal Power Commission, which was instructed, under the law, to cooperate with and to make use of the Corps of Engineers in the construction of dams for power purposes. I could not from memory give all the provisions of the Power Act, but there is nothing inconsistent between the Federal Power Act and the various annual appropriations by Congress for the improvement of rivers and harbors, or even flood control.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Let me ask the Senator if it is not true that when projects are constructed under existing flood-control acts, multiple-purpose projects, from which electricity is generated, there is no provision in the general flood-control acts with respect to the sale and distribution of the power, but it is now being handled by Executive order.

Mr. BARKLEY. I do not think the amendment we have under discussion now has any relationship to the question of the disposition of power. The amendment offered by the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY] today dealt with that subject, and this amendment, attempting to establish a policy, it seems to me, deals more with the inauguration and construction of the projects than the final disposition of power that may be created under them.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arkansas yield?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I am about to yield the floor.

Mr. MAYBANK. I wish to ask the Senator from Kentucky a question.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. MAYBANK. The Senator from Kentucky mentioned the Federal Power Commission law. I should like to ask the Senator from Kentucky if it is not a fact that the construction of any of these dams might have in view the generation of electricity. After they have been approved by the Army engineers, as the Senator suggested, is it not necessary that additional hearings be held by the Federal Power Commission before any permission is granted for the sale of power?

Mr. BARKLEY. I think that is true. They have general authority, under the law, to pass upon a license before disposing of power generated by a dam, even though the dam is approved by the Chief of Engineers.

The primary function of the Corps of Engineers in regard to the improvement of rivers originally was to pass upon whether a proposed improvement would obstruct navigation or improve navigation. That has been enlarged from time to time. By and large, any prospective producer of power must have a license from the Federal Power Commission.

Mr. MAYBANK. How about the Government?

Mr. BARKLEY. I am not able to say from memory whether that applies to the Government.

Mr. MAYBANK. But before a prospective producer of power on any river can get his license the Federal Power Commission holds proper hearings?

Mr. BARKLEY. That is true; they have to do that; they have to determine who is best able to produce the power.

Mr. MAYBANK. And whether it is necessary?

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes.

Mr. McCLELLAN. That would not apply to the multiple projects, would it?

Mr. BARKLEY. Only incidentally, because sometimes the production of power in flood-control projects is incidental. Indeed, in most cases it is incidental.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I have stated my position with respect to the proposed modification of the committee amendment, and I hope it will not be adopted.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] to the committee amendment.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, it is apparent that we cannot pass the bill this evening, and as there are some further provisions with respect to irrigation and reclamation which very seriously affect the whole northwestern area, I should like to have an opportunity to study them during the evening, as I have not had an opportunity to do so. For that reason I am going to ask that the bill may go over until tomorrow.

Mr. OVERTON. Can we not dispose of this one amendment?

Mr. WHEELER. No, because I think this whole amendment vitally affects the provisions with reference to irrigation and reclamation, and before we pass upon it I should like to have an opportunity to see how far it does affect irrigation. For instance, I find this provision:

> Such irrigation works may be undertaken only after a report and findings thereon have been made by the Secretary of the Interior as provided in said Federal reclamation laws and after subsequent specific authorization of the Congress by an authorization act; and, within the limits of the water users' repayment ability, such report may be predicated on the allocation to irrigation of an appropriate portion of the cost of structures and facilities used for irrigation and other purposes.

From a hasty reading of the language, a serious question is raised in my mind as to whether the Secretary of War would not have to pass upon the question of whether people about to receive the benefit of the improvement would be able to repay the cost, rather than have that determined by the Reclamation Bureau and the Department of the Interior, who are always the ones properly to pass upon the question.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, the Secretary of War has nothing to do with that.

Mr. WHEELER. I am not so sure but that the Senator is making that statement too hastily. Notwithstanding what the Senator's assistant tells him, I think there is a very serious question as to whether the Secretary of War does not have to do with it. At least, I desire to look into the matter further.

Mr. OVERTON. Very well.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the amendment being passed over? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, on behalf of the senior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HAWKES], who has been called from the Senate Chamber this afternoon, I offer an amendment to section 10, on page 38, after line 22, which has to do with authorizing a survey or preliminary examination of a project.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 38, after line 22, it is proposed to insert the following:

> Absecon Island, N. J., with a view to the protection of Atlantic City, Ventnor, Margate City, Longport, and other areas on the New Jersey coast that have been affected from floods due to tide and wind.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the amendment?

Mr. OVERTON. There is no objection so far as I am concerned, Mr. President.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, I do not know of any further amendments to be taken up this afternoon. Quite a number of amendments have gone over. I hope we may be able to complete action on the bill tomorrow.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. BARKLEY. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations (and withdrawing a nomination), which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received and nomination withdrawn, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts:

From the Committee on Finance:

Brig. Gen. Frank T. Hines, United States Army, to be Retraining and Reemployment Administrator, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate; and

William H. Burke, Jr., of Northampton, Mass., to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 4, with headquarters at Boston, Mass., to fill an existing vacancy.

From the Committee on Naval Affairs:

Capt. Harry L. Merring, United States Navy, retired, to be a rear admiral in the Navy on the retired list, for temporary service, to continue while serving as Deputy Chief of Industrial Readjustment Branch of the Office of Procurement and Material;

William F. Hausman, a naval aviator of the Marine Corps Reserve, to be a first lieutenant in the Regular Marine Corps, in accordance with the provisions of the Naval Aviation Personnel Act of 1940, as amended, to rank from the 1st day of September 1939; and

Sundry naval aviators in the Marine Corps Reserve, a meritorious noncommissioned officer, and sundry citizens to be second lieutenants in the Marine Corps.

By Mr. WILEY, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

Charles H. Cashin, of Wisconsin, to be United States attorney for the western district of Wisconsin, vice John J. Boyle, deceased.

By Mr. BAILEY, from the Committee on Commerce:

Harllee Branch, of Georgia, to be a member of the Civil Aeronautics Board for the term of 6 years from January 1, 1945 (reappointment); and

Sundry officers for appointment and/or promotion for temporary service in the Coast Guard.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

UNITED STATES MARITIME COMMISSION—NOMINATION PASSED OVER

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Edward Macauley, of California, to be a member, United States Maritime Commission, for the term of 6 years from September 26, 1944.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President, in view of the fact that the Committee on Commerce reported this nomination on September 20, 1944, I think I should say to the Senate that consideration of the nomination has been delayed at the instance of the senior Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN], who is absent and who informs me that he is not likely to appear here prior to the first of December. The committee has approved the nomination. I do not think any charges are pending in the committee against this nominee. There never have been charges made against him. Whether the Senate will proceed to consider the nomination or not is a question for the Senate to decide. The facts are that Captain Macauley's term expired just about the time Congress adjourned prior to the election. So he has been deprived of his salary from then until now and will be deprived of it until we confirm the nomination. Moreover, the Maritime Commission is deprived of his services.

I submit the matter to the Senate. I do not know whether the Senate wishes to await the return of the senior Senator from Nevada. If it does, I have no objection. But I believe that Captain Macauley is entitled to some consideration. Action on his nomination has been delayed from September 20 until now; that is, for 2 months the matter has been hanging fire here.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to this nomination?

The nomination was confirmed.

UNITED STATES PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the United States Public Health Service.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nominations in the United States Public Health Service will be confirmed en bloc.

That completes the Executive Calendar.

AUTHORIZATION TO RECEIVE AND REFER NOMINATIONS

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that any nominations that may be sent to the Senate by the President today may be received by the Secretary of the Senate and be appropriately referred.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Kentucky?

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, does the request include appropriate reference of the nominations to committees?

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the request will be granted.

(Subsequently, sundry nominations to the Office of War Mobilization and Reconversion and the Surplus Property Board were received and, under the above order, appropriately referred.)

RECESS

Mr. BARKLEY. As in legislative session, I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 18 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Wednesday, November 22, 1944, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate November 21, 1944:

THE JUDICIARY

DISTRICT COURT OF THE UNITED STATES FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Henry A. Schweinhaut, of Maryland, to be an associate justice of the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia, vice Hon. Oscar R. Luhring, deceased.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEYS

Gerald A. Gleeson, of Pennsylvania, to be United States attorney for the eastern district of Pennsylvania. (Mr. Gleeson is now serving in this office under an appointment which expired October 8, 1944.)

Steve M. King, of Texas, to be United States attorney for the eastern district of Texas. (Mr. King is now serving in this office under an appointment which expired July 30, 1944.)

UNITED STATES MARSHAL

Jordan B. Royall, of Florida, to be United States marshal for the northern district of Florida. (Mr. Royall is now serving in this office under an appointment which expired June 19, 1944.)

SURPLUS PROPERTY BOARD

The following-named persons to be members of the Surplus Property Board:

Robert A. Hurley, of Connecticut.

Lt. Col. Edward Heller, of California.

OFFICE OF WAR MOBILIZATION AND RECONVERSION

The following-named persons to be members of the Advisory Board, Office of War Mobilization and Reconversion:

PUBLIC MEMBERS

O. Max Gardner, of North Carolina.
William H. Davis, of New York.
Anna M. Rosenberg, of New York.

LABOR MEMBERS

William Green, of Ohio.
Philip Murray, of Pennsylvania.
T. C. Cashen, of New York.

AGRICULTURE MEMBERS

Edward A. O'Neal, of Alabama.
James G. Patton, of Colorado.
Albert S. Goss, of Washington.

INDUSTRY MEMBERS

Eric A. Johnston, of Washington.
George H. Mead, of Ohio.
Nathaniel Dyke, Jr., of Arkansas.

REGISTER OF LAND OFFICE

Richard McElligott, of Oregon, to be register of the land office at Roseburg, Oreg., terminating recess appointment, vice George Finley.

TEMPORARY APPOINTMENTS IN THE ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

To be lieutenant general

Maj. Gen. Wilhelm Delp Styer (colonel, Corps of Engineers), Army of the United States.

To be major generals

Brig. Gen. James Maurice Gavin (captain, Infantry), Army of the United States.

Brig. Gen. Clarence Ames Martin (lieutenant colonel, Infantry), Army of the United States.

Brig. Gen. Orvil Arson Anderson (lieutenant colonel, Air Corps; temporary colonel, Army of the United States, Air Corps), Army of the United States.

Brig. Gen. John Y. York, Jr. (lieutenant colonel, Air Corps; temporary colonel, Air Corps), Army of the United States.

Brig. Gen. Robert Morris Webster (lieutenant colonel, Air Corps; temporary colonel, Army of the United States, Air Corps), Army of the United States.

Brig. Gen. Kenneth Bonner Wolfe (lieutenant colonel, Air Corps; temporary colonel, Air Corps), Army of the United States.

Brig. Gen. Leo Donovan (lieutenant colonel, Infantry), Army of the United States.

Brig. Gen. Harry Briggs Vaughan (lieutenant colonel, Corps of Engineers), Army of the United States.

Brig. Gen. Arthur Arnim White (colonel, Field Artillery), Army of the United States.

Brig. Gen. Willard Gordon Wyman (lieutenant colonel, Cavalry), Army of the United States.

Brig. Gen. Wilton Burton Persons (lieutenant colonel, Signal Corps), Army of the United States.

Brig. Gen. James Edmund Parker (lieutenant colonel, Air Corps; temporary colonel, Army of the United States, Air Corps), Army of the United States.

Brig. Gen. Frank Emil Stoner (lieutenant colonel, Signal Corps), Army of the United States.

Brig. Gen. Russel Burton Reynolds (lieutenant colonel, Infantry), Army of the United States.

Brig. Gen. Julian Sommerville Hatcher (colonel, Ordnance Department), Army of the United States.

Brig. Gen. Clyde Lloyd Hyssong (lieutenant colonel, Infantry), Army of the United States.

Brig. Gen. William Howard Arnold (major, Infantry), Army of the United States.

Brig. Gen. Royal Bertrand Lord (major, Corps of Engineers), Army of the United States.

Brig. Gen. James Alward Van Fleet (colonel, Infantry), Army of the United States.

Brig. Gen. Carl Adolphus Hardigg (colonel, Quartermaster Corps), Army of the United States.

Chaplain William Richard Arnold (brigadier general, Chief of Chaplains), United States Army.

Brig. Gen. Otto Lauren Nelson, Jr. (major, Infantry), Army of the United States.

To be brigadier generals

Col. William Thaddeus Sexton (major, Field Artillery), Army of the United States.

Col. Josiah Toney Dalbey (lieutenant colonel, Infantry), Army of the United States.

Col. Francis Kosier Newcomer, Corps of Engineers.

Col. Robert Reese Neyland, Jr. (major, Corps of Engineers), Army of the United States.

Col. Clyde Davis Eddleman (major, Infantry), Army of the United States.

Col. Walter Edwin Todd (captain, Air Corps; temporary lieutenant colonel, Air Corps; temporary colonel, Army of the United States, Air Corps), Army of the United States.

Col. Robert Ward Berry (major, Coast Artillery Corps), Army of the United States.

Col. Morrill Watson Marston (lieutenant colonel, Infantry), Army of the United States.

Col. Hugh Bryan Hester (lieutenant colonel, Quartermaster Corps), Army of the United States.

Col. Matthew John Gunner, Infantry.

Col. John Andrews Rogers, Medical Corps.

Col. Jack Weston Wood (captain, Air Corps; temporary lieutenant colonel, Air Corps; temporary colonel, Army of the United States, Air Corps), Army of the United States.

Col. Walter Joseph Muller (lieutenant colonel, Infantry), Army of the United States.

Col. Fenton Stratton Jacobs (lieutenant colonel, Cavalry), Army of the United States.

Col. Herbert Bernard Loper (lieutenant colonel, Corps of Engineers), Army of the United States.

Col. James Michael Fitzmaurice (major, Air Corps; temporary lieutenant colonel, Air Corps; temporary colonel, Army of the United States, Air Corps), Army of the United States.

Col. Carroll Arthur Powell (lieutenant colonel, Signal Corps), Army of the United States.

Col. Roy William Grower (lieutenant colonel, Corps of Engineers), Army of the United States.

Col. William Joseph Morrissey, Infantry.

Col. Joseph James O'Hare (lieutenant colonel, Infantry), Army of the United States.

Col. William Lecel Lee (captain, Air Corps; temporary lieutenant colonel, Air Corps; temporary colonel, Army of the United States, Air Corps), Army of the United States.

Col. John Moore Thompson, Cavalry.

Col. Kendall Jordan Fielder (lieutenant colonel, Infantry), Army of the United States.

Col. Francis Andrew March (lieutenant colonel, Field Artillery), Army of the United States.

Col. Lewis Tenney Ross (lieutenant colonel, Corps of Engineers), Army of the United States.

Col. Charles Frederick Colson (lieutenant colonel, Infantry), Army of the United States.

Col. Halley Grey Maddox (lieutenant colonel, Cavalry), Army of the United States.

Col. Edmund Clayton Lynch (major, Air Corps; temporary lieutenant colonel, Air Corps; temporary colonel, Army of the United States, Air Corps), Army of the United States.

Col. Neal Henry McKay (lieutenant colonel, Quartermaster Corps), Army of the United States.

Col. John Howell Collier (lieutenant colonel, Cavalry), Army of the United States.

Col. Ralph Julian Canine (lieutenant colonel, Field Artillery), Army of the United States.

Col. Wayne Carleton Smith (major, Infantry), Army of the United States.

Col. Clyde Massey (major, Cavalry), Army of the United States.

Col. John Paul Doyle (major, Air Corps; temporary lieutenant colonel, Air Corps; temporary colonel, Army of the United States, Air Corps), Army of the United States.

Col. Francis Augustus Englehart, Ordnance Department.

Col. Bruce Cooper Clarke (major, Corps of Engineers), Army of the United States.

Col. Emil Lenzner (major, Signal Corps), Army of the United States.

Col. Leroy Hugh Watson, Infantry.

Col. James Creel Marshall (lieutenant colonel, Corps of Engineers), Army of the United States.

Col. Robinson Earl Duff (lieutenant colonel, Infantry), Army of the United States.

Col. William Albert Collier (lieutenant colonel, Infantry), Army of the United States.

Col. Sumner Waite, Infantry.

Col. Julian Merritt Chappell (captain, Air Corps; temporary lieutenant colonel, Air Corps; temporary colonel, Army of the United States, Air Corps), Army of the United States.

Col. William Franklin Campbell (lieutenant colonel, Quartermaster Corps), Army of the United States.

Col. John Ter Bush Bissell (lieutenant colonel, Field Artillery), Army of the United States.

Col. Carter Weldon Clarke (lieutenant colonel, Signal Corps), Army of the United States.

Col. Ford Larimore Fair (major, Air Corps; temporary lieutenant colonel, Air Corps; temporary colonel, Army of the United States, Air Corps), Army of the United States.

Chaplain (Colonel) George Foreman Rixey, United States Army.

Col. Urban Niblo (lieutenant colonel, Ordnance Department), Army of the United States.

Col. Crump Garvin (lieutenant colonel, Infantry), Army of the United States.

Col. Harry Howard Baird (lieutenant colonel, Cavalry), Army of the United States.

Col. James Stevenson Rodwell (lieutenant colonel, Cavalry), Army of the United States.

Col. Emery Scott Wetzel (captain, Air Corps; temporary lieutenant colonel, Air Corps; temporary colonel, Army of the United States, Air Corps), Army of the United States.

Col. Harold Loring Mace (captain, Air Corps; temporary lieutenant colonel, Air Corps; temporary colonel, Army of the United States, Air Corps), Army of the United States.

Col. Harold Alling McGinnis (lieutenant colonel, Air Corps; temporary colonel, Army of the United States, Air Corps), Army of the United States.

Col. Harold Eugene Eastwood (lieutenant colonel, Cavalry), Army of the United States.

Col. Hammond McDougal Monroe (lieutenant colonel, Infantry), Army of the United States.

Col. Francis Gerard Brink (lieutenant colonel, Infantry), Army of the United States.

Col. Samuel Davis Sturgis, Jr. (lieutenant colonel, Corps of Engineers), Army of the United States.

Col. Ernest Aaron Bixby (lieutenant colonel, Field Artillery), Army of the United States.

Col. John Harold Wilson (lieutenant colonel, Coast Artillery Corps), Army of the United States.

Col. Charles Heyward Barnwell, Jr. (lieutenant colonel, Infantry), Army of the United States.

Col. Ralph Adel Snavely (major, Air Corps; temporary lieutenant colonel, Air Corps; temporary colonel, Army of the United States, Air Corps), Army of the United States.

To be major general

Brig. Gen. William Joseph Donovan (colonel, Cavalry Reserve), Army of the United States.

To be brigadier generals

Col. Robert Wilbar Wilson (lieutenant colonel, Field Artillery Reserve), Army of the United States.

Col. L. Kemper Williams, Infantry Reserve.

Col. Frederick Walker Castle (first lieutenant, Air Reserve; temporary colonel, Army of the United States, Air Corps), Army of the United States.

Col. Archie J. Old, Jr. (captain, Air Reserve; temporary colonel, Army of the United States, Air Corps), Army of the United States.

Col. David Sarnoff, Signal Reserve.

Col. Timothy James Manning (temporary colonel, Army of the United States, Air Corps), Army of the United States.

Col. William Andros Barron, Jr., Army of the United States.

Col. Oscar Nathaniel Solbert, Army of the United States.

Col. John Adams Appleton, Army of the United States.

Col. Rudolph Charles Kuldell, Army of the United States.

HONOR GRADUATES FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE REGULAR ARMY

To be second lieutenants with rank from December 1, 1944

INFANTRY

Douglas Monroe Benbrook
Joseph Anthony Bohnak
Edgar Nicholas Glotzbach
Leroy Arthur Guest
Wilford LeRoy Harrelson, Jr.
Jules Ord Hendricks
Dallas Wilkinson Hoadley
John Merlin Hunter
Clifford Joseph Kalista
Maurice Wesley Kendall
Jonathan Frederic Ladd
John Browder Longley
Ben Hugh Lowry
George Horace Ried
William Bruce Robertson
Edward Ellis Smith
Robert Orion Smythe
Thomas Elton Terry
James Vardaman Thompson
Frederick Alven Wells

CAVALRY

William Francis Callahan, Jr.
John Hamilton Irving, Jr.

FIELD ARTILLERY

Philip Myers Chamberlain, Jr.
Ralph William Deuster
William Jefferson Galloway
James Marion Kidd, Jr.
Charles Ledyard McCord
Billy Murray McCormac
William Charles McKamy
Robert Louis Perdue
Lawrence Harrison Rogers 2d.
Carroll Hamilton Wood
E. T. York, Jr.

COAST ARTILLERY CORPS

Aaron George Amacher
Spencer Roe Baen
Stanley Marlin Block
John William McConnell, Jr.
Frank Watt Rose, Jr.
Vernon Roberts Widerquist

CORPS OF ENGINEERS

Edsel Jay Burkhart
William George Donaldson
John Irwin Dye
Stephen Charles Kaffer

SIGNAL CORPS

Daniel Overton
George Murrell Snead, Jr.

ORDNANCE DEPARTMENT

George Henry Childers
Walter Edward Rafert

CHEMICAL WARFARE SERVICE

David Mortimer Falk

QUARTERMASTER CORPS

William Wooldridge Dillard
Robert Bruce Stiles

APPOINTMENTS IN THE REGULAR ARMY

MEDICAL CORPS

To be first lieutenants, with rank from date of appointment

First Lt. William Karl Barton, Medical Corps Reserve.

Capt. Wayne Peter Beardsley, Army of the United States.

Capt. John Joseph Graff, Army of the United States.

Capt. Hal Bruce Jennings, Jr., Army of the United States.

Capt. Voris Francis McFall, Army of the United States.

Lt. Col. Wayne Creekmore Pittman, Army of the United States.

Capt. Joseph Gilbert Rogers, Army of the United States.

Maj. Carlton Willard Sargent, Army of the United States.

Capt. Walter Frank Smejkal, Army of the United States.

PHARMACY CORPS

To be second lieutenant, with rank from September 1, 1944

Pvt. (1st cl.) Jack Williamson McNamara, Army of the United States.

IN THE NAVY

Commodore Albert G. Noble, United States Navy, to be a rear admiral in the Navy, for temporary service, to rank from the 12th day of April 1943.

Commodore Jerauld Wright, United States Navy, to be a rear admiral in the Navy, for temporary service, to rank from the 5th day of May 1943.

Capt. James Fife, Jr., United States Navy, to be a rear admiral in the Navy, for temporary service, to rank from the 7th day of April 1943.

Capt. Charles W. Styer, United States Navy, to be a rear admiral in the Navy, for temporary service, to rank from the 13th day of April 1943.

Capt. Howard H. J. Benson, United States Navy, to be a commodore in the Navy, for temporary service, to continue while serving as chief of staff and aide to commander, Gulf Sea Frontier.

Capt. Leon S. Fiske, United States Navy, to be a commodore in the Navy, for temporary service, to continue while serving as commander, Service Squadron 12.

Capt. Giles C. Stedman, United States Naval Reserve, to be a commodore in the Naval Reserve, for temporary service, to continue while serving as Superintendent of the United States Merchant Marine Academy, Kings Point, N. Y.

Capt. William J. C. Agnew, Medical Corps, United States Navy, to be a medical director with the rank of rear admiral in the Navy, for temporary service, to continue while serving as Assistant Chief of Bureau of Medicine and Surgery.

Vice Admiral David W. Bagley, United States Navy, to be a vice admiral in the Navy, for temporary service, to continue while serving as commander, Hawaiian Sea Frontier, to rank from the 1st day of February 1944.

Vice Admiral Charles M. Cooke, Jr., United States Navy, to be a vice admiral in the Navy, for temporary service, to rank from the 20th day of September 1944.

Vice Admiral Charles H. McMorris, United States Navy, to be a vice admiral in the Navy, for temporary service, to continue while serving as chief of staff to the commander in chief, United States Pacific Fleet, to rank from the 23d day of September 1944.

Vice Admiral Howard L. Vickery, United States Navy, to be a vice admiral in the Navy, for temporary service, to rank from the 24th day of October 1944.

Rear Admiral Luther Sheldon, Jr. (MC), United States Navy, to be a medical director with the rank of rear admiral in the Navy, for temporary service, to rank from the 15th day of September 1942.

Rear Admiral Lucius W. Johnson (MC), United States Navy, to be a medical director with the rank of rear admiral in the Navy, for temporary service, to rank from the 15th day of September 1942.

Rear Admiral Ingolf N. Kiland, United States Navy, to be a rear admiral in the Navy, for temporary service, to rank from the 26th day of February 1943.

Rear Admiral Thomas R. Cooley, United States Navy, to be a rear admiral in the Navy, for temporary service, to rank from the 20th day of March 1943.

Commodore John J. Mahoney, United States Navy, to be a commodore in the Navy, for temporary service, to continue while serving as commander, United States Naval Operating Base, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, to rank from the 27th day of September 1944.

Commodore Valentine H. Schaeffer, United State Navy, to be a commodore in the Navy, for temporary service, to continue while serving as chief of staff to commander, Seventh Fleet, to rank from the 12th day of October 1944.

Commodore Albert L. Swasey, United States Naval Reserve, retired, to be a naval constructor with the rank of commodore in the Naval Reserve, on the retired list, for temporary service, to continue while serving in the Bureau of Ships, to rank from the 12th day of October 1944.

Commodore Irving H. Mayfield, United States Navy, to be a commodore in the Navy, for temporary service, to continue while serving as chief of staff to commander, South Pacific force, to rank from the 20th day of October 1944.

Commodore Francis W. Scanland, United States Navy, to be a commodore in the Navy, for temporary service, to continue while serving as commander, Naval Training and Distribution Center, Camp Elliott, San Diego, Calif., to rank from the 20th day of October 1944.

Commodore Otto M. Forster, United States Navy, to be a commodore in the Navy, for temporary service, to continue while serving as commander, Naval Training and Distribution Center, Shoemaker, Calif., to rank from the 20th day of October 1944.

Commodore Paulus P. Powell, United States Navy, to be a commodore in the Navy, for temporary service, to continue while serving as chief of staff to commander, Third Amphibious Force, to rank from the 20th day of October 1944.

Commodore Clifford G. Richardson, United States Navy, to be a commodore in the Navy, for temporary service, to continue while serving as commander of a transport squadron, to rank from the 20th day of October 1944.

Commodore Merrill Comstock, United States Navy, to be a commodore in the Navy, for temporary service, to continue while serving as chief of staff to commander, submarine force, Pacific Fleet, to rank from the 20th day of October 1944.

Commodore Herbert B. Knowles, United States Navy, to be a commodore in the Navy, for temporary service, to continue while serving as commander of a transport squadron, to rank from the 20th day of October 1944.

Commodore Donald W. Loomis, United States Navy, to be a commodore in the Navy, for temporary service, to continue while serving as commander of a transport squadron, to rank from the 20th day of October 1944.

Commodore Thomas P. Jeter, United States Navy, to be a commodore in the Navy, for temporary service, to continue while serving as chief of staff to commander, battleships, Pacific Fleet, to rank from the 20th day of October 1944.

Commodore John B. McGovern, United States Navy, to be a commodore in the Navy, for temporary service, to continue while serving as commander of a transport squadron, to rank from the 20th day of October 1944.

Commodore Arleigh A. Burke, United States Navy, to be a commodore in the Navy, for temporary service, to continue while serving as chief of staff to commander, First Carrier Task Force, Pacific Fleet, to rank from the 20th day of October 1944.

Commodore Edwin D. Foster (SC), United States Navy, to be a pay director with the rank of commodore in the Navy, for temporary service, to continue while serving as aviation supply officer and supply officer in command, Naval Aviation Supply Depot, Philadelphia, Pa., to rank from the 20th day of October 1944.

Commodore Milton O. Carlson, United States Navy, to be a commodore in the Navy, for temporary service, to continue while serving as commander of a transport squadron, to rank from the 25th day of October 1944.

Commodore Henry C. Flanagan, United States Navy, to be a commodore in the Navy, for temporary service, to continue while serving as commander of a transport squadron, to rank from the 25th day of October 1944.

Commodore Vernon F. Grant, United States Navy, retired, to be a commodore in the Navy, on the retired list, for temporary service, to continue while serving as commander, Naval Air Bases, Guam, to rank from the 25th day of October 1944.

Capt. John G. Moyer, United States Navy, to be a commodore in the Navy, for temporary service, to continue while serving as commander of a transport squadron, to rank from the 10th day of November 1944.

Capt. Homer W. Graf, United States Navy, to be a commodore in the Navy, for temporary service, to continue while serving as commander of a transport squadron, to rank from the 10th day of November 1944.

Capt. Russell H. Ihrig, United States Navy, to be a commodore in the Navy, for temporary service, to continue while serving on the staff of the commander in chief, United States Pacific Fleet and Pacific Ocean areas, to rank from the 10th day of November 1944.

Capt. James B. Carter, United States Navy, to be a commodore in the Navy, for temporary service, to continue while serving as assistant chief of staff (operations) to commander in chief, United States Pacific Fleet and Pacific Ocean areas, to rank from the 10th day of November 1944.

Capt. Thomas B. Brittain, United States Navy, to be a commodore in the Navy, for temporary service, to continue while serving as commander of a transport squadron, to rank from the 10th day of November 1944.

POSTMASTERS

The following-named persons to be postmasters:

ARKANSAS

Opal Mae Roland, Bryant, Ark. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Manley E. Nation, Lamar, Ark., in place of L. C. Barger, deceased.

Jesse C. Latta, Pollard, Ark. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Riley B. Emory, Rose Bud, Ark. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

CALIFORNIA

Oliver H. Umberham, El Modeno, Calif. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

CONNECTICUT

William J. Farnan, Stonington, Conn., in place of W. J. Farnan. Incumbent's commission expired May 12, 1942.

FLORIDA

Randilla B. Renfroe, Dover, Fla. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

INDIANA

Albert T. Ferber, Palmyra, Ind. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.
Clarence Rea, Patriot, Ind. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

ILLINOIS

Lawrence F. Markus, Aviston, Ill. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.
Frances Dalziel, Braceville, Ill. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.
Carl Miller, Macedonia, Ill. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.
Alfred R. Hart, Modesto, Ill. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

KENTUCKY

Bertha D. Vincent, Brownsville, Ky., in place of J. V. Carder, deceased.
William G. Kelly, Maceo, Ky. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.
Oleva C. Bailey, Rineyville, Ky. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

LOUISIANA

Eva A. Matlock, Bethany, La. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.
Mary V. Bryson, Greenwood, La. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.
Robert Hamilton Fuller, Hosston, La. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.
Idella N. Trombino, Keatchie, La. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.
Annie I. McCord, Keithville, La. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.
Audrey Rowe, Longstreet, La. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.
Adina M. Edwards, Noble, La. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.
Orren M. Peters, Quitman, La. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

MICHIGAN

Meda G. Keith, Bellevue, Mich., in place of W. A. Young, removed.
Velma Strait, Horton, Mich. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.
Carol F. Acre, Otter Lake, Mich. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

MINNESOTA

Thomas J. McGonigal, Bayport, Minn., in place of C. A. Smith, retired.
Ervan W. Finke, Vining, Minn. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

MISSISSIPPI

Louise Burris, McCall Creek, Miss. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

MISSOURI

Chester Alan Platt, Jefferson City, Mo., in place of Albert Linxwiler, deceased.
Josephine B. Diggs, Jonesburg, Mo., in place of W. H. Fleahman, resigned.
Otis C. Mackey, Morrisville, Mo. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.
Nadine Smith, Tina, Mo. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

NEW JERSEY

L. Raymond Gunter, Columbia, N. J. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.
William T. Keeshan, Navesink, N. J. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

OHIO

Frances L. Robinson, West Jefferson, Ohio, in place of J. S. Hockenbery, resigned.

OKLAHOMA

Pearl L. Bulman, Mill Creek, Okla., in place of J. S. Austin, transferred.
Ward H. Roysden, Pocasset, Okla. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

OREGON

Beatrice I. Scoggins, Arlington, Oreg., in place of L. O. Ferguson, resigned.

PENNSYLVANIA

Gladys M. Glass, Fallentimber, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.
James H. McConnell, Jackson Center, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.
Nathaniel E. Lyons, Lake Lynn, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.
Jacob C. Reddig, Reamstown, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.
Elsie D. Naylor, Warminster, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.
Clay E. Houck, Warriors Mark, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

TEXAS

Edmond B. Cummins, Cleveland, Tex., in place of M. A. Anderson. Incumbent's commission expired April 11, 1942.
Roe Sledge, Forestburg, Tex. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.
Mary V. Denton, Port Aransas, Tex., in place of A. L. Smith, removed.
William A. Ramirez, Roma, Tex. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

VERMONT

Arthur C. Wells, Bakersfield, Vt. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.
Murray K. Paris, Lyndon, Vt. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.
Raymond Taylor, Weston, Vt. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

VIRGINIA

Alvah B. Chappell, Clarksville, Va., in place of I. D. Newcomb, deceased.
E. Paul Osborne, Dungannon, Va. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.
Charles G. Coppedge, Powhatan, Va., in place of G. H. Jenkins, retired.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate November 21, 1944:

U. S. MARITIME COMMISSION

Edward Macauley to be a member, United States Maritime Commission, for the term of 6 years from September 26, 1944.

UNITED STATES PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

PROMOTIONS AND APPOINTMENTS IN THE REGULAR CORPS

To be temporary senior dental surgeons, effective October 1, 1944:
Leland E. Weyer
Robert A. Scroggie
Vernon J. Forney to be temporary dental surgeon, effective October 1, 1944.
Harold D. Lyman to be temporary senior surgeon, effective October 1, 1944.
To be temporary surgeons, effective October 1, 1944:
Daniel D. Chiles
James J. Griffitts
Robert R. Smith
To be temporary passed assistant surgeons, effective October 1, 1944:
Frederic C. Bartter
Warren S. Kennison
Joseph E. Maurer
Guy H. Faget to be temporary medical director, effective October 1, 1944.
Lynne A. Fullerton to be medical director, effective July 9, 1944.
Roy E. Wolfe to be temporary surgeon, effective September 15, 1944.
To be temporary surgeons, effective September 1, 1944:
David B. Wilson
George E. Parkhurst
Joe M. Chisolm
James K. Norman to be passed assistant surgeon, effective July 11, 1944.
To be assistant surgeons, effective date of oath:
John H. Prichett, Jr.
John K. McBane
Roland K. Iverson
Arthur Kornberg
Harold B. Alexander
Harry Leaffer
Henry A. Holle to be temporary senior surgeon, effective September 1, 1944.
Omar C. Hopkins to be temporary senior sanitary engineer, effective September 1, 1944.

WITHDRAWAL

Executive nomination withdrawn from the Senate November 21, 1944.

POSTMASTER

NEW YORK

Mrs. Gertrude A. Vande Bogart to be postmaster at Leonardsville, in the State of New York.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, NOVEMBER 21, 1944

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou who dwellest in the midst of the throne, we rejoice that we are in the presence of One who loves and understands and promises: "They who wait on the Lord shall renew their strength." We pray Thee to fortify us against temptation; make us faithful to that which we love and ever prepare us for labor here and for a brighter world beyond. Keep us free from that which is purely temporal and transient, ever sensible to the glorious things of the spirit.

We pray for those who are defending us on sea, land, and air, suffering the hardships of war even unto death, and for those homes from which they have gone; may they not sorrow as those who have no hope. Heavenly Father, in these gray and sober days reveal unto America the kindred humanness of all enslaved and tortured peoples. Humble us and lay bare before us our obligation and allow nothing to draw us away from our Christian duty. Be with us, O Divine Exemplar, subduing confusion and discord, taking away our narrow sense of liberty and our feeble understanding. In all things may we acknowledge Thee to be the Lord, and let us hear again the song of the morning stars in a world redeemed through Him who hath loved us and gave His life that we might claim eternity as our own. In the name of Saint Mary's holy Child. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Monday, November 20, 1944, was read and approved.

RESIGNATION FROM COMMITTEE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following resignation, which was read by the Clerk:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *November 21, 1944.*
HON. SAM RAYBURN,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I hereby tender my resignation as a member of the standing Committee on Mines and Mining and also the standing Committee on the Public Lands of the House of Representatives.

Respectfully submitted.

WALTER E. BREHM,
Member of Congress.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the resignation will be accepted.

There was no objection.

INFORMATION REGARDING CERTAIN REFUGEES

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Immigra-

tion and Naturalization, I present a privileged report and resolution (H. Res. 568; Rept. No. 1913) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

Resolved, That the Attorney General be, and he is hereby, directed to furnish the House of Representatives the answers to the following questions:

(1) How many refugees, if any, and of what nationality and from what countries, have arrived in the United States by plane at LaGuardia Field, N. Y., since June 1943?

(2) How many refugees, if any, and of what nationality and from what countries, have arrived at any other airports in the United States, giving the names of such airports, during the same period?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the resolution be laid on the table.

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. FAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 20 minutes today following the legislative business of the day and other special orders.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein excerpts from remarks at the testimonial dinner given to Hon. James A. Farley upon his retirement as chairman of the New York Democratic State Committee, July 10, 1944.

I have an estimate from the Public Printer that it will exceed the two-page limit by one-half page at a cost of $130. Notwithstanding, I ask unanimous consent that it be inserted in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Notwithstanding the cost, without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD in connection with two matters, and to include in one an editorial that appeared in the Evening Tribune, Lawrence, Mass., entitled "Al Smith," and in the second to include an address by His Excellency Archbishop-Elect Richard J. Cushing, of Boston, Mass.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. LANE]?

There was no objection.

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an address which I made over the radio recently.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include therein a letter I have today filed with the House Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include therein a short statement.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include therein a resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an editorial from the Wall Street Journal.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

NO PUBLIC DEMONSTRATION UNTIL FINAL VICTORY

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a House concurrent resolution and sincerely trust that prompt and favorable action may be taken on it. Personally I feel that it would be extremely unfair to our boys now fighting in the Pacific, as well as to the memory of those who have given their lives in that theater of operation, to engage in any public demonstration simply because Germany might collapse, unless it be a prayer of thanksgiving.

I trust America will reserve any emotional upheaval until final victory is achieved on all battle fronts.

PRIVATE CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will call the first bill on the Private Calendar.

AMENDMENT TO ACT ENTITLED "AN ACT FOR THE CONFIRMATION OF THE TITLE TO THE SALINE LANDS IN JACKSON COUNTY, STATE OF ILLINOIS"

The Clerk called the first bill on the Private Calendar, S. 1451, to amend the act entitled "An act for the confirmation of the title to the Saline Lands, in Jackson County, State of Illinois, to D. H. Brush, and others," approved March 2, 1861.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the act entitled "An act for the confirmation of the title to the Saline Lands in Jackson County, State of Illinois, to D. H. Brush, and others", approved March 2, 1861 (12 Stat. 891), is amended by striking out so much thereof as reads as follows: "To Stephen Holliday, the southwest quarter of the southeast quarter of the southeast quarter of section thirty-one, township eight, of range two:", and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "To Stephen Holliday, the southeast quarter of the southeast quarter of section thirty-one, township eight, of range two:".

SEC. 2. The amendment made by the first section of this act shall be effective as of March 2, 1861.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. PHOEBE SHERMAN

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 2354, for the relief of Mrs. Phoebe Sherman.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Mrs. Phoebe Sherman, Eatontown, N. J., the sum of $4,642. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Mrs. Phoebe Sherman against the United States on account of personal injuries sustained by her on January 19, 1942, when the automobile in which she was riding was struck in the borough of Shrewsbury, N. J., by a United States Army truck.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

"That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $1,500 to the estate of Mrs. Phoebe Sherman; to pay the sum of $650 to Mrs. Harriett W. Vanderhoef; and to pay the sum of $150 to Allan Vanderhoef, of Red Bank, N. J. The payment of such sums shall be in full settlement of all claims against the United States on account of personal injuries, medical expenses, and property damage sustained when Mrs. Vanderhoef's car was involved in a collision with a United States Army truck in Shrewsbury, N. J., on January 19, 1942: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of the estate of Mrs. Phoebe Sherman and Mrs. Harriett W. Vanderhoef."

CLARENCE H. MILES ET AL.

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 2688, for the relief of Clarence H. Miles, Mrs. Mollie Miles, and Hardy Miles, a minor.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Clarence H. Miles, of Leesville, La., the sum of $500, to Mrs. Mollie Miles, of Leesville, La., the sum of $2,500; and to Clarence H. Miles, of Leesville, La., as father of Hardy Miles, a minor, the sum of $1,000, for personal injuries sustained by the said Clarence H. Miles, Mrs. Mollie Miles, and Hardy Miles when the automobile in which they were riding was struck by a United States Army truck near Leesville, La., on September 10, 1942: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "$500" and insert "$250."

Page 1, line 9, strike out "$1,000" and insert "$250."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

IDA M. RUTHERFORD

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 2827, for the relief of Ida M. Rutherford.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Ida M. Rutherford, of West Bloomfield, N. Y., the sum of $5,000, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for compensation for personal injuries sustained by her and for reimbursement of medical, hospital, and other expenses incurred by her as the result of her being struck and knocked down by Israel Zitron, an employee of the Ordnance Department of the United States, on a public sidewalk on Franklin Street, in the city of Rochester, N. Y., on December 28, 1942: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "$5,000" and insert "$4,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. ROSE POISSON

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 3285, for the relief of Mrs. Rose Poisson.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, and in full settlement of all claims against the Government of the United States, the sum of $2,000, to Mrs. Rose Poisson, of Fall River, Mass., for medical and hospital expenses, loss of wages, and for personal injuries received as the result of an accident involving an Army truck on January 21, 1943: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 7, strike out "$2,000" and insert "$1,269.50."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. VIOLET DE GROOT

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 3727, for the relief of Mrs. Violet De Groot.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Violet DeGroot, the sum of $2,500, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for injury to said Violet DeGroot, on September 29, 1943, as a result of negligence and excessive speed in the operation of an Army vehicle in the city of Auburndale, Fla.: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 5, after the words "appropriated to", insert "the legal guardian of."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of the legal guardian of Violet De Groot."

CHARLES NOAH SHIPP

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 3791, for the relief of the estate of Charles Noah Shipp, deceased.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the estate of Charles Noah Shipp, deceased, a mechanic's helper at the time of his death, the sum of $10,000, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for the death of Charles Noah Shipp, April 2, 1943, as the result of being run over by an Army tank on that date, which was being operated by a soldier in the service of the United States Army, which occurred on the right-of-way of United States Highway No. 31W, a public highway of Hardin County, Ky., between Radcliff and Fort Knox, Ky., in Hardin County: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 7, strike out "$10,000" and insert "$5,361."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

F. L. GAUSE, ROSALIND GAUSE, AND HELEN GAUSE

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 3996, for the relief of F. L. Gause, Rosalind Gause, and Helen Gause.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $15,000 to F. L. Gause for personal injuries and permanent disability; the sum of $25,000 to Rosalind Gause for personal injuries and permanent disability; and the sum of $1,500 to Helen Gause for personal injuries and permanent disability, as a result of a United States Army airplane crashing into the automobile in which they were passengers on West Beach of Galveston Island, Galveston County, Tex., on February 21, 1943. The Secretary of the Treasury is also hereby authorized and directed to pay F. L. Gause medical and hospital expenses in the total sum of $2,006.65, incurred by himself, Rosalind Gause, and Helen Gause; also the sum of $114 for damage to the automobile owned by F. L. Gause: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this

act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 5, after the word "of", strike out down to and including the word "Gause", on page 2, line 8, and insert "$10,000 to F. L. Gause, of Galveston, Tex., for property damage, personal injuries, and permanent disability to himself: and medical and hospital expenses incurred for himself and his two minor daughters; to pay the sum of $12,500 to the legal guardian of Rosalind Gause, a minor, for personal injuries and permanent disability; and to pay the sum of $1,500 to the legal guardian of Helen Gause, a minor, for personal injuries and permanent disability, as a result of a United States Army airplane crashing into the automobile in which they were riding on West Beach Road, Galveston Island, Galveston County, Tex., on February 21, 1943."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of F. L. Gause and the legal guardian of Rosalind and Helen Gause, minors."

MRS. RUBY WINSCH

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 4014, for the relief of Mrs. Ruby Winsch.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Mrs. Ruby Winsch, Newark, Ohio, the sum of $2,109.29. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Mrs. Ruby Winsch against the United States on account of personal injuries sustained by her as the result of the crash of a United States Army bomber at Newark, Ohio, on September 8, 1942: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ALFRED F. ROSS

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 4049, for the relief of Alfred F. Ross.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Alfred F. Ross, of Marion County, Kans., the sum of $1,930.25, in full settlement of all claims against the United States by reason of personal injuries sustained on account of a collision with a Government truck operated by the Work Projects Administration agency of the United States Government, said injuries having occurred on the 28th day of November 1942: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person found guilty of violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LOUIS BECKHAM

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 4111, for the relief of Louis Beckham.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Mr. Louis Beckham, Jersey City, N. J., the sum of $2,500. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Mr. Louis Beckham against the United States for injuries sustained on August 9, 1942, when a United States Army truck struck said Mr. Beckham while he was walking in a southerly direction on Jackson Avenue, and having reached the intersection of Jackson and Bramhall Avenues, Jersey City, N. J.: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "$2,500" and insert "$1,343.50."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HENRY CLAY WALKER

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 4305, for the relief of Henry Clay Walker.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That sections 15 to 20, inclusive, of the act entitled "An act to provide compensation for the employees of the United States suffering injuries while in the performance of their duties, and for other purposes," approved September 7, 1916, as amended (U. S. C., 1934 edition, title 5, secs. 767 and 770), are hereby waived in favor of Henry Clay Walker, who is alleged to have sustained injuries diagnosed as ruptured intervertebral disc, necessitating operation for removal of disc and wearing of steel cast, in line of duty on or about September 15, 1942, while employed in the United States navy yard at Boston, Mass., and his claim for compensation is authorized to be considered and acted upon under the remaining provisions of such act, as amended, if he files such claim with the United States Employees' Compensation Commission not later than 60 days after the date of enactment of this act.

SEC. 2. The monthly compensation which the said Henry Clay Walker may be entitled to receive by reason of the enactment of this act shall commence on the first day of the month during which this act is enacted.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MABELLE E. OLIVE

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 4380, for the relief of Mabelle E. Olive.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Mabelle E. Olive, of Quincy, Mass., the sum of $5,000, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for personal injuries sustained as a result of an accident involving a United States Army vehicle and an Eastern Massachusetts Street Railway bus in Quincy, Mass., on January 12, 1943: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "$5,000" and insert "$2,655."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FREDERICK G. GOEBEL

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 1461, for the relief of Frederick G. Goebel.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $103.45 to Frederick G. Goebel, of Van Buren, Maine, a customs patrol inspector, United States Bureau of Customs, in full satisfaction of his claim against the United States for reimbursement of the total amount refunded by him as the result of the disallowance by the General Accounting Office of part of the travel expenses incurred by him during the period January 22 to February 7, 1937, inclusive, in traveling by personally owned automobile from Buffalo, N. Y., to Portland, Oreg., such excess travel expenses having resulted from the taking of a circuitous route necessitated by acts of God and other conditions beyond the control of the said Frederick G. Goebel: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DR. A. R. ADAMS

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 1465, for the relief of Dr. A. R. Adams.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Dr. A. R. Adams, of Leavenworth, Kans., the sum of $225, in full satisfaction of his claim against the United States for compensation for services rendered in conducting physical examinations of prospective employees of the United States pursuant to contract No. W-425-eng-409, dated April 14, 1942, with the post engineer, Corps of Engineers, at Fort Leavenworth, Kans., such claim having been disallowed by the Comptroller General on the ground that payment for such examinations was not authorized by law: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MARINO BELLO

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 1483, for the relief of Marino Bello.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. SPRINGER and Mr. HALE objected, and, under the rule, the bill was recommitted to the Committee on Claims.

HELEN HALVERSON

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 1731, for the relief of Helen Halverson.

There being no objection, the clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Helen Halverson, of Kimball, S. Dak., the sum of $3,000, in full satisfaction of her claims against the United States for compensation for personal injuries sustained by her, and for reimbursement of medical, hospital, and other expenses incurred by her, as a result of an accident which occurred when the bicycle which she was riding was struck by a United States Navy vehicle on St. Simons Island, Ga., on April 3, 1943: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

Mr. HALE. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HALE: On page 1, line 6, strike out "$3,000" and insert "$2,500."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SQUARE D CO.

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 1763, for the relief of the Square D Co.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Comptroller General of the United States be, and he hereby is, authorized and directed to settle and adjust the claim of the Square D Co. for payment for certain electrical supplies which were delivered by the said company to the War Department, construction quartermaster, Borinquen Field, P. R., on or about April 1, 1941, upon the failure of a Government contractor to make delivery thereof, and to allow in full and final settlement of the claim the sum of not to exceed $8,276.82. There is hereby appropriated the sum of $8,276.82, or so much thereof as may be necessary, for the payment of said claim: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. MAY HOLLAND

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 2345, for the relief of Mrs. May Holland.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. SPRINGER and Mr. HALE objected, and, under the rule, the bill was recommitted to the Committee on Claims.

DONNA MAY McNULTY

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 3463, for the relief of Donna May McNulty.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. HALE and Mr. SPRINGER objected, and, under the rule, the bill was recommitted to the Committee on Claims.

ARCHIE BERBERIAN, KURKEN BERBERIAN, AND MRS. OSGETEL BERBERIAN

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 3465, for the relief of Archie Berberian, Kurken Berberian, and Mrs. Osgetel Berberian.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $9,300 to Archie Berberian and Kurken Berberian, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for damages to their residence; to pay the sum of $500 to Mrs. Osgetel Berberian for personal injuries, medical and hospital expenses, sustained as a result of a United States Army plane crashing into their home in Warwick, R. I., on April 6, 1943: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 5, strike out "$9,300" and insert "$7,602.39."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

UNITED STATES COURT FOR CHINA

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 4080, for the relief of certain former employees of the United States Court for China.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to each of the following former employees of the United States Court for China the amount set forth opposite his name, such amount representing compensation as an employee of such court for the period beginning July 1, 1942, and ending May 20, 1943, the date such court ceased to exist:

Zee Yang Ling, $773.34; Koo Yu Tsong, $501.34; Wong Nyok Dong, $373.34; Gue Young Kong, $261.34; Zee Yung Zai, $261.34; Chow Zung Kung, $80.

With the following committee amendment:

At the end of the bill insert the following: "*Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JOHN L. MACNEIL

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 4631, for the relief of John L. MacNeil.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the appointment, effective March 26, 1943, by order of the Secretary of War, under the provisions of section 1, the Military Appropriation Act, 1943 (Pub-

lic Law 649, 77th Cong.), of John L. MacNeil, in an advisory capacity to the Secretary of War, with payment of actual transportation expenses and not to exceed $10 per diem in lieu of subsistence and other expenses while serving away from his home, without other compensation from the United States, is hereby amended to be in effect for the period July 1, 1942, to March 25, 1943, inclusive.

SEC. 2. That the appointment made in section 1 of this act shall be in lieu of the appointment, effectitve July 1, 1942, terminated March 25, 1943, by order of the Secretary of War, under the provisions of section 8, Military Appropriation Act, 1942 (Public Law 139, 77th Cong.), of John L. MacNeil, as expert consultant, with compensation of $10 per diem.

SEC. 3. That all United States Government transportation requests issued during the period July 1, 1942, to March 25, 1943, inclusive, for the travel of John L. MacNeil, invalid under the appointment referred to in section 2 of this act, but which would have been valid if they had been issued pursuant to his appointment under section 1 of this act, are hereby validated and the Comptroller General of the United States is hereby authorized and directed to credit in the settlement of the accounts of the disbursing officer or officers who has or have paid, or may hereafter pay, the sums stated in the aforesaid requests which have been or may hereafter be disallowed, the amounts so paid by him or them: *Provided*, That no person shall be held pecuniarily liable for any part of the sum credited in the disbursing officer's account under the authority of this section.

SEC. 4. That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay John L. MacNeil, out of any moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, any amounts of actual transportation expenses, and not to exceed $10 per diem in lieu of subsistence and other expenses while serving away from his home, to which he would have been or may become entitled for the period July 1, 1942, to March 25, 1943, inclusive, under the appointment made by section 1 of this act, and for the period subsequent to March 25, 1943, not heretofore paid: *Provided*, That all amounts heretofore paid to John L. MacNeil pursuant to the appointment referred to in section 2 of this act shall be deducted from the amounts to be paid under the authority of this section.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DIEMER ADISON COULTER AND FRANCES ANDREWS COULTER

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 2150, for the relief of Diemer Adison Coulter and Frances Andrews Coulter.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Diemer Adison Coulter, Huntsville, Ala., the sum of $5,000 and to Frances Andrews Coulter, Huntsville, Ala., the sum of $5,000. The payment of such sums shall be in full settlement of all claims against the United States arising out of personal injuries sustained by the said Frances Andrews Coulter and the death of Gerald Coulter, the minor child of the said Diemer Adison Coulter and Frances Andrews Coulter, on December 11, 1941, when they were struck by an automobile driven by an enlisted man of the United States Army on United States Highway No. 72 near Huntsville, Ala.

With the following committee amendments:

On page 1, line 6, strike out "$5,000" and insert "$2,500" and in line 7 strike out "$5,000" and insert "$2,000."

At the end of the bill insert the following: "*Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GEORGE A. CARDEN AND ANDERSON T. HERD

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 4513, to provide for an appeal to the Supreme Court of the United States from the decision of the Court of Claims in a suit instituted by George A. Carden and Anderson T. Herd.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. SPRINGER and Mr. HALE objected, and, under the rule, the bill was recommitted to the Committee on the Judiciary.

CITY NATIONAL BANK BUILDING CO.

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 1453, for the relief of the City National Bank Building Co.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. HALE, Mr. MADDEN, and Mr. PRIEST objected, and, under the rule, the bill was recommitted to the Committee on Claims.

MR. AND MRS. JOHN BORREGO ET AL.

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 1605, for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. John Borrego; Mr. and Mrs. Joe Silva; the legal guardian of Frank Borrego; the legal guardian of Rueben Silva; and the legal guardian of Rudolph Silva.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, (1) to Mr. and Mrs. John Borrego, of Garden Grove, Calif., the sum of $6,622.48, in full satisfaction of their claims against the United States for medical and hospital expenses incurred by them for the treatment of their minor children, Rosealva Borrego, Faith Borrego, and Frank Borrego, for burial expenses for Rosealva Borrego and Faith Borrego, and for compensation for their deaths; (2) to Mr. and Mrs. Joe Silva, of Garden Grove, Calif., the sum of $6,732.48, in full satisfaction of their claims against the United States for medical and hospital expenses incurred by them for the treatment of their minor children, Mary Silva, Frances Silva, Rueben Silva, and Rudolph Silva, for burial expenses for Mary Silva and Frances Silva, and for compensation for their deaths; and (3) to the legal guardian of Frank Borrego the sum of $1,000, to the legal guardian of Rueben Silva the sum of $1,000, and to the legal guardian of Rudolph Silva the sum of $1,000, in full satisfaction of all claims against the United States for personal injuries sustained by the said Frank Borrego, Rueben Silva, and Rudolph Silva; all as a result of an explosion which occurred when an Army airplane crashed near Huntington Beach, Calif., on June 27, 1943: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with these claims, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GLADYS A. ENNIS

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 195, for the relief of Gladys A. Ennis as executrix of the estate of George Pearse Ennis, deceased, and Oscar H. Julius.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Gladys A. Ennis as executrix of the estate of George Pearse Ennis, deceased, and Oscar H. Julius, the sum of $514.10. Such sum represents moneys expended by the said George Pearse Ennis and Oscar H. Julius for the rental of studio at 626–628 West Twenty-fourth Street, New York, N. Y., and public utilities for the use by the West Point glass project of the Work Projects Administration (official project No. 65–1699, superseded by No. 265–95–6900 W. P. 829) during the period October 1935 to March 1936, the said estate of George Pearse Ennis, deceased, and Oscar H. Julius have not been reimbursed for said expenditures and their claim for said sum has been disallowed as an unauthorized claim.

With the following committee amendment:

On page 1, line 7, strike out all after the word "of", down to and including the word "claim", on line 8, page 2, and insert "$514.10; and to pay to the Excelsior Automotive Service, Inc., the sum of $692.50. Such sums represent moneys expended by them for the rental of studio at 626–628 West Twenty-fourth Street, New York, N. Y., and public utilities for the use by the West Point glass project of the Works Progress Administration for the period October 1935 to March 1936, and the period February 1936 to April 12, 1937, respectively: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Gladys A. Ennis as executrix of the estate of George Pearse Ennis, deceased, and Oscar H. Julius; and the Excelsior Automotive Service, Inc."

DR. W. R. WILLIAMS

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 3074, for the relief of Dr. W. R. Williams.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. HALE and Mr. MOTT objected, and the bill was recommitted to the Committee on Claims.

MRS. PEARL W. PETERSON

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 3484, for the relief of Mrs. Pearl W Peterson.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Mrs. Pearl W. Peterson, Washington, D. C., the sum of $1,500. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims against the United States for personal injuries sustained by the said Mrs. Pearl W. Peterson on May 28, 1943, when she was struck while walking across the intersection of Seventh Street and Market Square NW., Washington, D. C., by a truck in the service of the Office for Emergency Management.

With the following committee amendment:

On page 2, line 2, change the period to a colon and add the following: *"Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. JEANNETTE B. STEDMAN

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 3782, for the relief of Mrs. Jeannette B. Stedman.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. SPRINGER and Mr. MOTT objected, and the bill was recommitted to the Committee on Claims.

M. SENDERS & CO.

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 3814, for the relief of M. Senders & Co.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. HALE. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER. One objection is not sufficient.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to M. Senders & Co., of Albany, Oreg., the sum of $5,000, in full satisfaction of its claim against the United States for compensation for the loss of property and business incurred as a result of the acquisition by the United States for military purposes of certain land at Wells, Oreg., which had theretofore been leased by the said M. Senders & Co. and upon which the said M. Senders & Co. had erected and maintained a warehouse: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendments:

On page 1, line 6, strike out "$5,000", insert "$3,000."

On lines 6 and 7, strike out the words "its claim" and insert the words "all claims."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

O. S. STAPLEY CO.

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 3852, for the relief of the O. S. Stapley Co.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the O. S. Stapley Co., of Phoenix, Ariz., the sum of $362.45, in full satisfaction of its claim against the United States for damages arising out of the rental by the Work Projects Administration in Arizona of a TD–40 tractor, owned by said company, under contract No. ER–TO2ps–4964 and dated May 5, 1941: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

On page 1, line 7, strike out the words "its claim" and insert the words "all claims."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read a third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ELSIE HAWKE AND CHARLES HAWKE

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 3584, for the relief of Elsie Hawke and Charles Hawke.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Elsie Hawke and Charles Hawke, of 7820 Garfield Avenue, Oakland, Calif., the sum of $250, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for personal injuries sustained on April 6, 1942, when an Army jeep No. W–2064111 which was in convoy traveling on Highway 50, two and one-half miles west of Pittsburg, Calif., at high speed struck their car almost head on.

With the following committee amendments:

On page 1, line 5, strike out the words "and Charles Hawke" and on page 2, line 2, strike out the words "their car almost head-on" and insert the words "the car which she was driving."

On page 2, line 3, insert the words: *"Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Elsie Hawke."

MRS. ANNA ZUKAS

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 3880, for the relief of Mrs. Anna Zukas.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Mrs. Anna Zukas, Cleveland, Ohio, the sum of $6,671. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Mrs. Anna Zukas against the United States for personal injuries sustained on March 6, 1942, when a United States mail truck struck said Mrs. Anna Zukas while she was standing on a raised safety zone at East Seventy-ninth Street and Superior Avenue, Cleveland: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendments:

On page 1, line 6, strike out "$6,671.00" and insert "$1,896.61."

On page 1, line 7, insert the words "less Post Office warrant No. 108179, for $500."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read a third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JOHN H. BONNEY

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 4036, for the relief of John H. Bonney, the legal guardian of Daniel R. Bonney, a minor.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized

and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $270.50, to John H. Bonney, of 16 Cushing Street, Medford, Mass., as legal guardian of Daniel R. Bonney, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for property damages sustained as a result of a fire in the living quarters of a group of Boy Scouts in Maysville, Maine, who were engaged in gathering the potato crop under the direction of the War Food Administration, Maine Extension Division, Orono, Maine, on September 22, 1943: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

BRIG. GEN. LOUIS J. FORTIER

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 4144, for the relief of Brig. Gen. Louis J. Fortier.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $1,140.80 to Brig. Gen. Louis J. Fortier, of Camp McCain, Miss., in full settlement of all claims against the United States as reimbursement for the loss of personal property as a result of the Yugoslav-German campaign, when he, while serving as military attaché, was forced to leave Belgrade, Yugoslavia, on April 24, 1941, without his clothing, household and other personal effects: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. FLORENCE ARMSTRONG

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 4331, for the relief of Mrs. Florence Armstrong.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Mrs. Florence Armstrong, of East Haven, Conn., the sum of $2,500, in full settlement of all claims against the United States as compensation for injuries sustained and expenses incident thereto, when the automobile in which she was riding was struck by a truck owned by the Work Projects Administration on April 25, 1942: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "$2,500" and insert "$1,650."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. EUGENE W. RANDALL

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 1471, for the relief of Mrs. Eugene W. Randall.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Mrs. Eugene W. Randall, route 1, Riverview Station, St. Paul, Minn., the sum of $1,000 in full satisfaction of all claims against the United States for damages sustained by her as a result of being struck by an automobile operated by a rural mail carrier on July 8, 1942, in the driveway to her home: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "$1,000" and insert "$2,500."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RAU MOTOR SALES CO.

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 1501, for the relief of the Rau Motor Sales Co.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the Rau Motor Sales Co., of Harrold, S. Dak., the sum of $250, in full satisfaction of its claim against the United States for reimbursement of the amount paid by the said company in settlement of its liability to the United States under contract No. I-1-Ind-19827 covering the procurement of a school bus for the Department of the Interior, such contract having been awarded to the said company despite a request made by it prior to the awarding of such contract that its bid thereon be canceled because of an error made in computing the price quoted in such bid: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FRANK ROBERTSON

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 1572, for the relief of Frank Robertson.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Frank Robertson, of Portland, Oreg., the sum of $86.13, in full satisfaction of his claim against the United States for payment on account of a $50 Fourth Liberty Loan bond which he purchased and paid for through the disbursing office at the United States Navy Yard, Puget Sound, Wash., but which was never delivered to him, with interest at the rate of 4¼ percent from date of issue, October 24, 1918, to October 15, 1935, the final redemption date of bonds of said Fourth Liberty Loan: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JOHN W. FARRELL

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 529, for the relief of John W. Farrell.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to John W. Farrell, of New York, N. Y., the sum of $1,500, in full settlement of all claims against the Government of the United States for damages received to an automobile truck owned by the said John W. Farrell on the 6th day of June 1938, when the said truck was completely damaged as a result of the careless and negligent manner in which the Works Progress Administration was constructing and repairing the roadway on Summit Avenue, between One Hundred and Sixty-second and One Hundred and Sixty-third Streets, in the Borough of the Bronx, city and State of New York: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or agents, attorney or attorneys, on account of services rendered in connection with said claim. It shall be unlawful for any agent or agents, attorney or attorneys, to exact, collect, withhold, or receive any sum of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof on account of services rendered in connection with said claim, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "$1,500" and insert "$1,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

F. L. RIDDLE

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 1218, for the relief of F. L. Riddle.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to F. L. Riddle, of Greenville, S. C., the sum of $11,530, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for damage sustained during the year 1942, when the Greenville (S. C.) Air Base installed a sewage disposal plant which emptied into Reedy Fork Creek, causing the condemnation of Mr. Riddle's dairy: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1 line 7, strike all the balance of the page after the words "United States", on line 7, down to and including line 8, on page 2, and insert "for all damages resulting from the flow of sewage waters from the Greenville Army Air Base, Greenville, S. C., into Reedy Fork Creek, which runs through the dairy farm of the said F. L. Riddle; *Provided*, That no payment shall be made, under this act until the said F. L. Riddle shall have granted unto the United States an easement in his land in a form satisfactory to the Secretary of War consenting to the flow of sewage waters from the Greenville Army Air Base into Reedy Fork Creek and through his said farm: *And provided further*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ARCHIE BARWICK

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 1556, for the relief of Archie Barwick.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., that the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Archie Barwick, of 1204 McGarrah Street, Americus, Ga., the sum of $5,000, in settlement of claim against the United States for the death of his son, Lucian, who was killed on September 5, 1942, by an explosion in a concrete building, while helping his father start in operation a gasoline motor used to pump water for a Soil Conservation Service nursery located at Americus, Ga.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 7, strike out "$5,000" and insert "$3,000."

Page 2, line 2, insert ": *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LILLIAN HILL, SAVILLA ELEY, AND EDNA BOOTH

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 3191, for the relief of Lillian Hill, Savilla Eley, and Edna Booth.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Lillian Hill, Windsor, Va., the sum of $620; to Savilla Eley, Norfolk, Va., the sum of $100; and to Edna Booth, Baltimore, Md., the sum of $100. The payment of such sums shall be in full settlement of all claims of such persons against the United States growing out of a collision on September 15, 1941, at Windsor, Va., when the vehicle in which they were riding was struck by a vehicle in the service of the United States Army.

With the following committee amendment:

On page 1, line 6, strike out the balance of the page after the word "of" down to and including the word "Army" on page 2, line 3, and insert "$100, in full settlement of all claims against the United States as a result of a collision between the car in which she was riding and a vehicle in the service of the United States Army on September 15, 1941, at Windsor, Va.: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Lillian Hill."

ENID M. ALBERTSON

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 3218, for the relief of Enid M. Albertson.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Enid M. Albertson, of Indianapolis, Ind., the sum of $5,000, in full satisfaction of her claim against the United States for compensation for personal injuries sustained and property damaged, as a result of the explosion of a bottle of Aqua Regia, a cleaning fluid, brought upon the Stout Field Army Air Base, Indianapolis, Ind., by an officer of Headquarters, I Troop Carrier Command, on the morning of October 19, 1942: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "$5,000" and insert "$2,585.45."

Page 1, line 6, strike out "her claim" and insert "all claims."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ELEANOR PARKINSON

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3302) for the relief of Eleanor Parkinson.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the consideration of the bill?

Mr. HALE and Mr. SPRINGER objected, and, under the rule, the bill was recommitted to the Committee on Claims.

QUEEN CITY BREWING CO.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3614) for the relief of the Queen City Brewing Co.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. MOTT and Mr. HALE objected, and, under the rule, the bill was recommitted to the Committee on Claims.

PETER PAUL BACIC ET AL.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3630) for the relief of Peter Paul Bacic, Charles C. Cox, H. Forest Haugh, and Luther M. Durst.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Peter Paul Bacic, Transfer, Pa., the sum of $500; to Charles C. Cox, Transfer, Pa., the sum of $590.76; to H. Forest Haugh, Transfer, Pa., the sum of $391.75; and to Luther M. Durst, Transfer, Pa., the sum of $310. The payment of such sums shall be in full settlement of all claims of said individuals against the United States for property damage sustained by them when water wells on their farms either became dry or polluted due to the lowering of the water table in that area as the result of the drilling of several deep wells by a

private contractor under contract with the United States to provide water for Camp Reynolds (formerly Shenango Personnel Replacement Depot) in Pymatuning Township, Mercer County, Pa.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, line 9, after the word "Pennsylvania", insert a colon and the following: ": *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HARLEY E. CARTER

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3709) for the relief of Harley E. Carter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. HALE and Mr. MOTT objected, and, under the rule, the bill was recommitted to the Committee on Claims.

LUTHER MARCUS SMITH

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4345) for the relief of Luther Marcus Smith.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Luther Marcus Smith, the sum of $5,000, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for personal injuries sustained in an accident at the Bristol Industrial School operated by the Federal Government at Bristol, Tenn.-Va.: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, lines 8 and 9, strike out the words, "operated by the Federal Government."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of the legal guardian of Luther Marcus Smith, a minor."

TO PROVIDE FOR THE CARRYING OUT OF AN AWARD OF THE NATIONAL WAR LABOR BOARD

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4498) to provide for the carrying out of the award of the National War Labor Board of April 11, 1919, and the decision of the Secretary of War of date November 30, 1920, in favor of certain employees of the Minneapolis Steel & Machinery Co., Minneapolis, Minn.; of the Saint Paul Foundry Co., Saint Paul, Minn.; of the American Hoist & Derrick Co., Saint Paul, Minn.; and of the Twin City Forge & Foundry Co., Stillwater, Minn.

Mr. MADDEN, Mr. PRIEST, and Mr. HALE objected, and, under the rule, the bill was recommitted to the Committee on Claims.

JOHN WEAKLEY ET AL.

The Clerk called the bill (S. 887) conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the Western District of Virginia to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claims of John Weakley and Rella Moyer.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That jurisdiction is hereby conferred upon the United States District Court for the Western District of Virginia to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claims of John Weakley and Rella Moyer, both of Luray, Va., for compensation for personal injuries and property damage sustained by them as a result of a collision between the automobile in which they were riding and a Civilian Conservation Corps truck in Luray, Va., on June 29, 1941.

SEC. 2. In the determination of such claims, the United States shall be held liable for damages, and for any acts committed by any of its officers or employees, to the same extent as if the United States were a private person.

SEC. 3. Suit upon such claims may be instituted at any time within 1 year after the enactment of this act, notwithstanding the lapse of time or any statute of limitations. Proceedings for the determination of such claims, and appeals from and payment of any judgment thereon, shall be in the same manner as in the case of claims over which such court has jurisdiction under the provisions of paragraph "Twentieth" of section 24 of the Judicial Code, as amended.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CHARLES T. ALLEN

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1226) for the relief of Charles T. Allen.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Charles T. Allen, of Wilmington, N. C., the sum of $2,717.60, in full satisfaction of his claims against the United States for compensation for the death of his minor son, Charles Joseph Allen, who died as a result of injuries sustained when he was struck by a United States Army truck on May 10, 1942, and for reimbursement of medical, hospital, and funeral expenses incurred by him as a result of such injuries and death: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

J. C. DREWRY

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1365) for the relief of J. C. Drewry.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to J. C. Drewry, of Ninnekah, Okla., the sum of $2,090, in full satisfaction of his claims against the United States for compensation for personal injuries sustained by him, and for reimbursement of medical and hospital expenses incurred by him, as the result of an accident which occurred when the automobile in which he was riding as a passenger was struck by a United States Army truck near Ninnekah, Okla., on January 14, 1942: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JOHN H. GRADWELL

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1503) for the relief of John H. Gradwell.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the consideration of the bill?

Mr. MOTT and Mr. HALE objected, and, under the rule, the bill was recommitted to the Committee on Claims.

MRS. CLARK GOURLEY

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 1709, for the relief of Mrs. Clark Gourley, administratrix of the estate of Clark Gourley.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Mrs. Clark Gourley, of Gainesville, Fla., administratrix of the estate of Clark Gourley, the sum of $5,506.60, in full satisfaction of all claims against the United States for compensation for the death of Clark Gourley, who died as a result of personal injuries sustained by him in the performance of his official duties as a second lieutenant in the Florida State Guard, when the Army vehicle in which he was riding as a passenger was struck by an Army airplane during a demonstration held for the Army-Navy staff college at the Alachua Army Air Field, Gainesville, Fla., on October 27, 1943: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LUELLA F. STEWART

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 1717, for the relief of Luella F. Stewart.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Comptroller General of the United States is hereby authorized and directed to credit the account of Luella F. Stewart, former postmaster at Bottineau, N. Dak., in the sum of $1,153.30, the amount due the United States on account of loss of post-office funds resulting from the failure of the Bottineau County Bank, Bottineau, N. Dak., which closed September 27, 1923.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

L. C. GREGORY

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 1776, for the relief of L. C. Gregory.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated to L. C. Gregory, of Trousdale County, Tenn., the sum of $3,500, in full satisfaction of his claim against the United States for compensation for the death of his minor son, Cecil Gregory, who died on May 13, 1943, as a result of personal injuries sustained by him when the team of mules which he was driving became frightened at low-flying Army airplanes: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. ANNA RUNNEBAUM

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 1983, for the relief of Mrs. Anna Runnebaum.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $2,500, to Mrs. Anna Runnebaum, of Axtell, Kans., in full settlement of all claims against the United States for the death of her son, Ralph Joseph Runnebaum, who was killed in an automobile accident while in the employ of the Civilian Conservation Corps: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FRED A. DIMLER AND GWENDOLYN E. DIMLER

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 1995, for the relief of Fred A. Dimler and Gwendolyn E. Dimler, his wife.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Fred A. Dimler and Gwendolyn E. Dimler the amount of $2,030.16, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for the value of personal property destroyed by fire while stored in a Government building in Alaska: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PEARL SAIEVITZ

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 2373, for the relief of Pearl Saievitz.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Pearl Saievitz, now of Boston, Mass., the sum of $1,500, in full satisfaction of all claims against the United States for damages for personal injuries, medical expenses, and property damage sustained by her when she was struck by a truck owned by the city of Boston and leased or rented by said city to the Work Projects Administration, and being operated by one Lawrence Flaherty, an employee of said Work Projects Administration in connection with a project then being constructed by and under the supervision of said Work Projects Administration on Atlantic Avenue in the city of Boston Mass., on November 15, 1938: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 5, after the name "Saievitz" insert "Hurwitz."

Page 1, line 6, strike out the figures "$1,500", and insert in lieu thereof "$100; to pay the sum of $500 to Ruth Levin, of Fitchburg, Mass."

Page 1, line 7, after the name "United States", strike out "for damages."

Page 1, line 11, strike out "Work Projects" and insert in lieu thereof "Works Progress."

Page 2, line 1, strike out "Work Projects" and insert in lieu thereof "Works Progress."

Page 2, line 3, strike out "Work Projects" and insert in lieu thereof "Works Progress."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Pearl Saievitz Hurwitz and Ruth Levin."

MRS. BERTHA MACKLIN

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 3138, for the relief of Mrs. Bertha Macklin.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Mrs. Bertha Macklin, Delaware, Ohio, the sum of $250. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Mrs. Bertha Macklin against the United States on account of personal injuries sustained by her on April 7, 1942, while walking on the sidewalk on the west side of South Sandusky Street in Delaware, Ohio, when a United States Army truck struck another truck parked at the curb, forcing the latter truck over the curb and causing it to strike the said Mrs. Bertha Macklin.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "$250" and insert "$100."

Page 2, after the colon in line 4, insert the following: "*Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. BERTHA GRANTHAM

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 3192, for the relief of Mrs. Bertha Grantham.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Mrs. Bertha Grantham, Bush, La., the sum of $50. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Mrs. Bertha Grantham against the United States for property damages sustained when a cow owned by the said Mrs. Bertha Grantham was killed as the result of being struck by a United States Army truck on the Bogalusa and Slidell Highway, near Bush, La., on December 18, 1941.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, line 2, after "1941" insert the following: "*Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this Act in excess of 10 per centum thereof shall be paid or de-

livered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. LUTHER S. SYKES

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 3585, for the relief of Mrs. Luther S. Sykes.

Mr. HALE and Mr. MOTT objected and, under the rule, the bill was recommitted to the Committee on Claims.

JOSEPH W. STEEL

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 4038, for the relief of Joseph W. Steel.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Joseph W. Steel, San Francisco, Calif., the sum of $2,132.01, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for reimbursement of expenses as a result of being transferred by the Director of the United States Mint, Washington, D. C., from San Francisco, Calif., to Philadelphia, Pa., during the month of July 1934 for a period of 6 months: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "$2,132.01" and insert "$910."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ALEX WYLIE AND JAMES EVANS

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 4366, for the relief of Alex Wylie and the estate of James Evans.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Alex Wylie, of Columbus, Ga., $1,500, and to the administrator or executor of the estate of James Evans, of Columbus, Ga., $5,000. The payment of such sums shall be in full settlement of all claims against the United States arising out of the injury of Alex Wylie, and the injury and death of James Evans, when the truck they were driving was struck by a tank driven by Private W. J. Jenkins, Company B, Seven Hundred and Sixtieth Tank Battalion, at the intersection of the Cusseta Highway and First Division Road at Fort Benning, Ga., on August 21, 1942.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "$1,500" and insert "$600."

Page 1, line 8, strike out "$5,000" and insert "$3,000."

Page 2, at the end of the bill insert *"Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LT. (T) P. J. VOORHIES

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 4452, for the relief of Lt. (T) P. J. Voorhies.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that S. 2031, a similar Senate bill, be considered in lieu of H. R. 4452.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection

The Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $3,243.05, to Lt. (T) P. J. Voorhies, United States Coast Guard Reserve, of Lafayette, La., as agent for Lafayette Flotilla and Iberia Flotilla, United States Coast Guard Auxiliary, in full settlement of all claims against the United States as reimbursement for certain building facilities used in connection with the Louisiana Gulf Coast Guard Auxiliary headquarters and for material and passenger transportation expenditures during the years 1942 and 1943: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill (H. R. 4452) was laid on the table.

TERRELL E. BECKNER, COMMITTEE FOR KIMBALL LEE BECKNER

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 4786, for the relief of Terrell E. Beckner, committee for Kimball Lee Beckner.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Terrell E. Beckner, committee for Kimball Lee Beckner, of Richmond, Va., the sum of $7,500, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for personal injuries and medical and other expenses sustained by Kimball Lee Beckner as the result of being injured on February 21, 1944, by an Army motorcycle driven by Eldon L. Dickinson, private, first class, Company D, Seven Hundred and Ninety-seventh Military Police Battalion, Byrd, Park, Richmond, Va.: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, lines 5 and 6, strike out the words "Terrell E. Beckner, committee for" and insert "the estate of."

Page 1, line 7, strike out "$7,500" and insert "$2,000."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of the estate of Kimball Lee Beckner."

SAUNDERS MEMORIAL HOSPITAL

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 5167, to confer jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the Eastern District of South Carolina to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of the Board of Trustees of the Saunders Memorial Hospital.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That jurisdiction is hereby conferred upon the United States District Court for the Eastern District of South Carolina to hear, determine, and render judgment upon, notwithstanding the lapse of time or any provision of law to the contrary, the claim of the board of trustees of the Saunders Memorial Hospital, Florence, S. C., against the United States for damages arising from the failure of the United States to exercise the option granted to the United States on November 16, 1942, to lease such hospital for the use of the Army. Such suit shall be instituted within 6 months from the date of enactment of this act, and the liability of the United States in such suit shall be determined upon the same principles and measures of liability as in like cases between private individuals.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JOHN C. SHAW

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 1101, to provide for the payment of the claim of John C. Shaw, administrator de bonis non of the estate of Sydney C. McLouth,

deceased, arising out of a contract between said deceased and the United States Shipping Board Emergency Fleet Corporation, for the construction of seagoing tugs.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to John C. Shaw, administrator de bonis non of the estate of Sydney C. McLouth, deceased, the sum of $27,467.97, in full satisfaction of the claims of said decedent against the United States Shipping Board Emergency Fleet Corporation, and its successors, including the United States of America, arising out of the certain contract dated May 24, 1920, between Sydney C. McLouth, of Marine City, Mich., party of the first part, and United States Shipping Board Emergency Fleet Corporation, a corporation organized and existing under the laws of the District of Columbia, acting for and on behalf of the United States of America, party of the second part, including particularly, without limitation on the foregoing generality, the obligation of said United States Shipping Board Emergency Fleet Corporation, to adjust and pay the subcontract of said deceased with Ingram-Day Lumber Co. under article 2 of said contract: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $2,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

YELLOW CAB TRANSIT CO.

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 1278, for the relief of Yellow Cab Transit Co.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Yellow Cab Transit Co., of 1405 Ramsey Tower, Oklahoma City, Okla., the sum of $2,267.98. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Yellow Cab Transit Co. against the United States for property damages sustained by it when its tractor, No. 387, and its semitrailer, No. 338, were destroyed by fire as the result of a collision with a United States Army truck on United States Highway No. 66, near Hazelgreen, Mo., on August 10, 1941: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 7, after the period, strike out down to and including the figures "1941", on page 2, line 4, and insert "and to Equitable Fire and Marine Insurance Co. of Oklahoma City, Okla., the sum of $7,901.83. Payment of such sums shall be in full settlement of all claims against the United States for the loss of tractor No. 387, semitrailer No. 338, and cargo carried therein resulting from a collision with a United States Army truck on United States Highway No. 66, near Hazelgreen, Mo., on August 10, 1941."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The title was amended so as to read: "An act for relief of Yellow Cab Transit Co. and Equitable Fire & Marine Insurance Co."

HENRY STOVALL

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 1772, for the relief of Henry Stovall.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Henry Stovall, of Hattiesburg, Miss., the sum of $500 in full and final settlement of any and all claims against the United States for injuries sustained when he was shot by an Army guard on Mobile Street in Hattiesburg, Miss., on August 16, 1942: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated by this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CLARENCE G. DOELLING AND DORIS J. (McNEIL) DOELLING

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 3279, for the relief of Clarence G. Doelling and Doris J. (McNeil) Doelling.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Clarence G. Doelling, of Valparaiso, Ind., the sum of $3,000, and to Doris J. (McNeil) Doelling, his wife, the sum of $1,000, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for personal injuries, and medical and hospital expenses incurred by them as the result of an accident in which the automobile in which they were riding was struck by a United States Army Air Corps Autocar truck at the intersection of United States Highway No. 6 and Indiana State Highway No. 49, about 6 miles north of Valparaiso, Ind., on June 27, 1941: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in a sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. WILLIAM M. WATSON

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 3323, for the relief of Mrs. William M. Watson.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Mrs. William M. Watson, Ocoee, Tenn., the sum of $10,500. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Mrs. William M. Watson against the United States on account of (1) the death of her husband, William M. Watson, and (2) personal injuries sustained by her minor son, Frank Watson. The said William M. Watson died as the result of personal injuries sustained on November 20, 1942, when a bridge, which had been allowed to remain in an unsafe condition, in the Cherokee National Forest, Polk County, Tenn., collapsed under a truck in which he was riding.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "$10,500" and insert "$5,000."

Page 1, line 9, strike out "and."

Page 1, line 10, strike out the word "The" and all of line 1 on page 2, and insert, ", and (3) to pay the sum of $440 to R. H. Price, of Ocoee, Tenn., in full settlement of all claims against the United States for property damage sustained on November 20."

Page 2, line 8, strike out "he was" and insert "they were" and after the word "riding", insert ": *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

Page 2, line 16, after the period strike out the balance of the line and all of line 17.

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Mrs. William M. Watson and R. H. Price."

LAVERNE WHIPPLE

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 3400, for the relief of LaVerne Whipple.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to LaVerne Whipple, Olympia, Wash., the sum of $10,000. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said LaVerne Whipple against the United States for personal injuries, and for damage to his automobile, sustained on May 3, 1941, when such auto-

mobile was struck by a United States Army vehicle on the Pacific Highway approximately 1 mile south of Tumwater, Wash.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "$10,000" and insert "$4,500." At the end of the bill insert "*Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FLOYD E. AND LENA MAE DRUMMOND

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 3678, for the relief of Floyd E. and Lena Mae Drummond.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Lena Mae Drummond, the sum of $5,000, in full settlement of all claims against the Government of the United States arising out of the accident caused by the negligent operation of an automobile driven by Ensign Singleton, attached to the United States Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Civilian Conservation Corps of the State of Ohio, while acting within the scope of his employment, on the Narrows Road, Ross County, Ohio, about 1 mile south of the Marietta Pike, on March 24, 1941; and to Floyd E. Drummond, the sum of $2,500, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for personal injuries sustained by him as the result of the above accident: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 5, after "appropriated," strike out the rest of page 1 and on page 2 down to "accident," in line 7, and insert "the sum of $2,500 to Lena Mae Drummond; and to pay the sum of $3,500 to Floyd E. Drummond, both of Ross County, Ohio, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for personal injuries, hospital and medical expenses, and property damage sustained as the result of a collision between the car in which they were riding and a Civilian Conservation Corps truck on the Narrows Road, Ross County, Ohio, about 1 mile south of the Marietta Pike, on March 24, 1941."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

IRA CANNON

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 4105, for the relief of Ira Cannon.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $10,000, to Ira Cannon, of Greenville, S. C., in full settlement of all claims against the United States for personal injuries sustained as a result of being hit by a bullet fired by a soldier on guard at the Greenville, C. S., Army air base, on June 12, 1943: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 5, strike out "$10,000" and insert "$5,000."

Line 8, after "injuries," insert "medical and hospital expenses."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

KELLY HOBBS

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 4125, for the relief of Kelly Hobbs.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $5,701.47, to Kelly Hobbs, of Meridian, Miss., in full settlement of all claims against the United States for property damage and personal injuries sustained as a result of a collision between the automobile in which he was riding and a United States Army truck, at the intersection of Twelfth Street and Twenty-second Avenue, Meridian, Miss., on August 19, 1942: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 5, strike out "$5,701.47" and insert "$3,634.19."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LOUIS CINIGLIO

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 4248, for the relief of the legal guardian of Louis Ciniglio.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the legal guardian of Louis Ciniglio, a minor, of 227 East Ruby Avenue, Palisades Park, N. J., the sum of $3,500, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for injuries, medical and hospital expenses sustained as the result of being struck by a United States Army Ford sedan No. 115702, on June 19, 1943, on State Highway Route No. 6 in Palisades Park, N. J.: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. FLOYD M. ADAIR, EVELYN LOUISE ADAIR, CORA ANN ADAIR, BETTY FLOYD ADAIR, AND ERNEST DEAN ADAIR

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 4322, for the relief of Mrs. Floyd M. Adair, Evelyn Louise Adair, Cora Ann Adair, Betty Floyd Adair, and Ernest Dean Adair.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Mrs. Floyd M. Adair, of Villa Rica, Ga., unremarried widow of Floyd M. Adair, deceased, the sum of $10,000; and to Mrs. Floyd M. Adair, of Villa Rica, Ga., as legal guardian of Evelyn Louise Adair, minor child of Floyd M. Adair, deceased, the sum of $2,500, and to Mrs. Floyd M. Adair, of Villa Rica, Ga., as legal guardian of Cora Ann Adair, minor child of Floyd M. Adair, deceased, the sum of $2,500; and to Mrs. Floyd M. Adair, of Villa Rica, Ga., as legal guardian of Betty Floyd Adair, minor child of Floyd M. Adair, deceased, the sum of $2,500; and to Mrs. Floyd M. Adair, of Villa Rica, Ga., as legal guardian of Ernest Dean Adair, minor child of Floyd M. Adair, deceased, the sum of $2,500, in full satisfaction of all claims against the United States arising out of the homicide of the said Floyd M. Adair who was killed when the truck trailer in which he was driving was involved in a collision with a United States Army truck near Austell, Ga., on or about June 10, 1943: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 per cent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 5, after "to", strike out down to and including "1943" in line 13 on page 2, and insert "the estate of Floyd M. Adair, deceased, of Villa Rica, Ga., the sum of $5,429.25, in full settlement of all claims against the United States on account of the death

of the said Floyd M. Adair resulting from a collision involving a United States Army truck, which accident occurred on United States Highway No. 78, about 7 miles east of Austell, Ga., on June 10, 1943."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of the estate of Floyd M. Adair, deceased."

OLLIE BRASHEAR HEARLDSON

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 4363, for the relief of Ollie Brashear Hearldson.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Ollie Brashear Hearldson, Bowling Green, Ky., the sum of $5,000. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Ollie Brashear Hearldson against the United States on account of the death of her husband, Charles Hearldson, as a result of injuries sustained in a collision, on January 19, 1943, at the intersection of Indiana Avenue and Eighteenth Street, Camp Campbell, Ky., between the vehicle in which the said Charles Hearldson was riding and a vehicle in the service of the Army of the United States.

With the following committee amendment:

At the end of the bill insert the following: "*Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JOHN McLAUGHLIN, SR., AND JOHN McLAUGHLIN, JR.

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 4451, for the relief of John McLaughlin, Sr., and John McLaughlin, Jr.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and is hereby, directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $250 to John McLaughlin, Sr., and to pay the sum of $1,000 to John McLaughlin, Jr., both of 519 East Thirty-second Street, Paterson, N. J., in full settlement for all claims against the United States for personal injuries, medical and hospital expenses, and property damage sustained as the result of the car which John McLaughlin, Jr., was driving being struck by a United States Army truck in Paterson, N. J., on November 17, 1942: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 5, strike out "$250" and insert "$75."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SANDY C. BROWN

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 4549, for the relief of Sandy C. Brown.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Sandy C. Brown the sum of $1,000 for injuries he received when an Army truck ran over him while walking on the shoulder of the State highway in South Carolina.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 6, after "$1,000", insert "in full settlement of all claims against the United States."

Line 9, after "highway", insert "No. 501", and after "Carolina", insert "on October 8, 1943: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ROBERT L. WHIDDON

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 4588, for the relief of Robert L. Whiddon.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Robert L. Whiddon, of near Merryville, La., the sum of $10,000, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for compensation for personal injuries sustained, and reimbursement of expenses incurred, as the result of being struck by a United States Public Health Service automobile, at the time being driven in the service of the United States Public Health Service and operated by a unit of the United States Public Health Service, on April 21, 1943, on Highway No. 190 between De Ridder and Merryville, La.: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "$10,000" and insert "$3,935."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ESTATE OF ANNIE BROWN

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 4703, for the relief of the estate of Annie Brown.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the estate of Annie Brown, deceased, the sum of $2,545.50, because of death incurred as a result of being struck by a vehicle operated by the United States Army, in behalf of the Post Office Department, at the intersection of Fremont Avenue and Briscoe Street, Baltimore, Md., on December 23, 1943, at 6:30 p. m.: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 6, after "$2,545.50", insert "in full settlement of all claims against the United States."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DR. H. L. KLOTZ

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 4736, for the relief of Dr. H. L. Klotz.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Dr. H. L. Klotz, Austin, Tex., the sum of $130. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Dr. H. L. Klotz for services rendered in conducting physical examinations for appointees for civilian positions in the Government service pursuant to War Department contract No. W-359-eng-4087, dated March 18, 1942. It was determined that the United States Army Engineers Office of the War Department was without authority in law to enter into such a contract.

With the following committee amendment:

On page 1, line 6, after the word "of", strike out the balance of the page, and down to and including line 4, page 2, and insert the words "$114, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for services rendered to the Engineer Corps, United States Army, un-

der contracts Nos. W-359-eng-4087, dated March 18, 1942, and W-359-eng-4438, dated June 29, 1942: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

VOLUSIA COUNTY, FLA.

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 4815, for the relief of the Board of County Commissioners of Volusia County, Fla.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the Board of County Commissioners of Volusia County, Fla., the sum of $4,068.10. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims against the United States on account of damage to an Adams motor road grader caused by United States Navy airplane *F4F-4*, Bureau No. 5223, on March 3, 1944, on the naval base grounds at Daytona Beach, Fla.: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

WILFRED T. PLANT, SR.

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 4817, for the relief of Wilfred T. Plant, Sr.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the provisions and limitations of sections 15 to 20, both inclusive, of the act entitled "An act to provide compensation for employees of the United States suffering injuries while in the performance of their duties, and for other purposes," approved September 7, 1916, as amended, are hereby waived in the case of Wilfred T. Plant, Sr., of Hartford, Conn.; and the United States Employees' Compensation Commission is authorized and directed to consider and act upon any claim filed with the Commission, within 1 year after the date of the enactment of this act, by or on behalf of the said Wilfred T. Plant, Jr., for compensation or other benefits under the provisions of such act of September 7, 1916, as amended, for disability due to an injury alleged to have been sustained by him in 1938, while lifting heavy rocks in the performance of his duties as a laborer on the Works Progress Administration project No. 16444 in Attleboro, Mass.: *Provided*, That no benefits hereunder shall accrue prior to the approval of this act.

With the following committee amendments:

On page 2, line 5, after the word "amended", insert the words "and as made applicable in the cases of employees receiving compensation from emergency relief appropriations"; and on page 2, line 9, insert the words "resulting in ruptured intervertebral disc left fifth lumbar interspace mediolateral, necessitating operation."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EMMA B. FLEET

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 4878, for the relief of the estate of Emma B. Fleet, deceased.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Charles J. Dunn, administrator of the estate of Emma B. Fleet, late of Everett, Mass., the sum of $10,000. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims against the United States on account of the death, on July 29, 1940, of the said Emma B. Fleet as a result of injuries sustained by her when the vehicle in which she was riding was struck, on July 8, 1940, at the intersection of Elm Street and Route 2 in Concord, Mass., by a vehicle in the service of the Army of the United States.

With the following committee amendments:

On page 1, line 5, strike out the words "Charles J. Dunn, administrator of."

On page 1, line 7, strike out "$10,000" and insert "$5,759.65."

On page 2, line 4, insert the words "*Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FRANCIS D. STOVALL, JR.

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 4927, for the relief of Francis D. Stovall, Jr.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the limitations of time in sections 15 to 20, both inclusive, of the act entitled "An act to provide compensation for employees of the United States suffering injuries while in the performance of their duties, and for other purposes," approved September 7, 1916, as amended, are hereby waived in favor of Francis D. Stovall, Jr., of Clinton, Miss., and the Employees' Compensation Commission is hereby authorized and directed to receive and consider under the remaining provisions of said act his claim on account of injury and disability alleged to have been incurred on or about November 10, 1942, while an employee of and performing his duties as a rural mail carrier of the Post Office Department: *Provided*, That claim hereunder shall be filed within 6 months from the approval of this act: *Provided further*, That no benefits shall accrue prior to the approval of this act.

With the following committee amendment:

On page 2, line 3, insert the words "while changing a tire on his automobile."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FRANCIS A. COLLINS

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 5034, for the relief of the estate of Francis A. Collins.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $6,209.25, to the estate of Francis A. Collins, deceased, in full settlement of all claims against the United States as compensation for the death of Francis A. Collins, and medical, hospital, and burial expenses incurred as a result of the said Francis A. Collins being struck by an Army ambulance at the intersection of Canal Street and South Scott Street, in the city of New Orleans, La., on December 15, 1943: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

On page 1, line 5, strike out "$6,209.25" and insert "$5,384.25."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

E. E. ARMSTRONG

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 5212, for the relief of E. E. Armstrong.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. HALE and Mr. MOTT objected, and the bill was recommitted to the Committee on Claims.

VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 1665, an act to relieve certain employees of the Veterans' Administration from financial liability for certain overpayments and allow such credit therefor as is necessary in the accounts of Guy F. Allen, chief disbursing officer.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the employees responsible for the excess or erroneous payments represented by the sums herein stated

be, and they are hereby, relieved of financial liability therefor and the Comptroller General is authorized and directed to allow credit in the settlement of the accounts of Guy F. Allen, chief disbursing officer, Treasury Department, in such amounts not exceeding the sums stated herein, which have been or hereafter may be disallowed, as may be necessary to relieve such disbursing officer of financial liability therefor: *Provided*, That this act shall not be construed to bar recovery of the amounts herein specified from the persons to whom and through whom such amounts have been paid:

First: A. J. Dalton, certifying officer at Veterans' Administration, Baltimore (now Fort Howard), Md., in the sum of $4.50, which amount was expended March 31, 1941, under symbol 11559.

Second: D. D. Campbell, certifying officer at Veterans' Administration facility, Perry Point, Md., in the sum of $7, which amount was expended in February 1941, under symbol 11559.

Third: C. F. Sargent, certifying officer at Veterans' Administration facility, Batavia, N. Y., in the sum of $420, which amount was expended from December 1, 1938, through February 28, 1939, under symbol 11564.

Fourth: John A. Hadley, certifying officer at Veterans' Administration facility, Bath, N. Y., in the sum of $12.66, which amount was expended from August 1 through September 26, 1939, under symbol 11564.

Fifth: Malcolm L. Stoddard, certifying officer at Veterans' Administration facility, Togus, Maine, in the sum of $467.50, which amount was expended from January 1 through June 30, 1939, under symbol 11565.

Sixth: D. F. Ivory, certifying officer at Veterans' Administration facility, Togus, Maine, in the sum of $42.50, which amount was expended June 30, 1939, under symbol 11565.

Seventh: F. X. McFadden, certifying officer at Veterans' Administration office, Philadelphia, Pa., in the sum of $4.20, which amount was expended July 31, 1941, under symbol 11566.

Eighth: H. H. Higginbotham, certifying officer at Veterans' Administration facility, Pittsburgh, Pa., in the sum of $5.26, which amount was expended in May 1941, under symbol 11568.

Ninth: Guy F. Palmer, certifying officer at Veterans' Administration facility, Dearborn, Mich., in the sum of $4, which amount was expended in July 1941, under symbol 11571.

Tenth: I. G. Sims, certifying officer at Veterans' Administration facility, Knoxville, Iowa, in the sum of $60, which amount was expended July 23, 1941, under symbol 11571.

Eleventh: A. B. Conley, certifying officer at Veterans' Administration facility, Wichita, Kans., in the sum of $125, which amount was expended in May 1940, under symbol 11573.

Twelfth: S. E. Malmsten, certifying officer at Veterans' Administration, Washington, D. C., in the sum of $18.55, which amount was expended July 12, 1938, under symbol 11647.

Thirteenth: A. P. Carson, certifying officer at Veterans' Administration, Washington, D. C., in the sum of $83.03, which amount was expended June 15, 1936, under symbol 99280.

Fourteenth: J. C. Dale, certifying officer at Veterans' Administration, Washington, D. C., in the sum of $182.25, which amount was expended June 30, 1936, under symbol 99280.

Fifteenth: M. Carey, certifying officer at Veterans' Administration facility, New York (Bronx), New York, in the sum of $100, which amount was expended June 15, 1936, under symbol 99282.

Sixteenth: A. Rosenthal, certifying officer at Veterans' Administration, Cleveland (now Brecksville), Ohio, in the sum of $4.71, which amount was expended July 10, 1936, under symbol 99284.

Seventeenth: C. A. Blackburn, certifying officer at Veterans' Administration, Little Rock, Ark., in the sum of $43, which amount was expended on June 15, 1936, under symbol 99288.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read a third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

OLIVER N. KNIGHT

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 1827, for the relief of Oliver N. Knight.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Oliver N. Knight, Guilford County, N. C., the sum of $20,442.16, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for the destruction of the residence of the said Oliver N. Knight and of all the money and personal property therein contained and for the death of his wife and three children as a result of an airplane in the service of the United States Navy crashing into his residence on September 13, 1943: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in the act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

On page 1, line 6, strike out "$20,442.16" and insert "$22,992.16."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read a third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MARY AGNES LICHTEFELD DROPPELMAN

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 3645, for the relief of Mary Agnes Lichtefeld Droppelman.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Mary Agnes Lichtefeld Droppelman, of Louisville, Ky., the sum of $1,500, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for personal injuries sustained by the said Mary Agnes Lichtefeld Droppelman as a result of a collision involving a United States Army truck and an automobile of which she was the operator, on October 14, 1942, in Louisville, Ky.: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendments:

On page 1, after the word "appropriated" insert "(1)."

On page 1, line 6, strike out "$1,500" and insert "$1,000."

On page 1, line 8, strike out the words "sustained by the said Mary Agnes Lichtefeld Droppelman" and insert "; (2) to pay the sum of $4,912.12 to Fred J. Lichtefeld and Josephine Lichtefeld, of Louisville, Ky., in full settlement of all claims against the United States for medical and hospital expenses for Mary Agnes Lichtefeld, and the death and burial of Ruth Marion Lichtefeld."

On page 2, line 5, strike out the words "of which she was the operator" and insert the words "in which they were riding."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HAROLD MILLER

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 4542, for the relief of Harold Miller.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $980, to Harold Miller, of Minneapolis, Minn., in full settlement of all claims against the United States for personal injuries, medical and hospital expenses, and loss of wages as a result of a collision between the car in which he was a passenger and a United States Navy ambulance No. 21880, on January 21, 1944, in San Francisco, Calif.: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JUDD: On page 1, line 5, strike out the figure "$980" and insert "$2,440."

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, this man, Mr. Harold Miller, was injured last January by a Navy ambulance going at an excessive rate of speed through a red light and without siren. The Navy accepts full responsibility for his injuries, which included a broken arm and injuries to his brain centers and organs of special sense, causing reduction of hearing in one ear and complete loss of smell and taste.

At the time I introduced the bill last March it was assumed the arm was healing satisfactorily and that $980 would be adequate for his hospital and medical expenses and his loss of time from work. However, later it was found that the bones had not united and it is going to require a special operation to plate the bones. That means a much greater expense and loss of time than was contemplated.

The office of the Judge Advocate General of the Navy has assured me that inasmuch as the claim was filed prematurely, it will not object to this larger amount under the circumstances, provided this explanation is placed in the RECORD.

The figure $2,400 covers the following:

Medical and hospital expenses already incurred	$524.70
Estimated surgical and hospital expenses for bone operation	500.00
Damage for loss of hearing, taste, and smell	350.00
Wages lost through unemployment	1,065.00
Total	$2,439.70

Actually if the man were to claim full damages, it would be considerably more than he is asking. He has loss of hearing on one side and complete loss of taste and smell, but he only asks $350 for that permanent damage. The case has not been in the hands of a lawyer.

I hope the House will accept this amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

THOMAS R. CLARK

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 4593, for the relief of Thomas R. Clark.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Thomas R. Clark, the sum of $5,000, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for injury to said Thomas R. Clark, on June 19, 1943, as a result of negligence and excessive speed in the operation of an Army vehicle in the city of Tampa, Fla.: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "$5,000" and insert "$3,500."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider laid on the table.

ESTATE OF EVERETTE MAXWELL, THE ESTATE OF REDMAN P. MADDUX, ELMER MASSA, AND ESTEL MASSA

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 4674, for the relief of the estate of Everette Maxwell, the estate of Redman P. Maddux, Elmer Massa, and Estel Massa.

There being no objection the Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to (1) Mrs. Lillian Maxwell, Cookeville, Tenn., as administratrix of the estate of Everette Maxwell, the sum of $10,518.79; (2) Mrs. Redith Maddux, Cookeville, Tenn., as administratrix of the estate of Redman P. Maddux, the sum of $10,442.50; (3) Elmer Massa, Baxter, Tenn., the sum of $5,000; and (4) Estel Massa, Baxter, Tenn., the sum of $228.45. The payment of such sums shall be in full settlement of all claims against the United States on account of (1) the death of the said Everette Maxwell, (2) the death of the said Redman P. Maddux, (3) personal injuries sustained by the said Elmer Massa, and (4) expenses incurred by the said Estel Massa as the result of the personal injuries sustained by his minor son, the said Elmer Massa. The said Everette Maxwell and Redman P. Maddux were instantly killed and the said Elmer Massa was severely injured on May 31, 1943 when they were struck by a United States Army truck on United States Highway No. 25, near Troy, Ohio.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 7, after "Maxwell" insert "deceased." Same line strike out the figures "$10,518.79" and insert "$5,468.79."

Page 1, line 9, after "Maddux" insert "deceased." Same line strike out the figures "$10,442.50" and insert "$5,442.50." Same line after "(3)" insert "the legal guardian of."

Page 1, line 10, after "Massa" insert "a minor."

Page 1, line 10, strike out "and (4) Estel Massa, Baxter, Tenn., the sum of $228.45 "

Page 2, line 5, strike out " and (4) expenses incurred by the said Estel Massa as the result of personal injuries sustained by his minor son, the said Elmer Massa."

Page 2, line 5, after "Massa" strike out the comma and insert a period.

At the end of bill strike out the period and insert: ": *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The title was amended so as to read "A bill for the relief of the estate of Everette Maxwell; the estate of Redman P. Maddux; and the legal guardian of Elmer Massa, a minor."

W. A. SMOOT, INC.

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 4737, for the relief of W. A. Smoot, Inc.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to W. A. Smoot, Inc., Alexandria, Va., the sum of $2,417.19. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said W. A. Smoot, Inc., against the United States for damages caused to its lumber and millwork plant located at Cameron and Union Streets, Alexandria, Va., as the result of an explosion on March 2, 1944, in a nearby building used and occupied by the Records Division of The Adjutant General's office of the Department of War.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "$2,417.19" and insert "$2,397.19."

Page 2, line 3, insert ": *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DR. J. SIMS NORMAN

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 4921, for the relief of Dr. J. Sims Norman.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Dr. J. Sims Norman, of Pueblo, Colo., the sum of $432. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims which the said Dr. J. Sims Norman has against the United States for and on account of professional services rendered during the month of May 1942, in making physical examinations of Government employees engaged in the construction of the Army air base at the Pueblo Ordnance Depot at Pueblo, Colo., which examinations were made under the orders and direction of the United States Army engineers who were in charge of said projects: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and that the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read the third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ESTATE OF CECILE H. BURGETT, DECEASED

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 5048, for the relief of Cecile H. Burgett, deceased.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the estate of Cecile H. Burgett, deceased, the sum of $10,000, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for the death of Cecile H. Burgett, October 5, 1942, as the result of being run over by a United States Postal Department vehicle on that date, which was being operated by an employee of the Post Office Department, which occurred on the intersection of Seventeenth and Davenport Streets, Omaha, Nebr.: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be

deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "$10,000" and insert "$5,350."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HYMAN L. SCHIFFER

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 299, for the relief of Hyman L. Schiffer.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Hyman L. Schiffer, of Brooklyn, N. Y., the sum of $500, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for the refund of a bail bond posted for Frieda Schiffer, an alien, same being forfeited on March 13, 1940, when she failed to appear for deportation: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HARRY V. HEARN

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 3369, for the relief of Harry V. Hearn.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Harry V. Hearn, of New York City, the sum of $5,000. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims against the United States for damages on account of personal injuries received by Harry V. Hearn on June 5, 1940, on United States Route 17, near Yorktown, Va., when he was struck by a motor vehicle operated by a member of the enlisted personnel of the United States Army: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 6, strike out the figures "$5,000", and insert in lieu thereof the figures "$2,500."

Page 1, line 8, strike out "damages on account of."

Page 1, line 8, after the word "injuries" insert ", medical and hospital expenses sustained as a result of being struck by a United States Army vehicle."

Page 1, line 9, strike out "received by Harry V. Hearn."

Page 1, line 10, after the name "Virginia" strike out "when he was."

Page 1, line 11, strike out the bill down to *"Provided."*

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

WALTER LUNDMARK

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 3995, for the relief of Walter Lundmark.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Walter Lundmark, Soap Lake, Wash., the sum of $2,500. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Walter Lundmark against the United States for personal injuries sustained on January 4, 1943, when he was struck with a catsup bottle and permanently disfigured by an enlisted man from the Army Air Base, Ephrata, Wash., in front of the Bob White Cafe, Soap Lake, Wash.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, line 2, after the word "Washington", insert *"Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

WILLIAM WEBER

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 4200, for the relief of William Weber.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to William Weber, Brooklyn, N. Y., the sum of $7,500, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for injuries sustained by the said William Weber, resulting from his being struck by gunshots inflicted by a United States Navy shore patrolman on May 12, 1943, at the intersection of West Fifty-first Street and Eighth Avenue, New York City, N. Y.: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "$7,500" and insert "$1,500."

Page 1, line 9, strike out "inflicted" and insert "fired."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

BERTHA LEFRANCQ

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4333) for the relief of Bertha LeFrancq.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Bertha LaFrancq, of Milwaukie, Oreg., the sum of $10,309, in full satisfaction of her claim against the United States for compensation for the death of her son, Paul Edwin LeFrancq, who died as a result of personal injuries sustained by him when riding in a jeep owned by the United States Army and operated by Sgt. Ivan McElwaine, Cannon Company, Two Hundred and Seventy-sixth Infantry, Camp Adair, Oreg., which overturned on the Falls City-Dallas Highway on December 22, 1943: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 5, strike out the word "LaFrancq" and insert "LeFrancq."

Page 1, line 6, strike out "10,309" and insert "$3,805."

Page 1, line 7, strike out "her claim" and insert "all claims."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ALBERT B. WEAVER

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4442) for the relief of Albert B. Weaver.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Albert B. Weaver, of Corvallis, Oreg., the sum of $8,600, in full satisfaction of his claim against the United States for personal injuries sustained by him on December 23, 1941, when the automobile which he was operating collided with a Chevrolet cargo truck, United States Army–W326663, driven by Pvt. Russell A. Bennett, of Battery A–121 C. A. (A. A.), of Burbank, Calif.: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding.

Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "$8,600" and insert "$4,500."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

WILLIAM H. CROMPTON

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4481) for the relief of William H. Crompton.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to William H. Crompton, of 1427 Southwest Third Street, Miami, Fla., the sum of $7,500, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for injuries received when he was struck by a stray bullet fired from a Navy plane near Hollywood, Fla., on February 7, 1943: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "$7,500" and insert "$5,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LUDWIG WOLF

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4629) for the relief of Ludwig Wolf.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That notwithstanding the provisions and limitations of sections 15 to 20, inclusive, of the act entitled "An act to provide compensation for employees of the United States suffering injuries while in the performance of their duties, and for other purposes," approved September 7, 1916, as amended, the United States Employees' Compensation Commission is hereby authorized and directed to receive and consider, when filed, the claim of Ludwig Wolf for disability resulting from hernia alleged to have been sustained by him while in the performance of duty during employment on April 15, 1942, as a laborer in the custodial service of the Post Office Department at Juneau, Alaska, and to determine said claim upon its merits under the remaining provisions of said act: *Provided*, That claim for benefits shall be filed with such Commission within 90 days from the date of the approval of this act: *And provided further*, That no benefit shall accrue under this act prior to the date of approval thereof.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LT. JAMES H. CLARK AND ELEANOR CLARK

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4929) for the relief of Lt. James H. Clark and Eleanor Clark.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Lt. James H. Clark, Carmel, Calif., the sum of $330, in full settlement of all claims of the said James H. Clark against the United States on account of funeral and burial expenses of his mother, Mrs. Esther Compton Clark, paid by him; and to Eleanor Clark, Carmel, Calif., the minor child of the said Esther Compton Clark, the sum of $4,000 in full settlement of all claims of the said Eleanor Clark against the United States on account of loss of support occasioned by the death of her mother, Esther Compton Clark, when the said Esther Compton Clark was run down and killed by a Navy truck on Ocean Avenue near Casanova Street, Carmel, Calif., on April 7, 1944: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 6, after the figures "$330", insert "and to pay the sum of $4,000 to Eleanor Clark, of Carmel, Calif."

Page 1, line 7, strike out "of the said James H. Clark."

Page 1, line 8, strike out "funeral" and insert in lieu thereof "the death."

Page 1, line 8, strike out "his" and insert in lieu thereof "their."

Page 1, line 9, after the name "Compton Clark", strike out the bill down to the word "killed" in line 4, page 2, and insert in lieu thereof "when she was."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JESSIE SPRINGSTEEN AND JOHN SPRINGSTEEN

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4962) for the relief of Jessie Springsteen and John Springsteen.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $5,003.30 to Jessie Springsteen, of Eatontown, N. J.; to pay the sum of $582 to John Springsteen, of Eatontown, N. J. The payment of such sums shall be in full settlement of all claims against the United States on account of personal injuries, medical expenses, and property damage sustained when Miss Springsteen's car was involved in a collision with a United States Army truck in Shrewsbury Township, Monmouth County, N. J., on October 28, 1943: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 5, strike out "$5,003.30" and insert "$1,870.30."

Page 1, line 7, strike out "$582" and insert "$182."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PUGET SOUND BRIDGE & DREDGING CO.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 449) for the relief of the Puget Sound Bridge & Dredging Co.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, instructed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the Puget Sound Bridge & Dredging Co., of Seattle, Wash., the sum of $595, representing liquidated damages accessed against that company as subcontractor of Semple & Kenny, a partnership of Juneau, Alaska, to whom was awarded contract No. W-1090-eng-28, dated February 6, 1931, for dredging and removal of rock at Port Alexander, Alaska: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or agents, attorney or attorneys, on account of services rendered in connection with said claim. It shall be unlawful for any agent or agents, attorney or attorneys, to exact, collect, withhold, or receive any sum of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof on account of services rendered in connection with said claim, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 8, strike out the word "Kenny" and insert the word "Keeny."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

G. F. ODOM

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 545) for the relief of G. F. Odom.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to G. F. Odom, Starke, Fla., the sum of $5,000. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement

of all claims of the said G. F. Odom against the United States on account of personal injuries sustained on October 9, 1941, when the truck in which he was riding was in collision with a United States Army truck on State Highway No. 5A, near Fort White, Fla.

With the following committee amendments:

Line 6, strike out the figures "$5,000" and insert in lieu thereof the figures "$527.70."

At the end of bill strike out the period and insert ": *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LINDSEY HARCROW

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 763) for the relief of Lindsey Harcrow.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Lindsey Harcrow, of Anniston, Ala., the sum of $500. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims against the Government of the United States for personal injuries sustained by the said Lindsey Harcrow, when he was struck February 10, 1941, by a truck in the service of the War Department.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 11, insert the following: "*Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. AGNES WOLTERS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2213) for the relief of Mrs. Agnes Wolters.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Mrs. Agnes Wolters, of East St. Louis, Ill., the sum of $608.90. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Mrs. Agnes Wolters against the United States on account of personal injuries sustained by her as the result of being struck by a United States Army truck at Edgemont Station, Belleville, Ill., on April 29, 1938: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ROSE B. LUZAR

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 2300, for the relief of Rose B. Luzar.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Rose B. Luzar, of Jeannette, Pa., the sum of $10,000, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for personal injuries sustained on July 10, 1941, when she was struck by a mail truck in the city of Jeannette: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "$10,000" and insert "$923.34."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. NELLE JONES

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 2543, for the relief of Mrs. Nelle Jones.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Mrs. Nelle Jones, Los Angeles, Calif., the sum of $5,000. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Mrs. Nelle Jones against the United States for the death of her husband, Samuel N. Jones, and for personal injuries sustained by her, as the result of an accident on July 3, 1942, when the automobile in which they were riding on United States Highway No. 99, near Chowchilla, Calif., was overtaken and struck by a United States Army truck.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 9, strike out "and" and after the word "injuries", insert "and property damage."

Page 2, line 2, strike out "was overtaken and struck by" and insert "collided with."

Page 2, line 3, after the word "truck", insert "*Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HUBERT McMAHON AND BARBARA McMAHON

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 3017, for the relief of Hubert McMahon and Barbara McMahon, a minor.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Hubert McMahon, of Harrisville, Lewis County, N. Y., the sum of $13,233 and to Hubert McMahon and Dorothy McMahon, legal general guardians of Barbara McMahon, a minor, of Harrisville, Lewis County, N. Y., the sum of $1,198.35 in full settlement of all claims against the United States for personal injuries sustained as a result of being struck by a 2½-ton Army truck on Main Street of the village of Harrisville, Lewis County, N. Y., on September 5, 1942: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "$13,233 and" and all of lines 7 to 10, inclusive, and on page 2, strike out lines 1 to 3, inclusive, and insert "$5,000 for property damage, personal injuries, and permanent disability to himself, and medical and hospital expenses incurred for himself and his minor daughter, Barbara McMahon; and the sum of $1,000 to the legal guardian of Barbara McMahon, a minor, for personal injuries, as a result of an accident involving an Army truck which occurred on September 5, 1942, in Harrisville, Lewis County, N. Y. Payment of said sums shall be in full settlement of all claims against the United States."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Hubert McMahon and the legal guardian of Barbara McMahon."

DEWEY H. DAVIS

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 3373, for the relief of Dewey H. Davis.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to

pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Dewey H. Davis, of Macon, Ga., the sum of $10,000, in full satisfaction of his claim against the United States for compensation for personal injuries, sustained by him as the result of an accident which occurred when the passenger bus in which he was riding was struck by a United States Army truck near Robins Field, Ga., on July 7, 1943: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "$10,000" and insert "$5,000", and strike out the words "his claim" and insert "all claims."

Page 1, line 8, after the word "injuries", insert "medical and hospital expenses incident thereto."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EDWARD C. ROBBINS

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 3414, for the relief of Edward C. Robbins.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Edward C. Robbins, Pineola, N. C., the sum of $4,273.75. The payment of this sum shall be in full settlement of his claim against the United States for permanent personal injuries suffered December 30, 1940, while employed by J. R. Eakin, superintendent, Great Smoky Mountain National Park, National Park Service, Gatlinburg, Tenn., as an expert appraiser and witness in the United States condemnation proceedings of the W. O. Whittle properties near Gatlinburg, Tenn.: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 7, strike out "his claim" and insert "all claims."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. ANNA CHANDLER

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 3881, for the relief of Mrs. Anna Chandler.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Mrs. Anna Chandler, Lakeside, Calif., the sum of $500. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Mrs. Anna Chandler against the United States for losses sustained as the result of an accident on June 14, 1942, in which a United States Army truck struck a building in Lakeside, Calif., in which a cafe operated by the said Mrs. Anna Chandler was located.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "$500" and insert "$200."

Page 1, line 8, strike out "losses" and insert "property damage and loss of business."

Page 2, line 1, after the word "located", insert ": *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JAMES LEROY EDEN

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 3928, for the relief of James LeRoy Eden.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to James LeRoy Eden, of 2180 Northwest Fifty-fifth Street, Miami, Fla., the sum of $2,500, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for the personal injuries sustained by him by the collision of a United States Navy station wagon with an automobile driven by John Andrew Godwin at the intersection of Northwest Seventy-eighth Street and Twenty-seventh Avenue, at Miami, Fla., on March 18, 1943: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JOHN CASEY AND MARIE CASEY

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 4016, for the relief of John Casey and Marie Casey.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to John Casey and Marie Casey, of Quincy, Mass., the sum of $5,000, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for personal injuries, sustained as a result of being struck by a United States Army truck, on Hancock Street, Quincy, Mass., on March 20, 1943: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "$5,000" and insert "$2,874.10."

Page 1, line 8, after the word "injuries" insert "medical and hospital expenses."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ROBERT ROWE AND MARY ROWE

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 4212, for the relief of Robert Rowe and Mary Rowe.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Robert Rowe and Mary Rowe, Norfolk, Va., the sum of $3,700. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Robert Rowe and Mary Rowe against the United States on account of the destruction of their house, at 620 Hughart Street, Norfolk, Va., on August 15, 1943, by a United States Navy airplane.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "$3,700" and insert in lieu thereof "$2,700."

Page 1, line 11, after the word "airplane", insert ": *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

KARL LUNGSTRAS

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 4213, for the relief of Karl Lungstras.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Karl Lungstras, Portsmouth, Va., the sum of $759.95. The

payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Karl Lungstras against the United States on account of damage to his automobile resulting from a collision, on March 1, 1943, on High Street, Norfolk, Va., between such automobile and a vehicle in the service of the Army of the United States.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 10, strike out "Norfolk" and insert in lieu thereof "Portsmouth."

Page 2, line 1, after the word "States", insert ": *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ROSA LEE FOREMAN

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 4309, for the relief of Rosa Lee Foreman.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Rosa Lee Foreman, of Winter Garden, Fla., the sum of $10,000, in full satisfaction of her claims against the United States for the death of Reuben D. Foreman, the husband of Rosa Lee Foreman, the said Reuben D. Foreman having been killed on June 5, 1943, when an Army airplane failed to leave the ground on a take-off, crashed through a wire fence, and crossed the highway: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 6, strike "$10,000" and insert "$5,585."

Page 1, line 7, strike out "her" and insert "all."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. JULIA TOLER

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 4367, for the relief of Mrs. Julia Toler.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Mrs. Julia Toler, Lynnhaven, Va., the sum of $10,000. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Mrs. Julia Toler against the United States on account of the loss of her minor daughter, Julia Frances Toler, who was instantly killed on February 24, 1942, when she was struck by a United States Army truck while crossing the Shore Drive, near Ocean Park, Princess Anne County, Va.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "$10,000" and insert "$3,000."

Page 1, line 8, strike out "loss" and insert "death."

Page 2, line 2, after the colon, insert "*Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FRANK LORE

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 4652, for the relief of Frank Lore.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. HALE and Mr. MOTT objected, and, under the rule, the bill was recommitted to the Committee on Claims.

CAPTOLIA COLVIN

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 4855, for the relief of Captolia Colvin.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a similar Senate bill (S. 1905), be considered in lieu of the bill H. R. 4855.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the estate of Walney A. Colvin, deceased, of Phoenix, Ariz., the sum of $5,000, in full satisfaction of all claims of the said estate for property damage and for the death of Walney A. Colvin, which occurred as the result of an accident involving an Army airplane on April 22, 1944, in Phoenix, Ariz.: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill, H. R. 4855, was laid on the table.

CLYDE H. PALMER

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 5060, for the relief of Clyde H. Palmer.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Clyde H. Palmer, of Coalinga, Calif., the sum of $6,322.50. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Clyde H. Palmer on account of the death of his wife, Lolo J. Palmer, who died as a result of an accident on November 29, 1944, when the automobile in which she was riding on United States Highway No. 99, at or near Tulare, Calif., was struck by a United States Army truck.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 6, after the words "the sum of" strike out the remainder of the page and down to and including the word "truck," on page 2, line 1, and insert "$762 for property damage and personal injuries sustained by him; to the estate of Lola J. Palmer, deceased, the sum of $5,572 for the death of the said Lola J. Palmer and for medical, hospital, and burial expenses incurred in connection with her injury and death; and the sum of $212.50 to the legal guardian of Margie Joan Palmer, a minor, for medical expenses and personal injuries of the said Margie Joan Palmer, all of which shall be in full settlement of all claims against the United States, as the result of an accident involving an Army truck on November 25, 1943, on United States Highway No. 99, at a point 5 miles north of Tulare, Calif.: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Clyde H. Palmer; estate of Lola J. Palmer; legal guardian of Margie Joan Palmer, a minor."

HERMAN WEINERT, JR.

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 3639, for the relief of Herman Weinert, Jr., M. D.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. HALE and Mr. MOTT objected, and, under the rule, the bill was recommitted to the Committee on Claims.

A. D. GIBSON

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 3931, for the relief of A. D. Gibson, M. D.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to A. D. Gibson, M. D., of Port Lavaca, Tex., the sum of $278, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for services rendered to the Corps of Engineers, United

States Army, from April 1, 1942, to September 30, 1942, inclusive.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 5, after the word "to", insert "the estate of."

At the end of the bill insert "*Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of the estate of Dr. A. D. Gibson."

C. C. THORNTON

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 1766, for the relief of C. C. Thornton.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to C. C. Thornton, of Walnut, Miss. the sum of $2,000, in full satisfaction of his claims against the United States for compensation for personal injuries and property damage sustained by him when the wagon in which he was riding was struck by a Civilian Conservation Corps truck on September 20, 1941, near Walnut, Miss.: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. AMY McKNIGHT

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 1959, for the relief of Mrs. Amy McKnight.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. MOTT and Mr. SPRINGER objected, and, under the rule, the bill was recommitted to the Committee on Claims.

CARL M. FRASURE

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 1477, for the relief of Carl M. Frasure.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Carl M. Frasure, formerly an employee of the Office of Price Administration, the sum of $506.91, in full satisfaction of his claim against the United States for compensation for accrued annual leave, the payment of which was prevented by the provisions of the eighth proviso in the paragraph under the caption "Office of Price Administration" contained in the National War Agencies Appropriation Act, 1944: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

IRMA S. SHERIDAN

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 2069, for the relief of Irma S. Sheridan, postmaster at Rockville, Oreg.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the General Accounting Office is hereby authorized and directed to credit the account of Irma S. Sheridan, postmaster at Rockville, Oreg., in the sum of $150, representing the amount in which the postmaster's account was disallowed because, through a misunderstanding, the postmaster was authorized to employ the assistant postmaster upon a mail-messenger route at the rate of $450 per annum although the Act of June 3, 1924 (43 Stat. 356; 39 U. S. C. 579), limits the compensation which may be paid to postmasters, assistant postmasters, and clerks of post offices of the third and fourth classes to $300 in any one year for contract mail-messenger service, it being established that the route is a very difficult one upon which the services of a mail-messenger have been exceedingly hard to obtain.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LUM JACOBS

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 2007, for the relief of Lum Jacobs.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Lum Jacobs, of Wills Point, Tex., the sum of $1,030, in full satisfaction of his claim against the United States for compensation for personal injuries sustained by him, and for loss of wages because of such injuries, as a result of an accident which occurred when the wagon in which he was riding was struck by an Army vehicle near Wills Point, Tex., on October 2, 1942: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 per centum thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CITY NATIONAL BANK BUILDING CO.

Mr. SPPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 1453) for the relief of the City National Bank Building Co., which was objected to on the call of the Private Calendar.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Commissioner of Internal Revenue is authorized and directed to consider and act upon the claim filed on or about September 27, 1940, by the City National Bank Building Co., of Omaha, Nebr., for a refund of deficiencies in income tax and interest paid by the said company on or about September 16, 1937, with respect to the fiscal years ended October 31, 1933, to October 31, 1936, inclusive, and to make any refund found due the said company, in the same manner and to the same extent as if such claim had been filed within 2 years from the time such income tax and interest were paid and had not heretofore been disallowed; the Supreme Court of the United States having rendered a decision on December 4, 1939, in the case of *Helvering* v. *F. and R. Lazarus & Co.*, which, in effect, overruled the conclusions upon the basis of which such deficiencies were assessed.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

IDA M. RUTHERFORD

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the proceedings by which the bill (H. R. 2827) for the relief of Ida M. Rutherford was passed be vacated, and that the bill be considered at this time, in order that I may offer an amendment.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Ida M. Rutherford, of West Bloomfield, N. Y., the sum of $5,000, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for compensation for personal injuries sustained by her and for reimbursement of medical, hospital, and other expenses incurred by her as the result of her being struck and knocked down by Israel Zitron, an employee of the Ordnance Department of the United States, on a public sidewalk on Franklin Street, in the city of Rochester, N. Y., on December 28, 1942: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "$5,000" and insert "$4,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BARDEN: On page 1, line 5, after "to", insert "the estate of."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of the estate of Ida M. Rutherford."

ELEANOR PARKINSON

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 3302) for the relief of Eleanor Parkinson, which was objected to on the call of the Private Calendar.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Eleanor Parkinson, of Mount Carmel, Ill., the sum of $5,000, for damages to her property, which was caused by the Wabash River overflowing, due to the Brevoort levee maintained by the United States Government in the State of Indiana: *Provided*, That no part of amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 perc nt thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "$5,000" and insert "$4,637.50."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

M. SENDERS & CO.

Mr. MOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to return to Calendar No. 656, H. R. 3814, for the relief of M. Senders & Co., vacate the proceedings by which the bill was passed and reconsider the same.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to M. Senders & Co., of Albany, Oreg., the sum of $5,000, in full satisfaction of its claim against the United States for compensation for the loss of property and business incurred as a result of the acquisition by the United States for military purposes of certain land at Wells, Oreg., which had theretofore been leased by the said M. Senders & Co., and upon which the said M. Senders & Co. had erected and maintained a warehouse: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "$5,000" and insert "$3,000."

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was rejected.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the other committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 1, line 6, strike out the words "its claim" and insert the words "all claims."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order on tomorrow, Calendar Wednesday, be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therewith a brief editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

FEDERAL AID ROAD ACT

Mr. COX, from the Committee on Rules, submitted the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 654, Rept. No. 1914), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered printed:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4915) to amend and supplement the Federal Aid Road Act, approved July 11, 1916, as amended and supplemented, to authorize appropriations for the post-war construction of highways and bridges, to eliminate hazards at railroad grade crossings, to provide for the immediate preparation of plans and acquisition of rights-of-way, and for other purposes. That after debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed 3 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and the ranking minority member of the Committee on Roads, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the reading of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the same to the House with such amendments as shall have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

FEDERAL CROP INSURANCE ACT

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 605 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4911) to amend the Federal Crop Insurance Act. That after debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed 2 hours to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and the ranking minority member of the Committee on Agriculture, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the reading of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the same to the House with such amendments as shall have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently no quorum is present.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 115]

Baldwin, Md.	Douglas	Jackson
Barry	Drewry	Jarman
Bates, Mass.	Eberharter	Jennings
Bender	Elmer	Johnson, Calvin D.
Bloom	Elston, Ohio	Johnson, Ind.
Bolton	Engel, Mich.	Johnson, Lyndon B.
Boren	Feighan	Jonkman
Boykin	Fellows	Kearney
Bradley, Mich.	Fernandez	Kee
Bradley, Pa.	Fish	Keefe
Buckley	Ford	Kelley
Bulwinkle	Fuller	Kennedy
Burchill, N. Y.	Fulmer	Kilburn
Burgin	Furlong	King
Busbey	Gale	Kirwan
Butler	Gallagher	Klein
Byrne	Gamble	Knutson
Camp	Gavin	LaFollette
Cannon, Fla.	Gibson	Lambertson
Capozzoli	Gilchrist	Landis
Carlson, Kans.	Gillie	Lea
Celler	Granger	LeCompte
Chapman	Grant, Ala.	Lesinski
Chenoweth	Grant, Ind.	Ludlow
Clark	Green	Lynch
Coffee	Hall, Leonard W.	McGregor
Cravens	Hare	McKenzie
Crosser	Hartley	McLean
Cunningham	Heffernan	Magnuson
Curley	Heidinger	Maloney
Curtis	Hendricks	Mansfield, Mont.
Daughton, Va.	Hinshaw	Marcantonio
Dawson	Hoeven	May
Delaney	Holifield	Monroney
Dickstein	Holmes, Mass.	Morrison, N. C.
Dies	Holmes, Wash.	
Dirksen	Howell	
Domengeaux		

Mruk	Sabath	Treadway
Mundt	Satterfield	Vincent, Ky.
Murdock	Scanlon	Voorhis, Calif.
Murray, Tenn.	Schiffler	Vorys, Ohio
Myers	Scott	Ward
O'Brien, Ill.	Sheridan	Weaver
O'Connor	Short	Weiss
O'Konski	Slaughter	Wene
O'Neal	Snyder	Whelchel, Ga.
Pfeifer	Somers, N. Y.	White
Pracht,	Stanley	Wickersham
C. Frederick	Stearns, N. H.	Winter
Price	Stewart	Wolverton, N. J.
Rees, Kans.	Stigler	Woodrum, Va.
Rizley	Sumner, Ill.	
Rolph	Tolan	
Rowan	Towe	

The SPEAKER. On this roll call, 269 Members have answered to their names, a quorum is present.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

FEDERAL CROP INSURANCE

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, this is an open rule on House Resolution 4911, commonly known as the crop insurance bill. As I say, it is an open rule which the Committee on Rules respectfully submits for the consideration of the House. If adopted, consideration of the bill will be under the general rules of the House. The time fixed for general debate is 2 hours. Mr. Speaker, it is not my purpose to discuss the merits of the bill. I do, however, wish to make the observation that careful examination of the bill, and the report that accompanied it, convinces me that the Committee on Agriculture endeavored to cure defects of previous crop insurance legislation. They have undertaken to make the operation self-sustaining, and make farming a more stable business.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COX. I yield to my colleague, of course.

Mr. TARVER. The rule provides for 2 hours' general debate, one-half the time to be controlled by the chairman of the committee and one-half by the ranking minority member of the committee. I am advised that both of those gentlemen are supporting the bill. Therefore, there appears to be little opportunity for those like myself, who are opposed to the bill, to have adequate time for its discussion. Would the gentleman be averse to an amendment or would he yield for the purpose of having an amendment offered which would provide an additional hour for general debate, with the understanding that that hour should be accorded the opponents of the bill?

Mr. COX. I am sorry but I could not yield to the gentleman for the purpose of offering an amendment to the rule.

Mr. TARVER. The gentleman knows, of course, that the House has been in session for a week and has done no business at all. It does seem to me that with a controversial matter like this before the House we could take an additional hour when those who are opposed to the bill want to be heard.

Mr. COX. Let me say to the gentleman that the Committee on Rules never undertakes to impose a condition upon any legislative committee with respect to the division of time. I will say, however, in all fairness, I think the committee should yield to the gentleman reasonable time to present his views, which are contrary to those of the committee sponsoring the bill. It is my experience that committees usually strive to make fair division of time.

However, if the gentleman feels any uncertainty as to whether he should be able to obtain reasonable time for the presentation of his views I will be very glad to yield to him 20 minutes on the rule, to speak to the merits of the bill.

Mr. TARVER. I may say to the gentleman that the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture has very kindly offered me some time. I understand the ranking minority member will also yield me some time. While that takes care of me, I think there are a number of other Members who desire to be heard in opposition to the bill, who will not have an opportunity to be heard.

Mr. COX. In an endeavor to accommodate the desire of those opposing the adoption of the bill, if there is any Member on the floor wishing time I will be glad to yield now 20 minutes to speak to the merits of the bill.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. COX. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. FISH. I will be glad to join with the distinguished gentleman from Georgia, and yield from this side 15 minutes under the rule to anyone in opposition to the bill, although I am in favor of the bill, so that we will have no difficulty about the minority being heard.

Mr. TARVER. Will the gentleman yield further to me?

Mr. COX. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. TARVER. In view of the remarks made by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Cox] and the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH] I shall avail myself of the offer made and shall take my time on the rule, so as to leave the chairman of the committee and the ranking minority member more time which they may yield under general debate, to other Members who may desire time in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. COX. I take it that the gentleman is not opposed to the adoption of the rule?

Mr. TARVER. Oh! I will not undertake to oppose the adoption of the rule.

Mr. COX. I gladly yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia, to speak on the bill.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I had intended to address the Committee of the Whole in the time which the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Agriculture had very kindly offered to yield to me for that purpose, but in view of the offer made by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Cox] and the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH], I think it best to take the time which they have offered me on the consideration of the rule, in order that more time may be available to other members of the Committee of the Whole who will discuss the merits of this very controversial proposition.

It is unusual, of course, that a Member of the House who is opposed to the enactment of proposed legislation should be heard in opposition before anyone has undertaken to present the merits of the legislative proposal; yet, under the unusual circumstances presented by the immediate situation, I feel it is entirely proper that I should undertake this course.

Mr. Speaker, I regret very much my inability to support the pending bill. I believe those who are familiar with my record during my service in this body will realize that I have never failed to support legislation which in my judgment carried with it a reasonable hope of benefit to our farming population. However, I do not conceive it to be to the interest of the farmers of the United States that Congress should enact legislation which is ostensibly intended for their benefit but which from past experience will neither carry to them any substantial aid, nor, in fact, appeal to them as being likely to do so.

We had the wheat-insurance program for 5 years and the cotton-insurance program for 2 years. These programs were abandoned by this House in the Agricultural Appropriation Act of 1944 and the abandonment was continued in the Agricultural Appropriation Act of 1945. They were not abandoned without very careful and painstaking surveys upon the basis of lengthy hearings concerning the results which had been accomplished. Much as it would be desirable to have a sound crop-insurance program, the plan which was undertaken was thoroughly and irrefutably demonstrated to have been futile in character, carrying with it tremendous losses to the Government and lack of substantial benefit to the farmers themselves.

As chairman of the Subcommittee on Agricultural Appropriations, it was my duty to present to the House the agricultural appropriation bills in which the abandonment of the program was projected and continued. In doing so, I attempted to review thoroughly the facts upon which your Subcommittee on Agricultural Appropriations based its conclusions. However, it is not necessary to review these facts in detail before this House which has on a number of occasions in connection with both of these bills voted, on roll call and otherwise, by overwhelming majorities, in favor of the abandonment of the program. Since this House adopted this position, nothing has occurred which could possibly have influenced its membership in arriving at a contrary conclusion, unless the inclusion in the national party platforms of declarations in favor of Federal crop insurance could be so interpreted. The declarations in these platforms, however, were not an endorsement of this particular pending legislation, nor could they possibly be construed to have been in favor of enactment of legislation increasing the cost of the program to farmers of the United States and decreasing the benefits to be received by them under the program. That, in substance, is the gist of the pending proposal. It is inconceivable that it should be reasonably believed by any Member of the House that a program which attracted the interest of less than 10 percent of the cotton farmers of the United States

and less than one-third of the wheat farmers could be made more satisfactory to them by decreasing the benefits which they would receive from it and increasing the cost of their participation; and yet that is substantially what is here proposed.

You are all familiar with the unfortunate history of the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation with its expenditures during its brief period of active operation of $31,963,072 for administrative expenses during the course of which expenditures it carried benefits to the farmers of the United States, over and above the premiums paid by them, of $31,149,974. The program, therefore, cost the Government for the brief period $63,113,046 in carrying benefits to the farmers of the United States of substantially less than one-half of that amount. It is to be noted with interest that those in charge of the administration of the program received more from the Federal Treasury than did the farmers. It is, I think, but fair to say that they have far more interest in the continuance of this program, and in the continuance of their jobs, than the farmers of the country have in the continuance of the crop insurance program as originally projected; certainly more than they would have in the continuance of a modified program increasing the costs and decreasing the benefits.

It has, however, been apparent during the course of the history of the pending bill that those interested in the maintenance of the existing administrative machinery, and jobs, have been willing to accept almost any suggested amendments rather than to have the program discontinued. In other words, it does not now seem to be substantially a question as to what is best for American agriculture, but rather a question of what it is necessary to have in the bill in order to secure congressional approval of the maintenance of the existing administrative machinery and of the employment of those who have been engaged in carrying on this work. This is perhaps a harsh thing to say. I say it reluctantly because I have the kindest feelings for those who are in charge of the administration of Federal crop insurance, and yet when I examine the pending bill and see how restrictions are proposed therein which can only curtail the benefits of those participating in the program and at the same time maintain and perhaps enlarge the administrative machinery, I can arrive at no other conclusion.

It is noted that in the bill it is proposed first to limit the amount of the insurance coverage, not only to 75 percent of the crop, which had been the previous restriction, but to the amount invested in the crop based on the cost of "preparing the land, or labor; seed; planting, cultivation; disease or insect control; harvesting; ginning, hauling to market; fertilizing; irrigation; use of land, and other applicable costs as determined by the board." There is, so far as I know, and can be secured, no reliable data upon the effect of such a restriction, or as to whether it would, upon the average, result in reduction in losses which might otherwise be approved for 75 percent of the crop to less than that percent. However, it is manifestly intended to bring about a reduction in benefits to farmers.

Further, it is proposed that the "insurance shall not cover losses due to neglect or malfeasance of the producer or of the failure of the producer to reseed with the same crop in areas and under circumstances where it is customary to so reseed or of the failure of the producer to follow established good farming practices." This opens a wide field of administrative discretion as to what constitutes neglect or malfeasance, failure to follow customary practices as to reseeding same crop, or to follow established good farming practices. It is such a broad field for the exercise of administrative discretion that innumerable controversies might logically be expected to result from this provision. Here, too, it is sought to further restrict benefits which in their original form were not sufficiently attractive to the wheat and cotton farmers to cause any excepting minorities of them to participate in the program. Still further it is provided that if the total amount of approved claims exceeds the total amount of premiums, such claims shall be paid on a pro rata reduced basis, "but for the first 3 crop years with respect to which insurance has been in effect on any crop after the enactment of this act, the payment shall be reduced by not more than 15 percent of the amount of the approved claim."

This provision faces in two directions.

First. It encourages the Members of Congress who believe in protecting the Federal Treasury to believe the program is self-sustaining.

Second. It assures the farmer that it will not have to be self-sustaining, but that in any event he will receive insurance aggregating 63.75 percent of an average crop. Here again the program is made less attractive to the farmer and at the same time no real assurance is given that the program would be self-sustaining, since the past history of the program demonstrates clearly that 63.75 percent of the average crop cannot be paid from the premiums charged and collected.

It is insisted, of course, that administrative expense will be reduced because provision is made that the program will not be installed in any county unless written applications therefor are filed "covering at least 100 farms, or one-third of the farms normally producing the agricultural commodities authorized to be insured." This might carry with it some hope of reduction in administrative expenses except for the evident purpose on the part of the administrative agency to save the jobs of those employed in the program, which is manifestly the major objective, and which objective, I think, we may rest assured will be carried out if this bill is passed, and except for two further facts. These facts are:

First. The exception "that insurance may be provided for producers on farms situated in a local producing area bordering on a county with the crop-insurance program."

The effect of this exception seems to me to be that if county A has a program, county B, which adjoins it, where the required number of applications have not been submitted, may also have a program, and county C, which adjoins county B, may then have a program also, and so on, ad infinitum. Perhaps this is not a reasonable construction, but it is at least one which could be made, and I do not expect any construction by the administrative authorities which would restrict the geographical area covered by the program.

Second. The provision authorizing the institution of insurance programs with respect to any agricultural commodity in 20 representative counties in the United States will undoubtedly vastly increase administrative costs. Besides this objection, I do not believe that producers of the various agricultural products will be satisfied to have only 20 counties picked out in which to carry on the program for their particular commodity for a period of 3 years if crop insurance for them is a good thing, and if it is not a good thing the wasteful expenditure of public funds, which may be anticipated without benefit to the farmers involved, is almost unlimited.

These are some of the objections which I have had to the pending bill. I was one of those who voted for the initiation of the crop-insurance program without much faith as to its soundness but with the feeling that a sound crop-insurance program would be of tremendous benefit to the agriculture of the country and that an effort should be made to work out such a program. In actual administration it has been thoroughly proven to be unsound, not to be attractive to the vast majority of farmers concerned, and it is now proposed to remedy the situation by increasing costs to the farmers and decreasing benefits, in which event it is only reasonable to suppose that participation will be smaller than ever before and proportionate administrative cost to the Government will vastly increase. I cannot be a party to handing this sort of lemon to the American farmer. In my judgment, those who do will not find 2 years from now that he has been grateful for the attempt to hoodwink him for political purposes. The proof of the pudding is in the eating. Go ahead and give this particular pudding you have cooked up to the American farmer and you will find out in 2 years whether he likes its taste. And remember in doing it that you are voting to reestablish a program which you have by your votes in this House several times disapproved as unsound without any basis for your change in position except declarations of general nature inserted in party platforms which had no reference to this particular bill. Certainly, if these platforms had declared in favor of a crop-insurance program which would reduce benefits and increase costs they would not have attracted many farmer votes. If you do this thing, you will have reversed without adequate reason your previous positions on numerous votes taken in this House. The Seventy-eighth Congress, which abolished the crop-insurance program as unsound, will have reestablished it in a less attractive form.

The King of France with twice 10,000 men
Marched up the hill and then marched down
again.

Surely, if we have meant anything by our pledges to the American people of economy in the administration of the civil affairs of the Government, against the maintenance of useless bureaus, and in favor of reducing to the greatest extent possible the tax burden of the American people we will not now recreate this useless bureau for further Government extravagance without compensatory benefits to the farmers of the country whom it is ostensibly proposed to help. There may be some areas in the United States where droughts and floods frequently totally destroy crops, where frosts frequently destroy the vegetable and citrus crops, in which live farmers who would like to be protected from these dangers even to the extent of 63.75 percent of an average crop upon the payment of comparatively small premiums to the Government; but other farmers living in areas where less than 63.75 percent of a crop is an exception which occurs at only widely separated intervals will not in my judgment be willing to join in this program and help pay the losses of those who farm in less favorable areas. Certainly, they have not been willing to do so during the 5 years in which this program was in effect and I have no reason to believe that their participation in the program will be increased by decreasing its benefits and increasing its costs. I think, therefore, that the title of this bill should be amended so as to read:

A bill for the relief of the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation and its numerous employees and to impress the farmers of the United States with the idea that their Representatives in Congress have done something for them when in fact they have not, and for other purposes.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TARVER. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. COX. I wonder if it is the view of the gentleman that no kind of crop insurance can be made sound and desirable.

Mr. TARVER. I hesitate to go to the extent of so stating. I should like very much to see a sound crop insurance program worked out, but I am convinced of one thing, that neither the program we have had nor the one which is provided for in the pending bill is sound. Time—and I think sufficient time has elapsed to justify this statement—has shown that the program as carried out under existing law is unsound. The effect of this amendment is to evolve a far worse program from the standpoint of the farmer, in whose welfare I am primarily interested, than is provided under the existing law. If the Congress desires to reinstitute the crop-insurance program, it would do far better to make an appropriation for that purpose under the existing law, which it has so many times declined to do, rather than to amend the law and decrease the benefits to the farmer and increase the cost to the farmer, and then expect him to go into the program, when heretofore he has refused to do so.

Mr. COX. Is the gentleman opposed to the Government's continuing in the field of crop insurance?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from the time allotted to me.

Mr. TARVER. I thank the gentleman.

If a sound plan could be worked out under which a crop-insurance program could be carried on in a way to be of benefit to the agriculture of the country, and which would appeal to the farmers of the country as sound, I would be in favor of it. I voted for this program in its initiation. But I am not in favor of handing to the farmers of the country something which will be admittedly less beneficial to them than the program we have carried on heretofore. That was not only found to be a failure costing the Government possibly as much as the benefits received by the farmers, but it did not appeal to the farmers themselves, since less than 10 percent of the cotton farmers went into it and less than one-third of the wheat farmers, and the number of wheat farmers going into it was steadily decreasing at the time it was abandoned.

Mr. COX. By that does the gentleman advocate an increase in premium rates?

Mr. TARVER. No. That is provided for in this bill. It is provided in this bill that there shall not be benefits paid in excess of the premiums collected. There is the restraint that for 3 years benefits shall not be reduced on this account more than 15 percent.

Mr. COX. How would the gentleman then hope to make any kind of a crop insurance scheme sound and self sustaining?

Mr. TARVER. I have not been able, may I say to my colleague, to envision any plan by which a sound method might be formulated.

In saying to him that I would favor the enactment of such a plan, if it could be devised, I do not mean to say that I, myself, entertained the belief that it may be possible to devise it.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TARVER. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Did the gentleman state for the RECORD the amount of money paid out by the Government under the old plan, in excess of the premiums it received?

Mr. TARVER. I did state the amount in the course of my remarks. It was approximately $82,000,000 paid out in benefits as against approximately $51,000,000 plus, paid in in premiums. The loss in this respect to the Government was almost $32,000,000. The Government's expenses or losses of about $63,000,000, including administrative expenses, were about twice as much as the benefits above premiums received by the farmers of the country. In other words, it cost $2 to the Government to carry $1 of benefits to the farmer.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. That is what I thought.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TARVER. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. The gentleman believes, does he not, during this troubled period of this country's history, this Congress should open up the Treasury and hand this out as a gratuity for the relief of the farmers who have suffered the disasters we are trying to protect against?

Mr. TARVER. If the gentleman is advocating this program, as one for the relief of the farmers, then he ought not to be including here any provisions to cut down benefits to the farmers, which they will receive as the result of payment of their premiums and to increase their costs. If all you want to do is to distribute money from the Treasury of the United States among the farm population of the country, then you ought to provide for a decrease in the premiums and an increase in benefits and then perhaps the farmers will go into it, as they have not done in the past, and will not do in the future, in my judgment, under the provisions of this bill.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. The gentleman is not willing to concede that is what we are trying to do in this bill. But I asked him a plain question. Did you participate or are you in favor of opening up the Treasury to the disaster-stricken farmers of our country, to help them in time of emergency such as they experienced in the Missouri Valley last year and the year before? Is the gentleman a party to that?

Mr. TARVER. I certainly would be in favor of extension of aid to the drought- and flood-stricken farmers. I have voted for that time and time again. I do not know that that is any reason why we should attempt to saddle the entire agricultural population of this country with a program of crop insurance which it has been demonstrated by 5 years of experience is fundamentally unsound.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TARVER. I yield.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I ask this question of the gentleman for a point of information. Can the gentleman estimate how much it costs the Government a year for crop insurance?

Mr. TARVER. For 5 years it cost the Government approximately $63,000,000. The gentleman can draw his own conclusions.

Mr. FISH. Will the gentleman say it cost at least $10,000,000 a year?

Mr. TARVER. More than that.

I fully realize that from the standpoint of preventing the passage of this bill I am, to use the words of a colloquialism, "barking on a cold trail."

The cards are stacked in favor of the bill. Everybody who wanted an amendment has gotten it. The form of the bill has not particularly mattered, but the maintenance of the Federal crop-insurance organization has apparently been the main objective. Even the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], who were instrumental in having crop insurance abandoned, have now reached the conclusion for reasons sufficient unto themselves that they ought to support this bill. I shall appeal from

the judgment of the House, which will doubtless be rendered here today, to the judgment of the future years when it shall be attempted to administer this program in the full confidence that no Member here present will have cause to remember with pride having voted to establish it.

I am strengthened in this position by the fact that I have expressed similar views at farmers' meetings and to many farmers individually in my district, and I do not at the moment recall that any one of them has ever taken issue with me on this question or has communicated with me by letter or otherwise urging the reestablishment of the crop-insurance program.

Now I want to say to our city Members that when you vote for this bill, under the impression that you are doing something for the agricultural population of this country, you will certainly be badly mistaken. This is not a bill, which in my judgment, is of any particular interest to the American farmer except perhaps in some greatly restricted areas where under drought and flood conditions relief of this kind might be appreciated and the farmers might be willing to participate in such a program.

But in the greater areas of the country, aside from the drought- and flood-stricken areas, or those which are likely to be drought or flood stricken, the great majority of the farmers have now and will have no interest in this program if you pass the pending bill. You are simply providing for additional raids on the Treasury for the benefit of a useless Federal bureau. In view of the fact that so many of my Republican colleagues have continually complained about useless Federal bureaus, I hope they will not vote to reestablish this one.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. McGEHEE). The time of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TARVER] has expired.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, this bill for crop insurance is primarily in the interest of the western and southern farmers. It does not help the eastern farmers, dairymen, or poultrymen at all. In fact, it may increase the cost of the feed that they buy for their cattle and poultry. But the principle of the bill was contained in both party platforms during the last campaign, and has almost the unanimous support of the Committee on Agriculture and of the Rules Committee. Perhaps the next Congress could work out a form of insurance not only for hay on the same basis as wheat, corn, and flax but for dairy-cattle insurance. Abiding by their judgment and my own party platform I expect to support the bill, knowing full well that it does almost nothing at all for the eastern farmers. I hope later on that they will have their day in court. I hope our dairymen and poultrymen in the East will be taken care of in the future and be assured of fair prices for what they produce. I think that will be a necessity in the conversion from wartime production to peacetime. Something has to be done for them or we will face the same disastrous condition with which we were confronted after World War No. 1 when many hundreds of thousands of farmers were driven from their own homes and farms. As a ranking member of the Subcommittee on Agriculture of the Post-war Economic and Planning Committee I hope every constructive effort will be made by the next Congress to maintain fair farm prices with or without farm subsidies. This is a difficult problem and is one which we have not dealt with as yet but which we cannot evade much longer. The new Congress should start right off in the most careful consideration of what action should be taken to prevent a repetition of the ruinous times after the last World War when the bottom fell out of farm prices and farm foreclosures were the order of the day. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to speak out of order for the balance of my time on noncontroversial subjects.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I expect later on in the session, probably within 10 days or 2 weeks, to ask the indulgence of the House to speak at length on the recent campaign and upon national and international issues, and somewhat upon my own defeat for reelection to Congress. I have for a number of years collected material for a book on the causes and responsibility for World War No. 2 which I anticipate writing, let the chips fall where they may, in defense of 100,000,000 American noninterventionists before Pearl Harbor whose predictions have been verified by time and history. At this time I want to refer to two bills which I introduced, which I do not anticipate will be passed due to the short time left of this Congress, but I hope some Member of the new Congress will at least carry on the fight and try to have them enacted into law or something of similar nature.

I asked the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TARVER] a few minutes ago how much this crop insurance would cost the Government. He estimated it would cost in excess of $10,000,000 a year.

The bill I introduced yesterday, to which I want to now refer, would also require an authorization annually of $10,000,000 for research, prevention of the spread of cancer, and for the cure of that dread disease in the United States.

Yesterday the President of the United States stated in a public message that we were spending $250,000,000 a day in this war, naturally, for destructive purposes. It seems to me it would be little enough if we increased the annual appropriation from $700,000 to $10,000,000 to the National Cancer Institute at the end of the war with Germany to try to find, through intensive and further research into the causes, control, and relief of cancer something that would either cure or prevent the spread and ravages of cancer in this country, which has been increasing 2 percent a year since 1900. Not many years ago cancer was sixth on the list of mortalities. Today it is only second to heart disease, and is taking more lives each year in America than we are losing in the war. Due to the war much of the research work formerly carried on by the National Cancer Institute, for which the Government appropriates $700,000 annually, has been curtailed since our doctors were needed in the war effort, but as soon as hostilities with Germany cease these doctors will become available and should be provided with every necessary facility and means to continue and increase their research efforts in the fight against cancer which is taking an increasing toll of the American people every year.

If this disease proceeds to increase at the rate of 2 percent annually, certainly it will soon be one of the major problems with which America will be confronted. In urging this bill, I hope some Member of the new Congress may have the same idea and carry on the same thought and introduce similar legislation in the next Congress to aid our own people in their fight against this dread and malignant disease, which is not only taking the lives of so many of our people but doing so in the midst of untold agonies. My proposal is not one of war and destruction of lives but deals with the preservation of life as a permanent policy and for the security, health, and happiness of American people. Compared to one battleship which costs $100,000,000, I am sure that we can well afford at least $10,000,000 annually to take care of and safeguard our own people in America from the scourge of cancer.

The other resolution I am introducing is one that is very close to my heart. I doubt whether it is necessary at all, because I believe it reflects the opinion of every Member of Congress, Republican and Democrat alike. This resolution is to have the Congress, due to the misunderstanding that arose during the campaign, to go on record in favor of bringing our servicemen who were inducted into the armed forces back to America as soon as the war has been won against Germany and Japan. Due to the campaign speeches, and otherwise, the American people were led to believe that their sons would be kept abroad, kept in the armed forces in a kind of militarized glorified W. P. A. all over the world. That, of course, is not the desire of the men in the service or of the American people. I have therefore introduced the following resolution and released a statement which is self-explanatory. I hope Congress will adopt a definite and concrete declaration of policy and stop the unnecessary worry and fear that exists in the minds of millions of American parents and wives that their sons and husbands will be kept in the armed forces after the termination of the war.

So much was said during the campaign about keeping our sons in the armed forces after the war instead of bringing them home immediately afterward that I believe the Congress should make its position clear to the public by passing legislation providing for the release of the enlisted and officer personnel, who were inducted into our armed forces under the provisions of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, from active service on the termination of the war with Germany and Japan.

It would be preposterous to keep our war veterans in the service after the war

has been won. Some of them have already been in our armed forces for 4 years. The Congress should take the lead in making a definite declaration of policy in favor of demobilizing our war veterans as rapidly as possible and stop the idea prevailing in some parts of the Nation that it is the intent of the administration to keep our sons under some kind of militarized W. P. A. all over the world.

With this in view, I have today introduced the following bill:

A bill providing for the release of enlisted and officer personnel from active service in the armed forces after the termination of hostilities

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy shall at the earliest possible date after termination of hostilities with Germany and Japan return to the United States and release from active training and service all persons who have heretofore been inducted into the armed forces of the United States under the provisions of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, who request such release through his or her commanding officer.

SEC. 2. Persons in the armed forces, affected by section 1 of this act, are not precluded herein from volunteering freely and without coercion or undue influence, for continued overseas service.

SEC. 3. As used in this act, the term "armed forces of the United States" includes the Women's Army Corps, the Women's Reserve of the Navy, the Women's Reserve of the Coast Guard, and the Women's Reserve of the Marine Corps.

I found in the recent campaign there was a great deal of alarm and fear amongst the American people that once the war was won their sons would be held overseas. As a former veteran of the last war let me say that the one thing uppermost in the minds of 90 percent of our servicemen is to get back home as soon as possible after the war has been won. They have a right after having won the war to come back home and get started again on their jobs and professions and to participate in shaping the destiny of this country and in helping to write the peace terms and in determining what action we shall take in entering into any world security organization. I do not think it would be fair for us or any one man, or even Congress without the cooperation of the war veterans who after all will have won the war, to enter into any foreign commitments that might involve us in another war without placing all the facts before the American people and the 11,000,000 returning veterans. I am 100 percent in favor of a world security organization and international cooperation to promote and preserve world peace; but I want the facts presented to the American people and to the servicemen themselves for final determination, for unless it is a fair and just peace it will not be lasting and then this war will have been fought in vain and our sons' lives sacrificed in vain. I know of no sacrifice that would be too great to preserve world peace, but I believe the American people have the right to know all the facts and to pass judgment upon any permanent commitments that might involve us in foreign wars. We certainly do not want to enter into any agreement or commitment that will enforce by the lives of American soldiers communism on the nations of Europe.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the remaining time on this side.

Mr. Speaker, I have been tremendously impressed by the fact that there has not been in this House up to the present time any boasting or any complaining over the recent election. That is an attitude which I think is most becoming and I hope that from that position there will be no departure.

A winner should always be humble and a loser silent. Humility is a velvet cloak to all other virtues. Without it they are poorly clad.

I look upon the election as a magnificent personal tribute to the President. The people have said that they want him and certainly the whole world salutes him as its first citizen. There can be no bitterness in the heart of his fallen adversary, for any man who receives 47 percent of the total vote in a contest with this master statesman-politician is himself a notable figure and has much for which to be thankful.

We need to continue united on the war and on the peace that will follow. We need to establish and maintain harmonious relations with the executive branch of the Government. That can be done by the exercise of tolerance on both sides, by trust and confidence. We all love the same flag, our problems are identical and our obligations the same.

So let us catch step and with hands clasped hand in hand, and shoulder firm to shoulder, go forward toward that noble destiny appointed by an All-Wise Providence for this glorious land of ours, for this, our beautiful America.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of the time on this side to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. MURRAY].

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, in keeping with the spirit of our colleague from Georgia, the Honorable EUGENE COX, I think maybe this would be a pretty good time to check up and see just exactly what this bill has to do with winning the war. During the campaign which we all went through I noticed that my opponent used the fact that I voted against crop insurance as one of the many political sins I committed since I have been here in your midst.

In the first place, I never voted against crop insurance because we never had a bill before the Congress for crop insurance, nor have we one here today. We have a bill, as has been explained very thoroughly by our colleague the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TARVER], that does provide for cotton and wheat insurance, and I am glad that wheat is in there because I will not be held partisan in the few remarks I may make. This year flax has been added. I do not know whether flax has been added in here to smooth the way for our colleague the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN] or whether they want to get more flaxseed in order to manufacture more oleomargarine. If we are going to talk about a crop-insurance program we should think of it in connection with the war and I would like to yield to anybody who will tell me why this bill should be brought here as a war measure and why we should be insuring two crops that have evidently embarrassing surpluses.

I often wonder how many of us realize the exact situation. We are supposed to have a war food program. We have nothing to insure the crops that are going to produce the crops we are short of. We are getting short of pork. Even corn is not insured. We do not have anything in this bill that is going to furnish a spread for your bread, but we do have insurance provided cotton and wheat and flax.

Let us analyze those two. Let us take wheat. I will leave cotton alone, because they are in enough trouble without my adding on to it. All during this campaign we heard about the Smoot-Hawley Tariff Act and how bad it was, how all these Republicans were bad when they put it in, but they did not say that it has been on the statute books for the past 12 years and nobody has taken it off. If it was bad then, it is surely bad now. They did not tell you during the campaign that the present administration has implemented the Smoot-Hawley Tariff Act as far as wheat is concerned and that we now have a near embargo on wheat. You can only bring in 200,000 bushels of wheat four times a year.

I am not opposed to crop insurance. I am not opposed to the agricultural program, but during this war it just does seem to me that maybe sometime we can arrive at the point where we can do something not only in the name of the farmer but do it in the name of the people and in the name of the war. I am going to confine this to wheat. In the papers I read that they want you to appropriate $28,000,000 to get rid of 70,000,000 bushels of wheat; that we have so much wheat we do not know what to do with it. I realize as well as anybody else that wheat is the staff of life, but I do not know any reason why we should be subsidizing the production of wheat, subsidizing the importation of wheat, and subsidizing the exportation of wheat all during the war. If there is any reason for that, I would be glad to have someone sometime tell me, because I have not been able to figure out that this makes just ordinary, common, horse sense. So I say today, if you want to have an insurance program, let us insure the crops that are necessary in order to win the war. No one has said anything about insuring these crops. You go out and ask people to raise crops that they never raised before. If there is any crop that should be insured, it is peanuts. Why? Because thousands of farmers have gone out to raise peanuts that never raised them before. They raised them for patriotic reasons. Some had good luck; some had bad luck. The same is true of soybeans.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Of course, the cotton acreage was cut down, as the gentleman knows, and they had to use the land for something, and they used it for peanuts.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I do not think there is any doubt but that the peanut acreage was increased due to a patriotic desire to produce peanut butter and also the oils that are so vitally needed.

Soybeans is another crop that has spread its acreage very rapidly. I might say that the Congress has recognized that fact within the last 2 years when it passed those nonrecourse loans under the R. A. C. C. That is a form of insurance. Those nonrecourse loans had the endorsement right here on this floor, and production was increased by making these nonrecourse loans. They may or may not have worked out very satisfactorily.

So I say that I cannot see where this bill at this time should have the preference of having only wheat and cotton and flax included. I think that if there is going to be any insurance at all, we should insure the crops that you want in connection with winning this war.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4911) to amend the Federal Crop Insurance Act.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 4911, with Mr. SPARKMAN in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I am indeed sorry that the former chairman of the House Committee on Agriculture, the gentleman from South Carolina, Mr. Fulmer, who had given so much time and thought to this piece of legislation, is not with us today to present it to the House. The gentleman from South Carolina, Mr. Fulmer, was deeply interested in every phase of agriculture, was an ardent supporter of crop insurance, and we miss his presence today.

In my opinion, this is not only an important piece of legislation, it is more, it is a great piece of legislation, and one that should have demanded the attention of the American Congress years ago. Over the years practically every group in America has been able to obtain insurance of one kind or another, with the single exception of the farmer. We who represent agricultural districts know that the farmer has never been able to go into the market place and buy an insurance policy covering farm products.

In 1938 the Congress after much study passed what was known as the Federal Crop Insurance Act. Under the provisions of that law wheat alone was included. In 1941 the law was amended to include cotton. For 5 years, from 1939 to 1943, we had crop insurance covering wheat, and in 1942 and 1943 we had crop insurance covering cotton.

I am frank to admit that the picture during the short trial period does not look too good. Remember, however, we were entering a new field. We were pioneering. We were trying to extend insurance protection to a new class—the farmers of America—and we had to start from scratch; but I venture to say that the record the Federal Crop Insurance program has made is comparable to the record made by any life-insurance company or fire-insurance company for the first 5 years of its existence.

We suffered losses; of course, we suffered losses. We went into it expecting to suffer losses. But do not forget we brought blessings, many blessings, to a stricken class here in America, and blazed the trail, I hope, for greater future blessings.

Now, the picture is not quite as bad as has been painted. Here is the picture as of June 30, 1944, figured on a monetary basis. Premiums collected on wheat amounted to $38,735,000 plus. Indemnities paid to the wheat farmers amounted to $71,593,000 plus. The loss on wheat amounted to $26,200,000 plus. On cotton, we collected in premiums, $13,155,000 plus and paid out in indemnities $24,260,000 plus. The over-all picture is this: We collected in premiums $51,850,000 plus and paid out in indemnities $95,854,000 plus, leaving a deficit of $37,227,043. I submit to the House, considering the fact that we were pioneering and had to start from scratch that that is not a bad record. During that short experience we have learned many things, which things we have tried to write into the bill before us today. When the Committee on Appropriations failed to include an appropriation in the last bill, to carry on crop insurance, our former colleague, the gentleman from South Carolina, Mr. Fulmer, called the Committee on Agriculture together and we made a further study, a pretty thorough study. We called before us farmers from the New England section, and from the great farming sections of the Midwest and the West and the South. With one voice, those farmers were in favor of continuing crop insurance. Men who live upon the soil and make a living by tilling it came, men who had carried crop insurance came. Men who had not carried crop insurance came. Yes, they came from all sections, and they all demanded that we continue the crop insurance program. As I say, we learned many things from our short experience. These men, deeply interested in the program, told us how, in their opinion, the program could be improved. And so we tried to improve the bill so as to make it more workable and, if possible, to lower the premium and make it more attractive, and at the same time, place the program, as far as possible, upon an actuarially sound and safe basis.

Mr. ROWE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FLANNAGAN. I yield.

Mr. ROWE. Referring to the figures quoted a moment ago, as to the deficit does that also include administration costs?

Mr. FLANNAGAN. We have made a great improvement in the administrative end of the program. When we started this program, as I said, we had to start from scratch. We had to collect the data upon which to build our program and it was not an easy matter. It took work, a great deal of work, to collect sufficient data to start out on. At first, you know it only applied to wheat. In 1939 it cost $26.89 to service a policy. Now, that is unreasonable. I admit that. But by 1943 we reduced that to $11.49. It will be further reduced as the policy holders increase in number. Another thing, the war has been going on most of this time. We did not have the opportunity to put on a sales campaign. You have got to sell crop insurance to the farmers, just like the old line companies sell fire insurance or life insurance, to make it a success.

You have got to bring as many farmers under coverage as possible to make the program a success. The more you can bring in the more you will be able to reduce the overhead or administrative expenses. Along with that I think you will be able to reduce the premium rate.

Mr. ROWE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield, if I may pursue the question further?

Mr. FLANNAGAN. I yield.

Mr. ROWE. The deficit to which you referred includes all administrative costs, does it?

Mr. FLANNAGAN. I have before me a statement furnished by the Department of Crop Insurance dated June 30, 1944. I do not think it includes administrative costs. I think it includes only premiums collected and indemnities paid.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FLANNAGAN. I yield.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Can the gentleman tell us how many premiums there were? We can figure it out then ourselves.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. How many there were participating in the program?

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Yes.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. At what time?

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. The $11.40 year.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. In that year we had 357,333 wheat policies in force. We had 164,998 cotton policies in force.

Now this matter has been given a great deal of thought by our great farm organizations.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Virginia has expired.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 additional minutes.

As I said, our farm leaders have given a great deal of thought to the program. The program has the endorsement of our great farm organizations and has the endorsement of the Farm Bureau. It has the endorsement of the Farmers' Union. It has the endorsement of the Grange. It has the endorsement of War Food Administrator Marvin Jones, who for years was the efficient chairman of the Committee on Agriculture in the House of Representatives. I say that any measure that comes before this body with the recommendation of those great farm organizations, plus the recommendation of Marvin Jones, is worthy of our very careful consideration. I ask permission to insert at the conclusion of my remarks letters and telegrams from Marvin Jones, War Food Administrator, the National Grange, the Farm Bureau, and the National Farmers' Union.

Now, I am not perfectly satisfied with this bill. No one is going to be perfectly satisfied with it. We will have to change and modify this bill from year to year as we learn from experience what it takes to put crop insurance upon a sound actuarial basis. One thing, I would like to see a change made in the 3-year period that is contained in the present bill. For the first 3 years we pay an indemnity of 75 percent on the average yield, or the actual cost of the planting and seeding and so forth. Now, we are in a war. It is hard to put this program over in the right way, and it cannot be put over in the right way, in my opinion, unless we can write a long-term contract. When you write a short-term contract this is what will happen: You will go to farmer A. He knows we have had plenty of moisture, and in all probability we are going to have a good crop year. Farmer A will say, "No; I do not believe I will take it this year." But, next year when we have had a dry season and there is very little moisture in the ground, he will be running after you to take it.

I want to be in a position to give him a 4- or 5-year policy so that the losses and benefits will distribute over a period of years. I believe if we can offer a longer term policy, we can bring under coverage the greater part of the wheat growers and the cotton growers.

Mr. ROWE. Is that policy which you have announced to establish security and to eliminate speculation?

Mr. FLANNAGAN. That is right. It is to eliminate the selection. If the farmers have prospects of a good season they will not want to take insurance; if the prospects are for a bad season they will take insurance. For this reason I should like to see it spread over a longer period of time so we could get a better average.

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FLANNAGAN. I yield.

Mr. GIFFORD. Do I understand correctly that the Administration has expressly instructed that the premium will only cover losses and create a small reserve, but that no part of the premium will be charged for administration?

Mr. FLANNAGAN. That is right.

Mr. GIFFORD. And the administration of an act like this where the premiums are paid in the commodity itself, as has already been shown, is very expensive.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. I may say to the gentleman from Massachusetts that I believe it has been rather expensive and that it will be rather expensive until we secure sufficient data so we will know more or less to a certainty what losses we may expect.

Mr. GIFFORD. We want to have our eyes open and realize that we are not attempting through premiums to pay for administration.

THE NATIONAL GRANGE,
Washington, D. C., November 21, 1944.
Hon. JOHN W. FLANNAGAN, Jr.,
House Committee on Agriculture,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. FLANNAGAN: We note that H. R. 4911, amending the Federal Crop Insurance Act, is scheduled to come up for consideration in the House this week.

The National Grange has long regarded a sound and workable plan for crop insurance as a necessary part of a well-rounded program to promote agricultural stability and to protect farmers against the hazards of the weather and other conditions beyond their control.

One of the reasons advanced for suspending the Federal program for crop insurance was to effect that the Government should not compete with private enterprise. Those who believe in our system of free enterprise will readily agree with that proposition. However, aside from hail and tornado insurance, which is available in some sections of the country, private agencies have never attempted to give the farmer crop insurance on any extensive scale.

Exaggerated statements were likewise made regarding the losses sustained by the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation, with the result that no funds were appropriated for the insurance of crops planted subsequent to July 31, 1943. As a consequence, no crops produced for harvest in 1944 were insured.

We note that the bill reported by the committee authorizes insurance on wheat, cotton, and flax. It provides that the insurance coverage shall not be in excess of 75 percent of the average yield for the insured farm, but with the restriction that the coverage will also not be greater than the investment in the crop.

We are glad that the bill authorizes trial insurance on other crops beside wheat, cotton, and flax, providing certain conditions are complied with.

Believing that his measure is in accord with sound public policy, and trusting that it may be enacted, we are,

Sincerely yours,
THE NATIONAL GRANGE,
FRED BRENCKMAN,
Washington Representative.

AMERICAN FARM BUREAU FEDERATION,
Washington, D. C., November 21, 1944
Hon. JOHN W. FLANNAGAN, Jr.,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN FLANNAGAN: In response to a request for the position of the American Farm Bureau Federation relative to the crop-insurance bill, H. R. 4911, I wish to advise that the Federation has consistently advocated continuation of crop insurance on wheat and cotton on an actuarially sound basis.

At the hearings on this proposed legislation, representatives of the Federation appeared and presented a number of specific recommendations. These recommendations, in the main, have been embodied in the pending bill.

Representatives of the Federation have advised against extending crop insurance to other commodities at this time, because it is believed essential to improve and protect crop insurance for these commodities before branching out into other fields.

We particularly commend the inclusion in this bill of the objectives of H. R. 3785, by Congressman CLARENCE CANNON, of Missouri, which is intended to assure that the program will establish adequate reserves and be placed on an actuarially sound basis.

The American Farm Bureau Federation therefore favors the enactment of this legislation, on a basis that will be in line with the recommendations presented by the Federation.

Sincerely yours,
W. R. OGG,
Director, Washington Office.

WAR FOOD ADMINISTRATION,
WASHINGTON, *November 21, 1944.*
Hon. JOHN W. FLANNAGAN, Jr.,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. FLANNAGAN: This is in reply to your request for information as to the length of time necessary to place into operation a program of crop insurance on each of the crops named in the Fulmer bill, H. R. 4911. The following comments are based on the assumption that legislation and the appropriation would be passed before January 1, 1945.

We believe it would be possible administratively to offer insurance on spring wheat for 1945. Consideration should be given by Congress, however, to the advisability in the case of wheat of using 1 of the 3 years with the 15-percent limitation on prorationing for spring wheat alone, thus leaving only 2 such years for winter wheat.

We believe it would also be administratively possible to insure the 1945 cotton crops. With the short time available a program could not be put in operation as effectively as we would like but we will be glad to follow the wishes of Congress in this matter.

Likewise we believe it would be possible to insure 1945 flax crops in the principal producing areas.

With respect to the crops for trial insurance it appears that a start might be made in 1945 on corn, tobacco, and possibly peanuts and sugar beets. Yield records for individual farms have been kept over a period of years on these crops. Perhaps insurance might be possible in 1945 on some of the other crops but considerable actuarial work and study will be necessary before a program is launched.

We would like to call to your attention particularly the situation in insuring winter wheat for 1946. It has been our practice to start writing winter wheat insurance by the first of July preceding the planting of the crop to avoid adverse selection of risks. In the past we have had a considerable amount of the work in preparation for the program under way by January 1. Six months' time would not be more than adequate to carefully prepare a revised program for new 3-year wheat contracts.

What we have stated above is our present thinking relative to the time required to put insurance into force on different crops. We assure you, however, that we will make every effort to develop carefully and put into effect as quickly as possible insurance on any crops that may be designated.

Sincerely yours,
MARVIN JONES,
War Food Administrator.

AUGUST 28, 1944.
Representative J. T. MARTIN,
The Capitol, Washington, D. C.
CLIFFORD HOPE,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.
L. C. ARENDS,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.
Speaker SAM RAYBURN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.
Representative JOHN W. MCCORMACK,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.
Representative HAMPTON P. FULMER,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

The National Farmers Union urges that you use your influence toward immediate consideration and adoption of H. R. 4911, authorizing a crop-insurance program. Adoption of the bill at this time would have a most beneficial effect among farmers. They have worked hard for the war effort in the face of great obstacles, and with peace now in sight in Europe many of them are frankly worried about prospects. Addition of crop insurance to the guaranties of the Steagall amendment would give many of them a new feeling of security for the future that would be reflected in greater production for the remainder of the war and greater eagerness for compliance with governmental programs after the war. As the November election approaches farmers are waiting fulfillment of the pledges

made by both parties in platforms endorsing crop insurance. They feel that now is the time to meet those commitments so that they may have this added measure of security available to them in the next crop year.

RUSSELL SMITH,
Legislative Secretary,
National Farmers Union.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Virginia has again expired.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN].

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, I am one of those who opposed crop insurance as it existed through the experimental stage. I have, on the other hand, always favored the establishment of a sound over-all crop-insurance program that would take care of all growing crops; and I am, therefore, supporting this bill with the hope that before it is finally enacted into law we can make necessary changes so as to cover all crops and also make it a sound and self-sustaining insurance program.

I intend to offer an amendment which will take in additional important crops in our agricultural economy, which amendment, I believe, should be agreed to. It will cover barley, rye, and oats.

This program was begun as an experiment. I opposed it at that time because I felt that the premiums were not high enough to pay out indemnities or losses sustained. Now the Government has undertaken to pay the overhead expense, but no insurance company or no insurance program can operate unless the premiums are large enough to take care of the cost of administration as well as the average cost over a period of time in paying indemnities or losses.

Mr. ROWE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield.

Mr. ROWE. Is it the intent or purpose of the Administration to keep administrative costs separate and apart from the set-up under this bill?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. That is not my intent; it may be the intent of the Administration, because the administrative costs up to this time have been a large share of the premiums that have been collected; but, of course, the program has gone through the experimental stage and it is sought now to write a sound crop-insurance law which eventually will be on a proven and adequate basis, a self-sustaining basis, so it may be continued and be of some value to the American farmers.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. If we include barley, rye, and oats in this program as the gentleman suggests, and we include cotton—and we tried that out for 2 years—we have some data on cotton and we have data on wheat—how can we place a premium that would not be exorbitant upon the farmer to take care of the operating expenses as well as the indemnities in case of losses?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I may say to the gentleman I intend to place that in part of the bill so that statistical figures may be worked up to determine what the premium should be. This will not be in the first part of the bill. I hope that answers the gentleman's question.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. The gentleman agrees that the Government must bear the administrative costs during the time that we are getting the necessary data which will enable the administrator to fix a reasonable premium in order to take care of the indemnities as well as the administrative costs.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. That data on production has been assembled under the A. A. A. for the last 12 years and it should not be very difficult for them to get it together and accumulate it in order to determine the figures.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CRAWFORD. What would be the necessity, if any, to begin insurance on a crop before you have that data? In other words, if it is justifiable to begin insurance on cotton and wheat before you have the data, why would we not be justified in putting some of the other crops in?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 5 additional minutes.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, I admit they must have the data, but I am including these other crops.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I agree with the gentleman and I intend to support his amendments because I have had a chance to see the amendments to be offered. But I want to answer the argument of the gentleman from Missouri, because if we can proceed to insure wheat and cotton, with the Government carrying the losses, before the data is established, is there any reasonable argument against proceeding to take on some other crops too?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. That is right.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I think we might as well get that in.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. The gentleman lives in a corn country, and I would like to ask the gentleman what crop he thinks is more important at the present time than corn?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I agree that corn is the most important crop in the country, but the gentleman will remember that 3 or 4 years ago the majority in this House refused to permit our farmers to plant corn enough to fill their silos. I live in a dairy country, just as the gentleman does.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Looking at it purely from an insurance standpoint, it is pretty nearly necessary to produce all the corn we need in our own country. You can import wheat if you need it. We do not need it but we could import wheat. However, it is pretty difficult to import corn because the sources of corn are very limited.

Mr. ARUGUST H. ANDRESEN. That is right.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. If any crop is a war crop today in comparison with national significance, it is corn, is that not right?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. If we were to have their measure just as a war measure there would be no necessity for it because we hope that the war will terminate within a relatively few months; but this is an effort that is being made by the Congress to set up a sound, permanent program for agriculture where the farmers may have some assurance that they will receive at least operating costs in the event of a crop failure.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. What is the object of insuring crops that we have too much of, if insurance increases production? Otherwise it will not be put in operation.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. The gentleman knows that we have had three of the most wonderful crop years in the history of our country and it is a good thing that we had it that way.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I would like to call the gentleman's attention to page 3, line 16, the twenty representative counties selected by the board. How does the gentleman feel with reference to fairness, and so forth? Are they all coming from the South or from the West or from some other section?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I cannot say, but, of course, that is the experimental program where they are trying to determine rates and production in order to arrive at some actuarial figures which must be had.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Does the gentleman feel that that can be carried out fairly and equitably?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. We hope the administration gets up into the State of New York to cover some of the hay that the gentleman has up there, because they often have crop figures in hay.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield.

Mr. ARENDS. I discussed with the gentleman from Minnesota a while ago the question that if a county is insured only on a percentage basis, say 75 percent must take out the insurance, will we find the Government in a position of going out and forcing the other farmers to take out this insurance also?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. There is nothing compulsory in this bill, and if there was anything compulsory in the program, I would not be for it. I recognize that under dictatorship countries, where they force everybody to do just exactly what the dictator wants done, why they would go out and force all of the farmers into the program as a mandatory proposition. They tried that out in the State of North Dakota a number of years ago on crop insurance and hail insurance, where every farmer had the

premium put on his tax roll, but the farmers of North Dakota got disgusted with that and then the law was repealed. A thing like that will not work in the United States.

Mr. ARENDS. There is no possibility of that taking place under the consideration of this bill?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. There is no possibility of that taking place, and I think the Congress would be the first to repeal such a law if it was put into operation.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield.

Mr. STEFAN. How many crops does the gentleman's amendment include? Does it include corn?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Corn is included in the bill, but I am adding some of the other basic crops. There is included in the bill wheat, cotton, flax, corn, tobacco, rice, peanuts, soybeans, sugarbeets, citrus fruits, and tame hay. I am adding barley, oats, and rye.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 5 additional minutes.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield.

Mr. DONDERO. In reading the report I notice, so far as it affects wheat, that it only applies to the commercial wheat area. Do I understand from that that wheat crops in Michigan or Ohio or Pennsylvania should not be insured?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. It is my understanding that the whole country is a commercial wheat area. The only differentiation in the set-up between a commercial and noncommercial area is on corn.

May I call attention to another matter which I think should be corrected in this bill, and upon which I propose to offer an amendment, and that is with reference to administrative costs. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TARVER] has brought out very clearly the large amount of money that has been spent as overhead expenses. I have an amendment that may not be right, but I am going to offer it, anyway, where it will limit the cost to a sum which is equivalent to 25 percent of the premium collected in any one year. That may be too high or too low.

I am hoping that with that amendment, if it is adopted in the House, we will have something to go to the Senate with, as well as in conference, where we can make the adjustment, because we want the farmers who stand the losses and pay the premiums to get the most benefit out of it.

Mr. ROWE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield.

Mr. ROWE. I am glad to know that the gentleman is contemplating that sort of an amendment, because it has been running through my mind that that is a subject that should be incorporated in the bill, to prevent exorbitant administration costs against the men involved so far as insurance is concerned.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Another thing that I think should be done by the conference committee, if it is not done in the Senate, and that is to put additional safeguards in the bill that will assure a sound program. We knocked out the crop insurance before because it was not sound, and that is why I want to urge the conferees and the Members of the Senate, if they do not adopt it, to go ahead and incorporate provisions in the bill that will make over-all crop insurance a sound and lasting program. No insurance program will stand the test of time unless it is founded upon sound policies.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has again expired.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON].

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. Chairman, the great and important Committee on Agriculture was organized, as I recall, about 1820. In the intervening 124 years only one Virginian has served as chairman of that committee. We, of course, mourn the passing of the great chairman who recently died, but since it was God's will to call him to his final reward we, in Virginia, are proud that a Virginian, Mr. FLANNAGAN, has been called to leadership of that committee. We predict that he will fully measure up to the high standard that has been set in the past.

Mr. Chairman, I am supporting the pending bill, first, because I feel that farmers are entitled to crop insurance; and secondly, because no private insurance company will write that type of insurance. I voted against the crop-insurance bill in 1938 because I did not think that the program should be limited to wheat and cotton only, and likewise because I did not think that the program was based upon a sound actuarial basis. The best proof of the latter point is that the Government lost about $26,000,000 on the wheat insurance and about $11,000,000 on the cotton insurance. Those inherent difficulties have been corrected in the present bill. My personal feeling is that a 5-year experiment in Government crop insurance would be better than the 3 years provided for in the pending bill, and I would support an amendment to that effect. And I likewise think that other crops besides wheat, cotton, and flax should be included although those who know more than I about the subject prefer to test out the feasibility of including other crops under the experimental provisions of the pending bill.

The national farm organizations have been very helpful to Members of Congress during the past 12 years and helpful to the cause of agriculture through their sponsorship of much sound legislation, yet I have noted a tendency among some of the leaders of national farm organizations to be a bit intolerant of those who failed to support every specific measure 100 percent as advocated by the particular organization. My colleagues in the House will bear witness to the fact that no Member of this distinguished body has been more interested than I in the cause of agriculture, representing as I do the Shenandoah Valley of Virginia and some fine counties east of the Blue Ridge Mountains than which there is no better agricultural section in the United States.

During the past 12 years I have supported every major bill in behalf of agriculture with the exception of the crop-insurance bill and the compulsory wheat-allotment bill. The National Grange, of which I have long been a member, was opposed to the compulsory wheat-allotment bill and I think properly so. I voted against that bill because the district I represent normally produces from one-fourth to one-third of all the wheat produced in the State of Virginia. There is only one State in the Union, namely, Pennsylvania, which has more flour mills than Virginia. The wheat produced in Virginia has never been adequate to meet our needs and when our Virginia millers import each year millions of bushels of wheat from the West the transportation charges on that wheat add from 10 to 15 cents per bushel to its cost to the local millers and ultimately to the local consumers. Of all the 48 States in the Union, there are only 9 which produce more wheat than the amount locally consumed, and, therefore, I took the position that if there was to be a compulsory curtailment of wheat produced, the curtailment should be on wheat as on corn—limited to those States which produced an exportable surplus. The American Farm Bureau Federation actively supported the compulsory wheat-allotment bill, and was very critical of me for my failure to do likewise.

In 1942 the American Farm Bureau Federation supported the Brown amendment to the pending price-control bill, which required the cost of labor to be included in figuring the parity prices of farm products. The President said that if that amendment were adopted, he would be unable to hold the line against further wage increases in industry, and spokesmen for the White House predicted a Presidential veto. The ranking minority member of the Committee on Banking and Currency, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT], offered a substitute for the Brown amendment which I thought was better than the Brown amendment. Consequently I voted against the Brown amendment and for the Wolcott substitute. When the Wolcott substitute was defeated and the Brown amendment adopted I voted for the bill that included the Brown amendment. When the bill went to the Senate a compromise was reached between the language of the Wolcott amendment and the language of the Brown amendment which was entirely satisfactory to both of them and satisfactory to the national farm organizations, as indicated by a joint statement signed by them and included in the remarks of the chairman of the House Committee on Banking and Currency during the debate in the House on the conference report. See page 7740 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of October 2, 1942.

I voted for the conference report which instructed the President to weigh the cost of farm labor in determining ceiling prices for farm products. Notwithstanding the fact that on two separate occasions I had cast the votes mentioned

above, in the spring of 1944 the president of the American Farm Bureau Federation, Mr. Edward A. O'Neal, sent to the Virginia State president of the American Farm Bureau Federation a statement purporting to be my record on farm legislation for the past 12 years. That statement omitted many important bills which I had supported, but condemned me for my failure to support the Brown amendment. When I learned of that situation I submitted to the national president of the American Farm Bureau Federation and to the Virginia State president of the American Farm Bureau Federation a complete, detailed, and accurate statement of my votes on all farm legislation of the past 12 years with the request that the National president inform the Virginia State president that the record sent him in the spring of 1944 was inaccurate. In the meantime, the Virginia State president had written me a letter complaining, among other things, of my failure to support the Brown amendment and sent a copy of it to my Republican opponent.

In spite of my most urgent plea to the National president of the Farm Bureau Federation and to the Virginia State president of the Farm Bureau Federation to correct the injustice that had been done me both refused to do so. As a result, day after day over the radio, in the press, and through printed literature, my Republican opponent appealed to the farmers of the Seventh Virginia Congressional District to vote against me on the ground that I had been their enemy and not their friend, and he even went so far as to charge that the elimination of the Brown amendment had resulted in a financial loss to the wheat growers of my district of from 25 to 30 cents per bushel. The facts are that a provision similar to all intent and purposes to the Brown amendment was written into the law and I voted for it.

The further facts are that we had a billion-bushel wheat crop in 1944, plus a 300,000,000-bushel carry-over, with a current domestic demand, exclusive of lend-lease, of approximately 600,000,000 bushels, and but for Commodity Credit Corporation loans to support the prices the law of supply and demand would have operated and the price of wheat in Virginia and throughout the Nation would have been less than it actually was. I am satisfied that many wheat farmers in my district believed the reports concerning my voting record circulated by the American Farm Bureau Federation and my Republican opponent, and as a result I lost on November 7, 1944, the largest wheat-producing county in my district by the largest majority it has ever returned against me.

I harbor no ill feelings against my Republican opponent for his misrepresentation of my voting record in the recent election and I harbor no ill feelings against anyone in the district who voted against me in that election. I repeat what I stated at the outset, that the American Farm Bureau Federation has during the 12 years I have been a Member of the House rendered outstanding service to the cause of agriculture and to the farmers of America. My only purpose in making this reference to what occurred in the recent campaign is the hope that in the trying years that lie ahead of us, when our farm problems may become as acute as they were in the depression years of 1932 and 1934, those who do their dead level best to advance the interests of agriculture but who may not see eye to eye with some national farm leader on some minor phase of the program will not be subjected to the treatment that I received in the last election at the hands of the American Farm Bureau Federation.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. LEMKE].

Mr. LEMKE. Mr. Chairman, I am for this bill, but realize that it is only a beginning. It is only a toehold. The ultimate solution of the farm problem will be and must be cost of production, and sooner or later we will have the intelligence to give that to the farmer. The farmer can no more continue to feed the Nation for less than it costs him to produce than a businessman can stay in business for less than it costs him to do business.

When cost of production finally comes, it must be 100-percent parity, not 75-percent parity, and it must be on 43 principal agricultural commodities, and not only 75-percent parity on only 5 agricultural commodities.

Sooner or later agriculture is going to come into its own. Sooner or later the farmer will know that the kind of legislation that has been handed to him means absolutely nothing. The farmer will again be made the shock absorber when this war is over, unless he gets cost of production. I want to say that the farmers in this Nation are universally and practically 100 percent for cost of production—100-percent parity on 43 agricultural products.

For some strange reason, some of their farm leaders have not yet awakened to the situation that in order to save agriculture, and that the only way that it can be saved, is by giving the farmer the cost of production, 100 percent—parity.

I realize that there are many people who think that the farmers are prosperous. I know that some politicians claim credit for great prosperity for agriculture. That is a deception and a fool's paradise, because the farmer during the last 4 years has been raising 20 bushels per acre of wheat on an average where 10 years prior, he raised only 8 bushels per acre. In other words, on an average he has been raising 20 bushels per acre for the last 4 years where for the previous 10 he has been raising only 8.

If the North Dakota farmer had gotten only the number of bushels per acre in the last 4 years that he got in the previous 10 years, he would have to be still filing under the Frazier-Lemke Farm Mortgage Moratorium Act in order to protect his home.

Again, if the farmer were getting only the 1937 price for his wheat, then he would be getting about one-half of what it cost to produce. Consequently, this crop-insurance plan that is coming up here, is the first step, I hope, a toehold, toward the cost of production for the farmers of this Nation, on 43 principal agricultural commodities, and not 75-percent parity on only 5.

I would like to know how any Member of Congress would like to do business with me, if whenever he trades with me, I take a dollar from him and give him back 75 cents. That is exactly what the hypocritical triple A program has been doing with the farmer, prior to this abnormal crop production which is due to climatic conditions and not to politicians and due in part to higher prices, because of the war. I hope we do not have to buy farm prosperity in the future by the shedding of the blood and the giving of the limbs of our sons.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. JOHNSON].

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, I am in favor of the pending compromise crop-insurance legislation. It is of course a matter of record that I support the crop insurance act when it was originally passed by this House and again when the law was amended and broadened to include cotton. We from Oklahoma are particularly conscious of the dangers of crop failure. While we usually produce good crops there, we are occasionally stricken by drought, hail, floods, excessive moisture, insects, and plant diseases. In my judgment the principle of crop insurance is sound and practical. It is not fantastic or visionary.

It is also well known that I also opposed the discontinuance of crop insurance in the summer of 1943 when as a result of legislation improperly added on an appropriation bill, this important program was discontinued. It will be recalled that the Appropriations Committee provided $3,500,000 for so-called crop insurance with a very unusual qualification; let me read it to you:

> *Provided*, That no part of this appropriation shall be used for or in connection with the insurance of wheat and cotton crops planted subsequent to July 31, 1943, or for any other purpose except in connection with the liquidation of insurance contracts on the wheat and cotton crops planted prior to July 31, 1943.

That was like saying that the little daughter might go for a swim, but with the proviso, "Hang your clothes on a hickory limb and do not go near the water." It was the kiss of death to crop insurance.

I opposed the discontinuance of the crop-insurance program, not only because the action taken by the great appropriation committee of which I am a member, was strictly a legislative matter, but also because I felt that a program as important as this to American farmers should be given a reasonable opportunity to prove that it could be a success.

The crop-insurance item was dropped because some money had been lost during the years of its development period, and because a lot of propaganda was spread against it. In my opinion it will take longer than a short period of 3, 4, or 5 years to develop a successful and widely applicable crop-insurance program. I would not be surprised if it would take 10 years or longer before we develop a type of crop insurance entirely acceptable to Congress and to the

American farmer. When Government crop insurance was first established, I doubt if any Member of this House considered that the act as passed was the final or perfect form. It got off to a rather bad start. Its premiums were too low and its benefits too high to be economically sound; but through experiment, there is being developed a more satisfactory system. Frankly, I am of the opinion the pending bill is far from being perfect. It is by no means the final form. It may be that the premiums under this legislation are too high and the benefits too low to be practical. That remains to be seen. But as I stated in the outset this pending measure is a compromise and undoubtedly is an improvement over the original crop-insurance law.

This bill provides that after 3 years the losses paid each year cannot exceed the premiums collected. That seems to be a wise safeguard. That provision makes certain that for at least 3 years the claims for loss would not be reduced more than 15 percent by the process of proration. The provision that this insurance should be limited to the investment in the crop is sound. It makes certain that we would not guarantee farmers profit but guarantee him that he gets his investment back in case of loss. This bill is, of course, far more conservative than the original crop-insurance law. It is at least a forward, progressive move in the right direction.

The rank and file of the real dirt farmers in Oklahoma are for crop insurance. Of course, I realize full well that there are some big-shot farmers, who "farm" the farmers, who still oppose it. While crops were generally good this year in my State, yet our farmers never know what will happen next year. Oklahoma farmers have carried this insurance since the program was originally started. They have carried insurance on wheat for 5 years and insurance on cotton for 2 years. Only today I got the following figures from the Department of Agriculture. During the last 5-year period 95,000 wheat crops have been insured and 17,000 cotton crops have been insured; indemnities have been paid for losses on 39,000 wheat crops and some 7,000 cotton crops; altogether over 4,000,000 acres of crops have been insured. During that period wheat farmers who lost their crops have received indemnities amounting to $5,500,000, and cotton farmers to $1,500,000. These figures speak for themselves.

It will be recalled that in 1939 and 1940 wheat farmers in Oklahoma suffered heavy losses from drought. In 1941 a wet harvest season caused severe losses; in 1942 and 1943 greenbugs destroyed a large part of the crops. In some counties during those years practically no wheat was produced. In 1943 floods also took a heavy toll of crops in both wheat and cotton. Cotton farmers of Oklahoma have not so soon forgotten that drought and boll weevil caused heavy cotton losses in the years of 1942 and 1943. So there is abundant evidence why Oklahoma farmers are deeply interested in this pending bill.

In conclusion, permit me to merely add that both political parties have endorsed Government crop insurance in their recent platforms. I believe there are many people in both political parties who want to make that promise good. I am convinced that the farmers of America expect that promise be kept. The American farmers, or, at least, some of them, are beginning to wonder if the pledges of both political parties on this subject were mere empty campaign promises, to be forgotten after the election is over. This is not, or, at least, should not be, a partisan political matter. The farmer, irrespective of political affiliation, is producing foods for war. He is working overtime without sufficient help with mighty little complaint. He is not letting down our loved ones who are in the armed forces. This Congress must not let the farmers down by refusing to restore this important agricultural program.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. ZIMMERMAN] such time as he may desire.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the bill. I think one of the greatest mistakes this House ever made was when it followed the recommendation of the Committee on Appropriations and said no part of this appropriation shall be used for or in connection with the insurance of wheat and cotton crops planted subsequent to July 31, 1943, or for any other purpose except in connection with the liquidation of insurance contracts on wheat and cotton crops planted prior to July 31, 1943.

Last year in the Missouri River Valley we had probably the greatest flood in all history. We had a disastrous flood in the Missouri Valley in 1943, but fortunately for the people, they had crop insurance. They did not have any crop insurance in 1944. Those farmers were wiped out—left with nothing. The same thing happens when drought covers our country as it has in the past, as well as insect infestations.

I do not think friends of mine like the distinguished gentleman from Georgia, Judge TARVER, really appreciate what it means to have an entire crop completely eradicated and the farmer left with absolutely nothing. That was the reason that crop insurance came into existence. As has been said today, you cannot buy insurance on your crops. Companies refuse to engage in such business, and if they did, the premiums would be so exorbitant that the farmers could not afford to pay them. This is a way that the Committee on Agriculture fell upon to enable the farmers of the country to carry their own insurance and to inveigh against the results of flood, drought, insect infestations, storms, and other things that destroy the farmer's crops, all that he has to rely upon. I do not think we tried the experiment long enough. The fatal blunder this House made was when we followed the recommendation of the Committee on Appropriations last year and struck crop insurance to the ground. It was a fatal blow to agriculture and to the future of agriculture. The farmers of this country have risen up against the action of this House in destroying the fruits of a great committee, that earnestly tried to do something to solve this problem of agriculture.

Since Members have come back here I think they have heard from the people. At least the people in the Missouri Valley do not want another experience like that in January of 1943 and 1944 when not even their chickens were saved.

This bill is a reasonable bill. It proposes to reimburse the farmer at least for not more than 75 percent of the average yield of his farm or at least for the amount of money he spent for seed, for preparing his ground, for rent, and so forth, all outlays made by the farmer. When a disastrous flood comes, all that he has is gone. His loss comes out of his pocket and he has not anything left. I believe this bill is a good beginning; and I am not so much opposed to including corn and some other commodities in its provisions, but let me say that no insurance company ever started off doing business at a profit. It took years of putting money and work into that business before it began to yield some profit. The trouble with us is that we tried to make an exception of agriculture and we stopped the experiment before we had gone far enough to see what should be done to make it a success. That was our fatal blunder.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. I yield.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Referring to the bill, page 2, lines 16 and 17, I ask this question: This language reads:

> Such insurance shall not cover loss due to neglect or malfeasance of the producer.

Suppose a crop has matured and it is utterly impossible for the farmer to obtain the labor necessary to harvest the crop and the crop is lost by reason of not being harvested; would this insurance cover it?

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. I am pretty sure the provisions of the bill would cover it because it is up to the Administrator to determine whether or not he has been guilty of misfeasance or whether he is not cultivating his land in the manner of a good husbandman. Similar language was carried in the original bill. There has never been any difficulty about that.

Mr. CRAWFORD. The point I am raising now is the case where a crop has matured, all the work of maturing the crop has been performed satisfactorily to anybody; it is there in the field, but due to the absence of labor it cannot be harvested and remaining in the field it becomes an utter loss.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. I believe the language is broad enough to cover that situation; that is my conclusion at any rate.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. I yield.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. River bottom land is very rich and in good years produces very heavy crops. Under the provisions of this bill would the hill man

who is not able to raise a good crop have to pay for the loss in the years when there is overflow in the river bottoms?

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. No.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Why not? The taxpayers pay.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. The program is based on the average yield of the land.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. I yield.

Mr. COOLEY. It occurs to me that the proper answer to the gentleman from Michigan would be that if failure to harvest is due to a shortage of labor the policy would cover it; but the landlord, the land owner could recover only the amount of money actually invested in the crop up to that point.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. That is right, of course.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I think that is fair.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. That is what I understood, because we do not cover more than 75 percent of the crop or the amount of money spent not to exceed 75 percent of money spent in preparing the land for crop buying seed, fertilizer, and for harvesting the crop.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. I yield.

Mr. STEFAN. I believe my colleague from Michigan in inquiring about the matured crop that could not be harvested because of lack of labor refers, for instance, to the corn crop. We in Nebraska now are harvesting the largest corn crop in the history of our State. A lot of that corn cannot be picked because the farmers cannot get help, cannot get corn-picking machines. Most of it has to be picked by hand. His kids have no work clothes. He is handicapped. His boys of draft age have gone to war. A lot of that corn never will be harvested. Will this bill cover that case, for instance?

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. It is my opinion that the bill will fully cover such a situation.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. I yield.

Mr. CRAWFORD. The gentleman from Nebraska has outlined the case perfectly so far as he goes, but I would not restrict it to corn only, because I know what the situation is in the cotton fields. I have seen many a crop of cotton lost because it was utterly impossible to get labor to pick it before the weather had beaten it into the earth literally until it was practically covered with dirt.

With our labor situation as it is, I simply wanted to know.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. I am giving you my interpretation of the bill as I understand it.

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. I want to get the gentleman's opinion on this crop-insurance-coverage situation. We had a situation in our district where tomatoes were so abundant they were bringing a price as low as 50 cents a bushel and the farmers did not deem it economically wise to pick them. Would that be covered?

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. No; I do not think it would. That is an economic situation and not within the contemplation of the bill. In other words, this is to protect the farmer against things that he cannot guard against, things that are unavoidable.

Mr. BURDICK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. I yield to the gentleman from North Dakota.

Mr. BURDICK. I think the gentleman's interpretation of the bill is correct. On page 2, in defining the causes for which insurance is granted, these words appear: "and such other unavoidable causes as may be determined by the board."

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. That is right, and I think that answers the whole question.

Mr. Chairman, I have consumed more time than I intended to consume. I do not think this House can afford to let the farmers of America down by failing to pass this bill and in making an honest effort to work out a sane crop-insurance program which will protect the farmers of this country just like all forms of business are able to protect themselves by means of insurance that they can buy at a reasonable rate. As I said before, the farmers cannot do this for themselves and in that respect they stand in a very unique position. It is our duty to give the farmers of this country a chance to carry their own insurance, which is all they have ever asked for. If we will give this program a chance to operate for a sufficient length of time and if we do not get the jitters like we got when we struck it down before it had a chance to operate, we can guard against the hazards that agriculture has suffered all these years.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK].

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Chairman, I want to call attention to the situation of crop insurance in North Dakota. When this House failed to provide an appropriation for that purpose there was on hand one and one-quarter million bushels of wheat as a surplus and all losses had been paid. We had that much left and under the terms of the old law the insurance for this year would be greatly reduced in that section of the country.

We are starting out again and the first question I want to ask the chairman of the committee on the majority side is, What has become of our one and one-quarter million bushels that we held in reserve? If we start out again, what assurance can we give the farmers that when we build up a reserve in North Dakota you will not come along and take it away a second time? What incentive can you hold out to these farmers to take this insurance after the action of this House in turning down an appropriation? I want to ask the chairman, what has become of our million and a quarter bushels that we had?

Mr. FLANNAGAN. The million and a quarter bushels of wheat that we still own?

Mr. BURDICK. The surplus.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. I imagine that the Government still owns it. They have been liquidated as fast as possible. They had 470 employees and it has been reduced to, I understand, 50 or 60. In accordance with the direction of the Congress they have been liquidated.

Mr. BURDICK. What assurance can you give the farmers next year that we are not going to take their surplus again when they build it up by the failure of the Congress to pass an appropriation?

Mr. FLANNAGAN. If we enact this law, it is up to the gentleman and the other Members of the House to stand between the farmer and the destruction of this legislation in future years.

Mr. BURDICK. I want to say to the chairman that it was no failure of mine that that appropriation did not pass because I spoke on that very subject.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. I appreciate that. I understand further that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], two of the chief opponents of the legislation, are now both in favor of it.

Mr. BURDICK. I am glad they have had a change of heart. It seems to me that we depend too much in this Congress, although I should not say so much about it, because I do not expect to participate in this body much longer—but it seems to me that we let the Committee on Appropriations dictate the legislation in this Congress in altogether too large a fashion. After Congress has authorized an action, then for the Committee on Appropriations to come along and curtail it and cut it out entirely, does not seem to me to be good legislative action.

I want the Members to understand that I am for this legislation. I was for it from the beginning. We have to start all over in North Dakota, but even if we do, I would like to see the thing started. The provision in this bill to try out other commodities, for instance, peanuts and what have you, by selecting 20 counties in the Union that raise peanuts, will give you a pretty good idea of what you can do. Then you can pick out 20 counties raising other crops, and from that experience the data that will be assembled by this Congress will indicate finally the proper kind of an insurance bill. But this is a start, Mr. Chairman, and I am for it.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, it is hard for me to conceive how it is possible for those Members of the House who have been inveighing against unnecessary Government expenditures and bureaucracy to vote for the pending measure. It provides for an unnecessary expenditure and the creation or continuation of a goodly sized Federal bureau.

The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TARVER] stated accurately the case against the crop-insurance program that is provided for in H. R. 4911. He pointed out what is common knowledge to all of us how completely Federal crop insurance has failed in the past. He showed that the loss to the Government in that venture was in excess of $63,000,000. He showed that the cost of administering

the program was nearly $32,000,000. He also pointed out that the pending measure would decrease the benefits and increase the cost to the farmers as compared with the benefits and costs to them that were involved in the crop-insurance program which has been in operation. Accordingly, it is reasonable to assume that this program of crop insurance would be less attractive to farmers than the previous one and from an administrative point of view comparatively more costly.

However, I wish to discuss another angle of this proposed crop-insurance program. It should be borne in mind that this bill specifically provides for the payment of losses by the Federal Government. That provision is found in section 2 (c) of this bill.

What is the source from which the funds are to come to pay for the losses that are likely to be produced by this program, if it should be adopted? In great measure, if not entirely, the losses that would be sustained would be charged to our children and their descendants.

The money that has been borrowed to pay for crop-insurance losses becomes a part of the permanent public-debt structure. The interest on it is obtained largely, if not entirely, by borrowing from future generations. At the going Federal rate of interest, which is about 2 percent, the principal will double itself in 35 years.

The Treasury statement of November 18, 1944, shows the Federal debt to be more than $212,000,000,000. According to Federal Reserve figures furnished me, of this amount more than $87,000,000,000 represents Government-printed bank money. The commercial banks and the Federal Reserve banks together hold more than $87,000,000,000 of direct and guaranteed Government securities. Financing Government securities through the banking system is in substance the printing of bank money by the Government.

Shall we vote for this measure which will charge the losses that may and, according to past experience will, eventuate by its passage to our children and grandchildren?

The financing of Government securities through the banking system is highly inflationary. Since a part of the losses that likely would be sustained in the operation of the contemplated program of crop insurance must be met with funds so derived the scheme would be extremely inflationary.

Inflation is even now upon us.

This proposed crop-insurance plan would rest upon a most unsound financial basis. It is one more risky measure that would threaten bankruptcy of our Nation.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD].

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. As I understood from the colloquy the gentleman had with the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. ZIMMERMAN], it was agreed that if a man produced a crop of corn, a crop which had matured, good corn, and he could not get labor and so left the crop in the field, he would be reimbursed for that.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I did not agree with that. I understood from the gentleman from Missouri that was what the language of the bill meant to do.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I do not see how anybody could read that into the law either for cotton or corn or any other crop.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I still question that very seriously myself.

Mr. Chairman, I have been furnished with data from the Department of Agriculture which shows that in the Eighth Congressional District of Michigan over a 5-year period there were 17,163 wheat farms insured. The number of indemnities was 3,516. The premiums paid were $111,952. Indemnities were $162,293, or a deficit of $50,341, which caused a loss ratio of 1.45. That is an illustration of what has taken place in the Eighth Congressional District of Michigan as far as wheat insurance is concerned.

As best I can analyze or determine it, we face a situation in this country wherein crop insurance is going to be adopted by this Congress and accepted by the people of the country. If I am not mistaken, I think both major political parties pledged that to the people of the United States. In other words, here is an additional cost of government, we will say, relating directly to agricultural producers, which I must assume the country is willing to accept. Therefore, I am going along with this program. We have had 2 or 3 years in which to debate it. I have opposed it strenuously all the time up to this point. If it is now to become a part of the agricultural economy of this country and the agricultural procedure, then let us go ahead and try this thing out and on as sound a basis as can possibly be worked out by intelligent and fair-minded men.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I yield.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Does not the gentleman feel that the people want to have us inaugurate a sound program that will be self-sustaining, so that it will not cost the Government any money?

Mr. CRAWFORD. Yes. I do not know how long I shall be in the House as a Member, but if I find that this Congress in the coming 2 years refuses to go along on sound principles, then I simply cannot support this program when it comes to the appropriation for its continuation.

On page 3 of the bill subsection (2) reads as follows: "For the purpose of determining the most practical plan, terms, and conditions of insurance with respect to" certain crops enumerated there. I think that is a wise provision.

But I do not believe we have gone far enough yet. I understand that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN] is going to offer some additional language. I propose to offer some additional language to that particular part of the bill and insert in there along with corn, tobacco, rice, peanuts, soybeans, sugar beets, and citrus fruits, dry beans. Dried beans are a support crop, at the present time, and have been for the last 2 or 3 years. I hope that the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. FLANNAGAN], will accept that amendment when it is offered. That will cover all types of dried beans, I may say to the gentleman from New York. I know his district produces dry beans. I may say to the Members from California, that covers your crops out there. We should have that crop in this bill. There should be no doubt about that at all. I am going to offer the amendment when we begin to read the bill under the 5-minute rule. I hope that the States that are interested will support me in that position. I believe that the coming Congress and the other body, as this bill progresses through the Congress, can design a fairly sound basis here on which we can proceed, as to the future. And then from time to time, I hope we will have the common sense and initiative and all the other necessary elements, to make this a sound program all the way through.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LARCADE].

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Chairman, coming from one of the greatest agricultural districts in the United States, I would be amiss in my duty, if I were not to say a few words at this time in support of this bill. It so happens I also have had considerable experience in the insurance business. I view this legislation largely from the standpoint of an insurance man. I have had the privilege of writing insurance for 30 or 40 years, acting in the capacity of a State and general agent and have had considerable experience in that line of business. I do know that with respect to the crop-insurance legislation that previously was enacted by the Congress, a fair trial was not given to the program. In the time that this program was in effect, it was not possible to assimilate enough actuarial data in order to arrive at a reasonable conclusion as to whether the program could or would be self-sustaining. Fire-insurance companies, in order to get an average experience on classes of risks, usually take a 5-year period. If I recall, the crop-insurance program, was only in effect about 2 years and it is my opinion that not only for the reasons that have been previously advanced, the principal one of which is the obligation of both sides of this House to furnish the farmers of this country some opportunity for crop-insurance protection, there are many other arguments which favor the passage of this legislation. Of course, as I said in the beginning, it is apparent, in my opinion, that a fair trial and experience has not been obtained for this legislation.

I recall during my experience where the fire-insurance companies ventured into fields where they, like the Congress, did not go along a sufficient length of time in which to obtain experience on the lines that they were writing, which were new lines. For instance, I recall one year after disastrous floods in my country the insurance companies ventured into crop flood insurance. It just happened that the year they went into the crop flood insurance business we had a devastating flood in my State and the result was that the insurance companies lost heavily.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LARCADE. I yield.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. The insurance companies have tried to give over-all coverage for all farm products, but they failed the first year because there were so many losses that they could not pay.

Mr. LARCADE. As I said, the reason for that is that they did not have an average record over a period of years to ascertain whether the rates which they established were sufficient to be self-sustaining or profitable.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Louisiana has expired.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER].

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Chairman, is the farmer entitled to have available some agency through which he can buy insurance protection against the general hazards inherent in the growing of crops? My answer is, Certainly. It is the duty of the Congress to see that he has such a privilege.

This is a problem that has received the consideration of insurance companies, actuaries, financiers, agriculturists, the Congress, and others over a period of many years. Private insurance companies have entered the field of crop insurance to the extent of making it possible for a farmer to buy crop insurance against loss by fire, hailstorm, and possibly some other hazards. The entire field, however, is so extensive, covers so much territory, with such varied inherent conditions and risks, that private insurance has not felt warranted financially in assuming the burden of exploration. Consequently, competition by the Government with private industry is not here involved.

After extensive committee hearings, due consideration, and debate, the House in 1938 passed a law setting up a formula whereby the Government, for a premium to be paid by the farmer, assumed the risk of insuring the wheat crop against hazards beyond the control of the farmer. Wheat was selected as sort of a guinea pig to try out the experiment. Wheat was determined upon because the experts in the Department of Agriculture, as well as insurance actuaries generally, felt that if sound insurance could be provided for any crop it would be easier and more successfully applied to wheat. The Congress passed the law and provided the funds to undertake the experiment, beginning with the 1939 wheat crop. This was not too successful, but the experiment did not go far enough to give the formula a fair trial.

In 1941 the cotton growers also wanted protection and cotton was added to wheat. In my judgment this was a mistake, because wheat insurance had not yet been placed on a sound basis. There had been losses on the part of the Government and when cotton was included, of course, additional losses were inevitable. This was discouraging and gave the opponents of crop insurance the opportunity of pointing out the losses which were branded as subsidies paid by the Government to the insured wheat farmers. The facts are that wheat was insured for 5 years and cotton for 2 years. During that time approximately 2,100,000 wheat and cotton farmers were insured. This represented insurance on about 56,000,000 acres of crops with a guaranteed income of about $586,000,000. Indemnities for loss of crops were paid to about 588,000 farmers representing a total of about $80,000,000. This money was paid to farmers, not in addition to their normal income, but as a substitute for the income they had lost as a result of crop failures. Out of the $80,000,000 paid, farmers themselves contributed $52,000,000 as premiums.

At first blush some say that crop insurance by the Government has been a failure and should, therefore, be abandoned. This is not necessarily sound reasoning, because all insurance ventures must contemplate an experimental period of loss, or at least no profits, in the initial stage.

In 1944 the Congress refused to appropriate additional sums to carry on the program, largely because of the way in which it was being administered. The bill we are now considering rewrites the formula and places the law upon a more secure foundation.

Mr. Chairman, I voted for the original crop control law because I am convinced that the farmer should be provided with some agency where he can purchase his own crop insurance and pay for it. That is all he is asking here. And there is only one way to determine this matter and that it by the trial and error method. I would prefer to have private industry do this, but if it will not, then the Government should. There will be losses in the beginning, yet it heems to me that the objective is so desirable and that the policy will be so sound, if economically administered, the Congress is justified in making the effort.

This proposal insures the producers of three crops—wheat, cotton, and flax—against lags in yiel dof such crops due to unavoidable causes, including drought, flood, hail, wind, frost, winterkill, lightning, hurrisane, tornado, insect infestation, plant disease, and such other unavoidable causes as may be determined by the board administering the law. It covers a percentage to be determined by the board not in excess of 75 percent of the recorded or appraised average yield of such commodities for a representative period. It is also provided that such insurance coverage shall not exceed the farmer's investment in the crop. Such insurance shall not cover losses due to neglect or malfeasance of the producer, or to the failure of the producer to follow established good-farming practices. The requirements of the bill safeguard the Government insofar as possible. If the bill becomes a law, the Congress, through the power of appropriation, still retains the control over its administration. The whole program can be discontinued at any time a majority of the Congress so desires.

In addition to wheat, cotton, and flax, provision is made for limited experiments covering corn, tobacco, rice, peanuts, soybeans, sugar beets, citrus fruits, tame hay, or any other agricultural commodity determined upon by the board. I am not enthusiastic about this provision. It seems to me that we should demonstrate soundness with the one most favorable crop before venturing into other fields. Again, a majority of the 435 Members feels otherwise, and, because of the limitations in the bill on the extent of experimentation with these additional crops, I shall go along.

The American people want the farmers to have some source from which they can purchase protection on crop losses over which they have no control. They do not want to pay continuous subsidies out of the Federal Treasury if a plan can be devised whereby agriculture can survive and carry its own load. A sound insurance plan must encourage the insured to obtain his income from his crop, rather than from his insurance contract, and this bill attempts to bring this about. A shiftless or unscrupulous farmer must not be allowed to make a profit out of his insurance.

The theory of crop insurance is to eliminate Government subsidies and to make it possible for the farmer to continue to furnish the food and fiber necessary for our well-being and, at the same time, operate on an independent, sound financial basis, free from Government interference, regimentation, and unnecessary regulation. This bill is intended to bring this about. While there have been losses by the Government under existing law, there is every reason to believe that those losses can be much reduced and eventually eliminated. Insurance against hailstorm is a profitable venture on the part of private insurance companies, and there is no reason why insurance against some of these other hazards should not also be made self-sustaining. In short, Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that the chance is worth the trial, and I shall support this bill.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. MURRAY].

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I want this record to show the facts. I just want to record that here we are, figuring out another scheme of distributing benefits to a small group and a small part of agriculture.

If we would only spend one-tenth as much time trying to administer the laws that are on the statute books as we do in figuring out new schemes, the farmers would be better off and the people would be better off because we would not have to keep piling bureau on top of bureau.

It has been a part of the law of this land for several months that the farmers were entitled to 90 percent of parity for the crops that were asked to be increased by the Secretary of Agriculture. Little or no attention has been paid to it. Some of the products that were asked to be increased were allowed to sell as low as 30 percent of parity. No one can dispute that statement of fact. I put the official returns in the RECORD, right from the packing house that brought the pork. We saw it on eggs last winter. Now, we figure out another grand scheme of something we are going to do for the farmers. Surely I think we should have a crop-insurance set-up. I do not think it is necessary to build up another big bureau in order to have it. I think we have established agricultural agencies now. I think there is no better one than the A. A. A. to put it into operation, where we have men in every township all over the United States.

It has not been so many months ago that we felt so badly for the farmers that we allowed their interest rates to rise, to exact another $6,000,000 out of their pockets after we had frozen what they could get for their products. So if this insurance could be put on a basis of some efficiency, some common sense, instead of going out and building up a bureau with a great many more people for the farmers to carry around on their necks, then there would be some reason to stand here and support it. But, there is no evidence presented that it will not take 50 percent of the money that is appropriated to operate another agency to conduct the experiment.

I realize who controls this House. I realize it is hard to beat both parties.

I just want it to appear in the RECORD that neither the Republican Party nor the Democratic Party ever supported the bill we have here to insure two crops that represent such a small part of agriculture. If we want to do something for agriculture I can name some other crops we should start out with.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I yield.

Mr. COOLEY. What crops would the gentleman like to add to this bill?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I would start out by insuring the crops, war crops, corn, and all deficiency crops. I would not start out by taking just wheat and cotton, two crops of which we have such surpluses.

Mr. COOLEY. But that is just a beginning as the gentleman knows.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. The other crops could be insured as well.

Mr. COOLEY. Certainly, but we start with those because we have actuarial figures available which are necessary to work with.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. The answer to that is that we have just as much information about the other crops as we have about cotton and wheat. If the benefits of the bill are to be limited to such a small part of agriculture I think we could get along without that kind of legislation. I think we should be able to divert ourselves long enough to produce the things that are necessary in order to win this war, and it seems to me that the farmers who enter into that war program should be insured in their efforts. I have nothing partisan or personal in speaking as I do but I am actuated merely by a motive of fairness. These crops should be insured just as much as wheat or cotton. I am not complaining or taking this attitude because the Vice President came out in my district and made several speeches. Do not think there is anything personal about this. This would be a good time to use some common sense.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY].

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, this is the first opportunity we have had to redeem a campaign pledge. This statement goes for members of both parties. Fortunately, members of both of the major political parties agree that something should be done about crop insurance. I know that in the past those of us who have advocated crop insurance have suffered many set-backs here on the floor of the House, but those of you who have opposed crop insurance in the past need not have any misgivings about changing your position, because this bill is a new approach to the problem. I shall not undertake to defend the activities of the old Crop Insurance Corporation further than to say that the losses suffered by the Government, even as great as they were, did not amount to as much as I expected they would amount to when the original bill was enacted into law. Those of you who were here at the time the original bill was enacted will recall that the program contemplated a possible loss of $100,000,000. There was not a Member on the floor of the House at that time who did not understand clearly that the Government was to defray the entire cost of the administration. The program was not a complete success; no one was optimistic enough to believe it would be. We all knew then that we were embarking upon an experiment of great magnitude; we all knew we were dealing with a problem with which no private corporation would attempt to deal because of its magnitude.

The question before us now is whether or not today, right on the heels of the election, we are going to redeem or repudiate these platform pledges. I am not foolish enough to suggest that either the Republican Party or the Democratic Party by name approved the Fulmer bill, which is now being considered.

The principles of crop insurance were certainly and definitely approved at both of the national conventions and every Member of this House, Republican or Democrat, ran upon one of those party platforms.

If this bill is not right it may be amended. No one would suggest it is a perfect piece of legislation. I certainly do not believe it is perfect, and I happen to have been chairman of the subcommittee that drafted the bill. The original bill was not perfect and this bill is not perfect. I do not kid myself into believing that I have ever voted for a perfect bill since I have been a Member of Congress, but I do say this is a reasonable and sound approach to the solution of a great problem.

I have several objections to this bill, although I am for it and every part and parcel of it. I can certainly see some of its weaknesses. Here is one of the weaknesses: Those who have opposed crop insurance in the past have insisted that any crop-insurance program inaugurated by the Federal Government should be actuarially sound and self-supporting, and I say that is a requirement which we cannot possibly meet, because none of the experts of the Government can figure out now an actuarially sound program which embraces all-risk crop insurance.

Mr. MAY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. MAY. I would like to know for my own information just what the cost of this entire program will be to the Government.

Mr. COOLEY. I regret very much I cannot tell the gentleman what the cost will be. I cannot tell the gentleman what the premiums will be because the premiums have not been fixed. The premiums will be based upon data which will hereafter be collected.

Mr. MAY. In view of the fact that the cost of the present war is running $250,000,000 a day and that victory is not yet quite in sight, if this is going to cost a fabulous sum so far as the Government is concerned, does the gentleman believe it wise to go ahead with it in view of the high prices that the farmers are getting for their products at the present time?

Mr. COOLEY. I do not think we should delay the enactment of this legislation until the end of the war.

Mr. RUSSELL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. RUSSELL. The gentleman has stated that the premiums have not been set. Under the bill who is going to set the premiums and how will they set the premiums?

Mr. COOLEY. If the gentleman will refer to line 6, page 4, of the bill he will find that the board is authorized "to fix adequate premiums for insurance in the agricultural commodity or in cash, at such rates as the board deems sufficient to cover claims for crop losses on such insurance and to establish within a period of 3 years a reasonable reserve against unforeseen losses."

Mr. RUSSELL. Is that "Board" the present corporation?

Mr. COOLEY. That is the board which will administer this law.

Mr. RUSSELL. There is going to be set up by this bill a new independent board to administer crop insurance?

Mr. COOLEY. That is right. An objection to the old bill was lack of participation on the part of the farmers. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TARVER] pointed out that in one county only one farmer applied for and obtained a policy. I regret that we did not have the broad participation desired.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Will the enactment of this bill increase the amount of red tape now binding the farmers, will it cause them to be any further harassed by governmental agencies, or will it leave them free?

Mr. COOLEY. I would not suggest that this bill will result in any farmer being harassed. There is nothing compulsory about it. No one can make him take insurance unless he wants it. I do not think the purpose of the bill is to create a bureau. I think it is a sincere effort to be of some aid to those who live upon the farm and are now faced with all of the many problems of the soil.

Mr. SCRIVNER. I thank the gentleman for that assurance.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. The gentleman assures us that this program will not become compulsory. What about the triple A? We were assured that the triple A would not become compulsory.

Mr. COOLEY. I do not agree with the gentleman. The triple A is not compulsory in any respect. The farmer may completely ignore all of the provisions of the triple A and go ahead and manage his own business. The Government merely offered some compensation to to those conserving the topsoil of American farms.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. What about the Supreme Court decision relating to wheat penalty?

Mr. COOLEY. I do not care to enter into a discussion with the gentleman on the merits or demerits of the triple A. That agency has its own record. The issue must be faced by the gentleman here today just as it is being faced by the rest of us. Are you or are you not going to repudiate the party platform upon which you ran for reelection?

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Is that a personal question?

Mr. COOLEY. No; that is not a personal question. It is directed to the entire membership of the House.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. May I answer that?

Mr. COOLEY. The gentleman may answer it in his own time if he desires. I repeat that this bill represents a sincere effort on the part of Democrats and Republicans alike. This bill was not drafted by any one member of one party. The members of the Republican Party participated in drafting this bill. No one man may claim credit for it. While it may not be perfect, and while I would not be foolish enough to say that it will be administered with perfection, I do believe that it should be enacted into law. I am sure that the experiments which will be conducted pursuant to the provisions of this bill will be well worth while, and I have no reason to believe that those who will be charged with the responsibility of administering the bill will unduly or unnecessarily increase administrative costs. Unless we continue crop insurance the many millions already invested will be a total loss and the data already collected will be worthless.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. STOCKMAN].

Mr. STOCKMAN. Mr. Chairman, I am glad to note that over the past year there has been a trend for a change of opinion in the House that has been slow, but I think quite steady, in favor of Government participation in crop insurance. This is a matter that I think is of Nation-wide importance, especially due to the fact that crops and food are major factors in winning the war.

Crop insurance to the farmers of this country is something that only the Government can make available. It is too large a thing; it is too complex and too new for private insurance companies to take up and to go into as a financial venture, and consequently it leaves only the Government itself as the one agency in this country that can make it available.

The fact that we had the crops and consequently the food with which to start out to win this war I think is due, in large measure, to the fact that we had crop insurance at the start of hostilities for several of our major crops. We will lose but very little money, if any, on the present plan that we have outlined for crop insurance.

Strong resistance made in the House a year ago last spring was the primary reason why crop insurance was discontinued, and it was made on account of the alleged large monetary loss involved. Thirty-seven million dollars for a total loss of crop insurance is a relatively small amount, and such as it was, however, is what contributed mainly to the defeat of it at that time. However, the bill as it is now set up calls for only 85 percent of the losses being paid the first 3 years, and if only that much money is available through premiums and rates adjusted after that to the losses as they then appear. That means that the Government will not lose any $37,000,000, or even any major portion thereof, and it puts it on a business-like basis, which I think we will agree is a progressive step for agriculture and the Nation. The farmers, as you all know, face everything in the world in the matter of adversity. Weather is a known uncertainty and we have no assurance that the seasons to come will be as kind to agriculture as the ones immediately past. Crop insurance is one thing we can make available to offset this natural disadvantage. It does not do a farmer any good to get a good price for his crop if he does not have anything to sell. Crop insurance and the fact that a fair price is assured the farmers are two of the big issues that I am certain are of the greatest importance to our farmers. We have something here that will help stabilize America. I hope the House continues to follow the trend in favor of crop insurance.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE].

Mr. CASE. Mr. Chairman, I should like to have the attention of the chairman of the committee to ask him a question about the operation of the bill. I should like to preface that, however, by calling attention to the fact that our experience in the Dakotas was not encouraging under crop insurance. The State of North Dakota started out in 1939 with 28,900 farms insured. The next year it went up to 30,448, but from that time on the number of wheat-insured crops dropped steadily, to 18,000 in 1941, 13,000 in 1942, and 11,000 in 1943.

In my own State of South Dakota in the first year, 1939, we had 10,644 farms insured for wheat. The next year it went up to 19,446, then it steadily went down, dropping to 12,585 in 1941, dropping further to 9,669 in 1942, and further yet to 4,888 in 1943.

In other words, the record of the Dakotas clearly shows that crop insurance as applied to wheat was going steadily out of favor. From the high in the second year it was tried it dropped to less than one-third or less than one-fourth of what it had been at the high.

As far as I could determine in talking with the farmers, the reason it was that they felt that the rate of premium was unfair and wholly out of relation to the benefits.

Now then, apparently, under this bill the Corporation will be given complete authority to fix the premiums for insurance at such rates as the Board deems sufficient to cover claims. I am wondering what hope the committee can offer to the farmers in the Dakotas, for instance, that the rates will be such that there will be any benefit for them.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. As I understand, the rates will be based upon past farm experience in that section.

Mr. CASE. That is what they told us before, and it always cost us so much more than we got out of it that the farmers just quit on it.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Probably it was partly due to the fact that you were not offered a long-time policy. It was a policy from year to year; is that right?

Mr. CASE. I do not know as to that; I simply know that the record shows that there was a steady decline.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. During the years that the number decreased, did you have good crop conditions?

Mr. CASE. Will the program be administered locally through the triple-A program?

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Yes.

Mr. CASE. Will the triple-A offices be instructed to use any pressure or influence in securing signers for the insurance program?

Mr. FLANNAGAN. I should not think so.

Mr. CASE. It will not be related to their compliance or noncompliance with the regular triple-A program?

Mr. FLANNAGAN. It has no connection.

Mr. CASE. The gentleman thinks that offering a 3-year contract rather than a 1-year contract will offer a better chance to level out the rates in proportion to the benefits?

Mr. FLANNAGAN. I do. I am definitely of that opinion.

Mr. PACE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASE. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. PACE. The gentleman is more familiar with the conditions in his State than I am, of course, but I am advised that one of the reasons for the decline was that you had a very favorable moisture condition during those years, that the wheat farmers can tell before planting season, even, what the prospects are for a crop, and that when the weather conditions or the amount of moisture in the soil was favorable they did not take the insurance. I understand you had a 2- or 3-year period there when it was very favorable. The last decline came about because the 3-year contract was put into effect, and there were quite a number of the farmers who were not familiar with it and did not subscribe to it.

Mr. CASE. Of course, I notice that in such States as Missouri, Illinois, and Ohio the rates were so low that there was a great increase from year to year in the number of wheat farmers insured. I would like to have some assurance that the rates will be leveled out in proportion to a true and accurate crop history of the area concerned.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. That is certainly the intention of the committee in drafting this legislation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I am approaching the consideration of this legislation on the theory that crop insurance is an experiment. The only way that we can find out whether it is going to work or not, is to give it a trial. I am further of the opinion that crop insurance is of so much importance to agriculture and will be such a great benefit to farmers that it is worth spending some money and taking some time to ascertain whether it can be made a success. I do not know of anything which this Government can do for agriculture or for the farmers which will be of any greater benefit than to work out a sound system of crop insurance. The farmer is the only businessman who cannot insure the risks which he takes in the normal course of his business. Yet, he takes a greater risk than the proprietor of any other kind of business. We know that if we are going to have a system of all-weather crop insurance to cover all of the hazards of farming, it must be conducted by the Federal Government, at least in the experimental stage. So I am supporting this bill, as I have previously supported the efforts which have been made to work out a system of crop insurance. Now, there are those who have offered some sound objections to the legislation which has been on the statute books. Among them has been our colleague the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], who has been a consistent opponent of the program which has been in operation. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] was not able to be present today, but I have in my hand a letter from him. I am not going to read all of it, but the gentleman from Illinois points out in this letter that this bill meets the objections which he has heretofore had to the crop-insurance program, and he concludes the letter with this paragraph:

> This appears to me to be a sound approach, and if I am absent when the bill is taken up for consideration on the floor, you are authorized to say for me that I would support and vote for the Fulmer bill.

Now, there have been things said today, in opposition to this particular measure, on the part of those who for good reasons are still opposed to it, but I have not heard anything said today, or at any time, against the theory of crop insurance. I think that everyone admits crop insurance does offer a sound program, if we can make it work. The thing I want to bring to your attention right now is that this is probably the last chance any of us will have to vote for a crop-insurance program. By that, I mean, if this House should turn down this legislation today, which has been worked out after a great deal of thought and study on the part of the Committee on Agriculture and on the part of those of the Department who are interested in the matter and on the part of the representatives of farm organizations, if we turn down this measure, then I do not believe that the Committee on Agriculture of this present Congress, the next Congress, or any subsequent Congress would be justified in again bringing before this House a crop-insurance bill.

This bill does meet the real, substantial objections which have been made to the former program. It offers an opportunity for us to see if crop insurance can be made to work. I am sincerely hopeful that this House will approve this bill and give us a chance to work out what I believe, if successful, will be the greatest step which can possibly be taken to stabilize American agriculture.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has expired.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN].

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, the Committee on Appropriations, of which I am a member, has been criticized to some degree today because of the action of some of its members a year ago. I think that the American people expect the Committee on Appropriations to weigh all these issues and to decide whether they think it is worth the money or not. We know that the administrative cost of crop insurance has been exorbitant. We weighed that against the benefits, and many of us voted against a continuation of crop insurance last year, I being one of them.

The bill that is before us now is a great improvement over the previous bill. I can see where it would not cost nearly as much money as the former bill did cost the taxpayers. So I have been battling with my conscience today considerably, after listening to this debate.

We have had many floods over the United States in many of the large rivers, especially on the Missouri River, where we have man-made floods, because of the fact that they have attempted to make the Missouri River navigable. Consequently they have created floods to such a degree that many of the people along the Missouri River are helpless and have lost their crops. I have finally come to the conclusion that I would like to vote for this bill if the amendment which the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. ANDRESEN] will offer is agreed to. I understand the gentleman said he would offer an amendment to limit the administrative cost to 25 percent of the benefits derived by the farmers.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENSEN. I yield.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. The amendment that I propose to offer limits the administrative expenditures to a sum equivalent to 25 percent of the premiums collected.

Mr. JENSEN. I thank the gentleman for the correction. I hope the gentleman's amendment will be adopted, because that is certainly a fair amount to provide for administrative cost. Certainly 25 percent is sufficient. Under the previous bill we spent $1.50, or $2 for every dollar of benefits. Certainly that is not good business; so I hope that the amendment to be offered by the gentleman from Minnesota will be adopted in order that I can conscientiously support this bill. I am sure a great many other Members would feel the same way. I reserve, however, my judgment on this bill until the time to vote comes. As I say I have battled with my conscience here all day. I want to do the right thing but I am not so sure this is the right way to do it.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENSEN. I yield.

Mr. CASE. I was just going to express the hope that the gentleman would work on his conscience a little more and get that 25-percent figure down somewhat. Twenty-five percent of the premium collected, strikes me as being too high a tax on the farmer to pay for administration.

Mr. JENSEN. I am satisfied it is, but it is at least six times better than the last one.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Mr. Chairman, earlier in the day I sought to yield time to the gentleman from Alabama, but he was not in the Chamber. I now yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HOBBS].

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Chairman, if I may, I shall be glad to take 2 minutes, and only 2, of the time yielded me, and yield back 4.

From the beginning I have been cordially in favor of crop insurance, and am for the pending bill. I would like to discuss the merits, and answer the arguments that have been advanced contra. But I shall content myself if I may stress one fact. May I speak in behalf of the personnel of the crop-insurance program?

It seems to me that, as reflected in this debate, they are greviously misunderstood. I know them, as many of you do also. The criticism of them stems from the same old fallacious argument that a preacher should not preach the gospel if

he takes money for his services. These men believe in crop insurance. They preach it from their hearts, as well as from their heads. They are investing their lives in this service, not for money, but to help farmers help themselves by pooling their interests, so that eventually, without cost to the Government, the many may by slight reduction of their profits, offset the losses of the few.

There is not a man in that office who could not make more money in private employment than he is making by working for the Government. They are outstanding men. They "know their stuff." They have done and are doing a good job—the best possible under the circumstances.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOBBS. I am glad to yield.

Mr. JENSEN. I wonder if the gentleman will not agree, however, that it is not necessary to send out a big sales force to sell something the farmer knows about already. The farmers all can read and write, or most of them. They can in my country at any rate. Instead of sending out a great sales force to prove to them that they have to take this insurance, that they should take it, it seems to me the farmers who want it will take it anyway. Understand, I am not criticizing the fine character of these salesmen, but I think there are too many of them on the Government pay roll.

Mr. HOBBS. I question the gentleman's thought that there are too many. No insurance sells itself. I may say to the gentleman from Iowa in answer to his observation that not a single insurance institution has been built without an adequate selling force of agents, that frequently seems too large. May I suggest, also, that many young life-insurance companies have found it necessary to pay agents 50 percent of the premiums collected.

If my information is correct, there has been more crop insurance written than life insurance, in the same period of time, by companies of a comparable age. I hope I make myself clear.

Mr. Chairman, 2,000,000 farmers paid $52,000,000, or its equivalent, out of their own pockets for crop insurance. That is no small volume.

Mr. CASE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOBBS. I am delighted to yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE. It seems to me that the analogy of life insurance is not comparable because when you are dealing with life insurance you are dealing with a lifetime risk. If the gentleman wants to offer a comparable figure as to percentage or cost he should deal with fire insurance or something like that where you are dealing with an annual risk. The gentleman is not contending that better than 50 percent of the premiums paid on every fire-insurance policy is commission.

Mr. HOBBS. Of course, I would not. What I am saying is that this group here has done better than life-insurance companies of the same age in their field. That is the only analogy I claim. I think it is analogous to fire insurance in that crop insurance has not the number of agents that you would expect for production of such volume in the fire-insurance field. These men in crop insurance are as hard working a group as there is in the Government.

Mr. JENSEN. I do not want to dispute the gentleman's figures.

Mr. HOBBS. I have no figures. I am shooting from the hip.

Mr. JENSEN. I am quite sure that the gentleman is shooting from the hip because certainly if the life-insurance companies or any other type of insurance company had the same kind of experience that we had in connection with this crop insurance for 4 years there would be no private insurance companies today. I am sure the gentleman knows that because they would have gone broke before they even got started.

Mr. HOBBS. I believe that just exactly the opposite is true. While many went broke, many survived. Practically all lost money during the first 5 years of their existence.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PACE].

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of the time on this side to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PACE].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PACE] is recognized for a total of 6 minutes.

Mr. PACE. Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that what the committee has requested the House to do today is what any group of businessmen would do. We have had a crop-insurance program which was unbalanced. The premiums were too low; the benefits were too high. Under that program it sometimes insured a profit. I am sure you will agree that no insurance company could be successful in doing that. It offered in many cases an inducement to a man to abandon his crop on account of the fact he could gain more through the insurance than he could by completing the crop.

Mr. Chairman, the committee comes to you today and it strikes out that program and goes back to rock bottom. That is, it seeks to insure only the farmer's losses. That is, his investment in the crop and no more. That is exactly what a fire-insurance company does. Certainly you cannot purchase fire insurance on your home or on your barn that would pay you a profit. The most that the fire-insurance company offers is to protect your investment and oftentimes only a percentage of your investment.

My only interest in this bill, my only interest in crop insurance is to bring to the farmers of this Nation some feeling of security on the farm.

You have set up legislation that offers security to many millions of people who work in the factories of this Nation. You appropriated last year in excess of $100,000,000 to match the retirement fund of Government employees. You have done that for 20 or 30 years, and you probably have put nearly a billion dollars in your Government employees' retirement fund.

I think it is the duty of the farmers of this Nation to produce the food and the fiber to feed and clothe the people. I think, on the other hand, there is some responsibility on the part of those who live in the cities, and on the part of Government, to see that those who must work in the fields and must produce food and fiber to feed and clothe the Nation are given that same assurance of security out on the farm. The latest proposal does not even cover the farmer. Word came to us the other day that they intend to include in the social-security program only the farmer-worker and the domestic servant, and the man who must pay the bill, the man who must take the chance, who must finance the crop, the man who must buy the farm, is today without any assurance of parity prices and crop insurance and has no conception of what the harvest is going to be when he plants his crop. Yet he, and he alone, in this Nation is the only man that must go into business with no conception of how he is coming out. Those who buy your farm commodities, those who process your farm commodities, they know when they buy your corn, when they buy your wheat, when they buy your cotton, what their profit is going to be. They know how the transaction will terminate. Yet those who feed this Nation, who produce the crops, must stand by and see the storms come. They must stand by and witness the long, dry season. They must stand by and see the insects ruin their crops; yet you tell me that with their responsibility to feed the Nation there is no responsibility on the people and on the Congress to bring to them some security on the farm.

It is for them, and for that reason, that I urge and the committee urges your approval of this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired. All time has expired.

The Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That subsection (a) of section 508 of the Federal Crop Insurance Act, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"(a) (1) Commencing with the wheat, cotton, and flax crops planted for harvest in 1945, to insure, upon such terms and conditions not inconsistent with the provisions of this title as it may determine, producers of wheat, cotton, and flax against loss in yield of such crops due to unavoidable causes, including drought, flood, hail, wind, frost, winter-kill, lightning, hurricane, tornado, insect infestation, plant disease, and such other unavoidable causes as may be determined by the Board. Such insurance shall cover a percentage to be determined by the Board not in excess of 75 percent of the recorded or appraised average yield of such commodities on the insured farm for a representative period subject to such adjustments as the Board may prescribe to the end that the average yields fixed for farms in the same area, which are subject to the same conditions, may be fair and just: *Provided, however*, That such insurance coverage shall not exceed the investment in the crop based on the cost, as determined by the Board, of preparing the land, or labor, seed, planting, cultivation, disease or insect control, harvesting, ginning, hauling to market, fertilizer, irrigation, use of the land, and other appli-

cable costs as determined by the Board. Such insurance shall not cover losses due to the neglect or malfeasance of the producer, or to the failure of the producer to reseed to the same crop in areas and under circumstances where it is customary to so reseed, or to the failure of the producer to follow established good farming practices. Insurance shall not be provided in any county unless written applications therefor are filed covering at least 100 farms or one-third of the farms normally producing the agricultural commodities authorized to be insured, except that insurance may be provided for producers on farms situated in a local producing area bordering on a county with a crop-insurance program. The Board may limit insurance in any county or area, or on any farm, on the basis of the insurance risk involved.

"(2) For the purpose of determining the most practical plan, terms, and conditions of insurance with respect to corn, tobacco, rice, peanuts, soybeans, sugar beets, citrus fruits, tame hay, and any other agricultural commodity, if sufficient actuarial data are available, as determined by the Board, to insure upon such terms and conditions not inconsistent with the provisions of this title, as it may determine, producers of such agricultural commodities against loss due to the unavoidable causes specified in paragraph (1) of this subsection. Insurance provided for any agricultural commodity under this paragraph shall be limited to producers in not to exceed 20 representative counties selected by the Board for a period of not more than 3 years, and shall be subject to the limitations and conditions provided in paragraph (1) of this subsection: *Provided, however,* That such insurance coverage may be the same as the insurance coverage provided in paragraph (1) of this subsection or may cover a percentage not in excess of 75 percent of the investment in the crop, determined in accordance with the provisions of paragraph (1) of this subsection. The Corporation shall report to the Congress the results of its operations as to each commodity under this paragraph."

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN: On page 3, line 6, at the end of line 6 insert "oats, barley, rye."

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Mr. Chairman, the committee accepts the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL: On page 3, line 7, after "citrus", insert "and other."

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Chairman, if any crop is worth insuring, it is fruit. Not just citrus fruits as the bill now reads, but all kinds of fruits.

Up-State New York is one of the greatest apple- and grape-producing sections of the country. Those who grow these fruits undergo considerable risks. Some years their crops are total failures. Other seasons they lose considerable from storms, drought, and the cold.

The country can ill afford to allow the growers of these precious foods to be put out of business. They should be considered in any crop-insurance program.

In presenting this amendment, I do not speak for my own area alone, nor am I being sectional. The raisins, figs, pears, plums of California, the West, and South will be brought into this program. I know everybody will want to protect the Nation's fruit supply and in this interest, I am glad to see my amendment looked upon so favorably.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Mr. Chairman, the committee will accept that amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BROWN of Georgia: On page 2, line 23, after "at least" strike out "one hundred" and insert "fifty."

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Mr. Chairman, the committee will accept that amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CRAWFORD. On page 3, line 6, after "corn" insert "dry beans."

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Mr. Chairman, we will accept that amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. LEMKE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. LEMKE: On page 1, line 9, after the word "such", insert "growing, unharvested, unthreshed, or unpacked."

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Mr. Chairman, we accept that amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. COLE of New York: On page 3, line 7, after the words "sugar beets", insert "potatoes and other vegetables."

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Mr. Chairman, while I think the bill is broad enough to cover potatoes and other vegetables, we are perfectly willing to accept the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, this is a proposition to extend the Federal power and, as I see it, with reference to a matter within the governmental capacity of the States. As I understand the provisions of this bill, it is not an arrangement under which there is to be a blanket insurance where any unfavored community, climatically or otheryise, can get any advantage. The people in the Dakotas, where they have droughts, and in my section where they have floods or droughts, each community is to pay for its own insurance and the cost of administration, maybe, as I understand the proposition. The average cost of insurance in each distinctive community fixes the premium cost. It is desirable, we are told, to get all the farmers in under this thing. This is typical of what is happening in America. We are getting everybody we can in under some agency or branch of the Federal power and dependent upon the Federal Government. That is the whole drift of things. I am convinced that it is a dangerous drift, that we must change the direction if we are to preserve our democracy. That is why I am taking these minutes of your time. The indications are this bill will pass overwhelmingly, but I feel this is an appropriate time to consider these matters.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. I yield.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. I would like to challenge that statement because under the provisions of this bill, if it becomes law, after a period of 3 years, the farmer pays the premium and if the premiums are not sufficient to pay off the indemnities, then the premiums are prorated.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. May I ask my friend if it is not a federally administered arrangement?

Mr. FLANNAGAN. It is.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. That is what I am talking about.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Let me go on a little.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that I may have 2½ additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. TABER. Is it not true that when these things are set up to be carried along, self-supported after 2 or 3 years, that that 2 or 3 years gets extended for 2 or 3 more and then 2 or 3 more?

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. I hope my friend will permit me to continue my line of thought instead of undertaking to answer questions.

I think, Mr. Chairman, this is a very serious matter. This general drift toward Federal power, the power of the Federal dollar, and the might of Federal administration. We are continually complaining about the extension of Federal power. The States could do this job. Insofar as the scheme of this bill is concerned, it is not contemplated that the people of any States in the long run will draw a single cent from the Federal Treasury except what is put there by its own people, less their split in the Federal contribution. Is that not right?

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Is my statement wrong?

Mr. POAGE. I think it is. This bill does not divide it up into 48 different funds. If the gentleman were correct, there would be 48 different funds, of which most of them would be broke.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. I cannot yield any further.

Mr. POAGE. The gentleman wants to know what is in the bill.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. I know what is in the bill. I know that you contemplate that each of these drought-stricken areas or flood-destroyed areas is to pay its own premium in that district. Is that right?

Mr. POAGE. No; that is wrong.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. The bill provides, beginning line 3, page 2, that such insurance shall cover a percentage to be determined by the Board, not in excess of 75 percent of the recorded or appraised average yield of such communities on the insured farm for a representative period taking in consideration average yield of

farms in the same area subject to the same conditions which, as I read it, is a matter of local adjustment, taking into consideration local susceptibility to droughts, floods, and so forth. My point is why could not the States do that if it is desirable. If the State would have to pay out more in a given year than it took in, it would recoup in other years when it took in more than it put out unless the actuary made a mistake in figuring averages.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield? Is this not just like a fire-insurance business? Each house has a separate rating, but each State is not put into a pool by itself.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. That is right. I am right in my statement, because there are communities where you have more floods and more droughts. That is true. Any community that is subject to a hazard which other communities do not have, according to the provisions of this bill as I understand it, pays a higher premium.

The point I am trying to emphasize is when are we ever going to establish States in the doing of the things within their governmental capacity unless we begin; unless we stop extending Federal power when the States have the power to do the job? When are we ever going to get away from this Federal Government? When are our States ever going to acquire the ability to govern unless as a people we put our States to the responsibility of dealing with these things that are within their own governmental capacity? Fifty years ago nobody would have offered this as a proposition that the Federal Government should deal with. There is not a single provision in the American Constitution that puts this responsibility on the Federal Government. We have gone on and on toward Federal extension of power until we no longer draw a distinction between Federal power and State duty. I do not say this in any lecturing sense. I do not deny my own responsibility, but it is getting mighty dangerous if we hope to preserve a democracy in this country.

The result is that we are taking from these States the necessity to deal with these things within their governmental capacity. The only way they can preserve that capacity is to use it. I do not want to be offensive, but we are destroying the States by relieving them from doing what they must do if they are to be and remain sovereign, respected, responsible agents of general government. There is no use complaining of the bureaucratic conduct of our bureaucracy—it is natural—or of the fact that we are becoming a bureaucracy if we concentrate power here which only a bureaucracy can exercise for the States or the habitat of our democracy. A democracy cannot function through the sort of governmental organization we are building upon the ruin of an independent States' structure. When we destroy the governmental capacities of the States, and we do it if we relieve them of the doing of those things within their capacities, then we have got to abandon the democratic system of government. This running up here to Washington for everything because the States would have to use their governmental muscles is not only destroying the efficiency of State government, but it is destroying the governmental capacity of the people. There is a great deal of difference between the sense of responsibility and the power and effort of the private citizen when a matter is in the States, than when it is moved up here.

If any States do not now have the capacity to deal with the drought problems and other hazards within their own communities, then we should hold our States to that responsibility until they develop that ability. The fact that it may be more difficult to carry out a governmental venture in a State where the people are watching than away off up here in Washington where we can cover up mistakes with borrowed money, is no argument in favor of moving the thing to Washington. If we run in ahead of State responsibilities, as we are accustomed to doing, when do we expect the States to begin to do their business, to gain strength by the effort and to assume the responsibilities of general government so that the Federal organization can be stripped down to Federal duties, and the Federal Government can then operate under laws enacted by the Congress instead of directives promulgated by an appointed personnel?

We know, as Members of Congress, that we have accumulated here in Washington a total of governmental power beyond all known capacity to comprehend. As a matter of fact, insofar as the details of Government policy are concerned, we hardly know what it is about. In all deference, I want to tell you Members of Congress we confront something more important in this bill than crop insurance. Ours is the responsibility of insuring if we can the possibility of democratic government operating in America. That is what we confront. In my view that is the big question in this proposition right here. I do not mean it would be determinative one way or the other, it is an important trend. I have not heard a single man get on this floor and say that this thing we are attempting to do is beyond the governmental capacity of the States. It may not be so easy. It may be difficult. Dealing with difficulties though is what increases capacity. That sort of thing alone is what would make our States strong and virile and capable of being our agents of general government. Like individuals States gain capacity by doing difficult things. We either make them strong and virile and sovereign and keep them that way, as they were intended to be and as they are adapted to be, or we go the way of the other democracies which chose the easy way and are no more.

That would have been required of our States in other days when, as a people, we really believed in the sovereignty of the States and in the people and their capacity to govern. We Democrats and Republicans—I do not claim a perfect score; I do not parade myself; I share in whatever blame there is, but that does not keep me from being certain we have got to change our policy if we are to preserve our democracy, and I take my full share of the blame for what we have done to this democracy. I do not say this bill is determinative, but I respectfully declare that the direction in which it moves us is determinative. We have already gone far. We do not consider now in this chamber whether or not a thing proposed is within the governmental responsibility of the Federal Government or within the capacity of the States, before we bring in a Federal law dealing with it. But as a matter of fact considering our structure of government, when we come to deal with a problem of this sort the big question, it seems to me, is whether or not we are moving more power into this great big Federal bureaucracy. There is nobody who will deny that we are proposing to create another bureau, more people on the Federal pay roll. This is what is to be determined by the Board, under this bill, the cost of preparing the land, labor, seed, planting, cultivation, disease or insect control, harvesting, ginning, hauling to market, fertilizer, irrigation, use of the land, and other applicable cost, as is shown on page 2, beginning at line 12. If we keep this up soon we will have men snooping around every farm in America and the people paying for it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, I see there is some misapprehension as to what this bill actually contains. This bill does not set up 48 insurance agencies; this bill sets up 1 insurance agency and only 1. The bill does provide that the premiums charged shall be in proportion to the risk. This is exactly what fire-insurance companies require. The rate in each city in Texas is not the same for fire insurance because our insurance commission, and I am sure the insurance commissions of the other States would do likewise, requires that the rate shall be in proportion to the risk. The risk naturally is greater in some communities than in others, and premium based on risk is what is provided under the terms of this bill; the rate will be higher in certain communities than others; where the risk is greatest the rate is highest. But the risk is spread over all of the participating farms in the United States, and that as I understand it is the fundamental of insurance. Insurance is nothing in the world but a spreading of the risk; that is all there is to insurance. For insurance to be sound the company must take in by way of premiums as much as it pays out by way of benefits; consequently there is no profit in insurance as such. Practically all insurance companies operate for a profit and charge in addition to the necessary funds to carry the losses an amount sufficient to pay a profit either in the form of dividends to stockholders, or salaries to officers and refunds to policyholders, but the actual cost of insurance itself is merely the loss paid, plus the actual operating expenses. A man could carry his own insurance if his property were sufficiently spread and if his spread were sufficiently varied so that the losses would not be likely to occur at one time

and in one place. It is just as cheap for him to carry his own insurance under such circumstances as it would be to buy it. So it would be with individuals on the farm. The one fundamental principle of insurance is the spreading of the risks. That is exactly what this bill does. It spreads the risk to all the farms in all the 48 States and not simply to the farms of 1 State as the gentleman from Texas erroneously assumed it does.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POAGE. I yield.

Mr. COOLEY. Does not the bill provide for the creation of only one reserve?

Mr. POAGE. That is all, only one reserve, and all of the payments are out of that one reserve. Should every farm in New Mexico in a certain year have a total loss, the reserve would be adequate to pay it, the income would be sufficient to meet it from the rest of the United States. But if you establish this on the basis of 48 separate States some of them would be broke all the time, as we have learned from experience in the past.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POAGE. I yield.

Mr. HOPE. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. SUMNERS] suggested we could have this operate under 48 different State set-ups; but did we not try that with the guaranty of bank deposits? And did we not find that the spread was not sufficient under such a set-up? Is there not a comparable proposition here?

Mr. POAGE. That is right.

Those who have opposed this were not seen here opposing the bank guaranty law. The bank guaranty law did the same thing when it was before this House and the voices who oppose this bill were silent when the bank guaranty law was before us. And that bill actually took from the States an agency that many of the States were then operating and placed it in Federal hands. This, on the other hand, is a function that the States have not seen fit to undertake. They have hesitated to undertake it because of the very danger of separating it into 48 agencies; consequently you are not now taking something away from the States. On the contrary, we are doing something that the States have not seen fit to undertake.

Mr. HILL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POAGE. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. HILL. I would like to straighten out another statement that has not squared with the facts. This bill was passed out of our committee long before election.

Mr. POAGE. That is right. I believe it was reported about June 2, 1944.

Mr. HILL of Colorado. When they say that the election had something to do with this bill and that we went home to see what our constituents thought about it, that is not according to the facts, because this bill was passed out of the committee practically unanimously before election.

Mr. POAGE. That is right. This is not a death-bed confession.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2½ additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POAGE. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Is it not contemplated under this scheme, for instance, that Texas on the average shall pay for the losses in Texas?

Mr. POAGE. It is hoped that the premiums collected in Texas will be sufficient to meet the losses that occur in Texas, but payments in Texas are definitely not dependent on the collection of a like sum in premiums in Texas.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Why do you have these changes and variations then in premiums?

Mr. POAGE. The rate would unquestionably be different in different parts of Texas. For instance, the rate would be different on the high plains of Texas from what it would be in Dallas County, just as the fire-insurance rate is different in Lancaster from what it is in the city of Dallas.

The rate will not vary according to State line but according to climatic conditions and the possibility of loss.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Is it true that Texas could not operate a crop-insurance program?

Mr. POAGE. Possibly Texas could, but the gentleman and I come from a State that is fortunately situated. It is the largest State in the Union, in area and agriculturally, and possibly we could successfully operate a crop-insurance system. There are certain life-insurance companies in Texas, one in the gentleman's own city, that operates very successfully in that State and confines its business exclusively to Texas. But there are other States that are not so fortunately located. For instance, let us take the farmers in Rhode Island, a small State. One storm might prove disastrous to every farmer in that State, and could wipe them all out. Whenever you set up an insurance system that allows one disaster to wipe out the entire reserve you have an unsound insurance system, because there is nothing to insurance except the spreading of the risk. This bill spreads the risk.

In counterdistinction to the existing law this bill takes the gamble, as far as the Government is concerned, out of crop insurance. It also ceases to be a proposition where a man can drop a quarter in and hope to hit a jackpot. He cannot make a profit out of this program; he cannot speculate on this and hope to make a profit because he can never get back out of this bill more than he has put into his crop. Insurance ought to be merely a protection rather than an opportunity to speculate in connection with some unearned profit. That is what the old bill allows and what this one denies. This bill allows a farmer to spread his risk all over the United States, but it does not let him make money off his fellow farmers or off the taxpayers by collecting more than he had lost. The present law allows speculation. This bill gives only insurance.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD at the point at which my amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I offer a motion which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. TARVER moves that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with the recommendation that the enacting clause be stricken out.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, in view of the fact that the agreeable and affable chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. FLANNAGAN] has accepted every amendment which has been offered so far, I am offering this one in the hope that he may also accept it. I rise to draw the attention of the chairman of the committee to my amendment. I sincerely hope that he will not make an exception in my case but will also accept the amendment I have offered.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Mr. Chairman, in answer to the distinguished gentleman, I might say that I have very high regard for him, but I also appreciate that he has a very keen sense of humor. I think he is trying to demonstrate to the House that he still has that sense of humor. We have accepted various amendments, it is true, but they have been in the general interest of the bill and we thought that we should accept them.

Mr. TARVER. May I inquire whether it is the gentleman's purpose to refuse to agree to any amendment which may be offered?

Mr. FLANNAGAN. We will refuse to agree to any amendment that we do not think should be accepted.

Mr. TARVER. I regret that the chairman makes an exception in my case. As far as I have observed, during the pendency of this bill both before the committee and in the House, all Members who had amendments to propose have met with a cordial reception upon the part of the gentleman from Virginia, in charge of the bill here. So far, all of these amendments have been accepted. So far as the statement of the chairman indicates, it is probably his purpose to accept all other amendments which may be offered. Therefore, I regret that an exception is to be made in the case of my own amendment, pending on the Clerk's desk. I sincerely hope the House may determine that that amendment also may be accepted.

Mr. Chairman, it is manifest from the procedure which has been had in connection with this bill that the purpose is not so much to work out a sound program of crop insurance for the benefit of the farmers, but that it is to devise some ways and means by which this useless Federal Bureau may be continued. The

language of the bill, it appears, so far as it is now before the Committee of the Whole, really does not matter. Amendments have been accepted and other amendments will undoubtedly be agreed to. The form of the matter that will be contained in the bill after its final passage in the House does not appear to be material. The only thing that is material is the continuance of this useless organization at tremendous expense to the taxpayers of this country. If gentlemen believe in the arguments which have been advanced from time to time during the last several years with regard to the abolition of useless Federal bureaus, I certainly hope in all seriousness that they will support the motion which I have just submitted and not reestablish this one.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Mr. Chairman, I cannot be persuaded that the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TARVER] offers his amendment in all seriousness. This is an important piece of legislation. It has been brought before the House after full hearings and careful consideration. If the gentleman's motion carries it simply means the death of crop insurance for, to say the least, years to come. I do not believe the gentleman himself would like to see such a thing happen. I am confident that this House is not going to let such a thing happen.

It is my purpose to move that the Committee rise at the conclusion of the vote on the pending amendment, and I hope that overnight the distinguished gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TARVER] will use that great brain of his, see the error of his way, and join hands with us tomorrow in giving the farmers of America a crop-insurance program. I know that he is a friend of the farmers and I know that he wants to do the right thing. Think it over, Judge.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FLANNAGAN. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Is it not a fair statement that the bill under consideration presents the concrete proposition as to whether or not we shall continue under existing law or whether we shall amend the existing law to perfect the Crop Insurance Act?

Mr. FLANNAGAN. That is right.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Furthermore, with respect to the amendments that have been agreed to by the committee on the floor, is it not fair to say that under the language of the section under consideration, for the purpose of experimental investigations, any other agricultural commodities, if sufficient actuarial data are available, are included, and the mere naming of them adds nothing whatever to the terms of the bill?

Mr. FLANNAGAN. That is absolutely true.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. For that reason, the gentleman accepted the amendments?

Mr. FLANNAGAN. That is the reason we accepted the amendments.

Mr. Chairman, I ask for a vote on the motion offered by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TARVER].

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TARVER].

The motion was rejected.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. SPARKMAN, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 4911) to amend the Federal Crop Insurance Act pursuant to House Resolution 605, had come to no resolution thereon.

HON. JAMES DOMENGEAUX

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House:

NOVEMBER 21, 1944.

The honorable the SPEAKER,
House of Representatives.

SIR: The certificate of election in due form of law of Hon. JAMES DOMENGEAUX as a Representative-elect to the Seventy-eighth Congress from the Third Congressional District of the State of Louisiana, to fill a vacancy in that district, is on file in this office.

Very truly yours,

SOUTH TRIMBLE,
Clerk of the House of Representatives.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. WICKERSHAM] be permitted to revise and extend his remarks on the pending crop-insurance bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. WEICHEL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on two matters.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. FAY] is recognized for 20 minutes.

PARTICIPATION OF THE TWENTY-SEVENTH (NEW YORK NATIONAL GUARD) ARMY DIVISION IN THE BATTLE OF SAIPAN

Mr. FAY. Mr. Speaker, at the opening of the session today, I introduced the following resolution:

Resolved, That the Committee on Military Affairs of the House is authorized and directed to conduct an investigation for the purpose of ascertaining the extent to which, and the circumstances under which, false or misleading reports have been published and circulated with respect to the character and circumstances of the participation of the Twenty-seventh (New York National Guard) Army Division in the Battle of Saipan.

The committee shall report the results of its investigation to the House at the earliest practicable date during the present Congress.

For purposes of this resolution, the committee is authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times, whether or not the House is sitting, has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings, to require the attendance of such witnesses, and the production of such books, papers, documents, and to take such testimony, as it deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued under the signature of the chairman of the committee or by any member designated by such chairman, and may be served by any person designated by such chairman or member.

In the September 18 edition of Time magazine there appeared an article attributed to a man named Sherrod in which the marine version of the Battle of Saipan was narrated. In part it read as follows:

The marines believe that their forge-ahead tactics cost less in lives than trying to cut off the enemy's tail by inches. (High marine casualties are due to the fact that marines are beachhead assault troops, always given the toughest assignments.) But the relief of Ralph Smith, according to the marine version, had nothing to do with tactics. By the eighth day of the Saipan battle the Second and Fourth Marine Divisions had advanced rapidly on each side of the island. Then they had to wait, because two regiments of the Twenty-seventh Army Division—with battalions faced in three directions, unable even to form a line—were hopelessly bogged down in the center. The third regiment of the Twenty-seventh, meanwhile, had failed dismally to clean out a pocket of Japs in the southeast corner of the island. Although terrific artillery barrages were laid down in front of them, Ralph Smith's men froze in their fox holes. For days these men, who lacked confidence in their officers, were held up by handfuls of Japs in caves. When it began to look as if what had been gained might be lost, Fourth Marine Division troops even moved in front of a sector of the Twenty-seventh's line to save it. From the marine point of view, Gen. Ralph Smith's chief fault was that he had long ago failed to get tough enough to remove incompetent subordinate officers. On the ninth day Ralph Smith was relieved (technically, for disobeying an order to attack), and Maj. Gen. Sanderford Jarman, who had come along as Saipan's post-battle commander, took over the Twenty-seventh temporarily, fired several officers, including a regimental colonel. Thereafter the Twenty-seventh performed fairly well until its greenest regiment broke and let some 3,000 Japs through in a suicide charge which a marine artillery battalion finally stopped, at great cost to itself.

Between these versions one thing was clear: When field commanders hesitate to remove subordinates for fear of interservice contention, battles and lives will be needlessly lost.

These high-sounding words mean just one thing in any soldier's mind—that the intention to convey was that the division lacked courage and was yellow.

This story is an absolute untruth, and I have it from men who led battalions in this engagement and who were not reporting it miles behind the lines, but were up there in the front giving their lives and limbs to capture this very important island.

As a member of the One Hundred and Sixty-fifth Infantry—the Fighting Sixty-ninth of New York of World War No. 1—I would be remiss in my loyalty to my regiment and the traditions it holds if I did not demand the immediate publication of the reports already gathered concerning this entire engagement. The Old Sixty-ninth has more battle rings on its flagstaff than any other regiment in our land. It has been in every battle

of our country since the Civil War and has been commanded by men like General Duffy, Gen. "Wild Bill" Donovan, Gen. Alex E. Anderson, and Col. Gerard Kelley, a product of my district and a graduate of West Point, who is a fearless leader, already wounded at Saipan, where he led our regiment, having taken command when Col. Gardner Conroy was killed by a sniper's bullet in the capture of Makin.

We do not have men who freeze in fox holes, neither does the rest of the regiments from New York State which comprise the Twenty-seventh Division.

This article has brought to my personal attention the plight of fathers and mothers whose sons lost their lives in this noble victory and who now are told that their men were bogged down when in fact they wrote some of the most glorious pages of history for posterity.

Let me read you a letter from Colonel Kelley and you will readily understand how lies of this kind can affect fighting men:

HEADQUARTERS, ONE HUNDRED AND SIXTY-FIFTH INFANTRY,
Somewhere in the Pacific, October 9.

DEAR JIM: It's a great feeling getting back with my gang. My pain was negligible compared to the worry lest they evacuate me so far back that I would lose the regiment. The Lord and my superiors were good and here I am, raising hell with the troops and quite happy about it all.

I say I'm happy. That's generally true. However, when I consider the libelous publicity that recently has been permitted to be published, concerning the division in the Saipan operation, I'm downright mad.

I refer to the September 18 issue of Time, which carried an article entitled "The Generals Smith." It came to our attention about a week ago. The article is attributed to one Sherrod, a heretofore unknown reporter. He was never seen by members of the regiment during the action. His coverage of operations out this way has been notoriously inaccurate, in a not too subtle effort to belittle Army accomplishments. As the publication he represents bears a similar reputation, his stories aroused little more than a scornful comment when read by the troops who participated.

However, this recent attack cannot pass unnoticed. No one, be he protected by one or all of the freedoms we strive to preserve, can characterize the members of this regiment or this division as "yellow" and go unchallenged.

It is a sad commentary on the fairness and sportsmanship of the "American way" that we who should be the last to be distracted from our "total war effort" must turn eastward and defend and justify ourselves. We must do it now. If not for ourselves, it's our bounden duty to justify our brave dead who cannot defend themselves. Our crippled remain mute evidence that we did not "freeze in our fox holes."

The regiment was called ashore the second night because it was needed badly. We were followed by the rest of the division. Within 26 hours after we relieved a marine unit, we took Aslito Airfield. Within 3 days we had swept clear across the island. A few days later the regiment, as a part of the division, moved north and again relieved the marines against what turned out to be the toughest enemy position on the island. The marines to whom I talked, freely expressed their gratitude at being withdrawn. Our progress was slow but we were never stopped. On the contrary, the marines who had been moved to our right flank, where the going was much easier, were highly complimentary. A most cordial and mutual respect was demonstrated throughout with the marine enlisted men and the officers who were actually fighting. I mention this because the many incidents similar to these, established what I believe to be the true marine version.

The regiment was in actual contact with the enemy from the moment it landed until several days after the battle was declared ended. All this without relief. It was in the fight longer than any regiment on the island in spite of the fact that we landed on the second night. On two distinct occasions the commanding general of the landing forces, Lt. Gen. Holland M. Smith, extended his congratulations to the regiment, the first after our speedy capture of the airfield. On that occasion he sent his "well done" to the regiment through our division commander who visited my command post and delivered the message personally.

After the battle was over Gen. Holland Smith came up to the command post and directed Colonel Hart (who had assumed command after I was wounded and evacuated) to extend his congratulations to every officer and man of the regiment.

The bold lies published in the story literally amazed us. We had returned satisfied that we had done our duty in a very creditable manner. Our fatigue, the dirt, our wounds, the going without proper food, the lost companions, and many other things, that you know only too well, were minimized in our minds by the natural expectation that we had accomplished something for which our beloved country would feel grateful.

We who are older and more experienced, and who have acquired patience to await the unprejudiced verdict of history can detect the unprincipled and disgusting efforts of Time to increase circulation by inciting controversy, thereby profiting by the aroused public interest. At the same time it is our responsibility to maintain the high state of morale of the men with whose welfare we are charged. Our men being younger and not used to such treatment are not content to await the justice that is inevitable but sometimes slow.

It is this that prompts me to write you on this subject. Beyond the common fairness, which is our due, is the greater need to reassure these brave young men before they go into their next battle that our friends and loved ones, particularly those honored with the responsibility of high Government office, are prompt to right such wrongs.

A mere retraction is not enough. We have suffered before from inaccurate and scanty descriptions of our accomplishments. You and I know this regiment and this division need no gaudy publicity. However, suppression of the truth of the past will add credence to the lies of the future and the calumny of the present. We will profit by a complete study of history to date.

Please see PAT KEARNEY, of Gloversville. I understand he is quite incensed over this matter. PAT is an old friend of mine and a former regimental commander of another regiment of this division. I hope you can find it expedient to render mutual support in your efforts to correct this situation.

Please remember me to Hazel and the rest of your family. I look forward to many pleasant meetings on my return.

Sincerely,

JERRY.

My fellow Members, let me read you a speech broadcast by General MacArthur from the Phillipine Islands in 1940 to a banquet at the Waldorf-Astoria of the Sixty-ninth, now in the Pacific, and the veterans of the old Sixty-ninth who served in the Rainbow Division in France under General MacArthur:

No greater fighting regiment has ever existed than the One Hundred and Sixty-fifth Infantry of the Rainbow Division, formed from the old Sixty-ninth Regiment of New York. I cannot tell you how real and how sincere a pleasure I feel tonight in once more addressing the members of that famous unit. You need no eulogy from me or from any other man. You have written your own history and written it in red on your enemies' breast, but when I think of your patience under adversity, your courage under fire, and your modesty in victory, I am filled with an emotion of admiration I cannot express. You have carved your own statue upon the hearts of your people, you have built your own monument in the memory of your compatriots.

One of the most outstanding characteristics of the regiment was its deep sense of religious responsibility, inculcated by one of my most beloved friends—Father Duffy. He gave you a code that embraces the highest moral laws, that will stand the test of any ethics or philosophies ever promulgated for the uplift of men. Its requirements are for the things that are right and its restraints are from the things that are wrong. The soldier, above all men, is required to perform the highest act of religious teaching—sacrifice. However horrible the results of war may be, the soldier who is called upon to offer and perchance give his life for his country is the noblest development of mankind. No physical courage and no brute instincts can take the place of the divine annunciation and spiritual uplift which will alone sustain him. Father Duffy, on those bloody fields of France we all remember so well, taught the men of your regiment how to die that a Nation might live—how to die unquestioning and uncomplaining, with faith in their hearts and the hope on their lips that we might go on to victory.

Somewhere in your banquet hall tonight his noble spirit looks down to bless and guide you young soldiers on the narrow path marked with West Point's famous motto—duty, honor, country.

We all hope that war will come to us no more, but if its red stream again engulfs us, I want you to know that if my flag flies again, I shall hope to have you once more with me, once more to form the brilliant hues of what is lovingly, reverently called by men at arms, the Rainbow.

May God be with you all until we meet again.

Gentlemen, I know the citizens of New York and our country will accept the judgment of General MacArthur rather than that of an individual who would create disorder among men fighting on the field of battle. Men whose one purpose is the preservation of our beloved America.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 1785. An act for the relief of Alex Wylie; to the Committee on Claims.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 15 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, November 22, 1944, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION

The Committee on Immigration and Naturalization will hold hearings on Wednesday, November 22, 1944, at 10 a. m., on public and private bills—unfinished business.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

2021. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting supplemental estimates of appropriations for the fiscal year 1945, amounting to $3,172,087.97, for the Department of State (H. Doc. No. 777); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

2022. A communication from the President of the United States transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the legislative branch, United States Senate, for the fiscal year 1945, amounting to $200,000 (H. Doc. No. 778); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

2023. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting deficiency estimates of appropriations for the legislative branch, House of Representatives, fiscal year 1944, in the amount of $6,000 (H. Doc. No. 779); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

2024. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of contract authorization for the fiscal year 1945, in the amount of $10,000,000, for the Navy Department, and naval service (H. Doc. No. 780); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

2025. A letter from the Postmaster General, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to amend section 2 of the act of May 29, 1928, and section 3 of the act of March 29, 1944, affecting the compensation of postmasters; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

2026. A letter from the Administrator, Federal Security Agency, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to provide that commissioned and warrant officers placed in St. Elizabeths Hospital or certain United States Public Health Service hospitals shall be liable to pay such rate per day as may be prescribed from time to time by the President, and to authorize the heads of the several agencies to deduct such sums from their pay and to transmit it to St. Elizabeths Hospital; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2027. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a request for withdrawal of the case of William Garfield Woods, alias William Martell, from the 316 cases involving suspension of deportation, referred to in his letter of December 1, 1943; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

2028. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to amend section 201 (g) of the Nationality Act of 1940 (54 Stat. 1138–1139; 8 U. S. C. 601); to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. DICKSTEIN: Committee on Immigration and Naturalization. House Resolution 568. Resolution requesting information as to arrival of refugees from the Attorney General; without amendment (Rept. No. 1913.) Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. COX: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 654. Resolution for the consideration of H. R. 4915, a bill to amend and supplement the Federal-Aid Road Act; without amendment (Rept. No. 1914). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. MAY: Committee on Military Affairs. S. 1373. An act to authorize the Secretary of War to convey to the people of Puerto Rico for school purpses a certain building and lot known as the Mayaguez Barracks Military Reservation now under the jurisdiction of the War Department; without amendment (Rept. No. 1915). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. MAY: Committee on Military Affairs. H. R. 5408. A bill to amend the Mustering-Out Payment Act of 1944, to provide a method for accomplishing certain mustering-out payments on behalf of mentally disabled veterans, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1916). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. MAY: Committee on Military Affairs. H. R. 5493. A bill to provide for the continuation on the active list of the Regular Army for the duration of any of the wars in which the United States is now engaged and for 6 months thereafter, of any officer on the active list of the Regular Army who has served as Chief of Staff during the wars in which the United States is now engaged; without amendment (Rept. No. 1917). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. MAY: Committee on Military Affairs. H. R. 5494. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act authorizing the President to appoint an Under Secretary of War during national emergencies, fixing the compensation of the Under Secretary of War, and authorizing the Secretary of War to prescribe duties," approved December 16, 1940; without amendment (Rept. No. 1918). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. MAY: Committee on Military Affairs. S. 1795. An act to amend that portion of the act approved June 30, 1906 (34 Stat. 697, 750), authorizing the settlement of accounts of deceased officers and enlisted men of the Army; with amendment (Rept. No. 1919). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. RANDOLPH:

H. R. 5511. A bill authorizing and directing the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to construct two four-lane bridges to replace the existing Fourteenth Street or Highway Bridge across the Potomac River, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina:

H. R. 5512. A bill to extend certain privileges, exemptions, and immunities to the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration and to the officials and employees thereof, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DICKSTEIN:

H. R. 5513. A bill to amend section 201 (g) of the Nationality Act of 1940 (54 Stat. 1138–1139; 8 U. S. C. 601); to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. FISH:

H. R. 5514. A bill providing for the release of enlisted and officer personnel from active service in the armed forces after the termination of hostilities; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. PLUMLEY:

H. R. 5515. A bill to provide that the automatic increase in taxes imposed in connection with old-age and survivors insurance shall not apply in 1945 and to provide for a special investigation with respect to such taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RANKIN:

H. R. 5516 (by request). A bill to amend paragraph 3, part VII of Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a), as amended, so as to establish a uniform vocational rehabilitation allowance in certain cases; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. RANDOLPH:

H. R. 5517. A bill to authorize construction of a national war memorial stadium with necessary appurtenances in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. SUMNERS of Texas:

H. R. 5518. A bill to amend section 119 of the Judicial Code; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BREHM:

H. Con. Res. 102. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that any public celebration of the cessation of hostilities with Germany would be inappropriate due to the fact that at such time all the resources and energies of the Nation must be directed toward the defeat of Japan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FAY:

H. Res. 655. Resolution to investigate erroneous statements concerning the Battle of Saipan; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. JUDD:

H. R. 5519. A bill for the relief of Nellie A. Ridings; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. OUTLAND:

H. R. 5520. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Harriette E. Harris; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

6200. By Mr. FAY: Petition of officers and members of Old Timers Post, No. 188, Jewish War Veterans of the United States, in meeting assembled at 150 West Eighty-fifth Street, Borough of Manhattan, city of New York, this eleventh day of October 1944, unanimously recommending the passage of bill H. R. 5402, introduced by Congressman FAY in the House of Representatives; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

6201. By Mr. ANTON J. JOHNSON: Petition of Mrs. Earl Forsythe, president of Mothers of World War No. 2, Unit No. 43, Cordova, Ill., and 50 other members of this unit as signers, favoring free transportation for their sons and daughters in the service, when on furlough; to the committee on Military Affairs.

6202. By Mr. MERROW: Resolution adopted at a joint public meeting of the Portsmouth Zionist District and Portsmouth Chapter of Hadassah, expressing its conviction that the integrity of the Balfour Declaration should be respected and that the United States should use its good offices for that purpose and recommending to the Congress approval of House Resolutions Nos. 418 and 419; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

6203. By Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin: Petition of Mrs. H. Shannon, Edgerton, Wis., regarding House Resolution No. 632; to the Committee on Rules.

6204. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Lieutenants' Benevolent Association, Police Department, New York, resolving that the Lieutenants' Benevolent Association, Police Department, city of New York, go on record as favoring legislation which will exempt persons receiving pensions from city, State, and Federal Governments, from paying Federal income taxes on such pensions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, NOVEMBER 22, 1944

(Legislative day of Tuesday, November 21, 1944)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

God of all mercies, Thou hast crowned our years with Thy goodness. We gratefully rejoice that we are the heirs of that first altar of thanksgiving set upon a strange shore by "rude men, unlovely, yes, but great, who prayed about the cradle of our state." In this later era, shadowed by horror, we would surround the same shrine whose stones have never crumbled as we, too, holding the Pilgrim faith, thank their God and ours and take courage.

Let not the spirit of thankfulness die in our hearts, thankfulness for a great heritage worth living and dying for; gratitude for abiding faith that will survive all disaster and rise triumphant above the wrecks of time. With all its sacrifices and separations, with all its loss and its death, we thank Thee for a noble cause which defends and rescues the despoiled and despairing, which lifts again to life and light those by the oppressor's lash outraged in body and soul, and whose victory will bring at last justice and freedom to all mankind.

"We thank Thee that there burns in youth
The love of liberty and truth,
That man his faith in Thee retains
Even when tortured and in chains.
For all our gallant absent men
We pray, for Thy peace again,
That at Thy table, peace restored,
We sit with them and Thee, O Lord."

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Tuesday, November 21, 1944, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. McLeod, one of its clerks, announced that the House had passed without amendment the following bills of the Senate:

S. 887. An act conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the Western District of Virginia to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claims of John Weakley and Rella Moyer;

S. 1101. An act to provide for the payment of the claim of John C. Shaw, administrator de bonis non of the estate of Sydney C. McLouth, deceased, arising out of a contract between said deceased and the United States Shipping Board Emergency Fleet Corporation, for the construction of seagoing tugs;

S. 1226. An act for the relief of Charles T. Allen;

S. 1365. An act for the relief of J. C. Drewry;

S. 1451. An act to amend the act entitled "An act for the confirmation of the title to the Saline lands in Jackson County, State of Illinois, to D. H. Brush, and others," approved March 2, 1861;

S. 1453. An act for the relief of the City National Bank Building Co.;

S. 1461. An act for the relief of Frederick G. Goebel;

S. 1465. An act for the relief of Dr. A. R. Adams;

S. 1477. An act for the relief of Carl M. Frasure;

S. 1501. An act for the relief of the Rau Motor Sales Co.;

S. 1572. An act for the relief of Frank Robertson;

S. 1605. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. John Borrego; Mr. and Mrs. Joe Silva; the legal guardian of Frank Borrego; the legal guardian of Rueben Silva; and the legal guardian of Rudolph Silva;

S. 1665. An act to relieve certain employees of the Veterans' Administration from financial liability for certain overpayments and allow such credit therefor as is necessary in the accounts of Guy F. Allen, chief disbursing officer;

S. 1709. An act for the relief of Mrs. Clark Gourley, administratrix of the estate of Clark Gourley;

S. 1717. An act for the relief of Luella F. Stewart;

S. 1763. An act for the relief of the Square D Co.;

S. 1766. An act for the relief of C. C. Thornton;

S. 1776. An act for the relief of L. C. Gregory;

S. 1905. An act for the relief of the estate of Walney A. Colvin, deceased;

S. 1983. An act for the relief of Mrs. Anna Runnebaum;

S. 1995. An act for the relief of Fred A. Dimler and Gwendolyn E. Dimler, his wife;

S. 2007. An act for the relief of Lum Jacobs;

S. 2031. An act for the relief of Lt. (T) P. J. Voorhies; and

S. 2069. An act for the relief of Irma S. Sheridan, postmaster at Rockville, Oreg.

The message also announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 1278) for the relief of Yellow Cab Transit Co., with amendments, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message further announced that the House had passed the following bills of the Senate, severally with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

S. 1471. An act for the relief of Mrs. Eugene W. Randall;

S. 1731. An act for the relief of Helen Halverson; and

S. 1827. An act for the relief of Oliver N. Knight.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 195. An act for the relief of Gladys A. Ennis as executrix of the estate of George Pearse Ennis, deceased, and Oscar H. Julius; and the Excelsior Automotive Service, Inc.;

H. R. 299. An act for the relief of Hyman L. Schiffer;

H. R. 449. An act for the relief of the Puget Sound Bridge and Dredging Co.;

H. R. 529. An act for the relief of John W. Farrell;

H. R. 545. An act for the relief of G. F. Odom;

H. R. 763. An act for the relief of Lindsey Harcrow;

H. R. 1218. An act for the relief of F. L. Riddle;

H. R. 1556. An act for the relief of Archie Barwick;

H. R. 1772. An act for the relief of Henry Stovall;

H. R. 2150. An act for the relief of Diemer Adison Coulter and Frances Andrews Coulter;

H. R. 2213. An act for the relief of Mrs. Agnes Wolters;

H. R. 2300. An act for the relief of Rose B. Luzar;

H. R. 2354. An act for the relief of the estate of Mrs. Phoebe Sherman, and for Mrs. Harriett W. Vanderhoef and Allan Vanderhoef;

H. R. 2373. An act for the relief of Pearl Saievitz Hurwitz and Ruth Levin;

H. R. 2543. An act for the relief of Mrs. Nelle Jones;

H. R. 2688. An act for the relief of Clarence H. Miles, Mrs. Mollie Miles, and Hardy Miles, a minor;

H. R. 2827. An act for the relief of the estate of Ida M. Rutherford;

H. R. 3017. An act for the relief of Hubert McMahon and the legal guardian of Barbara McMahon;

H. R. 3138. An act for the relief of Mrs. Bertha Macklin;

H. R. 3191. An act for the relief of Lillian Hill;

H. R. 3192. An act for the relief of Mrs. Bertha Grantham;

H. R. 3218. An act for the relief of Enid M. Albertson;

H. R. 3279. An act for the relief of Clarence G. Doelling and Doris J. (McNeil) Doelling;

H. R. 3285. An act for the relief of Mrs. Rose Poisson;

H. R. 3302. An act for the relief of Eleanor Parkinson;

H. R. 3323. An act for the relief of Mrs. William M. Watson and R. H. Price;

H. R. 3369. An act for the relief of Harry V. Hearn;

H. R. 3373. An act for the relief of Dewey H. Davis;

H. R. 3400. An act for the relief of La Verne Whipple;

H. R. 3414. An act for the relief of Edward C. Robbins;

H. R. 3465. An act for the relief of Archie Berberian, Kurken Berberian, and Mrs. Osgetel Berberian;

H. R. 3484. An act for the relief of Mrs. Pearl W. Peterson;

H. R. 3584. An act for the relief of Elsie Hawke;

H. R. 3630. An act for the relief of Peter Paul Bacic, Charles C. Cox, H. Forest Haugh, and Luther M. Durst;

H. R. 3645. An act for the relief of Mary Agnes Lichtefeld Droppelman;

H. R. 3678. An act for the relief of Floyd E. and Lena Mae Drummond;

H. R. 3727. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of Violet DeGroot;

H. R. 3791. An act for the relief of the estate of Charles Noah Shipp, deceased;
H. R. 3814. An act for the relief of M. Senders & Co.;
H. R. 3852. An act for the relief of the O. S. Stapley Co.;
H. R. 3880. An act for the relief of Mrs. Anna Zukas;
H. R. 3881. An act for the relief of Mrs. Anna Chandler;
H. R. 3928. An act for the relief of James LeRoy Allen;
H. R. 3931. An act for the relief of the estate of Dr. A. D. Gibson;
H. R. 3995. An act for the relief of Walter Lundmark;
H. R. 3996. An act for the relief of F. L. Gause and the legal guardian of Rosalind and Helen Gause, minors;
H. R. 4014. An act for the relief of Mrs. Ruby Winsch;
H. R. 4016. An act for the relief of John Casey and Marie Casey;
H. R. 4036. An act for the relief of John H. Bonney, the legal guardian of Daniel R. Bonney, a minor;
H. R. 4038. An act for the relief of Joseph W. Steel;
H. R. 4049. An act for the relief of Alfred F. Ross;
H. R. 4080. An act for the relief of certain former employees of the United States Court for China;
H. R. 4105. An act for the relief of Ira Cannon;
H. R. 4111. An act for the relief of Louis Beckham;
H. R. 4125. An act for the relief of Kelly Hobbs;
H. R. 4144. An act for the relief of Brig. Gen. Louis J. Fortier;
H. R. 4200. An act for the relief of William Weber;
H. R. 4212. An act for the relief of Robert Rowe and Mary Rowe;
H. R. 4213. An act for the relief of Karl Lungstras;
H. R. 4248. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of Louis Ciniglio;
H. R. 4305. An act for the relief of Henry Clay Walker;
H. R. 4309. An act for the relief of Rosa Lee Foreman;
H. R. 4322. An act for the relief of the estate of Floyd M. Adair, deceased;
H. R. 4331. An act for the relief of Mrs. Florence Armstrong;
H. R. 4333. An act for the relief of Bertha LeFrancq;
H. R. 4345. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of Luther Marcus Smith, a minor;
H. R. 4363. An act for the relief of Ollie Brashear Hearldson;
H. R. 4366. An act for the relief of Alex Wylie and the estate of James Evans;
H. R. 4367. An act for the relief of Mrs. Julia Toler;
H. R. 4380. An act for the relief of Mabelle E. Olive;
H. R. 4442. An act for the relief of Albert B. Weaver;
H. R. 4451. An act for the relief of John McLaughlin, Sr., and John McLaughlin, Jr.;
H. R. 4481. An act for the relief of William H. Crompton;
H. R. 4542. An act for the relief of Harold Miller;
H. R. 4549. An act for the relief of Sandy C. Brown;
H. R. 4588. An act for the relief of Robert L. Whiddon;
H. R. 4593. An act for the relief of Thomas R. Clark;
H. R. 4629. An act for the relief of Ludwig Wolf;
H. R. 4631. An act for the relief of John L. MacNeil;
H. R. 4674. An act for the relief of the estate of Everette Maxwell; the estate of Redman P. Maddux; and the legal guardian of Elmer Massa, a minor;
H. R. 4703. An act for the relief of the estate of Annie Brown;
H. R. 4736. An act for the relief of Dr. H. L. Klotz;
H. R. 4737. An act for the relief of W. A. Smoot, Inc.;
H. R. 4786. An act for the relief of the estate of Kimball Lee Beckner;
H. R. 4815. An act for the relief of the board of county commissioners of Volusia County, Fla.;
H. R. 4817. An act for the relief of Wilfred T. Plant, Sr.;
H. R. 4878. An act for the relief of the estate of Emma B. Fleet, deceased;
H. R. 4921. An act for the relief of Dr. J. Sims Norman;
H. R. 4927. An act for the relief of Francis D. Stovall, Jr.;
H. R. 4929. An act for the relief of Lt. James H. Clark and Eleanor Clark;
H. R. 4962. An act for the relief of Jessie Springsteen and John Springsteen;
H. R. 5034. An act for the relief of the estate of Francis A. Collins;
H. R. 5048. An act for the relief of the estate of Cecile H. Burgett, deceased;
H. R. 5060. An act for the relief of Clyde H. Palmer; estate of Lola J. Palmer; legal guardian of Margie Joan Palmer, a minor; and
H. R. 5167. An act to confer jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the Eastern District of South Carolina to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of the board of trustees of the Saunders Memorial Hospital.

CREDENTIALS

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I submit a certificate of election, and ask that it take the regular course.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The certificate will be read.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

STATE ELECTION BOARD—STATE OF OKLAHOMA—CERTIFICATE OF ELECTION

The State of Oklahoma to whom these presents shall come, greeting:

Know ye, That at a general election held throughout the State of Oklahoma on the 7th day of November A. D. 1944, ELMER THOMAS, the regularly selected and legally qualified candidate for the office of United States Senator on the Democratic ticket, received the highest number of votes cast at said election for said office, as appears from the records of the State election board of said State.

This then is to certify that the said ELMER THOMAS is the regularly and legally elected United States Senator of said State for a term of 6 years, beginning with and from the third day of January A. D. 1945.

In testimony whereof, the State Election Board of the State of Oklahoma has caused this certificate of election to be issued and its official seal to be hereunto affixed on this the 18th day of November A. D. 1944, in the capital of said State.

ELMER HALE,
Chairman of the State Election Board of the State of Oklahoma.

Attest:
[SEAL]
J. WM. CORDELL,
Secretary.
T. J. LUCADO,
Member.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The credentials will be placed on file.

Mr. BANKHEAD presented the credentials of LISTER HILL, chosen a Senator from the State of Alabama for the term beginning January 3, 1945, which were read and ordered to be filed, as follows:

To the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES:

This is to certify that on the 7th day of November 1944, LISTER HILL was duly chosen by the qualified electors of the State of Alabama a Senator from said State of Alabama to represent said State in the Senate of the United States for the term of 6 years, beginning on the 3d day of January 1945.

Witness: His Excellency our Governor Chauncey Sparks, of Alabama, and our seal hereto affixed at the capitol, in the city of Montgomery, this November 17, in the year of our Lord 1944.

By the Governor:
CHAUNCEY SPARKS,
Governor.

Attest:
[SEAL]
SIBYL POOL,
Secretary of State.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF HENRY A. SCHWEINHAUT TO BE ASSOCIATE JUSTICE, DISTRICT COURT OF THE UNITED STATES FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, and in accordance with the rules of the committee, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Wednesday, November 29, 1944, at 10:30 a. m., in the Senate Judiciary Committee room, upon the nomination of Henry A. Schweinhaut, of Maryland, to be an Associate Justice of the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia, vice Hon. Oscar R. Luhring, deceased. At the indicated time and place all persons interested in the nomination may make such representations as may be pertinent. The subcommittee consists of the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], chairman, the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER], and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER].

COMMITTEE ASSIGNMENTS

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask unanimous consent that the order which I submit in accordance with the instructions of the Democratic steering committee of the Senate be agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will read the order.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

Ordered, That the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] be excused from further service as chairman of the Committee on Indian Affairs and that he be appointed chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry;

That the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] be appointed as chairman of the Committee on Indian Affairs; and

That the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] be appointed as chairman of the Committee on Patents.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the order is agreed to.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, while I am on my feet I wish to announce that no further committee vacancies will be filled until the beginning of the new Congress. These chairmanships are to be filled because of the necessity of having chairmen of the various committees referred to in the order, but no other vacancies on committees will be filled until the next Congress convenes.

I am just reminded of the fact that a new Senator probably may come this week to fill out an unexpired term. I wish to make an exception in any such case as that. What I had reference to was general vacancies on the committees due to the retirement or defeat

of Senators, which will not be filled until the next Congress.

BIPARTISAN FOREIGN POLICY—ARTICLES BY SENATOR CONNALLY AND SENATOR AUSTIN

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this place an article published in the Post War World by the Commission on a Just and Durable Peace under date of October 16, 1944, entitled "Bipartisan Foreign Policy." A part of the article was written by the distinguished Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, and is entitled "World Security Organization," and a part of it was written by myself and is entitled "The First Step—Security."

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BIPARTISAN FOREIGN POLICY—SENATORS CONNALLY AND AUSTIN COMMENT

(Senator CONNALLY, chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate, and Senator AUSTIN, Republican member of this committee, have been kind enough to write the two following articles specially for Post War World.)

WORLD SECURITY ORGANIZATION

(By TOM CONNALLY, United States Senator from Texas)

The Federal Council of Churches, as the representative of its wide membership of moral and intellectual forces, has rendered a service in the cause of peace and will exert a strong influence upon public opinion in support of the preservation of peace. I commend it for its broad and humanitarian program.

On November 5, 1943, the United States Senate, by a vote of 85 to 5, enacted a resolution in which was expressed a desire that the United States participate in an international organization dedicated to the prevention of aggression and the maintenance of peace. The moral and spiritual leadership of the churches can contribute materially toward insuring achievement of this goal.

The imperative tasks of the United States require that the present war be waged to final triumph over all our enemies and that thereafter a just and lasting peace may be secured. Our tasks do not stop there, however. We must look toward the future. We must envisage the danger of another war by aggressors and conquerors. Our duty compels us to lead in the establishment of an international organization embracing the principle of sovereign equality of all peace-loving states and open to membership by such states, large and small, with the avowed and definite purpose of preventing aggression and preserving international peace and security.

In the matter of foreign policy, there should be no partisan politics. Partisanship must not cloud or confuse our national interests. The problem is greater than the fortunes of parties.

Why are our gallant troops dying on the Rhine? Why are our brave sons giving up their lives in the Pacific, in Burma, and in China? It is because after World War No. 1 we failed to create and adhere to effective peace machinery to crush international banditry. We must not fail again. Adequate machinery cannot be maintained by gentle words alone. The international organization must be endowed with power—military and naval power when needed—to suppress international criminals and outlaws.

It is also planned that the international organization shall employ conciliation, arbitration, and the channels of diplomacy in the settlement of international disputes. It is also provided that an international court shall be maintained for the settlement of justiciable issues between nations. If these peaceful measures are defied, force must be invoked against the lawless and aggressive nation.

The United States has not delayed until the end of the war to begin its preparation for peace. The Dumbarton Oaks Conference is now engaged in the preliminary and tentative draft of the structure of the organization. Its sessions have been fruitful, with a better understanding of the issues involved.

Following Dumbarton Oaks will be a conference of representatives of all of the United Nations at which it is expected the framework and the details of the organization will be drafted for submission to the home governments of the nations participating.

The general plan contemplates an assembly, to be composed initially of members of the United Nations and later of such other peace-loving nations as may be admitted. It is also contemplated that the executive and administrative authority of the international organization will rest in an executive council. Representatives of the four great powers—United States, Russia, Great Britain, and China—would be permanent members of the council. Seven additional members would be elected by the assembly for stated periods of tenure. The council would have general authority to administer the affairs of the international organization and to act in cases of emergency. It would also be its duty to refer to the assembly any matter which it deemed to be appropriate.

There are those who are opposed to any form of international organization. Some may argue that for the United States to join an international organization would constitute an impairment of our sovereignty. This is a specious claim. There is no surrender of sovereignty. On the contrary, there is an exercise of sovereignty. There is an assertion by our Nation of the will and the power to do those things which are for the best interests of our citizens and in a larger fashion in the best interests of the whole world and world peace. That is the very essence of sovereignty. Sovereignty involves the authority of a government to achieve governmental objectives and to exercise its own will and independence. International peace can be achieved only through the action of governments. Individuals cannot do it. The joining in an international agreement in behalf of peace is but the exercise of that governmental power, that governmental will, and that governmental independence which sovereignty suggests.

When we contribute to world peace, we are contributing to the peace of our own country—to the lives of our own people. In World War No. 1, we spent lavishly of our treasure, sacrificed on the battlefield much of the richest blood of the Republic. World War No. 2 has brought stupendous expenditures of our public moneys and has demanded the lives of many thousands of our brave and gallant sons. It has disturbed our domestic economy and has involved sacrifices by our citizens. In striving for the peace of the world, we are striving for our own peace, for our own security, for our own safety, for our own freedom from having to waste our treasure and spill our blood.

If we are to secure the maintenance of world peace, we must be willing to pay the price. That price is our cooperation with other nations of a similar mind. We must unite. We must be willing to assume our share in the obligations which unity requires. Peace machinery will grow and develop in the light of experience and the necessities of the times. However, we must begin. We must establish such machinery.

It is my hope that without partisan division, that without political passion, the United States may assume world leadership in the erection of peace machinery. Destiny is calling us. We must answer that fateful call.

THE FIRST STEP—SECURITY

(By WARREN R. AUSTIN, United States Senator from Vermont)

"A just and durable peace," founded upon principles such as those published by the Commission on a just and durable peace instituted by the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America, is attainable. I have no reason to believe that it can be established in negotiations resulting in a single treaty of peace. Sustained, prayerful, and faithful effort of the people is necessary for its attainment. The foundation must be laid in a condition of freedom from fear of aggression by military force. In this atmosphere the opportunity will be afforded humanity to devote its energy and service to the erection of that temple which is to be supported by the six pillars of peace.

The Dumbarton Oaks Conference is specifically concerned with the establishment of an international organization devoted primarily to security. The new characteristic sought to be vitalized in this organization is the authority to be exercised by society in maintaining order. This is a change from dependence upon unilateral action by each nation to defend its rights. It must be clear to everyone that a disturbance of the peace anywhere in the world threatens the peace of every nation. Therefore, collective action of nations should supplant action by the immediate victim of aggression. Promptness in discovering and conciliating or suppressing causes of war is essential.

A clear understanding of the singleness of purpose of the first treaty would facilitate its ratification by the Senate. That purpose is security. Issues raised against it resulting from misconceptions are not causes for delaying or defeating it. For instance, the claim that the President would be empowered to declare war through the executive council of the general international organization is not involved in the plans for this treaty.

Each country will have to decide for itself what functions and powers its delegate will have. Only Congress can, for the United States, create the office, grant its powers, and appropriate its revenues. The limitation that only Congress can declare war will circumscribe the statutory commission to our delegate. Congress will have the opportunity, separate from consideration of the treaty, to define the acts which the delegate may perform without asking Congress for instructions.

A natural concept of this new office is that it will be created within the executive department, in which exclusive jurisdiction over international transactions short of war, or making of treaties, is vested. Customary governmental procedure suggests statutory provision for constant collaboration between the President and the delegate.

No attempt to grant the power to declare war would be made. The power to vote for the direction of sanctions, including military force, would not be the power to commit an act of war. It would be to commit an act of peace. It would be based upon a treaty right providing for security. It would be defensive, interposing sufficient force, of whatever kind determined upon, to prevent war.

If all peace-loving nations should join the organization, each one would have consented to the direction against itself of the sanctions in case of violation of the basic treaty. The most probable guaranties of security through this organization are—1. Supremacy of the law over nations; 2. Disqualification to vote of a member charged with violating the law; 3. Certainty and promptness of the interposition of military forces; 4. Insurance

against the possibility that sanctions might not be applied, or that they might be applied "too little" or "too late."

We envisage a separate treaty imposed on vanquished Germany and Japan rendering them incapable of arming for aggression or making war. If they should later qualify to become members on the principles of the basic treaty, they, too, by joining, would consent to the provisions for security.

There is under contemplation provision for a special majority to be required for a decision of the Executive Council. Its use would safeguard vital interests of states. Smaller states would have a veto through collective voting. Each larger state would have a veto.

Cooperation is the spirit of the organization. We must assume that cooperation would persist. If we should assume that unilateral action would be employed, as occurred following the League of Nations Covenant, the Kellogg-Briand Treaty, and the Treaty of Locarno, we would face failure of the effort at peace. We must not fail this time. Civilization is at stake.

We emphasize the moral peace forces, such as are characterized in the six pillars of peace. Reason, as well as experience, has persuaded us that the real gains in this World War must include spiritual development of whole peoples to a level where their struggle for security and peace will stimulate rather than weary them.

Experiences under declarations by the Triple Alliance, the Holy Alliance, the League of Nations, the Kellogg-Briand Pact, and the Treaty of Locarno, have revealed the inadequacy of mere words. They all declare the spiritual basis of peace, but they have all failed in practice. The peoples of the states which made these declarations were not yet determined to pay that part of the cost of peace which consists in self-discipline and sacrifice. This we must develop if we are to have security and peace.

For the time being, we believe that the frailty of our international character requires that we set up an independent organization with the power to interpose military forces to prevent or repel military aggression anywhere on earth. This ought to be done before Germany surrenders. There must be visible absolute authority, ultimately expressed in military power, to enforce the law.

The paramount consideration of the moment is a clear understanding of the nature of our present effort. Collateral and premature issues might postpone or even prevent our first step toward peace. The question of specific authority of our delegate, the question of earmarking particular branches of the armed service, the question of what shall be done with Germany after her unconditional surrender—these and similar questions related to the peace—are not raised by the consideration of a treaty for a security organization. They will be taken up in their proper order separate from the consideration of the single question now before the world: Security.

Such organizations as the Commission on a Just and Durable Peace will serve the cause by clarifying the immediate undertaking in the minds of their members, and their correspondents.

In closing may I say: The forces of evil have thrown before Christendom a mighty challenge. Our generation has the great privilege and opportunity to meet this challenge through consecration to righteous practices, as well as precepts, in world affairs; through a more spiritual concept of the relations of men and nations.

PROTEST AGAINST ANGLO-AMERICAN OIL TREATY

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I have received a letter from Mr. O. E. Setter, president of the Wolf Creek Oil Co., of Wichita, Kans., protesting against approval of the Anglo-American Oil Treaty, which I believe states a position with which the Senate should be acquainted. Therefore I ask unanimous consent to print in the RECORD at this point, a copy of the letter.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WICHITA, KANS., *October 31, 1944.*

Hon. ARTHUR CAPPER,
United States Senator,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: The independent oil man is very much concerned over the apparent attitude of the Federal Government to spend our tax money for the development of oil resources in foreign lands which would be in direct competition with the production of domestic oil and which would be done with at least a part of the tax money which we pay annually to our Government. Besides this angle, there are a big majority of us as private citizens feel that if our Government expands its individual operations in the foreign countries, we are asking for trouble from several different angles.

It is our opinion that we not only speak for ourselves but practically for everyone that is directly or indirectly connected with the oil industry when we send in our protest against our country entering into foreign oil business as is proposed under the Anglo-American Oil Treaty, as we understand it.

Yours very truly,

THE WOLF CREEK OIL CO.,
By O. E. SETTER, *President.*

SOCIAL-SECURITY TAXES

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I made a broadcast last evening over the Columbia network respecting the problem of social-security taxes, presenting what I believe to be an unassailable argument in favor of immediate action by Congress to prevent the needless doubling of these taxes next January. I shall presently ask that the broadcast be printed in the RECORD. I desire particularly, however, to call attention to those portions of the address which dispel widespread misunderstandings regarding the scope of the action I propose. I wish to make it plain that this proposed action has nothing to do with the question of expanded social-security coverage or with the question of expanded benefits. It deals only with the pay-roll taxes that shall be collected to pay for existing benefits. Furthermore, it has nothing to do with unemployment benefits or any of the other notable features of social security, all of which are otherwise financed.

The sole question is, What 48,000,000 workers and 2,000,000 employers shall pay for existing old-age benefits. Let me illustrate with figures from my own State of Michigan. If my proposal is not adopted and this tax doubles on New Year's, it will add approximately $100,000,000 next year and every year thereafter to the pay-roll taxes in Michigan alone. Half of this will come from workers. It will needlessly take an additional $50,000,000 out of the pay envelopes of Michigan workers next year. Yet, no worker will get one single penny of added benefits as a result. He will simply continue to be entitled to existing benefits which do not require this added tax. It will be time to increase the tax when the benefits increase or when the existing system hereafter requires it.

Still using Michigan as an example, the successful effort, which I have had the honor of leading, during the last 3 years, has saved Michigan workers and employers about $250,000,000 in pay-roll taxes which they would have otherwise had to pay. It has saved the workers at least $125,000,000 in direct pay-roll deductions during this period. Yet no worker has lost a penny's benefits as a result. I want the workers, as well as the employers, to know what is going on.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that my broadcast of last evening be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the broadcast was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I am indebted to the Columbia Broadcasting System for this opportunity to discuss social-security pay-roll taxes. It is not an exciting subject, but it intimately involves 48,000,000 workers and their 2,000,000 employers. I shall seek to reduce to simplest terms the present congressional controversy respecting it.

Under the social-security law, "old-age insurance" is supported by pay-roll taxes levied equally upon workers and employers. This tax is now 2 percent of each worker's wage—1 percent paid by the worker—1 percent paid by the employer. The existing statute requires a 100-percent increase in this tax next New Year—2 percent on the worker, 2 percent on the employer. Each thus confronts a doubling of this tax next January unless Congress intervenes. On 3 previous annual occasions I have led a battle to stop the 100-percent raise. In each instance, the President and the Social Security Board have unsuccessfully opposed the "freeze." As a result, these 48,000,000 workers and their 2,000,000 employers have been saved nearly $3,000,000,000.

This question now recurs, Shall this tax be doubled next January? If Congress does nothing, the tax will automatically double. I propose another "freeze" at existing levels for 1945.

This poses an obvious inquiry. Does the payment of existing old-age benefits require this doubled tax? I submit that the social-security balance sheet denies any such need for years to come. The pay-roll taxes for this exclusive purpose, during the past year, at present tax rates, were $1,300,000,000. The payments were only $185,000,000. The tax collections, at existing rates, were seven times the benefits. The income was seven times the outgo. In addition the fund collected $103,000,000 on investments. Therefore, so far as present payments are concerned—or obligations for many years to come—there is no excuse for doubling this tax next January.

But this, of course, is far from the whole story. This old-age fund must build up reserves for the future when its obligations progressively accumulate. Thus we reach the crux of this controversy. How much should today's workers, and their employers, pay to pile up reserves for these future contingencies—20 or 30 or 50 years away?

Now, I inject a bit of essential history. When this system started in 1935, it was planned, though never completely, on the actuarial basis of a so-called full reserve, like any private insurance company. But in 1939, after an expert study, it was decided that a public, tax-supported insurance system does not require any such full reserve, as does a private insurance company, because the whole credit of the Nation is its unavoidable reserve. Congress thereupon deliber-

ately substituted a so-called contingent reserve to care only for extraordinary hazards.

Now, we reach the core of the problem. How big should this contingent reserve be to protect the full solvency of the fund? Secretary of the Treasury Morgenthau gave the official answer before the House Ways and Means Committee on March 24, 1939:

"Specifically, I would suggest to Congress that it plan the financing of the old-age insurance system with a view to maintaining for use in contingencies an eventual reserve amounting to not more than three times the highest prospective annual benefits in the ensuing 5 years."

There's the rule. Congress wrote it, as a criterion, into the Social Security Act. There it stands tonight.

Now, let's apply the rule to present social-security arithmetic. The old-age reserve last June 30 was $5,450,000,000. The highest expenditure in the next 5 years is between $450,000,000 and $700,000,000. Therefore, the existing reserve is from 8 to 12 times this highest expenditure—instead of only three. Hence, the status of the reserve does not justify a doubling of these pay-roll taxes next January. Indeed, the tax collections at present rates are equal to the revenue anticipated from the doubled rates when the Social Security Act was written.

Since the doubled tax next January is unnecessary for insurance payments (for many years to come) or for reserves, I submit that these taxes should not be doubled, and that Congress should act to prevent them from doubling. I submit, further, that 1945 is a poor year in which to inflict avoidable taxes on our people. We have just finished a political campaign in which both major parties and both candidates for President promised lower taxes on business as a prerequisite to the full release of private enterprise as our reliance against unemployment in the reconversion crisis. It would be a curious anomaly if, instead, we immediately double these pay-roll taxes—in the absence of necessity. Both parties also said that we must sustain the mass buying power of the workers. It would be an equally curious anomaly if, instead, we deliberately diminish mass buying power by doubling these taxes on 48,000,000 workers—in the absence of necessity. Still further, both parties dedicated their heartful sympathies to so-called small business and our hapless white-collar workers. This doubled tax next January would most severely burden these so-recent beneficiaries of anxiety in high places.

I recognize that the able members of the Social Security Board are on firm ground when they argue that we must at all times impress the workers, through their pay-roll taxes, that this is a contributory old-age insurance system and not a public subsidy. I also recognize the consistency of those who say that the so-called Morgenthau rule is wrong, and that this system of contingent reserves—which is essentially a pay-as-we-go system—may put too high a share of old-age costs upon the general tax rolls in 1970 or 1990 or thereafter. I emphatically agree that we should rid the social-security statute itself of its present contradictions—arbitrary pay-roll tax increases, on the one hand, and the Morgenthau rule, which denies the necessity for these increases, on the other. By the way, these arbitrary increases will go to 3 percent on workers and 3 percent on employers in 1948, unless changed. But I have met all of these anxieties by also proposing, in my pending freezing measure, that during 1945 the Joint Congressional Committee on Internal Revenue shall reexplore the whole subject, with the aid of another advisory committee of experts, and report to us a permanent tax formula to settle this vexatious question for keeps. I submit that this rounds out a safe and equitable program—fair to Social Security, to the country, to 48,000,000 workers, and their 2,000,000 employers.

I recognize no validity, however, in the argument that these pay-roll taxes should now be doubled because the General Treasury needs the money and that this is a painless way to get it. You see, this is what happens to these pay-roll taxes. They do not go directly into the social security fund. They go straight into the General Treasury where they are disbursed to pay the general expenses of the Government. Then the Treasury issues comparable Government bonds to the social security trustees. The Treasury gets the money. Social Security gets the bonds. Social Security collects the interest on the bonds. But if it ever needs the principal, the bonds must be resold to the public. I'll admit that this system gives the Treasury a steady outlet for bonds; and I deeply sympathize with the stupendous problem the Treasury confronts to find outlets for bonds. But this has nothing whatever to do with social security; and I shall always take the unsurrendering position that social-security taxes and reserves are supremely a public trust and that never, for any purpose, no matter how worthy, can they rightly be used for anything except social security.

In conclusion, I want to discuss some of the amazing misconceptions regarding this problem.

First. This pay-roll tax question has absolutely nothing to do with the expansion of social-security coverage or old-age benefits. I favor broad expansion of coverage and an equitable increase in benefits, particularly in the lower brackets. If and when this occurs pay-roll taxes must increase in proportion. That's something else. This problem today is solely what pay-roll taxes shall be paid for today's benefits. If the tax doubles in January, no worker will get a penny's additional benefit. Yet I have been pilloried, in this fight, as opposing better and broader social security. Instead, I am simply opposing doubled taxes on 48,000,000 workers, and their employers, to pay for existing benefits.

Second. These pay-roll taxes deal only with old-age insurance. They have absolutely nothing to do with other parts of the Social Security System. Yet I have been attacked, for example, by a St. Louis newspaper for thus interfering with unemployment benefits during reconversion; and by a Toledo newspaper for stunting all the social-security services to the blind, to crippled children, to maternal care, etc. Such inaccuracies are fantastic. These pay-roll taxes have nothing to do with any of these other services, all of which are otherwise financed.

The present controversy deals solely with the reserves which sound public policy requires for old-age insurance. I have submitted this problem to Congress on three previous annual occasions and Congress has agreed with me. I am now submitting it again, in behalf of 48,000,000 workers and their 2,000,000 employers. On the record, I submit that there is no justification for a 100-percent increase in these pay-roll taxes in 1945—an increase which would take another billion and a quarter dollars out of these pay rolls next year. Social security does not require it, and the national economy denies its wisdom.

ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY—ATTITUDE OF RAILROADS

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I assume I am in order in presenting a matter for the RECORD.

In view of the fact that it is frequently reported that the railroads of the country are hostile to the St. Lawrence seaway project, I should like to read into the RECORD an article from the Wall Street Journal of November 15, 1944. The article is as follows:

> The Rutland Railroad will petition the Vermont district court for an extension of time in which to file a plan of reorganization now due to be filed by December 6, it was reported from Washington.
>
> Prospective developments affecting the road's traffic and earnings including the possibility that Congress will approve the St. Lawrence seaway project which is parallel the Rutland-Ogdensburg branch will be cited as reasons for the delay. The construction of the seaway project would have a highly beneficial effect on the road's traffic volume, it was said.

As I have stated, Mr. President, this is an article from the Wall Street Journal relating to a petition by the Rutland Railroad, of Vermont, for an extension of time in which to file a plan of reorganization. The Rutland Railroad parallels the St. Lawrence seaway, and it is asking for an extension of time because if the seaway is constructed the position of the railroad will be materially improved.

I think the same condition prevails in regard to the New York Central Railroad; not that they have petitioned for the seaway, or anything like that, but they also parallel it, and would be benefited by the increased volume of business which would result from the completion of the St. Lawrence development.

I submit this matter merely to show that the railroads are far from being united in opposing the seaway. A great many of the western railroads are known to favor it, and individual directors and officers of the railroads throughout the eastern part of the United States are actually working for the project, knowing that what benefits the country as a whole and what increases their tonnage as a whole is bound to help them.

YELLOW CAB TRANSIT CO.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 1278) for the relief of Yellow Cab Transit Co., which were on page 1, line 6, to strike out all after "$2,267.98" over to and including "1941" in line 2 of page 2 and insert "and to Equitable Fire & Marine Insurance Co., of Oklahoma City, Okla., the sum of $7,901.83. Payment of such sums shall be in full settlement of all claims against the United States for the loss of tractor No. 387, semitrailer No. 338 and cargo carried therein resulting from a collision with a United States Army truck on United States Highway No. 66, near Hazelgreen, Mo., on August 10, 1941" and to amend the title so as to read: "An act for the relief of Yellow Cab Transit Co. and Equitable Fire & Marine Insurance Co."

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I move that the Senate concur in the amendments of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

PROHIBITION OF LIQUOR TRAFFIC DURING THE WAR—MEMORIALS FROM WISCONSIN

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, on January 20, 1944, I presented memorials

from citizens of Wisconsin remonstrating against the enactment of any prohibition legislation. At the time the memorials were presented I neglected to state the approximate number of signatures, and have been requested to insert the number in the RECORD. The approximate number of persons signing the memorials was 2,838. These memorials were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. O'DANIEL, from the Committee on Claims:

H. R. 1318. A bill for the relief of Jack V. Dyer; without amendment (Rept. No. 1158);

H. R. 1665. A bill for the relief of Joseph Paste, Anna Paste, Rose Paste, and to the legal guardian of Doris Paste, and to the legal guardian of Evelyn Paste; without amendment (Rept. No. 1159);

H. R. 2512. A bill for the relief of Betty Robins; without amendment (Rept. No. 1160);

H. R. 3495. A bill for the relief of Constantino Arguelles; without amendment (Rept. No. 1161); and

H. R. 4226. A bill for the relief of the legal guardian of William L. Owen, a minor; without amendment (Rept. No. 1162).

By Mr. WHERRY, from the Committee on Claims:

S. 1958. A bill for the relief of Fire District No. 1 of the town of Colchester, Vt.; without amendment (Rept. No. 1163);

S. 2064. A bill for the relief of Richard H. Beall; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1179);

S. 2098. A bill for the relief of Lt. James H. Clark and Eleanor Clark; without amendment (Rept. No. 1180); and

H. R. 2601. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Flossie Leeser; without amendment (Rept. No. 1181).

By Mr. ELLENDER, from the Committee on Claims:

S. 1756. A bill for the relief of William Luther Thaxton, Jr., and William Luther Thaxton, Sr.; with amendments (Rept. No. 1182);

S. 1960. A bill for the relief of Clifford E. Long and Laura C. Long; with amendments (Rept. No. 1164);

S. 1968. A bill for the relief of Elizabeth A. Becker; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1165);

S. 1993. A bill for the relief of the estates of Joseph B. Gowen and Ruth V. Gowen; with amendments (Rept. No. 1183);

S. 2006. A bill for the relief of J. A. Davis; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1184);

S. 2142. A bill for the relief of Lindon A. Long; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1185);

S. 2168. A bill for the relief of certain disbursing officers of the Army of the United States, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1186);

H. R. 262. A bill for the relief of Mrs. J. C. Romberg; without amendment (Rept. No. 1166);

H. R. 1919. A bill for the relief of Vannie Butler; without amendment (Rept. No. 1167);

H. R. 2896. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. R. L. Rhodes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1168);

H. R. 3548. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Robert W. Nelson and W. E. Nelson; without amendment (Rept. No. 1169);

H. R. 3608. A bill relating to certain overtime compensation of civilian employees of the United States; without amendment (Rept. No. 1187);

H. R. 3753. A bill for the relief of the legal guardian of Virginia McMillan, a minor, and Howard McMillan; without amendment (Rept. No. 1170);

H. R. 4024. A bill for the relief of Victoria Cormier; without amendment (Rept. No. 1171); and

H. R. 4439. A bill for the relief of Dennis C. O'Connell; without amendment (Rept. No. 1172).

By Mr. HATCH (for Mr. EASTLAND), from the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. 1747. A bill to further define the number and duties of criers and bailiffs in United States courts and regulate their compensation; with amendments (Rept. No. 1173); and

S. 1962. A bill extending the provisions of Public Law 47, Seventy-seventh Congress, as amended, to reemployment committeemen of the Selective Service System; without amendment (Rept. No. 1174).

By Mr. HATCH, from the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys:

S. 1819. A bill to repeal the acts of August 15, 1935, and January 29, 1940, relating to the establishment of the Patrick Henry National Monument and the acquisition of the estate of Patrick Henry, in Charlotte County, Va.; without amendment (Rept. No. 1175);

S. 1902. A bill to repeal the third proviso of section 2 of the act entitled "An act to promote the mining of coal, phosphate, oil, oil shale, gas, and sodium on the public domain," approved February 25, 1920 (41 Stat. 437, 438; 30 U. S. C., sec. 201); without amendment (Rept. No. 1176); and

H. R. 837. A bill to restore and add certain public lands to the Uintah and Ouray Reservation in Utah, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 1188).

By Mr. NYE, from the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys:

S. 209. A bill authorizing the conveyance of certain property to the State of North Dakota; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1177); and

H. R. 4917. A bill conferring upon the State of Montana authority to exchange for other lands certain lands selected by the State of Montana for the use of the University of Montana for biological station purposes pursuant to the act of March 3, 1905 (33 Stat. 1080); with an amendment (Rept. No. 1178).

REPORT ON DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

Mr. BARKLEY, from the Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers, to which was referred for examination and recommendation a list of records transmitted to the Senate by the Archivist of the United States that appeared to have no permanent value or historical interest, submitted a report thereon pursuant to law.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts:

S. 2196. A bill for the relief of Angelo Anthony Scavo; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

S. 2197. A bill granting an increase of pension to Jennie Eaton Ainsworth; to the Committee on Pensions.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED OR PLACED ON CALENDAR

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles and referred or ordered to be placed on the calendar, as indicated:

H. R. 195. An act for the relief of Gladys A. Ennis as executrix of the estate of George Pearse Ennis, deceased, and Oscar H. Julius; and the Excelsior Automotive Service, Inc.;

H. R. 299. An act for the relief of Hyman L. Schiffer;

H. R. 449. An act for the relief of the Puget Sound Bridge & Dredging Co.;

H. R. 529. An act for the relief of John W. Farrell;

H. R. 545. An act for the relief of G. F. Odom;

H. R. 763. An act for the relief of Lindsey Harcrow;

H. R. 1218. An act for the relief of F. L. Riddle;

H. R. 1556. An act for the relief of Archie Barwick;

H. R. 1772. An act for the relief of Henry Stovall;

H. R. 2150. An act for the relief of Diemer Adison Coulter and Frances Andrews Coulter;

H. R. 2213. An act for the relief of Mrs. Agnes Wolters;

H. R. 2300. An act for the relief of Rose B. Luzar;

H. R. 2354. An act for the relief of the estate of Mrs. Phoebe Sherman, and for Mrs. Harriett W. Vanderhoef and Allan Vanderhoef;

H. R. 2373. An act for the relief of Pearl Saievitz Hurwitz and Ruth Levin;

H. R. 2543. An act for the relief of Mrs. Nelle Jones;

H. R. 2688. An act for the relief of Clarence H. Miles, Mrs. Mollie Miles, and Hardy Miles, a minor;

H. R. 2827. An act for the relief of the estate of Ida M. Rutherford;

H. R. 3017. An act for the relief of Hubert McMahon and the legal guardian of Barbara McMahon;

H. R. 3138. An act for the relief of Mrs. Bertha Macklin;

H. R. 3191. An act for the relief of Lillian Hill;

H. R. 3192. An act for the relief of Mrs. Bertha Grantham;

H. R. 3218. An act for the relief of Enid M. Albertson;

H. R. 3279. An act for the relief of Clarence G. Doelling and Doris J. (McNeil) Doelling;

H. R. 3285. An act for the relief of Mrs. Rose Poisson;

H. R. 3302. An act for the relief of Eleanor Parkinson;

H. R. 3323. An act for the relief of Mrs. William M. Watson and R. H. Price;

H. R. 3369. An act for the relief of Harry V. Hearn;

H. R. 3400. An act for the relief of LaVerne Whipple;

H. R. 3414. An act for the relief of Edward C. Robbins;

H. R. 3465. An act for the relief of Archie Berberian, Kurken Berberian, and Mrs. Osgetel Berberian;

H. R. 3484. An act for the relief of Mrs. Pearl W. Peterson;

H. R. 3584. An act for the relief of Elsie Hawke;

H. R. 3630. An act for the relief of Peter Paul Bacic, Charles C. Cox, H. Forest Haugh, and Luther M. Durst;

H. R. 3645. An act for the relief of Mary Agnes Lichtefeld Droppelman;

H. R. 3678. An act for the relief of Floyd E. and Lena Mae Drummond;

H. R. 3727. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of Violet DeGroot;

H. R. 3814. An act for the relief of M. Senders & Co.;

H. R. 3852. An act for the relief of the O. S. Stapley Co.;

H. R. 3880. An act for the relief of Mrs. Anna Zukas;

H. R. 3881. An act for the relief of Mrs. Anna Chandler;

H. R. 3928. An act for the relief of James LeRoy Eden;

H. R. 3931. An act for the relief of the estate of Dr. A. D. Gibson;

H. R. 3995. An act for the relief of Walter Lundmark;

H. R. 3996. An act for the relief of F. L. Gause and the legal guardian of Rosalind and Helen Gause, minors;

H. R. 4014. An act for the relief of Mrs. Ruby Winsch;

H. R. 4016. An act for the relief of John Casey and Marie Casey;

H. R. 4036. An act for the relief of John H. Bonney, the legal guardian of Daniel R. Bonney, a minor;

H. R. 4038. An act for the relief of Joseph W. Steel;

H. R. 4049. An act for the relief of Alfred F. Ross;

H. R. 4080. An act for the relief of certain former employees of the United States Court for China;

H. R. 4105. An act for the relief of Ira Cannon;

H. R. 4111. An act for the relief of Louis Beckham;

H. R. 4125. An act for the relief of Kelly Hobbs;

H. R. 4144. An act for the relief of Brig. Gen. Louis J. Fortier;

H. R. 4200. An act for the relief of William Weber;

H. R. 4212. An act for the relief of Robert Rowe and Mary Rowe;

H. R. 4213. An act for the relief of Karl Lungstras;

H. R. 4248. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of Louis Ciniglio;

H. R. 4305. An act for the relief of Henry Clay Walker;

H. R. 4309. An act for the relief of Rosa Lee Foreman;

H. R. 4322. An act for the relief of the estate of Floyd M. Adair, deceased;

H. R. 4331. An act for the relief of Mrs. Florence Armstrong;

H. R. 4333. An act for the relief of Bertha LeFrancq;

H. R. 4345. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of Luther Marcus Smith, a minor;

H. R. 4363. An act for the relief of Ollie Brashear Hearldson;

H. R. 4366. An act for the relief of Alex Wylie, and the estate of James Evans;

H. R. 4367. An act for the relief of Mrs. Julia Toler;

H. R. 4380. An act for the relief of Mabelle E. Olive;

H. R. 4442. An act for the relief of Albert B. Weaver;

H. R. 4451. An act for the relief of John McLaughlin, Sr., and John McLaughlin, Jr.

H. R. 4481. An act for the relief of William H. Crompton;

H. R. 4542. An act for the relief of Harold Miller;

H. R. 4549. An act for the relief of Sandy C. Brown;

H. R. 4588. An act for the relief of Robert L. Whiddon;

H. R. 4593. An act for the relief of Thomas R. Clark;

H. R. 4629. An act for the relief of Ludwig Wolf;

H. R. 4631. An act for the relief of John L. MacNeil;

H. R. 4674. An act for the relief of the estate of Everette Maxwell; the estate of Redman P. Maddux; and the legal guardian of Elmer Massa, a minor;

H. R. 4703. An act for the relief of the estate of Annie Brown;

H. R. 4736. An act for the relief of Dr. H. L. Klotz;

H. R. 4786. An act for the relief of the estate of Kimball Lee Beckner;

H. R. 4815. An act for the relief of the Board of County Commissioners of Volusia County, Fla.;

H. R. 4817. An act for the relief of Wilfred T. Plant, Sr.;

H. R. 4878. An act for the relief of the estate of Emma B. Fleet, deceased;

H. R. 4921. An act for the relief of Dr. J. Sims Norman;

H. R. 4927. An act for the relief of Francis D. Stovall, Jr.;

H. R. 4929. An act for the relief of Lt. James H. Clark and Eleanor Clark;

H. R. 4932. An act for the relief of Jessie Springsteen and John Springsteen;

H. R. 5034. An act for the relief of the estate of Francis A. Collins;

H. R. 5048. An act for the relief of the estate of Cecile H. Burgett, deceased;

H. R. 5060. An act for the relief of Clyde H. Palmer; estate of Lola J. Palmer; legal guardian of Margie Joan Palmer, a minor; and

H. R. 5167. An act to confer jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the Eastern District of South Carolina to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of the board of trustees of the Saunders Memorial Hospital; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 4737. An act for the relief of W. A. Smoot, Inc.; ordered to be placed on the calendar.

RIVER AND HARBOR IMPROVEMENTS—AMENDMENTS

Mr. RADCLIFFE submitted three amendments intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 3961) authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

FLOOD CONTROL PROJECTS—AMENDMENTS

Mr. LANGER submitted two amendments intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 4485) authorizing the construction of certain public works on rivers and harbors for flood control, and for other purposes, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. MURRAY (for himself and Mr. LANGER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by them jointly, to House bill 4485, supra, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. GURNEY (for Mr. BRIDGES) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by Mr. BRIDGES to House bill 4485, supra, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

THE DEVELOPMENT OF FOREIGN COMMERCE—ADDRESS BY HON. JAMES A. FARLEY

[Mr. GEORGE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address regarding domestic trade and foreign commerce, delivered by Hon. James A. Farley at the third general session of the Thirty-First National Foreign Trade Convention, in New York, October 11, 1944, which appears in the Appendix.]

MISSOURI VALLEY AUTHORITY—STATEMENT BY JAMES G. PATTON

[Mr. MURRA asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement regarding the development of the Missouri Valley, issued by James G. Patton, president of the National Farmers Union, which appears in the Appendix.]

DEVELOPMENT OF THE MISSOURI RIVER BASIN—ADDRESS BY JONATHAN W. DANIELS

[Mr. MURRAY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address on the subject of the development of the Missouri River Basin by Jonathan W. Daniels, which will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

IT IS FOR US, THE LIVING—ADDRESS BY JOHN W. FESLER

[Mr. WILLIS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "It Is for Us, the Living," by John W. Fesler, at the annual observance of dedication day by the Indiana Commandery of the Military Order of the Loyal Legion, at Foster Hall, Indianapolis, Ind., November 19, 1944, which appears in the Appendix.]

TREATY OR AGREEMENT?—EDITORIAL FROM THE WASHINGTON POST

[Mr. MEAD asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial from the Washington Post, entitled "Treaty or Agreement?" which appears in the Appendix.]

THE NAVY'S WAR ACCOUNT

[Mr. MEAD asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a pamphlet entitled "The Navy's War Account," which appears in the Appendix.]

FLOOD-CONTROL PROJECTS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4485) authorizing the construction of certain public works on rivers and harbors for flood control, and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The pending question carried over from yesterday is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the senior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] inserting in the committee amendment on page 1, line 5, after the word "improvements", the words "provided for in this act." [Putting the question.] The vote seems to be a tie.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask for a division. There are more than two Senators in the Chamber, and I hope Senators will vote.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Those in favor of the amendment offered by the Senator from Kentucky will rise.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	George	O'Daniel
Austin	Gerry	O'Mahoney
Bailey	Gillette	Overton
Ball	Green	Pepper
Bankhead	Guffey	Radcliffe
Barkley	Gurney	Revercomb
Bilbo	Hatch	Reynolds
Brewster	Hayden	Robertson
Brooks	Hill	Russell
Buck	Jenner	Shipstead
Burton	Johnson, Calif.	Taft
Bushfield	Johnson, Colo.	Thomas, Idaho
Butler	Kilgore	Thomas, Okla.
Byrd	La Follette	Tunnell
Capper	Langer	Tydings
Caraway	Lucas	Vandenberg
Chandler	McClellan	Walsh, Mass.
Clark, Idaho	McFarland	Walsh, N. J.
Clark, Mo.	McKellar	Weeks
Connally	Maloney	Wheeler
Cordon	Maybank	Wherry
Davis	Mead	White
Downey	Millikin	Wiley
Ellender	Murray	Willis
Ferguson	Nye	

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] is absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. STEWART] are absent because of illness in their families.

The Senators from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN and Mr. SCRUGHAM] and the Senator from Utah [Mr. MURDOCK] are detained on official business for the Senate.

The Senator from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Utah

[Mr. THOMAS], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN], the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] and the Senator from Washington [Mr. WALLGREN] are necessarily absent.

Mr. WHERRY. The following Senators are necessarily absent:

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HAWKES], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MOORE], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED], and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. WILSON].

The Senator from Oregon [Mr. HOLMAN] is absent because of illness in his family.

The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DANAHER] is absent on important public business.

Mr. WHITE. I desire to announce that the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is necessarily absent because of illness.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Seventy-four Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

A division has been requested on the amendment of the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] to the committee amendment on page 1.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, if I may be permitted to, I should like to make a brief explanation. The pending amendment is the one I offered yesterday, to which no objection was made by the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON] in charge of the bill. My amendment simply limits the declaration of policy to the projects carried in this bill, and does not attempt to project the declaration of policy over into the future. I hope the amendment will be agreed to. We debated at some length in the Senate yesterday whether this Congress or any Congress had the power to bind another Congress, and, of course, we all agreed that one Congress cannot bind another Congress; but I felt that, in order that no one should receive the impression that we were trying to bind future Congresses, the amendment should be adopted limiting this declaration of policy to the projects set out in the pending bill. It is my understanding that the Senator from Louisiana does not object to that amendment.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. It seemed to me in the first instance that the amendment was quite needless and futile, but inasmuch as it has been offered, if it were now rejected, the impression might be created that we were trying to extend our jurisdiction further than we have power to do.

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes; that is true. All I am trying to do by my amendment is to prevent the impression from being created that we are trying to place another Congress under the moral obligation to extend a policy, which is something we cannot do.

The VICE PRESIDENT. A division has been requested on the amendment of the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] to the committee amendment.

On a division the amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question now is on agreeing to the committee amendment as amended.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will state the next amendment passed over.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 4, after line 13, it is proposed to insert:

SEC. 5. Electric power and energy——

Mr. BARKLEY. Just a moment. The amendment just agreed to was passed over yesterday at the request of the Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER].

Mr. OVERTON. The one we just agreed to was passed over until today.

Mr. BARKLEY. That is correct. I think the Senator from Montana did not realize that we were voting on the amendment which he asked to go over.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, I did not understand that the Senate was voting to agree to the entire amendment. I do not think that the amendment offered by the Senator from Kentucky to the committee amendment which has just been agreed to, changes the effect of the committee amendment very much, but it does apply to the pending bill. I have no objection to the Senator's amendment insofar as it applies to the provision with respect to flood control, but it seems to me the amendment goes further than that and tries to set up a policy for the future with respect to reclamation and irrigation projects.

It was stated yesterday, as I understood, that, while it was not felt that a provision with respect to irrigation and reclamation should be contained in the bill, nevertheless such a provision was placed in the bill at the request of the Bureau of Reclamation. I understand now that when the bill came from the House it did not contain a provision with respect to irrigation and reclamation, but that the Bureau of Reclamation asked for certain amendments to the bill. Some of the provisions for which it asked were placed in the bill, but certainly not all the provisions asked by the Bureau of Reclamation were placed in the bill.

Mr. OVERTON. My recollection is, Mr. President, that the amendment with respect to irrigation was suggested by the Bureau of Reclamation. The amendment dealing with power, that is the sale of power and the distribution of power, was modified in the first draft of the bill, and has been since modified by the committee amendment which was submitted yesterday by the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY].

Mr. WHEELER. I talked with a representative of the Department of the Interior this morning, and my information is—I may be incorrectly informed—that the Department feels that the provision dealing with reclamation and irrigation does not go as far as the Department would like, because it seems to throw the doors open with respect to the use of water, and does not eliminate the speculative features which they had suggested be dealt with, nor does it try to limit the use of water to small farms. The whole policy of reclamation in the past—and I hope it will always continue in the future—has been that when the Government establishes a reclamation and irrigation project, it is not for the big farmers, but for the purpose of creating small farms and homes for those who wish to operate small farms for the purpose of making a living.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHEELER. I yield.

Mr. OVERTON. I believe the Senator is referring to the Central Valley authority question, and not to the broad amendment with respect to irrigation. The Elliott amendment, which was inserted in the House, with reference to the Central Valley, provided that the 160-acre limitation should not apply to the Central Valley Authority. That provision was stricken out by the Commerce Committee. But that relates only to the Central Valley. I believe that the committee struck it out because it was thought that that was a matter on which we ought not to pass, but that the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation should pass on the recommendation. That was largely the reason, although not exclusively the reason.

Mr. WHEELER. It seems to me that we ought not to establish a permanent future policy for irrigation and reclamation without the limitations which have heretofore been in the Reclamation Act. At this time I shall not oppose the first section on that basis, but I wish to have it clearly understood that, so far as I am concerned, I am not for irrigation and reclamation merely for the benefit of a few big farmers. The purpose should be to create homes for small independent farmers, so that they can make a living. When the war is over, a great many men now in the service will wish to establish homes for themselves.

Section 8 of the bill provides in part as follows:

SEC. 8. Hereafter, whenever the Secretary of War determines, upon recommendation by the Secretary of the Interior that any dam and reservoir project operated under the direction of the Secretary of War may be utilized for irrigation purposes, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to construct, operate, and maintain, under the provisions of the Federal reclamation laws (act of June 17, 1902, 32 Stat. 388, and acts amendatory thereof or supplementary thereto), such additional works in connection therewith as he may deem necessary for irrigation purposes.

Under those conditions, first of all, a policy would be established under which the Bureau of Reclamation must go before the Secretary of War, hat in hand, to ask for approval of a project. Before a reclamation project could be constructed, the sanction of the Secretary of War would be necessary.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHEELER. I yield.

Mr. OVERTON. I should like to read into the RECORD what the Secretary of the Interior requested in that connection, and then it can be compared with what the committee did. This is the

provision recommended by the Secretary of the Interior:

SEC. 6. Hereafter, whenever the Secretary of War determines, upon recommendation by the Secretary of the Interior—

That is the "hat in hand" argument. Referring to the "hat in hand" argument, let me say that I do not believe that Secretary Ickes would take off his hat to anyone.

Mr. WHEELER. That is probably fortunate.

Mr. OVERTON. Someone must have control of a dam. If it is a flood-control or navigation dam, the Secretary of War has charge of it, and if it is an irrigation dam, the Secretary of the Interior has charge of it. Therefore the recommendation of the Secretary of the Interior is as follows:

SEC. 6. Hereafter, whenever the Secretary of War determines, upon recommendation by the Secretary of the Interior, that any dam and reservoir project operated under the direction of the Secretary of War can be consistently utilized for irrigation purposes, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to construct, operate, and maintain, under the provisions of the Federal reclamation laws (act of June 17, 1902, 32 Stat. 388, and acts amendatory thereof or supplementary thereto), or under the provisions of other applicable laws, such additional works in connection therewith as he may deem necessary for irrigation purposes. Such irrigation works may be undertaken only after a report and findings thereon have been made by the Secretary of the Interior as provided in said Federal reclamation laws or other applicable laws; and, within the limits of the water users' repayment ability, such report may be predicated on the allocation to irrigation of an appropriate portion of the cost of structures and facilities used for irrigation and other purposes. Dams and reservoirs operated under the direction of the Secretary of War may be utilized hereafter for irrigation purposes only in conformity with the provisions of this section, but the foregoing requirement shall not prejudice lawful uses now existing.

I do not believe there is any material alteration of that provision.

Mr. WHEELER. I believe the Senator is correct.

Mr. OVERTON. I think the Secretary of the Interior is satisfied with this amendment.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHEELER. I yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Let me invite the attention of the Senator to the language of the amendment proposed on behalf of a number of western Senators. I have not had an opportunity to consult with the Senator from Montana since this amendment was redrafted. If he will look on page 8 of the amendment, he will find there a new section 8 which I am persuaded will be quite satisfactory to the Army engineers as well as to the Bureau of Reclamation. I hope that before the day is over an opportunity will be presented for us to discuss this amendment with the Senator from Louisiana. However, I wish to invite the Senator's attention to the language which appears on page 8 of the proposed amendment, beginning in line 21. This amendment was submitted on behalf of a group of western Senators, of whom the Senator from Montana is one. On page 8, beginning in line 21, I believe he will find that this matter is adequately dealt with.

Mr. WHEELER. I thank the Senator from Wyoming.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will state the next amendment which has been passed over.

The amendment was read, as follows:

Amend section 5 by striking out all the language after the word "cooperatives" and the period on page 4, line 25, and ending on page 5, line 7, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"The sale of such electric power as may be generated at reservoir projects shall be made at the point of production, without special privilege or discrimination, so as to provide for the complete coordination of such power and energy with other power developments, both private and public, in the area contiguous with such projects. It shall be stipulated in connection with any sale that any and all savings realized by the purchasers shall be passed on under Federal regulation where no State regulation exists to the consuming public: *Provided*, That unless 90 percent of the firm power produced at such projects shall be demanded or purchased within 3 years after completion of construction of such projects, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to construct transmission lines for the purpose of selling such power at wholesale."

So that section 5 as modified will read as follows:

"SEC. 5. Electric power and energy generated at reservoir projects under the control of the War Department and in the opinion of the Secretary of War not required in the operation of such projects shall be delivered to the Secretary of the Interior, who shall transmit and dispose of such power and energy in such manner as to encourage the most widespread use thereof at the lowest possible rates to consumers consistent with sound business principles, the rate schedules to become effective upon confirmation and approval by the Federal Power Commission. Preference in the sale of such power and energy shall be given to public bodies and cooperatives. The sale of such electric power as may be generated at reservoir projects shall be made at the point of production, without special privilege or discrimination, so as to provide for the complete coordination of such power and energy with other power developments, both private and public, in the area contiguous with such projects. It shall be stipulated in connection with any sale that any and all savings realized by the purchasers shall be passed on under Federal regulation where no State regulation exists, to the consuming public: *Provided*, That unless 90 percent of the firm power produced at such projects shall be demanded or purchased within 3 years after completion of construction of such projects, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to construct transmission lines for the purpose of selling such power at wholesale."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment, as modified.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Louisiana is recognized.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, let me make the observation that the pending amendment is a committee amendment being handled by the senior Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY], who is now present.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, let me inquire whether the Senator from North Carolina intends to make a statement in regard to the amendment.

Mr. BAILEY. I will make a statement about it if one is necessary.

Mr. BARKLEY. Probably I should have read at this point a letter from the Secretary of the Interior which I have just received in regard to the amendment.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the clerk read from the desk a letter addressed to me by the Secretary of the Interior, discussing the so-called Bailey amendment, and also a memorandum which he attaches to the letter, in regard to the flood-control bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the clerk will read as requested.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

WASHINGTON, D. C. *November 22, 1944.*

Hon. ALBEN W. BARKLEY,
United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR BARKLEY: My attention has been called to the amendment that Senator BAILEY intends to propose on the Flood Control bill (H. R. 4485). That amendment would result in a fundamental reversal of the sound traditional policies of the Congress with respect to the sale of Federal power. By restricting the construction of transmission facilities, it would place the Government in a poor bargaining position in the sale of its power and would permit the private utility in the vicinity of each dam to monopolize, on its own terms, the power produced at the Federal project. Rather than giving the customary preference to public agencies and farmers' rural electric cooperatives in the disposition of public power, the effect of the amendment would be to foreclose these public and nonprofit agencies from securing the power. The amendment would therefore result in lower income to the Federal Government and in higher power rates to the farmers and other consumers who might otherwise be benefited from the Federal power developments.

The genesis of the proposed Bailey amendment may be found in the declaration of water resource policies of the United States Chamber of Commerce, issued on May 29, 1944, by a committee largely composed of officials of private power companies and large mining interests. Declaration No. VI of that committee called for the pooling of public and private power along the lines of the proposed amendment and also stated that Government power should be sold "at the point of production." This was also the position taken by Governor Bricker in the recent campaign when he suggested that Federal power be sold at the busbar.

Disposition of power generated at Government projects under public power policies, such as sales preference for municipalities and other public agencies and for farm cooperatives, has been a basic tenet of governmental policy since 1906 when the Congress first authorized power developments on reclamation projects. Subsequently, the Congress has reiterated and extended these policies in the Tennessee Valley Authority, Bonneville, and Fort Peck Acts and in the Reclamation laws. I cannot believe that the Congress will want to overthrow these sound policies that have been imbedded in our laws and have resulted in promoting the industrial development of the West and South and in the protection of the consumers in those areas. The policy of the proposed amendment would deprive the ultimate consumer of the benefits of low-cost electric energy produced at public projects and would permit their monopoly by a few private utilities.

I am attaching for your information a copy of a memorandum regarding the provisions of the flood-control bill that relate

generally to the power and irrigation policies of the Government.

Sincerely yours,

HAROLD L. ICKES,
Secretary of the Interior.

MEMORANDUM ON FLOOD-CONTROL BILL

The omnibus flood-control bill, H. R. 4485, as reported by the Senate Committee on Commerce, authorizes the post-war construction of a large number of projects. It has a serious effect on fundamental Government power and reclamation policies. Because these policies are involved, and because the bill does not authorize immediate construction, hasty action is not called for at the present time, and the implications of the legislation should be carefully weighed.

Section 5 of the bill, as reported, deals with the disposition of electric power. While the clause is not objectionable in itself, it is less comprehensive and progressive than comparable clauses in laws previously enacted, such as the Bonneville and T. V. A. legislation. Furthermore, it is understood that an attempt will be made to amend section 5 and completely reverse the progressive power policies of recent years by virtually prohibiting the construction of transmission lines by the Government. Thus the Government, which builds the dam and generates the power, would have to depend for its disposal wholly on whatever utility company brought lines to the dam.

Section 8 of the bill, as reported, wisely invokes the reclamation laws in the use of projects for irrigation purposes. However, the bill as it passed the House contained no such provision, and in the Senate, it is understood, an attempt will be made to amend or delete section 8. The reclamation policies of this country, in effect for more than 40 years, are designed to encourage family-type farms and to discourage speculation. They should not be changed or set aside in the course of a hurried consideration of a flood-control bill authorizing projects at some indefinite future date.

In section 9 of the bill, as reported, is a paragraph headed "Connecticut River Basin," in which there is a proviso prohibiting the generation of hydroelectric power at dams in the Connecticut River Basin. This would mean that the dams would be so constructed that opportunities to harness and use a great amount of power in the Connecticut River Valley would be forever wasted.

Also in section 9 is a paragraph entitled "Missouri River Basin." This paragraph authorizes construction, and establishes a Missouri River Commission, in the War Department, which will plan further navigation and flood control projects in the Missouri Basin. The establishment of such a commission, and in fact the entire paragraph, runs counter to the President's proposal for a Missouri Valley Authority. Such an Authority would have to handle problems of reclamation, the use of public lands, power projects, etc., as well as flood control and navigation, and would be responsible for the long-range planning for the region. Its duties would be onerous enough without having the situation muddied by the existence of other commissions with partial authority and the authorization of partial plans for construction, in the formulation of which it had no voice.

Finally, in section 9, a paragraph headed "San Joaquin River" authorizes Army construction of certain projects in California, on streams flowing into the Central Valley. The Central Valley project, as authorized by Congress, is operated by the Bureau of Reclamation; the Bureau has built dams and irrigation works, and markets the surplus power. The present bill changes the pattern. It puts two different agencies, in two different departments, at work on a multiple-purpose project where the utmost coordination is essential. Thus the effect of this section is harmful to good administration. Furthermore, it would be extremely harmful were section 8 deleted and sound reclamation policies disregarded as they were in the bill as it passed the House.

As the projects authorized by this bill would not be undertaken until after the war, there is no need for haste. There is danger in lightly changing fundamental policies for the conservation and development of our resources. Hasty passage of the bill might seriously hamper and delay every effort to adopt a sound program of unified development in the great river basins of the country.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President, it appears that the honored and honorable Secretary of the Interior does not like my amendment, and that he does not like a good many other features of the pending bill. I think that invites me to pay my respects to him. I think he is a very able man and a first-class Secretary of the Interior. He has conducted the Department of the Interior for nearly 12 years, and has done so with a great deal of ability. I think he is a first-class Administrator. But I do not think we could trust him—of course, I say that respectfully—in any matter of debate, or in any controversy in which he should determine to take a side. He is clearly a partisan in matters of this type, and I believe I am safe in saying that he is something of a crusader. The judgment of partisans and crusaders is always to be respected, just as the judgment of every one else is to be respected; but they are not, by any means, to be trusted. I think I may say, without violating the proprieties, that notwithstanding his unusual executive ability, his candor—and I think his honesty—he is the type of man who always goes to extremes, and if one gets into a debate with him and escapes without being called some foul name, or having some foul motive attributed to him one way or the other, he is lucky. That is a frank statement, but that is my estimate of the Secretary of the Interior.

I am glad this issue is here. It is a major issue of national policy. We have been coming to it for years, but we come to it now in the ultimate sense. If we settle it in one way, very clearly the national policy will be determined in that way, I should say, forever. If we should settle it in another way, in the way I propose to settle it, the national policy would at any rate be not irrevocable, and I think it would be constructive.

I submitted this amendment in a sincere effort to compose very great differences, and to bring about a substantial policy of live and let live.

When there were only a few dams here and there in the country, and we were not permitted the almost unlimited expenditures which are now permitted, the matter was not of any great pressing importance, and we did not think about the implications of what we were doing. It was not necessary to think about them because they were limited in their consequences. But we have before us a bill by which it is proposed to construct great dams throughout the country over a long period of years, which would call for, I believe, approximately a billion dollars of expenditure, and would be, as we say, in the interest of flood control.

We have coupled flood control with the production of power. I have no objection to that where it is done as an incidental matter. Flood control comes first. The argument that our cities and farm lands ought not to be devastated year after year by floods if we can possibly prevent it, appeals to the finest instincts in the breasts of every one of us. It cannot be said that we have been successful so far, but we have set out in that direction.

On that portion of this subject I am rather committed. I will go far in the interest of flood control. I will go far in the matter of appropriations for such purposes, although I take the opportunity of saying that I look forward to the unlimited expenditure of money in this country with the greatest of misgivings. I frequently think to myself—I question if I have heretofore uttered such sentiments in the presence of others—that we are now entering upon a period of borrowing and spending which will make the Hopkins era appear to be an era of misers.

But I shall have to pass by that subject. I shall not discuss it. I throw out the suggestion because anyone can see where we are going. We are learning no lessons from the past in the matter of expenditure. We have taken the view that the resources of the Government, so far as money is concerned, are unlimited; that there cannot be any such thing as too much spending or too much borrowing, and that national bankruptcy is by no means possible. On the other hand, the attitude appears to be that the more we spend the richer we shall be, and the more capable we shall be of spending. We shall come into the post-war period—I hope very soon—with the impression that merely by the process of unlimited spending we can create unlimited income, unlimited taxes, and unlimited revenue. It is an impression so fallacious that I shall not controvert it at this time.

We have before us a long list of projects intended primarily, as we say, to control devastating floods. But coupled with it in most instances would be expenditures for the purpose of producing power, and for additions to the dams called for in the interest of power. The increases in appropriations necessitated by the power program would be really greater than the appropriations called for in the interest of flood control. Of course, that was never contemplated by the Constitution. I shall not argue that point; it is a matter for our own conscience; but I do say that it is a rather lamentable thing that we should take the good cause, the necessitous cause of flood control and build upon that as a pretext whereby we obviate the constitutional inhibition and thrust the Federal Government into the power field. Yet, that is the program; it is at hand, and we have now reached the point where we are building power dams everywhere. Whether we build them in the name of flood control or not makes no difference, for it appears by every conception from any angle that the objective is the production of electric energy.

We have had some disasters, one of them as I recall the Pensacola disaster—not in Florida, but I think in Oklahoma—wholly consequent upon undertaking to convert a flood-control proposition into a power proposition. There have been other such incidents in Texas.

But, after all, that is not the main matter that I am driving at. Here it is: We have reached the stage in our policy when we must determine whether we shall go on into an era of Federal power universally, Federal electrical power universally, or have the division we have had heretofore.

Now, it will be impossible for the power companies, that I may refer to now as private power companies although, of course, they are all quasi-public corporations and are controlled by the utility commissions of the several States and, to some extent, by the national authority under the Federal power laws. But when I say private power companies I am speaking of those companies which have grown up in the last 30 or 40 years by way of corporate organizations, with subscription to stock, and which operate as other corporations do, but always subject to the regulatory laws of the States in which they operate. I consider these power companies to be a real asset to the country and to the sections in which they are located.

I realize that the power companies have been under attack in this country ever since I have been in the Senate, and, unfortunately, some of the power companies conducted themselves so outrageously that they justified the attack. I refer, of course, to Mr. Insull's conduct, but not to him alone, for I should say there are others. He created what we call the holding company, and one holding company upon top of another, until the Congress had to take action to get rid of them, and it took rather arbitrary action. The whole consequence of that was that the private companies fell into a sort of general disrepute, and, under the ordinary operations of human nature, many of them became the objects of public and private attack. I am afraid that almost unawares we were driven by that process to an attitude of thinking that private power companies were bad things anyway and ought to be gotten rid of, and I think that is a part of the program with which we are dealing here. I do not subscribe to that at all. I think a private power company, well conducted and supervised by its State, its rates regulated, as they are regulated in North Carolina, its activities supervised, as they are supervised in North Carolina, is an asset to a State and to the people.

I think that is the first time I have ever heard that said in the Senate. Most people just assume that they are as bad as the Insull operations, which took place a long time ago and have been cleared up. Mr. Insull has gone; he has rendered his final account, and I shall say nothing about it. But can we say that all that has been done justifies the American Government and the Senate, as a part of it, in undertaking now a policy which will inevitably strike down all the power companies, in which event we would have to substitute a national power system.

In the first place, we have always had in America the doctrine of free enterprise, and that doctrine has been revived in recent months to a greater extent than I had hoped at one time was possible. I think I will say something about that.

I am for free enterprise, not for the sake of free enterprise, but I am for free enterprise because we cannot have a free country without free enterprise. It is a keystone in the arch of American liberty.

I hear a good deal lately about "four freedoms." I have at least 44 freedoms, and I am equally attached to all 44, and do not intend to take four and let them eclipse the others. One of my freedoms is freedom of enterprise. That does not mean freedom to commit fraud; it does not mean freedom to oppress people; it does not mean freedom to take extortionate profits; but after all, it means freedom—freedom to invest money, freedom to create a business activity, freedom to conduct it within the law and with a fair regard to the welfare of your fellow men. But if we go ahead with this policy as we have been doing, some of us consciously, I fear, and some of us unawares, if we go on much further, if we pass this bill without such a provision as I have suggested, I believe we will then pass rapidly into the period of Federal power, Federal control, and at least, so far in the first instance as the production and sale of power is concerned, we will extinguish free enterprise.

Now let us go from that to the next point. If we extinguish free enterprise at that point and substitute Federal operation and Federal power I make bold to say that then we place the Federal Government in position to extinguish all other enterprise, for if I supply your house or your city or your industry or your factory with power and I am the government, I am also a tyrant; and I do not think the tyrants in ancient days had the power that the Federal Government would have if we should destroy the present private institutions and put ourselves to the necessity of establishing an all-controlling Federal system of power. The power of taxation would be involved. The Federal Government could make such rates as it pleased, and turn the profits over to the Government. It would have the power to kill and make alive. It could establish one rate for one section and another for another, one rate for one individual and another for another. I am unwilling to move into that field.

I realize that the Federal Government is growing in its centralization by leaps and bounds. I sometimes think it is nothing on earth but the long processes of the ages, that all governments tend to centralize and aggrandize their power. But really, Mr. President, we had hoped, when we founded this Government, to avoid all those gross mistakes of the past, and erect here a fabric and a structure in which the Central Government would never have the power to control as the aristocracies and the kingdoms of the Old World did. Yet the same tendency moves within the breast of the American people that was moving in England in the days of Henry VIII, that moved in Rome under Julius Caesar, and almost into full flower under Augustus.

I often think that the men who wrote our Constitution and framed the character of this Government—I know I am telling the truth when I say it—had studied governments of all ages, and they were determined to avoid the grave mistakes that had brought about the fall of the greatest of empires and the collapse of all the little nations. They sought to create a system in which there could be no aristocracy of power, no aristocracy of right.

I take much interest in the fact that Gibbons' Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire was published, in its first volume, in 1787. Our Constitution was framed about the same time and was finished in 1789. There is no question that that was what Jefferson was thinking about, no question that that was what Hamilton was thinking about, no question that that was what Ben Franklin was thinking about. I shall not go into that; it is an old story. I do not think there is any question but that Alexander Hamilton, with that great brain of his, was saying, "All right; this is a dream, but it will never amount to anything until we have a centralized government." He had looked at the history of other governments. He was attached to the idea of federalism. He is even charged with wishing to make George Washington king. If he could be living now Alexander Hamilton would say, "All right; it is being worked out as I had hoped it would be. We have the great, all-powerful central government I desired, and I am sorry I wasted my breath trying to bring it about sooner."

If we enact the proposed legislation without my amendment and leave the matter to the tender mercies of Mr. Ickes and those associated with him, we are going to have in the field of power precisely a degree of centralization which will extinguish anything like free enterprise in the power business, and I think will threaten to extinguish free enterprise in all the other fabric which is dependent, of course, upon power. We would place in the hands of the Federal Government, not a political, but an industrial sceptre which would dominate everything in America.

Mr. President, I am against that. I wish to stand here on the threshhold of this process and do what I can to prevent it, and if I can do nothing to prevent it, I could die more happy thinking that I would be remembered in the day of disaster as one who did stand to resist it.

Some may think I am theorizing. I am not theorizing. The proposition is to build power dams. Let due regard be had for the fact that they are also put forward as flood-control agencies. The proposition is to build power dams throughout the country, whether power is needed or not, and then to permit the Federal Government to sell the power in competition with private companies. It is said, that is a fair game. I think it is not a fair game. It is destruction. It is practically, I should say, immoral; it is so unfair.

I should have to defend myself for making that statement. But let us assume that here at Washington a dam is built on the Potomac to prevent floods, and it creates so many hundred million kilowatt-hours of power, and there is a private company here. I suppose there is one; I do not know, but let us assume there is one. Let us assume that from that dam we transmit the power into Washington and sell it, either wholesale or retail. Then we have put the existing company out of business.

Mr. President, if you want to know why I say that I can tell you why. The Federal power dam gets its money free, its capital investment comes free. The money is borrowed, borrowed by the Federal Government. The Government pays interest, but the Federal power institution pays none, so that it gets its money interest-free.

But that is not the worst of it. Power companies in North Carolina pay a 6-percent franchise tax on their gross receipts, representing quite a source of revenue to the State, and a considerable burden on such companies, competing with one which does not have to pay the 6 percent. If that were all the story, one might get along and tide over with it, and postpone his decision. But the private power company pays income taxes to the Federal Government on top of the other taxes. That is 40 percent of the profits. And on top of that it pays its property taxes. So that the Government-endowed company gets its money free, it is free of taxes, and yet it is put into the field of competition with the company which is operating as a private institution, paying its taxes, and under regulation by the State. I do not think I would undertake to run a business under such circumstances. I know that I would not call upon people to buy stock in a company under such circumstances. The Federal Government would have an advantage of at least 30 percent in the competitive market.

It might be said that it would be in order then for the private power company to reduce its rates to the level of those of the Government-owned company. The private power company could not do that without going into bankruptcy within a year, and if it should not reduce its rates, the consumer would buy where he could obtain power at the lowest rates, and the private power company would go into bankruptcy.

That, Mr. President, is the situation with which we are faced and that is what we are dealing with here. Unless we determine now upon a policy of live and let live, there will be in this country general destruction which will be very far reaching. I think it will go beyond the power companies and into all other industries, because there would be erected here in Washington an enormous and almost inestimable power. That is what has actuated me.

Mr. Ickes says that the Chamber of Commerce of the United States did something, and had taken a position similar to mine. I just heard Mr. Ickes' letter read at the desk. The Chamber of Commerce did not communicate with me about the matter. Mr. Ickes said that Governor Bricker had taken the same view. Well, who is Governor Bricker? He is one of the ablest Governors in America. He was elected Governor of Ohio three times in a row. I do not think it was at all to its discredit that his party nominated him to be its candidate for Vice President. I myself think he is a very able man and worthy to be named as nominee for that position. Governor Bricker is assumed to be for my amendment. I never heard from him in my life. I saw him but once before he came to Washington to attend the inauguration 4 years ago. Governor Bricker's stand is sprung into the situation because everybody knows about it.

Well, I have paid my respects to my dear friend the Secretary of the Interior, but I should add that that sort of thing, is perfectly characteristic of him. He cannot help it, and I forgive him on the ground that he cannot help it. I think I might preach a little sermon to the Senate on that subject. The Lord's prayer, of which I would always speak reverently, contains the expression—

> Forgive us our trespasses as we forgive those who trespass against us.

I think the true rendering of that is—

> Forgive us our trespasses, as we did forgive those who trespassed against us.

I was discussing that with a minister some years ago, and I hope I will not appear to be pedantic if I quote him as saying that the last "forgive" in the phrase "as we forgive" is in the Greek in the aorist tense, which means "did forgive." At any rate, I have my own interpretation of that, because when we had under consideration the question of the debts of foreign nations back yonder in 1931 and the question of forgiving those debts came up, I considered that passage of Scripture, because one rendering of it is:

> Forgive us our debts as we are forgiving to those who are indebted to us.

I remember I spent one entire Sunday afternoon digging into my books. It happens that my father was a minister, and my grandfather was a minister, and I have quite a collection of theological works which I inherited from them. I am sorry I did not inherit much of their piety, but I got something from their books and their examples. I spent that Sunday afternoon trying to find out whether there was anything in the Lord's Prayer that would move me to forgive the debts owing this country by other countries. I came to this conclusion, and it has abided with me. The expression in the Lord's Prayer means to make allowances for others with respect to those deeds which they seem incapable of avoiding doing. Forgive them with respect to their temptations which they do not have within themselves the power to resist. It does not mean to forgive a man who owes me $10, and not collect the debt. But it does mean that if an individual owes you $10, and he cannot possibly pay it, but has made an honest effort to pay it, he should be forgiven. I think it means that if a friend of yours simply by nature is quarrelsome and offensive, and you feel that he would bite you if you get into difficulty with him, you should look into the situation, and see if that is his nature. If he has been that way always and is incurable, forgive him. We should make allowances for others as they make allowances for us. As for myself, I expect the Almighty to forgive me with respect to all those things that were too strong for me. If someone insults me and I get into a fight on the spur of the moment, if I cannot resist it, if something just takes hold of me, I think the Lord's recording angel would blot that out and say, "Well, we could not expect him to hold his peace under those circumstances. He is just that sort of a fellow, and we will call it even."

That, Mr. President, is enough for my remarks about Mr. Ickes. I do not object to his statement. I simply wish to exonerate myself. I had no communication of any kind from Governor Bricker, but if I had I would not have been ashamed of it. I think very highly of him. I think a man who has been elected Governor of his State three times in a row should command the respect of the universe.

I have no objection to Mr. Ickes undertaking to attach this proposal to the Chamber of Commerce. I will take an oath that I never heard of any such thing before Mr. Ickes' letter was read at the desk. I simply say that that is the way my dear friend Ickes does things. If he can put you in a bad light, or put a piece of legislation in a bad light or in such a position that folks suspect you of low-down motives, he thinks he has won an argument. I do not think he has done so at all. I think he has lowered himself in the estimation of reasonable people.

I say that in all respect to him. He and I are good friends. I went down to see him not long ago and took lunch with him, and I think he is a pretty good executive, but a mighty poor talker. I would not trust him to lead me in any matter, because he has the way of taking the notion that everyone on earth is a rascal except himself. I do not fancy that. He thinks he can convince the American people that I am a rascal. Well, I have always thought I could outcuss him, but I was too much of a gentleman to try.

That, Mr. President, is enough for Mr. Ickes. I am sorry I became diverted from the main theme to a discussion of him. Now to return to the main proposition. If we go into this matter now and build these dams, and then authorize Mr. Ickes to take the power and distribute it to suit himself, build his transmission lines, he can shoot down any private company in America. I am not saying that private companies are perfect. I do not think we should impute to them all that Mr. Ickes would have us do. I think we should judge them not according to any individual's ideas, but judge them as we would any other person or any other corporation. I do think they are symbolic at this moment of private enterprise in America.

I will even go so far as to say that I look forward to the time when the Federal Government will no longer be begging for money on the streets and the

highways of this country, as it must do now, when it will no longer be extracting money from the banks and the insurance company, whether they will or not, and that we can erect a structure here on the ruins of the old depression in which the American people can invest their savings in going concerns with the hope of seeing them grow, with the hope of good dividends, and the hope of constant expansion. But if we adopt the policy suggested we strike down the first line of defense of free enterprise.

My proposal is a very simple one. I am trying to maintain a live-and-let-live policy. I am trying so to arrange the program that the Federal Government can build dams, control floods, and sell power, and at the same time not sell it in such a way as to destroy the invaluable assets we now have in the private power companies. Some may challenge my statement that they are invaluable assets. Let us agree that here and there everything bad has been done that is said to have been done. Let us agree that there was a necessity for reform in the holding company field. That reform is behind us. It is accomplished.

The power companies came to my State about 35 or 40 years ago. We had no coal. We had no industries. In those days it was generally understood that North Carolina would never get ahead. It was described as a valley of humiliation, with the mountain peak of South Carolina's pride—I hope I do not offend—on one hand, and the might of Virginia on the other. We had no iron, and we had no coal. It was thought, therefore, that we would never get any industries. I myself rather thought so.

While I am on my feet, let me tell a story. When I was about 24 years old I happened to fall in with Mr. D. A. Tompkins. We were coming down the mountain by the Happy Valley, to which I referred yesterday. Those were the days when we rode in hacks. He said to me, "Young man, you will live to see the day when all this country will be dotted with textile institutions. North Carolina is going to grow. We are going to manufacture our own cotton goods, and more besides; and when we get those industries we will get others."

That was in the midst of the old depression of the nineties. Some called it the Grover Cleveland depression, and others the Harrison depression; but it was my depression, at any rate. I was a victim of it. I was starting out in life, and looking about my own State. At that time the public schools of North Carolina were operating only 14 weeks in the year, and the pay of a teacher was only $25 a month for those 14 weeks. The outlook was very gloomy. Tompkins, with the eye of a prophet, told me about the development that was ahead. I said, "Mr. Tompkins, we have no iron, and we have no coal. We are not like Pennsylvania. We are not like New England. We have no seaports. Why do you make such predictions?"

He said, "We are going to flood this State with 'white coal.'" I had never heard the expression before. I asked him what he meant. He said "electricity." He said, "What is happening by way of the building of dynamos and the transmission of power is going to bring North Carolina and the South into their own. You ought to thank God every day that you are a young man, and will live to see it."

Mr. Tompkins lived to see a part of it, but not what I have seen. Today North Carolina has 400 cotton mills, and many woodworking and furniture plants. I think we outrank Michigan in the production of furniture. In addition we have great cigarette manufacturers. We have all that, not by virtue of Federal power, not because of dams operated by Mr. Ickes. We had never heard of him then. We have it because of private power. We are realizing the blessings of white coal, which was developed by private capital, and is to this day managed by corporations under the supervision of the State. So I say that the power companies are great assets. If we had not had them, North Carolina would probably be away back yonder where she was about 1910. Let me say to my fellow Senators from the South that we have a little coal around Birmingham, and we are now developing more or less traffic by rail. We have a little steel around Birmingham; but for the most part, the one portion of this country more dependent upon electrical energy than any other is the southern section of the country. That is not to say that we do not use coal. We use coal, but we must pay more for it than do the people near the coal fields.

In this connection, let me make a comment which may be of some interest. The Duke Power Co. in North Carolina operates a great series of dams, built under the supervision of the late Buchanan Duke; but it also operates a steam plant, which uses 700 tons of coal a day. I am told that the use of coal is just as economical as the use of water power.

On that point, let me say that if we go into this business and sell power to the public at rates less the franchise tax, less the State income tax, less the property tax, and less the Federal tax, there is no possibility that any power company can survive. I am satisfied that the Senate does not wish to destroy them. What we wish to have is a policy under which the Federal Government can build its flood-control projects and add to them, when it is reasonable to do so, power production, and then sell the power under circumstances which will permit private enterprise to live, even if the private enterprise does have the bad name of being a power company.

The only alternative is to destroy the power companies, or buy them in, as the Tennessee Valley Authority bought the Tennessee Power Co. Let the Federal Government borrow money to pay for them, centralize the power, and destroy free enterprise in the instance of power companies, and then use the centralized Federal power to control every enterprise in every section of the country.

That is the choice which we have. My amendment provides for the production of the power and the sale of it at the point of production. Everyone knows the reason for that. If Mr. Ickes is given authority to build transmission lines, he will build them into the cities and take the cream of the private companies' business at once. The private company must pay taxes. The Federal Government does not even have to pay for its money. It does not even have to pay for its losses. They can be taken out of the Treasury. That is the first point in the amendment. Then it provides for sale of the power on an equitable basis, the sale to everyone who comes, alike.

In his letter I think the Secretary of the Interior says we would be putting the rural electric lines in a bad position. That is not the case at all, Mr. President. The rural electric lines will be able to buy the power just the same as anyone else will be. The power line will be able to buy it the same as anyone else will. The amendment provides that any profits or savings shall be passed on to the consumers. Anyone else will be able to buy the power, just as he wishes, and will be able to distribute it. Of course, that will put the power in the hands of the local power companies, where they can use it, if they extend their transmission lines to the dam and get the electrical power and distribute and sell it; and we would help them to that extent, because we would build a great dam for it. But the power must be distributed in either one way or the other. We can either distribute it by means of the Federal Government, with the resultant destruction of free enterprise, or we can distribute it through free enterprise. Senators can make their choice about that. I have made mine.

Of course, there is the possibility that the power will not be sold. I have inserted a proviso in my amendment to cover that point. If under the system I have proposed the power is not sold within 3 years, the Federal Government will have a right to run a transmission line to the dam and to sell the power at wholesale. I think there may be some sections of the country where there is no demand for electrical power. There may be a demand for such power later on. I fear that there are some sections of the country in which there is a surplus of electrical power. Let us hope that will not be true later on. Let us not proceed on the theory that we have too much power. There may be a surplus at the present time in some places, but let us hope that we shall have a great abundance always. If, however, the private companies did not buy the power, or if the rural cooperatives did not buy it, then we would provide authority, after 3 years, to go into the market and to sell it at the end of a transmission line built by the Government. The power would be sold at wholesale. If we do not include a provision for its sale at wholesale, we will run Mr. Ickes right into the private power business. While I have said that he is a good Secretary of the Interior, I would not let him run any of my businesses if I could help it.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TUNNELL in the chair). Does the Senator

from North Carolina yield to the Senator from Louisiana?

Mr. BAILEY. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. Is it not true that the language which the Senator's amendment would strike from the bill provides that the power lines shall be built by the Secretary, for wholesale distribution only, not retail distribution?

Mr. BAILEY. That is correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. How can the Senator argue that under the law the Secretary of the Interior would have the right to sell the power at retail?

Mr. BAILEY. I am glad the Senator has called my attention to that language. I will read it myself. This language was in the amendment originally, but was stricken out——

Mr. ELLENDER. I am speaking of the language which the Senator seeks to strike from the bill.

Mr. BAILEY. Yes. While I have put similar language into my amendment, I was speaking of the alternatives to my amendment. I was not thinking of this special matter. But if the Senator wishes me to do so, I will state that the amendment as originally reported provided as follows:

> The Secretary of the Interior is authorized to construct and acquire only such transmission lines and related facilities as may be necessary in order to make the power and energy generated at said projects available in wholesale quantities for sale on fair and reasonable terms and conditions to facilities owned by the Federal Government, public bodies, cooperatives, and privately owned companies.

I will explain my position. I was not thinking about that alternative at all. I was giving Senators their choice between my amendment and the general alternative at which Mr. Ickes is striving. There is no question on earth but that the program in certain quarters in Washington is to put the Federal Government wholly into the power business, wholesale and retail. The pending amendment, which I do not think is an amendment of the Secretary's, was agreed upon in my absence by the chairman of the subcommittee, I think.

At any rate, Mr. President, I have undertaken to lay before the Senate the alternatives here. I have undertaken to state the terms of this problem, which now has come to the point where we must go either one way or the other. It is my judgment that unless the amendment which I have put forward here shall be adopted as the policy of our Government, in view of the great developments which we have projected, we will inevitably run into Federal power as a whole. We will destroy the free enterprise system upon which we have built the structure, so far, not only of the country but the industrial structure of our people.

I will say about the amendment that I drew it after very careful consideration. I drew it without the aid or assistance of anyone on earth. I drew it in the privacy of my office, and in an honest effort to solve a difficult problem. I put it forward here as the best that I can conceive of by way of a method of enabling the Federal Government to go on with its flood control and its incidental production of power, but at the same time to enable the private power companies and private enterprise generally to carry on without the condition of a hopeless and ruinous competition.

I submitted the amendment to the Committee on Commerce. Twelve Senators were present at the committee meeting. The amendment was very thoroughly discussed. It was altered to some extent from the original amendment which I had proposed, and I think it was altered for the better, and certainly with my approval. It was supported by the committee by a vote of 9 to 3. It stands here as a committee amendment, and has that status. I urge Senators, with all earnestness, seriously to consider it. If they take the view I have taken, I have no question as to what their decision will be.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BAILEY. I yield.

Mr. MURRAY. I should like to inquire whether the Senator feels that his description of the private power plants, as he finds them in his State, is generally applicable to such plants all over the country.

Mr. BAILEY. I would not know a thing about plants in the other sections of the country. I am simply using the situation in North Carolina and what I know about it as illustrative of the situation as I see it and, certainly, as having a great deal to do with my attitude.

Mr. MURRAY. Does the Senator believe that the private power plants have been a great asset in the development of industry in this country?

Mr. BAILEY. I am sure of it.

Mr. MURRAY. I am inclined to question that. I question it because of our experience in my own State of Montana. In Montana we have a power monopoly, controlled by the Montana Power Co. The Montana Power Co. was organized by means of grouping a number of smaller plants, and thereby obtaining control of the entire power industry of the State. In organizing that power monopoly, in each instance after a plant was acquired it was turned in at a very highly inflated value. The result is that the stock of the Montana Power Co. was inflated way beyond anything within reason. Then, later on, the Montana Power Co.'s controlling interest was taken over by the American Power & Light Corporation, and subsequently the control of the American Power & Light Corporation was taken over by the Electric Bond & Share Corporation. Each of those holding companies has also undertaken to milk the State of Montana, requiring the maintenance of excessive power rates.

As a result of this monopoly in our State, we find that it retards industrial development and business growth. As the result of this situation, we find that in our State no new industries are being developed and no business of any kind is growing, and the State has been witnessing a gradual loss of population. Every census taken during the last 40 years has shown a decline in population. This is all because of the fact that this power company monopolizes the production and sale of electric power in our State, holds up the rates, and prevents new enterprises from developing because they cannot afford to operate on the basis of the rates charged by the present company.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President, allow me to say to the Senator from Montana——

Mr. MURRAY. Only recently there came to my attention——

Mr. BAILEY. Is the Senator making a speech or asking a question?

Mr. MURRAY. I am merely trying to explain the situation existing in Montana as compared with the situation which the Senator has described with reference to the State of North Carolina. I admit that if all the States in the Union were in such excellent condition as that claimed by the Senator from North Carolina for his State, I do not believe there would be much opportunity for me to make an argument against him in this matter. I am inclined to think that if conditions in North Carolina are exactly as the Senator states, they do not apply to the country as a whole.

Mr. BAILEY. Allow me to say to the Senator from Montana that there are no conditions in North Carolina with respect to power which could not be made applicable in any State if the State knew what to do. I should be the last to suggest that Montana, represented here as it is by its senior Senator and the junior Senator, would not know what to do.

During a long life I have never heard of any industries leaving North Carolina or failing to come to North Carolina because of power rates. Power rates are low. But I have known of one great company which refused to go to another State because of the character of its politics. I suppose that politics in Montana are on a high level. I would not suggest anything to the contrary. But when the Senator gets into an argument as to why one State is growing and another is not, I do not think he can hold his ground that power companies are keeping the States from growing. Power companies grow by selling power, and most of them of which I have heard were trying to get industries to come into the State and consume power. It is a well-known principle that the more power there is to sell the lower the price of the power will be, and the greater will be the volume consumed. The principle applies with respect to power, I believe, even more than it does with respect to automobiles and other commodities. The volume has a great deal to do with the rate. Every time we reach a new peak volume in North Carolina we have a new dip in the rates. The rates are under the supervision of the State. We are not afraid of the power companies in North Carolina. We control them. We take 6 percent of their gross income to start with, and even then we obtain low rates.

Mr. MURRAY. The Senator makes what sounds like a logical argument. It may be true that in his State the situation can be controlled, and reasonable rates maintained but it is entirely different in Montana and, I believe, in many other sections of the country as well.

Mr. BAILEY. I will not dispute the Senator with regard to that point, but

God forbid that the time shall ever come when I stand as a Senator from North Carolina, and say that my State is not capable of dealing with any situation presented to it. I am not saying that the Federal Government should manage matters in North Carolina. If I had to do that I believe I would ask that the State be made a Territory.

Mr. MURRAY. I am not undertaking to dispute the Senator with reference to the manner in which problems are handled in the State of North Carolina. I am merely saying that as the result of a monopoly which exists in Montana, and the failure to develop adequate power and sell it at low rates, we are witnessing a decline in population and a failure to obtain new industries. Not only has the power monopoly to which I have referred failed to go forward and develop, and provide cheaper power, but as the Federal Government has undertaken to develop cheap power in Montana at Fort Peck and the Polson Dam the monopoly has been able to grab it and prevent the State of Montana from obtaining benefit from it. It is a subject which the senior Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER] was undertaking yesterday to explain. I believe that before the debate on the subject has been completed he will probably discuss this matter more fully.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, an amendment has been submitted and is lying on the desk. It deals with several matters involving the pending legislation. It deals, for example, with section 6 of the bill as reported by the Committee on Commerce, with section 8 of the bill, and with the provisions beginning on page 20 and continuing to page 21 with respect to the Missouri River Basin. It perhaps deals also with one other section.

In addition, Mr. President, there is an amendment which undertakes to deal with the protection of local rates in the planning of projects and in the distribution of water.

The sponsors of this amendment are hoping to have a conference this afternoon or tomorrow with a view to working out an agreement with the committee.

Inasmuch as it appears likely that the remainder of the afternoon will be devoted to matters which are now pending, and which have not been decided, I ask unanimous consent that the specific amendments to which I have referred go over until Friday.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, do the suggestions of the Senator and the amendments to which he has referred relate in any way to the Connecticut River Basin?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Yes; one of them does.

Mr. OVERTON. I was hopeful that we might possibly dispose of the Connecticut River Basin proposal this afternoon.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I doubt whether it can be disposed of this afternoon, because, as I have said, the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN] has been in conference with the sponsors of the amendment, and it is an integral part of the pending proposal.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, I have no objection.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, may I ask to what amendments the Senator is referring?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I am referring to the amendments which I asked to have printed, and which are lying on the desk. The amendments were offered on behalf of the senior Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. CLARK], and other Senators.

Mr. AIKEN. Is one of them the so-called O'Mahoney amendment?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Yes; the O'Mahoney-Millikin amendment.

Mr. AIKEN. To when did the Senator ask that the amendments go over?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Until Friday. I understand that there is to be no session of the Senate tomorrow.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, in asking that the amendments go over until Friday, is there implied any understanding that a vote will be reached on them on Friday?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Oh, no. I merely did not wish to have the amendments taken up for consideration today.

Mr. OVERTON. There is, however, a fervent hope on the part of the senior Senator from Louisiana that we may vote on them on Friday.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Wyoming that the amendments to which he has referred be passed over until Friday? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I rise in opposition to the amendment proposed by the distinguished Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY]. I followed his speech very closely in respect to his contention that the adoption of the policy contained in the committee amendment is a forerunner to the destruction of private enterprise. I cannot quite agree with him. The production of power from falling water in connection with flood control and navigation should by all means be carried out by the Federal Government. It is a large, intricate, and expensive undertaking and if left to private enterprise I entertain the view that little, if any, of our huge water resources would be adequately developed. It is necessary that our efforts be coordinated in that direction so as to properly develop that source of power. If left to private enterprise, profits, instead of a preservation of our natural resources, would be the motive, and I know that many feasible projects would remain undeveloped.

As I pointed out to the distinguished Senator from North Carolina a few minutes ago, under the original committee amendment the Secretary of the Interior is merely empowered to build lines so as to facilitate the distribution of power in wholesale quantities and not retail. Existing distribution systems by retail will be afforded the opportunity to tap such Government lines as may be built from the source of the power to points of distribution for retail. I repeat, and please bear in mind, Senators, that the original committee amendment does not authorize the building of power lines by the Government for retail distribution.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President, I wish to apologize to the Senator who is speaking and to the Senate. I must leave the Chamber to take a little lunch, and will be right back.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, when T. V. A. was created by the Congress I was not privileged to hold membership in this body and I was therefore not afforded the opportunity to vote for such a project. Since taking office I have always supported the T. V. A., because I believe it to be most essential for the preservation of our oil, coal, and other power resources for future generations. The power developed by T. V. A. from our water resources during this war has saved tons of oil, coal, and other power-producing resources and, may I add, the lives of hundreds of our boys. That power made it possible for us to prepare for war in a very short period.

Mr. President, I wish to state now that I propose to work for and fight for the establishment of other T. V. A.'s throughout the Nation. My hope is that a gigantic plan can be inaugurated and coordinated so as to make electricity available to all citizens in every section of our country. Such a plan cannot be carried out by private capital. Such a plan must be given national scope with a view of preserving our dwindling oil and coal resources. I firmly believe that if we should utilize falling water to generate electric power we could preserve under ground oil and coal in vast quantities for the protection of generations unborn. If properly developed, I can foresee our main railroad trunk lines powered by electricity generated from our water resources. I can see our major industries powered with cheap electricity. That, Mr. President, can be done only if we have a master plan to go by under Government supervision and with Government aid. My hope is that private industry will undertake to distribute by retail most of the power that will be developed with Government funds.

Mr. President, I do not intend to further elaborate on the advantages of power development by the Federal Government, but I shall discuss the pending amendment.

In my humble opinion, the so-called Bailey amendment, if adopted, would destroy a fixed policy which has been established by the Congress for over 40 years, and which has made it possible to distribute cheap electricity to many of the people of the United States. The amendment restricts the sale of Government power at the source, which is contrary to the public-owned power policy repeatedly declared by the Congress. Section 5 of the bill, as it is now written, provides that the Secretary of the Interior shall have the power to build lines, not to distribute electricity direct to the consumers but on a wholesale basis, so that all distributors, whether private or quasi-private or Government owned, will

have an opportunity of purchasing electricity for distribution to the ultimate consumer.

As I view the Bailey amendment, this is what would occur: The Federal Government would spend millions of dollars to develop electric power and then leave it to private industry to tap it at the source, purchase up to 90 percent of capacity, and then control the distribution of the electricty generated. If the policy prescribed in the Bailey amendment were to prevail at Bonneville and at Grand Coulee, it would be impossible for the cooperatives of the Nation to distribute any of the electricity produced at those dams, for the simple reason that the Grand Coulee is located almost 95 miles from appreciable habitation and Bonneville 45 miles. Under present conditions the cooperatives have much difficulty in borrowing sufficient funds to distribute electricity to customers near their source of supply. If they had to spend enormous sums in order to transmit electricity for from 45 to 95 miles, Senators can readily see that many farmers and many small communities which are now not furnished with electricity would continue to be deprived of it.

On the other hand, if the Bailey amendment were adopted the Secretary of the Interior would have to wait 3 years before he could make any move. Listen to the language, and I quote from page 3, beginning on line 6, of the printed amendment:

> *Provided*, That unless 90 percent of the firm power produced at such projects shall be demanded or purchased within 3 years after completion of construction of such projects, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to construct transmission lines for the purpose of selling such power at wholesale.

In other words, it is conceivable that a plant may remain idle 3 years before the Secretary can make a move. He must allow private industry 3 years so as to decide whether or not it will utilize at least 90 percent of the power developed. Should private industry exercise the right, then cooperatives would be excluded from using cheap, Government-owned power. That, I am certain, is not desired by the American people.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, does the Senator understand that if a private concern is willing to build a line to a dam and take the power there would be any control over the resale price of that power, except to say that the benefits of the dam should be passed on? For instance, if power is produced and the wholesale price, we will say, is a cent and a half, but because of the dam it can be produced for a cent, that means that the price might be reduced from 14 to 13½ cents per kilowatt-hour, but there is no assurance that the consumers would really get the benefit of the dam, is there?

Mr. ELLENDER. No, but the Bailey amendment would be subject to the same provision as that which is now contained in the bill, and that is that it would be under the control of the Federal Power Commission.

Mr. AIKEN. Does it say that the Federal Power Commission shall fix the rates? I do not so understand it.

Mr. ELLENDER. On page 4, in line 21, section 5, as modified by the Bailey amendment, it is provided—

> the rate of schedules to become effective upon confirmation and approval by the Federal Power Commission.

Mr. AIKEN. Is that in any State or simply in those States that have no public service commissions of their own?

Mr. ELLENDER. As I interpret the language I think it applies to all electricity sold by the Government, whether under the amendment as written or under the Bailey amendment. If the Senator will look at page 4 of the pending bill beginning with line 21 he will find the words:

> The rate schedules to become effective upon confirmation and approval by the Federal Power Commission.

That language remains in the bill even with the Bailey amendment, and applies with equal force.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. HILL. I think the Senator ought to take in connection with the provision he has read the provision of the Bailey amendment on page 3, line 2, beginning with the word "It", which reads:

> It shall be stipulated in connection with any sale that any and all savings realized by the purchases shall be passed on under Federal regulation where no State regulation exists, to the consuming public.

I think that provision nullifies, so far as any practical effect is concerned, any provision about the Federal Power Commission.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator may be correct. As I understand the language just quoted by him, it relates to savings made and not to rates.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, under the Bailey amendment the Federal Power Commission has to approve the rate schedules fixed by the Secretary of the Interior, but I do not see that the Federal Power Commission has to approve the rates charged the consumer.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator may be correct about that. However, I desire to point out and emphasize that the Federal Power Commission will have the same power if the Bailey amendment is adopted as it would have if the original committee amendment were adopted by the Senate, insofar as rate making is concerned.

Mr. AIKEN. It looks to me as if the Bailey amendment nullifies the provision of the bill which the Senator has just read.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, as I have said—and I desire to emphasize it—if the Bailey amendment is written into the bill as it is now framed and pending before the Senate it would be possible for the Federal Government to build a project and for it to remain idle for 3 years. I do not believe any of us want that to happen. I do not believe the people of this country desire to have the Federal Government build these projects, at enormous expense, and then let the power generated at the dams be utilized solely by private concerns.

The third and last objection I have to the Bailey amendment is that it is in some respects contradictory in terms.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield for a question.

Mr. HILL. Does not the Senator think that the Bailey amendment would put the Federal Government absolutely at the mercy of the private power companies? And when I say at the mercy of the private power companies, I call attention to the fact that there is no competition between private power companies, so far as the purchase of power and the distribution of power are concerned. They all work right together, and I wish to be fair and say that in many respects they have to work together. They have what we used to call in the old days the gridiron system. There may be a private power company operating in an area where the Government has built a dam, and no farm cooperative can go there, because there is no provision for transmission lines. So the Federal Government, unless it wants this power to go over the dams and be wasted for 3 years at a time, is absolutely at the mercy of the private power company as to what it will pay for the power.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator is correct and I have tried to make that point clear on several occasions during the course of my remarks.

Mr. HILL. We saw that at Muscle Shoals, at the Wilson Dam, after the last war. We recall how the power there was sold at 2 mills a kilowatt-hour, which was a very cheap rate at that time, and that it was sold to the consuming public for 5 or 6 or 7 cents a kilowatt-hour. There was no competition there at that time, and the Government was absolutely at the mercy of the private power company. It had to take what the company asked or permit the power to go to waste, with consequent loss to the Government.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, the third objection I have to the Bailey amendment, as I indicated a few minutes ago, is that it is in some aspects contradictory in terms. The amendment as originally adopted by the committee provides on page 4, line 23, of the bill, that—

> Preference in the sale of such power and energy shall be given to public bodies and cooperatives.

That language will remain in the bill should the Bailey amendment be adopted.

Now the Bailey amendment provides:

> The sale of such electric power as may be generated at reservoir projects shall be made at the point of production, without special privilege or discrimination.

The power shall be sold without special privilege or discrimination.

In other words, in the same section we have language to the effect that preference in the sale of power and energy shall be given to public bodies and cooperatives, and following that language

we have the Bailey amendment language, which states that—

> The sale of such electric power as may be generated at reservoir projects shall be made at the point of production, without special privilege or discrimination.

Now, Senators, which language would prevail? There is certainly a contradiction and my guess is that private concerns would be in a position to purchase power to the exclusion of cooperatives.

My hope is that the Senate will vote down the pending amendment. As I indicated at the outset, I do believe that the Congress should provide for the development of electric energy from falling water so that all citizens can obtain cheap electricity and so that we can preserve for future generations our oil, coal, and other natural resources.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MAYBANK in the chair). The Senator from California.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, it is my intention to vote against the pending amendment, and while I have no desire to make an extensive argument upon it, I wish briefly to express my views. While I do not wish to reply at length to the eloquent argument of the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY], I do want to say emphatically that I cannot agree with him in his contention that the extension of public power will imperil free enterprise in the United States. As a matter of fact, in the State of California we have seen a wide development of private enterprise directly because of the extension of public power, and I have no doubt that the continued development of power in California, both private and public, will further advance business and free enterprise.

The proposed amendment now pending would give large advantages to private utilities over cooperatives and public agencies in the purchase and utilization of public power. As a matter of fact, Mr. President, the portion of the proposed amendment which has been offered by the Senator from North Carolina would directly nullify the first part of the amendment which is now in the bill, and which would remain in the bill under the proposed amendment. The wording to which I refer is as follows:

> Preference in the sale of such power and energy shall be given to public bodies and cooperatives.

I take it that that is a principle of law on which all of us are agreed, that in these public-power projects, where public money is used, public agencies and cooperatives should be given the advantage in the purchase of the power. At least that sentence remains in the amendment. But in spite of that fact, the portion of the amendment now suggested by the Senator from North Carolina would prevent cooperatives and public agencies generally from competing on equal terms with private utilities, because it will be seldom, indeed, that any cooperative, any city, any public agency can build transmission lines from their point of consumption to one of these power dams to be erected. Private utilities, of course, can build such transmission lines. So the principal effect of the amendment would be that for 3 years, cooperatives and public agencies which should have preference, and to which we desire to give preference, would be denied equal opportunity with private utilities to purchase the power at the dam site.

Because, Mr. President, the proposed amendment would entirely nullify a beneficial principle of our law, that in public power projects cooperatives and public agencies should be given the advantage, because it directly gives to private utilities an advantage, which I think is totally unfair, it is my intention to vote against the pending amendment.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MCFARLAND in the chair). The Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. MAYBANK. It is not my intention to make any lengthy remarks on the pending amendment, but it will be my purpose to vote against it for many reasons. It is well known to the people of South Carolina that were it not for the public power projects in our State, established with the assistance of the Federal Government, many of the industries now operating in South Carolina would not be there, and much of the war work which has been done at the Charleston Navy Yard and elsewhere would not have been accomplished. Mr. President, furthermore, were it not for the excellent cooperation and work of the Department of Agriculture, the Interior Department, and of the Committees on Appropriations and Agriculture, in the extension through Federal funds of rural electrification, which has brought about cheap public power and no line charges, our farmers to a large extent would still be in the dark and their incomes low.

I am hopeful that future Congresses will continue Federal assistance and aid to the States for power development, direct as well as indirect, so that the farms of our State, from one end to the other, may be lighted at cost, and so that industries and others desirous of cheap power from the waters which flow through our State, may be the beneficiaries.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I believe on a question so fundamental as this we ought to have the yeas and nays. I therefore ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON] if he is going to try to dispose of this amendment today.

Mr. OVERTON. I hope to dispose of it today.

Mr. BARKLEY. If it is going to be voted upon I desire to make some remarks concerning it. If not I should like to postpone my remarks until Friday. I have no desire to delay consideration of the amendment.

Mr. OVERTON. I should like very much, I may say to the Senator from Kentucky, to have the amendment voted on today.

Mr. BARKLEY. Does the Senator from North Dakota wish to speak now?

Mr. LANGER. No; I do not wish to speak now, but I ask for the yeas and nays on the amendment.

Mr. BARKLEY. I join in that request.

Mr. OVERTON. I should like to make a brief statement in reference to the amendment and then the Senator from Kentucky can close, or he can proceed, and I can make a closing statement after he has concluded.

Mr. BARKLEY. It does not make any difference to me.

Mr. OVERTON. The Senator from North Dakota has the floor.

Mr. BARKLEY. If it is all right with the Senator I will proceed now and say what I have to say.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I wish to make a brief statement in regard to this amendment. I am sorry the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY], the author of the amendment, has found it necessary to leave the Chamber. I always regret the necessity, when it is a necessity, of disagreeing with the able Senator from North Carolina. I think he knows that there is no Member of this body for whose ability and for whose honesty and integrity I have greater respect than I have for his. I do not take the attitude which I am taking on this amendment because of what Mr. Ickes has said in his letter to me, although his letter has fortified me in my opposition to the amendment. I do not take the position I take because of any statement on the part of Governor Bricker. I have disagreed with Governor Bricker concerning many things in recent months. I do not thereby express any disrespect for him or his right to entertain his views on general political matters about which no one expected me to agree with him. While I have great respect for the ability and the power of the United States Chamber of Commerce I have found myself sometimes in disagreement with them and sometimes in agreement with them. But I am not actuated in my attitude on this amendment by anything the United States Chamber of Commerce or Governor Bricker or anyone else has said. I am actuated by my belief that the adoption of this amendment would be a serious mistake on the part of the Senate of the United States, and I have in a modest way been identified with the development of power legislation in the United States during the past 32 years.

For a long time the activities of Congress in regard to our rivers were limited to navigation. It was a wise provision which our forefathers inserted into the Constitution, giving the Congress the power to regulate the commerce among the States. That provision grew out of disputes among the Colonies prior to the adoption of the Constitution following the conclusion of the Revolutionary War, during that interim period when many of the States engaged in quarrels among themselves concerning the regulation of commerce among the States and Colonies and the navigation of or control of the navigation of rivers.

I recall that the Legislature of New York, for instance, adopted a measure prohibiting the importation of firewood from Connecticut in order to compel the people of New York to burn their own

wood, and they also passed a law prohibiting the importation of vegetables from Maryland and Virginia in the interest of home industries, and the States of Maryland and Virginia became involved in an acute quarrel over the navigation of the Potomac River, and came almost to armed conflict over it. The result was that there was held a conference in Annapolis to try to adjust that difference between Virginia and Maryland, and that little conference resulted in the Convention in Philadelphia which wrote the Constitution of the United States, and having in view the experience of the States prior to its adoption, the authors of that document wrote into it the provision which gives to Congress the power to regulate commerce among the States.

Congress did not exercise that power for 100 years, for while the Constitution was written in 1787, the first act to regulate commerce was passed in 1887.

I think we have all come to realize that in the complications of modern life there is of necessity a growing tendency, which has taken on, it seems to me, the attitude of compulsion, that as the years go by the Federal Government must deal constantly more and more with problems which are national. It would be inconceivable that two States in the American Union should be allowed to quarrel over the navigation of a river, or that one State should be allowed to prevent the importation into its boundaries of commercial articles from another State. So that when Congress finally decided that the time had come when we should inaugurate commerce among the States by the navigation or the improvement of the navigation of our rivers, which had been provided for by the commerce clause of the Constitution, we first dealt with the question purely from the standpoint of navigation, deepening the channels and improving the harbors, so that more ships could come into our ports and go out of our ports in the commercial activities of the growing Nation. When that policy was first adopted very little attention was paid to flood control or to electric power. These things were incidental for a long time until the passage of the Federal Power Act, which made no provision whatever for any power that might be generated by dams constructed for navigation purposes.

As the electric age advanced and electricity became a more important factor in our industrial and social life, we began to recognize the fact that while we were building dams for navigation purposes we might as well take care of whatever incidental power might be created by the construction of the dams while under construction. That saved expense both on the part of the Federal Government and on the part of private individuals who desired to embark upon the construction and operation of dams. The two things had to be coordinated, because it would have been unwise if not foolish to have the Federal Government building dams across rivers purely for navigation purposes and then have other dams built in the same vicinity for power purposes or for flood control. So gradually we came to coordinate navigation, electric power, and flood control in the development of our policy toward the improvement of our navigable streams.

I have no quarrel, and I have never had any quarrel, with honest industry of any kind. I have no desire to do it any injustice; and I do not believe that my record in the Senate and in the other body over a period of years would justify any complaint that I have ever attempted to do an injustice to business of any kind, especially if it is honest business. I do not think it is possible to do an injustice to dishonest business. If it is dishonest, the only just thing is to curb it. I believe in honest business; and if I know what we are talking about when we talk about free enterprise; I believe in that.

I have not yet heard an exact definition of free enterprise. I do not know where to draw the line between freedom and slavery as applied to enterprise. I do not believe in the freedom of any kind of enterprise, big or little, to do as it pleases, to drive out competition, and to engage in unfair practices. As business has become Nation-wide in its complications and ramifications, we have found it more and more necessary to regulate it by the only power which the Constitution recognizes as having the authority and jurisdiction to regulate commerce among the States; namely, the Congress of the United States.

Our rivers were not made by us. They were not made by any corporation. They were not made by any private enterprise, free or otherwise. Those rivers constitute a part of the great body of natural resources which belong to the American people, and they ought to be developed for the benefit of the American people. If no one, aside from the Government of the United States, has either the power, the financial strength, or the inclination to develop them for the use and service of the American people, I do not choke at any reasonable measure designed to harness those forces of nature for the benefit of the American people.

We know that the development of our resources on a comprehensive scale is a tremendous problem. It has never been undertaken by private enterprise on a very comprehensive scale, and in the very nature of things it could not be. If we had relied upon private enterprise, free or otherwise, Boulder Dam would not have been constructed for the benefit of the people of California and the other States in the Colorado River Basin. That dam was constructed long before Mr. Ickes became Secretary of the Interior. The policies laid down by the Federal Government for the control of the waters of the Colorado River by the construction of the Boulder Dam were laid down by the Congress of the United States long before Mr. Ickes was ever connected with the Federal Government.

If we had relied altogether on private enterprise the Roosevelt Dam would never have been constructed. As I recall that dam was built even before 1912, when Mr. Ickes was a Republican, or a Progressive. At least he was a follower of Theodore Roosevelt. That dam was built in the administration of Theodore Roosevelt, and was named after Theodore Roosevelt. The law governing the disposition of its resources was laid down by Congress when Mr. Ickes was a follower of Theodore Roosevelt, and not of Franklin D. Roosevelt. I mention these facts because Mr. Ickes' letter seems to have formed the basis of a large part of the speech of the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY]. A moment ago I referred to the fact that the Senator had been compelled to leave the Chamber. I am glad to see that he has now returned to the Chamber. The Roosevelt Dam was constructed long before Mr. Ickes had anything to do with the Government of the United States, and the policy was laid down by the Congress of the United States before I ever heard of Mr. Ickes, and before he supported Theodore Roosevelt in the Bull Moose campaign of 1912.

If we had relied upon private enterprise alone, the Grand Coulee Dam and the Bonneville Dam would never have been built, and the Tennessee Valley would never have begun its development. There was an application by a private concern to build a dam on the Tennessee River near the Kentucky-Tennessee line. There was grave doubt in the minds of those familiar with the project as to whether even that one dam would ever be built by that private corporation. It was never even begun; and when the Tennessee Valley Authority was created, not having any desire to have divided authority in the Tennessee Valley, with the Government building some of the dams and private corporations building others, the Tennessee Valley Authority entered into an agreement with this private corporation, which had never started construction of the dam, although it had made some surveys as to where it ought to be built. Finally the T. V. A. had to move it down the river several miles in order to find an appropriate place to construct what is now the Kentucky Dam on the Tennessee River, which is the largest and last dam in the Tennessee Valley, and is now nearing completion.

So if we had been required, in order to develop a water-power policy to harness the great resources of our rivers—and they are just as much natural resources as coal and iron, or the soil itself—such development never would have been realized.

We have not relied altogether on private enterprise to develop our country. We did not rely to any great extent on private enterprise to create a farm program for the benefit of the farmers of the United States. We have not relied on private enterprise to start in motion the conservation of our soil in order that we may not hand down to generations yet unborn a nation so impoverished that they cannot make a living upon the land.

We have not relied on private enterprise to deliver mail over this country. The delivery of mail is not a natural resource. The Post Office Department is simply a department of government, but it is not a natural resource. Our rivers are natural resources. The Post Office Department belongs to the people

because Congress has created it for the benefit of the people; but the rivers belong to the people without any act of Congress. They are by nature the inheritance of the people, and the people have a right to expect their Government to develop them for the use and benefit of all the people.

So while I am as much in favor of free enterprise as is anyone else, if I know what free enterprise is, I am not in favor of making it so free that it will be free to do nothing, or free to do anything it may see fit to do in order to carry out its own program.

I am not saying that in criticism. The Senator from North Carolina has referred to private power companies. I have no quarrel with them. A few years ago the State of Kentucky came under the blighting influence of the Insull institution, to which the Senator referred, and out of the debacle of the Insull empire came the Kentucky Utilities Co., which now serves many cities in Kentucky, but it is completely separate from the former Insull enterprises and enjoys its own corporate existence at this time. By the way, it has entered into contracts with the Tennessee Valley Authority for the use of power generated by the Tennessee Valley Authority. There has been no serious quarrel between the Tennessee Valley Authority and the Kentucky Utilities Co., because it has been willing to take power from the Tennessee Valley Authority, and is taking power from it, for the benefit of the consumers of electricity in the various cities where it furnishes power.

The policy which has been in progress ever since 1906 has been one by which Congress has made an effort to coordinate the improvement of our river valleys and the resources which may be developed by improvement, for the benefit of industry and agriculture and also of the private consumers of electric power. Under the bill as it has been reported by the committee—I do not recall whether the pending amendment was offered in the committee; I am not a member of the committee——

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President, it was offered in the committee after the bill had been reported. I was absent when the original amendment came up. My amendment was authorized by a vote of 9 to 3 to be reported as the committee amendment.

Mr. BARKLEY. Very well. I was not clear about what happened in the subcommittee.

Mr. BAILEY. I think the chairman of the subcommittee may make a statement about that.

Mr. BARKLEY. The provision in the bill which was originally framed by the committee is identical with the amendment offered by the Senator from North Carolina, down to the word "cooperatives," in the last line on page 4. In order that we may understand the difference between what it provides and what is provided by the amendment the Senator from North Carolina has offered, I shall take the liberty of reading the entire section:

SEC. 5. Electric power and energy generated at reservoir projects under the control of the War Department and in the opinion of the Secretary of War not required in the operation of such projects shall be delivered to the Secretary of the Interior, who shall transmit and dispose of such power and energy in such manner as to encourage the most widespread use thereof at the lowest possible rates to consumers consistent with sound business principles, the rate schedules to become effective upon confirmation and approval by the Federal Power Commission. Preference in the sale of such power and energy shall be given to public bodies and cooperatives.

Then it goes on, and provides—

The Secretary of the Interior is authorized to construct and acquire only such transmission lines and related facilities as may be necessary in order to make the power and energy generated at said projects available in wholesale quantities for sale on fair and reasonable terms and conditions to facilities owned by the Federal Government, public bodies, cooperatives, and privately owned companies.

The Senator from North Carolina proposes to strike out all of line 25 on page 4, and down to and including line 7 on page 5, and to insert the following:

The sale of such electric power as may be generated at reservoir projects shall be made at the point of production, without special privilege or discrimination, so as to provide for the complete coordination of such power and energy with other power developments, both private and public, in the area, contiguous with such projects. It shall be stipulated in connection with any sale that any and all savings realized by the purchasers shall be passed on under Federal regulation where no State regulation exists to the consuming public: *Provided*, That unless 90 percent of the firm power produced at such projects shall be demanded or purchased within 3 years after completion of construction of such projects, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to construct transmission lines for the purpose of selling such power at wholesale.

Mr. President, I am assuming that these dams must be constructed in order to accomplish flood control, which is the object of the bill. I do not agree with the statement of the Senator from North Carolina that in the construction of the dams and improvements in order to provide simultaneously for the possibility of the use of power and the prevention or control of floods the cost will be greater than the original cost of the flood-control project itself would have been.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President, let me interrupt the Senator from Kentucky, please.

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. BAILEY. It has been stated by the engineers, I believe, that a dam 100 feet high, for instance, can be built for flood-control purposes, but that if power is desired, and especially if primary power is desired—I am sure the Senator knows what I mean by that expression; I refer to constant power or what is otherwise known as primary power—a higher dam must be built. Sometimes the dam must be built 30 feet or 40 feet or even 50 feet higher. The engineers do not hesitate to say that they are building the dams higher in order to be sure of obtaining primary power. It is not done in order to be sure of having flood control.

Mr. BARKLEY. I appreciate the fact that in order to obtain power it is necessary to build some of the dams higher than they would be built merely for the purpose of flood control. But the adding of 30 or 40 feet to a 100-foot dam certainly would not cost as much as the original dam would cost, for the foundations would already have been built.

Mr. BAILEY. I myself would not say that. But if the Senator will look into the matter he will find that we used very moderate figures by way of illustration.

Mr. BARKLEY. I understood the Senator to say that the construction of the dams for power purposes could cost twice as much as their construction for flood-control purposes would cost.

Mr. BAILEY. That is true in some instances.

Mr. BARKLEY. It may be true in some instances, but I do not think it can generally be maintained that the construction of dams for power purposes would cost twice as much as would their construction for flood-control purposes only, although I grant that in some instances that may be so. Of course, we are dealing with the situation as a whole.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MAYBANK in the chair). Does the Senator from Kentucky yield to the Senator from Minnesota?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Of course, if a dam is built higher in order to yield power, it will yield an income.

Mr. BARKLEY. Oh, yes.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. If it is built merely for flood-control purposes, there will be no income, although of course there will be the possibility of prevention of destruction by floods or the flow of water.

Mr. BARKLEY. Of course, the building of a dam higher than is necessary for flood-control purposes may result in many incidental benefits. For instance, the higher the dam, the larger the lake of water impounded, and such a lake may be used for navigation or in some instances for irrigation and reclamation, and in other instances it may be used for recreation.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I should like to suggest to the Senator from Kentucky that the statement he has just made is not always true. It may be true in certain instances. I should like to cite an instance which occurred in Missouri, not at a Government-owned dam or a Government-owned reservoir but at a privately owned dam. A very high dam had been built for power purposes. It was operated for power purposes rather than for flood-control purposes. Because it was operated for power purposes the reservoir was permitted to be filled with water so as to make a great lake. Then we had some very unusually heavy rains in Missouri. Because the reservoir had been filled for power purposes, a 12-foot head of water was permitted to go down the Osage River. It caused tremendous damage not only on the lower Missouri River but also on the Mississippi River, and even as far along as at

the Senator's home town of Paducah, and as far as Cairo.

Mr. BARKLEY. Let me inquire where that dam is located.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. The dam is at Bagnell, Mo., on the Osage River.

Mr. BARKLEY. Then the water did not pass my town, because my town is on the Ohio River.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. But the result was to back up the water in the Ohio River.

Mr. BARKLEY. Of course, a rise in the level of the water in the Mississippi retards the flow of water in the Ohio River.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Very well. That is exactly what I am trying to tell the Senator. It not only caused damage on the Osage, on the Missouri, and on the Mississippi, but I have been informed that it backed a great deal of water up on the Ohio River.

Mr. BARKLEY. That may be true.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. That was not a Government-owned dam. I am not suggesting that it was. It was a privately owned dam, operated for power purposes instead of for flood control. It is my intention at the proper time to offer an amendment to the pending bill to put both publicly owned and privately owned dams under the control of the Corps of Engineers of the Army to the end that the dams shall be properly supervised.

Mr. BARKLEY. I have no doubt that there are isolated instances of the construction of a dam resulting in damaging the property of many persons.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. That very thing occurred in connection with a publicly owned dam.

Mr. BARKLEY. I am saying that by and large, whether the dam be built for flood control, navigation, or power, the program carries with it incidental benefits.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Yes; incidental benefits and incidental injuries.

Mr. BARKLEY. Which may not be the primary object of the construction of the dam.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Exactly the same thing has occurred elsewhere. I have been informed that it occurred with reference to the so-called Pensacola Dam in Oklahoma, which was a publicly owned dam operated by the Interior Department.

Mr. BARKLEY. I do not contend that any law passed by Congress may not ultimately do someone an injury. I do not suppose there is a Federal statute on the books which cannot now and then be administered in such a way as to do someone an injustice. I am speaking about the program as a whole.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. WHEELER. The fact that a dam is built does not necessarily mean that it is built for power purposes. The dams under consideration are to be built for flood control. If the water backs up behind a certain dam and some of it can be used for power purposes, or for irrigation, or reclamation, then it will be used for such purpose. I do not understand that all the dams to be constructed are to be used for power purposes.

Mr. BARKLEY. That is the point I have tried to make. The dams will be built, anyway. It would be ridiculous to build a dam purely for flood control or navigation and not equip it for all incidental benefits, such as the utilization of water for power, reclamation, and irrigation. In other words, it would be stupid to indulge in the expense of building a dam for flood control and later build one for power, irrigation, or navigation.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, I invite attention to the Fort Peck Dam. The dam was not built for power purposes. If it had been built for power purposes the engineers would probably have built a different type of dam. The dam was built for the purpose of flood control, navigation, irrigation, and whatever power could be obtained from it. The dam will not produce a tremendous amount of power. But those in charge of the construction of the dam did not say that it was to be built a certain height for power purposes. They merely said that whatever power could de developed from it would be developed and used for the purpose of attempting to bring into the area new enterprises, or for irrigation. If, as I have said, they had been building the dam for power purposes they would probably have built an entirely different type of dam, and would have built it much higher. So the cost of building the Fort Peck Dam for the development of power was comparatively small because only one turbine and a few items of that kind were installed. The cost of installing those items represented but a very small addition to the original cost of building the dam.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kentucky yield to me in order that I may reply to the Senator from Montana?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I was a member of one of the first delegations which ever talked to the President about the Fort Peck Dam. As everyone recalls, authorization for construction of the dam was provided originally by Executive order, that is to say, as a part of the P. W. A. On three different occasions I was a member of delegations headed by the former Governor of Nebraska, Mr. Weaver. The late Senator Norris, of Nebraska, the senior Senator from Kansas [Mr. CAPPER], several other Senators, several Representatives, and I called on the President and had a talk with him. The first thing he asked us was whether the project would develop any power. I was not interested in the development of power. I was interested in flood control. I thought the Fort Peck Dam would be a great factor in the problem of flood control, and it has proved to be such. I was not even very much interested in navigation, because I thought flood control was the essential thing so far as we who lived down at the bottom of the valley were concerned.

As I have said, the President asked whether the dam at Fort Peck would develop power. Governor Weaver said that it would develop a certain amount of power, and that if the dam were built high enough it would develop a considerable quantity of power. But what we were all primarily interested in was flood control and navigation, and we were willing to take what we could get in the way of power. We had no disposition to oppose power development at Fort Peck but, because of being at the other end of the valley, we were interested in developing flood control and navigation. That was the basis on which the President proceeded. Doubtless, there was included in the project an understanding that a certain amount of power would be developed. So far as all of us at the other end of the valley were concerned, we would have been glad to have as large a dam as was needed for power purposes; but the primary purpose of the whole project, supported by the entire Missouri Valley, was flood control and navigation.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield to me?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. WHEELER. What the Senator from Missouri has said is correct. When Governor Weaver first came to Washington he came to my office and told me exactly what was being proposed with respect to Fort Peck. He asked me if I would be interested in doing anything to help promote the project. I asked him if we would be in position to obtain irrigation in the drought-stricken area of eastern Montana in the event the project should go through, and he said that we would be given such benefits. I told him that if we could obtain such benefits in Montana and North Dakota I would be in favor of the project.

I telephoned the President and made an appointment with him, and Governor Weaver and I saw the President of the United States. I think we were accompanied by someone from the Omaha Chamber of Commerce. At that time the President told me that he would authorize the construction of the Fort Peck Dam. One of the reasons, of course, why he was anxious at that time to build it was the exceedingly high rate of unemployment throughout the country. The project which we proposed was ready to go ahead. Senators from States in the lower part of the valley were interested in the project because of navigation and flood control; but Senators from Montana and North Dakota were interested in it primarily because it would furnish power in their States, and if in an incidental way the project would aid in navigation and flood control we wanted to help in its promotion. But our primary interest was in the development of cheap power, and, perhaps irrigation.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. The Senator will agree that while we all cooperated in the matter we cooperated from different motives.

Mr. WHEELER. Exactly.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. The primary consideration of the President was the condition of unemployment throughout the country.

Mr. WHEELER. Yes.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Those of us living below the dam were primarily interested in flood control and navigation.

Mr. WHEELER. Yes.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. The Senator from Montana was undoubtedly interested in the development of power. We did not care how high the dam was to be built so long as we were afforded a means of controlling floods and supplying water for navigation.

Mr. WHEELER. The best evidence of what the President had in mind was the fact that when the dam was built the engineers installed a turbine and power plant. That was the best evidence of what was in the minds of the administration when the dam was built. Provision was made to install the turbine, and also the power plant, both of which are in operation today.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, I hesitate to interrupt the Senator from Kentucky any further except for just one statement, and that is that if the P. W. A. had started to build the Fort Peck Dam originally before a congressional act and had desired to make a power dam out of it, none of the supporters of the Fort Peck experiment or project would have objected to it. The administration did not choose to do it, but it was not because of any objection from any quarter that I ever heard of.

Mr. WHEELER. I do not understand the Senator's allusion. The administration did not choose to do what?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. To build a power dam.

Mr. WHEELER. But the administration put in a turbine and a power plant, and that power plant is in existence today, and is selling power to the Montana Power Co. at the present time at the busbar.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I do not wish to go into the details of any one particular dam.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, I simply want to call the Senator's attention to the fact that at each one of the dams which are to be built some power can be developed whether the dams are built for flood control, or for navigation, or for other purposes.

Mr. BARKLEY. That is undoubtedly true.

Mr. WHEELER. It seems perfectly ridiculous when we are going to build a dam where there is some potential power that that power should not be developed and the people of the country get some benefit by selling it or where it can be used for irrigation that they should not get irrigation.

Mr. BARKLEY. I thoroughly agree with the Senator, and that has been my position ever since I have been a member of the Congress.

I was discussing what I believe to be the fact that equipping these dams to produce power, whether they are originally designed for flood control or navigation, will not increase the cost of the dams anything like as much as it would later cost to build a separate dam for the purpose of producing power.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I might interject there that the extra cost of building the power features of the Fort Peck Dam was represented by the cost of the turbines only. The same dam was there and it only required the extra expense of installing the turbines.

Mr. BARKLEY. Take the Kentucky Dam on the Tennessee Valley project at Gilbertsville, Ky. At that dam locks and dams were built for the purpose of navigation, but at the same time there were built the sluices through which the water runs and the turbines for the creation of power. That was all a simultaneous performance. Merely from my layman's knowledge I would not be able to allocate how much of that cost would go into the construction of turbines and how much into the sluices; but it was all a simultaneous operation; and it would have been stupid for the Government to have gone there and built a navigation dam or a flood-control dam and not have equipped it with facilities for producing power at the same time.

Furthermore, if the Government is to start out and build dams for navigation or flood control and make no provision whatever for the creation of power it is extremely doubtful whether any private enterprise will ever undertake the job of building a dam on a river in a given locality solely for the production of power. It is therefore economy on the part of the people, who, after all, have got to pay the cost either in taxes or in charges for electric power, to construct these dams all in one enterprise simultaneously, so that whatever may be the use to which they may be put, whether navigation, power, or flood control, they may be available to be used for that purpose without repeating the expense and the energy necessary to build another dam.

It is my honest opinion that if we now reverse our course, if we reverse our policy, as this amendment seeks to do in a way—not completely, but it goes a long way in the direction of reversing our course—if we are to limit our construction of dams either to flood control or navigation without regard to any power possibilities it will be a long time before the people of the regions affected will have an opportunity to use any power that might be generated by the construction of dams on the rivers we are talking about.

I am not unconcerned, I will say to the Senator from North Carolina, about the question of expense. I know how easy it is for us to become pessimistic about the national debt and about our governmental expenditures. I am not indifferent at all to that phase of our public economy. We are now paying in taxes into the Treasury of the United States about $45,000,000,000 a year; we will pay into the Treasury of the United States this year about $45,000,000,000, which is approximately one-half of the cost of the war for the year. A few years ago that would have seemed like an incredible sum of money to raise in taxes from the American people. It is more by several billion dollars than all the American people earned a few years ago in a whole year's activity. That gives no excuse for extravagance; it gives no excuse or basis for taking an optimistic view that we can continue to pile up our debt or our taxes without regard to our domestic economy, and I do not advocate any such thing; but I believe that when this war is over and we are able to assess our obligations and charge off everything that is a war expense and recover everything we can recover out of the expense we have already incurred we will be able to reduce our annual tax obligations anywhere from 40 to 50 percent. I believe, instead of paying in $45,000,000,000 a year in taxes, as we are now doing, if we can build a sound economy, if we can build an economy that will give a job to every man who wants a job at reasonable wages and hold out a reasonable hope to every man who has money to invest that he can reap a reasonable profit from his investment, the demand upon our capital and upon our labor and our inventive genius will enable us to maintain an annual income among the American people of anywhere from $125,000,000,000 to $150,000,000,000, and even greater than that as we develop further our resources, increase our industrial activity, and receive additional benefit from our inventive genius. We may reduce our tax bill, without in any way being niggardly in regard to our obligations to our soldiers, our enterprises and our people, between $22,000,000,000 and $25,000,000,000 a year.

I realize that that is an enormous amount compared to the cost of our Government 15 or 20 years ago, but we are making that investment in order that we may enjoy our liberty and our independence as a nation. We could have avoided all this expense if we had been willing to take the chance of seeing our way of life and our democracy and our institutions go by the board; we were not willing to do that; we are pouring out our treasure and our blood and our lives in order that we may preserve them. I believe that, with the exercise of wisdom and with cooperation between government and business and agriculture and all classes of our people, we shall be able to build and maintain a sound economy in this country which will justify a reduction of our taxes without doing injustice to any group or person to whom we may be under obligation in the post-war period.

The effect of this amendment will be that wherever there is any power created by the construction of any of these dams it must be sold at the point of production. Nobody can build a transmission line to use the power unless it be a private enterprise or a corporation sufficiently large to indulge in that sort of expenditure. Under this amendment for 3 years at least the Government of the United States will not be allowed to build a transmission line, and even at the end of the 3-year period it could not build one if 90 percent of the power was being purchased.

Let us take a case where nobody could build a transmission line to the point of production, not even a community, a city, which desired to own its own electric plant. I have never been a confirmed advocate of municipal ownership in regard to public utilities, although I have always believed and now believe that when any city or town has the constitutional power to own its own municipal plant, and the people are willing to vote the necessary money to enable it to do it,

they have a right to do it and should be allowed to do it.

There are in the United States many cities the people of which do exercise the right to own their own municipal plants. That is a matter of local self-government. If they exercise that power, and vote in order to do it, they should not be denied the right to build a transmission line, if they desire, to the point of producing the power, in order that they may implement it with their own action in deciding to own their own electric plant.

Under the pending amendment they could not do that under any circumstances for 3 years, and they could not do it at the end of 3 years if any private enterprise had already contracted for 90 percent of the power; and no one could do that except a utility of some kind. No individual could do it, no municipality could do it, and nobody could do it except a power company itself within the 3-year period, and if within that 3-year period it had bought up 90 percent of the power, everyone else would be shut out.

In view of the fact that these rivers belong to the people, and that, by the Constitution of the United States, the power was reserved in the Congress to regulate them, I do not believe the people of any community, or that any private citizen who might be interested, should be denied the equal opportunity to buy the power, which might be a denial perpetually, because as long as 90 percent of the power was bought, no one else would have any right to it, nobody else could build a transmission line, even the Government itself could not build one.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield so that I may give an example of the effect of the operation of the amendment on a specific project?

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes; I am glad to yield.

Mr. AIKEN. If the amendment should be agreed to, the only possible customer for St. Lawrence power on this side of the St. Lawrence River would be the Niagara-Hudson Power Co., in spite of the fact that under the bill, public power companies and cooperatives are given first chance to buy the power. As a matter of fact, not more than 10 percent of that power is expected to be used by municipalities and cooperatives. The extent to which cooperatives would expand would depend upon the private utilities themselves and whether they were willing to deliver the power to unserved territory, or to territory now served, at a fair price.

Another effect of the amendment would be that the Niagara-Hudson Co. being the only possible customer for this power, the only possible purchaser, the rural areas in the center of New York State, at present unserved, would be unable to get the power except at a price at which the Niagara-Hudson Co. would be willing to resell it to them. In the meantime, if they got power from any source whatsoever at a high cost, they would be in the position of the private utilities underselling them, actually underselling a municipal plant, if operated at a loss, and eventually creating a condition whereby the cooperatives and the municipalities and public systems might be finally forced to sell out to the private utilities.

The amendment means that not only would it put a stop to any expansion of cooperative distribution lines, but it means that undoubtedly many of them would be forced eventually to give up the ghost and go back to some private utility system, even in territories which the private companies absolutely refused to serve a few years ago.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kentucky yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. If it is a sound proposition for a cooperative within a reasonable distance of a Government plant to have a transmission line to that plant, why should it not be financed as a part of the cooperative? Why is it necessary to have the Government go into the general business of distribution of power?

Recently three cooperatives in Ohio, at my request, largely, and with my support, have borrowed from the R. E. A. over $2,000,000 to buy a private electric distribution system. If the R. E. A. can lend them $2,000,000 to buy such a system, why could they not lend them $100,000, or a half million dollars, or whatever might be necessary, to build a transmission line to the power? In other words, should not the building of transmission lines be based on financing the particular cooperative, rather than made a general question of Government construction and distribution, wherever the Government may wish to go? Why is the Senator from Vermont correct in saying it would destroy them? Why could they not be financed through the R. E. A., if they want to build transmission lines?

Mr. BARKLEY. The inference to be drawn from the Senator's question is that while the Government itself should not build a transmission line, it should lend money to a cooperative in order to enable it to build it, all the money to come from the same source, which seems to me to be a rather inconsistent attitude.

Mr. TAFT. We do not base it on general discretion or deliberate permission by the Government, or building of new Government power projects, which, it seems to me, is going to result from a general policy of building transmission lines.

Mr. BARKLEY. The policy we are discussing, and which the amendment of the Senator from North Carolina seeks to reverse, is a policy we have adopted all along, insofar as the distribution of power is concerned. One of my objections to the amendment is that it automatically creates only one market, at the point of production, for the power, whatever it may be, and that restriction is limited to some concern which can build its own transmission line to the point of production. Unless there is such a concern in the community, then the power would go to waste for at least 3 years.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. In just a moment. If there is such an institution in a community, it would have a monopoly for 3 years in the ability to buy that power, and if at the end of the 3 years it was taking 90 percent, it would continue to have a monopoly, and no one else could move it. No one else could build a transmission line, and the Government could not build one.

Mr. TAFT. I suggest there is no discrimination, because we are backing the cooperative to such an extent that if a particular cooperative has a good case, if it is a reasonably safe proposition, the Government, through the R. E. A., can finance the building of a transmission line to that particular cooperative.

Mr. BARKLEY. I agree that if the cooperative had enough with which to build a transmission line from the point of production, it might be able to do so, provided the Authority did not discriminate against it in favor of some other private enterprise which was willing to take the power, although I realize the amendment says "without discrimination."

The point I make is that the Senator's inquiry shows that what he is willing to do is to take money out of the Treasury to lend to a cooperative with which to build a transmission line, but he is not willing, during the 3-year period, or any other period, if the private enterprise has bought 90 percent of the power, to permit the R. E. A. or anybody else to build a transmission line into the point of production, and be able to buy on equal terms with any other competitor.

Mr. AIKEN. I cannot conceive of a case in which we might have half a dozen transmission lines running to the same dam. The duplication of effort would certainly make the electric energy cost more for all consumers. I can conceive of a situation in some sections of the country where there might be 10 or 12 different cooperatives which could get together and build their own transmission line. But I would suggest to the Senator from Ohio that perhaps, after all, the final and proper solution of the existence of this duplication of transmission lines might be found in giving the transmission lines the status of common carriers. Then we would do away with the duplication of lines which is so expensive to customers all around.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I have already taken more time than I had intended to consume. For the reasons I have stated, I hope the amendment will not be accepted by the Senate.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, I think it perhaps will be somewhat helpful to a consideration of the so-called Bailey amendment, which is in reality a committee amendment, if I should undertake to give the history of the amendment and show what is really in controversy as between the Bureau of Reclamation and the proposal submitted by the Senator from North Carolina.

When this matter first came before the Committee on Commerce it came by way of an amendment suggested by the Secretary of the Interior. The amendment he suggested is in line with the amendment proposed by the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY] with the exception of the concluding sentence of

the Bailey amendment. On page 2, lines 11 to 25, down to the word "cooperatives" there is really no controversy as between the Bailey amendment and the proposal of the Department of the Interior. I shall read it. It is very short. This is the provision concerning which, as I understand, there is no controversy:

Electric power and energy generated at reservoir projects under the control of the War Department and in the opinion of the Secretary of War not required in the operation of such projects shall be delivered to the Secretary of the Interior, who shall transmit and dispose of such power and energy in such manner as to encourage the most widespread use thereof at the lowest possible rates to consumers consistent with sound business principles, the rate schedules to become effective upon confirmation and approval by the Federal Power Commission. Preference in the sale of such power and energy shall be given to public bodies and cooperatives.

When the Secretary of the Interior appeared before the committee he suggested as a part of his amendment these concluding lines, and they relate to what is now in controversy before the Senate. I quote from page 311 of the hearings on the flood-control bill:

The Secretary of the Interior is authorized to construct and acquire such transmission lines and facilities and to enter into such contracts, agreements, and arrangements as he deems necessary to carry out the duties and responsibilities herein conferred upon him.

Therefore the suggestion of the Secretary of the Interior was that he should be vested with untrammeled and unqualified power to construct and operate transmission lines from all dams constructed by the War Department.

A similar proposal has been made by the Secretary of the Interior to the river and harbor bill. When the river and harbor bill was considered by the Senate Commerce Committee, the committee inserted in lieu of what the Secretary of the Interior had recommended the following:

Provided, That the Secretary of the Interior is not authorized to construct or acquire transmission lines in competition, direct or indirect, with any existing company operating transmission lines for the sale of electric power; except as otherwise authorized by other sections of this act relating to Umatilla Dam and the Snake River project.

Therefore the committee amendment in the river and harbor bill, which was the first one acted upon by the committee and the first bill reported to the Senate, in the proviso prohibited the Secretary of the Interior from constructing or acquiring transmission lines which would come in competition, direct or indirect, with privately owned power companies.

After the river and harbor bill had been reported, the Secretary of the Interior, I understood and was advised, objected very strenuously to the proviso which has been inserted by the committee, which prohibited the construction by him of transmission lines which would directly or indirectly compete with existing companies. In an attempt to reconcile the differences between the committee view and the view of the Secretary of the Interior, I called to my office Mr. Goldschmidt. He is Director of the Division of Power of the Department of the Interior. He was therefore the ranking officer in the Department of the Interior in relation to the distribution of power from any and all dams. According to the testimony which will be found on pages 803, 804, and 805 of the record of the hearings, it was shown that he and I had gotten together with the view of trying to compose the differences which existed, and he then drafted an amendment which he submitted and which I shall read to the Senate. The amendment which Mr. Goldschmidt proposed was:

Provided, That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to construct and acquire only such transmission lines and related facilities as may be necessary in order to make the power and energy generated at said projects available in wholesale quantities for sale on fair and reasonable terms and conditions to facilities owned by the Federal Government, public bodies, cooperatives, and privately owned companies.

Exception then being made in reference to the Bonneville and Umatilla Dams, which has no application to this argument. That was the proposal made by the Director of the Division of Power in the Department of the Interior. I assume, without knowing it, that the Director of the Division of Power would hardly have submitted such an amendment without the approval of the Secretary of the Interior.

When, therefore, we came to consider the flood-control bill, Mr. Goldschmidt having appeared before the full committee, and made his statement and given the reasons why he thought there ought to be a modification of the amendment contained in the river and harbor bill, there was inserted in the flood-control bill the amendment suggested by the Department of the Interior through the Director of the Division of Power. It reads exactly as it was submitted by Mr. Goldschmidt. It now appears in the printed copy of the flood-control bill as it comes from the Committee on Commerce, as follows:

The Secretary of the Interior is authorized to construct and acquire only such transmission lines and related facilities as may be necessary in order to make the power and energy generated at said projects available in wholesale quantities for sale on fair and reasonable terms and conditions to facilities owned by the Federal Government, public bodies, cooperatives, and privately owned companies.

That was the provision reported by the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. WHEELER. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. CARAWAY in the chair). Does the Senator from Louisiana yield to the Senator from Montana?

Mr. OVERTON. I yield.

Mr. WHEELER. Am I to understand that the Interior Department is dissatisfied with that provision?

Mr. OVERTON. I do not understand that it is dissatisfied with it.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. OVERTON. I yield.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. The Senator will recall, of course, that when this subject was originally considered by the subcommittee of the Committee on Commerce of which the distinguished Senator is chairman, several questions were injected into both the flood-control bill and the river-and-harbor bill. The suggestion was seriously advanced by a distinguished member of the committee, namely, the distinguished Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], in response to a question from me, that the Bureau of Reclamation of the Interior Department should have jurisdiction of the Coosa, Ala., project, which is at least 800 miles from the nearest reclamation project. In other words, it is an effort of the Interior Department to grab jurisdiction of things with which it has nothing whatever to do.

Mr. OVERTON. I am undertaking to give the history of the amendment, which I think will clarify the atmosphere.

In response to the question of the Senator from Montana, let me say that Mr. Ickes appeared before the committee in the flood-control hearings, after we had reported the river and harbor bill, which prohibited him from building any transmission lines which would compete directly or indirectly with existing companies. I read from a portion of the statement of Secretary Ickes, to be found on page 461 of the flood-control hearings:

Your committee reported out an amendment to the river and harbor bill which incorporated the essentials of the policy to which I refer except for a proviso limiting the construction or acquisition of transmission lines. You can be certain that I deeply appreciate your action in so doing. However, I think that the restrictive proviso might well have been omitted. The reference to "indirect" as well as "direct" competition with any existing company operating transmission lines opens up a vast field for the exercise of the fertile minds of those who not only oppose Government transmission lines, but believe that the power resulting from Federal expenditures for water-resource conservation should be disposed of in a way that will permit the gleaning of as large a private profit as possible between the reservoir and the ultimate consumer.

Therefore the only objection that Mr. Ickes urged, as I recall his testimony, was as to the proviso which prohibited any indirect competition by the Bureau of Reclamation in the construction of transmission lines. Presumably, I take it, to be perfectly fair, he objected as well to the provision with respect to direct competition. However, apparently he is satisfied with the amendment originally proposed by the Committee on Commerce, which I read to the Senate a few moments ago.

The other day we held a meeting of the Committee on Commerce, called by its distinguished chairman. He expressed his dissatisfaction with the provision in respect to power as contained in the bill reported by the Committee on Commerce, and stated his reasons, very much as he has done upon the floor of the Senate. The Committee on Commerce decided, by a very large majority, to recommend the amendment suggested by the chairman of the committee.

That is the history of the matter, and shows exactly what is in controversy. I should like to make a further observation. Personally, so far as I am concerned, I wish that it had not been necessary to incorporate any irrigation or power provision in the flood-control bill or in the river and harbor bill. I wish that those two bills could have been limited, as they have been traditionally and historically limited, to the mere authorization of projects. After the projects have been authorized, if any hydroelectric energy is created, some other committee, in connection with some other bill, should determine just how the Bureau of Reclamation should handle the power. However, the baby was placed squarely on the lap of the Committee on Commerce. We had to do something about it, and we did the best we could. That is my whole attitude toward the question.

In this connection, let me make one further observation. If by chance the so-called Bailey amendment, or the committee amendment as modified, is defeated, I shall offer the committee amendment as presently contained in the bill, and as originally recommended by the Committee on Commerce. In order that there may be no mistake about that, let me read it:

> The Secretary of the Interior is authorized to construct and acquire only such transmission lines and related facilities as may be necessary in order to make the power and energy generated at said projects available in wholesale quantities for sale on fair and reasonable terms and conditions to facilities owned by the Federal Government, public bodies, cooperatives, and privately owned companies.

Mr. ELLENDER. Madam President, will my colleague yield to me?

Mr. OVERTON. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. As I understand, section 5 was originally drafted by the committee and voted upon by the committee as reported to the Senate. I am wondering what caused the committee to change its attitude and adopt the Bailey amendment.

Mr. OVERTON. The arguments presented by the Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Madam President, upon a first reading of the pending amendment I was inclined to give it favorable consideration and possibly my support. However, upon further study of it, and considering the changes it makes in the original committee amendment as printed in the bill, I have concluded that in its practical operation and administration the harm and violence which it would do to the program would be greater than the benefits which it would confer.

I think there are two extremes regarding this power controversy. I recognize on the part of the private utilities, or at least some of them, a policy or a desire, I would say first, to prevent the construction by the Federal Government of hydroelectric power dams. I think in many cases, and with respect to many of our power utilities, they would prefer not to see any dams at all constructed on our streams, except possibly for the purpose of flood control. In other words they oppose the construction of multiple-purpose dams. Then, if such dams are to be constructed, I think some of them are prompted by selfish desires that they shall have the advantages and the benefits which those projects might afford to them by providing cheap power which they might acquire, through purchase, because in many places and in most instances they are already equipped with the facilities for distribution, and they would like to have all the benefit of what the Government has provided, and would like to make distribution of it, at a very fine profit to themselves. That is one extreme. It would afford a monopoly on the part of private industry, on the part of free enterprise, which would be at the expense of the taxpayers of the Nation and at the expense of the full development of our natural resources and the benefits which can be derived from the construction of multiple-purpose dams.

On the other hand, I recognize that there are forces or influences, possibly on the part of some governmental agencies, certainly on the part of some who are strong advocates of public power, which would like to carry this program so far as ultimately to destroy all private utilities, and thus to put the Government exclusively into the business of power generation and distribution.

I think those are the two extremes. I do not believe either course is safe or wise for our Government to follow.

Reference has been made today, I believe, by the senior Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY], to the abuses which were committed by, and the evils which attended, private utility companies in years past. Reference was made by him, I believe, to the action of Congress some few years ago, at a time when I was a Member of the House of Representatives, in passing the Holding Company Act. I supported that bill, with a view to eradicating or correcting an evil practice or an evil situation which had developed in the power industry.

There are possibly other abuses which should be abolished and practices that should be regulated or controlled. But I do not go so far as to follow those who would use the governmental powers to the extent of destroying private enterprise or, to be more specific, of putting out of business the utility companies which are established and which are rendering a worth-while and an indispensable service in that field of endeavor. I think there is room in this country and in our industry for both the Government and private enterprise to operate within their respective spheres of influences and obligations in the generation and distribution of power.

The amendment originally adopted by the Senate Commerce Committee, and as printed in the bill, I think comes about as near being fair to both the utilities and the Government as any provision which has yet been developed or proposed does. I call attention to the part of it by which the Secretary of the Interior is authorized "to construct and acquire only such transmission lines and related facilities as may be necessary in order to make the power and energy generated at said projects available in wholesale quantities for sale on fair and reasonable terms and conditions to facilities owned by the Federal Government, public bodies, cooperatives, and privately owned companies."

In my judgment, if that provision were enacted and were properly administered, there would be no discrimination. No particular advantage would be given to one over another—for instance, to private enterprise over cooperatives or over public bodies. Certainly the provision is broad enough in its terms to permit the exercise of honest and sound discretion.

The real test of this section or provision would be determined by the character of administration which would be applied to it.

There is just one thing which I should like to add to the amendment originally proposed by the Committee on Commerce. I should like to see a portion of the Bailey amendment incorporated as an amendment to the committee amendment, to follow on line 7, after the word "companies." I should like to see this much of the Bailey amendment adopted as an amendment to the committee amendment as originally proposed—I quote from the Bailey amendment on page 3 in line 2:

> It shall be stipulated in connection with any sale that any and all savings realized by the purchasers shall be passed on under Federal regulation where no State regulation exists, to the consuming public.

I believe that to be a sound and wise provision which should be incorporated in any proposal establishing a policy with reference to the sale and distribution of power produced by hydroelectric dams. Certainly no private utility should be permitted to buy power at a price at which the Government can afford to sell it, and then distribute it at retail on the basis of what it may cost such private utility to produce the power through other means. In other words, if the cost to the private utility of producing power is 3 cents or 3 mills a kilowatt, or whatever the cost may be, and it is able to acquire power at wholesale prices from the Government-operated facility at half what it would cost the private utility to produce it, such benefit should be passed on to the ultimate consumer and the private utility should not be permitted to make a profit on the cost of the production of this power. It should be permitted to make a fair profit in connection with the distribution of the power.

I think the amendment would add an additional and desirable safeguard to the originally proposed committee amendment.

I cannot subscribe to or support the last paragraph or provision of the Bailey amendment. I agree with those who have interpreted the amendment and concluded that it would merely place power at the disposal of the private utility, and give it the advantage of such power for the first 3 years. If the private utility exercised the advantage within the 3-year period, and contracted for at least 90 percent of the power, it

would then have a continuous advantage so long as the contract remained in force. I see no sound reason for allowing a 3-year period of time.

In the course of the construction of the various projects, information will be available as to what the approximate capacity of each project will be, what the output of electric energy will be at the plant, and so forth. It would require from 2 to 3 years to construct those facilities, and during that period of time the private utilities would have the opportunity of making a contract and extending their lines. Usually they would already have extended their lines to the project in order to supply the power necessarily used in its construction.

I believe that an undue advantage would be given to the private utilities by the adoption of the proposed amendment. We can easily see what the effect of it would be. I believe the utilities are now entitled to the advantages which they would receive by reason of their present position, and by reason of their ability to move quickly and construct power lines. A power line might have been previously constructed to the facility. The utilities might be in position to contract quickly and acquire control of the power before public bodies such as cooperatives could bid for power, make a contract for it, and participate in the utilization of it. I see no sound reason why the Government should not be authorized to build a distribution line, a wholesale line, to some cooperative or to three or four cooperatives, or to some public body or municipality, if necessary, in order to insure a fair and equitable distribution of the benefits to the consuming public.

In many cases the utilities would be in better position to make distribution of the power. They would already be equipped, and it would not be necessary for them to build transmission lines. However, I believe the opportunity which may be granted to them should be safeguarded.

Mr. BURTON. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I yield.

Mr. BURTON. I noticed during the course of the Senator's remarks that he said he saw no reason why distribution lines should not be built to reach the consumers. I am sure he was referring to transmission lines for wholesale and not retail consumption.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Yes.

Mr. BURTON. I believe that a transmission line is commonly regarded as one which carries power for wholesale distribution, and I understand that the Senator is contending that the distribution should be for wholesale and not retail consumption.

Mr. McCLELLAN. The Senator is correct. I thank the Senator for his statement.

Mr. HILL. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I yield.

Mr. HILL. The original committee amendment, which the distinguished Senator from Louisiana says he will offer if the so-called Bailey amendment is voted down, distinctly provides that the power generated at the various projects shall be sold only in wholesale quantities. So the present debate really has nothing to do with retail distribution.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I did not intend by my remarks to refer to retail distribution. I do not want to see the Federal Government go into the retail power business. I can understand, however, that there might be conditions under which the Government should perhaps build a transmission line in order to make power available. If the amendment of the senior Senator from North Carolina were adopted, and if there should be a serious controversy or disagreement between the private utilities and the Government as to price and other terms incidental to the purchase of power, I can foresee a period of perhaps 3 or 4 years after the dam had been constructed and power made available, when no one would receive any benefit from it. I believe the amendment of the senior Senator from North Carolina goes a little too far.

Mr. HILL. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I yield.

Mr. HILL. Would not the amendment tend to put the Government at the mercy of the private power companies?

The Senator knows that power companies do not compete one with another over either the purchase or the distribution of power. They are tied together. For many practical reasons they should be tied together. One company in one watershed should be tied with another company in another watershed. When there is low water in one watershed, the power company in the other watershed should be in position to make up some of the deficiency in output of electric energy. But the companies do not all compete one with another. We wish to make sure that when a dam is constructed, whatever power company happens to be operating in that field shall not be able to dictate to the Government what it shall be paid for the power which the project furnishes.

Mr. McCLELLAN. That condition I can well foresee.

Mr. HILL. The Senator saw that very condition at the Wilson Dam, on the Tennessee River, when the Federal Government was compelled to sell power to the private power company there for a song, simply because there was nobody else who could come there and build a transmission line and compete with the private power company for the purchase of the power. The Government had to take just what the private power company was willing to give the Government.

Mr. McCLELLAN. That is one thing which I hope to see prevented by whatever policy we adopt. I say this to the Senator, however, on the other hand, I would not want to see the agencies of the Government which are entrusted with the responsibility of selling or distributing this power use the power of the Government arbitrarily just to destroy private enterprise for the very sake of putting the Government in the power business.

Mr. BAILEY. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I gladly yield to the Senator.

Mr. BAILEY. What does the Senator expect, if my amendment should be defeated and the amendment originally in the bill should prevail, except an arbitrary use? That is my difficulty, and let me explain it.

Under the amendment first proposed, and now incorporated in the bill, but proposed to be stricken out by the so-called Bailey amendment, it is proposed that the Secretary of the Interior should be permitted to go to any city where there is a power company operating, selling power, transmitting electricity from one of these dams, and let that city buy it and abandon the power company. Repeat that often enough, and see what happens to the power companies. There would be Government monopoly.

Since this debate began I have been informed that there is one State in the Union in which no power company is operating, except in one city in the State, and that company is soon to be extinguished. Both the Senators from that State informed me of that fact. I did not know we had gotten that far. But having gotten that far in one State, if we take the amendment originally proposed, and which will be adopted in case my amendment should be defeated, we place ourselves exactly in that position.

I agree that if the Senator from Arkansas were to administer this matter we might have a different tale to tell, but I am confronted with the fact that the law is to be administered down the street here by the gentlemen and the agencies which have moved successfully to destroy all the power companies in one State, and which—and I hope I do not misjudge them—appear to me to be bound upon destroying them everywhere else in order that they may take them over. Yet the Senator seems to think that is a good proposition, and he is going to vote for the amendment on the ground that he thinks they will not act arbitrarily. They have always acted arbitrarily, and they will continue to act arbitrarily, and they will act arbitrarily by our authority.

Something has been said about getting the power to the local rural cooperatives. The senior Senator from Alabama has submitted an amendment to me which I am agreeing to accept—and I think that situation will be out of the picture when that amendment is adopted—providing that the Government can run transmission lines to a rural electric association if they have none, and they can borrow the money, or the Government can put up the money. I think that takes out of this argument the objection on the ground of the needs of the rural population.

The Senators from the State which they said had no electric private power company operating in the State are going to offer an amendment providing that my amendment shall not relate to their State. Of course, I shall accept that. What I am trying to do is to save

the existing private power companies from a hopeless and ruinous competition.

Now, one other word, and I shall take my seat. Some complaint is made here that 3 years is too long a time, but I notice that the Senators who object to 3 years do not propose to vote for the amendment if we cut it down to 2 years, and they do not propose to cut it down to 2. I think the objection must be a little more deeply rooted. I wrote in 3 years after conferring with the committee, wholly on the ground of giving the private power companies a fair opportunity to build their lines and get the electricity. My judgment is that they will go after it, and they will know that if they do not go after it, the Government will send it after them. I think 3 years is a reasonable time. However, if there are Senators who object to 3 years, but will vote for the amendment if I make it 2 years, I shall be very glad to deal with them, but I do not think that should be brought up unless it is a serious objection which can be corrected by an amendment.

I thank the Senator from Arkansas. I took a little more time than I had intended to take.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I merely wish to say, in reply to one thing suggested by the very able Senator from North Carolina, that I recognize, as does the Senator, that no matter how diligent the Congress may be in the writing of laws, how just their provisions, if placed in the hands of designing administrators they can be abused, if any discretion is allowed at all, and there must be a measure of discretion entrusted in the administration of all laws.

While I should like to prevent any such abuse, I rather take this position, that it is my duty as a legislator to try to have laws passed which are just and fair in their terms and provisions, laws which can be administered equitably, justly, and properly. This is the legislative branch of the Government and I have a duty in connection with legislation. The administration of the laws we enact is the responsibility of another branch of the Government, and of the Chief Executive of the Nation.

I do not believe that we can adopt the amendment offered by the senior Senator from North Carolina without giving an advantage or preference to the private utilities.

Mr. MALONEY. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I yield.

Mr. MALONEY. The Senator's last observation interests me very much. I intend to support the amendment offered by the senior Senator from North Carolina, although in the committee I assisted in its modification in what I thought were important instances. I should like to have the distinguished Senator from Arkansas tell us wherein he thinks this language gives a special privilege to the private power companies, because if it does, I shall change my view about the amendment.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Just in the same respect that the very able Senator from North Carolina has pointed out, that under the committee amendment as originally offered it can be abused. The same thing is true of the Bailey amendment with respect to private utilities. In most cases they are already established, with their power lines, they have an advantage, and they are naturally going to object to a competing line being built by a cooperative. Cooperatives are at a disadvantage, largely because of finances, in building transmission lines. Many of them are some distance away, and are not in a position to finance those things for their own good, and therefore it does place the private utilities at a decided advantage in obtaining the power, if it is handled under the provisions of the Bailey amendment.

Mr. MALONEY. Madam President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I yield.

Mr. MALONEY. As I understand the so-called Bailey amendment, private companies are compelled to buy this power or suffer competition. I would assume they would buy it at whatever price the Federal Government asked for it.

Mr. McCLELLAN. If the Senator will pardon me, let us assume they do not do so, then what is the situation?

Mr. MALONEY. I am coming to that. Then the Federal Government builds a transmission line to sell the power. That is clearly provided in the amendment, as I understand it.

Mr. McCLELLAN. After 3 years.

Mr. MALONEY. The Senator from North Carolina said he would change it to 2 years, and I assume that if he were pressed hard he would shorten the time still more.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Why not take out the provision?

Mr. MALONEY. There is no guaranty under existing circumstances that they can get the equipment to build the transmission lines right away, because the authority over and the control of the necessary equipment rests in the hands of the Federal Government. I think that is the answer to that question.

Mr. McCLELLAN. The Senator is simply referring to a war condition——

Mr. MALONEY. That is correct.

Mr. McCLELLAN. And, of course, we do not expect many of these projects to be constructed until after the war.

Mr. MALONEY. I myself would prefer that there be no limitation of time, but I share the view of the able Senator from North Carolina that we ought to do everything we can to prevent a confiscation of private power in this country. If we were to start all over again I think I would favor public power. If we are going to nationalize power now, we ought to make certain that we do not do it by way of confiscation and destruction. Provision should be made to pay proper and reasonable prices for the properties with which the Federal Government would be in competition. I think we have a definite responsibility here. I do not call myself a special friend of the power interests. On all the votes we have taken up to now in the Senate, if my memory serves me well, I have been on the other side of the issues. I voted for the death sentence and other proposals which were intended to take from power companies what I thought were special privileges. But we are here and now confronted with a question of fairness, and I think the amendment which we are now considering has no other purpose.

Mr. BARKLEY. Madam President, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. I simply wanted the Senator to yield to me so I could make an observation. Many Senators have asked me if we wanted to dispose of this amendment this afternoon, and after conferring with the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON] in charge of the bill, I find it is desirable that we dispose of the amendment this afternoon. I make that statement so that Members of the Senate will not leave the Chamber, so we may dispose of the amendment one way or the other.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Madam President, I have discussed my views of this matter, and I state now that I shall move the adoption of that sentence in the Bailey amendment to which I have referred as an amendment to the original committee amendment in the event the Bailey amendment is rejected.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Vote! Vote!

Mr. WHEELER. Madam President——

Mr. BAILEY. I suggest the absence of a quorum in order that we may have a full attendance.

Mr. WHEELER. I will not yield for the purpose of the suggestion of the absence of a quorum. I shall speak for only a few moments.

Mr. BAILEY. I thought the Senate was about to vote on the question. I did not know that the Senator from Montana intended to speak.

Mr. WHEELER. Madam President, I wish to say that I concur fully in what the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN] has just said. I do not know that anything can be added to the statement he has made in reference to the pending question. In view of the fact, however, that the subject of utility holding companies has been brought up, I wish to say that when the bill providing for the so-called death sentence was pending before the Senate of the United States speeches were made on the floor of the Senate to the effect that we were going to confiscate private enterprise and put it out of business. The bill finally passed the Senate, as Senators will recall, by only 1 vote. I happened to be handling the bill, as chairman of the Interstate Commerce Committee of the Senate. The fight was probably one of the bitterest occurring in the Senate during my 20 years as a Member of this body. Never was a more powerful lobby congregated in the city of Washington than there was at that time in an effort to save the holding companies and to permit the continuation of the bad practices that had been perpetrated upon the American people by the holding companies of this country.

Madam President, we now hear talk about confiscating property. The Senator from North Carolina has called attention to the difference between the cost of producing power by private enterprise and by the Government, and he has pointed out the difference very carefully

and very correctly. I wish to call attention to the fact that some of those who are advocating this particular amendment in the interest of and protection of private enterprise are also advocating, at the same time, that the rivers of this country shall be widened and deepened at the expense of the Government—and for what purpose? For the purpose of setting up competition with other forms of transportation and with private enterprise. Those who advocate the widening and deepening of rivers do so not only for the purpose of permitting great corporations to send their vessels up and down the rivers but to keep the channels open year after year at the expense of the Government of the United States.

The railroads of this country pay income and other taxes. The same individuals who are talking about competition on the part of the Government with private enterprise on the one hand, are also supporting legislation providing for the deepening and widening of rivers. If one proposal is wrong, then the other is wrong. When the Government builds dams it does so at Government expense, because no private enterprise will attempt to build them. The Government builds dams—for what purpose? For the purpose of saving property. Those who want private property saved by such means cannot build the dams themselves. No private enterprise can do so or will do so. Therefore the Government steps in and does it.

Mr. BAILEY. Madam President, will the Senator yield for an interruption?

Mr. WHEELER. I yield.

Mr. BAILEY. I think the Senator's statement is correct generally, but it is certainly not correct with respect to North Carolina. In North Carolina the Government is saying to corporations which wish to develop sites which they have bought, "You shall not build dams for power." One such project was contained in this bill, and I had it stricken out yesterday. The money was available. The engineers were ready to build a dam at Tuckertown. The Power Commission said "No." Another project was at Nantahala, for a 500-foot-high dam which would cost private enterprise $27,000,000 and cost the Government $40,000,000 or $50,000,000, but the Government said, "You shall not build it. We will build it." We have come to the point where the Government controls the source of the power and intends even to control the distribution.

Mr. WHEELER. I do not know about the particular case to which the Senator refers, but generally when the Government builds flood-control projects it does so because private enterprise will not build them and cannot afford to build them.

Mr. BAILEY. Private enterprise does not come into flood-control projects anywhere, but I do not think the Senator can find a good power site in America on which private enterprise would not build if the Government would not lay hands on it.

Mr. WHEELER. Of course, private enterprise will not build flood-control projects because there is no profit in doing so, and if there is no profit in such construction private enterprise wants the Government to construct it. When a canal does not make money private enterprise desires to unload it on the Government, as was done with the Cape Cod Canal some years ago, and as is being done with reference to the canal along the B. & O. Railroad. I am in favor of private enterprise, but I am in favor of private enterprise being regulated.

Take the case of the radio broadcasting chains. The Republican Party adopted a plank in its platform to the effect that there should be no regulation of radio broadcasting chains in this country aside from the regulation of the mechanics of the operation of the radio. However, that is beside the point. When these great dams are built, as I understand, they are built essentially for flood control, and not for power purposes.

Mr. MALONEY. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHEELER. I yield.

Mr. MALONEY. I should like to note also, as did the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY], that in connection with flood-control projects the States of New England made a very strong effort to establish an interstate compact on flood control, and the pact was rejected by the Congress in 1937.

Mr. WHEELER. Frankly, I believe that when private enterprise wishes to build dams for flood control, or other purposes, and it can do as good a job as the Government in the prevention of floods, it ought to be permitted to do so, and the Federal Government ought not to step in. I am assuming—perhaps I am mistaken—that these flood-control projects are being built by the Government essentially for flood control. However, in the case of every dam which is built, there is bound to be some primary power developed; and if the Government can recoup some of the money which it has put into such a project, it ought to be permitted to do so.

Mr. MALONEY. Madam President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. WHEELER. Let me finish. For example, take the Fort Peck Dam. The Government had a transmission line, and installed a power plant. The project was in eastern Montana, where there were no large cities. The transmission line was originally built for the purpose of taking power from the Montana Power Co. and transmitting it into eastern Montana. Power was necessary for the construction. If that transmission line had not been there, a transmission line would have had to be built. I do not think the Montana Power Co. would ever have built it. But the power was bought because the transmission line was there, and the power was used for very necessary war purposes.

Many dams will be built along the Missouri River, where there are no large cities. It seems to me that in some instances transmission lines must be built in order to sell the power. If they are not built, the private power companies may say, "We do not want to buy that power. We have all the local power we need, and we are not going to buy it." Then it will be necessary to wait for 2 or 3 years to sell it.

Mr. MALONEY. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHEELER. I yield.

Mr. MALONEY. The Senator makes a good argument so far as it goes, and I share his feeling that when a dam is constructed for flood-control purposes and there is a potential use for power which might be developed, even though at some distant time, provision ought to be made in the construction of such a dam for power uses at a later date. I quite agree with that statement. I think it would be sinful to build a large flood-control dam in an area in which power might be used at some later date, without taking the necessary steps to make power later available. However, I cannot see how this amendment trespasses on that idea.

Mr. WHEELER. Of course, it does not trespass on the idea that provision may be made for power in the future.

Mr. MALONEY. The amendment is much more generous than that. This amendment does not frown on power dams.

Mr. WHEELER. I understand that thoroughly. The Senator misunderstood me if I gave him a contrary impression. It may be that in connection with some of these dams there will be no power provision. It seems to me that will depend entirely upon conditions.

Apparently what is troubling the Senator from North Carolina is that he is fearful, and does not trust someone in the department with reference to these matters. There may be some excuse for such a feeling. There may be those in the departments who are anxious to go into the power business and put private industry out of business. I believe that the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN] stated the situation very correctly when he said that after all, as Members of the Congress of the United States, our duty is to enact legislation, and that we must give some discretion to the various departments. I do not like to give them too much discretion. When I first came to the Senate I did not want to give them any discretion, because of the fact that I had had experience dealing with them in land matters, and as United States attorney. I thought, even in those days, that they made rules and regulations which were reprehensible.

Mr. MALONEY. It seems to me that the Senator is still pretty reluctant to give them discretion.

Mr. WHEELER. That is true; but we must give them certain definite powers and discretion. If we have men in the various offices in whom we have no confidence, men whom we cannot trust, and who violate the intent of the Congress, then the Congress ought to get rid of them, or see that they are eliminated.

Mr. MALONEY. If the Senator will yield to me for a moment, I should like to suggest that that is a pretty far-fetched observation. I am not lacking in confidence in those who would administer this procedure. I think I know what they would do. I believe that there are those within our Government—a great many of them—who believe in the nationalization of power, and I believe that they would go about it without much

delay. I think that is the issue involved here. I do not wish to see that done until we devise a way to make proper payment to those owning private power companies. Heretofore I have submitted an amendment to provide such protection. If the Federal Government wishes to enter that field, and will pay the proper price, it is all right with me. But millions of American people have money invested in private power companies. There are private power companies with bad records, and there are private power companies with good records. I believe in rigid regulation. I do not wish to take any uncertain steps, however, which might be avoided.

I see in this amendment a mild and modest attempt to indicate a Federal policy. We are entirely without one now. We are scattered all over the field. There is a great difference of opinion within the Government as to how we should deal with the power question. I wish to point out to the Senator, because he makes so much of it, that the Senator from North Carolina has indicated his willingness to cut down the period of waiting time before the power is sold.

Mr. WHEELER. I do not think there should be a waiting time, as has been pointed out on the floor of the Senate by the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] and the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN]. When power projects are being built, we know what power is to be developed. We know, before the construction is begun, the amount of primary power which is to be developed.

Mr. MALONEY. I do not quarrel with the Senator on that point. I should be willing to see the time limit stricken out.

Mr. WHEELER. It should be stricken out. When the construction of a dam is commenced, those in charge know the amount of primary power which is to be developed. They knew it in the case of the Fort Peck Dam. They know it in the case of every other dam which is being built. If we cannot build a transmission line so that the power may be sold, we shall be absolutely at the mercy of some power company at practically every place where one of these dams is built. The power company will be able to say, "You can sell us this power for so much, or you cannot sell it at all." We shall be tied up for an indefinite period of time, and will not be able to build any transmission lines. It seems to me that that is a mistaken policy.

When we talk about confiscating the property of private owners and not paying them enough, I should like to have someone tell me when the Government has ever taken any piece of private property anywhere in the United States and has not paid a most generous price for it. Will any Senator stand on this floor and tell me of any time when the Government has ever taken a piece of property and has not only paid a generous price for it but generally has paid far more than the property was worth?

I happened to be a member of the conference committee which considered the bill providing for the taking over of some of the properties of the Commonwealth & Southern Corporation. I sat in the conference committee room with the late Senator Norris. I saw the Members of the House of Representatives who were members of the conference committee come there and argue. I saw the late Senator Norris, who then was in his declining years, sit in that conference room with tears streaming down his face because of the fact that he thought the conference report would not be adopted. I said to him, "Do not worry about it. It is going to be adopted because of the fact that the power interests will get $10,000,000 more than the property is worth."

But, Madam President, were they satisfied with it? Was the late Mr. Willkie satisfied with the price he received? Was the Commonwealth & Southern satisfied with the price it received? They were delighted to unload the property on the Government of the United States for the price they were paid, and I happen to know it.

So when we talk about taking over private property and not paying for it, let me say that the Government always has paid most generously for everything it has ever taken over, whether it be a dog, a house, a cow, or a piece of property anywhere in the United States.

I agree that there are some good power companies and there are some bad power companies, depending upon the kind of management they have. I also agree with the senior Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY] that some of the power companies did a great service when they started and developed their companies. There is no question about that.

I am not in favor of having the Government of the United States go into the retail power business.

Mr. MALONEY. Madam President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. WHEELER. I yield.

Mr. MALONEY. Would the Senator have objection to this proposal if the time limitation were stricken out?

Mr. WHEELER. I do not know that I would. I am inclined to think that possibly I would not.

Mr. MALONEY. I am anxious to see us take a step toward the formulation of a Federal power policy. As I understand the discussion here, the only objection raised by the able junior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN] and the able senior Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER] is regarding the limitation of time. I have very good reason to believe that the author of the amendment is willing to remove that limitation.

Mr. WHEELER. I would not wish to commit myself definitely at this time with reference to it, but I think the provision which was originally adopted by the committee does adopt a policy.

Madam President, at this point I wish to place in the RECORD several telegrams which I have received from Montana. One of them reads as follows:

POLSON, MONT., *November 21, 1944.*
Hon. B. K. WHEELER,
Washington, D. C.:

The Bailey amendment to H. R. 4485 is absolutely the wrong theory. United States bar sales to any group as of law and practice by the Bonneville Power Administration is correct practice for fair distribution to everyone. Please use your influence to have the flood-control legislation to the benefit of all communities and groups along the waterways to the very source of the streams.

Board of Commissioners; Mission Irrigation District, Ray Biggerstaf, secretary; W. A. Jensen; Earl S. Ferrell; Stella M. Upham; Polson Chamber of Commerce, Louis Pratt, president; Reservoir Valley Grange, Lola Wolfinger, secretary; T. R. Delaney, attorney; W. L. Rader, publisher, Flathead Courier; F. N. Hamman, lawyer; Lloyd I. Wallace.

I happen to know most of the signers of the telegram. Most of them are very good Republicans, particularly the lawyer, the last person who signed the telegram, who has just been elected a State senator on the Republican ticket. Also all the members of the board of county commissioners are Republicans.

I also hold in my hand a telegram from Mr. A. F. Winker, chairman, and Mr. Don Treloar, secretary, of the Flathead Valley Citizens Committee. I ask unanimous consent that this telegram be printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

KALISPELL, MONT., *November 21, 1944.*
Hon. B. K. WHEELER,
Senator from Montana,
Washington, D. C.:

We understand an amendment to the flood control bill seeks to prohibit Government sale of power except from the bus bars at the dams. Such an amendment, if made into law, would jeopardize the entire Northwest program for development and sacrifice huge Government transmission facilities to selfish interests. We desire to express our disapproval of such action and urge you do everything you can to preserve the status quo in the Northwest as it pertains to distribution sale of power. If amendment cannot be stricken out immediately, we believe it should at least be delayed until an adequate opportunity is provided to oppose it. We feel that the aspirations of this Northwest States region hinge upon the defeat of this amendment, which we understand has been presented by Senator BAILEY.

A. F. WINKER, *Chairman,*
DON TRELOAR, *Secretary,*
Flathead Valley Citizens Committee.

Mr. WHEELER. Madam President, I sincerely hope that the so-called Bailey amendment will be defeated, and that the amendment which was first recommended by the committee will be adopted by the Senate.

Mr. HILL. Madam President, I do not desire to delay the vote on the pending amendment, but I feel so strongly about the amendment that I do not wish to have a vote taken on it without first voicing my vigorous protest against its adoption.

The senior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], the junior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN], and the senior Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER], have stated the reasons why, in their opinion, and also in my opinion, the amendment should not be adopted. I do not wish to detain the Senate in order to reiterate the arguments they have made.

As those Senators have well stated, the adoption of this amendment would, in their opinion, and also in my opinion, result in giving special favors to the private power companies, and in practically denying rural cooperatives and public power bodies an opportunity to purchase the power which might be generated at these flood-control projects.

The amendment which was originally reported to the Senate by the Committee on Commerce provides that transmission lines can be built only for sale of such power in wholesale quantities and for the purpose of giving a fair and reasonable opportunity to facilities owned by the Federal Government, public bodies, cooperatives, and privately owned companies.

If the Bailey amendment is adopted as a part of the bill, it might well be that there would be some other Federal project in close proximity to one of these flood-control projects, and that the other Federal project would not be able to obtain the power needed for its own operation. Certainly, the practical effect of the amendment would be that public power bodies generally and rural cooperatives would not obtain any of this power. It would go to the private power companies. As I have endeavored to indicate in the questions I asked on the floor of the Senate earlier in the day, it would not only go to the private power companies, but, as the amendment is now written, it would go to them largely on their own terms. As we know, and as I have said here before, there is no competition between private power companies, either in the matter of the purchase of power or in the matter of the distribution and sale of power. They are tied together; and, as I have said, to be fair to them, in many cases it works in the public interest for them to be tied together. But they do not bid one against the other for the purchase of power.

The result would be that the private power company which was nearest the particular flood-control project would obtain the power from that project, and the Government would be at a great disadvantage in attempting to get the best price for the power, inasmuch as the private power company would not have any competition, would not have anyone bidding against it or competing with it, for the purchase of the power.

As has been stated here, the amendment represents a reversal of our policy. Beginning in 1906, with the passage of the reclamation law, the Congress adopted a policy of at least giving an equal opportunity to public-power bodies for the purchase of power generated at projects built with funds provided by the Federal Government. In many of the acts passed since 1906, Congress has gone further than merely to give public-power bodies and rural cooperatives an equal opportunity. Congress has given them a preference.

As I recall, we granted preferences in the Tennessee Valley Authority Act, in the operations of the Fort Peck Dam, and the Bonneville and Grand Coulee Dams. The public power bodies, which are not operated for private profit but for the benefit of the people served by them, and the rural cooperatives, which are not operated for profit but for the benefit of farmers and members of the cooperative, have been given preferences for the purchase of power.

We would now reverse the policy. We would not only deny any preference but even an equal opportunity to the public power bodies or the rural cooperatives to buy any of the power.

My distinguished friend from North Carolina—and there is no abler Member of this body, nor one who is more persuasive or appealing—stated today that he felt that if we did not reverse our existing policy the private power companies would be put out of business. I share no such fears. I hold no such views. We were told exactly the same thing when we had before us the bill providing for the Tennessee Valley Authority. We were told exactly the same thing when we had before us the bill involving the dissolution of holding companies.

The truth is, Madam President, that the Tennessee Valley Authority brought about the dissolution of the Tennessee Electric Power Co. by its purchase of that company. Because the Tennessee Valley Authority did not wish to build competing lines and be in the position of impairing, if not destroying private property and private enterprise, it purchased the company to which I have referred. So the Tennessee Valley Authority compensated at a handsome price the owners of the Tennessee Electric Power Co. for every dollar's worth of its property.

So far as the Alabama Power Co. is concerned, the Georgia Power Co., and power companies serving Mississippi, Kentucky, and other adjoining States, I do not hesitate to say that instead of being inimical or harmful to the private power companies, the operation of the Tennessee Valley Authority has been most helpful to them. It forced them to put their operations upon a fair, sound, efficient, and businesslike basis. Instead of hurting them it has made customers for them. It has made people power minded. It has caused companies to reduce their power rates. They are selling far more power today than they ever dreamed of selling before the Tennessee Valley Authority was created.

In the Birmingham area we are served principally by the Birmingham Electric Power Co., which is a private company. The Tennessee Valley Authority also furnishes power to Bessemer and the adjacent area.

The fact that the Tennessee Valley Authority came into that area and is today, and has been for some time, selling power did not put the private power company out of business. It brought about seven reductions in the rates for power charged by the private power companies to the people of the Birmingham area. But that power company is still operating today. If we look at the quotation of its stock on the stock market, we find that it is in a sound and healthy condition, paying good dividends, selling more power and to more customers than it has ever sold before, and that it is in a better condition financially than ever before.

Madam President, the question before the Senate is not one of destroying private power companies or private enterprise. The question is merely one of permitting all the people to have a fair and equal opportunity to obtain the power which will be generated at the expense of the Federal Government. There is no intention of the Federal Government to enter widely into the power business. The truth is that under the language of the amendment which the committee first reported, and which, if the Bailey amendment is defeated, will be offered by the Senator from Louisiana, transmission lines could be built only for the sale of power in wholesale quantities. No authority is provided in the amendment as originally reported by the committee for any retail distribution of power.

Madam President, we talk of private enterprise, but let me say that the greatest thing which has ever come to the section of the South in which I have the honor to live has been the T. V. A. One of the greatest things the T. V. A. has done for that area has been to encourage and help the building of private enterprise. In that great section of our country we have more private enterprise and private business operating on a sound, stable, and prosperous basis than we ever had before. It is because of the advent of the T. V. A.

Madam President, I hope this amendment will be defeated. I hope the Senate will do nothing which might result in taking funds of all the people and giving to a certain group the benefits derived from the expenditure of such funds. I hope that by no act of the Senate will private power companies be given a fixed or vested interest in the power to be derived from flood-control projects.

I feel so deeply about this amendment, Madam President, that if it is adopted I, for one, will hope that the bill will never become law.

Mr. PEPPER obtained the floor.

Mr. WHITE. Madam President, will the Senator yield in order that I may make an inquiry?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. I wonder if it is the disposition of the Senator in charge of the bill to conclude consideration of the pending amendment this evening. It is now almost 5 o'clock. If my information is correct, amendments are to be offered to the committee amendment as modified. I think it is very dubious whether we can complete consideration of the pending matter in a short time.

Mr. OVERTON. I do not know of any amendments to be offered.

Mr. BAILEY. Madam President, I have received notice of three amendments to be offered.

Mr. OVERTON. Are they to be offered to the committee amendment as modified?

Mr. BAILEY. Yes. We can go ahead and vote, of course.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Madam President, I have an amendment which I intend to offer on my own behalf. I think it will protract the debate.

Mr. PEPPER. Madam President, I am in a position to advise Senators who are interested that what I have to say will not take more than 5 minutes, and will not prevent a vote being taken this afternoon.

Mr. WHITE. Madam President, if the Senator from Florida will further yield, it is my impression that there are amendments which will be offered and discussed. I do not believe that the amendment now pending can be disposed of until a substantially later time. In view of the fact that this is not the night before Christmas, but is the night before Thanksgiving, and that some Senators may desire to leave the city, I wonder if further consideration of the amendment could not go over until Friday.

Mr. OVERTON. I am glad to accept the suggestion.

Mr. BARKLEY. If there are several other amendments to be offered to the pending amendment, and several other speeches to be made, it is obvious that we cannot reach a vote on the amendment today. I wonder if we cannot enter into an agreement for a limitation of debate when we resume consideration of the amendment.

Mr. OVERTON. I hope so.

Mr. BARKLEY. I therefore will attempt to feel out the sentiment of the Senate and see whether it may be possible to get a vote on the Bailey amendment and all amendments thereto. Would 15 minutes be too much time?

Mr. BAILEY. Madam President, I can speak only for myself. I would not want more than 10 minutes, but there are some amendments.

Mr. BARKLEY. To the Bailey amendment?

Mr. BAILEY. Yes. I should like under the circumstances to have enough time to say whether they are agreeable or not. But I do not intend to make any argument.

Mr. BARKLEY. I think we might very well enter into a 15-minute limitation on the Bailey amendment and all amendments thereto. Therefore I ask unanimous consent that during the further consideration of the Bailey amendment, no Senator shall speak more than once or longer than 15 minutes.

Mr. BAILEY. I am willing to limit the debate to 5 o'clock, or until 10 minutes after 5.

Mr. BARKLEY. So am I, but I do not think we can get such a limitation. There are several Senators who wish to address the Senate. I am suggesting that during the further consideration of the Bailey amendment, or any amendment thereto, no Senator shall speak longer than 15 minutes.

Mr. BAILEY. I think that might result in a prolongation of the debate indefinitely, and I shall be very frank with the Senator. I should like to have a vote, and I am perfectly willing to have a vote by 10 minutes after 5, which will be 15 minutes from now. If the debate is to be prolonged and I must stay here, I may say that I had a great deal of work in the committee in the matter of the St. Lawrence seaway, and I came out of the committee after that morning's work, and without taking my seat, I found I had to speak. I have been proceeding all day. I can go a little while longer, but not much longer. That is my situation.

Mr. BARKLEY. I was basing my request on the suggestion that a number of other Senators desire to address the Senate, and also that two or three or four amendments are to be offered to the Senator's amendment. In that event, it is obvious we could not conclude the debate today.

Mr. BAILEY. That is correct.

Mr. BARKLEY. It was on that basis I was seeking to obtain a limitation of debate on the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MCFARLAND in the chair). Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Kentucky?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. May the request of the Senator from Kentucky be restated?

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask unanimous consent that during the further consideration of the pending amendment, known as the Bailey amendment, no Senator shall speak more than once or longer than 15 minutes on the amendment or any amendment thereto.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request?

Mr. AIKEN. As the Bailey amendment is an amendment to a committee amendment, can there be further amendments offered to the Bailey amendment?

Mr. BARKLEY. The Bailey amendment now occupies the status of a committee amendment, so that the inquiry propounded by the Senator may be answered in the affirmative.

Mr. AIKEN. The Senator means permission has been given to the committee to modify the amendment so as to include the Bailey amendment? Is that correct?

Mr. BAILEY. There was no permission in the committee, but I take it I can either agree to an amendment or not. I did not think there had been any rule to the contrary. I did not think there had been any rule to that effect. There may have been one since the Senator from Vermont came to the Senate.

Mr. OVERTON. There is no rule against a committee modifying its own amendment.

Mr. BARKLEY. I had understood from the Senator from Louisiana that the Bailey amendment had been put in such a position that it is a committee amendment.

Mr. OVERTON. It is, and is reported in lieu of the original amendment.

Mr. BARKLEY. It displaces the original amendment offered by the committee?

Mr. OVERTON. That is correct.

Mr. BARKLEY. So that it is an amendment in the first degree, and amendments to it would be in order.

Mr. AIKEN. That is the information I was seeking.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, it is understood that if the request for a limitation on debate shall be agreed to, we will recess at this time?

Mr. BARKLEY. I think that we might as well, in view of the situation. That is my purpose.

Mr. OVERTON. I wonder if we could conclude the debate by 2 o'clock Friday.

Mr. BARKLEY. I expect we have gotten about all we can get today in the way of an agreement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Kentucky? The Chair hears none, and the request is agreed to.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, is it the desire of our able leader to carry this subject over until Friday, or are we to have a session tomorrow?

Mr. BARKLEY. It is not my desire; I had hoped we might dispose of the amendment, but the situation is such that I think we must carry it over.

Mr. PEPPER. Very well. Then I shall desist. I should like to ask, if it is not inconsistent with the views of the leader, that I have the floor when we resume the discussion of this subject.

Mr. BARKLEY. I think that is not a very good practice in the Senate. There will be no difficulty about the Senator getting the floor.

Mr. PEPPER. Very well. At least I serve notice that I shall ask for the floor when we reassemble.

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, if it is in order, I desire to give notice now that when afforded the opportunity Friday I shall offer an amendment which would strike out on line 8, page 3, of the amendment the words "demanded or" and the words "within 3 years after," and to insert before the word "completion" the word "upon," so that the amendment of the Senator from North Carolina would at that place read as follows:

That unless 90 percent of the firm power produced at such projects shall be purchased upon completion of construction of such projects, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to construct transmission lines for the purpose of selling such power at wholesale.

Mr. MALONEY subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment concerning which I gave notice that I would offer Friday be now printed and lie on the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment will be received, printed, and lie on the table.

GRAVES COUNTY, KY., MEETS WAR BOND QUOTA FIRST DAY

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I have a telegram which I desire to read into the RECORD as an example and an inspiration not only to the Senate, but to all parts of the country. The telegram comes from Graves County, Ky., in which I was born. It is addressed to me from Mayfield, and is dated November 21:

Graves County went over its War bond quota first day.

That was the 21st.

Campaign was sponsored by the Lions Club, Rotary Club, Kiwanis Club.

The telegram is signed by Lara Barron and W. F. Foster. Miss Barron and Mr. Foster have been in charge of all the War bond drives in Graves County, and they have done a magnificent job in going beyond their quota every time bonds have been offered for sale. It is very

gratifying to me, as a native of the county, to be advised that on the first day of the present bond drive they have gone over their quota. That does not mean they are going to relax in their efforts to sell more bonds, but they were able on the first day to more than fill the quota assigned to the county, and it is a pleasure to me to read this telegram into the RECORD at this point.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. BARKLEY. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MCFARLAND in the chair) laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting several nominations in the Marine Corps, which were referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. BILBO, from the Committee on the District of Columbia:

Guy Mason, of the District of Columbia, to be a Commissioner of the District of Columbia for a term of 3 years, and until his successor is appointed and qualified (reappointment).

By Mr. CONNALLY, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Jefferson Caffery, of Louisiana, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to France; and

Waldo E. Bailey, of Mississippi, to be a Foreign Service officer of class 7, a secretary in Diplomatic Service and also a consul.

By Mr. HATCH, from the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys:

Richard McElligott, of Oregon, to be register of the land office at Roseburg, Oreg., terminating recess appointment, vice George Finley.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the calendar.

OFFICE OF WAR MOBILIZATION AND RECONVERSION

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Brig. Gen. Frank T. Hines, United States Army, to be Retraining and Reemployment Administrator.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. I ask that the nomination of General Hines be confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

THE JUDICIARY

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Charles H. Cashin, to be United States attorney for the western district of Wisconsin.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

CIVIL AERONAUTICS BOARD

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Harllee Branch, of Georgia, to be a member for the term of 6 years from January 1, 1945.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS

The legislative clerk read the nomination of William H. Burke, Jr., of Northampton, Mass., to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 4, with headquarters at Boston, Mass.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. I ask that the nomination be confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

THE COAST GUARD

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Coast Guard.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask that the nominations in the Coast Guard be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Coast Guard nominations are confirmed en bloc.

THE NAVY

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Harry L. Merring, to be rear admiral in the Navy on the retired list, for temporary service, to continue while serving as Deputy Chief of Industrial Readjustment Branch of the Office of Procurement and Material.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. I ask that the nomination be confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

THE MARINE CORPS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Marine Corps.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. I ask that the nominations in the Marine Corps be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations are confirmed en bloc.

That completes the calendar.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask that the President be immediately notified of all nominations this day confirmed, and all previous confirmations of nominations of which notice has not been given to the President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

RECESS TO FRIDAY

Mr. BARKLEY. As in legislative session, I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon on Friday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 1 minute p. m.) the Senate took a recess until Friday, November 24, 1944, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate November 22 (legislative day of November 21), 1944:

IN THE MARINE CORPS

Brig. Gen. Earl C. Long to be a major general in the Marine Corps, for temporary service, from the 7th day of January 1944.

Brig. Gen. Pedro del Valle to be a major general in the Marine Corps, for temporary service, from the 10th day of January 1944.

Brig. Gen. Louis E. Woods to be a major general in the Marine Corps, for temporary service, from the 10th day of September 1944.

Brig. Gen. Field Harris to be a major general in the Marine Corps, for temporary service, from the 10th day of September 1944.

Col. William T. Clement to be a brigadier general in the Marine Corps, for temporary service, from the 3d day of October 1942.

Col. Louis R. Jones to be a brigadier general in the Marine Corps, for temporary service, from the 4th day of October 1942.

Col. Joseph H. Fellows to be a brigadier general in the Marine Corps, for temporary service, from the 9th day of November 1944.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate November 22 (legislative day of November 21), 1944:

OFFICE OF WAR MOBILIZATION AND RECONVERSION

Brig. Gen. Frank T. Hines, United States Army, to be Retraining and Reemployment Administrator.

THE JUDICIARY

UNITED STATES ATTORNEY

Charles H. Cashin, to be United States attorney for the western district of Wisconsin.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

CIVIL AERONAUTICS BOARD

Harllee Branch, to be a member of the Civil Aeronautics Board, for the term of 6 years from January 1, 1945.

COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS

William H. Burke, Jr., to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 4, with headquarters at Boston, Mass.

IN THE NAVY

TEMPORARY SERVICE

Harry L. Merring to be a rear admiral in the Navy, on the retired list, for temporary service, to continue while serving as deputy chief of industrial readjustment branch of the Office of Procurement and Material.

IN THE MARINE CORPS

APPOINTMENTS IN THE MARINE CORPS

To be first lieutenant, to rank from September 1, 1939

William F. Hausman

To be second lieutenants, to rank from indicated dates

Jack Cosley, from February 9, 1942.
John W. Beebe, from February 9, 1942.
Kenneth D. Frazier, from March 12, 1942.
Arvid W. Blackmun, from March 12, 1942.
Clayton M. Canfield, from March 14, 1942.
Howard E. Cook, from March 14, 1942.
Taylor R. Roberts, from March 17, 1942.
Robert D. Bachtel, from March 25, 1942.
Robert F. Conley, from April 3, 1942.
John P. Long, from May 1, 1942.
Edwin E. Shifflett, from May 22, 1942.
Harold A. Langstaff, Jr., from June 19, 1942.
Gerald R. Graff, from June 19, 1942.
Ingram R. Rader, from July 13, 1942.
William A. Eddy, Jr., from August 7, 1943.
Warren R. Loney, from February 4, 1944.
Fred J. Kendall, from February 4, 1944.
Robert W. Tosch, from February 4, 1944.
Richard F. DeLamar III from May 2, 1944.
Robert P. Barnett, from May 2, 1944.
James E. Wallace, from May 2, 1944.
William E. Mack, from May 2, 1944.
Alfred A. Mannino, from May 2, 1944.
Stanley G. Raytinsky, Jr., from May 2, 1944.
Eugenous M. Hovatter, from July 26, 1944.
Howard F. Stevenson, from August 8, 1944.
John F. Graff, Jr., from August 8, 1944.

To be second lieutenants from August 8, 1944

Carl W. Hoffman
Leslie A. Gilson, Jr.
Joseph E. Fogg
Alfred A. Prusick
Ben E. Baker
Willmar M. Bledsoe
Frederick E. Malcolm

IN THE COAST GUARD

TEMPORARY SERVICE

Lyndon Spencer to be rear admiral while serving as assistant chief operations officer or in any other assignment for which the rank of rear admiral is authorized, to rank from October 1, 1944.

Robert Donohue to be rear admiral, to rank from June 30, 1942, while serving as chief, air sea rescue officer, or in any other assignment for which the rank of rear admiral is authorized.

Joseph F. Farley to be rear admiral to rank from November 1, 1943, while serving as chief personnel officer or in any other assignment for which the rank of rear admiral is authorized.

To be commodores while serving under the conditions specified, to rank from October 1, 1944

Frederick P. Dillon, while serving as Chief, Aids to Navigation Division, or in any other assignment for which the rank of commodore is authorized.

LeRoy Reinberg, while serving as commandant, Coast Guard Yard, Curtis Bay, Md., or in any other assignment for which the rank of commodore is authorized.

Norman B. Hall, while serving as vice chairman, Merchant Marine Council, or in any other assignment for which the rank of commodore is authorized.

Raymond T. McElligott, while serving as assistant chief personnel officer, or in any other assignment for which the rank of commodore is authorized.

William J. Keester, while serving as inspector in chief, or in any other assignment for which the rank of commodore is authorized.

Halert C. Shepheard, while serving as Chief, Merchant Marine Inspection Division, or in any other assignment for which the rank of commodore is authorized.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, NOVEMBER 22, 1944

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Thou who art the bearer of life eternal, infuse us with the nobility of giving thanks—the wealth which smiles upon us, which breathes in the air and glows in the sanctity of happy homes. Give us the hand which helps, the heart which cheers, and the spirit to carry on through unrewarding toil with an unyielding trust that Thou wilt order all things aright; let our works magnify Thy holy name, O Lord, our strength and our Redeemer.

O Thou who hast been our help in ages past and our hope in years to come, we bow at Thy altar beseeching Thee to bless our Republic with the mercy of grateful hearts; praising Thee for deliverance from national peril, for abundant harvests of field and orchard, and for all the fruitage of our Christian institutions. O crown us with the spirit that makes the load a little less heavy with more courage to go into the world with deathless hope and with a deep belief in man and with boundless faith in a good God. Thou whose love and sympathy came from a rent in Thine own heart and saw the wheels of inhumanity grind the hungry and the poor to dust and death, may there be no need of inscribing on the heart of our country the sublime rules of Christian service. May we minister most devoutly to those on our battle lines and to those dear ones whose lives have lost their greatest joy.

Bring selfish lives from shadow-lands of loss
Into the radiance of the Saviour's cross,
Where, in that gift, so precious, yet so lone,
Life finds its brotherhood and love its throne.

In our Redeemer's name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

RESIGNATION FROM COMMITTEE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following resignation, which was read by the Clerk:

NOVEMBER 16, 1944.

Hon. SAM RAYBURN,

Speaker, House of Representatives:

In view of the fact committee may begin further investigations which I could not later on participate in, believe best interests served if new man now entered into hearings. I therefore tender my resignation for your consideration as member Select Committee House of Representatives to Investigate Federal Communications Commission.

Sincerely,

WARREN J. MAGNUSON.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the resignation will be accepted.

There was no objection.

APPOINTMENT TO COMMITTEE

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of House Resolution 21, Seventy-eighth Congress, the Chair appoints as a member of the Select Committee to Conduct a Study and Investigation of the Organization, Personnel, and Activities of Federal Communications Commission the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PRIEST] to fill the existing vacancy thereon.

ADJOURNMENT OVER

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Friday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

THE LATE CAPT. JOHN S. BALDWIN

Mr. D'ALESANDRO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

Mr. D'ALESANDRO. Mr. Speaker, with deep regret, I wish to call to the attention of the membership of the House the loss sustained by our colleague the Honorable H. STREETT BALDWIN, of the Second District of Maryland, whose son was killed on November 11, 1944.

Capt. John S. Baldwin, who was a pilot, was taking a special course on the B–29's, and expected to go to the South Pacific in the near future. He was killed in an airplane accident at Clovis, N. Mex. The plane was out beyond the airfield when the trouble started, and while they could have bailed out they refrained from doing so in the hope that they could land the plane safely. However, in landing the plane turned over and burst into flames and 15 men were killed.

Another son, Lt. Harry W. Baldwin, was killed in the Tunisian theater of war on April 16, 1943.

I know that the Members of the House join with me in extending to our colleague and Mrs. Baldwin their deepest sympathy.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks on two matters and to include two radio broadcasts.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on December 7, after the reading of the Journal and the disposition of the legislative program and any other business on the Speaker's desk, I may address the House for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

SHORTAGE OF WAR SUPPLIES

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, some time ago General Marshall gave pictures of what was being done in the war effort. It is high time he came again. We now hear a great deal about the shortage of supplies and the shortage of war matériel. To my mind, it is inexcusable. After the Army landed on the Normandy beaches on D-day they saw what the fortifications were, they saw the thickness of the walls of the tunnels at Cherbourg and elsewhere. There is one thing that should be done. General Marshall should come before us so that the Congress can tell the people of the country what our military situation is at the present time. The situation needs explaining. The people of our country have lost faith. General Eisenhower prophesied at the end of last summer that the war would be over shortly. Mr. Churchill said last autumn that the war would be over soon. Obviously it is far from over. Something went wrong and General Eisenhower and the administration at Washington were strangely silent. You cannot blame the people for not continuing in war work if they think the war is practically over. For weeks after D-day General Eisenhower was strangely silent and Mr. Churchill in the House of Commons was blaming the press of the United States for their statements, forgetting his own. I said last September at London, England, that there was no excuse for delay in sending materials

of war to the fighting fronts. I still make that charge.

I hope, Mr. Speaker, you will extend an invitation to General Marshall to come before us and give us the whole picture. It is the only way by which we will get enough labor, in my opinion, to pursue the war to a successful end and quickly. Many lives are being lost because of the delay in getting the materials of war to our fighting forces. If you could see as I did the injured and dying in the hospitals, you would know exactly what I mean.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I ask unanimous consent to include an address by Mrs. Charles W. Tillett, assistant chairman, Democratic National Convention 1944; also an address by HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS, national committeewoman from the State of California, and an editorial from the News and Observer of North Carolina.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an article by Bill Cunningham.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Vermont?

There was no objection.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include an article by Raymond Moley.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. COSTELLO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include an address given by Mr. W. C. Mullendore, president of the Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. HOFFMAN. I ask unanimous consent that on Friday next at the conclusion of the legislative business and any other special orders I may proceed for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

FEDERAL CROP INSURANCE ACT

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 4911) to amend the Federal Crop Insurance Act.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 4911, with Mr. SPARKMAN in the chair,

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. LEMKE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. LEMKE: Page 2, line 1, after the word "lightning", insert the words "fire, excessive rain, snow, wildlife."

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEMKE. I yield.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. The committee has had an opportunity to examine the amendment and agreed to accept it.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the amendment will be agreed to.

There was no objection.

Mr. LEMKE. Mr. Chairman, I offer a further amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. LEMKE: Page 2, line 2, after the word "disease" strike out the comma, insert a period, and then strike out the balance of the sentence beginning with the word "quota" in line 2 and ending with the word "Board" in line 3.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Mr. Chairman, the committee also accepts that amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the amendment will be agreed to.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 2. That subsection (b) of section 508 of the Federal Crop Insurance Act, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"(b) To fix adequate premiums for insurance in the agricultural commodity or in cash, at such rates as the Board deems sufficient to cover claims for crop losses on such insurance and to establish within a period of 3 years a reasonable reserve against unforeseen losses. Such premiums shall be collected at such time or times, or shall be secured in such manner, as the Board may determine."

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN: Page 4, at the end of line 12, insert the following: "*Provided*, That, after the crop year of 1945, not more than a sum equivalent to 25 percent of the premiums collected in the preceding year (beginning calculation of premiums collected in the crop year of 1945) shall be used for administrative expense in any current operating year."

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this amendment is to place a definite limitation on the amount of money that can be spent for administrative expenses in the operation of the corporation. My amendment proposes to limit such administrative expenditures to 25 percent of the premiums collected in any one year; that is, the premiums collected in 1945 will be used as the basis for the administrative expenditures in 1946.

It may be possible that the 25-percent limitation I have placed in this amendment may be too low or too high, but one thing is quite definite as far as I am concerned and also as far as many Members who have expressed themselves to me are concerned, and that is that there should be a limitation on the amount of money any governmental agency, and particularly this one, can spend for administrative purposes. If the amount is too low it is my hope we can get more information before the bill goes to conference or is taken up in the Senate and make the necessary adjustments at that time.

It must be realized that this bill came here in haste after the reconvening of Congress and the members of the committee have not had an opportunity to get full and complete information from those in charge of the program as to the amount necessary to carry on the functions of crop insurance.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEMKE. I shall be pleased to yield.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. We all, of course, want to hold down the administrative costs as much as possible, but we do not want to be penny-wise and pound-foolish. I am afraid the limitation suggested by the gentleman in his amendment will not provide sufficient money to cover the administrative costs under the act.

I know the gentleman well enough to state that he wants to see the act succeed. The short investigation I have made shows that 45 percent of the premiums in ordinary insurance goes to administrative costs. In hail insurance some 35 to 40 percent of the premiums went into administrative costs. Taking the year 1943, under the Federal Crop Insurance Act, the total premiums collected amounted to $17,477,000. The Committee on Appropriations made an allowance for administrative costs of $3,572,000. As a matter of fact, the agency only used $6,448,000 of the appropriation, leaving an unexpended balance of $2,124,000. That figures around 37 percent of the premiums taken in during that year.

Of course, this program is in its infancy and we have not had an opportunity to demonstrate from actual experience just what the cost will be. The administrative costs will be reduced as the coverage increases because it takes a certain amount of overhead in each county whether you have service in that county covering a hundred policyholders or two or three thousand policyholders. I am perfectly willing to make a further study of this in order to determine, if we can, and arrive at some figure that is reasonable and fair and one that will not hamper the program.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Mr. Chairman, if this amendment is adopted, I hope that the Senate, before passing upon this provision in the bill, will make further study in order to arrive at a fair percentage of the premiums to be used for administrative costs, because I realize we have to keep the administrative costs down if we expect the Appropriations Committee to go along with this program. We want to put it upon a sound foundation.

I just wanted to make this explanation to the Committee, then I am willing to

abide by the judgment of the Committee with the hope that if the amendment is adopted the Senate will make a careful study in order to determine just what the percentage should be fixed at.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. There is no difference of opinion between the distinguished chairman of our committee and myself on wanting to have a sound program instituted under this act. If the program is not sound it is going to fail. If we want to do something to give the farmers an opportunity to insure their crops, we must now institute a sound program, actuarially and otherwise, and keep down the expense. If we can accomplish this, then we have done something constructive for everybody. Between now and the time the Senate takes this legislation up for consideration, I feel that the Committee on Agriculture should get together and study the actual needs and make estimates, submitting those figures to the Senate committee or to the conferees. We may make some revisions either up or down, and I recognize that that is necessary. So I hope that this amendment will be adopted in the interest of economy, and also in the interest of establishing a sound and self-sustaining program of insurance.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Does this bill provide for the payment of administrative expenses out of premiums paid?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. No; nor does my amendment provide for administrative expenses outside of premiums, but I say in my judgment that not more than a sum equivalent to 25 percent of the premiums collected can be used for administrative expenses.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Not more than 25 percent of the amount of the premiums paid?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Of the premiums collected in the preceding year can be used in the current year for administrative expenses.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Or an amount equal to 25 percent of the premiums paid.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Up to; not over 25 percent.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. An amount not to exceed 25 percent.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. That is right.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. That does not mean that the gentleman's amendment would provide that these administrative expenses should be paid out of the premiums?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. No; it does not mean that they are to be paid out of premiums, but the section to which my amendment is offered is as follows:

To fix adequate premiums for insurance in the agricultural commodity or in cash, at such rates as the Board deems sufficient to cover claims for crop losses on such insurance and to establish within a period of 8 years a reasonable reserve against unforeseen losses. Such premiums shall be collected at such time or times, or shall be secured in such manner, as the Board may determine.

Up to the present time all of the money for administrative expenses has been paid by the Government. What I am seeking to do is to hold down the administrative expense so that it will not exceed 25 percent of the premiums collected.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. This bill virtually provides for the payment of administrative expenses out of the Federal Treasury and not out of the premiums.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. That is existing law at the present time.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. And this bill does not change that?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. No.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has again expired.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 3 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. HOPE. I am in full sympathy with the gentleman's idea of holding the administrative expenses to the lowest point possible. I am not sure whether the figure of 25 percent which the gentleman's amendment carries is correct or not, but if I understand the gentleman he is not sure that this is absolutely the correct figure.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. That is correct.

Mr. HOPE. As I understand the gentleman's position, if it should develop later that that figure is not adequate to cover reasonable administrative costs, the gentleman is willing to agree to a larger figure if the Senate should increase that to a figure which does appear to be more in line with the information available then as to the facts?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. That is correct. I hope we will find the figure too high so that we can lower it, but if it is too low I want to make it so that the program will succeed. You will notice in my amendment I eliminated the crop year 1945, and I did that for a purpose so that they can go ahead and institute this new program. It may require more money. The limitation on the administrative expenses will begin for the crop year 1946.

Mr. HOPE. I think that is advisable.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 3. That subsection (c) of section 508 of the Federal Crop Insurance Act, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"(c) To adjust and pay claims for losses in the agricultural commodity or in cash, under rules prescribed by the Board: *Provided, however*, That if the total amount of approved claims for losses on any agricultural commodity for any year exceeds the total amount of premiums collected plus the accumulated premium reserves of the Corporation with respect to such commodity, such claims shall be paid on a pro rata reduced basis, but for the first 3 crop years with respect to which insurance has been in effect on any crop after the enactment of this act the payment shall not be reduced by more than 15 percent of the amount of the approved claim. The Corporation shall provide for the posting annually in each county at the county courthouse of a list of indemnities paid for losses on farms in such county. In the event that any claim for indemnity under the provisions of this title is denied by the Corporation, an action on such claim may be brought against the Corporation in the United States district court, or in any court of record of the State having general jurisdiction, sitting in the district or county in which the insured farm is located and jurisdiction is hereby conferred upon such district courts to determine such controversies without regard to the amount in controversy: *Provided*, That no suit on such claim shall be allowed under this section unless the same shall have been brought within 1 year after the date when notice of denial of the claim is mailed to and received by the claimant."

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SMITH of Ohio: On page 4, line 23, after "basis", strike out the comma and insert in lieu thereof a period, and strike out all thereafter down to and including the word "claim", in line 2, on page 5.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I need explain this amendment only briefly. This takes out of the bill the doubt as to who is going to pay for the cost of this program, except, of course, the administrative cost. As this bill is written, it opens the way for losses which must be met by the Government. My amendment simply strikes out that provision which provides for taking care of these losses by the Federal Treasury; in other words, if the administration of the agency operating the plan knows that there is no money to come from the Treasury for the payment of losses it will so operate it, if it goes into effect, that there will be no losses, if of course, that agency follows the law.

I do not believe it is necessary for me to explain this amendment any further.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. COOLEY. Is not the effect of the gentleman's amendment to make this Corporation merely a mutual insurance corporation? In other words, the indemnities would be paid altogether from premiums which had been paid in by the policyholders.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Correct.

Mr. COOLEY. Does the gentleman think the Corporation would be of much value to the farmers of the Nation under such circumstances, if it is made actuarially sound from the very beginning?

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. This has been tried for 5 years.

Mr. COOLEY. I should like to differ with the gentleman; it has not been tried on this basis. This is an entirely new approach to the problem and quite different from the original approach.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. I do not think it is a new approach to the problem. This is the same sort of bureaucratic setup as the other was. There is nothing fundamentally new whatever about it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, in my opinion this amendment would be the death knell to crop insurance. What we do here today is going to determine largely the policy of this Government with reference to the insurance of farm crops.

The bill provides that for the first 3 years the policy covers 75 percent of the loss of the average yield. During those 3 trial years, if the premiums are not sufficient to pay off 75 percent of the losses, then those losses cannot be reduced lower than 15 percent. That is, for the first 3-year period. We know that the crop-insurance program will have to struggle in the beginning before enough policyholders are brought in to make it a success. Every other insurance company had to struggle in the beginning and many of the insurance companies today are paying 100 percent of the first premiums collected. Fire insurance companies, I understand, are paying as much as 45 percent of the premium collected to agents who secure the business. After this initial period of 3 years the bill provides for the program to go upon a mutual basis. Then the premiums collected will have to take care of the indemnities. If the premiums are insufficient to take care of the 75 percent coverage, then the premium will have to be prorated among the policyholders. Let us give this bill a fair test.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FLANNAGAN. I yield.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Does not the gentleman feel that the adoption of this amendment will mean the killing of the bill?

Mr. FLANNAGAN. That is what it will mean.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. That is my opinion.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. That is just what it will mean.

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FLANNAGAN. I yield.

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. Is it not a fact that the adoption of this amendment will make every farmer a coinsurer for all the rest of the people in his neighborhood, and he is going to stay out of that type of insurance?

Mr. FLANNAGAN. That is right.

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. This amendment will absolutely destroy the bill if it is adopted.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. That is right. I do not know of any better way to destroy the bill than to adopt this amendment. I hope it will be the pleasure of the Committee to vote it down.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FLANNAGAN. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Is it not a fact that this provision, as it is written in the bill, does open the way to losses which would have to be paid by the Government?

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Oh, there may be a small loss for the first 3 years. The bill, however, does not open the way to losses. The farmers have no control over their losses. This bill provides for a 75-percent coverage, but in no case to exceed the actual cost or amount that the farmer has invested in the crop at the time it is destroyed. For the first 3 years it guarantees to the farmer, who takes insurance, a 75-percent coverage, with a limitation that that coverage cannot be reduced more than 15 percent. Thereafter the indemnities will have to be paid out of the premiums.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. But it says to be reduced not more than 15 percent.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. That is right. It cannot be reduced to less than 15 percent of the amount of the approved claim.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. But the gentleman says there is no possible way that this provision opens the way for losses. I would like to have the answer in the RECORD.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Yes; I say that and I stand by that statement. This will not open the way to losses any more than striking it out will open the way to losses. The loss is occasioned by some act over which the farmer has no control. The farmer does not bring about the loss.

The only thing the provision does is to guarantee to the farmers that for the first 3 years his loss cannot be reduced to an amount less than 15 percent of the approved claim.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SMITH].

The amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 4. That subsection (e) of section 508 of the Federal Crop Insurance Act, as amended, is hereby repealed.

SEC. 5. That section 518 of the Federal Crop Insurance Act, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 518. 'Agricultural commodity,' as used in this title, means wheat, cotton, flax, corn, tobacco, rice, peanuts, soybeans, sugar beets, citrus fruits, tame hay, or any other agricultural commodity determined by the Board pursuant to subsection (a) (2) of section 508 of this title, or any one or more of such commodities, as the context may indicate."

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment which is at the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN: On page 5, line 22, after the word "corn", insert "oats, barley, rye."

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Mr. Chairman, the committee will accept the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

There was no objection.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. On yesterday a great many commodity amendments were accepted and made a part of subparagraph 2 on page 3. I am wondering if there is some way by unanimous consent, by which all amendments and commodities that were adopted on page 3, can now be accepted without having to offer separate amendments.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. We will be happy to agree to that, because I do not think any one of those amendments changes the bill in any respect. The general language following the enumeration of crops mentioned in section 1, would certainly cover these other farm commodities.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Will the gentleman make that unanimous-consent request now?

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all amendments to subsection 2, of section 1, adding commodities, be consolidated and appear in the bill after the word "hay" on page 3, line 8.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, the gentleman means by that request that all those commodity amendments that were accepted will be included in the proper place in section 5?

Mr. FLANNAGAN. They would first appear on page 3, subsection 2, after the word "hay", line 8. Then they would appear again in line 23 on page 5, after the word "hay."

The CHAIRMAN. May the Chair ask the gentleman from Virginia if he intends to include the amendment made at the point following citrus fruits, and also the amendment with reference to dried beans?

Mr. FLANNAGAN. That is correct, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is not advised that they come in with the other commodity amendments. They appear in the same position as on page 3.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. That is correct.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. FLANNAGAN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I do not wish to unnecessarily take up any time of the House. However, a question arose here on the floor yesterday upon which I am constrained to comment briefly.

The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY] was addressing the House. He graciously yielded to me for the following question:

The gentleman assures us that this program will not become compulsory. What about the triple A? We were assured that the triple A would not become compulsory.

To this the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY] replied:

I do not agree with the gentleman. The Triple A is not compulsory in any respect. The farmer may completely ignore all of the provisions of the Triple A and go ahead and manage his own business. The Government merely offered some compensation to those conserving the topsoil of American farms.

I then asked the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY]:

What about the Supreme Court decision relating to the wheat-penalty case?

The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY] refused to make any answer to this question.

Now, I assert that it is utterly false for anyone to make the claim that the Triple A program is not compulsory. The Supreme Court in the wheat penalty case specifically and unequivocally ruled that a farmer who raised more wheat than the Triple A said he could raise had to pay a penalty of something like 49 cents per bushel on the excess.

It so happens that I am one of the persons over whose head now hangs a penalty for raising more wheat than the Triple A said I could raise. And, mind you, the law providing for the penalty was not passed until sometime in the summer following the fall when the wheat was sowed. The law was clearly retroactive.

I am not complaining about the money that is involved in the wheat penalty levied against me. That is as nothing. But to me and to every farmer who has had a penalty levied against him for raising wheat in excess of that allowed by the Triple A, and who in the future might wish to raise more wheat than allowed by it, this New Deal farm program is as compulsory as anything can be. To us it is tyranny of the same sort as that practiced by Hitler and Stalin. There is no essential difference.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. I yield.

Mr. COOLEY. Was not the wheat-control program imposed upon the wheat farmers after a referendum had been conducted throughout the country in the wheat-growing area and two-thirds of the farmers were required to vote before it could be invoked?

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. No; that is not correct; two-thirds of the farmers did not even participate in the program. The gentleman ought to know that.

Mr. COOLEY. How could any control program be imposed upon them?

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Here are some of the data relating to the strange device, something wholly foreign to our form of government and way of life, that provided for the so-called referendum on wheat quotas:

Total number of farmers in the United States, 6,096,799.

Total number of wheat farmers in the United States, 1,780,000.

Total number of wheat farmers with more than 15 acres who were eligible to vote on the wheat penalties, 970,000.

Only about 15 percent, or 1 in 6 farmers in the United States, was permitted to vote on the wheat penalties.

Only 54 percent of the wheat farmers in the United States were allowed to vote.

Only 31 percent, or 559,630, wheat farmers voted.

The ayes in that referendum were 453,569. The nays were 160,601.

So that only about 7 percent of the total number of farmers in the United States voted for the penalty.

Local and country Triple A committeemen and officials had complete control of the voting. Local A. A. A. committeemen sat on the election board. Local committeemen and the county chairman of the A. A. A. selected members to fill any vacancies on the board.

Accordingly, the local committeemen and county chairman of the Triple A said who was eligible to vote, did the challenging, counted the votes, and gave out the returns.

Without reflecting in the least upon the integrity and good intentions of the Triple A officials and employees, it must be said that the manner in which the wheat quota referendum was held is not in accordance with the time-honored practices relating to voting on public questions that had been in vogue in this country up to the advent of the New Deal since the formation of the Republic.

Many other gross irregularities in that procedure could be pointed out.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. I yield.

Mr. HOPE. Does the gentleman contend that there is any way by which this program can be made compulsory without further action by Congress?

Mr. SMITH of Oho. Yes; I contend that there is a way by which this crop-insurance program can in effect be made compulsory without further action by Congress. In the first place, it is well known that the New Deal administration has little regard for the Constitution and does not hesitate to circumvent the statutes or construe them to its own liking whenever it serves its purpose to do so. Secondly, this program will be operated through the Triple A, which, if we may judge from past experience with that Federal agency, may not hesitate to use the power it already possesses over the farmers to pressure them into insuring their crops.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. I yield.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I wish to call the gentleman's attention to the fact that with all this wet nursing there has never been a month during the last 2 years in which wheat has even been at parity price with all the billions that have been poured into this program.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. I gladly accept that statement as being correct.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD immediately following the unanimous-consent request of the gentleman from Virginia.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, a good, sound crop-insurance program is one of the pillars of a prosperous and permanent agriculture. Many of us found it necessary last spring to vote against the continuation of the old plan of insurance which was far too costly to the taxpayers of America, and which did not meet the needs of the average farmer.

Private insurance companies cannot assume the risk of covering a large devastated area of crops localized as such devastation usually is through hail storms and the like.

Personally, I am much opposed to our Government entering any field which can satisfactorily be taken care of by private business but the field of crop insurance is so vast and so hazardous that proper coverage cannot be obtained by the average farmer.

This is well illustrated by the high premium rates which private companies are forced to charge for coverage against hail storms, a premium rate which practically makes it impossible for the average farmer to insure his crop in my home township.

The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN] has offered an amendment which was accepted this afternoon and which provides that the administrative expenses in connection with the operation of this crop insurance program will be held down beneath an amount equal to 25 percent of the yearly income from premiums.

This limitation assures to the Congress and to the people of the United States that this program will be operated as nearly as possible on a pay-as-you-go basis.

We all of us want to see a sound crop-insurance program and I feel that this bill as written today, especially including the amendment proposed by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN] which was adopted, will form the basis of that sound program.

It is my hope that this proposed legislation will pass this House by a large majority and be enacted into law shortly.

The Chairman, there being no further amendments, under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and Mr. COOPER having assumed the chair as Speaker pro tempore, Mr. SPARKMAN, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union reported that the Committee having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 4911) to amend the Federal Crop-Insurance Act pursuant to House Resolution 605, he reported the same back to the House with sundry amendments adopted in the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not the Chair will put them en grosse.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. TARVER) there were—ayes, 102; nays, 5.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground there is no

quorum present and make the point of order that there is not a quorum present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Obviously a quorum is not present. The roll call is automatic. The Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 255, nays 16, not voting 160, as follows:

[Roll No. 116]

YEAS—255

Abernethy	Flannagan	Murray, Wis.
Allen, Ill.	Folger	Myers
Allen, La.	Forand	Newsome
Andersen, H. Carl	Fuller	Norman
	Furlong	Norrell
Anderson, Calif.	Gathings	Norton
Anderson, N. Mex.	Gearhart	O'Brien, Mich.
	Gerlach	O'Hara
Andresen, August H.	Gifford	O'Toole
	Gillespie	Outland
Andrews, Ala.	Gillette	Pace
Andrews, N. Y.	Goodwin	Patton
Angell	Gordon	Peterson, Fla.
Arends	Gore	Peterson, Ga.
Arnold	Gorski	Phillips
Auchincloss	Graham	Pittenger
Baldwin, Md.	Grant, Ala.	Ploeser
Baldwin, N. Y.	Gregory	Plumley
Barrett	Griffiths	Pratt, Joseph M.
Bates, Ky.	Gross	
Beall	Gwynne	Price
Beckworth	Hagen	Priest
Bennett, Mich.	Hale	Ramspeck
Bennett, Mo.	Hall, Edwin Arthur	Randolph
Bishop		Rankin
Blackney	Halleck	Reece, Tenn.
Bland	Hancock	Reed, Ill.
Bloom	Harness, Ind.	Reed, N. Y.
Bonner	Harris, Ark.	Richards
Boren	Hart	Rivers
Brehm	Hays	Robertson
Brooks	Herter	Robinson, Utah
Brown, Ga.	Hess	Robsion, Ky.
Brown, Ohio	Hill	Rockwell
Brumbaugh	Hoch	Rodgers, Pa.
Bryson	Holmes, Mass.	Rogers, Mass.
Buck	Hope	Rohrbough
Burch, Va	Horan	Rooney
Burdick	Hull	Rowe
Camp	Izac	Sadowski
Canfield	Jarman	Sasscer
Cannon, Mo.	Jeffrey	Sauthoff
Carrier	Jenkins	Schwabe
Carter	Jennings	Scrivner
Case	Jensen	Shafer
Celler	Johnson, Anton J.	Sheridan
Chapman		Simpson, Ill.
Chiperfield	Johnson, Okla.	Simpson, Pa.
Church	Judd	Smith, Maine
Clason	Kearney	Smith, Va.
Clevenger	Kefauver	Smith, W. Va.
Cochran	Kerr	Smith, Wis.
Cole, Mo.	Kinzer	Snyder
Cole, N. Y.	Kirwan	Sparkman
Colmer	Kunkel	Spence
Cooley	LaFollette	Springer
Cooper	Lane	Stanley
Courtney	Larcade	Stefan
Cox	Lea	Stevenson
Cravens	LeFevre	Stockman
Crawford	Lemke	Sullivan
Crosser	Lewis	Talbot
Curtis	Luce	Talle
D'Alesandro	Ludlow	Taylor
Daughton, Va.	McConnell	Tibbott
Davis	McCord	Torrens
Day	McCormack	Troutman
Delaney	McCowen	Voorhis, Calif.
Dickstein	McGregor	Vursell
Dilweg	McMillan, S. C.	Wadsworth
Dingell	McMillen, Ill.	Walter
Domengeaux	McMurray	Wasielewski
Dondero	McWilliams	Weaver
Doughton, N. C.	Maas	Weichel, Ohio
Dworshak	Madden	Welch
Eaton	Manasco	Whitten
Elliott	Martin, Iowa	Whittington
Ellis	Martin, Mass.	Wigglesworth
Ellison, Md.	Mason	Willey
Ellsworth	Merrow	Wilson
Elmer	Michener	Winstead
Elston, Ohio	Miller, Nebr.	Wolcott
Engle, Calif.	Mills	Wolfenden, Pa.
Fellows	Monkiewicz	Woodruff, Mich.
Fenton	Morrison, La.	Woodrum, Va.
Fish	Mott	Wright
Fitzpatrick	Murdock	Zimmerman

NAYS—16

Buffett	Kleberg	Smith, Ohio
Compton	McGehee	Sundstrom
Disney	May	Taber
Hoffman	Miller, Conn.	Tarver
Jones	Miller, Mo.	
Kean	Sheppard	

NOT VOTING—160

Barden	Hare	Murphy
Barry	Harless, Ariz.	Murray, Tenn.
Bates, Mass.	Hartley	O'Brien, Ill.
Bell	Hébert	O'Brien, N. Y.
Bender	Heffernan	O'Connor
Bolton	Heidinger	O'Konski
Boykin	Hendricks	O'Neal
Bradley, Mich.	Hinshaw	Patman
Bradley, Pa.	Hobbs	Pfeifer
Buckley	Hoeven	Philbin
Bulwinkle	Holifield	Poage
Burchill, N. Y.	Holmes, Wash.	Poulson
Burgin	Howell	Powers
Busbey	Jackson	Pracht, C. Frederick
Butler	Johnson, Calvin D.	
Byrne	Johnson, Ind.	Rabaut
Cannon, Fla.	Johnson, J. Leroy	Ramey
Capozzoli	Johnson, Luther A.	Rees, Kans.
Carlson, Kans.	Johnson, Lyndon B.	Rizley
Carson, Ohio	Johnson, Ward	Rolph
Chenoweth	Jonkman	Rowan
Clark	Kee	Russell
Coffee	Keefe	Sabath
Costello	Kelley	Satterfield
Cunningham	Kennedy	Scanlon
Curley	Keogh	Schiffler
Dawson	Kilburn	Scott
Dewey	Kilday	Short
Dies	King	Slaughter
Dirksen	Klein	Somers, N. Y.
Douglas	Knutson	Starnes, Ala.
Drewry	Lambertson	Stearns, N. H.
Durham	Landis	Stewart
Eberharter	Lanham	Stigler
Engel, Mich.	LeCompte	Sumner, Ill.
Fay	Lesinski	Sumners, Tex.
Feighan	Lynch	Thomas, N. J.
Fernandez	McKenzie	Thomas, Tex.
Fisher	McLean	Thomason
Fogarty	Magnuson	Tolan
Ford	Mahon	Towe
Fulbright	Maloney	Treadway
Fulmer	Mansfield, Mont.	Vincent, Ky.
Gale	Mansfield, Tex.	Vinson, Ga.
Gallagher	Marcantonio	Vorys, Ohio
Gamble	Merritt	Ward
Gavin	Miller, Pa.	Weiss
Gibson	Monroney	Wene
Gilchrist	Morrison, N. C.	West
Gillie	Mruk	Whelchel, Ga.
Gossett	Mundt	White
Granger		Wickersham
Grant, Ind.		Winter
Green		Wolverton, N. J.
Hall, Leonard W.		Worley

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

General pairs:

Mr. Hare with Mr. Knutson.
Mr. Barry with Mr. Hoeven.
Mr. Wickersham with Mr. Dirksen.
Mr. Heffernan with Mr. Kilburn.
Mr. Coffee with Mr. Ramey.
Mr. Byrne with Mr. Carlson of Kansas.
Mr. Lesinski with Mr. Rizley.
Mr. Keogh with Mr. Powers.
Mr. O'Connor with Mr. Hartley.
Mr. Lynch with Mrs. Bolton.
Mr. Rabaut with Mr. Gillie.
Mr. O'Neal with Mr. Grant of Indiana.
Mr. Vinson of Georgia with Mr. Johnson of Indiana.
Mr. Bulwinkle with Mr. Wolverton of New Jersey.
Mr. Pfiefer with Mr. Chenoweth.
Mr. Hendricks with Mr. Gamble.
Mr. Somers of New York with Mr. Cunningham.
Mr. Holifield with Mr. LeCompte.
Mr. Boykin with Mr. Keefe.
Mr. Curley with Mr. Jonkman.
Mr. Fogarty with Mr. Engel of Michigan.
Mr. Drewry with Mr. Mundt.
Mr. Mansfield of Texas with Mr. Rees of Kansas.
Mr. Hobbs with Mr. Short.
Mr. Philbin with Mr. Thomas of New Jersey.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The doors were opened.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Mr. Speaker——

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Virginia desire recognition in connection with the bill just passed?

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert at this point in the RECORD certain data which I thought had been inserted during the consideration of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

(The matter referred to follows:)

ESSENTIAL PROVISION OF H. R. 4911, TO AMEND THE FEDERAL CROP INSURANCE ACT

1. Insurance is authorized beginning with the 1945 crop on wheat, cotton, and flax. Flax was added in one of the later committee drafts of the bill. Flax is grown in areas where wheat is grown and many farmers produce both crops. The two crops are subject to many of the same hazards. It is probable that the insurance contract and related forms for wheat could readily be adapted to flax insurance.

2. The insurance coverage, in addition to being limited to 75 percent of the average yield for the insured farm, would be limited also under this bill to the investment in the crop. This additional limitation will provide more conservative insurance. It is believed that this limitation will apply most frequently when the insured crop is abandoned because of the smaller investment in a crop that is not completed. In such cases it may reduce the indemnity owed to the insured to a considerable extent and for the Corporation as a whole it should reduce the amount of losses paid by a rather large amount. At the same time it would not work a hardship in the insured farmer, because where the crop is abandoned the insured does not have the expense of carrying the crop to completion and oftentimes is enabled to use the land for a substitute crop. It has become more and more apparent in recent years that the present plan of insurance provided disproportionately large insurance in cases of abandoned crops and the Corporation had devised a somewhat different plant to meet this problem under the original legislation. An outline of this problem is given in the 1943 annual report of the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation (p. 9).

The insurance plan used in the past has been based on the assumption that the productivity of the farm in the past is the best advance indication of what it should produce in the year of insurance and therefore the history of yields on the farm was used as the basis of the coverage. However, the yield of the crop in the year of insurance will also be substantially influenced by the amount of fertilizer used, the extent and character of the preparation of the soil and the care of the crop. Using the investment as one basis of coverage these factors will be reflected in the amount of insurance protection.

Another feature of H. R. 4911 that would provide a more conservative coverage and eliminate overinsurance is the repealing of the provision in the cotton insurance relative to loss of cottonseed. Under that provision both premiums and indemnities were increased by a certain formula to cover loss

of cottonseed. The increase in 1943 was 20 percent. The continuation of that provision for cottonseed would have been inconsistent with the provision in the bill limiting the coverage to the investment in the crop.

3. The bill authorizes a trial of insurance on certain crops for a period of 3 years in not to exceed 20 representative counties for each crop. This provision covers corn, tobacco, rice, peanuts, soybeans, sugar beets, citrus fruits, tame hay, and any other agricultural commodity, if sufficient actuarial data are available, as determined by the Board. The insurance coverage may be the same as provided for wheat, cotton, and flax, or may be a percentage, not in excess of 75 percent, of the investment in the crop. The Corporation shall report to Congress the results of its operations as to each crop.

The Corporation, under the present act, has authority to conduct research work relative to other crops, but much can be learned from an experiment that cannot be learned from studies. It would seem that provision for a trial program on a small scale, following the research work, would be a sound approach toward extending crop insurance to other crops. Much has to be learned by experience and can be learned at less cost to the Government through a small experiment than through a broad program of insurance available to all farmers. While provision is made for trial in 20 counties it is not contemplated that more counties will be used than is necessary for a satisfactory test.

4. H. R. 4911 provides that insurance will not be provided in any county unless applications are filed for insurance on 100 farms or if less than 100 farms on at least one-third of the farms normally producing the crops subject to insurance. There is a qualifying provision, however, that some farms in such counties may be insured if they are in a local producing area bordering on a county with a crop-insurance program.

It was believed that this provision would accomplish two ends. First, it would reduce the expenses by eliminating insurance where the volume of business is small and the administrative cost per contract consequently high; and second, it would induce farmers who wanted insurance to help sell the idea of insurance to other farmers in their community. In this respect it would introduce something of a mutual or cooperative feature. The Corporation in the past has had many counties with very small participation both in absolute numbers and in relative proportion to the number of farms in the county. No minimum participation requirements have been made previously because the program was new and A. A. A. offices were available in all counties for local administration.

5. H. R. 4911 provides for the establishment of premiums that are deemed adequate to cover crop losses and to provide in 3 years a reasonable reserve against unforeseen losses. The original legislation provided for separate premium rates for each farm based in part on the crop-loss experience for such farm. It is believed that in many cases accidental factors so affected the crop-loss experience for individual farms that premium rates so computed did not properly reflect the probability of future losses. This formula has, therefore, been removed from the legislation and the Corporation would be given broad authority as to the method of determining the appropriate premium rate.

6. H. R. 4911 provides that if in any year the premiums collected and reserves applicable to any crop are not adequate to meet the losses on the crop, the amount available is to be prorated over all claims, except that for the first 3 years insurance is in effect with respect to any crop after the enactment of the legislation, no claim would be reduced by more than 15 percent.

After that 3-year period the indemnified losses each year on each crop would be limited to the premium collected and the accumulated reserves. Insurance would be less attractive with this provision because the insured would never know exactly how much protection he had. It was believed, however, that other changes in the legislation would improve the loss experience so that the reduction by proration would not be large and that this could be demonstrated in 3 years. During those 3 years the limitation of 15 percent on the reduction of claims by proration would provide the insured with a more definite amount of insurance protection.

7. Provision is made for giving local publicity to the losses paid on individual farms by posting annually in each county at the county court house a list of indemnities paid for losses on farms in the county.

Since under the proration provision the amount which an insured may collect will depend to some extent on the losses paid to other farmers, it was believed that each insured farmer was entitled to know what indemnities were paid to other insured farmers.

8. H. R. 4911 provides that legal action on claims may be brought not only in the United States district courts as formerly but in State courts of record.

The original legislation provided that claims might be brought only in United States courts so that more uniformity of interpretation might be obtained. The change was proposed by the committee with the thought that State courts would be more accessible or convenient to the insured.

9. H. R. 4911 gives the Corporation definite authority to limit (which means also refuse) insurance in any county or area, or on any farm, on the basis of the insurance risk involved.

TABLE 1.—*Federal crop-insurance experience—United States summary by years, as of June 30, 1944*

Commodity and crop year	Farms insured [1]		Indemnities	Insured acreage	Insured production	Commodity basis			Monetary basis			
	Insurance written	Insurance in force				Premiums	Indemnities	Surplus or deficit (−)	Premiums	Indemnities	Gain or loss from commodity transactions	Surplus or deficit (−)
Wheat:	*Number*	*Number*	*Number*	*Acres*	*Bushels*	*Bushels*	*Bushels*	*Bushels*				
1939		165,775	55,932	7,010,390	60,826,075	6,670,315	10,163,899	−3,493,584	$3,410,940.10	$5,601,561.79	−$1,417.71	−$2,192,039.40
1940	379,710	360,596	112,762	12,754,834	108,284,574	13,796,798	22,898,147	−9,102,349	9,155,062.21	13,694,263.62	−175,225.59	−4,714,427.00
1941	420,940	371,390	130,774	11,734,263	104,306,380	12,643,051	18,857,243	−6,214,192	7,096,366.64	18,925,433.85	4,182,654.71	−7,646,412.50
1942	504,047	400,043	108,368	[2]9,630,265	88,063,150	8,769,715	10,574,927	−1,805,212	8,447,498.18	13,666,902.68	1,738,922.15	−3,480,482.35
1943	487,663	357,733	133,076	[2]8,148,800	75,264,000	8,035,124	13,209,955	−5,174,831	10,625,480.33	19,705,072.29	912,775.32	−8,166,816.64
Total wheat		1,655,537	540,912	49,278,552	436,744,179	49,915,003	75,704,171	−25,789,168	38,735,347.46	71,593,234.23	6,657,708.88	−26,200,177.89
Cotton:					*Pounds*	*Pounds*	*Pounds*	*Pounds*				
1942		169,072	47,744	2,816,462	407,611,601	31,435,750	52,536,269	−21,100,519	6,302,938.89	11,254,151.87	207,840.90	−4,743,372.08
1943		164,998	40,632	[2]2,690,279	[2]386,690,312	30,744,370	56,800,979	−26,056,609	6,852,495.82	13,006,746.01	−125,795.40	−6,280,045.59
Total cotton		334,070	88,376	5,506,741	794,301,913	62,180,120	109,337,248	−47,157,128	13,155,434.71	24,260,897.88	82,045.50	−11,023,417.67
Other charges												−3,448.00
Total		1,989,607	629,288	54,785,293					51,890,782.17	95,854,132.11	6,739,754.38	−37,227,043.56

[1] Includes duplication where both landlord and tenant are insured.
[2] Estimated.

TABLE 2.—*Summary of administrative expenses by appropriations, as at June 30, 1944*

Fiscal year—	Net appropriations [1]	Expenditures						Savings
		Federal Crop Insurance Corporation			Cooperating agencies		Total expenditures	
		General	Storage	Total	Agricultural Adjustment Agency	Other	Total	
1938	$965,000	$234,546.07		$234,546.07			$234,546.07	$730,453.93
1939	5,000,000	1,648,390.41	$305,621.27	1,954,011.68	$2,245,743.31	$151,580.77	4,351,335.76	648,664.24
1940	5,823,200	1,320,437.79	858,317.17	2,178,754.96	3,280,167.88	191,916.17	5,650,839.01	172,360.99
1941	5,523,200	1,148,169.32	865,588.89	2,013,758.21	2,814,439.96	200,737.64	5,028,935.81	494,264.19
1942	8,559,827	1,598,212.74	−178,856.96	1,419,355.78	5,123,260.67	232,994.08	6,775,610.53	1,784,216.47
1943	8,572,954	1,352,122.05	−57,720.33	1,294,401.72	4,884,579.00	269,641.07	6,448,621.79	2,124,332.21
12-112/3000.017	550	494.22		494.22			494.22	55.78
1944	3,150,000	905,708.10	44,109.43	949,817.53	770,000.00	17,272.00	787,272.00	1,737,089.53	1,412,910.47
Total	37,594,731	8,208,080.70	1,837,059.47	10,045,140.17	19,118,190.82	1,064,141.73	20,182,332.55	30,227,472.72	7,367,258.28

[1] Adjusted to reflect reappropriations: $500,000, 1939 to 1940; $100,000, 1940 to 1941; $350,000, 1944 to 1945.

NOTE.—See p. 3 of annual report for reduction in cost per insured farm.

[From report of the Wheat Crop Insurance Consulting Committee, p. 37]

COMPARISON WITH FIRE INSURANCE COMPANIES

A comparison of the ratio of the operating expenses of the Corporation with the ratio of expenses of the 18 largest stock fire insurance companies operating in the United States, each having premiums written in 1940 of more than $10,000,000, as shown in the reports of Alfred M. Best Co., and with the ratio of expenses of approximately 372 stock fire insurance companies and 175 mutual fire insurance companies, as set out in the Spectator Yearbook, Fire and Marine, 1940, 1941, and 1942, shows the following:

TABLE A.—*Percentage of expense to premiums*

	Federal Crop Insurance Corporation	18 largest stock fire companies	371-372 stock fire companies	168-176 mutual fire companies
	Percent	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*
1939	54.5	51.3	50.6	36.1
1940	34.9	48.7	47.8	36.2
1941	33.2	46.6	45.6	32.3
Aggregate for 3 years	38.5	48.7	47.7	34.7

"Premiums written" for the corporation represents the bushels of wheat collected from farmers (in dollars) less cancelations, plus the part of the congressional appropriation used for expenses. For the private companies it represents gross premiums written less cancelations and reinsurance.

"Expenses incurred" for the corporation includes that part of the congressional appropriation used for underwriting (operating) expenses, including loss adjustment expense, and excludes investment (wheat) expense. For the private companies it includes, with underwriting expense, loss adjustment expense, and excludes investment expense.

From the standpoint of the operation of an insurance business, the administrative expenses of the corporation over the first 3 years compare favorably with those of the fire-insurance companies, which have generally operated over long periods.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

PROGRAM FOR THE BALANCE OF THE WEEK

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I wish to announce for the information of the House, so that the Members will know, what the program for the remainder of the week and the early part of next week will be, and so that they may govern themselves accordingly.

We will adjourn over tomorrow. That has already been agreed upon. The next order of business will be consideration of a rule on the so-called road bill which will be all for today.

On Friday next the road bill will come up under general debate. There will be no debate on that bill under the 5-minute rule. The road bill will then go over until Tuesday next for consideration under the 5-minute rule.

On Monday we will consider bills on the Consent Calendar. My announcement now does not constitute a statement of the program for next week but just covers the road bill so that the Members who go home for Thanksgiving may govern themselves in accordance with the statement I have just made that nothing controversial in relation to the road bill will come up before Tuesday next.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. COMPTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include a letter from the South Pacific.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a speech I made.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. WEICHEL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a news item.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. McGEHEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a letter from the American Farm Bureau Federation and one from the National Grange.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

FEDERAL-AID ROAD ACT

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 654, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4915) to amend and supplement the Federal-Aid Road Act, approved July 11, 1916, as amended and supplemented, to authorize appropriations for the post-war construction of highways and bridges, to eliminate hazards at railroad grade crossings, to provide for the immediate preparation of plans and acquisition of rights-of-way, and for other purposes. That after debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed 3 hours to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and the ranking minority member of the Committee on Roads, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the reading of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the same to the House with such amendments as shall have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I yield at this time 30 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH].

Mr. Speaker, as has been observed, this resolution proposes to make in order consideration of the so-called road bill, H. R. 4915. It is an open rule, which means that the bill will be considered under the general rules of the House.

There has been some difference of opinion with respect to this bill, but all Members will have the opportunity to offer amendments and have them considered where they are germane to the bill. Because of the tremendous amount of money involved, an authorization of Federal expenditures to the extent of a billion and a half dollars, and because of the importance of the subject matter and general interest, your Committee on Rules suggests that 3 hours of general debate be had. It is my understanding that since the Committee on Rules heard members of the Committee on Agriculture on the application for the rule, that differences then existing between members of that committee have been largely reconciled by agreement, and that the committee in charge of the bill will offer those amendments when read under the 5-minute rule.

It is not my purpose or desire to discuss the merits of the bill. The committee handling the measure has spent a great deal of time in its consideration, and are well informed. They will be able to answer all questions and clear up all doubts that may be upon the minds of the Members of this body.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH] for 30 minutes.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 12 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, this is one of the post-war planning bills. It is brought to the House by unanimous vote of the Committee on Rules as a part of the program to solve the most far-reaching problem affecting the destiny of America with which this House and its Members and the American people are confronted.

Some people might differ with that statement. They might say that the war is the greatest issue with which we are confronted. I submit that we are in the process of solving that issue thoroughly, efficiently, and rapidly. We are on the march to victory on land, sea, and air. It is merely a question of time when we will achieve victory in Germany, maybe 6 months or less, and a year or so in Japan. We have made the efforts. We have raised the troops. We have equipped and armed them. They are on the march to victory all over the world.

The second big problem with which we might be confronted is winning the peace, but we in the House have very little to do with that. Furthermore, we could not accomplish anything until we know the peace and war aims of our allies.

The other problem, which I believe is far greater, far more vital, and of more far-reaching effect on the destiny of America, is the question of putting veterans to work, 11,000,000 of them, when they return home, and giving them jobs at a decent standard of wages and of living, and of putting 11,000,000 more American wage earners, who will be demobilized from the war factories, into peacetime jobs. This is part of the program, a public-works part, and, of

course, the smallest part, involving $500,000,000 a year for 3 years.

If we fail to solve this problem of unemployment it will bring about chaotic conditions in this country such as we have never seen, and may destroy free enterprise and even our own free institutions and bring about the substitution of some form of national socialism in America and totalitarianism, which our sons are fighting against all over the world. This is a small part of the program, although it costs $1,500,000,000.

The real problem is expanding private enterprise so that it will take care of some 20,000,000 additional wage earners by providing them with permanent jobs.

I have the utmost respect for the statements emanating from the White House and the President of the United States, who has just been reelected by a large electoral vote and a very substantial vote of the people. He said in the closing days of the campaign that he had made plans, and he literally guaranteed those plans would put 60,000,000 American wage earners to work after the war. I hope to God that is true. I hope there is substance to that remark. I hope he has plans, blueprints, and specifications that will provide jobs for 60,000,000 Americans. Only time will tell. If this turns out to be mere campaign oratory then President Roosevelt will be held strictly accountable by the American people but in the meanwhile, God save America.

I am certainly not prepared to state here as a Member of the Congress that the Congress can pass any legislation that will guarantee jobs for 60,000,000 people. As much as I think it is desirable and as much as we Republicans and Democrats alike want to do it, at the very peak of prosperity in America prior to the war there never were more than 48,000,000 people at work in this country. Today 66,000,000 people are employed, including eleven or twelve million in the armed forces. As I pointed out, at the very peak and height of prosperity in the entire history of America we never had more than 48,000,000 people employed.

Back in 1937 and 1938 our national income was $67,000,000,000. Today, in the midst of war, it is $160,000,000,000. But at the height and peak of prosperity, maybe fictitious prosperity, back in 1929, our national income only reached the peak of $90,000,000,000. Today, during the war, it is $160,000,000,000. If it goes back to what it was prior to the war, $67,000,000,000, naturally we cannot take care of 60,000,000 wage earners, or 50,000,000, maybe not 45,000,000 wage earners.

Efforts must be made to expand our industry and free private industry so as to take care of this huge job. But I am not opposing this bill. I am in favor of it. This is part of the program. This has to do with public works, for which the Government puts up 50 percent and the States 50 percent to build highways and roads. Of course, that will employ some people, a limited number, and will put certain factories to work throughout the country. I am wholeheartedly in favor of this part of the program, but I want to point out that it is an infinitesimal, a very small part of the program of that grave major issue of putting 22,000,000 American wage earners back to work after the war has been won. That is the biggest single problem. That is the problem that you in the next Congress, under the leadership of my friend the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLMER], will have to try to help solve. I believe that with him as chairman of the Committee on Post-war Economic Policy and Planning the House will get at least sound recommendations for constructive and essential legislation. That committee is already laying the groundwork to solve that tremendous and far-reaching peacetime problem of employment that affects the destiny of America.

As far as this bill is concerned, I approach it also from the viewpoint of an interested party. When, as a member of the subcommittee on Public Works of the Committee on Post-war Economic Policy and Planning, which held hearings in New York City, we had before us as a witness, Commissioner Robert Moses of New York, probably the best-informed man in America on road building and road planning. In reply to a question from me he stated that one of the first programs which would go into effect after the Congress appropriated this money, which we are about to authorize, would be the building of a superhighway on the west bank of the Hudson River. May I say to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. EATON], who is sitting just in front of me that this proposed highway would run through part of New Jersey, over the Palisades, for which Mr. Rockefeller has already spent $16,000,000 of his own money to buy up the rights-of-way, and the properties, to have a main trunk highway or superhighway built from New York City over the top of the Palisades up into Rockland and Orange Counties up through my own district, connecting up with other main roads. To that extent I am naturally an interested party. New York City needs, in order to break up the bottleneck, more superhighways on the west side, the New Jersey side, which, may I say to the gentleman from New Jersey, to a large extent, has been overlooked. The other side, up the Hudson River on the east side and up through New England, have more highways. But our road facilities to Rockland County and Orange County are very very limited. Inasmuch as Mr. Rockefeller has already given $16,000,000 and has acquired the rights-of-way, I hope that we, Commissioner Moses, and the State legislature will agree to give priority to the construction of this superhighway over the Palisades up into Rockland and Orange Counties. I know my friends in the legislature are very much in favor of this road.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I certainly yield to my distinguished colleague.

Mr. COLMER. I merely ask the gentleman to yield to make public record of the splendid contribution by the distinguished gentleman from New York, now addressing the House, to the work of the Committee on Post-War Economic Policy and Planning. As the ranking minority member of that committee, the gentleman from New York has done a splendid job. I know of no one who has taken that job of trying to plan for the future, which the gentleman is now discussing, more earnestly and conscientiously and sincerely than the gentleman himself. I regret very much under the circumstances, that the gentleman will not continue indefinitely with us in that work.

Mr. FISH. I thank the gentleman very much for his kind remarks. But the work that is being done by the gentleman's committee, in my humble opinion, is the most important work which is being done today in the Congress of the United States, because it deals with by far the most important and vital issue. As the gentleman well knows, we had daily hearings for month upon month and because of those daily hearings which the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLMER], the chairman of the committee, myself, and many others attended, it was somewhat of a handicap for me in getting back into my district, a new district, which I should have done last spring and I believe if I had, the results on election day would have been different in Delaware County. But I think that was a sacrifice worth making. The work that the gentleman is doing with his committee deals directly with actual questions of employing 20,000,000 Americans and therefore with the future destiny of our country and maybe with our form of government.

Later on, as I have stated in the House, I propose to ask for 1 hour to talk on the national and international issues and some phases and aspects of my defeat in my campaign for reelection to the Congress. One thing that I have no control over, whatsoever, but which rather grieves me, is the fact that when we have important legislation such as we had today and yesterday in the House, and excellent speeches were made on crop insurance by Members of the House, including my distinguished friend the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Cox], the acting chairman of the Committee on Rules, yet there was no reference whatever to any of those speeches or even to the consideration of the bill in the daily press. I assume that the reason for that is that the war eclipses everything else and that the Congress in wartimes does not hold such a conspicuous public position as the Chief Executive and Commander in Chief of our armed forces or even of many others directly responsible for our war efforts, both civilian and military.

In the few minutes remaining I would like to state very briefly my views against one piece of legislation that is being broadcast through the newspapers. That is the building of the St. Lawrence seaway which is being pressed in this session of Congress, I think totally in vain, because I do not believe this Congress in the closing days of the session will have the time even to consider the merits or demerits of such a far-reaching proposition. I merely wanted to go on record at this time as being opposed to the construction of the St. Lawrence canal, which would divert trade and commerce

from New York City, Boston, Philadelphia, and Baltimore into a foreign country, up into the St. Lawrence River, which is frozen over 3 months of the year, and disrupt our great export and import trade in the city of New York and the port of New York, which has been built up over the last 100 years. I think any such proposition is utterly preposterous, to divert even into a most friendly nation which we all love and admire—Canada—our trade, at the expense of the American taxpayers. After all, our interest, duty, and obligation is to our own people, and to our own wage earners first. I have never thought it was treasonable to put the interest of America first, or that of the American people. I always have and I always will. I believe it is to the interest of America to provide for our own people, employ them, take care of them, and safeguard our own trade, and not divert it into some foreign nation by the use or abuse of the money of our own people and taxpayers.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York has again expired.

Mr. COX. I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BROWN].

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I am in favor of this rule. I am in favor of a bill along the lines proposed. I think it is very necessary that we have employment for our returning soldiers. I believe this is constructive, and in the interest of all the people.

I do believe, however, the House bill should be changed in some respects, and it is my understanding that the committee proposes to offer some amendments. I want to congratulate the committee, as I am sure they are endeavoring to bring out a bill which is acceptable to the people as a whole.

I do want to impress on the Members that some States will be unable to match the appropriation. I hope the bill will be amended in such a manner as to alleviate this situation so that all States will still receive a proportionate share. This is necessary to carry out the purpose and intent of Congress to give employment in these rural areas.

I hope the bill will be amended so that the funds which are appropriated for Federal-aid highway system will be apportioned to the States on the basis of section 21 of the Federal Highway Act. This in effect would apportion the funds to the States, one-third on the basis of total population, one-third on the basis of area, and one-third on the basis of rural post road mileage.

I further believe the funds for projects on the principal secondary and feeder roads, including farm-to-market roads, rural free delivery routes, and public school bus routes should be expended on a system of roads selected by the State highway departments in consultation with county supervisors, county commissioners, or other appropriate local road officials, and that the projects should not be subject to approval of a Federal commissioner of public roads.

It is further my opinion that it is undesirable to have a separate fund provided solely for the purpose of use in urban areas. I recognize the needs of our city neighbors, but rather than provide a special fund for Federal-aid highways through urban areas, thus preventing a State from exercising its own judgment in apportioning the funds, it would seem preferable to have whatever portion of that fund necessary lumped with the Federal-aid highway fund and apportioned in accordance with section 21 of the Federal Highway Act. I believe an amendment accomplishing this should be adopted by the Members of the House.

These are some of the suggestions I hope the Members will adopt.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 additional minutes to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. When it comes down to roads within the county not in the highway system, I think the apportionment for those roads should be the same as it is in the Senate bill, S. 2105, as amended.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. I yield.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I may state for the gentleman's information that the committee has agreed upon an amendment that Federal aid funds shall be apportioned as heretofore: one-third, one-third, and one-third; and I am sure it will be agreeable information to the gentleman to know that the committee has also recommended that in the matter of rural highways the apportionment be more beneficially divided with respect to those roads so that rural areas will receive even a larger distribution than the one-third, one-third, and one-third. Secondly, in the matter of rural roads, the total amount authorized is to be increased from $135,000,000 to $150,000,000.

And with that statement and with the gentleman's permission let me say that this is the first great rural program—and urban program for that matter—that has ever been submitted to Congress; and with all due deference it strikes me that if the Federal Government is to pay one-half of the cost of rural roads, the Federal Government should not initiate the plans and specifications or the locations but that the Director of Roads should at least approve.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. I thank the gentleman very much for this observation and statement. He never neglects the people in the rural sections.

I have a strong conviction that a road bill is a constructive step forward in providing not only a Nation-wide highway system but in meeting our post-war obligations to veterans of providing employment—employment not on a relief basis as in the days of W. P. A., but jobs, the efforts of which go to improve our Nation and its welfare.

I had hoped the size of the appropriation could have been trimmed; however, I realize a large sum is necessary because of our commitments to provide employment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has again expired.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. EATON].

Mr. EATON. Mr. Speaker, I have the honor to represent a State that is unique in many respects in its history and in its physical and social make-up. It is the fourth smallest in size, the ninth greatest in population, and the fifth in war production. It lies between the two greatest industrial and market centers of the continent, New York and Philadelphia; and its highways are the most congested by all forms of traffic of any State in this Union. Our highways cost more to construct and maintain than those in any State in the Union. Twelve miles of highway near my home cost $19,000,000, enough to construct 300 or 500 miles of highway in most other sections of the country. So the problem for New Jersey from the point of view of the allotment just referred to by the distinguished gentleman from Georgia is very, very discouraging indeed.

I have a few figures I should like to give you with reference to this bill. The bill proposes to do two things: To furnish a cushion to tide over the unemployment of men when they come back from the war and then to extend the highway system of the Nation, which, of course, is a very fundamental and necessary thing. The proposals under this bill are very strange. There seems to be no proper relationship established between the amount of unemployment or employment in the various States and the amount of money under this form of allotment which they will receive.

For instance, this bill makes $489 available for the employment of every person in Nevada, who, according to the United States Department of Labor, may be expected to be demobilized from the armed forces or our war industries. It makes $273 available for every demobilized person in Wyoming, $208 available in Montana, $195 in New Mexico, and $145 in Idaho. On the other hand, it makes $26 available for every demobilized person in New York, $26 in Illinois, $24 in Massachusetts, $22 in Ohio, $22 in Indiana, $21 in Pennsylvania, $17 in Maryland, $16 in Michigan, $15 in New Jersey, and $14 in Connecticut, showing that the whole thing is upside down.

If we are going to have this legislation for the purpose of giving our demobilized men opportunity to earn an honest living, we ought to spend most of the money where the most of them are. I am going to detain you but a few moments longer and then have a little additional matter placed in the RECORD for further perusal.

Under this bill Nevada would receive $115 per motor vehicle, Wyoming $52, New Mexico $49, Arizona $39, Utah $31; but, on the other hand, Illinois would receive only $12 per motor vehicle, Michigan $10, Ohio $10, Maryland $10, and Connecticut and New Jersey $9 apiece.

In 19 years New Jersey has paid $63,000,000 into this fund for helping road building in other sections of the country more than it has received from taxation. The question of gasoline taxation is an acute and personal one among our truck

owners as well as among the tens of thousands of our automobile owners and operators. So I hope when this bill comes before the House for amendment we will get down to the facts of the case and prepare a piece of legislation which will do justice to all sections and especially to my section where we are paying through the nose out of all proportion to what we get, which hurts the feelings of our thrifty people because of its apparent inequity.

After 19 months of study, public hearings, and public discussion, there is presented to the closing session of the Seventy-eighth Congress, a Federal-aid bill for post-war highway construction.

It calls for the expenditure of the large sum of one and one-half billions of dollars of Federal funds to assist in the construction of our Federal-aid system of intercity and inter-State highways, and Federal-aid system in the urban areas, and farm to market or secondary roads not on the Federal-aid system. The grounds upon which so large a post-war highway program was predicated are two.

First. To cushion the shock of post-war unemployment and provide jobs for our returning soldiers; second, to provide for much-needed highway facilities.

These purposes, while not specifically set forth in the present bill before this House, are set forth clearly in the committee report. Moreover, there could be no possible justification for this bill, which appropriates four times for 3 successive years the annual normal amount of Federal aid unless it would seek to meet the unemployment problem at the war's end through needed public works.

To assert that this present amended bill will do what its proponents assert that it will do is absurd. We cannot in good conscience tell our returning veterans that we of the Congress of the United States have appropriated one and one-half billion dollars to provide work opportunities at the war's end, when a critical examination of the bill discloses such glaring discrepancies.

Second. That this bill now before us will meet road needs. I do not pretend to know the road needs of the 48 States. I do know some of the road needs of my own State. Our needs, as the needs of every other State with a large population, are confronted with congestion in our urban centers. It is a peculiarly pressing problem in New Jersey. We have the greatest traffic density of any State in the Union on our highways.

The principal taxes on motorists are the 1½-cent gasoline tax and the $5 automobile use tax. The amounts thus collected are closely related to the vehicles in the States. Any Federal-aid program which allocates funds to the States without a reasonable relationship to the number of motor vehicles is unrealistic, and any bill which seeks to meet the urgent road needs of the several States will fail in one of its major purposes if it is not closely related to the number of motor vehicles that are using the highways.

As I have pointed out, under the bill now before us Nevada would receive $115 per motor vehicle; Wyoming, $52; New Mexico, $49; Arizona, $39; Utah, $31; on the other hand, Illinois would receive only $12; Michigan, $10; Ohio, $10; Maryland, $10; and Connecticut and New Jersey, $9 each, to mention but a few of the more populous States.

This disparity of aid in terms of motor vehicles is one important measure of road need. The House itself has both the wisdom and the power to produce a bill which will equitably and efficiently meet the road needs at the war's end. The general welfare will be best served, not by the advantage to the few at the expense of the many but by a proper regard for the welfare of all the States.

The Federal Government has been making grants to the States to aid in road building for many years. Usual appropriations of $100,000,000 to $125,000,000 were made. The States were required to match these funds on a basis of 50–50, except during the recovery period following the great depression.

This money was apportioned on the basis of the proportionate population, area, and post-road mileage in the several States—each of these factors received equal weight. Such a formula allowed roads to be constructed in many States largely at the expense of citizens in a few States. Federal taxes on motorists represent the fairest available estimate of the contribution of the several States toward all Federal expenditures. This applies particularly to highways. Of the money collected from New Jersey citizens to meet the Federal road bill, for every dollar which was returned to New Jersey, nearly $2 were used for building roads elsewhere.

These Federal diversions from the few States as subsidies to others applied to about one-third of the States. This condition obtained for more than the last 20 years. In the beginning when the prime necessity was to get the motorist out of the mud, there was perhaps some justification for this. Although the inequity was apparent, little was done about it, principally because the size of the appropriation was relatively small. Now, the road situation has changed in that the prime necessity is to reduce the confusion of traffic in our cities. Roads carrying comparative volumes of traffic in sparsely settled States are of higher standards than those carrying the same load in the populous States. This may be said to be the results of the accumulation of these diversions and subsidies for this long period.

Some of the more populous States object very strenuously to a continuation of this arrangement. Agitation for more favorable treatment of the more populous States has continued for about 19 months, resulting in some slight considerations, but these are mere palliatives and do not give a solution of the whole matter. Although registration in the several States is a predominant factor in the use of highways, it is submitted that such a factor represents road needs and is very close to proper demobilization of soldiers and war workers. Is not registration of motor vehicles a better index of service and need in a State than is the area of that State? Is it not a better index than the miles over which the rural mails are delivered? But we only ask that it receive equal consideration to area and possible road mileage as a factor to determine the proportion to the States. Even then we in New Jersey would be in a position of paying our entire road bill and contributing more money each year than formerly to the building of roads in other States. Is not this generous enough after all these years of helping other States?

We have seen in New Jersey the development of a good highway system, but each year we are falling farther behind in supplying our needs until our main arteries have become choked with traffic—in some places every day in the year. Often these traffic jams last for hours without relief. Many of our motorists stay home at times because they know from experience there is no room for them on our highways. The cost of New Jersey highways is far greater than those in other States. The burden of traffic on them is greater than in any other State by far, because New Jersey lies in the center of industrial traffic.

These are reasons why we must in justice have a greater return of taxes collected from our citizens, and a lesser diversion to other States than is proposed in this bill.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EATON. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I preface my statement by saying that I have a high regard for the gentleman's views. I recall the very excellent statement he made before the committee with respect to the numbers demobilized. But is it not true, and cannot we take general knowledge of the fact that many people have gone from their States to States like New Jersey, Connecticut, and similar States where we have the enormous war enterprises and war factories that does not obtain with reference to the others, and that the people will in all likelihood go back to their original States so the number demobilized will not be the correct number that might obtain in normal times? I think that is a fair statement. It was developed and brought out before our committee from time to time. May I make this further statement: It does strike me that the committee has leaned over backward in providing for the populous areas where there are urban communities in that we have recommended the largest amounts ever heretofore allocated to such areas? I believe that the gentleman will agree with this statement, and I propound the following question, that not only as to the demobilized people, but these other people have carried their vehicles from Alabama, from Tennessee, and from Mississippi to Illinois, to Ohio, to New Jersey, to Michigan and Connecticut, so that the matter of those who are demobilized as well as the matter of the vehicles, I respectfully ask my colleague if in his judgment would give us the same standard that would obtain in ordinary times in reference to this matter?

Mr. EATON. Of course, my answer to the gentleman is that these are not normal times, and the conditions following

demobilization or in demobilization will not be normal, measured by normal standards. But in spite of the very seductive statement that the gentleman has made in all innocence, although I can see what his objective is, the stark fact that the taxpayers of New Jersey have to confront remains that in 19 years we have paid $63,000,000 in cold cash into this road-building fund more than we got out of it. If there is anything in the world that an average Jersey man hates it is to have more taken out of his pocket by his neighbor than he puts in by his own industry.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. If it will be any comfort to the gentleman, I will say that the committee has an amendment which would increase the authorization to his State.

Mr. EATON. I am not only comforted but delighted to learn that New Jersey will have some consideration after a while.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EATON. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. In further answer to the question of the demobilized people and the people who have moved into New Jersey and Connecticut, those who have been in Connecticut for 3 years working in war industries—and most of them have been there 3 years—are now charges on the State of Connecticut. Although they came from Mississippi or Louisiana or Montana in the post-war period, their relief will be charged to Connecticut, regardless where they come from.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. And they would like to go home as fast as they can.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Those going on relief I can assure you we will be glad to send home, but you still charge relief to us.

Mr. EATON. I would like to say in addition to that that those in New Jersey who will go on relief will like it immensely, because we will take unusually good care of them, and those who are strong enough and wise enough to come from other States to join our citizenship in their great productive capacity will have fine jobs as well, and we will make good citizens out of them, and in time we hope to have them all vote Republican.

Mr. MOTT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EATON. I yield to the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. MOTT. The gentleman stated that over a number of years the State of New Jersey had paid into this fund a certain amount of money. He understands that this money is paid into the United States Treasury. It is not a fund at all. It is not even earmarked, and the Government expends annually for aid to States in road building only a portion of what it exacts in taxes from the road users of the several States; so it is not a fund at all that the gentleman said is a contribution.

Mr. EATON. Of course, the gentleman knows that the gasoline tax comes into the United States Treasury and, of course, mysteriously disappears like all other taxation does in that relationship. But the fact remains that we have put up $63,000,000 more than we got in this system of taxation, no matter how it is paid in or how it is paid out.

Mr. MOTT. But you do not put it into any fund.

Mr. EATON. A rose will smell just as sweet under any other name.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD on the resolution under consideration.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER] as much time as he may desire.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I take this time for the purpose of asking a question or, rather, making a suggestion. This road bill has been most controversial ever since it was introduced in June. Even tempers have been ruffled. I think that now we are reaching a point where we can all agree, as we should agree, on highway legislation, because we are all vitally interested in it. It has been stated here by the acting chairman of the Committee on Rules, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. COX], that the Roads Committee itself has worked out some amendments that will be generally satisfactory and will solve the problem so far as the difficulty in the Roads Committee is concerned.

I see the distinguished chairman of the Roads Committee, the gentleman from Utah [Mr. ROBINSON] and the distinguished ranking minority member, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT] on the floor. I hope those gentlemen will see to it that there is printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD their suggested amendment today, or not later than Friday, when the House again convenes, so that when the House takes the bill up for consideration and amendment under the 5-minute rule on Tuesday next, those of us—and that includes all of us—who are vitally interested in this important legislation will have some idea as to what the bill upon which we are supposed to act contains. Advance notice of the amendments to be offered will expedite the passage of the bill and also clarify the atmosphere.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT].

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, much of the objection to the bill is predicated upon the inequalities in the bill in respect to rural areas. I have proposed an amendment which I believe will remove some of the objections and distribute the money among the counties more equitably than might be done otherwise. I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include an amendment I propose to offer when the bill is read.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOLCOTT. On page 5 of the Senate bill (S. 2105), section 4 of which will be offered by the committee as a substitute for section 4 of the House bill:

> Amendment to subsection (b) of section 4, as amended: After the colon following the word "manner", insert "(1)", and after the word "States" strike out the period, insert a semicolon, and add the following new language: "and (2) apportioned among the counties of each State in the same manner as provided by part (1) of this subsection: *Provided*, That none of the funds authorized by this act for secondary and feeder roads shall be expended on any project unless such project conforms to standards to be established by the State highway department of the State wherein the project is located."

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to my distinguished colleague from New York [Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL].

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, I rise on the occasion of the discussion of this road bill to look back a few years to the time when my predecessor, Mr. Bert Lord, was regarded in this House as the father of the farm-to-market road. As you know, in up-State New York there are miles and miles of undeveloped roads which have been benefited by this farm-to-market road program. I think it is safe to say that the up-State New York farmer would never have been able to get his produce to market had it not been for the improvement the State of New York accomplished in the construction of these farm-to-market roads. There is no question but that in some of the outlying districts, some of the sparsely populated districts in up-State New York, the benefit of this program has been shown.

In the section which provides for funds for rural highways, I want to see as much money appropriated as is already listed thereunder, and perhaps an increase in that amount. I understand the present proposal calls for $125,000,000. I am told someone is going to propose an amendment increasing that amount. I want it made clear that as far as I am concerned I will support the program which calls for an improvement in rural roads.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMASON].

Mr. THOMASON. Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the Texas delegation, I desire to state for the record that when the vote was taken a few minutes ago on the so-called crop-insurance bill, H. R. 4911, roll call No. 116, there was in progress in the Speaker's room in the Capitol a meeting of the Texas Members of Congress. The notice of the roll call required by the rules was not given, and none of those present had any knowledge that the roll call was in progress.

The following Members, among those who were present at the meeting of the Texas delegation, have requested and authorized me to state that had they received the customary notice they would have been present on the floor of the House and have voted for the bill: Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON, Mr. MAHON, Mr. POAGE, Mr. PATMAN, Mr. WORLEY, Mr. GOSSETT, Mr. FISHER, Mr. THOMAS of Texas, Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas, and I would have also voted for the bill.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of the time to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. VURSELL].

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, I think one of the most important things that can be brought about by this bill, is to make certain that in the distribution of funds, and in the preparation for the allocation of funds, the rural areas should be given very careful consideration and attention. If we want to develop our farm sections and our rural sections there is nothing that would help to develop them more than better roads and rural electrification. It is much more important that we furnish transportation so that the farmer cannot only develop and improve his farm locality, but so that he can get his produce to the markets. I am more interested, and I think more good will be done, if we stay close to the rural areas to provide the proper transportation, than can be done if we go in in a larger way for belt and high-speed highways. After all, the farmers are one of the greatest segments of our population, and upon the farmer more depends than upon any other group of our citizens. This road bill will furnish an opportunity to lay a foundation that will help to improve agriculture and help to improve the financial economy of the country. We must make certain that the farmers' interests are taken care of in the allocation and distribution of these funds for the building of farm-to-market roads.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my own remarks on the subject of the road bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. KEEFE (at the request of Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin), 1 week, on account of illness.

To Mr. HOCH, for Friday, November 24, on account of official business.

To the Committee on Military Affairs (at the request of Mr. MAY), indefinitely, on account of absence on official business of the Committee on Military Affairs.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. CRAVENS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 3 minutes p. m.) the House, under its previous order, adjourned until Friday, November 24, 1944, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

2029. Under clause 2 of rule XXIV a letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting a report on records proposed for disposal by various Government agencies, was taken from the Speaker's table and referred to the Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. DICKSTEIN: Committee on Immigration and Naturalization. S. 963. A bill relating to the imposition of certain penalties and the payment of detention expenses incident to the bringing of certain aliens into the United States; with amendment (Rept. No. 1920). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. MASON: Committee on Immigration and Naturalization. H. R. 4642. A bill to amend the Nationality Act of 1940; without amendment (Rept. No. 1921). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. ELLIOTT: Joint Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report No. 1922. Report on the disposition of certain papers of sundry executive departments. Ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. HÉBERT:

H. R. 5521. A bill to abolish the United States Park Police force in the District of Columbia, to transfer the personnel of the United States Park Police to the Metropolitan Police Department, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. ELLSWORTH:

H. R. 5522. A bill to amend the joint resolution of July 23, 1941, relating to the removal of officers from the active list of the Regular Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey:

H. Res. 656. Resolution relating to the disposition of the files of the Special Committee to Investigate Un-American Activities; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. GORE:

H. R. 5523. A bill for the relief of R. H. Sindle; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. GREEN:

H. R. 5524. A bill for the relief of Willie H. Johnson; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 5525. A bill for the relief of John R. Jennings; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. McGEHEE:

H. R. 5526. A bill for the relief of Axel A. Stromberg; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 5527. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Russell C. Allen and Molly Ann Allen; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 5528. A bill for the relief of Max Hirsch; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 5529. A bill for the relief of the New England Telephone & Telegraph Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. McMURRAY:

H. R. 5530 (by request). A bill for the relief of Oswald Jaeger Baking Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. GORE:

H. R. 5531. A bill for the relief of I. H. Beasley; to the Committee on Claims.

SENATE

FRIDAY, NOVEMBER 24, 1944

(Legislative day of Tuesday, November 21, 1944)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

God of all wisdom, away from the confusion of tongues we seek the quiet pavilion of prayer. For these searching moments may the bewildering voices of the world about us and the clamor of wordy arguments be hushed. In Thy presence our arrogance is rebuked and our pride of opinion is mocked as we confess that we but grope in the darkness and that our sight is dim, our knowledge is partial, and our judgments fallible. We would yield ourselves to Thee as we are, with all our failures and our ignorance and our self-will, and yet with the climbing aspirations of our better nature.

Make us honest and honorable enough to bear the vision of the truth, to have done with all falsehood, to cast away all pretense, together with the pettiness of our spirits and the craven fear of our hearts. Break down the narrow boundaries of our minds that shut us out from fellowship and understanding with any of Thy children. Teach us to value beauty of heart or brain in any strand of our common humanity, that we may become workers together with Thee in binding the races of man into that perfect family that shall belt the earth with good will when Thy radiant kingdom comes. In the name of Christ Jesus our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. HILL, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Wednesday, November 22, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of the secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. McLeod, one of its clerks, announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 4911) to amend the Federal Crop Insurance Act, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the Vice President:

S. 887. An act conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the Western District of Virginia to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claims of John Weakley and Rella Moyer;

S. 1101. An act to provide for the payment of the claim of John C. Shaw, administrator

de bonis non of the estate of Sydney C. McLouth, deceased, arising out of a contract between said deceased and the United States Shipping Board Emergency Fleet Corporation, for the construction of seagoing tugs;

S. 1226. An act for the relief of Charles T. Allen;

S. 1278. An act for the relief of Yellow Cab Transit Co. and Equitable Fire and Marine Insurance Co.;

S. 1365. An act for the relief of J. C. Drewry;

S. 1451. An act to amend the act entitled "An act for the confirmation of the title to the Saline lands in Jackson County, State of Illinois, to D. H. Brush, and others," approved March 2, 1861;

S. 1453. An act for the relief of the City National Bank Building Co.;

S. 1461. An act for the relief of Frederick G. Goebel;

S. 1465. An act for the relief of Dr. A. R. Adams;

S. 1477. An act for the relief of Carl M. Frasure;

S. 1501. An act for the relief of the Rau Motor Sales Co.;

S. 1572. An act for the relief of Frank Robertson;

S. 1605. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. John Borrego; Mr. and Mrs. Joe Silva; the legal guardian of Frank Borrego; the legal guardian of Rueben Silva; and the legal guardian of Rudolph Silva;

S. 1665. An act to relieve certain employees of the Veterans' Administration from financial liability for certain overpayments and allow such credit therefor as is necessary in the accounts of Guy F. Allen, chief disbursing officer;

S. 1709. An act for the relief of Mrs. Clark Gourley, administratrix of the estate of Clark Gourley;

S. 1717. An act for the relief of Luella F. Stewart;

S. 1763. An act for the relief of the Square D. Co.;

S. 1766. An act for the relief of C. C. Thornton;

S. 1776. An act for the relief of L. C. Gregory;

S. 1905. An act for the relief of the estate of Walney A. Colvin, deceased;

S. 1983. An act for the relief of Mrs. Anna Rubinebaum;

S. 1995. An act for the relief of Fred A. Dimler and Gwendolyn E. Dimler, his wife;

S. 2007. An act for the relief of Lum Jacobs;

S. 2031. An act for the relief of Lt. (T) P. J. Voorhies; and

S. 2069. An act for the relief of Irma S. Sheridan, postmaster at Rockville, Oreg.

SENATOR FROM SOUTH CAROLINA—CREDENTIALS

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I send to the desk the credentials of a distinguished South Carolinian, WILTON E. HALL, who has been appointed by the Governor of South Carolina to fill out the unexpired term of my late colleague, Senator Smith.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The credentials will be read.

The Chief Clerk read the credentials, and they were ordered to be placed on file, as follows:

To the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES:

This is to certify that, pursuant to the power vested in me by the Constitution of the United States and the laws of the State of South Carolina, I, Olin D. Johnston, Governor of the said State, do hereby appoint WILTON E. HALL the Senator from said State to represent said State in the Senate of the United States until the vacancy therein caused by the death of Senator Ellison D. Smith is filled by election as provided by law.

Witness: His Excellency, our Governor, and our secretary of state, and our seal hereto affixed at Columbia, S. C., this 20th day of November 1944.

By the Governor:

OLIN D. JOHNSTON,
Governor.

[SEAL] W. P. BLACKWELL,
Secretary of State.

INVITATION TO INSPECT B–29 AIRPLANE AT WASHINGTON NATIONAL AIRPORT

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate an invitation from Gen. H. H. Arnold, Commanding General of the Army Air Forces, which was read and ordered to lie on the table, as follows:

HEADQUARTERS, ARMY AIR FORCES,
Washington, November 22, 1944.

Hon. HENRY A. WALLACE,
President of the Senate, the Capitol.

DEAR MR. WALLACE: The Army Air Forces respectfully invite you and the Members of the Senate to inspect a B–29 airplane at the new A. T. C. Terminal at Washington National Airport on Saturday, 25 November, from 9 a. m. to 5 p. m.

This airplane is being brought here from Wright Field especially to give Members of the Congress and other Government officials an opportunity to inspect the aircraft at close range. Technicians will be on duty to answer any questions Members may care to ask. The interior of the airplane will also be open for inspection.

Sincerely yours,

H. H. ARNOLD,
General, United States Army,
Commanding General, Army Air Forces.

BIRTHDAY CONGRATULATIONS TO SENATOR BARKLEY

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, it has just come to my notice that today is the birthday of the distinguished majority leader of the Senate, the senior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY]. Speaking for myself and, I hope and believe, for all other Senators on this side of the Chamber, I convey to him assurances of our highest regard and our congratulations on the political victory which has so lately been his.

Mr. President, Senator BARKLEY has had one of the most distinguished careers of any Member of the Congress in the history of the Legislature of our country. He became a Member of the House of Representatives some 32 years ago, as I recall, and during the intervening years has served in the House of Representatives and in the Senate with great ability and with great distinction. He has been a great Senator of a great State. He has been a Senator of the United States. I wish for him a happy continuance of the term to which he has been elected, and all good things in life.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I deeply appreciate the generous words of my friend from Maine, with whom I have served during most of the years to which he has referred. I am afraid that my present appearance would make me look much older than I am today, but I can guarantee to my friend across the aisle that my present handicap is purely incidental and temporary. I thank him, nevertheless, for his generous words.

SEVENTEENTH REPORT ON LEND-LEASE OPERATIONS — REVERSE LEND-LEASE AID FROM THE BRITISH COMMONWEALTH

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying report, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

To the Congress of the United States of America:

I

I am submitting herewith my seventeenth report to Congress on lend-lease operations.

In 15 of these reports I have reported on lend-lease aid extended by the United States. One year ago, the twelfth lend-lease report to Congress set forth the reverse lend-lease aid received by the United States from the British Commonwealth of Nations under the Lend-Lease Act. That report covered the period up to June 30, 1943.

I now report on reverse lend-lease aid received by the United States from the British Commonwealth of Nations up to June 30, 1944.

One year ago the governments of the British Commonwealth reported their expenditures for reverse lend-lease aid to the United States, on the basis of estimates carefully prepared from their records, as totaling $1,175,000,000. They now report that by June 30, 1944—1 year later—these expenditures had risen to $3,348,000,000—almost three times the previous total.

The first 6 months of 1944 showed a significant increase in reverse lend-lease aid from the British Commonwealth. These were the months when the final preparations were being made in the United Kingdom for the liberation of western Europe and for the offensives aimed at Germany.

In these 6 months, United States forces in the British Isles received the equivalent of almost 3,851,000 ships' tons of supplies from the United Kingdom under reverse lend-lease exclusive of construction materials and gasoline, compared with 2,950,000 tons in the entire preceding 18 months. In monetary value, the supplies and services we received in these 6 months were greater than for the entire preceding year.

By D-day, United States armed forces had reached the United Kingdom in vast numbers. From the day our first soldiers arrived in 1942, one-third of all the supplies and equipment currently required by United States troops in the British Isles has been provided under reverse lend-lease. The percentages of total United States Army requirements in the European theater provided by the United Kingdom have ranged as high as 63 percent in the case of quartermaster supplies and 58 percent for engineers' supplies.

Reverse lend-lease has played an essential part in the stupendous job of preparing for and supplying the great Allied offensives in Europe.

It would have required a thousand ships to send across the Atlantic what

we received for our men through reverse lend-lease from the United Kingdom.

We were able to use these thousand ships instead for carrying supplies and equipment that had to come from the United States.

Without the reverse lend-lease aid that we received from the United Kingdom, we would surely have been forced to delay the invasion of France for many months. Now that this campaign has been successfully launched and is on the road to ultimate success, it is possible to include in this report facts about specific and vitally important reverse lend-lease projects that could not previously be safely disclosed in a public report.

For the war against Japan, United States forces have also received increased quantities of supplies and services in the past 6 months as reverse lend-lease from Australia and New Zealand, and in India. These were the months in which the forces under General MacArthur were completing the New Guinea campaign and were preparing to launch the campaign for the liberation of the Philippines.

Our forces in the Pacific have already received 1,850,000,000 pounds of food alone from Australia and New Zealand, including more than 400,000,000 pounds of beef and other meats.

Another important reverse lend-lease program in this theater has been the production for our forces of landing craft, small ships and boats, for the campaign we are waging in the Pacific. Tremendous numbers of these boats are needed for landing and supply operations on hundreds of islands scattered across thousands of miles of water. More than 9,500 of these craft had been produced and delivered by Australia alone in time for the Philippines campaign and over 12,000 more are on the way. In addition, Australia and New Zealand have turned over to our forces many hundreds of coastal steamers, barges, tugs, lighters, yachts, and launches.

In India the increased rate of reverse lend-lease aid we have received in the first 6 months of 1944 has kept pace with the rising tempo of air, land, and sea operations in the Burma-India and China theaters. A significant proportion of the supplies we have received in India has consisted of aviation gasoline and other petroleum products drawn from British oil resources in the Middle East and refined at the British refinery at Abadan. This gasoline, provided to us as reverse lend-lease, without payment by us, is helping to power our B–29 Superfortresses in their raids from both China and India on the Japanese homeland and on such enemy-occupied strong points as Singapore. It is also being used by the fighter and bomber planes of the Tenth and Fourteenth United States Army Air Forces.

II

I take the occasion of this report again to point out that the reverse lend-lease aid rendered by nations of the British Commonwealth to the United States is only a part of the aid which we have received from the British in fighting this war. The United States has benefited greatly from reverse lend-lease aid, as the facts set forth in this report indicate. But we have benefited far more, and in a far larger sense, from the total fighting effort of our allies.

As I have stated in previous lend-lease reports and as the Congress has expressed itself in reports by its appropriate committees at the time of the virtually unanimous renewals of the Lend-Lease Act in 1943 and 1944, lend-lease and reverse lend-lease are not two sides of a financial transaction. We are not loaning money under lend-lease. We are not receiving payments on account under reverse lend-lease. The lend-lease system is, instead, a system of combined war supply, whose sole purpose is to make the most effective use against the enemy of the combined resources of the United Nations, regardless of the origin of the supplies or which of us uses them against the enemy.

Neither the monetary totals of the lend-lease aid we supply, nor the totals of the reverse lend-lease aid we receive are measures of the aid we have given or received in this war. That could be measured only in terms of the total contributions toward winning victory of each of the United Nations. There are no statistical or monetary measurements for the value of courage, skill, and sacrifice in the face of death and destruction wrought by our common enemies.

We in the United States can be justly proud of our contributions in men and materials and of the courage and skill and sacrifice of the men and women in our armed forces and of all those others who have devoted themselves selflessly to the war effort at home. We can also be rightly proud of and grateful for the contributions in men and materials of our allies and the courage and skill and sacrifice of their soldiers, airmen, seamen, and peoples.

In this war the United Nations have all drawn strength from each other—our allies from us and we from them. We can now begin to see the full significance of the overwhelming power that this steadily closer partnership has created. We already know how much it did to save us all from disaster. We know that it has brought and will bring final victory months closer than would otherwise have been possible.

Lend-lease and reverse lend-lease are a system of combined war supply. They should end with the war. But the United Nations partnership must go on and must grow stronger. For the tasks of building a workable peace that will endure, we shall need all the strength that a permanent and stronger United Nations can provide in winning security from aggression, in building the economic foundations for a more prosperous world, and in developing wider opportunities for civilized advancement for the American people and for all the other peace-loving peoples of the world.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *November 24, 1944.*

OUR INTERNATIONAL POLICY

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD an address made by me on Our International Policy, at a meeting of the Vermont Bar Association on October 3, 1944.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. President, Your Excellency, Your Honors, and so many, so many of my personal friends and associates, I don't know when I have been so privileged as I am tonight to come face to face with so many friends in one place and under such dignified and inspiring auspices. It is only upon a few occasions that I have spoken from this rostrum, but I never come here without being lifted up by a sense of the wonderful traditions that this statehouse and this house of representatives symbolize. I have always been inspired by the great services and sacrifices of our forefathers. The history of our State is in the foreground of my thought, bearing upon my judgment, affecting the character of my public service. I never, never forget it. It is a great history, not to be excelled by the history of any other State in the Union. The attitude of Vermont in this great crisis is recognized from the day when Vermont, by the solemn act of her general assembly, recognized that a condition of war existed in the world, which called upon Vermont to carry out her promises to her sons who offered their lives for their State and for their Nation and for humanity.

Thank you for the privilege of speaking to you about what is uppermost in the aspirations of the people of America, and probably of all Christendom. There is no more living vital desire and determination than that we shall this time so conduct ourselves that we will set up the guaranties of security and peace so that our children's children for many generations will not have to go to war. Without regard to partisanship, political partisanship, or partisanship over this question of isolationism or internationalism, everyone agrees that the challenge has come to us at a time when we have an opportunity to meet it. A challenge to surround posterity not merely with laws that shall direct conduct in the great family of nations, but also erect the organization to execute those laws and make them operate. Of course, we are familiar with what is known as the law of nations and international law. We know that it is not the product of search to find the rule of conduct that is based upon the difference between right and wrong, simply because we have had no organization that could bring into crystallized form the expression of conscience of all the people of Christendom. We know that such law as we call international law, or law of nations, is but the product of treaty, experience, and precedent. The lawyer who is smart enough to bring before an arbitration or before a world court the best line of weighty precedents holding in a certain direction is the lawyer who establishes the law for his case.

Now, we look forward to a new science. It is not entirely new, because for some 35 years leaders of thought have been studying the subject of international organization. We have made a try at it with the League of Nations, and from that experience we have learned so much that we think we have the groundwork today for a successful advance in this new science of international organization.

We go upon three postulates, viz: That conditions anywhere on earth which threaten military aggression to any single nation affect all nations.

Another postulate is that neutrality in its classic and narrow meaning cannot survive world wars, and that probably if we carry on as we aim to do, such a thing as legal neutrality cannot exist and will not exist in the future.

The third postulate is that all peoples everywhere who are competent to govern themselves and who desire peace are deter-

mined and willing to pay the costs of peace, however great they are.

These are self-evident truths. They do not need proof, and it is upon these foundations that we proceed with great hope that we may this time form an international organization that will avoid the mistakes and the shortages which we have discovered in the League of Nations. The Dumbarton Oaks Conference has been moving thus far very satisfactorily on a plan that was submitted by the United States. I might remind you, though perhaps it is unnecessary, that we have had several declarations from high sources indicating a general course of intent among the United Nations. In the first place we had the Atlantic Charter, first declared by the representatives of the United States and Great Britain, but subsequently subscribed to by all of the United Nations. In the next place we had the Declaration of Moscow, and finally the so-called Connally resolution, which passed the Senate by a vote really startling in its proportions of 85 to 5. The Moscow Declaration, which undertakes to complement the Atlantic Charter, and the Connally resolution declare for substantially the same thing, and that is an international organization established at the earliest practicable date upon the basis of the sovereign equality of nations both great and small, for the purpose of security and peace. I have not tried to quote it, but I have given you the sense of the declaration and the sense of the Connally resolution.

From the time of Secretary Hull's return from the Moscow Conference down to the time when the Dumbarton Oaks group met, meetings were held to work out a plan based upon that general policy, a plan which was single in its aim—it was for security—protection against military aggression anywhere on earth. The unique character of that plan is its singleness of purpose. If there is one thing that I want to emphasize here tonight, it is the irrelevance of the discussion you hear that we must not authorize our agent or delegate to this organization to act without coming to Congress every time he acts. That is used as opposition to the plan itself, but it is wholly irrelevant.

Another is that we must not enter into this plan because it is going to require of us that we allocate branches of our armed forces to be subject to the direction of some organization other than the sovereign government of the United States. Of course you can see that these objections confuse the issue, which is the simple one of security. Shall we enter into an agreement for security? Shall we abandon this unilateral policy which nations have heretofore held, and put into effect the cooperative plan by which society performs its duty to maintain order and peace in the world, instead of having every member of society undertake to carry out some advice that is given to it by the organization and every member given authority separately to maintain law and order.

Another objection, wholly irrelevant, which does not meet the issue that is before the Dumbarton Oaks Conference is this question of sovereignty. It confuses the true meaning of external sovereignty, treating it as if it were the same thing as internal sovereignty.

Our external sovereignty does not come as the result of a constitution that the people of the United States have entered into or agreed upon. External sovereignty comes as a result of the law of necessity in the family of nations, and that sovereignty, like freedom, is a relative thing. What it really is, is not what the word means, that is, superior over every other thing. If that were the exact meaning of external sovereignty there could be only one sovereign nation in the world. In fact, we claim that nothing under the word of God is sovereign.

And so, when against progress in the negotiation of this treaty at Dumbarton Oaks, there is interposed the idea that we are going to be asked to give up our sovereignty, that is just one of those fallacies which I undertake to point out does not meet the effort that we are making.

I might say in passing that if all of the peace-loving sovereign nations enter into the same agreement to submit to a direction of their armed forces to suppress or prevent a military uprising anywhere in the world, they have each contributed the same amount of independence. By that combined effort relative sovereignty has not changed at all, but has been exercised according to treaty.

Now, the American plan, so far as it has become public, comprehends an organization that is very like the outlines of the League of Nations. In it you have a general assembly, which possesses all of the jurisdictions and powers which are not specifically granted to other branches of the organization. Then you have an executive council, which has a very limited authority but a tremendous power, and that authority bears upon peaceful settlement of controversies among nations through conciliation or arbitration, or the ultimate direction of military force; and then you have as the third major branch of that organization a court. Supporting all of them, armed forces are to be set up by means of a separate agreement not contained in the basic treaty for the establishment of this international organization for security and peace.

Now, then, how do we protect; how do we intend in the American plan to protect the vital interests of each separate nation? It is not difficult to do, and I think it is not difficult to understand. If you have trouble understanding, it will be because of my lack of clarity in explaining it, but I am going to try it. Let's assume that your executive council has jurisdiction over the question of what constitutes an aggression; what constitutes a condition anywhere on earth that threatens war, also over the further question of what sanctions shall be ordered to prevent or repel military aggression. This little group, we will say, consists of 11 countries, each country having 1 vote. Four of those countries at the present time are contemplated to be the 4 great powers that now have the leadership in the conduct of this war, the Unired States, Great Britain, Russia, and China. Later it is contemplated that there may be another nation added to that group of major nations. They are to have permanent membership in this executive council. All the others would be impermanent members elected annually and in rotation, possibly having reference to geographical location as well as other factors qualifying nations to sit in that council.

Now, then, is this to be pure politics? Is this to be a set-up in which the 4 great nations shall overwhelm and control the lesser nations of the earth? Quite the contrary. The plan is to provide for cooperation in this manner: Any decision upon the cause for the application of sanctions and any decision upon the application of sanctions requires a majority vote of which the permanent members must be counted—that is, you must always have the 4 permanent members in your majority. But a majority of 11 is 6; therefore, you must have the vote of 2 of the impermanent members in order to have any action—any decision. Turn it around: If the minor nations were apparently being overshadowed by the major nations, you can see how that by these 6 minor nations voting together, or by 5 of them voting together, they could veto any action that the 4 major nations voted for. All right. Ask yourself the question, "Is the United States going to be endangered here by this arrangement so that against its will its troops can be ordered any place on earth at any time?" Oh, no! Because the United States has a veto of its own on any vote to determine these two issues which I have mentioned. All it has to do is to say "No," and that ends it, and that is true of Russia, it is true of China, and it is true of Great Britain. "Well," you say, "of what use or value is that kind of an organization at all?" And the answer is, "None, unless the peoples of the earth truly desire peace strongly enough to keep their delegates heartily in cooperation for security and peace. Without that, any organization you set up will fail."

We have to go on the constructive theory that it is possible for peace-loving nations to cooperate and that it is probable that they will prefer to cooperate than to pull apart. If we start on the other theory—that they are bound to pull apart—why, then, of course, there isn't any use starting whatever.

So, assuming the postulates which I stated in the beginning, and that one in particular—that all peoples are willing to pay the cost of peace—we go ahead with the hope and with the firm belief that we are about to erect an organization in the world that will be a complete change from anything we have ever had before. Now, let me try to simply picture that change. In the first place, we are going to have some fundamental rules that we have never had before. Just simple rules of conduct, and I will name two or three of them. In the first place, we will put into this basic treaty: No. 1, hereafter all disputes among nations shall be settled amicably and without resort to war; No. 2, we will promise not to use our armed forces against any other nation except as permitted by this basic treaty and the order or direction of the executive council of this organization; No. 3, we agree that those troops that we allocate in another agreement for this service of meeting and repelling armed force shall obey the direction of the executive council promptly and before the spark has burst into a world conflagration. That is the basis that we start with for an organization that is different than anything else heretofore experienced.

We start with some few simple rules of conduct, and then we set up a court to interpret and apply those rules, a new court in a way. We have had a world court and I look forward with eagerness to hearing Hon. Manley Hudson tell us about it tomorrow night. I know it is going to be a wonderful education to me, and I think likely it may be to you. But that court has no authority over a country until the country submits itself to its jurisdiction. In other words, there is no obligatory jurisdiction in that court. You can't say to a country that has aggrieved you, "Here, you come over into this world tribunal and let us present our case," and have that tribunal, an independent body, decide the case in a peaceful way according to well known methods of procedure. You can't do that now. Of course we already are under treaty for pacific settlement of international disputes with 40 countries, including Great Britain, France, Germany, Russia, and China. The Briand-Kellogg Treaty signed in 1928 provides for both arbitration and conciliation. However, submission to the Permanent Court of Arbitration of justiciable issues requires a special agreement in each case, made by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, settling all the terms of the reference. It gives no obligatory jurisdiction which can be invoked by a claimant. All the treaties are subject to termination after a certain period of time. However, the United States has acknowledged the propriety of submitting to an international court even the most serious of our international differences. This step advances us toward the desired goal of obligatory judicial procedure. The existing law of nations has

the infirmity that no state can without its consent be compelled to submit its disputes with other nations either to mediation or arbitration or to any other kind of pacific settlement.

This fatal defect in the Covenant of the League of Nations was pointed out by the Permanent Court of International Justice in a case where Finland sought to invoke the covenant in its dispute with Russia. This infirmity is that such covenants amount to no more than a promise to make a treaty of arbitration when the dispute arises. It fails to function automatically, while relations are pacific, when a dispute arises and before the passions of war are aroused. So that is new, the idea of giving to this court, this world court, and perhaps some regional courts, obligatory jurisdiction. What else is new about this plan of organization? I am talking about the American plan, which I hope will be accepted by the other great treaty powers of the earth.

The League of Nations in article 10 provided for advice. Advice to whom? To the aggrieved country—a country that might have been so weak in a military sense or economic sense and every other way that it could not possibly defend itself. Regardless of its competency to defend itself all we have under the League of Nations, is a scheme by which society advises the aggrieved to act. Thereby society evades—at least it avoids—its duty to maintain order under the law among nations of the world. That is under article 10. Now under article 16, which is the only other article in the Covenant of the League of Nations having to do with coercion, the League recommends to the member state what to do to protect itself.

Now what do we propose? Well, you will notice in the planks on war and peace of both the National Democratic Convention and the National Republican Convention, the same vital change, and that is the power to direct. Of course I am more familiar with the Republican plank than I am the Democratic plank. In the Republican plank there is a declaration of policy by which we say that we shall give to this organization the means of directing peace forces to prevent or repel military aggression. Those who drew both of those planks, the Democratic plank and the Republican plank, the men who really sat down and drew them were familiar with the American plan because they had helped to make it. Both planks are designed with the idea of getting the resources, moral and spiritual and political resources, of the people of the United States of America behind that American plan.

The hope for security and peace rests mainly on this power to direct. Great progress is represented in the change from unilateral acts of aggrieved nations to maintain security to society's authority under a basic treaty to direct those forces which maintain peace. Of course military forces will be the last resort. All the other forces, economic, spiritual, diplomatic, educational, conciliation and arbitration, judicial, all the other sanctions will be tried where adequate. If it becomes necessary to pay this particular cost of peace, we pay it by this basic treaty. The authority to that organization is not merely to advise or recommend, but to direct the peace forces of the United States or any other state to hasten to a spot before the war passion has become aroused.

This difference recognizes the almighty power of united nations. Here we summon the conscience and the military resources and the economic power of all peace-loving nations upon a single problem, upon a single spot in the world. We give to their great organization the authority, not to tell us what one of us shall do, but to do it itself. It is the shift from that unilateral attempt of the aggrieved nations to enforce its rights to the great act of society maintaining law and order in the world. Of course that is the greatest step of progress that society has ever undertaken.

"Well," they say, "that is good, but what about war? Supposing that all these benign influences, all these benevolent purposes fail, and it appears to the executive council that it is necessary to use the armed forces of the United States, how are you going to make that effective, that is, by having it operate quickly enough on the trouble to suppress it before it gets into a big conflagration?" Well, it is just this way: First, we will make our organization for the enforcement of security and peace in the world. Second, we will see to it that every country after having ratified the basic treaty setting up this organization, every country that is a member of that treaty will determine by its own parliamentary process what the authority of its delegate to that council shall be. Nothing less than that would satisfy the people of any country.

This country would not be satisfied to have the commission of its delegate to the council depend upon the decision of any other country. Each country will have to decide for itself what acts of its delegate may be done without further authority. That is why I say it is premature for the isolationists to raise that issue. It will not arise until we have first agreed upon a basic treaty that sets up an organization. Then, of course, it will be up to the United States Congress to determine what this office is. It will take an act of Congress to create this office, and Congress may say this office is great enough to have the dignity of a cabinet position. And so Congress creates the office, defines its powers, fixes its limitations, and makes appropriations to support it, and in so doing says there is one fundamental thing this office shall not have the power to do, and that is to declare war. The power to declare war is up to Congress, and Congress cannot delegate it and will not delegate it; but all those other acts of a lesser nature amounting to an interposition of armed forces we will delegate. Our delegate need not come back to us each time the question arises whether he ought to vote to send some of our people to a certain place to prevent or repel aggression. That is not declaring war. Of course, war may succeed as it did in China, at the time of the Boxer uprising, but in such event Congress would have ample time in which to pass upon the question of whether Congress wanted to declare war.

I don't know how long I have talked—I have talked too long already. I will detain you only long enough to point out that over a hundred cases have occurred already in the world where armed forces of the United States have been interposed on the soil of a country not at war with us, for the purpose of protecting the peace and security of the United States citizen abroad. It is not novel. It is an old precedent. And in addition to that, numerous cases have occurred where a show of armed force has been made, like the sending of the fleet around the world by President Theodore Roosevelt—numerous occasions when an invasion has not occurred, with a show of force sufficient to just put down that spark of trouble which is seen to be arising in the world.

If we have from time to time, more than a hundred times, employed the armed forces of the United States without any declaration of war and solely by the act of the Chief Executive, and those times have been successful in preserving the peace and preventing a war, how much more is it to be expected that armed forces directed by society, by an international organization would accomplish that moral result which we have been able to accomplish by our own act, our sole act. Contrast the influence, the prestige, and the power of such a great international organization to that of the United States alone, and you must arrive at the conclusion that the experience of history speaking to us with venerable accent justifies us in the expectation that we would probably never have the result of a condition of war flowing from the direction of armed forces sent out for the purpose of preventing or repelling military aggression at the earliest time that it appears.

Now I thank you very much for the privilege of talking with you about this subject. I feel that I have not done it justice, but if you will take from me tonight some of the earnestness that I feel, that we here at home give all that it takes to prevent another war, then these spurious debates over sovereignty, these external and irrelevant and immaterial issues that are thrown in the way of this simple treaty setting up a world organization for security and peace will have little weight. I feel sure that Vermont will be where she always has been, at the van of the fight meeting the challenge of opportunity to erect an international organization under whose protection peace can be attained that will prevail.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

WESTERN RECLAMATION DEVELOPMENT

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior in relation to reclamation development in the western United States, and calling attention to recent proposals regarding the river and harbor bill and the flood-control bill, and stating, in part, "These proposals, if adopted, would breach the long-established policies of the Congress under which reclamation development in the West has proceeded since 1902 in a manner that has gained for it bipartisan and Nation-wide support. It would be tragic if the basic reclamation policies of the Nation were breached by the pressure of shortsighted and selfish local interests"; to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

PAYMENTS BY OFFICER PATIENTS IN ST. ELIZABETHS HOSPITAL OR PUBLIC HEALTH HOSPITALS

A letter from the Administrator of the Federal Security Agency, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide that commissioned and warrant officers placed in St. Elizabeths Hospital or certain United States Public Health Service hospitals shall be liable to pay such rate per day as may be prescribed from time to time by the President, and to authorize the heads of the several agencies to deduct such sum from their pay and to transmit it to St. Elizabeths Hospital (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Military Affairs.

AUGUST 1944 REPORT OF THE R. F. C.

A letter from the Chairman of the Board of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, transmitting, pursuant to law, a confidential report of the Corporation for the month of August, 1944 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

PERSONNEL REQUIREMENTS

Two letters from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, supplemental estimates of personnel requirements for the Bureau of the Mint and the Procurement Division, Lend-Lease, under the Treasury Department for the quarter ending December 31, 1944; and also a letter from the Director of the Office of Censorship, transmitting, pursuant to law, an estimate of personnel requirements for that office for the quarter ending December 31, 1944 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Civil Service.

DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a list of papers and documents on the files of the

Departments of the Treasury (5), War (9), Post Office, Justice, Navy (3), Agriculture, and Labor; Federal Works Agency (2). Federal Power Commission, Federal Security Agency (3), and Office of Price Administration which are not needed in the conduct of business and have no permanent value or historical interest, and requesting action looking to their disposition (with accompanying papers); to a Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Papers in the Executive Departments.

The VICE PRESIDENT appointed Mr. BARKLEY and Mr. BREWSTER members of the committee on the part of the Senate.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate by the Vice President and referred as indicated:

A letter in the nature of a petition from the American University Park Citizens Association, Washington, D. C., favoring the prompt confirmation of the nomination of Guy Mason, of the District of Columbia, for reappointment for a term of 3 years as Commissioner of the District of Columbia; ordered to lie on the table.

A resolution by the Council of the City of Minneapolis, Minn., protesting against the enactment of legislation hampering or impeding the free use of inland waterway transportation facilities by requiring as a condition precedent to the making of appropriations for waterway projects for which a transportation value is claimed, a finding from the Interstate Commerce Commission; to the Committee on Commerce.

A resolution adopted by members of the Redlands (Calif.) Chapter of the Knights of the Round Table and its guests assembled, protesting against the ratification of a treaty between the United States of America and the United Mexican States relating to the waters of the Rio Grande, the Colorado, and the Tijuana Rivers; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

THE BAILEY AMENDMENT TO FLOOD-CONTROL BILL—TELEGRAM FROM THE GOVERNOR OF MONTANA

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, I offer for the RECORD and appropriate reference a telegram which I have received from the Governor of my State, the Honorable Sam C. Ford, in which he states:

HELENA, MONT., *November 24, 1944.*

Am opposed to Senator BAILEY's amendment to flood-control bill relating to disposal of power generated from multiple-purpose dams.

SAM C. FORD, *Governor.*

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the telegram will be received and lie on the table.

SETTLEMENT OF RAILROAD STRIKE IN THE CHICAGO AREA—PETITION

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. President, Mr. Otto J. Uhlir, 185 East Wilson Street, Elmhurst, Ill., has transmitted to me a petition signed by 61 commuters on the Chicago, Aurora & Elgin Railroad for the settlement of a strike which has been pending on the Chicago, North Shore & Milwaukee Railroad and the Chicago, Aurora & Elgin Railroad for the past week.

This strike has discommoded many employees of essential industries who use these roads to reach their places of employment. The various agencies of the Government have failed in obtaining an adjustment of differences.

The employees ask for a 9 cents per hour increase in pay, which is the equivalent of the increase granted by the President to the railroad workers earlier this year. The Government agencies were willing to approve a 5-cent increase, but disapproved the 9-cent increase.

The War and Navy Departments hold that arrangements have been made for the accommodation of their workers in essential industries, and have not certified the strike to the President as detrimental to the war in impeding the transportation of war necessities. As a result, a deadlock has ensued which leaves settlement apparently to the employers and employees. It is this situation for which the signers of the petition request alleviation.

I ask unanimous consent to include the letter and the petition, without the names of the signers, following my remarks, and that the letter and petition be properly referred.

I also have received the following telegram from Mr. LeRoy Mote, president of the Elgin Association of Commerce, advising me that 2,200 residents of the Elgin area are being embarrassed by this strike:

Chicago, Aurora & Elgin Railroad serves critical labor-shortage area. Strike on this road now in fifth day seriously handicapping some 2,200 Elgin area Chicago commuters, many of whom are war workers. Essential freight movements into Elgin and neighboring communities also completely cut off. Urge immediate attention be given this situation.

Other telegrams and letters were received, protesting against the continuance of the strike and urging its settlement.

There being no objection, the letter and the petition were received, referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD without the signatures attached, as follows:

ELMHURST, ILL., *November 20, 1944.*

Hon. C. WAYLAND BROOKS.

HONORABLE SIR: Herewith present for your consideration 60-signature petition regarding nonservice on Chicago, Aurora & Elgin R. R.

Thanking you in advance for any action you may take in the matter, I am,

Yours truly,

OTTO J. UHLIR.

ELMHURST, ILL., *November 18, 1944.*

Hon. C. WAYLAND BROOKS,
United States Senator, Washington, D. C.

Whereas the Chicago, Aurora & Elgin R. R. has discontinued service as of November 10, 1944;

Whereas this has caused undue delay to all essential workers thereby having a detrimental effect on the war effort: Therefore

We the undersigned citizens of the United States of America, commuters on above mentioned railroad, herewith petition you as our representative to use your judgment and influence in alleviating this nonservice as above-mentioned.

NATIONAL ST. LAWRENCE ASSOCIATION

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, on November 21 a group of leading American businessmen met at Detroit and organized the National St. Lawrence Association. The announced purpose of this association is to foster foreign trade and to give the industries and farmers of the Midwest direct access to world markets, as well as to our own intercoastal markets.

Among those participating in this association, according to a list which has been handed to me, are the following well-known businessmen:

Julius H. Barnes, of Duluth, three times president, United States Chamber of Commerce; Edward J. Noble, chairman of the board, Blue Network, New York; Henry Ford 2d, executive vice president, Ford Motor Co.; Daniel W. Hoan, former mayor of Milwaukee and president, Great Lakes Harbor Association; Fred J. Freestone, former chairman, executive committee, National Grange, Syracuse, N. Y.

Murray Lincoln, secretary, Ohio Farm Bureau, Columbus, Ohio; Cyrus Eaton, president, Otis & Co., Cleveland, Ohio; William Loeb, president, Burlington Daily News, Burlington, Vt.; Bernard Ridder, publisher, Pioneer Press, St. Paul, Minn.; Rollo F. Hunt, Duluth, Minn., chairman, Minesota Great Lakes Tidewater Commission.

Perry W. Jenkins, National Reclamation Association, Salt Lake City, Utah; Perry H. Stevens, president, Commercial Securities, Gary, Ind.; William L. White, publisher, Emporia Gazette, Emporia, Kans.; Donald S. Kiskadden, vice president and general manager, Buhl Land Co., Detroit, Mich.; John C. Beukema, secretary, Michigan Great Lakes Tidewater Commission, Muskegon, Mich.

George E. Hardy, chairman, Ohio Waterways Commission, Toledo, Ohio; Roy W. Gifford, vice president and general manager, Norge Division, Borg-Warner Co.; Clarence J. Reese, president, Continental Motors, Muskegon, Mich.; Manferd Burleigh, president, Great Lakes Greyhound Corporation, Detroit; James E. Davidson, shipbuilder, Bay City, Mich.

W. A. Stinchcomb, director, Cleveland Metropolitan Park District, Cleveland, Ohio; Murray D. VanWagoner, Detroit, former Governor of Michigan; E. B. Crosby, Northern Federation Chambers of Commerce, Massena, N. Y.; Jo Winterbotham, chairman, Champlain Valley Council, Burlington, Vt.

I understand that this is only a partial and preliminary list of the prominent businessmen of the United States who have united in this association for the purpose of bringing about the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence waterway development.

The association elected Julius H. Barnes, president; W. C. Cowling, executive director, Detroit Port Commission, as executive vice president; and Allen Dean, transportation manager, Detroit Board of Commerce, secretary-treasurer.

In announcing the organization of the association, Mr. Barnes, the president, stated that members participating in the organization were motivated by the conviction that the solution of the critical post-war problem of employment makes it imperative that steps be taken now to lift the transportation handicap of the great Middle West. As one phase the association hopes for early favorable action in Congress on the pending St. Lawrence seaway and power agreement.

The association office has been opened at 2200 Buhl Building, Detroit 26, Mich.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks a resolution which was adopted at the meeting of businessmen in Detroit.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The St. Lawrence navigation and power project has repeatedly been advocated by the responsible leadership of both parties and has been officially recommended by every President since before World War No. 1, as an improvement that will promote the security of the whole Natfon and benefit all our people in war and in peace.

On October 24, 1944, in messages made public by Senator GEORGE D. AIKEN, at the St. Lawrence conference at Detroit, President Franklin D. Roosevelt, and Gov. Thomas E. Dewey expressly renewed their previous endorsements of the St. Lawrence project in its entirety and joined in pledging its construction as a nonpartisan, post-war measure.

The merits of the St. Lawrence project are now beyond controversy, since it has been investigated and studied over the past 25 years by numerous international commissions and engineering boards, and by the United States Department of State, the War and Navy Departments, the Department of Commerce, the United States Corps of Engineers, the United States Maritime Commission, and in each instance the engineering, economic, and national defense advantages of the project have been unanimously approved.

The Senate Foreign Relations Committee in 1933 and the House Rivers and Harbors Committee in 1941 held extensive and exhaustive hearings covering every aspect of the project and overwhelmingly approved it.

The St. Lawrence project has the support of outstanding leaders of all parties in the Congress of the United States, among them Majority Leader Senator ALBEN BARKLEY, of Kentucky, the chairman of the Senate Banking Committee, Senator ROBERT F. WAGNER, of New York; Senator LISTER HILL, of Alabama; Senator JAMES MURRAY, of Montana; Senator GEORGE D. AIKEN, of Vermont; Senator ARTHUR VANDENBERG and Senator HOMER FERGUSON, of Michigan; Senator HENRIK SHIPSTEAD and Senator JOSEPH BALL, of Minnesota; Senator ARTHUR CAPPER and Senator CLYDE REED, of Kansas; Senator ROBERT LA FOLLETTE and Senator ALEXANDER WILEY, of Wisconsin, and many more of their colleagues in the United States Senate, as well as many leaders in the House of Representatives, the Speaker of the House, SAM RAYBURN; the chairman of the Rivers and Harbors Committee, Judge J. J. MANSFIELD; Congressmen LOUIS RABAUT and JOHN D. DINGELL, of Michigan, WILLIAM PITTENGER, of Minnesota, and a large number of their colleagues.

The Canadian-American agreement now before Congress was submitted to the Senate and the House in March 1941. The House Committee on Rivers and Harbors, under the leadership of its great chairman, Judge J. J. MANSFIELD, took jurisdiction over the measure after hearing arguments of the opposition that it should be submitted only to the Senate for two-thirds approval. The committee favorably reported the bill to the House but action was delayed by the attack on Pearl Harbor. In the Senate for 3½ years, no question was raised as to the power of the President to enter into such an agreement. The constitutional basis of the agreement is in the well-recognized power of the President in international relations and the power of Congress over domestic and foreign commerce, as well as the Boundary Waters Treaty of 1909, which provides for further improvements of the St. Lawrence Basin by joint legislative action of the legislatures in Canada and the United States.

Any attempt made by opponents of the project to raise the issue of treaty versus agreement is an obstructionist tactic to frustrate the will of the people and to break the pledges of both major parties and their leaders for 30 years. At a time when both parties are dedicated to creating unity in the world for peace and prosperity, a recalcitrant minority representing sectional or special interests must not be allowed to divide our country and to destroy the constructive program of both parties for creative employment for war workers and returning veterans.

The National St. Lawrence Association, therefore, commends the announced intention of Senator GEORGE D. AIKEN to obtain early approval of the St. Lawrence project on the floor of the Senate, and appreciates the support of President Roosevelt and Majority Leader BARKLEY for Senator AIKEN'S program of action.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. HATCH, from the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys:

S. 1581. A bill to authorize the Secretary of War to acquire lands and provide facilities to replace Indian fishing grounds submerged or destroyed as a result of the construction of the Bonneville Dam; without amendment (Rept. No. 1189);

H. R. 1654. A bill to authorize the acquisition, rehabilitation, and operation of the facilities for the public in the Olympic National Park, in the State of Washington, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1190); and

H. R. 5232. A bill to transfer jurisdiction over the Chattanooga National Cemetery, Chattanooga, Tenn., from the Department of the Interior to the War Department, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1191).

By Mr. GURNEY, from the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys:

S. 2141. A bill to provide for the acceptance and protection by the United States of property within the authorized boundaries of the Everglades National Park project, Florida, pending the establishment of the park, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1192).

By Mr. ELLENDER, from the Committee on Claims:

H. R. 4366. A bill for the relief of Alex Wylie and the estate of James Evans; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1193).

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

Bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. ELLENDER:

S. 2198. A bill for the relief of the New England Telephone & Telegraph Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts:

S. 2199. A bill to provide reimbursement for personal property lost, damaged, or destroyed, as the result of an explosion at the Naval Air Station, Norfolk, Va., on September 17, 1943; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

(Mr. BUSHFIELD introduced S. J. Res. 157, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. CONNALLY:

S. J. Res. 158. Joint resolution recognizing the outstanding service rendered to the United Nations by Field Marshal Sir John Dill; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

ELECTION OF THE PRESIDENT AND VICE PRESIDENT BY POPULAR VOTE—PROPOSED CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT

Mr. BUSHFIELD. I ask unanimous consent to introduce for appropriate reference a joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States. The purpose of the joint resolution is to abolish the electoral college and to make the selection of President and Vice President by popular vote.

There being no objection, the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 157) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the election of the President and the Vice President, was received, read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H. R. 4911) to amend the Federal Crop Insurance Act, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

RIVER AND HARBOR IMPROVEMENTS—AMENDMENT

MR. TYDINGS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 3691) authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

FLOOD CONTROL PROJECTS—AMENDMENTS

Mr. O'MAHONEY (for himself, Mr. AUSTIN, Mr. BUSHFIELD, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. CLARK of Idaho, Mr. DOWNEY, Mr. HATCH, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado, Mr. LANGER, Mr. MCCARRAN, Mr. MCFARLAND, Mr. MILLIKIN, Mr. MURDOCK, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. NYE, Mr. ROBERTSON, Mr. SCRUGHAM, Mr. THOMAS of Utah, Mr. THOMAS of Idaho, Mr. WHEELER, and Mr. WILSON) submitted amendments intended to be proposed by them, jointly, to the bill (H. R. 4485) authorizing the construction of certain public works on rivers and harbors for flood control, and for other purposes, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. BURTON submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to House bill 4485, supra, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. ROBERTSON (for Mr. BUCK) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by Mr. BUCK to House bill 4485, supra, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. MILLIKIN (for himself and Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by them jointly to House bill 4485, supra, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

INVESTIGATION OF INTERNATIONAL COMMUNICATIONS BY WIRE AND RADIO—INCREASE IN LIMIT OF EXPENDITURES

Mr. MCFARLAND (for himself, Mr. WHEELER, and Mr. WHITE) submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 340), which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That the limit of expenditures of the Committee on Interstate Commerce under Senate Resolution 268, Seventy-eighth Congress, agreed to March 29, 1944 (relating to an investigation of international communications by wire and radio), is hereby increased by $10,000.

REVIEW OF REPORTS ON GULF INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY (S. DOC. NO. 248)

Mr. CONNALLY presented a letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a report dated October 7, 1944, from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, on a review of reports on the Gulf Intracoastal Waterway, with a view to determining if it is advisable to modify the existing project in any way, particularly with reference to the construction of a side channel and turning basin in Red Fish Bay, which, with the accompanying report, was referred to the Committee on Commerce and ordered to be printed with an illustration.

UTILIZATION OF WATERS OF THE COLORADO AND TIJUANA RIVERS AND OF THE RIO GRANDE—PROTOCOL

As in executive session,

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, the President of the United States has sent to the Senate a protocol supplementary to the treaty between the United States and Mexico with reference to the waters of the Colorado and Tijuana Rivers and the Rio Grande. I ask unanimous consent that the protocol be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and that the ban of secrecy be removed therefrom.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, as in executive session, the request of the Senator from Texas is granted, and the protocol will be published in the RECORD.

The protocol (Executive H, Seventy-eighth Congress, second session) is as follows:

To the Senate of the United States:

With a view to receiving the advice and consent of the Senate to ratification, I transmit herewith a protocol, signed in Washington on November 14, 1944, supplementary to the treaty between the United States of America and the United Mexican States relating to the utilization of the waters of the Colorado and Tijuana Rivers and of the Rio Grande (Rio Bravo) which was signed in Washington on February 3, 1944.

I also transmit for the information of the Senate a report on the protocol made to me by the Acting Secretary of State.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *November 24, 1944.*

[Enclosures: 1. Report of the Acting Secretary of State.

2. Protocol, signed November 14, 1944, supplementary to treaty between United States and Mexico signed February 3, 1944.]

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, November 22, 1944.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House.

Mr. PRESIDENT: The undersigned, the Acting Secretary of State, has the honor to lay before the President, with a view to its transmission to the Senate to receive the advice and consent of that body to ratification, if his judgment approve thereof, a protocol, signed in Washington on November 14, 1944, supplementary to the treaty between the United States of America and the United Mexican States relating to the utilization of the waters of the Colorado and Tijuana Rivers and of the Rio Grande (Rio Bravo), which was signed in Washington on February 3, 1944.

The treaty of February 3, 1944, was transmitted to the Senate by the President with his message of February 15, 1944, with a view to receiving the advice and consent of the Senate to ratification thereof. The texts of the treaty and of the President's message, together with the text of the report of the Secretary of State dated February 9, 1944, have been printed in Senate Executive A, Seventy-eighth Congress, second session. The treaty was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate on February 15, 1944.

The purpose of the protocol is to clarify the meaning and application of those provisions of the treaty which relate to the functions and jurisdiction of the respective sections of the International Boundary and Water Commission in connection with the construction or use of works for storage or conveyance of water, flood control, stream gaging, or for any other purpose.

By its own terms the protocol is to be regarded as an integral part of the treaty of February 3, 1944, and shall be effective beginning with the day of the entry into force of the treaty, continuing effective so long as the treaty remains in force. Accordingly, after such time as the Senate may have given its advice and consent to the ratification of the treaty and protocol, the protocol should be ratified together with the treaty. It is provided in the protocol, as in the treaty, that the ratifications shall be exchanged in Washington.

Respectfully submitted.

EDWARD R. STETTINIUS, Jr.,
Acting Secretary of State.

[Enclosure: Protocol, signed November 14, 1944, supplementary to treaty between United States and Mexico relating to waters of the Colorado and Tijuana Rivers and of the Rio Grande signed February 3, 1944.]

PROTOCOL

The Government of the United States of America and the Government of the United Mexican States agree and understand that:

Wherever, by virtue of the provisions of the Treaty between the United States of America and the United Mexican States, signed in Washington on February 3, 1944, relating to the utilization of the waters of the Colorado and Tijuana Rivers and of the Rio Grande from Fort Quitman, Texas, to the Gulf of Mexico, specific functions are imposed on, or exclusive jurisdiction is vested in, either of the Sections of the International Boundary and Water Commission, which involve the construction or use of works for storage or conveyance of water, flood control, stream gaging, or for any other purpose, which are situated wholly within the territory of the country of that Section, and which are to be used only partly for the performance of treaty provisions, such jurisdiction shall be exercised, and such functions, including the construction, operation, and maintenance of the said works, shall be performed and carried out by the Federal agencies of that country which now or hereafter may be authorized by domestic law to construct, or to operate and maintain, such works. Such functions or jurisdictions shall be exercised in conformity with the provisions of the Treaty and in cooperation with the respective Section of the Commission, to the end that all international obligations and functions may be coordinated and fulfilled.

The works to be constructed or used on or along the boundary, and those to be constructed or used exclusively for the discharge of treaty stipulations, shall be under the jurisdiction of the Commission or of the respective Section, in accordance with the provisions of the Treaty. In carrying out the construction of such works the Sections of the Commission may utilize the services of public or private organizations in accordance with the laws of their respective countries.

This Protocol, which shall be regarded as an integral part of the aforementioned Treaty signed in Washington on February 3, 1944, shall be ratified and the ratifications thereof shall be exchanged in Washington. This Protocol shall be effective beginning with the day of the entry into force of the Treaty and shall continue effective so long as the Treaty remains in force.

In witness whereof the respective Plenipotentiaries have signed this Protocol and have hereunto affixed their seals.

Done in duplicate, in the English and Spanish languages, in Washington, this fourteenth day of November, 1944.

For the Government of the United States of America:

[SEAL] E. R. STETTINIUS, Jr.,
Acting Secretary of State of the United States of America.

For the Government of the United Mexican States:

[SEAL] F. CASTILLO NÁJERA,
Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United Mexican States in Washington.

C. I. O. CONVENTION ADDRESS BY THE VICE PRESIDENT

[Mr. LUCAS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the address delivered by the Vice President at the annual convention of the C. I. O. in Chicago, Ill., on November 21, 1944, which appears in the Appendix.]

REORGANIZATION OF CONGRESS—ADDRESS BY SENATOR DAVIS BEFORE PITTSBURGH LEAGUE OF WOMEN VOTERS

[Mr. DAVIS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "Reorganization of Congress," delivered by him before the League of Women Voters at Pittsburgh, Pa., on October 6, 1944, which appears in the Appendix.]

TRIBUTE TO THE LATE SENATOR ELLISON D. SMITH

[Mr. MAYBANK asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial tribute to the late Senator Ellison D. Smith, of South Carolina, published in the State, of Columbia, S. C., of November 18, 1944, which appears in the Appendix.]

EDITORIAL TRIBUTES TO JAMES A. FARLEY

[Mr. GERRY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "'Jim' Farley, Business Man," published in the Tucson Daily Citizen for June 12, 1944, and an editorial entitled "Jim Farley's Americanism," published in the Savannah News for July 24, 1944, which appear in the Appendix.]

TRIBUTE TO JOSEPHUS DANIELS BY RALPH McGILL

[Mr. HILL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article by Ralph McGill, entitled "Greatest Southerner?" paying tribute to Josephus Daniels, which appears in the Appendix.]

WELCOME TO THE PRESIDENT ON HIS RETURN TO WASHINGTON—ARTICLE BY JAMES E. CHINN

[Mr. BILBO asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article by James E. Chinn, published in the Washington Post, describing the welcome to the

President of the United States on his return to Washington after the election, which appears in the Appendix.]

MEDICAL PROBLEMS PRESENTED BY AVIATION—PAPER BY DR. A. J. HERBOLSHEIMER

[Mr. BROOKS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a paper on the subject of the medical problems presented by aviation, prepared by Dr. A. J. Herbolsheimer, Assistant Chief of the Aviation Medical Division, Civil Aeronautics Administration, which appears in the Appendix.]

DEVELOPMENT OF ST. LAWRENCE RIVER—EDITORIAL COMMENT

[Mr. AIKEN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD two editorials and an article on the subject of the St. Lawrence waterway development, which appear in the Appendix.]

THE ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY—EDITORIAL FROM ST. CLOUD (MINN.) TIMES

[Mr. LANGER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "East Still Fights Seaway," published in the St. Cloud (Minn.) Times for November 17, 1944, which appears in the Appendix.]

FLOOD-CONTROL PROJECTS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4485) authorizing the construction of certain public works on rivers and harbors for flood control, and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment as modified, to insert section 5, on which the yeas and nays have been ordered. The clerk will read the agreement providing for limitation of debate.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

Ordered by unanimous consent, That during the further consideration of the pending amendment (Bailey amendment) no Senator shall speak more than once or longer than 15 minutes on the amendment or any amendment thereto.

Mr. PEPPER obtained the floor.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. If my time will not begin to run until I begin to speak, I shall not be embarrassed by the limitation on debate, but I think the limitation on debate really applies from the time the Senator from Florida was recognized. Otherwise I should be very glad to yield.

Mr. HATCH. I withdraw the request.

Mr. HILL. Will the Senator yield so that I may suggest the absence of a quorum?

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, would the time for a quorum call be taken out of the time of the speaker?

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum call would come out of the Senator's time.

Mr. PEPPER. Very well, then I shall proceed.

Mr. President, the amendment pending before the Senate, known as the Bailey amendment, in my opinion is a very critical subject for the Senate to discuss. The able chairman of the Committee on Commerce, of which I have had the honor to be a member since I have been in the Senate, I think intends to reverse the public power policy of the United States Government. I do not think the able Senator has been reluctant to express that purpose. I am sure that those who have made a study of the amendment would agree that if the amendment were adopted it would have that effect.

I cannot but imagine, as I contemplate this amendment and the proposed change in the power policy of the United States, what sentiments would be expressed in the Senate upon this amendment by that great soul now departed from us who formerly was the symbol for the protection of public power in America, and the development of America's resources for public use, the lamented Senator George W. Norris, of Nebraska. I believe there is not a Senator on this floor who does not believe that if Senator George W. Norris were a Member of this body the full weight of his eloquence, and character, and ability, would be thrown against the amendment, for Senator George W. Norris would recognize that the amendment proposed practically would strangle the distribution of public power at the very source of it, the dam at which the power was generated.

Mr. President, my State is so geographically constituted that it has very little opportunity for the development of hydroelectric power. I wish the opportunities were greater. But in the last few months as on previous occasions, it has been my privilege to visit the great West, and particularly the areas around about those mighty dams which have been constructed in that section, the Coulee Dam, the Bonneville Dam, the Boulder Dam, and others in other parts of our country. I know that if we permit the adoption of such an amendment as is pending here today it will mean the strangulation of the distribution of that public power. It will retard and prevent the development of those great areas now in process of consummation, agriculturally and industrially. It will mean that where arid lands are today there will continue to be arid lands, instead of fertile lands watered into great fruitfulness by the magnificent sources of power which have been created there by public act. It will mean, Mr. President, that those arid lands will continue to be desert instead of the sites of great cities, as will occur if we permit the progression and the expansion of the public power policies which have been followed by the Government essentially since this administration has been in power.

The amendment of the Commerce Committee as it was originally reported provided adequate safeguards for private power companies. It provided that the Secretary of the Interior should not have authority to build distribution lines unless it were necessary in the public interest to do so; that is to say, unless it were necessary to build those lines by the Government in order to afford a proper distribution of public power at reasonable rates.

Those two requirements are singularly absent from the amendment of the able chairman of the committee. He provides that the Government cannot build an extension line unless an offer is made by a private company for the purchase of the power, or unless private companies do purchase the power. But, Mr. President, it will be noted it does not provide the safeguard the original amendment provides, that the distribution of the power must cover the area which properly should be served, at fair and reasonable rates. If a private company offered to take all the power which the dam generated and produced, or 90 percent of it, and distribute it in a small segment of the area which should be served by the great dam, then the amendment of the Senator from North Carolina would be satisfied, and there would be no power on the part of public authority to serve the rural sections or the other areas in that larger area which should be the beneficiaries of this great source of hydroelectric power.

Moreover, Mr. President, if the private company said, "Yes, we will take 90 percent of the power generated, but we are going to distribute at rates which we desire, or which we may be able to get by a State regulatory agency," that, too, would satisfy the requirements of the Bailey amendment, that would prohibit any public authority from extending lines out into the area which should be served in order to get that publicly generated power into the hands of users at reasonable rates.

So, Mr. President, it might as well be admitted that the purpose of the amendment is to protect the private power companies and deprive the people of the use of public power generated at public expense and which ought to be for public use. To my mind this proposal represents a brazen effort to reverse the public power policy of this Government, which has been initiated and carried out under this administration.

It seems to me, therefore, Mr. President, that those who are aware of what has been accomplished by this policy in all sections of the country would join in a concerted effort to defeat the amendment. It would seem to me especially that Senators who come from the great West, where dams have already been built, would not permit the strangulation of their cities and the fertile farms which are to grow around the dams, by the adoption of such a policy as is proposed by the amendment. It would seem to me that Senators who contemplate the improvement and development of the great rivers yet to be harnessed by other power authorities—and, as I recall, the President in one of his speeches during the campaign enumerated six or eight great river systems with respect to which authorities ought to be set up in order to harness the power of those streams and turn them into the service of the public—would come to the side of those who are opposed to this amendment.

It would further seem to me that all those interested in the opening up of the great mineral resources of the West and other areas of the country where such resources are to be found would not desire to deny to the public the power necessary to help them in the development of those resources by changing the power policy of the United States as is contemplated by the pending amendment.

Mr. President, a little while ago there were some of us who thought that it might be the policy of some, if they came into power in the Government, to do something like this, because a very

able gentleman, seeking a high office, speaking in Portland, Oreg., Governor Bricker, of Ohio, announced that it was his opinion—I suppose he meant to say it was the policy of his party, or at least his policy and that of his running mate—that public power should not be publicly distributed from the site of the dam. There were a great many people in the West to my personal knowledge who thought they could appreciate the significance of that proposal and were grievously concerned about it. I believe that it has been the action of the people of this country to discourage that kind of proposed alteration in the power policy of the country, and to preserve the policy which we have so successfully pursued in the years past. That policy has not taken any advantage of any private power company. It has not, as is feared by the able chairman of the committee, duplicated the line of a private company without satisfying the constitutional requirement of paying the company the fair value of the private line of which it has been dispossessed. There can be no reasonable fear based on the experience of the past, therefore, that any private company is about to be ousted from the enjoyment of its proper field. It would seem to me therefore, Mr. President, that it is not experience, it is not proven results of the power policy of this Government which dictate this amendment, but it is the wish to serve the private instead of the public interest; the wish to see these great resources enjoyed for private profit rather than for public use, which actuates those who believe in such amendment as is proposed here today.

I hope therefore that the people of the West will not be disappointed, I hope that those living in the vicinity of these great rivers yet to be harnessed will not be disappointed by action taken in the Senate today. I hope other sections of the country, including my own South, which are in process of having their own resources tapped and their own rivers harnessed, may not be disappointed by the action which the Senate will take today. It is my belief therefore that the amendment is not in the public interest and should be defeated.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment, as modified.

Mr. HILL. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Cordon	Kilgore
Austin	Davis	La Follette
Bailey	Downey	Langer
Ball	Ellender	Lucas
Bankhead	Ferguson	McClellan
Barkley	George	McFarland
Bilbo	Gerry	McKellar
Brooks	Gillette	Maloney
Burton	Green	Maybank
Bushfield	Guffey	Mead
Butler	Gurney	Millikin
Byrd	Hatch	Murray
Capper	Hayden	Nye
Caraway	Hill	O'Daniel
Chandler	Jenner	O'Mahoney
Clark, Mo.	Johnson, Calif.	Overton
Connally	Johnson, Colo.	Pepper
Radcliffe	Thomas, Idaho	Wheeler
Revercomb	Thomas, Okla.	Wherry
Reynolds	Tunnell	White
Robertson	Tydings	Wiley
Russell	Vandenberg	Willis
Shipstead	Walsh, Mass.	
Taft	Weeks	

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] is absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. STEWART] are absent because of illness in their families.

The Senators from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN and Mr. SCRUGHAM] and the Senator from Utah [Mr. MURDOCK] are detained on official business for the Senate.

The Senator from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN], the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER], the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], the Senator from Washington [Mr. WALLGREN] and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WALSH] are necessarily absent.

Mr. WHERRY. The following Senators are necessarily absent:

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BUCK], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HAWKES], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MOORE], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. WILSON], and the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER].

The Senator from Oregon [Mr. HOLMAN] is absent because of illness in his family.

The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DANAHER] is absent on important public business.

Mr. WHITE. I announce the necessary absence from the city of the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY].

The VICE PRESIDENT. Seventy Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, last Wednesday I had occasion to discuss the so-called Bailey amendment to the pending flood-control bill. I stated then, and I repeat now, that I favor the development of power by the Government because it is only by coordinated effort that our immense water resources can be adequately developed. I favor this development provided that it is under the supervision of the War Department, acting through its efficient Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors. Because of the close relationship that exists between the protection of our country from floods, the utilization of water for irrigation, and the development of electric power from our water resources, the Congress should insist that the War Department should be the instrumentality through which this important work is to be carried out.

During the course of my remarks I stated that the Bailey amendment was somewhat in conflict with the historical policy of Congress which had been established many years ago. I have a short synopsis of the various acts in which the Congress declared its policy in respect to the development of power. I ask unanimous consent that the synopsis be printed at this point in the RECORD, following my remarks.

There being no objection, the synopsis was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The proposed amendment is in conflict with the historical policy of Congress, originally expressed in the Federal Water Power Act in 1920 and subsequently embodied in such legislation as the Boulder Dam Act, T. V. A. Act, the Bonneville Act, and the Fort Peck Act.

Thus section 7 (a) of the Federal Power Act (formerly the Federal Water Power Act) reads in part as follows:

"Section 7 (a). In issuing preliminary permits hereunder or licenses where no preliminary permit has been issued and in issuing licenses to new licensees under section 15 hereof the Commission shall give preference to applications therefor by States and municipalities provided the plans for the same are deemed by the Commission equally well adapted, or shall within a reasonable time to be fixed by the Commission be made equally well adapted to conserve and utilize in the public interest the water resources of the region; * * *."

By this legislation Congress established the policy of giving public bodies preferential access to the water power resources over which it had jurisdiction. This policy was carried into section 5 (c) of the Boulder Canyon Project Act of 1928.

The Tennessee Valley Authority Act embodies this policy in sections 10, 11, and 12, which read in part as follows:

"SEC. 10. The board is hereby empowered and authorized to sell the surplus power not used in its operations, and for operation of locks and other works * * *, to States, counties, municipalities, corporations, partnerships, or individuals, according to the policies herein set forth; and to carry out said authority the board is authorized to enter into contracts for such sale for a term not exceeding 20 years, and in the sale of such current by the board it shall give preference to States, counties, municipalities, and cooperative organizations of citizens or farmers, not organized or doing business for profit, but primarily for the purpose of supplying electricity to its own citizens or members. * * *

"SEC. 11. It is hereby declared to be the policy of the Government so far as practical to distribute and sell the surplus power generated at Muscle Shoals equitably among the States, counties, and municipalities within transmission distance * * *.

"SEC. 12. In order to place the board upon a fair basis for making such contracts and for receiving bids for the sales of such power, it is hereby expressly authorized, either from appropriations made by Congress or from funds secured from the sale of such power, or from funds secured from the sale of bonds hereafter provided for, to construct, lease, purchase, or authorize the construction of transmission lines within transmission distance from the place where generated, and to interconnect with other systems."

The Bonneville Act embodies this policy in sections 2 (b) and 4 (a), as follows:

"SEC. 2 (b). In order to encourage the widest possible use of all electric energy that can be generated and marketed and to provide reasonable outlets therefor, and to prevent the monopolization thereof by limited groups, the administration is authorized and directed to provide, construct, operate, maintain, and improve such electric transmission lines and substations, and facilities and structures appurtenant thereto, as he finds necessary, desirable, or appropriate for the purpose of transmitting electric energy, available for sale, from the Bonneville project to existing and potential markets and, for the purpose of interchange of electric energy, to interconnect the Bonneville project with

other Federal projects and publicly owned power systems now or hereafter constructed."

"SEC. 4. (a) In order to insure that the facilities for the generation of electric energy at the Bonneville project shall be operated for the benefit of the general public, and particularly domestic and rural consumers, the Administrator shall at all times, in disposing of electric energy generated at said project, give preference to public bodies and cooperatives."

The Fort Peck Act contains sections 2 (b) and 4 (a) practically identical with those quoted from the Bonneville Act.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I wish to emphasize some of the arguments made by me last Wednesday in opposition to the so-called Bailey amendment.

The proposed amendment would limit the Federal Government to a single purchaser who would be in a position practically to dictate terms. In other words, the Federal Government would be placed in the position little better than that of building power projects for private monopolies. The sections from the various acts placed in the RECORD a few moments ago by me are clearly designed to avoid such a situation and the decision of the Supreme Court in the Ashwander case, involving the T. V. A., recognized the right of the Federal Government to full opportunity to market its power in such a way as best to serve the public interest.

The experiences of the Federal Government in connection with the marketing of Muscle Shoals power, prior to the creation of the T. V. A., prove conclusively the fallacy of the proposed amendment. The private power company serving the region was paying less than 3 mills per kilowatt-hour for the power, while retailing power to residential consumers in the area for as much as 8 cents. The distinguished Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] called attention to the matter last Wednesday.

The proposed amendment is in conflict with the Government's general power policy as embodied in the acts heretofore referred to and in the Rural Electrification Administration Act. That policy is designed to assure the widest possible distribution of electricity at the lowest possible rates in order to build up the economic life of the regions in which power can be made available. The purpose includes the development of industry, the electrification of farms, the improvement of home life, and the general raising of living standards.

To accomplish this broad purpose, the Federal Government must retain the authority to deliver power without the "by your leave" of the local monopoly, whose high rates may be thwarting this very purpose. Thus in the Brazos River area in Texas, the decision of the Brazos River Authority to build transmission lines and sell power to rural electric cooperatives led to a reduction from 12 mills to 6 mills per kilowatt-hour in the rates which the private company insisted it must charge for wholesale power supply to such cooperatives.

The proposed amendment is basically in conflict with the fundamental legal concept of such public services as the supplying of electricity. Historically such services have been universally recognized by the law as public or governmental functions which the Government may perform itself, through its own agency, or permit a private agency to perform. In the latter case, the private agency is performing a public function and must be subject to governmental control.

The Federal agency responsible for marketing publicly developed power from resources subject to the authority of Congress must not be hamstrung in its efforts to perform this public function in whatever way will best serve the public interest.

I understand that it is proposed to modify the Bailey amendment so as to permit the Secretary of the Interior to build lines for the use of cooperatives that sell in rural areas. Such an amendment would improve the Bailey amendment, but preference would still remain in the hands of private industry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment, as modified, to section 5, on page 4 of the bill. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, let me inquire what the modification is.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment as modified will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. It is proposed to amend section 5 by striking out all the language after the word "cooperatives" and the period on page 4, line 25, and ending on page 5, line 7, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

The sale of such electric power as may be generated at reservoir projects shall be made at the point of production, without special privilege or discrimination, so as to provide for the complete coordination of such power and energy with other power developments, both private and public, in the area contiguous with such projects. It shall be stipulated in connection with any sale that any and all savings realized by the purchasers shall be passed on under Federal regulation where no State regulation exists to the consuming public: *Provided*, That unless 90 percent of the firm power produced at such projects shall be demanded or purchased within 3 years after completion of construction of such projects, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to construct transmission lines for the purpose of selling such power at wholesale.

So that section 5 as modified will read as follows:

SEC. 5. Electric power and energy generated at reservoir projects under the control of the War Department and in the opinion of the Secretary of War not required in the operation of such projects shall be delivered to the Secretary of the Interior, who shall transmit and dispose of such power and energy in such manner as to encourage the most widespread use thereof at the lowest possible rates to consumers consistent with sound business principles, the rate schedules to become effective upon confirmation and approval by the Federal Power Commission. Preference in the sale of such power and energy shall be given to public bodies and cooperatives. The sale of such electric power as may be generated at reservoir projects shall be made at the point of production, without special privilege or discrimination, so as to provide for the complete coordination of such power and energy with other power developments, both private and public, in the area contiguous with such projects. It shall be stipulated in connection with any sale that any and all savings realized by the purchasers shall be passed on under Federal regulation where no State regulation exists, to the consuming public: *Provided*, That unless 90 percent of the firm power produced at such projects shall be demanded or purchased within 3 years after completion of construction of such projects, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to construct transmission lines for the purpose of selling such power at wholesale.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, to the pending amendment, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk, to be added at the end of the pending amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment to the amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. It is proposed that the following proviso be added to the amendment as modified:

Provided, That nothing herein shall prohibit the building of such transmission lines by the Federal Government or the Secretary of the Interior with Federal funds to supply rural electric associations organized for the purpose of supplying electric energy to rural districts.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President, I have no objection to the amendment. I have assured the distinguished Senator from Alabama that I would accept his amendment, and I ask that my amendment be modified according to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Alabama.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD] to the so-called Bailey amendment, being the committee amendment, as modified, on page 4, after line 13.

The amendment to the committee amendment as modified was agreed to.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, what have we voted on?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senate has voted on the amendment offered by the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD] to the committee amendment as modified, being the so-called Bailey amendment. The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The question now recurs on the modified committee amendment as amended, on which the yeas and nays have been ordered.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, in the absence of the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MALONEY] I wish to inquire what has happened to the amendment which he gave notice last Wednesday he would offer? His amendment would strike out in line 8, page 3, of the so-called Bailey amendment the words "demanded or" and the words "within 3 years after", and insert before the word "completion" the word "upon", so that the amendment of the Senator from North Carolina would at that place read as follows:

That unless 90 percent of the firm power produced at such projects shall be purchased upon completion of construction of such projects, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to construct transmission lines for the purpose of selling such power at wholesale.

Many of us are very much interested in the amendment. In the absence of the Senator from Connecticut I hesitate to press it. It would, however, make much difference in my attitude toward

the whole committee amendment if the amendment of the Senator from Connecticut were agreed to.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President, the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MALONEY] sent word to me that he would be present in the Chamber at 1:15 o'clock this afternoon, and not before. I should very much like to have the final vote on the pending amendment deferred until the Senator from Connecticut has arrived. I am agreeable to his amendment, and I believe that I have the right to submit it myself and get it before the Senate at this time. If the Senator from Michigan wishes to have me yield to him for that purpose, I shall be glad to do so.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I should be very glad if the able Senator from North Carolina would accept the amendment.

Mr. BAILEY. I should like to submit it in order that it may be before the Senate for consideration. Mr. President, I send forward the amendment heretofore referred to by the Senator from Connecticut, known as the Maloney amendment. I strike out the name "Maloney" and substitute in its place the name "Bailey," but with the understanding that if the Senator from Connecticut comes into the Chamber and wishes the amendment to be known as his amendment, it may be so arranged. It is an amendment to the so-called Bailey amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LUCAS in the chair). The clerk will read the amendment offered by the Senator from North Carolina.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 3, line 8, of the so-called Bailey amendment it is proposed to amend by striking out the words "demanded or" and the words "within 3 years after", and insert before the word "completion" the word "upon", so that the amendment of the Senator from North Carolina would at that place read as follows:

That unless 90 percent of the firm power produced at such projects shall be purchased upon completion of construction of such projects, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to construct transmission lines for the purpose of selling such power at wholesale.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, the amendment would strike out the 3-year twilight zone which has been, in my judgment, appropriately criticized.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I should like to say a word with reference to the proposed amendment. I should like to make it clear that I do not propose to vote for the amendment in any form unless it affects favorably the essential character of the original committee amendment. I cannot see how the amendment would overcome the objection some of us have to the committee amendment. In the first place, I believe the amendment to be impractical. It contemplates that by the time of the completion of a dam private companies shall have purchased in an effective way all or 90 percent of the firm power to be generated. That would mean that in contemplation of the completion of the dam, private companies must have constructed systems, laid them out, and actually begun the purchase of power, if I understand the language of the amendment correctly, by the time of the completion of the dam. In the first place, I doubt very seriously whether private companies could conform to such requirements. I can conceive of an interval of time existing during which private companies might not have constructed the lines to use the power which would be furnished. The Federal Government would not be authorized to construct the lines, and the result would be that the power would be in existence and available, and yet no use could be made of it.

But, as I have said, the proposed amendment would not overcome the essential objection which some of us have raised to the committee amendment as amended, namely, that nothing in the committee amendment lays down any requirement that the rates at which private companies may distribute power shall be reasonable rates.

In the second place, there is no requirement in the so-called Bailey amendment that the private companies which would have the right to avail themselves of the power shall serve the area which ought to be served by the power, control of which the private companies would have.

Until the two essential deficiencies to which I have referred can be met, I cannot bring myself into accord with the so-called Bailey amendment, and I do not see how the deficiencies could be cured by the amendment which has just been offered by the Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I wish to state that the modification which would be brought about in the Bailey amendment by the acceptance of the so-called Maloney amendment would not remove my fundamental objection to the Bailey amendment. All it would do would be to require that the preferential status proposed by the Bailey amendment to be given to private corporations shall be exercised by the time the dam has been constructed. All that would be required would be for the proper authorities to make a contract in advance of the construction of the dam for 90 percent of the power to be generated by it. So long as the private corporations consumed 90 percent of the power in perpetual exercise of the right given them, no one else could purchase any power unless it be the 10 percent remaining after the 90 percent had been consumed. As I said the other day, I am not willing to give to anyone a preferential status in the consumption and use of power made possible by the expenditure of public money. If any preference is to be given it should be given to cooperatives, and, I believe, municipalities should be included with them. They are not now included in the amendment.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Yes; they are.

Mr. BARKLEY. They are not included in the Bankhead amendment. So all the amendment would do would be to remove the 3-year period and give to the preferred companies the right to move in during the construction of a dam and contract for the purchase of the power. So long as they consumed 90 percent of it, whether for 10 years or a hundred years, no one else would have any right to it. I assume that if they consumed 90 percent of the power, but little additional difficulty would be encountered in contracting for the entire amount. So even if the amendment were modified, a great many people would be excluded who should have the benefit of the power. For that reason I cannot support the amendment.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. Does not the Senator from Kentucky understand that the Bankhead amendment would not give any preference to municipal plants, but only to rural communities?

Mr. BARKLEY. That is correct.

Mr. AIKEN. There are hundreds of small towns and small cities and some larger cities all over the United States that have municipal plants, and even with the Bankhead amendment added, they would be unable to purchase low-cost power from these Government-constructed dams.

Mr. BARKLEY. The vice of this whole amendment is that it makes it necessary to come in on short notice and upon the verge of a vote to make modifications by piecemeal to take care of somebody in whom a Senator may be interested.

I agree with the Senator from Alabama and all other Senators that rural electrification organizations and cooperatives ought to be put upon an equal basis, at least, and, in my judgment, they ought to be given some preference. We have encouraged them; we have set them up by act of Congress; we are loaning money to them on an amortization plan in order that they may function. Now certainly we ought to encourage them by giving them some degree of preference in the case of the power it is proposed to create by money from the Treasury of the United States. I sympathize with that attitude, but the necessity at the last moment to take care of that situation by an amendment illustrates the vice of now trying to deal with a permanent policy in reversal of what we have followed for nearly 40 years. I believe for that reason the whole amendment ought to be rejected.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. It seems to me there is an inconsistency involved. The Federal Government is going to build some power dams and, according to the language of the amendment, when it sells the power generated at the dams the rates shall be passed upon by the Federal Power Commission, unless within the State where the energy is sold there is a State regulatory body. It seems to me it is inconsistent for the Federal Government to spend Federal money to build these dams and power stations, and turn them over to a State to regulate the sale of the power which may be generated. Take, for instance, the rural electrification systems which are spreading all over the country. They are cooperatives, and are not operated for profit. Would the

State under this provision have the right to regulate rural electrification rates, and should a State in any way regulate a Federal project and the price and manner of the sale of the power?

Mr. BARKLEY. The object, apparently, of the language inserted on that subject is, if there is a State regulatory authority that it shall take over the control of the distribution and rates which are to be charged for power generated by a project that has been instituted and paid for by the Government of the United States.

The amendment provides that whatever savings there may be shall be passed on to the consumer, but I do not know how practical that moral gesture may be. The amendment does not implement any way by which it can be done. There is no way for the Congress to compel a State regulatory body to reduce rates because of any savings that may be brought about by the construction of a Federal dam. We certainly cannot compel them to do it if they are not willing to do it. So it is null and void. It does not set up any machinery by which it can be done, even if the Federal Government has control of it. I think that is a vice in it, rather than an accomplished legislative fact.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. The State regulatory body is, of course, a State agency.

Mr. BARKLEY. It certainly seems to me, in accordance with the Senator's idea, that if the Government of the United States is to pay for these dams and power projects across navigable streams, on which it has exclusive jurisdiction, it ought not thereafter to surrender its jurisdiction to some State regulatory body over which Congress has no control and the Federal Government has no control.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. HILL. In other words, the adoption of the Maloney amendment to the Bailey amendment would not in any way correct the fundamental wrong in the Bailey amendment, which is the giving of a priority to private profit-making companies over public nonprofit power organizations. Even if the Bailey amendment to the Bankhead-Maloney amendment is adopted, it means that the public bodies, towns, cities, and municipalities that operate not for profit but for the benefit of the people cannot get one kilowatt of the power generated at the dams unless some power company says, "We do not want the power." Is not that true?

Mr. BARKLEY. That is correct.

Mr. HILL. So the Maloney amendment does not correct any fundamental wrong in the Bailey amendment.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Maloney amendment simply requires a private concern to contract for the use of the power prior to the completion of the dam, and, if they want it, that is what they will do.

Mr. HILL. Instead of giving them 3 years to make up their minds, it requires them to be a little more prompt, but it does not affect their preference and their power.

Mr. BARKLEY. Or their monopoly.

Mr. HILL. The Senator is correct. It does not affect their monopoly.

Mr. BARKLEY. And so long as they exercise a monopoly, then, for a thousand years, perhaps, nobody else would be able to obtain any of the power created by the dam.

Mr. HILL. In reference to the amendment offered by my colleague [Mr. BANKHEAD] with respect to rural cooperatives, the R. E. A. advises me that some of these cooperatives get their power from public power bodies of cities, towns, and municipalities, and, of course, there could be no protection by the Bankhead amendment for such organizations. The R. E. A. cooperatives could not get the power.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY] to the committee amendment, as amended.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President, I will occupy just a few moments, I hope, by way of coming to an end of the discussion. I have no intention of delaying matters, although I should like a delay until the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MALONEY] can be in the Chamber.

What has just been said in the Senate by way of objection to the amendment which I accepted in aid of the passage of the bill and in an effort to accommodate the amendment to those who were objecting to it reminds me of the situation of a far better Man than I, or any of us, could ever hope to be, and of what He said when He found Himself whichever way He turned misinterpreted, contradicted, and opposed. He said:

> They—
>
> The men of this generation—
>
> are like unto children sitting in the market place, and calling to one another, and saying, We have piped unto you and ye have not danced; we have mourned to you, and ye have not wept.

I think the gentlemen who differ with me now in the matter of the so-called Maloney amendment which I offered for the Senator from Connecticut are in just that position. They have piped and then complained of me for not dancing. If I am in a sober appearing state of mind and they moan and I do not weep, they complain of me for not weeping. I understand that of course; I am not taking it personally. They are merely against this proposal anyway no matter what may be done.

Now let me illustrate. The last proviso was by way of aiding the Secretary of the Interior to build transmission lines, and it is now interpreted to aid him in building them at once when the dam is finished. It is now being interpreted as an aggrandizement of power by the power companies. When it was not here they said it was, "Take it out." The fact of the matter is that it is not even by way of aggrandizing the power of anybody. My amendment declares:

> Preference in the sale of such power and energy shall be given to public bodies and cooperatives.

That is the preference. That is my amendment. Some speak as if it were a preference to the power companies. They speak of the monopoly of the power companies, and maintaining a monopoly, and perpetuating a monopoly. I suppose that is when they piped and I did not dance.

Now, with further reference to the amendment, gentlemen say all this power, or 90 percent of it, must be bought by the power companies. That is not in the bill at all and is not in the amendment. It could be bought by anybody who could buy it and would run the transmission lines for the purpose. What becomes of the argument about monopoly?

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BAILEY. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. Whoever purchased the power must run his transmission line to the point of production, and have it ready to take the power at the time the dam is completed, under the Senator's amendment as it is now before the Senate.

Mr. BAILEY. Yes; but anybody can do it.

Mr. BARKLEY. Theoretically anybody might.

Mr. BAILEY. No; it is not theoretically. My conception of the amendment was that it aided the Secretary of the Interior in running transmission lines, and therefore would allay some of the opposition to the amendment, though, I recognize, not all. But we are now told it makes matters worse. I do not think so at all. As originally offered the amendment provided:

> Unless 90 percent of the firm power produced at such projects shall be demanded or purchased—

By "demanded" I meant called for. I used "demand" in the market sense.

"Within 3 years." That is the way it read. As now proposed to be amended it reads:

> shall be purchased upon completion of construction of such projects, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to construct transmission lines for the purpose of selling such power at wholesale.

It is an enabling proviso to the Secretary of the Interior, with a view to the disposition of the power produced at the dam.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President——

Mr. BAILEY. I shall yield to the Senator presently.

I think that as the amendment will read as amended by the amendment of the Senator from Connecticut it will practically guarantee the immediate sale of 90 percent of power produced at flood control dams and at river and harbor dams, and I know of nothing that would so advance the cause of flood control as such an amendment. I yield to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I think the last statement made by the Senator is one of the most persuasive that can be made. I cannot escape the conclusion that the amendment as now drawn virtually guarantees a solvent, paying operation in a Government project, and I know of no sanity which would assess that as a crime.

What I wanted to ask the Senator was this: In the sale of the 90 percent of the power we go back to line 20, on page 2 and in the sale of the 90 percent, "Preference shall be given to public bodies and cooperatives." Is not that true?

Mr. BAILEY. Yes.

Mr. VANDENBERG. How can anyone make monopoly out of that?

Mr. BAILEY. There is no monopoly. If there could be an economic justification beyond all question for the construction of what we call the multiple purpose dam—that is, for flood control plus electrical production, or river and harbor locks or dams plus electrical production—the policy which I have here provided, thanks to the Senator from Connecticut, would give us the perfect economic justification, and instead of arresting the process of flood control—and it may be arrested the way we are going—it would greatly aid it and promote it.

I submit that to the reasonable consideration of Senators who hear me. I think every Senator knows that in the 14 years I have been in the Senate I have never made a personal matter of anything, and I do not intend to do so. I have never tried to "get anything by," so far as I know, except upon its merits, and that is all I ask here, and that is all I shall ever ask. If any Senator decides that the merits are the other way, it is perfectly agreeable to me, and I respect his judgment, just as I hope he will respect mine in taking the opposite view.

Let us come down to the main point. It was stated here this morning that this was a reversal of the power policy of the Government. I may be very ignorant about that, but it is my judgment we have had no power policy, certainly no policy with respect to the distribution of power. This matter was provoked, not by me, but by the Secretary of the Interior coming to the Committee on Commerce and to the subcommittee with what he conceived to be a policy, but when I read it, I said, "No, this policy is destructive of the existing power companies in this country, and I do not think the Senate of the United States wishes to be destructive." Say everything you please against this one and that one, one of the cornerstones of our economic structure is the investment of money in private enterprise, and, of course, power should be available to private enterprise.

Behind us is a period now of 50 years of electrical development, and we suddenly come to a policy proposed by the Secretary of the Interior in which the Government can use the dams we are to build in the name of flood control, and later on in the name of river and harbor development, for the purpose of going into any State and any community and taking off the cream of the business, and leaving the power company, with all its investment and all its services, high and dry.

Mr. President, the companies may have been very bad, but they have not been that bad. There is no use, as we often say, of burning down the house to get rid of the rats. There may have been rats, but are we prepared here now, in a sort of revulsion against big things, to go to this length? Of course the power business must be a big thing. If the Senate will hear me a moment about that; it is not possible to sell power cheaply except by volume. There must be large volume in order to get a low rate. I heard the Senator from Montana speaking of reductions in his State, or some other Senator making some remarks along that line. The reductions in North Carolina have come year after year, and most of them voluntarily, because the business has been growing, the output has been demanded. So we meet the recording of the fact that they are big, but after all they are not so big as Mr. Ickes would be if we turned the whole power business of this country over to him.

We must make our choice here. We can go on with a policy placed in his hands as administrator, and I have every reason to believe he will be administrator for 49 months more, probably 50, and if his name comes before us, I shall vote to confirm him. I have nothing on earth against him as administrator of the Department of the Interior, and no disposition to fight his nomination. But if we proceed with this policy, if we do not now restrain it, while we are about to build a billion dollars' worth of flood-control dams, when it is proposed that we shall spread over the country seven T. V. A.'s, unless we now put proper restraints in our policy, we simply ordain the regime of Government power, unregulated by the State, paying no taxes to the State, and in the hands of whatever administration may happen to be elected.

That, Mr. President, is what I see in this situation. I must make a choice, and I choose to see to it that those who invested their money in power companies are respected as investors. I choose to say that corporations which have gone forth and developed this market and supplied this power shall not be struck down merely because the United States as a government has the power to do it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from North Carolina on the amendment has expired.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President, I had about finished, but I believe I could extend my time by speaking on the Bankhead amendment to the committee amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Bankhead amendment has been agreed to.

Mr. BAILEY. And I have no right to speak on the bill?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The agreement, as the Chair understands it, pertains to the pending amendment, so it will not be in order for the Senator to speak on the bill.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President——

Mr. BAILEY. I yield to the Senator from Arkansas. I can do that, can I not?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from North Carolina has expired. He cannot yield to anyone.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I ask for time in my own right, Mr. President. I wish to ask the Senator from North Carolina a question or two. I do not believe I have used any time on this amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas is recognized.

Mr. BAILEY. If the Senator takes the floor he may ask me a question, or if he prefers I will ask him a question. I will answer any question the Senator may wish to ask me. I think that is the better way to do it.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I should be glad to offer the Senator a further opportunity to discuss any feature of the amendment he cares to, but first I did want to ask the Senator a question.

Mr. BAILEY. Let me say, Mr. President, that I would not think of taking any advantage by way of extension of time. When it was announced that my time had expired I had said about all I wished to say, but if the Senator from Arkansas wishes to ask me a question, I shall be glad to answer. I do not think I should undertake to obtain extension of time which is limited under the order, either directly or indirectly. I have concluded my remarks. I have had my 15 minutes. I like the 15-minute rule.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, in all seriousness I wanted to ask the Senator a question regarding the pending amendment. First, I wish to say that I think the Maloney amendment—that is, the amendment which the Senator from North Carolina has offered on behalf of the Senator from Connecticut, and which I believe has been adopted, does correct one of the evils of the original amendment. I think it improves the original amendment considerably.

Mr. BAILEY. Let me ask the Senator a question. Does he not think that the Bankhead amendment, which I accepted, very greatly improves it?

Mr. McCLELLAN. Yes; I think it does. I wanted to make reference to it also. I now wish to ask the Senator from North Carolina a question. It strikes me that with the modification of the amendment there is now possibly an ambiguity in the whole amendment. I refer to the language on line 22 of page 2 of the Senator's original amendment where it provides—

> The sale of such electric power as may be generated at reservoir projects shall be made at the point of production.

That seems to be mandatory and emphatic. The amendment originally proposed by the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MALONEY] provides for the construction of transmission lines after a certain period of time, and I assume that it is intended that the power transmitted over those lines shall be sold not at the project but at the place where the territory is to be served.

Mr. BAILEY. Let me clear the Senator's mind. That is not an ambiguity nor is it a contradiction. A proviso always modifies the force and effect of the main statute or the main language. One proviso may modify the force and effect of another. It simply says that this shall be done provided, however, it shall not be done this way or that way or the other way. It is a limitation.

Mr. McCLELLAN. The language is probably adequate.

Mr. BAILEY. I will say, Mr. President, that I do not know whether the matter will ever go to conference. I

believe I will be allowed to make a mere personal statement. Whatever amendment I take to conference, if I am a member of the committee, I shall take in absolute good faith. I shall respect the instructions of the Senate. And I will say that any little ambiguity which may appear or any doubt which may seem to exist can be corrected in conference.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arkansas yield to me so that I may ask a question of the Senator from North Carolina?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I yield to the Senator for that purpose.

Mr. ELLENDER. Last Wednesday I brought to the attention of the Senate that some of the language in the committee amendment, which taken with the so-called Bailey amendment, is somewhat contradictory in terms.

Mr. BAILEY. Does the Senator mean the language of the original amendment compared with the language as it is now?

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes. The committee amendment that we are now considering, when taken with the Senator's proposed amendment.

Mr. BAILEY. The later amendment was not intended to go along with the original, otherwise I would not have offered it.

Mr. ELLENDER. I understood the Senator.

Mr. BAILEY. I ran along with the original amendment as far as I could. When I could not run any further along with it I wrote some language of my own.

Mr. ELLENDER. I understand that, but if the remainder of the committee amendment is read in connection with the amendment that the distinguished Senator proposes, there is a contradiction in some respects. If the Bailey amendment is adopted that part of section 5, on line 23, of page 4, reading: "Preference in the sale of such power and energy shall be given to public bodies and cooperatives" will be retained, and following that language will be——

Mr. BAILEY. That will be in my amendment, also.

Mr. ELLENDER. No.

Mr. BAILEY. Oh, yes. Here is the amendment——

Mr. ELLENDER. No. The language I have just quoted is not offered by the Bailey amendment. It remains in the bill and will be followed by this language from the Bailey amendment:

> The sale of such electric power as may be generated at reservoir projects shall be made at the point of production, without special privilege or discrimination.

The words "The sale of such electric power shall be made without special privilege or discrimination" certainly nullies the language "preference in the sale of such power and energy shall be given to public bodies and cooperatives."

Mr. BAILEY. The Senator is reading something else. Read the language just read by the Senator and it will be seen that it appears in my amendment. The Senator said it was not in my amendment. The language in my amendment is:

> Preference in the sale of such power and energy shall be given to public bodies and cooperatives.

That is in the Bailey amendment.

Mr. ELLENDER. I beg the Senator's pardon, but that language remains in the section and is not affected by the Bailey amendment.

Mr. BAILEY. The Senator said it was not.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is my contention. The language appearing on page 2, line 24, of the Bailey amendment nullifies that, in my opinion, because that language reads that it shall be sold "without special privilege or discrimination." That means, as I understand that language, that it is to be sold to private concerns without first offering it to cooperatives and public bodies. The language has the effect of nullifying the provision in the committee amendment reading:

> Preference in the sale of such power and energy shall be given to public bodies and cooperatives.

Mr. BAILEY. No. One is a preference which must be given according to the law as written. When it comes to the sale, the sale must be made without special privilege or discrimination between those who come to buy. There will be no difficulty on earth, even in a magistrate's court, in reconciling that language.

Mr. ELLENDER. I will not argue the point further, but it is my contention that a conflict exists. Let me ask the Senator another question: The Bankhead amendment, as I understand it, provides that the Secretary of the Interior shall have the right to build power lines so as to supply rural electric associations.

Mr. BAILEY. That is correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. I notice that the same privilege is not accorded to public bodies. Was that phase of the matter discussed with the Senator?

Mr. BAILEY. It was not discussed.

Mr. ELLENDER. I wonder if the Senator from North Carolina would object——

Mr. BAILEY. Yes. I think that I have gone far enough, and I do not think the Senator would vote for it even then. The whole idea is as contained in the quotation I previously gave:

> We have piped unto you, and ye have not danced; we have mourned to you, and ye have not wept.

I am not disposed to undertake to pipe or to dance or to mourn or to weep. I am going all the way down the road.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator may be in error as to what my position would be if public bodies were included. As I understand, the Senator would object to adding to the Bankhead amendment "public bodies" so that the amendment would then read:

> *Provided further*, That nothing herein shall prohibit the building of such transmission lines by the Federal Government or the Secretary of the Interior with Federal funds to supply public bodies and also rural electric associations organized for the purpose of supplying electric energy to rural districts.

Mr. BAILEY. The Senator is correct in his understanding.

Mr. ELLENDER. I thank the Senator.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DOWNEY in the chair). Does the Senator from Arkansas yield to the Senator from Alabama?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I yield to the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. HILL. The Senator from Arkansas agrees, does he not, that under the Bailey amendment, modified by the Maloney amendment, if any private power company wishes to buy 90 percent or more of the firm power that the Secretary of the Interior could not build a transmission line?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I think that is correct, unless the Bankhead amendment would take care of that situation.

Mr. HILL. Even if we admit for the sake of discussion that the Bankhead amendment would take care of it, the Bankhead amendment would take care of it only so far as rural cooperatives are concerned. It would not take care of the situation so far as a town, city, or municipality was concerned, which might also be supplying a rural cooperative.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Let me say to the Senator from Alabama that I think the Bankhead amendment and the Maloney amendment greatly improve the pending amendment, and eliminate some of the objectionable provisions in it. I believe that public bodies ought to be added. If that is done, I shall support the Bailey amendment.

Mr. HILL. If we add public bodies, of course, there is no Bailey amendment.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I do not know that that is quite a correct statement.

Mr. HILL. Is not that true? Is not that what the Bailey amendment is all about? If we add public bodies, so as to take in everything, then there is no Bailey amendment.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I do not understand that the Bailey amendment precludes cooperatives or public bodies from participating in the purchase of 90 percent of the power. They have an equal right to purchase it. In fact, they are given preference.

Mr. HILL. The Secretary of the Interior would be prevented from building a transmission line if some private power company should purchase 90 percent or more of the power.

Mr. McCLELLAN. If the private power company should purchase 90 percent of the power, I believe that under the Bankhead amendment a line could still be built to a rural cooperative. I do not believe that would be precluded.

Mr. HILL. The Senator realizes, as a practical matter, when he speaks about building a line out to a rural cooperative, that when it is undertaken to build transmission lines, costly as they are, there must be more than one little rural cooperative to serve. Very likely the line would have to be tied in to cities, towns, and rural cooperatives which may be getting power from some town or municipality.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I think that is true.

Mr. HILL. I agree with the Senator that perhaps a line should be built to a rural cooperative. As a practical matter, I believe that the amendment, as now submitted, does pretty much what the Senator from North Carolina, who is always frank and honest with the Senate, stated in the beginning that it would do. It would mean that private power companies would get all the power.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I am of the opinion at the moment that if public bodies were added to the Bankhead amendment the Bailey amendment would then provide a safe and sound policy. I stated last Wednesday that I would not support the Bailey amendment in its present form. But if public bodies were added, then I can see no objection to the Bailey amendment.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, may I direct a question to the Senator from Alabama?

Mr. HILL. The Senator from Arkansas has the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DOWNEY in the chair). The time of the Senator from Arkansas has almost expired. He still has about 2 minutes.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I yield the floor.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, the Senator from Alabama referred to a situation in which private interests or others were taking 90 percent of the power, and was wondering whether or not rural agencies would be able to get power. Does the Senator suppose for a moment that a private agency would not be glad to sell power to all customers, including rural agencies? Under the terms of the bill, would it not get the power at a reduced rate, and is there not an express provision that all savings which arise out of the operation must be passed on?

Mr. HILL. The Senator's question goes to the very fundamentals of public power. To answer the Senator's question logically, we would abolish all public power projects and go back to the old days before we had public power projects. The main reason why public power projects came into being was that regulation had failed in large measure. That is why the people demanded public power projects, in order that there might be provided yardsticks as a means of controlling the rates of private power companies, as well as to provide cheap power for the power consumers of the country.

Mr. BURTON. It seems to me that the Senator from Alabama has missed the reason why we had public power. It was not because private regulation had fallen down. It was because private power was not supplied at all in certain places. Under the Bailey amendment power would be made available to private agencies, and therefore the situation feared by the Senator from Alabama would not be brought about. The Senator fears that there would be a lack of power, and that public agencies would have to buy their power from private power companies. If private industries, including power industries, are in a position to supply power, they should be given an opportunity to do so, particularly if they are already in that line of business.

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, I should like to discuss the amendment briefly. I regret that my train was late, and that it was necessary for the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY] to offer the amendment.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President, I ask that the name of the Senator from Connecticut be substituted for mine as the author of the amendment.

Mr. MALONEY. I thank the Senator; but I have no pride of authorship. I was trying to improve and perfect the Senator's amendment.

Mr. President, I shall be very brief. First, I should like to point out, in connection with the statement made once or twice by the able Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], that it is provided in the so-called Bailey amendment that whatever savings are made as a result of the production and sale of power under Government auspices must of necessity be passed on to consumers. So I do not give great weight to that particular argument. The amendment now under consideration makes provision, as the Senate knows, that unless the private power companies or others purchase 90 percent of the so-called firm power made available, and purchase it immediately, the Federal Government is authorized to go ahead with the construction of transmission lines. It is a very simple amendment. I do not believe that any Senator will object to the amendment. For that reason I shall not consume any more time of the Senate.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MALONEY. I yield.

Mr. PEPPER. Does the able Senator believe that the adoption of his amendment would make possible the building of lines to reach public bodies and cooperatives by any other than private companies?

Mr. MALONEY. I am inclined toward the view of the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY] that that would be permissible under his amendment, with or without my amendment. As I understand, my amendment would not change the situation in that respect.

Mr. PEPPER. Then the amendment of the Senator from Connecticut would not confer any power which the Bailey amendment does not now contain to build transmission lines to carry power to public bodies and cooperatives?

Mr. MALONEY. I do not think it would make any difference. If it would have any effect, it would very likely be a favorable effect from the standpoint of the view of the Senator from Florida.

Mr. PEPPER. I think it is pertinent to observe that power from a dam cannot be delivered to a public body or cooperative unless a transmission line is built.

Mr. MALONEY. That is true.

Mr. PEPPER. Either the cooperatives or public bodies must get together and form an organization to build a transmission line or they must rely on the power companies.

Mr. MALONEY. What does the Senator mean by relying on the power companies?

Mr. PEPPER. To build the extension.

Mr. MALONEY. Is it a sin to buy or to refuse to buy power from private companies?

Mr. PEPPER. I did not say it was. I am simply saying that unless provision is made in some way or other for the power to be transmitted to public bodies and cooperatives it will not get there, except through the instrumentality of the private company. That is the reason why it is necessary to give the Secretary of the Interior authority to build transmission lines, unless we prefer, as the able Senator from North Carolina distinctly and fairly says he does, that distribution be by private companies.

Mr. MALONEY. I certainly favor that procedure. I favor distribution by private companies. I am among those who believe that private companies can produce power as cheaply as can the Federal Government. I cannot think of any reason under the sun which would permit the Federal Government to produce power more reasonably than can private industry. I favor the production of power by private companies, under rigid regulation and under the provisions of the Bailey amendment, which insists that any savings be passed on to the consumers.

As a matter of fact, in the committee I offered the language which provided that they "shall" pass them on. I think the original words were "may pass them on."

Mr. PEPPER. But, Mr. President, the Senator will admit, will he not, that watered stock, the birth of unnecessary holding companies, and excessive profits would prevent a power company from getting the power to the consumers at as cheap a rate as the rate at which the Government could get it there; would it not?

Mr. MALONEY. As I said before, in the bill provision is made for regulation.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President, let me inquire whether the Senator will permit an interruption.

Mr. MALONEY. Certainly.

Mr. BAILEY. In existing law we have abundant provision not only to prevent the issuance of watered stock but also to get it out of companies which have it. I understood that was a matter which had already been accomplished. I see no trouble about that. We have already passed a law on that subject, and the law is in operation.

Mr. MALONEY. When I said a moment ago that I would not speak at greater length because I doubted that any Senator was opposed to my amendment, I had in mind that even those who favor nationalization of power in this country would find my amendment to their liking. I would expect that Senators opposed to the Bailey amendment would accept this amendment, because it seems to me to go somewhat in the direction toward which they point.

Mr. MURRAY rose.

Mr. MALONEY. I yield.

Mr. MURRAY. I should like to inquire of the Senator if he does not appreciate the fact that a great many of the corporations which have a monopoly on power in various sections of the country are not going to be deprived of their control as a result of the public-utility holding-company law. For instance, in

the State of Montana we have the Montana Power Co., which was established there some years ago, and which as a result of the heavy watering of its stock is compelled to maintain high rates to earn and pay dividends on its capital structure. The holding company law does not affect that situation at all. That corporation can only be compelled to lower its rates by having the water drained out of its capital stock. An effort along that line is now being made, but it is a most difficult thing to accomplish.

So it seems to me that the only way to handle this situation is by the power developments, under the legislation we are proposing to enact, to set up yardsticks throughout the country, and in that way such companies will be compelled to have the water removed from their stocks.

Mr. BAILEY. Certainly the Senator will not say that what we have or what we propose is a yardstick, when the Federal power set-ups get their money free and pay no taxes. Of course they have lower rates.

Mr. MURRAY. Oh, no, Mr. President. The Tennessee Valley Authority is going to pay pretty well.

Mr. BAILEY. The Senator says it is going to. But is it doing it? It gets its money from the Government. It pays the Government back. That is called a yardstick.

I was merely pointing out what I think everyone knows with reference to whether such operations can be regarded as a yardstick. That operation may have been well meant at the time, but now it is a matter of laughter.

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Montana whether there is a regulatory body in his State.

Mr. MURRAY. Yes; there is. But it seems powerless to control the power interests.

Mr. MALONEY. Does the Senator say it is under the control of the power interests in his State?

Mr. MURRAY. Well, the power interests dominate the situation and seem to prevent any relief to the public.

Mr. MALONEY. I find that very difficult to believe.

Mr. MURRAY. The situation is a very peculiar one, but I will explain it.

Mr. BAILEY. Let me ask the Senator whether the members of the power commission in his State are elected by the people?

Mr. MURRAY. Yes; they are.

Mr. BAILEY. Did not the people of Montana elect the Senator?

Mr. MURRAY. Yes.

Mr. BAILEY. By the same power they might elect a good power commission.

Mr. MURRAY. It sometimes happens that persons they do not want are elected.

Mr. BAILEY. I am sure that was not so in the case of the Senator.

Mr. MURRAY. Of course, I was elected in spite of the opposition of the power interests.

But let me say that virtually every newspaper in the State is owned by the Montana Power Co. and the Anaconda Copper Co., and in that way they are able to deceive the public. We have very few independent papers to make the fight in the public interest.

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, I would not trade the two liberal Senators from Montana for all the reactionary press men that may operate in his State.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut has the floor. Does he desire to continue to yield?

Mr. MALONEY. Yes, Mr. President; I yield.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, the point I was endeavoring to make was that the corporations have their stock watered. In the State of Montana the corporations I was describing are compelled, because of their capital structure, to maintain high rates. In that way they prevent industrial development in the section of the country in which they operate. For instance, in the State of Montana the population has for a long period been declining. The censuses taken every 10 years for the past 40 years show a decline in population. The reason for the decline is that we have no opportunity to develop natural resources and to bring industry into the State. The State is conducted solely on the basis of a raw-material economy, and we find the population constantly dwindling, as shown by the census taken every 10 years. Unless there can be some development of cheap power, there will be no improvement in the situation. That fact is generally recognized, and it is well known that the idea of improving the situation is not a socialistic one. Some of the businessmen of the State are recognizing it. The president of the Great Northern Railroad, in discussing it in a public interview in the State of Montana, pointed out that we need cheap power in our State in order to develop industry there, and that that was the way to do it.

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, I am an advocate of cheap power. I want cheap power; but I do not want to rob and destroy private companies in order to get it.

If the Congress is willing to arrange for proper, fair, and reasonable prices to the private companies for their properties, I should be willing to join in such a proposal. But if the Senator from Montana means that he would have so-called cheap power at the expense of those who are carrying the watered stock in his State, I cannot go along with him.

Unless the Senator has a further question, I yield the floor.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I am sure the Senator from Connecticut does not approve of the policy of watering stock up to double the amount of the capital invested, and then claiming the right to earn returns on that basis.

Mr. MALONEY. Of course, I do not. The Senator understands that, I am sure. I helped to write the Truth in Securities Act, back in 1933, and supported it vigorously.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, that is all I wish to see done. I do not wish to prevent any corporation from receiving proper returns on its investment; but I do not believe such corporations have a right to water their stock, as in the case of the Montana power interests, which are the subject of an article which appeared in Harper's Magazine a short time ago. The article was written by Joseph Kinsey Howard. In the article he discusses the whole problem.

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, I condemn the abuse of watering stock by private companies. I think the means of correction in the situation which he describes are reposed in the Senator's State. But it seems to me that he is willing to have the Federal Government operate under a watered stock plan in competition with the private companies.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, in order to remedy the situation in the State of Montana we would have, first, to remedy the situation now existing among the newspapers in the State. We would have to get rid of 90 percent of the newspapers, which are owned, operated, and conducted entirely for the purpose of maintaining the situation about which I have spoken. Of course, frequently persons are elected as members of the State power commission who are backed up and supported by those newspapers, and we find that very little is done to remedy the situation. In order to remedy the situation it is necessary to go away back.

Mr. MALONEY. I should like to say that the Senator from Montana seems to have quite a problem on his hands.

Mr. MURRAY. Yes; it is a big problem.

Mr. MALONEY. It may be necessary for him to get at it in this roundabout way, but I must part company with him on this amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Connecticut to the committee amendment as amended, the so-called Bailey amendment.

Mr. BAILEY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Gillette	O'Mahoney
Austin	Green	Overton
Bailey	Guffey	Pepper
Ball	Gurney	Radcliffe
Bankhead	Hatch	Revercomb
Barkley	Hayden	Reynolds
Bilbo	Hill	Robertson
Brooks	Jenner	Russell
Burton	Johnson, Calif.	Shipstead
Bushfield	Johnson, Colo.	Taft
Butler	Kilgore	Thomas, Idaho
Byrd	La Follette	Thomas, Okla.
Capper	Langer	Tunnell
Caraway	Lucas	Tydings
Chandler	McClellan	Vandenberg
Clark, Mo.	McFarland	Walsh, Mass.
Connally	McKellar	Weeks
Cordon	Maloney	Wheeler
Davis	Maybank	Wherry
Downey	Mead	White
Ellender	Millikin	Wiley
Ferguson	Murray	Willis
George	Nye	
Gerry	O'Daniel	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Seventy Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

The question is on the so-called Maloney amendment to the committee

amendment as amended. The clerk will call the roll.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry. Have the yeas and nays been ordered?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Apparently the Chair is in error. The yeas and nays have not been ordered. The question is on the so-called Maloney amendment to the committee amendment as amended.

Mr. LANGER. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is the demand for the yeas and nays seconded?

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, is the vote about to be taken on the Maloney amendment to the committee amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On the Maloney amendment to the committee amendment as amended. On that question the Senator from North Dakota has demanded the yeas and nays. Is the demand seconded?

The yeas and nays were not ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the so-called Maloney amendment to the committee amendment as amended.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry. It still is not clear whether we are voting on the Maloney amendment or the Maloney amendment and the Bailey amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the so-called Maloney amendment to the committee amendment as amended.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. The vote is on that question only?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. That is to add the Maloney amendment to the Bailey amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. AIKEN. Will the Chair have stated the Maloney amendment so that the question may be clearly understood?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment offered by the Senator from Connecticut to the amendment of the committee as amended.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 3, line 8, of the printed committee amendment as modified inserting section 5, it is proposed to strike out the words "demanded or purchased within 3 years after" and insert "purchased upon", so that as amended the proviso would read:

Provided, That unless 90 percent of the firm power produced at such projects shall be purchased upon completion of the construction of such projects, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to construct transmission lines for the purpose of selling such power at wholesale.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the so-called Maloney amendment to the amendment of the committee as amended.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question recurs on the committee amendment as amended. Upon that question the yeas and nays have been ordered.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I should like to state briefly the reasons which compel me to vote against the so-called Bailey amendment as modified. It seems to me that the inevitable effect of the amendment would be to give tremendous advantage to the private power companies in bidding for the power to be generated as a result of the expenditure of public money for flood-control dams. Those who were in the Senate during the time the Muscle Shoals project was in operation, before the establishment of the T. V. A., will remember the exceedingly great advantage which the private power companies enjoyed. Because they had their transmission lines at the dam site, they were enabled to purchase great quantities of power at ridiculously low rates because they were the sole bidders for the power.

It seems to me fallacious to contend that the effect of this amendment would be to enhance the economic feasibility and soundness of these flood-control dams, because, if the Secretary of the Interior is denied the power, which he now has the right to exercise, to build transmission lines, in many instances, if not in nearly all instances, the private power company will either have built transmission lines to the site of the dams during the course of construction or they will have built them when construction has been completed and they will thus be in a position to bargain for the power generated at the dams at a tremendous advantage to themselves.

The provision in the amendment to the effect that the sales shall provide that all savings realized by the purchaser shall be passed on under Federal regulation applies only in States where there is no State regulation, and, therefore, in nearly every State with which I am at all familiar the stipulation that the savings in power costs shall be passed on to the ultimate consumer will be ineffective.

Therefore it comes down to a naked proposition as to whether we want to repeat the mistakes which we have made in the past and to permit private power companies in most instances to buy the power at their own price. I do not believe, Mr. President, that it is sound public policy, when we are spending public money for the purpose of flood control and incidentally for the development of power, to permit private interests to have an undue advantage over public bodies in the purchase of the power. That, as I see it, is the naked proposition that is before the Senate in this amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment as amended. On that question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Is the vote about to occur on the so-called Bailey amendment as amended?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct. It was amended by the adoption of the so-called Maloney amendment and the Bankhead amendment.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, before the vote is had I desire to submit the reasons why I am supporting the amendment.

The amendment attempts to set forth, in outline at least, a broad policy for the disposition of electrical energy developed by Government-constructed and Government-managed and operated hydroelectric plants. The bill itself proposes to approve and extend the heretofore adopted policy and program for the construction of multiple purpose dams and reservoirs. As I understand them, the purposes of such dams and reservoirs are as follows:

First, for flood control; second, for power development; third, for irrigation; fourth, for navigation; and, fifth, for recreation.

Under the present organization of the Senate I am a member of the Committee on Appropriations and as a member of such committee I have been assigned as chairman of the Subcommittee on War Department Appropriations. This subcommittee handles two bills annually, one the bill making appropriations for the Regular Military Establishment and the other the bill providing for funds for the nonmilitary activities of the War Department, which bill is known as the civil-functions bill.

The civil-functions bill carries money for the nonmilitary activities of the War Department, such as the construction of flood-control dams, flood-control levees, ditches, the Panama Canal, and things of that character. It is this bill which provides funds for the construction of many if not most of our hydroelectric developments. It is my position on this committee that causes me to have an unusual interest in the pending amendment.

Mr. President, I favor the construction of flood-control dams, and where power may be developed as an incident to flood control, then I favor the develpment of such power. The pending amendment brings out into the open a fight which has been going on for years, a fight for the development of public power as against the development of power by private companies. It has been my experience that many projects for the development of public power have been opposed by private power interests. The public power project at Muscle Shoals was started during World War No. 1, I am advised, and was abandoned with the end of that war. It took a great depression to bring about conditions under which it could be completed and made available and ready for the manufacture of power.

Every proposed dam having power possibilities is objected to by private power interests, and from their standpoint and their interest I can understand why they have their objections. If the Federal Government adopts a policy of constructing public power projects, and then goes further and

adopts a second policy of distributing the power so developed to consumers at rates having no relation either to the cost of the development of such power or the cost of distribution, then many private power concerns will be forced out of business. If this should happen, then two definite results would follow, in my opinion. First, the local government, the State government, and the Federal Government would lose taxes now being collected. It is my opinion that at this time we cannot afford to lose any of our sources of taxation for the support of our several State and local governments, and the National Government itself. A second possible effect would be to destroy the value of a vast amount of securities now held by the people of our country.

I am interested in having developed a plan or program under which we may increase the development of hydroelectric power.

If the Government may develop the power and then let private companies distribute such power, then no taxes will be lost and outstanding securities will not be injured or destroyed.

The pending amendment proposes a plan for such an arrangement.

In brief, this states my reason for my support of the amendment. I find myself already committed to the amendment in advance. On the first day of last July I participated in the dedication of the Denison Dam. At that time I made a speech in connection with the exercises, and I committed myself to the principles set forth in the Bailey amendment. In order that my views may be set forth more clearly, I ask permission to make the speech I delivered at the dedication of the Denison Dam a part of my present remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there obection?

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

We are assembled here in the Red River Valley between Denison, Tex., and Durant, Okla., on one of the great engineering works of America, to dedicate this dam and this vast inland sea to the public use and service of the present and future generations of our great country.

I doubt if any of us here today can foresee fully and clearly the value of this great engineering achievement.

To look at this work it appears to be a gigantic earthen dam, embracing a powerhouse filled with complicated machinery.

In front of this mountainous dam we see a vast expanse of water so long that we cannot see the other end and so wide that the hills on the other side fade away in the distance.

This project is so large that it could not have been undertaken by an individual, or a corporation, or a county, or a group of counties, or by even a State or, for obvious reasons, our two States acting together.

It has required the cooperation of our people, our cities, our counties, and our two States, all working through our Federal Government, to transform a dream into a reality and to bring forth this development for dedication here today.

Years ago, and on more than one occasion, I joined the present Speaker of the House of Representatives, then Congressman RAYBURN of Texas, in an effort to interest the agents of the Government in the possibilities of this project.

It certainly did not occur to me then that many years later I should be privileged to assist a Speaker of the House of Representatives in dedicating this structure to the use and service of the people.

I do not know who first suggested this project; however, I am in a position to know and I am glad to testify that this great flood-control work, this important power development, and this great recreational area, is due to the foresight, the persistent and well-directed energy and the ability and power of the Speaker of the House of Representatives, the gentleman from Texas, SAM RAYBURN.

The Congress and the Administration, making up the Government, are responsible for this project.

After the brain child was born the Congress authorized the United States Engineers to make a survey of this site and its possibilities for flood control, power development, and recreation.

The survey was made and the project was recommended for construction.

The Congress approved the report and authorized the construcion of this dam, reservoir, and power equipment.

The Chief of Engineers, General Reybold, and his corps of able assistants stand at the top of all our agencies and departments of the Government.

When the Chief of Engineers makes a recommendation it is accepted by the Congress as the last word in engineering ability and skill.

With a favorable report the Congress proceeded to act.

Money was appropriated to build this work—and now in record time—here it is ready to begin to work for the people of this section of Oklahoma and Texas.

Why was this dam and reservoir proposed, approved, and constructed?

The answer—to assist in controlling the damaging and disastrous floods in the Mississippi Valley.

The Government has spent and is spending multiplied millions in an effort to control the floods on the Mississippi.

Until recently the approved plan of flood control was through the construction of levees and dikes to confine the water in its channel.

The record shows that something more than levees is necessary to protect the rich bottom land on the tributaries of the Mississippi.

Today the levee plan is being supplemented by great dams and reservoirs constructed to catch the water and hold it back for beneficial uses—in some cases for irrigation, in others for the creation of power and still others for aid in navigation.

Always a byproduct of such reservoirs is recreation.

Already this dam has prevented flood damage down the Red River.

Already this flood control works has paid dividends to a vast number of people residing between here and the Gulf of Mexico.

Today the gates will be opened, the turbines will begin to turn and the generators will begin to convert water power into electrical energy to serve the war effort now and later when the war is won to transform this section of Oklahoma and Texas into an industrial area.

Why do I make this prophecy?

The answer—cheap power attracts factories and industry.

Let me call your attention to the following facts:

The development of water power in the Tennessee Valley has converted that section into a beehive of industry.

The construction of the Bonneville and Grand Coulee Dams on the Columbia River in Oregon has induced capital to flow to that area until now the Columbia River is dotted with factories and the available power is insufficient to supply the demand.

I have another reason for my prophecy.

Here in Oklahoma we already have the Grand River Dam flood-control and power project.

At this time the power created by this plant is serving the war effort.

Oklahoma electrical energy is creating aluminum to make planes which have already defeated Mussolini and planes which now are playing an important part in crushing what is left of the empires of Hitler and Tojo.

Even the prospect of cheap power is attracting industry to Oklahoma.

At Miami, in northeastern Oklahoma, we have a large Goodrich rubber plant almost completed.

In a few months the war effort will be moving forward on tires "made in Oklahoma."

When the war is over Americans will ride in cars propelled by Oklahoma gas and on rubber tires made from Oklahoma oil and branded, "Made in Oklahoma."

This development is made possible by the cheap power produced by the Grand River hydroelectric plant.

I made this statement once before and was challenged for its accuracy.

I now give my authority.

On May 18 Mr. T. G. Graham, vice president of the B. F. Goodrich Co., of Akron, Ohio, made a speech, in which he said:

"Water and power are two of the fundamental requirements for rubber manufacturing. When these factors were weighed, the lack of adequate water supply eliminated all but 26 locations, and power checked off all but 3 of these remaining, 1 of which was Miami."

Here in southern Oklahoma and northern Texas we have the water and the power, and nothing now can keep this section from industrial development save the limits on the amount of power that can be produced.

This statement leads up to another question, How will this power be distributed?

Public power, as a rule, is produced as a byproduct of flood-control developments.

The Government should not, in my judgment, enter the field of power development in such a manner as to destroy the value of existing power facilities which have served and are serving the wants and needs of the people.

It seems to me that a cooperative plan of power development and distribution may be worked out whereby the people in the cities and on the farms may receive the benefits of power at reasonable rates.

Such a plan should embrace a program wherein the Government may create the electrical energy and the existing distributing systems may take the current at the point of manufacture, and thereby both the Government and the existing systems may profit by such cooperative plan of operation.

Former Senator James P. Pope, now a director of the Tennessee Valley Authority, has just made the following statement:

"There is no doubt but that this cooperative effort, which makes for efficiency, economy, and better service, is here to stay and will play an increasingly important part in the future development of the public and private power industry."

Unless this policy is adopted, the Government will be forced to build stand-by steam plants and, in addition, will have to build transmission and distributing lines in order to deliver the electricity to the consumers.

The Government is interested in making a success of its flood-control and power developments.

The public is interested in securing electricity at a reasonable price.

These two interests can be harmonized and adjusted to the benefit of both the Government and the consumers.

This is one of the problems that must be solved, and when it is solved it must take into consideration the injury done by removing property from taxation, and then it must give credit to the values which may be created as the direct result of the making available of an abundance of cheap power.

In conclusion, we now see this great dam and reservoir in the rough. Very soon we shall see it in action.

Later we shall see the results of this development.

This great reservoir will be landscaped and parked for the benefit of the public. Recreational areas will dot the lakesides.

Industries will locate in the adjacent towns and cities.

This section will be a mecca for the millions of vacationists residing within easy driving distance.

The Government should locate and maintain here a major naval training station.

Should the people want and demand it, the Red River may be made navigable from this dam to the Mississippi, thence on to the Gulf and to the sea.

This would give us cheaper freight rates and would insure industries to the limit of available power.

If the public and private power could be fully integrated, then there need be no limit to the power available.

With navigation provided to the dam, it would be comparatively inexpensive to create a system of locks whereby ships and barges might sail from cities and towns adjacent to the lake carrying out in commerce the raw products of Oklahoma and Texas and bringing back the finished products which Oklahoma and Texas need.

My friends, this vision is not as wild today as was the proposal years ago to build this work at a cost of over $50,000,000.

Oklahoma and Texas form an economic empire.

Our Governors and our representatives in Congress are working together.

Through this cooperation, there is no limit to the development of our great States of Oklahoma and Texas.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment as amended, which will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 4, after line 13, it is proposed to insert the following:

SEC. 5. Electric power and energy generated at reservoir projects under the control of the War Department and in the opinion of the Secretary of War not required in the operation of such projects shall be delivered to the Secretary of the Interior, who shall transmit and dispose of such power and energy in such manner as to encourage the most widespread use thereof at the lowest possible rates to consumers consistent with sound business principles, the rate schedules to become effective upon confirmation and approval by the Federal Power Commission. Preference in the sale of such power and energy shall be given to public bodies and cooperatives. The sale of such electric power as may be generated at reservoir projects shall be made at the point of production, without special privilege or discrimination, so as to provide for the complete coordination of such power and energy with other power developments, both private and public, in the area contiguous with such projects. It shall be stipulated in connection with any sale that any and all savings realized by the purchasers shall be passed on under Federal regulation where no State regulation exists, to the consuming public: *Provided*, That unless 90 percent of the firm power produced at such projects shall be purchased upon completion of construction of such projects, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to construct transmission lines for the purpose of selling such power at wholesale: *Provided further*, That nothing herein shall prohibit the building of such transmission lines by the Federal Government or the Secretary of the Interior with Federal funds to supply rural electric associations organized for the purpose of supplying electric energy to rural districts.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The yeas and nays having been ordered, the clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. WHITE (when Mr. HAWKES' name was called). I announce the unavoidable absence of the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HAWKES]. I may add that if he were present he would vote "yea."

Mr. WHITE (when Mr. MOORE's name was called). I announce the unavoidable absence of the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MOORE], and will state that if he were present he would vote "yea."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] is absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. STEWART] are absent because of illness in their families.

The Senators from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN and Mr. SCRUGHAM] and the Senator from Utah [Mr. MURDOCK] are detained on official business for the Senate.

The Senator from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON], the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN], the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER], the Senator from Washington [Mr. WALLGREN] and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WALSH] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] has a general pair with the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES]. I am advised that if present and voting, the Senator from Utah would vote "nay," and the Senator from New Hampshire would vote "yea."

The Senator from Tennessee [Mr. STEWART] is paired with the Senator from Oregon [Mr. HOLMAN]; the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] is paired with the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED]; and the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND] is paired with the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MOORE]. I am advised that if present and voting, the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND] would vote "nay," and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MOORE] would vote "yea."

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] has a general pair with the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS]. I am advised that if present and voting, the Senator from New Hampshire would vote "yea."

The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DANAHER] is absent because of important public business. I am advised that if present, he would vote "yea."

The Senator from Oregon [Mr. HOLMAN], who is absent because of illness in his family, has a general pair with the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. STEWART].

The Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MOORE], who is necessarily absent, has a pair on this question with the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND]. If the Senator from Oklahoma were present, he would vote "yea." I am advised that if present and voting, the Senator from Mississippi would vote "nay."

The Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED] has a general pair with the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER].

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BUCK], the Senator from Maine [Mr. Brewster] and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. WILSON] are necessarily absent.

The result was announced—yeas 27, nays 42, as follows:

YEAS—27

Austin	Gerry	Taft
Bailey	Gurney	Thomas, Idaho
Bankhead	Jenner	Thomas, Okla.
Brooks	Maloney	Tydings
Burton	Millikin	Vandenberg
Bushfield	O'Daniel	Weeks
Byrd	Radcliffe	White
Clark, Mo.	Revercomb	Wiley
George	Reynolds	Willis

NAYS—42

Aiken	Gillette	McKellar
Ball	Green	Maybank
Barkley	Guffey	Mead
Bilbo	Hatch	Murray
Butler	Hayden	Nye
Capper	Hill	O'Mahoney
Caraway	Johnson, Calif.	Pepper
Chandler	Johnson, Colo.	Robertson
Connally	Kilgore	Russell
Cordon	La Follette	Shipstead
Davis	Langer	Tunnell
Downey	Lucas	Walsh, Mass.
Ellender	McClellan	Wheeler
Ferguson	McFarland	Wherry

NOT VOTING—25

Andrews	Hawkes	Thomas, Utah
Brewster	Holman	Tobey
Bridges	McCarran	Truman
Buck	Moore	Wagner
Chavez	Murdock	Wallgren
Clark, Idaho	Overton	Walsh, N. J.
Danaher	Reed	Wilson
Eastland	Scrugham	
Glass	Stewart	

So the committee amendment, as amended, was rejected.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, I desire now to offer the amendment as it was originally proposed by the Committee on Commerce. This amendment, I understand, meets with the approval of the Secretary of the Interior. I send the amendment to the desk and ask that it be read. I do not think it needs any discussion so far as I am concerned. It has been thoroughly explained over and over again.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be read.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 4, beginning with line 14, it is proposed to insert the following:

SEC. 5. Electric power and energy generated at reservoir projects under the control of the War Department and, in the opinion of the Secretary of War, not required in the operation of such projects shall be delivered to the Secretary of the Interior, who shall transmit and dispose of such power and energy in such manner as to encourage the most widespread use thereof at the lowest possible rates to consumer consistent with sound business principles, the rate schedules to become effective upon confirmation and approval by the Federal Power Commission. Preference in the sale of such power and

energy shall be given to public bodies and cooperatives. The Secretary of the Interior is authorized to construct and acquire only such transmission lines and related facilities as may be necessary in order to make the power and energy generated at said projects available in wholesale quantities for sale on fair and reasonable terms and conditions to facilities owned by the Federal Government, public bodies, cooperatives, and privately owned companies.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LUCAS in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the amendment to the committee amendment offered by the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I have an amendment on the desk which I offer as an amendment to the amendment offered by the Senator from Louisiana.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be read.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 5, at the end of line 7, it is proposed to add the following:

It shall be stipulated in connection with any sale that any and all savings realized by the purchasers shall be passed on under Federal regulation where no State regulation exists, to the consuming public.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, in discussing the Bailey amendment last Wednesday I made reference to this provision of that amendment and, stated at the time that I considered offering it as an amendment to the original committee amendment, that is, the one now offered by the Senator from Louisiana. I stated at that time my reasons why I felt that this provision should be a part of the flood-control bill and the policy provisions of this measure. I do not deem it necessary to discuss it. I believe that all benefits resulting from the sale of power which come from Government-built facilities such as power dams or flood-control dams should be passed on to the consuming public. I do not know whether this provision is wholly adequate to accomplish that purpose, but I do not believe in making any contract for the power with a private utility at a low rate for the wholesale price without some provision being in the contract whereby the benefits of the cheap power will be passed on to the ultimate consumers.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, will the Senator state briefly the burden of his amendment?

Mr. McCLELLAN. As I have said, I take no credit for the authorship of the amendment. I took this provision from the Bailey amendment. The amendment provides that in all contracts made for the sale of power it shall be stipulated that the benefits therefrom shall be passed on to the ultimate consumer. This is the condition which I think it covers: We assume that the Government in these hydroelectric dams can generate power at a much cheaper cost than a private utility can, and can afford to sell it to cooperatives and to a private utility at the same rate. If it is produced cheaper and the private power company makes a contract for it on a cheaper basis than it can itself produce it, that benefit should be passed on to the consumer and not go as an additional profit or an increased profit to the private utility. That is what I think the provision would accomplish. If the law were strictly followed, that is if the purpose and intent of the amendment were followed, in the administration of the law, I think it would inure ultimately to the benefit of the actual consumer.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I yield.

Mr. RUSSELL. Just how would this benefit reach the consumer? As I read the amendment it provides that it shall not be done except in cases where there is no State regulation. I think nearly every one of the States has some regulatory body.

Mr. McCLELLAN. That may be true, and we probably could not usurp the authority of the State, but it certainly would express the intent on the part of Congress that the consumer should receive the ultimate benefit of this cheap power. It would at least express our intent that the law should be administered in that way.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I yield.

Mr. WHEELER. I will say frankly that it seems to me that in order that the ultimate consumer may obtain the benefit which the Senator seeks to give him by this provision, there should be stricken from the amendment the words "under Federal regulation where no State regulation exists," and simply say, "and all savings realized by the purchasers shall be passed on to the consuming public."

Let me say that in some States there may exist a State body which instead of regulating the power companies is regulated by the power companies. Where the Government is furnishing cheaper power the general public should receive the benefit of such cheaper power. I should be delighted to support the amendment if the Senator would strike out the language "under Federal regulation where no State regulation exists," so the provision would be, "and all savings realized by the purchaser shall be passed on to the consuming public."

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, if the Senator from Montana will permit me, why not leave in the words "under Federal regulation" and strike out the remainder of the sentence?

Mr. WHEELER. I have no objection to leaving it under Federal regulation; but certainly the language "where no State regulation exists" should be eliminated, so as to read:

It shall be stipulated in connection with any sale that any and all savings realized by the purchasers shall be passed on under Federal regulation to the consuming public.

Let me say to the Senator that my attention was called by the Bureau to a case involving one of the power companies in eastern Montana. Some of the people there were able to get a much better rate by reason of the fact that the Bureau made the power company give a cheaper rate than was allowed by the State regulatory body. This was made possible because of the cheap power which the power company was getting from the Government. Otherwise, in connection with some of the projects, the power companies or municipalities may buy their power from the Federal Government at a very low rate, but when they come to sell it to the consuming public, they may charge a much higher price, and make a great deal of profit by reason of the low price of the power obtained from the Government. I believe that the general public ought to have the benefit of cheap prices for power. I feel that the only way we can make sure that the general public obtains the benefit is by doing as I have suggested.

Mr. McCLELLAN. That is the goal to which I am driving. My amendment may not be wholly adequate to accomplish the desired result.

Mr. WHEELER. I believe that the Senator's amendment would accomplish the desired result if the words "where no State regulation exists" were stricken out, so that the language would read:

It shall be stipulated in connection with any sale that any and all savings realized by the purchasers shall be passed on under Federal regulation to the consuming public.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LUCAS in the chair). Does the Senator from Arkansas yield to the Senator from Montana?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I yield.

Mr. MURRAY. Without striking out that wording, the result might be that the State regulatory body might permit higher rates. Some of the rates already established may be higher than would be justified, and those higher rates would be permitted to obtain in the case of power purchased at very low rates from the public power projects. It seems to me that if the Senator were to strike out that wording he would get substantial support for his amendment.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I shall be glad to yield to the Senator in a moment.

It is not my purpose, Mr. President, to sponsor any amendment which would usurp the power of the State regulatory bodies to fix rates generally; but I do wish to see in the Federal law a protection against profiteering from the sale of power. The real benefits should go to the ultimate consumers. If it is necessary to modify the amendment to attain that objective, I have no objection to modifying the amendment to that extent.

I now yield to the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I am indeed pleased to know that the Senator is willing to modify his amendment. At some time later in the day I wish to read some correspondence between William J. Neal, Deputy Administrator of the Rural Electrification Administration, and myself in connection with the matter now under consideration. The substance of it shows that in connection with a $45,000,000 power plant built in South Carolina with Federal aid, in many instances power is now being sold at 4 mills to the power companies because of lack of ability to obtain priorities from the War

Production Board for the construction of transmission lines. The power from that dam, which is sold at 4 mills, was made possible by the Congress of the United States. It is carried only a few miles, and the power company resells it to farm cooperatives for 12 mills, or three times the price paid for the power.

(On request of Mr. MAYBANK, and by unanimous consent, the following matter, which appeared in the daily RECORD of November 27, was ordered to be printed in the permanent RECORD at this point:)

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD correspondence between the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], myself, and Mr. William J. Neal, Deputy Administrator of the Rural Electrification Administration, as well as tables showing electrical rates charged by private power companies to South Carolina rural electric cooperatives.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The correspondence and tables are as follows:

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
RURAL ELECTRIFICATION ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D. C., November 24, 1944.

Hon. BURNET R. MAYBANK,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR MAYBANK: You will be interested in the enclosed copy of letter which I have today sent to Senator ELLENDER, of Louisiana, concerning the proposal of Senator BAILEY, and similar proposals to amend section 5 of the Flood Control Act relating to the construction of transmission lines for the sale of electric energy generated at Federal dams. Please note particularly our reference to the situation in South Carolina. As you intimately know, the State authority had planned to build transmission lines from the Santee-Cooper Dam to reach its markets. This construction was interrupted by the war. Because of this the Authority was able to serve only the Berkeley Electric Cooperative whose distribution facilities were in the Santee-Cooper Dam area.

The Authority's report for the calendar year 1943 shows that almost 275,000,000 kilowatt-hours of energy were sold to three utility companies at an over-all average rate of approximately 4 mills. I enclose a table showing the break-down of these figures. During the same period approximately one and one-half million kilowatt-hours were sold directly by the Authority to a cooperative. As appears from the enclosed table, the three companies which bought power from the Santee-Cooper Dam resold power to several cooperatives at rates averaging almost 12 mills.

Today the Authority is completing its transmission line to Conway and is actively engaged in building other lines which will deliver Santee-Cooper power at a 5½-mill rate to most of the South Carolina cooperatives. After considerable effort on the part of the cooperatives and the exhaustion of all other alternatives which might have brought power to the cooperatives at more appropriate rates, it has been definitely established that the only way that the cooperatives and the people of South Carolina can obtain benefit from the publicly produced power is by publicly constructed transmission lines.

Very truly yours,

WILLIAM J. NEAL,
Deputy Administrator.

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
RURAL ELECTRIFICATION ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, November 24, 1944.

Hon. ALLEN JOSEPH ELLENDER,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR ELLENDER: In answer to your inquiry as to the effect upon the Rural Electrification program of the amendment proposed by Senator BAILEY on Section 5 of the flood-control bill, H. R. 4485, please be advised that it is our firm convictions, based on the experience of our cooperative borrowers in all sections of the country, that the proposal would have the effect of denying the benefits of low-cost public power to the American farmers.

It is my understanding of the proposed amendment that it would postpone construction of transmission lines for the wholesale distribution of power generated at reservoir projects for a period of years within which potential purchasers would be given an opportunity to purchase the power generated at bus bar. I understand also that Senator MALONEY has given notice of his intent to propose an amendment which will limit the authority of the Government to construct transmission lines during the construction of the dams and which will provide that such authority could be exercised only if 90 percent of the firm power produced had not been purchased at the time of completion of the dam.

As you know, transmission lines are usually built at high voltages to carry substantial blocks of energy to load centers. In most instances the construction of such lines by R. E. A. cooperatives would not be feasible because of the scattered character of the cooperative power load which is limited by the Rural Electrification Act of 1936 to areas having populations of 1,500 or less. Except in unusual cases it would be impossible for the average cooperative or cooperatives to build such a line to the dam for the purpose of receiving the electric energy it requires for its consumers. Further there is the element of cost to be considered. Heavy transmission lines require large expenditures of funds which cannot be made out of the limited loan authorizations of R. E. A. Unless the cooperatives can obtain power from public transmission lines built into their distribution areas, they and their farmer members can derive no benefit from the development of Federal power projects.

This is convincingly demonstrated by the experience of the cooperatives in the Southwest region which are within service area of the dams operated by the Grand River Dam Authority. In your own State none of this power is available directly to the cooperatives from the Authority. Louisiana cooperatives are paying as much as 2 cents a kilowatt-hour for electric energy at wholesale. A notable exception is the Ark-La Electric Cooperative, which is buying a substantial amount of power from the Authority at 4½ mills and is receiving this power and transmitting over its own lines into Arkansas to serve a federally owned aluminum plant.

A similar situation exists in the State of South Carolina, where the State Public Service Authority is producing power at a federally financed dam. This Authority has contracted to sell South Carolina electric cooperatives substantial blocks of power at 5½ mills. However, its transmission lines now reach only one cooperative, which is enjoying the benefit of this rate. Several of the 22 cooperatives in South Carolina are buying power generated by the Authority at the Santee-Cooper Dam, sold to three private utilities at a rate averaging over all 4 mills, and resold to the cooperatives at wholesale rates averaging about 12 mills. This situation is being rectified as rapidly as possible by the construction of transmission lines by the State authority, the cooperatives having exhausted all other means of securing delivery of Santee-Cooper power at rates more commensurate with the cost of the power at the dam. The South Carolina experience convincingly shows the need for construction of transmission lines by the same agency which operates the dam.

The R. E. A. cooperatives cannot take advantage of cheap power supplies at publicly constructed dams unless the power is brought into their service areas. With the cheap power supply brought into those areas R. E. A.'s program of bringing electricity on an area coverage, self-liquidating basis, to all farm homes will be materially advanced. I need only refer to the rate experience of the cooperatives in Tennessee, Oregon, and Washington which are supplied respectively by T. V. A. and Bonneville. In Tennessee the cooperatives are paying between 4 and 5 mills for their power purchased from T. V. A., 12 mills for their power purchased from private utilities. In Oregon the public power rates are 4 mills as compared with 12 and 13 mills from private suppliers; in Washington 4 mills as compared with rates running between 11 and 16 mills. In North Carolina the cooperatives are paying an average of 12 mills per kilowatt-hour for their power. Not one of the North Carolina cooperatives is enjoying a wholesale rate from a private power company which is less than 1 cent per kilowatt-hour. In fact, the private utility company rates paid by cooperatives in North Carolina rank among the highest in the Nation.

I trust that this is the information you wish.

Very truly yours,

WILLIAM J. NEAL,
Deputy Administrator.

Energy purchases by South Carolina electric cooperatives from 3 private utilities, 12 months ending June 30, 1943

Cooperative	Supplier	Kilowatt-hours	Cost	Cost per kilowatt-hour
Aiken Electric Cooperative	South Carolina Electric & Gas Co	411,400	$4,743	1.15
Tri-County Electric Cooperative	do	703,755	7,859	1.12
Broad River Electric Cooperative	do	60,780	719	1.18
Mid-Carolina Electric Cooperative	do	1,106,700	12,325	1.11
Aiken Electric Cooperative	South Carolina Power Co	1,613,580	18,767	1.16
Edisto Electric Cooperative	do	945,260	11,961	1.26
Berkeley Electric Cooperative [1]	do	881,040	10,438	1.18
Coastal Electric Cooperative	do	734,060	8,896	1.21
Little River Electric Cooperative	do	391,440	4,878	1.25
Marion Electric Cooperative	Carolina Power & Light	652,800	6,528	1.00
Lynches River Electric Cooperative	do	742,000	7,890	1.06
Pee Dee Electric Cooperative	do	1,290,000	15,223	1.18
Marlboro Electric Cooperative	do	1,5 9,360	16,254	1.02
Santee Electric Cooperative	do	2,034,600	23,467	1.15
Black River Electric Cooperative	do	755,930	8,734	1.16
Horry Electric Cooperative [2]	do	1,120,800	13,683	1.22

[1] Purchases power now from Santee-Cooper at 5.5 mills per kilowatt-hour.
[2] Will soon receive 5.5 mills power from Santee-Cooper over Authority line now being constructed.

Santee-Cooper—Energy sales and revenues to utility companies—12 months ending Dec. 31, 1943

Consumer	Primary			Secondary			Surplus			Total		
	Kilowatt-hours	Amount	Average rate (mills)	Kilowatt hours	Amount	Average rate (mills)	Kilowatt-hours	Amount	Average rate (mills)	Kilowatt-hours	Amount	Over-all average rate (mills)
South Carolina Electric & Gas Co	48,000,000	$264,000.00	5.500				19,918,502	$24,123.05	1.211	67,918,502	$288,123.05	4.242
South Carolina Power Co	48,274,304	265,514.18	5.500	28,000,000	$70,000	2.500	20,531,112	45,555.41	2.218	96,805,416	381,069.59	3.936
Carolina Power & Light Co	48,000,000	264,000.00	5.500				60,343,000	153,064.50	2.536	108,343,000	417,064.50	3.849

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I shall be glad to yield in a moment. I should like to make a parliamentary inquiry, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Is there a limitation of time in the discussion of this amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is no limitation of time in the discussion of this amendment.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I thank the Chair.

I now yield to the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. LANGER. How are the savings mentioned by the Senator to be determined, and who is to determine them?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I assume that the contracting agent for the Government, the Secretary of the Interior, would write into the contract a provision which would protect the consuming public. This amendment is designed to give him that power.

Mr. LANGER. Suppose a transmission line were built; how would the savings be determined?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I believe that this provision would apply primarily to the private utilities and possibly public bodies which purchase power. Certainly they are now free to negotiate with the cooperatives and others, to give them the benefit of cheap power. But when power is sold to a private utility which already has established rates, if its cost of production is 4 cents a kilowatt, and it is able to buy power at the Government power dam for 2 cents a kilowatt, that represents a profit which should be passed on to the consumer and should not be permitted to be retained by the power company.

Mr. LANGER. I understand that; but when a dam is built, how are the savings to be determined, and who is to determine them?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I think the Federal Power Commission would have jurisdiction in determining what a fair rate would be. It would be consulted. Under the provisions of this amendment any rates established must be approved by the Federal Power Commission.

Mr. LANGER. As I understand, the rate to be fixed would take cognizance of any so-called savings.

Mr. McCLELLAN. We could refuse to contract with the private utility until such time as it satisfies us that it is passing on the benefits to the consumers.

Mr. LANGER. In other words, that the rates would be lowered.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Yes. I think we could do that. With this provision in the law, I do not believe that the Secretary of the Interior would be required to make a contract with a private utility until it met the provisions of the law.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to modify the amendment which I have offered, by striking out the words "where no State regulation exists."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator does not require unanimous consent. The amendment is modified accordingly.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I yield.

Mr. MURRAY. I merely wish to call attention to the fact that the amendment as it now stands provides that the Secretary of the Interior, in disposing of the power which will be generated at these dams, "shall transmit and dispose of such power and energy in such manner as to encourage the most widespread use thereof at the lowest possible rates to consumers consistent with sound business principles, the rate schedules to become effective upon confirmation and approval by the Federal Power Commission."

That is a mandate to the Secretary of the Interior to supply power at the cheapest possible rate consistent with sound business principles.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I have finished. I am glad to yield the floor.

Mr. OVERTON. Then I shall speak in my own time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana is recognized.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, the amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from Arkansas has quite an appeal. I am in sympathy with the principle and theory advanced by the amendment. However, it has been hastily prepared. It was offered on the floor of the Senate, without any committee study or investigation. No hearings have been held in reference to it. I can now conceive of reasons why perhaps it would not operate properly, as it is now drafted.

Let us take, for example, a private power company, which desires to connect with a Federal dam and obtain power at cheap rates. Assume that it is so circumstanced that in order to do so it must undergo certain expenses. If every dollar of the savings realized must be passed on to the consumers, the power company may say, "What is the use? We would rather not go through all the struggle, and incur all the expense incident to the additional operation if we are to get no profit out of it."

The Secretary of the Interior would have authority under this amendment to enter into a contract with a power company so circumstanced, and to say to it, "Well, your case is an unusual one, and we are not going to exact that all the savings you make shall be passed on to the consumer, but we shall require in the contract that you pass on to the consumer 75 percent of the savings" or "80 percent of the savings" or "90 percent of the savings."

To another power company he would say, "Your situation is entirely different. This additional operation would not require very much trouble insofar as your company is concerned. The transmission line would be a very short one. It would not require much additional overhead expense or many additional employees, and so forth. Therefore, we shall require that all the savings be passed on to the consumer before we dispose of the power to you."

I give those illustrations merely offhand. As pointed out by the Senator from Montana, the amendment as it now reads expresses, I think, the correct thought, namely, that it gives to the Secretary of the Interior the power to "transmit and dispose of such power and energy in such manner as to encourage the most widespread use thereof at the lowest possible rates to consumers consistent with sound business principles."

Therefore, the Secretary of the Interior and the experts who represent him would negotiate with the private power company and would make an equitable adjustment of the amount of the savings which should be passed on to the consuming public. I do not think it should be 100 percent in all cases. I can conceive of many cases in which it should be less than that. Otherwise, a power company would say, "Well, we will let it alone; we will not take this cheaper power."

Furthermore, the amendment as offered provides that—

> The Secretary of the Interior * * * shall * * * dispose of such power * * * at the lowest possible rates to consumers consistent with sound business principles.

I think that thought is the one which should predominate. But when it is said, as does the amendment proposed by the Senator from Arkansas—

> It shall be stipulated in connection with any sale that any and all savings realized by the purchasers shall be passed on under Federal regulation, where no State regulation exists, to the consuming public.

Then I ask: What Federal regulation? What Federal authority is going to make that regulation? That is not

stipulated in the amendment proposed by the Senator from Arkansas. Before the Senate acts on an amendment of this character, I think it should be subjected to the scrutiny of the Department of the Interior and hearings should be held on it, so that we could have prepared a suitable and appropriate amendment which would meet an objective which I am sure practically every Senator would like to have achieved.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. OVERTON. I yield.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I should like to ask the Senator whether the amendment which I have offered in connection with the Bailey amendment was not considered by the committee and recommended for adoption.

Mr. OVERTON. There was no evidence at all; no hearings were held on it.

Mr. McCLELLAN. No; but the committee considered the Bailey amendment and recommended its adoption, and this provision was contained in the Bailey amendment.

Mr. OVERTON. That is perfectly true.

Mr. McCLELLAN. So the committee has considered it.

Mr. OVERTON. I did not say the committee had not considered it. I said there were no hearings and it was not submitted to the Department of the Interior.

I think an amendment of this sort should be formulated after consultation with experts and those familiar with the disposition of power through a public agency before the Senate undertakes to adopt it.

The amendment proposed by me, if adopted, will go to conference; and if in conference, after consultation with the Department of the Interior, something can be worked out which would carry out this very laudable purpose, so far as I am concerned, speaking for myself, I should be very happy, indeed, to vote for its inclusion.

But I think this hastily drafted amendment should not be adopted by the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment, as modified, offered by the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN].

The amendment as modified was rejected.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, many Senators have asked me about the program relative to the holding of a session tomorrow. I am anxious to get along with legislation as rapidly as possible. We have been in session nearly 2 weeks, but we have not yet done anything. If we are to wind up the last ends of business which remains to be disposed of at this session, or which should be disposed of, we must make some speed.

Nevertheless, I realize how difficult it is to make any headway on Saturday. If the amendments which are contemplated are offered—one by the Senator from Wyoming, and possibly others, which will be controversial—I doubt whether we can finish consideration of the bill today, although from day to day I have been joining with the Senator from Louisiana in hoping that we could finish its consideration on that particular day. But here we are.

What is the Senator's idea about attempting to hold a session tomorrow?

Mr. OVERTON. Frankly, Mr. President, I do not think there is any possibility of completing consideration of the bill today. I think there might be an opportunity to complete its consideration on Saturday if we could get proper attendance here.

Mr. BARKLEY. That is always the problem.

Mr. OVERTON. But I know the difficulty which lies in the way of securing the attendance of a quorum on a Saturday.

I am perfectly willing to yield to the better and more trained and experienced judgment of the majority leader.

Mr. BARKLEY. I was not inquiring for the purpose of bringing today's session to a close now, but in order that I might advise Senators as to the probabilities of a session tomorrow.

In that connection, I wonder whether it would be possible to secure a limitation on debate on the bill and the amendments which will be offered, beginning with the next session.

Mr. OVERTON. I doubt whether it would be exactly the proper thing to secure a limitation on debate on the O'Mahoney amendment, because it is rather involved and intricate, and I think we will find some difficulty with it.

Mr. BARKLEY. I am not pressing the matter. I am simply attempting to feel out the situation.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. If the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] is going to offer the amendment which it has been indicated he will offer, namely the St. Lawrence waterway amendment, I can say to the Senator from Kentucky that I intend to speak indefinitely on that subject.

Mr. BARKLEY. I was afraid of that. [Laughter.]

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. In other words, I would not be willing to agree to any arrangement about amendments which would put a limitation on debate on the St. Lawrence waterway amendment.

Mr. BARKLEY. I have been conferring with the Senator from Vermont about his intention of offering that amendment to the pending bill. He has previously indicated his intention to offer it to the river and harbor bill, not to the pending bill. The result of my conference with him is that he himself has not yet decided which he will do.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Yesterday the Senator from Vermont told me that he did not know to which bill he would offer his amendment. I can say to the Senator from Kentucky that I not only know several different ways of speaking on a bill, but I know several different ways of offering amendments to a bill.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator does not have to remind me of his skill in that regard.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. In other words, I am reserving every right I possibly have on the St. Lawrence waterway.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, I suggest that we beat the devil tomorrow, when we meet him. But I hope we do not meet the devil.

Mr. BARKLEY. We would not have to travel very far to get on his tracks.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield to me?

Mr. OVERTON. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. I understood the Senator from Louisiana to say that in his opinion there was no prospect of passing the pending bill this afternoon.

Mr. OVERTON. The Senator is correct in his understanding.

Mr. WHITE. I completely concur in the view expressed by the Senator from Louisiana. I hope that no effort will be made to hold a session tomorrow, which will be Saturday. Senators do not waste their time on Saturdays, even though the Senate be not in session. Saturday affords an opportunity, which all Senators need, I believe, of clearing up correspondence and other matters which reach their desks during the week. If we hold a session of the Senate on Saturday we will find it increasingly difficult in the days of the coming week to keep Members on the floor of the Senate attending to legislative tasks. While I concur in the statement of the Senator that the pending bill cannot be passed this afternoon, I dare express the hope to him, and to the distinguished majority leader, that no effort will be made to hold a session tomorrow.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield?

Mr. OVERTON. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. I thank the Senator from Maine, and all other Senators, for their suggestions, which clear the atmosphere sufficiently for me to announce that we will not be in position to finish consideration of the pending bill today, and that we will not hold a session of the Senate tomorrow. Having made that statement, Senators may govern themselves accordingly.

I wish to say further, Mr. President, that certain legislation must be acted upon before this Congress expires. I have reference to legislation providing for the extension of certain war powers. It may be necessary to ask that the pending bill be laid aside in order that we may consider legislation for the extension of certain war powers which would otherwise expire on the 31st of December. I hope that we may dispose of the pending bill promptly enough to make it unnecessary to lay it aside in order to take up the other matters to which I have referred.

Mr. OVERTON. I think that question can be taken up when there is necessity for it being considered.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. WHERRY. Will the Chair state what is the business now pending before the Senate?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Louisiana on behalf of the committee.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield to me?

Mr. OVERTON. I yield.

Mr. BANKHEAD. With reference to the matters appearing on the calendar or to which an agreement has been reached, it is evident that it will be difficult to take them up and pass them before a majority of the Members of the Senate go home for the holidays and we would have difficulty in developing a quorum. In order that we make all the progress we can, I wish to ask the Senator from Kentucky if he believes it would be possible to get an agreement now, at the end of a week's debate on the pending flood-control bill, relative to a time for voting on it.

Mr. BARKLEY. Personally, I should be glad to enter into such an agreement, but I doubt whether it would be possible to reach an agreement of that nature at this time. I doubt whether Senators would now agree on a time to vote on the bill. Such an agreement would probably depend upon the character of amendments to be offered. I hope that no difficulty will be encountered in completing consideration of the pending bill and also the river and harbor bill by the end of next week. I doubt whether we could now reach an agreement to vote on the final passage of the pending bill on any date next week.

Mr. OVERTON. I believe that by next Monday we might be in position to reach such an agreement. It might not be possible to reach it early in the day, but I think it could be reached later in the day.

Mr. BARKLEY. Possibly we could reach an agreement later, but the Senator asked me if we could do it today, and I doubt it.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I do not see any need of attempting to speed the pending bill through Congress without affording opportunity for an adequate discussion of it. I think the pending bill is one of the most important pieces of legislation that can be brought before the Senate. I certainly will not agree to any limitation in the time to be allowed in presenting the proper views which I have in connection with the matter. I intend to bring up the Missouri Valley Authority amendment and have it considered in connection with the pending bill.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, when the Senator does that, if the Chair will give me recognition, I will move to lay it on the table.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, that would not prevent me from discussing the matter. I intend to bring forward the Missouri Valley Authority amendment and have the Senate understand what it is, and also point out to Members of the Senate what the effect of the proposed legislation would be on the country.

The entire purpose of the effort to speed the pending bill through Congress is to prevent the country from having the Missouri Valley Authority established in the West. The Missouri Valley Authority is absolutely necessary to the interests and welfare of the people in my section. I will not consent to any limitation of time in debate upon the present measure.

Mr. BARKLEY and other Senators addressed the Chair.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, I have the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana has the floor. Does he wish to yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. OVERTON. I will not yield to anyone.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana has the floor.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, when I stated that I would move to lay the Missouri Valley Authority amendment on the table in the event it should be offered by the Senator from Montana, I did so for certain reasons. In the first place, the Senator from Montana has said that the pending bill is being hastily railroaded through the Congress. It was originally introduced in the other House more than a year ago. Hearings were held on it for many weeks. It was passed by the House in the early spring of this year and sent to the Senate. Full hearings were held on it by a Senate committee, and everyone who had any amendment to propose was invited to come before the committee. I gave notice from the floor of the Senate that hearings would be held on the bill. I gave notice not only once but twice from the floor, and I also gave notice through the press. The Senator from Montana did not appear, nor did anyone else appear for the purpose of offering a Missouri Valley Authority amendment.

After the flood-control bill and the river and harbor bill had been reported, the Senator from Montana submitted the Missouri Valley Authority amendment. He now proposes to seek to have it incorporated in the flood-control bill as an amendment without any hearing having been held upon it by any committee, without any testimony having been heard, or without a report being made upon it by any department of the Government.

Mr. President, why do I say there should not be any discussion of the matter? The Senator from Montana has said that I am trying to railroad this bill through the Congress. I reply that I think he is making an effort to kill the pending bill in order that there may be no flood-control bill, or river and harbor bill, but that, instead, there will be a grandiose Missouri Valley Authority bill enacted next year by the Congress of the United States.

I do not believe the Senate would be willing to consider the amendment to which the Senator from Montana has referred, and vote on it if it should be presented, without a hearing having been held on it or testimony presented in its support. Even those favoring the Missouri Valley Authority would like to have some opportunity of ascertaining whether its provisions are proper, or whether some amendment should not be offered to it. So, Mr. President, I do not believe the time has come when the Senate will legislate in any such manner as proposed by the Senator from Montana.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. OVERTON. I yield.

Mr. MURRAY. I understood the Senator to say that the pending bill had been the subject of very exhaustive hearings, that the bill was carefully prepared and studied, and that no objections had been made to it.

Mr. OVERTON. I did not say that no objections had been made to it.

Mr. MURRAY. Is it not a fact that a fight has been made against this measure because it totally ignores the irrigation rights of the States in the upper part of the valley? Is it not true that the Senator from Louisiana and others supporting the proposed legislation attempted to get together for the purpose of preventing a Missouri Valley Authority, and that an agreement has been entered into between the Department of the Interior and Army engineers——

Mr. OVERTON. The Senator asks me too many questions at one time. Let me answer. No; I did not undertake to defeat the Missouri Valley Authority by having the Army engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation enter into any agreement.

Mr. MURRAY. Well, Mr. President——

Mr. OVERTON. I ask the Senator to wait a moment. He asked me several questions. The other question was as to whether there was not an irreconcilable conflict between the lower Missouri Valley people and the upper Missouri Valley people. There is no irreconcilable conflict. The volume of testimony taken upon that subject showed rather conclusively to myself, at least, and to the junior Senator from Wyoming and the junior Senator from Colorado that if an opportunity were given the engineers of the Bureau of Reclamation and the engineers of the War Department to get together they could reconcile the differences. They did get together, and they filed a joint report. So there is no irreconcilable conflict at all, and there has been no attempt to get any proposed legislation for the Missouri Valley Authority.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. OVERTON. I yield.

Mr. MURRAY. Does not the joint agreement which is supposed to have been entered into between the Bureau of Reclamation and the Army engineers show on its face that the projects which are being incorporated in and approved by this proposed legislation have not as yet been engineered and worked out? Does it not show that this is simply a list of projects thrown together for the purpose of making it appear that there are projects which can be worked upon, although they are not ready at all? The last paragraph of the agreement says——

Mr. OVERTON. Let us stop at one question.

Mr. MURRAY. What I am asking is one question; it is all a part of the question.

Mr. OVERTON. Very well.

Mr. MURRAY. The agreement itself says:

> Precise elevations and heights of reservoirs and dams and final determinations of the power installations required can be agreed upon after more detailed plans and cost estimates have been obtained and compared with benefits and after consideration has been given to the desires and objections of persons affected by the proposed developments.

The agreement proceeds on that very basis.

Mr. OVERTON. I do not yield for any additional questions until I have answered that one.

Mr. President, the Senator from Montana is in error when he says that only slight consideration was given to the projects contained in the joint report. For years the Army engineers have worked in the Missouri River Basin in order to determine proper projects for flood control and navigation and for a number of years the expert engineers of the Bureau of Reclamation have been working in order to decide upon proper projects for irrigation and local beneficial uses of water in the States comprising the Missouri Basin. The testimony before my subcommittee showed that there were really very little differences between the two and that they could probably be reconciled. They were reconciled. But every one of those projects has undergone careful scrutiny by the engineers of the Bureau of Reclamation or by the Army engineers.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. OVERTON. I yield.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I merely wish to ask the Senator a question, which can be answered yes or no if the Senator wishes to do so. Is it a fact that the subcommittee of the subcommittee of the Committee on Commerce having to do with both flood control and the river and harbor bill, of which the distinguished Senator from Louisiana is chairman, held hearings for 5 or 6 weeks—I think for at least 6 weeks—at which numerous Senators who were not members of the committee attended, examined witnesses, and presented their side of the controversy, and is it a fact that neither the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] nor the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] appeared before the committee during that period to present the famous so-called Murray-Langer amendment?

Mr. OVERTON. So far as I recall, the Senator from Montana never made an appearance.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I think I attended practically every hearing of the subcommittee. I was very much interested in the matter.

Mr. OVERTON. The junior Senator from North Dakota did on one day make a very brief appearance——

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I happened to miss that day.

Mr. OVERTON. With respect to a proposal in connection with his State; that is all.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. In other words, the matter was not presented to the subcommittee or to the full committee of the Commerce Committee at all.

Mr. OVERTON. No; but I want to say that some Senators from the Golden West, the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], who is not a member of the committee, and other Senators, including the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ROBERTSON], and the Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER] all appeared in a concerted effort with the committee to try to reconcile the differences and to undertake it in a way to present something on which the Senate of the United States and the House of Representatives could act intelligently, after full and free discussion, with the objective, Mr. President, of developing the Western States. The evidence of it confronts all Members of the Senate who are now in the Senate Chamber in the matter of the Missouri Basin States. It starts at the mouth of the Missouri River. There is the navigation channel at Sioux City. This has all been agreed upon, and then there are the flood-control and navigation projects above Sioux City, running up to the mouth of the Yellowstone River.

Those are the dams in which the engineers are most vitally interested with a view of having flood protection and navigation and incidental irrigation. Most of the other dams which can be seen dotted like flyspecks over the map in the rear of the Chamber are the dams and reservoirs which the Bureau of Reclamation has been working upon for years. They are essentially irrigation reservoirs. A joint report has been submitted and the differences have been reconciled in reference to two or three of the dams on the main stem of the Missouri River which were the main point of the dispute. Those differences having been reconciled, it seems passing strange to me that any Senator from the West should oppose a joint report involving the expenditure of $1,250,000,000 to develop the West. I cannot conceive why he should do it.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Senator indulge me further?

Mr. OVERTON. I yield.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. As a member for many years of the subcommittee of the Commerce Committee I can bear witness to the industry and genius I may say of the chairman of the subcommittee, the distinguished Senator from Louisiana. I should like to ask the Senator from Louisiana if he ever heard during the long and arduous sessions involving great controversies as to flood control and river and harbor problems of the United States a suggestion made of the so-called Murray-Langer amendment.

Mr. OVERTON. None whatsoever.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I attended most of the sessions—the Senator from Louisiana attended them all—but I never heard any such suggestion made, and I never saw the Senator from Montana or the Senator from North Dakota at a meeting of that committee. If they ever intended to offer such a suggestion as that, they certainly never offered it to the committee having jurisdiction over the subject matter.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Louisiana yield to the Senator from North Dakota?

Mr. OVERTON. I yield the floor.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me before he yields the floor?

Mr. OVERTON. Does the Senator desire to ask me a question?

Mr. LANGER. Yes.

Mr. OVERTON. Certainly, I yield.

Mr. LANGER. I merely wish to keep the record straight. I want to suggest to the Senator that his memory is slightly at fault, for I not only appeared at the time he indicated, but the Senator very kindly one day gave me nearly an hour in his private office to go over this matter with him.

Mr. OVERTON. I have discussed it with a great many Senators and with a great many who are not Senators.

Mr. LANGER. I said at that time that I intended to be at the meeting, but was engaged in other committee meetings. I went, however, to one meeting and all those called by the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], who is in charge of another angle of this bill. I personally appeared together with other Senators. I merely wish to keep the record straight.

Mr. OVERTON. But neither in any private or in any public appearance did the Senator ever mention the Missouri Valley.

Mr. LANGER. Not so far as the Senator from Louisiana was concerned.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield for a question?

Mr. OVERTON. I yield.

Mr. BUTLER. I think Nebraska is the only State in the entire group of the Missouri Valley Basin which is 100 percent within the Missouri Valley Basin. So we in Nebraska are keenly interested in the adoption of this proposal, and I for one would very much regret any delay in the passage of the bill at this session of Congress.

The question I wish to ask either the Senator from Louisiana or the Senator from Montana is this: Would not the passage of this bill as proposed at this session work in line with the ultimate development, if some future Congress desires to organize it, of an M. V. A.? Whatever we do under this bill will be a constructive part of the program in the future, so let us not delay the development of the Missouri Valley area at this time, and have further damage of millions and tens of millions of dollars year after year while we are waiting to determine something which has not yet had a hearing before Congress.

Mr. MURRAY. I might say, in answer to that, if the Senator from Louisiana will permit, that the bill as it now stands undertakes to foreclose the possibility of a Missouri River Authority, by reason of the provisions which are in the bill. The Senator will notice in section 9, I believe it is, under the head of "Missouri River Basin," the bill undertakes to set up a Missouri River Commission. He will notice on page 21 of the bill, starting at the third line, that it proceeds to describe the Missouri River

Commission which is to be set up in connection with the legislation. The purpose of that is to get away from the possibility of a Missouri River Authority.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, of course, the Senator may not be familiar with the vast amount of work which has been done by the Mississippi River Commission, which I think everyone who lives in the lower part of the Mississippi Valley will agree was directly responsible, under the great Overton Act, introduced by the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON] for preventing in the lower part of the Mississippi Valley floods which used to be so disastrous.

This bill is supposed to be a flood-control bill. The creation of a Missouri River Commission, patterned along the lines of the Mississippi River Commission, certainly would not interfere with any future legislation which Congress might see fit to enact setting up a Missouri Valley Authority. This is a flood-control bill and is necessary because frequently in my section we are under the water. The Senator from Montana may not be so much interested in it, but down at my end of the Missouri Valley we are under the water every year. We have had as many as two or three floods a year, and the whole theory of setting up a Missouri Valley Commission is simply that while we pursue the present system of keeping the water off us so far as we can, we adopt the methods which have been used in the lower Mississippi Valley.

Mr. President, this is an amendment I myself offered. There is no intention on earth of precluding any future development which might come about in the way of an M. V. A., although I am personally opposed to that. It is for the purpose of keeping the water off people who are now suffering inundation.

Mr. MURRAY. I will say, in answer to what the Senator has stated, that we in the upper States are in complete sympathy with his program and his efforts to protect the people in his part of the valley from the water, and we wish to cooperate with them, but they have been unable to get to any agreement and they have been fighting about this for a long while.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. The Senator stated that the inclusion of the provision in this bill for a Missouri River Commission was designed to preclude a Missouri Valley Authority. As the author of the amendment, I can say to the Senator from Montana that there was no such intention in connection with the amendment.

Mr. MURRAY. But the Senator is opposed to a Missouri Valley Authority.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I am; but that is an entirely different question. What I am trying to do now is to keep the water off the lands of people who live in the lower Missouri Valley.

Mr. MURRAY. Is it not the Senator's thought that the Missouri River Authority proposed to be set up will be better able to cope with this problem, and to work out a program?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I think that whether we ever have a Missouri River Valley Authority or not, which I think is an extremely problematical question, the Missouri River Commission, armed with proper authority, similar to that of the Mississippi River Commission, would be able to solve the flood control situation in the lower reaches of the Missouri River, which I think is very vitally necessary to the lives of our people.

The Senator from Montana, who lives on the upper reaches of the Missouri River, is in a position to regard the whole problem from an extremely theoretical view. I never in my life lived more than 15 miles from the Mississippi River and 20 miles from the Missouri River. I happen to live where the flood problems actually exist, and I therefore regard the subject from an extremely practical standpoint, not from a theoretical standpoint, not from reading newspaper editorials, not from reading Dave Lilienthal's book, not from reading anything of that sort. I regard it from the standpoint of a man who lives under the floods which come down.

Mr. MURRAY. I wish to say to the Senator that my interest in this problem has not been stimulated by reading any editorials. I live in Montana, and have lived there for nearly half a century, and I know this problem. I know how it affects Montana, and I know how it affects the lower valley States, too, and I am in sympathy with working out a program for this problem so that it will benefit not only Montana and Missouri and the other States, but the whole country.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. But the Senator from Montana insists not only on working out a flood-control program, but also on imposing a supergovernment on us, to which a great many people in Missouri are opposed.

Mr. MURRAY. The theory of working it out from the standpoint of flood control alone has failed, and it has failed continually for many years. This piecemeal effort to handle this problem will never succeed. That is the judgment and opinion of the best engineers and the best students of the problem all over the United States today. If Senators will take notice, all over the country people are beginning to discuss this subject, and demand that we have a program which will not only handle the actual construction of these dams but will handle the other problems which are incidental to the development of these basins, and without that we are not going to be able to meet the problems which will be upon us at the end of this war. If we are to find jobs for the millions of workers who will be compelled to hunt for jobs when the war ends, we have to have a program which will enable us to develop the resources of these Western States—these valleys—which have tremendous resources, and have a basis for settling millions of new settlers in that section tion of the country. We cannot further expand industry in the East, where it is already overdeveloped. We will have to come out to this area, where we can bring in millions of new settlers, and develop it.

There is a beautiful map here on the wall—a very alluring thing to look at—but the projects are not engineered, and this agreement, which has been signed by the Army engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation, shows that they have not been engineered. But the effort is to enact legislation, and go into the engineering problems afterward.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MURRAY. I yield.

Mr. OVERTON. Does not the Senator understand that after any project is authorized, whether it be under the War Department, or should, perchance, be one connected with the Bureau of Reclamation work, detailed plans and specifications are prepared?

Mr. MURRAY. Yes.

Mr. OVERTON. In the further study it frequently becomes necessary, as an engineering proposition, to make modifications so as to come nearer perfection and improve the project.

That is especially true with reference to basins. I do not think we have ever authorized the development of any basin or project and at the same time have not given authority to the Chief of Engineers to make such modifications as in his discretion are deemed reasonable. Those are minor modifications which come up in detailed study of plans and after further investigation. If a Missouri River authority were established and it would undertake to fix upon a project without any modifications it would reduce itself to an absurdity.

I will give the Senator an example. There was under consideration the construction of what is now known as the Kentucky Dam. The T. V. A. had intended to build that dam at one place on the river. The evidence first adduced showed that, as the dam was to be administered by the T. V. A., the place chosen by the T. V. A. was the proper place to construct the dam. Further investigation showed that that was not the proper place to construct it, that it should be constructed farther down the river. It was found on further investigation that safe foundations could not be constructed at the point originally designated for the location of the Kentucky Dam, so modifications were made and the dam was located further down the river. That is true also with respect to other dams in the T. V. A. system. I am quite sure that is true. The Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR] is not present at the moment to verify my statement. I do not think there is any doubt, however, about the truth of the statement. Modifications must be made wherever necessary, and I think it would be a very unsound thing for the Congress to authorize the development of any basin and not give authority to those entrusted with the development to make such minor modifications as may be necessary.

Mr. MURRAY. No one is criticizing the need for minor modifications. That is not what I am discussing.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MURRAY. Yes; I yield.

Mr. LANGER. May I call the attention of the distinguished Senator from Louisiana to the fact that on the 18th day of August, 3 months ago, the junior Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] discussed the M. V. A. in detail upon the floor of the Senate. He at that time

talked for over an hour and a half on the subject. At that time he said that this is an over-all proposition; that it involves flood control, that it involves irrigation, and that it involves power, and that before any legislation were enacted the Senator from Montana intended to be heard upon the matter on the floor of the Senate. That, as I understand it, has been the attitude of the distinguished junior Senator from Montana. Am I not correct in that statement?

Mr. MURRAY. The Senator is correct in his statement.

Mr. LANGER. The Senator from Montana went into the minutest detail in his discussion on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. OVERTON. Certainly he did. That was his own testimony, and he was speaking to his own bill, and not to an amendment to the pending bill.

Mr. LANGER. But that was done 3 months ago.

Mr. OVERTON. Certainly it was.

Mr. LANGER. So certainly the Senator from Louisiana cannot say that he is taken by surprise now, and that we are not acting in good faith when we now offer the amendment dealing with the M. V. A.

Mr. OVERTON. I do not charge Senators with any bad faith, but I do think it is wholly unsound and wholly unreasonable to offer such important legislation as a proposal to establish an authority to regulate the whole Missouri Basin, which stretches miles upon miles over the country, and goes through State after State, without any evidence being presented, and simply to accept the proposal on the ipse dixit of the Senator from Montana and the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, in reply to that, I may say to the Senator from Louisiana that all over the country people are expressing alarm at his action in seeking to force this legislation through the Senate at this time. I read an editorial in the Washington Post day before yesterday in which was pointed out the viciousness of the proposed legislation and the fact that it was unnecessary.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MURRAY. I yield.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. The Senator has not heard anyone deny that exhaustive hearings have been held by the Subcommittee on Rivers and Harbors and the Subcommittee on Flood Control of the Commerce Committee, that everyone was afforded the fullest opportunity to appear before the subcommittees, that a very large number of witnesses did appear before the committees, and that the matter received the fullest consideration by those subcommittees and also by the full committees.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. As I said, I never saw the Senator from Montana or the Senator from North Dakota before either the subcommittees or the full committee.

Mr. MURRAY. But after all these exhaustive hearings which were had and the full consideration which was given, the members of the committee did not do anything about the matter.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. The Senator from Montana thinks that he can go over to his office and hold a caucus with himself and make up his mind as to very much more improved legislation than the subcommittee and the full committee having jurisdiction of the subject could prepare.

Mr. MURRAY. Oh, no.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I am not in agreement with that view. I do not think there is anything innate in the distinguished Senator from Montana which permits him to lock himself up in his own office by himself, and possibly with a representative of the C. I. O.—

Mr. MURRAY. Well, now, just a minute.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. And arrive at a conclusion that is better than that of the Commerce Committee.

Mr. MURRAY. I should like to ask the Senator where he got this notion that I was locked up in my office with a C. I. O. representative?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, I got the notion from the fact that the Senator habitually introduces measures sponsored by the C. I. O.

Mr. MURRAY. The Senator is gravely mistaken about the Senator from Montana. I have not undertaken to introduce any legislation coming from the C. I. O. I never introduced a bill in the Senate of the United States since I have been here on behalf of the C. I. O. or after consultation with them on any subject whatever.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President——

Mr. MURRAY. Just a moment. I have the right to defend myself.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, I apologize to the Senator from Montana.

Mr. MURRAY. I have the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana declines to yield.

Mr. MURRAY. I have the floor. The Senator from Missouri has cast some aspersions upon me here, and I want to tell him that my record in the Senate is just as good as his, if not a little better in some respects, and I want to tell him that he has no right to stand up on the floor of the Senate and try to create the impression that I am an agent for the C. I. O. here. I am not. I have not introduced one bill since I have been in the Senate of the United States in which the C. I. O. was interested. I have never consulted them on the pending legislation. So that the Senator is entirely mistaken when he tries to create the impression here that I have been associated with or interested with the C. I. O. in connection with this legislation.

The Senator said that I locked myself up in my office and then undertook to determine for myself what kind of legislation we should have here. I have not done anything of the kind. The Senator told us here a few moments ago that a number of Senators from the West appeared before his committee here and they tried to advise the committee and assist the committee in working out legislation, but the members of the committee did not work it out, they did not accept the suggestions of those who appeared before them. The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] has a bill pending now——

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MURRAY. I yield.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. For the information of the Senate along the line the Senator is discussing now, I wish to say that the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] and I went before the committee and asked to be heard on the subject of the St. Lawrence waterway. We could never obtain a hearing. The Senator from Louisiana would not give me a hearing if I did go there. The Senator would not give me a look-in anyway.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MURRAY. I yield.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. It is unquestionably a fact that the subcommittee of the Commerce Committee has been holding hearings on the St. Lawrence waterway for the last 3 days, is it not?

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. I do not know of it.

Mr. MURRAY. Secret hearings.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. I never heard of it.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. They have been holding hearings.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. I never heard of it.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. There is no question that they have been holding hearings. The Senator from Vermont——

Mr. MURRAY. No one was notified of them. I will ask the Senator from Vermont if that is not true?

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I am sorry I did not hear the conversation.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. The charge has been made here that the Commerce Committee refused to allow hearings on the St. Lawrence waterway. Is it not true that the subcommittee of the Committee on Commerce held three different hearings on the St. Lawrence waterway?

Mr. AIKEN. No; I did not understand that they held any hearings on the merits of the waterway. I think what the Senator refers to is what happened last spring, when the river and harbor bill came over from the House.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Did they not have a hearing this morning?

Mr. AIKEN. I do not know whether they did. I am not on the committee.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Was not the Senator notified?

Mr. AIKEN. No.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Was he not notified day before yesterday?

Mr. AIKEN. No.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, during my temporary absence from the Chamber I am advised the question was asked what notice was given of the hearings on the St. Lawrence seaway. When the hearings were contemplated I wrote a letter to the members of the subcommittee stating I was going to call a meeting of the subcommittee for the purpose of determining when hearings would be

conducted and what would be the preliminary scope of those hearings.

I suggested to the members of the subcommittee that we begin hearings on the following Monday—that was Monday of this week—November 20, and that the hearings be confined to the preliminary, fundamental, and paramount question as to whether the arrangement between the Dominion of Canada and the United States of America is a treaty or an executive agreement—in other words, whether it is an instrument requiring ratification by a two-thirds vote of the Senate, or whether it could be ratified by a majority vote of both Houses. I sent a copy of that notice to the Senator from Vermont, the author of the bill, and also to others who were interested in the matter.

When the subcommittee met it determined to begin hearings; not on Monday, but on Tuesday, November 21, and to confine the hearings to the question whether or not the arrangement is a treaty or an executive agreement. I promptly notified the Senator from Vermont, the author of the bill, that hearings would be begun in the rooms of the Senate Committee on Commerce, and invited him to attend the hearings. I explained to him exactly what the scope of the hearings would be, and told him in effect that we would be very glad to hear any statement which he might desire to make.

The Senator from Vermont did not answer the courteous invitation which I extended to him, but the other day he took the floor of the Senate and stated that he had received the invitation, but did not propose to attend. Therefore the Senator from Vermont has had notice. We had hearings on Tuesday and Wednesday. Thursday was Thanksgiving Day. This morning, because of the absence of two witnesses whom we expected to have on the stand, there were no witnesses to testify, and we took a recess until Monday. That is the status. Notices were given in the press as to the hearings, and the scope of the hearings. The intimation of concealment on the part of the Senate Committee on Commerce is wrong, both with reference to the river and harbor bill and the flood-control bill, as well as the St. Lawrence seaway. There has never been any concealment. I gave notice on the floor of the Senate as to the time of the hearings and the schedule of hearings, project by project, both as to the river and harbor bill and the flood-control bill. I gave a notice twice or possibly three times. I called in representatives of the press and gave them the notices, and the press published the notices.

With respect to the St. Lawrence seaway, notices were given in the press. Those notices were issued before the Senate was in session, and therefore I could not give notice on the floor, but I notified the author of the bill, as well as others interested, who I thought might wish to testify. I notified the State Department and the Department of Justice. I also notified the representatives of those who oppose the St. Lawrence seaway.

Mr. MURRAY obtained the floor.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana yield to me long enough to make an explanation of the matter which has been brought up?

Mr. MURRAY. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I hope I shall not be interrupted before I have finished.

First, there is the question of the Committee on Commerce refusing last spring to hear the proponents of the St. Lawrence seaway, when the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. SHIPSTEAD] and I visited the Committee on Commerce. The river and harbor bill had come over from the House. Hearings were announced by the Committee on Commerce. After they were announced I read—I believe in a schedule sent out by the Senator from Louisiana—that 2 days would be devoted to the Tombigbee waterway, which was not in the bill when it came over from the House. So long as there was a proposal to add this southern waterway to the bill, it occurred to me that it would be entirely apropos to add the St. Lawrence seaway project also. So I asked the chairman of the Committee on Commerce if he would give us an equal amount of time to present the merits of the St. Lawrence seaway project. He declined to do so.

One day the Senator from Minnesota and I visited the committee while it was in session. The official reporter took down the statement which I made. I asked the Senator from Louisiana if he would give us 1 hour to present the merits of the St. Lawrence seaway project, with the idea of offering it as an amendment to the river and harbor bill, and he refused to give us 1 hour.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for the purpose of correcting the RECORD?

Mr. AIKEN. No; I will not yield. I wish to finish.

The Senator from Louisiana, however, did say, along about that time, in April, that he would hold hearings on the St. Lawrence seaway bill. He so stated on the floor of the Senate. He met me at various places and assured me that he would hold such hearings without delay just as quickly as he could finish with the river and harbor bill.

The committee finished with the flood-control bill first, I believe, and with the river and harbor bill in June. No time was set for hearings on the St. Lawrence seaway. We took a recess in July. The Senator had told me that he would start hearings as quickly as possible after we came back. I believe we came back about the 1st of August. In the meantime, Mr. President, he had engaged in a primary campaign. I had no inclination to hinder his work in that campaign, so I did not press him for hearings at that time, feeling sure that as soon as the Louisiana primaries were over, on the 12th of September, he would proceed with hearings on the St. Lawrence seaway project, and that it might be possible to obtain action on it at this session of Congress.

However, about the time the campaign was finished I received a copy of a page from the New Orleans Times-Picayune of Sunday, September 10, 1944. It is a full-page paid advertisement, which I hold in my hand, in behalf of the senior Senator from Louisiana. I shall read it again. I read it the other day, and I shall read it as often as it necessary, as often as the question is raised.

In one part of the advertisement we find the heading "Opposes St. Lawrence Seaway." I read:

OPPOSES ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY

With JOHN H. OVERTON in the Senate Louisiana and the South need have no fear that the freight traffic that justly should pass through our ports will be diverted by greedy combinations and unfair legislation to the so-called St. Lawrence seaway.

THREAT TO NEW ORLEANS

New Orleans knows that the proposed St. Lawrence channel is a threat to the export and import business that means so much to the Crescent City. The proposal means that hundreds of millions of taxpayers' dollars will be spent to make an artificial sea channel through the ice-bound North to carry freight to the eastern seaboard that now more easily and economically moves down the great Mississippi through New Orleans. The proposal is doubly unfair because Federal taxes levied on Louisiana would be used to destroy Louisiana commerce.

OVERTON STOPS PROJECT

Senator JOHN H. OVERTON has successfully prevented the passage of this measure, because he is chairman of the Senate special committee in charge of legislation concerning the St. Lawrence seaway. Senator OVERTON declared his opposition to this visionary scheme when the chairmanship was tendered him, but his colleagues in the Senate, knowing his thoroughness and uprightness, insisted that he accept the appointment. This compliment to JOHN H. OVERTON'S character has hardly been surpassed in the annals of the American Congress. The compliment to Louisiana should not be lightly tossed aside. But more than that, if JOHN H. OVERTON does not return to the Senate, into whose hands would this project fall?

Today JOHN H. OVERTON is the stalwart and successful defender of Louisiana's rights. Louisiana must return him to the Senate.

In another column of the advertisement his opposition to the seaway is reiterated. In still another column it is stated that the Senator from Louisiana can get appropriations. It tells about all the money he can get for Louisiana through the flood-control and river-and-harbor program. I quote:

Senator OVERTON is one of the senior majority members of the Senate Appropriations Committee, and from this committee will come the legislation appropriating the money to pay for the deep-water channel.

These two committee positions, so important right now to New Orleans, will be lost to the city and to Louisiana should Senator OVERTON not be reelected.

NEW ORLEANS NEEDS OVERTON

Because New Orleans needs Senator JOHN H. OVERTON'S influence and prestige in the Senate and because he will handle the deep-water-channel legislation are only two among many reasons why every loyal citizen of New Orleans and of the State should vote for Senator OVERTON'S reelection on September 12.

New Orleans' one great hope for a deep-sea channel lies in the reelection of Senator JOHN H. OVERTON.

That is from the paid advertisement I have been reading.

After that I received many clippings from Louisiana newspapers. I should like to read several of them. One is from the Shreveport Times for August 9, 1944. It is a report regarding a radio address made by the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON] from Washington, D. C., on August 8, 1944. I quote from the newspaper clipping:

The Louisiana Senator spoke by radio from the Capital, where he has been attending to official business of the Senate.

Senator OVERTON pointed out that he began his career as a Member of Congress in the House of Representatives in 1931, serving then on the House Flood Control Committee, and then went on to the United States Senate, where he now occupies such important and key posts as chairman of the Subcommittee on Flood Control, of the Subcommittee on Rivers and Harbors, of the Subcommittee on the St. Lawrence Seaway (which he is fighting vigorously as inimical to southern business interests), of the Subcommittee on Navy Appropriations, ranking majority member of the Army Appropriations Committee, chairman of the Manufacturers' Committee, etc.

I have many other similar clippings from newspapers.

Here is another one which I should like to read. It comes from the Alexandria Daily Town Talk for Wednesday, August 9, 1944, and is a dispatch by the Associated Press:

WASHINGTON, August 9.—Senator JOHN H. OVERTON made the third of a series of campaign addresses to his Louisiana constituents last night, asking reelection and reviewing flood-control work and rivers and harbors developments authorized by Congress during the 12 years he has been in the Senate.

"If I were to leave the Senate, who from Louisiana would be able to continue where I left off?" OVERTON asked in a speech for radio broadcast in his native State. "Who would be chairman of the Flood Control and Rivers and Harbors Committees?"

OVERTON said that the general plan of flood control on the Mississippi "has been authorized and is being executed. It remains, however, for necessary appropriations to be made annually by Congress to complete and keep in shipshape this great engineering work," he added.

"Fortunately, I am in a position to get these appropriations," he said. "I am a member of the Appropriations Committee of the Senate and the ranking majority member of the War Department Appropriations Subcommittee, which recommends all allocations to be made for flood control and river and harbor work."

FLOOD-CONTROL WORK

OVERTON said that Congress had appropriated $19,000,000 for the fiscal year 1944 and $26,000,000 for fiscal 1945 for flood-control work on the lower Mississsippi Valley, but that "only a token payment of $100" has been allotted for "all flood-control work outside of the Mississippi Valley."

In the light of all that, Mr. President, it seems to me that I can be excused if I was a little skeptical by that time as to the intention of the Senator from Louisiana to give fair hearings to the St. Lawrence project. One of the dispatches was dated August 2, about the time when we were going to hold hearings. The Senator from Louisiana pledged himself time and again, to his constituents, to defeat the St. Lawrence project. In the full-page advertisement it is said—

In offering for reelection, Senator OVERTON stated, "My platform will be the record of my service and the promise that such a record holds in the future. Upon that platform I submit my candidacy to all the people and all the factions of Louisiana.

Mr. President, it seems to me that anyone would have been justified in being skeptical. I do not mind his expressions as much as I do his going home to Louisiana and bragging about it. It seems to me that is adding insult to injury, to say the least.

As to the hearings which are now being held, after the committee has had the bill for 14 months, let me say that in the first place I attempted to have the bill referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, but I could not succeed in having that done. However, now, after the Commerce Committee has held the bill for 14 months, it suddenly challenges its own right to the bill of which it has held possession all the time. It announced that it will hold a hearing to determine whether the President's message and the contract between the United States and Canada should have been submitted to the Senate as a treaty or as an agreement.

It appeared to me, Mr. President, that the chairman of the committee was challenging the State Department. Nothing was to be said at the hearing on the merits of the St. Lawrence seaway itself, but simply on the method which the President could use to get the contract approved. The Senator from Louisiana did write me a letter announcing that the hearing would be held. He said witnesses would be restricted to authorities on constitutional law. The State Department will have one, I understand, and I understand that the public utility companies also have a witness waiting to testify. The Senator told me the committee would be glad to have any statement I would like to make. I do not pose as an expert in any degree on constitutional law. I did not see anything to be gained by entering into the dispute between the Commerce Committee and the State Department. Furthermore, I did not see anything to be gained by my appearance before the committee; I felt that any appearance before the committee would be futile, inasmuch as a majority of the committee told the press they believed it should be a treaty, not an agreement, and they made that statement before they had heard a single word of testimony.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MCCLELLAN in the chair). The Senator from Missouri.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President——

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I yield to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I have the floor.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, the Senator from Montana lost the floor by sitting down for 14 minutes while the Senator from Vermont read a diatribe attacking the Senator from Louisiana. The Senator from Montana absolutely lost the floor by taking his seat and retaining it until he heard me get up and request recognition and, after being recognized, yield to the Senator from Louisiana. I maintain that the Senator from Montana lost the floor by sitting down while the Senator from Vermont read the diatribe attacking the Senator from Louisiana.

I am glad to yield——

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, let me make an explanation. The Senator from Louisiana desires to reply to the Senator from Vermont, and I had consented to have——

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I do not need the consent of the Senator from Montana. I shall be glad to yield to the Senator from Louisiana, but I will not yield to the Senator from Montana.

Mr. MURRAY. If the Senator from Missouri is the dominant figure in that committee, I can understand how the kind of bill the Senator is now supporting has been brought from the committee.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I object to personal references by the Senator from Montana. I can take care of a matter of that kind in my own time.

Mr. MURRAY. The Senator from Missouri started the personal references.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I object very seriously, Mr. President, to having the Senator from Montana take the floor after he has lost it.

I shall be glad to yield to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I desire to have a ruling from the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will state that the situation is that the Senator from Montana had the floor and yielded to the Senator from Vermont, and then took his seat. The Chair did not know whether the Senator from Montana was yielding the floor.

Mr. MURRAY. No, Mr. President; I did not take my seat. I leaned against the seat for a few minutes.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, that is the most ridiculous proposition I ever heard.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, now I can understand the situation regarding the bill the Senator got from the committee.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I object to having the Senator speak out of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will state that at the time when recognition was requested by the Senator from Missouri, the Chair thought he recognized that the Senator from Montana was occupying his seat. The Chair stated that the Senator from Missouri would be recognized as the next speaker. The Chair assumed that the Senator from Montana had yielded the floor.

The Chair now recognizes the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, assuming that it may be agreed that the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON] may be recognized, since personal attack has been made on him, and

since he is entitled to answer that attack, I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to yield the floor to the Senator from Louisiana so that he may answer the personal attack made on him by the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield to me, I will answer.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If the Senator from Missouri yields the floor, the Chair will be glad to recognize the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. No; I will not yield the floor. I will be glad to yield to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, if the Senator from Missouri will permit me, and without engaging in a debate as to who has or who has not the floor, I should like to make an inquiry of my friend, the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. OVERTON. I was about to say——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair wishes to entertain the parliamentary inquiry. The Senator from New Mexico has asked to make a parliamentary inquiry. The Senator will state it.

Mr. OVERTON. The Chair has recognized the Senator from Missouri as having the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Missouri as having the floor, but when the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH] made a parliamentary inquiry the Chair wished to recognize him for that purpose.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I withdraw my parliamentary inquiry. [Laughter.]

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, I yielded to the Senator from Louisiana in order that he might ask a question.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, I should like to proceed without interruption.

I am somewhat surprised that any Member of this body should undertake to place me in a false light before the Members of the Senate and before the country, and that unpardonably he should do so without adhering to the facts. I have always undertaken to treat the Senator from Vermont, as well as other Senators, with proper respect. I hope I shall always be able to do so, and that I shall not be provoked into departing from what I believe to be the duty and high standard of a United States Senator.

It should be borne in mind that in either September or October of last year the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] introduced a bill with reference to the St. Lawrence seaway. I am sure it was more than a year ago. No further effort was made with regard to it for quite some time.

I was notified by the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY], who is chairman of the Senate Committee on Commerce, that I was to be appointed chairman of a subcommittee to handle the bill. When he requested me to act as chairman of the subcommittee I said to him, "I think it is only proper for me to say to you that I am opposed to the St. Lawrence seaway project." His answer was that he desired me, nevertheless, to proceed as chairman of the subcommittee and to conduct hearings in due course. I believe that conversation took place in January. I have heretofore given the exact dates on the floor of the Senate and they appear in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Immediately following my selection as chairman I asked whether any departmental reports had been received. I could have proceeded with the hearings at that time if the departmental reports had been filed. I was advised that no reports whatever had been submitted. Approximately each work week thereafter—my recollection has been confirmed by the deputy clerk of the Senate Committee on Commerce—I asked whether there had been any departmental reports submitted and I was advised that there had been none.

The situation continued until about April, when the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] apparently awoke to the realization that he had introduced a bill undertaking to implement the arrangement which had been entered into between Canada and the United States. According to newspaper reports, he called upon His Excellency, the President of the United States. Also, according to newspaper reports, the President of the United States directed that all interested departments submit reports on the Aiken bill. Reports then began to come in. They came in pretty rapidly. All the reports which had been requested up to that time were submitted by the latter part of April.

In the meantime, however, the House had passed the river and harbor bill. I was chairman of the Subcommittee on Rivers and Harbors, and the bill to which I have referred was placed in my lap to handle. As I have said, it was a House-passed bill. I felt that it was my duty to take up the bill which had been passed by the House. It dealt with a multitude of projects which, at least collectively, would be of infinitely more value to the United States than would be the St. Lawrence seaway project.

For the reasons which I have stated I promptly directed hearings to be held on the river and harbor bill. I gave notice on the floor of the Senate of hearings to be held. I also gave notice through the press so that anyone having an interest in the matter could appear before the subcommittee.

I invite attention of the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY], as well as other members of the subcommittee, to the statement which I am about to make because I differ with the Senator from Vermont in the statement which he has made.

In the midst of holding hearings by the subcommittee having charge of the river and harbor legislation the Senator from Vermont and the senior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. SHIPSTEAD] appeared before the subcommittee handling the river and harbor bill, and expressed a desire to be given a hearing, not on any amendment which had been proposed by the Senator from Vermont to the river and harbor bill but stating that they desired a hearing on the separate bill dealing with the St. Lawrence seaway project.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. OVERTON. I refuse to yield because the Senator from Vermont refused to yield to me. Otherwise I should be glad to yield to him.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, I have the floor. If the Senator from Louisiana wishes to reply to the Senator from Vermont I shall be glad to yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Misouri yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I do not yield to any Member unless the Senator from Louisiana is willing to be interrupted.

Mr. OVERTON. I do not wish to be interrupted.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I rise to a point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. MURRAY. The Senator from Missouri has lost the floor because he has been leaning on his desk for the last 15 minutes. [Laughter.]

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, I have been standing right here.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I invite attention to the fact that the Senator from Missouri was leaning against his desk.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I did not take my seat, and I understood the Senator from Louisiana desired to ask a question.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri is standing, and he still retains the floor.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, the request to which I have referred came to a subcommittee which had nothing to do with the Aiken bill. The subcommittee was the Subcommittee on Rivers and Harbors. Another subcommittee had been appointed to handle the Aiken bill.

The chairman of the Commerce Committee, the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY], advised the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] and the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. SHIPSTEAD] that the Rivers and Harbors Subcommittee had no jurisdiction over the Aikin bill, and that hearings would have to be conducted by the subcommittee which had been appointed to conduct such hearings. Thereupon the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] very naively remarked that the chairman of both subcommittees was one and the same person, namely, my humble self. I replied that that was the only relationship existing between the two subcommittees. Mr. President, the Senator from Vermont did not ask me to do so, but if he had asked that I adjourn the hearings on the river and harbor bill and proceed with hearings on the St. Lawrence seaway bill I should have refused to do so. He said he could present his matter in an hour, which was doubtful, but at the same time there were countless other persons who were interested in the St. Lawrence project, either for or against it, who wished to be heard.

When hearings are held on the merits of the bill they will probably last for quite a number of days.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. The Senator will recall that in 1934 the very same proposition was presented as a treaty, coming from the Committee on Foreign Relations, was debated for 8 weeks in this Chamber, and was afterwards defeated by a vote of the Senate. This is merely an attempt, in my opinion, a very cheap attempt to do by indirection what could not be done by direction, to put it in as a measure which could be voted on by the Committee on Commerce, and would not require the vote necessary for ratification of a treaty, which was required when it was last presented in the Senate.

Mr. OVERTON. I thank the Senator for his observation. The Senator from Vermont has made the statement that I repeatedly made promises of hearings. I said nothing to him in conversation about conducting hearings on the St. Lawrence seaway, which I did not say here upon the floor of the Senate. He brought the matter up on one or two occasions, and I stated exactly what I was going to do, and it is to be found in the RECORD, that when I got through with the river and harbor and flood control bills I would take up the St. Lawrence bill. I did not go further than that, and could not go further than that.

The Senator has stated this afternoon that I was involved in a primary election, and therefore I went home to look after my candidacy. That is true. Then he said he expected me immediately after the primary election to return to Washington to conduct hearings on the St. Lawrence seaway. My primary was on September 12. There would have no chance on God's green earth to assemble the members of the subcommittee here during the recess of the Congress, and on the eve of the general national election. No quorum could be obtained until after the general election had been held, and everyone knows that.

Mr. President, I returned to Washington before November 14, and I came back here for the purpose of initiating hearings on the St. Lawrence seaway, as well as for other purposes. I proceeded to it very promptly, when I thought I could get a quorum of the subcommittee, and later on a quorum of the full committee. I did it, I repeat, very promptly, even before Congress has reconvened, and gave notice that on last Monday the hearings would begin.

Mr. President, I think those who know me and have a just regard for me would not think that I had made any statement, in any campaign or otherwise, that I would take advantage of any trust imposed in me by the Congress of the United States. If there be those who, through enmity, do not entertain such a regard for me, I do not care what they think about me.

The only statements I made in my campaign concerning the St. Lawrence seaway and in reference to flood control are contained in my own broadcasts. I did state, as everyone knows, that I was opposed to the St. Lawrence seaway. I so stated to the chairman when he appointed me chairman of the subcommittee. I made a fight against it here in 1934.

I never made the statement at any time that I had been delaying hearings on the St. Lawrence seaway in order to defeat it. I said that I was opposed to it, and that I would do what I could toward defeating it. I have a right to an opinion. The fact that I am chairman of a subcommittee does not deprive me of my right to an opinion. Chairmen of full committees and chairmen of subcommittees are constantly expressing their opinions, and I have as much right to an opinion as has the author of the bill as to the merits or demerits of the St. Lawrence seaway.

Two days before the primary election, which occurred on September 12, there were some very enthusiastic friends of mine—and I appreciate their warm friendship—who did insert in the Times-Picayune a full-page advertisement, the Times-Picayune being a paper published in the city of New Orleans. The advertisement was entitled "Congress in Action," a beautiful headline, and it contained very laudatory comments about me. I was not the author of these eulogies. It was prepared by friends of mine, and I really do not know, outside of one or two whom I have since found out about, who were instrumental in getting up this full-page advertisement and inserting it in the Times-Picapune in reference to my candidacy.

The statements made by my overenthusiastic friends in order to get the votes of the people of the city of New Orleans in behalf of my candidacy, that I was going to do everything I could as chairman of the subcommittee to prevent hearings on the St. Lawrence seaway, that I proposed to defeat it, and whatever they did say, as has been read by the Senator from Vermont, were gross exaggerations, that is all.

What I said in my campaign in reference to the St. Lawrence seaway is all down in writing, because I made no campaign speeches except those that were made in State-wide broadcasts and, as usual, as is necessary, in fact, in order to make radio broadcasts, one's speech must be reduced to writing, and mine were all reduced to writing, and reproductions of them can be obtained at Station KWKH in Shreveport, out of which they originated and from which they were carried throughout the State of Louisiana. They could be reproduced in my own voice or the manuscripts I forwarded them can be presented to the Senator from Vermont or anybody else who has the curiosity to read them.

Mr. President, I wish to emphasize that I did not at any time make any statement that I was going to take advantage of my position as chairman of the subcommittee to thwart consideration of the St. Lawrence seaway. I propose to fight it; certainly I do. I am going to fight it in subcommittee, in full committee, and on the floor of the Senate, and I have a right to do that.

In reference to flood-control appropriations, I did make the statement that the Congress had appropriated some fifteen to twenty million dollars last year for flood control on the lower Mississippi, and so many millions the year before, and all during the war period. But it made those appropriations on recommendations made by the Bureau of the Budget. The appropriations were carried in the bill as it passed the House, and it came to the Senate without any controversy in the Senate Committee on Appropriations. Likewise, under Budget recommendations, there was a nominal sum, a token appropriation, of $100, made for flood control generally throughout the United States. That was done, not by any Senate amendment, not by any action of mine, but it was done in the House of Representatives, and was incorporated in the bill as it passed the House and came to the Senate without any controversy in the Senate whatsoever, and I had nothing whatsoever to do about the appropriation.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, before the Senator takes his seat, I should like to call his attention to the fact that I did not yield to him for a speech, but for a question, and I presume he has been leading up to the question. I hope before he takes his seat he will conform to the Senate's practice by asking me the question.

Mr. OVERTON. Indeed I will ask the Senator a question. I should like to know whether he is enjoying the best of health. I hope he is.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I certainly am.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, if any fault is to be found about delay in the consideration of the St. Lawrence seaway, that fault is to be laid on shoulders other than mine. I think it was in 1941—I do not remember exactly—when the President sent the St. Lawrence agreement to the Congress. The Senate of the United States did nothing about it. There was none so poor in the Senate as to do it reverence by the introduction of a bill implementing it. It was an administration measure and it was sent to Congress as such.

Lo and behold, suddenly there was an awakening on the part of one Senator. It did not come from the Democratic side of the aisle, but from over on the other side of the aisle. The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], a Republican, offered the bill to implement the administration-conceived compact between Canada and the United States. When he offered it he let it lie there. Is he blaming me because I did not offer a bill implementing it when I was opposed to it? But after he offered the bill he let it lie until after the department reports came in, and I took up the bill to examine it. It was pulled out of a pigeonhole. It was all covered with dust; cobwebs were all over it. It was a musty old bill that had lain there neglected by its own father.

But now suddenly there is a great revival of interest on the part of the Senator from Vermont, a tremendous urge to get this bill through, so much so that he

wants Rivers and Harbors Committee meetings to be stopped. He wants the river and harbor bill to be thrown out of the window. He wants flood-control hearings to be stopped in order that his own bill, which had lain so long neglected by him, by the President of the United States, and by all of the Government departments, can be brought to the Senate floor and shot through the Congress. He is now like a hen with one chick, tremendously interested in his one bill, and I say that without any reflection at all upon him, but simply to give emphasis to his suddenly awakened maternal interest in his long-neglected chick.

Very well; I will go along as quickly as it is humanly possible to consider the St. Lawrence seaway bill. When I say humanly possible I must respond to my other responsibilities in the Senate, and I want to get rid of the river and harbor bill, and I want to get rid of the flood-control bill before there is any report to be made on the St. Lawrence seaway. That is my view of it.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, I wish to make a statement. Excuse me, I thought the Senator had concluded.

Mr. OVERTON. Yes; but I should like to proceed for a moment if the Senator will permit.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Yes; I will be glad to.

Mr. OVERTON. On the question of fact arising between the Senator from Vermont and myself I wish to ask the Senator from North Carolina whether my statement as to what occurred is or is not correct.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I shall be glad to yield to the Senator from North Carolina for a question.

Mr. BAILEY. The statement which the Senator from Louisiana has made with reference to the appearance of the Senator from Vermont and the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. SHIPSTEAD] before the Subcommittee on Rivers and Harbors is absolutely correct. I was there and participated in giving the information which was necessary. They had asked us to consider the St. Lawrence seaway proposition, now known as the Aiken bill, while we were considering the river and harbor bill as it come over from the House. The St. Lawrence seaway bill was an entirely separate bill. It was not offered as an amendment. Meantime the subcommittee on the St. Lawrence seaway bill, that is, the Aiken bill, had been appointed. So the Senators were informed that our subcommittee then sitting, that is, the Subcommittee on Rivers and Harbors of the Commerce Committee, had no jurisdiction. I thought that settled it. I did not have the slightest impression that anyone was offended. I thought the two Senators, when apprised of the situation, were perfectly satisfied.

Now it seems that the matter of delay has been brought up here. There has been delay in connection with the consideration of the St. Lawrence seaway, but the delay is not due to the Committee on Commerce nor is it due to the subcommittee of the Committee on Commerce. I think it may be well for me to state that there is a fixed rule in the Committee on Commerce. I do not have to apply the rule every time a bill comes up, but the clerk is instructed that whenever any bill comes up with which any department of the Government has to do, the bill is at once sent to that department of government for its advice. We never bring a bill to the floor and never bring a bill before the committee until we have heard from the department concerned. That rule was followed in this case. But it happened to be that a great many departments were interested in the matter. I must say I do not know how many such departments there were.

This procedure was followed: I think about 2 weeks or 10 days after the bill came to the committee it was sent to the Department of State. We asked for the advices of the Secretary of State. I think we received some advices about 7 months later. I think the request was made in September, and the advices came in April. But in that matter I am going by the record which was printed by the Senator from Louisiana. It happened, however, that there were other departments—the War Department, the Navy Department, and the Department of Commerce, and I think even other departments—I will not undertake to say how many—which were interested in the subject. They took their time, and I had to write the second time to several of them and tell them we would like to have their views.

Mr. President, it may be news to some, but in the Commerce Committee I proceed on the thoroughgoing understanding that this is a Government of coordinated powers. When we receive a bill we send it to the department concerned in order to coordinate. I believe I can also say that since the day when I succeeded Senator Copeland, my late lamented friend, as chairman of the committee—and that was in 1938, or a little more than 6 years ago—there never has been a bill delayed in the Commerce Committee. Such a thing as pigeonholing a bill never occurred to me. If I do not like a bill I consider it my duty to have the committee pass on it. I believe we keep current, certainly within 30 days of winding up the calendar at all times. The idea that any subcommittee chairman or the chairman of the committee could suppress a bill there is totally abhorrent to me. The bills are brought out. They are referred to subcommittees. We have standing subcommittees. If a subcommittee does not report within 30 days, I request to know why. So there has been nothing whatever to justify the insinuation made here or the suspicions which have been uttered.

I wish to say another word. I requested the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON] to serve as chairman of the committee on the St. Lawrence seaway. I had theretofore requested him to serve as chairman of the Subcommittee on Rivers and Harbors and also as chairman of the Subcommittee on Flood Control. That was considerable responsibility to repose in one man, but I did not do it to compliment him. I did not do it out of any sense of favoritism, either. I did so because I consider him one of the most elevated men I have ever known. Furthermore, he is a very excellent lawyer; and, in addition, ever since he has been in the Senate he has made a specialty of river and harbor, flood control, and seaway matters.

I did it also because I have never known a more diligent worker than the Senator from Louisiana. I really felt ashamed of myself last summer. I saw him conducting hearings day after day through the hot weather. He suggested to me that he intended to call the committee together in September to consider the St. Lawrence seaway, and he undertook to do so. We agreed on the date, which was to be about the 20th of September, but that was during the recess. I could not be present, and other Senators could not be present. We all know that the campaign was approaching. We all felt the need of rest. That is the summary. There has been absolutely no delay, and no intention to suppress anything. No one can find the slightest evidence of any delay on the part of the Senator from Louisiana. Such delay as we have had has been delay in receiving reports from the departments. Certainly I do not wish to bring a bill before the Senate and then apologize for not having the views of the departments most concerned.

I should like to say something further about the Senator from Louisiana. I read these campaign statements for the first time after the distinguished Senator from Vermont brought them forward. In the first place, we may say generally that anyone who takes campaign political advertisements seriously is in need of a guardian. I thought that was well understood in America.

However, I am willing to underwrite those statements. The Senator from Louisiana deserves the confidence of his fellow Senators, the praise of his constituents, and the gratitude of his country for his enormous and indefatigable labors. I deeply regret that he should be made the subject of an attack here. In June he received from the Democratic side of the Senate—I can understand why our friends across the aisle are under some inhibitions in a campaign—one of the greatest tributes of which I have ever known. I believe it has no parallel in the history of the Senate. He announced that he did not intend to run for the Senate again, and when he did so, 43 Senators signed a petition addressed to him urging him to run and saying that we needed him in the Senate. I do not think the petition was circulated across the aisle, not because members of the opposition party would not have been willing to sign it, but because it is a very difficult thing to ask. I think it would be improper to ask a member of the Republican Party to support a Democrat, even in Louisiana, where we know that the nomination

amounts to an election. If the petition had been circulated throughout the Senate, I believe that it would have received 80 or 90, or perhaps even 95 signatures.

There he stands. He has lived and worked with us all these years. He has worked alongside me in the Committee on Commerce day after day and year after year. I wish to say to him that he should not be disturbed. The foundations of our respect and confidence are not to be taken away by the pride of a rooster, or even an old hen carrying around a little chicken.

I like to think sometimes about the deeper things. Men do build their characters and their lives on the rock, and the storms may come and the winds may blow, but the house stands. Let me say to the Senator from Louisiana that the house of his character and the house of the high esteem in which he lives by our assent, will stand the tornadoes and hurricanes. He need not be troubled at the little superficial criticisms and quarrels which blow around the great rock. They are but fleeting breaths of the moment.

The great winds blow across the world. Today we breathe air which 3 days ago was in the South Pacific. Tomorrow we shall breathe air which crossed the Sahara Desert 4 days ago; and another day we shall be breathing air which comes from the Arctic. The great winds and hurricanes may come, and we may have local tornadoes; but it would require something more than the breath of suspicion, or the attack of a momentary and personal impatience, even to make the Senator from Louisiana aware that a breeze was stirring.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, the illuminative questions asked me by the Senator from Louisiana and the Senator from North Carolina, which really do not require an answer, obviate the necessity of any statement on my part.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I shall be glad to yield the floor as soon as I yield to the Senator from Colorado, although I realize that I yield the floor when I yield to him.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I should like to ask the distinguished Senator to yield to me for the purpose of submitting a noncontroversial amendment.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I am glad to yield for that purpose, and then I shall be glad to yield the floor.

Mr. MILLIKIN. On behalf of the distinguished senior Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON] and myself, I offer an amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 16, at the end of line 20, it is proposed to change the period to a colon and add the following: *"Provided,* That the project may be modified to include storage in reservoirs upstream from Trinidad if the Secretary of War and the Chief of Engineers find such action advisable for flood control and in order to make more water readily available for agricultural and industrial uses without impairment of flood control for Trinidad."

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, the engineers have made a study——

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, is the Senator now offering that amendment?

Mr. MILLIKIN. I am offering it now because I understand that there will be no objection to it, and I wished to get it behind us.

Mr. OVERTON. There is an amendment ripe for action, namely, the committee amendment on page 4, after line 13. Has that amendment been acted upon?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair advises the Senator from Louisiana that that amendment is pending at this time.

Mr. OVERTON. I believe that all discussion is completed in reference to that amendment, and that all the Chair would need to do would be to put the question.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered on behalf of the committee, on page 4 after line 13.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, we have had a bad flood condition at Trinidad, and the engineers have devised what they think are preventive measures, which are largely confined to the city of Trinidad. When further studies are made it may seem advisable to build a dam or two which might also have irrigation significance upstream from Trinidad. As I understand, the amendment which I have offered would not increase the cost. It has the approval of the engineers, and I understand that the distinguished senior Senator from Louisiana will consent to the amendment.

Mr. OVERTON. Has the Senator a copy of the amendment? I have not had an opportunity to read it. Perhaps it would be better to have the amendment go over.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Very well.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be printed and lie on the table.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I had not intended to say anything further in reply to the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON] and the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY]. I did not understand that they said anything which refuted what I read. I read quotations from statements or addresses by the Senator from Louisiana himself.

However, in respect to one matter which was brought up, the Senator from Louisiana disagreed with me. That was the statement I have made, that I had asked for some time—an hour—before the Committee on Commerce for the purpose of offering the St. Lawrence seaway measure as an amendment to the river and harbor bill. The Senator from Louisiana disagrees with me, and he says I made no statement as to that. If the Senator from Minnesota were present, he would agree with me that we appeared before the committee for the purpose of getting our request on the official record. The official reporter took it down, because several persons watched him take it down. Yet, when the report of the hearings came out, the statements I had made were not in the hearings. I think the only way to settle the question as to whether the Senator from Louisiana is right or whether I am right—and I think I am—would be to get the original notes of the reporter and have the exact statement printed in the RECORD, where all of us could see it.

One other thing which I would suggest is that the Senator from North Carolina submit to us, for the RECORD, the request he made of the various departments for report on the St. Lawrence bill, so that all of us may learn on what dates the requests were made. I realize that some of them came in late. But I realize that in April it was announced that all the reports were in, and 2 or 3 months later it was announced that there were some yet to come in. I wonder whether some of the requests were made after the others were made.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President, I think that may be true. We did not know how many departments were interested at first, and I am not prepared to say to just what departments we wrote. On the whole matter, the usual routine was followed. The bill came in. When a bill comes in, the clerk sends it to the department which we think is concerned. But if, later on, another department expresses a desire to be heard, we write to that department. No one is denied an opportunity to be heard. But I cannot tell when a bill first comes to the committee how many departments will desire to come before the committee regarding it.

My impression is that the Navy Department and the War Department were belated in letting us know they were interested. My impression was that the only departments interested were the Commerce Department and the State Department—the Secretary of State. But I would not be able to say how many departments answered.

However, if the Senator wishes to go to the committee room and see the record, he will be welcome to do so.

Mr. AIKEN. In view of the Senator's statement that the requests very likely were made from time to time of the various departments, I withdraw any request I made that the letters be presented.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, I call up a noncontroversial amendment relating to Leatherwood Creek, Ohio.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

Mr. BURTON. As I have said, Mr. President, there is nothing controversial about the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 38, between lines 11 and 12, it is proposed to insert the following:

Leatherwood Creek, Ohio, with particular reference to flood control and water supply for Cambridge, Ohio.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Ohio.

The amendment was agreed to.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, it is apparent that we can accomplish very little more, if anything, this evening; and the hour is now late. Therefore I move that the Senate proceed to consider executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HILL in the chair) laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which was referred to the appropriate committee.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts, from the Committee on Naval Affairs:

Sundry officers for appointment and/or promotion for temporary service in the Navy and the Naval Reserve.

By Mr. CHANDLER, from the Committee on Military Affairs:

Sundry officers for temporary appointment in the Army of the United States, under the provisions of law.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the calendar.

FOREIGN SERVICE

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Jefferson Caffery, of Louisiana, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to France.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Waldo E. Bailey, of Mississippi, to be Foreign Service officer of class 7, a secretary in the Diplomatic Service, and a consul of the United States of America.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA—NOMINATION PASSED OVER

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Guy Mason, of the District of Columbia, to be Commissioner of the District of Columbia for a term of 3 years, and until his successor is appointed and qualified.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I have no personal objection to the confirmation of the nomination, but at the instance of another Member of the Senate I am obliged to ask that the nomination go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The nomination will be passed over.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, REGISTER OF LAND OFFICE—NOMINATION PASSED OVER

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Richard McElligott of Roseburg, Oreg., to be register of the land office.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, in view of the fact that the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. HOLMAN] was not present when the nomination was considered in the committee, and the fact that I understand he will be present when the Senate meets next week, I ask that the nomination be passed over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The nomination will be passed over.

That completes the calendar.

Mr. OVERTON. I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of the nominations acted upon today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith of all nominations confirmed today.

RECESS TO MONDAY

Mr. OVERTON. As in legislative session, I move that the Senate take a recess until Monday next at 12 o'clock noon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 36 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until Monday, November 27, 1944, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate, November 24 (legislative day of November 21), 1944:

POSTMASTERS

The following-named persons to be postmasters:

ARKANSAS

Myrtle Cunningham, Calion, Ark. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Howard E. Powell, Gurdon, Ark., in place of I. A. Blakely, resigned.

HAWAII

Arthur Chong Kong, Halaula, T. H. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

IDAHO

Verna Uletta Olson, Fruitland, Idaho, in place of L. R. Hollenbeck, retired.

INDIANA

Bessie Boston, Lewis, Ind. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

MAINE

Pearl S. Robinson, Chebeague Island, Maine. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

MARYLAND

Gilbert F. Murphy, Laurel, Md., in place of E. H. S. Boss, resigned.

MICHIGAN

M. Adele Zinger, Ruth, Mich., in place of A. C. Cook, resigned.

MINNESOTA

Earl L. LaPorte, Pillager, Minn., in place of C. E. McNair, resigned.

MISSOURI

Opal B. McCann, Cooter, Mo. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Edward R. Sinnott, Edina, Mo., in place of Charles Shumate, retired.

Maude M. Fleming, Graham, Mo. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

MONTANA

Oscar L. Henry, Belfry, Mont. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

NEW JERSEY

Peter Klapmuts, Oak Ridge, N. J. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

NEW YORK

Thomas J. Tighe, Jr., Amsterdam, N. Y., in place of W. A. Gardner, deceased.

John A. Bush, Hartwick, N. Y., in place of C. O. Weidman, deceased.

Frances A. Kinney, Locke, N. Y., in place of G. S. Mackey, transferred.

Helen M. Cronk, Staatsburg, N. Y., in place of J. J. Finan, removed.

PENNSYLVANIA

Howard C. Philson, Berlin, Pa., in place of E. B. Walker, deceased.

Frederick E. Riegner, Garrett Hill, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Anna C. O'Mara, Laceyville, Pa., in place of J. J. O'Mara, deceased.

Joseph T. Qualters, McKeesport, Pa., in place of Alexander Rankin, deceased.

Birtus B. McDowell, Mineral Springs, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

SOUTH CAROLINA

Robert R. Du Rant, Jr., Manning, S. C., in place of J. S. Bagnal, transferred.

TEXAS

Ruth Finley, Aquilla, Tex. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Catherine H. Bannister, Old Ocean, Tex. Office became Presidential October 1, 1944.

Jesse M. Robbins, Raymondville, Tex., in place of L. O. Robbins, resigned.

Nelson G. Hargett, Weslaco, Tex., in place of Clifton Davenport, resigned.

WISCONSIN

Leona R. Johnson, Danbury, Wis., in place of L. R. Baker, resigned.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate November 24 (legislative day of November 21), 1944:

FOREIGN SERVICE

Jefferson Caffery to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to France.

Waldo E. Bailey to be Foreign Service officer of class 7, a secretary in the Diplomatic Service, and a consul of the United States of America.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

FRIDAY, NOVEMBER 24, 1944

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou who art the Good Shepherd, as we go forth to the duties and adventures of another day, we pray that our labors may bring strength and courage to all who need us and to our country we love; thus may wisdom be justified. Thou Blessed Spirit which develops the hidden sources of the soul, direct us to disseminate knowledge and understanding among our fellow countrymen that

they may be bound together in common sympathy for the public weal.

Thou who art an acting, thinking God, make us wise by our mistakes and stronger by every temptation overcome. We bless Thee for Thy guardianship which at last triumphs over every emergency. Thou Christ, the Great Physician, walk through our hospitals; when the hand seems heavy, and the heart feels smitten, comfort the sick and those who are bowed down. Give them the blessings of a new-found joy. When affliction overthrows and the outlook is dim and dark, fill all such hours with Thy holy benediction; O be with them in the plentitude of Thy mercy. Almighty God, want, fire, and pestilence are in the benighted lands, and we pray that Thou wilt hear the cries and prayers of Thy children and give them speedy deliverance from the furnace of hate, persecution, and death. Give unto us a deeper conviction of the mission of the Son of Man, and Thine shall be the glory forever. In our dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, November 22, 1944, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to a bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 1278. An act for the relief of Yellow Cab Transit Co.

The message also announced that the Vice President has appointed Mr. BARKLEY and Mr. BREWSTER members of the joint select committee on the part of the Senate, as provided for in the act of August 5, 1939, entitled "An act to provide for the disposition of certain records of the United States Government," for the disposition of executive papers in the following departments and agencies:

1. Department of Agriculture.
2. Department of Justice.
3. Department of Labor.
4. Department of the Navy.
5. Department of the Treasury.
6. Post Office Department.
7. Department of War.
8. Federal Power Commission.
9. Federal Security Agency.
10. Federal Works Agency.
11. Office of Price Administration.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at two points in the RECORD, and to insert a poem by Horace C. Carlisle in each instance.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that there be inserted in the RECORD an address by Hon. J. F. T. O'Connor, United States district judge for the southern district of California.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include as a part of my remarks which I intend to make in Committee of the Whole today, certain tables and certain statements from the American Association of State Highways. Also the amendments that are proposed by the committee to the pending bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Utah?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in two instances, in one to include the recommendation of the New England Council adopted November 16, 1944; and in the other to include an editorial which appeared in the Lawrence Evening Tribune of November 20.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

ASSISTANT ATTORNEY GENERAL NORMAN LITTELL

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I am shocked and astounded to find an account in this morning's paper that the Attorney General has asked for the resignation of one of the most outstanding and fearless public servants in the entire American Government.

I refer to Assistant Attorney General Norman Littell, who not only has organized one of the most efficient agencies in the whole war effort but who over and over again in his 6 years of service has courageously resisted special-interest pressures and has stood for the public interest of the American people in the matter of protection of oil reserves and disposal of Government-owned lands and in countless other instances. Over and over again Mr. Littell has in straight-forward fashion provided information to congressional committees to which they were obviously entitled, which they needed in their work and which has been the kind of fearless outspoken testimony that should be forthcoming in all instances.

It is unthinkable to me that Mr. Littell can be forced out of his position and I cannot refrain from saying that I think it would be a very severe blow indeed to the public service of our Government if such an eventuality should take place. Incidentally, the entire Pacific coast will be profoundly concerned over this matter since Mr. Littell is one of the two or three ranking westerners in the whole executive department of the Government.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include therein an article entitled "The Hazy Line Between Agreements and Treaties," written by Arthur Krock.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Hampshire?

There was no objection.

Mr. CLASON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein remarks I made before the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads, with reference to the bill H. R. 4719.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

INCREASE IN SOCIAL-SECURITY TAX

Mr. CLASON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. CLASON. Mr. Speaker, many Americans are deeply concerned about the apparent desire of the present administration to permit an increase in the social-security tax, to go into effect in January 1945, notwithstanding the fact that the reserves for social-security purposes, for which the tax is levied, are ample. This is not the time for increasing the burdens on the war workers and war industries of America, or, for that matter, on any American citizen, unless the tax is absolutely necessary. Deduction after deduction is made from the pay of our people. The cost of living is now increasing steadily, according to Mr. Byrnes.

Americans generally believe that before we adjourn the Seventy-eighth Congress should freeze the social-security tax at its present level for another year. I favor this action and will vote for it if I have the opportunity. Senator VANDENBERG has brought the matter to the attention of the Senate. I hope that the gentleman from North Carolina, Chairman DOUGHTON, will see to it that the members of the Ways and Means Committee of the House give immediate consideration to such legislative action as may be necessary to have the freezing of this tax at its present level voted upon before adjournment.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HOLMES of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an editorial which was published in the Evening Gazette

on November 18, entitled "The Forgotten Postal Worker."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks on two subjects: in the first to include a letter received from the Detroit Board of Commerce; in the second to include an article from the United States News.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that in the revision of the remarks I propose to make on the Federal highway bill today to include certain data, tables, and allocations.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein remarks made by the Honorable Edward R. Stettinius, Jr., Acting Secretary of State, at a rally sponsored by the National Council of American-Soviet Friendship at Madison Square Garden, New York City, on November 16.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT OVER

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES—LEND-LEASE REPORT

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered printed:

To the Congress of the United States of America:

I

I am submitting herewith my Seventeenth Report to Congress on Lend-Lease Operations.

In 15 of these reports I have reported on lend-lease aid extended by the United States. One year ago the Twelfth Lend-Lease Report to Congress set forth the reverse lend-lease aid received by the United States from the British Commonwealth of Nations under the Lend-Lease Act. That report covered the period up to June 30, 1943.

I now report on reverse lend-lease aid received by the United States from the British Commonwealth of Nations up to June 30, 1944.

One year ago the governments of the British Commonwealth reported their expenditures for reverse lend-lease aid to the United States, on the basis of estimates carefully prepared from their records, as totaling $1,175,000,000. They now report that by June 30, 1944—one year later—these expenditures had risen to $3,348,000,000—almost three times the previous total.

The first 6 months of 1944 showed a significant increase in reverse lend-lease aid from the British Commonwealth. These were the months when the final preparations were being made in the United Kingdom for the liberation of western Europe and for the offensives aimed at Germany.

In these 6 months United States forces in the British Isles received the equivalent of almost 3,851,000 ships' tons of supplies from the United Kingdom under reverse lend-lease, exclusive of construction materials and gasoline, compared with 2,950,000 tons in the entire preceding 18 months. In monetary value, the supplies and services we received in these 6 months were greater than for the entire preceding year.

By D-day United States armed forces had reached the United Kingdom in vast numbers. From the day our first soldiers arrived in 1942 one-third of all the supplies and equipment currently required by United States troops in the British Isles has been provided under reverse lend-lease. The percentages of total United States Army requirements in the European theater provided by the United Kingdom have ranged as high as 63 percent in the case of quartermaster supplies and 58 percent for engineers' supplies.

Reverse lend-lease has played an essential part in the stupendous job of preparing for and supplying the great Allied offensives in Europe.

It would have required a thousand ships to send across the Atlantic what we received for our men through reverse lend-lease from the United Kingdom.

We were able to use these thousand ships instead for carrying supplies and equipment that had to come from the United States.

Without the reverse lend-lease aid that we received from the United Kingdom, we would surely have been forced to delay the invasion of France for many months. Now that this campaign has been successfully launched and is on the road to ultimate success, it is possible to include in this report facts about specific and vitally important reverse lend-lease projects that could not previously be safely disclosed in a public report.

For the war against Japan, United States forces have also received increased quantities of supplies and services in the past 6 months as reverse lend-lease from Australia and New Zealand, and in India. These were the months in which the forces under General MacArthur were completing the New Guinea campaign and were preparing to launch the campaign for the liberation of the Philippines.

Our forces in the Pacific have already received 1,850,000,000 pounds of food alone from Australia and New Zealand, including more than 400,000,000 pounds of beef and other meats.

Another important reverse lend-lease program in this theater has been the production for our forces of landing craft, small ships and boats, for the campaign we are waging in the Pacific. Tremendous numbers of these boats are needed for landing and supply operations on hundreds of islands scattered across thousands of miles of water. More than 9,500 of these craft had been produced and delivered by Australia alone in time for the Philippines campaign and over 12,000 more are on the way. In addition, Australia and New Zealand have turned over to our forces many hundreds of coastal steamers, barges, tugs, lighters, yachts, and launches.

In India the increased rate of reverse lend-lease aid we have received in the first 6 months of 1944 has kept pace with the rising tempo of air, land, and sea operations in the Burma-India and China theaters. A significant proportion of the supplies we have received in India has consisted of aviation gasoline and other petroleum products drawn from British oil resources in the Middle East and refined at the British refinery at Abadan. This gasoline, provided to us as reverse lend-lease, without payment by us, is helping to power our B–29 superfortresses in their raids from both China and India on the Japanese homeland and on such enemy-occupied strong points as Singapore. It is also being used by the fighter and bomber planes of the Tenth and Fourteenth United States Army Air Forces.

II

I take the occasion of this report again to point out that the reverse lend-lease aid rendered by nations of the British Commonwealth to the United States is only a part of the aid which we have received from the British in fighting this war. The United States has benefited greatly from reverse lend-lease aid, as the facts set forth in this report indicate. But we have benefited far more, and in a far larger sense, from the total fighting effort of our allies.

As I have stated in previous lend-lease reports and as the Congress has expressed itself in reports by its appropriate committees at the time of the virtually unanimous renewals of the Lend-Lease Act in 1943 and 1944, lend-lease and reverse lend-lease are not two sides of a financial transaction. We are not loaning money under lend-lease. We are not receiving payments on account under reverse lend-lease. The lend-lease system is, instead, a system of combined war supply, whose sole purpose is to make the most effective use against the enemy of the combined resources of the United Nations, regard-

less of the origin of the supplies or which of us uses them against the enemy.

Neither the monetary totals of the lend-lease aid we supply, nor the totals of the reverse lend-lease aid we receive are measures of the aid we have given or received in this war. That could be measured only in terms of the total contributions toward winning victory of each of the United Nations. There are no statistical or monetary measurements for the value of courage, skill, and sacrifice in the face of death and destruction wrought by our common enemies.

We in the United States can be justly proud of our contributions in men and materials, and of the courage and skill and sacrifice of the men and women in our armed forces, and of all those others who have devoted themselves selflessly to the war effort at home. We can also be rightly proud of and grateful for the contributions in men and materials of our allies and the courage and skill and sacrifice of their soldiers, airmen, seamen, and peoples.

In this war the United Nations have all drawn strength from each other—our allies from us and we from them. We can now begin to see the full significance of the overwhelming power that this steadily closer partnership has created. We already know how much it did to save us all from disaster. We know that it has brought and will bring final victory months closer than would otherwise have been possible.

Lend-lease and reverse lend-lease are a system of combined war supply. They should end with the war. But the United Nations partnership must go on and must grow stronger. For the tasks of building a workable peace that will endure, we shall need all the strength that a permanent and stronger United Nations can provide in winning security from aggression, in building the economic foundations for a more prosperous world, and in developing wider opportunities for civilized advancement for the American people and for all the other peace-loving peoples of the world.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *November 24, 1944.*

FEDERAL-AID ROAD ACT

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4915) to amend and supplement the Federal-Aid Road Act, approved July 11, 1916, as amended and supplemented, to authorize appropriations for the post-war construction of highways and bridges, to eliminate hazards at railroad-grade crossings, to provide for the immediate preparation of plans and acquisition of rights-of-way, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 4915, with Mr. COOPER in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. Mr. Chairman, this bill has been unanimously reported by the Committee on Roads. It amends and supplements the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1916 and takes the place of H. R. 2426, on which extensive hearings were conducted by the committee.

I want to assure the Members of the House that the subject has received long and careful study by the committee. Public hearings began on the last day of February 1944, continued through March and April, and were ended on May 2.

During this period public hearings were conducted on 28 days. Witnesses appearing before the committee included representatives of agriculture, labor, industry, highway users, consumers, and Federal, State, and municipal governments. The testimony of 110 witnesses, together with other statements which were filed with the committee in writing, make up a record which fills 2 printed volumes.

Mr. Chairman, this is a road bill. It is true that the program for which this legislation provides will have substantial employment values after the war. That is an important element to which full consideration has been given. But it is, nevertheless, a secondary element. The primary reason for the bill is to meet the country's road needs. One of the fundamental principles on which virtually all witnesses agreed, and which is expressed in this bill, is that an urgent need exists for the development of a program which after the war will take care of the serious deficiencies in our highway system which have existed for many years, which will catch up with the backlog of construction and replacement necessarily accumulated during the war emergency, and which, finally, will provide for the future the efficient and safe facilities this Nation will need to meet its expanding transportation requirements.

We found general agreement on several other basic principles which also have been written into this bill.

One of these is that the Federal program shall preserve the Federal-aid policies which have characterized road legislation in Congress for nearly 30 years. They include the allocation of Federal funds among the States on a formula basis and matched by State funds under the time-tested administration of the Public Roads Administration.

The road program proved long ago that a coordinate relationship, recognizing the sovereignty of the States, can be effective in the development of a Nation-wide system of highways of high standards. That is the Federal-aid highway principle which this bill proposes to continue.

Next we found unanimous agreement that the program must encourage the continuance of competitive bidding on construction and major reconstruction projects under the private-contract system.

Another was that Federal-aid projects shall conform to a definite classification of road system so that improvements are made on a selective basis to meet transportation needs.

There was agreement further that all necessary post-war highway legislation should be enacted by the Congress in a single, comprehensive amendment to the basic road law.

And finally, the testimony emphasized that it is necessary to act without delay, establishing the national policy and making clear the extent of Federal-aid, so that the States and their political subdivisions can proceed with the proper planning of their highway programs.

With these six fundamental principles, the members of the Roads Committee concurred, as I am sure the Members of the House also concur. They are applied in this legislation.

This matter of urgency cannot be emphasized too strongly with reference to the bill before us. Next year, the legislatures of 44 States will meet in biennial sessions. Some of them begin their sessions in January, which is only a few weeks away. Most of them continue for only comparatively short periods of time.

If the post-war highway program is to be a sound program, which the public interest requires, then the States will have to deal in advance, through their legislatures, with the many complex legal, financial, and engineering problems which are involved. It takes as long to plan a sound highway project—one that really meets transportation requirements—as it does to build it. The challenge in this important field which confronts the Congress is to enact the best possible bill in the shortest possible time. A great deal of time has passed since the subject of post-war highways first began receiving consideration here in Washington. That was nearly 2 years ago. But, of course, legislation of this importance cannot be accomplished overnight. And so we have had to work it out, giving careful consideration to all of the elements of the problem. That task is accomplished, and we now have before us a bill which is recommended by the committee, and which I believe comes as close to meeting the test as it is possible to get. Time is now running short, and prompt action is more urgently needed than ever before.

I would like to go through the bill briefly, section by section, in order to bring out some of the main considerations prompting its early passage. For this purpose, the report of the committee will be very useful, because it summarizes the conclusions we reached, and the reasons for them.

First, however, I want to make a few general comments regarding special features of the bill. This is an amendment to the Federal highway law, and therefore it recognizes the obligation of the Federal Government to provide leadership in the development of highway transportation facilities essential to the

general welfare and to the national defense.

The bill authorizes post-war Federal aid to the States for the improvement of congested and hazardous traffic arteries in metropolitan areas which even before the war began were grossly inadequate. The modern highways contemplated under this program will provide capacity and safety for the day-to-day business and social travel of millions of citizens between, through, and around population centers. These modern highways will attract the heavy traffic away from residential streets, and restore to them their original function of providing local access. By making possible the proper advance planning under this bill, these highways can become the framework for future urban redevelopment in all parts of the country.

The bill also provides for vast improvement of secondary and feeder roads in the rural sections of the country. On these roads—commonly called farm-to-market roads—travel the rural school bus, the mail carrier, police and fire vehicles. The secondary roads serve daily millions of farm trucks and passenger cars. This bill provides for the principal farm-to-market roads an improvement program considerably larger than any previously authorized in Federal-aid legislation.

The bill authorizes the designation of a new national system of key rural and urban highways not to exceed 40,000 miles. This is an extremely vital provision of the legislation. The limited road system would be jointly designated by the States and Federal authority, and would represent about 1 percent of our total road mileage. But it is a critical 1 percent; when improved in future years to new high standards of design and construction, it will carry 20 percent of the Nation's total traffic. The design standards which have been proposed for these roads in the report submitted to the Congress by the National Committee on Interregional Highways were described during the committee's hearings by the general manager of the National Safety Council as the "greatest single contribution ever made to highway safety."

The designation of this limited network as proposed follows in principle and in procedure the method used by the Congress for more than two decades. We have in this country something over 3,000,000 miles of roads. Many of them are not general purpose roads, and therefore would not be eligible for improvement from Federal funds. But even if they were, it is obvious that we could not improve all these roads to the same standards. It would be physically and financially impossible. Nor do they need improvement to the same standards, because the volume and character of their use varies.

And so, instead, we have used the principle of selectivity. We have selected out a system of roads, by joint Federal-State action, and we have set minimum standards. Then we restricted Federal funds to projects on that system. That is how the Federal-aid primary road system was developed over the years.

Exactly the same principle and procedure are proposed here, for the selection and development of a still more limited system of heavy-volume highways. For the most part, the system will be composed of existing routes on the Federal-aid system. It will be authorized by this bill, and then be designated by the States and the Federal Government. Then it will be improved during future years to new high standards which will afford the capacity and the safety which these major rural and urban arteries require.

There are many other compelling reasons for the designation of such a network: The requirements of national defense, the necessity for opening up traffic bottlenecks in and near population centers, and so on. I do not propose to go into detail because I think all of us know, from personal observation alone, the conditions which existed even before the war on our main thoroughfares, and which the proper development of this system can, in time, eliminate or reduce.

The important thing to remember is that only through the designation of these highways by road classification, as provided by this bill, can that improvement program be carried out in an orderly and economical manner. It is a program that begins right here in Congress, just as the Federal-aid primary system was begun in Congress in 1921.

I mentioned earlier the employment values of this legislation. It is first of all a road bill, aimed at meeting highway transportation needs. But in consideration of the employment situation which may exist after the war, and mindful of the needs of men returning from military service, the bill also enables the States, acting jointly with the Federal Government, to build up a shelf of essential road projects which can be undertaken at that time.

The capacity of the highway program to provide useful jobs, both on the site of the improvements and in supplying industries, was demonstrated in pre-war years when approximately one-half of all public works were road-improvement projects.

But beyond this, the road program will make an even greater contribution to the post-war economy by supplying the facilities which are needed to maintain and to expand the Nation's highway transportation system.

As President Roosevelt stated in his message to the Congress on interregional highways last January:

> A program of highway construction can serve not only to help meet the Nation's highway transportation needs, but also as a means of utilizing productively during the post-war readjustment period a substantial share of the manpower and industrial capacity then available. * * * It will, in addition, encourage and support the many diverse economic activities dependent upon highway transportation.

Since the beginning of the century nearly every year had seen new records of accomplishments in the field of highway transportation; more motor vehicles manufactured, more vehicles on the road, more miles of paved highways; and more billions of miles of travel. When finally in 1942 these upward trends were stopped by war, motor transport had become an integral part of the mechanism which makes our economy function. As the Baruch Committee described it, this was a country "geared to rubber-borne motor transport to an extent not approached elsewhere in the world"—The Rubber Situation, House Document 836, United States Government Printing Office, September 10, 1942.

Figures which measure the magnitude of motor-transport development in the United States are astronomical. In the past 25 years $42,000,000,000 have been spent for highways, and $55,000,000,000 worth of motor vehicles has been produced. The men and materials involved in these gigantic outlays comprise an imposing part of the Nation's resources. In 1940, 6,500,000 United States workers were employed in road building, vehicle production, petroleum refining, truck and bus transport, tire manufacture, and automobile sales and service—1 out of every 7 United States workers. Highway transport had become the No. 1 consumer of nickel, lead, gasoline, rubber, petroleum, and steel; and its requirements for glass, cotton, leather, aluminum, zinc, and tin had risen to enormous volumes.—Automobile Manufacturers Association, Facts and Fgures, 1941 and 1942. It was the combination of these resources which, in 1941, supported the operations of 34,000,000 motor vehicles in the United States—twice as many vehicles as in all the rest of the world combined.

Highway transportation is by far the most important method of passenger transportation, from the viewpoint of passengers carried, miles traveled, and dollars spent. At the same time transportation on the highways is by all odds the predominant method of short-run local movement for all traffic, both passenger and freight.

Now I come to the bill itself.

Section 1 redefines the term "construction" to include locating, surveying, mapping, cost of right-of-way, and the elimination of hazards at railway grade crossings. These are all essential elements of projects for which Federal-aid funds should be made available in the post-war program.

In section 2, we determine the size of the program. The bill authorizes the appropriation of $1,500,000,000, to become available at the rate of $500,000,000 a year for each 3 successive years. On this point, I wish to state that while the bill has been unanimously reported by the committee the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. MOTT], appended to the report a statement of his individual views in which he contends that the sum authorized is inadequate.

I think that he is correct in stating that the essential needs for highway improvements exceed the program provided by this proposed authorization. I would go further than that, and state as my own individual view that the road needs are so great that we could not

fulfill all of them at one time with an authorization larger than the original sum recommended. The need for replacement alone has accumulated to enormous proportions during the moratorium on road construction which began with a War Production limitation order in April 1942. It is estimated that 29,000 miles of our main highways are worn out or completely obsolete and will have to be replaced. This is a tremendous task. We have further evidence of need from the American Association of State Highway Officials, which estimated in a 1943 survey that the minimum necessary program of road construction and improvement totaled $11,000,000,000 as of that date. The needs have increased materially since 1943.

But I do not think we should consider this legislation as being inadequate because it does not provide the full amount of money which may eventually be required. The States suggested an authorization of $1,000,000,000 annually. The bill before us today proposes half that amount. I do not see any reason why this authorization should be considered as a ceiling on the program. I think we ought to make this authorization, and make it available to the States under the provisions of this Federal-aid bill, and see what kind of a job they do with it. Congress from time to time in the past has amended the Highway Act to provide for important new developments as progress was made in the highway transportation field. We are doing that now. It may be that in a year or two, if the program advances rapidly and if the way is clear, that Congress can consider supplemental authorizations. The main thing now is to get a bill enacted, with an authorization sufficiently large to make possible postwar planning by the States.

There have been some—not many, but a few—who have suggested that the $500,000,000 authorization is not too small but too large. They would not increase it but reduce it. And the argument is made that this sum, in annual authorization, greatly exceeds the annual authorizations of the past for this purpose.

The construction work provided by this bill, under regular Federal-State highway procedures, will extend over a 5-year period. Many of the States will obligate the funds over that period, with actual construction extending into additional years. We must remember, too, that the legislation now being considered will authorize funds for projects making up for at least 3 war years. For comparative purposes, therefore, the program cannot be fairly matched against any 3-year period of the past, but with at least 5 years, and, from a practical point of view, 8 years.

The record shows that Congress always has increased road authorizations when special circumstances and pressing needs made it advisable. Annual authorizations exceeding $500,000,000 have been authorized previously for road purposes, exclusive of W. P. A. grants.

With respect to the size of the authorization, the question also arises concerning the ability of the States to match the Federal funds provided by this bill. A survey just conducted by the American Association of State Highway Officials shows that virtually all of the States report they can take up the Federal aid proposed in this bill, H. R. 4915, within the 5 years allowed and matching through normal financing methods. Only one State indicates that it is considering an increase in its highway tax rates.

It seems absolutely clear that from the statement which follows, from the American Association of State Highway Officials, together with the table, that all of the States can match the funds appropriated by the Federal Government under the terms of this bill.

NOVEMBER 18, 1944.

AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF STATE HIGHWAY OFFICIALS

A special survey by the American Association of State Highway Officials discloses that Federal-aid authorizations provided in H. R. 4915, the post-war highway bill, can be matched by at least 44 of the 48 States within the time allowed through normal financing methods, and without increases in present highway tax rates.

Two States have not yet responded to the association's questionnaire.

This finding definitely rules out unofficial speculation to the effect that 30 States would be unable to finance the contemplated highway program.

The association directed its inquiry to the highway departments of these 30 States, and of the 28 which thus far have replied, only 1, Colorado, reports it is considering an increase in taxes because of its inability to take up the full apportionment of Federal funds within the time permitted.

The earlier speculation concerning the 30 States was based on estimated motor-vehicle revenues in 1945, 1946, and 1947, and apparently had incorrectly assumed that all the States would take up the Federal funds during those 3 calendar years.

Actually only 9 of the 28 reporting plan to do this, with 4 States spreading the program over 4 years and 6 over 5 years, as provided by this type of highway legislation. (The remainder did not indicate their financial programing by years. A State obligates its Federal-aid grant by signing a project agreement. The letting of contracts and actual construction work then follow in due course, usually requiring 1 or 2 years more.)

Another misconception dispelled by the survey is that all States which are unable to finance their share of the program entirely from current revenues assigned by statute to State highway use would be compelled to seek additional taxes.

The survey shows that 34 States (including the 18 whose ability to match is not questioned) do plan to meet their share of the program entirely from current revenues available to the State for that purpose.

But in four others bond issues will be used, and already have been authorized, while nine States report that contribution of funds from local units of government will be available for matching purposes. Both are long-established methods of financing capital improvements of major highways.

Seven States are undecided as to how they would finance the program if it got under way next year, which was assumed for purposes of making the survey. In these States the formulation of a financing program awaits final enactment of the Federal-aid law by Congress, and after that a consideration of the problem by their legislatures. But none of them foresees insurmountable difficulties and none reports plans for obtaining additional funds through increasing tax rates. Here are the seven States:

Delaware is a one-fund State, with all funds for highway work appropriated by the legislature out of the general fund. Revenues from highway user taxes in recent years have far exceeded appropriations for highway purposes.

Louisiana states that while its program is not formulated, it will not be necessary in any case to increase existing tax rates.

Maine expects to continue its State highway policy in effect for many years of issuing bonds for part of the major improvement program, but no estimates of amounts are available.

Mississippi recently set aside about $22,000,000 to retire all nonhighway bonds, and there remains approximately $12,000,000 in the general funds, with the Governor and legislative leaders definitely committed to provide adequate funds for matching Federal-aid highway grants.

Oklahoma will need an additional $12,000,000. The Governor and legislative leaders are said to have given assurance that the funds necessary for matching the highway program will be provided.

Montana's current revenues assigned to the State would fall about 30 percent short of matching the total apportionment. Funds from other sources or the sale of bonds would be necessary. No estimates are given as to the amount of matching funds which may be made available from the coutnies or cities.

Nebraska distributes a large portion of its highway revenue among political subdivisions, and is unable at this time to estimate how much of it would be available for matching purposes. More than two-thirds of the total apportionment could be obligated from present balances and the State's share of estimated revenues.

The survey reveals numerous significant sidelights on the position of the States generally to finance the contemplated program. Bond issues have been authorized, for example, in New Mexico, South Carolina, West Virginia, and North Dakota yet the total highway indebtedness of the first three States will continue to decline. (North Dakota's position in this regard not reported.)

In Alabama the highway department reports it will be able to match H. R. 4915 from current revenues but has the authority to borrow $2,500,000 more, if needed.

Illinois can obligate its entire apportionment in 3 years from existing balances and current revenues, with $100,000,000 more in the State general fund from which the general assembly could draw upon for matching purposes if necessary.

A State-by-State summary of reports from 28 of the 30 States which had replied as of November 18, 1944, appears in the attached tables. (States not reporting are Idaho and Tennessee.)

Shown for each of the 5 years, 1945 through 1949, are the estimates where given of the amount of Federal-aid funds the States would obligate (line No. 3), and the matching amounts to be provided (line No. 4). The bill H. R. 4915 provides three annual authorizations of $500,000,000 each, with the Federal matching share 60 percent the first year, 50 percent in the second and third years.

Another bill, S. 2105, already passed by the Senate, proposes a straight 50-50 matching basis, which would increase the States' share under the first year's authorizations. From the standpoint of the ability of the States to match, however, this is offset by a 10 percent lower authorization, the Senate bill providing for $450,000,000 annually.

State estimates of ability to match apportionment under H. R. 4915

State	1945	1946	1947	1948	1949	Will it be necessary to issue bonds	Local contributions		Remarks[1]
							Amount	Percent of total receipts	
	1,000 dollars	*1,000 dollars*	*1,000 dollars*	*1,000 dollars*	*1,000 dollars*		*1,000 dollars*		
Alabama:									
Apportionment	10,406	10,406	10,406			No	17,390	36.7	Matching requirements can be met from current funds. The State has authority to borrow $2,500,000, if necessary, to match Federal aid.
Matching funds required	6,937	10,406	10,406						
Amount to be obligated	10,406	8,000	10,000	2,812					
Matching to be provided	6,937	8,000	10,000	2,812					
Arkansas:									
Apportionment	8,186	8,186	8,186			No	1,540	3.7	Matching requirements can be met from current funds by 1949.
Matching funds required	5,457	8,186	8,186						
Amount to be obligated	4,912	4,912	4,912	4,911	4,911				
Matching to be provided	3,274	3,821	4,912	4,911	4,911				
Colorado:									
Apportionment	7,757	7,757	7,757						State cannot match with present highway balances plus current revenues. Under present tax rates, they anticipate that $10,666,400 would remain unmatched at the end of 1948. The State highway authorities plan to ask for an increase from 4 to 5 cents in the gasoline tax rate and an increase in registration fees.
Matching funds required	4,115	5,933	5,933						
Delaware:									
Apportionment	2,438	2,438	2,438						All State highway-user revenues go to the State general fund and all funds for highway work are appropriated by the legislature from the general fund. (In recent years revenues from highway-user taxes have far exceeded appropriations for highway purposes.)
Matching funds required	1,625	2,438	2,438						
Georgia:									
Apportionment	12,231	12,231	12,231						All State highway-user revenues go to the State general fund, and all highway expenditures are by appropriation therefrom. Highway-user revenues have been 6 to 9 million dollars greater than highway appropriations in each of the last 6 years. Highway-user revenues, if assigned to highway purposes, are sufficient to match proposed apportionments by 1948.
Matching funds required	8,154	12,231	12,231						
Idaho:									
Apportionment	5,114	5,114	5,114						
Matching funds required	2,240	3,148	3,148						
Illinois:									
Apportionment	21,876	21,876	21,876			No	None		Matching requirements can be met from balances now available, plus current revenues. There is at present a balance of more than $100,000,000 in the State general fund from which the general assembly could provide additional funds if necessary.
Matching funds required	14,584	21,876	21,876						
Amount to be obligated	21,876	21,876	21,876						
Matching to be provided	14,584	21,876	21,876						
Indiana:									
Apportionment	12,104	12,104	12,104			No	None		Matching requirements can be met from present balances, plus current revenue.
Matching funds required	8,069	12,104	12,104						
Amount to be obligated	12,104	12,104	12,104						
Matching to be provided	8,069	12,104	12,104						
Iowa:									
Apportionment	11,598	11,598	11,598			No	None		Matching requirements can be met from present balances, plus current revenue.
Matching funds required	7,732	11,598	11,598						
Amount to be obligated	11,598	11,258	5,532	2,711	3,695				
Matching to be provided	7,732	11,258	5,532	2,711	3,695				
Kansas:									
Apportionment	11,078	11,078	11,078			No	4,500	11.6	The State can match proposed Federal aid by extending the matching period into 1948 and 1949.
Matching funds required	7,385	11,078	11,078						
Amount to be obligated	11,078	11,078	11,078						
Matching to be provided	7,155	4,670	5,920	5,920	5,676				
Louisiana:									
Apportionment	7,732	7,732	7,732			Yes			The State at present has legislative authority to issue bonds for the purpose of matching part of the funds proposed under pending Federal legislation. Formulation of a complete financial program will have to be deferred until after pending Federal legislation is acted upon, but in any case it will not be necessary for Louisiana to increase existing highway-user tax rates.
Matching funds required	5,155	7,732	7,732						
Maine:									
Apportionment	4,013	4,013	4,013			Yes			It will probably be necessary for the State to continue to borrow part of the funds required for the construction of major highway improvements. This will be a continuation of State highway policy in effect for many years.
Matching funds required	2,675	4,013	4,013						
Mississippi:									
Apportionment	8,705	8,705	8,705			Yes			The State will not be able to match proposed Federal aid from current revenue, since the counties receive a very large portion of State highway-user taxes. The State general fund, however is in the best condition in its history. The legislature recently set aside approximately $22,000,000 to pay off all outstanding nonhighway bonds and there remains in the general fund uncommitted a balance of approximately $12,000,000. The Governor and the leaders of both the senate and house of representatives are definitely committed to providing adequate funds to match any Federal aid for highways which may be available and the uncommitted balances now in the State general fund are more than adequate. The State may also consider the sale of bonds to obtain funds for highway construction.
Matching funds required	5,803	8,705	8,705						
Missouri:									
Apportionment	14,519	14,519	14,519			No	None		Matching requirements can be met from present balances, plus current revenue. City contributions may be made if constitutional amendment to be voted on Februrary 27, 1945, is ratified. Ratification will permit State to construct highways in urban places of 2,500 or more persons.
Matching funds required	9,679	14,519	14,519						
Amount to be obligated	10,914	13,769	14,519	4,355					
Matching to be provided	7,276	12,567	14,519	4,355					

Parenthetical statements by American Association of State Highway Officials.

State estimates of ability to match apportionment under H. R. 4915—Continued

State	1945	1946	1947	1948	1949	Will it be necessary to issue bonds	Local contributions		Remarks
							Amount	Percent of total receipts	
	1,000 dollars	*1,000 dollars*	*1,000 dollars*	*1,000 dollars*	*1,000 dollars*		*1,000 dollars*		
Montana:									
Apportionment	8,093	8,093	8,093			No	None		Present State highway balances and current revenue will be insufficient to match $8,052,000 of proposed Federal aid within 5 years. Additional revenue from other State sources will be necessary.
Matching funds required	4,239	6,100	6,100						
Amount to be obligated	2,967	[1] 3,123	[2] 4,831	2,653	2,653				
Matching to be provided	1,554	1,000	1,987	2,000	2,000				
Nebraska:									
Apportionment	8,660	8,660	8,660			No	None		$7,853,000 of proposed apportionments cannot be matched by present State highway balances plus State share of highway-user taxes. Political subdivisions receive a large portion of Nebraska highway-user taxes and the State is unable at this time to estimate the amounts of city and county funds which may be available for matching purposes.
Matching funds required	5,773	8,660	8,660						
Amount to be obligated	6,195	3,322	2,710	2,900	3,000				
Matching to be provided	4,130	2,500	2,710	2,900	3,000				
Nevada:									
Apportionment	4,890	4,890	4,890			No	None		Matching requirements can be met from present balances, plus current revenue.
Matching funds required	724	940	940						
Amount to be obligated	4,890	4,890	4,890						
Matching to be provided	724	940	940						
New Hampshire:									
Apportionment	2,438	2,438	2,438			No	510	2.4	Do.
Matching funds required	1,625	2,438	2,438						
Amount to be obligated	2,438	2,438	2,438						
Matching to be provided	1,625	2,438	2,438						
New Mexico:									
Apportionment	6,542	6,542	6,542			Yes	None		State cannot match from current revenue, but intends to issue $1,000,000 in bonds in each of the years 1945, 1946, 1947. The legislature has already authorized the issue of $1,000,000 in bonds for 1945. (Since present outstanding highway debt is being retired at a rate exceeding $1,000,000 per year, the net debt of the State will be reduced each year notwithstanding the issue of the additional bonds.)
Matching funds required	2,634	3,663	3,663						
Amount to be obligated	6,542	6,542	6,542						
Matching to be provided	2,000	3,000	3,461	1,499					
North Dakota:									
Apportionment	6,177	6,177	6,177			Yes	2,400	18.8	Matching requirements can be met by issuance of bonds already authorized.
Matching funds required	4,118	6,177	6,177						
Amount to be obligated	6,177	6,177	6,177						
Matching to be provided	4,118	3,088	3,089	3,088	3,089				
Ohio:									
Apportionment	19,397	19,397	19,397			No	8,663	7.1	Matching requirements can be met from present balances, plus current revenue.
Matching funds required	[3] 11,800	[3] 17,619	[3] 17,619						
Amount to be obligated	19,397	19,397	19,397						
Matching to be provided	[3] 11,800	[3] 17,619	[3] 17,619						
Oklahoma:									
Apportionment	10,581	10,581	10,581						It will be necessary to raise an additional $12,000,000. The Governor and legislative leaders have given assurance that all funds necessary will be provided for matching any Federal highway program approved by Congress.
Matching funds required	6,414	9,455	9,455						
Oregon:									
Apportionment	7,204	7,204	7,204			No	None		Matching requirements can be met from present balances, plus current revenue.
Matching funds required	3,139	4,406	4,406						
Amount to be obligated	7,204	7,204	7,204						
Matching to be provided	3,139	4,406	4,406						
South Carolina:									
Apportionment	6,791	6,791	6,791			Yes	None		It will not be possible for the State to match from present State highway balances plus current revenue. However, authority now exists for the issue of bonds without further legislative action. The State is now retiring highway debt at a rate of approximately $6,000,000 per year, and the net highway debt will continue to be reduced notwithstanding the issue of additional bonds to match the proposed apportionments.
Matching funds required	4,527	6,791	6,791						
Amount to be obligated	6,791	6,791	6,791						
Matching to be provided	4,527	6,791	6,791						
South Dakota:									
Apportionment	6,473	6,473	6,473			No	3,421	20.7	Matching requirements can be met from present State highway balances plus current revenue by extending the program through 1949.
Matching funds required	3,479	5,024	5,024						
Amount to be obligated	4,750	5,000	5,000	4,669					
Matching to be provided	1,000	4,000	4,400	2,288	1,839				
Tennessee:									
Apportionment	10,575	10,575	10,575						
Matching funds required	7,050	10,575	10,575						
Texas:									
Apportionment	29,547	29,547	29,547			No	None		Matching requirements can be met from present balances, plus current revenue.
Matching funds required	19,698	29,547	29,547						
Amount to be obligated	29,547	29,547	29,547						
Matching to be provided	19,698	29,547	29,547						
Vermont:									
Apportionment	2,438	2,438	2,438			No	858	6.5	$2,192,000 cannot be matched through 1947, but can be matched with current revenue by 1949.
Matching funds required	1,625	2,438	2,438						
Amount to be obligated	1,601	1,583	1,938						
Matching to be provided	1,067	1,304	1,938						
West Virginia:									
Apportionment	5,831	5,831	5,831			Yes	None		Matching can be met by issuance of bonds already authorized. For 20 years the State has followed the policy of issuing bonds for State highway construction. (The State debt will probably continue to be reduced notwithstanding issuance of additional bonds.)
Matching funds required	3,887	5,831	5,831						
Amount to be obligated	5,831	5,831	5,831						
Matching to be provided	3,887	5,831	5,831						
Wisconsin:									
Apportionment	11,857	11,857	11,857			No	5,529	9.9	State can match proposed apportionments from present State highway balances plus current revenue by 1950. (The highway department has an additional book balance with the State treasurer of more than $30,000,000 consisting of highway-user revenues which have not been expended for highway purposes. This balance, or any portion of it, can be made available for highway construction by executive action of the Governor.)
Matching funds required	7,905	11,857	11,857						
Amount to be obligated	3,953	7,905	11,857	7,904	3,952				
Matching to be provided	1,977	4,941	7,905	7,904	5,928				

[1] 1946 and 1947 each include $1,214,000 of unmatched grade-crossing funds.

[2] Approximately 10 percent of apportionment has been deducted for unmatched grade-crossing construction.

Section 3 of the bill fixes apportionment of funds among the States by formula. A committee amendment will be offered as a substitute for this section. The amendment has been unanimously approved by members of the Roads Committee, and it provides for what is called a dual formula. The effect of this amendment will be to bring the bill into line with the Senate provision, since S. 2105, the post-war highway bill already passed by the Senate, contains this dual formula.

In previous road legislation, Federal-aid funds have been apportioned among the States in accordance with a formula which gives equal weighting to three factors—post-road mileage, State population, and State area. This formula has worked well over many years in the development of our rural highways. It is proposed that it be retained, so far as the funds for the regular Federal-aid system and farm-to-market roads are concerned.

But we have now reached a point where it is imperative that more emphasis be given to deficiencies in and near our urban areas, the bottlenecks of our national roads system. The classical formula does not lend itself well to this purpose. A more equitable basis for the apportionment of funds among the States for these projects is the urban population of the States. And so it is provided that those funds be apportioned on that basis—the urban population of each State, in proportion to total urban population of the Nation.

The dual formula is so called, therefore, because it has two parts. Funds for the Federal-aid and farm-to-market roads would be apportioned in accordance with the traditional formula. Funds for projects in urban areas, on the other hand, would be apportioned among the States in accordance with their relative urban populations in places of 5,000 or more. One further modification should be noted. In the case of the secondary- and feeder-road projects, only rural population would be used in the apportionment rather than total State population.

During the past year many formulas have been suggested for the purpose of accomplishing the purpose of this legislation. A great deal can be said in favor of each of them. But much more can be said in favor of the practical and tested values of the factors which over many years have proved to be effective. For this reason, Mr. Speaker, the population, post-road mileage, and area factors are retained. It is the judgment of the committee, as it was of the Senate and of most of the leading highway authorities, that the dual-formula method of apportionment will achieve the purpose which makes a change necessary at this time without sacrificing the dependable and successful values of the classic apportionment factors.

In this matter of formula we have naturally confronted the problem of resolving differences of opinion and interest. An easy way out of the difficulty would be to simply fall back on section 21—the classical formula—but this would amount to shirking the responsibility for leadership which conditions have imposed upon Congress at this critical point in our highway transportation history.

Despite the magnitude of requirements on main rural highways and local rural roads, city streets in many cases represent even higher degrees of inadequacy and often the most costly requirements for modernization. For while the recognized priority of rural highway improvement for many years necessitated principal attention to this tremendous task, the growth of urban vehicle registrations and the concentration of traffic in cities was rapidly shifting the most urgent need for highway improvement to the metropolitan areas.

Today well over half of all traffic is on city streets and in the suburban fringes about cities. In cities of over 100,000 population alone are 28 percent of our motor vehicles and 29 percent of our population.

Mr. Thomas H. MacDonald, the Public Roads Commissioner, stated before the committee that this legislation will influence the course of highway construction in the United States for the next quarter of a century. Because of the conditions brought about as result of the war, we are at a turning point in the development of roads in America. We cannot, at such a time, fail to provide legislation which will enable the country to solve these critical highway problems in urban areas. This modification of existing Federal-aid law, as proposed in the dual formula, represents a constructive and necessary step in that direction.

In section 4 the amount authorized for each year is divided into three categories. As a result of the committee's discussions, a substitute amendment also will be offered for this section, bringing the bill in line with corresponding provisions of the Senate measure, except for the amounts. Under the amendment to be offered, section 4 will divide the funds as follows:

(a) Two hundred and twenty-five million dollars annually for projects on the Federal-aid highway system.

(b) One hundred and fifty million dollars annually for projects on the principal secondary and feeder roads, including farm-to-market roads, rural free-delivery mail and public-school bus routes, either outside of municipalities or inside of municipalities of less than 5,000 population.

(c) One hundred and twenty-five million dollars annually for projects on the Federal-aid highway system in urban areas.

This section also provides for the selection of a secondary or feeder-road system by the State highway departments, in consultation with the appropriate local road officials, including county supervisors and county commissioners, subject to the approval of the Commissioner of Public Roads.

For the first time Federal aid for improvements on the Federal-aid highway system in urban areas is given specific recognition by setting aside funds solely for that work. Testimony before the committee clearly indicated the desirability and necessity of providing Federal aid for projects in urban areas where traffic bottlenecks create acute congestion and costly construction is required to provide relief from such conditions. Bypasses of cities alone will not cure the difficulty because traffic studies have demonstrated that the great bulk of travel is destined for sections well inside the cities.

Although the funds for each year are divided into three categories, a large measure of flexibility is provided. The funds for projects on the Federal-aid highway system may be used, either inside or outside of municipalities. Farm to market road projects and others in the secondary or feeder road group may be located in the rural areas or inside of the smaller cities. Projects in urban areas may be so located as to provide for bypasses around and routes into and through metropolitan areas. This flexibility will permit each State to utilize the funds to the best advantage in meeting the most important highway needs of that State.

Section 5 makes the funds authorized for the first post-war fiscal year available to pay 60 percent of the cost of any project, but for the second and third years the Federal share is restricted to the normal 50 percent. It also continues the so-called sliding scale of participation in the States which have certain public lands exceeding 5 percent of the total area of the State.

It provides further that the entire cost of projects for the elimination of hazards of railway-highway crossings may be paid from Federal funds but restricts to 50 percent the Federal participation in the costs of right-of-way and property damage on such projects.

Testimony submitted to the committee on the $3,000,000,000 program proposed in H. R. 2426 indicated that many States would have difficulty in matching Federal aid on the normal 50–50 basis because of great reduction in their revenues due to gasoline rationing and rubber conservation. The States will also have very heavy expenditures to make in rehabilitating highways which they have been unable to reconstruct during the war and heavy maintenance on roads on which they have been unable to provide adequate maintenance. With the reduction by one-half of the amount proposed and the provision for 60 percent participation on the part of the Federal funds for the first year, the committee believes that States should be required to match the Federal funds provided for the second and third years on an equal basis.

Section 6 provides for the advancing of Federal funds to the State highway departments to be set up in a special trust account and used only in paying for work performed on the Federal-aid projects provided for in the bill. As some of the States may not have cash readily available to assume the full cost of projects while waiting for Federal reimbursement, the setting up of such trust funds by advancing a part of a State's apportionment will insure prompt payment to contractors as the work is accomplished.

A similar provision was carried in the Defense Highway Act and with the approval of the General Accounting Office and the Treasury Department a similar procedure was followed in the expenditure of the emergency funds provided under the National Industrial Recovery Act.

Section 7 provides for the designation of a national system of interstate highways of not to exceed 40,000 miles so located as to serve the national defense and to connect by routes as direct as practicable the principal metropolitan areas, cities, and industrial centers. The designation of such a system, to which I referred earlier, is in line with the recommendation made by the Commissioner of Public Roads on a report made to Congress pursuant to the provisions of section 5 of the act of July 13, 1943.

Section 8 continues the provisions under which the State-wide highway planning surveys were conducted and permits the highway research necessary in connection with the planning of future construction with Federal-aid highway funds. The facts and information developed by these planning surveys have been of very great assistance in solving highway transport problems directly related to the war effort. It is important that this work be continued and the information kept up to date.

Section 9 provides for a resumption of the highway work in the national forests following the war. Except for access roads to sources of critical materials necessary to the war effort, highway construction in the national forests has practically ceased since the war. A 3-year post-war highway program is provided for by an authorization of $25,000,000 a year for forest highways and $12,500,000 a year for forest development roads and trails. The apportionment for forest highways in Alaska is limited to $1,500,000 for each of the post-war years, and the funds that would otherwise be apportioned to Alaska are to be divided among those States whose apportionment would otherwise be less than 1 percent.

Section 10 (a) provides an authorization of $4,250,000 a year for each 3 successive post-war years for park roads and trails. Section 10 (b) provides for the construction and maintenance of parkways to give access to national parks and monuments and authorizes an appropriation of $5,000,000 a year for each 3 successive post-war years. Construction of roads in the national parks and construction of parkways has been regularly authorized in previous Federal-aid highway legislation and this provision will permit the resumption of such work after the war.

Section 11 authorizes the Commissioner of Public Roads to cooperate with the State highway departments and any Federal agency in the location, development, construction, and maintenance of flight strips to insure greater safety for traffic on the public highways and to provide needed facilities for the landing and take-off of aircraft. Funds authorized in the act when requested by the State highway departments are made available for this work. Consultation of officials who are responsible for the construction of airports or flight strips with the State highway departments and the Public Roads Administration is required if Federal funds are to be used for the reconstruction or relocation of any highway giving access to such airport or flight strip.

Section 12 makes a desirable start in the direction of uniformity of traffic signals, signs, and markings by directing the Commissioner of Public Roads to concur only in such installations on Federal-aid projects as will promote the safe and efficient utilization of the highways.

Mr. Chairman, during this war the place of highway transportation in America has been forcefully brought to our attention. We have learned by shortages which interfered with travel how the use of passenger cars, trucks, and busses has become essential to our business, and agriculture; to every phase of our day-to-day living.

In the America of the future, we are looking forward to an expanded economy with useful jobs and prosperity and peace. Highway transportation will have an equally vital role to play in serving the Nation in the years to come. It must be an expanded highway transportation with more capacity and more economy of travel and maximum operating safety.

But the physical plant of that system is our roads—our rural roads and city thoroughfares that at present are completely inadequate to provide the kind of a transportation service the Nation needs and desires.

We can have the kind of roads we need if we provide for their orderly and continuous improvement. That means Federal leadership and assistance. It means advance planning which takes time; planning by the States and the cities, to schedule programs, acquire rights-of-way, arrange financing, make designs.

In this bill, the Congress can give that leadership and assistance. It is urgent that we do so, without delay.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. I yield.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. I am very much interested in the farm-to-market roads, the so-called secondary roads. I think that part of the program has perhaps been neglected. Of course, the war has caused a stoppage of work of that kind.

Does the gentleman say that under this bill provision will be made for an adequate allocation for farm-to-market and secondary roads?

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. Yes; I am glad to tell the gentleman from Texas that under this bill the farm-to-market roads have received better consideration than they have under any previous highway bill.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. I want to express my appreciation, because I think sometimes they are inclined to think about the superhighways and forget these remote sections where the roads are very badly needed.

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. I may also add that one of the amendments which we propose to offer as a unanimous committee amendment provides $25,000,000 more for secondary roads than is provided for by the Senate bill.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. I yield.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. I note that the bill provides for the construction of highways leading into cities to connect with our main highways. I think that is commendable. What portion of the funds for which authorization is sought will go to that development as compared with the farm-to-market roads that reach into the rural sections of America and that are now largely without any highway facilities?

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. The urban areas receive an authorization under this bill of $125,000,000. Secondary and feeder roads receive an authorization of $150,000,000 per annum.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. I want to express my appreciation of the action of the committee in recognizing the need for the extension of these farm-to-market roads which, as the gentleman has so ably said, affects the life of the communities, because they cannot have rural mail delivery, the school busses cannot operate, and they have no means of access to market. Undoubtedly it would certainly be a great contribution to rural life in America.

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. I yield.

Mr. VURSELL. I notice on page 4 of the report the allocation for Illinois. If I am correct, there will be an allocation of something over $16,000,000 for urban and Federal-aid highways, with only $5,469,000 for farm-to-market roads. We are pretty well belted with highways now in Illinois. That amount is less than one-third.

Then over in section 4 of the bill, if I read it correctly, a part of this money for farm-to-market roads can be used in the small towns and villages. If we are going to spend an enormous amount of money and continue deficit financing, as this bill seems to indicate in a very large way, I pause to wonder whether or not we are giving enough allocation to the farm-to-market roads, and I doubt the wisdom of $500,000,000 a year, trebling the Federal aid that was set up under the old bill, which was about one-third that amount in pre-war years. We are all for good roads, but there is a question of how far we can go and how many we can get with a national debt now amounting to $209,000,000,000.

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. In answer to the gentleman's question, I will say the figures he has given were the figures under the old bill, which has been changed in the committee. In the committee we have adopted the very idea the gentleman has suggested. That is, giving more to the farm-to-market roads. Under this bill which we will now ask the committee to consider, we will offer an amendment which will provide more money for the farm-to-market roads.

Mr. VURSELL. If the gentleman please, the following table shows the

approximate amount which each State would receive individually under H. R. 4915; that is, the bill under consideration; and those are the figures from which I have read.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. I yield.

Mr. POAGE. I wanted to ask the chairman about that very point. The gentleman has given us the amounts but I wanted to get it clear as to the method whereby we make this allocation. I understand we are going to grant an additional $25,000,000 to farm-to-market roads, but how do you allocate the money between States? We formerly allocated it one-third on area, one-third on population, and one-third on post-roads mileage. How do you go about making that allocation now?

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. We allocate all of the Federal aid primary money on the old basis of one-third, one-third, and one-third, as the gentleman just mentioned.

Mr. POAGE. That is for State-designated highways.

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. And it may be used either inside or outside of urban areas. We allocate the $150,000,000 which is for farm-to-market roads——

Mr. POAGE. Which will be $175,000,000 will it not?

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. No; it will be $150,000,000. We allocate that on the same formula except that we take the rural population; so it is allocated on about the same method as the old formula. The $125,000,000 for projects on highways in urban areas is allocated on population entirely.

Mr. POAGE. I want to get that clear; in other words, no matter what the size of the cities are, in a sparsely populated State there will not be very much allocation for the cities. Take for example, as an illustration some of these States that have large cities and a relatively small rural area; I imagine the State of Washington has its largest population in the cities of Seattle and Spokane. The gentleman's own State has a large percentage of its population——

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. Answering the gentleman from Texas I may say that we have taken cities of 5,000 and more and we figure it on that population throughout the United States.

Mr. POAGE. Do you allocate directly tc a city or do you allocate to a State?

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. We allocate directly to the State.

Mr. POAGE. But here is the point: In my State approximately 60 percent of the population is found in rural areas. We have no cities of very large population in Texas, although Houston in size is, of course, as large as many of the cities of the East, but still they would not get as much money allocated for that city as the same city would get in a State the greater part of whose population was urban, would it?

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. I believe we have taken pretty good care of Texas, all sections of Texas.

Mr. POAGE. I am not talking only about Texas, I am talking about Utah, Washington or any other State. I asked about Maryland; let us talk about Maryland because I know that in that State a very large portion of the population lives in the city of Baltimore. If, therefore, you allocate simply on the basis of city population, Maryland will get a much larger allocation than Arizona and possibly some other States where the population is scattered over a wide area.

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. Yes; in a sense, but they have a much more acute problem than in these smaller cities. There is no question about the larger cities. The purpose of fixing this allocation as it is, is an effort to try to help the large metropolitan centers solve their problem.

Mr. POAGE. Does the gentleman mean to say the large city needs more money per capita than the small city?

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. They get the same amount per capita.

Mr. POAGE. I always understood that the small city was the one that needed help, that the larger city with its greater population to draw on could get money enough to finance street operations.

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. They get the same amount per capita as the small cities. Where streets are taken care of under the regular Federal-aid highway system they would have that money anyway.

I must now yield to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO] who has been on his feet for some time.

Mr. DONDERO. I thank the gentleman, but I believe he has partially at least answered the thought I had in mind: The vital change in this bill is in this matter of distribution, is it not?

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. That is correct.

Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 additional minutes.

Mr. DONDERO. Is any change made in the method of administration? Does the Federal Government control the administration or do the States control it?

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. The money is paid into the State through its regular organization.

Mr. DONDERO. As it is under the present law?

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. As it is under the Federal Highway Act.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Will the gentleman yield for an observation?

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. The gentleman has made a very informative statement. I am quite sure that those of us from agricultural sections are interested and pleased to know that the pending road bill allocates extra Federal funds for farm-to-market roads. I congratulate the chairman and his committee especially on that part of the bill. Now, there seems to be a misunderstanding in at least some quarters with reference to the funds authorized in this road bill for the cities and towns of the country. A few moments ago the gentleman from Texas made inquiry of the gentleman concerning funds allocated under the terms of the pending bill for cities and urban towns. He mentioned cities like Houston and Baltimore. Frankly, I am at a loss to know how and why such large cities as these get in on a road bill. Will the gentleman tell us what portion of the funds authorized under this act will go to the cities or towns?

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. One hundred and twenty-five million dollars.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Do the small towns, many of which are hard pressed financially, participate? Or do the cities and larger towns get special consideration?

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. It is on the basis of population of all cities over 5,000.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. As one who is deeply interested in more and better highways I must confess I do not see the reason for barring towns of under 5,000 from participating if any portion is to go to towns and cities. To my mind funds appropriated or allocated or authorized for highways should be on highways in rural areas such as farm-to-market roads, school-bus routes, rural mail routes, or connecting up towns and cities large and small, and not spent in the great cities of the country like Houston, Baltimore, or New York City, any one of which can well afford to pave its own streets. Is this a road bill or is it a bill to pave streets leading into the larger towns and cities of the country?

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. This is a road bill and it is to be spent only on Federal highways.

Mr. MOTT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. I yield to the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. MOTT. In answer to the gentleman's statement, in which he said that $125,000,000 would be spent in urban areas. In addition to that, under the first provision of the bill, which appears on page 4 of the bill, $225,000,000 is allocated for projects under the Federal highway-aid system either inside or outside of the municipalities.

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. I made that statement previously.

Mr. MOTT. So in addition to the amount that the gentleman just referred to there is as much of this $225,000,000 which may be expended in municipalities as there is to be expended outside of those municipalities.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Will the gentleman explain to the committee how this road construction program is to be financed.

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. Yes. This road program is financed by Federal funds, but may I call the gentleman's attention to the fact that the user of the highway, the man who owns the automobile, pays into the Federal Treasury for the use of that automobile on our highways about $650,000,000 a year. Therefore, we are financing our own roads and in addition we are paying into the Federal Treasury about $150,000,000 a year in taxes. While technically it comes out of the Federal Treasury it does so because we put it in there with the

understanding it shall be used for these roads.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Does that include the stamp tax?

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. Yes.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. What is the amount of the stamp tax?

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. Five dollars per vehicle.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. The gentleman is not in position then to say whether outside of this stamp tax a part of this program might be financed by deficit financing?

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. It would not be deficit financing.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. The gentleman is including the stamp tax however.

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. Yes, and all other excise taxes on the motor vehicle and its use.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. So that including the stamp tax you will have sufficient funds to pay for the Federal Government's portion without any aid from the Federal Treasury, is that correct?

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. Yes.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I call the gentleman's attention to page 4, line 7, and I would like to ask him what in his opinion is the extent of the authority and the influence that local communities of government, such as county supervisors, county commissioners, and other local road officials, will have in determining policy as against the Federal and State authorities?

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. This is the first time it has ever been incorporated in a road bill. We are requiring the State people to cooperate with the county supervisors and county officials.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I am glad to hear that. The reason I asked the question is that I am very much interested in successful roadbuilding, and I believe that the local authorities must have their say in order to bring success to any roadbuilding program, particularly in the rural areas.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Is it the committee's understanding that the one-half of 1 percent minimum that applied on the old program will also apply on the farm-to-market roads in this bill? I notice on the chart prepared by the Public Roads Administration that they apparently are using that half of 1 percent; for example, Hawaii and the District of Columbia. The figure amounts to $609,000 on the farm-to-market roads. Is that the intention of the committee?

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. That provision is in the existing law.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. I know it applies on the old formula, but the committee would not anticipate that there would be $609,000 a year spent in the District of Columbia on farm-to-market roads?

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. No.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. The Public Roads Administration so listed it in the chart that they have prepared, and I was wondering about it.

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. I have not seen that chart, so I am not familiar with it. We do not have that intention.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. I thought there might be an error here.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE. I would like to ask the gentleman two questions with respect to this secondary or feeder roads provision. First, while there may be some argument for giving heavier weightage to the population factor in determining an apportionment of some of the funds, I do not follow the committee's argument with reference to the secondary or feeder roads. Why should population be weighted heavier than area or miles of roads when you are dealing with secondary and feeder roads?

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. Population is considered.

Mr. CASE. As I understand, section 3 provides that:

> The sums authorized in section 2 shall be apportioned among the States in accordance with the provisions of the Federal Highway Act of 1921, as amended, and supplemented, except that such apportionment shall be based as follows: One-half population, one-fourth area, one-fourth post-road mileage.

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. So that the gentleman will understand, I made a statement previously that by unanimous consent the committee was introducing an amendment to this bill which covered that point, and under that amendment the apportionment would be on the one-third, one-third, one-third basis for rural areas.

Mr. CASE. That would cover all of the funds for the secondary and feeder roads?

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. That is right.

Mr. CASE. I am glad to have that assurance. The other question is with respect to the proviso in subparagraph (b) that the State highway department should consult with the county supervisors. Does that mean that the States will set up the standards for the secondary roads, or will those standards be established by the Public Roads Administration?

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. The States have always set up those standards, and that would continue to be the program. However, I might say this: They are subject to the approval of the Bureau of Public Roads.

Mr. CASE. The county commissioners in my district have many times told me that the reason they did not avail themselves of the opportunity to match secondary road money is that the standards set were too high in proportion to the traffic involved, and that they were so expensive that even matching funds from the county it was too costly than it would be if they built suitable and satisfactory roads in sparsely settled sections.

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. Did they tell the gentleman who set those standards?

Mr. CASE. Yes; they finally had to be approved by the Public Roads Administration in Washington.

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. No. Mr. MacDonald appeared before our committee on that subject and told us that the Public Roads Administration in Washington has never set standards for the secondary roads.

Mr. CASE. Their district engineers are in error on that, then, under the Public Roads Administration, because the fact is that our counties found it practically unprofitable for them to try to match the funds offered because the standards were so high that they would build a boulevard instead of a secondary road.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Utah has again expired.

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 additional minutes.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. That arises primarily out of the fact that the funds heretofore provided were allotted to each State in very small amounts. Under this bill the largest amount ever contemplated for rural roads is provided, and inferior grades will be established so that they can be used in the counties. Thus the criticism to which the gentleman referred is obviated.

May I say further in response to the gentleman's inquiry that Federal highway aid under the bill, as agreed to by the committee amendment, will be apportioned on the basis of section 21, one-third, one-third, and one-third; but, under the amendment, the farm-to-market roads will receive a larger allocation than the one-third population, because under the amendment of the committee we limit that one-third to the rural population, and the farm-to-market distribution will be much larger than heretofore.

Mr. CASE. I am glad to have that statement.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I should like to express my appreciation to the committee for the apportionment formula reproduced on page 4 of the report and also call particular attention to the redefinition of "construction" included in the report. I think it is a very splendid approach to clearing up a misunderstanding that has prevailed heretofore. I think the committee should be complimented accordingly.

Will the gentleman yield further for a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. Yes.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. LEA] be permitted to extend his remarks in the RECORD on the pending bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. WELCH. This enormous sum of $1,500,000,000 which we are expected to appropriate is predicated on providing post-war employment?

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. It is predicated on, first, the need for highway construction. Investigation was made to find out just how much highway construction is needed at the present time, and it was determined that it would take $11,000,000,000 to modernize our highways to meet present-day needs. Therefore, the first predication is on the necessity for good roads. In connection with that, of course, there is the problem of putting men to work after the war ends.

Mr. WELCH. Has the distinguished gentleman from Utah and his able committee, which I know worked hard and long on this bill, made a break-down showing the percentage of the $1,500,000,000 which will be used for actual labor?

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. It is usually considered that about 87 percent of the amount will be used for the payment of wages to labor.

Mr. WELCH. Was expert testimony adduced before the gentleman's committee to that effect?

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. Yes.

Mr. WELCH. Is it included in the committee report?

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. I think it is.

Mr. WELCH. It should be included in the report.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. I notice that under "Parkways" you provide for authorization of an appropriation of $5,000,000 a year for each of 3 succeeding post-war years. As I understand, "Parkways" includes the Natchez Trace?

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. Yes.

Mr. RANKIN. Does not the gentleman think those parkways should be entitled to a larger allocation than the amount provided here?

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. Speaking personally, I think they should. As I recall it, this is just half of what was proposed by the Department, so that that amount was cut in half by the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 additional minutes.

Mr. RANKIN. So, if the Department's view had been carried out, there would have been at least $10,000,000 authorized for these parkways; that is correct, is it not?

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. That is right.

Mr. RANKIN. Now, with reference to the Natchez Trace particularly, which has already been authorized by law in the road bill—that is, large stretches of it—which extends all the way from Nashville, Tenn., to Natchez, Miss., I am wondering if the gentleman would support an amendment to carry out the views of the Department and increase that appropriation to $10,000,000?

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. Well, the gentleman realizes that I am subject to the desires of the committee, and the committee has passed upon that matter.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for one more question?

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Will this measure, if it is passed, and if the appropriation is finally made, increase the tax burden of highway users?

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. No. I am glad the gentleman mentioned that because I have given figures here to show that it will not increase the tax burden. We had the State highway officials make inquiry of every State in the Union as to whether or not in carrying out this program it would be necessary to increase the taxes in the various States. We have heard from all of those States and have statements here which I will insert in the RECORD as part of my remarks, showing that they will not need to increase taxes; and there is only one State in the Union that is contemplating increasing its gasoline tax, although not for carrying out this program but because that particular State thinks its tax is a little under what it should be.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. I yield myself 2 additional minutes.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Does the gentleman refer to the tax on motor vehicles which goes to the State or does he refer to the tax that goes to the Federal Government?

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. I am referring now to the contribution of these States. The State gets its money largely from the contribution of automobile users.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. And that need not be increased?

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. No.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. What about the proportion that goes for Federal taxes to be applied to road construction?

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. The amount that is paid in by the automobile users to the Federal Government exceeds the amount that is provided in this bill.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. So the gentleman can assure us there will be no increase in that tax to the highway users?

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. That is correct.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. I yield.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. I wonder if the committee gave any consideration to the matter of placing the minimum population of our urban area at less than 10,000. That is the minimum, I believe?

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. Mr. Chairman, we are proposing an amendment to that which will make it 5,000.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. I think that will be very helpful because most of our cities are less than 10,000 population.

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. We propose to amend that.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. I am glad to know that the committee has agreed to that.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 additional minutes.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. I yield.

Mr. JENSEN. I am wondering why you have any limitation at all. Why not take in all the towns? Will the gentleman explain that?

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. The reason is that this one fund is primarily for the benefit of urban areas. The urban areas need more money than they have ever needed before, due to the bottlenecks which exist as we enter and leave such areas. Therefore, the reason for basing this on city population is to give them some relief.

Mr. JENSEN. I did not quite understand why you just do not say that this money will be used, regardless of the size of the town in the urban areas.

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. That may be done. As I recall we have not considered that feature.

Mr. JENSEN. I am trying to find out why the limit of five thousand is placed.

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. The limit of five thousand is placed, as I understand it, for the reasons I have given.

Mr. KERR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. I yield.

Mr. KERR. In determining the amount which you ask under this bill, does that enable all the States to qualify with their present income?

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. Yes; they can now all qualify.

Mr. HALE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. I yield.

Mr. HALE. Can the gentleman tell me about the penalties for diversion? Are they continued under this bill?

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. Yes; they are continued.

The following amendments to the bill have the unanimous endorsement of the committee and will be introduced by me as committee amendments:

Amendment offered by Mr. ROBINSON of Utah: Page 2, line 4, after the word "of", strike out the word "ten" and insert the word "five."

Amendment offered by Mr. ROBINSON of Utah: Page 3, line 14, strike out all of section 3, and insert in lieu thereof the following language:

"SEC. 3. The sum authorized in section 2 for each year shall be available for expenditures as follows:

"(a) $225,000,000 for projects on the Federal-aid highway system.

"(b) $150,000,000 for projects on the principal secondary and feeder roads, including farm-to-market roads, rural free-delivery mail and public-school bus routes, either outside of municipalities or inside of municipalities of less than 5,000 population: *Provided*, That these funds shall be expended on a system of such roads selected by the State highway departments in cooperation with the county supervisors, county commissioners, or other appropriate local road officials and the commissioner of public roads: *Provided further*, That in any State having a population density of more than 200 per square mile, as shown by the latest available Federal census, the said system may be selected by the State highway department with the approval of the commissioner of public roads without regard to included municipal boundaries: *Provided further*, That any of such funds for secondary and feeder roads which are apportioned to a State in which all public roads

and highways are under the control and supervision of the State highway department may, if the State highway department and the commissioner of public roads jointly agree that such funds are not needed for secondary and feeder roads, be expended for projects in such State on the Federal-aid highway system.

"(c) $125,000,000 for projects on the Federal-aid highway system in urban areas."

Amendment offered by Mr. ROBINSON of Utah: Page 3, line 20, strike out all of section 4 and insert in lieu thereof the following language:

"SEC. 4. After making the deductions for administration, research, and investigations as provided in section 21 of the Federal Highway Act of 1921, the sums authorized shall be apportioned as follows:

"(a) The $225,000,000 per year available for projects on the Federal-aid highway system shall be apportioned among the States as provided in section 21 of the Federal Highway Act.

"(b) The $150,000,000 per year available for projects on the secondary and feeder roads shall be apportioned among the States in the following manner: One-third in the ratio which the area of each State bears to the total area of all the States; one-third in the ratio which the rural population of each State bears to the total rural population of all the States, as shown by the Federal census of 1940; and one-third in the ratio which the mileage of rural delivery and star routes in each State bears to the total mileage of rural delivery and star routes in all the States.

"(c) The $125,000,000 per year available for projects on highways in urban areas shall be apportioned among the States in the ratio which the population in municipalities and other urban places, of 5,000 or more, in each State bears to the total population in municipalities and other urban places, of 5,000 or more, in all the States as shown by the latest available Federal census: *Provided*, That Connecticut and Vermont towns shall be considered municipalities regardless of their incorporated status.

"(d) Any sums apportioned to any State under the provisions of this section shall be available for expenditure in that State for 2 years after the date of apportionment, and any amount so apportioned remaining unexpended at the end of such period shall lapse: *Provided*, That such funds shall be deemed to have been expended if covered by formal agreement with the Commissioner of Public Roads for the improvement of a specific project as provided by this act."

Amendment offered by Mr. ROBINSON, of Utah: Page 5, line 15, after the word "funds" strike out the period and insert a colon and the following language: *"Provided further*, That not more than 15 percent of the sums apportioned to any State shall be used for railway-highway projects."

Amendment offered by Mr. ROBINSON, of Utah: Page 9, line 5, after the word "department", insert the following language: "not to exceed 3 percent of the."

Amendment offered by Mr. ROBINSON, of Utah: Page 9, line 11, after the word "facilities", strike out the period and insert a colon and the following language: *"Provided*, That the expenditure of Federal funds for flight strips under this section shall be subject to section 303 of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended (U. S. C., 1940 ed., Title 49, sec. 453)."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Utah has consumed 41 minutes.

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH].

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Chairman, I think it is a correct statement to make that there has been no proposal that has uniformly come before the Congress which has received more widespread approval of the membership, regardless of party, than the so-called Federal-aid highway legislation.

I feel that the same condition will exist as we consider the provisions of this important measure, which authorizes a post-war highway construction program covering a period of 3 years. We all desire very earnestly to see America continue as the No. 1 transportation nation of the world. We know that under the impact of war our roads have deteriorated, and that necessary improvements could not be made. We also well understand that when victory has come it will be necessary for this Government, working in conjunction with private industry, to lay a foundation for job security, and not pensions, for returning members of the armed forces.

I believe road building legislation presented to the Congress at this time will provide hundreds of thousands of workers with gainful employment and be most important in cushioning the reconversion period from war to peace. The distinguished chairman of the Committee on Roads has properly said that the bill has been carefully studied and is brought to the floor with the general support of the members of our committee.

Weeks and weeks of testimony were presented for all phases of Federal, State, and local governments. Organizations closely identified with highway development in this country, were heard through their representatives. In this latter group I recall especially the counsel of Charles Upham, engineer-director of the American Road Builders' Association. Members who are not familiar with his A Sound Plan for Post-War Roads and Jobs should secure and read the studies made of periods of prosperity and depression, and the remedy set forth.

West Virginia road officials, through Ernest L. Bailey and others, have made efforts to have the amount increased above the over-all figure in H. R. 4915. Mr. Bailey, State commissioner, feels the annual authorization should be increased at least to $750,000,000. I, personally, in committee voted for a greater amount than carried in this bill. Under its approximate apportionment West Virginia will receive for its Federal-aid highway system the amount of $2,470,000; for farm-to-market roads, $2,078,000; and for urban highways the sum of $812,000 for an over-all fund of $5,360,000 annually over a 3-year building program. It costs much money in our mountainous country to construct adequate highways.

Mr. Chairman, during the reading of the bill for amendments, I shall offer at least two—one dealing with flight strip construction jurisdiction, and the other with the subject of Federal requirements as to road widths, and so forth. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. MOTT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 20 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I presume every Member of this House is familiar with the basic principles and provisions of the bill which is now before us for consideration. For nearly 30 years the Roads Committee of the House annually or biannually has submitted to this body a bill providing for Federal aid to the States for road building. The basic legislation, by general agreement, is considered to be the soundest of all methods of cooperation between State and Federal agencies in the bringing about of useful projects.

This bill authorizes a considerably larger amount of money for Federal aid to the States in road building than any other previous bill. It provides for the expenditure of a half billion dollars per year for a period of 3 years. The bill does not change in any very essential way any of the basic principles of the established Federal-aid road policy. For that reason, and because I have always been in favor of increasingly large Federal contributions to the States for road building, I would say that this is a very excellent bill.

This bill, however, is more than simply a regular road bill which the Committee on Roads of the House submits to this body periodically, because the purpose of it is to provide for a post-war road-construction program. The committee held hearings extending over a period of several months. Something more than 100 witnesses from all of the 48 States of the Union were examined, and we had the benefit of the best expert road opinion in the country.

It was almost the unanimous opinion of all these witnesses that the minimum amount required to undertake this post-war road-construction program would be $3,000,000,000 expended at the rate of $1,000,000,000 a year. After the hearings were concluded a majority of the committee decided that this amount should be cut in two; and over my own individual protest, and that of a few of my colleagues the bill was reported out carrying only one-half of the original amount or $1,500,000,000. To the committee report, therefore which, as the chairman has said correctly, is a unanimous report, I have thought it proper in the circumstances to append some individual views, which I am going to take the liberty of reading to you, because they are brief, and I hope that the arguments contained in these views may be considered sufficient to support an amendment which I intend to offer, to increase, at least by a modest amount the sums authorized in this bill. In my individual views attached to the committee report I said:

I shall support H. R. 4915 solely for the reason that it is essential that legislation providing for a post-war highway construction program be enacted at this session of the Congress. I feel constrained, however, to state here that the bill, as reported from committee, in my opinion, is wholly inadequate to meet proven post-war highway needs. It is my opinion, further, that there is no sufficient reason or excuse for this inadequacy, because the entire testimony presented at the committee hearings clearly disclosed (1) that the minimum amount required for an adequate post-war highway

program would be $1,000,000,000 per year for 3 years; and (2) that the financing of such a program would be economically feasible and would not result in an undue tax burden on the people who are to benefit by the legislation.

When introduced the initial legislation (H. R. 2426) provided $1,000,000,000 annually for the 3 successive post-war years. Throughout the course of the hearings there was complete unanimity as to the justification and appropriateness of this amount. Over a hundred witnesses appeared before the committee and presented incontrovertible testimony regarding post-war highway requirements. As the record will disclose, these witnesses established beyond question that the minimum amount of Federal funds necessary to support a post-war highway program of adequate proportions would be a billion dollars for each of the 3 successive post-war years. The action of the committee in cutting this authorization in half is not supported by the record, and it constitutes nothing more than a purely arbitrary finding. Such arbitrary findings fail to take cognizance of the basic problems involved in this legislation, the result of which would be a niggardly approach to a problem of extreme national implications.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOTT. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Does not the gentleman think it is going to be very difficult for some of the poor States to match the amount they are going to receive under this bill now?

Mr. MOTT. No; I will say to the gentleman I do not think so. That question was gone into very thoroughly in committee and it was shown that some of the States, for the first post-war year, may have difficulty in matching on a 50–50 basis, and for that reason the old established matching formula was changed so that the Federal Government would contribute 60 percent and the States 40 percent for the first post-war year. It was the opinion of the highway commissioners of those States that the so-called poorer States could do that without difficulty.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. May I call the gentleman's attention to the fact that some of the Members have made the statement on the floor that the main purpose of his bill is to give employment. If that be true, and if some of these poor States cannot match these funds, they will not have employment for the returning soldiers in their respective areas.

Mr. MOTT. The gentleman asks two questions. One is whether the States could afford to match on a 60–40 basis. My reply is that the highway commissioners from those very States said they could. As to the second question the primary purpose of this bill is post-war road construction. It is also calculated to help take care of an unemployment situation, which may develop. But that is a secondary purpose. It is generally believed that there will be an era of unemployment in which the Federal Government will have to contribute some sort of aid. It has been demonstrated year after year that no Federal activity supplies, dollar for dollar, as much aid to labor as does the construction of roads. The bill, therefore, is perfectly suited to unemployment relief. Does that answer the questions?

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Yes.

Mr. MOTT. May I proceed with this minority report, or, rather with this statement of individual views? And I hope I may have the attention of all Members because this is the argument upon which I am going to base my contention that the authorization should be increased.

Witnesses from the 48 States and Territories presented detailed data regarding highway requirements, the total of which involved over $11,100,000,000. That means it will require $11,000,000,000 to bring the highway system of the United States up to the point where it should be at this time were it not for the deterioration of these roads caused by war usage and the fact that during the war we could neither afford the manpower nor labor to keep them up. So it is going to take $11,000,000,000 to put the roads even in the condition that they ought to be normally at this time, to say nothing of taking the first forward step in an expanded road program which the traffic needs of this country after the war will require.

Other competent witnesses placed the total highway needs of the Nation in the neighborhood of $16,000,000,000. Practically without exception, the witnesses appearing before the committee emphasized the absolute need of at least $1,000,000,000 annually in Federal aid to support the post-war highway program. Witness after witness admonished the committee that unless a Federal-aid program of such proportions is established we will not be able to even approach post-war highway requirements and face a break-down of the highway transportation system.

Of equal importance was the wealth of testimony before the committee regarding the economic aspects of post-war construction. Witnesses representing the Federal Government, States, counties, and cities, as well as the highway users, labor, and industry warned the committee that unless we make adequate preparation now we face the return of the Work Projects Administration or even something worse in the post-war era.

According to the testimony of these experts the authorization of only $500,000,000 a year would be but a pitiful approach to a problem of tremendous proportions.

Much has been said regarding the size of the national debt as contrasted with the favorable financial conditions of the several States. In this connection, however, it may be pointed out that a Federal-aid authorization of a billion dollars a year for each of the 3 post-war years would have very little, if any, effect on the size of the national debt. Highway improvements may be truly classed as self-liquidating projects and according to competent authorities receipts from Federal excise taxes during the post-war period will be sufficient to meet the expenses of a program twice the size of the one contemplated under H. R. 4915.

That means that the Federal revenue from gasoline and other automotive taxes after the war will be more than a billion dollars a year, so that the roads themselves, if this were a $3,000,000,000 program, as I believe it ought to be, would be completely financed by the road users of the several States themselves without any burden at all upon the general taxpayers.

In fact, the amount provided in H. R. 4915 would not even equal the annual rate of Federal collections from highway users based on the 1942 level. For the fiscal year 1942 the receipts from Federal excise taxes on motor vehicles, gasoline, oil, and so forth, totaled $626,327,000, which is over $126,000,000 more than the annual amounts authorized in the bill under consideration. There is no question but that the number of vehicles and vehicle use will increase substantially following the war. This, of course, means substantially increased returns to the Federal Government from the various taxes now levied on motor vehicles and motor-vehicle use.

Accordingly, the amounts of Federal aid provided in H. R. 4915 are protested as being wholly inadequate and the recommendation is made that Federal aid for post-war highway construction should be fixed at the minimum of $1,000,000,000 per year.

As I said a moment ago, it would be futile to argue about the virtue of the general policy of Federal aid to States in road construction. There has never been any question as to its propriety or its necessity at all. There has been some question as to the method or the formulas by which this money ought to be allocated, and there have been some changes made here in this bill to meet those questions and objections. But fundamentally there is no legislation which has ever received such unanimous approval either from the Congress or from the country as the Federal-aid road legislation.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I want to say that in the opinion of most of us there will be an unemployment problem after this war. It has been demonstrated, as I stated a moment ago, that no form of Federal aid, so called, gives a greater proportion of the dollar to labor than does highway construction. Some have different opinions upon that during this debate. But year after year the Roads Committee had the statistics from the experts, and I believe the Roads Committee of the House knows what it is talking about when it makes this statement officially in its report on this bill.

Now, I believe, on account of the probability of a huge unemployment problem, that not only will $3,000,000,000 be spent in road construction during the 3 years following this war, and that is twice as much as is provided in this bill, but I would not be at all surprised if in the 3 or 4 years following this war the United States spent $6,000,000,000 in road construction. If that is the case, why should we not at this time authorize the expenditure of this money by mandatory law? Why should we not take care of it in this post-war road-construction bill? Let me tell you one reason why we should do that.

All of the money provided in this bill for Federal aid to States in road construction must, as you know, be spent under the provisions of mandatory, statutory law. The formula for allocations and expenditures is all laid down in this bill, as it has been in every road bill every year for 20 years. Under this bill Federal agencies and Federal agents and bureaucrats have absolutely no discretion as to how the money authorized by this bill is to be spent, or where it will be spent, or when or for what purpose. The Congress of the United States determines that, and no one else has anything to do about it.

Now, if we enact at this time an inadequate post-war highway-construction bill, and if need for relief on account of unemployment develops soon after the war, what is going to happen? The same thing is going to happen which happened in the depression days. We are going to revert to the system of road building through an agency something like W. P. A. No one who has ever had any experience with W. P. A. in road building wants anything of that sort to come back again, because under that system the jurisdiction is taken entirely out of the hands of the Congress, out of the hands of the highway departments of the several States, and out of the hands of the people, and is put into the hands of inexperienced, arrogant bureaucrats. Everyone, I am sure, wants to prevent that.

It would at least do no harm, therefore, as long as we are going to have a road-building program, to provide for it adequately now in this post-war highway-construction bill, and make the entire program not only an adequate one but a mandatory one under law, and not a discretionary one to be administered by some Federal agent.

Mr. Chairman, I am in favor of this bill as far as it goes. It is the largest and the best Federal-aid highway bill the Committee on Roads has yet reported to the House; but because the purpose of it is for post-war highway development, which we know will require much more than this bill provides, I think the amount should be increased at this time. When the bill is read for amendment, I trust very much that a majority of the Members of the House will favorably consider a proposal for an increase in the amount presently provided.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Oregon has expired.

Mr. MOTT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 additional minutes.

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield

Mr. MOTT. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. WELCH. Is it a fact that no road can be built in any State in the Union under the provisions of the pending bill unless that road has first been made a part of the State highway system by National and State legislation?

Mr. MOTT. No; that is not the case. The highway commissions of most States—at least in my own State it is the case—may, without any act of the legislature, include any road they please; but, besides those directly under the jurisdiction of the highway commissions of the States, we provide in here for farm-to-market roads, for schoolbus roads, for post roads, and for other roads which are named in the bill and which may benefit under the provisions of it.

Mr. WELCH. It first would have to be made a part of the State highway system by act of the legislatures of the several States?

Mr. MOTT. Perhaps your State may require an act of its legislature for that purpose. In my State, we do not need a legislative act.

Mr. WELCH. Perhaps, I will say to my friend, his State is an exception. I am agreeably surprised to know that that is the case.

Mr. MOTT. The State of Oregon is very progressive in all fields of legislation.

Mr. WELCH. Indeed it is. I had the pleasure of passing through the gentleman's beautiful and progressive State recently.

Mr. MOTT. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. MICHENER. As I understand, this is primarily and really a post-war measure?

Mr. MOTT. That is correct.

Mr. MICHENER. No roads can be built under this measure until after the war?

Mr. MOTT. That is correct.

Mr. MICHENER. Now the question is, Is the bill mandatory? Must the roads provided for in this bill, and the money authorized to be appropriated by this bill, be used immediately after the war?

Mr. MOTT. Well, in that respect, of course, it is not mandatory. If this bill becomes law and the State of Michigan refuses its allocations, the amounts of which are noted in the report, the State of Michigan could say "Well, we do not care to come in; we do not want any of the money." There is nothing under Federal law which can compel the State of Michigan to accept any of this money. But if the State of Michigan did not accept it, it would go to some other State which would accept it.

Mr. MICHENER. That is the point. If the State of Michigan did not desire to use the allocation which is made today immediately after the war, but wanted to delay the building of the State roads for a year or two, could the State of Michigan do that?

Mr. MOTT. Yes; it could do that.

Mr. MICHENER. Or would the money allocated to the State of Michigan in the first instance revert back to the general fund?

Mr. MOTT. No.

Mr. MICHENER. Would it revert back into the general fund if the State of Michigan did not use the money instanter?

Mr. MOTT. No; it would not. The statutory limitation is 2 years. And, if in the meantime anything should develop, as has happened in a number of instances, which would make it impossible for the State to use the money within that time, the Committee on Roads would write a provision in the next bill giving that State additional time, because the money really belongs to the State to which it is allocated, and it is only when the State definitely says that it does not want the money that it would revert to the Federal Treasury.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOTT. I yield to the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. ANGELL. I have a telegram from Mr. R. H. Baldock, the State highway engineer of our State, who, as the gentleman knows, is a very efficient man in road work, and he suggests that this allotment should be increased at least to $700,000,000 a year. What is the gentleman's idea of that?

Mr. MOTT. Of course, the proposal which I made to the committee was that we increase it to a billion dollars a year. I frankly admit I did not get very much support from the committee. But as I say, I intend to offer an amendment to increase it to whatever amount I think a majority of the House will agree to.

Mr. ANGELL. I may state further, he also makes a suggestion that the matching rate should be in the proportion of 60 percent for the Federal Government and 40 percent for the States.

Mr. MOTT. Well, it is, under the present bill, for the first year.

Mr. ANGELL. It covers that?

Mr. MOTT. Yes. For the second and third year it is 50–50.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOTT. I yield.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. Section 4, paragraph (c) of this bill, provides $150,000,000 for projects on the principal highways in urban areas on the Federal-aid highway system. I wonder if that is broad enough to include the construction of viaducts over railway crossings within urban areas?

Mr. MOTT. Well, it would be, but there is another provision here for the elimination of grade crossings.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. Within urban areas?

Mr. MOTT. Within or without urban areas.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. Within cities of more than 10,000 population?

Mr. MOTT. It does not make any difference where the grade crossing to be eliminated is located. There is provision in this bill for Federal aid for the elimination of those crossings.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. I thank the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MOTT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 additional minutes

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOTT. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN. If and when these highways are constructed, will they be open for travel for interstate and intrastate commerce without the payment of tolls?

Mr. MOTT. Yes; there are no toll roads provided for in this bill.

Mr. HOFFMAN. The gentleman says there is no toll?

Mr. MOTT. No toll roads are provided by this bill.

Mr. HOFFMAN. What about the American Federation of Labor Teamsters Union charging for going over the roads to get into a city? Is there any assurance that the farmers will be able to bring their produce into the cities without being required to pay a toll when they travel over these interstate and intrastate highways?

Mr. MOTT. If the A. F. of L. ever levied a toll on road users for passing over a road I can assure the gentleman it did not do so under the authority of this act or any of its predecessor acts.

Mr. HOFFMAN. The Supreme Court has legalized that collection. When you go into the cities of New York and Detroit and other such places, the Supreme Court has held they can levy that toll of $8.42 on a small truck, and $9.41 on a large truck. If we are going to build these highways are they going to be open to traffic by everyone?

Mr. MOTT. All I can say is to repeat that if a union did that, it did not do it under the authority of any road legislation.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOTT. I yield.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I note that the method of apportionment has been changed. Does that not react against the country districts?

Mr. MOTT. I think it may to a certain extent and I am not in favor of changing the formula of allocation. When the committee first began its hearings and studies on this bill it was thought that the amount would be something around $3,000,000,000, which is many times more than had ever been authorized before. On account of the much larger amount, a majority of the committee agreed to make a concession to some of the States of small area and large population, and that concession was agreed to. I think the concession should have been withdrawn when the committee decided to cut the bill in two.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Do the urban areas above 10,000 also come under the provisions of section A, on page 4?

Mr. MOTT. That is to be changed by committee amendment to 5,000.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. What do you intend to do there?

Mr. MOTT. Change it to 5,000.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. But nevertheless, under section A, such urban areas could also come under that first provision could they not?

Mr. MOTT. They could; yes.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. It seems to me in other words that this is a bill almost entirely for the large population centers.

Mr. MOTT. No; I would not say that. I would say the large population centers are receiving more consideration under this bill than under any previous highway bill.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. There is no question about that.

Mr. MOTT. But I would not say that the distribution is unfair.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. It certainly is if that change in apportionment goes through. The gentleman knows that.

Mr. MOTT. That is a matter of opinion. I am not in favor of changing the formula of distribution or allocation at all. All legislation, however, is a matter of compromise and we have to all agree before we can pass it.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOTT. I yield.

Mr. REED of New York. There was a similar bill passed by the Senate on September 15, 1944.

Mr. MOTT. That is correct.

Mr. REED of New York. Wherein do they differ?

Mr. MOTT. They differ in amount. The amount of the Senate bill is somewhat smaller. The formula for distribution among rural and urban areas was changed in the Senate bill.

Mr. REED of New York. What about the provisions for the railroads to pay 15 percent of the cost, in the Senate bill: "*Provided further*, That no such funds shall be available unless the railway or railways involved pay not less than 15 percent of the construction cost"?

Mr. MOTT. That is not in the House bill.

Mr. REED of New York. Does the committee contemplate trying to put it in?

Mr. MOTT. As far as I am concerned, whatever bill this House passes, as one of the conferees, I am going to insist upon the House bill and keep on insisting as long as I can, and then return for instructions, if we have trouble in retaining the House provisions.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Oregon has again expired.

Mr. MOTT. I yield myself 5 additional minutes, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. COLE of New York. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOTT. I yield.

Mr. COLE of New York. With regard to the funds available for grade crossing elimination, are they eligible for railroad construction, railroad diversion, which is designed to eliminate the grade crossing but which does not result in any overhead or underpass construction?

Mr. MOTT. Yes. If it eliminates a grade crossing, that project is eligible.

Mr. COLE of New York. These funds are available for grade crossing eliminations?

Mr. MOTT. In any kind of grade crossing, the highway must be changed. It must be changed to overhead or underpass.

Mr. COLE of New York. But the gentleman is speaking of the case where the highway must be changed.

Mr. MOTT. Yes.

Mr. COLE of New York. Whereas the situation I have in mind is not where the highway is changed but the railroad is changed in order to avoid the crossing.

Mr. MOTT. That question has not come up before the committee to my knowledge but I would say that a project of that kind would be eligible.

Mr. COLE of New York. So long as the objective is the elimination of the grade crossing?

Mr. MOTT. Yes; that is correct.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOTT. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. On page 4 I find this provision in the second paragraph:

(b) $125,000,000 for projects on the principal secondary and feeder roads, including farm-to-market roads, rural free delivery mail and public-school bus routes, either outside of municipalities or inside of municipalities of less than 10,000 population.

Mr. MOTT. That has been changed to 5,000.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Is that a new undertaking on the part of the Federal Government? Has the Federal Government heretofore expended funds for those specific purposes?

Mr. MOTT. Yes.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. This is nothing new?

Mr. MOTT. It is nothing new.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. What is the amount the Federal Government has expended for these purposes? Can the gentleman tell me?

Mr. MOTT. It has depended on the amount authorized in each of the previous bills. Offhand I cannot say just what amount for this purpose was expended under the last bill. Perhaps the gentleman from Utah will recall. I do not at the moment.

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. What is that?

Mr. MOTT. How much money was expended under the previous road bill for secondary and feeder roads, farm-to-market roads, rural delivery routes, and post roads?

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. I believe the last bill carried $17,500,000. It has been as high as $25,000,000.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. It seems to me the American Automobile Association offers some good suggestions with respect to this proposed authorization, which I shall ask unanimous consent to insert in the record at this point:

RESOLUTION PASSED AT FORTY-SECOND ANNUAL MEETING OF THE AMERICAN AUTOMOBILE ASSOCIATION, PALMER HOUSE, CHICAGO, ILL., NOVEMBER 20, 1944

FEDERAL-AID POLICY

Conditions arising from the war have confirmed the conviction of the American Automobile Association as to the soundness of the Federal-aid principle in highway construction and in its continuance as a constructive and coordinating influence in the entire road-building activity of the Nation.

At each level of government society is best served when that government administers functions in which there is a community of interest throughout its jurisdiction. Thus, in highway construction, highways which are of local importance should be the responsibility of local government; highways of State-wide importance should be the responsibility of State governments. There are also highways of limited mileage which because of their importance in the Nation's over-all needs, collectively assume national significance and for which the Federal Gov-

ernment should make financial contributions and determine standards.

Recently, however, there have emerged trends which if continued will mean the end of Federal aid as we have known and supported it, and will result in marked reduction in the importance of State highway departments, in widespread dissipation of road revenues, and in the inevitable unsound shifting of taxation and responsibility for roads from the States to the Federal Government.

The American Automobile Association strongly recommends that the following policies be made effective in the application of the Federal-aid principle:

1. Extent of Federal aid

A. Federal-aid highway policy should be based on transportation needs and should be confined to general-purpose roads of national significance. All such roads should be within one Federal-aid system, clearly defined and strictly limited as to mileage with proper emphasis on routes of interregional importance. There should be one agency at the national level and one agency at the State level to administer the joint Federal and State undertakings.

B. Congress should immediately direct that the Public Roads Administration, in cooperation with the State highway authorities, define and keep up to date such a system, their determinations to be based upon the highway planning surveys.

2. Basis for Federal-State sharing of construction costs

Federal-aid funds should be available to States on a basis not exceeding 50 percent of the construction cost, said cost to include participation in acquisition of rights-of-way.

3. Proper source of Federal-aid revenues

Federal aid should be a charge against general Government revenues. The amount of Federal aid apportioned in any given period should bear no relationship to the productivity of Federal excise taxes levied on automotive fuels, motor vehicles and accessories, or the motor vehicle use tax.

4. Basis of apportionment to States

A. The traditional formula for the apportionment of Federal aid among the States should be revised. The revised apportionment should be based on the expenditures required to maintain in each State a continuing level of improvement that will insure a balanced progress for the system as a whole.

B. Congress should direct the Public Roads Administration in collaboration with the State highway authorities to formulate and report to the Congress the necessary cost estimates for each Federal Aid Highway Act.

C. Funds apportioned to the States should not be earmarked by the Congress for application to any specific classes of facilities within the designated system.

D. Under the revised apportionment, provision should be made as heretofore for the special requirements of the public land States and as heretofore special appropriations should be made for the construction and maintenance of highways in the national parks and within national forests, including approach roads to those national parks and forests.

Mr. MOTT. A new undertaking is not provided for here in the section to which the gentleman refers. I may say, however, that the policy of the committee and the policy of the Congress from year to year has been to extend the scope of Federal aid; whereas originally the Federal-aid money was used only on main highways, now it can be used on almost any kind of highway.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Allow me now to reach the point I wished to raise: Is not that tantamount to the Federal Government's absorbing additional powers and functions of the States?

Mr. MOTT. It is not; and the Federal highway legislation has always very carefully safeguarded that. The entire jurisdiction over the expenditure of the money under this legislation is in a State agency and not in a Federal agency. It is true that projects, to be entitled to Federal highway aid, must have the approval of the Federal Commissioner of Roads, but that approval is a formality. The jurisdiction is entirely within the State, where it belongs. That is the difference between road building under this kind of legislation and road building under an agency like W. P. A., which I hope never returns and which is one of the reasons why I want to see a larger appropriation made.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. But the responsibility for raising the funds passes to the Federal Government and is lifted from the States; is not that true?

Mr. MOTT. In a sense, yes; but the road users of the States have already paid the money through taxation. The Federal Government actually expends nothing for road building; it simply takes the revenue that comes in from the road users of the several States and turns it back to the States to build roads.

Mr. MOTT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 7 additional minutes.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOTT. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. I understand the $125,000,000 for secondary roads will be increased to $150,000,000?

Mr. MOTT. That is true.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Is that an additional $25,000,000?

Mr. MOTT. That is an additional $25,000,000.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Where is it taken from?

Mr. MOTT. It will be taken from the previous item.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Will the committee amendments be placed in the RECORD today so that we can see them over the week end.

Mr. MOTT. That is the intention.

Mr. CALVIN D. JOHNSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOTT. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. CALVIN D. JOHNSON. May I refer to the 15 percent which the railroads will be called upon to furnish under the Senate legislation? I would object to that for the reason it will mean endless litigation as to the location and the amount that is to be contributed. It will mean in many instances, if that is retained in the bill, that years will probably pass before the roads will be built. In the meantime highways could be built and employment given were this not retained in the bill. I understand there was a case in the Supreme Court of Tennessee, which case was later taken to the United States Supreme Court, in which it was decided that no State or governmental agency could set a percentage that anyone would be called upon to contribute.

Mr. MOTT. We will try to take care of that in conference when the time comes. I will insist on the provisions of the House bill.

Mr. CALVIN D. JOHNSON. If we are going to build highways, we should proceed to build them.

Mr. MURDOCK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOTT. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. MURDOCK. The gentleman specified that the control is not in the Federal Government but, on the contrary, that the majority of the control is in the State highway department.

Mr. MOTT. All of the actual control is in the State.

Mr. MURDOCK. I approve of that, too. In this respect the bill is like preceding legislation?

Mr. MOTT. It does not vary from preceding legislation. No State jurisdiction that has ever been retained in any previous legislation is surrendered in this one, and I hope it never will be. All of these post-war programs and all projects financed in part or in whole by the Federal Government should be under mandatory law just as it is under this bill, and these executive agencies should be allowed no discretion at all.

Mr. MURDOCK. I thoroughly agree with the gentleman. The funds that we are expending in this matter are raised locally through users of the highway?

Mr. MOTT. They are. The funds raised to finance Federal aid to States for road construction come from revenue derived from taxes upon the road users of the several States. Heretofore the amount of money paid into the Federal Government by the road users of the several States has been about twice as much as the Federal Government has expended in aid to the States for road building. That should be corrected and I think this bill is a very good place to start to correct it.

Mr. MURDOCK. The only charge that can be made of bureaucratic control in Washington is uniformity of standards?

Mr. MOTT. That is true, but there has never been any attempt on the part of the Federal Bureau of Roads to dictate policy, and as long as we have basic legislation of this kind there never will be. So far as that is concerned no one need have any fear whatever of this bill.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOTT. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. The money that is allotted for railroad crossings is matched by the States? I refer to railroad crossings in cities.

Mr. MOTT. It is not.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. How do they arrive at that? Does the Government pay all of it?

Mr. MOTT. The Government does, according to my understanding.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. That is only limited to the city areas. Does the gentleman think that is fair?

Mr. MOTT. No, not to the city areas. This grade-crossing-elimination provision applies to the elimination of grade

crossings wherever located. It does not have to be in the cities.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. That allotment comes out of the funds allocated to the urban areas, is that right?

Mr. MOTT. No; that is separate.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. That is a separate fund?

Mr. MOTT. Yes.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. They have that fund in addition to any other fund?

Mr. MOTT. I do not think the rural areas will suffer at all so far as the grade-crossing-elimination provision is concerned. The provisions of highway law covering grade-crossing elimination have never been taken very great advantage of and I hope in the future that the States and the railroad companies too may take more advantage of it because it is a very necessary thing.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOTT. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Would the gentleman care to comment on section 11 as to why in the road bill we go into flight strips? I notice it has reference to flight strips adjacent to public highways.

Mr. MOTT. I am in favor of flight strips, but I have already talked too long, and we are going to have an amendment bearing directly on that question.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. On section 11?

Mr. MOTT. Yes; it will be fully debated when we resume consideration of the bill.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Is that a committee amendment?

Mr. MOTT. That is an amendment which will be offered by the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH].

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Oregon has again expired.

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTINGTON].

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, for years it has been the policy to pass highway authorizations every 2 years. The last authorization was passed in 1940 for the fiscal years 1942 and 1943.

Just prior to Pearl Harbor, and on December 2, 1941, the President issued an order eliminating further highway construction. Since 1940 the Congress has made authorizations and appropriations for strategic highways and for access highways as those highways are necessary to reach Army and Navy installations, critical materials and defense plants. There has thus been no ordinary or usual highway construction for the past 2 fiscal years by States or counties.

Our highways have deteriorated, and it is essential to pass highway authorizations to repair and rebuild those parts of the existing highway system that have become obsolete, and to provide for the construction that should have been made in the normal development of our highway program during the past 2 years, and for the unemployment that is to follow the war.

I believe it would be helpful if we keep in mind that the previous highway authorizations have provided from one hundred to two hundred million dollars annually for Federal-aid highways, and that no provision prior to 10 years ago was made for Federal participation in the farm-to-market roads or railway crossing eliminations. The annual authorizations for farm-to-market roads have been experimental, they have been from seventeen and a half to twenty-five million dollars, and for grade eliminations substantially from fifteen to thirty or thirty-five million dollars.

The pending bill is an authorization for the 3 years following the emergency, or, if the President should decline or fail to declare the emergency ended, the Congress could provide when the 3 post-war years would begin. But the authorization is to follow the war. This is a post-war construction bill. It is well enough to keep in mind that while it is for a period of 3 years, none of the funds will lapse for 2 additional years, so that the States in reality will have 5 years in which to match the funds. Under existing highway legislation the Federal Government matches the State money, but the local interests are required to furnish the rights-of-way.

All States are treated alike. All are required to match. Some may spend more for highways than others, but through the years it has been the virtue of Federal-aid highway legislation that no partiality has been shown and all States have been treated alike. Some State highway commissions have taken over the county roads. They might thus show that all highway collections are expended for highway purposes. In other States the counties or districts collect and expend funds in addition to those accruing to the highway commission, but the virtue I emphasize of Federal-aid highway authorization is that all States are treated alike and all are required to match.

The Federal Government pays the entire cost of the construction of railway grade-crossing elimination under existing law, and under the bill reported by the committee.

The bill under consideration is a forward step. It provides for the Federal Government's contributing 60 percent of the cost of construction for the first year following the war and for matching the 50 percent thereafter on Federal-aid and rural roads and in urban areas. There is a reason for this provision. Our highways have been used largely for defense purposes. They have been used in the war. They have been used for our common country. The Federal Government ought to participate for the first year in repairing and rehabilitating them at least 10 percent in excess of the normal amount that has been contributed by the Government.

Following demobilization there will be unemployment, and the economists tell us that construction is the real key to employment. The difference between good times and bad times is ordinarily a difference in employment. While many statements have been made as to the amount of highway funds accruing to labor in normal times as well as in the peace to follow the war, I think it a fair statement and a fair estimate to say that 75 percent of all of the money appropriated for highway construction ultimately goes to salaries and labor, either directly or indirectly.

The bill as reported to the House, as amended by the committee under amendments agreed to, is I repeat, a forward step in highway legislation.

During the depression relief funds were appropriated by the billions of dollars, and approximately one-half of all of those relief funds were expended in the building of streets and of roads—rural roads in the country, streets in the municipalities. This bill is intended to rehabilitate our highways, to eliminate the necessity for relief appropriations, and to provide for sound employment following the war. Instead of rural roads being constructed by day labor, and instead of streets being so constructed, we would utilize contractors and competitive bids, and the country will get a lot more in the way of streets and roads at a lot lower price than was the case during the emergency, or depression.

Of our Federal highway system of 231,000 miles, 27,000 miles are obsolete. It is not necessary to travel very far from Washington to find that out and to verify that fact; 222,000 of these 231,000 miles have been improved. In many cases these improvements are inferior. There is need for better rural highways. The remainder should be improved, and as I have said, many thousands of miles must be rebuilt.

We have approximately 2,406,000 miles of farm-to-market roads. Less than 25 percent of these have been improved. One of the great objectives of this legislation is to provide a sound system of farm-to-market roads. All projects—urban, local, or State—are initiated by the city, by the county supervisors, or by comparable authority, or by the State highway commissions, but they have to be approved by the Federal Commissioner of Roads. That is the principal reason the Government has invested in the laboratory for experimenting as to the types of highway construction probably in excess of $500,000. Prior to Federal aid there were different types of highways in all the different States. One of the best results of Federal aid has been to improve the types of construction. The Federal Commissioner of Public Roads in the very nature of the case profits from construction in all the States and under all conditions. The experimental plant is of use in improving the types of construction. Federal aid has resulted in better roads, in the elimination of curves, in the widening of highways, and in the general improvement of the type of construction. It has resulted in roads costing a lot less than they formerly cost where there was no Federal approval or cooperation.

It has been suggested that the type of secondary roads should be left to the counties and to the States. In my judg-

ment, that would be a mistake, for two reasons. In the first place, the Federal Government is contributing under the terms of this bill, 50 percent of the cost of those roads. In the second place, the Federal Government, with its experience, will enable the localities to construct a very much higher type of road for their money than the counties themselves could construct, without the experience of all the other 48 States, in the very nature of the case. Wherever the Federal Government expends money, it should follow that money with Federal supervision or cooperation.

I want to call attention to a departure in Federal-aid highway legislation in this bill. It provides that the Federal Government should pay one-half the costs of rights-of-way. Heretofore, as I have said, local interests have furnished the rights-of-way. We think there is a reason for this change. Often higher prices for rights-of-way were paid for the investment of Federal and State funds than were necessary. We believe Federal cooperation and supervision will result in an economy in this regard. Then again if the Government pays part of the construction, there is no reason why it should not pay part of the costs of rights-of-way.

There is a second outstanding provision in the bill under consideration. I would like Members to give attention to this statement. I think I can put it concretely so that much of the misapprehension and misundertanding, with respect to this legislation, may be dissipated. This bill authorizes annual appropriations of $500,000,000—$225,000,000 for Federal-aid highways. Under an amendment proposed and agreed to by the committee, those funds will be distributed as they have been since the Federal-aid highway program was initiated; that is, one-third, one-third, and one-third. Secondly, it provides, as I said a few moments ago, for the first time for an adequate authorization for a system of farm-to-market roads used by rural carriers, by school busses, and by farmers to transport their products to market. There is carried $150,000,000 for that purpose. Three hundred and seventy-five million dollars, therefore, are provided for the same purposes for which highway legislation has heretofore been authorized, with this additional advantage to the farm-to-market roads. Heretofore, farm-to-market roads have been allocated to States on the basis of one-third population, one-third area, and one-third rural mileage. There will be a larger allocation under the terms of the bill as amended by the committee amendment, which was unanimously agreed to, to the extent that rural areas will receive a larger distribution, and more mileage than they would under the old ratio of one-third, one-third, and one-third. Now then, if if we stop right there, we would have under the terms of this bill, a fairer and better allocation and authorizations for Federal-aid highways and farm-to-market roads than we have ever had.

But there is another problem. While I am from an agricultural State, and while I represent a cotton district, largely, I know that the millions and billions of dollars, during the depression, were spent very largely in the great cities of the country, in the metropolitan areas. When we think of employment in the countryside, we must, in all fairness, provide for employment in the cities. The cities are not in as excellent financial condition, particularly the larger ones, as has been suggested during the course of this debate.

We had the mayors from Boston to Los Angeles, from Portland to Jacksonville, before our committee. The truth of the matter is that the small municipalities are in far better financial condition, as a general rule, according to the testimony submitted to our committee, than the larger municipalities.

Now, shall we repeat the work-relief program of the depression in those municipalities or shall we provide for a system of sound public works so that the taxpayer can get a dollar for every dollar expended? That is the reason for adding to the usual $375,000,000 an additional $125,000,000 for the urban areas of our country. I think it is fair. I think it is just. Whatever criticisms have been made by those who spoke for the rural areas, please keep in mind that under the terms of this bill the rural areas get $375,000,000 under more favorable conditions and terms than they have ever received any Federal aid money heretofore.

There is another reason for the passage of this bill before the Congress adjourns. As I have said, there have been authorizations every 2 years. Forty-four or forty-five of the State legislatures convene in 1945. They usually convene in January and February. They must make provision for matching these funds at these sessions of the legislatures. It is time during the war to prepare for unemployment after the war. In war we must prepare for peace, and plans and wise and sound adequate public projects, not to compete with private construction, should be provided by the Government, by the States, counties, and municipalities now for the days that are to follow the war.

We must not wait until the emergency arises. There would be a repetition of the waste and extravagance when there were no matured plans during the depression. The Congress has provided that Federal-aid funds shall be utilized, those heretofore authorized, in the making of plans for the construction of Federal-aid and urban highways and farm-to-market roads.

There is another constructive provision in this bill which provides for the interregional system. There may be some misunderstanding about that provision. That system is to be agreed to by the State highway commissions and the Commissioner of Public Roads. It will largely be existing Federal-aid highways, but those will be 40,000 miles where one-fifth of all the traffic is carried on one one-hundredth of the road mileage of the Nation. That is an important matter. There will be a high type of construction along those regional roads. It is time for us to prepare for the days ahead, because the highways will be utilized more and more following the war than ever before.

This bill contemplates, as I have said, $500,000,000 annually. It is self-liquidating. The funds from gasoline and motor and similar taxes for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, aggregated $667,000,000. I think the Committee on Public Roads is to be commended for reporting this bill in the sum of $1,500,000,000 rather than for $3,000,000,000 requested by the 48 highway commissions of the United States.

Representatives of the highway commissions of practically every State in the Union appeared before the committee. The highway associations recommended an authorization of $3,000,000,000. They showed it would take $11,000,000,000 to meet the highway needs. They recommended that 45 percent be allocated to Federal-aid highways, 25 percent to farm-to-market roads, and 30 percent to urban areas, including cities of 10,000 and more inhabitants. One of the ranking minority members of the committee insisted upon the three-billion authorization. The ranking minority member insisted that authorizations be delayed for the present. The committee undertook to compose differences. The bill provides for one and one-half billion in authorizations, increases the authorization for farm-to-market roads, and decreases the percentage allotted to urban areas. I believe that the bill is fair to the Government, the States, and the cities. The hearings were exhaustive. With the exception of about 5 States, the highway commissions through their spokesmen testified before the committee that at least $3,000,000,000 should be authorized for construction of highways in the 3 years following the war.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 additional minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. The gentleman from Oregon [Mr. MOTT] has been perfectly frank. He was the only member of the committee who was willing to go along with the State highway commissioners in authorizing $3,000,000,000. This bill was reported in June. The Senate passed a similar bill in September of this year. The Senate authorization is $450,000,000 annually, or $50,000,000 less than our authorization, but the authorization of the House makes much better provision for Federal-aid highways and for farm-to-market roads, in my judgment, than the Senate bill, and on very much better terms.

I should like for the information of the House at this time to insert under leave heretofore granted me a table at this point in my remarks showing the amount that will accrue to each of the States under the allocations under the bill as reported by the committee in June of this year:

[Thousands of dollars]

State	Federal-aid highway system	Farm-to-market roads	Urban highways	Total
Alabama	4,683	2,601	3,122	10,406
Arizona	2,630	1,461	1,753	5,844
Arkansas	3,684	2,046	2,456	8,186
California	9,560	5,311	6,374	21,245
Colorado	3,490	1,939	2,328	7,757
Connecticut	1,739	966	1,160	3,865
Delaware	1,097	610	731	2,438
Florida	3,194	1,775	2,130	7,099
Georgia	5,504	3,058	3,669	12,231
Idaho	2,302	1,278	1,534	5,114
Illinois	9,844	5,469	6,563	21,876
Indiana	5,447	3,026	3,631	12,104
Iowa	5,219	2,900	3,479	11,598
Kansas	4,986	2,769	3,323	11,078
Kentucky	4,305	2,392	2,869	9,566
Louisiana	3,479	1,933	2,320	7,732
Maine	1,806	1,003	1,204	4,013
Maryland	2,111	1,173	1,408	4,692
Massachusetts	3,953	2,196	2,636	8,785
Michigan	7,258	4,033	4,839	16,130
Minnesota	5,675	3,153	3,785	12,613
Mississippi	3,916	2,176	2,613	8,705
Missouri	6,533	3,630	4,356	14,519
Montana	3,642	2,023	2,428	8,093
Nebraska	3,897	2,165	2,598	8,660
Nevada	2,200	1,223	1,467	4,890
New Hampshire	1,097	610	731	2,438
New Jersey	3,832	2,129	2,555	8,516
New Mexico	2,944	1,635	1,963	6,542
New York	13,588	7,549	9,058	30,195
North Carolina	5,518	3,065	3,678	12,261
North Dakota	2,780	1,544	1,853	6,177
Ohio	8,729	4,849	5,819	19,397
Oklahoma	4,762	2,645	3,174	10,581
Oregon	3,242	1,801	2,161	7,204
Pennsylvania	10,906	6,058	7,270	24,234
Rhode Island	1,097	610	731	2,438
South Carolina	3,056	1,698	2,037	6,791
South Dakota	2,913	1,618	1,942	6,473
Tennessee	4,759	2,644	3,172	10,575
Texas	13,297	7,386	8,864	29,547
Utah	2,154	1,180	1,416	4,720
Vermont	1,097	610	731	2,438
Virginia	4,171	2,317	2,782	9,270
Washington	3,362	1,868	2,241	7,471
West Virginia	2,624	1,458	1,749	5,831
Wisconsin	5,336	2,964	3,557	11,857
Wyoming	2,204	1,225	1,469	4,898
Hawaii	1,097	610	731	2,438
District of Columbia	1,097	610	731	2,438
Puerto Rico	1,589	883	1,059	3,531
Reserved for administration and engineering	5,625	3,125	3,750	12,500
Total	225,000	125,000	150,000	500,000

Then I should like to insert as part of my remarks a table showing the allocations that will accrue to each of the States under the bill as amended unanimously by the committee in amendments that have been submitted to the Committee of the Whole by the chairman of the committee:

Approximate apportionment of $500,000,000, Federal-aid highway system, section 21 of Federal Highway Act—farm-to-market roads, one-third area, one-third rural population, one-third post roads; urban highways, population of urban places of 5,000 or more

[Thousands of dollars]

State	Federal-aid highway system	Farm-to-market roads	Urban highways	Total
Alabama	4,710	3,731	1,310	9,751
Arizona	3,232	2,235	264	5,731
Arkansas	3,855	3,104	561	7,520
California	9,012	5,158	8,166	22,336
Colorado	4,042	2,720	939	7,701
Connecticut	1,396	767	1,985	4,148
Delaware	1,097	731	205	2,033
Florida	3,232	2,165	1,608	7,005
Georgia	5,647	4,309	1,631	11,587
Idaho	2,780	1,945	213	4,938
Illinois	8,858	4,769	9,562	23,189
Indiana	5,408	3,626	3,082	12,116
Iowa	5,582	3,990	1,601	11,173
Kansas	5,667	3,978	1,113	10,758

Approximate apportionment of $500,000,000, Federal-aid highway system, section 21 of Federal Highway Act, etc.—Continued

[Thousands of dollars]

State	Federal-aid highway system	Farm-to-market roads	Urban highways	Total
Kentucky	4,200	3,403	1,307	8,910
Louisiana	3,360	2,517	1,540	7,417
Maine	1,948	1,404	564	3,916
Maryland	1,832	1,171	1,800	4,803
Massachusetts	2,942	786	6,649	10,377
Michigan	6,836	4,135	5,713	16,684
Minnesota	6,054	4,170	2,218	12,442
Mississippi	4,040	3,333	603	7,976
Missouri	6,662	4,564	3,168	14,394
Montana	4,546	3,106	309	7,961
Nebraska	4,479	3,162	787	8,428
Nevada	2,870	1,923	61	4,854
New Hampshire	1,097	731	478	2,306
New Jersey	2,864	1,042	5,558	9,464
New Mexico	3,632	2,515	259	6,406
New York	10,840	4,276	18,878	33,994
North Carolina	5,424	4,448	1,501	11,373
North Dakota	3,355	2,417	216	5,988
Ohio	7,904	4,658	7,581	20,143
Oklahoma	5,084	3,731	1,356	10,171
Oregon	3,730	2,545	815	7,090
Pennsylvania	9,194	5,276	10,574	25,044
Rhode Island	1,097	731	1,129	2,957
South Carolina	3,046	2,516	658	6,220
South Dakota	3,532	2,513	223	6,268
Tennessee	4,766	3,667	1,602	10,035
Texas	14,250	10,037	4,488	28,775
Utah	2,532	1,686	436	4,654
Vermont	1,097	731	187	2,015
Virginia	4,113	3,190	1,499	8,802
Washington	3,542	2,398	1,475	7,415
West Virginia	2,470	2,078	812	5,360
Wisconsin	5,416	3,668	2,669	11,753
Wyoming	2,799	1,899	134	4,832
Hawaii	1,097	731	396	2,224
District of Columbia	1,097	731	1,153	2,981
Puerto Rico	1,110	1,133	839	3,082
Reserved for administration and engineering	5,625	3,750	3,125	12,500
Total	225,000	150,000	125,000	500,000

Under the pending bill the more populous States like Connecticut and New Jersey receive more funds than they would have received under the bill as reported in June 1944 by the Committee on Public Roads. They will receive more than they would receive under the Senate bill passed in September 1944. It is fair to say that at the same time the rural areas will receive a better allocation. Under the bill as reported States like Mississippi will receive a total of less than they would receive under the old formula of one-third population, one-third area, and one-third mileage, while the more populous States will receive more. Under the old formula Connecticut, for instance, under a $500,000,000 authorization would receive $3,102,000 annually, whereas under the pending bill Connecticut would receive $4,148,000. Mississippi would receive $8,977,000 under the existing old formula, whereas under the bill as reported and as amended by the committee, Mississippi will receive $7,976,000. Concessions are thus made to the populous States and to the urban areas. In consideration of this concession States like Mississippi receive more for farm-to-market roads, more accrues to Mississippi and other similar States in the House bill as amended by the committee than under the bill as originally reported or under the bill as passed by the Senate. Under the pending bill Connecticut will receive approximately $1,000,000 more and Mississippi $1,000,000 less than if the entire authorization were allocated under the old formula, while under the pending bill Federal-aid highways in Mississippi will receive about $100,000 more and farm-to-market roads will receive in excess of $1,000,000 more than under the bill as originally reported.

I say that the purpose of that urban-area amendment and the purpose of reducing its allocation from the original proportion based upon the population of the State as it related to cities of 10,000 has been amended by reducing the figure to 5,000 population. More money is thus given to the larger urban areas. I am perfectly frank in so stating. But it must be kept in mind that the smaller area, the smaller municipalities, the towns and the villages will have Federal-aid highways constructed through them in many cases. They have farm-to-market roads constructed; and for that reason they will not be neglected as we undertake to provide for a post-war program by granting this additional allocation to the larger municipalities of our country.

It has been said that the States will be unable to match. In my judgment, the States should be more nearly able to match than the Federal Government to appropriate the Federal funds provided by this bill. The Federal Government has had to wage the war, to provide the Army and the Navy and the Air Forces while the States, the counties, and the municipalities have been piling up a surplus.

They will be in better position to match the Federal aid and to provide for Federal aid than they have ever been. I would like to emphasize this point: In my judgment, following the war, while we hear of planning boards and planning commissions in the cities and in the States, the problem of construction and the problem of unemployment has got to be cared for pretty largely at home. The Government of the United States will not be the Santa Claus in the distribution of funds for employment that it is alleged to have been during the depression. We might as well be realistic about that. The local interests must provide now to care for their own unemployed then.

Mr. MAY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. MAY. The gentleman has gotten right down to the point where I want additional information. Will the gentleman tell us just how it is provided in this legislation for the work that will be authorized and done through this appropriaton and advise us if it will be done in another W. P. A. form or will be done by contractors with equipment who can do it cheaper, better, and more effectively?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. The answer is perfectly obvious and clear. That has been the procedure under existing highway legislation. This bill is an amendment to existing Federal highway legislation making authorizations.

Mr. MAY. It requires approval by the Federal engineers?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Absolutely. The fundamental principles that have heretofore obtained will continue under this bill.

Mr. MAY. With respect to the elimination of grade crossings as affecting the railroads, what percentage or part of the cost of elimination of those grade crossings is to be paid by the railroads?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Under existing law the Federal Government pays the entire cost of construction. The local interests, including the railroad and the State highway commission, provide the rights-of-way. My understanding is that under existing law the railroads have contributed the land along their rights-of-way and the States have provided the approaches thereto. Under the bill reported here that system will continue. The Federal Government will pay the entire cost of construction and will pay one-half of the cost to the States of providing an access or approach to the right-of-way. Under the terms of the Senate bill the railroads are required to pay 15 percent of the cost of construction.

Mr. MAY. I hope the conferees of the House will insist on its bill.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. The best way to do is to adopt the House bill and that will enable the conferees to act in the way the gentleman wants.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. First, may I say that the gentleman has made a splendid explanation of the bill. Now, we have three funds: $225,000,000 allotted annually to the Federal highways and $150,000,000 allotted to feeder roads.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. That is right.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Then $125,000,000 allotted annually to the urban areas, including towns from 5,000 up.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. That is the allocation to the States for the urban area; yes.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Will those towns from 5,000 up receive any other fund except that broad fund of $125,000,000?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. That is a fair question. Since the National Industrial Recovery Act, the Federal-aid highways have been constructed, under existing law, through municipalities and they may still be constructed through municipalities. But there is great congestion in the cities of our country and there is the necessity of bypassing the cities in order to provide for the general public in the municipalities, and the mere construction of one Federal-aid highway through a large municipality does not solve the problem. One of the reasons for this urban fund is to enable the bypassing of cities; it is to enable the construction not of one Federal highway but of more, perhaps. In many cases a department store, for instance, has its branch out in the suburbs and it is necessary to have additional means to reach such places. There will be a supplemental fund for the urban areas that will be required but, as a matter of practice, I am sure that the other Federal-aid funds will be utilized by the State highway commissions largely in the rural areas.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. In connection with the funds allotted to the Federal highways, towns under 5,000 will have to get their money from this particular fund?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I have answered that and I think I tried to anticipate by saying that there is nothing like the congestion in towns of 5,000 and under that there would be in a city like the city of Baltimore and the larger cities of the country.

Federal-aid highways ordinarily would provide for that; that is, one Federal-aid highway through a town of 5,000. Or it may be that an improved farm-to-market road will provide for the smaller towns. But they are not comparable to the case of Baltimore. My recollection is that it takes one nearly as long to get through Baltimore now as it does to travel from Washington to Baltimore, a distance of 45 or 50 miles. That is a fair example of the congestion that obtains, and one of the reasons for providing for bypassing in urban areas.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. One other question. I am not objecting to the $1,500,000,000, but I am very apprehensive that a lot of the States cannot match this fund in 3 years. I was wondering, if it would not be a pretty good idea to amend this bill and spend the billion and a half in a course of 5 years instead of 3 years?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I have anticipated the gentleman's argument by saying, and I challenge proof in denial of the statement, that in my judgment, with a public debt of two hundred fifty to three hundred billions of dollars for waging the greatest of all wars, and when our States are piling up surplus after surplus, that the States and the local jurisdictions will be and should be in a better position to match these funds than the Federal Government is to appropriate them in the first instance. I believe it would be utterly unsound to continue the depression, the emergency, and the relief policy that has heretofore obtained of continuing to make the United States the Santa Claus of the Nation. Moreover, the funds do not lapse in 2 years and the States will really have 5 years to match.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. One other question. Does the gentleman think we can intelligently spend a half billion dollars annually on the roads of this country?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I have answered that question by saying that under the National Industrial Recovery Act we spent four hundred million for roads. Under the act of 1934, following that, we spent two hundred million and one hundred million, or three hundred million, on Federal-aid highways alone. We authorized that much.

I also undertook to anticipate the question by saying that heretofore we had authorized the appropriation of from one hundred to two hundred millions of dollars annually, and that under the terms of this bill we only authorize two hundred and twenty-five million for Federal-aid highways. With our highways in the sad plight they are in, many of them being in such condition that they cannot be used without repair, some being utterly obsolete, many of the highways being crooked, and greatly needing to be straightened, it will be a lot easier to use the $225,000,000, when we have not had any construction in 2 years, than to have used $100,000,000 in the years prior to the war.

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. O'HARA. I have two questions which have been raised in my mind about this bill that bother me.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Let me have them.

Mr. O'HARA. The objections come from people who are supposed to know. The first is the same as the gentleman from Georgia just raised as to the question of whether we are going to be able to spend the amount which has been set out for an annual payment to the States from Federal funds. The gentleman has answered that. The other question is the objection of the formula of distribution to the States, in that it amounts to a discrimination against the agricultural sections by changing the formula which has heretofore existed.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. In response to the first question, let me say that the chairman of the committee has already inserted in black and white, as a part of his discussion, replies from the 28 doubtful States, those that might not have matched, and with probably one exception, every one of those States indicated that they will be able to match it. As to the remaining 17 States there has been no question about their being able to match.

I have anticipated the second question with respect to change in the formula and with respect to discrimination, and I have said that this bill is in three parts: $225,000,000 for Federal aid, $150,000,000 for rural roads, and that part of this bill is more generous in its distribution of farm-to-market road allocations than any bill previously passed. I have indicated that primarily the purpose of this urban additional authorization of $125,000,000 is to provide for the employment and for the relief of congestion in our larger cities.

The $225,000,000 authorized for Federal aid is to be allocated under the existing formula of one-third, one-third, and one-third. The $150,000,000 for rural roads is to be allocated upon a more generous formula so that larger allocations will accrue to the rural areas in the distribution of farm-to-market road funds, the one-third population being the one-third farm population instead of the one-third State population. Thus Federal-aid highways and farm-to-market roads in the country receive more generous treatment than has heretofore been accorded to them. I see no valid reason why provision should not be made for the highway problems in urban areas. We make adequate provision for rural areas. We make more generous allocations for the rural areas in farm-to-market roads than have heretofore obtained. We must provide for the cities as well as the country. The allocation to the cities,

which is the third part of the bill, is one-fourth of the total authorization. The highway commissions recommended 30 percent of the total. The urban fund is not only to relieve congestion but to provide full employment in the cities following the war.

I believe I have answered the gentleman's second question. I think it is the most constructive provision of this bill, because if we do not provide for unemployment and the relief of the congestion in the municipal areas, those cities can very properly come to Congress and ask for a renewal of the appropriations for unemployment relief following the war.

Mr. O'HARA. I agree with the gentleman that some of our large cities are in bad financial condition. On the other hand, I am wondering if we are not taking a step now which will lead the municipalities to believe that we are going to continue to keep up their street systems, if we are not a little careful in this legislation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 additional minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. The municipalities have to contribute one-half of the cost of the rights-of-way and one-half of the cost of construction under the terms of this bill. As I say, it is to help take care of the unemployment problems as well as to eliminate congestion in those areas following the war. At present, Federal aid, under existing law, is available for building Federal-aid highways through municipalities. The existing program is thus extended. The program is balanced. Highways are provided in the country and in the cities.

I should like to add that the committee will submit amendments to limit to 15 percent the amount that may be spent for railway grade crossings and to limit to 3 percent the amount that may be spent for flight strips. I have covered the changes in the existing law.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Under the amendment which the committee will offer, can the gentleman give us a break-down of the $500,000,000 between these three funds? Different figures have been quoted today.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I will give it to the gentleman, but I have already inserted it in my remarks. Two hundred and twenty-five million dollars for Federal aid under existing law allocation, $150,000,000 for Federal aid under a more generous distribution to the rural districts, and $125,000,000 to the urban areas under the formula contained in the Senate bill, which is the same as the bill reported by the House, except that the allocation is made on municipalities of 5,000 instead of 10,000 inhabitants, as contained in the original House bill as reported by the committee.

Mr. J. LEROY JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. J. LEROY JOHNSON. What I want to find out specifically is whether the $125,000,000 for highways through cities includes the widening of a Federal-aid highway. I am thinking of a situation on Highway 99 where the roadway is there and you cannot bypass the city. It will have to take in some built-up area.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I would say that is a matter for the municipalities in cooperation with the State highway commissions. That has been taken care of by the committee amendment, as I have previously stated in this debate. It is going to be necessary to widen highways not only in urban areas but in many other areas of our country, and widen the rights-of-way.

Mr. J. LEROY JOHNSON. But the Federal money can be spent for the widening of that kind of highways?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. For one-half of the widening in the municipalities; yes.

Mr. J. LEROY JOHNSON. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Highways are essential in peace. They are more essential in war. Highways cannot be constructed during war. Provision can be made for roads and bridges for the advances of the armies. But I know of no more satisfactory public works for peace and war than highway construction. I believe the bill, as reported by the committee and as amended unanimously by the committee in the amendments submitted, should be promptly passed so that the legislatures of our 48 States can make provision for the initiation of this essential and important program in the post-war period.

For the first time in Federal-aid highway legislation we have a complete bill. We have provided for the highways of the country and the highways of the cities. We have improved and extended the policy of Federal aid in highway construction. The pending bill will mark the progress of road construction for the next 25 years.

Mr. MOTT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE].

Mr. CASE. Mr. Chairman, I have asked for this time in order to call the attention of the Committee of the Whole, and also the attention of the committee which reported the bill, to the amendment which I propose to offer, to insert an authorization for roads on Indian reservations.

I do not know why that particular authorization was omitted in the preparation of this bill, except that I was told it occurred through inadvertence due to the fact that the Office of Indian Affairs has been moved to Chicago. But in all previous authorizations for Federal highway constructions, an authorization has been included for road work within Indian reservations.

This bill as reported to us carries an authorization for regular Federal aid in these three different categories which the gentleman from Mississippi described. It also carries an authorization for building forest highways, highways through the national forests. It also carries an authorization for the construction and maintenance of roads and trails in the national parks and in the national monuments. That follows the pattern of all previous highway authorizations. But this bill, contrary to all previous highway authorizations, does not have a paragraph authorizing appropriations for the maintenance, construction and improvement of Indian reservation roads.

The act of 1934, which provided $125,000,000 for regular Federal aid, authorized $4,000,000 for each year covered, for roads on Indian reservations.

The act of 1936 authorized $125,000,000 regular Federal aid in the years covered and again $4,000,000 for Indian reservation roads.

The act of 1938, which authorized $100,000,000 in 1 year and $115,000,000 in the other for regular Federal aid, authorized $2,500,000 the first year and $3,000,000 the second year for roads of Indian reservations.

Again in 1940 the authorization act provided $100,000,000 for regular Federal aid and $3,000,000 for roads on Indian reservations. But this bill comes to us now and covers all the other matters but neglects the Indian reservation roads.

Those of you who are familiar with the Indian country, and who have counties where there are Indian reservations, know that it is impossible for roads to be built by those counties because the Indian land is not taxable and the taxable land bears a small proportion to the total area which needs road service for both Indians and whites. Consequently, some weeks ago I asked the Office of Indian Affairs for the appropriate language which would make a parallel paragraph, authorizing the construction of roads on Indian reservations in proportion to other authorizations, as has been done in previous bills. That language I introduced as a bill on August 31, 1944, and it is H. R. 5282 which I propose to offer as an amendment to the pending bill.

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASE. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Utah, the distinguished chairman of the Roads Committee.

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. I will state there was no testimony before the committee as to the amounts that were needed in Indian reservations. I am sure that would not have been omitted if the information had been supplied by the Office of Indian Affairs. I think the committee would have no objection at all to an amendment to the bill which would provide a reasonable amount for this purpose. I feel personally that it should be done and I am sure the other members of the committee feel the same way.

Mr. CASE. I appreciate that statement by the chairman. I will state that I talked with the officials of the Indian Office and they said their failure to bring that to the attention of the committee was due to the fact their office had recently been moved to Chicago and they were not as closely in touch with the congressional hearings as they had been in previous years.

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. I just want to make this suggestion to the gentleman, that if an amendment is proposed, and a statement made by the Department justifying it, I am sure there could be no objection to it.

Mr. CASE. I thank the Chairman. I will say that I have some correspondence with the Office of Indian Affairs which includes such a statement, and with permission, when the Committee goes back to the House, I shall insert the statement at this point together with the language of the appropriate amendment:

EXCERPT FROM LETTER BY WILLIAM ZIMMERMAN, JR., ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER OF INDIAN AFFAIRS, TO HON. FRANCIS CASE, REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS, AUGUST 15, 1944

In response to your request, there is enclosed suggested language to be incorporated in the general highway authorization bill as section 11 following section 10 authorizing appropriations for the National Park Service, which would include Indian reservation road needs for the 3 post-war years. * * *

The amount of $8,000,000 requested for each of the 3 post-war years is required to put our roads back in shape and start a construction program. Many miles of the roads built in the early thirties have been worn out. They were built to a low standard, and while they have served the immediate need, they should be rebuilt to a standard that will provide permanent facilities.

The $8,000,000 would be distributed as follows: $1,600,000 for maintenance and $6,400,000 for construction. This rate of expenditure could be handled in an economical manner and still provide widespread employment in the post-war period.

Language proposed for inclusion in the post-war roads authorization bill, enclosed with the foregoing letter, and as embodied in H. R. 5282, introduced August 31, 1944, follows:

"SEC. . For the construction, improvement, and maintenance of Indian reservation roads and roads to provide access to Indian reservations and Indian lands under the provisions of the act approved May 26, 1928 (45 Stat. 750), there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of $8,000,000 for the first post-war year and a like amount for each of the second and third post-war years: *Provided*, That under the provisions of the act approved September 5, 1940 (54 Stat. 867), the location, type, and design of all roads constructed shall be approved by the Public Roads Administration before any expenditures are made thereon, and all such construction done by contract shall be under the general supervision of the Public Roads Administration."

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASE. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, with the gentleman's permission I want to make this observation in connection with his statement with respect to the improvement of the Indian roads. Under the terms of this bill as originally reported by the House and as it was passed by the Senate, there is no limitation on the amount of funds that can be spent for elimination of railway crossings. As the chairman will include in his remarks, in the committee amendments published for the benefit of the House, there is a limitation of 15 percent, and there is a limitation of 3 percent on the amount which may be paid for flight strips. That is a diversion from the statement of the gentleman, but I did want to make that observation in connection with his statement on amendments.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Chairman, I was glad to yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HARRIS].

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I asked for these few minutes in order to advise the committee that when we read the bill under the 5-minute rule I will propose an amendment which will permit those States who apply all of the receipts from special taxes on motor-vehicle transportation for road purposes, and maintain the present rate of such taxes and distribution, to obtain the full amount of their apportionment under this bill. There are a number of States, according to the report of the Bureau of Public Roads, that will not be able, or will not have sufficient funds available to their State highway department for construction purposes, and if the amendment I will propose is adopted, it will permit those States which do not have sufficient funds with which to match the full apportionment, to get their full allotment. The amendment would add a new subsection to section 5, page 5, line 15, after "funds" as follows:

(b) If within any of the 3 post-war fiscal years referred to in this act the Federal Works Administrator shall find with respect to any State (1) that the proceeds of all special taxes on motor-vehicle transportation, as referred to in section 12 of the act of June 18, 1934 (48 Stat. 995), as amended, are applied to highway purposes as defined in said section; (2) that 100 percent of such proceeds are applied to the administrative and operating expenses of the State highway department, the maintenance and construction of roads and highways, and the payment of interest on, and the amortization of, bond obligations of the State for the payment of which such revenues have been continuously pledged since January 1, 1942; (3) that the rate of none of such taxes has been reduced or the rate of distribution to political subdivisions of the State changed after September 1, 1944; and (4) that the portion of the proceeds of all such special taxes then available for construction together with funds available to the State from any other sources for highway purposes, will be insufficient to match all, or any part, of the funds apportioned to such State for such fiscal years in accordance with the provisions of this act, then such portion of such apportionments as the Federal Works Administrator shall find the State is unable to match shall be made available for expenditure in such State in accordance with the Federal Highway Act, as amended and supplemented, without being matched by the State. Any finding made by the Federal Works Administrator under this subsection shall be made by him only after a full and complete investigation of the facts and records upon which such finding is based.

A similar provision designed for and with the intention of meeting this same problem was offered and adopted in the bill that passed the Senate. An analysis was made by the Public Roads Administration as to what would be the effect. According to the analysis there were 20 States in the year 1943 whose receipts of special taxes on motor-vehicle transportation was applied 100 percent for highway purposes, and who will not have available to the State highway department, annually, sufficient funds with which to match the apportionment as set out in this legislation. I am including the full analysis as follows:

Disposition of receipts of special taxes on motor-vehicle transportation collected in 1943 in States using all of such receipts for highway purposes

State	Total receipts	Amount transferred to subdivisions of State	Used by State highway department					Available to State highway department for construction	
			Amount	Percent	Percent			Amount	Percent
					Used for purposes of sec. 5b (2) S. 2105	Not used for purposes of sec. 5b (2) S. 2105	Used by State highway department for local roads		
Arizona	$5,616,000	$1,266,000	$4,350,000	77.5	36.8	40.7	----------	$2,282,000	40.7
Arkansas	14,200,000	2,016,000	12,184,000	85.8	69.8	16.0	----------	2,275,000	16.0
Colorado	10,063,000	3,394,000	6,669,000	66.3	43.0	23.3	----------	2,340,000	23.3
Connecticut	13,702,000	155,000	13,547,000	98.9	55.2	43.7	18.9	3,402,000	24.8
Idaho	5,196,000	1,679,000	3,517,000	67.7	44.0	23.7	----------	1,230,000	23.7
Indiana	31,756,000	15,200,000	16,556,000	52.1	28.2	23.9	3.4	6,523,000	20.5
Iowa	22,690,000	5,331,000	17,359,000	76.5	54.9	21.6	3.4	4,132,000	18.2
Kansas	12,657,000	3,600,000	9,057,000	71.6	50.2	21.4	----------	2,700,000	21.4
Maine	7,611,000	----------	7,611,000	100.0	97.5	2.5	2.5	----------	----------
Michigan	45,212,000	28,312,000	16,900,000	37.4	22.9	14.5	.2	6,460,000	14.3
Minnesota	22,135,000	4,445,000	17,690,000	79.9	47.5	32.4	----------	7,171,000	32.4
Mississippi	12,739,000	6,704,000	6,035,000	47.4	45.6	1.8	----------	220,000	1.8
Missouri	21,179,000	195,000	20,984,000	99.1	70.7	28.4	----------	6,006,000	28.4
Montana	4,926,000	1,189,000	3,737,000	75.9	66.8	9.1	----------	448,000	9.1
Nevada	1,896,000	----------	1,896,000	100.0	44.5	55.5	----------	1,053,000	55.5
New Hampshire	4,388,000	98,000	4,290,000	97.8	77.7	20.1	7.7	541,000	12.4
North Dakota	4,233,000	1,379,000	2,854,000	67.4	41.3	26.1	.2	1,097,000	25.9
South Dakota	5,484,000	1,609,000	3,875,000	70.7	38.9	31.8	----------	1,742,000	31.8
West Virginia	12,821,000	----------	12,821,000	100.0	97.2	2.8	2.8	----------	----------
Wyoming	2,899,000	489,000	2,410,000	83.1	31.8	51.3	----------	1,489,000	51.3

Mr. Chairman, this bill authorizes quite a sizable amount of money for highway construction. A policy adopted by Congress, that each State should have a certain amount of money for highway construction, of course is desirable because of the tremendous impact brought on by the war. We must do something in order to rehabilitate our roads. We must do something in order to have a road program that will give us the needed facilities for transportation, and as we all know, give us an opportunity to make jobs available to the men both engaged in war and those at home.

Heretofore the formula has been 75 and 25 percent. This bill changes that formula. According to the House bill it is 60 percent for the Federal Government and 40 percent for the States the first year. The second and third years it will be on a 50–50 basis. If an amendment which I will propose is adopted, then those States which are not able to match all the funds allocated to them, and as the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. MOTT] said awhile ago, this amount of funds is to be set aside for the States, those States would be permitted to get that full apportionment. If each State is allotted so much for a road program and doing all it can by applying all its highway receipts on roads, maintaining a high tax rate and needs the entire allocation, certainly it should be permitted to obtain them.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRIS. I yield.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I am sure the gentleman desires to be accurate. Under the Federal-aid highway legislation, the 75–25 percent to which the gentleman referred is limited only to strategic highways, and for the war period. That is, where it was necessary to widen bridges and do other work to reach defense plants and military and naval installations.

Mr. HARRIS. Federal-aid highway systems and access roads.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Strategic highway systems.

Mr. HARRIS. That is right.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. And only for the war period.

Mr. HARRIS. That is right.

Mr. CALVIN D. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. HARRIS. I yield.

Mr. CALVIN D. JOHNSON. Would the fund that is set aside to assist the States that are unable to help themselves apply to any State, or would it apply only to such States as had no gasoline tax or such State as had made no effort to help itself?

Mr. HARRIS. Under this amendment each State would be required to maintain the same tax rate it now has and apply all the proceeds to the roads and highways.

Mr. CALVIN D. JOHNSON. But the States would be called upon to help themselves before these funds become available to them.

Mr. HARRIS. They will be required to apply everything from special taxes on motor-vehicle transportation taxes for this purpose.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Arkansas has again expired.

Mr. MOTT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK].

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Chairman, you all know I come from a very small town.

From an analysis of this bill I take the position that the country is not getting what it should; but let me say to you in the first place that this is not a highway bill; it is a plan of action to take up unemployment after the war ends, and so far as I know this is the only committee in the House that has yet gone on record as planning any definite action to take up unemployment after this war is over.

Wartime restrictions, of course, will disappear when the war ends, but complaints have been made about other restrictions on business. I will stake my reputation, if I have any, that if all restrictions were removed from private business it could not take care of the unemployed when this war is over. We must have some plan of action to provide useful work, to supplement what private business can do. I am in favor of private business doing the job if it can, but I remember the last depression. I attended the meeting of a committee where great financiers of the country were present. This question was asked: "If all these restrictions you complain of were removed could you take up this 15,000,000 unemployed?" And the answer was, No, they did not think they could.

In my judgment we are going to have about 40,000,000 unemployed when the war is over. Private business will be in the same position it was before; but do not let this Congress be in the same position it was before. We had no plan of action; we had to plan work overnight and you know what kind of work it was; they made fun of it, but it was work and the unemployed could get something to eat. In this instance, however, the committee has outlined a plan or scheme by which a large amount of labor can be absorbed, I do not know how much; I think it will not take care of more than 1,000,000, this whole program we have, this entire appropriation; and 39,000,000 more will be left to be taken care of. But this committee is to be complimented at least that they have striven to point out that there will be such a situation when the war ends.

To make this bill perfectly clear I want the RECORD to show that $225,000,000 is appropriated for the present highway system; $150,000,000 for farm-to-market roads; and $125,000,000 for urban areas. In the urban-area provision one of the principal cities included will be New York, which is allocated $30,000,000; but as soon as unemployment strikes this country it will be felt first in the cities, in the large centers, New York, Philadelphia, Los Angeles, Cleveland, and similar places. I think it is perfectly proper to make such arrangements because this is a plan to take care of post-war unemployed and I am sure there is no one in my section of the country who is opposed to this plan. In North Dakota in the last election we initiated a law to match whatever funds we may get under this bill; and we voted on that before you passed it here and it carried by some 87,000 majority.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURDICK. I yield.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Is it not true that the representatives of the highway commissions recommended a larger percentage for the urban area than will be included in this bill? Or to be specific, they recommended 30 percent of the total, whereas we have included only 25 percent.

Mr. BURDICK. Yes. There is some complaint, and I think there is some justification for it, that we are not appropriating money enough, but, at least, we are setting up the framework for which we can appropriate if it becomes necessary.

In the formula we take into consideration the population of the State. That is 50 percent of the formula. Area is 25 percent of the formula, and post-road mileage is the other 25 percent of the formula. We are establishing a formula, a system, and a plan. If there is not money enough it is easy to come back and get it. If we have the money we can get it; if we do not have it we can still get it. We have been getting it right along during this war when we did not have it.

Mr. MOTT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURDICK. I yield to the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. MOTT. The gentleman will remember that was not easy in the depression years. When we had passed the regular Federal-aid road bill, then along came the W. P. A. and, notwithstanding the Federal-aid road bill, we appropriated two or three times as much money for roadbuilding as was used under the regular law. We could not get any increase to build these roads under mandatory law but had to accept this W. P. A. scheme of road building.

It is my opinion that that same thing is going to happen again if we have an unemployment problem after this war unless we make provision now for a full and adequate road-building program under law and not under Executive discretion.

Mr. BURDICK. The gentleman is right on that. There are $500,000,000 of this money available right away, within 30 days after this bill passes, for the purpose of entering into these contracts, which is making a start right now, whether you want to or not. Within 30 days after this bill is signed and becomes law those contracts can be made by the commissioners of highways of the States, approved by the United States Commissioner of Public Roads.

There is just one other provision here that may cause some concern. I think I mentioned it previously. When the de-

pression first strikes this country we are going to feel it here in Washington before we feel it in the upper part of Mississippi or in North Dakota. We must meet that situation wherever we come to it. There is no danger of your not appropriating the money, because I sat here right in this House and voted for a $4,000,000,000 appropriation for W. P. A. when we had to. Now we do not have to. Now we can plan something useful.

Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that the committee has done the best it could on this bill. I would like to have seen the authorization larger than it is, but the formula, the plan, and the system is right. There will not be any difficulty about money just as soon as you see people around this country who are hungry enough to be in groups like they were when I first entered this Congress. Somebody said it could not be imagined that the Congress would appropriate $4,000,000,000 for W. P. A., but before we got through everybody voted for it, conservatives and radicals alike. We appropriated four billion for them, and we would have appropriated four billion more if it had been necessary. They were trying to balance the Budget in those days, but you cannot do much balancing when people are hungry. Now we have time. May I compliment this committee for being the first committee in this Congress to start out on a plan of action to provide useful employment. In my opinion, the other committees ought to get busy and see if they cannot point out something equally as useful and important.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MOTT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GOODWIN].

Mr. GOODWIN. Mr. Chairman, there is probably no joint enterprise of cooperative endeavor between the Federal Government and the several States calling for an expenditure of money which is so nearly self-liquidating as a program of highway construction.

The Committee on Roads has labored long and diligently with intensive hearings covering several months followed by many executive sessions held in the spirit which ought to prevail in the consideration of a bill affecting so many conflicting interests—the spirit of cooperative effort, reconciliation of differences, of compromise, of give and take.

I want to compliment the chairman of the committee, the distinguished gentleman from Utah [Mr. ROBINSON] for his patience and his fairness and his very evident desire to send to this floor a bill which should honestly reflect the composite judgment of all the members of the committee. Sitting under his leadership and helpful direction has been an exceedingly pleasant experience for a first-term Member of Congress.

The bill now before us, with the committee amendments which will be offered, is, in my opinion, a well-considered and intelligent approach to the problem of what to do in 1944 toward a comprehensive Federal-aid road-building program for the years immediately following the end of the war, with the two highly praiseworthy objectives of providing for the employment of a little army of our people when employment will be sadly needed, and to begin again where we left off when highway construction was of necessity stopped as a result of the war, and to go ahead with planned improvement of the contemplated system of roads and bridges, extending into every State of the Union.

For the first time since the old formula for distribution was set up nearly 30 years ago—one-third area, one-third population, and one-third post-road mileage—this bill recognizes the need for a change in consideration of the very obvious fact that country-wide conditions have necessarily changed during the period of a quarter of a century.

In those States where there is a paramount need for emphasis on either urban or rural roads, we attempt to meet that need by setting up a new method of allocation which will provide substantial benefit to both.

But we ought to go further, in my opinion, and try to bring up to date the rapidly becoming ancient formula with regard to the funds provided for projects on the so-called Federal aid highway system. An amendment will be offered to accomplish this, which I propose to support. Such an amendment would introduce into the formula a new feature which naturally was not seriously thought of when the formula was devised in 1916, namely, the number of motor vehicles in each State. Such consideration becomes compelling now, and I can conceive of no fairer yardstick for measuring actual road use. If such an amendment is adopted, the bill will be a fairer bill for those States which are now and for many years have been making the largest contribution to the billions of dollars which have been collected from the owners of motor vehicles by the Federal Government.

Mr. MOTT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. WELCH].

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Chairman, I have always been a strong advocate of the construction of major highways and bridges. These two are closely interrelated. A bridge is a part of a highway whether it crosses a creek, a river, or an arm of the ocean as do the great Golden Gate Bridge and San Francisco-Oakland Bridge.

California was one of the very first States to embark on a campaign for more and better highways. I was a member of the California State Senate in 1907 when Gov. James N. Gillett, a former Member of this body, sent a message to the State legislature recommending a bond issue of $18,000,000 for highways be submitted to the voters of the State for their approval. I supported Governor Gillett's proposal without reservation, both in the State senate and in the following State-wide campaign for the bonds. This bond issue was defeated in the rural sections of the State and would have been lost were it not for the enormous majority it received in the great seaport city of San Francisco.

Mr. Chairman, my work in support of highways and bridges did not end there. It really had just begun. In 1915 I was elected to the board of supervisors, which is the legislative body of the city and county of San Francisco. Upon taking office I immediately started a campaign to connect San Francisco, which is built on the tip of a peninsula, with its natural hinterlands, the San Joaquin, Sacramento, Livermore, Napa, Sonoma, Santa Clara, and Salinas Valleys, and the great redwood empire, by a comprehensive system of highways and bridges.

With the cooperation of the then Governor of the State, William D. Stevens, who also served in this body, I started the successful 1919 State highway bond issue for $40,000,000. At that time there was only a single highway and an antiquated ferry system serving the city of San Francisco with a population of approximately 700,000 people.

I started the Golden Gate Bridge by introducing the original resolutions in the San Francisco Board of Supervisors, one of which secured the original grant from the War Department to span the Golden Gate. I vigorously campaigned and led the good fight throughout the counties of northern California to make the publicly owned Golden Gate Bridge and the highways adjacent thereto a reality. This great bridge was built at the depth of the depression without one dollar of Federal funds and with very little help from the State of California. From its inception to the present time I have continuously been a director of this publicly owned enterprise.

I appealed personally to President Hoover for his help to overcome the opposition of the Army and Navy to the construction of the San Francisco-Oakland Bay Bridge. President Hoover favorably responded by appointing a commission which, after exhaustive studies, unanimously approved a plan which ultimately made the bridge a reality.

While chairman of the committee on highways, bridges and streets of the San Francisco Board of Supervisors, I secured the enactment by the California State legislature of laws permitting the union of two or more counties into bridge and highway districts for the purpose of increasing highway facilities. This legislation made possible for the San Francisco peninsula the Sky Line Boulevard, the Bay Shore Boulevard, and the reconstructed El Camino Real—the King's Highway. The hilly terrain of the San Francisco peninsula has made new highway construction a great engineering problem with enormous relative costs.

Mr. Chairman, due to its geographical location and strategic importance San Francisco and the San Francisco Bay area is today a principal defense area in the United States and these bridges and highways are a major contribution to the success of our war effort and national defense in that area. In this defense area are located some of the most important permanent military and naval establishments in the United States. They include the Presidio Military Reservation, one of the largest in the country and which was established during the Spanish regime, Fort Funston, Fort Mason, Fort Winfield Scott, Fort Miley,

Fort Barry, Fort Baker, Mare Island Navy Yard, Hamilton Field Bombing Base, other great airfields and military establishments at Sacramento and Stockton, the Sausalito shipyards, the great naval base at Hunters Point, as well as a host of other war industrial establishments, all located around San Francisco Bay.

Notwithstanding the foresight shown in the development of these highways and bridges in that area, the experience of the present war indicates that more highways and bridges are permanently necessary for our national security and the peacetime economy. It is only such needs as this in the interest of our national security that justify the enactment of this present legislation. Congress must see to it that this bill definitely earmarks specific sums out of this billion and one-half dollars to these defense areas that are so important to our national security.

This bill in its present form does not meet this condition. It should be amended to definitely allocate portions of these funds for defense areas. It is idle to say that additional funds will be appropriated to the Army and the Navy for such purposes. This enormous sum of a billion and a half dollars will be expected to provide for all of the needs. Now is the time to make specific and mandatory provisions in the bill. Otherwise it will not be done. I do not hesitate to state that there are some State highway commissions which could not properly define a defense area and to leave the allocation of funds entirely to them will defeat what should be one of the main purposes of the bill.

Amendments by Mr. WELCH to S. 2105:

Page 13, after line 14, insert the following new section:

"SEC. 14. (a) If the President determines that the security of the United States, in the event of war or other national emergency, will be materially aided by the construction in any defense area of a highway, road, or bridge, he shall transmit such determination to the Federal Works Administrator. If funds are available for such purpose under authority of this section, the Federal Works Administrator, through the Commissioner of Public Roads, is authorized and directed to construct such highway, road, or bridge.

"(b) In order to carry out any highway, road, or bridge project under subsection (a), the Federal Works Administrator is authorized to acquire, in the name of the United States, such rights-of-way, lands, or interest in lands as may be required for such project. Upon completion of such highway, road, or bridge project, the Administrator is authorized and directed to convey, by proper deed executed in the name of the United States, any such right-of-way, land, or interest in land to the State, or to the political subdivision of the State if the State law so provides, in which such right-of-way, land, or interest in land is situated, upon condition that such State or political subdivision will maintain the highway, road, or bridge constructed in such State or political subdivision without cost to the United States.

"(c) The cost of any highway, road, or bridge constructed under authority of this section shall be payable out of any sum or sums appropriated under authority of this act for apportionment to the State or States within which such highway or road is to be constructed, but the total cost of all projects under this section shall not exceed $50,000,000 for each post-war fiscal year for which funds are made available under this act."

Page 13, line 15, strike out "Sec. 14" and insert in lieu thereof "Sec. 15."

Mr. MOTT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WELCH. I yield.

Mr. MOTT. The State highway divisions have no jurisdiction to define a defense area.

Mr. WELCH. A defense area is a natural development. San Francisco and San Francisco Bay area are natural defense areas, placed there by the Creator of the universe. If some people are not able to see it in its true light, this Congress should tell them or show them the light. That is where I differ with the splendid committee in its recommendation to Congress. Sums should be earmarked. It is illogical and improper to drop into the laps of the highway commissioners throughout the entire United States $1,500,000,000 to use practically as they please. There are some States, may I say to my friends, where you cannot be nominated or elected pound-keeper without the sanction and support of the State highway commission. They constitute the political machines of many States.

Mr. MOTT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WELCH. I am not referring to the State of the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. MOTT] or my own State of California. I yield.

Mr. MOTT. I think that is a situation which the people of California should correct, and that it should not be left to the Committee on Roads of the House of Representatives to take care of your political situation.

Mr. WELCH. The great trouble with committees of this House in dealing with important matters of this kind, and also with the departments, is that they take the road of least resistance. Sums should be definitely earmarked, as I propose in an amendment which I will offer to the bill at the proper time, allocating certain sums for defense areas which are all important to the security of this country during war, and also important to our peacetime economy.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to include an amendment which I propose to offer when the bill is being read for amendment in the House.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. MOTT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. VURSELL].

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Chairman, I find myself not in complete harmony with the provisions of this bill. I realize I am in the minority and will probably find myself voting for the bill, as the best that we can get out of it, on the roll call. I want to make an effort to improve it. There seems to be considerable hysteria connected with the discussion of this bill. It has been said that our roads are badly worn and are in terrible shape. I had occasion recently to drive down through the Southland and back, some 800 miles, and from there over to Washington and back, I talked with one of my colleagues from Illinois a few moments ago and he said he had taken the southern route in going from Washington to his home in Illinois and that he marveled at the splendid condition the roads were in. And I have heard similar remarks from others. I have not found any bad roads in 1,600 miles of travel recently. When one makes something like 400 miles in a day of driving, then transportation is pretty rapid and the roads are in pretty good shape in this country. When I got back home I found my home town located in the center of the county which is 24 miles square, and when I visualize that, as you visualize your county, most of you know that you can drive from your county seat and from your largest town, to any of the smaller villages on fine highways at as rapid a rate of speed as the law will permit.

But there is another picture. If I want to go 5 miles or 10 miles or 15 or 25 miles southeast or northwest, out through the rural sections I find it very difficult, and in wintertime it cannot be done.

It has been said that much greater allocation and appropriation has been made for the rural farm-to-market roads in this bill than under the old bill. That is true. Yet, we notice that much greater appropriations have been made for the great cities than has been spoken about, and large sums of money for the smaller cities. I am wondering, with our States and cities having more money in their possession, and their finances being in better shape than they have ever been in the history of this country, if it is wise to continue to call more heavily on the Government which is now in debt over $200,000,000,000.

Might it not be better if we reduced the urban allocation by $100,000,000, and reduced the amount in the bill by $100,000,000 which is provided for the upkeep of the Federal highways already designated, and leave the farm-to-market road allocation as it is? The Congress will be in session constantly. We will have the law enacted and if an emergency arises, if we have unemployment, then we can rapidly vote for a larger allocation of funds.

I believe we should reduce the amount of $225,000,000 allocated annually for the Federal-aid highway system by $100,000,000, and that we should reduce the amount of $150,000,000 allocated annually to urban areas, which means the big cities, by $100,000,000. That we should leave in the bill the $125,000,000 allocated annually to farm-to-market roads. This will reduce the over-all authorization to $900,000,000 to be expended in the first 3 years of the post-war era which will begin at the close of the war unless otherwise provided by congressional action. It will hold back and probably save $600,000,000. The great need, at the earliest possible moment after the war, is the building of farm-to-market roads. This country is fairly well provided now with belt highways, and the $125,000,000 which would be left for the extension and repair of

Federal highways, with the bill so reduced, will be adequate to keep them in splendid condition.

If we take this action, it will make it easier for many States to match the Federal appropriations. In fact, many of the States of the South cannot match the larger appropriations contemplated in this bill.

If we take this action we are as fully prepared to provide labor on the highways as we will be if we vote the larger sum, for we will have enacted this bill, which carries such a large amount of money even with these reductions that if a depression comes, before much of this money has been spent, with the Congress in session we can quickly appropriate more funds, if necessary.

It is most unlikely, at the close of the war, that we will immediately go into a depression. I hold no such defeatist attitude. We may have a temporary lull for a few months during reconversion. Because of the lack of civilian goods during the past few years we are more likely to have a boom with everyone employed for the next number of years. I think it is unwise to provide for the expenditure of such a great amount of money because if that money is available we are likely to use it at a time when it is not needed and not have it to use when it might be very badly needed to bolster up the economy of the Nation and keep our laboring people employed.

This bill provides $150,000,000 a year to be spent largely in and about the big cities. This is a tempting amount of money for city governments led by such wasteful spenders as LaGuardia, of New York, Mayor Kelly, of Chicago, Hague, of New Jersey, and other city governments who continuously waste the taxpayers' money and who will spend everything they can get their hands on.

It has been argued that the larger cities are not in as good financial condition as the smaller towns and as are the State governments. It is because of their waste and extravagance in keeping their political machines builded up so they can control elections which bring about this condition. I do not want to tempt them with this large amount of money. That is why I suggest the reduction of this urban fund from $150,000,000 to $50,000,000, which should be adequate aid to help take care of emergency highway construction within their limits.

It has been argued that through Federal gasoline taxes and other Federal taxation against automobiles, that there is now in the Treasury $630,000,000. This money came from the users of automobiles throughout the Nation and from those who operate trucks and tractors. I do not believe in being generous in the expending of this money simply because it is there. I would much rather see a reduction of these taxes that comes from the people who are the Government. Countless numbers of farmers who are helping to pile up this money by reason of the taxes they pay on their trucks, farm tractors, and cars are living on dirt roads which are almost impassable except in dry weather. I want to see these people provided with better roads so they can build up the countryside and make their greatest possible contribution to the economy of the Nation.

So long as we place within the reach of these great political machines millions of dollars of the taxpayers' money, just so long will they spend it and call for more.

The general purpose of this bill is proper and necessary and the Congress will pass it whether or not we are able, by amendments, to improve it as we would like. I hope that the proper amendments will be offered and that a majority of this House will write them into the bill.

Let us apply sound reasoning and good judgment to the bill rather than wishful thinking and hysteria. Congress will be in session and if, in our desire to safeguard the interest of the taxpayers of this country, we fall short of the mark, it can and will be willingly and promptly corrected.

Six hundred million dollars is worth saving. There are abundant places where it can be used and we may find that this amount of money is a very large amount before we get the country back on an even keel. I am in favor of adequate highways and of the building of highways to take up the slack of labor when and if it is necessary. In my judgment we will employ more labor when it becomes necessary and keep our highway system in the best possible shape if we defer the expending of such a large amount of money until a depression and a labor shortage makes it necessary.

Mr. MOTT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. KNUTSON].

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, as I understand the measure that has been reported by the Committee on Roads, it is being proposed as a post-war employment measure. It would seem to me that it would be much better for the country if the Congress were to consider the entire post-war program at one time, of which road building would be an integrated part. It is to be regretted that this has not been done, because no man on this floor can tell how much we are going to be called upon to vote from time to time and what the grand total will be. The condition of the Treasury is not such that we can go at this thing piecemeal and in a haphazard way.

I find an objectional feature in section 5, in the last proviso, which reads:

> That the entire construction cost of projects for the elimination of hazards of railway-highway crossings may be paid from Federal funds, except that not more than 50 percent of the right-of-way and property-damage costs, paid from public funds, on any such projects, may be paid from Federal funds.

The railroads are going to be in bad shape when the war is over. Their rolling stock is rapidly wearing out due to the demands of the war, and they have not been permitted to lay aside any funds for rehabilitation. If you saddle this cost on top of what they will have to pay for replacing worn-out rolling stock after the war is over it may place an impossible burden upon them, and I am wondering just how much consideration the committee gave to that particular phase of the bill.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KNUTSON. Gladly.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I may say to the gentleman that under existing law local interests, including the railroads, are required to furnish the entire cost of the rights-of-way. Under this bill the Federal Government is assuming one-half of the cost; so this bill is very much more liberal and generous with the railroads than existing legislation.

Mr. KNUTSON. It may be more liberal but it will be more costly to the railroads.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. No; not at all.

Mr. KNUTSON. Because we are not now doing much road building. The gentleman will agree that the burden of existing law has been comparatively light on the railroads but here we are making them pay as they never paid before.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. No; I would say with all deference to the gentleman from Minnesota that the burden on the railroads in the legislation now under consideration is reduced rather than increased. The Senate bill increased it.

Mr. KNUTSON. That is probably true in a sense, but I am now speaking from the standpoint of actual cost to the railroads.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. So am I. As a matter of fact, the railroads have been contributing the rights-of-way and the States have been providing for the approaches. Now the Federal Government will merely pay one-half the cost of the approaches. I am sure it reduces the cost to them.

Mr. KNUTSON. Even assuming what the gentleman says to be correct, and he may be correct, the railroads are very much concerned over what the probable cost will be to them. The purpose of this legislation, among other things, is to eliminate hazardous crossings.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. KNUTSON. I yield.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. We heard the railroads at length. There has been no dissatisfaction expressed by the railroads to the House bill. The objection is to the Senate bill. The Senate bill makes them contribute 15 percent of the entire cost, and that is the objection the railroads have been making. They object not to the House bill, but to the Senate bill.

Mr. KNUTSON. While we are speaking of the Senate bill, the Senate bill calls for $3,000,000,000, does it not?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. No, for $450,000,000 annually. The House bill calls for $500,000,000.

Mr. KNUTSON. I am speaking of the total now.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Yes; the Senate bill is a little bit less than the House bill.

Mr. KNUTSON. And it is not nearly so favorable to the country areas as the House bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. MOTT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, the underlying purpose of Federal aid, when the first appropriation was made nearly 30 years ago, was to bind all parts of the country together with an adequate system of main roads. In the beginning few roads worthy of the name existed, and such as did exist were located largely in the most populous parts of the country. The problem was that of getting hard surfaces on the main roads to get the road users out of the mud. This problem bulked largest in the agricultural States of sparse population.

Nearly 100 percent of the original problem has now been met. Almost the entire mileage of the Federal-aid system has been paved.

This does not mean, however, that the Federal-aid system requires no further expenditure. During the intervening years motor-vehicle development has been phenomenal. The effect of this growth of traffic, however, has been very uneven. Roads built a number of years ago for several hundred vehicles a day and now carrying upward of 1,000 are still adequate and for the most part satisfactory because the capacity of a two-lane road is several thousand vehicles a day. But roads built many years ago for a traffic of 1,000 or 2,000 vehicles a day are now carrying upward of four or five thousand vehicles. These roads must have their capacities increased if we are not to suffer a disastrous stagnation of our highway traffic.

A new factor has thus entered the problem of the provision of adequate Federal-aid highways—the factor of congestion. It has become the most important factor, and it is not restricted merely to cities.

There is no corresponding factor in the formula heretofore used and now proposed by the committee for continued use in allocating funds to the Federal-aid systems of the different States.

Therefore I now propose that such a factor be added and that it be given the weight it deserves. I propose that the old "out of the mud" formula be retained in the apportionment of half of the funds, $112,500,000 set up for the Federal-aid system; but that the other half, $112,500,000 of the funds, be apportioned according to the registration of motor vehicles in the several States. This will apportion half of the Federal-aid system moneys according to the use made of the highways in the different States—according to the degree of congestion to be overcome on them.

The populous States, the States where highway congestion exists—as it does exist, for example, between Washington and Baltimore—are wholly reasonable in asking for this consideration. In earlier years their highway systems were more advanced than those of more sparsely settled States. Cheerfully these States consented to an allocation of funds that would enable other regions to "catch up." Now, largely as a result of years of operation of Federal-aid, the situation is reversed. The acute Federal-aid highway problems are in these densely populated States. As one illustration, most, if not all Congressmen know from personal experience that, mile for mile, driving from Washington toward Richmond is pleasanter, easier, less congested and irritating than driving in the much heavier traffic from Washington to Baltimore. Here is one field where the advice of experts coincide with the experience of the average individual. Traffic congestion cries for relief. The States where it exists may reasonably ask to be allowed to retain within their borders enough of the Federal appropriation to allow their Federal-aid system now to "catch up," to gain an equality with those of the less congested States.

The self-interest of one-third of the States, with six-tenths of the population of the country, should incline them to a distribution of one-half of the $225,000,000 for the Federal-aid system on a basis of the motor vehicle registrations of those States. It is not, however, on this basis that I advance this proposal, but as the basis of our national welfare which requires a uniform development of our federally aided system of highways—which required that in times past, the preference be given, to the sparsely settled States, but which now requires more consideration for the highways in those regions where they are now least adequate.

In 1916, highways were still more largely used—much more largely used—by horse drawn than by automotive vehicles. In those days, the motor vehicle registrations of the States were not particularly significant in respect to road needs. But now, in the field of highway traffic, the motor vehicle is everything. There should be, in the distribution of Federal-aid, some direct measure of it, as the most important element in the apportionment of funds. Were the present bill the first Federal-aid bill, it is conceivable that the use of the highways in the different States would not have been given preeminence in the allocation of funds.

The apportionments each State would receive if the $225,000,000 for the Federal-aid system were based wholly on section 21, and if it were based one half on section 21 and one half on motor-vehicle registrations, are shown in parallel columns in the table below:

Comparison of annual apportionments under proposed revisions of H. R. 4915

State	Committee amendment	Proposed motor-vehicle amendment
Alabama	$9,760,000	$8,700,000
Arizona	5,760,000	4,610,000
Arkansas	7,560,000	6,560,000
California	22,450,000	27,420,000
Colorado	7,750,000	6,900,000
Connecticut	4,490,000	5,540,000
Delaware	1,550,000	1,240,000
Florida	7,080,000	7,210,000
Georgia	11,660,000	10,620,000
Idaho	4,990,000	4,150,000
Illinois	$23,410,000	$25,440,000
Indiana	12,180,000	12,910,000
Iowa	11,310,000	11,140,000
Kansas	10,850,000	9,980,000
Kentucky	8,910,000	8,410,000
Louisiana	7,430,000	7,130,000
Maine	3,920,000	3,660,000
Maryland	4,840,000	5,490,000
Massachusetts	10,390,000	11,960,000
Michigan	16,770,000	18,720,000
Minnesota	12,540,000	12,380,000
Mississippi	7,970,000	6,890,000
Missouri	14,480,000	14,280,000
Montana	8,020,000	6,390,000
Nebraska	8,490,000	7,600,000
Nevada	4,890,000	3,610,000
New Hampshire	2,120,000	2,020,000
New Jersey	9,600,000	11,880,000
New Mexico	6,470,000	5,060,000
New York	34,180,000	37,880,000
North Carolina	11,330,000	10,700,000
North Dakota	6,020,000	4,950,000
Ohio	20,290,000	22,680,000
Oklahoma	10,250,000	9,600,000
Oregon	7,140,000	6,650,000
Pennsylvania	25,320,000	27,620,000
Rhode Island	2,350,000	2,440,000
South Carolina	6,240,000	5,960,000
South Dakota	6,310,000	5,200,000
Tennessee	10,050,000	9,310,000
Texas	28,970,000	27,620,000
Utah	4,710,000	3,930,000
Vermont	1,910,000	1,670,000
Virginia	8,830,000	8,600,000
Washington	7,480,000	7,700,000
West Virginia	5,370,000	5,200,000
Wisconsin	11,840,000	12,210,000
Wyoming	4,870,000	3,770,000
Hawaii	1,780,000	1,230,000
District of Columbia	2,260,000	2,270,000
Puerto Rico	3,090,000	1,540,000
Administration	12,500,000	12,500,000
Total	500,000,000	500,000,000

Explanation: Under committee amendment $225,000,000 for Federal aid system is apportioned on sec. 21 formula, $150,000,000 for secondary and feeder roads is apportioned ⅓ on rural population, ⅓ on area, and ⅓ on post road mileage. $125,000,000 for urban roads is apportioned on the basis of urban population. Under proposed motor-vehicle amendment $225,000,000 for Federal-aid system is apportioned ½ on sec. 21 and ½ on motor vehicle registrations in the States. $150,000,000 for secondary and feeder roads is apportioned ⅓ on rural population, ⅓ on area and ⅓ on post road mileage. $125,000,000 for urban roads is apportioned on the basis of urban population.

It should be emphasized that this proposed change in the allocation, in view of other existing provisions in the bill, will still leave great differences in the treatment accorded different States. In proportion to the use made of their highway systems, the States of sparse population are still far more generously treated than the States of dense population, as the following examples show. The proposal I advance merely somewhat narrows the discrepancies. My State of Connecticut, for example, still will receive only a small fraction of the amounts many other States will have.

Amendment of section 4. of committee amendment of H. R. 4915: "Change part (a) as follows:

"'(A) The $200,000,000 per year available for projects on the Federal-aid highway system shall be apportioned among the States one-half as provided in section 21 of the Federal Highway Act and one-half in the ratio which the total motor vehicles in each State bears to the total motor vehicles in all the States, as reported in Public Roads Administration statistical table MV–1 for the calender year 1941.'"

Speaking of discrepancies allow me to discuss the provisions of section 9 of the committee bill, H. R. 4915.

Annual apportionments per motor vehicle for various States

State	Under committee amendment	Under proposed motor vehicle amendment
Nevada	107	82
Wyoming	64	52
New Mexico	56	46
Utah	36	31
North Dakota	31	25
Mississippi	27	24
Oregon	24	23
* * * *	*	*
Wisconsin	12	13
New York	12	13
Rhode Island	12	12
Illinois	11	12
Massachusetts	11	12
Pennsylvania	11	12
Indiana	11	12
Michigan	10	11
Ohio	10	11
Maryland	10	11
California	9	10
New Jersey	8	10
Connecticut	8	10

No one that I have contacted questions the need for assisting the States with large Federal land areas in the development of an adequate system of highways. It is believed, however, by some that with the proposed expansion of Federal aid and forest highways authorizations under the pending legislation, it is necessary that careful evaluation be made of the assistance given the public-lands States, to the end that in granting them aid, they are not being afforded more aid than justified by the public land, and also being provided through Federal aid, a degree of highway improvement surpassing that attainable by other States, thereby reducing the funds remaining for apportionment to other States.

It has been possible to develop a fairly comprehensive picture of how public lands have been and are being used again and again, to get unwarranted and duplicating financial assistance to the public-lands States.

In a nutshell, this is the story:

First. Public land — unappropriated and unreserved public lands, nontaxable Indian lands, Federal forests and national parks, monuments, and recreational areas—is the element in the Federal highway-aid formula through which a large part of the Federal-aid apportionment accrues to public-land States. But the funds so obtained by those States are in large part spent for roads over private, not public land.

Second. Furthermore, because of the public lands, these States do not have to match Federal funds dollar for dollar when other States do.

Third. Over and above Federal-aid authorizations, special Federal lands highway authorizations have been made from 1931–1941 to a total of $23,000,000, providing in effect a direct 100-percent grant to the States for Federal aid and other main highways traversing public land.

Fourth. National forest road authorizations, which have been made year after year and go mostly to the public-lands States, are spent largely on Federal aid and State highway construction. These funds do not require any matching by the States and are spent outside as well as inside national forests and over private as well as public lands.

Fifth. National park authorizations are made for improvements in national parks with no matching required by the States.

Sixth. Approach roads to national parks are financed by authorizations for such roads, with no matching required by the States.

Let us see how well some of these things work out to the advantage of just a few of the public-lands States.

Under the bill S. 2105, Arizona would get solely because of the area of public lands, and excluding the forest road funds, over $7,200,000.

Idaho would get $5,300,000.

Nevada would get $9,300,000.

Utah would get $5,900,000.

And so forth. But these funds will not be spent entirely, or in major part, for the improvement of Federal-aid highways, or any other kind of highways, across public lands. For example, in Nevada in the 3 years before the war only $1,700,000 of Federal-aid highway expenditures were made on public lands, although that State got $3,650,000 of its funds because of the public-lands area in the State. On this basis we can expect that of the $9,300,000 Nevada would get under S. 2105 because of its public lands, only $4,400,000 would go to roads over public lands. The rest, $4,900,000 would be a windfall for roads over private lands. It should be understood that these funds we are speaking of here are only those accruing to the States under the apportionment of Federal-aid funds which results from their public-lands area. Each of them get in addition such funds as are apportioned because of the remaining area in the State, the population and the post-road mileage. On the same basis as the example, the other public-lands States mentioned above would get windfalls as follows: Arizona, $3,800,000; Idaho, $2,800,000; and Utah, $3,100,000.

Piled on top of the Federal aid is the authorization in S. 2105 of $112,500,000 for National forest roads. We find that the general conception of such roads is that they are the roads and trails in and through the Federal forests, to provide access to all parts of the Federal forests and to the extent needed to provide connections of main highways across them. If one does not delve into the matter, that is a perfectly logical conclusion, primarily because it does sound like a reasonable responsibility to be assumed by the Federal Government.

However, it will be noted from S. 2105 that two-thirds of the forest-road funds are for forest highways, $75,000,000. We have found some startling facts regarding forest highways and the expenditures of forest highway funds. Forest highways are defined in the Federal Highway Act as "of primary importance to the State, counties, or communities within, adjoining, or adjacent to the national forests." We find that to a considerable extent forests highways are outside of national forests and that over 40 percent of their mileage is through private property. There is no requirement for matching of forest highway funds by the States. In large part the expenditures in the past have been on the forest highways that are parts of the Federal aid and State highway systems, so that they represent a duplication of regular Federal aid to the State. Furthermore, the States that get this forest highway windfall are pretty much the same States that get the other windfalls from public lands. Federal forest areas are part of the public lands which give so much regular Federal-aid funds to some States. Taking the same four States as used above, we find that they would under S. 2105 get forest highway funds as follows: Arizona, $4,300,000; Idaho, $7,700,000; Nevada, $1,300,000; and Utah, $2,500,000. This does not include funds provided in S. 2105 for national forest development roads and trails. It is presumed that such funds, which total $37,500,000, will be spent for and in the Federal forest areas. However, it is worthy of note that S. 2105 provides a threefold or fourfold expansion over previous authorizations for this purpose.

From the foregoing it should be clear that under S. 2105 the public-lands States get a multiplicity of overlapping aids, not immediately obvious from the bill and probably not generally recognized even by members of the Roads Committee. These States, if the public-lands area is excluded, get Federal highway aid equivalent in amount to that which any other State with identical development of its private lands would have. On top of that they get an overflow resulting from the heavy allotment of Federal aid made because of the public-land area but not used for road development in that area. On top of that and for the same kind of roads, Federal aid and State roads primarily, they get forest highway funds which are spent to a large extent on private land. For some reason, which we do not know, the public-lands States have not advocated provision in the current legislature for direct authorization of Federal lands highway funds, such as have been provided in all but 2 years from 1931 to 1941. Is it possible that direct and obvious assumption of the obligation for roads across public land would tend to clarify the situation and ultimately eliminate the "gravy"? Maybe that thought can be applied as a solution of the problem.

Might it not be appropriate to consider some such revisions of S. 2105 as the following:

First. Eliminate the authorization of funds for forest highways in section 9.

Second. Add part (f) to section 4 as follows:

(f) *Provided*, That in the case of any State containing unappropriated public lands, nontaxable Indian lands, individual and tribal, federally owned forest lands, and national park, monument, and recreational area lands, exceeding 5 percent of the total area of all lands therein, the pro rata share of the funds apportioned to the State under this section because of the area of the aforementioned public lands shall be spent under the supervision of the Public Roads Administration for

the construction or maintenance of Federal-aid routes, forest highways, public lands highways, and other main highways, to the extent that those highways are on public lands.

Third. Revise the first proviso in part (a) section 5 as follows:

Provided, That in the case of any State containing unappropriated public lands, nontaxable Indian lands, individual and tribal, federally owned forest lands, and national park, monument, and recreational area lands, exceeding 5 percent of the total area of all lands therein, the Federal funds expended on public lands as provided under part (f) section 4, may be 100 percent of the cost thereof.

Mr. MOTT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN].

CHICAGO SUN CAUGHT IMPEDING THE WAR EFFORT

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, Marshall Field 3d inherited millions from a rugged ancestor who believed in free enterprise and amassed his fortune under the American system, but Marshall Field 3d apparently, with more money than he can intelligently spend, has been an ardent worshiper of the New Deal and at the shrine of internationalism.

The country and the form of government which gave him, with the assistance of his ancestors, the millions evidently are not his ideas of what a country and a government should be.

To aid the new dealers and the internationalists who would substitute for our Declaration of Independence a declaration of interdependence, who would haul down the Stars and Stripes and run up the flag of Union Now or some other international rag, who would surrender our sovereignty to a group of war mongers and international politicians, who would seek advancement through the sacrificing of millions of common people, Mr. Field established, so we are told, in New York the PM and in Chicago, Ill., the Chicago Sun.

If ever there was two so-called newspapers which carried on a campaign of falsehoods, deception, and vilification, designed to destroy the confidence of the people in their elected Representatives, those two publications are PM and the Chicago Sun.

False, vicious charges tending to create the impression that many individual Members of Congress were disloyal and unpatriotic have been made by the Chicago Sun. That publication has set itself up as qualified to pass upon the patriotism of the peoples' Representatives.

During the recent campaign and for months before the election, by direct, false charges, by innuendo, by the publication of half truths, by using the methods of dirty, lying propagandists, it sought to create the impression that many candidates for Congress were impeding the war effort and hence aiding the cause of Hitler.

Fortunately a part of the truth has caught up with the Chicago Sun and it has now itself been branded as hampering and impeding the war effort of the United States of America. The fact that it was creating disunity, that it was interfering with the war effort, that it was stirring up class prejudice and hatred was well known not only to many people but to the administration itself. It was expedient, however, that the administration should keep that fact concealed until after election, for the Sun, by its campaign of falsehood, was able to garner many a vote for the fourth term. Hence, it was not until after election that the hand of the W. P. B. was forced and at last we have an official characterization of the Chicago Sun, which is published by Field Enterprises, Inc., a corporation with its principal office in Chicago, Ill., a successor to Marshall Field 3d who owned and published the Chicago Sun prior to September 1, 1944.

Listen now to this characterization of the conduct of the Sun. After setting forth that "during the second quarter of 1944 the Chicago Sun used or caused to be used 886.89 tons of print paper in excess of the quota of print paper which it was permitted to consume during this quarter under the provisions of Limitation Order L–240, and in violation of that order," the W. P. B. under date of November 10, 1944, issued a suspension order which, among other things, states that—

The Chicago Sun had full knowledge of the terms and provisions of Limitation Order L–240 and the violations were willful.

Then the order continued:

This excessive use of paper has diverted scarce material to uses not authorized by the War Production Board, and has hampered and impeded the war effort of the United States of America.

During the recent campaign the Sun persistently, falsely, wickedly published and republished false charges against the Republican candidate for Congressman at Large, in the State of Illinois, STEPHEN A. DAY.

It made similar charges against a veteran of the First World War, whose loyalty and patriotism has never been questioned. I refer to the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH].

It made similar charges against me.

Aided by the war chest of the communistic P. A. C., by the pay-rollers of the New Deal, by those who would surrender our independence and our sovereignty, it may have had some part in the defeat of Mr. DAY and of Mr. FISH. Its false and wicked charges against me were unavailing for the voters of the Fourth Congressional District are familiar with the tactics of the P. A. C., of the Sun, of New Republic, of Walter Winchell, and its efforts in that district did not prevent the rolling up of a 5,000 majority greater than ever before received.

Today it is of record that the Chicago Sun itself stands convicted of hampering and impeding the war effort of the United States of America.

The false charges of a lack of loyalty, of patriotism, of true Americanism, which it made against others are now found to fit it perfectly. The word of the Scriptures might be read with benefit by the publishers of the Sun. On the chance that they are unfamiliar with the Good Book I here quote a few words as follows:

And why beholdest thou the mote that is in thy brother's eye, but considerest not the beam that is in thine own eye?

Or how wilt thou say to they brother, Let me pull out the mote out of thine eye; and, behold, a beam is in thine own eye?

Thou hypocrite, first cast out the beam out of thine own eye; and then shalt thou see clearly to cast out the mote out of thy brother's eye.

A copy of the W. P. B.'s order follows and is marked "Exhibit A."

EXHIBIT A

S–654.
NOVEMBER 10, 1944.

WAR PRODUCTION BOARD

Part 1010—Suspension Orders (Suspension Order S–654).

Fields Enterprises, Inc. and Chicago Sun.

Field Enterprises, Inc., is a corporation with its principal office in Chicago, Ill. Since September 1, 1944, it has been engaged in the business of publishing a daily newspaper known as the Chicago Sun and is the successor to Marshall Field III, who owned and published the Chicago Sun prior to that date. During the second quarter of 1944 the Chicago Sun used or caused to be used 886.89 tons of print paper in excess of the quota of print paper which it was permitted to consume during this quarter under the provisions of Limitation Order L–240, and in violation of that order. The Chicago Sun had full knowledge of the terms and provisions of Limitation Order L–240 and the violations were willful.

This excessive use of paper has diverted scarce material to uses not authorized by the War Production Board, and has hampered and impeded the war effort of the United States of America. In view of the foregoing it is hereby ordered, that:

Section 1010.654. Suspension Order No. S–654. (a) Field Enterprises, Inc., its successors or assigns, unless otherwise specifically authorized in writing by the War Production Board, shall reduce its use of print paper by 886.89 tons under the consumption quota it would otherwise be entitled to use as specified by the provisions of Limitation Order L–240, as follows: During the fourth quarter of 1944 by 197.08 tons; during the first quarter of 1945 by 295.64 tons; during the second quarter of 1945 by 295.63 tons; and during the third quarter of 1945 by 98.54 tons.

(b) Nothing contained in this order shall be deemed to relieve Field Enterprises, Inc., its successors or assigns, from any restriction, prohibition, or provision contained in any other order or regulation of the War Production Board, except insofar as the same may be inconsistent with the provisions hereof.

Issued this 10th day of November 1944.

WAR PRODUCTION BOARD,
By J. JOSEPH WHELAN,
Recording Secretary.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired. All time has expired.

The Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, when used in this act, unless the context indicates otherwise—

The term "construction" means the supervising, inspecting, actual building, and all expenses incidental to the construction or reconstruction of a highway, including locating, surveying, and mapping, costs of rights-of-way, and elimination of hazards at railway-grade crossings.

The term "urban area" means an area including and adjacent to a municipality of

10,000 or more, the population of such included municipality to be determined by the latest available Federal census. The boundaries of urban areas, as defined herein, will be fixed by the State highway department of each State subject to the approval of the Public Roads Administration.

The term "rural areas" means all areas of the State not included in "urban areas".

The term "secondary and feeder roads" means roads in rural areas, including farm-to-market roads, rural-mail routes, and school-bus routes, and not on the Federal-aid system.

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. COOPER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 4915) to amend and supplement the Federal-Aid Road Act, approved July 11, 1916, as amended and supplemented, to authorize appropriations for the post-war construction of highways and bridges, to eliminate hazards at railroad-grade crossings, to provide for the immediate preparation of plans and acquisition of rights-of-way, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 654, had come to no resolution thereon.

INVITATION TO INSPECT A B-29 AIRPLANE

The SPEAKER. The Chair lays before the House a communication which he thinks will be of interest to the Members.

The Clerk read as follows:

NOVEMBER 22, 1944.

The Honorable SAM RAYBURN,
The Speaker, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. RAYBURN: The Army Air Forces respectfully invite you and the Members of the House of Representatives to inspect a B-29 airplane at the new A. T. C. terminal at Washington National Airport on Saturday, November 25, from 9 a. m. to 5 p. m.

The airplane is being brought here from Wright Field especially to give Members of the Congress and other Government officials an opportunity to inspect the aircraft at close range. Technicians will be on duty to answer any questions Members may care to ask. The interior of the airplane will also be open for inspection.

Sincerely yours,

H. H. ARNOLD,
General, United States Army, Commanding General, Army Air Forces.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on the subject of America's post-war merchant marine forecast and to insert therein an article by Commander Wendell Phillips Dodge, editor of the Marine News, which has published this symposium of opinions of many American leaders, and I ask unanimous consent that the excerpts included in the paper be extended as part of my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend the remarks I made today and include therein an amendment which I shall offer when the bill is read for amendment next Tuesday, together with an analysis of the Public Roads Administration as to the distribution of the receipts of special taxes on motor-vehicle transportation collected in 1943, and States using all of such receipts for highway purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. MOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend the remarks I made this afternoon and include some statistics taken from the committee report and other documents.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

(Mr. CURTIS and Mr. LEA asked and were given permission to extend their remarks in the RECORD.)

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimus consent to revise and extend the remarks I made this afternoon in connection with the statement made by the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. MOTT] and to substitute for the news article I read into the RECORD at that time a resolution passed by the American Automobile Association which deals with the same subject.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include certain charts.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

THE LATE EDWARD PLUMMER CUNNINGHAM

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is their objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, it is with a heavy heart that I impart to you the sad news that Marine Corp. Edward Plummer Cunningham lost his life in the service of his country on November 15, on the Island of Saipan. He gave his life heroically that our America might live.

Corporal Cunningham was the son of our esteemed colleague PAUL CUNNINGHAM, himself a veteran of World War No. 1.

To Corporal Cunningham's loving wife and little son, Edward, Jr., and to his parental household, I extend the heartfelt sympathies of the entire membership of the House of Representatives.

We pray Almighty God to bring this terrible war to an early successful conclusion and to soothe the aching limbs and hearts of suffering humanity. Help us now, O God, to be worthy of the blessings of peace for which our Nation's brave defenders are giving their all as has Corp. Edward Plummer Cunningham.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] be permitted to revise and extend his remarks and include certain statistics.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon?

SENATE ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The Speaker announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 887. An act conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the Western District of Virginia to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claims of John Weakley and Rella Moyer;

S. 1101. An act to provide for the payment of the claim of John C. Shaw, administrator de bonis non of the estate of Sydney C. McLouth, deceased, arising out of a contract between said deceased and the United States Shipping Board Emergency Fleet Corporation, for the construction of seagoing tugs;

S. 1226. An act for the relief of Charles T. Allen;

S. 1278. An act for the relief of Yellow Cab Transit Co. and Equitable Fire and Marine Insurance Co.;

S. 1365. An act for the relief of J. C. Drewry;

S. 1451. An act to amend the act entitled "An act for the confirmation of the title to the Saline Lands in Jackson County, State of Illinois, to D. H. Brush, and others." approved March 2, 1861;

S. 1453. An act for the relief of the City National Bank Building Co.;

S. 1461. An act for the relief of Frederick G. Goebel;

S. 1465. An act for the relief of Dr. A. R. Adams;

S. 1477. An act for the relief of Carl M. Frasure;

S. 1501. An act for the relief of Rau Motor Sales Co.;

S. 1572. An act for the relief of Frank Robertson;

S. 1605. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. John Borrego; Mr. and Mrs. Joe Silva; the legal guardian of Frank Borrego; the legal guardian of Rueben Silva; and the legal guardian of Rudolph Silva;

S. 1665. An act to relieve certain employees of the Veterans' Administration from financial liability for certain overpayments and allow such credit therefor as is necessary in the accounts of Guy F. Allen, chief disbursing officer;

S. 1709. An act for the relief of Mrs. Clark Gourley, administratrix of the estate of Clark Gourley;

S. 1717. An act for the relief of Luella F. Stewart;

S. 1763. An act for the relief of the Square D. Co.;

S. 1766. An act for the relief of C. C. Thornton;

S. 1776. An act for the relief of L. C. Gregory;

S. 1905. An act for the relief of the estate of Walney A. Colvin, deceased;

S. 1983. An act for the relief of Mrs. Anna Runnebaum;

S. 1995. An act for the relief of Fred A. Dimler and Gwendolyn E. Dimler, his wife;

S. 2007. An act for the relief of Lum Jacobs;

S. 2031. An act for the relief of Lt. (T) P. J. Voorhies; and

S. 2069. An act for the relief of Irma S. Sheridan, postmaster at Rockville, Oreg.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 24 minutes p. m.) under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, November 27, 1944, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

2030. Under clause 2 of rule XXIV a letter from the Chairman, Reconstruction Finance Corporation, transmitting the report of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation for the month of August 1944, was taken from the Speaker's table and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia: Select Committee on Post-war Military Policy. Further report pursuant to House Resolution 465. Resolution to establish a Select Committee on Post-war Military Policy (Rept. No. 1923). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana: Committee on Immigration and Naturalization. H. R. 4981. A bill to amend section 327 (h) of the Nationality Act of 1940; without amendment (Rept. No. 1925). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana: Committee on Immigration and Naturalization. H. R. 5465. A bill to amend section 342 (b) of the Nationality Act of 1940; without amendment (Rept. No. 1926). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana: Committee on Immigration and Naturalization. House Joint Resolution 316. Joint resolution to correct an error in section 342 (b) (9) of the Nationality Act of 1940, as amended by the act of September 27, 1944; without amendment (Rept. No. 1927). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. MASON: Commitee on Immigration and Naturalization. H. R. 5156. A bill to amend section 28 (c) of the Immigration Act of 1924; without amendment (Rept. No. 1928). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. MASON: Committee on Immigration and Naturalization. H. R. 5464. A bill to amend the law relating to the authority of certain employees of the Immigration and Naturalization Service to make arrests without warrant in certain cases and to search vehicles within certain areas; without amendment (Rept. No. 1929). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. LESINSKI: Committee on Immigration and Naturalization. H. R. 5496. A bill to amend section 401 (a) of the Nationality Act of 1940; without amendment (Rept. No. 1930). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. LESINSKI: Committee on Immigration and Naturalization. H. R. 5513. A bill to amend section 201 (g) of the Nationality Act of 1940 (54 Stat. 1138–1139; 8 U. S. C. 601); with amendment (Rept. No. 1931). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. GOSSETT: Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments. S. 218. An act to authorize relief of disbursing officers of the Army on account of loss or deficiency of Government funds, vouchers, records, or papers in their charge; without amendment (Rept. No. 1932). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. RANDOLPH: Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments. H. R. 4547. A bill to amend the act of February 14, 1931, as amended, so as to permit the compensation, on a mileage basis, of civilian officers or employees for the use of privately owned airplanes while traveling on official business; without amendment (Rept. No. 1933). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. MASON: Committee on Immigration and Naturalization. H. R. 2148. A bill for the relief of Elias Baumgarten; without amendment (Rept. No. 1924). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. JEFFREY:

H. R. 5532. A bill for the relief of officers of the Army who were members of the first two classes at Civil Affairs Training School, University of Chicago; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BURCH of Virginia:

H. R. 5533. A bill to amend section 2 of the act of May 29, 1928, and section 3 of the act of March 29, 1944, affecting the compensation of postmasters; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. McCORD:

H. R. 5534. A bill to amend section 502 (a) of the Department of Agriculture Organic Act of 1944; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. VINSON of Georgia:

H. R. 5535. A bill to create the rank and title of lieutenant general in the Marine Corps, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. GRIFFITHS:

H. Res. 657. Resolution to direct the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors to review the report on the Muskingum River and its tributaries, Ohio, with a view to determining the advisability of improving Leatherwood Creek in the interests of flood control and water supply for Cambridge, Ohio; to the Committee on Flood Control.

By Mr. VINSON of Georgia:

H. Res. 658. Resolution providing for the consideration of S. 2019, a bill to establish the grade of fleet admiral of the United States Navy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania introduced a bill (H. R. 5536) for the relief of the legal guardian of Margaret Hockenberry, a minor, which was referred to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

6205. By Mr. GRIFFITHS: Petition submitted by the Ohio Brewers Association with 157 signatures protesting the passage of any prohibition legislation as the Bryson bill, H. R. 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

6206. By Mr. ROWE: Petition of 282 constituents of the Fourteenth Congressional District of Ohio, protesting against the passage of any such legislation as the Bryson bill, H. R. 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

6207. By Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin: Petition of 750 constituents in the First Congressional District, Wisconsin, protesting against the enactment of any and all prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

6208. Also, petition of sundry citizens of Racine, Wis., regarding House Resolution No. 632; to the Committee on Rules.

6209. Also, petition of sundry citizens of Racine, Wis., regarding House Resolution No. 632; to the Committee on Rules.

SENATE

MONDAY, NOVEMBER 27, 1944

(Legislative day of Tuesday, November 21, 1944)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father God, in whose sight all that concerns Thy children is precious and whose merciful eyes note even a sparrow's fall, speak to these struggling lives of ours, woven with strangely tangled threads that are sad and glad. Thou knowest all the days that go to make the total pattern as the years pass more quickly than a weaver's shuttle, days shadowed by sorrow, sparkling with mirth, bathed in tears, lifted up by gain and triumph, cast down by failure and loss. May this mixed medley of hopes and fears find its true meaning in Thy eternal purpose for our being.

In this tortured day open our eyes to perceive Thy presence in the mighty currents of the ages and to trust Thy wise and patient power to fashion a better day out of the strife and turmoil, the grief and bitterness of this present time. In all its plans and policies keep this dear land of ours mindful of all the family of nations, global in its sympathies, elevated in its thought, clean in its motives, that its sacrifice be unsullied by the base alloy of unworthy ambition. And in the deliberations of the Congress let every mind be attentive to Thy voice in this solemn day of our visitation, that we may know the things which belong to our peace and to the peace of the world. We ask it in the Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. HILL, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Friday, November 24, 1944, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. HILL. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Gerry	Overton
Bailey	Gillette	Radcliffe
Ball	Green	Revercomb
Bankhead	Guffey	Reynolds
Bilbo	Gurney	Robertson
Brooks	Hatch	Russell
Buck	Hayden	Shipstead
Burton	Hill	Taft
Bushfield	Jenner	Thomas, Idaho
Butler	Johnson, Calif.	Thomas, Okla.
Byrd	Johnson, Colo.	Tunnell
Capper	La Follette	Tydings
Caraway	Langer	Vandenberg
Chandler	McClellan	Wallgren
Clark, Idaho	McFarland	Walsh, Mass.
Clark, Mo.	McKellar	Walsh, N. J.
Connally	Maloney	Weeks
Cordon	Maybank	Wheeler
Davis	Millikin	Wherry
Downey	Murray	White
Ellender	Nye	Wiley
Ferguson	O'Daniel	Willis
George	O'Mahoney	

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] is absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senators from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN and Mr. SCRUGHAM] and the Senator from Utah [Mr. MURDOCK] are detained on official business for the Senate.

The Senator from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN], and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. STEWART] are unavoidably detained.

The Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD] is absent on official business for the Special Committee to Investigate the National Defense Program.

The Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] and the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] are absent on official business for the Senate.

Mr. WHERRY. The following Senators are necessarily absent:

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN], the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HAWKES], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MOORE], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY], and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. WILSON].

The Senator from Oregon [Mr. HOLMAN] is absent because of illness in his family.

The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DANAHER] is absent on important public business.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Sixty-eight Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

SENATOR FROM SOUTH CAROLINA

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, the Senator-designate from South Carolina, Hon. WILTON E. HALL, is present and prepared to take the oath of office. His credentials are already on file.

The VICE PRESIDENT. If the Senator-designate will present himself at the desk, the oath will be administered to him.

Mr. HALL, escorted by Mr. MAYBANK, advanced to the Vice President's desk, and the oath of office prescribed by law was administered to him by the Vice President.

LEGISLATION PASSED BY MUNICIPAL COUNCILS IN THE VIRGIN ISLANDS

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate two letters from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of legislation passed by the Municipal Councils of St. Croix, St. Thomas, and St. John, V. I., which, with the accompanying papers, were referred to the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs.

IMPROVEMENT OF THE ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE BY PRESCRIPTION OF FAIR ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEDURE

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to present for appropriate reference and to have printed in the RECORD at this point a letter which I have received from Miss F. G. Farrell, secretary of the Hartford Chamber of Commerce, Hartford, Conn.

The letter contains a resolution adopted by the board of directors of that organization urging enactment of the bills H. R. 5081 and S. 2030.

There being no objection, the letter embodying the resolution was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE HARTFORD CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
Hartford, Conn., November 22, 1944.

The Honorable FRANCIS MALONEY,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: At a regular meeting of the board of directors of the Hartford Chamber of Commerce held on the 20th day of November 1944, the following resolution was adopted:

"*Resolved*, That the board of directors of the Hartford Chamber of Commerce expresses its unanimous approval of the legislation 'to improve the administration of justice by prescribing fair administrative procedure, known as House bill 5081 and Senate bill 2030, and requests its prompt enactment by the Congress of the United States; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the chairmen of the Judiciary Committees of the House of Representatives and the Senate, and to the Connecticut Members of the Congress."

We send this to you for your guidance when the matter comes up for action.

Very truly yours,

(Miss) F. G. FARRELL,
Secretary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado, from the Committee on Military Affairs:

S. 2178. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act authorizing the President to appoint an Under Secretary of War during national emergencies, fixing the compensation of the Under Secretary of War, and authorizing the Secretary of War to prescribe duties," approved December 16, 1940, for the purpose of making such act permanently effective; with amendments (Rept. No. 1194).

By Mr. GURNEY, from the Committee on Military Affairs:

S. 2192. A bill to provide for the continuation on the active list of the Regular Army for the duration of any of the wars in which the United States is now engaged, and for 6 months thereafter, of any officer on the active list of the Regular Army who has served as Chief of Staff during the wars in which the United States is now engaged; without amendment (Rept. No. 1195).

By Mr. HILL, from the Committee on Military Affairs:

H. R. 5386. A bill to amend the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, to extend the time within which application may be made for reemployment, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 1196).

By Mr. BILBO, from the Committee on the District of Columbia:

S. 1434. A bill to provide for voluntary apprenticeship in the District of Columbia; without amendment (Rept. No. 1197);

S. 1979. A bill to regulate in the District of Columbia the transfer of shares of stock in corporations and to make uniform the law with reference thereto; with amendments (Rept. No. 1212);

S. J. Res. 155. Joint resolution establishing a commission to select a site and design for a National Memorial Stadium to be erected in the District of Columbia; with amendments (Rept. No. 1214);

H. R. 1951. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Motor Vehicle Parking Facility Act of 1942, approved February 16, 1942; without amendment (Rept. No. 1198);

H. R. 2116. A bill to amend the laws of the District of Columbia relating to exemption of property from judicial process, the assignment of salary or wages, and the advance payment of salary or wages for the purpose of preventing attachment or garnishment; without amendment (Rept. No. 1199);

H. R. 2644. A bill to grant additional powers to the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1200);

H. R. 3150. A bill to amend an act entitled "An act to regulate the practice of the healing art to protect the public health in the District of Columbia," approved February 27, 1929; without amendment (Rept. No. 1201);

H. R. 3313. A bill to amend section 10 of the act of March 3, 1925, entitled "An act to provide for the regulation of motor-vehicle traffic in the District of Columbia; increase the number of judges of the police court, and for other purposes," as amended; without amendment (Rept. No. 1202);

H. R. 3619. A bill to amend sections 675 and 676 of the act entitled "An act to establish a Code of Law for the District of Columbia," approved March 3, 1901, regulating the disposal of dead human bodies in the District of Columbia; without amendment (Rept. No. 1203);

H. R. 3621. A bill to amend an act entitled "An act to provide for the regulation of motor vehicle traffic in the District of Columbia, increase the number of judges of the police court, and for other purposes"; without amendment (Rept. No. 1204);

H. R. 3720. A bill to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to appoint notaries public; without amendment (Rept. No. 1205);

H. R. 4327. A bill to regulate boxing contests and exhibitions in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 1213);

H. R. 4867. A bill to extend the health regulations of the District of Columbia to Government restaurants within the District of Columbia; without amendment (Rept. No. 1206);

H. R. 4916. A bill to amend the act of June 19, 1934 (Public Law 435, 73d Cong.); without amendment (Rept. No. 1207);

H. J. Res. 289. Joint resolution authorizing the granting of permits to the Committee on Inaugural Ceremonies on the occasion of the inauguration of the President-elect in January 1945, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1209);

H. J. Res. 290. Joint resolution to provide for the maintenance of public order and the protection of life and property in connection with the Presidential inaugural ceremonies of

1945; without amendment (Rept. No. 1210); and

H. J. Res. 291. Joint resolution to provide for the quartering, in certain public buildings in the District of Columbia, of troops participating in the inaugural ceremonies; without amendment (Rept. No. 1211).

By Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts, from the Committee on Naval Affairs:

S. 1910. A bill to provide for the presentation of medals to members of the United States Antarctic Expedition of 1939–41; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1225);

S. 1935. A bill to amend an act entitled "An act authorizing the temporary appointment or advancement of certain personnel of the Navy and Marine Corps, and for other purposes," approved July 24, 1941, as amended, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1216);

S. 2056. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to lease certain lands situated in San Diego County, State of California; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1226);

S. 2067. A bill to authorize an exchange of lands between the city of Eastport, Maine, and the United States, and the conveyance of a roadway easement to the city of Eastport, Maine; without amendment (Rept. No. 1217);

S. 2068. A bill to amend an act entitled "an act to extend the time for examination of monthly accounts covering expenditures by disbursing officers of the United States Marine Corps," approved December 26, 1941, so as to extend the time for examination of monthly accounts of disbursing officers and special disbursing agents of the Navy and Coast Guard; without amendment (Rept. No. 1218);

S. 2073. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to convey to Oahu Railway & Land Co. an easement for railway purposes in certain lands situated at Halawa, Ewa, Oahu, T. H.; without amendment (Rept. No. 1219);

S. 2132. A bill for the relief of Ensign Frederick Matthews McCord, United States Naval Reserve; without amendment (Rept. No. 1220);

S. 2133. A bill to authorize the transfer of certain lands within the Colonial National Historical Park, Yorktown, Va., to the Secretary of the Navy; without amendment (Rept. No. 1221);

S. 2179. A bill to reimburse certain Navy personnel for personal property lost or damaged as the result of a fire at the naval auxiliary air facility, Astoria, Oreg., on April 2, 1944; without amendment (Rept. No. 1222);

S. 2180. A bill to provide reimbursement for personal property lost, damaged, or destroyed as the result of an explosion at the naval mine depot, Yorktown, Va., on November 16, 1943; without amendment (Rept. No. 1223); and

S. 2181. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to grant to the city of Canton, Ohio, for highway purposes only, a strip of land situated within the United States Naval Ordnance Plant at Canton, Ohio; without amendment (Rept. No. 1224).

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED

Mrs. CARAWAY, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that on November 25, 1944, that committee presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills:

S. 887. An act conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the Western District of Virginia to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claims of John Weakley and Rella Moyer;

S. 1101. An act to provide for the payment of the claim of John C. Shaw, administrator de bonis non of the estate of Sydney C. McLouth, deceased, arising out of a contract between said deceased and the United States Shipping Board Emergency Fleet Corporation, for the construction of seagoing tugs;

S. 1226. An act for the relief of Charles T. Allen;

S. 1278. An act for the relief of Yellow Cab Transit Co. and Equitable Fire & Marine Insurance Co.;

S. 1365. An act for the relief of J. C. Drewry;

S. 1451. An act to amend the act entitled "An act for the confirmation of the title to the Saline lands in Jackson County, State of Illinois, to D. H. Brush and others," approved March 2, 1861;

S. 1453. An act for the relief of the City National Bank Building Co.;

S. 1461. An act for the relief of Frederick G. Goebel;

S. 1465. An act for the relief of Dr. A. R. Adams;

S. 1477. An act for the relief of Carl M. Frasure;

S. 1501. An act for the relief of the Rau Motor Sales Co.;

S. 1572. An act for the relief of Frank Robertson;

S. 1605. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. John Borrego; Mr. and Mrs. Joe Silva; the legal guardian of Frank Borrego; the legal guardian of Rueben Silva; and the legal guardian of Rudolph Silva;

S. 1665. An act to relieve certain employees of the Veterans' Administration from financial liability for certain overpayments and allow such credit therefor as is necessary in the accounts of Guy F. Allen, chief disbursing officer;

S. 1709. An act for the relief of Mrs. Clark Gourley, administratrix of the estate of Clark Gourley;

S. 1717. An act for the relief of Luella F. Stewart;

S. 1763. An act for the relief of the Square D Co.;

S. 1766. An act for the relief of C. C. Thornton;

S. 1776. An act for the relief of L. C. Gregory;

S. 1905. An act for the relief of the estate of Walney A. Colvin, deceased;

S. 1983. An act for the relief of Mrs. Anna Runnebaum;

S. 1995. An act for the relief of Fred A. Dimler and Gwendolyn E. Dimler, his wife;

S. 2007. An act for the relief of Lum Jacobs;

S. 2031. An act for the relief of Lt. (T) P. J. Voorhies; and

S. 2069. An act for the relief of Irma S. Sheridan, postmaster at Rockville, Oreg.

JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

Joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. REYNOLDS:

S. J. Res. 159. Joint resolution to provide for a study and investigation with respect to the establishment and operation of a national lottery; to the Committee on Finance.

S. J. Res. 160. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States imposing a limitation with respect to taxation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHANDLER:

S. J. Res. 161. Joint resolution to authorize the presentation of a medal of honor to the Honorable Cordell Hull; to the Committee on the Library.

AMENDMENT OF FEDERAL CROP INSURANCE ACT—AMENDMENTS

Mr. LA FOLLETTE submitted amendments intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 4911) to amend the Federal Crop Insurance Act, which were referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and ordered to be printed.

FLOOD-CONTROL PROJECTS—AMENDMENTS

Mr. CORDON submitted two amendments intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 4485) authorizing the construction of certain public works on rivers and harbors for flood control, and for other purposes, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

THE PLAN FOR PEACE—ADDRESS BY SENATOR AUSTIN

Mr. WEEKS. Mr. President, on the evening of November 2, 1944, the distinguished senior Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN] discussed over the radio, in a most able and thoughtful manner, the problems of war and the peace to come. I ask unanimous consent that his address be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Senator Weeks, Governor Saltonstall, Governor Edge, and Governor Baldwin, in opening advocacy of the cause for which Wendell Willkie and his friends sacrificed much, I have confidence that the Congress will take the necessary parliamentary action to carry out the war and peace policies declared in both of the great political conventions and by both of the candidates for President.

The plan for peace is neither Republican nor Democratic. It is American. Both Democrats and Republicans have served in crystallizing policies expressed in the Dumbarton Oaks proposal. There are opponents of these policies in both parties. Vigorous advocates of extreme nationalism will be on both sides of the aisle in the Senate. The leadership of Governor Dewey in the campaign has been responded to favorably by many Republican nationalists. This causes me to believe that, notwithstanding their former attitude, they would support the establishment, not merely the planning, of the United Nations before hostilities cease.

After ratification of the treaty establishing the United Nations, the debatable questions involved in the further formation of our international policy could each be considered separately by the Congress. This method would simplify the issues and promote wiser decisions.

Both candidates for President advocate this method. I am convinced that the present sentiment of Republican Members of both Houses would support Governor Dewey's policy to vest adequate authority to vote in the council without returning to Congress each time for advice. Of course, the delegate could not make a declaration of war.

The power to direct peace forces to prevent or repel military aggression ought to be granted. Such risk as there is, that the delegate's acts might result in undeclared war, ought to be taken. The alternative is continuation of failure to prevent world war.

Experience throughout our history in the interposition of armed forces in other countries and on the high seas by the Chief Executive without a declaration of war has developed the basis for a provision in the statute defining governmental procedures to which the delegate could be required to conform. Such procedures would not cause the delays which would result if he were to ask Congress for advice upon each specific question. Certainty and promptness in applying sanctions is an objective which Governor Dewey advocates and which Republicans in Congress would provide for.

Peace forces would include a certain quota of the different branches of the armed forces which would be subject to direction by the council anywhere in the world. The earmarking of these elements of our common defense would be handled by Congress also separately from the basic treaty.

The Republican Party favors the definite contribution of whatever it takes to maintain international peace and security. The costs of this terrible war have convinced all thoughtful Americans that if urgent military measures must be taken by organized society to save our children's children from repetition of the experience of our children, this country will contribute its full share to the required armed forces.

I claim that the Republicans in Congress would vigorously support Governor Dewey as President in making available to the security council, on its call, and in accordance with a special agreement or agreements concluded among the members of the organization, armed forces, facilities, and assistance necessary for the purpose of maintaining international peace and security. They would make available to the organization national air force contingents for combined international enforcement action.

The campaign has emphasized military sanctions, but the Republican Party does not limit its earnest pursuit of security and peace to the development of military sanctions. The permanency of security and peace will depend more upon the other peace forces, such as developing conditions calculated to promote world-wide economic stability; fostering a world opinion to influence the nations to right conduct; furthering international law and use of international tribunals; removing or remedying basic causes of world disorder.

We believe that a peace that will prevail and have the elements of growth must be founded upon reciprocal interests and spiritual values more than upon military force. Ultimately the normal sanction for peace should be self-discipline. In the meantime, in the present stage of civilization, security and peace under the law, must have force on call. The historical method of unilateral interposition of force by individual states has proved to be futile and has been followed by world war.

The new method of cooperation through world organization challenges us. We accept this challenge and will establish guaranties of security and peace that will function upon the earliest sign of a disturbance anywhere in the world that might cause war.

It is a great pleasure to participate with other friends of Wendell Willkie in advocating the cause for which he gave so much.

THE ST. LAWRENCE: AMERICA'S NO. 1 PROJECT—ADDRESS BY SENATOR AIKEN

[Mr. SHIPSTEAD asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "The St. Lawrence—America's No. 1 Project," delivered by Senator AIKEN at a luncheon given at a joint meeting of the Duluth Chamber of Commerce and Rotary Club, at Duluth, Minn., October 26, 1944, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE MAKING OF ECONOMIC TREATIES—STATEMENT BY SENATOR KILGORE

[Mr. HATCH asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement by Senator KILGORE entitled "Who Shall Make Economic Treaties?" which appears in the Appendix.]

FLOOD-CONTROL PROJECTS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4485) authorizing the construction of certain public works on rivers and harbors for flood control, and for other purposes.

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I have received a telegram from R. T. Willette, manager, Kansas City, Kans., chamber of commerce, which sets forth the views of his group with regard to the pending measure, H. R. 4485. I ask unanimous consent to have the telegram printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

KANSAS CITY, KANS.,
November 24, 1944.

Hon. ARTHUR CAPPER,
United States Senator,
Washington, D. C.:

Board of directors of this chamber of commerce urges your support of H. R. 4485 which is in support of the Pick plan for conservation and flood control on the Missouri River and which as we understand it has now been amended and approved by the Commerce Committee of the Senate for passage. Would appreciate reply.

R. T. WILLEITE,
Manager, Kansas City, Kans., Chamber of Commerce.

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I have also received a telegram from R. W. McClure, a leading businessman of Kansas, and president of the Kansas Electric Power Co., urging favorable consideration of an amendment to paragraph 5 of House bill 4485, and I ask that the telegram be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LAWRENCE, KANS., *November 24, 1944.*

Hon. ARTHUR. W. CAPPER,
Senate Office Building:

We feel that amendment to H. R. 4485, omnibus flood-control bill which amendment revises paragraph 5 of that bill and which was approved by the Senate Commerce Committee and is being introduced by Senator BAILEY is much more fair and equitable than present provisions in paragraph 5 of bill and urgently request your support for such amendment.

R. W. MCCLURE,
President, The Kansas Electric Power Co.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will state the next amendment of the committee passed over.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 5, line 13, after the word "Department", it is proposed to insert *"Provided,* That no sale of such water shall adversely affect then existing lawful uses of such water."

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I should like to have the amendment stated again.

The amendment was again stated.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I inquire whose amendment this is?

The VICE PRESIDENT. It is a committee amendment.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, this committee amendment, together with other committee amendments and certain other provisions of the bill, have been the subject matter of considerable discussion and interviews between the proponents of the so-called O'Mahoney amendment and the committee and representatives of the committee. We have, I think, practically agreed upon a proper amendment which should apply to all matters in controversy, although there has not been a final agreement. I suggest that the amendment be passed over until we arrive at a final agreement.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the amendment will be passed over.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I could not hear what the Senator from Louisiana stated a few moments ago. I understood it was something about an agreement. Will he not restate what he said?

Mr. OVERTON. I stated that with respect to the particular amendment just read, and with regard to certain other amendments relating to the Missouri Valley Basin, an agreement had practically been entered into between the proponents of the O'Mahoney amendment and representatives of the committee. We have not yet quite perfected the arrangement, and I desire that this amendment and other amendments which relate to this subject matter be passed over for the present.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the distinguished Senator yield for a question?

Mr. OVERTON. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Does the agreement the Senator just mentioned in any way affect the committee amendment which appears in lines 13 and 14 on page 5?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I understand that amendment has just been adopted.

Mr. WHERRY. That is what I am inquiring about.

The VICE PRESIDENT. No; that amendment, at the request of the Senator from Louisiana, if there is no objection, will be passed over.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I misunderstood the situation, Mr. President.

The VICE PRESIDENT. If there is no objection, the clerk will state the next amendment.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I should like to have the distinguished Senator from Louisiana answer my question as to whether or not the agreement that was made in any way affects the committee amendment in lines 13 and 14, on page 5?

Mr. OVERTON. In my opinion, it does.

Mr. WHERRY. Does the agreement in any way override the committee amendment which provides that no sale of such water shall adversely affect the uses of such water that are now provided by the different States in the Missouri Valley?

Mr. OVERTON. The agreement has not yet been entered into, but there is a very good prospect of it being entered into, and I desire to have consideration of this amendment and certain other amendments passed over in order to determine whether or not there can be an agreement.

Mr. WHERRY. Then it is proposed to pass over this amendment at this time?

Mr. OVERTON. It is proposed to pass over the amendment at this time.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the Senator.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, before we leave this amendment I should like to inquire of the Senator in charge of the

bill whether or not the agreement about which he is talking, which is supposed to be in process of formulation, is the amendment proposed by the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] and other Senators, known as the O'Mahoney amendment.

Mr. OVERTON. With modifications and alterations which have not as yet been agreed upon.

Mr. MURRAY. Then the printed amendment purporting to be the O'Mahoney amendment will not be the amendment subject to the agreement?

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, we on this side of the Chamber cannot hear what is going on. I should like to hear the remarks which are being made, because I should like to know something about the amendment, if it is still under consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment has been passed over.

Mr. WHERRY. Very well. In any event, however, we on this side of the Chamber would like to hear the discussion.

Mr. OVERTON. The question propounded to me by the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] was whether or not the last version of the O'Mahoney amendment as now printed represented the agreement which had been entered into, and I told him that it would be the basis of the agreement, but there were to be modifications and alterations which have not as yet been agreed upon.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the Senator.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. OVERTON. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. The Senator refers to an agreement. An agreement between whom?

Mr. OVERTON. An agreement between the proponents of the amendment and myself and other representatives of the committee.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. OVERTON. I yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I may say for the benefit of all those who have cooperated in the preparation of the amendment which has been designated as the O'Mahoney-Millikin amendment, that the purpose has at all times been to protect the historic and traditional rights of the people of the West to use the waters rising in the West in the manner which has been recognized by law and by court decision for almost 100 years. It is also the purpose of those who have been sponsoring this amendment to make certain that there shall be the largest possible opportunity for the public authorities of States interested to review plans which may seriously affect conditions within the States. It has been the belief of the distinguished Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN] and myself and others who have been in repeated conference that this can be done. We believe that our trouble is largely one of writing language which clearly conveys the thoughts which are in the minds of the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee in charge of the bill and ourselves.

There have been numerous conferences. There have been some minor changes of language. Each change has served, in my opinion, to bring us closer to an understanding; but I want all the Senators who represent what are commonly called the arid-land States to know that there has been no agreement which sacrifices the rights of the people of those States, and, so far as I am concerned, there will be no such agreement, and it is my understanding that the distinguished senior Senator from Louisiana is not asking us to make any such sacrifices.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. OVERTON. Yes.

Mr. AIKEN. Is it also the desire of the Senator from Louisiana that the paragraph referring to the Connecticut River Basin go over? Because if an agreement is reached on the O'Mahoney amendment, it probably would automatically take care of the Connecticut River controversy.

Mr. OVERTON. The Senator is correct. We desire that to go over.

Mr. AIKEN. And the committee amendment which provides "That none of the dams herein authorized for the Connecticut River Basin shall be utilized for generation of hydroelectric power" will go over?

Mr. OVERTON. All of the paragraph will go over. All of the O'Mahoney amendment will go over, and the committee amendment in reference to the Connecticut River Basin will go over.

Mr. AIKEN. I thank the Senator.

Mr. OVERTON. That will be my request, that it go over.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. OVERTON. I yield.

Mr. MURRAY. I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Wyoming a question with reference to his proposed amendment. Am I to understand that this amendment, as it will be finally formulated, will iron out all the differences which have heretofore existed between the Bureau of Reclamation and the Army engineers with reference to the water rights of the upper States of the Missouri Valley?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I am hoping that it will.

Mr. MURRAY. The Senator could not give us any absolute assurance?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Of course, until there is an agreement I cannot give anyone an assurance as to what the contents of the agreement will be.

Mr. MURRAY. The Senator has found it very difficult in his efforts in the past to bring about this agreement to obtain any satisfactory response; is that not true?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. No; that is not true. As a matter of fact, I think we have had a very satisfactory response. The difficulty, as I said a moment ago, comes largely from the fact that Members of the Senate are so extremely busy it is not always possible to get all those who are interested in a particular problem together at the same time, and therefore it becomes necessary to go over in detail any changes of language with all those who may be concerned. I want to assure the Senator that the whole matter will be completely and fully explained upon the floor before there is any conclusion reached.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I have received a number of telegrams from my State urging me to support the O'Mahoney amendment in the form it appeared several days ago. The senders of the telegrams want me to support the amendment in that form. Now, do I understand that the changes which will take place in the amendment will make it necessary for me to contact the people in Montana who have telegraphed to me about this matter?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. No; I am sure that no changes will be made which will make it necessary for the Senator from Montana to make contact with those persons, because they are interested, as I am interested, and as the Senator from Montana is interested, in maintaining the rights of individuals to use the water that arises within these States. That is the objective of the amendment, it has been its objective from the very beginning, it will continue to be its objective, and I am happy to say to the Senator from Montana that I am most encouraged by the most amicable and understanding attitude of the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. MURRAY. If I may be permitted to say so, what struck me as rather strange was the fact that the telegrams which I have received from Montana had reference only to the O'Mahoney amendment. The senders gave no consideration whatever to the other features of the pending bill, among them the Bailey amendment, which struck me as being of very serious consequences to the Western States, because if that amendment were adopted——

Mr. O'MAHONEY. But it was not adopted. It was defeated, and the Senator from Montana and I were quite in agreement respecting it.

Mr. MURRAY. The point I am making is that the telegrams which I have received seem to devote attention to only one phase of the problem. It struck me that the most serious thing about this whole legislation is that it is designed—or it will be contended, at least, after it is passed, that it is designed—to obviate the necessity for a Missouri Valley Authority. If it had been adopted in its original form it would have hamstrung the entire West by turning over to the power interests control of the power which would be developed as a result of the program envisaged by the pending measure. It struck me as being very strange that those who have telegraphed me would overlook such a vitally important phase of the legislation and concentrate on one problem, namely that of the rights of the upper States. If we should have a Missouri Valley Authority there would be no question whatever about the upper States being protected. The President has so stated in his references to the Missouri Valley Authority and to the T. V. A. It strikes me that the entire bill should go over until we have an opportunity carefully to analyze it. The bill has been hastily thrown together, and contains many projects

which have not been properly engineered. I intend to discuss this matter later at some length, and point out the danger of passing this bill in its present form; but I wished to inquire at this time exactly what the status of the O'Mahoney amendments was. I understand that they have not as yet been agreed upon, and that those interested in the subject are working on them and expect to have them ready in the near future.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That is correct.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Clerk will state the next committee amendment passed over.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 5, after line 24, it is proposed to strike out:

SEC. 6. Hereafter, whenever in the opinion of the Secretary of War and the Chief of Engineers any dam and reservoir project operated under the direction of the Secretary of War can be consistently used for reclamation of arid lands, it shall be the duty of the Secretary of the Interior to prescribe regulations under existing reclamation law for the use of the storage available for such purpose, and the operation of any such project shall be in accordance with such regulations. Such rates, as the Secretary of the Interior may deem reasonable, shall be charged for the use of said storage; the moneys received to be deposited into the Treasury to the credit of miscellaneous receipts.

And insert:

SEC. 8. Hereafter, whenever the Secretary of War determines, upon recommendation by the Secretary of the Interior that any dam and reservoir project operated under the direction of the Secretary of War may be utilized for irrigation purposes, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to construct, operate, and maintain, under the provisions of the Federal reclamation laws (act of June 17, 1902, 32 Stat. 388, and acts amendatory thereof or supplementary thereto), such additional works in connection therewith as he may deem necessary for irrigation purposes. Such irrigation works may be undertaken only after a report and findings thereon have been made by the Secretary of the Interior as provided in said Federal reclamation laws and after subsequent specific authorization of the Congress by an authorization act; and, within the limits of the water users' repayment ability such report may be predicated on the allocation to irrigation of an appropriate portion of the cost of structures and facilities used for irrigation and other purposes. Dams and reservoirs operated under the direction of the Secretary of War may be utilized hereafter for irrigation purposes only in conformity with the provisions of this section, but the foregoing requirement shall not prejudice lawful uses now existing.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, this amendment will be the subject of the O'Mahoney agreement, and I ask that it be passed over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the amendment will be passed over.

The clerk will state the next committee amendment passed over.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 10, line 5, after the word "site", it is proposed to insert *"Provided further*, That none of the dams herein authorized for the Connecticut River Basin shall be used for the generation of hydroelectric power."

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, that amendment relates to the Connecticut River Basin, and should be passed over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the amendment will be passed over.

The clerk will state the next committee amendment passed over.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 21, after line 2, it is proposed to insert:

In the interest of developing the natural resources of the Missouri River Basin there is hereby created a commission to be known as the Missouri River Commission, which shall be in the War Department and shall function in accordance with existing law under the direction of the Secretary of War and the supervision of the Chief of Engineers in planning, constructing, operating, and maintaining improvements for navigation and flood control in the Missouri River Basin. The Missouri River Commission shall consist of the same number of members with the same qualifications and methods of appointment, replacement, and removal as prescribed in the act approved June 28, 1879, for the Mississippi River Commission and the compensation for the members of the Missouri River Commission shall be the compensation presently provided for members of the Mississippi River Commission. The President of the Missouri River Commission shall have the same qualification and shall be designated in the manner prescribed by existing law for the President of the Mississippi River Commission and he shall have the same functions and perquisites, including title, pay, allowances, and rank while actually serving as President of the Missouri River Commission, as well as the same subsequent retirement privileges under the same conditions as prescribed by law for the President of the Mississippi River Commission.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I should like to have the Senator in charge of the bill explain the effect of this amendment.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, this amendment was offered by the senior Senator from Missouri [Mr. CLARK], and agreed to by the committee. I regret that he is not present in the Chamber. I had requested him to make an explanation of the amendment when it arose. However, I believe I understand it. I think it speaks for itself.

The origin of this amendment lies in what is known as the Mississippi River Commission. The contention made by the Senator from Missouri during the course of the hearings before the committee was that not very much had been accomplished toward controlling the floods in the lower regions of the Mississippi River until a commission had been appointed, and that the Commission had done a very meritorious work. It was his thought that such a commission organized for the Missouri River Basin would do equally fine work and that it would be very helpful.

The Mississippi River Commission has no authority; nor would the Missouri River Commission contemplated by this amendment have any authority. They would be advisory boards or commissions. The Mississippi River Commission meets with the division engineer and considers plans, makes suggestions, recommends modifications, and even suggests radical changes. Such recommendations are considered by the division engineer, and if approved by him, or not approved by him, he makes his report to the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors, and the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors then passes on the project.

Of course, as I have repeatedly stated, no project originates anywhere except in Congress. Congress must authorize a preliminary investigation and survey in order to initiate any project. Then it is considered by the district engineer, and goes to the division engineer. When it gets to the division engineer and the Mississippi River Commission, the Mississippi River Commission is supposed to advise the division engineer as to whether the proposed project is good or bad, or requires any changes or alterations. So its function is purely advisory.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. OVERTON. I yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. In view of the fact that there has been introduced and is pending before the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, for study by that committee and by the Committee on Irrigation, a proposal to establish a Missouri Valley Authority, a proposal which will undoubtedly attract the attention of practically all Members of this body, does not the Senator feel that it would be advisable to pass over this amendment altogether and not adopt it, because of the apparent conflict between the proposal to set up a Missouri Valley Commission and the proposal to establish a Missouri Valley Authority?

Mr. OVERTON. If I may interrupt the Senator, I believe that the apparent conflict is more superficial than real, because a Missouri Valley Authority would have authority. A Missouri River Commission would have no authority. It would be merely an advisory board. I do not believe that it would make any great difference whether such an agency were organized or not, except from this standpoint: Such bodies, as a rule, are composed of very able engineers, as well as civilians who are deeply interested. On the Mississippi River Commission there are three engineers and three civilians, and they are very helpful in the advice they give; but that is entirely different from an Authority. There is no relation whatsoever.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. If the Senator will bear with me, my point is that there is no essential conflict between this bill, as I envisage it—and as I think the Senator from Louisiana envisages it—and a Missouri Valley Authority. The mere fact that we authorize the Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation to undertake post-war works of a character similar to those which have been constructed in the past by those agencies does not in any way whatsoever limit or change the power and jurisdiction of this Congress or of any future Congress to establish any type of new agency which it may deem desirable or in the public interest.

Mr. OVERTON. The Senator is absolutely correct in that respect. There is no difference between him and me in that regard.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. But when we have an amendment which provides for setting up a special kind of commission, even though it be only advisory, as the

Senator has said, but is a new commission, and do that at a time when a substantial number of our colleagues are urging the creation of a valley authority, do we not thereby invite a controversy which we can very well eliminate? My feeling, Mr. President, is that we shall proceed much more rapidly in the consideration of this bill by eliminating the amendment altogether, rather than by attempting to adopt it.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, far be it from me to take a position in opposition to what the committee has recommended be incorporated in the bill. I cannot very well do that.

I regret that the Senator from Missouri is not now in the Chamber. As soon as this matter came up, I asked one of the pages to notify him that the amendment was under consideration on the floor. I should like to have the Senator from Missouri present in the Chamber when it is considered. But I do not know where he is, and no one else seems to know.

Mr. President, I have made a full statement about the matter; I have stated the full reasons for it, and have stated what its effect would be.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. OVERTON. I yield for a question.

Mr. LANGER. In line 15, on page 21, provision is made for compensation for the members of the Missouri River Commission. Let me ask what the compensation is to be, as proposed at the present time?

Mr. OVERTON. Seven thousand five hundred dollars per annum.

Mr. LANGER. How many members are there to be on the Commission?

Mr. OVERTON. Six.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I should like to endorse what has been said by the distinguished senior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY]. I should like to eliminate the entire amendment from the bill, if that were possible, but at least I should like to have it passed over until there is a final determination of the Missouri Valley Authority amendment, if it is to be offered.

My reason for making that statement is that if the board is to be an advisory board—and I understand that the Mississippi River Commission operates as an advisory board—it would to some extent help create the policy. In my State we have not only those who believe in navigation and those who believe in power, but we also have in the State a large number of persons who believe in irrigation. If the Commission is appointed with a membership which is more favorable to navigation than to irrigation, or more favorable to irrigation than to navigation, we shall have conflicting interests in the State of Nebraska.

I feel that the bill, without provision in it for the Commission, will not be hurt any; and if there is to be a final authority at all, such as has already been suggested by the junior Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], it would seem to me that everything that is provided for in the provision for the establishment of a Missouri River Commission will be considered by that particular Authority. I, for one, hoping that all the interests of Nebraska may be represented, and that it will not be by the appointment of a commission composed of three civilians and three engineers, trust that the committee amendment will not be adopted or, at least, that it will be passed over until the Missouri Valley Authority amendment is brought up on the floor of the Senate and until we have a determination of it.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I wish to say that I am in full accord with what has been said by the able senior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] and the able junior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] with reference to this amendment. It seems to me that the only excuse for the proposed provision is the fact that heretofore the Bureau of Reclamation and the Board of Army Engineers for Rivers and Harbors have not been able to agree on a proper program for the regulation of the river as an entire matter. In view of the fact that an effort is now being made to get those two agencies to agree upon a unified method of handling problems on the river, it seems to me there will be no need for the Commission which is proposed to be set up. It would be only advisory, as stated by the distinguished senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON], and could have no effect.

But it is stated that the purpose and object of setting up the Commission are to offset the need for a Missouri Valley Authority. It may be that after the Commission is set up, attempts will be made to amend it and to expand its power and authority, and, instead of having it merely advisory, to give it administrative and executive powers in connection with the handling of the problems on the river.

It seems to me there is no need at all for the Missouri River Commission Amendment. It was introduced into the bill by the Senator from Missouri, who devotes his whole thought to the subject of flood control. He stated on the floor of the Senate on Friday that he was opposed to the Missouri Valley Authority and that he was in favor of the Missouri River Commission idea wholly from the standpoint of providing protection from floods for the lower States. I can see no benefit whatever from it. I join with the two Senators who have just preceded me in discussing this matter, in asking that this provision be entirely eliminated from the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HATCH in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment beginning on line 3, page 21.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, I believe it might be well to have before us the provisions of the act which are referred to in the amendment. They are rather brief, and I believe it will be helpful to have them appear in the RECORD.

The statute which was originally passed, and which has since been amended in ways which I do not think are material for purposes of the present discussion, is as follows:

Chapter 43

An act to provide for the appointment of a Mississippi River Commission for the improvement of said river from the Head of the Passes near its mouth to its headwaters

Be it enacted, etc., That a Commission is hereby created, to be called the Mississippi River Commission, to consist of seven members.

SEC. 2. The President of the United States shall, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, appoint seven commissioners, three of whom shall be selected from the Engineer Corps of the Army, one from the Coast and Geodetic Survey, and three from civil life, two of whom shall be civil engineers. And any vacancy which may occur in the Commission shall in like manner be filled by the President of the United States; and he shall designate one of the commissioners appointed from the Engineer Corps of the Army to be president of the Commission. The commissioners appointed from the Engineer Corps of the Army and the Coast and Geodetic Survey shall receive no other pay or compensation than is now allowed them by law, and the other three commissioners shall receive as pay and compensation for their services each the sum of $3,000 per annum; and the commissioners appointed under this act shall remain in office subject to removal by the President of the United States.

SEC. 3. It shall be the duty of said Commission to direct and complete such surveys of said river, between the Head of the Passes near its mouth to its headwaters as may now be in progress, and to make such additional surveys, examinations, and investigations, topographical, hydrographical, and hydrometrical, of said river and its tributaries, as may be deemed necessary by said Commission to carry out the objects of this act. And to enable said Commission to complete such surveys, examinations, and investigations, the Secretary of War shall, when requested by said Commission, detail from the Engineer Corps of the Army such officers and men as may be necessary, and shall place in the charge and for the use of said Commission such vessel or vessels and such machinery and instruments as may be under his control and may be deemed necessary. And the Secretary of the Treasury shall, when requested by said Commission, in like manner detail from the Coast and Geodetic Survey such officers and men as may be necessary, and shall place in the charge and for the use of said Commission such vessel or vessels and such machinery and instruments as may be under his control and may be deemed necessary. And the said Commission may, with the approval of the Secretary of War, employ such additional force and assistants, and provide, by purchase or otherwise, such vessels or boats and such instruments and means as may be deemed necessary.

SEC. 4. It shall be the duty of said Commission to take into consideration and mature such plan or plans and estimates as will correct, permanently locate, and deepen the channel and protect the banks of the Mississippi River; improve and give safety and ease to the navigation thereof; prevent destructive floods; promote and facilitate commerce, trade, and the Postal Service; and when so prepared and matured, to submit to the Secretary of War a full and detailed report of their proceedings and actions, and of such plans, with estimates of the cost thereof, for the purposes aforesaid, to be by him transmitted to Congress: *Provided*, That the Commission shall report in full upon the practicability, feasibility, and probable cost of the various plans known as the jetty system, the levee system, and the outlet system, as well as upon such others as they deem necessary.

SEC. 5. The said Commission may, prior to the completion of all the surveys and examinations contemplated by this act, prepare, and submit to the Secretary of War plans, specifications, and estimates of costs for such immediate work as, in the judgment of said Commission, may constitute a part of the general system of works herein contemplated, to be by him transmitted to Congress.

SEC. 6. The Secretary of War may detail from the Engineer Corps of the Army of the United States an officer to act as secretary of said Commission.

SEC. 7. The Secretary of War is hereby authorized to expend the sum of $175,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, for the payment of the salaries herein provided for, and of the necessary expenses incurred in the completion of such surveys as may now be in progress, and of such additional surveys, examinations, and investigations as may be deemed necessary, reporting the plans and estimates, and the plans, specifications, and estimates contemplated by this act, as herein provided for; and said sum is hereby appropriated for said purposes out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated.

Approved June 28, 1879.

With the exact terms of the statute before us I believe it will be clear that in the main the functions of the Commission have already been performed through the reconciliation of the plan of the Bureau of Reclamation and of the engineers on the Missouri River. I therefore see no point in the proposed amendment, and if we are to have something of that kind it should be broadened to give representation to the Bureau of Reclamation and to the States which are involved. I do not believe the statute would serve any useful purpose whatsoever in connection with this particular bill.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MILLIKIN. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. Referring again to the Missouri River Commission, I should like to have the opinion of the Senator from Colorado as to why a Commission composed of six members should receive salaries of $7,500 a year each, when they would have no work to perform, would have no responsibilities, and would merely serve in an advisory capacity?

Mr. MILLIKIN. I see no purpose in the Commission, and therefore no purpose in any salary which the members of the Commission would be paid. I believe that the services which they would perform have already been performed by others.

Mr. LANGER. We have already paid for the services and have paid the engineering bill.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Exactly.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, some discussion was had with reference to passing the amendment over. Has the amendment been passed over?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. No request has been made to pass over the amendment.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, if I did not do so, I ask unanimous consent to have the entire statute printed in the RECORD in connection with my remarks.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that all laws amendatory to the statute be included.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I am agreeable to the request of the Senator from Louisiana.

There being no objection, the laws amendatory to the statute were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXTRACT FROM 31 STATUTES AT LARGE 792–793

An act amending the act providing for the appointment of a Mississippi River Commission, and so forth, approved June 28, 1879

Be it enacted, etc., That an act entitled "An act to provide for the appointment of a Mississippi River Commission, for the improvement of said river from the head of the passes near its mouth to its headwaters," approved June 28, 1879, be amended by adding thereto the following section:

"SEC. 8. That the headquarters and general offices of said Commission shall be located at some city or town on the Mississippi River, to be designated by the Secretary of War, and the meetings of the Commission except such as are held on Government boats during the time of the semiannual inspection trips of the Commission shall be held at said headquarters and general offices, the times of said meetings to be fixed by the president of the Commission, who shall cause due notice of such meetings to be given members of the Commission and the public."

Approved, February 18, 1901.

EXTRACT FROM RIVER AND HARBOR ACT OF JULY 25, 1912 (37 STAT. 818)

The traveling expenses of the civilian members of the Mississippi River Commission, and of the assistant engineer of the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors, when on duty, shall be computed and paid in the same way as the traveling expenses of the Army members of said Commission and of said Board.

EXTRACT FROM MISSISSIPPI RIVER FLOOD CONTROL ACT OF MAY 15, 1928 (45 STAT. 537)

SEC. 8. The project herein authorized shall be prosecuted by the Mississippi River Commission under the direction of the Secretary of War and supervision of the Chief of Engineers and subject to the provisions of this act. It shall perform such functions and through such agencies as they shall designate after consultation and discussion with the president of the Commission. For all other purposes the existing laws governing the constitution and activities of the Commission shall remain unchanged. The Commission shall make inspection trips of such frequency and duration as will enable it to acquire first-hand information as to conditions and problems germane to the matter of flood control within the area of its jurisdiction; and on such trips of inspection ample opportunity for hearings and suggestions shall be afforded persons affected by or interested in such problems. The president of the Commission shall be the executive officer thereof and shall have the qualifications now prescribed by law for the Assistant Chief of Engineers, shall have the title brigadier general, Corps of Engineers, and shall have the rank, pay, and allowances of a brigadier general while actually assigned to such duty: *Provided*, That the present incumbent of the office may be appointed a brigadier general of the Army, retired, and shall be eligible for the position of president of the Commission if recalled to active service by the President under the provisions of existing law.

The salary of the president of the Mississippi River Commission shall hereafter be $10,000 per annum, and the salary of the other members of the Commission shall hereafter be $7,500 per annum. The official salary of any officer of the United States Army or other branch of the Government appointed or employed under this act shall be deducted from the amount of salary or compensation provided by, or which shall be fixed under, the terms of this act.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, the amendment providing for the creation of the Missouri River Commission was originally submitted by me in the form of a separate bill. The amendment was suggested to me by the War Department with which I had been working in connection with matters concerning flood control.

The subject of flood control is, of course, most vitally important to the people at the lower end of the Missouri Valley. The suggestion appeared to be so logical, so natural, and so imperative that I was glad to introduce a bill containing a provision for the Missouri River Commission. I may also state that the suggestion was originally made to me by one of the greatest engineers who ever served in the Engineer Corps of the United States Army, the members of which are in my opinion the greatest flood-control engineers in the United States. I refer to General Pick, who is now the builder of the famous Lido Road from India to Burma. The suggestion was to have a body modeled in all respects upon the Mississippi River Commission, which has been such a notable and monumental success in the relief of the lower Mississippi River Valley from the threat of disastrous floods. Under the leadership of General Ferguson the Mississippi River Commission has been so successful in the lower Mississippi Valley that in all the disastrous floods which have taken place in the last few years on the Missouri, on the Ohio, and on the upper Mississippi, the main stem of the Mississippi from Vicksburg to the mouth of the river has been free from the threat of disasters such as have befallen other portions of the valley.

Mr. President, it may be that there should be some change brought about in the composition of the proposed Missouri River Commission, perhaps by leaving out the member who would represent the Coast and Geodetic Survey and including a representative from the Reclamation Service. But as to the principle involved, it seems to me there can be no question that the measure would be calculated to alleviate to a very large extent the tragedy which year after year befalls the lower Missouri Valley, and the Mississippi Valley below the mouth of the Missouri.

Mr. President, during the year before last in the lower Missouri, from the mouth of the Osage to the mouth of the Missouri, we had not only one but three disastrous floods. I have seen land with which I had been familiar since I was a boy, and which had never in 60 years of cultivation produced less than 110

bushels of corn to the acre, lying under 5 or 6 feet of white sand cast up by the Missouri River. The cultivation of the land will probably be retarded for a generation, and the restoration of the land to its normal full fertility will probably never be possible. In the same year in St. Charles County, Mo., I saw land which was worth $275 or $300 an acre, and as fertile as any land to be found in the Valley of the Nile, absolutely destroyed. This was 6 weeks after the flood. A river 25 feet deep and 30 feet wide was running a current right through the middle of the farms which I have in mind. There was not a place as wide as 8 feet without a destructive gully running through it.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I yield.

Mr. MURRAY. Is it not true that the conditions which the Senator from Missouri is now discussing are due to the fact that there has been no unified method of handling problems on the river? Is it not also true that the Senator now contemplates, as a result of this program, the construction of huge works on the upper stretches of the tributaries of the river, where large reservoirs and dams will be erected which will do more to help the lower States in the control of floods than any levees or works such as the Mississippi River Commission has been constructing for the last 20 years?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, it would depend entirely on circumstances. The bill which I introduced would contemplate the construction of reservoirs on the upper reaches of the river. The contemplated plan would include some large reservoirs in my own State. In my judgment, it would also be necessary to have levees constructed on the lower reaches of the river. More important than anything else, it seems to me, would be to make every effort—and it was included as a separate title in my bill—to keep a great deal of the water on the land where it falls. In other words, it seems to me that we need all three of those benefits or methods. First, we need to retain as much as possible of the water on the land where it falls, and prevent it from draining into the tributaries. It is necessary, in my opinion, to have large reservoirs, or catch basins—whatever we may please to call them—on the upper and on the lower reaches not only of the Mississippi but the Missouri as well, and it is necessary to have levees.

I do not think the levee system has proved entirely successful as a separate proposition, although it undoubtedly saved the inundation of millions of acres of very rich land from time to time. Something more than a levee system is necessary. The Mississippi River Commission have done a superb work in their testing basin at Vicksburg. They worked out the matter of currents and floods in the Mississippi River, the elimination of a great many of the tortuous curves that used to be in the river, and the finding of other outlets. There have been tremendous floods in the last few years on the upper Mississippi and the Missouri, sometimes as many as three of them a year, I might say to the Senator from Montana that not all that water came from Montana, Wyoming, or any other places in the upper reaches of the Missouri River; a part came as the result of heavy rainfalls in Kansas and Missouri. But in all those tremendous floods the most disastrous in all history, the lower Mississippi, the section from Vicksburg to the mouth, which was formerly and from time immemorial the danger spot, the most vital and the most vulnerable of any place in the whole Mississippi Valley, has been free from those disasters. I think that the work of the Mississippi River Commission has been a tremendous factor in effectuating that result. It has been brought about under their leadership.

It does not seem to me that whether there shall be a Missouri River Commission, based on the same principles as the Mississippi River Commission, has anything whatever to do with the question whether ultimately Congress might decide to set up a Missouri Valley Authority, to which, so far as I am concerned, I will say frankly, according to my present lights, I am opposed. I think the Missouri Valley is too vast a section of the United States for the principle of the Tennessee Valley Authority to be applicable, certainly according to the lights we have at the present time.

So the establishment of the Missouri River Commission designed to handle the desperate emergency we have been facing year after year and sometimes three times in one year, does not seem to me to have anything whatever to do with the question of whether Congress ultimately desires to set up some other and more comprehensive scheme.

What I am pleading for is relief for the people who are being flooded away from their land. We are suffering loss of life, we are suffering tremendous loss of property. At a time when the effort is being made to have the United States feed the world we are losing incalculable sums by these constantly recurring floods.

I have another amendment which I intend to offer, as I suggested the other day. I think it is also very important as affecting the question of controlling and handling floods. Someone has to be put in charge of that work, and I propose the Corps of Engineers simply because I think they are better qualified than anyone else. I propose that the same authority shall control and regulate the dams of this country, both privately and publicly owned, for the purpose of preventing the occurrence of floods on the lower reaches of these rivers.

We had an example—I do not know whether the Senator happened to be in the Chamber the other day when I made reference to it—in the case of the Osage River in Missouri. The Bagnell Dam, owned and operated by a public utility which was privately owned, created a lake in the Ozarks. The lake was allowed to get full of water. Then heavy rains ensued, and they finally opened the flood gates and permitted a 12-foot head of water to go down the Osage River and into the Missouri and thence into the Mississippi, wreaking terrific damage as far down the Mississippi River as Cairo. At about the same time precisely the same thing happened in the case of the Pensacola Dam in Oklahoma, which was a publicly owned dam and under public operation. I say there ought to be some authority that can compel the operation of all such dams in such a way as not to create a serious menace to the people who live along any stream.

Coming back to the question of the Missouri River Commission, I want to repeat that there seems to me to be absolutely no reason to assume that by reason of the creation of the Missouri River Commission, based on precisely the same principles as the Mississippi River Commission, which has been so successful, any attempt is being made to make any commitments as to future policy of Congress against a more comprehensive scheme such as the Missouri Valley Authority. All we are seeking to do is to afford relief to the people of the Missouri Valley from the tragic and desperate situation which now confronts them. It is, it seems to me, an emergency matter.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I appreciate the very able argument the Senator from Missouri has just made, and I can understand his apprehensions with reference to flood problems in his section of the Missouri River. But it seems to me, unless it is absolutely necessary that we should have this Commission set up, that we should not undertake to set it up at this time. It would be a new Commission; it would add a new organization to the Government set-up.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, the Senator and I both have voted for so many new commissions and boards and bureaus and organizations since we have been Members of the Senate that in a matter which I consider to be a desperate emergency I do not think we should hesitate about the proposal. I have usually been reluctant to vote for the creation of new commissions, but in view of the fact that there is an established model for the Commission now proposed, it seems to me that in that situation the people affected are entitled to some relief.

We have a situation, I will say to the Senator, which would make it very difficult for a Missouri Valley Authority to operate effectively. At one place the Missouri River cuts through the Mississippi a distance of some 15 miles above the mouth of the Missouri. If we do not have a Missouri Valley Commission, who will have jurisdiction over the water that is coming down from Missouri and going across into the Mississippi above the mouth of the Missouri?

Mr. MURRAY. Is it not true that the need for such a Commission as the Senator is talking about will largely be obviated as a result of the understanding that is sought to be brought about between the various interests on the river and the Bureau of Reclamation and the Army engineers?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. So far as that is concerned, I am very happy that that agreement is being worked out. I think that is something which ought to have been done a long time ago. It is only common sense to have that done. But I repeat what I said a moment ago that we who are living on the lower reaches of the Missouri River are under

the gun. We are being flooded, we are having our lives endangered and our property destroyed, and, no matter what agreement may be made by the Bureau of Reclamation and the Corps of Army Engineers as to these great reservoirs, which I am sure will be helpful in preventing floods, we need a commission that could accomplish in some degree what the Mississippi River Commission has worked out for the lower Mississippi. Let me say that that was not done particularly by building reservoirs; it was done by a study of the problems, the creation of new outlets, eliminating tortuous turns in the Mississippi River, and, heaven knows, there is no stream on the face of the earth that has more tortuous turns to be brought under control than the lower reaches of the Missouri River.

It does seem to me that, whatever may be the ultimate policy of the Government as to a Missouri Valley Authority, the people in the lower end of the Missouri Valley are entitled to such relief as I believe would be afforded by the creation of the Missouri River Commission and they are entitled to it now. I do not wish to belabor the subject.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, it seems to me that in the absence of an effort to bring about a greater degree of unity and cooperation between the various Federal agencies which are working on this river problem, there can be no need now for this purely advisory commission. All they could do would be to advise. Would it not be true that, as a result of the engineers representing the various agencies working on the river, those engineers would be able to study the problem?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. It may be true that this would be an advisory commission, but such advice has been of incalculable value in the case of the Mississippi River. Certainly no one could be more zealously in favor of the principle of coordination of various Government agencies than I am and have always been; but, as I have said, it is like the man who house was burning and he was told, "Well, we will go down and have a consultation as to the best methods of fire protection and the best insulation, and we will let you know after your house has burned down." We are "under the gun," we are being flooded, we are losing property, we are losing lives, and therefore it seems to me that whatever may be the ultimate policy of the Government, and whatever degree of coordination may ultimately be worked out, the creation of the Missouri River Commission would be a very beneficial step.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TUNNELL in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the committee on page 21, beginning in line 3.

The amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next amendment passed over.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 45, after line 23, it is proposed to add a new section, as follows:

SEC. 15. (a) The Chief of Engineers of the United States Army is authorized and directed to make examinations of any privately owned or operated dam constructed across navigable waters of the United States, or across tributaries thereof.

(b) Whenever it shall appear, after reasonable notice and opportunity for hearing to the person or corporation owning or controlling any such dam, that such dam is being operated or maintained in such a manner as to jeopardize the safety of persons or property either above or below such dam, the Chief of Engineers shall enter orders requiring such changes in the operation or maintenance of such dam as he deems appropriate and necessary, and prescribing a reasonable time within which such changes shall be made. If, at the end of such reasonable time, the changes in operation or maintenance ordered by the Chief of Engineers have not been made, the Chief of Engineers shall notify the United States district attorney for the district in which such dam or any part thereof is situated, who shall forthwith cause criminal proceedings to be instituted against the person, or corporation, owning or controlling such dam.

(c) Any person or corporation willfully failing or refusing to comply with an order of the Chief of Engineers issued pursuant to this section shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and, upon conviction thereof, shall be punished by a fine not exceeding $5,000. Every month during which such willful failure or refusal continues shall be deemed to be a separate offense and shall subject such person or corporation to the penalties herein prescribed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the amendment?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, I was just undertaking to explain the amendment in my colloquy a few minutes ago with the Senator from Montana. The idea of the amendment came from two incidents which I observed during the floods of 2 years ago. One was in connection with the Grand River Dam, in Oklahoma, the other was in connection with the Osage River Dam, in Missouri, one publicly operated, the other privately operated, but both of them so misoperated that they caused very disastrous floods, indeed, some of the most disastrous floods in history.

The purpose of the amendment is merely to provide some police power which in a proper case can advise the operators of dams, whether public or private, when they are endangering life and property owners either above or below the danger point, and it does not make any difference which, from that standpoint. The purpose is to bring about a situation that it will not be possible for private operators of a dam such as that on the Osage River to open up their flood gates and let a 12-foot head of water go down the Osage River, thence into the Missouri, thence into the Mississippi, causing untold millions of dollars of damage, and destroying some natural resources which can probably never be replaced.

The theory of the amendment is merely to have some authority, it does not make a great deal of difference which authority is set up, so far as that is concerned, that can act for the protection of the property owners above or below where dams are located. I suggest the Corps of Engineers, because I regard them as the ablest authorities in the country in connection with flood control.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, I should like to invite attention to two preliminary facts: First, that we already have such legislation as to the navigable streams of the country; second, that this legislation is broad enough to cover the nonnavigable streams of the Nation.

When we come to consideration of the second fact, the proposed amendment crosses, in a very adverse way, the entire conception of the arid and semiarid States as to the control of the waters on nonnavigable streams. For example, Colorado, Idaho, New Mexico, Wyoming, and South Dakota have definite provisions in their constitutions, accepted by the Congress of the United States by their admission into the Union. I shall read the pertinent paragraph of the Colorado Constitution, for, roughly, it is the same in the others I have mentioned.

I quote from article XVI of the Colorado Constitution:

The water of every natural stream, not heretofore appropriated, within the State of Colorado, is hereby declared to be the property of the public, and the same is dedicated to the use of the people of the State, subject to appropriation as hereinafter provided.

I venture to say there is not one of the arid or semiarid States which does not have control statutes enabling the appropriate State officials to regulate and control the improper use of dams, or the improper construction of dams on nonnavigable streams.

For example, I should like to read into the RECORD some of the provisions which prevail in Colorado, and which we in Colorado believe afford the best protection that can be gotten, under the circumstances, for our citizens. I believe also that, somewhat similar statutes prevail in the rest of the 17 arid and semiarid States.

I read from the 1935 Colorado Statutes Annotated, volume 3, chapter 90, section 83 to section 92, inclusive:

CONTROL OF RESERVOIRS AND DAMS IN COLORADO FROM 1935 COLORADO STATUTES ANNOTATED, VOLUME 3, CHAPTER 90, SECTIONS 83–92, INCLUSIVE

SEC. 83. Reservoir and dam over certain size not to be built without filing plans with State engineer and obtaining his approval: No reservoir of a capacity of more than 1,000 acre-feet or having a dam or embankment in excess of 10 feet in vertical height, or having a surface area at high-water line in excess of 20 acres shall hereafter be constructed in this State except that the plans and specifications for the same shall have first been approved by the State engineer and filed in his office; and the State engineer shall act as consulting engineer during the construction thereof, and shall have authority to require the material used and the work of construction to be done to his satisfaction; and no work shall be deemed complete under the provisions of this law until the State engineer shall furnish to the owners of such structures a written statement of the work of construction and the full completion thereof, together with his acceptance of the same, which statement shall specify the dimensions of such dam and capacity of such reservoir or reservoirs (L. 1899, p. 314, sec. 1; R. S. 1908, sec. 3205; C. L., sec. 1685; L. 1925, p. 330, sec. 1).

SEC. 84. Cost of inspection and supervision paid by owner: The owner or owners of such reservoirs shall pay to said State engineer his actual expenses incurred in making personal inspection, and shall pay to any deputy

appointed by him to attend to such supervision not to exceed $10 per day and actual expenses for each and every day necessarily employed for such purposes (L. 1899, p. 314, sec. 2; R. S. 1908, sec. 3206; C. L., sec. 1686; L. 1925, p. 331, sec. 1).

SEC. 85. Engineer to determine amount of water to be stored: The State engineer shall annually determine the amount of water which it is safe to impound in the several reservoirs within this State and it shall be unlawful for the owners of any reservoir to store in said reservoir water in excess of the amount so determined by the State engineer to be safe (L. 1899, p. 315, sec. 3; R. S. 1908, sec. 3207; C. L., sec. 1687).

SEC. 86. Water commissioner to withdraw excess water—Close inlets: In the event of the owners of any such reservoir impounding water therein to a depth greater than that determined by the State engineer to be safe, it shall be the duty of the water commissioner of the district where such reservoir shall be located to forthwith proceed to withdraw from said reservoir so much of the water so impounded therein as shall be in excess of the amount so determined by the State engineer to be safe, and shall close the inlets to the same so as to prevent said reservoir from being refilled to an amount beyond what said State engineer shall have designated as being safe. In the event of the owners of said reservoir, or any other person or persons, interfering with the water commissioner in the discharge of said duty, the said water commissioner shall call to his aid such persons as he deems necessary, and employ such force as the circumstances demand to enable him to comply with the requirements of this section (L. 1899, p. 315, sec. 4; R. S. 1908, sec. 3208; C. L., sec. 1688).

SEC. 87. Complaint that reservoir is unsafe—Duty of engineer: Upon complaint being made to the State engineer by three or more persons residing or having property in such a location that their homes or property would be in danger of destruction or damage in the event of a flood occurring on account of the breaking of the embankment of any reservoir within the State, that said reservoir is in an unsafe condition, or that it is being filled with water to such an extent as to render it unsafe, it shall be the duty of the State engineer to forthwith examine said reservoir and determine the amount of water it is safe to impound therein. If upon such examination, the State engineer shall find that said reservoir is unsafe, or is being filled with water to such an extent as to render it unsafe, it shall be his duty to immediately cause said water to be drawn off from said reservoir, to such an extent as will, in his judgment, render the same safe. If water is then flowing into said reservoir, he shall cause the same to be discontinued (L. 1899, p. 315, sec. 5; R. S. 1908, sec. 3209; C. L., sec. 1689).

SEC. 88. Engineer may use force—Violation of engineer's order: The State engineer is hereby authorized and empowered to use such force as is necessary to perform the duties required of him in the preceding section, and to have and exercise all of the powers conferred upon the water commissioner by section 86 of this chapter. If, after any of such reservoirs shall have been examined by said State engineer, the owners thereof, or any other person or persons, shall fill or attempt to fill them, or either of them, to a point in excess of the amount the State engineer shall have determined to be safe, then it shall be the duty of the water commissioner of the district wherein such reservoir is located to proceed as is directed by section 86 of this chapter (L. 1899, p. 316, sec. 6; R. S. 1908, sec. 3210; C. L., sec. 1690).

SEC. 89. Expense of examination—By whom paid: The persons calling upon the State engineer to perform the duty required of him by section 87 of this chapter shall pay him mileage in advance at the rate of 10 cents per mile for each mile actually and necessarily traveled in going to and from said reservoir, and should the State engineer find upon examination that such reservoir is in an unsafe condition, the owners thereof shall be liable for all expenses incurred in such examination (L. 1899, p. 316, sec. 7; R. S. 1908, sec. 3211; C. L., sec. 1691).

SEC. 90. Appeal from decision of engineer: In the event of either party being dissatisfied with the decision of the State engineer, they may taken an appeal to the county or district court of the county wherein said reservoir is located, and said court shall hear and determine the matter summarily at the earliest practical time without written pleadings or the aid of a jury; subject to the right of either party to take an appeal or writ of error as in other civil cases; provided, that the judgment of the State engineer shall control until final determination of the cause (L. 1899, p. 316, sec. 8; R. S. 1908, sec. 3212; C. L., sec. 1692).

SEC. 91. Owners liable for damages in case of breakage of reservoir: None of the provisions of sections 83 to 92 of this chapter shall be construed as relieving the owners of any such reservoir from the payment of such damages as may be caused by the breaking of the embankments thereof, but in the event of any such reservoir overflowing, or the embankments, dams, or outlets breaking or washing out, the owners thereof shall be liable for all damage occasioned thereby (L. 1899, p. 316, sec. 9; R. S. 1908, sec. 3213; C. L., sec. 1693).

SEC. 92. Violation of sections—Penalty—Disposition of fines: Any reservoir company failing or refusing, after 10 days' notice in writing having been given, to obey the directions of the State engineer as to the construction or filling of any reservoir as herein provided, shall be subject to a fine of not less than $50, for each offense, and each day's continuance after time of notice has expired shall be considered a separate offense; such fines to be recovered by civil action in the name of the people, by the district attorney, upon the complaint of the State engineer, and in the county where the injury complained of occurred. The proceeds of all fines, after payment of costs and charges of proceedings, shall be paid into the county treasury for the use of the general fund of the county (L. 1899, p. 317, sec. 10; R. S. 1908, sec. 3214; C. L., sec. 1694).

As I said before, Mr. President, I believe that substantially similar legislation prevails in the other arid and semiarid States. Thus it will be seen that as to the unnavigable streams of the Nation, where under our State constitutions and under the laws of Congress and under the decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States we have control over the waters for local use, we have taken those precautions which are necessary to protect the people from flood damage.

Mr. BUSHFIELD and Mr. WHITE addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator yield, and if so to whom?

Mr. MILLIKIN. I yield first to the distinguished junior Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. I know the distinguished Senator has given this matter extensive study and thought, but I should like to ask him about the provisions of section 15, the first paragraph of which reads:

> The Chief of Engineers of the United States Army is authorized and directed to make examinations of any privately owned or operated dam constructed across navigable waters of the United States, or across tributaries thereof.

Mr. President, it seems to me the only construction that can be given to that language is that it would give the Chief of Engineers complete domination over all the waters in any of the individual States, because many of the tributaries are not navigable.

Mr. MILLIKIN. In my judgment, Mr. President, that is the entire purport of the proposed amendment, for, as I said at the beginning of my remarks, we already have a statute which gives the Chief of Engineers full power over navigable streams.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, will the Senator now yield to me?

Mr. MILLIKIN. Yes.

Mr. WHITE. Is it not true that under the language of subparagraph (a) as it stands, the Federal authorities are given the right to enter upon private lands, upon a privately constructed dam, and make investigations even though there is not the slightest showing of any danger arising from the structure itself, even though there is not even a shadow of suspicion that there is any defect in the structure or any danger to anyone? This language is sufficiently broad, nevertheless, to permit the Federal authorities to go upon a navigable stream or on a nonnavigable stream within the Senator's State or any other State, and make investigation.

Mr. MILLIKIN. That, Mr. President, is entirely correct, and it is correct despite the fact, which I believe I have developed by reading from a typical State statute for the control of dams and reservoirs, that we have taken the utmost precaution to render our streams safe.

In that connection let me add that we are prone to overemphasize the importance of our reclamation projects in their relation to the whole subject of controlled waters in the arid and semiarid parts of the country. The reclamation projects now in being only involve about 10 percent of all the reclamation that is being done in the western country. I am speaking in terms of acreage. In other words, roughly 89 or 90 percent of all the lands being brought under water by irrigation is by private individuals and private associations which have their own dams, and I venture to say that over the country at large there are literally thousands of dams, small and large, privately owned, on nonnavigable streams, having no possibility of damage to anyone below them, which automatically would come under the provisions of this measure, would require inspection of them, require enormous additions to the investigative staff of the Chief of Engineers, and would pester and harass and subject to criminal prosecution any man who declines to make the alteration requested or who declines to follow the order promulgated.

One of the basic defects of the measure is that even if a man were placed in jail there would be no assurance, under the terms of the measure, that the danger objected to would be remedied. I think the proposed amendment is full of many defects, especially in the matter of notice and hearing, and the absence of those provisions which, even if the policy were good, would not bring about the relief

desired, to wit, the correction of a condition rather than putting a citizen in jail.

The Chief Engineer, I add, must act automatically under the terms of this provision. If the citizen refused to do what the Chief of Engineers says he shall do, he is automatically subjected to a criminal proceeding, he can be fined and sent to jail, and the merits of the matter—this is an astonishing situation—the merits of the matter cannot be tried under the language of the proposed amendment. If the individual fails to obey what might be a completely arbitrary order, he goes to jail if the terms of this amendment are complied with.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MILLIKIN. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator has answered what I had in mind to ask, as to what would happen in the event of a conviction without a hearing. There is no provision in the section for a court review or for an appeal.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Nothing at all. The individual is automatically convicted, if the jury and the judge carry out the mandate provided in the amendment, if he fails to respond to the command of the engineers, whether the command is just or unjust. And the thing to be remedied, to save people from the damage of flood, is not touched by this section. A man who feels indignant over an unjust charge might be willing to go to jail, and the matter of the objection to his dam or the control of his water, as urged by the engineers, would not be touched.

Let me repeat that to my mind, and I believe to the minds of the rest of us from the arid and semiarid States, the theory of the bill represents an unwarranted encroachment on the control of water of nonnavigable streams which has been so often confirmed in the States by Supreme Court decisions, by the statutes of Congress, and by the constitutions of the States which I have mentioned and which were accepted by Congress.

I wish to read a few excerpts from the case of *California Oregon Power Co.* v. *Beaver Portland Cement Co. et al.* (295 U. S. 142), decided by unanimous opinion of the Supreme Court of the United States in 1935.

The question there was whether riparian rights on waters in the State of Oregon should prevail over the doctrine of prior appropriation and beneficial user. The cement company was blasting the stream to open up a way for an irrigation diversion, and to get building block for some kind of structure which it intended to erect. The power company brought an injunction proceeding on the ground that this was an interference with its riparian rights.

It will be recalled that under the common law the riparian owner is entitled to the undiminished, unpolluted flow of the stream, whereas under the doctrine which prevails in the arid and semiarid West, with the exception of some mixed systems in a few of the States, the man who first appropriates the water and puts it to a beneficial use is entitled to that water, whether or not he be on the stream and regardless of how far away from the stream he may be. The Supreme Court of the United States therefore felt called upon to discuss and consider the nature of our western water rights. I shall read a few excerpts from the opinion. I read first from pages 153 and 154 of the opinion:

> The question with which we are here primarily concerned is whether—in the light of pertinent history, of the conditions which existed in the arid and semiarid land States, of the practice and attitude of the Federal Government, and of the congressional legislation prior to 1885—the homestead patent in questfon carried with it as part of the granted estate the common-law rights which attach to riparian proprietorship.

Later the Supreme Court said in its opinion, on pages 155 and 158:

> The effect of these acts—

The Supreme Court was referring to an act of Congress of 1866 and an amendatory act of 1870.

> The effects of these acts are not limited to rights acquired before 1866. They reach into the future as well, and approve and confirm the policy of appropriation for a beneficial use, as recognized by local rules and customs, and the legislation and judicial decisions of the arid-land States, as the test and measure of private rights in and to the nonnavigable waters on the public domain (citing State cases).
>
> If the acts of 1866 and 1870 did not constitute an entire abandonment of the common-law rule of running waters insofar as the public lands and subsequent grantees thereof were concerned, they foreshadowed the more positive declarations of the Desert Land Act of 1877, which it is contended did bring about that result. That act allows the entry and reclamation of desert lands within the States of California, Oregon, and Nevada (to which Colorado was later added), and the then territories of Washington, Idaho, Montana, Utah, Wyoming, Arizona, New Mexico, and Dakota, with a proviso to the effect that the right to use of waters by the claimant shall depend upon bona fide prior appropriation, not to exceed the amount of waters actually appropriated and necessarily used for the purpose of irrigation and reclamation. Then follows the clause of the proviso with which we are here concerned:
>
> "All surplus water over and above such actual appropriation and use, together with the water of all lakes, rivers, and other sources of water supply upon the public lands and not navigable, shall remain and be held free for the appropriation and use of the public for irrigation, mining, and manufacturing purposes subject to existing rights" (ch. 107, 19 Stat. 377).
>
> For the light which it will reflect upon the meaning and scope of that provision and its bearing upon the present question, it is well to pause at this point to consider the then-existing situation with respect to land and water rights in the States and Territories named. These States and Territories comprised the western third of the United States—a vast empire in extent, but still sparsely settled. From a line east of the Rocky Mountains almost to the Pacific Ocean and from the Canadian border to the boundary of Mexico—an area greater than that of the Original Thirteen States—the lands capable of redemption, in the main, constituted a desert, impossible of agricultural use without artificial irrigation.
>
> In the beginning, the task of reclaiming this area was left to the unaided efforts of the people who found their way by painful effort to its inhospitable solitudes. These western pioneers, emulating the spirit of so many others who had gone before them in similar ventures, faced the difficult problem of wresting a living and creating homes from the raw elements about them, and threw down the gage of battle to the forces of Nature. With imperfect tools, they built dams, excavated canals, constructed ditches, plowed and cultivated the soil, and transformed dry and desolate lands into green fields and leafy orchards. In the success of that effort, the general Government itself was greatly concerned—not only because, as owner, it was charged through Congress with the duty of disposing of the lands, but because the settlement and development of the country in which the lands lay was highly desirable.
>
> To these ends, prior to the summer of 1877, Congress had passed the mining laws, the homestead and preemption laws, and finally, the Desert Land Act. It had encouraged and assisted, by making large land grants to aid the building of the Pacific railroads and in many other ways, the redemption of this immense landed estate. That body thoroughly understood that an enforcement of the common-law rule, by greatly retarding if not forbidding the diversion of waters from their accustomed channels, would disastrously affect the policy of dividing the public domain into small holdings and effecting their distribution among innumerable settlers.
>
> In respect of the area embraced by the desert-land States, with the exception of a comparatively narrow strip along the Pacific seaboard, it had become evident to Congress, as it had to the inhabitants, that the future growth and well-being of the entire region depended upon a complete adherence to the rule of appropriation for a beneficial use as the exclusive criterion of the right to the use of water. The streams and other sources of supply from which this water must come were separated from one another by wide stretches of parched and barren land which never could be made to produce agricultural crops except by the transmission of water for long distances and its entire consumption in the processes of irrigation. Necessarily, that involved the complete subordination of the common-law doctrine of riparian rights to that of appropriation. And this substitution of the rule of appropriation for that of the common law was to have momentous consequences. It became the determining factor in the long struggle to expunge from our vocabulary the legend "Great American Desert," which was spread in large letters across the face of the old maps of the far West.
>
> In the light of the foregoing considerations, the Desert Land Act was passed, and in their light it must now be construed. By its terms, not only all surplus water over and above such as might be appropriated and used by the desert-land entrymen, but "the water of all lakes, rivers, and other sources of water supply upon the public lands and not navigable" were to remain "free for the appropriation and use of the public for irrigation, mining, and manufacturing purposes." If this language is to be given its natural meaning, and we see no reason why it should not, it effected a severance of all waters upon the public domain, not theretofore appropriated, from the land itself.

I quote from pages 162 and 165 of the opinion:

> As the owner of the public domain, the Government possessed the power to dispose of land and water thereon together, or to dispose of them separately.

I interject to say that the Constitution, in article IV, gives the Congress the definite right to dispose of public property.

> The fair construction of the provision now under review is that Congress intended to establish the rule that for the future the land should be patented separately; and that all nonnavigable waters thereon should be reserved for the use of the public under the laws of the States and Territories named.

The words that the water of all sources of water supply upon the public lands and not navigable "shall remain and be held free for the appropriation and use of the public" are not susceptible of any other construction. The only exception made is that in favor of existing rights; and the only rule spoken of is that of appropriation. It is hard to see how a more definite intention to sever the land and water could be evinced. The terms of the statute, thus construed, must be read into every patent thereafter issued, with the same force as though expressly incorporated therein, with the result that the grantee will take the legal title to the land conveyed, and such title, and only such title, to the flowing waters thereon as shall be fixed or acknowledged by the customs, laws, and judicial decisions of the State of their location. If it be conceded that in the absence of Federal legislation the State would be powerless to affect the riparian rights of the United States or its grantees, still, the authority of Congress to vest such power in the State, and that it has done so by the legislation to which we have referred, cannot be doubted.

The proceedings in connection with the adoption of the Desert Land Act bear out this view. The bill which subsequently became the act was called up for consideration in the Senate on February 27, 1877. The report of the committee, among other things, said that the larger portions of the lands bordering on the streams had been appropriated; that the provisions of the bill would enable settlers by combined efforts to construct more extensive works and reclaim lands now worthless; that a system had already grown up in the States and Territories included in the bill which recognized priority of appropriation as the rule governing the right to the use of water, limiting the amount to that actually used, and thus avoiding waste. Senator Sargent, of California, who was in charge of the bill, in the course of the debate said that one great difficulty had been that "cattlemen go under a fictitious compliance with the terms of the preemption law and take their land along the margin of the streams, and then there is no possibility of getting water to the back country at all. I want to provide so that persons in the back country may go above such a person, for instance, on Humboldt River, and take the water out and conduct it on the back lands." (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. V, pt. 3, 44th Cong., 2d sess., pp. 1965–1966.) There is nothing in the language of the act or in the circumstances leading up to or accompanying its adoption that indicates an intention on the part of Congress to confine the appropriation of water in contravention of the common-law doctrine to desert-land entrymen.

Second. Nothing we have said is meant to suggest that the act, as we construe it, has the effect of curtailing the power of the States affected to legislate in respect of waters and water rights as they deem wise in the public interest. What we hold is that following the act of 1877, if not before, all nonnavigable waters then a part of the public domain became publici juris, subject to the plenary control of the designated States including those since created out of the territories named, with the right in each to determine for itself to what extent the rule of appropriation or the common-law rule in respect of riparian rights should obtain. For since "Congress cannot enforce either rule upon any State" (*Kansas* v. *Colorado* (206 U. S. 46, 94)), the full power of choice must remain with the State. The Desert Land Act does not bind or purport to bind the States to any policy. It simply recognizes and gives sanction, insofar as the United States and its future grantees are concerned, to the State and local doctrine of appropriation, and seeks to remove what otherwise might be an impediment to its full and successful operation. (See *Wyoming* v. *Colorado* (259 U. S. 419, 465).)

Briefly, Mr. President, acting on the assurances of our own State constitutions, accepted by the Congress of the United States, and acting on the assurances of opinions of this kind, we have constructed our own dams, and have set up our own rules for the regulation of water on nonnavigable streams, and the proposed amendment runs directly contrary thereto. Therefore I hope it will not be adopted.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I wish to add a word to what the distinguished Senator from Colorado has said about the importance to the people of the West of rejecting this amendment. I understand perfectly the reasons which have prompted the Senator from Missouri [Mr. CLARK] to suggest the amendment. Of course steps should be taken to prevent the improper use of constructions upon any river system that would tend to create danger of floods and make more difficult the control of floods; but what is not generally understood by those who have been dealing with this problem is that an utterly different condition exists in the far West from that which exists in all other sections of the country.

I have before me a map showing the average annual precipitation in the United States, compiled from weather records. It will be observed that more than one-half of the United States on this map is colored in green. That green area is an area in which the annual precipitation is in excess of 20 inches, and except for a very small portion of that area the annual precipitation is between 30 and 80 inches of rainfall annually.

The other area, the West, is what was known and described by Daniel Webster and others as the Great American Desert. Webster was of the opinion that that area could not be developed. He was of the opinion that it was utterly useless for the United States to consider, even in a passing way, the acquisition or development of that land; and yet we have lived to see the time when it has been developed into thriving and successful States, in which people have established prosperous businesses and homes.

All that growth in the West has been dependent upon the utilization of water by means of the application of the doctrine of appropriation. When the pioneers went west, when they went to the Pacific coast to bring about the development of the gold and other minerals there, they began the use of water in the streams by right of appropriation. In 1866, and later in 1877, and later by numerous other acts of Congress, the legislative body of this country has recognized the right of people to use water, as distinct and separate from the land. In other words, there has grown up the use of water as a separate entity from the use of the land itself. The doctrine of use of water—not ownership, but use—has become the basis of all western growth. No one in the West can assert ownership to water and can hold it against development. If there is water which has been appropriated by a user, but if the user is not using it, and if another settler feels he can make a beneficial use of it, he can go to the courts and can obtain an adjudication of his rights. That is the reason why the courts—the Supreme Court and all others—have stated that the use of water in the West is a public matter.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri rose.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield to the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I should like to say to the Senator that, regardless of the various irrigation projects in the arid and semiarid States, there is nothing in the amendment which is intended to interfere with the use of water by appropriation or to interfere with any other rights which may exist in the arid or semiarid States. The whole purpose of the amendment is to establish a police authority which will prevent the operator of a dam, such as the dams I have described in Oklahoma and Missouri, from operating his dam in such a way as to be a menace to both the property and life below it.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I fully realize that is the purpose.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Some of the dams have been operated in a manner which is as dangerous as having a man go out into a street and fire a revolver up and down the street. Many of the people living in that area have been constantly in the shadow of the fear that the operator of the dam will operate it in such a way as to endanger their lives or property, or both.

I may say that the amendment is not now in the form in which it was when I introduced it. Also let me say that I had no purpose of interfering with the Western rights in connection with the use of water.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I was quite sure that was the Senator's attitude. There was no doubt in my mind that the Senator had no intention whatsoever of interfering with the traditional land policy.

The point I wished to make, however, was that which has already been made by the Senator from Colorado, namely, that the language of the amendment is so broad that it would utterly tear down and destroy the State system of adjudication of water rights which has been established over a long period of years, because it would give the Secretary of War the right to control dams on the tributaries. Even though an individual, a lone farmer, in some distant tributary creek in the very heights of the mountains had built a dam, if some person under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of War deemed it to be an improper dam, it would be subject to the criminal provision which is written into the bill.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Certainly.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Would it meet the objections of the Senator if, in lines 2 and 3, on page 46, the words "or across tributaries thereof" were stricken?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Of course, that would be an improvement.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. The amendment is a committee amendment, and of course I have no authority to agree to eliminate those words.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I understand.

Mr. President, it is my belief that the interests of all parties will best be met if the amendment is rejected, so that opportunity will be given for further study—and there will be further study—as to the proper control of dams which create the menace which the Senator from Missouri so properly hopes to overcome.

Mr. President, I hope the amendment will be rejected.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, let me say that the incidents to which I have referred occurred 2 years ago. The only evidence which has come to my attention on the part of anyone with respect to giving consideration to those undoubted evils or bringing about a correction of them is contained in the pending amendment. Two years have elapsed since that time, with the possibility of the occurrence of many more such incidents.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, what the committee had in mind in accepting the amendment offered by the able senior Senator from Missouri [Mr. CLARK] was the control of dangerous dams so that any menace to life and property would be removed. That is the proper interpretation to be placed upon the amendment. We do not undertake to specify what the dams are, but we say:

(b) Whenever it shall appear, after reasonable notice and opportunity for hearing to the person or corporation owning or controlling any such dam, that such dam is being operated or maintained in such a manner as to jeopardize the safety of persons or property either above or below such dam.

So it is not to be supposed, as has been suggested here in argument, that the Chief of Engineers will undertake to control all private dams throughout the United States. What the Chief of Engineers will do under the terms of the amendment will be simply to remove the jeopardy and danger to life and property, when they exist, caused by private dams. That is the extent of the amendment.

It may be that the amendment in its penal provisions is rather drastic, and I am willing to concede that those provisions are rather drastic; but I think probably they could be so modified in conference as to remove the objectionable features.

The discussion has gone rather far afield as to the rights of States and of individuals in the navigable waters of the United States. Mr. President, I do not think there is any doubt whatsoever that the Congress has supreme authority over all navigable waters of the United States, and that what are navigable waters are not necessarily those waters which are actually being subjected to navigation. Navigable waters are those which may be subjected to navigation; navigable waters are those which influence other waters which are subject to navigation. That would probably take in all streams and tributaries which flow into any navigable stream.

In the course of the hearings I undertook to express the jurisprudence of the United States Supreme Court on this question, and I should like to read from page 41 of the printed hearings. The matter was under discussion and I made the following statement which I think is a correct statement of all the decisions of the United States Supreme Court taken as a whole. I said:

As I understand it, the authority of the Federal Government stems from the interstate commerce clause and, of course, the Constitution gives Congress control over navigable waters as an incident to its power to regulate interstate commerce. Decisions of the United States Supreme Court have, from time to time, construed the power of the Congress over waterways. It is my understanding that any waterway that can reasonably be improved so as to make it navigable in interstate commerce is a navigable waterway of the United States; that the waterway is navigable even though it has ceased to be used in interstate commerce; that the authority of Congress over navigable waters is not limited to control solely for the purpose of navigation but embraces all the needs of commerce; that Congress may control nonnavigable parts of a river in order to promote commerce on parts that are navigable; that the power of Congress to protect any navigable stream from flood damage extends to the control of tributaries to such streams; that Congress alone is to decide whether any given project, either considered by itself or as part of a comprehensive plan, is justified and should be authorized as having a beneficial effect on interstate commerce; and that the courts cannot question the reasons or the objectives that actuated Congress in voting for a project. It is my opinion that the power of Congress to regulate stream flow of waters that are either navigable in fact or ultimately influence navigable streams through the flow of water into the navigable streams is inseparably connected with and is supported by the interstate commerce clause of the Constitution.

Mr. President, I believe that what I have read is a condensation of the jurisprudence of the United States Supreme Court as I understand them to be. Therefore, in reference to the rights of Colorado or any other State, or of riparian owners in Colorado, Montana, Wyoming, or any other State with respect to navigable waters, as the word "navigable" has been interpreted by the United States Supreme Court, the argument has no application whatsoever to this amendment.

The purpose of the amendment is to protect human life and property. That is all. As the Senator from Missouri in two instances has pointed out, a dam may be operated and maintained so improperly as to constitute a jeopardy to human life and property, and may result in loss and material damage to property. The purpose of the amendment is to vest authority in someone to prevent improperly controlled dams from becoming menaces to the communities in which they are located.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, this is a committee amendment, and, therefore, I have no authority to modify it. But, in order to meet objections which have been urged, I ask unanimous consent to modify the committee amendment on page 46, in line 2, after the words "United States", by striking out "or across tributaries thereof."

Mr. OVERTON. That would make the language then applicable only to navigable waters.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. That is correct.

Mr. OVERTON. Or the main stem.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. That is correct.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I inquire, What is the definition of "navigable waters"? We have been told many times in the past that any stream capable of flowing pulpwood at any time during the year would come within the definition of navigable waters. That would mean practically any stream, whatever its size might be.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. The term "navigable" has been defined many times.

Mr. AIKEN. I know it has. I am merely asking for information. Is not a navigable stream one which will float pulpwood at any time?

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, as I said a while ago, any stream may be considered to be actually navigable if it may be improved for navigable purposes or flows into streams or influences streams which are navigable.

Mr. AIKEN. So the definition of the term "navigable" would reach up into the creeks.

Mr. OVERTON. Yes.

Mr. AIKEN. The amendment offered by the Senator from Missouri [Mr. CLARK] would not protect a person operating a little sawmill in the hills on a tributary of a navigable stream. In New England there are streams which furnish power for about 6 weeks during the year. I have one in mind which is large enough during the spring run-off to permit the operation of a plant to manufacture sufficient lumber to enable the operation of another small plant during the remainder of the year. There are other small streams which furnish a little power off and on for local industries. They do not permit the employment of any help except the owner of the dam.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, it seems to me to be far-fetched to suggest that the Corps of Engineers will go around to the operator of such a small sawmill as has been referred to by the Senator from Vermont and hale the operator into court, or that such an example should be taken as an excuse for not preventing tremendous disasters on the main stems of large rivers. It is not my purpose to bring about such results, and I do not believe the proposed amendment is subject to any such construction as the Senator points out. It is not my purpose to interfere with little sawmills, and it is inconceivable to me that the Corps of Engineers would do such a thing, and yet, if a mill were being operated in such a way as to create a menace to the people along the stream below the mill, the mill should be regulated.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I believe the Senator is correct. I recall that several years ago a prominent official said that the Government authorities had jurisdiction over the land through which small streams flowed. I think that is covering too much territory. However, I was merely seeking information.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I will say very frankly to the Senator from Vermont that I am not familiar with local

conditions as to the control of small streams.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request of the Senator from Missouri [Mr. CLARK] that the commttee amendment on page 46, line 2, after the words "United States", be modified by striking out "or across tributaries thereof"? The Chair hears none, and the committee amendment is modified accordingly.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, on page 46, line 22, after the word "section", I offer an amendment to insert the following in the committee amendment: "and found to be operating or maintaining a dam in such a manner as to jeopardize the safety of persons or property either above or below such dam."

That language would provide for court review, and I believe it would meet the objection which was heretofore made to summary process.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Missouri [Mr. CLARK] to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question recurs on agreeing to the modified committee amendment as amended.

The modified amendment as amended was rejected.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. OVERTON. That disposes of all the committee amendments, does it not, except the committee amendments which are affected by the O'Mahoney amendment?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, the so-called O'Mahoney-Millikin amendment embraces, as the Senator from Louisiana knows, several topics including the Connecticut River Basin. Some objection has been made on behalf of the Senators from Vermont to the work which has been authorized in the State of Vermont, and an effort has been made to reach an understanding between the Senators from Vermont, the representative of the Government, the Senator from Louisiana, and the Army engineers in respect to precisely what can and should be done.

The senior Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN] was unexpectedly called out of the city on Saturday night by an important law matter to which he is now attending in the State of Vermont. I telephoned to him and he advised me that it is his hope to be here tomorrow morning.

Language has been suggested by the representatives of the Governor of Vermont and the junior Senator from Vermont which seems to me, to the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN], and to others who have been in conference to be quite satisfactory, and I believe the language also is substantially agreeable to the Senator from Louisiana. But it will be necessary for us, I think, to present this matter to the senior Senator from Vermont. Therefore I feel that the understanding which was reached this morning that this matter should go over should be adhered to, so that when the Senate reassembles tomorrow we ought to be in a position to lay the matter before the Senate and before the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, it is my understanding, if the Senator will yield to me, that that subsection (b), the provision in reference to the Connecticut River Basin, will be deleted entirely from the O'Mahoney amendment and will come up as a separate and independent amendment either in connection with an amendment proposed by the committee or in some other way. In any event, either Senator or both Senators from Vermont may offer such amendment as they desire, and it will be disposed of as a separate amendment and not connected with the O'Mahoney amendment.

Furthermore, the Senators from Connecticut and the Senators from Massachusetts, who are vitally interested in the Connecticut River Basin, may propose amendments of their own or oppose the amendment suggested by the Senators from Vermont.

What I want to do is to agree with the Senator from Wyoming and the Senator from Colorado and other cosponsors of the O'Mahoney-Millikin amendment on provisions in relation to the Missouri River Basin. The Connecticut River Basin cannot, in my opinion, be handled under subsection (b) and there will never be an agreement so long as subsection (b) is in the O'Mahoney amendment. However, the whole matter of the Connecticut River Basin can be very easily handled independently of the O'Mahoney amendment, and should be so handled, and it can be handled after the elimination of subsection (b) from the O'Mahoney amendment.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I will say for the information of the Senator and of the Senate that our purpose is to bring about the elimination of subsection (b) from this amendment. Whether it will be desirable to do that by way of treating the Connecticut River Valley altogether separately or as a part of section (a) is a matter which I feel we are under obligation to discuss with the senior Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN] since we have not had that opportunity.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I ask the Senator from Wyoming if it is the purpose or is it the proposal now to lay this bill, with the thought that all that remains of a controversial nature is the O'Mahoney amendment and other amendments relating to the same general subject matter or proceeding along the same principle as the O'Mahoney amendment.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. So far as I can see I think that these are probably the last controversial items unless it be the amendment offered by the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] with respect to the Missouri Valley Authority or the amendment of the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] with respect to the St. Lawrence seaway. I have not been consulted about the latter amendment, and I do not know what the purpose of the sponsor of the St. Lawrence seaway may be but I think we are coming pretty close to an understanding upon this measure.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I would not agree to preclude any amendment that might be offered to this bill by any one of the 96 Senators from the floor. There might be other Senators who have amendments to offer to the bill. I do not think that we should accept the idea at this time that we are through with amendments.

As to the St. Lawrence amendment itself, I had intended to wait until all other amendments were disposed of. I do not know really whether it will be offered or not.

Mr. WHITE. The Senator from Vermont wants to know what the condition of the weather is when the other amendments are disposed of?

Mr. AIKEN. The Senator from Maine is exactly correct about that. I want to know what the bill looks like when the time comes to offer the amendment.

Mr. WHITE. If I may have the attention of the distinguished Senator from Louisiana in charge of the bill, as I understand, then, it is the opinion of the distinguished Senator that we can discontinue consideration of the bill for the remainder of the afternoon. Of course, if the bill should be laid aside to take up any other bill it will be with the understanding that it will be laid aside only temporarily, which would mean that the bill could be taken up for consideration the very first thing tomorrow. Is not that so, I will ask the Senator from Louisiana?

Mr. OVERTON. That is correct.

Mr. WHITE. I take it, then, with the further understanding that any Senator may offer other amendments on his own responsibility.

Mr. OVERTON. Certainly.

The Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN] has an amendment to which, I understand, there is no objection. It is a modification of a project which is authorized by the bill and that will entail very little if any additional cost. Is that correct?

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, on Friday I offered that amendment. It is the amendment on page 16 at the end of line 20, and as it is very brief I will read it. It says:

Provided, That the project—

Which is a project on the Purgatoire River designed to make the town of Trinidad safe from floods—

Provided, That the project may be modified to include storage in reservoirs upstream from Trinidad if the Secretary of War and the Chief of Engineers find such action advisable for flood control and in order to make more water readily available for agricultural and industrial uses without impairment of flood control for Trinidad.

The amendment was offered on behalf of the senior Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON] and myself. It is my understanding that it may be possible to add perhaps a reservoir upstream from Trinidad which will render the project a

better flood-control project and at the same time might admit of some irrigation. I do not understand that the cost will be substantially greater, but if the evolution of the plan should take us into unexpectedly high costs then the matter may be taken up before the Appropriations Committee.

I appreciate the courtesy of the distinguished Senator from Louisiana in not offering any objection to the amendment.

Mr. OVERTON. Modifications are to be left to the discretion of the engineers?

Mr. MILLIKIN. Yes.

Mr. OVERTON. I have no objection to the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I present another amendment which I ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 16, it is proposed to strike out the period at the end of line 1, insert a colon, and add the following: "*Provided*, That the project may be modified to include storage in reservoirs upstream from Trinidad if the Secretary of War and the Chief of Engineers find such action advisable for flood control and in order to make more water readily available for agricultural and industrial uses without impairment of flood control for Trinidad."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, I have conferred with the Senator from Louisiana about an amendment which I am sure is not controversial. It is of an emergency nature, and I believe this is an opportune time to take it up. I send the amendment to the desk and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 40, line 16, it is proposed to add the following:

The sum of $500,000 additional is authorized to be appropriated as an emergency fund to be expended under the direction of the Secretary of War and the supervision of the Chief of Engineers for the construction of emergency protection works to prevent flood damage to highways, bridge approaches, and public works: *Provided*, That pending the appropriation of said sum, the Secretary of War may allot from existing flood-control appropriations such sums as may be necessary for the immediate prosecution of such bank protection works; such appropriations to be reimbursed from the appropriation herein authorized when made.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, in conversations with the Army engineers, it has appeared that there are many projects of an emergency nature which, even in wartime, need some protection work. Because these matters come up when rivers are in flood, they must be handled quickly. If they can be handled quickly, and it is not necessary to wait for an appropriation by Congress, the public works can be protected with an expenditure of a small amount of money.

An emergency fund is in the hands of the Chief of Army Engineers to handle river damage where it affects navigation, but there are no emergency funds for flood-control emergencies. So I asked the Senator from Louisiana if this amendment would meet with his approval, and after he studied it he told me that he had no objection to accepting the amendment. I hope the Senate will accept it at this time.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, the Senator's statement is correct. I have no objection to the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY].

The amendment was agreed to.

EXTENSION OF STATUTE OF LIMITATIONS IN PEARL HARBOR CASES

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I ask that the Senate now proceed to consider Senate Joint Resolution 156, Calendar No. 1171.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, does the Senator ask that the pending bill be temporarily laid aside and that the joint resolution be taken up?

Mr. FERGUSON. That is correct. I understood that the majority leader had no objection to this course. I talked with him last week, at the time I introduced the joint resolution. It is a measure to extend the statute of limitations in relation to the court martials having to do with the Pearl Harbor catastrophe.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, the Senator from Michigan has said that he talked with the majority leader. I merely wish to call his attention to the fact that we discussed the matter on the floor of the Senate, and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] stated he wanted this joint resolution passed, and asked that it be passed at the earliest possible time.

Mr. FERGUSON. The Senator is correct. The RECORD shows that the Senator from Kentucky stated on the floor that he did want the joint resolution considered and acted upon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

There being no objection, the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 156) to extend the statute of limitation in certain cases, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That effective as of December 7, 1943, all statutes, resolutions, laws, articles, and regulations, affecting the possible prosecution of any person or persons, military or civil, connected with the Pearl Harbor catastrophe of December 7, 1941, or involved in any other possible or apparent dereliction of duty, or crime or offense against the United States, that operate to prevent the court martial, prosecution, trial, or punishment of any person or persons in military or civil capacity, involved in any matter in connection with the Pearl Harbor catastrophe of December 7, 1941, or involved in any other possible or apparent dereliction of duty, or crime or offense against the United States, are hereby extended for a further period of 6 months, in addition to the extensions provided for in Public Law 208, Seventy-eighth Congress, and Public Law 339, Seventy-eighth Congress.

ADDITIONAL JUDGE FOR THE THIRD CIRCUIT

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, it is my intention at this time to ask for a quorum in order that consent may be obtained to proceed to the consideration of bills on the calendar to which there is no objection, starting where we left off at the last call.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, there are two bills which I do not think would come within the call of the calendar the Senator has mentioned, which I have been discussing for several days with the majority and minority leaders, and with Senators from various States, and all are in accord that the bills should be passed, and should be passed quickly. They are bills providing for an additional judge for the third circuit, and removing the restriction which applies to the filling of a vacancy in the eastern district of Pennsylvania. There is another bill which provides for the creation of an additional judgeship in New Jersey. The Judicial Conference, and the leaders on both sides of the Chamber, are agreed as to the desirability of action on those bills, and I should like to have them considered.

Mr. HILL. If the distinguished acting chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary tells me he has consulted with the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], certainly I have no objection.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I ask for the present consideration of House bill 3750, Calendar 1058.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MCFARLAND in the chair). The bill will be stated by title.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (H. R. 3750) to provide for the appointment of an additional circuit judge for the third circuit, and to permit the filling of the first vacancy occurring in the office of district judge for the eastern district of Pennsylvania.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

REMOVAL OF PROHIBITION RELATING TO DISTRICT JUDGESHIP IN NEW JERSEY

Mr. HATCH. Now, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of Calendar No. 1169, House bill 3732.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be reported by title.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (H. R. 3732) to repeal the prohibition against the filling of a vacancy in the office of district judge in the district of New Jersey.

Mr. WHITE. Reserving the right to object for the moment, Mr. President, the Senator from New Mexico has been good enough to speak to me about some bills on the calendar which I thought he was to ask to have considered. He said he had conferred with the Senators from the respective States with respect to the bills, but this measure is something new. May I ask whether the Senator has discussed the bill with the Senators from New Jersey?

Mr. HATCH. Probably the Senator did not remember, but I did mention this specific bill to him. Yes; I have discussed it with both Senators from New Jersey, and they favor the passage of

the bill. So far as the amendment is concerned, it is a technical amendment. Unfortunately, in drafting the bill, the wrong section of the statute was referred to, and the amendment corrects that error.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and to insert the following:

That the proviso in subsection (a) of section 2 of the act approved May 24, 1940 (54 Stat. 219; U. S. C. 1940, title 28, sec. 1, note), entitled "An act to provide for the appointment of additional district and circuit judges", be, and it is hereby, amended to read as follows: "(a) *Provided*, That the first vacancy occurring in the office of district judge in each of said districts, except the district of New Jersey, shall not be filled."

SEC. 2. That subsection (d) of the act approved April 28, 1942 (56 Stat. 247, U. S. C. 1940, Supp., title 28, sec. 1, note), is hereby repealed.

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

Mr. HILL. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Gerry	O'Mahoney
Bailey	Gillette	Overton
Ball	Green	Radcliffe
Bankhead	Guffey	Revercomb
Bilbo	Gurney	Reynolds
Brooks	Hall	Robertson
Buck	Hatch	Russell
Burton	Hayden	Shipstead
Bushfield	Hill	Taft
Butler	Jenner	Thomas, Idaho
Byrd	Johnson, Calif.	Thomas, Okla.
Capper	Johnson, Colo.	Tunnell
Caraway	La Follette	Tydings
Chandler	Langer	Vandenberg
Clark, Idaho	McClellan	Wallgren
Clark, Mo.	McFarland	Walsh, Mass.
Connally	McKellar	Walsh, N. J.
Cordon	Maloney	Weeks
Davis	Maybank	Wheeler
Downey	Millikin	Wherry
Ellender	Murray	White
Ferguson	Nye	Willis
George	O'Daniel	

Mr. WHITE. The junior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] was present earlier in the day, but he has been called from the Chamber on official business and is therefore necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Sixty-eight Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

THE CALENDAR

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside, and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of bills on the calendar to which there is no objection, beginning where the last call left off, which would be Calendar No. 1158.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will state the bills on the calendar, beginning with Calendar 1158.

BILLS PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 637) to authorize the appropriation of funds to assist the States and Territories in more adequately financing their systems of public education, during emergency, and in reducing the inequalities of educational opportunities through public elementary and secondary schools, was announced as first in order.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

AMENDMENT OF VETERANS' REGULATIONS

The bill (H. R. 5041) to amend the Veterans' Regulations, was announced as next in order.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of that bill? If not, let the bill go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

Mr. VANDENBERG subsequently said:

May I ask the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BURTON] if what he has just said in connection with Calendar 1163, House bill 4999, just passed, applies to Calendar 1162, House bill 5041, which I asked to have go over in the absence of an explanation?

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, Calendar 1164, House bill 86, relates to widows of Civil War veterans who were married to the veterans subsequent to June 26, 1905, which was before World War No. 1. The adjustment provided for in this bill is not the same type of adjustment as is provided by House bill 5041, Calendar 1162. The purpose of House bill 86 is to bring the treatment in line with that given to other widows, but the bill does not relate to veterans of either World War No. 1 or World War No. 2. All three Calendar Nos. 1162, 1163, and 1164 relate to veterans of wars before World War No. 1, and the purpose of Calendar No. 1162 is quite similar to that of Calendar 1163.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I withdraw my objection to the consideration of Calendar 1162, House bill 5041.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

DISABILITY PENSIONS FOR CERTAIN VETERANS

The bill (H. R. 4999) to increase the service-connected disability rates of pensions for certain Regular Establishment veterans and veterans of wars prior to World War No. 1 was announced as next in order.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I should like to have an explanation of that bill.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, as a member of the Committee on Pensions, I believe that I can point out the main purpose. It is to correct a situation relating to the adjustment of disability rates of pensions for certain Regular Establishment veterans and veterans of wars prior to World War No. 1. It deals largely with veterans who have not been injured as a result of combat service, or do not have wartime service-connected disabilities. We recently increased the pensions based on wartime service-connected disabilities, but failed to change the compensation to the so-called peacetime veterans, which has been on the basis of 75 percent of the wartime service-connected disabilities. This measure reestablishes the same ratio for the two classes of pensions that has existed before. It brings the various rates into line, on the same basis as that previously established.

Mr. VANDENBERG. On what theory was this bill referred to the Committee on Pensions, when pension legislation is ordinarily handled almost exclusively by the Committee on Finance?

Mr. BURTON. That goes back of my own personal experience; but I understand that the Committee on Pensions has handled pension matters relating to veterans of wars before World War No. 1 and World War No. 2.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Then, as I understand, the bill relates entirely to the time preceding World War No. 1.

Mr. BURTON. That is correct.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill (H. R. 4999) to increase the service-connected disability rates of pension for certain Regular Establishment veterans and veterans of wars prior to World War No. 1, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

PENSIONS TO CERTAIN UNREMARRIED DEPENDENT WIDOWS OF CIVIL WAR VETERANS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 86) to grant pensions to certain unremarried dependent widows of Civil War veterans who were married to the veteran subsequent to June 26, 1905, which had been reported from the Committee on Pensions with amendments.

The first amendment was, in section 2, on page 2, line 25, after "Administration", to insert "after the date of enactment of this"; on page 3, line 2, after the word "Affairs", to strike out the comma and "but not prior to the date of enactment of this act"; and in line 5, after the word "once", to insert "since the death of the veteran."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 3, after line 10, to strike out:

SEC. 3. No agent, attorney, or other person shall, directly or indirectly, solicit, contract for, charge, or receive any fee or compensation for preparing or assisting in the preparation of the necessary papers in the application to the Veterans' Administration for benefits under this act. Any person who shall, directly or indirectly, solicit, contract for, charge, or receive any fee or compensation for such preparation or assistance shall be guilty of a misdemeanor, and each and every offense shall be punishable by a fine of not more than $500 or imprisonment at

hard labor for not more than 2 years, or by both such fine and imprisonment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

BERTHA L. TATRAULT

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1900) for the relief of Bertha L. Tatrault, which had been reported from the Committee on Claims with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause, and insert:

That jurisdiction is hereby conferred upon the United States District Court for the District of Massachusetts to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of the estate of Bertha L. Tatrault, late of Westboro, Mass., against the United States for the death of the said Bertha L. Tatrault, as the result of personal injuries sustained by her when the horse-drawn wagon in which she was riding as a passenger was struck by a United States Coast Guard vehicle on route No. 9, east of Park Street, in Westboro, Mass., on September 7, 1943.

SEC. 2. In the determination of such claim, the United States shall be held liable for damages, and for any acts committed by any of its officers or employees, to the same extent as if the United States were a private person.

SEC. 3. Suit upon such claim may be instituted at any time within 1 year after the enactment of this act, notwithstanding the lapse of time or any statute of limitations. Proceedings for the determination of such claim, and appeals from and payment of any judgment thereon, shall be in the same manner as in the case of claims over which such court has jurisdiction under the provisions of paragraph "Twentieth" of section 24 of the Judicial Code, as amended.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the District of Massachusetts to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of the estate of Bertha L. Tatrault."

MARJORIE E. DRAKE AND OTHERS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1740) for the relief of Marjorie E. Drake, Edith Mae Drake, Minnie L. Bickford, and Irene M. Paolini which had been reported from the Committee on Claims with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That jurisdiction is hereby conferred upon the United States District Court for the District of Massachusetts to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claims of Marjorie E. Drake, Edith Mae Drake, Minnie L. Bickford, and Irene M. Paolini, all of Westboro, Mass., against the United States for compensation for personal injuries sustained by them when the horse-drawn wagon in which they were riding as passengers was struck by a United States Coast Guard vehicle on Route No. 9, east of Park Street, in Westboro, Mass., on September 7, 1943, and for reimbursement of medical, hospital, and other expenses incurred by them as a result of such injuries.

SEC. 2. In the determination of such claims, the United States shall be held liable for damages, and for any acts committed by any of its officers or employees, to the same extent as if the United States were a private person.

SEC. 3. Suit upon such claims may be instituted at any time within 1 year after the enactment of this act, notwithstanding the lapse of time or any statute of limitations. Proceedings for the determination of such claims, and appeals from and payment of any judgment thereon, shall be in the same manner as in the case of claims over which such court has jurisdiction under the provisions of paragraph "Twentieth" of section 24 of the Judicial Code, as amended.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the District of Massachusetts to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claims of Marjorie E. Drake, Edith Mae Drake, Minnie L. Bickford, and Irene M. Paolini."

ALFRED FILES

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1899) for the relief of Alfred Files, which had been reported from the Committee on Claims with an amendment to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That jurisdiction is hereby conferred upon the United States District Court for the District of Massachusetts to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Alfred Files, of Westboro, Mass., against the United States for compensation for personal injuries sustained by him when the horse-drawn wagon in which he was riding was struck by a United States Coast Guard vehicle on route No. 9, east of Park Street, in Westboro, Mass., on September 7, 1943, and for reimbursement of medical, hospital, and other expenses incurred by him as a result of such injuries.

SEC. 2. In the determination of such claim, the United States shall be held liable for damages, and for any acts committed by any of its officers or employees, to the same extent as if the United States were a private person.

SEC. 3. Suit upon such claim may be instituted at any time within 1 year after the enactment of this act, notwithstanding the lapse of time or any statute of limitations. Proceedings for the determination of such claim, and appeals from and payment of any judgment thereon, shall be in the same manner as in the case of claims over which such court has jurisdiction under the provisions of paragraph "Twentieth" of section 24 of the Judicial Code, as amended.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the District of Massachusetts to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Alfred Files."

SIGFRIED OLSEN

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 2825) for the relief of Sigfried Olsen, doing business as Sigfried Olsen Shipping Co., which had been reported from the Committee on Claims with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That jurisdiction is hereby conferred upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claims against the United States of Sigfried Olsen, doing business as Sigfried Olsen Shipping Co., his heirs or assigns, for just compensation for actual cash losses necessarily incurred by him in the operation of two vessels to South America and return in the fall of 1941 in compliance with specific directions of the United States Maritime Commission, carrying in the interest of national defense cargoes specified and at rates designated by the Commission, outbound and return.

SEC. 2. Suits upon such claims may be instituted at any time within 1 year after the date of the enactment of this act, notwithstanding the lapse of time or any statute of limitation. Proceedings for the determination of such claims, and appeals from, and payment of, any judgment thereon shall be in the same manner as in the case of claims over which the Court of Claims has jurisdiction under section 145 of the Judicial Code, as amended.

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill conferring jurisdiction upon the court of claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claims of Sigfried Olsen, doing business as Sigfried Olsen Shipping Co."

EXTENSION OF PERIOD OF THE PHILIPPINE INSURRECTION

The bill (H. R. 4099) to extend the period of the Philippine Insurrection so as to include active service with the United States military or naval forces engaged in hostilities in the Moro Province, including Mindanao, or in the islands of Samar and Leyte, between July 5, 1902, and December 31, 1913, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MR. AND MRS. ROBERT W. NELSON

The bill (H. R. 3548) for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Robert W. Nelson and W. E. Nelson was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

VICTORIA CORMIER

The bill (H. R. 4024) for the relief of Victoria Cormier, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MR. AND MRS. R. L. RHODES

The bill (H. R. 2896) for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. R. L. Rhodes was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

FIRE DISTRICT NO. 1, COLCHESTER, VT.

The bill (S. 1958) for the relief of Fire District No. 1 of the town of Colchester, Vt., was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to fire district No. 1 of the town of Colchester, Vt., the sum of $10,562.07, in full satisfaction of its claim against the United States for reimbursement of expenses incurred by it in repairing damage to a sewer line, such damage having been caused by the negligence of Army authorities in the installation of such sewer line: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent

thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

CLIFFORD E. LONG AND LAURA C. LONG

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1960) for the relief of Clifford E. Long and Laura C. Long, which had been reported from the Committee on Claims with amendment, on page 1, line 6, after the words "the sum of", to strike out "$10,316.32" and insert in lieu thereof "$2,316.32"; and to add a proviso at the end of the bill, so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Clifford E. Long and Laura C. Long, both of San Diego, Calif., the sum of $2,316.32. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Clifford E. Long and Laura C. Long against the United States for damages sustained on account of the death of their daughter, Kathleen Mae Long, on or about August 18, 1943, as the result of injuries received when a United States Army airplane in the service of the United States Army crashed into the front yard of the home of the said Clifford E. Long and struck the said Kathleen Mae Long: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

JACK V. DYER

The bill (H. R. 1318) for the relief of Jack V. Dyer, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

LEGAL GUARDIAN OF WILLIAM L. OWEN

The bill (H. R. 4226) for the relief of the legal guardian of William L. Owen, a minor, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

JOSEPH PASTE AND OTHERS

The bill (H. R. 1665) for the relief of Joseph Paste and others was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

CONSTANTINO ARGUELLES

The bill (H. R. 3495) for the relief of Constantino Arguelles, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

BETTY ROBINS

The bill (H. R. 2512) for the relief of Betty Robins, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ELIZABETH A. BECKER

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1968) for the relief of Elizabeth A. Becker, which had been reported from the Committee on Claims with an amendment, on page 1, line 6, after the words "the sum of", to strike out "$2,282" and insert in lieu thereof "$1,282."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Elizabeth A. Becker, of Kalaloch, Wash., the sum of $1,282, in full satisfaction of her claim against the United States for compensation for the loss of certain equipment owned by her which was destroyed, while in the custody of the United States Coast Guard, as the result of a fire caused by the negligence of Coast Guard personnel, which occurred in a building occupied by the United States Coast Guard at Becker's Resort, Kalaloch, Wash., on January 8, 1943: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

MRS. J. C. ROMBERG

The bill (H. R. 262) for the relief of Mrs. J. C. Romberg was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

LEGAL GUARDIAN OF VIRGINIA McMILLAN AND HOWARD McMILLAN

The bill (H. R. 3753) for the relief of the legal guardian of Virginia McMillan, a minor, and Howard McMillan was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

VANNIE BUTLER

The bill (H. R. 1919) for the relief of Vannie Butler was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (H. R. 4737) for the relief of W. A. Smoot, Inc., was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

DENNIS C. O'CONNELL

The bill (H. R. 4439) for the relief of Dennis C. O'Connell, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

EXEMPTION OF UNPAID SELECTIVE SERVICE SYSTEM EMPLOYEES FROM CERTAIN PROVISIONS OF THE CRIMINAL CODE

The bill (S. 1962) extending the provisions of Public Law 47, Seventy-seventh Congress, as amended, to reemployment committeemen of the Selective Service System was announced as next in order.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the bill?

Mr. HATCH. Yes, Mr. President; I shall be glad to explain the bill. It simply would include the reemployment committeemen of the Selective Service System who serve without compensation. Under a former act of Congress employees of the Selective Service System who serve without compensation, who are purely voluntary workers, are relieved from the general provisions of law with respect to acceptance of contracts with or employment by the United States Government. The bill would merely place these employees on the same basis as that of other employees of the Selective Service System who serve without compensation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the bill was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That Public Law 47, Seventy-seventh Congress, approved May 5, 1941 (55 Stat. 150), as amended, be amended to read as follows:

"That nothing in sections 109 and 113 of the Criminal Code (U. S. C., title 18, secs. 198 and 203) or in section 190 of the Revised Statutes (U. S. C., title 5, sec. 99) shall be deemed to apply to any person because of his appointment under authority of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940 or the Selective Service regulations made in pursuance thereof as a member of a local board, a board of appeal, an advisory board for registrants, as a State director, a Government appeal agent, a reemployment committeeman, or as an individual to conduct hearings on appeals of persons claiming exemption from combatant training and service because of conscientious objections as provided in section 5 (g) of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940; or because of his appointment as a member of an alien enemy hearing board to assist the Attorney General in the execution of any proclamations heretofore or hereafter issued by the President under the authority of the Alien Enemy Act of 1798 as amended (U. S. C., title 50, secs. 21–24)."

CRIERS AND BAILIFFS IN UNITED STATES COURTS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1747) to further define the number and duties of criers and bailiffs in United States courts and regulate their compensation, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with amendments, on page 1, at the beginning of line 6, to strike out the words "his court," and insert "the court in which he presides"; on page 2, in line 5, after the word "four", to strike out "for each court", and in line 11, after the word "present", and the period, to insert "In case the position of crier or bailiff is to be filled by the appointment of a person who has not previously served as either crier or bailiff, preference in the appointment shall be given to a person who has served in the military or naval forces of the United States in time of war and who has been honorably discharged therefrom, if in the opinion of the appointing officer such person is as well qualified as any other available person

to perform to the satisfaction of the appointing officer all the duties of the position being filled", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 5 of the Judicial Code be amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 5. Each district judge may appoint a crier for the court in which he presides, who shall perform also the duties of bailiff and messenger, and who shall receive a salary of $1,800 per annum and, when necessarily absent from his designated post of duty on the business of the court, his actual traveling expenses and in lieu of his actual expenses for subsistence a per diem allowance to be prescribed by the Director of the Administrative Office of the United States Courts at a rate not to exceed $6. The marshal for each district may appoint such a number of additional bailiffs, not exceeding four, as the district judge may determine, to maintain order in the courtroom, to wait upon the grand and petit juries, and for other necessary purposes, who shall be allowed for their services the sum of $6 per day to be paid only for actual attendance on days when the court is in session or the judge or a jury is present. In case the position of crier or bailiff is to be filled by the appointment of a person who has not previously served as either crier or bailiff, preference in the appointment shall be given to a person who has served in the military or naval forces of the United States in time of war and who has been honorably discharged therefrom, if in the opinion of the appointing officer such person is as well qualified as any other available person to perform to the satisfaction of the appointing officer all the duties of the position being filled."

SEC. 2. Section 715 of the Revised Statutes is hereby repealed.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. HATCH subsequently said: Mr. President, I have just been advised that another bill which passed the Senate today is in exactly the same situation as the one which we discussed a while ago; that is to say, the House has today passed identically the same measure. That bill is on its way to the Senate. In order to preserve the parliamentary situation and to have something on the Senate Calendar, I ask unanimous consent that the vote by which Senate bill 1747, Calendar No. 1189, was passed be reconsidered, and that the bill be restored to the calendar.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE PATRICK HENRY NATIONAL MONUMENT

The bill (S. 1819) to repeal the acts of August 15, 1935, and January 29, 1940, relating to the establishment of the Patrick Henry National Monument and the acquisition of the estate of Patrick Henry, in Charlotte County, Va., was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the act entitled "An act to provide for the establishment of a national monument on the site of Red Hill estate of Patrick Henry," approved August 15, 1935, and the act entitled "An act to provide for the acquisition by the United States of the estate of Patrick Henry in Charlotte County, Va., known as Red Hill," approved January 29, 1940, are hereby repealed.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to cover into the surplus fund of the Treasury the unexpended balances of all amounts heretofore appropriated for the purposes of such acts of August 15, 1935, and January 29, 1940.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 1902) to repeal the third proviso of section 2 of the act entitled "An act to promote the mining of coal, phosphate, oil, oil shale, gas, and sodium on the public domain," approved February 25, 1920, was announced as next in order.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Let the bill go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

EXCHANGE OF LANDS SELECTED FOR USE OF UNIVERSITY OF MONTANA

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 4917) conferring upon the State of Montana authority to exchange for other lands certain lands selected by the State of Montana for the use of the University of Montana for biological station purposes pursuant to the act of March 3, 1905 (33 Stat. 1080), which had been reported from the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys, with an amendment, on page 2, after line 5, to insert: "The land acquired by the State of Montana under this act shall be held for the use of the University of Montana as if it had been granted by the United States to the State of Montana by the act of March 3, 1905 (33 Stat. 1080), and a recital to this effect shall be included in the deed by which the land is conveyed to the State."

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

CONVEYANCE OF CERTAIN PROPERTY TO THE STATE OF NORTH DAKOTA

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 209) authorizing the conveyance of certain property to the State of North Dakota, which had been reported from the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys, with an amendment, on page 1, after line 9, to insert "In any such grant, there shall be reserved to the United States the right to construct and operate over the property granted canals, ditches, transmission lines, and facilities incidental thereto that may be constructed in connection with Federal projects for the irrigation of land", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the act of June 25, 1938 (52 Stat. 1173), is hereby amended to read as follows:

"That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized to grant and convey to the State of North Dakota, for military and defense purposes, fee-simple title to all or any part of the lands and improvements comprising the Bismarck Indian School Plant. In any such grant, there shall be reserved to the United States the right to construct and operate over the property granted, canals, ditches, transmission lines, and facilities incidental thereto that may be constructed in connection with Federal projects for the irrigation of land."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

WILLIAM LUTHER THAXTON, JR., AND WILLIAM LUTHER THAXTON, SR.

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1756) for the relief of William Luther Thaxton, Jr., and William Luther Thaxton, Sr., which had been reported from the Committee on Claims, with amendments, on page 1, in line 6, after the words "sum of", to strike out "$5,000" and insert "$2,000"; and on page 2, in line 4, after the words "sum of", to strike out "$5,000" and insert "$2,694.93", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, (1) to William Luther Thaxton, Jr., of Houston, Tex., the sum of $2,000, in full satisfaction of his claim against the United States for compensation for personal injuries sustained by him when he was struck by an airplane propeller at Meacham Field, Fort Worth, Tex., on November 3, 1942, while undergoing training under the Civil Aeronautics Administration civilian pilot training program, as a member of the Army Enlisted Reserve Corps, and (2) to William Luther Thaxton, Sr., of Houston, Tex., the sum of $2,694.93, in full satisfaction of his claim against the United States for reimbursement of medical, hospital, and other expenses incurred by him on account of such personal injuries sustained by his son, the said William Luther Thaxton, Jr.: *Provided*, That no part of the amounts appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with these claims, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

OVERTIME COMPENSATION OF CIVILIAN EMPLOYEES OF THE UNITED STATES

The bill (H. R. 3608) relating to certain overtime compensation of civilian employees of the United States was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 2142) for the relief of Lindon A. Long was announced as next in order.

Mr. HILL. Let the bill be passed over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

J. A. DAVIS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2006) for the relief of J. A. Davis, which had been reported from the Committee on Claims, with an amendment, on page 1, line 6, after the words "sum of",

to strike out "$5,000" and insert "$2,000", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to J. A. Davis, of Chandler, Ariz., the sum of $2,000, in full satisfaction of his claim against the United States for compensation for personal injuries sustained by him when he was struck by a United States Army vehicle which crashed into his store at Norton's Corner, near Chandler, Ariz., on November 21, 1943: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ESTATES OF JOSEPH B. GOWEN AND RUTH V. GOWEN

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1993) for the relief of the estates of Joseph B. Gowen and Ruth V. Gowen, which had been reported from the Committee on Claims, with amendments, on page 1, in line 6, after the words "sum of", to strike out "$13,540.80", and insert "$6,040.80"; and on page 2, in line 4, after the words "sum of", to strike out "$12,775.50", and insert "$5,275.50", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated (1) to the estate of Joseph B. Gowen, the sum of $6,040.80, in full satisfaction of the claims of such estate against the United States (a) for compensation for the death of the said Joseph B. Gowen, (b) for reimbursement of funeral expenses incurred in connection therewith, and (c) for compensation for damage to personal property of the said Joseph B. Gowen, as a result of an accident which occurred when an Army airplane crashed near George Field, Ill., on December 30, 1943; and (2) to the estate of Ruth V. Gowen, the sum of $5,275.50, in full satisfaction of the claims of such estate against the United States (a) for compensation for the death of the said Ruth V. Gowen, and (b) for reimbursement of funeral expenses incurred in connection therewith, as a result of such accident: *Provided*, That no part of the amounts appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with these claims, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

RICHARD H. BEALL

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2064) for the relief of Richard H. Beall, which had been reported from the Committee on Claims, with an amendment, on page 1, in line 6, after the words "sum of", to strike out "$10,000", and insert "$5,785.40", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Richard H. Beall, of Delray Beach, Fla., the sum of $5,785.40, in full satisfaction of his claim against the United States for compensation for the death of his wife, the late Mary Juanita Beall, as the result of an accident which occurred when the automobile which she was driving collided with a United States Army vehicle in Delray Beach, Fla., on November 18, 1943: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MRS. FLOSSIE LEESER

The bill (H. R. 2601) for the relief of Mrs. Flossie Leeser was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

RELIEF OF CERTAIN DISBURSING OFFICERS OF THE ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

The bill (S. 2168) for the relief of certain disbursing officers of the Army of the United States, and for other purposes, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Comptroller General of the United States be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to credit in the accounts of the following disbursing officers of the Army of the United States the amounts set opposite their names: Lt. Col. Theodore B. Apgar, Quartermaster Corps, $3.88; Col. E. F. Ely (deceased), Finance Department, $351.15; Maj. J. W. McManus, Finance Department, $9.74; Maj. E. A. Muth, Finance Department, $127.73; Col. M. F. W. Oliver, Finance Department, $94.30; Col. H. R. Priest, Finance Department, $3.04; Lt. Col. E. F. Rea, Finance Department, $1.50; Special Disbursing Agent Clarence W. Ruland, Jr., $3.36; Col. John L. Scott, Finance Department, $21.66; Col. K. E. Webber, Finance Department, $30; the said amounts representing erroneous payments of public funds for which these officers are accountable, as listed in letter of September 19, 1944, of the Secretary of War to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, such erroneous payments having resulted from minor errors in determining amounts due individuals and commercial firms.

SEC. 2. That the Comptroller General of the United States be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to credit in the accounts of Col. H. M. Denning, Finance Department, the sum of $77, public funds for which he is accountable and which were destroyed by fire while in the custody of Special Agent Franklin C. Newman at a Civilian Conservation Corps camp: *Provided*, That the said Franklin C. Newman shall not be held pecuniarily liable for said sum of $77 or any part thereof.

SEC. 3. That the Comptroller General of the United States be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to credit in the accounts of Col. Raymond B. Hatch, Finance Department, the sum of $646.91, public funds for which he is accountable and which were stolen by a person or persons unknown while in the custody of his agent officer, Maj. (then Captain) Harold F. Scariano, Corps of Engineers: *Provided*, That the said Maj. Harold F. Scariano shall not be held pecuniarily liable for said sum of $646.91 or any part thereof: *And provided further*, That the said sum of $646.91 shall be considered and accounted for as a charge against the appropriation "Finance Service, Army."

SEC. 4. That the Comptroller General of the United States be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to credit in the accounts of Col. F. Richards, Finance Department, the sum of $241.56, public funds for which he is accountable and which were paid by him for newspaper advertising for and in behalf of the United States, said advertising having been published without the prior approval of the Secretary of War as required by Revised Statutes 3828 (44 U. S. C. 324): *Provided*, That Maj. Neil R. McKay, Corps of Engineers, shall not be held pecuniarily liable for said sum of $241.56 or any part thereof.

SEC. 5. That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated to Maj. Joseph J. Hickey, Air Corps, the amount of $140, in full satisfaction of his claim against the United States for a like amount which was supplied by him from personal funds to cover a shortage which developed when, on account of adverse conditions, it was necessary for him to accept from a bank pay-roll funds in Brazilian money, without opportunity for verification.

LT. JAMES H. CLARK AND ELEANOR CLARK

The bill (S. 2098) for the relief of Lt. James H. Clark and Eleanor Clark was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Lt. James H. Clark, Carmel, Calif., the sum of $330, in full settlement of all claims of the said James H. Clark against the United States on account of funeral and burial expenses of his mother, Mrs. Esther Compton Clark, paid by him; and to Eleanor Clark, Carmel, Calif., the minor child of the said Esther Compton Clark, the sum of $4,000, in full settlement of all claims of the said Eleanor Clark against the United States on account of loss of support occasioned by the death of her mother, Esther Compton Clark, when the said Esther Compton Clark was run down and killed by a Navy truck on Ocean Avenue near Casanova Street, Carmel, Calif., on April 7, 1944: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

RESTORATION AND ADDITION OF CERTAIN PUBLIC LANDS TO THE UINTAH AND OURAY RESERVATION IN UTAH

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 837) to restore and add certain public lands to the Uintah and Ouray Reservation in Utah, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the

Committee on Public Lands and Surveys with amendments.

The first amendment was, on page 1, line 7, after the word "reservation", to insert "the same constituting all of the undisposed of, surplus lands."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was on page 3, line 1, to insert "township 5 south, range 4 west, sections 12, 13, 14, 24, 25, 26, 35, and 36."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was on the same page, line 3, to insert "township 5 south, range 3 west."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was on the same page, line 4, to insert "township 4 south, range 1 east."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was on the same page, line 5, to insert "township 4 south, range 1 west."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on the same page, line 9, after the word "such", to strike out "lands formerly belonging to any Indian reservation in said State, to the extent that they have not been disposed of by the United States, are hereby declared to be the absolute property of the United States free from any trust restrictions" and insert "undisposed of open lands located within the boundaries of the former Uintah Indian Reservation in said State are hereby declared to be the absolute property of the United States free from any trust restrictions: *Provided*, That suit may be instituted in the Court of Claims under the provisions of the act of June 28, 1938 (52 Stat. 1209), as amended, to recover just compensation for such lands hereby taken and that the United States shall not, in such suit, be entitled to take as a credit or set-off any gratuitous expenditures made for the Ute Indians, but shall be entitled to take as a credit or set-off that portion of the expenditures made to carry into effect the provisions of the act of May 27, 1902 (32 Stat. 245, 263), opening said reservation to entry as the acreage hereby taken bears to the entire acreage thereby opened to entry: *Provided further*, That if in any suit which may be instituted under said act of June 28, 1938, as amended, the court shall find that any band or bands of the Ute Indians entered into a treaty or treaties with the United States whereby such band or bands agreed to surrender and relinquish to the United States all their possessory right of occupancy in and to all the lands theretofore claimed and occupied by them, as therein defined and set forth (except lands therein reserved for their exclusive use and occupation), and in substantial compliance with the provisions thereof, did surrender and relinquish to the United States such right of occupancy and that the United States, notwithstanding its failure to ratify said treaty or treaties accepted the benefits of such surrender and relinquishment, it is hereby declared that such action shall be sufficient grounds for equitable relief and the court shall enter judgment in favor of said Indians for such lands at the rate of $1.25 per acre; but such judgment shall not as respects such cause of action include any increment, interest, or equivalent thereof, from the date of taking to the date of judgment, as an element of just compensation or otherwise, and this limitation is not severable from the other provisions of this proviso: *Provided further*, That the said act of June 28, 1938, as amended, shall be construed to permit any and all bands of Ute Indians to assert any and all claims which have accrued to any or all of them since they acknowledged themselves to be under the exclusive jurisdiction of the United States (9 Stat. 984), except those actually litigated and determined in the cause entitled *"The Ute Indians* v. *The United States"* (45 C. Cls. 440), but this exception shall not be construed as barring claims which, although they could have been, were not litigated and determined in said cause: *Provided further*, That in any suit instituted under said act of June 28, 1938, as amended, the United States shall not be entitled to take as a credit or set-off, any expenditures made by the United States for the Ute Indians prior to the time the cause of action sued upon arose, or for educational purposes; and, in the event of recovery in any suit jointly brought by more than one band of Ute Indians, the court shall separately ascertain the share of the recovery to which each band is entitled, and separately set off the amount of offsets chargeable to each band: *Provided further*, That in any suit instituted under said act of June 28, 1938, as amended, the Supreme Court of the United States shall have authority to review, as in other cases, any final judgment, or any judgment relating to the right of the plaintiff to recover but which reserves for further proceedings the determination of the amount of the recovery and the amount of the offsets: *Provided further*, That in awarding compensation to the attorney or attorneys prosecuting any suit under said act of June 28, 1938, as amended, the Court of Claims, or the Secretary of the Interior, as the case may be, shall consider all services rendered by said attorney or attorneys and their predecessors under contracts entered into by the Ute Indians with their agent or attorneys, and approved by the Secretary of the Interior, including services rendered before the Members and committees of Congress, the departments of the Government, and the courts, with respect to all suits instituted thereunder: *Provided further*, That the actual expenses of said attorney or attorneys heretofore or hereafter incurred or expended in the prosecution of any suit instituted under said act of June 28, 1938, as amended, shall be paid as provided in the contracts approved by the Secretary of the Interior under which such suit is instituted."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 6, after line 17, to strike out:

SEC. 3. The Secretary is hereby authorized and directed, subject to any valid existing rights, to establish an Indian grazing reserve within the boundaries of Utah Grazing District No. 8 by selecting and setting apart public lands adjacent to the base properties of the Indians of the Uintah and Ouray Reservation for the exclusive use and benefit in common of the said Indians. The establishment of such Indian grazing reserve shall not restrict prospecting, locating, developing, mining, entering, leasing, or patenting the mineral resources in such reserve under the mining and mineral-leasing laws applicable to the public lands of the United States. The area of the public lands to be set aside shall be determined by the Secretary with due regard to the commensurability of said base properties, the amount of lands needed for the proper conduct of a livestock enterprise based upon such Indian properties, and such other range requirement standards as the Secretary may deem proper.

And insert:

SEC. 3. In determining the extent of the tribal and individual grazing privileges of the Ute Indians within the present boundaries of Utah Grazing District No. 8, the Grazing Service, under the supervision of the Secretary of the Interior, shall give recognition to the prior use and productive capacity of any lands purchased for said Indians during the last 11 years as of the time of their purchase; in all other respects the grazing rights of the Ute Indians (tribal and individual) shall be determined and administered by the Grazing Service under the provisions of the act of June 28, 1934 (48 Stat. 1269), as amended June 26, 1936 (49 Stat. 1976), and July 14, 1939 (53 Stat. 1002).

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

EVERGLADES NATIONAL PARK PROJECT, FLORIDA

The bill (S. 2141) to provide for the acceptance and protection by the United States of property within the authorized boundaries of the Everglades National Park project, Florida, pending the establishment of the park, and for other purposes, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, (a) for the purpose of protecting the scenery, the wildlife, and other natural features of the region authorized to be established as the Everglades National Park by the act of May 30, 1934 (48 Stat. 816; 16 U. S. C., secs. 410, 410a–410c), notwithstanding any provision contained in that act, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized in his discretion to accept on behalf of the United States any land, submerged land, or interests therein, subject to such reservations of oil, gas, or mineral rights as the Secretary may approve, within the area of approximately 2,000 square miles recommended by said Secretary in his report to the Congress of December 3, 1930, pursuant to the act of March 1, 1929 (45 Stat. 1443): *Provided*, That no general development of the property accepted pursuant to this act shall be undertaken nor shall the park be established until title satisfactory to the Secretary to a major portion of the lands, to be selected by him, within the aforesaid recommended area shall have been vested in the United States: *Provided further*, That until the property acquired by the United States pursuant to this act has been cleared of the aforesaid reservations, the Secretary in his discretion shall furnish such protection thereover as may be necessary for the accomplishment of the purposes of this act: *And provided further*, That in the event the park is not established within 10 years from the date of the approval of this act, or upon the abandonment of the park at any time after its establishment, title to any lands accepted pursuant to the provisions of this act shall thereupon automatically revest in the State of Florida or

other grantors of such property to the United States.

(b) Upon the execution of the aforesaid provisions relating to establishment thereof, the Everglades National Park shall be established by order of the Secretary which shall be published in the Federal Register.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, Representative PETERSON, who is chairman of the Public Lands Committee of the House of Representatives, has just called me on the telephone and told me that an identical bill to the one just passed by the Senate was passed today by the House and has just been messaged over to the Senate. The situation now is that the House and the Senate have passed the same kind of a bill on the same day. I ask unanimous consent that the vote by which Senate bill 2141 was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, be reconsidered, and that when the message from the House of Representatives announcing the passage of the House bill to which I have referred is laid before the Senate, the House bill then be taken up and considered, and the Senate bill be indefinitely postponed.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I think it would be well to reconsider the vote by which the Senate bill was passed, let the Senate bill lie temporarily on the table, and have the House bill immediately considered when the message is laid before the Senate.

Mr. HATCH. Very well.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the vote by which Senate bill 2141 was passed is reconsidered, and the bill will be returned to the calendar.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. McLeod, one of its clerks, announced that the House had passed a bill, H. R. 5289, to provide for the acceptance and protection by the United States of property within the authorized boundaries of the Everglades National Park project, Fla., pending the establishment of the park, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

EVERGLADES NATIONAL PARK PROJECT, FLORIDA

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair lays before the Senate a bill coming over from the House of Representatives, which will be read.

The bill (H. R. 5289) to provide for the acceptance and protection by the United States of property within the authorized boundaries of the Everglades National Park project, Florida, pending the establishment of the park, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 5289, which has just been laid before the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senate bill 2141 be indefinitely postponed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

TRANSFER OF JURISDICTION OVER CHATTANOOGA NATIONAL CEMETERY

The bill (H. R. 5232) to transfer jurisdiction over the Chattanooga National Cemetery, Chattanooga, Tenn., from the Department of the Interior to the War Department, and for other purposes, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

FACILITIES OF OLYMPIC NATIONAL PARK

The bill (H. R. 1654) to authorize the acquisition of certain privately owned property within the Olympic National Park, in the State of Washington, and for other purposes, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

REPLACEMENT OF INDIAN FISHING GROUNDS SUBMERGED OR DESTROYED BY CONSTRUCTION OF BONNEVILLE DAM

The bill (S. 1581) to authorize the Secretary of War to acquire lands and provide facilities to replace Indian fishing grounds submerged or destroyed as a result of the construction of the Bonneville Dam was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of War is hereby authorized, under such terms and conditions as he may deem advisable, to acquire lands and provide facilities in the State of Oregon to replace Indian fishing grounds submerged or destroyed as a result of the construction of Bonneville Dam: *Provided*, That not to exceed $50,000 may be expended for this purpose from funds heretofore or hereafter appropriated for maintenance and improvement of existing rivers and harbors works: *Provided further*, That such lands and facilities shall be transferred to the Secretary of the Interior for the use and benefit of the Indians, and shall be subject to the same conditions, safeguards, and protections as the treaty fishing grounds submerged or destroyed.

ALEX WYLIE, AND THE ESTATE OF JAMES EVANS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 4366) for the relief of Alex Wylie, and the estate of James Evans, which had been reported from the Committee on Claims with an amendment on page 1, line 6, after the word "Georgia", to strike out "$600" and insert "$1,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That completes the calendar.

HELEN HALVERSON

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MCFARLAND in the chair) laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 1731) for the relief of Helen Halverson, which was, on page 1, line 6, to strike out "$3,000" and insert "$2,500."

Mr. RUSSELL. I move that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

CHANGE OF TERM FOR DISTRICT COURT OF NORTH DAKOTA

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 916, Senate bill 1898.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (S. 1898) to amend section 99 of the Judicial Code, as amended, so as to change the term of the District Court for the District of North Dakota at Minot, N. Dak.

Mr. LANGER. All the bill would do would be to change the term of the District Court for the District of North Dakota at Minot, N. Dak., from the second Tuesday in April to the first Tuesday in October.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I notice the presence of the distinguished acting chairman of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary. I refer to the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH]. May I ask what are his views upon the subject?

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, in response to the question of the Senator from Alabama, my recollection is that the bill received unanimous support of the committee. The bill pertains to a matter relating to the term of the district court for the District of North Dakota at Minot, N. Dak. As I recall, there was no objection to the bill voiced by anyone to our committee.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I may add that I have talked with both Senators from North Dakota and I believe there is complete unanimity between them with reference to the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 99 of the Judicial Code, as amended, is amended by striking out the words "at Minot on the second Tuesday in April" where they appear in the fourth sentence thereof, and inserting in lieu thereof the words "at Minot on the first Tuesday in October."

ADDITIONAL ORDNANCE MANUFACTURING AND PRODUCTION FACILITIES

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Mr. President, from the Committee on Naval Affairs I report favorably, without amendment, Senate bill 2194, authorizing appropriations for the United States Navy for additional ordnance manufacturing and production facilities, and for other purposes, and I submit a report (No. 1215) thereon.

The bill is an emergency measure. There has already been appropriated $660,000,000 for manufacturing of war materials by the Navy. There is now available only $10,000,000, and that amount of money has been requested to be appropriated through the Committee on Appropriations. The request for $50,000,000 more comes as the result of demands of the Army for rocket bombs. The Navy manufactures such bombs, and delivers them to the Army. The demand has become so great that it is essential

that the requested authorization be made, if possible, during the present session of Congress. The committee has held hearings on the matter. There is no opposition to the measure. All members of the committee unanimously favor its consideration.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. Will the Senator state how much money is involved?

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. There is involved $50,000,000.

Mr. President, I ask for the present consideration of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill (S. 2194) was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That there is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, $50,000,000 for necessary tools, equipment, and facilities for the manufacture or production of ordnance material, munitions, and equipment at either private or public plants.

SEC. 2. The authority herein granted shall include the authority to acquire lands at such locations as the Secretary of the Navy may deem best suited to the purpose, erect or extend buildings, acquire the necessary machinery and equipment, and in private establishments provide plant-protection installations, and shall be in addition to all authority heretofore granted for these purposes.

SEC. 3. The Secretary of the Navy from time to time, but not less frequently than every 60 days, shall transmit to the Congress a full report of all acquisitions of land, by lease or otherwise, effected under the authority of this act.

RESIGNATION OF THE SECRETARY OF STATE

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I learned a few moments ago that the distinguished Secretary of State, our friend, Cordell Hull, has resigned as Secretary of State because of ill health.

Mr. President, I deeply regret that the condition of Secretary Hull's health will not permit him to continue as Secretary of State. He has made such an able, splendid Secretary of State that I regard it as a great misfortune that the country should be deprived of his services at this most important period of our history. He is familiar with every detail of the foreign situation; indeed, probably no one has it better in hand or in mind than has Secretary Hull.

Mr. President, I have known Secretary Hull for nearly 40 years. He is the soul of honesty and integrity and one of the most conscientious and high-minded statesmen who ever served the Republic. His services in the House of Representatives, his services in the Senate, and his services in the State Department have been outstanding and have reflected great honor upon the Nation and upon the State of Tennessee, from which he comes. My association with Cordell Hull in the House of Representatives, in the Senate, and since he has been Secretary of State has at all times been of the most intimate and cordial character. I do not believe that any man who has ever held that exalted position has reflected greater honor upon it or has ever conducted it in a more successful manner than has Cordell Hull. He has but one idea, one purpose, one ambition, and that was fairly and justly to protect and safeguard the interests of the great country which he represented so well as head of the Department of State. That was also the ideal which inspired him as a Representative in the other House, and as a Senator, as many of my colleagues will remember. There have been many criticisms, but very few if any that ever reflected in the slightest degree upon his ability, upon his sagacity, upon his honesty, his fairness, or his patriotism as an American.

It is, I repeat, a great misfortune that his health is in such a condition that he cannot further carry on his arduous duties, for never has a man studied questions more carefully or endeavored more earnestly to represent his country in all the momentous decisions which had to be made than has Cordell Hull during the years he has served so faithfully as Secretary of State. I deeply deplore his retirement from office and I hope that the indisposition from which he now suffers will soon pass away and that he will be restored to health and strength so that he may continue to carry on. I regard him as one of the finest men and one of the noblest characters I have ever known in all my public life.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, the resignation of the Secretary of State, the Honorable Cordell Hull, seems to me to be almost tragic. Just at a time when he was about to realize the culmination of years of toil and effort looking toward the establishment of an international organization in behalf of peace, his health becomes such that he feels that he is forced to retire from the active duties of his office.

Secretary Hull has an unblemished reputation for integrity, for high-minded public service, and for strict adherence to the highest ideals of professional ethics. He has been a tireless worker and has to his credit many outstanding accomplishments in behalf of the people of the United States and, in a larger measure, in behalf of the people of the world.

He rendered outstanding service with regard to the Western Hemisphere and the creation of a spirit of unity and harmony between all the republics of the western world. He took a leading part, as we know, in the great and historic conference held at Moscow, which was the forerunner of what we hope to be the machinery of an international peace organization which we anticipate will be created early in the next year.

Personally I feel a very keen regret and a deep sense of loss. It was my pleasure as a young Member of the House of Representatives to serve with Secretary Hull in that body for 10 years. I had also the honor of serving with him for a short time in the United States Senate. Throughout his service in the Congress he exemplified all the fine qualities that a Member of the Congress should possess. He had a concept of the functions of the departments and of the functions of the Federal Government with relation to the States that was entirely sound and reflected the historic policy of the Nation.

The great office of the Secretary of State has been held by many eminent men. Among the number were Thomas Jefferson, third President of the United States; John Jay, an eminent jurist and distinguished diplomat; James Madison, one of the authors of the Constitution, and a President of the United States. Daniel Webster served as Secretary of State, and was also a great Senator from the State of Massachusetts. William H. Seward, of New York, had a distinguished record in this office. Richard Olney, of Massachusetts, was Secretary of State in the Cleveland administration, and took a leading part in the controversy over the Monroe Doctrine, arising because of a dispute with Venezuela and Great Britain. Elihu Root, one of the great legal minds of the Nation, occupied this station. Philander C. Knox, of Pennsylvania, was also an eminent Secretary of State, and a great judicial authority. William J. Bryan was Secretary of State in the early days of the Wilson administration. Chief Justice Charles Evans Hughes served as Secretary of State.

Finally came the distinguished subject of these remarks, Cordell Hull. He does not suffer in comparison with the eminent men whose names I have mentioned. He perhaps did not play upon as spectacular a stage as some of them, but in the fundamental, primary qualities of statecraft, of personal integrity, of vision, and of outlook, Secretary Hull was not excelled by any of those whose shining names I have mentioned.

Mr. President, it is a misfortune to the people of the United States and to the people of the world that Secretary Hull's strength was not preserved and increased, in order that he might witness the culmination of his Herculean efforts and of his fine vision as to the future and the welfare of the world, and that he could not witness the organization and the ratification by this body of an instrumentality for world peace, and to suppress aggression.

Mr. President, I am glad to pay to Secretary Hull my personal tribute of admiration and affection and my official appraisement of the loftiness of character, of the strength, and of the gentleness of this great man, whom disease and illness have struck down in the very flower of his power and influence.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I wish earnestly to join, from this Republican side of the aisle, in the expression of the deepest regret regarding the news of the retirement of Secretary of State Hull. I regret it not only because his retirement is the result of ill health, from which a sympathetic world will pray for his swift and complete recovery; I regret it also and particularly because it takes from high public service at this critical moment of the world's history and our own, one of the ablest officers and one of the finest characters I have ever known in my time.

Secretary Hull has the confidence of Congress and the country—yes, and of the United Nations—in rare degree. He deserves it, because of his devotion to the highest principles, his indefatigable attachment to the high and humane

ideals which he personified, his capacity for friendly and considerate and unpartisan contacts with his fellow men, and the shining integrity which has always been the standard of his life.

If the great peace adventure upon which the hopes of the world hang is a success, it must never be forgotten or ignored that the trademark of Cordell Hull's genius, patience, vision, and diplomacy is upon it.

Many of us have known Secretary Hull here in the Senate; we have known him in his Cabinet portfolio; we have known him as a genial, kindly friend. We will all hope for his prompt recuperation and for his continuing influence in the administration which he leaves at such untimely moment.

Mr. President, the President of the United States will never make a more important appointment than the selection of the successor to Secretary of State Cordell Hull, because it involves not only the completion of our peace contacts with the international world, but it also involves the popular confidence with which the American people will engage themselves in this great peace adventure.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, the retirement of Mr. Hull is a national calamity. It is a tragic loss to the statesmanship of the world. As a Member of the House of Representatives, as a Senator of his State and of the United States, and as Secretary of State, in all these positions of public trust, he constantly grew in stature until today Mr. Hull is a world influence.

Kindly, gracious, with integrity unchallengeable, with deep convictions and steadfast loyalty to them, he has won the hearts and respect of all his associates in public service.

Mr. President, I deeply regret that physical conditions recommend his retirement. This regret will be universal. Our respect and affection will abide with Mr. Hull all the days of his life.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, as one of the younger group of Senators who did not have the privilege of knowing Secretary Hull as he served in the House of Representatives, but who in recent months have had more or less close contact with him in dealing with questions which involve the welfare of every human being in all the world, I cannot let this opportunity pass without saying one word or two of my own.

I could say, Mr. President, in this hour, that if ever the world needed statesmanship, it is now; if ever the world needed patriotic service to mankind, it is now; if ever the world needed integrity and courage in public officials, it is now, and in the months to come. I could say those things about all the world and about Secretary Hull, and they would be true of him, for he does embrace all those characteristics which the world needs so much today.

I do not choose to base my remarks upon the needs of the world; I am thinking at this moment of the needs of my own country, the needs of generations yet unborn, and I wish to say that America needs now more than ever, perhaps, in her history, men of leadership, men of courage, men of patriotism, men of integrity, and men of devotion to the country's welfare.

Cordell Hull possessed all these qualities and more. True it is, the world has lost in the illness which requires his resignation from the high position he has held, but I think it is more true that our own country suffers in losing the services of that great statesman, that great patriot, that great American, Cordell Hull.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I wish to join with the distinguished Members of this body who have expressed regret because of the retirement of Secretary Hull from the public service, and to join with them also in the just and deserved tributes which they have paid him. Practically the whole mature life of Secretary Hull has been a life of service to our country. He started back in his native State of Tennessee as a nisi prius judge. He came to the House of Representatives, and I recall when I had the honor of entering that body he was then acclaimed as one of the greatest and most outstanding authorities, not only in the Congress but throughout the Nation, on the great and troublesome questions of tariff and taxation. Promoted by his people to this body, his service here was one of great distinction.

But the crowning glory of his career has, of course, been his work as the Secretary of State. I was impressed with what the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] had to say about Secretary Hull's appreciation of this body, the Senate. Certainly no man who has been Secretary of State of the United States has had a deeper appreciation than he of this body or the place of this body in treaty-making and in the formulation and determination of our foreign policy, and at all times Secretary Hull not only gave to the members of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations but to other Members of the Senate his full confidence, ever inviting them to confer with him in order that he might give to them the best information or light on the vexing problems of foreign policy which were confronting our country.

Men may not always have agreed with Cordell Hull, but in all my 20 years of rather intimate knowledge of him, and of the Members of the Congress of the United States, I have never known any man who ever questioned his devotion, his patience, and his integrity. Mr. President, his integrity stood forth like a great rock in a weary land. He set an example of public service for all of us.

We know that Moses led the children of Israel out of bondage and led them for many a long year, but that it was denied to him to cross over into the promised land. If we shall ever cross over into the promised land of an enduring peace it will be due in large measure to the leadership, the devotion, and the indefatigable efforts of Secretary Hull.

During these later years of great stress and great suffering, Mr. Hull has been a man dedicated to the cause of his country and to the cause of the peace of the world. Future generations will know the service that he rendered as one of the great Secretaries of State of all time, as one of the great public servants in all our history. This is indeed, Mr. President, a sad day, not only for the United States but for all the world, when we lose the services of a statesman and a patriot so great as is Cordell Hull.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, it is a tragedy and a calamity that in this time of international stress and crisis, a time when our own domestic policy with regard to post-war relations with other nations is to be decided, the great statesman, Cordell Hull, has been forced to retire from the Cabinet. Millions of Americans will be deeply grieved not only by the fact of his retirement but by the fact that his retirement was caused by the state of his health.

I do not think the services of Secretary Hull in the last 12 years can possibly be overestimated. He has served longer as Secretary of State than any other man in the history of the country, and he will be enrolled in history as one of the very greatest of that illustrious line of statesmen who have been Secretaries of State of the United States, considered by many to have been a more distinguished line than the line of the Presidents themselves. It seems to me that Secretary Hull's services at this particular time are irreplaceable. I say that with all regard and admiration for his successor.

Mr. President, it has been my privilege to know Secretary Hull and know him intimately since he first went to the House of Representatives nearly 40 years ago. Even at that time, young as he was, he already had a record of distinguished service. He was an able officer in the Army during the Spanish-American War and a distinguished jurist in his own State of Tennessee. He immediately took high rank in the House of Representatives, and he was the father of the present theory of the income-tax law, of which he was the author, adopted before the constitutional amendment authorizing the income tax, and in an effort to circumvent the decision of the Supreme Court of the United States in the Pollock case. He speedily took high rank as the leading authority on the tariff and on other fiscal subjects in the Congress of the United States. His whole public career has been a monument of honor, of high courage, and of deepest devotion to the public service.

Roscoe Conkling once said in an oration that fame rests not so much on things written and things said as on the arduous greatness of things done.

I am sure that every patriotic citizen of the United States indulges the hope and the very devout wish that Cordell Hull's health will be sufficiently restored so that he may be called back to some position of high service to his country.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, I am glad to join with my colleagues in paying a tribute to Cordell Hull while he yet lives. In being able to pay this tribute we find ourselves at our best. Too often we wait until our friends and associates are dead to say what we think about them or about their services. Cordell Hull has earned in his lifetime the respect of the American people. He has

earned it because of his great devotion to their welfare.

A great tragedy has fallen upon the people today when we can no longer count on his services in his capacity of Secretary of State. His genuineness, his considerateness, his warmth of feeling, and his very great devotion to the people of the United States will be something that the people of the United States will never forget.

This, Mr. President, in a few words is my simple tribute to my friend who retires from the public service today.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, in joining in this expression of appreciation of our great Secretary of State, let me say that I have not had the privilege of serving with him so long as have some of the Members who have spoken. Nevertheless, I have formed the highest regard for him and for his services to the world and to the Nation.

I merely wish at this time to call attention to one particular feature as we move forward with the work which he has begun. The great progress in the world toward a general international organization dates from the visit which Secretary Hull himself made to Moscow. At that time he was the leading factor in bringing from that meeting the so-called Moscow Agreement, upon which the resolution of the United States Senate of November 5, 1943, was based. It is therefore upon his recommendation, upon the language of the Moscow Agreement and upon his leadership, that the Senate of the United States has taken its position and indicated the policy of the United States of America in this crisis. That policy is founded on four cornerstones. The Senate recognizes the necessity of there being established at the earliest practicable date a general international organization based upon the principle of the sovereign equality of all peace-loving states, and open to membership by all such states, large and small, for the maintenance of international peace and security. That in itself is a monument to Secretary Hull which the Senate has recognized and which I trust the Nation will shortly recognize.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. HILL. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MCFARLAND in the chair) laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting several nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committee.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts, from the Committee on Naval Affairs:

Sundry officers for promotion for temporary service in the Marine Corps.

By Mr. CONNALLY, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

Steve M. King, of Texas, to be United States attorney for the eastern district of Texas.

By Mr. HATCH (for Mr. MURDOCK) from the Committee on the Judiciary:

Joseph W. Kehoe, of Alaska, to be United States district judge for division No. 2 of Alaska, vice J. H. S. Morison, term expired;

By Mr. HATCH (for Mr. ANDREWS) from the Committee on the Judiciary:

Jordan B. Royall, of Florida, to be United States marshal for the northern district of Florida; and

Gerald A. Gleeson, of Pennsylvania, to be United States attorney for the eastern district of Pennsylvania.

By Mr. GEORGE, from the Committee on Finance:

The following-named persons to be members of the Advisory Board, Office of War Mobilization and Reconversion:

PUBLIC MEMBERS

O. Max Gardner, of North Carolina.
William H. Davis, of New York.
Anna M. Rosenberg, of New York.

LABOR MEMBERS

William Green, of Ohio.
Philip Murray, of Pennsylvania.
T. C. Cashen, of New York.

AGRICULTURE MEMBERS

Edward A. O'Neal, of Alabama.
James G. Patton, of Colorado.
Albert S. Goss, of Washington.

INDUSTRY MEMBERS

Eric A. Johnston, of Washington.
George H. Mead, of Ohio.
Nathaniel Dyke, Jr., of Arkansas.

By Mr. MCKELLAR, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads:

Sundry postmasters.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the calendar.

NOMINATION OF GUY MASON TO BE COMMISSIONER OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Guy Mason to be Commissioner of the District of Columbia, which nomination had been previously passed over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to this nomination?

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Mr. President, I wish to say a few words to explain why I do not believe this nomination should be confirmed.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN] was chairman of the District Committee at the time the matters whereof I shall speak were before the committee. The Senator from Nevada is not present. Although I have understood that it was his desire to be heard when this nomination was considered, I have no personal word from him to that effect.

In September 1943, the Senator from Nevada, as chairman of the District Committee, in answer to a petition signed by approximately 150 patients of the tubercular ward in Gallinger Hospital in this city, appointed a subcommittee to investigate Gallinger Hospital. In order to explain to Members of the Senate why I do not think this nomination should be confirmed, it is necessary for me to go into some of the details of that investigation, and I hope the Senate will bear with me. I shall be as brief as possible in the presentation of my views.

The Senator from Oregon [Mr. HOLMAN], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BUCK], and I were named on the subcommittee by the chairman, the Senator from Nevada. I had never heard of Gallinger Hospital before that appointment. We gathered in the office of the Senator from Oregon, and asked the clerk of the committee where Gallinger Hospital was. He could not tell us. So we called a taxicab and drove to Gallinger Hospital. We spent the afternoon there. If Senators do not know where it is located, let me say that it is on the Anacostia River, a short distance east of the Capitol.

While we could not possibly examine or investigate Gallinger Hospital in an afternoon, we did see a number of things which were so conspicuous that they could not be overlooked. For one thing, we called at the kitchen of the hospital. Excuses were made, during the course of the investigation and thereafter, that sufficient appropriations had not been made for obtaining proper facilities for the hospital. I challenge that statement, because the appropriations which have been made have been almost identical with the recommendations of the budget officer for that purpose throughout many years.

On the afternoon we went to the kitchen of the hospital I found the concrete floor in the kitchen covered with greasy, dirty water, standing in pools. I called upon a couple of newspapermen, who had apparently accidentally found their way into the place, to observe the conditions. The work tables in front of the ranges in the kitchen were greasy, unclean, and unfit for the preparation of human food.

We then turned to the ranges. There was a row of them on the wall behind the work tables. Those ranges were completely coated with an accumulation of old and unremoved grease which must have taken months to collect. The grease was at least a third of an inch thick upon all those ranges. In the warming ovens above the ranges we could see cockroaches flitting about. The dirt in the corners of the warming ovens was such that one would not keep food in there for a dog; and yet food was kept there for the poor and unfortunate people who were patients at that institution.

I hold no brief for anyone in this connection. I have a bare personal acquaintance with Mr. Mason, who is a Commissioner of the District of Columbia.

But we found other things. We went to the tubercular ward, where we found filth, dirt, and stinking corruption which were a disgrace to the city of Washington, and which had been there for months. In the cupboards of various rooms there were cockroaches, lice, and worms of various kinds. Bathrooms were filthy. The tubs were so black that one would not bathe a hog in them. The windows had not been washed for many months.

After seeing those things, your subcommittee thought it advisable to conduct hearings upon this matter, so we called a hearing. We advertised it so as to give everyone in the city of Washington who wished to appear before the committee an opportunity to be heard.

We took testimony for many days. I think we made a thorough and searching examination of the witnesses who appeared before us.

Senators may wonder how Commissioner Mason is tied into this thing. I will tell the Senate. Three Commissioners are appointed by the President for the government of the city of Washington. They are appointed for terms of 3 years. At the present time the term of one of the Commissioners is about to expire, or has just recently expired, but he continues to serve until a successor is appointed, so no harm is done by delay in acting upon the nomination.

Commissioner Mason, among others, was called as a witness Mr. President, before your committee. Before I conclude I shall read some of Commissioner Mason's testimony. He flatly refused to testify before the committee. He defied the committee and said that he would not answer questions until the investigation was over.

Mr. President, the position of Commissioner Mason in this matter is very important, for the following reasons: Prior to the hearing a year ago, the three Commissioners of the District of Columbia divided the work of the District of Columbia into three parts, and Commissioner Mason had exclusive jurisdiction of Gallinger Hospital and other institutions in the District of Columbia. The other two Commissioners paid no attention to them; that work was not their job. It was Commissioner Mason's job to supervise completely that institution. That is why Commissioner Mason becomes important when his nomination is before the Senate for another appointment for 3 years to that job.

Mr. President, Mr. Mason admitted in the course of a discussion of this matter that he had not been to Gallinger Hospital for many weeks. Several weeks before—about the middle of July 1943, as I recall—the Comptroller General of the United States had made a thorough examination of certain fiscal irregularities in that hospital. The Comptroller's report was submitted to the Commissioners on July 18, 1943, as I remember. The report, which is available to anyone who wishes to see it, specifically charged irregularities—thefts, if you please—at Gallinger Hospital by employees there, irregularities on the part of the superintendent, and the appropriation of property by employees here, there, and everywhere. In fact, they even carried away whole hams, for the use of various employees. In the face of charges of that kind, I maintain that Commissioner Mason was, in duty bound, obligated to go to Gallinger Hospital and find out what was going on, if he had not been there before—and according to the testimony and according to the evidence as to the physical conditions at Gallinger Hospital, the Commissioner had never been there, at least no more than to call on the Superintendent—because he was absolutely responsible for that hospital and its condition, and no man in his right senses could overlook the conditions of filth, degradation, and rotten stinkingness which existed at Gallinger Hospital, which made it a disgrace to the city of Washington and the District of Columbia, our National Capital. Commissioner Mason did not do anything to obviate those conditions. He did not do anything to try to correct what was going on. The testimony or the report of the Comptroller shows that several of the witnesses against whom the accusation of theft was made by the Comptroller and his investigators were still on the pay roll at Gallinger Hospital. Commissioner Mason knew what that report was. He had an opportunity to read it. What was his duty, Mr. President? Was it to take a position of stubborn pride, and to say, "I will not go there until Senator McCARRAN's committee gets through"? Or was it his duty to go there and investigate conditions for himself, at least to clean up the filth of which the patients at that hospital were the victims. But that was not done.

Now, Mr. President, I wish to call attention briefly to a few things which came up in the hearing and in the investigation. First of all, I wish to call the attention of the Senate to the recommendations of your committee, when it finished its investigation. They read in part as follows:

> We recommend the immediate removal of Commissioner Guy Mason, because of his complete failure to perform the duties of his job in supervising Gallinger Municipal Hospital.
>
> We recommend the removal of Dr. George C. Ruhland, because of his failure as Health Officer of the District to know and prevent a continuance of the condition described in this report as existing at Gallinger Municipal Hospital.
>
> We recommend the removal of Supt. Dr. Edgar A. Bocock. This investigation has convinced your committee that he is unsuited to the job of superintending an institution as large and varied as Gallinger Municipal Hospital.
>
> We recommend the removal of Dr. Joseph L. Gilbert, because he has not displayed an attitude of sympathetic understanding for the patients coming within his jurisdiction and seems to your committee temperamentally unfitted for the position he now holds.
>
> We recommend the dismissal of Dr. Charles P. Cake, in charge of the tubercular ward, because he has permitted an atmosphere of callousness, indifference, and neglect of patients to pervade that ward.

On the basis of that recommendation, Dr. Bocock, superintendent of the hospital, and Dr. Cake, the head of the tubercular ward, resigned. Your committee recommended the dismissal of three other men, Mason, Ruhland, and Gilbert. All of them are still in office. All of them are still functioning in Gallinger Hospital; and, so far as I know, the conditions we pointed out are still existing.

The Comptroller's report, supported by the findings of investigators from the District of Columbia Government—from the Health Department, I believe—referred to the irregularities, let us say, of Dr. Bocock, who now has resigned, and is no longer in the picture. I wish to say in defense of the committee, Mr. President, that during the course of the investigation we received many letters from persons in Washington telling us what a wonderfully fine man Dr. Bocock was. I have no quarrel with anyone in the city of Washington about the doctor; he may be all they say he is. But I have in my file at this moment a letter from the president of the University of Colorado, who stated to me in the letter that Dr. Bocock was dismissed from his position in one of their hospitals in connection with the university because of irregularities in his conduct of that institution. That letter was not placed in the hearings at the time your committee made its report, because we did not then have that statement from the University of Colorado.

I wish to call the attention of the Senate to the statements of half a dozen witnesses who testified before your committee. There were repeated witnesses who testified to seeing the employees, from the superintendent down, carry away food and other articles belonging to the United States Government from Gallinger Hospital while they worked there. At least three or four of those persons were still working there the last I knew of it, months after the discovery of their irregularities.

Eliza Smith testified:

> I worked at Gallinger Hospital between 1930 and 1940. Part of my work was taking care of Dr. Bocock's private car. I wash it every Wednesday and wax it about once a month. About two times each month while I was washing Dr. Bocock's car, an employee, a white man, brought a container of motor oil and put it in the engine of Dr. Bocock's car.

Another of the employees built a basement, a concrete floor, and a number of other improvements at Dr. Bocock's home out of hospital property, and used hospital trucks and hospital employees to do the work.

Another one outfitted a motor boat or launch, on the river, out of hospital property.

All those facts were reported by the Comptroller's office; and because of that report Commissioner Mason knew they existed, but he did not take any action whatever about them.

Another case is that of a witness, a young woman, whose name appears in the records and in the testimony. She appeared before our committee, and testified. She works in the District of Columbia. She said she had taken an overdose of headache tablets. Her landlady reported the case to the police. The police carried her to Gallinger Hospital. She was placed in the psychopathic ward, and was held there for a week. There was nothing the matter with her except something which happens to many persons. But when she reached there she had her clothing removed. She was placed in solitary confinement in a cell or room without furniture, without toilet facilities, and on a concrete floor, and kept there overnight. The next day she was put into a bathtub and tied in by her hands and her ankles. Sheets in the form of a cord or rope were rolled around her neck to keep her in the tub. She was kept in that position for a large part of the day and night, without permission to go to the toilet, and without the strain upon her being eased in any way.

The doctors in charge of the hospital knew the condition of this young woman. They knew how she was being treated, and they did nothing about it. Mr. President, the record is full of cases of patients in Gallinger Hospital being beaten and choked by orderlies and other help at the hospital. One man was choked into unconsciousness, and when he regained consciousness he found himself strapped down, hand and foot, and was kept in that condition for more than a day. Another man was tied in the bathtub with a sheet twisted around his neck. He asked for permission to go to the toilet and permission was refused him. He was told to "Go ahead and let your bowels move in the bathtub." That is in the testimony.

Mr. President, I do not charge that Commissioner Mason is responsible for the brutality, neglect, or ill treatment which may be accorded to patients at Gallinger Hospital; but such conditions are shown to have existed for a long time. If Commissioner Mason had been on the job he would have known about such conditions at the hospital and would have tried to prevent them. If he had been on the job some word of the situation would occasionally have come to him.

Dr. Gilbert, who is head of the psychopathic ward, has testified that he knows that the practice of tying down patients by the hands and feet is not practiced in up-to-date hospitals or psychopathic wards, but that he had to do it because he did not have enough room to treat patients properly. The entire testimony shows a complete disregard of the humanities on the part of the doctors and attendants involved.

Mr. President, Commissioner Mason did nothing to alleviate the situation to which I have referred, although he had exclusive jurisdiction over the hospital and had to take care of it. Yet, when we asked him to come before our committee and tell us what the situation was with reference to conditions in the hospital, he refused to testify and said that he wanted the record to show that he had refused to testify and would not talk until the investigation had been completed. In other words, Commissioner Mason showed a complete disregard of the amenities which we thought the situation called for. He showed a callous disregard, if you please, not only of the patients in the hospital but of the United States Senate as well. I believe that in every step of this proceeding Commissioner Mason has shown himself unfitted in every way, shape, and manner to hold his position. We felt sure—and that is the only reason I am bringing the matter before the Senate this afternoon—that Senators who are not members of the subcommittee have not had time to read the testimony and reports and familiarize themselves with Commissioner Mason's record. I have felt sure, for the same reasons, that the President would not have reappointed Mr. Mason had he had the record of Commissioner Mason brought to his attention.

Therefore, Mr. President, I object to the confirmation of the nomination of Mr. Mason as Commissioner of the District of Columbia, and I hope that in the face of the record of Mr. Mason's conduct of his office, Members of the Senate will deny him the confirmation for which the President has asked.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, as a member of the Committee on the District of Columbia, although not a member of the subcommittee which investigated the Gallinger Hospital, I wish to join in the statement which has been made by the Senator from South Dakota.

I am impressed by his remark that the Senate and the other House owe a peculiar duty to the District of Columbia. The people of the District of Columbia elect no officials whatever. The question is not one of removal from office, but it is a question of whether we will confirm the nomination for reappointment of an officer who is responsible for the conditions described by the Senator from South Dakota, which conditions have existed during his term of office.

The conditions at Gallinger Hospital were investigated by men of extraordinary ability. The Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN], who was at that time chairman of the Committee on the District of Columbia, appointed the Senator from South Dakota, who has served as Governor of the State of South Dakota, the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BUCK], who I believe was the only one ever to serve two terms as Governor of his State, and the Senator from Oregon [Mr. HOLMAN], who had served as a member of the board of commissioners of an institution in Oregon similar in character to that of Gallinger Hospital.

The members of the subcommittee held hearings, and were unanimously in favor of the removal of the officers of Gallinger Hospital. They also joined in an unanimous recommendation that Commissioner Mason be not continued as one of the three Commissioners of the District of Columbia. There was no way by which such suggestion could be carried out at that time, and no action was taken by the full committee on the recommendation.

In the discussions held before the committee it was pointed out that the matter of reappointment of Commissioner Mason would come up for confirmation before the Senate in due course, and that if the President should reappoint Commissioner Mason to his present position it would then be appropriate to call the attention of the Senate to the matters which had come before the subcommittee, which resulted in the unanimous recommendation of the subcommittee against the reappointment of Commissioner Mason.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN], who had previously served as a member of, and finally as chief justice of, the Supreme Court of the State of Nevada, joined vigorously in the recommendation that Mr. Mason be not continued in his office. I quote from a statement made on September 20, 1944, by the Senator from Nevada:

> When the renomination of Commissioner Mason comes before the Senate I shall make it a point, if I am then a Member of this body, to be present, and to oppose with all my strength confirmation of the nomination of Mr. Mason. My reason for that attitude is Mr. Mason's conduct before the Committee on the District of Columbia when he practically scoffed at the idea of giving any statement, explanatory or otherwise, pertaining to a public institution over which he had control.

The Senator from Nevada cannot be present today, and I feel obligated to invite the attention of the Senate to the position which he took upon the date to which I have referred, in view of his public life and his service as chairman of the Committee on the District of Columbia.

I wish also to mention the fact that service on the Committee of the District of Columbia is not an easy service. When a subcommittee such as this is called upon to make an investigation, and after it does so arrives at the unanimous opinion that conditions should be changed, and recommends changes in the officers responsible for such conditions, the Senate owes at least a duty to the subcommittee to support its recommendations. It seems to me that otherwise the Senate would not be carrying out its obligation to the public and to this community.

The Senate as a whole cannot make such investigations as the one which is made by the subcommittee. I believe that when we are confronted with a situation such as the one which has been described, there is only one remedy to pursue, and that is to remove the appointive officers and put others in their places, or, if it is a matter of election, to elect someone else to succeed him when his term ends.

We have that responsibility today. The people of the District of Columbia cannot act for themselves. The Senate itself is not in a position to investigate fully. Our subcommittee has reported, and it has recommended, and therefore I wish to join in the report of the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD], and oppose the confirmation of this appointment.

In order that the Senate may have before it the substance of the testimony which Mr. Mason gave before the subcommittee, I wish to read the testimony. It is as follows:

> Senator BUSHFIELD. Did you make any attempt yourself to investigate the charges made by the Comptroller General?
>
> Mr. MASON. I did not, and advised against our doing so until the district attorney had finished.
>
> Senator BUSHFIELD. Well, the presence of dirt or filth in Gallinger would not necessarily come under the district attorney.
>
> Mr. MASON. That was not a part of the Comptroller General's report.
>
> Senator BUSHFIELD. I beg to differ with you, Mr. Mason; it is very definitely in there.
>
> You have heard these various witnesses this week?
>
> Mr. MASON. I have.
>
> Senator BUSHFIELD. Testify about the dirt our there?
>
> Mr. MASON. I have, and I have no comment to make until the hearing is over and until the district attorney has passed on it.
>
> Senator BUSHFIELD. Then you decline to make any statement?
>
> Mr. MASON. I decline to make any statement about it.
>
> Senator BUSHFIELD (to the official reporter). You have that in the record, have you?
>
> OFFICIAL REPORTER. Yes, Senator BUSHFIELD.
>
> Mr. MASON. Please do.
>
> Senator BUSHFIELD. When did you go to Gallinger last?

Mr. MASON. Well, I think I went out with a newspaperman in August of this year.

The hearing being in the latter part of September.

Senator BUSHFIELD. That was the last time you have been there?

Mr. MASON. Yes, sir.

Senator BUSHFIELD. And you knew that there were charges being made by patients and by former patients and by some former employees as to the sanitary conditions out there, did you not?

Mr. MASON. I did not.

Senator BUSHFIELD. When did you first learn of it?

Mr. MASON. Newspaper accounts in September, after they had been submitted to Senator MCCARRAN.

Senator BUSHFIELD. But you have not been out there since you learned of it?

Mr. MASON. No, sir.

Senator BUSHFIELD. Why not?

Mr. MASON. Because we got the report in July from the Comptroller General's Office, and the minute that Senator MCCARRAN got the report he determined on a public hearing, and we thought we would wait and let the hearing develop.

Senator BUSHFIELD. And now you decline——

Mr. MASON (interposing). And we are going to wait on that.

Senator BUSHFIELD. Do you want the people of this city to understand that is your attitude?

Mr. MASON. Definitely.

Senator BUSHFIELD. And that you decline to talk about it?

Mr. MASON. I definitely want that understanding about it

Senator BUCK. You had the report how long?

Mr. MASON. Four days when it was transmitted to the district attorney.

Senator BUCK. And how long before Senator MCCARRAN got it?

Mr. MASON. Senator MCCARRAN got his report sometime in September; I don't know when. We are waiting on the United States attorney now for his report.

Senator BUSHFIELD. Well, he does not have anything to do with the cleanliness out there; does he?

Mr. MASON. He has nothing to do with it except what is in his report. We did not get the report on the cleanliness until it appeared in the newspapers. That was our first intimation after it had been submitted to Senator MCCARRAN.

Senator BUSHFIELD. That is your primary responsibility?

Mr. MASON. Not necessarily.

Senator BUSHFIELD. You are the Commissioner in charge of that hospital?

Mr. MASON. All right.

Senator BUSHFIELD. You have made no effort to ascertain sanitary conditions there since these charges were made?

Mr. MASON. Because it was already exposed in the newspapers and in the hands of this committee, and I knew the committee would make an investigation, because it had been ordered, and I did not want to interfere with this committee's functions in any way or to make any attempt to correct things so that it might be said it was being covered up.

Senator BUSHFIELD. And you know what the sanitary conditions are?

Mr. MASON. I do; from this testimony and from our own inspectors; and when this investigation is completed we will take all action requisite under the circumstances.

Senator BUSHFIELD. Well, I guess that is the end of the road, Senator; the man declines to talk.

Have you any questions?

Senator BUCK. I might ask Mr. Mason why he declines to talk.

Mr. MASON. Because I am not going to interfere with your investigation and come back and be charged with trying to cover up stuff. I know what these investigations are; I have been around here for 40 years.

Senator BUCK. You have the advantage of us; we have just come to Washington.

Mr. MASON. They get an investigation in July and recommend something, and then the next July we go to the Appropriation Committee and we don't get what we ask for.

Mr. President, I may say in closing that so far as the complaint goes, the appropriations asked for were granted. Investigation shows that the appropriations provided by the Congress were almost precisely what were asked for and approved by the Budget and referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

I believe that under these circumstances, we owe a duty to the people of the District of Columbia not to confirm the nomination.

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I shall not attempt to fix the blame for conditions at Gallinger Hospital, but it is well to keep in mind that some 73 or 74 citizens' associations of the District of Columbia have spoken in favor of continuing Commissioner Mason in his position. The citizens' associations represent a very strong and influential group of the people of the District. In fact, I think they come more nearly representing the wishes of the people of the District of Columbia than any other group in this city.

It is well to keep in mind that the newspapers here have covered this subject very thoroughly, have printed full and complete reports of the investigations at Gallinger Hospital, and every newspaper in the city has committed itself editorially, even in the last few days, to the support of Mr. Mason for reappointment to the position he is now filling. While they are not attempting to defend everything that has been going on at Gallinger Hospital, they do not seem disposed to blame Commissioner Mason for the condition.

I find a short editorial in the Washington Post, printed within the last day or two, which says:

> Thirty-two civic organizations have endorsed the Commissioner for a second term. Only one letter received by the committee expresses opposition. This is indeed phenomenal backing for any public servant. So it can be said without any chance of error that Commissioner Mason is the choice of the people of Washington for the position to which he has been nominated.

A similar editorial appeared only a few days ago in the Washington Evening Star. In fact, every newspaper in Washington, since the investigation of Gallinger Hospital which was conducted by the committee, has urged that Commissioner Mason be reappointed.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CAPPER. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. I was sitting quite a distance from the Senator when he referred to the citizens' associations. I think he referred to some 70 of them?

Mr. CAPPER. Approximately 70 of the citizens' associations of the District of Columbia have gone on record on this subject.

Mr. HATCH. In favor of retaining Commissioner Mason?

Mr. CAPPER. Yes. I myself have received resolutions adopted by over 35 of the citizens' associations, but I am told that about 70 of them have endorsed Commissioner Mason.

Mr. HATCH. Were any of the associations opposed to his confirmation?

Mr. CAPPER. There is no record of a single association opposing Commissioner Mason's reappointment.

Mr. HATCH. I thank the Senator.

Mr. BILBO. Mr. President, as the present chairman of the Committee on the District of Columbia I presume it is expected that I should have something to say in response to the observations made by my colleagues the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BURTON] and the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD].

The investigation of Gallinger Hospital took place during the administration of the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN] as chairman of the Committee on the District of Columbia. While I was then a member of the committee, I had nothing to do with and had no connection with that investigation, and I am not in a position to defend the officials in charge of Gallinger Hospital. In fact, I have a suspicion that just criticism could probably be leveled against all the hospitals in the District of Columbia, especially those which are financed by the Congress, because under present conditions, by reason of the increased cost of supplies and scarcity of labor, it has been a very difficult matter for any of these institutions to function properly. That is especially due to the inadequacy of labor and the inefficiency of labor they are forced to accept at the present time.

However, I am not speaking in defense of the hospitals of Washington. I am joint author with the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] of a bill which we have introduced which would provide for the building for the Nation's Capital of a medical center with 2,000 or 3,000 beds. If there is anything the District needs it is a real medical hospital or center with which all other institutions shall be synchronized or connected and regulated. The people are really in need of this kind of medical center or medical hospital. Of course the Navy Hospital is one of the best in the Nation, but it is not open to the public. I feel sorry for anyone in the District who has to go to the average hospital, especially some of those which are supported by appropriation made by Congress.

Mr. President, I shall say in passing in defense of Dr. Bocock, whom the subcommittee of the Committee on the District of Columbia asked to have removed after it had made an investigation during the administration of the Senator from Nevada of the affairs of the District of Columbia, that Dr. Bocock has been, I think, exonerated in that he was immediately elected director of the Medical Center of Washington, which comprises, among other medical activities, Doctors' Hospital, the outstanding hospital in the city of Washington.

As to the other employees of Gallinger Hospital whom the subcommittee rec-

ommended be removed, I do not know anything about their status, and indeed I do not know anything about the character of the testimony which was adduced before the subcommittee. It has been charged that the testimony was not the best in the world, but I am not here to defend those who had charge of Gallinger Hospital, except to say this: As the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CAPPER] has said, practically all the civic organizations which always speak for the best interests, or try to speak for the best interests, of the District of Columbia, have unanimously endorsed the reappointment of Mr. Mason, and I am sure the President had sufficient information concerning the investigation and all that had taken place in the District when he made the selection, and reappointed Mr. Mason to be Commissioner.

When I returned to Washington this fall I appointed a subcommittee of the District of Columbia to make an investigation for the full committee, and on the subcommittee were the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CAPPER], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WALSH], and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS]. The subcommittee held a meeting and after full discussion I understand the subcommittee decided that Mr. Mason should be endorsed, and they endorsed him unanimously.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BILBO. I am glad to yield.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. I should like to ask the Senator whether the citizens' associations, concerning which he speaks and concerning which the Senator from Kansas spoke, read or had occasion to know the contents of the report which was made by the subcommittee concerning Gallinger Hospital and Commissioner Mason.

Mr. BILBO. I do not know whether they read the report or not, but I have a suspicion that they obtained the worst side of the situation through the local press in Washington, because I think the matter was played up by some of the newspapers of Washington very freely at the time the investigation was in progress. It was a rather nasty story at the time, and I think it was played up by the newspapers of Washington. I think the people of Washington were fully advised of what was said, and who said it, and I think the people of Washington took into account the sources from which the statements emanated, more than anything else, in coming to their determination of the subject, and disagreeing with the recommendations of the subcommittee.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. BILBO. I yield.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. If we can judge at all by the hundreds of letters which are in my file protesting the conditions at Gallinger and protesting against the Commissioner, the Senator might not think that the people of Washington turned down the report.

Mr. BILBO. At any rate, all the civic organizations of Washington have endorsed Mr. Mason, and the full Committee of the District of Columbia, as now composed, has favorably reported the nomination. I say the "full committee." The committee met the other day and reported the nomination unanimously. However, I will say, in justice to the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BURTON] and the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD], that neither Senator was present.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator again yield?

Mr. BILBO. I yield.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. In justice to myself and the Senator from Ohio, I wish to say to the Senate that I arrived about 10 minutes late for the committee meeting in answer to a notice of the secretary of the committee, I presume, stating what would be taken up at that meeting. No word of the Mason appointment was mentioned in that notice; and after the adjournment of the committee I asked the distinguished chairman, the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. BILBO], whether or not he was going to bring up the Mason appointment, and he said "No." As a matter of fact, the committee had already acted upon it when that answer was made.

Mr. BILBO. I wish to say that I explained that to the Senator from South Dakota today. I would have been a fool to say "no" when the matter had already been passed on by the committee at that meeting, and it was done publicly. When the committee met on this occasion, the first matter we took up was the question of the confirmation of Mr. Mason, and there was no objection from anyone. It was not a partisan question at all. The action was unanimous. However, I will say that the Senator from Ohio and the Senator from South Dakota were not present at the time. They arrived late; and the Mason confirmation being the first matter on the calendar, they were not present when it was taken up.

Now, as to the notice that was sent out. It was prepared by the clerk of the committee, Mr. Terry. I told him to specify the bills or the legislation which the committee was going to pass on. Information as to the Mason appointment had been in the press and everyone knew that we were going to act on it.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. There were only three members of the committee present when the chairman called this matter up, were there not?

Mr. BILBO. Three members?

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Yes.

Mr. BILBO. I do not remember. However, I had the proxies of eight members of the committee to report Mr. Mason's nomination favorably.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. The Senator stated at that time that he held eight proxies in his pocket, and there were three Senators present.

Mr. BILBO. So far as the Mason matter was concerned, there was a presence of eight members of the committee on that question, because I held eight affirmative proxies for the nomination of Mr. Mason. Both Democratic members and Republican members of the committee joined in recommending the confirmation of Mr. Mason's nomination.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BILBO. I yield.

Mr. BURTON. I am rising solely because the Senator mentioned my name in connection with the meeting. I have the most cordial relations with the Senator from Mississippi. We room side by side in the Senate Office Building, and often see each other in connection with District of Columbia matters. But as to the meeting of the subcommittee of the District of Columbia which heard the question of confirmation, I will say that I received no notice of that meeting of the subcommittee, and therefore was not present at the meeting. I did receive notice on the evening before the meeting of the District of Columbia full committee that there would be a meeting the next morning at 10 o'clock. I already had a conflicting meeting at 10 o'clock for that same morning in another committee, and I therefore asked the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD] to act as my proxy at the District of Columbia meeting at 10 a. m. I was unable to be there in person, but I think the Senator from Mississippi knew my views on this matter in any event.

Mr. BILBO. I am very sorry that the Senator from South Dakota was given a proxy which he did not have opportunity to vote on this occasion. However, it would not have had any effect, because we had enough votes favorably to report the nomination.

Mr. President, I wish to make this statement of policy. Something has been said about delaying the confirmation of Mr. Mason because of the absence of the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN]. The Senator from Nevada has telegraphed——

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. BILBO. Yes.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Would the chairman of the committee be willing to put this matter over until the Senator from Nevada returns, which will be on the 6th of December?

Mr. BILBO. That is the point I was coming to.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. I beg the Senator's pardon.

Mr. BILBO. My feeling about this matter is that in legislation or in matters of this character, whenever one of my colleagues is absent because of illness, or attending to official business, and the request is made to me to postpone action on a matter, I would most certainly do so as a matter of courtesy to my colleague. But in this case the Senator from Nevada has telegraphed Mr. Biffle, secretary to the majority, merely requesting that he be recorded as voting against the nomination. He did not ask that it be delayed.

I agree with the press of the city that this matter has been hanging fire long enough, and ought now to be acted upon.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. BILBO. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. The Senator has referred to the vote reporting this nomination favorably to the Senate. How many votes were cast in the affirmative?

Mr. BILBO. In the committee?

Mr. WHITE. Yes.

Mr. BILBO. Eight or nine.

Mr. WHITE. How many of them were proxy votes?

Mr. BILBO. I had eight proxies. Of course, some of the members were present.

Mr. WHITE. Did the Senator vote the proxies in favor of the nomination?

Mr. BILBO. Certainly.

Mr. WHITE. Did they constitute a majority of the votes reporting the nomination to the Senate?

Mr. BILBO. Yes. There were about eight or nine votes for confirmation. So far as I have been able to determine, only three members of the committee are opposed to the nomination, namely, the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BURTON], and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN]. I know of no others.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I should like to say a word about this nomination. On last Friday I asked that the nomination go over. Following that I stated to certain Senators that I had no objection to the confirmation of the nomination, that I knew something of Mr. Mason and believed that he had a good reputation in the community. I believe I intimated rather definitely that I expected to vote for his confirmation. But, Mr. President, the situation presented today affects my mind on the question very substantially. In the first place, let me state my opinion that expressions by the newspapers of this community, and by civic bodies, are not very determinative or persuasive with me. Responsibility for what the Senate does rests on Senators. It is not the obligation of community bodies of one sort or another. So I brush all that aside as having little relevancy at this time.

I should like to vote for the confirmation of Mr. Mason's nomination; but unless the story which has been told here this afternoon by the Senator from South Dakota and the Senator from Ohio is traversed in direct terms, and unless I am persuaded that the facts are not as they have been stated this afternoon on the floor of the Senate, I cannot vote for confirmation of the nomination.

I am somewhat a partisan. I always like to see the majority side stand by its President in connection with nominations as well as other matters. By and large, I proceed on the theory that the responsibility for nominations is the responsibility of the Executive, and except in extraordinary circumstances I am not prepared to substitute my judgment as to an appointment for that of the President of the United States. But the charges which have been brought in the Senate Chamber are serious, and if they stand uncontradicted I cannot vote for the nomination.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to this nomination?

Mr. BUSHFIELD. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator withhold for a moment his suggestion of the absence of a quorum?

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Certainly.

Mr. HILL. I wonder if we can obtain an agreement to vote tomorrow on this nomination. It is now nearly half-past 4. Many Senators have left the Chamber to attend to business in their offices. Could we not agree on some time tomorrow to vote?

Mr. BUSHFIELD. I think so.

Mr. HILL. Would it be agreeable to the Senator to vote tomorrow at not later than 12:30 p. m.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. No; that is too early.

Mr. HILL. Does the Senator desire further debate?

Mr. BUSHFIELD. What will be the business tomorrow?

Mr. HILL. The business tomorrow, of course, will be further consideration of the flood-control bill. We might have an executive session tomorrow afternoon about 4 o'clock, and vote tomorrow afternoon.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. I wish to call attention to what I have already said, and to have as many Senators present as possible.

Mr. HILL. How much time would the Senator like to have?

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Why could we not have an executive session at 1 o'clock instead of four?

Mr. HILL. Would the Senator agree to vote not later than 1 o'clock tomorrow?

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, what was the suggestion?

Mr. BUSHFIELD. I suggested to the Senator that we have an executive session not later than 1 o'clock, instead of at 4.

Mr. WHITE. But the Senator did not mean to agree to vote not later than 1 o'clock, did he?

Mr. BUSHFIELD. No; I did not so intend.

Mr. WHITE. The Senator's suggestion was that the executive session should begin at 1 o'clock, was it not?

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Yes.

Mr. HILL. Does the Senator mean an executive session beginning at 1 o'clock, and continuing perhaps all afternoon?

Mr. BUSHFIELD. If it should require that long.

Mr. HILL. The Senate is now in executive session.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. That is true.

Mr. HILL. The Senate could take a recess at this time, in executive session, until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow, at which time we would continue to be in executive session, and proceed with the consideration of this nomination. That might be agreeable if we could agree to have some limitation of debate, and vote at a reasonable time.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Mr. President, I do not think it would be a fair disposition of the case to limit the period of debate, because it will be absolutely necessary for me to point out again what I believe to be the essential points in the Mason case; so I should not wish to be limited to 15, 20, or 30 minutes.

Mr. HILL. Would not the Senator be willing to agree to a reasonable limitation?

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Yes.

Mr. HILL. What would the Senator suggest?

Mr. BUSHFIELD. I suggest that the Senate meet tomorrow at a time agreeable to the Senator. If he wishes to meet at 12:30——

Mr. HILL. Of course, the Senate will meet at 12 o'clock noon tomorrow. The Senate is now in executive session. If we were to take a recess in executive session, it would mean that tomorrow we would proceed with the consideration of the pending executive business at 12 o'clock noon, the pending business being the Mason nomination. I should like, if possible, to have a time set when we may vote on this nomination.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, would it be agreeable to the Senator to meet at 12 o'clock, with the understanding that the vote be taken not later than 2 o'clock?

Mr. BUSHFIELD. That is agreeable to me.

Mr. WHITE. We could vote as much earlier as the circumstances might permit.

Mr. HILL. As I understand, the suggestion is that we vote not later than 2 o'clock.

Mr. WHITE. Yes.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I ask that when the Senate takes a recess today, it takes a recess in executive session, to continue tomorrow at 12 o'clock with the consideration of the nomination of Mr. Mason to be District Commissioner, and that the vote on the nomination be taken not later than 2 o'clock.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Alabama? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The clerk will state the next nomination on the Executive Calendar.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
REGISTER OF LAND OFFICE

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Richard McElligott, to be register of the Land Office at Roseburg, Oreg.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

THE ARMY

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Army.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, it is my purpose possibly to ask that the Army nominations be recommitted to the Committee on Military Affairs. My reason for doing so is that the entire list presented by the Chief of Staff is not before the Senate at this time. That is one reason. I have other reasons, but rather than delay the Senate in recessing this evening, I shall forego a detailed discussion of the other reasons.

I do not believe there will be any contradiction of the statement that personally I am one of the firmest believers in the ability of the Chief of Staff and the General Staff of our Army. That belief includes complete confidence that they are able to pick and choose which officers shall be promoted.

I try to be a rather consistent member of the Committee on Military Affairs, and I try to attend every scheduled meeting of the committee. Because, as I have said, I have not had full notice of any objection to the nomination of any officer suggested for promotion by the President, meaning the Chief of Staff, I do not see why the entire list

of nominations is not before us at this moment. Therefore, I move that the list of nominations for promotions in the Army, now before the Senate, be recommitted to the Committee on Military Affairs for further consideration.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, I would have no objection to that course, but I wish to relate to the Senate the circumstances. In the Committee on Military Affairs we have a Subcommittee on Nominations. The other day, when the full committee met, some members expressed a desire for haste in having nominations confirmed. One of the Senators who wanted haste was the Senator from South Dakota. I did not want haste because Senators on both sides of the aisle had spoken to me objecting to methods in respect to the handling of nominations in the Army and the refusal to give consideration to officers whom they thought were entitled to promotion. In the presence of the Senator from South Dakota I was asked whether there was any objection to the confirmation of nominations of officers serving overseas. I promptly replied that there was none, so far as I knew. Then I believe the Senator from South Dakota left the room, and there were only two of us remaining in the room—the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. REYNOLDS], who is chairman of the committee, and myself.

Having asked about the promotion of all the officers whose names were on the list, I thought there would be no objection to the confirmation of the nominations of approximately half or two-thirds of the officers whose names were on the list because all of them were serving overseas, and I did not think there would be any real objection to the promotion of officers who are actually in combat service. So that is the reason why their nominations are here.

The ones omitted from the list on the calendar are those of officers who are not serving overseas. If any Senator wishes to delay the promotion of an officer who is serving overseas, that is his privilege. Personally, I do not wish to do so.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHANDLER. I yield.

Mr. GURNEY. I am that Senator.

Mr. CHANDLER. The Senator may have their nominations sent back to the committee, if he wishes to do so. But that would only result in our bringing them back here, for later we would report both the nominations of those serving overseas and the nominations of those serving in this country. If the Senator wishes to do that, he is at liberty to do so, but not with my approval.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I hope the Senator from South Dakota will not ask this afternoon that these nominations go back to the committee. If he does not wish to have the Senate act at this time on the nominations, or if he wishes to consider the matter further, I wonder if he will simply ask to have the nominations go over. If the nominations are sent back to the committee, it might not be understood why that was done.

Mr. GURNEY. I would be very careful to tell the committee my complete reasons for asking that the nominations be sent back to it. In fact, I would be very glad to tell the entire Senate.

Mr. HILL. I understand there will be no meeting of the committee tomorrow, certainly not a meeting to consider these nominations.

Mr. GURNEY. There will be a meeting of the committee, as the Senator knows, of course.

Mr. HILL. But that will only be to consider the nominations of persons nominated to be members of the Surplus Property Board.

I would be perfectly willing to have the nominations go over until tomorrow or a later date provided that I be notified in advance and be given an opportunity to be on the floor of the Senate when the nominations come up for confirmation.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. CHANDLER. If the Senator from South Dakota wishes to delay action on the nominations, I wish to ask that they remain in their present place until I come back to the Senate, which will be on Friday. As the Senator from Alabama knows, because of the death of one of my closest friends, Major Burman, I must leave Washington, for I am to be a pallbearer at his funeral.

If the Senator from South Dakota wishes to have the matter handled without delay, I have no objection, for I am ready to vote on these nominations now. But if the Senator wishes to have action on these nominations postponed until he can get the other nominations out of the committee, I do not think he will be able to do so without delay. If he wishes to have delay in acting on the nominations, that is his privilege.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, in order to inform the Senate, I believe it is mandatory on my part to relate the happenings which resulted in having these nominations on the calendar this afternoon.

In the first place, I am a member of the subcommittee of the Committee on Military Affairs which considered the nominations. We have not had a meeting of that subcommittee.

Secondly, on Friday of last week, when other matters and promotions on the list were on the table in the Committee on Military Affairs, we considered the other matters. We adjourned without considering the promotions which were on the table. So the full list has not been considered, so far as I know, by any meeting of the Committee on Military Affairs. The meeting adjourned, and all of us left the room, and no action was taken on the nominations on the list.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GURNEY. I yield.

Mr. CHANDLER. That is precisely true, and I had not called a meeting of the subcommittee. I had not intended to call a meeting of the subcommittee until, as I explained, generals, who tramp up to the Capitol to talk to Senators, could talk to Senators about matters in which they are interested. One such Senator is my distinguished friend, the Senator from Maine, and there are other Senators who asked. So I had not intended to call a meeting, and no meeting was called. If a meeting had been called, I would have given notice to the Senator from South Dakota.

But in his presence and in the presence of the chairman of the committee, Colonel Watt, who is our aide, entered the room and said, "Have you any objection to the confirmation of nominations of officers serving overseas who are to be promoted?"

I said I had none.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, I refuse to yield further, because I must state that I was not present when Colonel Watt entered the room.

Now I will yield further.

Mr. CHANDLER. I am sorry. Did not the Senator tell me he had no objection to the confirmation of the entire list of nominations?

Mr. GURNEY. That is correct.

Mr. CHANDLER. Then it is obvious that the Senator was present at a part of the meeting. If he was not present at the time when Colonel Watt entered the room, I am mistaken.

However, then the Senator from South Dakota left the room. Then the chairman of the committee and Colonel Watt said, "Why not go on and promote the ones who are overseas?"

I said, "I have no objection, but I do not want to do it now if other Senators have objection."

Mr. GURNEY. The Senator admits that not more than two Senators were then in the room.

Mr. CHANDLER. The Senator from South Dakota was in the room just before that time, and he said he had no objection to the entire list of nominations. So I judged that the Senator had no objection.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, I refuse to yield further.

Mr. CHANDLER. Well, Mr. President, the Senator asked me a question, but now he will not permit me to answer it.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, the entire list of nominations was not considered by the subcommittee or the full committee in a regularly scheduled meeting. It is my firm belief that every officer on that list is a member of the team which is the Army of the United States. It is my firm belief that officers who happen to have the misfortune of being told to serve in the United States are just as much members of that team as if they were overseas. It is a team, and I intend so to conduct myself that I shall not differentiate between domestic service and overseas service. The officers who are up for promotion and who happen to be overseas would be the first ones to say that service in the War Department, in the Pentagon Building, is just as important as is overseas service. The men who are overseas are the fortunate ones. Men who are stationed in the United States in Uncle Sam's Army would give their right arms to be given duty overseas.

I make the statement to the Senators now on the floor that there is no objection to the nomination of any officer on the entire list. None has been presented

to the subcommittee; none has been presented to the full committee. The only objection to the list is that there are not on it the names of officers whom some persons wish to have promoted.

Therefore, Mr. President, I believe it is entirely fair that the full list of names be considered and that not merely a part of the list be considered. Unless we may be sure that the Military Affairs Committee, at a meeting of which all members are given notice that motions will be handled, is to be given another opportunity to examine the list, I am sure the nominations should not be confirmed tonight or tomorrow. Therefore I ask that consideration of the nominations go over, or be recommitted to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GURNEY. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. Who is responsible for not having the whole list before the committee?

Mr. GURNEY. So far as I know, the full committee has not had an opportunity to have the full list because the subcommittee has not met and reported to the full committee. I should like to be corrected about that if I have not stated the situation correctly.

Mr. ELLENDER. Are we to understand that the War Department has sent a certain list of names of officers to be promoted, and that the Military Affairs Committee has seen fit not to report the entire list?

Mr. GURNEY. The committee has reported only a part of the list, namely, that part relating to the names of officers who are now serving overseas. The committee deleted from the list the names of officers who are at present stationed in the United States.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, I explained at the outset that there had been no meeting of the subcommittee. I intended to call none. So far as objections are concerned, the Senator from South Dakota does not know about it because the committee has received no objections. However, I went to a meeting of the full committee of the Military Affairs Committee and there were some conversations principally concerning a point under discussion between the Senator from South Dakota and myself. Some members of the committee were absent, and others were not even in the city, and could not have attended a meeting if one had been called. The suggestion was made by Colonel Watt that there could be no objection to confirmation of officers serving overseas. I did not know of any objection. So Colonel Watt is responsible for taking the list to the chairman of the committee and scratching off all the names except the names of officers serving overseas.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GURNEY. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I ask if it is not true that as chairman of the Subcommittee on Confirmation of Nominations the Senator had numerous and frequent requests that consideration be given to the promotion of so-called armchair generals.

Mr. CHANDLER. That is correct.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. While at the same time there has been no objection whatever upon the part of anyone to the promotion of men who are serving overseas and who are engaged in actual battle.

Mr. CHANDLER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. The promotion of such officers is a matter of such great military importance that our committee and all its members have not considered that the wishes of those gentlemen be considered at all.

Mr. CHANDLER. That is correct.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. But when it comes to the promotion of generals in the Pentagon Building, the committee has required that such promotions be given very careful study. Many of those officers are entitled to promotion.

Mr. CHANDLER. Yes, sir.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. The members of the committee want the assignments in the Pentagon Building studied.

Mr. CHANDLER. The committee wants them scrutinized.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. The committee wants them scrutinized very carefully.

Mr. ELLENDER. Will the Senator from Kentucky tell us what authority, if any, Colonel Watt had to strike from the list the names of certain individuals?

Mr. CHANDLER. The Senator from Kentucky is out of the picture at that point, because the chairman of the committee was present, and he authorized what was done. The reason the subcommittee had not met was that no meeting had been called. At a full meeting of the committee I was asked about the overseas officers, and I said that I had no objection to them. If the Senator has objection, I have no objection to his objection. [Laughter.] But the names are before the Senate now because we wanted to approve of the nominations for promotion of overseas officers. I was not ready to call a meeting to approve of the promotions of officers in Washington. I want to be given time to look them over with my colleagues, and have a meeting of the subcommittee. I object to some of the things the Army does, and I do not mind saying so. But I have no objection to the Senator making any objection which he cares to make. I will call a meeting and give the Senator notice of it, and we will go over the list man for man before it is reported to the Senate. I would not have reported as I did had it not been for the fact that Colonel Watt took the list and checked it and took it to the chairman of the committee.

Mr. GURNEY. Did he take it to the chairman of the committee before the meeting ended or after it ended?

Mr. CHANDLER. Oh, I think the Senator from South Dakota had already left.

Mr. GURNEY. Will the Senator state how many Senators were present?

Mr. CHANDLER. I was there and the Senator from South Dakota had just left.

Mr. GURNEY. Was there present any Senator other than the Senator from Kentucky?

Mr. CHANDLER. I do not recall.

Mr. GURNEY. Was there any objection made to any other man whose name appeared on the list?

Mr. CHANDLER. We have had no meeting about that, one way or the other.

Mr. GURNEY. Has any objection been called to the attention of the Senator concerning the name of any man on the list?

Mr. CHANDLER. I have not been concerned with objections, and do not intend to be until I have called a meeting of the subcommittee.

Mr. GURNEY. But no one has voluntarily come to the Senator and said that he had an objection to such-and-such an officer?

Mr. CHANDLER. No; it is very rare that anyone ever goes out of his way to do that, but if notification is made that a hearing will be held, objections are frequently made. Many Senators object to the way in which appointments have been made, and if the Senator from South Dakota objects, I do not have any objection to his objection.

Mr. ELLENDER. In order to put before the Senate Military Affairs Committee the names which have been stricken from the list, will it be necessary for the War Department to submit the list again?

Mr. CHANDLER. Oh, no; the names are still on the list. Colonel Watt merely checked off the names of those who were serving overseas, and asked that they be reported, and the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. REYNOLDS] gave the names to him. Here they are. If the Senator from Louisiana wants to turn them back, he may do so.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, I am still unconvinced. I am still thinking of officers serving under General Marshall, no matter whether they be stationed in the Pentagon Building, in Detroit, in San Francisco, or elsewhere. They are still members of the team, and they have a right to be treated as members of the team. I object to the way promotions have been handled by the Military Affairs Committee. The nominations have never been considered by a subcommittee or the full committee of the Committee on Military Affairs. I firmly believe that there were no more than a very few Senators present at the time the secretary of the committee was told to have the names reported to the floor of the Senate. I therefore object to their present consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from South Dakota to recommit the nominations to the committee.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I understand that the Senator from South Dakota has merely asked that the consideration of the nominations be passed over.

Mr. GURNEY. That is correct.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from South Dakota withdraw the motion he previously made?

Mr. GURNEY. Reserving the right to object, and again to put the motion tomorrow, or when the names are brought

up for consideration, I will at the present time withdraw the motion, and only object to the present consideration of the nominations.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, I ask that they be not considered until I return to the Senate on Friday next.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The consideration of the nominations will be passed over, and, without objection, the request of the Senator from Kentucky will be granted.

THE NAVY

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Navy.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations in the Navy are confirmed en bloc.

That completes the calendar.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be notified forthwith of all nominations confirmed this day.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. McLeod, one of its clerks, announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 4065) further defining the number and duties of criers and bailiffs in United States courts and regulating their compensation, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

DUTIES AND COMPENSATION OF CRIERS AND BAILIFFS IN UNITED STATES COURTS

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, as in legislative session, I desire to make a request. During the call of the calendar today the Senate passed Calendar No. 1189, Senate bill 1747. I was later advised that the House of Representatives had acted favorably upon a similar bill. I am now told that a message from the House of Representatives concerning the bill is on the desk of the Vice President. I ask that the message be laid before the Senate as in legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. As in legislative session the Chair lays before the Senate a bill coming over from the House of Representatives.

The bill (H. R. 4065) further defining the number and duties of criers and bailiffs in United States courts and regulating their compensation, was read twice by its title.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 4065.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I understand the Senator is asking for consideration of a bill which has come over from the House in terms identical with those of a bill passed by the Senate.

Mr. HATCH. No; it is not identical. I wish to ask consideration of the bill from the House, then I wish to offer amendments which will make it conform exactly to the Senate bill, then send it back to the House.

Mr. WHITE. I have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from New Mexico?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 4065) further defining the number and duties of criers and baliffs in the United States courts, and regulating their compensation.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I offer the following amendment, on page 1, line 6, at the beginning of the line to strike out the words "his court" and insert "the court in which he presides."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HATCH. On page 2, line 5, after the word "four," I move to strike out the words "for each court."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HATCH. On page 2, line 10, after the word "present" and the period, I move to insert "In the case the position of crier or bailiff is to be filled by the appointment of a person who has not previously served as either crier or bailiff, preference in the appointment shall be given to a person who has served in the military or naval forces of the United States in time of war and who has been honorably discharged therefrom, if in the opinion of the appointing officer such person is as well qualified as any other available person to perform to the satisfaction of the appointing officer all the duties of the position being filled."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from New Mexico a question.

Mr. HATCH. Very well.

Mr. WHERRY. Does the Senator now know that with these amendments the bills are identical?

Mr. HATCH. I know now that the amendments which we have just adopted to the House bill make it identical with the Senate bill, but the bill has to go back to the House for the House to concur in the Senate amendments.

Mr. WHERRY. That is all I wanted to be sure about.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, Senate bill 1747 will be indefinitely postponed.

RECESS

Mr. HILL. As in executive session, I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 52 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Tuesday, November 28, 1944, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate November 27 (legislative day of November 21), 1944:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

Edward R. Stettinius, Jr., to be Secretary of State.

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

Maj. Gen. Patrick J. Hurley, United States Army, of New Mexico, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to China.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate November 27 (legislative day of November 21), 1944:

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

REGISTER OF A LAND OFFICE

Richard McElligott, to be register of the land office at Roseburg, Oreg.

IN THE NAVY

TO BE REAR ADMIRALS FOR TEMPORARY SERVICE, TO RANK FROM THE DATES INDICATED

Albert G. Noble, from April 12, 1943.
Jerauld Wright, from May 5, 1943.
James Fife, Jr., from April 7, 1943.
Charles W. Styer, from April 13, 1943.

TO BE VICE ADMIRALS, FOR TEMPORARY SERVICE, TO RANK FROM THE DATES INDICATED

David W. Bagley, to continue while serving as commander Hawaiian Sea Frontier, from February 1, 1944.

Charles M. Cooke, Jr., from September 20, 1944.

Charles H. McMorris, to continue while serving as Chief of Staff to the Commander in Chief, United States Pacific Fleet, from September 23, 1944.

Howard L. Vickery, from October 24, 1944.

TO BE MEDICAL DIRECTORS FOR TEMPORARY SERVICE, WITH RANK OF REAR ADMIRAL, FROM DATE INDICATED

Luther Sheldon, Jr., from September 15, 1942.

Lucius W. Johnson, from September 15, 1942.

TO BE REAR ADMIRALS, FOR TEMPORARY SERVICE, TO RANK FROM DATE INDICATED

Ingolf N. Kiland, from February 26, 1943.
Thomas R. Cooley, from March 20, 1943.

TO BE COMMODORES, FOR TEMPORARY SERVICE, TO RANK AS INDICATED

John J. Mahoney, to continue while serving as commander, United States Naval Operating Base, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, to rank from September 27, 1944.

Valentine H. Schaeffer, to continue while serving as chief of staff to commander, Seventh Fleet, to rank from October 12, 1944.

TO BE A NAVAL CONSTRUCTOR, FOR TEMPORARY SERVICE, TO RANK AS INDICATED

Albert L. Swasey, with the rank of commodore in the Naval Reserve, on the retired list, to continue while serving in the Bureau of Ships, to rank from October 12, 1944.

TO BE COMMODORES, FOR TEMPORARY SERVICE, TO RANK FROM OCTOBER 20, 1944

Irving H. Mayfield, to continue while serving as chief of staff to commander, South Pacific Force.

Francis W. Scanland, to continue while serving as commander, Naval Training and Distribution Center, Camp Elliott, San Diego, Calif.

Otto M. Forster, to continue while serving as commander, Naval Training and Distribution Center, Shoemaker, Calif.

Paulus P. Powell, to continue while serving as chief of staff to commander, Third Amphibious Force.

Clifford G. Richardson, to continue while serving as commander of a transport squadron.

Merrill Comstock, to continue while serving as chief of staff to commander, Submarine Force, Pacific Fleet.

Herbert B. Knowles, to continue while serving as commander of a transport squadron.

Donald W. Loomis, to continue while serving as commander of a transport squadron.

Thomas P. Jeter, to continue while serving as chief of staff to commander battleships, Pacific Fleet.

John B. McGovern, to continue while serving as commander of a transport squadron.

Arleigh A. Burke, to continue while serving as chief of staff to commander, First Carrier Task Force, Pacific Fleet.

TO BE PAY DIRECTOR, FOR TEMPORARY SERVICE, TO RANK FROM OCTOBER 20, 1944

Edwin D. Foster, with the rank of commodore the Navy, to continue while serving as aviation supply officer and supply officer in command, naval aviation supply depot, Philadelphia, Pa.

TO BE COMMODORES, FOR TEMPORARY SERVICE, TO RANK FROM DATE INDICATED

Milton O. Carlson, to continue while serving as commander of a transport squadron, from October 25, 1944.

Henry C. Flanagan, to continue while serving as commander of a transport squadron, from October 25, 1944.

Vernon F. Grant to be a commodore on the retired list, to continue while serving as commander, naval air bases, Guam, from October 25, 1944.

John G. Moyer, to continue while serving as commander of a transport squadron, from November 10, 1944.

Homer W. Graf, to continue while serving as commander of a transport squadron, from November 10, 1944.

Russell M. Ihrig, to continue while serving on the staff of the commander in chief, United States Pacific Fleet and Pacific Ocean areas, from November 10, 1944.

James B. Carter, to continue while serving as assistant chief of staff (Operations) to commander in chief, United States Pacific Fleet and Pacific Ocean areas, from November 10, 1944.

Thomas B. Brittain, to continue while serving as commander of a transport squadron, from November 10, 1944.

TO BE COMMODORES, FOR TEMPORARY SERVICE

Howard H. J. Benson, to continue while serving as chief of staff and aide to commander, Gulf Sea Frontier.

Leon S. Fiske, to continue while serving as commander, Service Squadron Twelve.

TO BE A COMMODORE IN THE NAVAL RESERVE, FOR TEMPORARY SERVICE

Giles C. Stedman, to continue while serving as Superintendent of the United States Merchant Marine Academy, Kings Point, N. Y.

TO BE A MEDICAL DIRECTOR, WITH RANK OF REAR ADMIRAL, FOR TEMPORARY SERVICE

William J. C. Agnew, to continue while serving as Assistant Chief of Bureau of Medicine and Surgery.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, NOVEMBER 27, 1944

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, our unfailing Father, as creation groans and travails in pain, we beseech Thee to fill us with that spirit of service which is willing to suffer. Whatever we lack, wherever we are weak, be Thou our strength and shield. O Breath of Heaven, take away the dust of care and anxiety and give us clear skies between Thee and our souls.

In Thy divine helpfulness, lead us to labor with the visible realities of life as pathways to that life which is higher and enduring. This life is for the senses, that life is for the spirit; this life is for the flesh which perishes, that life is everlasting. Teach us to walk in that realm where there is rest and peace; free us from the turmoils of this material world. Blessed Lord, as these times are so difficult, bestow Thy blessing upon those who find it hard to believe in an ever-present God; remember those who face circumstances fraught with disappointment and death. Console and steady the faith of those who are in distress of mind, blinded with sorrow as of storms at midnight. May they be sustained by the certitudes of faith, comfort them on their toilsome march, and in all their needs bring them to behold Thy face in peace. Through Jesus Christ, our Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Friday, November 24, 1944, was read and approved.

W. J. COX

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 2097) for the relief of W. J. Cox, with Senate amendments thereto, and agree to the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

"That the Court of Claims of the United States be, and hereby is, given jurisdiction to hear, determine, and render judgment on the claim of W. J. Cox, of Roanoke, Va., against the United States for personal injuries received by him when he was struck by a United States Army ambulance on United States Highway No. 11, near Christiansbury, Va., on June 3, 1940.

"SEC. 2. Suit upon such claim may be instituted at any time within 1 year after the enactment of this act, notwithstanding the lapse of time or any statute of limitations: Proceedings for the determination of such claim and appeals from and payment of any judgment thereon shall be in the same manner as in the case of claims over which the court has jurisdiction under section 145 of the Judicial Code, as amended."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, this is merely to give the claimant an opportunity to go into the Court of Claims?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. That is correct.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RESIGNATION FROM THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication:

NOVEMBER 25, 1944.

The Honorable SAM RAYBURN,
The Speaker, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I hereby tender to you my resignation as a Member of the House of Representatives in the Congress of the United States from the State of Florida at Large.

With great respect, your obedient servant,
LEX GREEN.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the Speaker will notify the Governor of the State of Florida of the resignation of the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GREEN].

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that after the conclusion of the business today and any other special orders I may be allowed to address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

MERCHANT MARINE AND OVERSEAS AVIATION

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries is filing today a report made by the Committee on Merchant Marine and Overseas Aviation. This should be sufficient to satisfy the Congress of the imminent peril to our merchant marine if it is not accorded the right to engage in overseas and foreign air commerce. Therefore, this committee will recommend remedial legislation. The legislation has been recommended by the committee. As soon as the report can be prepared it will be filed in the House with amendments.

HON. CORDELL HULL

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, the resignation of the Honorable Cordell Hull as Secretary of State on account of ill health brings sorrow and deep regret, not only to the people of this Nation but to the people of the world. For nearly 12 years he has served in this capacity with distinction and great ability. His name will live in history as one of the greatest Secretaries of State this Nation has ever had. The splendid preparation and far-seeing vision that he has exercised in preparing for the peace that will follow this war, and which will live as a monument to him after he is gone, stamp him as one of the world's statesmen. The people of the United States love and believe in Cordell Hull.

I am sure it is the prayer of everyone in this broad land of ours that his health may soon be restored.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein certain proclamations and docu-

ments issued by Gen. Douglas MacArthur.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, I also ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein certain documents, proclamations, and speeches issued and delivered by certain Philippine officials and by General MacArthur.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that after the disposition of other matters today and any other special orders I may address the House for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

CONTINGENT REVOLVING FUND FOR THE ARMY

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, in 1941, the Committee on Appropriations for the Army recommended to the Congress that we give General Marshall a contingent revolving fund, so that in emergency he would have something to draw on immediately. I have today received a letter from him and I ask unanimous consent that I may place it in the RECORD at this point.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The letter referred to follows:

WAR DEPARTMENT,
OFFICE OF THE CHIEF OF STAFF,
Washington, D. C., November 24, 1944.

Hon. J. BUELL SNYDER,
Chairman, Subcommittee on War Department Appropriations, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SNYDER: Since early in 1941, under the appropriation title "Contingent fund, Chief of Staff," the Congress has included in acts providing funds for the Military Establishment, a total of $150,000,200 to be expended at my discretion for emergent military purposes without regard to any other law. This authorization has given to me and to our overseas commanders continuing evidence of your confidence and has enabled us to take immediate action in many instances when, in our judgment, we believed it vital to the successful prosecution of the war.

In order that you could be informed of the general status of this fund, I have been gathering from overseas commands the many details concerning its obligation, and can now report that of the total amount appropriated, $54,882,207 had actually been obligated up to July 1, 1944. However, the fund has been reimbursed under the provisions of the law, by $31,276,896, which leaves a net expenditure of $23,305,311. The fund, therefore, had an unobligated balance of $126,694,889 as of July 1, 1944.

Through the flexibility which this authority gives, I have been able promptly to undertake, without the delay which necessarily arises through normal procedures, those extraordinary measures which appeared to me to be essential to the favorable progress of the war.

Our normal peacetime methods tended to slow the undertaking of the most urgent defense measures during the period immediately preceding our entry into the war. The fund made possible the immediate undertaking of such things as vital military construction and the procurement of urgently needed supplies and equipment. Later on it has enabled me to meet emergency requirements, such as confidential expenditures for military operations, secret missions, and other unusual military projects inevitably occasioned by the constantly changing military situation.

Should you wish, I shall be glad to appear before your committee to give whatever additional information you may desire, but at this time I do wish to express my deep appreciation of the action of your committee in making readily available to me this fund to meet the unexpected of global warfare.

Faithfully yours,

G. C. MARSHALL,
Chief of Staff.

Copy to Hon. CLARENCE CANNON, chairman, Appropriations Committee, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the Army and Navy Journal.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

HARLEY E. CARTER

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 3709) for the relief of Harley E. Carter.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Harley E. Carter, of Boone, Colo., the sum of $5,000, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for compensation for personal injuries sustained, and reimbursement of expenses incurred, as the result of a collision between the car in which he was riding and a truck from the Army Air Base at Pueblo, Colo., operated by Corp. Clyde T. Batson, in the service of the United States, on June 9, 1943, at a point about 2 miles east of Pueblo, Colo., on Colorado State Highway No. 96: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendments:

On page 1, line 6, strike out the "$5,000" and insert "$5,374.53."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include an editorial published in the San Francisco Examiner on post-war shipping.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

RUTH COHEN AND OUR ARMY NURSES

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to include a story on Ruth Cohen, by the Associated Press, from overseas.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

[Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts addressed the House. Her remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PACE. Mr. Speaker, last week I secured permission to extend my remarks and include an article from Fortune magazine entitled "Will Butter Win the Peace?" It has been returned to me by the Government Printing Office with a report that it exceeds two pages and will cost $182.

Notwithstanding the cost I ask unanimous consent that it may be extended in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Notwithstanding the cost, without objection, the request is granted.

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. KLEBERG. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday next, following the disposition of business on the Speaker's desk, I may address the House for 1 hour.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

THE HONORABLE CORDELL HULL

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Speaker, it is with deep regret that I have just learned from the remarks of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON] of the resignation of our great Secretary of State. I have the feeling that this regret is shared by the entire Membership of this body regardless of the side of the aisle on which the individual may sit, because I

have the impression that Secretary Hull is generally regarded by the Membership of Congress, and by the people of the United States as a whole, as one of the great Secretaries of State in the history of this Nation.

Secretary Hull's departure from the Cabinet will be a great loss to the Government, to the country, yes, to the world; and I indulge the sincere hope that his resignation does not mean that his health has deteriorated to such extent as to cause it to be necessary but that he simply feels in need of rest and that the good God may spare him for many years to do the great work I am sure he will do in an advisory capacity if spared, even though not a member of the Cabinet.

ADDITIONAL COPIES OF THE SEVENTH INTERMEDIATE REPORT OF THE SELECT COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE EXECUTIVE AGENCIES

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Speaker, from the Committee on Printing, I report (Rept. No. 1934) back favorably without amendment a privileged resolution (H. Res. 652) authorizing the printing of additional copies of the seventh intermediate report of the Select Committee to Investigate Executive Agencies, and ask for immediate consideration of the resolution.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That 30,000 additional copies of the seventh intermediate report of the Select Committee to Investigate Executive Agencies, House of Representatives, submitted pursuant to House Resolution 102, be printed for the use of said committee.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

(Mr. WICKERSHAM and Mr. FISH asked and were given permission to extend their remarks in the Appendix.)

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include a recent address on the subject Truth in Advertising delivered recently by Hon. R. E. Freer, Chairman of the Federal Trade Commission.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEARNEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a speech made by me before the Polish-Americans in the city of Amsterdam, N. Y., on Sunday, November 12, 1944, and I also ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a report on the Fifth War Loan drive among the Slovaks of America as reported by the Slovak League.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Wednesday next, after disposition of business on the Speaker's desk and at the conclusion of any special orders heretofore entered, I may be privileged to address the House for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include therein a clipping from a London newspaper of October 1 on lend-lease.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

THE LATE M. K. REILLY

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, I regret to announce to the House the death of the Honorable M. K. Reilly, a former Member of this body, which occurred during the recent recess of the Congress. For a considerable number of years Mr. Reilly very ably represented the district which I now have the honor to represent. At a proper future time I will suitably record the life and record of our late colleague.

Mr. McCORMACK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I am very sorry to hear of the death of our former colleague. Those of us who served with him remember him as not only a serious-minded legislator but a gentleman in every respect.

Mr. KEEFE. I thank the gentleman.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a short newspaper article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

DUFFY BROS., INC.

Mr. McGEHEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 2576) to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to determine and render judgment for any losses suffered by Duffy Bros., Inc., with Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 1, line 7, after "losses", insert "excluding any amount claimed for accrued interest thereon."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CLARA E. CLARK

Mr. McGEHEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 3000) for the relief of Clara E. Clark, with Senate amendment thereto, and to concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 1, line 5, strike out "$3,000" and insert "$2,000."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CORDELL HULL

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I desire to join the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON] and the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. JARMAN], in expressing my regret at the retirement of Cordell Hull—one of the greatest public servants this Nation has ever had.

In this connection I desire also to express the view that the President could not render a greater service to this Nation at the present time than to appoint the Honorable James F. Byrnes, of South Carolina, as Mr. Hull's successor.

I served with Cordell Hull for 8 years in this House, at a time when we were fighting on those domestic policies that go to the very foundation, you might say, of our economic life. America never had a finer Representative in the Congress of the United States, a more thorough Jeffersonian Democrat, one who believed in and adhered to those fundamental policies of democracy laid down by Jefferson, practiced by Madison and Monroe, and defended by Jackson, than Cordell Hull, of Tennessee. As a Member of the Senate he followed those same policies, and as Secretary of State he maintained Jefferson's attitude of preserving peace among the nations of the earth, and not a policy of intervening and meddling in the affairs of other countries.

HAROLD L. ICKES

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, while we are paying tribute to Secretary Hull and the great work he has done, we should not overlook the fact that if we want that kind of work to go on and bear the fruit we hope for, we should repudiate to the letter Mr. Ickes who, in his recent address in Chicago, has proven that he constitutes a definite threat to the unity of the Nation and, consequently, the peace and well-being of the world. I think the President owes it to the Nation, if he wants harmony within, that he demand the resignation of Mr. Ickes. He has outlived his usefulness.

When Congress reconvened after the election I listened to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Cox] express the sentiments of the whole House, and he was applauded on both sides of the aisle when he paid tribute to both the victor and the vanquished, Mr. Roosevelt and Mr. Dewey, and declared there is no bitterness anywhere. In the corridors and in the cloakrooms I have heard nothing but a willingness expressed to support the President in his foreign policy as well as in winning the war. In fact I and many others expressed ourselves publicly before coming to the Capital that since the majority have spoken we are perfectly willing to abide by their decision and help in every possible way. Now comes Mr. Ickes in his Chicago speech before the C. I. O. convention sowing the seed of doubt, fear, and mistrust, in other words, scattering poison. The President should not allow any member of his Cabinet to drive a wedge between our people to keep them divided and hereby foster hate and class feeling and thus make lasting peace impossible.

HON. CORDELL HULL

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I should like to pay my tribute to our former colleague, the Honorable Cordell Hull, and our Secretary of State during the last 12 years. He is an able man, a distinguished scholar, and pursued a straight path toward the goal that he thought was right. We all want the same goal. Some may have differed with the method, but no one, I think, in the United States, can doubt his sincerity in wanting peace. In my opinion it was his fight for the peace that brought on his serious illness. I hope he may be spared for many years to his devoted wife. He will go down in history as a great statesman, and a great scholar, and a very fine courteous gentleman. I spent an hour with him just before I went overseas, at which time he outlined to me his foreign policy both in the Western Hemisphere and all over the world.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that today, at the conclusion of the legislative program and following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the gentlewoman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that today, after the special order granted the gentlewoman from Illinois, I may be permitted to address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

PROGRAM FOR THIS WEEK

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to see if I can find out what the full program is for the week.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, it is rather hard to state anything definite now, except we are going to have a busy week. There is a bill out of the Committee on Banking and Currency relating to the Smaller War Plants Corporation, increasing its capitalization by $200,000,000, if my recollection is correct.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Has a rule been granted on it as yet?

Mr. McCORMACK. No; but we are hopeful that a rule will be granted. A rule, House Resolution 566, has been reported out on what is known as the antisabotage bill. It is the intention to bring that bill up this week. It will probably follow the roads bill. I do not want to commit myself definitely as to the order in which they will come up.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Will the gentleman tell us a little more about the antisabotage bill?

Mr. McCORMACK. That is the bill to amend sections of an act entitled "An act to punish the willful injury or destruction of war material, or of war premises or utilities used in connection with war material, and for other purposes."

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. From what committee did it come, and when was it reported out?

Mr. McCORMACK. It came out of the Committee on the Judiciary. I do not know when it was reported out.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. The gentleman says the rule has already been granted on it?

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes. The number of the bill is H. R. 3442.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. When was the rule granted?

Mr. SABATH. Some months ago.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Where has it been all these months?

Mr. McCORMACK. The rule was granted some time ago.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. The chairman of the Committee on Rules is here. What has he been doing with the rule all these days?

Mr. McCORMACK. It is not his fault. The bill was not put on the program by the leader. I will accept the responsibility.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. All right.

Mr. McCORMACK. Then there is the extension of the Second War Powers Act. That bill has not yet come out of the committee, but when it does we are hopeful that a rule on it will be reported as soon as possible, in which event it is my intention to try to bring it up this week.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. The Smaller War Plants Corporation bill comes first, then the antisabotage bill?

Mr. McCORMACK. I would prefer not to be committed as to the order in which they will come up. No rule has yet been reported on the Smaller War Plants Corporation bill, so in the absence of that the probabilities are that the Hobbs bill, known as the antisabotage bill, will be the next order of business. However, I do not want to commit myself definitely to that because if the rule on the extension of the Second War Powers Act is reported, or the rule on the Smaller War Plants Corporation bill, I may want to bring up those bills first. In other words, we shall have a busy week, but I am unable to state definitely now what the order of business will be.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. The most that can be said now is that we are going to have a full program for the week?

Mr. McCORMACK. Exactly.

Another bill has come out of the Committee on the Judiciary, one that aims to meet the Supreme Court decision rendered 2 or 3 months ago, as I remember, relating to the admission of delayed confessions. That is about the best way I can describe it. If a rule is reported out on that bill, it is the intention to bring that bill up also, but I am unable to state when it will be considered. In other words, we are hopeful of disposing of the legislation that should pass before this session is over by December 10. That is what the leadership is driving for. In view of the objective we are seeking, namely, an adjournment by December 10 if that can be accomplished, or as close to that date as possible, it is pretty difficult to give a definite program now.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Is that adjournment date in harmony with the plans of the Senate?

Mr. McCORMACK. I am unable to answer that question. Without knowing definitely, I should assume that there would not be much difficulty in arriving at a date agreeable to both branches.

HON. CORDELL HULL

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I heartily endorse the sentiments expressed this morning in regard to our great Secretary of State, Mr. Hull. It was my privilege and honor to enter the House at the same time he did. From the very inception of his career I have seen in him an ability possessed by very few men. He is a gentleman and a scholar. He served in the House for many years, and as a member of the Committee on Ways and Means proved himself to be an expert on tariff and other legislation. I have followed his activities in the Senate and as Secretary of State with a great deal of pleasure and satisfaction. I am satisfied that when the record is written he will go down in history as our greatest Secretary of State, as has been stated by those who preceded me.

He has rendered great service to our country. I regret exceedingly that it has become necessary for him to give up his important post. However, I hope that his health will again be restored and that he will continue to be of service to the Nation he loves so well.

CONSENT CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. This is Consent Calendar day. The Clerk will call the first bill on the calendar.

PAYMENT FOR LAND ACQUIRED DURING THE WAR PERIOD

The Clerk called the first bill on the Consent Calendar, S. 919, to expedite the payment for land acquired during the war period.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

FERTILIZERS, FEEDS, NURSERY STOCK, OR SEEDS DISTRIBUTED BY AGENCIES OF THE UNITED STATES

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 3405, making certain regulations with reference to fertilizers, feeds, nursery stock, or seeds that may be distributed by agencies of the United States.

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

PUBLIC LAW 537, SEVENTY-SEVENTH CONGRESS

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 2908, to amend Public Law 537, Seventy-seventh Congress, approved May 2, 1942.

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

WAR SHIPPING FIELD SERVICE

The Clerk called the next business, House Joint Resolution 182, to create the War Shipping Field Service.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the joint resolution be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

JACKSON HOLE NATIONAL MONUMENT

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 2241, to abolish the Jackson Hole National Monument as created by Presidential proclamation No. 2578, dated March 15, 1943, and to restore the area embraced within and constituting said monument to its status as part of the Teton National Forest.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, this is a controversial bill. I understand that an effort was made to obtain a rule on the bill. Therefore, I object.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. PRIEST, Mr. MADDEN, and Mr. PRICE objected and, under the rule, the bill was stricken from the calendar.

CRIERS AND BAILIFFS IN UNITED STATES COURTS

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 4065, further defining the number and duties of criers and bailiffs in United States courts and regulating their compensation.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 5 of the Judicial Code be amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 5. Each district judge may appoint a crier for his court, who shall perform also the duties of bailiff and messenger, and who shall receive a salary of $1,800 per annum and, when necessarily absent from his designated post of duty on the business of the court, his actual traveling expenses and in lieu of his actual expenses for subsistence a per diem allowance to be prescribed by the Director of the Administrative Office of the United States Courts at a rate not to exceed $6. The marshal for each district may appoint such a number of additional bailiffs not exceeding four for each court, as the district judge may determine, to maintain order in the courtroom, to wait upon the grand and petit juries, and for other necessary purposes, who shall be allowed for their services the sum of $6 per day to be paid only for actual attendance on days when the court is in session or the judge or a jury is present."

SEC. 2. That section 715 of the Revised Statutes is hereby repealed.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ACQUISITION OF BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS IN FOREIGN COUNTRIES FOR USE OF UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 4282, to amend the act entitled "An act for the acquisition of buildings and grounds in foreign countries for use of the Government of the United States of America," approved May 7, 1926, as amended, to permit of the sale of buildings and grounds and the utilization of proceeds of such sale in the Government interest.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

ASSISTANT SECRETARIES OF STATE

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 4311, to authorize the appointment of two additional secretaries of State.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc, That there shall be in the Department of State an Under Secretary of State and not to exceed six Assistant Secretaries of State, each of whom shall be appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, and who shall serve without numerical designation of rank.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. COLE, of New York: On lines 3 and 4, strike out the words "An Under Secretary of State and not to exceed six" and insert in lieu thereof, the following: "For the period of 2 years following the cessation of hostilities, two additional."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PREVENTION OF PERNICIOUS POLITICAL ACTIVITIES

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 330, to amend section 16 of the act entitled "An act to prevent pernicious political activities," approved August 2, 1939, as amended.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, with a committee amendment, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 16 of the act entitled "An act to prevent pernicious political activities," approved August 2, 1939, as amended by act of July 19, 1940 (54 Stat. 767), is amended by adding to said section, at the end thereof, the following sentence: "The employees of the United States Government, including the employees of the Alaska Railroad, residing in municipalities on the line of the railroad are permitted to take an active part in political management or political campaigns involving the municipality in which they reside."

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

"That subsection 9 (a) of the act entitled 'An act to prevent pernicious political activities,' approved August 2, 1939 (53 Stat. 1148), as amended by the act of July 19, 1940 (54 Stat. 767, U. S. C., title 18, sec. 61h), be, and it hereby is, amended by adding to said subsection, at the end thereof, the following sentence: 'The provisions of the second sentence of this subsection shall not apply to the employees of the United States Government, including the employees of the Alaska Railroad, residing in municipalities on the line of the railroad, in respect to activities involving the municipality in which they reside.' "

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to amend subsection 9 (a) of the act entitled 'An act to prevent pernicious political activities,' approved August 2, 1939, as amended."

MEDITERRANEAN FRUITFLY

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 2542, for the relief of certain claimants who suffered losses and sustained damages as a result of the campaign carried out by the Federal Government for the eradication of the Mediterranean fruitfly in the State of Florida.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, I object.

EMERGENCY OFFICERS' RETIREMENT BENEFITS

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 1948, to amend the act of July 15, 1940, pertaining to emergency officers' retirement benefits.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

CLAIMS ARISING AFTER JANUARY 1, 1926, OUT OF THE TARIFF ACT OF 1922

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 901, conferring jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims of the United States to consider certain claims arising after January 1, 1926, out of the Tariff Act of 1922.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

REIMBURSEMENT OF NAVY PERSONNEL AS A RESULT OF FIRE AT TUTUILA, AMERICAN SAMOA

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 4591, to provide for the reimbursement of certain Navy personnel and former Navy personnel for personal property lost or damaged as the result of a fire which occurred on the naval station, Tutuila, American Samoa, on October 20, 1943.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, this is one of eight or ten similar bills on the calendar today, each of which authorizes the Secretary of the Treasury to reimburse certain Navy personnel for losses incurred by reasons of fires that have taken place at various camps and establishments, caused not through the negligence of the naval personnel themselves. I rise to inquire if any member of the Claims Committee is present. The chairman of the committee was present a moment ago but I do not see him just now. I was going to ask why it is necessary to enact special bills for Navy personnel in situations of this sort, when apparently it is not necessary for Army personnel. Certainly similar instances must have happened with the Army personnel. Since the chairman or no member of the Committee on Claims is ready to discuss the matter I will withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a similar Senate bill (S. 1841) be substituted for the House bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sum or sums, amounting in the aggregate not to exceed $7,812.10, as may be required by the Secretary of the Navy to reimburse, under such regulations as he may prescribe, certain Navy personnel and former Navy personnel for the value of personal property lost or damaged as the result of a fire which occurred on the naval station, Tutuila, American Samoa, on October 20, 1943: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The Senate bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill (H. R. 4591) was laid on the table.

REIMBURSEMENT OF NAVY PERSONNEL AS A RESULT OF A FIRE AT PORT HUENEME, CALIF.

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 4604, to provide for reimbursement of certain Navy personnel for personal property lost or damaged as a result of a fire in quarters at Naval advance base depot, Port Hueneme, Calif., February 6, 1944.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I observe the chairman of the Committee on Claims is now present. I should like to restate my inquiry. As the gentleman knows, there are several bills on the Consent Calendar, approved by his committee, authorizing reimbursement of naval personnel for losses suffered by fire. My inquiry is whether such bills are also necessary in similar situations happening with the War Department to Army personnel.

Mr. McGEHEE. It is. We passed similar bills for the War Department.

Mr. COLE of New York. If that is the situation, there is no further need for discussing the subject, but I thought perhaps the Committee on Claims would like to consider general legislation authorizing the Navy to settle claims up to a certain amount, without having to come to Congress for special legislation to do it.

Mr. McGEHEE. As the gentleman knows, the Army and Navy, under acts passed by the Congress, have authority to settle claims up to $500 in value. Above that amount the claims must be passed upon by Congress.

Mr. COLE of New York. That applies to both the Army and the Navy.

Mr. McGEHEE. It applies to both the Army and the Navy; that is true.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I should like to ask the gentleman from Mississippi a question. I notice the bills are for the reimbursement of Navy personnel. It seems to me we have a lot to think about in passing bills of this nature. We are going to have a tremendous number of claims if we are going to follow out this policy. There is never a ship sunk that the personnel of that ship does not lose personal belongings. If we are justified in reimbursing the men who are on land and whose private property may be destroyed by reason of an act of God, we are certainly justified in reimbursing every man in the Navy who has lost anything as a result of the torpedoing or destruction of his ship; and the same might apply to the Army and the merchant marine. Just for one minute think of the personal belongings of the men in the armed service that have been lost as a result of this war.

It looks to me as though you are setting a precedent that may come back here to plague you at a later date.

I do not remember when this House has passed legislation to reimburse the personnel of a ship lost in time of war or to reimburse the personnel of an army whose private property might have been lost in battle.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COCHRAN. I yield.

Mr. COLE of New York. I believe the gentleman will find that under existing statutes both the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy may reimburse for losses occasioned by reason of the war itself, for losses arising out of combat. I am sure they have that authority now.

Mr. COCHRAN. Probably so but for a small amount, I think the gentleman understands that what I am calling attention to is the policy which we are apparently adopting recognizing certain groups. Let us recognize all or none.

Mr. COLE of New York. I just tried to tell the gentleman that as far as I understand, present law provides that the Secretary of the Navy can reimburse

personnel for losses occurring at sea under combat conditions. Such authority already exists.

Mr. COCHRAN. How about the War Department?

Mr. COLE of New York. I think that is also true for the War Department.

Mr. GIFFORD rose.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. GIFFORD. I wanted to comfort the gentleman by saying that precedent these days does not amount to very much; all precedents are being broken.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

Mr. PRIEST. I ask unanimous consent to substitute a similar Senate bill, S. 1839, for the House bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. RAMSPECK). Is there objection to the present consideration of the Senate bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sum or sums, amounting in the aggregate not to exceed $466.24, as may be required by the Secretary of the Navy to reimburse, under such regulations as he may prescribe, certain Navy personnel for the value of personal property lost or damaged in a fire in quarters at the naval advance base depot, Port Hueneme, Calif., on February 6, 1944: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read a third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider and a similar House bill (H. R. 4604) was laid on the table.

REIMBURSEMENT OF CERTAIN NAVAL PERSONNEL FOR DAMAGE TO PROPERTY BY FIRE

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 4607, a bill to provide for reimbursement of certain Navy personnel and former Navy personnel for personal property lost or damaged as a result of fires in quarters occupied by naval construction battalions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill S. 1838 be considered in lieu of the House bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the Senate bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sum or sums, amounting in the aggregate not to exceed $910.07, as may be required by the Secretary of the Navy to reimburse, under such regulations as he may prescribe, certain Navy personnel and former Navy personnel for the value of personal property lost or damaged as the result of fires in quarters occupied by members of the Twelfth Naval Construction Battalion on December 26, 1942, and by members of the Forty-second Naval Construction Battalion on March 29, 1943, respectively: *Provided*, That in the case of the death of any claimant payment may be made to the relative designated by the Secretary of the Navy: *Provided further*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill (H. R. 4607) was laid on the table.

MARINE CORPS PERSONNEL

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 4590, to reimburse certain Marine Corps personnel for personal property lost or damaged as the result of a fire at the marine barracks, naval supply depot, Bayonne, N. J., on April 25, 1943.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill S. 1842 be substituted in lieu of the House bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sum or sums, amounting in the aggregate not to exceed $1,268.06, as may be required by the Secretary of the Navy to reimburse, under such regulations as he may prescribe, certain Marine Corps personnel for the value of personal property lost or damaged as the result of a fire at the marine barracks, naval supply depot, Bayonne, N. J., on April 25, 1943: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill (H. R. 4590) was laid on the table.

REIMBURSEMENT OF NAVY PERSONNEL AND FORMER NAVY PERSONNEL FOR PERSONAL PROPERTY LOSS

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 4606, to provide for reimbursement of certain Navy personnel and former Navy personnel for personal property lost or damaged as the result of a fire in the bachelor officers' quarters, naval operating base, Argentia, Newfoundland, on January 12, 1943.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill S. 1840 be substituted in lieu of the bill H. R. 4606.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sum or sums, amounting in the aggregate not to exceed $8,080.61, as may be required by the Secretary of the Navy to reimburse, under such regulations as he may prescribe, certain Navy personnel and former Navy personnel for the value of personal property lost or damaged in a fire in the bachelor officers' quarters, naval operating base, Argentia, Newfoundland, on January 12, 1943: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill (H. R. 4606) was laid on the table.

REIMBURSEMENT OF COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY AND MARINE CORPS PERSONNEL FOR PERSONAL PROPERTY LOSS

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 1714, to reimburse certain Coast and Geodetic Survey and Marine Corps personnel for personal property lost or damaged as the result of a fire at the Marine Barracks, Quantico, Va., on December 16, 1943.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sum or sums amounting in the aggregate not to exceed $571.75, as may be required by the Secretary of the Navy to reimburse, under such regulations as he may prescribe, certain Coast and Geodetic Survey and Marine Corps personnel for the value of personal property lost or damaged as the re-

sult of a fire in the Marine Barracks, Quantico, Va., on December 16, 1943: *Provided,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REIMBURSEMENT OF NAVY AND CIVILIAN PERSONNEL FOR PERSONAL PROPERTY LOSS

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 1741, to provide for the reimbursement of certain Navy and civilian personnel for personal property lost as the result of a fire in hangar V–3 at the naval air station, Norfolk, Va., on November 12, 1942.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sum or sums, amounting in the aggregate not to exceed $2,775, as may be required by the Secretary of the Navy to reimburse, under such regulations as he may prescribe, certain Navy and civilian personnel for the value of personal property lost or damaged in a fire in hangar V–3 at the naval air station, Norfolk, Va., on November 12, 1942: *Provided,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REIMBURSEMENT OF NAVY PERSONNEL AND FORMER NAVY PERSONNEL FOR PERSONAL PROPERTY LOSS

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 1881, to provide for reimbursement of certain Navy personnel and former Navy personnel for personal property lost or damaged as the result of fire at the naval advance base depot, Port Hueneme, Calif., on January 12, 1944.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sum or sums, amounting in the aggregate not to exceed $1,599.54, as may be required by the Secretary of the Navy to reimburse, under such regulations as he may prescribe, certain Navy personnel and former Navy personnel for the value of personal property lost or damaged as the result of a fire in quarters occupied by said personnel at the naval advance base depot, Port Hueneme, Calif., on January 12, 1944: *Provided,* That is the case of the death of any claimant, payment may be made to the relative designated by the Secretary of the Navy: *And provided further,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDMENT TO SECTION 511 (C) OF THE MERCHANT MARINE ACT, 1936, AS AMENDED

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 4968, to amend section 511 (c) of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, relative to deposit of vessel proceeds received from the United States in certain cases, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the first sentence of section 511 (c) of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"(c) In the case of the sale or actual or constructive total loss of a vessel, if the taxpayer deposits an amount equal to the net proceeds of the sale or to the net indemnity with respect to the loss in a construction reserve fund established under subsection (b), then—

"(1) if the taxpayer so elects in his income-tax return for the taxable year in which the gain was realized, or

"(2) in case a vessel is purchased or requisitioned by the United States, or is lost, in any taxable year beginning after December 31, 1939, and prior to January 1, 1944, and the taxpayer receives payment for the vessel so purchased or requisitioned, or receives from the United States indemnity on account of such loss, subsequent to the end of such taxable year, if the taxpayer so elects prior to November 1, 1944, or prior to the expiration of 60 days after the receipt of the payment or indemnity, whichever is later, and in accordance with a form of election to be prescribed by the Commissioner of Internal Revenue with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury,

no gain shall be recognized to the taxpayer in respect of such sale or indemnification in the computation of net income for the purposes of Federal income or excess-profits taxes. If an election is made under subdivision (2) and if computation or recomputation in accordance with this subsection is otherwise allowable but is prevented, on the date of making such election or within 6 months thereafter, by any statute of limitation, such computation or recomputation nevertheless shall be made notwithstanding such statute if a claim therefor is filed within 6 months after the date of making such election."

With the following committee amendment:

On page 3, after line 4, insert a new section as follows:

"SEC. 2. Section 511 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof a new subsection to read as follows:

"'(n) The terms "contract for the construction" and "construction contract", as used in this section, shall include, in the case of a taxpayer who constructs a new vessel in a shipyard owned by such taxpayer, an agreement between such taxpayer and the Commission with respect to such construction and containing provisions deemed necessary or advisable by the Commission to carry out the purposes and policy of this section.'"

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BLAND: On page 2, line 13, strike out "November 1, 1944" and insert "March 31, 1945."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman from Virginia desire recognition?

Mr. BLAND. Yes.

Mr. KEAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLAND. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, I do not think it is very important in this case, but when we are given these bills to study and we allow them to come up for consideration, we do not expect amendments to be put in without consultation with us, because otherwise we cannot tell whether the bill should be considered or not.

Mr. BLAND. If I had known that the gentleman was the objector I would surely have consulted him. But I will say it is obvious that November 1, 1944, has passed, and this is merely a change of date which has been approved by the Treasury Department and by the Maritime Commission.

Mr. KEAN. I am not objecting to the amendment, but the gentleman can see the point.

Mr. BLAND. I can see the wisdom of it.

Mr. KEAN. Somebody should be consulted here when there are amendments to be introduced.

Mr. BLAND. I shall always try to conform to the views of the gentleman.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BLAND].

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDING THE NATIONALITY ACT OF 1940

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 1296, to amend sections 347 (b) and 401 (a) of the Nationality Act of 1940 by extending the periods within which petitions for naturalization filed prior to the effective date of that act may be heard, and to extend for a period of 4 years the time within which certain citizens must return to the United States as evidence of the fact that they have elected to become American citizens, respectively.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. MOTT. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object this seems to be a very important amendment to a very important act, the Immigration and Naturalization Act. I do not like to see amendments to this act go through on

the Consent Calendar even in ordinary times, and I think it should have even more careful consideration at this particular time. I would like to have an explanation from the author.

Mr. MASON. This just simply amends the present law by extending the time from 2 to 4 years for the people who are out of the country and must be back in time for their naturalization. They cannot come back because of the shipping difficulties. The other is to extend from 2 to 4 years the time in which action must be taken on the naturalization petitions which were filed before the 1940 act, because of that situation.

Mr. KEAN. The gentleman says "because of that situation." Does this apply only to people who have left the country, for example, soldiers, or does it apply to anyone?

Mr. MASON. It applies to anyone who is detained abroad; that part which extends the time from 2 years, which the present law gives them, to 4 years. The 2 years, in fact in one instance, is more than up. It has already expired.

Mr. KEAN. In that case the people who filed these petitions and did not take advantage of the opportunity to have them heard would be given this benefit by the amendment.

Mr. MASON. The 2 years' extension.

Mr. MOTT. I think this is a bill which deserves a little debate in the House. I ask unanimous consent that it be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

AMENDING THE NATIONALITY ACT OF 1940

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 2832, to amend the Nationality Act of 1940 so as to permit naturalization proceedings to be had at places other than in the office of the clerk or in open court in the case of sick or physically disabled individuals.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I think the House should have an explanation of the effect of this measure. Since the gentleman from Illinois seems to be so continually familiar with the bills reported by the committee of which he is ranking member, I will ask him to undertake an explanation of this measure.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, this is a bill that was introduced by the gentleman from California [Mr. GEARHART] to permit naturalization proceedings, which are now required to be handled in the office of the clerk, to be handled by allowing the clerk to go to the home of the invalid who cannot appear personally and carry on the same proceedings, or permitting the clerk to delegate the power to someone to go to that person where he is located, because of his physical inability to come to the clerk's office.

Mr. COLE of New York. In other words then, the person who takes the testimony must be formally authorized by the clerk?

Mr. MASON. Yes.

Mr. COLE of New York. Or by the court.

Mr. MASON. It must be the clerk himself or his officially authorized deputy.

Mr. COLE of New York. I withdraw the reservation of objection with that fine explanation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That so much of section 331 of the Nationality Act of 1940, as amended (U. S. C. 1940 ed., title 8, sec. 731), as precedes paragraph (1) thereof (excluding the heading) is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 331. An applicant for naturalization shall make, under oath before, and unless prevented by sickness or other physical disability only in the office of, the clerk of court or such clerk's authorized deputy, regardless of the place of residence in the United States of the applicant, not less than 2 nor more than 7 years at least prior to the applicant's petition for naturalization, and after the applicant has reached the age of 18 years, a signed declaration of intention to become a citizen of the United States, which declaration shall be set forth in writing, in triplicate, and shall contain substantially the following averments by such applicant:".

SEC. 2. Section 332 of the Nationality Act of 1940, as amended (U. S. C., 1940 ed., title 8, sec. 732), is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(e) If the applicant for naturalization is prevented by sickness or other disability from presenting himself in the office of the clerk to make the petition required by subsection (a), such applicant may make such petition at such other place as may be designated by the clerk of court or by such clerk's authorized deputy."

SEC. 3. (a) Section 334 (a) of the Nationality Act of 1940, as amended (U. S. C., 1940 ed., title 8, sec. 734 (a)), is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 334. (a) Except as provided in subsection (b) of this section, every final hearing upon a petition for naturalization shall be had in open court before a judge or judges thereof, and every final order which may be made upon such petition shall be under the hand of the court and entered in full upon a record kept for that purpose, and upon such final hearing of such petition the applicant and the witnesses shall be examined under oath before the court and in the presence of the court."

(b) Section 334 (b) of such act, as amended (U. S. C., 1940 ed., title 8, sec. 734 (b)), is amended by adding at the end thereof the following: "If the petitioner is prevented by sickness or other disability from being in open court for the final hearing upon a petition for naturalization, such final hearing may be had before a judge or judges of the court at such place as may be designated by the court."

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 4, after the word "amended", insert "(54 Stat. 1153."

Page 2, line 12, after the word "amended", insert "(54 Stat. 1154."

Page 2, line 22, after the word "amended", insert "(54 Stat. 1156."

Page 3, line 1, strike out the words "or judges."

Page 3, at the beginning of line 9, insert "(54 Stat. 1156."

Page 3, line 16, add a new section to be known as section 4:

"SEC. 4. Section 335 of such act, as amended (54 Stat. 1157; U. S. C., title 8, sec. 735), is hereby amended by adding the following new subsection:

"'(d) If the petitioner is prevented by sickness or other disability from being in open court the oath prescribed in subsection (a) of this section may be taken before a judge of the court at such place as may be designated by the court.'

"SEC. 5. Before a declaration of intention or petition for naturalization may be made outside of the office of the clerk of court, or before a final hearing on a petition may be held or the oath of allegiance administered outside of open court, the court must satisfy itself that the illness or other disability is sufficiently serious to prevent appearance in the office of the clerk of court or the court and is of a permanent nature, or of a nature which so incapacitates the person as to prevent him from appearing in the office of the clerk of court or in court for a period of at least 1 year."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CARROLL COLLEGE, HELENA, MONT.

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 1964, to reimburse certain aviation cadets and former aviation cadets for property lost or damaged as the result of a fire at Carroll College, Helena, Mont., on January 8, 1944.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sum or sums, amounting in the aggregate not to exceed $988.12, as may be required by the Secretary of the Navy to reimburse, under such regulations as he may prescribe, certain aviation cadets and former aviation cadets for the value of personal property lost or damaged as the result of a fire at Carroll College, Helena, Mont., on January 8, 1944: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EVERGLADES NATIONAL PARK PROJECT, FLORIDA

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 5289, to provide for the acceptance and protection by the United States of property within the authorized boundaries of the Everglades National Park project, Florida, pending the establishment of the park, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. COLE of New York. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I suggest that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. PETERSON] explain the effect of this proposal.

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, this bill is for the purpose of

working out and facilitating the transfer of certain lands with respect to the Everglades National Park. Previously the Congress passed an act fixing the boundaries of the park. At that time a certain area was fixed, and a reading of the act would indicate that everything in that area had to be conveyed. This will enable the working out in an orderly way of the boundaries. It is agreeable to the Park Service, to the Governor, to the Everglades National Park Association, and to the park board. It is the result of quite a few conferences and much study. It will enable them to reserve certain areas that might not want to go into the park, and to work out the boundaries in an orderly way.

Mr. COLE of New York. I call the gentleman's attention particularly to paragraph (b) of the bill, which reads:

Upon execution of the aforesaid provisions relating to the establishment thereof, the Everglades National Park shall be established by order of the Secretary, which shall be published in the Federal Register.

Will the gentleman explain the reason and the necessity for a provision of this nature, and the effect of it?

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. As the land is conveyed, if for any reason a sufficient area is reserved so that there is not a large enough area for a national park, it would not have to be designated as a park. It is intended that in the interim the Fish and Wildlife Service or the National Park Service shall protect the area, and the Park Service would take only that which is of national park dignity. For instance, they want to take in the headwaters of certain rivers and also certain bird rookeries. When this is all worked out, then the effective date will be published in the Register. The Congress, however, has already authorized the establishment of the park.

Mr. COLE of New York. Has the Congress already authorized the Secretary of the Interior to establish a national park known as the Everglades National Park?

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. The Congress has already authorized it.

Mr. COLE of New York. Then by paragraph (b) of this bill Congress delegates the authority to the Secretary of the Interior to establish the Everglades National Park?

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. He will merely carry out the will of Congress by order when sufficient land is acquired.

Mr. COLE of New York. Is there no limitation on the amount of land that may come in under this authorization?

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. It is to be worked out between the various authorities. In other words, there may be certain areas, such as oil lands, that the Park Service would not want in the park.

Mr. COLE of New York. That may be the plan, but what does the law say about it and what does this bill say about it?

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. The original act took in a vast area in south Florida, and said that the park would be established within these boundaries. Under the original act that would mean that every foot of land in that area had to be conveyed. Some of that land the National Park Service may not want and some the State would prefer not to have in the park. This gives them a chance to work that matter out. It is the result of months of conferences between the Audubon Society, the National Park Service, and the Governor of the State and his officials. The State has gradually blocked out the land and swapped it out. However, there are some tracts here and there they might not want to convey. The problem has been aggravated somewhat by the discovery of oil south of there, and naturally the Park Service does not want an oil well in the park.

Mr. COLE of New York. The original act, authorizing the Everglades National Park, established certain maximum boundaries for the park, did it not?

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. Yes.

Mr. COLE of New York. The effect of this bill will not operate to enlarge those boundaries?

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. No, sir. It might operate to cut down the boundaries.

Mr. COLE of New York. Did the gentleman say it might enlarge the boundaries?

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. It might operate to cut down the boundaries, or a piece here and there might not be conveyed. For instance, in a lot of national parks today there are still a few areas that have never been conveyed. But under the wording of the original act you have to convey every foot of land to carry it out unless this is passed.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, is this agreeable to the State administration of the State of Florida?

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. Yes; it is the result of a long series of conferences between the Governor, State officials, the National Park Service, and the Everglades National Park Association, and the park board. The fact is that I sat in on some of the conferences so as to give them an opportunity to work it out. Frankly, I think that is the way most parks should be established because it gives the State some say so and gives them a chance to work out the boundaries and to not get into difficulties as they might in other areas.

Mr. JENSEN. This bill does not give the Department of the Interior more authority over the national park?

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. No, sir; and I would not want to do that. As the Congress knows, I am very jealous of the right of the Congress, as is my committee, to regulate the boundaries of the national parks.

Mr. JENSEN. Will this cost the Federal Government anything?

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. All of the land is to be conveyed free. The State has been gradually blocking it and now has a substantial portion of it blocked out. They had to work out the drainage, the roads, and so forth, on this. All of the land conveyed must be given to the Federal Government.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, (a) for the purpose of protecting the scenery, the wildlife, and other natural features of the region authorized to be established as the Everglades National Park by the Act of May 30, 1934 (48 Stat. 816; 16 U. S. C., secs. 410, 410a–410c), notwithstanding any provision contained in that Act, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized in his discretion to accept on behalf of the United States any land, submerged land, or interests therein, subject to such reservations of oil, gas, or mineral rights as the Secretary may approve, within the area of approximately 2,000 square miles recommended by said Secretary in his report to the Congress of December 3, 1930, pursuant to the Act of March 1, 1929 (45 Stat. 1443): *Provided*, That no general development of the property accepted pursuant to this act shall be undertaken nor shall the park be established until title satisfactory to the Secretary to a major portion of the lands, to be selected by him, within the aforesaid recommended area shall have been vested in the United States: *Provided further*, That until the property acquired by the United States pursuant to this act has been cleared of the aforesaid reservations, the Secretary in his discretion shall furnish such protection thereover as may be necessary for the accomplishment of the purposes of this act: *And provided further*, That in the event the park is not established within 10 years from the date of the approval of this act, or upon the abandonment of the park at any time after its establishment, title to any lands accepted pursuant to the provisions of this act shall thereupon automatically revest in the State of Florida or other grantors of such property to the United States.

(b) Upon the execution of the aforesaid provisions relating to establishment thereof, the Everglades National Park shall be established by order of the Secretary which shall be published in the Federal Register.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed, and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DELEGATE IN CONGRESS FROM ALASKA

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 5246, to provide for filling a vacancy in the office of Delegate in Congress from Alaska.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, in view of the lapse of time which has occurred since the bill was reported, it appears that the need for it has passed. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill go over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

COLONIAL NATIONAL HISTORICAL PARK, YORKTOWN, VA.

The Clerk read the next bill, H. R. 5331, to authorize the transfer of certain lands within the Colonial National Historical Park, Yorktown, Va., to the Secretary of the Navy.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to transfer to the Secretary of the Navy complete control and jurisdiction over a parcel of land within the Colonial National Historical Park, Yorktown, Va., described as follows:

Beginning at a point on the existing property line between the United States naval

mine depot and the Colonial National Monument Parkway properties, said point being a fence corner seven hundred and sixty-five feet, more or less, southeast of the marine barracks gate; thence south fifty-six degrees thirty-eight minutes east fifty-three and fifteen one-hundredths feet, more or less; thence south fifty degrees sixteen minutes east three hundred and twelve feet, more or less; thence south thirty-nine degrees forty-four minutes west one hundred and twenty-five and seven one-hundredths feet, more or less, to the property line between the United States naval mine depot and the Colonial National Monument Parkway; thence along the said property line north thirty-nine degrees fifty-four minutes west one hundred and twenty-eight and ninety-six one-hundredths feet, more or less; thence continuing along said property line north twenty-eight degrees eighteen minutes west two hundred and fifty-six and fifty-nine one-hundredths feet, more or less, to the point of beginning; containing six hundred and twenty-one one-thousandths of an acre, more or less.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed, read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MAYAGUEZ BARRACKS MILITARY RESERVATION

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 1373, to authorize the Secretary of War to convey to the people of Puerto Rice for school purposes a certain building and lot known as the Mayaguez Barracks Military Reservation now under the jurisdiction of the War Department.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of War be and he is hereby authorized, under such terms and conditions as he may deem advisable, to convey to the people of Puerto Rico for educational purposes a certain building and lot consisting of the Mayaguez Military Barracks and 1.74 acres of land, more or less, located in the municipality of Mayaguez, Puerto Rico: *Provided*, That when said land and improvements shall cease to be used for the purpose aforesaid, the same shall revert to the United States Government.

The bill was ordered to be read the third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MUSTERING-OUT PAY

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 5408, to amend the Mustering-Out Payment Act of 1944, to provide a method for accomplishing certain mustering-out payments on behalf of mentally disabled veterans, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 5 of the Mustering-Out Payment Act of 1944, approved February 3, 1944 (58 Stat. 8), is hereby amended by inserting the following subsection immediately following subsection (b) thereof:

"(c) The Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy, or such subordinate officers as they may designate, are authorized to make direct payment to survivors over 17 years of age, and to select a proper person or persons to whom mustering-out payments may be made for the use and benefit of former active members of the armed forces, or survivors thereof, as defined by section 4 hereof, without the necessity of appointment by judicial proceedings of a legal representative of any such former member or such survivors when, in the opinion of the respective Secretaries or their designees, the interests of persons under 17 years of age so justify, or where the former active member or his survivors is suffering from a mental disability sufficient to make direct payment not in the best interests of such person or persons. Payments made under the provisions of this subsection shall constitute a complete discharge of the obligation of the United States as provided in this act; and the selection of a proper person or persons, as provided herein, and the correctness of the amount due and paid to such person or persons shall have the same finality as that accorded decisions made pursuant to subsection (b): *Provided*, That the provisions of this subsection shall not apply where a legal guardian or committee has been judicially appointed, except as to any payments made hereunder prior to the receipt of notice of appointment."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONTINUATION ON ACTIVE LIST OF THE REGULAR ARMY OF ANY OFFICER ON ACTIVE LIST WHO SERVED AS CHIEF OF STAFF

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 5493, to provide for the continuation on the active list of the Regular Army for the duration of any of the wars in which the United States is now engaged, and for 6 months thereafter, of any officer on the active list of the Regular Army who has served as Chief of Staff during the wars in which the United States is now engaged.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That neither the provisions of the act of June 30, 1882 (22 Stat. 118), which require the retirement of an officer on the active list of the Regular Army upon attaining the age of 64 years, nor any other similar provisions of law, shall for the duration of any of the wars in which the United States is now engaged, and for 6 months thereafter, be applicable to any officer on the active list of the Regular Army who, prior to the enactment of this act, has served as Chief of Staff during the wars in which the United States is now engaged.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

UNDER SECRETARY OF WAR

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 5494, to amend the act entitled "An act authorizing the President to appoint an Under Secretary of War during national emergencies, fixing the compensation of the Under Secretary of War, and authorizing the Secretary of War to prescribe duties," approved December 16, 1940.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 2 of the act entitled "An act authorizing the President to appoint an Under Secretary of War during national emergencies, fixing the compensation of the Under Secretary of War, and authorizing the Secretary of War to prescribe duties", approved December 16, 1940 (54 Stat. 1224), is amended by striking from the last paragraph thereof the sentence which reads "The provisions of this act shall cease to have effect on January 20, 1945, unless continued in force by an act of Congress", and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "This act shall remain in force during the continuance of the present war, and for 6 months after the termination thereof, or until such earlier time as the Congress by concurrent resolution or the President may designate."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SETTLEMENT OF ACCOUNTS OF DECEASED OFFICERS AND ENLISTED MEN OF THE ARMY

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 1795, to amend that portion of the act approved June 30, 1906 (34 Stat. 697, 750), authorizing the settlement of accounts of deceased officers and enlisted men of the Army.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the portion of the act entitled "An act making appropriations for sundry civil expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1907, and for other purposes", approved June 30, 1906 (34 Stat. 697, 750; 10 U. S. C. 868), relating to the settlement of accounts of deceased officers and enlisted men of the Army, is amended by striking out the words "five hundred" appearing in line 31, page 750, of volume 34 of the United States Statutes at Large, and inserting in lieu thereof the words "one thousand", and by changing the colon after the words "per stirpes" in line 42, page 750, of said Statutes at Large, to a period and adding the following language: "Where the amount due the decedent's estate is $1,000 or more and and no demand is presented by a duly appointed legal representative of the estate, the accounting officers may allow $1,000 of the amount due to the estate to the widow or legal heirs in the order of precedence hereinabove set forth:".

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

"That the portion of the act entitled 'An act making appropriations for sundry civil expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1907, and for other purposes,' approved June 30, 1906 (34 Stat. 697, 750; 10 U. S. C. 868), relating to the settlement of account of deceased officers and enlisted men of the Army, which reads:

" 'Hereafter, in the settlement of the accounts of deceased officers or enlisted men of the Army, where the amount due the decedent's estate is less than $500 and no demand is presented by a fully appointed legal representative of the estate, the accounting officers may allow the amount found due to the decedent's widow or legal heirs in the following order of precedence: First, to the widow; second, if decedent left no widow, or the widow be dead at time of settlement, then to the children or their issue, per stirpes; third, if no widow or descendants, then to the father and mother in equal parts, provided the father has not abandoned the support of his family, in which case to the mother alone; fourth, if either the father or mother be dead, then to the one surviving; fifth, if there be no widow, child, father, or mother at the date of settlement, then to the brothers and sisters and children of deceased brothers and sister, per stirpes: *Provided*, That this act shall not be so con-

strued as to prevent payment from the amount due the decedent's estate of funeral expenses, provided a claim therefor is presented by the person or persons who actually paid the same before settlement by the accounting officers,' is hereby amended to read as follows:

" 'Hereafter, in the settlement of the accounts of deceased officers or enlisted men of the Army, where the amount due the decedent's estate is less than $1,000 and no demand is presented by a duly appointed legal representative of the estate, the accounting officers may allow the amount found due to the decedent's widow or legal heirs in the following order of precedence: First, to the widow, second, if decedent left no widow, or the widow be dead at time of settlement, then to the children or their issue, per stirpes; third, if no widow or descendants, then to the father and mother in equal parts, provided the father has not abandoned the support of his family, in which case to the mother alone; fourth, if either the father or mother be dead, then to the one surviving; fifth, if there be no widow, child, father, or mother at the date of settlement, then to the brothers and sisters and children of deceased brothers and sisters, per stirpes. Where the amount due the decedent's estate is $1,000 or more and no demand is presented by a duly appointed legal representative of the estate, the accounting officers may allow $1,000 of the amount due to the estate to the widow or legal heirs in the order of precedence hereinabove set forth. *Provided*, That this act shall not be so construed as to prevent payment from the amount due the decedent's estate of funeral expenses, provided a claim therefor is presented by the person or persons who actually paid the same before settlement by the accounting officers.' "

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, this concludes the consideration of all bills eligible for consideration on the Consent Calendar today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks by including a poem by Howard McColly, of Gary, Ind.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a letter therein.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. RIVERS. I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include therein a speech by Rear Admiral Ben Moreell, of the Bureau of Yards and Docks, to the annual convention of the American Federation of Labor.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include a newspaper editorial.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

FAILED ALLOYS

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include therein a report from the Institutes of Sciences.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, in connection with a bill which is to be presented at this session, I wish to call attention to some remarks I am going to include in the RECORD at this point with reference to failed alloys, which may explain some of the crashes of airplanes used by our forces in this war, both in peace and in combat, across the seas and at home.

Mr. Speaker, under date of October 2, 1944 the Bureau of Public Relations of the War Department released the following figures:

> Five thousand three hundred nonbattle casualties (dead, missing, sick, and injured). The A. A. F. has lost 14,600 aircraft on combat missions from all causes, and an additional 9,900 have been lost overseas from other than combat causes. Additional plane losses totaling 17,500 have occurred in the continental United States so that since Pearl Harbor the A. A. F. has had approximately 42,000 airplane losses.

From this authoritative information we do not know how many of the 5,300 nonbattle casualties were killed; nor do we know how many of the 27,400 airplanes lost in noncombat operations have crashed.

Of course, the figures for the Army Air Forces given us by the War Department do not include the losses of men and planes sustained by the Navy, the Marine Corps, Coast Guard, nor the losses of men and planes engaged in civilian use.

What we do know is that there have been a large number of men and airplanes lost wholly without relation to combat causes and that many of these losses in both categories have been attributed to accidents, the causes of which have frequently been undetermined so far as public reports are concerned.

For a long time I have been profoundly interested in the question, how many of our noncombat airplane crashes may have been caused by defects in the planes themselves?

For more than a year I have been advised of investigations being made by Mr. Ashton Keith, president of the Institutes of Sciences, many of which involved unexplained airplane crashes, seeking to discover whether or not the explanation might be in many cases defects in the metals out of which the planes were made.

His abstract of a report is interesting, even to me, a layman utterly ignorant of such matters as are dealt with therein and in the hope that it may be of interest to other Members of Congress and to the War and Navy Departments and others seeking to save lives, I am including this abstract herewith for whatever it may be worth toward the patriotic end which was and is being sought by Mr. Keith and his associates:

ABSTRACT OF A REPORT ON THE UNCOVERING OF HIDDEN DEFECTS IN FAILED WAR METALS

Shortly after the United States entered upon its program of preparations for national defense the remarkable series of unexplained crashes of Army airplanes became impressive. Their continued occurrence and their increase above the expectable ratio to the number of men in training for Army pilots led to extended discussions by a small scientific group, some of whom had training in metals, optics, atomic structures, and spectroscopy.

Through comparisons with information from several foreign sources, it was found that in at least two respects this experience of the United States Army is unique. Examinations were made of the spectra of a number of pieces of light metals that had failed, and comparisons were made with the spectra of true alloys of known similar composition. The results of these preliminary tests indicated presence of certain unfavorable conditions in the manufacturing processes of some of the metals. Such conditions might be traced (1) to deception or (2) to carelessness or (3) to gross ignorance of some of the important and well-established requirements on the part of some of those in charge of some of the metal making. We now hold a written statement admitting the last-named condition by the designated chief metallurgist of one of the firms.

As time passed, the noteworthy increase also of engine explosions or disintegrations and other remarkable incidents attending some of the unexplained crashes of Army planes served clearly to demonstrate the suspected hidden weaknesses of metals as a cause of many airplane disasters.

For these reasons and as a worthy and needed contribution to our national war effort, in July 1941, it was decided by a small group meeting at the Institutes of Sciences at Kansas City to undertake a series of spectroscopic investigations of failed airplane metals and to provide an investigator especially trained for the purpose.

On the desirability of the use of the spectroscope rather than the spectrograph for this particular purpose there is now a more general agreement among experts when the true nature of these phenomena is clearly understood. While manufacturers and others in this country have not used the spectroscope so generally, it is largely because of a lack of adequately trained observers. In Germany, France, and England, where this instrument has had wider use, it long has been known as affording one of the most effective and delicate tests of physical chemistry.

In these investigations comparison with the spectra of standard samples became habitual. Electrodes from failed parts were made, not with saw, hammer, and chisel, but they were cut out with the aid of a blowtorch and were shaped with a hard-wood mallet to avoid introduction of extraneous elements into the metals under examination. Current controls, and in fact the entire setup, frequently were checked by an electrical engineer and by a spectroscopist.

SOME OF THE ANOMALIES OBSERVED

During our extended studies of the spectra of the failed metals, using comparisons with the spectra of standard samples, certain irregularities clearly and repeatedly were exhibited:

1. All the spectral lines of some of the minor component elements, such as copper, chromium, or nickel, were observed to dim quite noticeably, and for a considerable time, although the visible lines of the other metal components continued unchanged. That dimming obviously was due to decrease in the proportional amount of that strengthening minor metal in the spot of the failed

metal that was under examination at that time.

2. A complete "blanking out" of the visible lines of a minor element (magnesium; chromium), but reappearing later in full strength. During that time the lines of all other expectable components remained steady as usual and clearly visible. This can only be due to complete absence of the strengthening element at such places in the failed metal.

3. During two of the examinations complete blanking out of the lines of a minor element (e. g., chromium or copper) was followed, not by their reappearance but by the appearance of lines of a different minor element (titanium) whose lines thenceforth were observed. Lines of the first metal did not reappear. No traces of a weld were found. Incomplete or spotty distribution of some of the minor elements in the major metal (aluminum) thus was indicated.

4. Lines of undesirable or extraneous elements repeatedly were observed in the spectra of some of the failed metals. These occurrences were entirely unexpected—particularly helium, a gaseous element that was found to be included at a number of places in some samples.

The strong tendency of some atmospheric gases, as well as some furnace gases to become molecularly, ionically, or atomically distributed within aluminum metals, particularly when they are highly heated, is well known; and effective methods for prevention are well established. Descriptions appear at many places in the literature of metallurgy; and full acquaintance with such dangers of contamination and consequent decrease in metal strength is expected of all in charge of the making of dependable alloys.

VITAL SIGNIFICANCE

Specifications for metals for United States war uses generally stipulate expectable uniformity. But heterogeneous distribution instead, of some of the minor components, clearly is indicated by the phenomena. Authoritatively this is agreed. Also the weakening effects of inclusions of extraneous elements are duly established.

Additional important anomalies also were observed.

SUBSTITUTIONS OF METALS

In at least one sample already examined, the use of an old-type cheaper alloy, with comparatively low heat-resistance, in the making of internal moving parts of an airplane engine has been demonstrated. The almost general modern practice is to use an alloy of better resistance to high temperatures. Yet spectroscopic examinations of a failed conrod showed the more desirable, but more expensive, modern alloy (which withstands high temperatures in a better way), had not been used in the manufacture of the conrod. The conrod bent while the machine was in flight, causing almost instantaneous engine failure.

CONCERNING TRUE ALLOYAGE

In general, the conditions within the metals, that are indicated by the above-described anomalies, cannot exist in metals that are entirely uniform. This repeatedly has been attested. It was emphasized by Alfred Krupp and many other early authorities on metallurgy. It was set forth in the literatures of Germany and France as well as other countries. An extensive bibliography as well as a digest of their findings also appears in the monumental 18-volume work, Comprehensive Treatise on Inorganic and Theoretical Chemistry, by J. W. Mellor, of London. Only a few months ago the grave importance of true alloyage for maximum strength of divers made metals was emphasized also by no less an authority than Sir William Bragg, of England. Also the fact that the presence of some of these minute variations within many metals cannot be made so clearly and definitely manifest by use of a spectrograph, authoritatively has been agreed; and the true meaning of its partial recording of such phenomena readily may escape due appreciation by readers of the spectrograms.

CLOSER SUPERVISION OF PROCESSES OF MANUFACTURE OF ALLOYS FOR IMPORTANT USES IS RECOMMENDED—IMPROVED INSPECTION NEEDED

That there is urgent need for immediate use of additional and improved modes for examination of war metals, widely is agreed. And daily, it is being demonstrated by additional preventable crashes at grievous loss of lives and at enormous accumulating cash expense.

Also, and even greater is the need for improvement and greater extension of inspections of war metals.

Very sincerely,

ASHTON KEITH,
President, the Institutes of Sciences.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include an article written by one of my constituents.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

POST-WAR HIGHWAY CONSTRUCTION

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow, the so-called post-war highway construction bill will be before the membership for amendment. I propose to offer an amendment which will strike out section 11 of the measure (H. R. 4915) we are considering. This objectionable section would allow the Public Roads Administration to have certain jurisdiction in the building of flight strips for the purpose of the landing and taking off of planes. Under the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938 we definitely placed in the jurisdiction of the Civil Aeronautics Administration the responsibility for the construction of airports. I believe we may invite an overlapping jurisdiction if we pass the bill with section 11 included. I shall tomorrow offer an amendment to strike section 11, believing such a procedure to be for the best interest of our growing aviation.

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANDOLPH. I yield to my good colleague from Ohio.

Mr. McGREGOR. I concur in the statement of the gentleman from West Virginia, and I hope all Members will be on the floor tomorrow because the gentleman from West Virginia intends to offer another amendment which will give back to the people control in our various districts over the construction of highways.

Mr. RANDOLPH. The gentleman is correct about the second amendment. It has to do with the required width of the highways and leaves proper jurisdiction to the States.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from West Virginia has expired.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] is recognized for 10 minutes.

TAXATION AMENDMENT TO THE CONSTITUTION

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to include certain tables and excerpts.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

SNEAK DEVASTATING ATTACK BEING MADE ON THE CONSTITUTION OF THE UNITED STATES BY A GROUP WHOSE PRETENDED PURPOSE IS TO UPHOLD AND DEFEND THE CONSTITUTION—A PART OF THE CONSTITUTION NEVER BEFORE USED IS VEHICLE FOR THE ATTACK

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, an effort is being made by a group known as the Committee for Constitutional Government, alias the Committee to Uphold the Constitution, to slip through an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to restrict the amount of taxes that Congress may cause to be levied and collected by the Federal Government on incomes, gifts, and estates to 25 percent.

If adopted, it will pave the way to throw the enormous war debt on the shoulders of the poor, causing the poor to become poorer and to make the rich richer.

At the same time, the war wounded and the dependents of those who gave their lives in battle can receive nothing from the Federal Government if this amendment is adopted.

WASTE OPPOSED

I am opposed to extravagance and waste of Government funds. Money that is taken from the taxpayers should be discretely, judiciously, and wisely expended under the direction of Congress, and under the direction of those entrusted this duty by the Congress. Not one penny should be taken from a taxpayer and wasted. Congress should at all times be on the alert to prevent any kind of waste, extravagance, or useless expenditures of public funds, but this is not the way to stop extravagance or waste.

MAKE FASCIST STATE

It is the way to convert a successful and efficient democracy like our own into a Fascist state. The Committee for Constitutional Government, which is sponsoring this proposal which is referred to as the twenty-second amendment, is the outstanding Fascist group in America.

Those who are behind this group are trying to hide their identity and conceal their motives but the true facts have recently come to light. Anyone interested in the exposé of this group may receive copies of speeches I made in the House of Representatives in May and June of this year—upon written request to me—entitled "Most Sinister Lobby Ever Organized," and "Millionaires' Amendment To Make Rich Richer and the Poor Poorer." Single copies will be sent free upon request.

RESULTS IF AMENDMENT SHOULD PASS

If this amendment should become a part of our Constitution, it will result in the following:

First. The principle of "ability to pay" in Federal taxation will be discarded.

Second. Small business will be wrecked because big business will be able to keep so much of the huge profits that they make that little business will be unable to compete and will be quickly and easily crushed and destroyed.

Third. The Government will be unable to collect sufficient money under the restriction to provide for more than the payment of the interest on the national debt when the war is over. It is estimated that our national debt will be around three hundred billion when the war is over. If the interest rate is kept down to 2½ percent, the carrying charges will be $7,500,000,000 per annum. Therefore, it is very doubtful that the Government can raise more than enough to carry this enormous carrying charge on the national debt with this 25 percent restriction.

Fourth. Dependents of those who gave their lives for their country in this and other wars will no longer be able to receive relief from the Federal Government.

Fifth. There will be nothing left for the Federal Government to provide for those who can no longer carry on due to injuries and wounds received in battle while protecting our country in this and other wars.

Sixth. The aid for old-age assistance will have to be discontinued and much of the social-security program generally will be wrecked.

Seventh. There can be no soil-conservation payments to farmers.

Eighth. There can be no help by the Federal Government for construction of highways and roads; nor for the improvement of our rivers and harbors.

These are just a few of the benefits that will have to be stopped immediately, if this amendment becomes effective.

LITTLE TAXPAYERS WOULD BE HARMED

In practice, the 49,200,000 taxpayers in the lower brackets will not only not have their taxes reduced under this amendment, but their taxes will actually have to be increased to make up for the savings that will be granted to the few who now own and control so much of the wealth of the country.

DORMANT PART OF CONSTITUTION USED IN SCHEME

The plan is to use as the vehicle a part of article V of the Constitution which has never heretofore been used. This article of the Constitution provides that Congress "on application of two-thirds of the several States shall call a convention for proposing amendments." The States never have made use of this provision. This is the first attempt to use it.

The Committee for Constitutional Government, in a published statement about the proposed twenty-second amendment, stated:

All previous constitutional amendments have been adopted by the simpler method of having three-fourths of the States ratify amendments submitted by Congress. A second method, the one followed in pressing for the twenty-second amendment, is for action to be initiated by State legislatures with Congress obliged to call a convention if asked by two-thirds of the States.

CONGRESS, IN EFFECT, TO BE BYPASSED

It will be noticed that it is insisted by this organization and it is also insisted by others who are sponsoring this bad proposal that if 32 States will ask Congress to submit such a constitutional amendment, the Congress is compelled to submit it. Congress will have no other recourse, it is contended. The Committee for Constitutional Government in the early part of 1944 further said:

Nation-wide education on the need for this amendment is one of the major tasks before the committee at this time.

HUGE LOBBY BEHIND IT

This campaign which is obviously against the public interest has been conducted so quietly and smoothly, backed by huge lobbying funds, that 14 State legislatures had actually adopted the proposed amendment before I even knew it was being considered. If there was any publicity in the newspapers about it, I did not see it. Other people who also try to keep up with current events told me they were astounded to learn that such a devastating proposal got by so quietly through the 14 legislatures without the question being brought to public attention.

WILL DESTROY OUR DEMOCRACY

If this proposal is adopted, it will not be long before a few families will own practically all the wealth in the country. The people in the low-income brackets will have to sell their United States Government bonds to pay their increased taxes, due to this special benefit to the very wealthy.

The ones in the very wealthy class who will be benefited by this amendment will be the only ones who will be able to buy these United States Government bonds. Hence, it is entirely possible that within a generation, if this amendment is adopted, for a few very wealthy families to own the national debt of the United States and practically all the money they pay in taxes and the other people pay in taxes will go to themselves as holders of the national debt.

Anyone who has given serious consideration to this question, I believe, will come to one conclusion and that is the adoption of this proposal will mean possibly within a generation the destruction of our democracy insofar as it relates to promoting the general welfare of the people of the United States.

RENEWED DRIVE BEFORE STATE LEGISLATURES TO START SOON

The legislatures in practically all, if not all, the States will meet in January 1945. Efforts will be made by the group I have mentioned to slip this amendment through sufficient legislatures to enable them to contend that they have two-thirds of the legislatures of the several States, or 32 in all, asking for a constitutional convention to submit the amendment to all the States and they will then contend that Congress is compelled to submit it. They claim 16 States have already passed it.

I am inserting herewith a table showing the status of this amendment in all the States:

Status of resolutions calling for adoption of proposed twenty-second amendment

[Information based upon correspondence with various secretaries of state, as of Nov. 27, 1944]

	Adopted	Resolution offered	Passed House	Passed Senate
Alabama	July 8, 1943		Yes	Yes.
Arizona		None		
Arkansas	1943	1943	Yes (unanimous)	Yes (unanimous).
California		June 7, 1944	No vote taken	No vote taken.
Colorado		1943	No	No.
Connecticut		None		
Delaware	Apr. 22, 1943		Unanimous	Yes, 10 to 6.
Florida		None		
Georgia		do		
Idaho		do		
Illinois	1943		May 5, 1943	May 26, 1943.
Indiana	do		Yes	Yes.
Iowa	1941		do	Do.
Kansas		None		
Kentucky	Mar 20, 1944		Yes [1]	Do.
Louisiana		1944	No, tabled 54 to 22	Do.
Maine	1941		Apr. 17, 1941	Apr. 15, 1941.
Maryland		None		
Massachusetts	1941		Apr. 29, 1941	Apr. 24, 1941.
Michigan	do		May 16, 1941	Apr. 29, 1941.
Minnesota		None		
Mississippi	1940		Apr. 29, 1940	Apr. 29, 1940.
Missouri		None		
Montana		1941	Killed in committee	
Nebraska		None		
Nevada		do		
New Hampshire		do		
New Jersey	1944		April 4, 1944	February 25, 1944.
New Mexico		None		
New York		1944	Lost on vote	No vote.
North Carolina		None		
North Dakota		do		
Ohio		1944	Killed in committee	Yes.
Oklahoma		None		
Oregon		do		
Pennsylvania	Vetoed [2]	Mar. 31, 1943	Yes	Do.
Rhode Island	Mar. 15, 1940		do	Do.
South Carolina		Feb. 3, 1944	No vote	Recommitted.
South Dakota		None		
Tennessee		do		
Texas			Feb. 9, 1943, tabled 3 to 29.	May 10, 1943, lost 52 to 58.
Utah		None		
Vermont		do		
Virginia		1944	Yes	No.
Washington		None		
West Virginia		do		
Wisconsin	1943	Apr. 14, 1943	Yes, 44 to 31	Yes, 17 to 9.
Wyoming	1939		Yes	Yes.

[1] Rescinded by House.

[2] Vetoed by Governor, June 7, 1943.

PASSED FIVE STATES UNDER FALSE PREMISE

It is evident that it is claimed 16 States have already passed this resolution. I doubt that all the facts concerning the proposal were presented.

In five States the resolution which was passed contained this provision:

Whereas there is now pending in the current session of the Congress of the United States proposed legislation to repeal the sixteenth amendment of the Constitution of the United States and to amend the Constitution of the United States relative to taxes on incomes, gifts, and inheritances, and providing for a limitation of taxes thereon—

When in truth and in fact there was no such resolution pending in Congress at the time. I refer to the States of Arkansas, Delaware, Indiana, Iowa, and Pennsylvania.

The only resolution offered in Congress that I have ever found covering this subject was House Joint Resolution 1, offered January 3, 1939, by the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER], and was only effective until the end of that Congress, which expired January 3, 1941.

STATE LEGISLATURES CAN RESCIND ACTION

I have submitted the question, "Can a State legislature repeal a resolution of an earlier legislature requesting Congress to submit a proposed amendment to the Federal Constitution?" to the Legislative Reference Service of Congress and to a number of good lawyers in whom I have confidence. In addition, I have read everything I could find in connection with the subject. After getting the views of others and after making the investigation myself, I am convinced that a legislature in 1945 or any subsequent legislature in any of the States that have adopted this proposed "twenty-second amendment" can legally rescind the action of the preceding legislature that adopted it.

In view of information that is now available to the legislatures of these States that was doubtlessly not presented at the time of the adoption of the resolution, very likely some of these States will consider rescinding such action.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SNYDER] is recognized for 20 minutes.

SUPERHIGHWAYS

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, in February 1937 I first submitted to the Congress a bill then known as the transcontinental superhighway bill which provided for the building of at least three broad highways across the Nation from east to west, one in the north, one in the central, and one in the south portion of the United States, and six highways running north and south. Most of the Members who have been here since that time have seen the charts that I presented on the floor.

When I first submitted this plan it will be recalled I stated that we should do it as a Nation-building proposition, we should do it at once, and we know now that in 10 years, in 50 years, in a hundred years, or 500 years these roads and superhighways will be needed.

There was another situation existing at that time. We had much unemployment in 1937 and many of us thought they were employing people through the different agencies we had set up, such as the W. P. A., to do work that was not altogether worth while. My plan would have put several million men to work at that time on a worth-while project.

Would it not have been nice if we had those highways completed when the present war broke out? We would have saved this Nation many, many millions of dollars in transportation costs.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SNYDER. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Will the gentleman explain to the House where the money is to come from for this multi-million-dolar highway program?

Mr. SNYDER. May I say, and I say this kindly, not sarcastically, that it will have to come from the same source that all the other money comes from for the highway road-building program we are going to pass tomorrow. I may say that the bill I am introducing today calls for private industry to build these roads.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Will not most of this money or practically all of it have to be raised by deficit financing? That is the question I raise. Will it not have to be charged to our children, grandchildren, and their descendants?

Mr. SNYDER. Well, you know in the last 25 years, especially since I have been observing conditions, we in this country have educated our children and our people to be sort of 5- and 10-cent people. Did the gentleman ever stop to think about that? Who is to blame for educating our people to be 5- and 10-cent-minded? Let us take the department stores, for example; they teach and encourage the people to come in and buy on time and pay 10 cents a week or 40 cents a week or a dollar a week, and that applies on down through all categories of business. We have been educating the people to be 5- and 10-cent people. Now that we have educated these people to be 5- and 10-cent-minded, we might go ahead and have toll bridges or toll roads like we have on the Pennsylvania Turnpike.

We built the Pennsylvania superhighway, and we have tolls. I might say to the gentleman that if the war had not come on, instead of having 24 years to pay off the $40,000,000, we would have paid it off in 8 years.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SNYDER. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. The gentleman is not taking into consideration the Federal grant that was involved in the construction.

Mr. SNYDER. There was a $30,000,000 grant involved, but we do not have to pay that back.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. So it is a good-paying proposition as long as you do not have to bother about paying back the Federal grant?

Mr. SNYDER. That is right. I would like to say this about the highways: We should go ahead and build them now regardless, because after the shooting stops we will have to put men to work again. This would be a worth-while project in case private industry cannot put all the men to work that should be at work. This would be a worth-while nation-building project to put men to work, for regardless of what the volume of transportation will be by air, we will still need these roads that are called for in my bill. Take this road system of mine. Imagine seeing 3 highways running across the Nation, 100 feet wide, made up of 8 lanes, and a right-of-way of no less than 1,100 feet the whole way; if you picture that, and then take the 6 lanes running up and down, you will have a picture of 18 intersections. At each of these 18 intersections my bill calls for airdomes and airfields no less than 4 miles square.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SNYDER. In just a moment, when I finish this statement, I will be glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I am just thirsting for information.

Mr. SNYDER. The gentleman will get it.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I know, and I could use it too, if I could only get it somewhere.

Mr. SNYDER. I was going to say this about these airfields. You and I now realize that we will have to have great air bases. There is nothing new about these air bases in building for air service than there was in building for railroad systems. In building these continental railroads across the Nation, the New York Central, the Northern Pacific, the Southern Pacific, the Pennsylvania, the B. & O., and the great railway systems that were built—they ran their lines across the Nation, and then at places like Pittsburgh, Cleveland, Chicago, and St. Louis, and what not, there were centers, and from there they had what you might call shuttle service running out into the country here and there. The same thing is going to be true in the air service. We will have the shuttle service that will take us to these big air bases, and from there, of course, we will fly all over the world instead of just in the United States.

It says here in section 7 that the building of such roads shall be by contract to the lowest bidder per mile, and no contract to be less than 10 miles, the same to be supervised and accepted and approved by the Federal Government Army engineers and its agents. The Army engineers stand high all over the world—not only here—as being an agency that can build for the future instead of only for the present.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. I ask this question, not facetiously, but seriously. Does the gentleman have any concern for the danger that the country is now facing, of national bankruptcy?

Mr. SNYDER. That is a very important question, and I shall answer it by saying this: As I read, as I have in years gone, of the wars of all nations, from the beginning of time, I realize that in every war we have ever had, it has been said that we are going into bankruptcy. That was true of the Civil War,

and many people told Abraham Lincoln in the Civil War that there was danger of our going into bankruptcy. The same thing was said in every war, and I do not blame the people for saying it now during this war; but I have confidence in the American people, that when this war is over, the economic side, the financial side, will so adjust itself that we will take care of the finances, and we will not go into bankruptcy as a nation. The gentleman suggests just how. I do not know, and I do not think that anyone else in the world knows.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Let me suggest to the gentleman that he is proposing a program involving the expenditure of billions of dollars, and he ought to know how it is going to be financed. The gentleman ought to know how it is going to be paid for, in my judgment.

Mr. SNYDER. When we proposed a program to build this great war machine in short order, as we had to build in a hurry did we have a plan to finance it at its inception?

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. It seems to me that that was a life or death proposition for our Nation, and cannot be compared with the proposition that the gentleman is presenting here at the present time.

Mr. SNYDER. When we are thinking of future generations, let me say this. I talked to one of the boys who went up the Appian Way. You know when that was built, and it is still good. I have faith in my country that it is going to be here a thousand years or two thousand years from now. If that is true, it is poor economy to build highways and to build parts of highways that will not be lasting a thousand years from now, and so it is cheaper in the long run. I imagine that the gentleman from Ohio is a good businessman, and that he believes in buying things that are worth while, and not cheap articles. He believes in buying a good reaper or a good mower or a good horse or an automobile and not a cheap one. And so I believe that we ought to build good roads to last for a thousand years.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. I believe in buying the best, but I also believe in paying for it out of my own pocket, whereas it seems to me that the gentleman who is talking about buying the best is also talking about paying for it out of somebody else's pocket.

Mr. SNYDER. Oh, out of the Nation's pocket, which is the same thing.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. I would like to see someone in the well of the House sometime who seems serious about our future generations.

Mr. SNYDER. I certainly agree, and I would not be in Congress if I did not think that I am doing some good service for future generations, because, after all, I think that is what we are all trying to accomplish today.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SNYDER. Yes.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I appreciate that the gentleman is thinking of coming generations. I understand that he believes in industry, and of course from the gentleman's argument he is trying to fix it so that coming generations will have plenty of work, something to do, so that they may save their money to pay the taxes that we are rolling up for them and putting on their shoulders. That is what the gentleman is after?

Mr. SYNDER. Not for paying taxes that we are rolling up. I am for increasing the taxes if necessary so that the gentleman and I may pay our just share. There is another side to this. If the gentleman and I did not do what we are doing today, these future generations perhaps would not have anything before them but a Hitler set-up of slavery for generations to come.

Mr. HOFFMAN. They would still have the country, would they not, without the debt that we are piling up? We are spending all of this money that these people can earn in the next 500 or 1,000 years.

What we are doing is mortgaging the old homestead and letting them pay it off.

Mr. SNYDER. What would the gentleman suggest?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I suggest that they try to buy as they go along and not buy beyond their means. We should not give them all these fine things—and many of them are fine—and leave them to pay for it after. I know that you practice it in your own life. You pay for things as you go along.

Mr. SNYDER. That is right.

Mr. HOFFMAN. You do not go ahead and borrow and mortgage everything that you have got and leave your children to pay the bill when the time rolls around. Why not let us practice that as a nation?

Mr. SNYDER. I am glad to say I do not want to do that.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Why, sure. Why do we want to put the Nation in debt—in debt for billions and billions of dollars?

Mr. SNYDER. Permit me to make this observation to the gentleman: If the gentleman goes to any big business, such as the United States Steel Corporation or General Motors or Chrysler, and ask to see their books when they started out in business——

Mr. HOFFMAN. We have not just started out. We have 160 years behind us.

Mr. SNYDER. But this is a new proposition.

Mr. HOFFMAN. The gentleman knows what Churchill said the other day about this being the biggest and most powerful and richest and greatest nation in all the world, and about how we saved England, the English Empire, and, if he did not say it, he has forgotten, how we saved England twice, and saved the British Empire.

Mr. SNYDER. If the gentleman will permit me to complete my statement, all of these companies, you know, when they started out, borrowed the money.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Adam did not have anything. Of course, he had the Garden of Eden and all that, but he was kicked out of the Garden of Eden because he reached out too far.

Mr. SNYDER. Of course, he had Eve there.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Yes; and he got the apple, and the snake got him. That is what I am afraid of now; too many snakes around, trying to give too many apples, which is going to get us in trouble.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, in conclusion, I ask permission to insert my bill at this point.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. RAMSPECK). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

A bill to provide for the location, survey, and building of a system of superhighways, three east and west and six north and south highways

Be it enacted, etc., That the whole of the United States may have as near as possible equal facilities for transportation of commodities, a more justifiable avenue for caring for our unemployment situation, better adjustments for decentralizing our population, and to economize in the building of national highways and provide modern and adequate national defense equipment, the Department of the Interior is hereby authorized and directed to locate, survey, and build (a) 3 transcontinental highways, described in section 2 of this act; (b) 6 north-south highways, described in section 3 of this act; and (c) a system of airports, in connection with such highways, 1 such airport at least 2 miles square to be located at or adjacent to each of the 18 intersections of such highways one with the other. Such locations and surveys and construction shall be conducted by the Department of the Interior, in cooperation with the Bureau of Public Roads, the United States Army engineers, and the public bodies having jurisdiction over the system of highways in the several States, through which such transcontinental and north-south highways will pass.

SEC. 2. (a) One of the transcontinental highways referred to in section 1 of this act shall begin in vicinity of Boston, Mass., and run west by Salem, Oreg., by way of Albany, N. Y.; Cleveland, Ohio; Chicago, Ill.; Rapid City, S. Dak.; and Yellowstone National Park.

(b) One of such transcontinental highways shall begin in vicinity of Newark, N. J.; and run west to San Francisco, Calif., by way of Cumberland, Md.; Uniontown, Pa.; Wheeling, W. Va.; Indianapolis, Ind.; Springfield, Ill.; Phillipsburg, Mo.; Denver, Colo.; Huntington, Utah; Duckwater, Nev.; and Yosemite National Park.

(c) One of such transcontinental highways shall begin in vicinity of Savannah, Ga., and run west to Los Angeles, Calif., by way of north of Mobile, Ala.; Baton Rouge, La.; San Antonio, Tex.; by El Paso, Tex.

SEC. 3. (a) One of such north-south highways shall begin in vicinity of Miami, Fla., and run north to Canada, by way of St. Petersburg, Fla.; Reidsville, Ga.; Columbia, S. C.; Raleigh, N. C.; Richmond, Va.; between Washington, D. C., and Baltimore, Md.; New Brunswick, N. J.; Springfield, Mass.; and Concord, N. H.

(b) One of such north-south highways shall begin in vicinity of Buffalo, N. Y., and run south by Pensacola, Fla., by way of Pittsburgh, Pa.; Uniontown, Pa.; Charleston, W. Va.; Jonesboro, Tenn.; and Atlanta, Ga.

(c) One of such north-south highways shall begin in vicinity of Baton Rouge, La., and run to Canada, by way of Chicago, Ill.; Milwaukee, Wis.; Jackson, Miss.; and Memphis, Tenn.

(d) One of such north-south highways shall begin on the Mexican border in the vicinity of San Antonio, Tex.; Hobart, Okla.; Ness City, Kans.; Broken Bow, Nebr.; and Pierre, S. Dak.; Bismarck, N. Dak., to Canadian border.

(e) One of such north-south highways shall begin in vicinity of El Paso, Tex., and run north to Canada, by way of El Morro

National Monument, N. Mex., and Salt Lake City, Utah.

(f) One of such north-south highways shall begin in vicinity of San Diego, Calif., and run north to Seattle, Wash., by way of Los Angeles, Calif.; Bakersfield, Calif.; Sacramento, Calif.; and Klamath Falls, Oreg., and there be linked with highway to Alaska.

SEC. 4. Each of the highways referred to in section 1 of this act shall be 100 feet wide; 8 lanes of traffic; shall be built of the most modern, durable materials; and shall be equipped so as to be properly and abundantly lighted at night at all times, no light poles or obstruction to be within 350 feet from center of the highway; and shall not pass through any cities or towns unless there is no other place for the road. The right-of-way for such highways shall be not less than 1,100 feet wide, and the grade on all roads east of the Rocky Mountains shall be not more than 3½ percent and on or west of the Rocky Mountains not more than 5 percent. The set-up and program for the construction of these highways shall be perfected; estimates made, surveys made, blueprints completed by proper authorities as soon as possible after this act becomes a law, so that at the conclusion of the World War we will be in position to put millions of men to work on constructing these highways.

SEC. 5. Each of the airports referred to in section 1 of this act shall be not less than 2 miles square; shall be of the most modern construction, hard-surfaced, runways suitably lighted and equipped; and shall be so located that the intersection of the roads at which such airport is placed will be as nearly as possibly tangent to such airport.

SEC. 6. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $16,000,000,000 to carry out the provisions of this act. The estimated mileage of these highways is 18,000 miles. The portion of this sum to be used each year in the construction of said highways shall be designated each year by the Secretary of the Interior, and set aside on or before July 1 of each year in which it is to be used. Any of the amount designated to be used in any 1 fiscal year and not used during that fiscal year shall be returned to the Treasury of the United States and included in the sum set aside for the following fiscal year.

SEC. 7. That the building of such roads shall be by contract to the lowest bidder per mile and no contract to be less than 10 miles; and same to be supervised and accepted and approved by Federal Government Army engineers or their agents.

SEC. 8. The purchasing of rights-of-way for these highways shall be in the hands of a commission of 10, to be appointed by the President of the United States, at least five which must be selected from the Army, engineers who have had at least 10 years' experience in a big way, in the field of operations such as this highway construction embodies. These men to receive a salary of $12,000 each per year.

SEC. 9. One stipulation in each contract for building these highways shall be that the contractor employ first, ex-servicemen. Second, men that need work in that community between the ages of 52 and 64 and pay them such wages as shall be determined by the Government authorities designated to set satisfactory wages and hours for the various types of work to be done.

Mr. SNYDER. I will conclude with this remark. I just talked with the gentleman from Utah [Mr. ROBINSON]. He said this would not in any way interfere with the road program that he has presented and on which we will perhaps vote tomorrow. This is to take care of the bigger things that we are looking forward to after this war is over, as a Nation. We are looking forward to the time when this Nation will be a bigger and better place in which to live, not only 50 years from now but 100 years from now. Therefore, we will have to provide bigger and better roads and more splendid facilities.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Illinois [Miss SUMNER] is recognized for 10 minutes.

POLAND

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, the time may come when the only public figure in America still carrying a torch for liberty will be the graven image in New York Harbor. But that time is not yet. The heart of America is not yet turned to stone. Many Americans are not yet resigned to seeing their Government repeatedly throw its heavy weight on the side of injustice and tyranny in its dealings with foreign nations.

Saturday front pages flaunted the news that, because our Government, like Pontius Pilate, had washed its hands of the Polish affair, the legal Government of Poland—the same Government which has never surrendered, which kept its aviators in the R. A. F. fighting the Battle of Britain, which keeps an indomitable Polish Army fighting the Battle of Italy, which led the Polish underground fighting the Battle of Warsaw only to be victimized through Allied treachery—has been forced to resign.

One disgusted American cried, "Why print it on the front page? It should be printed in the obituary columns." Another, recalling the President's preelection assurance of a strong Poland, commented dryly, "Broken election promise No. 1—they didn't even wait until all the votes were counted." As usual, some urged Congressmen to protest. "At least it would comfort the poor Poles," they said. And likewise, of course, bring comfort to all deserving peoples who have "seen the things they gave their lives to broken" by Allied injustice.

Is there still hope for Poland? Allied indifference to war aims listed in the Atlantic Charter has long since made it obvious that the Atlantic Charter is now a last year's bird's nest, apparently never intended for anything but temporary shelter. Perhaps the Job's comforters who tell Poles frankly that, having lost everything, they had better give up their faith, too, are doing Poles a kindness.

But is there still hope for Poland? If there is it is because the integrity of Poland has become important to America and someday the American people are apt to realize it. American public opinion, to be sure, is beleaguered by mechanized propaganda coming at us from radio, magazines, and newspapers. Even the most alert Americans scarcely know what they dare believe these days. But some things Americans know from common sense.

One thing Americans know in their bones is that the surest way to discourage war making is not to let either victors or vanquished emerge from a war enriched by power or territory taken from innocent peoples. Americans know that one good thing about the Versailles Treaty which resolved World War No. 1 was that it liberated millions of Europeans, including Poles, giving them self-government. Americans know that these peoples would still be independent except for Hitler, and that there is no good reason why, after Hitler is extinguished, they should not regain the rights and boundaries they had before Hitler robbed them. Americans should also know that to the extent we sacrifice these Europeans and give their rights to somebody else, we are the same as inviting future war by showing that war is still profitable. We know, moreover, that the proposed international peace organization is designed for the purpose of committing America to fight in every war hereafter. That even without such an organization we shall probably be in every war hereafter because England is usually in every war and since 1914 America has acquired the habit of guaranteeing the British Empire. We know that if and when there is any war against Stalin we are likely to be in it on one side or other, the side England takes, despite protests from isolationists. Therefore Americans should know by instinct that when our Government, by shutting its eyes, enables Stalin to usurp rights of innocent peoples that we are simply creating wars for America to fight.

Probably the reason the American people have not already demonstrated that they believe these self-evident truths is because they have had no opportunity to do so. In the last two Presidential elections the American people were skillfully deprived of any chance to vote away the pernicious New Deal foreign policy or lack of policy. It was hard for people to believe that a Republican victory in 1944 might relieve our country of the hated New Deal foreign policy since the Republican Presidential candidate himself repeatedly and vehemently denied it.

If there is hope that the American people will ever again have a chance to vote their faith in the tried and proven principles of national security propounded by George Washington and Jefferson there is hope for Poland and worthy peoples everywhere. It is tragic for the world that now when we need it most we lack the virtuous leadership of these great American principles. If we had it Stalin might not be clutching for power all over creation. If Stalin is as shrewd as they say he is he has no confidence in the commonly overestimated ability of "new dealism" to run the world successfully. It could be that his purpose is to fortify himself in advance against the global war—economic and military—to which the unprincipled fumbling seems bound to lead.

For these reasons it may help to let it be known that the shining American principles which, rather than the British Navy, promoted ever increasing world civilization during the century we endeavored to adhere to them—the principles often referred to contemptuously as "isolationism"—are not so dead as the propaganda insists. American principles,

being so much wiser than anything pseudo-intellectual moderns have to offer, are hard to kill off. They still live. They may rise again though at present, unfortunately for mankind, they are suppressed in what might be called our comatose Republic.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include therein an explanatory memorandum on the Randolph amendment to the Federal interregional highway bill (H. R. 4915) to be offered by the distinguished gentleman from West Virginia tomorrow.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield back my time.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein an address made by the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Mrs. LUCE] at the New York Herald Tribune Forum.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

GEN. MARK CLARK AND THE ITALIAN CAMPAIGN

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 3 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I am very glad to see by today's paper that Gen. Mark Clark, commander of the American Fifth Army in Italy, has been designated commander of all the Allied forces in the Italian theater to take the place of Gen. Sir Henry Maitland Wilson, a British officer, who was formerly supreme Allied commander in the Mediterranean theater. General Wilson is coming to Washington to take the place of the late Sir John Dill. I am very glad General Clark is to be the supreme commander in the Italian theater. He has done extremely able work as the head of the Fifth Army under very great handicaps. It seems to me there was more rain, harder rain, heavier torrential rains in Italy than in any country I have ever visited; and the wind reaches almost hurricane velocity; the mud was deeper; and those who know Italy know that the formation of the Apennines makes fighting extremely difficult.

Only by visiting the Fifth Army front in the Italian theater of operations—by seeing the troops in action, by personally going over the terrain—can one begin to appreciate the difficulties confronting an attacking army in this combat zone.

It seemed incredible, as I looked up at the towering Apennine Mountains, that our Army should cross them. Mountains, not just in widely spaced series, but one mass of high, rugged peaks after another, lie astride the Fifth Army's path. Roads, at best, are few, and too often the enemy's commanding observation enables him to bring concentrated artillery fire down upon these vital arteries of supply. Soldiers told me that for 2 weeks they were in the valley looking up at the enemy wondering when the Germans would open fire at them.

The mountains are not the only barriers. Rivers, frequently at flood stage, cut across what little level ground there is. With high ground always before it, with rivers intersecting the valley floors, with mountain roads twisting their way through areas covered by enemy fire, any advance becomes a remarkable achievement. As some of the servicemen said: "It is fine to have climbed some of the mountains to be able to look down."

I have only mentioned the natural obstacles. In the skilled hands of the enemy, these have become fortresses. Only a little work is required to convert the terrain into a system of formidable defenses, spaced through with mine fields, antitank ditches, gun emplacements, pill boxes, machine-gun nests, and other military additions which made the ground almost impregnable.

German forces in Italy opposing the Fifth Army are good troops. They are skilled, fanatical fighters, well equipped, and determined to impose the maximum delay and casualties upon our forces. After seeing what has been accomplished, after seeing the insurmountable difficulties of weather, terrain, hostile fortifications, and strength, I am amazed at the victories already won. The Fifth Army's progress has been made by dogged, determined, courageous fighting against terrific odds.

The Fifth Army has often been called "the forgotten army" because it was not given replacements of men. Many Massachusetts men are fighting in this army; many have lost their lives and many have been wounded. All have been extremely gallant in that area. The WAC's at the headquarters of the Fifth Army are able and efficient and the doctors, nurses, and medical-detachment men work day and night in their care of the wounded. When I was in Italy I begged that more replacements be sent to the Fifth Army. Casualties are extremely heavy. I hope those replacements of men have arrived, because it seems to me inexcusable that General Clark should not have replacements of men. I rejoice that he is to be in charge of all the Allied forces in the Italian theater, as it is chiefly American soldiers who are doing the fighting and dying there.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. WORLEY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 43 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, November 28, 1944, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

2031. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to provide reimbursement for personal property lost, damaged, or destroyed as the result of an explosion at the Naval Air Station, Norfolk, Va., on September 17, 1943; to the Committee on Claims.

2032. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting pursuant to section 16 of the Organic Act of the Virgin Islands of the United States, approved June 22, 1936, one copy each of various legislation passed by the Municipal Council of St. Thomas and St. John; to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

2033. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting pursuant to section 16 of the Organic Act of the Virgin Islands of the United States, approved June 22, 1936, one copy each of various legislation passed by the Municipal Council of St. Croix; to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

2034. A letter from the Director, the Office of Censorship transmitting a revised statement of personnel limitations for the Office of Censorship for the quarter ending December 31, 1944; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

2035. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a copy of communication from this Department to the Director of the Bureau of the Budget relating to personnel ceiling of the Procurement Division, Lend-Lease; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

2036. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a copy of communication from this Department to the Director of the Bureau of the Budget relating to personnel ceiling of the Bureau of the Mint; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

2037. A letter from the Acting Governor of Hawaii, transmitting a copy of the Journal of the House of Representatives of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii, regular session of 1943; to the Committee on the Territories.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. JARMAN: Committee on Printing. House Resolution 652. Resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of the seventh intermediate report of the Select Committee to Investigate Executive Agencies; without amendment (Rept. No. 1934). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. KEFAUVER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 1590. An act for the relief of the State of Tennessee; without amendment (Rept. No. 1938). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. SPENCE: Committee on Banking and Currency. S. 2004. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to mobilize the productive facilities of small business in the interests of successful prosecution of the war, and for other purposes," approved June 11, 1942; without amendment (Rept. No. 1939). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. LESINSKI: Committee on Immigration and Naturalization. H. R. 4826. A bill to authorize the naturalization of Filipinos;

with amendment (Rept. No. 1940). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. BRYSON: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 1877. An act to transfer Georgetown County, S. C., from the Florence division to the Charleston division of the eastern judicial district of South Carolina; without amendment (Rept. No. 1941). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana: Committee on Immigration and Naturalization. H. R. 2549. A bill to reduce time to plead and to regulate service of process in proceedings to cancel naturalization, without amendment (Rept. No. 1942). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. LESINSKI: Committee on Immigration and Naturalization. H. R. 4571. A bill to grant a nonquota status to certain alien veterans and their wives; without amendment (Rept. No. 1943). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. BLAND: Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries. Interim report pursuant to House Resolution 52. Resolution authorizing an investigation and report on the merchant marine in overseas aviation (Rept. No. 1944). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. LESINSKI: Committee on Immigration and Naturalization. S. 556. An act for the relief of Pedro Jose Arrecoechea; without amendment (Rept. No. 1935). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LESINSKI: Committee on Immigration and Naturalization. H. R. 4146. A bill for the relief of Filip Nicola Lazarevich; without amendment (Rept. No. 1936). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LESINSKI: Committee on Immigration and Naturalization. H. R. 2626. A bill for the relief of certain Basque aliens; without amendment (Rept. No. 1937). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. JENKINS:

H. R. 5537. A bill to amend sections 1400 and 1410 of the Federal Insurance Contributions Act, as amended, so as to stabilize the present rate of tax on employees and employers; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SNYDER:

H. R. 5538. A bill to provide for the location, survey, and building of a system of superhighways, three east and west and six north and south highways; to the Committee on Roads.

By Mr. BLOOM:

H. J. Res. 317. Joint resolution recognizing the outstanding service rendered to the United Nations by Field Marshal Sir John Dill; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

Mr. PHILLIPS introduced a bill (H. R. 5539) for the relief of the Irvine Co., which was referred to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

6210. By Mr. HART: Petition of the Jewish community of Jersey City, N. J., urging that the United States shall use its good offices and take appropriate measures to the end that the doors of Palestine shall be opened for free entry of Jews in the country, and that there shall be free opportunity for colonization, so that the Jewish people may ultimately reconstitute Palestine as a free and democratic Jewish commonwealth; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

6211. By Mr. LAMBERTSON: Petition of J. E. Ramey, president, and 70 other members of the Townsend Club of Leavenworth, Kans., urging a hearing on the Townsend plan bill, H. R. 1649, with the least practical delay; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

6212. By Mr. WELCH: Resolution, No. 4307, of the Board of Supervisors of San Francisco memorializing the Congress and respectfully urging that the Hayden Federal-aid highways bill, after amendment to include a provision permitting acquisition of rights-of-way with moneys appropriated pursuant to such bill, be enacted into law and that in the event, for some reason, it is found impossible to comply with the foregoing request, this board of supervisors does respectfully urge immediate enactment of the Robinson Federal-aid highways bill; to the Committee on Roads.

6213. Also, resolution, No. 4308, of the Board of Supervisors of San Francisco, approving House bill 735 and respectfully memorializing the Finance Committee of the United States Senate urging the bill referred to be immediately reported out with a favorable recommendation; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

6214. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the National Education Association of the United States, Washington, D. C., requesting that insofar as Federal income tax is not applied to the annuities of employees retired under the Railroad Retirement Act, old-age benefits paid under the Social Security Act, and benefits paid under the International Typographical Union, the same reasoning should provide similar exemptions for the pensions and annuities paid by public retirement systems to retired local and State employees; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

6215. Also, petition of the board of education, office of the principal, of the city of New York and the teachers of public school No. 17, Manhattan, petitioning the Congress of the United States to pass legislation granting income-tax exemptions on pensions or retirement annuities and further that Congress consider such tax exemption as a social legislation benefit; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

SENATE

TUESDAY, NOVEMBER 28, 1944

(Legislative day of Tuesday, November 21, 1944)

The Senate met in executive session at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

Rev. Howard Stone Anderson, D. D., pastor, First Congregational Church, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

O Thou who art high and mighty and yet "closer to us than breathing and nearer than hands or feet," who art the maker of heaven and earth, the ruler of the destinies of all nations, before whose face the generations rise and pass and fall away, and yet who art so intimately concerned with us that Jesus taught we should think of Thee as our Heavenly Father, we pause at the beginning of another session to acknowledge our dependence upon Thee and to ask Thy guidance for our lives and decisions.

We pray for those whom time has lifted into positions of authority, responsibility, and leadership. Give us all a quality of teachableness and humility which will enable us to think Thy thoughts after Thee and, at last, to accomplish Thy purposes. Strengthen the men and women in the armed forces for the hard tasks which are theirs to do, and grant that as we perform the unpleasant necessities of warfare we may do it without degrading ourselves with hate. Bring peace and strength to the wounded and comfort and consolation to those souls and homes to which death has come. Be with the prisoners—those in concentration camps and those who witness for conscience's sake.

As we enter the advent season and look on toward that star of hope which is mankind's promise of peace, grant that we may do so in the spirit of the Prince of Peace, even Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. HILL, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Monday, November 27, 1944, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. McLeod, one of its clerks, announced that the House had passed without amendment the following bills of the Senate:

S. 1373. An act to authorize the Secretary of War to convey to the people of Puerto Rico for school purposes a certain building and lot known as the Mayaguez Barracks Military Reservation now under the jurisdiction of the War Department;

S. 1714. An act to reimburse certain Coast and Geodetic Survey and Marine Corps personnel for personal property lost or damaged as the result of a fire at the marine barracks, Quantico, Va., on December 16, 1943;

S. 1741. An act to provide for the reimbursement of certain Navy and civilian personnel for personal property lost as the result of a fire in hangar V–3 at the naval air station, Norfolk, Va., on November 12, 1942;

S. 1838. An act to provide for reimbursement of certain Navy personnel and former Navy personnel for personal property lost or damaged as the result of fires in quarters occupied by naval construction battalions;

S. 1839. An act to provide for reimbursement of certain Navy personnel for personal property lost or damaged as the result of a fire in quarters at naval advance base depot, Port Hueneme, Calif., on February 6, 1944;

S. 1840. An act to provide for reimbursement of certain Navy personnel and former Navy personnel for personal property lost or damaged as the result of a fire in the bachelor officers' quarters, naval operating base, Argentia, Newfoundland, on January 12, 1943;

S. 1841. An act to provide for the reimbursement of certain Navy personnel and former Navy personnel for personal property lost or damaged as the result of a fire which occurred on the naval station, Tutuila, American Samoa, on October 20, 1943;

S. 1842. An act to reimburse certain Marine Corps personnel for personal property lost or damaged as the result of a fire at the marine barracks, naval supply depot, Bayonne, N. J., on April 25, 1943;

S. 1881. An act to provide for reimbursement of certain Navy personnel and former Navy personnel for personal property lost or damaged as the result of fire at the naval advance base depot, Port Hueneme, Calif., on January 12, 1944; and

S. 1964. An act to reimburse certain aviation cadets and former aviation cadets for property lost or damaged as the result of a fire at Carroll College, Helena, Mont., on January 8, 1944.

The message also announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 1795) to amend that portion of the act approved June 30, 1906 (34 Stat. 697, 750), authorizing the settlement of accounts of deceased officers and enlisted men of the Army, with an amendment in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2097) for the relief of W. J. Cox.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to each of the following bills of the House:

H. R. 2576. An act to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to determine and render judgment for any losses suffered by Duffy Bros., Inc.; and

H. R. 3000. An act for the relief of Clara E. Clark.

The message further announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 330. An act to amend subsection 9 (a) of the act entitled "An act to prevent pernicious political activities," approved August 2, 1939, as amended;

H. R. 2832. An act to amend the Nationality Act of 1940 so as to permit naturalization proceedings to be had at places other than in the office of the clerk or in open court in the case of sick or physically disabled individuals;

H. R. 3709. An act for the relief of Harley E. Carter;

H. R. 4311. An act to authorize the appointment of two additional Assistant Secretaries of State;

H. R. 4968. An act to amend section 511 (c) of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, relative to deposit of vessel proceeds received from the United States in certain cases, and for other purposes;

H. R. 5331. An act to authorize the transfer of certain lands within the Colonial National Historical Park, Yorktown, Va., to the Secretary of the Navy;

H. R. 5408. An act to amend the Mustering-Out Payment Act of 1944, to provide a method for accomplishing certain mustering-out payments on behalf of mentally disabled veterans, and for other purposes;

H. R. 5493. An act to provide for the continuation on the active list of the Regular Army for the duration of any of the wars in which the United States is now engaged, and for 6 months thereafter, of any officer on the active list of the Regular Army who has served as Chief of Staff during the wars in which the United States is now engaged; and

H. R. 5494. An act to amend the act entitled "An act authorizing the President to appoint an Under Secretary of War during national emergencies, fixing the compensation of the Under Secretary of War, and authorizing the Secretary of War to prescribe duties," approved December 16, 1940.

PETITION

As in legislative session,

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a letter in the nature of a petition from Helen G. Gardner, of Los Angeles, Calif., praying for the enactment of the bill (S. 1882) to increase the compensation of employees in the Postal Service, which was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. HILL. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Green	Nye
Bankhead	Guffey	O'Mahoney
Bilbo	Gurney	Overton
Brooks	Hall	Radcliffe
Buck	Hatch	Reed
Burton	Hayden	Revercomb
Bushfield	Hill	Reynolds
Butler	Holman	Robertson
Byrd	Jenner	Russell
Capper	Johnson, Calif.	Shipstead
Caraway	Johnson, Colo.	Stewart
Clark, Mo.	La Follette	Tunnell
Connally	Langer	Vandenberg
Cordon	Lucas	Wallgren
Danaher	McClellan	Walsh, Mass.
Davis	McFarland	Walsh, N. J.
Downey	McKellar	Weeks
Ellender	Maloney	Wheeler
Ferguson	Maybank	Wherry
George	Mead	White
Gerry	Millikin	Wiley
Gillette	Murray	Willis

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] is absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senators from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN and Mr. SCRUGHAM] and the Senator from Utah [Mr. MURDOCK] are detained on official business for the Senate.

The Senator from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] are unavoidably detained.

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER] is absent attending the funeral of a friend.

The Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] is absent on important public business.

Mr. WHERRY. The following Senators are necessarily absent:

The Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MOORE], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. WILSON], and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY].

The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DANAHER] is absent on important public business.

The Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] is detained on official business.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Sixty-six Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

NOMINATION OF GUY MASON TO BE COMMISSIONER OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senate has convened in executive session following a recess. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Guy Mason to be Commissioner of the District of Columbia? Under the order of yesterday, the Senate will proceed to vote on the nomination at not later than 2 o'clock.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Mr. President, yesterday in executive session the reappointment of Guy Mason to be Commissioner of the District of Columbia was brought before the Senate for confirmation. I discussed briefly the reasons for my objection to the confirmation of the nomination of Commissioner Mason, but because there were so few Senators on the floor at the time I wish to repeat very briefly some of the things I mentioned yesterday.

I recall within the last few months that an American general when he landed his troops on one of the beachheads in Europe failed to take with him enough ammunition to protect the troops. That general was demoted and returned to this country where he is safely resting in peace, with no very large activities to occupy him. The head of a public institution who neglects his people, the people who are under his charge, should be treated in the same way, and I propose to show before I finish that Commissioner Mason is guilty of that kind of neglect, and does not merit the approval of the Members of the Senate.

In order to present this case to the Senate it is necessary for me to go back about 1 year. At that time a resolution was adopted by the Senate providing that an investigation be made of Gallinger Hospital in this city. Dr. E. A. Bocock was superintendent of the hospital. Dr. Cake was in charge of the tubercular ward. Dr. Gilbert was in charge of the psychopathic ward. Dr. Ruhland is the Health Officer of the District of Columbia. The Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], who was then chairman of the Committee on the District of Columbia, submitted a resolution, and when it was adopted, named a subcommittee composed of the Senator from Oregon [Mr. HOLMAN], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BUCK], and myself and directed us to make the investigation. The investigation was made upon charges signed by 150 patients in the tubercular ward at Gallinger Hospital.

The first move the subcommittee made was to visit the hospital. We found conditions there wholly unsatisfactory. We found in the tubercular ward a condition of filth and dirt that one would not expect to find in a modern hog house. We found conditions in the kitchen at Gallinger that were absolutely filthy. The floor was greasy and dirty. The work benches were covered with grease and cockroaches. The stoves on which the food for the patients of Gallinger Hospital was cooked were caked with black grease which had gathered through the months. We found kettles of food standing upon the stoves open to the flies, and there were myriads of them in that kitchen. There were driblets of spaghetti and other foods hanging over the edges of the kettles. It was something that nauseated the members of your committee when we examined it. No

excuse was made for it except that Dr. Bocock said at that time that the help was off that afternoon, and had not finished its work.

Mr. President, after that visit to the hospital the subcommittee decided that it was necessary to hold hearings upon this matter, and with the approval of the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN], hearings were started, and they continued for many days. We asked everyone in the city of Washington who had anything to say to come forward and talk to us. There were no restrictions and no restraints placed upon witnesses. We asked for their story; and a sordid, nauseating story it was, Mr. President, of savagery, cruelty, and barbarity toward patients on the part of attendants and orderlies in that hospital—a story of neglect, indifference, and callousness on the part of some of the medical attendants, in the tubercular ward in particular. I wish to point out very briefly a few of the instances so that the exact language of the story may be before the Senate.

In the first place, before we started the investigation the Comptroller General of the United States had made an investigation of the financial set-up, and of the way in which the business of that hospital was handled. A report had been submitted to the Commissioners of the District about the 15th of July, setting forth the irregularities found at that hospital; and there were many of them.

There was a great deal of petty thievery in the hospital. Attendants, helpers, and employees carried away large quantities of food. One employee carried away a whole set of hardware to outfit a motor launch on the river. Others carried away other things. Dr. Bocock was charged in that report with having supplied his own car with gasoline and oil from the hospital garage. He was also charged with furnishing his own kitchens, both at his home and on his farm in Virginia, with food from the hospital kitchen. Other employees were charged with similar offenses.

As I say, the report by the Comptroller General of the United States was turned over to the Commissioners in July 1943. Mr. Mason, one of the Commissioners, who has served since 1941, was a Commissioner at that time. He testified before our committee that the report was turned over by the Commissioners to the district attorney, but he said that he himself had not made any investigation. He said in substance that he had no intention of making an investigation of those charges until after our committee had finished its investigation.

Mr. President, Gallinger Hospital is one of the important institutions of the city of Washington. Hundreds of citizens of the District of Columbia take refuge there for treatment, help, and care by the officials and employees of the hospital. For the most part they are poor people. Sixty percent of them are colored and 40 percent white. Those poor people are entitled to humane treatment, decent food, and decent care while they are in that institution. They have a right to rely upon such care. They did not get it, and so far as I know they are not getting it now.

By agreement among the three Commissioners, Mr. Mason had exclusive and sole jurisdiction of Gallinger Hospital. He was responsible for that institution, and for what went on there, as was, also, Dr. Ruhland, as health officer of the District of Columbia. I maintain that the record which I hold in my hand shows that Mr. Mason absolutely failed in performing his official duty, and that is why I oppose confirmation of his nomination.

I wish to invite the attention of the Senate to a few things which were disclosed in the hearing in the testimony of the witnesses themselves, but first of all I wish to read to the Senate from the report of your committee which was submitted in due time to the full committee. I read from page 7 of the report:

> We recommend the immediate removal of Commissioner Guy Mason, because of his complete failure to perform the duties of his job in supervising Gallinger Municipal Hospital.
>
> We recommend the removal of Dr. George C. Ruhland, because of his failure as health officer of this district to know and prevent a continuance of the conditions described in this report as existing at Gallinger Municipal Hospital.
>
> We recommend the removal of Supt. Dr. Edgar A. Bocock. This investigation has convinced your committee that he is unsuited to the job of superintending an institution as large and varied as Gallinger Municipal Hospital.
>
> We recommend the removal of Dr. Joseph L. Gilbert, because he has not displayed an attitude of sympathetic understanding for the patients coming within his jurisdiction and seems to your committee temperamentally unfitted for the position he now holds.
>
> We recommend the dismissal of Dr. Charles P. Cake, in charge of the tubercular ward, because he has permitted an atmosphere of callousness, indifference, and neglect of patients to pervade that ward.

Mr. President, I wish to take up briefly the tubercular ward. Approximately 200 patients, residents of this city, are confined in that ward. Your committee found the quality and quantity of food supplied those patients to be insufficient, and below the proper standards. We found cockroaches and ants cooked in the food. We found dirty bathrooms and corridors. We found in that ward windows which apparently had not been washed for a year or more. The bath tubs were black and grimy. Some of the witnesses said that all the patients had to drink out of one cup, a porcelain cup which was broken and cracked; and yet, mind you, Mr. President, those were tubercular patients, suffering from a most communicable disease. But the citizens of this city were subjected to that kind of treatment.

In the psychopathic ward attendants were brutal, cruel, indifferent, and callous to the welfare and health of the patients in that ward.

Mr. President, the recommendations of the subcommittee should be carried out to the last letter. Every one of the five men I have named should be dismissed from his position. To repeat, that is why I oppose the confirmation of the nomination of Commissioner Mason.

I wish to read a few brief extracts from the testimony of some of the witnesses in this case. Let me say for the information of the Senate that Dr. Bocock and Dr. Cake resigned very shortly after the investigation. We still have on our hands Dr. Gilbert, Dr. Ruhland, the health officer, and Commissioner Mason.

Mr. L. C. Moss, an elderly man, who had been a citizen of Washington for 7 years, testified that he became a patient at Gallinger in April 1942, and was there for 1 week. He had had a minor operation. He arrived at the hospital about 3 or 4 o'clock in the afternoon. He took off his clothes and got into bed under direction. He stated:

> I asked for a pillow and they refused to give me one. There was no pajamas and no nightgowns. About 10 or 11 o'clock I began to feel things, itch, biting, so I scratched them and in about an hour I knew there was something wrong, and I called a nurse in and she looked on my neck and there were welts on my body as big as my fingernail, and I said, "This room has bedbugs or lice in it, or something, and I can't sleep; I can't stay in here." She went out and brought me back four tablets and told me to take them and I said, "What are they for?" She said, "To make you go to sleep." I said, "No, I ain't going to take them and be et up." And she said, "Very well," and she went out and so I got up in about an hour and wrapped a sheet around me and went out in the hall and sat down in the hall. I saw the things that were biting me. I raked them off my hand. They were lice.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BUSHFIELD. I yield.

Mr. BUCK. Let me inquire of the Senator whether the person whose testimony the Senator has been quoting is an employee of that public building.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. He is not an employee of that building, but is an employee of another public building near there.

Mr. BUCK. Is he a Government employee?

Mr. BUSHFIELD. He is, and has been a Government employee for 7 years.

Mr. President, I now wish to quote from the testimony of the witness Harry Lym Paris:

> I was on Work Projects Administration rolls in 1932 and 1933 and assigned to work at Gallinger Hospital in the laboratory of Dr. Harrison Loffler. I was then transferred to the pharmacy under Dr. Charles West. I remained there until 1939. I gave Dr. West $50 on the promise that he would get me a job with the hospital. Dr. West asked for more money and I paid him $25 more on the promise to get me a job of $1,260 a year.
>
> During my work in the drug room I was instructed to take various packages and deposit in Dr. West's private automobile. These packages contained drugs and medicines of various kinds. I was also requested by Dr. West to take gallon bottles of chocolate sirup from the drug room and place them in his private car. Other employees during my time did likewise for West's car.
>
> Under similar instructions from West I have taken alcohol from the drug room and placed it in the radiator of private individuals' automobiles—Pike, Smothers, West, Roane, Bocock, Files, and Kuhn. Doctors' prescriptions prescribing whisky for patients

were often filled by mixtures of rye extract, alcohol, and distilled water. This mixture only contained 1 pint of whisky to 7 pints of other liquids.

The inference is, Mr. President, that the whisky in those bottles was taken out by someone employed at Gallinger Hospital, and the poor patients who received prescriptions for whisky were fed this mixture of alcohol and water.

One witness testified that it was useless to complain about property being stolen from Gallinger Hospital because no one was ever prosecuted there.

Eliza Smith testified:

I worked at Gallinger Hospital between 1930 and 1940. Part of my work was taking care of Dr. Bocock's private car. I washed it every Wednesday and waxed it about once a month. About two times each month while I was washing Dr. Bocock's car, an employee, a white man, brought a container of motor oil and put it in the engine of Dr. Bocock's car.

David Gorman, who was an orderly at that hospital, testified as follows:

I have been employed as an orderly in Gallinger Hospital since July 1940. I have seen food taken from the kitchen by kitchen employees. This consisted of dressed chickens, sides of bacon, and hams. Some of the food was taken home by the employees, and some sold.

There is stated in this record a long list, Mr. President, of petty thievery similar to what I have recited. It is only because I feel sure that many Members of the Senate have not read this record that I take the time of the Senate to refer to it again.

I wish to call attention to the testimony of Bertha M. Morton, another witness before the committee. She said that on July 26, 1943, she entered her son William H. Morton, in Gallinger Hospital as a patient for observation. She saw him first thereafter on the evening of the 28th. He was clothed in old, ragged clothes and had the appearance of being completely crushed with despair. I read from her testimony:

He told me he had had no drinking water for some time as the ice had given out. I went for a drink for him and found an old-fashioned ice cooler in which the ice was dropped into the water, and it had a spigot. On top of the cooler was a porcelain cup, completely rusty inside.

I complained about the drinking cups and wrote a letter to Dr. Gilbert. The following Sunday I found 2 cups instead of 1. There were about 30 patients at that time. I tried to talk to Dr. Gilbert and had to talk with him as he walked down the hall. He would not stop.

I appealed to Dr. Pirioutti to have my son removed to St. Elizabeths. The doctor said nothing could be done about it, that Dr. Gilbert was in charge and what he said went. Dr. Pirioutti told me that my son was in bad condition when he was entered. This is not true. They placed him in a highly disturbed ward and he was there for a month in an environment which was highly detrimental to his nerves. He lost 13 pounds in weight during that month.

One of the inmates tried to strangle my son.

The patients in the tubercular ward saw all the dead people hauled by their windows. The attendants speak of the dead people as "stiffs" in front of the patients. On the same floor are the sick, crying babies.

The wife of a retired scientist in the District of Columbia characterized Dr. Gilbert as being rough and harsh. I read from her testimony:

The attendants in the psychopathic ward are a very inferior group, noisy, low in intelligence and unskilled. A physician told me that patients from the psychopathic ward of Gallinger arrived at St. Elizabeths in such a state of exhaustion that sometimes a week passed before the patient was in a condition to respond to any treatment.

When I took my husband to Gallinger, the interviewing nurse asked my husband to sit by her desk so that she could ask him some questions. I was horrified at two of the questions and I noticed the crushing effect they had on my husband. The questions were: Have you ever tried to kill yourself? Have you ever tried to kill anyone else?

I asked to be conducted through the ward after my husband was taken to his room. I was refused admission until the following Sunday, and then for only 15 minutes.

When I told Dr. Silverman I would like to give him my husband's case history, he walked away without speaking, and the nurse told me that the doctor had no time for case histories and for consultation, and continued with her own work.

When I said I thought it was terrible to expect a patient's relatives to be satisfied to leave him in a place where information as to surroundings and treatment was refused, the nurse nonchalantly said, "Oh, they just give them a bath and put them to bed."

I called at 7 in the evening to ask about my husband's condition. I was told he was all right and not to worry. The next day I found that at that time he was strapped to the bed. The next morning I called at 9:45 and was told my husband was critically ill. I asked Dr. Ruhland to permit me to transfer my husband away from there. Dr. Gilbert told me it was unwise for me to move my husband, and I, therefore, acceded to his advice. He told me I could see my husband at brief periods. I asked him to get two more nurses immediately for whom I would pay.

After consultation with our own doctor I decided to take my husband away from Gallinger. Upon arrival at the hospital about 2 in the afternoon I was aghast at the change in my husband's appearance since I left him the preceding day. His lips were so parched that the outer layer of skin had separated. I called for some water. My husband drank two cups without stopping. His arms were chained to the sides of the bed. His ankles were bound together with a sheet, and the spread on the bed was tied down tightly on all four corners. An attendant told me my husband had been so chained and tied since the preceding afternoon. When I succeeded in getting an attendant to unchain my husband's arm and untie a sheet, I found a soiled piece of gauze under one of the arm bands, which I was told by an attendant had been placed there the preceding day. My husband's arms and ankles were rubbed raw, and three blisters had burst. The same attendant told me that my husband had yelled a lot during the night. I asked for oil to rub on my husband's arms and ankles, but I did not get it.

Dr. Ella Oppenheimer testified before the committee, and also submitted a report to Dr. Ruhland as follows:

The conditions in the new-born nursery are unfit and overcrowded. Diarrhea has developed in well babies in this nursery. On the fourth and fifth floors, cribs are too closely crowded together. There was a shortage of diapers and they have to use bags or anything available for diapers. At that time a Work Projects Administration worker or a student nurse did breast work on the fifth floor mothers.

An open mesh package of clean diapers was on the premature nursery floor.

The maternity floors are badly crowded. The labor floor is overcrowded. Two beds in one labor room. This does not provide adequate facilities for delivery of clean cases.

Dr. Daniel Secklinger, assistant health officer, notified Dr. Bocock in a written memorandum that unsanitary conditions existed in the diet kitchen of the TB building.

I have before me the testimony of a soldier, Sergeant Kane. He introduced a letter which he had just received from a young lady who was a patient at Gallinger. In the letter she said:

I just finished eating dinner. I am sitting up in a chair right now. I have a new doctor looking after my side and he doesn't hurt me. Friday I was still asleep in the morning, when the head nurse came in and started fussing at me because all that was in the paper and asked why I didn't tell her instead of you. There was a roach on my breakfast tray this morning. I couldn't eat any dinner Friday. Then the nurse, the one that was on when you were here, came in and bawled me out and made me lose my supper. Every night since, when she comes in, she yells at me—I wish I had a father It takes a night nurse a half an hour to come when I call her. She just won't come.

The witness, George W. Buchanan, testified as follows:

Because I broke the rules out at Gallinger I was made to stay in lukewarm running water in a tub with no attendant for 4 hours. While thus confined, I had to use the toilet. The attendant ordered me to let my bowels move in the tub. I disobeyed and went to the toilet. I was seized by attendants with a sheet wrapped around my neck and under my arms and tied to the head of the tub. My left wrist was tied with a sheet which was run under the tub and tied to the right wrist, and both ankles were tied so that my body was above and did not rest on the hammock of the tub. I finally managed to wiggle my right wrist from these bands and an orderly came in cursing me and said, "This time I will tie you so you won't get out." They retied me and my calls finally brought Dr. Silverman, who ordered me untied, but not released from punishment. My wrists and ankles were tied so tightly that my arms and legs became swollen and began bleeding. The orderly paid no attention to my calls for help.

A sheet was thrown over the top of the tub to cover me up. The sheet finally soaked up the water and went into the drain plugging it. The water was over my mouth and was overflowing the tub onto the floor. Dr. Silverman ordered me untied.

Dr. Gilbert put some antiseptic on my infected wrists and ankles. I was then taken, naked, to a solitary room without clothing, blanket, or anything. It was so cold in there that I had to hop around and pat my body all night. No one answered my call to close the window or give me any covering. In the morning the orderly who released me told me if I reported that he left the window open at night I would get the same tie-up and solitary that I had had the day before.

Mr. President, Mr. R. A. Seelig, who was private secretary to our honored companion and colleague, the former Senator Bone, came before the committee and testified that he visited the hospital. He found the food to be insufficient in amount, poor in quality, and unfit for consumption by tubercular patients. He stated that he found conditions in the hospital very depressing,

with every condition working against the care of patients. He further stated that the food was so poor that patients lost weight unless they obtained food from the outside. No effort was made to feed patients who were too weak to feed themselves. He also said that some patients died from starvation as much as from tuberculosis.

This is the testimony of a woman patient at Gallinger Hospital:

My face was not washed twice while I was there, and then it was dried on the pillow case. My hair was not combed. It reminded me of a concentration camp of war prisoners.

Frank Rolston was one of the witnesses before the committee. He had a nervous break-down in May 1940 and was admitted to the Gallinger Hospital. He was strapped to his bed, both feet and hands. A sheet twisted into a rope was put across his chest under his arms and tied to the head of the bed. Two attendants, named Scott and Kohler, during the time this witness was tied, used his stomach as a punching bag. This happened several times. On another occasion Scott pushed his thumbs into the witness' eyes until he became unconscious.

The witness was sent to St. Elizabeths 10 days later. He was black and blue all over, with two black eyes. He was released from St. Elizabeths in August and has never been ill since.

Mr. Jones and Mr. Williams submitted a statement in writing concerning the truck used at Gallinger. They stated:

The same truck used at Gallinger to haul dead bodies from the different wards is used to haul food to the tubercular building. The same truck is also used to haul cooked food around the grounds to the different wards. Also the same truck is used to haul butchered hogs.

In connection with those hogs, Mr. President, allow me to remind the Senate that the testimony developed the startling fact that Gallinger Hospital raised hogs and fed them garbage from the various wards of the hospital, including garbage from the tubercular ward. The hogs were fed in a little hog house not far from the hospital. The garbage was all hauled to the hog house. The testimony of investigators for the food department of the District showed that the door of the house was left open, and millions of flies had gathered around the garbage, which had been scattered over the ground at Gallinger. The hogs were butchered and in turn fed to the hospital patients.

A registered nurse testified that the hospital was filthy and sordid at that time. She reported it to the hospital supervisor and was answered as follows:

These conditions have always existed at Gallinger and probably always will. These things have been reported. There was nothing done about it.

She testified further:

I worked in municipal tubercular institutions from New York to California and I was appalled at conditions at Gallinger. The food served was cold and unseasoned. Most of it went back into the garbage.

Rats and large flying roaches were numerous. One night I counted six large rats jump out of one basket. Nurses often heard a patient scream in the night and found one of the flying roaches had landed on him.

Neither orderlies nor nurses were instructed in the sanitary and safe disposal procedure of blood from lung hemorrhages.

I complained of the uncovered sputum boxes. Nothing was done about them, although many flies were in the ward all summer.

Orderlies were insulting to nurses. I asked one nurse why she didn't report to Dr. Bocock an insulting orderly, colored. She replied, "The nurses have stopped reporting. The reports usually end up in the nurses being in the wrong."

Edith B. Good, another woman who went to the hospital, stated:

I went over to Gallinger the other evening to donate blood. I noticed the sloppiness of the room and the attendants. The bed I was told to lie on was used by the three people ahead of me. The linen was filthy. I have never seen a dirtier pillow slip. The attendants went from person to person without washing hands between operations. A friend of mine had a similar experience at Gallinger several months ago.

Mr. G. V. C. Houghland was one of the witnesses. He submitted his statement in writing, in which he said:

I was a former patient at Gallinger, suffering from a nervous break-down. Bad conditions there impressed me as being everything to make a patient bad instead of better. Meals unplanned; nurses and doctors uninterested in the patients; no medical care was given me while I was there; we were thrown together with colored patients in the same ward. I was refudsed a release until I employed a lawyer to force my release.

Dr. Ruhland, the health officer of the District of Columbia, when he was on the stand, testified in part as follows:

Senator BUSHFIELD. Do you mean to say you have been feeding the garbage from the tubercular ward to the hogs that you fed back to the patients out there?

Dr. RUHLAND. That has been the practice out there, we found.

Senator BUSHFIELD. Well, "we found." You are the health officer of this District; it is kind of up to you to know about that.

Dr. RUHLAND. Undoubtedly we are trying to inform ourselves as completely as we can on the various things, but there are a good many problems outside of that institution.

Indicating complete indifference, complete callousness on the part of the health officer of this District to the hundreds of poor people of the city of Washington who are patients at Gallinger Hospital.

Richard J. Carroll and Glenn B. Smitley, food inspectors of the District, submitted a report to Dr. Bocock, the head of the institution, in which they said:

Supply department: Weevils in Indian corn, rats also, as well as in rolled oats, pea beans, and rice. Some bags were broken open by rats.

Toilets: Toilets across from the main kitchen are inadequate and filthy. Floors, walls, ceiling, and commodes dirty. Only two commodes in each toilet. These toilets are used by the laundry help, kitchen help, orderlies, and public drivers.

Garbage conditions: Doors in garbage shed were open at time of inspection. Garbage cans uncovered, some leaking, stagnant water around, cornhusks on the ground. Numerous green flies around the garbage.

Main kitchen and special diet kitchen: Roaches on shelves, cabinets, meat block, and in cracks between equipment and walls. Roaches in closet in dishwashing room. Weevils in pinto beans in storeroom. Cooking equipment was clean but inadequate.

Nurses cafeteria: Roaches in pantry, on steam table, and racks in back of counter.

Tuberculosis Building: Roaches in diet kitchen between walls and equipment. Walls dirty. Stairway halls in the building are damp and the paint chipped.

Isolation ward: Walls and ceiling dirty in diet kitchen.

Diet kitchen: Utensils are hand washed and put through machine. The utensils are set on trays on tray conveyor. No sterilizer.

Margaret A. Golden was one of the witnesses in this case. She testified in writing that her mother, age 75 years, was taken to Gallinger on June 30, 1943, and an examination revealed the fact that she had tuberculosis, and she was transferred to that ward. She complained bitterly of the bad food and the unhealthy and sordid conditions there and implored "me to bring her home." She was nervous and upset and finally her condition developed into hysteria but was diagnosed as insanity, so they removed her to the psychopathic ward. The manner of her removal was brutal—her body showed bruises from the handling she received. This woman was 75 years of age, and weighs less than a 100 pounds, and could not have, under any conditions, become violent or dangerous. She spent 5 days in the psychopathic ward, which Miss Golden describes as a filthy place swarming with flies, in a bed at the end of the ward surrounded by beds with soiled mattresses. Miss Golden continues:

It is my fondest hope that the investigation will result in an early and complete change for the betterment of that institution.

James John O'Brien was a disabled war veteran. Here is what he says:

On September 29 I was strapped to the bed by a brutal nigger and choked unmercifully by him. Dr. Gilbert paid no attention to my protests.

I shall not take the time of the Senate to continue reading further from the testimony, but there are cases of women patients, disrobed, stripped naked, placed in solitary rooms without furniture, without toilet or bathroom equipment of any kind, and kept there for hours on end. This is in the face of the fact that Dr. Gilbert, the head of that department, testified on the stand that such methods did not constitute the accustomed and acknowledged treatment in the hospitals of the country over.

Mr. President, should the people of the city of Washington be subjected to these horrible and uncalled for conditions in Gallinger Hospital? The point I am trying to make is that Mr. Mason, Commissioner of this District, with sole jurisdiction over that hospital for a period of 2 years at that time testified that he went there occasionally to see the hospital. My guess is that Mr. Mason was never in the hospital except when he went to see Dr. Bocock or some other

department head. He could not have gone there, Mr. President, without knowing the filthy, unhealthy, unsanitary conditions that prevailed throughout the hospital. I say that that hospital and Mr. Mason's neglect of it, he having sole jurisdiction of it, constitute a disgrace not only to him but to the people of Washington and to the Congress.

Mr. President, the committee called Mr. Mason as a witness. We asked him to testify. He refused to testify. He defied the committee and said he wanted his answer to appear in that way. He said he had not been to the hospital for a month although these complaints were flying thick and fast when I returned to Washington in September 1943. I say, Mr. President and Senators, that Guy Mason, by his callous neglect, and by his unaccountability, has proved himself to be an unfit person to serve as Commissioner of this District. If no one else has a word to say about it, I want to say that the people of this city do not deserve the kind of treatment which has been accorded them at Gallinger Hospital, no matter how poor they may be. Guy Mason should be dismissed, Dr. Ruhland should be dismissed, and Dr. Gilbert should be dismissed.

I hope the Members of the Senate will decline to confirm this nomination. I feel sure in my own mind that if the President, who makes these appointments, had had the time in his busy life to read the record in this case he would not have reappointed Guy Mason to this position, because the President does not approve the sort of thing the testimony shows has been going on at Gallinger Hospital.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I would not venture to take the time of the Senate upon the pending matter if it were not for the fact that I happen to be chairman of the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations which deals with the appropriations for the District of Columbia.

Let me say, first of all, that I think the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BUCK], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. HOLMAN] and the senior Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN] have done most excellent work in the investigation which the subcommittee carried on into the affairs at Gallinger Hospital. I think the work of that committee has resulted in so arousing sentiment not only in the District of Columbia, but in the Congress, that we shall very soon have a correction of the deplorable conditions which have existed in the Gallinger Hospital by the authorization of a new hospital. The District needs a new hospital.

Mr. President, there can be no doubt that the Gallinger Hospital has been neglected and that the conditions in that hospital are altogether unworthy of the capital of a great nation; but it would be a mistake to assume that the responsibility for these conditions lies upon the shoulders of Commissioner Guy Mason. The responsibility lies upon the Congress, and as a member of the Committee on Appropriations I have no hesitation in saying so, because for a period of 5 years during which I have served upon the District of Columbia Appropriations Subcommittee I have seen the recommendations of the District Commissioners, including Commissioner Mason, for the improvement of Gallinger Hospital, persistently and consistently rejected by the Congress.

Not only is that a fact, Mr. President, but even after the recent investigation, which made it quite clear that there should be an additional staff at Gallinger Hospital, and that there should be an improvement in the directing facilities of the hospital, the Senate Committee on Appropriations recommended an appropriation increasing the salary of the head of that institution; it was recommended by the District Commissioners and it was recommended by the Health Department; but, unfortunately, although the Senate committee agreed to the increase in salary which I proposed as chairman of the subcommittee, it was impossible finally to secure it.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MCCLELLAN in the chair). Does the Senator from Wyoming yield to the Senator from North Carolina?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. BAILEY. I am proceeding on the assumption that there was no answer to the accusation that Mr. Mason refused to appear before a committee of the Senate and testify. That was alleged by the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I shall speak of that. I was not a member of that committee.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wyoming yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. I know the distinguished Senator from Wyoming is aware of it, but I wish to call the attention of the Senate to the fact that the appropriations made for Gallinger Hospital during the years 1936 to 1944, inclusive, were almost to the dollar exactly what the Bureau of the Budget recommended.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, there is a difference between what the Bureau of the Budget recommends and what the Commissioners request. Many times in the past the Bureau of the Budget, like the Congress, has rejected the requests of the Commissioners. I have here a table showing the Commissioners' requests for Gallinger Hospital, the number of employees requested, and the congressional allowance in each case. Beginning in 1939 the Commissioners requested an appropriation of $210,260 for Gallinger Hospital, with an authorization to employ 74 new employees. The congressional appropriation allowed only $14,600, and an increase of only 7 employees.

In 1940 the Commissioners requested $445,200, and 196 new employees. Congress granted an appropriation of $89,380 and additional employees numbering 92.

In 1941 the Commissioners' request was for $429,260, and for 141 new employees. Congress allowed $88,180 and 67 new employees.

In 1942 the request was for $90,600, with 49 new employees. Congress allowed only $59,900 and 33 new employees.

In 1943 the request was for $186,597, with 28 new employees. Congress allowed only $131,420 and 15 new employees.

In 1944 the request was for $62,280 and nine new employees. What was granted was $45,000 with two new employees.

The total for 6 years of the Commissioners' requests was $1,424,757. The total congressional allowance was $428,560. Again I say the requests of the Commissioners and Budget estimates must not be confused.

So I say, Mr. President, Congress cannot avoid its share of the responsibility for the conditions which have existed in the Gallinger Hospital.

I am glad the investigation took place. I think it will result in very much better conditions, and I know from my own personal association with Commissioner Mason, who has appeared on innumerable occasions before the Subcommittee on Appropriations of which I am chairman, that he has been very much aware of the conditions at Gallinger Hospital, and that he wanted to correct them.

I suspect that the incident in the committee when Commissioner Mason declined to answer certain questions was merely one of those developments of which we have all been witnesses at one time or another, when tempers rise a little in the heat of an investigation or examination; but I am satisfied that there never was any intent or purpose upon the part of Commissioner Mason to decline to work with the Senate or with any committee of the Senate. As a matter of fact, I am advised that later he made an apology for his statements before the committee.

The facts as I see them are that Commissioner Mason has been a most excellent and industrious Commissioner. He has given his time without stint to the position he occupies. He is a man who is known to a great many Members of the Senate, and known only as possessing the very best character and reputation.

Mr. President, I have before me a letter which I received from Mr. David Babp, secretary of the Federation of Citizens' Associations of the District of Columbia. He says:

> By direction of the Federation of Citizens' Associations of the District of Columbia, I am transmitting herewith a copy of a report relating to the Gallinger Hospital situation, which was adopted by the federation at its recent meeting, for your information and consideration.

Then there appears this report, which I shall not read, but which I ask to have made a part of the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FEDERATION OF CITIZENS' ASSOCIATIONS
OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA,
Washington, D. C., November 6, 1943.

SUBJECT: GALLINGER HOSPITAL—REPORT OF PUBLIC HEALTH COMMITTEE, FEDERATION OF CITIZENS' ASSOCIATIONS

Recently a United States Senate committee investigated this institution and brought in

a critical report. Some of their findings were justifiable, but there is much to be said in commendation of Gallinger Hospital. In this report your committee shall state conditions at that institution based on personal observation and, with some of us, with knowledge of many years.

Let us look at the history of this municipal project: About 70 years ago it was started in a wooden building to house the poor and sick of our residents and sojourners. From time to time new buildings were constructed, long after the need developed. There were not enough appropriations for maintenance or construction of new buildings. Today Gallinger Hospital has a daily average of over 1,000 patients.

The buildings and facilities are inadequate for the patient population. The particular needs are a larger kitchen, a larger laundry, and a psychopathic ward. The present kitchen was constructed in 1929 for accommodation of 300 patients. Now there is need for three times that number. Stoves, refrigerators, and storage space for food are inadequate. They prepare 4,500 meals daily, using 24 Ford trucks three times a day to deliver the food to different buildings. The menu is well balanced and tastily served. Special diets are supervised by a competent dietitian. The meal carts are nickel-plated and closed securely so as not to be contaminated when carried to the patients; also, soiled dishes are thus returned to the kitchen. The laundry is small and lacking in equipment. A new and larger building is needed at once. Even with this handicap, soiled linen is thoroughly laundered and returned to the hospital in a sanitary condition. The laundry is operated 24 hours a day to meet the increased demand for that service. The present psychopathic ward is inadequate, and additional facilities should be provided for caring for mental cases.

Last week the management started moving T. B. cases into the new T. B. annex. Those who are well enough are moved to Glenn Dale Sanatorium. This report deals principally with the need of more buildings, equipment, and personnel for Gallinger Hospital.

A word as to the management would not be amiss. No one could manage so large an institution without some criticism. The records speak for themselves. They admit 50 patients a day. Besides, many patients are treated daily in the clinics. The death rate is lower than in all other municipal hospitals except the Massachusetts General in Boston. Eleven percent of all births in the District of Columbia are at Gallinger Hospital, with a record of 2,240 births and only 2 maternity deaths in 1942.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Gallinger Hospital today needs more appropriations to keep in step with the growing population of Washington, D. C., indigent sick. The immediate need is for a building to house a larger kitchen; one for a larger laundry, and a new building for the psychopathic ward. It is requested that funds be allocated from the Lanham Act and that priorities be granted for the installation of the materials needed.

2. The appointment of two assistant superintendents—one in charge of personnel, one as general manager of the buildings, preferably an engineer. Also, more adequate compensation for all employees.

3. The appointment of a visiting staff composed of three members to be named by the District of Columbia Commissioners. This staff to be composed of a physician, businessman, and a member of a welfare organization—to be volunteers and not in the employ of the District of Columbia or Federal Governments. They are to visit Gallinger Hospital at least once a month and make a report to the District of Columbia Commissioners.

In closing, would report that the medical staff is composed of teachers of medicine representing Georgetown and George Washington Medical Schools who are rendering efficient health education. No better medical service could be rendered, in view of limited facilities, no matter what fee was paid. All this is done in spite of lack of buildings and facilities. We emphatically recommend that the old original wooden buildings that are now being evacuated by the T. B. cases be razed before some excuse is given to have them occupied again.

Your public health committee met in special session November 4, 1943, and is submitting this report with the following:

Resolved, That copies of this report be sent to the Appropriations Committee of the United States Senate and House of Representatives, and the Commissioners, the health officer, and the Medical Society of the District of Columbia.

Respectfully submitted.

Charles B. Campbell, M. D., chairman; Mrs. Mary C. Nold, secretary; William A. Duvall; C. C. Clem; Dr. Lymond F. Kebler; Emil E. Chapman; Joseph H. Deckman; Dr. O. G. Hall; Dr. Vincent B. Norelli; Fred S. Walker, supervisor.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, in summary, the report reviews the conditions which exist and the conditions which have existed in the Gallinger Hospital. It recognizes the value of the report which was made by the special committee, and finds that some at least of the conclusions of the report are altogether justified.

Mr. President, I have trespassed upon the time of the Senate merely because I felt that I owed it to the Senate to let it know that the Congress itself has not made the appropriations for the Gallinger Hospital which were requested by the Commissioners, and I feel that the situation which has existed at Gallinger should not be used as a reason for refusing to confirm Commissioner Mason, whose services in every other respect are beyond criticism.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there also be printed as part of my remarks the summary from which I have been reading.

There being no objection, the summary was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Gallinger appropriations

Year	Commissioner's request		Congressional allowance	
	Funds requested	Employees requested (new)	Funds received	Employees received
1939	$210,260	74	$14,600	7
1940	445,200	196	89,380	92
1941	429,260	141	88,180	67
1942	90,600	49	59,900	33
1943	186,597	28	131,420	15
1944	62,840	9	45,000	2
Total, 6 years	1,424,757	497	428,560	206

PROGRESS AT GALLINGER

1937: Transferred to Health Department.

1938: Crippled children's clinic service instituted. Five full-time chief resident physicians appointed.

1940: Two hundred and seventy-six new beds in the medical building, 226 in the TB building, 38 in the nurses' home.

1942: Cardiac unit opened. Maintained standards set by American College of Surgeons, including eye, ear, nose, and throat work. Hospital approved by American College of Surgeons and American Board of Orthopedics for training in 1-year course in orthopedic surgery.

1943: Again approved by American College of Surgeons. Thirty-eight new beds for nurses, 38 new beds for interns; new maternity ward, 126 beds for mothers, 143 for infants; first 50-bed rapid-treatment venereal-disease unit in the city opened.

Mr. BURTON obtained the floor.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. BURTON. I yield.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. President, as a member of the subcommittee which investigated the Gallinger Hospital, I wish to certify to the unbelievably bad conditions that prevailed there at the time we made the inspection. The one I feel to be chiefly responsible for those conditions has been removed. He was the superintendent. However, Commissioner Mason, who, I am told, was assigned by his colleagues to take charge of and be responsible for the hospital, must share in the responsibility for the conditions that prevailed there at the time the Senate committee inspected that public institution.

When we called upon Commissioner Mason to testify, he defied the committee and refused to answer any of our questions. He was asked why he declined to talk, and his answer I quote from the record:

Because I am not going to interfere with your investigation and come back and be charged with covering up stuff. I know what these investigations are. I have been around for 40 years.

Just what he meant by those remarks each Senator must infer individually. I think that he sadly neglected his duty as a Commissioner of the District. I support the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD] in the recommendation he has made that the nomination of Mr. Mason for another term be not confirmed.

Mr. HOLMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Ohio yield to me, or does the Senator prefer that I speak after he has spoken?

Mr. BURTON. No; I am very glad to yield to the Senator so he may speak now.

Mr. HOLMAN. Mr. President, I was chairman of the subcommittee which made the report which the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD] has so ably presented to the Senate, and which the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BUCK] has substantiated and approved. I verify and support with all the sincerity and vigor of which I am capable the presentation made to this body by the able Senator from South Dakota.

All the money in the world will not put the milk of human kindness and common decency and cleanliness into any human being if he does not naturally possess it. The responsibility for the deplorable administration prior to the investigation made by the subcommittee rests solely and fundamentally upon the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, who had assigned the particular

piece of administration in question to Commissioner Mason, and he had accepted it.

Mr. President, no person who has the love of his fellow man at heart could visit and view the heartless conditions, the filthy conditions, the even dishonest conditions which were maintained over a long period of time at Gallinger Hospital, without making a most vigorous attempt to correct them, not simply a perfunctory attempt by reading reports of subordinates or making a half-hearted plea before the Bureau of the Budget; and, mind you, this bad condition at this miserable hospital had its genesis in the executive branch of the Government.

Mr. President, it should not be the duty of a committee of the Senate to do the work for which the Commissioners of the District of Columbia are paid but which they do not perform. I am convinced that the Commissioners of the District consider, as possibly does the appointive power, the job of Commissioner of the District of Columbia to be merely that of a political sinecure and the reward for favorable publicity to the appointing power.

If the Senate confirms the appointment of Commissioner Guy Mason it places its stamp of approval, in my opinion, upon as bad a piece of administration as I have ever witnessed, and I have had years of experience in my own State in an executive capacity of administering penal and eleemosynary institutions. Such action by the Senate also, it seems to me, would place the stamp of disapproval on the findings of the subcommittee and the unanimous opinion of that committee.

Mr. President, there is a constant cry throughout the District of Columbia for a better form of government for the District.

> For forms of government let fools contest;
> Whate'er is best administer'd is best.

We can change the form of government, we can pass all the appropriation bills we want to, but so long as we have Guy Mason and individuals of his kind administering the affairs of this District Gallinger Hospital scandals will continue.

Coincident with the report of the Senate committee and its findings with respect to Gallinger Hospital—and I have no doubt other committees investigating other items of administration of the District of Columbia would find similar conditions existing—reforms have taken place, resignations took place, and today the conditions at Gallinger Hospital are improved over what they were when the committee made its findings and submitted its report. They would have been improved if the Commissioners of the District had been diligent in the performance of their duties and, if they had been intelligent and honest in the discharge of their duties, there would never have been any necessity for the committee to have been appointed or to have done its work.

I sustain, support, and verify the statements and recommendations of my two colleagues, the able Senator from South Dakota and the able Senator from Delaware.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, this is an extraordinary case, bringing into question the confirmation of the nomination for reappointment to the office of Commissioner of the District of Columbia of a man who has served for 3 years in that office, and we are asked to confirm him in the face of a condemnatory report unanimously rendered by a subcommittee of the Senate appointed to investigate the Gallinger Hospital, which hospital was primarily under his general jurisdiction as the Commissioner assigned to that particular work.

That report demonstrates that the nomination should not be confirmed. The case goes back to the appointment of the subcommittee by the then chairman of the Committee on the District of Columbia, the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], who asked the three Senators who have just spoken to the Senate to make an investigation. It seems to me that the Senate owes to the Senator from Nevada and to those three Senators an obligation to act upon their recommendations in the absence of controverting testimony of any kind. There has been no controverting testimony to offset this charge of extraordinary administrative neglect, which in any other city of this Nation would bring about a change of administration by election of the people. That cannot be done in this city because the people have no authority to vote on it. We are the only ones who can act. We can act by voting for confirmation or refusing confirmation of this appointive officer, who holds one of the three chief-executive positions in the District of Columbia.

In this instance the investigating committee is one of outstanding and extraordinary competence for this particular work. Any city in America would be glad to have the services of three such distinguished and experienced administrators in making such an investigation. The chairman of the subcommittee, the Senator from Oregon [Mr. HOLMAN], who has just spoken, before he came to the Senate served as a member, and chairman, of the Multnomah County, Oreg., Board of Commissioners, which has charge of similar or larger institutions in that State. Furthermore, for 8 years he was a member of the Oregon State Board of Control, consisting of the Governor, the secretary of state, and the State treasurer. This board had charge of the administration of all the State penal and eleemosynary institutions, with a population of more than 6,000 inmates. The Senator from Oregon, therefore, has had large experience of an administrative character in that field.

The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD], who addressed the Senate today, has served as Governor of South Dakota, and is well versed and experienced in administrative responsibility.

The Senator from Delaware [Mr. BUCK], who spoke to the Senate a moment ago, served two full terms, or 8 years, as the Governor of Delaware. He was the first Governor of Delaware to serve two full terms. He has had long executive experience.

Those three Senators were highly competent to determine how best to cure administrative neglect. They recommended changes in the administrative leadership of the hospital which have been made, and they also recommend that the nomination of this Commissioner be not confirmed, in the light of his administration and supervision.

Not only have those three distinguished investigators so recommended, which should be enough, I believe, for any city in America, or for anybody appointing them, to act upon; but the then chairman of the Committee on the District of Columbia, the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN] from the other side of the aisle, who appointed them and asked them to conduct this investigation for him, has taken the same position on this matter. He is not now present, but I quote from his statement made on the floor of the Senate on September 20, 1944, as follows:

> When the renomination of Commissioner Mason comes before the Senate I shall make it a point, if I am then a Member of this body, to be present, and to oppose with all my strength confirmation of the nomination of Mr. Mason. My reason for that attitude is Mr. Mason's conduct before the Committee on the District of Columbia when he practically scoffed at the idea of giving any statement, explanatory or otherwise, pertaining to a public institution over which he had control.

The Senator from Nevada has been delayed in returning to the Senate. I understand, however, that he has sent a message to the Senate indicating that he wishes to be recorded as against the confirmation of the nomination of Mr. Mason.

I speak, not as a member of the subcommittee, but as a member of the full Committee on the District of Columbia. I well remember when the report of the subcommittee came before the full committee. It was an extraordinary report, which set forth an example of administrative neglect which is outstanding, not only in the history of this city, but in the history of the Nation. At that time it was clear that the committee might have some influence upon the continuance in office of those immediately responsible in the hospital, and changes have been made there. It was also clear that neither the committee nor the Senate had any right to remove from office a Commissioner of the District of Columbia, even though he might be guilty of neglect in his supervision of welfare institutions. It was, however, pointed out in the discussions in the committee that in the event Mr. Mason were nominated for reappointment to that position for another 3 years, the committee owed a duty to the Senate to lay before the Senate its conclusions and recommendations.

For that reason I join in the recommendation of the subcommittee, and urge that the Senate not confirm this nomination. It is not a question of removal from office. It is a question of confirmation of an appointment to continue in office for a new term. If an election were being held for mayor of the city of Washington, this question would be typical of the questions which would come up for debate among the people of Washington. The people of Washington cannot vote on the question. We

have the responsibility of curing the results of administrative neglect. If we fail to recognize a report of this kind, we are failing in our duty under the Constitution to do our full duty to the District of Columbia. It seems to me that the Senate owes a duty to recognize this report of the subcommittee and of the chairman of the committee in this particular matter.

I wish to make two further points, one relating to appropriations. I appreciate the statements by the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], chairman of the subcommittee on appropriations dealing with the District of Columbia. I am also a member of that subcommittee. I find from the report that there is no justification for the condition at Gallinger Hospital based upon the appropriations which have been made, as contrasted with the recommendations of the Commissioners. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a table which appears at page 33 of the report of the subcommittee, and which sets forth the Budget estimates and appropriations for Gallinger Municipal Hospital.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Gallinger Municipal Hospital-Budget estimates and appropriations

Year	Superintendent of hospital	Board of Public Welfare or Health Officer	Commissioners	Bureau of the Budget	Approved by House of Representatives	Final appropriation act
1936	$1,588,642	$1,588,642	$655,020	$631,400	----------	$631,400
1937	844,580	849,580	705,850	679,230	----------	679,230
1938	946,180	880,370	739,450	746,660	----------	743,660
1939	953,920	953,020	825,540	833,380	----------	800,360
1940	1,245,560	1,245,560	918,180	899,340	$906,940	899,440
1941	1,310,700	1,310,700	1,006,960	996,740	981,600	1,003,440
1942	1,535,220	1,535,200	1,333,120	1,333,120	1,227,820	1,323,775
1943	1,445,882	1,445,082	1,378,045	1,378,045	1,377,327	[1] 1,381,547
1944	1,426,987	1,426,987	1,401,207	1,401,207	1,393,807	[2] 1,396,207

[1] A deficiency appropriation of $6,800 was made to meet increased cost of personal services in addition to this.
[2] Supplemental appropriation to be requested to meet overtime for current fiscal year.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, I wish to refer to these important figures. For the past 3 years, the 3 years during which Mr. Mason has served as a member of the Board of Commissioners, the Commissioners received, in appropriations under the final appropriation act, almost the same amount which they had requested.

Beginning with 1944, and using round figures, the Commissioners asked for $1,401,000. They received $1,396,000, or $5,000 less. In 1943 the Commissioners asked for $1,378,000. They received $1,381,000, or $3,000 more than they requested.

In 1942, the first of the 3 years of Mr. Mason's term, the Commissioners asked for $1,333,000. They received $1,323,000, or only $10,000 less.

Going back of that period, in 1941, they asked for $1,006,000. They received $1,003,000, or $3,000 less.

In 1940, they asked for $918,000. They received $899,000, or $19,000 less.

In 1939, they asked for $825,000. They received $800,000, or $25,000 less.

In 1938, they asked for $739,000. They received $743,000, or $4,000 more.

In 1937 they asked for $705,000. They received $679,000, or $26,000 less.

In 1936 they asked for $655,000. They received $631,000, or $24,000 less.

It seems to me that that record is sufficient to indicate that there is no justification for any statement by the Commissioner that the failure to provide adequate funds is due to acts of Congress rather than the recommendations of the Commissioners with respect to this hospital.

Senators have heard the report of the subcommittee indicating the conditions in that hospital, which is a poor people's hospital. It is the place in this community where people go when they cannot afford to pay hospital bills. Those people need defense from the Senate, and the only way to cure serious administrative neglect is to change the administrator. It cannot be done by legislation. It can be done by putting in a new administrator. I believe it is vital that the Senate have before it a statement of the material testimony of Mr. Mason before the subcommittee on this particular matter. I, therefore, take the time again to read to the Senate these statements, which are the ones upon which I believe the Senator from Nevada based his emphatic recommendation, as set forth in the statement from him which I have just read. This hearing was on September 30, 1943. The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD] asked Mr. Mason:

Did you make any attempt yourself to investigate the charges made by the Comptroller General?

Mr. MASON. I did not, and advised against our doing so until the district attorney had finished.

Senator BUSHFIELD. Well, the presence of dirt or filth in Gallinger would not necessarily come under the district attorney.

Mr. MASON. That was not a part of the Comptroller General's report.

Senator BUSHFIELD. I beg to differ with you, Mr. Mason; it is very definitely in there.

You have heard these various witnesses this week?

Mr. MASON. I have.

Senator BUSHFIELD. Testify about the dirt out there?

Mr. MASON. I have, and I have no comment to make until the hearing is over and until the district attorney has passed on it.

Senator BUSHFIELD. Then you decline to make any statement?

Mr. MASON. I decline to make any statement about it.

Senator BUSHFIELD (to the official reporter). You have that in the record, have you?

OFFICIAL REPORTER. Yes, Senator Bushfield.

Mr. MASON. Please do.

Senator BUSHFIELD. When did you go to Gallinger last?

Mr. MASON. Well, I think I went out with a newspaperman in August of this year.

Senator BUSHFIELD. That was the last time you have been there?

Mr. MASON. Yes, sir.

Senator BUSHFIELD. And you knew that there were charges being made by patients and by former patients and by some former employees as to the sanitary conditions out there; did you not?

Mr. MASON. I did not.

Senator BUSHFIELD. When did you first learn of it?

Mr. MASON. Newspaper accounts in September, after they had been submitted to Senator MCCARRAN.

Senator BUSHFIELD. But you have not been out there since you learned of it?

Mr. MASON. No, sir.

Senator BUSHFIELD. Why not?

Mr. MASON. Because we got the report in July from the Comptroller General's office, and the minute that Senator MCCARRAN got the report he determined on a public hearing, and we thought we would wait and let the hearing develop.

Senator BUSHFIELD. And now you decline——

Mr. MASON (interposing). And we are going to wait on that.

Senator BUSHFIELD. Do you want the people of this city to understand that is your attitude?

Mr. MASON. Definitely.

Senator BUSHFIELD. And that you decline to talk about it?

Mr. MASON. I definitely want that understanding about it.

Senator BUCK. You had the report how long?

Mr. MASON. Four days when it was transmitted to the district attorney.

Senator BUCK. And how long before Senator MCCARRAN got it?

Mr. MASON. Senator MCCARRAN got his report some time in September; I don't know when. We are waiting on the United States attorney now for his report.

I may interject that means from July to September.

I continue to read from the hearings:

Senator BUSHFIELD. Well, he does not have anything to do with the cleanliness out there; does he?

Mr. MASON. He has nothing to do with it except what is in his report. We did not get the report on the cleanliness until it appeared in the newspapers. That was our first intimation after it had been submitted to Senator MCCARRAN.

Senator BUSHFIELD. That is your primary responsibility?

Mr. MASON. Not necessarily.

Senator BUSHFIELD. You are the Commissioner in charge of that hospital?

Mr. MASON. All right.

Senator BUSHFIELD. You have made no effort to ascertain sanitary conditions there since these charges were made?

Mr. MASON. Because it was already exposed in the newspapers and in the hands of this committee, and I knew the committee would make an investigation, because it had been ordered, and I did not want to interfere with this committee's functions in any way or to make any attempt to correct things so that it might be said it was being covered up.

Senator BUSHFIELD. And you know what the sanitary conditions are?

Mr. MASON. I do; from this testimony and from our own inspectors, and when this investigation is completed we will take all action requisite under the circumstances.

Senator BUSHFIELD. Well, I guess that is the end of the road, Senator; the man declines to talk.

Have you any questions?

Senator BUCK. I might ask Mr. Mason why he declines to talk.

Mr. MASON. Because I am not going to interfere with your investigation and come back and be charged with trying to cover up stuff. I know what these investigations are; I have been around here for 40 years.

Senator BUCK. You have the advantage of us; we have just come to Washington.

Mr. MASON. They get an investigation in July and recommend something, and then the next July we go to the Appropriation Committee and we don't get what we ask for.

Mr. President, I believe that under those circumstances, unless the findings of the subcommittee are adequately answered and are shown to be unfounded, we owe a duty to the subcommittee and to the Senator who was chairman of the committee at that time to support the recommendations against the confirmation of this nomination.

Furthermore, it seems to me that we have here an example of a case in which the District of Columbia is unable to meet this situation itself. We owe a duty to the residents of the District of Columbia to see to it that if a case of administrative neglect such as this arises, we will recognize it and will take a stand on it, through the investigation of our subcommittee, and will back up that subcommittee. That is the only way the people of this community can be protected against administrative neglect.

Mr. President, the testimony indicates to me a bureaucratic carelessness and neglect of the Gallinger Hospital which is inexcusable. It is the duty of the Senate to see to it, when the nomination is placed before it, that it does not ratify and support that kind of administration. The least we can do is to make sure, when we are asked to act on a nomination of this kind, that we act on the testimony which is before the committee and the subcommittee and that we back up their position, and thus protect the people of the District of Columbia.

Mr. WALSH of New Jersey. Mr. President, I have known Guy Mason for 10 years. I have always considered him to be a man of impeccable character and decidedly superior executive ability. He is extremely popular with the people of the District of Columbia.

The chairman of the Committee on the District of Columbia, the able senior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. BILBO] appointed me chairman of a subcommittee to consider the nomination of Mr. Mason. On the subcommittee also were the distinguished senior Senator from Kansas [Mr. CAPPER] and the distinguished senior Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], whose judgment and integrity were well known to the Members of the Senate long before I had the honor of serving here.

Before calling a meeting of my subcommittee, I carefully studied the report on Gallinger Hospital, although newspapers many months before had given me most of the gory details. When my subcommittee met, we well realized that when the matter reached the floor of the Senate, lice, cockroaches, and bodies of strangled women would, figuratively, be strewn all over the place. Yet our careful consideration of the matter prompted us to report unanimously and favorably the nomination of Mr. Mason.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DOWNEY in the chair). Does the Senator from New Jersey yield to the Senator from Ohio?

Mr. WALSH of New Jersey. I yield.

Mr. BURTON. Let me inquire whom the subcommittee had before it as witnesses.

Mr. WALSH of New Jersey. I will come to that, if the Senator will be patient.

Mr. President, the appointment by the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. BILBO] of a subcommittee was widely publicized in the daily press in the city of Washington. Yet, I, as chairman of that subcommittee, received only one adverse report and that was by an anonymous telephone call. The person making the telephone call positively refused to give his name.

On the other hand, I received numberless telephone calls from leading Washington citizens enthusiastically endorsing Mr. Mason.

Endorsements of most of the civic organizations of Washington were already in the files of the Committee on the District of Columbia when our subcommittee was formed. Among the endorsements which I personally received was one from 9,000 property owners. That organization desired to bring thousands of witnesses before the subcommittee in Mr. Mason's behalf. That is one reason why no public hearings were held. We knew that the thousands of Washingtonians eager to appear in Mr. Mason's behalf would cause the hearings to drag on for weeks and months. That, I say to the Senator from Ohio, was the reason why we heard no outside witnesses.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, I merely wish to inquire what witnesses the subcommittee did have before it.

Mr. WALSH of New Jersey. We had no witnesses before our subcommittee.

Mr. BURTON. Not even the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD] or the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BUCK]?

Mr. WALSH of New Jersey. We did not invite the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD], although I am sure he knew that such a subcommittee had been formed, and he attended the meeting of the full committee when the nomination was reported favorably. But, unfortunately, he arrived after such action had been taken.

Mr. BURTON. Let me inquire whether the subcommittee had Commissioner Mason before it.

Mr. WALSH of New Jersey. Yes; the subcommittee had Mr. Mason before it.

Although the eminent minority leader, the distinguished senior Senator from Maine [Mr. WHITE], for whom I have such unqualified admiration, stated yesterday that he did not consider that glowing editorials from newspapers or endorsements of most of the civic organizations had any relevancy in this case, I must confess that such tributes, added to the enthusiasm of my distinguished colleagues, the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CAPPER] and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], and added to my own high appraisal of Mr. Mason's qualities, influenced me very much.

Mr. Mason appears to be the choice of the people of Washington.

I cannot give Mr. Mason a high mark for his tact when he appeared before the subcommittee headed by the distinguished senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. HOLMAN]. At that time Mr. Mason lost his temper. I am informed that subsequently he apologized, and did so in writing. Mr. Mason has told me that his unwillingness to testify in connection with Gallinger Hospital conditions before the subcommittee headed by the senior Senator from Oregon was due to the fact that the District Attorney was investigating the matter at the time, and he was afraid that any testimony by him might be interpreted as an effort to cover up. Among other things, Mr. Mason is a lawyer.

In endorsing Mr. Mason, one large organization stated that the citizens of Washington believed Mr. Mason had performed a difficult job under arduous conditions. Perhaps busy Mr. Mason relied too much on the doctors in charge of the Health Department and the hospital. But is it not interesting that after Dr. Bocock had been attacked and resigned he was immediately employed as superintendent of Doctors' Hospital, which is considered to be the best hospital in the Nation's Capital?

Mr. Mason has gone through the trying and sad experience of the Gallinger investigation. Is he the type of man who will endeavor to prevent a repetition of whatever was wrong? I honestly believe that he is that type of man, and I am informed that he has already instituted corrective measures.

Mr. President, I would rather take a chance and vote for the confirmation of the nomination of Mr. Mason, who has received the endorsements of the people of Washington who have lived under his administration, than vote for some new nominee who might be without experience but might arrive with glowing promises and a new broom. I therefore urge the confirmation of the nomination of Mr. Mason.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Vote! Vote!

Mr. BILBO. Mr. President, I wish to repeat only a small part of the statement made yesterday, for the purpose of emphasis, and to invite attention to what has occurred in this case.

Under a Democratic administration the District of Columbia Committee is composed of nine Democrats and six Republicans. While the matter involved is not a partisan one, yet the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], in appointing a subcommittee to make an investigation of Gallinger Hospital, saw fit to appoint three Republicans and no Democrats. However, in the decision to recommend the appointment of Mr. Mason no partisan line was drawn. Both Republicans and Democrats have endorsed the confirmation. I have endeavored to ascertain the vote of the committee and it is my understanding

that the vote was about 9 to 4, or at a ratio of more than 2 to 1.

Mr. President, it has been said on the floor of the Senate that the opinions of the newspapers in Washington, as well as of all the civic bodies—I believe there are approximately 70 of them—would not affect or influence certain Senators. I believe I am best qualified to make that statement, but I shall not make it. I would not make it because it would not be true so far as I am concerned. The people of the District of Columbia do not have the right to vote. They cannot select their officers. They are dependent on the President and the Senate in the selection of three men to have charge of the civic affairs of the District of Columbia. But the people of the District of Columbia have a way in which they may express their judgment and preference. They register such expression through approximately 70 civic organizations within the District. When their interests are involved they do not hesitate to adopt resolutions and pass upon the questions which come before the Senate for action.

As has been stated by the Senator from Nebraska, 70 organizations in the District have endorsed the nomination of Mr. Mason. The committee has recommended his confirmation, and four newspapers of Washington, as I understand, have endorsed Mr. Mason, notwithstanding the fact that he is a Democrat appointed by a Democratic President. Considering those facts, it seems to me that Mr. Mason stands very highly.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BILBO. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Was not the Senator from Mississippi in error when he stated that the Senator from Nebraska had said that 70 organizations in the District had endorsed Mr. Mason, and did not the Senator refer to the senior Senator from Kansas who made the statement on the floor of the Senate yesterday?

Mr. BILBO. Mr. President, the Senator from Nebraska is correct. I thank him for the correction. The Senator who made the statement to which I referred was the senior Senator from Kansas [Mr. CAPPER].

Mr. President, in view of the recommendation by the press of the city of Washington, and of 70 civic organizations of the District of Columbia, as well as the subcommittee of the District of Columbia Committee, and the full committee, I submit that Mr. Mason is qualified and deserves the confirmation by the Senate of his nomination to be Commissioner of the District of Columbia. I believe that such action on the part of the Senate would conform to the wishes of all the civic organizations in the city, as well as of the press of the city of Washington.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to this nomination?

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Mr. President, I call for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. HILL. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Gurney	Overton
Bankhead	Hall	Radcliffe
Bilbo	Hatch	Reed
Buck	Hayden	Revercomb
Burton	Hill	Reynolds
Bushfield	Holman	Robertson
Butler	Jenner	Russell
Byrd	Johnson, Calif.	Shipstead
Capper	Johnson, Colo.	Stewart
Caraway	La Follette	Tunnell
Clark, Mo.	Langer	Vandenberg
Cordon	Lucas	Wallgren
Danaher	McClellan	Walsh, Mass.
Davis	McFarland	Walsh, N. J.
Downey	McKellar	Weeks
Eastland	Maloney	Wheeler
Ellender	Maybank	Wherry
Ferguson	Mead	White
George	Millikin	Wiley
Gillette	Murray	Willis
Green	Nye	
Guffey	O'Mahoney	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Sixty-four Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Guy Mason to be Commissioner of the District of Columbia? On this question the yeas and nays having been ordered, the clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. WHITE (when Mr. BARKLEY'S name was called). On this question I have a pair with the distinguished majority leader (Mr. BARKLEY). I understand that if he were present he would vote "yea." If permitted to vote, I would vote "nay."

Mr. LA FOLLETTE (when his name was called). On this vote I have a pair with the senior Senator from Texas (Mr. CONNALLY), who is temporarily absent from the Chamber. I am advised that if the senior Senator from Texas were present he would "yea," while, if permitted to vote, I would vote "nay."

Mr. REED (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER]. I understand that if present he would vote "yea." If I were permitted to vote, I would vote "nay."

Mr. VANDENBERG (when his name was called). On this vote I am paired with the Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN]. I understand that if present he would vote "yea." If permitted to vote I would vote "nay."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. DAVIS (after having voted in the negative). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER]. I understand if he were present he would vote "yea." I transfer that pair to the senior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HAWKES], who if present would vote "nay." Therefore I will let my vote stand.

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] is absent from the Senate because of illness. I am advised that if present and voting, he would vote "yea."

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER] is absent attending the funeral of a friend. I am advised that if present and voting, he would vote "yea."

The Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] is absent on important public business. I am advised that if present and voting, he would vote "yea."

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] are unavoidably detained. I am advised that if present and voting, the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] would vote "yea." I am not advised how the Senator from New Mexico would vote.

The Senator from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Texas [Mr. O'DANIEL], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS], the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are necessarily absent. I am advised that if present and voting, the Senator from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] would vote "yea."

The Senator from Utah [Mr. MURDOCK] and the Senators from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN and Mr. SCRUGHAM] are detained on official business for the Senate. I am advised that if present and voting the junior Senator from Nevada [Mr. SCRUGHAM] would vote "yea." I am not advised how the Senator from Utah would vote.

The Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] is paired with the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN]. I am advised that if present and voting the Senator from Maryland would vote "yea," and the Senator from Nevada would vote "nay."

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN] is detained in a committee meeting.

The Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] is detained on official business.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] is necessarily absent. He has a general pair with the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS].

The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL], the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HAWKES], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MOORE], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY], and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. WILSON] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Idaho [Mr. THOMAS] is unavoidably detained.

The result was announced—yeas 39, nays 20, as follows:

YEAS—39

Bankhead	Hatch	O'Mahoney
Bilbo	Hayden	Overton
Byrd	Hill	Radcliffe
Capper	Johnson, Colo.	Reynolds
Caraway	Lucas	Russell
Clark, Mo.	McClellan	Shipstead
Downey	McFarland	Stewart
Ellender	McKellar	Tunnell
George	Maloney	Wallgren
Gerry	Maybank	Walsh, Mass.
Gillette	Mead	Walsh, N. J.
Green	Murray	Wheeler
Hall	Nye	Willis

NAYS—20

Aiken	Davis	Millikin
Buck	Ferguson	Revercomb
Burton	Guffey	Robertson
Bushfield	Gurney	Weeks
Butler	Holman	Wherry
Cordon	Jenner	Wiley
Danaher	Johnson, Calif.	

NOT VOTING—36

Andrews	Eastland	Scrugham
Austin	Glass	Taft
Bailey	Hawkes	Thomas, Idaho
Ball	Kilgore	Thomas, Okla.
Barkley	La Follette	Thomas, Utah
Brewster	Langer	Tobey
Bridges	McCarran	Truman
Brooks	Moore	Tydings
Chandler	Murdock	Vandenberg
Chavez	O'Daniel	Wagner
Clark, Idaho	Pepper	White
Connally	Reed	Wilson

So the nomination of Guy Mason to be Commissioner of the District of Columbia was confirmed.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I move that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

MISSOURI VALLEY AUTHORITY

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DOWNEY in the chair). The Chair lays before the Senate a communication dated November 27, 1944, from the President of the United States relating to the creation of a Missouri Valley Authority, with accompanying papers, which will be read.

The communication was read by the legislative clerk.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the communication from the President, together with the enclosure, be printed at length in the RECORD. The enclosure, as I understand, was the integrated report of the Army engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation which has heretofore been printed as Senate Document No. 274.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection; the communication and report were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, November 27, 1944.

The PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE:

SIR: On September 21, 1944, I sent a message to the Congress recommending the creation of a Missouri Valley Authority that would be charged with the duty of preparing and carrying out a single coordinated plan for the development of the Missouri River Basin for the greatest benefit of its citizens, both present and future, and for the greatest benefit to the United States. At that time there was under consideration by the Congress two reports, the one presented by the Corps of Engineers, the other by the Bureau of Reclamation, which, while presenting comprehensive plans for the development of the Missouri River, were in conflict in many details. The two bureaus have reconciled the technical differences in these two reports and have prepared a joint recommendation which, in conjunction with the two reports, constitutes a basic plan for the development and control of the waters of the Missouri River.

This joint plan represents a beginning in the solution of the problems of the Missouri Valley. But it is only a beginning, for other important matters not within the scope of this joint report bear very materially upon the entire region. As a practical matter, most of these cannot be dealt with by conference and agreement among the 10 States directly involved working with separate Federal agencies, for the delay in getting action would be too great to bring about the objectives important to the economy of the entire region. A single authority, such as the Tennessee Valley Authority, over the entire region would provide an adequate mechanism for the adjustment of the interests of the States and for the planning and development of the entire valley.

I am transmitting herewith a copy of that report of reconciliation together with accompanying papers. I now recommend that the plans of the two bureaus, published in House Document 475, Seventy-eighth Congress, and Senate Document 191, Seventy-eighth Congress, as modified in accordance with the recommendations of this joint report, be authorized as a basic engineering plan to be developed and administered by a Missouri Valley Authority, such as I have already recommended in my message of September 21.

Sincerely yours,

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT,
BUREAU OF THE BUDGET,
Washington, D. C., November 16, 1944.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House.

SIR: There are transmitted herewith for your consideration letters from the Secretaries of War and of the Interior to me, a joint report of the Chief of Engineers and the Commissioner of Reclamation to the Secretaries of War and of the Interior, and a joint report of representatives of the Bureau of Reclamation and Corps of Engineers on plans for development of the Missouri River basin. I recommend that these papers be transmitted to Congress for its consideration in connection with the reports of the two agencies, published as House Document 475, 78th Congress, and Senate Document 191, 78th Congress.

Very respectfully,

HAROLD D. SMITH,
Director.

WAR DEPARTMENT,
Washington, November 4, 1944.

Hon. HAROLD D. SMITH,
Director, Bureau of the Budget,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SMITH: Reference is made to your letter of October 27, 1944, wherein you request, for consideration by the President, a copy of the reconciliation proposed by the Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation of the engineering plans for development of the water resources of the Missouri River basin as presented to Congress by those agencies in House Document 475, Seventy-eighth Congress, and Senate Document 191, Seventy-eighth Congress, respectively.

Complying with your request I am pleased to inclose herewith a joint report from the Chief of Engineers and the Commissioner of Reclamation to the Secretaries of War and Interior with its attached joint report by two engineering representatives of each agency. The joint report of the Chief of Engineers and the Commissioner of Reclamation was prepared in close collaboration among themselves and members of their staffs and completely reconciles the plans of the two agencies.

It is my opinion that the plans of the Corps of Engineers and of the Bureau of Reclamation, coordinated as proposed in the inclosures and authorized as a unified plan, will secure the maximum benefits from the water resources of the basin. I recommend that the joint report be made available for consideration by the Congress in its further deliberations on the pending flood control and river and harbor bills and other proposed legislation pertaining to the Missouri River basin.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT P. PATTERSON,
Acting Secretary of War.

THE SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR,
Washington, November 4, 1944.

Hon. HAROLD D. SMITH,
Director, Bureau of the Budget.

MY DEAR MR. SMITH: I am pleased to be able to reply to your letter of October 27 by transmitting a copy of the report reconciling the engineering features of the plans of the Bureau of Reclamation and the Corps of Engineers, which brings together the report of this Department as printed in Senate Document 191, Seventy-eighth Congress, second session, and the report of the War Department as published in House Document 475, Seventy-eighth Congress, second session. I recommend that this single coordinated plan be authorized in a manner that would modify both the reclamation plan and the Army plan and would carry with it the initial phases of both those plans. The Department of the Interior stands ready to prosecute its share and phases of the Missouri River program.

This agreement marks a definite step in advance toward solving the conflict between irrigation and navigation interests. More storage capacity will be constructed under it than under previous plans of either the Bureau of Reclamation or the Corps of Engineers. This additional storage will be sufficient to provide adequate water for irrigation needs and for navigation, and very adequate flood control storage. General Reybold has informed Commissioner Bashore of his complete agreement with this statement of the advance made as a result of the agreement.

The problem met by the agreement was that of providing adequate, non-overlapping storage sufficient to furnish irrigation, navigation, flood control needs, and for power development. The problems of allocation and return of costs have not been met in it, and there was no intention of meeting them in it. The additional storage to be constructed will serve various purposes, and it is my hope that it will be fairly allocated, and that no disproportionate burden will fall on power that would both limit the market for power and limit the advantages to the region from low-cost power. The Commissioner of Reclamation informs me that a final determination of the costs and allocations of the reconciled construction program will depend upon further joint studies.

This agreement is intended to present a comprehensive engineering plan for the Missouri River, parts of which could be carried out by either of the existing agencies in accordance with their authority or by any new agency that might be set up for the purpose. It does not, therefore, run counter to the principles of the message that the President has sent to the Congress regarding a Missouri Valley Authority. It is also my understanding that there is nothing in the agreement that renders impossible full and continual consultation between the construction agencies and other interests concerned in the program, or prevents passage of legislation

embodying the general principles of the O'Mahoney amendment.

Sincerely yours,

HAROLD L. ICKES,
Secretary of the Interior.

WASHINGTON, D. C., *October 25, 1944.*

To the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Interior:

1. In view of the questions raised regarding the differences between the separate plans presented by the Corps of Engineers (H. Doc. 475, 78th Cong., 2d sess.) and the Bureau of Reclamation (S. Doc. 191, 78th Cong., 2d sess.) for the comprehensive development of the Missouri River Basin, a committee composed of two representatives each from the Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation was appointed to review the engineering features of the two plans with a view of reconciliation between them.

2. The committee met at Omaha, Nebr., on October 16 and 17, 1944, discussed the various features of both plans, examined the supporting data for each plan and prepared the enclosed joint engineering report. The joint engineering report points out that by making appropriate modifications it is possible to eliminate existing differences between the two plans.

3. It was possible to bring into agreement the plans of the Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation by recognizing the following basic principles:

(a) The Corps of Engineers should have the responsibility for determining main stem reservoir capacities and capacities of tributary reservoirs for flood control and navigation.

(b) The Bureau of Reclamation should have the responsibility for determining the reservoir capacities on the main stem and tributaries of the Missouri River for irrigation, the probable extent of future irrigation, and the amount of stream depletion due to irrigation development.

(c) Both agencies recognize the importance of the fullest development of the potential hydroelectric power in the basin consistent with the other beneficial uses of water.

4. For convenience in referring to the joint engineering report the following comparable six subdivisions contained in the report of the Bureau of Reclamation (S. Doc. 191, 78th Cong., 2d sess.) have been used:

(a) Upper Missouri River Basin.
(b) Yellowstone River Basin.
(c) Missouri River—Fort Peck to Sioux City.
(d) Minor western tributaries.
(e) Niobrara, Platte, and Kansas Rivers.
(f) Lower Missouri Basin.

UPPER MISSOURI RIVER BASIN

5. The plan presented in House Document 475, Seventy-eighth Congress, second session, does not specifically designate any units in the Upper Missouri River Basin subdivision, although provisions are made for desirable and necessary projects in this area. The plan presented in Senate Document 191, Seventy-eighth Congress, second session, contemplates the construction of 19 reservoirs, with a total storage capacity of 3,359,950 acre-feet, for flood control, silt control, the development of hydroelectric power, the irrigation of 460,900 acres of new lands, and the provision of a supplemental water supply for 208,700 acres of land now being served with an inadequate water supply. There is no conflict in the proposed plans of the two agencies for the Upper Missouri River Basin subdivision.

YELLOWSTONE RIVER BASIN

6. The plan presented in House Document 475, Seventy-eighth Congress, second session, provides for the construction of Boysen Reservoir, with a storage capacity of 3,500,000 acre-feet, and the Lower Canyon Reservoir, with a capacity of 2,250,000 acre-feet, to be operated for flood control, irrigation, navigation, power, and other purposes. The plan presented in Senate Document 191, Seventy-eighth Congress, second session, provides for the construction of 27 reservoirs located on various streams in the Yellowstone River subdivision, with a total storage capacity of 4,285,200 acre-feet, the reservoirs to be operated for flood control, silt control, the development of hydroelectric power, the irrigation of 509,560 acres of new lands, the provision of a supplemental water supply for 204,500 acres of land now being served with an inadequate water supply. It was concluded that the plan described in Senate Document 191, Seventy-eighth Congress, second session, would be adequate to accomplish the objectives of the plan described in House Document 475, Seventy-eighth Congress, second session.

MISSOURI RIVER—FORT PECK TO SIOUX CITY

7. The plan presented in House Document 475, Seventy-eighth Congress, second session, contemplates the construction of five additional multiple-purpose reservoirs on the main stem of the Missouri River for flood control, navigation, irrigation, power, domestic and sanitary purposes, wildlife, and recreation, as shown in the following table:

Project and location:	*Approximate gross storage capacity (acre-feet)*
Garrison, near Garrison, N. Dak	17,000,000
Oak Creek, near Mobridge, S. Dak	6,000,000
Oahe, near Pierre, S. Dak	6,000,000
Fort Randall, near Wheeler, S. Dak	6,000,000
Gavins Point, near Yankton, S. Dak	200,000

The plan also provides that as soon as substitute storage is built on the main stem of the river, the Fort Peck Reservoir will be operated as a multiple-purpose reservoir primarily in the interest of irrigation.

8. The plan presented in Senate Document 191, Seventy-eighth Congress, second session, contemplates the use of Fort Peck Reservoir primarily for irrigation purposes, also for navigation, flood control, silt control, and power, and the construction of main-stem reservoirs to be operated for flood control, irrigation, navigation, power, silt control, and other purposes, as follows:

Project and location:	*Approximate gross storage capacity (acre-feet)*
Oahe, near Pierre, S. Dak	19,600,000
Fort Randall, near Wheeler, S. Dak	5,100,000
Big Bend, near Joe Creek, S. Dak	250,000

Senate Document 191, Seventy-eighth Congress, second session, also includes four inland reservoirs to assist in regulating the water diverted from the main stem and the irrigation of 2,292,900 acres of new lands in the Missouri River, Fort Peck to Sioux City subdivision.

9. After full discussion of the various features of the two plans in this subdivision the following main-stem reservoirs were recommended in the joint engineering report in order to more fully utilize the water resources of the basin and to most effectively serve the present and ultimate requirements of flood control, irrigation, navigation, hydroelectric power, and other uses.

Project and location:	*Approximate gross storage capacity (acre-feet)*
Garrison, near Garrison, N. Dak	17,000,000
Oahe, near Pierre, S. Dak	19,600,000
Fort Randall, near Wheeler, S. Dak	5,100,000
Big Bend, near Joe Creek, S. Dak	250,000
Gavins Point, near Yankton, S. Dak	200,000

The final storage capacities to be selected for the above reservoirs will be jointly agreed upon after more detailed plans and cost estimates have been made.

10. The Garrison Dam, Reservoir, and power plant was included in the coordinated plan as it provides a large volume of useful storage capacity for flood control, navigation, and irrigation, and permits the utilization of approximately 160 feet of head for the development of hydroelectric power in an area capable of absorbing the potential output and which, otherwise, has no prospective source of abundant low-cost power. A large reservoir at the Garrison site, situated immediately below the Yellowstone River with its large silt contribution, will prolong materially the life of downstream reservoirs.

11. The selection of the high Oahe Dam, Reservoir, and power plant as proposed in Senate Document No. 191, Seventy-eighth Congress, second session, floods out the Oak Creek Dam, Reservoir, and power plant as proposed in House Document No. 475, Seventy-eighth Congress, second session. The high Oahe Dam is required in connection with the irrigation of 750,000 acres of land in the James River Basin as well as to provide useful storage for flood control, navigation, the development of hydroelectric power, and other purposes. If the Oahe Reservoir is constructed to the elevation proposed in Senate Document No. 191, Seventy-eighth Congress, second session, a greater storage capacity will be provided than contemplated in the low Oahe and Oak Creek Reservoirs at considerably less cost.

12. The Fort Randall Dam in House Document No. 475, Seventy-eighth Congress, second session, and Senate Document No. 191, Seventy-eighth Congress, second session, utilizes the same site. However, House Document No. 475, contemplates a normal pool level at 1,375 mean sea level whereas Senate Document No. 191 contemplates a pool level at 1,365 mean sea level, in order to not interfere with the Big Bend power plant located near the upper limits of the reservoir. The Big Ben project is considered highly desirable in the ultimate development inasmuch as approximately 60 feet of head is thereby made available for the development of hydroelectric power. The use of the Garrison, high Oahe, Big Bend, Fort Randall, and Gavins Point Dams and Reservoirs as outlined above and agreed upon in the joint engineering report will provide the desired degree of flood control, supply the needs of irrigation as well as furnish cyclic storage for navigation during prolonged drought periods. The plan also utilizes practically all of the available power head in the Missouri River between the mouth of the Yellowstone River and the Gavins Point Dam.

MINOR WESTERN TRIBUTARIES

13. The plan of development presented in House Document No. 475, Seventy-eighth Congress, second session, does not specifically designate any units in the minor western tributaries subdivision, although provisions are made for desirable and necessary projects in this area. The plan presented in Senate Document No. 191, Seventy-eighth Congress, second session, provides for the construction of 15 reservoirs with a total storage capacity of 1,237,000 acre-feet, the reservoirs to be operated for flood control, silt control, the development of hydroelectric power, the irrigation of 212,980 acres of new lands, and the provision of a supplemental water supply for 11,300 acres of land now being served with an inadequate water supply. There is no con-

flict in the proposed plans of the two agencies for the minor western tributaries subdivision.

NIOBRARA, PLATTE, AND KANSAS RIVERS

14. The plan of development presented in House Document 475, Seventy-eighth Congress, second session, contemplates the construction of 9 reservoirs (of which 4 have been previously authorized) for flood control, irrigation and other purposes. The lands to be irrigated were not specified in the report and were to be determined by later detailed investigation. The plan presented in Senate Document 191, Seventy-eighth Congress, second session, contemplates the construction of 22 reservoirs on various streams in the Niobrara, Platte, and Kansas River subdivision with a total storage capacity of 5,650,400 acre feet; the reservoirs to be operated for flood control, silt control, the irrigation of 1,284,060 acres of new land, and the provision of a supplemental water supply to 21,804 acres of land now being served with an inadequate water supply. The following substitutions were found to be desirable in the Kansas River Basin:

(a) On the South Fork of the Republican River, the Bonny Reservoir, in Senate Document 191, was substituted for the Hale Reservoir in House Document 475 to permit the irrigation of approximately 6,500 acres of additional lands. The 2 reservoir sites are located within 4 miles of each other and for all practicable purposes would provide a comparable degree of flood control.

(b) On the Arikeree River the Pioneer Reservoir, in Senate Document 191 was substituted for the Beecher Island Reservoir in House Document 475 inasmuch as the Pioneer Reservoir controlled a larger drainage area, therefore was more advantageous for flood control, and reconnaissance studies by the Bureau of Reclamation indicated that there were no lands suitable for irrigation between the 2 sites.

(c) On Frenchman Creek the Enders Reservoir, in House Document 475 was subsituted for the Harvey Reservoir in Senate Document 191, because the Enders Reservoir could be built to a greater capacity than the Harvey Reservoir, and would furnish additional flood protection for the Frenchman Creek Valley in Nebraska. Both sites are suitably located to serve all potential irrigation developments.

LOWER MISSOURI BASIN

15. The plan of development as presented in House Document 475 and Senate Document 191 for this subdivision are identical, therefore, no conflict in the engineering features of the two plans exist. The plans include 7 reservoirs and a series of levees and appurtenant works along both sides of the Missouri River from the vicinity of Sioux City, Iowa, to the vicinity of the mouth of the Missouri River.

16. Development of the Missouri River Basin in accordance with House Document 475, Seventy-eighth Congress, second session, and Senate Document 191, Seventy-eighth Congress, second session, as coordinated in the inclosed joint engineering report, if authorized as a unified plan, will secure the maximum benefits for flood control, irrigation, navigation, power, domestic and sanitary purposes, wildlife, and recreation. Precise elevations and heights of reservoirs and dams, and final determinations of the power installations required, can be agreed upon after more detailed plans and cost estimates have been obtained and compared with benefits, and after consideration has been given to the desires and objections of persons affected by the proposed developments.

E. REYBOLD,
Major General,
Chief of Engineers, United States Army,
War Department.

HARRY W. BASHORE,
Commissioner, Bureau of Reclamation,
Department of the Interior.

WAR DEPARTMENT,
OFFICE OF THE DIVISION ENGINEER,
MISSOURI RIVER DIVISION,
Omaha, Nebr., October 17, 1944.

Subject: Joint report of representatives of Bureau of Reclamation and Corps of Engineers on plans for development of the Missouri River Basin.

To: The Chief of Engineers, United States Army, Washington, D. C., and the Commissioner, Bureau of Reclamation, Department of the Interior, Washington, D. C.

1. In accordance with instructions contained in letter of October 10, 1944, from the Commissioner of Reclamation to Mr. W. G. Sloan, Assistant Regional Director, Bureau of Reclamation, Billings, Mont., and Mr. John Riter, Acting Director, Branch of Project Planning, Bureau of Reclamation, Denver, Colo., and letter of same date from the Chief of Engineers to the division engineer, Missouri River division, a conference was held in Omaha, Nebr., on October 16–17, 1944, as a result of which the following joint report is submitted.

2. For purposes of discussion, the basin was divided into the following six subdivisions contained in the report of the Bureau of Reclamation, Senate Document No. 191, Seventy-eighth Congress, second session:

(a) Upper Missouri River Basin.
(b) Yellowstone River Basin.
(c) Missouri River-Fort Peck to Sioux City.
(d) Minor western tributaries.
(e) Niobrara, Platte, and Kansas Rivers.
(f) Lower Missouri Basin.

3. It was agreed that there were no points of conflict in the engineering features of the two plans in the following subdivisions:

(a) Upper Missouri River Basin.
(b) Minor western tributaries.
(c) Lower Missouri Basin.

4. It was agreed that the Yellowstone River Basin be developed in accordance with the plans set forth in Senate Document No. 191, Seventy-eighth Congress, second session. With regard to the other two subdivisions, all of the engineering features of both plans were agreed upon with the following modifications:

(a) Missouri River—Fort Peck to Sioux City.

(1) The Gavins Point Reservoir and the Garrison Reservoir to be developed in accordance with House Document No. 475, Seventy-eighth Congress, second session.

(2) The Fort Randall Reservoir, the Big Bend Reservoir, and the Oahe Reservoir to be developed in accordance with Senate Document No. 191, Seventy-eighth Congress, second session.

(3) The Oak Creek Reservoir, as proposed in House Document No. 475, Seventy-eighth Congress, second session, for the Hale and Beecher Island Reservoirs as proposed in House Document No. 475, Seventy-eighth Congress, second session, and to substitute the Enders Reservoir as proposed in House Document No. 475, Seventy-eighth Congress, second session, for the Harvey Reservoir as proposed in Senate Document No. 191, Seventy-eighth Congress, second session.

R. C. CRAWFORD,
Brigadier General, United States Army, Division Engineer.

GAIL A. HATHAWAY,
Head Engineer, Representing Office of the Chief of Engineers.

W. G. SLOAN,
Assistant Regional Director, Bureau of Reclamation, Billings, Mont.

JOHN R. RITER,
Acting Director, Branch of Project Planning, Bureau of Reclamation, Denver, Colo.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, I ask that the communication from the President just read from the desk and the accompanying papers be referred to the Committee on Commerce.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE ELECTION IN KANSAS—EDITORIAL FROM THE KANSAS CITY STAR

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, at this point, an editorial from the Kansas City Star of Saturday, November 18, 1944, commenting on the Kansas vote in the recent election. My native State gave Governor Dewey, the Republican nominee, a plurality of 154,217 votes, the largest he received in any State. Kansas also reelected Gov. Andrew Schoeppel by a margin of 229,000 votes, reelected my colleague, Senator CLYDE M. REED, elected 6 Republican House Members, and elected 39 Republicans and 1 Democrat to the State senate, 119 Republicans and 6 Democrats to the State house of representatives. It is what is called a Republican year in Kansas. I send the editorial to the desk for printing in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHEN KANSAS SPEAKS UP

What's the matter with Kansas now? Nothing except that it's still Kansas, your sunflower citizen wants the world to know. He aims to make it very plain.

Kansas gave Gov. Thomas E. Dewey the largest popular plurality of any State—154,217 votes—and returned its Republican Governor, Andrew F. Schoeppel, by a thumping 229,000-vote margin, an all-time high.

The State proved the storm center of all the pent-up revolt against the New Deal and expressed its emotions on the ballot. That was characteristic of Kansas. It spoke its piece in a loud and unmistakable voice. And some of the same emotions that agitated Kansas spilled across the borders and boiled up in neighboring agricultural States.

How did Kansas get that way? Under ordinary circumstances your average Kansan is a mild-mannered, even-tempered individual who goes his own way and attends to his own business. He also can be as independent as a hog on ice, as rambunctious as a yearling bull, and as intent on his freedom as the sportive jack rabbit.

Kansans don't like restraints—by outsiders. Something in the prairie air, the battle with nature, and the struggles with the soil, makes a Kansan the freest of individualists. He will regulate himself, sometimes almost to absurdity. He will ban cigarettes, as he did in the days of Lizzie Wooster, and cause merchants to hide them under the counter. He will ban hard liquor and defend his right to do it. But let someone else try it and your typical Kansan hits the ceiling.

The Kansas citizen has no love for Federal bureaus. The idea of being told what to do by a Federal agency rubs the fur the wrong way. He grows violent over regimentation and his blood pressure soars over having to fill out questionnaires. He is an ardent believer in State rights. To him O. P. A., O. D. T., W. L. B., and A. A. A. are fighting alphabetical symbols. Men who have raised wheat, cattle, and Cain through good years and bad want to stand on their own two feet and manage their own affairs.

That, in a nutshell, is why thousands of Kansas Democrats joined the Republicans to take a punch at the New Deal in far-off Washington. That's Kansas.

THE CHIANG KAI-SHEK GOVERNMENT IN CHINA

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I received a communication today from a provisional committee for the support of the Chiang Kai-shek government in China, organized in Dodge City, Kans. On the committee are the Lieutenant Governor of Kansas, Jess C. Denious, Mayor Arthur Nevins, and other leading citizens.

This committee is alarmed over the attacks on the Chiang Kai-shek government by Communist sympathizers in this country. These men also feel that one of the greatest helps the United States can render the Chinese National Government is to supply it, through lend-lease, with $50,000,000 in minted silver. I believe the Senate is entitled to the views of this committee, and ask unanimous consent that the communication be placed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the communication was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DODGE CITY, KANS., *November 24, 1944.*

SUSTAIN CHIANG KAI-SHEK NOW

The crisis in China demands more than halfway measures.

The Chinese Republic, born in the revolution of 1911, was an effort to realize for China the dream of democracy as exemplified by America. The inspiration that awakened China was due to the schools and Christian missions fostered by Protestant and Catholic since 1860.

This fact was attested by Yuan Shi-kai, the last Premier of the Manchus and the first President of the Chinese Republic. He urged Bishop Bashford 30 years ago to secure American help in withstanding Japan. He asserted, "Your schools and missions and the teachings of Jesus fomented this revolution and this ferment."

George Sokolsky, Russian, for years a correspondent in and resident of China, a few years ago, observed, "The most significant job done by Americans in China is so great a work that it is altogether misunderstood by small minds—that is, the tremendously important services of the American missionary." Enumerating the hospitals, the schools, and universities, he said, "They planted the seeds of social revolution, which produced in China a forward-looking, progressive, non-opium-smoking, monogamous leadership."

Nationalist China, headed by Chiang Kai-shek, for 8 years had withstood the well-equipped might of Japan and contributed immeasurably to our victory. Her poorly armed soldiery, at a cost of 5,000,000 lives, inflicted 2,000,000 casualties on the enemy and stalled their progress until America awakened. Today, the nationalist government of Chiang, despite its faults and mistakes made in most trying and difficult circumstances, represents the result of American teaching and inspiration. Our Government has properly recognized and supported Chiang. From Valley Forge to Valley Forge and to yet another Valley Forge, like a rock he has stood athwart the torrent of ruthless Japanese aggression. The Japanese have vowed to destroy him.

A peaceful, stable world in the trans-Pacific areas depends upon building on the foundation laid by Chiang in the nationalist government. The unfair sniping at him by a certain school of propagandists in this country is for the purpose of undermining faith in him among the American people and to serve the ends of those who prefer other than American interests to influence the Far East. If they succeed, the lives and sacrifices of our own sons and brothers in the Pacific will have been given in vain and our casualties will be augmented.

The immediate difficulties of Chiang's government are made more acute by paper currency inflation. Chinese have long been accustomed to silver money. Our own silver-buying policy of 1935 drained silver from China. We should now restore it tenfold from our useless silver hoard. We should begin by following the suggestion of the Christian Advocate to lend-lease $50,000,000 (minted in even smaller denominations). This could supplant the overloading of our air transports with worthless printed money. We gave Britain 50 unused destroyers and did well. Give China unused silver so that Chiang can pay his soldiers and civil servants in coin. Silver money would in a measure restore economic order to China, bring hoarded food out of hiding. Since our $2,000,000,000 silver hoard is worthless to us, this would put a portion of it to good use.

Provisional committee: Jess C. Denious, Kansas Lieutenant Governor, publisher, Dodge Daily Globe; Arthur Nevins, mayor of Dodge City; George B. Dugan, president, First National Bank; J. R. Throckmorton, Methodist district superintendent; Karl Miller, district judge; Carl Van Riper, lawyer; O. Ray Cook, Methodist pastor; C. C. Isely.

FEDERAL AND STATE CONTROL OF INSURANCE

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I wish to present a very persuasive letter from the State commissioner of insurance in Michigan, Mr. David A. Forbes, pointing out the dire necessity for action by Congress, prior to the adjournment of this session, in respect to the Federal and State jurisdictions in the control of the insurance business. Commissioner Forbes presents a cogent argument which I hope may be effective in its impact upon the Congress.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATE OF MICHIGAN,
DEPARTMENT OF INSURANCE,
Lansing, November 22, 1944.

Hon. ARTHUR H. VANDENBERG,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: I am sending you under separate cover a copy of the legislative proposal submitted to the Congress of the United States by the Executive Committee of the National Association of Insurance Commissioners.

Words fail to describe the chaotic condition now existing in the regulatory field of the insurance business. As evidence of this, there are now two court actions that have been brought against the Commissioners of New York and California questioning the constitutionality of the insurance license laws of those States in view of the recent Supreme Court decision.

In general, it can be said there are two proposals for Congress to consider in order to restore to the States at least some degree of control and regulation. One is the proposal by the stock fire and casualty companies, and the other the proposal by the National Association of Insurance Commissioners which has been endorsed by the life insurance companies and the mutual fire and casualty companies. Both proposals agree that the business of insurance should be excluded from the provision of the Federal Trade Commission Act and the Robinson-Patman Act. The two proposals really only differ on the question whether or not the insurance business should be given a blanket exclusion from the provisions of the Sherman and Clayton Acts.

The stock fire and casualty companies' proposal asks for that blanket exclusion as is evidenced by the Bailey-Van Nuys bill. The Commissioners' proposal on the other hand only asks for certain specific exclusions from that act after July 1, 1948. The Commissioners believe that the insurance business has no more right to ask for a blanket exclusion from those acts than has any other business that has been held to be engaged in interstate commerce. As commissioners of insurance, we do not feel that we have any right to ask that the business we supervise and regulate in our respective States should not be held to be applicable to any act of boycott, coercion, or intimidation as provided in the Sherman Act.

From a practical standpoint, I do not believe the Commissioners' program would have any opposition from Senator O'MAHONEY and his friends, nor do I believe that legislation based on that program would be vetoed. The opposite is true of the other proposal.

May I also stress the importance to the States of some declaration by Congress on this subject before January 1, because, as you know, most State legislatures convene at that time. It is important to all Commissioners to see to it that proper legislation is introduced in their respective States to try to bring the State insurance statutes in line with the unfortunate Supreme Court decision involving insurance. Without a declaration from Congress, we, as commissioners, are at a loss to know what our State legislative programs should be.

In view of the above, may I urge your support to the program of our association by proper and necessary amendments to the Bailey-Van Nuys bill.

With kind personal regards and best wishes, I am,

Very truly yours,

DAVID A. FORBES,
Commissioner of Insurance.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. MCFARLAND, from the Committee on Interstate Commerce:

H. R. 4184. A bill to amend section 321, title III, part II, Transportation Act of 1940, with respect to the movement of Government traffic; with amendments (Rept. No. 1208).

By Mr. MCKELLAR, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads:

S. 1971. A bill to provide for the disposal of certain mail matter condemned by the Director of Censorship; with amendments (Rept. No. 1227); and

H. R. 5154. A bill relating to dual employment in the Postal Service, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1228).

By Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts, from the Committee on Naval Affairs:

S. 2195. A bill to further amend section 22 of the act approved March 4, 1925, entitled "An act providing for sundry matters affecting the naval service, and for other purposes," by removing the limitation on the total personnel of the Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 1229).

By Mr. MALONEY, from the Committee on Banking and Currency:

S. 1954. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to authorize the use for war purposes of silver held or owned by the United States," approved July 12, 1943; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1230).

By Mr. MCFARLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. J. Res. 139. Joint resolution designating period from Thanksgiving Day to Christmas of each year for Nation-wide Bible reading; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1231).

FUNERAL EXPENSES OF THE LATE SENATOR SMITH, OF SOUTH CAROLINA

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, on November 21 the able Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK] offered Senate Resolution 337, and the resolution was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate. The resolution authorizes and directs the payment of the funeral expenses of the late Senator Smith. I report the resolution favorably without amendment from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, and ask for its immediate consideration.

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 337) was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay from the contingent fund of the Senate the actual and necessary expenses incurred by the committee appointed by the Vice President in arranging for and attending the funeral of Hon. ELLISON D. SMITH, late a Senator from the State of South Carolina, upon vouchers to be approved by the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. DOWNEY:

S. 2200. A bill to provide additional compensation for certain civilian employees of the Governments of the United States and the District of Columbia; and

S. 2201. A bill to provide for health programs for Government employees; to the Committee on Civil Service.

S. 2202. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Mae E. Sutton; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 2203. A bill to enable the mothers and widows of deceased members of the armed forces now interred in cemeteries outside the continental limits of the United States or in Alaska to make a pilgrimage to such cemeteries; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED OR PLACED ON CALENDAR

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles and referred or ordered to be placed on the calendar, as indicated:

H. R. 330. An act to amend subsection 9 (a) of the act entitled "An act to prevent pernicious political activities," approved August 2, 1939, as amended; to the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

H. R. 2832. An act to amend the Nationality Act of 1940 so as to permit naturalization proceedings to be had at places other than in the office of the clerk or in open court in the case of sick or physically disabled individuals; to the Committee on Immigration.

H. R. 3709. An act for the relief of Harley E. Carter; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 4311. An act to authorize the appointment of two additional Assistant Secretaries of State; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

H. R. 4968. An act to amend section 511 (c) of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, relative to deposit of vessel proceeds received from the United States in certain cases, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce.

H. R. 5408. An act to amend the Mustering-Out Payment Act of 1944, to provide a method for accomplishing certain mustering-out payments on behalf of mentally disabled veterans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 5331. An act to authorize the transfer of certain lands within the Colonial National Historical Park, Yorktown, Va., to the Secretary of the Navy.

H. R. 5493. An act to provide for the continuation on the active list of the Regular Army for the duration of any of the wars in which the United States is now engaged, and for 6 months thereafter, of any officer on the active list of the Regular Army who has served as Chief of Staff during the wars in which the United States is now engaged; and

H. R. 5494. An act to amend the act entitled "An act authorizing the President to appoint an Under Secretary of War during national emergencies, fixing the compensation of the Under Secretary of War, and authorizing the Secretary of War to prescribe duties," approved December 16, 1940; ordered to be placed on the calendar.

RIVER AND HARBOR IMPROVEMENTS—AMENDMENTS

Mr. WEEKS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 3961) authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. CONNALLY submitted two amendments intended to be proposed by him to House bill 3961, supra, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

ACCEPTANCE OF BUST OF HON. CORDELL HULL

Mr. McKELLAR submitted the following concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 56), which was referred to the Committee on the Library:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Joint Committee on the Library is hereby authorized and directed to accept on behalf of the Congress of the United States, a bust of Hon. Cordell Hull, Secretary of State, formerly a Member of the House of Representatives and of the United States Senate from the State of Tennessee, presented by the Cumberland (Md.) Evening and Sunday Times, and to cause such bust, executed by George Conlon, sculptor, to be placed in a suitable location in the United States Capitol.

ST. LAWRENCE RIVER DEVELOPMENT

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, with a view to ascertaining the effect of the St. Lawrence seaway upon the agriculture of the country I wrote on November 17 to Mr. Grover B. Hill asking him to express his views. Mr. Hill, as everyone knows, is Under Secretary of Agriculture and also Deputy War Food Administrator. I have received from Mr. Hill the following letter:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Washington D. C., November 25, 1944.

Hon. GEORGE D. AIKEN,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR AIKEN: I am glad to comply with your letter of November 17 by stating my views on the proposed St. Lawrence seaway and power project. As you know, this Department is already on record as favoring the project. Secretary Wickard, in a statement before the House Committee on Rivers and Harbors 3 years ago, endorsed both the navigation and power phases of the proposal for developing the St. Lawrence waterway.

As Secretary Wickard pointed out in his statement, we believe that the development of the seaway would benefit American agriculture as a whole by lowering transportation charges on the things farmers sell and the things they buy. It will aid in the restoration of our foreign markets after the war. It will increase our national security in times of crisis.

In the post-war years ahead farmers will need every possible facility for promoting trade both in the markets here at home and in foreign markets. Transportation, always a vital factor in commerce, looms large in that trade. Seaways are of great importance to our agricultural Midwest. This is particularly true of the St. Lawrence project. In addition to providing the States of the Great Lakes Basin with cheaper transportation, the construction of the St. Lawrence seaway would link the people of this area to each other and to the outside world. Any reduction in transportation costs would be an important factor in strengthening the American farmer's competitive position in the world market.

The power possibilities of the St. Lawrence project hold great promise to agriculture in the States where the delivery of cheap hydro power generated on the St. Lawrence would be feasible. In the States of New York, Vermont, and New Hampshire alone, there are still almost 50,000 farms without central station electric service. In addition, there are more than 85,000 unelectrified nonfarm homes and establishments in the rural areas of these States.

We hope you will call on us any time we can be of assistance to you.

Sincerely yours,

GROVER B. HILL,
Under Secretary.

Mr. President, I also wish to read a short editorial from the Alabama Journal of Montgomery, Ala., under date of November 18, 1944, as follows:

SAME OBJECTIONS

The Mobile Register has come out with a broadside editorial against the St. Lawrence River project. Now that President Roosevelt has expressed the hope that the project can go ahead as one of the peacetime methods of giving employment the Mobile port paper has nothing kinder to say of it than that it will mean waste of the public money and another era of boondoggling.

The opponents of the St. Lawrence development have been able to stir up an unusual scare. They have been able to make certain people in Chicago and in the Mississippi Valley feel that if the St. Lawrence River is opened to navigation it will turn millions of tons of commerce eastward and build up Atlantic ports to the disadvantage of the Midwest and the Gulf ports. It looks like straining things pretty far to assume that the opening of a new waterway from the Great Lakes to the Atlantic Ocean by way of the St. Lawrence River will be injurious to the port of Mobile.

Of course that is merely the red herring across the trail. There are selfish reasons against the river development that affect enormous interests in the East, especially those producing electric power and those utilizing the power now made at Niagara Falls. But the arguments against improving that great river and developing its electric power possibilities are no more convincing than are those which were advanced against development of the T. V. A. Time has shown the complete fallacy of the arguments made against the Tennessee River project.

Mr. President, it seems very strange to me that the Mobile Register should have come out against the St. Lawrence River project, saying that it would inaugurate an era of boondoggling and

would constitute a waste of public money, when that same newspaper is urging the construction of the Coosa-Alabama project and the Tombigbee Canal at a cost of nearly $300,000,000. I want to express my gratification that there is a newspaper in Alabama, the Journal of Montgomery, which sees far enough and is fair-minded enough to realize that what affects one section of the country beneficially is also of benefit to all.

REPORT OF LEGISLATIVE BRANCH DEFERMENT REVIEW COMMITTEE

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, at the request of the legislative branch deferment review committee, of which I am chairman, Col. Francis V. Keesling, Jr., of the Selective Service System, appeared before the committee on November 27, 1944, and informed us of the selective-service policies for deferment of men 30 years of age and over. The substance of his comments is as follows:

First. Under selective-service policies men 30 years of age and over who are not Federal employees are being deferred in class II–A if found by their local boards, subject to appeal, to be "regularly engaged in an activity in support of the national health, safety, or interest," or in class II–B if found by their local boards to be "regularly engaged in an activity in war production." Under those policies comparatively few men 30 years of age or over are being inducted for the reason that such policies do not require that men of that age be indispensable or irreplaceable, nor do they require such men to be engaged in work supporting the war effort insofar as class II–A deferments are concerned.

Second. Public Law No. 23, Seventy-eighth Congress, the Lodge-Maybank Act, prohibits Selective Service from deferring an employee of the Federal Government on a similar basis, even though he meets the foregoing requirements for deferment, unless the deferment review committee for the appropriate branch of the Government frees the hand of the selective-service local board by filing with it a document known as an Authorized Government Request.

Third. The deferment review committees of the executive and judicial branches of the Government respectively have been filing or authorizing the filing of authorized Government requests in the cases of employees of their branches of the Government who are 30 years of age and over so that the selective-service local boards will be able to defer them on the same basis as private employees. Unless the deferment review committee of the legislative branch of the Government files authorized Government requests on behalf of Federal employees of the legislative branch of the Government, including members of individual Senators' and Representatives' office forces, on a similar basis to that being followed by the deferment review committees of the other two branches of the Government, such employees of the legislative branch of the Government will be discriminated against not only as between them and private employees, but also as between them and employees of the other two branches of the Federal Government.

Colonel Keesling recommended that the legislative deferment review committee file authorized Government requests for employees of the legislative branch of the Government who are 30 years of age and over in order to preclude any discrimination against them by freeing the hands of the local boards so that they may classify such legislative employees on the same basis as private employees and employees of the other two branches of the Government. As a part of his recommendation, Colonel Keesling suggested that the committee in filing authorized Government requests in behalf of employees in that age group expressly indicate that the requests are being made solely on the basis of the registrant's being regularly engaged in an activity in support of the national health, safety, or interest, as set forth in the selective-service regulations, and that the committee is making no assertions that the employee is irreplaceable or is engaged in an activity in war production.

After considering these comments and recommendations, the legislative deferment review committee decided that it would file authorized Government requests on a basis similar to that followed by the other two branches of the Government in behalf of employees 30 years of age and over so as to permit Selective Service local boards to classify them on a comparable basis with other registrants.

As chairman of the legislative branch deferment review committee, I am bringing this to the attention of Members of the Senate and of the House of Representatives in order that they may be informed of the committee's action in this regard, and will submit to the committee appropriate information concerning employees on their committees or in their individual offices as a basis upon which the committee may take action. Senators may obtain information from my office, and Members of the House may obtain information from the office of Representative MAY, who is chairman of the House members of the committee.

ADDRESS BY SENATOR CONNALLY AT PRESENTATION OF HUMANITARIAN AWARD TO SECRETARY HULL

[Mr. HATCH asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the address delivered on November 24, 1944, by Senator CONNALLY on the occasion of the presentation of the Humanitarian Award to Secretary of State Hull by the Variety Clubs of America, which appears in the Appendix.]

PRESENTATION OF HUMANITARIAN AWARD TO THE SECRETARY OF STATE—REMARKS BY EDWARD R. STETTINIUS AND JAMES F. BYRNES, AND LETTER FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

[Mr. WALSH of New Jersey asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the remarks of the Acting Secretary of State, Hon. Edward R. Stettinius, the remarks of the Honorable James F. Byrnes, and a letter from the President of the United States to Carter Barron, general chairman of the Variety Clubs of America, on the occasion of presentation of the Humanitarian Award to Hon. Cordell Hull, Secretary of State, by the Variety Clubs of America, which appear in the Appendix.]

THE DUMBARTON OAKS PLAN—ARTICLE BY SENATOR CONNALLY

[Mr. BILBO asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article on the Dumbarton Oaks plan, written by Senator CONNALLY, and published in the Washington Post of November 26, 1944, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE STETTINIUS APPOINTMENT—ARTICLE IN PM

[Mr. LANGER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "The Stettinius Appointment," written by Max Lerner, editor of PM, and published in the issue of PM on November 28, 1944, which appears in the Appendix.]

ST. LAWRENCE RIVER DEVELOPMENT—EDITORIAL FROM CHICAGO DAILY NEWS

[Mr. AIKEN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "More Conversation?" relating to the St. Lawrence River development, published in the Chicago Daily News of November 20, 1944, which appears in the Appendix.]

DEWEY H. DAVIS

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I ask that the Chair lay before the Senate House bill 3373, for the relief of Dewey H. Davis, and I shall make a brief explanation of it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair lays before the Senate a bill coming over from the House of Representatives, which will be read.

The bill (H. R. 3373) for the relief of Dewey H. Davis was read twice by its title.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, on September 21 last the Senate passed a bill for the same amount carried in the bill just read, namely, $5,000, to compensate the claimant for personal injuries received. It went to the House of Representatives, and the House took no action upon the bill, but on November 21, 60 days later, the House passed an identical bill, so far as the amount was concerned, for the relief of this particular claimant, Dewey H. Davis. I have conferred with the chairman of the Committee on Claims of the Senate, and it is entirely unnecessary to have the bill go to the committee. I therefore ask that the Senate proceed to the present consideration of the House bill.

There being no objection, the bill (H. R. 3373) for the relief of Dewey H. Davis was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

LT. JAMES H. CLARK AND ELEANOR CLARK

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, yesterday the Senate passed Senate bill 2098, for the relief of Lt. James H. Clark and Eleanor Clark. On the day it was reported from the Committee on Claims, an identical bill was received from the House and referred to the Committee on Claims.

I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Claims be discharged from the further consideration of the House bill, H. R. 4929, that it be considered as having been considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed,

and that the vote on the passage of the Senate bill be reconsidered and the bill indefinitely postponed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the junior Senator from Louisiana? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

FLOOD-CONTROL PROJECTS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4485) authorizing the construction of certain public works on rivers and harbors for flood control, and for other purposes.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, I presume the regular order of business now is to proceed to the consideration of House bill 4485.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is the pending order of business.

Mr. OVERTON. As I understand the situation, we have acted upon all the committee amendments and some other amendments, with the exception of the amendments which are covered by the O'Mahoney amendments. I think, therefore, it would be proper now for the Senator from Wyoming to present his amendments.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I have already sent to the desk the text of the amendments upon which a group of Senators representing New England and the West have been at work for several months. The subject matter of these amendments was presented in detail to the Committee on Commerce, and the group of Senators who have sponsored the amendments have had numerous conferences with the distinguished and able, and I may say very amicable, Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON] who is in charge of the pending bill.

The problem which was presented to us, Mr. President, was that of bringing about the coordination in a legislative as well as in an engineering way, so far as this bill is concerned, of the two plans that had been worked out for the Missouri Valley by the engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation, and of obtaining a redeclaration of the historic doctrine of priority of the consumptive uses of water in the States west of the ninety-eighth meridian known as the arid-land States, and finally of securing recognition in the law of the interest and right of States that are affected by flood control or rivers and harbors improvement to have an opportunity to examine the plans and to suggest amendments, if necessary, before any such plans are adopted.

The subject matter has been discussed off and on upon the floor upon numerous occasions, and I think it is pretty well understood by all Members of the Senate, so I shall attempt now merely to explain briefly the purpose of the various amendments.

In the first place, Mr. President, there is a provision, referring to the works of improvement for navigation or flood control which are authorized in this bill, setting forth a policy by which all plans, proposals, or reports of the Chief of Engineers, War Department, which have not heretofore been authorized or are not herein authorized, shall be submitted to the Congress, after preliminary examination has been made by the affected States through the governors of the States. In other words, this language directs that notice shall be given to the governors of all affected States by the Chief of Engineers.

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. MALONEY. Has the amendment in its latest form been printed?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. No; it has not been printed. There has been an addition and a change which I was undertaking to describe.

Briefly paragraph (a) of the original amendment therefore was intended to apply to all future projects, and to provide a policy by which such projects should be cooperatively investigated and planned by all of the States and by the departments, the Interior Department and the Army engineers, which might be interested. As originally proposed to the Commerce Committee, the amendment contained provision for substantially this same policy with respect to existing projects, that is to say projects which have already been authorized, but to which some objection has been found by the public authorities of affected States.

The only object of that amendment was to deal with projects contained in this bill or previously authorized to which some objection had been made. It has been found that all the projects in that category, with the exception of the Connecticut River Basin, have been removed from the element of discussion, because the Senators concerned have asked or will ask that they be eliminated from the bill. So that provision no longer appears in this joint amendment.

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me again?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. If the Senator will bear with me, I shall cover the entire matter, but of course I shall be very glad to have the Senator interrupt me.

Mr. MALONEY. I was going to suggest to the Senator that, in order that we may mark our copies, I will be grateful if as he goes along he will point out the language he is striking out, and I shall not interrupt him again.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I shall be very happy to have the Senator interrupt me. The provision in the printed amendment which does not appear in the amendment which is now being offered, is that which is described in the printed amendment as subparagraph (b). It appears beginning in line 21 on page 4, and all of page 5, and on page 6 down to and including line 21. Paragraph (b) has been eliminated altogether.

Paragraph (c) as originally prepared therefore becomes paragraph (b) of the amendment we are now offering, and this is the provision which recognizes the priority of the use of water in the States west of the 98th meridian.

The next provision deals with the plans which may be developed not by the Army engineers but by the Secretary of the Interior in the future, and paragraph (d)—now paragraph (c)—has the effect of submitting the projects devised by the Bureau of Reclamation and the Secretary of the Interior to precisely the same policy as that to which plans and proposals of the Army engineers are subjected in accordance with paragraph (a) of the amendment.

The bill as reported by the committee contains, on page 5, in lines 8 to 16, a provision authorizing the Secretary of War to sell to States, municipalities, private concerns, and so forth, surplus water. Objection was made to that upon the ground that in the public-land States, according to the constitutions of the States, the acts of admission, the statutes of the States, and the policies of the Congress, as indicated in several laws which Congress has passed, such water does not belong to any individual or any agency, but is the property of the public. In the Western States water is such an important resource in the development of the whole economy that from the very beginning, as these States were admitted to the Union, it was provided that the ownership of the water should be in the public, and should be administered by the State so that water rights could be adjudicated between conflicting claimants.

The amendment contains a modification of the language on page 5, lines 8 to 16. We move that that language be stricken out, and a substitute is provided.

On page 5 of the bill, as reported, beginning in line 25, the committee struck out section 6 altogether, and suggested a committee amendment. The language stricken appears in line 25 on page 5 and lines 1 to 11 on page 6. We are also offering a substitute for that.

A new section, section 9 (a), is offered. It appears on pages 10 and 11 of the printed amendment and authorizes the integrated report on the Missouri Valley Basin, the report to which the President's message referred. Of course, the provision reported by the committee on page 20, lines 5 to 25, inclusive, and on page 21, lines 1 and 2, is stricken out, and the authorization for the coordinated plan is substituted for it.

Finally, Mr. President, there is the amendment which is offered to take care of the Connecticut River Valley. Senators will recall that there is a very important flood-control problem in the Connecticut River Valley. It affects the States of Connecticut and Massachusetts particularly because they are lower-basin States. It affects the State of Vermont very acutely because the State of Vermont is the State in which certain dams and projects to control the floods of the Connecticut River were proposed to be constructed. In other words, the State of Vermont is the State which would be required to surrender the use of arable land in order to create a reservoir to benefit States lower on the stream. The problem has been under consideration for a number of years. There is a New England pact, but the plans which were developed by the Army engineers were not satisfactory to the public authorities of the State of Vermont, and the Senators from Vermont have indicated their objection to those plans.

Subsection (b) as originally proposed would have provided for a review of those plans. The proposed amendment, upon

which, as I understand, there has been complete agreement, reads as follows: On page 10 of the bill——

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LUCAS in the chair). Does the Senator from Wyoming yield to the Senator from Louisiana?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. OVERTON. So far as the committee is concerned, there has been no complete agreement with respect to the amendment to which the Senator is presently referring.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I understood that it was satisfactory to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. OVERTON. It is not satisfactory to me. It would be a matter for debate. I will say that the other amendments which the Senator has read up to this point are satisfactory; and while I do not altogether agree with the exact interpretation which the Senator has placed upon them, as to their effect, they are all satisfactory, so far as I am concerned. The other amendment, relating to the Connecticut Valley Authority, is not agreed to.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Since we are talking about what has been agreed to and what has not been agreed to, if I may interrupt at this time—and I do not wish to interrupt the thread of the Senator's thought—I should like to ask what is the present tenor of the Senator's amendment, which I have not yet had an opportunity to put together, with regard to the Souris basin. I refer to the project for taking water out of the Missouri Valley watershed completely and irrigating 1,000,000 acres of land in Canada. If that is in the amendment I intend to oppose it.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I will say to the Senator that there is no provision in the coordinated report of the Army Engineers and of the Bureau of Reclamation for the irrigation of any land in Canada.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I am not asking the Senator that. I am asking whether it is proposed to divert water from the Missouri Valley watershed into the watershed of the Red River of the North. If that be true, I think it is an infamous proposal, which I shall personally oppose as long as I can.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The coordinated report of the Army engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation does provide for the diversion of a certain amount of water from the upper Missouri Valley for the irrigation of lands in North Dakota. The provisions of the engineering plans are such that a drainage canal is to be constructed for the purpose of recovering the recoverable supply of water after such irrigation. Some of it would go into the Cheyenne River and into the Red River of the North, as mentioned by the Senator from Missouri; but I am given to understand by the engineers that all of it, or practically all of it, will be used for domestic purposes in the United States, in the State of North Dakota, and that there is no possibility of the utilization of any of this water for the irrigation of lands in Canada.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Would that water, after it had been used for domestic purposes or any other purpose, drain back into the original watershed?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Some of it would go back into the Missouri. Some of it would go into the Red River and would not go back into the Missouri.

Mr. President, I was about to read the amendment dealing with the Connecticut River Basin. On page 10 of the bill as reported by the committee, it is proposed to strike out lines 3 to 7, inclusive, and insert the following:

> Nothing in this act or in any previous authorization shall be construed to authorize the construction of a dam, other than a retention type dam, not to exceed elevation 415 Sandy Hook datum on the main stream of the West River in the towns of Dummerston or Newfane in the State of Vermont. Plans, proposals, or reports heretofore authorized for construction at Cambridgeport, Ludlow, South Tumbridge, and Gaysville, in the Connecticut River Basin, or any modification of the comprehensive plan for the Connecticut River Basin in Vermont heretofore made under authority of the Flood Control Act of June 28, 1938, or heretofore made under authority of section 3 of the Flood Control Act approved August 18, 1941, shall not be carried out until after compliance with the provisions of paragraph (a) of section — of this act.

With that amendment, Mr. President, the section would read as follows, beginning on page 9 of the bill, in line 22:

> In addition to previous authorizations, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of $30,000,000 for the prosecution of the comprehensive plan approved in the act of June 28, 1938, as modified by the act approved August 18, 1941, for the Connecticut River Basin.

The provision I just read would then follow in lieu of the proviso of the committee amendment.

Mr. WEEKS and Mr. DAVIS addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Wyoming yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield first to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. WEEKS. Mr. President, let me inquire whether the Senator is offering this amendment to the amendment he has proposed or to the bill itself at the point at which reference is made to the Connecticut River Basin?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Of course, Mr. President, all of these, being amendments, are amendments offered to the bill itself. From what the Senator from Louisiana said a moment ago, I suppose we may proceed with consideration of these various items. It will be seen that they deal with separate and distinct parts of the bill.

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, let me ask a question, if I may do so. It is very important to me, and, I think, to some other Senators, to determine whether we will be voting upon this new proposal as a separate amendment or whether it may become necessary in order to get at it to oppose the entire O'Mahoney amendment.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, for the convenience of the Senate and of those who were working on these bills, this was printed as a whole. When we begin we jump from page 5 to page 6 and then to page 20; and I suggest that in the interest of orderly procedure it might be well for us to take them up as they appear.

Mr. MALONEY. I should like to suggest to the Senator that there is a slight risk, at least, of doing violence to his proposal by including it in the amendment covering projects for the State of Vermont.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Certainly.

Mr. OVERTON. I wish to assure the Senator from Connecticut that there will be a separate vote on the Connecticut River Basin projects. My suggestion will be that section 1 of the O'Mahoney amendment, which has no relation whatsoever to the Connecticut River Basin, be voted on—down to, let us say, subsection (a)—and that then we vote on subsection (a), and then on subsection (b), and then on subsection (c).

Mr. MALONEY. Just a moment, Mr. President. As I understand, subsection (b) in the printed form is to be stricken out.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator was referring to the new subsection (b). What was subsection (c) has now become subsection (b).

Mr. MALONEY. I understand.

Mr. OVERTON. And then the other amendments follow. When we get through with what the Senator has in his hand in the printed form the Connecticut River Basin projects will then come up to be voted upon.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wyoming yield to me, to permit me to ask a question?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Certainly.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Will there be a separate vote on the Souris River project?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I have no objection to having a separate vote on any particular items which may appear in the bill.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. The Senator has been reading from a private copy of his own. If the Senator can advise me where in the amendment the Souris River project appears, I should be very much obliged, because it is my intention to vote against the Souris River project and, if it is included in the bill, to vote against the bill.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I shall be very glad to point that out to the Senator. If one of the pages will hand a printed copy to the Senator from Missouri, he will find the authorization on page 10 of the printed report, beginning in line 7, and going through line 19 on page 11. That is the language which authorizes the integrated report.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, if I may be permitted to make a suggestion to the Senator from Missouri, let me say

that the Souris River question can easily be disposed of in a separate amendment which I presume the Senator from Missouri has in contemplation, and that would be to make another subsection, when we finish the O'Mahoney subsection.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I do not wish to interfere with the consideration of this very important matter, of course.

Mr. OVERTON. That subsection would be as follows, in effect: "Nothing herein shall be construed as authorizing a divergence of water from the Missouri River Basin to any other basin."

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. That is exactly what I had in mind.

In other words, Mr. President, if the Senator from Wyoming will permit me to speak for just a moment, the whole controversy, which started with the consideration of the wrong bill, in my opinion, commenced with the consideration of a river and harbor bill. It has had to do with priority of water in the Missouri Valley Basin. Senators from the irrigation States have contended that they were entitled to priority, and Senators from some other States have contended that they were entitled to some water for navigation.

Into an integrated plan which adjusts the differences between the irrigation States and the navigation States, if I may use those terms, there is now injected the proposition of diverting water from one watershed to another. I do not think that should be included in any sort of an agreement.

I am perfectly willing to agree with the irrigation States. I am anxious to compromise their differences. But I say when it comes to navigation, while under this agreement we are yielding to the irrigation States rights which we thought we had, I am not willing to yield them to different watersheds.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I appreciate the attitude of the Senator from Missouri, and I say to him that he can handle that matter by offering an amendment to section 9 (a).

Mr. AUSTIN rose.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, as one of the authors of the amendment about which the Senator from Wyoming has been talking, it is my understanding that the paragraph read, relating to page 10 of the bill, is a substitute for paragraph (b) in the amendment which is on the same subject. If it is not, that will make a great difference in my attitude toward the whole amendment.

Senators will notice on page 5 that the Connecticut River Basin is one of the subjects of consideration in paragraph (b), and that the paragraph beginning with line 3 and ending with line 7 relates to modifications of authorizations made years before. These are the subject of the separate amendment which has been read by the Senator from Wyoming.

If it is appropriate for a coauthor of an amendment such as this one, which undertakes to cover territory on both sides of the meridian, to do so, I would insist upon having this paragraph come in as a substitute for the first paragraph (b) in the amendment. I very strongly desire to have it come in that order of consideration.

I know that the rights of the Senator apply, and I am not running counter to them. But I should like to have this subject considered in its order in the amendment, and not have it put off until after all the rest of the controversy which is being discussed is settled. This is a part of the whole policy, and it should take its place as one in the amendment. I do not like to have special discrimination made with respect to this part of the amendment. I earnestly request the Senator from Wyoming to keep this subject in the same order in which it appears in this joint amendment.

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, as one of the Senators hostile to the proposal of the Senator from Vermont, I urge the Senator from Wyoming to accept the suggestion.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, the situation can easily be described, I think. The Senator from Vermont perhaps did not overhear the conversation between the Senator from Louisiana and myself. When I undertook a few moments ago to explain the various amendments, I stated that it was my understanding that there had been substantial agreement between us and the distinguished senior Senator from Louisiana. He immediately took the floor and said that he had not agreed to the provision with respect to the Connecticut River Basin. While he did not agree with some of the things which I had said with respect to other sections of the amendment, he wanted a separate vote upon that particular matter.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. In order to clear the situation somewhat, will the Senator from Wyoming tell us what the Senator from Louisiana did agree to? I understood earlier in the day that he had agreed to an amendment which would take care of the Connecticut River situation.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That was my understanding.

Mr. AIKEN. The Senator now says that no such agreement was made. I should like to know to what the Senator from Louisiana did agree, and in whose behalf the agreement was made.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, the Senator from Louisiana may speak for himself.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Do I correctly understand that the amendment known as the O'Mahoney amendment deals with a new policy affecting flood control in the future?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Yes; to the extent that it would grant an opportunity to affected States to participate in the planning of projects before being submitted.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. But the amendment is not intended to apply to provisions in the pending bill, or to an authorization heretofore made for flood control.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The original proposal contained two paragraphs, one of which dealt with projects to be planned in the future, and the other with projects already planned and authorized, but with reference to which there was some objection upon the part of affected States. With the exception of the controversy affecting the Connecticut River Valley, all the controversies have apparently been settled.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Is it not a fact that the proposed amendment is in the nature of a repeal of an authorization already made?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. So far as the Connecticut River basin is concerned, the amendment is in effect a provision for a review of the projects.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. The Senator is correct. In other words, the amendment would prevent the appropriation requested in the pending bill being made to carry out an authorization already determined upon and settled by the Congress.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Yes; until reviewed on behalf of the State of Vermont.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Yes. Are there in the pending bill any projects, other than the one referred to, as to which a review would be permitted by the States affected?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The others have all been taken up.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. So we are now dealing with what I choose to call a new policy, or a new right of States which they have not before had, and at the same time we are seeking to annul action heretofore taken in the case of flood control in the Connecticut River Valley?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Will the Senator pardon me? I did not clearly understand the last part of his statement.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. While we are proposing to give an additional right to the States to review flood-control projects affecting the area of the States involved, the amendment which the Senator last read, and which relates to the Connecticut River Valley, seeks in fact to provide a review of the only proposal in the bill which is based on a previous authorization.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. No; the Senator is not entirely correct. The amendment deals with certain specified sites in the State of Vermont. It should be pointed out that the authorization, if granted, would affect at least 33 different sites. At least, that is what I have been told. I believe that this amendment deals with only 5 of them.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. As indicated by the Senator's amendment, if the bill, as reported by the committee, were enacted, the flood-control projects in the Connecticut River Valley would proceed without any review of them being made by the States. Is that statement not correct?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. If the amendment should be agreed to——

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. It is proposed to prevent the procedure to

which I have referred, to nullify the report of the committee, and to subject this one project in the Connecticut River Valley to the review provided for in the general amendment.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator's statement is too broad, because the amendment deals only with certain dams.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. But they are a part of a larger authorization, and an included authorization which has already been granted by the Congress. Am I not correct?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Yes.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. In other words, the amendment would nullify a part of a previous authorization by permitting a review with reference to one or two dams?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Precisely. The amendment provides a modification, but it does not defeat flood control in the Connecticut River Basin because the language provides specifically for the construction of a retention type of dam not to exceed an elevation of 415 feet, Sandy Hook datum.

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I am very glad to yield.

Mr. MALONEY. I should like to point out to the Senator from Massachusetts that this language would in effect repeal existing law. It would do more than provide for a review. It would provide that if the Governor of the State of Vermont, for example, did not like the situation after a review had been made, we would not be able to obtain the flood control until Congress had again acted upon the matter. So the language would amount to a repeal of the law; that is the language as I last saw it.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I may say that the purpose of the amendment is to give to the people of Vermont, whose property is to be taken for the benefit of the States bordering on the Connecticut River, an opportunity to be heard in the matter of whether their property should be taken from them, removed from taxation, and destroyed. The reason for the amendment is that the people of Vermont have had no opportunity to be heard. No hearings have been held in connection with the entire situation in Vermont so that the people of that State could be heard. There is one exception to that statement. I believe that one hearing was held in Bellows Falls in 1939. The people of the communities affected do not know whether they are to be flooded out by dams to be constructed for one purpose or another. The purpose of the amendment is to give them an opportunity to be heard and to present their side of the case. They should be given an opportunity to show alternate sites which might be made available for flood control purposes, and to show why their property should not be destroyed. We have not had an opportunity to be heard up to the present time.

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, do I have the floor?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut has the floor.

Mr. MALONEY. I wish to ask questions, and since the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee is on his feet I shall first ask him whether the people of Vermont have had a chance to be heard.

Mr. OVERTON. The people of Vermont have had an opportunity to be heard.

Mr. MALONEY. Were they heard?

Mr. OVERTON. They were heard before the subcommittee of which I was chairman.

Mr. MALONEY. It seems to me, Mr. President, that the people of Vermont have not only had an opportunity to be heard, but have been heard on more than one occasion. I wish that my State might always have the representation which Vermont, through its two able Senators, has had in connection with this problem.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MALONEY. I am very glad to yield.

Mr. OVERTON. I should like to ask the Senator from Wyoming in what order he is presenting his amendments. I will preface that statement by saying that whatever he has read, or proposes to read, is agreeable to me as contained in the printed amendment as modified.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Will the Senator permit an interruption?

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, I have the floor, and I should like to hear the conversation.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, what I am proposing to do is to safeguard the opportunity of every Member of the Senate to have his say and to have his voice heard. I would not come to the floor of the Senate with any proposal which would deny a Senator such an opportunity. If Senators will be good enough to allow me to proceed, I think they will find that the safeguard which I am proposing will be afforded.

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, I am quite willing that the Senator should proceed now and I will yield the floor to him; but before doing so I should like to caution him that, in my judgment, he jeopardizes his own proposal, because this Vermont idea is an entirely new procedure, and, if the proposal prevailed, it would destroy existing law, and in my judgment, if we had another flood it would keep open the flood gates in northern New England and probably create, as it has in the past on more than one occasion, very great damage and loss of life in the States south of Vermont.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, ample opportunity will be afforded to develop that point.

Now let me offer the amendment as now phrased. Mr. President, I offer on behalf of the sponsors an amendment reading as follows:

In connection with the exercise of jurisdiction over the rivers of the Nation through the construction of works of improvement, for navigation or flood control, as herein authorized, it is hereby declared to be the policy of the Congress to recognize the interests and rights of the States in determining the development of the watersheds within their borders and likewise their interests and rights in water utilization and control, as herein authorized to preserve and protect to the fullest possible extent established and potential uses, for all purposes, of the waters of the Nation's rivers; to facilitate the consideration of projects on a basis of comprehensive and coordinated development; and to limit the authorization and construction of navigation works to those in which a substantial benefit to navigation will be realized therefrom and which can be operated consistently with appropriate and economic use of the waters of such rivers by other users.

Mr. President, I move the adoption of that amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY].

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, this is merely a declaration of policy. It does not affect the Connecticut River Valley and it does not affect the diversion of water in the Missouri River Basin, which are the only two matters now in controversy.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, I should like to observe that last week we debated here for a whole day the first paragraph of the bill as reported from the committee, at which time the distinguished Senator from Kentucky, the majority leader [Mr. BARKLEY], and the distinguished junior Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] insisted that that was an effort on the part of this Congress to bind future Congresses, and at which time the Senator from Louisiana and myself insisted that one Congress could not bind the next Congress, and indeed one Congress could not bind itself for a week in the future. I simply desire to observe that I have no objection to the declaration of policy proposed by the distinguished Senator from Wyoming on behalf of himself and a number of his colleagues, but it makes more or less ridiculous the contention of the distinguished Senator from Kentucky that the declaration of policy reported by the committee was an attempt to bind future Congresses.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, the Senator from Missouri perhaps did not hear my reading of the words "as herein authorized." Of course, it is quite true that no Congress can bind a future Congress.

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. MALONEY. The Senator has made a motion that the Senate adopt certain language on pages 1 and 2, and I am assuming that he is going to make separate motions as to various other proposals. Before permitting the Senate to act on this particular one, I should like to ask the Senator one or two questions. Will the Senator tell us whether or not in his judgment this language would change existing law?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. No; I will say it is a declaration of policy.

Mr. MALONEY. Then, I want to ask the Senator this question, if I may:

Does he think that this would give the States any additional power or authority or influence than they have under existing law?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. It is a declaration of policy to recognize the rights of the States——

Mr. MALONEY. I understand that.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. And it is preliminary to paragraph (a) which I shall offer in just a moment, and which does write into law a policy with respect to cooperation in the drafting of plans, which the States do not now have. To that extent it is in addition to existing law.

Mr. MALONEY. So it would change existing law, in the opinion of the Senator?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That is correct.

Mr. MALONEY. I want to call that statement to the attention of Members of the Senate, because, if I understand the view of the Senator from Wyoming, and his attempt in this instance, this language coupled with language which is to follow, if he is correct, would give the governors of certain States a veto power over flood control.

Mr. President, I have on many occasions stood on the floor of the Senate, oftentimes following the leadership and joining in the effort of the Senator from Wyoming, to protect the rights of the States. I am just as anxious—as anxious, I think, as anyone else could be—to keep the States free, and their rights from final extinction, but I have long since concluded that we cannot have States' rights to the degree which is desired by the Senator from Wyoming and at the same time have flood control.

I happen to live in a maritime State. What chance have we to protect ourselves against the ravages of floods if a State in northern New England can veto flood-control projects which must be constructed in that tier of States in order to protect our farm lands and our cities and the lives of our people? Such a condition could exist throughout the whole country if the original purpose of the distinguished Senator from Wyoming prevailed. I know that he is acting in all sincerity; I know that there is no more conscientious Member of the Senate than he, but I am fearful that in reaching out to help in the accomplishment of the aims of the distinguished Senator from Vermont he might imperil the seacoast and other States throughout this country, the States which need flood control. I am very hopeful, because he has so readily and sincerely admitted the purpose of this amendment that it will be defeated.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wyoming yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Wyoming yield to the Senator from Louisiana?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. OVERTON. I should like to assure the Senator from Connecticut and the Senate that there is no provision in the O'Mahoney amendment as presently offered, and as will hereafter be presented, that vests any veto power in the Governor of any State. There is no veto provision in it whatsoever. That has been eliminated entirely.

Mr. MALONEY. I understand; but the Senator from Wyoming just stated, in answer to my question, that this would change the law, if adopted in connection with additional and following language to be inserted in the proposed amendment.

Mr. OVERTON. It does not vest any power of veto in the Governor of any State whatsoever, and when Congress shall have acted upon it it will be final, unless Congress itself should hereafter in its own discretion repeal the law.

Mr. MALONEY. I disagree with the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, who has worked so hard for this legislation over the years, and for whom I have so much admiration, but I would rather have the word, in this instance, of the Senator from Wyoming as to what the amendment would do, and he has already admitted that it would make a fundamental change in existing policy.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I did not intend to burden the Senate today with any extended discussion of this amendment, but the statement which has just been made by the Senator from Connecticut impels me to state to the Senate my belief that we are dealing here with one of the most fundamental of all questions which are arising in the United States today. If we believe in the preservation of the rights of individuals to have an opportunity to say what shall be done with their property, with their economic existence, with their very lives, we must find the way to coordinate individual and local rights with these vast projects which are now possible because of the tremendous advance of engineering. I feel very deeply that what we are doing here today coincides with the fundamental philosophy of the Senator from Connecticut. I feel that the Senator is fearful of conditions which are not likely to arise at all.

Let me call the attention of the Senator and the Senate to the fact that there has been a controversy affecting the whole Missouri Valley, involving the Army engineers upon the one hand and the Bureau of Reclamation upon the other. Each one at the outset was fearful that the other was seeking to gain control over activities within the scope of the other.

The Army engineers had a plan for the development of the Missouri Basin. It dealt primarily with navigation and flood control, with incidental power. The Bureau of Reclamation had a plan for the Missouri Valley which dealt primarily with irrigation and reclamation. I felt from the very outset that it would be possible for these two agencies and their engineers to sit down together and to draw a plan by which the waters of that valley could be used to conserve the interests of everybody living in the valley; that it could be developed so as to protect irrigation and reclamation, so as to provide for the development of public power, so as to provide for all feasible and possible and desirable navigation, and so as to provide complete flood control. Finally, Mr. President, at the urging of the President of the United States and at the urging of Members of this body who have been cooperating in this amendment, the engineers did get together, and they did agree upon a plan.

I say to the Senator from Connecticut that, in my judgment, the people of Connecticut and the people of Massachusetts will find no difficulty whatsoever in working out with the people and the public officials of the State of Vermont a completely feasible plan which will protect flood control in Connecticut and Massachusetts.

Mr. MALONEY. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Certainly.

Mr. MALONEY. Let me say, first, that three times we have had fatal floods in Connecticut, and when the Senator from Wyoming suggests that we need not anticipate trouble, I should like to know what creates that feeling in his mind, when we have already on more than one occasion suffered millions upon millions of dollars of property loss and loss of life.

I should like to say further to the Senator from Wyoming, who says that the people should be heard on these important issues, that they are being heard through their Congress; and, so far as the Senate is concerned, the people of Connecticut must be heard through my distinguished colleague the junior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DANAHER] and myself.

I should like to have the matter handled the way the Senator from Wyoming would do it. The New England Governors had a plan. They tried to create a flood-control compact which would have kept unto themselves the various phases of this program mentioned by the Senator from Wyoming. That, too, was encouraged by the President of the United States, and we went to work and formed a plan; it was a good plan, it came here, and the Senate accepted it. But it went to another body, and it has not been possible to get it out. So, as a representative of the State of Connecticut charged with the responsibility, in this instance, of affording proper protection of the people of my State, I take the only avenue open.

As I have said, I should like to see the matter handled in these other ways, which would afford a preservation and protection of States' rights, but the Congress of the United States has said no. It has laid down a program, it has established a policy, and because this is the only avenue I have, I am going to resist the proposal of the distinguished Senators from Vermont, as they make it through the amendment of the Senator from Wyoming.

I should like to cooperate with Vermont, I should like to see the matter worked out as they would have it. I should like to believe, and I think I do believe, that they could with the Army engineers come to an understanding, that the matter could be rearranged; but it is going to be too late, insofar as my State is concerned, if they erase the existing law, if they deny us the right or deny the Federal Government the right to build these already authorized projects on the streams of Vermont; and that is what this proposal would do.

I can understand the position of those people in Vermont, the comparatively few people who would be affected by the dam which has caused such great consternation. I can quite understand it. Under the existing situation Vermont gets very little, if any, benefit, and I think we should go as far as we can to afford them some benefit for the sacrifices, if there are sacrifices, they are called upon to make. But, Mr. President, if this Vermont amendment prevails, we go back to the last writing of a law on this subject, we take it all out, we destroy any chance for early flood-control work in the Connecticut River Basin, and in my judgment it would be a great mistake, a very great mistake, for the Senate to adopt the proposal.

I should like to see a compromise. I think probably that with the Army engineers, who have latitude, who have a right to make modifications, the people of Vermont might work the matter out, but I hope the Senate will not wipe it out by the adoption of the proposed language.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, there is nothing in the provision which is now before the Senate which in any way modifies the Connecticut River Basin project. It is merely a declaration of policy, and it is a declaration of policy which has been pursued from time immemorial by the Army engineers. It merely declares:

> It is hereby declared to be the policy of Congress to recognize the interests and rights of the States in determining the development of the watersheds within their borders and likewise their interests and rights in water utilization and control, as herein authorized to preserve and protect to the fullest possible extent established and potential uses, for all purposes, of the waters of the Nation's rivers; to facilitate the consideration of projects on a basis of comprehensive and coordinated development.

And so forth.

Mr. President, that has always been the policy of the Army engineers, and there is not a Senator on this floor who can point to any project which has ever been recommended by the Army engineers or authorized by the Congress which militates against the policy herein proposed.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield?

Mr. OVERTON. I yield.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Of course, the Senator from Louisiana realizes that, in its first modified form as offered in the Committee on Commerce by the distinguished Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ROBERTSON], the O'Mahoney amendment—I call it the O'Mahoney amendment, although I understand it was sponsored by a very large number of Senators—did actually contain authority for the Governors of the States at the headwaters of one of these great rivers to prohibit any improvement of any sort at the other end of the river. In other words, in the judgment of the Senator from Louisiana, and in the judgment of myself, it would have permitted the Governor of Montana or the Governor of Wyoming absolutely to prohibit, on his own ipse dixit, an improvement of the jetties at the mouth of the Mississippi River, and both the Senator from Louisiana and I very violently opposed that.

Mr. OVERTON. And it was eliminated.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. It was decisively defeated in the committee, and I would not vote for the amendment if that had not been eliminated.

Mr. OVERTON. It has been wholly eliminated.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. It seems to me the objection raised by the Senator from Connecticut has been met by the correction which has been made. It is a criticism which applies very justly to the first and second versions of the O'Mahoney amendment, but does not apply to the present version.

Mr. OVERTON. It has been completely obliterated, and there exists no right of veto in any Governor.

The next provision submitted by the Senator from Wyoming in subsection (a) also provides for everything that has heretofore been done by the Army engineers, with one exception, and that is, it provides that objections made by the Governor of a State shall be submitted in writing to the Chief of Engineers, and those objections shall be incorporated in any report he submits to the Congress. That is the only change. But the Army engineers have always consulted local interests. They have consulted State agencies from the very inception of a project on up to its final recommendation by the Chief of Engineers.

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. OVERTON. I yield.

Mr. MALONEY. The Senator was present I think and heard the Senator from Wyoming say that he felt that the adoption of this language coupled with the language later appearing in the amendment would change the present policy?

Mr. OVERTON. Would suggest a veto power?

Mr. MALONEY. Would change the present flood-control policy of the Government. Did the Senator hear that language?

Mr. OVERTON. No; I did not hear that statement, but I will not question it.

Mr. MALONEY. The Senator from Wyoming, if I correctly understood him, did say that.

Mr. OVERTON. Whether he did or did not, it does not change the policy that has been pursued by our Government and by the Army engineers ever since I have had anything at all to do with flood-control legislation, and that has been about 12 or 13 years. They have always consulted local interests. They never have deprived any State of water that it needs. They have always looked after local uses and they have always consulted local authorities before submitting any report. This language simply puts in form what they have always undertaken to do. Therefore, there is no change of policy and there is not the slightest suggestion of a veto. That has been eliminated entirely from the O'Mahoney amendment.

Mr. MALONEY. I understand that. I felt that was the case, and I so said earlier, but in answer to my inquiry the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], the sponsor and the author of the amendment, disagreed. He said it does change the policy.

Mr. OVERTON. Well, I do not know in what connection it does change it.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. OVERTON. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. Do I correctly understand the Senator from Louisiana to say that the engineers consult the local authorities before putting dams into their programs?

Mr. OVERTON. They have always done so, so far as I know.

Mr. AIKEN. I wish to say that that may have been true in the Senator's section of the country, but it certainly has not been true in New England. When the Senator from Connecticut stated that the people had a chance to be heard at a hearing, through their Senators, that was perfectly correct, but when they do not have a chance to be heard is when dams are being planned for their communities, and when the first they know about the matter is after the dams are already written into the program. I was Governor of Vermont 4 years, and just once was I ever consulted about any proposed dams. That was when a dam was partly finished, and they wished to modify the contract in some way, and then I had to be consulted. But they did not consult the local people.

I will make one exception. In 1939 they had one hearing at Bellows Falls on the West River Dam when local people were permitted to appear. After that hearing the site of the dam was moved several miles and the local people were not notified about it, they knew nothing about it until they saw the engineers working there taking their soundings in the rock about a year ago. I must say that local authorities are not notified or consulted in any way in my section of the country.

Mr. OVERTON. Does the Senator object then to a provision that does require them to consult the local authorities?

Mr. AIKEN. I think they ought to be required to consult them before a dam is written into the program.

Mr. OVERTON. Very well. That is what this language provides.

Mr. AIKEN. I agree that the people have a chance to be heard through their Members of Congress after the dam is already written into the program, but not before.

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. MALONEY. The Senator knows that they do have a chance to be heard before the dam is constructed. The Senator knows that if he notifies the Army engineers that he wants a hearing to be held on any proposed project in any area, the hearing will be arranged.

Mr. AIKEN. But when no one knows that the project is contemplated, how can notice be served that a hearing is desired to be held?

Mr. MALONEY. The Senator can arrange tomorrow, in a blanket request, to have hearings on every project in his State, even though they are yet unborn,

simply by sending notice to the Army engineers.

Mr. AIKEN. I am not saying what can be done in the future. I am saying what has been done in the past, and I know that no one has taken a stand more in favor of the local people having a right to be heard than has the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. MALONEY. That is correct, and they have been heard in my State.

Mr. AIKEN. I should like to quote from a speech made on the Senate floor——

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, before the Senator does that, will he yield to me?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. OVERTON. The Senator stated that while he was Governor of Vermont he was never consulted with respect to any project that was being built by the Army engineers. Was there any project of flood control built by the Government while the Senator was Governor of Vermont except a project built by the C. C. C. on the Winooski River?

Mr. AIKEN. Yes; one.

Mr. OVERTON. The Army engineers had nothing to do with the project on the Winooski River. There was no occasion to consult with the Army engineers with respect to that project.

Mr. AIKEN. The Army engineers did plan to construct one dam while I was Governor. The engineers never notified me with respect to it. They never notified any State officials about it until they found they had to relocate the highway, and then they notified the highway department that they would have to move the road. That was the first notification we ever had.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] inserting at the proper place lines 1 to 4, on page 1, down to and including line 13, on page 2, of the printed amendment intended to be proposed by him, setting forth a declaration of policy.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Mr. President, I wish to make an observation or two in reference to some features of the discussion which has taken place here today. The United States Government can walk into any city in the country, even in peacetime, and take one-quarter or one-half of all its water front for the building of a navy yard, and the local authorities have nothing to say about it. Even in time of peace, and not as a war measure, the United States Government repeatedly goes into communities and takes large portions of those communities for cantonments and for development of Army and Navy stations. It does so both in time of peace and in time of war. I know that in some communities in my State two-thirds of their areas have been confiscated because of the military need of defending our country. Very appropriately has flood control been under the control of the Army, because flood control affects human life. The war against flood is a war inside our own land. It is a war against the destruction of property and the destruction of human life.

The Government cannot take land for a naval base without representatives of the Government appearing before the Committee on Naval Affairs and having a hearing on the matter. A flood-control project cannot be initiated without the Army engineers holding hearings on the subject. Representatives of the Army engineers come before the committees of Congress, and hearings are held in both the House and the Senate respecting the wisdom and the propriety and the necessity for taking the property in question and damming streams in order to save human life and to promote and protect navigation.

It seems to me that we ought to realize that we are dealing with something perhaps even more vital than the preparation for national defense, that is, preparation for defense of life and property here at home. We ought not to go to extremes because of the fact that a given community has been opposed to a particular dam or is opposing the use of a particular site, which opposition, if successful, would result in thwarting the purpose for which the project is intended, that is, the control of floods and the prevention of the awful damage resulting from floods.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I should like to ask the Senator from Massachusetts if it is not a fact that the State of Massachusetts and every other State by law gives its consent to the acquisition of land by the Federal Government for post offices, docks, navy yards, and that representatives of the Government come to the Senator's committee to obtain authorization for the money needed for the project, not for authorization to take the land, which has already been granted by the State.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Under the Constitution the Federal Government has the right to take the land from the States for the purposes enumerated.

Mr. AIKEN. But each State has a law—and I am sure the State of Massachusetts has one—providing that it may grant its consent to the Federal Government to acquire land for the purposes which the Senator has mentioned.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. For defense purposes, that is true.

Mr. AIKEN. Some of the States have in their laws the words "other needful buildings," which, according to the Supreme Court interpretation, may mean almost anything for which the Federal Government may want the land.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. I believe attempts have been made to include dams in the word "buildings."

Mr. AIKEN. That is true.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. The Senator suggested that no hearing was held in Vermont, but he will recall that when he was Governor he and I discussed this same project in an effort to reconcile the various groups in New England.

Mr. AIKEN. If at the time I had been Governor matters had been left to the Senator from Massachusetts and myself, the question would have been settled satisfactorily a long time ago. The State of Vermont would not have suffered any serious damage, and the people of Massachusetts would have had protection.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. I appreciate the compliment.

Mr. WEEKS. Mr. President, it seems to me that some misapprehensions should be cleared up. Some Senators may have gained the impression that this is a new subject, insofar as the Connecticut River Valley is concerned. After the flood of 1927, which was very disastrous in Massachusetts and Connecticut, the engineers began to study methods of alleviating the suffering and loss of life and property occasioned by the floods which for years have been ravaging that valley.

I should like to point out, Mr. President, that in discussing the Connecticut River Valley we are not discussing irrigation or reclamation. We are not discussing power. We are discussing nothing but flood control, as specified in the terms of the bill reported by the committee.

Commencing after the 1927 flood the engineers studied 275 different sites for dams to protect the lower valley of the Connecticut River. They finally settled upon a project involving 20 dams and dykes on the lower river. Those dams would, if erected, take care of 25 percent of the drainage area of the whole Connecticut River Valley, and would take about 6 feet off the peak of the flood in the lower Connecticut Valley. At first the States of New Hampshire, Vermont, Connecticut, and Massachusetts attempted to make a compact, but in 1938, by the act of that year, the United States took over the administration of flood control, and the procedure from that point on was for the Federal Government to take care of flood control in toto. So the compact idea went overboard at that time.

In 1938 this project was established and agreed upon. The project involved 20 dams to take care of flood control in the Connecticut Valley. In effect, the project was reaffirmed in 1941, in the act of that year. So I may say, Mr. President, that for the past 6 years and prior to that time, in all the discussions among the States involved, every one of the four States which I have mentioned, namely, Connecticut, Massachusetts, Vermont, and New Hampshire, has been thoroughly acquainted with the situation and the necessity for doing something. Not only were the State officials acquainted with the problem, but also the people were familiar with it. For 10 or 12 years past we have all been fully acquainted with the situation.

Twice, in the act of 1938 and the act of 1941, a policy was established; and now, as I see it, with respect to the established policy of the Federal Government looking toward adequate flood control in the Connecticut Valley, by this amendment the clock would be turned backward, and in effect we would have to start all over again.

I wish to point out that in an 11-year period we had three disastrous floods, involving great loss of life, and a property

loss, direct and indirect, amounting to nearly $150,000,000. In my judgment any attempt at this time to turn the clock back and to make the States of Massachusetts and Connecticut start all over again on flood control will be very injurious to a situation which has been so troublous and so disastrous to the people of the lower Connecticut Valley.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, let me say just a word about the first paragraph of the O'Mahoney amendment. It ought to be adopted, even though it should change the law in reversal, because all it lacks for is the doctrine of cooperation between the Federal Government and the States. If there is any ground upon which we can all unite with respect to the general policy of government in the United States, it is the ground of cooperation. Many times we in Congress are vexed by the fact that two governments exist upon every foot of land in this country. Each State has two governments to obey, and two loyalties to keep. Occasionally those governments are found in conflict; and the conflict comes before us in the Senate to be resolved upon a specific issue. We are troubled by it many times. We are troubled to distinguish between that which belongs to the Federal Government and that which belongs to the State government. Often we become divided, I think without reason, for it is the purpose of every Senator to serve the welfare of the whole. That is the main objective.

The reason why we have insisted upon preserving the Federal system, with State autonomy well protected against encroachment by an ever-growing Central Government, is that we have learned by experience that that type of government has outlived any other type of government in the world, and has been successful in preserving the common welfare. This is the oldest Government in the world, in terms of having existed unchanged for the longest period of time.

Now we are entering upon a very important period of our political history, and both great parties, during the past few years, at least, have declared the purpose not to change from the Federal system into an enormous national system which attempts to cover the whole country by a horizontal obligation.

When we undertake the control of waters, we are immediately confronted by the question to which I have referred, because every great river basin in the United States is different from the others. Among other questions which arise is the question of rights. I do not like to talk about rights; yet we may have to do so before we are through with this debate.

Of course, we must consider the question of the desires of the people, the will of the people. We, with our enormous power, should not override the will of the people in any river basin. If such basins have characteristics which are geological, or otherwise, which make their problem peculiar, should we not give due regard to the wishes of those people in devising our plan for them? Oh, Mr. President, I think that is a perfectly reasonable thing.

All that section 1 does is to write into law, to crystallize it in black and white, that we are about to declare a policy of cooperation between the Federal Government and the State governments on the subject of flood control. That is all the paragraph does.

The discussion of the Connecticut River Basin and its peculiar problems has not been reached, for the paragraph we are now considering relates to the whole United States, and declares a great principle. When it says, "To facilitate the consideration of projects on a basis of comprehensive and cooperative development," it declares a great principle. It is one upon which we can unite, and we can avoid the appearance of always being in a fight with the Federal Government in order to have a chance to present our view. It is a very uncomfortable thing for me as a Senator to appear in the Committee on Commerce or in a subcommittee of it and to seem to be in opposition to the views of the Army engineers. I should be there cooperating as fully as possible, but I cannot do so when I have never before had a chance to act, because they had not crystallized a plan and submitted it. Until then I cannot act effectively, and your committee cannot do so. Your committee cannot act because it has not had before it the wishes or the views of the people.

I now hold in my hand a design for one of these river valleys comprehending 8 different sites, instead of one, and protecting our friends and neighbors almost as much as the single high dam would protect them. I shall point that out in detail later.

But as for the principle of cooperation, it is wholesome, and we should unanimously adopt the first paragraph.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MAYBANK in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] inserting at the proper place the language contained in the printed amendments on page 1, down to and including line 12 on page 2, setting out a declaration of policy.

Mr. WEEKS. Mr. President, I understand that we are about to vote on the first paragraph of the so-called O'Mahoney amendment. Is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The vote about to be taken will be on that part of the amendment setting forth a declaration of policy.

Mr. WEEKS. Down to line 13?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Down to line 12.

The question is on agreeing to that portion of the amendment. [Putting the question.]

As it appears to the Chair, the "ayes" have it, and that portion of the amendment is agreed to.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I now offer the amendment which appears in the printed amendments, beginning in line 13 on page 2, and including all of page 3, and all of page 4 down to and including line 20. It is what is known as subparagraph (a).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. At the proper place in the bill it is proposed to insert the following:

In conformity with this policy:

(a) Plans, proposals, or reports of the Chief of Engineers, War Department, for any works of improvement for navigation or flood control not heretofore or herein authorized, shall be submitted to the Congress only upon compliaice with the provisions of this paragraph (a). Investigations which form the basis of any such plans, proposals, or reports shall be conducted in such a manner as to give to the affected State or States, during the course of the investigations, information developed by the investigations and also opportunity for consultation regarding plans and proposals, and, to the extent deemed practicable by the Chief of Engineers, opportunity to cooperate in the investigations. If such investigations in whole or part are concerned with the use or control of waters arising west of the ninety-seventh meridian, the Chief of Engineers shall give to the Secretary of the Interior, during the course of the investigations, information developed by the investigations and also opportunity for consultation regarding plans and proposals, and to the extent deemed practicable by the Chief of Engineers, opportunity to cooperate in the investigations. The relations of the Chief of Engineers with any State under this paragraph (a) shall be with the Governor of the State or such official or agency of the State as the Governor may designate. The term "affected State or States" shall include those in which the works or any part thereof are proposed to be located; those which in whole or part are both within the drainage basin involved and situated in a State lying wholly or in part west of the ninety-eighth meridian; and such of those which are east of the ninety-eighth meridian as, in the judgment of the Chief of Engineers, will be substantially affected. Such plans, proposals, or reports and related investigations shall be made to the end, among other things, of facilitating the coordination of plans for the construction and operation of the proposed works with other plans involving the waters which would be used or controlled by such proposed works. Each report submitting any such plans or proposals to the Congress shall set out therein, among other things, the relationship between the plans for construction and operation of the proposed works and the plans, if any, submitted by the affected States and by the Secretary of the Interior. The Chief of Engineers shall transmit a copy of his proposed report to each affected State, and, in case the plans or proposals covered by the report are concerned with the use or control of waters which rise in whole or in part west of the ninety-seventh meridian, to the Secretary of the Interior. Within ninety days from the date of receipt of said proposed report, the written views and recommendations of each affected State and of the Secretary of the Interior may be submitted to the Chief of Engineers. The Secretary of War shall transmit to the Congress, with such comments and recommendations as he deems appropriate, the proposed report together with the submitted views and recommendations of affected States and of the Secretary of the Interior. The Secretary of War may prepare and make said transmittal any time following said ninety-day period. The letter of transmittal and its attachments shall be printed as a House or Senate document.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, there is no objection to that amendment.

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, I should like to ask a question regarding the amendment. As originally drawn, the entire amendment made provision that the interested parties outside the Federal Government could hold up the projects until the Federal Government accepted their plan or the matter needed to go back to Congress again. Is there any provision in this language which would enable any State to hold up a project for further action by the Congress?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Oh, no.

Mr. MALONEY. I thank the Senator.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. We have been very careful about that.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, in view of the fact that the senior Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN] a moment ago pointed out that the Connecticut River Basin provision is a substitute for what was originally in the O'Mahoney amendment, and in order that the matter may be determined, I now offer the following amendment:

On page 10 of the bill, strike out lines 3 to 7, inclusive, and insert:

"Nothing in this act or in any previous authorization shall be construed to authorize the construction of a dam, other than a retention type dam, not to exceed elevation 415 Sandy Hook datum on the main stream of the West River in the towns of Dummerston or Newfane in the State of Vermont. Plans, proposals, or reports heretofore authorized for construction at Cambridgeport, Ludlow, South Tunbridge, and Gaysville, in the Connecticut River Basin, or any modification of the comprehensive plan for the Connecticut River Basin in Vermont heretofore made under authority of the Flood Control Act of June 28, 1938, or heretofore made under authority of section 3 of the Flood Control Act approved August 18, 1941, shall not be carried out until after compliance with the provisions of paragraph (a) of section — of this act."

The paragraph (a) to which reference is made in the amendment is the paragraph (a) which has just been adopted.

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, I am misled by the words "Sandy Hook." Is the point from which the elevation is measured Sandy Hook, N. Y.?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I shall ask the Senator from Vermont to explain that.

Mr. AUSTIN. I understand it to be the datum employed by the Army Engineers as the basis of stating the elevation of dams for our neighborhood.

Mr. MALONEY. Is it 415 feet above sea level at Sandy Hook?

Mr. AUSTIN. I do not know that. It is an arbitrary datum.

Mr. AIKEN. I am sure it is.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, that is my understanding. Sea level at Sandy Hook is the base from which elevations are taken.

Mr. MALONEY. Is the reference to Sandy Hook, N. Y.; Sandy Hook, Conn.; Sandy Hook, Vt.; or any other Sandy Hook?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I assume that Sandy Hook, N. Y., is meant. At any rate, it is a word of art which is understood by the engineers.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. In view of the fact that the amendment has been read by its author, it will not be read at the desk.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY].

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, the pending amendment is the one which would do violence to my State, and it might well establish a precedent which would do harm to any other State under similar circumstances. The amendment is a new one. It was never considered by the committee. It came to the Senate only this afternoon. It would upset a program heretofore established. It might wipe out all the projects already planned. In my judgment it would destroy the aim and the effort of the Army engineers and of others who are or who have been affected by the dangers of floods in the lower part of New England.

There may be some Senators who have never seen a serious flood. But I have seen the waters roar in my State. During one of the serious floods there, one was able to go into a leading hotel in Hartford by boat. Millions and millians of dollars' worth of damage was done to the cities of that State. Farms were destroyed. Livestock on the farms was destroyed. Many lives were lost.

The adoption of this language, should another flood come, would permit the roaring waters again to destroy lives and property in the maritime State whence I come.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MALONEY. I yield.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Would it not also nullify the $17,000,000 already spent on flood control by the Federal Government, which is only a small part of the program?

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, I do not know whether it would nullify the $17,000,000, but if a flood the like of which we earlier had should occur, we would be denied the right to build to a proper protective state the work which has already been begun.

I never heard of any part of this proposal before. I am a member of the Committee on Commerce. The subcommittee met for a long time. It seems to me that, quite apart from the many other objections, it is a very unusual request to ask that the States of New England not only stop a program which is well on the way, but be denied the right to continue the program until some future action by the Congress has been taken. I do not know when another flood-control bill will be presented to the Senate. The pending bill involves the expenditure of almost a billion dollars. If the pending bill is passed, and we come to the after-the-war policy, and the natural efforts toward economy which I hope and pray will then be made, it seems to me most unlikely that the Congress will soon undertake to pass another flood-control bill.

I realize that there is always present the possibility that the Congress will pass a separate bill affecting some area of the country. But that is not easy, as Senators know. I beg Senators to believe that, in my knowledge, at least, they would do us and the rest of the country a very great injustice by agreeing to this part of the so-called O'Mahoney amendment.

Mr. President, as I have already said, I want to cooperate with the State of Vermont. My State enjoys a splendid relationship with the State of Vermont in every possible way. The names of many towns in both States are similar because in the early history of Vermont the people of that State adopted the names of many of the towns in Connecticut. Many people from Connecticut moved into Vermont. I believe the original constitution of the State was an adaptation of——

Mr. AUSTIN rose.

Mr. MALONEY. Am I incorrect in my statement?

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, I know what the Senator has in mind. He has in mind the original statutes of the two States. Our constitution was largely influenced by the first Pennsylvania Constitution. But the first statutes of Vermont were passed in the midst of great commotions just preceding the Battle of Bennington, and the men were in such a hurry, because they were all warriors, to rush to Bennington that they passed a resolution substantially as follows:

We adopt the laws set forth in the Connecticut Lawbook, and in defect thereof, the laws of God as set forth in the Holy Bible.

There is a very strong connection, spiritually and in other ways, between Connecticut and Vermont, and I hope this little flurry will not disturb it in any way whatever.

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, what the Senator has said was what I was endeavoring to say, but perhaps in a clumsy way. I am very grateful to the distinguished historian, the senior Senator from Vermont, for his assistance.

I should like to point out that the State of Vermont is still represented in a large part, and particularly at this moment, by the kind of warrior who was once hastening off to war at Bennington, and in the interim was willing temporarily to adopt the laws of the State of Connecticut, if protected by the laws of God.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MALONEY. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. My colleague, the distinguished senior Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN], has given the history as we understand it in Vermont. But whenever I go to Connecticut I hear that the people of Vermont met and agreed to abide by the laws of the State of Connecticut and the laws of God until they had time to devise better ones. [Laughter.]

Mr. MALONEY. The Senator is correct, and the people of Vermont are still endeavoring to improve their position, as is evidenced by the work of its two great Senators.

Mr. President, perhaps it is well to have momentary facetiousness during the consideration of a very serious subject such as the one before us. I shall not

talk long about it because we have been talking quite a long time about it already.

The issue is clear. The proposal made is easy to understand. The proposal is that the Army engineers shall not undertake to construct the flood-control projects already planned, and it would wipe out the project of one dam on the West River, the so-called Williamsville Dam. The Army engineers have told us that the construction of that dam is more necessary than is any other project in the program of providing proper flood protection for the lower Connecticut River Valley.

If there were another way to approach the problem, if another avenue were open to us and I, as one Member of the Congress could cooperate, I would be anxious to do so. But all other avenues have been closed.

By the hearings which were held in regard to the matter, the long study made of it, and the consultations had with the people of Vermont, as well as the hearings which were held by Congress in which the people of Vermont were heard, it is evident that the plan already agreed to is the proper one.

As I understand, the real issue is the so-called Williamsville Dam. During the holding of hearings we were told that the project would not only bring about destruction by the inundation of fertile valleys but would necessitate moving a great many people and their properties away from the areas affected. The truth of the matter is, as I have been advised by the Army engineers, that in connection with this particular project, the one which has created the pending controversy, only 70 persons would be involved. Only one small cemetery would be affected. I make that statement on the basis of information furnished me by the Army engineers, supported by the statements of others who made an examination of the proposal.

Mr. President, there has just been handed to me by the distinguished junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WEEKS] a statement which I understand was prepared by the Army engineers. It states the drainage area, how much land would be needed, and about all the additional information which one would need in carefully examining the project. I shall ask that it be printed in the RECORD after I have referred to some of the items contained in it.

The total number of sets of buildings located in a town affected by the Williamsville site amounts to 55.

No churches are involved. There are no commercial buildings involved. There is involved one small industrial establishment. I believe it is a woodworking plant.

There are two small cemeteries. There would be a need—and all of us regret this—to relocate 350 graves. That is serious. There is a great sentimental attachment, almost a reverential attachment, to graves, but on the other hand there are the millions of people in the lower valley who would be endangered by a serious flood.

I understand the town affected, and first shown on this paper, is the town of Harmonyville. There are 70 people in the town of Harmonyville. I think there is a fear on the part of the Senators from Vermont, a fear which I cannot understand as justifiable, that the Army engineers have a broad power, under the existing law, and that they might some time later build a dam at another point.

I ask that the table to which I have referred be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Comparative data, flood-control dams

Designation	Unit	West River, Vt.		
		River mile 5.3, West Dummerston site	River mile 8.3, upper Williamsville site	River mile 10.8, Newfane site
Drainage area	Square mile	407	400	326
Flood control, storage	Acre-feet	152,000	149,500	105,000
Spillway crest (flow line—flood-control pool)	Elevation, mean sea level.	462	478	486
Reservoir area	Acres	2,770	2,800	2,130
Swampland	Acres	55	55	[1] 55
Urban	Acres	55	50	[1] 45
Pasture	Acres	165	170	
Cultivated	Acres	390	400	
Agricultural (including pastureland)	Acres			1,500
Woodland:				
Cut over	Acres	390	400	
Not classified	Acres			500
Woodland (standing timber)	Acres	1,715	1,725	
Dwellings (sets of buildings)	Each	81	55	60
Churches	Each	2	0	
Schools	Each	1	0	
Commercial buildings	Each	4	1	
Industrial establishments	Each	4	1	
Cemeteries	Each	4	2	
Graves (would be relocated)	Each	850	350	350
Population (United States census 1940):				
West Dummerston		100		
Harmonyville		70	70	70
Total in reservoir area [2]		300–350	200–250	[1] 200–250
Total estimated cost		[3] $14,000,000	[4] $6,280,000	$4,513,500

[1] Estimated.
[2] Based on average of 4 persons per dwelling.
[3] Includes wide base and provisions for future power.
[4] As reported in H. Doc. No. 724.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MAYBANK in the chair). Does the Senator from Connecticut yield to the Senator from Vermont?

Mr. MALONEY. I yield.

Mr. AUSTIN. If the Senator is about to leave the subject of the number of people affected by a low dam, would he permit an interruption at this point?

Mr. MALONEY. I have always permitted an interruption.

Mr. AUSTIN. I should like to call his attention to the testimony of Mr. Tier, who resides in the valley there. He stated, as appears at page 168 of the hearing in the Senate committee:

Mr. TIER. Mr. Chairman, I would just like to make the correction of an error that I think was made here on the population. This matter of the low dam and the high dam seems to be very confusing to everyone. This estimate that Mr. Bush made was on a high dam. Now, on a low dam, or with any dam, in fact, West Dummerston would be inundated, and there are about 300 people comprising that population. It would affect Newfane, probably not wholly, but there are 850 people there.

Senator CORDON. How many?

Mr. TIER. Eight hundred and fifty. That would not affect the whole village. Brookline would be flooded out—about 150 people. Harmonyville would be flooded out, on either dam—150.

Senator CORDON. What portion of Brookline would be flooded out, would you say? What proportion of the population would be rendered homeless?

Mr. BUSH. On the high dam it would be all gone except one or two.

Senator CORDON. And on the low dam?

Mr. BUSH. On the low dam there would probably be five or six houses left.

Senator CORDON. The low dam then would substantially obliterate it.

Mr. BUSH. Yes.

I thank the Senator for permitting me to put this in at this place.

Mr. MALONEY. I am very glad to have it.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President——

Mr. MALONEY. Will the Senator permit me to comment on this matter?

Mr. AIKEN. I was about to make another factual suggestion.

Mr. MALONEY. Please proceed.

Mr. AIKEN. In regard to cemeteries, it appears from the data that there are 6 cemeteries involved, with 1,075 graves. I think probably the Army engineers took the 1 modern cemetery, and very likely forgot to count the old ones, where there are hundreds of graves of pioneers.

Mr. WEEKS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Connecticut yield?

Mr. MALONEY. I yield.

Mr. WEEKS. I think the figures the Senator has just cited are not applicable to the particular dam which the engineers now tell me is going to be constructed if this authorization is provided for, and I think the Senator has the figures pertaining to that dam.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, the trouble is that we do not know from day to day just what kind of a dam the engineers plan to construct, or where they are planning to construct it. That is why we are trying to attach amendments to the bill, so that we will have some knowledge as to what is to be done.

Mr. MALONEY. If the Senator succeeds in having his amendment agreed to, he will not need to seek more knowledge; the whole program will stop.

Mr. AIKEN. I think these figures are for the high dam which I understand the engineers hope eventually to construct.

Mr. MALONEY. As a result of the efforts of the Senators from Vermont, or the people of Vermont, the bill provided, as it came here, that it should be a low dam, and it is written in the law.

Mr. AIKEN. But we have no definition of a low dam.

Mr. MALONEY. I have not, either, but I understood there was a desire on the part of the people of Vermont that that language be included. I think it is the difference between a power dam and a nonpower dam. I had believed they should have made provision in the plans for the future use of the dam for power if the need arose.

Mr. AIKEN. I think the Senator will find that the amount of money requested would provide, even though it were a low dam, for building a base on which it would be possible to add, later, a considerable height to the dam, thus making it a high dam.

Mr. MALONEY. I favor that.

Mr. AIKEN. They would be building it in stages, instead of all at once.

Mr. MALONEY. Yes.

Mr. AIKEN. The effect on the State, though, would be about the same.

Mr. MALONEY. The purpose of that would be, as the Senator so well knows, to provide for power if there were later a need for power, and I think it is pretty wise to go about it in that way.

Mr. AIKEN. Let me ask the Senator now if he is insistent on the prohibition against the development of power at any of these dams in Vermont.

Mr. MALONEY. I did not understand the Senator's question.

Mr. AIKEN. The committee wrote into the bill a strict prohibition against the development of any power at the dams to be constructed on the tributaries of the Connecticut River in Vermont.

Mr. MALONEY. What is the Senator asking me?

Mr. AIKEN. Does the Senator believe it is just to say that the Government is to take our land, take our valleys, and use the storage space to maintain the flow of the Connecticut River down the river for the benefit of the power plants in Massachusetts, and at the same time insert a prohibition saying that we simply cannot generate one horsepower of power at the dams?

Mr. MALONEY. No; I am not in sympathy with that, and I have so stated on many occasions, unless it would seriously interrupt the flood-control program. If it would not impede the effort toward flood control to a very serious extent, I would favor having that language removed from the bill.

Mr. AIKEN. The Senator would trust the Army engineers to see to that, would he not?

Mr. MALONEY. I certainly would.

Mr. President, it has been a long time since I noted that the figures which I used, and the material which I asked to have inserted in the RECORD, which is the only means I have of contradicting the statements of the Senators from Vermont concerning cemeteries and population, were prepared for the Senator from Massachusetts by the Army engineers, and I should dislike to believe that they are overcareless in the compilation of statistics and figures.

Mr. AUSTIN. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. MALONEY. I yield.

Mr. AUSTIN. I have not the advantage of the knowledge of the Senator from Massachusetts with respect to the height of the dam contemplated by the engineers in stating these figures. I wonder if he is willing to give us that information.

Mr. MALONEY. I am having this matter put in the RECORD.

Mr. AUSTIN. I know, but does it go in the RECORD as expressing the view of the Army engineers today as to the height of the dam?

Mr. MALONEY. I think this is on the basis of a so-called low dam, as is provided in the bill, but I have no definite knowledge of the height of the dam.

Mr. AUSTIN. That is the trouble with this whole matter.

Mr. MALONEY. This statement is based on a low dam.

Mr. AUSTIN. I understand, but that is one of the troubles with the text of the bill and the text of the existing law, and that is one of the defects we desire to correct. It will not deprive Connecticut or Massachusetts of the protection they should get, and will not delay it. But I shall discuss that in my own time and not hold up the Senator.

Mr. MALONEY. I shall continue to be hopeful that before these projects are constructed, or before construction is started at all, the people of the State of Vermont and the Army engineers will be able to come to a satisfactory understanding. All I am aiming to do here today is to prevent the interruption of a flood-control program in its entirety. I do not care what form it takes so long as it gives us flood control, a proper flood control, or flood-control projects which are reasonably proper. How they come, where they are located, does not interest me one bit. If we can get the same protection by going elsewhere than Williamsville, that is all right with me. I am concerned because an effort is made to stop the whole program, to deny us the right given to all the other States under the bill, to anticipate the further flood-control plans which are contemplated under the language of the existing law. I do not want to permit the destruction of the progress already made. I do not want to see the people of my State or the State of Massachusetts or any other State subjected to the dangers of devastating and roaring floodwaters that are almost certain to come again some time. We have had terrible experiences in recent years. Some of our war plants, plants used for war work, plants engaged in producing materials used later in war, on the banks of this river, suffered great losses. Food so sorely needed by the people all over the world, and particularly by our own people, was destroyed in those floods, and other food might well be destroyed should we have another serious flood. But all this is superfluous. Senators understand all of this as well or better than I do, but I want to emphasize, as I urge their protection to us, what this provision would do to the States of Connecticut and Massachusetts, and what it would do to the Connecticut River Valley, as it would do to no other valley in the land. It would stop us where we are, and let us look into the uncertain future, knowing that our hands are tied.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MALONEY. I have finished, but I will be pleased to yield.

Mr. DANAHER. I should like to ask my colleague a question, if he has the bill before him and will turn to page 10, lines 5 to 7. The committee amendment reads:

Provided further, That none of the dams herein authorized for the Connecticut River Basin shall be utilized for the generation of hydroelectric power.

Supplementing as it does the authorization of a $30,000,000 appropriation for the comprehensive flood-control program, it would not do violence to the views of my colleague, would it, if the committee amendment were adopted?

Mr. MALONEY. To which committee amendment does the Senator have reference?

Mr. DANAHER. The committee amendment on page 10, lines 5 to 7, inclusive.

Mr. MALONEY. I have no reason to believe that it would do violence to my views.

Mr. DANAHER. I believe the Senator's answer is compelled by the argument which he has offered. With that statement let me offer the following: If we were to adopt the committee amendment, and take in addition the first sentence of the substitute which has been offered by the Senator from Wyoming—and to refresh the Senator's recollection I will read the first sentence from the substitute:

Nothing in this act or in any previous authorization shall be construed to authorize the construction of a dam, other than a retention-type dam, not to exceed elevation 415 Sandy Hook datum on the main stream of the West River in the towns of Dummerston and Newfane in the State of Vermont.

If we were to take that sentence, and add it to the committee amendment on page 10 we not only would accomplish the result argued for by my colleague so ably, but we would also protect the State of Vermont according to the assertions which its Senators make on this floor, as I view them. I, therefore, would rephrase the entire committee amendment and modify it to read as follows, and I will ask my colleague's judgment on it:

Provided further, That none of the dams herein authorized for the Connecticut River Basin shall be utilized for the generation of hydroelectric power: *And provided further*, That nothing in this act or in any previous authorization shall be construed to authorize the construction of a dam other than a retention-type dam not to exceed elevation 415 Sandy Hook datum on the main stream of the West River in the town of Dummerston or Newfane in the State of Vermont.

Let me, then, suggest to my colleague that if the amendment were modified to read as I have just read it, not only could the comprehensive flood-control program go forward without interruption, but it could also go forward without

doing violence to the town of Dummerston or Newfane in the State of Vermont. Moreover, it would provide that no dam other than a retention-type dam could be erected which would exceed elevation 415 Sandy Hook datum so far as the State of Vermont is concerned.

Mr. MALONEY. I do not know, I will say to the Senator, what the 415-foot Sandy Hook datum really means. I would have to have the advice of the Army engineers. It has just been called to my attention that the present plan provides for a dam 478 feet high, so there is a difference that might be of great moment in connection with this construction.

Mr. DANAHER. Am I not correct? Will my colleague the Senator from Connecticut yield for a further question?

Mr. MALONEY. I certainly will for as many as my colleague desires.

Mr. DANAHER. I was simply trying to see if we could not resolve the difference between the viewpoint which has been argued by my colleague and that which has been argued by the Senators from Vermont. If we were to agree to the entire substitute offered by the Senator from Wyoming, it is clear that there would be an effective interruption of the accomplishment of comprehensive flood control until plans were submitted to the Congress in accordance with paragraph (a) of the earlier amendment adopted. My colleague, the Senator from Connecticut, is eminently correct in that assertion. I hope that perhaps we could work out a solution of the conflicting viewpoints along the lines I have suggested.

Mr. MALONEY. I thank the Senator.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MALONEY. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. May I make an observation to the Senator's colleague with respect to the remarks he has just made?

Mr. MALONEY. I am glad to yield for that purpose.

Mr. AIKEN. There is one other thing it would accomplish which the Senator did not call to our attention. It would provide that the Federal Government would condemn the land and take the property of our people in the Vermont valleys. It would provide that dams be constructed at Federal expense. It would provide that the State of Vermont could never salvage one cent from the electric energy produced or the cheaper electric power which might be produced there. It would turn over 100 percent of the electric power at these dams in the State of Vermont to the private utility companies of the States of Massachusetts and Connecticut. That is the main thing it would accomplish.

Mr. MALONEY. I should like to say first that I cannot understand the observation that the Federal Government would go into Massachusetts and Connecticut to dispose of power created by the Federal Government in Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. The Senator knows that for years it has been the dream of the utility companies in the States of Massachusetts and Connecticut to have dams erected in Vermont so they could employ down below the electric power generated by the increased flow of the Connecticut

Mr. MALONEY. I do not know that. I am not now ready to believe that that is true. And I am not ready to believe that the Senator is correct in his assertion that the Federal Government would own and build a dam and take power therefrom down into Massachusetts to dispose of it to private companies. That would not be done by this administration, it would not be done by the power authority we have in Washington now. It would not be permitted by the Senate.

Mr. AIKEN. I do not care what administration it is. If those reservoirs are constructed in Vermont and the water is let out in such a way as to maintain the flow of the Connecticut River below, the public utilities in the States of Massachusetts and Connecticut would get 100 percent of the benefit. This amendment would prohibit the State of Vermont from getting 1 cent of value out of the $56,000,000 which it is proposed to spend on dams in the Connecticut Valley.

Mr. MALONEY. I understand that this language came out of Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. Before I get through I am going to write into the RECORD the names of every one of the dams there. I will tell the Senate just how much public utilities would profit by the proposal we have before us to prohibit the production of power in Vermont, and to give the Government the unlimited right to construct storage reservoirs there.

Mr. MALONEY. Let the record be clear that the Senator from Connecticut is not opposed to the creation of power in Vermont. The Senator from Connecticut has said that he thought it would be wise, in the construction of these dams, to look into the future, to the possibility of a need for power in that area at a later date; and if we should find a reasonable likelihood of a need for power, these dams should be constructed in such a manner that they may later be used for the creation of power.

Mr. AIKEN. I give the Senator credit for saying that he has no objection to it; but why is there insistence on a proposal against the production of power in Vermont being written into the bill?

Mr. MALONEY. I do not know where the proposal came from.

Mr. AIKEN. I do. It was offered by the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON]; and there is nothing anywhere to show that anyone from Vermont asked for it.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MALONEY. I yield.

Mr. OVERTON. That is an incorrect statement. It was proposed by the senior Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN] that there be a prohibition against these dams generating power. I am sure the senior Senator from Vermont will admit authorship of the proposal.

Mr. MALONEY. There are many who believe that it would be extravagant to talk about power in connection with some of these little streams.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MALONEY. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. In view of what the Senator from Louisiana has said, will the Senator from Connecticut permit me to read from the printed hearings?

Mr. MALONEY. Certainly.

Mr. AIKEN. I read from page 193 of the printed hearings:

> Senator OVERTON. Well, now, suppose we—I will advance a step forward in my compromise—and this is purely a matter of compromise, of course. I can speak only for myself, but I just want to feel your pulse, as it were, as we go along. Personally I would be in favor—we will eliminate the West River dam. All right; no dams on the West River. And we will remove power generation from all the other dams; we will prohibit the generation of power on all the other dams. How about that?

That is the first time the proposal was made. According to this record, it was not made by anyone from Vermont.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President——

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, I am anxious to yield the floor, but I yield to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. OVERTON. When this question came up the junior Senator from Vermont and the senior Senator from Vermont were present at the hearings. At first there was objection not only to the Williamsville site dam, or the Dummerston Dam, they being one and the same, but there was objection to other dams. Finally we reached the point where there was a rather slight objection to other dams than the Williamsville site dam. The senior Senator from Vermont, in an off-the-record discussion—and possibly some of it is in the record—stated that he desired that no power be generated at any of the Vermont dams.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MALONEY. I yield.

Mr. AUSTIN. Let me add to that a phrase which qualifies it to some extent—except by negotiation with the people of the State, and with their consent. That qualification runs through the whole matter.

Mr. OVERTON. That had escaped my attention.

Mr. AUSTIN. Provided the people consent.

Mr. OVERTON. The senior Senator from Vermont will agree with me that the suggestion that no power be generated at those dams was a suggestion emanating from the senior Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AUSTIN. I think it emanated not from the senior Senator from Vermont but from witnesses, notably Mr. Philip Shutler and the master of the National Grange. I have the testimony, and I intend to call attention to it when I discuss this subject. That is where the question first arose, showing, first, that we must take into account the difference in the burden of cost which arises from a dam built for power, as against a dam built solely for retention in flood control. That was Mr. Shutler's point. He was trying to ascertain whether the damages which had been comprehended in the cost took into account a flood-control dam or, on the contrary, a dam erected for the purpose of permitting at some time the production of electric energy.

That is only one side of it. Along comes the master of the National Grange

and points out how little alluvial land there is in Vermont, and how much more damage is created in rendering useless our farms in Vermont by the construction of dams capable of generating power than results from the construction of dams solely for retention, to prevent floods. So far as the master of the Grange was concerned, the whole point was that in those cases the people should have an opportunity to be heard on the question. As the Senator from Louisiana knows, that is the important thing in the mind of the Senator from Vermont. The people should have an opportunity to be heard.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield to me? I had not completed my statement.

Mr. MALONEY. I yield to the Senator for the purpose of completing his statement. Then I shall yield the floor.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, I do not know where the idea of no generation of power at the Vermont dams may have originated; but certainly I think the senior Senator from Vermont will agree with me that he was at least an endorser of that proposal.

Mr. AUSTIN. That is correct.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President—

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, I should like to continue. I have the floor, by the good grace of the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MALONEY].

Mr. MALONEY. That is true.

Mr. OVERTON. Finally, since the main objection was to the Williamsville site dam, it was suggested that no power be generated at any of the Vermont dams. Personally I do not care whether power is generated at the Vermont dams or not; but since that suggestion had been made, and the senior Senator from Vermont, in whose good judgment I have absolute confidence, was a reliable sponsor, at least, of that proposal, I made the suggestion that we could compromise the difficulty, so far as I was personally concerned, without undertaking to bind the committee, by eliminating the Williamsville site dam entirely, and by a provision that no power should be generated at any of these dams.

That appeared to be acceptable. If the junior Senator from Vermont made any objection, I have no recollection of it. All this took place in his presence. I think he made some slight observation to the effect that he was not altogether certain whether it was agreeable to him to remove the generation of power from these dams.

That, Mr. President, is the sum and substance of the whole story. I thank the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MALONEY. I yield.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Has there not been a policy in the Committee on Commerce to provide for the development of electricity at flood-control dams if it is considered feasible?

Mr. MALONEY. I so understand. I do not know whether or not it could be called a fixed policy or not. I defer to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. If the people of Vermont were really afraid that electricity which might be developed there would be taken away from them, it could easily be provided in the amendment that whatever electricity was developed there should be used in the State of Vermont.

Mr. MALONEY. I do not know whether that would be possible, with the use of Federal funds.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. At least a preference could be provided for.

Mr. MALONEY. Yes. I think so.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. It seems to me that this whole question comes down to a proposal to create a new policy and to prevent the generation of electricity when it can be generated at flood-control dams. So far as I am concerned, I want every dollar spent by the Federal Government on such projects to be used, if it is humanly possible, for the development of electricity and for the sale of it to the people at the lowest possible cost.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MALONEY. I yield.

Mr. AUSTIN. Let me ask the senior Senator from Massachusetts if he would want to do that entirely at the cost of the homes of the people in our river valley?

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Of course not.

Mr. AUSTIN. I did not think so.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. I am assuming that the Army engineers will recommend the building of a dam primarily for flood-control purposes; but an incidental purpose may be the development of electricity. I think it is a shame that in all this legislation one dam in a particular State should be selected at which no electricity may be developed, when it is the policy of the committee to develop electricity if it can be done.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, that is not the situation. Already we have struck out of the bill projects which heretofore had been agreed to. We have struck them out entirely.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Does the Senator mean that projects already agreed to, by which dams are to be built and electricity generated, have been stricken from the bill? Have they been stricken out so that no electricity will be generated?

Mr. AUSTIN. No; they have not been stricken out for that reason. We have stricken out the projects entirely. We are not asking for what the Senator has suggested, certainly.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. The result has been that a new policy has been adopted, if possible to prevent the development of electricity at these dams.

Mr. AUSTIN. No, Mr. President; I do not think that is true.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. That is so in this case, at least.

Mr. AUSTIN. No; I do not think that is true. Heretofore no Senator has had trouble in getting these plans modified on the floor of the Senate. I have heard many Senators arise and move a modification of these plans, and such modification has been adopted without any trouble.

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, I should like to say to the Senator that I think the reason for that in this instance is that the projects are in one State and the flood-control needs are in another. It so happens that Vermont cannot be hurt by floods to the extent that we in the lower valley can.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MALONEY. Certainly.

Mr. AUSTIN. If we are smaller than Connecticut and smaller than Massachusetts, and if we have a smaller population, yet we are constricted in the area we can occupy. I maintain that it is equally bad, if not worse, to flood us out by artificial means in order to protect Massachusetts and Connecticut. I maintain that it is equally bad, if not worse, to fill our valleys with water and drive our people out of the valleys and perhaps out of the State, because if this plan is carried to its logical conclusion and if every valley is flooded, we shall have nothing left in Vermont but a tracery of mountain tops.

Mr. MALONEY. That would not be a logical conclusion, let me say to the Senator.

Mr. AUSTIN. Let me point out to the Senator that there are to be 20 dams in the whole project. Either 10 or 11 of them are to be in Vermont; I am not certain whether one of them was agreed upon. But certainly 10 of them are to be in Vermont, and on that side of the mountains they take in all the valleys which lead into the Connecticut River. Mr. President, should we not be heard at least on the question of the type of dams?

Mr. MALONEY. Of course, the Senator's State has been heard, and it will have a chance to be heard further.

Mr. AUSTIN. I regret very much to say it was not heard. It is such a curious——

Mr. MALONEY. As I understand, representatives of the Senator's State testified at the hearings on the subject on three occasions, namely, 1938, 1941, and this time.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. The attorney general of the State has been present at all those hearings, every time a matter of flood control affecting Vermont has been before the Congress.

Mr. AUSTIN. Yes; that is to say, with respect to legislation. I am talking about plans in the field.

Mr. MALONEY. I presume that the Army engineers had more consultations with the distinguished junior Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], when he was Governor of Vermont, than they did with the Governors of many other States of the Union.

Mr. AUSTIN. The question was asked whether the people of Vermont favor or oppose the use of these dams for flood control. While that question was being asked there was delivered to me a telegram from a prominent leader of thought in Vermont, who, I think, is well known to many Senators here, Ralph E. Flanders. His telegram reads as follows:

BOSTON, MASS.,
November 28, 1944—3:48 p. m.

HON. WARREN R. AUSTIN,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

I very much hope that in connection with pending legislation you will be able to arrange to protect the inhabitants of the West

River Valley. To my mind this is best done by recognizing in legislation the principle that no power project, public or private, should be imposed on a State without its own consent and that flood control should be arranged by negotiation.

RALPH E. FLANDERS.

Mr. President, that is substantially our position.

Mr. MALONEY. I think I could subscribe to that. I am not sure, but I think I could. I believe a flood-control plan should be worked out by cooperation. We have always endeavored to do it that way. That is the policy of the Army engineers and it is the policy of the Congress. But Vermont now says, "You must hear us. You must accept our decision or you cannot have flood-control projects in our State."

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MALONEY. Of course.

Mr. AUSTIN. I wish to have the Senator yield for a friendly observation. Let me say that I promise to try to show that what we ask will not stop the work, will not set back the work, and will not affect the whole plan for the valley, even so far as it relates to Vermont. Only a small part of the project is involved, and that part of it is not likely to be reached even if we do not amend the law before another session of Congress. But, as the Senator has inquired, when will we have another flood-control bill?

Mr. MALONEY. When will we have another flood? That concerns me more.

Mr. AUSTIN. The flood has not yet arrived. We do not wish to have a flood imposed upon us by building a dam around us. That is the main thing. All this protection can be had without flooding us out. I am sure the Senator is for that.

Mr. MALONEY. I am for every bit of cooperation I can give the State of Vermont to the extent that it does not increase the flood dangers in my State.

Mr. WEEKS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MALONEY. I yield the floor.

Mr. WEEKS. The distinguished senior Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN] has said that in the amendments which have been adopted some projects have been abandoned. The point I should like to make is that we are in the middle of this project which in total involves approximately $75,000,000—$45,000,000 has already been authorized and appropriated—$17,000,000 has been spent in erecting dikes at Hartford and at Springfield. Those dikes have been erected to a height which would be adequate for flood-protection purposes if the dams which are a part of the total project were constructed and put into operation.

Twenty-eight million dollars has also been authorized and appropriated for the erection of some of the dams among the 20. Three of the dams in the State of Massachusetts have already been constructed.

So, Mr. President, the point I wish to make is that this is not a case of abandoning a project. It is the interruption of the orderly construction of the entire number of 20 dams and the dykes on the lower Connecticut River which go to make up the project as a whole.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Wyoming offered as a substitute for lines 3 to 7 on page 10 of the bill.

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I am pleased to have a telegram from Mr. E. K. Dean, president of the Kansas Farmers' Union, with respect to the pending flood-control bill. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD, as a part of the debate on the pending proposed legislation.

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SALINA, KANS., *November 28, 1944.*

Senator ARTHUR CAPPER,
Senate Building:

Our organization is bitterly opposed to the flood control and rivers and harbors bills presently being considered. We abhor the efforts of special interest groups to pass legislation foreclosing the people's rights to full development and use of the vast resources of our valleys. The bills now under consideration will waste vast sums of money in partial development of our river valleys for the protection of and use by special-interest groups. We urge you to use all of your influence to have these bills carried over to the next session of Congress when time will be available to give proper consideration to full development of our valley resources in the interest of all of the people. Will appreciate your inserting this telegram in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

KANSAS FARMERS' UNION,
E. K. DEAN, *President.*

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, if the amendment is agreed to, this is how the bill, on page 9, line 21, would read as respects the Connecticut River Basin:

CONNECTICUT RIVER BASIN

In addition to previous authorizations, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of $30,000,000 for the prosecution of the comprehensive plan approved in the act of June 28, 1938, as modified by the act approved August 18, 1941, for the Connecticut River Basin: *Provided*, That nothing in this act or in any previous authorization shall be construed to authorize the construction of a dam, other than a retention type dam, not to exceed elevation 415 Sandy Hook datum on the main stream of the West River in the towns of Dummerston or Newfane, in the State of Vermont. Plans proposals, or reports heretofore authorized for construction at Cambridgeport, Ludlow, South Tunbridge, and Gaysville, in the Connecticut River Basin, or any modification of the comprehensive plan for the Connecticut River Basin in Vermont heretofore made under authority of the Flood Control Act of June 28, 1938, or heretofore made under authority of section 3 of the Flood Control Act approved August 18, 1941, shall not be carried out until after compliance with the provisions of paragraph (a) of section — of this act.

In order to understand the relationship to the project which has been discussed, I read from the report of the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors dated April 18, 1940, which is designated as House Document No. 724, and is expressly referred to by number in both the acts relating to the project for which appropriations are requested in the amendment before us. I refer to the act of June 28, 1938, and the act of August 18, 1941.

"1." That is a reference number.

Under the heading "Reservoir" appears "Knightville."

Under the heading "Stream" appears "Westfield."

Drainage area in square miles, 164.

Capacity, acre-feet, 39,300.

Flood control, $2,318,000.

Adaptations for power, $433,000.

Total flood control plus adaptations, $2,751,000.

That is No. 1. There are 20 of those items. They comprehend river valleys in the Connecticut River Basin, in Massachusetts, and in Vermont.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the remainder of this table printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Reference No.	Reservoir	Stream	Drainage area (square miles)	Capacity (acre-feet)	Costs		
					Flood control	Adaptations for power	Total flood control plus adaptations
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)
1	Knightville	Westfield	164	39,300	$2,318,000	$433,000	$2,751,000
2	West Brookfield	Chicopee (Quaboag)	106	33,900	2,317,000		2,317,000
3	Barre Falls	Chicopee (Ware)	57	24,300	965,000		965,000
4	Tully	Millers (Tully)	50	22,150	665,000	94,000	759,000
5	Birch Hill	Millers	175	49,900	3,005,000		3,005,000
6	Honey Hill	Ashuelot (South Branch)	70	26,200	1,935,000		1,935,000
7	Surry Mountain	Ashuelot	100	32,500	1,620,000		1,620,000
8	Claremont	Sugar	245	78,400	5,160,000		5,160,000
9	West Canaan	Mascoma	80	34,100	2,240,000	280,000	2,520,000
10	Sugar Hill	Ammonoosuc	246	91,600	6,530,000		6,530,000
11	Williamsville	West	400	150,000	5,960,000	320,000	6,280,000
12	Cambridgeport	Saxtons	58	21,600	1,975,000		1,975,000
13	Brockway	Williams	101	32,300	2,944,000		2,944,000
14	North Springfield	Black	[1]102	33,400	2,018,000		2,018,000
15	Ludlow	do	56	23,900	1,741,000	459,000	2,200,000
16	North Hartland	Ottauquechee	222	71,100	3,630,000		3,630,000
17	South Tunbridge	White (First Branch)	102	32,600	2,275,000		2,275,000
18	Gaysville	White	220	84,300	4,080,000	705,000	4,785,000
19	Union Village	Ompompanoosuc	126	30,200	1,944,000	432,000	2,376,000
20	Victory	Passumpsie (Moose)	66	28,200	1,023,000	392,000	1,415,000
	Total		2,752	939,950	54,345,000	3,115,000	57,460,000

[1] Exclusive of drainage area above Ludlow.

Mr. AUSTIN. Of those 20 projects at least 10 are in Vermont, and the proposal before the Senate is to have a review of only the following: Cambridgeport, Ludlow, South Tunbridge, and Gaysville.

Mr. President, I ask Senators to examine them and see what proportion of the entire project they represent, and then answer the question whether this amendment would stop the project of flood control in the Connecticut River Basin.

Cambridgeport is No. 12 on the table.

Mr. WEEKS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AUSTIN. I yield.

Mr. WEEKS. Did the Senator from Vermont include the West River Dam in his table?

Mr. AUSTIN. Certainly not. I am talking only about those projects which would be held up by the amendment. The West River Dam project has been authorized specifically as to height. I believe this is the first time it has appeared in anything about which we in Congress know.

Mr. President, allow me to read the first sentence and then I will return to what I was undertaking to do. This is the part which relates to the West River Dam.

> Nothing in this act or in any previous authorization shall be construed to authorize the construction of a dam, other than a retention type dam, not to exceed elevation 415 Sandy Hook datum on the main stream of the West River in the towns of Dummerston or Newfane in the State of Vermont.

That is all there is on that point. That would not knock out the protection which would be afforded the cities and villages and farm lands lying to the south, so far as the West River Valley is concerned. The dam is higher than the one which has been considered by the local people, which has an elevation of spillway of 410 feet above the datum to which I have referred. We have offered 5 additional feet in order to be on the conservative side.

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator from Vermont a question?

Mr. AUSTIN. I do not want to get too far away from what I started to prove.

Mr. MALONEY. I merely wanted to ask the Senator how he arrived at the elevation 41, Sandy Hook datum.

Mr. AUSTIN. We arrived at it from the surveys made by our local people in undertaking to find an alternative plan which would protect our good neighbors south of us and not inundate us beyond reason. This project would result in the inundation of some of our buildings, and we would have to remove houses and people and find places for them elsewhere. But the dam is what I regard as being the lower dam. When we previously discussed the matter, without any figures representing the elevation of the spillway, and speaking of the dam as the low dam, I thought of the dam at 410 feet elevation. The one proposed would have a leeway of 5 additional feet.

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, I shall not interrupt the Senator at the present time, but I should like to question him later.

Mr. AUSTIN. Yes; indeed. I am very greatly concerned to have my neighbors from Connecticut and Massachusetts understand our position, because it is of the greatest importance to us to continue the feeling of interest in each other's welfare which we have always had. I consider that far more important than the other questions here involved. I want to be able to discuss the question with them on that basis so that we can come to an understanding instead of pulling apart. There is no other basis on which I wish to discuss the matter.

What I am undertaking to prove is that we are not asking by the proposed amendment to stop the project of flood control in the Connecticut River Basin. We are not attempting to defer anything more than a small part of the project. We are asking only for sufficient deferment to enable us to present our views to the Army engineers. That is all. Ninety days would be sufficient.

Mr. President, I return to what I was undertaking to prove.

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, I dislike to interrupt the Senator now, but I am afraid the Senate may misunderstand me if I do not interrupt him. If I correctly understood the Senator, he said that all he asked for was 90 days' delay and that the matter might be adjusted within that length of time. I do not think that would be possible.

Mr. AUSTIN. Let us see. We will not come to that yet, if the Senator will excuse me for trying to finish the point I am making. We will take up the other point later.

Mr. MALONEY. I am sorry I interrupted the Senator.

Mr. AUSTIN. I am claiming that the proposals or reports heretofore authorized for construction at Cambridgeport, Ludlow, South Tunbridge, and Gaysville comprehend relatively small parts of the total Connecticut River Basin projects. I shall start with the first one, Cambridge.

Mr. WEEKS. Mr. President——

Mr. AUSTIN. Will not the Senator let me go on for a brief time?

Mr. WEEKS. I merely desire to comment on that part of the Senator's statement.

Mr. AUSTIN. The Senator may comment later. Let me do what I have started out three times to do.

At Cambridgeport the stream is the Saxtons River. Drainage area, 58 square miles. Capacity, acre-feet, 21,600. Flood control, $1,975,000. There is nothing allowed there for power. Total flood control, plus adaptations, $1,975,000.

Now let us look at Ludlow. Ludlow is the fifteenth item on the Black River. Consider now the area of drainage. Drainage area, square miles, 56. By the way, Mr. President, that is the smallest one of all the 20. Capacity, acre-feet, 23,900. Flood control, $1,741,000. Adaptations for power, $459,000. Total, $2,200,000.

Now we come to South Tunbridge. That is the seventeenth item. It is on White River. First, as to the drainage, the drainage area, in square miles, is 102. Capacity, acre-feet, 32,600. Flood control, $2,275,000. Nothing for adaptations for power. Total, $2,275,000.

The last one is Gaysville, on the White River. Drainage area, square miles, 226. Capacity, acre-feet, 84,300. Flood control, $4,080,000. Adaptation for power, $705,000. Total, $4,785,000.

Now, Mr. President, compare those figures to that whole project. The drainage area for the project is 2,752 square miles. The capacity in acre-feet is 939,950. Flood control, $54,345,000. Adaptations for power, $3,115,000. Total, flood control, plus adaptations, $57,460,000.

Mr. President, I am glad to have been able to put these figures into the RECORD tonight, because if anyone cares to examine them overnight before we take up the question tomorrow, he will see how absurdly small the claim is that by postponing so that we can have a chance to consider the question whether these funds for adaptation for flood control should be spent, and especially whether the valley in these particular instances should be flooded the extra amount required to generate electricity, we would be hindering the plan adopted by the Congress for those particular valleys.

Mr. President, it is not necessary for us to make a hard and fast declaration that in every instance we are against the use for generating electricity of these waters which are impounded for flood control. We would not want to take that position. We want to be able to examine each case on its merits, and I know my colleague the junior Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] takes that position. Is not that so?

Mr. AIKEN. The Senator is correct.

Mr. AUSTIN. Any attempt to drive a wedge between him and me on that point will fail, because I believe we are in agreement on it. Is not that so?

Mr. AIKEN. We can agree on this amendment; in fact, we have been working together on the amendment, and in looking through the report I cannot find any place where my colleague asked for the prohibition on power, as has been stated.

Mr. AUSTIN. I am glad my colleague has called attention to that point.

Mr. AIKEN. Although the figures which my colleague has read are the figures which were submitted last spring, there have been great changes in some of them since they were released last spring, particularly as to the Williamsville site, and changes are still taking place, I find on inquiry of the Army engineers.

Mr. AUSTIN. We are not aware of that; we do not know exactly what the correct figures are. All we know is that they have been sufficiently changed to make this appropriation which comes before us today $30,000,000.

Mr. AIKEN. For instance, the figures my colleague has read show that the cost of flood control at Williamsville was $5,960,000, and for adaptation of power $320,000, or $6,280,000 in full. It was stated in the committee, as I recall, that the contemplated cost would be about $29,100,000. I have with me a letter from the Army engineers.

Mr. WEEKS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Vermont yield?

Mr. AUSTIN. I yield.

Mr. WEEKS. I think the dam which is involved in the $29,000,000 figures has not been under discussion for some time. Certainly the committee report involves a dam which on the record is to cost $6,280,000, and I do not think the $29,000,000 figure has been in the picture for quite a while.

Mr. AIKEN. When I speak in my own time I shall put this letter in the RECORD, showing that the figure "$6,280,000" has been greatly changed. The letter is signed by Colonel Goethals, so I think it is accurate.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, I think I am not overemphasizing this point with respect to the question of whether Vermont is unreasonable in asking for this amendment. If Vermont were asking that the entire Connecticut River project should be suspended for the purpose of a review, some people might regard that as a wise thing to do, but that is not the situation, and the complaint made here that that is what we are effecting by the amendment we have offered, that is, holding up the protection of Massachusetts and Connecticut from floods, is not accurate. That is what I want my colleagues to understand. Therefore, I call attention to the relative importance of these valleys, protection of which would be postponed long enough for a review.

Here is No. 12, Cambridgeport, drainage area square miles 58. Comparing 58 square miles with the total, 2,752 square miles, it can be seen how utterly ridiculous it is to take the position that this provision would tie up the whole project.

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AUSTIN. I yield.

Mr. MALONEY. I am very sorry I was called from the Chamber and did not hear the Senator's statement, and I am even more sorry, for my sake, that I have been called from the Chamber again. I should like to ask the Senator a question at this point which he might consider overnight.

Mr. AUSTIN. Yes.

Mr. MALONEY. Was the name "Williamsville" left out of the first sentence of the proposed amendment by error?

Mr. AUSTIN. No; I do not think so. Williamsville is on the West River.

Mr. MALONEY. Yes. I will tell the Senator what I mean. The first sentence reads as follows:

> Nothing in this act or in any previous authorization shall be construed to authorize the construction of a dam, other than a retention type dam, * * * on the main stream of the West River, in the towns of Dummerston or Newfane in the State of Vermont.

I was wondering if the Senator would be willing to add the town of Williamsville there?

Mr. AUSTIN. There is not any town of Williamsville. I think Williamsville is a station.

Mr. MALONEY. Is it in one of those two towns?

Mr. AUSTIN. It is in one of those two towns.

Mr. MALONEY. It would be agreeable to me if we could have that understanding. Then I was wondering if the Senator would be willing to change the dam height from 415 to 478 feet, or the figure for a low dam given by the Army engineers.

Mr. AUSTIN. I will consult those who are here from Vermont representing the State government and who have knowledge of technical matters which I do not have.

Mr. MALONEY. If the Senator would be willing to consider those two features, the inclusion of the town of Williamsville, unless it is in the town of Dummerston or the town of Newfane, and the modification or the change in the figures of the height of the dam from 415 to 478 feet as the low dam height, I think there is a strong likelihood that we might be able to reach an agreement.

Mr. AUSTIN. Then, Mr. President, might I save energy by suspending at this point so as to consult with people who can advise me in answer to this proposition, and so far as I have any privilege to reclaim the floor in the morning I should like to save that privilege.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TUNNELL in the chair). Does the Senator ask that he be given the floor tomorrow when the Senate convenes?

Mr. AUSTIN. Yes; if I can obtain unanimous consent.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, would there be any objection if we were to proceed with some of the other features of the amendment?

Mr. AUSTIN. Tonight?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Yes.

Mr. AUSTIN. I have no objection at all. My last statement was provoked by my good friend the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MALONEY] suggesting a compromise which may be accepted. It all depends on whether this height of dam is within reason or not and within the principle of getting the maximum amount of control of floodwaters at the minimum amount of damage to the people in the valley.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Then, Mr. President, let me say that there are——

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wyoming yield to me before he proceeds further?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Surely.

Mr. WHITE. I hope the Senator from Wyoming will not urge that the Senate proceed at this hour to other matters. In the first place I think it is unfortunate to have new matter projected into the middle of a talk by the Senator from Vermont. But beyond that, it is now after 5 o'clock. There is but a handful of Senators present. It would be difficult in the extreme to get many more here, and I understand further that the acting majority leader, the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], has other matters that he would like to dispose of this evening.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, the only reason I made the suggestion was that there are some items which are altogether noncontroversial.

Mr. WHITE. I never yet have been able to make certain what was noncontroversial and what was controversial.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Those matters on which the Senator from Maine and I agree are noncontroversial.

Mr. WHITE. In other words, the matters upon which we agree are right.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I do not have the floor. I simply rose to make a suggestion.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Well, whoever has the floor is requested to yield. The Souris River Valley project, the diversion of water from one watershed to another, represents a highly controversial proposal. I am not disposed to interfere with consideration of noncontroversial portions of the Senator's amendment, but I do not wish any agreement to be made which would preclude me from offering an amendment which would prohibit such a diversion.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I would not think of doing such a thing.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I am sure the Senator would not.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DAVIS] wishes to offer several amendments on behalf of himself and the junior Senator from Pennsylvania, which are not controversial. The senior Senator from Pennsylvania has been waiting here all day for an opportunity to dispose of the amendments. Also the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE] has an amendment which is not at all controversial. The amendments I mentioned can be considered and agreed to quickly, I am sure. The Senators I have referred to would like to be accommodated in this respect, and I should be very happy to accommodate them.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana has the floor.

Mr. OVERTON. I yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania to offer the amendments.

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. President, on behalf of the junior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. GUFFEY] and myself I offer an amendment which I ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 11, it is proposed to strike out lines 19 to 24 inclusive, and on page 12 it is proposed to strike out lines 1 and 2.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. OVERTON. I yield.

Mr. HILL. I take it there is no controversy between the distinguished junior Senator from Pennsylvania and the senior Senator from Pennsylvania with respect to this amendment.

Mr. DAVIS. No, Mr. President. Both the junior Senator from Pennsylvania and I have agreed on this and three other amendments I am about to offer.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I take it from a rather hasty examination of the amendments that they relate simply to projects affecting the State of Pennsylvania?

Mr. DAVIS. The Senator is correct.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the senior Senator from Pennsylvania on behalf of himself and

the junior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. GUFFEY].

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The next amendment offered by the senior Senator from Pennsylvania on behalf of himself and his colleague will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 26, it is proposed to strike out lines 16 to 20 inclusive.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next amendment offered by the Senator from Pennsylvania on behalf of himself and his colleague.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 38, following line 22, it is proposed to insert: "Juniata River and tributaries, Pennsylvania, with special reference to the proposed Raystown Reservoir."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next amendment offered by the Senator from Pennsylvania on behalf of himself and his colleague.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 39, following line 13 it is proposed to insert "Youghiogheny River Basin, Pa. and Md."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE] I offer an amendment which is not objectionable, and which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 17, after line 13, it is proposed to add the following: "*Provided*, That the elevation of the crest of the spillway of the dam shall not exceed 780 feet above mean sea level."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Vermont a question. Are lines 5 to 7, inclusive, on page 10, included in the Senate's amendment, or are they eliminated?

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, that is a very important question. The effect of this amendment, as now presented, is to do exactly the same thing that is called for in my original amendment, but the finger is pointed at the precise river valleys, instead of covering everything generally. It is pointed right at the valleys that are named in the amendment. Notice this language:

> Plans, proposals, or reports heretofore authorized for construction at Cambridgeport, Ludlow, South Tumbridge, and Gaysville, in the Connecticut River Basin, or any modification of the comprehensive plan for the Connecticut River Basin in Vermont heretofore made under authority of the Flood Control Act of June 28, 1938, or heretofore made under authority of section 3 of the Flood Control Act approved August 18, 1941, shall not be carried out until after compliance with the provisions of paragraph (a) of section — of this act.

Section (a) was adopted by the Senate just before we took up this amendment. It provides for notice to the State authorities of the modifications to be made. There was a big blanket of modifications to be made in the discretion of the Secretary of War and the Chief of Engineers. We not only vested the Federal Government with complete control, but we named the men who should be able, in their discretion, tomorrow to modify the plans agreed upon in Congress. This language eliminates that power. In effect, it provides that that general authority is now taken care of by us. We say that any modification heretofore made shall come under section (a).

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AUSTIN. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. Does it or does it not strike out lines 5 to 7 on page 10 of the bill?

Mr. AUSTIN. As I understand, it does.

Mr. LANGER. In order to make it clear, let me read it:

> *Provided further*, That none of the dams herein authorized for the Connecticut River Basin shall be utilized for the generation of hydroelectric power.

Mr. AUSTIN. I had not caught the point of the Senator's question. I do not believe it strikes out that language. I do not think it could, that being a committee amendment.

Mr. AIKEN. Is there any objection to withdrawing the committee amendment?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That is for the committee to do.

Mr. AIKEN. That would go a long way toward straightening things out.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I am sure if the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON] were consulted about it, he would have no objections to the elimination of the committee amendment; but I am not the one to speak for the committee, of course.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, I object to the elimination of the committee amendment until we find out what is going in in its place. I am perfectly willing to agree on the compromise when we know what the compromise is. As a member of the committee, I certainly object to the elimination of the committee amendment until we know what is to take its place.

CONTINUATION OF GENERAL MARSHALL AS CHIEF OF STAFF

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, it is my understanding that the pending business, the flood-control bill, is being passed over until tomorrow. I intend to ask unanimous consent for the consideration of a bill passed by the House yesterday. An identical bill was approved by the Senate Committee on Military Affairs last Friday and is now on the Senate Calendar. It would allow the retention of General Marshall as Chief of Staff of the Army. I refer to Senate bill 2192, Calendar No. 1210. The Senate Military Affairs Committee reported a bill in the identical language of the measure passed by the House. So I ask unanimous consent that House bill 5493 be substituted for Calendar 1210, Senate bill 2192, and that the House bill be now considered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from South Dakota?

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GURNEY. I yield.

Mr. HILL. Of course, the Senator is asking that the flood-control bill, the pending business, be temporarily laid aside, and that the Senate consider the House bill to which he has referred?

Mr. GURNEY. I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside, and that the Senate proceed to consider House bill 5493; also that Senate bill 2192 be indefinitely postponed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from South Dakota? The Chair hears none.

The Chair lays before the Senate a bill coming over from the House of Representatives, which will be read.

The bill (H. R. 5493) to provide for the continuation on the active list of the Regular Army for the duration of any of the wars in which the United States is now engaged, and for 6 months thereafter, of any officer on the active list of the Regular Army who has served as Chief of Staff during the wars in which the United States is now engaged was read the first time by its title and the second time at length, as follows:

> *Be it enacted, etc.*, That neither the provisions of the act of June 30, 1882 (22 Stat. 118), which require the retirement of an officer on the active list of the Regular Army upon attaining the age of 64 years, nor any other similar provisions of law, shall for the duration of any of the wars in which the United States is now engaged, and for 6 months thereafter, be applicable to any officer on the active list of the Regular Army who, prior to the enactment of this act, has served as Chief of Staff during the wars in which the United States is now engaged.

The bill was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, Senate bill 2192 will be indefinitely postponed.

RIVER AND HARBOR IMPROVEMENTS

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I submit two amendments to the river and harbor bill, and ask that they be printed and lie on the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendments will be printed and lie on the table.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. HILL. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. WHEELER, from the Committee on Interstate Commerce:

George M. Barnard, of Indiana, to be an Interstate Commerce Commissioner for the remainder of the term expiring December 31, 1950, vice Joseph B. Eastman, deceased.

By Mr. McKELLAR, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads:

Sundry postmasters.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TUNNELL in the chair). If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the Calendar.

THE ARMY

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Army.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, as I understand, under the agreement those nominations will be passed over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Army nominations will be passed over.

OFFICE OF WAR MOBILIZATION AND RECONVERSION—ADVISORY BOARD

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of members of the Advisory Board in the Office of War Mobilization and Reconversion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations in the Office of War Mobilization and Reconversion are confirmed en bloc.

THE JUDICIARY

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Joseph W. Kehoe to be United States district judge for Division No. 2 of Alaska.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Gerald A. Gleeson to be United States attorney for the eastern district of Pennsylvania.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Steve M. King to be United States attorney for the eastern district of Texas.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Jordan B. Royall to be United States marshal for the northern district of Florida.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

THE MARINE CORPS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Marine Corps.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations in the Marine Corps are confirmed en bloc.

POSTMASTERS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations of postmasters are confirmed en bloc.

That completes the calendar.

Mr. HILL. I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of all nominations confirmed today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, have all the nominations on the executive calendar been confirmed?

Mr. HILL. With the exception of those in the Army. They went over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

RECESS

Mr. HILL. As in legislative session, I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 17 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Wednesday, November 29, 1944, at 12 o'clock meridian.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate November 28 (legislative day of November 21), 1944:

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Guy Mason to be a Commissioner of the District of Columbia for a term of 3 years, and until his successor is appointed and qualified.

OFFICE OF WAR MOBILIZATION AND RECONVERSION

MEMBERS OF THE ADVISORY BOARD

Public members

O. Max Gardner
William H. Davis
Anna M. Rosenberg

Labor members

William Green
Philip Murray
T. C. Cashen

Agriculture members

Edward A. O'Neal
James G. Patton
Albert S. Goss

Industry members

Eric A. Johnston
George H. Mead
Nathaniel Dyke, Jr.

THE JUDICIARY

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

Joseph W. Kehoe to be United States district judge for division No. 2 of Alaska.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEYS

Gerald A. Gleeson to be United States attorney for the eastern district of Pennsylvania.

Steve M. King to be United States attorney for the eastern district of Texas.

UNITED STATES MARSHAL

Jordan B. Royall to be United States marshal for the northern district of Florida.

IN THE MARINE CORPS

PROMOTIONS, FOR TEMPORARY SERVICE

To be major generals, for temporary service, from dates indicated

Earl C. Long, from January 7, 1944.
Pedro del Valle, from January 10, 1944.
Louis E. Woods, from September 10, 1944.
Field Harris, from September 10, 1944.

To be brigadier generals, for temporary service, from dates indicated

William T. Clement, from October 3, 1942.
Louis R. Jones, from October 4, 1942.
Joseph H. Fellows, from November 9, 1944.

POSTMASTERS

ALABAMA

Leon C. Taylor, Deatsville.
Frances M. Beaty, Eldridge.
Horace P. Haynes, Hodges.
Leila M. Weekley, Perdido.
Vira Cox, Wilmer.

ARIZONA

Hickey Ross Henderson, McNary.
James M. Owens, Safford.
Warren E. Ware, Superior.

CALIFORNIA

Arthur J. Meyer, Atwood.
Josie F. Ratto, Calistoga.
Mary Elizabeth Bowden, Canby.
Charles C. Toland, Covina.
Oliver H. Umberham, El Modeno.
Howard P. Heintz, Graton.
Dorothy M. Stewart, Ione.
Virgil E. Combs, McFarland.
Delma Lois Justus, Mission San Jose.
Christine Hansen, Penngrove.
Leon A. Parker, Rio Dell.
John Jolly Jones, Sr., Seal Beach.
Ray L. Dowden, Shandon.
Mary Jane Davis, Stanton.
Mathus Reed Wolfskill, Suisun City.
Laurence L. Hodge, Tuolumne.
Ruby J. Cunningham, Ukiah.
Abbie E. Schaeffer, Vernalis.

MASSACHUSETTS

William C. Young, Millbury.
Ruel S. Thayer, Bellingham.

MISSISSIPPI

Annie L. Womack, Marietta.
Sarah L. Brewer, Steens.

NORTH CAROLINA

Sallie M. Brigmon, Barnardsville.
Don P. Steed, Candor.
Alice T. Clarke, Columbus.
Claude M. Schell, Conover.
Clen R. Heath, Cove City.
Myrtle U. Wall, Knightdale.
William Lee Shoaf, Linwood.
Frances M. Todd, Plumtree.
Bessie Caudill, Roaring River.
Marvin J. Carver, Rougemont.
Nettie M. Millis, Sneads Ferry.
Daniel R. Bulla, Sophia.
Ethelyn G. Hawes, Supply.
Carl D. Moore, Mount Ulla.
Anna L. McNeill, Wade.
Rubye S. Hood, Welch Cove.
Basil D. Barr, West Jefferson.

NORTH DAKOTA

Elder G. Ottis, Abercrombie.
Oliver C. Sogard, Alamo.
Amelia K. Martin, Goodrich.
James B. McMillen, Hampden.
James R. Brown, Heaton.
Shirley M. Cascaden, York.

OKLAHOMA

J. Lloyd McLinn, Indiahoma.
Leona M. Hilliary, Medicine Park.
Thomas O. Talla, Sterling.

PENNSYLVANIA

John M. Jones, Allenport.
Thomas J. Murphy, Ashville.
Harold Doering, Bethayres.
H. Vincent Miller, Bird in Hand.
Margaret Darras, Bulger.
Mildred V. Miller, Chadds Ford.
Elmer L. Russell, Cokeburg.
Loren R. Judson, Columbia Cross Roads.
Pauline M. Barry, Custer City.
Anna M. Warner, Derrick City.
Hope B. Sterner, Dewart.
Mary C. Shaefer, East Freedom.
Walter W. Raub, Edinburg.
Lawrence E. Barry, Elwyn.
Ethel M. Krug, Emeigh.
Charlotte S. Clemens, Fallsington.
Bernard M. Schupp, Fryburg.
Jennie T. Rauch, Geneva.
Lula Withrow, Glenwillard.
Earl M. Rynier, Gordonville.
Ruth R. Stiely, Gratz.
Reginald S. Feather, Hadley.
George C. Shick, Hawthorn.
Arthur Chattaway, Hazzard.
Engelbert J. Dittmer, Herman.
Rachel M. Thurston, Iselin.

Hiram Greenland, Karthaus.
Edward Dworak, Kelayres.
Frank C. Gutekunst, Kintnersville.
Walter H. Davis, Klingerstown.
Carroll G. Reynolds, Lakewood.
Helen F. Sheehan, Landenburg.
Fred W. Patterson, Lattimer Mines.
Elen Nora Robinson, Lloydell.
Edgar J. Burkett, Manns Choice.
Katherine M. Norton, Marsteller.
William D. Kelvington, Meadow Lands.
Rebecca Campbell, Midway.
Manning J. O'Connor, Mineral Point.
Pearl M. Severns, Neshaminy.
Edwin Zimmerman, Newmanstown.
Ralph B. Fields, Newton Hamilton.
Mabel Helen Craig, Noblestown.
Charles E. Robacker, Penfield.
Noah B. Becker, Perkiomenville.
Nellie R. McNamee, Pomeroy.
Alice D. Traub, Richboro.
William F. Shuman, Rixford.
Edna M. Huston, Robinson.
Robert D. Hoffecker, Ronks.
Harry Y. Adams, Rothsville.
Viola Cleland, Rutledge.
Beaver Cornelius, Saltillo.
Edith M. Frey, South Heights.
Anna E. Astle, Stockdale.
Emile A. Rank, Sturgeon.
Roland D. Heile, Transfer.
George Acker, Venango.
Ruth E. Funk, Washington Boro.
Edward S. Bookheimer, West Point.
Gertrude A. Burns, Winfield.
Robert V. S. Snyder, Wood.
J. George Keeler, Wyalusing.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, NOVEMBER 28, 1944

The House met at 12 o'clock noon, and was called to order by the Speaker.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Infinite Spirit, God over all, we pray Thee that soon, ah, soon, this world may be released from the appalling grip of despotic masters. Too long have their deadly ministries held captive Thy children and thus caused the heaven-born virtues of the soul to languish and die. O stay Thou their unparalleled cruelties which are benumbing man's best powers and speed the crusade of deliverance until chivalrous benevolence shall cover the earth as the waters cover the sea.

Blessed Lord, today the heart of every lover of liberty and true brotherhood throughout the appealing world goes out in prayerful hope for our peerless Secretary of State. For the affection we bear him, we pray that this strong, noble servant, wise and firm in counsel and just in decision, may be spared to the cause of humanity to which he has given so many years of devotion. May he continue to live and labor in the vanguard of the onward march toward the final triumph of justice over slavery and of good over evil, inspiring us in our thoughts and deeds as he beholds the widening of the pathways of earth's millions—the fruition of his great soul. Grant him, dear Lord, Thy divine tenderness, that all his paths may be paths of peace, and Thine shall be the glory. In the name of our Elder Brother. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 262. An act for the relief of Mrs. J. C. Romberg;

H. R. 1318. An act for the relief of Jack V. Dyer;

H. R. 1654. An act to authorize the acquisition, rehabilitation, and operation of the facilities for the public in the Olympic National Park, in the State of Washington, and for other purposes;

H. R. 1665. An act for the relief of Joseph Paste, Anna Paste, Rose Paste, and to the legal guardian of Doris Paste, and to the legal guardian of Evelyn Paste;

H. R. 1919. An act for the relief of Vannie Butler;

H. R. 2512. An act for the relief of Betty Robins;

H. R. 2601. An act for the relief of Mrs. Flossie Leeser;

H. R. 2896. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. R. L. Rhodes;

H. R. 3373. An act for the relief of Dewey H. Davis;

H. R. 3495. An act for the relief of Constantino Arguelles;

H. R. 3548. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Robert W. Nelson and W. E. Nelson;

H. R. 3608. An act relating to certain overtime compensation of civilian employees of the United States;

H. R. 3750. An act to provide for the appointment of an additional circuit judge for the third circuit, and to permit the filling of the first vacancy occurring in the office of district judge for the eastern district of Pennsylvania;

H. R. 3753. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of Virginia McMillan, a minor, and Howard McMillan;

H. R. 4024.—An act for the relief of Victoria Cormier;

H. R. 4099. An act to extend the period of the Philippine Insurrection so as to include active service with the United States military or naval forces engaged in hostilities in the Moro Province, including Mindanao, or in the islands of Samar and Leyte, between July 5, 1902, and December 31, 1913;

H. R. 4226. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of William L. Owen, a minor;

H. R. 4439. An act for the relief of Dennis C. O'Connell;

H. R. 4929. An act for the relief of Lt. James H. Clark and Eleanor Clark;

H. R. 4999. An act to increase the service-connected disability rates of pension for certain Regular Establishment veterans and veterans of wars prior to World War I;

H. R. 5041. An act to amend the Veterans Regulations;

H. R. 5232. An act to transfer jurisdiction over the Chattanooga National Cemetery, Chattanooga, Tenn., from the Department of the Interior to the War Department, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 5289. An act to provide for the acceptance and protection by the United States of property within the authorized boundaries of the Everglades National Park project, Florida, pending the establishment of the park, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 86. An act to grant pensions to certain unremarried dependent widows of Civil War veterans who were married to the veteran subsequent to June 26, 1905;

H. R. 837. An act to restore and add certain public lands to the Uintah and Ouray Reservation in Utah, and for other purposes;

H. R. 2825. An act for the relief of Sigfried Olsen, doing business as Sigfried Olsen Shipping Co.;

H. R. 3732. An act to repeal the prohibition against the filling of a vacancy in the office of district judge in the district of New Jersey;

H. R. 4065. An act further defining the number and duties of criers and bailiffs in United States courts and regulating their compensation;

H. R. 4366. An act for the relief of Alex Wylie, and the estate of James Evans; and

H. R. 4917. An act conferring upon the State of Montana authority to exchange for other lands certain lands selected by the State of Montana for the use of the University of Montana for biological station purposes pursuant to the Act of March 3, 1905 (33 Stat. 1080).

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills and a joint resolution of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 209. An act authorizing the conveyance of certain property to the State of North Dakota;

S. 1581. An act to authorize the Secretary of War to acquire lands and provide facilities to replace Indian fishing grounds submerged or destroyed as a result of the construction of the Bonneville Dam;

S. 1740. An act conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the District of Massachusetts to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claims of Marjorie E. Drake, Edith Mae Drake, Minnie L. Bickford, and Irene M. Paolini;

S. 1756. An act for the relief of William Luther Thaxton, Jr., and William Luther Thaxton, Sr.;

S. 1819. An act to repeal the acts of August 15, 1935, and January 29, 1940, relating to the establishment of the Patrick Henry National Monument and the acquisition of the estate of Patrick Henry, in Charlotte County, Va.;

S. 1898. An act to amend section 99 of the Judicial Code, as amended, so as to change the term of the District Court for the District of North Dakota at Minot, North Dakota;

S. 1899. An act conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the District of Massachusetts to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Alfred Files;

S. 1900. An act conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the District of Massachusetts to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of the estate of Bertha L. Tatrault;

S. 1958. An act for the relief of fire district No. 1 of the town of Colchester, Vt.;

S. 1960. An act for the relief of Clifford E. Long and Laura C. Long;

S. 1962. An act extending the provisions of Public Law 47, Seventy-seventh Congress, as amended, to reemployment committeemen of the Selective Service System;

S. 1988. An act for the relief of Elizabeth A. Becker;

S. 1993. An act for the relief of the estate of Joseph B. Gowen and Ruth V. Gowen;

S. 2006. An act for the relief of J. A. Davis;

S. 2064. An act for the relief of Richard H. Beall;

S. 2168. An act for the relief of certain disbursing officers of the Army of the United States, and for other purposes;

S. 2194. An act authorizing appropriations for the United States Navy for additional ordnance manufacturing and production facilities, and for other purposes; and

S. J. Res. 156. Joint resolution to extend the statute of limitation in certain cases.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendment of the

House to a bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 1731. An act for the relief of Helen Halverson.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES—DEVELOPMENT OF THE MISSOURI RIVER BASIN

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following letter from the President of the United States, which was read and the letter, together with accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, November 27, 1944.

The SPEAKER OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES:

SIR: On September 21, 1944, I sent a message to the Congress recommending the creation of a Missouri Valley Authority that would be charged with the duty of preparing and carrying out a single coordinated plan for the development of the Missouri River Basin for the greatest benefit of its citizens, both present and future, and for the greatest benefit of the United States. At that time there was under consideration by the Congress two reports, the one presented by the Corps of Engineers, the other by the Bureau of Reclamation, which, while presenting comprehensive plans for the development of the Missouri River, were in conflict in many details. The two bureaus have reconciled the technical difference in these two reports and have prepared a joint recommendation which, in conjunction with the two reports, constitutes a basic plan for the development and control of the waters of the Missouri River.

This joint plan represents a beginning in the solution of the problems of the Missouri Valley. But it is only a beginning, for the other important matters not within the scope of this joint report bear very materially upon the entire region. As a practical matter, most of these cannot be dealt with by conference and agreement among the 10 States directly involved working with separate Federal agencies, for the delay in getting action would be too great to bring about the objectives important to the economy of the entire region. A single authority, such as the Tennessee Valley Authority, over the entire region would provide an adequate mechanism for the adjustment of the interests of the States and for the planning and development of the entire valley.

I am transmitting herewith a copy of that report of reconciliation together with accompanying papers. I now recommend that the plans of the two bureaus, published in House Document 475, Seventy-eighth Congress, and Senate Document 191, Seventy-eighth Congress, as modified in accordance with the recommendations of this joint report, be authorized as a basic engineering plan to be developed and administered by a Missouri Valley Authority such as I have already recommended in my message of September 21.

Sincerely yours,

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order on tomorrow, Calendar Wednesday, be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an address delivered by Assistant Commissioner William E. Warne of the Bureau of Reclamation, before the National Reclamation Association at Denver, Colo., November 17, 1944.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Utah?

There was no objection.

HON. EDWARD R. STETTINIUS, JR.

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Speaker, 24 hours ago we were indulging in expressions of deep, sincere regret over the necessity for the resignation of our great Secretary of State, the Honorable Cordell Hull. The king is dead. Long live the king. Several hours thereafter the President appointed as his successor an able young man—in fact, he will be the second youngest man to have occupied that position—who will also make an excellent Secretary of State. As the Washington Post said this morning, Secretary Stettinius has climbed rapidly. After having filled numerous responsible positions in the Government throughout the war effort he became Lend-Lease Administrator, in which capacity, I believe, he really came into his own. In fact, I am confident that his service as Lend-Lease Administrator caused his appointment as Secretary of State.

During this service the members of the Foreign Affairs Committee saw much of him, and I am sure I do not err in expressing the opinion that the impression created on us by that association was unanimously favorable. He is an able, considerate, personally attractive, diligent gentleman, whom to know is to like. He now steps into huge shoes which will be difficult indeed to fill. However, I am confident that he is as capable of adequately doing so, if not in fact more so, than any man in the United States except the distinguished gentleman who yesterday stepped from them. Toward that end he has my very best wishes which I am quite confident will be concurred in by every member of the Foreign Affairs Committee.

SIDNEY HILLMAN AND THE P. A. C.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to include a news article written by Willard Edwards which appeared in the Washington Times-Herald on November 22, in which my name is listed as being one of the Congressmen supported by the P. A. C.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

[Mr. STEWART addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend by remarks in the RECORD and include a resolution adopted by the National Board of Officers of the Catholic War Veterans, Inc.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a letter from the American Political Science Association to the Members of Congress, and further to extend my remarks and include an address by Hon. Paul A. Walker, of the Federal Communications Commission.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that in the remarks which I shall make this afternoon in the Committee of the Whole I may include the text of certain telegrams.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, and include a letter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. CARLSON of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, and include an editorial from the Kansas City Star on What Is the Matter With Kansas?

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

(Mr. COLE of New York and Mr. BECKWORTH asked and were given permission to extend their remarks in the RECORD.)

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, and include an address by Mr. Lilienthal.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

HON. CORDELL HULL

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, I cannot refrain from taking this time to express my deep regret that continued ill-

ness has required Judge Cordell Hull to resign as Secretary of State.

Secretary Hull has held this most important post in the Cabinet longer than any of his predecessors. He goes into retirement with the high respect and best wishes of the free people all over the world. During these trying years since 1933 Mr. Hull has held steadfastly to the cause of fairness and justice between all nations. Early during his service he saw the danger of nazi-ism and fascism to the cause of world peace. He refused to compromise his ideas and principles when to do so would have been the easier course. He refused to recognize any advantage gained by large nations over small nations through means of aggression. His forthright frankness, honesty, and straightforwardness of purpose has done much to create better relations between the nations of this hemisphere. He is, as President Roosevelt so aptly said, "The father of the United Nations."

The contribution Mr. Hull has made to the cause of world peace gives him a great place in history. He deserves and will receive the thanks of thoughtful citizens of all nations not only in this generation but in the generations to come. We all join in the hope that his health may soon be restored and that he may, in an advisory capacity, continue his great usefulness to the cause for which his life is dedicated.

The Nation is fortunate that Mr. Hull's policies will be carried on by capable Edward Stettinius, who will make a fine Secretary of State.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on two distinct subjects, and further to extend my remarks and include an address by Harry S. Radcliffe on the subject, Foreign Trade Zones as a Post-War Facility. The cost of printing that address in the RECORD is estimated by the Public Printer to be $78.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that today, at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day and following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an address I delivered before the annual meeting of the Mississippi Valley Association on Monday, November 27, on the subject, Proposed Valley Authorities Threaten National Flood Control.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a statement I made before the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 117]

Allen, Ill.	Ford	Merritt
Andrews, N. Y.	Fulbright	Morrison, N. C.
Barry	Fulmer	Mruk,
Bolton	Furlong	Murdock
Boykin	Gale	Myers
Bradley, Mich.	Gallagher	O'Brien, Ill.
Brooks	Granger	O'Connor
Brumbaugh	Hall,	O'Neal
Bulwinkle	Leonard W.	Pfeifer
Burchill, N. Y.	Harness, Ind.	Poulson
Burgin	Hébert	Pracht,
Busbey	Heidinger	C. Frederick
Byrne	Hendricks	Reed, Ill.
Cannon, Fla.	Hinshaw	Rizley
Capozzoli	Holifield	Robsion, Ky.
Carson, Ohio	Jackson	Rolph
Carter	Jeffrey	Rooney
Coffee	Jensen	Rowe
Cooley	Johnson,	Sadowski
Costello	Lyndon B.	Scanlon
Courtney	Jones	Scott
Daughton, Va.	Judd	Shafer
Davis	Kennedy	Sheppard
Dawson	Kilburn	Sheridan
Delaney	Kilday	Somers, N. Y.
Dickstein	King	Sparkman
Dies	Kleberg	Starnes, Ala.
Dingell	Lambertson	Taylor
Domengeaux	Lewis	Thomas, N. J.
Douglas	Luce	Tolan
Ellison, Md.	McKenzie	Treadway
Elston, Ohio	McLean	Ward
Fay	Maas	Whelchel, Ga.
Fenton	Magnuson	Winstead
Fish	Mansfield,	Winter
Fitzpatrick	Mont.	

The SPEAKER. On this roll call 327 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

Further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

PROGRAM FOR THE WEEK

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to find out the program for tomorrow, if this bill is disposed of today.

Mr. McCORMACK. I am glad the gentleman from Massachusetts has made that inquiry. Yesterday I was able to give the program only generally.

The first order of business, now that the rule on it has been reported out, will be the bill extending the Second War Powers Act. A rule has also been reported out on the Smaller War Plants Corporation bill, and that will follow. After that the bill introduced by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HOBBS] and to which I referred yesterday, in relation to acts of sabotage, will be called up.

CRIERS AND BAILIFFS IN UNITED STATES COURTS

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 4065) further defining the number and duties of criers and bailiffs in United States courts and regulating their compensation, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "his court" and insert "the court in which he presides."

Page 2, line 5, strike out "for each court."

Page 2, line 10, after "present", insert "In case the position of crier or bailiff is to be filled by the appointment of a person who has not previously served as either crier or bailiff, preference in the appointment shall be given to a person who has served in the military or naval forces of the United States in time of war and who has been honorably discharged therefrom, if in the opinion of the appointing officer such person is as well qualified as any other available person to perform to the satisfaction of the appointing officer all the duties of the position being filled."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman explain the Senate amendments?

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, the amendments extend to bailiffs the same privileges that veterans now enjoy in other governmental positions. In other words, they give veterans preference in the appointments that will be made in the future.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, this has nothing to do with the raising of their pay?

Mr. WALTER. No, indeed.

Mr. RANKIN. It does not have to do with the commissioners of the courts?

Mr. WALTER. Oh, no.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FEDERAL-AID ROAD ACT

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 4915) to amend and supplement the Federal-Aid Road Act, approved July 11, 1916, as amended and supplemented, to authorize appropriations for the post-war construction of highways and bridges, to

eliminate hazards at railroad-grade crossings, to provide for the immediate preparation of plans and acquisition of rights-of-way, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 4915, with Mr. COOPER in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Section 1 of the bill has been read and is now open to amendment.

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. Mr. Chairman, I offer a committee amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment offered by Mr. ROBINSON of Utah: On page 2, line 4, after the word "of", strike out the word "ten" and insert the word "five."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I am sure we are all in sympathy with the purposes of this bill, which has to do with a very important feature of our post-war activities, especially during the time of reconversion.

The matter of road building naturally involves three particular general classes of such construction, the highways under the Federal road system, the farm-to-market roads, and the urban roads or highways, each of which is important in its relation to a comprehensive program.

My purpose in rising at this time is to get information with reference to one feature of this bill which I think should be clarified by a statement from the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Roads.

Beginning in November of last year, the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds conducted very voluminous hearings with reference to many phases of post-war planning. Mr. Thomas H. MacDonald, Commissioner of the Public Roads Administration, and Mr. W. E. Reynolds, Commissioner of the Public Buildings Administration, each of whom has devoted very serious thought and study to the matter of urban development and its relation to the Federal highway system, appeared and testified before that committee. There are relatively few distinctive cities in the United States from the standpoint of original planning for their progress. Most cities of this country, like Topsy, have just "growed," without any well-defined pattern formed in advance. They have proceeded in rather a haphazard way, and this has been largely due to the lack of vision in determining their development. This matter is more largely concerned with proper highway planning than many of us may at first realize.

I feel sure that the chairman of the Committee on Roads has read the testimony of Mr. MacDonald and Mr. Reynolds before the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds. The acquisition of rights-of-way for rural roads is much less expensive than the rights-of-way of highways in cities, which should be constructed both to facilitate traffic and also to accord with proper development planning of the cities themselves. More than one-half of our automobile traffic involves the use of such urban highways and their connections with roads of other character contemplated by this bill.

I infer from the terms of the pending bill, from the standpoint of encouraging proper planning of urban highways in accordance with such purposes as I have indicated, that it is proposed with reference to the acquisition of rights-of-way that such cost is to be borne in part by the Federal Government in the same proportion recited with reference to roads and highways not urban in character. I think we should have some definite understanding along this line in the enactmet of this legislation.

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANHAM. I am glad to yield to the distinguished gentleman from Utah.

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. I will say that under the terms of our bill the Federal Government pays its proportionate share of urban rights-of-way. The Senate struck that provision out of the bill, but that provision is in the bill that we now present to the Committee.

Mr. LANHAM. I appreciate that statement and am glad to have that matter made clear.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANHAM. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. Is it the understanding of the distinguished gentleman from Texas that we are going to build streets in our cities and go out and condemn land to build streets, aside from highways?

Mr. LANHAM. Oh, no; that is not the proposal I have in mind. If my good friend from Missouri will read the testimony to which I have referred, before the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds—and I am sure the chairman of the Committee on Roads has read it—I think he will get an accurate impression of just what I have in mind, especially from the standpoint of urban development.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. I will be glad to read it, but I predicated my question upon the statement of street development in cities.

Mr. LANHAM. As a matter of fact, we are going to have to modify very considerably our system with reference to highways through the cities if we are going to facilitate traffic and stop this haphazard development of cities. It is with reference to that particular feature that I was speaking.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 additional minute.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANHAM. May I ask the chairman of the Committee on Roads also to what extent the State highway commissions will be consulted with reference to the interregional highways, which are very important in many of our States, and naturally the State authorities are very familiar with local conditions. The bill, as I understand it, provides for conference and consultation with them. I am wondering to what extent the Commissioner of the Public Roads Administration will rely upon and acquiesce in their recommendations.

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. Under the terms of this bill, the fixing of highway locations is left entirely with the State highway commissioners, but they must be located with the approval of the Commissioner of Public Roads.

Mr. LANHAM. And I believe, from the statement made before our committee by Mr. MacDonald, that he is quite in sympathy with the argument I have been making.

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. I am sure he is.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has again expired.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Georgia is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I am in favor of this bill, but I am very apprehensive about the amount to be spent annually; I just do not believe that all the States can match the fund that is allotted to them.

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. I yield.

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. Has the gentleman read the statement that was put in the RECORD in connection with my remarks? It was a statement compiled by the American Association of State Highway Commissioners. Each State was asked in what financial position it was to make the contribution called for under the terms of this bill.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. I have.

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. Under that statement, I believe we must all conclude that the States are in position to match this fund.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. I have read that statement. The Commissioners of the respective States are fine men; but of course represent roads only and therefore probably have not given consideration to other worth-while projects. Each State is now planning post-war projects; each county of each State is planning post-war projects, each municipality of every county is planning projects. I admit that if we had no other projects than this, we probably could match the highway fund, but with all these other projects doubt is raised in my mind.

Another thing to which I desire to call attention is that during the first year or two following the end of the war we are not going to have a great deal of unemployment. The unemployment will reach its peak 4 or 5 years from now. I am not against the billion and a half. It does not mean the expenditure of merely the $500,000,000 carried by the

bill, but when that amount is matched by the States it means a billion dollars a year for 3 years. Why can we not spread that amount over 5 years, instead of 3? I do not believe we can judiciously spend a billion a year. Remember, this does not mean $500,000,000 a year; it means a matching of the $500,000,000, the expenditure of a billion a year. I was in hopes the committee would accept this suggestion. I do not want to suggest anything in the way of defeat of the bill, for the program is a fine program; but I believe we ought to give serious consideration to the ability of the States to match these funds; and I feel that it should be spread over 5 years, instead of 3.

I expect to offer an amendment to page 4, beginning in line 11, to strike out "Subject to the approval of the Commissioner of Public Roads", and insert "The specifications and plans for the construction of such roads shall not be subject to approval by the Commissioner of Public Roads."

I understand the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT] a member of the committee, is going to offer an amendment to carry out this idea.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. I yield.

Mr. WOLCOTT. May I suggest to the gentleman that that language has to do only with the selection of the roads; it has nothing to do with the standards under which the roads are to be constructed.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. What I am trying to get at is that in the case of feeder highways—not in the Federal-aid highway system—the authorities in the county, together with the State highway commissioner, ought to select these roads, because when they come to Washington the standards are going to be so high that they will not be able to construct so many roads. These roads are not subject to such heavy hauling. I believe the commissioner here would probably accept the recommendation of the State highway commissioner. If not, the construction of these county roads in the various States would be very costly.

Mr. WOLCOTT. As I understand it, section 3 of the Senate bill (S. 2105) will be offered by the committee in substitution of a section of the House bill. Section 3 of the Senate bill provides that these selections of secondary road systems shall be made in cooperation with the county commissioners, county supervisors, or other appropriate local officials. The House bill provides that this shall be done by consultation. I do not believe that the Federal Public Roads Commissioner would approve a secondary road unless the project was initiated by a local authority and the selection made in cooperation with that authority.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 additional minute.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOLCOTT. The gentleman, as I understand it, seeks to prevent arbitrary standards being constructed and that should go into subsection (b), page 5, of the Senate bill, which is section 4.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Is that the amendment the gentleman proposes to offer?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I have an amendment.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. I will support the gentleman's amendment and not offer mine.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I was greatly interested in the remarks made by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LANHAM]. The cost of rights-of-way and the local engineering fees have not been regarded as being properly matched and after perusal of this bill rather carefully I cannot see that the assurance of the chairman of the committee is sufficiently conclusive. I suppose he refers to page 3, the latter part of the first paragraph. I would like to ask the chairman if he considers that when there is a contract agreement on the part of the Federal authority with the State authorities that half the cost of the rights-of-way shall and must be paid by the Federal Government?

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GIFFORD. I yield to the gentleman from Utah.

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. On page 1 of the bill is the following:

> The term "construction" means the supervising, inspecting, actual building, and all expenses incidental to the construction or reconstruction of a highway, including locating, surveying, and mapping, costs of rights-of-way, and elimination of hazards at railway grade crossings.

Mr. GIFFORD. That is what I have in mind. The first paragraph of the bill is as usual rather descriptive and the word "construction" is supposed to be clearly defined. I will be content with that version, but I wanted to make it perfectly clear so that it would not and could not be otherwise interpreted. I accept the explanation of the chairman and I thank him, because we all know that the bottlenecks in automobile travel are in the urban centers. It is a highly expensive proposition to acquire rights-of-way there. I can see that in my own State if they did not include rights-of-way the matching would result in few miles of actual roads. We would get 15 to 30 percent only of the actual cost of construction. I wanted to emphasize this feature of the bill and intended to take the floor, although I was gratified that the gentleman from Texas brought it to the attention of the committee.

Mr. Chairman, year after year I have been voting for these measures allocated on the present basis, but some day the man who pays this bill, the men who are the auto owners themselves, will expect to get a larger distribution according to their contributions by their particular States. I am not opposing this bill, although I am interested in some amendments. I wanted to be assured by the chairman of the committee regarding the inclusion of costs of rights-of-way. I feel somewhat relieved by his explanation.

Here is another point that has not been brought out. This is a road bill that will cost 2 to 1 in some States inasmuch that the interest charge might be as large as the original cost. We understand that debt is sometimes incurred in matching funds that have run for as long as 20 years.

It is to be hoped that all States may get on a pay-as-you-go basis. Is it possible that in some States they have paid $2, because of interest paid for a long term of years? Am I right about that, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. I would not be able to answer that. I do not know what they do in the gentleman's State.

Mr. GIFFORD. I have been told this, and I sometimes have to believe what I am told, of course, this condition does not prevail in my own State. However, I wish to say to the gentleman that we have to be a little watchful, because as with all Federal appropriations we pay about from three to five times as much as we ever get.

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. I was going to say this, that the Commissioner of Public Roads, Mr. MacDonald, appeared before the committee and made some suggestions that we thought should be adopted, and I think that most of the suggestions Mr. MacDonald, of Massachusetts, made have been incorporated in this bill.

Mr. GIFFORD. I am familiar with many of Mr. MacDonald's recommendations. I have communications from him in a file I have here.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

The Clerk read as follows:

> SEC. 2. For the purpose of carrying out the provisions of the Federal Highway Act, approved November 9, 1921, as amended and supplemented, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of $1,500,000,000 to become available at the rate of $500,000,000 a year for each 3 successive post-war fiscal years. The first post-war fiscal year shall be that fiscal year which ends on June 30 following the termination of the present war emergency, or as otherwise directed by the Congress. The authorization for the first post-war fiscal year shall be apportioned among the States within 30 days from the passage of this act. The authorizations for the second and third post-war fiscal years shall be apportioned among the States not later than January 1 next preceding the beginning of each such fiscal year. As soon as the funds for each of the first 2 post-war fiscal years have been apportioned, the Commissioner of Public Roads is authorized to enter into agreements with the State highway departments for the making of surveys and plans, the acquisition of rights-of-way, and the post-war construction of projects. His approval of any such agreement shall be a contractual obligation of the Federal Government for the payment of its pro rata share of the cost of construction.

Mr. MOTT. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MOTT:

On page 2, line 19, after the words "the sum of", strike out "$1,500,000,000" and insert "$1,800,000,000."

On page 2, line 20, after the words "the rate of", strike out "$500,000,000" and insert "$600,000,000."

Mr. MOTT. Mr. Chairman, this amendment provides for an over-all increase of $300,000,000, which would give an additional $100,000,000 per year for the 3-year post-war highway construction program under the terms of this act.

As every member of the Committee on Roads knows, the testimony before that committee is complete and indisputable to the effect that it will require $11,000,000,000 to bring the existing road system of the United States up to standard. As I stated when I discussed this bill during general debate, the amount originally proposed for this program was $3,000,000,000, or an expenditure of $1,000,000,000 a year for 3 years. This bill as reported from the committee will not make an adequate beginning even for the reconstruction of our highway system, to say nothing of expanding that system, which everyone admits we must eventually do. I stated then, and I repeat it now, that when this war is concluded not merely $1,500,000,000, not $3,000,000,000, but five, six, or seven billion dollars will be expended within the next few years for road construction. Everyone knows that must be done and that it will be done. The question is, Shall the Congress do it under law or shall some executive agency do it under directives or Executive orders?

Mr. Chairman, you all know that there are planning agencies in every department of this Government which for years have been busy making plans, plans which have not been submitted to Congress, but which the executive agencies intend to use after this war is over, and the road-building phase of this executive post-war planning has by no means been overlooked. The planners are already at work now on a comprehensive plan of post-war road construction, which will amount to more than the figure named in this bill.

As soon as an unemployment problem presents itself these planners are going to put that plan into effect, under an agency set up along the lines of the W. P. A., and they will build the post-war roads of this country without consulting Congress at all, except to come in from time to time to ask for appropriations after the program is under way. That is what these executive planners did in the depression days. That is what they will do again unless we prevent it now by enacting an adequate post-war road-building program now—a program to be carried out under the processes of law and not under executive directives.

I hope none of you will misunderstand this, for there is nothing political about it, when I tell you that the present administration has always opposed road construction under mandatory law. The President a few years ago, you will recall, sent a message to Congress asking the Committee on Appropriations to appropriate no more money for roads, and asking the Committee on Roads to authorize no more road programs. On one occasion he vetoed a road bill because it was a mandatory bill, and we were obliged to pass it over his veto.

There has never been a time in the last 10 years when, so far as administration approval was concerned, the Committee on Roads could not have obtained all the money it wanted for a biennial road program if it had only consented to leave the entire discretion in road building to an executive agency. We have never consented to do that. We have always insisted that these road programs be carried out under mandatory law of the Congress.

Now is the proper time for the Congress to put into effect a real post-war road-building program by increasing the amount which is provided in this bill and requiring that the program be carried out under the law of this Congress and not under the whims and discretions of bureaucratic agencies, which was the case when W. P. A. built the roads, and which will be the case after this war is over, unless we prevent it now by authorizing an adequate sum for our post-war reconstruction program.

I think this is a proposal which everyone can conscientiously support. The bill would not provide nearly enough money, even as amended. We are going to spend much more than that. We should spend it under mandatory law of this Congress and not leave the whole thing to the discretion of a bureaucratic agency. I ask your serious consideration and your favorable vote on this proposal to increase the sums proposed in this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Oregon has expired.

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, this part of the bill was given very serious consideration. We as a committee spent many hours on this particular phase of the bill. It is true that the testimony that came before the committee would bear out what the gentleman from Oregon says, that more money could be used. Unquestionably it could be used. However, it was the unanimous opinion of the committee, I may say, with the possible exception of one or two members, one of whom was the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. MOTT], that $500,000,000 annually should be allowed under this bill. It was thought that that was a reasonable sum. It was a little more than some members of the committee thought ought to be authorized and it was much less than a great many members of the committee thought should be authorized. It is true that there have been no authorizations for our roads for 3 years, and unquestionably more money could be used. However, the Congress will be in session and if we see that more money can be used in this particular work, the committee can meet again and make further authorizations.

Mr. MOTT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. I yield to the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. MOTT. Did we not have exactly that experience during the depression, that the Congress was in session and the Committee on Roads was in continuous session, and there was not a thing we could do to stop road building on a more huge scale than was the case under the regular program? There was nothing we could do to stop road building by the W. P. A. That is the reason I make this prediction: Unless we do it by mandatory law now, we are going to do it under bureaucratic discussion after the war is over.

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. The committee takes the position they are doing just that now by mandatory law, if the amount that is now provided in this bill is retained.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. I yield.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Is it not true during the depression there were $400,000,000 which were authorized and confined, substantially, to 1 year? Under the terms of this bill, four times that much is allowed, or $1,500,000,000, so that we have increased three times over the amount that was authorized for road construction during the depression.

Mr. HARE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. I yield.

Mr. HARE. Is it not true that this is also contemplated, that in addition to this road-building program, following the war, there may be a further program for the construction of superhighway systems for military purposes, and it will take money to build those too.

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. I will say it will take money to build this type of roads if that kind of program is contemplated.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. MOTT].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WOLCOTT, of Michigan: On page 2, line 21, after the word "years", strike out the sentence in lines 21, 22, and 23 and 24 and insert in lieu thereof the following: "The first post-war fiscal year shall be the fiscal year 1945 or as otherwise directed by the Congress."

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, the argument used as to why this bill should be passed at this particular time, is that the legislatures of 44 of the States meet next January. I have always thought that was a rather shallow excuse for passing this bill at this particular time. But, nevertheless, there is a certain degree of substance to that argument. But the language in the bill completely nullifies that argument because the legislatures of the States have no information whatsoever, as to when this program is going to start. The language of the bill at present is as follows:

The first post-war fiscal year shall be that fiscal year which ends on June 30, following the termination of the present war emergency, or as otherwise directed by the Congress.

Now, can anybody describe what is meant by "the termination of the present war emergency"; and who determines whether the present war emergency is terminated, except the Congress under this language? If the Congress has to take some subsequent action to make this bill effective, then, of course, there is no justification for passing the bill at the present time. So, in order that the States might have a definite program laid out for a definite period, starting at a definite time, I have substituted for the language which I have just read, the language which indicates that the program will start at the end of the present fiscal year. The seriousness of this lies in the fact that on page 3 of the bill, line 10, after the approval has been made by the Federal Bureau of Public Roads, that approval and the agreements and authorizations entered into thereunder, become a contractual obligation between the Federal Government and the States, and the States might go into the Court of Claims and sue the United States for its portion under this bill, notwithstanding the language which I have just read, which is now in the bill. We do not know whether the present war emergency will end after the collapse of Germany, or even after the total defeat of Japan, because the war continues until peace is signed and ratified, unless somebody does something about it in the meantime.

So it is only sensible to make this program start at a very definite time. If it becomes impracticable to start this program at the end of this fiscal year, then the Congress, being in session next year, can take some negative action much more safely than it can leave this bill in this nebulous form.

I hope the amendment will be adopted.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield.

Mr. MAY. Does not the gentleman think his amendment should be modified to make it read "for the year 1946," in view of the fact that that fiscal year will begin in the middle of the next year?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I assume that Germany will be knocked out of the war before the end of the fiscal year 1945, and that the men would be coming home and that materials might be safely allocated for highway construction by at least next July. I hope that is the case.

Mr. MAY. I think there is merit in the amendment, but I think it ought to apply to the definite year 1946.

Mr. WOLCOTT. If it applies to 1946, then the plan would not become effective until July of 1946, 2 years from now, because it is the end of the fiscal year and not the beginning.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. The proposed amendment would be exceedingly unwise. The war has not been won as yet. Under the terms of the bill the usual phraseology has been included in the bill with respect to post-war projects and post-war construction. The bill provides that the first appropriation or allocation shall be for the fiscal year ending June 30, following the termination of the present war emergency, or as otherwise directed by the Congress. The President of the United States declared the emergency. The President of the United States will declare when the emergency ends. But if the Congress is not satisfied with that declaration, under the terms of the bill the Congress reserves the power and reserves the right as to when the first appropriation shall be made.

The provision in the latter part of this section with respect to contracts and contractual obligations is exactly the law as it now obtains, and it is necessary in order to provide for a constructive program. To show you how unwise it would be to accept the proposed amendment, let me remind you that the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MAY] asked a most pertinent question. The Congress has already made appropriations for the fiscal year 1945. The fiscal year 1945 began on July 1, 1944. It would be most unwise for us to now hamper this legislation, to retard it by a provision that would be virtually retroactive, in that it would require appropriations for the present fiscal year, whereas we have made appropriations for all necessary construction under existing legislation, and for all other purposes for the fiscal year 1945, unless a deficiency appropriation indicates that additional appropriations should be made.

In other words, the Commander in Chief, the President of the United States, has proclaimed the emergency; the fact of the emergency is well known. This is language that was used by the Senate in the passage of a similar bill; it is the language that obtained when the Committee on Roads agreed to reserve to the Congress of the United States the power to determine when the first allocation and appropriation should be made. We were not content to rely exclusively upon the declaration of the close of the emergency by the President of the United States, but we included the words which are contained in the gentleman's amendment; "or as otherwise directed by the Congress."

I now yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. MAY. The point which I think is important is that during the war emergency all of the States have had to suspend road construction on account of inability to get materials and labor.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Yes.

Mr. MAY. Under the bill, as now written, it is uncertain as to when it becomes effective. We have a majority of the State legislatures meeting month after next. How can they make a commitment unless a definite date is fixed?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. The Congress must keep faith with the country. This is a post-war construction bill. If we are to have a post-war construction bill that means that it will go into effect after the termination of the present emergency. The amendment provides for the fiscal year 1946. I do not know what the future holds in store for us, but we have reported this as a post-war highway bill and we ought to keep faith with the country and not undertake to stipulate that this program should begin in any year prior to the post-war period. The adoption of the proposed amendment or any similar amendments specifying any particular year, which year may be before the end of the war would be a mistake, and would change the character of this program.

Mr. Chairman, I trust the amendment will be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. WOLCOTT) there were—ayes 53, noes 46.

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. Mr. Chairman, I ask for tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chair appointed as tellers, Mr. ROBINSON of Utah and Mr. WOLCOTT.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 101, noes 84.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which I have at the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. RANDOLPH: Page 3, line 13, after the word "construction", insert *"Provided, however,* That the Commissioner of Public Roads shall not as a condition of approval of any project for Federal aid hereunder require any State to acquire title to or control of any marginal land along the proposed highway in addition to that reasonably necessary for road surfaces, median strips, gutters, ditches, and side slopes."

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Chairman, the provisions of H. R. 4915, as presented to the committee after most careful study and hearings, are most important to this House and our action which affects post-war road construction will be in a sense a foundation upon which we will build any future legislation of this type. It is, therefore, desirable that consideration be given at this time to the amendment which I have presented.

It is a protective amendment. The distinguished chairman of the Committee on Roads, a committee on which I am delighted to serve under his leadership, might say that it is unnecessary. Under section 7 of the bill which relates to interregional highways, and the set-up of these express roads, the Commissioner of Public Roads of the United States would not exercise certain powers it may be contended if he were to follow the recommendations which were adopted when we received the report of the Interregional Highway Committee as filed with this Congress in January 1944, also as a result of the request of the President of the United States, for a plan of interregional highways of this country.

The amendment, as I say, is protective. It would allow to the States the discretion of securing the rights-of-way as to widths which would be necessary for any roadway to be laid down.

Let us analyze that problem just a moment. Approximately 100 feet is now recognized as a sufficient width for the construction of most highways. Under the report, House Document No. 379—Seventy-eighth Congress, page 93—that

the Commissioner of Public Roads "shall only approve projects which meet the basic standard specified in the report" or in other words the Federal Government would require the States to have 300-foot widths for highways; in other words, 100-foot marginal strips on either side of that roadbed, and so forth, which would be necessary for actual road construction.

I believe that it is necessary to reserve to the States reasonableness in connection with the purchase of the rights-of-way. One State might find it advisable not to have the 300 feet. Another State might find it advisable to have that amount. I do not want a farmer's land to be taken out of productivity because that acreage happens to abut on a road. I do not want legitimate business which is close by a highway, if it does not interfere with the actual motor travel, to be torn down and removed.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANDOLPH. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. MICHENER. Is this the amendment that has the support of the outdoor advertising companies?

Mr. RANDOLPH. It has general support, including those whose business is highway-sign advertising.

Mr. MICHENER. That means bill boards.

Mr. RANDOLPH. That is correct. Support also comes, I might say, of the American Federation of Labor, the Grange, the Highway Property Owners Association, and the Farm Bureau. Those organizations have contacted Members in support of the amendment. My colleague the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. McGREGOR], is on his feet adding properly the official, The Farm Bureau, because he is interested in the amendment from that standpoint. It takes into consideration the acreage now in productivity. It takes into consideration the available sites that are used by legitimate business. The amendment would provide that the States provide reasonable land for road surfaces, for medium strips, for gutters, for ditches, and for side slopes.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANDOLPH. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. In other words, the Federal Government might use that particular power as a club over the States in withholding Federal aid.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Yes; that could be done. I believe, as the gentleman believes, that there should be certain discretionary powers remaining to the States in connection with highway construction. No one is advocating a narrow road; one which is not adequate. All that we are asking is that the Federal Government not require the States to buy excessive land tracts on either side of the road where the highway is to be constructed.

Mr. Chairman, I trust the committee will find it reasonable to support this amendment in the interest of a fair distribution of responsibility between Federal and State governments.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

I sincerely hope that my Republican colleagues will support this Randolph amendment.

The effect of this amendment is to leave the matter of the establishment of these proposed marginal strips to the uncontrolled discretion of each State highway department and to leave the matter of the enactment of laws authorizing States and municipalities to acquire title to, or control over, such strips to the uncontrolled discretion of each State legislature, without, in either case, having such action forced upon the States by the threat of withholding Federal aid if the action desired by the Federal bureau is not taken. The proposed amendment does not prohibit the establishment of such marginal strips, nor the enactment of laws authorizing them. It simply prevents Federal aid to highways from being used as a club to force State action and legislation—a purpose for which Federal aid was never intended to be used.

If the amendment is adopted, each State highway department and each State legislature can consider on its merits the proposal to establish these marginal strips. Each of them will then balance whatever advantages such strips may possess against their many disadvantages and objectionable features. Included in the latter—in addition to the constitutional objections—is the added cost of such strips. To purchase such strips would approximately triple the cost of acquiring new right-of-way.

Many States simply could not afford to contribute their portion of this added cost. Most States would prefer to use whatever highway funds are available for the purpose of actual highway construction which will create jobs, rather than for the purchase of this excess right-of-way, which will create no jobs. The impelling motive which is causing Congress to appropriate vast sums for this interregional highway program is the creation of jobs. Establishment of these marginal strips would not only work against this end by using available funds for non-job-producing purposes—purchase of excess right-of-way—but would also interfere with the Nation's job-creating machinery by eliminating roadside business such as gasoline service stations, retail stores, outdoor advertising companies, and so forth, capable of employing many people, and by eliminating outdoor advertising structures capable of producing great consumer demand for many products advertised along streets and highways, which consumer demand means jobs for the employees of such advertisers.

It is certainly to be hoped that the sections of the interregional highway committee's report, recommending that withholding of Federal aid be used as a club to force States to establish such marginal strips, does not represent the ideas of the United States Commissioner of Public Roads and that he does not plan, as recommended by the report, to use this power of approval for any such harsh or unwarranted purpose. If he has had no such intention, then there should be no objection to the proposed amendment, and the amendment will be merely a safeguard to insure that some future occupant of the office does not use this power of approval in this fashion. Certainly it would cause much public resentment to have a Federal official use his veto power for the purpose of forcing States to take action, or to pass laws designed to carry out his ideas, especially where such ideas deal with a very controversial matter which has not been submitted to nor approved by the Federal Congress.

I sincerely hope the Members on my side of the aisle will support the Randolph amendment.

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment close in 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Utah?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. Mr. Chairman, I want to inform the Committee that this matter was considered by the committee very carefully. I believe that most of the members of the committee failed to understand some of the matters with reference to this particular amendment. In the first place, the present law provides that the rights-of-way when purchased by the state must be approved by the Public Roads Administration. No serious trouble has ever arisen over that provision. We are going further in this bill than we have ever gone before. We are extending to the States and paying to the States one-half of the amount of the cost of the rights-of-way and yet, while we are making the Federal Government pay one-half of the cost of the rights-of-way, you are saying to the Federal Government, "You must not have any control, whatever, over these rights-of-way." This is a plan, I think, principally advocated by people who want to advertise along the rights-of-way.

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. I yield.

Mr. McGREGOR. I wonder if my distinguished chairman, and I know he wants to be fair, will tell the Members of the House, what the opinion of the committee was and the vote of the committee on this particular amendment?

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. As to the number of votes, I do not recall.

Mr. McGREGOR. If the gentleman would yield further, is it not a fact that this amendment was really carried in the committee before it was offered in the House?

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. I would not say that because we were operating under a rule where everything had to be unanimous or we did not report it to the House.

Mr. McGREGOR. If my chairman will yield further, he would not say that my statement is in error?

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. I surely would not say that the gentleman's statement is in error. If the gentleman

makes that statement, I take it, it is correct. We were handling our amendments under a plan whereby the amendments had to be unanimously approved or we did not offer them to the House.

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. I yield.

Mr. VURSELL. The gentleman makes a distinction that the Federal Government will pay half and that they should have at least some measure of control. I think the argument was made here that the Federal Government pays no part of this and that it is only a trustee of the money taken from the taxpayers.

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. Mr. Chairman, I did not yield for an argument. I want to say this: That under the law as it now stands there has been no encroachment on States' rights. Under the law as proposed here, we feel it is necessary that the Federal Government have some control over the rights-of-way that are purchased and that it becomes absolutely necessary if we are to build the proper highways.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. I yield.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Is it not true the title to the rights-of-way remain in the State and local subdivisions and that any prohibitions against advertising would be up to the States and local subdivisions, and that this bill makes no change in that existing law?

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. I think that is correct.

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. I yield.

Mr. McGREGOR. I think my chairman will agree with me, this is not just a matter of advertising. Unless this amendment is accepted, it will be within the power of the Commissioner to say to every one of my farmers and every one of the property owners along the right-of-way that they must move their fences, corncribs, or other property.

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. He has nothing to do with that; all the Commissioner of Public Roads has to do is to approve of the action of the State road commission. He can approve or disapprove.

Mr. McGREGOR. May I ask my chairman, what if he does not approve? What is going to be the effect?

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. If he disapproves it, of course, then he will have to set forth his reasons for disapproval.

Mr. McGREGOR. Then if the chairman wants to be fair, and the Commissioner wants to be fair, why is there any objection to this amendment?

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. Simply because we are trying now to make a harmonious road system throughout the whole United States. It will be for the entire people. If something arises where some State is interfering with the rights of the people of the United States, we feel, and the committee felt, that the Commissioner should have some say as to what action should be taken under those circumstances.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman be kind enough to yield?

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. I yield.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I do not believe our chairman, for whom I have very high regard, means to leave the impression with the Committee that rigidity of any highway system necessarily means it is a good system. There has to be a give and take, with certain States, of course, using their judgment as to rights-of-way, and as to methods of raising funds with which they match the Federal dollar. We give by this amendment, reasonable assurance to the Federal Government that ditches and gutters and marginal slopes and median strips will be provided by the States.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired. All time has expired.

The question recurs on the amendment offered by the gentleman from West Virginia.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BROWN of Georgia: Page 2, line 20, strike out "$500,000,000" and insert "$300,000,000", and strike out "three" and insert "five"; and on page 3, line 2, strike out "second and third" and insert "remaining."

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, my amendment does not change the amount allotted to the highway system. It retains $1,500,000,000, but instead of expending this in 3 years we allot it over a period of 5 years. Instead of spending $500,000,000 annually for 3 years we would spend $300,000,000 annually for 5 years.

The amount contained in this bill is much larger than any other sum that has ever been appropriated by the Congress, and many of the States have had a difficult time in matching the amount heretofore.

In addition to that, while I know of nothing more desirable than spending our money on highways, at the same time there are many other post-war projects for which money must be spent. We should realize that.

Many of the States cannot match the $300,000,000 and carry out other projects that must be taken care of.

I know of many other projects that should be developed for which money must be spent. I am not trying to reduce the amount in the bill. I want to see $1,500,000,000 spent on the highways of America, but I want it spent judiciously and equitably among all the States of the Union. In order to do that, and so the poor States or those States less able to match will have more time to receive the benefits of the Government, we should extend the time to 5 years instead of 3 years.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired.

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. We regard this as a matter of very vital importance. I sincerely trust the Committee will sustain the Roads Committee in the amount that it has placed in this bill. As I recall, we met in executive session for 7 different days. We considered every amount that was suggested at that time. After considering the various amounts over a period of time we concluded, as a compromise, that $500,000,000 should be the proper amount. Some wanted more than that; others wanted less than that.

The gentleman from Georgia is mistaken in his facts about the amount that has been authorized for these purposes heretofore; $400,000,000 was authorized at one time and $500,000,000 at another time. So this is not out of line with the authorizations that have been made heretofore for road purposes.

I also want to call the attention of the Committee to the fact that no construction of roads has taken place, except for defense purposes, in 3 years. It may be some time yet before we will be able to work on our roads. Therefore, we are in a position where we must have more money than the ordinary appropriation, and the ordinary appropriation for Federal highways has always been from $20,000,000 to $400,000,000 annually.

One other matter to which I want to call the attention of the Committee is this: we made a study of every State in the Union as to whether or not this amount of money could be used by them under their present tax structure; that is, without imposing additional taxes.

We have the report of these States, the report is in the RECORD; and you will find by an examination of the report that all of the States can use part of this $500,000,000 if they have the opportunity to do so.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. I yield.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Chairman, is it not also a fact that States providing their money without increase of taxes also were practically unanimous in the belief that they would have no difficulty in matching the Federal funds?

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. That is correct. I wish also to state that the main highway users and the various people interested in highways came before our committee; in fact, we had 110 witnesses appearing before our committee and I cannot recall 1 who advocated a lesser amount than now appears in this bill. Nearly all of them advocated a much larger amount.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. I yield.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. It is my understanding that no more than $250,000,000 has been spent in any 1 year on the matching program.

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. The gentleman is talking about the primary roads. We are appropriating only $225,000,000 for those roads.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. I am talking about the whole system.

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. No; under the established system we have authorized the appropriation of as much as $500,000,000 in 1 year for this work.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Utah has expired.

Mr. PACE. Mr. Chairman, I believe this amendment is very important for this reason: We are now about to set the pattern. As I recall, this is the first

appropriation authorization made by the Congress for a program which has nothing whatever to do with the winning of the war. We have appropriated enormous sums for the prosecution of the war. We have done so without hesitation. We have done so, I think, with the full approval of the American people, for whatever the cost, this war must be won. We will win the war with a national debt beyond our conception, in the neighborhood of $300,000,000,000. After this road bill soon will come an airport-construction program, then will come the public-works program, then will come a post-office building program, one after the other, for post-war expenditures of some type.

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PACE. I cannot yield; I am sorry.

We are told here today that this is no more than the States can match without raising their taxes; but certainly no one on the floor will challenge the statement that the American people cannot provide the Federal funds without the levying of taxes. It seems to me that here is a program that is utterly in the dark. The bill provides that it shall not go into effect until the war emergency is over; we are setting up a plan for spending $1,500,000,000 of the people's money with no knowledge of what sum will be necessary when the time comes. It may be that unemployment will be such that we shall need three times that amount, although we hope no such stupendous sum will be necessary. It may be there will be need for much less than that amount. You gentlemen are sufficiently intelligent businessmen to know that when you appropriate this money, your highway contractors will fight to get every possible dollar of it to spend on the roads and there will then be nothing you can do about it. I say that by the vote you are now about to cast, believe it or not, you are setting the pattern, and if I know anything about the people of this Nation they expect this Congress to appropriate every dime necessary to win this war and then to cut expenditures for nonwar purposes to the very minimum.

This amendment by my colleague, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BROWN] to extend this $1,500,000,000 over a 5-year period instead of 3 years, is the smart thing to do and the thing you businessmen ought to do this afternoon. If, when this program is put into effect, it is found that additional funds are needed, the Congress will be here to consider such need.

The taxes to pay the cost of this war are going to be a heavy burden on the people, and I feel that we should make it our particular business to see that all nonwar appropriations are kept to the minimum and that we get a dollar's value for every dollar we spend.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the bill under consideration is an authorization bill. Of course, it was an inept expression on the part of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PACE] when he stated that this was the first appropriation bill because it is only an authorization bill. It is a part of the program of the Congress to provide for needed works and for post-war unemployment.

If the argument of the two gentlemen from Georgia were to prevail, we will have a repetition of what occurred in the depression in 1933 and 1934. We were without a program of adequate public works. There was no program on the shelf and we had to resort to work relief and to adopt programs that resulted in waste and extravagance. The House of Representatives has gone on record in May 1944, when we passed a flood-control bill for post-war construction. That bill is now pending in the Senate. There are other bills pending which provide for post-war construction. The bill now under consideration is a part of those bills. We ought to be relieved of the necessity of resorting to W. P. A. programs and similar programs for the unemployment that must follow this war.

If the proposed amendment prevails, as has been very wisely brought to the attention of the membership by the chairman of our committee, there would be about the same amounts to be spent on Federal-aid highways that have been spent and authorized by the Congress in the average pre-war period. I think it is a fair statement to say that we have authorized from about $150,000,000 annually for Federal-aid highways. Now, two-fifths of $300,000,000 would be less than that amount. We would not provide for the normal requirements of Federal aid much less the requirements for unemployment following the war.

There is something more in this bill. There has been a demand from the rural areas and from the agricultural States of the Union, including the Commonwealth of Georgia, that provision be made not only for the Federal-aid highways but for the farm-to-market roads, the rural roads. For the first time as a part of the post-war construction program of this country we have included a major program for the construction of rural roads. That program would be hindered; that program would be long delayed by adoption of the pending amendment.

The States are required to make provision for matching the funds. The legislatures of some 45 of our States are to meet in January. If this proposed program of post-war works is to be hindered by the adoption of an amendment that will return us to the pre-war status, the highway construction program of the United States will be delayed and we will be faced with the necessity of a repetition of work-relief programs. Those work-relief programs always result in waste and extravagance.

For my part I advocate a post-war program that will provide for public works that will be satisfactory, that will give to the taxpayers of the Nation a dollar's worth for every dollar expended. I therefore trust that the amendment will be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last four words.

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REED of New York. I yield to the gentleman from Utah.

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 12 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Utah.

There was no objection.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to speak out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, on Friday, November 24, when the Federal Aid Road Act, H. R. 4915, was under consideration in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, I made some inquiries of the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. MOTT] who was debating the bill:

Mr. REED of New York. There was a similar bill passed by the Senate on September 15, 1944.

Mr. MOTT. That is correct.

Mr. REED of New York. Wherein do they differ?

Mr. MOTT. They differ in amount. The amount of the Senate bill is somewhat smaller. The formula for distribution among rural and urban areas was changed in the Senate bill.

Mr. REED of New York. What about the provisions for the railroads to pay 15 percent of the cost, in the Senate bill: "*Provided further*, That no such funds shall be available unless the railway or railways involved pay not less than 15 percent of the construction cost?"

Mr. MOTT. That is not the House bill.

Mr. REED of New York. Does the committee contemplate trying to put it in?

Mr. MOTT. As far as I am concerned, whatever bill this House passes, as one of the conferees, I am going to insist upon the House bill and keep on insisting as long as I can, and then return for instructions, if we have trouble in retaining the House provisions.

Mr. Chairman, I recall, as I am sure do most of the Members, that under Government control of the railroads during World War No. 1, the rolling stock, equipment, and property generally of the railroads were worn out and the railroad systems made practically bankrupt. It required years to rehabilitate the railroads following the Government operation during War No. 1.

There are, as is well known to the Members of the House, a large group of persons in this country who wish to bring about Government ownership of the entire railroad system of this country. I know of no better method for this group to achieve such an undesirable purpose than to require the railroads to pay 15 percent of the cost of grade-crossing elimination. Such a proposal is manna from heaven for the demagogs who never lose an opportunity to stir up hatred and prejudice against any successful business enterprise, whether it be railroads or any other utility. Whatever sins of commission or omission may be charged against the railroads, the time has not come to weaken or destroy a

transportation system so essential to the welfare of the whole economic structure of the United States.

The contribution made by the railroads and their employees to the present war effort ought to be an answer to those who would at this time impair our railroad transportation system.

This global war could not have been successfully fought by the United States without the marvelous services rendered by the railroads and their loyal employees. Here is the transportation record of the railroad system in War No. 1 and so far in War No. 2:

The current war effort has induced levels of activity never before attained. The volume of railroad freight transportation reached an all-time peak in 1943 of 727,000,000,000 ton-miles. Freight handled by rail amounted to 447,000,000,000 ton-miles in 1929 and 405,000,000,000 ton-miles in 1918. Ton-miles handled in 1943 were 62.5 percent greater than in the peak year of 1929 and were 79.4 percent greater than in 1918, the high point of traffic in the First World War.

In 1943, railroads handled 87,820,000,000 passenger-miles as compared with 46,849,000,000 in 1920 and 42,677,000,000 in 1918. The number of passenger-miles handled in 1943 were 87.5 percent greater than in the previous peak year of 1920, and more than double those of 1918.

In 1943, the record traffic level was handled without the congestion and delays of the First World War, and the present job is being done with one-third fewer locomotives, one-fourth fewer freight cars, and one-third fewer passenger cars than in 1918.

In 1918, railways of class I owned 63,889 locomotives, 2,325,673 freight-carrying cars, and 35,613 passenger-carrying cars, not including 7,720 Pullman-owned cars. At the end of 1943, the number of locomotives owned totaled 42,717, freight-carrying cars totaled 1,759,267, and passenger-carrying cars owned totaled 22,429, not including 7,766 Pullman cars.

The present remarkable wartime performance of the railroads was accomplished through more intensive utilization of the railroad plant and equipment and planned and organized cooperation between carriers, employees, and users of transportation.

I realize that during this war, as during the last war, the rolling stock and equipment of the railroads have been worn out; and if post-war efficiency in the field of transportation is to be maintained, the railroads must be able to replace the old worn-out equipment with new equipment and new rolling stock. The replacement of locomotives, cars, rails, and ties will furnish more jobs for men than the proposal to put 15 percent of grade-crossing elimination upon the railroads. To impose this burden on the railroads during the post-war period, when wartime earnings have ceased and tax burdens have increased, will drive the railroads again into the hands of receivers.

It is estimated that as of December 31, 1943, there were 226,938 highway grade crossings in class I line-haul railways, or an average of 1 crossing per mile of railroad. For railways of all classes, there are probably close to 240,000 highway crossings at grade. I am told that no accurate survey of the cost of eliminating all of those crossings has ever been made. However, those crossings that have been eliminated in recent years by separation of grade have averaged approximately $85,000 per crossing. If this average cost is applied to the 240,000 crossings in existence at the end of 1943, the total elimination cost would exceed $20,000,000,000.

Whether or not this vast sum of $20,000,000,000 will reflect the post-war cost of eliminating the 240,000 grade crossings, it would at half the sum of $20,000,000,000 be a crippling burden to the railway transportation system.

I heartily favor the elimination of grade crossings, but it should be done in the light of keeping the cost to all branches of the transportation service on an equitable and fair basis.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE].

Mr. CASE. Mr. Chairman, however the members of the Committee may want to vote on this amendment, there is one point that should be made clear. It comes to my mind, by reason of a statement made by the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi, that this is an authorization bill. He compared it to authorization bills such as the flood-control bill.

There is a distinction between this as an authorization bill and the authorization of flood control projects. This bill on page 3 states:

> As soon as the funds for each of the first two post-war fiscal years have been apportioned, the Commissioner of Public Roads is authorized to enter into agreements with the State highway departments for the making of surveys and plans, the acquisition of rights-of-way, and the post-war construction of projects.

Notice particularly the next three lines:

> His approval of any such agreement shall be a contractual obligation of the Federal Government for the payment of its pro rata share of the cost of construction.

That kind of language does not appear in flood control and river and harbor authorizations. There projects are authorized, but it remains to be determined by the appropriations later made as to how much shall be appropriated in any given year. Here, however, the hands of the Congress are tied. Whether you want to spread this over 3 years or 5 years is a matter to be determined, but the Congress should understand that here we establish a contractual obligation and the hands of the Committee on Appropriations are tied. The only thing the Committee on Appropriations subsequently can do is to determine the amount of maturing contracts within any of the years and the cash that will be needed to meet them.

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASE. I yield to the gentleman from Utah.

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. The gentleman understands that this is the same provision that is applied to all highway legislation, and this provision is absolutely necessary?

Mr. CASE. I agree that this provision has been in previous highway authorizations. I also recognize that, many State legislatures meet but once in 2 years, and the argument that they need to know what they can count on and arrange to match. It should be clear, however, that we do establish a contractual obligation here which creates the obligation to make the appropriation as the contracts mature. This is not an ordinary authorization of appropriations.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN].

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I am strongly in favor of this post-war highway legislation, H. R. 4915. The House Committee on Roads has worked many weeks on it. There have been many witnesses who have come from many of our States to talk in its favor. Among them have been representatives from my State. The good-roads organizations of my State favor some immediate action. We all know that we can get more value and labor per dollar spent from highway construction than from any other activity. The passage of this legislation with helpful amendments will be a step in the right direction. It will mean part of the great post-war planning which this Congress has undertaken. It will be part of the gigantic post-war planning which American industry has undertaken. It will be part of the post-war planning of our State and city and town officials.

I will support all amendments which will improve this legislation and I will also support all of the amendments which have been offered in order to give rural and farm road construction a real start. I am anxious that I can see the day when we will have an all-weather road to every producing farm in America.

The membership of this House knows of my 10 years of labor for the construction of farm-to-market roads. This bill, properly amended, will go far toward reaching the objective of an effective farm-to-market road program.

In my State of Nebraska some 10,000 miles of roads are eligible for the Federal-aid secondary highway system, which includes the principal farm-to-market roads. So far, some 3,400 miles have been included in that system. More than 6,000 miles of eligible roads are still left out in the cold. We still have mud with which to contend in Nebraska. Beyond that secondary Federal-aid system, which is miserably far from completion, there are the other thousands of miles of local roads in Nebraska likewise waiting for some measure of highway improvement.

Before leaving Nebraska I conferred with our State officials regarding this post-war highway legislation. They favor it. I talked with a large group of our county commissioners and county supervisors. They are anxious that this Congress do something soon in order that

they can plan their future road programs. I have talked with many rural mail carriers. They favor the passage of this bill, with helpful amendments. The people of my State want Nebraska roads constructed. They want to get the same treatment that other States receive. They want our rural mail routes improved. They want farm-to-market roads made passable so that the producers of our food can come to market. We want all-weather roads in Nebraska. This legislation will give us a real start. I urge its passage.

Mr. Chairman, as a member of the Committee on Appropriations, I, too, have been worrying about the last three lines in section 2. I was wondering if that language would not be subject to a point of order. I agree with the gentleman from South Dakota that it has puzzled a number of the members of our committee.

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEFAN. I yield to the gentleman from Utah.

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. This is the language that has been used in highway bills since we started writing them.

Mr. STEFAN. Will the gentleman agree that it is subject to a point of order?

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. No; it is not subject to a point of order. It must be there in order to carry out our agreement with the States. We are asking the States to put up as much money as we are appropriating. In order for them to know what that will be, we have to have it arranged so that when they do put up that money, the money will be available to carry out our contracts.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEFAN. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE. I think the statement made by the gentleman from Utah is correct. It is not subject to a point of order, because it does not actually take the money out of the Treasury. However, it does establish the obligation. It is true also that the State legislatures are meeting next year. This practice was established in highway legislation in order to make it possible for the States to make provision, when they meet once every 2 years, for any opportunities that may arise for matching Federal aid. I simply thought that the Congress should have that point in mind.

Mr. STEFAN. I am glad the gentleman brought up the subject, because a number of the members of the Committee on Appropriations were very much worried about it.

Another reason I rose at this time was to ask the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTINGTON] what he meant by his reference to the present amendment, that it would affect farm-to-market roads or rural roads. Does the gentleman say it would destroy the farm-to-market road section of this bill? I would not want anything like that to happen.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I meant just what I said, that for the first time the Congress is asked to adopt an adequate farm-to-market road program. Heretofore we have made authorizations of from $17,000,000 to $25,000,000 annually. We have provided in this bill for $150,000,000 as a part of the public-works program, keeping in mind that the expenditure of these funds is under the Public Works Administration and is a part of our post-war public works. The Commissioner of Roads is now not under the Secretary of Agriculture but under the supervision of the Public Works Administrator.

Mr. STEFAN. I call the attention of the Members to the fact that when section 4 is read for amendment the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT] is going to offer an amendment which, in my opinion, will result in real construction of farm-to-market roads. If any of you are interested in your farmers, if you are interested in rural mail highways, farm-to-market roads, and secondary highways, I suggest you be on the floor and vote for the Wolcott amendment.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEFAN. I yield.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Of course, my amendment would not affect this item any more than the other two items. I am not doing anything except to provide for a 5-year program instead of a 3-year program, with the same amount of money.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I want an explanation because I do not want anything to happen to the farm-to-market roads.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. I am especially in favor of the feeder roads and the committee stated they were going to offer an amendment to increase the feeder-road item by $25,000,000.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Nebraska has expired. All time has expired on the pending amendment.

Mr. PACE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the Clerk may again read the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BROWN].

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

The Clerk again read the amendment offered by Mr. BROWN of Georgia.

The pro forma amendments were withdrawn.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BROWN].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. ROBINSON of Utah) there were—ayes 57, noes 71.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. McGREGOR: On page 3, line 13, after the word "construction", strike out the period and insert a colon and add the following new language: "*Provided*, That none of the funds authorized by this act, except sections 9 and 10, shall be expended for the construction of any project, unless the same has been awarded by contract in conformity with sections 3709 and 3710 of the Revised Statutes of the United States."

ARGUMENT IN SUPPORT OF AMENDMENT REQUIRING FEDERAL-AID HIGHWAY PROJECTS EXECUTED BY THE CONTRACT SYSTEM

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Chairman, this is a very simple amendment, and I will read it again.

Provided, That none of the funds authorized by this act, except sections 9 and 10, shall be expended for the construction of any project, unless the same has been awarded by contract, in conformity with sections 3709 and 3710 of the Revised Statutes of the United States.

In order to receive maximum benefits in road construction and at the same time produce a program strengthening private enterprise and the national economy, it is quite essential that all post-war highway construction be undertaken by the contract method. This method not only provides the greatest amount of useful work but also guarantees to the taxpayer the maximum amount of highway improvements per dollar expenditure. While other forms of constructing public works, such as the so-called force-account plan, have been used rather extensively during the period 1930 to 1940, nevertheless, studies made by the Public Roads Administration offer convincing evidence that the contract method by far is the most economical and efficient process.

Several years ago the Public Roads Administration made a comparative analysis of the two methods and found beyond a doubt that the contract method could not be challenged as the most economical means of prosecuting public works. Commenting on the studies made by the Public Roads Administration, Commissioner MacDonald said:

> In order to get a reasonable measure of the relative efficiency of the contract and force-account work, we required each State to undertake at least one project by the force-account or direct-labor method. These projects were selected after bids had been taken, in order to know what the work would cost if let by contract. The States have kept very careful records of the cost of doing the work by force account and while we have not the final records, in practically all cases the cost has been higher by force account—some materially higher.

However, there is no question about the relative economy of contract work versus force-account work under the supervision of the public bodies.

In addition to being most efficient, the contract method represents, in the final analysis, the American way of doing business. On the whole, it is small business operating under the American system of free enterprise. Construction by force account is never used in private building and should not be used in public works. There is no justification for force-account work and only one excuse; that is, that under the exigencies of the times it is impossible to prepare the necessary plans and execute the work in orderly manner. However, it is one of the purposes of the bill we are considering to avoid a repetition of any such conditions. It follows that in a carefully planned post-war highway program such as is provided for by this legislation there is no justification or excuse for

abandoning the time-tested method of constructing public works under contracts awarded on a competitive basis. Such a plan provides for competitive bids by contractors of experience. It means that the contractor has made a study of the project and is willing to stake his money and reputation on the completed work for a specific price. This means that the contractor must keep abreast of the times and do work by the most efficient methods, utilizing the most highly developed equipment. It provides for plans, specifications, and blueprints to be prepared in advance of the letting of the contract. Great savings and better designed construction have been the result of careful planning. An engineer's estimate of the probable cost may be used in order that the reasonableness of the bid can be ascertained prior to the making of the contract. The bidding system serves as a check against errors and the bid is the expert opinion of bidding contractors who are willing to back up their opinion of costs with their own funds.

Competitive bids are taken on a uniform basis, thereby assuring efficiency and the development of a special industry. The contract is awarded to the lowest responsible bidder, and the owner gets the benefit of competition based upon efficient methods.

I have heard Member after Member take the floor in this body, insisting that we should do away with cost-plus-fixed-fee contracts, or cost-plus contracts. This amendment which I have introduced will comply with their wishes and will prohibit any portion of the money under this act being expended for any contract unless it is awarded under sections 3709 and 3710, which specifically state that the contracts shall be awarded to the lowest responsible bidder, after due publicity and advertisement is given.

When you vote on this amendment you are going to determine whether or not you are going to allow $500,000,000 a year to be used, if the Commissioner of Public Roads deems fit, under a cost-plus program; or to allow all an equal chance to bid which will insure the taxpayer a fair return for his tax dollar. I want to compliment Commissioner MacDonald. I think he is doing a good job. He is not following the procedure of cost-plus in road construction, but if he sees fit or some future highway commissioner comes into office and the new commissioner sees fit, this entire amount of money can be used on highway construction under a cost-plus- or cost-fixed-fee contract.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McGREGOR. I yield.

Mr. DONDERO. It has been my understanding that the administration of these funds is left entirely in the jurisdiction of the States. I wonder if the National Commissioner of Public Roads would have any authority to dictate how these contracts would be let?

Mr. McGREGOR. Indeed so, because every one of these contracts that is awarded first has to receive the recommendation of the State highway director and then the O. K. of the Commissioner of Public Roads.

Mr. DONDERO. I am in complete sympathy with the gentleman's amendment and what he seeks to do. I think the statutes you have mentioned already are applicable and wise to pursue, but I wonder whether or not the Commissioner of Public Roads of this country can dictate to the States when they have the disposition and administration of the funds.

Mr. McGREGOR. Under authority of the act that we are passing today, final action on this entire program rests upon the Federal Commissioner of Public Roads. He is a human being, and subject to pressure. So I say we should make it mandatory that none of these funds can be expended except under contract properly awarded—no special favors to anyone—regardless of politics.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McGREGOR. I yield.

Mr. KEEFE. Would the gentleman's amendment in any way affect a situation where roads are constructed by local county municipalities that are thoroughly equipped to build the roads and have always built their own roads under the direction of the State highway departments?

Mr. McGREGOR. Wherever any portion of these Federal funds is used, it would be mandatory that they would have to advertise for bids and award a contract. But if they used their own county or State funds they could construct any project as they please, either force account, cost-plus, or require all to bid.

Mr. KEEFE. If your amendment were passed, then as to any Federal-aid highway, whether it be a secondary road or a trunk line, the counties that have the equipment, machinery, and personnel, and which have heretofore built the roads in that county, would be precluded from building their own roads, and it would be required that they be built by contractors?

Mr. McGREGOR. If Federal funds are used or a portion of this money is expended, that would be applicable. They would be compelled to advertise for bids and give all an equal chance. Which I am sure the record shows will give us better roads at a lesser cost per mile. Let me call your attention to the danger of a program of $1,500,000,000, giving the Commissioner of Public Roads the right to say that the entire amount can be allocated to projects incorporating a cost-plus plan. This bill can be made a bill of special recognition—recognizing those contractors who have political pull and powerful influence.

I trust the amendment will be accepted.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. Mr. Chairman, the entire amount of this appropriation will be let under contract by the various States. They have the right of contract, and the Federal Government does not contract for the construction of this work. The result of such an amendment as this would be simply that every piece of work in every county, no matter how small, would have to be let by contract. Inasmuch as we are starting a program whereby we are trying to help the rural areas, I do not think it is fair to tie that up so that they cannot do a thing unless they have entered into a contract that has been approved by the State administration and also by the Federal administration.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. I yield.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Is it not true this goes into States' rights and controls the methods of the use of the funds which match this money?

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. That appears to me to be absolutely so.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. I yield.

Mr. DONDERO. I wonder what effect it will have on those States which employ prison labor in the building of their roads?

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. Such States could not use these funds.

Mr. DONDERO. I was afraid of that.

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. There is no question about it.

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. I yield.

Mr. McGREGOR. Does the gentleman feel we should enter into a program of cost-plus contracts on road construction?

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. I believe the gentleman understands that I do not. I am just as much for contracts as he is.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. I yield.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Is it not true that the fundamental reason for this bill is to provide post-war construction, and that universally the construction of Federal-aid highways, farm-to-market roads, and the elimination of grade crossings has been done by contract? That is the universal policy, but it is the contract that is authorized by the States and local jurisdictions. The adoption of this amendment would take from those States and local jurisdictions the powers they now exercise in making contracts.

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield? I know the gentleman from Mississippi wishes to be fair.

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. I yield.

Mr. McGREGOR. This amendment takes no power from anybody. The only thing about it is that it is mandatory that each of the contracts awarded shall be subject to bids and acceptance.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. I yield.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. But the fact remains that it is to be awarded according to Federal statute and not according to the statute of Ohio or any other State.

I respectfully submit that it would modify the existing provisions by which public contracts are made, not according to Federal law but according to the laws of the several 48 States.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. I yield.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Is it not true that the amendment proposed by the gentleman from Ohio the Federal-aid statute to which reference is made—and it is incorporated in the amendment—provides for bidding by the States and provides for bidding pursuant to State law, and provides exceptions from bidding, the very exceptions the gentleman has incorporated in his amendment?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. No; I do not think, from my recollection, that is true, but if true, there is no occasion for the amendment, as policy now obtains.

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield? I shall be pleased to answer that.

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. I yield.

Mr. McGREGOR. The Commissioner of Public Roads may accept the award or reject it. This amendment simply makes it mandatory that he advertise and receive bids, and where Federal funds are used he cannot use these funds on a cost-plus-fixed-fee basis or on a cost-plus basis.

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. Our position is that the State fixes that right.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. The effect of this amendment is that if the State is to receive Federal benefits under this act no contract can be made under State law but must be made in accordance with Federal law. Is that correct?

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. That is absolutely correct.

Mr. McCORMACK. I am astonished that my Republican friends who made such an issue of States' rights during the election should at the very first opportunity after the election make a complete about face and advocate, by this amendment, the very opposite of what they were advocating during the campaign.

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, I may state to the gentleman from Massachusetts, the distinguished floor leader on the other side, whose ability we all recognize, that we all realize that this $1,500,000,000 might be made a political football. If they do not so intend I wonder why so many spokesmen on the other side of the aisle oppose this amendment.

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. I may call the attention of the gentleman from Ohio to the fact that we have authorized appropriations for this purpose ever since I have been here, a period of 12 years, and never has the accusation been made that the funds were used as a political football.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Utah has expired.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I should like to ask the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. McGREGOR] this question: Does he know of any State that provides for the letting of road contracts on a cost-plus basis?

Mr. McGREGOR. In reply I may say that I do not believe there is a State in the Union that does not have a certain proportion of its road contracts under a cost-plus-fixed-fee system or under a cost-plus system. I ask my distinguished chairman, the gentleman from Utah, if there is any State in the Union that does not do that?

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Is it not the rule in the States that that applies only to very small amounts?

Mr. McGREGOR. I think it is a minor amount, but I may say to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio that Mr. MacDonald, the Commissioner, in his testimony admitted the fact that there were certain projects let on a cost-plus-fixed-fee basis and he admitted that those projects were enormous in their costs in comparison to other contracts let.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, it is evident from a reading of the hearings and report of the Committee on Roads and listening to the debate on this measure that the primary appeal for its passage is that it would encourage employment. The appeal is based on the anticipation that unemployment will supervene at the end of the war and that the public-works program involved in this measure is needed to help in meeting that situation.

This is, in my judgment, a wholly wrong approach for Congress to take. It is a defeatist attitude. It shows a profound lack of faith on the part of Congress in the ability of our enterprise system to function normally, or an inability on our part to go to the root of the matter. To set up plans now to provide Government-made work in anticipation of impending unemployment upon the cessation of hostilities is nothing short of deliberately encouraging unemployment. It opens the way to unleashing the thousand and one other New Deal schemes for providing Government-made work that have long been hatched out and waiting to be sprung upon Congress.

This procedure discourages private industry as a whole to go ahead. It knows that whatever funds the Government may use to provide employment must come from industry itself, which would leave it with that much less financial resources with which to carry on and provide employment.

This line of approach will have other baneful effects. It will encourage the movement that is proceeding apace to further destroy the Republic and make it into a totalitarian state. One of the principal means that is being used by those who are promoting this change is that of making the Government the employer, thus destroying the normal social function of providing employment through private enterprise.

It would encourage people to look to the Government for employment instead of private industry. And, last but by no means least, it would further weaken what resistance there remains in Congress to impede the retrogressive movement that is destroying our free economy and forcing us into a communistic regime.

Indeed, it seems to me that if the Congress were to set out with the idea of deliberately devising a plan to dampen the American spirit of enterprise and to destroy the real job-making machinery of the Nation, it could not make a better start than by passing the bill before us in its present form and under attending circumstances which make for its passage.

So far as I have been able to learn, the proponents of this measure have not in the hearings, or the committee report, or in the debate, uttered a single word as to how the Federal Government's share of this program is to be financed. That is, from whence the funds are to be derived. It is true that Mr. ROBINSON of Utah, chairman of the Roads Committee, made a statement, in response to a question asked by myself, that apparently was intended to give the impression that the Federal Government's share would be financed out of Federal highway-user taxes. However, this statement can, and likely will, be misleading to those who do not know the underlying facts.

Federal taxes on gasoline, motor oil, and other highway-user taxes have no relation whatever to the Federal-aid road program. The revenues collected from those sources are merely general taxes. They are covered into the general fund of the Treasury and are expended for general operating purposes. The gentleman from Utah [Mr. ROBINSON] is mistaken when he states, "It would not be deficit financing."

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for an additional 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. STEFAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. STEFAN. The gentleman said that the taxes on gasoline and oil have no relation to the Federal-aid highway program.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. That is correct.

Mr. STEFAN. That money goes directly into the Treasury?

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Yes.

Mr. STEFAN. That is what the gentleman is inferring?

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Yes.

Mr. MOTT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. MOTT. Were it not for the fact that the Federal Government contributes a certain amount to the States to aid the construction of roads, does the gentleman think there would be any excuse whatever for a Federal gasoline tax?

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. I do not believe that enters into the proposition I am

discussing. I am not discussing the question whether the Federal Government should or should not enter into this program.

Mr. MOTT. The theory has always been that the Federal Government takes this revenue from the road users of the several States by a Federal gasoline and other automotive tax and that it is morally obligated to give that back to the States.

If it does not do that, the Federal tax is wrong. The Federal gas tax should not be used for general governmental purposes.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. It is being used in this way by the Federal Government and also by certain States.

Mr. MOTT. That is correct. The Federal Government is the biggest diverter of the gas tax; worse than any of the particular diverter States.

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. McGREGOR. May I call the gentleman's attention to the fact that approximately $627,000,000 a year is collected in the form of a Federal gasoline tax?

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. And that does not change the fact that the funds go into the Treasury as general revenue. This involves deficit financing, as I have already said. They are covered into the general fund of the Treasury and are expended for general operating purposes. I repeat, the gentleman from Utah [Mr. ROBINSON] is mistaken when he states it would not be deficit financing.

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from Utah.

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. Is it not a fact that if these funds collected from the automobile users were not used for highway purposes, that they would not be collected and therefore would not go into the general fund?

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. It is also a fact that, since these taxes are not levied or earmarked for any special purpose, but are covered into the general fund of the Treasury to be spent for general operating purposes, it must follow that the cost of this program must be financed by deficit financing. Let there be no misunderstanding on this point. Federal higher-user taxes, along with Federal taxes on radios, refrigerators, matches, electric energy, and so forth, were all originally instituted simply as general revenue-raising measures. Federal highway-user taxes were not levied for any specific purpose any more than were the other taxes mentioned. Nor has there been any Treasury policy to relate Federal highway-user taxes to Federal-aid highway construction or maintenance. All Federal highway-user taxes are covered into the general fund of the Treasury and are expended for general operating purposes the same as other internal revenue receipts. The gentleman from Utah [Mr. ROBINSON] is mistaken when he states it would not be deficit financing.

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. No; this money will be collected for the automobile users for next year and next year and next year. We are asking that the money be spent on the highways so that we can use our automobiles more economically.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. The fact is the funds for the Federal Government's share of this program would have to be raised by deficit financing. Certainly much or the greater portion would have to be so raised. That cost would therefore have to be charged to our children and their descendents. A considerable and likely the greater part of the cost would fall upon people who could not possibly derive any benefit from this program because the roads built under it would be worn out before they could avail themselves of their use. This fact alone should be sufficient to cause us to move with the greatest of caution.

Take the case of my own State, Ohio. Under this bill Ohio would be allotted roundly $60,000,000. On the basis, however, of the percent of internal revenue payments made by Ohio in 1941, namely, 5.83, as shown on page 867 of the hearings, the cost to Ohio of this program would be, roundly, $87,000,000. Ohio would pay out $87,000,000 for which our people would receive in return only $60,000,000 worth of highway construction. This is a difference of $27,000,000.

On the basis of internal revenue payments made by Ohio in 1941, the children, grandchildren, and so on of the adult population of my State would be forced to assume the debt that this Federal-aid road bill would create. And we should not overlook the fact that so long as deficit financing continues, this debt will draw compound interest.

The Federal-aid road program provided for in this bill further materially involves encroachment of the Federal Government upon the rights and responsibilities of the several States. Aside from greatly increasing the amount of funds to be contributed by the Federal Government as compared with previous grants, which is in itself further such encroachment, it would engage the Federal Government in new fields and policies. It provides for allocating the huge sum of $475,000,000, to be expended over a period of 3 years for the construction of streets and highways in urban areas.

The program would greatly relieve municipal and State authorities of the responsibility of raising funds for the construction of streets and highways and place this burden upon the Federal Government. Along with the giving over of this responsibility to the Federal Government would also inevitably go a corresponding amount of control. This becomes a serious matter when viewed in the light of the extensive absorption of State and municipal functions by the Federal Government that has been taking place in recent years. It is another definite step toward centralizing all governmental power in Washington.

The mounting Federal debt and its composition cannot be too often called to the attention of the Congress and the country. The debt stands today at about $213,000,000,000. A debt of $300,000,000,000 or more is already in sight. Of the debt now outstanding, more than $87,000,000,000 consists of fiat bank money. This fiat bank money is created the financing of Government securities through the banking system. Much of the $23,000,000,000 of currency in circulation consists of fiat dollars. Here we have precisely the same condition that brought on the tragic German inflation. So that we are threatened not only with national bankruptcy but also with the same kind of uncontrollable inflation that overtook Germany and Russia, and which in my judgment was the controlling force that moved those two states to adopt their present totalitarian regimes.

The factors which I have mentioned should be controlling in determining the position Congress takes on this Federal-aid road bill.

I cannot subscribe to the theory that the Federal Government either should or can take upon itself the responsibility of guaranteeing employment to all or even to a substantial number of persons by means of public works, or on the basis of any kind of partnership between the Government and private enterprise.

The assumption that the Government can make up any amount of deficiency in employment in private industry is a gross delusion. It is completely vitiated by the fact that the Government neither possesses nor creates any funds of its own but must always obtain them either by taxing the producing group or confiscating the fruits of their labor. The Government is essentially a consumer, not a producer.

Can a government utilize the productive resources of the Nation in such a manner as to provide a greater quantity of employment of a higher or just as high quality, with a higher or just as high standard of living, and more or just as much general happiness and contentment, as can the social group?

Yes, say Hitler and Stalin and those in our country who seek to destroy the Constitution and free enterprise process and replace it with a politically planned economy. The only proof they can give to substantiate their position is Government war work.

Unchallengably "no," says the whole record of American economy, especially the tragic experience in Government-made work during the recent depression. All true history also answers in the negative.

The crux of the whole problem relating to Government employment versus private employment which now confronts the Nation is this: Once a government embarks upon a permanent policy of assuming the responsibility for maintaining full employment by means of public works construction, it enters upon an almost fatal course. Powerful economic, social, and particularly political forces quickly come into play and relentlessly press for the next step to be taken, the formation of a so-called limited partnership of the Government with private enterprise. After that there can be little stopping until the totalitarian state is completed. The economic and social organism cannot be half private and half communistic.

The problem of setting up a public roads program should have been approached in an entirely different manner than it has. We should have the best roads possible, but based on what we can really afford. In setting up a Federal-aid road program we should have in mind the true state of our national finances and industry as a whole and cut our cloth accordingly. This would require a completely unbiased and disinterested survey of the actual requirements in the form of needed road repairs and new construction, altogether dissociated from any questions of employment.

Approached in this manner, I feel certain a modest Federal-aid road program could have been worked out that would have served all needs—giving due weight, I wish to repeat, to all the other factors which I have discussed.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last three words.

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAMSPECK. I yield to the gentleman from Utah.

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this section and all amendments thereto close in 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Utah?

There was no objection.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Chairman, I am very much interested in the source of this amendment. In the first place, I want to say that it ought not to be a party or partisan question. The division between the political parties in the State governments today, I think, is 26 Republican and 22 Democratic. After January I think it will be about 24–24, or something of that sort. Therefore, there could not be much party advantage in whether or not the States control the contracts or the Federal Government controls them. Certainly the Republicans would fare better to leave it to the States.

The thing that intrigues my interest is that we find the Republican Party sponsoring an amendment that not only undertakes to dictate to the States about the Federal money that will be used in this road program but also reaches over and controls the method of contracting the 50 percent which the States will furnish. This is not the first time that this sort of a proposal has been used on Capitol Hill to defeat Federal aid. About a year ago two distinguished Members of the other body defeated Federal aid for education by this same technique, by undertaking to sponsor and have adopted an amendment which not only controlled Federal aid but controlled State educational funds also. They defeated that bill in the United States Senate by that method. So I am wondering if it is the purpose of the gentleman from Ohio by indirection to stop this Federal-aid-for-highways program. That is what it appears to me to be.

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAMSPECK. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. McGREGOR. I am very happy to endeavor to the best of my ability to answer my distinguished friend. The only thing the amendment was introduced for was to assure the taxpayers of the United States that they were going to get road construction for the dollar spent. I think my friend will agree with me that we do not get the value we should get when it is on a cost-plus-a-fixed-fee basis. This amendment will not hurt anyone who wants to be honest with the taxpayers' money. I say let all who are qualified have a chance to construct highways regardless of politics. I am opposed to any cost-plus program regardless of who is in power.

Mr. RAMSPECK. The gentleman ought to be willing to trust the State of Ohio as I am willing to trust the State of Georgia to run their own affairs. As far as I know, under this program, which has been going on for a great many years, the contracts have been let by competitive bidding. I know they have in my State. Regardless of whether or not they are let by competitive bidding, we have a principle at issue here and that is the principle of States' rights and State control. We should not by act of Congress reach out and not only undertake to control Federal money but also undertake to control the State money which must be used to match it.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAMSPECK. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. If this amendment is adopted, does it not necessarily follow as the natural and probable result that the Walsh-Healey Act will apply to all contracts made by the State governments, as well as the Davis-Bacon Act and all other Federal laws which relate to the making of contracts?

Mr. RAMSPECK. I would presume that to be so. I have not checked up on it, but I think that probably would be true. That is a further interference with the right of the States to control their own affairs.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAMSPECK. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. MAY. I agree absolutely with the gentleman on the question of the States' rights doctrine, but I think he is a little mistaken about the Republicans as a party being for this thing. I think about two-thirds of the Members on that side will vote against the amendment.

Mr. RAMSPECK. I hope they will, and I would expect them to stand up for States' rights, because the echoes of their cries about States' rights in the last campaign have hardly died down yet.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAMSPECK. I yield to the gentlewoman from Illinois.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. If it is a 50–50 proposition, with the States spending 50 percent, why should one State have any more right to control all that fund than the Federal Government, which has all the States? I do not see that there is any question of States' rights involved when it is a 50–50 proposition.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Is not the gentlewoman willing to trust the State of Illinois to let these contracts?

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. I am unwilling to have Illinois money paid into the Federal Government put into cost-plus contracts, which we know are the worst kind of contracts there are.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Nobody is talking about cost-plus contracts. There are not going to be any such contracts under this bill.

Mr. McCORMACK. Whatever contracts are made in Illinois are made by the officials of the State of Illinois.

Mr. RAMSPECK. That is correct; that is the way it ought to be and that is the way we want to keep it. So let us defeat this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired. All time has expired on this amendment.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. McGREGOR].

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 3. The sums authorized in section 2 shall be apportioned among the States in accordance with the provisions of the Federal Highway Act of 1921, as amended and supplemented, except that such apportionment shall be based as follows: One-half population, one-fourth area, one-fourth post-road mileage.

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. Mr. Chairman, I offer a committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ROBINSON of Utah: Page 3, line 14, strike out all of section 3 and insert in lieu thereof the following language:

"SEC. 3. The sum authorized in section 2 for each year shall be available for expenditures as follows:

"(a) $225,000,000 for projects on the Federal-aid highway system.

"(b) $150,000,000 for projects on the principal secondary and feeder roads, including farm-to-market roads, rural free delivery mail and public-school bus routes, either outside of municipalities or inside of municipalities of less than 5,000 population: *Provided*, That these funds shall be expended on a system of such roads selected by the State highway departments in cooperation with the county supervisors, county commissioners, or other appropriate local road officials and the Commissioner of Public Roads: *Provided further*, That in any State having a population density of more than 200 per square mile, as shown by the latest available Federal census, the said system may be selected by the State highway department with the approval of the Commissioner of Public Roads without regard to included municipal boundaries: *Provided further*, That any of such funds for secondary and feeder roads which are apportioned to a State in which all public roads and highways are under the control and supervision of the State highway department may, if the State highway department and the Commissioner of Public Roads jointly agree that such funds are not needed for secondary and feeder roads, be expended for projects in such State on the Federal-aid highway system.

"(c) $125,000,000 for projects on the Federal-aid highway system in urban areas."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Utah [Mr. ROBINSON] is recognized.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, is it in order to offer an amendment to the committee amendment at this point or after the gentleman from Utah [Mr. ROBINSON] addresses the Committee?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Utah [Mr. ROBINSON] has already been recognized to speak in support of the amendment.

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. Mr. Chairman, this amendment changes the formula that was adopted in the bill, H. R. 4915, and substitutes in reality a formula which was adopted in the Senate bill S. 2105, with this exception, in our formula here, we have set up $225,000,000 for the regular Federal-aid highway system. In the Senate bill $200,000,000 was set up for that purpose. Then we have set up $150,000,000 for projects on the secondary and feeder-road systems; that is, on the farm-to-market roads. This is $25,000,000 more than the amount provided in the Senate bill. I think other than those two items, this is the same formula that was passed in the Senate bill and one which has been discussed here at great length in this debate and in the hearings and was discussed here last Friday at great length in general debate.

I think the Committee pretty well understands this formula. If there are any questions I shall be glad to answer them.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. I yield.

Mr. HOPE. The formula which directs the application of the money which goes for the construction of highways in urban centers states that it is based upon the number of inhabitants of cities having more than 5,000 population. Does the gentleman understand that to mean that the money must be expended within a State in cities having more than 5,000 population, or can it be expended anywhere?

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. It is allocated to the States.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. I yield.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I think the gentleman misspoke himself when he referred to the formula in section 3. I think he had in mind the formula which is in section 4, which the gentleman intends to offer as a substitute. What the gentleman had in mind when he used the term "formula" was the basis of funds for use by the States.

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. I think that is correct.

Mr. HOPE. Does the gentleman care to reply to my inquiry as to whether or not funds can be used in cities of less than 5,000 population?

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. The $125,000,000 cannot be used in cities of less than 5,000 population. The $150,000,000 must be used in interurban areas.

Mr. HOPE. Let me ask the gentleman again, The amount which is to be used on secondary and feeder roads, is limited as far as cities are concerned, to cities having a population of less than 5,000?

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. That is correct.

Mr. HOPE. I have a letter from the State highway director in my State in which he states that that should include cities up to 20,000 as far as secondary roads are concerned, because many cities up to 20,000 are still farming or rural centers. You have farm-to-market roads leading into those cities, and under this bill, if a city had a population of more than 5,000 you could not expend any of that money, as I understand it. Is that correct?

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. The two amounts, $225,000,000 and $150,000,000 can be spent any place, either inside or outside of urban areas, providing the $150,000,000 is spent on feeder roads or the $225,000,000 is spent on Federal highway roads.

Mr. HOPE. Does the gentleman see any objection to an amendment which would increase up to 20,000 the size of a city upon which money might be spent for secondary or feeder roads?

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. As I understand, the gentleman wishes to raise the population in the urban area?

Mr. HOPE. No; I want to permit secondary or farm-to-market road money to be spent in a city with a population up to 20,000 purely on secondary roads.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. As the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT] has properly suggested, this question comes up in connection with section 4, to which the committee will offer a substitute; but anticipating the answer to the gentleman's question, the committee found this out, that with cities with populations of 10,000, instead of cities with populations of 5,000, agricultural States like Kansas and Mississippi, would receive far less under the 5,000 than under the 10,000-population formula. I therefore believe they would receive less under the 10,000 than they would under the 20,000 formula, but they would receive more for the farm-to-market roads and Federal-aid highways under either formula.

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. That is not the gentleman's question. As I understand the gentleman's question it is that the amount for secondary and feeder roads cannot be used in cities of over 5,000 population.

Mr. HOPE. That is correct.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Utah has expired.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman's time may be extended 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOPE. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. I yield.

Mr. HOPE. My present question goes to the amendment which is now pending and which provides $150,000,000 for secondary and feeder roads, including farm-to-market roads, rural free delivery mail and public school bus roads, either outside of municipalities or inside of municipalities of less than 5,000 population. My question is whether the gentleman would have any objection to increasing the 5,000 to 20,000.

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. Yes; because we have already provided for cities of 5,000 and over in the other fund.

Mr. HOPE. The other fund, however, is on Federal highway system roads, while this fund is upon secondary roads. My point is there are secondary and farm-to-market roads going into cities up to 20,000 population that should receive consideration here just the same as those going into cities of 5,000 or less.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Our position is that we think the $150,000,000 provides adequate money for the farm-to-market roads, and roads in the country as a general rule outside of cities of 5,000 population, and that the $125,000,000 will provide sufficient money for the cities of 5,000 or over, especially in view of the fact that in these cities they can use the Federal-aid highway money, provided elsewhere in the bill, which is $225,000,000. I do not believe there was any testimony before the committee indicating that these cities should be higher than 10,000 population. There was testimony to the effect the figure should be 10,000, but not higher. Most of the witnesses who testified thought that 5,000 was a better figure.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. I yield.

Mr. HOPE. There are two different types of roads we are talking about: One is secondary and feeder roads which cannot receive any apportionment of funds under this amendment in cities with a population of more than 5,000.

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. That is right.

Mr. HOPE. My point is that there are some of the secondary and feeder roads which lead into market places in cities which have more than 5,000 population.

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. They would come under the other formula and get their money from another section.

Mr. HOPE. The other formula, as I understand it, however, applies only to main highways, Federal-aid highways.

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. There are three formulas. One formula applies to main highways, one to urban areas such as the gentleman is talking about, and the third to rural areas.

Mr. HOPE. But there is only one fund that applies to secondary and feeder roads.

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. That is correct.

Mr. HOPE. And that applies only so far as cities are concerned to cities that have a population of less than 5,000.

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. That is correct.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. I notice that the amount allotted to feeder roads is $150,000,000, and to urban sections $125,000,000. It was my impression that it was going to be the other way around.

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. That was changed by the committee at its last meeting.

Mr. McCORMACK. I should like to have this made clear. It was my understanding that the amendment offered would allocate $225,000,000 for the Federal-aid highway system; $125,000,000 for secondary and feeder roads; and $150,000 for projects on the Federal-aid highway system in urban areas. I have before me a copy of the bill with the amendments. I see now, however, it is the other way around. I am not going to object except that had the amount been divided, the $275,000,000 been divided $137,500,000 for each of these two latter projects, when the committee made its last change, with which I am not acquainted, it would have been most pleasing and more equitable.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. I yield.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Utah has expired.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Utah may proceed for 3 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. As I understand it, of these funds $225,000,000 will be allocated by the State highway commissions in the respective States.

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. That is correct.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. And they may allocate all of that money to the cities of Missouri; is that right?

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. Of over 5,000 population.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. Of over 5,000 population.

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. That is correct.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. It may all be spent extending the highways through the cities of that State.

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. No; that is not correct. It is up to the State highway commission.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. I mean they may make that allocation.

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. Yes; this is up to the State highway commission.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. All the $225,000,000, of course, goes to improvements in the cities?

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. Yes; that is correct.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. So that if the highway commission in my State of Missouri, for example, should make the allocation, all of the money in the $225,000,000 fund and in the $125,000,000 fund could be spent in the cities of Missouri?

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. Yes; those two funds may be.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. I will ask the gentleman if he does not think there is a danger there of the rural areas being discriminated against in favor of the big cities and they monopolize all of this money?

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] thought we were discriminating against the big cities a moment ago.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. In response to the question asked by the gentleman from Massachusetts, if the bill were to remain as reported by the committee, there would accrue to the Commonwealth of Massachusetts a total sum of $8,785,000 annually, whereas under the bill as it is proposed to be amended here there would accrue to the State of Massachusetts the total sum of $10,377,000, or approximately $2,000,000 more, it being kept in mind that while there is a smaller allocation for the Federal-aid highways and rural roads there is an additional allocation for urban areas in the gentleman's State that gives that State approximately $4,000,000 more for urban areas.

Mr. McCORMACK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman from Massachusetts has been very cooperative with the committee in trying to iron out its difficulties.

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. I think that is correct.

Mr. McCORMACK. I could not let the opportunity pass without asking the chairman why it is that $25,000,000 was shifted over to the secondary and feeder roads. If they had to take it away, we Members from the cities always being desirous to cooperate with the Members from the country districts, why not take half and let us have the other half? That is all I ask for. It was a friendly inquiry.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. We gave you more for the urban areas, an increase in the total for your State, by reducing your Federal-aid and farm-to-market allocations.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 3 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Utah?

There was no objection.

Mr. CASE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE. I should like to ask the gentleman whether or not the amendment that was read is an amendment replacing section 3.

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. Yes.

Mr. CASE. From what we could hear of it the amendment sounded like it was a substitute for section 4.

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. Section 4 will also be amended when we reach it. They should be considered together.

Mr. CASE. The use of the various allocations works under the new formula in three places?

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. That is correct.

Mr. CASE. Is it not true that this entire fund here for urban roads is a new item in the road bill?

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. Yes; it is.

Mr. CASE. So the gentleman from Massachusetts who is worried as to whether or not he should get half might take a little consolation in the fact that urban roads are coming in here for $125,000,000 for the first time in timely legislation.

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. That is correct.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. May I say that on last Wednesday and Friday the chairman and the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTINGTON] both stated what these amendments would be; that on page 4 (b) would be increased to $150,000,000 and (c) would be reduced to $125,000,000. It is in the RECORD of Wednesday and Friday.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. GOODWIN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GOODWIN to the committee amendment offered by Mr. ROBINSON of Utah to strike out section 3: On page 3, line 14, in (a), strike out "$225,000,000" and insert "$200,000,000", and in (c), strike out "$125,000,000" and insert "$150,000,000."

Mr. GOODWIN. Mr. Chairman, my amendment is an answer to the prayer of the distinguished majority leader. The effect of this amendment will be to take away from the allocation for Federal-aid highways $25,000,000 and add it to the allocation for projects in urban areas. The result of the amendment, if adopted, would be to put the bill into better balance in accordance with the information and evidence that came out at the committee hearings. Everywhere, from every corner, it became evident that the demand now is to take care of the bottlenecks in the cities and situations causing traffic congestion in the urban areas.

The National Association of Highway Commissioners came before your Committee on Highways and asked for a better break for the urban areas than this committee bill gives them. I suppose it is proper for me to state here that a bill adopted by another branch allocates the same amount to the urban interests as to the rural interests. There has been reference made in debate here today to the very comprehensive analysis contained in the recent report of the Public Roads Administration and the National Interregional Highway Committee. I would like to quote from that report:

Now, with congestion of the transcity routes replacing rural highway mud as the greatest of traffic barriers, emphasis needs to be reversed and the larger expenditures devoted to improvement of the city and metro-

politan sections of arterial roads. * * * All facts available to the committee point to the sections of the recommended system within and in the environs of the larger cities and metropolitan areas as at once the most important in traffic service and least adequate in their present state of improvement. * * * If priority of improvement within the system be determined by either the magnitude of benefits resulting or the urgency of need, it is to these sections that first attention should be accorded.

There is more in the report along the same line.

Mr. Chairman, there will be adopted by the House later on, I hope, a committee amendment which will introduce an innovation in Federal-aid highway legislation, and that is to acknowledge and recognize for the first time that the old formula of 1916 has become outmoded, and that new yardsticks ought now to be taken into account. Transportation needs are changing, as well as a lot of other things. If such amendment is adopted, it will give to those who seek an advantage for urban-area construction, and those who seek an advantage for rural-area construction, substantial benefits by forgetting the old one-third, one-third, and one-third formula for a moment, and saying that here and now we will figure on the basis of the ratio of urban population in the one instance, and suburban or rural in the other.

If the House will adopt my amendment to the committee amendment, and increase by $25,000,000 the amount available for projects in urban areas, thus making the same amount available for urban projects and for secondary or feeder roads, we will give to the urban communities the same advantage in a new formula that we are going to give, I hope, to the rural areas, and in all fairness, I submit that ought to be done.

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this section and all amendments thereto close in 30 minutes, the last 5 minutes to be reserved to the committee?

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Utah?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN].

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment. Having spent 4 years on the Committee on Roads, I have had occasion to make a study of the subject of roads, and have personally engaged in highway construction for a period of years as a surveyor.

In my opinion, gentlemen such as the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK], who facetiously suggests that more of this money be taken away from the farm-to-market roads and thrown over to the urban areas, are trying to delude the House. This bill is far too generous to the urban sections. There is very little in here for agricultural America. Yet here the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GOODWIN] endeavors to take another $25,000,000 away from the general appropriation for the Federal-aid highway system and make this still further a large city bill. If we were to do the decent thing here today, we ought to cut instead $50,000,000 off the $125,000,000 for urban highway development and put it into the Federal-aid highway allotment, if not into the farm-to-market system.

Perhaps very few of you realize what the new method of apportionment to be established under the next section, section 4, will do. What does it do to the farmers in my State of Minnesota? It simply takes hundreds of thousands of dollars from the farm-to-market road system of the farmers in that State and throws it into the big city areas. I regret to see the majority leadership of the House take this attitude toward the people who have the most need for good roads, the tillers of the soil.

I have seen the representatives here of the city areas shed crocodile tears about the money it is going to cost the big cities to take care of their highway obligations, but these cities do not have one-tenth of the mileage to take care of that we do out in the country; and every bit of that mileage leading into the urban areas is for the purpose of giving those cities a profit on the products produced by the farmers. It seems to me that a very selfish attitude is being shown by the most populous States today, in their demand for far too great a portion of the $500,000,000 annual appropriation for highway construction.

I repeat, I think that this bill is decidedly lopsided in favor of the urban interests. It is with great reluctance that I can vote for this measure at all. It surely does not help much to give to the farmers a gravel road strong enough to carry our products to market. Let us not make this bill, already unfair to agriculture, still more so by adopting this amendment of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GOODWIN].

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment which I ask unanimous consent to be read at this time.

The CHAIRMAN. Is it an amendment to the committee amendment?

Mr. WRIGHT. That is correct.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment to the committee amendment offered by Mr. WRIGHT: On page 3, line 19, after the committee amendment to section 3, insert "Any through interstate Federal-aid highway (excluding secondary or feeder roads) constructed or improved in whole or in part, under the provisions of this act, shall be so constructed that it will support and carry safely, vehicles having a gross weight of at least 10 tons per axle and having a total height of 14 feet and a width of 9 feet."

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I did not quite hear the amendment. Is this an amendment to section 3 that is proposed to be stricken out?

Mr. WRIGHT. It is an amendment to the committee amendment.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I know, but it was read as an amendment to section 3, line 19, and it was not read in connection with the appropriate page in the committee amendment.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, I dislike to correct the gentleman because he knows a lot more about this bill than I do, but it was reported as an amendment to the committee amendment. I think the Chair will bear me out on that.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I understand that it was so read, but, frankly, what part of the committee amendment does it amend or what line does it amend?

Mr. WRIGHT. It comes at the end of the committee amendment.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. At the end of the committee amendment?

Mr. WRIGHT. Yes.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I heard the Clerk read line 19 and there is no such line.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, frankly this is a missionary job. This amendment was not presented to the Committee on Roads and the committee therefore has had no chance to study it. But I am quite certain that in the next year or so, Congress is going to hear more about the problem which I have, in a rather hasty fashion, attempted to solve by my amendment. I understand that the commercial automobile traffic pays taxes to the States and the Federal Government in an amount exceeding the entire taxes paid by the rail transportation industry. I also understand that one of the greatest obstacles to the development of interstate truck transportation is the type of roads which exist in certain States. You gentlemen undoubtedly have read a good bit in the press and elsewhere about the barriers to interstate truck transportation which arise from various State statutes. But I have learned from consultation with people who are in the trucking industry, that their idea is that many of these laws are a matter of necessity because of the inferior roads in the States affected, with short turns, steep grades, insubstantial roadbeds, low overpasses or bridges, all of which impede interstate truck transportation. One of the principal tests that should be applied to the expenditure of Federal funds is whether or not it is going to benefit the country by increasing the national wealth. If, in planning our highways, we prefer our private passenger traffic, which, of course, is necessary, to our freight traffic or our commercial passenger traffic, we are not, in my opinion, serving the best economic interests of the country. In the future, this country should adopt a policy as to its interstate roads that they should be so constructed as to encourage the development of truck and commercial passenger transportation. I have discussed this problem with various people in the trucking business, and, as I say, this amendment is offered at the present time, as a missionary undertaking. I do not feel that I have the complete answer to the problem in this amendment. However, I do not address this House idly, because I think that the Members of the House should take cognizance of the fact that if we are spending Federal funds in this country, we should spend

them in such a manner as to increase our national wealth and to put such funds in projects which might be described as self-liquidating.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. STEFAN. I think the gentleman is bringing up a very interesting point, but does not the gentleman feel that his amendment would put us in the position of writing specifications on roads? Does not the gentleman think that Mr. MacDonald can write those specifications as we need those roads? I think the gentleman is absolutely right that we should encourage the use of trucking, but how can we write the specifications on the floor of the House?

Mr. WRIGHT. I do not think we can decide this matter on the floor, as a matter of fact. I described the amendmen I offered as a missionary effort, but am sure the country will hear more about this problem in the next few years. I think some attention should be paid to our highways in aid of interstate bus and truck transportation. If we do consider our road problem in this light, we will build up our national wealth thereby.

Mr. STEFAN. The gentleman is absolutely right, because the designs for future trucks and busses are such that they will require heavier construction than we now have; but I do not think we Members of Congress on the floor can write what those specifications should be.

Mr. WRIGHT. I hope the House will pardon me for trespassing upon its time. I do not have too much confidence that my amendment will be adopted. But I do think it is a matter of sufficient moment to bring to the attention of the House at this time. I feel certain you will hear about it at some later date.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment to the committee amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment to the committee amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee, as a matter of information.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment to the committee amendment offered by Mr. KEFAUVER: In amended section 3 (b), line 6, after the word "population" and after the colon, strike out the following language: *"Provided*, That these funds shall be expended on a system of such roads selected by the State highway department in cooperation with the county supervisors, county commissioners, or other appropriate local road officials, and the Commissioner of Public Roads;" and insert in lieu thereof the following: *"Provided*, That these funds shall be expended on a system of such roads selected by the county supervisors, county commissioners, or other proper county road officials in cooperation with the State highway departments and Commissioner of Public Roads."

The CHAIRMAN. The reading of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee, as well as the prior amendment, was only for information. The amendments will have to be offered later, after the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts has been disposed of.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Chairman, I see present the distinguished chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives, the gentleman from Texas, Judge SUMNERS. I have heard him expound this philosophy many times, and I know most of us agree with it, that government is always best when it is closest to the people, and that in these matters whenever possible we ought to place the responsibility on the people who are affected by what is being done. If we agree with that philosophy, and I am sure most of us do, we should be in favor of the amendment I have proposed, because this is the situation: This bill for the first time in Federal-aid road legislation recognizes a responsibility to rural and secondary country roads. It recognizes that something should be done about country roads in order to get the farmer out of the dust and the mud, and enable him to market his products. However, I feel that the local people in the local communities, the road authorities there, ought to originate and ought to have the primary say-so about the road system that is going to be built in those rural counties. They live there. They know the type of road that is needed. They know what the traffic problem is. They know what the marketing problem is. They are more interested than anybody else in having roads that will satisfy the requirements of that particular county. I think that the system of secondary or feeder roads should be originated by the road supervisors or road officials of those counties. The road plan ought to be originated by them and worked out in cooperation with the State highway department and with the Public Road Administrator. If you do not do that, what will happen will be that somebody in the State capital will decide what sort of roads should be built in each of the counties, and it is not going to be satisfactory. I read with interest the colloquy between Mr. Chase and a member of the committee in which the statement was made that in the past the counties had not seen fit to enter these Federal-aid programs because they always got some expensive kind of road they did not want or could not afford, or the requirements were too high. In the past the counties have not found it profitable to take Federal aid. They could serve their people better by spending their own money on roads they found would meet the needs of the people. So I believe with the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SUMNERS] that the primary responsibility of deciding upon these county secondary roads ought to be placed with the local road officials in the counties and that they ought to originate the program. Then, of course, the program has to be approved and worked out in cooperation with the State officials and with the Public Roads Administrator. But if you leave the authority in Washington or to some highway official in the State capital as to the secondary roads in the counties, then you are not going to have a road system in the particular counties that will meet their desires or needs.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield.

Mr. STEFAN. The gentleman's amendment would apply only to secondary highways and feeder roads?

Mr. KEFAUVER. It only affects the $150,000,000 that is going to be expended on secondary roads. The States would have the authority to lay out the State highway program, but as to the county roads that need surfacing or building, the county people know what they need, they know the traffic conditions, and this amendment places them in position to do it.

Mr. STEFAN. Still the State engineer's office would draw the plans and specifications for these roads.

Mr. KEFAUVER. That is right.

Mr. STEFAN. But as to the question of priority as to which road should be built in a particular county the county would have the right through its supervisor or commission to determine, would it not?

Mr. KEFAUVER. That is right.

Mr. STEFAN. The gentleman's amendment would eliminate the necessity of the county people going to the State capital or elsewhere to get permission to deal with a local situation.

Mr. KEFAUVER. That is correct; the secondary road system in the county would be in the hands of the local road people and they would not have to go to the State capital to plead for the rights we want them to have under this bill.

Mr. STEFAN. Would the gentleman's amendment make possible the elimination of so many surveys that are so expensive, blueprinting, and mapping before they could get any gravel on the road?

Mr. KEFAUVER. The gentleman is right. I thank the gentleman for his contribution. That is one of the forceful reasons for the amendment. The great Roads Committee and its chairman, the gentleman from Utah [Mr. ROBINSON], have done an excellent job on this legislation. I hope they agree to my amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee has expired.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. VURSELL] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Goodwin amendment, much as I regret to be in opposition to the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. Chairman, I come from a great agricultural State, some 425 miles long, a State of rich, deep, black soil; a State that is almost impassable in the rural areas in wet weather or in the wintertime. At the same time we have one of the finest systems of belt highways in America, and the great metropolis of the Middle West, Chicago, has extending out for 25 to 30 miles wonderful, wide, four-lane highways leading to the city. We are in splendid shape in Illinois with the exception of the embattled farmer, the forgotten farmer. The wealth-producing, life-sustaining large element of our people who need roads to contribute more greatly to the economy

of the Nation find themselves provided in this bill already with a sum of $1,000,000 less than is granted to the urban areas. Consequently I would oppose the taking away from the general State-aid fund the $25,000,000 and adding it to the urban area which would give $150,000,000 to that fund.

The facts are that our State and the economy of our State and its contribution to the Nation would be better served if we were to allocate at least as much to the feeder roads, the farm-to-market roads, in this bill, and half as much to the urban section of the bill. We must provide so far as we can for the building of farm-to-market roads in this legislation.

Mr. STEFAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VURSELL. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. STEFAN. The gentleman is not talking about the Kefauver amendment?

Mr. VURSELL. No.

Mr. STEFAN. How does the gentleman feel about the Kefauver amendment which would give the county supervisors and county commissioners a little more to say as to which county road or which rural road shall be constructed, resulting perhaps in a little more economy?

Mr. VURSELL. I would be very much in favor of that. I have observed in my own county that those in charge of the local road-building programs are very solicitous on account of the demands of the people. They live close to the people and they want to help to get the people out of the mud just as much as they can.

Mr. STEFAN. The gentleman's State is like my State. During rainy weather you have mud, during the winter you have snow and mud, and the farmer can stand on his front porch and see the cars whiz by on the highway not far from him, but cannot get to that highway. He needs gravel.

Mr. VURSELL. In our State we do not have much gravel so it is difficult for us to build farm-to-market roads.

Mr. STEFAN. I agree with all the gentleman says. I believe that the county supervisor should have something to say as to which road should be taken care of first.

Mr. VURSELL. I am in favor of the Government being kept close to the people and the Kefauver amendment makes that provision.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VURSELL. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Does not the gentleman feel that the counties will get much more for their money if the selection of these roads is primarily left up to the people who are going to use them because they know better than somebody in a State capital or in Washington as to what roads they need and the types of road they need?

Mr. VURSELL. There is no question, I may say to the gentleman, but that those county superintendents of highways and the road commissioners of the various townships ought to initiate and lay out the program for county road improvement.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTINGTON].

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, there are three amendments pending: First, the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GOODWIN]; second, the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WRIGHT]; and third, the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER]. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WRIGHT] very frankly confesses that his amendment is a purely exploratory one, written during the progress of the debate, and it undertakes to provide specifications for highways. It should be promptly rejected.

The amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] would not promote a system of secondary and farm-to-market roads. On the contrary, it would hinder them.

Under the terms of the committee bill those roads are approved by the highway commissioners in cooperation, in the language of the amendment, with the supervisors and with the officials of the county. Concretely, under the terms of the committee amendment, all highways for secondary and feeder roads will be determined by the local people, and they will have to secure the approval of the State highway commission, whereas under the Kefauver amendment they would have to come to Washington and secure the approval of the Federal Commissioner of Public Roads.

The committee carefully considered this matter. That view was presented time after time. The junior Senator from Tennessee came before our committee. It was the view of the Committee on Public Roads that secondary and feeder roads would be promoted better by cooperation between the State highway commissions and the county supervisors with the approval of the highway commissions, rather than by requiring the supervisors from the various counties to come to the National Capital.

With respect to the Goodwin amendment, which is the real amendment I would like to call attention to, under the terms of the bill as reported originally by the House there was allocated to the urban areas $150,000,000 and to the rural areas $125,000,000. We found upon further investigation, and as disclosed by the debates in the Senate, that the formula there would give to a State like Nevada something like $1,467,000 for one town, because the House bill provided for 10,000 population formula, as there is only one such city in Nevada.

That was utterly out of proportion to the amount allocated to Nevada for Federal aid and for feeder highways, so the committee in proposing the amendment under consideration has allocated $150,000,000 to the feeder roads, thereby increasing in substantially two-thirds of the States of the Union the allocation to Federal-aid highways and the allocation to feeder or secondary roads. At the same time, by amending the formula, striking out 10,000 and inserting 5,000 inhabitants in the towns, there has been an increased allocation to States like Massachusetts, Connecticut, and the other populous States.

Under the bill as reported by the House there would accrue to Massachusetts a total of $8,785,000; $2,636,000 to the urban areas. Under the revised formula agreed to by the committee there would be allocated to Massachusetts for her urban areas $6,449,000, and a total of $10,377,000, with a lesser apportionment to Federal-aid highways, and with a lesser apportionment to secondary roads, because the testimony before our committee showed that the need in that and similar States was really for urban roads.

Under that same amendment recommended by the committee there would accrue, as I repeat, to substantially 36 States of the Union larger allocations to the regular Federal-aid roads, and to the regular farm-to-market roads; in other words, there has been a concession. The gentleman's amendment, in all candor, would not embrace the attitude of compromise that was made by the committee, because he would retain the 5,000 population formulas that we have agreed to in amending section 2, and he would further profit so that there would be a larger allocation under his amendment to the few States like Massachusetts and Connecticut than there would be to the other 36 States.

I trust that all of these amendments will promptly be voted down, because, in my judgment, the committee amendment is the fairest that could be devised to all the interests and to all of the States of the Union.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired. All time has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GOODWIN] to the committee amendment.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. GOODWIN) there were—ayes 27, noes 93.

So the amendment to the committee amendment was rejected.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. KEFAUVER to the committee amendment: In amended section 3 (b) line 6 after the word "population" and after the ":" strike out the following language: *"Provided,* That these funds shall be expended on a system of such roads selected by the State highway departments in cooperation with the county supervisors, county commissioners, or other appropriate local road officials and the commissioner of public roads:", and insert in lieu thereof the following: *"Provided,* That these funds shall be expended on a system of such roads selected by the county supervisors, county commissioners, or other appropriate county road officials in cooperation with the State highway departments and the commissioner of public roads."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee to the committee amendment.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. KEFAUVER) there were—ayes 23, noes 68.

So the amendment to the committee amendment was rejected.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the committee amendment.

The Clerk read, as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WRIGHT to the committee amendment: After the committee amendent to section 3 insert:

"Any through interstate Federal-aid highway (excluding secondary or feeder roads) constructed or improved in whole or in part under the provisions of this act shall be so constructed that it will support and carry safely vehicles having a gross weight of at least 10 tons per axle and having a total height of 14 feet and a width of 9 feet."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the committee amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 4. After making the deductions for administration, research, and investigations as provided in section 21 of the Federal Highway Act of 1921, the sums authorized for each three successive post-war years shall be apportioned as follows:

(a) $225,000,000 for projects on the Federal-aid highway system either inside or outside of municipalities.

(b) $125,000,000 for projects on the principal secondary and feeder roads, including farm-to-market roads, rural free delivery mail and public-school bus routes, either outside of municipalities or inside of municipalities of less than 10,000 population: *Provided*, That these funds shall be expended on a system of such roads selected by the State highway departments in consultation with the county supervisors, county commissioners, or other appropriate local road officials subject to the approval of the Commissioner of Public Roads.

(c) $150,000,000 for projects on the principal highways in urban areas on the Federal-aid highway system.

(d) That any sums apportioned to any State under the provisions of this section shall be available for expenditure in that State for 2 years and any amount so apportioned remaining unexpended at the end of such period shall lapse: *Provided*, That such funds shall be deemed to have been expended if covered by formal agreement with the Commissioner of Public Roads for the improvement of a specific project as provided by this act.

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. Mr. Chairman, I offer a committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ROBINSON of Utah: Page 3, line 20, strike out all of section 4 and insert in lieu thereof the following language:

"SEC. 4. After making the deductions for administration, research, and investigations as provided in section 21 of the Federal Highway Act of 1921, the sums authorized shall be apportioned as follows:

"(a) The $225,000,000 per year available for projects on the Federal-aid highway system shall be apportioned among the States as provided in section 21 of the Federal Highway Act.

"(b) The $150,000,000 per year available for projects on the secondary and feeder roads shall be apportioned among the States in the following manner: One-third in the ratio which the area of each State bears to the total area of all the States; one-third in the ratio which the rural population of each State bears to the total rural population of all the States, as shown by the Federal census of 1940; and one-third in the ratio which the mileage of rural delivery and star routes in each State bears to the total mileage of rural delivery and star routes in all the States.

"(c) The $125,000,000 per year available for projects on highways in urban areas shall be apportioned among the States in the ratio which the population in municipalities and other urban places, of 5,000 or more, in each State bears to the total population in municipalities and other urban places, of 5,000 or more, in all the States as shown by the latest available Federal census: *Provided*, That Connecticut and Vermont towns shall be considered municipalities regardless of their incorporated status.

"(d) Any sums apportioned to any State under the provisions of this section shall be available for expenditure in that State for 2 years after the date of apportionment, and any amount so apportioned remaining unexpended at the end of such period shall lapse: *Provided*, That such funds shall be deemed to have been expended if covered by formal agreement with the Commissioner of Public Roads for the improvement of a specific project as provided by this act."

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. Mr. Chairman, this amendment makes the amendment which we have just adopted conform to the general purpose of the bill. I do not believe I care to explain it further than it has already been explained.

Mr. DIMOND. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. I yield.

Mr. DIMOND. I notice in section 4 of the Senate bill there was a provision that the term "State" as used in that section shall include the District of Columbia, the Territory of Hawaii, and Puerto Rico, but that no such provision is embraced in the House bill or in the amendment just offered. Will the gentleman explain why that was omitted?

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. The reason that section does not appear here is that provision is included in the general law and is not necessary in this bill.

Mr. DIMOND. Under the general law the District of Columbia, the Territory of Hawaii, and Puerto Rico would be eligible for allocation of money, not only for Federal-aid highway projects but also for secondary and feeder road projects and for urban projects as well?

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. Yes; they would be eligible wherever they can qualify.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the committee amendment, which I have sent to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WOLCOTT to the committee amendment: In subsection (b) of section 4, as amended: After the colon following the word "manner," insert "(1)", and after the word "States" strike out the period, insert a semicolon, and add the following new language: "and (2) apportioned among the counties of each State in the same manner as provided by part (1) of this subsection: *Provided*, That none of the funds authorized by this act for secondary and feeder roads shall be expended on any project unless such project conforms to standards to be established by the State highway department of the State wherein the project is located."

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, several years ago we made available certain sums for so-called secondary and feeder roads. Those moneys have not been used by the counties for the reason that the standards provided for the construction of rural roads, farm-to-market or feeder roads, are so high that the counties cannot afford to participate. They can build about twice as much road mileage without participation as they can by participating, because of the high standards.

There is no particular reason why a farm-to-market road should be built to withstand a 25-ton truck. Most of the farm-to-market or feeder roads are used to truck produce to market. The farmer's 1- or 2-ton truck is about the heaviest thing that goes over it. So they should not have to conform to the same standards in the building of the secondary and feeder roads as are used in the construction of the principal highway systems. For that reason I would leave the standards under which secondary and feeder roads are to be built to the States to determine for themselves.

I have also provided that the moneys which are allocated to the States by the Federal Government under the formula of subsection (b) be distributed among the counties by the same formula. For instance, we will assume that a particular State gets $1,000,000 under the formula in subsection (b). That would be one-third on the ratio which the area of the State bears to the total area of all States; one-third on rural population; and one-third on mileage. I use that same formula in distributing that $1,000,000 among the counties of that State. If you will pardon a personal reference to my home county, I will use that as an example. If the State of Michigan gets $1,000,000, the county of St. Clair will get a certain definite portion of that $1,000,000, established by this formula. That money is set aside to the credit of St. Clair County. St. Clair County may match it; the State may match it. The question of matching is left to the States. So the States may provide by law or by regulation the manner in which the State or county allocations shall be matched. In all probability, because in most States a certain amount of the weight tax and gasoline tax is returned to the counties, some provision will be made for the use of gasoline taxes and weight taxes collected within the counties for the matching of this money which is set aside definitely for that county.

This gives the counties the assurance that the money which is allocated by the Federal Government to the State is going to be used on secondary and feeder roads. We can also be assured under this system that it is going to be used there and nowhere else.

Mr. MOTT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield.

Mr. MOTT. How would that work in a county of very small area but very large population, say, a county like the county of San Francisco, in which the city and county are coexistent, in which

they probably would not need any feeder or farm-to-market roads?

Mr. WOLCOTT. That would not be considered a rural area because rural area is an area outside of a municipality with a population of 5,000 or more.

Mr. MOTT. Then the amendment would exclude the counties of small area and large population?

Mr. WOLCOTT. No; it would exclude, as is excluded in the formula in the committee amendment, all cities having a population over 5,000 because none of this money is to be spent in cities over 5,000.

Mr. MOTT. Yes; but they could expend it in the county outside of the city.

Mr. WOLCOTT. That is right.

Mr. MOTT. Take, for example, the county of Multnomah, in Oregon; the city of Portland probably constitutes nine-tenths of the population of the county. Outside of the city you have a rural area, but it is a very small one. Would the gentleman's proposal be fair to the other counties of Oregon considering that fact?

Mr. WOLCOTT. Oh, yes; because population is only one factor. Other factors must be taken into consideration—area and mileage. If the city within the county were so large that it took up most of the county, which is the case probably in Cook County, Ill., and Wayne County, Mich., then the bill provides that the $250,000,000 in the one case and the $150,000,000 in the other will be spent upon the Federal highways within those cities.

Mr. MOTT. The gentleman does not believe that a county such as I have mentioned would get too much of this farm-to-market and feeder-road money?

Mr. WOLCOTT. A county situated like those having large populations, such as we find in Cook County, Ill., and Wayne County, Mich., would get their money primarily from the urban provisions of this bill.

Mr. MOTT. But it would also get a certain share of the farm-to-market road money.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Oh, certainly; they would get a share of this too.

Mr. MOTT. Suppose a city in the county were so big that there was practically nothing left of the county, but nevertheless there was some rural area, then, under the gentleman's farm formula would not that county get too much farm-to-market and feeder-road money?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 3 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOLCOTT. No; they would not get a proportionate amount, because the area would be small even though the population were large; so it would balance off. But there is no reason why you should defeat the purpose of the farm-to-market program merely because there might be one isolated case somewhere in the United States which in itself might be the exception to the general rule which I believe would be applied equitably throughout the United States.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield.

Mr. CASE. I must confess that the gentleman's amendment goes far toward ensuring the carrying out of the intent of Congress in setting up the secondary road program. Under the original law in my State the money received from Federal aid was matched with State road funds and the total fund then allocated among the counties, 75 percent of it on the basis of assessed valuation and maybe 25 percent to take care of administration and put roads here and there. The result was that the counties which had a high assessed valuation regardless of their area or the kind of roads to be served "hogged" the road funds, so to speak. I believe the gentleman's amendment would correct that and ensure that the fundamental purpose of providing secondary road funds would be carried out.

Mr. WOLCOTT. And it would also prevent the State highway commissioner or the State highway office from giving a decided advantage to any particular section of a State. This money would be allocated to a particular county and accredited to that county until it was used or reapportioned under the Federal Highway Act. So that the State highway commissioner, if he happened to think he might have to favor one particular locality in order to get political advantage to himself or to his administration, would be unable to utilize these funds outside of the areas to which they were originally allotted.

Mr. WELCH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. WELCH. May I ask the gentleman who allocates the money to the different counties?

Mr. WOLCOTT. It will be allocated under this formula. As I stated, the formula provides one-third area, one-third population, and one-third mileage. In the first place, you have $150,000,000. You allocate it to the States on that formula. When the money has been allocated to the States then we apply that same formula to the allocation of those funds among the counties within the States.

Mr. WELCH. The State highway commission controls the money. Now, what is to prevent it from allocating it to any county or counties it so desires?

Mr. WOLCOTT. Because it must be allocated within the State according to this same formula.

Mr. WELCH. Of course, it will be allocated within the State, but who makes the final allocation?

Mr. WOLCOTT. The census helps. St. Clair County, in Michigan, has a known population; St. Clair County in Michigan has a certain road mileage; St. Clair County in Michigan has a certain area. Those things control. The State highway commissioner would have nothing whatsoever to say about the distribution excepting to make a finding that the 1940 census said that there were a certain number of people in this county and some State department says there is a certain area in that county and perhaps according to the figures on his own maps he establishes the road mileage; so everything is very certain as to the manner in which this is going to be apportioned, the same as it is certain as to the manner in which it is going to be apportioned to the State itself.

Mr. MOTT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield to the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. MOTT. The gentleman said something about matching by counties with the States on the same basis that the States match the Federal funds. Would the gentleman's amendment require matching by the counties?

Mr. WOLCOTT. No. That is up to the States to determine for themselves how it will be matched.

Mr. MOTT. In many States, in mine for instance, they require no matching by counties.

Mr. WOLCOTT. You would not have to. The Federal Government requires matching of these moneys and the States can determine for themselves where it raises the money to do the matching.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. What effect does the gentleman's amendment have in States where counties do not mean anything, or are not so indicated?

Mr. WOLCOTT. In all of those States the counties are political and geographical entities and that is the thing which would control. The State highway department could make the allocation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the committee should understand the full import of this amendment. It does at least two things that are different from any highway bill that has ever been passed by Congress. So far, we have only dealt with States. The Federal Government makes its appropriation to the State. Under this amendment, we would make appropriation directly to the county.

Let us look at this a moment. There are 3,054 counties in the United States.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. WOLCOTT. The Public Roads Administrator does not deal with the counties at all. He deals with the State highway commissioner and he has nothing whatsoever to do with the county. All of the preliminary work is done between the county and State highway commissioner and the appropriation is not made to the county. It is a bookkeeping operation within the State to the credit of that county.

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. That is true in one sense; the highway commissioner simply puts the appropriation to the credit of a county—and there are

3,054 counties in the United States—and that county is charged with the expenditure of that money. There are various counties in the United States that are small; that have a considerable population but very few roads. So no matter what the county has, we are making a direct grant to the county. That is all you can say. Here we are coming right back to our old W. P. A. and saying to a county, "Here, you have so much money. Whether you need it or not, we are not interested in that. Whether you need it or not, you must take it, and you must spend it on your roads." That is what we are saying to the counties. We have never before gone that far. To my way of thinking—and I am satisfied a great majority of the committee feel the same way I do—we are going right back to a Federal grant to counties for road purposes. Not only that, but we are violating another principle, it seems to me, which is absolutely fundamental. We are doing this: We are saying to the Federal Government, "You must put up half of the money for this county purpose, and yet you have no say whatever about how it will be spent, where it will be spent, or under what conditions it will be spent." It seems to me that this amendment violates two very fundamental principles of Federal-aid highway construction.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. MURDOCK. Is not this amendment a backward step in this respect? We have generally progressed from a county highway system to a State highway system throughout America, and this is a reversal of that process, is it not? I wish to meet local needs, but think the bill elsewhere provides by consultations to meet local needs to a certain degree.

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. I think it is not only a step backwards, but I think it is doing something which this Congress has refused to do and talked about not doing for a number of years, and that is the making of a direct grant to 3,054 counties for purposes that we do not know whether they need them or not.

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. McGREGOR. I am wondering if my distinguished chairman will recall his argument against my amendment a few minutes ago in which he insisted we should recognize State rights. My distinguished chairman has reversed his opinion, and therefore I would like to ask this question. Does he not feel that our local township trustees and our county commissioners have a better knowledge of the needs for the local roads than anyone in Washington, regardless of who he may be?

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. I want to leave this matter with the State road commission, where it always has been; with men who have studied the problem, and who understand the problem. I do not want to make an appropriation direct to a county without any engineering, without possibly any facilities for the expenditure of the money, without any knowledge of what money they might need for this particular purpose.

Mr. McGREGOR. Do I understand my distinguished chairman to say that his county commissioner has ever recommended a project that has not been surveyed and engineered?

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. No. May I say this, that in at least nine-tenths of the counties in the United States—though that may be a little overstatement—but I do not think there are more than 150 counties in the United States that have any engineering staffs at all; not only highway engineers, but any other kind of engineers. This engineering work in most of the States is usually done through the State engineers and the State administration. I want to leave this right where it has been, with the State engineers.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this section and all amendments thereto close in 25 minutes, the last 5 minutes to be used by the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Utah?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment I intend to offer later be read for information.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment to the committee amendment offered by Mr. MILLER of Connecticut: Change part (a) as follows:

"(a) The $225,000,000 per year available for projects on the Federal-aid highway system shall be apportioned among the States, one-half as provided in section 21 of the Federal Highway Act, and one-half in the ratio which the total motor vehicles in each State bears to the total motor vehicles in all the States, as reported in Public Roads Administration statistical table MV-1, for the calendar year 1941."

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, if we were undertaking today a new formula, or for the first time a formula for the distribution of Federal funds to the various States, I believe the committee and the House would certainly take into consideration in the establishment of that formula the number of automobiles on any given road to be built under this appropriation.

The amendment I have offered is comparatively simple to understand. It has no effect whatever on the allocation of the appropriation for farm-to-market roads or for the urban road. It affects only the $225,000,000 allocated in this bill for the Federal-aid highway system. It proposes that one-half of the $225,000,000 be appropriated to the several States according to the old section 21 formula—that is, one-third area, one-third population, and one-third road mileage. The other $112,500,000 would be apportioned among the States in the ratio which the total motor vehicles in each State bears to the total motor vehicles in all of the States. Accurate figures as to the number of motor vehicles in any State are readily available.

There are two sound reasons for the passage of this legislation at the present time: First, the need of improving our highways; and, second, road building is a sound plan of public works, and such public works will be needed during the reconversion period, and possibly for some time thereafter, to furnish necessary employment.

The old section 21 formula was all right when it was first adopted. The problem then was to get hard surfaces on our main roads. That problem has been pretty well met. Today the acute problem is to be found in the urban areas. As the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTINGTON] pointed out the other day, it takes longer to drive through the city of Baltimore than it does to drive from Washington to Baltimore. Similar situations can be found in practically all of the congested areas throughout the country. I cannot conceive of a sounder method of determining road needs than to determine the number of automobiles in a given area. It must be apparent to every Member of the House that it costs a great deal more to build a mile of road capable of carrying from thirty to fifty thousand automobiles daily than it does to build a road adequate for the needs of a thousand or fifteen hundred cars a day.

In the congested areas, grade crossings must be eliminated, which means the building of bridges over our through highways. Such projects are very expensive. It is my contention that the amendment just offered will give us a more equitable method for the distribution of Federal funds; that it will put the money where it is admittedly most needed and that it will put the money where unemployment is bound to be heaviest. To that extent it squares with the announced purpose of this legislation.

Charts have been prepared to show the allocation under this amendment to each of the States and may be found on page 8412 of the RECORD of November 24.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment pending which I ask unanimous consent to have read for the information of the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. KEFAUVER to Mr. ROBINSON's amendment of section 4: Amend the amended section 4 (b) by adding at the end thereof the following: "The amount available to each State under section 3 (b) shall, upon the counties of said State complying with law and other requirements, be apportioned to the said counties or to the use of said counties in their road program as herein defined in the following manner: one-third in the ratio which the area of each county bears to the total area of the State; one-third in the ratio which the rural population of each county bears to the total rural population of all of the counties of the State, as shown by the Federal census of 1940; one-third in the ratio which the mileage of rural

delivery and star routes in each county bears to the total mileage of rural delivery and star routes in all the counties of the State."

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Chairman, it will be seen that my amendment is the same as the second part of the Wolcott amendment. His amendment is better in that it covers two subjects which I think are of primary importance to those who are interested in seeing that we have a real rural road program out of this bill. The first part of his amendment goes to the matter of specification as to the type of roads, and I would prefer to have the primary responsibility with respect to that matter rest with the local road supervisors of the counties. But that was voted down. Therefore, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT], in the first part of his amendment, has placed that responsibility on the State highway departments, who, I would assume, would act in cooperation with the county and local road supervisors. The second part of his amendment is the same as mine. If his amendment is acted on favorably, I shall not ask the passage of the amendment that I have submitted. I do feel that we would be saving the rural sections and the counties an awful lot of trouble and we would be complying with the spirit of this bill if some provisions were made for the distribution of the funds that are allotted to the States for rural road construction between the counties of that State. The Wolcott amendment uses the same basis for distribution between the counties as is used for distribution between the States. If anybody says that is not a fair distribution, then they would have to advance the same argument as to the distribution between the States of the Union because the same formula is used. I think everybody recognizes and agrees that the committee's formula of distribution between the States is very reasonable and very equitable. That being true, then the formula of the Wolcott amendment must be the same, and it must satisfy the requirements of the committee. It has been suggested here that we would be dealing with the counties and that it is not the purpose of this Federal Aid Road Act to deal with the counties. Well, I thought we were all in agreement that it was a fine and healthy part of this bill that we were recognizing some responsibility for rural and secondary roads. If we want to do that, then we have started out on the wrong premise. If we want to recognize some responsibility to rural roads, then why not see that the counties get some share of it.

It has been stated by the chairman that many counties may not have highway engineers. Back in 1916 and 1920, when the first Federal-aid Road Act was passed, the same argument was made as to the States, but it was found that when responsibility was placed on the States they formed highway departments, and they secured competent engineers. I am sure the same thing will happen in respect to the counties. Even though some of them may not have good engineers at the present time, the county supervisors know where these roads ought to be. After all, the States would not approve it unless it did meet with their requirements and regulations.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield.

Mr. HARRIS. As I understand, the purpose of the gentleman's amendment is——

Mr. KEFAUVER. I am supporting the Wolcott amendment.

Mr. HARRIS. I understand; but the purpose of your amendment will be to assure every county that it will get its pro rata share as allotted to the State.

Mr. KEFAUVER. That is right. It does not involve dealing with the Federal Government at all, because the State takes this money on the condition that it will be divided among the counties in the State. That is a matter for the State to do after it gets the money, and not for the Federal Government. So it does not go into a W. P. A. proposition at all. It is setting up a formula for carrying out the intent of this committee as expressed in the report and as expressed on the floor of this House.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield.

Mr. WOLCOTT. We have recognized the Federal Government participating with county boards in subsection (b), of section 3, in which we provide that these secondary-road funds shall be expended on a system of roads selected by the Federal Roads Administration in cooperation with the county supervisors, county commissioners, or other appropriate local road officials, and we are simply applying that principle to the use of the money.

Mr. KEFAUVER. We are now seeing that the money gets there so that they can cooperate.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee has expired.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, we have been fighting for farm-to-market roads ever since I have been a Member of this House, 10 years. Unless we pass the Wolcott amendment we may be back where we started.

What we want is the elimination of expensive blueprinting, the elimination of expensive survey after survey. We want some actual work done on rural market and farm roads.

The Wolcott amendment does not change the formula one iota if I read it correctly, and if I am mistaken I ask my colleague from Michigan to correct me. The formula is maintained whereby the counties cooperate with the State engineers and the State highway authorities. They have the advantage of the State engineering work, of the study and information made available by the State. I hope you will vote for the Wolcott amendment if you have any interest in getting the farmers in your State out of the mud and getting an all-weather road to the producing farms of our Nation.

Mr. MOTT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEFAN. I yield to the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. MOTT. Suppose you have two counties in Nebraska, one of which has fully developed its farm-to-market road system——

Mr. STEFAN. I heard the question the gentleman from Oregon asked of the gentleman from Michigan. The gentleman from Michigan gave him the information that the formula was based one-third on area, one-third on population, and one-third on mileage; that that would work in all of the counties in the suburban areas. The urban population would come under the $225,000,000 formula.

Mr. MOTT. I started to ask the gentleman from Nebraska a different question. Suppose in the gentleman's State there were two counties, one of which already had its farm-to-market road system rather fully developed.

Mr. STEFAN. We do not have such an outstanding condition in my State; we do not have a fully developed farm-to-market road system. That is our objective in this amendment.

Mr. MOTT. I will not ask the gentleman a hypothetical question based upon conditions that do not exist in his State.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Nebraska has expired.

The gentleman from California [Mr. ELLIOTT] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Chairman, I wish in a moment or two to ask the gentleman from Utah a question. Being a member of the Committee on Roads my interest to a large extent has been centered on farm-to-market roads. Up to this time my mind is not fully clear as to what we expect to get out of this road bill in the way of aid to farm-to-market roads. I mean this: I see no assurance that money allocated to my State for use on farm-to-market roads would not be subject to control of the Federal Commissioner, Mr. McDonald, that he could not say that a certain type of road must be constructed, a type that would give us but 2 miles of completed road as against 20 if the road were constructed under the control of the county boards of supervisors or commissioners.

I ask this question of the chairman of the committee of which I am a member: Is it the gentleman's understanding that Mr. McDonald will give full cooperation to the boards of supervisors and boards of commissioners to the end that the type of road now being used in these several localities throughout the States will be accepted as the standard rather than to require the counties to conform to a standard set up by the Federal board?

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELLIOTT. I yield to the gentleman from Utah.

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. The gentleman will recall that Mr. McDonald appeared before the committee on this subject and stated, first, that due to the small amount of money that had been heretofore set aside for farm-to-market roads the Federal Bureau of Roads had never set up standards for those roads; that if this amount of money were appropriated, then the Bureau would attempt as best it could to cooperate with the local people in helping them to set up standards that would operate in those

particular communities where a particular type or some type of road is needed. It was his opinion that these standards for farm-to-market roads would be entirely different from the standards that have been set up for the regular Federal-aid highway system.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Was it also the gentleman's understanding that the same type of roads now under construction or the same type of road being used in various localities would be the standard of road maintained under this act?

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. That is my understanding from the Commissioner as he testified before our committee.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Chairman, several provisions set up in this bill are a little bit confusing and the question is asked as to why these various amendments such as the one suggested by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT] have been offered. In order to guarantee our various county farm-to-market roads such an amendment as the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT] has offered might not be bad in this bill so that we will have some kind of a guaranty that this money will be made available to the various counties throughout the United States and not leave it to the jurisdiction of one or two people to designate where the money will go, then awaken too late, after the bill is passed, and find that we have no voice in the matter whatsoever.

Mr. Chairman, I favor the Wolcott amendment and I hope it will have the full approval of the committee.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, I offer a preferential motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. REED of New York moves that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with the recommendation that the enacting clause be stricken.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, here is a rather significant letter signed by the highway commissioners of several large States: William J. Cox, Connecticut State Highway Commissioner; Edward W. Staves, Massachusetts Postwar Highway Commissioner; Spencer Miller, Jr., New Jersey State Highway Commissioner; Harvey Schermerhorn, New York State Highway Commissioner; and John U. Shroyer, Pennsylvania Secretary of Highways, and I think it is important that some consideration be given to what they say. It says:

After the war—40,000,000 cars, trucks, and busses on the roads. Many of them bright, shiny, new cars, owned by millions of ex-servicemen who dreamed in Africa, Europe, or the Pacific about driving a coupe or sedan through the country they fought for, and by millions of war workers who saved their money to buy what they wanted. Forty million cars on the roads.

What roads?

The same old winding, narrow thoroughfares that make Sunday motoring more of a trial than a happy adventure? The same old penned-in city streets that choke up business traffic? The same old traffic snarls?

We say, "No." We say that a nation on wheels must be able to move instead of crawl.

This means an adequate system of broad, straight highways linking our States. It means courageous, intelligent plans to cut through our great centers of population so that we will not be bound by city streets built for ambling horses and surreys-with-a-fringe-on-top. It means Federal highway legislation which will provide roads where they are needed and post-war jobs where the shock of reconversion is greatest.

HERE'S WHAT YOU ARE UP AGAINST

There is pending in Congress a Federal post-war highway aid bill, approved by the House Roads Committee, which proposes to distribute $1,500,000,000 among the States over a 3-year period. The bill purports to provide greatly needed highway facilities and, at the same time, to cushion the shock of post-war reconversion and employment.

Will it accomplish what needs doing? We say, "No."

Why?

It is a subsidy first and a highway construction program second. It gives a pittance to traffic-strangled communities of New York and other congested States and dumps millions on towns and cities elsewhere that have no real traffic problem. It is not in the national interest to subsidize—to the tune of $552,000,000—road construction in States where traffic congestion is not acute, even though New York and other wealthy States are admittedly better able than many others to contribute generously to a genuinely national cause. Getting down to cases, the pending bill would require New York taxpayers to pay in $289,235,000 and would return to us only $90,585,000 in the form of Federal highway aid, the difference, $198,650,000, being allocated among 34 other States where road needs are less urgent.

It disregards reasonable yardsticks, such as number of motor vehicles, road use, and cost of highway construction.

THE BILL IGNORES ROAD NEEDS

New York would get $31 per motor vehicle.

Wyoming would get $205 per motor vehicle.

Any Federal highway aid program which allocates funds to the States without a reasonable relationship to the number of their motor vehicles is unrealistic. Obviously, road needs are most urgent where the concentration of motor vehicles is greatest.

See above how New York, with her acute traffic problem, fares in comparison with Wyoming, with relatively little traffic congestion. To see how New York compares with all other States with respect to total Federal funds.

The bill provides a poor program for good roads because it unfairly treats the cities' traffic problems.

New York would get $92,000 for Auburn (population 35,763).

New Mexico would get $2,320,000 for Albuquerque (population 35,449).

SIX OTHER GLARING EXAMPLES OF UNEQUAL TREATMENT

California: Bakersfield (population 29,252) $130,000.

Nevada: Reno (population 21,317) $4,400,000.

Massachusetts: Lawrence (population 84,323) $187,000.

Arkansas: Little Rock (population 88,039) $2,700,000.

New Jersey: Perth Amboy (population 41,242) $113,000.

South Dakota: Sioux Falls (population 40,832) $2,290,000.

Rhode Island: Warwick (population 28,757) $101,000.

Vermont: Burlington (population 27,686) $1,090,000.

Pennsylvania: Johnstown (population 66,688) $274,000.

Mississippi: Jackson (population 62,107) $1,780,000.

Ohio: Mansfield (population 37,154) $164,000.

Montana: Butte (population 37,081) $2,000,000.

Dollars per motor vehicle

Nevada	$331
Wyoming	205
New Mexico	180
Montana	166
Idaho	164
Arizona	156
Utah	117
South Dakota	98
North Dakota	95
Delaware	94
Mississippi	90
Arkansas	88
Colorado	82
Oregon	82
Alabama	79
Vermont	77
Georgia	66
Tennessee	62
Nebraska	61
New Hampshire	59
Kentucky	58
North Carolina	55
West Virginia	55
Kansas	54
Louisiana	54
Maine	54
Oklahoma	54
South Carolina	53
Virginia	50
Texas	49
Washington	48
Missouri	45
Minnesota	43
Iowa	42
Florida	40
Wisconsin	37
Rhode Island	36
Indiana	33
Illinois	32
Pennsylvania	32
New York	31
Michigan	29
Ohio	29
Maryland	28
California	27
Massachusetts	27
New Jersey	22
Connecticut	21

Dollars per demobilized person

Nevada	$1,650
Wyoming	1,080
Montana	875
Idaho	837
New Mexico	715
Arizona	699
South Dakota	513
North Dakota	462
Utah	334
Colorado	326
Vermont	289
Oregon	278
Nebraska	268
Delaware	208
Arkansas	193
Minnesota	184
Mississippi	179
Iowa	179
New Hampshire	175
Oklahoma	169
Texas	158
South Carolina	155
North Carolina	152
Georgia	151
Kansas	151
Kentucky	150
Maine	143
Florida	142
Tennessee	139
Missouri	125
Alabama	124
West Virginia	120
Louisiana	114
Washington	110
Wisconsin	109
Virginia	108
Rhode Island	78
California	76

Dollars per demobilized person—Continued	
Illinois	$72
Indiana	70
New York	64
Ohio	62
Pennsylvania	60
Massachusetts	54
Maryland	48
Michigan	47
New Jersey	42
Connecticut	35

THE BILL IGNORES JOB NEEDS

New York would get $64 for each demobilized person, as based on total Federal funds and estimates in Monthly Labor Review, July 1943 (U. S. Department of Labor).

Montana would get $875 for each demobilized person, as based on total Federal funds and estimates in Monthly Labor Review, July 1943 (U. S. Department of Labor).

If a Federal highway aid program is to provide post-war jobs, there must be a reasonable relationship between the apportionment of funds to the States and their estimated employment needs. Viewed as an employment measure, the bill does not adequately provide for post-war jobs in New York and other highly industrialized States.

The vast majority of post-war jobs must, of course, be provided by private enterprise. Any public-works program must be considered not as a prime source of employment, but as an adjustable makeweight to take up any slack. From the employment standpoint only, the Nation's heavy financial burden will not permit the expenditure of public funds for a Federal highway aid program, which is only one of many proposed public-works projects, except to provide jobs where and when they are most needed.

In a nutshell, Federal highway aid, originally developed in 1916 to get the motorist out of the mud, has required a substantially greater contribution from States with resources of population, industry, and money than from those less fortunately situated. However—and this is important—normal Federal highway aid to the States has never exceeded $200,000,000 a year, and in recent years has averaged about $135,000,000. An unprecedented jump to $500,000,000 a year can be justified only by relieving traffic congestion and by providing post-war jobs where needed. Any such expenditure which does not attain these objectives is a wanton extravagance and unfair to the people of New York, who have heretofore been happy to pay a generous share toward the development of a national system of highways.

This, too, is important. Powerful interests, comprised of self-seeking, short-sighted, and poorly informed groups, are promoting the pending bill on the defeatist theory that "it is the best we can get." Who is to say that Congress cannot write a sound Federal-aid road bill? Such a position cannot be substantiated in the light of the factual analysis presented in this leaflet, which shows that more equitable and reasonable legislation can and should be written.

HERE'S WHAT YOU CAN DO ABOUT IT

Tell your Congressman you are aware that the pending bill (H. R. 4915) is at best a compromise which has aroused dissatisfaction in many quarters—that if he votes for it he is not representing your best interests—and that what we in New York must have is completely fair and very simple:

1. For the especial benefit of States which do not have our resources, continued normal aid as in effect since 1916, but not to exceed $135,000,000 to $150,000,000 a year to all States.

2. Any amount in excess of $135,000,000 to $150,000,000 a year to be distributed among the States with due regard to road needs, as computed by the yardsticks of population, motor-vehicle registrations, road use, and construction cost; and with a realistic appraisal of employment needs.

This objective can be accomplished in a number of ways. For instance, the Miller-Wene bill (H. R. 4628) proposes an allocation under a more reasonable formula which, if applied to the $1,500,000,000 program embodied in the pending bill, would give New York $126,150,000 as against $92,940,000. The Miller-Wene basis of allocation recognizes New York's traffic problem. It is endorsed by the following highway officials of five States in which 25 percent of the Nation's population and about 23 percent of the total motor vehicles are compressed within less than 4 percent of our country's area.

WILLIAM J. COX,
Connecticut State Highway Commissioner.
EDWARD W. STAVES,
Massachusetts Post-war Highway Commission.
SPENCER MILLER, Jr.,
New Jersey State Highway Commissioner.
HARVEY SCHERMERHORN,
New York State Highway Commissioner.
JOHN U. SHROYER,
Pennsylvania Secretary of Highways.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I regret exceedingly that the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. MILLER] persists in his amendment. The Committee on Roads, and the House thus far in the consideration of this bill, has been more generous to the five or six States named by the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED] than the Congress has ever been in any previous highway legislation. Under the bill as amended by the committee the State of Connecticut is given an allocation of $1,000,000 more than it has ever been given heretofore under the old formula of one-third, one-third, and one-third. Not satisfied with that concession, not satisfied with the generous treatment, the gentleman now proposes that that State and four or five others be given a few million dollars more at the expense of two-thirds of the States of the Union.

I say that we have been most generous, and I regret exceedingly that the gentleman has offered his amendment.

As to the Wolcott amendment, of which the Kefauver amendment is a part, let me call attention to this fact: The Wolcott amendment, a part of which is identical with the Kefauver amendment, is a departure from the established practice of Federal aid, that has never been tried and has never obtained. It provides for an allocation in the States among counties on a formula that has never been presented to the Committee on Roads, except in the motion of the gentlemen in executive session after the rule was reported on this bill, and there have been no hearings thereon. Please keep in mind that this is not a bill to construct all of the rural highways of the country. If the gentleman's amendment obtains, there may be constructed 3 or 4 miles in all of the counties of the States of the Union, with the result that there would be no complete satisfactory secondary roads.

We have never insisted that the Federal-aid fund shall be distributed in the States in the congressional districts of the Members of this body, 435 of them. We have left the distribution and the allocation to the States. We have the highway commissions make the distributions among the several parts of the States. There would be just as much reason in our having advocated for the last 30 years that Federal funds be distributed among the congressional districts as there is in asking that they be distributed in the counties based upon the population area and mileage which might do an injustice to many, many counties in the country.

There is a second proposition embraced in the Wolcott amendment that is a departure from the practice that has obtained. The Congress of the United States has provided a laboratory. As a result of the tests in that laboratory the types of Federal-aid highway construction have been improved. The improvement is so great that the roads that have been constructed in the last few years are incomparably better and are constructed more economically than the roads that were constructed 25 years ago. That provision should be available now as we initiate a program of secondary roads. The type of construction should be approved by the Federal Commissioner of Roads. One county may want one type and the other counties in your State may want another type. The money authorized in this bill is money that is being matched by the Federal Government, and it is to the interest of the people of the Nation to secure the very best type of local secondary roads.

If this part of the Wolcott amendment is adopted, if the Federal Government shall have no voice in the selection of the type of secondary roads, if we are to discard the benefit of the experiments that have been made and of the information that is available for the construction of secondary roads, there will be a setting back of the secondary road program in the United States for which this Congress ought not to be responsible.

Therefore, I say that as we now initiate a real program of secondary roads it would be unwise for us to dispense with the approval and the establishment of the type for secondary roads, both of which have obtained heretofore. That type would be inferior for secondary roads, as Mr. MacDonald has said, to the high type of Federal-aid highway roads. Contracts for secondary roads, including the type of construction, should be approved by the Commissioner of Public Roads.

Mr. Chairman, I trust that all these amendments may be defeated in the interest of real constructive Federal highway legislation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired. All time has expired on this section and all amendments thereto.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT] to the committee amendment.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. WOLCOTT) there were—ayes 51, noes 77.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were refused.

So the amendment to the committee amendment was rejected.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment to the committee amendment offered by Mr. MILLER of Connecticut: Change part (a) as follows:

"(a) The $225,000,000 per year available for projects on the Federal-aid highway system shall be apportioned among the States, one-half as provided in section 21 of the Federal Highway Act, and one-half in the ratio which the total motor vehicles in each State bears to the total motor vehicles in all the States, as reported in Public Roads Administration statistical table MV-1, for the calendar year 1941."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment to the committee amendment offered by the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. MILLER].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. MILLER of Connecticut) there were—ayes 37, noes 96.

So the amendment to the committee amendment was rejected.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. KEFAUVER to the committee amendment: Amend the amended section 4 (b) by adding at the end thereof the following: "The amount available to each State under section 3 (b) shall, upon the counties of said State complying with law and other requirements, be apportioned to the said counties or to the use of said counties in their road program as herein defined in the following manner; one-third in the ratio which the area of each county bears to the total area of the State; one-third in the ratio which the rural population of each county bears to the total rural population of all of the counties of the State, as shown by the Federal Census of 1940; one third in the ratio which the mileage of rural delivery and star routes in each county bears to the total mileage of rural delivery and star routes in all the counties of the State."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the committee amendment was rejected.

The question recurs on the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 5. The Federal share payable on account of any project provided for by the funds made available by this act for the first post-war year shall not exceed 60 percent of the cost thereof; for the second and third post-war years the Federal share shall not exceed 50 percent of the cost thereof: *Provided*, That in the case of any State containing unappropriated and unreserved public lands and nontaxable Indian lands, individual and tribal, exceeding 5 percent of the total area of all lands therein the Federal share shall be increased in each of the 3 post-war years by a percentage of the remaining cost equal to the percentage that the area of all such lands in such State is of its total area: *Provided further*, That the entire construction cost of projects for the elimination of hazards of railway-highway crossings may be paid from Federal funds, except that not more than 50 percent of the right-of-way and property damage costs, paid from public funds, on any such project, may be paid from Federal funds.

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. Mr. Chairman, I offer a committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment offered by Mr. ROBINSON of Utah: On page 5, line 15, after the word "funds", strike out the period, insert a colon and the following language: "*Provided further*, That not more than 15 percent of the sums apportioned to any State shall be used for railway highway projects."

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. Mr. Chairman, this is just a limitation of 15 percent on the amount that the States can expend for railway highway crossings.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WOLCOTT: On page 4, line 23, strike out the first sentence of section 5, down to and including the semicolon in line 3, on page 5, and insert in lieu thereof the following: "The Federal share payable on account of any project provided for by the funds made available by this act shall not exceed 50 percent of the cost thereof."

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, the bill as it is now written provides that the first year the Federal Government will put up 60 percent of the funds and the State governments 40 percent. Then for the second and third years it is provided equally 50 percent by the Federal Government and 50 percent by the State government. I think we should have this in mind, that the State governments are in much better relative financial condition than they ever have been before. Whether we want to recognize it or not, this country is broke. At the close of this war we will owe in the neighborhood of $300,000,000,000. The carrying charges on that $300,000,000,000 will be at least $9,000,000,000 a year. We are never going to run this Federal establishment again for less than seven or eight billion dollars. So it will cost us at least sixteen and perhaps seventeen billion dollars to run the Federal Government.

I do not take into consideration in that statement any debt retirement or cost to run the State governments. It means if we can maintain a national income of $100,000,000,000, at least 17 cents out of every earned dollar has to be paid into the Federal Treasury. It has been estimated by economists, when we take into consideration the total amount of our deficit financing, the total amount of our Federal debt and the total amount of our State and municipal debt, that from 22 to 27 cents out of every earned dollar must go into the Federal and State treasuries. For that reason the income comparable to that which we had in 1929 of approximately $100,000,000,000 would have a usable power, purchasing power, of about $78,000,000,000.

To have the same prosperity, the same purchasing power on the basis of the same dollar value we had in 1929, one of two things must be done: Either depreciate the value of the currency or increase production; and when you take money out of production channels to meet carrying charges you, of course, stifle production.

The States today are in better relative financial position than they have ever been before. They have not been spending their money, they have been building up huge reserves out of the gasoline money and the weight money they have been collecting. The argument is that we pay them this 10-percent bonus for the use of their highways during the war. We are paying them sufficient, but at least they can wait, they can wait until the Federal Government gets on a sound basis or they will not get anything; and at least this should be reversed; if we are going to do it, we should wait until the Federal Government is in a position to give the States this bonus.

Now just a word or two about this bill. Mr. Chairman, you have defeated the secondary and feeder roads system by not adopting the amendment that was offered, because under the provision as it now exists none of the counties can afford to build secondary and feeder roads.

Let us turn for a minute to the urban section having in mind that there is not a dollar of this urban money which can be spent on streets off the Federal-aid system. It can be spent only on the Federal-aid system within your urban communities. By these two things you have defeated this bill so there is no harm in voting for it; the bill is harmless, but ineffectual.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan may proceed for 1 additional minute; and I ask him to yield for a question.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. If the gentleman's amendment is agreed to it seems that, as heretofore, hereafter the States and the local subdivisions will be required to match 50–50 Federal aid for the 3 years to be covered by this bill.

Mr. WOLCOTT. That is right; they are in much better position to do it than the Federal Government is to pay them a bonus of 10 percent at the present time, which we are doing if we make it 60 percent on the part of the Federal Government instead of 50 percent the first year. Why hand the States anything at this particular time? We are protecting the States and we are spending their money for this purpose, but we are spending $300,000,000,000 to save this country, and the States are anxious and willing to contribute their part. They do not have to be handed a bonus to do it.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. The gentleman will recall that personally I go along with my committee, and I have been in agreement with the gentleman.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I know the gentleman does.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has again expired.

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. Mr. Chairman, I seek recognition on the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Utah is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. I do this, Mr. Chairman, because I feel that on this particular amendment the committee should be given one more opportunity to be heard, for it is a highly controversial problem and was discussed by the committee. When the bill was introduced it provided that the Federal share should be 75 percent and the State share 25 percent. We finally in the committee agreed that the Federal share for the first year would be 60 percent, thereafter 50. The reason for it, as is briefly stated by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT], is that for 3 years the States have allowed their highways to be used for Federal and war purposes with the result that the State highways at the present time are in very poor condition. It was felt by the committee that some little consideration should be given to the States for having their highways punished as they have been punished by the Federal Government during the last 3 years of war.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. I yield.

Mr. MAY. Is there any State in this Union that has not offered to contribute the use of its highways to the Nation for the war effort, or who should not in view of the fact that year after year during the depression they have had billions of dollars out of the Federal Treasury?

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. I think the gentleman can answer that question himself without asking me. That is his opinion. I have mine. There is the problem that is presented in this bill. I am perfectly willing to state that our committee was very sharply divided on that. We were not very definite. The Senate provided a 50–50 matching for each of 3 years and we vary little from the Senate bill. I am willing to abide by the decision of the committee on that question.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate close in 5 minutes on this section.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Utah?

Mr. STEWART. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I have an amendment that I would like to offer.

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. I will limit my request, Mr. Chairman, to this pending amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Utah asks unanimous consent that all debate on the pending amendment close in not to exceed 5 minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MOTT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pending amendment.

Mr. Chairman, if the amendment just offered is adopted, then this bill reverts back to nothing but an ordinary biannual Federal-aid highway bill. In the first place, as I have said a number of times, and as testified to by every expert witness who appeared before our committee, the bill as it is presently before us carries only one-half the amount of money that these experts said was a minimum with which to undertake a post-war road-building program. Now it is cut down to one-half of the minimum.

We made a concession, as was stated, by the unanimous vote of the committee, by providing for a 60–40 contribution on the part of the Federal Government for the first post-war year because this bill was intended to be a comprehensive post-war road-construction program. There were sound reasons for this, and every member of the committee knows what they were. If we take away now even that concession then, surely, this bill becomes only an ordinary highway bill and not a comprehensive post-war program at all. The only difference between this bill and other similar road bills which we have passed heretofore is that this one does not take effect until the war is over. The whole purpose for which the bill was introduced will have been abandoned.

Mr. Chairman, I want to call the attention of members to the fact that the Federal Government already is under moral obligation to the States at this time for a contribution of several billion dollars in road funds which it never has returned to the States. For 20 years the Federal Government has been collecting from the road users of the States in Federal gasoline and other automotive excise taxes an average of twice as much as it has contributed to road building.

This bill as it stands now will give to the States no more Federal funds during the 3-year post-war period than the road users of the several States will contribute to the Government during those 3 years. We have already cut down the bill to such an extent that it cannot properly be called a post-war construction measure. I hope we will not slash it further by adopting the amendment which has just been offered and which would cut the Federal contribution for the first post-war year down from 60 to 50 percent.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. ROBINSON of Utah) there were—ayes 88, noes 59.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. COOPER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 4915) to amend and supplement the Federal-Aid Road Act, approved July 11, 1916, as amended and supplemented, to authorize appropriations for the post-war construction of highways and bridges, to eliminate hazards at railroad-grade crossings, to provide for the immediate preparation of plans and acquisition of rights-of-way, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 654, had come to no resolution thereon.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an address I recently delivered.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

(Mr. LEFEVRE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.)

EXTENSION OF SECOND WAR POWERS ACT

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary may have until midnight to file its report on H. R. 4993, the extension of the Second War Powers Act.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

MORE EFFICIENT DENTAL CARE FOR THE PERSONNEL OF THE UNITED STATES NAVY

Mr. BATES of Kentucky, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 659), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered printed:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4216) to provide more efficient dental care for the personnel of the United States Navy. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall be continued not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and the ranking minority member of the Committee on Naval Affairs, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the reading of the bill for amendments, the Committee shall rise and report the same to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion, except one motion to recommit.

EXTENSION OF SECOND WAR POWERS ACT

Mr. SABATH, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 660) which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered printed:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4993) to amend Public, No. 507, Seventy-seventh Congress, second session, an act to further expedite the prosecution of the war, approved March 27, 1942, known as the Second War Powers Act, 1942; that after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall be continued not to exceed 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and the ranking minority

member of the Committee on the Judiciary, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the reading of the bill for amendments, the Committee shall rise and report the same to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion, except one motion to recommit.

SMALLER WAR PLANTS CORPORATION

Mr. SABATH, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 661), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered printed:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (S. 2004) to amend the act entitled "An act to mobilize the productive facilities of small business in the interests of successful prosecution of the war, and for other purposes," approved June 11, 1942; that after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall be continued not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and the ranking minority member of the Committee on Banking and Currency, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the reading of the bill for amendments, the Committee shall rise and report the same to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion, except one motion to recommit.

SAFEGUARDING ADMISSION OF EVIDENCE IN CERTAIN CASES

Mr. SABATH, from the Committee on Rules (on behalf of Mr. SLAUGHTER), reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 662), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered printed:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3690) to safeguard the admission of evidence in certain cases; that after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall be continued not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and the ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the reading of the bill for amendments, the Committee shall rise and report the same to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion, except one motion to recommit.

THE TRUTH ABOUT PEARL HARBOR

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include therein a joint resolution I am introducing today.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, truth though crushed to earth will rise again and, like murder, though it hath no tongue, will speak with most miraculous organ.

The American people have not been told the truth about Pearl Harbor. They want to know the truth and are entitled to know it in the name of both the living and the dead. Someday we will know it, though from my exasperating and painful experience with this particular matter I dare not prophesy when, but I repeat, sir, someday we will know the complete story and the whole truth about the most shameful and disgraceful massacre of our armed forces in the annals of our country.

And when the complete story is told and the whole truth known, the American people will be shocked, angered, and grieved—deeply grieved and sorely wounded. Perhaps we shall have to wait for future historians to place the responsibility for this most tragic chapter in our Nation's history, but that does not relieve us from at least attempting to do our duty now. We certainly should exert every effort to prevent a replica of the Dreyfus case in the United States with all its unfortunate implications. Truth will ultimately triumph.

Mr. Speaker, last December a resolution passed unanimously the House of Representatives and the Senate of the United States Congress and was signed by the President, which became Public Law No. 208 of the Seventy-eighth Congress. That law extended the statute of limitations for 6 months from December 7, 1943 to June 7, 1944, for the prosecution, trial, and punishment of any person or persons, in military or civil capacity, involved in any manner in connection with the Pearl Harbor catastrophe of December 7, 1941.

For reasons best known to this administration, no effort was put forward to bring about the court martial of Admiral Kimmel and General Short or the trial of any other person involved. So Public Law 339 was passed last June by the Seventy-eighth Congress and signed by the President, which further extended the statute of limitations for an additional period of 6 months until December 7, 1944. Under this law the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy were severally directed to proceed forthwith with investigations into the facts surrounding the Pearl Harbor catastrophe and commence such proceedings against such persons as the facts may justify.

Both the War and Navy Departments set up their respective committees for holding extensive hearings and, after rather exhaustive investigations, filed their reports, respectively, with the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy, on or about October 20, 1944. However, no proceedings have been commenced pursuant to the direction in Public Law 339.

For some strange and unknown reason the findings of the War Department's board of investigation and the Navy Department's court of inquiry are shrouded in mystery and clothed with secrecy. Both the Congress and the American people are still in the dark concerning this awful tragedy which took the lives of thousands of American men, cost the taxpayers hundreds of millions of dollars, and indefinitely prolonged the war in the Pacific.

Mr. Speaker, almost 3 years have elapsed since Pearl Harbor. It is inconceivable that the truth concerning this catastrophe could now aid and abet the enemy. Indeed the enemy perhaps knows certain secrets which have been hidden from the American people.

Both Maj. Gen. Walter C. Short and Rear Admiral Husband E. Kimmel, who were in command of our armed forces at the Pearl Harbor disaster, have each severally waived the statute of limitations against any court martial, but no other officer or person in military or civil capacity has waived the statute of limitations against any court martial or other proceedings in connection with the Pearl Harbor catastrophe. Unless the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy commence proceedings immediately as directed in Public Law 339 against any officer or person who may not have waived the statute of limitations, they will be forever barred on December 7, 1944, unless such proceedings are commenced before then or the statute is further extended.

Because of this present serious situation, I am today introducing into the House of Representatives a joint resolution. Some people may consider the preamble superfluous, as most whereas paragraphs usually are, but in my opinion it does state the factual chronology of the extensions of the statute and the executive action under them.

This joint resolution is not at all complicated and it is easy to understand. It does four things:

Section 1 simply extends the statute for a further period of 6 months in addition to the extensions provided for in Public Law 208 and Public Law 339, both of the Seventy-eighth Congress.

Section 2 severally directs the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy to transmit forthwith to the Congress the records, including the findings of fact, opinion, and recommendations of any board of investigation or court of inquiry, conducted pursuant to Public Law 339.

Under section 3 the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy are severally directed to commence forthwith such proceedings against such persons as the facts in the reports of their respective committees may justify.

Section 4 is simply a saving clause. Nothing in this resolution shall relieve in any way the Secretary of War or the Secretary of the Navy of any obligation imposed upon either of them under the provisions of Public Law 339, Seventy-eighth Congress.

Mr. Speaker, in fairness to all concerned, I do not see how anyone could object to this resolution. It is not exactly what I would personally prefer. What I have asked for since the day of Pearl Harbor is the natural, normal, and orderly procedure in such matters, namely, a court martial for military parties involved, who personally want an open and public court martial, and a

free, open, public trial for any civilians who might be involved.

At no time or in any manner, in or out of Congress, have I condemned or condoned Admiral Kimmel or General Short. I am neither attacking nor defending them now as I do not now know that they deserve either prosecution or defense. All that I have insisted is that they be given their day in court, to which every free-born American is entitled. They have asked for public trial and have waived the statute of limitations, but still somebody, somewhere, does not want the truth known or the story told.

Mr. Speaker, honest men have nothing to hide. Truth and competence need no shield to defend them. This is a grave matter which rises far above the hopes, ambitions, and interests of any individual. Justice must be done and responsibility must be placed for such an appalling and unparalleled disaster where it rightfully belongs.

Why not have an open and public trial for all men involved? The late Secretary Knox in August 1943 in writing promised Admiral Kimmel an open and public court martial when the Secretary got the admiral to waive the statute of limitations. Secretary Knox then stated that the public interest and safety would permit a court-martial trial at that time, but that it would be impracticable to do so until witnesses who were on war duties would be available. Practically all of the witnesses who had any knowledge of the issue testified before the Navy Court of Inquiry which conducted hearings for several weeks. Consequently, the only obstacle that Secretary Knox saw to an immediate and public trial has been met.

Mr. Speaker, there is no reasonable excuse for further procrastination and no justification for further delay in this vital matter. The resolution I am introducing today should receive immediate consideration by the appropriate committee to which it is referred and passed by unanimous vote of this House. Let it be said in all the years to come that we in this body have faithfully met the challenge and fearlessly discharged our duty.

The resolution follows:

Whereas by Public Law 208, Seventy-eighth Congress, the statute of limitations for the prosecution, trial, and punishment of any person or persons in military or civil capacity involved in any manner in connection with the Pearl Harbor catastrophe of December 7, 1941, or involved in any other possible or apparent dereliction of duty or crime or offenses against the United States in connection therewith was extended until June 7, 1944; and

Whereas by Public Law 339, Seventy-eighth Congress, the statute of limitations was further extended for an additional period of 6 months, until December 7, 1944; and

Whereas in section 2 of the said Public Law 339 the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy were severally directed to proceed forthwith with investigations into the facts surrounding the Pearl Harbor catastrophe, and to commence such proceedings against such persons as the facts may justify; and

Whereas the Secretary of War caused an investigation to be conducted by an Army board of investigation; and

Whereas the Secretary of the Navy caused an investigation to be made by a Navy court of inquiry; and

Whereas the Army board of investigation and Navy court of inquiry have completed their investigations and filed their reports respectively with the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy on or about October 20, 1944; and

Whereas no proceedings have been commenced pursuant to the direction in said Public Law 339; and

Whereas Maj. Gen. Walter C. Short, United States Army, retired, commanding general of the Hawaiian Department at the time of the Pearl Harbor catastrophe, and Rear Admiral Husband E. Kimmel, United States Navy, retired, commander in chief of the Pacific Fleet at the time of the Pearl Harbor catastrophe, have each severally waived the statute of limitations against any court martial or other proceedings in connection with the Pearl Harbor catastrophe; and

Whereas no other officer or person in military or civil capacity has waived the statute of limitations against any court martial or other proceedings in connection with the said Pearl Harbor catastrophe; and

Whereas the right of the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy to commence proceedings, as directed in said Public Law 339, against any officer or person who may not have waived the statute of limitations will be forever barred on December 7, 1944, unless such proceedings are commenced before then, or the statute is further extended: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, etc., That, effective as of December 7, 1943, all statutes, resolutions, laws, articles, and regulations affecting the possible prosecution of any person or persons, military or civil, connected with the Pearl Harbor catastrophe of December 7, 1941, or involved in any other possible or apparent dereliction of duty, or crime or offense against the United States, that operate to prevent the court martial, prosecution, trial, or punishment of any person or persons in military or civil capacity, involved in any matter in connection with the Pearl Harbor catastrophe of December 7, 1941, or involved in any other possible or apparent dereliction of duty or crime or offense against the United States, are hereby extended for a further period of 6 months, in addition to the extensions provided for in Public Law 208 and Public Law 339, both of the Seventy-eighth Congress.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy are severally directed to transmit forthwith to the Congress the records, including the findings of fact, opinion, and recommendations of any board of investigation or court of inquiry, conducted pursuant to Public Law No. 339, Seventy-eighth Congress.

SEC. 3. The Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy are severally directed to commence forthwith such proceedings against such persons as the facts in the reports of the board of investigation of the Army, and the court of inquiry of the Navy may justify.

SEC. 4. Nothing in this act shall relieve in any way the Secretary of War or the Secretary of the Navy from any obligation imposed on either of them under the provisions of Public Law 339, Seventy-eighth Congress.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a poem.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

There was no objection.

HON. EDWARD R. STETTINIUS, JR.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, I believe the President of the United States should be congratulated on his selection of Edward R. Stettinius, Jr., as the new Secretary of State. As a member of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs during the past several years I have had frequent occasions to confer with Mr. Stettinius, individually, and I have also watched him in action before our committee. He is a splendid American and a highly able public servant.

His career in public life demonstrates that in America, in politics, as in business, a man can start at the bottom, and by studious devotion to high ideals he can work himself up to the top.

Cordell Hull in his long period of public service through his courteous demeanor and patient persistence has endeared himself to the people of this country and ingratiated himself with the people of the world. History will pass judgment on the success of his efforts, but all who know him can pay tribute to his sincerity. I predict that Mr. Stettinius is going to be a worthy successor to Cordell Hull and I hope that America will many times have occasion to congratulate itself on the service he will render as Secretary of State in these epochal times.

The challenges confronting Ed. Stettinius are tremendous. As he assumes his office he is entitled to the prayers and hopes of all the world that he may exercise caution, candor, and correctness in the work that lies ahead.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an address by W. G. Sloan, Assistant Director of the Bureau of Reclamation.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wyoming?

There was no objection.

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the Milwaukee Journal of November 23.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

SENATE BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS REFERRED

Bills and a joint resolution of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 209. An act authorizing the conveyance of certain property to the State of North Dakota; to the Committee on Public Lands.

S. 1581. An act to authorize the Secretary of War to acquire lands and provide facilities to replace Indian fishing grounds submerged or destroyed as a result of the construction of the Bonneville Dam; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

S. 1740. An act conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the District of Massachusetts to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claims of Marjorie E. Drake, Edith Mae Drake, Minnie L. Bickford, and Irene M. Paolini; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 1756. An act for the relief of William Luther Thaxton, Jr., and William Luther Thaxton, Sr.; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 1819. An act to repeal the acts of August 15, 1935, and January 29, 1940, relating to the establishment of the Patrick Henry National Monument and the acquisition of the estate of Patrick Henry, in Charlotte County, Va.; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

S. 1898. An act to amend section 99 of the Judicial Code, as amended, so as to change the term of the District Court for the District of North Dakota at Minot, N. Dak.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1899. An act conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the District of Massachusetts to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Alfred Files; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 1900. An act conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the District of Massachusetts to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of the estate of Bertha L. Tatrault; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 1958. An act for the relief of Fire District No. 1 of the town of Colchester, Vt.; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 1960. An act for the relief of Clifford E. Long and Laura C. Long; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 1962. An act extending the provisions of Public Law 47, Seventy-seventh Congress, as amended, to reemployment committeemen of the Selective Service System; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1968. An act for the relief of Elizabeth A. Becker; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 1993. An act for the relief of the estate of Joseph B. Gowen and Ruth V. Gowen; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 2006. An act for the relief of J. A. Davis; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 2064. An act for the relief of Richard H. Beall; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 2168. An act for the relief of certain disbursing officers of the Army of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 2194. An act authorizing appropriations for the United States Navy for additional ordnance manufacturing production facilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

S. J. Res. 156. Joint resolution to extend the statute of limitation in certain cases; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 1373. An act to authorize the Secretary of War to convey to the people of Puerto Rico for school purposes a certain building and lot known as the Mayaguez Barracks Military Reservation now under the jurisdiction of the War Department;

S. 1714. An act to reimburse certain Coast and Geodetic Survey and Marine Corps personnel for personal property lost or damaged as the result of a fire at the marine barracks, Quantico, Va., on December 16, 1943;

S. 1731. An act for the relief of Helen Halverson;

S. 1741. An act to provide for the reimbursement of certain Navy and civilian personnel for personal property lost as the result of a fire in hangar V–3 at the naval air station, Norfolk, Va., on November 12, 1942;

S. 1838. An act to provide for reimbursement of certain Navy personnel and former Navy personnel for personal property lost or damaged as the result of fires in quarters occupied by naval construction battalions;

S. 1839. An act to provide for reimbursement of certain Navy personnel for personal property lost or damaged as the result of a fire in quarters at naval advance base depot, Port Hueneme, Calif., on February 6, 1944;

S. 1840. An act to provide for reimbursement of certain Navy personnel and former Navy personnel for personal property lost or damaged as the result of a fire in the bachelor officers' quarters, naval operating base, Argentia, Newfoundland, on January 12, 1943;

S. 1841. An act to provide for the reimbursement of certain Navy personnel and former Navy personnel for personal property lost or damaged as the result of a fire which occurred on the naval station, Tutuila, American Samoa, on October 20, 1943;

S. 1842. An act to reimburse certain Marine Corps personnel for personal property lost or damaged as the result of a fire at the marine barracks, naval supply depot, Bayonne, N. J., on April 25, 1943;

S. 1881. An act to provide for reimbursement of certain Navy personnel and former Navy personnel for personal property lost or damaged as the result of fire at the naval advance base depot, Port Hueneme, Calif., on January 12, 1944; and

S. 1964. An act to reimburse certain aviation cadets and former aviation cadets for property lost or damaged as the result of a fire at Carroll College, Helena, Mont., on January 8, 1944.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 13 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, November 29, 1944, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON THE PUBLIC LANDS

The Committee on the Public Lands will have a hearing on Wednesday, November 29, 1944, at 10:30 a. m., to consider H. R. 2550, H. R. 3953, H. R. 4665, H. R. 5453, S. 1062, S. 1746, S. 1925, and S. 2026, and such other business as may come before the committee.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

2038. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the Federal Works Agency for the fiscal year 1945, in the amount of $75,900,000 (H. Doc. No. 782); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

2039. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a draft of a proposed provision pertaining to an appropriation for the Department of Agriculture (H. Doc. No. 783); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

2040. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting a report on records proposed for disposal by various Government agencies; to the Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers.

2041. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a summary report of the national airport plan; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and ordered to be printed with illustrations.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. COCHRAN: Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments. H. R. 5062. A bill to authorize certain transactions by disbursing officers of the United States, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1945). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. MANASCO: Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments. H. R. 5221. A bill to eliminate as uncollectible certain credits of the United States; without amendment (Rept. No. 1946). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. MANASCO: Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments. H. R. 5248. A bill to amend an act entitled "An act to extend the time for examination of monthly accounts covering expenditures by disbursing officers of the United States Marine Corps," approved December 26, 1941, so as to extend the time for examination of monthly accounts of disbursing officers and special disbursing agents of the Navy and Coast Guard; without amendment (Rept. No. 1947). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. PETERSON of Florida: Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries. S. 1645. An act relating to the administration of the Glacier National Park Fish Hatchery, at Creston, Mont., and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1948). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina: Committee on Ways and Means. H. R. 1033. A bill to suspend the effectiveness during the existing national emergency of the tariff duty on coconuts; with amendment (Rept. No. 1949). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. BURCH of Virginia: Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads. H. R. 4919. A bill to amend the act authorizing postmasters in Alaska to administer oaths and affirmations; without amendment (Rept. No. 1950). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. HOBBS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 5518. A bill to amend section 119 of the Judicial Code; without amendment (Rept. No. 1951). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee: Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads. H. R. 4892. A bill relating to clerical assistance at post offices, branches, or stations serving military and naval personnel, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1952). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. ELLIOTT: Joint Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report No. 1953. Report on the disposition of certain papers of sundry executive departments. Ordered to be printed.

Mr. ELLIOTT: Joint Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report No. 1954. Report on the disposition of certain papers of sundry executive departments. Ordered to be printed.

Mr. BATES of Kentucky. Committee on Rules. House Resolution 659. Resolution for the consideration of H. R. 4216, a bill to pro-

vide more efficient dental care for the personnel of the United States Navy; without amendment (Rept. No. 1955). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SABATH: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 660. Resolution for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4993) to amend Public, No. 507, Seventy-seventh Congress, second session, an act to further expedite the prosecution of the war, approved March 27, 1942, known as the Second War Powers Act, 1942; without amendment (Rept. No. 1956). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SABATH: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 661. Resolution for the consideration of S. 2004, to amend the act entitled "An act to mobilize the productive facilities of small business in the interests of the successful prosecution of the war, and for other purposes," approved June 11, 1942; without amendment (Rept. No. 1957. Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SLAUGHTER: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 662. Resolution for the consideration of H. R. 3690 to safeguard the admission of evidence in certain cases; without amendment (Rept. No. 1958). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. HOBBS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 4993. A bill to amend Public, No. 507, Seventy-seventh Congress, second session, an act to further expedite the prosecution of the war, approved March 27, 1942, known as the Second War Powers Act, 1942; with amendment (Rept. No. 1959). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. MAY:

H. R. 5540. A bill to establish the grade of Fleet Admiral of the United States Navy, to establish the grade of General of the Army, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BURCH of Virginia:

H. R. 5541. A bill to provide for the disposal of certain mail matter condemned by the Director of Censorship; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. FORAND:

H. R. 5542. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to permit credit unions to make payments in connection with the redemption of United States Savings Bonds, to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina:

H. R. 5543. A bill extending the time for the release of powers of appointment for the purposes of certain provisions of the Internal Revenue Code, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GILLIE:

H. J. Res. 318. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on Election of President, Vice President, and Representatives in Congress.

By Mr. SHORT:

H. J. Res. 319. Joint resolution to extend time for immunity, to require transmittal forthwith to the Congress of the records including the findings of fact, opinion, and recommendations of any board of investigation or court of inquiry conducted pursuant to Public Law 339, Seventy-eighth Congress, and to direct the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy to commence forthwith such proceedings against such persons as the facts in the reports of the board of investigation of the Army and the court of inquiry of the Navy may justify; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico:

H. R. 5544. A bill for the relief of Karl E. Bond; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. DONDERO:

H. R. 5545. A bill for the relief of Madeline J. MacDonald; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. FAY:

H. R. 5546. A bill for the relief of the Centaur Construction Co., Inc.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MOTT:

H. R. 5547: A bill for the relief of John F. Davis; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WENE:

H. R. 5548. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Lena Rottenberg; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

6216. By Mr. BUCKLEY: Petition of Michael J. Brennan and 90 others in protest against prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

6217. By Mr. CANFIELD: Resolution of the national board of officers of the Catholic War Veterans, Inc., urging legislation to memorialize representatives at the peace conference to strive for peace without pacifism, a peace based on justice; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

6218. By Mr. HOEVEN: Petition from members of the Cherokee Garden Club, Cherokee, Iowa, in favor of a proper zoning law which will regulate and prohibit outdoor advertising and other nuisances contingent to and adjacent to our highways; to the Committee on Roads.

6219. By Mr. HOPE: Petition of members of the Martha Class of the Methodist Church, Dodge City, Kans., requesting Congress to vigorously support the Nationalist Government of China; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

6220. Also, petition of sundry citizens of Dodge City, Kans., requesting Congress to support the Nationalist Government of China; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

6221. By Mrs. NORTON: Petition of the national board of officers of the Catholic War Veterans, Inc., urging the passage of legislation memorializing representatives at the peace conference to strive for a peace without pacifism, a peace based on justice; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

6222. By Mr. ROLPH: Resolution of San Francisco Tyee Club, endorsing Senate amendment to House bill 3961; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

6223. By Mr. SCHIFFLER: Petition of Rev. and Mrs. George W. Twynham and other citizens of McMechen and Marshall County, W. Va., urging the passage of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

6224. By Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin: Petition of sundry citizens of Wisconsin on House Resolution No. 632; to the Committee on Rules.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, NOVEMBER 29, 1944

(Legislative day of Tuesday, November 21, 1944)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou whose love passeth understanding, we thank Thee for the unquenchable impulse toward Thee which Thou hast planted within our hearts and for winged desires that disturb our lowest moods. From the fret and fever of the vexed world's problems, from all thought of the praise or blame of men, from discordant noises and confused conceptions which beat upon our senses, at noontide we would follow the path to the quietness of Thy presence. May there fall upon us now a sense of Thy kingdom and Thy power and Thy glory.

Hear us as we lift our intercession for those who wander in bitterness of spirit, victims of ruthless coercion; for those whose homes have been destroyed, whose fields have been seized, whose liberties have been crushed. And we pray, too, for those who, as defenders of freedom far from this sweet land of liberty, think with wistful longing of dear and familiar faces and places; for those in posts of constant danger, where every breath is drawn in peril; for those in every nook and corner of our land where hearts and homes are desolate at poignant losses that are piercing souls like swords. O Thou who art everlasting mercy, make tender and understanding our hearts toward all those to whom the morning light brings less joy than the daily gifts it brings to our more privileged hands. In the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. HILL, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Tuesday, November 28, 1944, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. McLeod, one of its clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4065) further defining the number and duties of criers and bailiffs in United States courts and regulating their compensation.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the Vice President:

S. 1373. An act to authorize the Secretary of War to convey to the people of Puerto Rico for school purposes a certain building and lot known as the Mayaguez Barracks Military Reservation now under the jurisdiction of the War Department;

S. 1714. An act to reimburse certain Coast and Geodetic Survey and Marine Corps personnel for personal property lost or damaged as the result of a fire at the marine barracks, Quantico, Va., on December 16, 1943;

S. 1731. An act for the relief of Helen Halverson;

S. 1741. An act to provide for the reimbursement of certain Navy and civilian personnel for personal property lost as the result of a fire in hangar V–3 at the naval air station, Norfolk, Va., on November 12, 1942;

S. 1838. An act to provide for reimbursement of certain Navy personnel and former Navy personnel for personal property lost or damaged as the result of fires in quarters occupied by naval construction battalions;

S. 1839. An act to provide for reimbursement of certain Navy personnel for personal property lost or damaged as the result of a fire in quarters at naval advance base depot, Port Hueneme, Calif., on February 6, 1944;

S. 1840. An act to provide for reimbursement of certain Navy personnel and former Navy personnel for personal property lost or damaged as the result of a fire in the bachelor officers' quarters, naval operating base, Argentia, Newfoundland, on January 12, 1943;

S. 1841. An act to provide for the reimbursement of certain Navy personnel and former Navy personnel for personal property lost or damaged as the result of a fire which occurred on the naval station, Tutuila, American Samoa, on October 20, 1943;

S. 1842. An act to reimburse certain Marine Corps personnel for personal property lost or damaged as the result of a fire at the marine barracks, naval supply depot, Bayonne, N. J., on April 25, 1943;

S. 1881. An act to provide for reimbursement of certain Navy personnel and former Navy personnel for personal property lost or damaged as the result of fire at the naval advance base depot, Port Hueneme, Calif., on January 12, 1944; and

S. 1964. An act to reimburse certain aviation cadets and former aviation cadets for property lost or damaged as the result of a fire at Carroll College, Helena, Mont., on January 8, 1944.

TRIBUTE TO THE COMMITTEE ON NAVAL AFFAIRS

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. President, in the very serious times in which our country finds itself, it seems to me appropriate that, for the sake of the RECORD, we give proper recognition to those who are unhesitatingly and patriotically giving their time to the work of carrying on the affairs of the Nation. No part of our Government has been more arduous in its efforts than has the Committee on Naval Affairs.

I believe it is fitting at this time to read to the Senate a letter which has been received by the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs, the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH], from Vice Admiral Ben Moreell, Chief of the Bureau of Yards and Docks. His letter reads as follows:

NAVY DEPARTMENT,
BUREAU OF YARDS AND DOCKS,
Washington, D. C.

HON. DAVID I. WALSH,
Chairman, Naval Affairs Committee,
United States Senate.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I believe it fitting for me to write you on the occasion of the great naval victory in the Philippine area.

It has been my privilege to appear before your committee as Chief of a Bureau of the Navy Department for the past 7 years. Therefore, I believe that I am qualified to testify to the vital part which your committee, under your vigorous and able leadership, has played in the preparations essential to this great victory.

I am sure that history will record the accomplishments of the Naval Affairs Committees of the Senate and House during this crisis in terms expressing the appreciation of the American public.

Respectfully yours,
B. MOREELL,
Vice Admiral (C. E. C.),
United States Navy,
Chief of Bureau.

DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a list of papers and documents on the files of the Departments of the Treasury (4), War, Justice, Post Office (3), Navy (2), and Interior; The National Archives (2), Committee for Congested Production Areas, War Relocation Authority, and the Government Printing Office which are not needed in the conduct of business and have no permanent value or historical interest, and requesting action looking to their disposition, which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to a Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Papers in the Executive Departments.

The VICE PRESIDENT appointed Mr. BARKLEY and Mr. BREWSTER members of the committee on the part of the Senate.

PETITION

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a letter in the nature of a petition from the Hollywood Coat & Suit Co., of Los Angeles, Calif., signed by Samuel Smith, praying for the enactment of the bill (S. 1882) to increase the compensation of employees in the Postal Service, which was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

ESTABLISHMENT OF WORLD PEACE ORGANIZATION—PETITION FROM MEMPHIS, TENN.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to place in the RECORD and to have appropriately referred a communication from the minister of the Westminster Presbyterian Church at Memphis, Tenn., Dr. S. E. Howie, together with a petition signed by members of that church for a world organization after the war to keep the peace; and also I ask consent to print in the RECORD the names attached to the petition. I thoroughly endorse a world organization, and the views of these splendid, law-abiding, peace-loving people are the same as my own.

There being no objection, the letter and petition were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and ordered to be printed in the RECORD with the names attached thereto, as follows:

WESTMINSTER PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH,
Memphis, Tenn., November 23, 1944.

Senator K. D. MCKELLAR,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MCKELLAR: * * * Our evening service here takes the form of an open forum, at which time we discuss matters of interest to members of the church and community. On the Sunday evening following the sermon which you heard, we discussed rather fully the subject The Church and the New World Order. At the conclusion of our discussion the question was asked, What can we do to implement our opinions? The enclosed petition was then drawn up and an opportunity given for all who cared to sign it. You will note that among the signers of this petition are many of the stable and valued members of this church. I believe it to be a sincere expression of the vast majority of the membership of our church. It is sent to you for the purpose of acquainting you with the fact that we at Westminster earnestly hope that out of the present war there may come some kind of agreement between sovereign nations which shall forever make unnecessary the destruction of human life and property which we are witnessing today. We have every confidence that you will use your influence toward this end.

With every good wish to you personally and to the administration of which you are a part, I am,

Sincerely yours,
S. E. HOWIE.

We, the undersigned, citizens of the United States and members of the Christian community, humbly conscious of our own share in the common guilt for world chaos and war, and sincerely desirous of having a share in building a decent world order, based on justice for all the peoples of the world; respectfully petition you, our chosen Representative in the Senate of the United States, to lend your influence to the creation of a world organization, in which the United States shall pursue a responsible national policy with concern for the welfare of all peoples, and shall cooperate with all other nations that seek the same end.

S. E. Howie, A. W. Whitaker, Jr., Hervey Conway, Mary Morrison, Mrs. H. N. Rodgers, Leta Mae Harslery, Mrs. J. E. Wells, Mrs. Louise N. Yarbrough, Mrs. Franklin L. Johnson, Mrs. Robert M. Ritchie, Val Lapworth, Mrs. M. P. Horsley, Alberta Hereford, Elmo D. Utz, Mrs. Wm. E. Lammey, Mrs. Chas. G. Hanna, Mrs. Lucia Royce Phelps, Mrs. E. D. Utz, Frances Clark, Eugene H. Winston, Mrs. E. H. Winston, Mrs. S. E. Howie, Catherine Maddux, Pauline Smith, Lucy Garner, R. S. Hall, Charles G. Hanna, Robert E. Henry, P. A. Cogswell, Mrs. Irwin J. Calvin, Jr., Mrs. J. H. Knight, Mrs. C. L. Faust, Jr., Pvt. (1st cl.) Roland J. Brett, Ernestine Andre, Dorothy Irene Daniel, Elizabeth Routon, L. H. Routon, C. L. Dausas, Mrs. J. Rex Schreiner, Mrs. L. G. Uhlhorn, Mrs. A. W. Whitaker, Mrs. Hendic A. Taylor, Ethel I. Ward, Mrs. D. Heber Johnston, Mrs. Edward McKnight, Marian Litty, Lucy Gray C. Dawson, Mrs. H. H. Litty, Mrs. J. W. Jackson, Mrs. C. H. Mayfield, Mrs. P. A. Cogswell, Mrs. H. C. Pitman, Mrs. John C. Clark, Mrs. Will L. Hamilton, Mrs. C. H. Albright, Mrs. J. B. Disbrough.

SOCIAL-SECURITY PAY-ROLL TAXES—RESOLUTION BY PETROLEUM ACCOUNTANTS SOCIETY OF KANSAS

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed as a part of the RECORD, and appropriately referred, a resolution adopted by the Petroleum Accountants Society of Kansas, urging that the existing law relating to the Federal social security tax be extended and that the tax be frozen at its present rate.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas under existing law, Federal Social Security Taxes will, on January 1, 1945, be increased 100 percent over the present rates unless action to defer this increase is again taken by Congress; and

Whereas the social-security reserve fund is reported to be in excess of five times the estimated maximum expenditures for any year during the next 4-year period: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That this society go on record as urging Congress to take appropriate action in order that the tax may be continued at the present rates of 1 percent on the employer and 1 percent on the employee, for the following reasons:

1. Congress has held that an amount equal to three times the estimated annual disbursements shall constitute a prudent reserve and the reserve fund is now reported to be substantially in excess of the estimated total expenditures for the ensuing 3-year period.

2. A most conservative estimate shows that the total expenditures from the fund during the next year will be substantially less than the amount collected at the present rates.

3. An unwarranted increase of 100 percent in this tax on January 1, 1948, will work an unreasonable hardship on both the employee and the employer who are already burdened with staggering taxes.

FLOOD CONTROL AND RIVER AND HARBOR PROJECTS—MEMORIAL

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed as a part of the RECORD, and appropriately referred, a telegram from E. K. Dean, president of the Kansas Farmers Union, Salina, Kans., opposing the flood-control and river and harbor bills now being considered in the Senate.

There being no objection, the telegram in the nature of a memorial was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NOVEMBER 29, 1944.

Our organization is bitterly opposed to the flood-control and rivers and harbors bills presently being considered. We abhor the efforts of special-interest groups to pass legislation foreclosing the people's rights to full development and use of the vast resources of our valleys. The bills now under consideration will waste vast sums of money in partial development of our river valleys for the protection of and use by special-interest groups. We urge you to use all of your influence to have these bills carried over to the next session of Congress when time will be available to give proper consideration to full development of our valley resources in the interest of all of the people. Will appreciate your inserting this telegram in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

KANSAS FARMERS UNION,
E. K. DEAN, *President.*

SUGGESTED POSTPONEMENT OF FLOOD-CONTROL AND RIVER AND HARBOR BILLS

Mr. WALSH of New Jersey. Mr. President, I present and ask to have printed in the RECORD at this point a telegram from the eastern division of the National Farmers Union relating to the flood-control and the river and harbor bills.

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HIGHTSTOWN, N. J., *November 28, 1944.*

Senator ARTHUR WALSH,
Senate Office Building:

Urgently request you delay flood-control and river-harbor bills to next session. Present bills wasteful of public funds and are typical pork-barrel legislation. Request you insert this wire in CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

ED YEOMANS,
Executive Secretary, Eastern Division, National Farmers Union.

ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY—TELEGRAMS FROM KANSAS

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD and appropriately referred a telegram I have received from the Southwestern Interstate Coal Operators Association, of Pittsburg, Kans., expressing opposition to attaching the St. Lawrence seaway and hydropower project as a rider on the flood-control or rivers and harbors bill.

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PITTSBURG, KANS., *November 22, 1944.*

Hon. ARTHUR CAPPER,
United States Senator:

We urge that you resist any consideration of St. Lawrence seaway and hydropower project except as a treaty to be voted upon after full committee hearings on merits, and that you oppose all attempts to attach this project as a rider on flood control or rivers and harbors, or any other bill in Senate.

SOUTHWESTERN INTERSTATE COAL OPERATORS ASSOCIATION.

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD and appropriately referred a telegram I have received from Henry Allai, president of district No. 14, United Mine Workers of Kansas and Missouri, expressing the opposition of that group to the proposed St. Lawrence waterway project. He states that such a program would throw a great many people out of work after the war at a time when a large number are out of employment.

There being no objection, the telegram was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PITTSBURG, KANS., *November 27, 1944.*

Hon. ARTHUR CAPPER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Delegates of district 14 and district 50, of the United Mine Workers of America, Kansas and Missouri, representing some 12,000 members, in convention assembled in Kansas City, Mo., unanimously went on record November 18, 1944, opposing Senate bill 1385, on the St. Lawrence waterway. Their reason for opposing this bill is that it will displace thousands of coal miners and railroad men. We believe if this bill is passed it will be a detriment to the entire United States, as it will displace thousands of people after the war at a time when we are going to need employment for the people of the United States. This convention asked that you do all within your power to defeat this bill.

HENRY ALLAI,
President of District No. 14.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. RUSSELL, from the Committee on Immigration:

H. R. 1284. A bill relating to the naturalization of persons not citizens who serve honorably in the military or naval forces of the United States during the present war; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1232).

By Mr. TUNNELL, from the Committee on Interstate Commerce:

S. 1957. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, so as to prohibit interference with the broadcasting of noncommercial cultural or educational programs; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1233); and

S. J. Res. 92. Joint resolution directing the Federal Power Commission to inquire into and report to the Congress on various matters with respect to natural gas; with amendments (Rept. No. 1234).

From the Committee on Claims:

S. 2070. A bill for the relief of G. F. Allen, chief disbursing officer, Treasury Department, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1259); and

S. 2071. A bill to eliminate as uncollectible certain credits of the United States; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1260).

By Mr. ELLENDER, from the Committee on Claims:

H. R. 195. A bill for the relief of Gladys A. Ennis as executrix of the estate of George Pearse Ennis, deceased, and Oscar H. Julius; and the Excelsior Automotive Service, Inc.; without amendment (Rept. No. 1235);

H. R. 449. A bill for the relief of the Puget Sound Bridge & Dredging Co.; without amendment (Rept. No. 1236);

H. R. 545. A bill for the relief of G. F. Odom; without amendment (Rept. No. 1237);

H. R. 763. A bill for the relief of Lindsey Harcrow; without amendment (Rept. No. 1238);

H. R. 1772. A bill for the relief of Henry Stovall; without amendment (Rept. No. 1239);

H. R. 2213. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Agnes Wolters; without amendment (Rept. No. 1240);

H. R. 2373. A bill for the relief of Pearl Saievitz Hurwitz and Ruth Levin; without amendment (Rept. No. 1241);

H. R. 3138. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Bertha Macklin; without amendment (Rept. No. 1242);

H. R. 3192. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Bertha Grantham; without amendment (Rept. No. 1243);

H. R. 3285. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Rose Poisson; without amendment (Rept. No. 1264);

H. R. 3323. A bill for the relief of Mrs. William M. Watson and R. H. Price; without amendment (Rept. No. 1265);

H. R. 3400. A bill for the relief of LaVerne Whipple; with an amendment (Rept. No. 12521;

H. R. 3584. A bill for the relief of Elsie Hawke; without amendment (Rept. No. 1244);

H. R. 3645. A bill for the relief of Mary Agnes Lichtefeld Droppelman; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1253);

H. R. 3881. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Anna Chandler; without amendment (Rept. No. 1266);

H. R. 3931. A bill for the relief of the estate of Dr. A. D. Gibson; without amendment (Rept. No. 1245);

H. R. 3996. A bill for the relief of F. L. Gause and the legal guardian of Rosalind and Helen Gause, minors; with amendments (Rept. No. 1254);

H. R. 4080. A bill for the relief of certain former employees of the United States Court for China; without amendment (Rept. No. 1267);

H. R. 4200. A bill for the relief of William Weber; without amendment (Rept. No. 1268);

H. R. 4363. A bill for the relief of Ollie Brashear Hearldson; without amendment (Rept. No. 1246);

H. R. 4674. A bill for the relief of the estate of Everette Maxwell, the estate of Redman P. Maddux, and the legal guardian of Elmer Massa, a minor; without amendment (Rept. No. 1269);

H. R. 4736. A bill for the relief of Dr. H. L. Klotz; without amendment (Rept. No. 1247);

H. R. 4815. A bill for the relief of the Board of County Commissioners of Volusia County, Fla.; without amendment (Rept. No. 1270);

H. R. 4921. A bill for the relief of Dr. J. Sims Norman; without amendment (Rept. No. 1248);

H. R. 4927. A bill for the relief of Francis D. Stovall, Jr.; without amendment (Rept. No. 1249);

H. R. 5048. A bill for the relief of the estate of Cecile H. Burgett, deceased; without amendment (Rept. No. 1250); and

H. R. 5167. A bill to confer jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the Eastern District of South Carolina to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of the board of trustees of the Saunders Memorial Hospital; without amendment (Rept. No. 1251).

By Mr. WHERRY, from the Committee on Claims:

H. R. 976. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Sebastian Eger; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1255);

H. R. 4111. A bill for the relief of Louis Beckham; without amendment (Rept. No. 1256);

H. R. 4125. A bill for the relief of Kelly Hobbs; without amendment (Rept. No. 1257);

H. R. 4305. A bill for the relief of Henry Clay Walker; without amendment (Rept. No. 1271);

H. R. 4786. A bill for the relief of the estate of Kimball Lee Beckner; without amendment (Rept. No. 1258);

H. R. 4817. A bill for the relief of Wilfred T. Plant, Sr. (Rept. No. 1272);

H. R. 4878. A bill for the relief of the estate of Emma B. Fleet, deceased; without amendment (Rept. No. 1273); and

H. R. 5034. A bill for the relief of the estate of Francis A. Collins; without amendment (Rept. No. 1274).

By Mr. ROBERTSON, from the Committee on Claims:

S. 2088. A bill for the relief of Galen E. Walter; without amendment (Rept. No. 1261); and

H. R. 2066. A bill for the relief of A. L. Rinkenberger and John Floering; with amendments (Rept. No. 1262).

By Mr. WILEY, from the Committee on Claims:

H. R. 4309. A bill for the relief of Rosa Lee Foreman; without amendment (Rept. No. 1275); and

H. R. 4331. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Florence Armstrong; without amendment (Rept. No. 1276).

By Mr. HILL (for Mr. PEPPER) from the Committee on Patents:

H. R. 2994. A bill to extend Reissued Letters Patent No. 19,028; without amendment (Rept. No. 1277).

By Mr. CONNALLY, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. J. Res. 158. Joint resolution recognizing the outstanding service rendered to the United Nations by Field Marshal Sir John Dill; without amendment (Rept. No. 1263).

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. McFARLAND:

S. 2204. A bill authorizing the Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Railway Co., or its successors, to convey to the States of Arizona and California, jointly or separately, for public-highway purposes, an existing railroad bridge across the Colorado River, formerly known as the Red Rock Bridge, near Topock, Ariz.; to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

(Mr. BILBO introduced Senate bill 2205, which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia, and appears under a separate heading.)

(Mr. WILLIS introduced Senate Joint Resolution 162, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and appears under a separate heading.)

WOMAN'S CHRISTIAN ASSOCIATION OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. BILBO. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to introduce a bill to authorize the dissolution of the Woman's Christian Association of the District of Columbia and the transfer of its assets. Unless one reads the bill he might get the wrong impression that I am trying to break up the Woman's Christian Association by this transfer of property, but such is not the case.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 2205) to authorize the dissolution of the Woman's Christian Association of the District of Columbia and the transfer of its assets was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

TENURE OF OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT—PROPOSED CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. President, at various times there have been before the Senate and the House of Representatives joint resolutions proposing to amend the Constitution of the United States relative to the very important matter of the tenure of the President in office. As we all know, such a joint resolution, after being passed by the Senate and the House of Representatives, would have to be submitted to the States for ratification. The time is approaching when the legislatures of the various States will assemble. Therefore, out of order, I ask unanimous consent to introduce at this time a Senate joint resolution to amend the Constitution of the United States to limit the tenure of office of the Chief Executive to two terms.

There being no objection, the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 162) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, limiting the tenure of office of the President of the United States to two terms, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

RIVER AND HARBOR IMPROVEMENTS—AMENDMENTS

Mr. THOMAS of Idaho (for himself and Mr. CLARK of Idaho) submitted amendments intended to be proposed by them jointly to the bill (H. R. 3961) authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. BAILEY (for Mr. ANDREWS) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by Mr. ANDREWS to House bill 3961, supra, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

INFORMATION FROM TARIFF COMMISSION CONCERNING CERTAIN PRODUCTS AND THE RATIO OF IMPORTS IN RELATION THERETO

Mr. BREWSTER submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 341), which was referred to the Committee on Finance:

Whereas prior to the inception of the Trade Agreements Act, the United States Tariff Commission supplied to the Senate, in response to Senate Resolution 325, Seventy-second Congress, certain valuable information and statistics relative to the foreign trade of the United States and to conditions and methods of tariff bargaining; and

Whereas considerable stress has been laid in public discussions on the effect of tariffs on the volume of our post-war foreign trade; and

Whereas according to recent newspaper dispatches, international conferences are to be held to determine whether trade barriers should be modified through multilateral tariff agreements, or through other means; and

Whereas decisions in these matters should be based so far as possible upon factual information: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the United States Tariff Commission is hereby directed, under the provisions of section 332 of the Tariff Act of 1930, to examine the dutiable items, the imports of which in 1939 were valued at over $100,000, and to report to the Senate, with respect to each such item or closely related group of items, as follows:

(1) The quantity and value of United States production in 1939 and the ratio of imports to domestic consumption in that year;

(2) The probable long-term annual imports in quantity and value for each of these products in the post-war period if the duties in effect on July 1, 1939, were to (a) remain in effect, (b) be reduced by 50 percent, and (c) be increased by 50 percent: *Provided*, That such estimates shall be based upon two assumptions: First, that the national annual income in the post-war period is approximately that which prevailed in 1939; and, second, that the national annual income in the post-war period will be 75 percent greater than in 1939.

SEC. 2. The Commission shall indicate, insofar as statistical data will permit, the number of persons engaged in 1939 in United States industries producing each of the products or groups of products covered by this resolution, and the estimated number which would be employed under the assumptions set forth under (2) above.

SEC. 3. (a) The Commission shall undertake these projects, so far as practical, according to the schedules in the Tariff Act of 1930, or, if preferred, according to the import classes used by the Department of Commerce. The report on each group shall be submitted to the Senate as it is completed and all reports in response to this resolution shall be submitted not later than January 31, 1945.

(b) In the preparation of the report in response to this resolution, the Commission is authorized to secure such information as may be necessary from the Departments of Commerce, State, Agriculture, and such other departments or agencies of the Government as may be necessary, and is directed to give precedence to this work over other work now before the Commission.

COMMITTEE SERVICE

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I wish at this time to ask for the assignment to certain committees of the distinguished junior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. HALL]. As we know, the Senator's tenure will expire on January 3 next, with the expiration of the present session of Congress, and in making this request I wish to state that these assignments, if given, will not in any way be binding so far as the next session or any future session of Congress is concerned. I ask unanimous consent to submit an order and have it acted upon at this time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the clerk will read the order.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

Ordered, That the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. HALL] be assigned to the following committees: Interstate Commerce, Manufactures, Naval Affairs, and Patents.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I do not intend to object, but I think I should call attention to the fact that it was stated on the floor of the Senate a few days ago by the distinguished leader of the majority, the Senator from Kentucky

[Mr. BARKLEY] that there would be no further committee assignments during the present session of the Congress. I have in mind that a new Republican Senator is likely to be present in the early part of December. I do not know whether he would desire to have his committee assignments made at that time or not, but I had rather indicated to some of his friends that it would not be possible, because of the statement made by the senior Senator from Kentucky. Having made this statement of the situation, I leave it to the good conscience of the Senator from Alabama as to what course he will pursue.

Mr. BILBO. Mr. President, unless I was dreaming, the case of the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. HALL] was called to the attention of the Senator from Kentucky at the time the statement was made, and an exception was made. I do not think I was dreaming.

Mr. HILL. As I recall, the case of the distinguished junior Senator from South Carolina was called to the attention of the Senator from Kentucky at the time he made the statement to which the Senator from Maine has referred, and, as I understand, it was then understood that there would be an exception made in the case of the junior Senator from South Carolina.

I will say this to the Senator from Maine, I do not know what the facts are, I do not know of the case to which the Senator referred in reference to a new Member on the minority side, but I think the Senator from Maine will agree that if any exceptional or extenuating case is presented, as there was with reference to the Senator from South Carolina, there will be no difficulty in working it out in a way which will be entirely satisfactory to the distinguished minority leader, the Senator from Maine.

Mr. WHITE. In view of what has been said by the Senator from Alabama, I can have no possible objection to what he proposes, and I subside and take my seat.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the order submitted by the Senator from Alabama? The Chair hears none, and the order will be entered.

POWER OF AMERICAN REPRESENTATIVE ON COUNCIL OF LEAGUE TO ACT

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, I request unanimous consent to insert in the body of the RECORD a copy of a letter which appeared recently in the New York Times by Prof. Milton Handler of Columbia University, as well as the editorial comment on that letter by the Times. Professor Handler examines in his letter the historical and legal precedents concerning the use of force for the protection of our national interests by the executive branch of the Government without prior authorization of the Congress. It is his conclusion that our delegate on the Council of the United Nations could be empowered by appropriate measures of the Congress to act in concert with other nations to preserve the peace, even to the extent of using such forces as are made available for this purpose by the Congress to repel aggression. This, he believes, can be done without the need of seeking specific Congressional approval in each case when the peace is threatened. I commend to the attention of the Senate his thoughtful and persuasive letter.

There being no objection, the letter and editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times of October 2, 1944]

PROMPTNESS A FACTOR—POSSIBLE USE OF FORCE TO PREVENT AGGRESSION NOT DEBATABLE

To the EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

The text of the Dumbarton Oaks agreement discloses that our armed forces may be used in two ways to preserve world peace. A contingent of our air forces is to be kept available for combined international action when urgent and speedy military measures become necessary. The circumstances under which other types of armed forces are to be employed will be defined in separate compacts which are still to be negotiated and which when concluded are to be ratified in accordance with the constitutional processes of the various United Nations. Apparently it is not contemplated that the approval of Congress will be sought in advance either of the use of our air contingent or other forces to prevent aggression.

The suggestion has been made in public discussions of the problems of international security that the Constitution does not permit our armed forces to be used without prior congressional approval. According to this view, congressional consent must be sought in each instance before resort is had to armed action.

CONSTITUTIONAL QUESTION

Is this a sound construction of the Federal Constitution? Or, stated differently, is it within the constitutional competence of our Government to make the commitments concerning our armed forces which are embodied in or contemplated by the Dumbarton Oaks pact?

As is true of most great constitutional issues, our organic charter provides no direct answer to these questions.

A declaration of war requires congressional action. But the use of force is not always the equivalent of war. There are numerous instances in our history of the use of force by the Executive in the protection of our national interests which have never been regarded as acts of war and which were not preceded by any congressional declaration or specific authorization. The principal examples are listed in a printed pamphlet prepared by the Solicitor of the State Department, entitled "Right to Protect Citizens in Foreign Countries by Landing Forces," and published by the Government Printing Office.

Forces have been sent to foreign lands to protect the lives and property of American citizens, to safeguard our shipping from piracy, to punish the nationals of other countries for crimes, injuries, and insults against American citizens. The outstanding incidents were the landing of troops in China during the Boxer revolt, the naval excursions into the far Pacific in the nineteenth century, and the landing of marines in Mexico, Haiti, Nicaragua, and other Central American countries.

HIGH COURT STATEMENT

One of the most famous occasions for the display of force is described by the Supreme Court in *In re Neagle* (135 U. S. 1, 64) as follows:

"One of the most remarkable episodes in the history of our foreign relations, and which has become an attractive historical incident, is the case of Martin Koszta, a native of Hungary, who, though not fully a naturalized citizen of the United States, had in due form of law made his declaration of intention to become a citizen.

"While in Smyrna he was seized by command of the Austrian consul general at that place, and carried on board the *Hussar*, an Austrian vessel, where he was held in close confinement. Captain Ingraham, in command of the American sloop of war *St. Louis*, arriving in port at that critical period, and ascertaining that Koszta had with him his naturalization papers, demanded his surrender to him, and was compelled to train his guns upon the Austrian vessel before his demands were complied with. It was, however, to prevent bloodshed, agreed that Koszta should be placed in the hands of the French consul subject to the result of diplomatic negotiations between Austria and the United States."

PUBLIC APPROVED

"The celebrated correspondence between Mr. Marcy, Secretary of State, and Chevalier Hulsemann, the Austrian Minister at Washington, which arose out of this affair, and resulted in the release and restoration to liberty of Koszta, attracted a great deal of public attention, and the position assumed by Mr. Marcy met the approval of the country and of Congress, who voted a gold medal to Captain Ingraham for his conduct in the affair. Upon what act of Congress then existing can anyone lay his finger in support of the action of our Government in this matter?"

It would be idle to deny that the use of force may lead to war. This is equally true, though perhaps to a lesser extent, of other aspects of the conduct of our foreign relations, which the Constitution entrusts exclusively to the Executive.

"The President," stated Chief Justice Marshall, "is the sole organ of the Nation in its external relations, and its sole representative with foreign nations." According to Justice Sutherland in *U. S.* v. *Curtiss-Wright Corporation* (299 U. S. 304, 318), "As a member of the family of nations, the right and power of the United States [in the field of foreign relations] are equal to the right and power of the other members of the international family. Otherwise the United States is not completely sovereign." The same idea was expressed by the Supreme Court in *Burnet* v. *Brooks*, (288 U. S. 378, 396), where it said, "As a Nation with all the attributes of sovereignty, the United States is vested with all the powers of government necessary to maintain an effective control of international relations."

Our Government, like other governments, has found it necessary in the past to resort to force in its dealings with other nations. If this could be done consonant with the provisions of our Constitution, certainly there should be no constitutional difficulty in our acting hereafter in concert with other peace-loving nations. Under the settled construction put upon the Constitution throughout our entire history, the Executive may use force in the protection of our national interests without congressional authorization, either general or specific.

How much clearer is it that this may be done pursuant to international arrangements duly ratified by Congress. The commitment for the use of air power is in the Dumbarton Oaks compact which will be submitted to Congress. The agreements concerning other forces will be subject to ratification by the Senate. Under the decision of the Supreme Court in *U. S.* v. *Curtiss-Wright Corporation* there can be no doubt that Congress, by ratification of these general arrangements, may supplement the President's "plenary" authority over foreign affairs with ample power to join with other powers in all necessary measures to curb aggression.

POWER FOR CONGRESS

The fullest participation of Congress in preserving peace is manifestly to be desired. No Executive is likely to authorize the use of force without the fullest consultation with Congress; the action he would take on his own initiative would be limited. Where police measures fail, it will always be up to the Congress to determine whether war itself should be declared.

Our experience in two wars teaches that aggression can only be prevented if the international community is able to move promptly. If our participation in collective measures is to be debated in each instance in Congress and if the parliaments of other United Nations are similarly to pass upon the extent of their participation, costly delays will ensue. Hitler could have been stopped long before 1939 with a minimum cost of human lives had the world been organized to move swiftly against aggression. Paralyzing debates by the democracies provide the aggressors with the head start which makes their ultimate destruction so difficult and costly.

It has been suggested that a distinction be drawn between the use of force in this hemisphere and its use elsewhere. Members of Congress who are most jealous of congressional prerogatives recognize the need for speedy action in the western world and are not insistent on advance congressional approval when force is needed in our own back yard. Constitutionally, however, there is no basis for distinction between action in this part of the world and elsewhere. And we must always keep in the forefront of our minds that the two world wars of the twentieth century originated in Europe and Asia. If there is to be no repetition of the invasion of Belgium, Manchuria, and Poland, we must join our fellow nations willingly and without hampering reservations in keeping the peace. Nothing in the Federal Constitution stands in the way of our assuming our full share of responsibility.

Let all these difficult questions of policy be debated on their merits. The injection of constitutional objections of superficial plausibility but of dubious validity will only serve to confuse the issues.

MILTON HANDLER.

NEW YORK, *October 17, 1944.*

[From the New York Times of October 23, 1944.]

THE PRESIDENT'S PROPOSAL

President Roosevelt used his speech before the Foreign Policy Association on Saturday evening to add to the blueprints of Dumbarton Oaks a recomendation of very great importance. This was his proposal that the American representative on the council of the new league of the United Nations "be empowered in advance by the people themselves, by constitutional means through their representatives in Congress, with authority to act." By this he clearly means authority for the American representative to determine on his own right, and without further specific reference of the question in each instance to Congress, whether such American forces as have been made available for this purpose—our quota of an international air force, for example—shall be used, along with the forces supplied by other members of the United Nations, to prevent or restrain aggression.

The President backed this proposal with an argument which may seem to be oversimplified but which does, after all, go to the heart of the problem. A policeman, he said, would not be a very effective policeman if, when he saw a felon breaking into a house, he had to go to the town hall and call a town meeting to issue a warrant before the felon could be arrested. "If we do not catch the international felon when we have our hands on him, if we let him get away with his loot because the town council has not passed an ordinance authorizing his arrest, then we are not doing our share to prevent another world war. I think, and I have had some experience, that the people of this Nation want their Government to work, they want their Government to act, and not merely talk, whenever and wherever there is a threat to peace."

It is important to keep in mind the precise words in which the President advanced his proposal. He wishes the American representative on the council to be given his authority "by the people themselves, by constitutional means through their representatives in Congress." It is clear that he intends to propose, concretely, a method of procedure which he believes will be in accordance with the letter and the spirit of the Constitution. This could be done in various ways: By Senatorial ratification of a treaty, or by making the American representative on the council a delegate of Congress as well as of the President, through one of several devices. Fundamentally, we believe, there are no constitutional obstacles to the perfection of a plan which would sanction the use of American force in this manner. For while the Constitution does require Congressional action for a declaration of war, the use of force is not always the equivalent of war, and its use in this case would be for the purpose of preventing war. As Professor Handler of the Columbia Law School wrote yesterday on this page:

"Our Government, like other Governments, has found it necessary in the past to resort to force in its dealing with other nations. If this could be done consonant with the provisions of our Constitution, certainly there should be no constitutional difficulty in our acting hereafter in concert with peace-loving nations. Under the settled construction put upon the Constitution throughout our entire history, the Executive may use force in the protection of our national interests without congressional authorization, either general or specific. How much clearer is it that this may be done pursuant to international arrangements duly ratified by Congress."

We believe that a plan to embody the President's proposal can be developed which will rest on sound constitutional grounds, and we believe that from the point of view of public policy the case for the adoption of such a plan is very strong. Surely, the best hope of averting the two great wars in Europe and Asia, in which American blood and treasure must now be poured out lavishly, would have been to confront Germany and Japan with the certainty that their first aggression would be met immediately by consultation which could bring coalition action. It is the factor of certainty, quite as much as the factor of promptness, that is important. For while the American representative on the council might not vote in all cases to approve the use of force (he would certainly not do so unless he had evidence that American opinion was behind him), the fact remains that any potential aggressor would know henceforth that there were policemen in the world who had power to arrest felons. In the deterrent influence of this knowledge, and the maintenance by the peace-loving nations of adequate armed forces, lie real hope that out of the present war there may come a long period of peace.

The President has made a courageous and constructive proposal which we hope will have the prompt support of Mr. Dewey. For there is an American interest here which transcends party lines and will outlast election campaigns. We shall need, on November 8, and from that point forward, all the bipartisan support that can be mustered for the plan that seems most certain to avert the tragedy and the waste and the heartbreak of another war.

CONFIRMATION OF THE NOMINATION OF COMMISSIONER GUY E. MASON

Mr. BILBO. Mr. President, in order to give further assurance to my colleagues who voted for the confirmation of the nomination of Mr. Mason and to clear any doubt in the minds of my brethren who saw fit to vote against confirmation, I wish to read into the RECORD a telegram which it was intended should have been read yesterday, but it came too late. The telegram is as follows:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *November 28, 1944.*

Senator THEODORE BILBO,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

We have read in this morning's press of the hospital charges, and on the basis of thorough personal investigation of all the municipal hospitals, including Gallinger, and having observed the performance with which Commissioner Mason has acted upon all practical suggestions for improvement, we heartily commend Commissioner Mason for carrying out his duties and warmly endorse his reappointment.

The following members of the board of visitors committee:

Mrs. C. Ashmead Fuller, Rabbi Norman Gerstenfeld, Rev. E. L. Harrison, Mrs. Willis W. Jones, Rev. Edward G. Latch, Mrs. Harold N. Marsh, Mrs. Stanley Reed, and Rudolph Berger.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, may I inquire what is the board of visitors and who constitute it?

Mr. BILBO. It is a volunteer organization in the District of Columbia and is approved by the Board of District Commissioners.

FLOOD-CONTROL PROJECTS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4485) authorizing the construction of certain public works on rivers and harbors for flood control, and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] for himself and other Senators, striking out lines 3 to 7 on page 10 of the bill and inserting in lieu thereof certain words.

Mr. AUSTIN obtained the floor.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Vermont yield to me to make a point of no quorum?

Mr. AUSTIN. I yield.

Mr. HILL. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Downey	Langer
Austin	Ellender	Lucas
Bailey	Ferguson	McClellan
Bankhead	George	McFarland
Bilbo	Gerry	McKellar
Brewster	Gillette	Maloney
Brooks	Green	Maybank
Buck	Guffey	Mead
Burton	Gurney	Millikin
Bushfield	Hall	Murray
Butler	Hatch	Nye
Byrd	Hawkes	O'Daniel
Capper	Hayden	O'Mahoney
Caraway	Hill	Overton
Clark, Mo.	Holman	Radcliffe
Connally	Jenner	Reed
Cordon	Johnson, Calif.	Revercomb
Danaher	Johnson, Colo.	Reynolds
Davis	Kilgore	Robertson

Russell	Tunnell	Wheeler
Shipstead	Vandenberg	Wherry
Stewart	Wagner	White
Taft	Waligren	Wiley
Thomas, Idaho	Walsh, Mass.	Willis
Thomas, Okla.	Walsh, N. J.	
Thomas, Utah	Weeks	

Mr. WHITE. I announce the absence of the senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] on official business of the Senate.

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] is absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senators from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN and Mr. SCRUGHAM] and the Senator from Utah [Mr. MURDOCK] are detained on official business for the Senate.

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER] is absent attending the funeral of a friend.

The Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] is absent on important public business.

The Senator from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CLARK] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] and the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] are unavoidably detained.

Mr. WHERRY. The following Senators are necessarily absent:

The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MOORE], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY], and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. WILSON].

The VICE PRESIDENT. Seventy-six Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, when the Senate recessed I was discussing the subject whether the amendment now pending would stop the whole program, as claimed by the distinguished Senator from Connecticut, or whether it would wipe out all projects planned, as claimed by the distinguished Senator from Connecticut. I was undertaking to point out that it would not and that, as a matter of fact, the drainage area in square miles comprehended by the postponement in the amendment is only 436 square miles out of a total drainage involved in the 20 projects of 2,752 square miles. In other words, five-sixths of the project could go forward. Only one-sixth of it would be suspended, and for merely a long enough time to have the opportunity given to the representatives of the State of Vermont to present their claim with respect to the valleys involved—and there are only 4 of them, 4 out of 10—so that they could be considered by the engineers, and perhaps assented to and agreements made, without a postponement of the projects further than that involved in a mere conversation between the engineers and the representatives of the State of Vermont. That would not bring about serious delay; indeed, it should cause no delay at all, for, as a matter of fact, the report of the Army engineers which is referred to in the authority given by the bill contemplated exactly such a possibility of delay. I find on page 4 of the report of the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors, contained in House Document No. 724, the following, bearing upon that subject:

> There are indications that when the studies now underway are completed, a larger number of reservoirs than contemplated under the approved plan may be found desirable. It has also been found that some of the sites that will be used for construction of the 20 reservoirs under the approved plan, as it may be modified, have potentialities either for the future development of power or for the provision of additional storage for streamflow regulation for the benefit of downstream power plants.

And on page 5 of the same report there is found the following:

> The Board notes that construction of 20 reservoirs under the approved plan probably would extend over a period of years as continuing authorizations, and appropriations for that plan are made by Congress. As construction proceeds changes in the approved plan, beyond those now considered advisable, may become desirable.

In other words, Vermont is merely carrying out what was contemplated by the Board of Engineers in respect to this development, and specifically pointing out only a few out of the 20—that is, 4 out of the 20—valleys to be reconsidered.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AUSTIN. I yield.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. I understand the Senator from Vermont to state that the objection on his part is largely related, in fact entirely related, to one project.

Mr. AUSTIN. Not entirely, but it is largely related to one.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Would the Senator from Vermont be willing to accept in the nature of a compromise the language in the bill subject to a limitation that the one project the Senator is referring to should be suspended for 6 months in order to enable a reinvestigation to be made?

Mr. AUSTIN. I could not enter into an agreement with respect to a compromise on my own authority alone. The State of Vermont has appointed a water conservation board which is represented here, and which is now, I understand, in conference with the distinguished colleague of the Senator who has asked this question, and they have under consideration a possible compromise relating to the watershed of the West River which might, if accepted, clear the question entirely. That matter may come to a decision while I am talking here, or within a short time.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. The proposal which I suggest to the Senator would provide for a review of this one project, and all parties would be given a chance to be heard, and then if modifications or changes should be desired, they could be made. It would at least permit further study and inquiry with respect to that one project.

Mr. AUSTIN. I understand, and the suggestion made by the Senator from Massachusetts is a perfectly laudable one, and one of which I approve. If a limitation of time were imposed the question would arise, of course, if action could be taken within the time limitation. That is something I do not know. That is for technicians to determine.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. I have not talked with my colleagues from Connecticut and Massachusetts about this matter, but I am wondering if it is not possible to permit projects with respect to which authorizations already exist, as well as projects authorized in this bill, to proceed, subject to review of the one project under discussion.

Mr. AUSTIN. I think that is doubtful, in view of the fact that question was raised with respect to other small valleys. There is a question raised by the committee amendment with relation to the use of these dams for power which could be resolved very easily by having it made possible for the representatives of the States and of the Federal Government to consider each valley on its merits with reference to the use of the water for power.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. May I ask the Senator if the present law and the plan outlined in the pending measure permit the use of these dams in Vermont for generating power.

Mr. AUSTIN. Well, in this way, that it is possible that it could be done.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. There is a feeling, I judge, on the part of some of the representatives of the State of Vermont that at least some of the dams, not all of them, should not be permitted to generate power. Is that true?

Mr. AUSTIN. Yes. The matter does not really turn on the question of power at all. It turns on other points.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. But the question rises with respect to the building of dams of a type that might be used for generating power.

Mr. AUSTIN. Yes; that is the point; the type of dams which might create burdens on the community.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. I cannot conceive of the construction of a type of dam which generates power that would be different from other dams, except in the matter of cost and in the matter of height.

Mr. AUSTIN. I am informed by the evidence that such a dam does impose a wholly different burden on the valley.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. The burden on the valley is the flooding of the valley, and that depends, does it not, on the height of the dam?

Mr. AUSTIN. That is not the only burden. The burden is in the use also, by drawing down and exposing the soil that has been so full of water and creating an obnoxious situation. We have to regard the interests of Vermont in maintaining its resource of recreation as a valuable asset of the State. There is another question involved, namely, that of alluvial land which can be used for agriculture. We want to be heard on those two points when the question of construction of a dam that is suitable for generating power comes up with respect to a certain valley.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Of course, that has already been considered. But does the Senator think there ought to be further hearings?

Mr. AUSTIN. No, Mr. President; it has not been considered by the State. It has not been considered in respect to the matter in question.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Has not all the evidence which the State desires to produce been presented to the Army engineers and also to the Committees on Commerce of both the House and the Senate?

Mr. AUSTIN. No. That is what we are after. We are after the same thing that the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Commerce was after and obtained from the Senate in his amendment, which appears in the RECORD at page 8235. I read as follows:

> Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President, the amendment which I offered, and which the committee unanimously approved, reads as follows:
>
> "On page 12, after line 14, strike out lines 15 to 23, inclusive, under the title 'Yadkin-Pee Dee River Basin' and insert in lieu thereof the following:
>
> "'The general plan for the comprehensive development of the Yadkin-Pee Dee River Basin for flood control, and other purposes, recommended by the Chief of Engineers in House Document 652, Seventy-eighth Congress, second session, is hereby stricken from the bill and is referred to the Committee on Commerce to the end that hearings may be had from the people concerned and with instructions to report back to the Senate within 6 months.'"

That amendment was supported by claims which are so very much like the claims which the committee heard from the inhabitants of the West River Valley, that it seems strange that there should be a conflict here over a similar request, for the effect of our amendment is substantially the same as the effect of the amendment which has already been accepted with respect to the Yadkin-Pee Dee River Basin.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Is there not a material difference between the Senator's amendment and the amendment he has just read?

Mr. AUSTIN. Yes; there is. But it is on another point, and that is that we seek by this amendment to meet the claim of delay which would be involved if we were to strike out the whole Connecticut River basin and try to narrow this effort by Vermont down to a small part of the Connecticut River basin, that part which is in Vermont, and point out that there is authorized improvement on the West River, although there should be no modification of it without an opportunity to be heard.

I call attention to the fact that the present location of the Williamsville site dam is a modification. At one time when we considered this project it was to be located in the town of Dummerston, which is below the present location. Now it has gone upstream to a different location, and I am informed that still another location, with which I am not familiar, has been considered by the engineers. Those are regarded as modifications within that section of the law which reads "with such further modifications as may be found justifiable in the discretion of the Secretary of War and of the Chief of Engineers."

We do not want that to take place again without our knowledge or without our having an opportunity to be heard.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AUSTIN. I yield.

Mr. OVERTON. There is this difference between the Yadkin-Pee Dee and the Connecticut River Basin: In the first place, I accepted the amendment which was presented by the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY] because the Yadkin-Pee Dee affects only one State, namely, the State of North Carolina. On the other hand, the Connecticut River Basin affects three States, and the reservoirs in the State of Vermont, while being located exclusively in the State of Vermont, would affect the flow of the Connecticut River through Massachusetts and Connecticut, and therefore three States are involved. If the Senators from the three States had agreed on some compromise arrangement, I think I would gladly have accepted it, so far as I could accept an amendment.

The other difference is that the Yadkin-Pee Dee report was submitted at the beginning of the hearings by the Senate Committee on Commerce, and the point was made that there was no opportunity on the part of the local people to have been so advised as to the project that they could understand it and arrive at a conclusion as to whether they desired it or not. Therefore they had been denied an opportunity to be heard. On the other hand, the Connecticut River Basin contemplated improvement has been before the Congress for a number of years. I believe surveys were made in 1936, and reports in 1936 and 1937. There was an act of Congress in 1938, and another act of Congress in 1941. The present law is embodied in the act of 1941.

If I may proceed a little further, the question arose in the House, as I understand, in opposition to the Williamsville site dam. It was desired that it should be made a low dam, that is, one which would be used solely for the purpose of flood protection, and not a high dam which could be used for purposes of power. At least, when the bill came over from the House, there was a provision in it that the Williamsville site dam should be a low dam.

Those are the main differences between the two situations. Of course, I cannot consent to any suggestion unless it meets with the approval of the Senators representing the States affected. That is the main consideration.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. We appreciate the Senator's explanation.

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AUSTIN. I yield.

Mr. MALONEY. I should like to point out that the situation has changed so rapidly, and so many different amendments have been offered or corrected, that yesterday's statement on the floor sounds rather foolish today.

I should like to reiterate that I am anxious to cooperate with the Senators from Vermont. I rose some time ago to comment upon a statement made by the distinguished Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN], who has the floor. Perhaps it is a little late now to point out that the delay which he asks, and which he mentioned a little earlier, is available.

This bill deals with post-war projects. Those projects will not be undertaken until the war is over. The law already provides that the Army engineers have the right to modify their plans. The distinguished Senator from Vermont was somewhat exercised a few days ago about the language in the law dealing with modification, and he then gave notice to the Senate that he intended to move to strike out that language in the law. Apparently that plan has been abandoned, although I suspect it may be revived.

Mr. AUSTIN. I think the Senator ought to know that it has not been abandoned, and that it is really in the amendment now under consideration.

Mr. MALONEY. Let me point out that if all the Senator wants is delay in order to review the matter, he has all the time between now and the end of the war. The Army engineers are empowered to make modifications. The Army engineers are recognized as men who are always anxious to cooperate. I have never known them to be arbitrary. So if all the Senator wants is review, and a delay to bring about the review, it is already available to him.

I am hopeful that those now engaged in conference, representatives from the State of Massachusetts and officials from the State of Vermont, will come to us soon with an agreement which we can all accept; but I wish to point out that the language in this amendment has been changed from day to day, and now I am informed by the Senator that his amendment, although it does not say so in A B C language, makes provision for striking out language in existing law. I do not believe that is necessary.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AUSTIN. I yield to my colleague.

Mr. AIKEN. I should like to point out two things. First, in addition to the Yadkin-Pee Dee project which was eliminated, and which has been discussed here, this body has also eliminated other projects from the bill, notably a dam in Indiana, which it was contended would do more damage than would be compensated for by the benefits derived from it, and also a dam in West Virginia. They were both deleted from the bill for exactly the same reasons which we are now presenting in asking for the elimination of the West River Dam.

Let me also point out a further thing: The Senator from Connecticut states that we would have ample time for review, and that none of these projects can be started until after the war; but the language of the bill at the top of page 8 is as follows:

> *Provided further*, That when the existing critical situation with respect to materials, equipment, and manpower no longer exists, and in any event not later than immediately following the cessation of hostilities in the present war, the projects herein shall be

initiated as expeditiously and prosecuted as vigorously as may be consistent with budgetary requirements.

In other words, instead of being post-war projects, it will be required that these projects start not later than at the end of the war. So the projects are very different from being post-war projects. They could start tomorrow. I do not understand that the materials required for starting the dams are necessarily strategic materials. So, Mr. President, I think we should take into consideration the fact that the pending flood-control bill is not a bill for post-war projects.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, I thank my colleague.

Now let us consider the claim made that Vermont should longer endure the absolute and unqualified authority of the Secretary of War and the Chief of Engineers which is contained in the language:

With such further modifications as may be found justifiable in the discretion of the Secretary of War and the Chief of Engineers.

That language appeared for the first time in the act of 1941 with reference to the Connecticut River Basin. Under it a modification was made without the cooperation or consideration of the State of Vermont. The location of the dam on the West River, which is so much discussed here, was changed from below West Dummerston upstream 3 miles to Williamsville Station.

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DOWNEY in the chair). Does the Senator from Vermont yield to the Senator from Connecticut?

Mr. AUSTIN. I will yield in a moment.

Mr. President, that change is regarded as a modification under the Connecticut River Basin provision. But there is so much evidence in the act of 1941 itself that the word "modification" comprehends substitution of one dam for another, change of type of dam, change of height of spillway, that one of the chief objectives we have is that there shall no longer exist the arbitrary power of the Secretary of War and the Chief of Engineers, after Congress has acted, to operate in these Vermont valleys without consulting the State of Vermont.

I do not wish to have the Congress vote an authorization and then later find that within 6 months the Secretary of War and the Chief of Engineers have modified it by changing the location to a point 3½ miles upstream or by changing the type of the dam or by changing the height of the spillway. That is why there is written into the amendment the clause:

Plans, proposals, or reports heretofore authorized for construction at Cambridgeport, Ludlow, South Tunbridge, and Gaysville, in the Connecticut River Basin, or any modification of the comprehensive plan for the Connecticut River Basin in Vermont heretofore made under authority of the Flood Control Act of June 28, 1938, or heretofore made under authority of section 3 of the Flood Control Act approved August 18, 1941, shall not be carried out until after compliance with the provisions of paragraph (a) of section — of this act.

In other words, Mr. President, Vermont wishes to have the same privilege—not greater privilege—which is granted to the great States of the West and the South and to all other States except Vermont. That is all we wish to have. We desire to have a decent chance to have the wishes, plans, and vital interests of the State considered in the report on modifications made by the Army engineers to the Congress, and we want a report. We do not want a modification made by the Secretary of War and the Chief of Engineers which does not come here for our consideration and the action of Congress thereon. It is the blanket authority contained in this sleeper clause which is the great danger to us and to all our interests.

Mr. President, all we are asking for, in plain English, is a chance to be consulted, not merely in the committees of Congress, but on the ground, among the engineers who are at work on these types of dams and who look over the ground locally to see whether the proportionate damage and injury to the people of the State of Vermont and to the State itself is so great that a certain type of dam should be constructed there, instead of another type, or that a certain location should be adopted instead of another location, or that a certain use instead of another use should be employed at that place in that valley.

There are 10 Vermont valleys for which dams have been authorized. Of the 10 we have picked 4 to which objection has arisen. We have said that as to them there shall be a further consideration regarding the dams. That request is a very modest one, and granting it will not delay the whole project. Five-sixths of the project can be advanced just as rapidly as it is possible to find the manpower with which to do so. This morning we read in the newspapers that there is a "supercritical" shortage of 90,000 men who are needed to carry on the war production. Will it cause delay to require reconsideration of these projects with reference to all their characteristics, and to have a report made to Congress, in the light of the fact that we cannot find the manpower needed in order to go ahead with the projects, even if we ratify the authorization which was made in 1941 for these particular projects? The answer is "No." It will not delay. In fact, it probably will promote the construction of the projects.

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. AUSTIN. I yield.

Mr. MALONEY. I wished to comment on something the Senator said awhile ago at a time when he found it inconvenient to yield to me. I can quite understand why he did not wish to yield then, but I make this reference and place this emphasis in order that what I am about to say will be better understood.

It is true, as the Senator has pointed out, that some tentative modifications have been made in the location of a dam on the West River; but I have understood that, quite contrary to the position the Senator from Vermont seems to take, the modification was made for the purpose of serving the wishes of the people of Vermont. It is true that the location originally intended was changed and that a location a little farther up the river was selected; but, as I understand the situation, the purpose of changing the location to one farther up the river was to protect Vermont. Fewer persons and fewer homes would thus be affected.

So I do not wish the RECORD to show, without a contradiction, that the change was made because of an arbitrary attitude on the part of the engineers, in which they were ignoring the wishes of Vermont.

The Senator from Vermont also has made much of the fact and has earlier, at least, if not now, entertained the idea that the modification privileges contained in the law are peculiar to Vermont. They are not peculiar to Vermont or to the Connecticut Valley, Mr. President, although the Senator from Vermont has earlier said on the floor of the Senate that they were. Similar language is found in connection with other projects. It is necessary that the Army engineers have this modification authority if they are to comply with desires such as are here expressed by the Vermont Senators, namely, to provide a chance to review, a chance to discuss, a chance to reexamine. In large part, that is why that language is in the law, namely, to permit just the things which the able senior Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN] now advocates.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, I hardly believe that the distinguished senior Senator from Connecticut has in mind what the Senate voted yesterday.

Mr. MALONEY. I confess that I am becoming confused as the amendments undergo rapid change.

Mr. AUSTIN. He could not make the statement he has just made if he clearly recollected the amendment the Senate adopted yesterday. I shall take the time to read the language, because I think it is well to have the RECORD contain it. We took the first paragraph of the amendment offered by the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], which I shall read, and unanimously agreed to it.

Mr. MALONEY. Oh, no; not unanimously. I opposed it.

Mr. AUSTIN. Did the Senator oppose it?

Mr. MALONEY. Yes.

Mr. AUSTIN. Does the Senator agree that it was adopted by the Senate?

Mr. MALONEY. Oh, yes.

Mr. AUSTIN. Very well.

Mr. MALONEY. And I am trying to adjust myself to the situation as it moves along.

Mr. AUSTIN. Very well. The provision to which I refer reads as follows:

In connection with the exercise of jurisdiction over the rivers of the Nation through the construction of works of improvement, for navigation or flood control, as herein authorized, it is hereby declared to be the policy of the Congress to recognize the interests and rights of the States in determining the development of the watersheds within their borders and likewise their interests and rights in water utilization and control, as herein authorized, to preserve and protect to the fullest possible extent established and potential uses, for all purposes,

of the waters of the Nation's rivers; to facilitate the consideration of projects on a basis of comprehensive and coordinated development; and to limit the authorization and construction of navigation works to those in which a substantial benefit to navigation will be realized therefrom and which can be operated consistently with appropriate and economic use of the waters of such rivers by other users.

I believe I have in my hand an original copy of the amendment. In the form agreed to there were slight changes made which brought out the idea of cooperation between the Federal Government and the States.

The following clause, which the Senator from Connecticut seems to think should apply to the Connecticut River Valley, is opposed to the language which I have read because it would give absolute dictatorial power and exclusive discretion to the Army engineers. The provision to which I refer is as follows:

With such further modifications as may be found justifiable in the discretion of the Secretary of War and the Chief of Engineers.

There is nothing in that clause which should now apply to Vermont. If that provision becomes law, Vermont should have the benefit of the policy which was agreed to yesterday. Vermont should not be singled out and discriminated against when all the other States in the Union have the benefit of this declaration of policy.

Mr. President, yesterday the Senate agreed to the following provision, which I read from page 2, line 13, of the text before me, which I believe to be an old text, but if there is a difference, I shall be very glad to correct it later:

In conformity with this policy: (a).

That "(a)" is referred to in our amendment.

Mr. MALONEY. Will the Senator yield for a correction?

Mr. AUSTIN. Yes.

Mr. MALONEY. The Senator has said again that this language is peculiar to Vermont, and that he only asks for what other States of the Union have been given. If he will look on page 465, United States Revised Statutes, Seventy-seventh Congress, first session, volume 55, part I, Public Laws, under "Arkansas River Basin," he will find the following clause:

With such modifications as may be advisable in the discretion of the Secretary of War and the Chief of Engineers.

That provision is identical with that applying to Vermont.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AUSTIN. I yield.

Mr. OVERTON. I believe the provision to which reference has been made will be found in connection with all comprehensive plans relating to river basins.

Mr. MALONEY. The Senator is correct, and it is impossible to have a comprehensive plan without providing for such modifications.

Mr. OVERTON. It is not only peculiar to the Connecticut River Basin but is peculiar to all reports of the engineers in connection with similar plans.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, with that statement I disagree. I am subject to error in reading. I contend that if we examine the act of August 31, 1941, we will find a reference to 31 projects. The project in the Connecticut River Basin is the only one which contains the peculiar clause to which I have referred. There are clauses in the provisions relating to similar projects, but in most cases they are qualified by a sufficient description of the project so that the breadth and scope of the authority does not exist as it would in the case of the Connecticut River Basin.

Mr. MALONEY. It exists in the language to which I just referred in connection with the Arkansas River Valley.

Mr. AUSTIN. If what the Senator says be true, why should Arkansas and Vermont be singled out and not be given the benefit of the policy the Senate adopted yesterday?

Mr. President, the claim I make is that we are now in the business of rectifying the mistakes which Congress made in 1938 when it enacted a flood-control bill at the very end of the session, and which did not become law until after adjournment. My recollection is that Congress adjourned on June 16 of that year, and that the 1938 act did not become effective until approximately June 22, 1938. It was crowded through Congress at the end of the session. It absolutely reversed the action which Congress had taken in 1936 with reference to the policy of flood control. I shall discuss that subject later if I do not forget it. I now return to what I was undertaking to prove.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AUSTIN. I yield.

Mr. OVERTON. In order to throw additional light on the question of modification, I may state that it is rare for an act itself ever to contain a provision for modification. The act authorizes certain plans for flood control. I am advised by the engineers that in the report submitted by the Chief of Engineers with respect to all basins there is contained a provision that the Chief of Engineers may make such modifications as he believes to be proper. Such authority to made modifications is never abused. The modifications are only minor ones, which become necessary as revealed by the investigation. When a comprehensive plan is adopted in connection with the recommendations of the engineers, the provision that the Chief of Engineers may make modifications becomes a part of the law without being so expressed in the statute.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, I meet that statement by citing what appears in the act of 1941.

Mr. WEEKS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AUSTIN. I yield.

Mr. WEEKS. In response to the observation made by the distinguished senior Senator from Vermont, I should like to read from the act of 1938 in which in reference to the Ohio River Basin, the following words are set forth:

with such modifications thereof as in the discretion of the Secretary of War and the Chief of Engineers may be advisable.

The same language is used in connection with the Red River Basin. In that instance the word "advisable" is used. In the provision relating to the Connecticut River Valley the word "justifiable" is used. It seems to me, Mr. President, that a precedent exists for this language, and that by using the word "justifiable" instead of "advisable" the language would be modified at least to the extent stated.

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AUSTIN. I yield.

Mr. CAPPER. I have received from John B. Gage, mayor of Kansas City, Mo., a constructive and helpful statement setting forth his views as to the pending flood-control bill. I have great confidence in the judgment of Mayor Gage, and urge the Senate to give his statement serious consideration before the pending measure reaches a vote. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point the statement to which I have referred.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The importance of prompt authorization of flood-control works in the Missouri River and its tributaries as provided for in the flood-control bill now before the Senate cannot be overstated. The plans for the Army engineers as modified by agreement with the Bureau of Reclamation to better serve irrigation needs within the basin are unquestionably sound from an engineering standpoint. Carrying them into execution involves only the recognition of a responsibility that is traditionally Federal and not the extension of Federal activity into new fields. The economic benefits to be derived are so vast as to defy description or accurate forecast. The very extent and multiplicity of these economic benefits provokes controversies as to their distribution. It will require years to settle upon and acquire the precise sites and construct the proposed works before these benefits materialize. If authorizations are immediately given through passage of the flood-control bill, there will be more than ample time for Congress to settle these controversies. The questions raised do not challenge but, in fact, further establish the conceded engineering soundness and economic value of the proposed works. The important thing is to immediately approve the construction plans so that sites may be acquired and designs and specifications made ready for the post-war period. Such is the progress that our armed forces and those of our allies are making toward victory, that the time for this preparatory work is all too short.

Here is a program that will more realistically and effectively than any other plan I know about harness the tremendous American technological ability in the field of construction which has amazed the world and done so much to win the war to the pursuits of peace. It will turn these great abilities and energies from the task of destruction to construction enterprise of the highest order. All up and down this great valley once the fear or certainty of recurring flood is removed, both on the farms and in the towns, private enterprise will create and build new improvements, new homes, new barns; new factories by the thousands will arise. The public works themselves proposed by this bill will be but a drop in the bucket as compared with the total utiliza-

tion of manpower and materials which will develop. New and expanded markets will be created. If the action of Congress is prompt and if the agencies of government more expeditiously act when authorization has been given, it is entirely possible that these new demands for manpower and materials will exist when in the course of the post-war era the economy of the Nation will have the greatest need for their stimulating effort. If this is to occur, however, there can be no further delay. Let controversies over the distribution of these vast benefits await timely and more adequate consideration in calmer days. Compromise and adjustment of conflicting rights, always properly a part of democratic government, can then be had in a typically American way.

In the proposed O'Mahoney amendment to the flood control bill there apppears to be a commitment establishing a priority for irrigation water in large amounts to be taken out of the main stem of the Missouri River near Fort Pcck for lands in the Hudson Bay drainage area. I refer to the so-called Souris River project comprising millions of acres. Personally, I seriously question the desirability or propriety at this time of such a commitment. It is by no means certain that there will be a surplus of water in the Missouri River Basin after all beneficial uses within the basin have been provided for.

Furthermore, the construction of the Souris River project would not only divert large amounts of Missouri River water through reservoir construction and underground drainage into Canada, but would also destroy the greatest waterfowl refuges and breeding grounds in the Nation—a project upon which the Federal Government has expended many millions of dollars. It would also permanently commit large volumes of the incidental hydroelectric power developed at Fort Peck to irrigation pumping to carry the water over the divide, and it is at least arguable that such power should be conserved to provide cheap electricity for industrial and other uses in the Dakota and Montana area. It would therefore seem most appropriate that no such commitment to beneficial use outside the basin, of Missouri River water, be made at this time. Here is a matter which, like others that concern beneficial use, should be left to future solution and determination at a time when it can be clearly established that under proper control a surplus of water above all uses both on the lower and upper river actually exists.

This is not to challenge the desirability of an authorization of irrigation works within the Missouri Basin as proposed by the Reclamation Bureau and approved in the joint report of that Bureau and the Army engineers. The reclamation program covering sound irrigation projects as well as a comprehensive soil-conservation program for the entire valley and the conversion of vast areas suitable therefor to expand recreational uses are all parts of an over-all development of the Missouri Valley which in the interests of the future of the Nation must come to pass. This ultimate objective so feasible and readily attainable when men with vision and courage set to work to accomplish it should enlist the active support of Americans in every section of the country for it visualizes a sound central core for the Nation—a heartland not only vastly rich in all the raw materials essential to modern life, but strong and virile in its capacity to produce those materials and fashion them to the uses of man. At the base of all of this, as I see it, lies the problem of the complete and ordered utilization of the water resources of the region. In this, as was the case with countless peoples of the past, rests the limiting factor. Engineering genius has definitely and certainly pointed the way to the substantial removal of that limiting factor. Action lies within the scope of Federal power and is covered in its initial steps by the provisions of the flood control bill. I earnestly hope that the Senate will find it possible to pass the measure before adjournment.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, returning to my point in answer to the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, I may state that the act of 1938 was full of the spirit of usurpation of power. I do not refer to water power. I refer to political power. I venture to say that no legislation appears on the books containing such great centralization of authority as the legislation contained in the flood-control act of 1938, which was passed during the closing hours of the session of that year. It is literally filled with the theory of taking away from the States any right, any discretion, any expression of their wishes, and depositing the authority in the Federal Government. There will be found not only those references which were read by the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts in the 1938 statute, but there will be found many others similar in character and spirit, vesting in two men here in Washington authority to undo what we do here. Let us authorize a certain project for a certain type of dam, and some day we wake up and find that the location of the dam and the type of the dam have been changed.

The 1941 act undertook to remedy much of that. It is quite a different proposition as will be seen when I continue.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AUSTIN. I yield.

Mr. DANAHER. I wonder if the Senator will not allow me to underscore his reference to the 1938 act by the observation that it was passed without any hearings whatever and without any notice to the States of the United States until it was an accomplished fact.

Mr. AUSTIN. I thank the Senator from Connecticut.

Now I will go back and try to answer the distinguished Senator from Louisiana with respect to what Congress did with these modifications in 1941, except in the case of Vermont. On page 640 of Fifty-fifth Statutes we find this:

The project adopted by the act of June 22, 1936, to provide for local flood control protection works on Otter Creek at Rutland, Vt., is hereby modified—

This is an act of Congress, it will be understood—

in accordance with the recommendation of the Chief of Engineers in Senate Document 171, Seventy-sixth Congress, third session, and is authorized to be constructed substantially in accordance with said recommendation at an estimated cost of $308,000.

In other words, they did come back to the Congress with the report of the modification, and Congress had a chance to act on it.

Now, let us take another on page 642. Here is a case where a project was abandoned and another substituted under the great scope of the clause relating to modification as it was interpreted:

The project for flood control on the lower Mississippi River adopted by the act of May 15, 1928, as amended by the act of June 15, 1936——

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Vermont yield?

Mr. AUSTIN. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HALL in the chair). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll; and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Guffey	Radcliffe
Austin	Gurney	Reed
Bailey	Hall	Revercomb
Bankhead	Hatch	Reynolds
Bilbo	Hawkes	Robertson
Brewster	Hayden	Russell
Brooks	Hill	Shipstead
Buck	Holman	Stewart
Burton	Jenner	Taft
Bushfield	Johnson, Calif.	Thomas, Idaho
Butler	Johnson, Colo.	Thomas, Okla.
Byrd	Kilgore	Thomas, Utah
Capper	Langer	Tunnell
Caraway	Lucas	Vandenberg
Clark, Mo.	McClellan	Wagner
Connally	McFarland	Wallgren
Cordon	McKellar	Walsh, Mass.
Danaher	Maloney	Walsh, N. J.
Davis	Maybank	Weeks
Downey	Mead	Wheeler
Ellender	Millikin	Wherry
Ferguson	Murray	White
George	Nye	Wiley
Gerry	O'Daniel	Willis
Gillette	O'Mahoney	
Green	Overton	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Seventy-six Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, I have not concluded the statement which I wish to make in support of the pending amendment, but I desire to confer with my colleague and the representative of the Water Conservation Commission of Vermont, who is here, and with representatives of the States of Massachusetts and Connecticut, upon a possible agreement, and therefore I yield the floor with the hope that I may be recognized later.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I have a letter from the Honorable Harold L. Ickes, the Secretary of the Interior, in reference to amendments to the flood-control bill, and I ask that the letter be read at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the clerk will read as requested.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR,
Washington, November 29, 1944.

Hon. LISTER HILL,
United States Senate.

MY DEAR SENATOR HILL: The long-established reclamation policies of the Congress are at stake in the flood-control bill, H. R. 4485. Proposed amendments, which may be debated today, would authorize the Corps of Engineers to develop and dispose of irrigation water storage without regard to the repayment and land policies of the Federal reclamation laws.

These proposed amendments, although not limited in geographical scope, were first sponsored by California interests. Recently, several western Senators have subscribed to them without realizing, I am sure, the serious consequences. I hope that you will inform the Senate of the serious departure those proposed amendments would make from the 40-year-old reclamation policies of the Congress.

It is proposed to modify section 6 of the bill, as reported to the Senate, by providing that, in connection with any dam and reservoir the Corps of Engineers constructs, the Secretary of War may contract for water storage for irrigation and any other beneficial uses on whatever terms the Secretary of War may deem reasonable. There would be no

requirement that the water users pay for their benefits under the terms of the reclamation law that now governs Federal irrigation projects. There would be no requirement of compliance with the excess-land provisions of the reclamation law which promote family-sized farms and which curb land speculation based on Government benefits.

As a result, approximately $500,000,000 of accounts receivable from existing Federal reclamation projects would be jeopardized, since all water users on those projects would insist that they should enjoy the most favorable terms that a Secretary of War in his discretionary largess provided for an Army irrigation project. The door would be opened to the monopolization of Federal irrigation benefits by industrialized farm corporations. It would be opened also to the fleecing of war veterans by land speculators.

The proposed amendment of section 6 was not requested by the Chief of Engineers or by the Secretary of War. It was not proposed in the House, nor before the Senate Committee on Commerce. It represents the desire of California interests to obtain the benefits of Federal irrigation development without having to comply with the repayment terms and the excess-land provisions of the Federal reclamation laws.

The proposed amendment of section 6 should be rejected and the section 6 as reported by the Senate committee, or section 4 as passed by the House, should be adopted.

The same California interests initiated a proposed amendment of section 8 in the bill as reported to the Senate. In the form reported, or in the form passed by the House (as sec. 6), that section should be adopted. The Californians' proposed amendment would delete from the section, as reported to the Senate, the provision that dams and reservoirs under the jurisdiction of the War Department may be utilized for irrigation purposes only in conformity with the provisions of this section. By another major revision, the Californians' proposed amendment would exclude the application of the section to any Army dam or reservoir "which supplements any existing locally operated irrigation system or other locally operated water facilities." As might be expected, the projects included in the bill for the great Central Valley area of California (Sacramento-San Joaquin River Basin, p. 31, H. R. 4485) would supplement some existing locally operated irrigation systems. Those projects, therefore, would be left subject only to section 6 which, as the Californians would have it amended, disregards the Federal reclamation laws while placing the Corps of Engineers in the irrigation field.

The President, both orally and in writing, has stated repeatedly that the Kings River project (p. 33, lines 3–19) and the Kern River project (p. 32, lines 13–19) and the other projects proposed for the Sacramento-San Joaquin River Basin, should be authorized for construction by the Bureau of Reclamation under the Federal reclamation laws. As he has pointed out, they should be integrated parts of the Central Valley project which the Bureau of Reclamation has partially completed and placed in operation. I hope that the Senate will give consideration to the recommendations made repeatedly by the President.

I urge that the Senate adhere to the long-established reclamation policies of the Congress and reject the California amendments of sections 6 and 8 that would endanger the future of Federal reclamation development throughout the West.

Sincerely yours,

HAROLD L. ICKES,
Secretary of the Interior.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I have just listened to the reading of the letter from the Secretary of the Interior. I should like to make inquiry of the author of the amendment, first, with respect to section 6. Unless it is the intent of those who have written the amendment to remove from the terms of the Reclamation Act certain projects which combine flood control and irrigation, I can see no necessity for its enactment.

It seems to me that the recommendation made by the Secretary of the Interior with respect to section 6 as it appears in the amendment is well taken, because what the House did in section 4—or section 6, as renumbered by the committee—applies only to domestic and industrial uses. If there is in any flood-control project built by the Corps of Engineers surplus water which might be sold for domestic and industrial uses, the money to be obtained to be placed in the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts, that seems to me to be a very sound proposal. But if we are to collect money from those who are irrigating arid lands, the collection should be under the reclamation law. There should not be two rules.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. The Central Valley, California, item was stricken in the Committee on Commerce on my motion, on the theory that it had no place in a flood-control bill, that a change in the irrigation laws was a technical subject over which the Committee on Commerce had no jurisdiction, and that it had no business whatever in a flood-control bill. It was also done in response to a letter from the President of the United States to the chairman of the Committee on Commerce opposing a change in the general reclamation laws. It was my opinion, which was adopted by the committee, that a flood-control bill was no place for a change in the general reclamation laws, and that if such a change were to be made, it should come in a separate bill, considered and reported by the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation, and considered by the Senate as a separate proposal. It has no place in a flood-control bill. To that view I still adhere, and I believe the committee still adheres to it.

Mr. HAYDEN. I believe the committee exercised sound judgment in that regard, because otherwise it would be legislating on a matter beyond the scope of its jurisdiction.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. And about which we knew nothing.

Mr. HAYDEN. If section 6 were to remain in the bill, as proposed in the substitute, it certainly should be amended so as to eliminate from it any irrigation use of water.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. Has not the Senator from Arizona already prepared amendments which would take care of the entire situation?

Mr. HAYDEN. I prepared the amendments before I heard read the letter from the Secretary of the Interior as to section 6. Let me say that if section 6 in the proposed O'Mahoney amendment were amended as I would suggest, it would provide that except for irrigation uses, or solely for domestic and industrial uses, these provisions might apply. Then it would, in effect, be exactly what the committee has already done. If the Senator will look on page 5 of the House bill, at section 4 or section 6 as renumbered, it provides as follows:

> That the Secretary of War is authorized to sell to States, municipalities, private concerns, or individuals, at such prices and on such terms as he may deem reasonable, for domestic and industrial uses surplus water that may be available at any reservoir under the control of the War Department.

If we eliminate irrigation uses, the only uses which remain are domestic and industrial. So I do not see that it would be any improvement over what is already in the bill to adopt the suggested amendment and insert the words which I had in mind, either "except for irrigation uses" or "for domestic and industrial uses only."

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Let me suggest to the Senator that this discussion be postponed for a moment, until the amendment to which he is addressing himself is before the Senate. There is another amendment which I should like to present now, and upon which I think there will be no disagreement. Thereafter, with due notice to the Senator, I shall bring up for discussion the two amendments mentioned in the Secretary's letter.

Mr. HAYDEN. I have no objection to postponing the discussion.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President——

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, does the Senator wish to be recognized?

Mr. BANKHEAD. I wish to be recognized.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I should like to proceed for a few moments.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Very well.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I desire to offer, as a part of the first section, of which subsection (a) was adopted yesterday, the following, to be subsection (b):

> (b) The use for navigation, in connection with the operation and maintenance of such works herein authorized for construction, of waters arising in States lying wholly or partly west of the ninety-eighth meridian shall be only such use as does not conflict with any beneficial consumptive use, present or future, in States lying wholly or partly west of the ninety-eighth meridian, of such waters for domestic, municipal, stock water, irrigation, mining, or industrial purposes.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, I suggest that the amendment as read by the Senator from Wyoming be handed to the clerk in order that it may be properly inserted in the bill.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I left a copy of it at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair invites the attention of the Senator from Wyoming to the fact that the so-called Connecticut River amendment has not as yet been disposed of.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, the Chair calls attention to the fact that the Connecticut River amendment has not been disposed of. I thought announcement had been made that the

Senator from Vermont and the Senator from Connecticut were in conference endeavoring to reach an agreement upon that amendment. I ask unanimous consent that the pending amendment be temporarily laid aside, awaiting the outcome of that conference, and that we proceed to the consideration of the amendment which I have offered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the pending amendment is temporarily laid aside. The amendment offered by the Senator from Wyoming will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. At the proper place in the bill it is proposed to insert the following:

(b) The use for navigation, in connection with the operation and maintenance of such works herein authorized for construction, of waters arising in States lying wholly or partly west of the ninety-eighth meridian shall be only such use as does not conflict with any beneficial consumptive use, present or future, in States lying wholly or partly west of the ninety-eighth meridian, of such waters for domestic, municipal, stock water, irrigation, mining, or industrial purposes.

Mr. OVERTON. I have no objection to that amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection——

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. HILL. What is the purpose of the amendment? Does it conflict in any way with the views expressed by the Secretary of the Interior?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. It does not. As I stated a moment ago, I shall call the attention of the Senate to the controversial amendment when it is reached.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY].

Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President——

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I now offer, on page 7, the following amendment——

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President——

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I have the floor. Does the Senator desire me to yield?

Mr. BURTON. I was endeavoring to get the attention of the Chair in order that I might ask a question with respect to subsection (b), which the Chair announced was agreed to.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield for that purpose.

Mr. BURTON. I should like to inquire with regard to subsection (b), which we have just been discussing. As I understand, that is in precisely the same form in which it was originally presented by the Senator from Wyoming——

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Not exactly.

Mr. BURTON. With the exception that there have been eliminated from it the words "or hereafter" dealing with the construction of projects.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Yes; the Senator is correct. That change was made so that it would apply only to projects which are authorized in the bill.

Mr. BURTON. I should like to inquire of the Senator from Wyoming whether he will throw a little light on the effect of the final clause in the section, which reads:

The use for navigation, in connection with the operation and maintenance of such works herein authorized for construction, of waters arising in States lying wholly or partly west of the ninety-eighth meridian shall be only such use as does not conflict with any beneficial consumptive use, present or future, in States lying wholly or partly west of the ninety-eighth meridian, of such waters for domestic, municipal, stock water, irrigation, mining, or industrial purposes.

My question relates to the industrial purposes. I can well understand, from having lived in that section of the country myself for a number of years, the close relationship which use of water for "domestic, municipal, stock water, irrigation, and mining" purposes bears to the needs of the territory west of the ninety-eighth meridian. But when we come to the industrial purposes, I wish the Senator would enlarge upon that, because it occurs to me that the effect of the language might be, unless it is otherwise explained, that the water might be taken out of navigable rivers and might be used for industrial purposes which have no relation to the arid or semiarid condition of the region. It might be taken out in large quantities for manufacturing purposes, and thus be detrimental to the navigation needs.

Of course, such a situation is comparable to the situation in the East, where we have need of water for industrial purposes, but where we cannot take it out to the detriment of navigation.

Will the Senator comment on the situation with reference to the arid and semiarid States, as we find it referred to in the amendment?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, let me say that this language is a recognition of the situation which has long existed and which has found recognition in practice, in the Federal law, and in the State law in the area west of the ninety-eighth meridian. I believe that the rule which should apply in arid areas should be slightly different from the rule which may apply in the eastern States, because of the very fact that the rain in the area west of the ninety-eighth meridian is only a fraction of that which falls in the eastern area.

Industrial consumptive uses have always been recognized. However, I wish to say that I doubt whether there is very much consumptive use of water for industrial purposes in the arid and semiarid regions. I believe the water would be used largely for navigation and irrigation purposes. The situation was examined thoroughly by the Army engineers and the navigation interests, and no substantial reason was suggested for any change of language.

Mr. BURTON. What I had in mind, Mr. President, was the consumptive use which might arise, for example, in connection with a steel mill in which a great deal of water is evaporated, or in connection with the use of water in a chemical plant, in which a considerable amount of water is actually consumed. Such plants might, according to the purport of this language, have priority over use for navigation purposes. As I understand the situation, use for navigation, according to the Constitution, has certain prior rights, in that under the Constitution we are not permitted to interfere with navigation, which is a Federal function.

I merely wish to make sure that the language under consideration would not result in anything which would be interpreted as authority to permit a large diversion of water for industrial purposes from rivers west of the ninety-eighth meridian, so that it would raise a legal question as to whether it was actually a substantial interference with navigation, which I have understood has a Federal status under the Constitution and cannot be interfered with except to meet actual necessities based on the peculiar need for water in the arid or semiarid States.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. It is my understanding that there would be no such interference and that no such question would be raised. That is not the purpose of the amendment, and I do not believe it would be so interpreted.

Mr. BURTON. I thank the Senator.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I do not know what effect this discussion would have on the interpretation of the action we are taking, but I believe it was the intention of the Congress in enacting the Desert Land Act—and the Supreme Court has so said in a rather recent decision—that the arid States should have the use of the water for industrial purposes.

Speaking for myself, I do not believe we should limit that privilege which Congress has already given us, and which has been confirmed in the decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States. I, like the distinguished senior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], do not anticipate in the arid and semiarid States any exorbitant demands on water for industrial purposes; but we have no crystal bowl here which we can use to foresee the future, and we certainly do not want to preclude any industrial development which it might be possible to bring about.

From studying the whole history of the policy of Congress with respect to the arid and semiarid States, I think it is very clear that it was intended that we should have the privilege of achieving, if we can, a well-rounded economy, and, of course, that includes some industrial economy.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, the point I wish to make, and the one which the Senator from Colorado has been emphasizing, is merely that this provision is a declaration of policy. Therefore, it is subject to amendment by the Congress at any time the Congress wishes to amend it. If it develops that there would be an interference with industrial usage in the East, by comparison, or if there were a very substantial diversion of water for industrial uses having no relation to the arid or semiarid conditions, resulting in interference with navigation, there would be no violation of the present intent if at that time the

Senate were so to define its policy as to avoid that situation.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. There is no attempt here to bind any future Congress.

Mr. BURTON. I wish to make clear that a future Congress would not be violating the present intent if it were to modify the language or policy so as to meet a situation which does not exist at the present time. I wish to endorse heartily the purpose of meeting the needs of the arid and semiarid States, and I wish to do everything possible to preserve and promote their development insofar as it is based on their peculiar geographical situation.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I should like to add that if the Congress should ever reconsider the policies which have prevailed, nothing which is being said here should prejudice the contentions which might be made either way on the subject.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I now offer the next amendment, which will be subsection (c) of the section originally offered. I ask that it be read at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be read.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 7, after line 5, it is proposed to insert:

(c) The Secretary of the Interior, in making investigations of and reports on works for irrigation and purposes incidental thereto shall, in relation to an affected State or States (as defined in par. (a) of this section), and to the Secretary of War, be subject to the same provisions regarding investigations, plans, proposals, and reports as prescribed in paragraph (a) of this section for the Chief of Engineers and the Secretary of War. In the event a submission of views and recommendations, made by an affected State or by the Secretary of War pursuant to said provisions, sets forth objections to the plans or proposals covered by the report of the Secretary of the Interior, the proposed works shall not be deemed authorized except upon approval by an act of Congress; and subsection 9 (a) of the Reclamation Project Act of 1939 (53 Stat. 1187) and subsection 3 (a) of the act of August 11, 1939 (53 Stat. 1418), as amended, are hereby amended accordingly.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, there is no objection to the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection——

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, am I to understand that the words in lines 17 and 18 on page 7 of the amendment, to wit, the words——

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I assume the Senator refers to the words "on grounds not inconsistent with paragraph (c) of this section."

Mr. HILL. Were those words stricken out?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Yes; they have been omitted.

Mr. HILL. So I assume there is nothing in the amendment contrary to the views of the Senator——

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I have told the Senate that when a controversial amendment arises I will call the attention of the Senate to it.

Mr. HILL. I may say to the Senator that those amendments on their face do not, of course, show just what they are or what they would do.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. No; but I have told the Senate what I shall do, and I usually keep my word.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TUNNELL in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, we now come to the first of the controversial amendments. The amendment which appears on page 8 of the printed text is one which was agreed to at a Chicago conference called by the group of Senators who were sponsoring the original amendment. The conference was attended by representatives from many Western and Eastern States. We thought that the entire problem was thoroughly canvassed at the conference. Representatives of the Department of the Interior were present. I understood that they had been consulted about this amendment. I now learn that my understanding in that respect was incorrect. I was called away from the conference at the time sections 6 and 8 were under discussion. I was called away by pressing matters of importance, but of an altogether different character. I was therefore not present when the amendments were agreed to. But, Mr. President, in order to get them before the Senate at this time, I propose, on page 5, to strike out lines 8 to 16, inclusive, and insert the provision which I will ask the clerk to read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 5 of the bill it is proposed to strike out lines 8 to 16, inclusive, and insert the following:

SEC. 6. That the Secretary of War is authorized to contract for water storage for any beneficial uses or purposes with States, legal subdivisions thereof, State and interstate agencies, municipalities, public, quasi public, or private corporations, firms, associations, or individuals on such terms and conditions as he may deem reasonable, when storage capacity for any such uses or purposes is or may be made available at any reservoir now or hereafter constructed by the War Department: *Provided*, That the right to the use of water for such purposes shall have been established by proceedings in conformity with State laws: *And provided further*, That no such water storage shall be in conflict with, or adversely affect, then existing lawful uses of water. All moneys received from such contracts shall be deposited in the Treasury of the United States as miscellaneous receipts.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I wish to say a word or two in explanation. The Senate should know that the entire effort of those of us who have been working for these amendments was to bring about coordination and agreement between the Bureau of Reclamation and the Army engineers. As I have already stated, there were before the conference two separate plans for the development of the Missouri Valley. There were other plans involving other States. The flood-control policy envisaged the construction of vast new works which would store great amounts of water, over which the War Department and the Army engineers would have jurisdiction.

Other projects which were offered—and so far as this amendment is concerned they are included in the integrated report of the Bureau of Reclamation and the Army engineers for the Missouri Valley—embraced primarily irrigation and reclamation projects.

It was the thought of those who were sponsoring this amendment that, so far as the War Department is concerned, it should have jurisdiction over those works which are to be constructed primarily for flood control, but if they store surplus waters, such waters should be made available for any purpose, domestic irrigation or otherwise, which residents in the neighborhood or in the vicinity affected may desire. But since it was the purpose to give to the War Department jurisdiction over War Department dams and improvements, and to the Bureau of Reclamation jurisdiction over those which were primarily to be used for reclamation, this amendment is intended as an authorization to the Secretary of War to make contracts for the use of surplus water stored in dams which would be constructed solely by the Army engineers. We then provide that the disposal of water should take into account the fundamental principles which have governed the distribution and use of water in the West. That, Mr. President, was the reason for this amendment.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield to the Senator from Arizona.

Mr. HAYDEN. I believe the proposed language goes entirely beyond what the Senator has suggested. It seems to me that so far as the use of water for irrigation is concerned, the language would change the fundamental principle concerning our irrigation law. Section 4 of the House bill, now renumbered section 6, reads:

That the Secretary of War is authorized to sell to States, municipalities, private concerns, or individuals, at such prices and on such terms as he may deem reasonable, for domestic and industrial uses—

And so forth. There could be no possible objection to that language because we cannot tell what the circumstances may be, and it is entirely probable that the Federal Government will make reimbursement for a part of the cost of projects by obtaining revenue through the means suggested. But when it is left, as it would be by this language, to the Secretary of War also to sell water for irrigation uses on such terms and conditions as he may prescribe, then we change the basis of the reclamation law.

I believe that by agreeing to this amendment we would be no better off than we would be by retaining the language originally contained in the bill.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. I agree with the Senator from Arizona. I should like to add one further thought: It is a matter of great importance to those of us in the Western States who are greatly inter-

ested in irrigation and reclamation, to preserve the basic features of the long-established law relating to projects of the nature which we have been discussing. But under the provision as it is now written, it would be entirely possible for the Army engineers to construct dams and reservoirs, and to supply water for purposes which would be entirely removed from the reimbursable features, as well as the acreage limitations and the other basic foundations of our irrigation law. I suggest to the Senator from Arizona that instead of saying "except for irrigation" we should adopt language confining the application only to domestic and industrial purposes, as the House bill now provides.

Mr. HAYDEN. If that were done, the proposed amendment might just as well be rejected.

Mr. President, I wish to make a statement as a matter of background. In 1914 Senator Marcus A. Smith, who represented my State in this body, was opposed by a candidate in a primary election who said that if he were elected to the United States Senate he would seek to amend the law so that no reimbursements would be made for irrigation charges. His argument was that river and harbor improvements were made without reimbursement, that flood-control works were constructed without reimbursement, or, if there was reimbursement it was merely nominal, and therefore the same rule should apply to irrigation. It was not my campaign, but I dipped right into it, and I said to the people of the Salt River project, which is one of the great reclamation projects of America, that our lands were being burned up by drought; we asked and plead with the Federal Government to come there under the reclamation law and build a great dam, reservoir, and canal, and we said, "If you come here and do that we will reimburse you for the cost." That was just as solemn an obligation as though a note were signed at the bank to assure that word would be kept. They did keep their word. What is the effect? There is created a revolving fund, as was originally contemplated, and the money which is repaid is used to reclaim lands elsewhere. If we depart from that principle we are doing the entire West and the country as a whole and the Treasury a great injustice.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, I want to make it clear that our opposition to this particular language is that it confers possible advantages for which we have never asked and which we ought not to seek.

Mr. HAYDEN. That is exactly the position I take, and, as I have said, that has been my position for 30 years.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Arizona yield to the Senator from Colorado?

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, I have been trying to get the floor for some time.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Alabama, the chairman of the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation, if I may.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alabama is recognized.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, I want to submit a parliamentary inquiry. Would a motion be in order to refer this amendment to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation for its consideration?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will hold that a motion of that kind would be in order.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Then, Mr. President, I make that motion. I am not for or against this amendment because, frankly, I do not know its provisions. As chairman of the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation, however, I feel that it is my duty in the protection of that committee and of its jurisdiction and of the reclamation laws to object to this kind of procedure attempting to bring about an important and material amendment to the basic law. The discussion which has just taken place fully justifies that position, because it appears that there is a difference of opinion about how far this amendment goes—not that it does not go a part of the way but how far it goes—in changing in a most important way the fundamental law of irrigation and reclamation. If we proceed to enact legislation in this important field by this sort of method, by what might be called a rider to a flood-control program, without any hearing, without any consideration of the changes proposed, without consideration by the committee which has complete jurisdiction of the subject, I submit to the friends of the principle of the irrigation and reclamation laws that they are entering upon a most dangerous proceeding and one which may sooner or later lead to the wreckage of the entire reclamation program.

There are many, in fact, doubtless, there are a large majority of the Members of this body and of the other body who have no direct interest, so far as their constituents are concerned, in the reclamation program, and it might not be difficult to adopt hostile amendments which would have a crippling effect upon this program. I regard it as a great program in the interest of the economy not only of the West but of the entire country, and I should dislike to see adopted a crippling, hamstringing amendment or even amendments that do not appear at this time to be vital but which may become so in the construction and administration of the great program which has been worked out over a period of time by successive legislation, building it up to fit the conditions in the West.

So, whether this is a good amendment or not, I think it should not be entered upon at this time and in this way, and that this important change in the reclamation laws should be referred to the committee which has jurisdiction of irrigation and which has not, as every Member from the West knows, declined to consider or unduly delayed the consideration of any measure sent to that committee dealing with these problems in the West.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I have listened with interest to the statement made by the Senator from Alabama, the chairman of the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation. I think the motion he has made is sound and proper and that the Senate should adopt it.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I do not rise to resist the motion of the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation, of which I am a member. I do wish to say, however, that section 4, the amendment we have been considering, and the succeeding amendment to be offered have the combined purpose of not subjecting all of the detail of the reclamation law to projects where the Army engineers have a reservoir in the middle of an existing privately owned irrigation system, where those who have that private irrigation system are in independent position to take the water and therefore should not be required to go through all the incidents of a reclamation project started from grass roots.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, in the letter from the Secretary of the Interior which was read a few minutes ago the Secretary very vaguely, and I think with a great deal of confusion, referred to the genesis of this amendment which the Senator from Wyoming has presented as being from California interests. Of course, I do not know what the Secretary means by "California interests." I think it is a most unfortunate way for any Cabinet member to characterize the supporters of any issue.

I do not know of any California Representative or Senator who attended the reclamation meeting about which the Senator from Wyoming spoke when he said that was where this amendment was first discussed. I have not had a single letter from California urging my support of the amendment or even discussing it, and I think it is most unfortunate that under those conditions the Secretary of the Interior has sought to focus the attention of the Senate upon California interests.

As a matter of fact, I think I clearly understand what the Secretary is attempting to do. There will later be before the Senate a controversy over the viewpoint of representatives of the State of California and the viewpoint of the Department of the Interior. I think the Secretary of the Interior is endeavoring in advance to prejudice the understanding of the Senate upon that matter, peculiarly affecting California, a subject totally disconnected and independent from the pending one.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD].

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, the motion made by the able Senator from Alabama will probably apply to section 8 of the O'Mahoney amendment and section 8 of the pending bill.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Let me say to the Senator that it is my purpose, when we reach that section of the bill, to make a similar motion.

Mr. OVERTON. I think I am authorized to make this statement: Insofar as the War Department and the Chief of Engineers are concerned, it is immaterial whether these provisions appear in the

bill or not. I stated at the outset of the debate on the bill, when I was presenting it, that there are certain irrigation features which were added to the bill at the request of the Secretary of the Interior, and that they were a departure from the policy we have heretofore been following with respect to the consideration of flood control and river and harbor bills. They have been purely authorization bills, authorizing certain projects to be constructed, either for flood control or for navigation purposes. It was, however, at the request of the Secretary of the Interior, and at his very earnest insistence, that these provisions were included.

Section 8, which is by far the most important section, is, according to my recollection, word for word as recommended by the Secretary of the Interior, and I think he was rather insistent on the provision going into the bill. The War Department has no objection to its going in. That is the situation.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. OVERTON. I yield.

Mr. McFARLAND. I wish to make a parliamentary inquiry. Does the motion of the Senator from Alabama include the committee amendment, or does it include only the amendment proposed by the Senator from Wyoming?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion refers wholly to the amendment offered by the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. OVERTON. Then we will revert to the provisions of the bill, and let that remain as reported by the committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That will be a question to be determined.

Mr. OVERTON. I have no objection then.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion made by the Senator from Alabama that the pending amendment be referred to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, I gave notice that I intended to make the same motion with reference to the amendment appearing as section 8 of the bill, which has not yet been offered, but which I presume will be offered. If the Senator from Louisiana will offer it now, so that we can proceed to consider it, I shall make the motion about section 8.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I shall be very glad to do that.

Mr. BANKHEAD. All the Senator has to do is to offer the amendment, and then I shall make the motion.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, on behalf of the group of Senators who sponsored the amendment, I now offer the following amendment, on page 5, to strike out line 25, and on page 6, lines 1 to 11, inclusive, and to insert in lieu thereof the amendment which I send to the desk.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, I move to refer that amendment to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation for its consideration.

Mr. OVERTON. A parliamentary inquiry. Should not the amendment be stated?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment as offered will be stated by the clerk.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. It comes on pages 8 and 9 of the amendment, pages 5 and 6 of the bill.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 5, after line 24, it is proposed to insert beginning with line 19 of the amendment:

SEC. 9. Hereafter, whenever the Secretary of War determines, upon recommendation by the Secretary of the Interior, that in connection with any dam and reservoir project constructed or to be constructed by the Secretary of War——

Mr. OVERTON. A parliamentary inquiry. That is not all the amendment. The amendment should begin on page 5, to strike out line 25.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I had stated that, and the clerk is just taking up the amendment which is to be inserted.

Mr. OVERTON. I should like to have the entire amendment stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 5, it is proposed to strike out line 25 and on page 6 to strike out lines 1 to 11, inclusive, and in lieu thereof to insert the following as section 8:

SEC. 8. Hereafter, whenever the Secretary of War determines, upon recommendation by the Secretary of the Interior, that in connection with any dam and reservoir project constructed or to be constructed by the Secretary of War additional works for the diversion and distribution of water may be utilized for irrigation, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to make a report and findings on the construction of such additional works for the diversion and distribution of water as he may deem necessary for such purposes. Such report and findings shall be made in accordance with and subject to the provisions of the Federal reclamation laws (act of June 17, 1902 (32 Stat. 388), and acts amendatory thereof or supplemental thereto). Within the limits of the water users' repayment ability, such report may be predicated on the allocation to irrigation of an appropriate portion of the cost of structures and facilities used for irrigation. After specific authorization of the Congress by an authorization act, the Secretary of the Interior shall construct, operate, and maintain such additional works in accordance with said Federal reclamation laws and shall be authorized to deliver to such lands such portion of the water made available by said dam and reservoir project as may be set forth in said report and findings of the Secretary of the Interior or as may be otherwise provided by law. The provisions of this section shall not prejudice lawful uses then existing nor water rights or priorities established under applicable State laws, and shall not apply to any dam or reservoir heretofore or hereafter constructed which supplements any existing locally operated irrigation system or other locally operated water facilities, nor shall this section nor the provisions of section 6 hereof apply to any dam or reservoir heretofore constructed in whole or in part by the Army engineers, which provides conservation storage of water for irrigation purposes.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, I now make the motion I gave notice I would make, that the amendment be referred to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair having held that the other motion was in order, will hold that the motion now made by the Senator from Alabama is in order.

Mr. HAYDEN. Obviously, Mr. President, on the face of the amendment, it seeks to amend the Reclamation Act in a flood-control bill, which is something which should not be done. More than that, however, if we look at the end of the amendment, we find that it states that this change—

shall not apply to any dam or reservoir heretofore or hereafter constructed which supplements any existing locally operated irrigation system or other locally operated water facilities, nor shall this section nor the provisions of section 6 hereof apply to any dam or reservoir heretofore constructed in whole or in part by the Army engineers.

In other words, a rule would be adopted which amends the Reclamation Act as to certain projects, and then the Secretary of War would be given blanket authority to do as he pleases with others, so obviously it is a question which should go to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD].

The motion was agreed to.

NOMINATION OF EDWARD R. STETTINIUS, JR., TO BE SECRETARY OF STATE AND OF MAJ. GEN. PATRICK J. HURLEY TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY TO CHINA

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I desire to call attention——

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. The Committee on Foreign Relations this morning voted unanimously to report favorably the nomination of Mr. Edward R. Stettinius, Jr., to be Secretary of State, and Maj. Gen. Patrick J. Hurley to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to China. These matters are rather urgent, so I ask unanimous consent, as in executive session, that the Senate proceed to the consideration of these two nominations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. LANGER. I wish to object to the giving of unanimous consent at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Chair understand that objection has been made?

Mr. LANGER. Yes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator from North Dakota bear with me for a moment?

Mr. LANGER. Yes.

Mr. CONNALLY. Does the Senator have any objection to either one of these nominees?

Mr. LANGER. There may be.

Mr. CONNALLY. Well, does the Senator have objection? I do not know about "may be."

Mr. LANGER. There may be. I cannot say definitely.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I shall ask that the Senate take up for consideration one of the nominations, if it is agreeable. But I wish to observe to the Senator from North Dakota that the handling of matters dealing with foreign relations is very important.

Mr. LANGER. Is the Senator going to ask that the Senate consider the Hurley nomination?

Mr. CONNALLY. Yes.

Mr. LANGER. I have no objection to that.

Mr. CONNALLY. Is the Senator's objection to the nominee for Secretary of State?

Mr. LANGER. There may be objection.

Mr. CONNALLY. The Senator from North Dakota had the opportunity to appear before the Committee on Foreign Relations. He did not appear.

Mr. LANGER. I am very sorry. I had a meeting of a subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary of which I am chairman.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. I am in complete agreement with the distinguished chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee that it is advisable that the promptest possible action be had on these nominations, and I express the hope that the Senator from North Dakota will at his earliest convenience reach a determination as to whether or not he is to oppose the nomination of Mr. Stettinius.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I should like to have the RECORD very plain that the action of the committee this morning was unanimous; that the Republican side of the committee was unanimous; and I want to add my own testimony that from my knowledge of Mr. Stettinius I think he is one of the ablest possible successors to Secretary Hull and that I cordially join in the hope that with the least possible delay his nomination may be confirmed.

Mr. CONNALLY. I thank the Senator from Michigan. I had observed in my opening remarks that the action of the committee was unanimous. There was no partisanship. There was no objection made by any outside parties. No Senator raised any objection whatever. I sincerely urge the Senator from North Dakota either to withdraw his objection at this time or, if he is going to oppose the confirmation, that he be prepared to do so at the earliest possible date, because this is a matter which affects, not the welfare of Mr. Stettinius but the welfare of all the people of the United States and the people of the world. We do not want any interruption in the processes of carrying on our foreign relations at this critical period.

I do not care to present either one of the nominations, Mr. President, in view of the objection.

FLOOD-CONTROL PROJECTS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4485) authorizing the construction of certain public works on rivers and harbors for flood control, and for other purposes.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I call attention to the fact that by sending to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation the proposed amendment to section 6 of the bill, as reported by the committee, that section, as reported by the committee, is now before the Senate. One of the reasons why it was desired to amend that section was that it provides for the sale by the Secretary of War of water in the West. Ownership of the water does not repose in any individual or in any agents. It reposes in the public. So it was our desire to change this language from an authorization to sell to an authorization to make contracts for the distribution; and so, Mr. President, I now offer a clarifying amendment.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. OVERTON. Before the Senator from Wyoming offers the amendment, there is a committee amendment in section 6 which ought to be acted on first, and then any other amendments may be offered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair holds that the committee has the right to perfect the section before it is subject to amendment from the floor. The committee amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 5, in line 13 of section 6, after the word "Department", it is proposed to insert *"Provided,* That no sale of such water shall adversely affect then existing lawful uses of such water."

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President——

Mr. OVERTON. The committee amendment has not been acted upon.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I desire to ask the Senator to modify the committee amendment, because of the use of the word "sale." My purpose was to provide for contracts for the water. So I move that the committee amendment be altered so as to read:

Provided, That no contracts for such water shall adversely affect then existing lawful uses of such water.

Mr. OVERTON. There is no objection on the part of the committee to that modification.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment will be so modified.

The amendment, as modified, will now be stated.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, may I now offer the following amendment——

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, we have not yet acted on the committee amendment, as modified.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment in section 6, on page 5, as modified.

The amendment, as modified, was agreed to.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, may I inquire as to the interpretation of other language in the very section with which the Senator from Wyoming is dealing? If we change the word "sale" to "contracts," in the committee amendment in line 13, will it not be necessary to change the language appearing in line 8, on page 5 of the bill?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Yes. That would also be necessary. I began, however, from the other end, by taking the language in the committee amendment. So, Mr. President, on page 5, in lines 8 and 9, I move to strike out the words "sell to" and to insert in lieu thereof the words "make contracts with", so that the beginning of the section will read:

That the Secretary of War is authorized to make contracts with States, municipalities—

And so forth.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, there is no objection on the part of the committee to that change being made.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 5, in lines 8 and 9, it is proposed to strike out the words "sell to" and to insert in lieu thereof "make contracts with."

Mr. OVERTON. I again make the observation that there is no objection on the part of the committee to that amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, now I desire to call to the attention of the Senator from Arizona——

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me again?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Yes.

Mr. BURTON. As a matter of clarification, and as a matter of legal interpretation, I wish to ask the Senator from Wyoming, would it be necessary to change the language in the last sentence of section 6, that is the language "All moneys received from such sales shall be deposited," or would the language be satisfactory as it stands?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I thank the Senator. The word "sales" should be changed to the word "contracts."

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the word "sales" in line 15 on page 5 be changed to "contracts."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 5, in line 15, it is proposed to strike out the word "sales", and to insert in lieu thereof the word "contracts."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Now, Mr. President, I desire to call the attention of the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD] and the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] to the fact that the motion which was made to refer to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation the proposed amendment to section 8 which I offered earlier in the day, leaves before

us the committee amendment which appears on page 6 of the bill. This is a new section 8.

The last proviso of that section, however, is language which came from the House, and it deals precisely with the subject which aroused the interest of the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] and the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN]. Let me read that language:

Provided, That this section shall not apply to any dam or reservoir heretofore constructed which supplements any existing locally operated irrigation districts.

The Senator from Nebraska should have an opportunity to present his amendment. The Senator from Arizona has now entered the Chamber. Let me invite his attention to the bill as reported by the committee.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. OVERTON. What is before the Senate?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. There is nothing before the Senate at the moment. I am merely exercising the senatorial prerogative of talking.

Mr. OVERTON. If the Senator from Wyoming will permit me, I think the clerk ought to state the committee amendment appearing in the bill on page 6, after line 11.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That, of course, is the proper parliamentary procedure, and I have no objection.

Mr. OVERTON. I believe that is the proper procedure. We can then proceed in an orderly way.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next committee amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 6, after line 11, it is proposed to insert the following:

SEC. 8. Hereafter, whenever the Secretary of War determines, upon recommendation by the Secretary of the Interior, that any dam and reservoir project operated under the direction of the Secretary of War may be utilized for irrigation purposes, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to construct, operate, and maintain, under the provisions of the Federal reclamation laws (act of June 17, 1902, 32 Stat. 388, and acts amendatory thereof or supplementary thereto), such additional works in connection therewith as he may deem necessary for irrigation purposes. Such irrigation works may be undertaken only after a report and findings thereon have been made by the Secretary of the Interior as provided in said Federal reclamation laws and after subsequent specific authorization of the Congress by an authorization act; and, within the limits of the water users' repayment ability, such report may be predicated on the allocation to irrigation of an appropriate portion of the cost of structures and facilities used for irrigation and other purposes. Dams and reservoirs operated under the direction of the Secretary of War may be utilized hereafter for irrigation purposes only in conformity with the provisions of this section, but the foregoing requirement shall not prejudice lawful uses now existing.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, if the Senator from Arizona will look on page 7 of the bill as reported by the committee, he will find that the concluding sentence of section 8 is language which came to the Senate from the House. It reads as follows:

Provided, That this section shall not apply to any dam or reservoir heretofore constructed which supplements any existing locally operated irrigation districts.

That provision was contained in section 8, which the Senate has referred to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation. Obviously, nothing will be gained by referring the amendment to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation if the language as contained in the bill as it passed the House remains in the bill. I knew that the Senator from Nebraska, as well as the Senator from Arizona, had made some comments about that precise section, so I wished to give notice before action was taken.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, it seems to me that it would be the part of wisdom to strike out that proviso, and at least take it to conference. Then there could be no question about the entire matter.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, that question will arise later. The sole question now is on agreeing to the committee amendment. Is there any objection to the committee amendment? The proviso is not a part of the committee amendment.

Mr. HAYDEN. Is it in order to move to strike out the proviso at this time?

Mr. OVERTON. We should act first on the committee amendment. The proviso is not a committee amendment. It was in the bill as it came from the House.

Mr. HAYDEN. Then, as I understand, it will be in order, as soon as the committee amendment is disposed of, to move to strike out the proviso.

Mr. OVERTON. It will be in order.

Mr. HAYDEN. Very well.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, in view of the statement just made by the distinguished senior Senator from Wyoming, I should like to say that I am not offering an amendment to this section. I am ready to vote on the committee amendment. If the amendment to this section as proposed in the so-called O'Mahoney amendment had been agreed to, I would have had an amendment to offer to that section; but inasmuch as that amendment has been referred to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation, I have no objection to proceeding to a vote on section 8, which is now before the Senate for consideration. I am in favor of the committee amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment, on page 6, after line 11.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I now move to strike out the proviso on page 7, lines 9 to 11.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The proviso proposed to be stricken will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 7, line 9, after the word "existing", it is proposed to strike out "*Provided,* That this section shall not apply to any dam or reservoir heretofore constructed which supplements any existing locally operated irrigation districts."

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator from Arizona to explain exactly why he wishes that language stricken out?

Mr. HAYDEN. Because if we are to proceed in the way the committee has recommended, it ought to be done that way. If not, we should not adopt the amendment. I do not like to see a proposal adopted, and then have an exception made to it when we do not know how broad or how narrow the exception is. Either we ought to do it or we ought not to do it. For that reason, since we are changing the situation and providing for cooperative action, we should have cooperation everywhere. Therefore, I suggest that the proviso be stricken, and taken to conference.

Mr. OVERTON. It will be in conference, and we can work it out there.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I should like to ask a question of the Senator from Arizona. Will the Senator from Arizona please explain what action was taken?

Mr. HAYDEN. The committee made a recommendation for cooperative action.

Mr. WHERRY. Yes.

Mr. HAYDEN. If we are to have cooperative action, let us have it, and not have an exception to it when we do not know just what the exception means. The language is vague. It says:

Provided, That this section shall not apply to any dam or reservoir heretofore constructed which supplements any existing locally operated irrigation districts.

It ought to be stricken out.

Mr. WHERRY. And it has been stricken out by the Senate?

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, on behalf of my distinguished colleague the senior Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON] and myself, I offer the following amendment: After the word "existing", in line 9, on page 7, strike out the colon, insert a period, and add the following: "This section shall not apply to any dam or reservoir heretofore constructed in whole or in part by the Army engineers, which provides conservation storage of water for irrigation purposes."

I should like to explain the purpose of that amendment. It is in the O'Mahoney amendment, but was not in the bill as it came from the House. In the late 1930s an able Representative from Colorado initiated the steps which resulted in the so-called Caddoa Dam on the Arkansas River. It was an odd project, in which irrigation storage was planned and built into it from the beginning, but there were no provisions in the enabling law as to how that storage should be financed, or how it should be handled. Since then there has been a water dispute between the State of Kansas and the State of Colorado involving, among other things, the waters stored

in that reservoir. So we do not wish to do anything here that could possibly prejudice these situations. The language which I have proposed will protect them.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator please send his amendment to the desk?

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Mr. President, may I inquire of the Senator from Louisiana whether or not this is the opportune time to renew the discussion with regard to flood control in the Connecticut River?

Mr. OVERTON. There is an amendment pending, which the clerk is about to state.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. I was about to send for the Senator from Vermont if this were the opportune time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senators from Colorado will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 7, line 9, after the word "existing", it is proposed to strike out the colon, insert a period and the following: "This section shall not apply to any dam or reservoir heretofore constructed in whole or in part by the Army engineers, which provides conservation storage of water for irrigation purposes."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senators from Colorado.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I now offer the last of these various amendments. I call the attention of the clerk to page 10 of the printed amendments.

On page 20 of the bill, it is proposed to strike out lines 5 to 25, inclusive; on page 21, it is proposed to strike out lines 1 and 2; and on page 7, between lines 11 and 12, it is proposed to insert a new section, which will be numbered section 9. I ask that it be read at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair asks that the amendments be stated separately and voted on separately, if there is no objection. Without objection, the first amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 20, it is proposed to strike out lines 5 to 25, inclusive, and on page 21 it is proposed to strike out lines 1 and 2.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The next amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 7, between lines 11 and 12, it is proposed to insert the following new section:

SEC. 9. (a) The general comprehensive plans set forth in House Document 475 and Senate Document 191, Seventy-eighth Congress, second session, as revised and coordinated by Senate Document 247, Seventy-eighth Congress, second session, are hereby approved and the initial stages recommended are hereby authorized and shall be prosecuted by the War Department and the Department of the Interior as speedily as may be consistent with budgetary requirements.

(b) The general comprehensive plan for flood control and other purposes in the Missouri River Basin approved by the act of June 28, 1938, as modified by subsequent acts, is hereby expanded to include the works referred to in paragraph (a) to be undertaken by the War Department; and said expanded plan shall be prosecuted under the direction of the Secretary of War and supervision of the Chief of Engineers.

(c) Subject to the basin-wide findings and recommendations regarding the benefits, the allocations of costs and the repayments by water users, made in said House and Senate documents, the reclamation and power developments to be undertaken by the Secretary of the Interior under said plans, shall be governed by the Federal Reclamation Laws (act of June 17, 1902, 32 Stat. 388, and acts amendatory thereof or supplementary thereto), except that irrigation of Indian trust and tribal lands, and repayment therefor, shall be in accordance with the laws relating to Indian lands.

(d) In addition to previous authorizations there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of $200,000,000 for the partial accomplishment of the works to be undertaken under said expanded plans by the Corps of Engineers.

(e) The sum of $200,000,000 is hereby authorized to be appropriated for the partial accomplishment of the works to be undertaken under said plans by the Secretary of the Interior.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, I understand that all the committee amendments have been disposed of, with the exception of one pertaining to the Connecticut River Basin. Of course, I understand that a small committee amendment pertaining to the Connecticut River Basin still remains to be acted upon. It provides that none of the dams shall be operated for the generation of hydroelectric power.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Mr. President, I would say to the Senator from Louisiana that the controversy which has taken place yesterday and today between the Senators from Vermont and Connecticut has been adjusted satisfactorily, and an amendment which is agreeable to all concerned is to be offered.

In view of the absence of the Senator from Vermont, who will propose the amendment, I think I should suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. OVERTON. Very well.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Davis	Johnson, Colo.
Austin	Downey	Kilgore
Bailey	Ellender	Langer
Bankhead	Ferguson	Lucas
Bilbo	George	McClellan
Brewster	Gerry	McFarland
Brooks	Gillette	McKellar
Buck	Green	Maloney
Burton	Guffey	Maybank
Bushfield	Gurney	Mead
Butler	Hall	Millikin
Byrd	Hatch	Murray
Capper	Hawkes	Nye
Caraway	Hayden	O'Daniel
Clark, Mo.	Hill	O'Mahoney
Connally	Holman	Overton
Cordon	Jenner	Radcliffe
Danaher	Johnson, Calif.	Reed
Revercomb	Thomas, Okla.	Weeks
Reynolds	Thomas, Utah	Wheeler
Robertson	Tunnell	Wherry
Russell	Vandenberg	White
Shipstead	Wagner	Wiley
Stewart	Wallgren	Willis
Taft	Walsh, Mass.	
Thomas, Idaho	Walsh, N. J.	

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I renew the statement made earlier in the day of the necessary absence, upon business of the Senate, of the senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Seventy-six Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, I am about to ask permission to perfect my amendment and because, as originally submitted, it was sponsored by a number of Senators, I make a unanimous-consent request to perfect it. I realize that under the rules, had I submitted the amendment alone I could perfect it myself. But under the circumstances I ask unanimous consent to perfect my amendment.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. AUSTIN. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. Referring to page 10, lines 5 to 7, would the language there contained be included or eliminated?

Mr. AUSTIN. If the amendment is effective in touching the committee amendment, it would delete the language to which the Senator has referred. My amendment does not undertake to deal with that point.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AUSTIN. I yield.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Is there not a separate committee amendment now pending which would deal with the provision referred to?

Mr. AUSTIN. Yes.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Will the Senator from Vermont yield so that I may ask a question of the Senator from Louisiana?

Mr. AUSTIN. I yield.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. I ask the chairman of the subcommittee if there is not pending an amendment relating to the development of dams in the Connecticut River Valley?

Mr. OVERTON. There is.

Mr. AUSTIN. So I understand the amendment relating to that subject will be discussed separately.

Mr. OVERTON. I so understand.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, has my unanimous-consent request been acted upon?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request of the Senator from Vermont to perfect the amendment? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, I perfect the amendment, as follows: On page 10, I wish to amend by striking out lines 3 to 7, inclusive, and inserting the following:

Nothing in this act or in any previous authorization shall be construed to authorize the construction of a dam other than a flood-control-type dam, on the main stream of the West River in the towns of Dummerston or Newfane, in the State of Vermont: *Provided,*

further, That the Army engineers are authorized and directed to construct eight reservoirs in the West River Basin in Vermont instead of the flood-control reservoir authorized by existing law, known as the Williamsville Reservoir in the above-mentioned towns, in accordance with an alternative plan submitted by the Vermont State Water Conservation Board as the same may be modified by agreement between the said board and the Secretary of War and the Chief of Engineers, provided the total costs of the alternative plan shall not exceed the sum of $11,000,000 and the amount of flood control secured by them at the entrance of the waters of the West River into the Connecticut River shall not be less than 75 percent of the flood control which may be secured from the single so-called Williamsville Reservoir now authorized to be constructed by the Army engineers. Plans, proposals, or reports heretofore authorized for construction at Cambridgeport, Ludlow, South Tunbridge, and Gaysville in the Connecticut River Basin, or any modification hereafter made of the comprehensive plan for the Connecticut River Basin in Vermont under authority of the Flood Control Act approved June 28, 1938, or of section 3 of the Flood Control Act approved August 18, 1941, shall not be carried out until after compliance with the provisions of paragraph (a) of section — of this act.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AUSTIN. I yield.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Did the Senator mean to strike out lines 3 to 7, inclusive? The language beginning with the word *"Provided"*, in line 5 and continuing to the end of line 7, is in the form of a committee amendment and has not yet been acted upon. Therefore there would be nothing at that point to exclude.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, if the Senator from Vermont will yield to me, I may say that if the proposed amendment should be adopted, it would have the effect of striking out the committee amendment.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. In other words, if the amendment were adopted it would eliminate the amendment which has been proposed by the committee, as well as the House text of the bill.

Mr. OVERTON. The Senator is correct. The amendment of the Senator from Vermont would be, on page 10 in line 3, to strike out down to and including line 7, the following language:

That neither this authorization nor previous authorizations shall be construed to authorize the construction of a high dam at the Williamsville site: *Provided further*, That none of the dams herein authorized for the Connecticut River Basin shall be utilized for the generation of hydroelectric power.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. That makes the situation clear, and it is in accordance with my personal wishes. However, I do not know whether the Senator from Vermont desires to include the language beginning in line 5 and reading as follows:

Provided further, That none of the dams herein authorized for the Connecticut River Basin shall be utilized for the generation of hydroelectric power.

My understanding is that if his amendment is adopted the language which I have just read, including the committee amendment, would be stricken from the bill.

Mr. AUSTIN. On that point I understand that in connection with any of the dams which are appropriately so constructed, it would be possible to make of them power dams as well as flood-control dams if an agreement to do so were arrived at between the Federal Government and the State. Another opportunity would be afforded for cooperation, proper consideration having been given to the views of the people at home.

On that point, Mr. President, allow me to say that our great concern has been to protect, if possible, certain interests which were emphasized in the testimony. One interest was recreation. Recreation is of real interest to Vermont. It is not only a human interest, but it turns into cash. Vermonters need the cash.

Another interest was that of agriculture, to avoid unnecessary destruction of any of the good farm lands in the valleys affected. I say "unnecessary destruction"; I mean for the purposes of flood control. That policy may still be carried out in spite of the elimination of the committee amendment.

Now I will make a brief explanation of what the perfected amendment would do.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield there?

Mr. AUSTIN. I yield.

Mr. HILL. As I understand, the amendment which the Senator from Vermont now offers is in lieu of the committee amendment as well as some language which was in the bill as it passed the House of Representatives. Is that correct?

Mr. AUSTIN. Yes. The language as it passed the House and which is eliminated is as follows:

Provided, That neither this authorization nor previous authorizations shall be construed to authorize the construction of a high dam at the Williamsville site.

And the language which is in the committee amendment is:

Provided further, That none of the dams herein authorized for the Connecticut River Basin shall be utilized for the generation of hydroelectric power.

Mr. HILL. All that language goes out, does it not?

Mr. AUSTIN. Yes; it all goes out.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. The committee amendment was not a matter of discussion among the Senators, although it was a matter on which I thought we ought to reach an agreement. It is satisfactory to me personally that those provisions be eliminated; but the controversy was over the language of the House provision rather than the language of the committee amendment.

Mr. AUSTIN. That is correct. Let me state for the RECORD that my colleague and I appreciate the good spirit in which the distinguished Senators from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH and Mr. WEEKS] and the distinguished Senators from Connecticut [Mr. MALONEY and Mr. DANAHER] cooperated in arriving at the content and language of this amended amendment. We appreciate it greatly, and we are all in harmony on it as it now stands.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AUSTIN. I yield to my colleague.

Mr. AIKEN. I should like the RECORD also to show that the Member of the House of Representatives from Springfield, Mass., Mr. CLASON, was present at the conference at which this compromise was agreed upon.

Mr. AUSTIN. That is correct.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. It was suggested to the Member of the House, Mr. CLASON, to whom the Senator from Vermont has referred, that his name be mentioned as one of those who cooperated, but out of his extreme modesty he said he would just as soon not be included. I think, however, he is deserving of having his name appear, for no one in the Congress has been more interested or has been more helpful during the years in urging flood control in the Connecticut Valley.

Mr. AIKEN. I think we should overwhelm his modesty and have his name show in the RECORD.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, the first part of this amendment as it is now drafted is expressly directed to the West River Basin, that is, the river itself and its tributaries. It provides for the substitution of eight dams for one, the dam mentioned as the Williamsville Dam. Four of the eight dams would be on the West River itself and four of them on tributaries thereof. The plan would include a dam at Mount Taber on Mount Taber Branch; a dam on West River called The Island location; a dam on Winhall Brook; a dam on West River at Jamaica; a dam on Whetstone Brook; a dam on West River above Townshend; a dam on Dover Branch above South Newfane, and a dam at the site of the old Williamsville station in the town of Newfane.

It is expected that the carrying out of this plan will accomplish a greater degree of flood control than provided in the limitation contained in this amendment. The limitation on this project is that—

The amount of flood control secured by them—

That is the eight dams—

at the entrance of the waters of the West River into the Connecticut River shall not be less than 75 percent of the flood control which may be secured from the single so-called Williamsville Reservoir, now authorized to be constructed by the Army engineers.

Their own research and planning indicates that if these eight dams are constructed as now planned they will in fact provide for a drainage area of 358.8 square miles or 88 percent of the total area.

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Vermont yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Vermont yield to the Senator from Connecticut?

Mr. AUSTIN. I yield.

Mr. MALONEY. If the Senator is willing, I should like to have it appear in his remarks that as we sought a compromise we were constantly advised by the Army engineers, or a representative of the Army engineers, we wanted to be sure that we were not denying proper flood protection to the lower valley. As we understand, the Army engineers are in accord with the action we propose to take. Is that correct?

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, I cannot speak for the Army engineers, but the engineer who has represented them here, helping the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee in the conduct of this bill, has gone over this text very thoroughly and takes the position that the Army engineers are ready to carry out the design or plan the Congress approves and that they have no objection to the plan here proposed. There was a question on one point, namely, the type of dam at the Williamsville site.

Mr. MALONEY. I know that to be so, because I raised that question myself.

Mr. AUSTIN. The difference is between the use of the words "detention type dam" and "flood control dam," and the Army engineers and the representative here of the Vermont Water Conservation Commission have gone over that subject fully and have agreed on the language adopted, which is "flood control type of dam," instead of "detention type of dam."

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AUSTIN. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I think we might further show in the RECORD that, regardless of what the dam is called, whether a detention, retention, or flood-control dam, we mean that type of dam which permits the water to flow through immediately following a flood as fast as the river below can accommodate it, so that the area back of it will be cleared of water within a reasonably short time after the storm rather than perhaps taking months to be drained off, thus enabling the farmers to use their lands for grazing purposes or any other purpose, perhaps cutting a little hay from it.

Mr. AUSTIN. I think I ought to say that in the conversation between the Army engineers and the representative of the water conservation commission on that point the understanding was that this dam could be of a type having gates in it so that if the crest of a flood on the Connecticut River reached so dangerous a height that it became important for flood control to do so, the dam could be closed completely, and thus stop the flood entirely until the crest of the flood in the Connecticut had passed by the outlet of the West River. The understanding was that type of dam ought to be erected and that it was a better type of dam than one that merely had a fixed outlet in it. So it is understood that the words "flood-control dam," as distinguished from "detention dam," make it possible for gates, or valves, to be constructed in this particular dam in order to obtain the highest degree of control of the water at the peak of the flood. It was also stated that in all probability no good purpose could be served in detaining the water longer than necessary to allow the peak of the flood to pass by the mouth of the West River.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, I wish to make an observation or two, and that will be all I shall have to say in reference to the amendment suggested by the senior Senator from Vermont.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Mr. President, the Senator from Vermont has only two more clauses in the amendment to explain, and I suggest that we then have the explanation of the Senator from Louisiana. The Senator from Vermont was in the middle of the explanation, and there are only two more clauses.

Mr. OVERTON. I appreciate the Senator's yielding. I shall wait.

Mr. AUSTIN. Another new clause in the amendment is the proviso:

> That the total cost of the alternative plan shall not exceed the sum of $11,000,000.

The estimates relied upon by us in this negotiation are as follows: We have understood that the single dam at Williamsville, as planned, would cost $8,400,000, and that the eight dams, as we have calculated, would cost $9,514,240.

In consideration of the protection and the saving of property which would be made by the choice of the eight dams instead of a single dam, this difference of a million dollars in the cost of the project is entirely reasonable, and from an economic point of view entirely justified. The sum of $11,000,000 is stated in the bill as a sufficiently generous authorization to take care of errors and estimates, so that we can feel sure that the project is not to be held up on account of the lack of an adequate authorization.

Unless there is question about that, I shall pass on to the last observation I wish to make.

Mr. BAILEY. Before the Senator proceeds, will he yield?

Mr. AUSTIN. I yield.

Mr. BAILEY. The Senator's amendment is a substitute for the portion of the bill appearing on lines 3 to 7, on page 10, and that does away with the Senate committee amendment, "*Provided further*, That none of the dams herein authorized for the Connecticut River Basin shall be utilized for the generation of hydroelectric power." What is the effect of the Senator's amendment with respect to the generation of hydroelectric power?

Mr. AUSTIN. The effect of the amendment would be to permit the use of the type of dam in which hydroelectric power could be generated if the Army engineers and the officials of the State of Vermont agreed upon it. It merely gives the people of the State a chance to be heard on that question, and it is based upon the knowledge we have of the additional destructiveness to farm lands and to highways, and the creation of a nuisance in the way of exposed wet soil close to highways, which things affect our economic interests, and affect the human elements which are involved in this problem.

It also benefits us in this regard, that in a river valley like that of the Yadkin-Pee Dee, there is the same problem which the distinguished Senator from North Carolina met with respect to the situation in his State. Our problem is that the type of dam, whether for the generation of electricity or not, changes the injury which may be suffered on account of the removal from the valley of houses in case the dam were built for electric generation.

There are other interests of the State to be consulted in connection with the decision as to whether in a certain valley the type of dam shall be one from which hydroelectric power can be generated.

Mr. BAILEY. I think the Senator's amendment provides very properly for advice from the State, but how is that advice to be gotten, from the governor, from the legislature, or from the utilities commission; or in what manner?

Mr. AUSTIN. Subdivision (a) of the amendment offered by the Senator from Wyoming, which has already been accepted, points out the manner. Does the Senator care to have me read that?

Mr. BAILEY. No; if it is in the amendment, I can read it.

Mr. AUSTIN. Very well. A way is pointed out by which to consult the State governments. It is not limited to the State of Vermont, or to the West River Valley, or to any valley. It is a provision which covers the entire United States and enables all the States of the Union to be heard on the problems which are peculiar to their localities.

On one side of a certain meridian there is no substantial need for irrigation; on the other side there is great interest in it. Of course, the consideration of what the construction of dams will affect on one side of the meridian is different from that applicable to the other side.

We come under the benefit of that provision by the last clause, which I was about to point out. This will be my last comment about this new text. It reads as follows:

> Plans, proposals, or reports heretofore authorized for construction at Cambridgeport, Ludlow, South Tunbridge, and Gaysville, in the Connecticut River Basin, or any modification hereafter—

And "hereafter" is a new word—

> or any modification hereafter made of the comprehensive plan for the Connecticut River Basin in Vermont under the authority of the Flood Control Act approved June 28, 1938, or of section 3 of the Flood Control Act approved August 18, 1941, shall not be carried out until after compliance with the provisions of paragraph (a) of section —— of this act.

Now I think that, on my own desire, I shall read paragraph (a):

> In conformity with this policy:
>
> (a) Plans, proposals, or reports of the Chief of Engineers, War Department, for any works of improvement for navigation or flood control not heretofore or herein authorized, shall be submitted to the Congress only upon compliance with the provisions of this paragraph (a). Investigations which form the basis of any such plans, proposals, or reports shall be conducted in such a manner as to give to the affected State or States, during the course of the investigations, information developed by the investigations

and also opportunity for consultation regarding plans and proposals, and to the extent deemed practicable by the Chief of Engineers, opportunity to cooperate in the investigations. If such investigations in whole or part are concerned with the use or control of waters arising west of the ninety-seventh meridian, the Chief of Engineers shall give to the Secretary of the Interior, during the course of the investigations, information developed by the investigations and also opportunity for consultation regarding plans and proposals, and to the extent deemed practicable by the Chief of Engineers, opportunity to cooperate in the investigations. The relations of the Chief of Engineers with any State under this paragraph (a) shall be with the Governor of the State or such official or agency of the State as the Governor may designate. The term "affected State or States" shall include those in which the works or any part thereof are proposed to be located; those which in whole or part are both within the drainage basin involved and situated in a State lying wholly or in part west of the ninety-eighth meridian; and such of those which are east of the ninety-eighth meridian as, in the judgment of the Chief of Engineers, will be substantially affected. Such plans, proposals, or reports and related investigations shall be made to the end, among other things, of facilitating the coordination of plans for the construction and operation of the proposed works with other plans involving the waters which would be used or controlled by such proposed works. Each report submitting any such plans or proposals to the Congress shall set out therein, among other things, the relationship between the plans for construction and operation of the proposed works and the plans, if any, submitted by the affected States and by the Secretary of the Interior. The Chief of Engineers shall transmit a copy of his proposed report to each affected State, and, in case the plans or proposals covered by the report are concerned with the use or control of waters which rise in whole or in part west of the ninety-seventh meridian, to the Secretary of the Interior. Within 90 days from the date of receipt of said proposed report, the written views and recommendations of each affected State and of the Secretary of the Interior may be submitted to the Chief of Engineers. The Secretary of War shall transmit to the Congress, with such comments and recommendations as he deems appropriate, the proposed report together with the submitted views and recommendations of affected States and of the Secretary of the Interior. The Secretary of War may prepare and make said transmittal any time following said 90-day period. The letter of transmittal and its attachments shall be printed as a House or Senate document.

That is all of paragraph (a), and it has been accepted by the Senate, and it is the paragraph to which my amendment refers.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AUSTIN. I yield.

Mr. BAILEY. The language is general, but I think it applies to all the projects in the bill.

Mr. AUSTIN. Yes, indeed. It would not have been necessary to mention it in my amendment were it not for the fact that we are dealing with a prior authorization which is not covered by paragraph (a), unless we include such parts of the previous authorization as we wish to have included, and so we name them, we point them out, and we say that on such a valley, and on such a valley, this shall be done. We say that if hereafter any modifications are to be made in the authorized plans, that then such modifications shall come under paragraph (a).

Mr. BAILEY. I take it the Senator's amendment relates to a very special case in which the Senator has to place the language in question.

Mr. AUSTIN. Yes.

Mr. BAILEY. But to the other projects generally the language which the Senator has just read will apply?

Mr. OVERTON. Not as to projects contained in this bill, but projects hereafter undertaken.

Mr. BAILEY. I am speaking about projects which may hereafter be undertaken.

Mr. AUSTIN. Yes.

Mr. BAILEY. I tried to follow the Senator while he was very kindly reading the language. It is very difficult to follow the reading of a long paragraph or the reading of several paragraphs. No preventive power is placed in a State.

Mr. AUSTIN. No.

Mr. BAILEY. The only power is that of conference, or of protest, perhaps.

Mr. AUSTIN. That is true.

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, in order that the record may be clear, let me say that it provides a little more power than simply the power to protest. If the governor of the State protests, it provides the power of delaying, the power to demand further consideration.

Mr. OVERTON. If I may be permitted, I think I could clarify the situation. It would admit of no delay except the delay of 90 days in which the g vernor or governors must submit a report, which report will be incorporated in the report of the Chief of Engineers. That is the only delay that would occur under the language of paragraph (a) to which the Senator has referred. There is no power in a governor to set aside any project which the Congress has authorized. There is no power to vitiate any act of Congress. The only power, as stated by the Senator from Vermont, is one of conference and one of protest.

Mr. AUSTIN. It provides an opportunity to be heard, which is vitally important. It provides for cooperation, which I think will be a new principle in the relationship between the Federal Government and the several States. For many years we have clashed over the subject of States' rights, and when we have had our greatest difficulty it has been simply because there was not provided any machinery or means by which the Federal Government and the State governments could get together and undertake to work out the plans in cooperation. This is a new principle, and I am very much in favor of it.

Mr. BAILEY. I agree with the Senator.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Mr. President, will the Senator yield, so that I may attempt to clarify the matter?

Mr. AUSTIN. I yield.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. The provisions which the Senator from Vermont has read, and which are a duplication of the O'Mahoney amendment which is included in the bill as now drafted, only apply, so far as the Connecticut River Valley is concerned, to four dams, and then only to future changes that may be made in the plans. The word "hereafter" is of vital importance. It does not apply in any other respect to the construction of flood control in the Connecticut River.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President, I will say frankly I am very much interested in the undertaking to institute a new and better policy. I am not opposing the proposition, but I am inquiring because of the peculiar situation I am in in North Carolina. The Senator referred to it. I shall not undertake to describe it. The Army engineers said that they proposed to build a dam at a given point for multiple purposes; that is, flood control and the production of electric power. They then proposed to build a dam 30 feet or 40 feet or 100 feet higher, wholly in the interest of the production of electrical energy. Now, does the State have the right under the general provision which the Senator read, to call that in question, and ask for delay, and ask for its views to be considered?

Mr. AUSTIN. I shall state what I understand the situation to be. I understand that that special project was deleted from this bill by an amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from North Carolina. Therefore it is not authorized. Is that correct?

Mr. BAILEY. I had to move to strike out the Yadkin-Pee Dee project, because it would result in so much destruction.

Mr. AUSTIN. Is it not true that it is not an authorized project?

Mr. BAILEY. It has been approved by the engineers, and it was placed in this bill for the purpose of authorization.

Mr. AUSTIN. It has not yet been authorized by Congress.

Mr. BAILEY. It has been stricken from the bill by my amendment.

Mr. AUSTIN. Very well. On that understanding, North Carolina would have the same benefit of this provision, paragraph (a), with respect to the Yadkin-Pee Dee River as any other river. The amendment, which we agreed to, which we refer to as paragraph (a), applies all over the United States.

Mr. BAILEY. The Senator has made it very clear to me, and I thank him.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, I have no idea of taking the time of the Senate further. I believe after the very considerate attention that has been given by everyone interested to this amendment, and the unanimity of agreement among those who have been specially interested in it, that it ought to be accepted by our colleagues in the Senate.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, I wish to congratulate the Senators from Connecticut, Massachusetts, and Vermont upon having arrived at an understanding with respect to this very controversial matter. I shall not oppose the amendment which has been offered by the very able and distinguished senior Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN]. I wish to see an end to the controversy upon the floor of the Senate just as soon as possible in order that we may complete consideration of the bill.

However, I wish to make this observation in order that this action may not be used as a precedent hereafter. I do not think it is a wise policy—and it is one which has never been pursued so far as the committees of both Houses are concerned—to agree to the incorporation in a bill of a new project which has not been reported on by the Chief of Engineers and has not undergone committee hearings.

There are eight reservoirs which, by the amendment, the Chief of Engineers is authorized and directed to construct. Those eight reservoirs, on the tributaries of the West River, as I understand, have not been reported on by the Chief of Engineers and have not undergone committee hearings. However, since this problem with reference to the Connecticut River Basin has been before Congress for so many years, and since there is a concord between the distinguished representatives of the three States concerned, I believe that there should be no opposition to the adoption of the amendment by the Senate. For that reason I shall not oppose it, but I do not wish it to be urged hereafter as a precedent.

As I have heretofore said with reference to the Yadkin-Pee Dee project, the action taken in that connection was not the inclusion of a new project which has never been considered. It was the elimination of a project which had been considered. I was perfectly willing to eliminate the project, because it affected only North Carolina, and because the Senator from North Carolina desired that it be deleted from the bill. Therefore I had no objection.

In the State of Pennsylvania there were two reservoirs which I believe affected only Pennsylvania, and which the two Senators from Pennsylvania desired to have eliminated. They were very small and insignificant. That question did not involve the substitution of new projects, and there was no objection to the proposal.

There was a small project in Indiana, and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER] desired to have it eliminated. His statement on the floor was that it affected only a very small area within the State of Indiana. From my own knowledge of that project, I should say that in a rather remote and perhaps insignificant way, it does affect the flood waters of the Mississippi River, because it is on a tributary of the Mississippi River; but I thought that that was too remote to give any importance to it.

Those are the exceptions which I think might be held against me; but in the future I do not wish to have any Senator say on the floor that we must agree to some new project because the two Senators from the State in which the project is located desire its inclusion in the bill, even though it has not undergone engineering investigation and committee hearings.

To repeat, I am very happy that at long last there is, so far as the Senate can go, apparently an amicable settlement of this controversy.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Mr. President, we can all understand the fear and apprehension which the distinguished Senator from Louisiana entertains toward accepting legislation which has been framed outside the committee, and through a compromise reached by various Senators. We are grateful to him for his graciousness and for his willingness to accept the decision which we have made after much deliberation.

In my own name, and in the name of my distinguished colleague [Mr. WEEKS], as well as in the names of the Senators from Connecticut, I wish to express appreciation to both the distinguished Senators from Vermont for their willingness to cooperate with us in reaching this agreement.

We had two objectives which were entirely in conflict with each other. The objective of the Senators from Connecticut and Massachusetts was to protect the lives of their people and the property of their people against floods coming down through the waters of the Connecticut River from the State of Vermont, where the headwaters are. The objective of the Senators from Vermont—a very worthy and praiseworthy one—has never been to prevent reasonable flood-control protection to the States below the State of Vermont. They have strenuously and insistently, over a long period of time, insisted in adopting flood-control projects that nothing more than was absolutely necessary should be done in the way of usurpation of property or prevention of the conservation of their territory. That has been their position, if I correctly understand it.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. I yield.

Mr. AUSTIN. That is a very gracious statement, Mr. President, coming from the dean of the New England delegation in the Senate. It is very pleasing to us. The recognition of years of amicable relationship among us in general, and especially upon the subject of flood control, in which we have interests which seem to be in opposition to each other, is characteristic of the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts, who has just spoken. On behalf of my colleague [Mr. AIKEN] and myself, as well as the whole State of Vermont, I wish to have the RECORD show our gratitude.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. I thank the Senator. I ought to say to the Senator that we fully sympathize with the point of view of the Senators from Vermont. I myself, when alone and thinking of this problem, had many pictures come to my mind of the beautiful valleys and fertile soil along the Connecticut River in Vermont which would be submerged when it became necessary to establish flood-control projects, and I have therefore had an understanding of the attitude of the Senators from Vermont.

Mr. President, we have achieved what seemed to be the impossible. The Senators from Massachusetts and Connecticut, with the assistance of a very able and distinguished Member of the other House [Mr. CLASON], who has collaborated with us so faithfully and so well, and who perhaps knows this subject better than anyone else, have achieved the seemingly impossible. We feel that when these reservoirs are built we shall have obtained control of the floods which have swept down upon the prosperous cities and towns of Massachusetts and Connecticut. I believe also we have agreed to the minimum amount of sacrifice which the State of Vermont ought to be asked to make; and we appreciate exceedingly the cooperation which the Senators from Vermont have given us in reaching this very happy solution of a difficult and long-drawn-out contest. We can hereafter march forward together with a united front for all things which will benefit New England.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LUCAS in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], as modified by the amendment of the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN], as a substitute for the language on page 10, in lines 3 to 7.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I should like to say just a word. First, I desire to thank the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] for the kind words and the cooperation of himself and his associates, his colleague the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WEEKS], and his colleagues the Senators from Connecticut. Vermont has never objected to protection for the States down the Connecticut River. I have worked with the Senator from Massachusetts for a great many years, beginning in 1936 and 1937, to achieve the protection which all of us have sought. We have—and, I think, rightfully—insisted that such protection be afforded with a minimum of damage to our State.

It seems to me that the agreement reached here this afternoon attains that end, and that the program can go forward providing for the protection of the people of Massachusetts and Connecticut, while at the same time depriving Vermont of as little of her resources as possible.

Furthermore, I wish to say that while I had objected to the blanket prohibition against production of power on the tributaries of the Connecticut River from the federally constructed dams, yet it appears to me that the amendment leaves the way open for the generation of whatever power can be generated at the dams where the production of power is feasible. In the State we have dams at which the production of power, while possibly bringing a few dollars into the Treasury, would take much more from our citizens; but we have other sites where power can be developed without doing excess damage to the community. I think the amendment leaves the way open to such development for that purpose.

Again I wish to thank my colleagues and to express appreciation of the work of my own colleague from Vermont in reaching this agreement.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President, I hesitate to intrude upon this very delightful and commendable love feast, but I have a request from a distinguished Member of the Senate. The senior Senator from

Florida [Mr. ANDREWS] has sent me an amendment, together with the statement that he is ill. He requests me to offer the amendment in his name. I send it to the desk and ask unanimous consent that it be received on behalf of the Senator from Florida, with a view to having it called up at the proper time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I should like to take this opportunity to thank the Senators from Vermont, Connecticut, and Massachusetts for their very great kindness in helping North Dakota, this afternoon, by the adoption of the Missouri River Basin section of the O'Mahoney-Millikin amendment, which will give North Dakota approximately 1,200,000 acres of irrigated land. Let me add that thus far the only irrigated land in North Dakota has amounted to 21,615 acres, whereas our neighboring State of Montana has had 1,711,409 acres of irrigated land.

On behalf of my State, I wish to express my great thanks for the support given to that portion of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], as modified by the amendment of the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN], offered as a substitute for the language on page 10, in lines 3 to 7. [Putting the question.]

The amendment as modified was agreed to.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, on behalf of the junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON], I desire to call up at this time his amendment proposed on page 4, in line 11. The amendment is a noncontroversial one, and I understand there is no objection to it.

Mr. OVERTON. There is no objection to it.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, may the amendment be stated before action is taken upon it?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 4, line 11, after the period, it is proposed to insert the following: "No use of any area to which this section applies shall be permitted which is inconsistent with the laws for the protection of fish and game of the State in which such area is situated."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I also have been requested by the junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON] to announce that he will not propose the printed amendments on page 3, line 11; on page 3, line 12; and on page 3, in line 15. He has written a short paragraph in explanation of why he will not offer those amendments to the bill. I ask unanimous consent that his explanation be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I also presented an amendment providing that all dams constructed under the flood control shall contain suitable and necessary means for protection of fish life in the several rivers involved. I have reached the conclusion, however, that the subject of fish protection is of such vital importance that it should be dealt with in a separate bill, and only after full consideration of all the factors involved.

For those reasons I shall not offer the amendment in question to the pending bill.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, several days ago I submitted an amendment on behalf of the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY]. I send it to the desk and ask that it be stated. I understand there is no objection to it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 10, line 5, after the word "site", it is proposed to insert a colon and the following: "*Provided further*, That neither this authorization nor any previous authorization shall be construed to authorize the construction of a dam or reservoir at the Sugar Hill site on the Ammonoosuc River."

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. GURNEY. On this same matter I wish to say that the senior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] asked me to offer a similar amendment with respect to the same site. With the Senator's permission, I should like to request that there be printed in the RECORD at this point a letter I have received this afternoon from the office of the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] with respect to this matter. The letter shows that he is in agreement with the junior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] in requesting that the amendment be approved.

Therefore I ask unanimous consent to have the letter printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS,
November 29, 1944.

Hon. CHAN GURNEY,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR GURNEY: Relative to the amendment to H. R. 4485 which you submitted in behalf of Senator BRIDGES and which amendment, in effect, calls for the elimination of the construction of a reservoir at what is known as the Sugar Hill site, the following facts may be of value to you when action is taken on this matter.

The flood control bill of 1936 set up a series of reservoirs to be established for flood-control purposes. The site chosen at the time of the passage of this bill for a flood-control dam in the particular district in question was known as the Bethlehem Junction site and, I believe, at that time no objection was raised to that particular site. Further plans were developed and approved in 1938, and the present Sugar Hill site was substituted for the Bethlehem site. Serious objections are being raised by inhabitants of the communities affected by the construction of a dam and a reservoir on this site.

A dam and reservoir at the Sugar Hill site will flood a branch line of the Boston & Maine Railroad, which serves the territory between Woodsville, N. H., and Berlin, N. H. It is my understanding that the railroad would be reimbursed in the amount of $1,500,000, covering the loss of right-of-way. The welfare and industry of 9 towns, each with a population of 2,000 or more inhabitants, would be affected by the loss of this railroad.

The particular site chosen is in the heart of the White Mountain area, which area has a considerable revenue from tourist and recreational business. The financial loss which the communities would suffer as a result of no railroad service can be easily understood. This is particularly true during the winter season as the communities to be affected have developed an extensive winter recreational program, and are wholly dependent upon train service from Boston and New York areas for their clientele.

It is further estimated that farm lands in the value of $1,500,000 would be directly affected by the construction of this dam and reservoir. This particular section of New Hampshire is very hilly and mountainous, and farm land is at a premium. Therefore any loss in farm properties such as is estimated would be a most serious blow to the communities involved.

Sincerely yours,

CARL W. CORLISS,
Secretary to Senator Bridges.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I understand that the Army engineers do not wish to have a dam constructed there anyway, so I do not see why there should be objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] on behalf of the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, on behalf of the junior Senator from Delaware [Mr. BUCK], who is unable to be present at this time, I offer an amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 38, after line 22, it is proposed to insert a new paragraph, as follows:

Rehoboth Beach, Bethany Beach, Lewes, and Fenwick Island, Del., and other points along the Delaware coast, with a view to providing protection against damage resulting from erosion and from floods due to wind and tide.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Nebraska in behalf of the junior Senator from Delaware [Mr. BUCK].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, on behalf of the senior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] I offer the amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have stated. I may say that I have no objection to the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 39, after line 18, it is proposed to insert the following:

Big Canyon on Washita River in Murray County, Okla.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON] in behalf of the senior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I offer an amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 22, after line 4, it is proposed to insert the following: "*Provided further*, That neither this authorization nor any previous authorization shall be construed to authorize the construction of a dam or reservoir at the so-called Tuttle Creek site on the Big Blue Kansas River, a tributary of the Kansas River in Kansas."

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, a protest meeting was held at Topeka, Kans., about 3 weeks ago which was largely attended by the officials of the county, and without exception they were all opposed to any action of the kind proposed to be taken. They have asked their Senators to do everything they could to have the pending measure amended along the lines set forth in the amendment which I have just offered. I do not believe there is any opposition in Kansas to the amendment.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, I find that sometimes projects are suggested to a committee together with the statement that there is no opposition to the project, and later a great deal of local opposition develops because many of the local people had not previously been advised of the project. I have also found it to be true that sometimes when a statement has been made in perfectly good faith that there was no opposition to the elimination of a project, objection was made later. The project referred to in the amendment is not local. It is situated in the Missouri River Basin. It is a very important project. I cannot consent to the elimination of the project, or an amendment to do so, when no hearing has been held upon the matter and when it is a part of a comprehensive program.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I inquire if the chairman of the subcommittee is unable to accept the amendment which has been offered by the senior Senator from Kansas [Mr. CAPPER]. In the first place, construction of Tuttle Creek Dam has not been actually authorized.

Mr. OVERTON. If it has not been authorized there is no purpose in asking that it be eliminated.

Mr. REED. A meeting was held at Topeka, as the senior Senator from Kansas has said, at which both he and I were present. The meeting was widely attended. So far as I know, there is no opposition in Kansas to the elimination of the project. There is no support for it in the valley affected, which is one of the most important and fertile valleys in Kansas, and which would be almost entirely destroyed if the project were constructed.

Mr. OVERTON. Am I correct in understanding the Senator to say that the project has not been authorized by Congress?

Mr. REED. That is my impression.

Mr. OVERTON. Then, there is no necessity of offering an amendment relative to it.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I did not know until today that the senior Senator from Kansas had intended to offer the amendment.

Mr. OVERTON. It was my recollection that the project has been authorized.

Mr. REED. May I inquire of the senior Senator from Louisiana whether he anticipates a vote upon the bill as a whole tonight?

Mr. OVERTON. I think we will reach a vote.

With reference to the amendment, Mr. President, I may say that I will take it to conference.

Mr. REED. Very well. The senior Senator from Louisiana says that he will take the amendment to conference.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CAPPER].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. REED. I thank the Senator from Louisiana.

USE OF GOVERNMENT-OWNED SILVER FOR WAR PURPOSES

Mr. AIKEN obtained the floor.

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, I have asked the Senator from Vermont to yield in order that I might make a unanimous-consent request that the pending bill be temporarily laid aside. If my request is granted, I shall then move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 1954, a bill introduced by the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], known as the silver bill. It authorizes the extension of existing legislation for 1 year.

Mr. President, I move that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside——

Mr. HILL. Mr. President——

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. HILL. I suggest that the Senator from Connecticut merely asks unanimous consent that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the bill to which he has referred.

Mr. MALONEY. I make that request, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request of the Senator from Connecticut that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 1954?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1954) to amend the act entitled "An act to authorize the use for war purposes of silver held or owned by the United States," approved July 12, 1943, which had been reported from the Committee on Banking and Currency with an amendment, on page 1, line 7, after the numerals "31", to strike out "1946" and insert "1945", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 2 of the act entitled "An act to authorize the use for war purposes of silver held or owned by the United States," approved July 12, 1943 (Public Law 137, 78th Cong.), is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 2. This act shall expire on December 31, 1945."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I was asked about this bill earlier in the day, and I have taken occasion to consult such minority members of the Banking and Currency Committee as I could reach, and I found no opposition to the bill.

Mr. MALONEY. I thank the Senator. I do not think there is oppositon from any source.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD the report of the committee pertaining to the bill which has just been passed.

There was one error in the printing of the report. A word was left out. I have made the correction, and I ask that the report be printed as I have corrected it.

There being no objection, the report (No. 1230) was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The Committee on Banking and Currency, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1954) to amend the act entitled "An act to authorize the use for war purposes of silver held or owned by the United States," approved July 12, 1943, having considered the same, report favorably thereon with an amendment and recommend that the bill as amended do pass.

The act of July 12, 1943, authorized the President, through the Secretary of the Treasury, upon recommendation of the Chairman of the War Production Board, to sell or lease for domestic purposes for a period not longer than 6 months after the cessation of hostilities in the present war, upon such terms as the Secretary of the Treasury shall deem advisable, to any person, partnership, association, or corporation, or any department of the Government, for purposes including but not limited to the making of munitions of war and the supplying of civilian needs and the converting of existing plants to those purposes, any silver held or owned by the United States. The act provides that no silver shall be sold under its authority at less than 71.11 cents per fine troy ounce. The act further provides that at all times the ownership and the possession or control within the United States of an amount of silver of a monetary value equal to the face amount of all outstanding silver certificates issued by the Secretary of the Treasury shall be maintained by the Treasury.

Under the terms of the present law, the act will expire on December 31, 1944. This bill, as reported by the committee, extends the life of the act until December 31, 1945. The bill makes no other change in the present act.

In presenting the bill to the full committee, Senator MALONEY, the chairman of the subcommittee which considered the bill, made the following statement:

"I should like to make it clear at this meeting of the full committee, as I endeavored to make it clear when the subcommittee met, that one of the principal purposes of the so-called Green bill was to provide silver for civilian needs—silver that might keep men at work when there is no war work for them to do, and silver that would protect that industry.

"I have heard it said that the War Production Board officials have been reluctant to recognize this feature of the law. I want

them to know, and the Congress to know, that it was the intent of this committee, and still is, to protect the silver industry—and that next to the needs of war that was the purpose of the legislation. I hope that there will be no mistake about it.

"In recent months many people have been talking about after-the-war jobs. I want to make as certain as I can that there will be after-the-war jobs in the silver industry and that we endeavor to protect the silver industry between now and then, just as we shall endeavor to protect every industry. The silver industry has been in the forefront in the war program and is entitled to every proper protection. This industry will not need much of the silver held by the Treasury, but it will need some of it."

The bill, as reported, has the unanimous support of the Banking and Currency Committee.

Reports recommending enactment of the bill have been received by the committee from the Treasury Department, the War Production Board, the War Department, and the Navy Department.

FLOOD-CONTROL PROJECTS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4485) authorizing the construction of certain public works on rivers and harbors for flood control, and for other purposes.

CORDELL HULL AND THE ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, in the last few days we have witnessed one of the most extraordinary tributes ever paid to an American statesman, in the recognition accorded to the Honorable Cordell Hull upon his retirement after 50 years of public service, in the office of Secretary of State, including 12 of the most critical and eventful years of this Nation's history.

Mr. Hull has been acknowledged by the President of the United States as the "Father of the United Nations." His active and unremitting efforts to create inter-American unity with Canada and the republics to the South, from the beginning of his administration, have been recalled. His sponsorship of measures to promote reciprocal trade among the nations of the earth has been emphasized. His historic trip to Moscow, during which he laid the foundation for effective cooperation by the United States, Russia and Great Britain, has been referred to as one of the most successful missions in the annals of world diplomacy.

Throughout the tributes which have come from public men who have served with him in the Cabinet and in both branches of Congress, from the press of the Nation and from statesmen the world over, runs one consistent thread. Secretary of State Cordell Hull is universally acclaimed for his moral and intellectual integrity, for the honesty and directness of his approach to all the great public problems of his day, and for his devotion to democratic ideals, attainable under orderly process and within the letter and spirit of the Constitution of the United States.

I wish to review briefly today another phase of the outstanding public service for which Secretary Hull has earned and has received the respect of the Congress and the gratitude of the American people. I refer to the years of patient, constructive and persistent effort by him in the negotiations with Canada which he successfully carried through to the signing on March 19, 1941, of the United States-Canadian Agreement for the completion of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence seaway and power project. This agreement is given effect by the bills S. 1385 and H. R. 2280, and by the pending amendment to the river and harbor bill.

The record shows that Secretary of State Cordell Hull gave more study and consideration to the St. Lawrence seaway and power project, throughout his 12 years as the head of the Department of State, than to any similar project or undertaking which came before him for official action over that period. The record shows that he initiated the negotiations which resulted in the agreement of 1941, that he approved the instrument in the form in which it was submitted to the Senate and the House, as an agreement and not as a treaty, and that on repeated occasions he has, by his own act and over his own signature, strongly recommended the enactment of the pending bill into law.

Secretary of State Cordell Hull has made such substantial contributions to the advancement of the St. Lawrence seaway and power project that the pending agreement can only be rightly considered in the light of one of his major accomplishments as the head of the Department of State. When this project is built, as it will be, it will stand as an enduring monument to the untiring efforts of Secretary of State Cordell Hull and to his successful conduct of negotiations with our good neighbor to the north which resulted in the United States-Canadian agreement of 1941.

Support of the Hoover-Stimson treaty with Canada on the St. Lawrence project, 1933–34

When he took office on March 4, 1933, Secretary Hull found on his desk a treaty with Canada, dated July 18, 1932, providing for construction of the St. Lawrence project, which treaty had been negotiated by President Hoover and Secretary of State Stimson.

It was then recognized, as it has always been, in the diplomatic correspondence of this country with Canada, since the ratification of the Boundary Waters Treaty of 1909, that the improvement of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence system might be effectuated either by means of a separate treaty, or by means of an agreement, implemented by concurrent or reciprocal legislation of the Congress of the United States and the Parliament of Canada.

Since their predecessors had elected to proceed by the treaty method, President Roosevelt and Secretary Hull gave their support, regardless of partisan considerations, to the instrument signed in 1932, as the most direct means of initiating the construction of the St. Lawrence development. Public hearings were held at that time before the Committee on Foreign Relations, which resulted in overwhelming approval of the project on its merits, in a report filed with the Senate in March 1933. The St. Lawrence Treaty was submitted for ratification in a special message from President Roosevelt on January 10, 1934, and on March 14, 1934, was approved by a majority vote of the Senate, 49 to 43, including pairs. Lacking a two-thirds majority, it failed of ratification and, as a result, the development of the St. Lawrence was effectively blocked, while the T. V. A., Bonneville, Grand Coulee, and other projects of like magnitude went forward apace during the early years of this administration.

From 1934 to 1941 Secretary of State Hull conducted negotiations with Canada looking toward the adoption of a new agreement under which the St. Lawrence development might be completed. Many notes were exchanged between the two Governments on the St. Lawrence development. Secretary of State Hull personally participated in conferences on this subject with Canadian Ministers, Prime Minister Mackenzie King, and with representatives of State commissions and authorities concerned with the improvement. As a result of disturbed conditions, due first to world-wide depression and later to the entrance of the Dominion of Canada into World War No. 2 in 1939, negotiations were delayed and at times interrupted. But up to the signing of the agreement on March 19, 1941, Secretary Hull persisted in his unyielding efforts to obtain a constructive solution of all the problems related to the development of the greatest natural resource in North America, shared by the two neighboring countries.

In the midst of the negotiations with Canada, Secretary Hull renewed his advocacy of the St. Lawrence project in a statement made public in October 1936. At that time, a program of action adopted by the National Seaway Council September 16, 1936, on behalf of representatives of the National Grange, commissions of Great Lakes States, and other civic organizations was presented to Secretary Hull by the Honorable Fred J. Freestone, chairman of the council. The statement presented to Secretary Hull read in part, as follows:

> The national, State, and regional organizations which comprise the national seaway council give unqualified and active support to the project for completing the St. Lawrence seaway at the earliest possible date. * * *
>
> The Great Lakes-St. Lawrence system is the most valuable and useful natural resource on the North American Continent. Its full development for navigation and for the production and distribution of cheap hydroelectric power by public agencies in the United States and Canada will confer incalculable benefits upon producers and consumers in both countries. * * *
>
> The national seaway council recognizes that efforts to complete the development of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Basin have met with resistance and opposition from powerful special interests. Nevertheless, we believe that with the support of the responsible leaders of all parties and with the approval of an overwhelming majority of the American people, every obstacle to this improvement may be overcome.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ELLENDER in the chair). Does the Senator

from Vermont yield to the Senator from Missouri?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Does the Senator contend that the St. Lawrence waterway, irrespective of its merits as a separate project, has a thing on the face of the earth to do with the subject of flood control in the United States?

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I decline to yield for the purpose of getting into a controversy with the Senator from Missouri. I am simply placing Secretary Hull's attitude and his great work on behalf of the St. Lawrence seaway before the Senate. I think it is very fitting to do so at this time, after so many other distinguished Members of this body have paid him public tribute, and I am simply placing Secretary Hull's record before the Senate, as I believe it deserves to be done.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. The Senator does not have to answer my question if he does not want to. He has the floor.

Mr. AIKEN. At a later date I shall be very glad to enter into probably extended arguments with the Senator from Missouri regarding the St. Lawrence seaway and its relation to navigation, power, and flood control.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. If the Senator contends or ever will contend that the St. Lawrence seaway has a thing on the face of the earth to do with or any possible connection with flood control in the United States, I shall be very glad to controvert that contention indefinitely.

Mr. AIKEN. The Senator knows that a great many things get into flood-control bills that have very little relation to flood control, and I think there are some such things in the bill we are considering here today.

To the statement I have just read, Mr. President, Secretary of State Hull replied in a letter dated October 26, 1936, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, October 26, 1936.

Mr. FRED J. FREESTONE,
Chairman, Executive Committee,
National Seaway Council,
Interlaken, N. Y.

DEAR MR. FREESTONE: Your letter of October 22 and the statement adopted by the National Seaway Council define objectives with which I am in full accord.

The Great Lakes-St. Lawrence system has played an historic part in the development of North America. Agriculture, industry, and the great cities which have sprung up on the shores of the lakes, hundreds of miles from the seaboard, testify to the value of this natural resource to the United States and Canada.

Under plans advanced by the President, the construction of works in the international section of the St. Lawrence River to complete the seaway will also make available an abundance of cheap power, to be generated and distributed by public agencies on either side of the boundary, as present and future needs require.

Treaties now in force guarantee equal navigation rights throughout the full extent of the Great Lakes and the St. Lawrence River. The frontier has remained unfortified for more than a century, facilitating mutually profitable trade between the two nations.

Ratification of a treaty to permit construction of the seaway to proceed during the coming year would be in keeping with this traditional policy. Successful accomplishment of the project by two great neighboring nations, on terms of mutual benefit, would further strengthen the foundations of peace on this continent, and furnish another notable example of cooperative effort to utilize the resources of an international frontier.

Sincerely yours,

CORDELL HULL.

During 1937 and 1938 Secretary Hull continued his negotiations with Canada, consistent with the assurances given to supporters of the St. Lawrence project in his statement of October 26, 1936. At this stage of the negotiations both the treaty form and the agreement method were considered by the United States and Canadian representatives in conferences designed to reach an accord between the two countries.

On May 28, 1938, Secretary Hull submitted to Canada a tentative draft in treaty form, embodying new proposals for the construction of the St. Lawrence project, some of which proposals are now embodied in the agreement of March 19, 1941, as approved by the pending bill, S. 1385. In this letter Secretary Hull stated:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, May 28, 1938.

The Honorable SIR HERBERT MARLER,
P. C., K. C. M. G.,
Minister of Canada.

SIR: I have the honor to refer to my note of March 17, 1938, and to my memorandum of the same date in which I expressed the conviction of the United States Government that the mutual needs of Canada and the United States could be best provided for through a jointly planned development of their extraordinary natural resources in the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence River Basin. I stated that this Government is ready and eager to enter into and push to a speedy conclusion negotiations for a mutually satisfactory agreement directed to this objective.

I now desire to lay before you certain additional proposals which, in the opinion of the United States Government, should make it possible to reach an immediate agreement providing for the early initiation of the undertaking in accordance with a program designed to give full recognition to a possible divergence of interest between the two countries with reference to the timing of specific works. * * *

In brief, the proposed treaty would enable the United States to go forward immediately with the International Rapids section link in the proposed St. Lawrence deep waterway and the incidental power development; defer Canada's responsibility for completing its share of the waterway for a sufficient time to assure the readiness of the Ontario power market to absorb its share of the power; provide for an international commission to develop plans and advise the two Governments in a program to promote the most advantageous use of the entire Great Lakes-St. Lawrence resource; assure the immediate undertaking under the supervision of this commission of the proposed remedial works to preserve the scenic beauty of Niagara Falls; permit the Province of Ontario to go forward with its plans for diversions from the Albany River Basin into the Great Lakes and utilize such additional water for power at Niagara; make available considerable additional Niagara power to each country for development at will; and enable the proposed commission to proceed immediately with the preparation of comprehensive plans for more efficient use of the resources of the Niagara River. * * *

Certain observations on the proposals which have been incorporated in the tentative treaty draft will serve to clarify the extent to which they are designed to meet the needs of both countries.

The United States would immediately undertake the development of the International Rapids section of the St. Lawrence River * * * and would complete all proposed works except the Canadian power-house superstructures and their equipment. * * *

The State of New York would be able to proceed immediately with the development of the 1,100,000 horsepower of cheap hydroelectric power which constitute the American share of the power available in the International Rapids section of the St. Lawrence River. This additional power supply at a cost of less than $8 per horsepower year would thus be assured to meet its future market requirements. * * *

The civic interests in both countries concerned with the preservation of the scenic beauty of the Niagara Falls and Rapids would be assured the immediate undertaking of the remedial works to distribute the waters of the Niagara River in such a way as to insure unbroken crest lines on both the American and Canadian Falls, as recommended in the 1928 report of the Special International Niagara Board. * * *

Both countries would be assured not only the immediate possibility of developing considerable additional supplies of very cheap hydroelectric power at Niagara but also the initiation of the first scientific approach to the development of a comprehensive plan for the utilization of the Niagara River. Such a plan would provide both for enhancement of scenic spectacle and for future power development, which would prove an important contribution to economic expansion on both sides of the boundary.

The important economic areas tributary to the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Basin on both sides of the border would be assured of the realization of their desire that ocean navigation be brought to the heart of the continent, while at the same time the period within which completion of the deep waterway would be contemplated would be sufficient to provide a natural growth of traffic assuring the railroads the ability to adjust themselves to the new transportation agency without financial hardship.

Both countries would be assured a continuing basis of cooperation in the planned utilization of one of the world's greatest natural resources. Provision would be made for the prompt solution on a sound technical basis of all problems, including those of navigation, power, lake levels, diversions from and into the basin, etc., in terms of the mutual interests of the two peoples. * * *

Accept, sir, the renewed assurances of my highest consideration.

CORDELL HULL.

This letter, addressed to the Canadian Minister at Washington, well demonstrates the breadth of vision for which Secretary of State Cordell Hull has been noted.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Vermont yield to the Senator from Wisconsin?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. WILEY. What is the date of that letter?

Mr. AIKEN. The letter is dated May 28, 1938.

Mr. President, shortly after Secretary Hull had made his proposals of May 28, 1938, the pre-war crisis in Europe resulted in suspension of active negotiations between the United States and Canada on the St. Lawrence development.

In the fall of 1940, Secretary Hull again took up the St. Lawrence project and initiated renewed negotiations with Canada at that early stage of the war, prior to the entrance of the United States into the conflict. It had evidently become apparent to Secretary Hull that both the United States and Canada would require a great expansion of transportation and power facilities to provide adequate production for the defense of the Western Hemisphere. Accordingly, in September 1940, Secretary Hull received reports on power and transportation needs in the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence area and forwarded to the President proposals by Governor Lehman of New York and other State officials for initiating the St. Lawrence development. In October 1940 the State Department reached an agreement with Canada for the creation of the United States-St. Lawrence Advisory Committee and a similar body in Canada to supervise the preparation of plans for construction of the project in the International Rapids section. Due to this timely action, the Corps of Engineers, United States Army, was enabled to complete field surveys and to prepare plans and specifications which are now available for the construction of the project. Under the arrangements completed by the State Department in 1940, the engineering work proceeded with an allocation of $1,350,000 in funds assigned by the President and by the Public Works Administration to complete the surveys, plans, and specifications for the project.

Discussions between the State Department and Canada continued through the winter of 1940–41 until, on March 19, 1941, the complete accord sought by Secretary Hull was achieved with the signing of the United States-Canadian Agreement, now pending for approval before Congress.

A bill (H. R. 4927) to effectuate the March 19, 1941, agreement was introduced in the House of Representatives on June 2, 1941, by Representative JOSEPH J. MANSFIELD, of Texas, chairman of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Public hearings were held on this bill in the last Congress at intervals over a period of more than 3 months, resulting in complete approval of the project under the agreement of 1941 by vote of the committee, 17 to 8. At the opening of the hearings a letter in support of the agreement and the bill was presented from Secretary Hull as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, June 7, 1941.

The Honorable JOSEPH J. MANSFIELD,
House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. MANSFIELD: I have received your letter of June 3, 1941, transmitting a copy of H. R. 4927, a bill to provide for the improvement of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Basin in the interest of national defense, and for other purposes, and asking for an expression of my views relative to the advisability of enacting this measure into law.

In reply I am glad to inform you that I am in full accord with the proposed legislation, and I trust that the bill will receive prompt and favorable consideration.

The officers of this Department who are familiar with the subject matter of the bill will be glad to appear before your committee with reference thereto, should you desire to call upon them.

Sincerely yours,

CORDELL HULL.

The Committee on Rivers and Harbors favorably reported the St. Lawrence project bill to the House on November 21, 1941, incorporating its text as a provision of the omnibus river and harbor bill. The attack on Pearl Harbor resulted in deferring action on river and harbor legislation throughout the last Congress. Secretary Hull, however, continued throughout 1942, 1943, and 1944 to recommend in the strongest terms the approval of the agreement of 1941 and the enactment of the St. Lawrence project bill.

Early in 1942 Gov. Harold H. Stassen, of Minnesota, and other supporters of the project wrote President Roosevelt on behalf of the St. Lawrence development. In a letter to Governor Stassen, dated February 4, 1942, Secretary of State Hull replied as follows:

The President has asked me to acknowledge the receipt of your telegram to him of January 25 in which you urge that there be no delay in the construction of the navigation works in the proposed St. Lawrence development and that such works be proceeded with on the same footing as the proposed power works.

I am glad to assure you that there has never been any intention on the part of this administration to separate the navigation and the power works in the St. Lawrence development. The President has from the outset regarded the navigation and the power aspects as integral parts of a single development.

It is our earnest hope that this great project, which will contribute so effectively to our war effort as well as to the general welfare of our country, will receive the early approval of the legislative bodies of the United States and Canada in order that the construction work may be started and pushed to an early conclusion.

The St. Lawrence project bill, S. 1385, was introduced in the Senate on September 28, 1943, in identically the same form in which it had been approved by the House Committee on Rivers and Harbors upon the recommendation of Secretary of State Hull.

On April 10, 1944, Secretary Hull addressed a letter to the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY] as chairman of the Committee on Commerce, to which the bill, S. 1385, had been referred. This letter, strongly endorsing the St. Lawrence project and recommending the approval of the agreement through legislative action, is as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, April 10, 1944.

DEAR SENATOR BAILEY: I refer to your letter of October 8, 1943, transmitting a copy of S. 1305, a bill to provide for the improvement of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Basin in the interest of national defense and for other purposes.

The bill would approve the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence agreement between the United States and Canada, signed at Ottawa on March 19, 1941, providing for the construction of dams and powerhouses in the International Rapids section of the St. Lawrence River and the completion of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence deep waterway. The bill would authorize the President to fulfill the undertakings made in that agreement on behalf of the United States. The construction would be undertaken under the direction of the Secretary of War and the supervision of the Chief of Engineers. The bill would provide for an agreement between the Federal Government and the Power Authority of he State of New York for the transfer to the State of the power facilities and the right o use the United States' share of the waters at the project for hydroelectric purposes, uch arrangement not to become effective ntil approved by the Congress.

I suggest that S. 1385 be amended to authorize construction as a post-war rather than as a wartime project. This could be done by deleting the word "immediately", in line 12, page 2, of the bill, as well as the phrase "and shall be diligently prosecuted with a view to making essential facilities of said project available for national defense uses at the earliest possible moment," in lines 16 to 19 on the same page. Consideration might well be given to the desirability of describing the terms of the arrangement with the Power Authority of New York by means of a formula rather than the statement of a particular amount.

Subject to the foregoing suggestions, I recommend the enactment of S. 1385. I believe that it would be desirable to assure the availability of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence seaway and power project for early post-war construction. The enactment of this bill now would provide the authorization for undertakings which would make an important contribution to the post-war period in providing for the expansion of water-power development and for greater efficiency in transportation, as well as in providing employment on useful and essential public works during the period immediately following the war.

The Great Lakes-St. Lawrence seaway and power project has been supported by leaders in the United States for many years without regard to political affiliation. It is my earnest hope that Senator AIKEN'S bill authorizing this great project will be enacted into law.

Sincerely yours,

CORDELL HULL.

Mr. President, following the recommendation of the bill by Secretary Hull, the chairman of the Committee on Commerce gave to the press a statement attacking the agreement and renewing his opposition to the St. Lawrence project, which he had vigorously opposed when presented to the Senate in 1934 by President Roosevelt in the form of the treaty of 1932.

Again, on May 23, 1944, Secretary of State Hull recommended the prompt passage of the St. Lawrence project bill, Senate bill 1385. In a letter addressed to the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG], Secretary Hull dealt specifically with the form in which the agreement had been submitted to the Congress, and in unequivocal terms upheld the agreement method of authorizing the St. Lawrence development, subject to the adoption of legislation by both branches of the Congress and by the Canadian Parliament. Secretary Hull's letter reads as follows:

In brief, we have a situation of tremendous interest to our country which is open to be dealt with by either of these two constitutional methods. The fact that the treaty process was chosen in 1932 does not mean that a treaty was necessary at that time, nor does it preclude resort to the legislative process proposed in the present agreement between the United States and Canada.

There were two special considerations which impelled the present administration

to sign the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence agreement in a form which would involve its becoming effective upon approval by the Congress and by the Canadian Parliament. The issues involved in the project are largely domestic rather than international. The project would involve the expenditure of approximately $285,000,000 Federal funds to complete our share of the works (of this sum roughly $93,000,000 would be repaid by the State of New York for the United States share of the water power). It therefore seemed appropriate that the House of Representatives should have a voice in passing on an international obligation involving so large an appropriation of Federal funds.

To my mind it is a question of little importance which method is pursued. What is of importance is that we should not lose the benefits of this great international waterway system, with all its potentialities.

Mr. President, I have presented only a few of the documentary records which demonstrate that, for more than a decade, Secretary of State Hull has given his active and consistent support to the completion of the St. Lawrence seaway and power project. No one who reads these records with an open mind can challenge the statement that Secretary of State Hull initiated and successfully conducted the negotiations with Canada which resulted in the agreement of March 19, 1941; that he approved the signature and the submission of this instrument in the form of an agreement, rather than in the form of a treaty; and that he has insistently recommended to both branches of Congress its enactment into law through passage of the pending bill—Senate bill 1385.

It is unnecessary to emphasize to this body the complexity of the problems and the difficulty of the obstacles presented to Secretary Hull in the negotiations which he conducted to final success and to a complete accord. Suffice it to say that, in addition to negotiating the agreement of March 19, 1941, it was necessary also for the Secretary of State to reconcile the interest of the State of New York and the Province of Ontario in this development, expressed in accords related to the agreement.

It is almost incredible that in the hour of Secretary Hull's retirement, it should seriously be proposed that the whole structure of his plan for developing the resources of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence system should now be cast aside. Yet, at a time when the whole country is ringing with the acclaim earned by Secretary Hull as a constructive statesman, some voices are being raised to tell us that the agreement of 1941 is an irregular and an illegal instrument; that it violates and overrides the Constitution of the United States; and that, if approved, as recommended by Secretary Hull, it will strike down the constitutional prerogatives of this body, in which Secretary Hull himself served with such honor and distinction, when we come to deal with the world settlements which will follow victory in this war.

I do not believe for one moment that such fantastic arguments as these or any attack whatever against the handiwork of Secretary of State Hull in his successful negotiation of this agreement will carry any weight among the unprejudiced and fair-minded membership of this body.

When Cordell Hull entered the House of Representatives, from Tennessee, as a young man more than 30 years ago, he soon established himself as one of the outstanding leaders from the southern section of our country. In the lower House, and later in this Chamber, he won deserved recognition as a statesman of national vision and national stature. As Secretary of State, by the breadth and character of his statesmanship, he has won the respect of the civilized nations of the world. No matter what sectional arguments may be raised against the St. Lawrence agreement, no matter what attempts are made at this late date to invoke technicalities against it or to sow fears and jealousies between the United States and our ally and good neighbor, the Dominion of Canada, I am confident that the Senate will uphold, and will not repudiate, the agreement recommended to this body by the retiring Secretary of State.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, on page 10, at the end of line 20, I move to amend by striking out the period and inserting "when approved pursuant to the provisions of paragraph (a) of section — of this act."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Connecticut.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I offer an amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 2, at the end of section 2, line 19, it is proposed to insert:

Provided, That all functions, powers, duties, and projects of the Secretary of War, the Chief of Engineers, and the Corps of Engineers with respect to the examination, survey, construction, operation, and maintenance of western water-conservation reservoirs owned or controlled by the Federal Government, or with respect to any works of improvement appurtenant to such reservoirs, whether heretofore, herein, or hereafter authorized for examination, survey, construction, operation, or maintenance are hereby transferred to the Secretary of the Interior and shall be administered, under his direction and supervision, by the Bureau of Reclamation in the Department of the Interior. The term "western water-conservation reservoirs" as used in this section shall be deemed to include all reservoirs which are used, or capable of being used, in whole or in part for the conservation, storage, or detention of water, including flood control, or for the reclamation of arid or semiarid lands, and which are located in the States of Arizona, California, Colorado, Idaho, Kansas, Montana, Nebraska, Nevada, New Mexico, North Dakota, Oklahoma, Oregon, South Dakota, Texas, Utah, Washington, and Wyoming: *Provided further*, That all records and property (including office equipment, machinery, supplies, facilities, contracts, and assets of every kind, but excluding property needed in the conduct of military operations) used primarily in the administration of any such functions, powers, duties, and projects shall be transferred to the Department of the Interior for use in connection with the administration of said functions, powers, duties, and projects: *Provided further*, That all civilian personnel engaged primarily in the administration of any such functions, powers, duties, and projects shall be transferred to the Department of the Interior for use in connection with the administration of such functions, powers, duties, and projects. Any of the civilian personnel transferred under this section who are found by the Secretary of the Interior to be in excess of the personnel necessary for efficient administration of the activities covered by this section shall be retransferred under existing law to other positions in the Government service or shall be separated from the service. Any person whose employment is terminated on account of a reduction of personnel resulting from the operation of this order shall, for a period of 1 year from the date of such termination of employment, be given preference, if qualified, whenever an appointment is made in the executive branch of the Government: *Provided further*, That so much of the unexpended balances of appropriations, authorizations, allocations, or other funds heretofore or hereafter made available for use in the administration of any of the functions, powers, duties, and projects transferred by this section (including appropriations, authorizations, allocations, or other funds available for general departmental or staff services used in the administration of any such activity) as shall be determined, upon the basis of the pertinent legislative, budgetary, and administrative apportionments, to be properly subject to utilization in the administration of such functions, powers, duties, or projects shall be transferred to the Department of the Interior for use in connection with the administration of the functions, powers, duties, and projects transferred by this section. The moneys so transferred may include amounts to provide for the liquidation of obligations incurred against such appropriations, authorizations, allocations, or other funds prior to the transfer. No moneys transferred under this provision shall be expended for purposes other than those for which such moneys were appropriated or otherwise originally made available, except to the extent to which their expenditure for other purposes may be authorized by law: *Provided further*, That nothing contained in this section shall impair the validity of any outstanding obligations or contracts of the United States of America or of any department, establishment, or agency thereof: *Provided further*, That all rules, regulations, orders, permits, licenses, privileges, or other like matters made, issued, or granted in pursuance of, or with respect to, any function, power, duty, or project transferred by this section which are in effect at the time of such transfer shall continue in effect to the same extent as if such transfer had not occurred until modified, superseded, or repealed: *Provided further*, That the Director of the Bureau of the Budget shall take such action as may be necessary or appropriate for the effectuation of the transfers provided for herein, and shall prescribe the date or dates on which such transfers shall become effective. His determinations with respect to the proper allocation of the records, property, personnel, and funds referred to in said sections shall, when approved by the President, be final for the purposes of this act.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, the amendment which I have offered would have the effect of transferring civilian construction under the Corps of Engineers in the West to the Bureau of Reclamation. I shall take a few minutes of the time of the Senate to explain the amendment.

The action which would be taken under the amendment is necessary, first of all, because of the necessity of protecting the interests of the western section of the country against the inroads of a Federal agency which, by law, is not required to obey State statutes.

Acting under the authority of the commerce clause of the Constitution——

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MURRAY. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. I am interested in knowing whether the Senator desires to proceed with the discussion of his amendment and conclude it tonight. Many Senators are absent. I think a quorum would have to be developed before a vote could be taken on the amendment.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I consider the amendment to be a very important one, and it will take considerable time to present it. It seems to me that it should be carefully considered by Members of the Senate because of its possible effect and because of the great need for it.

Mr. WHITE. I have very great sympathy with the Senator's point of view, not with respect to the amendment, because I do not know what it is, but with respect to procedure.

May I ask the acting majority leader what his plans are for the remainder of the day?

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, if the Senator from Montana will yield to me, I will say to the Senator from Maine that I have just conferred with the senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON], the chairman of the subcommittee in charge of the bill, to ascertain if it be his intention to proceed further with the bill tonight. I shall be glad to have the Senator from Louisiana advise us on that point.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana yield?

Mr. MURRAY. I yield.

Mr. OVERTON. I should be very glad to bring consideration of the bill to a conclusion tonight. It has been before the Senate for many days. I had hoped that we had reached the point where we could vote on final passage of the bill.

I ask the Senator from Montana how much time he expects to consume in the presentation of his amendment.

Mr. MURRAY. I cannot say exactly. I think it will take several hours to present this matter alone. The Senator has heard the amendment read, and he understands its significance. It will require a very careful explanation, which will take some time, and it seems to me it would be proper to let the matter go over until tomorrow.

Mr. WHITE. Has the particular amendment which has been read at the desk been printed?

Mr. MURRAY. No; it has not been printed. It is a lengthy and complicated amendment.

Mr. WHITE. I suggest whether Senators are not entitled to have the printed text before them before they listen to a discussion of the amendment.

Mr. OVERTON. Of course, that presents another matter; namely, Shall we delay consideration of the bill because Senators are late in offering their amendments, and we have to recess until the next day in order that the amendments may be printed? That course could be pursued indefinitely, from day to day.

Mr. WHITE. Of course, the Senator is quite right.

Mr. OVERTON. May I ask, would the Senator from Montana have hesitancy in advising whether this is the only amendment he has?

Mr. MURRAY. I have several other amendments.

Mr. OVERTON. About how long does the Senator think it would take to dispose of them?

Mr. MURRAY. It seems to me the legislation proposed is the most important which will come before the Congress during the continuation of this session. It proposes to set up a program involving the appropriation of billions of dollars, and the projects which are included in this program are not defined in the proposal. To ascertain what the projects are it is necessary to look at separate documents. Projects are sought to be incorporated in the pending bill by mere reference to certain documents, which are not printed in the proposed legislation at all, and it is impossible for anyone on the floor of the Senate to know what the projects are. Yet, it is proposed to spend billions of dollars in constructing the projects, and they are based upon what is known as an interim report, which means that the report is not conclusive, and that the projects can be amended and changed after they are authorized, and the amount of money which will be spent on them may be doubled before we get through with them.

Mr. OVERTON. Of course, the Senator understands that all the projects now in the measure have been authorized in the bill which passed the House and in the committee amendments.

Mr. MURRAY. Yes; but we have not voted on it yet.

Mr. OVERTON. Yes; we voted.

Mr. MURRAY. I mean we have not voted on the bill.

Mr. OVERTON. No; we have not voted on the bill.

Mr. MURRAY. Senators should know what they vote on when they vote.

Mr. OVERTON. I think they did.

Mr. MURRAY. No. I ask Senators to explain to me what they were voting for when they voted for the matter on line 17, page 31, which refers to House Document Numbered 649, Seventy-eighth Congress, second session. Who has read that? Who knows what is in it? I should like to have some Senators tell me they have read that and understand exactly what it means. Members of the committee may have done so.

Mr. OVERTON. The Senator has been a Member of the Senate for a number of years, at least sufficiently long to have seen several flood-control bills passed. On second thought, I do not know that he has, because the last one was passed in 1941. But for many years, in connection with river and harbor bills and flood-control bills, the course has not been to reproduce an entire report in the bill, but simply to refer to the report, which is printed and available to all Senators and, if they are interested, they can read it. Then the projects are authorized pursuant to the report. There could not very well be any other legislative process.

Answering the Senator from Alabama, from the information given me by the Senator from Montana, I doubt very seriously, at least I entertain some doubt, that we could complete the consideration of the bill this evening.

Mr. HILL. If that be true, and it is agreeable to the Senator from Louisiana and the Senator from Montana, since we have one or two minor matters to dispose of, I suggest we may proceed to dispose of them and then recess until tomorrow.

Mr. MURRAY. That will be satisfactory.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Montana yield the floor?

Mr. MURRAY. I ask the privilege of having the floor when we resume tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. In the opinion of the Chair the Senator would not have any difficulty in obtaining the floor.

Mr. MURRAY. I yield the floor.

CONFIRMATION OF NOMINATION OF COMMISSIONER GUY MASON—EDITORIAL FROM WASHINGTON EVENING STAR

Mr. BILBO. Mr. President, the Government Printing Office prints about 50,000 copies of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. It is sent to every nook and corner of the Republic, and no doubt millions of the citizens of this country read that important document, the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

In justice to those who voted for the confirmation of Mr. Guy Mason yesterday to be a Commissioner of the District of Columbia, I wish to include as a part of my remarks an editorial from the Evening Star of today which sums up, in a very effective and conclusive way, all that was said on the floor in this controversy.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MR. MASON CONFIRMED

There is not the slightest doubt that the Senate vote to confirm Guy Mason for a second term as District Commissioner is in line with the wishes of the people of the District and fully consistent with his own record in public office.

The opposition to Mr. Mason's reappointment grew out of the investigation by a Senate subcommittee last year of Gallinger Hospital, which comes under his jurisdiction as a District Commissioner. Many undesirable conditions were found, and the necessity for improvement was affirmatively established. But to suggest, as was done in Senate debate yesterday, that the evidence taken by the subcommittee reflected conditions of "savagery, cruelty, and barbarity" in the hospital is a fantastic distortion of the testimony submitted to the investigating group. The fact is, as Senator O'MAHONEY pointed out, that the real responsibility for neglect at Gallinger—if there has been neglect—rests with Congress and not with Mr. Mason.

What the subcommittee did was to base its highly critical report on selected bits of testimony, much of which was of a highly dubious character, and to ignore the evidence submitted by responsible witnesses. For example, the chairman of the subcommittee prevailed upon the Assistant Surgeon General of the Public Health Service to make an independent investigation of Gallinger. His report was favorable to the hospital, but it was ignored by the subcommittee in making public its findings.

All of the individuals singled out for denunciation in the report have since been vindicated in one way or another. This is especially true of Mr. Mason, whose vindication has taken the form of an impressive expression of public confidence in him, renomination by the President, and confirmation by the Senate. The favorable decision will be welcomed by the unrepresented citizens of Washington, who know that Mr. Mason has worked hard in their behalf in the past and who have every expectation that he will continue to do so in the future.

APPLICATIONS FOR REEMPLOYMENT BY DISCHARGED MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, the Senate will recall that when Congress passed the Selective Service Act in 1940, it provided that men entering or being inducted into the armed services should have the right to get back the jobs which they held at the time of their entrance or induction into the service, provided they made application within 40 days from the time they were discharged.

As the Senate knows, of course, there are some men now leaving the armed services, most of them because of physical condition. The Selective Service Administration, now charged with the administration of this provision of law, finds that the 40-day period is too short a time. Particularly is it too short a period when a discharged member of the armed services must be hospitalized, or finds himself in the hospital at the time he is discharged.

Therefore, the House of Representatives has unanimously passed a bill to change the period from 40 days to 90 days, and to provide that if a discharged member of the armed services is in a hospital, provided he does not remain in the hospital for more than a year, the 90-day time shall not begin to run until the termination of his hospitalization.

That bill was passed by the House, as I have said, unanimously. It has been reported unanimously by the Senate Committee on Military Affairs, and I now wish to ask, Mr. President, that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside, and that the Senate proceed to consider House bill 5386.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request made by the Senator from Alabama?

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, the Senator from Alabama called this matter to my attention earlier in the day, and I took opportunity to consult with such minority members of the Military Affairs Committee as I could. I talked with the senior Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN] and the senior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY], as well as with the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WEEKS], who is I believe, not a member of the Military Affairs Committee, but who is always interested in military matters, as well as in other matters, and I find complete unanimity with respect to the bill. I have no objection to the request made by the Senator from Alabama.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request made by the Senator from Alabama that the pending bill be temporarily laid aside and that the Senate proceed to consider House bill 5386?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 5386) to amend the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, to extend the time within which application may be made for reemployment, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Military Affairs with amendments.

The first amendment was on page 2, after line 2, to insert the following:

SEC. 2. Section 3 (b) of Public Resolution 96 of the Seventy-sixth Congress (U. S. C., 1940 ed., Supp. III, title 50, App., sec. 401; 54 Stat. 858), as amended, authorizing the President to order members and units of reserve components and retired personnel of the Regular Army into active military service, is further amended by striking out the word "forty" therefrom and substituting the word "ninety" therefor and by adding after the words "relieved from such active duty or service" the following: "or from hospitalization continuing after discharge for a period of not more than 1 year."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, to insert a further section, as follows:

SEC. 3. Section 7 of Public Law 213 of the Seventy-seventh Congress (U. S. C., 1940 ed., Supp. III, title 50, App., sec. 357; 55 Stat. 627), the Service Extension Act of 1941, is hereby amended by inserting "as amended," after the words "Selective Training and Service Act of 1940."

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read the third time.

The bill H. R. 5386 was read the third time and passed.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. HILL. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. McKELLAR, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads:

Sundry postmasters.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ELLENDER in the chair). If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the calendar.

INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION

The legislative clerk read the nomination of George M. Barnard, of Indiana, to be Interstate Commerce Commissioner for the remainder of the term expiring December 31, 1950.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

POSTMASTERS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

Mr. HILL. I ask that the nominations of postmasters on the calendar may be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the postmaster nominations are confirmed en bloc.

Mr. HILL. I ask that the President be immediately notified of all nominations this day confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

RECESS

Mr. HILL. As in legislative session, I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 3 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Thursday, November 30, 1944, at 12 o'clock meridian.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate November 29 (legislative day of November 21), 1944:

INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION

George M. Barnard, to be an Interstate Commerce Commissioner for the remainder of the term expiring December 31, 1950.

POSTMASTERS

ALASKA

Ann M. Lange, East Anchorage.

CONNECTICUT

Russell F. Neary, Bridgeport.
Viola A. Swanson, Grosvenor Dale.
William J. Farnan, Stonington.
S. Henry Acton, Yalesville.

GEORGIA

Beatrice B. Baker, Baldwin.
Warren C. Haynes, Clermont.
James P. Pirkle, Hoschton.
Oka Eason, Manassas.
Robert L. Sumner, Poulan.
Rilla S. Porter, Silver Creek.
William A. Ryals, Townsend.

IDAHO

Verna Uletta Olson, Fruitland.

INDIANA

Bessie Boston, Lewis.
Mary F. Woods, Manilla.
Albert T. Ferber, Palmyra.
Clarence Rea, Patriot.
Anna Jones, Seelyville.
Willard Miller, Shelburn.
Earl J. Myers, Solsberry.
Louis W. Butler, Straughn.

MINNESOTA

Vern C. Hanson, Arco.
Thomas J. McGonigal, Bayport.
John Wilson Hart, Bethel.
Hjalmer J. Mattinen, Esko.
Albert D. McCormack, Garden City.
Louise M. Muller, Hugo.
Lucy C. Clark, Kent.
Edward R. Spink, Mahtomedi.
Irene M. Vizenor, Ponsford.
Walter R. Dahl, Puposky.
Elva M. Franck, Racine.
Edla M. Hawkinson, Scandia.
Ervan W. Finke, Vining.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, NOVEMBER 29, 1944

The House met at 12 o'clock noon, and was called to order by the Speaker.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Thine is the kingdom, O Lord. Greatness and power belongeth unto Thee; both riches and honor come from Thee: Therefore we would praise Thy glorious name and come into Thy presence with thanksgiving. We rejoice that to every fear Thou dost offer a promise, to every suspicion an assurance, and between the enemy and ourselves Thou dost lift up a standard against him.

As the beautiful life of our Saviour looms brighter and brighter through the passing years, may we make straight our pathways by the inspiration of His words and the example and influence of His daily rectitude. Thou whose patience is without measure and whose mercy is from everlasting to everlasting, we praise Thee that Thou dost carry the burdens of the heavy laden, dost comfort sorrow, and makest the heart to rejoice when we do right. Oh, increase our faith in that overruling providence which hitherto has shaped and guided the destiny of our Republic. Grant that each citizen may vie with one another in faithful, patriotic devotion, in simplicity and in understanding. We pray that all the coordinate branches of our Government may cooperate and labor zealously for those ideals which make our Nation great and glorious. O Holy Spirit, descend in full measure upon our President that he may be guided in thought and purpose. In our dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 5493. An act to provide for the continuation on the active list of the Regular Army for the duration of any of the wars in which the United States is now engaged, and for 6 months thereafter, of any officer on the active list of the Regular Army who has served as Chief of Staff during the wars in which the United States is now engaged.

The message also announced that the Vice President has appointed Mr. BARKLEY and Mr. BREWSTER members of the joint select committee on the part of the Senate, as provided for in the act of August 5, 1939, entitled "An act to provide for the disposition of certain records of the United States Government," for the disposition of executive papers in the following departments and agencies:

1. Department of the Interior.
2. Department of Justice.
3. Department of the Navy.
4. Post Office Department.
5. Department of the Treasury.
6. Department of War.
7. Committee for Congested Production Areas.
8. Government Printing Office.
9. National Archives.
10. War Relocation Authority.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. OUTLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in two instances in the RECORD and include in each an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks on two different matters in the Appendix of the RECORD, first, to include an editorial which appeared in the New York City Mirror entitled "Pigeonholed," and, second, to include an editorial which appeared in the New York Post.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on four subjects and include therein certain statements and excerpts.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 118]

Allen, Ill.	Fitzpatrick	Myers
Baldwin, N. Y.	Forand	Newsome
Barry	Ford	O'Brien, Ill.
Bolton	Fulmer	O'Connor
Bonner	Gallagher	Pfeifer
Boykin	Granger	Philbin
Bradley, Mich.	Griffiths	Plumley
Brooks	Hall,	Rizley
Brumbaugh	Leonard W.	Robsion, Ky.
Bulwinkle	Harness, Ind.	Rolph
Burgin	Hendricks	Rooney
Busbey	Hinshaw	Rowe
Canfield	Holifield	Satterfield
Cannon, Fla.	Jackson	Scanlon
Capozzoli	Jeffrey	Scott
Carson, Ohio	Judd	Shafer
Case	Kennedy	Sheppard
Chenoweth	Kilburn	Sheridan
Clason	Kilday	Short
Coffee	King	Somers, N. Y.
Cooley	Klein	Sparkman
Costello	Lewis	Starnes, Ala.
Daughton, Va.	Luce	Sullivan
Davis	McGehee	Sumner, Ill.
Dawson	McKenzie	Thomas, N. J.
Delaney	McLean	Treadway
Dickstein	Magnuson	Ward
Dies	Maloney	West
Domengeaux	Mansfield,	Whelchel, Ga.
Douglas	Mont.	Winstead
Ellison, Md.	Merritt	Winter
Elston, Ohio	Miller, Mo.	Wolverton, N. J.
Fay	Morrison, N. C.	
Fenton	Mruk	

The SPEAKER. On this roll call, 329 Members have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks on the subject of the St. Lawrence seaway project.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in two particulars; in one to include a speech delivered by Federal Judge E. B. Freed on the revision of the criminal laws, and in the other to include Glimpses of Federal Trials and Procedure, by Judge Moskowitz, of Brooklyn. The latter, however, I have been advised, will exceed the limit and will require five pages and cost $260, notwithstanding which I make the request.

The SPEAKER. Without objection and notwithstanding, the request of the gentleman from New York is granted.

There was no objection.

PETER A. CONDELARIO

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Public Lands be discharged from further consideration of the bill (S. 1746) authorizing and directing the Secretary of the Interior to issue to Peter A. Condelario a patent in fee to certain land, and that the same be rereferred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

CHARLES F. WHITE

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Public Lands be discharged from further consideration of the bill (S. 1925) to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Interior to issue to Charles F. White a patent in fee to certain land, and that the same be rereferred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

RICHARD PICKETT

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Public Lands be discharged from further consideration of the bill (S. 2026) authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to Richard Pickett, and that the same be rereferred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HEFFERNAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include a report furnished by

Capt. John L. Beebe, superintendent in charge of Sheepshead Bay Naval Station, Sheepshead, N. Y.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

FEDERAL-AID ROAD ACT

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 4915) to amend and supplement the Federal-Aid Road Act, approved July 11, 1916, as amended and supplemented, to authorize appropriations for the post-war construction of highways and bridges, to eliminate hazards at railroad-grade crossings, to provide for the immediate preparation of plans and acquisition of rights-of-way, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 4915, with Mr. COOPER in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Section 5 of the bill has been read and is now open to amendment.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I desire first to ask the attention of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT]. On yesterday, the gentleman proposed an amendment to line 21, on page 2, which states:

> The first post-war fiscal year shall be the fiscal year 1945, or as otherwise directed by the Congress.

Later in the gentleman's remarks he said:

> I have substituted for the language which I have just read the language which indicates that the program will start at the end of the present fiscal year.

I assume from that the gentleman intended his amendment to mean the fiscal year 1946.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRIS. I yield.

Mr. WOLCOTT. The gentleman is probably correct.

However, the important thing was to get a definite date in the bill. It was to be hoped that in conference, if there was any question about it, 1946 would be substituted for 1945, because it was my intent that the program start on July 1, 1945. Perhaps under the language of the amendment the program will be retroactive as of July 1, 1944, which was not my intention. So, rather than ask unanimous consent, because of opposition to the amendment, to change the date to 1946, I was content to let the conferees work it out. The principal thing, however, is to get the date fixed with certainty so the States will know when the program is to start. It was intended that it should start July 1, 1945.

Mr. HARRIS. As a practical proposition it was intended that it should begin with the fiscal year 1946 which begins July 1, 1945.

Mr. Chairman, with this clarification I wish to make a statement for the benefit of the committee. Last Friday, when we were in general debate, I advised the committee that when we read the bill under the 5-minute rule, I would propose an amendment at this point, which would permit the States applying all of the receipts from special taxes on motor-vehicle transportation for road purposes, and who maintain the present rate of such taxes and distribution to obtain the full amount of their apportionment under this bill, even though they were unable to meet the full matching requirements.

However, since then circumstances have developed which make it necessary to obtain additional information with particular reference to our State of Arkansas and for clarification of the facts.

The question has been raised by several in consideration of this legislation as to whether or not the States will be able to match their full apportionment accrued to them under the bill. Frankly, I have some apprehension as to whether or not a number of them can provide their share of funds for matching. If not, that part of the allocation any State fails to match will revert to the Treasury and will not be used for the purposes authorized herein.

After the committee reported this bill, H. R. 4915, I directed under date of June 28, 1944, a letter to the director of our Arkansas Highway Commission in Little Rock, Arkansas, requesting information as to the State's ability to match Federal funds proposed therein. In answer thereto, I was advised by letter under date of July 5, 1944, from Mr. W. W. Mitchell, director-chief engineer, of the Arkansas State Highway Commission, that—

> In this connection, will state that assuming that the war ends in 1946, the State would probably be in a position to match the first year's Federal funds on a 60–40 basis. This would give a $14,000,000 program for the first year. This would practically take up all available funds, and funds for matching for the second and third years would have to come from revenue which will be insufficient for matching the $8,000,000 that will be available to Arkansas annually.

On September 15, the Senate passed S. 2105, its post-war highway program. It adopted the McClellan amendment, which is somewhat similar and intended for the same purpose as the one I stated I would propose and included in the RECORD on page 8407 last Friday. Following the adoption of the McClellan amendment by the Senate and the passage of the bill, an analysis was made of the amendment and on September 22, 1944, Mr. W. W. Mitchell, director-chief engineer, of the Arkansas State Highway Commission at Little Rock, advised Senator JOHN L. MCCLELLAN by letter that—

> A careful analysis has been made of your amendment to Senate bill 2105, a copy of which was submitted with your letter of September 16, 1944. The estimate you made that Arkansas will be able over the 3-year period to match approximately $0,000,000 of our total allotment of $19,722,000 is substantially correct and unless some such enabling legislation is passed, the State will lose approximately $11,000,000 in Federal funds.

It was very obvious that from these communications from our State Highway Department of Arkansas, that our State would have insufficient funds to match the allocation under these proposed bills. For this reason, I told the committee last Friday of my intention of proposing a somewhat similar amendment as the McClellan amendment in the Senate. To further substantiate our position I included in the RECORD an analysis by the Bureau of Public Roads, showing that, according to the receipts collected in 1943, there are approximately 20 States that would not have sufficient funds available to the State highway department for annual construction to match all of their apportionment. Some of these States may be able to make arrangements to match their full allocation by issuing bonds, raising taxes, a transfer of funds from some other source, or extending the matching period for 2 additional years. Arkansas already has a high rate of gasoline tax, 6½ cents per gallon State and 1½ cents Federal, or a total of 8 cents. We cannot issue additional bonds, because we are already, as the Members of this House know, overburdened with a huge indebtedness. It is very unlikely we could obtain funds from some other source in our State for road purposes.

Although we have been advised that it would be impossible for Arkansas to match Federal funds provided in this legislation, we have now been advised from the same source, Director W. W. Mitchell, of the Arkansas State Highway Commission, that there is a possibility that the State may be able to match the funds allocated, if all allotments can be obligated or placed under project agreement within the 4 years allowed under the bill and if the funds will be available for expenditure over a 5-year construction program. Subsection D, on page 4, provides that any sums apportioned to my State shall be available for expenditure in that State for 2 years, and that such funds shall be deemed to have been expended if covered by formal agreement with the Commissioner of Public Roads for the improvement of a specific project as provided in this act. I therefore interpret this section to mean that all allotments can be obligated or placed under project agreement within 4 years and that all of the funds apportioned will be available for expenditure over a 5-year construction program. That is what I understood the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTINGTON] to say in his very able explanation of the bill last Friday.

Only yesterday, we received the information from our State highway department, indicating that our State could match the allocation accrued under this bill, which is in direct conflict with the information previously given.

We of the Arkansas delegation and all of the people of our State appreciate very much the consideration the Congress has given heretofore, and in consideration of this bill to our road problem. We certainly do not want to request anything unreasonable or unnecessary. We only want a part in the road

program comparable, under given circumstances, to other States in this Nation.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, considering the conflicting information, as to the ability of Arkansas to match its full allotment, we have decided to not propose and press my amendment at this time, but to let it pass over until we can clarify the information and determine what the actual facts are. If it is a fact that we cannot participate fully in the program, we hope that it can be worked out in conference between the two bodies. We certainly want to be fair and if such a provision is not needed, we of the entire Arkansas delegation can assure you that we would not request it. We will make every effort to clarify the situation and do everything possible to meet all of the requirements.

ARKANSAS STATE HIGHWAY COMMISSION,
Little Rock, Ark., November 23, 1944.

Hon. OREN HARRIS,
Member of Congress,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN HARRIS: A few weeks ago a meeting was held in this office with Congressman HAYS, Norrell, and yourself and members of the State highway commission for the purpose of discussing pending post-war highway legislation. This meeting was called by you, for the purpose of determining the State's ability to participate in the proposed post-war highway program, as set out under the terms of Senate bill No. 2105 and H. R. 4915.

As a result of the meeting further study of the problem has been made and it appears desirable to submit certain information developed on this subject to our Senators and Representatives.

Enclosed herewith are two tabulations, one showing an estimate of the State's ability to match Federal-aid apportionments under S. 2105 and the other showing the same information for H. R. 4915. Also enclosed is a sheet explaining the various items shown on these forms by line number. In the preparation of these estimates the following assumptions are made:

1. That no post-war construction funds will be allocated prior to January 1, 1946.

2. That the gross highway income for 1947 will approximate the 1941 figure of $17,650,000 which was the highest ever reached for Arkansas, and that by 1948 the gross income will exceed all previous records by more than $300,000 and will maintain or slightly exceed this level.

3. That all allotments can be obligated or placed under project agreement within the 4 years allowed under either bill.

4. That funds will be available for expenditure over a 5 year construction program.

Informal information from representatives of the Public Roads Administration indicates that there may be some difficulty in entering into project agreements for obligating the funds (item (3) above) on the basis of anticipated revenues. Normally, the P. R. A. requires that a contract must be awarded for any project before the funds can be considered by them as under obligation. In the event a workable plan can be found for obligating the funds within the 4-year period, and provided the coming legislature allows construction funds to accumulate for a post-war program with only a minimum expenditure for State road construction, it is believed that upon the above basis, Arkansas will be able to match the majority of funds allocated under either proposed measure.

Although there is a possibility that the State may be able to match all funds allocated, a nonmatching clause under which the State could qualify would insure full participation in the post-war highway program. If Senator MCCLELLAN'S amendment, section 5 (b) of S. 2105 were changed to read as follows: "(2) That 100 percent of such proceeds are applied to the administrative and operating expenses of the State highway department, the maintenance of Federal-aid and other highways within the State," it is the opinion here that the State could then qualify, as all highway revenue is spent for highway purposes.

Regardless of the Federal legislation finally enacted, it is believed all possible effort will be made to secure the passage of such enabling State legislation as may be required for Arkansas to take full advantage of Federal-aid funds made available.

We have been requested by the American Road Builders' Association to request our membership in Congress to insist upon a larger authorization of funds in order to preclude the possibility of another W. P. A.

Our commission, in session today, discussed this request and I was instructed to inform you that it was the considered opinion of the membership that we in Arkansas were not in a position to ask for a greater authorization than was set out in either of the proposed bills, as it would be difficult, if not impossible, to match the amounts provided therein.

Trusting that you will find this information helpful, I am

Very truly yours,
W. W. MITCHELL,
Director-Chief Engineer.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Arkansas has expired.

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Arkansas may proceed for 3 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield briefly?

Mr. HARRIS. I shall be pleased to yield to my colleague from Arkansas.

Mr. NORRELL. I wish to say that the gentleman has correctly stated the position of the delegation from Arkansas. We understood in the beginning that there would be approximately 20 States which could not match, including Arkansas. We are now a little confused as to whether we in Arkansas can match or not. If we can we will not ask the Congress for any relief, but if we find we cannot match we will be asking the Congress for relief along with the other States.

I wish to compliment the gentleman from Arkansas on his remarks.

Mr. HARRIS. I thank the gentleman for his statement which is acquiesced in by our entire delegation from Arkansas.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRIS. I yield.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. With respect to the gentleman's inquiry as to when this program should begin, I believe it is the intent of the committee, or the intent of the House in considering and passing this bill, that the first year of this program shall be the first year following the war, when we have determined that the war has ended. That is my construction of this entire post-war program for the construction of Federal-aid highways.

As the gentleman from Michigan stated, and as I understand his amendment contemplates, the Congress will provide for that year.

Mr. HARRIS. I would like to ask the gentleman, in further reference to that point, if he thinks as a practical matter the program can possibly start before the next fiscal year, which would be the fiscal year of 1946 to begin on July 1, 1945?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I do not, and there will be no occasion for it to start because, as a matter of fact, there have been impounded the authorizations that we have heretofore authorized under the acts of 1940, 1942, and 1943, and we have extended the time for the utilization of the authorizations under those acts. There are funds that would be available aside from this act. This post-war program and the first fiscal year for the post-war program is the first year following the end of the war.

Mr. HARRIS. That is a consideration in our State and other States because if the program does not start before the fiscal year 1946 we will have additional funds with which to match the Federal allotments.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GILLIE: At the end of section 5 insert the following:

"If the State highway commission of any State and the Public Roads Administration, after full investigation, shall find that the safety of the public will be best served by the elimination of a grade crossing located within the confines of such State, or if they shall find that the movement of traffic over the public highways of the State is being seriously hampered and impeded by the movement of trains over grade crossings in thickly populated areas within the State; and if said State highway commission and Public Roads Administration should further find that the cost of eliminating such grade crossing, either by the construction of an overhead passage or a subway beneath the railroad right-of-way is in excess of the cost occasioned to such railroad by eliminating such crossing by rerouting of their tracks and right-of-way, then said State highway commission shall have authority to order a rerouting of said railroad; or if said State highway commission and Public Roads Administration should further find that the cost of eliminating such grade crossing by the construction of an overhead passage or a subway would not be in excess of the cost occasioned to such railroad by rerouting their tracks and right-of-way, but that the safety and best interests of the traveling public could be better served by a rerouting of said railroad, then said State highway commission shall have authority to order a rerouting of said railroad without regard to comparative cost.

"The costs occasioned to such railroad company by such rerouting, or construction of overhead passage or subway in compliance with such order shall be paid to said railroad company by the State highway commission upon receipt of claims properly audited by their engineering department and when approved by the Public Roads Administration shall be paid from funds allocated to such States by the Federal Government for the elimination of grade crossings or the improvement of the State highway system.

"In the event such railroad company, when so ordered to reroute its right-of-way, shall believe such order of such highway commission to be arbitrary, unreasonable, and oppressive, then such railroad company shall have the right to appeal from such order to a court of competent jurisdiction of the

county, parish, or town wherein such proposed rerouting is ordered and the issue shall be tried as in any other civil action."

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Chairman, I will try my best in the short period of time I have to explain this to you.

As you will observe, the amendment itself explains what I desire to have done by this amendment. Picture for a moment this situation: Crossing my own particular district we have five transcontinental railroads. We have the New York Central; the Baltimore & Ohio; the New York, Chicago & St. Louis, better known in our district as the Nickel Plate; the Wabash; and the Pennsylvania Railroads. The last three railroads pass through my own city. The Wabash and the Pennsylvania almost parallel each other through to the central part of the city. The Nickel Plate Railroad crosses the Pennsylvania a few miles west of Fort Wayne and comes into the business district of the city. Down through the years the Nickel Plate Railroad has done a magnificent job in helping to build Fort Wayne. The traffic over this railroad during the war is extremely heavy. It is one of the best railroads we have in our section, I am sure, but because of the fact that it travels down through the central part of our city, through the business section, it has seriously impeded automobile and pedestrian traffic.

We have tried for a great many years to get this railroad to elevate its tracks so that it would not interfere with downtown general traffic. However, we have never been able to accomplish this.

Failure to elevate these tracks has hampered the development of the northern section of our city, and as a result the city is growing southward. So I think if we could arrange to have the State highway commission eliminate these grade crossings, either by elevating the tracks or by rerouting the railroad, it would be beneficial to the public safety.

Other cities in the State of Indiana have similar problems, and for that reason the committee should seriously consider this amendment, inasmuch as the Federal Government will give half of this money and the State will supply the rest of it.

Mr. MOTT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GILLIE. I yield to the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. MOTT. I am interested in the legal phase of the gentleman's proposal. On what theory does he think the Congress could authorize a State highway commission to relocate a railroad? That is not a Federal matter.

Mr. GILLIE. That is not a Federal matter.

Mr. MOTT. What jurisdiction would the Federal Government have to order that by law?

Mr. GILLIE. We do not ask the Federal Government to do that. We are merely asking to get this amendment into the bill so that the State of Indiana would supply the necessary legislation to implement this recommendation.

Mr. MOTT. It does not appear to me that under the Constitution Congress can authorize the passage of a law directing a State highway commission to relocate a railroad.

Mr. GILLIE. It is right in this amendment; that the State highway commission and the Public Roads Administration shall have authority to order a rerouting of such railroad.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman be given 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. MOTT. If the gentleman will yield further, will he repeat his language in the amendment right on that point?

Mr. GILLIE. I said that the State highway commission and the Public Roads Administration shall have authority to order a rerouting of such railroad.

Mr. MOTT. A State highway commission cannot be given that authority by the Congress. They can be given that authority by State law, but not Federal law.

Am I mistaken in thinking that the gentleman's amendment confers jurisdiction upon a State highway commission to relocate a railroad?

Mr. GILLIE. By State authority.

Mr. MOTT. I do not believe you can do it.

Mr. GILLIE. I think you can. However, as I said before, this is an opportunity for the State highway commission and the citizens of my city, Fort Wayne, and the railroad officials, to work out a plan to correct the terrible traffic situation we have in our city. This traffic situation has caused trouble for the last 25 years. As the city continues to grow, this situation will continue to get worse. We now have an opportunity to work toward successful resolutions of this problem and I trust that the Committee will give this amendment favorable consideration.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, as a former member of the Committee on Roads, I have always attempted to maintain a lively interest in the highway building program of this great country. Not only do I favor the idea of a great public roads system after this war, but I strongly advocate our instituting such a program for one particular reason. I believe that what we do in the decade after the war will determine the future of America for the next century. It took 10 years of idleness in Germany after 1918 to cause the rise of national socialism and that archfiend Adolf Hitler. It took a decade of unrest brought about by unemployment on the continent of Europe to ruin the future peace. The way we solve this problem of unemployment, both by private employment and by public works, and by the building of public highways, will decide what becomes of this great land. So, Mr. Chairman, I think it is very important that we pass a good bill now, a bill that will take care of some of the unemployment which private industry is not able to remedy.

I hate to visualize, and I know the rest of the Members of this House do, too, what would happen after this war if we failed to take any further interest in the legislation which we have passed for the returning soldiers. What is going to happen to the war jobs? They are going out the window. The war plants will be idle unless those in authority assume some responsibility for creating peacetime jobs for every American.

I would rather see this highway bill go through than a thousand leaf-raking projects put into effect. I would rather see employment given the laboring men of America on highways than through boondoggling projects which the W. P. A. and all the other alphabetical agencies of the New Deal in the past decade tried to make work. I think this bill will answer the great question that a lot of us are pondering and I expect to support it.

It will go a long way in taking care of the post-war unemployment which is bound to appear just as soon as the war contracts, which are already terminating by the dozens, really go out of existence. I hope this bill will pass as it now is.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, I wish to state at the outset that the amendment which my colleague, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. GILLIE], has presented to the House is an amendment which was prepared under the specific direction of the State Highway Commission of the State of Indiana, and which was carefully prepared by the legal department of the State highway commission of that State. It involves matters which exist in Indiana and it also involves matters which exist in practically every other State of the Union. The situation which has been detailed and outlined by my colleague the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. GILLIE] exists, I am confident, in many of the States of the Union, if not in all of the States of the Union. There is another situation which develops, and I know this is a situation which exists in practically every State of the Union. As we know, the railroads came along and thereafter the towns sprang up, and, in many instances, the railroads run along some of the principal streets in our villages, towns, and cities. I know many of those instances in my own State and I know of many of such instances which exist in various other States. In those cases where the railroad runs along the streets in our villages, towns, and cities, we find numerous grade crossings, where the intersecting streets cross, and in many of those cases the particular street along which this railroad extends, running lengthwise of the street, is one of the major highways in that vicinity. I call to mind, not only in my own State, but in other States, where these major highways run along these same streets which are now occupied by railroads—the railroad running down the center of that street, and upon and along the major highway.

For example, referring to the farm-to-market roads which will run into these major highways, and the major highways leading to the market place where the farmers will eventually find the place to dispose of their produce, in many of those instances, those farmers will be

compelled to travel along streets which are occupied by railroads, and they will encounter grade crossings, thereby enhancing and increasing the hazard and the danger of accident to the traveling public. That one particular instance, which I have just called to the attention of the Members of the House, exists in one of the larger cities in the congressional district which I have the honor to represent, a city which has the honor of having been designated as the "typical American city," Muncie, Ind. I know of that same condition existing in various other cities in Indiana and in various other States throughout the Nation.

Under the provisions of the pending bill, there is no provision by which this extreme and grave hazard can be entirely eliminated. But by the amendment offered by our colleague the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. GILLIE] that situation could be handled properly and the danger eliminated and be remedied by and through the various State highway commissions, acting in conjunction with the Public Roads Commissioner, and they, cooperating and working together, could eliminate that extreme and grave hazard.

Under this highway bill, as I see it, and as we are all thinking about it, one of the outstanding thoughts which emanate from it is that safety be provided for the traveling public insofar as it is possible to do so. This amendment which the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. GILLIE] has offered, provides a method by which these extreme and grave hazards can be eliminated through the cooperation of the State highway commissions and the Public Roads Commissioner. I think this is a laudable amendment and I hope the Members of the House will adopt it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Chairman, I ask for recognition.

Mr. Chairman, as my colleague from Indiana [Mr. SPRINGER] has stated, this amendment has support of the Indiana Highway Commission, which is composed of nationally known highway experts. The import of the amendment is Nationwide in its scope. Its purpose is to facilitate the abolishment of grade crossings wherever it is in the public interest to do so, to the extent that is possible under the grade-elimination provisions of this bill.

In the bill before us, by an amendment adopted yesterday there are earmarked funds to the extent of 15 percent, that may be applied to abolishment of grade crossings. The amendment my distinguished colleague from Indiana is presenting is predicated on the theory that there should be some authority representing the interests of the public that can advise and direct the railroads what to do in order that dangerous grade crossings may be eliminated. That authority under the set-up proposed in the amendment is the State highway commission of each State in collaboration with the Public Roads Administration.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a brief question?

Mr. LUDLOW. Certainly.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Does this amendment have any connection with the division of the money between the railroads and the Federal Government, as to how the cost of these grade-crossings is to be divided between the Federal Government and the railroads?

Mr. LUDLOW. Under this amendment it is all to be paid by the Federal Government. There is no burden on the railroads. An order to a railroad company to reroute its tracks to conform to this program of track elimination does not impose a financial burden on the railroad under this amendment. The railroads have about all the burdens they can bear in taxes and cost of repairing run-down equipment.

I think it is only fair to the railroad companies to say that they are as anxious as anyone else to protect human lives. Many railroad companies are in favor of local grade elimination projects but are not in a financial position to assume the cost. The situation in which they find themselves is deserving of sympathetic consideration.

During this national emergency the railroad companies have shown themselves to be highly patriotic and cooperative and they have done a magnificent job. When the history of the war is written it will be found that the transportation record has been one of the most outstanding accomplishments. The figures as to the men and tonnage successfully and expeditiously handled is perfectly marvelous. All credit is due to the railroads for one of the greatest feats at a time when many great feats were being performed.

But in accomplishing these results rolling stock and road beds have been taxed beyond reasonable limits. The railroads, in addition to their heavy taxes, must raise enormous revenues for rehabilitation purposes if they are to continue to function with safety to passengers and crews. I would oppose this proposed amendment if it placed any part of the burden of cost on the railroad companies at this time when all of their vital resources are so much needed for rehabilitation purposes.

The cost of the rerouting under this amendment is to be paid from the appropriation carried in this bill and earmarked for grade eliminations upon receipt of claims properly audited. If a railroad company believes the order of the Highway Commission to be unreasonable and oppressive it has the right of appeal to a court of competent jurisdiction in the county where the improvement is to be made and the issue shall be tried as in any other civil action.

This amendment seeks to protect the rights of both the carriers and the public. The proponents of the amendment are convinced that it opens the way for the elimination of many dangerous grade crossings. They believe it is the only way these eliminations can be made. We submit the plan and invite your considered judgment as to its merit.

By unanimous consent of the House, I present for printing in the RECORD at this point two telegrams I received today from Indianapolis:

Urge your support amendment to S. 2015 Federal roads appropriation bill enabling State highway and public roads administration to reroute railroad right-of-way as means of eliminating grade crossings. Our investigation shows this will facilitate thoroughfare highway program for post-war.

GEORGE A. KUHN,
Chairman, Indianapolis Post-War Planning Committee.

Urge amendment to Senate bill S. 2015 granting authority to State highway commission to order grade elimination or rerouting for reason that vesting of authority in commission is necessary to facilitate and speed execution of order. Law will be futile without authority to compel execution. Grade eliminations badly needed in many Indiana cities. Life and property as well as thousands of man-hours and gasoline are lost by delays of passenger cars, trucks, and busses at Indiana grade crossings.

W. VINCENT YOUKEY,
Executive Secretary, Indiana Municipal League.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired.

Mr. MOTT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I think the objectives sought to be attained by this amendment are proper, but I think they cannot be attained by an amendment of this kind. I cannot support this amendment because a careful reading of it convinces me it constitutes a direct trespass by the Federal Government on the jurisdiction of the States. The language of this amendment gives the State highway commission authority to order the rerouting of a railroad. That is a matter entirely within the jurisdiction of the State. The State highway commission could be given this authority by State law if the legislature or the people of the State involved wanted to do it; but the Congress certainly would not have any right to authorize a State highway commission to order the rerouting of a railroad. I believe that should a railroad company contest a case arising out of the administration of such an amendment, the highest Court undoubtedly would hold it unconstitutional. For this reason I cannot support the amendment.

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. Mr. Chairman, I ask that all debate on this amendment close in 5 minutes.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, I object. I ask recognition on the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, my object in taking this time is to ask for information from the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. MOTT] and from the gentleman from Utah [Mr. ROBINSON] in connection with this amendment which has to do with the elimination of grade crossings through the use of Federal funds. Is there now in the bill any provision for the division of costs between the railroads and the Federal Government on a basis which has been established in the bill or by amendment? In the State of California our custom has been to divide the costs in each case on a basis set up by the railroad commission. It has been a very satisfactory method and we would not be well satisfied with some other formula set up either in the bill as reported by the committee or by amendment. What is the situation in the bill?

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILLIPS. I yield.

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. There is no change in existing law. The law has been in existence, I believe, for about 10 years. Under this law the entire cost of reconstruction involved in changing a railroad grade crossing can be borne by the Federal Government.

Mr. PHILLIPS. The gentleman says "can be." If some portion of the cost is borne by the railroad who determines the amount?

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. That is done by agreement between the State and the railroad company.

Mr. PHILLIPS. That is the way we should like to have it.

Mr. MOTT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILLIPS. I yield to the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. MOTT. I think another statement could be made in that connection. If the grade crossing elimination involved land acquisition, then under present law the Federal Government would pay not more than one half of it.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Is that a change in present law?

Mr. MOTT. That is the law as it has always stood and would be the law under this bill as presently written; but if acquisition of land is not involved the Federal Government would pay for all of it.

But I wanted to suggest this and I ask the chairman of the committee if it would not be possible under present law to eliminate grade crossings by the relocation of railroads?

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILLIPS. Yes; I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. The gentleman's question is whether or not the grade crossing elimination by overpass or underpass is always necessary?

Mr. MOTT. I rather doubt it. It is my opinion that grade-crossing elimination would not be confined entirely to underpass or overpass if by a change of location of the railroad itself a grade crossing could be eliminated and I do not see why it could not be done in that way.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Does the gentleman from Utah want me to yield?

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. I think, however, under the law it would practically have to be a change in the highway and very likely not involve a change of the railroad because when you come to the question of changing the railroad you have to deal with the Interstate Commerce Commission.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Is the gentleman from Oregon satisfied?

Mr. MOTT. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SMITH] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 3 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. Mr. Chairman, I do not like to object, but everyone here is waiting to proceed with this bill and under the circumstances I am forced to object.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, from the debate that has been going on in respect to H. R. 4915, it is quite evident that certain Members of the House persist in trying to relate the Federal-aid road program to the Federal revenues derived from taxes on lubricating oil, gas, manufacturers' sales tax on trucks, other automobiles and motorcycles, tires and tubes, auto parts and accessories, and the automobile use-stamp tax. They give figures showing the amount of these so-called highway-user taxes. The gentleman from Utah [Mr. ROBINSON] chairman of the Roads Committee, said in the debate on this measure:

> The user of the highway, the man who owns the automobile, pays into the Federal Treasury for the use of that automobile on our highways about $650,000,000 a year. Therefore, we are financing our own roads and in addition we are paying into the Federal Treasury about $150,000,000 a year in taxes. While technically it comes out of the Federal Treasury it does so because we put it in there with the understanding it shall be used for these roads.

They make an attempt to convey to the country the idea that the revenues collected from these sources are somehow earmarked legally or morally for the Federal-aid road program and that, therefore, it is self-sustaining. This is a wholly false position. The facts do not sustain it. Neither the Treasury nor the Internal Revenue Department recognize any such thing as highway-user taxes, either as such or as taxes levied on the above-stated articles as being in any way related to their use on public highways.

Federal taxes are levied upon all lubricating oil and gasoline sold in the United States and not only on these products sold to highway users. Farmers must pay a Federal tax on these products for their use in tractors on the farm. Aviation interests and all other users of internal-combustion engines off the highways must pay the Federal taxes on these products. Every manufacturer must pay these Federal taxes.

These facts should be sufficient to completely dispel the claim that the cost of the Federal Government's contribution to the Federal-aid road program is borne by highway users, or that it is directly or indirectly related to excise taxes on any article used in highway transportation.

I have seen no break-down of the amounts of these taxes that are derived from those who use the highways and those who do not. The Internal Revenue Department informs me that it does not have this break-down. Certainly the amount of these revenues collected from users of the highways must be comparatively large.

Following are some data provided me by the Internal Revenue Department which should be of considerable interest to the Members:

Excise revenue collected on all lubricating oil, gasoline, manufacturers' sales taxes on trucks, other automobiles and motorcycles, tires and tubes, automobile accessories and parts, and the auto-use tax for the following fiscal years ending June 30 of each of the years 1941, 1942, 1943, and 1944

Lubricating oil	$38,220,000
Gasoline	343,021,000
Trucks	10,746,000
Other automobiles and motorcycles	81,402,000
Tires and tubes	51,054,000
Auto parts and accessories	13,083,000
Total	537,526,000
Lubricating oil	46,432,000
Gasoline	369,587,000
Trucks	18,361,000
Other automobiles and motorcycles	77,171,000
Tires and tubes	64,811,000
Auto parts and accessories	28,087,000
Total	604,449,000
Lubricating oil	43,318,000
Gasoline	288,785,000
Trucks	4,229,000
Other automobiles and motorcycles	1,424,000
Tires and tubes	18,345,000
Auto parts and accessories	20,478,000
Use tax	146,284,000
Total	522,863,000
Lubricating oil	52,473,000
Gasoline	271,216,000
Trucks	3,246,000
Other automobiles and motorcycles	1,221,000
Tires and tubes	40,333,000
Auto parts and accessories	31,551,000
Use tax	134,325,000
Total	531,365,000

May I ask this question?

If the highway users are entitled to the use of the revenues from excise taxes on the lubricating oil and gasoline they use on the highways for the maintenance and construction of the highways, then why is not the farmer entitled to recover the Federal tax he pays on these same products to repair and construct lanes on his farm?

Why am I not entitled to recover the Federal taxes I pay on the lubricating oil and gasoline that are used to operate the tractor on my farm to help pay for improving the lanes on my farm?

Mr. MOTT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. MOTT. The gentleman would not pay any State or Federal gasoline tax on the gasoline used on his farm. He only pays a Federal and State tax on the gas he uses for highway purposes.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. That is not true. The facts are to the contrary. They are just as I have stated them. My information was obtained directly from the Internal Revenue Department this morning.

Mr. MOTT. May I say to the gentleman that is certainly true of the Federal Government, and it is true in my own State. In Ohio they may tax the farmer when he buys gasoline, but I do not know of any other State that does it.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. The amendment which provides for starting this proposed Federal-aid road program in 1945, regardless of the status of the war, certainly does not help this measure.

Also, the amendment which provides that no State which diverts any of its gasoline taxes, automobile license fees, or other taxes or fees intended for highway purposes to other uses can obtain any Federal funds for highway purposes.

The data relating to "estimates of ability to match apportionment under H. R. 4915," on pages 8390 and 8391 of the November 24, 1944, RECORD are extremely interesting. Those given under the heading "Remarks," especially. They should require no comment, but anyone who has had experience in and the responsibility of financing most any one of the political subdivisions must realize that any public spending program based on such data as those cannot possibly be sound financially.

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment close in 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Utah?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. Mr. Chairman, I sincerely hope that the Committee will not support this amendment. In the first place, there is very serious question of the constitutionality or the legality of this kind of an amendment in the present highway bill. This amendment, I appreciate, might aid in the solution of a particular problem in some district or in some city, but it does this, which seems to me would be entirely wrong to do in a highway bill. It would permit the relocation of a railroad without a cent of payment from the railroad for relocation, and the Federal Government would be required to pay the entire cost. Surely this Committee would not want to enact that kind of legislation.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Not only the relocation, but the elevation of railroads would be covered by this bill; a matter absolutely foreign to the bill under consideration.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Would not the adoption of this amendment amount to the Congress of the United States telling the highway commissioners of the several States to regulate interstate commerce?

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. I think that is also true. Mr. Chairman, I ask the Committee to vote down this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. GILLIE) there were—ayes 9, noes 59.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. STEWART:

On page 4, line 25, after "exceed", strike out "60" and insert in lieu thereof "75."

On page 5, line 2, after "exceed", strike out "50" and insert in lieu thereof "60."

On page 5, line 5, strike out "exceeding."

On page 5, line 6, strike out all of line 6 and down to and including "area" in line 10.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against the amendment that it perhaps would properly come as an amendment to the amendment I offered yesterday, but it is not in order at the present time inasmuch as that language has been stricken out and new language substituted for it.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Oklahoma desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. STEWART. Yes, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will be glad to hear the gentleman on the point of order.

Mr. STEWART. On the question of the point of order, a majority of the votes of a legislative body can do anything in the way of changing any amendment adopted or that failed to be adopted. My amendment was offered, I believe, before the amendment of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT] was offered, but we are just now getting to it. We are just a little late. Not having had an opportunity of reading the gentleman's amendment until the RECORD was printed this morning, I believe the only question involved is the matter of percentage. I think the question is properly raised because my amendment does not represent the same percentage that was in the bill formerly, so I think my amendment is germane.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is prepared to rule.

The gentleman from Oklahoma offers an amendment which has been reported, and the gentleman from Michigan makes a point of order against the amendment. The Chair invites attention to the fact that the language appearing in the bill on page 4, line 23, section 5, down through and including the first four words in line 3 on page 5, was stricken out by the amendment adopted yesterday. The amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma seeks to amend language carried in the original bill, which has already been amended by an amendment adopted on yesterday. The amounts appearing in the original language of the bill, which the gentleman seeks to amend or change, do not appear in the amendment which was adopted yesterday. Therefore, the Chair thinks that very clearly the first part of the gentleman's amendment is subject to a point of order, therefore all of it, and sustains the point of order.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that this amendment go to the question of percentages as did the Wolcott amendment, and that I may have an opportunity at this time to amend my amendment in dealing with the percentage in the Wolcott amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against the unanimous-consent request that it is not properly put, as I understand it. The only way the gentleman can submit his amendment is to ask unanimous consent to vacate the proceedings by which the amendment I offered was adopted, which, of course, I would object to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is of the opinion that would be one way. But, the gentleman from Oklahoma, presenting a unanimous consent request, may present it in his own way, and as presented by him, his request is subject to the consideration of the committee.

Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I would like to make a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Where does the gentleman from Oklahoma intend to offer his amendment?

Mr. STEWART. To that part of your amendment which reduced 60 to 50 percent, to raise your 50 percent to 75 percent and 60 percent, and eliminate that part, in your amendment, referring to Indian lands on a percentage basis, leaving that purely to a question of the area, regardless of the State, and the acreage, where you state they are to participate equally.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, I am sorry that the chairman of the committee has taken the attitude of objecting to a request for a post-war program. We are merely considering a routine Federal-aid bill and trying to make a political football out of it, as if we were putting up a post-war road program. The truth is, my State does not receive one dollar in addition by reason of this much publicized, advertised, and advocated bill, any more than it would receive under the regular Federal-Aid Act. I am sorry that the boys and girls from the broad prairies are not here where they could vote against the boys from the tall skyscraping cities and really make this a post-war bill. I am interested in roads. I have been interested in roads ever since I became a grown man.

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEWART. I am happy to yield, sir.

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. I wish to state that Oklahoma under this bill will receive annually, $10,171,000. That is over $30,000,000 which the State of Oklahoma will receive in the 3 years under the provisions of this bill.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. Chairman, I think I am familiar with the figures as to what Oklahoma will get. Oklahoma has not collected gasoline tax on all of the oil and gas she has sold during the war and the revenues are very much decreased over normal times—the major portion of

gas is sold to the Government free from taxes. She has not anything but a bunch of 4-year-old cars just like the rest of the States of the Union, and all the State's maintenance equipment is worn out and a bunch of junk. The first thing the State highway department is going to do when the markets are opened is buy graders, trucks, tractors, and other equipment to maintain the roads which are worn and being worn out during this war. All this expense coming at once will take a great deal of the money coming into the road fund and the State cannot match dollar for dollar. We are going to have just what the little boy shot at, when this bill passes, in the way of a program—simply nothing. I am sorry, due to parliamentary procedure, the chairman of this committee, who represents one of the broad-acre States, has objected to the consideration of my amendment. At the time the State engineer and the three members were before the Roads Committee this bill provided 75-percent participation by the Federal Government—that is just what my amendment proposes to do. As the bill now stands since the adoption of the Wolcott amendment we will have a more restricted Federal-aid bill than we have had in many years.

Mr. BEALL. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment which is at the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BEALL: On page 5, line 15, insert a new section, as follows:

"SEC. 6. Notwithstanding the provisions of the act entitled "An act to provide that the United States shall aid the States in the construction of rural post roads, and for other purposes,' approved July 11, 1916, or of the Federal Highway Act of November 9, 1921, as amended and supplemented, not to exceed 50 percent of the amounts apportioned to any State under the provisions of this act may be used to pay the Federal share of the cost of construction of any toll highway in such State on the same basis and in the same manner as in the construction of any free highway upon the condition that any such toll highway shall be owned and operated by such State and all tolls received from the operation thereof, less the actual cost of operation and maintenance, are applied to the repayment to the State of its part of the cost of construction of such toll highway; and upon the further condition that when the amount contributed by such State in the construction of such toll highway shall have been repaid from he tolls, the collection of tolls for the use of such highways shall thereafter cease and the same shall be maintained and operated as a free highway: *Provided*, That the provisions of this section shall not be construed to permit the imposition of tolls by any State or political subdivision thereof on any highway heretofore built with Federal aid under the provisions of the Federal Highway Act of November 9, 1921, as amended and supplemented: *Provided further*, That this section shall apply only to the funds provided in this act for post-war highway construction and when such funds are expended, this section shall become inoperative."

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and on this section close in 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Utah?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the amendment offered by the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. BEALL], involves the use of Federal-aid highway funds for the construction of toll roads. No matter how much that road, whether toll or otherwise, may be desired in a metropolitan area, it is and has been the uniform policy in Federal-aid highway legislation that no tolls shall be permitted on such roads.

I call attention to section 9, of the Highway Act of 1921, and I read:

All highways constructed or reconstructed under the provisions of this act shall be free from tolls of all kinds.

It is to the credit, and it is one of the chief virtues, of Federal highway legislation and Federal aid for all types of highways, whether the funds have been used in the construction of highways or bridges, that through the years, from the inception of the Federal-aid highway program in 1916 down to date, all appropriations have been made with the definite understanding that there should be no tolls. I think it is unwise to depart from that policy at this time.

Mr. BEALL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Yes; I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BEALL. The gentleman will notice in this amendment we do not permit the closing of any existing highways. If there happens to be now in use any highway, it cannot be closed under this amendment.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I so understand. I understand the gentleman's amendment. But when all has been said and done, and even with the reservation in the amendment, the fact remains that these funds are now requested under the gentleman's amendments to be used for the construction of a toll road. That is contrary to the policy of Federal aid. While I am in sympathy with the gentleman in his effort to solve his metropolitan problems, yet in my judgment it would be most unwise to depart from the policy that has universally obtained, for I oppose any Federal aid to any toll bridge or highway.

I trust that the amendment will be promptly voted down.

Mr. BEALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I yield.

Mr. BEALL. Does the gentleman realize that if we were to build a new road from Baltimore to Washington it would take all the money for the next 6 years, the total amount in this bill, to construct such road?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I stated I was in sympathy with the gentleman's problem. He brought this matter to the committee and they unanimously rejected it. While there is need for superhighways in metropolitan areas there is a way to get them, but that way is not to change the policy that has obtained with respect to Federal-aid highways in all 48 States of the Union, since Federal-aid highways were first authorized.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Maryland.

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 6. If the Commissioner of Public Roads shall determine that it is necessary for the expeditious completion of projects undertaken pursuant to this act, he may advance to any State from funds heretofore or hereafter made available the Federal share of the cost thereof to enable the State highway department to make prompt payments for work as it progresses. The funds so advanced shall be deposited in a special trust account by the State treasurer, or other State official authorized under the laws of the State to receive Federal-aid highway funds, to be disbursed solely upon vouchers approved by the State highway department for work actually performed in accordance with plans, specifications, and estimates approved by the Public Roads Administration under the provisions of this act. Any unexpended balances of funds so advanced shall be returned to the credit of the appropriation from which the funds have been advanced.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WOLCOTT: On page 6, line 8, strike out the period, insert a semicolon and the following: "*Provided*, That any advance made to any State under the provisions of this section shall be deducted from any apportionment allocated to such State under the provisions of this act for the year next succeeding the year in which such advance is made and no agreement made in accordance with the provisions of section 2 of this act shall be valid for any pro rata share of the cost of construction in excess of such apportionment less such advance."

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. Mr. Chairman, I think there is no objection to that amendment. I believe it is a good amendment, and as far as I am concerned will accept it.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I may say to the gentleman from Utah that I believe it carries out the thought of the committee.

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. I am sure it does.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

There was no objection.

Mr. SAUTHOFF. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. SAUTHOFF: Page 5, line 22, strike the period, insert a colon and add the following: "*Provided*, That such State has not diverted revenues derived from gasoline taxes, automobile license fees, and other taxes and fees intended for highway purposes to other uses."

Mr. SAUTHOFF. Mr. Chairman, I have offered this amendment for the simple reason that in the last year of highway construction $226,000,000 was diverted from State funds for other than highway purposes.

Now, what is the effect of this? Let me point out what it will do in my State. In 1941, which is the last year we had highway construction preceding the war, we had $3,400,000 allotted to us from Federal highway-aid funds. That was not a difficult amount to match. The amount prescribed in this bill will mean $12,000,000 instead of $3,400,000 for Wisconsin.

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAUTHOFF. I yield to the gentleman from Utah.

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. Mr. Chairman, I have just consulted members of

the committee who are here and so far as the Members present are concerned, we are willing to permit the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. SAUTHOFF. Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairman of the committee and want to compliment the committee on its good work on this bill.

Merely by way of explanation I should like to add that it is not my intention to interfere with any State law by this amendment. I am trying to save States from increasing their State taxes in order to meet the 50–50 matching basis. If highway funds are kept for highway purposes, no additional State taxes will be required.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SAUTHOFF].

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 7. There shall be designated within the continental United States a national system of interstate highways not exceeding 40,000 miles in total extent so located as to connect by routes, as direct as practicable, the principal metropolitan areas, cities, and industrial centers, to serve the national defense, and to connect at suitable border points with routes of continental importance in the Dominion of Canada and the Republic of Mexico. The routes of the national system of interstate highways shall be selected by joint action of the State highway departments of each State and the adjoining States, as provided by the Federal Highway Act of November 9, 1921, for the selection of the Federal-aid system. All highways or routes included in the national system of interstate highways as finally approved, if not already included in the Federal-aid highway system, shall be added to said system without regard to any mileage limitation.

SEC. 8. With the approval of the Federal Works Administrator, not to exceed 1½ percent of the amount apportioned for any year to any State under the Federal Highway Act as amended and supplemented, except sections 3 and 23 thereof shall hereafter be used with or without State funds for surveys, plans, engineering, and economic investigations of projects for future construction in such State, on the Federal-aid highway system and extensions thereof within municipalities, on secondary or feeder roads, urban highways or grade-crossing eliminations, and for highway research necessary in connection therewith.

SEC. 9. For the purpose of carrying out the provisions of section 23 of the Federal Highway Act (42 Stat. 218), as amended and supplemented, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated (1) for forest highways the sum of $25,000,000 for the first post-war year and a like amount for each of the second and third post-war years; and (2) for forest development roads and trails the sum of $12,500,000 for the first post-war year and a like amount for each of the second and third post-war years: *Provided*, That the apportionment for forest highways in Alaska shall be for each year $1,500,000 and that such additional amount as otherwise would have been apportioned to Alaska for each of said years shall be apportioned among those States, including Puerto Rico, whose forest highway apportionment for such year otherwise would be less than 1 percent of the entire apportionment for forest highways for that year.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HOPE: On page 7, line 18, strike out "$12,500,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$25,000,000."

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, this is one of the most encouraging things that has happened in this House in a long time, when the gentleman from Kansas, a great agricultural State, recognizes what we have in the way of wealth and the development of the natural resources in the great forest sections of the United States. I have just come from one of the big developments out West, way back 80 miles in the rugged section of the forests of Idaho, where there is a model community, where they are mining and taking out a million dollars a month in mineral wealth to supply the needs of our war efforts. They are handicapped in moving out that material, because they have to haul it over three mountain ranges; over some of the worst roads you ever saw. If we could have liberal appropriations for forest roads and trails in the great undeveloped sections of the Northwest embraced in the national forest and bring out the minerals, and bring out the timber, it would go a long way in providing the revenues to pay our Government operating expenses in the form of taxes.

I am in full support of the amendment proposed by the gentleman from Kansas. I have been here 12 years, and I have been trying to impress this Congress and trying to impress the bureaus here in Washington with the importance of opening up new areas and opening up new wealth, not only in the State of Idaho and the Northwest, but in Alaska and all over the country where land has been set aside that is now embraced in national forests.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITE. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. Is there any opposition to this amendment?

Mr. WHITE. I do not know whether there is any opposition, but it ought to pass without any opposition. It is the most important thing that we can do here, and that is to provide access to Government-owned timber and to open up the copper deposits and the iron deposits and minerals of all kinds that are locked up in the national forests, as well as to open up the timber resources and give access to water power sites. This timber is needed. It is inaccessible today. This simple appropriation will do more to open new wealth and give access to the things the Government owns, and thereby increase taxes and revenue, than anything else we in this House could do.

I certainly am encouraged that the gentleman from Kansas has taken the lead in this movement.

We are told that one-third of the water power in the Northwest is undeveloped. Where is this water power? It is in this inaccessible country, where there are no roads. It is inaccessible now. Let us pass this authorization and give the Forest Service the money with which to open up that country.

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment close in 10 minutes, 5 minutes to be reserved to the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Utah?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ELLSWORTH].

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I rise, speaking in favor of this amendment, for the particular purpose of directing the attention of the House to the fact that the logging industry of the United States has undergone a revolutionary change within the last few years, almost within the war period. Previous to 1940 or thereabouts most of the logs which were made into the lumber we use in this country were hauled out of the woods on railroad rails. The development of the pneumatic-tired logging truck has changed the picture entirely, so that at the present time more than 85 percent of all of the logs that are made into lumber in this country are hauled out over such roads as we are now discussing, namely, forest-development roads and highways.

This is simply a development in the line of progress, but it does indicate that in considering appropriations for forest-road development we must take into consideration the fact that more money will be required than heretofore for such roads because this new development has taken place in the operation of our forests.

The fact that this Congress not long ago reiterated the sustained-yield policy in Senate bill 250, which authorizes the Forest Service to make sustained-yield agreements with private owners in order to bring more and more of our timberlands under the sustained-yield principle, coupled with the new development I have just mentioned, makes it highly necessary that we have the widest possible development of roads in the forests so that the sustained-yield policy may be carried out. I urge the adoption of the amendment.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, this pending section was given careful attention and the interests that it promotes most generous treatment by the committee. Section 9 provides for appropriations not to be matched out of the Federal Treasury of $25,000,000 annually for 3 years for forest highways, and it provides for the authorization for appropriation for roads and trails, the secondary means of traversing the forests, $12,500,000 a year for 3 years, the largest amounts ever authorized by Congress for such purposes, including the authorization under the National Industrial Recovery Act, when we authorized $400,000,000 for highway construction. These amounts were thought out.

Our forests have been increased in the past 12 years, but in the past 3 years they have been depleted. This is one type of construction that has gone on during the war. Congress has appropriated each year during the emergency,

when we made no appropriations for our highways, moneys for the construction of roads in our national forests to reach our timber and to bring it to market, and these appropriations have amounted to large amounts annually. I have before me the last authorization bill we passed. It was in 1940; $7,000,000 was authorized for forest roads. That was in 1940. We have acquired no more forests since then. And for the $12,500,000 authorized by this bill, under the section under consideration, in 1940 we authorized $3,000,000. I assert, Mr. Chairman, that the amounts carried in this bill, both for the forest highways and for the forest roads and trails, are the largest and most generous comparable amounts ever carried in any highway legislation.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I will yield in just a moment.

I represent an agricultural area. I am interested in the promotion of our forests, but when this committee, after months of consideration, gave to those interests and to those highways and to those trails and roads, the largest authorizations ever accorded them, it occurs to me there is no occasion for this amendment. And now I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Idaho.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman appreciates that in this war emergency we have been forced to send our mining men and our capital into foreign countries and have had to bring in copper. And we have had to bring in lead from other countries and we have left ourselves locked up. Does the gentleman realize $7,000,000 for forest roads and trails is a niggardly amount and does not reach the situation at all?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I decline to yield further. I have answered the gentleman's question.

Mr. WHITE. And that recently we have had to send our money to foreign governments and have increased taxation when we ought to put our money in our own country.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I decline to yield further. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman's attitude is typical of those who advocate increasing generous authorizations.

Repeating what I said a few moments ago: The Congress has been most generous. I have been in sympathy with forest roads because, as part of our emergency legislation, we have put the construction of roads in the forests and through the forests, to reach our timber, on the same basis that we have put the construction of roads to our Army camps and to our defense plants. In my judgment, we have been most generous and there are no reasons for this amendment.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I yield. May I have the gentleman's question, please?

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I agree with the gentleman that this is an increased amount, but I want to inquire of the gentleman if it is not true that we are now taking twice the amount of timber out of our national forests that we have taken in 5 years; and if it is not true, from now on we are going to take a proportionately larger amount?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I have answered the gentleman's question. We are not only taking it out but we are making provision to provide or appropriate the funds. Please keep in mind, also, that this is not the only money that is being spent for the construction of roads, trails, and highways. Much of the proceeds of the timber that is being used in the war effort, and being sold from these forests, is used in the construction of forest roads. I think I have yielded to the gentleman sufficiently.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield for just one more question, only 10 percent of these proceeds are being used for that purpose.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I understand, but that is an additional amount. I repeat, not only that amount or percent, but other amounts in this bill, provide most generous treatment. I trust the amendment will be voted down.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. HOPE) there were—ayes 21, noes 62.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 10. (a) For the construction, reconstruction, improvement, and maintenance of roads and trails, inclusive of necessary bridges, in national parks, monuments, and other areas administered by the National Park Service, including areas authorized to be established as national parks and monuments, and national park and monument approach roads authorized by the act of January 31, 1931 (46 Stat. 1053), as amended, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of $12,750,000 to become available at the rate of $4,250,000 a year for each 3 successive post-war years.

(b) For the construction and maintenance of parkways, to give access to national parks and national monuments, or to become connecting sections of a national parkway plan, over lands to which title has been transferred to the United States by the States or by private individuals, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of $15,000,000 to become available at the rate of $5,000,000 a year for each 3 successive post-war years.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ABERNETHY: On page 8, line 19, strike out "$15,000,000" and insert "$30,000,000"; strike out "$5,000,000" and insert "$10,000,000."

NATCHEZ TRACE PARKWAY

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Mississippi is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his amendment.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ABERNETHY. I yield to my distinguished colleague.

Mr. RANKIN. I understand there is no opposition to this amendment by the committee. The committee has gone over it carefully and I am wondering if they would not be willing to accept.

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. I do not know if there is any opposition on the other side or not.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Apparently there is, so I would like to proceed. Mr. Chairman, from the reading of this amendment the members of the committee might assume that it is in effect an increase in the authorization of appropriations that will eventually be made by the Government toward the completion of the national parkways. That is not the case and I believe I can convince you that it is not. Therefore, I respectfully seek your indulgence and will appreciate your close attention during the brief time allotted me.

In 1934 the Government represented to the States in which these parkways are located that if they would purchase the rights-of-way and bear certain technical costs, the parkways would definitely be completed. The States accepted the proposal of the Government as tendered them by Federal statutory law. Following their acceptances these States, in good faith, have secured and paid for the rights-of-way and have also contributed certain legal and technical services, all aggregating an expenditure of near onto $4,000,000.

Thus a promise was made, contingent upon the affected States assuming certain responsibilities. The responsibilities were not simply assumed but have been performed. So not only is there a contractual statutory obligation, but a moral obligation on the part of the Government to complete the parkways. And the only debatable issue is not how large or how small a sum we may authorize, but what amount are we bound by contract to authorize, limited only to a sum which the National Park Service may judiciously expend annually. The National Park Service says that amount is $10,000,000 per annum for the next succeeding 3 post-war years. Its statement stands undisputed.

So the amendment simply means, if adopted, that the national parkways will be judiciously and expeditiously completed, and not dragged on over an unnecessary lengthy period of years.

The States most particularly affected by this proposal are Virginia, North Carolina, Tennessee, Alabama, and the State of Mississippi, the Fourth District of which I have the honor to represent. The parkways most particularly affected are the Blue Ridge, the Natchez Trace, and the George Washington Memorial Parkway. While my interest in this matter is a general one, my personal interest lies in the completion of the Natchez Trace Parkway, which traverses the very heart of my district.

There is this significant fact to which I direct your particuluar attention: Prior to the war the Congress has in each of the years wherein it has made authorizations for parkway construction authorized much larger appropriations than is authorized in this particular bill.

To date the Government has expended and/or programmed the sum of $29,073,126.57 toward the construction of the Blue Ridge and Natchez Trace Parkways. In other words, the Government as of this date has a tremendous equity in these parkways. That equity must be protected, and it can only be done by completion of the projects.

The National Park Service has estimated that $56,216,715 will be needed to

complete these two parkways, and of this amount the Natchez Trace will require $34,271,610.

If hereafter there is appropriated annually for the Natchez Trace and Blue Ridge Parkways the sum as now authorized in this bill, which is $5,000,000 per year, 11 further long years will be required in completion, or almost a quarter of a century since their authorization. Really some of us would like to use the Natchez Trace Parkway before Father Time overtakes us, and no doubt my friends and colleagues from Virginia and North Carolina dream of the completion of the Blue Ridge Parkway.

To accept the authorization as it stands would naturally incur waste in administrative costs since the National Park Service is prepared to go forward with construction with much more dispatch than the authorization permits.

Mr. A. E. Demaray, the Assistant Director of the National Park Service, appeared before the Committee on Roads and recommended that a sum of $10,000,000 per annum be authorized for each of the three succeeding post-war years. I have studied the hearings closely and find no objection offered to his recommendation by any member of the Committee on Roads; nor is there any intimation in the hearings that his recommendation was excessive.

Mr. Demaray informed me a few days ago that he knew of no objections to his recommendation and no member of the Roads Committee with whom I have conferred knew of such. Nevertheless, the Committee on Roads, in reporting out the bill, sliced the recommended authorization in half. Of late, several Members have agreed with me that the amount should be restored, as my amendment seeks to do, and none expressed themselves to the contrary, although I have not consulted each Member.

When giving due consideration to the facts, that is, the Government's contractual offer to the various States; the good faith in which the offer was made; the acceptance of the offer by the States in purchasing and giving over to the Government the rights-of-way and further by bearing certain technical costs, all aggregating slightly under $4,000,000, thus definitely sealing the contract; Government expenditures to date amounting to $29,073,126.57; and the further fact that to prolong construction would tremendously increase administrative costs per mile of construction, as it is bound to do; so, I say that my amendment should be adopted.

I respectfully submit that your failure to do so would be akin to a breach of contract on the part of the Government, although unintentional, I know, on your part, and it could result in the parkways forever remaining unfinished. To adopt the amendment will assure completion.

Most sincerely do I urge you to support my amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. RANKIN rose.

The CHAIRMAN. Is the gentleman from Mississippi seeking recognition on the amendment?

Mr. RANKIN. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Mississippi is recognized.

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from Mississippi yield for a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield.

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this section and all amendments thereto close in 20 minutes, the last 5 to be reserved to the committee.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, that will not preclude me from offering a new section immediately following this, would it?

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, is the committee reserving 5 minutes in which to oppose the amendment?

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. Yes; to oppose the amendment. I may say that the position of the committee is that these amounts are simply authorizations, not appropriations. The amount contained here, I say frankly, is less than has been authorized in any other bill. I believe the least we have ever authorized is $7,500,000. The usual authorization is $10,000,000. While personally I rather feel that this authorization for at least $7,500,000 should be made, the committee did not feel that way, and I consider myself obligated to support the committee's views.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Utah asks unanimous consent that all debate on this section and all amendments thereto close in not to exceed 20 minutes, the last 5 to be reserved to the committee.

Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN], the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DOUGHTON], and the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. MCGEHEE] will be recognized for 5 minutes each and then the committee for 5 minutes.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, I was seeking recognition; that is why I reserved the right to object.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is sorry; the Chair did not know the gentleman was seeking recognition.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. All I want is 2 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. If the gentleman was seeking recognition he will be included and the time for the others accordingly reduced.

The gentleman from Mississippi is recognized.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I hope the committee adopts this amendment. As has been pointed out by my distinguished colleague from Mississippi [Mr. ABERNETHY] and also by the chairman of the committee, the regular authorizations for this work have been $10,000,000 a year. If this amount is cut to $5,000,000 it will simply double the time necessary to complete the work; the waste and erosion that are taking place constantly on the roadbed will be that much greater and the expense that much larger; and it will be that much longer before these projects can be used.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. Yes; I yield.

Mr. ABERNETHY. I should like to point out further that these projects have already been under construction and authorized for 11 years.

Mr. RANKIN. Yes; they have not only been authorized but they have been under construction for a long time.

Mr. ABERNETHY. And we are obligated to finish them by statutory law.

Mr. RANKIN. Yes; we are obligated to finish them; this is a Federal obligation.

To slow this work down now after all these expenditures have been made, all the rights-of-way acquired, all the roadbed that has been built and the bridges that have been provided, and stretch this construction out over an unlimited number of years, would simply mean national waste.

One of these highways is the old Andrew Jackson Trail from Nashville to New Orleans known as the Natchez Trace. It is dedicated to the Chickasaw and Choctaw Indians. Those Indians opened up their territories to Jackson's army and made it possible for him to go to New Orleans in time to win that great battle in 1815.

This road is 446.81 miles long, and, as I stated, a large portion of the roadbed has already been built.

The Park Service is the one service that did not double its demands or estimates this year. Many of these agencies came in and asked for twice as much as they had been asking for, but the Park Service did not do that. It merely came in and asked for the amount that had been allotted to them from year to year. When the committee cut them all 50 percent, it reduced this service below actual requirements.

As has been pointed out, if we are going to finish this project we will have to do it immediately following the war. We will have more unemployment at that time and we will have more need for employment. It cannot be said that this great highway will not be used. It will probably be the most traveled highway of its kind in the country. There are no surface crossings, which will make it that much more desirable.

From a military standpoint this Natchez Trace will be one of the most valuable highways in America.

I hope the committee will accept the amendment and that it will be agreed to without opposition.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DOUGHTON] for 4 minutes.

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi. As has been pointed out, this amendment does not authorize new projects. This amendment is only for projects that have been previously authorized and that have been partly constructed.

Mr. Chairman, I am somewhat familiar with the authorization and construction of the Blue Ridge Parkway,

having been active in the original legislation. This parkway extends from the Shenandoah National Park to the Great Smoky Mountains National Park, and has been partially constructed. However, the construction has been in sections and these sections are not connected. If this project is not completed those parts that have been constructed will be of very little benefit. The States, including my own State of North Carolina, have acquired the rights-of-way at an expense of several million dollars.

If this appropriation is cut down, or reduced by one-half, it will take some 15 or 20 years to complete the parkway and it will be of very little utility or benefit until it is completed. This parkway traverses, in North Carolina, one of the most scenic sections of the United States. When completed it will be not only a great asset to the entire eastern part of the United States, but it will also be a godsend to the people in that section where the parkway is being constructed. This parkway is located in the mountainous sections where there are few public works. It will be a great post-war development which will take care of any serious unemployment problem that may occur in that area.

I feel it will be an economy to the Federal Government now to complete the construction of these parkways which have been authorized and partially constructed.

The Blue Ridge Parkway, in which I am particularly interested, was authorized by an amendment to the Federal Aid Highway Act, June 16, 1936. This parkway is 477 miles in length, of which 332½ miles have been constructed at a cost of $23,165,257.51. There are approximately 144½ miles yet to be constructed at an estimated cost of $13,840,857.67, plus an additional $1,493,884.82, which has already been allocated but not expended. If $3,000,000 were allocated each year, it would take approximately 5 years to complete.

Mr. Chairman, I sincerely hope that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi will be adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. MILLER] for 4 minutes.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, I have asked for this time to secure information and not that I am necessarily opposed to the amendment. I know little about it. But I was scolded yesterday gently but firmly for not agreeing with the committee on the allocation of funds, and I want to agree with the committee on this if I can.

It is my understanding on the appropriation for national forests that that money does not necessarily have to be spent in the national forests, but that under Public Roads Administration regulations roads giving access to or adjacent to a national forest, even though they are on the Federal-aid highway system, can be rebuilt under Federal forest highway funds.

That being true, the question in my mind on this section was not that I was opposed to seeing these parkways—some of which I have been over and admired greatly—completed, but I was wondering about the language that allowed for the construction and maintenance of parkways. We find the same language here as is used in connection with national parks: To give access to national parks and national monuments.

My specific question is this: If a road now on the Federal highway system, not a part of one of these beautiful parkways, but giving access to a national park will, under this appropriation, be built in the future wholly with Federal funds, or will it be limited to the parkways already under construction or to be constructed in the future? I will be happy to yield to the chairman of the committee if he can enlighten me.

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. I yield to the gentleman from Utah.

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. My understanding is that that refers to existing highways, and would not include new highways.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Existing State-aid highways giving access to national parks?

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. No.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. In other words, I am not opposed to using 100 percent Federal funds in the national forests, but I raise the question: Are we going to do with this as we do with the national forests funds and use the money on roads giving access to the national parks?

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. It is the same language that has been used, and the money has not been used for new construction. It has been on the same highways.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. The gentleman does not understand my question. My question is this: This language allows appropriations on roads to give access to national parks. Will those access roads, not a part of the national parks, be built under this section 100 percent with Federal funds?

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. As I understand, that would be only the roads inside of the parks.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. I think it should be the roads inside the parks. If I may say to the gentleman from Mississippi, I wondered why the language, "giving access to national parks," was included, because that could be added ad infinitum.

Mr. RANKIN. Some of the lateral roads there are merely access roads to main highways, but this is all, as I understand, inside of the park.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. I yield to the gentleman from Idaho.

Mr. WHITE. The gentleman understands, no doubt, that a different policy exists. In dealing with national forests you are building roads on Government-owned land. In building national parkways you are buying private land on which to build the roads, such as Sky Line Drive, and Natchez Trace Highway, and all the rest of them. There you acquire private land to build the roads upon, but in the national forests it is the opposite. The Government already owns the land. We are trying to get these areas opened up by building roads on Government-owned land.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. I agree that that is what it should be, but, as a matter of fact, in the national-forest appropriation, we are building roads not on public land.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. The word "access" here contemplates that where those parkways cross existing highways those highways may be adjusted so that you can get into the parkways.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. They are within the parkways.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. That is absolutely right—within the parkway area.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. MCGEHEE].

Mr. MCGEHEE. Mr. Chairman, several years ago this House and the Senate—and a majority of those who were Members at that time are still here—made a contract with the 8 or 10 States that these parkways traverse that they would construct these parkways in the event the States spent certain moneys and paid certain costs. The States have lived up to their obligations in this respect. They have bought the rights-of-way and paid the costs, as this Congress demanded of them.

We are thinking today of unemployment during the post-war period. Were it otherwise, this bill would not be before the Congress today. In the authorization of the appropriation of moneys we are devising ways and means for the construction of highways throughout this country of ours, not only highways for the public but highways to the forest areas, to the park areas, and to others.

In the bill before you today the committee has recommended larger sums than have heretofore been given to any department of the Government with the exception of this one. Heretofore the Members of this House have authorized $10,000,000 a year to be expended in the construction of these parkways. The committee now recommends only $5,000,000 a year. The National Park Service recommended $10,000,000 a year, the usual amount authorized by the Congress.

I understand from some members of the committee they thought that this bureau asked for twice what they ought to have, just as every other department had asked for about twice what it should have, and they arbitrarily cut them in half. That is what was done in this case.

Certainly, Mr. Chairman, if you are going to continue the construction of these parkways, if you are going to continue in faith with the States through which these parkways go, if you are going to continue in faith with these States

by putting up the funds for the construction of these parkways that you said you would, then there is no question but that you will vote for this amendment and give this bureau under this bill just what it has been securing for the past several years and what you have been giving it.

Mr. MOTT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McGEHEE. I yield to the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. MOTT. The gentleman said the committee arbitrarily cut the amount of this item in two. Perhaps that is true, but is it not also true that a majority of the committee arbitrarily cut every other item in two that is proposed in this bill?

Mr. McGEHEE. That is true, but in most other instances twice as much was asked for as they had received before, so the committee cut the items. In this instance only the amount that had been heretofore authorized was asked for.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Utah [Mr. ROBINSON].

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. Mr. Chairman, I ask for a vote on the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment which is at the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CASE: On page 8, after line 20, insert a new section, as follows:

"(c) For the construction, improvement, and maintenance of Indian reservation roads and roads to provide access to Indian reservations and Indian lands under the provisions of the act approved May 26, 1928 (45 Stat. 750), there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of $8,000,000 for the first post-war year and a like amount for each of the second and third post-war years: *Provided*, That under the provisions of the act approved September 5, 1940 (54 Stat. 867), the location, type, and design of all roads constructed shall be approved by the Public Roads Administration before any expenditures are made thereon and all such construction done by contract shall be under the general supervision of the Public Roads Administration."

Mr. CASE. Mr. Chairman, I do not know that there is any opposition to this amendment. I have submitted it to the committee on both sides. It merely makes authorization for roads on Indian reservations, similar to that which has been carried in every previous highway authorization bill. Its omission in this bill was due to the fact that the Office of Indian Affairs had been moved to Chicago at the time of the hearings and was not able to make a presentation to the committee.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASE. Mr. Chairman, I do not care to debate this matter unless there is some objection to the amendment.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASE. I am glad to yield to a member of the committee.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. The language of the amendment is a bit different from the language previously carried for similar authorizations. The language, for instance, in the act of 1940 provides for the construction of roads and your amendment provides for the construction and maintenance of roads. In that regard it differs from the previous authorizations. Am I correct in that?

Mr. CASE. The gentleman is correct, but the language that I submitted is the language which I obtained from the Office of Indian Affairs. The gentleman understands that unless these roads are maintained the construction goes to pieces, and there is no other maintenance agency on the Indian reservations, other than the Office of Indian Affairs, and they thought it would be proper to have the language make clear their authority. Actually the word "improvement", which has always been carried, would probably be interpreted to cover maintenance.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I understand that it is the language from the Office of Indian Affairs, but the fact remains, it is an enlargement of the authority heretofore obtained. Now I ask this second question: The amount carried is $8,000,000 annually for 3 years, or a total of $24,000,000?

Let me invite the attention of the gentleman to the fact that section 10 carries for the maintenance of roads and trails in the National Park Service substantially the same amounts that were carried in the authorization of 1940. The amount being carried for those purposes in the act of 1940 was $4,000,000, and as amended, it carries two and one-half million dollars for the national parkways, or about 25 percent more than the amount carried in the act of 1940. Whereas the gentleman's amendment would almost multiply by three times the amount heretofore carried. I am just wondering if the gentleman would not agree to an amendment to, say, double the amount, or fix it at $6,000,000 annually, because I think $8,000,000 is entirely too much.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Chairman, I am not sure that I want to prolong the debate on that particular point. I might point out two things. In the authorization act of 1934 the authorization for Indian roads was $4,000,000. At the same time the regular Federal-aid was $125,000,000. In this bill it is $225,000,000, to say nothing of the $125,000,000 for urban roads and the one hundred and fifty million for secondary.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I understand that.

Mr. CASE. This $8,000,000 is in proportion to the primary system of Federal-aid authorizations in this bill, and bears approximately the same ratio as in previous years. Now, as a matter of fact, Congress has never appropriated the full amount of Indian authorizations. This portion of the bill, as the gentleman knows, of course, does not carry the contract authority but is merely an authorization for an appropriation, under the sections now being discussed.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I say in all kindness to the gentleman, I trust he will accept the suggestion and substitute $6,000,000, particularly in view of the fact that we have here an agency of the Government which, for the first time, neglected, whether located in Chicago or elsewhere; to come before the committee and, frankly, I think we ought to have more information before we agree to $8,000,000.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to modify my amendment to substitute "$6,000,000" for "$8,000,000."

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASE. I yield.

Mr. MURDOCK. Notwithstanding the fact that the Office of Indian Affairs is an agency that did not appear in behalf of this proposal because of their location at some distance from Washington, I want to say that the gentleman's amendment is good and timely. We have been out over the country visiting Indian Reservations. I find that today many young Indians are in the service, averaging about 10 percent of the total Indian population of the reservations I visited. We have to do something for those returning veterans. I want to do much for those Indian veterans as well as for all veterans and we must stabilize the economic conditions of our Indian reservations. The gentleman's amendment is as justified as any other part of the bill, and I congratulate the gentleman on offering it.

Mr. CASE. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASE. I yield.

Mr. MUNDT. I just want to second the sentiment expressed by the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. MURDOCK]. We have just returned from a trip to his section of the country. We found the absence of sufficient highways one of the greatest difficulties in helping to assimilate the Indians.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASE. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. I am in full support of the gentleman's amendment. I can take him to Indian reservations in my State where we produced great crops of wheat, and we do not have access roads to bring that wheat down to market from the Nez Perce Indian Reservation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from South Dakota has expired.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may have 1 additional minute.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASE. I yield.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Frankly, I am willing for this amendment to go to conference, but I think they should justify the amendment before it is finally agreed to by the conferees. A hint to the wise is sufficient.

Mr. CASE. The hint is appreciated. I will be glad to furnish the House committee with copies of the correspondence I

have had in the matter and also to suggest to the Office of Indian Affairs that complete information be supplied to the conferees.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from South Dakota has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Dakota.

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 11. The Commissioner of Public Roads is authorized, notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, to cooperate with the State highway departments and any Federal agency in the location, development, construction, and maintenance of flight strips adjacent to public highways, or roadside development areas along such highways, in order to insure greater safety for traffic on the public highways by providing additional facilities to be available for the landing and take-off of aircraft. When requested by the State highway department, funds, authorized by this act, are hereby made available, in addition to any funds that may be available under any other appropriation, for carrying out the provisions of this section and for paying all or any part of the necessary costs incurred therefor, including the cost of acquiring the land necessary for such facilities. Federal highway funds shall not be used for the reconstruction or relocation of any highway giving access to a flight strip or airport, or for the reconstruction or relocation of any highway which has been or may be closed or the usefulness of which has been or may be impaired by the location or construction of any flight strip or airport, unless the officials in charge have first concurred with the State highway department and the Public Roads Administration in the location of such flight strip or airport.

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. Mr. Chairman, I offer a committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ROBINSON of Utah: On page 9, line 5, after the word "department", insert the following: "not to exceed 3 percent of the."

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this amendment is to limit the amount of funds that can be used for flight strips. This limits the amount to not to exceed 3 percent. That would make it so that not more than 3 percent of the amount of this bill could be used, or $15,000,000 a year.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendment offered by the gentleman from Utah.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. Mr. Chairman, I offer a further committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment offered by Mr. ROBINSON of Utah: On page 9, line 11, after the word "facilities", strike out the period, insert a colon and the following: *"Provided,* That the expenditure of Federal funds for flight strips under this section shall be subject to section 303, of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended (U. S. C., 1940 ed., title 49, sec. 453).

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this amendment is to make it clear that only one branch of the Government is to have control pertaining to this matter, that is the Civil Aeronautics Administration. There has been some question as to who would control here, and in order to make it entirely clear this amendment appeared to be necessary.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Utah.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. RANDOLPH: Page 8, line 21, strike out all of section 11.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Chairman, in 1938 the Congress passed the Civil Aeronautics Act. With the creation of that agency we charged to those officials the responsibility for the building, in this country, of our air navigation facilities, including the construction of airports. I believe that when the Congress establishes an agency for a particular purpose the agency should not have interference from other agencies, no matter how meritorious these groups are in their own fields. There is no reason for the Public Roads Administration to enter into the airport picture.

I call your attention to the fact that on June 23 this House passed a resolution which called upon the Civil Aeronautics Administration for a report to this House, and thus to the country, prior to the end of this year of an over-all plan for a post-war construction program of airports. Such a plan was submitted last night. It asks for the construction of 3,050 new airports and for the improvement of 1,625. In other words, we have charged the Civil Aeronautics Administration with airport planning; and when Congress authorizes and appropriates the money to build this airport system it is wrong for the Public Roads Administration to attempt to force an entering wedge, in other words, to leave its field of highway building and enter the field of airport construction.

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANDOLPH. I yield.

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. Does not the gentleman have pending now a bill to authorize this airport program?

Mr. RANDOLPH. The gentleman refers to the bill, H. R. 5024, which I sponsor. It is pending before the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and would in effect provide the legislation necessary to carry out the recommendations of the Civil Aeronautics Administration. The measure was introduced June 14. I trust every Member of Congress will read this report. The national airport plan breaks the program down into almost every community and every State of the Union. We should follow this vital highway bill with post-war airport legislation.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANDOLPH. I yield.

Mr. DONDERO. It was the gentleman's amendment that on yesterday took out of this bill the right of the Federal Commissioner of Highways to propose or use that as a club upon the States in acquiring highways of 300-foot width or refuse to grant them the Federal aid. Is not that correct?

Mr. RANDOLPH. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. DONDERO. If we are now to construct 3,050 airports—that is one for practically every county in the United States——

Mr. RANDOLPH. That is quite correct; and I wish to say to the gentleman from Michigan that I am sure the majority of our membership here believes that hand in hand, as it were, with a highway program for America in the post-war period, there must go an airport construction program. We are fully determined—I am sure the Seventy-ninth Congress will also be—that when we spend a dollar in the post-war period that it be a tax-dividend dollar.

In other words, we should discriminatingly appropriate the money of the Federal Government, knowing it will be a dollar which will give a dollar's return. Airports throughout America will be a real investment, which will bring our people closer together in the bonds of business and well-being.

Mr. WELCH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANDOLPH. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. WELCH. I may say to the gentleman from West Virginia that I know of a major highway which is the only possible approach to one of the largest airports in the United States. The road to which I refer is a part of the State highway system, having been voted into the system by an act of the State legislature.

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. And the language in section 11 results in ambiguity. The gentleman is correct in his observation.

Mr. WHITE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANDOLPH. I yield to the gentleman from Idaho.

Mr. WHITE. Does the gentleman think it is wise to coordinate the Bureau of Public Roads and the Civil Aeronautics Authority in building roads and landing strips?

Mr. RANDOLPH. No; I do not. When you build a landing strip along a highway you do not necessarily build it in connection with the prevailing winds necessary for safe flight use. We had before 1938 in this country a chaotic condition from the standpoint of airport construction.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITE. Does not the gentleman think a landing strip along a highway is a godsend to a fellow in trouble?

Mr. RANDOLPH. Yes; a field or landing strip is a haven for a pilot in trouble, and the Civil Aeronautics Administration should build it. This is the agency we created to build airports and landing facilities in this country. Prior

to 1938 we had several agencies building airports. We were in a disrupted condition. The C. A. A. is the expert on this subject. The Congress of the United States laid down a policy in 1938, and we should not deviate from it today.

Mr. HARE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANDOLPH. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. HARE. Does not the gentleman think there ought to be taken into consideration also the fact that the air is being laid out in lanes, like the land is being laid out for highways, and that the air lanes will not comport exactly with the highways that are being constructed by the highway departments. These air strips should be built or constructed to meet the conditions, the circumstances, and justifications for airplanes, and not the highways.

Mr. RANDOLPH. You are correct. Airports are the main streets of aviation.

Mr. Chairman, before I leave the amendment, may I say there is not a single organization connected with the advancement of aeronautics in the United States that does not feel deeply that section 11 should be removed from this bill. The National Aeronautic Association, the National Aviation Trades Association, and the National Association of State Aviation Officials are among this group.

Mr. MOTT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANDOLPH. I yield to the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. MOTT. Does the gentleman know whether any State under authority of previous road law has actually constructed any of these flight strips; and if so, what are they doing with them?

Mr. RANDOLPH. A few have been constructed during the war by the Army and Public Roads Administration in an experimental manner, but I may say to the gentleman that I am advised that the work carried forward has not always produced acceptable results.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. MILLER] for 3 minutes.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, I concur wholeheartedly in every argument advanced by the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH] and I rise to offer additional objections to include section 11 in this highway bill.

If the Public Roads Administration is going to be brought into the program of building air strips and landing fields, it will of necessity have to employ some personnel that knows a great deal more about the building of air strips and fields and planes than does the average civil engineer engaged in the building of roads. In addition to that, it is bound to create conflict, not only in the Federal Government between the Public Roads Bureau and the C. A. A., but in the States as well.

Many of the States now have State aviation commissions. My own State of Connecticut was the first State in the United States to enact regulatory legislation affecting the flying of aircraft.

As a result of that legislation we have a State Aviation Commission, and a commissioner, and a State Aviation Development Commission.

In addition to that general objection to bringing the Public Roads Administration into this bill, the language contained on page 9, line 11, beginning with the "Federal" reads:

> Federal highway funds shall not be used for the reconstruction or relocation of any highway giving access to a flight strip or airport, or for the reconstruction or relocation of any highway which has been or may be closed or the usefulness of which has been or may be impaired by the location or construction of any flight strip or airport, unless the officials in charge have first concurred with the State highway department and the Public Roads Administration in the location of such flight strip or airport.

In 1940 the State of Connecticut leased to the Federal Government for the duration of the war at a rental of $1 a year a field known as Bradley Field. In order to meet the traffic conditions and prevent accidents around that airport, the State had to close one of its through highways. Under the language of this bill no Federal fund could be used when it becomes necessary, as it will as soon as the war ends, to relocate our former State highway that led to or adjacent to Bradley Field. I can see no good reason for any such restriction as that.

Further than that, this section is advanced by its proponents as an aid to greater safety. I cannot think of anything that is a greater menace to automobile safety than to have flight strips alongside of our through highways. More automobile accidents are caused near airports by careless drivers who drive with one hand on the wheel and their eyes up in the clouds. If those flight strips are to be built, they should be very carefully selected by those who have knowledge of the prevailing winds in that territory. Simply building a flight strip alongside of the road from Washington to Baltimore, if the prevailing wind should be at right angles to that road, is no asset to anybody who might be flying overhead. We might just as well put a wind sock up and trust to a nearby meadow for emergency landings.

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this section, and all amendments thereto, close in 13 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Utah?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PRIEST].

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH], striking out section 11.

I think all of us recognize that the question of airport construction in the post-war period, the question of air routes, the question of air regulation, and air safety will be difficult enough to handle without further dividing jurisdiction in the handling of such problems. As the gentleman from West Virginia told the House a few minutes ago, a resolution was reported here in June directing that a survey and a report be made. That report was placed in the mails last night. It should be on the desk of every Member of the House today.

There is now pending before the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, of which I am a member, a bill introduced by the gentleman from West Virginia to carry out the recommendations made by the authority in this report.

The gentleman from West Virginia and others have already told the House that practically every organization in the country that has a vital interest in aviation is opposed to section 11 of this bill. Let us look at it just for a moment from the State's viewpoint. On the 14th day of this month the National Association of State Aviation Officials met in Oklahoma City, and there that Association of State Aviation Officials went on record as being opposed to section 11 of this bill. So it would seem to me that it would be most unwise to bring the Public Roads Administration in at a time when we are about to launch on a post-war program already envisioned, and surveyed, and reported on by the Civil Aeronautics Administration.

I therefore hope that the Committee will approve the amendment offered by the gentleman from West Virginia and strike section 11 out of this bill, for it has no place in it, in my judgment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. ELLIOTT].

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from West Virginia.

The committee of which I am a member has given this a great deal of thought. I, for one, some 3,000 miles from my congressional district, must rely upon airplane transportation to get to and from my work.

Up until the time our committee took under consideration the construction of flight strips along the highways between the airports, nothing had been done about it. I know of no better agencies than the State agencies or our Federal agency dealing with the construction of roadways to do this work, no agency that is more capable or better qualified to construct the type of runways that may be necessary to protect the people who travel by air. If I were as close to the Nation's Capital as Tennessee or West Virginia, I would not be talking this way; I would just get on a mule and ride across the mountains, and be in Washington quicker than you could be here by automobile from California. But because I must depend on travel by air, I think there should be some protection in the way of flight strips between airports for those who travel by air.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELLIOTT. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. PRIEST. I agree with the gentleman that flight strips may be a protection, and I am not opposed to the construction of flight strips, but I believe in an integrated national program. The construction of flight strips where they are needed should be done under the

jurisdiction of the Civil Aeronautics Authority, which knows and has already surveyed the airways and knows the direction of the winds, the direction of the air routes, navigation facilities, and other things that enter into the picture. I am not opposed to field strips.

Mr. ELLIOTT. In reply to the gentleman's statement, may I say that we have had too much wind and not enough action. Until our Committee on Roads started doing something, we had just a lot of conversation and no flight strips had been constructed. Here the Committee on Roads have taken it upon themselves to make it possible for flight strips to be constructed, and not leave it to a bunch of hoorays and talks that we hear here from time to time, with no action. This is in the bill here. If you want to have flight strips, let us put it in here now and keep it here.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELLIOTT. I have already yielded to the gentleman. I have heard him talk. He has not enlightened me at all.

May I say further that it is necessary, if we believe in protection for the public traveling by air, to keep what is in the bill at the present time, and not adopt the Randolph amendment, because it just means delaying the program until many more thousands of people are killed when planes are in trouble and there is no place for them to land. Let us give consideration to keeping this in the bill, until we get what we want.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Utah [Mr. ROBINSON].

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. Mr. Chairman, may I say to the Committee that we have only one more section of the bill to consider. I am hopeful that this section will not be controversial, so that we may soon be through with this bill.

On this particular subject, I realize fully that it is a controversial subject. It is a new subject. We were asked about 4 years ago to insert this provision in the Highway Act and did so. Under that provision $10,000,000 has been expended in building flight strips. Now we are told that the flight strips that have already been built have saved the country many, many times the amount that they cost in that emergency landings have been made on them that otherwise would have meant crack-ups if the flight strips had not been built.

I feel that those who are enthusiastic about civil aeronautics are taking this matter too seriously. There is no intention to interfere with their work. We simply feel that in certain sections of the country we can build a flight strip for one-tenth of what an airfield would cost, and that it will serve the same purpose the airfield would. We also feel that there are places where the building of the road in connection with the airport is possibly of as much importance as the airport itself. Therefore, we think this matter should be left to be handled at least, in cooperation with, if not under the jurisdiction of, the State highway commissioner.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. I yield.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Chairman, I have a very high regard, personally, for the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Roads under whom I serve. I know that insofar as I can, I support every amendment that comes from the committee, as he well knows. There is no desire here to do away with the construction of flight strips in the United States. All we ask is that this Congress, having set down in basic law in 1938 the responsibility for all air navigational facilities in the Civil Aeronautics Administration, that we keep it there and allow no agency, be it the Public Roads Administration or any other agency to enter in with a wedge to try and take over the functions which are handled expertly by the Civil Aeronautics Authority.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. I yield.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Is it not true that there are two parts really to this amendment and that the second provision of this amendment was especially recommended to the committee by the Commissioner of Public Roads and that part of the amendment provides none of these funds shall be used for the construction or reconstruction of any highway giving access to any flight strip or airport? That has been abandoned and we have included this provision in the bill at the request of the Commissioner of Public Roads. Do I state the facts?

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. That is correct. I appreciate the attitude of the gentleman from West Virginia in this matter, but I still feel that it is a mistake for the committee to take out of this bill the entire subject of flight strips because this has been a very profitable matter, so far as the Federal Government has been concerned. I think if there is any question arising between these two departments of the Government, we should be able to iron them out to the satisfaction of both parties. I hope that the amendment will be voted down.

Mr. KERR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. I yield.

Mr. KERR. This is an emergency feature anyway; is it not?

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. That is correct.

Mr. KERR. Why do we need rules and regulations for an emergency feature?

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. Mr. Chairman, I think that question is very well put.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Utah has expired. All time has expired. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH].

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 12. On any highway or street hereafter constructed with Federal aid in any State, the location, form, and character of informational, regulatory, and warning signs, curb and pavement or other markings, and traffic signals installed or placed by any public authority, or other agency, shall be subject to the approval of the State highway department with the concurrence of the Public Roads Administration; and the Commissioner of Public Roads is hereby directed to concur only in such installations as will promote the safe and efficient utilization of the highways.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, in the 12 years that I have been in Congress, I have heard a lot of criticism about trips by Congressmen out into the country, sometime called junkets. Well, if there is anything that the Congress and the Members of this House should do, it is to get around the country and know something about the welfare of the people in the country they represent. We just had a demonstration here today, of the policy on the part of this Congress in dealing with the resources of this country. You know we have been sending our mining experts and our money into foreign countries, into Africa, South America, and Mexico, to dig out metal which is needed in this war emergency. For the 12 years that I have been in this House, I have tried to secure the adoption of a policy on the part of the Congress and on the part of the Department of Agriculture to open up the resources of minerals which we have in our own country.

Today we are confronted with the spectacle of seeing money taken from the taxpayers of this country and paid to foreign governments to bring in copper, lead, zinc, and everything that we need in the war emergency; money that flows out of our Treasury into the treasuries of other countries in tax revenue.

In the State of Idaho, the State of Nevada, and in fact all the Western States, there are resources in timber, in minerals, and in water power that are locked up and inaccessible in a very rough and inaccessible country. Yet today, when we ask for a little increase in an appropriation to make these resources available, to build up new industries, to create new tax revenue, to open up new country, that request is denied. In other places you spend money lavishly. You appropriate and pay out $2.50 for every dollar that you get out of the national forests. We need access roads into the yellow pine district and in other places in Idaho. Yet, we do not know anything about it.

The gentleman from Mississippi will take the floor and advocate increased appropriations to build these parkways which are toll roads over the country. The Park Service charges admission to use them. That is all right according to the gentleman from Mississippi, but, to build some roads on your own land, in your own national forests, in order to get access to this timber and to get access to the minerals that are located there, or to open new water-power sites, that is wrong. That plan is set aside. Today we could not get a handful of votes in support of one of the greatest protective policies you could undertake, to open up the resources of your own land.

You know I have been dealing with the Secretary of the Interior, Mr. Ickes, with his conservation policy. All I could wish for Mr. Ickes, that he would make a flight across central Idaho and have to make a forced landing back in this inaccessible

area and have to come out on his own power, in order that he might learn something of the magnitude of the country and the forests located there, and that he might know something of the wonderful resources, in timber, water power, and minerals we have out there to be developed.

I just wanted to call the facts to the attention of the House after its action today.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Idaho has expired.

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WELCH: On page 10, line 4, insert the following new section.

"SEC. 13. (a) If the President determines that the security of the United States, in the event of war or other national emergency, will be materially aided by the construction in any defense area of a highway, road, or bridge, he shall transmit such determination to the Federal Works Administrator. If funds are available for such purpose under authority of this section, the Federal Works Administrator, through the Commissioner of Public Roads, is authorized and directed to construct such highway, road, or bridge.

"(b) In order to carry out any project under subsection (a), the Federal Works Administrator is authorized to acquire, in the name of the United States, such rights-of-way, lands, or interest in lands, as may be required for such project. Upon completion of such project, the Administrator is authorized and directed to convey, by proper deed, executed in the name of the United States, any such right-of-way, land, or interest in land to the State, or to the political subdivision of the State, if the State law so provides in which such right-of-way, land, or interest in land is situated, upon condition that such State or political division will maintain the highway, road, or bridge constructed in such State or political subdivision without cost to the United States.

"(c) The cost of any highway, road, or bridge constructed under authority of this section shall be payable out of any sum or sums appropriated under authority of this act for apportionment to the State or States within which such highway, road, or bridge is to be constructed, but the total cost of all projects under this project shall not exceed $50,000,000 for each post-war fiscal year for which funds are made available under this act."

Mr. WELCH. I am offering this amendment——

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a consent request?

Mr. WELCH. I yield.

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the bill and all amendments thereto close in 20 minutes, the last 5 minutes to be reserved to the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Utah?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California will proceed.

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Chairman, I am offering this amendment to insure the building of roads in defense areas. In his opening remarks the chairman of the committee made reference to the importance of this when he said, in referring to the Federal-aid system:

Then it will be improved during future years to new high standards which will afford the capacity and the safety which these major rural and urban arteries require.

There are many other compelling reasons for the designation of such a network: The requirements of national defense, the necessity for opening up traffic bottlenecks in and near population centers, and so on.

The chairman of the committee placed his finger on the most impelling reason for the enactment of my amendment in those remarks.

I have the honor to represent a great defense area concerning which the following statement was made a number of years ago by Admiral Charles F. Hughes, while Chief of Naval Operations, before the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. He said:

San Francisco Bay is, as you know, the principal harbor of the Pacific coast. To my mind, it belongs to the Nation; it is not the property of California nor the cities that are on its shores. From its natural advantages and its location, San Francisco Bay is certain to be the major continental fleet base for any exhaustive campaign in the Pacific.

Current history has fully justified the foresight and vision of Admiral Hughes. San Francisco is today one of the two principal ports of embarkation in the United States, if not in the whole world, and as such is a principal defense area.

Mr. Chairman, not a single Member of this House can offer a guaranty that one dollar of this enormous appropriation, when once available to the several highway commissions will be spent in defense areas.

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WELCH. Gladly.

Mr. McGREGOR. Does not the gentleman's amendment take all control out of the various State highway departments and leave it entirely to the President of the United States and the Commissioner of Public Roads?

Mr. WELCH. Not at all; only such as apply to defense areas. Every major highway in the country is an integral part of our national defense. The bill that we have under consideration now does not consider defense areas.

Mr. McGREGOR. Does the gentleman's amendment take control of the construction of highways in defense areas from the highway director and put it in the hands of Washington, another glorified WPA program?

Mr. WELCH. I do not agree with the statement of the gentleman from Ohio. It places with the President the right to see to it that permanent, old established defense areas be granted some of the enormous sum of $1,500,000,000 authorized in this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Nebraska, [Mr. CURTIS] for 3 minutes.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, I would like to call attention to an amendment which was adopted a little bit ago without debate. Both sides of the committee accepted the amendment, but I want to raise a question about it at this time. I refer to the amendment in line 22, page 5, which section deals with advances to States of certain road funds. The proviso adopted reads as follows:

Provided, That such State has not diverted revenue derived from gasoline taxes, automobile license fees and other taxes and fees intended for highway purposes to other uses.

I would like to ask the gentleman from Wisconsin, author of this amendment, which has been accepted by the committee, if it was his intent to deprive a State of advances where that State by law levies a tax on gasoline that goes for another purpose? In the instance of my State it goes for old age pension purposes. It is put in there by law and that is the intent of the tax.

Mr. SAUTHOFF. In answer to the gentleman's question, may I say that it is not my intention to interfere with any State law.

Mr. CURTIS. The gentleman's language does not so indicate.

Mr. SAUTHOFF. It says "intended for highway purposes." Your State law says it is intended for old-age purposes, therefore it does not interfere with your State law.

Mr. STEFAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. STEFAN. We levy a certain amount for road purposes and earmark 1 percent for old-age pensions out of the total. The gentleman's amendment, I am afraid, would preclude us from doing that.

Mr. SAUTHOFF. That is under State law?

Mr. STEFAN. That is right.

Mr. SAUTHOFF. There is no intention to interfere with State law.

Mr. CASE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS. Very briefly.

Mr. CASE. It occurs to me it does not make very much difference because all the penalty does is to apply to the advances. It does not apply to the Federal aid allotment.

Mr. CURTIS. All States should be treated alike and we should not say to any State that it cannot levy a tax on any commodity it wants to and use it for such purpose as it chooses. That is an inherent right of the States. I want the record made clear that the Sauthoff amendment will not work to the disadvantage of Nebraska.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. J. LEROY JOHNSON] for 3 minutes.

Mr. J. LEROY JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. WELCH.] It is true, as pointed out in a question brought up by the gentleman from Ohio, that the determination of these roads in defense areas would be made by the President, who is Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy. However, the proposition offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. WELCH], if understood properly by the membership, would be agreed to.

Let me give you an illustration in my own district, which illustrates what the author of this amendment is trying to do.

In Stockton, Calif., we have just built a new Navy supply depot at a cost of about $30,000,000. That is a permanent installation. Next to it is the Stockton Ordnance Depot which is also a permanent Army installation. These two installations are about 2½ miles from United States Highway No. 50, and most of these supplies that come by automotive equipment will go across a county highway which will be thoroughly torn up, and worn out, and destroyed by the traffic which is conducted during the war, and will be carried on for several years after the war. I think it is a sensible provision to allow the President, if he deems it necessary, to rebuild that sort of a highway as sort of a feeder highway into those two defense installations.

Mr. MOTT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. J. LEROY JOHNSON. I yield to the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. MOTT. Does the gentleman realize that the War Department can do that now under the Defense Highway Act? If it recommends that as a project on which a war road or access highway should be built, that could be built out of defense highway money as long as it is in the Treasury.

Mr. J. LEROY JOHNSON. I did not know that they could build public highways within the jurisdiction of a State.

Mr. MOTT. We appropriated $100,000,000 for that purpose last year, and $50,000,000 the year before.

Mr. J. LEROY JOHNSON. May I answer the question in this way: Another installation in my district has a similar problem. They moved Highway No. 40 away from the Benicia Arsenal, and the War Department did not put in one penny to rebuild the highway to that arsenal. The State of California and the county of Salinas built the whole thing. I think we ought to have a provision in here, in addition to the rights of the Army and the Navy to build these short feeder highways into these permanent Army and Navy installations. It seems to me it is a very fair provision to have and something that compensates the State and the local communities for expenses that they now bear.

Mr. MOTT. Existing law already provides for that and authorizes it. As I said, $150,000,000 has already been spent.

Mr. J. LEROY JOHNSON. For the instances I know of there was no money spent by the Army or the Navy. I hope the amendment will be accepted.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment which I ask to be read for information at this time.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MILLER of Connecticut: On page 9, line 20, strike out section 12.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. MILLER] is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, section 12 is the last section of the bill, and I believe we should do with section 12 as we did with section 11 and strike it from the bill.

Section 12 reads:

On any highway or street hereafter constructed with Federal aid in any State, the location, form, and character of informational, regulatory, and warning signs, curb and pavement or other markings, and traffic signals installed or placed by any public authority, or other agency, shall be subject to the approval of the State highway department with the concurrence of the Public Roads Administration; and the Commissioner of Public Roads is hereby directed to concur only in such installations as will promote the safe and efficient utilization of the highways.

May I tell you what that means to the State of Connecticut? Remembering that it says "hereafter constructed," as to any roads we build in the future the Federal commission will tell our State the type of center road marking that they will install. If the Federal commission wants a system of three lines, with a yellow line going upgrade and a blue line going down and a white line in the center, that is what that State will have to put in. In my State at the present time we use the system of one white line in the center of the street, with a broken line on areas where it is safe to pass. To change from that system to the system that has been advocated by the national administration, namely, a three-line system, would cost my State $100,000 a year additional, and it would have to be done just as soon as we had a few of these Federal-aid highways built and marked under the direction of the Federal administration. It would not have to be done immediately, but as soon as we had a few miles of that we would have to do it or else we would have confusion worse confounded within the various States, with various types of roads built under various appropriations marked in different ways.

That is only one item of all the items mentioned in section 12. The same applies to traffic lights. Some States use a system of putting their traffic lights on through highways in the overhead center. Others have them on each corner. Some States use a trip signal and others use something else. There is no element of safety involved there. The motorists from California can see the light in Connecticut if it is on the side just as well as they can if it is overhead. There is no argument that we need a uniform system for that. But under this section you will have the system that the national administrator sees fit to regulate, as soon as he controls three or four to ten or twelve million dollars that is to be allocated to the various States. It is no argument to say that he has no control. The argument has been advanced by members of this committee throughout the debate that we want to leave the direction for the building and the maintenance of these highways within the States. Section 12 completely contradicts that in every respect as it relates to informational markings, traffic signs, and similar signs. I hope that although it is late in the day the members of the committee will think seriously before they adopt section 12 of this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GIFFORD].

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Chairman, after listening to the gentleman from Connecticut who has just spoken, I might well weaken in the proposal I want to present. I sympathize with him in his general view. But I have been greatly interested in removing dangerous signs on our highways. I recall being in court as a witness trying to induce my State to get rid of such signs adjacent to our streets and highways. I ponder the words in the bill "on the highway." Does that mean exactly within the boundaries of the roads? I assume it would legally. I intend to offer this amendment: After the word "on" insert "or adjacent to."

Some very dangerous and annoying signs are erected simply for advertising purposes. In my State we have fought to get those obliterated. I am rather hoping that some authority might be granted in this bill under which any State might meet this situation.

I have in mind one particular sign. Coming around the curve, you see a very large advertising sign with a finger pointing like this, advertising some commodity. Your attention is necessarily distracted from your driving. It is highly dangerous. Our State has driven most of those signs from the highway and lands adjacent thereto. Again does "on" mean simply within the limits of, or on land adjacent to the right-of-way? I wonder what kind of an interpretation would be put on it. If we are to have the word "on" I would like to add the words "or adjacent thereto."

Well do I remember my first trip to the city of Richmond after I came to Washington some 20 years ago. All along the way were signs, constructed not by public authorities but, as you have recited here, by other agencies. Some church organization apparently had put up many quotations from the Bible, in scrawling writings, telling what would happen to you if you did fast driving. Are we to spend this money and still allow that practice to go on? Would not the gentleman want to accept the amendment I am going to offer?

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. I may say to the gentleman that as far as I am concerned I think it is a very good amendment, and I would have no objection to it.

Mr. GIFFORD. Let us adopt it and then trust to the law that it may be a legal regulation.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GIFFORD. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MASON. Does the gentleman realize that "adjacent to" means on private property outside the right-of-way, and there is a question as to whether we can legislate to take over the right of the private property owner to use his land?

Mr. GIFFORD. I fully agree that is the question involved. I was in court all one day as a witness, trying to convince my State authorities that they should, by law, overcome the private owners' objection. Shall a private owner be allowed to have erected on his property, for

a small rental, any kind of an ad that might be highly dangerous?

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GIFFORD. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. STEFAN. Would that not also eliminate the signs giving information as to historical sites, such as with regard to the First Battle of Bull Run, the Second Battle of Bull Run, and so forth?

Mr. GIFFORD. Every man from Virginia might rise here to object, I fear. It does seem that there were many Bull Runs in that State, from the many signs noticed there.

Mr. STEFAN. I think the language would eliminate those signs, too.

Mr. GIFFORD. I bring this up, because I desire to get rid of dangerous signs. Under the present laws perhaps we cannot do it. Shall a private owner always do as he pleases on the side of a road that you and I help pay for?

Mr. MOTT. Mr. Chairman, I dislike to oppose the amendment offered by the gentleman from California because I know how near this is to his heart. I believe, however, the object which he wishes to obtain cannot be obtained by an amendment of this kind. We have legislation which already takes care of defense highways, and, as I mentioned a moment ago, the year before last we authorized $50,000,000, last year, $100,000,000, and we will probably have another $100,000,000 authorized this year, for the sole purpose of building highways in defense areas. This amendment as proposed is a perversion of the entire philosophy of existing Federal-aid highway policy, which is based upon mandatory law. Under this amendment, if it is adopted, the President would be given the authority, at any time that he decided an emergency existed, to take a part of this money, authorized for an entirely different purpose, and use it to build highways in defense areas, entirely in his own discretion. This would constitute a return to the W. P. A. system of building highways.

The objectives of the gentleman, I believe, can be obtained through separate legislation on the subject of defense highways through existing legislation on that subject. As a member of the Committee on Roads, I assure him that I will do my very best to secure favorable consideration of legislation which will do this. But I ask the Members of the House not to vote for this amendment, the direct effect of which would be to destroy the whole plan and purpose of Federal-aid highway legislation.

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOTT. I yield.

Mr. WELCH. The object which I hope to attain by my amendment cannot be accomplished in the manner referred to by the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. MOTT. Well, that is a difference of opinion.

Mr. WELCH. The appropriations referred to by the gentleman from Oregon have been used in defense highways, so-called defense highways, in the interior of the country. They built roads on which grass will be growing a year after the war is over. I am referring to permanent defense highways in defense areas.

Mr. MOTT. That is correct. That is what I am referring to also.

Mr. WELCH. I am referring to permanent defense highways in defense areas such as San Francisco, Boston, New York, New Orleans, and other great seaport cities of this country.

Mr. MOTT. That is correct.

Mr. WELCH. Will the gentleman say that any money thus far appropriated has been used in defense highways in the great metropolitan areas?

Mr. MOTT. Yes; $150,000,000 has been put into them in the last 2 years.

Mr. WELCH. Not one dollar has been used in San Francisco in the construction of new major highways.

Mr. MOTT. I think the records will show that defense highways have actually been built in San Francisco County. I know they have been built in areas across the bay from San Francisco. That was the purpose of the defense-highway legislation—to build roads in and to defense areas. But your amendment would take a part of the money authorized in this bill for one purpose and give the President discretion to use it for a purpose not even contemplated by this bill. I agree with you that you should have these defense highways, but you should not get them by giving the President discretionary authority to take a part of the money out of this bill and use it for a purpose which neither the committee nor the Congress ever intended it to be used for. This is not a defense-highway bill. It is a post-war, peacetime road-construction bill.

Mr. J. LEROY JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOTT. I yield.

Mr. J. LEROY JOHNSON. I do not see what the difference is between the proposal of the gentleman from California [Mr. WELCH] and the one for the parkways which passed here and where they doubled the amounts allowed where they were only little feeder highways and not defense highways.

Mr. MOTT. There is a great deal of difference between the parkway item and this amendment. That was a mandatory authorization by Congress for the construction of parkways. The amendment offered by the gentleman from California is a proposal which gives the President authority, without even consulting the Congress, to take a part of the money authorized by this bill for other purposes and to build highways with it in defense areas however and wherever and whenever he pleases. I hope the amendment will not prevail.

Mr. J. LEROY JOHNSON. But the total amount is limited.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTINGTON] is recognized for 5 minutes to close the debate on the bill.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. WELCH], as has been stated by the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. MOTT], has no place in this bill, and I say that in all kindness. It may be that the bridge across the bay at San Francisco has not been constructed under the national-defense highway legislation. There has not been any road built in the area where I live, nor has there been in many places in the United States under the Defense Highway Act.

We have heretofore authorized and the Congress has appropriated $150,000,000 for the construction of roads in defense areas. The beginning of the pending amendment refers to defense areas. That is legislation with respect to the war. In addition to that, we have authorized and there has been expended substantially $290,000,000, as I recall, for the construction of access highways to defense plants and to defense installations. They are constructed during war, not at the request of the President but upon the request of the Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Navy, and other appropriate officers of the armed services. This is a bill for post-war construction—for peacetime construction.

I repeat what I said, that the amendment for construction to a defense area has no place in this bill. It provides that not exceeding $50,000,000 shall be allocated by the President. The whole appropriation allocable to the State of California in 1 year is less than half of that amount. That shows you the impropriety, if not the absurdity of that provision in the bill under consideration.

As to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. MILLER] to strike out section 12 of the bill I should like to say that this language is only applicable to highways hereafter constructed. The purpose is to promote uniformity, with the consent of the Highway Commission of Connecticut, and of the other States, with the approval of the Public Roads Commissioner of the United States. It is an effort to promote uniformity of signals and regulations. In one place you turn to the right on the red light; in another city you turn to the left. The whole purpose of this section 12, is to promote uniformity that would be in the interests of public safety. The last word in the amendment is:

> The Commissioner of Public Roads is hereby directed to concur only in such installations as will promote the safe and efficient utilization of the highways.

Is there any objection to undertaking to secure uniformity in the interest of public safety when that uniformity cannot be made effective without the approval of the highway commissions of all the States of the Union?

I say the section is in the interest of safety and for the benefit of the public.

Now, I have just a word to say finally. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT], the ranking Member of the committee, proposed an amendment to section 2, that was adopted by the Committee of the Whole on yesterday. I congratulate him upon his frank statement today that his amendment should be revised in conference. His amendment provided, and the Members will recall that I urged it was improper and unwise, that the first post-war year should be the fiscal year 1945, substantially half of which has already expired. If that language in the amendment remains in this bill it means that the allocation of the entire billion and a half dollars must be made in a period of 12 months and

that the additional 2 years granted to the States under the terms of this bill to match, would be practically eliminated. In other words, the program, as the gentleman has very wisely admitted on reflection, would be hindered by keeping the fiscal year 1945 in the bill. For that reason alone the bill should go to conference; and the Wolcott amendment should be modified or eliminated to provide for post-war construction for the first 3 years following the war.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

All time has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. WELCH].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MILLER of Connecticut: On page 9, line 20, strike out section 12.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Connecticut.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GIFFORD: Page 9, line 20, after the word "on", insert "or adjacent to."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts.

The amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. COOPER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 4915) to amend and supplement the Federal-Aid Road Act, approved July 11, 1916, as amended and supplemented, to authorize appropriations for the post-war construction of highways and bridges, to eliminate hazards at railroad-grade crossings, to provide for the immediate preparation of plans and acquisition of rights-of-way, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 654, he reported the same back to the House with sundry amendments adopted in the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en grosse.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, on that I ask for the ayes and nays.

The ayes and nays were refused.

So the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Roads be discharged from further consideration of the bill (S. 2105) to amend and supplement the Federal-Aid Road Act, approved July 11, 1916, as amended and supplemented, to authorize appropriations for the post-war construction of highways and bridges, to eliminate hazards at railroad-grade crossings, to provide for the immediate preparation of plans, and for other purposes; that the bill be immediately considered and that all after the enacting clause of said bill be stricken out and the provisions of H. R. 4915, to amend and supplement the Federal-Aid Road Act, approved July 11, 1916, as amended and supplemented, to authorize appropriations for the post-war construction of highways and bridges, to eliminate hazards at railroad-grade crossings, to provide for the immediate preparation of plans and acquisition of rights-of-way, and for other purposes, as passed, be inserted in lieu thereof.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Utah?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the Senate bill and the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

S. 2105, an act to amend and supplement the Federal-Aid Road Act, approved July 11, 1916, as amended and supplemented, to authorize appropriations for the post-war construction of highways and bridges, to eliminate hazards at railroad-grade crossings, to provide for the immediate preparation of plans, and for other purposes.

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah offers the following amendment: Strike out all after the enacting clause of the Senate bill and insert in lieu thereof the provisions of H. R. 4915 as passed.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the proceedings whereby the bill H. R. 4915 was passed will be vacated and the bill laid on the table.

There was no objection.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Utah?

There was no objection.

DEVELOPMENT OF THE VIRGIN ISLANDS

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BELL].

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 5029) to assist in the internal development of the Virgin Islands by the undertaking of useful projects therein, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman explain this legislation?

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, this bill provides for certain internal improvements in the Virgin Islands. I may say to the gentleman that it provides for certain improvements in connection with sewers, water systems, hospitals, and things of that general nature.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. The revenue is to be secured in the Virgin Islands?

Mr. BELL. The bill provides for an appropriation of $10,028,000. I may say to the gentleman from Massachusetts that for many years the rum revenues coming out of Puerto Rico, for instance, have been returned to the Puerto Rican treasury; but that is not true of the Virgin Islands. During the current fiscal year we have received about $28,000,000 from these rum revenues in the Virgin Islands, but none of that is being returned to it.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. We are returning about half of it?

Mr. BELL. I would say approximately half of it would be returned under this bill.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Does this have the unanimous support of the committee and are the departments in favor of it?

Mr. BELL. The departments are in favor of it, and it has been reported unanimously by our committee.

Mr. Speaker, I do not want to be misunderstood. This is not an allocation of the rum money as in the case of Puerto Rico. It is an authorization for a direct appropriation, but I called attention to the rum money which was largely the reason why the committee unanimously reported this bill.

Mr. WELCH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. WELCH. This permits very necessary improvements to be made by the use of the so-called rum revenue. The bill was carefully considered by the Committee on Insular Affairs and unanimously reported. It will bring necessary relief to the unfortunate natives of the Virgin Islands and I hope the bill will receive favorable consideration.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BELL]?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in order to assist in the internal development of the Virgin Islands, and for the benefit of the government, municipalities, and inhabitants thereof, the Federal Works Administrator (hereinafter referred to as the "Administrator") is authorized to provide or undertake the following useful projects, including work incidental thereto, on lands owned by the United States, the government of the Virgin Islands, the municipalities of St. Thomas and St. John and St. Croix, or on land acquired for such purpose, at the respective estimated costs indicated: *Provided*, That where found necessary by the Administrator, the funds authorized herein shall be available for the augmentation of limits of cost of projects in an amount not exceeding 25 percent for any project.

PROJECTS ON ISLANDS OF ST. THOMAS AND ST. JOHN AND ESTIMATED COST THEREOF

1. Hospital facilities, $565,000.

2. Sanitation and fire-protection facilities, including sewer and water system, $563,695.

3. Intercepting sewer system including sewage treatment and disposal, $278,000.

4. Water supply facilities, $883,750.

5. Schools and educational facilities, $566,000.

6. Water-front highway, sea wall, and harbor facilities, $1,097,500.

7. Highways and roads, $1,387,300.

8. Street improvements, including storm-water drainage, $327,200.

9. Engineering surveys, $35,000.

10. Improvements to and construction of public buildings, $630,000.

11. Prison facilities, $105,000.

12. Recreational facilities, $80,000.

13. Telephone and radio communication facilities, $170,000.

14. Malarial control, $31,875.

15. Hospital, electric power plant, and improvements to administration building, Cruz Bay, St. John, $47,500.

16. Abattoir and cooling plant facilities, $75,000.

17. Public market facilities, $80,000.

PROJECT ON ISLAND OF ST. CROIX AND ESTIMATED COST THEREOF

18. Hospital facilities, $475,000.

19. Sanitation and fire protection facilities, including sewer and water systems, $244,600.

20. Water supply facilities, $490,000.

21. School and educational facilities, $510,000.

22. Highways and roads, $606,000.

23. Improvements to and construction of public buildings, $73,000.

24. Prison facilities, $113,000.

25. Recreational facilities, $30,000.

26. Telephone and radio communication facilities, $150,000.

27. Malarial control, $50,000.

28. Municipal pier for Christiansted, $190,000.

29. Public market facilities, $174,000.

SEC. 2. Not to exceed 5 percent of the funds herein authorized shall also be available for the purpose of making studies, investigations, estimates, plans and specifications, preliminary and final, of the projects herein authorized in advance of undertaking projects and the cost thereof shall be charged to the projects involved.

SEC. 3. The Administrator is authorized to acquire, prior to the approval of title by the Attorney General if necessary (without regard to secs. 1136, as amended, and 3709 of the Revised Statutes), improved or unimproved lands or interests in lands by purchase, donation, exchange, or condemnation for any project herein authorized. Upon completion of projects on land acquired under this section the Administrator shall transfer custody thereof to the Secretary of the Interior, who shall forthwith transfer all rights and title of the United States therein to the government of the Virgin Islands or the municipality of St. Thomas and St. John, or the municipality of St. Croix, except those projects constructed for Federal agencies. Projects authorized by this act may be constructed without regard to the provisions of sections 355, as amended, and 1136, as amended, of the Revised Statutes.

SEC. 4. The Administrator is further authorized to receive and accept funds, materials, supplies, and equipment from the government of the Virgin Islands, the municipalities of St. Thomas and St. John, and St. Croix, and other sources, for use in connection with authorized projects or parts thereof. Any funds so received shall be deposited in a special fund in the Treasury of the United States and shall be expended or utilized as determined by the Federal Works Administrator.

SEC. 5. All construction with respect to projects shall be by contract: *Provided, however,* That repairs or improvements to existing structures or facilities and incidental work in connection with new structures or facilities may be accomplished by the employment of persons without regard to the civil-service and classification laws. The rates of pay, hours of work, and terms of employment for persons engaged on projects shall be fixed by the Administrator.

SEC. 6. The Administrator is authorized to procure (without regard to the authority of the Procurement Division, Treasury Department, to undertake the performance of such procurement, as regards procurement from sources within Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands), and to warehouse and distribute property, facilities, structures, improvements, machinery, equipment, stores, and supplies from the funds appropriated pursuant to this act. The Administrator is further authorized to prescribe rules and regulations for the establishment of special funds in the nature of revolving funds for use, during the availability of funds herein authorized, in the purchase, repair, distribution, or rental of materials, supplies, equipment, and tools.

SEC. 7. The provisions of section 3709 of the Revised Statutes shall not apply to any purchase made or service procured in connection with the funds appropriated pursuant to this act when the aggregate amount involved is less than $500.

SEC. 8. The provisions of the act of February 15, 1934 (48 Stat. 351), as amended, relating to disability or death compensation and benefits shall apply to persons (except administrative employees qualifying as civil employees of the United States) receiving compensation from funds appropriated pursuant to this act for services rendered as employees of the United States: *Provided,* That this section shall not apply in any case coming within the purview of the workmen's compensation laws of the Virgin Islands, or in any case in which the claimant has received or is entitled to receive similar benefits for injury or death.

SEC. 9. The Administrator is authorized to consider, ascertain, adjust, determine, and pay from the funds appropriated pursuant to this act any claim on account of injury to persons, or any claim for damage to or loss of privately owned property, caused by the negligence of any employee of the United States paid from such funds while acting within the scope of his employment. No claim shall be considered hereunder which is in excess of $500 or which is not presented in writing within 1 year from the date of accrual thereof. Acceptance by a claimant of the amount allowed on account of his claim shall be deemed to be in full settlement thereof and the action upon such claim so accepted by the claimant shall be conclusive.

SEC. 10. The Administrator is authorized to make such rules and regulations as he may deem necessary to carry out the provisions of this act.

SEC. 11. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of $10,028,420 to be immediately available and to remain available until expended, for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this act, administrative and otherwise, including the employment of engineers, architects, and consultants without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes, and the civil-service and classification laws; personal services and rental in the District of Columbia and elsewhere; supplies and equipment; travel expenses, including transfer of household goods and effects as provided by the act of October 10, 1940 (5 U. S. C. 73c–1), and, notwithstanding any other provision of law, transportation to the Virgin Islands and return of officers, employees, and other persons engaged in carrying out the functions prescribed in this act; purchase, repair, operations, and maintenance of motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicles and such other expenses as may be necessary for the accomplishment of the objectives of this act. All payments from funds made available pursuant to this act shall be made through the Division of Disbursements of the Treasury Department, upon vouchers certified by the Administrator or employees designated by him for such purpose.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of the remarks I made in the Committee today I may be permitted to include a letter I received from W. W. Mitchell, of the State highway department, under date of November 23, 1944.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

(Mr. GORE asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an editorial.)

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Thursday of next week, after disposition of all matters on the Speaker's desk and at the conclusion of any special orders heretofore entered, our colleague from Texas [Mr. DIES] may be privileged to address the House for 1 hour.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF SECOND WAR POWERS ACT

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 660 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4993) to amend Public, No. 507, Seventy-seventh Congress, second session, an act to further expedite the prosecution of the war, approved March 27, 1942, known as the Second War Powers Act, 1942; that after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall be continued not to exceed 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and the ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the reading of the bill for amendments, the Committee shall rise and report the same to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion, except one motion to recommit.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, later on I shall yield the usual 30 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH].

The rule makes in order the bill—H. R. 4993—proposing an extension of the Second War Powers Act enacted in 1942, which expires this year, to December 31, 1945, unless sooner terminated by concurrent action of both Houses or by proclamation of the President. The rule provides for 2 hours' general debate, after which the bill will be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule.

The Committee on the Judiciary approved and will submit as committee

amendments two amendments, one which I consider significant in that it will to some extent tend to restrict some of the departments and agencies, but I am informed that it is a compromise amendment that was agreed to after many conferences and therefore I shall not oppose it. Rumors have reached me, however, that further amendments to this legislation may be proposed on the floor of the House. I urge that all such proposals be rejected and that this legislation be passed as reported by the Committee on the Judiciary. This is no time to hamstring or confuse the vast and intricate system based upon this legislation which has made possible the remarkable achievement of American industry in its war-production effort. As I have stated, I do not object to the amendments to the bill which have been recommended by the Committee on the Judiciary. One is of a clarifying character, and the other provides a method of judicial review and does no more than extend to all agencies exercising the allocation power the provisions for judicial review of suspension orders contained in the Stabilization Extension Act of 1944 with respect to Office of Price Administration suspension orders. Furthermore, the right to this judicial review comes into being only after all administrative remedies have been exhausted by the persons claiming it. It seems to me fair that in such case a person against whom a suspension order has been issued for violating the regulations should be entitled to have the question of his wrongdoing reviewed by a court.

Mr. Speaker, for the time being I shall not take up any more time, and yield now 30 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH], reserving the remainder of my time.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

This rule comes to the House without any opposition. It is the usual open rule, and makes amendments in order. The bill itself merely extends the War Powers Act of 1942 until December 31, 1945. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH], the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Rules, seems to think that the proposed amendment which gives certain powers to the Federal courts to review decisions by governmental agencies might hamstring some of those agencies. I am sure that that amendment is meant primarily to protect the interests of the American people, of the public, and not to promote fees for lawyers, as the gentleman suggested. It is in the interest of the American people, and I hope it is aimed at restoring representative and constitutional government in the United States, and, above all is in the interest of restoring the legislative powers of the Congress itself. We have a vital concern in that, because these various bureaus and agencies are usurping our legislative powers almost daily in defiance of the Constitution and in defiance of the Congress. The amendment seems to me to be an admirable one.

Mr. Speaker, I have no requests for time. I understand that as soon as this rule is adopted the House will adjourn and not continue with the consideration of the bill this evening. If that is the case, I think the House should be so advised. Is that correct, I ask the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH]?

Mr. SABATH. I really do not know.

The SPEAKER. That is correct.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I would just like to make a comment in view of the nature of the bill, the extension of the War Powers Act, extending these vast powers to the President in the midst of the greatest war in the history of the world and, of course, of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, in the history of our country no minority party has ever given such all-out and loyal support to the President and to the Commander in Chief as has the minority, the Republican Party, on all war measures since the declaration of war. There has been no partisanship whatsoever on these great issues involving the prosecution of the war and the winning of the war at the very earliest possible moment. Republicans and Democrats are united in their desire to win this war as quickly as possible and then to bring our soldiers back home to America.

I, as a minority member, want to emphasize that we have given—now that the campaign is over—since Pearl Harbor, since the declaration of war, complete and loyal support on all administration war measures.

Prior to Pearl Harbor the minority supported appropriations for our armed forces—for the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force—and certainly since 1938 has supported all such appropriations. But there was a great difference of opinion among many Members of Congress and 100,000,000 people back home were noninterventionists and opposed to measures that would involve us in war or lead us to war. Many of us supported measures that were short of war, but opposed openly, and have never regretted it in any way, measures that would lead us into war and make war inevitable. These measures were openly opposed, as the RECORD will disclose.

I have never impugned the patriotism or the Americanism of any Member of this House or of the 20 percent of the people who desired to involve us in war before Pearl Harbor. That was their constitutional right, their right of free speech as free sovereign Americans, to express their own sentiments and to actually believe that it was our war from the beginning, and that we should enter the war before Pearl Harbor. But 100,000,000 Americans thought otherwise, and the great majority of this House—many Members of this House on both sides, I will say, in order not to raise a controversial issue at this time. I am just trying to point out the difference between supporting all war measures since war was declared, and appropriations for our armed forces before the war, and opposing with every possible influence, power, and voice and vote all measures that were steps toward war, that made war inevitable, which is an entirely different thing from supporting appropriations for defense and measures for victory after war was declared.

I am glad to take these very few minutes, Mr. Speaker, to state without fear of contradiction that the minority party, the Republican Party, has given 100 percent loyal support to the President and the administration, and the Commander in Chief, in all legislation since the declaration of war, toward helping to win the war as quickly as possible.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. SABATH. Does the gentleman wish any additional time?

Mr. FISH. No; I have no requests for more time.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, it is not my desire to answer the gentleman from New York. The record speaks for itself.

Mr. SPEAKER. I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MILLER] is recognized for 15 minutes.

HOSPITALS IN ENGLAND

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for these few minutes this afternoon to give you a short résumé of some work in the hospitals which I visited in England 2 months ago.

This was my third trip to England, but the first time during wartime. I went immediately to the Military Medical Personnel in London, and they kindly supplied me with a car and driver. I spent several days looking at the hospitals in the midlands of England. I want to report to the House concerning the fine care that our soldiers are getting in these hospitals.

As of October 1, we had something over 100 hospitals in England. There were 86,350 patients in these hospitals. That sounds like a lot of casualties in hospitals, but, with American nurses, American doctors, and American equipment, our boys are getting most excellent medical care. I was told by the Surgeon General there that but 2 percent of the wounded actually died. Of the 2 percent, 1 percent were mortally wounded when they were first reached. This is an outstanding record. With the use of new drugs, new techniques, many lives are being saved.

I went up about a hundred and seventy miles north of London to see some of these hospitals. At one hospital for the care of the nervous, I was particularly impressed with the care being given to the soldier who was nervous. We all have a breaking point. Whether you are a Member of Congress, a banker, a lawyer, or a businessman, there is a place in your life when you can be stretched too far, and you may have a nervous break-down. The hospital was located in a beautiful setting in the countryside. In this hospital of temporary construction were some 1,000 soldiers. They brought in about 30 a day and they were sending out about 30 each day. They kept them there for about three or four weeks. Those boys were jittery. Some of them had been on K-rations too long, too much flak in a bomber, too much time in the front trenches. They were nervous and upset. They put these boys to bed; they really unhitched and unharnessed them.

They gave them a sedative. For 48 hours they are completely relaxed. When they awaken they are in a warm bed. They have good food. There is a sympathetic nurse on hand. They have some music and papers and things around them that are conducive to returning them to health. The doctor in charge of the hospital told me that 95 percent of those boys were being rehabilitated and sent back to service. Perhaps a tail-gunner does not go back being a gunner in an airplane, but they are sent back to some type of duty. During the last World War we did not take very good care of some of the soldiers who were stretched too far. We called it shell shock. We put a label on them. Many of them were sent back to hospitals and institutions for the insane. When the depression was on there were long waiting lines at veterans' hospitals. Some who could have been rehabilitated went insane because of lack of understanding and treatment of the case. But in this war you do not see that. They call this illness battle exhaustion. It does not appear on their records. The boy does not come home with the feeling "I have been shell shocked. There is something wrong with me," like we did in the last World War. He goes back to duty. He puts on the uniform. He is a part of the Army again.

It is going to be a big saving to that soldier in the years to come. It is going to be a big saving to the taxpayers of America, because we will not have to fill our institutions with men who have cracked up.

I went to a fracture hospital where some 1,500 soldiers were being treated, mostly paratroopers, men with fractured legs and arms. They had very few bed patients. I saw the care they were getting. They have gymnasiums that are busy from morning until night. These gymnasiums are fully equipped. The treatment being given will eliminate the stiff joint which would otherwise occur. There will be little if any disability resulting from the fractures.

During the last World War I served in a rehabilitation hospital. There were fewer fractures then because we had no paratroopers. I am sure from 20 to 30 percent of the fracture cases had some disability afterwards. Some still carry them. Now these fracture cases are getting expert care and we are not going to have the stiff joints we had before.

I saw a group of soldiers going through a tough obstacle course, through trenches, under barbed-wire entanglements, up over walls and, hand over hand, across water hazards. Three months before they had fractured arms or fractured legs. The marvelous treatment will assure them little or no disability—the men go back to some type of duty.

I went over to an amputation hospital. You know they do not do very much work on amputations; it is just the rough amputation. I have particular reasons for being interested. They send most of them back here to this country for further amputation. Go out to Walter Reed Hospital or to the Naval Hospital, and some of you ought to go if you can lend some encouragement to those soldiers with amputations. The last time I was out I saw some 30 boys—amputation cases. A lad who gets an amputation, whether it is a finger, an arm, or a leg, has to make some adjustments within himself. He has to learn to make friends with his disability. If it is possible to cheer those boys up it ought to be done. When they realize that they can get around with artificial limbs it does a great deal to them, physically and mentally.

On the ship coming home were some 800 hospital cases. Some of the boys were almost mortally wounded, seriously wounded, and it will take a great deal of rehabilitation to reestablish them. That is being done at the different hospitals throughout the country. Many of these cases need plastic surgery—or a long period of hospitalization.

I was at an evacuation hospital. Something that happened there touched me very deeply as I am sure it will you. It was in one of those hospitals just across from France. They bring some of the badly wounded boys in by airplane. Thirty or forty of them were there in this little tent hospital on stretchers. They were waiting to be moved back to a larger hospital. A little redheaded American nurse was working at top speed trying to relieve pain, changing dressings and carrying out the doctors' orders. As I walked through with the captain of the nurses we came to this girl and the captain said: "Nurse, you must be getting tired; I will try to get some relief for you soon." What do you think that little American nurse said? She said: "No, captain; I really am not tired. I have only worked 20 hours; I can stand another 6 or 8 hours." That is courage and the spirit the nurses are showing over there. Then I thought of some of the strikes we are having in this country by people who wanted to get double time or time and a half for working a little overtime. There is a difference.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I yield.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. The gentleman may have noticed in the paper recently that one Massachusetts nurse was killed over there. The night before her death she had written a very beautiful description of the courage of the wounded men.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Yes. When I saw these boys in this temporary evacuation hospital I saw evidence of the highest degree of courage. These wounded men had real courage. The nursing and medical care is the best.

There are other things I should like to report on at a later date.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield briefly?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I yield.

Mr. PHILLIPS. I am very glad the gentleman from Nebraska is bringing these things to the attention of the House, and I wondered if this would not be a good opportunity to say what was said at the conference in Paris which the gentleman will remember: The reason for the low number of deaths from casualties in this war, according to information given by General Hawley, and if my recollection is faulty I want the gentleman to correct me, was due to three factors: First, prompt attention; second, blood plasma and fresh blood procured in Britain; and, third, the sulfa drugs, and so forth, and that these are things in which the people of America are having a part and they are among the reasons for our low casualties?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I am glad the gentleman from California has brought that out. It is the early attention to the injured, the use of plasma and whole blood, which is very valuable in these shock cases, as well as the use of the new drugs.

Mr. Speaker, I talked to a great many boys at a bomber plant. I had the opportunity to go to a bomber plant the day on which there was a thousand-plane raid on Cologne. I saw these boys when they came back. They told me they would be back at 1:27 in the afternoon. They left between 6:30 and 7 in the morning and at exactly 1:27 in the afternoon the planes showed up overhead, and one by one they peeled off and landed.

I saw the boys give their reports. I saw the squadron leaders reporting the fighter opposition, and what they saw over the target. Before they were through with their report, or shortly afterward, the photographer came in with a picture approximately 4 by 3 feet in dimension showing the proof of the pudding, as he called it, showing what they had bombed that day from great heights.

Mr. Speaker, those boys, I think, without exception, all want to come home as quickly as possible after this war is over. They do not want to come home by way of the Suez Canal.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, a large percentage of the doctors and nurses are Americans, are they not?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Yes; entirely so at these hospitals.

Mr. JENSEN. Is it not a fact that under the American doctors and nurses there are less deaths than under the nurses and doctors of any other country?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I cannot say as to that. The American physicians and the standards of medical and surgical care are very high.

Mr. JENSEN. Yes. The ability of the American doctors and nurses has been developed under a free system of medical care which we have in America.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Yes; that is true.

Mr. JENSEN. That is as against socialized medicine. Our free system in America, I feel quite sure, will save the lives of more American boys and girls in the service of their country and the lives of more American citizens than if we were under socialized medicine. Does the gentleman agree with that?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I agree with the gentleman on that.

Mr. Speaker, at another time I would like to bring forth some other reflections on certain things I saw in England which

are not as rosy and encouraging as what I have reported here today. But I shall reserve that for a future time.

Mr. CURTIS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. CURTIS. Did the gentleman find that the hospitals having the care of the members of the American armed forces are adequately equipped with everything reasonably necessary to bring them back to health?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Yes. The hospitals I visited had the finest equipment that could possibly be secured.

Mr. CURTIS. How about the staffing, was it ample?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. With the possible exception of some nurses in the areas where they have a great many casualties coming in, there was an ample staff for the care of the boys.

Mr. CURTIS. Were these hospitals that the gentleman described base hospitals or field hospitals?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Both. Some base hospitals and some field hospitals. The most of them were the temporary type of construction. They have been put up since the war started. As I stated earlier, we have something over a hundred hospitals and on October 1 there were 86,350 patients in these hospitals.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I yield to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I think that there is a great shortage of real blood.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Of whole blood.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. And I also think there is a shortage of doctors. In the thousand-bed hospitals in Italy, France, and Belgium I find that they cut the doctors by 5 and the nurses from 100 to 83. The consulting surgeon in Italy, they told me, is responsible for a great deal of the very fine care of the men, keeping the wounds clean and open until they get to an evacuation hospital.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. The distinguished gentlewoman from Massachusetts spent considerable time in Italy and France and areas that I did not visit. I think the closer you get to the line of battle the more shortages you find in personnel.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. The gentleman is a very distinguished doctor and views it from purely a medical standpoint.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. CURTIS. This shortage of whole blood that was apparent, is that because of our failure at home to give sufficient blood, or is it because of the inherent difficulties in getting whole blood where it is needed at all times?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. The physician I talked to said that we just recently started to supply whole blood to these areas. We have been supplying a great deal of plasma. They have sufficient plasma. The whole blood was a new idea, a new technique that had been developed, and because of its newness we have not quite caught up with the necessary supply. Then I think there has been a definite falling off in this country of the number of people who have been giving their blood to the Red Cross for this purpose.

Mr. CURTIS. Of course, many people are rejected as donors of whole blood and accepted for plasma; is that not true?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Yes; that is true.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. In Italy there is a very fine blood bank. They are also taking blood from the personnel; the soldiers. I realize some types are difficult to get. Then again, I think they are afraid of whole blood interfering with plasma. That was one reason that was given to me, because they did not ask for the whole blood earlier.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I yield to the gentlewoman from Ohio.

Mrs. BOLTON. I have two questions to bring out that are rather interesting. In the matter of the whole blood, is it not true that the plasma gives only a certain liquidity; it does not give the hemoglobin. The boys bleed so desperately that they have not enough blood left wherewith to rebuild the normal quantity.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. That is true. There are cases where the plasma will work as well as the whole blood, but there are cases that need the hemoglobin or the whole blood that is not supplied in the plasma. There is quite a demand for whole blood for these severe casualties.

Mrs. BOLTON. I am so sorry, I did not know the gentleman was speaking on this matter. I was in committee meeting, or I would have tried to come down.

As to the matter of the English care of their wounded, there seems to be a little comparison going on here among the doctors. Is it not true that the British had to set up an entirely different method of caring for their wounded because of the blitz and the care of civilians, and that therefore they established a different type of hospital for most of their work?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Yes.

Mrs. BOLTON. They can hardly be compared with our military hospitals.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. That is right.

Mrs. BOLTON. I think it should be brought out that this is because we have the advantage of them. We have sent over the best we have in the way of personnel.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. That is true.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. If the gentleman will yield further, just for a comparison with regard to the nurses, I understand that the English have 120 nurses per thousand in the hospitals, whereas we have only 100, and now we have cut that to 83.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Nebraska has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BENNETT] be permitted to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Friday next, at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day and following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. KLEIN, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 262. An act for the relief of Mrs. J. C. Romberg;

H. R. 1318. An act for the relief of Jack V. Dyer;

H. R. 1654. An act to authorize the acquisition, rehabilitation, and operation of the facilities for the public in the Olympic National Park, in the State of Washington, and for other purposes;

H. R. 1665. An act for the relief of Joseph Paste, Anna Paste, Rose Paste, and to the legal guardian of Doris Paste, and to the legal guardian of Evelyn Paste;

H. R. 1919. An act for the relief of Vannie Butler;

H. R. 2097. An act confering jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims of the United States to consider and render judgment on the claim of W. J. Cox against the United States;

H. R. 2512. An act for the relief of Betty Robins;

H. R. 2576. An act to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to determine and render judgment for any losses by Duffy Bros., Inc.;

H. R. 2601. An act for the relief of Mrs. Flossie Leeser;

H. R. 2896. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. R. L. Rhodes;

H. R. 3000. An act for the relief of Clara E. Clark;

H. R. 3373. An act for the relief of Dewey H. Davis;

H. R. 3495. An act for the relief of Constantino Arguelles;

H. R. 3548. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Robert W. Nelson and W. E. Nelson;

H. R. 3608. An act relating to certain overtime compensation of civilian employees of the United States;

H. R. 3750. An act to provide for the appointment of an additional circuit judge for the third circuit, and to permit the filling of the first vacancy occurring in the office of district judge for the eastern district of Pennsylvania;

H. R. 3753. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of Virginia McMillan, a minor, and Howard McMillan;

H. R. 4024. An act for the relief of Victoria Cormier;

H. R. 4065. An act further defining the number and duties of criers and bailiffs in United States courts and regulating their compensation;

H. R. 4099. An act to extend the period of the Philippine Insurrection so as to include active service with the United States military or naval forces engaged in hostilities in the Moro Province, including Mindanao, or in the islands of Samar and Leyte, between July 5, 1902, and December 31, 1913;

H. R. 4226. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of William L. Owen, a minor;

H. R. 4439. An act for the relief of Dennis C. O'Connell;

H. R. 4929. An act for the relief of Lt. James H. Clark and Eleanor Clark;

H. R. 4999. An act to increase the service-connected-disability rates of pension for certain Regular Establishment veterans and veterans of wars prior to World War No. 1;

H. R. 5041. An act to amend the Veterans Regulations;

H. R. 5232. An act to transfer jurisdiction over the Chattanooga National Cemetery, Chattanooga, Tenn., from the Department of the Interior to the War Department, and for other purposes;

H. R. 5289. An act to provide for the acceptance and protection by the United States of property within the authorized boundaries of the Everglades National Park project, Florida, pending the establishment of the park, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 5493. An act to provide for the continuation on the active list of the Regular Army for the duration of any of the wars in which the United States is now engaged, and for 6 months thereafter, of any officer on the active list of the Regular Army who has served as Chief of Staff during the wars in which the United States is now engaged.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ROWAN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 27 minutes p. m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, November 30, 1944, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

2042. A letter from the chairman, the Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission, transmitting a copy of their third annual report; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

2043. A letter from the Administrator, War Shipping Administration, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to permit the Administrator, War Shipping Administration, and the United States Maritime Commission, during the national emergency, to pay the tax imposed under section 1410 of the Internal Revenue Code without regard to the $3,000 limitation in section 1426 (a) (1) of the Internal Revenue Code; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee: Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads. H. R. 4715. A bill to increase the compensation of employees in the Postal Service; without amendment (Rept. No. 1974). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. BLOOM: Committee on Foreign Affairs. House Joint Resolution 317. Joint resolution recognizing the outstanding service rendered to the United Nations by Field Marshal Sir John Dill; without amendment (Rept. No. 1975). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. PETERSON of Florida: Committee on the Public Lands. H. R. 5453. A bill authorizing the conveyance by the Secretary of the Interior to the Chesapeake & Ohio Railway Co., a railroad corporation, of certain perpetual easements near Afton, in Augusta and Nelson Counties, Va., being a portion of the Blue Ridge Parkway land of the Shenandoah National Park; without amendment (Rept. No. 1976). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. PETERSON of Florida: Committee on the Public Lands. H. R. 4665. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain lands in Powell townsite, Wyo., Shoshone reclamation project, Wyoming, to the University of Wyoming; without amendment (Rept. No. 1977). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. McGEHEE: Committee on Claims. S. 1002. An act to compensate Roy W. Olsen for the loss of an eye on account of negligence of Work Projects Administration employees September 25, 1938, at Cranston, R. I.; without amendment (Rept. No. 1960). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. McGEHEE: Committee on Claims. S. 1274. An act for the relief of Vodie Jackson; without amendment (Rept. No. 1961). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. McGEHEE: Committee on Claims. S. 1462. An act for the relief of Solomon and Marie Theriault; without amendment (Rept. No. 1962). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. McGEHEE: Committee on Claims. S. 1557. An act for the relief of Joel A. Hart; without amendment (Rept. No. 1963). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. McGEHEE: Committee on Claims. S. 1732. An act for the relief of Arthur M. Sellers; without amendment (Rept. No. 1964). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. McGEHEE: Committee on Claims. S. 1853. An act for the relief of Dr. Frank K. Boland, Sr.; without amendment (Rept. No. 1965). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. McGEHEE: Committee on Claims. S. 1869. An act for the relief of Mrs. Mamie Dutch Vaughn; without amendment (Rept. No. 1966). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. McGEHEE: Committee on Claims. S. 1897. An act for the relief of Mrs. Sophia Tannenbaum; without amendment (Rept. No. 1967). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. McGEHEE: Committee on Claims. S. 1942. An act for the relief of Dr. E. S. Axtell; without amendment (Rept. No. 1968). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. McGEHEE: Committee on Claims. S. 1987. An act for the relief of Gordon Lewis Coppage; without amendment (Rept. No. 1969). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. McGEHEE: Committee on Claims. S. 1997. An act for the relief of Jack Stowers, B and O Store, and Cotton County Poultry & Egg Co.; without amendment (Rept. No. 1970). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. McGEHEE: Committee on Claims. S. 2008. An act for the relief of Herman Philyaw; without amendment (Rept. No. 1971). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. McGEHEE: Committee on Claims. S. 2042. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of Nancy Frassrand, a minor; without amendment (Rept. No. 1972). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. JENNINGS: Committee on Claims. H. R. 4224. A bill for the relief of the Morgan Creamery Co.; without amendment (Rept. No. 1973). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CELLER:

H. R. 5549. A bill to amend Public Law 603, Seventy-seventh Congress (ch. 404, 2d sess.), entitled "An act to mobilize the productive facilities of small business in the interests of successful prosecution of the war, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. DISNEY:

H. R. 5550. A bill relating to the deductibility under chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of expenses paid or incurred in connection with the return, payment, assessment, and recovery of certain taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PATTON:

H. R. 5551. A bill to transfer certain land in Nacogdoches County, Tex., to the United States Forest Service; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BLOOM:

H. R. 5552. A bill to repeal the act entitled "An act to prohibit financial transactions with any foreign government in default on its obligations to the United States," approved April 13, 1934; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. LESINSKI:

H. Res. 663. Resolution to investigate whether the provisions of the Public Utility Holding Company Act of 1935, as amended, and regulations promulgated thereunder have been violated; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. IZAC:

H. R. 5553. A bill for the relief of the Harbor Boat Works; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. McCORD:

H. R. 5554. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Mirtie Pike and the estate of Mrs. Bernice Smotherman; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 5555. A bill for the relief of Katherine Kelton, a minor; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 5556. A bill for the relief of the estate of Bobby Messick; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 5557. A bill for the relief of Elizabeth Rowland; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 5558. A bill for the relief of Ben Thomas Haynes, a minor; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. PHILLIPS:

H. R. 5559. A bill for the relief of Mrs. J. A. McDowell; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 5560. A bill for the relief of Roy S. Councilman; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

6225. By Mr. MYERS: Petition of Boleslaw Grochowski American Legion Post 396, of Philadelphia, Pa., requesting an appeal for justice to Poland at the peace table; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.